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LOAN COPY.
The object of the Thesis is to demonstrate from all available sources the origin, rise, prosperity and decline of the Hoysala dynasty, and to explain its sudden disappearance, into which questions no sufficient investigation has hitherto been made.

The information has been derived from the very numerous inscriptions in Old Kannada, Sanskrit, Tamil and Telugu, available both in published and unpublished form; from various literary sources in each of the above-mentioned languages; from Persian chronicles, including the valuable Futūḥ us Salāṭin of'Isāmī never before investigated from the point of view of Mysorean history; and from the works of Arabic geographers. Attention has been paid to legendary and semi-legendary material, largely collected by Europeans during the nineteenth century and existing for the most part in unpublished form.

The whole political history of the dynasty has been illuminated by a thorough geographical investigation of the limits of the kingdom throughout the period of three centuries, and the thesis is illustrated by a series of maps, which facilitate a knowledge of the extent of Hoysala power and influence to a greater degree of precision than has been possible hitherto in the case of any Hindu dynasty.

The main body of the thesis describes the origin of the family from the chiefs of a hill-tribe, obscure but enjoying certain natural advantages; its early rise at the expense of neighbouring dynasties; its prowess against the Cōla, and its period of apprenticeship under the Cālukya; its subsequent hostility towards and successes against the latter and against his successor the Kālacūrī; and its eventual triumph during the ascendancy of the Yadava. A series of reverses than led to an aberration under Ballāla II, consisting in the commencement of a series of interferences in the affairs of the southern Cōla and Pāṇḍya kingdoms, which, apparently confirming, in fact undermined the stability of the Hoysala empire. A civil war between the sons of Sōmeśvara stimulated the decline, and vain attempts were made by Ballāla III to stave off the disruption of his kingdom before a sudden blow at the hands of the Muslims made it a ripe suitable object for the ambitions of the Hindu Vijayanagara family.

The thesis is accompanied by a brief description of the administrative methods employed during the period, together with cont.
lists of officials, which, it is hoped, will enable the epigraphic material which is constantly being discovered to be thereby more easily dated, collated and utilized.

Throughout the thesis further light is thrown on the political history of twenty contemporary dynasties.
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INTRODUCTION.

Small attention has hitherto been paid by students of Ancient India to the part played by the people of the country now known as the Mysore State. It has been known for a considerable time that a large and fine collection of sculptured temples is to be found there, and that there survives, largely in unpublished form, a great body of literature produced in this part of the Peninsula in both Sanskrit and Kannada on a varied range of topics, many of the works being of outstanding importance. It is known, too, that an important religious sect, the Vâra-Śaivas, originated in this sphere and that these regions were the scene of some of the greatest triumphs of the Vaisnava propagandist Râmacarita. It is, moreover, not unknown that this country possesses a vast number of lithic and copper records which are capable of providing, when reduced to order, a connected story of the history of the land with a varying degree of fulness from about the fifth century to the present day.

Nevertheless, with such sources and such fields for inquiry, insufficient research has yet been made into the contributions of the various sections of the Karnâtaka people to Ancient and Mediaeval Indian culture, without a full understanding of which the study of Ancient India must always be incomplete. And not only that of Ancient India. The history of Mysore has some unique contributions to make to the solution of the many and perplexing problems concerning Muslim and British rule in India. For she preserves records of the condition, manners and ways of government of purely Hindu states which are far
fuller than any but those of the Cōla and Pāṇḍya kingdoms, while the Mysorean records, for all their faults, are very considerably better adapted to the requirements of the historian, and will remain so until the rich mine of Tamil epigraphical material yields to the approach of more systematic and laborious research than has so far been applied to it. Thus, quite independent of the reports of Muslims upon the peoples they plundered and conquered, we have first-hand evidence in large, and, with labour, manageable quantity and of sufficiently high quality, of the exact state of the country before the advent of any recognizable foreign influence.

Several attempts have been made, notably by Dr. B. A. Saleatore, to portray the social and religious history of various sections of the Karnataka people in different periods. A full and reliable account of the social, political, religious, literary, economic and architectural histories of the Mysorean plateau and adjoining districts is still a desideratum, and will remain so until the records upon which it must be based will have been better read, interpreted and arranged than they have been up to the present.

This work is a contribution to the task, being the political history of the Hoysalas, the most considerable and most prosperous dynasty that has ruled in Mysore. Their line saw some of the best and most characteristic developments of the Karnataka genius, and their period, A.D. 950 to 1343, is most worthy of full and sympathetic examination. No works of art produced in earlier or later periods in the south Deccan
can be compared with the achievements of persons living under their rule or enjoying their patronage. This political history is intended to provide the bony skeleton upon which the social and cultural histories of this most fruitful period may be founded. In it are traced the origin, growth, prosperity, decline and collapse of the Hoysalas themselves, accompanied with the greatest detail and with the fullest completeness that the importance of the subject demands and the weaknesses of the sources permit.

The last original account of the dynasty was written in 1917. (1) It occupies 33 pages, and contains certain errors. Previous to that the only work of importance was the chapter on the Hoysalas of Durasamudra in J.F. Fleet's Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, which work contained in the last edition (that of 1896) 307 pages, itself an advance on the 105th version in the edition of 1882. Of those pages only a small proportion was devoted to the Hoysala dynasty. The first edition itself was a very marked advance on the previous knowledge of the subject, which had been of the very flimsiest nature, based on ill-interpreted Muslim sources and the ill-understood discoveries of European scholars of the first half of the nineteenth century among the vernacular literature and local traditions of the regions in question, such, for example, as form a large part of the Mackenzie Collection. (2) The movement towards the utilization of the epigraphical sources was initiated

---

(1) S. Srikantaiya: The Hoysala Empire. Q.J.M.S. vii & viii.
(2) See below, Appendix 111. Cf. the mention of the Bellāls in Meadows Taylor's Students' Manual of the History of India (London, 1870) pp. 71 & 111; also in Wilks' Historical Sketches of the South of India.
by Walter (later Sir Walter) Elliot of the Bombay Civil Service, whose article on Hindu inscriptions in the fourth volume of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (1837) made, despite its many inevitable errors, a landmark not only in the historiography of Mysore or of India but in scholarly research in general. His facsimiles of the old Kannada characters, significantly without the numerals, and his private collection of copies of inscriptions, many of the originals of which have since been damaged or lost, are still of the greatest value.

Of the many scholars, both native and European, who have contributed to the history of this dynasty two names only deserved particular mention: those of B. Lewis Rice and J.F. Fleet. The first was responsible for a book of translations from texts of inscriptions deciphered from minute photographs, and therefore, as well as on account of the infancy of the study, a work of comparatively little value to-day; for the edition of several works of the old Kannada writers; and especially for the wonderful collection of Mysorean inscriptions, edited with Roman as well as Kannada text and translation, that is known as the Epigraphia Carnatica. His works suffer from several faults, all of which are due to the conditions under which they were produced. In the first place the copies from which text and translation were made were not always identical, and the Roman and Kannada texts vary, sometimes largely. The variation is in a sense helpful, as it often enables a correct restoration to be made where the text has been corrupted by the copyists. Moreover, those inscriptions which seemed too damaged
or too uncommunicative were neglected in the Roman Text and the translation; several valuable records have been recovered in the following pages and their mutilated testimony has been added to the pile. The translations were never exact and full: their author did not consider the whole of an inscription worthy of reproduction, often with reason; and in the period during which this monumental work was published the knowledge of old Kannada was still very defective. It is not now very considerably advanced, but many improvements can be made to Rice's renderings, and have been made in this thesis.

The standard of publication of inscriptions after Rice's time has not been uniformly high, and his successors often declined even from those levels of scholarship that prevailed in pioneering days. For several years no Roman or Kannada texts were published in the Reports of the Archaeological department of Mysore, and the same deficiency is found throughout the annual reports of epigraphy of the Madras presidency. The inscriptions collected in that area are however slowly being published without translation or, in many cases, even an index, in the volumes of the South Indian Inscriptions. It is very unfortunate that no systematic collection has ever been made of the inscriptions in the southern parts of the Bombay presidency, though certain collections of "Bombay-Karnatak" records have been made recently under the auspices of the Madras epigraphists; similarly a complete collection of the Kannada inscriptions in the Nizam's State has yet to be made: Walter Elliot's lithographed collection is thus of more than ordinary
J.F. Fleet published a considerable amount of epigraphical material on many dynasties, and amongst them several in close contact with the Hoysalas. But his greatest work was the construction of a reliable political history of the dynasty from the epigraphical material that had so far been published. His own copies of the Epigraphia Carnatica and other works are to be found in the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, bearing many interesting and useful annotations. Fleet's many errors are seldom due to inexcusable carelessness or faulty deduction, and he remains the best writer on the subject both in point of the thoroughness and exactness with which he worked and in the remarkable success with which he reconstructed the history from the most scanty and difficult materials. His work stands a peculiar test: vast numbers of inscriptions have been published since his work was written, yet his main contentions stand, and his mistakes are insignificant compared with those of his successors, none of whom has surpassed him in this field. Yet Fleet's work is fifty years old, and much material has accumulated, with the double effect of adding new facts to our knowledge and altering the value and interpretation of that which existed in Fleet's time. Records continue to appear, and are discovered annually. The lists of officials at the end of this work are intended primarily to assist in the identification, dating and utilizing of the material to be discovered in the future. These lists will themselves require revision in time, as the identification and affiliation of the officers is at present in very many cases
a matter of conjecture, for records are laconic and the people suffered from an acute shortage of names: a distressing characteristic for the historian as it affects not persons only but places as well.

Although the arrival of fresh evidence is eagerly awaited, the two thousand eight hundred stone and copper inscriptions which have been selected from the fifty thousand available, and upon which this work is based, provide, when supplemented by literary evidence, sufficient material to justify an attempt to construct a history of the whole dynasty.

The task is fraught with difficulties, which have marred the work of previous writers, and will long prove an obstacle to accurate work in this field. An original error made by Rice has often been handed down by the credulous or uncritical so as to deceive several writers before arriving at last at the sanctuary provided for it and its fellows within the historical section of the Mysore Gazetteer which was recently edited by Hayavadana Rao, and which consists of a conflation of all previous theories together with a few suggestions by the compiler, some of which are just, while the remainder are of little value. These errors are very largely due to misreadings, misinterpretations, and faulty deductions based on correct or incorrect material. Misreading is encouraged by the damaged condition of many of the records, very large numbers of which were deliberately damaged and defaced as many as six centuries ago. But faulty sight-copies and imaginative readings of impressions and rubbings have accounted for many more errors. The
real similarity of different characters adds to the confusion, (1) which is worsened by the tendency of decipherers to read familiar and correct forms for unfamiliar words and peculiar forms, which grammarians persist in calling incorrect but which were in their day as usual as the forms selected by grammarians. Copyists have a habit of copying what they think an original ought to read, and Walter Elliot's inscriptions in particular are full of corruptions introduced by copyists. The editors, copyists, readers and, particularly in India, printers do not form the sum total of the sources of errors in our copies; the original authors and the masons or engravers who reproduced their work are responsible for many solecisms and flaws. A good example of the opportunities which these six parties have of corrupting an inscription may be seen by comparing two readings of one record, and the readings of several similar records on unfamiliar and partially intelligible topics. Excellent examples of the misreadings that unfamiliarity brings into a copy may be found in the accounts of settlements, examples of which are provided in Appendix II. (2)

When all is considered it is remarkable that so much material is correctly read. Many corrections have been made by the present writer, but they are only a small fraction of the total number that are required. Correction is only possible when there is a great bulk of material available for consideration at one time, and that advantage has been present in this case, perhaps for the first time.

(1) La and A, da and dha, ā and ā are nearly alike; ja, ca, ba, and bha are hardly distinguishable in many cases; gu and sa are often identical; ta and ra are alike; ṇḍa and ṇṭa can not be told apart. Numerals are extremely treacherous. (2) over.
Great as is the number of errors produced by poor epigraphy, the present lack of knowledge of the languages hampers the reconstruction and interpretation of the texts to a very large extent. Indeed there is a vicious circle: until better texts of inscriptions are produced a proper knowledge of the different styles of literary, official and popular ancient and mediaeval Kannada and Tamil can not be attained, and without the latter the production of good texts of classical authors is well-nigh impossible, and the publishing of texts of inscriptions little more than a hazardous venture.

The present position is that texts are often published without the editors having a full comprehension of their meaning. It is hoped that eventually it will be possible to exceed even that high standard that is reached by some of the publications of inscriptions in the Epigraphia Indica and the Hyderabad Archaeological Series.

When, again, it is realized that even where they are fully intelligible the records are iconic in general and productive of historical facts often only in an incidental manner, while much of the material that has to utilized for historical purposes is thrown into a poetical and highly imaginative form, it is clear that there is a large room for error and misunderstanding. Two thousand eight hundred records are very few considering that they were produced over four hundred years, and therefore scraps of evidence have to bear a much greater weight than they were originally designed to support. Careless and

Page viii n.(2) E.E.I.6 and E.C.V Arkalgud 38 are copies of the same record made by different persons but both edited and published by Rice at different times. The differences are very odd and instructive. One has difficulty in believing that they are of the same stone, but that is undoubtedly the case.
insignificant statements, which may have been of doubtful accuracy at the time they were written, falsehoods and forgeries, all have to contribute to the picture of this dynasty, whose traces, but for the temples, these stone and copper inscriptions and a few coins of almost negligible historical value, (1) have utterly vanished. Small wonder that very many mistakes have been made by writers on one or many aspects of this subject. The temptation to refute and contradict all of them has been great, but the amount of argumentation resulting would have been far too bulky to admit of being reproduced here, and moreover, the errors of previous writers are as satisfactorily contradicted by implication. The field is wide, the facts are few, the room for error vast: it is difficult not to take advantage of it. The present writer has been careful not to overstep the limits of the materials, and where they are unreliable their weaknesses have generally been pointed out.

The translations offered in this work are not expected to be final; they are, in the majority of cases, improvements on those already existing. Defremery’s translation of Ibn Battūtah is so good that very slight and few alterations have had to be made in the passages quoted. In the case of the valuable author 'Īsāmī, however, no translation of his Futūḥ us Salāṭīn has so far appeared, and it has never been examined from the point of view of Hoysala history. Besides 'Īsāmī, most of the Muslim writers consulted in this work have received general attention before, though without any critical comparison

(1) A coin bearing, for example, the legend Nonambavādi-gonḍa, tells us nothing that we do not know from better sources. Hoysala coins were of little artistic value. See M.A.R.1917, p.63 and M.A.R.1929, pp.23-27. A.R.1919,360(1201) mentions Bhuja-bala mādai, which must have been a Hoysala coin.
with the whole of the indigenous records. The existing translations, summaries, extracts and so on, especially in the collection of Elliot and Dowson, are very nearly worthless. Their readings of names alone are of value, as, on account of the extreme liability of the Persian script to corruption, we can never have too much material to enable us to reconstruct the original reading of the Mss. For this purpose very many copies were examined in connection with the events of 1310-1343. (1) Habib's translation of Amīr Khusrau's Khazāīn ul Futūn contains very many unexplained omissions and slips, as well as more than one case of serious inadequacy; but this author is the most difficult of all, including Wassāf, and Habib's efforts may be criticized leniently. No translations exist of the majority of the Kannada classics; and the small extracts appearing in this work, particularly of the interesting and recently published work, the Sūktisuddhārṇava, are likewise in the nature of pioneer attempts.

Of the varied literary material used occasionally in this work a sufficient account will be found wherever relevant. No part of it takes precedence over epigraphical material, with the exception of the question of the death of Ballāla III, where the epigraphical material is clearly faulty. Disagreements are, however, extremely rare. Of some works, such as the Sanskrit Gadyakarnāmrta, we have only reports: if the texts are ever published some additional light may be thrown on Hoysala problems.

(1) Of 20 Mss. of the Tabaqāt i Akbarī of Khwājah Nizām ud din Ahmad (listed in the Bibliography) for the correct reading Ballāl one has Balār, three have Balādār (or approximations), one has Balād, three have Balār with the Bū undotted, three have Malāl, five have Malār, one Malā, one Palār, one Madār, & one Malāz.
Orthographical difficulties beset a work of this nature. The inhabitants of the countries concerned were themselves not sure how their language and especially proper names ought to be spelt. When words occur in several languages and in different forms the Kannada form has usually been preferred, but absolute consistency has been found impossible. Belagāvi has been chosen arbitrarily instead of Baligāve, Baligāvi, Belagāme, Belāgāmve and other forms, all of which were at some time in use amongst the Kannadigas themselves; similarly Talakād has been chosen instead of Talekād, Talakād, or Talaik-kādu. In many other cases a similar choice has had to be made. In the cases of the names of persons it is often doubtful whether the reading followed is correct or preferable to current alternatives. The reader should be aware of the peculiar Kannada fluctuations between la and la, la and la, ra and ra, ha and pa, pa and va (and even ma) after vowels; the doubled consonant after r has not generally been allowed, despite the fact that it was almost universally affected by the contemporary writers, and is therefore faithfully reproduced in the quotations. These are exactly as they occur in the originals, with only the most obvious errors corrected, and with emendations clearly shown.

It will be found with the references that the date is supplied after the identification of the epigraph: this useful datum in very many cases differs from that used by the editor or editors. The reasons for the change are not always given, as the reasonings behind it are often lengthy and complex; in the majority of cases a misreading of a numeral or some
other irregularity is responsible for the error, which the broad comparison of a large number of records soon repairs. Some examples are particularly difficult, as the date is not only inconsistent with the subject matter but with itself; such cases may often be explained by the suggestion that the record was fabricated or mistakenly copied after the event which it was intended to commemorate.

No great attention has been paid here to chronological worries, which have been stimulated by experts in astronomy and have exercised many minds with little dependable result. Sewell and Dikshit's scheme has been followed, though the names of the samvatsaras are not always identical with those in their list. The incidence of eclipses proves that their identification of the Saka year, whether current or expired, with the cyclic year is correct, and that both have a certain relationship to our era. The absence of an eclipse mentioned in an inscription from their list proves nothing: the Kannada astrologers used invisible as well as visible eclipses, and a pleasant looking date was to the majority of people as good as an accurate one. There is, incidentally, no proof that any samvatsaras were expunged during this period. When a question mark precedes a date, it signifies that the year may be taken as correct, but that the record itself does not give absolutely convincing proof of the year. The sign for "circa" gives a conjectured date a latitude of three years in each direction.
The maps, which are, perhaps, the most certainly original portion of this thesis, provide for the first time a basis for the exact assessment of the territorial power of this dynasty and some surrounding dynasties. Map 'C' will prove of value when the history of the north-western districts comes to be written. With the exception of maps 'D' and 'E' 75% of the villages known to have been occupied during the period are shown. Of the remainder by far the greater part are now deserted, have altered names, or are for some other reason not included in either the 1 inch or 4 miles-to-the-inch sheets of the latest ordnance survey. A complete set of these sheets may be found in the Record Department of the Commonwealth Relations Office, King Charles Street. The maps provided here are accurate to within a half-mile, and will be found very helpful in following the campaigns of the Hoysala kings. With few exceptions the names are shown in their contemporary forms, while only gross differences from the modern forms are noted in brackets. The reader will find it of great help to use a map of modern Mysore also, especially one that, like that found in Riëe's "Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions", shows the boundaries of the tāluqas, to which constant reference is made in this work.

Certain subjects connected with the history of the Hoysala dynasty have received ample treatment elsewhere or are outside the scope of this thesis. Such are the questions of the origin of the first Vijayanagara dynasty, on which the latest views of Dr. N Venkataramanayya are followed, and the very
doubtful matter of the conversion of Viṣṇuvardhana by Rāmānuja, references to which are found amongst the nearly-worthless material in Appendix II.

This work could not have been written without the enthusiastic cooperation and assistance which the writer obtained from Messrs. A. Master, M. S. H. Thompson and G. M. Wickens, all at the time of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, who instructed him in Kannada, Tamil and Persian respectively and gave unsparing efforts towards the solution of the very numerous problems presented by the materials. The writer is obliged likewise to Professor J. Brough and Mr. C. A. Rylands, both of the same School, for their patient compliance with his requirements in the fields of literary and epigraphical Sanskrit. He is particularly indebted to Dr. L. D. Barnett, whose perseverance and learning, both exercised often at no small personal inconvenience, have not only encouraged the work at every stage from its inception, but also contributed many valuable suggestions and detected numerous cases where he would have fallen into error.

Esher,

September, 1949.
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(1) The shaded portion indicates very approximately the area ruled at different times by Hoysala kings. It was never ruled in its entirety by a Hoysala king at any one time.
The subdivisions of the Hoysala country

With a key to their position on Map "A".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alageya-nāḍ</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arakere-nāḍ</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arasu-nāḍ</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āsandi-nāḍ</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badabagundu-nāḍ</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badagere-nāḍ</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballavi-nāḍ) near Bellur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballagi-nāḍ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bambaya-nāḍ</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bānatiyahalli-nāḍ</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayal-nāḍ</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beku-nāḍ near Tagare-nāḍ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidurūr-nāḍ</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biligūr-nāḍ unidentified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canga-nāḍ</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cikka-Gangavāḍi-nāḍ</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cokka-nāḍ</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāsarātyahalli-nāḍ</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēvagunda-nāḍ</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēvalige or Dēmalige-nāḍ</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ede or Idai-nāḍ</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elahakahka or Yelahakahka or Elahaka-nāḍ</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enne-nāḍ</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadavalike-nāḍ</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nad</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haruve-nād</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiriya-nād</td>
<td>same as Ede-nād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogare-nād</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangalvādi-nād</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosavūr-nād</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulēnahalli-nād</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiddulige or Jidvalige-nād</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabbunālīge-nād north of Jiddulige-nād</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabbuhu-nād (a 1000 nād)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaivāra-nād</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāiyara-nād</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalavara-nād</td>
<td>?19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkani or Kalukani-nād</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāulvali-nād or Kēluvali-nād</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kēla-nād</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kēregōdu-nād</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kīlalai or Kīlalūr-nād</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōdagi-nād</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōlka-nād part of Hiriya-nād</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōnda-nād</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōgalī-nād</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koppa-nād</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōru-nād</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuḍugu-nād or ? Kuḍugalūr</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūkkalā-nād</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūmāra-nād otherwise Tore-(? &amp; Tāra)nād</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurukki-nāḍ</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuruvanka-nāḍ</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magare-nāḍ (a 300 nāḍ)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magatanga-nāḍ</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maisu-nāḍ</td>
<td>unidentifed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-nāḍ</td>
<td>Near Dōrasamudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallige-nāḍ</td>
<td>unidentifed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manali-nāḍ</td>
<td>Near Dōrasamudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manñai-nāḍ</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marugare or Maruguli or Marugal-nāḍ</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māsandi-nāḍ</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayse or Maise-nāḍ</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mōdur-nāḍ</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murasu-nāḍ</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nallūr-nāḍ</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nekku-nāḍ</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nema-nāḍ</td>
<td>Near Tagare-nāḍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirugunda-nāḍ</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nugu-nāḍ</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padinālku(14)-nāḍ</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakali-nāḍ</td>
<td>? part of Hiriya-nāḍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponmanîge or Hommalige-nāḍ</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulliyūr-nāḍ</td>
<td>otherwise Kuñji, Kurukkuñji 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmaḍi-nāḍ</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sañi-nāḍ</td>
<td>Near Palliyūr-nāḍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāntalige-nāḍ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nad</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigal-nāḍ or Siyal-nāḍ</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīge-nāḍ</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīre-nāḍ</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīkala-nāḍ</td>
<td>in the western districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagadai-nāḍ</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagare-nāḍ (a 70 nāḍ)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagu-nāḍ</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talige-nāḍ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tēkkal-nāḍ</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūṅgaṇi-nāḍ</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapada-nāḍ</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veppūr-nāḍ</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīra-Vallāla-dēva-nāḍ</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalagali-nāḍ</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeḍatore-nāḍ</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.S.I.</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.M.</td>
<td>British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.H.I.</td>
<td>Cambridge History of India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.K.D.</td>
<td>Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.</td>
<td>Epigraphia Carnatica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.I.</td>
<td>Epigraphia Indica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.I-M.</td>
<td>Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.I.S.I.</td>
<td>Historical Inscriptions of Southern India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.A.</td>
<td>Indian Antiquary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.H.Q.</td>
<td>Indian Historical Quarterly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.O.</td>
<td>India Office. (Now Commonwealth Relations Office.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.I.H.</td>
<td>Journal of Indian History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.K.</td>
<td>Kadamba Kula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.K.C.</td>
<td>Karnataka Kavi Carite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.T.</td>
<td>Kannada Text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.R.</td>
<td>Reports of Epigraphy, Mysore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.INS.</td>
<td>Mysore Inscriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.I.A.</td>
<td>New Indian Antiquary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd.</td>
<td>Pudukkottai Inscriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.S.O.C.I.</td>
<td>Pali, Sanskrit and Old Canarese Inscriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.S.</td>
<td>Royal Asiatic Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.T.</td>
<td>Roman Text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S.I.I.          South Indian Inscriptions.
S.K.H.         Sources of Karnataka History.
V.C.E.         Vijayanagara: the Origin of the City and the Empire.
W.E.           Walter Elliot.

...           Syllables missing.
---           Syllables or words deliberately omitted.
(   )         Round brackets enclose
(1) words necessary to complete the sense;
(2) explanatory or illustrative matter.
[   ]         Square brackets enclose syllables barely visible on the stone or copper plate.
<   >         Pointed brackets enclose syllables inserted by the present writer, except where otherwise stated.
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CHAPTER ONE

THE BEGINNINGS
CHAPTER ONE: THE BEGINNINGS.

In the tenth century of our era Southern India can not have lacked in appearance many of the features which it now displays. The same wide plains extend across the Deccan and in the Tamil districts at the extreme south-east of the peninsula; the same lofty range separates the relatively narrow strip of the Malabar coast from either; the Western Ghats, as it is known, form a junction, at a point about two thirds of their distance towards Cape Comorin, with the culminating ranges of the Eastern Ghats, that less continuous but no less formidable concatenation, to form the massive heights of the Nilgiris, which project above the southern plains like an enormous bastion. The table-land which lies between these ranges forms at its western edge the watershed of the rivers Tuṅga and Bhadra, which with the Vēdāvati flow northwards, and the Hēmāvati, Lākṣamantīrtha and Kabbanī rivers which, uniting with the Kāverī, itself rising in the same region, flow by its sinuous bed to the east and then south; the eastern parts of this plateau, receiving as they do far less rain than the western, provide, besides the Shimsha, but exiguous streams to the waters of the Kāverī, while to the Kistna river, so plenteously supplied by the western districts, they send only the Suvarṇāmukhi, a tributary of the Vēdāvati, and harbour at the extreme eastern edge the sources of the Pinākini or Northern Pennār with its tributaries the Jayā- maṅgali and Kumudvati.
These rivers may perhaps, in the tenth century, have been a little less wide; their progress, hardly as yet impeded by ambitious schemes of irrigation, may have been more rapid. Upon the flanks of the mountains a little more soil may have remained. Two notable features, however, distinguish the face of the country of that day from that of the present: the extent of the forests has dwindled, while the number of artificial reservoirs, or tanks as they are known, has increased.

Many hills are now bare which were then thickly wooded. Isolated tracts of woodland, now protected by the intervention of the State from further depredation, were then continuous belts of dense forest traversed by few and winding paths, trod by the wayfarer in terror of wild beasts and by the merchant in fear of robbers. Dense scrub and jungle then covered large areas which have long since yielded to the mattock and the harrow, while the areas of forest which now render the western and southern boundaries of Mysore effective barriers against any but the most enterprising invader, then extended rather further to the east and north than they do at present. (1)

Accordingly an area corresponding roughly to the modern Hassan, eastern Mysore, eastern Kadur and south-west Tumkur districts formed a space, dotted here and there with small if often lofty hills, but otherwise comparatively flat and slightly wooded, which could be considered a gigantic natural clearing amid the mountainous forests that encircled

---

(1) Epigraphic evidence of deforestation is found, for example, in E.C.V Belur 175(1186) & E.C IX Bangalore 133(1307).
it completely on the west and south, though less so on the north and east. On those sides gaps were found sufficient for unimpeded access in the first place to two separate tracts, namely that corresponding to the modern Bangalore and Kolar districts to the east, and that lying between the rivers Vēdēvati and Pinākini in the north, forming part of the north of the Tumkur district and the Madaksira and Kalyandrug tāluqas of the modern Anantapur district - a tract itself giving access to the wider spaces of the Deccan plain; and secondly in a similar manner to a naturally homogeneous tract formed by the western parts of Chitaldrug, the northern part of Kadur district and the northern and eastern regions of the Shimoga district together with parts of the southern portion of Dharwar district in the modern Bombay Presidency. This latter tract, separated incompletely from the great clearing mentioned above by a series of irregular wooded hills running from the main western range, was in its turn made distinct from the lands included in that tract of which the northern portion of Tumkur district forms a part by a comparatively low range parallel to the Western Ghats and joining the east-west projection just referred to. (1)

If the climate of the plateau at that time differed at all from that of the present, it will have been

(1) At this point it may be convenient to refer to Map 'A', the shaded portions of which indicate areas at present wooded.
on account of the greater rainfall which a greater degree of vegetation may have given it. In all other respects modern records will be a reliable guide to the climatic conditions enjoyed by its tenth century inhabitants. The plateau is renowned for its healthy and equable climate, secured by its average height of two thousand five hundred feet above mean sea level. Accordingly, not only is the maximum temperature lower than that experienced in the plains, but the daily variation in temperature is greater. (1) Specially worthy of attention is the peculiar proportion of the rainfall. While about three hundred inches are registered in the area now included within the western half of Kadur, Shimoga and Hassan districts, this level drops sharply as the monsoon clouds leave the heights of six thousand feet and enter the plateau. Within sixty miles of the area with the heaviest rainfall only forty inches in a good and twenty five in a bad year are precipitated.

The historical importance of this fact is very great. As the diet of the greater part of the Dravidian as well as Aryan sections of the inhabitants must have been entirely vegetable - for the prevailing creeds discouraged the consumption of animal food, and neither climate nor soil favoured the pasturing of large herds of cattle - land upon which heavy seasonal rain fell was clearly more desirable than that which enjoyed an irregular or scanty water supply.

(1) A detailed description of the climate of Mysore is found in the chapter entitled Meteorology in vol. 1 of Hayavadana
In the west, the ground once deforested and tilled, two or more crops could be raised within the year with comparatively little labour, while further eastwards well water and the seasonal streams could hardly provide a single crop, while a failure of the north-east Monsoon, which waters eastern Mysore during October and November, frequently subjected the population to drought and famine. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that it was in the eastern half of the plateau that the tank originated, as a means of conserving an inadequate water supply. The damming of a stream, permitting only the overflow to enter the old bed, enabled the owner of the land below the tank to triple the value of his soil. In the tenth century hardly a tenth of the existing number of these tanks had been constructed, and the present total, in the region of forty thousand, demonstrates the enterprise of subsequent rulers and the consequent growth of wealth and population.

Great, however, as was the natural cleavage between east and west as regards their respective enjoyment of a water supply, other benefits awaited the hardy immigrant to the west. The farmer whose labour in clearing the forest was rewarded by luxuriant crops could afford luxuries for which the subsistence farmer of the east might not hope. Manufactured goods and precious commodities passed, in dry weather, along the route from north to south which skirted the western

---

Rao's Mysore Gazetteer, pages 42 and following.
mountains, and met the roads from Mangalore, Bārahūr and Honnāvar, along which passed the trade which the South Deccan and indeed Southern India carried on with the Indian Ocean. Commodities as varied as horses and salt entered the plateau in exchange for Mysorean paddy, gold and iron; the rulers of the small communities gathered upon these arteries of trade enjoyed a substantial revenue from the luxurious tastes of the courts of the Kamaḍa rulers in the north, the Telugu princes in the east, and, to a moderate extent, the Tamilian dynasties of the south-east as well. Soon an indigenous power would exploit this source of income to the full.

But, whatever the difference between east and west as a result of the superior opportunities offered to the energetic in the western parts of the plateau, an equally important distinction is to be drawn between the types that inhabited hill and plain. The plain-dweller, whether of Āryan, Dravidian or mixed descent; whether a Brahman occupied in the civil service, or in elegant repose in some agrahāra which a dutiful monarch had bestowed upon his ancestors; or a Jaina merchant living in a depot belonging to the Nānā Dēśis or to another branch of the Five Hundred Swāmis of Ayyāvole, situated at the crossing of important roads or at some other place that was the proud possessor of a regular fair; or the Gāvūṇḍa, a respectable farmer having many tenants under him; or even the humble cultivator upon whose devoted efforts the whole structure of society rested: all alike feared and detested the hill-dweller, whose habitation and ways of life made the plain-dweller of every description his natural prey.
These inhabitants of the hill ranges, whose chieftains were referred to generally under the term malepar,(1) or hill-chiefs, belonged originally to tribes, presumably of pre-Dravidian descent, which had either never known life in the plain or had been driven from there by early imperial dynasties. Their life was obliged to be harder than that of the plain-dweller. This was principally on account of the poorer facilities for raising crops, due as much to the general lack of security in their less populous and less organized society, as to the roughness of the land and the duration and intensity of the summer rains, which isolated each family from its fellows and from the outside world when swollen streams rendered the narrow paths impassable. Their actual livelihood depended in part upon the sale of sandal and other woods, as also the flesh of wild and half-wild beasts, which they themselves ate and which was not despised by the less respectable castes in the plain; they also sold their services to the plain-dwellers, who employed them for the purpose of exterminating wild animals, principally tiger and leopard. Yet they derived their greatest profit, and doubtless no little pleasure, from looting outlying farms and carrying off women, cows and draught-cattle. Their physical strength being, on account of their environment, naturally superior to that of their victims, they proved a constant source of terror to the villager and of concern to the official, who could seldom deal promptly

(1) References to malepar or malehar are not rare. Even in later days malehar raided cows from villages: M.A.R.1915-6 para.86(1136) and E.C.VII Shikarpur 273(1222)K.T.only. A certain Cika-malapa is mentioned in E.C.VII Shimoga 127(?c1020)K.T. only.
with the menace. Raids by these Bēdar, as they were known, are frequently recorded even in the days of a prosperity which could afford to set up inscriptions commemorating the disasters. Only imagination can measure the extent of the danger in the tenth century. (1)

As mercenary soldiers, on the other hand, the subjects of the malepar had another source of income and means of employment. It was a means which without doubt contributed largely to their domestication and their eventual emergence into the plain and into civilized society together. By this means the Bēdar of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries reached a high social position, and the Māvalis of the same period achieved prominence in the Marātha empire. But the less enterprising among our hill-dwellers, whose ambitions never leapt beyond the robbing of caravans or perhaps the offer of protection to passing merchants from the attentions of their fellow robbers, and who consequently remained in the depths of the forests, never developed a civilization worthy of the name, remained inarticulate from the point of view of history, and are buried in a well-merited obscurity.

Not that warlike propensities were monopolized by the hill-dwellers: the entire country was favourable to

(1) Attacks by Bēdar are referred to in M.INS 85(1102); E.C.VII Channapatna 37(1200); E.C.VI Tarikere 84(1209); E.C.VII Honnali 48(1216); E.C.VI Tarikere 63(?1244); ibid. 48, 49(1237); M.A.R.1927,27(1237); E.C.XI Davangere 38(cl300).
the development of a virile constitution. To the labour of
cultivation was added the strain of constant watchfulness
against the attack of the human foes which a bad state of
public order encouraged, and against the ever-present menace
of wild beasts, which the wild condition of the terrain
rendered inevitable.(1)

Of all the inhabitants of the plateau it may be
said generally that they were brave, despising death, pugnacious, and, especially in the north-west, warlike to the
degree of blood-thirstiness; in all which qualities the hill-
dweller may be supposed to have excelled.(2)

(1) Men are mentioned as in conflict with tigers, sometimes
single-handed, in E.C.X Chintamani 162(1114); E.C.IX Kan-
kanhalli 12(1118); E.C.IV Nagamangala 67(c1060); ibid. Gundlu-
pet 66(1293); E.C.VI Tarikere 16(?1193);
M.A.R.1917 para.102(1266); A.R.1919,319(?1285); E.C.IX Kan-
kanhalli 40(1351). The hunting of wild boar, for which dogs
were employed, is mentioned in E.C.III Mandya.22(1144); E.C.
IX Kankanhalli 11(1310), and E.C.VIII Sorab 340(1249).

(2) The couplet that almost invariably concluded the record
upon the viragal, or hero-stone, deserves to be quoted:
"jītena labhyate Laks̄mī (or Bhūmī) mṛtēnāpi surāmgaṇān
kṣaṇa-vidyautemānē kāyē kā cintā māraṇē raṇē." "The victor
gains wealth (or the earth): even the slain gains the cele-
tstial nymphs: what fear then of death in battle when the body
perishes in an instant ?" To this is added in E.C.VI Chik-
magalur 122(1140): "aniyam adhruvam pṛṇam mānam E-candra-
tārakaṁ | pṛṇam ēva (read pṛapasyaiva) paritīgē mānam ēva
su-rakṣitām." "Life is transient and uncertain: honour lasts
as long as moon and stars: honour must be preserved even at
the cost of life." As an indication of the bloodthirsty
element in the national character, note the following in
E.C. VIII Nagar 19(1320): "marulagalu karula māleya<ṃ>
koroḷu sarav ittū rudhira-tilakam ittūm /'harasutider i-
Kūrukan / uravaniy ēlu tanake meci samarāṅgapadol // pita
Cīla wāte Nāgale / suta-Kūrukan ubhaya-kulavan uddhārisidhan
end / atimudadiṁ dēvāṅganeṇāra varadiṁ Puppakavan ēśi Sivana
The Kārṇaṭaka people, as the Kannada-speaking inhabitants of the plateau were called, show in their early literature and in the less formal of their inscriptions a simple and exuberant attitude to a life which conditions must have made comfortless and brief, but, while it lasted, full, vigorous, adventurous and satisfying.

padamam sā . . //" (If the metre is, as it appears to be, of nine syllables to the line - in which case the divisions, here taken from Rice's text, should be neglected - the original have been padam sāreyādam; otherwise padamam sārdaq may be correct. But the reading sā may be unreliable.) "The frenzied people placed on his neck a garland of entrails and, with a shout, a wafer-spot of blood (upon his brow), and blessed that Kūruka, approving him upon the field of battle as an impetuous soldier. While his father Cīla and mother Nāgāle said that their son Kūruka had elevated both the families, with exceeding joy he mounted the heavenly chariot by the choice of the heavenly damsels and (approached) the feet of Śiva."

An interesting illustration from literature of the native Kannada vigour is provided by typical verses from the Jaimini Bhārāta (of disputed date but clearly no earlier than the commencement of the Vijayanagara empire). Verse 44 of the fourth book runs: - "taṃtairīdu kattarīsi kocci naṭṭ uccalisi korad aradu kaṇḍid irīdu bagid ugdīgu gabbarisī paṇḍu sīld uṭṭarīsī ketti khaṇḍisī balicetipīd (u read etti piḍ) ikki koydu poydu / eragi kavid iḍid otī kaduki mābil kilisī kiri turugi tūṇḍisī tuḷūki nāṭti maṇumonegŏndu re poralcīd-avari cartu balavān ellāmam Kārnajān esuva kanegalū //". Here the arrows shot by the son of Karna subject all the opposing force to thirty-five varieties of striking and cutting, the words for which are all pure Kannada with the exception of three (uṭṭarīsī, khaṇḍisī and kilisī) which are Sanskrit roots adapted to use in Kannada with slightly different meanings. Likewise, in verses 5 and 6 of book two, we find king Yudhīsthira ruling the earth putting down a large number of vices oppressions and injustices, the large majority of which are represented by pure Kannada words, and protecting and fostering virtues and prosperity depicted in a vocabulary entirely of Sanskrit origin.
The hazards and vicissitudes of this existence were, of course, much more evident to the plain-dweller than to his contemporary in the hills. While the latter was a member of an independent clan secure from the effective threat of foreign domination, the former was constantly at the mercy of any freebooter who happened to be able to defy the government, of an invasion by a hostile power, or by punitive or protective expeditions by his own ruler which could be equally disastrous. The tenants and cultivators were continually finding themselves pawns in the political game played as occasion offered between their local ruler and the sovereign.

Thus while conditions in the mountains might remain unchanged for generations, the inhabitants of the plains, despite their common language, which might have been expected to render them a single nation distinct from Telingas, Tigulas (Tamilians) and Āryas (Marāthas)(1), seldom found themselves fellow-citizens of a single empire. Yet a single empire, or at worst a small number of truly powerful states, was essential for the protection of the lives and properties of the individual inhabitants, and several notable attempts were made to bring about this desirable condition. As however no agreement lasted for long, as to which families in particular should exercise supreme authority, and as those which succeeded in achieving the recognition of the majority sooner or later lost the power they had acquired and so forfeited their claims,

(1) For the use of the word Ārya to signify Marātha see below page 300, 359, 406. See also M.A.R.1937,36(1240) where there is an obscurity.
tenth-century Mysore was littered with the remains of many once-powerful dynasties, whose degree of co-operation with the sovereign for the time being varied with their own ambition and the latter's weakness.

At that time the north-western area of the plateau was ruled by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty, then about to give place to the Caḷukyas; the remainder was nominally governed by the Gaṅga dynasty, whose original headquarters appear to have been at Kōḷāḷapura, the modern Kolar. They belonged therefore to the eastern sector of the plateau, and though they had entered into a fine inheritance in the western clearing of which mention has been made above, they never moved their seat of government further west than Talakād. Their authority had, however, been sufficiently well-recognized in the past for the whole of the plateau with certain small exceptions to be designated the Gaṅgavādī 96,000, the numeral referring to the number of inhabited places in the area(1) according to a survey made several centuries before the period now under consideration. The only portions of the plateau not included in the Gaṅgavādī 96,000 were, besides certain uninhabited areas in the north-east and north, the Banavāse 12,000 which centred around the once-important town of Banavāse, and the Noḷambavādī (or x̂r Noṇambavādī) 32,000 which stood between the Gaṅgavādī and the Deccan plain, and of which Uccaṅgi was the chief town.

(1) This is proved beyond question by M.A.R.1937,33(1097), which distinctly states "96,000 villages(ūrgal)". It had been suggested that the number referred to a sum of revenue, and so on.
The Nolambavadi province derived its name from the Pallava family of the Nolambas, who had exercised great power in that region until defeated by the Gaṅgas, and left remnants of their family to carry on their name in parts even far south of this region. (1)

Nor were the Nolambas the only famous family of which branches continued to rule in a subordinate capacity under the Gaṅgas, or in opposition to them, during the tenth century. Certain well-known branches of the Kadamba family ruled, indeed, under the Rāstrakūtas and afterwards under the Gālukyās at Hāṅgal, Banavāse and Bandalike in the north-west, but representatives of the dynasty flourished at Kīrtipura in the extreme south, on the Kabbani river, at Banavāse, Rājendrapura and the vicinity in the modern Manjarabad and Hassan

---

(1) The northern Nolamba-Pallava family is represented by the following inscriptions: E.C.XI Davangere 126(1037) at Mudi-hadadi; ibid.19(1043) at Ávaragere; ibid.20(1045) at Vaḍdana-halāli; E.C.XI Nolakkerē 65(1061) at Muttagadūr; E.C.VII Ḍonnali 119(?1054) at Neraḷagunḍī; E.C.XI Jagalur 10(1054) at Asaḡūdu; ibid.Molakalmurū 28(1072) at Rāmasāgara; ibid.Citaldrug 32(1074) at Hulagundī. The family must have been important in this area long before the eleventh century; likewise Udēyāditya Pallavā-rayā of Arakere in Seringapatam tāḷuqa, who is mentioned in E.C.XIII Seringapatam 119(1108), must have had lineal connections with the family of a much earlier date. M.A.R.1932,37 (c950) at Marale, mentioned below, has another reference to this family. Nolambas in the east are referred to in E.C.X Mulbagal 248 (?860) at Mūtagapalli, ibid.Kolar 57(c 926) at Kyalanur, ibid.198 & 245 (c950 & 966) at Gaṇḍlahalli and Haralakunte respectively, ibid.Mulbagal 84(974) at Mēḷāgāṇi, and finally, in the same volume, Cintamani 118(1010) at Kalllahalli. Moreover certain references in E.C.V Arskikerē 42(1130) and ibid.55(1143) show clearly that Nolamba fame lingered on in the memory of certain areas for a long while. These are the title Nolamba-devā-pādārādhaka, "worshipper of the feet of Nolamba-deva and the name Nolamba-gauḍa, with the story of Sthira-gambhīra-Nolamba, the grandfather of the sāmanta Bhima who was honoured by Viṣṇuvardhana.
talugas, and at Molakalmuru in the north.

Of independent families of high standing may be mentioned the Cangālvā and Koṅgālvā dynasties, whose names are derived from the Canga and Koṅga nāḍs respectively. They ruled areas in close proximity to each other in the region between the Hēmāvati and the Kāvēri and to the south of the Kāvēri on the very edge of the mountains of Coorg.

(2) Of rather greater vitality were the Sāntaras, who were about to leave the restricted neighbourhood of their forest fortress of Pomburccha or Humca for the fertile lands of the northwest, while the several branches of the Sinda family and the Guttas occupied areas of the northern plain to the east and south of the Tuṅgabhadra river. Among entirely submerged dynasties, some traces are found of the Bānas, a line that had been powerful in the northern as well as southern parts

(1) The existence of the Kīrtipura or Kittūr family is shown by E.C.IV Heggadadevankote 56 (1079) at Kittūr, ibid.55(1087) at Hāleyūr, ibid.79(1107) at Sōgai, and very probably ibid. 50(1158) at Narasīpura, where a certain Mukkanna-Kaḷamba has the title Dvārāvati-puravarādhiṣvara, almost certainly as a sign of dependence upon the Hōysalas. The relationship of this family to that of Rājendrapura is unknown: the latter is evidenced by E.C.V Hassan 38 (?)1000) at Kūndūr, where it is stated that a "lord of [Banavāsi]pura,(worshipper) of Madhukēśvara" was residing at Banavāsē, the smaller town of that name, 17 miles east of Rājendrapura and more than 50 miles north of Kittur; also perhaps by Hassan 45(1025) where mention is made of the "performer of 18 horse-sacrifices, receiver of a boon from the goddess Padumāvati, having the lion signet, Malapa-rāja ("king of the Malepar") (was ruling); likewise a group of inscriptions of the king Niti-mahārāja are to be taken as evidence of a Kadamba branch at or near Rājendrapura: E.C.V Manjarabad 54(c1026), ibid.55(c1035), ibid.57(1030) and 53(1026) all at Balli; ibid.44(1027) at Rājendrapura, and 45(?c1030) at the same place; and ibid.50(1034) at Cikkanāyakanhalli. A remnant of this family appeared later: E.C.V Manjarabad 1(c1090) at Hosagūru, E.C.I 57(1095) at Yaḍūr in Coorg, and E.C.V Manjarabad 18(1095) at Hale-Belūru. See also E.C.XI Molakalmuru 41(1100).

(2) For further details of
of the plateau, but at this time were mostly confined to the tracts below the ghats in the modern Salem and surrounding districts.

The Ganga family had during its exercise of authority over the greater part of the Karnātaka country for more than six hundred years thrown off many subordinate branches in various quarters. In the tenth century junior families bearing the Ganga name and titles were to be found as far north as Uāri, at Āsandi, in the vicinity of Kolar, and in other parts, as proper names show clearly without enabling a precise identification to be made of the number of families that existed, or their exact location.

But however deep their roots in the country, the Gāngas had not succeeded in raising it to any high degree of development. The general level of culture appears to have begun to rise in the last half-century of their power, that is, from about 950 A.D.; but prior to that period the central and southern parts of the Karnātaka country at any rate had been remarkable for no distinctions either politically or in the fields of literature, religion or architecture. (1)

(1) The works of early Kannada literature come with few exceptions from the north, for example from Puligere, the modern Lakahmeshvar, where, according to Nṛpatuṅga (Kāvirājāmārga I, 37.) the pith of Kannada was spoken - a distinction also enjoyed by two other northern cities, Kopāna and Kisuvalal. The great Kannada poets of the tenth century, Pampa, Ponna and Ranna, were indeed patronized by Gāṅga kings, but the last two enjoyed Rāstrakūṭa patronage equally with that of the Gāṅga, and the first, author of the Pampa Bharata, himself originated in Puligere. The first indigenous writer of outstanding merit
Moreover, the general low level of prosperity as compared with succeeding centuries may be judged from the very small number of lithic and copper records surviving. It may safely be assumed that the silence and obscurity that surrounds the Gaṅga dynasty is due to the poverty and under-developed condition of their subjects. Yet, by the end of the thirteenth century the Gaṅgavāḍi had become one of the most prominent, if not the most enterprising, parts of Southern India culturally as well as politically, while the remnants of the Gaṅga dynasty appear to have played no noticeable part in the struggle to vindicate Karṇāṭaka claims for recognition. How this revolution came about may be understood with ease if regard be had to the circumstances of the rise of the Hoysala dynasty.

under Gaṅga rule appears to have been Cāvunḍa-rāya, minister and general to the Gaṅga king Rācamalla IV, who composed in prose the Cāvunḍa-rāya-purāṇa in 978. The paucity of earlier works which can safely be ascribed to Gaṅga subjects is the more remarkable for the fact that the early cultivation of the Kannada literary language as opposed to Sanskrit was fostered by the Jaina community, which had been heavily subsidized by the Gaṅgas, and claimed almost universal support in the southern Karnāṭaka. Their chief centre south of Kopāṇa was Śravaṇa Belgola in the heart of the Gaṅga empire, but here too the tenth century saw decay and decline. The gigantic statue known as Gommatēśvara, erected according to a not undisputed tradition by the same Cāvunḍa-rāya, was a magnificent gesture of a dying cult. Saivism, on the other hand, had no extensive temporal roots in that part of the plateau known as Gaṅgavāḍi, and when the movement back to the orthodox worship achieved considerable momentum in the twelfth century teachers were sought from the northern cities, such as Belagāvi. Gaṅga sculpture was likewise in a state of torpor. The buildings that survive are remarkable in comparison with later structures for their smallness, plainness and general lack of vitality. Indeed, it is has been stated (by Moraes, K.K. 314) that the Hoysalas chose Kadamba motifs when they were developing their own peculiar style of temple construction. It is, at any rate, certain that they employed sculptors from the north.
The part of the modern Hassan and Kadur districts which formed the north-western corner of that tract of Gangavāḍi which has been described as the southern and largest of the three greater clearings is to-day, and must have been in mediaeval times, peculiarly favoured by nature for the production of a vigourous and enterprising race. This corner of that healthy plateau is the most salubrious, enjoying not only a very heavy rainfall in the summer but freedom from the heats which occasionally strike the northern part of the plateau, and experiencing the greatest cold, and the highest degree of variation between the morning and evening temperatures. These advantages are doubtless due to its situation between the mountains and forests on west and south, and between the valleys of the upper Hēmāvati and Yagaci rivers and the sources of the Vēdāvati, which lie in the irregular mass of wooded slopes to the north. Sheltered, well watered, and fertile, the tract was destined to be the centre of the Hoysala empire. (1)

Near the sources of the Vēdāvati, within the safety of the harsh recesses of the mountains, yet within easy reach of this favoured plain, having within their territ-

(1) Only at the observatory at Chitaldrug have temperatures of over 100° been recorded on five or six consecutive days. The values for the daily range of temperature at Hassan during March and July are the greatest and least for the four observatories, being respectively 28°.8 and 12°.2 (Hayavadana Rao, volume I, page 44). "The lowest temperature recorded is 42°.7 registered at Hassan on the 12th December 1895. The temperature on the coldest day in the year has generally been below 50° at Hassan......" (ibid. page 45).
ory the main trade route from Mangalūr to the east and north by way of the important trade centre at Belūr, a town at the very foot of the hills, lived a group of hill-dwellers of presumably Dravidian and pre-Dravidian extraction, who had, by the middle of the tenth century achieved an unusual degree of domestication, not to say civilization, and had begun to feel the attraction of a settled dwelling-place and the comforts of a less isolated existence, and had commenced to move plainwards very much after the fashion of a wild beast that issues cautiously and tentatively from its lair.

Their leaders were men of exceptional foresight and energy: whilst having much in common with the majority of the tribe they ruled, they possessed unassailable rights to their position. Even the feeblest of their descendants clung tenaciously to the proud titles that alluded to their virility and supernatural power; to the end of their line they retained the titles malaparol gaṇḍa and gaṇḍa bhērunda, that is to say "champions amongst the hill-kings" and "male bhērundas", the bhērunda being the mythical bird that is often represented in the sculpture of the period grasping elephants and lions in its talons. These male-rāja-rājar, then, distinguished for their bhuja-bala, or strength of arm, were not only "kings of hill-kings" but claimants to descent from the Lunar race through Yadu, and called themselves not only Yādavas, but also Dvārāvatīpuravarādhīśvarar, "lords of the excellent city of Dvārāvati", the legendary capital of Kṛṣṇa, the Yādava prince.
This was their chief claim to the respect of their followers, and it is not improbable that they differed from them racially with, perhaps, a fairer skin. Indeed, they may have been originally of the stock of the Āryan conquerors of the south Deccan long since overwhelmed by stronger successors from amongst their own kind. It is, however, useless to speculate on their origin; let it suffice to note that long established and powerful dynasties were not ashamed to intermarry with Hoysala princes. Whatever the nature of their ancestry, it caused no great scorn among the contemporaries of their prosperity. (1)

But that both recognition and prosperity alike were not due solely or even chiefly to their claims to a distinguished ancestry, their family name clearly demonstrates. Hoysala, from the Kannada root hoys, signifies "the smiter", and this terse cognomen indicates without ambiguity the type of role this family first played in Karnāṭaka history. (2)

(1) Sant Lal Katare, in Ind. Hist. Cong. Allahabad 1938, p. 200, says that Dvārāvatī is Dvāraka, the legendary city of Kṛṣṇa and the original seat of the Yādavas. He adds, "this mythological origin cannot stand the test of historical criticism. Hence it is to be rejected." The statement of Saletore in Tuluva, p. 270 para. 3 (quoting his Wild Tribes p. 79 ff.), that the Hoysalas were of Malepa stock, inferior to that of the Āḷupas, is misleading. That the majority of the original subjects of the Hoysala rulers were of the lowest social category may well be believed, though the conclusion as regards their standing relative to the subjects of the Āḷupa dynasty is far from clear. That the Hoysalas themselves were of malepa stock means nothing, for we have no proof that the malapar or malepar, i.e. mountain princes, were collectively of any stock in particular. That the Hoysala was not inferior to the Āḷupa is proved by the marriage of an Āḷupa queen (who would not be exempt from the matrilineal and semi-matriarchal prejudices of the locality and time) to Ballāla III. See below, page 481.

(2) See page 20.
Note (2) of page 19.

The Kannada root was originally poysa, the change from pa to ha taking place during the Hoysala period; the form Poysa is, especially in the early days of the dynasty, quite as common a form as Hoysala. The root, however, not being present in Marathi or Tamil, certain corruptions are found in the spellings of the name originating from Marathi, Tamil and other sources. In the former Hoysala and Hoysana are found, and in Tamil Pocala (for Pova) and Poca, while in Grantha Bhocala, Bhojala and Hoyisala deface the records. In Kannada inscriptions also the forms Poysana and Hoysapa are used indiscriminately with Poysa and Hoysala (cf. Bifjal and Bijnaja) with the occasional occurrence of Hoyisala, Hoisala and Hoyisana, the latter in E.C.V Hassan 183(61195). The forms which never occur in authentic records, Hoysala and Hoyisala, are preferred by Sant Ial Katare (I.H.Q.XIV 1938, pp.613-622) and Krishnaswamy Aiyangar and other Tamilian scholars respectively. Aiyangar uses Hoyisala also wrongly. Poyna in E.C.IX Nelamangala 38b(1292) is corrupt.

The Poy Sala myth hardly deserves notice, and but for the credulous support given to it by Indian scholars and the apparent acquiescence of Rice would be passed over here, belonging to the dream-land of Indian fiction rather than political history. Saletore and S.Srikanthayya believe in Sala, and one may wonder whether even Shama Shastri himself doubted his existence (M.A.R.1925, para.119). Hayavadana Rao, "Place names of Mysore" in Q.J.M.S. VI p.266, is justly sceptical. School-children in modern Mysore are taught the story as follows:-

There was in the village of Saksapura a Jaina guru named Vardhamana; one of his pupils was an arasumaga, or prince, named Sala. When a tiger attacked the guru he thrust his salaki or rod, into the tiger's mouth. As the tiger had been destructive to cattle and had killed some men also the people were pleased. Vardhamana told them to make Sala their master, and pay him tribute, and they all agreed: (Kannada Third Book: pp.27-29 - Mysore Education Department, 1947). This account is roughly Saletore's interpretation of the story as given in the records. It is noteworthy that Sala is a very unlikely name form; that the inscriptions vary in their accounts of the incident, one saying that the guru was Sudatta (E.C.VII Sorab 28(1208)); and that there is sufficiently frequently mention of the sele or salaki, the rod or staff, to give the impression that here was an alternative derivation. One of the earliest records to refer to the legend is E.C.VI Chikmagalur 137(1130), and it is pretty clear that the inventor of the myth was Vitaprudhanya, who wished to copy the Gaugas, who had a somewhat similar legend. Cf. the legend of the foundation of Vijayanagara. Cf. also E.I.XII (1913) p.122n.6, for the story of Trungoeverman. There does not appear any likelihood that there was any connection between Trungoeverman and the Hoysalas.

B.R.Joshi's theory (I.H.Q.XXII p.172 ff.) on the derivation of Hoysala from the people called Hoisaleru in N. Canara, and his reference to Mysore Tribes and Castes under Hasaleru are both unconvincing; his statement about Vasantikadevi is false. ---0-0-0-0-0---
CHAPTER TWO

THE RISE OF THE HOYSALA

(The reigns of Nṛpa Kāma, Vinayāditya and Dṛyāṅga.)
The name Poysala (to use the older form for the present) is first mentioned in an inscription which was found near the village of Marale in the present Chikmagalur tāluqa—that is to say, at the western edge of a small hilly and wooded tract to the north of Belūr and Dōrasamudra, facing the main forest belt of the Western Ghats across a plain space of about six miles of clearing. Its purport is that a certain Sāmanta Rāma, otherwise Nanni Kandarpā, son of Arakella, together with Arakella's grandson Poysala-māruga, fought at Sirivūr with Anniga and fell; for a gaṇḍa who fought and died in a retaliatory battle Arakella made a grant of land.(1)

Arakella himself is supposed by the editors of the text to have been a Rāṣṭrakūṭa chief, but the mahārāja Anniga has been identified tentatively with Bīra-Nolamba, son of Ayyapa, a member of the Nolamba-Pallava family, who must have lived about 950 A.D. The style of the inscription and its palaeographical characteristics, together with another mention of Arakella in the same area (2) in characters likewise described as pūrvada-hala-ganḍaṅkṣa, or early old Kannada, all show that the individuals mentioned belonged to the middle of the tenth century of our era.

(1) M.A.R. 1932, p.200, also M.A.R. 1915/6, para.69: Sāmanta Rāma Nanni-Kandarpā Sirivūrada<1> Anniganol kādi satta Arakellanag aśava mama Poysala-mārugaṁ avara pāgege Arakellanabesado<1> mahārājanol kādi satta Kella-gauṇḍa etc.
(2) E.C. VI Chikmagalur 138.
The name Poysala-māruga, deriving from the proper name Poysala, with which we are already familiar, and the Kannāḍa root māru, "to strike", with the ending ga, which may be paralleled with cases such as Bīruga and others mentioned below, can mean only one thing, "the smiter of the Poysala". This seems to confirm our impression of the character of the hill-chief in question and the manner in which he acquired his distinctive cognomen. The relative of the Nolamba warden of the marches, for such was the true function of a sāṃanta, could be sufficiently identified for his contemporaries as "the smiter of the Poysala" only if the Poysala had been a public menace of some considerable strength. (1)

When, however, the name Poysala reappears in our records, the general political situation in the Gaṅgavādi had undergone a profound change, a change which affected the status of the Poysala to a most important degree. By the year 1004 the entire country had, in theory, submitted to the rule of the Cōla conqueror. In actual fact the Kadambas of Rājēndrapura and Banavāse as well as those at Kīrtipura did not, as far as we can tell, recognize Cōla overlordship; but the Kongālva ruler at least, perhaps accompanied by his close associate the Gaṅgālva, assumed the Cōla style, and appears to have made use of the assistance which the conqueror may be presumed to have afforded him, to the disadvantage of his neighbours. (2)

---

(1) Salestree, Medieval Jainism p.70, says:"we find one member of the Hoysala family connected with the feudatory chief Arakella." He does not appear to have understood the meaning of the title in question.

(2) The inscriptions of the period 1025-27 belonging to both
The area however in which Belūr and Dōrasamudra were the principal towns, an area into which the Kadambas had not apparently penetrated, seems indeed to have been ruled by none of the great families; the life of the immediate rulers being perhaps neither very affluent nor very eventful, no inscriptions testify to the activity of a powerful overlord. The tract, being geographically somewhat isolated and probably economically underdeveloped, escaped the notice of either of the mighty rivals for the supremacy of the Deccan, and was at first neglected by Cālukya and Cōla alike.

With his home in this quarter, the Poysaḷa's entry upon the stage in his own person is as provocative as it was dramatic. We are obliged to draw upon an ample fund of imagination in order to build from the meagre details of a lithic record a living picture of this anonymous tribal chieftain in his recently won environment, as we witness the fruition of what must have been a formidable labour of initiative, observing from its commencement the operation of the factor of fresh blood upon new ground.

By the spring of the year 1006 the Poysala fought, at least 120 miles from the seclusion of his home, a battle with a feudatory of one of the strongest and most efficient powers of the day. On the south bank of the Kāveri river, immediately opposite to the town of Talakāḍa, which the Cōla had occupied two or perhaps three years before this event, is the village of Kaliyūṛ, at that time known as Kalavūr. An

Kadamba and Koṅgālva rulers presuppose a contest for the tracts on each bank of the Yagaci stream to the north of the
inscription found there, dated in the year Parābhava, Saka 929, tells us that Apramēya, lord of Kottamandala(1), who bore the titles "destruction to the races of the hill-chiefs" and "a bee at the lotus feet of Rājarāja-ēva (Cōla)", defeated in battle, in the plain of Kalavūr, Nāganna or Nāgavarma, minister of the Poysala, while apparently repulsing the officers Mañjaga, Kāligaga, Bīruga and Candiga besides.

The inscription is damaged and many words are illegible, but several of the phrases are notable, and the unique character of the information makes them specially worthy of attention. After an introductory praśasti containing Apramēya's titles we read:

...m ene sanḍa Poysalanā dhāma Nāgannam tamay amātya-mattam
enē dōrdā bal-mahābharaṇan iyā vijaya-prabhu-mattam
enē ballit allī koḍegal paḷam ettige nūnki manda-san-
grāmadin otti satyamati-patyam raṇāgradol Apramēyanē //(2)

"Is not Apramēya a follower of loyalty in the front of the battle, acting powerfully in the close fight, driving the parasols in many directions when he knew that here were also various victorious chiefs - he the wearer of fine great ornaments, who had rent Nāganna the glory of the famous Poysala (or "belonging to the host of the famous Poysala"), seeing that here was his own minister also?"

Kāverī river. We find the most probable period for the commencement of this struggle to be that immediately following the Cōla conquest.

(1) A division so far unidentified. Should it be read Kotta-
maṅgala? A place of some importance of that name is found on
the north bank of the Bhavāni, about twenty-seven miles south
of Talakād, but on the other side of a mighty forest-range.

(2) B.C.III Tirumakudal-Narsipur 44(1006) It appears to be
And again:

... padapinolu tanipidol ugram anya-sādhana<m>...

enippa Hoysalanan anhāva-rāṅgadol atti ... pēle matte

hunkoden hayavēli benkode vairi-sēne .... jaya-lakṣmiy
eydidal // (1)

"When he had pursued on the field of battle the Hoysala,
named......, who had acquired power over others, who was fierce
with pleasure and satiety.........; tell, besides, how (when
he had destroyed) the enemy army as the cavalry ? leaders
retreated with shouts, the goddess of victory came to his
side !"

Moreover, after further fragmentary references to the Poysala
and to the military prowess of Apramēya:-

nijade bhūja-baladim kōti-ripu-brajaman Kalavūra
bayalol ānt iridu rakṣō-vijayiy enipp Apramēyana
vīryadi ......... arka-candra-taram baregam salugum // (2)

"He who with the strength of his own arm met and smote in the
plain of Kalavūr the multitude of ten million enemies, Apra-
mēya, known as the demon victor - by his valour....... will
endure as long as sun, moon and stars."

a viragal to Apramēya himself. Rice's text reads bharaṇa niyā
and menda. The translation offered here is in some respects
conjectural.
(1) ibid. For vēli compare Tamil vēl, "a chief". Yet it is a
case of ari-samāsa.
(2) ibid. It has seemed necessary to introduce a lacuna into
the last line of the record, a most unusual course to adopt.
The structure of the words of the last sentence, so long as it
be not shown they are misread, appear to require it.
From this inscription several facts are apparent: that the Poysala had by 1006 acquired control of a force of foot, horse and likewise elephants, as may be judged from the phrase gajottunga-sena-varidhiye ("an ocean of a lofty army of elephants") which occurs amongst the fragments; that he had been sufficiently formidable to Aprameya for the latter to consider it an honour to have defeated him; and that the Poysala seemed to him to be in a flourishing condition, impelled, as the writer alleges, by a fierceness due to "pleasure and satiety". It may be gathered that the Poysala was engaged in warfare at such a distance from his home for one if not both of two possible reasons: for the purpose of recovering from a Cōla feudatory a part of the Gaṅga province, of which Talakād was the capital, or, on the other hand, in order to avenge aggressive activity on the part either of Aprameya or his associates against the country in which the Poysala and his fellow Malepar lived, or against the plain country into which they must by now have ventured. Aprameya's title malepa-kula-kālam, or "Destruction to the families of the hill-chiefs", seems to support the latter at least of the two suppositions. It is, however, certain that, little as we know of the activity of the Gaṅga or Kadamba families in the neighbourhood, the Poysala could not have marched that distance with a large army without considerable co-operation from the rulers of the country between Aprameya and the hills. Perhaps the phrase "anya-sādhana...", refers to his success in acquiring it. It would, again, be
unreasonable to suppose that the attack upon the capital city of the Cōla sāmanta would have been attempted while the Cōla connection, the Koṅgālva, remained active in the rear, and we may thus postulate a successful campaign against the Koṅgālva before the movement against Aprameyā was commenced.

Information of another kind also is provided by this inscription. The minister of the Poysala is called Nāganna or Nāgavarma, and the other leaders are named Maṇjaga, Kāligaga, and so on. These names are all of an unpretentious kind, the former being such as in later times belonged to persons of no great importance, and the latter group being of primitive Kannada form showing none of the graces that power and wealth soon brought to the nomenclature even of persons of subordinate authority in the Hoysala empire.

It may thus be concluded that whereas in 1006 the Poysala appears as the robust and successful champion of an unsubdued portion of the Gaṅgavādi, and a leader of eminence that could tempt the resentment of a Cōla sāmanta, at the same time the personnel of his administration was unassuming, its organization probably being of a similarly primitive complexion. Moreover, though strong enough to bring Aprameyā to a pitched battle, he was not able to defeat him, still less to disturb the Cōla emperor's quiet. The year 1006 found the Poysala at the head of a power as modest as it was ambitious. (1)

(1) E.C.III Tirumakudal–Narsipur 44 was accepted by Fleet at first as an authority, and he quotes it as such in his D.K.D., p. 494. Afterwards, however, he changed his mind, for in his own copy of E.C.III (at the S.O.A.S.) he wrote, beneath the
It is a further sixteen years before the Poysala reappears in our surviving records. By that time he had so consolidated his hold upon the resources of the plain that he could engage in battle with the Kongalva chieftain, who had evidently been increasing his domain at the expense of his northern neighbour, the Kadamba, thus drawing nearer to the Poysala homeland. An inscription of 1022 at Rājendrapura,

statement of Kielhorn (from E.I.IV 1896/7, p. 68) that the date was of no value for historical purposes, "the same remark must apply to the record itself." This is too sceptical a view of the valuable inscription. Kielhorn's objection was that the date as given was Saka 929, Parābhava, Caitra bā 5, Adi, that is to say, Sunday the 5th tithi of the dark half of the month Caitra of the year Parābhava corresponding to the 929th year of the Saka era, whereas by his own calculations that tithi ended on Friday, the 22nd of March 1006 if the Saka year were current, or Thursday, the 10th of April 1007 if it were expired. The year Parābhava is, however, unquestionably equivalent to A.D.1006/7, so that the latter hypothesis no longer applies. His suggested correction to Saka 989 (A.D.1066) is otiose.

Inaccuracies in the dating of early inscriptions are very common even where there may be no possible ground for rejecting the genuineness either of the body of the record or its date. In this case there are excellent reasons for rejecting the suggested 1066. In the first place the record is in Kannada, a language that went out of use for official purposes in the eastern parts of the Mysore district and the adjoining tracts very soon after the consolidation of Cōla rule, and reappeared only with apparent reluctance in the reign of Ballāla III; in the second place the commencement of Cōla rule in Mysore is a much more probable time for a confederacy led by the Hoysala to attempt to oust a Cōla feudatory, than one 60 years later when Rājendra Cōla's power was at its zenith; finally in 1066 the Hoysala was actively engaged in subduing opposition on his northern frontier.

Salter's, Mediaeval Jainism, p.69/70, accepts the date 1006 for this inscription, while Sewell does not mention the important record in his H.I.S.I.
eighteen miles south-west of Dōrasamudra, relates that when Rājēndra-Cōla-Pṛthvī-mahārāja made war on Nṛpa Kāma Poysala, the latter engaged with an officer named Kannōamma, and a certain general was killed. The outcome of the battle is unknown. (1) However, four years later, as we see from an inscription at Honnūru, the same king marched upon "munda Poysala", that is, the one-armed Poysala, and was victorious in the battle of Mannī. (2) Many battles may have taken place of which no records survive, but, as thirty years elapse before the Koṅgālva's name reappears on an inscription, we may be fairly certain that the Poysala succeeded in temporarily subduing his enemy. (3)

This collapse of the Koṅgālva was not due solely to the jealousy of the Poysala. His most powerful enemy appears to have been none other than the Cālukya himself, who in or a little before the year 1024 sent a daṇḍanāyaka, or general officer, southwards to secure to himself the allegiance of those parts of the Gaṅga mandala which had maintained a complete or qualified independence of the Cōla power. An inscription at

(1) E.C.V Manjarabad 43(1022). Śaka-varṣa 944 ne Dundubhi samvatsara da .... da būhula pādiva Arīmatu Rājēndra-Cōla Pṛthvī-mahārājam Nṛpa Kāma Poysalana mēle .... dīmāda kallal...... Poysala ...... Kannammanavarāl kūdi .... mahanājana bāsa-(read besa)dai Kannammana kudureyam peṇad iridu padevala- Jōgayya sarggake sanda, etc.
(2) E.C.V Arkalgud 76(1026) dated Śaka 947, Kṛodhana, Māgha full-moon. Śri-Rājēndra-Cōla-Koṅgālvaṁ munda-Poysalana mēle naḍēdu Maṇṇiya kāḷagamaṁ geldu, etc.
(3) After the record of 1026 none appears until 1058, when Rājēndra-Koṅgālva is recognized at Mallūr in Coorg. E.C.V Arkalgud 75, undated, being a viragāl of a soldier of Rājēndra-Cōla Koṅgālva may well refer to the same battle of Mannī of 1026, or to a similar action.
Hāngal relates how Malli-đēva, otherwise Malla-dāndādhīśa, took tribute in respect of the kings called Cāṅgalva, Koṅgalva and Niṅuntōlam Cōla, or "the broad-shouldered Cōla", and triumphed over the camp of the Hoysala. (1) We know that the Koṅgalva was to some extent a dependent upon the Cōla, and the "broad-shouldered Cōla" mentioned here may have been another subordinate ruler who had taken the Cōla name; likewise one can hardly err in associating with that bloc the Cāṅgalva, whose interests and people were so closely connected with those of the Koṅgalva. That the Hoysala however, was fit to be classed with these is an absurdity, and the incident may be taken as an illustration of the political methods of mediaeval Indian imperial rulers. A provincial governor was encouraged to levy tribute from any neighbouring power, whether friendly, neutral or hostile, so that the bounds of the empire might, in theory at least, undergo enlargement.

Even so, it seems very strange that the only local ruler in that area who had actually attempted to weaken the Cōla ascendancy should suffer more at the hands of the Cōla's rival than confessed confederates of the Cōla. The words "bīḍan geldam" are plainly stronger than "kappama-γonţu", and the order of the sentence suggests that the levying of tribute from the others was in some way anterior to and subordinate to the task of reducing the military power of the Hoysala.

(1) W.E.L.27-8, dated Saka 946, Raktāksi: - Cāṅgalva-Koṅgalva-Niṅuntōlam-Cōlan ema bhūbhujarol kappāna gondu Hoysalana bīḍan geldam Malli-đēva-dāndādhīsam. For Cāṅgalva the text reads Baṅgalva, a common error. For the locative see Kittel, Grammar, p.390 para.4, "pūjya-sādhunipuṇa"; but the treatment of the case is insufficient.
Moreover, as far as we can tell, while providing a but transitory satisfaction for his master, Malli-dēva by his visit afforded no accession of strength to any party in Mysore, and his departure for the north-west left the rivals free to work out for themselves the questions of local supremacy, and the choice of a leader against the Tamilian invader. This, the first recorded interference in this particular area on the part of the Cālukya, was distinguished still further by being remarkably ill-opportune and ill-advised.

So far, however, from discouraging his enterprise, adversity seems to have spurred the Poysala to greater activity. His defeat at the hands of Apramāya, the temporary reverses at the hands of the Kōṅgālva, and finally the enforced submission to the Cālukya, came at a time when he was speedily establishing himself as a territorial sovereign. To this very period must belong the inscription at Uggihalli, the village on the spur that faces, across a narrow valley, another spur upon which lies Sosavūr, the modern Anagadi, which was Saṣakapura the legendary birth-place of the Hoyśala family. Uggihalli shares with Sosavūr the advantages of being at once easily defensible, well watered and yet protected against the Monsoon floods, provided with arable land along the banks of the Hēmāvati, and having by means of fords across this river easy access to the main road. This runs between Maṅgalūr, Kalaśa and Belūr, skirting the hilly ground on the north side of the river, and joining the road from Saklespur and the south, which passes to the east of Uggihalli itself. In this place, in the month
Kārttika of the seventh year of the reign of Kāma Voysala, known as Rācamala (Rācamalla) Permmādi, a catra, that is to say a choultry or rest-house (otherwise "sattra", Tamil "cattiram"), was set up for two Brahmans.

With this area, then, within his home territory, the Poysala continued to extend his sway. A damaged inscription at Rājendrapura shows that in December 1027 he was at war with the Kadamba family of Banavāse and that place. All that can be gathered is that some one fought and died when Banavāse itself was attacked on Nṛpa Kāma's order. A conflict which proximity rendered almost inevitable had matured at last, the eventual success of the Hoysala being in the circumstances certain. Banavāse is just over thirty-two miles east-south-east of Sosavūr; the inhabitants of the district were plain-dwellers and no match for the troops of the hill-chief.

It may now be convenient to sum up what it is possible to conclude concerning the earliest member of the Hoysala dynasty to whom a personal name is given. We can not, of course, be sure that the Poysala of 1006 was identical with Nṛpa Kāma, for the ambiguous word "sanda" in the Kaliyūr inscription may signify that he died in battle. But, though he was not the first of his line, nor the one to whom exclusive credit may be

(1) E.C.VI Muddere 19 (?c1025):- iryvar brāhmanargge oṣṭraman nirisida Rācamala-Permmādiy unipa Kāma Voysalaṇa prtuvi-rajjyaṃ elaneya sambaccara Kārttika-māsadal nirisittu, etc. Voysala is a normal though uncommon phonetic variant for Poysala, occurring even as late as the Kōlga-ḍēma-ṛājakāl (Voisala): Brown's Telugu Collections, vol.II p.194.
(2) E.C.V Manjarabad 44(1027) The numeral of the Saka date has disappeared. -- Banavasiya mēle bildu ḍūttire brīman Nṛpa Kāma-mahāraṇa besaḍim...]|liya Keleyabbeya maṣa, et.
awarded for initiating Hoysala enterprise, Nrpa Kāma must be considered for the purposes of an historical survey to have been the head of his dynasty, and it is desirable to give our attention in the beginning to his name and to the associations which it bears. The name itself, Kāma, as he is called in the Uggihalli inscription, or Nrpa Kāma, to give him his usual designation, together with the title Rācamalla-Permādi which he adopted, shows clearly the political affiliation which the Poysala had assumed or inherited.

These are Gaṅga names. At least one Nrpa Kāma occurs in the genealogy of the Gaṅga dynasty (1) and there were several Rācamallas (or Rājamallas - the forms were alternative), while the title Permādi or Permānādi was a regular Gaṅga style, afterwards adopted by the Cālukya emperor Vikramāditya VI. We have already inferred that some kind of connection between the Poysala and the Gaṅgas must have been necessary before the expedition of 1006 could have taken place. We are now able to confirm this view. With the exception of the Gaṅgas, moreover, every immediate neighbour of importance had been fought by the Poysala by 1027. The Gaṅgālvas also are to be excluded, but we have grounds for believing them closely connected with the Koṅgālvas, with whom the Poysala undoubtedly had many conflicts. An alliance between the Hoysala house and the petty Gaṅga dynasties in its sphere of activity may thus be safely postulated as the first step to prominence in their world, followed eventually by the emergence of the former as the champion, leader, and finally master of the latter.

---

Of Nṛpa Kāma it may also be said that he was, as were most of his contemporary monarchs, a Jaina. Quite probably he had not only a religion but also teachers in common with his near neighbours.(1) It is curious to note that, although having a guru in common was a bond between families at least as respected as inter-marriage, that did not prevent hostilities between Hoysala and Kōṅgālva, who must have enjoyed the ministrations of the same series of Jaina tutors. That a creed of which a devotion to ahimsa was so prominent a characteristic permitted warfare at all, is perhaps even more curious. With the Gaṅgas, on the other hand, the religious bond coincided, for the time being, with an identity of interest. For the most conspicuous of all the signs of connection between the Hoysala and the Gaṅgas is that inscription at Sosavūr itself which refers to King Māra, Rājamalla. This is clearly the name of a member of a Gaṅga family, or at least of a family much influenced by Gaṅga traditions, even if it is not possible to identify the ruler with a particular member of any known Gaṅga family. Rice dates the inscription at about 1040, but all that it is safe to say about its period is that it was contemporary with Nṛpa Kāma Hoysala.(2)

(1) Most of the principal persons were Jainas. E.C.II 113(1120) Ecigāṇa, the father of Gaṅga-rāja, had the wealthy and famous king (udātta-vittam avadāta-yasam) Nṛpa Kāma as his patron, and the good, sinless and most exalted lord of sages Kanakanandi of Mullūr as his guru.
(2) E.C.VI Mudgere 18. It refers to Vajrapāṇi-paṇḍita, a Jaina guru, who is said to be the chief muni of the Gaṅgavāḍi, and guru to Rājamalla-bhūpalaka, king Māra, who bears several ordinary laudatory titles. It is not absolutely necessary to conclude that this Māra actually ruled Sosavūr, though that is
Two facts of another sort complete the scanty details of Mrpa Kama's life. He suffered from a disability which would be worthy of comment in a world of orthodox Jainas, who appear to have had a horror of bodily blemishes. The Honnur inscription of 1026, referred to above, describes him as "muṇda". This has been translated "base" - an unnecessary interpretation, as words of abuse are too rare in inscriptions for such a translation of an ambiguous word. (2) The word in question can, according to Kittel, mean bald, shaved, and also deprived of a limb as well as base. It is very probable that Mrpa Kama lost an arm in battle: a notable mutilation which would be sufficient to account for the epithet.

Of Mrpa Kama's wife or wives we know nothing, but his son was Vinayāditya, who succeeded him as ruler in or before the year 1047. (3)

far from being impossible. The dating of this inscription is assisted by the fact that the same Vajrapāni is mentioned in E.C.VI Mudgere 9, where disciples of his appear in the reign of Vinayāditya-Poysala, in the year Jaya, Saka 924, which should be understood as 917; corresponding to the year A.D.1052 or 1063.

(1) Compare the stories of how Gommateśvara lost the distal joint of his left forefinger, and concerning the conversion of Visnuzvardhana by Rāmānuja, below p.572.

(2) Indeed, if one neglect odium theologicum, only one case can be quoted, and that too a very mild example: in E.C.VIII Sorab 252 & W.E.II 73b-74a(1177) we find sukha-rahitā Guṇḍa-sama, or "the wretched Guṇḍa-sama". (3) E.C.V Arskere'157(1154) at Hosakalyadi svasti <samadhigata-pañca-maha> sabda-mahā-mandalaśvaram Dvārāvatī-puravā <dhīś-varam Yādava-kulāmbara> cūṇaṇā samyakta-cūḍāmaṇi maleparol gaṇḍādy-anēka-nāmādi-pra <sasti-sahita> śrīman-mahāmandala-śvaram Mrpa Kama Hoysalan Atana tamaya --- Vinayādityam etc. It is very likely, though not certain, that Mrpa Kama actually held these titles, except the one commencing samadhigata, which may not have been assumed until under his son Vinayāditya the Hoysala accepted the status of a provincial governor nominally subordinate to the Cālukya emperor. It was quite regular
The legacy, which he bequeathed to him can be assessed fairly easily: the leadership of a hardy people of hill-dwellers, with influence and perhaps some territorial property in the plain; the friendship of influential branches of the ancient imperial family of the Gaṅgas; the complacent regard of the other inhabitants of his small sphere of activity; and the healthy respect of fighting men on every side. The old antagonism to the Cōla and to Cōla dependents suggested joining the Cālukyan camp, and the visitation of Malli-dēva may have re-inforced the suggestion. (1) But we have no proof that such an approximation took place before the accession of Vinayāditya. An inscription of 1047 gives the Hoysala, whether

for ancestors to be credited with their descendants' titles, though often, as in this example, some attempt at realism is maintained. Sāmyaktya-cūḍāmani is a conventional title borne by many important Jainas of the period. Note also M.A.R. 1929, 12(1062) at Halebid: svasti (savasti is a misprint) Śaka varṣa 984 neya Subhakrit-samvatsaram pravarttise anupaman enisa Naṃ Pōysala enisi ciram Gaṅgavādiyam pālisutum etc.: "while the Śaka year 984, Subhakrit, was current - while Vinayāditya Poysala, supreme in the world, the son of the Poysala named Nṛpa Kāma who was styled the matchless, is protecting for a long time the Gaṅgavādi ...." The records that say that Vinayāditya was the son of Śala are all late: E.C.IV Nagamana 29(1218) and E.C.VI Chikmagalur 20(1249); E.C.XII Tiptur 42(1229) says that Śala had Vinayāditya by Bhūmi (Earth).

(1) It is not probable that the Dōra in E.I. XVI 75 ff(1037) had anything to do with the Hoysalas, as stated by G.C. Roychaudhuri, p.214-5, where he says that Vāvanarasa (in error for Cāvanarasa) governor of Belvola and Puligere was a "scatterer of Dōradōā" which might stand for Dōrasamudra, etc. The phrase is in any case Dōra-dīśāpattā, "the scatterer of Dōra".
Nṛpa Kāma or Vinayāditya can not be discerned, the title Tribhuvanamalla.(1) This may be held to indicate either subordination to the Cāḷukya Tribhuvanamalla - for many local rulers within the Cāḷukya orbit assumed that and similar titles - or that the Hoysala felt himself to be of such a stature as a monarch as to merit the cognomen "wrestler of the three worlds". The balance of probability inclines to the former solution, especially as an inscription, which may be assigned to 1049 does not give the title Tribhuvanamalla.(2) Titles assumed out of regard for a superior were not retained as tenaciously as those derived from personal achievements. It will therefore not be unreasonable to suggest that if in any respects Hoysala political interests required close relations with a paramount sovereign at a time of continuous rivalry between Cāḷukya and Cōla, the first year of the reign of Vinayāditya shows, as the life of Nṛpa Kāma is not able clearly to reveal, a notable tendency in the direction of sympathy with the former.(3)

(1) M.A.R. 1914/5 para.76, at Tōṇacī, Krishnarajapat tāluqa.

(2) E.C.VI Muddgere 21h at Kanacūru. The date is doubtful as the record gives Saka 989 and Virōḍhi in the text while 996 is read in the translation. Saka 989 would correspond to 1067, & 996 to 1074: Virōḍhi corresponds to A.D.1049 or Saka 971, and the baldness of the phrasing of the record makes the earlier date seem more probable.

(3) Later references to Nṛpa Kāma include beside those already quoted, E.C.V Arskere 142 (1162) at Karugunda in the same neighbourhood as E.C.V Arskere 157(1154), which is at Hosakālāḍi. It gives him the title maha-ḍāntaleśvara, probably without warrant. N.K.Sastri, Cōḷas II p.41, gives him the dates c 1022-1040. As Vinayāditya's accession can not be placed before or after 1047, Nṛpa Kāma's reign can not be held to have ended earlier than that year.
Compared with Nṛpa Kāma, Vinayāditya, or Vineyāditya or Vīnīta as he was also known, was far better remembered by later generations. Often indeed he was considered to be the first member of the dynasty, or at least the first worthy of mention after the mythical Sala; (1) and, as he was considered to be the founder of the fortunes of the Hoysala kingdom, his achievements deserve as close an examination as those of any of his more famous successors. There exists a sufficient body of evidence to support a general conclusion that the reign of Vinayāditya constituted a period of rest, in which the strength and resources of that part of the Kannada people which made up the Hoysala dominion were conserved and consolidated, while many individuals gained experience in other districts and acquired ambitions which were to inaugurate in the subsequent reigns a period of dynamic aggrandisement.

The reign of Vinayāditya, commencing in or shortly before the year 1047, lasted until at least 1098, when he was succeeded by his son Ereyanga, who then ruled in association with two of Vinayāditya's three grandsons, Ballāla and Bitti-dēva, who were almost certainly assisted by their brother, who is always mentioned with them in the epigraphic genealogies, Udayāditya. Since Vinayāditya's reign spanned a full half-century, it embraced not only the life's work of his son, but many of the more spectacular exploits of his grandsons besides.

(1) He is the first named in E.C.VI Kadur 53 (?1175) and E.C. VII Shimoga 64(1172), while for example in E.C.III Nanjangud 175(1169) and E.C.V Hassan 53(1170) we find the following poor Sanskrit couplet:

tatō Dvāraṇa-nāthā Hoysala dvīpi-lāṃchanāṅ /
jātā Saṣapurē tēṣu Vinayāditya-bhūpatiṅ //
Perhaps chiefly because of its length, it is in Vinayāditya's reign that we are first able to make a fairly exact estimate of the area of territory which the Hoysala occupied or controlled. The area outlined on Map 'A' shows the part of the Gaṅgavāḍi actually governed by Vinayāditya at the time of his death. It is not, however, to be supposed that the whole of this area was under his control at the commencement equally with the close of his reign. A gradual expansion almost certainly took place towards the north and east. Nor would it be reasonable to conclude that these villages, being, as they were, places sufficiently settled and prosperous for some of their inhabitants to afford records such as have been able to survive to this day, comprise the total area which came under Hoysala influence. Undoubtedly the Hoysala made himself felt in all directions, and his influence was naturally more fruitful in spaces more sparsely occupied or less effectively governed. This at least is a partial explanation for the fact that later inscriptions often appear to ascribe to the early Hoysala dominion bounds wider than the surviving contemporary records will justify. The area outlined on the Map, on the other hand, being about ninety-five miles long at the long-

Ma. VI Kadur 51(1169) gives a similar account: असभेसालम पेट पोयसला-नामम कुला-नामम एगे नेगलाम सादुल-सल-लालिशनकाल-itarkkal Sosavūrol innu palaram rājyaṃ geyytt irppinam // janiyisidam vinayādhyam Vinayādityam pratāpi etc. Sala acquired the family name Poyisala. Many others of these, distinguished by the noble tiger crest ruled the kingdom in Sosavūr; then was born Vinayāditya, the glorious, abounding in vinaya (propriety of conduct).
est and seventy miles broad at its widest part, represents the entire known area within which the Hoysala enjoyed the revenues up to and about the year 1098, and thus it, and it alone, may be said to be the Hoysala nad proper, the Hoysala empire of the period, and the nucleus of the vast domain which little more than a century was to put into the hands of that dynasty.

An inscription of the year 1184, and therefore suspect when purporting to give information concerning the kingdom of over a hundred years earlier, speaks of Tribhuvanamalla Vinayaditya as ruling with "dusta-nigraha-śiṣṭa-prati-pālaneyum", that is, in the conventional phrase, exercising the powers of restraining the wicked and protecting the good, over the area bounded by Konkaṇa, Álvakhēḍa, Bayal-nāḍ, Talekāḍ and Sāvimale.(1)

Of these boundaries, Konkaṇa and Álvakhēḍa are very vague terms for the coastal strip of northern and central Malabar, implying in this case that Hoysala rule extended to the limit of the territory held by the Kadambas of Hāṅgal and the Sāntaras of Pomburccha; Bayal-nāḍ was then a district consisting of two sections now impossible to distinguish, and corresponding to the modern Heggadadevankote tāluqa of Mysore district, of which Kittūr, under Kadamba rule, was probably the capital; Talakāḍ or Talekāḍ must here, as in other cases to be mentioned below, signify not the city of that name, but the province named after it. Of this province nothing definite is known, as there is insufficient evidence to enable any sort of impression to be obtained as to its size or constitution. How-

(1)EC.IV Nagamangala 32 of which E.C.VI Chikmagalur 160 (?1184) is probably a mutilated copy.
ever it will be observed that Talekāḍ city was about thirty-five miles from the boundary of Vinayāditya's kingdom. If, then, it be conceded as possible that the area between the Kāverī and the Kabbani rivers was under Hoysala influence if not actually colonized or governed by that power, and that the Talekāḍ district boundary met the limit of Hoysala influence in the region of Śrīraṅgapattanam, the eastern and southern bounds mentioned in the inscription are fairly comfortably accounted for. The boundary indicated by Sāvimale, however, is another matter. This hill has never been identified, although the most obvious choice seems to be Kumārasvāmibēṭṭa, the last two parts of which name signify the same as Sāvimale. This identification suits the later uses of this landmark very well, but can hardly have been at any time a boundary of the kingdom of Vinayāditya. It appears, indeed, that two important families only stood in the way of such enlargement, namely that of Huliyēra or Huliyāru and that of Nīḍugal and Heṅjeru. It is true that the first inscription of the Nīḍugal Cōla family is no earlier than 1106 (1), but there is no reason for doubting their presence there from the first half of the eleventh century. Yet two such families would have been quite strong enough to render very doubtful a claim on the part of the Hoysala to rule from his capital as far as Sāvimale, supposing that hill to be a hundred and twenty miles distant, access to even half that distance being difficult without the consent of those rulers.

(1) E.C.XI Challakere 16(1106) dated Cālukya Vikrama 40, Vyaya, which is inconsistent. Rice's readings in the Roman and Kannāḍa texts vary. The suggestion of ?1226 is unlikely.
It must therefore be agreed that an historical error was committed by the author of the inscription that credited Vīn-ayāditya with a boundary so far to the north.

The discrepancy regarding Hoysala influence in or near the Kadamba and Sāntara districts of the north-west can not be disposed of so simply. What appears an obvious exaggeration seems to have had a basis in fact. An undated inscription of the reign of Trailokya Calukya, which may safely be attributed to the period about 1060, suggests that Hoysala and Sāntara forces had recently been in conflict.(1) The fact that the inscription is at Nāḍamaṇcasāle does not prove that the battle was fought in that vicinity, for the place was merely the home-village of the hero commemorated. But the inscription clearly supports the view that the Hoysala had within the first few years after Nṛpa Kāma's death been so powerfully attracted by the fertile soil, the gold mines, the flourishing condition, and the older civilization of the upper Varadā valley; and had begun so successfully to subdue the country to the north of his home between the sheltered clearing from which he had sprung and the Tuṅgabhadra river and again between that and the Kumudvati, that he had at length ventured to attack upon their own ground a people whom we know from the vast number of virāgals found on their land to be the most warlike of all the Kannada speaking nation.

(1) E.C.VIII Sagar 130. It is highly damaged; Hoysala and Sāntara are mentioned twice in all; a fragment indicates that a warrior fought so as to win the approval of both Hoysala and Sāntara in front of the whole of Santalige, that is, the country ruled by the Sāntaras bordering on the Ālvakhēda. E.G.VIII Sorab 487(K.T.only) of 91053(Vijaya, Jeṣṭa su 10) at Maralugadde mentions the Hōsana and confirms this impression.
Another undated inscription, this time of the ruler Vīra-Sāntara himself, which may be dated confidently in the region of 1062, (1) tells how the ministers of Vīra-Sāntara had gone to the Siriyas of Mūḍa-nāḍ, that is, perhaps to the southern border of the Sāntara region, and in a clash with the Hoysāna's hostile force one of the officials servants died.

Another, also at Billēvara, in the heart of the Sāntara dominion, tells how a cavalryman died bravely in a fight with the "Hoysala's nāyaka". (2) The date in this case is probably 1068. It thus seems that Vinayāditya engaged with the Sāntara in at least two separate campaigns. Their result can be gathered by comparing the fact that Ammaṇa-dēva Sāntara, son of Vīra-Sāntara, married Hōcala-dēvi, who was almost certainly one of Vinayāditya's daughters, (3) with the implication in later inscriptions that Vinayāditya frightened the inhabitants of Koṅkan, with whom by a stretch of imagination the Sāntaras and their allies might be associated. (4)

---

(1) E.C.VIII Nagar 71 at Billēvara: Hoysanana mārbbalada kūḍe kādi; ibid. Nagar 47 and 58 are of this ruler and of the year 1062.
(3) E.C.VIII Nagar 36(1077).
(4) E.C.V Belur 58(1117), also ibid. 71, where idu is read for ade with hardly any change of sense: Koṅkanigar ivana khadgāda/ kaṅkanav ade namman elavo muluqisug enutum / bhōṅkal kedaruvinām niśāṅkam pariyyṭṭan alte Vīhayādityam // Rice translates this: "The Konkanigas, saying his sword will destroy us all, scattered in every direction, when Vinayāditya set forth to war" Better: "While the Konkanigas disperse quickly saying, "Ah! the (very) wrist-band of this man's sword is (going) to ruin us!", did not Vinayāditya set out fearlessly?"
Moreover, for the space of about forty years from the close of Vinayāditya's reign, the absence of Sāntara inscriptions suggests that their prestige suffered a temporary eclipse, an eclipse materially assisted if not entirely effected by Hoysala pressure. It can not be said, on the other hand, that the Hoysala conquered Sāntalige, nor even subjected it to a prolonged occupation, for no Hoysala inscriptions of this period are found there, and no Sāntara kings at any time acknowledge Hoysala supremacy. Nor does the inscription at Andigere in the present Tirthahalli tāluqa, describing how Boppavve, wife of Hoysala-dēva's treasurer Candimayya, died by samādhi, give us any reason to suppose that the village came within Hoysala jurisdiction; apart from the doubtfulness of the date, which may be 1090, the presence of an official's wife at a particular place is no evidence of sovereignty over that place on the part of the official's master. (1)

Certain important, but little known dealings with the Gaṅgas likewise contributed to the consolidation of the Hoysala dominion. There was this difference that the achievement of Vinayāditya in this field was permanent, whereas Hoysala relations with the Sāntara were a constant, if not unprofitable, source of anxiety. An inscription which is dated 1089 gives the Hoysala king the title Vikrama-Gaṅga (2) This title, with the usual delightful ambiguity, probably signified not only "a hero amongst the Gaṅgas" but also "a champion over the Gaṅgas".

(1) E.C.VIII Tirthahalli 198(?1090) dated Sukla, without the Saka date.
(2) E.C.VI Kadur 21(1089) at Yellambalase, dated Cāl.Vik.13, Vibhava.
The title "Gaṅga-bhū-vadhūṭi-stana-tāra-hāram", which occurs in the same inscription, clarifies the sense further. The "snatcher of the mountains which are the breasts of the damsel, the Gaṅga country" can hardly have extended his sway to the disadvantage of the other groups of families without some exercise of force. War with the Sāntaras would naturally provide both the inclination and the power to crush any opposition on the part of a family, such as the Āsandī Gaṅgas, that lived immediately in the path of movement towards the North. By 1089 Vaijarasa of that family had recognized Hoysala overlordship (1), while Hermādi Gaṅga, a close connection of his, had married Ereyaṅga's daughter before 1067.(2) And after this conflict, of which we know so little - it must have been very brief or otherwise unworthy of being recorded - this Gaṅga family together with its connections became an integral part of the Hoysala kingdom, retaining its individuality and traditions without obstructing the designs and activities of its overlord, so that this group, one of the earliest to be pressed into subordination, remained true to its sovereign until the collapse of the empire itself nearly three centuries later.

In the east, however, we can be fairly sure that no attempt was made during Vinayāditya's lifetime to annex the possessions of the Cōla feudatories; nor did he disturb, as an act of personal aggression, the Gaṅāḷva-Koṅāḷva nexus on his

---

(1) E.C.VI Tarikere 66(?1089) of Cālukya Jagadēkamalla 73 (for 13), Sukla. Rice wrongly suggests 1141. Here Jagadēkamalla refers to Vikramāditya.

(2) E.C.VII Shimoga 64(1172): mahāmandalēśvara Ereyaṅga-Hoysaṅa dēvan aḷiyām --- Hermādi-dēva --- Saka-varṣa 989 neya Plavaṅga-samvatsara etc.
southern frontier. But, within the limits already described, Vinayāditya's followers gradually consolidated their control, as the steadily increasing production of stone records indicates. Struggles there must occasionally have been, as the families already in possession failed to compromise on adequate terms with the rising power. An inscription at Neralige, about nine miles to the north-north-east of Dōrasamudra, on a route to Āsandi, refers to just such a struggle. Ālāmayya, the perggade or chief of Neralige, fought in the year 1084 with the Nolamba at Nolambanakere (or Nolamba's tank), which we may suppose to have been not far from Neralige itself. (1)

And so it came about that from about 1060 Vinayāditya was said to be ruling the Gaṅgavādi 96,000, although at no time in his life did he rule more than half of it. The expression should not, however, be condemned as an exaggeration: it was

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 6(1084): Cālukya-Vikrama-kālada 9 ttaneya Raktākṣi-sāṃvatsarada... śrīmatu Tribhuvanamalla Vinayāditya (R.T. reads Vineyāditya) Poysalā-dēvanu Gaṅgavādi tombhattaruvā sāsirāmaṃ duṣṭa-nigraha-siṣṭa-pratipālaneyiṃ sukhā-saṃkathā-vinōdadin rājyam geyuttam ire; tat-pādapadmopajīvi samadhigata paṅca-mahāsabda-mahā-sāvanta --- Poysalā-dēva-pādārādhakam --- Neriligeya perggade Ālāmayyaṃ Nolamba Nolambanakereya kālegadalu māl-ālu kudureyan iridu vīra-svarggakke sanda // In the ninth year of the Cālukya Vikrama era, the year Raktākṣi, while Tribhuvanamalla Vinayāditya Poysala was ruling the Gaṅgavādi 96,000, restraining the evil and protecting the good, in the enjoyment of pleasant communications, his devoted servant the great sāmanta who had achieved the dignity of the five great
customary for a ruler of part of one of the old divisions to claim to rule it, with the odd result that often, especially in the north-west, several rulers purported to rule the Bana-väse 12,000, for example, at the same time.(1)

One may well wonder what were the sentiments of the Cālukya emperor on the progress of Hoysala power. It seems clear that at any rate until the accession of Vikramāditya VI Hoysala expansion was viewed without alarm, for a reason which will appear in due course. There had been a faint tradition of friendliness, and some time before 1055 Vinayāditya had married a member of his family, a daughter perhaps or a sister, to the emperor himself - a clear sign of the growing importance of his dynasty. In that year we learn that Hoysala-dēvi, a senior queen of Trailōkyamalla, while residing at Kalyāṇa, the Cālukya capital, made a grant of land "for the Mallikēśvara tīrtha of Onnāli on the bank of the Tuṅgabhadra".(2)

---

(1) Vinayāditya's rule of the Gaṅgavādi 96,000 is claimed in E.C.V Arsikere 186(cl060) and finally E.C.V Belur 200(1098). In 1063 he is stated in an inscription to be protecting, in the company of his son Ereyahga, under the shade of his sole parasol, the Male country and other parts of the Gaṅga-maṇḍala 96,000: that is to say, particularly the hill region. E.G.II Kadur 161(1063): Male-viṣeyam modal āgi Gaṅga-maṇḍala etc.

(2) E.C.VII Honnāli 1(1055). Honnāli was not at the time within the Hoysala boundaries.
Another sign of friendliness we have already noticed, namely the title Tribhuvanamalla which Vinayaditya bore from the commencement of his reign: his association with the emperor is confirmed by his use of the title Trailokyaamalla in or before 1061. Moreover in an inscription of about 1074 Vinayaditya bears the titles of a regular feudatory of the Cālukya empire, that is to say, "samadhipata-pañca-maha-sabda-maha-mandalaśvara" the lord of a great tract who has achieved the dignity of the five great instruments, or processional band. But it must be noted that this does not prove actual subordination to the emperor. Indeed Vinayaditya prided himself upon a kind of sturdy and uncouth independence, in which he was content to class himself with Cālukya feudatories of older culture and more flourishing dominions, without discarding his peculiar atmosphere of vitality. In 1062 he is called "Rakkasa-voysalaṁ ugra-calakkam Yādava-kulambujärkkan", a demon Poysala in his fierce determination, the sun to the lotus the Yādava race. The title Rakkasa-, or Rākṣasa-Poysala, which is clearly copied from the title Rakkasa-Gaṇga, held by several members of that dynasty, is repeated in a verse which occurs in two inscriptions, the first of 1063 and the second of 1094.

Rakkasa-voysalaṁ emb ār-akkaravaṁ baredu paṭaman ettidaṭ idirolo lakkada sava-lekkada maru-vakkam nindapuve samara-saṅghaṭṭanadol

"If, writing the six letters Ra-kka-sa-Po-ya-sa-la on his flag, he hoists it aloft, can an hostile army of even a full hundred thousand stand before him in the trampling of battle?" (3)

(1) E.U. VI Cikmagalur 7(1061) & ibid.15(?1074) (2) & (3) over.
In Vikramāditya's reign, however, Vinayaditya actually accepted Cālukya overlordship, but this was more a tribute to the power and efficiency of that ruler than a reflection upon the capacity of the Hoysala. For, in fact, Vinayaditya had been one of the strongest supporters of the rule of the emperor Sōmēśvara II, Vikramāditya's elder brother, and on being approached by him for aid had sent a large contingent of Kannadiga troops from his small principality under the command of his son Ereyanga.

Ereyanga had entered public life perhaps a little before 1063. If, as we believe, his father came to the throne in 1047, it is possible that his son began to assume responsibilities round about 1060. At any rate it is in 1063 that he is first mentioned in an Inscription. (1)

The situation in which he was called upon to serve the emperor was in no way extraordinary. A period of weakness in the military strength of the central authority had encouraged at least one hereditary rival to rebel. In the previous reign Sōmēśvara I of the Cālukya dynasty had enjoyed remarkable successes against Bhōja, the Paramāra king of the Mālavas.

Page 48 n.(2) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 15(?1074).

Page 48 n.(3) M.A.R. 1929,12(1062); E.C.VI Mudgere 13(1063) & E.C.V Channarayapatna 148(1094), which has the negligible variants akkaraman, sama-lekkade and saṅghaṭṭaṇadol. The ār-akkara were, Dr.Barnett suggests, reminiscent of some actual ṣaḍakṣara; in that case it was probably Ōṃ nāmas siddhēbhyaḥ.

(1) E.C.VI Kadur 161 (1063) where he is called Kumāran. In E.C. VI Kadur 33(c1075) Ereyanga bears the titles maha-mandalēśvara and Tribhuvanamalla, indicating that in the interval he had acquired the status almost of a partner in his father's government, or alternatively enjoyed the exceptional favour of the emperor.
Sometime before 1058, perhaps in the year 1057, he had actually attacked and sacked Dhārā, the modern Dhar, which was the capital city of the Paramāra family. (1) But Bhōja had recovered quickly from this disaster and apparently regained for a while his past glory, and by the time that Sōmēśvara had been succeeded by his son of the same name, with the title Bhuvanaikamalla, that is in 1069, Jayasimha, Bhōja's successor, was prepared to take sides in a squabble amongst the members of the imperial family. The jealousy between Sōmēśvara and his younger brother Vikramāditya was an invitation to all the discontented subordinates of the Cālukyas to recover their liberties; Jayasimha decided in favour of Vikramāditya, but was unfortunate enough to declare his preference before Sōmēśvara could be ousted from power.

Accordingly, after what appears to have been an unsuccessful attack upon Dhārā, Sōmēśvara called to his aid the Hoysala together with a Gaṅga prince by name Udayāditya. (2)

At some period, then between 1069 and 1076 - it is not possible to pick the precise year - Ereyāṅga attacked Dhārā with complete success, and thus provided the first battle-honour for the Hoysala family's prāṣasti, or record of achievements. (3)

(1) Sōmēśvara refers to this victory in inscriptions dated 1058, 1059, 1060 & 1067. See Ganguly, Paramāras, p.93-4. This is the victory to which Bilhaṇa referred in his Vikramāṅka-dēva-carita, I 91-4, with interminable puns on the word Dhārā.
(2) Ganguly, op. cit. p.128. The view that Ereyāṅga attacked Dhārā before 1058 is improbable, because he would have been very young then, and his subsequent adventures can be assigned only to the post-1076 period.
(3) G.C.Roychaudhuri, p.265, wrongly assigns the attack on Dhārā to c.1100. He also states, without foundation, that Viṣṇuvarddhana went too.
Mālava-rājana durggaṁ
Cālukyargg adhika-ballit enal aśramadim /
dhālitṛ eydiye <ka>ṇḍ ure
Cālukyar mnoḍe nṛḍal Ereyaṅga-nṛpa //

"Well done! King Ereyaṅga, while the Cālukya was actually watching, stormed (as soon as he) reached the fort of the Mālava king, without effort, saying that it was too strong for the Cālukya (himself)." (1)

An earlier record, in a good Sanskrit and two fine Kannada verses, enlarges on the topic.

Dhārādhārō bhujā-balavatāṁ Mālavādhāśvarāṇāṁ
Bhōjēnaujō-vijita-ripuṇā varadhitā yā piśiddhā /
sābhūd āpōṣanam ahita-bhū-bhōjanē yasya pūrvvaṁ
Kaubērasā-vijaya-samaye varṇyatē kim sa vīraḥ //

"How may one describe that hero, (Ereyaṅga), in the season of his northern victories? His preliminary sip, before he consumed the lands of his foes, was that Dhārā, which was the support of the mighty-armed lords of the Mālavas, (a city) famous for having been extended by Bhōja, who had conquered enemies with his vigour." (2)

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 117(1161) Dr. Barnett is responsible for the very plausible conjecture ka to fill the gap beforeṇḍ ure.
(2) E.C.V Belur 58(1117).
"The overpowering Poysala burnt together the fortresses that had been the pride of Bhōja (1), so that the smoke entered the eyes of the lords of the quarters and bleared them; the smoke all around smudged the whitish tusk of the elephant(s) at the quarters to make it appear like (another) limb; and through its smoke the fire of his fierce valour caused the region of the heavens to be said to be filled with flocks of clouds."(2)

(1) Literally 'fortresses of Bhōja's mark.' (2)&(3) E.C.V Belur 58.
"Overcoming with his own army Dhārā, the mighty, called the foundation of the Malava kingdom, and fostering the prowess of his own arm so that victory might increase for the emperor, king Ereyaṅga set up in the northern region the standard of his fame, which was notorious for victories in the quarters, in such a way that the Sun shuddered to see it." (1)

Although the taking of Dhārā and the humbling of the Malava king was considered the most remarkable of Ereyaṅga's achievements, in later times he was remembered for three other exploits, which are not, as it happens, even as easy to assign to a period as the Dhārā campaign itself. He is celebrated for the burning of Baleya-patţana; for the capture of Cakragoṭṭa; and for sigra services on behalf of the Cālukya against the Cōla king.

Accordingly, at least a century after these activities, verses were composed praising this series of successes in one breath.


"Trampling upon the Malava army he showed no kindness to Dhāre and burnt it; then he seized and dragged the Cōla, and with violence thoroughly plundered his camp; he, the powerful one, routed the Kalinga and ruined him, so that the

lord(s) of the quarters heard of the prowess of his own arm: in this manner did King Ereyanga acquire fame." (1)

And again, in a Sanskrit quatrain:

kaṣṭaknāty Ereyanga-maṇḍalapatēr ddōr-vikrama-kriṇānaṁ
stōtam Mālava-maṇḍalēśvara-purīṁ Dhāraṁ adhākṣīt kṣaṇāt /
dōḥ-kaṇḍūla-kaśāla-Cōla-kaṭakam drāk kāndīśīkaṁ vyadhān
nirddhāmakṛta Cakragottam akarōd bhaṅgam Kālingasya ca //

"Who is able to praise the sport of the prowess of King Ereyanga's arm? In a moment he burnt Dhāra, the city of the Mālava ruler, speedily put to flight the camp of the formidable Cōla eager for conflict, and made Cakragottam void of habitation and routed the Kālinga." (2)

Of his attack on Bāleya-paṭṭana it was said that "the burning of Bāleya-paṭṭana through the fire of King Ereyanga's anger, when he had seized the shore (or 'boundary'), made one think of the trembling mass of the ocean waves when faced with the glittering fire of Rāma's arrows." Likewise, a very badly damaged inscription of the reign of Ballāla I mentions not only Ereyanga's success against the Cōla but also his taking of Bāleya-paṭṭana. (3)

(1) E.C.VII Shimoga 64(1172). In line four of the quotation diśādhipaṁ is almost certainly a misreading for diśādhipar.

(2) E.C.II 349(1159).

(3) E.C.V Belur 68(1117): kare viḍidu Bāleyapattaṇaṁ urivuduv Ereyanga (sic)nrpana kōpānālanim / smariyisidudu Rāma-viśara-sphuritāgniyan abdhī-viḍi-nicayācakitaṁ // The word kare could mean either the bank of a river, shore of the sea, or a boundary; thus the translation offered by Rice, "Bāleya-paṭṭana on the sea shore" is liable to mislead. The figure certainly demands the near presence of water. M.A.R.1936,9(1101) shows plainly the words "Bāleya-paṭṭanamam kond(u)."
In fact, it was subsequently believed, no doubt with reason, that Ėreyaṅga's services to the emperor were considerable. Speaking of Ėreyaṅga, an inscription of 1181 says:

\[
\]

"He the resolute valiant hero, a rod in the right hand of the Cālukya king, was a thunderbolt in splitting the lofty mountains the assemblage of formidable kings, a raincloud to the crops the panegyrists, and made the world white with the splendour of his famous increasing glory that was pure as the white lotus, the celestial elephant, an autumnal cloud, the moon, or a kunda flower." (1)

Unfortunately we are not as yet in a position to be certain when these campaigns took place, on whose behalf, or even in what order of sequence. In the case of Baleya-patīna we can not tell even where it was.

Of the two places which could have been named Baleya-patīna, neither seems really satisfactory. Balagāvi, Belagāvi, or Baligāme, to the north-west of the Hoysala nāḍ, was a place of importance, and there is plenty of evidence that it was called Baleya-pura, or Bali's city. It was not, however, near the sea, or even a large river, and we have no reason to believe that it was at this time of sufficient strategic or political eminence to be considered a prize worthy

(1) E.C. II 327(1181).
of mention beside the other achievements, which were unquestionably remarkable. On the other hand, Baliapattam, a few miles north of Kannanur, while satisfying the presumed condition of being on the sea-shore, is not a satisfactory identification unless we are to suppose either that Breyanga was engaged in a campaign against a Malabar dynasty that may have recognized the overlordship of the Cola at this time, or that he was attacking the Kerala ruler, the latter suggestion having some probability seeing that Vikramaditya claimed to have defeated the Cēra king. Neither of these suggestions is impossible, yet further support would be required for either, as it is not very likely that the Hoysala would send an expedition into territory that had never been under Cālukya control, where in fact he would have few allies, and would be leaving his country on the plateau above a prey to the possible attacks of those Cālukya feudatories and other enemies whom he had provoked. An expedition into the Malabar coastal strip must have been a perilous aberration.

On the whole it is more likely that Baleyapaṭṭana was either on the west coast, perhaps in the region of Goa, or on the east coast in the province of Orissa. Breyanga may well have been sent to humble a rebellious dependent of Somēśvara II or even Vikramaditya VI, or perhaps took Baleyapatṭana during the Cakragotṭa campaign.

Of the Cakragotṭa exploit our knowledge is fortunately more extensive, if less definite than could be desired.
It is known that Cakrapotta, otherwise Cakrakūta, was in the modern Bastar State near Jagdalpur in the present Central Provinces. (1) The place had a very adventurous career, having been taken by the Cālukya ruler just before 1062, only to be lost to the Cōla four years later when he invaded Sakkaragottam (Cakragotṭa) and Kaliṅga. (2) Some time after the beginning of the reign of Vikramāditya, and almost certainly before the Hoysala contact with the place, Prōla, son of Bēta Kākatiya, had some opportunity to bring it under his control, as is shown by the statement in 1090 that he had "straightened the Cakrakūta province". (3)

It remains to decide when, and, if possible, on whose behalf Bṛeyaṅga led his force of Kannadigas so far across the Deccan against this remote principality. It appears from what Bilhana says of Vikramāditya's successes just prior to his father's death that Cakrakūta, as he calls it, was one of his captures. (4) If this information may be relied upon, it is possible that the Hoysala expedition took place about 1068. As, however, Bṛeyaṅga's principal task, the capture of Dhārā, was effected in the reign of Sōmēśvara II, that is, between 1069 and 1076, and as Bṛeyaṅga's son Viṣṇuvardhana almost certainly accompanied, and is not heard of before 1101, the expedition will have to be assigned to the post-1076 period.

---

(1) This is proved by inscriptions, as for example that at Temarā of 1324, see Hira Lal, p.152 (1st edition).
(2) S.I.I. XIX pt.1,97(1062) at Mulgund, copied partially in W.E. I,f.101, shows Mādarasa, who ruled Belvola 3,000 and Puligere 300 for the Cālukya, bearing besides the titles "slayer of Rājādhirāja Cōla" and "rod of death to the Cōla family" that of Cakragotṭa-dāvānalam, a forest-fire to Cakragotṭa. For the Cōla invasion see G.C.Reycaudhuri, p.229. (3) & (4) over.
and indeed a date in the neighbourhood of 1090 would be more suitable than an earlier one. The fact that Anantapāla-danñ-āyaka, the officer who ruled the districts of Belvola, Puli-gene and Banavāse between about 1101 and 1121, is accredited with the title Cakrakūta-saṅcālana in a damaged inscription of doubtful date, is not sufficient evidence for his having taken part with the Hoysalas in a single campaign. It appears, on the contrary, that Anantapāla may well have earned the title very late in his career, indeed after his departure from the Kannada for the Telugu country. (1)

That Ereyanga was accompanied by his second son, Viṣṇuvardhana, who was born somewhere in the region of 1075, is shown by several references to this expedition. It must be borne in mind that Viṣṇuvardhana could not have taken Cakragotṭa during his reign as the Hoysala king. By the time of his accession the Hoysala kingdom was beginning a movement towards independence, and his energies were directed at objects more obviously profitable, and less hazardous, than a march unaided across the Deccan. It was, therefore, as a subordinate commander under his now elderly father that he earned these praises:

"Did not the brave king Viṣṇu display the sharpness of his formidable sword so that Somēsvara was afraid, Somēśvara the lord of Cakragotṭa of famous splendour?" (2)

Page 57 n.(3) H.A.S. 13, p.25-9. The inscription was set up by Prōla's son Bēta.
Page 57 n.(4) Vikramāṅka-dēva-carita IV,30: ākrānta-ripucakrēna Cakrakōṭa-patēḥ param / likhitāś citraśālāsu tēnāmucya-anta dantinaḥ // He set free even the elephants in the frescos.
(1) S.I.I.VI 112/3(A.R.1897,154) in Kannada at Cebrōlu, Bap-atla tāluqa, Guntur district. G.C.Raychaudhuri, p.268, feels that the Hoysalas and Anantapāla took part in the same errand. He
Again, in an inscription of 1205 he is called "a powerful lion in swallowing the fierce elephant Sōmēśvara" as he "displayed his might before Mānikya-dēvi whose throne is at Cakrakūṭa", while in one of 1133 he bears the title Cakrakūṭādhiśvara-Sōmēśvara-mada-marddanaḥ, "destruction to the pride of Sōmēśvara, lord of Cakrakūṭa". (1) Another again says that he terrified Cakrakūṭa, pursued and captured Sōmēśvara’s elephants. (2)

Unfortunately our information about the Sōmēśvara mentioned in these inscriptions does not help us to fix very precisely the period of Ereyaṅga’s and Viṣṇuvardhana’s attack. The earliest date of the Nāgavamsi chief Sōmēśvara is 1069, and the latest 1109, although he probably lived until 1111, when his son Kannara-dēva succeeded him. (3) Yet we have already independent reasons for believing that the attack did not take place before the accession of Sōmēśvara II or after the accession of the Hoysala Viṣṇuvardhana (1108). On the whole, the period about 1090 seems to fit all the known circumstances well, and to it we accordingly assign not only the Cakragotta exploit but the campaign against the Kaliṅga, that says that the title refers to Gōvinda, Anantapāla’s nephew: his name does indeed appear in the record in question, but the title evidently belongs to his uncle. It is possible to see besides that the exploits of this Anantapāla were performed on the order of Vikramaṅka, that is Vikramāditya.

Page 58 n. (2) E.C.VI Mudgere 22(1129): prakāṭātōpada Cakragottad oḍeyam Sōmēśvaram balke tanna karālāsiya kūrppan ēṁ meradanō --- adaṭam ārī Viṣṇu-bhūpālakam // M.A.R.1925,30(c1135) ēhas (line 12-3) the same verse in a badly mutilated condition, misconstrued by the editor(p.40):"He was a help to Sōmēśvara (Cāl- ukya king)."

(1) E.C.V Belur 58(1117) and E.C.VI Kadur 149(1205); E.C.V Belur 124(1133).
(2) E.C.VI Kadur 69(1160)
is referred to in the records quoted above, as suggested by
the proximity of Cakragotta to the Kalinga sphere of influence.
Both these enterprises, then, form a part of the process by
which Vikramaditya attempted to consolidate his empire, at a
time when the Hoysala was content to serve a military apprent-
iceship under the emperor, to take lessons in the science of
expansion, and to taste the advantages of power and influence
without the burden of responsibility.

But, before the Cakragotta campaign, several interest-
ing changes had taken place in the relationship between
emperor and ally. Somesvara had been content to employ Ereyanga
against Dhara without prejudice to the Hoysala status as an
autonomous ruler, and Vinayaditya had been prepared to send his
son on a sponsored tour of foreign parts, and to keep up his
private army at the emperor's expense: Vikramaditya's accession
brought a fresh element into the relationship.

When his relations with his elder brother broke down
in the year 1076, besides the feudatories in the west whom he
had already conciliated, he found the Hoysala one of his chief
supporters. In the decisive battle that gave Vikramaditya the
empire Ereyanga appears to have taken an active part. An insc-
ription of 1100 tells us that at the emperor's order king
Ereyanga caused the elder brother to sheath (his sword); the
Colikas king he caused to wear leaves; Nannuge he caused to be
drawn in three colours (?), so that the world praised him.(1)

(1) E.C.V Asikere 102a(1100): annam oregolisi Cilikar annaleyam
taliran udisi Nannugeyam m u-vannam barisidan urvrire baapisal
Ereyanga-nppati cakriya besadi // This is an obscure verse.
Nannuge is unknown. annaleyam has been translated here on the
analogy of the Tamil annal, but may be a proper name. Urvrire
may be "the great ones".
The "elder brother" has been taken, rightly, to refer to Sōmēśvara II Bhuvanaikamalla. This important service must, then, soon have been followed by the campaign against the Cōla. Nothing is known of it except that he fought the enemy with success at Vallūr, which may tentatively be identified with the Vallūr in the Mārājavadī 7,000 which perhaps corresponds to the Pavugada tāluqa of the Tumkur district. This period, therefore, sees for the first time a real advance by the Cālukya against his rival, with the Hoysala, as the location of his home territory would suggest, playing a big part in ridding the Kārṇāṭaka plateau of the Tamilian invader. (1)

But Vikramāditya had permitted this powerful maṇḍalēśvara to assist him on conditions which, while in strict accordance with the objects of the new and more efficient reign imposed a degree of humiliation upon the Hoysala.

If an inscription of somewhat later date may be trusted, Vinayāditya acknowledged Cālukya sovereignty by 1078. (2) An undoubted case of such recognition occurs in an inscription of 1090,(3) while the official use of the Cālukya-Vikrama era, that of Vikramāditya's coronation, commenced in the Hoysala nādi in or before 1083.(4) Inscriptions continue to be dated from time to time in the Śaka era, but the regular use of the Cālukya era in the Hoysala record offices during the reign of Vikramāditya is a reliable indication of at least the theoretical supremacy of the imperial family.

(1) M.A.R. 1936,9(cl101); G.C. Raychaudhuri, p.271-2 says, "The Hoysalas occupied a strategic position of great importance in relation to the Cālukya-Cōla contest." (2) E.C.XII Tiptur 105(1078 & 1107). It is possible that the phrases referring to
There are additional reasons for supposing that Vikramāditya made a vigorous attempt to secure the allegiance of dynasties on the borders of his hereditary dominions. It may be in this way that we can account for the presence of an inscription bearing the name of the mahā-manḍalēśvara Jayasiṅgha at the village Holahalli in Hassan Tāluqa, that is, well within the Hoysala nāḍ. (1) Indeed this Jayasiṅgha may be the Kadamba ruler of Goa, who lived according to Moraes between 1030 and 1037, and who may have had occasion to invade thus far to the south, though it seems very unlikely. The only possible alternative seems to be Jayasimha the younger brother of Vikramāditya, who ruled Banavāse 12,000, Sāntalige 1,000, Belvola 300, Huligēre (Puligere) 300, and Bāsavalli 1,000, all districts in the north-west of the Mysorean plateau, in and about the year 1080, under the title of Vīra-Nolamba-Pallava-Permādi Jayasiṅgha. (2) It may well be the case that he passed through the Hoysala nāḍ on a punitive expedition of which we have no other knowledge. That the Hoysala suffered severely then is unlikely: that a demonstration in force was made is quite possible. But we have clear evidence that Vikramāditya undertook extensive operations in the regions to the south and east

---


(2) W.E.I,ff.184b and 185b.
of the Hoysala nād, in which, we shall not be rash in supposing, the Hoysala must have rendered useful if not enthusiastic assistance. In 1088, the year Vibhava, the thirteenth of his reign, Vikramāditya boasted of having subdued by the strength of his arm many rulers including Caṅga-Koṅgālva, Ĉēra and Siṅgalika. (1) It is very significant that the name of the Hoysala does not occur amongst those said to be subjected by the "only beloved of the three worlds". Yet no operations against the Caṅgālva-Koṅgālva group, whose unity at this period is fully demonstrated by the method of referring to them in this record; nor against the Ĉēra, whose forces must have been met somewhere in the Nilgiri or Coorg region, rather than Malabar, if indeed any fighting actually took place; nor against the Siṅgalika, whom we have reason to place somewhere in the south-east of the plateau; none in fact of these expeditions could have been undertaken had the Hoysala offered any resistance. On the other hand, the Hoysala's co-operation could easily have been enlisted by the consideration that the might of the emperor was profitably employed from the Hoysala point of view if it reduced the strength and ambitions of the Hoysala's neighbours. (2)

---


(2) The effect of Vikrama's attack upon the Ĉēra and Siṅgalika can not be judged, on account of the absence of relevant evidence. His relationship with the Caṅgālva and Koṅgālva appears to have had a curiously mixed effect. Of the Caṅgālva we have only two inscriptions: E.GV Arkalgud 65(1090) at Lakkūra, and M.A.R. 1925,114(1091) at Kiraṅgūr, Hunsur tāluqa. In the first instance Mādeyarasa Caṅgālva, in the second merely Caṅgālva-dēva is mentioned. Of the Koṅgālva we possess, from
On the strength of this co-operation, combined with the services he rendered through his son Ereyanga and grandson Visnuvardhana, Vinayāditya received this encomium within three years of his death:

kay-sērada ripu-nṛparam
poy-seṇḍam poydu mēreye vidvīt-nṛparam /
Poysala-dharādhipaṁ besa-
keysidan ā-Kuntalādhipatigam tanagam //
ā-Vinayāditya-ma-
hī-varan aparākeyinde Taḷakāḍu-varaṁ /
Dēvēndran ant ir āldām
bhūvaleyaṁ mecci jīya jīy emb inegam //

"The Poysala king subjected to that lord of Kunt-
āla (the emperor) and to himself enemy kings who did not join hands, striking in a brilliant way hostile kings (as if) balls in a game. That king Vinayāditya ruled from the west as far as (the province of) Taḷakāḍ like Indra, until the circle of the earth cries "well done, sir!" in approval."

(1) 1058, the following series: E.C.I 35(1058) at Mallūr, Rājēndra; E.C.V.Arkalgud 93(1066) at Siṅganakuppe, Rājēndrā-Prthvī-Koṅg-
āla-dēva; E.C.I 49(1070) at Hoshallī, the same; E.C.I 43(1077) at Mallūr, Rājēndra-Cōla-Koṅgalva; E.C.V Arkalgud 99(1079) at Sōmavāra, Adaṭāraditya, otherwise samadhi-gata-panca-mahāśabda-
mahāmandalāśvāra, lord of the city of Oreyur, sun to the eastern mountain the Cōla-kula, crest-jewel of the Sūryya-vamśa, Rājēndra-prthuvi-Koṅgalva; M.A.R.1912-3 para. 62(1079) at Sāl-
igrāma, Tribhuvanamalla Koṅgalva; E.C.V Hōle-Narsipur 16(1080) at Gubbi, Tribhuvanamalla-Cōla-Koṅgalva, with a mention of Adaṭāraditya; E.C.V Arkalgud 102(1080) at Madalāpura Adaṭāraditya; E.C.V Arkalgud 94(1091) at Doḍa-Bemmatti, Rāj-
ēndra-Prthuvi-Koṅgalva; ibid. 95(1094) at Cikka-Bemmatti, the same; then a long silence.

It will be seen that the arrival of effective Cāḷukya pressure brought a decline, followed by a temporary revival which affected both Cāṅgālva and Koṅgalva from about 1090 to (1) over.
While the political condition of the Hoysala seems, at least in respect of his independence, to have changed somewhat for the worse, the Hoysala kingdom saw a considerable degree of progress during Vinayāditya's long reign not only in the development of the army and on account of the fine opportunities available for Hoysala generals and statesmen to gain experience in an unusually wide field, but also in respect of the material prosperity of the country. The wealth acquired on foreign campaigns, and the added consequence which they brought attracted to the Hoysala court and country the first of what was to become, in the normal course of events, a steady stream of immigrants, adventurers, each having something to offer, if only a blessing, and each expecting ample and substantial patronage from the young and doubtless self-conscious dynasty. At least a small percentage of these newcomers made, eventually, valuable contributions to the material and intellectual advancement of the Hoysala nāḍ.

As success brought self-confidence, Vinayāditya set up his residence further from the hills, in a position less safe strategically, indeed even perilous, but indicating a real appreciation not only of a security born of a settled and faithful peasantry round about, but the advantages of a capital enjoying a more central position and a better degree of access to the trade routes of the new kingdom.

1094, before both slid into oblivion. The temporary assumption of the title Tribhuvanamalla and the amusing compromise in the Gubbi inscription show the struggle for supremacy. The revival while the Hoysala was otherwise occupied was followed by a relapse into mediocrity. M.A.R. 1912-3 para. 62(1079) shows the Caṅgālya attacking the Koṅgālya unsuccessfully, perhaps due to the Koṅgālya's change of front. Page 64 n.(1) E.C.V Arsikere 102a(1101).
Vinayaditya's first inscription of reasonably certain date is at Angadi, otherwise Sosavur, the Sašakapura or Sašapura which has already been noticed as the legendary birthplace of the Hoysalas. (1) That Sosavur was indeed Vinayaditya's earliest capital is shown by an inscription of perhaps 1184, which seems to have been based on documentary material of much earlier origin. Vinayaditya was ruling, according to this authority, at Sosavur together with his wife, Keleyabbe (the mother of Ereyanga), in the year 1047-8, for so we interpret Sarvavajīt, Saka 969, and error for 970. (2)

It is interesting to notice from this part of the record that Keleyabbe bestowed on Mariyâne-daṁayaka, a fosterling of hers, a girl by the name of Dēkave as a wife together with the prabhutva, or chiefship, of Sindagere in Asandi-nâd for their maintenance. Mariyâne was probably an adopted son, supplying the place of children whom either she had not born in addition to Ereyanga or who had died in their infancy. This village Sin-

(1) E.C.VI Mudgere 9, dated Jaya and Saka 924, which may be an error for 976 or 977, can be assigned to 1054 rather than any other year firstly because Vinayaditya can have seen only one Jaya, namely this one, and secondly because Vajrapâṇi-pandita, whose disciple is mentioned, has another reference in an inscription of about 1040. The only other inscription which may claim to be Vinayaditya's earliest is E.C.VI Mudgere 21 at Kanaciru, not very far from Sosavur. It is dated Virōdhī, which would be 1049. The Saka year is 989 (A.D.1067) according to the text, and 996 (A.D.1074) according to the translation; as the ruler is named "Poysala" only, no decision can be made on the date of this inscription as yet.

(2) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 160(?1184) at Sindigere. Rice misdates it ?1103. It is an incomplete copy of E.C.IV Nagamangala 32(1184) at Alêsandra. The same family appears to have held both places. The Alêsandra copy has the date 967 for the Saka year quoted above; the error, if error it be, and not merely a misreading, being one of merely three years, strengthens rather than weakens the value of the evidence.
dagarved was only six miles north of Dörasamudra, but the fact that it was in Asandi-nāḍ confirms the view that Vinayāditya's territorial expansion was of an early beginning and involved intimate relations with the Gaṅga family of Asandi, from whom this village may have been acquired by other means than simple purchase.

By the year 1062, however, after a possible stay at Belūr, Vinayāditya was ruling at Dörasamudra, and it is from that year that we can grant the city the status of a rājadhāni, or capital city. (1)

Its name gives some room for controversy, and it is open to question whether it should be spelt Dhōra, Dōra-, or Dörasamudra. The most usual form found in the Roman and Kannada texts of the inscriptions is Dörasamudra, and the cases where the transliteration gives Dörasamudra are to be attributed to the fact that a distinction between the long and the short vowel was hardly ever made in the writing of the period. The text of the Sūktisudhārṇava of Mallikārjuna, written in the reign of the Hoysala Sūmēśvara, uniformly gives the long vowel.(2) The presence of the aspirate is to be doubted, for the Kannadājī have and still have an antipathy to aspirated consonants and the form found in inscriptions may represent the common pronunciation without indicating a conventional spelling, which may or may not have included the aspirate. An element of uncertainty will always remain as to the official spelling, for

(1) M.A.R. 1929, 12 (1062) at Halebīd (Dörasamudra itself).
(2) E.g. p. 132: Orama meccidam' kṛti-sāram sutavarnanakke Hoy-
salavamp共和国 dhāraṇa Narasimha-sutaṁ Dörasamudrādhināyakaṁ
Sūmanṛpam // where the metre puts the vowel beyond question.
the distinction between da and dha in the contemporary script, between ੼ in fact and ੼, was so slight that on many occasions Dōra may well be a misreading for Dhōra. The Muslim historians, who had often a knack of recording the contemporary and colloquial pronunciation with accuracy, and who have thus preserved for us, despite the corruptions to which their unfortunate script is so liable, forms of which we have no other trace, with the single exception of Waṣṣāf, who writes Dōr-samun, invariably spell the name of this town with an aspirate: Dhōr,samundar. It is true that the MSS. are about equally balanced between -samund and -samundar, that is to say, if one neglects several absurd corruptions due to careless copying; and one can put aside at once the previous transliterations of the Persian letters such as "Dahūr-samandar" and so on. Yet the crux remains, and, in the absence of an adequate solution, the unaspirated form has been chosen for this work, as it is known to be more akin to the peculiarities of mediaeval as well as modern Kannāda. The name signifies "the tank (samudra, the modern sandra - the Muslim historians testify to the early intrusion of the n) of Dōra". We are not able to identify this man, but there appear to have been several persons of importance by this name in Rāṣṭrakūṭa times.(1) Certain it is, at any rate, that the name of the city has nothing to do with dvāra, a door; and the name Dvāravatīpura, which is applied to it very rarely, is a case of fanciful folk-etymology, as is for example Baḷeya-pura for Beḷagāvi. When the Hoysalas called

(1) A king Dōra is mentioned in K.I.VI p.163. The builder of the Dōra-samudra was probably not legendary (!), So the view of
themselves lords of Dvārāvatīpura - a title which they held in common with a Caṅgālīva branch and the Dēvagiri Yādavas to mention only two contemporary holders - they were referring to their Yādava pedigree and their mythical descent from Krṣṇa. (1)

While Dārasamudra was the capital, Belūr also had a palace which was used as a subsidiary seat of government. It seems likely that it was occupied by the Hoysala court before Dārasamudra, because the site was more immediately attractive, and can reasonably be supposed to have been a stopping-place intermediately between Sosavūr and Dārasamudra. Belūr was about eight miles south-west of Dārasamudra, and is now in a more flourishing condition than its ancient rival. As has already been remarked, it lies on two main trade routes; moreover, with its back, as it were, against much hilly and difficult ground, it had a far stronger defensive position than Dārasamudra, though neither could be said to be well situated from a military point of view. Dārasamudra was, and still is, linked with Belūr by a good road, while from the first half of the Hoysala period a fine channel, which excited Colonel Mackenzie's admiration, brought to the capital a supply of water from the Yagaci river. When it is considered that the town already stood between several stretches of water, it will be appreciated that the population must have been large to require such elaborate provision, large even for a capital city. In those times life was still largely rural, and even a rajadhāni was a village first and a seat of government second.

(1) Fleet wisely left the question open, though he

De la Vallee Poussin, Dynasties...depuis Kanishka, p.224 n.1, is as unlikely, as his giving Dvārasamudra as an alternative form for Dārasamudra.
Vinayāditya was ruling at Belvūr, that is Belūr, in 1096, approximately two years before his death. (1) It may be that he was holding a nominal authority while his son Breyānga controlled the government at Dōrasamudra, either personally or through his sons Ballāla and Viṣṇuvardhana(Biṭṭi-dēva). Belūr itself, when Dōrasamudra received an unwelcome visit from an enemy a few years after this date, it seems to have failed to escape his attention. (2)

Intimately associated with the growth of the kingdom which is observed during this period was a programme of public works, conspicuous amongst which was the provision and repair of tanks. As early as 1062 the king made a grant for the upkeep of recent renovations to the Dōra-samudra itself. (3) The building of tanks is referred to in several inscriptions at intervals during Vinayāditya's reign. (4) An ambitious scheme of land development was carried out by Pōcimayya-daṇñāyaka prior to the year 1063 in the villages around Bīrūr, in the present Kadur district, which came under his jurisdiction. (5) In the inscription at Haḷeḇīḍ which tells how Vinayāditya, in the 21st year of the Cālukya Vikrama era, the year Ṭisvara, set up a sluice for a tank at Dōrasamudra, the fact also is mentioned - to judge from a mutilated phrase - that in his reign all streams and hollows were turned into tanks. This kind of activity is thus seen to have extended throughout his long reign. (6)


(1)E.C.VI Kadur 142(1096) where Vinayāditya's name does not
Naturally, the public resources were expended in other ways also; again conspicuous among the beneficiaries were religious persons, bodies and temples. In 1061 Vinayaditya made a land grant to a Brahman agahāra, and in \textbf{1093} to a Śaiva temple.\(1\) As the royal family were Jaina by persuasion it is not surprising that we hear more of the Jaina than of the Śaiva or Vaiṣṇava faith in contemporary records. In 1062 Vinayaditya made a grant to his Jaina guru Śānti-dēva's colleague Abhayacakendra-ṇaṇḍita. The former had just died at Sosavūr, after a life of adventure in fields political as well as religious. It is said of him that men possessed of such great and brilliant glory were rare. Who could describe the ability of the ascetic Śānti-dēva, having worshipped whose pair of pure lotus feet the Poysala king Vinayaditya brought the goddess of wealth to the territory under his rule? The Pāṇḍya king (of Uccāṇgi, of course) gave him the title Svāmi and Āhavamalla (the Cālukya) that of Sabda-caturmukha, and he had finally attached himself to the Hoysala.\(2\)

\(\text{\textit{appear, merely the title Tribhuvanamalla Poysala. M.A.R.1926,7 of the same year speaks of the rule of Tribhuvanamalla Vinayaditya as current, and mentions Ereyaṅga as the master of a certain warrior there praised.}}\)

\(\text{Page 70 n.}(2)\ \text{See below, p. 94.}\n\text{Page 70 n.}(3)\ \text{M.A.R.1929,12(1062).}\n\text{Page 70 n.}(4)\ \text{E.C.VI Chikmagalur 16(?1074) at Basavanahalli. The Śaka year 998 should be corrected to 997 to correspond with the year Ananda. E.C.VI Kadur 33(c1075) at Bommēnahalli. The work was carried out under the mahā-maṅḍālēvara Tribhuvanamalla vīraṇ Ereyaṅga Hōsala-dēva. E.C.V Ārsikere 187(c1090) at Kurādahalli. E.C.XII Tipṣṭur 57(1091) at Aralaguppe. M.A.R.1924,19 (1094) at Dēvahalli, near Hālebid. E.C.V Hassan 107(1095) at Nittūr. Finally, E.C.V Channarayapatna 207(1098) at Kēmāḷu.}\n\text{Page 70 n.}(5)\ \text{E.C.VI Kadur 161(1063). Page 70 n.(6) M.A.R.1937, 33(1097): toreyaṇitum kuḷiyanitum kereyā ... dama negāḷa, etc.}\n
\(\)\(\text{(1) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 7(1061); E.C.VI Tarikere 76(1093).}\n\text{(2) E.C.VI Mudgere 17(1062); E.C.II 67(1129) where the following}\
Sānti-dēva's successor in the capacity of guru to the Poysala king was a certain Guṇasēna-paṇḍita-dēva of Mullūr in the modern Coorg. This Jaina priest was guru to a certainŚcala-dēvi also: we do not know whether she belonged to the Hoysala, Kuṅgālva or some other family. (1) The king made a grant for a basadi (modern basti) or Jaina temple in 1068,(2) yet the most interesting proof of the connection between the Jaina community and the government is found in a casual reference concerning the guru Vardhamāna-dēva, disciple of Vādirāja, who died by sannyāsa about 1070. The record says of him that he was Hoysala-kārāliyadalu agraganyar

which, if we read kāryālayadalu (= -ol) for the difficult kārāliyadalu, may be translated "thought the best in the offices, or highly esteemed in the diwān, of the Hoysala". So that it is clear that at this time Jaina teachers were consulted, if not actually employed, on matters of importance in the civil administration. (3)

quatrains are:

yasyōpāsya pavitra-pāda-kṣamal-dvandvaṃ nṛpah Poy sala
laṃkṣīmāṃ sannidhim ānayat sa Vinayādityah kṛtājñā bhuvah /
kaś tasy ārhati Śānti-dēva-yaminās sāmarththyan itthāṃ tathāty
èkhyātum virālāṃ khalu sphurad-uru-jyōtir-ddāsas tādṛśāḥ //

(1) E.C.VI Mudgere 13(1063); E.C.V Arkalgud 98(c1060). He is mentioned immediately after Śānti-dēva in the Sravana Bēlgōla record of 1129(above).
(2) E.C.IV Nagamangala 66(1068).
(3) M.A.R.1929,41(c1070). Dr.Krishna,ibid.p.109,rightly holds that this inscription belongs to the reign of Vinayāditya. Sal- etore, Med.Jainism,p.66-7, denies this on the ground that another priest was the guru of that monarch, saying that this Vardhamāna is the Sudatta connected with Sala, in whom of course he believes. He says,"If Vardhamāna had only aided Poy sala in founding the royal house, that fact would have been expressed, as in the case of the illustrious Simhanandi Acārya (of Gaṅga fame), thus - that Vardhamāna-dēva had merely created (madīda) the kingdom. But it was because Sudatta Vardhamāna stabilized the Hoysala government in the reigns probably of three success-
The peaceful scene of domestic progress, founded upon the docility of the Hoysala's neighbours, the influx of wealth from foreign campaigns, the steady development of the cultivation of the soil, and the growth of religious and cultural institutions under royal patronage, while internal unity was secured by the prolonged absence of the most adventurous and lively members of the society on the imperial service, was rudely shattered at a moment when Vinayāditya was in extreme old age, his son was apparently absent from the capital, and the community was unprepared to receive the shock. Only a few years after the Hoysala had captured Cakragoṭṭa and engaged with the Kaliṅga ruler on the emperor's behalf, not to speak of other notable services, that same overlord thought fit to permit another of his subordinates to trample upon the Hoysala's youthful self-satisfaction, and at the same time work off an old grudge. There is no evidence that the Hoysala

ive rulers that the phrase Hoysala-kārāliyadalu agraganyaru is applied to him in the Sāgarakaṭṭe record. --- the reigns of all the first three Hoysala rulers - Poysāla, Vinayāditya I and Nṛpa Kāma were short-lived." Every word of this is unwarranted, and the general conception fantastic. It is convenient to dispose at this point once for all of the phantom Vinayāditya I: there never was more than one Vinayāditya in the Hoysala line. EC.VI Chikmagalur 33,M.A.R.1915-6,para.83(revising the former) and M.A.R.1932,21(giving the text), all concerning one inscription at Uppahalli near Índāvāra, almost certainly belongs to the year 1092 and not 1012 as was thought by its last editor, whom Saletore followed. It is dated in the reign of Tribhuvanamalla-Vineyāditya, a circumstance in itself sufficient to suggest a date after 1047, the year Paridhāvi and the curious expression "Vikrama-gālam 1070" or, as the later editors read the figure, "1060". The editor in M.A.R.1932 writes,"Obviously Vikrama-gāla of the record does not mean the Cālukya-Vikrama era: it means the Vikrama era, though Hoysala inscriptions dated in that era are very rare...... Taking the cyclic year to be correct we arrive at 1070 of the Vikrama era (A.D.1012) which appears to be the date intended". The northern Vikrama era is not rare in Hoysala inscriptions, it is unparalleled: of the 2,500 odd Hoysala records not one bears a date in this era. The expla-
had effected, though he may well have meditated, any movement to the emperor's disadvantage: it is quite certain that Jagaddēva Paramāra could not have come so far southwards without the emperor's permission, whereas it is highly likely that he received assistance and encouragement besides.

It appears that Jagaddēva, son of Udayāditya and nephew of Bhōja, gained favour with Vikramāditya by promising to subdue enemies that had appeared too difficult for Vikrama himself to attack without Jagaddēva's support. In fact Jagaddēva had revived the fortunes of the Malava kingdom to such an extent that Vikrama must have preferred him as an ally to a possible enemy, even if such an alliance might have unfortunate repercussions upon the chances of performing Vikrama's other obligations. Jagaddēva had carried out successful campaigns against Cakradurga, which may be Cakragotţa, and it is quite likely that he came into contact with his old enemy Ereyaṅga, the taker of Dhārā, on this occasion. If he did not take Cakradurga on the instructions of Vikramāditya, he may well have taken it for his own purposes subsequently to the capture of the place under Ereyaṅga. At any rate, if we may trust Meru-tuṅga, Vikramāditya was quite infatuated with the Paramāra, and the latter was at liberty to do as he pleased.(1)

(1) Ganguly mentions Jagaddēva on p.148 etc. He is known from
The exploit against Cakradurga was followed by an attack on the Ændhra king, presumably the Kākatiya Bēta, and a march upon the Hoysala country. He describes his adventures in some clever Sanskrit verses forming part of an inscription at Jainad in the Adilabad district of the present Nizām's Dominions, an inscription which can be assigned with great probability to the year 1093 or to the immediate neighbourhood of that year. (1)

Speaking of king Pramāra it says:

\begin{multline}
\text{tadanvayē sānvaya-nāmadhēyaḥ śrīmān Jagaddēva iti kṣitīśaḥ}
\text{abhūd abhūpāla-dig-antarāla-nirmāna-nirvyūdha-bhuja-śramō'yaṁ}
\text{yasy-ōdayāditya nṛpaḥ pitāśid dēvāḥ pitrvyāḥ sa ca Bhōja rājaḥ}
\text{virējatur yau vasudhādhipatyā-prāpta-pratiṣṭhāv iva puṣpavantau}
\end{multline}

Andhrādhīsa-mṛgidrṣaḥ pati-parityaktāś ciram yaccamū-\begin{multline}
vāha-vyūha-khur-āgra-khaṇḍita-bhuvi kṣīnāḥ skhalantyō 'dhvani
niyante navanīta-kōmalā-padās tāmra-prabhāiḥ pallavair
dattālamvam anuvudhēḥ parisara-kṣōnī-latā-śrēṇībhīḥ
\end{multline}

the Rās Māla (Rawlinson, 1924, vol.I p.117 ff.). He is identified by Ganguly satisfactorily with Laksma-dēva. See E.I.II p.192. Merutūṅga, Prabandhacintāmāṇi, Tawney, p.186 (see also E.I. XXII 57) says that Jagaddēva was earnestly invited by the Cāḷukya king to his court and accepted service under him. The Dongargaon inscription of Jagaddēva says that the king of Kuntala graciously addressed him as "the first among my sons, the lord of my kingdom, my right arm, a victory incarnate in all regions, my very self": E.I.XXVI 185. On p.268 G.C.Raychaudhuri says, "Jagaddēva was undoubtedly fighting the battles of Vikramāditya", but it can not be supposed that his motives were altruistic. For his connection with Cakragoṭṭa compare below p.148 n.(2).

(1) D.C.Ganguly, E.I.XXII p.57, says, "That Jagaddēva occupied the throne of Mālava sometime between 1086 and 1094 A.D. can not be disputed".
krīḍāccaśita- [Ca]krodurgga-ṛṇpatēr adyāpi yasyājñayā
dandāhīta-gajēndra-dāna-salilair nyastāṁ prāsastim parāṁ /  
śail-ōpānta-vasundhārāśu vipinōtsaṃgēśu [bhū] pānganāḥ //  
nadā- 
madhyē-[Dō] rasamudram adri-śikharākār[ām] kapāl-āvalīm 
ālōkya [dvi] radēndra-danta-musala-prānta-sprēṣām prēyasām /  
sākramdaiḥ prati-mandiraṃ [Ma] lahara-kṣoniśa-citt-ōdarē  
śūlam [pa] llavayanti vāhpa-salilair yad-vairīṇām vallabhāḥ /  
śūlam [pa] llavayanti vāhpa-salilair yad-vairīṇām vallabhāḥ //

"In his line was king Jagaddēva, who bore that name together with that of his line; he was a man unwearied in stretching out his arms to embrace the intervals held by kings between the quarters (or, alternatively, 'a man the labour of whose arms was to stretch them out to measure the spaces between the quarters that had not any kings over them')."

"His father was Udayāditya, and his uncle king Bhōja: these two shone as if they were covered in blossoms, when famous for the lordship over the earth which they had acquired!"

"The ladies of the Āndhra king, long abandoned by their lord, enfeebled by stumbling over land trampled by the hoof-tips of the multitude of his (Jagaddēva's) army's horses, are led, they of the butter-soft feet, on their way over the ocean, a support being provided for the saffron-shining toes by piles of creepers taken from the neighbouring shore."

"Already by his order the queens of the king of the Cakradurga ('wheel-fort') he has rolled away in sport read continually with such groans rumbling in their throats his
great eulogy written by the rut-juice of the great elephants he had brought in by force in the regions deep in the woods, bounded by rivers and rocks."

"The darlings of his enemies, seeing in the middle of Dōrasamudra a heap of skulls belonging to their dear ones, a heap reaching the tips of the pestle-like tusks of great elephants and appearing like the peak of a mountain, with weeping in every house cause to sprout with their tears the spear inside the heart of the king of the Malahar (Malepar)."

Naturally the remark about the king of the Malepar, if it is supposed to refer to a Hoysala, is not to be taken too literally. But the claim to have reached Dōrasamudra is amply supported by Hoysala inscriptions themselves. That the Mālava force, fresh from successes on the east coast, was a powerful one is amply demonstrated by the pride which the Hoysala princes felt in being able to withstand it.

In the supposed absence of Ereyaṅga, his two sons Ballāla and Bṛttī-dēva, or Viṣṇuvardhana, defended the Hoysala capital and succeeded in driving off the invader. Speaking of Ereyaṅga, a later inscription says about his successor, that he was Ballāla, a crest-jewel among Śaivas, one who had conquered in a battle of elephants Jagaddēva who was mounted on an elephant. (2) Of the two brothers, Ballāla and Viṣṇuvardhana, a

---

(1) H.A.R. 1927/8, App.B(c.1093) re-edited by D.C.Ganguly in E.I. XXII p.54-63, with a translation. In the 8th line of the quotation he reads dattvālambanam and ksōṇī (the earlier reading had been ksōṇi). Note that in the 11th line nādā must almost certainly be a mistake for nādi. In line 12 Ganguly reads bhrūgangaṅaṅh, and accordingly translates the verse: "He in sport

(2) M.A.R. 1923,1(1194): Jagaddēvan gajārūṭham yo jīgāya gaj-
verse that occurs frequently in the next century asks, "who can deny their valour?"

Dōrasamudradalli Jagadēvana(sic) sēneyan ikki tamma tōl vīra-samudram āge jaya-lakṣmīge tād-gaja-vaktra-rakta-kā- / śmīra-vilēpamaṇaṁ nerāpi tat-padakāṁ beras eyde konu bhān-dāraman ā-nṛpar tālēda bīraman āro gabhīram ennadar //

"Smiting the army of Jagadēva in Dōrasamudra, their arm being an ocean of heroism, completing the anointing of the goddess of victory with the saffron of the blood from the faces of his elephants, and capturing his treasury together with his breast-ornament - who will not say that the heroism sustained by those kings is profound?" (1)

A more fanciful verse in a rather late record gives more credit to the elder brother:-

kālegadol taḍan gaḍidu mundana thatṭin (?) read -an) avuṇki pāydoṇ ā-
Mālava-cakravartti Jagaděvane tanna madāṇḍha-sindhuraṁ /

kil ide pūtu rāvut ene rāvutan allen idirccu vīra-Bal-
lāḷan en endu metṭi tivid āltanav accariy āytu dhātriyoī //

uprooted the king of Cakradurga, and at his command, even now, the streams on the slopes of the mountain, and the female bees in the midst of the forests, recite without ceasing, in different notes coming out of their throats, his all-surpassing eulogies, fixed with (the libation of water in the shape of) the rutty fluid of powerful elephants of his army." In line 13 of the quotation he reads Dōrasamudra without doubt. His translation of the verse appears to neglect the more obvious sense of the last line:- "In every house the weeping widows of his enemies, having seen in Dōrasamudra the peak-like heaps of the skulls of their lords, who came in contact with the pointed club-like tusks of his best elephants, increase with tears the acute pain in the heart of the chief of the Malahara!"

"In battle he cut down the obstacle, and, crushing the host in front of him, leapt forward: then that (famous) Mālava emperor Jagaddeva, when (the Hoysala) brought low his passion-blind ed elephant, said, "Well done, horseman!"; he said, "I am not a horseman, I am Vīra-Ballāla; oppose me!", and, as he stepped along and struck out, his valour became a marvel in the world." (1)

But Viṣṇuvardhana does not lose his own share:

\[
\text{cak্রি-প्रेषित-मालवेश्वर-जागड्डेव-सैन्यार्ग्नावं}
\]
\[
\text{घूर्णन्ततम सहस्रपिब न करतलेहात्यं मृत्यु-प्रभुहं}
\]

"Powerful as Yama, striking with his hand, he drank up all at once the rolling ocean which was the army of the Mālava king, Jagaddeva, and others sent by the emperor." (2)

It seems possible that two engagements took place before Jagaddeva departed for the north. An unfortunately much damaged inscription, to which reference has already been made, gives the impression that Ballāla went to consult Vikramāditya on his position, and perhaps to enlist that ruler's support against the Mālava, and then took part in two conflicts, in at least one of which Jagaddeva was involved. The fragments refer to the Poysala king Ballāla's seeing Ballāla, that is, Vallabha, or the emperor, and being capable and gaining a victory without effort in some way connected with a camp; he vowed or assented something without fear in a particular connection with the

---

(1) E.C.VI Tarikere 45(1197). Rice's translation is faulty, & has been copied by Ganguly, E.I.XII p.59.
(2) E.C.II 349(1159) The title Jagaddēva-prabala-pannaga-Vainatēyam, "Garuḍa to the fierce snake Jagaddēva", was probably earned on this occasion: E.C.V Ariskere 34, etc.
emperor; someone ran off in fear; a battle took place at...samudra, perhaps Dōrasamudra; and the stout Jagaddēva was the object of an attack. (1)

The attack made by Jagaddēva upon the Hoysalā capital, partial though its success was, had a profound effect upon the relationship between the Hoysalā family and the Cālukya, and the last years of Vinayāditya and Eyeyaṅga were occupied in an attempt to recreate Hoysalā prestige at the expense of surrounding families.

Vinayāditya himself must have died in the year 1097/8 at the latest, leaving Eyeyaṅga to rule in his stead. This he did until 1102. Eyeyaṅga’s death then coincided with the first general movement of aggrandisement made by the Hoysalā power, under the superintendence of Ballāla I and his younger brother Viṣṇuvardhana, affectionately known as Bitti­dēva, presumably aided by their third, less distinguished brother, Udayāditya. (2)

(1) M.A.R. 1936, 9(?1100): Ballāla Poysalāsem Ballahanam kāṇḍu kaṭaka<ṃ>...n ārddu geldan aṣramādīydaṃ / māṇiyade pūṇḍu cakrä­ē<śvara>...; sāhaṇisi...samudradalli tat rāhavavam ? tarumbole sāngara ?...; Jagadēvam kadiyam karuttana(?)...

Until the discovery of the Jainad inscription of Jagaddēva that king was supposed to have been a Sāntara. Fleet was of this opinion, D.K.D. p.494, and was followed by the editors of M.A.R. 1923,1(1194) and M.A.R.1936,9(?1100), while Krishnaswami Aiyangar, C.H.I.37 p.474 leaves it open. Jagaddēva Sāntara lived about forty years later. G.C.Roychaudhuri, p.270, feels that the attack of Jagaddēva upon Dōrasamudra took place in the first year of the reign of Ballāla and Viṣṇuvardhana, whom he understands to have reigned jointly from about 1100. The evidence of BC.V Arsikere 34, which he quotes, is unacceptable as proof of the date of the invasion, as its own date, which in fact coincides with 1101, is completely out of accord with the titles applied to the king for the period in question. Ganguly’s article in E.I.XXII has nothing definite to add on the subject. (2) Vinayāditya’s last inscription is M.A.R.1937,33(1097); Ereyaṅga’s death then coincided with the first general movement of aggrandisement made by the Hoysalā power, under the superintendence of Ballāla I and his younger brother Viṣṇuvardhana, affectionately known as Bitti­dēva, presumably aided by their third, less distinguished brother, Udayāditya. (2)

(1) M.A.R. 1936,9(?1100): Ballāla Poysalāsem Ballahanam kāṇḍu kaṭaka<ṃ>...n ārddu geldan aṣramādīydaṃ / māṇiyade pūṇḍu cakrä­ē<śvara>...; sāhaṇisi...samudradalli tat rāhavavam ? tarumbole sāngara ?...; Jagadēvam kadiyam karuttana(?)...

Until the discovery of the Jainad inscription of Jagaddēva that king was supposed to have been a Sāntara. Fleet was of this opinion, D.K.D. p.494, and was followed by the editors of M.A.R. 1923,1(1194) and M.A.R.1936,9(?1100), while Krishnaswami Aiyangar, C.H.I.37 p.474 leaves it open. Jagaddēva Sāntara lived about forty years later. G.C.Roychaudhuri, p.270, feels that the attack of Jagaddēva upon Dōrasamudra took place in the first year of the reign of Ballāla and Viṣṇuvardhana, whom he understands to have reigned jointly from about 1100. The evidence of BC.V Arsikere 34, which he quotes, is unacceptable as proof of the date of the invasion, as its own date, which in fact coincides with 1101, is completely out of accord with the titles applied to the king for the period in question. Ganguly’s article in E.I.XXII has nothing definite to add on the subject. (2) Vinayāditya’s last inscription is M.A.R.1937,33(1097); Ereyaṅga’s death then coincided with the first general movement of aggrandisement made by the Hoysalā power, under the superintendence of Ballāla I and his younger brother Viṣṇuvardhana, affectionately known as Bitti­dēva, presumably aided by their third, less distinguished brother, Udayāditya. (2)
Ereyanga was, as we have seen, absent at the time of Jagaddéva's attack. Though this must have been as great a moral shock to this lifelong servant of the Cālukya family as it was a material disaster to Hoysala prestige, we do not gain the impression that he took part personally in any schemes of revenge. He must have been little short of sixty years of age at the time of his father's death, an age then considered advanced, and he was probably no longer capable of taking an active part in the strenuous public life of the day. We can however imagine that the new century, and the new policy of his dynasty, were initiated under the beneficial influence of his mature and varied experience, and the departure from his own policy of faithfulness to the Cālukya, which his sons conducted, was not embarked upon without his approbation and support.

Ereyanga's first wife, Ścala-dēvi, the mother of Ballāla, Viṣṇuvardhana and Udayāditya, probably did not live to see the turn of the century: he was almost certainly survived by his second wife, Mahādēvi, whom he appears to have married.

Ereyanga's last inscription may be E.C.XII Tiptur 30(1102), which is faulty: the R.T. reads Tribhuvanamalla Vīra[n Erey]gāṅga-Poysala-dēva, which is a possible reading, as Ereyadga is an occasional alternative form for Ereyanga; the K.T. omits the brackets; the translation however reads Tribhuvanamalla Vīra-Gāṅga Poysala-dēva. On the whole it seems that the translation is in error. Should this inscription not be accepted as sufficient evidence of Ereyanga's living until 1102, his last inscription of certain date is E.C.V Ariskere 102a of 1101. Of Viṣṇuvardhana the first epigraphical mention is in E.C.VI Kadur 164 dated CV. 25, Vikrama = 1101 A.D. Fleet,D.K.D.p.492, doubted whether Ereyanga succeeded his father; Rice held that he did not reign; Hayavadana Rao,p.1519, says,"He probably pre-deceased his father." On the contrary he almost certainly held the throne for three to four years, having held the chief executive authority from at least three years before his father's death; E.C. VI Kadur 142(1096); M.A.R.1926,7(1096) & M.A.R.1925,43(1097). In ibid.1937,33(1097) Vinayāditya is praised because, amongst other things, he was the father of Ereyanga.
not long after the accession of Vikramāditya. The marriage itself appears to have been of no small political importance. She was the daughter of a certain Iruckkupāla, brother of a certain Pândya who had joined Vikramāditya at the critical moment of his conflict with his brother Sōmēśvara Bhuvanañkamalla, and was therefore probably on a social plane with Ereyanga himself, although the absence of records of his family shows that they were neither so wealthy nor so advanced as the Hoysalas; on the other hand their ancestry was more elevated, for Pândya's father was Tēja-rāya, who traced his line from the Cōla emperors in the Sūrya-vamśa. Her mother's father was Karkkala-mahārāya, who was "active in Tereyūr". This man was a very substantial landowner, of Cōla connections, but otherwise an independent power of importance in the east of the plateau. His descendants in the thirteenth century had more intimate dealings with the Hoysala. (1) This marriage clearly extended Hoysala relations with the eastern half of the Gaṅgavādi, and may thus have been a profitable alliance. (2)

(1) The form of the title that then occurs is Karkkata-mahārāya, for which indeed this form Karkkala may be either an alternative spelling or a misreading.

(2) E.C.V Arsikere 102a(1101): Mahādevi contributed largely to a tank, constructed under the instructions of one Kādvitti: the inscription tries to make out that she built it; but subsequent inscriptions show that it was Kādvitti who was remembered rather than the queen.
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CHAPTER THREE:

THE FIRST ATTEMPT AT ACHIEVING IMPERIAL STATUS,
AND ITS FAILURE.

The reigns of Ballāla I,
Visnuvardhana, and Nārasimha I.

After about seven years of rest and comparative peace, in which the Hoysala government recruited its resources and repaired the damage done by the Mālaya invasion, Ballāla and Visnuvardhana commenced preparations for a campaign which would turn the Hoysala kingdom from an ally and subsidiary of the Cālukya empire into an independent power, capable of withstanding the shock of hostile invasions, even perhaps those of the emperor himself, by providing itself with a number of satellites or buffer states to protect those of its frontiers that were geographically weak, and by extending its effective influence in a manner at once conciliatory and predatory into every inhabited quarter of the Mysorean plateau.

It must have been almost immediately after his accession, in 1102, that Ballāla I listened to encouraging rumours from the north-western districts. Vikramāditya's affairs were in an unsteady condition, and a conspiracy appears to have been on foot with a view to depriving him of his dominions in that quarter.

In 1100 the large districts of Belvola and Halasige (1) were administered by an unusually able civil servant of the Cālukya, Anantapālayya or Anantapāla-daṇḍāyaka, who generally enjoyed the assistance of his equally capable nephew Gōvinda.(2)

(1) The modern Halsi, 15°32'N.74°36'E. (2) W.E.I f.245b.
In the following year Gōvinda ruled the Belvola 300, the Huligere 300 and the Banavāse 12,000, that is to say, portions of the Gadag, Lakshmeshvar and Banavāse localities came under his jurisdiction. (1) While he was exercising authority in this wide area, disturbances or threats of rebellion brought the emperor himself to Banavāse, where he stayed for a short time. (2) By 1103, however, though Anantapāla retained a substantial part of his government, several changes had taken place in the political scene. Jayakēsi II had no sooner ascended the Kadamba throne of the Gōve (Goa) principality, than he assumed the title Koṅkana-cakravarti, or emperor of the Koṅkan, clearly declaring himself free from Cālukya supervision. (3) The mahā-maṇḍalēśvara Tailapa of the Kadamba family of Hāṅgal, then known as Hānuṅgal, though not in open rebellion, became articulate for the first time in this year, making no reference to the authority of the Cālukya viceroys in his area. (4) Ananta-

(1) W.E.I 252b and 247.
(2) W.E.I 246b. The emperor was ruling at Jayantīpura, the formal name of Banavāse: Rice, E.C.VIII p.iv para.3.
(3) Moraes, K.K.,App.III No.4, dated 1146, his 43th year; also ibid.p.190. Moraes ascribes this act of Jayakēsi to the attack of the Hoysala, mentioning a later Hoysala inscription as evidence, and speaking of Gaṅgarāja. These references are unacceptable, while the Hoysala menace to the Cālukya would not in itself have been sufficient to act as a stimulus to a ruler of Jayakēsi's calibre. They may well have been in communication, and may have acted in concert to some degree; Vijayēditya Kadamba may have been the obstacle to an earlier effort.
pāla had lost his control over Belvola by 1102, for an inscription at Gadag, the chief town of that district, and another at Lakshmmeshvar, the 'old Huligere, reveal that at least parts of the Palasige 12,000 had passed during the year into other hands. (1) One area alone remained stable - that part of the Banavāse 12,000 which was governed from Belagāvi. Inscriptions show that Anantapāla ruled there with the assistance of Gōvinda in 1102 and 1103, while the claim made by the former, in the later record, to rule Belvola and Huligere suggests that at length his authority was to some extent restored in those troublesome but much coveted areas. (2)

It was in this atmosphere of nebulous and rather misleading unrest that Ballāla I decided to test the ability of his army against the motley collection of officials, feudatories and land-holders that acknowledged the imperial dynasty.

As Anantapāla and Gōvinda, whatever their fortunes might be to the north and west of the Tuṅgabhadra, were still firmly entrenched in the Belagāvi area; and as the Āsandī Gaṅga family had, no doubt, reasons for complaint at encroachments by their northern neighbours; as, moreover, the family in question was of greater age and of longer civilization than his own, Ballāla seized the opportunity when the Cālukya officers were otherwise occupied, and commenced his campaign by attacking the Pāṇḍya ruler of Uccāngi.

(1) W.E.I ff. 260 (Jīvanayya); W.E.I f. 262 (Bhīmanayya - ? a misreading: Bhā and Ja were very similar, and va was a common variant for ma.).

(2) W.E.I ff. 266(1102) and 279(1103).
Of earlier relations between the Hoysala and the Pândya we have no knowledge, but it can hardly be doubted that the survivors of this proud but effete family felt little but scorn and discontent at the Hoysala’s rapid rise and progress, a feeling that their close proximity can hardly have helped to conceal. A success against this Pândya, while being an exploit of no great military prowess, provided the hill-fort of Uccaṇgi itself could be induced to capitulate, was nevertheless an object quite attractive to Hoysala ambition, for the very name would be a fine addition to the family prāśasti, in fact a trophy which could not be re-aquired or paraded too often.

Therefore, bearing northwards through the Āsandinaṇḍ and avoiding contact with the north-western districts, the Hoysala force made for Uccaṇgi. The Pândya, who does not appear to have been entirely unprepared, met them and was defeated.

madadin idirāda Pândyana
madamamā nija-khalgabalade kaccīyekalēdō-
vade rājya-lakṣmiyān konḍ
adatar kkēvalame Viṣṇu-Ballāla-nṛpar //

"Only the kings Viṣṇu and Ballāla are valorous, they who bit with the force of their own blades the pride of the Pândya who proudly opposed them, and without showing kindness took the wealth of his kingdom." (1)

(1) B.C.V Belur 56(1117) & Hassan 116(1123), the latter reading karcciye without alteration of sense. Because in these records this verse stands before the account of the defeat of Jagaddēva we need not suppose that the defeat of the Pândya was prior to those events.
Not only did the Pāṇḍya capitulate, but he agreed to join the movement against the Cālukya, forsaking the allegiance which he had previously owed to the emperor. (1)

The Hoysalas appear then to have crossed the Tuṅgabhadra, when, keeping in touch with the Kadambas of Gōve and Hānuṅgal, they made a rapid progress through the districts to the north and west of that river. (2) They seem to have been on their way homewards when they were attacked, not by Anantapāla, as might have been expected, for apparently he was otherwise engaged, but by an extraordinary expedition commissioned against the rebels, under the command of Ācūga II of the Sinda family of Brambarage, the modern Yelburga in the Nizām’s Dominions.

This ruler, who was probably not beyond middle-age, led the expedition in person, accompanied by his son Permāḍī-ḍēva. Both were, probably on account of the relative proximity of their home to Kalyāṇa, the Cālukya capital, remarkably devoted to the imperial cause, and appear to have boasted of their success against the emperor's rebellious subjects for at least seventy years after the campaign in question. (3)

---

(1) E.C.XI Davangere 139(1101) shows that in that year he acknowledged the overlordship of the Cālukya.
(2) It is perhaps possible to see a trace of this movement in a very curious and crude notice of an inscription at Belagāvi, which apparently makes no mention of Anantapāla or Govinda, but purports to be of a certain Permāḍī(ā)-ḍēva of a Gāṅga dynasty, presumably that ruling both sides of the Tuṅgabhadra, about 25 miles south-east of Belagāvi, which is exemplified by E.C.VII Shimoga 97(1113),23(1115),12(1120),4,11(1122),13 & 15(1122) 56(1125),99(1127) and 37(1140). Living in an out-of-the-way pocket, they were generally unmolested by the Hoysalas. See infra, p.145. This record, M.INS.85(p.173),P.S.O.C.I.169, coming from highly unreliable sources, can not be trusted as regards any of the proper names. Fleet himself could not see in the minute photograph the word "Raṭṭa" which Rice saw. However we can be sure that it records an attack upon some villages in the region of Belagāvi or between it and the Tuṅgabhadra in the Cālukya
The year 1103, then, saw the complete deflation of the rebels' enterprise, an achievement of which the Sinda was justly proud. An inscription at Naregal in the Rön tāluqa of the modern Dharwar district, the first of an interesting series of Sinda inscriptions, dated in November 1104, describes two phases in the successful campaign:

\[
\text{camdāmu \ pratibhāsi \ Hoyisalan \ ārd \ īrvattidām \ Gōveyām}
\]
\[
\text{kondām \ Laksmanan \ ājīyol \ tavisidām \ vikrāntadīmid \ aīde \ bem- /}
\]
\[
\text{kondām \ Pāṇḍyaṇan \ āvagam \ Malaparam \ tūld \ attidām \ Koṅkanām}
\]
\[
\text{gondām \ Vikrama-cakravartti-besasal \ samgrāma-kāntīravam} //
\]

"(Ācugi), shining like the sun, roaring, opposed the Hoysala; took Gōve; destroyed Laksmana in battle; by his prowess well pursued the Pāṇḍya; moreover scattered and chased the Malapar; and took Koṅkan - by the order of the emperor Vikrama: (Ācugi) the lion in battle." (1)

Vikrama era 27, the year Citrabhānu, the first of the dark half of Phālguna, equivalent to the beginning of January, 1103. The raiders were Bāgar, who may have been Hoysala troops, Hoysala allies, or local tribes profiting from the disturbances.

Page 87 n.(3) Inscriptions of the Erambarage Sindas are not common, but all are informative. Acarasa, who must be our Ācugi II, was ruling Kiskād 70 and other districts in 1122, according to W.E.I f.375b at Kodikoppa, also J.B.E.P.A.S.xi p.247. A powerful argument for the early dating of Ācugi II and in support of the date 1104 for W.E.I f.282b-4b(see n.1 below) is the fact that Ācugi drove back Bhoja who had invaded his country. This Bhoja, as Fleet rightly remarks on p.574 of his D.K.D., must have been Bhōja I of the Silāhāra family of Kolhāpur, who reigned before 1110, the year of the first record of his youngest brother Gaṅgarāditya (see Sewell, H.I.S.I.p.392), and thus Fleet reasonably conjectures, D.K.D.p.104(earlier edition), that Ācugi repulsed him in about 1098-9, or at least in the first years of the twelfth century.

(1) W.E.I f.282b-284b(1104), dated Śaka 1026 Tāraṇa, Kārttika 30, Brīhaspativāra, on the occasion of a solar eclipse. According to the list given on page 122 of Sewell & Dikshit's Indian Calendar no solar eclipse was visible in India during 1104, but this is no sufficient obstacle to accepting the date as valid. The
It thus appears that the Pândya, the Kadamba of Goa, various powers in the Konkan probably linked with Jayakēsi in his revolt, and lastly the Hoysalas and their associates the Malepar were all chastised. Laksmana was probably a Kadamba general, either the ex-governor of Banavāse, who functioned there between 1066 and 1068, or more probably the dādanāyakā attached to the household of Mailalā-dēvi, daughter of Vikramāditya and wife of Jayakēsi.(1)

From an inscription of 1163 we learn that Ācugi burnt not only Gōve but Uppinakaṭṭe as well. The latter has not as yet been identified, but may well have been within the Kadamba dominions.(2)

eclipse on November 16th 1164, corresponding sufficiently exactly to the date detailed above if Śaka 1026 were changed to 1086, makes it very tempting to assign this inscription to that period, but this is prevented by the consideration that in 1163 Gāvunda was the Sinda ruler (J.B.B.R.A.S.xi p.259-273 of 1163). He had indeed grown sons ruling districts under him, including an Ācugi and a Permādi. But the Permādi of this inscription is unquestionably that elder brother of Gāvunda of whom we have another date, 1144 (J.B.B.R.A.S.xi p.253); and who doubtless died before 1163. Fleet was content to accept 1104 as the date of this inscription of Permādi-dēva, D.K.D.p.96(earlier edition) but changed his mind and rejected it "because of the later date for the father, Ācugi II", ibid., 1896 edition, p.575 n.3. That an inscription should be set up in his name during his father's lifetime is not very strange: parallels are found constantly throughout Hoysala history.

Moraes does not seem to have known of the existence of this inscription. G.C.Roychaudhuri does not use it, and attributes the attack of the Sinda upon the Hoysala to the 1144 period (p.292-3). It is not surprising that he can not make this theory correspond with Hoysala inscriptions of the period 1143-52, for the first Sinda attack took place in 1103 and a second, of which we have less information, probably in the period about 1120.

The verse quoted above occurs again in J.B.B.R.A.S.xi pp.224-238, W.E.I 396a-7a(1130), where Fleet reads the date as Śaka 872, Saumya and so on: fortunately, as Fleet knew, the absurdity is corrected in Walter Elliot's copy which must have been taken many years before his, when the stone was presumably in better condition; the latter reads Śaka 1051, the

(1) & (2) over.
The second phase of the campaign was undertaken by the young Permâdi, who proceeded southwards and inflicted one defeat among others which is of great significance for Hoysala history.

talegondam Kulaśekharāṇkaṇa podarpipp Caṭṭanaṃ mutti bāl-dalegondam Jayakēsiyam bedare bēṃkondam pracaṇḍāvani- / talan ād agraṇīy appa Hoysalana rājya-srīyan il koḍdan a-skhalitam tēnene rūḍi vettan ileyol Permâdi-bhûpālakam //

"King Permâdi killed Kulaśekharāṇka; brilliantly beginning Caṭṭa, he took his living head; frighteningly he pursued Jayakēsi, and snatched the royal wealth of the Hoysala, who was outstanding, a fierce chief of the earth: (thus) he acquired fame in the world as being himself (only) the firm one." (1)

correct figure. A similar correction should be made to the Saka date of J.B.B.R.A.S. xi p.239-46(1130), where Fleet reads doubtfully Saka 872 Sādhāraṇa, etc. The version of this verse contained in J.B.B.R.A.S. xi p.224-238 reads Pāṇḍyaran,"the Pāṇḍyas."

Page 89 n.(1) Moraes, K.K., pp.120 and 193.


(1) W.E.I.ff. 282b-284b(1104); the same verse occurs in J.B.B.R.A.S. xi pp.239-246(1130) edited by Fleet, whose text is superior to Walter Elliot's: the latter reads muridu muttidale for mutti bāl-dale; akhalitam for askhalitam; pemde(which might stand for pemdeyam,'a badge') for rūḍi. All these variants can be accounted for as misreadings. W.E.'s text is however right in reading talan ād agraṇī for Fleet's taḷanādāgraṇi. Here as elsewhere Fleet's translation is not quite precise.
In an inscription of 1130 we find an elaboration of Permadî's exploit, which may in fact contain a reference to a second Sinda-Hoysala conflict in the early 1120's. However, as the distinction between the two incidents is difficult to make, and as Visnuvardhana is referred to on both occasions as Biṭṭiga, a name that fell out of use during the first decade of his reign, we shall be justified in quoting the entire passage as illustrative of, if not precisely appertaining to, the events of 1103. The Sindas themselves do not appear to have made any nice distinction: an understandable reticence on the part of the Hoysalas prevents us from being more successful in apportioning the adulation between the campaigns.

[ell] seyal Biṭṭigan idda kolligana ghaṭṭak eydi dāl iṭṭu Dhōrasamudrakk idir ēṭṭi Bēlupuramam kōṇḍ ante bembatti khaḍ-ga-sahāyaṁ taguluttav ā-Hadiya-ghaṭṭam muṭṭi tāḷṭ addi kōṇḍu sutējam mige Permma-bhūpati jagad-vikhyaṭiyam tāḍidām //

"Brilliantly reaching the mountain pass of the (?) robber that was Biṭṭiga, rushing forward he came up before Dhōrasamudra and took Bēlupura; thus pursuing and driving back, with the sword as his companion, reaching the (famous) Hādiya-ghaṭṭa, coming to grips he took the obstacle: the glorious king Perma obtained abundantly fame in the world."

And again: -

Biṭṭiga-nṛṣālan odan irivittige vād arasu-gegalam ranadol tāḷṭ atti pidiḍ āneyanitumān ottajiyaṁ tandan asama-sāhasa-tuṅgam //

"Gripping in battle the king-friends who had disapp-
eared into a mountain difficult of access together with king
Bittiga, pursuing, and capturing all the elephants he, the
unequalled master in daring, brought them away in abundance."

The same proviso applies to a consideration of the
facts related by an inscription of 1179:

ghana-baah-baladinnde Hoysalana matt-ebhamgalan vastu-vaa-
hanamam kond atidhiranam Torahanam bemkomdu tuld eydi ma-
taxi neram bade kaatii tamdu chaladhi(read di)m Calkukyagrey-
amge kott-
an anu-prabala-pratapa-vibhavam Permmadi-bhupalakam

"By the strength of his robust arm winning the Hoy-
sala's furious elephants and treasure-waggons, driving into
flight the very bold Toraha, pursuing, approaching, coming into
touch, binding (him) without none coming to aid, king Permadi,
splendid in the prowess of perfect strength, boldly carried him
off and gave him to the Calkukya king." (2)

(1) J.B.B.R.A.S. xi pp.239-246(1130) Fleet's translation is
not accurate: e.g."Pursuing and seizing in war the friends,
(mighty) as elephants(though they were), of the kings who join-
ed king Bittiga in the work of slaughter, (Permadi) unequalled
in his great impetuosity, brought them(back as captives) with
derisive cheers." He reads Vahadiya-gatta; but Hadiya-gatta
is known from E.C.IV Nagamangala 23(cl125), etc. On p.245,n.8 of
J.B.B.R.A.S. xi Fleet mentions that he reads anitum anattaji
(in the text he reads anitum anattaji) and says that he was
not able to obtain an explanation for it as a separate word.
The correct reading is established by a comparison with E.C.V
Belur 119(cl180): ottaji may well exist as an alternative form,
unknown to Kittel, of ottaj, although je and ji are almost
indistinguishable in the script.

(2) E.I. XIX 38(1179) v.15. This Toraha (properly Toraha) appears
from the title given in the same inscription (v.63) to the
mahajanas of the agrahara of Rôn - Torapa-kulamtakar, "slayers
of the Torapa race", to have been a ruler in the north of Shi-
moga district or south of Dharwar district. The name occurs
again in E.C.VII Shimoga 37(1140) as of a ruler of minor im-
portance in that area; in E.C.VIII Sagar 108b(1042) we read that
a warrior "without fear plucked up the Beddar by the root, and
It is thus abundantly clear that the Sinda succeeded not only in punishing various rebellious chiefs in the west and south-west divisions of the Cālukya empire, but also followed the Hoysalas to their capital, taking meanwhile the booty they had collected on their abortive northern expedition, and cut off Dōrasamudra. If he failed to take it it was surely not due to its strength, for the king apparently fled first to Belūr, as the stronger town, then into the mountains to the westwards, as indeed he might well have been expected to do. We see him accompanied thither by several chiefs of hill-tribe origin, who formed the back-bone of the Hoysala army, and we see him retiring to ground over which his elephants could not follow. The Sinda no doubt looted Dōrasamudra and Belūr at leisure, took the elephants away with him, and, being satisfied that he could not profit by a longer stay, returned northwards.

We see that it was Bittiga, or Viśnuvardhana, who bore the brunt of this attack. His brother had moved away to the south, not merely to escape Permādi but also to face a threat from the Caṅgālva.

Indeed there are strong indications that Permādi actually communicated with the Caṅgālva, concerting an attack upon the Hoysalas from north and south simultaneously.

We see Ballāla on his way to deal with this menace: when he was at Guddatteranya, just a mile or so north of the Hēnvātī river, he made, in order, no doubt, to secure a favourable event to his enterprise, a gift of land to the god of the temple there. (1)

(1) Gained the name that he alone was Torahara-māri, smiter of the Torahar. He was thus a ruler of a type not dissimilar to the
The next thing we hear is that the Cāṅgāḷaḷa engaged with the Hoysala at a place called Hosāvīḍu, which has as yet defied attempts at identification; the result of the battle is not known, but the absence of any Cāṅgāḷaḷa inscriptions from that time until twenty-six years later, followed by a further gap of thirty-four years, suggests that Ballāḷa's efforts at Hosāvīḍu and afterwards were not entirely unsuccessful. (1)

The interesting point is that the record that mentions the battle explains the circumstances as follows:-

"When Permmāḍi-ḍēva gained a victory over the great Hoysala army, at his command a (certain) warrior fell upon them at Hosāvīḍu and went to heaven." (2)

It seems therefore highly likely that the battle was timed to coincide with the attack upon Dōrasamudra and Belūr, and the "great army" must have been that left under Viṣṇuvardhana's command to attempt the repulse of the Sinda. Viṣṇu, being the more experienced of the two brothers, naturally occupied the post of greater danger. (3)

Hoysala himself. Ṭoraha is probably a corruption of ṭoṛe-pa, a lord or owner of a river or stream, and is thus comparable with the title Malepa or Malapa.

Page 93 n.(1) E.C.V Hassan 162(1103) relates that when Tribhuvanamalla Ballāḷa-Hoysala-ḍēva was leading an expedition against Cāṅgāḷaḷa-ḍēva, he made a grant of Sindūr to provide for the Monday ceremonies and perpetual lamp of the god Sōṃśēvāra.

(1) E.C.IV Yedatore 30(?1103-4, dated by Rice ?c1110); E.C.IV Hunsur 86(1130); M.A.R.1912-3 para.67(1164).
(2) E.C.IV Yedatore 30(?1103-4) at Chik Hanasōge, on the Kāvēri Ā-Permmāḍi-ḍēvam jaya-/āriyam tāld ure Hoysāḷōgra-balamam nin-nindod āṣeṣpaḥiṇād / ātām Ār-ti-Hosāvīḍinoḥ subhātam kond eyidam svarggamam // The fact that it does not state that a Cāṅgāḷaḷa was the ruler and therefore the master of the warrior is not an obstacle to the present interpretation. Yedatore 26(?1100) at Chik Hanasōge, M.A.R.1912-3 para.67(1164) at the same place, and E.C.V Arkalgud 65(1090) at Lakkūra, 3 miles to the S.W., all bear the names of Cāṅgāḷaḷa rulers. (3) over.
The defeat at the hands of the Sinda, following so soon after the invasion of Jagaddēva Paramāra, together with the humiliating outcome of their little northern venture, must have left the Hoysalas' spirits as well as their fortunes in a very low condition. The extreme scarcity of inscriptions during Ballāla's reign shows plainly the reduced tempo of public life, the practice of economy and the reserve of effort.

Nothing but contempt for their failure remained in the Tuṅgabhadra districts as a memorial of the brothers' journey. Even their single trophy and their duped but unenthusiastic ally, the Pāṇḍya, resumed his allegiance to the emperor with alacrity, promising to show towards his southern neighbours the worst side of the zeal of a convert. (1)

Meanwhile the brothers attempted to recreate their national strength, this time without any scruples as to its eventual object. All trace of subservience to the emperor must, if possible, be obliterated, but, to effect that, the elimination of all hostile or untrustworthy material on the fringes of their kingdom was to be secured, where conciliation or colonization failed, by force.

Ballāla's reign came to an end shortly after 1108, when his last inscription was set up. We are not able to say whether he died then, or whether Viṣṇuvardhana superseded him and forced him into retirement. It is interesting to note that

---

Page 94 n.(3) The relationship between the Caṅgālva family and the northern powers required further investigation. An inscription of 1100 at Chik Hanasoge itself, E.C.IV Yedatore 26, states that Rājendra-Cōla-Nanni-Caṅgālva, "of the Yādavas who were Caṅgālvas", rebuilt a basadi at that place. An inscription of the year 1101(Visu) at Chikkerūr, Kod tāluq, W.E.I f.257-8 tells of a Mahāmāndaleśvara Dvārāvatīpuravārādhīśvara by name

(1) E.C.XI Davangere 139(1106) and 128(1107).
it is said of him in an inscription of 1102 that Ballāla was obeyed by his younger brother as Rāma was obeyed by Lakṣmaṇa. (1) There does however seem to have been some sort of difference between the brothers: it may have been that the elder was in poor health, or that his comparative lack of experience of foreign affairs may have led to his favouring a more modest, a more temporising policy. Or it may have been that the destruction wrought upon Hoysala economy by the two invasions was not repaired before the time when Viṣṇuvardhana took control of the dynasty's fortunes. Certain it is, however, that Ballāla pursued a policy of peace and reconstruction, without apparently indulging himself, or encouraging his followers to indulge, in heavy capital expenditure. Indeed, apparently as a sign of a desire to encourage the Cālukya to ignore his domestic preparations, Ballāla is seen more than once to have acknowledged Cālukya supremacy. (2) This feature is conspicuous for its rarity in the vastly more numerous inscriptions of Viṣṇuvardhana.

Of his operations against the Cāṅgālva, we have already had occasion to notice that Ballāla enjoyed a consider-

---

Tribhuvanamalla-Nanni-Cāṅgālva (misread Bhamgalpa) ruling at that place.

(1) M.A.R. 1934,6(1102): Viṣṇu ....<anuvjaṃ tanag Æ-Rāmaŋ anuvjaṃ besa kayva terade besakeyye yaśō [1a]kāmiyan anubhavisutt irdan atibalan Ballāla etc.

(2) M.A.R. 1934,6(1102) and E.C.V.Chamarayapatna 169(1106): both mention that Tribhuvanamalla (Cālukya) was ruling.
able degree of success. He did not, however, absorb the Cāṅgālva territory into his dominions, nor draw revenue from them. Neither does he appear to have exercised notable control over Cāṅgālva affairs, for in 1105 the Cāṅgālva ruler attacked his neighbour and old associate, the Kōṅgālva.(1) It was not long, however, before a deep depression settled over both families alike.

Apart from his relations with the Cāṅgāḷvas Ballāḷa took part in no expansionist attempts during the period from 1103 until the end of his reign. It is said of him, in an inscription of about 1125, that he inspired fear in surrounding rulers:-

Cērama vairamam bisudu Pāṇḍya kadāṅgadir Andra(sic) randramam pāradir Od ā godāman adān bidu Mālava kālegake mai-dōrada sār ēle Tīguḷa nim jagul embud apāra-vīra-dōr-
vvām-gabhīra-dhīrate viniśruta-ghōsane Ballu-bhūpanam //

"The profound valour of the massive arms of his unbounded heroism declares the resounding proclamation of king Ballu: Cēra, abandon your enmity! Pāṇḍya, do not be eager! Andhra, seek not an opportunity (or 'weak spot')! Oḍḍā, abandon that nonsense! Ho! Mālava, approach without exposing yourself to war! Retreat thou, Tīguḷa! "(2)

(1) M.A.R. 1912-3 para.62(1105) and para.66 which is probably of the same year or period.

(2) E.C.IV Nagamangala 28(c1125).
But this amusing verse with its pretty assonances does not prove that Ballāla actually inspired a high degree of respect in anyone of the mighty powers enumerated. On the contrary, the enthusiasm shown by Hoysala panegyrists for the successes of Visnuvardhana would hardly be rational had Ballāla made any marked contribution to the solution of the problems of independence and imperial status.

Before we pass to observe how Visnuvardhana dealt with the difficulties which faced the Hoysala at the time, a little can be added to the picture of Ballāla himself.

It is very significant of the broadening of the Hoysala horizon that during this period the dynasty began to abandon its ancestral faith for one that was less austere, more catholic, and generally more accommodating, especially when considered as the religion of a house that aimed at territorial sovereignty, and therefore religious patronage, over an area where the predominant cultures were maintained by non-Jaina bodies. There was something very old-fashioned and narrow about twelfth century Jainism; a man of the world would not have his spiritual desires concentrated upon the polemical austerity of the syādvāda; and a nation that had had a vision of the enjoyment of a higher standard of living for a longer period was not attracted so much by attendance upon a person, whose personal merit depended more upon not having washed, or moved from a peculiar squatting position, for a quarter of a century than the descent of his teaching by way of a constantly varying but never unimposing list of predecessors back to the
blessed Vardhamāna-svāmī himself. Not that austerity, asceticism
or self-sacrifice in an acute form was banished from the religious
scene; merely a greater degree of urbanity and elasticity
of temper was required of a religious teacher. And so Śaivism,
ever an accommodating faith, claimed many converts from among
Jaina families; and since Jainism had never insisted on the
abandoning of caste, and had always availed itself of Hindu
imagery and language, the change was easy and smooth, and a
conversion on the part even of a king seemed hardly a revolution
of importance, except, of course, to the unfortunate gurus of
the sect then abandoned.

We have already seen that Ballāla I was known as a
crest-jewel among Śaivas. (1) We see him in 1101 on his way to
visit Sosavūr, the ancestral home, redolent with Jaina associa-
tions, and making a grant to a Śaiva shrine. (2) His brother
Viṣṇuvardhana, on the other hand, though almost certainly
brought up in a Jaina atmosphere, and married in early life
to a Jaina girl, learned eventually to Vaiṣṇavism, and though
not noticeably unhelpful to needy members and bodies of the
Jaina and Śaiva faiths, spent huge sums on the construction of
Vaiṣṇava temples, now some of the finest surviving monuments
of the dynasty's wealth and culture. (3)

Of Ballāla's family life we know very little. Later
inscriptions mention constantly Ballāla, Viṣṇuvardhana and
Udayāditya as the sons of Ėreyaṅga by Ėcala-dēvi: of them
Viṣṇuvardhana is frequently said to be the best. We never hear

(1) M.A.R.1923,1(1194) mahēśvara-sikhāmaniaṁ.
(2) E.C.VBelur 199(1101) at Dabbe: Kobe-gavun ḍa mādisida Śiva-
stānāmaṁ kaṇḍu Kobēva-ra-deva-kāryaṁ mādi etc.
(3) The perplexing question of Rāmānuja is here ignored.
that there was any doubt as to the possibility of Viṣṇuvar-
dhana's succeeding Ballāla, and we may safely suppose that
Ballāla was without a son. Perhaps it was in an attempt to
obtain one that late in life he married three daughters of a
family henchman. The circumstances of the marriage as related
in later inscriptions are in themselves quite interesting.
In the year 1103, "while in the enjoyment of pleasant commu-
nications, he was in the capital Beluḥuru, ruling the kingdom:
to Cāmave-daṇḍanāyakītī, like a second Lakṣmī, wife of Mari-
yāṇe-daṇḍanāyaka, were born Padumala-dēvi, Cāmala-dēvi and
Boppa-dēvi. These three having grown up skilled in science,
singing and dancing, worthy to grace the capitals of three
separate kings, Ballāla-dēva wedded these three girls in one
pavilion in the Saka year 1025, etc., and as payment of the
debt for their wet-nursing, again conferred on Mariyāṇe-daṇḍ-
anāyaka (in the second generation) Sindagere, with the lordship
thereof." (1)

(1) E.C.IV Nagamangala 32(1184) and VI Chikmagalur 160(?1184)\[^{11}\],
there being only negligible differences in the text: antum
sukha-sāṅkathā-vinādādmā śrīmad-rājadhāni Beluḥuru-bīqinolū
rājyam geyyuttam irdu; Mariyāṇe-daṇḍanāyakana dvitiya-Lakṣmi-
samāneyar appa Cāmave-daṇḍanāyakītītī putṭīda Padumala-dēvi
Cāmala-dēvi Boppa-dēviyar int i-mūvarum śāstra-gīta-nṛtyadalu
pravudeyarum mūru-rāya-kaṭaka-pātra-jasa-daḷeyar enesi baleyal
ā mūvaru kanyakeyar ondē haseyolu Ballāla-dēvam vivāham mādi
Śaka-varṣam 1025 neya Subhānu-saṃvatsarada Kārttikeya-suddha-da-
śami-Bṛhavārad andu molevāla-riṇakke Mariyāṇe-daṇḍanāyakaṅge
Sindagereya erāḍaneya-paryāyadalu prabhitva-sahitam neley āgi
punar dāhāra-pūrvvakam koṭṭu salisuttam ik ire....
If Ballāla had a son by any of these girls the child did not live long, for, as we have seen, within about five years of this marriage his younger brother succeeded him. No descendant of Ballāla I is ever heard of.

It has been suggested by R.Narasimhacar that this was the Ballāla whose life was saved at one time by a certain Jaina guru named Čārukīrtti. An inscription at Śravaṇa Belgola says of Čārukīrtti that even the air that had but touched his body cured disease; "was it much, then, that his medicine cured king Ballāla of his sickness?" (1) The theory may be disputed chiefly because no mention of this fact, well worthy as it is of notice, occurs in the inscriptions at Śravaṇa Belgola which eulogise the earlier, Jaina, members of the dynasty. Moreover, an inscription of 1393 says that Čārukīrtti's disciple was called Pandita, and it appears that this same Pandita died at Śravaṇa Belgola in that year. (2) Hence the Ballāla in question must have been either Ballāla III., who would certainly have had no objection to enlisting Jaina medicaments in the service of his feeble person, or possibly even Ballāla IV.

The deepest obscurity veils the several activities of Visnuvardhana during the early years of his reign. It is unknown even in what year he assumed the sovereignty. His brother's last inscription is dated 1108, therefore we may assume that his reign commenced in that or the following year. (3) His own earliest inscription, referred to below, belongs to

(1) E.C.II 258(1432): yeṣāṁ sarīrāsvayato'pi vāto rujah pra-
sāntim vitatāna tēṣām / Ballāla-rājottita-rōga-sāntir āsīt
kilaitat kimu bhēṣajēna // See also ibid. p.63. Narasimhacar
states that Čārukīrtti is called Ballāla- jīva-rakṣāpālaka, the
the year 1109.

His reign thus lasted approximately thirty-two years, a reign that saw few years of military inactivity, and fewer in which some scheme for the enlargement of the Hoysala dominions was not actually in the process of being promoted.

The reign can be divided broadly into two parts, the first lasting from 1108 to 1130, and the second from then until the king's death. The first and longer period was that of the finest phase of Hoysala expansion, of the most splendid achievements of the fresh vigour of the young dynasty, eager, enthusiastic, and impulsive: after it had over-reaching itself, the later period saw a more intense, more concentrated and less care-free warfare on the part of a people whose ruler had to struggle fiercely to retain even a portion of what he had attempted to digest. His son Nārasimha lived to see a brief but instructive period of disillusionment and frustration, followed by a dramatic revival somewhat in the spirit of his great father.

In the early part of his reign Viṣṇuvardhana's movements were so rapid, his first campaigns so far-flung, that those who were employed in them as well as their victims had difficulty in apprehending the magnitude of the scale upon which they were conceived, or in recovering from their sudden violence; hardly any contemporary records remain to indicate

preserver of the life of Ballāla, and refers to the Bhujabali-sataka of Doddaiya who apparently lived in the 16th century. Page 101 n. (2) E.C. II 254(1398)
Page 101 n. (3) M.A.R. 1925,52(1108). Sewell, following Rice, makes 1106 Viṣṇuvardhana's first year. The discovery of this inscription makes a correction necessary. There is a slight error in the date: Sarvadhāri corresponding to §.1032(in words): correct to 1030 expired or 1031 current: A.D.1108.
either their actual scope or their precise temporal sequence, and, with a few trifling exceptions, only inscriptions of a later, and no more modest, period inform us of Viṣṇuvardhana's earlier undertakings.

Certain it is, however, that after about six years of preparation and recuperation after the blow dealt them in 1104, Viṣṇuvardhana abandoned Ballāla's policy of restraint, and commenced delivering a series of sudden but well-co-ordinated blows in every direction in turn. He did not make the mistake of provoking the detested Cālukya as the first object of his just resentment. He repeated the plan employed successfully by his great-grandfather and whetted his steel first upon less formidable foes.

His attention was turned first in an easterly direction, where he proceeded to attain two objects at once. He penetrated due eastwards as far as the limits of the plateau, reaching Naṅgali.(1) He must have sought to establish closer contacts with his relations, by his father's marriage, among the Cōla feudatories and remnants of the royal houses of the Gāṅgas and Nolambas in that region. For a short while he exercised sovereignty over a very restricted area in the east of the plateau, and an incident during his operations in that quarter is recorded in a contemporary inscription.(2) A danda-śānyaka of his, named Viṭṭiyānan, attacked Mūgapaṭṭi in Iru-

(1) It will be convenient to follow this and other movements on Map 'A'.
(2) E.C.IX Bangalore 85c(clllO) at Bēgūr states that during the reign of Poysaḷa-dēva a work of merit was carried out there in Mūrasu-nāḍ in Rājendra-Cōla-vala-nāḍ of Mudigonda-Cōla-maṇḍalam.
madi-nāḍ, and was defeated at the hands of a person who may have been a Bāṇa or a Gaṅga dependant upon a Nolamba, who bore a title that may be translated "binder of the Cōla king", if in fact it does not mean "servant of the Cōla king". (1) Whilst these and similar operations were proceeding in the east, at the same time Viṣṇuvardhana was in a position to make a circuit, bearing southwards and westwards, of the northern limits of the Cōla province of Talakāḍ, and, apart from military successes there of which we have no knowledge, he may well have entertained personal negotiations with land-holders and rulers in the northern and eastern parts of that area.

Having returned from the east, his reconnaissance completed, he crossed the Kāverī and entered the Koṅgu region. Whether he summoned the Caṅgalva and Koṅgalva princes to tender their submission is not known. He passed, however, through the Koṅgu country, which was ruled partly by Cōla feudatories and partly by autonomous and half-civilized tribal chiefs, until he had taken his nominal boundary in that region as far south as the Cēra frontier and Anamale, the elephant hills, in other words to the north-eastern fringe of the modern Malayālam-speaking country. (2)

Having thus disposed of possible interference from East and South, he commenced the attack upon the Cēlukya by

once again aiming at the emperor's weakest feudatory. The capture of the Pándyan capital, Uccaṅgi, one of the chief cities of the Nolambavāḍi 32,000, entitled the Hoysala to assume the titles Uccaṅgi-goṇḍa, "taker of Uccaṅgi", and at the same time Nolambavāḍi-goṇḍa, "taker of Nolamba- or Nolamba-vāḍi." From this convenient point of vantage he appears to have moved westwards out of the Pândya-nāḍ across the Tūṅgabhadra into territory of the Kadamba ruler of Hāṅgal. 

There no doubt he found a better organized and more compact society than that which he had left in Nolambavāḍi, one which could defend the wealth which he had come to take. But it seems that he found himself occupied in that region for several months, during which he almost certainly sent a raiding party northwards of Bankāpura into the Halasige 12,000. He may well have returned to Dōrasamudra by way of Hallavūr, Homāli and Kūḍali, along the western fringe of the Gaṅgavāḍi province. Before turning to the events that occurred during his journey homewards, it is convenient to attempt to decide in which years the second capture of Uccaṅgi and the Hāṅgal and Halasige expeditions took place. Only one dated Hoysala record guides us: it relates that in 1111 Viṣṇuvardhana was ruling the Gaṅga-maṇḍala in peace. 

(1) Moraes, K.K., makes no mention of this campaign.
(2) EC. IV Krishnarejapet 49 (1111), corrected by M. A. R. 1914-5, para. 78: samadhigata-paṁca-mahāsabda-mahā-maṇḍalēśvāra Dvārāvatī puravarādhīśvāra Yādava-kulāmbara-dvīmaṇī samyaktva-cuḍāmaṇī malaparōli gaṅḍa Hoysala-dēva Gaṅga-maṇḍalamam āḷuttu sukhadind ire Saka-varṣa 1034 Kara (for Khara)-saṁvacchardā Sōmavāra, etc. There is mention of Biṭti-dēva, i.e. Viṣṇuvardhana. The earlier transliteration actually read Saka 1017, Yuva: a considerable discrepancy!
dynasties provide slightly clearer clues. It will be seen from a schedule of their records during the period that the probable year for the invasion of Nołambavădi was 1111, 1112, or early in 1113, while that of Hāngal or any part of the Banavăse 12,000 must have taken place either in 1113 or 1114. Other considerations make the former year more likely, while no evidence is available as to the precise year of the invasion of the Halasige 12,000. (1)

(1) Pândya inscriptions (with the exception of W.E.I f.331, E.C.VII Shikarpur 99(1112) of Kāma-Pândya, as he does not appear to have been connected closely with the Uccāngi house.):

E.C.XI Davangere 128(1107) Tribhuvanamalla Pândya ruling the Ballakunde 300 etc. " " " " 135(1109) the same ruling a peaceful Nołambavădi 32,000.
" " Jagalur 9(Jan.1111) the same ruling the Nołambavădi.
" " Davangere 149(Nar.1113) the same " " " " " " " " 166(1117) " " " " " " " "

Kadamba inscriptions:

W.E.I f.302b(1107) Tailapa Kadamba ruling Banavăse 12,000 & Hāngal 500
" " " " 308 (1108) the same ruler ruling the same area.
" " " " 314 (1109) " " " " " " " "
" " " " 315 (1110) " " " " " " " "
" " " " 318 (1112 Dec.) " " " " " " " "
" " " " 336 (1113 Oct.) " " " " Hāngal 500 only.
" " " " 340 (1115 Apr.) " " " " Banavăse & Hāngal.
" " " " 346 (1117) " " " " " " " "

Gālukyā inscriptions

W.E.I f.297b(1107) Anantapala-dānṇāyaka ruling Banavăse 12,000 and Halasige 12,000.
" " " " 310 (1108) " " " " " the same area.
E.C.XIDavangere 12(1109) " " " " " " " "
W.E.I f.317b(1112) Emperor himself at Banavăse.
" " " " 328b(1112) Śrīpati-dānṇāyaka ruling Balvolā and Huligērē.
" " " " 331 (1112) Kāma-Pândya ruling at Siaugali.
" " " " 334 (1112) Gōvindarasa ruling. Fighting in which a man of Bandālike was engaged.
" " " " 334b(1112) Udayāditya Gaṅga-Permādi ruling Banavăse & Sāntalige 1,000.

(cont.over)
It seems, then, very likely that Viṣṇuvardhana was on his way homewards during the year 1113. His achievement had been more spectacular than profound. Although an inscription of the spring of 1113 already says of him that he had taken Talakādi, Koṅgu, Naṅgali, Banavāse, Belvala (Belvola), Halasige, Hānuṅgal, Noṇambavādi and Ucčaṅgi, and was then ruling in the capital Dōrasamudra, Viṣṇuvardhana himself doubtless regarded the expedition as an extended raid and exploratory series of skirmishes. (1) He left no inscription behind him, or if he did they were sedulously removed or obliterated. The effect of his invasion, if we may judge from the incidence of inscriptions, was felt rather longer in Noṇambavādi than in Banavāse or Hānuṅgal: it cannot however be contested that any lasting benefit was gained by the Hoysala from either quarter. The Kadamba Tailapa continued to reign, though his control over Huligere was given to a Cāluṅga general in 1112, and in the same year the emperor moved to Jayantipura (Banavāse) for a short period to direct operations against the invader and his sympathisers.

(2) In that year Anantapāla and his nephew Gövinda retained

W.E.I f.339 (Jan.1115) Gövindarasa ruling the Banavāse 12,000.
" " " 345 (Jan.1117) Emperor recognized at Lakṣunḍi.
" " " 349 (1117) Nāgavarmayya ruling Belvola 300, Huligere 300, and Banavāse 12,000.

(1) E.C.V Hassan 149(1113) dated Vijaya, Caitra su 10: it can be dated 1113 with confidence, as in 1173, the only alternative the king can hardly have been referred to as Vīra-Gaṅga-Viṣṇu-bhūpālaka, and, moreover, the subject of the inscription is the grant of land to the architect who built and adorned the temple of Mahālakṣmi at Doddā-Gaddavalli, where E.C.V Hassan 135 of ?1114 and 134 of c1116 mention gifts to the same temple.

(2) Compare W.E.I f.302b with ibid.f.328b.
Belagavi, the latter holding Bāraṅgi, ten miles north of Belagavi, apparently with some difficulty (1); in 1114 he ruled in Sātēhalī in the modern Kōḍ tāluqa, (2) and in 1115 Tailapa Kadamba was well ensconced in the Háŋgal region. (3) The unsettled condition of the districts is shown by the appearance in 1115 of a new figure, obviously that of a Cālukya general, who took over parts of the Belvola 300 together with Huligere 300 and a part of the Banavāse 12,000. (4) Yet by 1118 the Cālukya's control over the north-western parts of the Hoysala's outer world was sufficient to enable him to organise a counter-attack.

Even by the Hoysala's subjects themselves no impression of grandiose expansion was gained. Two inscriptions of 1113 say merely that Viṣṇuvardhana was ruling the Gaṅgavāḍi 96,000, but the fact that neither states, as was customary, where he was ruling, suggests that he was still engaged in movement of some kind, and official pronouncements on the subject may not have had time to be circulated. (5)

It is not, indeed, possible to be certain that the fortresses, as distinct from the towns, of Uccāṅgi and Háŋgal

(1) W.E.I f.334(1112).
(2) W.E.I f.339(1114).
(3) W.E.I f.340,341(1115).
(4) W.E.I f.344b(1115)
(5) M.A.R.1914-5 para.78 and E.C.VI Kadur 19. In the latter he is called merely Pōysala-ṛeva. As it is dated only with the year Vijaya, Asāṅha suddha 14 Sāmavāra, there is some excuse for dating it 1053. The beginning of July 1113 does seem, however, to suit the circumstances much better than 1053, as that year was several years too early for the claim to rule Gaṅgavāḍi, little as that signified. Moreover the title Vikrama-Gaṅga is mentioned, which was not in use in 1053. Rustic records sometimes refer to the ruler as Pōysala even in later times.
were taken at this time. The extraordinary exclamations that arose when his grandson Ballāla II took the fort of Uccāṅgī suggest not only that it had not been taken so well before, but indeed that it had never before been taken by assault. In this case Visṇuvardhana may have starved the garrison into surrender, reduced it by negotiation or bribery, or even cut it off from the nāḍ as a whole until the campaign closed. Likewise even Hāṅgal city may not have been taken, for captures within the 500 district which bore its name would have sufficed to give Visṇu the title "taker of Hāṅgal".

Yet it is at this period that we first find the title Vīra-Gaṅga in use, a title of significance when we wish to estimate the growth of Visṇu's influence in his home-land and in the neighbouring tracts. (1) Like the title Vikrama-Gaṅga which he already bore, it is ambiguous, but its most probable meaning was that he was a hero among the Gaṅgas, that is, a champion over, as well as of, the Gaṅgavāḍi in which he had his dominions proper.

Returning to the close of Visṇuvardhana's 1112-3 campaign, we find that the presence of his army in the Banavāśe and neighbouring districts had encouraged the Ālupas of the modern South Kannara, who had apparently maintained some connection with their old home, to invade the Sāntalige 1,000, then partly in Hoysala hands. An inscription of March 1114 tells how, while Tribhuwanamalla Visṇuvardhana Hoysala-dēva was ruling the

---

(1) For example E.C.V Channarayapatna 212, which Rice dated c1220, but can now be assigned to 1113 or 1114. It refers to the mahā-maṅḍalāsvara --- brīmāt Tribhuwanamalla <Gaṅga>vāḍi-Nol-ambavāḍi-Uccāṅgī-Hāṅngalulu-gonda Vīra-Gaṅga-Viṣṇuvardhana-Hoysala-dēvaru.
Gangavadi 96,000, a certain Setti-gavunda had fought a battle with daggers with the people of Aluva-khēda who had taken prisoners in the 1,000, and had been victorious; as a result he had apparently been awarded the then highly esteemed of Gavunda of Kariviḍī-Hirūr, about seventy miles south of the scene of the conflict. He could not have been there long when the Halikāra Nāyakas of Sīre-nāḍ came and harried the cows "after their custom", and the unfortunate hero died defending the herds. (1) Thus, as if to provide examples of the risk which a ruler then ran if he led a military expedition beyond the borders of his own kingdom, an invasion from the northern edge of the Hoysala nāḍ followed swiftly upon the invasion from the north-west. Doubtless it was the absence of the royal troops that encouraged a certain Baḍi-arasa likewise to raid the cattle of Meleyūr in the modern Krishnarajapet Tāluqa during 1114-5. (2) We can not determine whether Baḍi-arasa was a Koṅgālva chief, whose territory would be nowhere more than ten miles from the place he raided, or whether he originated from the half-civilized country between the Nilagiri and Koṅgu nāḍ. On the other hand he may have been an official of a Cōḷa deputy, for in that year Jaya (1114-5) an inscription dated in the 45th year of Kulōṭtuṅga Cōḷa was set up at Kannambāḍi, about eight miles up the Kāvēri from Śrīraṅgapattānām and not twenty miles from the Koṅgu nāḍ itself. (3)

(1) E.C.XII Tiptur 81(1114) at Karadi.
(2) M.A.R.1927,108(1114-5) dated merely in the year Jaya.
(3) E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 34(1114-5).
Each of these raids was avenged in its turn: the Sīre-nāḍ nāyakas having to wait the longest for retribution to be paid to them.

Viṣṇuvardhana found it convenient to vent his anger first upon the Ālupas; and their discomfiture, which could only have been the result of a single and rapid campaign, is often called to mind in later inscriptions. On his way southwards he was obliged to deal with a small-scale civil war which had broken out, in his absence, in the extreme west of his kingdom. It appears from the damaged stone that a certain Hemmādi, who is otherwise unidentified, but was probably of Gaṅga origin or connections, had rebelled against the Hoysala and had been attacked by a local mandalika named Karna and a dannayaka called Bēgipayya. This provoked a further revolt which only the king's presence seems to have been able to reduce. It is of incidental interest that his wife Sāntala-dēvi was present with the king, and she may well have accompanied her husband from Dōrasamudra through Uccāngi and Hāṅgal. (1)

The punishment of the raiders of the Kōngu area we may presume to have taken effect in the years 1115 and 1116. A later inscription mentions how Viṣṇu put to flight the chiefs who had ruined Pāgadakōte and Kōngu, while it seems that a campaign against the Maleyāḷas followed automatically. (2)

(1) E.C.VI Mudgere 32(1115) at Pātadūr.
(2) E.C.IV Nagamangala 47(1199):
Pāgadakōte-Kōng-alida dāndada mandalikar ppodarppu getṭ
āgaleyy ṝḍī kāṅgade kandada manneyar aṭṭje tīrṇa-viṅ
āgade vairi-māndalam av ill ene Viṣṇu-narēndram āldam ī-
sāgara-vēṣṭitācalayen ātanoḷ ār dāore bhutālādhipar //
"King Viṣṇu ruled this ocean-clad earth, being one who was unsurpassed(?) in devouring the territory of enemies, while
In this campaign operations against the Caṅgāḷva and Koṅgāḷva would hardly have been avoided, as there can be no doubt that these rulers hesitated seldom to attack the Hoysala when he was in difficulties, and the smallest trouble in dealing with the Maleyāḷas would have provided an excellent opportunity. In 1117 an inscription was set up at Cāmarājanagar describing the exploits of Puṇīsa, a Hoysala daṇḍāyaka, mahā-pradhāna and sandhi-vighati, in other words a high ranking minister. His activities, which must have occurred between 1115 and 1117 are described as follows:

"He frightened the Toda (the pre-Dravidian inhabitants of the Nilagiri), drove the Koṅgas underground, terrified the haughtiness of the arm of King Kāla, and entering the Nīla mountain offered its peak to the Lakṣāmi of Victory, he the great minister of Bitti-dēva, Puṇīsa of overwhelming might. On the Poysala king once giving the order he valiantly seized Nīlāḍri (the Nilgiris) and pursuing the Maleyāḷas in battle and obtaining success over their forces, he became the master of Kērala; then he eagerly returned (literally "showed himself") to the Bayal nāḍ (plain country)."

commanders who had not waned in battle were terrified, as they fled at the moment when was destroyed the power of the chiefs of the force that had mined Pāgadakāṭe (and) Koṅgu. What ruler on the earth's surface were his equals?" Both the R.T. and K.T. read anji, here corrected to aṇjje. The interpretation of tīr-vīr-āgada is conjectural, supposing nir, "to surpass", to be intended. Pīr, a possible alternative is quoted by Kittel from Abhinava Pampa signifying "a state of being scattered". The K.T. reads āgada correctly for the R.T.'s āgada; on the other hand the former's reading āgale mādi for āgaleśy ődi, and illige for ill ene, are not acceptable. Pāgada-kōṭe, the "Farthing-fort" is as yet unidentified.

(1) E.C.IV Chamrajñagar 83(1117):

(verses quoted over)
Likewise an inscription of about 1120 gives Viṣṇuvardhana the title purī-kṛta-Nīla-parvata, "erector of a city on the Nīla mountain, or turner of the Nīla mountain into a city."(1) A later record tells of Viṣṇuvardhana's ultimate successes over the twin rulers between the Hēmāvati and the Nīlagirī, successes for which Puṇīsa or his colleagues were probably responsible, in the titles Koṅgālva-ṛṇāla-vana-dahana-davanālanum and Caṅgāl-ṇṛpāla-bala-jala-nidhi-badavānalanum, "a wild fire in burning the forest that was the Koṅgālva king and a submarine fire to the ocean, the forces of the Caṅgālva king."(2) On this account it is reasonable to believe that it was in 1115 or 1116 that Viṣṇuvardhana sealed a treaty with these turbulent southerners by his marriage with Candala-devī, who was certainly a Koṅgālva princess.(3)

Kāla, a ruler of the Koṅgu-Nīlagirī region, was often called Kalapāḷā in the later inscriptions.

(1) E.C.III Seringapatam 49 (cl120).
(2) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 137 (dated 1130 but really of about 1190) Caṅgālā stands (as Rice acknowledged) for Caṅgālva, and was misread Bhāṅgālā. The same inscription calls Viṣṇu Kēraḷa-nārēśvara-hālēśvara-hālēśhālaṇā, "a poison to the Kerala king."
(3) M.A.R. 1927,115(cl119) at Sravanahalli records the gift, by Candala-devī (misspelt Cantala - the editor wrongly identifies her with Sāntala-devī) together with her younger brother Dudda-malla, of a village near Mandagere which she had received as a perquisite from her father Pṛthvī-Koṅgālva to the Jaina guru Prabhācandra, disciple of Mēghacandra, of the Mēḷa saṅgha, Puṣṭaka gaccha, etc., for the expenses of the Viṣṇa-Koṅgālva Jaina temple. Mēghacandra is known to have died in 1115(E.C. II
Next Viṣṇuvardhana turned northwards. In the Spring of 1116 he was faced with another campaign against the Pāṇḍya, in which the latter may well have been the aggressor. Viṣṇu marched in the direction of Uccāngi and met the Pāṇḍya army at or near Dumme, where a hill of some size for that part of the plateau overlooks a plain just south of the road from Channagiri to Holalkere, near what must have been the northern limit of the Āsandi māḍ and thus of effective Hoysala influence. Beyond it it would have been unsafe for the Hoysala army to follow the Pāṇḍya in the direction of his capital. An incident in the engagement is recalled by a vīragal that relates that when Bitti-dēva marched against the Pāṇḍya, and in the battle of Dumme a troop of elephants and a force of cavalry came against him, Mācanṇa, a henchman belonging to Ārundūr, on the security of double pay from the general Pāva, collecting a force, set forth and destroyed the village of Jalahalli, which must then have been in Pāṇḍya hands. (1) Another vīragal, dated in May-

and Prabhācandra is mentioned in 1115, 1120, 1123, 1139 and finally when he died, in 1145 (E.C.II 127, E.C.V Hassan 112, E.C.II 132, 131. Cf. ibid. 117, 142, 141, 140). Duddamalla is not an uncommon name in Koṅgālva circles: compare M.A.R.1912-3 para. 63 of Duddamallarasa, who may well be the same man - it is at Ankanāṭhapura in Hole-Narsipur tāluqā; and also M.A.R.1912-3 para. 65 (1171) and (1177) of Vīra-Duḍḍa-Koṅgālva, both at Mūḍalīpya in the same tāluqā. Due to the doubtfulness of the source one can not feel sure that these inscriptions do not belong to 1111 and 1117 respectively. The text of the record quoted above reads:— Viṣṇuvardhana-Hoysala-dēvara piriyarasi Cantala-dēviyaru Tribhuvanā-tila....tīrthāda Vīra-Koṅgālva-jinālayada dēvara anābhoggakam riṣiyar āhāra-dānakkaṁ tamma bappa Prithu-vi-Koṅgālva-dēvara vaga (?) balīvalī bitta Mandagereya bṛitiy-olage Kāvanahalliya tamma tamma Duddamalla-dēvanu tāvum ilda— Prabhācandra-siddhānta-dēvara kāḷam karcī — bitta //

(1) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 99(1116): Vīra-Gaṅga-Hoysala-Bitti-dēvar Pāṇḍyana māl etti Dummeya kāleγadalu āneya ghaṭa kudereya dālav ettītdallī Ārundūra leṅka Mācanṇa immadi-jīvitaṅke Pāva-haḍa-
June 1116, found at the same place, almost certainly refers to the same campaign. We can not be sure that any severe treatment was dispensed by the Hoysala after the battle of Dumme; indeed the situation seems to have been that the Pāṇḍya remained quiet for a year or more. Yet he was still able to send a contingent to the emperor when the latter required it. Of activity on Bīṭṭi-dēva's part in the Pāṇḍya nād evidence may in fact exist. An inscription at Ālūr, south of Uccāngī, purports to mention the mahā-mandalēśvara Bīṭṭe-dēva(sic) in connection with a land grant by a Pāṇḍya minister at the end of the year 1116. (2) The grant is, however, too badly damaged to admit of a positive deduction of any kind.

The activity that occurred in 1116 was not relaxed. Before the year Hēmalambī had commenced, in March 1117, the status of the Hoysala kingdom had been enhanced by a resounding triumph which brought in its train a series of minor if no less imposing military successes.

valana honeya(?m) kōṭṭu idīdu harada Jālahalli-grāmam iridanu.
This inscription is referred to in the pleasant article by N. Kasturi, "The Hero Stones of Mysore", in the Professor K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar Commemorative volume, Madras, 1940, p. 202 ff. A merchant, given custody of this double pay, raised the stone when he learned of the soldier's death.

(1) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 100(1116) dated Durmukhi, Jyēṣthā.
(2) E.C.XI Davangere 166(?1116). The R.T. reads(with conjectures added): - srīman-mahā-pradhānām daṇḍanāyakam Uccāṃ<gi>... tnameyy jīvitada kōṭey-Ātūra-Nāgēsvara<ra>... Brīmac-Cālukya-Vikrama-kālada 41 neya(? Durmu>ki-sāmvatsarada uttarāyana-sāhaka<nti>.... mādi mahā-maṇḍalēśvara Bīṭṭe-dēvaru Mallige-geyeyα...yi biṭṭa mattar Viṣṇudēvarge Mattikatēṭṭa-kēlāge biṭṭa, etc. The K.T. has gross discrepancies: Ālūr(correct) for Ātūr and several omissions including Bīṭṭe-dēva. In any case, Rice is not justified in stating in his translation "the mahā-maṇḍalēśvara Bīṭṭe dēva made grants of land(specified) for the god Viṣṇu."
It was almost certainly during the first months of 1117 that Viśṇuvardhana reaped the fruit of his careful preparations, and, with his army under the command of his principal daṇḍanāyaka, Gaṅga-rāja, took at one blow the famous city of Talakāḍa, and within a few months turned the Cōla officials out of the south-east corner of the plateau. He then followed up his advantage by swift marches to the east, taking the Hoysala standard for a brief space even as far as Kāṇci.

It is true that of the long list of titles recited by breathless panegyrists very few were founded upon achievements from which the Hoysala kingdom may be said to have derived substantial gains: they remain, however, as an interesting record of a campaign of astonishing speed and unusually extensive scope. Boldness in capacity, boundless enterprise, and constant movement characterise Viśṇuvardhana's ambition; every province within his reach was compelled to contribute battle-honours to his standards; yet the chief cause of the respect with which he was remembered by later generations was that, unlike his descendants, his desire for ostentation experienced no very determined obstacle.

Early in 1117 occurred the first of his great victories. Several attempts, as we have seen, had already been made to probe the defences of the Talakāḍ province, and it is very likely that by 1117 a body of opinion within that largely Kannāḍa-speaking area had been conciliated by the rising power that aimed at the expulsion of the representatives of the Cōla.
The Hoysala army approached the province from the north-west. The news reached the capital, Talakād itself; and the senior Cōla governor in the district came out to meet it. He belonged to the well-known Adigaimān family originally of Tagadūr, otherwise known as Dharmapūri, and thus was usually referred to as Adiyama by his opponents. (1) He drew up his troops on the western side of the Kāvēri river. Before the engagement Gaṅga-rāja, we learn, asked for and received certain land grants, presumably to provide for his own spiritual welfare should he die in battle. Viṣṇuvardhana gave him a village for the upkeep of the Bindigana vīle tīrtha. (2)

Gaṅga-rāja then summoned the Cōla commander to surrender the province. When this was refused, the Hoysala army drove the enemy in a south-easterly direction; the latter fled before them across the river into the fortress of Talakād, which lay in the bend of the river immediately upon its north bank. Viṣṇuvardhana entered the town almost at once, and captured the fort. The fate of Adiyama is unknown, but his death is likely. At once the Hoysala struck out eastwards in pursuit of the other Cōla feudatories who had so signally failed to

---

(1) N.K. Sastrī, Cōlas, II p. 42 correctly identifies him with the family of Tagadūr. The name is variously spelt Adiyama, Adiga, or Adiyama.

(2) E.C.IV Namamangala 19(1118) : mahāsaṃantādhīpati śrīman-mahāpradhāni drōha-gharaṭṭa pirīya-dāṇḍanāyaka Gaṅga-rāja Talekāḍaṃ kōḷuvalī mulgala bēdikōndu geldaṛē meccidem bēdikolk ēne śrī-Bindigana vīleya tīrthhārkkē tala-vittiyam bēḍe śrī-Viṣnuvardhana-Hoysala-dēvaru kāṛunyam geydu koḍe koṇḍu, etc.

"The chief of great sāṃantas, the great minister, a grindstone to evil-doers, senior dāṇḍanāyaka, Gaṅga-rāja, being on the point of taking Talakād: Viṣṇuvardhana-Hoysala entreated him beforehand, saying, "Ask a boon. When you have conquered I shall be pleased for you to ask", and when he asked a grant of land for the holy place of Bindigana vīle, graciously granted it!"
assist their colleague. A certain Dāmōdara fled in the direction of Kāṇci; another, by name Narasiṅga-varma, fled and was put to death in the neighbourhood of Bāṅgīri; other representatives likewise of the Tamilian power vacated their offices. Contemporary inscriptions describe or refer to these events in lively terms:

Gāṅga-rājam Cōlana-sāmantan Adiyamaṁ modalāṛī Tālakāḍa
bīḍinol padiy ipp: ant irddu Cōlāṁ koṭta nādaṁ kudade kädi
kollim ene vijigīṣu-vṛttiying etti bāḷam erāduṁ śārcidalli //
ittana bhūmi-bhāgadoli ad anyarad ēke bhavat-pratāp-sam-
pattiya varṇanā ē-vidhīge Gāṅga-camūpa jīgīṣu-vṛttiying //
ettida ninna kayya nisitāsiya taumone benna-bāran ett-
utt ire pōgi Kāṇci-gūri-yappinam ōdida Dāman eydane //

Ēn onde-meyyoleydi Narasiṅga-varma-modalāḍa Cōlana-sā-
antar ellaram beṅkoṇdu nād ādud ellaman ēka-cchatram mādi kude,
etc.

"When Cōla’s feudatory Adiyama and others, being like a
door in the camp of Tālakāḍ, refused to give up the country
which the Cōla had given (them), saying "Fight and take it!",
Gāṅga-rāja, with an action (impelled by) a desire for victory,
rose and caused the two forces to come into contact."

"In this part of the world, why, Gāṅga the general, should
it belong to others, that (proper) style of describing the
success of your valour? When the destructive point of the
sharp sword in your hand raised with the desire for victory was
lifting the skin on his back,—is not Dāma sufficient, who went
off, and running made for Kāṇci as his goal?"
"He (Gaṅga) meeting them in his own person alone put to flight Narasiṅga-varmma and all the other sāmantas of the Cōla, and bringing all the parts that had been the nāḍas under one umbrella gave them (to Viṣṇu)." (1)

Some of the circumstances of the action are recorded in two inscriptions, one nearly contemporary and one later.

The later one, referring to an ancestor of the Nāyaka who set up the record, says:

anāka v i ṇe n melam moḷaği tām moḷagōv ene Ḥattagārara Ḍe-Nāya-
kana virājip adḍaṇada bal-moḷagaṁ nege kēldu becci teṅ-
kaṇa-deseyind Adiyamaṁ tōre vāyād irad ōde pokkan ā-
ḵšanadole Viṣṇuvardhana-nṛpaṁ balikam Taḷakāḍa-kōṭeyam //

"Saying, "What mockery is this? Is the earth rumbling, or is it thunder?" as he heard clearly the loud roar of the flashing shield of Ḍe-Nāyaka of the Ḥattagārās, Adiyama, terrified, crossed the river from the south bank, did not stay but ran: at that moment king Viṣṇuvardhana entered the fort of Taḷakāḍ behind him." (2)

The earlier one is at Aṅgādi in Mudgere tāluqā, that is, Sosavūr. It is damaged, but it records that a warrior named Bāsaya under the orders of a Hoysala officer called Biṭṭi-dēva-
Hoysala-sāhāni died in some connection with a battle in which elephants took part when Hoysala Biṭṭi-dēva opposed and fought

(1) E.C.III Malavalli 31 (Dec. 1117). The K.T. and the R.T. do not agree. Moreover, though the former reads sāmantan Adiyamam and the latter sāmantar Idiyamam, the translation spells the name Idiyama. The K.T. reads a blank after Adiyamam until Taḷakāḍa; eppinam for appinam; tāmone for R.T.'s unintelligible temone, here corrected to tau-mone; and Gaṅga-camupam. Cf. E.C.II 240.
(2) E.C.V Channarayapatna 209 (1178).
with Adiyama in the (?) assault upon Talakād. (1)

Visnuvardhana's success is thus briefly described in an inscription of 1160:

"The triumphant king Visnu pursued after Adigama when he hesitated, saying, "he will not do what he says", and took both his country and his (capital) Talāvana-pura, the abode of the goddess of victory." (2)

An amplified version of the story told in B.C.III Malavalli 31 (above) is found in a later record of uncertain date. After the lines already quoted above come the following three quatrains:

"O Ganga, unable to expose his body to the turn of your sword once in battle, the Tigula(Tamilian) Dāma escaped and took refuge in the forest, and thinking of it again and again even now, is frightened like the deer day and night, causing palpitation in the hearts of his faithful wives."

enitānum bavaraṅgalol palabaram beṅkonda gaṇḍindam ōv-
enisuttam Talakādol innevaram irdd īgal karam Gaṅga-rā-

"Having remained till now in Talakaḍ astonoshing people
by his valour which put to flight many in any number of battles,
the sāmanta-Dāmōdara, turning now his back on the fight through
great fear of the blows of Gaṅga-rāja’s sword, lives like a
šaiva ascetic eating from a skull from which a dog will not eat.”

embinam onde meyyol avayavadin eydi mūdalisi dhṛti-gidisi beṅ-
koṇḍu-mattam Narasiṅga-varmam modalāge ghaṭṭadim mēlāda Cōlana
sāmantar ellaram beṅkoṇḍu nād ādud ellaman śka-cchatrad undige-
sādhyam mādi kudē, etc.

"Marching alone rapidly, taunting and making them lose
courage, he thus put them to flight. Moreover, he put to flight
Narasiṅga-varma and all the other sāmantas of the Cōla above
the ghats, and brought the whole nād under the dominion of a
single umbrella, and handed it (to Viṣṇuvardhana).” (1)

The same inscription mentions what we know already,
that Talakāḍ was the frontier of Gaṅgavādi-nād above the ghats.
(2) The town had an important strategic position, being, as a
glance at the map shows, the first real stronghold reached by
one who ascended the ghats from the south-east. It was thus of
very great value to a king who intended not only to control the plateau upon which Talakād stood, but also to venture into the regions that might be reached by way of the Kāverī valley.

The remark concerning Viṣṇuvardhana's success at Talakād which is most often encountered among the inscriptions has an important element of fact in it:

"First of all taking into his arms the wealth of the Poysala kingdom, his inheritance, while his fortune shone, his strength sufficed, his might increased, and his command prevailed, he overpowered all points of the compass, and capturing Talakād became himself the first in the Gaṅga kingdom - king Viṣṇu, promoter of the Yadu race." (1)

Of course, Viṣṇuvardhana's sudden, but well anticipated rise to a position of almost unchallenged supremacy in the ancient Gaṅga-mandala could not have taken place without attracting the attention of the Cōla king Kulōttuṅga I. He was known to the Kannadigas by the name Vīra-Rājēndra, the title he bore as the Eastern Cālukya sovereign before he acceded to the Cōla throne. A sarcastic Kannada verse tells us:

Page 121 n.(1) E.C.II 240(1178). The translation is based on that of R.Narasimhacar.
Page 121 n.(2) ibid: ghaṭṭadim mēlāda Gaṅgavāḍi-nāda-gaḍiya Talakāḍa bidinol pādiy ipp ant, etc.
(1) E.C.V Belur 71(March 10th 1117). The as yet unexplained title Gandagiri-nātha, given to Viṣṇu in E.C.V Belur 58(1117) may refer to the conquest of the eastern mountain rim of the Gaṅga country.
ele Kāvēriya-vāri kūḍe polas ādatt endu pēv aysutum
keladol kūpā-jalāsiy appinegam ā-Rājēndra-Gośaṁ bhujā- 
balādīn Viṣṇu tadiya-sēneya pēnaṅgal tan-nadi-pūralō
kalasal vikrama-kāliyam meradān aty-ugra-pratāpōdayam //

"Viṣṇu displayed the sport of his valour and the rise
of his very fierce prowess as he mingled in the flood of
the Kāvēri river, by the strength of his arm, the corpses of
the army of Rājēndra-Gośa, so that Rājēndra, being disgusted
at the general pollution of the Kāvēri, drank the water of
the wells nearby."{(1)}

Indeed it appears that if no immediate attempt
was made to avenge the defeat of his sāmantas, Rājēndra did
not remain quite inactive. Two years later we find a Hoysala
inscription at Būka in the present Channarayapatna tāluqa which
mentions not only the ruler of Kukkara-(=Kukkala) nāḍ, who
bore the name Viṣṇu-Rājēndra-Gośa, but also of Viṣṇu-Rājēndra
otherwise <Kulō>ttuṅga himself, in circumstances which certainly
suggest warfare in the south-east of the Gaṅgavādi. (2)

It seems likely that Viṣṇuvardhana set out north-
wards and then eastwards for Kāñci immediately after his capture
of Talakāḍ. Kāñci was at that time a royal city in the hands
of Kulōttuṅga, but it appears to have fallen to Viṣṇuvardhana
with the same ease that he experienced in taking a whole string
of towns in rapid succession. The Gośa appears to have had a:

(1) E.C.V Belur 58(March 1117) and ibid. 147(1121).
(2) E.C.V Channarayapatna 272(1119). A viragal dated Saka 1041,
Vikāri.
an embarrassing series of failures, and no doubt the un-
settled condition of the Cōla country as a whole at this period,
owing to the old-age of Kulottuṅga himself and the Cōlas' lack
of success in their perpetual rivalry with the Cālukyas, account
for them to a large degree. (1)

References to the capture of Kāṇci are not common,
but are irrefutable: in March 1117 Viṣṇuvardhana is given the
title utkampita-Kāṇci-puramā, "he who shakes Kāṇci"; in 1125
he is called Kāṇci-gonḍa, "taker of Kāṇci"; and in 1162 it is
said of him that

Tulu-nāḍaṁ Male-nāḍaṁ
Talakādaṁ konḍu matteyum taniyade bhū- /
talamaṁ Kāṇci-varam konḍ
alaヴァdisida Viṣṇu-bhūbhujam kēvalam ēm //

"King Viṣṇu was surely unique, he who not being satisfied
by taking Tulu-nāḍ and Male-nāḍ and Talakāda as well, took and
subdued the surface of the earth as far as Kāṇci." (2)

It was almost certainly on his way towards Kāṇci
that Viṣṇu took Kōḷāla-pura (Kolar) and Naṅgali, both of which
would have been on his line of march; and it is not improbable
that Kōyatūr or Kōvatūr, with the capture of which he was
frequently credited, now correctly identified with Laddigam in
Chittūr district, was also one of his prizes before he reached
the Cōla royal city. (3)

(2) E.C.V Arsikere 142(1162); E.C.V Channarayapatna 149(1125);
E.C.V Belur 58(1117) and ibid. 147(1121). E.C.V Belur 124(1133)
says of Viṣṇu that when he put his foot forward, Kāṇci came
under his command.
(3) E.C.III Malavalli 31(1117) says Viṣṇu took the shining
We are, however, unable to say at what period in his campaign he took Tereyūr, otherwise spelt Teriyūr. There is a Teriyūr, a place of some importance, situated between the river Pinākini and its tributary the Jayamaṅgali, at about four and a half miles from Hindupur, and it was suggested by Rice as the scene of one of Viṣṇuvardhana's triumphs. If this identification is correct, and it may well be so, Viṣṇu must have taken it during his campaign against the Cōḷa ruler of Ḫeṅjeru and Niḍugal, which was not more than twenty miles to the north-west of Teriyūr. On the other hand some doubt is thrown upon the identification by an inscription of 1100, to which reference has already been made in connection with a marriage of Bṛyaṅga, where it is stated that a certain Karkkāla-mārāya was 'active in Tereyūr'. (1) If this signifies that he had attacked Tereyūr himself the identification given above may stand: if, however, it means that he counted Tereyūr among his hereditary possessions, we should look for the town in Bangalore or Kolar districts, for all the inscriptions of the Karkkāṭa-mahārāya, who is certainly a descendant of the ruler mentioned in the 1100 record, are found within those districts, not one of them being nearer than forty-five miles from Teriyūr. (2) In the latter case Tereyūr may well have

Kōyatūr and Tālavanapura which was Rāyārayapura. The latter was an alternative name for Talakāṭ, though it may have applied to a newer part of the town perhaps founded by Rājarāja Cōla. There seems to have been a Koṅga Rāyārayapura as well. Fleet, D.K.D. p. 496, thought Kōyatūr was Coimbatore. The circumstances require a place in the east; Laddigam, nearly 4 miles N.E. of Punganur in the tāḷuqa of that name, at 13°23'30", 78°37'30", lies very near (a trifle to the north) the route Naṅgili-Kānci. It was the old Kōyardūr or Kōyatūr, otherwise Uttama-Cōla-puram. See V. Rangacari, p. 500. 

(1) E.C.V Arşikere 102a(1100-1).
(2) E.C.IX Bangalore 114-5(c1262) at Tālegaṇṇapura; ibid. 99 (1262) at Hoṅgasandra; E.C.IX Anekal 41(c1265) at Handeṇahalli;
fallen a victim to Viṣṇuvardhana's onslaught on his outward journey to Kāṇci.

During the same period Viṣṇu took Cāṅgiri. We do not know that he assaulted it in person, or even that his commander-in-chief sent a very considerable detachment against it. It may have been taken while the main army was on its way to Kāṇci. A more serious uncertainty surrounds the place itself. Rice identifies it with Śāṇji, that is, Ginjee in the South Arcot District. The identification is not attractive; a place in the hills of Salem or perhaps North Arcot district would be more acceptable. Yet we can not be sure that in fact the word itself does not conceal two distinct places. It is frequently read Beṅgiri, a perfectly possible name-form. Rice mostly corrected this reading to Ceṅgiri in his translations, on the ground of the actual difficulty in distinguishing Ba and Ca in the script. But in two inscriptions of the period of 1120 the following titles were applied to Viṣṇuvardhana:-

Beṅgiri-bhujaṅga-bhaṅgakara-khāḍga-khagājanum

Beṅgiri (read Ceṅgiri)<Perramāla>kutkhila-cālana-catura-cāpa-

The alliteration, together with the fact that in prāsastis a proper name is very seldom mentioned twice in such a context, shows clearly that there must have been two places, the one named Beṅgiri and the other Ceṅgiri. The "Vainya in shaking with his bow the mountain, the Perumāl, or lord, of Ceṅgiri" must have been engaged in a separate operation to acquire the title "he whose sword is a royal kite in destroying the serpent Beṅgiri."
No really satisfactory location has been found for either of these places. Beṅgiri may well have been on the plateau, for we learn that, a fugitive, Narasiṅga deserted his queens, forsook his kingdom and died in the country near Beṅgiri, so that Viṣṇu took possession of his wives, presumably before taking Kāṇci, and almost certainly before defeating Aṅgara and trampling on Siṅgalika, the latter of whom we already have reason for locating in the eastern part of the plateau. (1) Now this Narasiṅga must be the Narasiṅga-varma, otherwise Narasiṅga- or Narasimha-brahma who was one of the Cōla sāmantas defeated by Gaṅga-rāja. He fled before the Hoysala forces, meeting his end near Beṅgiri, while his colleague Dēmōdara apparently reached Kāṇci before Viṣṇuvardhana. (2)

Concerning Ceṅgiri there is rather more information available. In an inscription of about 1120 we learn that the ruler of Ceṅgiri had an army, the dust raised by which covered up all points of the compass. (3) The situation of the hill is

---

Page 126 n. (1) E.C.V Belur 16(c1120). The latter title is found in E.C.V Belur 58(1117) where Ceṅgiri is read; there however the first title has also the reading Ceṅgiri. In E.C. Ill Seringapatam 49(c1120) both are read Beṅgiri.

(1) E.C.V Belur 17(1136) originally at Dōrasamudra. The text reads Beṅgiri, and the translation Ceṅgiri:

(?) saṅgaradol ānt a...arasiyaram bisuṭu jaguṇe taguld avana rājya mane
Beṅgiri gal ā dharaṇī-bhāgadol sāye Narasiṅgana vadhu-nikaramam padedu...
Aṅgaranan ikki bide Siṅgalikanam tūlidu Gaṅgevaram atta maguld uttaradharitri-raṅgada nṛpalan asuṅgol en Kṛgaṅga-nṛpa-nandanan avāryyatara sauryyaṁ //

The reference to a northern campaign is to be associated with that against Iruṅgōla, for which see below, and the operations that followed. Aṅgara is mentioned in E.C.V Channarayapatna 149 of 1125, where it is said that Viṣṇuvardhana captured the
clarified by a verse in an inscription of the latter part of Visnuvardhana's reign, almost certainly referring to the events of early 1117:

A young protegé of Visnuvardhana, called Immati
daandanayaka Bittiyanama was credited with a triumph, remarkable on account of his youth, over the Kongu rulers. The period of this event is settled by the subsequent statement in the record that when the flames of Rayarayapurā spread towards Kāñci, the minds of the Cōla, Čera and Pândya rulers were filled with fear.

Of Bittiyanama we learn from the quotation above that "when the king ordered him, saying, "Who are titled mārāyas when you are in the world? Bring quickly tribute in respect of Kongu!", he put to flight Cengiri in half a pakṣa, (that is to say within a week) burnt his city, plundered his territory, took an astonishing amount of tribute and brought it in with a troop of lusty elephants."(1)

component parts of the kingdom of (?)Ahgara. For Siṅgalika see above p.63.
Page 127 m.(2) In E.C.III Sēringapatam 49(cll20), which is damaged, the translator mentions Narasimha-brahma ? of the city of Cakragotṭa, and the text has Cakragotṭapura..rasimha-brahma-
bhujā-bhaṅjana-prbhaṅjanaunām, the space appearing to require the very plausible conjecture <da Na>. There is however no evidence that Cakragotṭa had a ruler Narasimha until a century or more later. In 1111 Kannara-dēva was ruling there: see Hira Lal, op.cit.(2nd.edition)p.210. Page 127 n.(3) E.C.III Sēringapatam 49(cll20): bala-pāddhūta-dhūli-dhūsarita-dikupāla-Bel(read Ce) āgiri-Perumāla-kukkiḷa etc. In E.C.V Hassan 89(1135) we find the word dikupāla ending in -nim, thus separating the preceding phrase and making it into a separate title without reference
It is known that of the Koṅgu-nāḍī, besides the portion south of the Kāvērī which was partly inhabited by the Koṅgālva's subjects and partly by wild tribes, there was an eastern section which extended some distance into the northern limits of the modern Coimbatore and Salem districts. We may be reasonably sure that Cēṅgiri was not far from Salem itself and near to the Kāvērī valley; a place easily approached once the obstacle offered by the Cōḷa occupation of Talakāḍ had been overcome. This suggestion is confirmed by the fact that Perumāḷ is a regular Tamil name for a ruler. Likewise the Patti-Perumāḷa, who is so often said to have been established by Viśnu with his own troops,(1) was probably a petty Tamilian chieftain whom the Hoysala encouraged in insubordination to his Cōḷa overlord.

Several other references to Cēṅgiri show that Bitti-yanna's campaign was highly admired. Viśnu was pleased to bear the title Cēṅgiri-bala-kāḷāṇalam, "the fire of death to the force that belonged to Cēṅgiri."(2) An amusing verse from a

---

(1) E.C.V Belur 17(1136) In E.C.IV Nagamangala 76 of 1145 where Rice is content to read Beṅgiri in the expression "Viṣṇu plucked out the moustaches of Koṅgu and Beṅgiri" the reading should be altered to Cēṅgiri.

(2) E.C.V Belur 124(1133) and elsewhere.
record written about eight years after the event says:—

Adiyaman ōdid ōtama mer ōdisi kaltu Nṛsimha-varman ō-
didan avan ōtamaṁ gunisī Ceṅgiri Ceṅgiriyalli kaltu kond / adaṭina Koṅgar ā-negardda Koṅgaran īkṣiśi Pāṇḍyan ōdidam Yadu-tilakaṅga Viṣṇu-dharanīpatig ōdadar ār ddharitriyol //

"Adiyama ran as if in a race, and learning the pace

Nṛsimha-varma ran, while Ceṅgiri having multiplied upon

that pace the proud Koṅgas learnt it in Ceṅgiri, and seeing

the celebrated Koṅgas the Pāṇḍya also ran: who did not run

before king Viṣṇu, the ornament of the Yādavas ?"(1)

In another inscription, no doubt by virtue of being

commander-in-chief, Gaṅga-rāja takes the credit for the Ceṅgiri

exploit:—

Tālakāḍam seled ante Koṅgam olakond ā-Baṅkiyam tūlā dōr-

bbaladīn Ceṅgiriyaṁ kalalci Narasiṅgang Antakāvāsamam /

nilayam mādi nimircci Viṣṇu-nṛpan anthā-mārggadīm :: Gaṅga-ma-

ndalamanm koṇḍav arāti-yūtha-mṛga-sīngam Gaṅga-dāndādhipam //

"Drawing to himself Tālakāḍ, and so taking possession of

Koṅgu, driving away the famous Baṅki, throwing down Ceṅgiri,

and sending Narasiṅga to dwell in the abode of Death, he en-

larged king Viṣṇu and in other ways captured the Gaṅga-mandala:

Gaṅga-dāndādhipa, the lion to the herd of deer that were his

enemies !"(2)

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 149(1125).
(2) E.C.V Channarayapatna 248(1134). The text reads nilayam

which must be an error. Baṅki, perhaps a Coḷa or Siṅgalika

general, is otherwise unknown.
It is thus very likely that the expedition against Cēṅgiri and the Koṅgas took place while Viṣṇu himself was engaged upon the journey to Kāñci. When he arrived there he seems to have sent another detachment beyond that city towards the coast. It reached Mahābalipuram, and marched southwards, without meeting effective enemy opposition. This we gather from the total silence of the Cōla, Pāṇḍya and Hoysala inscriptions on the subject: a battle of importance would almost certainly have been claimed by one, if not both of the parties, as a signal victory.

That Viṣṇu's force reached the coast is shown by the statement in a later inscription that he destroyed Jana-nāṭhapura, which is identified with Mahābalipuram, or Seven Pagodas. (1) They then proceeded to the south, and may actually have reached Madura, if a literal interpretation be made of the expression kara-tala-krōḍi-krīta-dakṣiṇa-Madhurāpuram, "he that squeezed in the hollow of his hand the southern Madhura." (2) It is clear however that the Pāṇḍyas, then under the domination of a weakened Cōla dynasty, offered no more resistance than their masters to the lightning movements of the Hoysala raiders. The following verse may be compared to the remark about the Pāṇḍyas running in imitation of the Koṅgas:

\[
\text{karavāḷaṇa śade Pāṇḍyaṇa}
\]
\[
\text{karavālim Hoysalēśan iṛiyal nōda-} /
\]
\[
\text{lk are-vāl allade kādal}
\]
\[
\text{karavāḷ iḷḷ āvytu nōde Tīguḷana padeyol //}
\]

(2) E.C.V Belur 17(1136).
"There was not a (single) sword in the army of the Tamilian (i.e. Cōla) as he watched, while not even a half-sword was to be seen during the fighting, when the Hoysala lord struck with his sword the Pāṇḍya when (the Pāṇḍya) flourished his sword." (1)

It is not at all impossible that a detachment, or even the same body that reached Madura, may have penetrated as far as Rāmā̀svaram. There was a great fascination in that place of pilgrimage, which offered to the ruler whose representatives reached it the title of"ruler as far as " or "setter up of a pillar of victory at" Sētu, for Sētu, though not the most southerly point of the peninsula by many miles, was conventionally supposed the limit opposite to Hima, or the Himalaya. An echo of just such an achievement is heard in the rhetorical statement occasionally met with in Viṣṇu's reign, that he "protected all lands as far as the shores of the southern ocean under the shadow of his sole umbrella." (2) An inscription of Parākrama Pāṇḍya, as N.K. Sastri notes, may well refer to the early part of 1117. It deals with the grant of privileges to some Pallis on account of their having rescued the images of gods and Nāyaṇmārs of the village of Āduturai

(1) E.C.V Belur 171(1160).
(2) E.C.V Channarayapatna 149(1125) N.K. Sastri, Cōlas II, p.43-4 does not believe in the Hoysala expedition to Kāṇci and Madura. But as he says that they are no less incredible than his wars against Cakrakūṭa or Lāṭa, he partially answers himself. Lāṭa assuredly was never attacked by a Hoysala: but Guzerati contingents must have played a large part in the army of the Cāḷukya, led, as in the case of the Sinda, by a representative of the royal line. The defeat of such a detachment in one of his many attacks upon the Cāḷukya dominions would be considered by contemporaries more than adequate excuse for claiming the defeat of the Lāṭa.
which were being carried away to Dōrasamudra during the war of the Periya-vadugān. This Periya-vadugān, the 'great northerner,' may well have been the Hoysala himself, though better suggestions are that he represents the Kākatiya or the Cālukya, known at this time to have been encroaching powerfully upon the Cōla's northern districts, and thus creating the diversion of which Viṣṇuvardhana made such good use. Āduturai is on the Vellār river, in Perambalur tāluqa, in the modern Trichinopoly district and it is not at all improbable that the Hoysala force raided it on its way towards Madura, supposing as in the theory outlined above, that it went from Kāñci to Mahābalipuram and thence to Madura; otherwise, had the movement been from Ceṅgiri to Madura, then to Nāmēsvaram and to Kāñci by way of Mahābalipuram, a not impossible but unproven route, then Āduturai would have been raided on the northward journey. It remains to enquire why the idols should have been stolen. They may have been stolen for their intrinsic value, being perhaps of gold, and bejewelled; perhaps the removal of the idols seemed to be a method of weakening the good fortune and thus the morale of the enemy, though the rapid nature of the campaign seems to preclude this explanation; on the other hand the interest in temple building in Mysore at this period may have suggested to the leader of the Hoysala troops the pleasant anticipation of building in his own culturally less mature province a new Śaivite temple elegantly adorned with these examples of Tamilian craftsmanship.(1)

(1) A.R. 1913, 35; ibid. p.113-4; N.K. Sastri, Cōlas II, p.44.
Visnuvardhana soon returned to the plateau. Almost his first task was to cope with opposition offered him by the Cola family of Heñjeru and Nidugal. In other parts also of the plateau the Cola name was recognized, but the most active family actually to claim descent from the Cola line lived near its northern limit, Heñjeru itself being about fifty-five miles north-west of Kolar. It was not unnatural that this family with its extensive territories mainly between the rivers Vēdāvati and Pinākini, and with interests in the watersheds of these rivers, should have made an attempt to assist the remaining Cola adherents on the plateau, and the ruler, Iruṅgōla, may well have marched to intercept Visnuvardhana on his homeward journey. In any case, Visnu had several inducements to engage in battle with him, because it was from his territories, in particular the Sīre nād, that a raid had been conducted upon Hoysala lands a few years before, and the Cola ruler, being a subordinate of the Cālukya,(1) and having access to the main parts of the Cālukya's southern dominions, was a very suitable victim for the Hoysala's initial schemes of aggrandisement: Visnuvardhana could even pretend that the absorption of the nād then under Cola control was in the interest of the imperial family, so long hostile to Colas in general.

If Visnuvardhana met Iruṅgōla's forces in the field he rapidly put them to flight, and took first Roddam, a city on the eastern bank of the Pinākini, and a city of importance to the Cola, who bore the title Gōva, or governor, of Roddam.(2)

(1) The Heñjeru Cola was a subordinate of the Cālukya emperor from 1108 at the latest (E.C.XII Challakere 43) and continued to be so, at least nominally, until the Kalacuri usurpation.
(2) The title is found in E.C.XI Challakere 43(1108) and ibid. 21 (1147) where Malla-ḍēva rules Sīre and Rodda nāds amongst others.
This success was followed by the capture of Vallūr, thirteen miles north of Roddam, the scene of engagements between northern and southern rivals in the past, including one in which Bittideva's father Emeyanga had fought. It is very likely that Iruṅgōla's troops fled to that place and that there he capitulated. It is also likely that Tereyūr was taken, if not on the march to Roddam, at any rate on the way back to Talakāḍ (1)

Iruṅgōla's submission did not apparently curtail his self-governing powers or the extent of his territory. Like the southern Goḷa and Pāṇḍya, he seems in his official documents to have ignored the Hoysala successes. He lived for many years after his defeat, apparently a loyal subject of the emperor.(2)

Very frequent mention was made of Visnuvardhana's victory; he was often given the titles Henjeru-disāpaṭṭa, "scatterer, or confounder of Henjeru"(3) and Iruṅgōla-kuntakadala-vana-vidalana-karāla-śundāla, "grim elephant in breaking down the plantain garden that were the spears of Iruṅgōla".(4) The title Roddava-tuliva, "trampler upon Roddam", was almost certainly won at this time, although it is not mentioned in the earliest of Visnuvardhana's praśasti.(5)

In E.C.XII Sira 7(1128) Iruṅgōla is called Dēva of Rodda.

(1) Cf. above p.128.
(3) EC.II 143(1131) etc.
(4) E.C.V Hassan 89(1135) etc.
(5) E.C.II 143(1131). As for Budali, which was captured almost certainly in this campaign, as there is little evidence that Visnuvardhana thrust in this particular direction in later years, see below p.173. Budali is 21 miles S.E. of Roddam.
Having subdued the northern Cōla, Viśnūvardhana seems to have returned to Talakāḍa. There much work awaited him. The city had to be settled after the conflict of a few weeks previously, and the entire district had to be searched for remnants of Cōla adherents, and brought under the Hoysala jurisdiction. The fear of a counter-attack from Kulottuṅga, combined with subversive activity within the newly won territory induced Viśnūvardhana to place these eastern districts under the general superintendence of his brother Udayāditya, and it is not unlikely that, on his departure for the north, he may have consigned Talakāḍa also to his brother's care.

For he can not have been in Talakāḍa many days when a summons reached him, requiring his presence before the emperor himself.

We are not at liberty to speculate on the emperor's views on Viśnūvardhana's brush with the Pāṇḍya at Dumme in 1116, but it is reasonable to suppose that the Hoysala successes of the winter of 1116-7 and the spring of 1117 had produced at Kalyāna sensations not wholly of satisfaction. Vikramāditya's pleasure at the discomfiture of the Cōla must have been outweighed by a suspicion, as we know not unfounded, that the long list of titles which Viśnūvardhana had accumulated, together with the real extension of Hoysala power and influence in the east and south-east, pointed to an intention on Viśnūvardhana's part of setting himself up as an imperial ruler in his own right. The interview must have been one of great interest: we know nothing of its details, but subsequent events show that
Viṣṇuvardhana and Viśnuditya failed to reestablish relations of real cordiality or mutual confidence.

It is not easy to locate the spot where this interesting conference took place. We learn that early in March 1117 Viṣṇuvardhana was on his way to "(?)*Kadunaḍu of Hemmaḍi-rāya of Kaṭaka", and made a vow to the goddess Kālamma at Janivāra in the modern Channarayapatna tāluṇa.(1)"Hemmaḍi-rāya of Kaṭaka" may indeed mean Viśnuditya of the kaṭaka of Kalyāṇa. that is, his capital, or more probably Viśnuditya "who was in camp", in other words engaged on a royal progress through his dominions. Janivāra is on the way from Talakāḍ to the north, or but a few miles from a main route from that city to Belūr and Dōrasamudra, being but five miles from the Hēmāvati river near which the route passed. We in fact find Viṣṇuvardhana ruling with Śaṁtalā-đēvi in Belūr itself on the 10th of March 1117, as he paused to review the government at the capital, where his son Ballāla had been acting as his deputy, and incidentally to issue the two grants which have often been quoted in these pages. These grants tell us at great length of Viṣṇu's victory lately won over the Ėōla, and of his successes from the days of his earliest campaigns: apart from the puzzling title Ganḍagiri-nāṭha, almost certainly won during 1116-7, the rest of the titles have already been accounted for in our review of his early history, and the endless succession of alliterative, bombastic or vapidly rhetorical titles would be as unenlightening to discuss as it is tedious to read.(2)

(1) M.A.R. 1912-3 para. 75, p. 35(1117). (2) E.C.V Belur 58 & 71 say that Viṣṇu and Śaṁtalā were ruling at Vēḷāpura. The former is a curious inscription containing adulatory material of later reigns. It may be a re-edition of an older record with append-
An inscription of much later date refers to this meeting. Viṣṇuvardhana marched north and joined Vikramāditya, perhaps in the north-western districts near the Tungabhadra, towards the end of March. The record says, in describing how a certain man obtained the status of land-holder, that Caḷuk-avve was the servant of Biṭṭi-dēva on his return journey from the north, when he had gone to pay homage to the senior Hemmāḍi-rāya of Kalyāṇa. (1)

It may not be a mere coincidence that at the end of the year 1117 a single inscription commences with the words svasti samasta-bhuvanāśraya ṛṛī-pṛthvī-vallabha māhā-rājādhi-rāja rāja-paramāśvara and so on, being the style and titles of Tribhuvanamalla-dēva, otherwise Vikramāditya Cālukya. Such a thing had not happened since 1111, and even that example could be explained by suggesting that the Āsandi Gaṅga family, which had apparently erected the inscription, either valued an ancient connection with the Cālukya family more than politeness to the Hoysala, or had greater reason to fear Cālukya than Hoysala resentment. (2) It seems therefore that there was a slight, if impermanent, element of contrition, or at least regret, at Dōrasamudra, for the uncompromising severance of confidence that had for some years made happy relations between Vikramāditya and the Hoysala court impossible. The sentiment, which can hardly have been very vigorous, was soon obliterated by the action of Vikramāditya himself.

There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the information provided in it.

(1) E.C.VI Kadur 111(1215-6) ṇlagišal hōgi badagaṇīndam bahali Cālukavvev ṇlagišatiy(read-kāriy) āgiddalli etc. Rice was not justified in translating ṇlagišal "to serve"; it rather means "to attend a durbar". (2) E.C.V Belur 116(1117); VII Shimoga 89(111)
Viśnūvardhana seems to have returned from the north almost at once to Talakād. Cōla representatives were not yet evicted from the whole province, for the two inscriptions on the plateau dated in the forty-ninth year of Kuḷottuṅga show clearly that in the year 1117-8 Viśnu experienced no little difficulty in ridding the newly won province of the Tamilian. (1) Viśnūvardhana's presence at Talakād is shown by several inscriptions, one of which is dated in April 1118, the rest being capable of being dated in that or the preceding year. (2) We learn that on the first of January 1118 Viśnūvardhana granted four villages besides Talakād itself, and a tank, for the cult of the god Kīrtinārāyana which he set up there after he had "rooted out Adiyaman and taken possession of Talaiṅkādu." (3) By this time Viśnu had set up a subordinate head-quarters at Kolar, where, no doubt, he stationed his brother Udayāditya, together with his staff, for the purpose of bringing the east under his control. An inscription states that Viśnuvardhana was ruling the Gaṅgavādi 96,000, including Kōṅgu, residing at Talakād and Kōḷāḷapura. (4) Udayāditya's daughter Ecala-devi died at Vijayādityamāṅgala, the modern Bētamaṅgalam in Kolar district, during this period. (5) The policy which

(1) E.C.XI Kankanhalli 12 and E.C.X Siddaghatta 30. (2) E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 31(1118); E.C.VI Chikmagalur 70(cll17) E.C.X Chik Ballapur 17(cll18); Rice wrongly dates c1135. (3) M.A.R. 1911-2, para. 83(1173) at Talakād itself. (4) M.A.R. 1920 para. 70 which is E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 37 revised. On his way to or from Kolar he set up his camp at a place called ...deśi-pattanam; M.A.R. 1909-10, para. 74 at Siti. (5) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 70(cll18).
Udayaditya implemented was not to overturn the existing governmental machinery, but to collect the revenues from the late Cōla districts with the least possible disturbance. Once the Cōla viceroy were gone, and their underlings promoted or stiffened with Hoysala officials, nothing remained but to order the executive officials to continue in their functions as usual. A small and gradual infiltration did actually take place in the eastern districts from the west, but until intensive tank building and land improvement was initiated in the thirteenth century under pressure of circumstances few who were otherwise comfortably settled cared to choose the dry and comparatively barren plains of Bangalore and Kolar in exchange for the luxuriant fields of the western districts. The disinclination to colonize was matched by a lack of initiative in the administrative sphere. From inscriptions it is apparent that not even the designation of the mandalas was changed. The easy-going new-comer was content to have part of his territory called Nigarili-Cōla-mandalam as long as, in the Cōla manner, a nād ruler called himself Tribhūvanamalla-Poysaḷa-sāmanta Maṇṇai-nāḍ-Ālva. (1)

While these arrangements were being prosecuted steadily, if without uniform success, in the eastern and south-eastern districts, Viṣṇuvardhana himself could not, of course, attend to the general administration of his increasing kingdom. His eldest son Ballāla, presumably, though not certainly, his son by Śāntala-dēvi, was therefore, as has been noted, employed

(1) E.C. IX Nelamangala 67(01117).
as his father's deputy at Dōrasamudra, and in that office not unnaturally bore his father's titles. We first find him acting in this capacity early in 1117, with the titles Tribhuvanamalla Taḷakāḍu-gonda and bhuja-bala-vīra-Gaṅga-Hoysala. He performed the same duty on future occasions when his father was abroad on campaigns, until his untimely death deprived Visnuvardhana of his most valuable subordinate.

Viṣṇu's peace was soon broken by the invasion of his country by a coalition of northern rulers under the direction of the emperor Vikramāditya. Amongst the mandalēśvaras and sāmantas that would willingly have contributed forces to this expedition were the Kadambas of Goa and Hāṅgal, the Pāṇḍya of Uccāṅgi, the Cōla of Heṅjeru and the Sinda of Erambarage, and we have reason to believe that each of these was represented. In the early months of 1118 this expedition was intercepted and routed by the general Gaṅga-rāja.

Śrīman-mahā-pradhānam daṇḍanāyakaṁ drōha-gharaṭṭam Gaṅga-rājaṁ Cālukya-akravartti-Tribhuvanamalla-Permmādi-dēvana daḷam pannirvvar sāmantar vverasu Kannegāḷa-bidinalu biṭṭire //
tegē vāruvamam hāruva bageyam tanan irula-bavaram enuta savaṅgam
buguva kaṭakigaran aliṟam pugisidudu bhujiśi Gaṅga-ḍand-adhipana //
embinam avaskanda-kēliyindam anibarum sēmantarum bhanigit
 tadīya-vastu-vāhana-samūharmaṁ nīja-svāmige tandem koṭṭu, etc.

"When the army of the Cālukya emperor Tribhuvanamalla-
Permmādi-dēva, including (the) twelve sāmantas, was encamped

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 56(1117) at Ṣankaranahalli. Rice thought this an error.
at Kannegal, Gaṅga-rajā, the great-minister, general and millstone to traitors, saying, "Away with the idea of desiring a horse; this will be a night battle for me!"; attacked and defeated with ease all the satraps, so that people said that the sword in the hand of Gaṅga-dandādhīpa caused the men of the army who had put on their armour to enter mire, carried off the collection of their stores and vehicles and presented them to his own lord."(1)

A further reference to the imperial army's venture is to be found in an undated inscription which can now be assigned to 1118. It appears to relate that when Bhallaha's, that is Vallabha's or the emperor's, general Bhōga Cāṭṭa marched against the Mahā-mandalesvara Tribhuvanamalla bhuja-bala-vīna-Gaṅga-Hoysala, Hoysala-dēva drove him back.(2)

A difficulty nevertheless remains to decide where the fighting took place: Kannegāl does not seem to be beyond hope of identification, but satisfactory proof of identity is not available. There are several possible places in the neighbourhood, or to the south of Hassan, and even south of the Hēmāvati river: it seems nevertheless improbable that the force of Vikramāditya should have been able to travel so far through Hoysala territory without record either in Hoysala or foreign inscriptions. Kannegāl must thus be sought in the northern confines of the Hoysala nāḍ proper.

(1) E.C.II 73(1118) Attention has been paid to the translation of R. Narasimhacar. The word alir appears in the Sabda-mani-darpana, but Kittel could not discover its meaning. It may be "mire", the rendering adopted here; cf. Tamil alaru. Savāṅgām Narasimhacar renders "(? )camp"; it is a variant for savāga, "a suit of armour". It appears in the Pampa-Bhārata, IX 103, with
In March 1118 Viṣṇuvardhana counter-attacked. His strength had obviously not been diminished. The warriors who had taken Talakāḍ, Kōyatur, Tereyūy, Vallūr, Kāṇci and the rest were in good heart for a campaign against the ungenerous and ungrateful Cāḷukya. The successes of Gaṅga-rāja were soon followed by an invasion in force of the Kadamba territories beyond the Tuṅgabhadra. Tailapā Kadamba was said in March 1118 to be amongst "mandalika-enemies" in the Banavāse 12,000. (1) This confusion was certainly stimulated if not caused by Viṣṇuvardhana's invasion. The town of Tāgarate, about seven miles north of Hosagunda, was held by a nāyaka of Viṣṇu when it was attacked, very probably on the Kadamba's behalf, by a certain Mudda. (2) Viṣṇuvardhana next moved through the northern parts of the Pāṇḍya and Cōla principalities, apparently including in his programme an assault upon Uccāṅgi. (3) It was almost certainly in this rather than in the 1117 campaign that Viṣṇu took Gōndavāḍi-sthāla, otherwise Gōvindavāḍi in the extreme north of the Heṅjeru Cōla dominions, only seventeen miles south-south-east of Bellary. (2) He made a grant to the god Dēṃ-ēśvara, which had been set up eleven years earlier by a dependent of the son-in-law of the famous Anantapāla, at a place

the meaning, according to the editor, of "toṭṭu-kolluva sāmagri that is, "a suit of clothes". (2) M.A.R.1912-3, para.75.

(2) M.A.R. 1929,5(cll118). See Map 'C'.
(3) The assault on Uccāṅgi was carried out in the presence of Viṣṇuvardhana by Cāma-dēva, son of Cōla-Gaṅga-mahīpāla, a dependent of Gōvi-dēva of Huliyēru, a fief then in doubtful relations with the Hoysala: E.C.XII Chiknayakanhalli 29(1149). E.C. V Belur 171(cll60) says that the Hoysala cut Pāṇḍya down, probably referring to this event.
now known as Hire Hadagalli, but then as Hosa Hadanigile, near
the extreme north of the territory of the Pândya king of Ucçaṅgi.
(1)

We have little further certain information about
the events of the years 1118-1120. Visnuvardhana's activities
in the north seem to have been, for the first time, of some
degree of deliberation and less comparable to a cattle-raid.
He appears indeed to have traversed a wide stretch of land.
It was probably at this time that Muduganur, Râjavûr and
Belavâttîge fell into his hands, and he "muddied the Malapra-
hāriṇī", that is, the Malprabhā river. (2) Movement, once one
had passed the Tuṅgabhâdra, was considerably easier, population
less dense, and organized resistance less formidable.

Visnuvardhana was satisfied for the time being with
the gains in the north, modest though in fact they were, and
expended effort on improving the state of communications between
the capital and the Sântara territory, where we have seen him,
at Tâgarate, taking advantage of the low state of the ruling
house's fortunes. If he were to deal a sound blow at the Kad-
amba dynasty that ruled the northern half of that wide corridor
to the northern plains, he must not only attack in the north
but prepare an assault from the hilly and forested land to the
south of their dominions. He accordingly spent part of his
forces in an effort to reduce the small but virile principality
of Gaṅgas that lived on the banks of the upper Tuṅgabhâdra,
retired from the main field of Kannada power politics, but in
a position to interrupt communications between Dōrasamudra and

(1) In S.I.I. IX pt.1.118,A.R.1914,494,at Hire Hadagalli,Visnu
appears in a series of donors over a period. He is credited
the north-west. He sent Boppana against Tribhuvanamalla bhujabala Gaṅga-Permādi, and a battle was fought at Halasūr in March 1120. (1) Hoysala attacks on this family were extremely rare.

Meanwhile, as was usual when the grand army was away on a campaign, the Hoysala nāḍ itself was open to invasion. We learn from an inscription set up by the grandsons of the deceased hero that a man died in the time of Bitti-dēva when Kanna-mahārāja attacked Kabbinakere, which was in fact very close to the heart of the Hoysala nāḍ, in the year 1118.

(2) The difficulty is to identify the Kanna in question. The title mahārāja points him out as a personage of considerable importance. It remains to be shown whether or not this Kannara-dēva I, son of Somēśvara-dēva, the Nāgavarmē chief of Cakragotṭa, who may well have joined in the battles on the Calukya’s side. (3) However it may be, we see once again the extreme vulnerability of the Hoysala nāḍ, once the main forces of the king were withdrawn.

with the capture of Cakrakūṭa, Talavanapura, Uccāṅgi, Kōḷāla, the Seven Hills, Vallūr, Kānça, Koṅga, Hari (read di)yaghaṭṭa, Bayal-nāḍ, Mālācala-dūrga, Ṛyavāyōttamaṇḍapuri, Tereyūr, Kövatūr, Gōndavāḍi-sthala, Tāḷakāḍu, Koṅgu, Naṅgili, Tulu-nāḍ, Noḷambavāḍi, Gaṅga-mahīmāṇḍalam and Banavāse. Hādiyaghaṭṭa must have been in the western, not the eastern, ghats, as is clear from the fact that Permādi Sindha reached it soon after his capture of Belūr (above p. 91). The editor of S.I.I. IX pt.1,113, p.94 para. 2, by an unfortunate error of punctuation made it appear that Viśva-Viśnu, our Viśnuvardhana, was of the Bhāradvāja-gōtra.

Page 144 n.(2) See Map 'B' and below p.1723.

(1) E.C.VII Shimoga 12(1120) at Gondicatṭanahalli. See above, p.87.
(2) E.C.V Hassan 11(1178), saka-varīṣa sāsirada nālvattaneya (1040 in error for 1039) Vilambi-saṃvatasarada Nāgha-suddha 10 Sōnavāradandu svasti ārīman-mahā-mandāleśvara-Tribhuvanamalla-Bitti-dēvara kāladalu Kanna-mahārāja Kabbinakereyān (?read am) iṛid andu, etc.
Although Visnuvardhana's lengthy counter-attack against the emperor was successful, in as far as it enabled him to carry out extensive and leisurely reconnaissances across the frontiers of enemy mandalikas further northwards than he had ever before ventured on his own behalf, he returned nevertheless to DOrasamudra without leaving permanent garrisons, or settlements, or even records, in any area beyond the already existing limits of the Hoysala nad - with the possible exception of the Santara districts, and that one lithic record in the Pandy a nad which has already been noticed. On the other hand, it seems very likely that he suffered a reverse in the period between the commencement of 1119 and the end of 1120 at the hands of the Sinda ruler of Erambarage. Such a reverse would be very easy to inflict, for Permadi-deva Sinda, son of Acugi, must have observed the length of the Hoysala communications and the hazardous conditions in which his troops were supported. It is conjectured that the Sinda added to his laurels of the period 1103-4 by a victory in this time from the statement in a later inscription that "Pemma" frightened and put to flight the Hoysala lord who had ruled with severity over the countries Ceengiri, Cer a, Cola, Malaya, the Seven Hills, Tulu, Kolla(?), Pallava (i.e. Kâmbi), Koôngunapura (i.e. city of Koônguna, which may be Koôngu, cf. the western Ganga title Koôngunivarma), Bana- vâse, Kadambale (i.e. Kadambalige, the Kadamba country, of which much extended beyond the Banavâse province) and Hayve, which was the 500 province on the confines of Halasige and Goa, to the north of Banêkapura. And then, apparently, the brave king Pemma seized in war a multitude of infuriated elephants. (1)

Now a claim to these possessions might be said to have been proper to Bitikī-dēva in 1120, but not at any rate in any year before 1117. Not unnaturally the Hoysala inscriptions throw no light on the question. On the other hand, various miscellaneous records help to fill in the picture of these active years.

A Hoysala inscription which has hitherto been ignored shows distinctly that in the year 1120-1 some fighting took place in which the emperor was opposed to the Hoysala; moreover we first meet in it the famous Kadamba general Masanāyaka, an arch-enemy of the Hoysala, who was apparently present on Vikramāditya's behalf. The mention of the river Kāverī seems to suggest that the battle in question was fought not only inside the Hoysala nāḍ but actually well towards the south of it. All of this goes to show that Viṣṇuvardhana's temerity had evoked several distinct retorts - though from the event we can tell that they were all repulsed, leaving Viṣṇu many useful recollections if few solid gains. (1)

An undated inscription of the period of 1120 included among the forts taken by Viṣṇuvardhana the famous mountain retreat Pombuccha (otherwise Pomburccha or Huṃca) besides Andhāsura-cauka, which is seven miles south-east of Hosagunda, and Taleyūr, which is yet unidentified. Had Pombuccha alone been taken by the Hoysala, the blow to the Sāntaras would have been rather moral than practical, for they had in recent years moved towards the broad valley north of the mountainous belt in which their old capital lay, and laid more store by these new acquisitions. But the capture of Andhāsura together with the

(1) E.C.V Hassan 12(1120-1) K.T.only; corrupt, damaged and with some possible misreadings. The year Sarvvari, the Hoysala
occupation of Tāagarate mentioned above (p. 143) shows that Hoysala influence in the Sāntara districts was far from being a formality, and that some profit was gained at the time, besides the glory of taking the old capital city. In this record the old titles were continued and reinforced by these and similar achievements. (1)

In an inscription of 1121 Viṣṇuvardhana's boundaries are given as Nāṅgali in the east, Cēram and Anamale in the south, Bārakanūrghaṭṭa in the west, and Sāvimale in the north. The southern boundary, like the eastern, accords well with our story, and the western implies, as is quite possible, that the Hoysalas held the hill country as far as the ghats that lead to the plains of the Ṭāylvakhāḍa, or the modern South Kanara district. The Hoysala's attention was turned in every direction but that of the teeming lands by the sea-shore, on the further side of the mountains from which his line originated. Then if, as is here contended, Sāvimale was the modern Kumāra-swāmi-betṭa, Viṣṇuvardhana's wanderings beyond the territories of the prostrate Pāṇḍya and Cōla certainly deserve this claim. (2) An inscription of two years later is less modest, and claims that Viṣṇu's northern boundary was the Heddore, or Krishna river. A later claim, to which we shall return, to have "reduced Annigere to little bricks", and the capture of Rājavūr and other places near the Malprabha river show that by 'boundary' the writer really meant the limit of his movements. Any claim titles, words for battle, the names Madanaya, Kāvēri and Vikrama-māditta are quite plain.

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 227(c1120) and E.C.II 132(1123). Pombuccha was sometimes called Paṭṭi-Pomburcapura(sic). E.C. XII Tiptur 58(c1120) gives Viṣṇu the titles Tuluva-bala-jaladhī-bāḍarāhālam Pāṇḍya-kula-kamala-vēdana, Cōla-kataka-sūrskāra &

(2) E.C.V Belur 147(1121).
actually to rule; these northern districts must have been absurd. In fact the Hoysala northern boundary at this time ran from the southern effective limits of the Hennjeru and Ucçaṅgi districts to the central portion of the Sāntalīgē nāḍ, though even this last detail can not, in the absence of clear proof, be other than a tentative conjecture. Beyond it, however, we can be sure that Hoysala influence never rose above the level of intrigue.

All, however, was not well with the Gaṅgavāḍi 96,000 itself. Viṣṇuvardhana did not enjoy undisputed rule, for the year 1120 saw a revival of Cōla power on the Mysorean plateau. Kulōttiṅga’s successor, Vikrama Cōla, set up several inscriptions, ranging in date from 1120 to 1130, in different parts of the Kolar district. It is of interest to note that this successful attempt was made at a time when the Hoysala king was engaged in one or perhaps two simultaneous campaigns in his home territory or on its northern periphery; at a time, moreover, when we may be justified in supposing that his viceroy in the east, Udayāditya, was ill or otherwise incapacitated, and in the area that was furthest removed from the centre of Hoysala power. The provenance of the inscriptions shows that Vikrama Cōla held for ten years a tract to the immediate north and west of Kolar. It may have been, when at its greatest extent, of no more than nine hundred square miles in area; we can not, however, be sure of the extent to which depredation was
carried on by the Cōla upon surrounding lands, connived at in all probability by the officials in the neighbourhood who had once served a Cōla master. It appears that Kaivāra, Puda and Kunī nāḍs were under Vikrama’s control, and Kolar itself must almost certainly have been in his hands at one time or another. This difficulty in the east was accompanied by
trouble in the south. Insurrections did not normally arise singly in mediaeval Hindu kingdoms, and the success of one, however short-lived, was sufficient to encourage others. In 1122 Viṣṇuvardhana in person must certainly have been engaged away from the capital, for Ballāla was again ruling in the Gaṅgavādi. From the pressing emergencies which awaited his attention in the east and south we can guess that Viṣṇu put off for a while his further schemes of attacking the Cālukya. Our information, indeed, regarding his relations with Vikramāditya after 1120 and before 1128 is so slight that no definite judgement can be arrived at, and when relations with Kalyāṇa come again into the light, Vikramāditya was already dead. That the operations of 1120 had some temporarily damping effect on Hoysala pretensions is somewhat confirmed by the inscription of Ballāla of the year 1122 commencing with the style and titles of Tribhuvanamalla Cālukya: it seems that until control over the whole of Gaṅgavādi had come in sight and the Hoysala strength had been recruited afresh, official documents once again assumed a less independent tone, a characteristic which was not thrown.

(1) E.C.X Sidlaghatta 8b & 9 at Sugatūr; E.C.X Srinivasapur 61 at Maḍivāla; ibid.Kolar 186 at Daḷasanūr; ibid.Chintamani 70 at Doḍa Naṅjūr. N.K.Sastri mentions Vikrama’s success in Cōlaśi, p.64. Puda and Kuṭi nāḍs are not shown on Map ‘A’: the former included Mādamaṅgala, and the latter was nearby.
off for ever until the death of Nārasiṃha I. (1)

Of Udayāditya a little more information is available: an inscription of 1123-4 states that when Viṣṇuvardhana was on the bank of the Kāveri his younger brother Udayāditya-dēva died in Kellavatti, a place in the modern Hassan tāluqa. (2) From this we learn that Udayāditya may have been relieved of his post in the east, and may have died in retirement. It also appears that Viṣṇu himself was engaged on a southern campaign, which in fact he may have commenced in the previous year, as we find him in Belūr in the third month of the year 1123. (3) Ballāla's court, being the permanent administrative headquarters of the kingdom, was at Dūrasamudra. When Viṣṇuvardhana made his comparatively brief visits to the capital he was generally accommodated at Belūr.

Udayāditya's death is referred to in another record, which almost certainly belongs to the year Krōḍhi, that is, 1124-5. It states, as far as one can tell, that after the illustrious mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Tribhuvanamalla conqueror of Talakād bhuja-bala-vīra-Gaṅga-Hoysala-dēvar Udayāditya-dēvar attained the world of gods at the village of Kelevatti, a certain gauda of Bidirūr set up the stone on Sunday the 10th day of the bright

(1) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 151(1122) at Īśvarahallī. The R.T. & K.T. agree in reading śrīmat-Tribhuvanamalla Talakādu-gonda bhuja-bala-vīra-Ballāla-dēvaru duṣṭa-nigraha, etc. Rice could not believe what he saw, and translated it "the capturer of Talakādu, the strong-armed [Bitṭi-dēva] putting down the evil!"
(2) E.C.V Hassan 102(1124) dated Sōbhakrit, Puṣya,uttarāyana-saṅkrānti.
(3) E.C.V Kadur 119(1123) dated Subhakrit, Phālguṇa suddha; E.C.V Manjarabad 60 at Mangalagōḍu is probably of this period. On the southern expedition: E.C.VI Chikmagalur 65(1123-4), K.T. only, relates the death in battle of a seṭṭi Koṅgam sādhya mā<di>, or "having mastered Koṅga, or Koṅgu."
fortnight of Karttika in the year Krōdhi. After the gauda had
given his head in the way he had promised at some time, the
illustrious mahā-mandalēvara Kumāra Eyeyanga-dēva graciously
granted a kāhu of one pana at Bidirūr starting from the year
Subhakrit. What appears to have happened was this: Udayāditya
died in the first months of the year 1123. Afterwards, when
the year Krōdhi had already commenced, a stone was set up to
commemorate not only the death of Udayāditya, but that of his
henchman, who had had himself decapitated a short while before,
in payment of the vow he had made not to survive his master,
and had left instructions that a stone was to be erected
and to receive the usual regular worship. Eyeyanga, who must
have been a son of Udayāditya, did his duty and rewarded the
suicide by providing either a freedom from taxation to the
extent of one pana for the man's family, or, what is more likely,
an income of one pana a year towards the cost of the upkeep and
worship of the stone, the grant commencing from the time when
the vow ought to have been fulfilled. The inference is that
Ereyanga had been obliged to send to the gauda and remind him
of the need to perform his vow! We shall encounter later a
family that had bound itself in a similar way to the ruling
sovereign for the time being. We learn from this inscription
the fact also that members of the royal house were permitted
to carry a part at least of the king's titles: the phenomenon
was observed in the case of Ballāla; here it occurs even with
the king's nephew.(1)

(1) M.A.R. 1932,31(1124) also M.A.R.1915-6,para.85.
Concerning Udayāditya there is a doubt as to whether he may have been known by the name Vijayāditya also. The name occurs in circumstances that do not admit easily of another conjecture. We should not invent a new member of the dynasty with so unsatisfactory an authority. The name Vinayāditya likewise occurs, but may perhaps be dismissed as an error or a misreading. Udayāditya was a rather mediocre and obscure person, and later generations may have found it difficult to remember him clearly. (1)

Meanwhile Viṣṇuvardhana was engaged in campaigning against the Koṅga-Malayāla tribes. Two inscriptions tell how a certain Hermādi-gaunda at the king's order attacked and captured the hill-fort of Kulkala, which must have been Kukal in the Nilgiris. (2) The tribes in that area may well have led skirmishes and cattle-raids against the Bayāl-nād to their north, now within Hoysala boundaries.

Viṣṇu's preoccupation in this area naturally encouraged raiders from the north. Not far from the capital trouble was brewing. A certain Mācanna of Ballūru attacked Sige, seventeen miles east-south-east of that place. (3) Balleya-nāyaka of Huliyēru conducted a cattle-raid against Byālkēre in the modern Chiknayakanhalli tāluqa. (4) Perhaps the same raiders attacked Neṭṭakunte in the modern Gubbi tāluqa. (5) The daṇṇāyaka that was in camp at Niṭṭūr, about seven miles away, was posted there perhaps with a view to the pacification of the district and the reduction of ill-disposed members of the Huliyēru family and

(1) M.A.R. 1912-3 para. 75 (cl120): Viśa-Gaṅga Viṣṇu-Āditya-Hoysala-dēva. E.C.V Arsikere 38 (cl200) and M.A.R. 1909-10, para. 74 (cl30). Rice, in M.A.R. 1907 para. 57, quotes from "a Kannada Ms. on Halebīḍ temples" the statement that Udayāditya built Seringa-
In 1125 Viṣṇuvardhana was in Talakāḍ again, probably keeping in touch with developments in both east and south. (2) The next two years appear to have been spent in peaceful preparation for the second half of the reign, the second phase of the first Hoysala attempt to achieve independence and empire. A strong effort was about to be made to cast aside the enforced compromises and pretences of the previous seven years, and to strike a series of blows which would bring about these objects by direct methods.

If Rice was correct in supposing that the Tamil year Amudākali was equivalent to Kīlaka, than in 1128 operations were in progress against Vikrama Cōla, who had destroyed a town in Kaivāra-nāḍ. (3) An incident in the fighting is recorded in an inscription at Cikka Bāṇāvara in the modern Bangalore Tāluqa. (4) Perhaps it was on his way back from the eastern front that Viṣṇuvardhana stayed for some time at Yāḍavapura. He had not left that town before fighting commenced between Hoysala troops and the Kadamba general Masaṇāyaya. It seems very

---

(1) Of the dannayaka's name only . . . mayya is left.
(2) E.C.V Chamrajnagar 20(1142) refers to another capture of the fort and states that it was above the peak of the Nīlagiri. There is a viragal, perhaps belonging to this campaign, at Nāgarahalli in Kadur tāluqa dated Cāḷukya-Vikrama-kāla Krōḍhi(1124-5): E.C.VI Kadur 71(K.T.only).
(3) E.C.V Belur 228(1124).
(5) E.C. XII Gubbi 1(c1125).
likely that a Hoysala danñâyaka posted to the Sāntalīgē nāḍ had been ordered to strike at this moment, with the object of commencing the task of avenging the insults offered to the Hoysala country by the Kadamba during the past eight years.

For we learn that while Bitti-dēva was ruling in Yādavapura, on Bitti-dēva's making an attack against Masanāya, a warrior of Bidirūr fought by order of Hossa-lā-dēva(sic) against the troops of elephants and horses in the fort of Hānuṅgal, and died. (1)

Now we see, from the fact that a large-scale battle was fought actually within or on the immediate circumference of the fort of Hānuṅgal, that is, Hāṅgal, that the Hoysala attack upon the Kadamba had enjoyed a considerable initial success. This was, of course, not the first time that the Hoysala had attacked Hānuṅgal, nor was it to be the last. It seems that a general marauding campaign was commenced, which occupied, on and off, no less than four years, eventually concluding in a manner disappointing to the Hoysala.

The chief incentive, which impelled Viṣṇuvardhana to direct the attack in 1128, was the turmoil into which the death of Viṣṇumāditya had thrown the north-western districts. That famous emperor is calculated to have deceased in January 1127. (2)

(1) That Viṣṇu stayed at Yādavapura in 1128 is proved by E.C. III Mysore ić. Yādavapura is Tonnūr in Seringapatam taluqa, not Mēlukōṭē, as Rice thought. Mēlukōṭē, not far removed from Tonnūr was called Yēdavagiri. M.A.R. 1932, 30(?1128) is a re-edition of the inscription mentioned in M.A.R.1915-6, para.86, misdated by the editor ?1125. It runs: svasti śri-maḥāmaṇḍalēśvaraṃ Tribhuvanamalla Taḷākāḍu-gonḍa-gaṇḍa bhuja-bala-Viṣṇa-Gaṅga Bitti-ga Hossa-lā-dēvaru Yādavapuradolū su-katē-viṅ[da] dim rājyaṃ geyytam irlalu Bitti-ga-Hossa-lā-dēvaru Masanāyanara mēl ett-alu Bidirūra Muṛuvanahisa Hānuṅgalakōṭeyalu ānaya Kudureya dala Hossa-la-dēvaru besasalu kādi su-ra-īka prāptanāda, etc.

(2) G.C. Raychaudhuri, p.255.
His successor Bhūlōkamalla, otherwise Sōmēśvara III, had already taken up the duties of government, apparently without impressing the maṇḍalikas and sāmantas in the north-west of his efficiency. (1) In 1128 Jayakēsi, the Kadamba king of Goa and Hayve, made a raid eastwards and southwards and reached Puligere, or Huligere the modern Lakshmeshwar. (2) The remarkable dearth of records in this area, and in the Banavāse, Hāṅgal, Sāntalige and the adjacent nāds during the years 1128 and 1129 is a clear proof of the disturbance that the conflicting ambitions of a multitude of petty dynasties inflicted upon the unfortunate population of a rich territory. The Hoysala was thus only one of those who discovered an opportunity to achieve two objects with one expenditure of effort. Commencing as one of many, he remained longer in the field than the majority, until, exhausted with an interminable warfare so far from home, he was obliged to abandon the enterprise for the time being.

In January or February 1129 Sōmēśvara himself came down to the south, in fact to Hulluni, dig-vijayam geyyal endu, "With the intention of making a victorious expedition to all parts". He found Tailapa Kadamba of Hāṅgal ready to assist him. (3) Viṣṇuvardhana apparently retired for the moment to the Sāntalige district, where no doubt his troops found congenial quarters, for Maṇaṇaya had in 1127 been a leading commander in a battle between his master Tailapa and the latter's ambitious...

(1) It must be remembered that the districts that were north-west from the Hoysala point of view were south-west to the Cālukya. (2) W.E.I f.330(1128). (3) E.C.VII Shikarpur 100, W.E.I ff.428a-431b(1129).
subordinate Permādi Sāntara. We know that in that year a battle took place around the town of Isāpura, which appears to have been close to Uddhara. (1) An incident in the fighting which now occurred between the Cālukya allies, the Kadamba forces, and the Hoysalas supported by the Sāntaras may be reflected in the inscription which speaks of Perggade Boppadeva's siege of Hañci. (2)

At the end of 1129 Visnuvardhana was in his capital Dōrasamudra, using his son Ballāla as his representative, though whether in the field, or in the civil administration we can not be sure. (3)

The preparations of the winter over, an onslaught against the northern powers began. Fighting broke out in the modern Tumkur district, apparently in an attempt on the part of malcontents to rid themselves of Hoysala rule. The continued power of the loyal Āsandī Gaṅga family seems to have rendered this plot abortive. (4) Reasonably enough Visņu first applied himself to the task of subduing, yet again, the Uccāṅgi Pāṇḍya. This ruler had not unnaturally favoured, and very probably assisted, Masanaya in his latest hostilities towards the Hoy-sala. The enemy encamped with a large army on his frontier at Emmeganūr. (5) Visnuvardhana attacked him, and one of his ablest

(1) E.C.VII Sorab 141(1127).
(2) M.A.R. 1928,97(cl129).
(3) E.C.VI Mudgere 22(1129): Visnuvardhana-Hoysala-dēvaru --- Dōrasamudrada nelevidinolu sukha-sankatha-vinśādadim rājyam geyyuttum ire --- Īrmaṅ Tribhuvanamalla Kumāra-Ballāla-dēva manvirārata-manṣrathāvāptiyim rājyam geyyuttum ire, etc.
(4) M.A.R. 1909-10, para.74(1130 - Saumya only). The place was Bilugali.
(5) E.C.XII Chiknayakanhalli 35(1190) and M.A.R.1909-10, para.76(1169). Emmeganūr was the modern Yammiganūru, 30 miles SSE of Uccāṅgi, at the extreme southern boundary of the Pāṇḍya nāg, about 17 miles NE of Āsandī, and 25 NW of Huliyēru.
lieutenants, Caṭṭa of Huliyēru, whose proximity to the northern powers may have lent him reasons for alacrity quite as pressing as those entertained by his ruler, captured the Pāṇḍya's elephants and presented them to Viṣṇuvardhana, who witnessed the exploit.

The same Caṭṭa then accompanied Viṣṇu to the Kadamba country west of the Tuṅgabhadra. There the redoubtable Masana awaited them at a place called Balemeri which has so far not been identified, and there suffered a defeat at the hands of the Huliyēru chieftain, who seized the Kadamba's horses and presented them to Bitti-dēva. It might perhaps be convenient to interject at this point that the elephants and horses which might be present at these battles would not be very large, of the former seldom more than a hundred, and the later two thousand at the very most, so that these exploits were not so extravagant as they appear. (1) The Kadamba country was now open to the Hoysala. With friendly Sāntaras in his rear, and a friendly Gaṅga dynasty to assist him in holding down the Hāṅgal area - Ekkalarasa Gaṅga of Uddhare was almost certainly set up by the Hoysala in 1129 (2) - he advanced northwards and continued the depredations.

The general effect of this invasion can be gathered from the fact that in October-November 1130 Taḷalapa-dēva died, thus closing a long reign at a time of great stress and anxiety. The Hoysala subsequently took credit for causing his death. One of Masana's younger brothers committed suicide on the occasion.

(1) M.A.R. 1909-10, para. 76(1169)
(2) The first inscription of that family (E.C.VIII Sorab 149) is dated 1129.
Moreover his successor, Mayūravarma, lived under the most difficult conditions. For the next ten years the Kadamba power in Banavāse-nāḍ seems to have been well nigh eclipsed. In March 1131, returning no doubt to the Hoysala country, Visnūvardhana's forces encountered Massaṇa at the Kapeli, that is, the Kabbani river, but without a decisive engagement. (1) In October of the same year we find that general enjoying territorial jurisdiction a few miles to the south-west of Uddhare, while his master Mayūravarma continued to claim sovereignty of the Banavāse 12,000. (2) But the power of the dynasty was severely shaken, and the Sāntaras, for example, took advantage of the fact by establishing their own authority in the districts just south of Uddhare.

In 1131 Visnūvardhana claimed, besides his previous successes in the south of the peninsula, to be the submarine fire to the assemblage of mandalikas of Tona (the country about and south of Kānci), capturer of Hānuṅgal, destroyer of Pombucca, disturber of Sāvimale, destroyer of the ghats and Roddam, and so on, ruling the Gaṅgavādi 96,000 as far as Lökkigundī. This is an error as, of course, Nōnambavādi intervened between Gaṅgavādi and Belvola, in which lay Lökkigundī, the modern Lakkundi. From the absence of Kadamba and Cāḷukya inscriptions in the area until the year 1132 it would seem that this claim may not have been quite rhetorical. (3)

(1) E.C.IV Nagamangala 56(1131) at Honnērahalli.
(2) E.C.VIII Sorab 80(1131). W.E.I f. 442(1131) at Hire Kerūr, Kod tāluqa, shows Mayuravarma, as a subordinate of Bhūlōkamalla, purporting to rule Banavāse, Hāṅgal, Halasige and Sāntalige. The extreme paucity of his records belies this specious claim.
(3) E.C.II 143(1131).
An indication of Viṣṇuvardhana's growing influence in the Sāntara districts, in which he seems to have performed in turn the functions of conqueror, champion and ally, is to be found in one of the multitudinous inscriptions at Belagāvi which, dated in October 1131, portrays certain functionaries in the suite of a queen of Ballāla making a gift. This may signify that Ballāla himself paid a visit to Belagāvi, or merely that his queen was a Sāntara lady and that her entourage was drawn from among her own folk. However, that they were present in their official capacities suggests that at the time Hoysala authority was well respected and familiar to this area. (1)

We know nothing of the events of 1132; we may imagine from the lack of information from both parties that fairly continuous pressure was being exercised by Viṣṇuvardhana on the northern districts, perhaps as far eastwards as Gadag.

By May 1133, however, Viṣṇu had encountered Masāna, otherwise Masanāya, in person, had defeated him, taken over his country, and had set up his own headquarters in the town of Baṅkāpura. From this advanced base he clearly hoped to extend his conquests in the north, and to repeat his former achievements without the need to abandon his territorial gains almost as soon as they had been acquired, which had been inevitable hitherto. (2) But the extent of his real influence around Baṅkāpura itself can be judged from the absence of Hoysala inscriptions not only in the town but also in the surrounding country; yet on the other hand no Cālukya or Kadamba inscriptions

(1) E.C.VII Shikarpur 87(1131).
(2) E.C.V Belur 124(1133).
appear in the vicinity, except a Cālukya record at Hāvērī, which is in any case not very near. (1) Nevertheless an inscription of this year states that he had mastered all territory south of the Kṛṣṇavēṇī, a dubious statement to some extent supported by the words occurring in a later record, which say of him that "having given away in religious gifts the whole of his own territory, he invaded Ucçāṅgi and other lands of his enemies; invading the whole country from his own abode to Belvola, he bathed his horse in the Kṛṣṇavēṇī," that is, the Krishna river. (2)

But leaving aside these doubtful claims, we note a more realistic touch in several later statements. A damaged record of 1136 tells us that Viśṇuvardhana destroyed Masaṇa root and branch, Masaṇa who had been a torment to the country, and wrote the Banavāse 12,000 down in his account-book. When the king Viṣṇu played with the great Sahya and Nīla mountains as if in a game, what wonder was it that he took the famous Hānuṅgal in half a second with a simple flip of his finger? He killed with a glance ...nātha who was taking Kīṣukal, pursued after Jayakēśi and gained possession of the Halasige 12,000 and the <Hayve> 500.(3)

It deserves to be explained that since Viṣṇu's campaign of 1129 against Masaṇa the Pāṇḍya dynasty of Ucçāṅgi had been quiescent, and with one doubtful exception no record of the dynasty appears until 1142. So it was that in 1134 Viṣṇu

---

(1) W.E.I f. 442b(1134)
(2) E.C.V Belur 93(?1133-4) and E.I. VI 10(1192).
(3) E.C.V Belur 17(1136): Banavāse-pannircchāsirāmumāṇ kāditakk varise.
could claim to be ruling, in Dōrasamudra, both the Gaṅgavāḍi 96,000 and the Nolambavāḍi 32,000,(1) and that when he was recalled to the north in 1137 he was able to march direct to Uccāñgi and make his camp there without opposition.

On the other hand, the claim that he ruled southwards as far as Rāmāśvaram can not be substantiated.(2) Another record, in the following year, states, with more reason, that his southern boundary was Koṅgu.(3) Indeed, his relations with those parts would have been more secure had not so much of his energy been expended at the opposite extremity of his kingdom. Operations at Baṅkāpura, for example, naturally raised the hopes of the inhabitants of Koṅgu, just as warfare in Kolar infused optimism into the ambitious inhabitants of the male-nāḍ, or western hill-tracts: with the same result in each case - disturbances, from cattle-raids to open insurrection, depending on the degree of preoccupation on the part of the ruler. As it was in 1130, while Hoysala troops were beginning to overthrow the power of the Kadamba, Viṣṇuvardhana was obliged to order an invasion of the Bayal-nāḍ, and some action took place at Hanner-adu-bīḍa in that area.(4)

With these disadvantages, however, his preparations for the last and most furious part of his northern struggle were almost complete, when Viṣṇuvardhana suffered a bitter domestic blow. His son Ballāla, who, from all we have been permitted to judge of him, not only a dutiful son but an efficient and reliable subordinate, and a capable ruler, died between 1129 and 1133, most probably, if we may judge from the reference to

(1) E.C.XII Gubbi 34a(1134). (2) E.C.V Arsikere 30(1134).
(3) E.C.V Hassan 89(1135). (4) M.A.R.1927,37(1130 April) at
his wife at that time, after November 1131. It is a remarkable sign of Viṣṇuvardhana's stalwart determination that despite the tremendous handicap which the loss of his administrative chief inflicted upon his freedom of movement and even hopes of personal safety, he yet managed, with frequent flying visits to Dōrasamudra or Belūr, to keep up a continuous, if sometimes rather nebulous state of war against both Kadamba and Dālukya, at a distance of not less than a hundred and twelve miles from his capital.

It was, therefore, with extreme rejoicing and genuine satisfaction that the birth of another son to a piriyarasi was greeted. Nārasiṃha was born to Lakṣmī-.Devā at Dōrasamudra in April or May 1133, and the king hastened to the capital to set up this boy as his successor. The dangerous nature of his own occupations, the continual possibility of insurrections and civil discord, and the need for a king to step into his shoes with the same enthusiasm and with at least a modicum of the same experience that had inspired his own efforts, caused Viṣṇuvardhana, now past his sixtieth year and perhaps nearing his sixty-fifth, to make with all possible haste such arrangements as could achieve his purpose. The boy was crowned at oge, and not only given his father's titles, but also, as a sign that he was to be the fulfiller of his father's ambitions, the title Jagadēkamalla, "the sole wrestler with the earth". The infant was appointed a court. Ministers, Hunasemakke in Chikmagalur taluqa: Bittīga-Hoysala-dēvaru Bayalnēdina mēl etti Hanneraṇu-bīṭa kidīsi .... Does E.C.V Hassan 13 (k.T.only) belong to this period and campaign? A cavalry battle against (?) Beppa-dēva in the time of Bittī-dēva: a viragal.
no doubt together with his mother as Regent, formed a committee
to exercise jurisdiction in his name: he entered, a boy born
to be king in a sense perhaps unique, upon his public offices
in the dual capacity of a shadow of his future self, and a
reflection of his father.\(^{(1)}\)

We learn that Visnuvardhana was still in Dōrasamudra
in 1135,\(^{(2)}\) but his affairs in the north had not been static.
Already in 1134 it appears that Mallikārjuna-đēva Kadamba,
younger brother of the unfortunate Mayūravarma, had engaged
with the Hoysala.\(^{(3)}\) At the beginning of 1135 he had retaken
Hāṅgal and the Hoysala officers in the area were placed in a
dilemma. An attack on Hāṅgal was commenced and abandoned.
Yāḷavaṭṭi in the vicinity of that town was besieged without
success. The village of Hāhamūr was besieged, it matters little
whether with success or failure, for the recognition of the
Cālukya emperor and of the Kadamba ruler continued in the dis-
puted areas.\(^{(4)}\) At the end of the year 1136 Visnu was said to
be ruling the kingdom of the earth having on the one side
Bankapura and on the other Taḷavanapura as his royal cities.\(^{(5)}\)
But by the month of November 1137 the Kadamba had driven the
Hoysala governor out of Bankapura, and the authority of the
emperor was re-established there.\(^{(6)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) The birth of Nārasimha is related in E.C.V Belur 124 and
93. He is described as a ruler, at the age of three, in E.C.VI
Kadur 35(1136), and at the age of six in E.C.V Chamaraṇapātana
145(1139), where he is called Viṣṇuvardhana Jagadekamalla Nāra-
simha. Note that the title Vīra has not yet appeared.
\(^{(2)}\) E.C.V Belur 170(1135). \(^{(3)}\) A.S.I. 1929-30, p.174, para.3(a)
(?1134): a hero fought Hoysala Biṭṭi-đēva on the side of Mall-
ikārjuna. \(^{(4)}\) W.E.I f.453a, which is damaged; almost certainly
identical with A.S.I. 1929-30, p.174, para.3(b); A.R.1933-4, App.E
31, at Katinelli:(all of 1135). \(^{(5)}\) E.C.V Arskikere 144(1136).
\(^{(6)}\) W.E.I ff.455b-456a(1137).
satisfied with this success; he continued to attack the Hoysala officers in the area about Bankapura. The presence of Viṣṇuvardhana himself was clearly required. He marched northwards again, and the western route being impracticable on account of Sāntara unrest and Kadamba hostility, made for Ucçaṅgi, where we find him encamped during some part of the year 1137-8.(1) There he waited until he learned that Mallikārjuna had moved northwards, and then himself sprang westwards at Mallikārjuna’s capital. He entered and plundered the town. An inscription at Hire Māgadi was set up while he was besieging Hāṅgal, and another at Kalagūr at the same time, while one at Kōdavalli tells of an incident in the Hoysala rād during the plundering of the town: some malepar, or perhaps adherents of the Kadamba’s cause attacked from the west, and were dealt with by a local detachment.(2) While the Hoysala was congratulating himself on having achieved the first step towards the reconquest of Bankapura, the unfortunate Mallikārjuna was happily engaged in the siege of Lōkkigundi.(3) He was attempting to assist the imperial dāṇḍānāyakas; for the emperor’s cause had made some progress lately, and the emperor was in November 1138 acknowledged in Huligere.(4) The emperor can have afforded little particular support to the Kadamba, for Sōmeśvara’s death at this point does not seem to have had any adverse effect on Mallikārjuna’s fortunes. We find that Viṣṇuvardhana besieged

(1) E.C.XII Tiptur 14(1137-8): Hoysala-dēvaru Ucçaṅgi-rāja- dhēṇiyōle rājyaṃ geyyutt ire Śaka-variṣa ...1059 neya Pingala-samvaccaradandu, etc.
(2) E.C.VIII Soprab 414(1138); M.A.R. 1915-6, para. 86(1138); E.C.VI Chikmagalūr 71(1138).
(4) W.E.I f. 457-9a(1138).
Hangal once again as late as the end of 1138, so that in effect two distinct battles had to be fought for the place within a single year, and the Kadamba must have been able to regain his capital in the meanwhile. (1) At the latter operation likewise Viṣṇuvardhana was himself present. He claimed to rule over the Banavāse 12,000 and the Hangal 500 as well as Gaṅgavādi and Nolambavādi, while in 1139 we find him with the imposing title Vīra-Gaṅga-Kadamba.(2)

The year 1139 saw some speedy movements by Nārasiṃha as well as Viṣṇuvardhana. The former was ruling at Dōrasamudra with the title Vīra-Gaṅga-pratāpa-Nārasiṃha-Hoysala-dēva in the month of March.(3) Between June and July his father was ruling in Bāṅkāpura,(4) and from what we gather from two inscriptions both father and son were present at its recapture.

bhuvanaikāścaryav āyt ātana caritav ad ent embe Kādamba-sainyam
kaviy ēring endu Bāṅkāpuradol iral adam kēdu garbbhasthan āg
irdd / avatāraṃ geysutam tad-balaman aredu tat-prājya-sāmṛājya-sarvva-
svavan adam tandeg ittam jasav esevinegam Nārasiṃha-ksitiśam //

"King Nārasiṃha, when the army of the Kadamba was at Bāṅkāpura with the intention of beginning an onslaught, hearing of it while he was yet within the womb, he made a descent (into the world, or "an unexpected attack"), crushed that force, and gave to his father all the wealth of that rich empire, so that his fame shone forth, and the sole wonder of the world was his marvellous adventure." (5)

(1) E.C.V Belur 202 (Śaka 1060 Kālayukti, Dhanur = 1138).
(2) E.C.V Arsikere 105(1139). (3) E.C.V Arsikere 17(1139).
(4) E.C.V Channarayapatna 199(1139); E.C.IV Krishnarajaspat 73
is of this period. (5) E.C.V Belur 193(1161) and ibid.Arsikere
172(1162): the former reads id ent, yēr āg for ēr ing, and
But the six-year-old boy did not remain long in the forward areas, and by the end of the year was back in Dōrasamudra. It is not certain whether Viṣṇuvardhana himself was there in December 1139 and January 1140. He claimed to have taken Virāṭa's city, that is, Hāṅgal, and Baṅkāpura. (1) Moreover, we learn that in the interval between July and December 1139 Viṣṇu had engaged in battle with the forces of a Jaga-ḍeva (sic). This can be no other than the Jagadėva (for Jagaddēva) Sāntara for whom the two dates 1149 and 1160 are already known. It is not unreasonable that the growing power of the Sāntara dynasty should have found Hoysala interference and pressure intolerable. It was essential to Hoysala progress in the struggle with the Cālukya and the Cālukya sattelites in the north-west that a passage should be free through Sāntara territory, and that supplies of food, munitions and perhaps troops could be recruited easily from that neighbourhood. Thus we can hardly doubt but that Viṣṇu suppressed Jagadēva's action sharply and ruthlessly.

Viṣṇuvardhana maintained his hold on Baṅkāpura until his death, and thus not only Sāntara, but also Kadamba lands were between his newly won territory and his home. It is thus very curious to note that despite the difficulties to which such a state of affairs must inevitably have exposed him, for a good part of the period 1139-1141 Hāṅgal itself was permitted to remain in hostile hands. In December 1139 at the period of

aledu for aredu; aledu, "shaking" , is not an impossible variant, but is less acceptable than aredu, "crushing" .

(1) E.C.V Hassan 114(1139), E.C.VI Kadur 32(1140). It is a very odd fact that the former, relating as it does to Viṣṇu's successes against the Kadamba and Cālukya, commences with the (obsolete) title Tribhuvanamalla Cālukya. Doubtless a merely conventional use.
the winter solstice Viṣṇuvardhana, the title Vikrama-Gaṅga being once again in evidence, was ruling in Baṅkāpura, his capital of victory (vijaya-rājaḍhāni), ruling the provinces of Gaṅgavādi, Banavāse, Halasige and the "two 600s", which remain to be identified.(1) An inscription of early January 1140 states that a certain warrior fought in the battle of Hānuṅgal during the victorious expedition of the king.(2)

The extraordinary paucity of Kadamba and Cālukya inscriptions in this area during the period 1138-1142 shows that Viṣṇu's power to prevent certain sorts of constructive activity under the sway of those two dynasties was widely exercised. The absence of his own inscriptions, for which deliberate vindictiveness on the part of his enemies is not a sufficient explanation, suggests that his own authority was restricted and precarious. Yet we gather from a much later record that he dedi-
cated a Hoysalēśvara temple at Baṅkāpura, and Hulla-dannāyaka had time to renovate a Jaina temple in that town.(3) The area in the immediate vicinity of Baṅkāpura was neither highly produc-
tive nor thickly populated, so that in fact Viṣṇuvardhana probably derived less direct profit from it than he would have obtained from a closer control of Kadamba or Sāntara territories.

On the other hand Baṅkāpura looked northwards and eastwards, and Viṣṇu's experienced eyes were turned in the direction of the subordinates of the now waning Cālukya power. Some time between March 1140 and the end of the year Raudri Viṣṇu, from

---

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 18(1139). The "two 600s" are mentioned in E.C.IV Nagamangala 76(1145) and E.C.VI Kadur 36(1203).
(2) M.A.R. 1935,9(1140) at Kuduregundi. It is E.C.V Hassan 92 revised; though it is damaged and there must be a lacuna, it appears that the warrior died in an assault or escalade during an actual siege of the fort of Hāṅgal.
(3) E.C.V Arsikere 14(1288); E.C.II 348(1159).
his camp at Baṅkāpura, engaged with a certain Jayakēsi, who
can be none other than Jayakēsi Kadamba of Goa. (1) It was
almost certainly under Viṣṇuvardhana's orders, again, that
an expedition was sent to Lōkkigundi in or a little before
September 1140. Forces were recruited for the purpose even
from the Gaṅga area on the Tuṅgabhadra, and the opportunity
was seized by the Toraha chief to plunder the neighbourhood
of the depleted villages. (2) Before long Hānuṅgal capitated
to the Hoysala for the fourth time. In the meanwhile the king
himself had been at Hulluni on the Belvola campaign, so that
it appears that very large forces were then at his disposal. (3)
By the very commencement of the year 1141 Viṣṇuvardhana was
ruling in the town of Hāṅgal in the company of Bammala-dēvi,
daughter of a certain Gōvinda of the Pallava family, whom he
must have married during one of his northern campaigns. (4)
Two months later he was again in Baṅkāpura, where his position
was infinitely stronger than it had ever been. We find him
there in October 1141 ruling a "victorious kingdom", and again
perhaps in April 1142. (5)

(1) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 122(1140-1): Duddeya-sāhāni Hānuṅgalu-
nāda turuva Jayakēsiya kudure kādi turuvam uyyallī kādi kudur-
eyā hīdīdu turuvam magurcci suralōka prāptan āda / A cattle-
raid in the Hāṅgal area by cavalry of Jayakēsi is repelled by
the hero, who died after successfully recovering the cows.
(2) E.C.VII Shimoga 37(1140); for Toraha see above p.92 n.(2).
(3) M.A.R.1937,32(1140).
(4) E.C.XII Gubbi 13(1141). It is of interest to note that he
married a Pallava. The connection with this politically effete
dynasty, which had lost all trace of its former glory, was
apparently still of value to a Hoysala sovereign of Viṣṇu's
calibre. Her relations and dependants in Nolambavāḍi and Bana-
vāse may have been many, but the alliance can have had little
more than a sentimental recommendation.
(5) E.C.VIII Scraib 348(1141),E.C.VI Kadur 96(1141); ibid.99(1142)
says he was ruling at Baṅkāpura, but it is dated irregularly:
It will be no surprise to learn that, in the midst of this triumph, Viṣṇuvardhana's long absence from his capital and his preoccupation with the Cāḷukya war had encouraged disturbances again within the Hoysala rāṣṭra. Nārāśimha had the greatest difficulty in keeping order within the Gaṅgavāḍi province. He ruled with Viṣṇuvardhana's titles, as has already been remarked, and several inscriptions which would otherwise be assigned to his father were clearly issued under the authority of the child prince. (1) In fact Bīṭṭi-dēva, the great Viṣṇuvardhana, intended that his son should be a kind of alter ego at home, while he himself was occupied abroad. But we have evidence of fighting in the modern Kadur district in December 1140, and in the next year in the Tumkur district a battle between a previous Cōla feudatory and others. (2)

Hardly had the entourage of the boy king recovered from the strain of these commotions, when the aged Viṣṇuvardhana died at Baṅkāpura, and one of his generals carried his corpse to the capital for the rites of his funeral. His eight-year-old successor was unable to secure even an uninterrupted journey for his father's bier. (3)

Śaka 1064 Rudhirōdgārī (error for Dundhubi), Vaisakha su 10.
The last certainly dated inscription of Viṣṇuvardhana Bīṭṭi-dēva is E.C.VI Kadur 96.

(1) For example neither E.C.VI Kadur 32 nor E.C.V Hassan 114 can be assigned without question to Bīṭṭi-dēva. E.C.V Arsikere 58 (1139-40) is almost certainly in the same category and may well belong in fact to Nārāsimha, bearing the title Vīra-Gaṅga-Hoysaḷa. The Vīra-Gaṅga Viṣṇuvardhana Hoysaḷa at Beluhūr (Belūr) in January 1140 is probably Nārāsimha likewise(E.C.VI Kadur 79). (2) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 4(1140), E.C.XII Tiptur 25(1141). (3) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 96(1142) at Havalli: the inscription commences with the statement that the māhā-maṇḍalēśvara Tribhuvaṇamalla —— vīra-Gaṅga-Viṣṇuvardhana-Hoysaḷa-dēva (i.e. Nāra—
Thus, after a life of extraordinary activity, and of unusual success in the field of military enterprise; having surmounted formidable obstacles, and sufficiently overcome several natural deficiencies and disadvantages in his homeland to enable himself to profit by the occasional weaknesses of his neighbours; and having at their expense promoted the expansion of the Hoysala kingdom in an effort to bring the Kannada people south of the Krishna river under a single empire, whose centre of gravity might be more in accord with the distribution of population and the growth of southern Indian integration; Visnuvardhana, the greatest of the Hoysalas, died at the very moment when his hopes appeared to be on the point of being realized, when the north-western dynasties were learning to accommodate themselves to a new hegemony, and when the integrity and enthusiasm of the rising Hoysala power was strong enough to assume exacting responsibilities. The duty of his successor was clearly to carry the process forward to its next stage; a relaxation of effort, on the other hand, could clearly undo all his father's achievements.

Simha) was ruling the Gaṅgavāḍa 96,000 and continues: Śaka-varṣa 1063 neya Dūrmati-samvatsaradandu Baṅkāpuradalu hiriyarasa Bitṭi-deva kālaṃ geyye Boppa-deva-daṇṇāyakarulu kaṇṭhavam kondu bennane bandalli Mudurgeteya kaḷegadallī--; this is followed by details of a warrior's exploit, and the petition of the Talige-Rād thousand to Nāraśīṅga-deva for a grant of land for the worship of his memorial stone.

That Visnuvardhana Bitṭi-deva died in 1142 has been disputed. Various other dates have been suggested for his death even as late as 1156. Many have been misled by the fact that Nāraśīṃha bore all Visnuvardhana's titles except his personal name, Bitṭi-deva, while, to be more precise, the name Visnuvardhana which Bitṭi-deva bore as a personal name, Nāraśīṃha had as a title.
As has already been remarked, we are not able to assess Bṛttī-deva's triumphs with precision. We know from the distribution of his own and his son's inscriptions that a slight increase of territory took place to the north and to the south, with a fairly considerable expansion to the east. But among the many places mentioned among the lists of his conquests are several which remain unidentifed, and others that may have been visited by flying companies of horse or swift-moving reconnaissance parties rather than conquering expeditions. The brilliance of Viśṇuvardhana's vigour reached far, but the energy of firm government was concentrated within a more restricted circle.

Amongst the forts said to have been taken by Viṣṇu in a late record were Banavāse, Virāṭa-nagara (Hāṅgal), Ballārī, Vallūr, Iruṅgōla's fort (Niḍugal), Kāruka's cliff, Kummaṭa, Cincilu, Perma's Rācavūr and Muduganūr. Ballārī, otherwise Ballāra (the modern Bellary) and Kummaṭa, six miles north-west of Anegundi, were probably accounted for during the northern expedition of 1120, and so likewise Rācavūr, or Rājavūr, which is now Rājūr, fourteen miles north-east of Naregal, and was as the record indicates in the hands of the Erambarega Sindas. Muduganūr may have been the Mudenūr in Rāmdurg State, two miles north of the Malprabha river, but was more probably the present Madaganūr which is eight miles east-south-east of Navalgund, as shown on Map 'B'. Kāruka and Cincilu are still unknown. (1)

(1) E.C.IV Nagamangala 70(1178).
A similar doubt, based perhaps as much upon uncertain readings as on a lack of clear proof of identity, surrounds three of the names occurring in another late inscription. Besides the statement that Visnu set fire to Rājavūr and reduced the well-known Annigere to little bricks, we hear that he subdued Sādali, reduced Būdali to ashes, surrounded and smote Pāriyūr, burnt Bellittalige, and made the mud standing in Sindu run out. (1)

Būdali is still in existence on the west bank of the Citrāvati river, eighteen miles south-east of Roddam, and may, as already suggested, have been taken during the Cōla campaign of 1117-8. Bellittalige is almost certainly Belavatige in Dharwar district, three miles north-east of Navalgund. Sādali and Pāriyūr as well as Sindu remain to be identified.

Like other mediaeval monarchs of his class, Viṣṇu received congratulatory messages from the rulers of even remote peoples, and claimed to have established his superiority over them either by virtue of this fact, or because they had not offered to prevent his schemes, or, having so offered, had failed to do so. So it was that the Hoysala claimed, in the pompous and preposterous style of the day, to have broken the bones of Mālava, Cēra, Kērala, Nōlamba, Kadamba, Kaliṅga, Vaṅga, Baṅgāla, Varāla, Cōla, Khasa, Barbbara, Oḍḍaka and others. (2)

Of all the tributes paid him, however, the following is probably the most genuine and most significant: after speaking of Viṣṇuvardhana's successes against Jagaddēva(Mālava) and Uccaṅgi and his capture of the Belvola region, a record says of

(1) E.C.V Belur 193(1161). See Maps 'A' & 'B'.
(2) E.C.V Channarayapatna 179(?1190).
Whenever they wait upon him (the emperor), his servants remind him: "know that the Hoysala alone among princes is unconquerable for king Paramardi-deva!"  

For of all the successes of Viṣṇuvardhana surely that was the greatest. Vikramāditya, with all his immense advantages, never succeeded in reducing the ambition of this mandalēśvara, while his successors so long as Viṣṇuvardhana lived continued to retire step by step before the Hoysala advance.

The death of Viṣṇuvardhana Bīṭṭi-deva thrust upon Nārasimha a heavy burden. The boy himself, naturally enough, took but a feeble part in the counsels of his own kingdom, and the responsibility for the poor figure which he made lies chiefly with the group of ministers to whom he entrusted his affairs. It was hoped that Nārasimha's relationship to the great Viṣṇuvardhana, and his inheritance of the latter's armies, territories, and lastly, though by no means least significantly his titles (3) would protect him from internal disorders and external menaces. In fact the death of his father was the sig-

---


(2) The fact, which could hardly be doubted, that Nārasimha relied largely on officials of different grades to carry on both policy and administration is indicated by M.A.R.1937 34, (1143) at Dōrasamudra, where several danāyakaś "induced" the king
nal for protracted disturbances within the Hoysala nāḍ, invasions from the south, and a concerted effort by the northern allies to throw the Hoysala out of the north-western provinces.

The reign of Nārasimha I was far from being uneventful, but it is a story of inadequacy, feebleness and failure, in fact a very marked contrast to that of Viṣṇuvardhana. A firm policy at home was as lacking as a consistent attempt to advance against the Cāḻukya and his maṇḍalikas. The thirty years of Nārasimha I are not the most inglorious in Hoysala history, and indeed they performed the useful function of stimulating the dramatic reaction under Ballāla II, but they provide an interesting example of the result of the chance transfer of power from strong to weak hands at a time of tension and feverish effort, as well as gigantic sacrifice and a near approximation to exhaustion. Had Viṣṇu lived longer perhaps the Hoysala nāḍ might have borne the strain more successfully.

As it was, it verged perilously near to break-down, and all the high hopes were dashed. With them went the genuine spontaneity of the early period; the spirit of the far-flung campaigns of Viṣṇuvardhana was never recaptured.

to make a grant.

Page 174 n.(3) Nārasimha is called Viṣṇuvardhana Nārasimha in E.C.III Nanjungud 110(1148); E.C.IV Hunsur 143(c1150); E.C.III Malavalli 44(c1150)(K.T.only); E.C.V Channapatnapatna 228(1154) - Viṣṇuvardhana-Hoysala-pratāpa-Nārasimha in E.C.V Arsikere 55(1143), E.C.XI Tiptur 61(1162), ibid.66(1163),ibid.32(1164); IV Chamrajnagar 98(1167); ibid.Hunsur 3(1167); M.A.R. 1912-3,para.77(1172), Viṣṇuvardhana-Hoysala in E.C.IV Chamrajnagar 20(1142); V Arsikere 110(1142); IV Nagamangala 94(1142); V Belur 178(1145); ibid. Hassan 130(1147); VI Kadur 69(1160). Viṇa-Gaṅga is found in E.C.VI Mudgere 3(1144). It is doubtful whether E.C.VI Kadur 50(1174) refers to Nārasimha I or to Ballāla II: Viṇa-Gaṅga-Hoysala-Viṣṇuvardhana-rāya.
The first three years of the reign saw the Hoysala kingdom exerting itself to withstand pressure from the north. The emperor Jagadēkamalla may himself have led the attack. In March 1142 he was acknowledged in the modern Gadag tāluqa (1) and by February 1143 in the Kod tāluqa, much further to the south; (2) shortly afterwards his reign was recognized in Belagāvi itself, (3) while Kuppatūr, thirteen miles to the northwest of Belagāvi was in his hands by August of that year. (4) A Sinda feudatory of the emperor had been ruling as far south as Harihar from August 1142, and was recognized in the modern Rani-bennur tāluqa, that is, on the western side of the Tuṅga-bhadra, opposite to Harihar, in April and August 1143. (5) The whole of the Hāṅgal 500 and its environs appears to have been recaptured by the northern allies by the end of the first year after Viṣṇuvardhana's death. (6)

The scarcity of Kadamba inscriptions during these years is not necessarily attributable to Hoysala activity or ruinous warfare, so much as to a new policy adopted by the emperor Jagadēkamalla. For the next thirty years, at the least, the Cālukya attempted to govern these districts through the direct instrumentality of his daṇḍanāyakas, the native dynasties being placed under their jurisdiction: actually, as might have been anticipated, a kind of compromise resulted. But the independence, and therefore the liberty to prosecute feuds, among the māndalikas and sāmantas was considerably curtailed for

several years. The slightest relaxation, however, on the part of the government at Kalyāṇa could result in turmoil amongst the north-western dynasties, and it was one of the most remarkable signs of Hoysala weakness during the following years that sufficient advantage was not taken of the disputes which tended to preclude the chances of a united front amongst the Cālukya sāmantas.

It must not be supposed that the loss of Bankāpura, Hāṅgal and the greater part of the Banavāse 12,000 did not cost the Hoysa,la much anxiety and expense. The paucity of Hoysala inscriptions between 1141 and 1144 seems to show that a considerable retrenchment of public benefactions was enforced, and a curtailment of enterprises both national and private. Moreover, the government had to attack on several fronts at once.(1) The Cālukya thrusts were almost certainly three-fold; that through Banavāse being more powerful than those through the Pāndya and Cōla nāds, as the first was more valuable than the two remaining areas put together. At the same time, towards the end of 1142, inroads from the Nilgiris caused the Hoysala to send an expedition to Kulkalla in reprisal. It was apparently successful.(2)

The forces with which the Hoysala had to contend in the north were of the usual composite character, the hard core being supplied by the dynasties that had already reasons for harming the Hoysala. They brought with them companies of Muslim mercenaries, one of the earliest cases of their employment by Hindu states.(3)

(1) E.C.VI Mudgere 34(cll42), K.T. only, tells of a battle being waged against Śrīkala-nād while Nārasimha who was the Hoysana was ruling the kingdom of the earth. The record is at Banakāl,
As incidents in the struggle, we hear first, in October 1143, of the Hoysala raising a great army against Malli-
dēva Kadamba, who, stripped for the time being of his heredit-
ary estates, ruled several small portions of Hayve 500 and
other parts of the north-west including Māhalige, the modern
Malāli, which is situated as far to the south and west of the
area once safely within the Hoysala grasp as twenty-three miles
in that direction from Belagāvi. As was the campaign as a
whole, that particular attack upon Māhalige was a failure. (1)
The death of a certain Māsanāya, who can hardly have been the
famous Kadamba general of that name, in November 1143, referred
to in a record at Siragōḍu must likewise have occurred during
this campaign, Māsanāya, like his namesake, having been on the
side of the allies. (2) Cāvundarasa Sinda, one of the Cālukya's
instruments, was so satisfied with his success against the
Hoysala at this time, that he doubtless accepted with much
complacency the encomium of which he have a trace from: a record
of several years later.

(1) E.C.VIII Sagar 58(1143): it commences with the titles of
When the army of the Hoysala king who had prepared himself for battle met him bravely with a united front, King Cāvunḍa, the moon to the ocean of the Sinda family stepping forth valiantly rushed through, burning like the sun, killed its general (or 'master') and those that had opposed him and, moreover, took a group of fierce and rutting elephants."(1)

The Pāṇḍya, for his part, obtained, as it were, a new lease of life from his master's good fortune. Pāṇḍya inscriptions hence-forward appear in some numbers and the ancient kingdom appears to have enjoyed a revival. An inscription at Gāṅganarasi, in the Pāṇḍya nāḍ, states that Jagadekamalla attacked the Hoysala and increased his fame by capturing his elephant. His subordinate is said to be Vīra-Pāṇḍya-dēva.(2)

Jagadekamalla followed by those of Malli-dēvarasa, and then records the death in battle of a hero after putting to flight a great force of all arms, Hoysala maḥā-dand āgi Māhalīgeg ettid allī.

Page 178 n.(2) W.E.I f.481b(1145).

(1) E.I.xx 12(1167) at Bēncamaṭṭi in Dharwar district. In the third line of the quotation the text reads matta-ēbha, which is impossible according to the metre.

(2) E.C.XI Davangere 85(1145): it states also that he enslaved the Cōla (=Cōla). This improbable statement can not be verified here.
The same Vīra-Pāṇḍya was ruling in Uccāṇgi at the beginning of January 1143, being recognized in that year at Ānēkoḍa and Ambali.(1) A Pāṇḍya inscription, dated six years later, at Astēpanahalli near the southernmost limit of the Pāṇḍya nāḍ shows that the ruler of Uccāṇgi extended his sway during this period to the limits of his capacity. On the other hand, an inscription of an independent nēyaka at Holalkēre of the year 1154 shows that neither Pāṇḍya power, not that of the Cālukya vicariously, extended any considerable distance south or east of Astēpanahalli.(2)

In his Sāṃgītacūdāmaṇi Jagadēkamalla himself mentions among his birudas the title 'pracuratara-Haīṣalalakṣmī-harana', 'snatcher of the very abundant wealth of the Hoysala'(3), so that it is clear that a defeat was inflicted on the latter, at least from the emperor's point of view; and when Nārasimha is given the title "lion to the row of sons of the lord of the earth Sōmēśvara" it signifies no more than that Jagadēkamalla and his brother Trailōkyamalla were, as is quite likely, forced to accept occasional reverses at the Hoysala's hands.(4) However, we get the impression from the general bulk of Nārasimha's inscriptions that a qualified kind of dependence was forced upon Nārasimha, and that at one blow the emperor had deprived that ruler of the special advantages in point of income, prestige and influence that his father had laboured for many years to secure.

(2) E.C.VII Channagiri 39(1148); E.C.XI Holalkēre 1(1154); Pratāpa Nēyaka, a single instance. (3) K.Madhava Krishna Sharma, I.H.Q., xx p.87-8. (4) E.C.V Hole-narsipur 17(1154); Sōmēśvara-bhūmiśvara-putra-srēṇi-sīgha.
It has been noticed already that no very clear indication of the status of the Hoysala can be drawn from the occasional occurrence at the commencement of his inscriptions of the style and titles of the emperor; on the other hand it is a phenomenon usually worthy of comment, and seldom fails to receive some explanation. In and after 1145 Nārasimha's inscriptions bear this heading more frequently than was the custom in his father's reign, while the King himself often bore the title Jagadēkamalla, not, as in his early youth, as a sign of power, but as a sign of humility towards the emperor whose title he had adopted. There is of course nothing very disgraceful in such conduct: the ruler who had so successfully integrated the forces of the empire, who had imposed his authority so uniformly upon his turbulent and mutually discordant subordinates, that he was able to crush the finest armies of the Hoysala, besides achieving exacting successes in distant parts of the peninsula, such a ruler was a man to whom even the proudest mahā-maṇḍalēśvara might think it honourable to defer to the extent of adopting his title. The contemporary custom supported the maxim that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. (1)

Defeat in the north brought, as usual, its train of troubles in the south. Here, however, the Hoysala was, by reason of the proximity of the source of anxiety, and the ease with which the available forces could be concentrated, enabled to achieve a substantial, if somewhat negative success.

(1) Instances of the use of the title Jagadēkamalla are found in M.A.R. 1914-5, para. 79(1145); M.A.R. 1915-6, para. 87 or E.C.VI Chikmagalur 43(1145); E.C.X Kolar 100a(1153); E.C.Y Hassan 57(1155); E.C.X Kolar 169(1155); E.C.III Serinca Datam 62
The Caṅgalva ruler appears to have provoked the government at Dōrasamudra by extensive manoeuvres in the southern districts of the Hoysala nād which were immediately adjoin- ing his own hilly and almost inaccessible domain. His cattle raid on a particular village is recorded. (1) He must have been well satisfied with his achievements, and may have celebrated his return to political prominence by raising an army in that locality with the proceeds of his plundering expeditions, re­ cruiting his numbers from the many discharged soldiers that must have been available at the time. The later half of the year Krōdhana, that is, from about August to October 1145, can be chosen as the most probable period in which Nārasimha's forces attacked the Caṅgalva. We are told by the inscription on a viragal that Balla-veggaḍe and Bōki-haḍavala fought against the Caṅgalva, both being officers of Vīra-Gaṅga-vikr- ēnta-Cōla-vijaya-Noṇamba-sāhasa-Gadamba-Tribhuvanamalla-Viṣṇu- vardhana who was the Hoysala-dēva, in other words Nārasimha. The battle involved foot, horse, and elephants. (2) The same campaign is referred to in two later records. One tells us that Gōvi-dēva of Huliyēru, a famous member of a noteworthy family, incised wounds on the face of the Caṅgalva's elephant that resembled the characters of an inscription recording his valour. (3) The other states that Malla, son of Sitagara-ganda,
another prominent figure in the political life of the twelfth century, captured two elephants in the fierce war with the Caṅgālva, and without hesitation charged on his horse, pierced Caṅgālva's proud elephant and captured his umbrella. (1) Bōki, the Hoysala general was not forgotten: he is mentioned as a famous general who subdued Tulu, Caṅga, Bayal-nāḍ, the Koṅga dominions and the Cōla country to the hero Nārasimha, a statement that shows how widespread the disaffection had become, and again as the destroyer and plunderer of the Koṅgas. He is called in these records Bōkimayya. (2) The general result is reflected in this verse found in a contemporary record:

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

Himadim Setuvaram tolald u nelanam niskantaṇaṁ māduva-līlī mahāgrājīyoḷ ānt idirccid adatīṁ Caṅgālvanāṁ konduvā ā- / samad ṇēbhāvaliyoṁ haya-pratatiyoṁ cambongalāṁ nūtna-ra-

"While he was clearing the earth of thorns (i.e. enemies), having wandered about from the Himālaya to Rām-ēśvaram, Nṛsimha the king withstood in a mighty battle and slew valorously the Caṅgālva, and taking that row of rutting elephants, a multitude of horses, golden articles and uncut jems, he supported the earth upon the pillar of his arm". (3)

(1) E.C.VI Kadur 36(1203).
(2) E.C.V Hassan 69(1155) and E.C.XII Kunigal 1(1157).
(3) E.C.IV Nagamangala 76(1145). The text actually reads in the fourth line of the verse eleyam, here corrected to iḷeyam (earth). Eleyam is an attractive reading, meaning "lad". If one were to take nūtna-ratnamum and the rest as the object of tāldidam, a very tolerable sense would be obtained; but the construction would be too clumsy.
We are now in a position to notice a change in the tone of the bombast which faces us in the reign of Narasimha. In common with the nostalgic references to the territories ruled by Vishnuvardhana, with which so many of Narasimha's inscriptions are embellished, these effusions ring with a sad bewildered kind of hollowness. The pandits knew that their ruler was hardly managing to maintain the Hoysala kingdom intact and free, yet they spoke always of victory, conquest and success, as if to shame Fortune into bringing back the prosperous days of the great Vishnuvardhana.

At about the same time that Narasimha sent his armies to reduce the southern districts, turmoil broke out not ten miles north of his capital. Some raiders from the west stole cattle and a fight took place at Uppavalli. This then seems to have developed into something more serious, for Kundūr and Mittūr were attacked, and two heggades lost their lives besides many persons of lesser importance. The general activity seems to have been so severe that, for perhaps one of the only two occasions since the death of his father, Narasimha was forced to leave Dūrasamudra. He moved for a while to Kondāla in the modern Hunsur tāluqa, where he was safe from the disturbances near his capital as well as nearer to the operations against the Gaṅgālva and others, operations then proceeding in Narasimha's favour.

The years that followed were punctuated by lawlessness. The weakness and preoccupation of the government are

(1) M.A.R. 1915-6, para. 87, E.C.VI Chikmagalur 43 revised; E.C.V Hassan 37(1145); and ibid. 109(1145).
(2) M.A.R. 1914-5, para. 79. The editor wrongly thinks Kondāla to have been Kodāla in the Krishnarajapet tāluqa.
thereby clearly demonstrated. Two cases at least of cow- 
harrying occurred in 1146 and 1147. (1) In 1147 or 1148 Gōvi-
dēva, the sāmanta of Huliyaṛu was engaged in fighting. His 
enemy is unknown, but the Pāṇḍya of Uccaṅgi or the Cōla of 
Mīḍugal are equally probable choices. (2) It may well have 
been the latter, for an expedition was sent against him in 
August 1149: it appears to have overcome some opposition in 
region of Maddalūr, at the southern edge of the Cōla dominions. 
(3) By then Nārasimha claimed not only to have campaigned 
successfully against the Caṅgāḷva but to be the conqueror of 
Kuḍagu, that is, Coorg, the greater part of the eastern dist-
tricts of which was in Caṅgāḷva hands, and also Kōḷāhala, 
Purṛūr and Vāṇibhadra, all three places as yet unidentified. 
Purṛūr may in fact be the modern Puttūr in Acṭūr tāluqa of 
Salem district, in which case the three conquests may have been 
in the Koṅgu region, in the broadest sense of the term, and 
we may support by these claims the suggestion that the disturb-
ances and invasions in the south were of wide extent and not 
quickly suppressed or avenged. (4) Further activity in the 
south and east followed later.

For the space of about six years we know nothing 
of Hoysaḷa political life. Nārasimha seems to have spent the 
time in the double process of growing up himself, and organizing 
the internal resources of his troubled kingdom. When the period 
of silence, and, we may guess, repose came to an end, Nārasimha, 
now in his twenty-first year, felt sufficiently strong to attack 
his north-western neighbours. Since 1152 a certain Mahādēvarasa

(1) E.g.E.C.V Hassan 108(1147) at Nīṭṭūr.  
(2) E.C.VI Kadur 34(1148) at Muttūr.  
(3) E.C.XII Sira 44(1149).  
(4) M.A.R. 1911-2, para. 35(1148).
had been ruling the Banavāse 12,000 and Huligere 300 in the name of the emperor Trailokyamalla. In that year, 1152, disturbances had been proceeding in the southern parts of the dominions of Ekkalarasa, the Ganga ruler of Uddhare, who owed the prosperity of his family to the intervention of Viṣṇuvardhana many years before. Ekkalarasa was clearly a ruler of a turbulent and ambitious character and had many enemies. (1)

In 1154 Bamarasa, the ruler of Gutti, otherwise Candragutti, raided Naduhalli, which was only five miles south-east of Gutti, though probably within Ekkala's dominions. (2) We may presume from the events of the next few years that the Sāntaras who were in a position to profit from hostilities among their northern neighbours, took interest in these proceedings and communicated with the Hoysala. In 1154, then, Nārasiṃha marched against Caṭṭaya. Caṭṭaya must have been the official of that name who was employed on the part of the Cālukya under Mahādēvarasa. (3) The result of the expedition was that Nārasiṃha reached Banavāse, stayed there a while and withdrew. (4). After this he was 'anointed to the vira-patta', or received a special decoration for bravery, and adopted the title to which reference has already been made, "lion to the row of sons of king Sōmeśvara". (5) The war in question is said in that record to have been against Ahumalla, that is Āhavamalla, which, like Vallabha, appears to have become a common way of referring to the emperor for the time being.

(1) EC.VIII Sorab 525(1152).
(2) E.C.VIII Sorab 54(1154).
(3) E.C.V Belur 168(1154). See E.C.VIII Sorab 570(Jan.1154) also ibid.438(Feb.?1154), K.T. only mentioning "Hoysala's flag".
(4) E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 32(1154).
Narāsimha’s withdrawal from the north may have been accelerated by further trouble in the east and south. It seems very likely that as soon as Narāsimha started for Banavāse, a Cōla invasion occurred in the east. In 1155 Bokimayya was encamped at Naṅgili, having performed much of value to his master’s cause. An inscription of Rājarāja-dēva Cōla is found at Kendaṭṭi, in the modern Kolar tālūqa, dated in his 7th year, which must be 1153-4, and not 1139 as Rice conjectured. (1) Bokimayya thus had plenty to occupy him in the Naṅgili region, but it seems that he went further and added more to his already luxuriant laurels. We hear that he suddenly routed a king named Śaṅkha and also Panarjoṭṭa; he defeated with great energy the rulers of Kāṇci and Koṅgu, and obtained superior elephants. (2) Not that the trouble subsided so soon: in 1156 Tippūr in the modern Bangalore district was attacked by a certain Muraśādi, and in the same year a Vāmaṇa Mallana invaded Koṅgu, though it is not quite certain whether or not he was a Hoysala officer. Much fighting ensued, however. (3) Narāsimha himself may well have gone to the eastern front, because we hear that he visited Śravaṇa Belgola in 1159 "after his victorious expedition." (4)

By this time the Kalacuri Bijjaḷa, or Bijjaṇa, who had held office under Trailōkyamalla, had usurped the Cālukya throne; and, in keeping with the novelty of his position, he had determined to bring all the southern manḍalēśvaras and

(1) E.C.X Kolar 75(1153-4). (2) E.C.X Bowringpet 9(1155) at Bētamangala. Rice wrongly has Cokimayya. The "ruler of Kāṇci" need not have been the Cōla viceroy at Kāṇci, but any Pallava prince who bore the title Kāṇcipuravarādhiśvara.
(3) E.C.IX Bangalore 112(1156); M.A.R.1930,35(August 1156) at Gopālapura. (4) E.C.II 349(1159).
sāmantas into allegiance to himself, not only to strengthen his own position against the Cālukya, who was still alive, but also to revive the former, more efficient, constitution of the empire he had obtained. The Hoysala naturally attracted his early attention, but it was after rather more than three years of power that Bijjala sent an expedition against Dōrasamudra. An inscription of the year 1162 speaks of a certain Bambamana-Dāvana-danānayaka as having marched against the capital, where the inscription is situated; Yādava-nāyaka fought by order of Nārasimha and fell. Another of the same year at Hosaholalu states that when, at the instance of Bijjala, Besada and Daviraga came to fight with the mahā-maṇḍalēśvara Nārasīṅgha-dēva, Lakumaya-nāyaka marched against them and in a battle that followed a certain Bīmeya-nāyaka pursued the cavalry. (2) The forces that Nārasimha had in the Sāntara country and which might have been expected to come to the rescue of the Hoysala nād proper, were set upon by Barmarasa-danānayaka, the ruler of the Banavāse nād, and an officer of Bijjala, who thus claimed to have driven the Poysala army into the Tunga-bhadra. (3) Nārasimha's success was, positively, so little that space in records could still be taken up by references to his "victory" at the age of six, while, in the very year that his losses at the hands of the Kalacuri were added to the lists of

---

(1) M.A.R. 1908 para.41b(1162). It is possible that Bijjala had attacked Nārasimha in 1160, for an inscription describing an incident in a battle between the two in the year Vikrama, although bearing the Saka date 1142 may in fact be of 1160(Saka 1082) as the titles and method of referring to Nārasimha suit Nārasimha I better than the second of that name. As however Bijjana is not identified more particularly, and as E.C.VIII Sorab 256(1218) mentions a vīra-Bijjana-dēva, there appear some grounds for supposing that after all, despite the incon-
failures at the hands of the Cālukyas, he boasts of taking for his own the Cōla country, overcoming the Mālava, agreeing with the Gurjara, assenting to the Vaṅga, and driving away Koṅga and Kaliṅga. We can pronounce no suitable judgement on these claims: whether in fact any military or diplomatic operations underlie them it is hardly possible to say. The statements that he was much greater than his father, in fact quintuple the celebrated hero Viṣṇu, and that he subjected Dravila, Magadha, Paṅcāla, Nēpāla and Lāla, are absurd.(1)

On the contrary, Nārasimha's government missed some splendid opportunities. The state of affairs in the north-western districts was very favourable to Hoysala ambitions. The year 1162 was punctuated by outbursts of violence. The emperor Trailōkyamalla, or Tailapa, was far from being dormant, and his agents were vigorously striving to embroil the manḍalēśvaras and sāmantas with the usurping Kalacuri, and where that failed, with one another. In 1161 the Cālukya himself had been at Banavāse.(2) At the beginning of 1162 Bijjaḷa was at Belagāvi, doubtless trying to undo Tailapa's work in that area.(3) That he had recently defeated the Pāṇḍya is seen from his granting villages in the Pāṇḍya-nāḍ.(4)

gruity of the titles, 1220 may be the correct date for this inscription (E.C.V Belur 113).
Page 188 n.(2) M.A.R. 1914-5,para.79 which is E.C.IV Krishnarajapēt 4 revised.

(1) E.C.IV Hunsur 137(1162).
(2) W.E.I f.543(1161).
(3) E.C.VII Shikarpur 102(1162).
In April his minister Sêyavamarasa began to besiege Gutti. (1) In June Bijjala attacked Têgarate, and in the meanwhile his victim Tailapa Sàntara fought against Pândyarasa, who may well have been the Ucçangi ruler, now a supporter of the Kalacuri. (2) Troubles was brewing in the Sàntalige nàd itself. A branch of the Sàntara family had commenced to rule on its own account from the important town of Hosagunda, and a certain Bîrarasa, ancestor of a tenacious line, made it plain that the Sàntara dynasty had from thence forward more than one head. (3) In the next year the canâvas of the political scene is crowded with characters. Bommaya-dannayaka, obviously the same as the Bammaramasa, brother-in-law of Kasapayya, who had defeated a Hoysala force in the previous year, was ruling Hângal and Banavâse for Bijjala. (4) Càvunda Sinda ruled the Kîsukâd 70, Bâgadage 70, and Kèlavàdi 300, all north of the Tûngabhadra. (5) Kîrti-dêva, a Kadamba ruler in Banavâse nàd, who may in fact have been in charge of Gutti, resisted Kalacuri blandishments and remained loyal to his own independence if not to the Càl-ukya. (6) A certain Jagadêva of the Sàntara family, with undefined relationships with Tailapa or Bîrarasa, exercised some

---

(1) E.C.VIII Sorab 568(1162).
(2) E.C.VII Shikarpur 56(1162) at Barûru, about 3½ miles north of Têgarate. M.A.R. 1923, 64(1162), at Hâluuguâde, Nagar Taluqa.
(3) M.A.R. 1923, 64(1162): Vîra-Bîrarasa ruled Mèlu-Sàntalige & the agrahâra.
(4) E.C.XI Davangere 42, M.INS.33, P.S.O.C.I.121(1162), also E.C.VII Shikarpur 102(1162).
(6) A Bammaramasa, minister of Kîrti-dêva, seems to have ruled Gutti in 1158 and later. Kumâra-Kîrti-dêva is mentioned in 1159: E.C.VIII Sorab 416. He appears to be ruling Gutti in E.C.VIII Sagar 114(1165).
ruling functions still in the Sāntalige 1,000.(1) Moreover, the ruler of the little Gaṅga principality of Uddhāre, a place of strategic importance far outweighing the slightness of its territorial possessions, was under specific obligations neither to the Kaḷacuri nor to the Cāḷukya, but to the Hoysala. In 1163 Ekkalarasa Gaṅga is distinctly described as the Hoysala mandalika.(2) It is, therefore, clear that in these years the Hoysala Nārasimha had a sound diplomatic footing in the very centre of the affairs of this valuable north-western country, and it is very remarkable that no satisfactory use was made of the advantage. In March Sōvavarma, who must be the Sōyavamarasa mentioned above, together with other officers, was ordered by Bijjala to attack Gutti, and they besieged it. (3) Jagadēva was apparently with this army, and was stationed between Uddhāre and Gutti. In April Ekkalarasa, doubtless in league with the Kadamba in Gutti, attacked Jagadēva near Kūḷuganūr.(4) The siege must have been abandoned, for in August or September we find Kīrti-dēva, accompanied by his minister Bammanna (i.e. the officer otherwise known as Bammaraṇa, to be distinguished from the Kaḷacuri viceroy of that name), together with Ekkalarasa, setting upon Jagadēva. (5) This operation must have concluded soon to their satisfaction, for by October Ekkala was free to engage in a raid further north, at Belagali, five miles north of Banavāse.(6) In 1164, however,

(1) E.C.VIII Sagar 91-93(1160).
(2) E.C.VIII Soraḥ 193(?1163): the word Hoysaṇa occurs thrice in this fragmentary record.
(3) E.C.VIII Soraḥ 287(1163).
(4) E.C.VIII Soraḥ 193(?1163).
(5) E.C.VIII Soraḥ 177(1163).
(6) E.C.VIII Soraḥ 449(1163).
Vijaya-Pāṇḍya of Uccaṅgi recognized the Kaḷacurā, and moreover had as his subordinate the important Sinda ruler at Harihar, Tāvara-dēva, whose territory was of very great strategic as well as commercial importance. (1) In the same year Vīra-Sāntara recognized Bījjaḷa, and the outlook became very unfavourable for the Hoysala. All movement to the north seemed hedged in by hostile powers. But still there were opportunities to be missed, and Nārasimha did not fail to miss them. The successes of his partisan Ekkala Gaṅga were supported by confusion amongst the Sāntaras. In April 1164 the Sāntara Siṅga-dēva of Hombucca together with the authorities of Banavāse nāḍ launched a double attack upon Bīrarasa of Hosagunda. Then Jagadēvarasa, "the Ālva king below the ghats", apparently not identical with the Jagadēva mentioned above, raided the districts in the Sāntalige nāḍ, and an army hostile to the Sāntara marched upon Andhāsura, which may or may not have been within the Hosagunda family's domain. (2) The confusion continued at the same pace in 1165. Here again Nārasimha allowed his opportunities to slip past. Bīrarasa was sufficiently unencumbered by the malice of his competitors to be able to send a raiding expedition to a village seven miles west of Hosagunda. (3) In March Jagadēvarasa, together with several of, we may presume, Bījjaḷa's dannāyakas, pitched their camp at Andhāsura. Then a coalition comprising the Gutta chief

(2) M.A.R. 1930, 67(1164) at Bairāpura.
(3) E.C.VIII Sagar 112(1165).
Vikramāditya, whose own territories lay north of those of the Sinda of Harihar, in the region of Guttavolalu on the western bank of the Tungabhadra, and who had clearly not succumbed to the Kaḷacuri intrigues as had his close associates whether Pāṇḍya or Sinda, together with Sōyi-dēva of Bandanike, Ekkala of Uddhare and the ruler of Gutti, who was almost certainly Kīrti-dēva, joined with Bīrarasa, who had returned from his other activities to Hosagunda, and engaged in a body with the Sāntara-Kaḷacuri force at Andhāsura. They were apparently successful, and the imperial officers were defeated. (1) In May 1165 Ekkala was raiding in the immediate vicinity of Kaḷacuri-held Banavāse, and to the north of that town. In each case we hear him called "the Hoysala mandalika", yet there is no proof that Nārasiṃha sent him men or munitions or even money, though the latter is not unlikely. (2) In October Daśaratha-daññāyaka and Kāḷarasa, who were probably Sāntara officers, raided Hosavalli, six miles west of Belagāvi and three miles south of Uddhare. (3) But the coalition which had aimed at the prevention of the Kaḷacuri power extending further southwards appears not only to have succeeded in that object, but also in the embarrassment of those officials who ruled in Bijjala's name already.

The process continued into 1167, but, from first to last, the Hoysala took no active part in operations that could have turned out very largely to his advantage. Domestic con-

(1) E.C.VIII Sagar 114(1165). Rice wrongly read Sattavōdili for Guttavolalu.
(2) E.C.VIII Sorab 372 &373(1165), 368(?1165)(K.T. only).
(3) E.C.VIII Sorab 6(1165). They plundered "according to the custom of their class."
siderations appear to have eclipsed the dream of empire. Meanwhile Ekkala bravely carried on. In April 1166 Bammarasa of Gutti and BiRARASA of Hosagunda besieged GiṃnaLAGUNDI, a place as yet unidentified. The fort was held by Bijjala's men, but Ekkala, who accompanied the allies, succeeded in drawing them out by a trick.\(^{(1)}\)

The death of Bijjala in 1167 seems to have altered the situation considerably. The improved chances of a restoration of the Cālukya family, and the accession of a less active man to the government at Kalyāna, brought less apprehension than relief to the maṇḍalikas of the north-west. In November a certain Ciṅna-Deva attacked Kīrti-Deva and Cikka Bommana, who was probably an officer in the forces of the coalition, but with this last flicker the fires of discord appear to have died down, and a period of comparative quiet ensued until 1171. In this over-disputed area the Kalacuri seems to have forgone his chances of expansion.\(^{(2)}\)

Hoysala activity during this period was remarkably slight. Disturbances of an undefined nature broke out in the north-western portion of the Hoysala nāḍ in 1164, probably on account of the much more violent upheavals further north.\(^{(3)}\) But neither this, nor the threat of invasions and insurrections in the south and east, accounts fully for the strangely passive attitude of the Hoysala government. Narasimha himself was by 1164 thirty-one years of age, and therefore probably in a position to exercise a tight control over each department: his

\(^{(1)}\) M.A.R. 1928, 81 & W.E.II ff. 30b-31a(1166): Hoysara-mandalika balvimge hōgad iral upāyadhīm horavandisida samayadole, etc. The editor of M.A.R. 1928 mistranslated this, "The Hoysala mandalika not resorting to force of arms, drove out the besiegers by some stratagem", giving an entirely wrong impression of the facts.
upbringing being of a kind most likely to encourage an inflated sense of his own importance, he may well have been something of a tyrant, whose restricted views and cautious habits may have exercised a constraining and damping effect upon the enthusiasms and projects of his followers. But there is evidence that Nārasimha was in no condition to exercise even that control which we have here suggested as being an unhealthy one.

His eldest son, Ballāla, was born to Mahādēvi, Nārasimha's chief queen, in or about the year 1150. From the titles which he subsequently adopted it appears that while still in his adolescence he had had some experience of action against the Kalacuri. (1) If he was too young to criticise his father's conduct of affairs, he was old enough to be stirred by the tales he would hear of his grandfather, tales which, however exaggerated, could not fail to portray a great man, and an ancestor of whom he might be justly proud. He was old enough to realize that a forward policy was the only possible policy for the type of state that his future kingdom was destined to become, and had almost become already.

His own entrance into public life as an administrator occurred when he was about fourteen. In 1164 he exercised authority in his own name, but clearly under his father's control.

---

Page 194 n. (2) E.C.VIII Sorab 29(?1167) wrongly dated by Rice 1227.  Page 194 n.(3) M.A.R. 1909-10 para. 77(c1164) at Jinaga, and E.C.XII Tiptur 32(1164) at Tāṇḍaga.

(1) Two inscriptions purporting to be of the year 1158 must be relegated to the year 1218. E.C.V Arsikere 184 is dated Saka 1080 Bahudhānya etc., but as the king is given the titles sri-prthvi-vallabha etc. the date has plainly been misread. E.C.V Channarayapatna 211a is to be attributed to 1218 for the same reason, while the record has a sequel in 211b of ?1222.

(2) E.C.IV Nagamangala 30(1164).
In 1165 we find him "ruling the kingdom" with the title Kumāra, as would be expected in the case of a Prince of his age. \((1)\) In 1167 he is mentioned in an inscription, and indeed in that year he exercised for a period a regency together with Mahādēvi. \((2)\) It is not impossible that this regency was of a local and temporary kind, or that the two were deputed to the joint administration of certain particular districts. In fact an attack in the year 1166 on the northern bastions of the Hoysala kingdom, till then protected from Kalacuri cupidity, may well have resulted in Nārasimha being forced to delegate powers to his family. Īśvara-dēvarasa of the southern Sinda family invaded Arakere nāḍ from the west, entered Malevūr, three miles north of Honnāli, on the banks of the Tungabhadra, and took Haṅnisige, which must have been near-by. In this fighting, probably, a certain Bamma-gauda of Kisugola obtained a reward for fighting against Lakha, who is otherwise not heard of. \((3)\) But the fact appears to be this, that Nārasimha was through sickness, or some other cause, incapacitated, so as to be unable to conduct the government in person. For the regency of Ballāla, which commenced late in 1167 was continued in 1168. Though a boy of perhaps no more than 17 years, he enjoyed a large number of high-sounding titles. Such were the distinctive titles asahāya-sūra,"hero without a companion"; ēkāṅga-vīra,"warrior, or hero, (even) with a single limb"; niṣlanka-pratāpa,"of

\((1)\) E.C.V Channarayapatna 210(1165) at Bidare.
\((3)\) E.C.VII Honnali 98(1166) at Singatigere, 3 miles E.S.E. of Mallūr. E.C.VI Mudgere 7(?1167) at Bommanahalli.
\((4)\) Even if he had one arm tied behind his back: but cf. the other meanings of ēkāṅga - Mars and Viṣṇu.
unshaken prowess"; rāṇa-raṅga-dhīra,"bold on the field of battle", not to quote others of similar tenor but less common.

(1) In an inscription of 1168 he is called Viṣṇuvardhana Kumāra-vīra-Ballāla-Hoysala-dēva, son of Viṣṇuvardhana Nārasimha-dēva, son of Viṣṇuvardhana Bīṭṭi-dēva. In the same record we meet his younger brother Mahadeva.(2) Again, in the spring of 1169, Ballāla was ruling with the titles "wrestler with hill-forts" and "the one who succeeds even on a Saturday (an inauspicious day)", Giridurgamalla and Śanivāra-siddhi being titles first introduced into the Hoysala prāṣasti by Ballāla II, or Vīra-Ballāla as he may be known, won or borrowed by him from the Kalacuri Bijjala, who had used them for a number of years previously. (3)

Soon Nārasimha resumed control, while in 1169 one of his inscriptions reveals a curious perversity: the titles of the Cālukya Bhūvallabha appear. Bhūvallabha was a general term such as might apply to any Cālukya emperor, but in 1169 the Cālukya's cause was at a very low ebb. Perhaps the reason was that the Huliyāru family, that commissioned the inscription, had a sentimental regard for their ancestral connection with that house, so that the obedience of Nārasimha I was not in fact owed to a member of an almost impotent dynasty.(4)

(1) E.C.V Arasikere 1(1168).
(2) E.C.V Channarayapatna 184(?1168). RICE dated this 1208, the date given being Saka 1777(aged) and Vibhava; the record almost certainly belongs to Saka 1091 Virūdh, as internal evidence demands it.
(3) RICE, e.g. in M.A.R. 1900 para. 7, followed by others, misled by inscriptions after Ballāla II's capture of Uccaṅgi, ascribed the assumption of these titles to that famous event. Bijjala used the titles from 1156 (E.C.VII Shikarpur 104, of 1156); Ballāla first used them in 1169, as far as we know: E.C.XII Tiptur 91(1169). (4) M.A.R. 1925, 49(1169); ibid.1909-10 para. 76(1169).
The next three years saw sporadic fighting in various quarters of the Hoysala nāḍ. The weakness of the government at Dūrasamudra was not concealed from neighbouring princeulings by the pretentious and vapid claims. In 1169 they learned that before king Nārasimha trembled the Maleyālas, Koṅgu, Vaṅga's king, the Tuluvas, Pāṇḍya, Paundra and Āndhra kings, Cōla, Lāla, Yāvana, and Śaka, as well as the kings of Śimhala and the seven islands in the midst of the sea. (1) No similar terrors appeared to assail petty rulers of whom we hardly know their very names. In 1169 there were again disturbances in the eastern districts (2); in 1170 and 1171 there was military activity in the modern Bangalore district. An official called Nārasīṅga-Poysaḷa-Kiḷalādiraya-Kā(?read Va)coi-deśvar marched against Cendapādi from Peruvēdak-kōṭṭai in Kiḷalai-nāḍ, which was his fief, in Irājēndra-Cōla-vala-nāḍ, and fell at Pondam. (3) About the same time fighting took place in the same area between a nāyaka and the ruler of Sigal-nāḍ at ...yāndigāpalli in that nāḍ. An inscription at Balepura states that Nārasimha destroyed Sigal-nāḍ, so that it appears that the insurrection was fairly serious. (4) Meanwhile trouble had broken out again in the south-west, for in 1171 the Hoysala was obliged to undertake a punitive expedition in that quarter also. Molateyabīdu, in Koṅgālva territory, was attacked. (5)

Again, in March 1172, fighting broke out in the north. A certain Dāna-veggaḍe of Mūṭta died when an elephant troop and an army of horse attacked Baluhada-koppa. We can not be sure who was the enemy, but it may well have been Ṣiva-rādēva Sinda.(1)

However, a pause must have supervened, for we learn from an undated record, which may be assigned with some confidence to the period 1171-2, that a certain Lakumayya, a mahāpradhāna, or minister, of Nārasimha, had freed the latter's kingdom from enemies and had established him. (2)

Amid all this confusion, in 1171, when he was about 21 years of age, Vīra-Ballāla seems to have enjoyed some heavy responsibilities.(3) Perhaps it was at this period that he began to feel active dissatisfaction with his father's misconduct of affairs. In June, and again in December 1172 Vīra-Ballāla was still exercising powers of government.(4)

Bad as in fact was the general condition of the Hoysala nāḍ, the political situation in the north-west once again suggested Hoysala action, action that might have the double effect of reducing lawlessness at home and reaping rich rewards abroad. After a pause of two years in which the only military activity had been a civil war between the brothers of Bīraraśa in the vicinity of Hosagunda,(5) fighting had again broken out in the Banavāse district. A guard-house held for the Kalacuri was attacked. The Twelve Manneyar, a nominal coalition of northwestern chiefs under imperial leadership, were in action.(6) In May 1172 fighting took place in

(1) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 81(1172) at Kasige. Perhaps E.C.VI Mudgere 6(?1172) at Nandipura may contain a reference to the same conflict; as also E.C.III Mandya 117(1172-3), K.T. only.
in which a man from "eastern Gutti" was concerned, and a man from the southern district of the Säntalige nāḍ died.(1) The "eastern" Gutti was probably not Gutti, the modern Candra-gutti, about which the inscriptions of the period say a very great deal, but on the other hand it is not clear that it was the famous Gutti(Gooty) in the Bellary district. Again, in September of that year a battle took place at the Gutti near Banavāse between the ruler there, Kṛti-dēva, and parties unknown, success being obtained apparently by the former. (2)

As far as we can gather, the once "Hoysala mandalika", the ruler of Uddhare, was dormant or exiled, for we last hear of him in 1166, and the next ruler, his son Tailapa, does not appear, epigraphically speaking, until 1176.

Ballāla must have been informed both of the past inefficient handling by his father of Hoysala affairs in the north-west, and of the opportunities to regain lost ground at the Kalacuri's expense. These considerations, together with those problems that faced the government solely on account of the previous weak control of nāyakas and sāmantas, seem to have inspired Vīra-Ballāla to an unusual course of action.

---

Page 199 n.(2) E.C.V Hassan 66(c1172) at Honnāvara: śrīman-mahāpradhānam heggade-Lakumayyaṃ Poysala-Nārasimha-dēvaṃ rājyaṃ nīśkanṭakam mādi pratiṣṭhāpīsi, etc. The record shows that Lakumayya claimed a high status on account of his services. He omits Nārasimha's titles.

Page 199 n.(3) E.C. IX Kankanhalli 86(?1171), which RICE dates ?1230, a date impossible on account of the subject-matter.

Page 199 n.(4) E.C.VII Shimoga 43(1172) at Hiriyūr; E.C.VI Tarikere 85(1172) at Mudigere.

Page 199 n.(5) E.C.VIII Sagar 116(1170) at Taṅgalavāḍī. The battle was at Alavalli. Page 199 n.(6) E.C.VIII Sorab 370(1172).

(1) E.C.VIII Tirthahalli 112(?1172), K.T. only, dated Śaka 114 Khara Jēṣṭa su 5 Ṛṣi. A cavalry battle took place.

(2) M.A.R. 1923,125(1172) at Māgaḍi, Soraṭ taluqa.
In March 1173 he was in Dōrasamudra as ruler, ruling jointly with his father, though, no doubt, nominally under Nārasimha's supervision, even if no document specified the fact. (1) By April he had found it impossible to bring his father to accept his views on the best way to manage the kingdom, and we learn that he left him, and went south-westwards towards the villages and forts of the hill-dwellers, the people, of all the now mixed population of the Hoysala nāḍ, who were most likely to appreciate and applaud Vīra-Ballāla's forward policy. A certain novus homo, by name Tantrapala Hemmādi, made capital out of this extraordinary situation, and recommended Vīra-Ballāla to make a tour of the hill-districts, in order to conduct not only a propaganda campaign, but a recruiting drive, with a view to raising an army for the discomfiture of the despised Kalacuri and his northern sycophants, and at the same time obliging Nārasimha to acquiesce in the bold schemes of his son. The tour passed off with no small éclat. The rulers on the fringe of the Hoysala nāḍ hastened to pay their respects. The Köṅgālva and Caṅgālva, who had reasons of their own for wishing to please the heir apparent, made their obeisances with the rest. (2)

(1) E.C.III Mysore 58(1173) dated Caitra suddha 5; E.C.V Belur 25(1173) at Belur shows Nārasimha ruling at Dōrasamudra on Caitra suddha 11.
(2) E.C.V Belur 86(1177): Ārīman-mahā-pradhānam Tantrapāla-Hemmādiyaṇṇam --- munne tann aldā sri <vīra> Ballāḷa-dēva tamma bappānim tolagī male-vāyī īralu samasta-maleya praje-gavundugalam Köṅgālva-Caṅgālvan-ādiyāda maleya mandalikarumān kāpisi tann aldānge sāmrajya-patṭamān kāṭṭisī pradhāna-padvīyan paḍādaṇ // "The great-minister Tantrapāla-Hemmādiyaṇṇa, when formerly his ruler <vīra> Ballāḷa-dēva, separating from his father, crossed the hill-country, made all the subjects (and) land-holders of the hills together with the Köṅgālva and Caṅgālva and other hill-mandalikas visit him, caused his ruler to have the diadem of empire bound on him, and achieved the rank
With a force of some size and, we may be sure, of good quality, he marched from the south towards Dōrasamudra. Nārasiṃha’s many loyal adherents attempted to impede Ballāla’s progress, but, before he had crossed the Hēmāvati, he was in action, and had destroyed the village of Hūvinahallī. (1)

In the month of May he arrived within striking distance of Dōrasamudra. The village of Gauḍagere in the modern Hassan tāluca suffered, (2) and the Talige-nāḍ and Koḍagi-nāḍs were invaded and plundered. (3)

Early in June 1173 Vīra-Ballāla entered Dōrasamudra in triumph, and made arrangements for his coronation. His father Nārasiṃha, now in his fortieth year, but probably aged beyond expectation by sickness and natural debility, was compelled to accept terms: these were that he should change places with his son, exercising powers in a subordinate and strictly subsidiary capacity. (4)

---

(1) M.A.R. 1912-3 para. 77 (1173) dated by the editor 1172. The fact that the warrior commemorated came from Kōlāla-nāḍ suggests that Nārasiṃha had difficulty in obtaining supporters near home.

(2) E.C.V Hassan 154, completed by M.A.R. 1926, 55 (1173): Hoysala Nārasiṃha-dēyaru Dōrasamudradā nelevidinalu sukha-saṅkathā-vinēḍadalu rājyaṃ geyyuttire Kūmāra Bāladaṇu viṣṇūratadalu Vijaya-saṅvatarsarada, etc. The expression is, “in the hostility of Prince Vīra-Ballāla.” The M.A.R. note is a little too free, and the text has viṣṇūratadalu (wrongly).

(3) M.A.R. 1932, 34 (1173): saka-varasa (?) 1176 (read 1096) Vijaya-saṅvatarsara-Mārgaśiśra su 12 Mam --- maha-maṇḍalēśvaram --- Nārasiṃha-Hoysala-dēyaru Dōrasamudradalur prthvi-rājyaṃ geyyuttiradalu Kumāra Ballāla-dēyana tamma-ayyange tappi bandu Talige-nāḍam Koḍagināḍam huku rājyake keḍadu Talige-nāḍu sā<vīra>bhūmīgam tele mādi (?) etc. It might appear from this that the invasion of Ballāla took place in November 1173: but the date refers not necessarily to the invasion itself, but either to the date of the death of the hero commemorated, or to the date of the erection of the stone.

(4) Sewell and Krishnaswami Aiyangar, in
Many of Narasimha's old retainers and subordinates disliked the change, for occasional grants show him as ruler even a few years after his forcible deposition.

Vīra-Ballāla, his obstacle removed, now began to proceed against the enemies of the state with all the vigour of a youth that had been pent up for long and was now suddenly released. His coronation was celebrated on the 21st of July 1173 with all the magnificence that the event deserved. The Hoysala country was awakened from stagnation, and the significance of the moment excused a lavish expenditure from an almost bankrupt treasury.¹

¹ H.I.S.I.p.116 say: "On January 15, 1170, the Hoysala king Nārasimha died. So says an epitaph at Billahalli in N. W. Mysore." But E.C.VII Channagiri 36 to which they refer consists merely of the following, omitting a fragment of no importance:...gūvundanu...<samasta-bhuva>nāsraya-śrī-pṛthvī-vallabha mahā-rājādhirājan Hoyisaga-pratāpa-cakravarttī vīra-Nārasimha-dēva-rājyāda Vīrodhi-sañvatsara Pugya ba<hu>la-dasami-Bhaśpativāra-dalu sura-līka-prāptar adaru. The significance is that in January 1230 in the reign of Nārasimha II a certain gūvunda and perhaps others died in battle. The interpretation of Sewell & Aiyangar is in defiance of the rules of grammar and the royal titles.

Nārasimha is stated to be ruling in E.C.V Belur 114(1173) at Dōrasamudra: he is mentioned likewise in E.C.IV Chamrajnagar 96(1174).

¹) Ballāla was recognized in Tumkur district even in June 1173: (E.C.XII Ğubbi 34c(1173)), and in July in Kadur district (E.C. VI KADUR 136(1173)). The date of the coronation is given by E.C.VI Kadur 4 and E.C.V Arsikere 71 as Vijaya,Śrāvana śuddha 11 Adivāra; E.C.V Hassan 71 gives it as Śrāvana śuddha 10 Ādvāra, while E.C.V Belur 118 gives Śrāvana śuddha 1 Sōmavāra, though 1 is probably a mistake for 11. M.A.R.1911-2,para. 87 merely gives Vijaya,Śrāvana.

V. Rangacharyya vol.Ilp.1216 says that Vīra-Nārasimha was succeeded by Vīra-Ballāla in 1188. Not only is the date wrong but Nārasimha I never held the title Vīra. The same scholar's Salem 109(?1159) is not likely to refer to Ballāla, whatever the true date may be, as Hosūr was not at the time within Hoysala territory.

A reflection of the fighting which brought Ballāla to the throne is found in E.C.V Arsikere 173(1173) dated in Nov-
Before passing to the next phase of the history of this dynasty it is convenient to consider what progress, if any, was made during Nārasimha's reign towards the object for which his father had given his whole life. Besides the defence against the Kalacuri attacks, and the counter-attack in the north-west, which have been described above, there are distinct signs that if no territorial aggrandisement took place, at least some consolidation occurred in the south and east, areas for the possession of which the great Viśnuvardhana was chiefly responsible, and which his son had barely managed to retain.

Again, it is interesting to note that Hoysala subjects took over and developed some land in the north, which must have been in Nārasimha's hands from his earliest years. The area itself was perhaps not more than four hundred square miles in extent, and lay to the north and west of Āsandi, on the eastern bank of the Tūṅgabhadra. We hear of activity at Mēvanakōte in 1163, Sīṅgatigere in 1166, Bidare in 1172 and Purale in the same year. But there was no really important town thereabouts: the area presumably in Hoysala occupation was wedged between districts ruled by Sinda and Pāṇḍya and no doubt had been neglected by both. The Sinda recognized Hoysala overlordship in the second year of Vīra-Ballāla,(2) but had probably flouted it during the ember-December, whereby a grant of land was made for a prāyas-cittā, perhaps on account of the killing of a Brahman. It may well be that the Erōyana rewarded by Ballāla II for successes against enemies in E.C.V Arsikere 136(1174) had fought against Nārasimha.

Ballāla made gifts to his supporters, on the occasion of his coronation, and to Vaispava, Śaiva and Jaina temples: E.C. VI Kadur 136(1173 - as are all the following); E.C.V Hassan 71; E.C.VI Kadur 4; E.C.V Arsikere 71; E.C.V Belur 118; M.A.R.1911-2 para. 87; and E.C.V Hassan 119.

(1) E.C.VII Honnali 87(1163); ibid.98(?1166); E.C.VII Shimoga 55
whole of Nārasimha's reign; drastic measures would be needed to bring down the Uccāṅgi family also, which had profited so highly from the decline in Hoysala fortunes. Moreover the best part of this area was occupied, albeit in the Hoysala's name, for its own advantage by a Gaṅga dynasty, with whom the Hoysalas had been in contact since Ereyāṅga's time. So that in fact the expansion was not only less real than apparent, but even less solid than either Viṣṇuvardhana's triumphs or Nārasimha's own modest achievements might have encouraged us to anticipate.

(1167); ibid. 43(?1172); and ibid. 64(1172). E.C.VII Channagiri 36 at Billahalli is of 1230 (see above p. 202 n. 4) and not 1170 as Rice thought.

Page 204 n. (2) E.C.VII Honnali 45(1175) at Belagutti.
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The reigns of Ballāla II (Vira-Ballāla I) and Nārāsimha II (Vira-Nārāsimha I).

Vīra-Ballāla's accession was auspicious in one respect in particular: a most encouraging conjunction of laudatory epithets. The young monarch's adoption of the titles "successful on a Saturday" and "wrestler with hill-forts" from the prāṣasti of Bījāla Kālacuri has already been mentioned. These became invariable parts of the Hoysala prāṣasti from 1173 until the last years of the dynasty's decay. (1) He carried forward several of the titles of his predecessors and added to them: "a submarine fire to the ocean of the Tuluva army, a wild fire to the fort which was his dāyāda (rival kinsmen, especially half-brothers), a thunderbolt to the mountain the Pāṇḍya family, plunderer of the Cōla camp, a Bhīma in war, Kāma of the Kali age, very inclined to the liberal delight of rejoicing the minds of all the tribe of panegyrist", and so on. (2)

Such indeed was the confidence and energy of the new

---

(1) E.C.V Belur 118(1173) at Dūrāsamudra: Śrīmaṇ-mahā-maṇḍalāś-varam Talakādu-Gangavādī-№oṇambavādī-Banavāse-Rānuṅgalu-gonḍa bhuja-bala-Vīra-Ganga Nisānkan asaḥāya-būra Malārāja-rāja malaparolu gaṇḍa ḫadana-praṇaṇḍa Śanivāra-siddhi Giridurgga-malla Cālad-aṅka-Rāma Viṣṇuvardhana-pratāpa-Hoysala-Vīra-Ballāla-dēvaru. The title caład-aṅka-Rāma Kittel translates "Rāma who is distinguished by firmness of character", referring to the Sabdānādīrāpaṇa (p.205), and a M.S.at Mūḍabidār(a very unsatisfactory type of reference). We could adopt this or a similar translation here were it not for the fact that in the 12th & 13th centuries Rāma was generally thought of as a warrior rather than in any other capacity: an interpretation such as "a Rāma in the swift battle" might not be unacceptable.

(2) E.g. E.C.V Channarayapatna 146(1173).
direction of Hoysala affairs, that Ballala was ready to commence the task of regaining his grandfather's lost prestige after slightly more than half the breathing space that his predecessors had allowed themselves after a disaster or sequence of setbacks. Four years were sufficient for Ballala to gather the strength of the kingdom for a general attack upon the outposts of the Kalacuri dominions.

Not that during that period, one of the most disturbed in Hoysala history, he had not sufficient troubles nearer home. Tiptur, about 38 miles east of the capital, was attacked by persons unknown in April 1174, doubtless an incident encouraged by the general lawlessness of the short civil war and the long period of weak government that had preceded it. (1) In October a battle of unknown magnitude took place at or near Halevagilu, 16 miles south of DoraSamudra. (2) In January 1175 two villages, also close to the capital, fought a battle over a disputed boundary. (3) Indeed, the unrest must have been violent, for there seems to be evidence that Ballala was away from the capital about the end of the year 1174, that is to say if he were not ill, for it is said in an inscription at Sannnahalli that Narasimha and Ballala-deva's queen Bammala-devi were ruling in DoraSamudra. (4) In April 1175 the Talige

(1) E.C.XII Tiptur 62(1174). (2) E.C.V Hassan 29(1174). It must be Halevagilu in the place indicated and not the Haluvagilu near the east bank of the Tuṅgabhadra in the Ucchāgī dominions. (3) Honnāvar and Niragunda: E.C.V Hassan 68(?1175). (4) That seems to be the best interpretation of E.C.V Channarayapatna 229(1174). Vīṣṇuvardhana-Hosala <Nāra>śiṅga-deva Ballālu-dēvārasi Bammala-dēvi DoraSamudra<da bīdina>lu sukha-samkathā-viṁśādānaṁ rājyam gevuttam ire. The suggestion that the words preceding Ballālu should be understood as a title without any implied copula is less probable.
nad 1,000 was attacked by parties unknown. Raids during this period were probably experienced from the direction of Huliyaru, for in September 1175 Vira-Ballala undertook a campaign in that region. He attacked Sibi, which is almost thirty miles east of Huliyaru, and must therefore have driven his enemies before him into that wild and sparsely populated region, where neither Hoysala nor C6la rule was then acknowledged.

That the Hoysala nad suffered a raid from the south during this period is suggested by an inscription at Malur in the present Channapatna taluqa, which records a grant of land to a man who replaced at the cost of 130 gadyanas the ornaments of the god Aprameya-perumal, which had been carried away from the place where they had been buried, during a raid by foreigners "in former days". Certainly in June 1175 Kolatuir, the modern Channarayapatna, had been destroyed, without any trace of the culprits. And while troubles assailed the government on the north-east and south-east, the Kongalva and Cangalva were making a feeble attempt, in fact their last, to shine among the competing interests. Kulottunga-C6la-Cangalva-deva is known to have ruled in May 1172; in 1174 he appears twice with the title Dvaravatipuravaradhi'svara, not in order to acknowledge Hoysala supremacy, for that he never did in his records, but to assume in common with the Hoysala a title reflecting his claims to Yadava ancestry.

(1) M.A.R.1927,36(1175).
(2) E.C.XII Sira 99(1175) at Borasandra, to the N.N.E.of Sibi.
(3) E.C.IX Channapatna 89(1176).
(4) E.C.IV Hunsur 113(1172); ibid.111 & 112(1174).
apparently the year 1177 is found at Nandigunda in Coorg. (1)

It is clear therefore that Ballāla incurred many embarrassments when he assumed the crown by force. He had to control the very forces by which he had come to power. One can hardly doubt but that his schemes for vindicating Hoysala military glory were accelerated by a desire to provide employment for troublesome members of his society. An inscription of 1177 shows how much difficulty was encountered, as well as the success he experienced in meeting it. His queen Bammala-dēvi must have been a stalwart companion; she is said to have plucked up the families of the hill chiefs by the root. (2)

At any rate, before his internal difficulties were entirely surmounted, with admirable suddenness and vigour, at the end of August or the beginning of September 1177, he launched a powerful attack upon Ucčaṅgi, and destroyed the prestige of the Pāṇḍya dynasty for ever. Not that the Pāṇḍya ceased to reign, to rule and to issue grants in his own name, but the remarkable resilience and recuperative powers of his family were at last exhausted. (3)

nere mū-lōkamum eyd ad eyde balasal Pakṣīsanum laṅgisal(sic) nereyam kūṭa-taṭakk enipp atula-bhāsvad-durggaman Pāṇḍyan al - 
karin Ucčaṅgiya-beṭṭan abramadin āt and annakall ādidam 
tirikall ādidan ēn ati-prabalanō Ballāla-bhūvallabham //

(1) E.C.I 33(?1177) dated Manmatha etc. 
(2) EC.V Arshikere 62(1177) at Halkūr. 
(3) Ballāla was in Dōrasamudra in August 1177: E.C.V Arshikere 62(Hēmaṅambi Bhādra su 13).
"How mighty was King Ballāla! He played at pebble-games, saying, "Dance!", with the hill of Uccāṇgi without effort, and with the Pāṇḍya delightfully, and with the fort gleaming immeasurably by reason of the slope to the summit, which is fit for the Lord of Birds (Garuda) only to surmount, and which truly extends so as to enclose the three worlds." (1)

A Sanskrit verse amplifies the picture:

agrē yasya ca vigrahēṇa ruṭitas tyaktācalō niścalam
Pāṇḍyas tāṇḍava-śālinām ca turagaṃ tyaktvā viyktāsanaḥ
bibhyat kāṇana-madhyam ētya vivaśas tatrāpi bhūyō bhayān
māyatya abhuta-vikramō vijayatē Ballāla-bhūpālakah

"King Ballāla of marvellous prowess is victorious - he, in battle with whom the Pāṇḍya was smitten, first of all; now he abandons his hill, leaves his prancing horse motionless, and forsakes his throne, and, making in terror for the midst of the forest, even there in his helplessness languishes in great fear." (2)

It appears that there were in Uccāṇgi at the time two members of the Pāṇḍya dynasty. The principal of them was Kāma-देवa, who was the Vijaya-Pāṇḍya-देवa whose inscriptions are found in this period; who ruled at the time of Ballāla's attack; and who continued to rule after Ballāla's departure. (3)

(1) E.C.V Channapatna 209(April 1178). E.C.VI Chikmagalur 21 (Dec. 1178) has this verse, but reads akkarin for alkarin; both are forms of alkarim, from alkar, "love" or "pleasure". RICE has in both cases misunderstood the sense. The Pāṇḍya king, his fort, and the hill itself follow one another into the air as if Ballāla were tossing one pebble while picking up another.
He was the Kāma-dēva who had suffered an attack from the Sinda ruler a few years before. But it appears that a relation of his, known as Odeya or Odeyarasa, was with him; it is clear that he was Kāma-dēva’s father, living in retirement, after a lifetime of obscurity under the rule of his uncle, that staunch enemy of the Hoysala, Vīra-Pāṇḍya. (1)


"When in the pride of his arm Odeyarasa was with great fury determined to fight, king Ballāla, having marched, surrounded him, and laid siege, then, on the peak which had been ground to powder by the blows of the tusks of the chief elephants in his army, in Uccāngi King Pāṇḍya fell into his hands, accompanied by his beautiful women, country, treasure-heaps, father, and groups of horses!"

cira-kālam ripugaḷg asādhyam enisirdd Uccaṅgiyarum mutti dur- ddhara-tōjō-nidhi dhūli gōteyane kond a-Kāma-dēvāvani- / āvaramam sand Odeya-ksitīśvaranan a-bhandāramam striyaram turaga-vṛatamumam samantu pīdīdham Ballāla-bhūpālakām //

"Laying siege to Uccaṅgi, which was for a long time considered impregnable to enemies, king Ballāla, full of irresistible prowess, took it as if a fort of dust, and seized in a delightful manner not only king Kāma and the famous king Odeya but also their treasury, women, and troops of horses."

(1) RICE’s translations are defective in other respects also. Page 210 n. (2) E.C. VI Chikmagalur 21 (Dec, 1173): here again RICE’s translation is not precise.

Again, in a later record, which has given rise to some misapprehension:

Colam muttire panneral-barisakaṃ kōlpoṭe tāṃ pōdan emb
āḷāpaṃ bare sāṛdd ad ondu mōlanaṃ mēḷ peccuv Uccaṅgiyaṃ /
hēḷāsāḥhyav ad āduḍ endu divijar cōḍyaṃ baḍutt īye ba-
ll āḷ āḷḍam giri-durgga-malla-vesaraṃ Ballāḷa-bhūpaḷakaṃ //

" 'Though the Cōḷa besieged it for twelve years, was it plundered? (No.) He went away.' When this report came he approached, and while the heavenly ones experienced wonder, saying that Uccaṅgi was fit to be taken in sport because it reared above (him) but one cubit, and (thus) bestowed it (upon him), he possessed himself, he the mighty man (Ball-āḷ), king Ballāḷa, of the name "wrestler with hill-forts"."(1)

we find Vijaya-Pāṇḍya-dēva ruling over territory including Ganganarasi, 14 miles W.of Uccaṅgi in August. But no details are given of where he was residing at the time.

Vijaya-Pāṇḍya's first record is E.C.XI Davangere 43(1164)q.v.
Page 211 n.(2) E.C.II 327(1181) The latter verse occurs in E.C.II 240(1178), where there are some printing errors.

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 178(1196) reads as above, but with baḍuttire, which is contrary to the metre; E.C.V Belur 137(1183) contained the verse, now much damaged; E.C.V Belur 175(1186) reads beras ardḍ, which is less acceptable. This grammatically complex verse seems to have misled RICE and others. The last line may indeed be rendered "he acquired the name Giri-durgga-malla", though it is possible that āḷḍam should have Uccaṅgiyaṃ as its object, leaving īye absolute: thus giri-durgga-malla-vesaraṃ could be an irregular tat-puruṣa compound:"he who has Giri-
durgga-malla as his title". Cf.M.A.R.1909-10 para.80(1235)

It is open to question who is the Cōḷa referred to. That Uccaṅgi, as a Cāḷukya outpost, was open to Cōḷa attacks over a long period in the 11th century is very likely, but attacks from the southern Cōḷa must have ceased at least by 1070. The only apparent alternative is the Cōḷa of Nidugal, who must have been from time to time antagonistic to his neighbour, whose territory he flanked throughout its entire length. It is curious that this is the only evidence of Cōḷa-Pāṇḍya hostility in Noḷambavāḍi.
King Ballāla, having attained the sevenfold (sovereignty) of the Pāṇḍya king on a Saturday, from that instance of fortunate accomplishment assumed in his splendour the name "successful (even) on a Saturday".\(^{(1)}\)

That these titles were not in fact obtained on that occasion is already well-known, but the thought was sufficiently pleasant for the inaccuracy to escape notice a decade after the event.

Other references to the capture of Uccaṅgi are many. One record of 1181 asks:-

"What kings had taken the famous fort of Uccaṅgi with unequalled strength of arm in the past after the fashion of Ballāla, the hero without a helper, successful on a Saturday, the wrestler with hill-forts?"\(^{(2)}\)

What happened after the capture we gather from two other references:-

(1) Clearly composed at the same time as the verse quoted before it, it appears only in E.CV Belur 137(1183).
point of its ditch, the eight quarters in extent, and in height the sky, thus expanding in both dimensions, and famous in all three worlds, when, after all, the Pāṇḍya sought refuge (with him), being gracious to him, Viśva-Ballaḷa-dēva gave (back) his kingdom, and acquired fame in the three worlds by taking and bestowing (or, 'destroying and supporting')." (1)

And, again, we notice that a dignitary who subsequently held office in the Eastern districts, by name Rāghava-dēvarasa, held the title "lion to the elephant Pāṇḍya-rāya, setter up of Pāṇḍya-rāya." He probably took a prominent part in this campaign.(2)

Ballaḷa's forces were not as yet in a position to take over the occupation of the Pāṇḍya territory, though they might overrun it, and therefore it was in Ballaḷa's interest to reinstate Kāma-dēva as his vassal. Kāma-dēva did not, however, show in his inscriptions any sign either of gratitude to the Hoysala or of subordination to him.

Ballāḷa II was ruling his kingdom, "protecting the earth between Hima and Sētu under the shadow of his single umbrella, having accomplished a victory in all quarters, having vanquished the Pāṇḍya and made Uccāṃgi his royal city" in the month of September 1177.(3) While he was at Uccāṃgi, preparing

---

(1) E.C.VI Tarikere 10(1184). E.C.V Belur 136(1217) has a damaged copy of the verse. E.C.V Belur 72(1179) has the erroneous readings vyōmadind and bokkāda.
(2) E.C.IX Nelamangala 82(1196). (3) E.C.XII Ciknayakanhalli 36 at Huliyēru.
for further campaigns, two other movements were afoot. An expedition penetrated into the neighbouring territory of the Nidugal Cōla, while another swept onwards towards the Tuṅga-
bhadra, which must have been the Pāṇḍya's northern boundary, crossed it perhaps in the region of Hūvina-Hadāṅgile, to which place Vijaya-Pāṇḍya himself resorted in times of distress in July of the following year,(1) and passed north-westwards as far as Mulugunda. That Ballāla did so much is clear from the title Ballāla receives in a record of 1177: "capturer of Nonāmbavāḍi and Mulugunda". That he claims the capture of Mulugunda indicates that he met at the time with no effective obstruction from the Gutta or from the Cālukya or Kalacuri officials in the Huligere region, while it appears that there was sufficient strength in the region of Dharmavolalu, Lokki-
gundi and Gadagu to prevent the expedition penetrating the chain of hills which the Kalacuri's subordinates probably held, and thus entering the territory which had most to offer to the invader. Indeed the whole movement suggests that whatever the condition of the Banavāse nāḍ and the Bankāpura-Huligere region there was at the time a sufficiently reliable and united force between Gadagu and Koppana to suggest a flanking movement by way of Mulugunda rather than a frontal attack across the Tuṅga-
bhadra by way of Alavaṇḍi or Mevundi.(2) This expedition having clarified the position to the north of the Pāṇḍya nāḍ, and shown that the time was not ripe for further attempts in that direction, Ballāla reviewed the situation in the Cōla district, and

(2) M.A.R.1909-10 para.78(1177) at Oṭikere, Ciknayakanhalli tal∞
turned towards the west.

Malli-dēva Cōla, who was ruling at the time at Henjeru, was forced to acquiesce in the new Hoysala encroachments. (1)

To explain the condition of the districts which Ballāla next invaded, it will be necessary to give a picture of the general political situation, which will be found to explain not only the ease with which Ballāla’s task-force reached Mulugund, but also why he chose that particular period for the invasion of the Pāṇḍya-nāḍ itself.

The Čāluṅga family had lost its empire, but not its vitality. There can be no doubt but that the Čāluṅga cause had many adherents and propagandists in the Banavāse and adjoining nāḍs, though amid the signs of the confusion that prevailed there at the period it is not easy to assess their actual strength. The Pāṇḍya dynasty was inclined to sympathize with the ex-imperial dynasty, and it is known that, at least during Nārasimha’s reign, the Hoysala himself had not been strongly repugnant to the admission of Čāluṅgayan supremacy, a notion as harmless as it was sentimental. Meanwhile, from the total ab-

(1) Malli-dēva, son of Iruṅgōla, ruled between 1147 & 1179 according to inscriptions, his first being E.C.XI Challakere 21 and his last S.I.I.IX pt.1,273, A.R.1927, 104. He was at Henjeru in 1158 (S.I.I.VI 557) and 1167 (E.C.XII Sira 23); in Govindavādi in 1169 (S.I.I.IX pt.1,269) and at Henjeru in 1179.

A verse in E.C.VBelur 119 (c1180) relates something of the eastern expedition:-

dhareyoḷ munne nareṇdran emb esakad Čōlaṅge kōḷ-pōgad emb aridam naccina Dēva-durggaman adam dhāl itṭu Pāṇḍyāvanī- / ñvara-sāmrājya-samētam ottajeyin itēm kondan Uccāṅgiyam para-durgga-Tripura-Trinētran adaṭam Ballāla-thūpālakaṃ //

"King Ballāla is a hero, a Trinētra(śiva) to the Tripura(demon) that were the forts of his enemies. He it was that, assaulting formerly that Dēvadurga that had given con-
sence of records that acknowledge either Cālukya or Kalacuri sovereignty in the Banavāse, Hāṅgal, Sāntaīge, or Huligere districts, we may imagine that both dynasties had their representatives in that area, that these had reached a point in their rivalry which precluded peaceful activities on both sides without enabling a decision to be arrived at to the advantage of either, so that the districts formed in fact a kind of no-man's-land between the Kalacuri empire and the Hoysala outposts. In 1173 some Kalacuri agents were very inhospitably received in Banavāse nāḍ.(1) Between that year, however, and 1176 no heavy fighting is recorded. In 1176 Vikramāditya, almost certainly the Gutta ruler of Guttavolalu and an uncle of Vijaya-Pāṇḍya-dēva, was worsted in the battle of Tavanidhi, and was attacked on his way thence by a subject of Tailapa Gaṅga, the son of a Permādi-dēva, no doubt Ekkala of Uddhare, who himself in the same year raided a village belonging apparently to the Kadamba ruler.(2) In 1177 we hear that Vikramāditya had obtained some territorial jurisdiction in the Banavāse nāḍ, so that it appears that his reverse at Tavanidhi can not have been very severe. (3) Kuppattūr, on the road
from Hāṅgal to Belagāvi, was attacked by a certain Gavūda-
sāmī and looted. He seems to have been assisted by some one
at Uccaṅgi, prior, of course, to the Hoysala occupation of
that place. (1) Sōvi-dēvarasa of Bandalike, probably in league
with Tailapa, marched against Gutti. Tailapa himself was at
Kuppe, possibly the village about eight miles south of Uddhāre,
his capital, though with what object it is difficult to guess,
unless it was to direct a raid upon a Santara or an imperial
fief to the south of his small principality. There he was sub-
jected to a siege by Vikramāditya, so that two nominal subjects
of the Kalacuri Saṅkama-dēva, who had recently taken up the
imperial responsibility, were openly at war with each other.
It will be remembered that Vikramāditya Gutta had been, in 1165
(above p.193) inimical to the Kalacuri; we are not justified
in inventing a Kalacuri dāṅñāyaka of the name Vikramāditya,
which is the only alternative, and thus we must conclude that
in the interval of ten years the Gutta's views had been changed.
The shifting pattern of political life in this corner of the
empire permitted such changes within even smaller intervals.
Clearly, then, while Vikramāditya was engaged in this struggle
of 1177 he was in no position either to defend his nephew's
kingdom or to prevent the Hoysala expedition from passing through
his own. (2)

were sent by the Kalacuri emperor to collect the dues of Bana-
vāse rād; a nāyaka the emperor had honoured invited the Kadambas Sōyi-dēva and Bammana of Gutti together with Vikramāditya
Gutta and the Santara ruler to watch a day's "manoeuvres". He
then surrounded Kavaṇa and Sōvaṇa's army and a fight "developed*!
Page 217 n. (2) E.C.VIII Sorab 32 (1176); ibid. 313 (?1176)

(1) E.C.VIII Sorab 251 (Jan. 1177) Durmati is an error for Dur-
While this confusion reigned in the west a ruler of Bāllāla's energy was not likely to waste the opportunity. Between September and December 1177 he invaded Banavāse nāḍ in force and inflicted heavy losses upon the Kadambas and others impartially. A mutilated verse of the period relates:

```
Kari.pan ildu<du> Cōlika-kṣiti-talam pāl ēlvinam bhasamāg urid int eyde Nolambavādi-Banavāsi-mandalam pūlide /
tird ant ādudu Gutti potti pogid att ā-Pānugal bandud Ā-
vra-khēḍam prabala-pratāpa-sikhīyam Ballāla-bhūpālanam //
```

"Through the fire of the mighty prowess of king Bāllāla the surface of the land of the Cōla was (?) reduced to blackness; the country of Nolambavādi and Banavāsi blazed well, becoming ashes, so that ruin was produced; Gutti became as if roaming about, being covered up; on that side the (famous) Pānugal (Hāṅgal) catching fire was covered with smoke, and the Ālva's country was scorched." (1)

It is not to be assumed from this that Hāṅgal was actually taken, nor that Ālva-khēḍa was invaded: but both might be expected to be uncomfortably aware of the distress of their near neighbours.

Bāllāla returned home, leaving detachments in the Cōla, Pāṇḍya and Banavāse regions. He was ruling again in Dōrasamudra during December 1177. (2)

mukhi: the 10th year of Rāya-murāri Sōvi-dēva is 1177. The use of the emperor's era for dating does not indicate political subservience.

Page 218 n. (2) E.C.VIII Sorab 498(1177); ibid. 174(1177).

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 220(?1178),? before March - on the back of the stone is an inscription of that date and others later. pūlidē tirid is a conjecture for the text's unintelligible pūlid eśtared. (2) E.C.IV Nagamangala 70(1177, Pauṣya su 3).
The operations in the north-west, however, he considered as only just begun. In the spring of 1178 he returned to continue the struggle. We have no very satisfactory evidence as to the progress of the Hoysala forces between 1178 and 1179, but from subsequent events it appears that Ballāla directed another swiftly-moving raiding party, which he may not in fact have accompanied throughout its journey. We learn that he slew warriors and by the strength of his valour took possession of Viṣṇu's conquests, namely Halasige, Belvola, Huligere and Lokkigundi, as far as the Herdore, that is, the Krishna. (1) If this is true, his force enjoyed the same freedom of movement as had been at Viṣṇuvardhana's disposal fifty years before; one feels that the Kalacuri must have put up a very stiff opposition in Belvola at least. However, to leave such pretentious claims, it seems certain that Hāṅgal fell into his hands at this time. Of two later inscriptions the first states that Ballāla swallowed Viṣṇa-raja-pura, that is, Hāṅgal, and the second that "like letters on water Poysala's army blew away Hāṅgal where Kāvaṇa was .... and great Pāṇḍya's hill considered impregnable." (2) Meanwhile his authority must still have been accepted in Malli-dēva's country, for in December 1178 an inscription in Viṣṇa-Ballāla's name was put up at Parigi in the modern Hindu-pur tāluqa, on the eastern outskirts of the Hennjeru kingdom. (3) We can feel fairly sure, too, that there was activity against Kalacuri subordinates to the north of the Tuṅgabhadra,

otherwise it would not have been possible for the king to have reached Kavalūr in the next year without very extensive and lengthy preparations.

By April 1178 Ballāla was again in Dōrasamudra, during what seems to have been a lull before a storm. (1) In the previous month a battle in which his forces were involved took place probably in the Belagāvi area. (2) During this period Ballāla certainly acquired a body of active supporters in Belagāvi itself; an inscription of the third year of the Cālkūka emperor Āhavamalla refers to the presence at a ceremony of various persons including "those known as the suns among champions who, having subdued the Konkan, took tribute from Vijayāditya, and only honoured ones amongst men, who acquired renown having caused satisfaction to the Malaparol gaṇḍa, the Hoysala Vīra-Ballāla." (3) Ballāla's troubled kingdom was once again experiencing disturbances in the east, and some tightening of governmental control was required there. It may be guessed that an invasion had occurred from the Cōla district for in June 1178 a Hoysala dependent attacked the fort of Vindūr. Though clearly a small incident in a minor campaign, it must have added to the already considerable anxiety at the capital. (4)

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 209(1178). He was still there in May: E.C.V Hassan 55(1178). (2) E.C.VIII Sorab 2(?1178). The date is not certain.
(4) E.C.IX Kankanhalli 35(?1178) There is little doubt of the date: Vilambi, with the king's title maha-mandalēśvara --- Vīra-Gaṅga-Viṣṇuvardhana-Pośala-vīra-Vallāla-dēvan.
Meanwhile a far more critical situation was developing. The events of the past few years had not been unnoticed at Kalyāna. The emperor Saṅkama determined to lead a counter-attack in person. The news of his preparations must have reached Ballāla at the beginning of the year 1179: he moved northwards at once. He was at Kavalūr, about fifty miles north of Uccaṅgi, in the Belvola province, in the last days of April 1179, in the company of a wife called Remma-dēvi.(1)

It is clear that he supposed that he would be able to intercept Saṅkama well to the north of the Hoysala dominions. But the Kalacuri was too clever for him. Early in May he was actually in Belagāvi, having pushed aside Ballāla’s partisans, in the company of Lakṣmī-dēva, Sōvanayya and Kāvaṇayya, the last two daṅṇāyakas being the agents who had been insulted by rulers of the Banavāse district in 1173.(2) In the same month, having thus stolen a march on Ballāla’s leader, he attacked the Hoysala detachment and inflicted a series of defeats upon it. The fighting continued, and Ballāla retired to the capital.(3)

Saṅkama’s general Kāvana-daṅṇāyaka claimed to have driven the Hoysala to the points of the compass,(4) and the ubiquitous Candugi-dēva-daṅṇāyaka, an officer of Ahavamalla, Saṅkama’s successor, boasted of having taken the Hoysala and Cōla kingdoms as well as burning the territory of the brave Vijayāditya.(5)

---

(1) Ballāla was in Dōrasamudra in November 1178: E.C.V Belur 83. The queen’s name is spelt incorrectly, Ryamā W.E.II f. 82b-83a(1179). (x) (2) E.C.VII Shikarpur 96, I.A.v p. 45-50, P.S. O.C.I.189(1179). (3) He was apparently there in May: E.C.IV Nagamangala 15(1179).
(4) E.C.XI Davangere 44(c1180). E.C.VI Chikmagalur 87(c1180) shows Ballāla at Sāyirārava (unidentified) in this period.
(5) E.C.VII Shikarpur 119(1181) at Belagāvi. The Cōla was the Neñjeru ruler, and Vijayāditya the Kadamba ruler of Goa.
(x) It is possible that she was wife of a Māsavādi Ballāla.
The many references to this campaign, occasioned by the number of viragals erected after it, indicate that the Hoysala troops were heavily engaged without achieving proportionate success. The emperor returned northwards after he had as he thought disposed of the Hoysala menace, made an effective show of strength in the disaffected nāds, accepted the submission of the chief of Uddhare, (1) and doubtless confirmed the tenure of the Kadamba ruler of Gutti. (2) Hoysala records tell us that a certain Bīṭṭiya-nāyaka defeated troops of elephants while he himself sat on horseback in Ballāla's battle with Saṅkama; (3) a battle took place at ...rugalu in May 1179; (4) Hammāna of the modern Mudgere tāluqa died piercing the head of Saṅkama's elephant at the battle of Madavalli; (5) Accaya-sahāni, chief of the Hoysala camel force distinguished himself at the battle of Madavalli(sic) against Saṅkama-dēva; (6) when Ballāla sent for Babbeya-nāyaka and ordered him to fight against the army of Saṅkama-dēva, he went and fought with great valour, killing several mandalikas and cutting to pieces numerous warriors; (7) and Ballāla himself encamped at Hadaḍeya-kuppa when he marched against Murāri-Kēśava Nārasiṅga, who was accompanied by the Kalacuri Bijjala's general Canna-Kālama-sāhāni. (8) An obscure reference to Saṅkama is found in an inscription at Hulikal dated July 1179. (9)

---

(1) E.C.VII Shikarpur 96(1179).
(2) W.E.II f.31lb(1179) at Alūr: Sōvi-dēva ruled in Gutti, the Panthipura-baliya bāda 200 (a dependency of the Hāṅgal 500) with parts of the Banavāsē nād in August and September 1178.
(3) M.A.R. 1931,2(c1179) at Belūr.
(4) E.C.IX Channapatna 64(1179) at Iggalūr.
(5) E.C.VI Mudgere 33(1179) dated October-November, but referring to an event later than the battle, i.e. Ballāla's going to Sosavūr. Maḍavalli is as yet unidentified.
(7) M.A.R.1914-5, para. 81(1179) at Aγrahāra-Bācahalli.
Though Saṅkama retired without invading Ballāla's own territory, he retained all the other advantages of the war, and thus the Hoysala can hardly have considered the outcome anything less than a serious set-back; no doubt this is sufficient reason for assigning to the year 1179-80, with comparatively small hesitation, an inscription referring to the king Nārasimha and bearing the date Vikāri. It commemorates the death of a son of Kālpeṭṭi-danḍāyaka at the battle of Vasudhare in Talige-nāḍ. Now Vasudhare was clearly the modern village of Vastāra, twenty miles or so to the west of Dōrasamudra. The preoccupation of the government with the war against Saṅkama Kalacuri must have encouraged some raid or commotion, which had then led to this fighting. Nārasimha, now in his forty-sixth year, was doubtless a kind of viceroy during Ballāla's frequent absences on active service, and so performed the same function for his son as he had for his father - as we can see from this viragal, and from Ballāla's presence from time to time at Dōrasamudra when he clearly would have been better employed at the front, with about the same degree of inefficiency. (1)

During the period between 1179 and 1182 Ballāla had to settle his quarrel with the Kalacuri and repair the damage which the war had inflicted on his kingdom. Indeed the latter

Page 223 n. (8) M.A.R. 1917 para. 99(?1179). The editor dates it 1189, but that is manifestly impossible.  
Page 223 n. (9) E.C.XII Tiptur 35(1179): Saṅkama and Ballāla do not appear to have been engaged in conflict at that moment; the impression given is that Saṅkama had to fight another enemy, but the record is damaged.  

(1) M.A.R. 1927, 8 at Belur. Vikāri must be 1179 because the king bears the titles maha-mandalesvara Tribhuvanamalla Talakādu- Konga-Naṅgali-Banavásē-Hanuṅgal-gonda bhuja-bala-vīra-Gāṅga-pratēpa-Hoysala sri-Nārasingha-devarū, a series inconsistent with 1119, before Nārasimha was born, or 1239 when the titles were obsolete. Admittedly the date refers to the setting
necessity powerfully urged an early accommodation with the emperor. The latter was probably quite ready to come to terms with Ballâla, as his successes in the war of 1179 were soon counter-balanced by a recrudescence of ill-feeling towards his dynasty in the regions that separated the two powers. Malli-déva Cûla, despite his defeat at the hands of Caṇḍugideva, acknowledged in December 1179 neither the Kalacuri nor the Hoysala, but the Câlukya supremacy.(1) The attitude of the Pândya was ambiguous, but the tradition of independence in general and objection to the Kalacuri in particular was rooted fairly deeply in Banavâse and Sântalige. This situation the Câlukya, although he had, naturally, other areas besides to consider; might be expected to exploit. The real interest of the Kalacuri was therefore to come to an agreement with the Hoysala, to take the form of a non-aggression pact, with the tacit understanding that Ballâla might tamper with the north-western nâds it he wished, so long as he thereby hampered the Câlukya's attempts at a revival, and abstained from crossing the Tuṅgabhadra in the Belvola region in such a way as to embarrass the Kalacuri's faithful adherent, the Erambarage Sinda.

It would be impossible here to give even an outline of the vast number of considerations that, between 1179 and 1183 poured in upon the deliberations of the foreign department of Ballâla's council of ministers. Perhaps at no other time in the history of the Mysorean plateau had so many conflicting inter-

---

ests converged upon one point. The geographical position of
the Hoysala, together with his degree of stability, activity,
ambition and material resources, rendered his kingdom spec-
ially influential in deciding the growth or decay of dynasties
in the peninsula. In the north the Yadavas of Devagiri were
stirring; in the west the coastal strip of the south Konkan
was restless; in the east the Kākatīya was coming to the height
of his power; in the south Cōla and Pāndya were involved in a
highly complex struggle for survival amid a welter of conflicting
interests now too strong to submit even to two dynasties.
The great Karnātaka empire was showing signs of decay: it was
for the Hoysala, if he wished, to cast his weight into one pan
or the other, or to profit from the needs of both the rivals.
As it turned out, until the last few years of this reign Hoysala
policy was very astute. Whether the credit be due to Ballāla him-
self or to his mantri-mandala, the fortunes of his dynasty
were able in a brilliant manner to reach the very highest pitch
of which they were in fact capable.

The first step was to accept a Kalacuri offer: for
indeed whether the victor of 1179 actually took the initiative
or not, his was the greater need. We have available an inter-
esting piece of evidence on this point. An inscription of the
year 1255 set up by a son-in-law of a son-in-law of a certain
Kuṇjanambi-setti states that the latter, "pleasing both the
Hoysala emperor in the south and Ballāla himself in the north,
formed an alliance between the two kings which was universally
praised."(1) A comparison of dates shows that the Ballāla
(1) EC.Varsikere 108(1255).
(i.e. Vallabha) in question must have been Saṅkama Kaḷacuri. An alternative suggestion, that the alliance may have taken place after 1183 between Viṣṇu-Ballāla and Sōṃśvara Cāḷukya with the object of providing Ballāla with a free hand in other regions, is not so attractive, as we know that Ballāla was engaged in hostile operations against Sōṃśvara not only in 1183 itself, but also as soon as the Yādava of Dēvagiri appeared near enough to disturb seriously the Cāḷukya administration. Indeed, a Cāḷukya-Hoysala alliance would be so unnatural a circumstance and so difficult to justify, that, while not being impossible, it is hardly to be credited without better authority than the present reference.

Having thus accommodated his relations with his only serious rival, Ballāla proceeded to inspect the state of his affairs in the regions intermediate between their frontiers. In March 1180 he was almost certainly at Hallavūr, where we find him adjusting some boundary dispute between Noṇambavādi and Gaṅgavādi, though we are unable to tell whether his decision was in favour of the Āsandi family, on whose part the investigation appears to have been carried out, or that of the other party, the unfortunate Pāṇḍya. (1) Hallavūr was a place of almost as great strategic importance as Harihar itself, and in a similar way. A little less than eighty miles from the capital by the shortest route, and about twenty miles upstream from Harihar, the town was in an excellent position for the receipt of intelligence from every direction, while from it movement might be made at the shortest notice into either the

(1) E.C.VII Channagiri 73(1180). Vijayasamudra was a name
eastern or western parts of the area in which Ballāla, like his grandfather, was interested. An invasion of the northern regions was as easily effected as a sudden retreat to the Hoysala rād, while the town of Hallavūr itself was admirably situated for defence in every direction but the south.

In 1180-1 some fighting took place at Ummādi (1) and in December 1180 at Ānadare.(2) It is possible that Ummādi may be the Ummadūr that is about thirteen miles south-west of Talakād, where Ballāla is said to have destroyed a crore of warriors.(3) In 1181 operations, apparently on no very great scale, continued in the north. In March Ballāla himself took the field against Bāceya-nāyaka of Herbbeṭṭa,(4) while a certain Saṅkama-dēva, a sāmanta under Āhavamalla Kalacuri, joined Ballāla and went with the latter's daṇḍanāyakas to Tāṇagunda, north-east of Belagāvi, where no doubt the Hoysala was trying to obtain some advantage from the confusion into which the growing weakness of the Kalacuri and activity on the part of the Cālukya had once again thrown this distracted but valuable area.(5) Kēśimayya-daṇṇāyaka, the Kalacuri lieutenant who applied to Hallavūr in this period, probably during an early Hoysala occupation. In this record only .yaśasamudra remains of the name. Compare Channagiri 72(1220). He pitched his camp for the occasion outside Siḷagōḍu.

(1) E.C.X Goribidnur 41(1180).
(2) M.A.R. 1929, 16(1180) at Dorasamudra.
(3) E.C.V Belur 175(1186) at Vīra-dēvanahalli.
(4) M.A.R. 1926, 16(1181) at Tagare, Belūr tālūqa. See below p.385. Herbbeṭṭa or Hebbeṭṭa in this case may be the Hebbeṭṭa mentioned in M.A.R.1927, 35(1288), near Anūr in Chikmagalur tālūqa. It is not likely that it was that near Antaravalli or that at 74°45.13’13°57’.
(5) E.C.VII Shikarpur 197(1181-2).
nominally ruled Banavāse 12,000, Hayve, Sāntalige and Yeḍadore in Belagāvi, fought a battle at Mayile in March 1181,(1) and in the following year the Jiddulige-nād was the scene of further fighting.(2) Meanwhile, fortunately for the Cālukya, Ballāla's attention was diverted. Leaving his detachments in the north-west to carry on as best they might, he directed his energies in the opposite direction. The battle of Ummadur has already been noticed. If indeed it took place in the south, as has been suggested, the occurrence fits into the usual pattern. The preoccupation of the government and the royal armies in the north and the recent reverses encouraged an invasion from the Koṅgu nād, which now required to be repelled. The story was repeated in the east. In 1181 Vīra-Vallāla-Kīḷalādiraja-Vācci-dēvar, Hoysala feudatory with his headquarters at Peruvēḍakōṭṭai in Kīḷalai-nād, sustained an attack from an unknown nayaka.(3) He appears to have held his own, but the king felt that further steps were necessary, and determined on reprisals. As his grandfather had done, he drove towards Kāṇci. It does not appear that his forces remained long in that area, but he seems to have been pleased with the success of the demonstration, as well as with those in other directions, for a verse, in the style of the wordy panegyric now common to the public compositions of the period, tells us:-

mēḍalu saṅgaḷisittu Kāṇci paḍuvalu ghōḷittud ambōḍhiy eḍḍ ēḍitt addada Cēra-dēśav anitum Pāṇḍyāvāṇī-mandalam /
kāḍol kūḍe keraldu pokk aḍagid att uddāma-saṅgṛamadoli
kāḍirdd entu bardunkuv annar oḷāre Ballāla-bhūpālanol //

(1) E.C.VII Shikarpur 144(1181) at Belagāvi. (2) & (3) over.
"On the east Kāñci trembled; on the west the ocean
groaned; all the great Cēra country got up and ran; the country
of the Pāṇḍya land, raging, entered the forest all at once and
vanished; are there any who escape alive from King Ballāla when
pressed in the mighty war?" (1)

Whatever his successes in other directions, his
policy in the north began to bring good returns. Supported by
the anxiety of the Kaḷacuri, Ballāla had taken part in the
quarrels of the north-west, where his motives were for the
present allowed to remain hidden under the cloak of co-operat­
ion with the emperor. Naturally, nothing but the impossible,
namely an alliance between Kaḷacuri and Cālukya, could prevent
Ballāla from bringing the north-western nāḍas under his control,
as a step preliminary to a general movement towards the Krishna
river. The chaotic condition of the districts, the petty feuds
between the many ruling families, and the complete lack of
control on the part of the imperial government, were sufficient
reasons for the growth of the Hoysala dominion in the interests
of governor and governed alike. But this was not to be achieved
as long as Kaḷacuri or Cālukya remained possible alternatives.

Page 229 n. (2) E.C.VIII Sorab 43(1182).
Page 229 n. (3) E.C.IX Kankanhalli 84b at Daḷavāyi-kōdihallī. He
made a grant to the god Siṅgapperumāl in the same year (Flava)
and a similar one in the next: E.C.IX Channapatna 167 at Byād-
erahalli, and ibid.160 at Honnayakanhallī.
(1) M.A.R. 1925,64(1181) reads pañcaḷisittu, an editorial slip;
ghūliṭṭud; kāḍolu, saṅgrāmaḍolu and bhūpālanolu, where the u is
merely a substitute for a virāma; and kōḍiiṭṭante for kāḍirḍa
entu. M.A.R. 1937,17(1196) reads ōḍit, wrongly; the u's as in
the previous copy; taguḍu ('running after') for keraḷū;
kāḍittāntu for kāḍirḍa entu; and bradumkuvaṁnaṁ. E.C.V Arsikere
23(1197) reads argga, an alternative form for aggada.
Ghōliḍu must be an alternative form (not noticed by Kittel)
for gōliḍu,"to lament".
In 1183 Ballāla's policy enjoyed its first success: Somēśvara IV Cālukya, known as Tribhuvanamalla or Jagadēka-
malla, recovered the throne which his father had lost to Bijjala, and, with the disappearance of Sinīgana, the youngest son of Bijjala, in 1184, the Kalacuri dynasty came to an end. Thus the only enemy of whom the Hoysala had had sufficient cause to be afraid was removed for ever.

Naturally, the accession of Somēśvara IV was hailed as a return of the days of Vikramaditya, and families such as the Pāṇḍyas of Ucchāngi, the Cōlas of Heŋjeru and Nidugal and the Kadambas of Hangal felt satisfaction on two distinct grounds: firstly their own efforts, feeble as in fact they had been, had contributed to the re-establishment of the supposedly legitimate dynasty, and therefore the emperor could be expected to leave them a very large share of their precious self-government, and not to interfere in their several schemes of aggrandisement; secondly, the re-establishment of the Cālukya, even on such unsatisfactory terms, would enable them to resist Hoysala infiltration, and so save themselves from becoming mere feudatories of either of their powerful neighbours.

The Hoysala, however, knew well enough the real strength of the Cālukya, saw the evident signs of decay in other parts of his empire besides those in which he took a particular interest, heard the sound of a new language from the north, and decided to wait for the second stage in the process to develop. He had only six years to wait.
In 1183-4, however, while Sōmesvara's name was being affixed to documents and recited in ceremonial preambles in one principality after another, and as long as the Kalacuri maintained forces in the area, the Hoysala took an active part in the commotions. There is evidence of an officer of the 'Mahā-māṇḍalēśvara Ballāla-dēva' attacking villages under the Cālukya's indirect control in the modern Sorab tāluqa. (1) But we have no further evidence of military activity by the Hoysala in any of the districts before the year 1190. An inscription at Sōgi, probably of the 1185 period, tells us of Brahmadānḍanāyaka, who was in fact the son of Kāvana-dānḍanāyaka, of whom we have already heard much, and gives him the titles Vānarāya-diśāpatṭa, "scatterer of the Bāna king", the Bāna, of course, being a member of the northern, Karpātaka branch of the Bāna family; and Hoysaḷa-saila-durgga-hīrgghāṭa,"thunderbolt to the hill-forts of the Hoysala". (2) But it is more than likely that these titles were earned by Brahmadānḍanāyaka while he was a general in the service of the Kālasuris, and before he changed sides and became a man of great importance in the Cālukya empire. (3) There is thus no reason for supposing that any warfare took place between the year of Sōmesvara's accession and the time when Ballāla judged that his opportunity had come.

These six years of peace in the north, peace that is to say from the Hoysala's side, for fighting took place, on and off, between the various mandalikas in the area, these years

(1) E.C.VIII Sorab 419(?1183) at Hire Idagōdu.
(2) S.I.I.X pt.1,287,A.R.1914,458(c1185).
were not years of diplomatic idleness. While Ballāla's own kingdom was accumulating material resources, and preparing for the coming struggle, the families in the north were vigorously canvassed for their support against the Cālukya. No overt act of hostility appeared, but one by one the dynasties assumed dignity and power: between 1187 and 1189 at least eight dynasties were active and articulate – anticipating the opposite of the fate that awaited them. (1) Particularly noticeable is the resurrection of Sāntara power and prestige. This activity does not indicate weakness on the Hoysala's part, for our knowledge of Ballāla's position and the progress of affairs in the region during his grandfather's lifetime show us the contrary. It does however confirm our opinion of Sōmesvara's position, and points the way to the next step, which clearly lay within the Hoysala's initiative.

In the year 1189, due to a fortunate conjunction of circumstances into which it is not here necessary to enquire, the ruler of the Marātha dynasty of Dēvagiri, Bhillama Sēvuna of the Yādava race, had acquired large portions of the northern half of the Cālukya empire, and was on his way southwards. We know nothing of the struggle put up by the Cālukya, or the odds against which he fought. But Bhillama's progress was rapid, and the Kannada-speaking people south of the Krishna fell swiftly under the control of his dalavāyis. Sōmesvara, whose life and influence lasted certainly until 1200, but with far less vigour

(1) The ruling families of Uccai, Henjeru, Belagavatti, Udhāre, Hāṅgal, Pomburacha, Gutti (or, perhaps Bandalike), and Guttavolalu. Ghambarage may be omitted as the Sinda ruler there was loyal to the imperial family for the time being. The eastern families have been ignored here as politically insignificant.
than during the first exile of his family, abandoned Kalyāṇa, and fled, it seems, south-westwards.

The Sēvuna advanced towards the Tuṅgabhadrā on a broad front, and during 1190 occupied several important towns.

Ballāla's opportunity had come. The emperor had abandoned his capital; the mandalikas were terrified by Bhillama's advance and by the ex-emperor's presence to an almost equal degree. The Hoysala army crossed the Tuṅgabhadrā, swept through districts that had previously proved an insuperable obstacle, and met the Sēvuna advanced parties perhaps several miles north of the Erambarage Sindā's dominions. In April 1190 his queen Mādēvi ruled in his stead in Dōrasamudra, and it seems that he was on active service during the spring of that year. (2) We know nothing of the details of the campaign, except that the first meeting of the antagonists was favourable to the Hoysala, and that the Sēvuna attack was staved off for about eighteen months. An inscription of December 1191 tells how by Ballāla the fortress of Uccāṅgi was burnt up, Virāṭarājapura swallowed, and the power of the Sēvunas sipped up, and that he, the fire to the forest the fame of the Pallava, scatterer of the deer Simhāla and Sapāla, scatterer of Bhillama, submarine fire to the army of the Sēvunas, was ruling a territory extending up to Kalyāṇa. (3) He was certainly now in

---

(1) Bhillama was recognized at Annigere in January 1190 (A.R. 1928-9, App.F,192,W.E.II f.166a-7b(1190) at Annigere); at Gadag in May 1191 (E.I.iii 30) but must have been in power there much earlier. Sōmēvara Cālukya was recognized at Lakkundi in 1186 (A.R.1926-7,App.F,48,W.E.I f.565b(1186)) and at Hosār near Mulugunda in 1187 (A.R.1926-7,App.F,112(1187)), but his last record before the Sēvuna-Hoysala war is at Hombal of 1189 (A.R. 1926-7,App.F,145(1189) where read 6th for 3rd year.).

(2) E.C.V Arsikere 85(1190).

(3) M.A.R. 1926,25(1191). The Pallava must have been an almost
a position to assume a good portion of the responsibility which his dynasty was now mature enough to shoulder. The area between the Hoysala mād and the territory occupied by the Sēvuṇa was at his disposal. His preparations for this event had been wisely laid, and he had only to secure that which he had entered in the north before absorbing the western districts, in order to acquire all that justice or ambition could assign him.

So highly did Ballāla value the significance of his first operation against the Sēvuṇa that, although he did not assume the titles samasta-bhuvaṁśāraya śrī-prthvī-vallabhā mahā-rajādhirājā paramēśvara paramabhaṭṭāraka, "Refuge of the entire world, beloved of the goddesses of Fortune and the Earth, overlord of great kings, the mighty lord, the most venerable one," until after the decisive victory of 1192, and thus proclaimed in that year his assumption of the dignity and prestige of the now extinct Cālukya sovereignty, he soon commenced to date his records in the northern districts in his own era, not calculated from his accession in 1173, or from the year of the assumption of imperial titles, but from 1190-1. (1)

From 1191 to 1218 Ballāla II was engaged in continuous warfare in the north. A chronicle of his personal movements alone reveals the furious tempo of his life: the general records of the period - and they are many - depict when properly co-ordinated a fast-moving scene of conflict, on many fronts and often at the same time, giving, out of the welter of information, a picture of superlative success, of real greatness, followed by a decline, ending eventually in a period of stability at a point of grandeur quite considerably higher than that displayed when the process commenced.

In June 1191 Bhillama was himself at Hērūr, the modern Bēlūr, about thirty miles to the north-east of Gadag. (1) In the summer of 1192 Ballāla in person led his army probably from the Pāṇḍya nāḍ, or alternatively from the Baṅkāpura region towards the Sēvuṇa forces at Sōrāṭūr (otherwise Sorattūr). These were drawn up at this spot in order to prevent his passage into the Belvola district which lay on the further side of the hill-chain, and which was already in Bhillama's hands. The Yadava army was commanded by Jaitrasimha, Jaitisimha, or Jaitugi as he was variously known, and must have been an array of all arms, organized upon the most advanced lines of the day, and already experienced in defeating Karnātaka opponents. Ballāla

drove this force before him, through the gap in the hills, to the Lokkigundī/Yādava camp. There, despite the fortifications, he found the morale of the enemy so much reduced, that he captured the city without much delay, and proceeded to take over control of the entire Belvola country.

The earliest reference to this series of events is found in an inscription of October 1192 at Hosūr, about seven miles south-west of Lakkundi, the old Lokkigundī, and about four miles west of Soraṭūr. It states that compensation was paid to the governing body of that place for the damage caused by the encampment of the king's army. (1) We are later told that Ballāla single-handed vanquished the hundreds of the Sēvuna army; (2) he was ruling after having destroyed (?) the entire Sēvuna army composed of the four arms, together with the city named Vīra-vardhana, and having given back (punardattī mādi) Lokkigundī otherwise Śrī-Rāma-datti, which had been given him by ...mana; Ballāla moistened his sword with


(1) A. R. 1926-7, App. F. 113 (1192).

(2) M. A. R. 1910-1, para. 101 (c1195).

(3) M. A. R. 1908 para. 45 (1195). This record is partly illegible. An attempt has been made, it is difficult to see why, to identify Vīra-vardhana with the Śrī-vardhana mentioned by Hēmādri; both are in any case otherwise unknown.
the blood of the Pāṇḍyā, whetted it on the grindstone of the head of Bhillama, and sheathed it in the lotus mouth of Jaitugi; (1) mention of Ballāla's battle with Jaitiśiva at Soraṭūr and the defeat of the latter is likewise found in a record of the period. (2) It was not long before poetry was composed to celebrate the glorious events:

pudid irdd aṭṭale peccid álvariy agurvv āgirdda mēl gottalam kadanakk adbhutam appa ḍeṅkani karam gunpull agal kādi hō- / gad enipp aggada durggad ondu baladindam Jaitugam kāde bē- gade kondam kali Lokkīgundīyan adām Ballāla-bhūpālakām //

"The hero king Ballāla quickly took that Lokkīgundī, when he fought against Jaituga, who was with his single force at the great fort, which was thought impossible to fight against (on account of its) encircling ramparts, lofty bastions, amazing bulwarks aloft, a flagstaff marvellous for battle, and an extremely deep moat." (3)

And again:

ēn olavinda baṇṇisadaq ēm gaḷa dākṣiṇa cakri yuddhadol tān asahāya-śūran enip unnatiyaṁ rūpu-rāya-Sēvūpā- / nūna-gajāśva-sad-bhaṭa-balaṅgālan aṅk uṛad onde meyyoḥ ond āneyoḷ okkilikkida parākramad unnati tāne hēlade //

"If I with pleasure describe how indeed the southern Emperor was in battle -(what was) his greatness expressed (in the title) "Hero without a companion"; does not his greatness itself speak, the greatness of that prowess that with his single body on a single elephant without fear or (1) E.C.V Belur 77(1198). (2) E.C.V Channarayapatna 249(?1193). (3) over.
hesitation thrashed thoroughly the entire forces of the
enemy-king Sêvuṇa, consisting of elephants, horses and
good warriors?"(1)

And again:

kari-sainyôtkarav unçu vâji-balav unç äl unçu talt ennol är
dhuradol kâduvar Bhillama nrapäm båmd ämt od ärd onde sim-
dhuramäm nûnkidan okkal ikki tulidam bennätî kônd ikkidan
Soratûrindave Lokkigûndivarig em Ballâla-bhûpâlakam //</

"When king Bhillama, saying,"I have a multitude of
elephants and warriors, I have a force of horses, I have
soldiers: who will fight in war, coming to grips with me?",
came and met him, king Ballâla crying aloud, pushed for-
ward that same elephant, thrashing (the army) thoroughly
trampled on it, pursued and flogged it from Soratûr right
up to Lokkigûndî, did he not?"(2)

Then, after other details, we hear of the further developments
after the battle of Soratûr:-

sand-ugrâhita-raktadindava alîr ädatt ë-mahi-cakrav inn
ending ärvud ottar attégala bett ell emiyum bättey inn /
ending appudu Mârigam hasiv ad ending appud embannegam
kondam Sêvuṇa-sainyamam bavaradol Ballâla-bhûpâlakam //</

"'The circle of this earth has become mud by reason
of the blood of famous and fierce enemies - when will it
dry again? When will all the roads become (free) again,
that are now all mountains of piled headless trunks? When
will Mâri (the Goddess of Death) become hungry?' King Bal-
When as many as two hundred thousand (?) infantry with array of thunderbolts, and a troop of twelve thousand horses with decorated saddles above and jewelled breast-plates rising to view approached him, king Vīra-Ballāla on his own single elephant drove the force of the Sēvuna king and pursued it and slew it from Soraṭūr as far as the bank of the Krishna river.

"How can I praise the vigour of Giri-durga-malla who besieged suddenly and took the forts within the famous Erambarage, proud Virāṭa's fort, Gutti, Bellittage, Raṭtapalli, Soraṭūr and Kurugōḍa, when enemy kings (?) forming a group, making their mass great, and becoming proud, were of firm determination?" (1)
Another account gives a different list of the places occupied after the victory:


ari-Girṇi-duṛgga-malla-nṛpan ettida bēgade koṇḍa duṛggav oneraḍe Virāṭa-rāja-nagaraṃ Kuṛugōdu Mataṅga-bhūdharaṃ / Dhorevadi-Gutt-Guttavolal-Uddhare-Kālaḍi-Bandanike-Ba-
llare-Sōratūr-Erambarage-Hāluve-Mānuve-Lokkigundīgal //

"Further, the southern Emperor conquered from Sōratūr to Belvola (land) fit for being brought under (cultivation) as if he were scattering, for sprouting, seeds of the greatness of his valour. Friction against the ten million skulls of the brave warriors of the Sēvuṇa army was produced from the fore portion of the ploughs of the cultivators, which had thus lost their peg - the ground being covered over and pulverised (by Ballāla)."

"The king was a "wrestler with the hill-forts" of his enemies who rose and took with speed, as if one or two forts, Virāṭa-rāja's town, Kuṛugōdu, the Mataṅga hill, Dhorevadi, Gutt, Guttavolal, Uddhare, Kālaḍi, Bandanike, Ballarāre, Sōratūr, Eram-
barage, Hāluve, Mānuve and Lokkigundī."(1)

with the Pāṇḍya king's son (?) Bhu...ka, and the fall of the hero-king that was the great Jaituga.

Page 240 n.(1) E.C.XI Davangare 25(1224). Concerning Alir see above p.142 n.(1), where the interpretation is confirmed by this instance. The second verse of this quotation appears in S.I.I.XIX pt.1,340(1224) also. There for sutthāṇeyar, suttāṇeyar is read.
It is thus quite clear that when Hēmādri, in the prāṣasti to the Vrata-kānda of his great treatise, says of Bhillama Yādava "vidadhē yō Hōsaḷēśam vyasum", that he made the Hoysala king lifeless, his statement is utterly without foundation. (1) Nothing is heard of Bhillama after 1193, when he was still recognized at Hipparagi, Sindagi tāluca in Bijapur district, (2) and his only connection with the Hoysala king, which took place between 1190 and that year, had the opposite effect on the latter.

Indeed, by his victory of 1192 Ballāla-II put himself in the very position which he most wished to occupy. He was able to promote the expansion of his empire upon three fronts at once. Naturally enough, Banavāse and the adjoining districts fell into his hands without a serious struggle, compared with the effort such an acquisition would have cost during the period of Cālukya or Kalacuri rule; naturally, likewise, the Belvola nāḍ, whose chief cities were within his grasp, that district long coveted by his grandfather, was not open to his further encroachment, but also offered access to other attractive parts of the late imperial dominions. On the other hand, the opportunity had clearly arrived for subjecting to Hoysala rule those dynasties that lived on the north-eastern flank of the Hoysala nāḍ, and had either troubled Ballāla's frontier districts from time to time, or had assisted in the various

---

Thought quoted in the Sabdanaṇḍarpana (Kittel's ed.p.23) it is so far unexplained. RICE's remark about fire-arms should be ignored. E.C.XI Davangere 25 in the last verse reads voṭṭaṭi, a slip. The sense of kari-gatiṭida remains obscure. A textual corruption is likely. Page 241 n.(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 179 (cl195). It purports to be of 1190, a date incompatible with the contents. THK.T. reads erēḍ, and the translation Māṭaṅga. The translation given here is not perfect, though an improvement.
invasions, or, partaking of the general unsettled atmosphere of the times, gave no better excuse for absorption into a universal state. Thus it was that towards the end of November 1192 Ballāla was still encamped at Lokkigundi, had acquired Gadagu, about seven miles to its north-west, and was in a position to dispose, by deed of gift, of the village of Hombal nearly eight miles further to the north-west of Gadagu itself. We learn from the record which provides us with this information an additional noteworthy fact. Besides telling that Ballāla cut off Jaitrasimha, the right arm of Bhillama, and so acquired the sovereignty of the Kuntala country, it relates that previously Ballāla had defeated with the use of cavalry only, and deprived of his rājya, or territorial jurisdiction, the general Brahma, whose army was strengthened by an array of elephants, and who had conquered sixty tusked elephants with a single tuskless elephant, at the time when he was tearing their wealth from the Kalacuri family because of an insult to his father, who was, it will be remembered, Kāvana-dānñāyaka. (1)


(1) E. I. vi, 10; W. E. II ff. 124b-127a (1192) at Gadag:

nyakkāraṇa pituh śriyaṁ Kalacuri-kṣatrānvayat karsatā
yenaikena hi tūbarēṇa kariṇā gaśṭir-jjitaṁ dantināṁ
tam ca Brahma-camūpatiṁ gaja-ghatāvaśtabdha saṁyaṁ haṁhād
yēn āśvair api kevalair-bhuja-bhṛtā nirjjitya rājyaṁ ātṛtam /
cchidyā Jaitrasimhaṁ dakṣiṇam iva tasya Bhillamasya bhṛjaṁ
vīrēṇa yēna labdham Kuntala-deśādhipatyam api //
It is thus clear that Ballāla was prepared at the critical moment not only to attack and throw back the Sēvūṇa but also to defeat a subordinate obstacle, the general Brahma, who had once been a Kaḷacuri officer and was at the last a legatee of the Cāḻukya. And this helps to explain the ease with which Ballāla assumed the sovereignty of the greater part of the southern half of the Kuntala-dēśa. Another record, dated on the same day as the preceding, at Balaganur, about six miles, in its turn, to the north of Hombal, mentioning the grant of land by Ballāla to a gauḍa who had "caused him pleasure", proves the rapidity with which Ballāla entered upon his new property. (1) There is therefore little doubt of the accuracy of the claim made in the quotations above, that Ballāla took, besides Sorāṭūr and Lokkigūṇḍi, Bṛambarage also. The discomfiture of the Sinda dynasty of that place must have afforded the Hoysala particular satisfaction. Bellittage, which we have met in connection with Viṣṇuvardhana and identify with Bellavaṭṭige (or Belavaṭṭige) to the north-west of Madaganūr, is likewise justly claimed for the Hoysala, and we should hardly be rash in adding Madaganūr and Annigere itself to the list of conquests.

Before turning to the most complex and doubtless most difficult part of the process of absorption which faced Ballāla's administration during the period between 1192 and 1195, namely the subduing of the north-western principalities, we may

notice the progress that was made in the east. The places claimed in the two records quoted above and being in that quarter were, from south to north, Ballare, otherwise Ballare or Bellary, which was in the hands of a Sinda chief; (1) Dhorevadi, otherwise known as Doravadi and successfully identified with Daroji, about fifteen miles north-west of Bellary; (2) and Kurugōdu, about twelve miles north of Bellary, being the last mentioned in the group of towns between the Tuṅga-bhadra and the Hagari rivers. We should however be justified in including Siruguppe, near the junction of those rivers, for the claims to have taken Hāluve and Mānuve show that Ballāla passed at least twenty miles to the north of that place. Hāluve must certainly be the modern Hālvi, about two miles from the Tuṅgabhadra, to the south of the river, and Mānuve must be Mānvi, nearly five miles north of the river, both places being equipped with hill-forts, and the latter, Mānuve, probably being the most northerly fort ever taken by a Hoysala king on his own behalf. (3) Although Ballāla may have had a variety of reasons

(2) Venkataramanayya, V.C.E.p.167-8, strongly presses the identification, which the later history of the place well supports. Mackenzie Collection, General(I.O.), vol. x p.145-8, "Account of Daroojee, received at Darojee Dec.1800" relates that the country was overgrown with jungle by the reign of Krishna-rāyulu of Anagundi who caused the jungle to be destroyed and the village to be built and named Dvārāvati. Daroji to the eastwards was actually built by the Moghuls. Daroji is said to be four miles from Kampili, but it is clear that it is about ten miles. It is by no means impossible that the ancient name of the place which Krishna-rāyulu revived was Dvārāvati, of which Dhorevadi, Doravadi and even Daroji may have been corruptions. Saletore, in his article on the origins of Vijayanagara in the Vij.Sexc. Gnm. Volume, p.141 n.9, doubts the derivation of Daroji from Doravadi, but does not offer any other site for the place, or help in any way by relating that Doravadi was "the ancient name of Doravadi (quoting E.C.VIII Sutra 309), an absurd error, as Doravalli is the name of the village where the record is,
for taking the towns near Bellary, it is certain that Hāluve and Mānuve were taken in the course of operations designed to remove Sēvuṇa authority from as much as possible of the area within Hoysala range, (1) and we may suspect that the Yadava king's officials had penetrated quite far southwards on the eastern flank of the Hoysala's new field of activity, for an inscription of Jaitugi Sēvuṇa is found at Cinna Tumbalam in the modern Adoni taluqa, not thirty miles to the east-north-east of Siruguppe. (2)

The date of this north-eastern campaign is in part determined by two records, the first of which tells of the king's siege of Kurugōḍu in August 1194, and the second informing us that he was encamped in that place in September of that year. Kummata was taken at the same time, if we may judge from an inscription of May 1195, in which Ballāla is given the title "taker of Tālakāḍu (and so on), Lokigundi(sic), Kummata & Brambarage". (3)

It will, doubtless, have been during his stay in the north that Ballāla set up a linga at (? )Jālevale on "the western bank of the Tuṅgabhadra", a place so far unidentified, in the name of his father Nārasiṅga-dēva, who seems to have died during this period of his son's triumph. (4)

and thus the home of the warrior commemorated in the inscription. Doravalli and Doravali are of course identical, and neither had or has any connection with Doravāḍi. If Doravali had been an alternative (not any more ancient, as Saletore himself says, correctly, that the record is of 1212) form of Doravadi, it would not have affected the stages by which Doravadi became Daroji. Page 245 n.(3)Hālvi, Aḍoni taluqa, Bellary dist., 77°7' 15°53'; Mānvi, Raichur dist., 77°4' 15°59'. Their approximate position is shown on the frontispiece map; the other places are to be found either on Map'A' or Map'B'.

(1), (2), (3), and (4) over.
Vīra-Ballāla was still at Lokkiguṇḍa in January 1193. The inscription relating this is actually at Beḷagāvi, and tells that a certain Ereyana-daṇḍayaka united the Banavāse 12,000 and Sāntalīge 1,000 under one government.(1)

To turn for a moment to the west, we see from a later record that, the defeat of the Sēvūṇa king having been accomplished,"among the many countries which that emperor of prowess, Vīra-Ballāla-dēva had by the might of his arm brought into subjection and was ruling with energy, the Banavāse country was an abode of Kāma (Love)".(2) It is thus clear that the movement westwards took place soon after the collapse of the Sēvūṇa forces, and Hoysala administrative control was hastily imposed upon the unfortunate dynasties, whether Kadamba, Sāntara or Gaṅga, former allies and former antagonists alike. It is not possible to settle the order in which the towns fell, but Ballāla certainly acquired, according to the inscriptions to which repeated reference has been made, Raṭṭahālli, or Raṭṭiḥālli on the Kumudvati river, then Bandālike, the now desolate and overgrown city about twelve miles further west, Uddhare, ten miles further in the same direction, and then Gutti, at the extreme edge of the great north-western clearing. Buttavolalu, the seat of the Gutta and Hāṅgal, the seat of the Kadamba dynasty, were taken at about the same time. Conquests in the Sāntara region are not recorded, but many must have occurred, and the Sāntara dynasty entered a dark period.(3)
However, as may be anticipated, a region with such a reputation did not accept this fate quietly. In 1193 Ballāla went southwards to observe the state of affairs in his home territories. An invasion from beyond the southern frontier appears to have taken place in 1192, in the usual way, and there is mention of a battle with the Polagas, whoever they may have been. (1) But though Ballāla was in Dūrassmudra in April 1193, (2) he was, within a very short time, on his way northwards again, and staying at Hallavūr. (3) In August serious disturbances were on foot in the Banavāse nāḍ, while Ballāla was visiting it; (4) in October Ballāla felt the need to be at a more central position, and had gone to Bālguli, about seventeen miles north of Uccāngi. (5) This Bālguli was, like Hallavūr, a favourite place for Ballāla's camp during a northern campaign; it was further advanced than Hallavūr but hence misdated by the editor 1229.

Page 246 n. (3) E.C.V Belur 204 (1194). M.A.R. 1923, 1 (1194) at Nerēlīge. E.C.II 355 (1195). Another record of 1195, M.A.R. 1926, 40 and 1908 para. 45, calls Ballāla the taker of Tattavādi and Talekādu-nāḍ, or, otherwise, Tardavādi and Tarikādu-nāḍ. The latter has yet to be identified, but Tardavādi 1,000 is known to be a district stretching from Bijnūpur to the Krishna river, and often governed by officials who held Belvōla, Huligere and H alasige districts (see Fleet, D.K.D. (1896 edition) pp. 451, 440, 458, 485 and 521). Ballāla could only have conquered the southern part of this district. Page 246 n. (4) E.C.VI Honnali 17 (1226).


(1) E.C.III Malavalli 27, 29 (1192); M.A.R. 1920, para. 74.
(2) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 39 (1193).
(3) E.C.V Channarayapātna 249 (?1193).
was not so favourably situated strategically, requiring for its defence a much larger force, as the hills that surrounded it, even in those days of greater afforestation, presented a very wide perimeter. While he was there some fighting took place, perhaps at some spot between his camp and the previous Hoysala frontier. (1) Proof that the area was being settled under Hoysala administration, on the complete collapse of the Pāṇḍya and the subordination of the Gutta dynasty, is provided by the inscriptions that were set up in the north in 1194-5. Two are found at Kuruvatti, five miles south-east of Guttavolalu, one at Lakkundi, and one at Holal, which is four miles north of Kuruvatti. (2)

Vīra-Ballāla remained at Bāguli, sometimes called Bāguli, during January 1194, and did not move his headquarters from there until March. (3) He returned to Dōrasamudra in early April, and may well have been in the capital throughout the summer. (4) In the meanwhile it is clear that he was engaged in some operations of a fairly minor character. We hear that he besieged Dusthe "in the north" during March. (5) Its position is not known. Perhaps during this obscure period he stayed at another fort while moving in the newly-won territories, a fort which likewise defies attempts at identification, Mahāvaḷeyadurga. (6)

---

(1) EC.XI Hiriyur 70 at Huvvinahalli. The date is not certain.
(4) E.C.VI Kadur 77(1194). It appears that he was in Dōrasamudra in June (M.A.R.1926, 107 (?1194)) but the details are not conclusive, and the inscription, which refers to an attack by Nārasiṅga of Bematur upon a place in Nagamangala tāluga, is
It was probably rather during the later than during
the earlier half of the year 1194 that Ballāla attacked the
Cōla ruler of Heṇjeru and Nīḍugal. It would seem that the
ruler, Bhōga-dēva, had begun to erect fortifications to defend
his kingdom from Ballāla, who now surrounded him on all sides
but the east; to this period we can assign records that describe
the battle at the fort of Hāne, or Hāneyakōte. This was supposed
by Rice to be on Brahmagiri near Siddhāpura, (1) a view supported
to some extent by the existence of an inscription at Siddhāpura (2) which refers to the rebuilding of the forts at Nīḍugal and Hāneya, or Hāne. However, the fort was taken, despite
valiant efforts by Bhōga-rāja in its defence, (3) and another
record at Siddhāpura says that after bringing into subjec-
tion the Hāneya fort Ballāla built a city called Vijaya-giri. (4)
Of this Vijayagiri nothing further is known, though it can not
be assumed to have been situated within the Cōla dominions,
however likely the sequence of the statements makes that sug-
gestion appear.

In the Banavase 12,000 Ballāla's position in 1194

in several respects irregular.
Page 249 n. (5) E.C.VI Mudgere 5(1194).
Page 249 n. (6) MA.R 1936,2(?C1194 - dateable only by the refer-
ce to Bammala-dēvi and by the titles of the king.)

(1) E.C.XI introd.p.19. It is not the Hāne in the north-west.
(2) E.C.XI Molakalmuru 20(1218).
(3) M.A.R.1908 para.44(c1194) at Kattesōmanahalli near Halebidu.
(4) E.C.XI Molakalmuru 12(c1194).
was fairly secure, for we find a certain Padmi-dēva, bearing the then highly coveted title Kumāra, holding Ballāla's commission for that district with his headquarters at Belagāvi. (1) A little over twenty miles to the north, however, the Kadamba family of Hāṅgal were contemplating resistance to the Hoysala, and the chronicle of the period from 1196 to 1211, when the Yādava drove Ballāla out of his northern outposts, is largely occupied with an account of the extraordinarily valiant fight which that family sustained against apparently overwhelming odds.

But before this began, Ballāla had further work to do in the north. In January and March 1195 he was at Dōrasamudra,(2) but before the summer was over he had returned to the further side of the Tuṅgabhadra and resumed the direction of the process of occupying the sometime Cālukya districts. An inscription of the next year tells that, besides other conquests conventionally associated with his name, Ballāla II took Bana-vāse, Hāṅgal, Halasige, Huligere, Noḷambavāḍī, Beḷuvala (Beḷvola), Bāgaḍage, Emerbarage, Kisukādu, Kummaṭa, Balla, Kudēri, Ayyaṇavāḍī, Māsavāḍī, Keḷavāḍī, Sindarige, Uccaṅgi and Lokkigundī. (3) The capture of many of these places has already been noticed in its place, while Balla, Kudēri and Ayyaṇavāḍī remain to be identified. It seems extremely likely that a corruption has occ-

(1) EC.VII Shikarpur 138(1194).
(2) E.C.V Arsikere 5(1195), and ibid. 150(1195).
(3) M.A.R.1937,26(1196).Kisukōḍu is certainly a misreading.
urred, and that the reading should be Ballakunde, the well-known 300 of that name not far removed from Kukkanūr, and almost certainly within the old Erambarage Sinda dominions, followed by some other name which is not at present apparent. (1) Halasige may have been claimed under conditions similar to those under which Viṣṇuvardhana claimed it from time to time, that is to say, there is no proof that Hoysala officials ever administered even a part of it, though they may easily have raided the southern portions of it. Huligere must have been in Ballāla's hands from the time of the Soraṅgu battle if not continuously from the time of the Muḷugund expedition. Māsavādi was the small district including Dambal and Kaulūr which one who crossed the Tūṅgabhadra on the way to Lakkundī then had to pass through, in other words between Belvola proper and the Pāṇḍya rāḍ. It was only a 140 district, and counted as a sub-

division of Belvola. (2) Māsavādi had provided Ballāla with his wife Remma-devi, of whom mention has already been made. She belonged to the ruling house of the district. Bāgadage, on the other hand is known to have been a Sinda district, in fact a small 70 nāḍ, probably situated in the modern Bijapur district. (3) Kisukādu, the chief town of the 70 nāḍ of that name, is the modern Paṭṭadakal, eight miles north-east of Bādāmi (4), and thus about 40 miles north of Lakkundī, and was likewise a Sinda possession of long standing. The Sindas had also held

(2) See Fleet, op.cit. pp.333 (in 1040 there were only five towns in it),435,465,502,506 n.2. Also W.E.II ff.80a-84a, and I f.20 & I f.41.

Kelavādi, a nāḍ of larger size than the preceding, being a
300 nāḍ, with a chief town of the same name which is the
modern Kelavādi, eleven miles north of Bādāmi, and thus about
fifty miles north of Lakkundi.(1) These districts, Bāgadage,
Kisukādu and Kelavādi must all have been parts of the Tardavādi 1,000, and thus the claim to have conquered them is in
accord with another contemporary claim to have conquered the
Tardavādi-nāḍ,(2) but the truth seems to be that the Sinda
family had collapsed, and the Sindavādi nāḍ which includes
this southern portion of the Tardavādi 1,000 naturally fell
into Ballāla's hands, to the extent, that is, to which he was
able to occupy it; and that was severely limited, as the
absence of inscriptions shows. Sindarige, which remains to be
considered, may have been an alternative name for the Sindavādi nāḍ.

True to this list of nominal conquests from the
Sinda dynasty, Ballāla is found in October 1195, having"raised
the north",(3) actually ruling in their capital Brambarage.
He was there, in the fort, on the fifth of October,(4) and
seems to have taken the unusual course of remaining in that
quarter during the winter, for we find him there in February
1196.(5) Almost immediately afterwards he returned homewards,

(2) See above, p.248 - being Page 246 n.(3).
(3) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 54(1195): haqagal etti.
(4) E.C.III Tirumakudal-Narsipur 31(1195).
(5) E.C.V Arsikere 104(1196).
for, as usual, difficulties began to be experienced in other regions. Ballâla had hardly reached Dôrasamudra, where he stayed in March and May 1196 (1), when a Hoysala contingent led by his wife Umâ-dëvi, raided the Sinda principality of Belagavatti.(2) It seems that the Sinda ruler, Malli-dëva, whose possessions lay across important lines of communication between Dôrasamudra and the north, whether out of discontent or sympathy with his relatives of Erambarage, had decided to embarrass the Hoysala. Umâ-dëvi repeated her raiding activities in April of the next year, attacking both Yarehalli and Belagavatti.(3)

The amount of work impending in the Hoysala country, and the general strain on the administrative machinery of the kingdom, probably account for the emergence into public life at this time of Kumâra Vîra-Nârasiângâ-dëva, son of Ballâla by Padmala-dëvi, who enjoyed authority in May 1196, although, having been born in November 1182, he was only 13½ years of age.(4)

But, whatever the activity south of the river, Hoysala progress in absorbing the areas to the north of the Tungabhadra was steady. Three inscriptions at Mevundi, about eight miles south-east of Lakkundi, dated respectively between March 1196 and January 1197 proclaim Ballâla's titles.(5)

Naregal, an old stronghold of the Sinda,(6) situated about thirty-seven miles south-west of Erambarage, has a record of Ballâla

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 16(1196), E.C.IV Gundlupet 27(1196).
dated in November 1197, while another at Annigere is of the same month. (1)

In the late autumn of 1196, however, the Hoysala attention was at last turned towards the Kadamba. Ballāla himself visited Hāṅgal, where Kāma-dēva was ruling. He laid siege to the place, and, camping at (?) Ārērakēri, fought an elephant battle. From this one would be justified in supposing that "Ārērakēri" was a village in some proximity to Hāṅgal or at least within the Kadamba dominions. It is still unidentified however, and some difficulties surround its very name. (2)


(2) W.E.II ff.309b-310a, Moraes,K.K.p.453-4(1196) at Hāṅgal. There are discrepancies between the two readings: the former reads: Padmayya sāḥaṇi Kāma-dēva varūṣa 16 Naḷa-sāṅgavatsara ῳśvīja-bahula...māṃgala varadalu, śrīmatu Hoysaṇa-Ballāla-dēvanu Hāṇumgalla bāṇḍu mutti ārērakēriyalu bīḍam bīṭṭu alleya mōhar-amaṇ mūṃkī kāḍuttire, etc. The latter reads ....vāradandu; Hoysāla (wrongly); ānēmōhakamaṇ (probably correctly), and a lacuna from sāḥaṇi to Naḷa exclusive. But for mutti ārērakēriyalu Moraes reads Muttalakēriyōlū (read -oḷu), which might on several grounds, particularly that of the natural sequence of the record, be rejected, but for the fact that the existence of a village in Bijapur district, at 75°37'15°54', about four miles south-west of Bādāmi, by name Muttalageṛi, makes it appear that Ballāla's presence near Hāṅgal, and the elephant battle against persons unknown took place at different times, and at different places. Muttalageṛi is excellently suited to a camp. It has a large tank (kere) and lies between a wooded mass to its north, and a small gap between two ranges of four to six hundred feet in height running from east to west, the gap itself being about a mile north of the Malprabha river. Such a site was very likely to have been chosen by a commander campaigning in the Sinda districts. If such was the case here, the elephant battle may have been either against the Sinda or a Sēvuna force from the north.
Of Hoysala relations with Kāma-dēva we hear no more until 1203. Certain it is, at any rate, that Kāma lived on in hostility to the new emperor.

Meanwhile, in January 1198, Vīra-Ballāla "having returned from a season of victorious expeditions to the north for the purpose of putting down the evil and upholding the good", was in the residence of Hallavūr, otherwise known as Vijayasamudra. (1) By August, however, he is represented as being again in the capital,(2) but he can hardly have remained there long, for he was, by November, in the fort of Kukkanūr, about eight miles to the north of Erambarage, once again inspecting the state of the Sindavādi.(3) He may have left the greater part of the responsibility of his kingdom in the hands of Umā-dēvi, his son Vīra-Nārasimha, and perhaps other queens such as Bammala-dēvi, for he is not known to have returned to Dōrasamudra until December 1200.(4) Meanwhile he was at Lokkigundai in April 1199,(5) Huligere in July-August of that year, (6) and at Hallavūr, obviously on his way homewards, in October November 1200.(7)

The year 1201 appears to have been totally free from military violence on a large scale, but the latent hostility of the dynasties in the north-west must have been accumulating strength. It is not surprising to learn that by 1202 Ballāla

---

(1) E.C.VI Tarikere 45(1197-8).  (2) M.A.R. 1929,51(1198).
(3) EC.V Belur 77(1198).  (4) E.C.III Mandya 23(1200).
(5) E.C.IV Nagamangala 47(1199).  (5) E.C.V Arsikere 103(1199).
(7) E.C.V Hassan 139(1200).
had subjected Pândya, Cōla, Sinda, Sāntara, Gaṅga of Uddhara, Kadamba and Gutta,(1) but the statement itself suggests that some deliberate process of absorption and discipline was being applied to the areas in question. The Gaṅga family of Uddhara had fallen about 1193, the date of their last lithic record, and the Gutta must have lost his independence soon after the fall of Uccāngī, and the Mulugunda expedition. The Sāntara dynasty appears to have lost its vitality, to judge from the rarity of its inscriptions, between those years and the time when the Sēvuṇa drove Ballāla from the north, so that its obscurity must have been due to Hoysala pressure.

Towards the end of the year 1202, however, activity on an important scale was resumed: Nārasimha, the Crown Prince, was ruling in Dōrasamudra in December, a fairly sure sign that the king was on campaign.(2) A battle took place at Baniyūr in this period, though nothing definite can be deduced from the fact so long as the location of the place is unknown. (3) The king was, however, in Lokkigūndi at the end of the year.(4) From whatever operations were afoot there he was recalled southwards by an insurrection in the west at the beginning of 1203. In early February he attacked Uddhara, which may or may not have been occupied still by a member of the famous Gaṅga family, (5) and must have achieved his object, for at the end of the month he was again at his camp at Hallavūr.(6) It was well that

(2) E.C.V Channarayapatna 186(1202).
(3) E.C.VII Shikarpur 156(1202): a roughly phrased vīrāgal, the date being in the month of Divali, the year Dundumī (१२०३) the 28th year of the Yādava emperor Ballāla. 28 is an error for 12.
(4) E.C.VI Kadur 36(1202-3). (5) E.C.VII Shikarpur 244(1203).
(6) E.C.VI Kadur 127(1202).
he remained in such a point of vantage, for at once Kāma-dēva Kadamba began to assail several of Ballāla's more northerly villages. Kolligudde, for example, was attacked, and was assisted on the part of the Hoysala government by Mallāna-danāyaka. (1) Kolligudde is not as yet identified, but seems not to have been far from Sātēnahalli, a village about two miles north of Hāṅgal. It is of interest to note that a village so near to the Kadamba capital was in Ballāla's hands both before and after this attack by Kāma-dēva. It is unknown whether Ballāla returned to Dōrasamudra during the summer. Most probably he did. But the situation in the north still required his presence, and he was in Hallavūr at the end of 1203 and in February 1204. (2) In May he was still busy in the area, for he was able to visit the tīrtha of the god Rāmanātha at Kuruva, which is 14 miles south of Hallavūr and six miles south-east of Beḷagavatti. (3) In the summer, satisfied with the condition of his new dominions, he returned homewards, and was in Dōrasamudra in August 1204. (4) He was still there in February of the next year and appears, for once, to have enjoyed some tranquillity. An inscription of that year gives Ballāla the Bhīmarathī, which must be the Bhīma river, as his northern boundary. (5) That his

---

(1) W.E.II f.150a-b, also ibid.150b(ii)(1203), & 144b(a)(1203).
(2) E.C.VII Shikarpur 225(1203-4); W.E.II ff.144b-149b at Sātēnahalli.
(3) E.C.VII Honnalli 7(1204).
(4) E.C.VII Shimoga 65(?1204).
(5) E.C.XII Tiptur 43(1205): he was at vijaya-Dōrasamudra, the "victorious Dōrasamudra". He was ruling with his queen Umā-devi, "Umā-garamesvari-sahita", in February 1205, according to E.C.VI Chikmagalur 40(1205), K.T.only; but several gaudas died in the battle of Indūr, which may be Indāvāra in the west. The trouble may have been merely local - the area had a bad reputation.
troops reached the Krishna river is quite probable, and the
Sevunas may have admitted it as the boundary for the time
being. That they crossed it to meet the Bhīmā at any great
distance from its confluence with the Krishna is most unlikely.
If they ever penetrated so far north, they must have returned
soon, and no government was ever carried on by the Hoysala at
any distance beyond the Krishna river.

Kāma-dēva's hostility was unabated. In March 1205
he raided Tevarateppa and Kuṇiteppa, villages about 15 miles
south of Hāṅgal. Thus we see that he had been able to cross the
Varadā and enter the sphere that had once depended from Uddhara
or Bandalike. (1) It appears that he was met by a coalition
under Gōparasa-dannāyaka, the Hoysala official at Belagāvi,
and certain other elements perhaps of Sāntara origin. A battle
took place at Maradi.(2) Then an inscription of doubtful inter-
pretation appears to show that Kāva-( that is, Kāma) dēva
attacked Jambūr agrahāra, which indicates, if dependable, that
Kāva-dēva's success against the coalition had been considerable,
as Jambūr is no less than three miles south-east of Belagāvi
itself.(3)

It is not surprising therefore that Ballāla returned
northwards again. In May 1205 he was at Hallavūr, while 'Kumāra
Yādava-cakravarti Nārasīṅga-dēva' filled his place at Dōras-
(4)

\[\text{(1) E.C.VIII Sorab 332,333(1205). (2) E.C.VII Shikarpur 145,}
\]
\[\text{A.R.1902,20. Mādarasa, son of Ārāmat Bīrarasa, fought and fell}
\]
\[\text{at Maradi. Bīrarasa was almost certainly a Sāntara.}
\]
\[\text{(3) M.INS.65, p.137,P.S.O.C.I.197. Panapparasa(?)"skilled in}
\]
\[\text{conciliating the commanders of the army" ruled in Balligrāme nāḍī.}
\]
at identification. In May fighting took place in the region of Kallukere, which must have been about three miles south of Hangal. (2) Apparently his forces had managed to repress Kāma-dēva for the time being, for Ballāla left the area at once, and was in Dōrasamudra in April. (3) A year's breathing-space was ample for so resilient a spirit as Kāma-dēva. At the beginning of March 1207 he commenced repeated attacks upon the districts in the west held by Ballāla. He raided Mūvaḍibīdu, the modern Mūdi, an important place at a ford over the Varadā, eleven miles south of Hangal, his capital. (4) Gōkarna he attacked and took. On his way home, however, his forces were ambushed by Hoysala partisans. (5) This was in April: an inscription of Ballāla II dated May 1207, at the important road-junction of Hāvēri, about seventeen miles east of Hangal, shows that Kāva-dēva's power was still fairly narrowly circumscribed. (6) From the statement of a record of that period that Ballāla ruled, having made a victorious expedition as far as the Heddore, we can learn nothing: (7) but his presence at Hallavūr during the year shows his anxiety plainly. (8) Meanwhile Nārasimha ruled at Dōrasamudra in April 1207: (9) his position in the state was secure, and it is not surprising to find him referred to three years later as Yuvaḍāja. (10)

(2) W.E.II ff. 151a(1206). The Postal Directory places Kallukere near Alūr.
(3) E.C.V Channarayapatna 265(1206).
(4) E.C.VIII Sorab 171(1207).
(5) E.C.VIII Sorab 79(1207) at Hosūr agrahāra.
(7) E.C.VI Kadur 134(1207).
(10) E.C.V Channarayapatna 243(1210).
In November 1207 the Belagavi area was raided again, probably by Kāva-dēva. But as Ballal still possessed Kalkēri, nine miles south-east of Hāṅgāl on the eastern side of the Varadā, at the beginning of December, it seems that Kāva-dēva concentrated on the southern parts of the great valley, to the exclusion of those less fertile and less densely populated. Ballal was obliged to continue this oscillating movement during the years that preceded the Sēvuna attack; Kāva-dēva was a perpetual cause of anxiety. In March 1208 he raided Haya, situated between Banavāse and Uddhār. Clearly the Hoysala defences south of the Varadā were inefficient. The king was at Hallavūr in April, but it does not appear that he intervened personally in the campaign against the Kadamba, though he was at Hallavūr in January 1209 also. A return to the capital during the spring was followed by another long stay at Hallavūr between July and December. He was assisted at these headquarters by his son, the minister Paṇḍit-āyya-dānāyaka.

By 1210 the unsettled condition of the north-west, together with premonitions of the coming disaster, had brought about a state of feverish watchfulness. Ballāla is said, in one of the few records of the year, to be ruling together with his wife Padmala-mahādevi and with Nārasimha-dēva: the government needed the full co-operation of the various households within the family.

(3) E.C.VIII Sorab 305(1208). (4) E.C.VI Kadur 117(1208).
(5) E.C.V Arskere 40(1209). (6) E.C.V Arskere 59(1209); S.I.I.X pt.1,329, A.R.1913,123(1209); also E.C.V Channarayapatna 172(1209) and E.C.VI Tarikere 84(1209); E.C.V Channarayapatna 244(1210). (7) E.C.XI Holalkere 14(1210).
In March 1211 Ballāla was at Hallāvūr, and indeed was there until December, (1) not daring to move further to the north, or to leave the districts to themselves. For Simhaṇa-dēva Sēvuṇa, son of the Jaitugi who was defeated by Ballāla nearly twenty years before, took advantage of the remarkable successes of Kāma-dēva Kadamba. Doubtless encouraged by the latter's invitation, he scorned to attack Belvola or the eastern Sinda districts, but drove straight at Banavāsenāḍ, thus outflanking all Ballāla's possessions to the north of the Tuṅgabhadra. In April 1211 he opened an attack on the Hoysala's lands in the modern Sorab taluqa, and thus continued, only with greater vigour, the work Kāma-dēva had commenced on his own account. (2) An incident in the fighting against Siṅgana (sic) is found in an inscription at Elavāre, (3) and an undated record mentioning an expedition against Siṅga-dēva by Mahādēva-dannayaka ought perhaps to be attributed to this year. (4) A battle took place in August at Bīlivūr, (5) and in October Ballāla-dēva's "raiders" besieged Bīrāūr, only five miles west of Sorab, thus demonstrating the high degree of success attained by the Kadamba-Sēvuṇa combination. (6)

While this struggle was in progress in the west, far to the north the Hoysala towns were hardly disturbed. Nāgāvī was still in Ballāla's hands in October 1211. (7) In January 1212, while Ballāla was in Hallāvūr, his wife Padmala-dēvi was ruling

parts of the northern Pāṇḍya nāḍ, including the village of Hosa-Hadaṅgile, apparently without any anticipation of a serious threat from beyond the river. (1) In February the king seems to have taken the field, though the name of the place where he camped being incomplete, it is impossible to say whether it was northwards or westwards. (2) That the latter direction is the more probable is shown by the fact that in April Siṅgaṇa-dēva's forces attacked another area in Ballāla's western districts. (3) Clearly the Sēvuṇa, whose local partisans had advised him correctly, chose to concentrate on the fertile valley rather than fight for the scattered townships of the northern plateau, realising, without doubt, that these latter must fall easily into his hands once the Banavāse nāḍ had been won and the Hoysala strength undermined. Thus in April (4) 1212 Ballāla still held Lokkigundi, while in the next month Siṅgaṇa-dēva's forces seized the people and cattle of Bandalike and shut up the grain stores in that important town. This was presumably in order to force the Belagāvi district's inhabitants to submit, which they might do more readily if there had in fact been a period of drought. (5) But by February 1213 the second part of Siṅgaṇa's plan had begun to unfold. He had taken Gadag, and we shall not be rash in supposing that Erambarage, Naregal, Balaganūr and Pombulca(Hombal) had fallen too. Whether Belavattige, Madaganūr and Anṇigere were also in the Sēvuṇa's hands cannot be known, but it is highly likely. (6)

By March of the next year Śiṅgana had taken Nāgāvi, and a direct threat was opened against Huligere. At the same time he must have taken Bentūr, just over seven miles west of Nāgāvi, for he is known to have ruled it in December 1214.

(2) As Ballāla may well have held Lokkigundī, for he is represented as being in ..., as did Ballāla in April 1214, the Sēvuna must have surrounded his post on two sides at least. In any case no Sēvuna penetration was effected to the south of the Tūṇgabhadra as far as we can tell, for Ballāla still occupied Magala, an important point on a much-used ford over the river.

In April, again, the chief of Bandalike, Bammī-ḍēvarasa, now a subject of the Sēvuna, joined by a Sēvuna officer by name Drōnapala, besieged Uddhare, which was probably holding out for the Hoysala. Ballāla's forces in the area, perhaps reinforced by levies from the Sāntalige nāḍ and by Hoysala troops coming by way of Raṭṭihalli, began to make some headway against the Sēvuna, and retook Bandalike. So pleased was Ballāla with the success of this counter-attack that he commenced his return to the capital. The Belvola nāḍ was probably left in the hands of one of the royal household. The king was in Dōrasamudra in August 1215, and was there when he learned that Śiṅgana had taken advantage of his absence and captured Balagāvi. At once Śiṅgana was proclaimed as Karṇāṭa-ksiti-

(1) WE.II f.156a(2nd ½)(1214) at Nāgāvi. A.R.1926-7, App.F.23 shows that he still held it in March 1215.
(2) A.R.1926-7, App.F.154(1214). (3) S.I.I.X IX pt.1,332(1214) at Muttigi. Did he stop at Virūpāksapura (the reading is Vi...paṭṭana) on his way towards Lokkigundī (E.C.XI Holalkere 2(1214))? Virūpāksapura or Virūpāksapatṭana has been identified - not conclusively - with ḍosadurga in Chitaldrug district. See below p.477 . (4) S.I.I.X IX pt.1,333(1214) at Magala. (5) E.C.VII Sorab 391. (6) E.C.VII Shikarpur 243(1214) at Ban-
pāla-sainya-timira-pradhvāma-sa-trīrātapō, "a fierce sunshine in destroying the darkness that was the army of the Karpāṭa king."(1) A later record gives him the title Hoyisaṇa-rāya-Ballāla-lakṣmī-lata-kanda-sandhā-mardana-gaṇendra,"a lordly elephant in crushing the abundant mass of creepers that was the fortune of Ballāla the Hoysala king."(2) Likewise Siṅgana's grandson, who may actually have taken part in this war during his early youth, Kṛṣṇa, otherwise Kaṅhara or Kandhara-dēva Sēvuṇa, is called some years later Ballāla-sthūla-kūla-prapat-ana-taṭiṇī-pūra-ramhō...haṁ, "a ...river's raging flood in dashing upon the massive bank Ballāla."(3)

In 1216, while gifts were being made to temples in the Hoysala-nāḍ for Ballāla's victory in this war on two fronts, (4) Siṅgana was in possession of Bisalahalli, between Bandalike, which he must have retaken, and Balagāvi,(5) while in April he was master of Citiṭur, five miles south of Belagāvi, and pointing the way southwards and eastwards.(6) Hire Kabbūru, five miles north of Belagāvi, had long been in his hands, and Ekalarasa, descendant of the well-known Uddhare Gaṅga dynasty, which until Ballāla's victories of 1192-4 had been a loyal Hoysala ally, was obliged to acknowledge Sēvuṇa supremacy, perhaps the only step that could restore the past fortunes and greatness of his house.

---

(1) E.C.VII Shikarpur 95(1215). See also Hēmādri, Vrata-kāṇḍa-prasasti in S.Srikantha Sastri's Sources of Kaṇ.Hist.i.p.228-9.
(2) W.E.II ff.200a-205b(1238) at Tilivalli. (3) E.I.xix 3(1250).
(6) E.C.VIII Sorab 507(1216). (7) ibid.398(1216).
Nor was the Ganga the only potentate to change sides. The Sinda ruler of Belagavatī, Īśvara-dēva, who held such an important strategic position athwart Hoysala communications with the north that his defection could be counted a major disaster, accepted the overlordship of the Sēvuna in April 1216. But while the Kadamba Kāma-dēva and the Sinda Īśvara-dēva were by choice allies of the Sēvuna - for the repeated attacks of the Hoysala on Hāngal were more than ample immediate provocation, and Umā-dēvi's attacks on the Sinda's possessions a few years before did little to encourage that family's loyalty - and while the Gaṅga was perforce a member of their confederacy, Ballāla himself was not without his adherents.

South of an imaginary boundary running from Cīṭṭūr westwards to Nisarāṇi the land was held by rulers favourable to the Hoysala cause, or, at the least, hostile to the northern confederacy. An officer acting under Ballāla's orders, and doubtless supplied and reinforced from Sāntara territory, with which he had close connections, invaded Jiduvalige-nāḍ in April 1216. He was Bāleyamma-verggaṭe, otherwise known as Bādeyamma, and his objective was to chastise the Uddhare Gaṅga, in whose hands the best part of the Jiduvalige (otherwise Jidvalige or Jiddulige) nāḍ lay. (3) Troops from Cīṭṭūr opposed

(1) E.C.VII Honnali 48(1216) at Belagutti.
(2) He bore Sāntara-type titles: E.C.VIII Sagar 124, 125(1216) at Nāḍamaṅgaśeṭe.
(3) E.C.VIII Sorab 398(1216). Bāleyamma was the son of the general Gōṅgana and Biyabarasi, daughter of Bāleyamma-verggaṭe's sister Keleyabarasi, sister of Kālarasa, son of Bommarasa, ruler of Kunda and Koḍa-nāḍs. He was a subordinate of Ballāla II. See E.C.VIII Sagar 15(1218).
opposed this movement, (1) and Kāma-dēva ordered a large force against him. The ensuing battle was fought at Parige, or Harige, well within Sāntara-held territory. (2) Bāleyamma not only escaped from the trap but lived to give distinguished service in the same cause three years later.

(1) EC.VIII Sorab 507(1216) at Cittur.

(2) M.A.R.1929,73(1216) at Kuppagadde, about 3 miles N.W. of Uddhara. The reading may be defective; but in any case the "Note" by the editor is completely misleading. The text relates; śṛimatu Kadamba-cakravarthi Kāva-dēvarasaru Kēśava-dēva Bommeya mukhyavāgi palarum nāyakarum Bāleyamakke Sōdiya mēle daṃḍam bīlā pēlal ēri baṇḍu Parigeya bayalali biḍam biṭṭu --- mahā-bavaram ādalli, etc., for which the editor writes, (p.148). "It mentions a great battle near the village Parige, when Kēśava-dēva, Bommeya and other generals of the Kadamba king were marching with an army under the king's orders to seize the places Bāleyamakki (a place near Bālehonmur in Koppa tāluqa) and Sōde (in South Canara)." To this it is objected that though in Koppa tāluqa there are several place-names incorporating "makki", Bāleyamakki does not appear in the sheets of the Survey, and neither Koppa nor South Kanara are suitable districts in which to find the goals of an expedition sent by Kēva-dēva during this war. The distance alone makes either impossible, if the very fact of the two places suggested being in opposite directions from Kuppagadde or Cittur did not make the absurdity apparent. A better translation of the sentence is: "When the Kadamba emperor Kāva-dēvarasa, ordering many nāyakas, of whom Kēśava-dēva and Bommeya were the chief to lead the army against Sōdi (in the war) against Bāleyama, rose and came and camped in the plain of Parige; and when there was a great battle,..." Sōdi must have been in the neighbourhood of Uddhara, like Parige itself.
An inscription of Siṅgaṇa at Uddhāre dated in September 1217 boasts of the prowess of the Sevuna king, a "rutting elephant in destroying the lotus-garden that was Ballāla-rāya", (1) and an undated record at Bijapur refers proudly to the king's victory over the Hōsana. (2)

But Ballāla's conquests had not yet melted away. His hold upon the north-eastern parts was hardly diminished. Hāluve and Mānuve he must indeed have lost, but Siruguppe probably remained. There is no proof that Siṅgaṇa had as yet anywhere crossed the Tuṅgabhadra, and Oruvay, about thirteen miles north-west of Bellary, was certainly in Ballāla's hands in August 1217. (3) In June 1218 he still held Tālūru, about twelve miles south-west of Oruvay, and in October Kuḍatini, then known as Kōṭṭitone, a place between Bellary and Doravaḍi. (4)

Towards the end of the year, while Ballāla remained inactive at his capital, (5) worn down, it would seem, by more than forty years of almost ceaseless warfare or preparation for war, his allies the Sāntaras kept up the struggle against the Sevuna and his subordinates. An inscription at Kuṇiteppa relates that Siṅgarasa and Bīrārasa raided Tevaratēppa, thus making some considerable headway against the enemy. (6) Ballāla's relations with the Sāntaras at this period appear to have been complex, and no obvious solution of one difficulty has been

(1) E.C.VIII Sorab 135(1217).  
(2) A.R.1933-4, App.E.158.  
(5) He was there in August 1217: E.C.V Belur 136(1217); and in December: ibid.224(1217).  
(6) E.C.VIII Sorab 339(1217).
found. Though in September 1218 Nāḍakalaśi, about six miles north-west of the Sāntara stronghold of Hosagunda, and very close to the Sāntara boundary, was in Ballāla's own hands,(1) Nāḍamañcasāle, two miles south of Nāḍakalaśi, was ruled two years before neither by the Hoysala nor by a Sāntara, but by a certain Jagadēva Pāṇḍya, who may perhaps have had connection of some kind with the Ālva or Ālupa dynasty.(2)

It may have been the Hoysala's success in Banavāse nāḍ, or the departure of the same ruler from the Sinda districts north of the Tuṅgabhadra, or it may have been merely the operation of a local principle of seeking a balance of power, that in 1219 induced Īśvara-dēva Sinda of Belagavaṭṭi to foresake the Sēvuna alliance. A highly damaged inscription tells that in the year Pramādi, the fifth of the bright half of the month Jyēṣṭha, in other words May 1219 (and not 1193, as RICE supposed), while a Kumāra Vīra..., perhaps Bīrarasa, was ruling Kunda & Koḍa nāḍs, and while Ballāla II with the usual titles was exercising some authority or prosecuting some scheme, certain nāyakas died fighting at a time when Īśvara-dēva of Belagavatti was in the fort of Cittūr and Bāleyamma-verggade was smashing the army.(3) This in itself would not appear to be unambiguous proof of the change in Īśvara-dēva's policy, even though it is known that, three years before, Cittūr was in Sēvuna hands, but during the next month Īśvara-dēva together with many manneyar, or superior fief-holders, with a force of ten thousand foot

(1) E.C.VIII Sagar 15(1218).
(2) ibid.126(1216).
(3) E.C.VIII Sagar 4(1219).RICE is guilty of a mistranslation.
and one thousand horse, attacked Abbalūr, which lies about twenty miles to the north-west of Belagavatti, and was then in Sevuna territory.\(^{(1)}\)

For a while nothing further is heard of the Sevuna war. The Sevuna himself seems to have been well satisfied with his achievements, and it was clearly only a question of finding a suitable opportunity before advancing over the Tuṅgabhadra and stripping the Hoysala empire of its northern accretions. This must have been well understood by those living in the threatened areas. In or before July 1218 Bammī-ḍēva Cōla had learnt of the Hoysala's embarrassments in the west, together with the sudden increase of his obligations in the south, of which more will be said below, and guessed that Ballāla could only be weakened by these entanglements and that an opportunity would thereby be afforded him to pay off something of the score which his family owed Ballāla, particularly on account of the defeat inflicted on his father in or about 1194. He was, moreover, anxious to prevent an invasion of his elongated dominion by the Sevuna. Accordingly he undertook the task of re-occupying certain villages in his hereditary domain from which he had been ousted, it seems, during the last Hoysala occupation. He then fortified Nidugal, which Ballāla himself had left only six months before, when he visited Bammī-ḍēva on a tour of inspection of the north-eastern quarter of the kingdom, and finally linked up Nidugal together with Hāne, or Hāniya, which

\(^{(1)}\) W.E.II ff.185b-186a(1219).
had also been refortified, (1) with the explicit object of impeding future invasions by either Hoysala or Sevuna, both of which, he correctly foresaw, would approach, if at all they did, from the west. The work, completed in haste, (2) was apparently untouched until the conduct of Iruṅgōla-dēva of Nidugal in 1276 forced the Hoysala, tardily but finally, to crush the Cōla family. But those fortifications did not save the unfortunate Bammidiēva from falling under the power of the Dēvagiri ruler. In or about 1220 his independence was lost temporarily to the Sevuna. We may judge this from the gap in Cōla inscriptions between 1218 and 1247, and by the title "Cōla-rāya-disāpaṭṭe", or "scatterer of the Cōla king", an otherwise inexplicable title borne by Siṅgaṇa in an undated record which can hardly be later than 1247, the date of Siṅgaṇa's death. (3)

Having thus failed to control the Nidugal Cōla, or to prevent his imminent absorption into a foreign empire that was gradually increasing at his own expense, the aged Vira-
Ballāla, despite his recent failures the most successful of the Hoysalas, found himself obliged to make preparations for the succession to the throne. At the beginning of 1220 he was in the capital, (4) and it was there that he died in June or perhaps July of that year. (5) He had however taken precaution to

(1) For Hāne see above, p. 250.
(2) E.C.XI Molakalmuru 20(1218).Ballāla was in Dōrasamudra in January 1218(E.C.VI Kadur 129), but in Nidugal in early February(E.C.V Hassan 61). He appears to have been at the koppa of Nallūr on his way there(E.C.V Channarayapatna 211a, where the figure of the Saka year -1080- must be a misreading, as 1157-8 is quite impossible for this āsāna.). (3) W.E.II f.221a.
(E.C.VII Channagiri 6).
have his son Vīra-Nārasimha crowned a few months before that event, in fact on the 18th April 1220.(1) The latter enjoyed a considerable degree of responsibility even before his coronation, his name being mentioned significantly twice,(2) and the great southern expedition, to which we are about to turn, having been left largely in his care. It is however noticeable that Nāmasimha, even with the title Yuvarāja, did not exercise even a fraction of the influence upon the affairs of the kingdom that his father had done during his own period as Crown Prince.

Vīra-Ballāla appears to have maintained to within a very few years of his death the vigour and masterfulness of his early youth, and an indomitable optimism and boundless energy characterise all his ventures. His family seemingly had little initiative of their own, and consequently the decline in the dynasty's fortunes, when it came, could be laid without hesitation at the great man's door.

He passed away leaving, he supposed, an empire which despite attacks on one side, was still holding what was more truly its own, and was about to commence in the opposite direction a fresh career of conquest, with a new field of activity and with a new world in which to shine. The dreams of his grandfather had been attained, and if his ambitions in the north had not proved capable of uninterrupted realisation, the prospect that offered itself in the south exceeded Viṣṇuvaradhana's most sanguine expectations. And so:

(1) E.C.V Channerayapatna 172(1209 & 1220)
(2) M.A.R.1926,53(?1219), E.C.IV Hegadadevankote 14(?1219), and M.A.R.1915-6, para.89(?1218).
When Ballāla-dēva, being of advanced age, went to heaven after establishing Nṛsimha on the throne, (the latter) after receiving with deferential regard every instruction of Ballāla observed it. Taking refuge sincerely at the firm lotus feet of the heroic (god) Nārasimha and (thus) remaining, he (Narasimha) desires (?) and obtained that the Lakṣmī (wealth and power) of his kingdom shall, accompanied by fame, be spread in every respect over the ten quarters.

Nārasimha entered upon his duties with the intention of carrying forward the political schemes of his father without modification, and his reign, as we can view it from the rather scanty records, shows no indication that the verse gave expression to a mere rhetorical sentiment. Vīra-Nārasimha had the good fortune to take over a kingdom in a good condition. Throughout his father's vigorous reign the improvement in the level of public order and social security had risen, slowly at first and steadily after 1190, so that by the middle of his reign the greatest degree of expansion abroad was coupled with the highest level of public order and governmental control at home. But despite the comparative tranquillity in which Nāra-

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 21lb (cl222). The R.T. of this very irregular verse reads a blank after Kāṅkṣa and before sukīrttim instead of the ty āsthē of the K.T., āsthē being unintelligible, unless the poet, who appears not to have been very skilful, intended it for ā-tāsthē. RICE's translation is confusing and contains one serious error.
simha found his kingdom, the task which he took upon his shoulders was, if a legacy from his father, still a decided departure from the previous policy of his dynasty. The object of Visnuvardhana and Ballāla II had been to extend Hoysala rule over areas which would not only repay the effort, but by their chaotic condition and lack of vigorous leadership invited a conqueror of similar racial extraction, identical language, and customs homogeneous with their own. A political vacuum in the north-west and beyond the Tungabhadra drew the Hoysala onwards, as it were, by a natural force: the establishment of a Kannada national empire based upon a more vigorous and spirited Mysorean dynasty was a reasonable and proper conclusion to the period of upheaval which had preceded the rise of the Hoysala, and had continued during his first century and a half of growth. But Ballāla in his old age had turned his face in another direction where neither natural force, nor reasonable ambition suggested Hoysala activity. Thus the quietness of his kingdom was in fact deceptive, for Nārasimha's ministers, court, nobles and people were saddled with the distressing responsibility of a historical aberration.

To describe the origin of this phenomenon is difficult for two reasons: firstly because, being essentially a fortuitous departure from a normal development in the history of a group, it partakes of the individual and the particular, and consequently to understand it rightly it is not sufficient to observe happenings in the broad, to gather evidences from a wide field,
or to deduce a general movement from a mass of details of
diverse kinds and varying proportions. One must be a party to
the secret desires of one or two men, must follow the convol-
usions of diplomacy in which the needs of personalities play
as great a part as national aspirations. Yet, of the period in
question, no personal letters, no notes of cabinet meetings, no
records of family intrigues remain. Almost without exception
the important evidence is missing; and the element of imagi-
ation is perforce called to aid the helpless historian. The
second difficulty follows in a sense from the first: the evid-
ence which does exist, and which presents us at every turn
with faits accomplis rather than traces of policies or motives,
suffers from the transfer of emphasis from the Kannada to the
Tamil world. As we move from the plateau and follow the Hoysala
into the southern plains we leave behind the atmosphere of
historical awareness we have hitherto utilized and the structure
of dynastic reality which we have been able to erect. Laconic
and confused as are often the Kannada records, the Tamil records
are in a still greater state of confusion, and are still less
communicative. It is not therefore surprising that the Tamil
inscriptions, and the highly complex political history which
they conceal, have received a greater attention from scholars
than their Kannada contemporaries, and very numerous articles
by living or lately dead native historians have endeavoured to
clarify the history of the Cōla, Pândya and other southern
dynasties during the centuries with which we are here concerned.
The account that follows gives due consideration to the many
interesting and ingenious theories which they have published; in the normal way Hoysala history would be expected to solve for them many of their problems: unfortunately the theory elaborated below may itself join the heap of discarded suppositions, when once more solid and reliable evidence is discovered, and when the chain of circumstances is more happily demonstrated.

In the year 1217, as will be remembered, Ballala II had been obliged to admit that the dreams of a Hoysala empire embracing the country as far north as the Krishna river were broken, at least for the time being. He may have visualized a time when the northern and north-western dynasties would rebel in their turn against the Maratha ruler of Devagiri, but it was clear to him that unless the Hoysala received a substantial accession of strength from some quarter, he or his successors would be unable fully to take advantage of the opportunity when it offered. It was at this critical time that he received interesting news from the country south of the ghatas. Before detailing what that news was, it is necessary to give a picture of Vira-Ballala's own relations with the south.

Prior to the defeat of Jaitugi in 1190 the Hoysala had hardly been on equal terms, socially or politically, with the Cola family which had ruled at various times in Oriyur, Tanjavour (Tanjore) and GangaiKonda-Cölapuram. The great Kulottunga III was, however, by that time beginning to experience difficulty in maintaining control over the extensive Cöla dominions, and within ten years of that date was happy to
enter into intimate relations with his successful neighbour. Balāla was pleased to have an understanding on equal terms with a descendant of the mighty rival of the Cālukya whom he was himself striving to imitate, and took one of the Cōla king's daughters, it seems, as a wife. (1) It appears that he was not satisfied with this, but actually married a daughter of his to the aged Kulōttuṅga. The facts at our disposal point to such a conclusion, although direct proof is missing. The daughter in question was Sōmala-dēvi, otherwise Sōvala. She was the daughter of Padmala-mahādēvi, the mother of Nārasimha II, and is called in one inscription narapati-Nārasimhana sahōdari, and in another Nārasimha-rāyan-ōdavuttida, indicating that she was Nārasimha's full sister, as well as Padmala-dēviya putri. (3) She was thus a person of rather greater importance than the other female members of the family, (4) and remained close to her brother's interests even when she had been transported to the Tamil country. For not otherwise can these facts be interpreted: in two inscriptions she is pointedly termed rāpi, which can only mean "queen". (5) As she could not have been the queen of her own brother, she must have been queen of some other king, and no other seems to fit the circumstances than Kulōttuṅga himself. She maintained some administrative rights in the Hoysala rād, for an inscription which presumably

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 206(cl200) tells of Cōla-mahādēvi & a village under her control. An agrahāra seems to have been named after her, namely Cōla-mahādēvipura, according to E.C.VII Honnali 90(1290). (2) E.C.V Hassan 84, also ibid.Arsikere 123(1236). (3) E.C.V Arsikere 123(1236); ibid.Channarayapatna 243(1210); AR.1937-8, 6(1239) calls Sōmala-mahādēvi daughter of Hoysala Ballāla. (4) She it was who was mentioned in a rather elegant Sanskrit verse in E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 63(1237), where RICE makes the absurd error: "..Nārasimha, whose wife was Sōmala." (5) E.C.V Channarayapatna 243(1210), ib.Arsikere 123.
belongs to 1230 speaks of a relative of Kumāri-Sōvala-dēvi's heggade:(1) in this case the title Kumāri may have survived as an affectionate "Princess" long after she had ceased, at least technically, to be a maiden. Again, another record of 1230 speaks of the resentment of Nārasimha-dēva and Sōvala-dēvi that would attend disobedience of an order.(2) Her duties in her new kingdom can have claimed only a part of her attention, and thus we feel that her marriage was either of an unusual kind or that it did not last long. Then we find it said that

vanaja-dalēksane guna-manā-
ḍane Sōvala-dēvi Sōvi-dēvaṅge jagad-
vinaṅge Kūrmmeṁ tāy
eṇe permmege tāne dal tavarmaney ādalu //

"Sōvala-dēvi, she of the eye like a lotus-leaf, adorned with good qualities, was in truth herself the native home of greatness, because she was in affection a mother to the world-famous Sōvi-dēva."(3)

Now Sōvi-dēva was Sōmēśvara, son of Nārasimha, and was of course her nephew. How was it that she was in a position to be like a mother to him? The verse quoted above is not the only instance of the expression. An inscription at Jambukēśvara in Trichinoply tāluqa dated in the reign of Vīra-Sōmēśvara-dēva

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 78(?1230 - dated Vikṛti).
(2) E.C.VI Tarikere 53(1230). RICE is in error in attributing an exactly similar sentence to ibid. 55.
(3) E.C.V Arsikere 123(1236). There is a pathetic irony about the word tavarmane, the house in which a woman is born and which she leaves when she marries. Sōmala left hers for the Tamilian court, and then had, in widowhood, to make one for herself.
registers exemption from taxation granted by the king from his sixth year on the land endowed by Avvai Sōmala-mahādevi to the temple of Saṅgamallīśvaram-udaiyar-nāyanār and to the Saṅgamadēvar-maṭha at Tiruvāṇaiikkā, otherwise known as Tīru-āṇaikkāval at the same place as Jambukēśvaram itself on the island of Śrīraṅgam. (1) This is clearly the same person as the Sōmala-mahādevi, daughter of the Hoysala king Vīra-Vallāla-dēva, who purchased land in Pērūr Cirudavūr otherwise Pālūrcēri in Kīlpalāru of the Pāccil-kūrram of the Rājarāja-valanād in the sixth year of the "emperor of the entire earth", Vīra-Sōmēśvara-dēva. (2) Avvai means mother, though it is not, and apparently was not, strictly confined to that meaning. Again a record near Tirugokarnam near Pudukkōṭṭai speaks of Sōmala-dēviyār as mātā - unquestionably "mother" - of Sōmēśvara-dēvar, the son of Pōsala Vīra-śrī-Nārasinga-dēvar of Dōraisamuttirām. Another record, of the sixth year of Sōmēśvara, at Śrīraṅgam, mentions a priest or official connected with the worship of the private deity of Sōmala-dēviyār. (4) It is seen therefore that not only was Sōmala considered Sōmēśvara's mother but that she occupied herself in the Tamil at least as much as in her native Kannāda country. We never hear of her having any children, for the ciruppillaiagal who are said to belong to her on one occasion must have been either step-children, or, more probably, subordinate servants. (5) Thus Sōmēśvara was her only "child",

(1) A.R.1937-8,5(1239). (2) ibid. 6(1239) at Jambukēśvaram. (3) S.I.I.VII,1043(1226) in Rāmanātha's tenth year. The same inscription, Pd.183, reads 20th year of Rāmanātha, i.e.1236. (4) S.I.I.IV,515(1238-9). (5) S.I.I.VII 1043(1226).
and that in a certain sense only, for besides the way in which the verse quoted above is phrased, we hear that Somesvara's mother was Kālala-dēvi, wife of Nārasiṃha. The first instance is in the very same record in which Sōmala-dēvi's affection is recorded: Nārasiṅga-dēvaṅgam Kālala-dēvi-rāṇigam Yadu-kula-
tīlakaṁ Sōvi-dēva-nṛpan udayisidām, "king Sōvi-dēva was born, he the forehead-ornament of the Yādava race, to Nārasiṅga-dēva and to his queen Kālala-dēvi."(1) It was for this lady, whom he calls his ammai, "mother", for her spiritual welfare, that towards the end of his life Somesvara made several gifts to temples in the Tamil country.(2)

The mystery is solved by a passage in the as yet unpublished Gadyakarṇāmṛta of Sakala-vidyā-cakravarti, which states that Somesvara's mother Kalavati, which must be a Sanskritized form of Kālala, died about three years after his birth.(3) It seems very probable that Somesvara was born about 1206, for we first hear of him in the year 1216, when he was mentioned as the son of Nṛsiṃha, who was then still Yuvarāja. (4) Other circumstances of his life support such a conjecture. In that case Kālala-dēvi died in or about 1209, and Somala-
dēvi adopted the baby soon afterwards. She was herself married to the aged Kulōttunga, who died and left her a widow in 1217-1218, so that she was then free to devote herself to her various interests both in her own country and that of her adoption, and

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 123(1237).
(2) S.I.I.IV 421(c1249); A.R.1936-7, 122(1258) & 123(1260)? dates mistaken; both at Jambukēśvaram.
(3) M.A.R.1924, para. 70-72(?c1232 or c1257)
(4) E.C.VI Kadur 111(?1216).
to the up-bringing of her nephew. It is very probable that she kept Somesvara with her in the Tamil country, and that it was in his early youth that he acquired a liking for that part of the peninsula, which had so little in common with his ancestral home, and which he later made his permanent abode. There could have been no objection to the boy's remaining in the Cōla country as long as there existed ties of friendship between the countries, or rather the dynasties, and as long as Ballāla was alive and well and his son Nārasiṃha was waiting for his succession to the throne. It is just possible that Somesvara may not have been Nārasiṃha's first son, and that the latter was kept at Dōrasamudra until his death, which must have occurred before 1216, but for such a conjecture no clear evidence exists.

Besides Ballāla's marriage with Cōla-mahādevi, and his daughter's marriage to Kulottunga, he thought fit to cement the dynastic alliance by a further sacrifice. He seems to have obliged Nārasiṃha to give one of his daughters to Kulottunga's son, later Rājarāja III. That Nārasiṃha did so is proved by the instances where Rājendrā III, son of Rājarāja, calls Somesvara māmā, "uncle". (1) That he did so during the life-time, and thus under the direction, of his father is indicated by the fact that in 1220, when Ballāla died and his son succeeded, the latter was almost thirty-eight years of age,

(1) A.R.1936-7,117; E.I.VII 24(Kielhorn's dates,33).
and only very junior daughters would still be unmarried.

When, then, the Cōla family, whose fortunes, especially in the north, had been failing for some time, began to experience severe pressure from their erstwhile vassals, the Pāṇḍyās, it was very natural for them to approach Ballāla for assistance. The first approach was very tentative. Ballāla, fancying that to the loyal support of his relations by marriage he would add the enviable function of arbitrating between the rivals, and thereby derive prestige and perhaps material profit besides, naturally agreed in principle. After the final humiliation had been effected, the unfortunate Rājarāja and his aged father demanded Hoysala aid. Ballāla's preoccupation with the Sēvuṇas prevented his intervention in person, and therefore he sent Nārasimha with a large force to take his place. The position was that in 1216 Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya succeeded to the Pāṇḍya throne, or, more correctly, succeeded to the direction of Pāṇḍya policy, for there were several Pāṇḍya rulers at once, and immediately commenced a war against Kūlōttuṅga in which he was completely successful. (1) After a campaign which appears to have been soon accomplished he permitted Kūlōttuṅga to remain in his kingdom on the most humiliating terms. The power was to be given to his son Rājarāja. Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya then probably returned to Madura, leaving some garrisons under his own officers, if not one of his brothers, to help the Cōla, whose prestige had naturally

suffered as a result of the defeat, to keep his promise to pay tribute. Professor Nilakantha Sastri thinks that the Pāṇḍya did not take the fullest advantage of his victory because of the Hoysala intervention. This is not the case. The Pāṇḍya had succeeded beyond his wildest dreams, for he had liberated his family, humiliated the ruler of the enemy dynasty, and put the powerful and extensive territory of the Cōla under tribute. No mediaeval conqueror could hope for more. The Cōla's own hold over the great fief-holders was precarious enough: direct Pāṇḍya rule would have been impossible. So it was that the Hoysala's task was to liberate the Cōlas from the Pāṇḍya garrisons. In addition Rājarāja required that punishment should be inflicted upon the rulers of the Bāṇa and Adigaimān dynasties, who had actually assisted the Pāṇḍya forces against their nominal overlord. Rājarāja himself was in no position to revenge himself upon them, but a power from the plateau could easily attack both the Bāṇa, who held the regions of Āṭṭūr, Jambai, and Tittagudi, and probably controlled as far west as Tāramaṅgalam, and the Adigaimān whose power centred upon the valley of the Ponnaiyar, and whose capital was Tagadūr, the modern Dharmapuri, more exposed to attack from the north-west than the greater and richer parts of his dominions that stretched from Tirumalai in the north to Tiruvannaimallūr in the south.

(1) The Bāṇa had in ancient times held lands even as far north as Punganur tāluqa, Chittoor district (A.R.1912,327;1906,543 for example), but in the thirteenth century his power was restricted to the areas mentioned above, his hold on the eastern parts of which was always precarious; he had however managed to obtain power in districts otherwise held by the Adigaimān, e.g. Tiruvaraṅgam on the Ponnaiyar.
(2) The Adigaimān was in possession of Tirumalai (S.I.I.I.75-6) Tiruvannāmalai (A.R.1902,536); Tiruvannaimallūr (ibid.312); also
The Bāna and the Adigaimān had two features in common: they both originated, and held their chief cities, in the mountainous country that separated the Mysorean plateau from the Tamilian plains, and both tended constantly to move eastwards, and then, as they could, to north and south, in order to avail themselves of the comparative ease and plenty prevailing in those plains; yet both were, as dynasties, declining: both had lost the vigour and ability necessary to take advantage of the disorganization now to be seen in the affairs of their Cōla overlord. The Bāna, being the nearer of these mal-contents, had been chosen by the Pānda as chief beneficiary from his victory of 1217, as is recorded in certain verses at Tiruvānaikkāval, (1) but that arrangement had been altered when Rājarāja and his father submitted. Rājarāja's anxiety that the Bāna should be subdued is thus quite understandable. A glance at the map shows that the Hoysala was in a position to destroy the power of the Adigaimān by a march by way of Hosūr and Bairamaṅgalam to Tagaḍūr and then to Tiruvannāmalai, and that of the Bāna by continuing southwards from Tagaḍūr to Taramaṅgalam, and then striking eastwards at Attūr.

In the year 1218 Vīrā-Ballāla sent his son Vīra-Nārasimha with an army to the rescue of the Cōla. How much sacrifice this and later expeditions of the kind cost the Hoysala country is seen from the special tax, Cōla-kāruṇya-biṭṭiya bhandī, imposed in the year 1217-8 for the salvation of the Cōla.(2) Nārasimha was doubtless met by the armies of the Adi-

---

(1) A.R.1908.481 and 482; also E.I.xxii 10.
(2) See below, p.556-7.
gaimān and Bāṇa in turn. They must have had warning of his approach, but he defeated them, and gained the Kāvēri plain. There he put to flight some Pāṇḍya detachments before returning, no doubt by the same route, to the Hoysala naḍ.

Frequent references to his exploit are found. He is called, in an inscription of January 1219 "the only protector of the Cōla family, the uprooter of the Magadha (i.e.Bāṇa) king", while his father added to his already multitudinous titles those of Magara-rājya-disāpaṭṭa Adiyama-gharaṭṭa Cōla-rājya-pratīsthācārya, "scatterer of the Magara (i.e.Bāṇa) kingdom, mill-stone to Adiyama (i.e. the Adigaimān), architect of the establishment of the Cōla kingdom."

(1) E.C.IV Nagamangala 29(1219). The famous Jagannātha-vijaya of Rudrabhatta, assigned by R.Narasimhacharya (K.K.C.i,271) to about 1180, must have been completed in 1219, for in the opening verses the poet addresses the god in words that apply to his patron, Ballāla II:-


"Destroyer of his enemy Kāma (i.e. the Kadamba), having a bracelet composed of a mass of snakes (or,"having a court filled with crowds of preeminent men"), devoted to the establishment of emperors (or, "(the Cōla)Rājarāja"), he who has the unbounded Ganges thrown upwards in playful fashion, whose wrath is expended in the destruction of enemy cities, whose mark is the bull (or,"virtue"), praised by the learned, husband of the affectionate Umā, receptacle of overwhelming might, - may that Trīṇētra (Śiva) on the battle-field protect the earth!"
A record of 1220 tells how Nārasiṁha acquired a multitude of elephants, incidentally showing what is otherwise without evidence, that on his expedition to the south Nārasiṁha came into contact with the Kādava ruler of the Vṛddhācalam district, who had recently grown in power at the expense of the Adigaiṁan, and now seems to have been attempting to take over responsibility for the northern half of the Cōla country out of Pāṇḍya hands.

Magaregana ājiyōl sugidu kolv(read kolv) ibham int ivu Cōlana attid Ś.-negal ivu Pāṇḍ[y]anaseladu(read seladu) Kādava-rayayuv itta matta-ha-stigal ivu nōdim endu Nārasiṁhana balmegemecci nōduvar vvageyolag akipi Simhaṇana Lālana Gaulana rāyabhārigal //

"These elephants he took after looting the Magara king (i.e. the Bāna) in war; these elephants the Cōla sent; these furious elephants were given by the Kādava king after beating the Pāṇḍya - look!" So spoke the ambassadors of the kings of Ceylon, Gujerat and Bengal, shuddering in their minds, as they watched, admiring Nārasiṁha's might."

āneya-nāyakanga nerad-āneya-nāyakan allad ānan emb ī-nudi yēvud endu Nārasiṁha-mahīpati nūru-gāvudam // tān irad etti mūḍaṇa-disāvarad uddhataram poralci nūr-āneyan oddid ś-Magaran-śegalam pidi tandan aśvadim //

"King Nārasiṁha, saying, "What expression is this, that he did not command sufficient elephants for a (real) elephant-commander, and so was not (one) ?", himself setting out without hesitation for a hundred gavīdas (about 1,000 miles) bowled

(1) A.R.1918,74.
over the haughty ones in the eastern quarter, seized the elephants of the (famous) Magara, who had arrayed a hundred elephants, and brought them in with his horse." (1)

Further references are to be found in the title virōḍhi-Magara-baḷa-jalānidihi-badavaṇaḷa, "submarine fire to the ocean which was the forces of the enemy Magara", and Cōla-rājya-pratisthācārya in a record that may be dated about 1220,(2) and the title "pursuer after kings" in one of 1220.(3) Moreover, a certain Kuvara (i.e. Kumāra) Laksma claimed to have conquered the world for Ballāḷa as far as the southern ocean, a claim which suggests that before 1220 he had taken part in a southern campaign. It must have been that of 1218.(4)

(1) E.C.VII Channagiri 72(1220). The text displays some curious irregularities: kol and eels are not regular forms for kol and sele. alkī is mistaken read for alki. The K.T. reads ivu for ivu and eud for evud; vage is an unusual form for bage. The phrase Pāṇḍyanaṁ seladu grammatically follows Kāḍava, and has been so translated, but it must not be lost sight of that by an awkward choice of words the poet perhaps hides from us that it was Nārasimha who beat the Pāṇḍya. 1,000 miles is an exaggeration.

(2) E.C.V Arsikere 76(1220). (3) E.C.V Belur 85(1220).

(4) E.C.V Belur 112(?1220). N.K. Sastri's view of the circumstances of the first Hoysala intervention is here accepted, with the proviso that the Hoysala's part ended before the beginning of 1219. K.S. Vaidyanathan in Q.J.M.S. 1947, p.125 ff. takes the view that the Hoysala did not intervene before Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya was faced with the revolt of Kulaśēkhāra Pāṇḍya supported by the Cōla, and then took the Cōla's part, while Māravarman had on his side the Kāḍava-rāya, Bāṇa and Singhalese. This may to some extent have been the case in 1222, but not in 1218. However Vaidyanathan is correct concerning the part played by the Bāṇa. The account given by Krishnaswami Aiyangar in C.H.I.iii, p.481 is now out of date; incidentally, his statement as to the power and extent of territory of Vīra-Sōmēśvara on p.481-2 is completely wrong, the misstatement concerning the Tamil country being for him less excusable than the slip about Pandharpur.
Now, it would have been possible for Nārasiṁha, after his coronation in 1220, to have concentrated on the task of defence against the Sēvunan, and to have left the powers in the south to work out for themselves a solution to their complex rivalries. But the campaign of 1218 had demonstrated the practical advantages of "mediating" in those struggles, and Nārasiṁha was inclined to pursue the course he had begun. A short account in Sanskrit, from an undated record, to be ascribed to 1220-1, tells us that after his coronation, intent upon conquest in every direction, he first went to the east, and, taking action against him, uprooted the Magara king, then set up the kingdom of the Cōla who had taken refuge with him, then saw the god Allālanātha (at Kānci), and stationed there a body of Bhērundaśa (picked troops) to uproot the evil element, returned, entered the ratnakūṭa (jewel-pinnacled) capital and was at peace. (1)

The second of the interventions of Nārasiṁha thus consisted of another attack upon the Magara on the outward journey, the rescue of the Cōla from further persecution of a kind similar to that of 1218, and a return journey, showing the flag, as it were, through the northern provinces of the Cōla, through the territories of the Kādava and the Adigaimān, the Yādavarāya and others, ending at Kānci. This town was within

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 211b(c1221). tataḥ paṭṭābhiṣiktō vīra-Nārasiṁha-bhūpaḥ sakalā-dīg-jayārtthāṃ pravṛttāḥ pūrvvaṃ pūrvva-dīśā-varam gatvā pratipraśraṅgatḥ Magara-rājaṃ nimmūlāya saranāgata-Cōla-rājyaṃ pratiṣṭhāpya śrīmad-Allālanāthāṃ dṛṣṭvā dustā-nimmūlānārtthāṃ tatra Bhērunda-varggaṃ sthāpayitvā nivarttyā sukhēna ratnakūṭa-rajadhānim praviṣṭē sati, etc. Rice was quite wrong in translating pratipraśraṅgatḥ "having been surrounded".
the sphere of influence of the Telugu Pottapi-Cōla Manumasi-diddhi Tirukkālattidēvan, otherwise Gaṇḍagōpāla, who was nominally a dependant of Rājarāja, and also of the Telugu dynasty of Wārangal, which, though not at the time in direct control of the neighbourhood of Kānci, always exercised influence and held interests there. The loyalty of the Telugu family of Nellore, that of Gaṇḍagōpāla, being by no means certain, as Rājarāja's prestige was at a very low ebb at the time, and Nārasimha having undertaken to quieten his royal son-in-law's apprehensions, the Hoysala was thus obliged either to remain in the neighbourhood of Kānci until the situation was clarified, or to return himself to his more pressing affairs at Dōrasamudra and leave a detachment with a political agent in the plain. He at length chose the latter course, but only after a stay which lasted up to September 1221 at the earliest; and thus began a long association between the Hoysalas and Kānci.(1)

In the previous February a certain Madhava-dānḍāyaṣka who had been occupied in the south of the Hoysala-nāḍ and then in the north of the Cōla country, had marched against Vajradēva, and a battle took place at Kanāryi. It is not possible at present to identify either the person or the place: it may well have been an incident in a struggle between the Hoysala and Gaṇḍagōpāla, as such a struggle could hardly have been avoided. (2)

Naturally, the power of the Cōla Rājarāja, supported by such fleeting expeditions, could hardly stand for long. His

---

(1) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 150(1221), K.T. only, another record which RICE did not think worthy of transliteration and translation, contains but a few words, but they are very valuable.

The king, bearing among others the title samastabhuvanāraya, was ruling the kingdom of the world Cōḷu-rājyadali, "in the
most vigorous enemy, Köpperuṇjiṅga of the Kadava family, set upon him in concert with the Pāṇḍya from the south and the Bāṇa from the north-west. While Rājarāja was escaping with his court, he actually captured him at Tellāru, about thirty miles south of Kāṇci, where apparently he was on his way to seek the aid of loyalists and Hoysala officials in that city. The Cōla country naturally fell into the hands of the conspirators. A detachment of Kannadar, clearly Hoysala troops, engaged with Köpperuṇjiṅga, but apparently without making any impression. (1)

And so it was that Nārasimha felt himself obliged to commence the third expedition into the Tamil country.

This, the third intervention, was of a different character to the previous two. The Hoysala, being now in a position to exact substantial rewards for his assistance, entered the scramble for power in the rich lands of the plain with redoubled enthusiasm, and by so doing, as it turned out, brought about the downfall of his dynasty in return for very indifferent gains.

In September 1222 Nārasimha marched in the direction of Srīraṅgam, that is, in all probability, by the Kāvēri valley route, and on his way fought a battle in Biligūr nād. (2) His campaigns then developed in two distinct phases. A rapid movement to Srīraṅgam disposed of Adigaimān and Bāṇa obstruction and defeated a Pāṇḍya contingent. An equally brisk march north-

Cōla kingdom, during the month Āsvāyuja of the year Viṣu.

Page 289 n. (2) E.C.V Hassan 106(1221) At about the same time the Kadava fought Vīra-Nārasīṅga Yādava-rāya at Uratti: A.R. 1904, 271. Care should be taken not to confuse this ruler with the Hoysala.

(2) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 56(1222). N.K. Sastri, Cōlas II, p.148, says
wards released the Cola, defeating the Kadava Köpperuňjiṅga and reestablishing relations with the powers in the neighbour-
hood of Kāṇci. The Cola was thus "set up" in a more thorough
manner than before, but this time Nārasiṁha did not make the
mistake of leaving him entirely to his own resources. Arrangements
were made for Hoysala officials to remain at the Cola
court and at Kāṇci, and doubtless bodies of troops were sta-
tioned with them. Events in the north recalled Nārasiṁha him-
sel£ to Dūrasamudra, where he had returned by March 1223, but
his subordinates continued the work of supporting the Cola in
his absence. Naturally his son-in-law showed his gratitude,
and an inscription relates that he ruled at his capital in the
enjoyment of the victory-won wealth consisting of a multitude
of elephants, horses, jewels, and articles never before acquired
through his victories in the eastern region. (1) The same record
gives him the titles Magarādirāja-laya-kālam, Cola-nistārakam
Magara-rājya-nirmūlanam, Pāṇḍya-disapaṭṭanam, Cola-rājya-
pratiṣṭhācārya, "Kāla in destroying the Magara ruler, saviour
of the Cola, the uprooter of the Magara kingdom and scatterer
of the Pāṇḍya; the architect of the setting up of the Cola
kingdom." The last three titles are found also in a record of
December 1222. (2)

As his business in Dūrasamudra claimed less attention
than the novel situation in the south, a call from Rājarāja

the date is 1217; see also J.I.H. vi p. 205 & E.I.vii p. 162 &n. 10.
(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 197 (March 1223): pūrva-dig-vijayadol
apūrvasadhitā-kari-turaga-ratna-vastu-vistārita-vijaya-lakṣmi-
vilāsam esse ye.
(2) S.I.I.X pt. 1, 339 (1222).
brought him again to the Tamil country in October 1223, to complete the second phase of that third campaign.

He had already much to his credit: he was called Cōla-kula-kamala-kāñja-priya, "a lotus-lover (i.e. Sun) to the lotus the Cōla family." Moreover it is said of him:

Adiyama-Cēra-Pāṇḍya-Makarōḍdhata-Kāḍavaraṁ kavartte-gon- 
dudan adan ēke bāṇīsuve bāṇīsuv Cōlanan eḻtarakke dan- / 
dudan eḻe Sētu-muṭṭe besakeyduṇā ā-Tri-Kaliṅga-bhūpar a-
ūttida kari-sāle vokk asama-sāhasamaṁ Narasimha-rāyanā //

"Why should I describe how he plundered the Adiyama, Cēra, Pāṇḍya, Makara and haughty Kāḍava? Describe thou, the raising of the Cōla to a high position, the submission of the earth as far as Sētu. Unequalled is the prowess of Nāra-
simha, is it not, that penetrated the multitude of elephants sent by the (famous) Tri-Kaliṅga (i.e. Teliṅgana) kings?" (1)

A brush with the Cēra and Kākatīya may have occurred while he was engaged with the Pāṇḍya and Gandagāpāla respectively, but, as we know nothing further of such operations we should not suppose that the Hoysala's successes against either were very great, or that the operations themselves were either extensive or important. It is of interest, on the other hand, to note that during this period, or that immediately following it, the Kākatīya ruler of Teliṅgana, Gaṇapati-dēva, gained some success against the Hoysala, however minor, so as to enable him

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 203a (October 1223). The translation of Rice is in several respects inexact. He states that Nārasimha "captured" Adiyama and the rest.
to claim, in a record of 1231, that he had easily subdued the lords Cōla, Kaliṅga, Sēvāṇa (i.e. Yādava of Dēvagiri), the great Karnāṭa (which must be Nārasimha) and Lāṭa. (1)

At the time of the record from which the verse quoted above is taken Nārasimha was actually marching against Magara, that is, the Bāṇa, and had paused at a place called the koppa of Čūḍavāḍi, so far unidentified, and there held a festival on adding to his necklace the emerald which had come from Munivarāḍitya. (2)

On arrival in the plain he appears to have completed his task with exceptional vigour, as several records from the end of 1223 onwards testify. An inscription at Thruvaṭattur, on the Vellār about ten miles south-west of Vyṛddhācalam, relates how in 1226 an official set up three images of the gods, to replace those taken away when the Hoysala king Nārasimha had destroyed the country and the temples, a desecration almost certainly committed in 1223. (3) A vīragal exists at Belatikere, Kadur tāluqa, referring to the death of a warrior in fighting in November 1223, and the battle in question can hardly have taken place otherwise than in this campaign. (4) The actions thus referred to must have been part of a scheme to extirpate the Bāṇa from this land, which was further eastward than his hereditary territories, and to which he had been striving during the disturbances of the past years. The conjecture is to...

(1) E.I.iii 15(1231) at Gaṇapēśvaram, Bandar tāluqa, Kistna distr.
(2) E.C.V Channarayapatna 203a(1223).
(3) A.R.228 of 1928-9, N.K.Sastri, Cōlas III, p.733. 10th year of Rājārāja. One is put in mind of A.R.1915, 35; see above p.133.
(4) E.C.VI Kadur 82(1223), K.T. only.
some extent supported by the fact that the official who restored the temple was named Vānapājan, that is, in the Tamilian style, a protege of the Bāna king.

Again, Narasimha is called a wild fire to the forest that was the Kadava, a mill-stone to Adiyama, a cage to the Cēra, the chaser of the Magara, and, if the reading may be depended upon, seizer of the Avuṭa king, whom we know nothing more about, and a lion to the antelope that was the Konga king, and finally emperor of the south.(1)

Again:

"When the gods and demons churned the ocean with the mountain of the immortals they thus obtained only one elephant: the emperor Narasimha, ornament of the Yādava race, having encompassed the great ocean that comprised the armies of Pāṇḍya Makara and haughty Kadava, churned it with the Mandara that was his arm, and obtained many ferocious elephants."(2)

In the same inscription, along with titles of the same purport as those already mentioned, we find Kadava-rama-Kaiṭabha-Janārddana, which signifies that he destroyed the Kadava as did Visnu a particular demon. Yet another record, of

(1) MA.R.1914-5, para. 82(1224).
(2) E.C.XI Davangere 25(1224) at Harihara.
1227, tells how Nārasimha protected the Cōla, looted and uprooted Magara, and reduced the Pāṇḍya and Pallava kings to the condition of servants. The Pallava was the Kādava Köpperuṇjiṅga. (1) The same series of events is referred to by a record of March 1226, which gives the king the titles Cēlarāya-rajōddhāraka, Magarādhirāya-sainya-saṃhāraka, Cōla-nallūra-pura-kālāgni-Rudra, Āralūrttala-durga-nīrada-layānila, Dravila-ṃāṇḍala-nirddhūma-dhāma, Bāṇodareya-gaja-ghataṣṭahita, "upholder of the Cōla Rāyarāja (error for Rājarāja), destroyer of the army of the Magara king, Rudra of the fire of the last day to the city of Cōla-nallūr (unidentified), wind to scatter the clouds of the fort below, or based on Āralūr (perhaps Āragalūr, east of Ārrūr, or Āttūr, in Magadai-ṃandalam), a smokeless home, that is, utter destruction, to the Dravila, or Tamil country, accompanied by the troop of the elephants of the Bāna ruler."(2)

As a result of these successes Nārasimha was involved more firmly than ever in the affairs of the south and east. He appears to have received from Rājarāja a stretch of territory for himself on the western bank of the Kāvēri river. Sōṃśāvara, his son, then about 18 years old, is found ruling over Tīṅgalūr in that region in 1224-5.(3) Later, as we shall see, he took on greater responsibilities, and consolidated the Hoysala influence in the area.

(1) E.C.V Belur 161(1227).
(2) S.I.I.IX pt.1, 343, A.R.1925, 280(1226). Bāṇodare is an odd form, as also Bāṇōdara below. Is odara or odāre an alternative for oḍeyer, or uḍaiyar? Or is this an attempt to represent the man's name?
(3) A. R.1905, 602(1224-5).
As early as 1221 a Hoysala dāṇṇāyaka, Rāhutta-rāya Mācappa, bearing a Tamil cognomen, made a grant to the temple at Alagarkoyil in Madura tāluqa, hardly more than ten miles north of the Pāṇḍya capital, Madura itself. (1) In 1224-5 a Seṭṭi from Kaivāra-nāḍ in the Hoysala country made a grant to the temple of Śrīraṅgam. (2) Two years later Bācala-dēvi, daughter of Bhūtadeya-nāyaka of Dōrasamudra, made the gift of a ½ lamp in a temple at Kāṉcoi. (3) The activity of Hoysala subjects in the Tamil districts was to increase.

In the meanwhile however, and actually while the second phase of the last Magara campaign was opening, (4) the Sēvuṇa ruler's grandson, Kṛṣṇa, otherwise Kāndhara (Kānhara), took advantage of the Hoysala's preoccupation with the south, and invaded the Hoysala country from the Tūṅgabhadrā valley. It is open to question just what power the Sēvuṇa had in the districts south and east of the river. We have already found it likely that the Cōla of Niḍugal was overcome by him during the period after 1220, but Hoysala inscriptions are found in that area as follows: at Kottūr, fifteen miles north-east of Ucčaṅgi, in 1221; Anājigere, two miles north of Ucčaṅgi, in 1222; Nilagunda, eleven miles north-west of Ucčaṅgi, in 1224; and Sōgi, twenty-five miles north of Ucčaṅgi, in 1226. (5) So in fact it would be fairly safe to believe that the Hoysala held the eastern bank during the greater part of the period.

The Sēvuṇa, for his part, held areas all round: his records at Mēvundi in 1223, at Dampetla in 1225, and Hāvēri in 1228 (6) merely confirm the impression already obtained, that the

Hoysala possessions in the north were confined to the Pândya nāḍ, and the Sāntara districts. The claim, made in this period, that Nārasimha ruled the 7½ lakh country, that is the country formerly ruled by the Cālukyas, was merely a formality. (1)

Kṛṣṇa Sēvuṇa intended to make a thrust direct for Dōrasamudra, and to subdue the Hoysala at one blow. However, Pōlālva and other dānṇāyakas so successfully counter-attacked that the Sēvuṇa menace was postponed indefinitely. "On his expedition to the north the Tūṅgabhadra was filled to the banks with blood, and by his slaughter of Vikramapāla, Pāvusa and others he filled the abodes of the celestial nymphs." (2) "He defeated Pōmsa in battle." (3) Again—

"Vikramapāla, Pāmsa, Makara and the fierce Hoysāryamā became animals for his sacrifice; his arrows the enclosures for the sacrificial fires; the battle-field his sacrificial hall; his anger the kindling wood; the hosts of his furious enemies the fuel; the fire being his prowess; the rough, harsh words of his wrath the mantra: the fruit (of the sacrifice) was the setting up of the Cōla." (4)

"while Bāṇodara was being defeated there, Pōlālva-dānṇāyaka guarded the whole of the Hoysala empire here." It was said that "his sword which he had soiled 'with the brains of Vikramapāla and Pāvusa he cleansed with the hot blood of Makara."


idir änt uddhata-Sevunadhipana senä-nätharam kandu kö-
pade dör-ggarbbad agurvvan illi meçevem bhai bhaiy enutt ägal ä-
rida matta-dvipamam Nrśimha-mahipam bit itt ikki kondam rañon-
madaram Vikramapāla-Pāvusaran antas-sāraram sūraram //

"When King Nrśimha saw arrayed against him the
leaders of the army of the haughty Sēvuna king, saying in anger
"Here will I make clear the terror of the pride of my arm.
Ah! Ah!" he mounted then an infuriated elephant, set to, and
smote the war-mad heroes Vikramapāla and Pāvusa, who contained
treasure (of valour) within them."(1)
modalol Vikramapāla-Pāvusaran ittal kondan attal poral-
cidan ā-Kādava-rāyanam Magaranañ Pāndyēśanañ kondan un-
mada-gandhēbhahan oldu paṭṭaman adan Ėolāṅge mund itṭu kaṭ-
tidan ā-Sētuvinol Nrśimham adatim naṭṭam jaya-stambhamam //

"First he slew Vikramapāla and Pāvusa in one direc-
tion: then in the other he rolled over the (famous) Kadava king,
the Magara, and the Pāndya lord. He captured proud rutting
elephants. Wishing him well, he placed the Ėola before him and
bound upon him the diadem. At the (famous) Sētu did Nrśimha set
up by his valour a pillar of victory."

---

Page 297 n.(2) E.C.V Hassan 84(c1223). (3) M.A.R.1914-5 para.
82(1224). Page 297 n.(4) E.C.IX Bangalore 6(1253).

(1) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 20(1249). It is not necessary to suppose
merely from this verse that Nārasimha was actually present at
the time of the campaign against Kṛṣṇa Sēvuna. A later refer-
ence would likewise make it appear that Sōmeśvara too was
present: but these poetical compositions must be interpreted
with more than ordinary caution. We can say that it was only
just possible, and unlikely, because the two were most pro-
bably engaged at the time in the south.
javarā tū jagad-śka-vīru majha dēvā rōnakū bāpu Já-
dava-Nārāyaṇu Nārasiṅgu bhalay end aṁmiṅge tāṁ mecchi tū- /
guvavol Vikramapāla-Pāvusa bīrah-kaṇjaṅgal allāṅ̄tu īr-
dduvu tann āneya honna-ḍeņasyada caṅcat-kētu-dāṅdaṅgalol //

"The lotus heads of Vikramapāla and Pāvusa dangled
among the quivering flag-poles of his elephant's golden howdah,
as if nodding in approval of his valour, saying,"You are Yama-
rāja (the lord of the dead, or "a very devil"), the only hero
in the world, the restrainer of my king, sire !, the Yādava-
Nārāyaṇa, Nārasiṅga, bravo !"(1)

Thus the unfortunate generals of the Sēvuṇa, whom
we know only from this episode, Vikramapāla and Pāvusa or
Pāmsa, were actually killed when the Sēvuṇa attack was repulsed.
It is interesting to note that their severed heads are iron-
ically depicted as praising their enemy in disjointed phrases
of Marāṭhi. Of Pāvusa we can add only that a Pavasariya (? read
Pavasa-rāya) Hari-dēva was the adhikāri, or official, of Pāndya-
nāḍ under the Sēvuṇa Rāmacandra in 1282, and was thus very
probably a Marātha, and perhaps a relative of the Pāmsa who
died in 1223. That the Sēvuṇa had sent southwards a contingent
of Muslim mercenaries under a Muslim commander from one or
other of the small principalities of Gujerat or Rajasthan is
the only probable explanation of the fact that we hear from
this period references to the Turuṣka as a defeated enemy. For

(1) E.C.XI Davangere 25(1224). RICE's translation is defective
in places; in the second verse he is surely wrong to print in
the R.T.Yādava for Jádava in the second line. These have a
claim to be two of the earliest Marāṭhi lines.
example, the Turuška is said to have carried a light as a subject prince to dispel the darkness for Nārasimha. (1) Hoys-āryamā, probably for Hoysa-sūrya, is otherwise unknown. It is of interest to note that the Kannada power referred to the Marātha invaders as Āryas: we learn that Nārasimha trampled down the Āryas with his elephant. (2)

There is no evidence that Nārasimha followed up his northern victory by retaking any of the lost towns north and west of the Tuṅgabhadra; on the contrary, his control of his own dominions seems to have begun to deteriorate perceptibly. During 1224 there were disturbances in Kadur and Mysore districts. In the latter case a certain Hoyseya-nāyaka, who may conceivably have had some connection with the Hoysa supposed above, invaded a part of the Kabbahu-nāḍ, and had to be expelled by military action, at the beginning of the year. (3) Moreover in the eastern parts of the Hoysala nāḍ a certain Kūtt-āśun-dēvar, of Tamilian origin, had begun to set himself up as the independent ruler of Iḷavaṇji-nāḍ, centred upon Āvaṇi, about twelve miles east of Kolar, with the title Jayaṅgonḍa-Cōla-Iḷavaṇjiya-rāyar. One record at Āvaṇi of 1225 and another of about the same time at Gaṭṭu-Kamadēnahaḷi, about seven miles south of Āvaṇi, testify to his success. (4) We hear in 1228 of his wife Cangalvar, daughter of Vasudevar Hulambada-raya of Āvaṇi-nāḍ, (5) and Iḷavaṇjiya-rāya himself was still active in 1229. (6) It seems, indeed, that soon afterwards his power was

suppressed, but the family was clearly not extinguished, for his son Vāsudēvar appears to have been alive and ruling independently in 1254, (1) and the dynasty, if it were worthy of the name, flourished from 1260 apparently without interruption until 1312, ruling an area of approximately four hundred square miles including Kurudumale, Bētamaṅgala and Madivāla besides the places already mentioned. (2) The specially interesting feature of this success on the part of the Ilavaṇjiya-rāya, which was in fact only an outstanding example of the tendency in the Kolar region during this period, is that the Hoysala made no attempt to keep under close control the Naṅgili route to Kāñci. We may perhaps exclude the years 1229-1254, for within them we can not be sure that the Hoysala had not regained the mastery of the area; but the general conclusion distinctly supports the view, here upheld, that Nārasiṃha preferred to enter the Tamil country by way of the Kāveri valley, thus leaving the region east of Kolar in a kind of backwater.

But, however equivocal Nārasiṃha's successes on the plateau, his son's progress in the plains was continuous.

In 1228, with all the titles of his father, samasta-bhuvanāśraya, śrī-prthvī-vallabha, mahārājādhirāja, paramēśvara, paraṇa-bhaṭṭāraka, Dvāravatīpuravarādhīśvara, Yādava-kulaṁbaradvyumaṇi, sarbbajña-cūḍāmaṇi, male-rāja-rāja, maleparol ganda, ganda-bhēruṇḍa, kadana-pracaṇḍa, ēkāṅga-vīra, asahāya-sūra, ṣanīvāra-siddhi, giri-durgga-malla, calad-āṅka-Rāma, Magara-

(1) E.C.X Mulbagal 61(?1254).
(2) E.C.X Mulbagal, 178(1260); ibid.Bowringpet 32(1262); ibid. 34(1269); Mulbagal 184(1273);Bowringpet 7b(1275);Mulbagal 186 (1277);189(1298);57a(1306); and 181a(1312).
rājya-nirmulana, Cōla-rājya-pratisthācārya, Pāṇḍya-rājya-nirddhūma-dhāma, nīśanka-pratāpa-cakravartti, Poysala-Vīra-Sōṃśvara-dēvarasa was ruling the realm at Kāṇṇanūr in the Cōla kingdom. (1) The reasons for choosing "Cōla-rājyada-Kāṇṇanūr" as the seat of his government require to be stated. There was, it seems, at Kāṇṇanūr in 1228 no large town, or fine temple, or stately palace, only a small village, which even in later times was referred to merely as the "koppa". Its name was in no respect distinguishing, as very many such koppas in the surrounding country bore the same. It seems to have been chosen by the Hoysala for a capital city on account of its geographical position. From the point of view of traditional Kannāda strategy, it is true, it had nothing to recommend it. There was no fort, no substantial hill for miles. It lay exposed to attack from every side, while the Kāvēri river, which lay three miles to the south, afforded it no protection. These considerations were not of so much moment, however, to a ruler in Sōṃśvara's position. His father had apparently enabled him to occupy this village as his own representative in the Tamil country, on condition that the Cōla king yielded to the Hoysala government not only some lands to the west of the Kāvēri, as has already been noticed, but also to the north of that river, including the area in which Kāṇṇanūr itself lay, perhaps recently taken out of the hands of the Bāna; adding to that grant the necessary facilities for the raising of a large standing army, to be officered by Kannāda daṇḍanāyakas. From the teeming population

(1) E.C. III Nanjagud 36(1228). The R.T. reads nirddhūma-hōma, which is absurd, and the K.T. nirddhūma-dūma, which is gibberish, for the correct reading: nirddhūma-dhāma.
of the plains there would be little difficulty in recruiting a large establishment, which, stiffened by a mixed Kannada and Tamilian cavalry mounted on Arab horses and perhaps a few companies of Muslim mercenaries, would provide not only a sufficient bulwark against the Pandyas, if it were stationed in the land to the north of the Kaveri, but also a useful means of preventing any further revival on the part of the Bana or the Kada. For Kannanur enjoyed this geographical advantage that it lay on the vital communications from Madura to Cidambaram, by way of Alattur, Uraiyur, Sرافapam, and Gaṅgaikonda-colaparam; from Madura to Āṭtur(Āṭrur) by way of Perambalur; from the south to Vṛddhācalam, Tiruvanţamalai, Kāṇṇi and Nellor; and most important of all, it had a distinctly central position in the plains, while it lay within the most direct and easy reach of the Hoysala-nad by way of Mahādānapuram, Nāmakkal and Tāramaṅgalam.

Sōmēśvara, a lad of about 20 or 22 years, thus remained at Kannanur in the enjoyment of easily earned revenues, and at hand to preserve his Cōla brother-in-law from both internal and external foes. It is possible that one of his first tasks was to tackle the irrepressible Kada. Kōperunjiṅga had evidently been attempting to absorb territory to the south of Cidambaram, which, by the multitude of Kada inscriptions there, seems to have been the chief town in his dominions, and to the neighbourhood of which he had perhaps been confined after 1223. The year 1228-9 has, however, been chosen by a competent
scholar as the first year of Manavāla-perumāl, the father of the second and more famous Köpperuṉjiṅga, who commenced his own reign in 1243-4. (1) If this be the case, then soon after Sōmēśvara's removal to Kannanūr, the new ruler attempted to penetrate south of the Kāvēri, and we learn from a record dated in the 33rd year of Perumal Śrī-vallabha-dēva, a so far unidentified Pāṇḍya prince, at the village of Tiruveṅkādu in the modern Shiyali tāluqā, that the festivals of the temple had not been conducted up to the 32nd year of the king, commencing from the time when Köpperuṉjiṅga-dēva was fighting against the Kannadigas who were building forts on the north bank of the river Kāvēri. It is clear that the Hoysala forces, having marched no less than sixty miles down the river, had attempted to prevent the Kāḍava armies crossing it, but without success, as the disturbances at Tiruveṅkādu, ten miles south of the river, indicate. (2)

In March 1229 Sōmēśvara's father was at Kāṇcī. There had clearly been cause for his presence, but the absence of evidence leaves the matter open for unaided conjecture. (3) Whatever it was, it was of some importance, such as an invasion, or something equally urgent, for when the presence of the king was required at Dōrasamudra, he ordered Sōmēśvara to go there. Sōmēśvara was there in January 1230. He was given the titles "hoe to the root the Kāḍava king, splitter of the skull of the Magara king, a valiant arm in smiting the pride of the Sēvula (i.e. Sēvuṇa) king", and he was given credit for personally acting in the Sēvuṇa campaign of 1223: "First fighting against

---

the famous Kṛṣṇa Kandhara, who like you penetrated into the Cōla country and subdued it? Who pursued after the Pāṇḍya king and captured his elephants? Who of the kings of the Soma line established the Cōla in his traditional kingdom?" He ruled, it is said, from Kānci to Vēḷāvura (Belūr) and from Bayal-nāḍ to the Krishna river, the last of which boundaries is, of course, quite impossible for the period.(1)

As his father was at Horanūr-paṭṭana in October 1230, (2) and may have been at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, to judge from an undated record which states that he was there,(3) it seems that Sōmēśvara's stay at Dōrasamudra was prolonged. There was some fighting, perhaps in the Hoysala nāḍ itself, in 1231 while Sōmēśvara, called in the damaged vīragal "vīra-Nārasiṅga-dēvarasa's son", was still at the capital.(4)

Perhaps while Nārāsimha was at Dōrasamudra during the early summer of that year, preparing to celebrate Sōmēśvara's marriage, if we may rely upon the Gādyakarṇāmṛta,(5) he learned of the advantage taken by the conspirators in the Tamil country of the absence of the two rulers. That the country was stripped of Hoysala officers is most unlikely, but the absence of the two courts and their attendant armies, together with the greater likelihood of their Tamilian troops being corruptible, encouraged the Pāṇḍyas to renew their alliance with the Bāṇa and the Kāḍava, and to commence an invasion of

---

(1) E.C.IV Nagamangala 98(1230) also E.C.III Mandya 122(1230).
(4) E.C.V Arskere 36(1231),K.T.only, dated only Śaka 1153. Khara.
the southern Cōla provinces from three sides at once. The Cōla Rājarāja fled for the second time, and was overtaken by the Kādava and captured at Sendamaṅgalam. The Sendamaṅgalam in the modern Tirukkoyilur tāluqa, about twelve miles west of Tiruvadigai and thirteen miles north of Vṛddhācalam has been suggested as Kopperuṇjiṅga's capital.(1) That a particular Sendamaṅgalam was in fact his capital is to a slight extent supported by a Pāṇḍya record which states that Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya besieged the prosperous city of Sendamaṅgalam and fought several battles to frighten the Pallava.(2) But the identification of the Sendamaṅgalam here in question is difficult. That in Tindivanam tāluqa, forty-eight miles east of Tiruvaṭṭāmalai and about twenty miles from Teliṟṟu, where the Cōla was first captured, possesses four inscriptions of Kopperuṇjiṅga (whether the first or second of that name we can not say) in his 2nd., 9th., 17th., and 19th., years.(3) The Sendamaṅgalam preferred by Hultzsch possesses, according to the epigraphical reports up to and including 1938, no Kādava inscriptions, and, although nearer the general scene of the Kādava's activities, is very probably not the scene of the Hoysala enterprise of 1231.(4)

From the point where Nārasimha learnt of the capture of the Cōla at Jayantamaṅgala, otherwise Sendamaṅgala, the story of the Gadyakārṇāmṛta is supplemented by an inscription at Tiruvēndipuram in the South Arcot district, near the sea coast, about twenty miles north of Cidambaram.(5)

(1) E.g. Hultzsch in E.I.vii p.167. (2) A.R.1894,166(1257). (3) A.R.1903,70,71,69,76. (4) The Sendamaṅgalam to the north of Namakkal should be borne in mind when considering operations in which Bāha or Hoysala were engaged. The Kādava himself does
It appears that the king, hearing that Köpperuñjhīṅga had captured the Cōla emperor at Sendamangalam, and had destroyed the kingdom with his army, and that the temples of the god (Śiva) and the places of Viṣṇu were destroyed, exclaimed, according to the Tamil inscription, "This trumpet shall not be blown unless I maintain my reputation of being the establisher of the Cōla country." He then started from Dōrasamudra, uprooted once again the Magara kingdom, seizing the king, his women and treasures, and then halted at Pāccūr. This place is less than a mile north of the northern branch of the Kāvēri as it passes the island of Īṟṟaṅgam, and about four and a half miles west-south-west of Kannanūr. (1) The great army clearly camped near the capital which Sōmēśvara had vacated during the previous eighteen months; and, having to face opposition from the Pāṇḍya and not wishing to show the latter the Hoysala rear, Nārāsimha did not propose to go himself northwards, but sent a strong contingent under two general officers. Thus, to continue with the inscription's story, the king was pleased to order, "Destroy the country of Köpperuñjhīṅga and liberate the Cōla emperor", and the great minister, particular confidant, daṇḍanāyaka Appanna, who bore the titles "controller of the army" and "sole champion of the world", together with Samudra-Goppayya-daṇṇākka (i.e. daṇṇāyaka), took leave of the king and started northwards. The inscription then gives a chronicle of their adventures, which are here accompanied with a commentary.

---

1. Hultzsch's location of Pāccūr is in several respects faulty e.g. 9½ miles west by south of Kannanūr. He is certainly wrong in supposing that Nārāsimha left his dominions by the Gujalhatti pass. There is no evidence that this pass was used by Nārāsimha at any time.
They moved parallel with the north bank of the Kāvēri or Coleroon river until they reached the southern limits of the territory recently acquired by the Kāḍava Köpperuṇjiṅga in the Cidambaram district. Their first considerable capture was Ellēri, which they destroyed; next fell Kalliyūrmalai, about four miles north of Ellēri, Köpperuṇjiṅga himself escaping only just in time. They then took and destroyed Toḷudagaiyūr, where Sōlakōn was staying. This Toḷudagaiyūr, in default of villages nearer to Cidambaram, must be identified, tentatively, with Toludūr, about forty-five miles up the Vellār river. It is quite possible that the Hoysala force in order to reach Cidambaram, a town which Köpperuṇjiṅga was justly proud of possessing, was obliged to meet and defeat large forces deployed at intervals in the districts of Vṛddhācalam and to the westwards, where, as for example at Toḷudagaiyūr, the Kāḍava could count upon loyal assistance from the Bāna. It is clear at any rate that the entry into Cidambaram was not easily effected, for in addition to the Sōlakōn whom they defeated at Toḷudagaiyūr, and whom Hultszch rightly associates with a high Kāḍava officer of that name, they killed among the king’s officers Vīra-Gaṅga-nāḍāḷvan and Cīnatta-rāyan, and, if the damaged reading may be relied upon, four others, including Parākramabāhu, king of Ilam, or Ceylon, although the significance may be

the Hoysala cause, for the Ceylon ruler had been intervening on behalf of a faction among the Pāṇḍya princes for a number of years, and was probably, on the Pāṇḍya side, a party to the confederacy against the Cōla. The defences of the Kādava being at length broken, the daṇḍanāyakas entered Cidambaram, or, as the inscription puts it, worshipped the god of Ponnambalam; next, they proceeded northwards, and destroyed rich places including Toṇḍaimāṇāllūr, which can hardly be the Toṇḍaimāṇallūr about nine miles south of Tiruvannāmalai, but must be represented by the modern Tondamāṇattam, near the road from Vāṭdhācalam to Kūdalūr, about fifteen miles north of Cidambaram. They caused forests to be cut down in that area and halted at Tiruppādiri-puliyūr, about seven miles north of Tondamāṇattam. Köpperunjīṅga must have fled before them, for they next entered and destroyed Tiruvadigai, or Tiruvādi, just over ten miles west of their last halting-place, before crossing the Ponnaiyār and the Varāhanadi and reaching Tiruvakkarai. The trail of destruction continued northwards until they reached the coast in the Kādava's home territory, where they burnt and destroyed port-towns on the shore and the crops (1) to the east of Sēndamaṅga-lam, that is between that town and the sea. These activities are said to have been south of the Vāraṇavāsi river. This N.K. Sastri, following Hultzsch, identifies with the Gaḍilam, an untenable identification, as the Sēndamaṅgalam to which Köpperunjīṅga fled, and where Rājarāja was held, was that in the modern Tindivanam talūga, so that the Vāraṇavāsi may have been

(1) So N.K. Sastri, Cōla II p. 182, for Hultzsch's "drinking channels".
either the great Pālār, or the small Oṅgūr river. When Appana
Kopperuniṅga
and Goppaya were on the point of advancing against Šendamaṅgalam
itself offered to the king (Nārasimha) to release the Cōla
emperor. It appears that the Kāḍava sought and obtained a res-
pite from the marauding operations of the daṇḍanāyakas while
Nārasimha's approval was sought to the terms offered. As the
release of Rājarāja was one of the chief war-aims, no other
terms, so far as we know, were exacted, and Kopperuniṅga
released the Cōla emperor; and the Hoysala daṇḍanāyakas, claim-
ing the credit for this release, accompanied him some distance
and allowed him to enter his kingdom.(1) It is supposed that
on arriving at Tiruvēndipuram on their southward journey the
Hoysala officers' and the Cōla's ways parted. It is very likely
that the latter presented them with valuable gifts, while they
had the remarkable inscription put up to commemorate their
achievement.

Goppaya-daṇṇāyaka, bearing the titles daṇḍināgōpa
and jagadobbagānda, like Appana, presented the village of
Tiraiyālam in Elavūr-nāḍ, a subdivision of Eyil-nāḍ, to the god
Allālanāṭha of Kāṇci in the 15th year of Rājarāja, that is, 1231.
It was almost certainly a part of the reward he received for
his zeal on behalf of the Cōla. In his gift he was following
the example of another Hoysala officer, Ammaṇa-daṇṇāyaka, who
made a grant for a lamp in the same temple during the previous
year.(2)

(2) A.R.1919,404(1231); ibid. 408(1230).
The Gadyakarṇēṃṛta tells us, according to the report, that Appana and Goppaya slew the Kāḍava king called Nigāhu. But it is probably certain that they did not kill Köpperuṇjiṅga himself, while it is quite possible that they may have killed one of his family. The heroic rather than historical nature of this Śanskrit work is amply displayed by its relating that Nārasimha himself went to Jayantamaṅgala. Of Nārasimha's actual movements after camping at Pāccūr we have no really trustworthy contemporary evidence, but it is very unlikely that he visited Köpperuṇjiṅga personally, or that he could have had occasion to go to Sēndamaṅgalam. A later record tells us that previously the king was in Ravitadāṇa's kuppa "in order to make a victorious expedition over Pāṇḍya". (1) This event may safely be dated in 1231-2, but as long as the place in question remains unidentified no more precise fact can be ascertained from the statement.

The Gadyakarṇēṃṛta then tells us, so far as may be gathered from the summary, how Nārasimha engaged the combined army of Pāṇḍya, Kāḍava, and perhaps Bāna forces, with the Kāḍava's mleccha or vaideśika allies, who might be either from Ceylon, or perhaps Muslim mercenaries, for a period of ninety days. The scene of this extended conflict was the plain near Śrīraṅgam, perhaps on the south side of the river. The result was the defeat of the confederates, and the submission of the Pāṇḍya princes. Sakalavidyācakravarti says that they became tributary vassals to the Hōysala, a statement which may be

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 123(1236).
dismissed as windy rhetoric. Nārasiṃha’s eulogists, however, soon garlanded him with epithets. He is called “the setter up of the Cōla-rāya, day of judgement to Makara and other kings, confiner within narrow limits of the Pāṇḍya empire.”(1) In January 1234 he has the titles Magara-maṇḍalika-bhūri-bhūruha-kathōra-kūṭhāra, Adiyama-prabāla-bāla-pannaga-Vainatēya, Kāḍava-rāya-maṇḍa-maṇḍa-mēghārava, uddāṇa-prabāla-bāla-Pāṇḍya-gaṇḍa-garbha-parvvata-Pākasāsana, “a hard axe to the mighty tree, the Magara ruler; a Garuḍa to the snake, the powerful might of Adiyama; thundering in the clouds to the infatuated flamingo, the Kāḍava king; an Indra to (split) the mountain, the pride of the champion Pāṇḍya with haughty powerful might.”(2) Again, in a record put up two years later:—

Magarōrvīpāla-nirmmulakan atula-balam Cōla-rājya-pratisthā-pakan int i-Nārasiṃha-ksitipati bare sarvvasvamam Pāṇḍya-bhūpālakar tettälāge bāl end ulidapud enisitt ādam udvṛtta-matsya-prakarōgra-grāha-nakra-kramana-jaṇita-nirdhvāna-raudṛam samudram //

“When the uprooter of the Magara king, setter up of the Cōla king, Nārasiṃha the king of unequalled might came (there), the ocean, roaring with the noise produced by the movement of crocodiles, multitudinous fierce sharks, and fishes come to the surface, took voice and cried, “O Pāṇḍya princes, pay up all you have, become servants, and live’’”(3)

(1) E.C.VI Kadur 12a(1233). (2) E.C.V Arsikere 82(1234). (3) E.C.V Arsikere 123(1236). The R.T. has bhūpālaka ttett; the KT. mačchya for matsya, perhaps rightly.
Even a certain Ballaya-danṇāyaka claimed credit for his master's success in a couplet in which he says that it was through him, in battle, that Nārasimha acquired the legendary victories that were renowned throughout the circle of the quarters. The dādanāyakas that released the Cōla were not forgotten in their native land, where however they did not think fit to have so lengthy a record put up, but were satisfied with a brief resume of their defeating of the Kāḍava and escorting of the Cōla, both of which are mentioned in a record of April 1233.

Nārasimha did not leave the Cōla country immediately after his success. He seems to have spent some time in arranging the Hoysala affairs there to his satisfaction. He was in Pāncāla, in the Cōla nāḍ" in November 1233. It may be conjectured that Pāncāla is to-day represented by Pāncālam in the Tindivanam tāluqa, about twenty miles south west of Sēndamaṅgalam.

Sōmēśvara was now in a position to resume his duties at Kannanūr, and did so soon after his father's victory, but with this difference that he ruled as the sovereign of some part of the Cōla country, enjoying a status far superior to that allowed him five years before. He was, naturally, in fact still subordinate to his father, and indeed Nārasimha himself was recognized as ruler at Śrīraṅgam in November of that year, but from 1233 he commenced the era of his reign which was used for

dating his records in the Tamil country. The Cōla and Pāṇḍya rulers habitually dated their śāsanas in the year of their reign, with such modification as might be necessary to particularize the day of that year and with certain peculiar features of specification of the total of the years themselves, which is not yet in fact fully comprehended and is unnecessary to describe here. Sōmeśvara for his part, while not adopting all the peculiarities of this method, did not care to introduce the Śaka era and Jupiter cycle, which was actually brought into the south by his grandson, Ballāla III; but did not become usual until the advent of the Vijayanagara empire. (1) Sōmeśvara was certainly settled at Kaṇṇanūr in July 1233. (2)

While the Hoysalā was improving his hold upon the Cōla country, and was attempting to derive thence consolation for the failure of his family’s ambitions in the north, no progress was made towards recovering from the Sēvūnas lands captured by them from Nārasiṃha himself and from his father, or even preventing Sēvūna penetration south of the Tuṅgabhadra. No major offensive was made or withstood, but it is clear that the continuous diplomatic and other activity formerly kept up by the Hoysalā in the north-west was in this reign almost entirely abandoned, with results that will become evident when the reign of Nārasiṃha III is described.

Vīra-Nārasiṃha must have died in December 1235: his last dated inscription is of that month. (3) His son was in (1) Proof that 1233-4 was the first regnal year of Sōmeśvara is provided by the following coincidences of cyclic year and regnal year: 17th year, Sādhāraṇa (A.R.1910, 204 at Adhamankōṭṭai); 21st Ananda (E.C.III Seringapatam 110); 5th, Vikāri (E.C.VI Tarikere 87). (2) E.C.VI Kadur 12a(1233). (3) E.C.V Channarayapatna 221b. E.C.IX Bangalore 139a(?1237) is a retrospective grant.
Viradānada-kuppa, which may have been on the route between Kannanūr and Dōrasamudra, in August 1235.(1) That he went to the capital is clear: it may have been during his father's illness.(2) It is interesting to see that very shortly after his father's death he was again on his way to the south: "having marched towards the Cōla-Pāṇḍya kingdom (i.e. the Kannanūr principality, which partook of both spheres), he was in the residence of ṬAruna>samudra".(3)

So it was that, at the age of fifty-three, Nārasimha II died, and in him the last traces of the traditions inherited from the great Viśnuvardhana. With the accession of Śomēśvara the Hoysala dynasty entered upon a decline which led steadily, if not quite inevitably, to the collapse of 1343.

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 203b(1235).
(2) M.A.R.1909-10(1235).
(3) E.C.XI Jagalur 33, dated Śaka 1157, Manmatha, ...... saṅkrānti.
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THE DECLINE.

The reigns of Śomēśvara, Rāmarātha and Nārasimha III.

Of all the reigns of Hoysala kings, that of Śomēśvara seems to have been the most tragic. Ill-success often dogged the movements of the sons of Ereyaṅga; Ballāla's closing years were encompassed by disappointment and error; Nārasimha II's life's work was largely devoted to a misguided course and a futile end; Śomēśvara's son Nārasimha enjoyed triumphs amid distress and victories where the victors suffered equally with the vanquished; and, again, his son Ballāla witnessed, after panic-stricken convulsions inspired by folly or genius by turns, the utter hopelessness of his cause, and paid for his incompetence with his life. But none of these experienced the hopes or the opportunities of Śomēśvara; none shouldered such responsibilities or betrayed them so thoroughly; none had such occasions for self-congratulation, or was obliged to accept such humiliations, as this unfortunate monarch. Had we sufficient records surviving, doubtless as fine a tragedy as a treatise on state-craft could be composed out of the events of his life, crowded as it was with incidents and vicissitudes of an equally violent character.

Śomēśvara's preoccupation with the south would have harmed the Hoysala country, and so the Hoysala dynasty, very little, had he been able to maintain a firm and efficient hold
over the details of internal affairs on the plateau, had there been no danger of a governmental breakdown from within as well as foreign attack from without, and had the presence of Hoysala officials and troops in the south been rewarded by a continuous and highly profitable return. As it turned out, the riches which the Hoysala acquired at first served only to encourage and enhance the desires of the courtiers, and to prejudice the prosperity of the Hoysala nāḍ itself, while the position which Sōmēśvara felt it necessary to maintain in the Tamil districts soon commenced to cost more than it produced. Stronger efforts to keep a hold on Kaṇṭanūr, even when it was plain that the venture was a failure, only rendered defeat more costly, while the constant attention paid by the sovereign to the affairs of the plains tended to alienate from the dynasty the loyalties of many influential persons on the plateau.

Sōmēśvara himself doubtless imagined that his policy was very astute. The aid he had been able to afford to the Cōla had purchased not only a limited territorial sovereignty in the Kāvērī valley, but also the diplomatic as well as geographical opportunity to keep a kind of balance of power between the ancient enemies, Cōla and Pāṇḍya, in the hope that each would turn to him for assistance against the other. Had there been, in fact, only three parties to this little project, all might have been well. But the Cōla had other allies, who had their own reasons for deprecating the dismemberment of the Cōla empire. With the Pāṇḍyas on one side, Sōmēśvara had to cope on the other with the Kādaṇa, the Telugu ruler of Nellore, other-
wise the Cōḍa Tikka Gaṇḍagōpāla, who had a son with the same title, and beyond him the resources of the Kaṭakiya Ganapati, who might or might not support his southern neighbour—all these besides the Cōḍa. And the Cōḍa court was not of one mind. The feeble Rājarāja III was bound by many obligations to his brother-in-law: not so Rājendrā. This Cōḍa prince, who later became Rājendrā III, commencing to rule in his own right in 1246, was probably Rājarāja's son, though the precise relationship between them is not certain. (1) He had ambitions and energy much exceeding those of Rājarāja, and it was not long before he began to resent the presence of the Hoysala in the Cōḍa country.

In 1236, however, Somēśvara was fairly well established there. He was in a position to remit taxes, in return for a lump payment, on land belonging to the temple at Jambukēśvaram on the island of Śrīraṅgam and to the shrines of Vīra-Cōḷiśvara, Padumaliśvara, Vīra-Nārasiṅgiśvara, and Sōmalīśvara. (2) We can not be certain, but it seems likely that it was Somēśvara himself who set up these images in memory of his foster-mother Sōmalā-dēvi (then still alive), his father, his grandmother and grandfather. The title Vīra-Cōḷai is very intriguing: it seems to refer to Ballāla II, but we have no other evidence of Ballāla's assuming the title "hero amongst, or in respect of, the Cōḷas", although the events of 1218 may well have justified it.

Before the month of May 1236 Somēśvara, on the Cōḷas behalf as well as his own, faced a full-scale Pāṇḍya invasion,

(1) The view that he was Rājarāja's younger brother does not conform to the scheme of matrimonial alliances between Hoysala and Cōḍa as narrated here, (2) A.R.1936-7.119(1236).
himself crossed the Kāvēri, and moving southwards occupied certain areas in the Pāṇḍya maṇḍala.(1) He is described in a reliable record as residing in the Pāṇḍya country which he had acquired by his strength and valour.(2) At the time of the grant his ministers Bōganna and Mallanna were at Rāmeśvaram, a sure attraction for visitors during an invasion of the Pāṇḍya country. It is submitted that the occasion for this movement by Sōmēśvara was the invasion by Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya which is referred to in the second part of the historical praṣasti of the famous inscription at Tinnevelly, which relates that when the Cōla king, resolving not to remain submissive and refusing to pay tribute, thinking that the Pūnal-nād (the part of the Cōla country which centres on the Kāvēri river) belonged to its ruler, sent a large army, the Pāṇḍya destroyed that force, took the Cōla country, entered Muḍikondacōlapuram and performed the ceremony of the anointing of heroes.(3) It is clear from the statements themselves that Māravarman Sundara’s movement was a hasty one and of little substantial effect compared with his success of twenty years before. Naturally the Cōla king no longer considered the settlement of 1216 valid, and in the action that the inscription describes we can recognize the hand of the prince Rājēndra.

Sōmēśvara’s part in the task of repairing the damage done by Rājēndra’s hasty action seems to have been extensive. His troops appear to have ravaged Pāṇḍya territory over a wide

(1) A viragal belonging to this campaign is to be found in the fragmentary but valuable E.C.V Belur 152(1236), K.T. only.
(2) E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 63(1236).
(3) E.I.xxii 10(?1238). See also N.K.Sastri, Cōlas II,144-6. The site of Muḍikondacōlapuram is still unknown.
area, if one may judge from a record of 1239, which tells of the confiscation of lands belonging to persons guilty of having broken into the treasury of the temple at Tiruppatūr, Rāmnād district, and having slaughtered some Brahmans during the troublous times of the Hoysala invasion. (1)

The Hoysala next faced the Kādava, who must have marched southwards to attack him in the rear, true to his alliance with the Pāṇḍyās. In December 1236 Somēśvara was himself at Maṅgalada-koppa on a victorious expedition against the Kādava-rāya. (2) This action was necessitated by the success that Köpperuṇjiṅga had already obtained over his forces. Kēśava, Harihara and other đaṇḍāyakas of the Hoysala were killed, and the Kādava was obliged to make a gift to the temple at Vṛddha-ācalam as expiation for the slaughter of these Brahmans at Perumbalūr, about twenty miles north of Kāmnānūr, and for the seizure of their women and treasure. Somēśvara however succeeded in obtaining the title Kādava-rāyana-benkoṇḍa-gaṇḍa, "the champion who pursued the Kādava king."

haranā-bharanā-kṣamaṇ rāyarol Ī-kali-Sōvi-dēvan upad āntire saṅgaradol būrim kiltam šaraṇ ene Rājendra-Cōlanam pālisidam //

"This hero Sōvi-dēva, practised in destroying and supporting (like Hara and Hari) among kings, without hesitation plucked (them) up by the root in war, and protected Rājendra Cōla as a suppliant." (4)

(1) A.R.1935-6,170(1239). That the Hoysala suffered some losses at Pāṇḍya hands is not impossible and is supported by A.R.1927, 29 at Tinnevelly, which is an inscription of Kulaśēkhara Pāṇḍya (? Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkhara, see N.K.Sastri, Pāṇḍyas, p.155) of 1238. He built the high prakāra wall of the Śiva temple from booty obtained from the Kērāla, Cōla and Hoysala kings.
(2) E.C.V Arsikere 123(1236). (3) A.R.73 of 1918, N.K.Sastri,
With the treasures acquired by himself and by his officers Śomēśvara's success was announced far and wide. The king himself sent an embassy northwards, across the plateau, to make gifts of gold in his name to the gods Virūpākṣa of Hampe, later the famous city Vijayanagara, and Viṭṭhala of Pandharapur. (1) It is of interest to note that the Sevuna ruler of Dēvagiri put no effective obstacle in the way of the Hoysala embassy's reaching the latter place. It has been supposed, quite wrongly, of course, that the existence of these inscriptions implies some authority on the Hoysala's part in the area at the time. (2) Meanwhile Vallaya-dāṇḍāyaka made a grant at Tirumalavādi; certain officials of Sōmala-dēvi at Tirugōkapam; Pōḷāḷva-dāṇḍāyaka at Kānci; and Sōmala-dēvi herself at Śīraṅgam. A grant at Kānci, left unfinished, but probably mentioning the Yādava Śomēśvara and his queen Dēvikā is probably of this year. (3)

Śomēśvara's power and position seemed assured.

Hoysala officers penetrated at will all parts of the Tamil country, and the king himself meditated an alliance with the Pāṇḍya. (4) For all this an inscription of 1237 makes but modest
claims: his boundaries were given as śrīraṅgam in the south,
Sāvi in the north and Naṅgili on the east. Thus it is
plain that in that year Sōmēśvara's southern kingdom did not
extend beyond the Kāvēri into the Cōla provinces in the mod-
ern Trichinopoly or Tanjore districts or into the Pāṇḍya
country that lay to the south of these; nor in the east did he
hold any rights in the country of the Cōḍa in the neighbour-
hood of Kāḻci; in the north again his claims had shrunk, as
indeed they should, to the limits claimed by Viṣṇuvardhana in
his early years. It is unlikely that Sōmēśvara's rule extended
to the Tuṅgabhadra for more than a few miles east of the point
where the river turns eastwards. The Sēvuna certainly held the
north bank of the river, as a record of 1236 at Harti shows.(2)
Sōmēśvara himself was on campaign in the autumn of
1237, but it is not certain in which direction or against whom.
He was at Docale, an unidentified place, in October. It may be
that he was on his way to deal with an outbreak of fighting in
the eastern part of the Hoysala dominion in which apparently
one of the nāḍ-āḷvas of the eastern nāḍs, who were, like
Ilavaṇjiya-rāya, of Cōla origin or associations and never fully
accommodated to the Hoysala style of government, and ever ready
to seek independence, had engaged in conflict with regular
Hoysala officials.(3) This conflict presaged more of the same
and similar kinds that were to come in the future.

616-7(1236); A.R.1936-7,72,ibid.para.48,p.79(1236); and A.R.1919
602(?1236).
Page 321 n.(4) To this period perhaps belongs A.R.1929-30,433
(cl237) which shows Kēśava- daṅdanāyaka in some way concerned
with affairs in Kuda-nāḍ. The record is of an unidentified ruler
whose titles began with samastabhuvaṅgaṅraya, and is at Āttūr,
Tiruccendūr tālūqa, Tinnevelly district; no inscriptions have
been found further south mentioning Hoysala officers.
(1),(2) & (3) over.
In December 1238 Sōmeśvara was said to be happily ruling at Vijaya-rājendra-pura in the Cōla kingdom, a city which he had created. (1) It is open to question where this city was, but the probably most reasonable suggestion yet made is that it was either Kannanūr itself, which later acquired the name Vikramapura in the same way, or somewhere in the vicinity. There is, however, something very curious about the choice of the name: it was natural enough to choose another designation for a Hoysala capital otherwise known by such a common and insignificant name as Kannanūr, but what diplomatic connection with the Cōla court accounted for the flattering reference to Rājendra has yet to be discovered. In the following year Sōmeśvara was said to be ruling in the Cōla kingdom "having taken it", a statement which implies, not without truth, that his presence at Kannanūr was the result as much of pressure upon the Cōla, if not blackmail, as of any direct invitation by the latter to remain. (2) His relations with Rājarāja and Rājendra must, however, have been tolerably good, for, when in 1239 Hoysala troops were attacked by Gaṅgāgopāla's forces in the region about seventy miles north of Kannanūr, he was able to embark on a protracted campaign against him, in which the Cōla must have furnished some assistance, and was at least in a position to attack the tiny Hoysala kingdom.

---

Page 322 n. (1) M.A.R. 1909-10, para. 80 (1237) at Vaidyanāthapura.

(1) M.A.R. 1912-3, para. 81a & b, at Ellēnapura, Hole-narsipur taluk.
(2) E.C. III Tirumakudal-Narsipur 103 (1239): Cōla-rājyan kōṇdu aṅgē prathīvari-rājyaṁ pāṇāniṛka, etc.
while its ruler was marching northwards. (1) The circumstances seem to be that Gandagopala, nominally a subordinate of Rajaraja, was engaged in an expedition, perhaps of conquest or merely of preliminary exploration with that end in view, from his own territories in the modern Nellore, Chittoor and Chingleput districts, towards the land held by Kopperunjinga. An inscription at Jambai, no less than fifty miles south-west of Kanchi, tells how "Nayanar Gandagopalar was pleased to go out, and having stabbed Vallala-deva proceeded to (?) Cambai". The record is dated in the twenty-third year of Rajaraja, the month Cittirai, otherwise April-May 1239. (2) Somesvara's officer was probably

(1) Another circumstance strengthens this conclusion. Between 1237 and 1240 there are a number of grants which show that when Hoysala officers made religious endowments in the Tamil country their records quoted the indigenous rather than the Hoysala ruler's era. Thus we have, of the 22nd year of Rajaraja (1237), an inscription at Jambai recording a grant by Devanaga,... son of a danandanayaka of Somesvara-deva(A.R.1937-8,435); of the same year (1238), at Kanchi, a grant by Vallaya-dandanayaka, son of Duzaippuram, a jana-pradhani of Somesvara(A.R.1919,366); of the 24th year of Rajaraja(1239) at Srirangam itself, a grant by Vittaya a senabova of Bhimannadanayaka, minister of Somesvara(A.R.1936-7,30); of the same year, at Jambukeswaram a mention of Bagnaya-danayanaka in connection with a grant(A.R.1937-8,14); of the same year a grant by three persons including daninagopa Somaiya-dandanayaka at Karuvur,Trichinopoly district(A.R.1905,138); of the same year gifts of cattle for a lamp at Kanchi by Mallaya-dandanayaka, son of Appaya-dandanayaka,brother of the mahapradhani daninagopa(?) by Kesava son of Appaya(?) and by Goppaya-dandanayaka, younger brother of Mallaya-dandanayaka son of Appaya(A.R. 1919,611,612 & 615).

(2) A.R.1937-8,439. The editor, on p.94, says that Vallala is Narasimha II. His ground is that Vallala was the common name of all the Hoysala rulers. The suggestion is absurd because (a) Vallala was a common name amongst the Kannada people generally, bal and ala, "a strong man", and (b) because the term "the Ballalas" or "the nine Ballalas" only came into use in the seventeenth century, and was derived from the lingering fame of the third, not the second Ballala.
not the only important casualty in the campaign, for Gandagopala was bent on achieving something by his enterprise, and, approaching Rājarāja or Rājendra with promises of support against the overpowerful Kādava and Hoysala, persisted in hostile activity in the area of the Pennaiyār river. Sōmeśvara was actually marching against Gandagopala in August 1240 while, in camp with the Māpeya army (or the army in or at Māpe) he "obtained the birth of a son."(1) The result of the campaign was unsatisfactory to Sōmeśvara, if we may judge from the statements of a contemporary Telugu poet, who was in a good position to know the facts, even if he did not chose to tell all of them. Tikkana Sōmayāji in the opening verses of his Nirvacanottara Rāmāyaṇānum wrote of the achievements of Tikka nrpati, the father of his patron Manumasiddhi. Both these rulers held the titles Potappiicoḷaṇ Tirukkalattidevana Gandagopalaṇ, and it is with the former that Sōmeśvara first came into contact.

Tikkana portrays Tikka nrpati as a loyal subordinate of Rājarāja, who by his warfare against Samburāja, Kānci, Čēdimandala and the Kādava king enlarged his own supremacy, and by his victory over the Kānatā ruler Sōmeśvara earned for himself the title Cōlasthāpanācārya.

kamalapta-pratimāna-mūrti-yagunā-Kānṭā-Sōmeśu-du-
rdama-dōr-garvamu rūpu māpi nije-darpāmbum bratiṣṭīmci li-/lameyin Jōluni bhūmipai nilipi Cōla-sthāpanācāryanā-
mamu dakkamgoni Tikka-bhūvibhuḍu sāmartyambu cēllimpaḍē //

"King Tikka made good his power by spoiling the arrogance of the untameable arm of the Kānṭākana Sōmeśvara,

(1) E.C.VI Kadur 100(1240). This was Narasimha. His upanayana was
who had an appearance resembling the Sun; by consecrating his own pride; by establishing upon the earth the Cōla as if in sport; and by acquiring the title "architect of the setting up of the Cōla." (1)

It is at any rate clear that while in 1240 Sōmesvara suffered no considerable blow at the hands of the jealous Rājendra, the Nellore Cōla not only harmed his prestige but encouraged the Cōla to expect aid from another quarter. Even the blow dealt by Gaṅdagopāla at the Kāḍava, though apparently advantageous to the Hoysala's cause, in fact added to Sōmesvara's discomfiture. It was chiefly the presence of the ambitious Kopperunjiṅga, ever striving towards Tiruvannāmalai and beyond Cidambaram, that had kept Rājarāja in mind of his dependence upon the Hoysala.

However, life seems to have gone on as usual at Kannanūr. Sōmesvara's foster-mother endowed the temple of Sangamallisvaram-udaiyār-nāyanār at Tiruvānaikkā with land bought for the purpose in Pērūr Cirudavūr or Pālūrcēri. (2) A record at Tiruvasi near Śrīraṅgam of about this period refers to the disposal of land in various nāds within Rājarājavālanād, and is signed in Grantha characters with the word Maleparul ganda, a form of Maleparoḻanda, the Hoysala king's vernacular signature. (3) Of about this period must be the record at Ālambakkam also, in Trichinopoly tāluqa, which tells of

performed in 1255, i.e. at the age of 15, which is suitable to the caste to which the Hoysalas belonged. Rāmanātha was, one may be right is guessing, younger, and born in the month Cittirai: (E.C.X Chintamanani 88(1294)).

(1) Nirvācanottara Rāmāyanamu, verse 34(p.4) Cf. verse 33, last 4 lines. See N.K.Sastri, CōḷasII, p.200-1.
services to the temple there by Vittappa-dandanayaka, son of a general of Narasimha-deva and a native of a village near Madhurantakam in Tondaimandalam, well to the north of the Cola areas normally within Sōmēśvara's supervision at this time. Yet another record of Sōmēśvara's reign at Periyakorukkai in Lalgudi taluqa, and thus on the north bank of the Kāverī, refers to a gift of land to the Brahmans of Girrumbala-caturvedimahalā, presumably at that place. The period of the inscription may be about 1240.

Meanwhile, Hoysala affairs on the plateau were progressing without glory if without disgrace. Sōmēśvara still enjoyed some authority, surprisingly enough, in the Sāntara territory. In 1239 a Sēvupa officer by name Lakhaṇapāla was attacked by Bīrarasa Sāntara, ruler of the Sāntalige 1,000 in Hosagunda, at Kuppagadde. The Sēvūṇa had taken advantage of the divisions between the inhabitants of this distracted quarter, in remarkable contrast to the supine attitude of Sōmēśvara, and had taken Gutti in that year. Despite constant opposition from the Sāntara Bīrarasa, who although claiming Hoysala protection received no substantial support from the Hoysala, Laksmipāla, to give him an alternative form of his name, ruled the Nāgara-khanda division and a good portion of the Banavāse 12,000 until 1248. The years were filled with activity and fighting either between the mandālikas and manneyar themselves or between them and their Sēvūṇa overlord, the Sāntara not only managing to keep out of the Devagiri imperial net, but also achieving marvellous

(1) A.R.1909,713(1240), V.R. Trichy, 311.
(2) A.R.1926, 269(1240).
(3) E.C.VIII Sorab 492(1239) at Barige.
successes. (1) The Hoysala did nothing to assist these sturdy recusants. In January 1238 a Sevuna officer by name Vīcana, who claims to have taken a large part in the conquests of his ruler, Simhana II, procured a grant which was engraved on copper-plates and includes this phrase:

helāsādhita-Raṭṭa-Koṅkaṇa-kanat-Kādamba-Gutta(y)ō(read u)llasat-Pāṇḍyodda(read ḍdā)mara-Hosa(read Hoysa)nādi-vividha-kṣmāpāla-
bhūmāndalaḥ

"He who acquired in sport the territories of various kings including the Koṅkaṇ (famous on account) of the Raṭṭas, Gutti (once belonging to) the glorious Kadambas, the Pāṇḍya and the turbulent Hoysana."(2)

(1) In April 1244 Bīrarasa was actually in Belagavatti (E.C.VII Honnali 49(1244)); in March 1245 Sōyi-dēva of Gutti fought against him (E.C.VIII Scrab 521(1245) K.T.only; read Gutti for Satti); Kūḍali was under siege in June 1245 (E.C.VII.Honnali 54(1245)). See also E.C.VII Sagar 27(1241), 1(1241) and cf. E.C. VII Honnali 55(1247). Bīrarasa still had Belagavatti in his power in 1247: E.C.VII Honnali 58(1247), K.T.only, and ibid. 56 & 57(April 1247) at Kuḷahalli. The last, also found in the K.T.only, is an important record which seems to prove Bīrarasa's connection with the Hoysala cause:<ka>kādana-praçaṅdā maleparol ganda...Cola-rāyapratiṣṭhācāryya <Hoysa-la-dēva-pāḍā>rādhaka Bīra-dēvarasa ruling at Belagavatti. It is not known whether in fact, late in his campaigns in the east, Bīrarasa was forced to accept Hoysala overlordship; it seems more likely that he needed Hoysala support to make headway against the Sevuna and other enemies, but it is pretty clear that he received little.

(2) J.B.B.R.A.S.xv 384-90. The text is corrected by Fleet in order to conform to that provided by the inscription he published in J.B.B.R.A.S.xii 42-50(1253), at Bēnatiḷḷi. He translates it, "having acquired with ease the territories of various kings, commencing with the Raṭṭas, the Kadambas who are glorious in the Koṅkaṇa, Pāṇḍya who shines at Gutti, and the turbulent Hoysana." This translation is rendered impossible by the fact that no Pāṇḍya was ever associated with Gutti, although the Kadamba certainly was. Were it not for the text of J.B.B.R.A.S.xii 42-50(1253), we should be amply justified in rejecting Fleet's emendation, and reading Guttōlassat Pāṇḍya,"the shining Pāṇḍya and the Gutta", a translation consistent with the grammar and the history of the period. No facsimiles are available. The word uddāmara likewise gives trouble. Perhaps one might render "the Hoysana who was turbulent over, or in respect of the Pāṇḍya."
Putting aside the not altogether unjustified claim against the Hoysala, the mention of the Pāṇḍya arouses interest. The reference in the same copper-plate grant to the erection of pillars of victory near the Tuṅgabhadra suggests that the Pāṇḍya in question was either north of that river or not far from it. Thus he may well have been a descendant of the Pāṇḍyas of Uccāṅgi, lingering on in the ancestral territories, and a certain Pāṇḍya-dēva of Haluvāgilu was active in 1235, (1) and may well be the one mentioned. On the other hand, it will be remembered that the difficult Sanskrit phrase above speaks of bhū-mandalas rather than particular rulers, and thus it would be possible to suppose that the reference was to the Pāṇḍya-nāḍ, which certainly retained its name long after the decay of the Pāṇḍya dynasty. (2) If this is a correct solution, the culpability of Sōmeśvara is amply demonstrated. The last Hoysala inscription in the Pāṇḍya-nāḍ is at Bāgāli, dated 1232, (3) while the first Sēvuṇa record there is at the same place, and dated 1250. (4) Sōmeśvara had thus ample opportunity to strengthen it against the invader. Claims to the discredit of the Hoysala are continued during his reign, even though they look back for the most part to the pre-1220 period; but Sōmeśvara was too pre-occupied with the task of securing wealth in the south to spend any effort in achieving that purpose for which the wealth itself was originally desired. (5)

He was at Kannanūr in September 1241 "having gone to the Cōla kingdom."(1) While he was there an extraordinary occurrence took place - extraordinary because unprecedented in the history of the Hoysala dynasty. A daṇḍānāyaka became too powerful, and commenced and maintained a policy of aggression against him, escaping his vengeance only to fall a victim to a determined enemy of both. Śīṅgana-daṇḍāyaka, the nephew of the powerful Kambaya-daṇḍāyaka, and possibly the son of Śomaya-daṇḍāyaka, commenced his career by attacking territory in the region of Vēdāranyam, at the extreme eastern edge of the southern part of Rājarāja's dominions,(3) and about seventy miles south-east of Kannanūr. He followed this action, of which the objective remains doubtful, by attacking the Kabahu-nāḍ in the Hoysala dominions proper.(4) It may be that he acted as an agent of Śomēśvara in both cases, attempting to subdue seditious elements: but the Kabahu-nāḍ incident makes it appear that his activity was personal in origin and hostile to the interests of his sovereign. It may even be that the battle of Mālaṅgi-Māvinahalli took place during the upheaval of this period. (5) At any rate the disturbances seem to have affected Śomēśvara's movements, for at some time during 1242 he was at Dūra-samudra, honouring the capital with one of his very rare visits:

(1) E.C.VI Kadur 83(1241).
(2) A.R. 1902, 498 & Pd. 666 (1255). It is possible that he may have been the son of Saṅkara-dēva-daṇḍāyaka. This Kambaya-daṇḍāyaka was the man, described as one of the mahāpradhānās of Viśva-Somēśvara-dēva (for it was before Rāmanātha's elevation) and given the cognomen Tiruv-Egambam-uḍaiyān (a name of Śiva at Kāṇci), that in the 26th year( of Rājarāja, obviously ) -1242-, made a gift of land to the temple at Māṇmārgudi; the place is 45 miles south-east of Kannanūr: S.I.I.vi 49, A.R.1897,97.
(4) E.G.IV Krishnarajapet 8 revised by M.A.R.1914-5, para.83.
And whereas he was again in the Cōla country in September 1242, he was in camp at Pācale, of unknown situation, in December. (1)

Sōmēśvara returned to Kannanūr sometime before June 1243, and seems to have enjoyed a year’s peace. (2) But such quiet as he enjoyed was delusive. Siṅgāna-daṇḍāyaka had plans afoot, for he is the most likely person to have been at the bottom of the invasion of a certain village in the modern Yelandur tāluqa, to the south of Talakāḍ, (3) which appears to have occurred in 1244, while in the same year two Hoysala dandanāyakas commenced hostilities against each other in the modern Belur tāluqa, thus actually embarrassing the very centre of the government of the Hoysala country, Dōrasamudra. (4) This struggle continued into May 1245, and was accompanied by fighting in other parts of the Hoysala country. (5) The king remained at Kannanūr, and appears to have been there still in October 1246. Some success seems to have crowned his efforts there, for an inscription at Damaijieruvu, Wandiwash tāluqa, is dated in his 13th year, a phenomenon inexplicable except upon the supposition

where the editor wrongly identifies "Sigala" with Siṅgāna Sēvuma
Page 330 n. (5) M.A.R. 1911-2, para. 90 (?1241) - Plava, Aśvayuja ba 2. Page 330 n. (6) M.A.R. 1909-10, para. 81 (1242) at Muddēnāhalli, Chiknayakanhalli tāluqa. It is very interesting to note that he claims to rule only Gaṇgavāḍi, Naṇmbavāḍi and the Cōla country.

(1) E.C.IV Krishnarajapat 76 (1242); M.A.R. 1925, 47 (1242) at Paṭṭapagere, Kadur tāluqa. Is this Pācale a misreading for Do­cale, or vice versa ?
(2) E.C.IV Nāgamangala 55 (1243).
(3) M.A.R. 1917, para. 149 dated Krōḍhi, 120 years from the foundation of Āgara agrahāra by Kulōṭtuṅga Cōla. The area was not very close to Kabahu-nāḍ, which was on the north of the Kāverī, if as is almost certain Kabahu-nāḍ is identical with Kabbuhu-nāḍ (No. 27 on Map 'A').
(4) M.A.R. 1910-1, para. 105 (1244) at Cikkoli.
(5) Five viragals at Candanahalli, Belur tāluqa: M.A.R. 1910-1, para. 105 (1245); ibid. 1909-10 para. 84 at Bhaṭṭanahalli; ibid. 1926, 15 (1245) at Tagare.
(6) M.A.R. 1910-1, para. 105 (1245); E.C.XII Tiptur 23 (1246). Doubtless E.C.VII Shimoga 87 belongs to this year.
that the Hoysala had been able to extract further land grants from Rājarāja in consideration of services against the Kādeva or, more probably, Gaṇḍagopāla. (1) Meanwhile a civil war proceeded in the eastern nāḍis of the Hoysala country, probably continuing into 1247, as an inscription at Maṭivāḷa is a grant for the success of the arm and sword of Iḷavaṇjiya-rāyar. (2)

Under the weight of these conflicting claims upon his attention Sōmeśvara appears to have handed over a large portion of his responsibilities to an important subordinate by name Sōmaya-daṇṇāyaka, who was probably the father of the famous Sīṉgaṇa. A record of the king's fifteenth year, 1247-8 announces the remission of taxes on temples in Tagadai and Puramalai nāḍs on behalf of the health of the king and Sōmaya. (3) The situation of this inscription, in the corridor between the plateau and the Cōla country, and in the old Adigaimān territory, within a few miles of Tagadūr and Kambayanallūr, leads us to suppose that valuable and strategically vital parts of the Hoysala dominions were in the hands of over-powerful daṇḍanāyakas, who soon attempted to overshadow the ruler himself. Of these Sīṉgaṇa was an extreme example: there seems little doubt that Kambaya and Sōmaya belonged to the category. Meanwhile Bhōgayya, who had fought Sōvi-dēva in the heart of the Hoysala nāḍ in 1244, as narrated above, oppressed districts not ten miles south of the capital, and the damage was partly repaired in 1248. (4)

(1) A.R.1921,179 (1245-6) Damalceruvu is not in the survey, but cannot be far from Tellāru.
(2) E.C.XII Tiptur 23 (1246); E.C.IX Bangalore 68 (1247).
(3) A.R.1910,205 (?1248) at Adhamankōṭṭai. It remains to be proved that grants "for the health of..." imply actual contemporary sickness on the part of the supposed beneficiary.
Despite these confused incidents, the uncertainty of the loyalty of his subordinates on the plateau, and the doubtfulness of his tenure of the principality in the plains, and despite the many other considerations which required his attention, Sōmeśvara felt it his duty at this time to commence an entirely new course of policy in the south. Rājendra had long been an unwilling spectator of the Hoysala progress in his country, and the prosperity of the Pāṇḍyas, together with their alliance with Köpperuṇjiḥga II, who had recently acquired the Kādava throne, inspired his energetic mind to take the initiative. Without consulting Sōmeśvara, or obtaining his approval, he sent an army southwards against the Pāṇḍya princes.

The Hoysala's traditional alliance with the Cōla against the Pāṇḍyas was at once abandoned, and Sōmeśvara sent his forces to intercept the Cōla. He was completely successful, and the mortified Rājendra had the misfortune to see a movement from the north joining the conspiracy to his disadvantage. Sōmeśvara's detachment seems to have marched far into the Pāṇḍya country, and the outcome of the event was apparently quite sufficiently profitable. In February 1248 Sōmeśvara bore the title Pāṇḍya-kula-samrakṣaṇa-dakṣa-dakṣiṇa-bhujam, "a skilled right arm to protect the Pāṇḍya family."(1)

It is of interest to speculate on the extent to which the overt hostility of Rājendra, or the cautious planning of the foreign-affairs ministry, had already pledged the Hoysala to assist the Pāṇḍyas in such a contingency. There is

(1) E.C.V Arkalgud 12(1248).
evidence that Somesvara had related himself to a Pandya prince by marriage even a few years before the Cola attack. Maravarman Sundara Pandya II, in a record believed to belong to the year 1247, remitted at the request of his māmaḍi the taxes on the village Tirukkōṭṭiyūr in Kērala-singa-vala-nāḍ, for offerings and other expenses of the service called Pōsala-Vīra-Somi-dēva-sandī instituted in that temple in the name of Somesvara. (1) In the same year the same ruler, claiming, incidentally, hereditary supremacy over various kings including the Pōsala, sanctioned that certain lands in and near Kūḍalūr near Tinnevelly should be measured and assessed with a view to the establishment of the Pōsala-Vīra-Somi-dēva-caturvēdīmaṅgalam, on the suggestion of the king's māmaḍi after whom it was named. (2) This same agrahāra is mentioned, some years later, in a record of the 14th year of Jaṭāvarman Tribhuvanacakravarti Vīra-Pandya, which, according to the calculation of Professor Nilakantha Sastri, should be in the region of 1267, and again in another of the same ruler of about 1274. Somesvara was clearly so interested in committing his relative to some sort of responsibility for his own spiritual welfare, that he caused agrahāras and services to be endowed well within Pandya frontiers. It remains to decide upon the relationship implied by the word māmaḍi. It can signify either a maternal uncle, a father's sister's husband, or a father-in-law. It has usually been translated "uncle," (4) and upon that ground it has been held that

(1) A.R.1929-30,291(?1247) at Alagarkoyil.
(2) E.I.xxiv,22:S.I.I.v 446(?1247) at Tinnevelly.
(3) A.R. 1906,425(?1267);A.R.1927,72(?1274) at Murappunāḍu & Tinnevelly respectively.
(4) E.I.xxiv,22 for example.
Nārasimha Hoysala must have married a daughter to Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya's father, whoever he was. No historical theory so far evolved upon the basis of Hoysala materials can account for such an action on Nārasimha's part, and we must accordingly suppose that the word signifies "father-in-law", and that during the period 1240-7 Sōmēśvara gave Māravarman Sundara a daughter of his in marriage. Some further complications seem to have involved the Hoysala-Pāṇḍya relations in the period before the 1247-8 war. In the seventh year of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya a dispute between Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas had stopped the worship in both the temples at Tirumayyam, just over forty miles south of Kannanūr, and about the same distance north-east of Madura. The district was in Pāṇḍya territory and under Pāṇḍya sovereignty, but was actually administered by Ravi-dēva, a dandanāyaka of Sōmēśvara. His brother-in-law Appāṇa-dandanāyaka presided over a meeting which ultimately composed the disputes. The interesting feature is that the Hoysala dandanāyaka Ravi-dēva was described as having "taken" Viruda-rāja-bhaṭyaṅkara-vala-nād, corresponding roughly to the modern Tirumayyam tāluqa. It is not necessary to translate the word "take" into either "seize", "capture", or "conquer", and the most likely explanation is that the nād was invaded in or about 1245 by Rājēndrā's subordinates, in an attempt to probe the Pāṇḍya defences on the south of the Vellār river, which was probably the frontier, (1) and Ravi-dēva was sent to eject them. He then "took over" the nād on the Pāṇḍya's behalf, and so laid the foundation for the brief Hoysala-Pāṇḍya alliance. (2)

(1) The Cōla almost certainly held Tirugōkārṇam: Pd.183(1236).
So it was that, after the campaign of 1247-8, with one or two negligible exceptions, (1) the Hoysala title "scatterer of the Pāṇḍya king" was officially and permanently changed to Pāṇḍya-rāja-nilāraka, "saviour of the Pāṇḍya kingdom", and expressions of similar meaning. (2) A reference to Sōmeśvara's military operations in the south in defence of the Pāṇḍyas is contained in the statement of a record of February 1249 that "his elephants pierced the clouds and so filled the Tambraparni river". His general Brahma says of himself that his enemies "with their towns, villages and chattras ruined took refuge under the trees in Lulāya-lakṣma-nagara." (3)

While Sōmeśvara was at Kannanūr, the unfortunate Rājarāja lost his overlordship of Kānci, which was taken out of the hands of Gaṇḍagopāla in June 1249 by Gaṇapati Kākatīya, who sent a certain Sāmanta Bhōja to govern it. (4) The years 1250 and 1251 Sōmeśvara seems to have spent in peaceful inactivity, fondly imagining, no doubt, that the balance of power he had achieved was to continue indefinitely. In 1250 Sōmayya-daṇṇāyaka made a grant at Adhamankottai for his king's health, so it is quite possible that Sōmeśvara was undergoing a serious illness. (5) The same consideration may have prompted him to give away large sums in religious donations. He ordered gifts to be made to the god Pōsalīśvaram-uḍaiyār, the image of whom he had set

---

Page 335 n. (2) Pd.340,341; A.R.1906,387. N.K. Sastri Cōlas II,199, where he says, without authority, that Kāna-nāda had been captured "some years before". The text reads: svasti śrimar pratiśaka-pravaṭṭi Bhōcalā-śrī-Vīra-Somīśvaradevar(sic) daṇḍanāyak-karkalīl i[ñ]nādu piḍitta Iravi-dēvar daṇḍanāyakkar maithunan Appanna-daṇḍanāyakkar munnilaiy äga, etc.

(1) e.g. E.C.VI Kadur 101(1252).
(2) In February 1249 Sōmeśvara was in Kannanūr bearing this title: E.C.VI Chikmagalur 20(1249). (3) E.C.V Channarayapatna 238(1249). (4) I.A.xxii p.200-2(1249) at Kānci. (5) A.R.1910, 204(1250) - similar is ibid.203, undated, at the same place.
up at Tiruvāṇaikkāval, for services for the benefit of the soul of his long-dead mother Kālala-devi. (1) Another grant of a similar nature, bearing the title Pāṇḍya-kula-samuddharam, "supporter of the Pāṇḍya family", is found nearby. (2) A further grant of the same period comprehends further endowments for the gods Vallālīśvaram, Viṁa-Nārasiṅgīśvaram, and [So]malīśvaram set up by him at Tiruvāṇaikkāval, and for Pōsalīśvaram set up at Vikkiramapura, that is, Vikramapura, "the town of prowess", or Kannanūr. (3) Meanwhile his foster-mother, bearing several pleasant titles, "an embodied Parvati", Sōmala-mahādēvi, made gifts of land on her own part to the temple of Tiruvāṇaikkāval for the worship of the gods Vallālīśvaram, Padumalīśvaram, Narasiṅgīśvaram and Sōmalīśvaram, and for a yearly service instituted in her own name. (4) Others follow their example. Māraya-nāyaka, with the title Gaṇdāragūli, son of the mahāpradhāna Sōmaya-daṇṇāyaka, gave land and irrigation rights to the temple of Ālagiya-Tiruc-Gīrīmbalam-udaiyar-nāyanār at Sattra-vāda, which seems to be in the vicinity of Puttūr in Dindigul talūga, in which case it is about forty miles south-west of Kannanūr. (5) A Kannāda inscription at Timnevelly itself records the gift of money for two lamps in the great temple there by

---

(1) S.I.I.IV 421, A.R.1891,20(c1250): udaiyār Tiruvāṇaikkāvudaiyar koyir dānantārkku nam ammai Kālala-dēviyārkku naṇrāga nam elundaruļuvitta udaiyār Pōsalīśvaram udaiyārkku irupattelāvadu Kānumudāl nam itīṣa dēvadānantāgalil udal kōndu. (2) S.I.I.IV 420, A.R.1891,19(c1250). (3) ibid. 419, A.R.1891,18. (4) ibid. 423, A.R.1891,22. The editor dates it 1258, which is impossible on account of the events of that year, and V. Rangacari says it is dated in the 25th year of Vira-Sōmeśvara (Tp.407), but the figure "25" has nothing whatever to do with the date. (5) A.R.1911,391(c1250).
Vāmana, brother-in-law of Varadana-daṇḍāyaka, a śrī-karaṇa or treasury official of the Hoysala-dēva Vīra-Sōmēśvara-dēvarasa. Perhaps this gift was made at the time of Sōmēśvara's southern expedition of 1247-8, or during the ensuing alliance.

(1)

In 1252 the political situation assumed another aspect: Rājendra's hostility broke out at last. After about six years of enlarged governmental responsibility, Rājendra chose 1252 for an attack upon his māma or māmaḍi. In the previous year relations between Sōmēśvara and his connection by marriage must have worsened, but no trace of the circumstances or of the actual provocation to warfare survive. An inscription of the fourth year of Rājendra (1250) at Sivayam in the Kāveri valley, about twenty miles west-south-west of Kaṭṭanūr, speaks of a committee of enquiry into the affairs of the temple of Tirumāṇikka-malaiy-uḍaiya-nāyanār, which included Aliya Sōmaya-daṇḍānāyaka, who is called maṇḍalika-murāri and may have been a son-in-law of the Hoysala king, and Sōmanātha Viṭṭaya, a servant in the palace of Sōmēśvara-dēva. Clearly there was still much cooperation in the area, as Rājendra's regnal year was used for dating the record. (2) Again, at Mahā-dānapuram on the Kāveri, about twenty-six miles west of Kaṭṭanūr there is a record of 1251 dated in the fifth year of Rājendra by which Sōmaya-daṇṇāyaka, an officer of Vīra-Sōmēśvara-dēva, made a grant of land to the temple of Madhurāntaka-Cōḷīśvaram.

(2) A.R. 1913,49. N.K.Sastri, Cōḷas III,762.
in the same year, perhaps more significantly, the king Rājendrā granted as a tax-free dēvadāna lands in seven villages for worship in the temple of Pōsaliśvaram-udaiyār built by his māmaḍi Vīra-Sōmēśvara at Kannanūr in Pāccir-kūram. 

(1) In the same year, again, the fifth of Rājendrā, Simhana-daṇḍanāyaka, after a victory, made a grant of the village Vākulavalli, or Magulampūṇḍi, to the god Śiva at Tiruvannāmalai. 

The circumstances of this last grant may perhaps provide a clue to the question of Rājendrā's choice of 1252 for his sudden attack on Sōmēśvara. The Simhana-daṇḍanāyaka was that Simhana to whom reference has already been made. His action may or may not have been sponsored by Sōmēśvara, but his success in 1251 consisted in conquering Prthvi-Gaṅga, a service against a turbulent but obviously minor subordinate which he may well have performed for Rājendrā himself. This Simhana had already acted in a manner reminiscent of a robber-baron, and was probably glad to undertake campaigns for his own profit without being particular for whom the service was performed. He had the title maṇḍalika-Yama-rāja, "king Death to maṇḍalikas". It seems that his uncle Kampaya-daṇṇāyaka (otherwise Kambaya) had recently died, perhaps on the same exploit. 

(3) If the reconstruction here offered is in fact the case, Rājendrā's vindictive designs against Sōmēśvara must have been greatly encouraged by this powerful general's recent acquisition of strength, and by 

his(1) A.R. 1936-7,1117(1251). (2) S.I.I.viii 88,A.R.1902,498 (3) ibid. It contains these crude Sanskrit verses:—

(over)
However, be this as it may, in 1252 Sōmesvara was in Dōrasamudra; it is more than likely that he was obliged to retire there on account of direct pressure from the Cōla. An inscription which Kielhorn dated 25th December 1252 gives Rājendra the titles Kannariga-rāja-prati kūla-kāla-danda, "rod of death to the enemy Kannada king", and Vīra-Sōmesvara-karāmukta-pāda-vīrābharana, "he who wore the ornament of a hero on his leg, placed there by the hand of Vīra-Sōmesvara (or, removed from the arm of Vīra-Sōmesvara)." (1) Rājendra claims at the same time to have supported the Manu race, and to have defeated Pāṇḍya and Kēraḷa. Clearly 1252 was the year of a strong Cōla revival. In the next year Rājendra is, more emphatically, called māma-Sōmesvara-pratikūla-kāla-danda. The fact that both this and the previous inscription are at Śrīraṅgam shows that Hoysala resistance in the very near neighbourhood of Kaṇṇanūr must have been negligible at the time. (2)

Of Sōmesvara's doings between 1252 and 1253 we know little. He was in Dōrasamudra in 1252, but the month is unknown. (3) In January of that year he went to Rāmanāthapura, in the modern Arkalgud tāluqa, in the south of his dominions on the plateau, and made some religious grants and provisions. (4) In June 1252 he was in Dōrasamudra, "having marched to Halagere and returned." Halagere is not as yet identified, but the reference is almost certainly to some internal conflict on the

Svastyastu / Kampaya-camūpati-bhāgineyō gōsthāpagāharana
Singhāna-dānānāthah //
Śrī-Sōnaśailapataye bhuvī Prthivi-Kaṅkam jītvā dadau Vakulavallim
akhaṇḍabhāgaḥ //
Śrī-Sōnadri-pāṭer ddatvā Vakulākhyaapura[m]mahat
vijitvā Prthivi-Kaṅkam ja[ya]-stambham ivā karot //
Śōnadri is Arunācalam or Tiruvanṉāmalai. (cont.)

(1) to (4) over.
plateau. (1)

It was probably while he was at Dūrasamudra that the unhappy exile from his favourite Kaṇṇanūr was entertained with the compilation of Mallikārjunā, the father of Kēśi-rāja the grammarian, entitled the Sūktisudhārṇava. This florilegium, containing as it does much material invaluable to the student of Old Kannada, is formed after the pattern of a classical maha-kāvya, and is characterized throughout by a tone of rejoicing and prosperity quite incongruous with both the contemporary condition of the Hoysala kingdom and with its reasonable expectations for the future. Historically speaking the work can be described as a splendid example of gross, if unconscious irony.

Each chapter makes a reference to the king, and most contain several references, of a more or less direct nature, to Sōmeśvara, his father Nārasimha, or his grandfather Ballāla. The section entitled Nāyakabhuyudaya-varṇanam, or "the description of the ruler's prosperity", ends with the verse

örante meccidaṁ kṛti-
sāram nrpa-vijaya-rājya-pulakam śubhada-
kāram Hoysala-vamśād-
dhāram chaladaṁka-rāma Sōma-nṛpālam //26//

"As always, he approved the substance of the poem, which is the delight of a kingdom victorious over kings, an embodi-

A record of the 6th year of Tribhuvanacakravarti Rājendrā-deva (1281-2) gives the king the title "who revived the Manu dynasty and wore the legitimate crown", and records that Siṅgaṇṇa-dāṇḍa-nāyaka purchased land in Pāccil (read Pāccin)-kūram and gave it for the worship of the god Cīdeviṣvaram-uṇīyār erected and consecrated for him at Jambukēśvaram:(A.R.1937-8.73).

Page 340 n.(1) These are the readings of Kielhorn, E.I. vii 24.
ment of good fortune, he the uplifter of the Hoysala race, a Rāma in firmness of character, the king Sōma."(1)
The section entitled Kumārōdaya-varṇānam, or "the birth of a prince", ends thus:—

ōrrante meccidam kṛti-
sāram suta-varṇānakke Hoysala-vamsōd-
dharam Narasimha-sutam
Dōrasamudrādhināyakam Sōma-nṛpaṃ //79//

"As always, he approved the substance of the poem on account of the description of the son, he the uplifter of the Hoysala line, the son of Narasimha, king Sōma the overlord of Dōrasamudra."(2)

And again the Sūryōdaya-varṇānam, or "description of the sun-rise", thus:—

halacitu sūryōdayam ñ-
sthalak ellam kāvyā-sāradolag endudu Ho-
ysala-vamsa-śri Yādava-
kulāmbara-dyumanī Sōyi-dēva-nṛpālaṃ //83//

"The sun-rise, that is king Sōyi-dēva, the sun to the sky of the Yādava race, has struck the Meru which is the Hoysala lineage: this is what is told in all these places in the sub-

But S.I.I.IV 511, A.R.1892, 64, has Kannāda-rājya etc.
Page 340 n. (2) E.I.vii 24 (Kielhorn's Cōla dates, 83); A.R.1892, 65
Page 340 n. (3) M.A.R.1907, para. 23 (1252). Page 341 n. (1); E.C.VI

(1) Sūktisudhārṇava p. 97.
(2) Ibid. p. 132.
The general style of the compilation, which is given some coherence by verses of the compiler's own composition, can be gathered from a few specimen verses. The Nāyakābhuyudaya-varṇanam commences:

"By smiting opponents in his rage he has cleared the circumference of the earth of its thorns; grasping the circle of the quarters that follows his own glorious commands, he embraces it; may this lord of men, who hears with joy music everywhere in his court, himself turn into an occasion for an increase of his bounty that part of (my) great poem which is named "The Prosperity of Princes!"

"As fruit of his victory Rāma, that came first, received Sītā, the Earth-born, into his arms; to Yuddhiṣṭhīra, son of Dharma, in succession, came as fruit the sovereignty over the wide world; to him who through his valour justly succeeds in the festivals of passion, to the Sky-voyager, Sōma (the Moon), in that wise accrues as fruit that which makes the

(1) Śūktisudhārṇava, p. 233. The ending of the Yātraṅga-varṇanam is similar.
attainment of fruits lasting - the part of my great poem called "The Prosperity of Princes". (1)

The vast mass of laudatory and highly auspicious material, culled from ancient and then-contemporary authors alike, contains many verses such as the following:-

padivāt āṃ Sōyi-dēva-ksitipati pora-vīdīṃge sūlaisa vēḷ ēṃ -

dōde dhāṃdhāṃ dhāṃ dhāṃ bikkādu kuḍūhina nissāla-ghōsakke ṭāyār

ekēdēr pādaḷidār oragidār pallaṭambōduv ettaṃ

sidid āśā-danti tūguyyale vol alugutirdattu munnīra pūruṣam //

"What was like it, when king Sōyi-dēva said,"Order the outer encampment to make a din."? Kings fell down, lost their proper state, and bowed low, at the drum-roll of the sticks that stuttered out the roar dhāṃ-dhāṃ-dhāṃ; in every direction the elephants of the quarters took to flight in confusion; and the ocean-flood before them became agitated like a swing in motion." (2)

and this, that closely follows it:-

anitum dik-cakramam parvidud arasuva vōḷ oḍid urvīṣaram saṃ-
da nṛpāla-sṛṇigā saggame guru perat ill emba vōḷ abhramāṃ bhōm-
kane suttitt eyde. Sōmeśvara-samara-bhēri-nīnādam dadhāṃ dhāṃ-
dani-nidrā-bhaṅgadīṃdam gaman uduguvinaṃ kharpārakk ādi-kūrmāṃ

"The roar of the war-drum of Sōmeśvara swiftly, in truth, enveloped the sky, with the whole circle of the quarters spread out (for it) as if it were running in search of kings (for him to conquer), as if saying,"Heaven alone and nothing else is the aim of the row of famous kings", until the primaeval Tortoise shrank into his shell, because his sleep was broken by the noise dadhāṃ-dhāṃ!" (3)

(1) Ibid. p.93. (2) Ibid. p.381. (3) Ibid. p.383.
How much this work contributed to the raising of the level of the morale of the Hoysala court can hardly be conjectured, but at any rate soon after the time when it is supposed to have been offered to the king for his delight, Sōmeśvara gathered together a force for a descent into the Tamil country, and recaptured Kannanūr. It is supposed that premonitions of trouble from the Pāṇḍyas and bad news from the Kāṇci area helped to persuade Rājendrā to adopt a more conciliatory policy towards his Karṇāṭaka māmāṭi. At any rate, by 1253 he had ceased to cause hostile references to the Hoysala to be engraved on temple walls. The feud in fact appeared to have been forgotten. Sōmeśvara for his part was, in March 1253, living in the "great capital called Vikramapura, which he had created for his pleasure in the Cōla-māṇḍala that he had conquered by the might of his own arm", and making a grant for the spiritual welfare of Sōmalā-ḍēvi, one of his queens, who seems to have died in that year.

There are, however, signs that this diplomatic success was really fruitless. Sōmeśvara himself appears to have acquired a sudden enthusiasm for Jainism: he is said to have "set up an order in the four frontier provinces to honour the mukkaḍe(triple parasol) of Vijaya-Tīrthādhinātha to show that

(2) E.C.IX Bangalore 6(1253) also E.I.iii p.8 (the record is on copper-plates in the Bangalore Museum, originating from a village called Mattikaṭṭu): श्री-सोमेश्वरो bhūnipālah sva-bhuja-balavinirjita-Cōla-māṇḍalē sva-manō-vinōdaya vinīrmitām Vikramapurā-nāmadhēyām mahārajādānam adhīvasan Paridhāvi-saṃvatsarasasyā --- Mattikatṭa-nāmadhēyām puram svasya paṭṭa-mahisyāḥ Sōmalā-ḍēvyāḥ śrīyo'rtham Sōmalāpurāpara-nāmakam kṛtvā, etc.
he was lord of the earth." His son Nārasimha made an offering to Vijaya-Pārśva in December 1254, having already made a grant to the god Cenna-Kēśava of Belūr in the previous March. The movement towards outstanding patronage of the now unfashionable Jaina faith was emphasised by another gift to a basadi by the prince Nārasimha on the occasion of his upanayana, or investiture with the sacred thread, towards the end of February 1255.(1) This curious fact, combined with the probably simultaneous elevation of two sons of the king to regal status in 1254, powerfully suggests that Sōmeśvara had again been afflicted by some severe malady. Nārasimha, Sōmeśvara's son by Bījjalamahādēvi, was hardly fifteen when he assumed the kingship of the Hoysala rādā,(2) and Rāmanātha, his son by the Cālukya princess Dēvalā or Dēvika-mahādēvi,(3) can hardly have been much, if at all, older. That he was a little older is possible, as this would account very simply for the subsequent rivalry between the half-brothers, but there is no evidence for it. Yet Nārasimha was reigning at Dārasamudra in April 1255, while Rāmanātha's first year must have been 1254, as his second year, in which his earliest records are dated, commenced in the spring of 1255.(5) In that year Rāmanātha was recognized at Śrīraṅgam.

(1) E.C.V Belur 125(1254),73(1254),126(1255). It is open to question whether Sōmeśvara himself returned to Dārasamudra sometime before April 1254: the date of E.C.XII Tiptur 78 is doubtful, but this year seems more probable than 1232, the only reasonable alternative.
(2) E.C.V Channrayapatna 269(1276) tells how Sōmeśvara's pleasure at Nārasimha's prowess in the gymnastics of his infancy led to the latter's taking up the protection of the Hoysala-rājya. (3) She is mentioned in A.R.1919,602(c1240); S.I.I.IV 501(1233) and 504(1265). (4) E.C.V Arkalgud 38 and E.C.I 6(1255), two copies of the same inscription.
(5) His 29th year was Subhānu (1233-4), E.C.IX Bangalore 43; 30th Tāraṇa(solstice 1284-5),E.C.X Chintamani 91; 32nd Vijaya(Dec.
with the titles sārvabhauma-śrīmat-pratāpa-caṅkravattigal
Poysalā śrī-Vīra-Rāmanātha-dēva,(1) thus copying the titles of
his father, who was likewise called "emperor of the entire
earth" in inscriptions of the period in the Tamil country.(2)

The year 1255, then, which saw the commencement of
a movement soon to overturn the whole political structure of
the plain, saw the Hoysala government in three hands at once,
one of the rulers probably being unable to take a full share of
the responsibilities of his office, and the others being little
more than children. The ubiquitous Siṅgana-daṇṇāyaka, whose
relations with Śomeśvara and Rājendrā were extremely ambiguous,
seems to have been active and prosperous. His gifts to temples
in 1251-2 have already been noticed. In the third year of Rāma-
nātha he established a sālai, or dispensary, at Śrīraṅgam, and
in the twenty-third year of Śomeśvara took part in the making
of a grant of land to the god at Tirumalavādi, nearly twenty
miles east of Kannanūr. He was not permitted more than a year
to enjoy the fruits of his beneficence.(3)

(1) S.I.I.IV 514(1255).
(2) S.I.I.IV 429,A.R.1891,28(1253) at Tiruvānaikkāval; A.R.1914,
176(1253) at Ratnagiri; A.R.1936-7,118 at Jambukēsvaram; but not
(3) A.S.I.1936-7, p.107, para.3(1256); S.I.I.V 629,1895,72(1255).
He is almost certainly the Siṅgana who is referred to on p.12
of the Koyilolugu as having made a kaiṅkariyam, or service, to
the temple of Śrīraṅgam, under the title Gaṅgai-dēvar Siṅganna-
daṇḍāyanāyakkar (sic). Cf.above, p.339: his defeat of Prthvi-
Gaṅga.
1286-7), E.C.X Kolar 95; 34th Sarvadārī(Oct.1286-9), E.C.X Sri-
Nivaspur 36; 35th Virāḍhi (April 1289-90), E.C.X Chintamani 117;
also E.C.X Kolar 92; 36th Vikrītī(1290-1), E.C.X Chintamani 84;
and so on.
Jatavaran Sundara Pandya I had just come to the direction of Pandya affairs, and with his accession a new spirit entered Pandya policy. The obvious weaknesses of the Cola-Hoysala alliance were observed, and the degree of competition between Kadava and Hoysala, Cola and Kadava, all of these and Tikka's son Gandagopala, and the latter with the Kachatiya Ganapati, was in each case weighed up. In midsummer 1255 the Pandyas sent an exploratory expedition northwards.(1)

An inscription at Alattur seems to show that Somesvara sent a force to protect the Cola country south of the Kaveri; the first Pandya onslaught was repulsed with losses, and the Hoysala forces were able to pursue the extended Pandya lines and to capture booty.(2) The Pandyas then invited communications from other parties north of the Kaveri who had grievances against the Hoysala-Cola alliance, and soon entered into an understanding with the Bana. This at least is the most likely interpretation of an inscription which speaks of the death of a Hoysala nayaka from the plateau, who went under orders against Magare, which must have been an equivalent for Magadai, the Bana kingdom of Attur, and fought in the battle of ttodu-mangala in the month of September 1256.(3) For the

(1) In January 1255 Somesvara held Jambukeilvaram (A.R.1936-7, 118); at that time old claims were revived: that he made the Magara king roll on the ground, struck Kadava in the face and killed him, plucked up Pandya by the root, and set up Cola again in his kingdom. He was then in Kanjanur(E.C.V Arsikeri 108(1255), where he still was in June 1255(E.C.IV Heg gadadevankote 10) and held Alattur, just under 30 miles south of Kanjanur in July(Pd.666).

(2) Pd 666(1255).E.C.VI Kadur 115 is a damaged viragal, but the sense of this stanza is sufficiently plain:
vistaram tanag åge Pândya-nrpanam bënkonda sri-Vikramam duṣṭārātiya geldu kondan adhikam sriyam jaya-sriyumam //
The date is given plainly as Saka 1179 Raksasa Bravana, which
Hoysala had been obliged, after a long interval, to reopen hostilities with the Bāna.

In the meanwhile Somēśvara's illness had increased in violence, and he was expected to die at any moment. In April a hereditary henchman, of a family which had acquired the rank of sāmanta in what had been a frontier province of the early Hoysala kingdom, performed a complicated ceremony of self-sacrifice, in which not only the sāmanta himself, but his wives and servants male and female committed suicide. It is clear that he was expected to precede his master into the next world. The king, however, recovered, and the sacrifice was ill-timed.

Within a few months of Somēśvara's contact with the Bāna, in which the latter probably came to terms with his more powerful neighbour in the absence of opportune Pāṇḍya support, Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I invaded the Cōla country in force. Somēśvara and Rāmanātha fled before him. The Cōla government collapsed. To the victories which Sundara had already won over the rulers of the Kērāla country and Ceylon he was also able to add the Bāna, the Kādava, the Telugu Cōda, the Kākaṭiya and even the Sēvuṇa as well. The whole of the Tamil country and a portion of the Telugu lands were subjected to Pāṇḍya rule.

must be supposed to be July-August 1255. This may be the occasion which the panegyrist had in mind when he said, many years later, that Nārasimha III, "born with rejoicing (i.e. not long after his birth) speedily subdued the Cōla king and the pūrvva rāyār, or foremost kings, of the Pāṇḍya ruler". The defeat of the Cōla must be the 1254 incident. The reference to rāyār of the Pāṇḍya king must be accepted as a supplementary proof of the simultaneous rule of several Pāṇḍyas under one principal ruler; (E.C.IV Kadur 125(1272). Page 348 n.(3) E.C.V Arsikere 166(1256) Māgateya mēle hēlikey āge hōda. Rice is probably wrong in translating hēlikey āge as "with a message".

Together with Vikrama Pāṇḍya(1), Jatavarman Sundara loaded the more famous temples in the country with a proportion of the immense hoards of wealth which he had acquired from his unprecedented series of victories, and set up from Srīraṅgam in the south to Nellore in the north no less than twenty inscriptions, in Tamil and Sanskrit of varying qualities, which bear eloquent and diffuse witness to his amazing success. A few examples will here be quoted, particular attention being paid to the Pāṇḍya's success against the Hoysala.

Sundara Pāṇḍya, emmandalāṅkonda koyilponmēynda perumāl, "the lord who having taken every country covered the temple with gold", was one of the greatest benefactors of the great shrine at Srīraṅgam, and his gifts of gold and jewels, and his large architectural alterations and improvements, his fabulous tulābharanās, where he was weighed against gold actually seated in full array upon an elephant, are fully recorded, erroneously under two headings, in the Koyirolugu, a Tamil prose account of the temple and its benefactors probably composed in the sixteenth or seventeenth century from much earlier documentary material. (2) The temple itself contains two of his Sanskrit inscriptions which are of interest. The first contains these verses:

śrī-Ramga-padmākaraḥ

yenaṣau karuṇām anīyata daśāṃ
kṛtvā tam bhuvanāntara-prañayināṃ karnaṭa-dōṣākaram /

bhūyō'py atra jagat trayī-bahumatāṃ lakṣmīm avasthāpayan

dēvas Sundara-Pāṇḍya-bhānur udayam lēbhē pratāpōṣmaṇam //

(1) It is here supposed that Vikrama was not identical with Sundara. (2) Koyirolugu, p. 12-14, commencing: Sundara-Pāṇḍya-devaṃ Gēran CoIaṇ Vallāla-devaṃ mudalāṅnārai jayittu emmandalaṅkonda perumāl enru. N.B. Vallāla, instead of Sōmeśvara or hoysala.
"Having caused to long for the other world (i.e. to set, or languish) that Moon of the Karnāṭa (Sōma), by whom this lotus pond of Śrīraṅga had been reduced to a pitiable state; reinstating there Lākṣāmī who is worshipped by the three worlds - king Sundara-Pāṇḍya arose, full of brilliance, like the Sun."

The sun among kings gave to Viṣṇu who resides at Raṅga a garland of emeralds which he had taken from the treasure of the Kāthaka king, which clinging to his broad breast bears resemblance to the tender arms of the Earth who has sportively approached from behind to embrace him.\(^{(1)}\)

The victorious Sundara-Pāṇḍya, king of the Earth, having ascended a second balance gave to Viṣṇu of Śrīraṅgam a heap of gold; through him he, the lord, being entirely of gold, shining as he lives in a golden hall, nourishes his own Lākṣāmī, who was born in the dwelling at the centre of his illustrious realm.\(^{(1)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) E.I.iii 2, verses 1 & 4: verse 8 also contains a reference to the wealth of the city of the Kāthaka, or Kāḍava.
Having given in battle Simhana to a mad elephant, and having, as an unselfish act, caused to be quelled Ksêma, who had been an evil influence over the earth to the disadvantage of king Rama (1), the hero king Sundara Pândya, the fortunate one, moreover, by ascending the balance made the sapphire hill, which has Raṅga as its lord, into a mountain of gold.

Having conquered the Yadava, Kērala and Cōla, with the heap of crowns torn from them by force, having ascended (?) again, and been weighed against them placed in the balance, king Sundara Pândya here with beneficent care made for Viṣṇu the whole golden hall and bed-chamber.

After conquering all the peaks, and ascending a second balance at Raṅga, with the wealth of the kings of the

---

(1) This line is capable of other renderings. This however is subtle irony not inconsistent with the style of these compositions. It is quite possible that the Sēvuṇa officer Kṣêma was commissioned to embarrass the Hoysāla amongst others.
Kērala, Cōla and Hoysala families that he had snatched away
king Sundara-Pāṇḍya-dēva made for Viṣṇu a sleeping-chamber,
a bed consisting in the King of Snakes, a door, an awning and
an outside wall." (1)

At Tiruppundurutti, further down the Coleroon
river, is to be seen a fine Tamil inscription with a historical
prasasti of unusual length and complexity. It recounts how
Sundara left the Cēra and his army dead on the field of battle,
and destroyed the Malai-nāḍ, which probably represents Malabar
rather than the hilly parts of Gimbatore and Coorg which are
frequently referred to in Kannada inscriptions as the male-
nāḍ. He then compelled the payment of tribute by the Cōla, who
came of a great dynasty of rulers and possessed great fighting
strength. The prasasti proceeds:-

\[
\text{tindōl-valiyir}
\]

\[
Ponni-nāttup Pōsalatt araisar
kalaippurisaiy [iv]ādaittup poṅgu vīrappuraviyuṅ
ceru-virāl ānmai Siṅgaṇaṅ mudalāya
dandat talaivarun tānaiyum aippadat
tunditt alavil cōri-veṅgalip
perum-pināk kunram iruṅgan niraittup
paruntuṅ kāgamum pārun [da] caiyu
arunti magilndāl amark kaliam eduppak
kam .... <ā> naiyuṅgaḷaip puraviyuṅ campor
kuvaiyun tigal kadir maṇiyu maṇḍantaiya-
ra ārāṇārpumudan kavarnd arulī
d

(1) S.I.T.IV 507, A.R.1892, 60 and Gopinatha Rao, in Sen Tamil
IV p.495-6, 512-3; the latter version contains several errors.
The former reads hiranya-mayas and haimāṇi.
"Reaching by the strength of his own shoulders the splendid fortification of the Hoysala kings who were in the Ponni-nāḍ (i.e. the Kāvēri country), he butchered the restive warriors' horses and the army in the rout, together with the generals such as the manly Siṅgana, brave in battle, until he covered the great rocks with hills of corpses (amid) hot floods of blood, while kites, crows and vultures having eaten flesh rejoiced. (?Passing) aloft (?over) the battlefield he graciously seized elephants, horses, heaps of superior gold, brilliant-shining gems, and women with sandal-paste on their breasts. He (?) showed conduct like an elder brother as regards every fault (produced from) the enmity towards him of the Hoysala who had fled, and killed Cēma (i.e. Kṣēma) who stood forth like an inveterate enemy in valour (or ?"falsehood"), and became enraged."
Graciously being......, he graciously captured Kaṇṇanūr-koppam, which was difficult for strangers to think of approaching, and, of his favour protected the rich Pūna-nāḍ (i.e. the Cōla country) that surrounds the Ponni (Kāveri), just like the Kanni-nāḍ (i.e. Pāṇḍya country; having taken a tribute of elephants from the king of Kaḷṇāṭaka, who had taken refuge in the city to the rear which belonged to the lord of the great mountain (i.e. ?? Śiva), he graciously took tribute from the king of Ceylon, consisting of elephants surrounded by bright gems (or "bells") swaying from side to side."

Though it is open to question how much consideration was in fact shown to Sōmeśvara and Rāmanātha, this passage proves both their flight and the death of the disloyal Siṅgana daṇṇāyaka. It is not certain that the Hoysalas retired to the plateau, and indeed the expression "city in the rear" etc. strongly suggests that they fled to such a place as Tiruvāṇāmānil.

(1) The text of this inscription is found in S.I.I.V 459, A.R. 1894,166, but what is obviously a copy of the same inscription is published by T.A.Gopinatha Rao in Sen Tamil IV,514-6 apparently as if from Tiruppukkal. However, both texts have several errors, though the S.I.I.text is on the whole better. Yet Gopinatha Rao's reading Cēma is very much better than the official reading Cēra. I am indebted to Mr.M.S.H.Thompson for the conjecture dacai instead of kacai (armour), which is unacceptable. The gaps are the chief reason for the inadequacies of the translation of Krishnaswami Aiyangar, which appears in his work, South India and her Muslim Invaders, pp.217-221, and which is in many respects very faulty. It reads for example: "but desisted from pursuing the fleeing Hoysaḷa in the conviction that it was unfair to do so. Putting to death the Cēra, who, while pretending to conduct himself towards him with an affection exceeding that of a mother, was actually inimical at heart and proved a traitor, he captured Kaṇṇanūr-koppam, - - - he then put under a tribute of elephants the Hoysaḷa (Karunada-rāja) who fled for protection to his city protected by hill-like elephants - - -".
Amongst the many inscriptions set up by Sundara Pāṇḍya at Cidambaram, a place which benefited at least as largely as Śrī-rajagam from the conqueror's munificence, there appear two Tamil verses which deserve quotation. Their style is however, so extremely ambiguous that the translations appended must be understood to be little more than tentative.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{manpaṭṭa mēni moli paintodi} \\
\text{Kōṅgai parakka vaivēr} \\
\text{kaṇpatta mutta-vadañ kanduñ} \\
\text{kākkilan Kādvarkō-} \\
\text{n enpatta sēnaiy edir paṭṭo-} \\
\text{luga valunda punnar} \\
\text{vin paṭṭ alaiyap padai totṭa} \\
\text{Sundara-Mīnavānē.}
\end{align*}
\]

"Sundara Pāṇḍya sent forth his army: (then) bedecked with jewels and with a golden bracelet at his wrist (he went) while his sharp spear flew against the Kōṅga; the Kādvava king seeing the string of pearls that attracted his eye was unable to defend himself, while his army of repute came to oppose (the Pāṇḍya), and the wounded men rose up and wandered about after gaining heaven."(1)

(1) Gopinatha Rao, in Sen Tamil IV p.491. This may form part of the record referred to in A.R.1913,332(ii).

The attack on the Kōṅga could not have taken place until after the capitulation of the Hoysala; as the verse states, it preceeded the attack on the Kādvava. Sundara moved systematically from south to north.
vaṭṭa veṇkuḍai mānnaṛ tām pugal koṇḍu
māmuḍi koṇḍu pōr maru koṇḍ elu
Pōsalaṇ tada koṇḍu Vāṇaṇ aṇaṁ pugat
toṭṭa vempaḍai virañ vėrri puṇaṁinda
Sundara Māraṇ mun cūla viṭṭa Teliṅgar
seṇai mel tuṇitti venra kalattu mēl
vitta vempari paṭṭa pōtelu cōri-vāriyaiy
okku nēr mel midanda niṇap perun tiral
venpurait tiral okku mun patta vēṅga-
riy anda vāri paṇḍinda māmuģil okkum vīl
paru maṇiŋ kuḍaiy aṅgu vand elu parutim-
maṇḍalam okkumē.

"Sundara Pāṇḍya, the hero who had decked himself
with victory over the ferocious army of one like the Bāna,
who had begun to enter (his territory), after he had obstructed
the Hoysala, who rose opposing (him) in battle, after he (the
Hoysala), a king with a round white parasol, had gained his
own glory and won a great crown; (Sundara) having been victor-
ious over the army of the Teliṅgar who had previously beset
(him), cutting it up, appears as he comes from under his heavy
sinking jewelled umbrella, like the disk of the sun that rises
(from behind) the ferocious elephants which had attacked him
(or "came in front") and were like a great cloud that had sunk
down in that ocean, straight upon which floated a great multitu-
dude of corpses like white froth, like an ocean of blood, which
arose as soon as he slew the ferocious horses that were left
(sc.by the Teliṅgar) upon the battle field."

(1) Gopinatha Rao, in Sen Tamil IV p. 491. This almost certainly is
A.R.1913, 340, which is supposed to glorify the prowess of
Another inscription at the same place may stand as an example of the whole of the Sanskrit category:

hatvā Cēram apāsyā Hoysala-patim vidrāvyya Cōlēśvaran
jītvā Kāṭhaka-Gandgopā-Gaṇapatyādīn arāthin api /
vīras Sundara-Pāṇḍya-dēva-nṛpatiḥ kṛtvā tulārōhaṇaṁ
caṅre Tāṇḍavinaś saśātha kalikācūḍasya haimim saṁbham //

"Having beaten the Cēra, driven away the Hoysala lord, and caused the Cōla king to run away; having conquered the Kāṭhaka also and other enemy kings including Gandgopāla and Gaṇapati; the hero king Sundara Pāṇḍya performed a tulābhāra (i.e. weighed himself against gold) and made (and) adorned a golden council-hall for Śiva who bears the moon's digit in his crest."

citram Sundara-Pāṇḍya-dēva [vima]lē tvat khaṭga-dhārājale
magnāḥ Kērāla-Kāṭhakāndhra-Magadha-Kṣēmais samam Seunāh /
unmājjanti surāmgaṇa-parivṛte Śvārājya-simhasane
Paulōmi-kara-tālavarnta-pavana-premkhōla-dōrmalikāṅ //

"It is wonderful, o king Sundara Pāṇḍya; the Sēvunas together with the Kērāla, Kāṭhaka, Āndhra, Magadha and Kṣēma, having been submerged in the pure water (blade) of your sword, emerge by the throne of the celestial realm which is surrounded by heavenly damsels and (there) they (the Sēvunas, etc.) have the garlands on their arms fluttering in the breeze of the fan in the hands of Paulōmi (wife of Indra)." (1)

Sundara Māran "who annihilated the forces of the Teliṅgas that surrounded him and drove the Bāna chief into the forest."

(1) S.I.I. IV 627, 1892,179; first two verses. In the first Dr. Barnett suggests that saśātha may be a mistake for saśāṅka, but the latter word is not likely to be corrupted easily, while the use of the rare root sath 3 is quite in accordance with the recherché style of these compositions.
From the other records, taken as a whole, we obtain further information, not necessary to particularize here, which shows clearly that the Hoysala was for the first time, in defeat, in the company of the Bāna and the Kādava, the latter referred to above as Kāthaka, as well as the Cōla. Sundara Pāṇḍya's triumph over the Kādava Kōpperuṇjiṅga was complete, as also his discomfiture of Gandagōpāla. His relations with the Kākatīya, whom he claims to have defeated, require further investigation which is outside the scope of this work, but it is clear that he spent some time not only at Kāṇci, where both he and Vikrama Pāṇḍya, if indeed they were two separate persons, held coronation ceremonies, but also as far north as Nellore. More curious is the question of the Sēvuṇa, in with whom we have reason to believe Kṣēma, Tamil Cēma, was closely connected. Very probably he was a Sēvuṇa officer in command of a detachment from the districts ruled by the Dēvagiri family, who had somehow become mixed up in the general turmoil of 1257. He can hardly have faced the Pāṇḍya on the Hoysala's behalf, and we have seen from a quotation above that Sundara Pāṇḍya considered, or pretended to consider, that Kṣēma was an evil influence from Rāmanātha's point of view. It seems therefore most likely that an occasion arose when the Sēvuṇa decided to assist the Kākatīya, whom he is well known to have instated in his place, and explore the possibilities of harming the Hoysala at the same time. An account of this campaign of the Pāṇḍya king speaks of the "Telugus and their allies the Āryas", and this greatly supports this conjecture. (1)

But thorough as was the Pāṇḍya's conquest,(1) he could still not expect to govern the entire Tamil country solely by Pāṇḍya machinery. The Hoysala territories in the Kāvērī valley and to the west of the river were, of course, a very minor part of the whole, but the Hoysala ruler was in position to balance other disaffected elements in the country, and thus when the time came for Sundara Pāṇḍya to consider the appointment of viceroys in the Cōla country he was not disinclined to allow the Hoysala exiles to return.(2)

There is evidence that his decision to do so was accelerated by commotions against his government fomented in the west. We have heard that the Bāna "had begun to enter" Pāṇḍya territory: to this period, then, with more probability than any other, may be attributed the series of inscriptions at Tiruvanṉāmalai, and at Nārattāmpundi in the Polur tāluqa of the North Arcot district, about ten miles north of Tiruvanṉāmalai, which were composed in praise of the Bāna king. Those at Tiruvanṉāmalai consist of two laudatory compositions one in Tamil, the other in Sanskrit. The Tamil appears to be two attempts at the viruttam verse-form and one, the last, at a venba, but the condition of the record is so bad that no connected intelligible translation may be made of it. It is however clear that it mentions the Pāṇḍya king or kings,(3) the Cōla and some obstacle provided by the latter,(4) and the Magadai king Bāna's contact with them;(5) enmity (6) the whole of Madura of the

handsome Pândya, and the dry land of Tiruccendür in Tinnevelly district (1), and it would be rational to gather that in some action in which the Cûla offered opposition to someone the Bâna managed to penetrate into the Pândya nāḍ and inflict losses on the conqueror's homeland. The fact that this and other inscriptions of the same Bâna are so far north as Tiruvanțâmalai and Nâratâmpundi shows that from his success at the expense of the ruler of the entire Tamil country he had been able to achieve an ambition long frustrated. This explanation is borne out by the Sanskrit inscription at Tiruvanțâmalai, which commences with an amusing self-introduction by the poet.

likhatu bhujasahasraṃ Kàrttavîryârjunîyam
pathatù mukhasamuhâ Kâdraveyâdhipasya
kavyati kâvrâjah kâmadhûnuḥ kâvinâm
sapadi Sakalavidyâcakravarti kâvîndraḥ //1//

"Let a thousand arms write the story of a Kârttavîryârjuna;(2) let the multitude of faces of the lord of serpents read (it):(for) the excellent poet Sakalavidyâcakravarti, king of poets, a cow of plenty to poets, is composing quickly!"

S. I. I. VII 429, A. R. 1901, 216, where he has the title Kârṇâta-

Page 360 n. (2) An inscription of the 5th year of Tribhuvana-
cakravarti Kûnerimai-kondân Vikrama Pândya-dêva at Avûr, about 12 miles south-east of Tiruvântâmalai, a record which probably belongs to cl260 tells of Mallaya-dânapyaka ordering a grant of of land. He must almost certainly have been a Kannâdiga, and probably an ex-Hoysala official whom this Pândya found useful in his civil service. Page 360 n. (3) S. I. I. VIII 154, A. R. 1902, 543. It is ill-spelled as well as misread and damaged. Airâpâdam may be an alternative rather than a misreading for airâvadam. valutiyaruḥ; (4) oemîyânu (for the incorrect un) tâdai uđâne itar ("hostile", for the text's unintelligible iar) enra (5) perumânnai Magadaiyâr tam perumânnai Vânanai hit (for the text's ni) pecuvâye; (6) pagai.
Formerly there were five crowns, to-day one (only). From the Pândya who threatened the pride of Indra the diadems have been snatched away in battle. Of these, O Bāna king, one has been granted (or "saved") for the sake of the Cōla; the others have been set up on your great mountain called Aruna (i.e. Arunācalam). "But what will you give to a petitioner?"

Having conquered by the strength of your arm the forces of the arm-born (Kṣatriyas), and snatched hostages and booty, with the latter you made, O Bāna, a tawny hill (Arunādri is Arunācalam, otherwise Tiruvanāṉāmalai) for a golden Śiva; can it be that in wandering over the earth the Sun, intent on his southward journey is mistaken in thinking (this mountain) to be Mēru, and neglects to travel over the three worlds?" (1)

---

Page 361 n.(1) Ėr (instead of the text's er) celiyar Madurāpuri muluduṉ Cendi vilaiya. Ėr, "beautiful", is a hint at "Sundara." Page 361 n.(2) On Kārtavīryārjuna see Paraśu-Rāma-Vijaya, No. 891 on p.207 of vol.iii of Taylor's catalogue of the Mackenzie Collection.

(1) S.I.I.VIII 135, A.R.1902, 544. The author has very nearly succeeded in writing in such a manner as to puzzle the reader. In verse 2 the text has Pândyan. Dr. Barnett has suggested the very necessary correction.
At Nārattāmpundi, we are told, there are eight verses in Tamil or Sanskrit respectively, one of which praises the Bāna chief's victories over the Southern King - here clearly the Pāṇḍya. The Bāna lord's liberality, heroism and devotion, and the terror inspired in his enemies are extolled; in another he is said to have taken Kāṇci and Vaṇji, the latter of which may be Karūr, capital of the Cēra country, in which case the meaning can only be that the Bāna defeated Sundara's Cēra allies; he is also said to have killed Vaṅgāratuṅgan, who may have been a Pāṇḍya general. He is said in another inscription at the same place to have "covered with gold", thus imitating his enemy. The temple he covered must have been Tiruvannāmalai, thus explaining the third verse of the Sanskrit poem quoted above. Two of the verses of the Nārattāmpundi records are explicitly stated to have been composed by Sakalavidyācakravarti, otherwise kavi-cakravarti, or "emperor among poets", who is said to have been rewarded by a gift of elephants. He of course was the author of the Sanskrit verses quoted above.(1)

Again, one is tempted, in the absence of certain proof, to assign to the same period, and to the author of the Nārattāmpundi Tamil verses, four similar Tamil verses at Kudumiyaṃmalai on the Vellār river, actually no less than twenty five miles south of the Kāvēri. They are accompanied by two verses concerning Vīra-Māgadaṇ Rējarāja-dēvaṇ Ponparappināṇ, lord of Magadai.(2) Even if the expression which attributes to

(1) A.R.1925, 367-374.
(2) The latter of these two is A.R.1906, 383. The texts of all six are printed, uncritically it seems, as Pd. 673-678 inclusive.
the Bāna king the defeat of the king of Madura, just as Indra cut off the wings of the mountains, (1) were not sufficient to link these laudatory records with a Pāṇḍya defeat at the hands of the Bāna, the unprecedented phenomenon of Bāna records so far south prove the point almost beyond question. Moreover, the theory is corroborated by the fact that they are situated on the Vellār river and not south of it. The Vellār, as has been noticed already, was probably the Cōla-Pāṇḍya boundary in the 1240-50 period, so that in fact the Bāna's adventures in the direction of Madura and Tiruccendūr must have been either purely rhetorical flourishes or expeditions of unusual swiftness and shortness of duration. In the year 1257-8 the Pāṇḍyas would have found it difficult to prevent a penetration for a relatively short distance south of the Vellār river, but the fifty odd miles between Kuḍumiyāmalai and Madura would have been contested strongly and there would have been no leisure on the Bāna's part for the erection of monuments or inscribing such verses in that region.

The dating of these records does to some degree hang not merely upon the peculiar conditions of the year 1257-8, which only, as far as is at present known, could have permitted such an unparalleled success on the part of a nearly effete dynasty, but upon the fact that the Sanskrit verses were composed by Sakalavidyācakravarti, "the emperor of all knowledge", who bore the same titles as he who, as we know from the prose Gadyakarpāṁrta, bore also the titles kāvirāja, abhinava-Bhaṭṭa-Bāna, kalikāla-Kālidāsa, Kāhala-kavi-sārvabhauma, kāla-kavi-

(1) The critical verse is highly damaged (Pd.675), but the following words are clear: Madurāpurī kāvalare maṭṭuyar tār kaṇṇaṭ vārkaḷar kalla malaic-cīraku veṭṭi....
kalabha. These titles are not inconsistent with those found in the Sanskrit verse at Tiruvanṭāmalai, and it is quite possible, despite theories as to the existence of a number of Sakalavidyācakravartis, to identify the two writers as the same person. There is no pressing reason for doubting that the Gadyakarṇāṃṭa may have been written at a time of despondency and defeat rather than during the triumphs of the times which it describes. The defeat of the Pāṇḍyas by Somaśvara's father in the ninety days' battle, and the connection of these events with the marriage of Somaśvara himself, would have had in more than one respect an agreeable effect on the ears of the king when driven from the principality of the Kāvēri valley by the Pāṇḍya and beset by many pressing anxieties.¹

There is moreover a certain date for Sakalavidyācakravarti. He is mentioned in an inscription of 1269, the 15th year of the "glorious emperor of the entire earth" Vīra-Rāmanātha-dēva, which is to be found at Śrīraṅgam. Here he appears with his own personal name and occupational designation, both of which, as it happens, require further investigation, as the donor of various implements for the temple, which had themselves been gifts to him by the king Vīra-Pāṇḍya-dēva. This king may be identified with Jaṭāvarman Vīra-Pāṇḍya, whom Nilakantha Sastri assigns to the lifetime of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, and states to have been his assistant.²

¹ M.A.R.1924, para 70-72. The statement that "no inscription of the Hoysalas fails to mention the part played by the kings of this line in putting down the Pāṇḍyas and rendering the power of the Gōlas firm" is very misleading, and unfounded.

² N.K. Sastri, Pandyas p.159 ff. The Śrīraṅgam record of Sakalavidyācakravarti is S.I.I.iv 499, A.R.1892,52: Pāḍagattuc Cokka-
duced the poet to transfer his panegyrical activities from the Bāna to a Pāṇḍya court - at any rate, the Bāna sank rapidly into obscurity and is hardly heard of again.

It may well have been with the help of the Bāna and of the Koṅga rulers that Sōmēśvara and Rāmanātha returned to the Kāvēri valley. The Cōla Rājēndra accompanied them.

We gather from two rather unreliable sources that Sōmēśvara was ruling there in his 25th and 27th years. One inscription at Jambukēśvaram in the year 25, if indeed it is not the 25th year of Rājarāja or Rājēndra, (which latter is highly improbable) seems to show that Sundara Pāṇḍya had permitted the Hoysalas to return by 1258, so that their exile from Kaṇṇanūr was of a comparatively short duration. (1) Another record at the same place, and one at Üttattūr (Ürrattūr), just over ten miles north-east of Kaṇṇanūr, make it appear that Sōmēśvara was still there in 1259-60. The dating of the latter is more plausible because it states distinctly that the gift made by the king was for the merit of his grandson Viśvanātha-dēva, who was none other than the son of Rāmanātha, who followed that unhappy monarch to the throne of the Eastern Kingdom. It is to be supposed that the year 1259-60 was that of his birth. (2) On the other hand the record at Jambukēśvaram alleged to be dated in the 27th year, and concerning gifts for the merit of his mother Kālala-dēvi, who had been dead perhaps fifty years, is suspect because the

(1) A.R.1936-7,122.  (2) A.R.1912,519.

villi-bhaṭṭarāṇa mudaliyār Kariyamari Sakalavidyācakravarttigal tamakkup perumāl Vīra-Pāṇḍiya-dēvar kuṭutta vaiyāy perumālukkut tandu, etc. He would appear to have belonged to a particular sect of bhaṭṭas, that is, either Brahmans in general or bards or panegyrista in particular, connected with a Viṣṇu shrine at Kānci. But the interpretation is uncertain.
notice which is all we have to inform us of its contents seems to argue an unusual similarity to another inscription of much earlier date. (1) However, broadly speaking, Sōmēśvara's reign ended in 1257, and it is a matter of no consequence for how long he was able to linger on at Kanṇanūr. (2) His son Rāma-
nātha assumed active control of what was left of Hoysala policy in the south, and the progress of Hoysala affairs in that region can be attributed to his guidance.

Rāmanātha's activity was at first entirely confined to the Tamil country, and to that part of it which lies in or closely adjoining the Kāvēri valley. An inscription purporting to be of the third year of Rāmanātha at Cammenahalli in the modern Anekal tāluqa of the Bangalore district is probably mis-dated, and should be assigned to some later year, perhaps his twenty-third. (3)

From his 6th year (1260) Rāmanātha's inscriptions begin to appear. Until 1262 they are confined to a small area near Kanṇanūr, with the exception of one at Adhamankōṭṭai on the route between Kanṇanūr and the Hoysala nāḍ. (4) The sovereignty which he enjoyed was circumscribed by two facts: that he was there by permission of the Pāṇḍya, and that he shared his very qualified good fortune with the Cōla. Rājēndra ruled on until 1279, according to Milakantha Sastri, (5) with confined dominions

---

(1) A.R.1936-7,123.Cf.S.I.I.IV 421. Among the mass of inscrip-
tions at Jambukēśvaram there is ample room for confusion.
(2) N.K.Sastri is certainly wrong when he says (Cōlas,II,206) that Sōmēśvara was defeated and killed in a battle fought near Kanṇanūr in 1264. There are other erroneous views on the topic.
(3)E.C.IX Anekal 30(?1277). Nārasimha III possessed Hosahalli in Kankanhalli tāluqa in 1259(E.C.IX Kankanhalli 71), so that, though it is not impossible that Rāmanātha had partisans on the plateau so early, it is unlikely.
(4) A.R.1920,45(1260) at Tirunalavāḷi;A.R.1937-3,12(1260) at
as well as diminished prestige. His records between 1257 and 1262 are comparatively rare. (1) The oppressive influence of the Pāṇḍya still pervaded the atmosphere, and the Hoysalas themselves were clearly not given a free hand at once. A record at Samayapuram, in the immediate vicinity of Kaṇṇanūr, of the twelfth year of Jaṭāvarman <Sundara> Pāṇḍya speaks of a cirup-pillai of Viṅga-[m]iśvara-dēva, and its date is probably 1261-1262. (2) Two inscriptions of Rāmanātha have been found at Tiruccatturai, about twenty miles east of Kaṇṇanūr, which show the administrative association of Sōmēśvara's reign continuing; the one bears as dates the twentieth year of Rājēndra Cōla(1266) & the tenth year of Rāmanātha(1264), showing that both eras were is use concurrently, while the second bears the dates 1271 and 1269 in like manner, being respectively the twenty-fifth year of Rājēndra and the fifteenth of Rāmanātha. As Rājēndra's first is here held to be 1246, in both cases a discrepancy of two years is observed. When the texts of the inscriptions are published a solution may be found for this difficulty. In any case Nilakantha Sastri's conclusion, that there was "the closest possible alliance between the two rulers, if not actually their joint rule over the territory where the inscriptions are found", is not proved by the evidence available. (3) It is much more

Jambukēśvaram; A.R. 1909, 748 (c1260) at Samayavaram; A.R. 1910, 202-3 (1260 & undated - the latter records a gift of land for the merit of Viṅga-Sōmēśvara and Sōmaiya-dānākkar, and mentions Siṅgaiya-dānākkar) at Adhamankōṭṭai; A.R. 1910, 92 (c1260) at Jambukēśvaram; S.I.I.iv 427, A.R. 1891, 26 (1261) at Tiruvāņaikkāval; and A.R. 1936-7, 62, 64, 65 and70 (1262) at Śrīraṅgam. It was probably in this period that Kambaya-dānāyaka did notable services for the temple of Śrīraṅgam as recorded on p.16 of the Koyilolugu. He is there described as Vallāla-dēvan vagaiyil pratāpa-cakrapavartti Rāmanāṭa-đēva-varūḍhaiya pradāni Kampayar-dānāyakkar, "a minister of the glorious emperor Rāmanātha-đēva of the line
likely that the strongest rivalry existed between the Hoysala and the Cōla.

Between 1264 and 1274 no event of political importance seems to have occurred within the sphere of Rāmanātha. The aggressive activity of the Pāndya may have abated a little after the death of Sundara Pāndya, which is held to have occurred about 1270. If, as is likely, he is the Tribhuvanacakravarī Kōnerinmaikondān of the inscription at Tiruppārkadal in North Arcot, he was himself at Kānnānūr in his fourteenth year, which would be equivalent to 1264-5. Rāmanātha was not, as far as can be known at present, absent from the town at the time, and it is possible that Sundara was on a state visit to the capital city of this one of his dependants.

Rāmanātha’s rule was recognized at Sendalai, near Tanjore, in that year, and in the record in question we meet a personage whose political importance still remains to be assessed. (3) The Aśdicandēsvayrā-āgva there mentioned as a Mūla-
of Bālla-āgva.” He probably contributed largely to the building of the thousand-pillared mandapam there: A.R.1937-8,114 shows his name on ten of the pillars. He was also the founder of Kambaya-nallūr on the plateau, one suspects.

Page 367 n.(5) N.K.Sastri, Cūlas II,207.

Page 368 n.(1) A.R.1908,202(1257),206(1258),207(1259) all at Kovilūr, Pattukkottai tāluqa, Tanjore district; A.R.1914,93(1260) at Kamarasavalli, Udayarpalayam tāluqa, Trichinopoly district.


(1) A.R.1904,702.
(2) A.R.1897, p.4.
(3) S.I.I.VI 6,A.R.1897,57.
bhṛtya (mūlabradhya in the text), or hereditary servant, of Tribuvanapati, is certainly the same as the Adicandēśvara-dēva mentioned in records of 1249, 1250 and 1261 at Udaiyarkoil, Tanjore tāluqa, Anbil, Trichinopoly tāluqa and Tiruvāṇaiikkāval respectively, all of which places were within Sōmēśvara's and Rāmanātha's sphere of influence. (1) In no case does he appear in person, being mentioned only as the master of various officials. The Tribuvanapati of whom he was the hereditary servant remains to be identified. He may be the Cāla, but that is hardly more than possible.

Between 1264 and 1274 Rāmanātha's rule was acknowledged at Kārgudi, in the modern Musiri tāluqa; at Koyil-Dēvarāyanpettai, in Papanasam tāluqa; Nattamāṅgudi, in Lalgudi tāluqa; Tirummalavādi, Udayarpalayam tāluqa; Kandirādittam, in the same tāluqa; Aṟagāḷūr, in Attur tāluqa; Tirunedungālam, in Trichinopoly tāluqa; Taramangalam, in Omalur tāluqa; Śivayam Kurittalai tāluqa; Üttattūr, Lalgudi tāluqa; Tirumanaṅjeri, Alangudi tāluqa; and Paruttippallī, Tiruccengode tāluqa, besides Kaṇṇanūr, Srīrangam and other places associated with his father. (2) Now it is clear from this list and from details already given that Rāmanātha's territory during the period extended from about Kāmarasavalli in the east to Adhamankōṭṭai in the north, being a tract of varying width on both sides of the Kāvēri river; in the east the total width hardly exceeded ten

miles; in the centre the river-side tracts widened to enclose areas more than twenty miles from the Kāvēri. Thus Tirumanañ-jēri may well have been included among the continuous and contiguous Hoysala possessions in the area, and Ūttattūr likewise. That Perambalūr was in fact Hoysala property is not proved, and thus the possession of Āragalūr may have been due to a grant of lands in that area to Rāmanātha by the Bāña, of whose relations with the Hoysala more will be said below. Tāramangalam and Paruttippalli certainly belonged to the broad valley which was the Hoysala's route to the plateau, the whole of which route must have been in Rāmanātha's hands, though it is uncertain whether he retained control of the lands on the west bank of the river. Hence it is seen that though the Hoysala possessions were valuable commercially and no doubt profitable to their ruler, they provided politically nothing more honourable than a gigantic buffer between the north and the south Tamil districts, between the Pāṇḍya on the one side and their untrustworthy dependants on the other. Moreover, apart from the western division, it had no natural, linguistic, or racial frontiers, and had all the marks of an ephemeral state. Perhaps the ten years of quiet enabled Rāmanātha to observe the true condition of his kingdom, and spurred him to undertake the only course likely to remedy its defects. He endeavoured to obtain a part of his half-brother Nārasimha's kingdom.

Now, by 1274 Nārasimha III was in the midst of a task of some difficulty and magnitude. At the time of his accession, as a lad of 15, he had found the country in a state
of unrest and discontent. A decline in the value of money is plainly shown by comparison of records, and there had been a very remarkable lowering of the rate of interest which a man might obtain for a deposit. This had reacted badly among all the influential communities, and a poor standard of public order added to the confusion. (1) The fall in prosperity seems never to have been compensated for, despite the amputation of the Kaṇṇanūr kingdom, which had been the prime cause of the trouble. It seems unlikely that Nārasimha ever provided a subsidy for his half-brother, so that we might have expected that a return to the policies of 1220 and before would have checked the fall in public prosperity. Yet, whatever chance there might otherwise have been of a recovery on the plateau was certainly frustrated by the events of 1274 to 1297.

In January 1259, Nārasimha was involved in fighting. (2) In May 1260 he was obliged to march against the "hill army" which may have been a band of Koṅga rebels. (3) Some dealings with the southern neighbours of his country seem to be indicated by the title Cēru-rajya-pratisthārya which is found in a record of the early part of his reign. A claim to have set up the Cēra, if this is not a mistake, requires some substantiating, but no evidence is available. (4)

However, some of his compatriots rallied around him and provided his government with the strength it needed. This they did largely perhaps out of pleasure at the occupation of

---

(1) In 1060 the rate was 625% (E.C.XI Davangere 140); in 1159 it was 75% (E.C.VI Chikmagalur 141); in 1169 it was 73% (E.C. IX Channagiri 88b) - N.B. in 1172 in the N. Pāṇḍya country it was (? · 25% - in 1194 it was 30% (E.C.V Arsikre 174); in 1206 it was 12 1/2% (E.C.II 333); from 1217 to 1283 it was stable at 2 1/2% (E.C.VI Kadur 55a; M.A.R.1931, 3; M.A.R.1911-2, para. 92; E.C.X Bow-
Dūrasamudra once more by a royal prince. A record of 1261 says that Vīra-Nārasimha-dēvarasa was residing "in his own Hoysala country, in the proper capital Dūrasamudra, filled with all the wealth, which his father had with affection stored with the riches of the kingdom", a statement which implies that before 1257 Sōmēśvara had actually endeavoured to maintain a full establishment and treasury at Dūrasamudra in anticipation of the inevitable collapse of his southern kingdom, which, if a correct interpretation, shows that the king had more foresight than he was able to implement. A later record speaks of Nārasimha as then ruling in the "modern Dvāravatī of the south, his own royal city Dūrasamudra."(1)

In 1262, late in the year, the king was engaged in "striking down from Nīralkal in the east to.....", which suggests that Nārasimha had at last been able to tackle the problem of the eastern nāyakas who had been defying Hoysala authority.(2) So successful does he seem to have been, that two years later he triumphantly (3) reentered the field of north-
western politics which his father had abandoned many years before. By this time the Uddhara Ganga family, which had been weakened by Ballala II despite its record of faithfulness to the Hoysala dynasty, had disappeared from view; Kumara Bommadévarasa, son of Bīrarasa, ruled in Hosagunda as a dependant of the Śeũna, an humiliation doubtless due to the effects of family intrigues. (1) A Śeũna officer however yet found work to do, as there were still powers in the north-west hostile to the Dēvagiri emperor, if not strong enough to resist a force to which Kadamba and Sāntara alike had fallen prey. A certain Kala or Kalla-veggade of Uruvatti, probably an officer of one such mandalika or nāyaka, came to blows with him. Nārasimha determined to make the most even of this unpromising situation, and sent Sīṅgayya-dānṇayaka to raid the Sāntara territory. (2) The same officer fought on behalf of Nārasimha, his "odeya" or ruler, against a village named Hanaje with the object of destroying Kaduvūr, which was in the possession of the Sāntara. He appears to have had his headquarters at Kūḍali. (3) All this he could achieve with some safety as Bommarasa Sāntara was occupied at the opposite edge of his kingdom, against Malali. (4) No sooner, however, had the Hoysala taken upon himself to rescue some parts of the north-west from Śeũna aggrandisement, than serious opposition broke out in the east. The rulers of the modern Bangalore and Kolar districts, as has already been

(1) E.C.VIII Sagar 140(1265).
(2) W.E.II ff. 248b-249a(1264); E.C.VIII Sagar 139(1264); E.C.XI Davangere 87(1264).
(3) E.C.VIII Sagar 140(1265) at Hosagunda. The spelling Saṅga is an error.
(4) E.C.VIII Sagar 78(1265).
noticed, had in many cases ancient Cōla connections: they welcomed the uncertainty about the claims of Rāmanātha and Nārasimha to take the revenue from them, and decided to turn it to their advantage. One of their number, called Cōla-Kakalānād-āluva, revolted and Nārasimha had to fight against him in July 1265.(1)

The unrest of that year had hardly subsided when the prevailing weakness of the authority at Dūrasamudra encouraged the ruler of Nidugal to invade Hoysala territory. In 1269 Irungōla-dēva himself attacked villages in the modern Tumkur district(2) The days of the power of Ballāla II were clearly past. Irungōla, son of Bommi-dēva, son of Bhōga-dēva, ruled in Nidugal, while Tripurāntaka, son of Irungōla, or Irungōla himself, ruled in the fort of Hāniya or Hāne.(3) Meanwhile the Sāntara seems to have returned to the attack, and in 1270 showed great activity against a certain Anłama-veggade, who was very probably a Hoysala agent.(4) Perhaps he was stimulated by the news that the Sēvuna emperor himself was on the point of marching southwards. Mahādeva did apparently come in or before March 1271, but, having brought an insufficient or unwilling force, was obliged to retire.

madavad-udagra-vairi-mada-marđdana-Vīrā-Nṛsimha-bhūbhujang adirade bandu Sēvuna-mahā-mahipam Mahādeva-rāṇeyam / kadanadol āntu nittarīsal ārade bittu turangamangalam / bedare palayanam kuśalam end irad ēdidad end raṭriyol //

(1) E.C.XII Tiptur 22(1265).Kakala is Kakkala,Karkkala or Karkkata: see above,p. 82 n.(1).
(2) E.C.XII Tumkur 49(1269).  (3) E.C.XII Sira 11(1256);34(1262).
(4) E.C.VIII Sagar 138(1269) & 137(1270).
"The great Sēvuna king, Mahadeva-rāne, having come without fear of king Vīra-Nṛsimha, who crushes the pride of intoxicated fierce enemies, met (him) in battle, was not able to endure (it), abandoned his horses, and thinking in fear that flight was safest, did not stay, but fled in one night."(1)

The discomfiture of the Sēvuna caused the Sāntara to rely for the while upon local tactics to preserve his frontiers. By fighting had apparently taken place between Vīra-Bammarasa Sāntara and an agent of Nārasimha.(2) The accession of Rāmacandra, however, to the Sēvuna throne about two years before that date, brought a more vigorous spirit to the Sēvuna policies, and this soon manifested itself in a series of attacks launched against the Hoysala, with the object not only of putting an end to Hoysala intrigues in the north-west, but also of conquering the Hoysala rājā itself.(3)

It was at this critical moment, while Nārasimha III was preparing the resources of his diminished kingdom for a severe struggle on the northern frontier, that his half-brother Rāmanātha chose to order an invasion of the plateau. The exact circumstances amid which the conflict commenced, as well as the immediate provocation, or even the identity of the aggressor, are unknown. It is, however, clear that it would not have been in Nārasimha's interests to provoke a quarrel at this particular time, and thus the ultimate responsibility rests by impli-

(1) E.C.IV Nagamangala 39(1271). Cf. E.C.V Channarayapatna 269 (1276) where the same verse has bedari wrongly. The former is, in the R.T., wrongly divided: Mahadevar añeyam (!). There is an undated inscription at Devikere near Hassan which states that a warrior fell in battle in the reign of Mahādevarasa. The
cation upon Rāmanātha. By December 1274 the civil war had begun. It is highly likely that the initial battles were fought between the nāyakas and Nād-Āvalas of the offce-Cōla districts at the south-eastern extremity of the plateau and emissaries of the Dōrasamudra government. The former claimed the protection of Rāmanātha, whose background generally had more in common with their own than that of Nārasimha, and thus the government at Kaṇṇanūr found an opportunity to take an active part in the politics of the plateau. In 1274 Tribhuvanamalla [Pūrvā]darāyar, later one of the outstanding partisans of Rāmanātha, was engaged in battle, very probably against an agent of Nārasimha.(1)

Progress must have been very speedy, for at Saṃnēn¬ahalli in the modern Channarayapatna tāluqā quite 130 miles west of Rāmanātha's chief supporters' towns in the east, is an inscription, unquestionably dated in January 1275, which relates that while the glorious emperor Hoysala-Vīra-Rāmanātha¬dēva was in the residence of Kaṇṇanūr, ruling the kingdom of the earth, etc., a certain gauda of that village and others fell in a battle in which Rāmanātha, that is to say rather his forces, took part.(2) As the record is attributed to Rāmanātha's reign, the latter must clearly have won Saṃnēnahalli itself, a town only 28½ miles from the capital. Another sign of his

viragal is damaged and it is probable that, if in fact the very period has been correctly identified, it actually recorded a death in battle against Mahadēva or Mahādēva Yaḍava (Sēvuna): M.A.R.1908-9, para.88. Page 376 n.(2) E.C.VIII Sora 223(1273) at Gendla. See also ib. 520(1274), K.T. only, at Pura, which may be a badly damaged Hoysala record. Is the Pāndya-maĉhārīya mentioned there the Alupa ruler? Page 376 n.(3) SEWELL,H.I.S.I.p.405: "Mahādēva lost his possessions in Mysore. They were recovered by the
success is to be found in the records of September 1275 and September 1276 as far north as Kōgali, more than 25 miles north of Uccāngi. Although it is said that the Yādava-Nārāyaṇa Rāmanātha-dēva was ruling a settled kingdom, it is not to be supposed that the whole of the Hoysala nāḍ between Bangalore and Hadagalli tāluqas was under his sway. A more likely view is that emissaries of his found at Kōgali an oasis where the Sēvuna occupation was dreaded and the effective power of Nāra-

Hoysala king Nārāyana III”. This is nonsense.


Page 377 n. (2) E.C.V Channarayapatna 231(1275).

(1) S.I.I.X 346(1275) & 347(1276). If vīra-Rāmanātha were a recognized form of the name of the Yādava emperor it would be simple to transfer these inscriptions to that dynasty.

(2) E.C.XI Davangerē 70(1275); E.C.XI Jagalur 30(1279); S.I.I.X 379, A.R.1918,205(1280).
Cikka Balligere in the modern Kankanhalli taluqa, relates how the government and a religious body joined in creating an endowment for a temple and for services for "victory to the arm and sword of the emperor of the whole world, Poyisala Vīra-Irāmanāda-dēvar", and for the continued increase of his prosperity, a set of phrases that were to become familiar throughout the eastern districts. (1)

Meanwhile the first battles of the long-impending war with the Sēvuna Rāmacandra-dēva had taken place. In April 1275 Jōya-nāyaka of Hāveri, about eight miles south-east of Bankāpura, a town that had long been in Sēvuna hands, marched against the nakara, that is, the merchants, of Dōrasamudra and died fighting in the presence of the Sēvuna commander Jayadalavaya. (2) In the same month Bommarasa found his adherence to the Sēvuna cause very costly. An account is found of his bitter and unsuccessful struggle. (3)

Between May and June Mallidēva-daṇñāyaka, a minister and general of Nārasimha III, fought in the sagunda fort, which must have been Hosagunda itself. (4)

The confused and sporadic warfare of the year seems to have satisfied both sides about equally. Nārasimha bears the as yet inexplicable title Timmaṇa-rāya-māna-marddana, (5) and the Sēvuna rejoiced in the title "putter to flight of the Hoysala king". (6) The critical moment came, however, in January of the

(3) E.C.VIII Sagar 134(1275).
(4) E.C.IX Channapatna 46(1275) at Hōnganūr.
(5) E.C.V Belur 186(1275): Timmaṇa has not been identified.
next year. A battle took place at Belavādi, which is only four and a half miles north of Dōrasamudra. A viragal dated in May 1276 refers to an event which is unintelligible, when Sāluva-Tikkama and Mali-dēvā-daṇḍāyaka were encamped (?) in Belavādi, and another of April 1276 refers to a war with a general, who must be the same Tikkama, who came, it is said, by order of the Sēvuna rāya. (1) Two inscriptions, both of the same day in May 1276, give further information. The first relates that in the name of the Sēvuna king Rāma-dēva, his general Sāluva-Tikkama came and encamped at Belavādi; then the Sāluva himself, saying "I will take Dōrasamudra in one moment only", came suddenly with the brave Jeyi-dēva and Haripāla and Iruṅgula's army and laid siege to the fort. Kumāra Cikma Kēteya, a relative of the royal family, said "Who will conquer the enemy?", and his son Ankeya drove them out of the country of Belavādi, and chased Tikkama as far as Dummi without leaving him time for moving his camp or taking a meal. (2) The second tells a similar story of the prowess of Naṅjeya and Gullaya. (3) Another inscription at Belūr describes how Sāluva-Tikkama, general of the Sēvuna army, marched upon Dōrasamudra, the capital of Vīra-Nārasinga-rāya. When Sāluva heroically gave his word to the Sēvuna king, and marching with his troops attacked Dōrasamudra a certain warrior went to battle, smote an army of 12,000 horse, pursuing them as far as Dummi, while the Yadu king Nārasimha praised him. Further, when Sāluva was chased, encountered

(1) E.C.V Belūr 167(1276); ibid. 120(1276). The text should read sṛt-Vīra-Nārasimha-dēvarasara ... mahāpradhānam Mali-dēvā-daṇḍāyakarā-Yādava-rāya-Rāma-dēvana ma... mukhya-dalavāyva Sāluva ... Tikkamanu Belavādiyalu bitṭallī, etc., where the R.T. & K.T. alike have the absurd reading Mali-dēvā-daṇḍāyaka-raṅga-dēva-raṅga-Rāma-dēvana, etc. E.C.V Hassan 49(1276).
and pierced, Haripāla marched to battle and a certain Khaṇḍeyarāya-rāṇeye attacked Haripāla and another Rāṇe fell in the battle.(1)

It is interesting to note in passing the part played by the Nidūgala Cōla in the campaign. Irungōla had clearly committed himself to a policy hostile to the Hoysala, and the latter's revenge had to be delayed for nearly ten years.

Moreover, we know that Khaṇḍeyarāya-rāṇe was the son of Mummudi Siṅgaya-nāyaka, who was a thorn in the flesh of the Sēvunas for many years. His name and title both reflect the Marātha influence under which he was brought up, and he probably entered the Hoysala service much as would a soldier of fortune.

The Hoysala success in driving the Marātha general as far as Dummi, or Dumme, was certainly admirable, seeing how near to capture the capital itself had been. But that Dummi was chosen as the point beyond which the Sēvuna forces were not to be followed shows that the Pāṇḍya as well as the Cōla nāḍ was largely held by the enemy. The Sāntara on the other hand thought the Hoysala success a sufficient encouragement to rebel against the Dēvagiri power, and in September 1276 Rāmacandra had to order an officer to attack him. This apparently met with little success, as in June 1277 Bommarasa of Hosagunda recognized no superior, and organized an expedition against Hāneya, a place about 14 miles south-west of Hosagunda and eight miles west of Pomburccha. The town may have been held by the growing power of

---

Page 380 n.(2) E.C.V Belur 165(1276). Jeyi-dēva may have been the same as Jaya-dalavāya, or there may be a misreading for Joyi = Jovi. (3) E.C.V Belur 164(1276).

(1) M.A.R.1937,23(1276).
(2) E.C.XI Davangere 26(1300).
the Šeti family, which was domiciled, we know, within comparatively few miles of that place, and the Šántara had doubtless good reasons to fear its growth. But the extent of the Hoy-sala success can not disguise the fact that the weakness of the defences of the capital had been demonstrated once again, and that the invader was in a position to carry away with him large quantities of spoil. At Harihara, a town that had been in Hoysala hands since the time of Ballāla II until about two years before his attack, Sāluva Tikama began to build a temple of Lakṣmī-Nārāyana "with the spoils he brought, having in a victorious expedition to the south invaded Dōrasamudra and brought a tribute of all kinds of wealth, especially elephants and horses." The golden kalaśa of the temple was put on in 1280. Tikama calls himself the scatterer of the Hoysala rāya, and Rāmacandra, his master, was said to be a powerful arm in seizing the wealth of the Hoysaṇa-rāya's empire.

It may well have been during this campaign that Perumāle, a well-known and well-rewarded henchman of Nārasimha, obtained the title Javanike-Nārāyana because, it is said, he captured the javanike, or "screen", of Ratnapāla, a Sēvuna officer, and offered up his head with his sword to the Lakṣmī of Victory.

(1) E.C.VIII Sagar 69-70(1276); E.C.VIII Nagar 20a(1277).
(2) EC. XI Davangere 59,M.INS.26,p.44,46,P.S.O.C.I.125,W.E.II 258a-261a(1280).His praenomen is Sāluva,Sāliva,or Sāleya.
(3) A further reference to Sālīveya Tikama (sic) is found in SII.IX 387(1297),where his chief minister is mentioned.
(4) E.C.V Chammarayapatna 269(1276); M.AR.1912-3,para.83(1276); E.C.IV Nagamangala 38(1284);E.C.XI Chitaldrug 12(1286);E.C.III Tirumakudal-narsipur 27(1290), where the victim's name is mis-spelt Naraṇa.
Now Rāmanātha did nothing to assist in the war against Rāmacandra, and can claim no share in the credit for the victory. On the contrary, he did his utmost to impede his brother's progress in the now urgent task of reconstructing the resources and integrity of the Hoysala nāḍ. Taking advantage of the weakness inevitably resulting from the efforts of the past three years, he renewed his own aggressions with vigour. The contestants were fairly evenly matched, and the struggle continued with hardly an interruption for twenty years.

In November 1277 Kumāra Dorabhakkare-daṇḍāyaka ruled the kingdom in the east on behalf of Nārasimha III at Halkūr in the modern Kankanhalli taluqa, which must have been near the frontier between his lands and those of Rāmanātha. (1) In December a viragal was put up at Marusu, probably to a soldier killed in the east, and fighting was then still going on at Kundatūr, likewise in Kankanhalli taluqa, if the date is read correctly. (2) Cikka Köteya-daṇḍāyaka returned from a successful expedition with the army of the eastern kingdom, and made a grant in February 1278. (3) This important officer's success is shown by his making a grant in 1278 for the success of Nārasimha's sword and arm as far east as Bannēṟghattā, which is about thirty miles south-west of Kolar. It is to be presumed that this took place after he marched from Hoṅganūr and suffered an attack at Hode. Hoṅganūr is about 27 miles south-west of

---

(1) E.C.IX Kankanhalli 72(1277).
(2) E.C.V Hassan 48(1277); E.C.IX Kankanhalli 37(?1277).
(3) E.C.III Mandya 1(1277).
(4) M.A.R.1908, para.43; E.C.IX Channapatna 13(1278).
Bannārghattā.

The tide of fortune turned, however, and in 1279 Cikka-Kēteya fell from favour, (1) for in the meantime Rāmanātha had made surprising gains. In June 1278 some higher officers of one of his chief subordinates, Pūrvvādirāya, "came and camped in Honnavāra and did obeisance to the god Cūdanātha and departed; Cikka-Kēteya then presented a village and some taxes to the same god, presumably to counteract the meritorious efforts of the enemy. (2) But it availed him little, for by October 1278 Rāmanātha's rule had extended even into the modern Arsikere tāluqa, and some authorities, whether forced to do so, or choosing to do so out of partiality for Rāmanātha, actually recognized his reign at a distance of no more than eighteen miles from Dōrasamudra. (3) By September 1279 Rāmanātha appears to have been within a little of ruling over Sitakallu in the modern Tumkur tāluqa; the record however makes a point of remarking "i-dharmavanu vīra-Nārasiṅga-dēvaru prthivī-rājyava nōḍalu," (he gave) this work of merit while Nārasiṅga-dēva was looking after the ruling of the earth." (4)

Meanwhile Nārasiṁha was embarrassed by other problems. In October a battle was fought at Kabbu, in the northwest: a certain Ballaha-dēva, who may have been the Immaḍi-Ballaha-dēvarasa of the Sētu kingdom, "went to Dōrasamudra to war with Vīra-Nārasiṁha-dēvarasa. A rāne, who may have been either a Sēvuna officer or one of Nārasiṁha's mercenaries,

(1) E.C.V Belur 166(1279).
(2) E.C.IX Channapatna 65(1278) at Yeliyūr; cf. E.C.IX Anekal 94 (1318).
(3) E.C.V Arsikere 149(1278). Rāmapātha was fighting in Mannana-Kōgil and killed Sīngeya-dāṇḍāyaka.
(4) E.C.XII Tumkur 56(1279).
camped at Hosavūr, and a battle followed in which a Sāntara
took part. (1) Similarly in 1279, it appears likely, an attack
was made upon a hamlet of Antaravalli in Kelale-nāḍ by a cer-
tain Nārasiṁga-dēva of Hebbetta. (2)

In February 1280 Mummudi Siṅgeya-nāyaka, who appears,
like his son, to have been allied for the while to the Hoysala
cause, suffered an attack by Cāvunḍarasa, son of Caṭṭarasa, from
the southern parts of the Sēvuna empire north of the Tuṅgabhadra
who marched to Doravaḍe in Kurugōḍu nāḍ for the purpose. It is
thus plain that Mummudi Siṅgeya-nāyaka held a small principal-
ity in the region of Kampili (3), and we have no doubt that he
was an independent adventurer. In October 1281 he fought with
Siṅgeya-nāyaka in front of Vētandakal; in March 1282 Kannara-
dēva marched against him to Doravaḍi and fought; and he was
still active in 1287. But there is no evidence that Nārasiṁha
was able to send him any effective support or otherwise utilized
his hostility to the Sēvuna. (4)

In the war between Rāmanātha and Nārasiṁha a curious
event took place in December 1280. It is unfortunate that the
record that gives several interesting and suggestive hints is
too damaged to admit of a complete understanding of its contents.
It appears that while Nārasiṁha was ruling Rāmanātha was joined
by a person called ......<ara> saru Gajapati, and they fought Nāra-
simha at Soleūr, with a result unfavourable to the latter. Both
the kings then did something in which Nārasiṁha took a part. No

(1) E.C.VIII Nagar 9 (1278). Perhaps because of this the Hoysala
attacked Sētu in 1296.
(3) E.C.VII Channagiri 24 (1280); M.A.R. 1935, 39 (1282) and E.C.XI
Holalkere 37 (1281 misdated by Rice); A.R. 1935-6 App. E 23.
(4) See Map 'B'.
further evidence clarifies the issue, but the mention of Gajapati is curious, as no important bearers of the title were active, as far as is known, in Mysore during this period. A conjectural correction to Gaṇapati has some plausibility. (1) This could not be the famous Gaṇapati Kākatīya, as he had been dead for twenty years.

Between 1281 and 1283 the warfare between the brothers continued. Rāmanātha's influence over the eastern nāyakas does not seem to have been very strong, and they not infrequently fought each other - while seldom caring to recognize Rāmanātha's sovereignty. (2) He was however able to engage with Nārasimha, although the latter seems to have gained ground steadily. In 1285 fighting continued in the neighbourhood of Talavi, (4) and about this time Nārasimha himself was able to go to Hoṅganūr in Kelaṭe nāḍi, perhaps then stopping at ..rtivūru "when he was fighting with Rāmanātha-dēvarasa". (6) Feeling sufficiently relieved of the pressure from the east, he moved northwards and attacked Nīḍugal, the great hill-fort of the Cōḷas, to wipe out the disgrace of their invasion with Sāluva-Tikkama in 1276. On the way he destroyed Bāgeyakere, and finally took the fort of Nīḍugal itself, no mean achievement. (7) He could approach this task the more readily because Rāmanātha was obliged to interest himself in affairs in the Cōḷa country once more.

(1) E.C.V Belur 187(1280). After the date it reads: śrīmatu pratēpa-cakravarṭti...(one line missing)...<śrāva>saru gajapati Ḥoysala-Rāmanātha-dēva ...kūḍi Soleṭra Kāle<śa>le Nārasimha-rāyana mēle kāḷaga bilalu ubhaya-rāyaru .calu krama Vīra-Nāra-simha-dēvara sāṁmateyā ...<śrīmanu>maḥā-paśāytaru, etc. The K.T. has koḍi for kūḍi and has several more syllables in the lacunae than the R.T. It is not essential to divide dēvara sāṁmateyā: dēvarasāṁ mateya is equally possible, thus removing the idea of consent, as in Rice's translation.
If we can rely upon the accuracy of the inscription of 1286 which gives Rāmanātha the title Makara-rājya-pratisthācārya, he must have extended his protection to the Bāna, in whose country he was likely to have had an interest, as it so closely adjoined his line of communications with the plateau. (1) His claim to be the supporter of the Pāṇḍya family (2) does not seem to have saved him from expulsion from Kannanūr, and for that the Pāṇḍyas were either directly or indirectly responsible, as they were the only great power left in the Tamil districts. In 1287 Rāmanātha was already ruling in Kundani, otherwise Kundāni, a spot which a glance at the map shows to have had very little to recommend it to anyone but a fugitive. (3) It stood, it is true, in direct communication with the Kāveri valley, but was as remote from Kannanūr as was possible without actually entering the Kolar plain. It was on the plateau, but so closely surrounded by wooded mountains as to be almost completely shut off to access from either east or west. (4) A small opening from this retreat permitted communication with Kolar and the lands of the Nādāvās to the north and north-east. This was the capital from which Rāmanātha chose to survey the collapse of his Tamil empire and the progress of his long-drawn-out attempt to acquire one in the Karnāṭaka country at his brother's expense.


(1) E.C.X Kolar 27(1286) at Madivāḷa: the old title Makara-rāja-nirmālana is found in E.C.IX Devanhalli 45(1291), Nelamangala 33b(1292) and others. (2) E.C.X Kolar 27, Chintamani 188(1294).
It is very significant that not a single inscription of Rāmanātha's dating from after 1277 is to be found in the Kāvēri valley districts that were once in his hands. (1) His power had evidently waned abruptly after then, and he had been obliged to retire to Kundāni as a means of securing his very livelihood. He then began to amplify the domain which he already possessed there. In the Bangalore and Kolar districts he had been recognized for some time, and since 1281 his inscriptions had begun to be frequent. (2) In 1284 so many are found to have been set up that it seems likely that the transference of the headquarters of the eastern kingdom from Kannanūr to Kundāni took place in the year 1283-4. In his thirty-first year, that is to say 1285, Rāmanātha possessed Bairamangalam, about twelve miles south-west of Kundāni, on the other side of the Ponnaiyār river and on one of the chief routes to the south, from Hosūr to Tagadūr and Adhamankōttai. The process of absorbing the lands to the east and north progressed steadily, behind the fluctuating frontier which separated them from those of the dependants and officials of the Dōrasamudra government. In 1286, in addition to activity under his rule in

---

Page 387 n.(3) E.C.XII Tumkur 17(1287) and 27(1287). The place is also known as Hale-Kundāni. Hesar-Kundāni was an honorific way of referring to it.

Page 387 n.(4) It was referred to as guddagala aramanē, "the palace in the mountains": E.C.IX Nelamangala 63(1288).

(1) The last is at Nallur, about 35 miles east of Kannanūr: A.R 1911, 43.
(2) E.g. E.C.IX Anekal 45(?1274) at Mayisandra; E.C.IX Kankanahalli 13(1276) at Cikka Balligere; E.C.IX Anekal 30(?1277 -3rd year must be an error for 23rd) at Cammēnahalli; E.C.X Malur 45(?1281 -18th year(damaged) an error for 26th) at Bannahalli; ibid. 37 (?1281) at Ullērahalli; E.C.IX Bangalore 43(1283) at Hagarāru.
(3) E.C.X Bowringpet 82(?1284) at Sūlukunte; Chintamani 91(1284 at Kaivēra; Kolar 98(1284) at Bellūr; Malur 38(1284) at Cambe; all these places are within thirty-five miles of Kundāni, and
the area already occupied, (1) a movement was made to fresh ground, which had one feature in common with some of the parts of Bangalore and Kolar districts: it had been neglected previously and was probably hardly cultivated or even populated before Ramanātha's arrival at Kundāṇi. (2) Ramanātha's income now depending upon the productivity of the eastern half of the plateau, which was comparatively poorly favoured by nature, he made it part of his policy to further development schemes and to subsidize the building of new tanks and the repair of ancient and breached ones, thereby making an enormous contribution to the increase of the general fertility and prosperity of the country. One of his agents who is observed carrying out this policy is Kambaya-dāṇṇāyaka, probably not the famous Kambaya of Śōmeśvara's day, but the donor to the temple of Śrirāṅgam. (3)

It appears to have been his duty to endeavour to accustom the western parts of the new kingdom to union with the Tamil-speaking Nāḍ-āḷivas under a throne that had for so long dedicated itself to a hopeless mission among the alien inhabitants of the plains. The event showed that a considerable measure of success followed the efforts of the motley band of ministers and adherents that assisted Ramanātha in this unpromising task, and among them Kambaya held a high rank, as this little pair of verses tries to show:

śrī-Rāmanātha-ksitipāla-mauli-mālā-dyōtita-pāda-pīṭhaḥ
avyāhatājādhipatīm abēsām ānāṃdayaty ambudhi-mēkhalāṃtām //

all but one within twenty-five.

(1) E.C.X Kolar 27(1286) at Mādivāla; ibid. 35(1286) and M.A.R. Hu.1913-4, para. 36(1286) at Bellūr; E.C.XI Nelāmangala 36(1286) at Huskūr; M.A.R. 1909-10, para. 33(1286) at Sīti-bēṭṭa.

(2) E.C.XII Maddagiri 47(1286) at Kōdanaḷḷi. (3) over.
"The foot-stool that is brightened by the jewels in the festoons in the crown of king Rāmanātha gladdens the entire ocean-girdled (earth) that is ruled (by him) with unimpeded orders. His minister, the general Kamba of great glory, is the contriver of helpful (measures) for the subjects for as long as moon and stars." (1)

Of the thirty-one inscriptions of Rāmanātha dated between 1287 and his death in December 1295 the greater number are to be found in the central and southern portions of the modern Kolar district, with one exception at Puṅganūr in the modern Chittoor district, about ten miles north of Naṅgili, and in the northern and eastern portions of the modern Bangalore district, to which his brother's forces at length managed to confine him. The plain between the Ponnaiyar and Arkavati rivers was his, including Bannırghaṭṭa, from which Cikka-Kēteya had been forced to withdraw. West of the Arkavati his possessions seem to have been more scattered, and were doubtless held more precariously. (2)

Page 389 n.(3) E.C.XII Tumkur 17(1287) at Mulukuṇṭe; ibid.27(1287) at Rāyapura; ibid.28,29,33(1287) at Haraluru and Bairasandra. It is interesting to note that the records are in Kannada; and all refer to Rāmanātha ruling at Kundāṇi.

(1) E.C.XII Tumkur 29(1287). The K.T. reads dyōdita; abyāhat; āṃ dvipatimī Kambe, for dyōtita,avyāhat,ādhipatim and Kamba of the R.T., but fills the gap left by the latter between tāram and kṣitītī. The R.T.on the other hand absurdly separates mekhālam tām. The R.T...kṣitītī and K.T.sadhakataksitī are equally unintelligible. A hasty reader might well mistake kṣitītī for kṣitītī as the characters can be very similar. The rare word taksitī is very appropriate, as its primary meaning, "wood-cutter, carpenter", suits the function of one who, to settling new villages, is obliged to destroy much jungle.

(2) E.C.XII Kunigal 14,16(1292) at Begūr; E.C.IX Nelamangala 38b (1292) at Ayigandapura. The Puṅganūr record is A.R.1931-2,210.
Rāmanātha had much to contend with besides the civil war which he had brought about within the body of the Hoysala state. His henchmen, as might have been anticipated, were ready to fight amongst themselves. Their varying degrees of loyalty to the government at Kundāṇi were no obstacle to schemes of individual aggrandisement. In 1291 Maṇjiya or Maṇjaya-māvuttar, who had acquired the title Kumāra, fought Ilavaṇjya-rāyar at Vircunai. In addition to these two causes of anxiety he seems to have suffered from poor health, which may in itself have been a strongly contributory factor in the decision to remove from Kannanur to Kundāṇi. Gifts for his health, and for his success in battle, or both together, abound throughout his domain from about 1281 or a year or so later to 1295, the year of his death. Although the precise significance of these gifts remains to be proved, it is very probable that, just as we know that he was constantly at war with Nārasimha, if only on a moderate scale for much of the period, and therefore in a position to benefit from gifts to various gods for his success in battle, so likewise he may have been ill at the time that gifts were made with the object of fostering by supernatural means the health of his tiru-mēṇi or "sacred body".

Nārasimha too was hampered in his war with Rāmanātha

Relations with the Sēvana were not good: in July 1283 a quarrel

(1) E.C.X Bowringpet 23(1293), where Rice (almost certainly) wrongly calls him "son of Rāmanātha".
(2) E.C.X Kolar 239(1291) at Sahapūra.
(3) Such gifts are recorded in E.C.X Malur 38(1284) at Cambe; M.A.R.1909-10,para. 83(1286) at Sītibetta; E.C.X Kolar 140(1287) at Colaghatta; E.C.IX Devanahalli 53(1281) at Bayanahalli; E.C.X Kolar 28(1291) at Madivāla; E.C.X Malur 43(1291) at Mākārahalli; E.C.X Chintamani 88(1294) at Kaivāra; E.C.X Kolar 18(1294) at Kalluhalli; E.C.IX Bangalore 100(1294) at Hoṅgasandra; E.C.X Bowringpet 25a & b(1295).
broke out on the northern frontier. (1) The Sàntara, now freed from Sèvunà control very largely through Hoysala valour, had become predatory at the expense of all alike. Bommarasa of Hos-
agunda attacked Kùdali in February 1287. Worse still, an ever-
present menace that his ancestors had successfully restrained burst upon the Hoysala. Bèadar, hill-dwelling part-time hunters and full-time robbers, raided on the same day, the 22nd of July 1287, two villages more than twenty miles apart. (3) Many other such incidents must have passed unrecorded.

In fighting against Ràmanàtha and in activity of a similarly protective nature (4) the last years of Nàrasimha were spent. There were some operations in February 1288 in the south east. Ammali "below the ghats" was visited by an army. (5) On the 1st of September 1289 Nàrasimha's forces were apparently investing Biàṭada-köhë, and Ràmanàtha marched to its defence, and thus a battle took place. (6) Of about the same period must be the stone now in the National Museum of Copenhagen. It states that Bereya-dànmâyaka Ràhuta died in attempting to seize the elephants of Màyi-sàhàni in a battle in which Nàrasimha and Ràmanàtha were engaged. (7) In December 1289 Ràmanàtha's forces made an attack on a scale that can not now be estimated. (8) At the commencement of the year 1290 Lahkeya-dànmâyaka marched against (?) Nàmiya-dànmâyaka in the direction of the gàṭṭada-
nàd or hill country. In a battle that followed Hoysala officers

(1) E.C.XI Davangere 137(1283) at Mayigonda.
(2) E.C.VII Shimoga 61,62(1287).
(4) It is interesting to note in connection with the doubtful loyalty and security of the Pàndya-nàd that in the spring of 1288 Gaṅga-Perumålë-dëvarasà, ruler of Koliganagatta-vëtti in that nàd, a northern feudatory of the Hoysala, went
were on both sides, and a karttuga, which may have signi-
ified, as Rice says, an agent, of Rāmanātha offered a boon
to a warrior, who fought and fell. The record has two inter-
esting features: the first that Rāmanātha had an agent in Kaḍ-
aba, which was close by the spot where the record was found, in
the east of the Tumkur district, thus to some degree delimiting
Rāmanātha's forward possessions; (1) the second that the ruler
in whose reign the battle took place was the "glorious emperor
Hoyisana Vīrā-Ballāla-dēvarasa, ruling at Dōrasamudra." This
was Vīrā-Ballāla, later Ballāla III, son of Nārasimha by Paṭṭa-
mahādevī, a queen who may have been of Cālukyan stock, as her
son is once called Cālukya-kulōdbhavam. (2) He is mentioned in
the genealogy of the dynasty twice in the year 1286, and was
held by some to have commenced his (effective) reign from 1288.
In June and December 1291 Ballāla is found ruling the kingdom, (4)
while in November 1291 he bears all the imperial titles, and
is said to be in his own capital Dōrasamudra gaining praise in
carrying on the government in peace, a statement that seems to
imply that the war with Rāmanātha had temporarily subsided, owing

Page 392 n.(5) E.C.IX Channapatna 66(1288).
Page 392 n.(6) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 11, revised by M.A.R.1915-6,

(1) E.C.XII Gubbi 58(1290): Kaḍabada Rāmanātha-karttuga vara
hārige yembali Hoyisana-parivarā meccalu hoyidādi, etc. The sug-
gestion that the Rāmanātha referred to was in some way connected
with Kadaba is not as attractive as it is grammatically possible,
however, even so it would have to read Kaḍabada Rāmanāthana
karttuga. Should Lahkeya be read Ankeya ? La and a are alike.
(2) E.C.XII Holalkere 136(1307).
(3) E.C.XII Tiptur 123(1286); also E.C.VI Chikmagalur 146, which
Rice misdates 1226. According to A.R.1933-4,65(?1341) Ballāla III
began to reign in 1288, for Vikrama is called his 53rd year.
(4) E.C.IV Nagamangala 1; E.C.IX Kankanhalli 64.
to the weakness and insufficiency of the kingdom which Ballāla had inherited. In the September previous to this the king's henchman at Agnāra-Bācāhallī committed suicide with part of his family, and it is reasonable to suppose that Nārasimha III died in that month.(1)

He left to his son a realm weaker than it had ever been: it was not only divided against itself and enfeebled by wars of doubtful success against foes of greater or more apt strength, but was suffering from a relaxed morale and a reduced economic condition. It had neither the stout, severe and adventurous spirits of Vinayāditya's day, nor the material resources and markets to repay the less aggressive subjects of his degenerate successors.

(1) E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 10(1291) as revised by M.A.R.1914-5, para. 84.
CHAPTER SIX

THE COLLAPSE.

The reigns of Ballalāla III (Vira-Ballalāla II) & Ballalāla IV or Vira-Virūpākṣa-
Ballalāla.
The reigns of Ballāla III (Vira-Ballāla II) & Ballāla IV or Vira-Virūpakṣa-Ballāla.

Ballāla came to the throne of the western Hoysala kingdom at or about the age of twenty-eight. (1) He had been in public life since he was mature, and had probably gained a fairly sound experience of the way in which his country was governed. His reign was to be the longest of all the reigns of the dynasty, and he is to be counted, for all the purposes of historical judgement, as the last of the Hoysalas. His senility and death epitomize in a remarkable way the old age and collapse of the dynasty: an old age of prolonged and agonizing ineptitude with an ending as abrupt and complete as it was dramatic.

The struggles of the first ten years show plainly the weakness of the kingdom, and the personal vitality of its ruler, which was less worthy of notice for its inability to solve the problems that challenged it. In his first year a curious quarrel broke out in the west. It has already been noticed that the Hoysalas had never laid claims to the country on the western side of the mountains from which their line had emerged; the inhabitants of the Ālva-khēḍa and the Konkan had felt the Hoysala sword in the days of the great Viṣṇuvardhana, despite the fact that they were some miles to the north and to the west of the Hoysala nāḍ, because they were in close contact with the Sāntaras and Kadambas, in whose districts the Hoysala was then interested. (1) Ballāla's age when he died is settled within a year or so by the occasions when he is mentioned before 1291, and by the remark of Ibn Battūtah (see below, p. 496).
But the Bārakanūr or Bārakūr ghat had always been considered the western boundary of the Hoysala empire, and the teeming plains between the sources of the Hālādi, Sītānādi and Svarana-nadi rivers and the valuable coast which stretched from Kundapūr and Basrūr to Maṅgalūr had never been an object of Hoysala imperialistic ambitions. The important trade routes over the mountains passed, however, once over the Tuṅga river, within Hoysala territory, and a rich direct and indirect revenue was drawn from this traffic. In the days of Hoysala greatness the roads had been held by families under the imperial control, but since the time of Sōmēsvara others had commenced to profit from the traffic, towards which they contributed little or no service.

Like the castle of a robber-band, at a strategic point on a main artery, lived a family which was of origin not unlike that of the Hoysalas themselves, and apparently claimed descent likewise from the Lunar race, ruling a confined and backward principality from the village of Kālāśa. Inscriptions of the dynasty, hitherto inarticulate, commence in 1246, and the general picture of the line gives the impression that it was matrilinear in constitution, an impression likewise derived from a rapid survey of the records of the Ālupa dynasty that ruled on the further side of the ranges. Kālala-dēvi, who calls herself, in the language of the Kannada peoples of the plateau, "the senior crowned queen", but who probably held a position more independent even than those exalted and well-trusted personages, ruled at Kālāśa at least within the years 1270 and 1281. (1) Her son, Vīra-Pāṇḍya-dēva, was ruling at the same place.

(1) EC. VI Mudgerea 71a(1270); 67(1277); 71b(1277); 72(1279); 73(1281).
and the family existed, and, as far as we can tell, prospered for some while longer, although eclipsed temporarily by Hoysala pressure, which the first Vijayanagara dynasty were sensible enough to continue. For in 1292, Ballāla III's first year, in fact on the first of February, and within a few weeks of his coronation, Marakāla of the house of Samudra Pāṇḍya, clearly a rival claimant to the title of ruler of Kāḷaśa and doubtless a successful applicant for a grant of authority from Ballāla, went and demanded the Khāṇḍya agrahāra. Now Khāṇḍya was a place intermediate between effective Hoysala control and Kāḷaśa itself, and was moreover a place of importance, probably a customs post of more than ordinary profit. The chief administrative unit was probably the agrahāra there, and thus the record refers to it in that fashion. The demand was therefore a test. Pāṇḍya-dēva-mahādēva came to Khāṇḍya, seized the place and killed Marakāla. This was followed by a rising in the neighbouring Hoysala nāḍs, who sent contingents against Pāṇḍya-dēva, and a cavalry battle took place close beside the Honnūr river, perhaps one of the few level stretches in the area. Of the outcome this only is certain, that Pāṇḍya-dēva was not displaced at the time, and it may well be that his contumacy went unpunished, though his wealth was certainly diminished by Ballāla's measures after an interval of about five years. (2)

The accession of Ballāla seems to have given Rāma-

(1) EC.VI Mudgere 68 (1297).

(2) EC.0 only, also 36 (1292) at Indāvāra. Taḷi-ga-ṇaḍ, Deヴァla-γa-ṇaḍ and perhaps Hīre-ṇaḍ took part.
Bangalore district then held by Ballāla. (1) A partisan of his, Ranna-ōdayar, evidently the same as the Rāja-Ranna against whom there was some fighting in 1286, engaged with Hoysala forces in September 1293, a large part in the campaign being sustained by Kāveri-vallabha Mādiga-dēva, who held large fiefs in the southern districts. (2) In March 1294 Rāmanātha's forces took, but apparently lost again, Hiriya-Gaṅgavāḍī in the modern Channapatna tāluqa. An offensive in strength was developing, but it is worthy of note that the parts held by Rāmanātha did not include the most highly populated and therefore most valuable agriculturally, which were to the south of Hiriya-Gaṅgavāḍī. (3) In March 1295 Rāmanātha attacked Kunigil, which he was now in a position to outflank both to the north and the south-east. (4) His success in the north is evidenced by the fact that he must have been in possession of Haridāli in Sīranāḍ when it was attacked by Ballāla III in November of this year. A man and his three sons had gone to help or work for Rāmanātha and came back only to lose their lives in the siege of the place. (5)

After this year no further records are found of fighting between Ballāla and his uncle. The unfortunate Viṣvanātha inherited the Eastern Kingdom after Rāmanātha's death, (6) and appears in fact to have commenced to exercise regal functions from 1294. Only six inscriptions have so far been discovered of Viṣvanātha, and a certain amount of mystery surrounds his end.

(1) E.C.IX Kankanhalli 28(1292). (2) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 146 (1286). E.C.IX Kankanhalli 107(1293) at Kallahalli; ibid. 46 (1293) at Purusagondahalli - both dated the same day. (3) E.C.IX Channapatna 183(1294) at Doḍda-Gaṅgavāḍī. (4) E.C.IX Channapatna 179(1295) at Taḷavāḍī. (5) E.C.XI Chiknayakanhalli 33(1295) at Siṃgabāḍī. (6) The last inscription of Rāmanātha is E.C.X Bowringpet 25b
The records however, few as they are, give some information about him. His first is at Kambayanallur on the Ponnaiyar in the plain below the first range of the ghats; another at Tiruppapur, at the north-eastern edge of the same plain, reinforces the impression that Visvanatha's ministers concentrated on deriving revenue from the areas where there was little to impede their demands. (1) The other records, including one at Kundani itself, show that his authority was recognized within a limited range of that capital, or, alternatively, that other districts depending on Kundani were too impoverished by the war to indulge in the setting up of works of merit that might be commemorated by inscriptions. (2)

After the year Hevalambi nothing further is heard of Posa-la-Vira-Visvanatha-devar. As there is no direct evidence that Ballala III invaded the eastern kingdom in force, or indeed that he absorbed it rapidly, it is not permissible to suppose that Visvanatha died at the hand of Ballala himself or his agents. He may have died of disease, or been shut up in a fortress by rebellious subordinates. However it may have been, a certain cohesion and resistance in the eastern districts themselves prevented Ballala's reoccupation of the area until after 1301; it can not be said that that resistance was organized by or in favour of Visvanatha.

Meanwhile several miscellaneous activities were on foot which are worthy of mention.

at Madivala: dated in his 41st year, which must have been Marmatha, and the month Aparasi, or October-November 1295.

(1) S.I.I.VII 9,10,A.R.1900,9 & 10(1295); A.R.1909,250(1297).
(2) AR.1911,204(c1296) at Devar Kundani; E.C.X Chintamani 45 (1296-7) at Kurubur; M.A.R.1919, para.80(c1297) at Jinnagara; E.C.X Hoiskote 136 & 138(1297)' at Paramanahalli.
Sometimes during 1294 or the previous year Ballāla III sent Bettarasa-dannayaka to Pālpare, which seems to have been the headquarters of a Cāṅgālva ruler. There he "ruined Cāṅgālva-mahādēva and built a city at Pālpare and made it his capital". He was not, however permitted to enjoy his acquisition in peace, for Cāṅgālva Pemma Vīrappa, Nandi-dēva of Bādagunda and Udeyāditya of Kuruce and others the kodagas of all the nāḍas united, and attacked Pālpare, fought Bettarasa, and worsted him. Bettarasa must have retained part at least of the territory Ballāla had offered him, for he was able to make a nettaru-kodagi for a warrior out of it. (1) This story, like that of Khāndya, shows well the degraded condition of the Hoysala power.

In February 1294, according to a not very reliable source of which the genuineness may well be called in question, the famous Pratāpa Rudra, most renowned of the Kākatīyas, reached Mulukunte, about sixty-five miles east of Dōrasamudra and about the same distance from Kolar, while on an armed tour of the tirthas in the east. The part he is said to have entered was between the localities belonging to Ballāla and to Rāmanātha, and he doubtless kept clear of both of them. (2)

In 1298 it is interesting to note that Khāṇḍeya-rāya, son of Mummuḍi Siṅgeya-nāyaka, was in Ballāla's service. He appears to have been normally resident at the capital rather than with his pugnacious father in their wild retreats between the mass of Kummaṭa and the plain on the further side of the Tungabhadra, for in that year he joined with Sōmeya-dannāyaka in renewing the wood-work of the famous Cenna-Kēśava temple at

(1) E.C.IV Hunsur 20(1294) at Hitna Hebbāgilu.
(2) E.C.XII Tumkur 14(?1294).
Belur. (1)

From 1296 Ballāla III had recommenced the interference in the affairs of the north-west which his father had revived after a long lapse in the tradition. In 1292 the Sāntara dominions had been racked by civil war. A certain Kōṭi-nāyaka, whose career was one of the most brilliant of the age, was ruling in Hosagunda on behalf of Bommarasa. (2) His position was precarious as he had survived an attack by the Sēvuna emperor Rāmacandra only to fall a victim to intestine intrigues. He remained in Hosagunda in 1293, and had to face a conflict with Pāraśūrāma-dēva, a dālavāyi of Rāmacandra. (3) Meanwhile a certain Immaḍi-Sōyi-dēva was ruling at Sētu, and in April 1296 Dēvarasa of that place came into contact with Māyi-dēva, a dālavāyi of Ballāla III at Mūttūr. Clearly while the ruler of Hosagunda, now the most powerful of the representatives of the Sāntara line, was engaged with the Sēvuna, the Hoysala was endeavouring to profit at his expense, and the Sētu ruler had no sympathy with the claims of either. (4)

(1) E.C.V Belur 24, A.R.1902, 57 (1298).
(2) He was minister to Bommarasa Sāntara 1282: E.C.VIII Sagar 67, 86; allied to Tammaraśa 1284: E.C.VIII Nagar 31; allied to Tamasī Sōma-nāyaka 1287: E.C.VIII Sagar 77; allied to the same 1288: E.C.VIII Nagar 61, W.E.II f. 359b (I); with Sōme-nāyaka rules the 18 kampana 1290: E.C.VIII Sagar 31; rules alone with the title Vīra 1292: E.C.VIII Sagar 110, 94 (K.T. only); with mahāmāndalēśvara Bhīma-dēva rules the Sāntalige 1000 1292: E.C.VIII Sagar 89; rules Sāntalige on behalf of Bommarasa 1292: E.C.VIII Sagar 97; rules alone, having subdued the Sāntara nāyakas 1293: E.C.VIII Sagar 102; rules alone with the title mahāmāndalēśvara 1296: M.A.R. 1931, 73; E.C.VIII Sagar 102; rules together with Tammēya-sāvanta 1298: E.C.VIII Sagar 99; rules as mahāmāndalika, and marches with Bommarasa to Hosagunda 1299: E.C.VIII Sagar 122, Sagar 96; captured by Ballāla III 1300: E.C.VIII Sagar 45; (the same man or his son) as mahāmāndalēśvara rules Sētu kingdom 1320: E.C.VIII Nagar 19; his son falls in Ballāla's service 1329: E.C.VIII Sagar 104. See also MAR. 1931, 66 (p. 1284).
(3) E.C.VIII Sagar 102 (1293).
Kōti-nāyaka had had to face Abbara-nāyaka, a Sēvuṇa dalavāyi who may have been a subordinate of Paraśurāma-dēva. (1) Hoysala diplomacy at the time is obscure: but by 1299 Ballāla III had occupied Hosagunda and united the Sāntaras against him. He subsequently managed to detach one at least of their number, but in 1299 Bommarasa, Kōti-nāyaka and Karatala Kālatamma with their sāmantas advanced against him with the intention of taking Ballāla's own elephant, and in May of that year a battle took place. (2) No doubt the Hoysala was the victor, for by December 1300 he had captured both Kōti-nāyaka himself and his elephants without losing Hosagunda. He followed up this achievement by moving northwards into the Kadamba territory, and, turning westwards, encamped at Sirisi, about ten miles west of Banavāse. That he moved there can be explained by two suppositions only: that the main body of the Kadamba districts then owing nominal allegiance to the Sēvuṇa was occupied on the latter's behalf by a strong force; and that by camping at Sirisi he could for a period drain off much of the revenue of the Kadamba by collecting the tariffs on the trade routes that converged on Sirisi before passing to Hāṅgal and the north. The Kadamba Kāva-dēvarasa's minister Jagadāla Gaṅgeya-sāhaṇi, who had already refused Ballāla's demand for tribute, attacked him and inflicted heavy losses at the Kalugāra stream, which is so far unidentified. (3) Retiring southwards, Ballāla left a nāyaka at Uddhare, that strategically important place that had more

(1) M.A.R.1931,73(1296). His name is there spelt Ebhar-ap. In E.C.VIII Nagar 27(1302) it is given as Abbara-nāyaka; in M.A.R. 1931,72(1302) as Yebara-nāyaka.
(2) E.C.VIII Sagar 96(1299) at Nāḍamaqvū.
(3) E.C.VIII Sagar 45(1300) at Baradavālī.
than once played a large part in the history of the north-west. There in February 1301 Gangeya-sāhāni attacked him, and in the siege Tōya Siṅgeya-dannāyaka lost his life.\(^{(1)}\)

Until three years later nothing further is heard of Ballāla's activity in this region. The most probable reason is that he began to dissipate what little resources he once had over a number of ventures simultaneously.

His first duty was clearly to reunite the traditional members of the Hoysala kingdom. Before 1301 not a single record of Ballāla was set up in Kolar or in the east or north of Bangalore districts. However, we can not be sure that military activity was not afoot, if perhaps on no very vigorous scale. But in the month of December 1301 a decisive step was taken by the government at Dōrasamudra to win the support not only of Heaven but of the religious potentates of Viśvanātha's former realm, with a view to facilitating the reabsorption of those districts into a single Hoysala kingdom. The object was achieved, and a pronounced increase in the influence and power of Ballāla is perceptible in the area after 1301. A proclamation was issued to the heads of mathas and sthanas in the temples situated in the Kundāṇi or Hesar-Kundāṇi, that is "the well-known Kundāṇi", kingdom, consisting of Virivi-nāḍ, Murasu-nāḍ, Māsandi-nāḍ, Cōkkanāyan-parru, Peṇnaiyāndārmaṇa-nāḍ, Aṁbuḷugūr-nāḍ, Elavūr-nāḍ, Kuvaḷāla-nāḍ, Kaivāra-nāḍ, Ilaippākka-nāḍ, Tēkkal-nāḍ, Aṁbaḍakki, Nōṇḍanguli, Veppūr, Erumārāi-nāḍ, Eyi-nāḍ, Tagaḍai-nāḍ, Puramalai or Adīgaṁiśa-nāḍ, Paiyyūr-parru, Pulliyūr-nāḍ and "all others", amongst which list may at once be recognized.

\(^{(1)}\) E.C.VII Shikarpur, 212(1301).
if by name only, all the parts of Rāmanātha's and Viśvanātha's
kingdom since 1287 both on the plateau and on the plains immi-
ediately beneath the first range-mass. Each copy of the inscrip-
tion relates that lands have been granted to the god in question
or taxes remitted, especially taxes on gifts to the temples, a
levy which must have made the Kundāni government unpopular
among the clerics. In return for these concessions the dignit-
aries addressed were instructed to undertake that worship should
be conducted properly for the benefit of "ourselves and our king-
dom", that temple repairs be executed, and prayers uttered for
"our prosperity". (1)

That the efforts of the king were not confined to
such proclamations is shown by a grant at Sīti for the success
of the sword and arm of Vallāla. (2) An illustration of the
effect of the civil war may be seen in an inscription at Jigani,
Anekal taluqa, which refers to the restoration of a breached
tank there; (3) though it is a well-known fact that tanks breach
on account of excessive rain, the deliberate damaging of irri-
gation channels and such necessary works was a regular part of
the long-drawn-out and futile warfare of the period.

But Ballāla's energies were not restricted to this
field alone: he was embroiled in the north on two fronts, and
appears to have been engaged in operations of an unfortunately
nebulous nature in the east and south-east. In at least two of
these cases his action was voluntary and premeditated, and for
the absurd dispersal of his forces and the consequent deterior-
ation of the resources of his kingdom he and his advisers must

(1) E.C.X Malur 71(1301) at Lakkūr; ibid.100(1301) at Madivāla;
M.A.R.1910-1, para.109(1301) at Domlūr; E.C.IX Ngalamangala 38(1301)
at Ayigandapura; ibid.Bangalore 51(1301) at Gajjūr; ibid.65(1304)
bear heavy blame.

In 1303 Sōmeya-dānnāyaka, husband of Ballāla's sister, normally resident at Bematūrkalu, the modern Chitaldrug, marched to Holalkere, twelve miles to the south-west of Chitaldrug, and there fought with Kampila-dēva, a general in the Sevūṇa army, until he died in battle. The episode is mentioned in two inscriptions of the year. (1) A question now arises, as to who this Kampila was. There seems to be no objection to the theory that this was the son of Mummuḍī Singeya-nāyaka who subsequently ruled at Kampili in the dominions of his father, (2) and who therefore must have been an officer of the Sevūṇa before he took over the Kampili, or, as the Muslims term it, the Kampilah kingdom. (3) Thus the family had a remarkable career; a father at war with one ruler and in a state of uneasy alliance with that ruler's enemy, while one son served one of the rivals and another served the other. The geographical position of the kingdom probably accounts for the anomaly.

In the meantime Sōdala-dēva of the Sēntara family fought under Ballāla's orders in Salūr with Abbara-nāyaka, the Sevūṇa officer. Thus while the Sevūṇa was able to make deep thrusts into the northern parts of the Hoysala-nāḍ, a Hoysala ally fought with one of the enemy generals on a flank. (4)

at Maṇivāla; E.C.IX ChikBallapur 20 (1301) at Nandi.
Page 404 n. (2) M.A.R.1909-10, para. 84 (1302) at Siti.

(1) In one of them, M.A.R.1911-2, para. 93 (1303) at Cittanhalli, Krishnarajpet taluqa, the enemy is incorrectly described as "Lenkampaela of Holalkere", which must be corrected to "Kampila in Holalkere." M.A.R.1912-3, para. 85 (1303) at Bagavāḷa, HoleNarsipur taluqa.

(2) Rama Sharma, The Exploits of King Kampila and Kumara Ramanatha, p.2. Saletore, Theories concerning the Origin of Vijaya-
Ballālā III took part in the war against the Śeṣuṇa in person, for an inscription of 1304 relates that he was at Dōrasamudra "after having led an expedition against the Āriyas in the north, destroyed the fort of Nākkigundī and achieved victory."(1) Besides the record which informs us of this, others of about 1305 and 1306, repeat the motif of grants for the sword and arm of Vīra-Vallāla-dēva, and for the benefit of his "sacred body". (2) In February 1305, then, Ballāla marched against the Yādava king Rāma-dēva. Rice from the damaged record obtains the meaning,"on his (Rāma-dēva's) issuing an order for the battle, saying "You must take the king of the Karṇāṭakas, and seize and give me that tiger's cub", making no hesitation ... performed various exploits."(3)

Not content with these exacting activities, and with the maintenance of forces in the Sāntara country, as the record at Māḍadūru, seven miles south of Malāla, shows,(4) Ballāla III had begun operations in the east. Having penetrated the eastern nāds, his emissaries came into contact with the powers of the plain, and attempts seem to have been made to revive interest in the Hoysala dynasty among the remaining royal families in the Tamil country, then totally under the sway of the various members of the Pāṇḍya dynasty. In 1303 Ballāla was called "set-

---

(1) E.C.IX Bangalore 53(1304). Nākkigundī is unidentified.
(2) M.A.R.1908, para. 50(c1305) at Bannāṛghaṭṭa; ibid.1913-4 para. 87(1306).
ter-up of a stone pillar at Kānci", as well as the unexplained "Agastya to the ocean of the eighteen forts". (1) In 1307 he is called Kānci-kāncana-kanna-pūraka, "he who has Kānci for a golden ear-ornament", in addition to the titles Kādava-śāya-kulāntaka and Pāṇḍya-disāpaṭṭa, which are very significant, as the former appears to be a revival of an old title that had fallen out of use, and the second is a strange contrast to the titles referring to the setting-up and supporting of the Pāṇḍya which had been usual since 1248. (2) Muslim writers bear witness to this renewed interest in the south-east. (3)

Fighting on an undefined scale continued in 1307 and 1309. Grants were made in the east for the king's success. (4) In this connection we first find mention of Vallappa, or Ballappa-daṇṇāyaka, a relation by marriage of the king, who was one of his principal lieutenants in the modern Bangalore district, and soon to become one of the foremost in the kingdom. (5)

The tale of incompetence and extravagence would not be complete without a brief notice of the fact that between 1304 and 1306 a remarkable activity developed on the part of an association called the Vīra-Pāṇcālas. Upper-class artisans formed, under royal charters, a type of society not dissimilar to that

---

(1) What were the 18 forts? 18 was apparently a favourite number: 18 kaṇmāna, 18 castes. It is doubtful whether they were specific forts. M.A.R.1937, 47(1303). (2) E.C.IX Channapatna 76. (3) See below, pp. 422, 487. (4) E.C.IX Bangalore 133(1307). M.A.R.1913-4, para. 87, a completion of E.C.X Malur 83. M.A.R. 1909-10, para 84(1309) at Sīti.
of the Vīra-Baṇañjas, the merchant union, which received special privileges in at least the expanding eastern part of the country. The previous military and administrative classes were now balanced by a pair of strong associations of trade guilds that could both resist unscrupulous oppression and could to some degree take in society the place which the convulsions of the period and the impoverishment of the land-holding classes had put within their reach.(1)

In the spring of 1310 the king was ruling in a kingdom which the extreme paucity of inscriptions reveals as exhausted and enfeebled. One record shows him sharing the function of rule with two general officers, Mēdagi-dēva-daṇḍāyaka and Aliya-Mācaya-daṇḍāyaka. This very rare feature is a clear indication of the weak condition of the administration.(2)

Then, at a moment when in all its chequered history the Hoysala kingdom was least prepared to receive such a visitation, Ballāla III was obliged to entertain a guest as terrible as he was unexpected. Dēvagiri and Wāraṅgal, which had suffered in turn from the attentions of the Muslims, were both far off, and the echoes of the Muslim triumphs can not have failed to counter-balance in Ballāla's mind the respect thus aroused for Muslim arms with satisfaction at the downfall of rival monarchs, of whom one at least had been a dangerous and pertinacious enemy. The sudden arrival of Malik Nāib must then have been a very distasteful shock.

(1) For example, E.C.IX Kankanhalli 81 & 110(1306); ibid. Dod-Ballapur 52(1306); ibid. Magadi 19(1341), 16(1315).
(2) E.C.XI Chitaldrug 1(1310) The stone is defective.
The circumstances which surrounded the first
expedition from Delhi to the Karnataka country are recounted
in a more or less full form by several contemporary and later
writers in the Persian language. Their readers were interested
to learn of the fabulous wealth acquired by the Sultan 'Ala'
ud din of Delhi in the south, and of the efforts made by that
adventurous ruler to spread Islam over the vast unbelieving
masses of the Peninsula. Later expeditions to the south are
also reported by many Persian historians, but the glamour and
notoriety attaching to that of 1310-1 exceeded that of all the
rest combined. The accounts of contemporary writers differ in
several respects from each other, but a comparison enables a
fairly just chronicle to be compiled; to that picture may be
added some slight features derived from later sources, which
may, and probably do, preserve contemporary traditions which
the early writers neglected. Alive in 1310 were Amir Khusrau
Dihlavî, 'Isâmî, 'Abd Allâh Shirâzî Waṣṣâf, and Ḍiyâ ud din
Baranî. Their accounts deserve to be quoted in extenso, although
in the case of our principal Persian authority, Amir Khusrau,
it will not be necessary to quote certain poetical or highly
rhetorical passages which add nothing to the historical value
of the account. These passages are far fewer than has been
thought by various critics who have misjudged Khusrau's objects
in composing this remarkable example of Indianized Persian.

Amîr Khusrau's contribution is of unusual value be-
cause he may have been present during the expedition, accom-
panying Malik Kâfûr Hazâr-dînârî, otherwise Malik Naîb or Bârbek,
the Sultan's representative, on his journey from Delhi to Ma'bār, that is to say the Cōla-Pāṇḍya country, by way of Dēvagiri and Dōrasamudra. 'Abd ul Qādir Ibn i Mulūk Shāh al Badāonī says in his Muntakhab ut Tawārīkh: "And in the year 710 the country of Ma'bār including Dhūr Samund came into the possession of the Muslims; and in the year 711 Malik Nāīb brought to the court and presented his spoils, consisting of 312 elephants, 20,000 horses, 96,000 maunds of gold, and many chests of jewels and pearls besides other booty beyond the limits of computation; Amīr Khusrāu, who was with that army, has given full particulars in the Khazāīn ul Futūḥ." Amīr Khusrāu's contribution is fortunately greater: in addition to the florid, artificial, and difficult Khazāīn ul Futūḥ, a shorter account is found in his Duwal Rānī i Khādir Khān, with which this series of quotations commences.

After describing the defeat of Laddar Dēv (Rudra, that is, Pratāpa Rudra-dēva of Wāraṅgal) the Rai of Tilang, or Teliṅgāna, he continues:

"After that, Bārbek was further ordered to make the elephants of Ma'bār food for falcons; he should make the heroes throughout the army on every side drunk with Ma'bāri blood; he was to grasp the shores up to the territory of Lanka (i.e. Cey-

(1) Muntakhab ut Tawārīkh, p.197.
The expression ولايات معبر تاوراموعسر is vague, and Ba-
dāonī probably knew little of the geographical relationship be-
tween Ma'bār, the plain country, and Dhūr Samund(ar), the plat-
eau. That the Karnāṭaka country was termed Dhūr Samundar by the Muslims of the north is plain from the statement of Amīr Khuss-
rāu himself in the third Sipihr of his Nūh Sipihr (718/1318) that every province has a peculiar idiom of its own, and he lists several including Ma'bāri(Tamil) and Dhūr-Samundri(Kannāḍa). See M.W.Mirza's "Life and works of Amir Khusrau", p.185, where the note "i.e. the language of Dharva-samudra" contains an ob-
lon), and to seize the surface of the ocean in one drop; all
the earth of the coasts up to Sarândîp (Ceylon) he was to make
fragrant, as if with ambergris, with the scent of the Faith;
and he should cast the heads of the evil doers with his sword
one after another before the feet of Adam. The army started out
with Victory as a fellow-traveller, so as to raise dust up
from the sea to the moon. It arrived within the territory of
the Râi-râyân; (2) the earth disappeared beneath the quadrupeds.
As the master of Dêvägîr was Râm (3) (or "had become quiet, or
submissive") they set out quickly for the other Dêvs. When the
army was further advanced from there, the shaking of the earth
produced an earthquake at the boundaries of Dêvägîr."

"In those parts there was another, entitled "Râi",
whose name was Balâl, a champion in battle (or "of the period):
with his crushing force and his elephants, both of the choicest,
the (rulers) of Dêvägîr and Ma'bâr had both been worsted by him.

The statement is, however, open to question.

(1) Adam's Peak, the well-known landmark and place of pilgrimage
in Ceylon. The translation follows the reading as in
S.O.A.S.18729, p. 84; I.0.2796 f.30 ⊕ 38a, l.15; and I.0.188 f.30b,
l.10. If one reads as in the printed text, p.70 l.19, one
must render it "he had to cast to their end the evil-doers in
front of the feet of Adam", but it is strained and unlikely.

(2) Râi-râyân, or "king of kings", was the title bestowed upon
the Ñêvûna ruler of Dêvägîrî by 'Alâ'ûd dîn, Sultan of Delhi,
after his submission. (3) This is a pun on the name of Râma-ôêva
or Râmacandra-ôêva, the Ñêvûna emperor. He was, we learn, either
dying or dead when Malik Nâîb arrived.

(4) I.0.2796 reads for " and the latter reading is shared by S.O.A.S.18729."
The army first took "booty thereabouts - they found his (Bār-bek's) hint sufficient - from the elephants and property and horses which he (Balāl) had in his possession. The Shāh’s army received finances for its subsistence. That clever Rāi did not become a hero in war; he came out without delay from his fort. While that auspicious Victory was progressing well, the army's face turned to the chief task. He (Bār-bek) made ready all the equipment and provisions; the iron mountain set out in the direction of the ocean. This army raised a wind through that land, so that by it stones flew about like shavings. When the riders of the wind brought their hands to that quarter, the boats were all broken by the wind. The shore of the ocean, coast after coast began to seethe - likewise the villages and towns and the stages of the route."

"In that territory there was a Rāi also, a viceroy (or "heir apparent"): in the Hindu crown he was the priceless pearl. (1) His commands were fulfilled over sea and land; the Brahmans called him Bīr Pandyā. Many were his cities on the land and amid the sea: he had beautified Patan and Barhatpūrī. (2) Patan

He was, of course, Vīra-Pāṇḍya, the deputy of his father Kula-śākhara until the latter's murder by Sundara Pāṇḍya.

(1) S.O.A.S.18729 reads absurdl y, and مرهب پری. I.O. 2796 reads Fatan ختن فتن, which was probably the original reading and which may be transliterated Marhamatbarī or -purī. I.O.188 also reads Fatan in the second place, but Khatan in the first; also مرهب پری. I.O.89 and the same name repeated. Marhatkarī or Marmatpīrī are no more intelligible than the other readings: in any case the syllable "ma" is a misreading for "ba", cf. Khażāīn ul Futūḥ below. The corruption is not uncommon, cf. the I.O. Ms. of 'Īsāmī;
he had made his own residence: there were many devils (Buts) and devil-houses in Barhatpūrī. He had raised out of gold a devil-house up against the moon: Saturn he had banished with those devils. A certain devil in it was drowned in rubies and precious stones, so that a single city might feed on (the price of) each jewel. His army was numerous and his ships innumerable: Musulmans as well as Hindus were his attendants. (1) Before him were a thousand mad Ma'bār elephants: the quantity of his fiery horses was infinite."

"When the army of the Shāh came within the limits of Patan, the misguided Rāi lost his way through terror. Within a forest where few ants crept, like an ant he crawled despite his considerable strength. His subjects, grieving, wandered in all directions: the army and the elephants, having lost their head, wandered too. Do not say "an army", when the head of the army is missing; what use is in a body when it has lost its head?"

It is unnecessary to pursue any further the account contained in the Duwal Rānī i Khādir Khān, which continues to describe the submission to Malik Nāīb of Vīra-Pāṇḍya's Muslim troops, and Malik Nāīb's eventual return to Delhi. The account of the Khazāīn ul Futūn is very full, though, as will be shown, it is not as sincere as it is vivid. With sundry omissions, as has been stated, the whole account is reproduced here in order to enable the story, as far as it concerns this history, to be examined in the fullest appreciation of the style and method of our authority.

which reads Mandrak for Hosadrug. The Patan may not be the Bataev of Ibn Batūtah and Rashīd ud din: the latter was certainly a port.

(1) The printed text has Ḥenrū for Ḥenrū. (2) The Duwal Rānī i Khādir Khān was composed in 715/1315, four years after the
After relating how the Imperial army, under Malik Naib Barbek, left Delhi on Tuesday, the 26th of Jamādi ul Akhir 710, otherwise November 20th 1310, and moved across the country in a south-westerly direction, he continues:-(1)

"When the day of Jupiter became bright after the descent of Venus, and the date of the month Ramazān was exceeding the middle of the fast - that is, Thursday the 13th of the month, 710 (2) (otherwise the 4th February 1311) -"

"Here is a description of dēvs (i.e. devils) and fairies."

"- the umbrella of Solomon cast its shade upon the neighbourhood of Devagir, so that the land of Devagir was by the aid of heaven held by ranks of angels, and the army of humanity though it is jin-like, decided to bring together out of that locality, for the fortress of Balāl-dēv and the other dēvs, a store of shooting-star spears and four-feathered arrows. The Rai-rayān, Rām-dēv, as from the drum of the fear of Muhammad the veritable voice of Satan was heard, that dēv made himself submit (rām) to that court through his opinion upon saving one's life by keeping quiet."

"Here is concerning counsel (rāi) and device."

"That Rāi of good family with true counsel, in order to praise and to submit to the envoys of the court, both by arrangement of necessaries for the army against the forts of the evil-doers, and by providing (as foundation) policies: (or devices) against the Bir(3) and Dhor-samundar, became entirely an embodiment of judgement (or counsel)."

Khazāin ul Futūh, which was written immediately after the events it narrated. The passage quoted here is from the printed text, B.M. 14797.f.6(1917), p.70, commencing at line 15.

(1) The passages translated occur on pp.132-152 of the printed text; ff.60b-69a of B.M.Add.16,838; and ff.87b-78a of B.M.or.7560.
"Here also is about Shāhnāmah."

"This example of his time, namely the Rai-rāyān, in order to please the servants of the Shāh, tricked out a letter of submission with the writing of sincerity, and ordered the city of Dēvagīr to be adorned with the ornaments of paradise. He ordered that supplies ready for the use of the army should be placed in the bazaar; if anything like the feathers of the Simorgh should be needed for the arrows of the Rastams of the Shāh, incessant attempts should be made to acquire them, until the point when the illustrious company of Irān and Turān might be prepared, so that it might slay every kind of mighty dev from the regions of Dhōr-samundar and Ma'bar, just as did Rastam in Māzandarān."

"Next here is about stars."

"------- The Rai-rāyān had explained to a Hindu dalvay whose reservoir was on the main road to the Bīr and Dhōr-samundar, that at the end of a few days there would be a tethering drawn out for the caravan of the army's troops by the watering place of that habitation. And the dalvay(bucket), having his mouth open like a bucket, watched the road of the host of Islam and wanted, in order to obey (wet) the nobles of the Ka'bah of the religion, to draw out the whole of Dhōr-samundar by the bucket."

"About the army and heavenly aid."

"The flourishing army remained for three days at the before-mentioned fortress (Dēvagīr) to put the divisions into order."

Page 414 n.(2) Given by the chronogram: = 697 + 13.
Page 414 n.(3) Krishnaswami Aiyangar is wrong in thinking that this is Bhir in Nizam's State. It must be Vīra, the king.
"On dates astrological" (abridged)

"On Tuesday, the 17th of Ramazan - "

"About arrows straight as Mercury."

"- the servants of the faith of Muhammad, each one with his bow strung, concerning himself with the sharpening of arrows to the extremities of the edge (or "country"), moved off with the umbrella of the all-highest accompanying them."

"On water and land delicate as water."

"From the felicitous camp of Devagir to the evil dwelling of Paras-dev-dalvay, the army, under the command like that of Solomon, had to cross three rivers by five marches. One the Sini was such that the breast of the ocean appeared like a heart and thorax, and its water was above thirty long reeds (in width); another, the Godavari, had of its own a plain of such wide surface, that it carried away the ball of dispute throughout the globe of the world. And the third was the Bhinur whose breast was no less than the Sini.(1) And they crossed other rivers of awe-inspiring sound in a smooth ship (like) larks in flight - until, after five days, they dismounted at the stage of Bandri (in) a fief of Paras-dev-dalvay.(2) The dalvay, who was a bucket, drawn up by the servants of the Presence, and wanted some water from the Bir of Dhör and Bir Bandyā, wished to put both the birs (wells) together with the ocean (or"their waters") into (his) water-pot.(3) Then the army of the Oxus arrived."

(1) There is an error here. The Bhinur, or Bhīnavar (read in B.M Or.1700 as Bīhanur) must be the Bhima river, which is joined by the Sīna on its left bank, thus the Sīni was certainly passed before the Bhinur, but the Godāveri precedes both and must have been the first large river crossed after leaving Devagiri. (2) Parāśurāma-dēva-dalavāi had evidently been moved from the south where he held a command in 1293(E.C.VIII Sagar 102), but
"Again about watchers of the heavens".

"That dalvay, who had remained dried up in that water-less place, saw by consequence of the revolution of the (heavenly) wheel his own prosperity in the ascendant and all his stability in the (heavenly) mansion. Eventually he came to meet the auspicious stars of Islam, and became for the army a guide for its proper encampment like the sphere of the heavens. When the day of Jupiter became bright with the heart of the sun, the Master of the East (Malik Nāib), to illuminate news ahead, frequently caused fire-footed messengers to become early risers and was engaged upon investigation and enquiry upon all sides; until it became known, from those that came from advanced stage as follows:- two Rāis of Ma'bar, who had been of one mind in union, had been more strongly joined than the twin-faced (stars the Furqān, when Sundar Pandya, the younger brother, with a view to the elements (that is, the four elements of nature, or "mothers") of the interests of the country (or,"government") dyed the palms of his own hands with the blood of his fathers (or "the nine heavens") and recognized their heads to be an impediment to (the proverb) "seize what you find". (1) The elder brother, the Rai Bir Pandya, had made a gathering of several thousand Hindus like Saturn, and leaving two cities empty, became swift of journeying for the purpose of flaying him (or, as it were,"eclipsing him"), while Balāl-dēvā (2) the Rai of Dhŏr-

Bendri remains unidentified. It may not have been Pandharapur, as says Krishnaswami Aiyangar, but must have been somewhere nearby. A possible identification may be Bāramati, 22miles S.of the Bhima river in Bhimthadi taluqa of the Poona district, at about 74°35'18°10'. Page 416 n.(3) Although supported by B.M. Or.1700, Syed MoinulHaq is wrong in bracketing the first p.137 of the text.

(1) It is well worthy of note that the victim of Sundara Pandyā
Samundar, as soon as he heard that the cities were empty of their Mahārajā, formed the intention of making his one camp on the left (or northern) side of both the cities for the purpose of plundering the Mahajans. (1) Suddenly, like a splitting noise from heaven, he heard from the drums of the victorious army "Behold our army, they are the victorious ones" (2) and, remaining at a loss through the conquests of "They placed their fingers in their ears at the thunder-claps, for fear of death", and from that awe, like Saturn reversed, in an ill condition and reversed fortune, returned towards his own unlucky mansion. And the great bird was trapped by the moving planets and the (constellation) Eagle (or, "was trapped by the moving stars, the army, and the Canopy") and arrived at his own low house.

"Concerning fruit pipes, roasted and fresh."

"The Malik grasped the weight (fruit) of all this news in entirety and full ripeness; then, when Sunday became bright through the Sun of the World and the number of the month of the Fast had produced for the thirsty warriors a single grape (the number "23") from the disk of the sky, that is, twenty-three had passed away from the month -(3) in consultation.

is spoken of deliberately in the plural. This may mean little, as the figure is happier so, but may also signify either that Sundara's father and uncle (little-father locally) were killed, or that Khusrau knew and many of his readers would recognize the local habit of putting titles of relations, etc. in an honorific plural: cf. Ibn Batūtah, "These are the king!", below, p.496.

Page 417 n. (2) B.M.ADD.16,838 reads as also the text, 

but B.M. Or.1700 reads the same with the alif erased, dêv.
(1) B.M.Add.16,838 reads Mahajan, but Or.1700 Mahajan. The word must mean 'merchants'; it could hardly mean Brahmins.
(2) Q.xxxvii 173. (3) 23rd Ramazān is equivalent to 14th February 1311.
with the great chiefs who held the weight of momentous decisions, he picked from the complete trunks and branches of the army one tumān (10,000) of choice (otherwise "cucumber") warriors, and had a muster called. There were javelin throwers who could for the bewildered spectators make a thousand reticulations in a poppy-seed, and swordsmen who, having given one blow with their blade, could cut a mountain in two like a nut."

"Next about uneven roads."

"For the space of twelve days soft-mouthed ones swift of hoof, soft-going ones with patient breasts, and soft hearted ones unwearied with toil travelled through ascents and declivities............. When the day of Jupiter with favourable portent joined the base of the pinnacle in the presence (or, "to the disadvantage") of the moon, that is Thursday, and also the fifth of the month <Shuwwāl> -"

"Next the foundation, concerning the fort."

"- the king's fort-taking army, at the even moment when the disk of the sun had made the earth into a blazing oven, bound a cordon around the fort of Dhōr-samundar. The fortress was such that from seeing it the sky did not come into view. It was not Dhōr-samundar, but a pool named Bīr, having become an ocean surrounding on every side a perfidious Bīr( or "a well of a pond").(1) You would say that it had its firm foundation in the middle of the round sun, its destruction being small despite the passing round of full cups."

(1) Khusrau is never tired of making puns about Bīr. The "Vīra" is quite probably a way in which Ballāla and Vīra-Pāṇḍya were referred to by their subjects. Dōrasamudra was situated between a large stretch of water and three smaller lakes: M.A.R.1930, plate VIII.
"Look at the water-creatures!"

"The belief of the inhabitants of that fort was based on watery customs. Through the body of all, on account of the confusion caused by the army, there arose a trembling of the arms and legs; and from an apprehension of the hurlers of arrow-shafts (they were) like fish having their entrails full of thorns (fish-bones); and these terrified fish together thumb to thumb (or, "fish-hook to fish-hook", or,"with sacred threads entwined") having bound their shields on their backs, and put on their coats of mail, began to seethe and move up and down like the commotion of the penitents in that water-tank.(1) The Rāi, Balāl-dēv, turning pale like drowning men from terror of the flood of the Sultan's heart (army), his heart palpitated from fear like the dewlap of a frog, and, as he crept within the Bir (well), he made to fly windy babblings in his outlandish speech,"What answer should I give to the heart of the Shāh?"

"Look! Description of a fire, like the garden of Abraham."

"And if that fire-worshipper wished not to send up breath and smoke, the handful of straw which was around him (or "Brahmans") blew upon him, and kept (him) occupied,(2) saying:- "There need be many days while the mass of the smoke of us fire-worshippers must rise in Dhōr-samundār.(3) There is

(1) Reading پداک ان آیان در آبگیر داران آبگیر تپاک سیل for an interesting reading, for it means "a platform", or "fishes".
(2) Of the many scores of clever puns and double-meanings that Khusrau employs this is surely one of the subtlest: پیرامان ای around him, but plainly also Brahmans of his.
(3) To be interpreted alternatively, (a) "it will be a long time
nothing like us (or, "we have no doubt about it"). It appears from the fire and is in Dhōr-samundar (or, "The Salamandar comes forth from the fire and is for (all) ages").(1) When the army of the Turk, which is a river of fire, arrives for the burning of our straw-built towns, this fire will have a foundation for making a stone fort also into lime (or "like nought"). But then, this fort, which they call the Bir of Dhōr-samundar,(2) has water near itself, and always the gate of this land has been by water. When the tongues of the swords of the Turks start to work, if it is not possible to extinguish all of them, it would be less (that is, preferable) than giving an answer to the chief of wild beasts,(3) for we should not die, since we are to be burnt, at any rate without water (honour)."

The Rāi became hot through their vapourings, and displayed the fire in his insides: "Before now our fire-worshipping ancestors, since the lamp of their heart was bright, have made it clear that the Hindu can never have brightness before the Turk, nor fire before water. Since this is so, nothing else is possible for us to do before the flaming arrow-tips of the Turk, except turn the face. One must not cast any water (honour) which may become oil on their torches and make us food for fire through all our lives. Therefore I put fiery opposition entirely from my head, and will go forward wallowing over the face of the dust, with the humility of water. It may be that the fire of the wrath of the Turk may submit to a degree of quietening."

before we are burnt" & (b) "our worship will continue for a long time yet." Note that the word for "our smoke" means not only "our anguish", but also "the race, or tribe", so that it is possible to render, "Our tribe will flourish for long yet."

(1) (2) Reading for the text's (3) Here is an alternative explanation for Khusrau's use of the word Bir: it is unsupported by local evidence.
The torchbearers of sedition from this circumstance became a little cool after being heated and on the part of (or, "on the side of") the Bir and Dhôr-samundar made their hearts rivers, and agreed that they should open the gate of the Bir.

"About table-wine which causes drunkenness (pride)."

"When in the early morning the Cup-bearer had taken out the red disk from the bottom of the goblet of a clear sky, the chief scout of the army went around that stone fortress, which had been protected from damage by the Ma'bâri by two defeats (inflicted on him), (2) and he fancied all those goblets full to the brim that were all round about the fortress to be a wine glass of red-wine (or, "a plain for bay horses"). And he (Malik Na'ib) organizing the besieging parties of drunk and heavy-headed lions together with sober lion-tamers, company by company, and himself with the array of the chiefs took up his stand before the gate of the fort. The noise of the tumult from the blood-drinking lions went up, and from the noise (hemp-juice -Hindi-) of drums of the warriors a clamour (gurgling of liquor, or chirping of intoxicated birds) descended upon the head. (3) The Sufi-tempered sword of the men of pure religion poured down the blood of the rebels for the sake of God, like wine, to such an extent that the flood ran as far as the ditch of the fortress, and offered up a prayer (or, "fire") for wickedness: From the heat of the torches of the messengers (or, "arrows") the blood in the body of the Hindus became water and poured off them as sweat. The company of chiefs decided to

Darwâzah however means pass, boundary, and castle as well as gate.

(1) " Appears "on the Bir".

(2) There is a misconception here. (3) B.M.Cr.1700 reads "on the Bir".
flinging stones at the door of that fort as if at the hat of a devil, or give a sign to the lancers of the army to turn it upside down with the tips of their lances like an empty glass, so that the rebels, caught (or, "satiated") with blood might fly out of that seething Bir like flies from the mouth of a vat. But for the moment, for the sake of expediency, it desisted from the points (dots) of magnificence (ornament), and employed deliberation, in order to offer them the one assembly of Islam or the infidel-tax. If they accepted, well: otherwise, to the glory of God, they would smash that fort with western-stones (1) like china.

"Behold, here is about infidelity and Islam."

"When Balāl-dev perceived that the call to prayer would be uttered in his oratory, and that they would make the devil-house prostrate itself, and that where had been placed a dēv by the name of Balāl, (a) the stature of Muezzins would rise upwards, and that preachers would make the sword of the niche (or, "sword of the dogma", or "sword curved like the arch of the niche") an assistant to the tongue (2) when Thursday night, having thrown the black cloak of evening over its shoulder, had risen over the stone pulpit for the mountain - that Balāl, who had a dēv as his attendant, after the bed-time prayers sent Kesav Mal to spy out the army of Islam. As soon as he arrived at the ring of the orthodox he became deaf like the Devil from hearing the sound of the Qurān. He saw the purity of the readers forming a ring round about the fort and being attentive (or, (1) western or "wonderful" stones: the technical name for the projectile of a particular kind of catapult. (1a) There must have been a shrine of Ballāḷēsvara, (2) set up by Ballāḷēśvara II in the great Hoysalēśvara temple, or in another near by. But no Ballāḷēśvara shrine is known at Halebid to-day: M.A.R 1930, page 34-61."
"knowing the Qurān by heart"), until, when the dawn of the blessed day of Friday should adorn with a veil of light the whole world (or "the Friday mosque"), that band of zealots according to the doctrine should carry on the battle of the holy war, and should flatten out his fortress for the Dēv, like prayer-mats in a row upon the face of the ground of a sanctuary, and enter that dēv-house with ranks of angels."

"Behold! About hair like fine hair."

"Kēsav Mal, when, through the curly hair (1) of the net of night he saw completely the soldiers more numerous than the hair on the venerable head of God, from terror of it, the hair on his body stood on end like a Hindu comb, and like hair that is twisted, he turned on himself and twisting (or,"being quick") he fell all together on the nape of the neck (or "re-treated"). He hastened until he arrived near the woolly Rāi; as soon as he had released the tooth of information upon his thick hair by the presence of the army, it was almost the case that the combs of the opinion of prudence were broken. Through his bereavement he (the Rāi) began to open out his hair."

"Again watch! About dēvs and fairies."(2)

"After that, he (Balāl) taught all the charms and magic that he knew to Bālak-dēv-nāyak, who was equal in devilishness and shrewdness to a hundred thousand dēvs, and sent him

Page 423 n.(2) It is of interest to note that according to Lane's Egyptians vol.1, p.107, the sword held before the niche during the sermon was of painted wood.

(1) It is of interest to note that Kēsava means "hairy-headed", and ُكَيْسَاء a head of hair.

(2) Besides "look!" ُلَانَكَ can also mean "cunning" and "the city", both of which fit the grammatical position better. But the grammar of these titles is odd.
towards the army of the Jamshīd-like Shāh. This shadow of the Household demanded a safe-conduct, and arrived before the Imperial Canopy. He requested for the sinner Balāl-Ī ṯēv his life and livelihood, and upon his tongue was the intention which he (Balāl) held in his heart: "I, Balāl-Ī ṯēv (otherwise, "Balāl-Ī ṯēv, the slave"), like Ladar-Ī ṯēv and Rām-Ī ṯēv, am submissive to the commands of the Jamshīd-like Shāh, and bow to whatever the Solomon of the age commands. If he make a signal to bring out fleet horses as large as devas, elephants like giants, or other valuables, behold - they are here ready! And if the object of the tumult is the destruction of these four walls, the walls can be removed from before you. The fortress is the fortress of the king - take it. (It is true) that I, Balāl-Ī ṯēv, have cast a few stones from the top of the fort, but God forbid that those stones of a dev should be able to damage men! Then, what can be better than that I should keep my stones to myself? Like the Hindus of Dēvgīr, I should not place my head in misery. A Hindu, after the burning, becomes a dev: as long as the flame of the Hindi sword of the Turk has not reached me it is not wise to make myself a dev (or,"to set myself up as a Dēva, i.e. a Rai"). Behold how many spirits of Hindu devas are twirling, having become whirlwinds, in the dust of the king army! They have given their lives to the wind out of disobedience to this dev-restraining Solomon, and inevitably after their death appear all of them to be earth-bound. If I, Balāl-Ī ṯēv, am a descendant of mighty devas, nevertheless I put aside all the devilishness which I had, before the minister with the counsel of Āṣaf, who is the transmitter of the commands of the court of
Solomon, and place my living body under the protection of the army that has the wings of angels, dense rank by rank, that are to aid on right and left flank, and, like a devil in Ramazān, submit my neck to the chain of obedience."

"Next about counsel and judgement"

"When the exalted minister heard the purport of the submissive message of the Rāi, even though the light of his intelligence had illumined perfectly the interior of the Rāi, in spite of that he pronounced the instruction of the Khalīfah of Islam: "Concerning the Rāi Balāl-dev and the other Rāis the command of the Imperial Court amounts to this: I am to hold the two-tongued candle of the creed commencing with Lā (Na) first of all before them; it may be that from the light of both they may find illumination by day and night. But if the curtain of destiny becomes an impediment before the gaze of their clearsightedness, so that they do not see that light, by order of the Rope of God I must make an offer of the yoke of the zimmah (tribute) upon the neck of their submission. If they are obstinate in rejecting this also, and are not able to pay the account, I will place no burden upon their necks, but will relieve their necks even of the burden of their heads. Which of these three conditions contents the Rāi Balāl-dev? We, too, together with the counsellors of the army will weigh (the matter) in that scale of realism: the answer must be weighed according to a well-balanced judgement. Thou also must weigh thy opinion in the balance of truth.""

"Next allusions right and straight as an arrow."

"The messengers of the Rāi, who were almost distrac-
ted by the arrow of this message, said from their broken spirits: "We are Hindu messengers (or "arrow-heads"), and these messages which are straighter than an arrow, since the Hindus have not a right faith (or "a straight quiver"), perhaps may suffer crookedness to enter them. In company with us straight-faced persons must also be sent, so that the message which leaps from the force of your arm may in any case pierce the interior of the Rai, so that your entire designs may be achieved.

To send such people offered only gain to the Malik, as he was contented without a shooting-contest; and he discharged along with the two or three travellers several chamberlains who were Hindu Barmārs, who were, like Turkish arrows, snakes with wings of dēvs, and of great strength. These messengers, through the strength of the arm of the one that had despatched them, flew like arrows (of "terribly") so that they passed through the fort in the twinkling of an eye, and commenced to wound the Rai with their tongues. The Rai, as if driven mad by the mere hearing of that gall-bladder-splitting noise, jumped up from his place and threw himself on the protection of paradise. Although he wished to say "Bravo!", a knot came into his tongue. It took long before the notch of his mouth was arranged. When to some extent his heart, which had been put to flight by that stroke of terror (or "the arrow"), had returned again to its place, like an arrow of submission, with hands folded stood up and said: "All the portions which from the grasp of Fate have fallen to the lot of me, Balāl, whether they be silent or articulate, all are at the service of the Court which has the protection of Heaven. I, Balāl, am also one of those who have
surrendered themselves. (1) In the morning, before the shooting-stars and their candle the moon have gone down, I shall keep with me not even a twisted (or "powerful") thread, besides the broken faith of the Hindus which is a wound-up thread, and the girdle of that faith which I wear on myself; and I will pay all tribute to the faith of Muhammad. And if by the scale of the zimmah every year they place all together the lot upon my neck, like an arrow I will bind up my loins and draw a knot upon my belly, and will satisfy the desires of the servants of the Court. By God, who has given such weight to the arrows of the warriors that they can outweigh the heavy hearts of the heathen, I shall not depart from this contract."

"Allusions to the bow and about bow-strings."

"The messengers, when they had mended the humility of the Rai, who was like a mere practice-bow through distraction, in the confidence that his distraction was quite durable, dragged him to his feet, and brought their tense bow before the Malik. He consigned to the archers of the army the offerings of the submission of the one who had suffered a warp, presents which were the subject of a 'bravo' (or "bow-string"). When it became clear to the Malik that that utter fanatic was content to be a sacrifice (that is "a devotee", otherwise "a bow-case") for himself, he laid aside the knot of anger from his brow and rested the bow of his rage in its rack." (2)

(1) This seems the only likely meaning of دهانگان.

(2) If انشلقيمي can mean a bow-case in which the bow is kept under tension. Otherwise we must render, "rested his bow that had been tortured in rage".
"In the morning when the day of Venus and the number of the month were bright from the middle of Sagittarius (or "the bow"), otherwise Friday and the sixth of the month, and a bright sky had covered its feet in light that bore the appearance of a net (?), the intermediaries coming hard behind, they who were like bows settling down crookedly but straight in speech, such as Bālak-dēv-nāyak (1) and Māin-dēv (2) and Jetmal and a group of some twenty others, came out with folded hands. They presented their tokens of submission before the exalted Canopy for their performance of obeisance, like bows that have discharged arrows, and made a speech of tasteful sound that flew from a bow-string; and said: "The Rai, who is straighter than the string of a bow, informs you in truth that he, the slave Bālāl, for the sake of his own safety, became more bent than a Hindui bow of shaven appearance, when he discovered that the Turks, wherever they see long nooks (or "notches"), draw the bow in season, and submits himself as one of the number of special dependants (3), before they put a string round his neck and take him within their grasp, and surrenders his person to all the many orders which they let fall, and will place in retirement the bow-bending archers of his fort.""

Amīr Khusrau proceeds to describe the elephants that Ballāla gave to Malik Naīb. The latter was supposed to have valued them as a means of conquering the "iron hills of Ma'bar". (4) He then speaks of the horses which Ballāla gave

---

(1) So B.M.Add 16,838 f.68a, but it is most interesting to observe that B.M.Or.1700 f.76b reads "danāyak" with the syllable "da" partly erased.
(2) B.M.Or.1700 reads Nārāyan-dēv, a very plausible, if not certainly the correct reading. Elliot agrees, p.29, Narain Deo.
(3) Text, p.151; Add.16,838 f.69a.
him on the Tuesday in wildly extravagant terms, following this description by the final account of Ballāla himself. "Allusions to things celestial".

"When the sun of a new day brightened over the horizon, Balāl-dēv the sun worshipper contemplated the rays of the sword of Islam over his head; prostrating himself he ran forth from his fortress (or "mansion"), came before the Canopy of God’s shadow, and wallowed in the dust of submission like a trembling lifeless shade. And he sunk the forehead of service in the ground of disgrace. After acquiring the light of good fortune, he passed back towards the mansion of his residence at a sign from the High Chamberlain, in order to fetch the pearly stars of his treasuries (1), and to bring forth his treasures and buried valuables. All night he hauled up the treasures which, like the Sun, he had plundered from the heart of the night, until the Hindu night cast out the treasure of the Sun from under the earth. He sent all the treasures like the Sun, on the heads of which dust had been cast by his hand, to the royal Court, with a gesture of reckless indifference (literally "casting out his skirt"), and they were handed over to the officers of the public treasury. He (Malik Na‘īb) spent a period of twelve days in that city, which for four months has (?) an area of four cities like it (or "is the arena of four moons"), (2) until the light cavalry of his forces which had remained behind had come up. Then the

(1) ? women.
elephants of Dhör-samundar he despatched to the court of the Khalifah with a gentle breeze, like the clouds which move towards the Qiblah on the east wind."

On Wednesday, the 18th of Shuwwāl Malik Nāib left for Ma'bar. Five days later he reached the frontier, where he used two passes called Talmalī and Tābar respectively. (1) It seems that they attacked and took a city called Mardi. (2) On Thursday the 5th of Zīl Qa'da they started from the river Kānūbārī (3) towards Bīrdhūl. (4) The Hindus made a stand there

(1) B.M.Add.16,838 f.71a. Text, p.155. Habib, p.95, reads Tarmalī and Tābar, and Elliot, p.90, has Sarmalī. B.M.Or.1700 has, on f.80a, Sharmalī. The names seem to represent Talaimalai and Tāvāre. There is a Talai at the foot of the hills in Hosur tāluqa, and the army is known to have chosen an unusual route. But the room for conjecture is almost infinite.

(2) B.M.Add.16,838 f.71b. Text, p.157. Elliot ignores this. It may be Marudippatti about twenty miles east of Dharmapuri. It certainly does not represent Madura.

(3) The corruption from Kāverī is easily traced. B.M.Or.1700 on f.81a reads Kānu Bārī; Add.16,838 f.71b reads Kānu Bārī, so also the Text, p.157. Elliot has Kānabārī, which is misleading, while Elliot has Kānabārī. The original must have been correctly Kānu Bārī.

(4) Bīrdhūl or Bīrdhōl is the reading of both the Mss, the printed Text and the translations. Abu'l Fidā in his Taqwīm ul Buldān (p.355) says that Biyyirdawal (or Biyyardawul) was then, the middle of the 14th century, the capital of Ma'bar. The Index by Mu'īn ud Dīn to the Nuzhat ul Khawātīr of the modern writer 'Abd al Ĥaiy shows Bihīrwal as a small village in Southern India in the province of Madras, and the map places it in the immediate neighbourhood of Kānci, which is impossible. From Khusrau's account it is clear that it was at some, but no great distance from Kannānūr, probably north of the Kāverī. It was probably not Srīrangam, which was in the Kāverī and may have been one of the "two cities" vacated by Vīra Paṇḍya in 1310-1, as well as the Patan which Khusrau mentions in the Duwal Rānī; it can not however be put aside completely. Though it is still open to conjecture, Krishnaswami Aiyangar's guess, Jayangonda-colapuram, or alternatively Gαŋgaikonda-colapuram, is very suitable. K. Aiyangar's statement that Bīrdhūl is equivalent to Vīra-Cola is very doubtful.
but the Rai, whom he calls the Rai of Raiis, otherwise Bir, fled first to Kandur and then to the forests. (1) A body of Muslims in the service of Bir deserted to Malik Naib. (2) The Muslim forces were much hampered by rains in their search for the Rai, who eventually fled back to Kandur, which was stormed and taken, but he escaped. His elephants to the number of 250 were captured at Barmatpuri (3) where the army went for the purpose. They also destroyed the golden temple there, of which a florid description is given. The army returned to Birdhul on Sunday, the eleventh of Zil Qa'd, and the temples of that place were destroyed. (4) On Thursday, the 15th Zil Qa'd, the army arrived from Birdhul at Kupam (5) arriving five days later at the

(1) B.M. Add. 16,838 f. 73b. Text, p. 161. B.M. Or. 1700 f. 83a. There is no dispute as to the reading of Kandur. It is Kannanur.

(2) These Muslim mercenaries are mentioned by Friar John of Monte Corvino in a letter dated 22nd December, 129(?3): Yule, Cathay and the way thither, vol. iii, p. 64.

(3) The printed Text, p. 169, has Barmatbari or Barmatpuri: B.M. Add. 16, 838 has the same; Or. 1700 has Elliot, p. 90, has Brahmapuri, which looks like a correction of the editor or translator. Krishnaswami Aiyangar says that it is equivalent to Brahmapuri, and that the place was Cidambaram. The identification is correct, as there were only three "golden temples" in Ma'bar: Tiruvannamalai, Cidambaram and Srirangam. The former was too far off, the latter too near for the troops to have made a considerable journey from Kannanur, and would not have elephants stabled near it on the island in the midst of land held by the enemy.

(4) B.M. Add 16, 838 f. 79a; Text, p. 173; Or. 1700 f. 89b. The two former read Birdhur, and the latter only Birdhul.

(5) The printed Text had Gim, but Add. 169838 f. 79a has Kim. Or. 1700 has, on f. 89b, Kham; so also Elliot, p. 91. Krishnaswami Aiyangar suggested that this was Ka'dambavanam, 60 miles from Cidambaram. But the obvious correction is Kupam: كاپي and كاپي. Kannanur was also a kuppam or koppa, but is referred to in this work as Kandur; so another Kuppam has to be found. The name is very common, and a fully satisfactory identification is difficult. That in Karur taluqa of the Trichinopoly district is far from impossible.
city of Mathrā,(1) the dwelling place of the Rāi's brother, Sundar Pandya. He, however, had fled, but two or three of his elephants were taken, and the temple of Jaganāṭ was burnt.(2) Altogether 512 elephants were taken by Malik Nāib. The return journey to the capital was commenced on Sunday, the 4th of Zil Hijjah, 710.(4)

Of the account of Amir Khusrau the principal characteristics are fidelity in detail and artificiality in the broad. Many references to the customs of the southern Hindus and the geography of the country bear witness to first-hand knowledge as the source of his book, and lend support to Badaoni's statement that Khusrau accompanied the expedition.

But the whole scheme of the work is directed to the praise of 'Alā'ud dīn on the one hand, and on the other to the display of Khusrau's own abilities as a writer of highly elaborate and artificial prose. Thus, not only may the facts be suspected of having been chosen with discretion, but the form in which they appear must be prevented from enhancing their real value or obscuring their real significance. Khusrau's story in fact amounts to no more than this: Malik Nāib's object was the looting of their wealth from the Rāis of Ma'bar, and incidentally to destroy the temples and to uphold Islam.

(1) So the printed Text, not following Add. 16,838 f.79a which reads Matharaha, which is read by Or.1700 f.39b also. It was the Pāndya capital Madura. The Mss. reading may be better.
(2) So the printed Text. Add. 16,838 has Chakanār and Or.1700 has Jakanār. It represents Jagannātha.
(3) The number is given clearly: पाचू और दो वारह. Text, p.174
(4) Text, p.180.
He reached Devagiri on the 4th of February 1311, and there received every support from the Marātha emperor, who was happy to assist him against Ballāla, and sent him forward recommending him to the guidance of Paraṣurāma-dēva, a Sēvuṇa dalavāi, who from his service in the south had special qualifications for advising Malik Nāib on the route through the country bordering on the Hoysala dominions. The Malik reached Paraṣurāma's territory eight days later, having completed a journey of about 150 miles at an almost incredible speed. It was while making a general reconnaissance at that point that he was informed of the murder of Maravarman Kulaśēkhara Pāṇḍya by Sundara Pāṇḍya, the movement of his brother Vīra-Pāṇḍya against Sundara, and the plans of Ballāla III to go southwards to take advantage of these events. This he chose as the right moment to attack Ballāla. With a picked body he pushed on and after twelve days journeying over rough ground, the last stages of which would be steeper and more difficult, reached Dōrasamudra on the 26th of February. Ballāla offered resistance for a short while, then asked the invader's terms; he was required to accept Islam or to pay the infidel tax, and to the latter he committed himself, and submitted to Malik Nāib unconditionally. After receiving Ballāla's elephants, horses and treasure, and remaining twelve days to gather and equip his forces - the period indicating that he ordered the remainder of his force to join him immediately he arrived at Dōrasamudra - Malik Nāib left on the 11th of March for Ma'bar, hoping to take it by surprise, to judge from his haste, as had been the case with the
Hoysala. There, however, he failed to capture either of the two Rāis, Vīra or Sundara Pāṇḍya, but took much booty and destroyed the temples of Cidambaram, and Bīrdhūl, which may be Gāṅgaikonda-colāpuram. After a visit to Madura he returned towards Delhi from Ma'bar on the 25th of April 1311.

So much we gather from Amir Khusrau. To this picture much may be added. 'Īsāmī, a writer who by his residence in the south was in a position to avail himself of local tradition, (1) and who being quite free from any obligation to the Khaljī dynasty had no reason to obscure certain important features in the story, relates the circumstances as follows: -

"Malik Nāʿīb's departure towards Ma'bar and the destruction of the golden temple under the guidance of Balāl-rāî of Dhōr-āamund."

"Another time, when the Shāh of Hindostan was free from troubles in respect of the infidels, he ordered every commander, together with his army, to make his way towards his own country. And after that he ordered the bold (2) Malik Nāʿīb, the obedient general, to drive his army against Balāl; he was to trample his country right under foot; from there he should move directly towards Ma'bar, and draw his single country-conquering sword, until he should take the entire realm of Ma'bar and receive the whole of it, together with his adviser. I have heard that in that land there is a temple, the fame of which is legendary through every quarter, built by the ancient Hindus who were of the truly genuine religion, (3) out of pure gold from

---

(1) C.A. Storey, Persian Literature, Sect. II p. 433, No. 612. The work was composed in 750/1349-50, dedicated to the first ruler of the Bahmani dynasty. The portion quoted extends from f.166a to 168b of I.0.3089.
(2) Reading ملک نابی راد ر; the suggested لار is not so accep-
summit to base: the edifice within was constructed (with) walls and doors, studded inside with brilliant pearls, and crowned outside with liquid rubies. It resembled the rose-garden of Shaddād of 'Ād,(1) and was a refuge and resort for that country. In appearance it was devoid of mortar or beams or bricks; in the judgement of the Hindus it was a dream of heaven. "In short, when thou comest, O exalted one, to that country, thou shalt first of all, empty-handed by reason of any plundering foray, destroy first that house of the devil", - for the destruction of the temple was (his) aim - "thou shouldst (then) take from there gold to thy fill: there are many with empty hands within the country. Thou wilt find many stern (2) ones in those regions: from that silver and gold thou must afford help to everyone. Next lead on thy army from that place, and direct thyself towards the house of the throne." I hear that the renowned Malik Nāib, when he heard the order of the Prince, led his army forthwith from the palace, and in one movement passed from Dēvagīr. And from there he arrived at the territory of Balāl, and utterly ravaged his border lands. They brought this news to Balāl: "The Turks are arrived with attack and retreat; the soldiers approach by the aid of devils; they are all bearing nooses and are able to throw down lions. They bring the dust from remote districts: they whole country has become a house of affliction!" I hear that when the Rāi heard this tale, he said to himself:

---

(1) Shaddād was an impious king, founder of the garden of Iram.

---

table, as no other instance of a Muslim officer bearing the title Rao is found in this period.
Page 435 n. (3) كه که بودن درو دین خور مستقیم; this curious remark is probably prompted by a desire to imitate Firdausi in a rhetorical flourish.
"This impetuous army destroys in whichever direction it gallops; as if in sport it breaks the ranks of the Hindus. Laddar-dēv (1), that Rāī, did not come out to war against this people, nor yet did the hundred thousands of Telang. Such was the case, in the cradle of Hindostan, with that Rāī, a Sun in glory, Rām-dēv, who was the sovereign in the country of the Marhattas, that he hardly saved his life by turning away from (the onslaught of) this people: he did not for long come out to war with this host, but presented his head in submission without delay. If it comes, but I turn away from (i.e. am uncooperative towards) this company, it will not change a single intention (?) as if the weight of a mountain. (2) Surely it is better that I should place my head in obedience, and make the best of the destruction which they are doing. With gold I will buy off my country, and drive away these sellers of peoples." (3)

"The next day, when the vault of calamity for the Rāī had removed the veil from the face of day, Balāl paid great homage with both Horses and jewels and elephants and goods. He departed towards the special deputy of the Shāh, and kissed his feet in the middle of the way. When the exalted Malik Naīb saw him, Malik Naīb that was vanquisher of his enemies and (withal) hospitable, he soothed him with a hundred inquiries and apologies and elevated him like those who wear turbans of rank. He accepted from him all his tokens of homage, and made him con-

---

(1) Reading for the Ms.'s Pratāpa Rudra.

(2) The reading is held to be "stern" through virtue or bravery, and not elephants.

Page 436 n. (3) could mean "bow-string".

Page 436 n. (2) I.0.3089 f.166b line 6. The reading is held to be "elephants."

'Ad was a probably mythical nation or place often identified with Iram, and destroyed by heavenly wrath.
tented with many promises. He gave a precious robe of honour to him, in graciousness and condescension with a sincere countenance,"

"The joining of Balāl, the Rāi of Dhūr-samund, with Malik Nāīb, and his guiding him to Ma'bar." (1)

"After a week that fortunate one said to him:

"O glory of the standards of Hindostan, when from thy heart and mind thou becomest our ally, may they heart and mind know our familiar society! Now listen, O glory of Hindustan: thus is the order of the Shāh of the World: that thou shouldst become an ally in accompanying the army, and shouldst beat the drum and go in the direction of Ma'bar; that no one of the people on the way should be aware of it, and the army should fall suddenly upon Ma'bar. Thou must guide the army of the Shāh on its way towards the black resort." (2) When these words reached the ear of Balāl, he saw no escape besides obedience. He accepted the command of the Shāh of the World, and for the sake of accompanying (Malik Nāīb) firmly bound his loins. On the following day the deputy of the Shāh caused the army to set out in the direction of Ma'bar."

Page 437 n. (2) f. 167a line 3: "there is some doubt whether the reading should not be "this idle, or erroneous, people".

Page 437 n. (3) Reading, f. 167a line 3: but there is some doubt whether the reading should not be "this idle, or erroneous, people".

(1) Read: بیستین بلال رای دهور سنگر برگ نایب مطلبی مکرزند

(2) There seems to be some corruption in the text: (f. 167a line 18), (or ?) کنی لشکر شاه را رهبری نیازگری سپری رازبیزی (سیاست) The last two words may have been copied in error from the preceding line.
"The making of apologies by Abājī Mughal to Malik Naīb in the territory of Ma'bar and his capture."

"I hear that when the fortunate Naib started out according to the order of the Shāh of the World, he took (with him) suitable men delegated (for the purpose) from the Court of that powerful emperor. Like Bahram of the Ass in the killing of the crocodile, like Mahmūd in pride with intelligence and guile, (1) a Mughal leader also, in his army, was obedient to him according to the command of the Shāh. Every day from chosen men belonging to that nation, whom the Shāh had appointed to go with the Naīb himself, one went on ahead for the sake of news: he brought information of all kinds both good and bad. He took with him a certain interpreter, who was skilled in all tongues. The perfidious man Abājī, on that day when his conversion took place, separated together with his army from the host: he produced a certain excuse, this faithless man. He said to himself: "I will go to the Rai of Ma'bar, and be agreed with him from my heart and soul. I will tell him the news of the armies of the Turks, and raise soldiers from that ill-fated land. I will make a night attack upon the armies of the Turks, and throw the head of the Shāh's deputy in the dust." And after that he called on that interpreter to move off from the army in company with him. He said to him, "O wise interpreter, - for all languages have their seat on thy tongue - to-day (we will be) with (16) sole guidance. (2) When the army of Ma'bar comes into sight, say to

(1) The rendering is tentative; f.167b line 7: ينكل جوهور سرئیه باهشگه هنک
(2) Reading, f.167b line 9: برخوازیان نجی مرجیون
(3) A tentative rendering of (ib, line 19): بکر اروس باایود رهبری
them in the style of Ma'bar: "This Turk is seeking your friendship. Lead him towards your ruler and tell your Rāi of his disposition." When Abājī had professed some excuse, he withdrew several parasangs of distance from the army. A commotion and tumult suddenly arose: a horde of Hindus caused it (coming out) from an ambush. At that moment an arrow from a Hindi bow struck the breast of the interpreter, and at the same instant the interpreter gave up his life, and destruction fell upon the army of Abājī. Then on the third day that worthless man, like one struck with amazement, joined the (main) army. When Malik Naib heard of this occurrence he seized him and dragged him, like thieves, on a rope. At any rate when the wise Malik Naib had put an end to the excuses of Abājī (1), he galloped from there to the fief of Ma'bar, and raised aloft the standards of Islam. He was going along happily with good fortune, and Balāl's loins were girt to guide him on the way. On the next day he arrived in the country of Ma'bar, by a route that no one at all observed. First he came to the golden temple, in order that the command of the emperor might be fulfilled. I hear that he destroyed the golden temple: an infinite amount of gold came into his hands. After that he ordered them to set fire (to it) and to dig up the walls from their foundations. When that man of energy was free from that work, he laid his hand on the quarters of the country. All the people from (all) quarters, from fear of the drums, had sought asylum.

(1) This appears to be the sense of (f.188a).
at Kōban and Bīrdhōl. (1) I hear that Ma'bar in those days was not within the grasp of a single prince. In it there were five persons who enforced commands: that group they call the Five Pandyas. (2) Born of one mother and one father, all five sought to please one another. When they saw that the Turk had lit up fires, and was burning together the land and the country and the temples, that the women and children were carried off, and peaceable folk were being vexed, they did not see themselves as leaders on the battle-field, and all five put their heads in flight. (3) The army galloped (on) in all righteousness, and their entire country fell into the hands of the Turks. A wise man knows that when an army comes suddenly into a country, the people of the army make acquisitions in that land, especially when they have experienced many toils on the way. I hear that in those days they attained their goal in the shape of elephants like mountains. They gathered them all (?) with the gold, and set out from there for Madrā. (4) The army drove towards the

(1) The text actually reads (f.168a line 17): - بناء جسست دركاليم و بيرد هول
Kōban must be Kannanūr.
(2) The text reads (f.168a line 19): - كه خواننر بني بنريه ان قوم ز
(3) It is of great interest to note that 'Iṣāmī believed in the "Five Pāṇḍyas" tradition, which has received such little credence amongst modern historians. We know that there were at least three Pāṇḍyas ruling together in 1309: Māravarman Kulaśekhara, Jātāvarman Sundara and Jātāvarman Vipla. Firishtah tells us that two Pāṇḍyas were interviewed by Malik Nāib; that then makes up the five. They may easily have been five in number during this period, under a single head, and a greater or smaller number at other times. Marco Polo who was in Ma'bar about 1290 repeatedly mentions the five brothers: Book III Ch.16(p.177-8 of Benedetto's text); Ch.17(p.180); Ch.18(p.187); Ch.21(p.195). Rashīd ud din (1247-1318) says (Jami ut Tawārikh,1.O.3524 f.375b;E. M. Add. 7628 f.381a; ib.18.878,f.118a) that Sundar Pandi had three brothers; "each had obtained overlordship over one part". This was Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II.
(4) There is a textual corruption here: the text actually reads Karā; but in shekastah مارا could be mistaken for
capital: day by day the way grew less. When it had seen many mountains and plains it turned its head towards Delhi."

"In short, when the exalted Malik Naïb arrived at the Presence with a hundred courtesies, he brought to the Shâh many elephants and valuables: to kiss the Shâh's foot he brought the Rai Balâl. The Shâh smiled like the rose of the dawn (i.e. the Sun) and gave a special robe of honour to Malik Naïb. The Shâh ordered that to the exalted Balâl, because he had been the guide in front of the army, they should give a parasol together with a special robe of honour, and should place an imperial turban on his head. To him he gave a gratuity of ten lakhs of tankahs, and, showing him honour, made him many promises. And after that he sent him back to his country and gave him his land and its produce as a free gift."

From this account we learn that Ballâla not only submitted to Malik Naïb but actually led him to the Tamil country, enabling him to arrive there in secrecy and to attack his own enemy Vîra-Pândya by surprise. Ballâla helped the Muslims to ravage the Kâvēri valley strip, and we are left to imagine whether or not he accompanied Malik Naïb to Madura. He appears by this account to have returned with Malik Naïb to Delhi, and there received his country from 'Alâ'ud dîn's hands as a gift. (1) 'Iṣâmi agrees that Malik Naïb stripped Ballâla of the greater part of his goods, and we can suppose that the Hoysala country's finances were put to a great additional strain in serving to supply and assist in the maintenance of

---

(1) Venkataramanayya, V. C. E. p. 11-12, forgot that there was a third course open to the Muslims besides allowing Ballâla to remain free and making him a prisoner of war. 'Amîr Khusrau ...
the Muslim army while on its way to and from the plains. These sacrifices Ballāla must have made the more readily because he anticipated sharing in the plunder obtained by his warlike and successful ally in the Pāṇḍya country. It is worthy of remark that ten lakhs of tankahs was just five times the yearly stipend of a Kāhan, that is, the highest rank in the service of the Sulānate, at the time of Muhammad bin Tughluq Shāh. (1)

To the invaluable information supplied by 'Īsāmī Wassāf again has material to add, and with that material he provides us with what are apparently his own or his informant's views on the facts. Wassāf did not, as far as we know, himself visit India, but it is clear that he had access to first-hand knowledge of events there. The part of his work from which the follow quotation and references are taken was completed in or soon after the year 713/1313, and thus the facts he narrates were quite fresh in the memory of his Indian contemporaries. (2)

It is to be remarked in the first place that Wassāf may not have enjoyed as clear a conception of the relative positions of Teliṅgāna, Dōrasamudra and the Tamil country as most of the Persian authorities. He is therefore not to be censured too severely for a less correct account of the campaigns of Malik Naīb Kāfūr than is seen in the pages of Khusrau or Barānī. This is doubtless the only explanation for his separate treatment of the conquest of Dōrasamudra and Ma'bar. He passes from a brief description of the conquest of Teliṅgāna in the year 709/1309 to an account of the campaign against Dōr-saman, as he calls

...does not even remotely suggest the capture of Ballāla." No, indeed: he says that Ballāla offered abject submission.

the realm of Ballâla III. (1)

"From that stage the army set out for Dîr-saman. The Rai at first (2) avoided the issue (3) and asked for support for his army from Ma'bar; when, after the slaying of their father, a dispute had arisen between the brothers Birah Pandah and Sundar Pandah, Birah Pandah had sent an army of foot and horse to the support of the Rai of Telang. (But) once again the Rai travelled the royal road of felicity and took possession of the realm of self-control. And the land and the realm, without and need of a battle being joined, was surrendered to the "And his temper became mild" (that is "to the angry one - Malik Naîb"), on the basis that the jizyah (poll-tax) should be paid and that a treasure should be sacrificed which the tongue of (the wildest) suppositions is incapable of recording." (4) These treasures included 55 fine elephants.

It is of considerable incidental interest to notice what Wâsâf has to tell further concerning the enmity between the two Pândya brothers, of which we heard something from Khusrâu, but which 'Isâmi ignored. These events clearly had a bearing on both the movements and policy of Ballâla and the success of his unwelcome ally, Malik Naîb.

Wâsâf states that the expedition for Ma'bar left Delhi in Rajab 710, that is December 1310, and that certain towns were captured there through the hostility that arose.

---

(1) This appears on p.527 of the printed text (Bombay 1853).
(2) Read راه بترا. Elliot wrongly translates (p.49): Râi Pandhâ (thus saddling Wâsâf with a serious error), though the printed text and also B.M. Add.23,517 concur in the reading shown here.
(3) اشتاط نور. (4) Elliot's translation is in many respects defective, but the omission of the mention of Telang, and the invention of a place 'Arikanna are the worst
between the two brothers, but that Malik Naib, whom he refers to as Malik Nabū, was forced to withdraw by the pressure of a large army attended by numerous elephants.

Of the hostility between the brothers he recounts as follows: Kulesh-dēvar, the ruler of Ma'bar, enjoyed a prosperous reign of more than forty years free from foreign invasion; there was an enormous mass of wealth in his treasury at Mardi; he had two sons, one, the elder, Sundar Bandī, who was legitimate, and the other, the younger, Birah Bandī, who was not. Birah Bandī was however chosen for his abilities as his father's successor. His brother Sundar Bandī, enraged at this supsession, killed his father towards the end of the year 709, that is, the spring of 1310 A.D., and had himself crowned in the city of Māravī. He conveyed some of the royal treasure there to the city of Mankūr and went there himself in state. Birah Bandī gave battle to him near a lake locally known as Balācī (1); both opponents fled, but Birah Bandī was wounded, and his equipment and treasure fell into the hands of Sundar Bandī. Alki-manār-barmāl, daughter (or grand-daughter) (2) of Kulesh-dēvar, assisted Birah Bandī with material and men, but nevertheless Sundar Bandī got possession of the army, country and treasures. During the year 710 (1310-1 A.D.) Birah Bandī launched an attack, and Sundar fled and sought the protection blemishes. The text in the latter case reads:-

the word being found in B.M.Add.23,517 f.434a, but not in the printed text. The use of Arabic quotations in either manner is common in Waggāf.

(1) It is highly likely that this represents the lake now known as the Pulicat Lake, north of Madras. The existence of a place Palacci requires to be investigated.
(2) No such princess is as yet known. It may be pointed out
of the hosts of 'Alā'ud din of Delhi, while Birah in turn
inherited the country and reigned independently. (1)

From this account we see that Maravarman Kulaśekhara
Pāṇḍya I was murdered by Sundara Pāṇḍya before the arrival of
Malik Nāib at Dūrasamudra, which was fairly clear already, and
in fact some months before he had even left Delhi for Ma'bar.
The arrival of that force from Delhi appeared, then, to offer
support for one party in the perennial rivalries in the Pāṇḍya
kingdom against the other. Doubtless Sundara's original intention
was to enlist the aid of Ballāla III, who was not only in
an excellent geographical position to attack Viṇa-Pāṇḍya, whose
headquarters we know from the Muslim accounts, and from the area
in which his inscriptions are found, to have been in the north,
but also had considered an invasion of the plain, and had actu-
ally attempted some such project. If, as can be believed, Viṇa-
Pāṇḍya occupied Kannanūr, Ballāla would have seemed to Sundara
a very promising ally, as the Hoysala king's first goal would
naturally be that city. Thus at the time of Malik Nāib's arrival
within Hoysala territory Ballāla was, as Khusrau tells us, on
the point of leading an expedition to take both Kannanūr and
Srīraṅgam and perhaps Gaṅgaikonda-cōlapuram or Jayangonda-cōla-
puram as well. Sundara must have regained control of Madura,
that it is odd that a Tamilian lady should have a name of which
two parts seem to kānār-perumāi, both clearly masculine. Per-
haps Waṣṣāf was misinformed as to the sex of the ally of Viṇa.

(1) Elliot and Dowson III p.52 ff. B.M.Add.23,517 f.435a-437b;
Bombay text p.528-9. The M's reads Bandī in this section; the
text Bandah. The latter reads Pirah occasionally. While both
read Mardī in the first instance, both read Māravi, which may
easily be a corruption for Mardāi, in the second. The city of
Mankūr (unidentified) is called by Elliot Mankūl, a likely var-
ant. The lake is called Ballājī in the M's and Tālājī by Elliot.
Both text and M's clearly give the erroneous date 700 for the
710 preserved in Elliot. Elliot omits the mention of the
for when in fact Ballāla and the Muslim army reached the plain, and the former was busily occupied in ravaging Vīra-Pāṇḍya's possessions in the old Hoysala tract beside the Kāvēri, the Muslim went to Madura and impartially plundered the other Pāṇḍya. (1) It is, moreover, of interest to note that Vīra-Pāṇḍya had in 1310 attempted to assist Pratāpa Rudra - and therefore, though Wassāf does not say so, was unwilling to risk another failure - and that Ballāla first considered asking his aid; but this may not be a correct interpretation of the facts.

It remains to quote Barani's account of the achievement of Malik Naīb Kāfūr in the south, to review the local records of the invasion, and to summarize the contributions offered by later historians.

Pāṇḍya princess's part in the war; mistakes the fate of Bīra Bandi, whom he wrongly calls Tīra Pandi; and wrongly translates "took refuge under the protection of 'Alā'ud din of Delhi", which has led scholars to suppose that Sundara Pāṇḍya embarked on the six months' journey to Delhi, while the text reads clearly: "درداس حائت لشكرات علائم البريد دلي اونيران"

On the question of the spelling of Vīra's name, Elliot has thrown doubt on the quality of Wassāf's source by upholding the bad reading Tīra by discovering the pun "tīra-bakht". This is however a case of , a sight-pun.

(1) N.K. Sastri, in his work on the Pāṇḍyas of Madura, is sceptical of the murder of Kulaśēkhara. He says, p.204, "neither Amir Khusrau nor Barni has anything to say about the murder". Of course, Khusrau not only says that Sundara murdered his father but hints that he murdered another person, possibly an uncle, as well. Sastri gives Jaṭāvarman Vīra-Pāṇḍya the accession date c1296, and Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya (?III) c 1303: A.R. 1915, 608 makes saka 1236 (A.D. 1314-5) his 12th year. If this be so, the resentment of Sundara was a matter of longer standing than Wassāf's account seems to suggest. Unfortunately A.R. 1906, 46 makes the 34th year of Kulaśēkhara equivalent to 1301 (I.A. xliiv p.198), and his records appear to range up to his 44th year (A.R. 1916, para. 30). This would be current in 1311, which causes a discrepancy of at least nine months, if he were murdered in
Barani's description proceeds as follows: -

"Then Sultân 'Alâ'ud dîn despatched Malik Nâib with well-equipped armies towards Dhôr-samundar and Ma'bar; and Malik Nâib and Khwâjah Hâji, the Muster-master, left the city, taking leave of the Sultân, and went through Râpri,(1) and collected their armies. They moved forward and stage by stage arrived at Dêvagîr. Râm-dév had gone to Hell. From Dêvagîr Malik Nâib by a forced march came to the frontier lands of Dhôr-samundar, and in the first very onslaught Balâl-dév, the Râî of Dhôr-samundar, fell into the hands of the army of Islam. Dhôr-samundar was captured and thirty-six elephants and all the treasures of Dhôr-samundar fell into their hands, and a despatch of victory reached Delhi. Malik Nâib led the army from Dhôr-samundar towards Ma'bar, and as they went conquered all of it, and caused the golden temples of Ma'bar to be destroyed, and broke the golden idols which had been the divinities of the Hindus of that land for centuries, and all the gold of the temple and the broken golden idols and incrustations beyond the limit of computation he placed among the treasures of the army. In the country of Ma'bar there were two Râîs: from both of the Râîs of Ma'bar he took all their elephants and treasure."

He continues to describe the booty with which Malik Nâib returned to Delhi in the early months of 711 (Summer 1311):

the spring of 1310. Such a discrepancy however, is of little moment, seeing the chaotic condition of the Pândya dynastic history, and the account given by Waqsâf is here upheld. A.R. 1916,106 may in fact belong to Maravarman Kulaśêkhara II.

(1) Râpri is in Shikohabad tahsil, Mainpuri district, United Provinces, where after his return from Ma'bar Malik Kâfür built an 'Idgah in 1311 A.D. E.I-M.1917-8, p.30, plate X(a).
312 elephants, 96,000 maunds of gold, and several chests of jewels and pearls and 20,000 horses. (1) It is of interest to note that the elephants taken from Ballāla is given as 36, against Wāṣṣāf’s 55.

There are three contemporary inscriptions which refer to Malik Naib Kāfūr’s attack upon the Hoysala country prior to Ballāla’s submission. The first is at Hosahalli in Honnallī tāluqa, very near the Malik’s route of approach to the Hoysala capital and seventy miles north of that city; the second is at Dudda, and the third at Belūr, both places close to the capital. The first, dated in the middle of February of the year Sādhāraṇa, mentions a movement in the direction of Dōrasamudra, the fighting of Bommaya-nāyaka, and the Turaka or Muslims, and records the death of a warrior in battle. (2) The second relates that while Vīra-Vallāla-dēvar was ruling, when the Turks came and attacked Dōrasamudra, a certain person fought to the admiration of both armies and fell. (3) This record is wrongly dated Saumya Māgha su 5 Sō, in other words Monday the fifth tithi of the bright half of the month Māgha of the year Saumya, which would correspond with a day in January 1310, which is very improbable. The record may not have been set up until

(1) Tarīkh-i Firōz Shāhī (text of 1862) p. 332-3; I.O.177 f. 215b; B.M.Or.2039 f. 165a; Bodleian, Elliot 352 f. 129b; B.M.Or.6376 f. 153b. Both I.O.177, B.M.Or.6376 and Or.2039 read:-

which shows that Rāmacandra was held by Baranī to have died at the very time that Malik Naib reached Devagiri, and is therefore a superior reading to that of the 1862 text. The first two Mss. likewise read .Delayai Rai Dūrisūnī indicating that the treasures were of the Rāi of Dhūr-samundar rather than of the place: this accords better with our other authorities and is to be preferred. B.M.Or.2039 omits the sentence on Balāl, while I.O.177 omits the name Balāl, reading

(2) E.C.VII Honnalli 116 (Feb.1311), K.T. only. Rice neglected this
well on into the year Virōdhikṛt, which began in March 1311, and the author had probably forgotten that the previous year was Sādhārāṇa and not Saumya. The date January-February accords well with Khusrau's date for the arrival of Malik Naīb at Dōrasamudra.

The third says that on Sunday the 14th lunar day of the bright half of Phālguna in the year Sādhārāṇa, that is, the 4th of March 1311, while Vīra-Ballāla-dēvarasa was ruling and the Turks "were about" (?) a certain warrior fought on horseback.(1)

There are no further Kannada records on the subject. As Ballāla abandoned the struggle within a week or ten days, it can be readily understood.

The later writers, with the exception of Fīrishtah, provide little that is of comparable value. Khwājah Nizām ud dīn Ahmad wrote of the expedition in 1592. His brief account tells that Rām-dev was only just dead when Malik Naīb arrived at Dēvagīr, but the story is in other respects in exact agreement with Baranī.(2) Yāḥyā bin Ahmad bin 'Abdullāh Sirhindī in 1428 ignored the Dōrasamudra campaign.(3) On the other hand Muḥammad valuabłe record. The dating in 1311 is certain, for neither of the other possible years, 1131, 1191, or even 1251, provide a suitable period for the information supplied.

Page 449 n.(3) E.C.V Hassan 51(1311): turakaru Dōrasamudrakṣacetī bandalli, etc.

(1) M.A.R.1936, 11(1311). The words Turukāyavāgidalu, which the editor fails to translate, could be a misreading for Turukār yāvāg idalu, "when the period of the Turks was". The editor's final remark is most inexact. He says,"Thus the present record belongs to the series of inscriptions (E.C.V Hassan 51, Arskere 31, etc.) which relate to the brave fight which the last Hoysala kings Ballāla III and Ballāla IV put up against the Mussalman invasions of the Khilji generals of Delhi." Apart from the fact that the fight was not a particularly brave one, being quickly
Bihamad Khani, writing in or about 1438, speaks of Malik Naib's many victories, and among them mentions Dhôr-samund and Ma'bar and the destruction of the idolaters' golden temples in the latter place. (1) Amin Ahmad Razi, writing in 1594, speaks of Malik Naib's attack on WârangaL and the taking of tribute from the Râis of Ma'bar, but neglects to mention Dhôr-samundar or the part played by Balâl. (2) In his Hâdiqat ul Aqâlim Murtaza Hussain, writing in 1788, tells not only of Malik Naib's dealings with Devagiri and Sânkara-dèva, the son of Râmacandra, but also of his campaign against Dhôr-samund and of his acquisitions from the Karnâtak. (3)

The two versions of Firîshlah, however, add many details that are omitted by contemporary writers: too great a divergence from the scheme adopted above, on the other hand, renders his statements suspect occasionally, and liable to rejection. Both versions are here reproduced in extenso to enable the whole account to be submitted to examination. The first, which we will call version A, generally known as the Gulshan i Ibrâhîmî, proceeds as follows:-(4)

"In the year 710, the king again sent Malik Naib and Khuwajah Hâji with a great army to reduce Dhôr-samundar and Ma'bar, whose temples were very rich in gold and jewels, and of which parts the Râis' treasury had great renown. Having reached

Page 450 n.(2) Tabaqât i Akbarî, Calcutta text (1927)p.167.
Storey, op.cit.p.433.
Page 450 n.(3) Tarîkh i Mubârak shâhî, Calcutta text(1931)p.78-
Storey, op.cit.p.512.

(1) Tarîkh i Muhammadi,B.M.0r.137 f.389a, where the reading is,
corruptly, Dhôr-mahand. (2) Haft Iqlim, I.O.49 f.160b-161a;
also I.O.3143. (3) & (4) over.
Dēvagir, they found that Ram-dēv was dead and that his son Sankul-dēv had succeeded him, but was not living in obedience and submission like his father. As caution dictated, they kept their head-quarters near the town of Jālnahpur (1) which is situated on the bank of the Ganges. (2) They went on and strove more than they had ever done in the slaughter of the infidels of Gurah. (3) With this juggling and diplomacy they proceeded.


(1) Both the Bombay text and B.M.Egerton 1,000 read something incomprehensible for Jālnahpur, in the first place appearing like Par, in the second Habar. The text of Kishor reads Jāltahpur. R.A.S.P.61 reads پنک حب which one would naturally transliterate "pattan", but Briggs curiously enough transliterates "Peitun", and says that it is on the Godavery, though his own specially collated text says clearly: جب کے براب کینک انسک Jalna is actually a short distance only from Dēvagiri-Daulatabad, being but 38 miles east of Aurangabad. It is near the Dudna river, a tributary of the Godavari.

(2) No town having the remotest connection with the dominions of Dēvagiri could be on the Ganges. See version B, p.455 below.

(3) The style of this passage is very incoherent and troublesome. The printed texts read کنهره Kanharah, but B.M.Add. 6569 has كهره, while Egerton 1,000 omits it altogether. One is very much tempted to read كری Karah or Garah, as in Masālik ul Absār fi Mumālik ul Amsār, Chapter 1, in Notices des Mss.Tome xiii (1838) p.151 ff., where that place is noted among the provinces ruled by Muhammad bin Tughluṭ Shah in 1333. It is noticed by Quatremère that Abulfẓāl in his Akbarnameh says it was on the bank of the Ganges; Waṣṣāf mentions it together with Oudh; it occurs in the Haft Aqālim; but was identical with "Gurrah" in Mālwa. However that may be, Gura on the left bank of the Penganga river, and only a short distance east of Jālna, seems to be the most likely place. Version B, however, arouses further considerations, and the matter is still open to fuller examination.
until, after three months, they arrived at the before-mentioned cities. (1) Having captured Bālāl-dēv, Rājah of the Karnātak, they ravaged his territory and smashed the temples. All the encrusted idols were captured. They built a small mosque of plaster and stone, and the Muhammadan call to prayer was recited there and the Khuṭbāh was read in the name of Ṭalā'ud dīn. This mosque exists at the time of writing in the region of Sēt-band-Rāmēsār, and it is known as the Ṭalā'ī mosque. (2) And from this it is clear that the port (or city) of Dhōr-samundār, which was on the shore of the sea of Umān has been destroyed at the present time by the water. (3) And some say that the infidels have preserved God's sanctuary and have not smashed that mosque, and others say that it is written in their books that those regions, nay, the whole inhabited earth will eventually belong to the kings of Islam, and for that reason their learned men will not give an order to smash it. And in any case, when Malik Nāīb had got possession of the treasures and wealth of the Rāīs of those regions he wished to return."

(1) Three months, we presume he means, after leaving Delhi. That is, of course, if the goal in question were the Hoysala country. If it were Mā'bar, then it could conceivably be three months from Dēvagiri, but we know from the contemporary authorities that the whole expedition was over in about three months after Malik Nāīb left Dēvagiri. بناءو means "ports" as well as "cities", but there is no occasion to translate it so here.

(2) Kishor's text wrongly reads رعسيرا. Both the Bombay text and Egerton 1,000 have the correct reading, but B.M.Add.6569 has the common corruption سبت بِن فراقِر. It stands, of course, for Sēt-bandha-(Tamil: banda)Rāmēsāram, an odd expression but clearly signifying the Rāmēsāram that is connected with the Sēt-bandha, or bridge ʻ�(Sētu) to Ceylon, i.e. the famous one.

(3) This nonsensical interruption of the account of the mosque is not to be found either in B.M.Add.6569 or Egerton 1,000. The absurd sentence may perhaps be traced to Khusrau's puns on the word Bīr, and to the fact that Dōrasādrā did lie between severa{l
"The night before his intended march, a quarrel arose among some Brahmans who had escaped the swordsmen and had taken refuge in his camp, over buried treasure which lay under those temples and of which a quantity had been removed and divided up. They began to shout, and one of the Muslims learning of this dispute communicated it to the Kōtwāl (or magistrate), who seized the Brahmans and carried them to Malik Kāfūr. Despite the tortures to which they were subjected they would not yield up those treasures, but pointed out six other lots of buried treasure which were in the open country. Malik Naīb took possession of those lots and loaded them onto elephants and set out for Ma'bar. And there too he smashed the temples and got possession of cash and jewels which had for several thousand years belonged to the Rās of those regions. He returned victorious and triumphant to Delhi, where he arrived in the year 711. He presented the Shāh with 312 elephants, 20,000 horses, 96 maunds of gold, which amounted almost to 10 crores of tankahs (1), several boxes of jewels and pearls not included in this reckoning and other precious effects - all he had passed before the Shāh in the 1,000 pillared hall at Sirī."

Before commenting on the quality of this account it is fitting to quote the later version, version B, known as the Nauras-nāmah. It relates (2) that Malik Naīb and Khwājah Ḥājī tanks. The destruction of the greater part of Dōrasamudra is not to be attributed to the water or, as others have thought, to the action of the Muslims, but to the Vijayanagara dynasty, which had no use for the Hoysaḷa capital after the first half-century of their rule. Neglect, and civil strife then finished off their work.

(1) The correct reading must be "96,000 maunds". If, as 'Isāmī says, Ballāla received 10 lakhs, then he was given 1% of the cash spoil.
(2) R.A.S.P. 65 f. 109a; R.A.S.P. 64 apparently f. 152b; R.A.S.P. 63
arrived at Dēvaḡīr and heard that Rām-dēv having obeyed the inescapable command of death, his son was ruling in his place. Accordingly they thought it necessary to stop at that place for a few days, and ascertained the true position with regard to the son of Rām-dēv. And when they learned that he was not like his father in straightforwardness and sincerity, as a precaution he (Malik Naib) put into confinement a few of the nobles at Jālnāpūr, that is to the east of Dēvaḡīr, and took (with him) for the sake both of security on the way and guidance on the route a number of the horse and foot of the Rāl of Gulbargah.(1) He set off for Dhōr-samundar and on the way he engaged himself to the utmost in killing the infidels of Gurah,(2) and did not spare himself in this business. and proceeded with this trickery and diplomacy until after three months reaching those aforementioned cities they pillaged that region and captured Balāl-dēv, Rājāh of the Karnātak. They broke the temples of that place, and all the idols encrusted and covered with gold were consumed. A little mosque of plaster and stone was built at some distance from the Hindu temples, and the Muhammadan call to prayer was recited there, and they read the Khūṭbah in the name of Sultaṅ 'Alā'ud dīn and at the present moment when my ambergris-perfumed pen is busy recording these events a mosque is still to be found in that heathen land at Sēt-band-Rāmēsar,(3) and is famous as the mosque of Sultaṅ

---

apparently f.95a; R.A.S.P.62 apparently f.86a (the pages of the last three are not numbered) -all four Ms were in the possession of Lt. Col. Briggs. I.O.1251 f.145b; I.O.2035* f.113b; I.O.2887 f.135b; and I.O.2425, 128a. These are all entitled to be called Nauras-nāmah (recession of 1609-10) contrary to the classification of Storey, op.cit.p.447 (Ethe 391-296). To this list may be added B.M.Add.6572 and Add.4940.

(1) Following I.O.2887 (Jālnāpūr), I.O.1251 and R.A.S.P.64; R.A.S.P.65 omits the passage about Jālnāpūr. R.A.S.P.62, on the
'Alā'ud dīn. And from this it may be deduced - the city (or "port") of Dhōr-samundar was at the edge of the lake (or "sea") in those parts, and at the present time it has been overwhelmed by the waters. Some say that the infidels of those regions have preserved God's house and have taken no steps to destroy it; others say it is written in the books of the infidels that these regions will eventually adhere to the Sultāns of Islam, and that the principles of the faith of Muḥammad will gain currency there. For this reason their learned men, who have great skill in astrology, have shown foresight in not issuing instructions for the destruction of that mosque. In any case, as is written in the "Appendices", when the building of that mosque was complete and the treasures of the Rās of those parts had been captured, Malik Nāīb determined to march from there and to go in the direction of Maʿbar. Suddenly, however, some of the Brahmins who had officiated in the temples and had escaped the sword of the Muslims, and were in the camp of Malik Nāīb, went at night to locate some treasure which was buried under those temples, and removed a quantity of it, but fell out over the division of it. In the dispute their voices rose so loud that

other hand, reads:

"For the sake of caution put into confinement some of the nobles of the outlying part that is now the city of Jālnahpūr and is to the east of Devagilr". I.O.2035* has another reading somewhat similar to this, with the same sense.

Gulbargah was almost certainly within the Sēvuna dominions, rather than those of the Kākatiya Pratapa-Rudrā, and could have been on Malik Nāīb's route towards Dhōr-samundar, though it would of necessity have lengthened the journey. Perhaps Saṅkara-deva deputed the rāja of Gulbarga to supply guides.

See version A, p.452 above. Note that R.A.S.P.63 very plausibly reads گُرْنَا تَلَّ، I.O.1251 has گُرْنَا تَلَّ, so also I.O.2035* I.O.2887 appears to read گُرْنَا تَلَّ. Do these various
some people in the camp learned of it and brought it to the ear of Malik Nāib. He seized the Brahmans and tried to discover the truth of the matter, but they all denied knowledge of it. But when they were put to torture, they produced that amount and even revealed the rest of the buried hoard. Malik Nāib, having digested this news, ordered that the cellars should be broken open, and the great treasure which they had put there brought forth and loaded upon the elephants which he had acquired in that same country. Then he set off with his victorious army for Ma'bar. The Raʾīs of that place were incapable of resistance and fled, and Malik Nāib performed a radical service for the temples there also (!), and got possession of several thousand years' collection of cash, jewels and valuables belonging to the citizens and merchants. He then sent an army after the Raʾīs of Ma'bar; they seized two Raʾīs, the cream of the Raʾīs of those places, and brought them before him. Malik Nāib said to them, "You know full well that as long as the treasures of your particular leader and the wealth of all the nobles of the land are not surrendered, there can be no prospect of your release. The best course is that you should give up the wealth and save your lives." This speech appeared reasonable to them, and they brought forth all the treasures and jewels of their store-houses without suffering any torture; moreover they obtained every gold piece which might be presumed to be in the

readings conceal the place Şīt bin ū Rāmūsar. Now known as Kumbhargaoon on the Bhima? Page 455 n.(3) The Mss. have the corruption Şīt bin ū Rāmūsar.
possessed of the people and surrendered it to Malik Naīb, thereby obtaining their release. And they were not content that there should be any shortcomings in the hospitality and entertainment they offered. Just as he had sent a despatch of victory over Dhōr-samundar to the Sultan previously, so now the Malik sent one concerning Ma'bar. On each occasion when the despatches were read in Delhi, drums of rejoicing were beaten according to custom; and Malik Naīb returned safe and victorious by the same road by which he went. They came to Jālnapūr and stayed there a short while, and he dismissed Balāl-dēv and that body of nobles of the Karnātak which he had taken along with him. (1) He arrived at the Court by way of Sultanpur (2) in the year 711; bringing to Delhi with him 312 elephants, 96,000 maunds of gold, sufficient for about 10 crores of tankas, and other items already mentioned.

Ignoring the many minor differences between the versions, we must acknowledge at once the value of the information contained only in version B. The remarks about the Rā's of Ma'bar and their subordination to a single superior harmonizes well with the other information we have obtained about this perplexing dynasty. That Ballāla accompanied Malik Naīb as far as Jālna is quite probable in itself, seeing that Ballāla would have enjoyed vastly a journey with his court through the territories of the prostrate Sēvuna, whom by himself he would never have been able to defeat; but unhappily this account conflicts

(1) Almost certainly the Sultanpur in the Shahada tālūga of the West Khandesh district, which held the name from 1306. It is to the north and west of Dēvagiri-Daulatabad.

(2)
with that of 'Isāmī, who understood Ballāla to have travelled the whole distance to Delhi. On the other hand, it is apparent from the two versions that Firishtah had but a feeble notion of the geography of the south of India, and allotted to the campaign against Dūrasamudra events which if they took place at all must have taken place in Ma'bar. A mosque at the southern Rāmāsvaram is indeed precisely what the Muslims at the Pāṇḍya courts would have wished Malik Naīb to construct. Again, it is doubtful whether Malik Naīb wasted any time at all on his journey towards Dūrasamudra, and since the chief characteristic of his movement was speed, he probably contented himself with the contents of Ballāla's jewel and specie treasuries without looting the temples. It is quite certain that no damage worthy of the name was done to the Hoysala temples at the capital or in any part of the country. As Ballāla was a useful ally and soon submitted, Malik Naīb's forebearance is easily understood.

'Isāmī's account fortunately enables us to conclude, not only why Ballāla submitted so readily to Malik Naīb, an action as sensible from the point of view of the weak state of the Hoysala country as it was in accord with his own futile schemes of reconquest of the Kāvēri districts, but also that with the Muslim's aid he actually effected some considerable parts of his plans with regard to the old Hoysala principality of Kāmpanūr.

As to his movements after April 1311, the accounts of Firishtah and 'Isāmī must be harmonized with an inscription of 1313 as well as with each other. The record at Kūdli in the
modern Shimoga taluqa, a place which must then have been on
the frontier between the Hoysala and the Sevuna dominions,
states that when Hoyisana Vīra-Ballāla-dēvarasa was carrying
on a pleasant government, after the war with the Muslims was
over, on the occasion of his son Vīra-Ballāla-rāya entering
the city (while returning) from Delhi, he made a grant to the
god Rāmahātha of Kūdali on the 10th tithi of the bright half
of Jyēṣṭha of the year Pramādi, which corresponds to a day in
June 1313. His son, Vīra-Ballāla, must have left Delhi at the
end of March 1313 at the latest, and it is likely that he left
Dōrasamudra for the Sultān's court in October 1312. The sequence
of events was probably as follows: Ballāla III accompanied
Malik Naib as far as Jālna, so as to be able to respect to the
Sultān, claim his gratitude, and insult the Sevuna ruler of
Dēragiri at the same time; he returned to Dōrasamudra during
the month of August 1311, having promised to send his son to
Delhi to receive the Sultān's gifts and to present homage on
his behalf. The following year he fulfilled his promise, and his
son Ballāla went to Delhi, and was welcomed by his father at
the frontier on his return. 'Isāmi, who wrote nearly forty years
later, was probably not in a position to distinguish between
Ballāla III and Vīra-Ballāla-rāya his son, and it was of no
importance to him whether the latter made obeisance to 'Alā'ud
dīn in 1311 or 1312.(2)

(1) E.C.VII Shimoga 68(1313): Turaka-vigrah Ādalli Dīlyinda
makkalu Vīra-Ballāla-rāya Paṭṭana-pravēṣa māḍuv avasaradalli, etc.
(2) Whether this interpretation be true or false, the dogmatic
statement of Venḵataramanayya, V.C.Ep.13, that "there is no
ground for the belief that he was taken to Delhi", is unjust-
ified as far as concerns Ballāla III.
After the disgraceful proceedings of 1311 no inscription of Ballāla appears bearing his full titles until 1313; moreover from this period we find an increasing number of records in the name of daṇḍanāyakas and sāmantas normally subordinates of Ballāla III.

Proof of reviving Hoysala power in the southern plains is found in a record of rather doubtful authenticity at Sevūr in the modern Avanasi tāluqa, quite thirty miles west of the Kāveri in land that may have belonged to Rāmanātha.

But until 1315 no activity of any importance seems to have been undertaken by the new recruit among the dependants of the Sultān of Delhi. In this year Ballāla commenced using regularly the title Visnuvardhana, doubtless in order to attempt to improve his standing in the eyes of his people. (2) He is said in a record of March-April 1315 to be ruling the kingdom in fair peace. (3) The same inscription speaks of Mādhava-daṇḍāyaka, son of Perumāle-daṇḍāyaka, a favoured subordinate of Ballāla III, who ruled a large fief in the south of Mysore district from Terakanāmbi, and bore the titles "ruiner of the face of the Pāṇḍya pāḍi, elephant to the lotus pond the Pāṇḍya forces," titles probably gained in 1311. That Ballāla was in difficulties is shown by a grant for his success made in August of that year. (4) It is odd that Ballāla is still called "upholder of the Pāṇḍya-kingdom", and still more odd that he is called

---

(1) V.R.I p.524, Coimb.44, quoting "Ins.S.dts.p.42.No.1" (1312, dated śaka 1233).
(2) E.C.IX Magadi 15(1315), E.C.IV Gundlupet 58(1315).
(3) E.C.IV Gundlupet 58(1315): sarūpa-sukhadim: not "apparent peace" as Rice.
(4) E.C.IX Hoskote 159(1315): Vīra-Vallāla-nanrāga.
"Sun of the Pallavas" and "Pallava Śiva", unless the former be a mere traditional and conventional usage, and the latter be due to some ancestral connection with the Pallava family. (1) But we can believe that a state of warfare between the Hoysala and Vīra-Pāṇḍya continued for long after the departure of Malik Naib. Rashā ud dīn in his Jāmi ut Tawārīkhp says that there was another country besides Ma'bar called Dēvagīr, adjoining Ma'bar inland, the king of which was at constant enmity with the Dēvar of Ma'bar. Its capital was Dōrōsamundūr! (2)

We learn that in April 1316 Ballāla III was living in Dōrasamudra, having built a residence there. (3) It is possible that it was only then that the damage caused by the first onslaught of the Muslims was repaired. (4) Ballāla did not, however, remain in his capital for long. By September 1317 he was residing at Arunasamudra, otherwise known as Arunasamudra-Ballāla-paṭṭana. This town has not as yet been identified, but was clearly in a position of easy access to both the Kāvēri districts and the Hoysala nād, and may well have been in the Kāvēri valley itself. In September 1317 he had just experienced a battle, which must have been against Vīra-Pāṇḍya's forces, while on his way to Arunasamudra from Kaṇṇanūr. (5) He was still at Arūsamudra in February 1318, and fighting continued. (6)

(1) E.C.IV Gundlupet 58(1315): Pallavāditya Pallava-Trinētra; correct to this the corrupt reading of E.C.III Malavalli 12(1317).
(2) Jāmi ut Tawārīkh, IQ.3524 f.376a. Elliot & Dowson, I p.73.
(3) E.C.III Mandya 100(1316): Dōrasamudradolu nelebidam kaṭṭi.
(4) Sewell, H.I.S.I. p.180 says Ballāla had ruled from Belūr or Honnūr since Malik Kafūr's destruction of Dōrasamudra. Quite incorrect alternatives following from an incorrect assumption.
(5) E.C.XII Chiknayakanhalli 4(1317).
(6) M.A.R.1915-6, para.91, revised by M.A.R.1932,8(1318).
He was still there in November, but, affairs having probably turned out to his advantage, left for Dōrasamudra where he arrived just over three weeks later. (1)

The most likely cause for his return seems to have been pressure from the west: his own preoccupation in the south-east, at a time when the condition of his kingdom was so unsettled and the resources of both his army and his treasury were so feeble, seems to have encouraged an incursion from the coastal districts into Sāntara territory or through the passes by way of Kalaśa or similar posts. It is worth while noticing that the defeat of 1311 had not altered Ballāla’s hold over the Sāntara country: he held Hosagunda still. (2) Bāiceya-daṇḍayaka’s brother-in-law Saṅkhyya-sañhāni marched, in January 1319, against Basava-dēva of Candāvūr below the ghats, destroyed that place and marched to Muṭṭa... where he fought. The Tuluvas were destroyed, says the record. (3) Neither of the places can be found, but Ballāla’s subsequent interest in the Ālupa or Tuluva country may have originated in this clash on his western boundary.

Meanwhile, as if Ballāla’s interests and energies were not already sufficiently dissipated, in 1320 a new field for activity was opened up. The effect upon the Sevuna kingdom of Malik Nāib’s campaigns had been as destructive as upon the Hoysala country. The death of ‘Alā’ud dīn had brought a short respite, but the general condition of the country was weak, and opportunities clearly arose for ambitious leaders to vindicate

(1) E.C.IX Channapatna 73(1318); M.A.R.1922, para.41b, E.C.IX Kankanhalli-68(1318).
(2) E.C.VIII Sagar 135(1320).
(3) E.C.VII Homnali 117(1319).
their independence. The son of Mummudi Śiṅgeya-nāyaka, Kampiladeva, about whom we have already gathered much information, consolidated the principality of Kampili into an independent state, whose paltry natural resources were to be augmented by conquest in the lands beyond the vast and well forested mountain ranges that formed the strongholds of the ruler. (1) The land south of the Tūṅgabhadra naturally attracted his close attention, and he soon trespassed from his headquarters at Kampili, or as the Muslims called it, Kampilah, upon territories to which Ballāla had a claim.

Kampila's own realm consisted of Kampili, Doravadi, Hampe, Hosapet and Kummaṭa, which lay in the mountains, with Hosamale near it, to the north of the Tūṅgabhadra. This latter area had been the object of a "hunting expedition" of Malik Naib Kāfūr, who had destroyed the neighbourhood of Kummaṭa in or about 1314. (2) Kampila seems to have recovered comparatively swiftly from this raid, and to have recommenced aggression.

In April 1320, assisted by Kōṭi-nāyaka, perhaps the son of the famous enemy of that name of twenty years before, Ballāla marched against Ka[m] pila-dēva, met him, apparently, and then, leaving him behind at Balaha, marched on to Doravadi and there fought a battle, remaining on the field as the victor. (3) As a result some sort of compromise must have been arrived at. To keep a close watch on the north-east Ballāla occupied the valuable post of Penugonda, and there in September 1320 Aliya Māceya-daṇṇayaka ruled on his behalf. There he was attacked

---

(1) Much interesting, if not altogether trustworthy, information about Kampila is found in the Parṇāriyarige Sahodarenbantha Kathe of Nagaśāṅgayya quoted by H. Sreenivassa Jois in his article on Kumāra Rāma in Q.J.M.S. xxxii. 1941 p. 58 ff. Concerning his son Rāma much legendary material exists here, and in the Kumāra
by the manneya of Mēlumāvu, and a cavalry battle ensued. (1)

Ballāla's various commitments required further movement. In July 1321 he was back in Arunāsamudra. (2) In that year a certain nāyaka who called himself "destroyer of the Turaka army", and must therefore have been of unusual boldness, thought it necessary to make a religious grant for victory to the sword and arm of Ballāla. (3)

Soon afterwards or within a few months of his residence at Arunāsamudra Ballāla was at Pudu-pādaś-vīdu. (4) In January 1322 he went through Hariharpura in the south of his dominions in the Hoysala nād and visited the agrahāra and the dam there. (5) He may have been on his way towards the Tamil country, but this is not certain. Singeya-dannāyaka, son of the Sōmeya-dannāyaka who was Ballāla and died. III's brother-in-law, took part in the battle between Vīra-Pāṇḍya, who still ruled at Kaṇṇanūr, on whose side he in fact fought, and his son Samudra Pāṇḍya and Paraka Pāṇḍya on the other. Vīra-Pāṇḍya was defeated in this battle, and Ballāla's sorrow at the misfortune of his relative must have been amply counterbalanced by the downfall of Vīra-Pāṇḍya. (6)

Ramana Sangatya of Ganga, vide Q.J.M.S. for Oct. 1929, and the Parādara Sodara Ramana Kathe in M.A.R.1929, p.26-47, also Q.J.M. xx, 1930 p. 89-106, 201-211. The Huliyar nād is mentioned as an object of Rāma's attack. That Ballāla attacked Kampila and Rāma in alliance with the Muslims in very unlikely according to the facts shown by the present writer, although not in itself impossible.

Page 464 n. (2) 'Iṣāmī, Futūn us Salātīn, 1.0.5089 f.188b. Malik Naib stayed at Kummata for one week, while he had his head-quarters at Dēvagiri.

Page 464 n. (3) E.C. VIII Nagar 19(1320). Balaha is unidentified.

(1) S.T.I.X pt.1.354,A.R.1917,722(1320) at Sirivara, Hindupur
(2) E.C.IX Gundlupet 69(1321).
(3) M.A.R.1909-10 para. 85(1321) at Sitibetta.
(4) E.C.X Kolar 173(1321).
(5) E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 44(1322)
Ballāla's restless spirit soon engaged him in another adventure, as fruitless and misguided as any that he had so far attempted. In December 1322 he was in Unāmale(sic), that is to say TiruvaṉṆāmalai.(1)

TiruvaṉṆāmalai had been visited once before by a Hoysala ruler, but had never been occupied for any length of time as a royal residence. When Nārasimha II was there, he was clearly on his travels in the Tamil country, and the town was merely on his route. A glance at the map will show the significance of Ballāla's movement. In 1322 he commenced to use TiruvaṉṆāmalai as his most favoured head-quarters after Dōrasamudra. In so doing he confirmed his intention of deriving regular profit from the plains, however much that policy had cost his family in the past. The famous place of pilgrimage lay at the point where the valleys of the Cheyyār and Ponnāyār rivers diverged, providing a broad plain, dotted with occasional hills, to which easy access might be had by way of the valleys themselves, either from the north by way of Tiruppatūr from Madivāla and the Kolar plain, or from the west by way of Kam-bayanallūr from Bairamaṅgalam, Bānnerghaṭṭa and the modern Bangalore district. At Ānnāmalai, as the town was, and still is, more often known, Ballāla was in close contact with the Kundāṇi kingdom and so with the eastern parts of the Hoysaḷa rāy, in the widest sense of that term, with which parts in particular his relations were good, having improved steadily since 1301.

Occasional feuds between the Tamilian rāy-āḷvas, and occasional

(1)E.C.IV Gundalupet 85(1322) The solar eclipse dates it certainly 9th December 1322.
acts of insubordination amongst them, do not remove the impression that the greater part of the modern Bangalore and Kolar districts were in this period loyal to Ballāla.

At Anṇāmalai, however, Ballāla was not able to keep a close watch over developments in the north or even in the hill districts of the west. Nor was he so closely connected with his fief on the west of the Kāveri and to the south of the ghats. He must have chosen this spot because of its convenient communications with every part of the plains, and the reason why he deserted Kaṇṇanūr and the Kāveri valley for this northern post can be explained by a brief consideration of the political structure of the Cōla-Pāṇḍya country in 1322.

First of all, one must confirm, emphatically, the opinion of Nilakantha Sastri that no Muslim garrison was left at Madura. (1) There was therefore no foreign element to complicate the already difficult situation. Vīra-Pāṇḍya and Sundara Pāṇḍya had lived on, had continued their feud, had been defeated separately by Ravivarmaṇa Kulaśekhara, the Cēra king, who was able in 1315 to reach Kāñci, at a distance of little less than four hundred miles from his home, and had, as we have seen, bequeathed their fratricidal strife to another generation. (2) No sooner had the Malabāri left the northern Tamil districts than Pratāpa Rudra of Wārangal, otherwise ḍēkaśīlanāgarī, sent his general Muppidi-nāyaka to take Kāñci, (3) and indeed it is by no means certain that the Kākatīya did not drive Ravivarmaṇa out of it.

(2) Ravivarmaṇa Kulaśekhara's successes are recorded in A.R.1900 para.15; E.I.IV p.146, at Cidambaram; A.R.1911,34. Also see A.R. 1908,54(1314), ib.1903,34(1313)=E.I.viii p.8;A.R.1890,34; and A.R.1891,46, which is at Srīraṅgam. (3) E.I.vii p.128(1316).
Kānci, however, seemed to be the limit of Pratāpa Rudra's ambitions, and there was no fear that he would move south of the Pāḷār river. The Telugu Cōḍa family of Nellore had been crushed by the famous Sundara Pāṇḍya in 1257, and likewise Köpperunjiṅga the Kāḷava. The Adigaimān and the Bāṇa had been dormant for long, and the Hoysala was no longer a persona grata in the Kāvēri valley, as he was either unwilling or unable to take sides effectively in the Pāṇḍya family quarrels, which remained the only excuse for his presence. (1) Thus Tiruvannāmalai was a convenient point from which one might explore this new field of activity, and attempt to fill a new vacuum. A strong Hoysala ruler would have been able, had he wished, to take a most profitable advantage of the circumstances: Ballāla made the attempt, but too feebly and about five years too late.

From the point of view of the attack of Ulugh Khān, son of Ghīyās ud din Tughluq, upon Wārahgal, Ballāla's move was timely but a certain Venrumāṅkonda Sambuvaraiyan, who called himself "emperor of the entire world", had set himself up as a ruler already in the very same area. We may guess too that an additional recommendation for the place was its comparative safety from further Muslim visitations: where fear was one of the motives, no great success could be expected of the enterprise. (2)

In the same year further evidence of Ballāla's rule in the fief to the west of the Kāvēri is found. Inscriptions are at Perūr, Sēvūr, Vijayamaṅgalam, and Avanāsī. (3) In 1323 a record of Ballāla's appears at Daṇāyakanṅkottai. (4)

---

(1) It appears that Māravarman Kulaśēkhara Pāṇḍya II, Jāṭāvarman Vira-Pāṇḍya and Jāṭāvarman Parākrama Pāṇḍya were ruling at this time.

(2) This would in any case have been vain, for Khusrau Khān
In 1324 Aliya Mēcēya-daṇṇāyaka, Ballāla’s lieuten-
ant at Penukonda, was again in difficulties, but was victorious
in battle. (1) He was still ruling at Penukonda in 1328 despite
the events of 1325-1327, and we may judge from this fact that
Ballāla managed to handle the double difficulty with sufficient
success. (2)

The first embarrassment originated with an old rival
Kampila-dēva of Kampili. An inscription at Kaḍasūr dated in
July-August 1325 tells us that while Ballāla III was ruling at
<Dōra> samudra, and the ministers Beceya-daṇṇāyaka and Sīngeya-
daṇṇāyaka were governing the district, the great samanta the
Kukula-nād-ālva, that is, the ruler of the Kukula or Kukkala-nād,
which lay due east of that district, engaged in combat with
some one; Becaya-daṇṇāyaka took part in a battle in which Kam-
pila-dēva confronted both the daṇṇāyakas. (3) It may be gathered
that Kampila-dēva made an attack upon the north-eastern parts
of the Hoysala nād and the local governors joined forces to
repel it. Ballāla had meanwhile moved to Dōrasamudra to direct
operations. An inscription of the following month, that is per-
haps the end of August 1325, tells how Bebeya-daṇṇāyaka, min-
ister of Ballāla-dēvarasa granted a nattaru-gōḍagi, or "blood-
grant", to the brother of a certain warrior who fell when Bebeya
attacked Kambala (i.e. Kampila)-dēva, who had smitten Huliyera

---

Page 468 n. (4) A.R.1906, 444 and (1907) p. 80.

(3) over.
and was departing. The battle took place in front of Molala.
Thus Kampila had made a raid across a wide area of land against one of the most important Hoysala towns in the north. An undated inscription at Kudli gives further information about Ballāla's dealings with Kampila, and it may safely be assigned to 1325. Ballāla had marched against Kampila-dēva, who bore various titles including gāḍa-gēva, miseyara-gāḍa and Pīngali-rāya-rakhamāḍaka, and was on the point of seizing all his property, and had actually reached Siruguppe, which must have been near the northern limits of the Kampili dominions, when Kampila, learning of this, attacked Ballāla and fought "so as to win the praise of the whole world". Ballāla was present at the battle, and a certain Bembeya-danmāyaka, probably he who was mentioned before as Bebeya, came and promised to perform a feat. It is plain that the Hoysala got the better of Kampila, but later developments show that an agreement or non-aggression pact was entered into between them. (1)

Hardly had Ballāla succeeded in dealing with this menace when he was once again forced into contact with the Sultan of Delhi. He had, no doubt, eleven years before, received with mixed feelings the news of the ravaging of Kampila's kingdom by Malik Naib. His dealing subsequently with Mubarak Shāh, it is fairly clear, had been formal, and there is no proof either that he remitted tribute to Delhi, or that he received a Muslim garrison within his dominions, as Firighatāh says.

Page 469 n. (3) E.C.XII Tiptur 24(1325). The record is extensively damaged. Rice unnecessarily supposes that Kampila was pierced and slain. It is open to question whether the name Beceya should not be read Baiceya, Bebeya, Bembeya, or even Beceya.

(1) E.C.XI Hiriyur 16(1325), misdated by Rice 1205; likewise Hiriyur 18 should be dated 1328 instead of 1208. (2) over.
This time the ruler was Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shah, the former Ulugh Khan son of Ghiyās ud dīn, a man of exceptional energy, and the object of about equally enthusiastic praise and blame in his own day as at present. Bāllāla took the same view of his relations with the Muslims of Delhi as in 1311, and once again refused to endanger his life or security, even though in this case the disgrace incurred may appear much greater.

We learn from Badāonī that towards the end of the year 727/1326-7 Malik Bahādur Gurshāsp revolted. (1) Sirhindī tells us that he was 'Ariz i Lashkar, or Inspector-general of the Forces. He continues: "Khwāja i Jāhān was sent against him with victorious troops, in order to ward off his evil intention; on his arrival at his destination the aforesaid Bahādur opposed him with a proportion of his forces, and joined battle. Losing the day, he was put to flight and made prisoner by the Hindus. They brought him alive to the Court, where he was punished." (2)

To this laconic account contemporary writers add much of interest. Ibn Battūtah tells us that Bahā ud dīn Gush-tāsp, as he calls him, was a cousin of Muḥammad bin Tughluq, and governor of a province under Ghiyās ud dīn. (3) He refused to swear allegiance to Muḥammad, and so was attacked by an army sent by the latter under Khwāja Jāhān. Defeated, Bahā ud dīn fled to a Hindu Rāi named Kanbīlāh, or rather, as Ibn Battūtah explains, Rāi of the country called Kanbīlāh. The Rāi owned

Page 470 n. (2) Firishtah, Bombay Text (1831) p.220-1. "He placed thanas (i.e. police-posts) at, or in, Gulbarga, Sāghar and Dhōrsamundār." RīĀ?S?P.65 f.122a-b reads

which shows that the author imagined that Kampūlah(Kampilli) also was the quarters of a thāna. But there is no evidence to support the statement. In 1318-9 activity both in the Hoysala and the Kampili domains belies such an unnecessary intrusion.

(1) Muntakhab ut Tawārīkh p.226-7. (2) Calcutta text, p.99. Basu's translation is defective here. (3) Firishtah says that he was governor of
lands situated amongst inaccessible mountains and was one of
the principal kings among the unbelievers; things went hard
for this Rai, as his supplies were in danger of being exhausted,
and so he decided to perish in battle, while the female members
of his family committed sati. Ibn Battūta explains at length
how this was done, but tells how before the impressive ordeal
the Rai told the fugitive to go to a certain king, naming a
Hindu prince, and stay with him, for "he will defend you". He
sent someone with him to conduct him to this Hindu sovereign.
After this the Rai and his followers died in battle, the city
was taken, and the eleven sons of the Rai of Kanbilah were brought
to the Sultan and "made Muslims". They were made generals and
held in high esteem, and one in particular was an intimate
friend of Ibn Battūta himself. After the death of the Rai of
Kanbilah the troops of the Sultan turned towards the country of
the unbeliever to whom Baha ud din had fled for refuge, and
encircled it. The prince said, "I can not do like king Kanbilah;"
and seized Baha ud din and handed him over to the Sultan's
army. Details of his horrid end follow. (1)

It is easy to recognize in this little drama Kampiladeva and his old enemy Ballāla, both clearly hostile to the
Sultan of Delhi, but the former immeasurably more courageous
than the latter. 'Isāmī has some further details to add. He also
he was governor of Sāgar (otherwise Sāghar). Hence his familiarity with Kampiladeva. Cf. Mahdi Husain, p. 143-4.

(1) Defremery and Sanguinetti, vol. iii p. 318-322. Ferishtah's account is similar except that she omits to mention Kampila's fate. The Rajah of Kanbilah had twice defeated Khwajah Jahān before he was beaten. Ballāl feared the pursuit of the armies of Islam, seized Gursāsp and sent him to Khwajah Jahān, and counted himself one of the well-wishers of the king:
Bombay Text, p. 241;
B.M. 6569 f. 151b.
calls the rebel Bahā' ud dīn Gurchāsp. The revolt was of so serious a nature that when he fled with his army to Kampilah, as 'Īṣāmī calls the place, Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shāh came himself to Dēvagiri-Daulatabād, and sent an expedition against Kampilah. It appears that Kampiladēva and the Muslim fugitive moved from Kampilī, which we know was an exposed spot, to Kummatā in the mountains on the further side of the Tungabhadra, about 22 miles from Kampilī. From there they were driven to Hosadurg, otherwise Hosamale-durga, which was on the same mass, and it was there that they stood the final siege. The fall of Kampilā must have been a bitter blow to Hindu schemes for the revival of self-government in the Tungabhadra region. Kannāḍa verses at Lakshmēswar (Hulikērē) state that people mourned over the death of Kampilā and Sīdilā-Bōmma, mentioning Dillī (Delhi).(2) Of Bahā' ud dīn's fate 'Īṣāmī then says:

"Bahā' ud dīn's flight from Hosadurg to the territory of Dhōr-samund, and his capture."

"I hear that when Gurshāsp with few horses and goods arrived in flight in the territory of Balāl, the stars and Fortune turned their faces away from him: grief and pain alone overtook him. Balāl took him with guile and deceit, except that on his brow appeared the abode of reproof. He sent him back to Malik-zādah, did that feeble Hindu, with a hundred deliberations; Malik-zādah placed him in heavy fetters and sent him to the Shāh of the World." It is unnecessary to continue with the description of Gurshāsp's sufferings, in the narration of which Ibn Battūtah and 'Īṣāmī are sufficiently

(1) The story is contained within ff.232b-236a(The quotation is from f.236a) of Futūh us Salātīn,I.0.3089.Hosadurg is spelt: (2) A.R.1935-6,App.E:21(?1327). (3) Read,f.236a, line 6:
agreed.

The destruction of the kingdom of Kampili, for which Gurshāsp was the immediate reason, but which must have been among the early objects of the young Sultan, can not but have given much satisfaction to Ballāla III. Undoubtedly his own conduct was unethical, but the interests of his kingdom as well as his own prompted the treachery. (1) Even with the details of the surviving accounts there may not be sufficient ground for the view, but one can not help feeling that Kampila-dēva, knowing that Ballāla had not assisted him against their common enemy, but had stood by idly - as indeed the weakness of his resources must have obliged him to do, even if he had wished to do otherwise -, had been very rash to send Gurshāsp to Hoysala territory in the hopes of protection. Of course, no evidence survives that Ballāla did not agree to receive the Muslim, and 'Isāmī's account seems to suggest that in fact he did.

There is some ground for believing that after the Gurshāsp incident Muslim detachments penetrated into the Tamil districts of the plain. The Köyilolugu, whose account of Śrīraṅgam is certainly based on authoritative sources, states that Muslim disturbances took place between 1327 and 1371. (2) And it may be to 1327 rather than 1311 that we should attribute the destruction of the temple doorways and ruining of the country which an inscription of 1336 at Tiruvāmattūr, in the Ponnaiyār valley, about 20 miles south-east of Tiruvannāmalai, says were due to Muslims "in former days". (3)

(1) The Paranāriyarīge Sahodaranembantha Kathe of Nagasāngayya makes it appear that when Kampila gave shelter to Bahādur Khān (sic) Ballāla was approached by the Sultan's general, Nāmi Khān to attack Rama, son of Kampila, who takes the chief part in the story. (2) & (3) -over.
It may well have been this Gurshasp incident that prompted Barani to write that within the first few years of the reign of the Sultan Muhammad taxes were recorded as received from various provinces, including Devar, Telang, Kanpilah, Dhör-samundar and Ma'bar. (1) The inclusion of Ma'bar casts a shadow of doubt over the whole statement, but it is quite possible that after the Gurshasp incident payments for the Hoysala country and on behalf of the Tamil districts were actually sent to Delhi by Bālāla, or if not sent, promised. Firishtah probably had just such a notion in mind when he wrote that "Muhammad Tughluq turned to the organization of the army and the conquest of the countries; he subjected distant provinces such as Dhör-samundar, Ma'bar, Kanpilah, Wāraṅgal, Laknahoti, Chetgāon and Sōnārgānn as well as places near Delhi." (2) Likewise Muhammad was supposed to have chosen Daulatābād instead of Delhi for his capital on the ground of its being in a central position between the various provinces, amongst which Ma'bar, Telang, and Dhör-samundar are mentioned by Barani. (3)
The Masālik al-Abṣār likewise attributes Dōrasamund to the empire of Muḥammad bin Tughluq at about 1333, as one of the 23 provinces. (1) Ibn Battūtah, on the other hand, does not mention Dōrasamudra as among the provinces of the Sultanate of Delhi, probably because he gives no specific list. In any case it may be understood that only a very remote contact could have existed between Delhi and Dōrasamudra, Ballāla’s meekness naturally preventing the Sultan from taking any special measures to ensure his loyalty. When steps were needed to be taken for the subjection of Ma’bar, that is principally the Pāṇḍya nāḍ, the Sultan’s deputy revolted and set up his own government there: this danger was always present when expeditions were sent over great distances, and the attitude of Ballāla must have been highly appreciated at Delhi.

The situation on his northern frontier now being quiet, Ballāla moved back to the plains, and by July 1328 was in Tiruvanṇōmalai, frequently called in the inscriptions Uṇṇāmale-paṭṭana. (2) He was still there in August and October 1328. Ballāla’s authority was still recognized in the south, but still to a limited extent. His records are found at Vijayamāṅgalam, and Pāriyūr in the modern Coimbatore district, and at Tiruppattūr, nearly thirty miles north-west of Tiruvanṇōmalai. (3)

It seems that in 1329 Ballāla was involved in warfare again: a certain Parabala-Siṅga, about whom nothing is known, was the object of his attack, and the record being at Bāsūru in the Sagara tāluq makes it appear that the disturbance occurred in the north-west. (4)

(1) Masālik al-Abṣār, Notices des Mss, Tome xiii, p. 167 ff. Cf. Māhdi Husain, p. 91. The word Tīlanj does not in fact appear to be attached to Dōr-samund. (2), (3) & (4) over.
In September 1330, however, Ballāla was at Virūpakṣa-patṭana. The name is unfortunately so common that a definite identification is impossible.(1) Again, he was at Virūpakṣa-Hosadurga in October of the next year.(2) Whether any military activity took place there is open to conjecture.

In the same month he had returned to Arunasamudra, a fact which makes it appear that wherever Virūpakṣa-Hosadurga was it was not anywhere in the north. He then bore the titles Hammīra-rāya Brahmarāksasa and Rūḍīrāya-vaḍabānala, both of which are of doubtful significance. Hammīra may be the brother of Rudra of Vāraṇgaḷ, or any Hindu prince who assumed the Muslim title āmīr as a name. Rūḍī-rāya may mean "a famous prince", or may be a proper name, while, on the other hand, it may just possibly refer to the Pāṇḍya, if it be shown that the later Pāṇḍyas perpetuated a reference to Sundara's fabulous tulābhāranas.(3)

Whatever the meaning of these titles, it is certain that in April 1331 some Muslims were active in the north of the Hoysala rāda. Their place of origin is unknown, but it is quite possible that they were more or less free-lance adventurers, attempting to follow the example of the followers of Malik Naib and Khusrau Khān. They were at Goravanakallu, which may be Koravangala in the modern Hassan Tāluqa, hardly ten miles from Dōrasamudra, or Kuruvanka further to the north-east, a short distance from the place of the record. When on their way northward they were intercepted by a small Hoysala force and suffered
some losses. The king and Kāmeya-dāṇṇāyaka, apparently ruling jointly, gave a "blood-grant" to a warrior. (1)

It may have been the same band of Muslims that fought with the local inhabitants somewhere in western Mysore in February 1332. At any rate the need for security against Muslim penetration began to be felt more strongly than before.

The general condition of the Hoysala country had recovered a little from its deep decline after 1310, but only at the cost of the central government, which had probably had no opportunity to recruit either the royal treasury or the royal armies, and the power of the executive lay principally in the hands of a large body of Dāṇṇāyakas whose influence had never been so great in the history of the dynasty. A swollen number of Kumāras, seldom having any close connection with the royal family, exercised sway hardly unequal to that of the ageing Ballāḷa himself. (3) The king’s ingenuity was by no means exhausted, and a series of measures was prosecuted with a

Page 477 n. (1) There is a Virūpapura in the Magadi tāluqa of the Bangalore district. Venkataramanayya, V.C.E.p.45, prefers this to the three Virūpākṣapuras he has discovered in or near the Mulbagal, Channapatna and Coondapoor districts respectively. E.CX Goribidnur 49, undated, tells of Vīra-Ballāḷa-devarasa’s stay at Hosāvīḍu. We know nothing of the place or the period in which Ballāḷa was there, but it may have been on his way to or from Virūpakṣa-paṭṭana.

Page 477 n. (2) E.C.V Arsikere 66(1330); E.C.XII Gubbi 30(1331).
Page 477 n. (3) E.C.IX Channapatna 71(1331). Spelt Rūdi-rāya-vaḍa-
Bānala the title is used much earlier: E.C.IX Channapatna 73 (1318): the correct spelling is Ṛuḍi. E.C.IV Nagamangala 29 of 1219 may be quoted in support of a theory that Ḍūmīra was the Sultan of Delhi: Ḍūmīra attends Ballāḷa II’s durbar. E.C.XII Gubbi 30(1331) has similar titles, while E.C.IX Bangalore 110 (1336) has Aḍava-rāya-baḥjānāmuṛti. Aḍava-rāya is also unknown.

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 31(1331). (2) E.C.II 405(?1332 -Angira), M.A.R.1910-11,para.110. (3) Amarai-udaiya; Hiriya Ballappa-
dāṇṇāyaka; Dādi-Ballappadaṇṇāyaka; Cenneya-nāyaka; Lakey-
nāyaka; Lakṣmidhara-dāṇṇāyaka; Māyili-nāyaka; Somapa-dāṇṇāyaka; Ekkattī-Vīra-Kampa-Somīśvara-nāyaka; Tiparasa; see lists in Appendix D.
somewhat pathetic zeal, in an attempt to frustrate the internal and external forces tending towards the disintegration of the kingdom.

The Tiruvannāmalai venture was by no means closed, for Ballāla III subsequently used it as his place of residence on several occasions. But the scope for aggrandisement had turned out to be far less extensive in that quarter than the king had supposed ten years before. The Sambuvārāyar had not yielded place to him, not had the Pāṇḍyas ignored his action, even if they had not as yet actively striven to dislodge him. Admittedly the Hoysala possessions to the west of the Kāverī in the Koṅgu regions remained apparently undisturbed until the collapse of the dynasty; a continuous chain of records proves this. (1) But Hoysala general success and profit in the south was poor. No inscription of Ballāla III are found in the Kaṇṭhānūr region or further east than Tiruvannāmalai: indeed it seems that hardly any distance from that town was covered by Ballāla's revenue collectors. The Hoysala country had therefore failed to expand in the south as had been anticipated, and to that failure was added a sad fact which must have called for urgent attention. The heart of the Hoysala rād proper, the modern Hassan, Kadur, western Tumkur and northern Mysore districts, was beginning to fall into decay. The capital Dōrasamudra

(1) AR.1923,6,10, & 31(1334); 9(1325),17(1325),12(1331), & 19(1331) all at Idigarai; south-west of Amnūr; V.R.I p.525 Coimb.53(1334) at Sēvūr; V.R.I p.526, Coimb.65(c1335) at Aṇḍiyūr; ibid.539(c1335 at Tiṅgalūr; A.R.1920,273 & 277(1336) at Kattaṅganl; A.R.1927-8 222(1338) at Anaimalai, Pollachi tāluqā; V.R.I p.547(1338) at Elattūr, Gobicettipalayam tāluqā; A.R.1906,437(1338) at Daṇḍyakankōṭṭai; S.I.I.IV 415, A.R.1391,14(1340) ? same as V.R.I p.535, Coimb.155 at Erode; A.R.1935-6,106(1341) at Viṇṇapalli; A.R.1910 141(1342) at Veḷḷalūr. There is even an undated and unfinished inscription of Ballāla III at Māgūr, a short distance south-
was now situated not at the centre of a vigorous nation, but amid a plain which had degenerated almost to the level of what might be called a few latifundia of absentee landlords; active spirits had long since migrated to more profitable fields; both wealth and initiative was being dissipated over the now much more extensive area in which the Hoysala was interested or committed. This appears to be the only explanation for the extraordinary dearth, indeed almost entire absence, of inscriptions during the last decade of the Hoysala dynasty in this region, while, in sharp contrast, the modern Bangalore and Kolar districts, which had been backward until the time of Rāmanātha, provide an ample collection of lithic records.

Ballāla must have been aware of this wedge of weakness through the heart of his dominions, and endeavoured to remedy the defect by a bold move towards the west.

It will be remembered that Ballāla had retained, if not improved upon, the old Hoysala connection with the Sāntara dominions. His failures and necessities in other directions now drove him to exploit these, and to initiate a new policy. A combination of diplomacy and force achieved his object with remarkable speed and success.

He represented to the ruling queen of the Alupa dynasty, Cikkāyi-tāyi, who was probably the daughter of Sōyi-dēva Ālupendra of Bārahakanyāpura, or Bārakur,(2) the extreme advis-

ability of forming a single kingdom from coast to coast, which

east of the Amarāvati river, in a clearing beneath the moun-
tains which separated the district from the territories depend-
ing on Mādura. But he was clearly not allowed to remain in con-
trol there for long: A.R.1908,150(c1335).

(1) Cf. S.I.I.vii 274, A.R.1901,92(1325) at Kāp; also ibid.308, A.R.1901,118a(1328).
would prove an obstacle to the further penetrations either of the Muslims themselves or of the Hindu vassals of the Sultan of Delhi. He had himself visited Kānci (1) and had a system of communications throughout the Deccan and the Tamil country; the Kakatiya power could not be counted on any longer, and the Hoysala could, he thought, protect the eastern approaches; his only weak point was the western coastal strip. To these arguments the Alupa queen added her own reflections on the ambitions of the Muslims, especially those amīrs who ruled small principalities on the Malabar coast and recognized the overlordship of Muḥammad bin Tughluq.(2) The result of the negotiations was the marriage of the two sovereigns and the absorption of the Alupa country into the Hoysala dominions. Some resistance was doubtless experienced from interests prejudiced by this innovation, but Ballāla successfully overcame it. In March 1333 he was acknowledged at Nilāvara, just over two miles from the Alupa capital. A record at Vāḍarāṇe likewise belongs to Ballāla. (3) In December of the same year he was recognized at Hosāla in the same region. The association between the two houses continued without interruption until Ballāla III's death. Inscriptions of Ballāla, his queen Cikkāyi, whose name appears with the variant spelling Kikkāyi and the misreading Bukkāyi, and finally herself with their son Kulasēkhara appear over an area of 800 miles between Kanyāna in the north and a point about twenty miles north of Maṅgalūr in the

(1) This seems the only possible interpretation of the difficult A.R1919,401(dated Bhāvaka,Tai 2) at Kānci. When the text is published more satisfactory use may be made of it. E.C.III Malavalli 104(1333) gives Ballāla the title "glittering mirror to Kānci". Rice makes an error in his translation of the now insig-
It does not appear that any considerable profit was derived by either party from this arrangement. An economic advantage to the Hoysala nāḍ certainly resulted, but it was probably small in practice, for the taxes on imports and exports over the ghatas were in any case enjoyed largely by inferior officials, and the change of ruler would have made little difference.

In November 1333 Ballāla was in Hosabattā, a place unidentified, like Hosanād, at which also resided at one time. (2) He may have been superintending the completion of his arrangements with the Tuluvas or Alupa country. Perhaps a similar origin accounts for the military operations he was obliged to continue against Kuppe in the north-western districts, from which fighting he appears to have emerged successful. (3) It is interesting to note that one petty ruler at least benefited from the vicissitudes of the period: a certain Jaina inhabitant of the mountainous recesses between the Hoysala nāḍ and the Alupa country set up an inscription in which he, Lōkanātha -dēvarasa, appears with several absurdly boastful titles, which significant title Kādana-kulay-Adiyamay-apravēśā-pratāpa, which seems to mean, "He whose prowess prevents the intrusion of Kādana-clan and Adiyama (or "the Adigaimān")."
include the title "Ballāla-rāya-citta-camatkārar", the surpriser, or delighter of the heart of king Ballāla. The instance is unique(1). Doubtless he performed some small service for the moribund dynasty.

In October 1334 Ballāla was still watching the situation in the west, for he was at Dōrasamudra, ruling "his own kingdom".(2) He was still there in February 1336,(3) for affairs had just taken a fresh turn. In the south Māravarman Parākrama Pāṇḍya, a man of apparently more than ordinary initiative, had commenced to reign, and had begun to bring some of the northern Tamil districts under his rule. An inscription of his second year if found at Āduturai, and subsequent records shew that he held extensive lands in the Kāvēri valley and further north.(4) But a series of new and much more important developments opened in 1336 in the region of the kingdom that had once belonged to the hero Kampila.

Of the many scholars that have devoted their labour to the problem of the origin of the first Vijayanagara dynasty the most successful seems to have been Dr.N.Venkataramanayya, whose works have progressively elucidated the mysterious question, and there is no need to enter here into any discussions on the topic. Let it suffice to say that a fuller examination of the Persian Texts clearly confirms his theories in their latest form, and helps to dispose finally of the erroneous theory that Vīra-Ballāla himself founded Vijayanagara.

(1) S.I.I.vii 247, A.R.71 of 1901(1335) at Hiriyangadi, Karkal tāluqa. (2) E.C.IX Channapatna 7(1334); sva-rājyam gevuttiralu. (3) E.C.IX Bangalore 110(1336). (4) A.R.1913, 24(1336); A.R.1913 35(1338) at Āduturai; A.R.1903, 364(1342) at Andanallūr; A.R.1903, 264a(1342) at Tirūppālatturai.
Both versions A and version B of Firishtah have in common the story that Ballāla founded Vijayanagara, giving it a name after his son, which subsequently became corrupted to that current in Firishtah's day. He states that the city was on Ballāla's frontier and in an inaccessible place. As a matter of fact the city was originally known as Vidyānagara, having been named after the founders' ally, the sage Vidyārānya whose support was necessary for the establishment of the new kingdom, and later, though not many years later, it received the name Vijayanagara, when military prowess had made the reference to the sage otiose. Firishtah is clearly transmitting legends current at that city in his own time: they are not without interest. As for the position of the city, it was well beyond Ballāla's frontier, and was readily accessible from all points of approach. (1) Firishtah, moreover, assigns to the period of 1342 the conference of Kṛṣṇa-nāyaka of Wāraṅgal with Ballāla, and assumes that the foundation of Vijayanagara developed from it.

The facts, however, appear to have been as follows: The numerous rebellions against Muhammad bin Tughluq Shāh encouraged the rulers in the old Kākatiya and Kampili dominions to expect complete freedom from Muslim overlordship, and in consequence of agitation some severe repressive measures had to be instituted by the Sultan. Among other means adopted by him for the preservation of order in the south was the despatch of at least two men who had once been of the household of Kampila-đeṇa, and who had been "made Muslims", to take over the gover-

(1) Firishtah: version A: Bombay Text B.246; B. M. Add. 5569 f. 154b Egerton 1000 f. 113b; version B: R. A. S. F. 65 f. 181b; I. O. 2035 f. 128b; I. O. 1251 f. 167a.
norship of the Tungabhadra region. Circumstances and legendary sources, which need not be discussed here, indicate that these men were originally connected with the court of Pratāpa Rudra of Warangal, so that, though they were socially of low status among Hindus, as the emissaries of the Sultān they were not only qualified but also in a position to exercise influence in that region where neither the Hoysala nor the remnants of the old governing classes under the Kākatīyas were in fact able to establish regular control. As Firīshtah puts it: "A person from among the relatives (2) of the king of Kampilah, whom Sultān Muḥammad had made a Muslim, had been sent to Kampilah; and he deserted Islam and practised impiety, and he too released Kampilah from the rule of the Sultān's officers. Among remote countries nothing but (those of) the Rāis of Gujerāt and Dēvagīr remained under his thumb. On all sides troubles and disturbances occurred." This passage explains the reference of 'Īsāmī when he says: "An apostate seized the country of Kannar and captured (the land) from Gūṭi to the boundaries of Ma'bar." (3) For 'Īsāmī sums up in a sentence the process of six years, part of which we are going to observe in more detail. A discordant note is heard from Barānī, who, being a closer contemporary, has the right to more credence. He says, "A person from among the relatives of Kanya whom Sultān Muḥammad had sent to Kampilah, turned, unhappy one, from Islam and became an apostate, and practised tyranny; and the whole of the region of Kampilah fell into the hands of the Hindus...."(4)

---

(1) Version B. (2) (3) Futūḥ us Salāṭīn, I.0.3089 f.326a line 13. (4) Tārīkh i Fīrōz Shāhī, p.484. B.M.Or.2039 f.239b reads Kambānāyak a few lines earlier and it is just possible that "should be read relatives of Kampilah."
The truth, however, seems to be that because these two men, Hariharā and Bukka of the family of Saṅgama or Saṅgarāya, had been connected with both the Kākatiya and Kampili courts before being taken to Delhi, and spoke both Kannada and Telugu, the historian was not able to ascertain to which part of the Deccan they in fact belonged. The Vidyāraṇya Vṛttānta says that they were treasurers of Pratāpa Rudra and were captured at Wāraṅgal and found favour by miraculous means in the eyes of the Sulṭān, who subsequently sent them to the south to reduce the rebellious Ballālas to obedience. (1)

Ignoring the statement in that semi-legendary account, repeated in similar sources, that the Ballālas at first defeated Hariharā and Bukka, we may proceed by noticing the word "too" which occurs in the version B of Firīshtah. The liberation of Kampili from Muslim domination is shown by that writer to have been the cooperative work of Ballāla III and Kṛṣṇa-nāyaka, whom he calls Kīsnā or Kītnā-nāyak, son of Lad-darśdēv, Pratāpa Rudra. (2) According to Firīshtah Kṛṣṇa-nāyaka approached Ballāla with a view to their joint action against the Muslims, who were expected to employ more forcible methods to control the Karnātak and the Telugu country. Ballāla agreed to concentrate on the defence of the northern frontier, and Firīshtah says that he actually left his dominions behind and made his camp in the north, helping Kṛṣṇa-nāyaka to regain control of Wāraṅgal and eject the Muslim wazīr who was there. Together, he says, they detached from the Muslims, and brought over to their common cause, the Raīs of Dhōr-samundar and Ma'ībār,

(2) I.O1251 f.167a gives Kītnā; R.A.S.P.65 f.181b varies between Kīsnā and Kīnsā; B.M.Add.6569 reads f.154b, Kānā, but
who "of old had paid tribute to the ruler of the Karnātak."

From this confused account it is apparent that Ballāla and the descendant of the Kākatīya ruler or his representative connived at the establishment of the kingdom of Vijayanagara, which could never have survived infancy had not these two powers cooperated in protecting its initial stages. (1) As soon as was convenient Harihara and Bukka apostatized from Islam, and in 1336 the city of Vidyānagara was founded on the bank of the river opposite to Ānegondi, near the ancient shrine of Virūpākṣa at Hampe, within the old kingdom of Kam-pili. There survive two inscriptions of Harihara dated in 1336.

For the first four years of his reign Harihara enjoyed the complacent support of Ballāla, especially when a Muslim expedition under Sayyid Hasan Kithilī was sent by the Sultān of Delhi to conquer Ma’bar. Harihara however gradually extended his control over the Karnātaka, spreading his net further and further from the Tungabhadra valley, and before long actually possessed several districts within the Hoysala country itself. Ballāla’s hostility at that stage could be despised, as he was fully occupied in the south, attempting to profit from the confusion caused by the newly formed Sultanate of Madura. The varied stages of the process can easily be traced.

but on f.155b Kansa; Egerton 1000 f.113b also reads Kanā. The excessively lengthy arguments of Venkataramanayya in V.C.E. p.171-176, to prove that Kanyānāyaka was the same as Māpaya-nāyaka who is said to have ruled at Wāraṅgal after 1344 are here ignored as irrelevant. (1) It is not necessary to follow Firīštah to the extent of supposing that the expulsion of the Muslim governor from Wāraṅgal, which is held to have taken place about 1345, followed closely upon the conference between Ballāla and Kṛṣṇa-nāyaka. The account is not sufficiently circumstantial to receive an analysis here. (2) N.D.I. vol.1 p.109-124; E.C.X Bagepalli 70. If the latter is a forgery, as Rice thought, then both
Some time before January 1337 Ballāla III made an expedition to the north. (1) Its object can only be conjectured; probably his intention was to impress the brothers at Hampe with his power, as well as to discourage possible alternative candidates for the supremacy of the Tūṅgabhadra valley. At any rate the expedition was successful in its object, for he is said to have performed a "conquest of the quarters" in the northern region. (2)

Meanwhile two conflicts were in progress elsewhere. In the east his trusted subordinate and remote kinsman, Dādi Vallappa-dāṇṇāyaka was engaged in a campaign against unknown enemies, perhaps rebels in that region where there was always an element attached to their independence; (3) in the north-west some difficulties had arisen, and a garrison had to be posted at Bārakūr, the capital of Ballāla’s Ālupa queen. In April 1338 he was ruling in "his own royal city Dōrasamudra", after paying a visit to the army at Bārakūr; at that time he had ordered a nāyaka to remain in Bārakūr, and on his promising to do so gave him a kodagi in his home territory, Nirugunda-nāḍ. (4) This was not, in all probability, a very valuable present. In 1339 Vallappa-dāṇṇāyaka was still engaged in warfare, apparently increasing his own importance in the eastern part of the kingdom. (5)

But at the beginning of the year some sort of adjustment of are. But they are likely to be genuine, and the date 1336 for the foundation of Vijayanagara is almost universally supported by various types of materials, legendary, semi-legendary and epigraphic.

(1) MAR.1937, 52 and E.C.IV Chamrajnagar 204(1337).
(2) It is not probable that the title Teluṅga-rāja ...bhāru pra ...kāla-Rudra is of any practical significance. E.C.IX Bangalore 111(1340).
(3) E.CX Chintamani 53(1337).
(4) E.C.V Arsikere 183(1338).
(5) E.C.X Kolar 54(1339) and Bowringpet 28(1339).
conflicting interests must have been arrived at for the time being, for Ballāla was ruling "a peaceful kingdom" in the residence of Vīra-Vijaya-Virūpākṣapura, probably identical with the Virūpākṣa-pañca which he had visited before, "as sole king by his own valour."(1)

But the situation was now complicated by another feature, to which allusion has already been made. If Hariharā's expansion in the north gave cause for watchfulness,(2) a serious menace developed in the south.

Āgha Mahdi Husain in his work on Muḥammad bin Tughluq has been unable to show when precisely Sayyid Hasan Kithili, to follow Sirhindi's way of referring to him, or Sayyid Ahmad Shāh Kaithili, as he prefers, was sent by the Sultan to Ma'bar. It may have been in 1338 or 1339. The Muslims obtained some control of the southern Pāṇḍya country, though we can not be sure that any very extensive area around Madura was under their government. In 1341-2, according to Sirhindi, he declared his independence of Delhi.(3) Troops sent to suppress his rebellion joined him instead, and the Sultanate of Madura was established upon a firm if doubtless luxurious foundation. It is known that many Muslims were employed by the Pāṇḍya princes, and often held high offices of State,(4) so Ahmad Shāh found no difficulty in organizing a fairly profitable and secure regime under their guidance and with their cooperation. In July 1340 Ballāla III was already obliged to return to Tiruvanmālai to observe the

---

(1) E.C.IX Hoskote 43(1339) nijada vīrada ēka-rāya-rājavāgī.
(2) An inscription of Harihara is found at Badami dated March 1340: I.A.X p.82-83; W.E.II p.657 provides an incorrect copy.
(4) Rashid ud din, Jami ut Tawārīkh, I.O.3524 f.375b; B.M.Add. 7628 f.381a; Binākīti, Tawārīkh i Binākīti, I.O.215 f.174b; B.M.Add.7627 f.121a; B.M.Add.7626 f.112a; R.A.S.P.27 f.6b; Wāṣṣaf.
progress of this new venture. He was, of course, not alone in his anxiety. Maravarman Paräkrama-Pändya, who in fact was recognized at Cengama in 1340, and thus must have been in a position to embarrass Ballāla had he wished, was likewise interested in the degree of enthusiasm about to be shown by the Sultan of Madura to recover the whole territories ruled since 1257 by the dynasty whose capital he had usurped. A degree of tolerance must have been exercised by both parties, for while Paräkrama ruled here and there around him, Ballāla III stayed in Tiruvanàmalai apparently undisturbed. Apart from his records at Annàmalai itself, one is found dated 1341 at Nārañākuppam, about twelve miles south-west of that town near the river Ponnaiyār.

According to the Arunacalampurānam, Ballāla III was one of the most important residents at that famous hill, and the eighteenth-century author of the purānam records the legends concerning his stay at Annàmalai. The seventh canto is entitled Vallāla-magarācan-carukkam, "the chapter on the great king Ballāla". He gives the impression that the king was well established there, and was renowned for his virtues; but continues the legend with the baseless statements that he was of the Agni-vamśa and without issue. He made announcement of a general feast at his own expense, with the object of obtaining a son, and eventually succeeded in doing so after allowing a

---

(1) E.C.IX Devanhalli 54(1340). He was in Dōramudra just before. Cf. the damaged and partially dated S.I.I.IX pt.1, 359.
(2) Cengama was on the main road from Tiruvanamalai to the Hoysala country: S.I.I.vii 125(1340). It is of interest that a certain Brahman named Appana, who originated in the Hoysala nāḍ.
junior queen to offer herself for the satisfaction of Śiva, the god of the temple at Tiruvanāṉāmalai, who arrived disguised as a mendicant, and who in this form was unable to obtain the services of any of the regular prostitutes of the town. The son, however, who turned out to be Śiva himself, blessed the king and promised to perform his funeral rites according to the rules given in the Vedas. This delightful tale can, of course, be entirely ignored, the only particular of it which is true being Ballāla's residence at the town. He is known to have constructed certain parts of the Arunacalēśvara temple there, and it is possible that sculptured scenes then erected may have stimulated the inventive genius of later generations. (1) As if to disprove the main point of the puerile story, we have evidence to hand that Ballāla III actually crowned his son Ballāla IV in the city of Tiruvanāṉāmalai. An inscription of October 1340 states that Vīra-Ballāla-dēvar was ruling the kingdom in the enjoyment of pleasant communications, having been engaged in performing a coronation to the kingdom. (2) Clearly the person crowned was his son, afterwards Ballāla IV. The events which prompted Ballāla to take this step must have been the activity of the Madura Sultān and that of Harihara of Vijayanagara, in addition to the fact that his own advanced years prevented him from controlling the complexity of his declining affairs with even a small show of efficiency. Ibn Battūṭah exercised some authority there at the time.

Page 490 n.(3) E.C.IX Bangalore 31(1340); S.I.I.VIII 99 & 89(1340). He is called amongst other things Koṅkaṇa-akravarti, a title which he had to some extent earned. It is certain from the two inscriptions that Ballala possessed the agrahāra called Rupa-nārāyana-caturyēdimāṅgalam on the north bank of the Ceyyār river. Page 490 n.(4) A.R.1933-4,65, dated Vikrama, 52rd year.

(1) More than one copy of the story is found besides that in
tells us that Ballāla was in his eighties; he had been on the
throne for fifty years, and though the estimate may be a little
inexact, for he was probably nearer 78 than 80, yet he had
reached an unusually extended period of life for his contemp­
oraries, and it is remarkable that he was as active as our
evidence clearly shows that he was. Ballāla-rāya, his son,must
have been little short of fifty-five when he was crowned, and
the very low ebb of Hoysala affairs during his father's reign
may be held to show that as Crown Prince he too showed no special
abilities or effective powers.

While the two Ballālas were in their look-out at
TiruvanṆāmalai, perched at the very edge of their dominions,
and far from the centre of their hereditary possessions, Hari­
hara-rāya was preparing to occupy the Hoysala-nād. An inscrip­
tion of equivocal date, but probably of 1340, shows the mahā­
maṇḍalesvarā, ari-rāya-vibhāda, rāyara-gaṇḍa, catussamudrádhi­
pati Vīra-Hariyappav-ōdeyar ruling in the modern Nelamangala
(1)
tāluqa of the Bangalore district. He seems to have retired from
there for the moment, but returned certainly four years later.
His relationship to Ballāla seems to have been comparable to
that of a vulture to a dying beast.(2)

the Arunācala-puranam itself. Mackenzie Collection: General,
vol xvi pp.245-52. It notes that Ballāla built the third inclos­
ure wall and its four Gopurams; a yearly ceremony is conducted
there in the month Tai (January-February) in the name of Vāllāla­
rāya. It is far from certain, but the service may have been in­
stituted in that month of 1341.
Page 491 n.(2) Rājyābhiṣekava maṇdalāgi: E.C.IX Bangalore lll(13
Rice is wrong in supposing that the coronation took place at
Virupākṣapura.

(1)Cf.E.C.IX Nelamangala 19 with Bangalore lll; in both Naralōka­
ganḍa Meyileya-nāyaka appears as a subordinate ruler.
(2) E.C.IV Yedatore 29(March 1342) mentions a certain Hampe­
voḍeyar who is called the Kumāra of the pratāpa-cakravarti vīra
Ballāla-dēvarasa. This has been thought to be Harihara, and
with some plausibility. The fine titles which he bore at this
In October 1341 Ballāla was still at Tiruvannāmalai; in February 1342 likewise, and again in March. Doubtless he was there in June 1342, and certainly in September.(1) During the summer he appears to have paid a flying visit to the plateau, only to return with resources, one supposes, for an attack upon the Muslims of Madura.(2)

On the eighth of September 1342 Ballāla pounced upon the army of the Turukas and fought at the place Ciriciṇapali, which has been happily identified with Trichinopōly.(3) Naturally, during the whole of the disturbed period of Pāṇḍya civil war and Muslim invasion and finally the foundation of the Sultanate of Madura, Ballāla had been waiting for an opportunity to recapture the lost fief in the Kāverī valley. Trichinopoly was situated beside the old Cōla capital of Oṛiyūr (or Uṛaiyūr), and lay on the further side of Śrīraṅgam from Kannanūr. It is possible that Ballāla did not capture Trichinopoly at that time; that he had regained possession of Kannanūr is very unlikely, for the Muslims still held it during the following year. In December Ballāla had left troops in the south and was back in Tiruvannāmalai, having made the eighty-mile journey apparently without ill effect.(4)

would hardly be countenanced in an official record, and Harihara may well have been given the title Kumāra by Ballāla III in the early years of their association. However, there are many Hampes, and the identification is not certain.

(1) E.C.XII Sira 10(1341); E.C.IX Bangalore 129(1342), 24(1342); E.C.IX Devanhalli 46(1342) and Bangalore 21(1342).
(2) E.C.IX Devanhalli 21(1342). He was at Virūpākṣa-pāda on Śrāvanasa l.
(3) E.C.VI Kadur 75(1367). The record states that Ballāla died then, but the evidence is too late to be preferred to better authorities. Rice reads Beribi in the R.T. but Cirici in the K.T.
(4) E.C.IX Bangalore 41(1342). This is the same stone as Hoskote 147.
Two inscriptions remain bearing Ballāla's titles. They are of the year 1343. One in dated in April, and the other merely with the nakṣatra Pusālya: these are the last extant of his reign. (1)

At some point between April and the middle of August 1343, probably near the end of that period, Ballāla III met his end. The circumstances are known only from Ibn Battūtah, who was not only in southern India at the time, but also visited Ghiyās ud dīn, the then ʿUlūm of Madura, his relative by marriage, and was probably in an excellent position to hear the accounts of eyewitnesses only a few months after the events themselves. The account he gives bears so many minute traces of authenticity and is in itself so plausible, that it deserves to be quoted in extenso and almost without comment. (2)

"In the neighbourhood of his (Ghiyās ud dīn's) territory there was a Hindu sovereign named Balāl-dyav, who was one of the principal Hindu kings. His army exceeded a hundred thousand men, (3) and he had besides about twenty thousand Muslims near him, made up of debauched or criminal types as well as runaway slaves. This ruler eagerly desired to conquer the country of Maʿbar, where the army of the Muslims did not exceed six thousand men, of whom half were of excellent quality, and the rest quite worthless. The Muslims came to grips with him near the city of Kubbān; (4) he put them to flight and they retired to Mutrah, the Court. The Hindu ruler camped near Kubbān, which is one of the largest and strongest places held by the Muslims. He besieged it for about ten months, and at the end

(1) E.C. IX Hoskote 112 & 75(1343).
(3) 100,000 appears a small number, when one considers that
of that period the garrison had provisions only for two weeks. Baliyl-dyaev sent a proposal to the besieged that they should leave under a safe-conduct, and hand the town over to him, but they replied, "Our Sultan must study this proposal first." He then promised them a truce of fourteen days, and they wrote of their situation to the Sultan Ghayyud din. That prince read their letter to the people on the following Friday. The faithful wept and said, "We will die under the sword. Behold, if the idolator take that city, he may move on to our stronghold; then death under the sword would be preferable to us." They then exchanged undertakings to expose themselves to death, and set off the next day, taking their turbans from their heads and placing them on the necks of their horses, to indicate that they sought death. They placed the most brave and warlike amongst them in the van, to the number of three hundred. On the right flank was Saif ud din Bahadur, a pious and brave lawyer; on the left Malik Muhammad the Silahdar. As for the Sultan, he was stationed at the centre accompanied by three thousand men, placing behind him the three thousand that remained, under the command of Asad ud din Kaikhusrau al Farsi. Thus drawn up, the Muslims made for the camp of the Hindu king at the time of the siesta,(1) when the soldiers were not on guard, and had sent each of the petty princes of the north-west could put 10,000 men into the field at a time. It is an indication of the decline in Hoysala prosperity. Ibn Batuta was not underestimate here. Page 494 n. (4) Lee's translation of the abridged version of Ibn Batuta reads Kian, the text being Kian, obviously an error for Kupan. He says that Kian Belonged to Malbar. The text reads for Mutrah (Madura) Muturan, an improvement: p.193.

(1) Reading القليلة. If one read القليلة it would signify that the camp of the Hindus was at Kafilah.
their horses to pasture. They poured upon the camp; the idolators thinking that they were thieves came out before them in disorder and fought with them. The Sultan Ghiyas ud din then came up and the Hindus were worsted more severely than ever before. (1) Their king attempted to mount a horse, although he was eighty years old. Nasir ud din, the Sultan's nephew and successor, reached the old man and was about to kill him, for he did not know him. But one of his slaves having said "They (or "These") are the Sultan", he took him prisoner and brought him to his uncle, who treated him with apparent consideration until he had extorted from him his wealth, elephants and horses by promising to release him. When he had relieved him of all his goods, he slew him and had him skinned; his skin was filled with straw and hung on the wall of Mutrah, where I saw it in the same position."

The Muslims' sixty-mile sally had proved very effective, and the senseless pursuit of the will-of-the-wisp city of Kannanur (Ibn Battutah's Kubbân) had proved fatal to the unfortunate Ballāla. His murder was not avenged until about thirty years later, when the famous Kampana-odeyer of the Vijayanagara family destroyed for ever the Sultanate of Madura. As Ganga-devi says in her Madhuravijayam, with a poetic disregard for accuracy:

Parakramadha-krtacOla-ndiyam Vallala-sampallatika-kutharam ranomukham Kampa-nrpobhyananddvirah Suratrnam udagra-sauryah

(1) Lees translation of the abridged version relates that only the cavalry and those who concealed themselves in the woods escaped: p.193.
"King Kampa, a hero of towering valour, welcomed the Sultan eager for the fray, the Sultan who had brought low both Cola and Pāṇḍya, and had been an axe to the creeper, the prosperity of Ballāla."(1)

In August 1343 was issued a śasana granting certain dues to farmers in the name of Vīra-Virupāksa, son of Vīra-Ballāla-dēvarasa, jointly with Ballappa-dānṇāyaka son of Dādiya (elsewhere spelt Dādi) Sōmaya-dānṇāyaka, on the occasion of the former having obtained the pāṭṭa, or crown. It seems that after Ballāla III's death Ballāla IV assumed the government with some ceremony distinct from the abhiṣēka rites which his father had performed a few years before.(2) It is at any rate evident that his power was enjoyed with the acquiescence if not permission of Ballappa, whom as Vallappa we have observed carrying on certain conflicts on the eastern plateau. This powerful subordinate had been employed in this fashion at the beginning of the year, and the capture of Ballāla III had doubtless made him practically indispensable to that king's successor.(3) His opponent had doubtless been Harihara-rāya of Vijayanagara, who had already succeeded to the control of large portions of the Hoysala dominions. The port of Honāvar, to the north of the Hoysala-Ālupa territory, was during Ibn Battūtah's voyage ruled by a certain Jalāl ud dīn, a feudatory of "Haryab".(4) In April 1343 Hemmaragalli, Heggadadevankote tāluqa, was subject neither to Ballāla nor to Harihara, but by October 1343 Harihara was

---

(1) Madhurāvijayam, Trivandrum ed. 1916, p. 82.
(2) E.C. VI Chikmagalur 105(1343).
(3) E.C. X Malur 16(1343).
(4) Ibn Battūtah, Broadway Travellers' ed. p. 230.
acknowledged at Gandasi, Arsikere taluqa, only a few miles to the north. (1) Soon afterwards Tēkal, the capital in turn of Dādi Sōmeya and Ballappa dānāyakas, was under the control of Harihara's brother Kampaṇṇa-udaīyar. (2) Two places on the fringe of the Hoysala's eastern dominions recognized Bukka, Harihara's brother, in March 1344. (3) Fighting between Ballāla IV and the Vijayanagara family is evidenced by several viragals and by the title "maṇḍalēvara who had achieved greatness over the Turaka, Sēvuṇa, Teluṅga, Pāṇḍya and Hoysana armies", which the Vijayanagara dynasty soon acquired. (4) In 1346 Harihara, "having conquered the earth from the eastern to the western ocean", made a grant to the matha of Śrīṅgēri to celebrate the festival of his victory. A certain Aliya Ballappa-officer dānāyaka, who was probably an ex-Hoysala, joined the udaiyar brothers in making the grant. (5)

In November 1346 a certain Pāṇḍya-cakravarti, probably of Alupa connections, recognized Harihara at Caṭṭakodagi in Tirthahalli taluqa, twenty miles east of Hatyaṅgadi, (6) and in the same year the Vijayanagara ruler was recognized in Bangalore and Kolar districts, then the most productive parts of the decayed Hoysala kingdom. (7) The Immaṭi-rāhutta-rāya of Dānāyakaṅkōṭṭai seems to have remained independent for the while, but he must soon have acquiesced in the collapse of his master's government. (8) Before January 1347 a Kadamba ruler in the Bana-

(1) E.C.IV Heggadadevankote 112(1343); E.C.V Arsikere 159(1343).
(2) M.A.R.1918-4, para.91. (3) So at least it appears. E.C.X Goribidnur 46 and Mulbagal 158 are both copies of one original and are identical but for slips and occasional omissions. Rice refused to believe that Bukka had a Tārāpa year in his reign. (4) E.C.IV Hunsur 114(1345), Krishnarajapet 46(1346); E.C.XI Chitāldrug 2, M.INS 2, p.4-5. Cf.A.R.1909,159(1343 and 1345): gifts for the vijayābhīṣaydaya of Śiṅgāya-dānāyaka. Also see E.C.V Channarayapatna 230(?1345), K.T.only: Harihara-dēvaranu kāṇa hōhali, etc.
vâse 12,000 was defeated, and so the ancient enemies Hoysala and Kadamba were swamped together in the rising flood of Vijayanagara power. (1) By 1348 the Alupa dynasty had likewise given way. (2) The last inscription of a Hoysala may be one of April 1346, but as no numerical date is given the attribution is doubtful. (3)

So ended, after at least four hundred years of activity, the existence of the Hoysala dynasty as a force in the politics of southern India. With the sudden and unnoticed disappearance of the last representative of the line, the Hoysala leaves the arena of history as abruptly as he entered it. The line had, by its own ambition and ineptitude, undermined the structure raised by its earlier achievements, and had rendered a once flourishing and powerful state a helpless prey for more vigorous and clearer-sighted antagonists. To this dynasty neither the Muslim nor Vijayanagara was as hostile as its own inordinate aims.

Their greatness was not, however, quite forgotten. Their devastated and despoiled country was for long known as the Hoysala nāḍ, and a few centuries later a petty ruler claimed descent from their line. (4) The legends of Mysore, as collected in the nineteenth century, still contained many references to the Nine Ballālas. (5) A caste of Mysorean Brahmans still call themselves Hoysala Brahmans, probably because a king of that family took their progenitors under his protection.

They were the most important of those who might claim to be the makers of modern Mysore, and the literature

---

and architecture of their country still bear witness to the bygone splendour of their rule, the shadow of a great name.

Page 498 n.(6) E.C.VIII Tirthahalli 154(1346).
Page 498 n.(7) E.C.IX Bangalore 47(1346), 59(1346); X Malur 61, 69
Page 498 n.(8) A.R.1906, 440 & 442.

Page 499 n.(1) E.C.VIII Sorab 375(1347).
Page 499 n.(2) S.I.I.VII 231, A.R.1901, 57(1348) at Kantavara.
Page 499 n.(3) E.C.IX Bangalore 120(?1346): it speaks of the time of Ballala-raya, but it may be of 1226 (Vyaya, Vaisakhā su).
Page 499 n.(4) S.I.I.VII 77, A.R.1900, 72 at Wandiwash(1697).

Later epigraphical references to the Hoysalas are:-
E.C.IV Chamrajnagar 113(1365).
A.R.1936-7, 162(1372) Restoration of the temple of Posalisvara-udaiyar which the Tulukkar had converted into a mosque.
E.C.V Belur 75(1382), 3(?1397).
E.C.VI Koppa 34(1386).
E.C.II 254(1398), 258(1432).
E.C.XII Pavugada 54(1487).
E.C.VI Koppa 17(1553).
E.C.VII Channagiri 83(?1680).
E.C.III Seringapatam 64(1722).

Page 499 n.(5) See Appendix III, page 578.
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CHAPTER SEVEN

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOYSALA COUNTRY.

The object of this chapter is to provide, as far as the limitations of the materials permit, a brief survey of the relations which existed between the government of the Hoysala kingdom and its subjects, and of the manner in which it affected their lives. The theoretical principles of government which in the form of treatises then exercised influence on the ruling classes, together with the details of the various relationships in which the subjects stood to each other, are, for the most part, alike ignored in this account.

The system of government, as observed in practice, may be described as a modified tyranny, the despotic rule of one man being qualified by considerations of expediency. These in fact so far prevented his control from being absolute that a type of constitutional monarchy may be discerned.

There is no reason to believe that this form of government actually operative in the Hoysala country differed materially from that in use in the other sections of the Karnataka; the Calukya as well as the Kadamba, Sinda and northern Pandyya courts for example almost certainly functioned on similar lines. Several details of their administrative structure, indeed, appear to have differed from the corresponding details in the fully developed Hoysala rajya; so also, on the other hand, the administrative machinery of the Cola and Pandyya kingdoms of the south had its own peculiarities which are exhaustively investigated elsewhere; but, in the broad, the general
characteristics of the Hoysala governmental mechanism may be accepted as illustrative of southern Indian political institutions in general and those of the Kannada-speaking and a not inconsiderable section of the Tamil-speaking peoples in particular.

The unifying factor in a state was the ruler; there could not be more than one ruler in a state, and the emergence of a second split the unit at once into two parts. In the many instances where our records show the king ruling in the company of another person, it is to be understood that the second was a deputy, subordinate or intermediary of the king. Whenever this was not in fact the case - it invariably was so in theory - the kingdom was already in an advanced stage of disintegration. Whether the unit were large or small, the same principle applied, and the subjection of the ruler of another unit automatically increased the size of the first. The functions of the ruler affected all parts of the unit equally, and pervaded even the remotest extremities: if they at any time failed to do so, the unity was thereby prejudiced, and the appearance of several smaller but equally valid units was facilitated. The larger the unit, and the greater its material resources, the greater the power of the ruler and consequently the greater his ability to exercise his functions to the fullest geographical extent of his dominion. Hence the constant urge to conquer, which can be remarked in the activities of the dynasties that have passed within our view.

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 191(1167); ibid. 229(1174) and E.C.IV Heggaddevankote 23(1218) are examples of the first category; E.C.V Arsikere 31(1331), E.C.XII Gubbi 30(1331) and E.C.XI Chitaldrug 4(1328) of the second.
In the ruler the personal and the functional were compounded, producing one entity. And rightly so: insufficiency in either capacity, as a man, or as a king, undermined the security and tranquillity of his subjects with equal celerity. The lives of Nārasimha I and of Ballāla III leave in the mind no doubt of the truth of this proposition. As in the cases of more primitive nations, so the mediaeval Mysoreans dreaded the smallest hint of weakness in their leader; but it was not the magical effect of his physical debility which they feared, so much as the inevitable material loss and suffering which his incompetence would bring them. While he or his line declined, others were striving to rise, and the continuous balance of power never permitted the fall of one ruler without a compensating rise in another; the exchange of rulers was never unaccompanied by immense personal misery on the parts of the landholders and cultivators whose homes lay in the path of the conqueror, not to speak of the loses to be endured by commercial groups. Hence the tendency to attribute to the sovereign not only physical strength (bhujabala) but pre-eminence in prowess (Pratāpa-cakravarti), with a continual extension of dominion over the earth. His victorious king is said to continue as long as the moon, the sun and the stars, increasing with an ever-enlarging growth. (1) He rules the earth in the enjoyment of pleasant communications with his subordinates and subjects. (2) No hyperbole is too extravagant for this convention, and he is supposed, even in dark days, to be ruling without opposition from Hima to Śetu.

(1) vijaṇa-rājayam uttārottarābhivṛddhi-pravardhamānam ā candrārka-tāram-baram saluttam ire.
(2) suka-samkathā-vinōdadiṁ prthvī-rājayam geyyuttam ire.
It is conventionally added, again, that he rules exercising the functions of restraining the evil and protecting the good, (1) precedence, it may be noted, being accorded to the office of repression. So far as they can be discovered from the inscriptions, the facts throw much light on the manner in which the king performed these functions, and one may with interest survey the resulting conditions of public order on the one hand, and the extent of royal patronage of "the good" on the other.

It may be stated at the outset that the function of keeping the peace was never perfectly performed. There was, however, a noticeable variation in the number of outrages against public order between periods of strong and well-integrated government and those when local animosities or personal greed were unchecked by any paramount legal control. The rise and fall of the total number of cases of violent assault, whether upon wayfarers, houses, or entire villages, is a reliable index not only to the prevailing degree of public security but to the health of the administration likewise. A detailed inquiry into the subject is thus justified.

Between 1089 and 1273 more than forty cases of serious attacks upon villages are known to have taken place, in which women, cattle, or both were looted by the aggressors; in each case both attackers and attacked were fellow subjects of the Hoysala, and peace prevailed in the locality. In the same period there are known to have been eleven cases of highway robbery in which persons lost their lives; twenty-four cases of (1) duṣṭa-nigraha-śiṣṭa-pratipālanadim.
internal disorder, when fighting took place for various reasons unconnected with any war waged by the king; and eight cases of pitched battles specifically between chiefs under the authority of the Hoysala ruler. These numbers do not appear to have been alarming, but it must be remembered that only a small proportion of such incidents were commemorated by the erection of stone inscriptions, and of those so commemorated not all have survived in a decipherable condition. There are several references to burglaries, robbers, and robber-bands, but the number of depredations accountable to them must of necessity have been very much greater than the few that occasioned permanent records.

Of all classes of disturbance by far the greater number of known cases took place between 1181 and 1199, (1) more in fact than twice the total registered in either of the two periods which appear to have been next in order, 1161-1180 and 1221-1240. Next comes 1281-1300, then 1141-1160, the other periods of the Hoysala rule showing a comparatively negligible number of cases, the small rise in the middle periods being deprived of significance by the almost certain fact that the times of the rise of the Hoysalas and their decline were too disturbed and impoverished to have provided us with the same proportion of records of these calamities.

It is clear then, that, while the greater part of the reign of Ballala II was singularly free from disturbances, the period between the last years of Narasimha I and the first secure

---

(1) E.C.III Malavalli 46(1182); 92(1183); E.C.VI Kadur 47(1195); Chikmagalur 38(1193), 157(1195); E.C.VII Shikarpur 214 (1186), 173(1198); M.A.R.1915-6, para. 88(1193); S.I.I.X pt. 1, 321 (1194); M.A.R.1926, 40(1195); M.A.R.1927, 31(1191); E.C.XI Hiriyur 70 (?1193), and so on.
success over the Sēvunas was one of an extraordinary level of public disorder. The weak rule of Nārasimha, the unorthodox methods employed and exhausting efforts undergone by Ballāla to dispel the lethargy of the kingdom, together with the huge drain of able-bodied men which his northern campaigns demanded, and the effect of the war levies upon ill-managed estates, all these were contributory causes for this remarkable burst of lawlessness. On the other hand the periods that followed the deaths of Viṣṇuvardhana and Ballāla II, the two strongest members of the dynasty, show a noticeable deterioration compared with the preceding decades, and the declining state of the Hoysalas' kingdom from the last years of Nārasimha III to the end of the civil war was understandably one of considerable disorganization and internal strife.

When he had an opportunity to do so, the king, or his deputy was not slow to punish offenders, and several instances of the exercise of the royal powers of punishment are to be found. (1) It is not possible here to enter into any discussion of the severity or appropriateness of the respective penalties awarded, for the evidence is too slight and the interpretation of it somewhat doubtful. It must however be remembered that no theory existed of any royal prerogative of retribution, and ordinary members of the public were entitled to defend themselves in whatever manner they chose. (2) It is quite clear from the records that few people of any substance

---

(1) E.C.XII Tiptur 35(1179) is a fairly clear case; Cf.E.C.VIII Sorab 80(1131). A queen puts a man to death: E.C.V Arsikere 81 (?c 1225). (2) M.A.R.1915-6,para.89(1220): a man killed a gauḍa to avenge the death of another gauḍa, and seizing the gauḍike set up the stone to record the event.
travelled unarmed, and it is very likely that men and women of importance hired armed escorts. Robbers were slaughtered without mercy, and it is not apparent that the ruler demanded any account of the circumstances. It may be guessed, however, that if the robber happened to be a Brahman, his killer paid a sum of money to a temple as prāyaścitta, or expiation, for such was the custom in warfare at least, as we have already seen.

Only one record tells us at length of royal vengeance against those then supposed to be wrong-doers, and is sufficiently interesting to be quoted at length. It states that while Cōla-mahādevi, queen of Ballāla II, was at peace, both she and her subjects, she heard news of disaffection (duṣṭa-kaṣṭa-mātan). She gave orders to her army, and "that army, having besieged Bēvūr and taken prisoners, was on its way off, when Kētamalla, while the royal army was engaged in the siege, resolutely faced it, closed, came to grips, fought and engaged many, turned back the captured goods and cattle, and quickly opposing the heroic soldiers cut them up by his blows and through the strength of his arm alone, and upon the battle field reached the heavenly world." Then we are told that the heavenly maidens took up Kētamalla's soul in the heavenly chariot. When Kētamalla-nāyaka had thus gained the world of the gods, after this, Cōla-mahādevi called her treasurers, the heggades Rāyaṇa and Nācaṇṇa, and ordered them to go before the sixty farmers (or landholders) of Kambaḷūr (to which Bēvūr doubtless belonged) and summon Kētamalla's son Nāraśimha-nāyaka; to appease him, and give him a rent-free grant. She said, "We have caused dis-

(1) -over.
tress to our children - do you go and take them security in our name (or "gracious words"). And she gave certain tracts of wet land and black soil as a kodagi.(1)

Another record, which was doubtfully held by its editor to relate the looting by Nārasimha II of a village which he had granted as an agrahāra, certainly does not describe any such event. In fact, some gauḍas objected to their holdings being converted into an agahāra, and attacked the village. The relatives of the defenders were liberally rewarded by the agrahāra Brahmans and the land-holders of the locality. It is noticeable, in fact, that though these former gauḍas had been specifically disloyal to their king, no evidence is available that they were punished.(2)

Rewards and punishments were in practice often delegated to the lower degrees of governors, and the land holders were expected to secure their own defence. They are frequently found rewarding those who drove off raiders.(3)

Page 507 n.(1) E.C.VIII Sagar 31(1290), Sorab 402(1199): cf. ibid. 302(1270 or ? 1211), 189(1283) and also E.C.VI Chikmagalur 44(1287).

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 205(c1200). Śrikantha Sastri, in N.I.A i.p.426, says "when the people of Bēvūr slandered the fair name of Cōla-mahādevi, her servant Kētamalla attacked them and gave up his life. The queen touched, by remorse made a grant for the merit of his soul ". In this precis there are three certain errors and probably a fourth - remorse was apparently not the feeling uppermost in the Queen's mind, however the sāsana may put it: to her, clearly, the peace of her district was the first consideration, and those who could not be forced to submit had to be conciliated.

(2) M.A.R.1936,19(1230). To the king's face the gauḍas said "Yes", but behind his back they organized a force with the object of defeating his intentions. The editor was clearly misled.

(3) Very many viragals mention grants of small plots of land to the families of men, often called the 'dear sons' of the Brahmans, who died fighting in defence of an agrahāra: e.g. E.C.V Arsikere 134(1239). Part of the schemes adopted by local landholders for their own defence and that of their hamlets is reflected in
The king himself, however, exercised the power of choosing his advisers and officials, and controlled the promotion list, managing, when sufficiently strong, to keep them in hand by the dual provision of reward and punishment. It is has already been noticed how richly Gāṅga-rāja and Perumāle-damāyaka profited from the gratitude of Viṣṇuvardhana and Nārasimha III respectively. We hear on the other hand of Sīgarasa being obliged by Viṣṇuvardhana to give up his fief in Arasiyakere and of the threatened and actual dismissal of officials of both high and low status. (1) The fact that titles and estates were expected to become hereditary, a characteristic that is as noticeable in Mysore of the Hoysala times as in Hindu India generally during later periods, did not impair the ruler's power to dismiss and depose an official; it was generally understood that although titles were indestructible and might be gathered by a family from a number of dynasties, posts and offices were held at pleasure. Thus, when sufficiently powerful, the ruler had an effective disciplinary weapon in his hands.

One further aspect of his function of protecting the earth in its repressive character requires to be mentioned. Enemy kings and rival rulers were held conventionally to be troublesome or evil elements, and the process of uprooting them was compared to the clearing of a space of land of its thorny undergrowth. The king was frequently held to have "made the earth thornless" (niskantakam mādi), and thus to have brought to

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 48(1189), 45(1132); Belur 166(1279); Arsikere 21(1278-9).

records which refer to guard-houses (ṭhāpa): E.C.XI Davangere 102(1268). Cf. E.C.V Belur 140(1200), and also ibid. 83(1178), where certain persons lived tax-free in consideration of their guard-the god Sākara, and doubtless his treasury.
it ease and quiet by eradicating the previous dynasties.
This he did at the head of his "four-fold force", his army of foot, horse, elephants and chariots. Until the very last years of the dynasty, every Hoysala monarch led his troops in person on the field of battle. (1) Even the pusillanimous Nārasimha I almost certainly took part personally in one campaign. It is true that the king was not present on every occasion when the records state that he attacked a place or moved against an enemy, but there are very many instances, several of which have already been quoted, where he is stated to have observed the siege of a town or the exploits of a warrior, while more than once we hear of the ceremonial betel leaf by the gift of which the king dismissed a warrior to fight to the death on behalf of his master. The warlike Kannadigas were encouraged in their efforts to serve him by the knowledge that just as private citizens and corporations rewarded those who died fighting on their behalf, so the king granted land to reward valour on the field of battle. The nettaru Kdagagi, or grant of rent-free land as a reward for blood shed in its service, was the regular method for providing for widows and children's pensions out of State funds. We hear, again, that after heggaδe Gōtana, a servant of Gōvi-dēva, had slain enemies and put them to flight both in the battle in the plain and in the battle in the fort, he received a badge of honour and a head-piece for his elephant, together with praise and fame, besides which Nārasimha I apparently gave him a rent-free estate (1) Cf.E.C.VI Mudgere 5(1194).
in Mattavuru. The living, then, were rewarded as well as the dead. (1)

In the more positive aspect of "protecting the good" the king performed several distinct functions. These may be divided into judicial and purely administrative. Here again his powers were often exercised by and through deputies.

The king's judicial functions covered a wide field of activity. He exercised supreme jurisdiction in cases of contract, inheritance, and general disputes concerning property. In this he was almost certainly assisted by a sabhā or committee of Brahman jurists and assessors, of which we hear nothing in the inscriptions, as is to be expected, for the ṣāsanās record the decision without concerning themselves with the consultations through which it was arrived at. (2) The great labour of deciding cases did not devolve in its entirety upon the king, for he seems to have heard cases from districts near the capital, and although he was prepared to deal with litigation, especially that initiated by the government, concerning inhabitants of every part of his kingdom, local governors, their deputies and communal assemblies, trade guilds and local committees of landholders either dealt with the disputes themselves or deputed some eminent person to hear cases and pass sentence. The eminent person concerned appears often to have been a mere figure-head at the proceedings, his motions being swayed by the

(1) E.C.VI Kadur 34(1348). See also E.C.V Arsikere 31(1331), E.C.V Channarayapatna 267(971) and E.C.III Nanjangud 71(1192).
(2) The sabhā of Ballāla-dēva mentioned in E.C.III Malavalli 83(1304 - not 1184 as Rice says) is probably not a sabhā of this kind, but a committee set up by Ballāla II to deal with the affairs of the endowment.
conclusions of arbitrators who may or may not have had a direct or indirect interest in the outcome of the dispute. (1) Frequently a combination of central and local jurisdictions was employed. For example, one record, having outlined the regulations to be followed by tenants at Dambala, regulations actually framed by the tenants themselves, and doubtless approved by the king's advisers at the instance of the ruler of Kukkala-nād, Jāleya-dannāyaka, proceeds to invest the tenants in their corporate capacity with the power to try those who transgressed the rules of the caste, while Vīra-Ballāla was to punish those found guilty. (2)

(1) For example M.A.R.1920, para. 77(1313). A particular deed was executed in favour of a litigant in the presence of a son of the mahāpradhāna Dādi-Sōmeya-danpāyaka by the 7 puras and sthānapatis of the 5 mahās of Talaikkādu (Talakād) after arbitrators had sent for the parties and brought about a reconciliation by a compromise. (Nāte: one should correct to "sthānapatis of the 7 puras and 5 mahās", cf. E.C.III Malavalli 104(1324), 107 (?1321), 60(?1153), 122(1312), 109(1338) and 83(1304).) E.C.V Channarayapatna 170(1231) shows a dispute, among agrahāra Brāhmans about the divisions of the shares, settled by the governing body of the agrahāra itself with the aid of surveyors. M.A.R.1915-6, para 88(1190): the chief men of the "nine nāḍs" were called in to settle a dispute over the boundary between two villages after fighting had taken place. They decided the limits of the villages, settled the claims and imposed a fine on the village that had caused deaths in the other. S.I.I. IX pt.1,327(1207) is not, as the editor thought, an instance of the reference of breaches of conduct and offences to a guru: in fact the five vargas of the sthāna, the ēlkti-mahādēvas, the numberless gaṇas and the mummuridāṇas, that is to say, representatives of civil, commercial and religious bodies interested in the promotion of the sect that centred round the shrine in question, joined with Viṣṇukara-brahmacāri, a learned ascetic, and decided that if anyāya and avāntara should be levied on the village, the sthānikas, that is, the managers, should deal with the affair with the approval of the ascetic, further provisions being obliterated on the stone and so illegible. Anyāya was a tax (see below p.560), and avāntara means "extra" or "subordinate", and thus may or may not be the proper name of a tax.

(2) E.C.IX Nelamangala 12(c1330). Rice's translation is defective.
When new groups were formed, new societies fashioned and new engagements entered into by old institutions, the King or his deputy or both were often quoted as authority for the contract, which was generally framed by the parties independent of the government. The active support of Vīra-Ballāla given to the Vīra-Paṇcālas has already been noticed. We read in one record that if anyone transgresses this permanent contract (dhruva undige(1)) he incurs the wrath of the emperor Vīra-Nārasimha-devarasa and of Sōvala-dēvi, who must have been the governor of the district, and is banished from the 300 (the agrahāra) and the 32,000 (Nolambavādi).(2) Likewise the transgressor of the regulations prescribed in another record is said to come under the "order" of Ballāla-dēva and of Tōya Siṅgeya-danṭāyaka.(3)

To the transfers of landed property also, and to exchanges of holdings it was thought necessary to obtain the king's sanction, and the evidence, together with considerations derived from the revenue system, is sufficient to support a conjecture that a kind of central land-registry system existed.

(1) Undige means "stamp", or seal of authorization; cf. the common expression undige-sādhyam mādi, "having made it subject to his writ", i.e. "having conquered"; then the word came to mean (1) stamped paper in the modern sense; (2) stamp-duty, in the vocabulary of the contemporary taxation offices.

(2) E.C. VI Tarikere 53(?1230). Rice is mistaken in attributing this threat to ibid.55(?1231) also. But the latter does indeed bear the expression Vīra-Nārasimha's āge and that of the 300, that is, the "order" of the king and of the corporation. E.C. III Tirumakudal-narsipur 118(K.T. only) of Ballāla II or III mentions the āge of a daṇṭāyaka.

(3) E.C. XII Tiptūr 83. So also E.C. IV Nagamangala 49(1270), where the authorities are Nārasimha III and the śrī-Varaṇavas of the 18 nāds. It is worth noting that in E.C. V Belur 174(1225) K.T. only, it is stated that those who damaged the stone (a baldly phrased viragal) would receive punishment from śrī-Vīra-Nārasīṅga-dēvaṇṇa, probably because some land-grant was connected with the record and the stone itself.

(4) E.C. VI Mudgere 21(?1049) and E.C. V Arsikere 112(1174).
The King was thus in a position to be an effective final court of appeal to which disputes about land-grants might be brought, and there is no doubt but that these were very frequent. (1) One such case may be reproduced at length:

Cōla-gaṇḍa in former times had obtained a grant on account of his victory over some enemies of the state. A dispute arose over the boundary of Garudahalli: the copper-plate grant was produced, but the people of Murudipura filed a petition (2) to the effect that there had been no agreement (ōdamādām) about it even in former times and the boundary stones had been set up by force. Kannayya of Garudahalli opposed this move, which merely aimed at rendering void the agreement which had in fact been made, holding that the stones might have been set up by force, but that the land being his they ought not to be disturbed. He had an (?) affidavit (śirah patra) made out declaring how far Murudi extended, and underwent an ordeal in the temple of Hoysalēśvara in the royal city of Dōrasamudra. He won his case, but, to enable the stones to continue as the boundary, Nārāsinha III had to make further grants both to him and to Garudahalli. The jaya-patra or document attesting his success was given him by the king, who signed the record "śrī-Malaparol gānda" above the signatures of the interested parties or their legal representatives. (3)

The King was called upon to give judgement in cases of inheritance likewise. An interesting case occurred in 1255.

(1) E. g. E.C.V Arsikere 49(1215), 51(1215); Channarayapatna 170(1231)
(2) uṇḍīgēyān ikkīdāde, "when they had executed a stamped document."
(3) E.C.III Mandya 79(?1275). Rice made several errors, but the record is damaged. For ordeals and their part in contemporary lawsuits see E.C.VIII Sorab 387(1241) and M.A.H. 1908, para. 50;
A certain Devanna sold a house site to Bhandari Adiyanna in 1251; subsequently his sons Naganna and Sovanna, not knowing this, wanted to take possession of the site, whereupon the case went up to Narasimha III. The king told them that they were in honour bound to carry out the wishes of their father, and decided the case in favour of the other party. The point of the case was that Devanna, according to the regular custom as interpreted in the Mitaksara, which was a standard text-book of the period, ought to have sought his son's permission before selling the land, and his negligence enabled them to submit that the sale was void. (1)

Disputes over succession and partition were common, and, as in the case of contracts, were usually settled by local authorities. In one case three chief heggades of a district dealt with the case of encroachment by daughter's children on the land of son's children, who, of course, had superior claims in law. (2) In another the raja-guru, or royal preceptor, Candrabhūsana-dēva and the 120 sthānikas of the capital Dōrasamudra divided the lands of the cleric Sōma-jiya among his wife, his son-in-law and another, and the violator of this arrangement was to be considered as having disregarded the raja-guru and the religious body (samaya). The threats were not inapposite, as the partition was clearly unusual; beside the wife, the other parties had insignificant rights to the possessions of the praepositus. Other instances are recorded of disputes and their

(1) M. A. R. 1911-2, para. 91 (1255). Kane, op. cit., i, pp. 556, 557, 593, 639. One example of the many instances where compliance with the regulation is explicitly recorded is E. C. V. Channarayapatna
solutions. A general problem of the period was, however, not tackled by the king or his appointed authority for the time being as occasion arose. In several respects Mitākṣarā doctrines did not satisfy the prevalent feeling of the several sections of the Kannada people, and in others the room for dispute was held to be too wide. Accordingly we find instances where, in the interests of public confidence, the ruler set out the law on the difficult question of the succession to the property of a man dying aputra, or without sons, sons'sons, or sons' grandsons.(1)

The Mitākṣarā view was that in such cases the order of succession was the widow, failing her the daughter, failing her the daughter's son, failing him the mother of the praepositus, failing her his father, failing him the brothers of the praepositus, and, to complete the compact series, failing all these, the brothers' sons - the series itself being prolonged by the addition of gotrajas and bandhus.(2) It will be seen that concubines are not provided for in this scheme. The Mitākṣarā and its school are not silent on the subject of the rights of their offspring: the dāsiputra, or son of a kept concubine, is entitled to maintenance only, and to no share on 242(1252). In other cases the approval of the coparceners must be understood, when not expressly stated. In the case here quoted it appears that the father was dead and the sons were unseparated members of the coparcenary, but it is not absolutely certain, and the occasion of the suit may have been a partition. Page 515 n.(2) E.C.VI Mudgere 24(1188),damaged.


(1) Examples of disputes: E.C.VI Kadur 152(1235) and E.C.V Arsikere 38(1200). On the interpretation of the word aputra, see Kane op.cit. p.701.
(2) Kane op.cit. p.700-762. The right of the widow to succeed is shown by records, see below p.567, not to have been undisputed.
partition or to any inheritance, when the father is of the
twice-born classes; when the father is, as were the majority
of the Kannadigas, a śūdra, the dāsiputra is entitled to a
share of the property at the discretion of the father, and to
a half share if his father be dead at the time of partition.(1)
The same, or worse, discrimination is harboured against the
dāsi herself. She is not entitled to inherit to a sonless par­
amour.(2) Now a powerful section of Kannāda public opinion,
for various reasons including economic conditions, favoured
the promotion of these persons, together with the brothers of
the deceased, in the ranks of the beneficiaries to the exclusion
of more remote connections and of the parents of the praepos­
itus.

A Caṅgālva record of 1297 shows a group of local
personages declaring the law in a regulation by śāsana to the
nakhara (merchants) of their nāḍ: - "The former custom for land
descending to a woman in Kundūr proceeds as follows: it descends
to a woman, to female children and to the children of female
slaves."(3) The regulation touches upon the rights of a widow
over property inherited from her aputra husband: the true
Mitāksara doctrine is that a widow has only the usufruct of
such inheritance, and it may not descend from her to her chil­
dren by another marriage - in which case she forfeits the in­
heritance from her first husband - or to any other person but
the coparceners to whom it would have descended had she not
been alive.(4) This particular record is of rather wider impli­

(1) Kane, op. cit. p. 600-1.
(2) ibid. p. 707.
(3) E.C.I 59(1297).
cations than the present topic requires to be investigated, and, being in any case from Coorg and outside Hoysala administrative boundaries, may here be dismissed with the remark that the power of the Mitāksarā law was limited and probably as stoutly resisted by the mountain and forest communities in one direction as it was rejected by reactionaries against the widow's rights in another.

Similar to the example quoted above is one which portrays the sale by Bōkāna in 1140 or 1141 of land out of his koḍagi, on condition that the land passed from the buyer to the children of his female slave. (1) Again, about 1222, in the south-east part of the kingdom, Vīra-Cōla-vaṇikar, who had some connection with the king when in Talakād, obtained a sās-ana from him and gave it to the subjects of the locality with regulations as follows:— the property of those who die without children (makkalu yilladavaru) shall go to elder brother, younger brother, son-in-law, father-in-law, father's younger brother, father's elder brother, or their children, in this order of priority. The high precedence of the son-in-law reminds us of the aliya-santāna itself, which is now almost confined to the Malabar coast, but must have been of far-reaching influence in medieval times. The aliya-santāna is, of course, entirely opposed to the orthodox doctrines, whether Mitāksarā or Dayabhāga. Moreover the exclusion of grandchildren is very remarkable; it may be explained by the fact that "childless persons" in this record does not signify "those childless at the time of their death", which is inherent in the technical use of the Sanskrit

(1) E.C.V Belur 219(c1141). The record is damaged and confused. The king appears to have exercised some control over the transaction, probably registering the transfer. It is not probable that these children were to take precedence.
aputra, but "those who have never had children". (1)

In 1331, when a paṭṭaṇa was formed by the mahā-
mandalēśvara Koyaḷarasa in his capacity as ruler of the dis-

trict, he promulgated regulations including one that a younger
brother should inherit the property of an (aputra) elder brother
and vice versa.(2) Similar rules are found elsewhere, and reg-
ulations for burial of concubines and wives, as well as for
taxation are often found together with them.(3)

That the king was entitled to dispose by proclamation
of the property of those that died without heirs of any kind is
plain from several contemporary records. A trace of this right
being exercised is found in an example of 1181. A general assem-
over legitimate children.

(1) E.C.III Tirumakudal-narsipur 21(c1222). Kane, op.cit.p.560.

(2) E.C.III Mālavalli 114(1331).

(3) E.C.VI Chārmagalur 105(1343); E.C.IX Nēlamangala 12(c1330)-
if a tenant died without children (makkal illād iddaqe to be
interpreted as aputra) his elder and younger brothers were to
have possession. If there were no brothers, his son-in-law and
grandchildren were to have possession. See also E.C.IX Kākan-
halli 81(1306) which is damaged; M.A.R.1920,para77(1297), and

E.C.IX Channapatna 73(1318) where a temple was to be the bene-
ficiary when a childless (aputrika) man dies without brothers,
beloved relatives, or "all relatives without exception"(naṣṭar-
ışṭaru), and children by female slaves. There is a difficulty in
this record: does tammādi, variously read tammaḍe or tammadā,
mean an attendant on an idol, or are we to understand tammadā,
"obstruction"? If the former, then the regulation depended on
the existence of a temple staff to receive the cattle, otherwise
a paṭṭaṇa for the Nāṇā Dēsīs was to be set up free of fines for
adultery, etc., and stamp duty (uṇḍige). If the latter, then
the regulations were contingent upon some hindrance, perhaps
the absence of legitimate children. In any case the record is
obscure and unreliable.

(4) Besides E.C.IX Channapatna 73(1318) quoted above, E.C.XI
Davangere 70(1275) and E.C.X Bowringpet 34(1269). On the royal
powers of escheat see Kane, pp.762-3.
bly of the officials, priests, mayors and the Nānā Dēsīs of the district decreed that the property of the Bānāṅjigas of Belagāvi dying without sons, grandsons or greatgrandsons (aputrika) should be appropriated to the festivals and so on of the god Gavaresvara; that of the Bānāṅjigas in the nagara, to the god Nagaresvara; and in other parts to the gods of the various quarters respectively. (1) It is true that the property belonged to persons, or rather families, represented at the assembly, but the right to dispose of property by such a general regulation, to the disadvantage of degrees of kinship arbitrarily considered remote, was derived from the general power of escheat vested in the ruler. It is in any case clear that no sort of uniformity prevailed as to type of body or authority that exercised this derived right; provided the caste were agreed upon a policy it was immaterial who supervised its execution.

Of the decisions given by the king in disputes over real property, besides the cases already quoted, two examples survive. An inscription in Tamil of the year 1233, of which we possess as yet no more than a report, records that Sōmēśvara in settling a dispute between temple managers and a private individual regarding the ownership of the village Vannam, otherwise Madurāntaka-nallūr, decided that it should be enjoyed as temple property. (2) Two records refer to Bālāla II's settling the boundary between the Āsandī and the Pāṇḍya nāḍa, a decision which he is said to have arrived at together with his pañca-

(1) E.C.VII Shikarpur 119(1181). Rice says "without sons"; E.I. v. p. 26-8(1178) shows that aputrika has exactly the same significance as aputra. It is clear that at this time the right of the widow to inherit was still debated. E.I. v. p. 26-8 provides for the widow as heir. (2) A.R. 1914, 94(1233).
pradhāna or committee of five ministers. It is very unfortunate that the details of the boundary can not be traced on the modern survey maps; but it is plain that, as both nāḍs were part of the Hoysala kingdom at the time, the inquiry must have been instituted at the request of a village or villages subject to the king against others likewise subjects, and it therefore partook of a judicial character rather than a political one.

A final example of the judicial functions of the ruler may be found in the activity of a certain officer of the hejjuṅka and others who made a grant out of the taxes in 1192 to Mahābala-gāvūnda and the 700 (division) as compensation for the damage caused by the encampment of the king's army. It is clear that Ballāla II desired to pacify and conciliate the authorities in the newly conquered territories, and such relief from taxation was an easy method of winning their support. The decision of the exact amount to be granted and the taxes to be sacrificed was for the officials on the spot to make, and it is likely that they had to hear a series of complaints and petitions before an award was arrived at.

In the purely administrative field the king's activities were complex. Not only had he at his disposal large areas of land which had not already been awarded to public servants, formed into agrahāras, or bestowed upon temples, but he had in his gift offices from that of gauda or even watchman to that which bore the title Kumāra. In practice, however, his rights were often delegated to subordinate rulers and local bodies who might be expected to have a better know-

(1) E.C.VII Channagiri 73(1180), copied by 72(1220). The expression pāṇca-pradhāna is a hapaxlegomenon in Hoysala records. (2) A.R.1926-7, App.F.113(1192). (3) & (4) over.
ledge of a candidate's qualifications. In religious appointments likewise the king held many valuable posts in his gift and is known to have exercised the right of presentation; in many cases again he exercised a controlling influence on the management of individual temples.(1)

From the wealth at his disposal he made money grants towards various objects of public importance, and assigned for such purposes lands at ordinary, reduced or nominal rent, the produce of which was expected to provide for all the expenses. Highest in the list of beneficiaries from the royal patronage stood the Brahman community, for whose support vast areas of land were set aside, often without any express condition that they should perform any service in return for this gigantic public sacrifice. This is not the place to enter into a discussion as to the merits of this community or the benefits which the nation derived from susidizing it, but it is worthy of notice that of the large number of agrahāras that must have existed no less than 103 reserves are mentioned in Hoysala inscriptions, and if the average agrahāra produced, tax-free, between 800 and 1,000 gadyānas a year the total yearly loss to the State can hardly have been less than 100,000 gadyānas, even when due allowance is made for the revenue paid on the lands. It is known that some bitterness was caused by the devotion of the ruling house to the interests of the Brahman community, a feeling that can readily be forgiven when

Page 521 n.(3) If he wanted to grant land that had already been alienated to a temple, he could buy it back: E.C.V Belur 18(1292).
Page 521 n.(4) Gaudā: E.C.V Arsikere 67(1335); watchman: E.C.V Arsikere 79(1184).
(1) E.C.III Tirumakudal-narsipur 3(1180, not 1300 as Rice suggests) E.C.III Tirumakudal-narsipur 3(1180, not 1300 as Rice suggests); E.C.III Mandya 123(1269).
it is considered that the ruler often deliberately invited foreign, especially northern, Brahmins to come and receive land grants. The Brahmins, or mahājanaṅgal as they were known, were left to manage their own affairs, the heads of the original founder families forming a committee, known in the characteristic Kannada way as the Thirty, the Sixty, the Hundred and Four, and so on, choosing a chairman to act as their executive head for a month at a time. At the inception of the agrahāra the land was divided among the Brahmins into so many shares, seldom more than a hundred, and the method of apportioning them was recorded together with any subsequent modifications. The inhabitants worked under the share-holders precisely as if they were private land-holders, while the agrahāra as a whole was responsible for forwarding the stipulated revenue, if any.

As recipients of the State's bounty the temples stood second. The land grants for the provision of offerings, vestments, garlands, services, lamps, furniture, repairs to and embellishment of the structure of the temples were not as excessive in size as they were numerous, and even when the stipends of the various temple servants and attendants were added, the gross loss of revenue was not very considerable. For every gadyāna appropriated to this unproductive end by the State, private donations accounted for at least two. (1)

(1) A good example of the establishment of temples and the expenditure involved is found in E.C.V Channarayapatna 238(1249) and may be compared to a rather more magnificent establishment recorded in E.C.XII Chiknayakanhalli 2(1261). In the first case the Brahmins of Unguragere transferred their payment of saḍḍhayā, a total of 95 gadyānas, from the State to the upkeep of two temples, ūn the authority of Bommana-dannāyaka. The sum was apportioned as follows:

(continued over.)
It should, in all fairness, be added that the government did not consider these alienations unprofitable: the worship of the gods was thought essential to the prosperity of the realm, and beyond that the donor anticipated a happy existence in the next world. It was of importance to the donor, more-

| **5 pujāris** | ga. 25 pa. - |
| **2 attendants** | 4 - |
| **4 cooks** | 10 - |
| People who draw ornamental designs. | 2 5 |
| **Clerk** | 11 - |
| **2 Bhaṭṭa-gutta (?)** | 5 6 |
| **8 davasaiga (grain-dealers)*** | - |
| **2 garland-makers** | 5 - |
| **2 angharika (?)** | 8 - |
| **2 grove-gardeners** | 4 - |
| **2 potters** | 2 2 |
| **Washermen** | - 7 |
| **Total:** | ga. 95 pa. 0 |

In the second case we are incidentally introduced to a method by which the administrative classes provided for their own comfort. Gopala-danmayaka divided land he had received from Narasimha III into 47 shares, and gave 37 shares to Brahmans, one of which they managed for his benefit. The remaining ten shares he gave to the temple of the god Yoganaṭha which he had set up, and the Brahmans agreed to pay the fixed rent and other dues of these ten shares, which also were apparently in their charge, to the government. One share was to defray the cost of a yearly feast in Gopala's name in honour of Bharita-prakāśa Yogēśvara, who must have been a local guru; one for the upkeep of the temple and other buildings and the garden together with the livelihood of the gardeners and ornaments for the god; while eight shares were expected to provide an income of 151 gadyāṇas, to be apportioned as follows:-

| Offerings and Nambis (officiants) | ga. 6 |
| Decorators (or ? dancing girls) | 6 |
| Attendants | 4 |
| Cooks | 4 |
| Water-carriers | 2 |
| 5 servants of different classes, viz. 2 drummers, 1 garland maker & 1 sweeper. | 22 |
| Bhariteya-danmayaka in the dual role of manager and treasurer. | 40 |
| Singeya-danmayaka as clerk and inspector. | 40 |
| Gopala's daughter Bāyaka as superintendent of gardens, lands, & granary. | 20 |
| Preparer of meals, rice, cooked food, and pigments. | (cont. over) 2 |
over, that his grant should be continued even after his own end, for it was generally believed that the gods resented any interruption in their worship and attributed any defalcations to lack of care on the part of the original donor. Hence the curses called down upon the one who might tamper with the lands producing the temple's income, and intermitted the revenue thus enjoyed by the god, and hence the precautions with which the grants were recorded and displayed on stone for all to see. The future beatitude of the king, then, was clearly of more importance than that of a mere subject, for his anticipation of the favour of heaven was part of the semi-supernatural atmosphere that hedged about his royal person and upon which the obedience of his subjects largely depended. Naturally, being so easily acquired, this preeminence was not exclusive, and any wealthy subordinate had equality of opportunity with his sovereign; so that both the king and his competitors for divine favouritism took more than the usual precautions to protect their grants. Humbler persons wisely entrusted the management to a perpetual body, such as a corporation of merchants or gaudas or substantial personages of the nād. A king's grants, unfortunately for the comfort of his soul, often fell with his kingdom, for a new dynasty might restore or renew the religious grants of the members of the previous ruling house, or might not. And when private persons from time to time diverted such funds into their own pockets, or appropriated land set aside for religious pur-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oilmonger, potter &amp; washerman, Vaiśnavaś</th>
<th>ga. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The disparity of the salaries is well worthy of attention.</td>
<td>ga. 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
poses, what was to be expected of a conqueror, whose arrival signaled, in theory at any rate, the immediate cancellation of all land grants and tenancies whatever? (1)

It should be added categorically that the Hoysala kings made grants from public lands, or of lands purchased out of public funds, to temples of all three denominations, Saiva, Vaishnava and Jaina, in that order of amount, in conformity with the popularity of the respective doctrines, but without noticeably preferential discrimination.

The last objects of royal beneficence which deserve mention are tanks and towns. Royal interest in tanks is remarkable throughout the period, but increased in vigour in the eastern half of the kingdom during the last decades of the dynasty when the east had to be relied upon to make good the deficiencies of the west. Not only the construction of "virgin" tanks, but the preservation of existing dams, sluices and channels, together with the provision of necessary equipment, were the object of royal solicitude. (2) For those who contemplated

(1) M.A.R.1933, 48(1251) gives an interesting account of the appropriation of a śivapura, or agrahāra for lingāyats, and its restitution, due to the efforts of a certain person, who "pierced himself and went to the four boundary stones". It would be of value to investigate further the extent to which fear of the supernatural affected public conduct, compared with the pressure exercised by a legal sense. There are several instances of Hoysala rulers confirming or continuing the religious grants of their predecessors of other houses, e.g. E.C.VII Shikarpur 235 (1207); and vice versa, e.g. E.C.VII Honnali 17 (1286). The holders of a grant were very proud of the length of time which their body had been permitted to keep it: see E.C.VI Kadur 49(1291), M.A.R.1933, 48(1251) and M.A.R.1935, 49(1206). The ever-present danger of grants being made void is reflected in the questions, "What sāsana is this? Where is it? Who set it up? Why should I maintain it", in the imprecatory of E.C.VI Kadur 157(1191).

(2) E.C.V Arsikere 86(1223), 88(1184), 102a(1100-1); E.C.III Seringapatam 154(c1225); Mandya 44(c1297); E.C.IX Hoskote 56(c1330); 96(1334); E.C.XII Tumkur 17(1287), 27-33(1287).
the construction of a new tank either taxes were remitted on land they already held but which would benefit from the irrigation, or a rent-free grant was made. It is of interest to note that though the cost of building a tank would of course depend upon its size and the appropriateness of the terrain, it is known that one in particular, the Kācisamudra at Halagōḍu, cost 1,200 gadyāṇas. (1) The land granted as a kodagi in this case was 500 kambas of wet land of a sowing capacity of 12 salages. The value of wet land in the area during this period is unfortunately unknown, but a few miles westwards fifty years before a kamba sold at 9 paṇas, and, despite the possible variation in the length of the kamba and quality of the land, it is unlikely that the prices differed considerably. (2) At that rate the market value of the kodagi must have been in the region of 450 gadyāṇas. The taxes forgone on this holding can not have been more than 15 gadyāṇas a year, so that, although the grant was a valuable one, it was by no means over generous, and the treasury suffered a very inconsiderable loss compared with the gain which the country and indirectly the government experienced as a result of this piece of official encouragement.

The creation of a town was likewise an administrative measure of great importance and of some, if not considerable, initial loss to the treasury. It must be remembered that ninety nine inhabited places out of a hundred were ārgal, that is to say, a few houses, gathered together for protection, and owned

---

(1) E.C.XII Tumkur 33(1287) and 28(1287). E.C.IX Bangalore 111 (1340) concerns a tank costing 3,000 honnu, or gadyāṇas. 
(2) E.C.VI Kadur 12a(1233).
perhaps by less than half a dozen persons. Attached to each ūr were several still more detached groups of dwellings which were known as Kāluvalī, or the hamlet or hamlets associated with the ūr for revenue purposes. Communications between the villages were very poor, but some routes were beaten more firmly than others, and carried sufficient traffic to prevent the cultivators from ploughing them up each year. These routes were the main trade arteries of the country and served to carry internal as well as foreign produce, allowing the passage of goods from every direction to markets even beyond the Hoysala boundaries. It has already been noticed that the State derived a revenue from the customs dues on this traffic, and therefore certain villages on the main routes were chosen to house customs posts. Moreover, a country such as was the Hoysala country produced normally a large surplus of foodstuffs, with a variety of crops in the different quarters of the kingdom. Those therefore with produce to exchange or sell needed places in which to find a good and generally frequented market. These market towns not seldom growing up around villages that housed customs posts were known as puras or paṭṭanaśas, the latter being the more usual name for a well established town in the modern sense and an equivalent for the Sanskrit term nagara. In these dwelt a motley population seldom seen in the villages, and the constitution of these more populous and infinitely more prosperous centres was quite different to the village pattern. The paṭṭanā raised a large revenue not only from a house tax (1) but on dues on commodities bought and sold within its limits. The

(1) M.A.R.1920, para. 77 shows that this was in one case 2 panas for each house.
funds were administered and the market supervised by a
variable number of mayors or wardens called paṭṭana-svāmis,
who were themselves not of the administrative but invariably
of the merchant classes (seṭṭis).(1) Some paṭṭanas, of which
Arasiyakāre or Ariskere is an outstanding example, bore the
proud title of rājadhāni-paṭṭana, or metropolis, a paṭṭana
which had held or continued to hold a royal residence.

Now paṭṭanas had to be created and given a charter,
and the process generally involved some immediate financial
loss to the State. A charter (sāsana) was given by the subordi-
nate officials and landholders of the nād in assembly under
the superintendence of the district governor. Its terms were
that certain persons might build houses and set up facilities
under favourable fiscal conditions, the taxes due on their
premises and those subsequently erected being remitted for the
first year, and for two years in the case of newcomers to the
place, and to be low in the following year, and at the full
rate in the third and fourth year respectively. A fair (sante)
or regular market would be established, almost certainly with
stipulated dues to be paid to the commune. The establishing of
this market was considered as a privilege, and was doubtless of
great value to the surrounding country. The scanty details
available make it appear that the action was originally a royal
prerogative which was gradually usurped by the lower orders of
the administration, though the name of the local governor was
generally mentioned in the record - if indeed he or she were
not entirely responsible for the innovation - and the sanction

(1) These officials occur in no less than nineteen records, e.g
E.C. II 335(1195); E.C. VII Shimoga 88(1203); and M.A.R.1922, para.
41c(1318).
of the revenue department was almost certainly obtained beforehand. (1)

The outline here given of the various governmental powers and duties of the king as actually observed in operation in our surviving records has obliged us to recognize the very large part played in the everyday execution of those functions by persons other than the king himself. It is of value to classify in order of social importance the degrees of administrative officials upon whose shoulders the burden actually lay, following that classification by an enumeration of the most important of the executive officials recognized during our period.

After the king himself came the Yuvarāja or heir apparent. Ereyanga and Nārasimha II are known to have held this title. (2) More usually Kumāra was the title of the heir apparent in the Hoysala records, and from the existence of a Kumāra-nāḍ among the larger of the nāḍs in the Gaṅgavāḍi 96,000 it may be guessed that he often acted as a district governor. But on the whole, even if he drew part of his income from such a source, he was, as has been seen, the second-in-command and principal deputy of his father. His father's crowned queens, pattad arasiyar, not only governed provinces but also conducted campaigns. (3) The queens are not listed among the officials in the lists of Appendix V but are found in the genealogical table. Almost every one there mentioned exercised administrative authority and had ministers and officials under her. (4) The uncrow-

(1) Examples: M.A.R.1911-2, para.90(1251); ibid.1920,para.77a(1337). (2) E.C.VI Kadur 142(1096); E.C.V Channarayapatna 243(1210). (3) Cēṣa-mahādēvi is an example of the former, see above,p.507-8; Umē-đēvi of the latter, above,p.254. (4) For example Sōvarasa, mahāpradhāna and treasurer of Padma-lađēvi,S.I.I.IX 325(1205). Rāyanā and Nācanā were treasurers.
ned queens and concubines, on the other hand, are not known to have wielded any jurisdiction, and it is uncertain from what source their livelihood was derived. The distinction between the "senior" and "junior" crowned queens does not appear to have affected their status in any way relevant to this classification. (1)

Of the subordinate governors those that were of a status nearly equal to that of the crowned queens were, in order of seniority, the Maṇḍalēśvaras, mandalikas and sāmantas. The prefix maḥā (great) to each of these was of little practical significance: as a sign of superior dignity it was very frequently affected. The first pair were generally of families which had roots in the soil from long before the emergence of the Hoysala dynasty, and had been obliged to accept Hoysala overlordship. Often their titles were out of proportion to their actual power and resources. The mandalēśvara, though his title scarcely differed in meaning from that of the mandalika, was higher in rank than the latter, because conventional usage reserved the term to the superior dynastic heads in the days of the Cāḷukyan empire. The Hoysala himself had been a maḥā-maṇḍalēśvara until 1192. The term maṇḍala was, like nāḍa, a term of very elastic use, signifying a country or district; and both maṇḍalēśvara and mandalika were rulers of a maṇḍala. The word was not however used for administrative purposes, and thus had much in common with the word Kampana, which then certainly existed, with a meaning similar to maṇḍala, but was never em-

(1) The greatest exponent of this system was Ballāla II. His successor seems to have abandoned it. See below, p.531.
ployed by the Hoysala governmental machine to designate a
district of any particular size or standing. The sāmanta, as
the title itself indicates, originated as a guardian of front-
rier districts, given large privileges in areas that were sub-
ject to the invasion of less civilized tribes, and with the
task of holding in check the rugged and wild regions that lay
between the nascent kingdom and the surrounding chaos. This
responsible officer often retained as a hereditary fief the
lands originally entrusted to his family, even in days when
they had long ceased to be on a frontier and civilization had
spread far beyond, leaving him with his title of sāmanta as an
antique survival. Small wonder, then, that the word sāmanta
came eventually to mean little more than a feudatory or tribut-
ar chief. More logically named were the nād-ālvās of the
Tamilia districts in the east of the plateau. Their title,
drawn from the nād which they had in their charge, preceded their
personal names, and gives a precise notion of their function
and position; as rulers of a nād apiece they were equal to the
western sāmantas, but in practice their degree of independence
made them more akin to the mandalēsvaras.

These officers were not, however, the only subordinate
governors of districts. Directly depending on the government at
the capital was a large number of officials who for the most
part ruled small divisions, generally one or more nāds, or ad-
ministrative subdivisions, near their family estate, but were
often employed on a more temporary basis and were movable from
one quarter of the kingdom to another. These were frequently,
but by no means exclusively, Brahmans, who by the end of 
the Hoysala period occupied numerically a very high position 
in the civil service. The most common title by which they 
were known was dandanāyaka, generally found in its Kannada 
form danṇāyaka. This, with the poetical variants daṇḍanātha, 
daṇḍādhinātha, daṇḍēśa, daṇḍādhīśa and daṇḍādhipati, originally meant a military rank similar to colonel or brigadier. It 
seems, however, clear that not every dandanāyaka held a military commission, but that all such general officers were qualified to hold them at the king’s pleasure. Many governors, again, had not attained that rank, but were entitled mahāpradhāna, or "(great) minister", or merely nāyaka, or "chief".

To illustrate the manner in which the various 
types of territorial administrators carried out their duties, 
let us suppose that a certain dandanāyaka is put in charge of a 
particular nād, just as, for example, Harīhara-dandanāyaka ruled 
Āsandī-nād between about 1216 and 1238. During his twenty years 
or more of command he enjoyed absolute control of his nād, subject on the one hand to the extent to which Ballāla II may have interfered directly in the nād’s administration, and on the 
other to the limits of the cooperation which he obtained from 
the local gentry and inhabitants. His personal staff consisted 
of one or more advisors, termed, in imitation of the ministers 
at the king’s court, mahāpradhānas;(1) a treasurer, the bhanḍārī; 
a secretary, the sēnabōva;(2) and a number of functionaries 
passing under the general title of pergade or heggade, who were 
personal assistants who may or may not have been seconded to 
his service by the central government, together with a number of 

(1) Except in poetry the titles pradhāna and mantri were out of use. (2) The title appears to have been at first a military
constables and body-guards called puruṣa and bal-manuṣya respectively. (1) In his capacity as governor he commanded a small garrison, his seconds in command being one or more māyakas, with perhaps a troop of horse under a chief sāhāṇi and a few elephants commanded by a chief māvanta. He was in contact with, though not apparently in direct control of, the various treasury officials of the nāḍ. These were the śrī-karanas, or accountants, who received the revenue on behalf of the government at Dōrasamudra, and, who, in token of their high degree of responsibility, often held the title mahāpradhāna and so probably were commissioned directly by the king. Both they and their accounts were very necessary, as sānasas concerning land-grants were not always sufficiently displayed or recognized, and taxes might be levied in error on sarvamāṇya or tax-free lands. (2) They had their gradations of rank, into which it is not possible to make any fruitful scrutiny, on account of the vagueness and flexibility of the terms employed. Their offices were doubtless close to that of the daṇḍāyaka in the chief city of the nāḍ, in the case of the present example, Āsandī itself. In the market towns and at the various customs posts besides were the officials of the customs departments who collected the dues on traffic passing through the nāḍ as also a large and complicated excise revenue from various sources which will be instanced later, but which may here be summarized as taxation on property, production and purchases. The customs dues were known under the generic term of sūnka, and the adhiti title; in Hoysala times he was little more than a clerk, and is represented by the modern Kannada Sāṅabōga.

(1) A puruṣa of the royal court is mentioned in M.A.R. 1927, 35 (1288); examples of bal-manuṣya are found in M.A.R. 1912-3, para. 81b(1238), E.C.V Channarayapatna 237(1253), & ibid. Belur 166(1279).
kāris or officials who collected them were known as suṅkada
haggades or hejjuṅkada-haggades, superintendents of the cus-
toms or superior customs, a distinction which it is not now
possible to explain. The remittances made by these officers
were probably handled by the śrī-karaṇas, who forwarded the
fixed amount of the suṅka to the capital and apportioned the
remainder between the other persons who derived a part or the
whole of their livelihood from this source.

Besides these functionaries, the authorities within
the nāḍ were of various descriptions. The dānṇāyaka not only
had Āsandī town under his control, and therefore the surviving
members of the influential Gaṅga dynasty as his subjects, but
also a variety of corporations and institutions over and above
the villages and pattaṇas. The pattaṇa-svāmis have already
received mention. It is open to question whether in the Āsandī-
nāḍ there existed such functionaries as ūr-oḍeyas, but a com-
mittee of several of the important landholders in the villages
in the extreme north of the Hoysala dominions used to bear this
name, and would be the representative body of the village with
which the governor would deal. (1) North of the Tuṅgabhadra
certainly this was the form of village organization which the
Hoysala met, probably having its origin in the smaller number
of villages, compared with the Hoysala nāḍ for example, and their
greater size. But in the larger part of the Hoysala dominions
only a few ūrs had separate articulate establishments. Several
indeed of the larger amongst them had a sēṇabōva each, most

(1) E.C.VII Channagiri 73(1180); A.R.1928-9, App.E 193, W.E.II 139
143a(1202); S.I.I.X IX pt.1 333(1214), 332(1214). A mahāprabhu
ūroḍeya is mentioned in E.C.VI Kadur 105(1220), K.T. only.
will have had one or more watchmen supported out of the local funds: for a complex organization one must look to a general union of the otherwise unattached villages into political entities such as the nāḍ assembly or other councils, on which the landholders were represented and which were usually constituted as regular bodies, which were entitled the 60, the 300 or the 1,000, and so on, according to the size and importance of the body and the locality which it represented. These bodies, it seems, appointed the nāḍ officials known as nāḍ-prabhus. Their exact method of election and appointment is obscure, and probably varied from place to place. Head over the group of nāḍ-(or nāl-) prabhus, and the representatives of the other substantial bodies, such as the local committees of the Vira-Banañjas, over the pattana-svāmīs and the managers of the agrahāras, was the nāḍ-heggade or nāḍ superintendent. His appointment seems to have been governmental and was of the next importance administratively to that of the governor himself. As his stipend was derived from a fixed tax, he was probably intended to be independent of the governor, and may have been at times an obstacle to that officer's private machinations. He, together with the inspectors, the vicāris and ādhyākṣis, who certainly depended on the central government, exercised a check on the normal ambitions of the governor. The need for check and counter-check is aptly illustrated by the words of an inscription of the confused period of Ballāla II's reign: Padma-dandādhēpalī, for the decoration and so on, of the Agnīśvara temple --- made

(1) It is uncertain whether the nāl-gāmundas (nāḍ-gaudas), of whom frequent mention will be found in the Lists of Officials below, were of the same standing as the prabhus. They appear to have been officials of a similar kind.
a grant of the formerly well-known sthala-vṛtta (or share appertaining to the holy place) with all rights, free of all encumbrances, with the finger exhibited (forbidding entry) to the two forces, those of the king and those of the king's agents; thus indicating that both in the name of the government and in their own officials were liable to set aside grants that proved inconvenient to them.(1)

With this body of officers, then, the duties of the dandanāyaka, as the king's representative in judicial and administrative affairs, were transacted. Litigation, petitions, and the supervision of the legislation of the subordinate bodies, all came within his sphere, besides the activities that occupied him from his own initiative. And much as was the work settled in his office, large numbers of questions had to be submitted to the capital for the king's approval. The treasury department in particular was kept in constant activity. For example we hear of the king being informed by a dannāyaka of the distress caused to weavers by the oppression of tax-collectors, and of their emigration, and the consequent reduction by the king of the tax in question to 8 kāsu per loom.(2) All proposals that involved a direct loss to the State were liable to be referred to the government for sanction and registration, and the words "Śrī-Malaparol ganda", or "Śrī-Ballāla-dēvasya", or "Śrī-Narasimha-dēvasya" and so on, being the king's sign-manual, appear on a very large number of the records, which are

---


(2) An incident in the Kāvēri valley principality under Rāmanātha: A.R.1928-9,152(1267),203(1267).
copies of the sāsanas which the central authority permitted landholders to have made as the equivalent of title-deeds.

It remains to describe the constitution of the central government itself, as far as it is known, and to explain the revenue system by means of which this structure was supported.

The king's advisors were known as maha-pradhānas, or ministers, the prefix maha having no significance. The body of maha-pradhānas had by the thirteenth century grown so large, that it is quite certain that the advice of all of them was never used at any one time. They may have formed a kind of privy council from amongst whom a cabinet of select persons was chosen by himself to conduct the general policies of the kingdom. In any case the king's ministers were expected to carry out executive duties as well whenever their assistance was required. The specially favoured men were frequently daṇḍāyakas, who had completed a regular cursus honorum, by which they received in addition the titles of sarvvādhikāri, or officer with a commission in every department; mahāpasāyta, or (great) master of the robes; and parama-viśvāsi, or particular confidant. The desire for titles grew as time went on, and the ingenuity of the king was nearly exhausted. Nārasiṃha II created many rāya-daṇḍanāthas, or "royal colonels", and his descendants, as has been mentioned elsewhere, bestowed the title Kumāra with ever increasing frequency. Occasionally we find the use of the title bāhattara-niyōgadhipati, which was a favourite title among Cālukya subordinates: "master of 72 (that
is to say, "a great many") officials" is quite often a
title of Hoysala ministers after the achievement of imperial
status.(1)

Of the fifty and odd daṇḍanāyakas that are known
to have held posts in the army or the civil service during
the reign of Ballāla II, perhaps twenty were employed chiefly
in the military department. The civil powers they held were
doubtless necessary for the purpose of obtaining from civilians the provisions and facilities necessary when the armies
were on campaign. An eminent soldier was often entitled sēn-
ādhipati, or general, and samasta-sēnādhipati, or commander-in-
chief; but it does not appear that any definite gradation of
rank was in use. Each officer had his own associates as en-
courage, and was commissioned separately or with others for a
particular task. There is evidence, for example the case of
Appanna and Goppayya in the reign of Narasimha II, that relat-
ives were often employed together, probably on account of their
smoother mutual cooperation. It is of interest, incidentally,
to note that the title pādevala, which was the Kannada equiva-
tent for sēnādhipati, was in use, especially in the form
hiriya-hadevala, or chief general, until the first years of
Ballāla II, and then abandoned.(2)

Amongst the civilian ministers there were the heads
of the foreign affairs and treasury departments. The former
held the rank of sandhi-vigrahi, that is peace and war minister,
and the latter sri-karaṇa-heggade, or principal accountant. Of-

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 197(1223); ibid.244(1210); E.C.IV Gun-
dlupet 37(1221); ibid.Heggadevankote 23(1218); and M.A.R.1909-10
para.80(1235). Cf.E.C.VI Kadur 124(1272), where Rice wrongly
takes maneya with the words that immediately follow it, instead
of with Nonambi-setti. (2) over.
ten these ministers had served in other departments before joining this branch, and there is no proof that they actually held the appointment for all the period in which they retained the rank. In addition to the latter class, the treasury had several touring inspectors, of whom mention has already been made, and several additional grades, such as the inspector of the jewel treasury, (1) senior jewel treasurer, (2) and chief of the treasury enclosure. (3)

The king had several other minor ministers who appear to have risen in social standing though still bearing humble titles; of these the palace superintendent, and senior doorkeeper were the most prominent; (4) Rice's translation of prāṇādhikāri as "commander of the lifeguard", in default of evidence to the contrary, is accepted, and thus another example appears to be added. (5)

In addition to his regular ministers and attendants the king had several hereditary henchmen whose tenure of their lands and whose personal honour depended on fulfilling the curious function of accompanying their masters into the next world. One family, that of Agrahāra Bācahalli, had an unbroken record of service from the time of Breyānga to that of Nārasimha III; they had been accompanied in their suicide by their wives and a number of male and female servants in each case. (6)

Page 539 n. (2) E.C.X Bowringpet 9(1155); E.C.XI Nagamangala 56 (1134, not 1071 as Rice); 57(1181); E.C.VI Chikmagalur 66(1089); 71(1137), ibid. Mudgere 3(1144). It is easily confused with the title padavāla which was an equivalent for paṣāyta.

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 123(1258), 203b(1235) - senior inspectors mentioned. (2) E.C.VI Hadur 148(1202), C.E. Chikmagalur 78(1188). (3) E.C.V Arsikere 71(1173). (4) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 43(K.T. only); E.C.VI Hadur 99(1143), 100(1241), 143(1275); E.C.VII Shimoga 88(12
(5) E.C.IV Nagamangala 32(1184). Insufficient is known of besavagas and kūsus (obedient protégés) to be sure that they were
It remains to explain briefly the methods by which this machinery of government was paid for. Besides the livelihood of all the officials the king had to provide for his gifts to temples, to public works, to individual benefactors of the State such as merchants, literary personages and the like, and for foreign endowments. (1) He had, moreover, to provide for the upkeep of his court and its numerous population, and to supply the pay of the mercenary soldiers, such as the Muslims that were employed by the later Hoysala kings, and the means to buy imported Arab horses, the price of which we learn from Marco Polo and Rashīd ud dīn to have been very high. (2) Moreover it appears that the king was accustomed to collect jewels, and the royal treasures of jewels and gold performed the useful function of maintaining those valuable commodities at a stable price.

One source of income was undoubtedly the mines, of gold and of baser metals, of which, curiously enough, not a single clear trace is found among the thousands of contemporary records. Old workings have been discovered in numbers, and no doubt exists about the early tapping of the vast mineral resources of Mysore. An inscription mentions an ākara-mandali kā or, apparently, governor of mines, but the reference is not conclusive. (3) A royal monopoly was almost certainly preserved actually office-holders. Cf. rāyasa-kūsuga l (secretariat kūsus?) in E.C.V Arkalgud 53(1252). Likewise the enigmatical cirup-pillaigal of R d.183(1256) and A.R.1929-30,242(?1262).

Page 540 n.(6) M.A.R.1914-5,para.84; E.C.IV Krishmarajapet 9(1256),10(1292). Instances of self-destruction by courtiers are not rare: e.g. Kuvara Lakṣma,E.C.V Belur 112(1220). Cf. E.C.VI Kadur 146(1180). See also E.C.VII Honnali 47(1130). The king demanded payment of the vow if not kept:E.C.VII Shikarpur 249(1185). See also M.A.R.1936,22(1250), where a queen was so accompanied. The suicide of a henchman and his wife for a subordinate of Rāmacandra Yādava in 1284 in Rani Bannur tāluqa, formerly
as the income from the mines was intimately connected with the
State privilege of coinage.

The other sources were the products of the soil and
the labour of the country's craftsmen. A theoretically variable
proportion of the produce of each of these sources was appro­
priated by the government. In practice it will be seen that the
chief bulk of the revenue drawn by the State from the land was
derived from the application of the two principles of permanent
settlement and cash payments. These principles, to insufficient
attention has been given by students of the vexed and import­
ant topic of the Indian land revenue, did not apply to the
same degree in the field of the minor dues and local levies,
but it is clear that the benefits of a permanent settlement of
the revenue, in a society which was believed to be economically
stable, were fully appreciated in Hoysala and pre-Hoysala times
and a prosperous and highly organized economic system justified
a striving for cash payments wherever possible. It must be
borne in mind, however, that the permanent settlement, though
persisted in until the collapse of the kingdom, a calamity for
which it was itself largely responsible, was intended to be
permanent only in a broad sense, each individual settlement re­
vealing the gradual building up of the total by the superimpos­
itio of one item upon another. Against the addition of further
land taxation, however, there was a tremendous weight of pre-

Page 541 n.(1) E.g the many vadda-yyāvahāris or merchant princes
who conducted not only trade but also negotiations between
states and even at times arranged alliances between them:E.C.V
Arsikere 108(1255).Foreign endowments: E.C.V Arkalgud 21(1278-9
M.A.R.1908-9, para. 86(1279). (2) Marco Polo III Ch.xvii:500
judice, the inertia of which only extraordinary circumstances could shift, when accompanied by the fullest health and vigour on the part of the administration. (1)

Unfortunately the information available on the Hoysala revenue system is not so scanty as it is ill-balanced and complex. The revenue terms themselves were many centuries old before the Hoysalas employed them, and the abbreviated methods especially of referring to the multitudinous heads of taxation make an accurate analysis almost impossible. Without a comprehensive and reliable account of the revenue methods of the earlier dynasties, we are obliged to approach the body of material on the Hoysala system in a disorderly fashion, beginning the study at a point well beyond the true commencement of the story.

It should be stated here that no account is made of the voluntary levies which were constantly voted by various public bodies for a variety of purposes, principally religious or charitable; the analysis that follows concerns only those taxes that were imposed upon the people by or in the name of the government. (2)


(1) In the Kaveri valley Principality the Hoysala seems to have adopted a system of regular revisions of the revenue rolls, in which the small changes that had occurred throughout the year were published. In S.I.I.IV 422 (p.1256) we hear of the payment of money according to the 23rd account (or "settlement") of Vira-Someshvara: Vira-Someshvara-devarku irupattu muṇravādu varainda kaṇakkuṇḍadi. This system was not employed in the Hoysala-nād. Cf. N.K. Sastri, Četas II, p.328.

(2) The voluntary levies, a good example of which is found in E.C.X Kolar 70 (1330) were a compound of money due to be paid on the possession of costly articles, such as an elephant (1 gadyāra) or a horse (1 paṇa), and dues in kind for loads of necessities, such as grain, salt, pepper and betel leaves; a servant tax was also included in the example taken.
From the four specimens of the detailed settlement of estates (in each case agrahāras) found in the four records which are compared in Appendix II, it is clear that the principal government taxes were divided into classes, probably for ease of accounting. In the thirteenth century these consisted of the following:

The first item, called kula in the earliest example and modalu in the second and third, was the basic assessment, or first total levied on a specified area of land, to which all the other items were additions, generally known as the bāli. (1)

To the question, by whom and by what method this kula was assessed, the instances give a fairly clear answer. On every piece of cultivated land within the kingdom not specifically freed from taxation the king in his capacity as landlord and owner of the soil imposed first a basic assessment, then levies for specific purposes and customs dues. This leaves out of account

(1) The word kula occurs with modalu in E.C.V Channarayapatna 197(1223), where it is said that the donor of land for an agrahāra freed it from taxation, having had the kula cut into parts so as to make the modalu which the agrahāra had to pay 20 ga.; this in its turn was granted by the government with a copper āsana so that the Brahmans were free to allocate it to the service of a god set up by the donor. The government's part in this sacrifice is very clearly shown. E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 50(1270) shows where the kula was divided into seven parts, but by that time kula and siddhāya were practically synonymous in the wider sense of siddhāya. The phrases modalu-siddhāya and modalu-kula occur in E.C.VI Sringeri 1(1346) with no apparent distinction. In E.C.VI Tarikere 20(1185) the modalu-gadyāna is given as 50 ga.; added to it is a consolidated sum of another 50 ga. giving a total called kattu-guttige pindadāna; thus the modalu was clearly independent of all other items which are enumerated as part of the consolidated sum. Cf. a similar case: M.A.R.1923,1(1194). The modalu is likewise mentioned in E.C.XII Chikmayakanhalli 2(1261) where it is accompanied by bāli.

(2) See Appendix I.
the local taxes not normally paid direct to the government, though raised on the authority of the king. All tax-regulations emanating from the palace (aramane) were applied and adjusted in general by the treasury officers attached to the head city of the nāḍ. It is not known whether at the earliest settlements the method employed was to fix a sum for a nāḍ or for a village, but our examples seem to point to the government's settling a sum for a variety of subdivisions in which there existed a number of persons or corporations capable of being responsible for the revenue. (1) These persons or bodies were then free to split up this sum amongst the various towns, villages and hamlets, and they in their turn distributed the load among the land-holders. (2) But this is a surmise of a dangerous kind, as, except in the important case of newly cultivated ground, no settlement man have been entirely original. It is certain however that every adjustment, variation, (3) and redistribution of the responsibility for the revenue was submitted to the central government for approval and was recorded at Dōrasamudra as well as in the account books (sivadi, literally "bundle") of the śrī-karanas of the nāḍ. (4) Of this government

(1) One must not be misled by the flagrant mistranslation of E.C.XII Tumkur 17(1287) where Kambaya-dānāyaka is said to have been "making the settlement (of revenue)", a gross distortion of the text. alutt irdu simply means "ruling". The K.T. nāḍanol etiddu is a corrupt reading for nādan ālūt iddu which should accordingly be read in the R.T.

(2) E.C.VI Kadur 12a(1233): ūrukaṭṭida siddāhāya, "the siddāhāya fixed by the ūr." The arrangement when ratified bore the seal of the ratifying authority, the king or his deputy, and became an ujjādige: E.C.VI Kadur 132(1215).

(3) See E.C.V Channarayapatna 180(1252) for the method of lessening the State revenue by paying sēse, in this case an "extra contribution"; the method seems to be a type of sporadic act of anticipation by the government of its income, apparently involving a substantial loss over a period. Cf. A.R.1938-7,119.

(4) E.C.V Arsikere 77(1220) and E.C.VI Tarikere 55(1291).
revenue the starting point, the kula or modalu, must have been the result of long ages of experience. A Ganga-siddhāya, or Ganga fixed rent, is spoken of in a Kongālva record of 1176,(1) and there is no doubt but that the first Hoysala kings took over the Ganga system and experience of taxation, as indeed in later times they took over the Cōla system in the east on the plateau, merely adding their own occasional taxes at rare intervals to the pile already existing. The assessment of the kula was therefore based on the local experience of the productivity of the soil and the general earning capacity of the locality. A study of the records shows that each village had its own kula, which, being often an odd number of panas and hāgas, had been at some time doubtless the result of careful judgement and reckoning, and not a round sum thrust forward on guess work. The impression is confirmed by the fact that two of the instances quoted show kulas roughly 1/6th of the total government revenue, a proportionate correspondence not unconfirmed by the fourth instance, where the kula and the consolidated total for the taxes of the first, second, third and fourth groups make up a sum of 8 ga.2 pa.1 hā.; which would have borne the same proportion (a little less than 1/3rd) to the total (21 ga.4 pa. 1 hā.) as the totals of the same classes with their respective kulas bear to the sum totals of each of the other instances, if the tax nallāvu nallettu, and the kaṇḍike-vana and the kaluku, had not been left out of the account: they were apparently mānya, having been altogether remitted in the case of this estate. In the third example the kula is rather

(1) E.C.I 33(1176). It is worth noting that it is separate from the heads nallettu, heggaḍe-gadyāṇa, kaṇike-gadyāṇa, aṇa-tere, and handala-hana (tax on marriage awnings).
more than a fifth of the total revenue recorded, a slight discrepancy probably due to the fact that the land in question was nearer to the capital than that of the other examples, and so perhaps may have been open to a more recent reassessment of the kula. The proportion, also, borne by the classes to the constant total, remaining in four instances taken from different decades and parts of the kingdom, shows that these classes were adjusted according to a principle of universal application, which can have been no other than the productive value of the territorial unit in question. Whether this was an estimate of the gross or the net produce is uncertain, but judging from later practice one would suppose with little hesitation that it was the net produce that was used in the formation of the assessments. That this was considered a stable factor is clear from the details of the settlements being engraved on stone as integral items of the conditions upon which grants were conveyed, grants that were in every case intended to be perpetual.

Having disposed of the kula or Modalu, we may proceed to the first four classes. The item vat tam is easily explained as discount, being a charge made by the government for the services of a banker or other expenses intermediate between the remitter and the treasury. The item remained, even when the revenue was enjoyed by a party other than the royal exchequer. It is seen from the first three instances quoted in the Appendix to be just $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ of the kula: hence it must have originated with it, and justifies its position at the head of the list by its age if by no other reason. The item sadam is not satisfactorily
explained; the word may have signified "quality (of the coins)" or perhaps "forwarding". As in any case the philological value of these headings is almost irrelevant, it must be accepted that the tax had some relationship to the estimated net produce. From the examples it is seen that it did not bear a fixed proportion to the amount of the kula, though it varied roughly with the size of the estate. No example of the pa.2/āśeṣe, the "2 pana contribution", has been found actually charged. In the cases shown in the Appendix it was mānya until 1253 at the earliest, and it is known to have been free from 1190 at the latest. (1) It remained on the revenue roll until about 1260, when it was abolished, if we may judge from the silence of the third example.

On the other hand, the first item of the second class bore a fixed proportion to the kula, or, to be more precise, to the total estimated net produce. This was the vallabha or ballaha, which must have originally signified "emperor", and thus the item represents a tax levied in the name of the Rāṣṭrakūta and Cālukya rulers by the mahā-maṇḍalēśvaras; it is of interest to observe the tax still existing more than a half-century after it could possibly have reached the authority in whose interests it was originally levied. The cumulative nature of the Hoysala revenue system is very clearly demonstrated by this instance. The items kumāra (2) and nibandha, which complete the second class, though varying in the three examples in a

(1) E.C.V Channarayapāṇa 179.

(2) Kugāra in E.C.V Hassan 84(1223) must be an error.
ratick which remains constant between them, do not bear a
fixed proportion to the kula, and it is doubtful whether they
were not settled upon a sliding scale. The kumāra was probably
a tax levied for the service of a particular Crown Prince, long
since dead, although it may be suggested that it was a perpetual
levy for the support of the heir apparent for the time
being. Nibandha is another enigmatical heading and is
probably an abbreviation for a more intelligible phrase. It
may be an equivalent for nibandhi, which in one instance seems
to mean an obligatory cess or due of a particular kind, (1)
while as nimandi it means little more than a duty. (2)

A similar position is revealed by the third class.
The first item bears a fixed proportion to the kula, the other
two do not. The reason is easily found, however. Śrīkaraṇā is
obviously a levy for the livelihood of the treasury accountant,
being proportioned to the amount of the basic assessment; thus
the chances of corruption in the settlement department were
greatly reduced. Suṅka and pannāya varied, perhaps on a sliding
scale, but more probably on a deliberate individual assessment.
Suṅka was unquestionably the consolidated estimate for the
customs and excise dues for the area. Pannāya may have been a
levy on sales, but beyond the fact that it had much in common
with suṅka no certainty exists as to its nature. (3)

(1) E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 50 (c1270) ondu haṇavina lekkadalu
varga prati nibandi āgi gadyāṇam ondu haṇav erādanu, "1 ga.2 pa
a year, being a nibandhi at the rate of 1 pa." Cf.S.I.I.IX pt.
1,341 (1226), where the suṅka officials of Pāṇḍya-nāḍ gave 2 ga.
a year from the grain duty of Kōgali-nāḍ as a nibandha. But see
E.C.VII Shimoga 78 (1291) sthala-nibandhi, an obligatory pay-
ment to the holy place. (2) E.C.X Kolar 18 (1294).
(3) Suṅka in E.C.V Hassan 84 (1223) is an error. Suṅka was used
in the sense of "tax" also, e.g. adākeya suṅka in E.C.V Hassan
139 (1200) and E.C.VI Tarikere 20 (1185), which represents
the adake lakka 1 kam tax; cf. maggada suṅka in E.C.V Arsikere
therefore that the total which the heggades of the suňka and pannāya were expected to pay in to the treasury was calculated in advance, and this is the reason why they were so often able either to release a particular building or oil-mill from tax or actually to devote to a particular purpose sections of the dues which their committee was entitled to levy, and so alienate parts of their own incomes in perpetuity; conduct which was quite legal, provided the profits over and above the recorded estimate were sufficient.

The fourth class apparently consisted of one tax only: the adake lakka 1 kam was a levy "on one hundred thousand of areca nuts". It seems to have been assessed to the nearest gadyāna, and was applied on a sliding scale according to the size of the estate or perhaps the area of areca-bearing land, though it seems impossible that every estate paying the tax can have produced areca nuts. There is at any rate no reason for supposing that it was a proportional levy on the actual production of areca nut, and it may by the Hoysala have become a mere fiction. It was known for short as the adake-suňka.

These four classes with the kula formed the hard core of the siddhāya, or fixed rent, although the whole of the headings discussed in this connection were also grouped under the title siddhāya. (1) In the example of 1291 we see that the 117(1161), which is magga-dere, while suňka-dere (ibid.) must be the heading suňka described here. See also E.C.V Arsikere 21(1278-9) where suňka represents this heading. Also E.C.XI Chitaldrug 2(1355). Hejjuňka and nāgu-suňka are other varieties of suňka, mentioned in E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 44(1322). Holeya suňka, river-tolls, is mentioned in E.C.XIII Seringapatam 154 (c1225). Note that in E.C.VI Tārikere 36(1178) the heggade of the pannāya makes a grant of "50 on a bullock load of betel leaf, on a full load", which probably means the duty on 50 full loads, whatever it amounted to for the time being. But in (1) over.
whole of the four classes were consolidated with the kula.

under the title modalu pindādāna. The word pindādāna, literally
"acceptance of the pinda", appears quite inapposite, while kāṭṭu
guttige, which is often associated with it, is of as yet unex-
plained meaning. S. Chandrasekhara Sastri does not appear to have
gathered any information concerning it. (1) However the instances

E.C.II Davangere 20(1045) pannāyada sūṅka, "the sūṅka of the
pannāya", is spoken of; and again in E.C.IV Hunsur 137(1162)
pannāya-derē, "pannāya tax".

Page 550 n. (1) In E.C.V Hassan 84(1223) all the headings enum-
erated except the kula are called the sarvvāya, which Rice mis-
translates "produce".

(1) Op. cit. pp. 207-8: that it was a consolidated sum seems to
have escaped him. The cases where siddhāya and sēse occur jux-
taposed leads us to suppose them not one item, "the siddhāya-
contribution", which is a contradiction in terms (not in it-
self a fatal objection), but two abbreviations: "the siddhāya
group, and the sēse classes". E.g. E.C.V Channarayapatna 238(1249).

Instances where the siddhāya is the four groups with the
kula: E.C.V Hassan 139(1200); E.C.V Belur 182(1227); E.C.III Chit-
aldurg 32(1286); E.C.IV Nagamangala 38(1284) and E.C.XII Tirumakudal-narsipur 27(1290): Instances where the siddhāya is
the whole of the settlement enumerated: E.C.VI Kadur 49(1291),
but note a few exceptions that appear on the side of the other
taxes; probably E.C.V Channarayapatna 238(1249) and E.C.III Chit-
aldurg 2(1255), while E.C.X Kolar 100(1301) is doubtful. In
E.C.V Channarayapatna 179(1190) occurs the phrase modala-sid-
dhāyada kula-dolage haṅa verādara sēse mānya имвata kāruṇya,
apparently extending the meaning of modala and kula also. Pindā-
āṇavāgī occurs meaning "in consideration of the consolidated
sum" in M.A.R.1923,1(1194). Pindāṇāṇa occurs with kāṭṭu-guttige
in E.C.V Hassan 135(1114); E.C.V Channarayapatna 242(1252); E.C.
XII Chiknayakanhalli 2(1261); M.A.R.1923,1(1194); and E.C.VI
Tarike 20(1186). With kāṭṭu-guttige may be compared kāṭṭu-
kudāṅgai, an allowance of tax-free land for the construction
of public works. Guttage occurs in E.C.V Belur 219(1141) and
E.C.XII Tirumakudal-narsipur 20(1185) without assisting in the
present inquiry. It is open to question to what total the San-
skrit word kara applied. In E.C.IX Bangalore 6(1253) it cert-
ainly was equivalent to the total siddhāya in the wider sense.
In E.C.V Channarayapatna 172(1209 & 1220) likewise it is said
that of the agrahāra the prathama karaḥ, or first revenue, kap-
paṇa-kṛtāṅka-sahita, together with the additional kappāṇa, was
100 niśkas, that is, gadyāṇas. The kappāṇa is doubtful, being
neither Sanskrit nor Kannāga: it is likely that it represents
the word Kappa, "tribute", almost an equivalent of kāṭṭike,
the obligatory present. So it seems that kara may indeed equal
the second sense of siddhāya, while mūlakara certainly repres-
ents the kula: E.C.V Hassan 84(1223). Dr. Barnett holds that
guttige was a revenue-farming contract.
make it clear that these phrases refer to a consolidated sum, or an attempt at simplification of the revenue rolls.

The fifth group contained three taxes, the pa.l ra sése, or the "one pana contribution", the khandike-vana, or (?) "ball of thread pana", and (?) unata, or "depreciation". The first bore a fixed proportion to the kula, appearing to have been about 1/5th of that sum; the second, the origin of which is obscure, unless it be that it has some connection with the weavers' loom-tax, being identical in the first two instances where it appears, gives the impression of being applied on a sliding scale of wide gradation. If so, it was reduced before 1261 and may have been abolished by 1291, unless the instance of that year indicates a special remission. The unata, a heavy tax, likewise of uncertain origin, rose with the productivity of the estate but on no fixed proportion, and so may have been separately assessed.

The sixth group appears to consist of one tax only, the vira-sése, or "warrior contribution", and was probably a war tax instituted during the time of Ereyanga. From the four instances it is not plain upon what principle it was assessed, but it certainly bore some relationship to the productivity of the estate.

A large group follows, containing at least five headings. The first, nallävu nallettu, has the curious feature of being assessed according to some factor other than the total productivity of the taxed unit, and even varying in an inverse ratio to it. The 1223 instance, an estate of moderate size,

---

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 179(1190) has övata; E.C.XI Bangalore 6(1253) has vovata; E.C.V Hassan 84(1223) has ovata; E.C.V Belur 74(1261) has vatta and E.C.VI Kadur 49(1291) has unatta.
(2) Khandike-vana occurs in E.C.VI Tarikere 20(1185). Cf. the
paid 9 ga. 5 pa. 3hā., while the example of 1253, a much larger estate, paid only 8 ga. 2 pa., and that of 1261, although the largest in size, paid but half the latter amount. The political circumstances of the period make it unlikely that the tax was reduced, and a possible explanation is to be derived from the nature of the tax itself. The heading means "good cow and good bullock", and the tax must have originated in the need of cows for milk and bullocks for hauling waggons when the king was on campaign, the two to be provided by villages on or near his route. Later the government found it convenient to commute this levy into a perpetual money tax to be paid by every tax-paying unit. The amount levied on the village or agrahāra much originally have been calculated on the cost of those animals, and the calculation must always have varied from place to place. It is not known whether the calculation was revised from time to time; if so, an even wider discrepancy would easily appear between the amounts paid under this head by the several estates. (1)

The khāna-nibandha was a tax of the earlier type, and bore a fixed proportion to the kula. It was clearly based upon some obligatory provision of victuals, perhaps for the armies in the field, later commuted to a money assessment. (2)

expression khandika-vṛṣṭi in E.C.XII Chiknayakanhalli 2(1261), where it clearly has another meaning.
Page 552 n. (3) The tax is called vīra-vāṇa in M.A.R.1915-6, para 84(1077).

(1) The tax is referred to in E.C.VI Tarikere 20(1185) also.
(2) The reading bāṇa of E.C.VI Kadur 49(1291) is an error. Khāna nibandhi occurs in E.C.VI Tarikere 20(1185). The following mentions of khāna may be references to this tax or to the khāna assessment below: E.C.V Hassan 139(1200); E.C.XI Chitaldrug 32(1286); E.C.IV Nagamangala 38(1284); E.C.III Tirumakudal narsipur 27(1290); E.C.VI Kadur 49(2191) and M.A.R.1909-10, para. 86(1295).
The origin of kaluku or kaluku remains doubtful, as the word itself is unintelligible. The charge seems to have fluctuated from estate to estate in a wild fashion, and no sort of explanation of it can be offered. (1)

Todaru was a tax on badges of distinction, apparently a round sum charged according to the rank of the estate holder or estate holding body. (2)

The âneya sêse was a relic of the time when each district had to provide for the upkeep of its own force, which later became part of the king's army. The cost of elephants and horses was the most expensive charge, and every estate contributed to the cost, the kuđureya sêse being frequently mentioned alongside the âneyasêsêse. This group of taxes was generally referred to as sêse, "contribution", the original meaning of the word having long been obscured. The "elephant contribution" was a heavy sum, but variable according to the productivity of the respective estates and, when new settlements were made, with the needs of the military department.

Included in this group was also the jêdê-dêre, a tax on plaited hair. All that is known of it is that each estate paid a substantial sum on its account. (3)

First of the eighth group is the kuđureya sêse, or "horse contribution". It varied in a manner similar to the âneya sêse, and appears to have been increased, as the making of fresh settlements offered, in accordance with the national

---

(1) E.C.VI Kadur 49(1291), E.C.VI Tarikere 20(1185). In E.C.IV Nagamangala 38(1284) kaluhu may perhaps be a mistake for kaluku if kaluku is not itself a misreading.
(2) Todaru-gadyâna occurs in E.C.V Hassan 139(1200).
(3) The reading ceda is an error. See also E.C.V Hassan 139(1200) where it was remitted by the king; in E.C.V Arsikere 117(1161),
exigencies. It would seem, for example, that in the period about 1250 horses were needed more than elephants. (1)

Kumāra-gānike followed. Kānike was, and still is, a present which one is expected to give. The kānike, which was due to the Crown Prince, bore a fixed proportion to the amount of the kula. (2)

The vijaya-vīra-vāna was another, later, war tax for the provision of "victorious warriors". It operated on a sliding scale, and was, as its name suggests, a pana only on all but the larger estates.

The kodati-vāna, which appears to be a "hammer or pestle tax", was a similar small tax operating on another sliding scale different to the former and producing less revenue; the scale may have been revised between 1253 and 1261. (3)

There follows a group of taxes, all of which had a peculiar feature in common which distinguishes them from the other taxes. Each estate was expected to give an amount of grass, paddy and sesamum seed to the state, and this had been commuted to a cash payment based on an assessment of the estate's powers to supply the items. It does not follow in fact that these crops were invariably grown on the estates during our period, but rather that they were grown at the time when the original siddhāya was laid down, and after commutation the assessment became in many if not all cases a formality. The charge for

where it appears to have been in the gift of the heggaḍes of the suṅka.

(1) Āneya-sēse kuḍureya sēse: E.C.V Hassan 139(1200); E.C.V Channarayapatna 242(1252); E.C.IV Nagamangala 38(1284) and E.C. III Tīrumakudal-narsipur 27(1290).
(2) Kumāra-gānike: E.C.V Hassan 139(1200). Kānike only: E.C.XI Chitaldrug 32(1286). See also E.C.X Malur 39(1346) and Kolar 100
khāna (food in general, but perhaps fodder in particular, so "grass") was 10 hāgas, that is to say, 2 panas and 2 hāgas on every salage, or "rod" of khāna demanded. In the first instance quoted the estate was rated at 11 rods, and thus paid 2 ga. 7 pa. 2 hā. under this head. The units of measurement were salage, kolaga, balla and māna, or rods, pints, gills and quarter-gills: the measuring rod may have been inserted in the centre of the heap, or may have determined the size of a square measure, the smaller amounts being measured by the pint, there being 20 pints to the rod, four gills to the pint and four mānas to the gill. The charge for bhatta, otherwise nellu, or "paddy", was $\frac{61}{4}$ ths hāgas: it was clearly a less valuable crop. Thus in the first instance quoted the estate was rated at 2$\frac{1}{2}$ salage and so paid 4 panas and 1 hāga. Ellu, or sesamum, curiously enough, was charged at exactly twice the rate of paddy, namely 3 panas 1 & 3/5 ths hāgas per salage. More curious is the fact that in each of the instances quoted the amount of sesamum demanded was half that of the paddy to the nearest $\frac{1}{2}$ kolaga. This detail clearly demonstrates how conventional had become the method of assessment. The rates remained exactly the same from 1223 at the latest to 1291 at the earliest, despite the many variations in the current price of those commodities which must have occurred in the meanwhile. (1)

Three heads more remain. Most interesting is the item Cōla-kārunya-bīṭṭiya-bhandī. The sense of the word bhandī is open to question. It can not mean "cart", as Rice thought. It


(1) Ellu is mentioned in E.C.VI Tarikere 20(1185).
must mean a type of levy, one in fact of the numerous words
signifying a tax, of which the original significance has
been lost. (1) In any case the bhandi was a "forced service",
or "forced contribution" for "compassion, or kindness towards
the CÔla", a tax obviously instituted in 1218 or thereabouts,
being an example of the efforts made by the Hoysala to acquire
diplomatic supremacy in the plains. It is to be noted that it
was still levied in 1291, 33 years after it had become impos-
sible to render any effective aid to the CÔla dynasty. It
appears to have been gradually lowered during the century, and
the new settlements gave the landholders the benefit of the
lowered rates.

Both the ettin upottara and khânad upottara are but
partially intelligible items, presumably commuted sums origin-
ally for the provision in the king's service of the "best but
one" or first fruits of the bullocks and fodder available on
the estate. The figures available give us no indication upon
what principle the assessment was made.

This then was the body of the siddhâya, or permanent
rent, to which occasionally the palace added other burdens of
a more temporary nature, and this siddhâya as described above
is the only full example of a particularized statement of the
principal direct government demand known to us belonging to
the Hindu period, absolutely uninfluenced by Muslim notions,
and totally derived from Hindu revenue practice.

(1) Â-biṭṭiya-bhandî: E.C.V Hassan 139(1200). Bhandî alone:
E.C.IV Nagamangala 38(1284); but see E.C.VI Kudur 49(1291)
where it is remitted though the CÔla tax remained. CÔla alone:
E.C.VI Târikere 20(1185). Note that the curious interpolation,
"1 salage 17 kolagas . mânas" in E.C.IX Bangalore 6(1253) is at
variance with the rate "1" in E.C.V Hassan 54(1223). Further
The question that at once excites interest is what proportion of the net produce was actually taken by the State. There is, as Dr. Altekar found in the earlier periods, an extreme difficulty (1) in determining the proportion of the produce accruing to the State, from the absence of records which tell us at the same time both the productive value of land and the tax levied on it. In cases where we know the number of mattar or kambas involved we are no better informed, for the very area, let alone the productive capacity of those units, is unknown. (2) There is however ground for believing that a thorough and profound study of the multitudinous facts of the economic life of the people might enable a solution to be found. There is one inscription at least which gives us some data upon which to base a notion of the State's share. (3)

From it we learn that Gopala divided some land given him by Narasimha III into 47 shares. Of these, 8 shares produced 151 gadyāṇas. As shares were almost always equally divided, we can guess that the whole estate produced 887 ga. 4pa. and 1 hāga. The total siddhāya being 41 ga. 5pa., the State's share of the produce was a little more than a 22nd part of the total. We can not however be certain that the revenue settled in this case was not estimated at a reduced rate, and indeed the reference to the Huliyara viṭṭiya maryāde, or "the rate appertaining to the forced levy of Huliyaru (estate)" confirms evidence is required to solve the difficulty.

(1) Rastrakutas and their times, pp. 217, 219, 221. Appadorai, in the section on Taxation in his Economic Conditions in Southern India, finds the difficulty almost insoluble, but agrees with the feeling, expressed in this chapter, on the smallness of the State's share, though he judges mainly from Tamil sources. The statement of P.N. Ramaswami, in Early History of Indian
this impression, to the extent that a part, but certainly a
small part of the estate was assessed at a rate different to
that usual in the Hoysala nāḍ proper. That the siddhāya formed
such a small proportion of the produce is indeed to be believed
from the multitudinous collection of taxes which existed over
and above those "permanent" items hitherto discussed; from the
extreme paucity of instances of a failure to pay the sum due; (1)
and from the fact that as soon as circumstances had enabled
powerful dannāyakas to engross the income from large areas of
land, after the royal treasuries had been looted by the Muslims,
the Hoysala king's ensured income dwindled to so small a sum
that the very functions of government could not be maintained
under their old head, and under pressure from the rising
Vijayanagara brothers the kingdom disintegrated at once. Had
neither the principle of permanent settlement, nor the persisting
low level of taxation been maintained, a revival of Hoysala
power would have been possible, if not certain. The taxation
over and above the siddhāya was either insufficient to meet all
the purposes for which it was required, or was consumed by the
local governors, for whose livelihood it was in large part des-
igned.

Famines, I.A.52 p.194, that the Cōla, Hoysala and Pāṇḍya kings
the native dynasties of the northern Circars and the famous
kings of Vijayanagar, all exacted 50% of the gross produce, is
quite unwarranted by evidence.

Page 558 n.(2) See S.Chandrasekhara Sastri, op.cit.p.207,229. Cf
E.C.V Hassan 66(c1170) with E.C.V Belur 171(1160), Arsikere 1
(1168), Channarayapatna 296(1276) and E.C.III Tirumakudal-nar-sipur 15(c1110) for example. There were no less than a dozen
kinds of kamba, or pole. Page 558 n.(3) E.C.XII Chiknayakanhallī
2(1261).

(1) Inefficiency in agrahāras was not uncommon. E.C.V Belur 182
(1227) and M.A.R.1926,8(1224) both show Umā-dēvi intervening at
the committee's request to arrange for the payment of the sid-
dhāya. Cf. the regulations in E.C.V Arsikere 128(1229) on mom-
The remaining categories of taxation include the royal extraordinary taxes, the nad, nad official's and landholders' taxes. In the first category come those elements of the apūrvaya which have not hitherto been discussed. Pūrvaya and apūrvaya, "previous and recent (or "non-previous") revenue", is an ancient classification which can no longer be distinguished with any exactness. It appears, however, that the items already discussed included the greater part of the pūrvaya, if not the whole of it, and a portion of the apūrvaya besides. Amongst these, aliya and anyāya could be imposed by the palace, and several records make arrangements for this contingency. The headings mean "depreciation" or "destruction" and "illegality", and they constituted irregular and occasional taxes.(1) Another royal tax was the kātaka sēse or contribution for the forces.(2) Likewise hodake (3) was a kind of tribute expected by the king on certain occasions. Abhyāgate, "adventitious", paṭṭa-baddha, "coronation", and putrōtsāha "birth of a son", were similarly occasional levies.(4)

It would be impossible to give a full and reasoned list of the taxes levied with royal sanction by the nad assembly, the nad heggade, and the landholders, or to distinguish precisely which taxes were collected by which authority. Many of the terms are unintelligible and probably misread in the copies: of those that remain the following are taken as the principal items and examples.

gaging an underproductive share; and the rearranging of unproductive shares in E.C.VI Tarikere 55(1291). See also E.C.V Arsikere 113(1318).
(1) E.C.XI Chitaldrug 32(1286); E.C.IV Nagamangala 38(1284); E.C.III Tirumakudal-narsipur 27(1290).(2) E.C.XI Chitaldrug 32.
The nad heggade had a tax of his own, called his kāṇike. (1) We learn from a record of 1307 that he could draw, at the discretion of the nad assembly, an income from the villages, in this case one pāṇa from each of 40 villages and a ⌘ pāṇa from each of 30 villages, being a total of 5 ga. 5 pa. a year not including certain dues received from the fair. (2) If this was an official that depended entirely on this source for his income, he would have enjoyed an emolument nearly equal to that of a Brahman teacher of literature, or pujiārī, who usually received 6 ga. a year, but still it was noticeably smaller than the salary of the dannāyakas that governed districts. Together with the nad suṅka officers the nad heggade probably enforced the collection of various taxes for the benefit of the customs department and/or the landholders. Amongst them were the āgantuka (unexpected guest), maduve (marriage), magga-dere or tari irāi (loom tax), gāna-dere or cekkirai (oil-press tax), bannige (dyeing), kōṭeyya-hāḍike (fort tax), kōṭti̇ḡe dere (cowshed tax), mane-dere (house tax), kadai irāi (shop-tax), hoge-dere (smoke, or hearth-tax), kabbu or āle-dere (sugarcane press tax), kode (parasol), hala (plough), ālu-dere (goat-tax), kabbilara-hāḍike (fowler-tax), holeyara-hāḍike (outcaste tax), tattār-pāṭtam (goldsmith tax), Āsvak-kadimai (Ājīvaka tax), nāṭṭar varivu (assessment of the nad occupants), nāvida-dere (barber tax), pāṅca-kāruka (five classes of artisans), kumbāru-dere (potter tax), tottu-dere (concubine tax), ambiga-dere (boatman tax), bāla-vāna (child tax), irāyasa-nimandi (clerk-tax).
tax), kelvi-nimandi (duty on hearings), bitti-bidāra (contribution in lieu of lodging, or? forced labour), odda-dere (tank-diggers' tax), ayādāya (grain receipts by civil servants), sōdige (tax), olavāru, horavāru (import and export duties), kil tāndu mēl tāndu (inferior and superior fines), and cilavāna (odd sums, or miscellaneous). (1)

The inhabitants likewise paid to their local ruler tappu (fines), tavudi(decrease) and daṇḍāya (income from penalties) and the various income which was received by the payer of the siddhāya was known as kirukula, or the subordinate assessment. Ur-mala-braya is also heard of, but its significance is as yet unknown. (2)

Thus as subordinates and deputies of the sovereign the various governors, rulers and others, leaving aside the larger tenants and landholders, enjoyed a considerable income over and above the value of the kodagis and other lands which had been granted by the king to them or to their ancestors. When much of the siddhāya and sēsē also was alienated by a weak government to grasping or deserving dannayakas, their gain inflicted a permanent loss on the State, a process which in fact contributed very largely to the downfall of the Hoysala dynasty, as also that of other dynasties in similar positions.

Page 561 n. (1) E.C.V Hassan 139 (1200). (2) E.C.XI Holalkere 137.
(1) E.C.V Hassan 119 (1173); 136 (1114); Belur 83 (1178); Channarayapatna 268 (1199); Arkalgud 21 (1278-9); 84 (1275); cf. E.C.XI Chitraldrug 2 (1355), also ibid. 32 (1286); E.C.X Kolar 18 (1294), 28 (1291); Malur 39 (1346); Kolar 100 (1301); E.C.IV Chamrajannagar 84 (1280); Hunsur 137 (1162); Nagamangala 38 (1284); E.C.IX Channarayapatna 65 (1278); E.C.VII Honnalli 7 (1204); also M.A.R.1915-6, para, 84 (1077) and E.C.VI Tarikere 55 (1231). Numerous terms are doubtful. A modern list is found in M.A.R.1927, 113 (1826).
(2) E.C.II 333 (1206) and E.C.III Tirumakudal-Ynarsipur 27 (1290) Ibid. 97 (1276) the phrase used is siddhāya sēsē māla-braya. Braya normally means expenditure, and māla waste or impurity.
Appendix I.

Private & State Ownership and Land Taxation under the Hoysala Kings.

There is no proof that the subjects held absolute rights of private ownership of the soil, but the landholders enjoyed during their tenancy most of the advantages of ownership subject to their payment of the revenue and maintenance of the prevailing customs of their tenure. It is very doubtful whether absolute private ownership of land has ever existed even in pre-Socialist Europe; only the complicated restrictions of the Hindu law of inheritance put the Hoysala subjects at a marked disadvantage compared with their western contemporaries. However while others put the accent on "ownership", the mediaeval Hindu emphasised "enjoyment". In practice they can not have differed very much. The āstā-bhoga-tējas-svāmya, mentioned in E.C.V Hassan 61(1218), E.C.I 65(?1295), E.C.III Tirumakudal-narsipur 100(1281) and E.C.VI Kadur 143(1275), translated by Rice as "the eight rights of possession", but better put as "the ownership that consists in the dignity derived from eight enjoyments", are aksīnī (undiminished, i.e. present profit and capital), āgāmi (future, i.e. increased profit), nidhi (hidden stores), nikṣēpa (treasure trove), jala (waters), pāśāna (stones, or rocks), siddha (completed works) and sādhyā (prospective works). See also E.C.XI Chitaldrug 2(1355) and E.C.IV Ghamrajnagar 23(1578) for the permanence of the notion. Similarly, in the eastern districts, grants of land were made conveying rights to wells underground and trees overground: for example, E.C.X Kolar 55 (1285).
Sale and mortgage took place frequently, but the transactions referred not to the soil itself but to the position of landholder, and to the authority derived therefrom to receive the suvarṇāya and bhattāya, or income in cash and kind (E.C.VI Kadur 132 of 1215), to which custom and the king's order entitled them. The conditions under which tracts of land were entrusted to a landholder's care varied, and he, or the body which held the same status, was in his turn able to state conditions on which portions might be sublet to sub-tenants. The whole position is well illustrated by the article by S Chandrasekhara Sastri, on the economic conditions under the Hoysalas, in the half-yearly journal of the Mysore University for July 1928, pp. 196-233, particularly pp.204-9, an article which, in the absence of a more profound and complete treatment of the subject, may be considered authoritative. The rights of sale, exchange and mortgage were sometimes given (E.C.V Belur 132(1227)) and sometimes withheld (E.C.IV Nagamangala 39(1271)). Free sale and mortgage, when taxes were comparatively high, was in the State's interest, and here the temples as money lenders played a very important part, a part which requires further research.

A good example of the conditions under which land was granted to a person as a kudāngai (kōḍagi), or on the understanding that he stood to the tenants and cultivators in the position which had previously been held by the State, is given by E.C.X Malur 39(1346).

It is unfortunate, but inevitable, that we may not describe the legal position or economic status of the cultivator and landless classes, apart from the merchant and artisan commun-
Ities. It seems that they were little better than those of serfdom: slaves and depressed classes certainly existed. Our epigraphic evidence is almost exclusively confined to the affairs of substantial and free persons of the rank of gauda at least. The okkalu in E.C.IV Nagamangala 39(1271) translated by Rice wrongly as "cultivators" were in fact the sub-tenants of the Brahmans, who were themselves the land-holding corporation. These sub-tenants might indeed have been tenants under government but for the supervision of the agrañāra grant of a half-century before. Their substantial status is revealed by their titles - there is a gauda, accompanied by two settis, a sāhani (knight) and a heggade, as well as a son of the mighty Perumāle-dēva-dannāyaka himself.

In Chapter XI of his work on the Rāstrakūtās and their times Dr. A.S.Altekar has given a quantity of material on "revenue and expenditure" drawn from various dynasties of or near the period of the Rāstrakūtās. He admits the unsatisfactory scope of the evidence, yet many of his conclusions are valid and help to show in a rather vague fashion the advance which must have been made during the early Hoysala period. Much that he says is irrelevant to the subject at present under consideration, but the view he expresses on pp.236-241 concerning the State ownership of land is unacceptable. There can be no doubt that the theory of ownership had undergone little change between Rāstrakūta times and the Hoysala period, and from the much more vast body of evidence existing on the latter it is quite clear that Dr. Altekar's view is false. This is most unfortunate, as
the problem is of present-day importance as well as of great interest to students of Muslim and British revenue history. The battle between the partisans of State ownership and those of private ownership is shown by a study of Hoysala history to be quite idle: both parties are in the wrong. The king was bhū-bhuja, and was believed to own the earth by right of conquest or inheritance or both: his subjects, at his pleasure, enjoyed the fruits of it. It was convenient for him to secure them in their holdings under certain variable restrictions, and they felt at least as certain of maintaining their enjoyment of the lands held by them and their ancestors as do the present inhabitants of Europe. State ownership was combined with private usufruct in a manner difficult for western minds to appreciate; hence the controversy. The views of the Śāstras, which Dr. Altekar admits to be divergent, are not infrequently reflections of the Brahmans' anxiety to prevent conquerors from cancelling their grants. In Hoysala times the Brahmans never questioned the king's right to disturb the tenancy of previous landholders in favour of a body of agrahāra Brahmans. From the State's point of view it was a matter of indifference who were responsible for the revenue providing they paid it, and kept law and order at a reasonable level.

Dr. Altekar's method of arriving at his conclusion, which does not require a fuller scrutiny here, is similar to that on p. 243, where he judges that it was "absolutely clear that the property of persons dying without male issue did not escheat to the crown, as was the case in contemporary Gujarat"
from the fact that a single inscription assigns the property to a religious object only after it is found that no wife, female children, and so on, to and including gōtrajas, survive. The record, E.I.v p.26-28, is dated 1178, and thus can have no very close bearing on Rāstrakūta usage; the incident is very similar to that described on p.519-520 above, and Dr. Altekar by corrupting the translation (on page 28 of E.I.v line 28) "make" to "take" (on p.244 of his work) has badly confused the position; and if these authorities (not "of the village", as Altekar says) assigned the property conditionally at all it is clear that they did so by virtue of the right of the ruler which had been by custom or order vested in them to dispose of the property of those who died without heirs in the male line, and that they bowed to public opinion and interest by (a) putting a limit upon the exercise of the right, and (b) assigning the property to a public "charity". Dr. Altekar's method is shown to be insufficiently exact and his conclusion unsound. It is felt that his view on the proprietary right to the soil is similarly unreliable.

---o-o-o-o---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.C.V Belur 74(1261)</th>
<th>E.C.VI Kadur 49 (1291)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ga. pa. hā.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ga. pa. hā.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 3(a)</td>
<td>8 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 5 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 8 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 5 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 -</td>
<td>8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 8 -</td>
<td>2 7 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Text reads 8 pa. 3 hā.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| alage 34 kol 15 | 8 | 8 |   |
| balla 1 |   |   |   |
| alage 8 kol 18 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Kolaga 13½ |   |   | 1 |
| alage 3 kol 19 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Kolaga 6½ |   |   | 1 |
| 1 | 9 |   |   |
|   |   |   | 1 |
| 4 | 3 |   | 2 |
| 1 | 5 | 3 |   |

| 153 | 5 | 3 | 21 | 4 | 1 |

a) Text reads 8 ga. 5 pa, 2 hā.
b) Text reads 22 ga. 8 pa. 2 hā. Similarly, in the next, 8 pa.
c) Text has in error 1 hāga for 1 paña.
d) Text has 2 hāgas, a misreading for 1 hāga.
Appendix II.

Examples of Land Revenue Settlements.

General Note: The running balances, though they have been most useful for the purpose of reconstructing the true figures, are omitted in this analysis. The coinage was 4 hāgas to a pāna (5·2 grs. gold); 10 pānas to a gadyāṇa (61\(\frac{1}{2}\) - 63 grs.); a copper bēle was in use and is sometimes mentioned in these accounts, but may safely be neglected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>E.C.V Hassan 84(1223).</th>
<th>E.G.IX Bangalore 6 (1253).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ga. pa. hā.</td>
<td>ga. pa. hā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kula</td>
<td>10 -</td>
<td>25 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vattam</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>6 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sādam</td>
<td>8 -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa 2 ra sēse</td>
<td>(mānya)</td>
<td>(mānya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vallaha</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>2 7 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumāra</td>
<td>8 2</td>
<td>1 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nibandha</td>
<td>8 -</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śri-karaṇa</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>9 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suṅka</td>
<td>1 5 3</td>
<td>5 3 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pannāya</td>
<td>3 1(a)</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adake lakka 1</td>
<td>4 -</td>
<td>5 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa 1 ra sēse</td>
<td>2 - 2</td>
<td>4 5 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kandike-vaṇa</td>
<td>4 -</td>
<td>4 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ūnata (?)</td>
<td>8 -</td>
<td>12 8 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Text reads 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vīra-sēse</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nallāvu nallettu</td>
<td>9 5</td>
<td>3 (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khāna-nibandha</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaluku</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>todaru</td>
<td>4 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āneya sēse</td>
<td>6 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jede-dere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 7 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kudureya sēse</td>
<td>5 9 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumāra-gānike</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vijaya-vīra-vana</td>
<td>1 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kodati-vana</td>
<td>1 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khāna salage 11</td>
<td>2 7 2</td>
<td>salage 28 kol 5½</td>
<td>7 - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhatta salage 2 kol 10</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>salage 6 kol 8½</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ellu salage 1 kol 5</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>salage 3 kol 4½</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cōla-kārunya-bittiya-bhaṇḍi</td>
<td>2 -</td>
<td>id. sal.1 kol 17½</td>
<td>8 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ettin upōttara</td>
<td>8 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khānad upōttara</td>
<td>1 (d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Text reads 9 ga. 2 pa.
(b) Text reads sa.2½ for sa.28.
(c) The 8 pāpas and 1 hāga are added for blanks in the text.
(d) The numeral 1 is inserted for a blank in the text.
Appendix III

Legends and European Collections.

In the early part of the last century, when the organization of what was then known as the Carnatic and of Mysore was in progress under British government or supervision, efforts were made deliberately to discover the history of the country then newly entering under the protection of the British people. Colonel Colin Mackenzie's collection of historical material as well as of vernacular manuscripts still forms one of the largest collections of its kind in existence. Amongst the vernacular manuscripts on southern Indian history are several bearing on the early history of Mysore, and a vast number more which deal with the Tamilian districts of the plains. They are of works mostly of the 17th and 18th centuries; several of them were translated into English for Mackenzie and still survive in their quaint and often hardly intelligible style. Of the rest the catalogues of Wilson and Taylor give us a fair knowledge, and enable us to estimate the value of the whole.

About the same time that Mackenzie was beginning to collect information from every possible source, epigraphical, literary and local records, Dr. Francis Buchanan made his well-known "journey from Madras through the countries of Mysore, Canara, and Malabar, preformed under the orders of the Most Noble the Marquis Wellesley, Governor-General of India, for the purpose of investigating the state of Agriculture, Arts and Commerce; the religion, manners, and customs; the history natural and civil, and antiquities, in the dominions of the
Rajah of Mysore, and the countries acquired by the Honourable East India Company, in the late and former wars, from Tippoo Sultaun. "His three-volume account of his journey, together with the Mackenzie collection, and the later collections of Telugu, Tamil, Sanskrit and Kannada works by Sir Walter Elliot and C.P. Brown, all illustrate not only the very ignorant condition of the so-called literate classes of those parts of India during the first half of the nineteenth century, and the total absence of any profound or critical historical knowledge amongst them, but the labour which European scholars have been obliged to undergo to arrive even at the most elementary conclusion concerning the early history of the country. The comparative ignorance of these early labourers in this most perplexing field is amply demonstrated in the following brief survey of the material on or connected with the history of the Hoysala dynasty, where it has been thought fit to leave the proper names in the same state in which they were found, leaving the confusion in their transliteration undisturbed, and to make no comments on the veracity or otherwise of the facts alleged, as a comparison with the foregoing chapters will show what is legendary, mistaken or corrupted, and will demonstrate with sufficient clarity where - and it is very seldom - these vernacular works, local records, and oral traditions depend upon good sources. Where the present material does not give the date A.D., this has been added to facilitate comparison.

The first volume of the General Collection of Mackenzie contains (1) a "Translation of Canada Manuscript of (1) pp. 74-87. (i.e.)
Deevia Charita or divine actions of Sree Ramanogacharrys."

Ramanooogachary went to Tondanoor, where he learnt that the king of that part, Veetalada raja, son of Ballayaragenga, had a daughter that was possessed by a Peeshachey, or "davils". Veetaladdeva Roy asked Ramanooochary to cure his daughter, and he did so, whereupon Veetaladeva Roy became his disciple and received from him the name Vistnoovardana Roya. Ramanooogachary destroyed the Jain pagoda at Tondanoor and repaired the tank with it. In "Shalleevahum 120 in the Cycle year Bahoodana in the month of Magum 14th of soodum at thursday" ( ? A.D.1098) he went with the king to find the white mud near Yadavagiri. There follows the story of the image of the god "Ramanaprayaror" in the chamber of the daughter of the Dillyswer (Dillisvara, i.e. Sultan of Delhi)(2); Ramanooogachary went to find it. (The author of the catalogue is wrong in saying that the Hoysala Yādava prince converted by Rāmānuja is called Dellyswar here.)

In the 17th volume, amongst the details of the "legendary account of the five lingums of Vydanāda swamy that are erected in the Holy Place of Gajarunya Chatra from the Stala Mahatma and Pooranum of Tallacaud", appears the statement that in the Callee yoogum Bettavurdana Roya, a Jaina king, intended to build 5 Bustees and while they were building a boil appeared on his back; cured by Ramanooja-Charey he became a disciple of Vistnoo. Again, the Karnātaka-rājakal-savistara-caritram, No.2305 on p.34 of Taylor's Catalogue (vol.iii), (1) p.47. (2) The Koyilolugu enlarges on this legend.
relates that Ramanuja was at Seringapatam when the Muslims took the images of the gods thence to Delhi. The translation of the Kongadesa-rajkakal or Konka-raja-vamsavali, referred to as I.R. (Local Records) vol xi p.557, and printed in "Cyclic Tables"1850, (1) contains references to Ramanuja together with much information on the Hoysalas.

The Sala myth opens the tale, the last date in the previous account being Saka 927 Visvavasu (A.D.1005). Vinayaditya was king at Talacca; he usurped some villages in the Tulava country. In s.991 Sadharana (? A.D.1070) he was succeeded by Vallalen (in Telugu written Vallyalen), his son by his wife Valadevi. The country was called Sasapuram. This Vallalen was a Jaina. In s.1015 Akshaya (?A.D.1086) his son Betteda-rayya, who took the title Bettada Vishu Vardhana, ruled Talaccadu and various parts of Tulava, Concan, Malayala and Codugu, northwards Jatimala and eastwards Alambadi. He long fought the king of Kerala. His wife was Santala-devi, who was at first a Jaina but became a Vaishnavite in s.1021 Vikrama (A.D.1100) in the day of Ramanujachari. There follow notices of some grants in s.1039 Vilambi (?A.D.1113) etc. In that year he was at Velur (which, says Brown, we call Vellore, near Chittoor (!)) and consecrated the pagoda to Chenna Keshava Narain Swami. Vishu Vardhana died in s. 1055 Ananda (A.D.1133) and his son Narasinga Raya succeed him at Talaccad. Then he dwelt at Dora-samudram; Narasinga died in s. 1095 Jaya (?A.D.1174), having ruled 27 years. His son was Ballala, who ruled at Talaccadu, and had a vizier Chandra Mauli

(1) Brown's Telugu Collections vol2, p.194 ff.
He ruled the Koncan country, conquered the Kerala and Pandya country; Someshvara succeeded to Vallala raya in § 1155 (A.D. 1232), having been crowned during his father's life. His son vira-Narasininga Raya ruled at Dora Samudram in § 1205 (A.D. 1233). His mantri was Perumān dand Nāyac; his commandant (dalavay) was Pramacham-ūpati (i.e. Brahma-ūpati). The same work is No.2303 on p.32-3 of Taylor's Catalogue. Of similar substance, but with fuller detail, is the Hoisala-rajah-Veejayum or Balana Raya Cherita ("translated from the Sanskrit"), which appears in volume iii of the Mackenzie General Collection. (2) It overflows with errors, clearly on account of the original but misguided researches of a sixteenth or seventeenth century writer. The story of Sala appears at length; for his bravery he collected a hana from every house at Shasa-gramam, then two then three, in each successive year, so that he could "support an army of the four elements". The sanyasi ordered him to re-build Dwara Samoodrum which had long been in ruins, telling him, "your ancestors have there deposited much wealth". His son was Venayaditta, whose son was Anag Rauja, whose three sons were Balana rajah, Batadava and Audita. Batadava had a beautiful daughter named Manorama, who was possessed by a Brahmarakshasa and cured by Ramaunj Acharloo. Batadava erected many pagodas to Vistnoo and destroyed all the Jain temples. Balana Rayadoo, brother of Batadava, obtained a cup of Sidda Russum that turned iron into gold. He was affected by leprosy and built a most excellent pagoda for the image Hosal Eswar to rid himself of it (1) pp.53-62. This is referred to on p.501 of Wilson's catalogue.
The daughter of the Delhi Pauzahah resolved to marry Balana Raujudoo; he married her and then neglected her, hence the attack of the Pauzahah. Destruction of Dora Samudram was foretold by Balana's sister, whose sons he killed.

In the same volume is found a translation of the "Hoisala Rajacul Vamsum or the Genealogical Account of the Hoisala Rajahs of the Yadoo Vamsum." (1) It is of a similar character. For Veeenee Aditya is given the Saka date 999 (A.D. 1077), and for Bettada Vistnoo Vurdana-royen 8. 1020 (A.D. 1098). These rulers lived at Talcaad. Many grants are mentioned, the details obviously having been taken from 'śasanas. It contains many errors as does the previous account, in eluding the statement that Someswaran fought and made friends with Rāma Rajah of Kerala. He fought with the Mussulman army and defeated it; his mother was Veetoo-Javaanee Lokambe; and there were grants in his name of $1206 & 1207 (A.D. 1283-4).

In the seventeenth volume (2) appears the " Legendary tale of the Rachasee of Toonoor or the Story of the Kerabunta Rajah Translated by Soobarow 1806". It relates that Bellal roya of Hallabede had a daughter of 16 years for whom the only suitor he could find was Herrybunta-roya-Naraputty, son of Maula bhoop Naraputty, who lived 260 yojanums away. In the "Kyfeyat of Canumbaddy.... literally translated by Sooba Row in 1809" in the same volume (3) we learn that in $ 876 (A.D. 953) Dwaravutt Puttun was built, now Halla-beed; there Balall Raya son of Veeniaditt Ray ruled. He had nine pradhans; he granted the Canava-

(1) pp.118-130. (2) pp.20-27. (3) pp.28-33; see Taylor III, p.269, No.1880.
pooree seema to Govinda Dha-naik who was one of them: a legend
concerning Govinda follows. From the Haulabedoo Kyfeat, in the
uncatalogued MSS. listed by Wilson and appearing as Class V
No.5, we learn nothing new, except that Yareanga-bhoopah lived
to's 1048 Manmatha (?A.D.1125 or 1115). The Delhi mahā-rājakal
Kyfeyat, which appears as No.2324 on p.53 of vol iii of Taylor's
catalogue, gives Ballalā 30 years, Vīra-Ballalā 41, Cenna Bal-
lalā 41, Visnuvardhana 40, Raja Ballalā 51, Irtihya Ballalā 41,
and Vijaya 41 with other names of Ballala kings running into
the rayas. The account of Karikala Cola, being No.597 sect.5 on
p.486 of the same volume, tells us that the wife of the Ballala
king was of great assistance to the Cōla's kingdom.

Further references to the Hoysalas in this catalogue
are many, but none are of any independent historical value, or
need to be detailed here.(1) Of the many inscriptions among
them the majority are either better edited elaswhere or are
unidentifiable and unusable. The same applies to a large extent
to the inscriptions collected by C.P.Brown,(2) which need never
be consulted, and require no comment except for one remarkable
example, which defies explanation. It purports to show (297 p.34)
Visnu Vardhana pratapa cakravartti Hoisala bhuja bala vīra-
Nārasimha-dēva ruling the Telugu country at Rajamahendravaram
in 1191 Sukla (A.D.1269).(3)

The Elliot MSS. give an interesting view of the
contemporary information on the Kākatīyas, giving legends of
Pratāpa Rudra, the Cōlas, Gandagopāla (4), and "Koperam Singa-
devar",(5) which do not require to be mentioned here; a refer-

(1) Ibid. pp. 67-8,90-1,316,392,435 (Ballala rajas mentioned in
connection with Mavalivaram),630,639,708. See also
Mackenzie General xxv p.205-6. See ibid.p.237: Kampila the son
ence to Parākrama Pāṇḍya in a Telugu History of the Pāṇḍyas

is however of value, for it tells us that the Muslims from Delhi attacked him in Kaliyuga 4425, s.1246;(A.D.1323) they had a "lakh of horses in addition to a considerable number of foot-soldiers".(1) Parākrama Pāṇḍya fought for 3 days and nights near the river Vaika, The country was disturbed for twenty years, until in Kaliyuga 4445 s'.1266(A.D.1343) Kammana Vadaiyar and Tammana Vadaiyar came from Mysore and conquered the Muslims and restored peace to the country. The source of this account does not appear to have been used before.

At Tonnur Buchanan was told the story of Rāmānuja, together with the tale of his having ground Jainas in an oil-mill.(2) He discovered traces of Hoysala rule in Tuluva,(3) & learned that Ramanuja was responsible for the loss of the tip of Gommatesvara's finger.(4) He met a man whose ancestors had been hereditary accountants in the Barcuru (Bārakūr) district since Hoysala times, and who said that that dynasty lasted from A.D.714 to 1336, the correct date of the foundation of Vijayanagara being preserved in this case as so often elsewhere.(5) This man had made an account of the previous kings of his country, Tuluva, from a Vidyāranya Śikṣa and other papers. The gross confusion of data is a good example of the intellectual darkness of the period.

The apocryphal accounts of the Hoysalas and their contemporaries may well be concluded with an abstract from the Canna-Basava-Kālajñāna which is quoted by Rice in the first

Sringeriṇāyaka a commander under Rāma-pāva of Devägiri.

Page 576 n.(2) I.O., MSS.Bur.D 297, 296. (3) Brown's note: "Cer-
tainly misplaced: 170 years too late", is based on a miscon-
edition of his Mysore Gazetteer, and of which a copy was doubtless available to him, but which is not to found in London. It was probably written during the last years of the Vijayanagara kings, and purports to be a prophetic account of the "Belāl sovereigns who ruled at Dwārasamudra". The list gives Hayasāla Belāla Rāya 59 years from s.906 to 965 (A.D. 933 - 1042); Vinayāditya Belāla from A.D.1042 to 1072; Yarey-anga Belala to 1113; Visnvardhana Belāla to 1144; Vijaya Narasimha Belāla to 1182; Vīra Belāla to 1232; vīra Narasimha Belala to 1248; vīra Somesvara to 1267; and vīra-Narasimha to 1307, the last prince being taken by the Muslims.(1)

Page 577 n.(1) Elliot MSS. History of the Pāṇḍyas, p.49-50.
The Hoysalas are frequently referred to in this work as the Nine Ballālas.

(1) Rice, Mysore Gazetteer ("Mysore and Coorg")1877, vol.1, p.214. From p.213 to 219 is to be found an account of the "Hoysala Ballālas".

---0-0-0-0-0---
Appendix IV.
Genealogical Table of the Hoysalas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KĀMA , Nṛpa Kāma, or Rācamalla Permādi</th>
<th>(c1006 - 1047)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1047-1097) VINAYĀDITYA, Tribhuvanamalla.</td>
<td>daughter: Rakkasa Hoysala, Trailōkyamalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Kaleyabbe.</td>
<td>Cālukya.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (1097-1102) EREYĀNGA, Tribhuvanamalla. | daughter: |
| m. Ecala-dēvi | Ammana Sāntara, Mahādēvi |
| ? Talavala-dēvi (1) | |

| BALLĀLA I | VIṢNUVARDHANA, Bītti-dēva. | daughter: |
| m. Padmala-dēvi | m. Sāntala-dēvi | Udayāditya |
| Cāvala-dēvi | Bammala-dēvi (2) | Hemmādī, Gaṅga |
| Boppa-dēvi | Lakṣmi-dēvi | |
| (1102-1108) | Rājāla-dēvi (3) | |
| ? By Sāntala I | Dēvaki-dēvi (4) | |

| BALLĀLA II, VIIRA-BALLĀLA-dēvaṛasa. (1173-1220) | Mahādēva |
| m. Padmala (12) | EREYĀNGA |
| Umā-dēvi | |
| Baićala-dēvi (13) | |
| Bammala-dēvi (14) | |
| Abhinava-Kētala (15) | |
| Tuluvala-dēvi (16) | |
| Cōla-mahādēvi | |
| ? Remmā-dēvi (x) | |
| Kētala-dēvi | |

(1) Awe of Viṣṇuvardhana: E.C.III Seringapatam 49(c1120).
(2) E.C.V Arskēre 32(1136); E.C.IV Nagamangala 3(1135); E.C.VI Kadur 96(1141) & E.C.XII Gubbi 13(1140).
(3) E.C.VI Kadur 96(1141) & E.C.XII Gubbi 13(1140).
(4) E.C.VI Kadur 79(1140). (x) See above p.222 n.(x); cf. Fleet's absurd statement on D.K.D.(1896)p.502,1.5-6 with ibid.n.506 n.2.


(18) A.R.1919, 602(c1240); S.I.I.IV 504(1265), 501(1233).

(19) Known only as the mother of Nārasimha.

(20) S.I.I.IV 423(c1250) ? Also E.C.IX Bangalore 6(1253).

(21) S.I.I.IV 504(1265).

(22) A.R.1910,92(c1260).

(23) A.R.1936-7,62,65(1262); S.I.I.IV 427(1261).

(24) A.R.1936-7,64(1262); ibid.72(1236) ?

(25) It is worthy of notice that we know of no Queens of Ballāla III except Cikkāyi-tāyi. And she was a ruler in her own right. The comparison with the case of Ballāla II, and the difference in their prosperity, together suggest that one of the secrets of Ballāla II's strength was that he knew how to employ his Queens in the public service: their mutual jealousy would make them very efficient provincial governors or administrators of any kind in a very general way; Ballāla III on the other hand for some reason did not use that system - indeed it seems to have been dropped after Nārasimha II's time. Had the evidence been less negative, and the facts less nebulous, this might have been put forward as one of the contributory reasons for the break-down of the Hoysala administration.
Appendix V.

LISTS OF OFFICIALS.

Arranged by reigns and according to function.

List of Abbreviations.

b. brother of.
bd. bhaṇḍāri (treasurer).
b.i.l. brother-in-law of.
cam. camūpati.
d. daṇḍanāyaka, daṇḍāyaka, daṇḍanāṭha, etc.
f. father of.
gs. grandson of.
h. heggade, veggade, perggade, etc.
h.h. hiriya hadavala, piriya padavala.
m.m.l. mahā-mandalika.
m.m.r. mahā-mandalēśvara.
m.p. mahā-pradhāna.
m.p.d. mahā-pracanda-daṇḍāyaka.
m.p.s. mahā-pasāyta.
m.s. mahā-sāmanta.
m.s.v. mahā-sandhi-vigrahi.
m.v. mane-veggađe.
p.d. piriya- or hiriya-damnāyaka.
p.v. parama-visvāsi.
r.d. rāya-daṇḍanāṭha.
s. son of.
sarv. sarvādhikāri.
sen. sēnādhipati.
s.i.l. son-in-law of.
sāmanta, sāvanta.
srī-karana.
srī-kamaṇa-heggade.
sandhi-vigahī.

NRPA KĀMA
Mandalikas & Sāmantas

General Officers.

Other Ministers.
Nāgavarma, otherwise Nāganna. (1) 1006

Subordinate Military Officers.
Bīruga. (2) 1006
Kāliga. (3) 1006
Maṅjaga. (4) 1006

Subordinate Civil Officers.

(1) E.C.III Tirumakudal-narsipur 44(1006).
(2) Ibid.
(3) Ibid.
(4) Ibid.
General Officers.

Bōkaya. (4) m.p., sen., h.h. 1089

Ecimayya. (5) samadhigata...m.mr., m.p.d., s.v. 1049

Ellapayya. (6) d. cl090

Mariyāne. (7) d. f. Mariyāne-d. 1047

Nāgavarma. (8) d. ?cl070

Other Ministers.

Candimayya. (9) m.p., bd. ?1090

Cāvunda-rāya. (10) m.p., s.v., h. cl060

Nāga-dēvayya. (11) nāyaka, m.s.v. 1096

Vardhamāna-dēva. (12) Jain guru. Hoysala-karālay-adalu-agraganyaru cl070

General Officers.

Bōkaya. (4) m.p., sen., h.h. 1089

Ecimayya. (5) samadhigata...m.mr., m.p.d., s.v. 1049

Ellapayya. (6) d. cl090

Mariyāne. (7) d. f. Mariyāne-d. 1047

Nāgavarma. (8) d. ?cl070

Other Ministers.

Candimayya. (9) m.p., bd. ?1090

Cāvunda-rāya. (10) m.p., s.v., h. cl060

Nāga-dēvayya. (11) nāyaka, m.s.v. 1096

Vardhamāna-dēva. (12) Jain guru. Hoysala-karālay-adalu-agraganyaru cl070
Subordinate Military Officers.

Subordinate Civil Officers.
Kāleyamma. (1) nāl-gāvunda of Āsandī-nāḍ. 1090
Rācimeya. (2) h. 1089
Rājimayya. (3) ruled Koligunda. 1083
Sēnābōva.
Muddaya. (4) 1091

EREYANA.
Mandalikas & Sāmantas.
Cattaya. (5) saṃadhigata..., m.s., mañlaparol 1097
ganda. Kadurahaḷi, Kadur taluqa.
Cinna-gaundha. (6) saṃadhigata..., m.s. "Sun to 1101
the lotus the Ganga kula".
Vaijarasa. (see under Vinayāditya)

General Officers.
raja, and Kēśava-rāja.

Other Ministers.
Kunda-mārāyar. (8) m.p., m.v. Ruled Mayse-nāḍ. 1094

Subordinate Military Officers.

Subordinate Civil Officers.
Bhāsa-gāvunda. (9) nāl-gāvunda of Ballavi-nāḍ. 1097

(1) E.C.VI Kadur 22(1090).
(2) E.C.VI Tarikere 65(?1089).
(3) M.A.R.1910-1, para. 97(1083).
(4) E.C.XII Tiptur 57(1091).
(5) M.A.R.1925, 43(1097).
(6) E.C.V Belur 141(1101).
(7) E.C.V Channarayapenā 244(1210); E.C.V Chikmagalur 20(1249).
(8) M.A.R.1924, 19(1094).
(9) M.A.R.1926, 7(1097).
BALLĀLA I.

Mandalikas & Sāmantas.

Bācarasa, Bāciga.(1) samadhigata..., Cālukyābharaṇa, 1106
"Sun to the lotus the Cālukya family." ?s. Muddamarasa:
Doddagani, Channarayapatna tāluqa.

Bommana.(2) sāmanta. ? same as Barmayya of Viṇahāditya. Banur, Kadur tāluqa.

Nād-arasa.(3) satyavākya etc., m.ml. Āsandi-rād ?1104
Sāntayya.(see under Vinayāditya)

General Officers.

Bhadrāditya.(4) d., m.p.

Mariyāne.(5) d. f.in-law of Ballāla I

Vittiyānān.(6)

Subordinate Military Officers.

Subordinate Civil Officers.

Bimmanna.(7) Ruled Tanjīga.

VISNUVARDHANA

Mandalikas & Sāmantas.

Māca.(8) s. Ahavamalla; sitagara-gaḍa; sāmanta. ?c1130
Villages in Kadur tāluqa.

Māra, Māraya-māyaka.(9) sāmanta. Yidagur, Gubbi 1134 tāluqa.

Karṇa.(10) mandaliaka. Villages in Mudgere tāluqa. ?1115

General Officers.

Bala-dēva.(11) or Ballaṇa. d.

Ballā-veggade.(12) or Balvayya. m.p., sarv., d., 1139-51
piriya-perggade. f. Nāganna & Singänna.

(3) E.C.VI Tarikere 62(?1104). (4) E.C.V Arsikere 141(1158)
(5) E.C.IV Nāgamangala 32(1184). (6) E.C.X Goribidnur 57(?1109)
(7) E.C.XII Tiptur 30(1102). (8) E.C.VI Kadur 30(1170), 36(1203)
(9) E.C.XII Gubbi 34a(1134). (10) E.C.VI Mudgere 32(?1115).
(11) E.C.II 142 & 141(1139). (12) E.C.V Arsikere 105(1139),
52(1151); E.C.VI Chikmagalur 4(1140); Mudgere 3(1144); E.C.V Belur
178(1145).
Ballala, Vallu.(1) cam. s.Bamma-h. 1136 587
Begipaya.(2) d. 1145
Bācarasa.(3) d. c1137
Bharata.(4) or Bharatamayya,Bharatēsvara,Bharatētya, b.Mariyāne; s.i.l. Viṣṇuvardhana. 1137-1145
Bheppaya.(5) m.p., sen. 1133
 Bhōpaiyya.(6) m.p., d. ?1133
Bittiyanna.(7) or Viṣṇu. d. 1136
Bōki.(8) or Bōkimaya, Bōkāṇa. m.p., sen.,h.h. 1138-1157
Boppa.(9) or Boppana. m.p.,p.d. s.Ganga d., f:Eca d. 1120-1141
Camana.(10) or Cāvimagaya. m.p.,h.h. 1155
Cikka (?) (11) hadavala. f.Singeya,Mareya & Adāyada Harihara. c1135
 Dāmā-rāja.(13) or Dāvarasa. d. s.Srīdhara d. c1120
 Dāva.(14) or Dāvapaya. d. s.Mall cam. c1130-80
Ēcana.(15) m.p., d. f.Viṣṇu,Bōkāṇa,Mahādevānna,c1125 Harihara & Īcana; s.Bōppa. 1138
Ēcana.(16) or Īcimayya. d. s.Gaṅga-rāja. 1138
Gaṅga-rāja.(17) or Gaṅgipaya. d. "Chief of Karnpata Brahms". s.Ecī-rāja. f:Eca & Boppa. 1115-c1123

(1) E.C.VI Madge 35(1136). (2) E.C.VI Madge 32(?1115).
(3) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 161(1137). (4) E.C.II 267(c1140);M.A.R. 1937, 34(1142);E.C.VI Chikmagalur 160(?1184),44(1287);E.C.IV Nagamangala 32(1184);M.A.R.1914-5, para. 79(1145).
(7) E.C.V Belur 17(1136). (8) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 71(1138);E.C.V Belur 178(1145); E.C.V Hassan 69(1155);E.C.XII Kunigal 1(1157).
(9) E.C.VII Shimoga,12(1120); M.A.R.1928,97(?c1129);E.C.V Channarayapatna 248(1154);M.A.R.1925,30(c1135);E.C.VI Chikmagalur 96(1141);E.C.V Belur 137(1185); ? E.C.V Hassan 124(?c1125),K.T. only. (10) E.C.V Hassan 57(1155). (11) E.C.III Mandya 121(1225).
(12) E.C.IV Nagamangala 32(1184). (13) E.C.V Channarayapatna 244(1210). (14) E.C.V Ariskere 129(c1180);Channarayapatna 244(1210).
(15) E.C.IV Nagamangala 28(c1125). (16) M.A.R.1908, para.39(1138), E.C.II 120(c1138). (17) E.C.II 127(1116);E.C.III Malavalli 31 1117;M.A.R.1908-9, para.74(c1171);E.C.II 73(1118);E.C.IV Naga- mangala 19(?1118);E.C.II 118(1120);E.C.V Channarayapatna 212 (c1120),227(c1120),260(1120);E.C.II 128(1121);E.C.V Belur 124 (1133);M.A.R.1914-5, para.78(c1135);E.C.II 384(c1135);E.C.V Channarayapatna 248(1134);M.A.R.1908, para.39(1138);E.C.II 120 (c1138),240(c1175);E.C.IV Nagamangala 30(1184).
Ganapayya. (1) d. c1137
Hiriyarasa. (2) d. c1130
Hullu. (3) or Hulamayya, Pulla. m.p., d., bd. s.Yaksa-rajä. c1135-1177
Huñisimayya. (4) or Punasamayya, d. s.Cavana. 1116-1120
Këśava-rāja. (5) m.p., d. ? s.Sṛidhara. 1142
Liṅgapayya. (6) m.p., d. 1118
Mariyāne. (7) d., m.p., bd., m.p.d. 1137
Pāva. (8) hadavala. 1116
Rāyana. (9) d. s.Kālimayya. 1130
Sōkkimayya. (10) sen., m.p., h.h. 1155
Sōvarasa. (11) d. c1137
Taila. (12) d. s.Bhdrāditya. c1120
Udeyamaya. (13) d. 1142
Vinayāditya. (14) d. ?c1120

Other Ministers.
Bācimayya. (15) m.p., d. 1141
Cāvunda-rāya. (16) s.v.; s.Taila. 1136
Surigeya Nāgi-dēvānna. (17) m.p., h. c1120
Nārasimha. (18) (It is presumed that this is not Nārasimha I) 1128-1136
Rāmaya. (19) m.p., m.pś. ?c1130
Sōvanna. (20) tantrapāla. ?1115

(1) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 161(1137).(2)E.C.V Channarayapatna 213 (?c1150).(3) E.C.II 178(c1150), 349(1150), 345(c1150), 64(1163), 66(1177); E.C.IV Hunsur 137(1162); E.C.XII·Gubbi 12(1162); E.C.VI Tarikere 19(1192); E.C.V Channarayapatna 146(1174).
Subordinate Military Officers.

Basava-sāhāni. (1) 1139
Bitti-dēva-Hoysala-sāhāni. (2) 1117
Malaya-sāhāni. (3) 1131
Maleya-sāhāni. (4) 1141

Subordinate Civil Officers.

Cinna. (5) Governor of Maṅkike 12. 1113
Marāsinga-gāvunḍa. (5a) Governor of Talekādu-nād. c1120
Haggade.

Bācimayya. (6) h. of the vīra-vana of the Nāgara- c1141
khandha 70

Dāsimayya. (7) 1139
Kēsiyanna. (8) c1118
Mahādēva. (9) 1132
Mallinnātha. (10) 1130
Mardimayya. (11) 1123
Muddaya. (12) 1139
Satti (? Gutti). (13) ?1130

Page 588 n(19) E.C.V.Channarayapatna 213(?c1130).
Page 588 n. (20) E.C.VI Mudgere 32(?1115).

(1) E.C.V Hassan 114(1139).
(2) M.A.R.1934,12(1117).
(3) M.A.R.1914-5, para.81(1131).
(4) E.C.V Belur 219(c1141).
(5) M.A.R.1914-5, para.78(1113).
(5a) E.C.IV Nagamangala 15(1179).
(6) E.C.VIII Sorab 320(c1141).
(7) E.C.VI Kadur 76(?1139).
(8) M.A.R.1908, para.37(c1118).
(9) E.C.V.Channarayapatna 271(1132).
(10) E.C.III Mandya 50(1130).
(11) E.C.II 117(1123).
(12) E.C.V Arskere 17(1139).
(13) M.A.R.1927,37(?1130).
NĀRASIMHA I

Mandalikas & Sāmantas.

Bammarasa. (1) m.mr. Gaṅga. Āsandī-nād. 1172

Gūli Bāci. (2) sāmanta. samadhigata... Mānyakhēdepura... Adalāradītya. Magugāre-nād

Bīcayya. (3) sāmanta. Kikkēri. c1171

Biṭṭeya-nāyaka. (4) sāmanta. Kaṅcigallu 1151

Śrī-Nārasiṁha-Pōṣala-Brahmādirājan. (5) c1145

Bōgeya. (6) sāmanta. Tōṇḍeyahala. 1167

Hariya Calikeya-nāyaka. (7) m.s. Calukeya estate. 1153

Uttama Cōla. (8) m.s. Tippatūr. 1162

Gōyi-dēva. (9) sāmanta. Huliyēru. 1143-9

Kīlalādi-rāya Kācci(?Vācchi)-dēvan. (10) Kankanhalli tālūqa.

Bhujā-bala-vīra-Gaṅga-Poysala-Kelalādirāya. (11) 1160

Kukkala-nādālvar. (12) 1156

Mācayya-nāyaka. (12a) sāmanta. 1169

Māci. (13) mandalika of Sativāgala. Abhimānemēru, ahitara-ganda, gaṅḍara-mānika. c1164

Sigal-nādālvan Mādēvar. (14) Kankanhalli tālūqa.

Malla. (15) sāmanta of Okkalugere estate. 1170

Mahādēva. (16) sāmanta. ?1154

Ghaseṇe Mahādēva-nāyaka. (17) m.s. s.Keccana- Māceya-nāyaka of Kalikatī in the Magare 300.

Malli-dēva. (18) māryā. 1167

Mayi-dēva. (19) nāyaka. sāmanta of Sōmanahalli. 1141

Noṇabeya-nāyaka. (20) sāmanta of Kaṅcigallu. 1151

Sōma. (21) sāmanta. Kalukāṇi-nād 1142

Udayāditya-nāyaka. (22) ? sāmanta. 1158

Visnu, Bitti-dēva. (23) sāmanta of Huliyēru. 1160-9

(1) E.C.VI Tarikere 85(1172). (2) E.C.XII Tumkur 9(1151).
(3) E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 53(21171). (4) E.C.VI Kadur 112(1151).
(5) E.C.IX Hoskote 40(c1145). (6) E.C.IV Hunsur 3(1167).
(7) E.C.VI Kadur 28(1153). (8) E.C.XII Tiptur 61(1162).
(9) E.C.V Arsikere 55(1143); E.C.VI Kadur 54(1148); E.C.XII Chik-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aci-rāja.(1)</td>
<td>-cm. sri. m.p., sarv.</td>
<td>s.Keśava; b. Saṅkara, Malla &amp; Candra.</td>
<td>1172-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amareśvara.(2)</td>
<td>mahā-sarv., samasta-sen., m.p., d.</td>
<td>s. Nāgavarma.</td>
<td>1162-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bala-dēva. (see under Viṣṇuvardhana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1139-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bammeya (?)</td>
<td>m.p., sen., h.?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharatimayya, Bharata. (see under Viṣṇuvardhana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1137-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitiyanna.(4)</td>
<td>m.p., d., sarv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1162-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bōkaṇa, Bōki. (see under Viṣṇuvardhana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1138-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveya (?) Biluvayya.(5)</td>
<td>samasta-sen., hiriya m.v., 1145-52 elephant-commander.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candiraya, Candimayya.(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1152-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cāmana, Cāvimayya.(see under Viṣṇuvardhana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cōkimayya (?) Bokimayya.(7)</td>
<td>m.p., sarv., sen., p.d.; s. Babbaya.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1144-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cōkkanna.(8) hadavala. m.p., d.(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11130-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāva, Dāvapayya. (see under Viṣṇuvardhana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēvapra.(9)</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table continues with further entries and references.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hariyanna</td>
<td>(1) d.</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemmaqi</td>
<td>(2) sen.</td>
<td>1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulla, Hullamayya</td>
<td>(see under Viṣṇuvardhana)</td>
<td>c1135-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣvara</td>
<td>(3) cam. s. i. 1. Ṝeyaṅga.</td>
<td>c1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāteya-nāyaka</td>
<td>(4) d.</td>
<td>c1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvanna</td>
<td>(5) d.  s. Kolliyayya d.</td>
<td>c1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālpatti</td>
<td>(6) d.  f. Aṅkeya.</td>
<td>c1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kēsimayya, Kēsava</td>
<td>(see under Viṣṇuvardhana)</td>
<td>1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutādi</td>
<td>(7) d., sarv., cam.</td>
<td>1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakumaya, Lakkarasa</td>
<td>(8) m. p., sarv., sen., d., bāhattara...</td>
<td>1162-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manisanayya</td>
<td>(9) m. p., d.</td>
<td>c1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariyāne</td>
<td>(10) d.</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padmanābha</td>
<td>(11) cam.</td>
<td>1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koneya Šaṅkara</td>
<td>(12) d.</td>
<td>1149-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiyanna</td>
<td>(13) d.</td>
<td>1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sōkkimayya</td>
<td>(see under Viṣṇuvardhana)</td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippa</td>
<td>(14) sen., m. p.</td>
<td>1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udēyanna</td>
<td>(15) m. p., d.</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) E.C. XII Tumkur 38(c1145).  (4) M.A.R.1914-5, para. 79b(c1150)  
(5) M.A.R.1914-5, para. 79b(c1150).  (6) M.A.R.1927,8(c1179).  
(7) E.C. III Seringapatam 62(?1158).  (8) E.C. III Nanjangud 175(1169);E.C.V Hassan 66(c1170), 67(1174);M.A.R.1911-2, para. 37(1180);M.A.R.1914-5, para. 79(1162);1932,46(1180);  
(13) E.C.V Arsikere 141(1158).  
(14) E.C.V Belur 177(1167).  
(15) E.C.XII Kunigal 1(1157).
### Other Ministers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bammacayya</td>
<td>m.p.</td>
<td>cl1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellappayya-nāyaka</td>
<td>m.ps. s.Kēta-nāyaka</td>
<td>1165-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitṭimayya</td>
<td>m.p.</td>
<td>1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Būcira, Būcimayya, Būceyya</td>
<td>m.p., sarv., sri.h., s.v.</td>
<td>1154-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candimaya</td>
<td>serv. h. of Bāgi</td>
<td>1172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēva-rāja</td>
<td>m.p. s.Udeyāditya</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govinda-dēva</td>
<td>s.Govinda-rāja; b. Nāka, Kālidāsa, and Būci</td>
<td>1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālimeyya</td>
<td>m.p., h.</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanteimayya</td>
<td>m.p., h.</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammata Mācaṇṇa</td>
<td>m.p., h.</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mācayya</td>
<td>m.p., sarv.</td>
<td>1171-c75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mādhava, Mādi-rāja</td>
<td>m.p., sri.</td>
<td>1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmaṇa Mallana</td>
<td>m.p.</td>
<td>1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manimangalam udaiyān</td>
<td>or Śrivaisnava-dāsa. sri.h.</td>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nākimayya, Nāka</td>
<td>sri.h., sarv. s.Govinda.</td>
<td>cl1160-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārisaṇa</td>
<td>m.p., bd.</td>
<td>1136-c50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucciya Sinγanna</td>
<td>m.p., m.p. Ruled Kalilavādi.</td>
<td>1171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiva-rāja</td>
<td>m.p., h.</td>
<td>1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sōmannā</td>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sōmayya</td>
<td>sri.h.</td>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrivaisnava Tirumale</td>
<td>m.ps.</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Subordinate Military Officers.

Dasaya-sahani.(1) c1162

Habbeya-sahani.(2) ?1154

Jasapala(3) or Dasapala-sahani. ?1160

Nageya-sahani.(4) 1145

Subordinate Civil Officers.

Maratamma.(5) mahaprabhu of Kuḍugu-nāḍ. 1156

Heggades.

Accalaiyan.(6) Tippūr. 1156

Bācayya.(7) c1160

Balla.(8) Phalguni. 1144-5

Bamma.(9) s. Hanmasetti h. 1173

Barmma.(10) f. Bhāva h. 1159

Bhāva.(11) Suleyakere. 1159

Bikkimagya.(12) Mattavuru. 1148

Bittiyanam.(13) h. of the bannige-dere. ?1167

Bomma-dēva.(14) h. of m. p. Kammata Mācanṇa. 1173

Būci.(15) Mattavara. 1143

Candu.(16) Kundūr. ?1145

Cinna.(17) 1155

Dāna.(18) s. Bhatta h. of Mutta. 1172

Desi.(19) Kundūr. ?1145

(1) E.C.V Hassan 148(?1162), K.T. only. (2) E.C.V Belur 168(1154).
(6) E.C. IX Bangalore 112(1156). (7) E.C.V Belur 188(1191).
(8) E.C.VI Muddere 3(1144); E.C.V Belur 178(1145). (9) Ibid. 25
Kadur 34(1148). (13) E.C.V Hassan 146(?1167), K.T. only.
(14) E.C.XII Gubbi 34c(1173). (15) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 162(1143).
(16) E.C.V Hassan 37(?1142). (17) Ibid. 69(1155). (18) E.C.VI
Chikmagalur 81(1172). (19) E.C.V Hassan 37(?1145).
Ereyanga, Ereyamayya. (1) 1155
Getana. (2) Mattavuru. 1148
Jannamaya. (3) Belavadi. c1160
Kōvayya. (4) 1163
Mācimayya. (5) Kotṭāra & Hollave. c1155
Mādi. (6) sunka h. 1167
Mādimayya. (7) Šivara. 1163
Mādiyanna. (8) Karigunda. 1162
Mahādeva. (9) 1168
Maṭcayya. (10) sunka h. 1174
Māranda. (11) 1171
Munjayya. (12) Tenginagatta c1150
Nāraṇa. (13) Mattavara. 1143
Nēma. (14) naḷ-prabhu of Edadore 70 (Mandali 1000). 1172
Vijayāditya. (15) Sulige. 1166

(1) E.C.V Hassan 69(1155). (2) E.C.VI Kadur 34(1148).
(3) E.C.V Belur 171(c1160). (4) E.C.II 64(1163).
(7) E.C.XII Tiptur 66(1167). (8) E.C.V Arsikere 142(1162).
(9) E.C.V Channarayapatna 184(1168). (10) E.C.XII Tiptur 66b(1174).
(15) E.C.V Hassan 179(1166).
Ballala, Balli-dēva. (1) sāmanta of Hulyeṣa. 1181-c90
s. Gōvi m. s.; g. Bhima.

Bammādēvarasa. (2) m. m. Vīra-jagadāḷa. 1212

Barmmarasa-dēva. (3) m. m. Kongulivarma, etc. 1180
Āsandī-nāḍ.

Buvayya. (4) sāmanta. samadhigata... 1204

Calukkeya-nāyaka. (5) m. s. Ruled Senavagere estate. 1197

Cattaya, Catteya-nāyaka. (6) m. s. Nūrganda-nāḍ. 1173-c80

Sōsali-nāḍalūva Magara Cikeya-nāyaka. (7) 1192
f. Kāmeyya-nāyaka of Kādalavāgilu.

Dēkeya-nāyaka. (8) m. s. s. Kunna Bīraya-nāyaka. 1181
Kānṇambī.

Dhurumāṇa. (9) Hoysala m. s. s. Hennayya-nāyaka. 1179
Talekāḍu-nāḍ.

Dumeya-nāyaka. (10) m. s. 1179

Ekkala-dēvarasa. (11) samadhigata... Kolalapura... 1198-1204
Gaṅga-kula-tilaka, Nānnyā-Gaṅga.
Uddhare.

Vīra-Gōma-dēva. (12) samadhigata... m. m. r. Dvārā-c1194
vatāpuravārdhiṣvāra, mandālikā-
Nārāyana. Kuruvatti.
Īsvara-dēva. (13) Sīnda. Belagavatti. 1175

Kādeya-nāyaka. (14) sāmanta, m. p. s. Keśegōdu-nāḍ. 1206

Kallayya-nāyaka. (15) m. s. s. Appagalli Palyeya-
Haruha-Hossur-nāḍ.

Vīra-Gaṅga-Poyṣala-Vīra-Vallāla-Kīlalēdirāya-
Pammi-dēvan. (16) 1181

Kāmeyya-nāyaka. (17) m. s. s. sārānāgata... calad... 1192
Dvārāvati... Kolalu-nāḍ

Kāccana Māceya-nāyaka. (18) m. s. s. Kalikatti in Magare 300.

Malla. (19) sāmanta. s. i. l. Cāṭṭaya-nāyaka. 1187

Malla-gaunda. (20) sāmanta. Nandi. 1178

Malli-dēva. (21) s. Īsvara-mandalēśvara Sinda. 1204

Marayya. (22) sāmanta. Doorkeeper to the king. 1203-4

Mayileya-nāyaka. (23) s. Deveya-nāyaka. Diduga. 1186

(1) E.C.XII Chiknayakanahalli 13(1181), 35(1190), 20(1183).
(2) S.I.I.IX 331(1212). (3) E.C.VII Channagiri 37(1180).
(6) E.C.VI Kadur 136(1173), 36(1203); XI Holalkere 104(1186).
(9) Ibid. 15(1179). (10) Ibid. 12(1179). (11) E.C.VII Sorab
140(1199), 148(1204). (12) S.I.I.X 337(c1194). (13) E.C.VII
Honnalle 45(1175). (14) E.C.V Channarayapatna 265(1206). (15)
Mikkana (a) sāmanta  Kaleyakaṭṭa.  1179  597
Hādiyakere Nāga-gāvunda. (1) m.s. cūdamanī.  1206
Nāgayya. (2) m.s.  Maraḍipura.  1185
Nārasimha-bhūpa. (3) s.Bammarasa of Asandi.  1180-1214
Nārasinga-nāyaka, (4) "King of the south", Hatna.  1177
Nōṇabeyā-nāyaka. (5) Calukeya estate.  1203-1215
Rājeya-nāyaka. (6) pattigāra of Kolatūr.  1175
Rāya-dēvarasa. (7) samadhigāta..., m.mr., Asati-mayurapuravaradhiśvara, Belvaladitya.
Nārasīṅga-Poysala-Siyal-nāḍālvar. (8)  1178
Kumāra Vīra-Vikramāditya-dēvarasa. (9) m.mr. s.Cattama-dēva, m.mr. Gutta.
Visnu. (10) samadhigata..., m.s. s.Gōvi.  1188


General Officers.

Adicandan. (1) 1183

Amita. (2) d. s. Hariyama-setti. m.p. Born in Lokkigundi. 1196-1207

Amiteya. (3) d. s. Basaveya. 1214

Amrtesvara. (4) d. samasta-bähattara...; f. Amita, 1202

Kalpa, Masana and Basava d.'s.

(? ) Armattivala. (5) d. m.p., sarv. Ruled Tára, Hadi & Kú náds in Sātarūr. 1195

Bittimayya. (6) d., m.p., sarv. (see under Narasimha I) 1162-75

Balagayya-déva. (6) d. sen. 1191

Balaya. (7) d. 1189

Baleyamma-veggađe. (8) Sántara general (ally). 1218-9

Ballala. (9) d. 1214

Ballyaya. (10) d. adhikāri of Annigere. 1208

Basavana. (11) d. s. Kaliyamrta d. (Amrta); Ruled Bélvola 300. 1202-17

Bahubali. (12) d. 1184

Bëttā. (13) cam. s. Malla cam. 1210-52

Dãkarasa. (14) d. s. Mariyane. 1184

Dãvarasa. (15) d. 1205-12

Dãvapaiya. (16) d. 1180-?1202

Dēsi. (17) d. b.i.l. Candramauli. 1182

Ereyanna. (18) ?d., m.p., sarv., m.ps. "Yádvavaraka-raksapālaka." sri.h. f. Balla. 1174-93

Gaudayya. (19) d., m.p., sarv., h.d. 1198

Goparasa. (1) d. 1205
Gōvindamayya. (2) d., m.p., sarv., h.d. 1211
Bila Gōyindarasa. (3) d. 1180
Gōyvana. (4) d., m.p. 1214
Harihara. (5) d. Ruled Asandi-nād, 1216-c1238
Hulla. (see under Viśnuvardhana) c1135-1177
Jyōtimayya. (6) d. 1189
Kalla-dēva. (7) d. 1202
Kālpatti. (8) d. f. Ankeya (Cf. under Nārasimha I) c1179
Kāmeya. (9) d. 1214
Kēśava, Kēśiraja (10) d., m.p., s.v. s.Malli d. 1210-c60
Lakkarasa. (11) (see under Nārasimha I) 1162-80
Kumāra Lakṣmī-dēva. (11) d. 1191-1220
Mācayya. (12) d. m.p., sri.h., h.d. 1181
Mācirāja. (13) d. s.Rāma; f. Kiriyā Rāma, Sīripayya, Nārana and Kēśi-rāja. c1195
Mācīrajayya. (14) h.d., m.p., m.ps., sarv.; s.Dāsi. 1189-94
Mādhava. (15) d., m.p., sarv., m.ps. 1177
Madhusūdana. (17) d. 1194

Page 598 n.(18 cont.) Goribiḍnur 41(?1180); E.C.VII Shikarpur 105(1193); E.C.VIII Sorab 4(1211)?. (19) M.A.R.1929,51(1198).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahādēva. (1) d.</td>
<td>Arasiyakere</td>
<td>1197-1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kēśava Mallāpa. (2) d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malleya, Malla. (3) d., m.p., sen.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1199-1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maṅcayya. (4) d.</td>
<td>y.b. Govindarasa</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masanayya. (5) d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nrsimha. (6) cam.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāra Padmi-dēva. (7) s. Cāvana sen.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(?Panapparasa. (8)  
Kumāra Panditayya. (9) d.  
Pālāla. (10) d.  
Pālaiya-d. (see under Nārasimha II)  
Ramayya. (11) d., m.p.  
Śaṅkara. (12) d. s. Singayya.  
Śingayya. (13) d. s. i. l. Kumāra Lakṣmī-dēva.  
Śivaka. (14) d.  
Kumāra Sōmēśvara-dēva. (15)  
Śrīdharā. (16) d.  
Śrīrahga. (17) d.  
Śūryya-dēva. (18) d., m.p. "Pratipannasāra."  
Todapille. (19) d. In suite of Padmala-dēvi.  
Ruled Belagavatti-nāḍ.  

(1) E.C.VIII Sorab 514-5(1197); S.I.I.X IX 323(1197); 325(1206); M.A.R.1910, 11, para. 102(1203), 1927, 156(?1207), 1935, 49(1206).  
Other Ministers.

Ammanna. (1) h., m.p. c1176
Bammacari. (2) sarv. ?1190
Basaveya-nayaka. (3) m.ps. c1179
Jaya Bhattaya-nayaka. (4) m.ps., p.v., Savasi official. 1218
Buci, Bucayya. (see under Narasimha I) 1154-74
Candramauli. (5) m.v., m.p., m.ps., sarv. 1181-1219
S. Saikhara.

Doomayya. (6) m.p. 1177

Komara Goviyanna. (7) m.ps., p.v.; f. Doomayya & Nagayya. c1220
Haraha-sahani. (8) m.p. 1205
Kaliyana. (9) sri. 1175
Kameya-nayaka. (10) m.ps., p.v. c1220

Kammata Macayya. (see under Narasimha I) 1173-c75

Maciraja. (11) m.p., sarv.; f. Mara. ?1171-81

Maciraja. (12) m.p., sri.; s. Rama; f. Kirinya-Rama, etc. (identical with the Maciraja on p. 599) 1174

Mahadev. (13) m.ps., m.p. 1174

Madaya. (14) m.ps., pattsa-sahani. Ruled Alambur. 1205

Hiriya Hadeya Asavara Marayya. (15) m.p. 1204

Naga-deva. (16) mantri; s. Bamma-deva. 1195


Kusa Gantaeya Singayya Nagayya. (a) m.ps. 1214
Naganna. (1) m.p., sri., sarv., m.v., m.ps., bahattara... of the suite of Padmala-devi.
Naranimayya. (2) s.v. cl1178
Mila. (3) m.p., sri.h. ?cl1177
Perumala. (4) m.p. 1217
Permmadi. (5) tantrapala. 1177
Singayya. (6) senior jewel treasurer. 1202
Sovarasa. (8) m.p., sri., bd. of Padmala-devi. 1205
Uttararka-heggade. (3) m.p. 1197

Subordinate Military Officers.

Accaya-sahani. (1) Chief of the camel force. 1179
Bittiga. (2) ravuta. cl1179
Haraha-sahani. (3) 1205
Tribhuvanamalla Haryam-satti. (4) s.Kami-setti. 1203
Kaceya (? Acayya)-sahani. (5) 1207
Sujuya Madeya-nayaka. (6) Of the hattagaras. 1178
Madiyanna. (7) m.ps., p.v., patta-sahani of eleph- ants & horse.
Sivanayya-sahani. (8) b.ekikarna Aciraja. 1175

Subordinate Civil Officers.

Annamarasa. (9) nāl-prabhu of Holalkere. 1217
Bamma-gaunda. (10) mahā-prabhu of Belagumba. 1199

(10) E.C.V Arsikere 103(1199).
Bomma-gaunda. (1) mahā-nāl-prabhu of Yaguvatti. 1218
Gāvunda-raya. (2) hejjuṅka official of Belagāvi. 1199
Gōydi-setti. (3) nāl-prabhu of the Mandali 1000. 1180
Hiriyappa. (4) nāl-prabhu of the Mandali 1000. 1180
Heggade-dēva. (5) "Nilagiri-sādhāra". Kudugu. 1216
Caladāṅkarāma Hariyama-setti. (6) nāl-prabhu of Kalukēre.
Kāma-gaunda. (7) mahā-nāl-prabhu of Asandi. 1180
Kēsava-dēva. (8) Senior treasurer. 1184
Madhusūdana-dēva. (9) nāl-prabhu. 1218
Mahābala-gaundā. (10) mahā-prabhu of Nāgāvi. 1207
Hebbāri Mārkkanda-dēva. (11) Asandi-nāḍ prabhu. 1216
Ganda Nārayama-setti. (12) mahā-prabhu of Kabahu-
Saṅka-gāvuda. (13) mahā-nāl-prabhu of Hiriyūr. 1173
Singayya. (14) senior jewel treasurer. 1202
Heggadas.
Bācarasa. (15) suṅka h. Heragu 1174-6
Bamma-dēva. (16) Heragu. 1176
Bāsa. (17) Āvati. 1193
Bijjaya. (18) Ammalī. 1180
Callayya. (19) 1173
(?)Cibbila. (20) suṅka h.; s. Kamaṁ Keśiyanna. 1195

(1) S. II.IX 335(1218). (2) M.A.R.1929,62(1199). (3) E.C.VII
(9) E.CVII Shimoga 5(1218). (10) W.E.II f.153b(1207).
Hassan 74(?1174), 59(1176). (16) Ibid. (17) E.C.VI Chikma-
(20) E.C.III Tirumakudal-narsipur 31(1195).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devayya</td>
<td>Akkuru</td>
<td>1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganapaiya</td>
<td>Channarayapatna</td>
<td>1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gattiyarasa</td>
<td>Heragu</td>
<td>1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hariyanna</td>
<td>Superintendent of the horse.</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakkayya</td>
<td></td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jannaiya</td>
<td>Kuruvatti</td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javaneeya</td>
<td>In household of Singipilla.</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesiyanna</td>
<td>Khandya</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kethamalla</td>
<td>Inspector at Arsikere.</td>
<td>1183-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kundada</td>
<td></td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madiraja</td>
<td>Hiri-Kalukani</td>
<td>1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahadeva</td>
<td>Inspector at Arsikere.</td>
<td>1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallayya</td>
<td>h. of the jewel treasury.</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malliyanna</td>
<td>Under the orders of Kataladevi.</td>
<td>1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manayya</td>
<td>sunka h. Under Madhava-d.</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnayya</td>
<td>sunka h. Manne.</td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacanna</td>
<td>In the suite of Cola-mahadevi.</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasinga</td>
<td>sunka h.</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raingaya</td>
<td>Muttigi</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramayya</td>
<td>sri h. of Konga-nad.</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayanna</td>
<td>treasurer of Cola-mahadevi.</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revana</td>
<td>Inspector at Arsikere.</td>
<td>1183-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sankara, Sankanna</td>
<td>f. Chandramauli; s.Kesiraja; b.Kamarasa, Bacarasa, Nacarasa.</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singayya</td>
<td>Senior jewel treasurer.</td>
<td>1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivanayya</td>
<td></td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somayya</td>
<td>sunka h. Doada-Gaddavalli.</td>
<td>1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijeyaditya-deva</td>
<td>Tariyakere.</td>
<td>1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yareyana</td>
<td></td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senabōvas.

Bācanna. (1) 1178
Bittiyanna. (2) 1186
Dāsanna. (3) 1215
Kalyana-dēva. (4) 1191
Lakmarasa. (5) 1205
Mādayya. (6) 1209
Nārana-dēva. (7) 1182
Sōmayya. (8) 1176

(1) E.C.V Hassan 55(1178).
(2) E.C.V Arsikere 39(1186).
(3) Ibid. 49(1215).
(4) E.C. VI Kadur 157(1191).
(5) E.C.XI Chitaldurg 23(1205).
(6) E.C.V Arsikere 40(1209).
(7) E.C.V Channarayapatna 254(1182).
(8) E.C.V Hassan 59(1176).
NARASIMHA II

Mandalikas & Sāmantas.

Jagaddāla Bamma-dēva. (1) f. Sōyi-dēva. mandalika of Kotṭūr.


Bammaraśa-dēva. (3) m.m.l.; s. Narasiṅga. Āsandī. (?) 1226

Billeya-nāyaka. (3) m. s. 1234

Nārasiṅga-Poysala-Brahmādhirāyār. (4) ?c 1230


Īsvara-dēva. (6) m.m.l. Sinda.

Kāppayya-nāyaka. (7) m.m.l., lord of Huliyarapura. s. Cattēya, the b. Gōvi:


Masaneya-sāvanta. (9) Bannēhālī.

Asagōda-Pallava. (10) sāmantā; saranāgata...


Kāreya Saṅgeya-nāyaka. (11) m.s. ?c 1225
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amita</td>
<td>d., m.p., bāhāttara.. f.</td>
<td>1223-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammanna</td>
<td>d., m.p., sarv., m.ps., p.v., r.d.</td>
<td>1222-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appayya</td>
<td>d., m.p., r.d., p.v.</td>
<td>1228-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballāla</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballayya</td>
<td>s.Dūdappillai d.</td>
<td>c1235-1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bōmmaya</td>
<td>d., m.p.</td>
<td>1226-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cōvamayya</td>
<td>d., s.v.</td>
<td>1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūdappillai</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>c1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammanṇa Gōpāla</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>?1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samudra Goppayya</td>
<td>d. dandinagōpa, jagad-</td>
<td>1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḍḍāyada Harihara</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1235-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kēśava</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1221-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mācappa</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>?1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhava</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1221-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahādeva</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māyantaya</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komāra Nāga-deva</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāra Nārasihga</td>
<td>s. Nāgannya.</td>
<td>1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōḷalva-deva</td>
<td>m.p., d.</td>
<td>1224-41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) E.C.V Channarayapatna 197(1223); S.I.I.X 343(1226).
(2) S.I.I.X 339(1222); A.R.408 of 1919(1230); E.C.V Belur 101(1231), K.T.only.
(3) E.C.XII Tiptur 54(1228); E.C.XII Gubbi 45(1273); E.I.VII pp.167-8(1231).
(4) E.C.V Channarayapatna 197(1223).
(5) S.I.I.V 659(c1235); A.R.1919, 366(1233); A.R.1920, 39(1236).
(6) S.I.I.X 341(1226), 344(1229).
(7) E.C.V Channarayapatna 221b(1235).
(8) S.I.I.V 659(c1235).
(9) E.C.V Chunnarayapatna 338(?1223).
(10) E.C.XII Gubbi 45(1233); E.I.VII pp.167-8(1231); A.R.1919, 404(1231).
(11) E.C.III Mandya 121(1235); ? A.R.1918, 73(1235-7).
(12) E.C.III 121(1235); A.R.1918, 73(1236-7).
(13) E.C.III 121(1235); A.R.1918, 73(1236-7).
(14) E.C.V Hassan 106(1221), 122(c1230); A.R.1910, 201(1235).
(15) E.C.V Arsikere 162(1227).
(16) E.C.V Arisikere 50(1227).
(17) E.C.V Channarayapatna 221b(1235).
(18) E.C.V Channarayapatna 11(1226).
(19) E.C.V Gubbi 11(1226).
(20) E.C.XI Davangere 25, W.E.II f.156b-160a(1224); M.A.R.1931, 3(1241); A.R.1919, 369(1236); M.A.R.1912-3, para. 81b(1238).
Kangaya. (1) d. b. Kesava d. 1233
Kallaya Sivanaya. (2) d., mp., serv., p.v., bāhattachara...; ruling Alambūr.
Sōma. (3) d., m.p., serv., sen., m.ps., p.v., bāhattachara...; otherwise Sōmana.
Sōvi-dēva. (4) d. 1226-45
Sriraṅga. (5) d., m.p., serv., bāhattachara... 1221-31

Other Ministers.
Devanna. (6) sri., s.v. 1235
Kēśava. (7) sri. 1235
Viśvanātha. (8) sri.; s. Rayanna; b. Gōparasa, & Iśvara.

Subordinate Military Officers.
Korigamāri Paramaya-sāhani. (9) Attached to Mādhava d. at Adhamankottai. 1235

Subordinate Civil Officers.
Candra-dēva. (10) āurodeya of Nalkudure. 1233
Hadala Kalaiyya. (11) nal-prabhu of Ganga-nad. 1226
Siripanna. (12) sunka adhikari for Paṇḍya-nad. 1226

Heggades.
Candayya. (13) s. Bettiya-nāyaka. Drummer of Macarasa of Moguvada. 1232
Caudaiyya. (14) nāh-heggade of Ganga-nād. 1226
Dātayya. (15) h. of Kumāri Sōvala-dēvi. 1230
Divākara. (16) 1226
Mailara. (17) 1226
Mallaya. (18) 1226

(11), (12), (14), (16), (17) & (18) S.I.I.IX 341(1226).
Mandalikas & Samantas.

Birarasa. (1) m. mr., satyaratnakara, saranagata..., 1239 ruling the Santara kingdom.

Boppa-dēva. (2) Cangālva prince. 1252

Celvāndān. (3) sāmanta. 1245

Gaṅgarasa. (4) Koṅgulivarma, etc., m. mr. ? 1240 Arabala 70.

Kannaya-nāyaka. (5) m. s.; s. Kanteya-nāyaka. 1242 Bāceyahalli.

Cola-Kukala-nāḍ-āluva Kadasūr Kāleya-nāyaka. (6) 1237

Cola-Kukala-nāḍ-āluva Kadasūr Apeya-nāyaka. (7) 1246

Lakumayya-nāyaka. (8) m. s., sitagātra..., saranāgata..., 1242 ruling Huliyeṣu and the Magāre 300.

Nārasimha-dēva. (9) Koṅgulivarma Kolalapura, ruling Asandi. 1240

Sōma-dēva. (10) Cangālva prince. 1252


(1) E.C.VIII Sorab 492(1239).
(2) E.C.V Arkalgud 53(1252).
(3) A.R. 1921. 179(1245).
(4) E.C.XI Holalkere 121(1240).
(5) M.A.R. 1914-5, para. 83(1242).
(6) E.C.XII Tiptur 21(1237).
(7) Ibid. 23(1246).
(9) E.C.VI Tarikere 72(1240).
(10) E.C.V Arakalgud 53(1252).
General Officers.

Ballaya. (see under Nārasimha II)

Bettayya. (1) d.; b.Balla cam.; Mādhava; s.Kēsava cam.; g.s.Malla; g.gs. Śrīdhara. 1249-52

Bhīmanna. (2) d. 1239

Billayya. (3) d. (? read Ballayya ) 1252

Bōgaya, Bōganna, Bhōgaya. (4) d.; s.Kētana d. 1236-48

Bommanna-dānṇāyaka. (5) m.p., hiriya s.v. 1250-2

Cattan-udāiyrā. (6) 1242

Goppayya. (7) d.; b.Malleya; s.Appaya d. 1240

Addayada Harihara-dānṇāyaka. (see under Nārasimha II)

Ammān Kambayya-dānṇāyaka. (8) 1242-51

Kēśava. (9) d.; s.Appaya d. 1240

Kētana. (10) d. 1236

Mādaya. (11) m.p., dāndīnaṇagōpa. 1236

Mallaya. (12) d.; s.Appaya d. 1240

Murāri Malleya. (13) d.; s.Kētana d. 1236

Māvantayya. (14) d. 1235

Kumāra Nāga-ḍēva. (15) d. 1237

Perkadi-ḍēva. (16) m.p., d. 1236

Pōlalva-ḍēva-dānṇāyaka. (see under Nārasimha II)

Sānta. (17) d. 1246

Sēvaya. (18) d. 1250

Sīnganna. (19) d.; s.Somaya d. (?) 1251-5

Aḷiya Sōmaya. (20) d., m.p., dāndīnaṇagōpa. 1240-51

Varadana. (21) d.; sri. c1250

Vittappa. (22) d. ?c1240

(1) E.C.VI Chikmagalur 20(1249); E.C.V Channarayapatna 242(1252)
(2) A.R.1936-7, 30(1239). (3) E.C.V Channarayapatna 242(1252).
(4) E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 63(1236); M.A.R.1910J1, para.105(1244).
M.A.R.1926, 46(1248); A.R.1937-8,14(1239). (5) E.C.V.Channa-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 610 n. (5 cont.)</th>
<th>Kesiyanna. (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patna 211, 1250; E.C.V Arai 55, 1250</td>
<td>Subordinate Military Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.V Channarayapatna 219, 1250; E.C.V Chamarajnagar 219, 1250</td>
<td>Kesiyanna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para. 81a (1258); (12) E.C.IV Arkalgud 12 (1248); (11) A.R. 1911, 15, 713 (1250); (21) A.R. 1910, 15, 713 (1250); (22) AR.1909, 713 (1250).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesiyanna. (11)</td>
<td>Kesiyanna.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kesiyanna. (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patna 211, 1250; E.C.V Arai 55, 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.V Channarayapatna 219, 1250; E.C.V Chamarajnagar 219, 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para. 81a (1258); (12) E.C.IV Arkalgud 12 (1248); (11) A.R. 1911, 15, 713 (1250); (21) A.R. 1910, 15, 713 (1250); (22) AR.1909, 713 (1250).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesiyanna. (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kesiyanna. (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patna 211, 1250; E.C.V Arai 55, 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.V Channarayapatna 219, 1250; E.C.V Chamarajnagar 219, 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para. 81a (1258); (12) E.C.IV Arkalgud 12 (1248); (11) A.R. 1911, 15, 713 (1250); (21) A.R. 1910, 15, 713 (1250); (22) AR.1909, 713 (1250).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesiyanna. (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kesiyanna. (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patna 211, 1250; E.C.V Arai 55, 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.V Channarayapatna 219, 1250; E.C.V Chamarajnagar 219, 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para. 81a (1258); (12) E.C.IV Arkalgud 12 (1248); (11) A.R. 1911, 15, 713 (1250); (21) A.R. 1910, 15, 713 (1250); (22) AR.1909, 713 (1250).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesiyanna. (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kesiyanna. (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patna 211, 1250; E.C.V Arai 55, 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.V Channarayapatna 219, 1250; E.C.V Chamarajnagar 219, 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para. 81a (1258); (12) E.C.IV Arkalgud 12 (1248); (11) A.R. 1911, 15, 713 (1250); (21) A.R. 1910, 15, 713 (1250); (22) AR.1909, 713 (1250).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesiyanna. (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nārāsimha III

Mandalikas & Samantas.

Bēci-dēvarasa. (1) m. mr., Tribhuvanamalla, Nandagirinātha. Yelahanka. 1267

Bhūmaya. (2) sāmanta. Rāvadūr. 1255

Bommeya-nāyaka. (3) sāmata-dhipati; s. Kambeya. 1277

Gaṅga-dēva. (4) m.s., nādalūva of Kaidēla. 1258-9

Kēmeya-nāyaka. (5) samadhigata., m. s. s. Cōleya-nāyaka. 1258

Keppeya-nāyaka. (6) Huliyeṣu. 1260

Māca. (7) sāmanta; f. Gujja. Kalukeni-nād. 1260

Cōl-Ku[la]-nād-āluva Kādasūr Kādaya-nāyaka. (8) 1265

Lakumeya-nāyaka. (9) Huliyeṣu. 1260

Nāranamayya. (10) m. s., ? Gaṇḍasi. 1270

Cikka Nonabeya-nāyaka. (11) Calikeya estate. 1272

Gaṅga Perumāle-dēvarasa. (12) m. mr. Brahmādhirāja. 1290 Ruler of Koliganaghatta in Pāṇḍya-nād.

General Officers.

Ankeya. (13) d.; s. Cikka Kēteya d. 1276-90

(? ) Ballaha. (14) d. 1282

Bāceya. (15) d. 1271

Bīreya. (16) d. (Otherwise Vīrayya) 1288

Bommanna. (17) d.; b. Harihara Sōvaṇṇa d. 1279

Cakravarti. (18) d.; s. Perumāle.

Kumāra Dorabhakkare. (1) d., m.p., gāyi-gōvāla, gānda pendāra; s.i.l. Sōmeya ā.

Gōggeya. (2) d.; gāyi-gōvāla, gānda pendāra

Gōpāla. (3) d.

Hiriya. (4) d.

Kētaya. (5) d.; s. Mādhava d.


Hiriya Kēleya. (7) d. Ruled at Honganur.

Khandeya-rāya Rāne. (8)

Lakumi-nārāyana-dēva. (9) d.; s. Perumāle d.

Madugeya. (10) d.

Cikka Madaneya. (11) d.; s. Madaneya d.

Malleya. (12) d.

Kumāra Malli-dēva. (13) d.

Mallikārjuna. (14) d., m.p., sarv.

Mañcana. (15) d., m.p.

Mullulār-dēva Tiruvālāndurai udaiyēr. (16) m.p., sarv., samasta sen.

Paramesvara. (17) d.

Perumāle. (18) d.; s. Viṣṇu cam.

Perumāle. (19) d.; f. Cakravarti d.

Rēcaya. (20) d.; b. Harihara Svānna d.

(1) E.C.IX Kankanhalli 72(1277). (2) E.C.VI Tarikere 80(1278).
(5) M.A.R.1931,37(1282). (6) E.C.III Mandya 30(1261); E.C.XII Tumkur 49(1269); E.C.V Belur 167,165,164(1276); E.C.III Tirumakudal-narsipur 97(1276); E.C.III Mandya 1(1277); M.A.R.1908, para.
48(1278); E.C.IX Channapatna 13,65(1278); M.A.R.1911-2, para.92
(11) Ibid. 78(1291). (12) E.C.IV Heggadadevankote 102(1264);
(1276); E.C.IX Channapatna 46(1275). (14) E.C.IV Gundupet 80
(?1282); E.C.III Nanjangud 96(1282). (15) M.A.R.1936,47(1278).
Singeya. (1) d. 1278
Sivaneya. (2) d. 1289
Meyduna Soma, Someya. (3) d., m.p., gāyi-gōvāla,
ganda pendāra. 1265-81
Sōvanna. (3) mahā s.v. 1267
Harihara Sōvanna. (4) d., s.v. (identical with (3)) 1260-1279
Tāreyana. (5) d. 1279

Other Ministers.

Bommanna. (6) m.p., sēnabāva. 1278
Gōpāla-devanā. (7) m.ps. 1277
Kūtana-heggade. (8) m.ps. 1286
Nārana-dēva. (9) sarv. of customs. 1291
Sīripanna Sōmanthaka-nāyaka. (10) mahā s.v. 1258
Sōvanna. (11) m.ps. 1281
Sīripanna Viśvanātha-dēva. (12) m.ps., s.v. ?cl260

13(1279);E.C.V Belur 87(1265). (18) E.C.IV Nagamangala 48
(1270), 39(1271), 50(1270), 49(1270); E.C.V Channarayapatna 269
(1276); M.A.R. 1912-3, para. 83(1276); E.C.VI Tarikere 3(1260);
E.C.V Belur 74(1261), 53(1277); E.C.V Belur 155(1280); (? M.A.R.
1924, 10(1280); (? M.A.R. 1908-9, para. 86(1285); E.C.XI Chital-
drug 12(1286), 32(1286); Tirumakudal-narsipur 58, 27(1290); M.A.R.
1908, para. 48(1292). (19) M.A.R. 1932, 50(1274); E.C.IV Nagamangal
41(1284), 58(1284), 142(1285); Chamarajnagar 13(1285); Yelandur

(1) E.C.V Arsikere 149(1278).
(2) M.A.R. 1937, 18(1289).
(3) E.C.IV Krishnarajapat 12(1267); E.C.IX Kankanahalli 80(1265);
M.A.R. 1910-1, para. 106(1265); E.C.VI Chikmagalur 89(1265); E.C.
XI Davangere 36, W.E.II f. 354a-356b(1263); M.A.R. 1937, 39(1271);
E.C.III Tirumakudal-narsipur 22(1272); E.C.III Tbid. 97, 101(1276);
100(1281); E.C.IX Kankanahalli 72(1277); M.A.R. 1909-10, para. 82
(1278).
(4) E.C.III Tirumakudal 84(1279); M.A.R. 1911-2, para. 92(1279);
(8) E.C.V Arsikere 8(1286). (9) E.C.VII Shimoga 78(1291).
(12) E.C.V Channarayapatna 223(?cl260).
### Subordinate Military Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office/Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adiyanna</td>
<td>(1) bd.</td>
<td>1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baceya-nayaka</td>
<td>(2) nāl-prabhu of Devalige-nād.</td>
<td>1257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basavanna</td>
<td>(3) Konga-nād suńska.</td>
<td>1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavunda-dēva</td>
<td>(4) mahāprabhu of Hiriya-nād.</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāli-gavunda</td>
<td>(5) mahāprabhu of Hiriya-nād, ruler of Alageya-nād.</td>
<td>1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśi-nātha</td>
<td>(6) Ruler of Kumāra-nād.</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharani-dēva</td>
<td>(7) customs of Kikkeri.</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gummanna</td>
<td>(8) Konga-nād suńska.</td>
<td>1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampanna</td>
<td>(9) Konga-nād suńska.</td>
<td>1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piriya Mādanna</td>
<td>(10) adhikāri of Gaṅgavādi-nād.</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallanna</td>
<td>(11) adhikāri of Kāyiāraṇād &amp; Pa-kali-nād.</td>
<td>1273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mançayya</td>
<td>(12) mahāprabhu of Hiriya-nād.</td>
<td>1273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masanayya</td>
<td>(13) nayaka.</td>
<td>1272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vithappa</td>
<td>(14) adhikāri of Beluhūr.</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallanna</td>
<td>(11) adhikāri of Kāyiāraṇād &amp; Pa-kali-nād.</td>
<td>1273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannamānda</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>1259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subordinate Civil Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office/Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senabōvas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bācayya</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Casavarasa</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakkanna</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāganna</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgayya</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satanna</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>1286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2. E.C.VI Chikmagalur 1 (1257).
3. E.C.V Arkalgud 54 (1275).
7. E.C.IV Krishnarajapet 50 (c1270).
8. E.C.V Arkalgud 54 (1275).
10. E.C.IV Chamarajnagar 131 (1273).
### Rāmanātha

#### Mandalikas & Sāmantas.

Gaṅga-perumāl Ayanāṅkakāra-Tuttarāditya-rāja- Nārayana Brahmādhirāyar. s. Vasi-nāyan. (1)

Gaṅgādhara. (2) s. Sōmanā-deva, bhuja-bala, vīra- Nārayana. mandalika of Koyyakura-mād... (1280-9)

(1)rāja-rāja-Karkata-mārāyar Gaṅga-perumāl. (3) 1283

(1)rāja-rāja-Karkata-mārājar Tamati-ālubar. (4) 1277-95

Kulōttunga-Colā-Tagadaṅdirāyār Māra Cika-dēvar. (5) 1294

Tekkal-rāyar Kuttaṇḍuṇ-dēvar. (6) c1281

Tekkal-rāyar Nārana-dēva. (7) 1278

Madurānta<k)a> Colā-Viruvī-nād-ālvar Pālāndai-nāyan. (8) 1288

#### General Officers.

Ariya-pilla. (9) d. 1261-2

Cikka-dēva. (10) or Annapāmalai-dēva. d. 1294

Gaṅganā. (11) d.; s. Ravi-dēva d. 1269

Kambayya-dāṇṇyaka. (see under Sōmēśvara)

Kambayya, Kampaṇa. (12) d. 1287-8

Mārūr Cikka Kētēya. (13) d. c1270

Rāvi-dēva. (14) d. 1267-9

Śīṅgana. (15) (see under Sōmēśvara)

Kumāra vīra-Śīṅgeya. (15) d.; s. Cikka Kētaya d. 1279

Kumāra Sōmaya. (16) (see under Ballāla III)

Vīraiya. (16) m. p., d. 1267-76.


(1) E.C.X Kolar 45 (1280), 55(1285), 95(1286); Chintamani 117 (1289); M.A.R. 1913-4, para. 86 (1286). (2) E.C.X Kolar 92 (1288). (3) E.C.X Bangalore 43 (1283). (4) E.C.X Anakal 30 (?1277); Bangalore 100 (1294); M.A.R. 1908, para. 49 (1295). (5) E.C.X Bangalore 91a (1294). (6) E.C.X Malur 32 (c1281). (7) Ibid. 38 (1284).
Other Ministers.

Kadai-cetti. (1) 1284
Ilavanji-rayar. (2) 1291
Kumāra Manjiya-māvuttar. (3) 1293-5

Subordinate Civil Officers.

Cembi-dēvar. (4) 1281
Kalaiyya. (5) adhikāri of Marugali-nāḍ. 1287
Mayilāndar. (6) Ditto of Tēkkal-nāḍ. 1281
Mānika-dēva. (7) Ditto of Marugali-nāḍ. 1287
Viruvi-rāyan. (8) adhikari of Periya-nāḍ. 1284


(1) E.C.X Chintamani 38(1284).
(2) E.C.X Kolar 239(1291).
(3) E.C.X Bowringpet 23(1293), 25a&b(1295).
(4) E.C.X Malur 45(?1281).
(5) E.C.XII Tumkur 17(1287).
(6) E.C.X Malur 45(?1282).
(7) E.C.XII Tumkur 17(1287).
(8) E.C.X Malur 38(1284).
BALLĀJĀ III.

Mandalikas & Sāmantas.

Bammarasa.(1) m.mr.; s.Murāri-dēva. 1321
Cikka (?) Bayireya-nāyaka.(2) m.s., m.ps. 1342
Vīra-Vallāla-Poysala ...māṇikka Brahmādirāyar.(3)1312
Hiriya Bommeya-nāyaka.(4) m.s. 1320
Bommeya-nāyaka.(5) m.s. 1338
Gangeya-nāyaka.(6) m.s. c1340
Cikka Kallaya-nāyaka.(7) m.s. 1342
Yedavanka Kamalarasa.(8) m.mr. 1331
Kōyalarasa.(9) m.mr. ?1331

Vīra-Kumāra Cikkaya-nāyakka Kuḷaiya-nāyaka. (10)?1318
Maṅcaya-nāyaka.(11) m.s., sen. 1338-43
Kāvēri-vallabha Māra-dēva.(12) 1314
Kumāra Mayili-nāyaka.(13) "Naralōka-ganda." 1333-40
Tribhuvanamalla Purvādirēya Tamattalvār.(14) m.mr.1305
Kumāra Tiparasa.(15) m.mr. 1317
Vuḍeya Viṅgha-dēva Rāṇe.(16) m.mr. (? ally) 1313-8

---

(5) M.A.R. 1909-10, para. 87(1338). (6) E.C.XII Sira 10(1341),
(7) E.C.IX Hoskote 147(1342). (8) E.C.IX Channapatna 71(1331).
(9) E.C.III Malavalli 114(?1331). (10) M.A.R. 1913-4, para. 88
(?1318). (11) E.C.IX Devanahalli 72(1338); Hoskote 75(1343).
(12) E.C.IX Kankanahalli 57(1314), 70(1314). (13) E.C.IX Banga-
lore 110(1336), 111(1340); E.C.IX Nelamangala 9(1333); M.A.R.
S.I.I.IX 353(1317). (16) E.C.XI Hiriyur 87(1313); M.A.R. 1909-10
para. 86(1318).
General Officers.

Allappa.(1) d.; b.i.l.Kāmaiya d. 1308-27
Kumāra Amrai-udayār.(2) 1341
Baicaya.(3) d. 1319-28
Kumāra Hiriya Ballappa.(4) d.; s.Rāmeya. 1338
Dādi Ballappa.(5) d.; s.Dādi Somaya; b.Dādi Siṅγaya d.
Teṅgala Ballappa.(6) d. 1340
Kumāra Ballappa.(7) d.; s.Nārasiṅγappa. 1293-1307
Ballappa.(8) d.; s.Bēba; b.Siṅγeya.
Beceya, Bebeya, Bembeya, Cambeya (? Baiceya).(9) d. 1320-8
Bettarasa.(10) d. 1294
Bettarasa.(11) m.p., d. Ruling Elahanka-mād. 1336-43
Bhimaya.(12) d. 1292
Bōgayya.(13) d. 1337
Bommayya.(14) d. 1318
Cakravarti.(15) d.; s.Perumāle d. 1303-9
Bila Cokkayya.(16) d. 1337
Dēvappa.(17) d.; s.Tōya Siṅγeya; b.i.l.Bimalapa. 1314
Erupeya.(18) d. 1307

(1) E.C.IX Bangalore 134(1308); E.C.XI Hiriyur 87(1313); E.C.V Belur 207, 208(1327); K.T. only; E.C.IV Camrajnagar 193(1318).
(2) E.U.IX Anakal 55(1341).
(3) E.C.VII Honnalli 117(1319); E.C.XI Chitaldurg 4(1328).
(4) E.C.XI Chitaldurg 6(1338).
(5) E.C.X Malur 10, 11, 12, 13(1328); 18(1330); M.A.R.1915-4, para. 87(1330); E.C.X Malur 28(1333); E.C.III Malavalli 104(1333); E.C.IX Hoskote 137(1336); 134(1336); M.A.R.1909-10, para. 85(1337); E.C.X Cintamani 53(1337); Bowringpet 10(1338); M.A.R.1913-4, para. 87(1339); E.C.X Bowringpet 28(1339); E.C.X Malur 16(1343); E.C.IX Hoskote 75(1343); & E.C.VI Chikmagalur 105(1343).
(6) E.C.IX Hoskote 49(1340).
(7) E.C.VI Kolar 102(1293); E.C.IX Bangalore 133(1307).
(8) S.I.I.VIII 99(1340), 89(1340).
(9) E.C.VII Shimoga 69(1320); E.C.XI Hiriyur 16(1325), 18(1328); E.C.XII Tiptur 24(1325); M.A.R.1923, 121(1325).
(10) E.C.IV Hunsur 20(?1294).
(11) M.A.R.1913-4, para. 87(1336); E.C.IX Hoskote 112(1343).
(12) E.C.III Nanjangu 103, 92(1292).
(13) M.A.R.1937, 52(1357).
(14) M.A.R.1915-6, para. 91(1318).
M.A.R.1932, 8.
(15) M.A.R.1910-1, para. 109(1303); E.C.IV Nage-
Kumāra Ganga-deva. (1) d.; s. Aliya Mācaya d. 1333
Gengeya. (2) d.; r.d.; s. Aliua d. 1317
Hariyappa. (3) d. 1341
Hāya. (4) d. 1328
Īśvara. (5) d.; s. Aliya Mācaya d. 1340
Jāleya. (6) d. cl330
Jātraya. (7) d.; m.p. 1307
Kambaya. (8) d. 1303-41
Kāmayya, Kāmeya. (9) d.; s. Ponnaṇṇa; f. Kāmeya. 1318-34
Kaya. (10) d.; f. Balapa-nāyaka. 1340
Keteya. (11) d.; s. Mādhava d. 1303-41
Khāṇḍeya-rāya Rāne. (12) (see under Nārasimha III) 1276-1298
Kumāra Lakeya. (13) d. cl321
Kumāra Latkimidhara. (14) d. 1310-28
Lōkappa. (15) d. 1306
Aliya Mācaya. (16) d. 1314
Māceya. (17) d.; s. i. l. Aṅkeya d. 1314

mangala 41(1309); E.C.IX Bangalore 23(1305); (16) M.A.R.1937, 52 (1337); E.C.IV Chamrajnagar 204(cl337). (17) M.A.R.1909-10, para. 84(1314); E.C.IX Magadi 58(1315); E.C.VIII Sagar 135(1320); S.I.I. VII 213(1341). (18) E.C.VIII Sagar 62(1307).

(1) E.C.X Goribidnur 16(1333); M.A.R.1909-10, para. 84(cl333).
(8) A.R.1919, 401(1334). (9) E.C.V Ariskere 67(1335), 31(1331); E.C.XII Gubbi 30(1331); E.C.IX Hoskote 124(1328); Dód Ballapur 14 (1328); Devanahalli 1(1328); Magadi 58(1315); M.A.R.1909-10, para. 84 (1323); M.A.R.1910-1, para. 109(1328); (?) 1911-2 para 93(1328); E.C.VIII Sorab 494(1334); E.C.IX Bangalore 31(1340); E.C.V Belur 207(1327), 208,K.T.only; E.C.V Hassan 156(1334), K.T.only. (10) E.C.IX Magadi 15(1340). (11) M.A.R.1937, 51(1334); M.A.R. 1912-3, para. 87(1334); E.C.IV Gundlupet 55(1327), 69(1321); M.A.R. 1937, 47(1303); E.C.III Seringpatam 92(1310); E.C.III Nanjangud 65(1332); A.R.1906, 444(1323); 1935-6, 106(1341).
Madappa. (1) s. Perumāla d.; d. 1317-27
Madaya. (2) d., m.p. 1328
Vīra-Mādhava. (3) d.; s. Perumāle d.; Immadi Ra-
hutta-rayā, "subduer of Nīla-
giri."
Mādige-dēva. (4) d. "manomūrtti of the prāta-
caikravartti". 1306-10
Maṅcaya. (5) d.; s. Allāla-dēva. 1292
Mēdagi-dēva. (?) = Mādige q.v.)
Panayya. (6) d. 1341
Perumāla-dēva. (7) (see under Nārasimha III). 1274-93
Perumālu-dēva. (8) d. 1292
Sakaleya. (?)- (9) d.; s. Perumālu d. 1292
Śaṅkara. (10) d. 1332
Dādi Siṅgeya. (11) d., m.p., s. Dādi Sōma d. 1313-c30
Aliya Siṅgeya. (12) d. 1310
Tōya Siṅgeya. (13) d. 1301-20
Mādappa Siṅgeya. (14) d. 1333
Siṅgeya. (15) d.; s. Pendāra. 1297
Ādi Siṅgeya. (16) d. 1335
Siṅgova. (17) d. 1326
Kumāra Vīra-Sōmapa. (18) d. 1316
Mayduna Sōmeya. (19) d. (see under Nārasimha III) 1265-1303
Dādi Sōmeya. (20) d., m.p. 1313-8

(1) E.C.IV Chamrajnagar 137(1317). (2) M.A.R.1914-5, para.85
(1328). (3) E.C.IV Gundlupet 56(1318), 58(1314); Chamrajnagar
116(1317); E.C.III Seringapatam 80(1319), 92(1310); Nānjangud
93(1315); M.A.R.1937,47(1303); 1911-2, para.93(1314); 1918, para.
98(1314); 207, para. 24(1312). (4) M.A.R.1914-5, para.85(1306);
E.C.XI Holalkere 136(1307); Chitaldrug l(1310); E.C.V Belur 163
(1308); M.A.R.1912-3, para.35a(1310). (5) E.C.III Nānjangud
103(1292). (6) E.C.IX Channapatna 135(1341). (7) Also E.C.IV
Gundlupet 66(1293); A.R.1902,60(1298). (8) E.C.III Nānjangud
103(1292). (9) Ibid. (10) Ibid.65(1332). (11) E.C.X Malur 8
(1339), 104(1332), 140(1332); E.C.IX Hoskote 140a(1313), Kankan-
halli 6(1316); M.A.R.1922,para. 41(1318); E.C.IX Channapatna 10
(1318);
Sōmēya. (1) d. 1298
Vaijappa. (2) d. (In the service of the Alupa court.) 1333-6
Vasamappa. (3) d.; s. Dādi Someya d. 1328

Other Ministers.

Aduri-devanna. (4) m.ps. c1309
Bāyicana. (5) Ruled Tore-nād 1309
Hariyappa. (6) sarv. of Hādavalige-nād. 1309
Kāthyappa. (7) m.p. 1338
Ponnanna. (8) m.ps. c1319
Kariya (I)ramaiya-nāyakka. (9) 1321
Kattari-Saluva (I)ācaya-nāyaka. (10) 1317-21
Uriyanna. (11) sarv. 1305
Pasaluva Cikka Viṭṭappam. (12) m.ps. to Dādi Balalappa d. 1342

? Kesava. (13) 1310-1

Page 621 n. (11) cont.: (? ) ibid. 12(1319); E.C.IX Anekal 84(1322); M.A.R.1912-3, para. 86(1322); (?) /C.XII Tiptur 24(1325).
(12) E.C.XI Chitaldrug 1(1310). (13) E.C.XII Tiptur 83 (1333); E.C.VII Shikarpur 212(1301); E.C.VIII Sagar 135(1320).


Subordinate Military Officers.

Agattiyandhi-nayakka. (1) Of the valangai force. 1300
Ajanna-sahani. (2) 1333
Biceya-sahani. (3) Palace servant. 1313
Bimeya-sahani. (4) ?1292
Devega-sahani. (5) 1313
Mayi-sahani. (6) f. Kañciya-nayaka. ?1324
Sakki-sahani. (7) b.i.l. Bambeya d. 1325
Sanckiya-sahani. (8) b.i.l. Bameya d. ?1324

Subordinate Civil Officers.

Bayise-deva. (9) Yelahanka-nad prabhu. 1342
Kalla-gauda. (10) Huliyara-nad mahaprabhu. 1313
Koteya-nayaka. (11) Ruler of Kukkala-nad. 1339
Madanna. (12) sunka h. of Koppa-nad. 1327
Mara-gavuda. (13) nad h. of the Arabala 70. 1307
Marappa. (14) mahaprabhu of Sigala-nad. 1318
Pemmanna. (15) Revenue officer of Kuvalala-nad, (Kolar). 1330
Rama-gavuda. (16) mah-nad-prabhu. 1338
Ranganna. (17) Adhikari of Belur. 1298
Vithala. (18) prabhu. 1299
Villa-gauda. (19) Adhikari of Vira-Vallala-deva-nad. 1307

Senabovas.

Madanna. (20) 1314
Kavanna. (21) 1314
Siripanna. (22) 1318
Virappa. (23) 1338
Visvasahgala. (24) 1334

ADDENDA TO THE LISTS OF OFFICIALS.

VINAYADITYA.

General Officers.
Pocimayya. (1) p.d., s.v.; s. Ecimayya. 1063-83
Rama-deva. (2) d.; f. Sridhara d. ?c1060

VISNUVARDHANA.

Mandalikas & Samantas.
Bankeyya. (3) samadhigata..., m.s. Senavagere 12. 1134
Bireya-nayaka. (4) Kuka<la>nad<alva. 1137
Ganga-manikka Brahmodir<jan. (5) Kaivara-nad. ?1128
Ghasani Cattaya.(6) samanta, Huliyara estate. ?1137
Viruntaraya-bayankara Mannai-nad-alvan Cattayan. 1120
Tribudanamalla-Poysala samanta Mannai-nad-alvan c1117 Sama-gamundam. (7)

Other Ministers.
Ketayanna. (9) m.p., sarv., sri.h. Desavana. 1139

BALLALA II.

Mandalikas & Samantas.
Macaya-nayaka. (10) near Talakad. 1179

Subordinate Civil Officers.
Aggapa. (12) 1205
Bittiyanna. (13) Under Ketala-devi. 1176
Madiraja. (14) sunka h. 1197

BALLALA III.

Other Ministers.
Amir Khusrau mentions (p.429 above) Balak d., Main-deva (or Narayana-deva (?)) and Jetmal (? Jeta-malla). It is not possible to identify these with any Ministers or Generals so
far known from contemporary local records.

Page 623 n.
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BOMBAY ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS

Progress report of the Archaeological Survey of Western India, esp. for the year ending 30th June 1898. Bombay, 1898.

BUTTERWORTH, A & VENUGOPAL CHETTY, V.

A collection of the inscriptions on copper plates and stones in the Nellore District. Three volumes. Madras, 1905.

EPIGRAPHIA CARNATICA, see RICE, B. LEWIS.

EPIGRAPHIA INDICA.

A collection of inscriptions supplementary to the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum of the Archaeological Survey. Edited by Burgess, Hultzsch, Sten Know, Thomas, Krishna Sastri, Hirananda Sastri and others. Calcutta, 1892 -

EPIGRAPHIA INDO-MOSLEMICA.

Edited by E. Denison Ross 1907-8; J. Horovitz 1909-10, 1911-12; G. Yazdani 1913-4 to 1937-8. Calcutta, 1907 -

ELLiot, Sir WALTER.
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HYDERABAD ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS

Annual report of the Archaeological Department of H.E.H. the Nizam's Dominions. Calcutta, 1915-
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The Indian Antiquary, a journal of oriental research in Archaeology, History, Literature Languages, Folklore, etc., etc. edited by Burgess and others. Bombay, 1872-1923.

LAL, HIRA


MYSORE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS

Annual reports of the Mysore Archaeological Department. i. Edited by R. Narasimhacar. Bangalore, 1906-2 (Separate Index) ii. Edited by R. Shama Sastry. Bangalore, 1924-3 (indices in each volume; from 1925 onwards Kannada Text also)
Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of Mysore. Edited by Prof. M.H. Krishna. 
Bangalore, 1931-7

NARASIMHACARYA, R.

Inscriptions at Sravana Belgola. 
(Revised edition of Epigraphia Carnatica vol. II) 
Bangalore, 1923.

PUDUKKOTTAI INSCRIPTIONS

Chronological list of inscriptions of the Pudukkottai State arranged according to dynasties. 
Pudukkottai, 1929.

Inscriptions (texts) of the Pudukkottai State arranged according to dynasties. 
Pudukkottai, 1929.

RANGACHARYA, V.

A topographical list of the inscriptions of the Madras Presidency (collected till 1915) with notes and references. 
Three volumes. Madras, 1919.
(This work contains epigraphical references from material in the Mackenzie collection, besides the reports of the Archaeological Survey of Madras.)

RICE, B. LEWIS

Mysore Inscriptions. Translated for Government. 
Bangalore, 1879.
(The copy in the library of the S.O.A.S. (1781) belonged to Fleet. The microscopic size of Major Dixon's photographs, 150 in all, led to the translations being often very inaccurate.)

RICE, B. LEWIS

Madras Archaeological Series. Epigraphia Carnatica. 
vol. I Coorg inscriptions. Mangalore, 1886.
vol. II Inscriptions at Sravana Belgola. Mangalore, 1889.
vol. III Inscriptions in the Mysore district. pt. 1 Mangalore, 1894.
vol. vi. In Kadur district, Mangalore, 1901.
vol. vii Shimoga district.

vol. viii Idem pt. 2 vol. 1
Idem pt. 2. vol. 2
pt. 1 Mangalore, 1902.
Mangalore, 1903.
Mangalore, 1905.
vol. x Kolar pt. 1.
Idem pt. 2.
Mangalore, 1905.
vol. xi Chitaldrug dist.
vol. xii Tumkur dist.
Bangalore, 1903.
Bangalore, 1904.

(The set in the S.O.A.S., lacking two parts of the Kannada text, belonged to Fleet, & contains several valuable pencilled notes and underlinings.)

RICE, B. LEWIS

Coorg inscriptions (revised edition)
Madras, 1914.

SOUTH INDIAN EPIGRAPHY

Annual reports of South Indian Epigraphy, formerly Annual reports of epigraphy, Southern Circle. (Under the direction of Hultzsch, Venkayya, Krishna Sastri and others)
Madras, 1887-

(Lists of inscriptions copied during the year with brief and often erroneous summaries of the contents. Texts being published in the following series.)

SOUTH INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS

Archaeological survey of India. New Imperial Series, volumes XLIV, XLIX, LII, LIII, LIV (vols. iv to viii inclusive) South Indian Inscriptions.


(No index, to this vol. or vols. v or vi)
vol. v The same continued; 3 plates.
Madras, 1925.

vol. vi The same continued; 5 plates. Edited by K.V. Subrahmanya Aiyer.
Madras, 1928.

vol. vii Miscellaneous inscriptions from the Tamil, Malayalam, Telugu and Kannada countries. Index. Edited by K.V.
Subrahmanya Aiyer. Madras, 1933.
vol. viii The same continued. Index.
   Madras, 1937.
vol. ix pt. l. Kannada inscriptions from the
   Madras Presidency. Edited by R. Shama
   Sastry. No Index. Madras, 1939.
   (There is a short English summary before
   the texts, which are arranged chronologically
   by dynasties.)
vol. x Telugu inscriptions from the Madras
   presidency. Edited by J. Ramayya Pantulu.
   Madras, 1948.
vol. xi pt. l. Bombay Karnatak Inscriptions (vol. l
   pt. l) with introductory notes in English.
   General Editor: C. R. Krishnamacharlu.
   Index. Madras, 1940.

SREENIVASACHAR, P.

Hyderabad Archaeological Series, 13. A corpus
   of inscriptions in the Telingana districts of
   H. E. H. the Nizam's dominions. Edited by P. Sree-
   nivasachar. Part II Texts & Translations of
   inscriptions with 56 illustrative plates.
   Glossary and index. Calcutta, 1940.

TAYLOR, Col. MEADOWS & FERGUSSON, JAMES

Architecture in Dharwar and Mysore, photographed
   by the late Dr. Pigon, Bombay Medical Service,
   A. C. B. Neill Esq., and Col. Biggs late of the
   Royal Artillery. With an historical and descrip-
   tive memoir by Col. Meadows Taylor and architec-
   tural notes by James Fergusson.
   London, 1866.
   (Some fine photos; two āsanas and four viragals
   amongst them. R.A.S. 53C left.)

(2) Literary.

Sanskrit.

BILHANA

Vikramāṅkadeva-carita. Edited with an intro-

GANGA DEVI

Madhurāvijayam or Vīra Kamparāya Caritam.
   (B. M. 14058 a. 26) Trivandrum, 1916.

HEMADRI

An extract from the praśasti to the Vratakānda
   of his Caturvargacintamaṇi is found in S. Sri-

Prakrit.

JINAPRABHA SURI

(This work, of between 1308 and 1333 contains interesting references to the Muslims, Kākatīyas and ancient dynasties. See B.C.Law in Jain Antiquary, vol.iv No.iv of March 1939, pp. 109-123, and P.K.Gode, Prof.K.V.Rangaswami Aiyangar Commemoration volume, Madras 1940, p.345 ff.)

Telugu.

TIKKANA SOMAYAJI

(I.O.Tel.D.168)

Kannada

ANDAYYA, MAHAKAVI


LAKŚMISA


MALLIKARJUNA


NAGACANDRA, otherwise ABHINAVA PAMPA


NRPATUNGA


Rudrāhata


Tamil.

Koyilolugu

(Account of gifts to and history of the temple at Srirangam.) Madras, 1909. (B.M.14171 d.19)

Sen Tamil

A monthly journal of literature and science (in Tamil) published by the Tamil Sangham of Madura. Madura, 1902–

Arabic & Persian.

'Abd al-Haïy

Nuzhat ul Khawātir wa-baḥjat ul-Masāmi 'wa'il-nawāzīr. (Part of an encyclopaedia of biographies of famous Muslims of the 8th to 14th centuries, containing accounts of those who lived in India.) pp.214. Hyderabad, 1350/1931

'Abu'l Fida (Imā'il ibn 'Alī, Imād ud dīn)


Amin Ahmad Rāżī

Haft Iqlīm. MSS. I.O. 49 & 3143.

Badāoni ('Abd ul Qādir ibn i Mulūk Shāh)


Binākitī

Tawārīkh i Binākitī. MSS. I.O. 215; B.M. Add. 7627, 7626; and R.A.S. P.27.
DIYĀ 'UD DĪN BĀRĀNĪ

Tārīkh i Fīroz Shāhī. (Bibl.Ind.) Edited by Saiyid Ahmad Khan under the superintendence of Capt.W.Nassau Lees, LL.D. and Mawlevi Kabir al-dīn. Calcutta, 1862. MSS. I.O.177; B.M. Or.2039 & 6376; Bodleian Eliott 352.

FIRISHTAH (M.Qasim Hindū-Shāh Astarābādī)


Tārīkh i Nauras Nāmah.(Called in this thesis 'version B') MSS. R.A.S. P.65, 64, 62, 63; I.O. 2035*, 1251, 2887, 2425.


IBN BATTŪTAH (Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh)


'IgāMĪ

Futūh us Salātīn. MS. I.O. 3089.
KHUSRAU (Amir Khusrau Dihlawi)


MSS. B.M. Add.16,838; Or.1700.
(Haq's edition is supposed to be based on Add. 16,838.)

The campaigns of 'Ala'ud din Khalji being Hazrat Amir Khusrau's Khaza'in ul Futūh (treasures of victory) translated with notes by Muhammad Habib Historical introduction by S.Krishnaswami Aiyangar. Madras, 1931.

KHUSRAU (Amir Khusrau Dihkawi)

(B.M.1479 f.6)

MSS. I.O.2796; 188(Tipu Sultan); S.O.A.S. 18729.

KHWAJAH NIZĀM UD DĪN AHMAD


MUḤAMMAD BIḤĀMAD KHĀNl

Tārīkh i Muḥammadi. MS. B.M.Or.137.

MU' IN UD DĪN UL NADWI


MURTĀZĀ ḤUSAIN

Hadīqtat ul Aqālim. MS. I.O.2643.

RASHĪD UD DĪN (Fadl Allah)

Jāmi'ut Tawārīkh. MSS. B.M.Add.7628 & 18,878; I.O.3524.
SHIHĀB UD DĪN (Abū ul abbas Ahmad otherwise ? wrongly Al Marāsī.)
Masālik ul Absār fi Mumālik ul Amsār. Notice...

SIRHINDĪ (Yaḥyā ibn Ahmad ibn 'Abd Allāh)
Tarikh i Mubārak Shāhī. Edited by M. Hidayat Hosain.
Calcutta, 1931.

WAṢṢĀF (‘Abd Allāh ibn FadlAllāh)
Tazjiyat ul Amsār wa-tajziyat ul A'sār otherwise Tarikh i Waṣṣāf. Edited by M. Mādi Is’hānī.
Bombay, 1269/1853
Idem.
Tabriz, 1315/1897
M. S: B. M. Add. 23, 517.

ELLIO T, Sir H. M.
The history of India as told by its own historians. The Muhammadan Period. Edited from the posthumous papers of the late Sir H. M. Elliot, ...by Professor John Dowson. London, 1871
Particularly vols. I & III.

Miscellaneous.
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Il milione. Prima edizione integrale a cura di Luigi Poscolo Benedetto. (Comitato geographico nazionale italiano pubblicazione n. 3)
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