

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE MADRAS REGION CHENNAI

K.V.RAMAN



FOREWORD

It is with much pleasure that I accede to the request of Sri K. V. Raman, M.A., M. Litt. to write a foreword to his book on *The Early History of the Madras Region*. Madras attained the rank of an important port city and one of the greater urban centres of modern India as a result of the development of the trade of the Coromandel coast under the aegis of the English East India Company. Before the seventeenth century, the Madras region comprised a group of villages of varying size closely interrelated to one another in many ways.

Sri Raman has aimed in his monograph at presenting as continuous and complete a narrative of the history of this region as is possible now from the time man began to inhabit it right down to the middle of the seventeenth century A. D. This was work that needed to be done and has now been done with commendable competence. The author has availed himself of all sources, literary, epigraphic, legendary and so on, and made critical use of them in his study of all

aspects of the history and life of the region. I hope the book will receive the attention it merits and will be the forerunner of other essays in local history that would enable readers to link it up with the unbroken past of our country's ancient civilization on the one side and the current problems and changes that we see emerging in our own day.

Sri Raman has proved himself an able student of history and I wish him every success in his future endeavours.

University of Chicago, }
May 21, 1959 }

K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI

PREFACE

The present thesis "The Early History of the Madras Region upto 1650 A. D" embodies the results of my research work on the subject for two years, 1954-'56, when I was a research student in the Department of Indian History and Archaeology, University of Madras. I worked under Dr. T. V. Mahalingam, now Professor of Archaeology, and Dr. M. Arokiaswami, Reader in Indian History, to both of whom I am deeply indebted for having guided me in the preparation of the thesis. I am also grateful to Dr. K. K. Pillai, Professor and Head of the Department of Indian History and Archaeology, for the keen interest he took in my work and for getting me all facilities for preparing the thesis. I am thankful to the University of Madras for having awarded me the Studentship and permitted me to publish the thesis.

I must acknowledge my gratefulness to the Department of Epigraphy for having kindly given me access to the transcripts of unpublished inscriptions and to the Department of Archaeology, Southern Circle, for having permitted me to use a photograph in the thesis. I take this opportunity to thank Sri V. D. Krishnaswami, Deputy Director - General of Archaeology

in India, for his valuable guidance regarding the pre-history of Madras and its surroundings.

My profound thanks are due to Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, Director, Institute of Traditional Research, UNESCO, or gracing the book with his esteemed foreword. I also offer my thanks to the Amudha Nilayam Publishers, Madras, for their neat and careful printing and publication of the book.

MADURAI
25—4—1959 }

K. V. RAMAN

ILLUSTRATIONS

*Map of the Vicinity of Madras in the
13th Century A. D.*

Fig. 1. View of a Jain image found near the Cathedral, San Thomé.

Fig. 2. The Pallava Cave at Pallāvaram.

Fig. 3. The Vimāna on the central shrine at Adipuriswara Temple, Tiruvorriyūr.

Fig. 4, Tyāgarājar Maṇḍapa, Tiruvorriyūr.

Fig. 5. Closer view of a pillar in the Tyāgarājar Maṇḍapa, Tiruvorriyūr.

Fig. 6. The Vimāna over the sanctum, Dharmapuriswarar Temple, Tirusulam.

Fig. 7. Front view of the Tirusulam Temple.

Fig. 8. The Subramania Temple at Kunnattur.

Fig. 9. The Four-pillared maṇḍapa in front of Sri Pārthasārathi Temple, Triplicane.

ABBREVIATIONS

ARE	Annual Report of Epigraphy
EI	Epigraphia Indica
IA	Indian Antiquary
JIH	Journal of Indian History
JOR	Journal of Oriental Research, Madras
JRAS	Journal of Royal Asiatic Society of Bombay
MJLS	Madras Journal of Literature and Science
MTCV	Madras Tercentenary Commemoration Volume
MER	Madras Epigraphical Report
QJMS	Quarterly Journal of Mythic Society, Bangalore
SII	South Indian Inscriptions
SITI	South Indian Temple Inscriptions
TAS	Travancore Archaeological Series
TTD	Tirumalai Tirupati Devasthanam Report

INTRODUCTION

Though history is indivisible, it admits of study under different heads, such as political history, social history, economic history, religious history, dynastic history, local or regional history and so on. A general history would comprise all these phases but the nature of its perspective would naturally compel attention only to 'the great lines of historical evolution'. Events, seemingly less pregnant and material to such historical development would lose that measure of attention and emphasis, which they could otherwise get in the sectional study of the subject. The role of regional history in a scheme of general history is thus very important. It forms a vital tributary to the great confluence of general history. In India, the importance of the study of the history of certain regions for the reconstruction of the full history of the country, can hardly be exaggerated. For instance, the early history of the vicinity of Madras city is a fertile field. The history of the city of Madras as such, has only a life of three centuries; Scholars like Talboys Wheeler, W. Foster, H. D. Love, and C. S. Srinivasachari have written on the history of Madras and its surroundings from the advent of the English to recent times. But the hoary past of the area and the historic significance of ancient places like Mylapore, Triplicane, Egmore which form part of the city, as well as those like Pallavaram, Vēlachchēri, Tiruvāṇmīyūr, Kunnattūr, Mān-gādu, Poonamalle, Tiruvoṇmīyūr, Pādi, Tirumullaivāyil, Ambattūr, Korattūr, Pujal (Red Hills), Puliyūr, that are

at the outskirts of the Madras City (within 20 miles) are striking. All these places and many more like Nungambakkam, Chetpet (Sērruppēdu), Tambaran (Tāmpuram) and others formed a good part of the ancient Tonḍamandalam. The early history of this region has not been undertaken in a full measure so far. The present thesis seeks to provide such a study and bring out the importance of the region in her political, administrative, economic, social, literary, religious and architectural history from the earliest times up to 1650 A.D.

The region is important *par excellence* from the point of view of pre-history. It has rightly been called as "the classic ground of early Palaeolithic culture in South India". The first Palaeolithic relic was discovered in this region at Pallavaram and it led to the further discovery of many more Palaeoliths in other places. No less significant is the discovery in this region of Megalithic sites and tools, generally ascribed to the Iron age. For instance, the Archaeological Department which recently conducted excavation at Kunnattur (near Pallavaram) is reported to have discovered many megalithic finds. In historical times, the pageant of the history of this region was adorned with rulers belonging to many major dynasties of South India and their feudatories. Inscriptions belonging to the Pallavas, the Chōlas, the Rāshtrakūṭas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Chēras and the Vijayanagar kings, as well as many smaller dynasties like the Telugu Chōlas, the Kāḍavarāyas the Yādavarāyas and the Sāmbūvarāyas, have been found, in, and around, the city of Madras, in places like Pallavaram, Triplicane, San Thōimē (Mylapore), Tiruvōrriyūr, Poonamalle, Tiruvānmiyūr (near Adyar), Vēlachchēri (near Guindy), Tirunīrmalai, Pādi etc. These lithic records bear witness to the political

vicissitudes through which the region passed. The vicinity of Madras was also among the earliest places to attract the European powers like the Portuguese, the Dutch and the English, who vied with one another to establish factories on the east cost for purposes of carrying on trade.

In the matter of administration, the epigraphs of the region also reveal the prevalence of the essential features of a sound administrative system, both central and local. They also tell us about the active functioning of the village assemblies (*sabhās*) in Maṇali and Adambakkam. These were working well even in the 9th century A. D., during the Pallava rule. In later times, under the Chōla and Vijayanagar rulers, the - village assemblies functioned in many other places of the region. The economic and social history of the region may be gleaned from the epigraphs and other sources, as also many interesting details of information relating to taxation, agriculture, irrigation, land tenure, trade and commerce, wages, weights and coins, land-value, land-measures, interest-rates, community life, customs and manners of the people etc. The vital part that the prominent temples like those of Tiruvorriyūr and Triplicane, played in the economic, social and religious life of the villages is also striking.

In the field of literature and learning the history of the region has its contribution. On the Tamil side, tradition associates Tiruvaluvar, the author of the immortal, *Tirukkural*, with Mylapore. Sēkkiār, the renowned minister of Kulottunga II and the author of the famous *Periapurāṇam*, hailed from Kunnattūr and Mayilaināthar and Jñānaprakāśar, noted commentators, were from Mylapore and Tiruvorriyūr, respectively. Similarly, Sanskrit learning flourished in this region, as is borne out

by the fact that in the Tiruvo^{lli}iyūr temple there was a special hall in which a regular school was conducted for the teaching of Sanskrit grammar and the exposition of the doctrines of several schools of philosophy.

The religious history of the area is indeed very eventful. Vaishnavism, Saivism, Buddhism and Jainism, has each played its part here. Some of the heralders of the Vaishnava wing of the *Bhakti* movement, were either born in this region or were closely associated with it. P^{ey} Ālvār, one of the earliest Ālvārs, came from Mylapore. Tirumaligai Ālvār was born in Tirumaligai, near Poonamalle. Bhūdattālvār and Tirumangai Ālvār visited Tirunirmalai and Triplicane. They, it may be remembered, were renowned composers of exquisite devotional poetry, enshrined in their *pāsūrāms*. Tirukkachchi Nambi, the elder contemporary and a close associate of Sri Rāmānuja, the famous philosopher of the Visishtādvaita school, came from Poonamalle, and later, the great Eṭṭūr Kumāra Tātāchārya, one of the leaders of Vaishnavite sect, made Tirunirmalai one of the centres of his activities. Saivism, contributed alike, its own share to the religious importance of the region. The *Tēvāram* hymners, associated with the Saiva wing of the *Bhakti* movement, have visited temples in the region and found inspiration for their *padigams*. Paṭṭinathār, the poet-ascetic, lived and died in Tiruvo^{lli}iyūr. Nirañjanaguru, Vagisvara Paṇḍita and Chaturānana Paṇḍita, the exponents of the Somasiddhānta or the Pāśupata cult of Saivism, were active in this region. Epigraphical, archaeological and literary sources reveal that Buddhism and Jainism once had a hold on this region. Mylapore had a Jain pagoda for Tirthankāra Nēminātha to whom was dedicated later, *Nēminātham*, the Tamil grammar-work

of the 12th century. The age-long tradition that St. Thomas came to San Thomé and attained his martyrdom there, is an interesting episode in the history of this region, which has attracted many Christians to this place. The Portuguese were mainly drawn to Mylapore for this reason and San Thomé grew in importance under their protection.

The architectural history of this region is also of great interest. The very early rock-cut cave at Pallavaram recalls to our minds the architectural activities of the Pallavas; and many other monuments with which the region is studded, remind us of the Chola and Vijayanagar contributions in this field.

The sources for writing the history of this territory round Madras are many. Epigraphy, Archaeology, Literature and Tradition come to our aid. A classified bibliography of the sources is furnished at the end of the thesis.

CONTENTS

	<i>Pages</i>
<i>Foreword</i>	iii
<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>Illustrations</i>	vii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	viii
<i>Introduction</i>	ix
CHAPTER I Antiquity of Madras Region	1
CHAPTER II Political History of the Madras Region	49
CHAPTER III Administration, Economic and Social Life in the Region	128
CHAPTER IV Growth of Religion and Literature in the Madras Region	186
CHAPTER V Architecture	237
APPENDIX I The Nilagangarāyās in the Vicinity of Madras	259
APPENDIX II List of inscriptions of the Region	268
APPENDIX III Sources	281
<i>Index</i>	290

CHAPTER I

ANTIQUITY OF THE MADRAS REGION

In tracing the early history of the Madras city and its immeditate surroundings, one is inevitably struck with the many prehistoric relics that have been discovered in the region by archaeologists like Robert Bruce Foote,¹ Dr. William King,² Rea³ and others. The Madras region, along with the Chingleput district as a whole, has in fact, been described as the 'classic ground of early palaeolithic culture in Southern India'⁴ and 'the key-site for South Indian palaeoliths'. To Pallavaram, near Madras, belongs the unique credit of having been the place where the palaeolithic relic of India was first found. It was discovered in a ballast pit on the Brigade ground at Pallavaram in 1863 by Robert Bruce Foote, who has been rightly called 'the father Indian Prehistoric Archaeology'.⁵ In 1864 again, he found two more palaeoliths at the same place. A more systematic and vigorous search led to the discovery of extensive palaeolithic sites in places like Orattur, Panjur, Sriperumbudur, Tirumullavayil (2 miles from Avadi), Attrambakkam, Pundi, and other places, so that Chingleput district, as a whole, gives 'the most numerous and important traces of palaeolithic man known in South India'.⁶ A number of

1. Bruce-Foote: *Indian Prehistoric Antiquities*, 1916.

2. *Madras Journal of Literature and Science*, Vol: 23.

3. G. O. No. 1135, dated 12th August, 1887.

4. P. Mitra: *Prehistoric India*, p. 163.

5. *Archaeology in India*, Govt. of India Publication, 1950, p. 18.

6. P. Mitra: *op. cit.*, p. 150; Bruce-Foote: *op. cit.*, p. 8.

7. Bruce-Foote: *op. cit.*, p. 109.

implements belonging to the palaeolithic age, or the old Stone Age, have been found at Pallavaram and also all along the Pennar river.

Implements in the neighbourhood of Madras were evidently made by chipping the boulders of quartzite situated in the laterite beds. About the implements found at Pallavaram, and attributed to the Old Stone Age, Robert Bruce Foote remarked that 'they point out a deliberate choice of colours and distinct progress in craftsmanship. They show how humanity was flourishing in those portions of South India under conditions highly favourable to primitive life. The proximity of the rivers to the rocks highly suitable for the old weapons and implements, no doubt, was helping man much to be the dreaded hunter of animal life.' Though these stone-implements show considerable skill, they are not polished. Bruce Foote gives a long list of the tools found in the neighbourhood of Madras in his classic work '*Indian Prehistoric and Protohistoric Antiquities*' and calls them the 'Madras type.'

The main reason why such vast relics of the palaeolithic people are found near about Madras, is that it is rich with quartzite-yielding rocks, with which those ancient people could make implements to protect themselves from the wild animals. The relics of the palaeolithic people begin to diminish considerably in the south of the Palar valley as the quartzite becomes rare.¹ Such an important part did the quartzite play in the localisation of the palaeolithic people, that they also go under the name 'quartzite men.' And, according to archaeologists, the quartzite users are the most prehistoric men of India.²

1. *Ibid.* 2. *Ibid.* p. 36. 3. Logan: *Chipped stones of India*, p. 65.

The Palaeolithic Age or the Old Stone Age passed on to the Mesolithic Age or the Middle Stone Age and then to the Neolithic Age or the New Stone Age.¹ The relics of the third mentioned age, though not available in plenty, are not unknown in the territory round the city of Madras.² Subsequent to the Stone Age, we have in Madras some relics of the Iron Age. Thus, in the garden of a private bungalow in Hall's Road, Egmore, many interesting prehistoric relics have been discovered. Among things found were a prehistoric cemetery, burial urns, a small sarcophagus (of Adichchanallur type), a few small hoeblade of a very primitive type with a curved cutting edge and a narrow butt, and an iron rod about six inches long. These have been ascribed to the Iron Age.³ Other than this, a number of urn burials and tombs, which generally go under the name 'megaliths', have been found in the tract round Madras. The age to which the megalithic monuments of South India belong, has not yet been settled beyond doubt. But the probability is that they belong to the Iron Age.⁴ Archaeologists have found many varieties in such burial graves. One such variety, known as 'dolmenoid cist', has been discovered at Pottur, near the Red Hills, Madras. Round about the Red Hills have also been found both pyriform urns and legged sarcophagi without cists. Similar burials are also reported to have been discovered by Mr. Rea in Palla-

1. *Ancient India*, 1949, No. 5.

2. J. C. Brown and Sir John Marshall: *Catalogue of Prehistoric Antiquities in the Indian Museum* (1917), p. 4.

3. C. S. Srinivasachari: *History of Madras*, Introduction, p. xviii.

4. Mr. V. D. Krishnaswami says that 'south Indian megaliths seem to be essentially rooted in the Iron Age supported as it by the Brahmagiri excavations.' *Ancient India*, op. cit. p. 42.

varam and Tirusūlam.¹ Mr. V. D. Krishnaswami, a well-known archaeologist, calls Chingleput district a megalithic province in itself. 'It has megalithic individuality of its own in that the dolmenoid cists, so far as known, invariably enclose a terracotta legged sarcophagus, a feature not known in other two regions (Pudukkottai and Cochin, where also megalithic monuments have been discovered)². In Pallavaram, near Madras, has been found an interesting terracotta sarcophagus, oblong in shape and standing on short legs. One remarkable and noteworthy feature about this sarcophagus is that it bears striking resemblance to the terracotta coffins found near Bagdad.³ The similarity of internment in such earthenware coffins, identical in shape, size and material,⁴ has been taken as evidence of the active intercourse that existed between South India and the West.⁵

Coming to historical times, we find that this region, along with the modern districts of Chingleput, South Arcot and North Arcot, came under two ancient divisions - Aruvānādu and Aruvāvadatalainādu, Aruvā

1. G. O. No. 1135, dated 12th August 1887. Mr. Rea also found at Pallavaram many utensils along with burial tombs. It is Significant to note here that ancient Tamil literature of the Sangam period, for example, the *Puraninītru* makes a definite reference to the custom of urn-burials. G. U. Pope, the well-known Tamil Scholar from the west, in his commentary on the *Puraninītru*, says that the vessels discovered at Pallavaram by Rea conform to the description found in the lyric. *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. xxix, p. 285. Also see *Ancient India*, No. 2, July, 1946.

2. *Ancient India*, No. 5, p. 36.

3. Sir John Marshall in *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, p. 615.

4. J. C. Brown and J. Marshall, *op. cit.* p. 7.

5. *Cambridge History of India*, *op. cit.* QJMS. xvi, p. 256.

south and Aruvā north.¹ Even Ptolemy, has noted this territory, roughly extending between South Pennār and North Pennār, as Aruvārnoi or Arvārnoi.² These two divisions, Aruvānādu and Aruvāvadatalainādu, together came to be called as Tonḍaimaṇḍalam or Tonḍainādu perhaps after the conquest of this place by Tonḍamān Iḷam Tiraiyan,³ a contemporary of Karikāla Chōla, who has been ascribed to the second century A.D.⁴ Even though the *Perumbāṇarupādai*, a work of the S'angam Age, informs us that Iḷam Tiraiyan was ruling at Kāñchi when Karikāla was adorning the Chōla throne, we do not get much information about the conquest of the territory round Kāñchi by Iḷam Tiraiyan and also about the people whom he conquered. But a very late tradition preserved in the famous Mackenzie collections⁵ seems to throw some light on the early inhabitants of Tonḍaimaṇḍalam whom Iḷam Tiraiyan conquered.

The Manuscript has it that the ancient territory known as Tonḍaimaṇḍalam was first inhabited by wild tribesmen, Kurumbas by name, who began to evolve gradually a certain form of civilization and also political organisation. Fierce people as they were, they built a number of forts, and at one time practically dominated the Tonḍaimaṇḍalam region which was then known as Kurumba Bhūmi.⁶ The ancient Tamil work *Puranāmūrū* describes the Kurumbas as warlike people of whom even

1. S. K. Iyongar: *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. II, p. 36.
2. K. N. Sivaraja Pillai: *Chronology of Early Tamils*, pp. 227-228.
3. Walter Elliot: *Coins of Southern India*, p. 37 and R. Gopalan: *Pallavas of Kāñchi*, pp. 26-27.
4. K. A. N. Sastri: *Studies in Chōla History and Administration*, p. 45; contra K. N. Sivaraja Pillai, *op. cit.* p. 185.
5. MJLS. Vol. xix, pp. 244 ff.
6. *Annual Report of Archaeology*, 1906-7, p. 221, fn. 4.

kings were afraid.¹ The learned editor of the *Puranānūru* Dr. V. Swaminatha Iyer, translated the term Kurumba to mean a fort.² Perhaps because of this close association with a vast network of forts, they got that name - Kurumba.

The Mackenzie Maanuscripts point to Mādavaram or Puṭal near Madras, as the headquarters of the Kurumbas. The Kurumbas are said to have divided the Tondaimandalam region into 24 districts or Koṭṭams in each of which was built a fort. The twenty four districts were: Puṭal Koṭṭam, Ikkāṭṭu Koṭṭam, Manavir Koṭṭam, Sēngāṭṭu Koṭṭam, Paiyūr Koṭṭam, Eyi Koṭṭam, Dāmal Koṭṭam, Urrukāṭṭu Koṭṭam, Kalattūr Koṭṭam, Sēmbūr Koṭṭam, Āmbūr Koṭṭam, Vengunra Koṭṭam, Palgunra Koṭṭam, Elangāṭṭu Koṭṭam, Kaliūr Koṭṭam, Sengarai Koṭṭam, Paduvūr Koṭṭam, Kadikūr Koṭṭam, Sendirukkai Koṭṭam, Kunravarttāna Koṭṭam, Vēngada Koṭṭam, Vēlūr Koṭṭam, Sethūr Koṭṭam and Puliyūr Koṭṭam. From inscriptions of the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries A. D., we know that the place where the present Madras city is situated and its immediate surroundings, were included partly in Puṭal Koṭṭam and partly in Puliyūr Koṭṭam. Thus while Tiruvorriyūr, Puṭal, Ayyanāpuram (the modern Ayyanāvaram which is a part of the Madras city) were in Puṭal Koṭṭam,⁴ places like Elumūr (the modern Egmore),⁵ Mayilārpil, (the modern Mylāpore),⁶ Pūndaimalli,⁷ Palla-

1. *Puram*, 97, 98, 177.

2. *Puranānūru* ed. by Swaminatha Iyer, *Index*, p. 27.

3. V. Kanakasabhai Pillai: *The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago*, p. 28.

4. SII. vol. iii, pt. ii, No. 64, pp. 132-3; SII. vol. viii, No. 537.

5. EI. vol. viii, p. 291; also 238 of 1912.

6. SII. vol. ii, pt. v, *Introduction*, p. 28.

7. 192 of 1894 and EI. vol. iv. p 8.

varam¹ and Tāmpuram (the modern Tambaram)² were all in Puliyūr Kōṭṭam. Puliyūr Kōṭṭam seems to have derived its name from a small village called Puliyūr near the modern Kodambakkam, Madras³ and the Puṭal Kōṭṭam derived its name from Puṭal a village near the modern Red Hills.⁴ These villages, now insignificant, were probably important centres of the Kurumbas who built their forts there. The Mackenzie Manuscript says that Puṭal had a fort. Without some such thing as the existence of forts in these places, the naming of the whole district after the small villages is inexplicable.

It was already pointed out that the antiquity of the Kurumbas is proved by the reference to them in the Sangam work *Puṛanānūru*. But an earlier reference to them in the edict of Asoka is claimed by some. Rock Edict XIII mentions the Visas, the Vajris, the Yonas, the Kamboyas, the Bhojas, the Piṭinkas, the Āndhras and the Pulindas as his subordinate communities.⁵ The last-named people, the Pulindas, have been identified by some with the Kurumbas on grounds of close similarity between their civilizations.⁶ If this identification of the Kurumbas with the Pulindas is accepted as valid, a natural question that would crop up for discussion is: Did Tonḍaimaṇḍalam, where the Kurumbas lived in large numbers, form part of the empire of Asoka? There is a great difference of opinion among

1. SII. vol. vii, Inscriptions, No. 537-549.

2. 56 of 1932-33.

3. G. O. No. 814, 815 dated 6th August 1896, p. 4.

4. EI. vol. iv, p. 8, n. 1.

5. EI. vol. ii, p. 471.

6. R. Satianathier: *Studies in ancient History of Tonḍaimaṇḍalam* pp. 7-9. Mr. V. R. R. Dikshitar is not inclined to accept the identification as correct, op. cit. p. 146.

scholars regarding this question. One of As'oka's edicts mentions the Chōlas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Satyaputra and the Kēraḷaputra as independent powers, outside the pale of his empire.¹ The late Dr. Vincent Smith, evidently thinking that the dominion of the Chōlas, during the period of As'oka, included Tonḍaimandalam also, maintained that the southern frontier of As'oka's empire was 'approximately a line drawn from the mouth of the Pennār river near Nellore on the eastern coast, through Cuddappah and the south of Chittaldoorg, to the river Kalyāṇapuris on the western coast.'² Dr. S. Krishnaswami Iyengar held that the Mauryan empire during As'oka's time stopped short of the northern frontiers of Tamil land, which according to him, was marked by Paṭavērk-kāḍu the modern Pulicat, 30 miles north of Madras.³ Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar held that the country round Kāñchi was known as Saṭyavṛtakshētra and that it is the latter that is mentioned by As'oka's Edict II and XIII as the Saṭyaputra, one of the countries that was independent of the As'okan Empire.⁴ But Prof. Sathianathier maintains that As'oka's empire included in it the whole of Tonḍaimandalam. He is of the view that Tonḍaimandalam region was a separate entity in As'oka's time as distinct from the Chōla country which had the northern Villear river as its northern limit. Its distinct entity is also attested by Paṭanjali, the Sanskrit grammarian, who lived in the second century B. C., and foreign geographers like Ptolemy and the author of the *Periplus*. He says that the kingdom of the Chōlas that is described by the edict of As'oka as independent of his empire only

1. Rock Edict II.

2. V. A. Smith: *Early History of India*, p. 163.

3. S. K. Iyengar: *Beginnings of South Indian History*, pp. 83-4.

4. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar: *Advanced History of India*, p. 155.

comprised the land between the South Vellār and the North Vellār and that the latter which formed the northern boundry of the Chōla dominion marked the southern boundary of the empire of Asōka. In other words, Asōka's empire included the whole of Tondaimandalam. The same writer points out that some of the inscriptions giving the geneology of the Pallavas, for example, the Vayalūr inscription of Rājaśimha¹ mention the name of Asoka or Asōkavarman after giving the names of many mythical kings. This, according to that writer, favours the view that Asōka must have held sway over Tondaimandalam. He however attributes the actual conquest of Tondaimandalam to Asōka's father Bindusāra who invaded South India between 298 and 278 B. C.² Prof. Sāthianathier's reasons to show that Asōka's empire included Tondaimandalam region seem to be convincing on the whole. His conclusion will seem to be all the more probable if his identification of the Kurumbas of Tondaimandalam with the Pulindas of the Asōkan edicts is acceptable. Even otherwise, his various other reasons seem to be weighty enough. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri is inclined to hold that it is not unlikely that a part of Tondaimandalam was in Asōka's empire. Thus he writes: 'How much farther south (than Raichur, Chitaldurg and Kurnool districts) the empire of the Mauryas extended, can only be conjectured; it seems not unlikely that a part of the Tondaimandalam was included in it; at any rate, a Pallava inscription of the 9th century A. D. (the Velūrpālayam Plates) mentions an Asōkavarman amongst the earliest rulers of Kāñchipuram.'³

1. 368 of 1908; EI. xviii, p. 145.

2. R. Sathianathier: *op. cit.* pp. 3-12.

3. K. A. N. Sastri: *History of South India*, p. 84.

Later on, that is about the 2nd century A. D. Tonḍaimandalam region was conquered¹ by one Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan, who, as has been pointed out before, is represented in the Sangam work, *Perumpānārruppādai* as being in possession of Kāñchi. Even the other Sangam works like the *Purananūru*, *Maṇimēkhalai*, and *Pattinap-palai* have references to him. The last mentioned work has it that Kāñchi with its surrounding district, was ruled by Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan in Karikāla's time. Many scholars accept that Karikāla and Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan were contemporaries; but there is much difference of opinion as regards the relationship between them and their respective kingdoms. A scholar, identifying Iḷam Tiraiyan of *Maṇimēkhalai*, with Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan, says that he was descended both from the Chōla and Tiraiya families. He is also of the view that Iḷam Tiraiyan was appointed ruler of Kāñchi after Karikāla's conquest of the place and that he continued to be so even after Karikāla's death.² Another writer wrote that Iḷam Tiraiyan usurped the throne of Kāñchi after Karikāla's death.³ Dr. S. K. Iyengar held that after Karikāla's conquest of Tonḍaimandalam, Kāñchi became a 'Chōla viceroyalty.' It was in charge of the Chōla princes immediately following Karikāla and subsequently of an illegitimate scion of the

1. The late tradition as embodied in the Mackenzie MSS has it that one Adonidai Chakravarti, an illegitimate scion of the Chōla family, conquered Tonḍaimandalam by waging a victorious battle against the Kurumbas. The venue of that battle, according to the same source, was Puṭal near the Red Hills, Madras. MJLS. xix, pp. 244-45.
2. P. T. S. Iyengar: *History of the Tamils*, pp. 397-399.
3. V. Kanakasabhai Pillai: *Tamils 1800 years ago*, pp. 67 ff.

Chōla family - Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan - before it passed on to the hands of the Pallavas.¹

Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri rejects the above views and says that Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan was not at all related to Karikāla. He is even sceptical about the descent of Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan from the Chōla and Tiraiya families.² Nor does he accept Karikāla's association with Tonḍaimanḍalam³. He says that Karikāla and Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan were contemporary kings of neighbouring states, independent of each other.⁴

1. Dr. S. K. Iyengar: Introduction to R. Gopalan's *Pallavas of Kañchi*, p. xxiv.
2. K. A. N. Sastri: *Studies*, pp. 55-56.
3. *Tonḍaimanḍalasatakam*, a rather late work, has it that Karikāla conquered Tonḍaimanḍalam, cleared forests, settled a number of Vellala families, constructed tanks and made irrigation work possible (verse 97). Besides, we have the Tiruvalangadu plates of Rajendra Chōla (11th century A. D.) and many other Telugu Chōla inscriptions which speak of the connection between Kāñchi region and Karikāla. Thus an inscription of Vijayagañdagopala dated A. D. 1250 gives the important information that Karikāla settled at Kāñchi seventy Vellala families (329 of 1930-40). Again, Sikkilār, a native of Kunrattūr, near Madras, has recorded in his *Periapuranam* a tradition that Karikāla settled colonists from other parts of the country into Tonḍaimanḍalam. All these evidences are not accepted by K.A.N. Sastri, for, according to him, they are very late testimony and the early Sāṅgam literature does not mention the event at all. Therefore, he says that Karikāla never conquered Tonḍaimanḍalam and much less introduced civilization into it, (*Studies*, pp. 48-50). On the contrary, Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar does see a reference to Karikāla's conquest of the territory up to the modern districts of Kurnool and Cuddapah, in the Sāṅgam literature. But Mr. Sastri rejects it on the ground that it is a wrong reading of the text. However this controversial issue might be, the tradition, as seen in the inscription of 11th and 12th centuries and in literature like the *Periapuranam*, seems to be strong and persistent.
4. K. A. N. Sastri, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-52.

If Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan was not a member of the Chōla family, to what dynasty, or family, did he belong? Opinions in favour of connecting Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan of the Sangam period, with the Pallavas of Kāñchi, are not wanting.¹ But this theory is quite untenable because in the whole of Tamil literature, we do not find a single reference to the existence of the Pallavas.² Moreover, Pallavas were alien to Tamil language and Tamil land and they were pre-eminently, at least to begin with, patrons of North Indian culture.³ On the other hand, Iḷam Tiraiyan, who ruled from Kāñchi, was a Tamil poet himself, as vouchafed to us by the *Puranānūru* and the *Narrinai*, two works of the Sangam collection.⁴ In the light of the arguments put forward by scholars like Dr. S. K. Iyengar, R. Gopalan and Dr. Minakshi, the theory which connects Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan with the Pallavas, cannot be regarded as tenable. It is more probable that he was born of a Chōla family, as the ancient commentator, Nachchinārkiniyār, has it, in his commentary on the *Perumpānirruppadai*.⁵

The memory of Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan's association with Tonḍaimāṇḍalam in general, and the Madras region in particular, seems to have been preserved by the local tradition, as embodied in the *Sthalapurāṇa* of the famous temple at Tiruvoḍḍiyūr, about five miles north of Madras. It says that when Tonḍaimān Chakravarti was

1. See I. A. Vol. iii, pp. 75-80 for Mr. Rasanayagam's views. See also 'Studies in South India Jainism' by Mr. M. S. Ramaswamy Iyengar. The latter author would say that the Tiraiyar mentioned in the Sangam works were none but the Pallavas.

2. Dr. Minakshi: *Administration and Social Life under the Pallavas*, p. 24.

3. R. Gopalan: *op. cit.*, p. 24.

4. *Ibid.*

5. Quoted by K. A. N. Sastri: *Studies*, p. 55.

engaged in a fierce struggle with the Kurumbas, he met with a series of initial reverses at their hands, so much so, he had to run away to Tiruvarriyūr. There, he met a sage, who got for him a weapon from Lord Siva, with which Tonḍaimān quelled the Kurumbas. After having successfully subdued them, he returned to Tiruvarriyūr and asked the sage what he could do in return for the help that he rendered. The sage suggested the construction of a temple to Lord Siva at Tiruvarriyūr, which the king is said to have gladly done. Legendary character of this story apart, Tonḍaimān Chakravarti that figures in it, perhaps stands for Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan, especially because of the former's connection with the conquest of the Kurumbas of Tonḍaimandalam. That the famous Tiruvarriyūr temple could itself have been founded, not as it is to-day, but in some small way, by Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan himself, is not altogether improbable. For, the enthusiastic way in which the great Saiva Nāyanmār Appar, who lived in the first half of the 7th century A. D., sung over his visit to the temple, may suggest that the temple had already attained sufficient renown and fame among the Saivite circles.¹ If that were so, could this temple have originated when Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan was ruling over Kāñchi? It may be remarked in this connection that the building of temples was not unknown during the Sangam period, for Sengannan of that age has been eulogised by Tirumāṅgai Ālvar for having built seventy temples.²

The political history of Tonḍaimandalam, from after the reign of Tonḍaimān Iḷam Tiraiyan to the advent of

1. Refer to Appar's Devaram: Tirumurai v, padikam 138, Tirumurai vi, padikam 259.
2. *Peria Tirumoli*, vi, 6, 8. Also See K. A. N. Sastri: *Cholas* (1955), pp. 51-55.

the Pallavas, is rather obscure and this will be dealt with in the second chapter in greater detail. Immediately concerned as we are in this chapter with the antiquities of the Madras region in the early periods, we have necessarily to examine an important Christian tradition, current in this place, regarding the apostolic mission of Saint Thomas to Mylapore in the first century A. D. According to tradition, Saint Thomas, after preaching in Malabar and other places, came to Mylapore to found a Church there. But the local Hindus rose against him and attacked him, so that he had to run to the nearby place, Saint Thomas Mount (Parangimalai), where he was thrust through by a spear. In 1547, the Portuguese found on the Mount the famous Bleeding Cross (a stone cross bearing old inscriptions as well as some blood-stains, said to be those of the Apostle) and built a Church on that spot. Little Mount, which is situated about three miles from Saint Thomas Mount, is also associated with the tradition. It is the place where the Apostle is said to have taken shelter from his pursuers temporarily, before he finally went to the Great Mount.

But many scholars like Dr. Burnell, W. R. Phillips, James Hough, have questioned the authenticity of this tradition. According to them, the story of Saint Thomas' visit to Mylapore, and in fact, to South India, has no historical basis, whatsoever. Thus Rev. James Hough, the historian of Christianity in India, wrote that the visit of Saint Thomas to South India is 'most improbable' and 'is unsupported by the faintest vestige of authentic history.'¹¹ The critics of the tradition maintain that it was a late invention of the local Christians to show it as a proof of their orthodox descent. On the contrary, the

11. *James Hough: History of Christianity*, vol. I p. 40

genuineness of the tradition has been accepted by writers like Bishop Medlycott,¹ Richard Collins² Dr. P. J. Thomas and a host of other scholars. Thus Dr. P. J. Thomas wrote about the apostle Thomas' martyrdom at Mylapore: 'At one time, this was regarded as a Portuguese fraud, but a later research has considerably dispelled the doubts, and to-day, it is hazardous to question it, unless one could explain away the testimony of the numerous pre-portuguese travellers who have written about Saint Thomas' tomb there (Mylapore).'³

A vast literature, not always free from personal prejudices of the writers, has grown round this subject. The essential arguments put forward by the supporters and critics of the tradition are summed up here. In tracing the history of the tradition connecting Mylapore, Saint Thomas Mount and the Little Mount with Saint Thomas, we may get light on the antiquity of Madras and its neighbourhood. For example, we would know what the ancient Christian literature and many foreign travellers who visited this part of our country, have said about it.

Perhaps the earliest work that is pointed out by the supporters of the tradition as an important proof in favour of St. Thomas' visit to South India, is the apocryphal *Acts of Thomas*, a work attributed variously from the second to the fourth century A.D.⁴ These Acts are in many versions and of all of them, the Syriac version is generally regarded as the original as well as the earliest one.⁵ According to the *Acts*, king Gudnaphar

1. Medlycott: *India and the Apostle Thomas*.

2. IA. Vol. iv.

3. IA. (1931) p. 106.

4. JRAS. 1905, p. 225.

5. IA, xxxii, pp. 3-6.

of India sent a merchant named, Habban, to the west to bring him a skilful architect to build a palace; and Habban purchased Saint Thomas from 'our Lord' for twenty pieces of silver and sailed along with him to India. In India, saint Thomas began to preach Christianity and even managed to convert king Gudnaphar and his brother, Gad. From there, he set out in a 'Chariot drawn by cattle' and reached the city of the king of Mazdai, not far away (Act 7). The ninth and the final Act records that there also St. Thomas began to preach Christianity and that he was condemned to death by the king. His martyrdom took place 'outside the city' and 'on the mountain.' The *Acts* also says that the bones of the apostle were taken away secretly by one of the brotheren to the 'West.'

The above story embodied in the *Acts* has been made the interesting theme of many ingenious theories by the supporters as well as the critics of the tradition. The former see in it an unmistakable proof for the martyrdom of the apostle in South India, at Mylapore. Thus a writer tries to show, how many of the names of places and personalities occurring in the *Acts* were South Indian. He identifies king Gudnaphar with Kūthappar, his kingnom Mhuza with Mysore, and his brother Gad with Kāthan. He also locates the kingdom of Mazdai, near the city of Madras, on the ground that Mazdai was the name for Massa-deva (fishermen king) and says that he must have been ruling in the place where the city of Madras is now situated as this place was a very famous fishing centre.¹ This interpretation, though ingenious, is extremely unconvincing. Depending as it does on the superfluous similarity of the names, it has some serious

1. *Ibid.* for a brief summary and translation of the *Acts*.

2. QJMS. Vol. xx, No. 1.

shortcomings of a fundamental nature. For example, the writer who tries to connect the name Gudnāphar of the *Acts* with Kūthappar, fails to connect the latter with the history of Mysore. Kūthappar is a Tamil name, and how, and when, did a king bearing that name become the king of Mysore, the writer never tries to show. Nor is South Indian history aware of any king, either like Kūthappar or Massadēva.

Another supporter of the tradition points out that there was, and had been, a strong tradition in Malabar about conversion of a certain king called Chōlapperumāl or Kandapparāśar, by Saint Thomas and also about the latter's martyrdom at Mylapore. This theme, he says, was taken by the Syriac writer of the *Acts* and woven into a story by using the names of Indo-Parthian king Gudnāphar.¹

Dr. Burnell, on the other hand, wrote that the *Acts* was 'a historically worthless composition' for it was written more than a hundred years after the event it relates, and added, that even if it could be regarded as evidence, would only connect Saint Thomas with the extreme north-west of India.² Some scholars, like Alexander Cunningham, held that Gudnāphar was a north Indian king, because some coins bearing a similar name have been discovered in the Punjab and that the king Mazdai, was also a North Indian king and that the Saint did not visit South India.³

Dr. Burkitt holds an altogether different opinion. He says that Mazdai was the name of the well-known

1. Dr. P. J. Thomas in his introduction to Father Hosten's '*Antiquities from San Thome and Mylapore*' p. xi.

2. IA. vol. iv, p. 182.

3. Archaeological Survey of India, 1863-64, p. 59. E. J. Rapson in the Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, also identifies Gudnaphar with the North Indian king, Gondophernes (p. 579).

satrap of Babylonia and adds that many names in the *Acts* are old Persian names and not Indian.¹ Many other writers have also pointed out that 'India' that is mentioned in the *Acts* need not necessarily be taken to refer to India of modern times, for the ancient writers used the term 'India' to mean the whole south eastern part of Asia, as well as a portion of Afghanistan.² But this is denied by the supporters of the tradition, who see in the mention of the name 'India' in the *Acts* an unmistakable proof to show that the country visited by Saint Thomas was 'first and foremost South India' for, even the Greco-Roman geographers like Pliny, Ptolemy and the author of the *Periplus*, knew and wrote about India, especially South India, with minuteness of topography.³

Another way by which Mylapore is sought to be associated with the life of St. Thomas, is by identifying the former with the place called 'Calamina' that figures in ancient patristic literature as the scene of the apostle's martyrdom. Thus Yule writes: 'There is a fair presumption that the spot (Calamina) alluded to by Gregory of Tours was Mailapur, and that the shrine visited by King Alfred's envoy, Signelm, may have been the same.'⁴ The way in which the identification is sought to be explained is as follows: The Malabar Christians, when asked about the place where the apostle died, would say: Mayilāpūr Callinmēl (on the stone at Mylapore) and 'Callinmēl' turned out to be Calamina' in the ancient

1. IA. xxxii, p. 6.

2. JRAS. 1905, p. 224.

3. Dr. P. J. Thomas: *op. cit.*

4. Yule: *Marco Polo*, vol. ii, p. 353 (edn. 1903)

Christian writings.¹ Another writer suggests Chinnamalai (Little Mount) near Mylapore might have been called by the ancient writers as Calamina.² Father Stephen also identified Calamina with Little Mount on the ground that the word Calamina is derived from the Syriac word 'Gadmaona' which means rocky hillock.³

But many writers do not accept the above-mentioned identifications. Alexander Cunningham⁴ was inclined to identify Calamina with Min-nagar of the *Periplus*, which he thought might have been called Kala-Mina to distinguish it from the older Min in Sakastene. He also added that Calamina might also refer to Kila Mina or the 'Fort of Min'. Bishop Medlycott identified it with a port in the Malaya Peninsula.⁵ Yet another writer placed Calamina in Kalwan near Taxila.^{5a} Besides these, numerous other suggestions have been put forward, all so speculative and vague, that Dr. Vincent Smith rightly remarked 'Calamina should be regarded as a fairyland, which it is vain to try to locate on a map.'⁶

Let us now turn to the accounts left by a number of foreign travellers who came to Mylapore from the beginning of the 13th century and who have spoken about Mylapore's connection with St. Thomas.

First of them was Mar Solomon of Basrah who visited India in 1222 A. D. He has referred to the incident of St. Thomas being stabbed by a spear and said

1. JIH. Vol. 28, p. 201.

2. IA. Vol. 53, p. 95.

3. Hosten: *op. cit.* p. 308.

4. Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report, 1863-64, p. 60.

5. Medlycott: *op. cit.* p. 156.

5a. T. K. Joseph *Six Thomases of South India* (1955) pp. 37-38.

6. V. A. Smith: *Early History of India* (1904) p. 205.

that the saint's body was 'laid in Edessa' while 'others say that he was buried in Mahilup (Mylapore).'¹

The great Venetian traveller, Marco Polo, who visited India in the same century, came to Mylapore. Though Marco Polo does not mention Mylapore, he has this description of a 'little town': 'The body of Messer Saint Thomas the Apostle lies in this town having no great population. It is a place where few traders go, and where there is vere little merchandise to be got there and it is a place not very accessible. Both Christians and Saracens frequent it on pilgrimage. For the Saracens also do hold the Saint in great reverence, and say that he was one of their own Saracens a great prophet.....'² He also refers to a Christian tradition current in his time, namely, that the Apostle was accidentally killed by the arrow of a fowler, who aimed it at one of the peacocks, for which the place was noted.

The next traveller to mention Mylapore in connection with St. Thomas' martyrdom, was John De Marignolli who visited the place in the middle of the 14th century. He mentions Mylapore as 'Mirapolis' and refers to the peacock feature of Mylapore particularly in reference to the legend. If Mylapore was mentioned by Marignolli as Mirapolis, the Catalan Map which was executed about 1375 A. D. has it marked as 'Mirapōr.'³ Friar Odoric in the same century has noted the existence of the grave of St. Thomas, and a few Christians at Mylapore.⁴ Nicolo

1. Quoted from Mar Solomon's 'Book of the Bee' by Rev. Medlycott, *op. cit.* p. 38. Mr. T. K. Joseph says that Mar Solomon's remark is not decisive as the mss differ in their texts. (JIH., 1948, p. 314)

2. Yule: *op. cit.* p. 353.

3. Yule: *op. cit.*,

4. Yule: *Cathay and the Way Tither*, vol. ii, pp. 141-142.

Conti, who was in India in the first half of the 15th century, speaks of Malepūr (Mylapore) as having a 'large and beautiful Church where the body of Saint Thomas lies honourably buried.' Joseph of Cranganore and Durate Barbosa, who were here in the 16th century, also speak about the legend. Thus wrote Barbosa: 'Here lies buried the body of the Blessed Saint Thomas departed thence being persecuted by the Heathen, he came with a certain of his fellow to the city of 'Mailapore' which in those days was a city of twelve leagues in length and far removed from the sea which afterwards ate away the land and advanced well into the city...' ² Gasper Correa came from Portugal in 1521 as a member of the committee of investigation into the story of Saint Thomas' burial at Mylapore. He wrote his famous '*Lendas da India*' wherein he mentions that the two Portuguese sent by their king came to Mylapore and found there an ancient Church, having crosses and peacocks for decoration. Gasper Correa himself made some excavations on the spot, and is said to have discovered some of the remains of a supposed king, who was probably converted by the Apostle. It was the Portuguese who gave the name San Thomé to Mylapore, where was situated the tomb of Saint Thomas.³

In 1547 A. D., the Portuguese turned their attention to St. Thomas Mount, and began to undertake vast repairs to a hermitage which existed there. In the course of the work, the workmen discovered a stone slab which had a cross and some inscriptions, carved upon it. It was

1. *India in the XV century* published by the Haklyut Society.
2. IA. vol. 52, p. 106 Quoted from Barbosa's *A description of the Coast of East Africa and Malabar*.
3. Love: *Vestiges of Old Madras (1640-1800)*, vol. I, pp. 287-88.

thought by many at that time that it was the cross which was embraced by St. Thomas when he was dying. This cross was then lodged on an altar of the Church, which was afterwards erected on the Great Mount in St. Thomas Mount. The inscriptions on the slab have attracted the attention of many palaeographists, who do not, however, see eye to eye, as regards the actual translation of the inscriptions and their approximate date, as can be known from the characters of the script.¹ Thus the zealous supporters of the tradition try to give an early date to the inscription, and hold that it was written by orthodox Christians, that is, Saint Thomas Christians.² On the other hand, we have Dr. Burnell, a strong critic of the tradition and a well-known palaeographist, who shows the inscription to be in Pahalvi characters, belonging to the 7th or 8th century A. D. and says that the Catholic Missionaries, who took the crosses and the inscriptions to be the relics of the mission of Saint Thomas were wrong, for they belonged to 'the period long subsequent to the Apostle Thomas.' He also says that it was not the work of Saint Thomas Christians or Nestorians but that of Persians who were Manichaens.³

The great art-critic Fergusson, judging from the architectural character of the slab with the crosses and the inscription, placed it in the 9th century A. D.⁴

1. El. vol. iv, pp. 174-76 where Mr. E. W. West edits the inscription. His reading of the inscription is as follows: '(He) whom the suffering of the selfsame Messiah, the forgiving and upraising, (has) saved, (is) offering the plea whose origin (was) the agony of this.' Compare it with Dr. Burnell's reading, IA. vol. iii, pp., 308 ff.
2. Richard Collins in IA. vol. iv., p. 153 ff.
3. Dr. Burnell in IA. iv, pp. 312-314.
4. Yule: *Marco Polo* vol. ii, p. 359.

Thus it can be seen from the foregoing discussion about the celebrated legend that many points with regard to the visit of Saint Thomas to South India are disputed and challenged. Not only that, there is large scope for speculation and 'flights of imagination' as seen, for example, with regard to the question of identification of Calamina. The result of it is that almost every writer has his own theory with regard to the places that the Apostle visited, the actual place of his martyrdom, the place where his mortal remains were kept etc. It is well nigh difficult to give all such speculations and guesses much reliability. Nor is it necessary. Having gone through most of these materials, one finds it rather difficult to come to any definite conclusion. That the tradition is very old, and that it had had a long and continuous currency in this place, at least from the 13th century A. D., can be seen from the accounts of the foreign travellers already given. But whether this tradition had stemmed from any real historical fact or not, is the crux of the question and it is that on which many writers have cast their doubts. It should, however, be observed that the visit of St. Thomas to South India, though lacking definite proof, need not be dismissed as being improbable if one takes into consideration the fact that there was free intercourse even in the beginning of the Christian era between South India and the western countries like Greece and Rome.¹

Whether St. Thomas the Apostle visited Mylapore or not in the first century A. D., Ptolemy, the famous Greco-Roman geographer of second century A. D. has

1. K. M. Panikkar: *A Survey of Indian History*, p. 7. Mr. Panikkar says that because of the Arikamedu excavations the probability of the tradition being true has greatly increased.

mentioned Mylapore as 'Mylärphan.'¹ Earlier in the previous century came the author of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* to the Coramandel coast and he has mentioned Poduke, Kamara and Sopātamā as ports to which merchants from north would resort. Poduke and Kamara have been identified with Pondicherry and Kāverippattiṇam respectively. But as regards the identification of 'Sopātamā' there was some difficulty. K. H. Schoff, the editor of the *Periplus*, wrote of Sopātamā that 'it is probably Su-patana, fair town, and may be identified with the modern Madras.' Mr. Schoff was obviously influenced by the familiar modern Tamil name for Madras, namely Paṭṭinam or Chennai Paṭṭinam, when he identified it with Sopatama of the *Periplus*. But it is not acceptable, for 'Sopātamā' has been satisfactorily identified with Sopattiṇam of the early Tamil literature which is now called Markānam.²

In tracing the antiquity of the Madras region subsequent to the second century A. D., we have to depend upon the work of the early Vaishnavite Ālvārs called the Mudalālvārs, who have been ascribed to the fifth and sixth centuries A. D.³ Thus, Būdattālvār, in his second

1. *Madras Tercentenary Commemoration Volume*, p. 41.

2. K. A. N. Sastri: *Chōlas* (1955) p. 22.

3. M. Raghava Iyengar: *Ālvārgal Kālanilai*, p. 42. Dr. S. K. Iyengar ascribed the Mudalālvārs to the 2nd and 3rd centuries A. D. and regarded them as contemporaries of Tondaimān Ilam Tiraiyan. (*Early History of Vaishnavism*, pp. 72-75). Mr. R. Gopalan agrees with the latter view, *op. cit.* p. 160. But other scholars like M. Srinivasa Iyengar (*Tamil Studies*, p. 302) and T.A. Gopinatha Rao (*History of Sri Vishnavas*, pp. 16-17) are inclined to give to the Mudalālvārs a much later date-later half of the 7th century A. D. Mr. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri maintains that the Mudalālvārs belong to not later than 5th or 6th century A. D. (*A History of South India*, p. 408).

Tiruvandādi,¹ has sung a verse in praise of the god at Tirunirmalai, a place about two miles from the modern Chrompet station near Madras. In that verse the Ālvār mentions Tirunirmalai along with Vēngadam, Tirukkōṭṭiyūr and Tirumāliruns'olai - all greatly renowned places for the Vaishnavites. Pey Ālvār, a contemporary of Būdattālvār, has picturesquely described Triplicane and its temple in a beautiful verse beginning with the words 'Vandaitta Ven̄thiraigal' (III Tiruvandādi, verse 16). He says poetically that the white pearls and the red corals, that are transmitted and deposited on the seashore by the waves, act as bright lights, and illumine the whole of Triplicane in the evenings. The Ālvār obviously had in his mind the nearness of Triplicane to the sea when he sang the verse. 'Tiruvallikēṇi', used by the Ālvār seems to have been derived from Tiru Allikēṇi, which meant a sacred lily tank. The *Sthalapurāṇa* of the temple informs us that the place was also known as Kairavini, the exact Sanskrit equivalent of Tiru Allikēṇi. A Sanskrit work of the 17th century *Visvagunadarsa*, by one Venkatadhvāri, also calls Triplicane as Kairavini.² That tank, evidently the one situated opposite to Sri Pārtha-sarathiswāmi temple, seems to have been held in great reverence in olden days as it is done even to-day. The *Guruparamparai*, a work dealing with lives of the Vaishnavite Ālvārs and the Āchāryas, tells us how the father of the great Vaishnava Āchārya Sri Rāmānuja was not endowed with a child for a long time, and how Tirukkachchinambi advised him to have a bath in the holy tank at Tiruvallekēṇi and a 'darsan' of the Lord of that place, so that he might be blessed with a child.

1. அணி திகழும் சோலை அணிந்த மலையே (verse 46).

2. MTCV. p. 107.

He is said to have acted accordingly, as a result of which was born to him a child, who later on grew to be none other than Sri Rāmānuja. The foregoing incident serves to show the great reverence in which the tank was held by the people at the time when the *Guruparamparai* was written and also in the 11th century when Rāmānuja was born. And the fact that this town has been called after its tank may suggest that the temple and its adjunct, the tank, perhaps formed the nucleus round which the town of Triplicane sprang up.

Another Ālvār called, Tirumajisai Ālvār, who, according to the *Guruparamparai*, was a contemporary and a disciple of Pēy Ālvār, has mentioned both Mayilai (Mylapore) and Tiruvallekēṇi (Triplicane) in his *Nān-mugan Tiruvandādi*.¹ He clubs both the names in the epithet 'Māmayilai Māvallekkēṇiān' (மாமயிலை மாவல்லீக் கெணியான்) in speaking about Triplicane. Tirumangai Ālvār, who lived in the 8th century, also clubs these two names in his epithet 'Māmayilai Tiruvallekēṇi'.² (மாமயிலை திருவல்லீக்கெணி) This tendency of bringing in the name of Mayilai, when singing about Tiruvallekēṇi, was perhaps due to the fact that the latter was some sort of a suburb of the former, which must have been a well-known town at that time. Another reason for clubbing the names of Myilai with Tiruvallekēṇi might well be due to the prominence attained in the Vaishnavite circles by the former as the birth-place of the great Pēy Alvar. It is significant to note that Pēy Ālvār himself does not club the name Mayilai with Tiruvallekēṇi. Hence, it might well be that Tirumangai Ālvār who came later, not to speak of Tirumajisai, who

1. Verse No. 35 'வந்தலைக்கும் மாமயிலை மாவல்லீக்கெணியான்'.

2. *Peria Tirumozi* II, Ten, III *Tirumozi*.

was a disciple of Pēy Ājvar, naturally brought in the name of Mayilai when singing about Tiruvallekkēṇi out of their great reverence to the Mudalājvār.

Be that as it may, we have to study Tirumangai Ājvār's separate 'pāṣurams' on Triplicane and Tirunirmalai more closely, for they contain descriptions of the places, the temples, the various shrines inside them and also about the people residing in those places. His famous pāṣurams on Triplicane contain ten beautiful verses, nine of which end as 'Tiruvallekkēṇi kandēṇe' (I have seen Triplicane.) One important feature of Tirumangai Ājvār's verses is that he has mentioned in it all the deities that were in Sri Pārthasārathi temple of Triplicane in his time (8th century A. D.). Thus, he devotes five of his verses in praise of the main deity, Sri Pārthasārathiswami. His second verse is in praise of Sri Ranganātha, for whom there is a separate shrine in the temple. His seventh verse is in praise of Sri Rāma, for whom also there is a separate shrine. His eighth verse is devoted to Tejjias'ingar (Lord Nara-simha), for whom there is a shrine on the western side of the temple. His ninth verse is in praise of Sri Varadarājāswāmi, to whom there is a shrine on the southern side of the main shrine. Thus, it is in Tirumangai's verses that we get for the first time a comprehensive account of almost all the deities inside the Triplicane temple.

Besides this, we also get some useful information of a general character about the place and its inhabitants. In his second verse, he describes Mayilai-Tiruvallekkēṇi as a place possessing storied buildings and inhabited by women of exemplary character.¹ By far the most important piece of information is to be seen in

1. தூப்பவரில்லா மரதர்கள் வாழும் மர்த்தமாமலை.

his last verse, which eulogises one 'Thennan Ton̄daiyarkon̄' for having built high buildings, rampart walls, gardens, pavilions etc., at Triplicane. Who was this Ton̄daiyar king? 'Ton̄daiyar' is a Tamil word used to denote the Pallavas, during whose period Tirumangai Ālvār lived. This Pallava king, who did such great service to the Triplicane temple, must have been either Nandivarman Pallavamalla (731 - 795 A. D.) or his son, Dantivarman, of both of whom the Ālvār was a contemporary.¹ Both of them were devout Vishnu bhaktas. In the Garbhagriha of the Triplicane temple itself, there is an inscription dated 12th year of Dantivarman's reign.² These things taken together go to show that the antiquity of Triplicane and its temple goes at least as far back as the 8th century A.D. But it should not be thought that the temple itself came into being for the first time during Tirumangai Ālvār's time, for it could not have been the case, as P̄c̄y Ālvār and Tirumilisai Ālvār, who certainly preceded Tirumangai Ālvār and Nandivarman, had already sung about the temple at Triplicane. Tirumangai Ālvār's verses need only be taken as a reference to the laying out of the town and the numerous additional embellishments and extensions that were the work of either Nandivarman or Dantivarman, and not as a reference to the actual founding of the temple. The original shrine must have been there already and the Pallava king must have only re-constructed it so elaborately that it elicited the praise of the Ālvār.

The same Ālvār also has ten separate verses on the Lord of Tirunirmalai. All the verses, except the last

1. M. Raghava Iyengar: *op. cit.* pp. 111-112.

2. EI. vol. viii, p. 291.

one, end with 'Māmalaiyāvadu Nirmalayē.'¹ மாமலையா
வது ஸ்ரீமதீஸ்வர. After expatiating on the greatness of
Vishnu in general, he mentions the name of the deity as
Nirār Perān.² An inscription in the temple on the hill,
dated 4th year of Kulōttunga Chōla III, also mentions
Lord Nirvāṇan.³ Another inscription of the third year
of the same king mentions the shrine of S'ingap-
perumāl.⁴ Tirumangai Ālvār also refers to the existence
of a big grove in Tirunirmalai,⁵ a fact also alluded to by
Būdattālvār. Of the two temples at Tirunirmalai,
the beautiful little one (of Sri Ranganātha) that is situated
on the hill and that is conspicuously visible from the
Chrompet Railway station, is the older one and it is that
which has been sung by the Ālvārs. The other temple
down the hill is of later construction.⁶

Coming to the evidences furnished by the Saivite
Nāyanāmārs regarding places near Madras, we find that the
famous Tēvāram trio, Appar, Sambandar and Sundarar,
who lived in the 7th and 8th centuries A. D., visited and
sang about Mylapore, Tiruvānmiyūr (three miles south of
Mylapore) and Tiruvottiyūr (five miles north of the
Madras city). Appar, the eldest of the three and a
contemporary of Mahēndravarman I (600-630 A. D.),

1. *Peria Tirumozhi*, II. 4 Besides this he also refers to Tirunirmalai in
Peria Tirumozhi, VI 8, verse 4, VII. 1, verse 7. VIII. 2, verse 3,
X. 1, verse 3, *Tirunāṇundandakam*, verse 18, *Siria Tirumādal*,
verse 73, *Peria Tirumādal*, verse 130.

2. *Ibid.* verse 6.

3. 542 of 1912.

4. 560 of 1912.

5. வரசமாகி வண்ட்டரை வைப்புறவில்...மரமகூராவது ஸ்ரீமதீஸ்வர

(verse 9).

6. ARE. 1911-1913, p. 112; also see chapter V below.

in his 'padikam' on Tiruvanmiyūr, has mentioned the deity there as 'Vāṭṭam Tirthidum Vānmiyūr Īś'anc' (வாட்டம் திர்த்தும் வான்மியூர் ஈசுங்க) and his consort as 'S'okkanāyaki'. Sambandar, a younger contemporary of Appar, has recorded the fact that Tiruvānmiyūr is situated near the sea. He also mentions the existence of big mansions. He has a special word of praise for the spotless character of the womenfolk of the place. He also refers in admiring terms to the Brahmins of the place who recite the Vēdās.¹ The *Sthalapurāṇa* of the temple at Tiruvānmiyūr claims a very great antiquity for the place, and says that the name, Vānmiyūr, was given to it, because the great sage, Vālmīki, is said to have worshipped the Lord of that place. Whatever might be the truth in this claim, it cannot be gainsaid that the antiquity of Tiruvānmiyūr goes back at least to the 7th century A. D., as it has been sung by Appar. Unfortunately, the temple does not contain any Pallava inscriptions, though the temple did exist during the Pallava days. The earliest inscriptions in the temple belong to Rājēndrachōla I (1011-1043 A. D.).² Most probably this temple underwent many changes during the Chōla days. One of the inscriptions, dated 14th year of the above-mentioned king, informs us that Thiruvānmiyūr was a dēvadāna land in Kōṭṭūrnādu, a subdivision of Puliyūr Kōṭṭam (to which Mylapore also belonged).³

All the three Nāyanmārs aforementioned came to Mylapore and sang about this place, according to the *Periapurāṇam*. It must have been a wealthy town of first grade importance during the period of the Ālvārs

1. Sambandar's II *Tirumurai*, *Padikam*, 140.

2. 77, 81, and 83 of 1909.

3. 77 of 1909 and EI, vol. viii, p. 291, n 7.

and the Nāyanmārs, for everyone who saw it has spoken in glowing terms about the mansions, the beautiful streets and the general prosperity of the town.¹ Sambandar calls it has 'Maṭṭamayilai', beautiful Mylapore, in his famous Pūmpāvai Padikam, sung in the Kapāli-varar temple, Mylapore. Besides this, he mentions a number of festivals that were held in the temple on various occasions. In verse 6, for example, he tells us how the people of Mylapore, during the Māsi Magam festival, would go in large numbers to the sea to have a bath, a custom that is popular in Mylapore even today. The word, Mayilai, seems to have been the familiar name in those days for Mylapore. Thus Sambandar used the word; Tirumajisai and Tirumangai Ālvars used the word; *Nandikkalambakam*,² a work composed during the period of Nandivarman III in ninth century A. D., also calls Mylapore as Mayilai. So did the Kalingattuparani,³ a work of the 12th century, and Aruṇagirinādār in the 15th century. Sekkijār in his *Periyapurāṇam* calls it also as Tirumayilāpuri. But Appar refers to Mylapore as 'Mayilāppil'.⁴ Some of the inscriptions also refer to it as 'Mayilāppil' and as 'Mayilārpu.' Thus an inscription belonging to Kampavarman, one of the last of the Pallava

1. Appar's Koilpukka - Tiruttandakam I, 1 and Sambandar's Pūmpāvai Padikam, verse 8.
2. Verses 44 and 51.
3. வண்டை வளம்பதி பாடக்கே
மல்லையும் கச்சியும் பாடக்கே
பண்டை மயிலையும் பாடக்கே
பல்லவர் கோன்றலை பாடக்கே
(Kalingattuparani, verse 534, edited by P. Palanivel Pillai—
The South India Saiva Siddhanta Publication, 1954).
4. Tiru-viraiṭanam, Kupputtiruttandakam, 12; also see Appar,
6-2-1.

kings of the 9th century, mentions it as Mylärpu.¹ Some other inscriptions belonging to 12th century mention it as Mayilärppil.² Mayilärpu means 'the majestic strut of a peacock.' Mylapore came to be associated with peacocks. It was already remarked that both Marco Polo and John De Marignolli have referred to the peacock feature of Mylapore, in connection with the St. Thomas' visit. Significantly enough, the goddess of the Vishnu temple (Kēs'avapperumāl Temple) at Mylapore is called Mayūrvalli, Mayūra being the Sanskrit equivalent of peacock. In the Kapālis'varar temple also, the goddess Karpagāmbāl is represented as having peacock features, for, according to the tradition, Pārvati put on a peacock's appearance to worship the Lord there. This custom of associating certain places with peacocks was quite common in South India, and we have many places like Mayilam and Mayilādudurai to show the widespread prevalence of the same.³

Speaking about Mylapore, certain important facts about the Kapālis'warar temple have to be recorded. We have already shown how this temple was visited and sung by the Tēvāram hymners. The common opinion that prevails among the people is that the present-day Kapālis'warar temple at Mylapore is the same old one that was described by the Nāyanmārs. But archaeological and epigraphical findings made at San Thomé, Mylapore, seem to raise a doubt that the old temple of the Tēvāram days was situated in an altogether different place, perhaps near the San Thomé Beach. It is held that the present temple came into existence just about three hundred

1. 182 of 1912.

2. 333 of 1911, 355 of 1911, 161 of 1910 and 256 of 1912.

3. R. P. Setu Pillai: *Urum Pērum* pp. 26, 30, 300.

years ago.¹ The reasons for saying that the present-day Kapalis'varar temple might have been of a more recent growth are as follows: The 'Structures' in the present temple, including the Kalyāṇa maṇḍapa, judged from the corbels (pillar-brackets), seem to belong to the late Vijayanagar period, say about 16th or 17th century.² Another strange feature of this temple, which may be said to go against identifying it with the old one, sung by the Tevaram hymners, is the complete absence of any old inscription. Nearby temples like those at Tiruvoggiūr, Tirumallaivāyil, Triplicane and Tiruvānmiyūr, all of which were also, more or less, as old as the Kapālis'varar temple of the Tēvāram fame (for, they have also been sung by either the Nāyanmārs or the Mudalālvārs), do contain inscriptions going back, at least, to the days of Rājendra I (11th century), if not earlier. And the complete non-existence of any such old inscription in the present Kapālis'varar temple alone, strikes one as a strange fact, which can be explained only in one of two ways: either the old temple must have been completely remodelled into the present one, so that its old vestiges, like the inscribed walls might have disappeared, or the present temple must have been built anew in a different place, perhaps owing to some extraordinary contingencies which necessitated the abandonment of the older temple. Of the two explanations, the latter one seems to be more probable (as can be presently shown), for remnants, apparently of the old Kapālis'varar temple have been found by the Archaeological Department, farther east of the present temple, that is near the San Thomé Beach.

1. See the small note on Mylapore by Mr. C. M. Ramachandran Chettiar on pp. 1385-6 of *Tiruttondar Puranam*, Vol. V (Kova Tamil Sangam publication, No. 12, 1950).

2. Rev. Figredo: *Voices from the Dust.*

Thus in 1923, the Archaeological Department of India undertook a survey of San Thomé and made some excavations near the San Thomé Cathedral.¹ In the course of their excavations, they found a slab with fragmentary Tamil inscriptions on it, near the north-western end of the verandah of the Cathedral. The inscription registers a tax-free gift of land for burning a lamp for the idol of Kūttāduvar (Lord Natarāja).² The Government Epigraphist assigned this inscription to 12th century A. D. Another slab, bearing inscriptions, was found by Father Hosten in 1921 near about San Thomé Cathedral. It is a fragmentary Sanskrit inscription, the translation of which runs as follows: 'All the structures including the central shrine to the glorious S'iva and Parvati at Mayilāpūr...'. This inscription has also been placed in the 12th century A. D.³

The Epigraphical Report for 1923 gives some more inscriptions found at San Thomé: A slab found lying in front of the verandah of the Bishop's House, San Thomé, contains a fragmentary Tamil inscription which makes clear mention of the goddess, Tiruppūmpāvai at Tirumayilāppūr.⁴ Yet another slab containing a fragmentary Tamil inscription, is said to be kept in a private house. It records some gifts to god Tiru Ilampirai Udaiyar.⁵

Apart from these, some slender pillars with Hindu carvings on them, are also reported to have been discovered in the vicinity of San Thomé and the same are kept in the Bishop's museum.⁶ A broken idol of Subrah-

1. Archaeological Survey of India; 1922-23; pp. 120-121.

2. 217 of 1923.

3. D. O. 536, June 1923; D. O. 203/I - 550, July 1923; Hosten *op. cit.*, pp. 54-55.

4. 218 of 1923. 5. 221 of 1923. 6. Hosten: *op. cit.*, p. 96.

manyā, leaning on his 'vāhana', peacock, has also been found near San Thomé Cathedral and it is now kept in the same Museum.¹

The stones, carrying Tamil and Sanskrit inscriptions, clearly show that they must have formed part of a Saivite temple, as they mention gifts made to Natarāja and S'iva respectively in the usual manner in which any gift is made to an old South Indian temple. And because the Sanskrit inscription proclaims a gift to 'S'iva and Pārvati at Mayilāpūr...' it can be easily inferred that it refers to a temple at Mylapore. The inscription which mentions the gift to Tiruppūmpāvai is of special significance because, according to the *Periapurāṇam*, Pūmpāvai was a great devotee of S'iva who lived in Mylapore and who, after having been bitten to death by a snake, was revived to life by Tirugnānasambandar's spirited appeal to the Lord at the Kapālis'varar temple.² This inscription must have also been a remnant of the old Kapālis'varar temple in which, evidently, there was a shrine for Tiruppūmpāvai. Thus, there are many presumptive evidences to show that these inscriptions belonged to an old and now-defunct S'iva temple, which perhaps flourished somewhere near the foreshore. The late Mr. C. S. Srinivasachari thought that the old Kapālis'varar temple was situated close to the sea and that it must have been abandoned as a result of encroachment by the sea.³ It must be noted here, that there is a strong tradition in Mylapore, as regards the

1. Rev. Figriodo: *op. cit.*, wherein a good description of certain relics that are kept in the Bishop's museum, San Thomé, is given.
2. Sambandar II Tirumurai, Padikam No. 183.
3. C. S. Srinivasachari: *op. cit.*, p. xix. Mr. C. M. Ramachadran Chettiar (*op. cit.*) thinks that the old Kapalis'varar temple might have been destroyed by the Portuguese who settled down at San Thomé in the 16th century.

encroachment of the sea, that took place long ago. And this finds echo even in a Jain tradition of this place, as preserved in an old manuscript, which says that a Jain temple situated near the seashore at Mylapore, had also to be abandoned owing to the encroachment of the sea.¹ More about this Jain temple will be said in the fourth chapter. Suffice it to say here that the encroachment of sea at Mylapore finds corroboration in a Jain tradition also.

It is not clear when the old temple was abandoned and the present one built. But from the way in which Arunagirināthar, the author of the immortal *Tiruppugal*, refers to the Kapālisavarar temple, as situated near the sea shore,² we may infer that probably till Aruṇagirināthar's time i.e. 15th century,³ the old temple stood near the sea shore.

Having reviewd the ancient charecteristics of Mylapore, we have next to turn our attention to another famous Saivite centre, Tiruvoṇiyūr, that is situated about five miles north of Madras, on the sea coast. This place has been sung by all the three Tēvāram hymners, Appar, Sambandar and Sundarar. According to the *Periapurānam*, the marriage of the last-mentioned Nāyanār took place at Tiruvoṇiyūr. Known also as Oṇiyūr,⁴ it has been described in the Tēvāram as being surrounded by sea.⁵ Oṇiyūr, in Tamil, literally means 'mortgage-village,' and a number of old inscriptions⁶ as well as Aruṇagirināthar

1. Taylor's Catalogus Raisonne of Oriental MSS. Vol. III, p. 372.
2. கடங்கரை திரையருக்கே குழ் மயிலை பதிதனீல உழறவேசனே.
3. *Kalaikkalanjiyam*, Vol. I (1954), pp. 197-8.
4. Appar, IV *Tirumurai*, Padikam No. 138; vi, Padikam 259.
5. 'பைம்பொழில் குழ்திரு வெற்றியுர் and திரையினர் புடைகுழ் திருவெற்றியுர்' - Appar IV *Tirumurai* Padikam No. 89.
6. e.g. 112, 170 and 236 of 1912.

refer to the place as Ādipura or Ādigrāma - the exact Sanskrit equivalent of Om̄iyūr.¹ An inscription of Aparājita (879-897 A. D.) calls the place as Om̄imēdūr.² The God of the place was known as Tiruvōm̄iyūrudaiyar and Ādipuris'varar.³ One of the oldest and also greatest temples of South India, from the point of view of the magnificent part it played in fostering the Saivite religion, the Tiruvōm̄iyūr temple is very rich with inscriptions, which throw a flood of light on matters like the construction of some of the shrines and *mandapas*, the existence of a number of *mathas* (monasteries) in the premises of the temple for the propagation of Saivism and for patronising the learned, the visit to the temple of great kings like Rājarājadeva III and many devotees from Northern India, the conducting of a number of festivals from time to time, the provisions for the recital of the Vēdas and the Tēvāram during special occasions, and also on other social, economic and political conditions of those times. The pages of the history of Tiruvōm̄iyūr glitter with many a well-known personality in the sphere of religion as well as of literature, who at one time or another, visited the place and sang about it. Thus came the great Advaita philosopher Sankara in the 9th century, the illustrious poet-ascetic Paṭṭinathu Aḍigal in the 10th, the renowned Tamil poet, Kamban⁴ in the 12th and the

1. EI. v. p. 106, n. 5. 2. 180 of 1912.

3. 369 of 1911 and 107 of 1912.

4. A late Tamil work called the *Tamil Nāvalar Charitai* quotes a number of verses attributed to Kamban which describe Kamban's visit to Mylapore and Tiruvōm̄iyūr. The verses inform us that Kamban married one Valli at Tiruvōm̄iyūr and lived there for some time. See *Tamil Nāvalar Charitai* (verses 93-99) edited by O. S. Duraiswamy Pillay, The South India Saiva Siddhanta Works publication.

author of *Tiruppugal* Arupagirināthar in the 15th, centuries. More about the visit of these well-known personages, as well as about their references to this place, will be said in subsequent chapters. But what we need mention here is that Tiruvorriyūr, having an antiquity which goes at least as far back as to the 7th century A. D., has been one of the most important Sāivite centres of South India.

Two other places in the vicinity of Madras the antiquities of which go back to the days of the Tēvāram hymners, are Tirumullaivāyil and Tiruvallidāyam or Pādi. Both the places are situated about ten miles northwest of Madras city. Sundarar, the youngest of the Tēvāram hymners, has devoted a whole *padikam* of eleven verses on Tirumullaivāyil.¹ Each verse of this *padikam* except the last, ends with 'Pās'upataparañjudarē.' He describes the place as being surrounded by beautiful groves,² fertile paddy-growing fields³ and magnificent mansions.⁴ According to tradition as bequeathed to us by the *Periapurānam*, Sundarar, after he lost his eyesight at Tiruvorriyūr, came to Tirumullaivāyil and prayed to God there. He himself refers to the incident of God blinding his eyes for the sake of Sangali in the above-mentioned *padikam*.⁵ Besides this, the Māśilāmanis'varar temple at Tirumullaivāyil contains many old inscriptions, the earliest of which go to the 10th century A. D. and belong to Pārthivēndravarman⁶ and Uttamachōla.⁷ Tiru-

1. Sundarar, Tirumurai 7, Padikam, 69.

2. செம்பக்கோலை குழ் திருமுல்கூவாயல் (verse 3)

3. செங்கோவங்கழனி குழ் திருமுல்கூவாயல் (verse 4)

4. செம்பெருச் சுற்றிகை குழ் திருமுல்கூவாயல் (verse 5)

5. See below for the fuller account of the incident.

6. 676 and 683 of 1904.

7. 669 of 1904.

mullaivāyil is described in an inscription as having been situated in Kanappērūr Nādu in Pūjar Kōṭṭam in Jayangonḍasōḍamaṇḍalam.¹

Pāḍi, or Tiruvallaidāyam, as it was known in the Tēvāram days, was the place which Tirugnānasambandar visited and worshipped before he entered Tiruvon̄iyūr. The local Tiruvallisvara temple contains many Chōḍa, Telugu-Chōḍa and Vijayanagar inscriptions. The earliest of them, as those at Tirumullaivāyil, belong to Pārthivēndravarman of the 10th century A. D.² A Chōḍa inscription informs us that Pāḍi, or Tiruvallidāyam, was situated in Ambattūr-nādu in Pūjar-kōṭṭam alias Vikramasōḍavajanādu, a sub-division of Jayangonḍasōḍamaṇḍalam.³ Another epigraph from the same place belonging to the Telugu-Chōḍa king, Vijayaganḍagopāla, gives us the interesting information that a dancing girl from Tiruvegambam-Uḍaiya Nāyanār temple at Kāñchi, consecrated the image of the goddess, Tiruvidināchiyār in the temple at Tiruvallaidāyam, and presented a number of jewels and vessels.⁴ The building of a Pillaiyār shrine in the same temple by a private person in the Chōḍa days is also reported by another inscription.⁵

Another place near Madras which has a hoary antiquity is Pallāvaram. It is situated between Egmore and Tambaram, about 12 miles from the former. There is, in Pallāvaram, a rock-cut monolithic cave, excavated by the Pallava king, Mahēndravarman I. (600-603 A.D.) Now used by the Muslims as a mosque, it contains inscriptions which are somewhat analogous to those found in other Pallava caves, such as those of Trichinopoly, Vallam, Mahēndravādi, Siya-

1. 666 of 1904. 2. 225 of 1910. 3. 214 of 1910.

4. 217 of 1910. 5. 21 of 1910.

mangalam and Daļavanūr, which were all contemporaneous with one another and which were all the creation of Mahéndravarman I.¹ Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil remarks that the forms of letters in the Pallavaram cave are more like those found at the Trichinopoly cave. He is of the view that there existed during Mahēndravarman I's reign two Grantha Pallava alphabets; the one that of Mahēndravādi, Daļavanūr, and Siyamangalam, very simple; and the other found at Trichnopoly and Pallavaram, more ornate and almost florid, in which the straight lines have a tendency to become curved and turned.² The inscription at the very beginning mentions 'Mahēndravikrama' and gives a series of his 'birudas' or titles.³ Evidently because of its past association with the Pallavas, the place came to be called Pallavapuram, which means 'the town of the Pallavas'. Inscriptions datable to the beginning of the 12th century, mention it as Pallāpuram and Pallavapuram and say that it was in Puliyūr Kōttam.⁴ Some inscriptions found at Tirusūlam,⁵ a village near Pallavaram, give us an important information that Pallavaram had another name, Vānavannādēvichaturvēdimāngalam, evidently called after the queen of Rajendra I.

The foregoing facts viz. that Pallavaram was chosen as the venue of architectural activity of a Pallava king and that it was even called the 'town of the Pallavas', seem to indicate that it might have been a place of considerable importance in the olden days.

1. G. O. No. 538 dated 28th July, 1909.

2. Jouveau-Dubreuil: *Pallava Antiquities*, vol. I, p. 75.

3. See the original of the inscription in SII. xii, pp. 7-8.

4. 339 of 1908 and 297 of 1895.

5. SII. vol. vii, Inscription Nos 537 to 549.

Six miles west of Pallavaram, is Māngādu which has two inscriptions of the Pallava kings, Nandivarman III¹ and Aparājitavarman.² But perhaps even an earlier reference to Māngādu can be seen in the famous Udayindiram Plates of Nandivarman II (8th century A. D.). The actual name that occurs in the plates is 'Cutavana' which is considered as the exact Sanskrit equivalent of the Tamil name, Māngādu.³ Māngādu was also known in the Chōla days as Aļagiyas'ōlanallūr.⁴ It was apparently the headquarters of a nādu, called Māngādu-nādu which was a sub-division of Puliyūr-Kōṭṭam in Jayangonḍas'ōlamanḍalam.⁵ While the Valliswara temple at Mangadu has inscriptions of Pallava kings Nandivarman III and Aparājita (9th centry A. D.), the Kānakshiamman temple in the same place, has Chōla, Pāṇḍya and Vijayanagar inscriptions of later date.⁶ In the local Māriamman temple also an inscription of Krishnadevarāya has been discovered.⁷

On the eastern side of Pallavaram, are two small villages-Tirus'ūlam and Vēlachchēri-which have old S'iva temples with Chōla inscriptions. While the earliest epigraphs at Tirus'ūlam go back to Kulōttunga I's time (A. D. 1070 - 1118),⁸ those of Vēlachchēri go farther back, to the time of Gaṇḍarāditya (10th century).⁹ Tirus'ūlam was a suburb of Pallavaram in Surattūr nādu in Puliyūr

1. 352 of 1908.
2. 351 of 1908.
3. See the article 'The Udayindiram plates of Nandivarman II, a new study of place-names' by K. R. Venkataraman and K. R. Srinivasan in J.O.R. xix, 1949-50, p. 192.
4. 348 and 349 of 1908.
5. 353 of 1908.
6. 353 to 360 of 1908.
7. 361 of 1908.
8. SII. VII, 538, 541, 542, and 543.
9. 306 of 1911; SII. III, No. 114.

Kōṭṭam.¹ Vēlachchēri, which is two miles from Guindy, was, along with Tiruvānmiyur, in Kōṭṭūr nādu.² Kōṭṭūr nādu was named after Kōṭṭūr, a village near modern Guindy. The other name for Vēlachchēri was Dīnachi-nāmaṇi Chatuvādimangalam.³

There are other places too, near about Madras, the antiquities of which, according to epigraphical records available, go at least as far back as 12th century A. D. Thus Poonamalle (about 15 miles south - west of Madras) seems to have been a flourishing town even in the days of Kulōttunga II (1133-1150 A. D.).⁴ Known as Pūndamalli⁵ and Pūvirundamallinagaram⁶ in those days, it was in Māngadunādu, a sub-division of Puliyūr Kōṭṭam.⁷ An inscription from Tirusūlam dated 37th year of Kulōttunga III's reign (A. D. 1215) informs us that Pūndamalli was known by another name, Uyyakkondān - S'olapuram.⁸ Another inscription from the Perumāl Temple at Poonamalle itself informs us that Poonamalle was called S'era-Pāṇḍya Chaturvēdiimangalam, a name evidently given to it as a result of its conquest, first, by the Pāṇḍyas and later, by the Chēras in the 13th and 14th centuries respectively.⁹ There are Pāṇḍya and Chēra inscriptions in the Perumāl Temple at Poonamalle, besides the Chōla, Telugu-Chōla and Vijayanagar inscriptions, thus showing,

1. SII. VII, No. 538, 547 etc.

2. 305 of 1911.

3. 303 of 1911. See SII. XII, p. 125.

4. 192 of 1894.

5. 293 of 1938-39 and SII. vol. vii, p. 403 for 193 of 1901.

6. 542 of 1912.

7. 31 of 1911.

8. 311 of 1901, SII. Vol. vii, No. 537.

9. 33 and 34 of 1911, MER. 1911, p. 79.

in a way, the many-sided political vicissitudes through which Madras and its surrounding had to pass.

We do not know much about the origin and growth of the Perumāl temple at Poonamalle, excepting that according to Vaishnavite tradition, it arose in the time of Tirukkachchinambi.¹ The temple has inscriptions of the 13th and 14th centuries, besides many of later date.²

It is interesting to note that some early Chōla inscriptions have been found on slabs lying loose in the compound of the mosque at Poonamalle. One of them mentions the existence of Nedunchejiavinnagar at Pūndamalli.³ The Government Epigraphist thinks that the inscription must have formed part of a Hindu temple in Poonamalle. Nedunchejian is a well-known Pāṇḍya king of the Sangam times and it is remarkable how a temple named after him came into existence so far north as Poonamalle.⁴

Besides all these, Poonamalle figures prominently in the *Guruparamparai Prabhāvam* as the birth-place of a Vaishnavite Āchārya, Tirukkachchinambi, an elder contemporary of the great Rāmānuja.

Another ancient place situated very near Poonamallee is Pachaiperumalkoil. It is also called 'Pettai.' This was the birth-place of Muthali Āndān, the sister's son of the Great savant Sri Rāmānuja and one of the latter's leading and devoted disciples. He was also known as Rāmānuja Ponnađi and Sri Vaishnava Dāsan. There is an ancient temple also in the village.

1. See chapter V below.

2. 31 to 34 of 1911 and 297 of 1938-39.

3. 302 of 1938-39.

4. ARE. of the same year II, p. 75. Also see chapter V below for some more details.

Kunnattūr (Kunrattūr) a village about four miles south-west of Pallavaram, is mentioned in an inscription of the 9th century A. D. of Nandivarman III from Māngādu¹. It is called Kunattur because it is situated right at the foot of a 'Kunru' or hill. Kunrattūr seems to have been quite an important place during and after the reign of Kulottunga Chōla II (12th century A. D.), for, it was in that period hailed from this place, the famous author of the *Periapurānam*, Sēkkijār, who became a close personal associate, and also a minister, of the Chōla monarch. Sēkkijār, who is said to have turned the attention of Kulottunga II, from the Jain literature to Saivite literature and religion and made him evince greater interest in the latter, must have been a really dominant personality in his days; and surely, under him and under his successors, who had the name 'Sēkkijār', evidently as their family name, and who figure in the inscriptions² frequently, Kunrattūr must have been quite a prominent place in the later Chōla days. Sēkkijār who was greatly attached to the temple at Tirunāgēs'varam, a Saivite shrine in the district of Tanjore, built a temple near his own place Kunrattūr, and called it Tirunāgēs'varam, so that, perhaps, whenever he happened to come from the capital to his place, he might have the sentimental satisfaction that he was not after all away from his favourite shrine! The Tirunāgēs'varam temple near Kunnattur has inscriptions going back to the days of Kulottunga III and Rājarāja III.³ A Vaishnavite temple, dedicated to Tiruvūragapperumāl, in the locality called Nattam (in the same village, Kunrattūr), as well as the

1. 352 of 1908.

2. 445 of 1912, 136 of 1929-1930, 218 of 1929-1930.

3. 214, 218 and 220 of 1929-30; 194, 198, 202, 212, 215 etc. of 1929-30.

Saivite temple dedicated to Kundalisvarar contain inscriptions belonging to Rājarāja III and the later kings.¹ Numerous other places which now form the most fashionable parts of Madras city like Egmore, Chetpet, Nungambakkam, Ayanavaram, as well as the places at the outskirts of the Madras city, like Vyasarpadi, Villivakkam Ambattur, Madavaram, Kattuppakkam, Koyambedu and Tambaram—all of which seem, at first sight, to be modern names of recent origin, are, in reality, places which are mentioned in the inscriptions belonging to the 12th and 13 centuries A. D., that is, about five hundred or four hundred years earlier than the arrival of the English in Madras.

Thus, Egmore is mentioned frequently in the inscriptions of the Chōla king Kulottunga I and his successors as Ejuṁūr. It was the headquarters of a 'nādu' called as Ejuṁūr-nādu, a subdivision of the Puḷal Kōṭṭam.² Chetpet, near Egmore, is mentioned as Seguppēdu in an inscription at Tiruvorriyūr belonging to the Rāshtrakūṭa king, Krishna III (10th century).³ Another inscription from Kunnattūr, belonging to Rājarāja III, also mentions Seguppēdu (Chetpet).⁴ Nungampakkam figures in a copper-plate inscription (discovered at Tiruvalangādu) belonging to Rājendra Chōla I (11th century).⁵ Ayanavaram figures as Ayanā-puram in an inscription of 12th century from Triplicane.⁶ Places like Vepery (called as Veppery), Puduppakkam and Vyāśarpādi, are mentioned in an inscription belonging to

1. 179 of 1929-30 and 184 of 1929-30.

2. SII. vol. iii, p. 133; see also 238 of 1912 and SII. vii, No. 537.

3. 177 of 1912.

4. ARE. 1929-1930, p. 80.

5. SII. vol. iii, pt. iii.

6. SII. vol. viii, No. 537.

the Vijayanagar king, Sadāśīva (1542-1570).¹ Vyāśar-pādi figures even in a much earlier inscription, going back to the 11th century.² Villivakkam (Villippākkam) and Ambattūr, figure in an inscription³ dated 1242 A. D. The latter, like Egmore, was also the headquarters of a nādu called after itself - Ambattūr-nādu.⁴ Tambaram, which now marks the southern terminus of the electric railway line from Egmore, figures as Tāmpuram, in an inscription of the 13th century. It was in the Surattūr-nādu, a sub-division of Puliyūr-Koṭṭam, to which also many other places, near Madras, belonged.⁵

Other places near about Madras like Maṇali,⁶ Māḍavaram,⁷ Kuraṭṭūr (Koraṭṭur),⁸ Puṭal,⁹ Eṇṇūr,¹⁰ Puliyūr,¹¹ Koyampēdu,¹² Maduraivāyal,¹³ Kāṭṭupākkam,¹⁴ Kōvūr,¹⁵

1. 239 of 1903.
2. 127 of 1912.
3. 99 of 1912.
4. 129 of 1912.
5. 50 of 1932-33, ARE. 1932-1933, p. 75.
6. 165 of 1912, 372 of 1911 and 189 of 1912.
7. 77 and 78 of 1941-1942.
8. 225 of 1910, 129 and 179 of 1912. Kurattūr alias Parāntaka-chaturvedimangalam was in Ambattūr-nādu in Puṭal koṭṭam.
9. EI. IV, p. 8. Another name for Puṭal was Rajasundarinallūr (205 of 1912).
10. 133 of 1912.
11. 79 and 80 of 1941-42.
12. 1 to 10 of 1933-34.
13. 536 of 1912. Maduraivayal was in Pērurnādu in Puliyūrkoṭṭam.
14. 238 of 1912.
15. 329 of 1939-40.

Tirunāgēswaram,¹ (near Kunnattur), Manamai,² Vallisarpakkam,³ Ādampākkam,⁴ Kōṭṭūr,⁵ Pammal,⁶ and Sēlaivās'al⁷ figure in the inscriptions of the 13th century A. D. and even earlier.

1. 218 and 220 of 1922-30.
2. 256 to 260 of 1909. Manamai alias Jananāthanallūr was in Āmūr-nādu in Āmūr kottam (256 of 1909).
3. 111 of 1940-41. It is now called as Velasarvakkam.
4. Two Ādampākkams are mentioned in the Thiruvoggiyūr epigraphs. One is mentioned as being situated in Surattūr nadu in Puliyyūr Kōṭṭam (155 of 1912). This is evidently the Ādampākkam that is near St. Thomas Mount. Another Adampakkam is mentioned in the Pallava epigraph as a suburb of Tiruvoggiyūr (163 of 1912).
5. 77 of 1909.
6. 555 of 1912. Pammal, along with Tirunirmalai, was in Surattūr nadu in Puliyyūr kottam.
7. 242 of 1912.

THE VICINITY OF MADRAS IN THE 13TH CENTURY A.D.

MANALI
 PULAL o TIRUVORRIYUR o
 MĀDAVARAMO
 TIRUNULLAIYĀVALO SĒLAIVĀSALO
 OAMBATTUR o KURATTUR
 O VILLIPĀKKAM
 TIRUVALLIDĀYAM (PADJO) VIĀSARPĀDIO
 MADURAIYĀVALO AVYANĀPŪRAMO ELMŪRŪ
 TRUNAÇISA, KÖYAMPĒDŪ OSĒRUDĒDU
 PŪLURUNDĀVALLI NUNGAMDĀKKAM
 KĀTTUPPĀKKAM TULIYUR o TIRUVALLIRKENI
 MĀNGĀDUO VĀLLISARPĀKKAM KÖTTUR o MAYILAI
 TIRUNĀGĀSWARĀNG RUMRATHUR o VELACCHĒBI o TIRUVĀHMITYUR
 KÖVŪR o ADAMDĀKKAMO o TĀMMAL
 o TIRUŚULAM o PALLAVAPŪRAM
 o TIRUVĀHMITYUR
 o TĀMPŪRAM

BAY OFF BENGAL

CHAPTER II

POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE MADRAS REGION up to A. D. 1650.

In the reconstruction of the political history of South India in the early periods, the inscriptions have proved to be of invaluable help to the historian. The political history of the territory round Madras is no exception to this general rule. The numerous inscriptions that have been discovered in the neighbourhood of Madras, supplemented by some literary evidences available, throw much welcome light on the many-sided vicissitudes through which the region had to pass. Thus inscriptions belonging to various dynasties like the Pallava, the Chola, the Rashtrakūṭa, the Pāṇḍya, the Vijayanagar, besides various other smaller dynasties, which have been found in and around Madras, clearly indicate the eventful variations in the political fortunes of the region through the centuries.

The Region under the Pallavas

We have already referred to the fact that Tondaimandalam, of which Madras and its surroundings formed part, was ruled in the second century A. D. by Tondaimān Ilam Tiraiyan, who was probably a representative of the Chola family at Kāñchi. Subsequent to him, the history of Tondaimandalam region is not very clear. It seems to have been ruled by the Chola prince, Ilam Killi, who is mentioned in the Tamil epic, *Maṇimēkhalai*.¹ The Chola

1. Dr. S. K. Iyengar: JIH. II, p. 58.

occupation of Tondaimandalam, according to Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar, was put an end to by the Andhra Satavāhana incursions from the north under their king, Pulumāyi II, whose ship-coins have been found all along the eastern coast, from the North Pennār to the South Pennār. Sometime after the conquest, perhaps in the time of Sri Yajna Sātakarāṇi (c. A.D. 170-199), they felt the necessity of appointing a chieftain of some influence to look after the Kāñchi region.¹ Bappaswāmi, who figures in the Prākrit charters² of the Pallavas and who is considered by some as the first Pallava to rule from Kāñchi, was himself perhaps a chieftain of the tract round Kāñchi, under the Satavāhanas.³ After the collapse of the Satavāhana empire in about the beginning of the third century A. D. the Pallavas, who had so far been merely viceroys, became independent rulers of Kāñchi and its surrounding areas.⁴ From that time onwards, that is, from about the beginning of the 3rd century A. D. to the closing years of the ninth, except for the interval of some decades, when the whole of South India experienced a dark period under the spell of the Kalabhras, Tondaimandalam was under the aegis of the Pallavas.

Scholars have envisaged as many as four periods in this rather long duration of the Pallava rule in South

1. *Ibid.* pp. 38 and 57. Also see *T. T. Devasthanam Inscriptions*, Vol. I (1931), Intro. p. 2.

2. Hirahadagalli Plates.

3. Dr. C. Minakshi doubts whether Maharaja Bappaswami was the name of king at all. *Administration and Social Life under the Pallavas*, pp. 6-10.

4. S. K. Iyengar: Introduction to R. Gopalan's *The Pallavas of Kāñchi* (1928) pp. xv and xvii. See the various theories regarding the origin of the Pallavas discussed in the same book. pp. 15-31.

India. They are the period of the Pallavas of the Prākrit charters, the period of the Pallavas of the Sanskrit charters, the period of the Pallavas of the Stone inscriptions, when the Simhavishnu line was prominent, and lastly, the period when a new line of Pallavas, under Nandivarman Pallavamalla, became powerful, before it ultimately yielded to the Cholas of the Vijayālaya line in the end of the 9th century A. D.¹ Of these, the periods of Pallavas of the Prākrit and the Sanskrit charters, ranged roughly from the third century to the sixth century A. D. Even though their charters enable us to know the names of the numerous Pallava kings who ruled in that period, they throw very little light on the political history of their territory.² Indeed, Prof. K. A. N. Sastri observes that during the large part of this period the political history of the Pallavas is 'almost blank.'³ The closing years of the reign of the Pallava kings of the Sanskrit charters witnessed the fierce waves of invasion spearheaded by the rather enigmatical people, known as the Kājabhras, who seem to have occupied the whole of South India for a considerable time, upsetting the order of things and dislocating many of the established institutions. This Kājabhra interregnum of South India was not put an end to until the last quarter of the 6th century, when the Pandyas under Kadungon, and the Pallavas under Simhavishnu recovered from their blow and drove out the erstwhile invaders.

Thus, the next stage in the history of the Pallava rule is represented by the emergence of a new line, called

1. *SII.* Vol. II, p. 506.

2. *SII.* Vol. XII, Intro. pt. i.

3. K. A. N. Sastri: *History of South India* (1955), p. 99.

the Great Pallavas, starting from Simhavishnu, who adorned the Pallava throne from about 575 to 600 A. D. With the advent of the great Pallavas, the obscurity that had so far covered the political history of the Pallava kingdom, gets considerably cleared up thanks mainly to the availability of the stone inscriptions, which are a veritable treasure-house of information. Known also as Avanisimha (lion of the earth), Simhavishnu not only swept aside the Kājabhras from the Pallava kingdom, but even acquired the region up to the river Kāveri in the south.¹ The association of Simhavishnu with the Madras region seems to be well perpetuated by the fact that Maṇali, a village near Tiruvorriyūr, is referred to in numerous inscriptions as Simhavishnu Chaturvēdimangalam.² Maṇali was known by that name even as late as the days of Rājarāja III.³ Another record found at Kanjanur (in the Kumbakonam taluk) also calls the place as Simhavishnu Chaturvēdimangalam, evidently in honour of the same Pallava king. Probably the region between these two villages formed the dominion of Simhavishnu.⁴

Simhavishnu was succeeded by Mahēndravarman I (600 - 630 A. D.) whose monolithic cave with inscriptions has been found at Pallavaram near Madras. The inscription,⁵ written in Pallava-Grantha characters, is very valuable as it gives a number of *birudas* or titles that Mahēndravarman I assumed. Some of them are: Sri Mahēndravikrama, Mattavilasah, Chethakāri, Vichitra-chittah, Aluptakāmah, Lokasalyah, Kalahapriah, Lali-

1. SII. I. p. 29.

2. 102, 112, 128, 142, 156, 228 etc. of 1912 (all from Tiruvorriyūr).

3. 211 of 1912.

4. R. Gopalan, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

5. SII. XII, No. 13; 369 of 1908.

tānkura, Sankirnajāthih, Pravrittamātrah etc. Sri Krishna Sastri says that the above-mentioned *birudas* were from Sanskrit. There were some from Telugu like Chi(vi)bhundu, Nilvilonayyambu, Ventulavittu, Pasa-rambu etc. and still others from Tamil like Chitrakārap-puli and Pugapiduka. All these colourful names were titles of a versatile genius that Mahēndravarman I was.

From the point of view of political history, the reign of Mahēndravarman I witnessed the beginnings of the long-drawn-out Pallava-Chālukya and Pallava-Pāṇḍya conflicts, which more or less became a regular feature of South Indian history for some time to come. Thus though Mahēndravarman managed to keep the Southern frontier of his empire as far south as Trichinopoly, he was not very successful in his campaigns in the north. At first, his empire extended in the north up to a little beyond the river Krishna; but soon he had to lose his northern provinces to the Western Chālukya Pulakēśin II, who invaded the Pallava territory and inflicted a blow against the Pallava monarch. But Mahēndravarman retaliated and gained a victory at Pullalūr near Kāñchi¹.

Mahēndravarman I was followed by Narasimha-varman I (630-668), Mahēndravarman II (668-670), Paramēśvaravarman I (670-680), Narasimhavarman II (680-720) and Paramēśvaravarman II (720-731).² The reigns of these kings, with the exception of that of Mahēndravarman II and Narasimhavarman II which enjoyed peace, were marked by a Janus-faced conflict with the Chālukyas in the north and the Pāṇḍyas in the south³.

1. R. Gopalan: *op. cit.*, p. 89.

2. The scheme of chronology as given in Prof. K. A. N. Sastri's *History of South India* (1955) has been followed here.

3. SII, Vol. I, p. 152.

Thus, if the Pallavas under Narasimhavarman I Mahāmalla defeated the Chālukya army at Maṇimangalam and even invaded and captured the Chālukya capital Bādāmi,¹ the Chālukyas under Vikramāditya I retaliated by capturing Kāñchi and marching as far south as Trichinopoly, thereby surprising the Pallava king, Paramēśvaravarman I.² Vikramāditya, in his fight against Pallavas, enlisted the support of the Pāṇḍya ruler Arikēsari Parānkusa Māravarman I (670-700), who was an enemy of the Pallavas. But subsequently, however, Paramēśvaravarman I managed to score a decisive victory over the Chālukyas at Peruvalannallūr, near Uraiyūr and to recover his kingdom.³ The Chālukya aggression on the Pallavas was again renewed by Vikramāditya II (733-744) who was helped by the Ganga ruler, Erēyappa, son of Śripurusha. The Pallava king Paramēśvarman II, when attempting to retaliate against the Ganga ruler, was killed in the battle of Vilande by the latter.

After the death of Paramēśvaravarman II, came Nandivarman Pallavamalla (731-795) with whose advent commences the rule of a new dynasty of the Pallavas. The throne to which Nandivarman ascended was not a bed of roses, for the Pallava-Chālukya and Pallava-Pāṇḍya conflicts that had been going on with fluctuating fortunes, began to assume greater intensity in his time. Thus Vikramāditya II Chālukya, according to his own Kendūr Plates and the Vakkalēri plates of Kirtivarman II, overran the Pallava capital, defeated Nandivarman and got large booty from him in the early years of the latter's reign. But the Chālukya occupation of Kāñchi did not last long. Nandi-

1. SII. Vol. II, p. 508. 2. EI. X, pp. 100-6.

varman revived his hold over Kāñchi soon. Nandivarman's conflict with the Pāṇḍyas was a prolonged and deadly one. The immediate cause for this clash between the Pallavas and the Pāṇḍyas, was apparently that the latter espoused the cause of Chitramaya, who was a rival of Nandivarman in the latter's claim to the Pallava throne. Though the Pāṇḍyas met with many victories in the beginning and even managed to actually siege the Pallava king at Nandipura (near Kumbakonam), they began to face a series of reverses at the hands of the gallant Pallava general, Udaynchandra, who not only rescued his king from the Pāṇḍyan siege, but also according to the Udayindiram plates,¹ waged many successful battles against the enemies of Pallavamalla, and thus made the throne secure for his master. He also killed Chitramaya, whose cause the Pāṇḍyas had championed.

Nandivarman Pallavamalla also came into conflict with the Rāshtrakūṭas and the Gangas. The conflict with the first was happily consummated by a marriage between the Pallava king and the Rāshtrakūṭa princess, Reva. The conflict with the Gangas redounded to the credit of Nandivarman, for he decisively defeated their king, Sripurusha, and thus avenged the defeat of Paramēśvaravarman II at Vilandē. This victory over the Gangas might have taken place in A. D. 783.²

Nandivarman Pallavamalla was an ardent Vaishnavite and as has been pointed out in the earlier chapter, he might have been responsible for effecting many of the embellishments to Sri Pārthrsārathyswāmi temple at Triplicane, which Tirumangai Ālvār describes in his

1. SII. Vol. II, p. 365. Contra JOR. xix, 1949-50, pp. 191-195.

2. K. A. N. Sastrl: *op. cit.*, p. 150.

classical *pāsurams* on Triplicane. Tirumangai Ājvār was a contemporary of Nandivarman Pallavamalla and it is quite possible for the former to acknowledge, with a profound sense of gratitude, the pious services of the latter, by eulogising him in his verses.

The next Pallava ruler to succeed Nandivarman was Dantivarman (795-845) the son of the former by the Rāshtrakūṭa princess, Rēva. Dantivarman was also an ardent Vaishnavite like his father; and his inscription dated 12th year, has been discovered near the sanctum sanctorum of Sri Pārthasārathyswāmi temple, Triplicane.¹ This epigraph calls him 'Pallavakulatilaka Dantivarman Mahārāja.'

In spite of the fact that Dantivarman's mother was a Rāshtrakūṭa princess, the Rāshtrakūṭa power under Gōvinda III threatened the Pallava capital. On the southern side of the Pallava territory, the danger of Pāṇḍyan aggression which troubled Nandivarman II continued unabated. The Pāṇḍyan forces, under their king Varaguṇa II, had been making constant inroads into Tonḍaimandalam region, and in fact, once penetrated as far north as Araisūr, on the banks of the Pennār, in the North Arcot district.² As Dantivarman was a weak monarch, the great task of defending the country against the Pāṇḍyan aggression was taken up by his son, Nandivarman III (A. D. 844 to 866). He hit upon a shrewd policy of coalition with the powers like the Gangas, the Chōlas, and the Rāshtrakūṭas, and struck a heavy blow on the Pāṇḍyas at Tellāru, in North Arcot district. This dazzling victory gave for Nandivarman III the far-famed title 'Tellārerinda.'³ The association of Nandivarman III

1. El. VIII, pp. 290-6. 2. 105 of 1905.

3. An epigraph of Nandivarman III from Tiruvarriyur calls him by this title (162 of 1937-38).

with the region round Madras, is evidenced by a contemporary Tamil work called *Nandikkalambakam*. It informs us that Mylapore (Mayilai), along with Mallai and Kāñchi, was the chief city during that period and that Nandivarman III took the title 'Mayilaikkāvalan' which meant the guardian or protector of Mylapore. The inscriptions of Nandivarman III, dated in 17th and 18th years of his reign, have also been found in the Madras region. They come from Mangadu¹ and Tiruvaliyūr² respectively. The epigraph from the former place mentions the village of Kunrattūr which was situated in the Puliyūr koṭṭam.

The fortune that favoured Nandivarman III at Tellāru deserted him soon, and we find the Pāṇḍyas rising with redoubled vigour, and inflicting a blow against the Pallavas and their allies in a battle at Kudamukku (Kumbakonam).³ This defeat of the Pallavas did not, however, go unavenged, for, Nripatungavarānan, the son of Nandivarman III by a Rāshtrakūṭa princess, defeated the Pāṇḍyas on the banks of the Arisil, near Kumbakonam.⁴ But for this battle with the Pāṇḍyas, the reign of Nripatungavaraman (c. A. D. 855-896)⁵ was characterised by comparative tranquillity. The Pallava supremacy was acknowledged by the Muttaraiyars under Sāttamī Paliyili,⁶ the Gangas under Prithivipati,⁷ and the Bāṇas under Vidyādhara.⁸ Nripatunga's inscriptions have been discovered in the territory extending roughly between Gudimallam and Madras in north, and Trichino-

1. 352 of 1908; SII. XII, No. 53. 1a. 162 of 1937-38.

2. ARE. 1907, pp. 63 ff. 3. SII. II, part v, p. 509.

4. K. A. N. Sastri: *A History of South India*, p. 163. *Contra JOR.* XIX, pp. 148-151.

5. Narthamalai Inscription, SII. XII, No. 63.

6. EI. IV, p. 182. 7. EI. XI, p. 227.

poly¹ in the south. In the region round Madras, his epigraph comes from Tiruvor²iyūr.² It is dated in his 18th year and mentions one Videlvidugu Pallavarāyar, who was probably a local chief in charge of Umbalanādu at that time. But Nripatunga seems to be the last great Pallava king to hold the extensive Pallava empire intact. For, towards the end of his reign, we find several neighbouring powers, including the Nolambas, rising to prominence, with the result that the Pallava dominion began to diminish so much, that in the time of Nripatunga's successor Aparājita, it consisted only of Saidapet, Ponneri, and Conjeevaram taluks in Chingleput district and portions of the Tiruttani taluk in Chittoor district.³ This small and depleted territory fell an easy prey to the rising Chōjas under Āditya I.

But before taking up Aparājita's reign, which virtually witnessed the twilight of the Pallava power, we have to take note of another Pallava king, Kampavarman, whose inscriptions have been found at Tiruvor⁴iyūr, and whose place in the scheme of Pallava genealogy and chronology, is not very clear. While some regard him as the son of Nandivarman III and brother of Nripatungavarman,⁴ another writer thinks that he was the son of Aparājita and that he ruled between A. D. 901 and 933.⁵ But two other writers do not accept the date as correct. They think that Kampavarman ruled jointly with Nripatunga or Aparājita or with both.⁶ However this might be, the inscriptions of all the three, Nripatunga, Aparājita

1. SII. XII. 2. 162 of 1912, SII. *op. cit.* No. 70.

3. EI. XXIII, p. 146. 4. EI. VII, p. 196.

5. See T. N. Ramachandran's article on Vijayakampavarman in JOR. VI, pp. 224-235.

6. K. V. Subramania Iyer in EI. XX, p. 48-49 and V. Venkatasubbier in EI. XXIII, p. 143-146.

and Kampavarman, have been found in the Madras region. Those of the latter, dated in his 6th, 9th and 19th years as well as an undated one, come from Tiruvorriyūr,¹ While the epigraph dated in the 6th year records a gift of gold to Tiruvorriyūr temple by a resident of Mayilāppil (Mylapore), the one that is undated, and which records the gift of gold by one Pudi Arindigai, wife of Vidēlvidugu Iļankovēļar of Kodūmbaļūr in Kōnādu, makes us infer that the Kodūmbaļūr chiefs of Kōnādu had friendly relations with the Pallavas at the time of Kampavarman.² The association of Kampavarman's sway over Tiruvorriyūr also resulted in the temple at that place being called as Kampisvaramuļaiyar temple.³ Besides those near Madras, Kampavarman's epigraphs have been found in other parts of Chingleput and North Arcot districts and also at Mallam, in the Nellore district. Perhaps these places show the extent of the territory under the authority of Kampavarman.⁴

Aparājita's place in the Pallava line as well as his exact dates, like those of Kampavarman, are not clearly known. While one writer⁵ thought that Aparājita was the son of Nripatungavarman, another⁶ held that Aparājita was only another name for Nripatunga. But more recent researches tend to show that Nripatunga and Aparājita were two distinct scions of Pallava line, who were perhaps related to each other and who ruled the Pallava territory conjointly for some time.⁷

1. 189, 188 of 1912; 372 of 1911; 174 of 1912. SII XII, No. 100-103, 105. The editor of the undated inscription suggests that it might have been dated in 11th or 13th or 16th years of Kampavarman's reign.
2. SII. XII, part vi. 3. ARE. 1913, p. 86. 4. SII. XII, p. vii.
5. ARE. 1906, p. 65.
6. Madras Christian College Magazine, xxiv, p. 538.
7. C. Minakshi: *op. cit.* p. 5.

Aparājita's inscriptions have been found only in the taluks of Saidapet, Ponneri and Conjeevaram in Chingleput district and in the Tiruttani taluk.¹ The majority of these epigraphs from the Chingleput district have been found at Tiruvarriyūr and Mangadu.² The dates of these inscriptions range from the third to the eighteenth year of Aparājita's reign. He is described in the Tiruvarriyūr records, as Vijaya Aparājitavarmān and as Aparājita Vikrama-Pottarāiyar. An interesting epigraph from the same place, gives us the information that Aparājita's queen was called Mahādēvi-Āḍigai and that she gave some gold (30 kāṣāṇju) as gift to the Tiruvarriyūr temple.³ Two other epigraphs from the same temple speak about the gifts of gold made by the wives of Viramēghan alias Vānakavarāiyar.⁴ The late Mr. Krishna Sastri put forth the suggestion that Vairamēghan of the Tiruvarriyūr inscriptions was the son of Aparājita, and that he was given the title, Vānakōvarāiyar, probably because he was in charge of the Bāṇa kingdom which was subordinate to the Pallavas at that time.⁵

The age-old tug of war between the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallavas, returned like a tidal wave in Aparājita's reign also. The Pāṇḍyas, under Varaguṇa II, made incursions into the Chōṭa territory on their way to the Pallava dominion. But there appeared on the scene this time, a combination of powers, the Pallavas under Aparājita, the Gangas under Prithivipati I and also the Chōṭas under

1. SII. XII, p. vii.

2. *Ibid.*

3. 163 of 1912; SII. XII, No. 91.

4. 158 and 161 of 1912; SII. XII, Nos. 87 and 88.

5. ARE. 1913, pt. II.

Āditya I¹ to stem the oncoming tide of the Pāṇḍyan incursions. The conflicting forces met at the historic battle of S'ripurambiam (about 879),² in which the Pallava were decisively defeated, even though the Pallava ally, Prithivipati, lost his life on the battle field.

The battle of S'ripurambiam, which marked the defeat of the Pāṇḍyas, also signalled the emergence of a new power, the Chōlas of the Vijayālaya line, on the political stage of South India. Āditya I, the Chōla, who helped the Pallava king at S'ripurambiam to score a victory over the Pāṇḍya, perhaps got the southern Tonḍaimāṇḍalam as the price of his cooperation.³ But this soon whetted the appetite of the proud Āditya I and made him launch on an unscrupulous attack on his own erstwhile ally, Aparājita. In this war, according to the Tiruvālan-gādu and Kanyākuṇari inscriptions,⁴ Aparājita was defeated and killed. This defeat of Aparājita at the hands of the Chōla Āditya, not only placed a considerable part of Tonḍaimāṇḍalam at the disposal of the Chōla king, but also rolled back the hitherto dominant Pallava power into the limbo of oblivion and powerlessness.

1. T. A. Gopinatha Rao held that Āditya I did not help the Pallava king Aparājita but allied himself with Varaguṇa Pāṇḍya (ARE, 1906, pp. 47-8). Prof. K. A. N. Sastri and others think that Āditya I might have helped Aparajita. With regard to the friendly relation that existed between the Chōlas and the Pallavas till at least the 12th year of Aparājita, two epigraphs from Tiruvoḍḍiyūr may be studied with interest. While one of them (159 of 1912) records the gift of gold to Tiruvoḍḍiyūr temple made by a chief from Sōla-nādu, another one (180 of 1912) calls the shrine in the same temple as Sōlamālīśvara. *Vide* V. Rangacharya: *Topographical List of Inscriptions*, Vol. I, p. 447, No. 1049.
2. K. N. Sastri: *Chōlas* (1955) p. 110. 3. *Ibid.* p. 118, n. 26.
4. SII. III. No. 205; TAS. III, 141 ff.

The Region under the Chōlas

The inscriptions of Āditya I have been found in many places in Tondaimandalam, like Tirukkalukunram, Tiruvadandai, Kāñchi and Takkolam. But, it strikes us rather strange that the region immediately round Madras, especially Tiruvoṇiyūr, which contains so many inscriptions of the later Pallavas like Aparājita, does not have even a single inscription belonging to Āditya I. Mr. Krishna Sastri, in the Epigraphical Report for 1913, wrote "Perhaps the northern corner of Tondaimandalam in which Tiruvoṇiyūr is situated, had not yet been completely brought under subjection by him, and it was, consequently, left to Āditya's son, Maduraikonda Parakēsari varman (Parāntaka I) to do this and also extend his conquests as far north as Nellore, beyond the borders of Tondamandalam."¹ This shrewd surmise of that talented epigraphist regarding Parāntaka's encounter with the lingering remnant of the Pallava power, seems to find increasing support in the recently discovered Karandai plates, which include the Pallava among the kings overthrown by Parāntaka I.² Prof. Nilakanta Sastri also, taking into consideration the recently discovered fact regarding Parāntaka's encounter with a Pallava king, remarks in his celebrated work '*The Chōlas*' that 'it is not easy to decide if Parāntaka's war with the Pallava was undertaken by him as 'Yuvarāja' in his father's reign, or if vestiges of

1. ARE. 1913, II, para 18.

2. JOR. op. cit., pp. 148-9.

3. pp. 113-114. Recently it has been shown by Mr. N. Lakshminarayana rao that the Pallava king whom Parāntaka I conquered was Nripatunga. The latter is taken to have ruled over the depleted Pallava territory till A. D. 910-11. JOR. XIX (1949-50) pp. 148-151.

Pallava independence survived into Parāntaka's reign.¹ But, if the latter were true, the territory newly conquered by Parāntaka I might probably have been the tract immediately round Tiruvor̄miyūr, as suggested by Mr. Krishna Sastri. The main reason for making this surmise is that Tiruvor̄miyūr and the tract round Madras, which are replete with many inscriptions belonging to the later Pallavas as well as Parāntaka I, are completely devoid of any inscription belonging to Āditya I. However, with the reigns of Āditya I (871-907) and Parāntaka I (907-955), it can truly be said, begins a new chapter in the history of Ton̄daimandalam, and indeed, South India as a whole. Ton̄daimandalam, which had been so far the centre of the Pallava rule, came under the aegis of the Chōlas, who, for some centuries to come, held it under their sway against many odds.

Many of the inscriptions of Parāntaka I, as pointed out earlier, have been found in Tiruvor̄miyūr.² Some of them refer to him as Maduraikonda Parakēsari. An inscription from Vēlachchēri, near Guindy, belongs to Parakēsari varman, who might probably be identified with Parāntaka I.³ The title 'Maduraikonda,' obviously refers to Parāntaka's conquest of the Pāṇḍyas, in the battle at Vellūr, about A. D. 915. In another campaign against the Pāṇḍyas in A. D. 920, he caused the expulsion of Rājasimha II Pāṇḍya. He even beat the Sinhalese who came to aid the Pāṇḍyas. The Tiruvor̄miyūr inscriptions of Parāntaka I also speak about Parāntaka's expedition beyond Ton̄dainādu. Thus two epigraphs³ record the gift made to the Tiruvor̄miyūr

1. See Appendix II under Parāntaka I.

2. 317 of 1911.

3. 160 and 236 of 1912.

temple by one Maran Paramēśvaravararman alias Sembian Sōliyarāyan of Sirukalattūr in Sōla nādu, 'who captured Sitpuli, destroyed Nellur' (Sitpuliyai-Yerindu Nellūr ajiṭtu mindu poduginṛan).¹ Mr. H. Krishna Sastri thought that Sitpuli might have been the name of a person, perhaps the general of Bhīma II, the Chālukya ruler.² But Prof. K. A. N. Sastri proves that Sitpuli refers to the district in the southern region of the Eastern Chālukya kingdom and says that Chōla campaign was directed against the Vengi ruler, Chālukya Bhīma II.³ We have also a record of Parāntaka in his 29th year, which throws some light on the Chēra-Chōla relations during that time.⁴ It relates to the gift made to the Tiruvoṇṇiyūr temple by Iravi Nili, daughter of Vijayarāgavādēva, the Kēralarāja, who is identified with the son or brother, and successor of the Chēra king, Sathāṇuravi. As the Government Epigraphist rightly points out, this gift of the Chēra princess to a temple situated so far away as Tiruvoṇṇiyūr in the Chōla dominion, corroborates the friendly relations that existed between the Chēras and the Chōlas in Parāntaka's time.⁵ There are many other inscriptions too of Parāntaka in Tiruvoṇṇiyūr which bring out the association of the latter with the former. Thus, for instance, one of them informs us that a street in Tiruvoṇṇiyūr was called as Sūra-Sūlamāṇipperunderu, evidently after Parāntaka, who had the title Sūrasūlamāṇi.⁶ Two other epigraphs dated in the 30th year of Parāntaka inform us about the gifts made to the Tiru-

1. ARE, 1913, II, para 18 and SII. III. No. 108.

2. K. A. N. Sastri: *Chōlaus*, pp. 127-128.

3. 169 of 1912, SII. III, 103.

4. ARE, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

5. 187 of 1912.

vo^miyūr temple by the king's sons-Kōdandarāmar, identified with Rājāditya, and Arindigai Perumānar.¹ An epigraph of Pārthivēndravarman from Pādi, gives us the interesting information that Kurattūr, near the modern Ambattūr, Madras, was called Parāntaka-Chaturvēdi-mangalam, evidently after Parāntaka I.²

The Rāshtrakūṭa Interlude

Though the major part of Parāntaka's rule was characterised by splendid success, the closing years of his reign witnessed a threatening crisis, which almost shook the Chōla empire, though but temporarily. The source of this threat was the combined forces of the Rāshtrakūṭas and the Gāngas. The latter power, under Prithivipati II, acknowledged the supremacy of the Chōlas. But the coming of Bhutuga II, after the death of Prithivipati II in 940 A. D., changed the situation. Bhutuga II, who had married the sister of Rāshtrakūṭa king Krishna III, naturally became an ally of the latter and turned against the Chōla power. The combined forces of the Rāshtrakūṭas under Krishna III, and the Ganga forces under Bhutuga II, invaded Tonḍaimāṇḍalam and defeated the Chōla forces decisively at Takkōlam, near Arkonam in 949 A. D. We have no less than four inscriptions in the Tiruvo^miyūr temple belonging to the Rāshtrakūṭa king. Krishna III (A. D. 939-966), which clearly show that the place came under his sway for some time.³ The dates of these epigraphs range between 18th and 22nd years of his reign. One of them gives the interesting information that a merchant of Manyakhēta, called Narasīnāyyan

1. 164 and 170 of 1912.

2. 225 of 1910.

3. 177, 178, 179 and 181 of 1912.

who was in the camp (kaṭaka) of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Krishna III, made a gift of gold to the Tiruvorriyūr temple and deposited the same with the residents of Sērappēdu (modern Chetpet, Madras) in Tudarmuniyūr-nādu. Another epigraph records the gift to the same temple made by the Rāshtrakūṭa king's mother, Pulaichchirāṇi. These two instances show that even peaceful people followed the Rāshtrakūṭa army of invasion to Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam and thereby introduced Kanarese people in this region.¹ Yet another important record² from Tiruvorriyūr, which is partly written in Tamil and partly in Grantha, graphically describes how Rājāditya, the son of Chōla Parantaka I, was killed, while fighting on the battle-field of Takkolam, and how his royal *guru*, Vallabha, became grief-stricken at his disciple's death, and came to Tiruvorriyūr temple and settled down there for the rest of his life, adopting an ascetic's life. The battle at Takkolam was probably followed by the invasion and capture of Kañchi by Krishna III. He describes himself in his inscriptions as 'Kachiyum-Tanjaiyunkonda,' one who has captured Kañchi and Tanjore. Even though his claim to have captured Tanjore, the Chōla capital, seems to be nothing but an empty boast, it cannot be gainsaid that he inflicted a severe blow on the Chōla power. Indeed, Prof. K. A. N. Sastri says "the Chōla empire was no more; it had to be built up all over again."³

As Parāntaka's eldest son, Rājāditya, died on the battlefield of Takkolam, his second son Gañdarāditya by a Kerala princess, succeeded to the Chōla throne. Rāja-

1. ARE. 1913, II para 17. 177 and 179 of 1912.

2. 181 of 1912. E1. Vol. XXVII (1957-8) No. 47.

3. *op. cit.* pp. 132 and 134.

kesari Gaṇḍarāditya's inscriptions have been found in Tiruvoṇiyūr¹ and Vēḷachchēri² near Madras. They are dated in the 5th and 7th years of his reign. Gaṇḍarāditya was succeeded by his younger brother Ariñjaya Parakēsari who had a very short reign of perhaps only one year (956-957), before he died on the battle field of Ayyūr. Though Ariñjaya's inscriptions have not been found in the region round Madras, his gift to the Tiruvoṇiyūr temple is mentioned in an inscription of Parāntaka.³ During the reign of Gaṇḍarāditya and his brother Ariñjaya, the Chōla power did not witness any rapid recovery from the blow that it had sustained at the hands of Krishna III, even though some feeble attempts were made by them as seen, for example, in Gaṇḍarāditya's alliance with the Bāṇas. But the reign of Sundara Chōla Parāntaka II (c. 956-973), who succeeded his father Ariñjaya, witnessed some determined attempts at revitalisation of the Chōla power. Thus, he led an expedition against the Pāṇḍya power under Vira Pāṇḍya, in which the latter was worsted. In this campaign, according to the Tiruvālangādu plates, he was actively helped by his son Āditya II (956-969),⁴ who, in his inscriptions, claims to have conquered Vira Pāṇḍya. Two other kings—Pārthivēndravarman and Vikramakēsari—also claim victory over Vira Pāṇḍya. The former has been identified by Prof. Nilakanta Sastri with Āditya II.⁵ Pārthivēndravarman's

1. 246 of 1912; SII. III, No. 115.
2. 306 and 315 of 1911; SII. III, No. 114 and 116.
3. 170 of 1912, ARE. *op. cit.* para 18.
4. EI. XXII.
5. K. A. N. Sastri: *op. cit.* pp. 148-151. But Mr. Krishna Sastri did not identify Parthivēndravarman with Āditya II. On the other hand, he thought that Partivēndravarman was a prince of the royal family and viceroy of Tondaimāṇḍalam (SII. III, Introduction, p. 15).

inscriptions have been found in and around Madras, as well as in other parts of Tonḍaimaṇḍalam. Thus a fragmentary inscription of Pārthivēndravarman has been discovered near Mint street, Madras and the same is now kept in the Madras Museum.¹ Four other inscriptions of his, dated in the 5th, 10th and 13th years of his reign, have been found in Tirumullavāyil,² Vēlachchēri³ and Pādi.⁴ Āditya II, with whom this Pārthivēndravarman has been identified, seems to have been murdered by his own brother Uttama Chōla, who afterwards ruled the Chōla throne from 970 to 985. His inscriptions have also been found in Tirumullavāyil⁵ and Tiruvoṇṇiyūr.⁶ They are dated in the 14th, 15th and 16th years of his reign. One of them mentions the many gifts, including an image of Sribalidēva, made by Uttamachōla Dēva to the Tiruvoṇṇiyūr temple. From a record of one Madiraikonda Rājakesari (identified with Gaṇḍarāditya) we learn that Uttamachōla, accompanied by some officers, paid a visit to the Tiruvoṇṇiyūr temple.⁷

Reappearance of Chōla power in Tonḍaimaṇḍalam

The provenance of a number of inscriptions belonging to Āditya Parakēsari, Pārthivēndravarman, and Uttamachōla in many parts of Tonḍaimaṇḍalam, coupled with the fact that they relate to the normal transactions like endowments, irrigation works, and even to the visit of

1. MTCV. p. 365. Also see 306 of 1938-39. This epigraph evidently formed part of the Thiruśūlam temple.
2. 676, and 683 of 1904; SII. III, Nos. 174 and 196.
3. 316 of 1911; SII. III, No. 191.
4. 225 of 1910; SII. III No. 181.
5. 669 of 1904; SII. III, No. 141.
6. 166 and 245 of 1912; SII. III, Nos. 143 and 145.
7. 246 of 1912; SII. III, No. 115.

the Chōla princes to the temple indicate that a bulk of Tonḍaimanḍalam had once again come back to the Chōla hands after the short interlude of the Rāshtrakūṭa occupation.

Uttama Chōla was succeeded by Rājarāja I (985-1014) who, by his many-sided achievements, has earned the title the Great. Rājarāja pursued a vigorous policy of expansion and aggrandisement, the might of which was felt even by far-off places like Ceylon, portions of southern districts of Bombay, Kalingam, the Maldive islands etc. It is needless to detail all his conquests here. Suffice it to say that under him the Chōla empire began to spread far and wide. Early in his reign, he wanted to extend the Chōla power farther beyond the north. Though under Parāntaka I, the Chōla power spread as far north as Nellore, the Rāshtrakūṭa invasion did much to curtail it. The successors of Parāntaka recovered the territory only up to Tiruvorriyūr, near Madras. It was left to Rājarāja to extend it up to Nellore as in the days of Parāntaka.¹

Rājarāja's inscriptions have been found in Tiruvorriyūr, Pāḍi, Vēlachchēri, San Thomé (Mylapore), Puliyūr, Poonamalle, and Pallavaram.² There is also a fragmentary epigraph found in Triplicane temple which bears the king's name as Rājarājadēva, and dated in his 23rd year.³ The dates of the other inscriptions range between the third and twenty fourth year of Rājarāja's reign. One important fact to be noted in his reign is that Tonḍaimanḍalam came to be called thereafter as Jayangonḍas/oḷamandalam - after Rājarāja's own title,

1. K. A. N. Sastri: *op. cit.* p. 178.

2. See Appendix II under Rājarāja I.

3. 242 of 1903, SII. VIII, No. 541.

Jayangondas'ōjan.¹ One of the many titles that Rājarāja I assumed was Uyyakondān,² and, significantly enough, an inscription informs us that Poonamalle was called Uyyakondāns'ōlapuram.³ The latter name was evidently coined after Rājarāja's title.

Rājarāja the Great was succeeded by Rājēndra I (1012-1044) who inherited from his father an extensive empire which included the whole of the modern Madras and Andhra, parts of Mysore and the island of Ceylon. To this already overgrown empire of the Chōjas, Rājēndra added many more territories so that the extent of the Chōja empire was 'at its widest and its military and naval prestige stood at its highest.'

The area round Madras has about twenty-five inscriptions belonging to Rājēndra.⁴ They are found in places like San Thōmē, Tiruvorriyūr, Tiruvānmiyūr, Poonamalle, Tirumullavāyil and Vēlachchēri. Their dates range between second and thirtysecond years of Rājēndra's reign. One of them informs us that a pavilion (*mantapa*) in the Tiruvorriyūr temple was called "Mannikonda Sōla" evidently to commemorate Rajendra's conquest of Manyakheta (Malkhed) which was under the Chālukyas. Another record from Tiruvorriyūr makes mention of the gifts made by Kūttan Gānavadi the military officer of Gangaikondān *alias* Uttama-sōlamarāyan, a chief of Tiruvārūr. One of the queens of Rājēndra I was called Vānavan-Mahādēviyār and, interestingly enough, Pallavaram near Madras seems to have been called after her, for it figures as Vānavan-

1. SII. II, No. 69 and p. 312.

2. *Ibid.* Intro. p. 7.

3. 311 of 1901, SII. VII, No. 537.

4. See Appendix II under Rājēndra I.

Mādēvi-Chaturvēdimangalam in the inscriptions of Rājēndra's successor, Rājādhīrāja I.¹ There was also a *mata* (monastery) in the Tiruvomiyūr temple called Rājēndrasōjanmata - evidently named after the king Rājēndra I.²

After Rājēndra I, came one after the other Rājadhīrāja I (1018-1054), Rājēndra II (1052-1064), Virarājēndra I (1063-1069) and Ādhīrājēndra (1067/8-1070) all of whose inscriptions have been discovered in the Madras region. Their reigns were also characterised by wars between the Chōlas and the Western Chālukyas which invariably ended in a victory for the Chōlas. Thus, in the battle of Koppam in 1052, the Chōlas defeated the Western Chālukyas under Sōmēsvāra I. But they lost their king Rājādhīrāja who fell fighting on the battlefield.³ Rājēndra II, the son of Rājādhīrāja I, crowned himself king on the very battlefield of Koppam, where he had distinguished himself by his bravery and is said to have marched to Kolhapūr to erect a pillar of victory there. Later on Rājēndra II inflicted yet another severe defeat on the Western Chālukyas at Kūḍal-Sāngamam with the object of preventing the latter's interference with the Eastern Chālukyan affairs.⁴ As Rājēndra II's immediate brother Rājamahēndra who took part in the battle of Kūḍal-Sāngamam and who was chosen heir-apparent in 1059 A. D. died prematurely, his younger brother Virarājēndra I (1063-1069) succeeded Rājēndra II to the Chōla throne. In Virarājēndra I's time internal trouble arose between Sōmēsvāra II and Vikramāditya VI, the sons of Sōmēs-

1. 220 of 1912; also see SII. VIII, 547, 538 and 540.

2. 127 of 1912.

3. SII. III, No. 29; EI. XII, pp. 296-298.

4. SII. III, p. 37. K. A. N. Sastri: *op. cit.* p. 262.

vara I. Vikramāditya, along with his younger brother Jayasimha, planned to invade the Chōla territory, but at that time, the Kadamba king of Goa, Jayakēsi, is said to have mediated and brought about an alliance between Vikramāditya and the Chōla king. The latter also gave his daughter in marriage to Vikramāditya. This Chōla alliance tilted the scales in favour of Vikramāditya and Jayasimha as against Śoṇīśvara II who was consequently compelled to give up portions of his hereditary dominions. One of Virarājēndra's inscriptions from Tiruvorriyūr makes mention of a particular quarter at Tiruvorriyūr as Jayasīnga-kula-Kālapperunderu and a certain officer of Virarājēndra called Jayasīnga-kula-kāla Vilupparāiyan who instituted an enquiry into the temple affairs.¹ The prefix Jayasīnga-kula-kāla in both the above-mentioned names seems to be a reference to Virarājēndra himself, who was the opponent of the Western Chālukys king Jayasīnga III, and who might have had it as his surname.²

Virarājēndra was succeeded by his son Ādirājēndra who ruled from 1067 to 1070 with his father, and only for a few weeks, as sole monarch. After him the Chōla throne passed on to Kulōttunga I (A. D. 1070-1120) who did not belong to the direct line of the Chōlas; but he was an Eastern Chālukya prince who had married the daughter of the Chōla king Rājēndra II. Adroitly exploiting the confusion that prevailed in the Chōla kingdom soon after the death of Virarājēndra, Kulōttunga pushed his claim forward and also succeeded in occupying the coveted Chōla throne, despite the attempts of Chālukya Vikramāditya VI to prevent a union of the Vengi and the

1. 136 of 1912.

2. ARE. 1913, pp. 103-104.

Chōla powers in the same hands.¹ During his time, the Chōla empire became somewhat depleted in its extent, for Ceylon which was part of the Chōla empire till his time asserted its independence; Gangavadi and Vengi also slipped out of the Chōla hands - the former to the Hoy-sālas under Vishnuvardhana (A. D. 1111-1141) and the latter to the Western Chālukyas under Vikramāditya VI. But Kulottunga I exhibited the strength of the Chōla power by undertaking two successful raids on the Kalinga territory in 1096 and 1110 A. D. The second expedition is more famous, for it has been immortalised by Jayangondār, a contemporary Tamil poet, in his celebrated work *Kalingattupparani*. The work says that the Chōla forces marched against the Kalinga kingdom because its king failed to pay tribute to the Chōla monarch.² The Chōla army was led by a scion of the Pallava family called Karuṇāgara Tondaimān who now served under the Chōlas. He is stated to have had his headquarters at Vāṇḍainagar which was sought to be identified with Vāṇḍalūr near the modern Tambaram and about 20 miles south of Madras.³ The Tamil work also states that Mallai (Mahabalipuram) and Mayilai (Mylapore)

1. K. A. N. Sastri: *op. cit.* p. 297.
2. Canto 11; IA, xix, p. 338 where the late Mr. Mr. V. Kanakasabhai Pillai's lucid summary and translation of *Kalingattupparani* is given.
3. *Ibid.* p. 340. Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai wrote: 'Vāṇḍai, the capital of the Pallava now goes by the name of Vāṇḍalūr; a very spacious tank and the ruins of a native fort to the west of the village indicate that it must have been a populous town in the days gone by.' But Pandit M. Raghava Iyengar identifies it with Vāṇḍuvāñjeri in Kumbakonam taluk which is called in an inscription as Vāṇḍāñjeri in Tirunaraiyūr-nādu in S'olamāṇḍalam (*Kalingattupparani-yāraicchi*, pp. 34-36. Also K. A. N. Sastri: *op. cit.* p. 333.

were two important towns in his times.¹ Even though this expedition resulted in the defeat of the king of North Kalinga, and brought large booty for the Chōjas, it did not result in any permanent occupation of Kalinga by the Chōjas.

Kulottunga's inscriptions with dates ranging between 2nd and 49th years of his reign have been found in Tiruvoniyūr, Tirusūlam (near Pallavaram) and Tiruinaisai.² From these inscriptions we learn that Kulottunga I had titles like Tribhuvana-chakravarti,³ Jayadhara,⁴ Sungamavirtta⁵ etc. A record from Tirusūlam dated in his 39th year records the naming of a new village as Tirunigruch-chojanallūr which was given as a *devadāna* village to the temple at Tirusūlam.⁶ Tirunigruchchōja was another surname of Kulottunga I. One of the queens of Kulottunga I was called Dīnachintāmaṇi⁷ and it is interesting to note that Vēlachchēri near modern Guindy figures in a fragmentary inscription from Triplicane⁸ as Dīnachintāmaṇi-Chaturvēdimangalam, obviously called after queen of Kulottunga I. The Tiruvoniyūr inscriptions of Kulottunga I are of unique value in that they give the names of a number of chiefs and military officers who worked under him and who made gifts to the Tiruvoniyūr temple. Such are Rājarājan Parānripārakshasanār *alias*

1. IA. op. cit, p. 337.

2. See Appendix under Kulottunga I.

3. 114 and 118 of 1912 (dated in 11th and 23rd years respectively) SII. Vol. I, No. 511.

4. 109 and 121 of 1912. Also see SII. VII, p. 131.

5. 312 of 1901, SII. VII, No. 358.

6. *Ibid.*

7. SII. II, p. 131.

8. 242-A of 1903; SII. VIII, No. 542, XXXV, p. 280. The inscriptions 303, 307, 313 and 314 of 1911 are from Vēlachchēri.

Viras'ōla Ilangōvēlār,¹ Kuļāmuļār Ērankūttanār *alias* Rājarāja Muvēndavēlār,² Sundaras'ōla-Muvēndavēlār,³ Gurukularāiyar,⁴ Ādittan Tarparāmporuļār *alias* Madurāntaka Muvēndavēlār⁵ and Jñānmurti Panditan *alias* Madurāntaka Brahmnādirājan.⁶ The last mentioned name was that of a Brahmin military officer who was a commander (Senāpati) of the Chōla forces. Under Kulottunga I, Puliyūr Koṭṭam came to be called Kulottuga'sōla-vaļanādu.⁷

After Kulottunga I, came Vikramāchōla (1118-1135) Kulottunga II (1133-1150) and Rājarāja II (1146-1173) whose inscriptions have been found in the region under investigation. The rule of these kings, except that of the first, was characterised by general peace. Vikramachōla's reign alone, however, witnessed expeditions to recover Vengi and Gangavadi which the Chōlas had lost in Kulottunga I's time. Vikramachōla was successful in getting back Vengi; but as regards Gangavadi he could recover only parts of it. Kulottunga II's reign was not marred by wars and, as such, it afforded a conducive atmosphere for poets like Kamban, Sēkkijār and Ottakūttan to produce their masterpieces in Tamil literature. Of these Sēkkijār, the author of the *Periapurāṇam* hailed from Kunrattūr near Pallavarai, Madras. He was not merely a poet and philosopher but was Kulottunga II's trusted minister and adviser. Kulottunga II was followed by his son Rājarāja II whose reign also, like that of his father, was a peaceful one. One of his inscriptions found at Tiruvoṇiyūr mentions his queen as Mukkōkilānađigal⁸ while another informs us of a gift made by a certain

1. 131 of 1912, SII. VIII, p. 132.

2. 130 of 1912.

3. 221 of 1912. 4. *Ibid.* 5. 133 of 1912. 6. 119 of 1912.

7. 19 of 1911. 8. 369 of 1911.

Kulöttunga-s'ōla-mahipāla, son of Aggrūr-nādālāvān, a native of Chōlēndra singanallūrpalli in Paiyūr kōṭṭam in Jayan-gondas'ōlamandalam.¹ Though the major part of Rājarāja's reign witnessed peace, the closing years were marked by an outbreak of a fierce civil war in the Pāndyan country which dragged the Chōla and the Sinhalese power on opposite camps. This succession dispute fanned on either side by the age-old rival powers of Chōlas and the Sinhalese continued with strange twists and turns beyond the reign of Rājarāja II and till about 1177. The ultimate result of the civil wars was dreadful to both the Chōla and the Sinhalese powers, for "out of the ashes of the civil war arose the Pāndya power which in its renewed strength soon swallowed up both the kingdoms which espoused the rival causes of the protagonists in the civil war."²

Rājarāja II was succeeded on the Chōla throne by his brother Rājadhirāja II who ruled from about 1163 to 1179 A. D. and whose inscriptions have been found in the vicinity of Madras. He continued the Chōla policy of intervention in Pāndyan affairs, successfully drove back the Sinhalese and placed Vira Pāndya on the Pāndya throne as against Kulasekhara who was found guilty of treachery towards the Chōla power.³ Rājadhirāja II's active association with the region under our study is well attested by the provenance of his inscriptions at places like Tiruvarriyūr and Tirusūlam. A Tiruvarriyūr record dated in his 9th year speaks of Rājadhirāja's personal visit to the Tiruvarriyūr temple on the occasion of Panguni Uttiram festival in the temple.⁴ Another epigraph from the same place mentions an officer in

1. 123 of 1912. 2. K. A. N. Sastri: *op. cit.*, p. 354 and 366.

3. 465 of 1905. 4. 371 of 1911.

charge of the Tiruvorriyūr temple, called Kaliyan Tonḍai-Tirunāṭṭuperumāl *alias* Vikramasōla-Paduvūrnāḍalvān.¹

About 1178 A. D., the Chōla throne passed on to the hands of Kulōttunga III, the last of the great Chōlas who ruled it till about A. D. 1216. Kulōttunga III has been called the last great Chōla king to enjoy the benefits of an extensive Chōla empire. From his time, if not even earlier, begins an extremely troublesome period for the Chōla empire, which came to be threatened by disruptive forces from within and the ambitious and the newly rising powers from outside. Thus, even though Kulōttunga III, in the early years of his reign, actively interfered with the protracted Pāṇḍyan civil war and put his own candidate Vikrama Pāṇḍya on the Pāṇḍyan throne and later still, could even penetrate as far south as Ceylon, his last years saw one of the fiercest invasions of the Chōla dominion spearheaded by Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, who was the first of a series of great Pāṇḍyas who retrieved the Pāṇḍya country from the whirlpool of civil war, and made it the most dominant power of South India in the 13th century. This victorious march of Maravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya in 1216-17 right into the heart of the Chōla dominion, bringing in its train considerable loss of life and property, and the complete helplessness of the Chōla power to stem the oncoming tide, spotlighted, for the first time, the hallowness of the Chōla power and its growing vulnarability. The Chōla monarch sought refuge in flight, but later on, he was restored to his throne after some negotiations and thanks, in a way, to the intervention of Hoysala power under Viranarasimha on behalf of the Chōla monarch.²

1. 100 of 1912.

2. K. A. N. Sastri: *op. cit.*, p. 397.

Kulottunga III's reign also witnessed the strengthening of the Chōla feudatories, like the Telugu-Chōdas, the Kāḍavarāyas, the Yādavarāyas, the Sāmbūvarāyas, and others, who developed the tendency of asserting their independence from the Chōla tutelage. The relation of these feudatories to Kulottunga III, and their association with the vicinity of Madras, will be dealt with under separate headings. But before that, something should be said regarding Kulottunga's active association with the tract round Madras, as reflected by his inscriptions - about forty in number - that have been found there. Thus, an inscription,¹ dated 19th year (i.e. 1197 A. D.), informs us that Kulottunga III visited Tiruvarriyūr temple on the occasion of Āni festival. Two inscriptions from Tiruvarriyūr make mention of the king's secretaries like Minavan Mūvēndavēlān² and Neriyudaichchōla-Mūvēnda vēlān.³ Neriyudaichchōla, according to the Government Epigraphist for 1913, might have been a surname of Kulottungachōla III himself.⁴ Among those who seem to have been chiefs and officers of some importance and who figure in Kulottunga's inscriptions are Paiyurnāḍālavan-Valaiyamajagiyān Oṛiyarasān,⁵ Pañchanādīvānan Nilagangarāyan Nallanāyan alias Sōlagangadēva⁶ and Durgaiyāndi-Nāyakkan, agent of Sittarasān.⁷ Puliyūr Kōṭṭam figures as Kulottungasōlavalanāḍu in Kulottunga III's epigraphs.⁸

1. 368 of 1911, SII. V, 1359.

2. 209 of 1912, SITI. I, No. 521.

3. 201 of 1912, SITI., *op. cit.* No. 518.

4. ARE. *op. cit.*

5. 108 of 912.

6. 546, 556 and 557 of 1912; also see 2 of 1911.

7. 201 of 1912, SITI, *op. cit.*

8. 368 of 1911, 209 of 1912 etc.

The decline of the Chola power and the rise of the feudatories

The reigns of Rājarāja III (1216-1246 A. D.) and Rājendra III (1246-1279 A. D.), who succeeded Kulottunga III on the Chola throne, represent but the last phase in the history of the Chōla empire. Their reigns constitute a pitiable record of how the central authority of the mighty empire was slowly undermined and finally overthrown by the disintegrating elements and the centrifugal forces that were gaining ground on account of the growing power of the Chōla feudatories like the Telugu Chōdās, the Kāḍavarāyas and others, who wanted to shake off their position of vassallage and assert their independence. They even slowly began to omit mention of their overlord in their inscriptions and issue them in their own names. There are many such inscriptions in the vicinity of Madras belonging to these feudatories who issued those inscriptions in their own regnal years. Furthermore, the growing discontent within the empire, especially that of the Pāṇḍyas, acted as an invitation to the outside powers like the Hoysalas and the Kākatiyas who began to fish in the troubled waters of the Chōla empire. Rājarāja III, in particular, was a very weak monarch and during his time the Chōla power was put to great troubles by its own vassals. Thus the Pāṇḍyas under Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I (acc. 1216 A. D.) inflicted a crushing defeat on Rājarāja III who, according to the *Gadyakarnamrta*, was even made to abandon his capital. The same work also says that while the Chōla king was going away from his capital with his retinue, the Kāḍava chieftain, Kopperūñjinga, attacked him and made him a prisoner. This is also confirmed by the

Tiruvēndipuram inscription.¹ This shocking news of the imprisonment of the Chōla monarch by his feudatory reached the Hoysala king, Vira Narasimha, who despatched his army under his able generals who struck terror into the Kādava country and compelled Kōppernēninga to release the Chōla monarch and restore him to his throne. The Hoysala army did not stop with devastating the Kādava country and defeating its chieftain; it further penetrated into the Pāṇḍya country and defeated the Pāṇḍyas at Mahēndramandalam. Some Hoysala inscriptions show that they reached as far south as Rāmēśvaram. This gave an excellent opportunity for the Hoysalas to give effect to their designs of domination over South India; and the Chōla country, as it has been pointed out, virtually became a protectorate of the Hoysalas during the time of Rājarāja III.²

Rājarāja III's inscriptions have been found in rather large numbers in places round about Madras, like Tiruvoṇiyūr, Tirunirmalai, Kunnattūr, Tirumajisai and Tirumullaivāyil.³ Their dates range between his 3rd and 28th regnal years and give some useful information pertaining to the region round Madras. Thus, we know from an epigraph that Rājarāja III, in his 19th year (A. D. 1235), paid a visit to the Tiruvoṇiyūr temple, on the occasion of Āvanittirunāl and heard, in the *Rājarājan tirumāṇḍapam*, a Padiyālar sing in the āgamārṅga style.⁴ Among the officers and chiefs of Rājarāja III, who were closely associated with the region round Madras and who figure in Rājarāja's inscriptions are: Vira-Narasīṅga

1. 142 of 1902, EI. VII, pp. 160 ff.

2. K. R. Venkataraman: *The Hoysalas in the Tamil country*, pp. 17 and 27.

3. See Appendix II under Rājarāja III.

4. 211 of 1912.

Yādavarāya,¹ Madurāntaka Poṭṭappichōla Gaṇḍagopala,² Nilagangarāyan Kaṭakan Sōlagangadēva,³ Sāmbūvarāyan Ajagiyasiyan, son of Sāmbūvarāyan. Pullavandar⁴ and Oṣṭi-arasan son of Paiyūrnādāvān.⁵ Perhaps the last mentioned person was identical with the chief of the same name, who figured in Kulottunga III's inscription found at Tiruvoḍḍiyūr.⁶ Besides these, an epigraph dated in the 14th year of Rājarāja III records the gift of gold-ornament to the Vishnu temple at Kunnattur by one Perumbāṇan Kunrappерumāl *alias* Sōlakērajan, and his son, Mūvēndadāsan.⁷ Probably, the former was also a chief of Rājarāja III. Another epigraph from Tirunirmalai, mentions the gift of money to the temple by Ilappadaivēnraṇ (the conqueror of the Sinhalese army), one of the *agambadiyars* of the prince Sōlagangadēva.⁸

Rājēndra III (1246 - 1279 A. D.) was not a weak monarch, like his predecessor Rājarāja III, and as such, he made some attempts at reinstating the Chōla prestige. Thus, he seems to have scored a victory over the weak Pāṇḍya king Māravarman Sundara II, and even made him acknowledge the overlordship of the Chōlas. But this victory over the Pāṇḍyas, cost the Chōlas the friendship of the Hoysalas, who now joined the Pāṇḍyas, though only for a short time, in order to redress the balance of power. This made the Chōlas turn to the Telugu-chōla chieftains who were ruling over the

1. 199 and 227 of 1912.
2. 534 and 198 of 1912.
3. 535 and 549 of 1912.
4. 106 of 1912.
5. 113 of 1912.
6. 108 of 1912.
7. 216 of 1929-30.
8. 549 of 1912.

territory of Nellore, Cuddappah and some parts of Chingleput districts and who supported the Chōjas against the Hoysāla king Sōmēsvara. The Telugu-Chōda king Tikka even assumed the title 'Chōlasthapānāchārya' - 'the establisher of the Chōla.' Rajēndra also met with success in his campaign against the Virarākshasas, i.e. the Sāmbūvarāyas who were ruling in North Arcot.

But these successes of Rājēndra, however, were short-lived. After the accession of the strong Jāṭavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I to the Pāṇḍya throne in A. D 1251, events took a different turn. From then began the rapid rise of the Pāṇḍyas, who defeated the Hoysālas under Sōmēsvara and the Chōjas under Rājēndra III. The former was killed in the battle that took place near Kannanur in 1264 A. D., and his successor Rāmānatha (A. D. 1254 - 95) who came to the rescue of Rājēndra III, was also defeated; consequently, the Hoysālas were compelled to withdraw from the Tamil country over which they had been dominating for a considerable period. The Chōla Rājēndra III's latest regnal year seems to be thirtythird, which corresponds to the year 1279 A. D.¹ That year roughly marks the end of the Chōla rule in South India. The Chōla kingdom became completely absorbed in the Pāṇḍyan empire which, under Jāṭavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya and his successor Māravarman Sundara, attained the zenith of its power and glory. The association of the Pāṇḍyas with the region round Madras and the importance of their inscriptions found there, will be adverted to subsequently. But it is now our turn to review briefly the association of the many Chōla feudatories with the tract round Madras in the closing years of the Chōla rule. It has already been pointed out that one of the most

1. *Ibid.* p. 437.

remarkable factors of the 13th century politics in South India was the rise of many feudatories like the Telugu-Chōḍas, the Kāḍavarāyas, the Yādavarāyas and Sāmbūvarāyas who virtually parcelled out among themselves the Tondaimandalam region, and ruled the same independently, all but in name. The Chōḍa king was only their nominal overlord. They even began to omit any mention of their overlord and issue inscriptions in their own name. Such inscriptions of the above-mentioned feudatories are available, in quite a large number, in the vicinity of Madras and it is worth while considering them in greater detail.

The Telugu-Chōḍas: Prominent among such quasi-independent feudatories who have left their mark on the political history of Tondaimandalam were the Telugu-Chōḍas of Nellore. A Sanskrit inscription in Grantha characters from Tiruvorriyūr, dated in S' 1129 A. D. 1207-1208, belonging to the Telugu-Chōḍa king Tammusiddhi, traces the genealogy of this branch of the Telugu-Chōḍas from the solar line and mentions the great Karikāla Chōḍa as one among its ancestors.¹ The exact chronology and the genealogy of this line of rulers are not clearly known. But inscriptions make mention of two shadowy figures, Madurāntaka Poṭṭāpi Chōḍa and Tilungu Vidya as among its early ancestors, whose time, however, is not known.² Then came Bēta, the feudatory of Vikramachōḍa.³ Bēta's son was Erasiddha who had in turn three sons - Manmasiddha, Bēta and Tammusiddha. It is the last mentioned king whose inscription (dated A.D.

1. 104 of 1892, EI. VII, pp. 148-152.

2. IA. XXXVII, p. 9.

3. *Ibid.*

1207 - 1208) has been found at Tiruvo^{ri}iyūr. According to Robert Sewell, Tanimu Siddha succeeded Manmasiddha in A. D. 1205 because Bēta II, who was religiously inclined, relinquished the kingship in favour of his younger brother.¹ The genealogy of the Telugu-Chōdas of Nellore subsequent to Tammusiddha, is somewhat confusing, the occurrence of many kings with more or less similar names and titles causing the confusion. But Robert Sewell's scheme of genealogy and chronology can be given here: After Tammusiddha, came Tikka I *alias* Ajuntikka - Kālatti I, who ruled roughly from A. D. 1223 to 1250. After him, came Manmasiddha II *alias* Vijayagandagōpala, who ruled between A. D. 1250 and 1291. After him, came Nallasiddha II, Tikka II or Tirukkalatti (about A. D. 1278, 1280), and Manma Siddha III *alias* Vira Ganda Gōpāla (about A. D. 1290 to 1316).²

The Telugu-Chōdas of Nellore were, in the beginning, feudatories who acknowledged the overlordship of Chōla monarchs. Thus Erasiddhi's father, Bēta, was himself a feudatory of Vikraṇachōla.³ Many of the inscriptions of Kulōttunga III from places like Tiruppalaivanam, Kalahasti and Nandalur, as well as some of the inscriptions issued by Telugu-Chōda princes like Nallasiddha, bear testimony to their position of vassalage to Kulōttunga III.⁴ In Tiruvo^{ri}iyūr also, an inscription⁵ of Kulottunga III dated in his 38th year mentions an agent

1. R. Sewell: *Historical inscriptions of Southern India*, p. 130 and 396. Also see Dr. S. K. Iyengar's note in the same page.

2. R. Sewell: *op. cit.*

3. 583 of 1907.

4. 317 of 1929; 192 of 1892; 601 of 1907; 582 of 1907. K. A. N. Sastri: *op. cit.* pp. 388-9.

5. 201 of 1912, SITI. No. 518.

of Sittarsan in that place. Sittarsan might have been the name of a Telugu-Chōḍa chieftain, probably Manmūsiddha or Manumasittaran. But, however, during the closing years of the reign of Kulottunga III the Telugu-Chōḍas under Nallasiddha rose in revolt against the central authority and even brought Kāñchi under their sway for a short time. This necessitated Kulottunga III to take an expedition against them and to recover Kāñchi from them.¹ Subsequent to the conquest of Kāñchi by Kulottunga III in about A. D. 1196, the Telugu-Chōḍas were loyal and friendly towards the Chōḍas. But the coming of the weak monarchs like Rājarāja III and Rājendra III gave them very good opportunity to strengthen their position, and even assert their independence. Thus while the inscriptions of Rājendra III are virtually absent in the vicinity of Kāñchi, those of the Telugu-Chōḍa king, Tikka I, predominate. An inscription of Kākatiya king Gaṇapati dated in A. D. 1249 has also been found in Kāñchi.² This might indicate that Kāñchi was part of the territory of the Telugu-Chōḍas, who first held it in nominal subjection to the Chōḍa king, and then, to the Kākatiyas, who under Gaṇapati, extended their empire as far south as Kāñchi.³ It was when the Telugu-Chōḍas were in charge of Kāñchi in nominal subjection to Gaṇapati, came the thunderbolt of the Pāṇḍyan invasion of Tonḍaimāṇḍalam. Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I (acc. 1251) advanced against Kāñchi, and as an inscription of his claims, killed the Telugu-Chōḍa king, Gaṇḍagopāla, put the latter's brother in charge of it;⁴

1. SII. III, No. 88.

2. 2 of 1893.

3. K. A. N. Sastri: *op. cit.* pp. 435-436.

4. 354, 340 and 361 of 1913.

and then invaded the territory of the Kākatiyas and defeated them at Mudugūr. Who was this Gaṇḍagopāla, whom Jatāvarman Sundara claims to have killed? There is considerable difference of opinion among scholars, regarding this question, the difference arising mainly because of the different schemes of geneology and chronology they attribute to the Telugu-Chōḍas. Thus, while some scholars hold that it was Viragaṇḍagopāla, who was killed by the Pāṇḍyan king, others maintain that it was Vijayagaṇḍagopāla.¹

However this might be, inscriptions of both Vijaya-*gaṇḍagopala* and *Viragaṇḍagopāla*, have been found in the vicinity of Madras. While only two inscriptions of the latter - dated 3rd and 4th year - have been found at Kunnattur, those of the former number about eighteen and range between the third and thirtythird years of his reign.² The places from which *Vijayagaṇḍagopāla*'s inscriptions come within this region are Tiruvorriyūr, Pāḍi, Tirumullaivāyil, Kōvūr, Kunnattūr, Tirumūlīsai, Poonamalle, Tirunirmalai and Puliyūr. Three of these inscriptions bear the signature of *Gaṇḍagopāla*.³ His inscriptions show how he was associated with the region personally as well as through a number of his officials, like Pañchanadivānan *Nilagangarāiyan*,⁴ Tiruvannāmalai *Perumāl Lankēs'varadēva*,⁵ Pañchanadivānan *Arunagiri Perumāl Nilagangarāyan*,⁶ *Vallamerinadān Pañchanadivānan*.⁷

1. See TTD. Report, 1930, pp. 126-127; Also see ARE. 1916 para 81, *Contra*. K. A. N. Sastry: *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, pp. 168-169. fn; *The Chōḍas* p. 436.

2. See Appendix II under Telugu Chōḍas.

3. 672 of 1904. 222 of 1910 and 241 of 1912.

4. 117 of 1912. 5. 1 of 1911. 6. 4 of 1911.

7. 547 of 1912; See Appendix I.

After defeating the Telugu-Chōdas at Kāñchi, Sundara Pāṇḍya I, with the help of Kāḍava Koppēruñjīṅga, attacked the overlords of the Telugu-Chōdas at that time, viz., the Kākatiyas. He met with success in that direction also; he invaded their territory right up to the R. Krishna and returned to Nellore in triumph, and performed his Virābhishēka. From then on, the Telugu-Chōdas turned their allegiance to the Pāṇḍyas.¹

The Kāḍavarāyas: Another important feudatory power of the Chōdas, which came to prominence in the 12th and 13th centuries, was the Kāḍavarāya family. The Kāḍavās or the Kāḍavarāyas, claimed descent from the ancient Pallava family, some of whom were also called the Kāḍavās.² Even though this feudatory family was slowly working its way up at least from the days of Vikramachōla, it was not until the great Kopperuñjīṅgā Kāḍavarāyan made his advent, that the Kāḍavā power rose to the position of an independent power, though only for a short time. Steering clear of the old controversy³ as to whether there were two Kopperuñjīṅgās or only one, and falling in line with the writers like R. Sathianathier⁴ K. A. N Sastri⁵ and S. R. Balasubramania Iyer,⁶ who envisage only one Kopperuñjīṅga, we find the latter's inscriptions existing in places near Madras like Kunnattūr, Veṭachchēri and Tirumiliṣai. And we have to see now, how, the Kāḍava king, Kopperuñ-

1. K. A. N. Sastri: *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, p. 168.

2. SII. XII, Intro.

3. ARE. 1923 and SII. XII and Mr. V. Venkatasubba Aiyar in the *Journal of the Madras University* (Vol. XIII, 1941) postulate two Kopperuñjīṅgās.

4. Dr. S. Krishnaswami Iyengar Commemoration volume, pp. 212-216.

5. *op. cit.*, p. 416, note 162.

6. *Journal of the Madras University*, Vol. IX and X.

jingga, who was a feudatory of the Chōjas in charge of the South Arcot region, with his headquarters at Sēndamangalam, happened to come as far as Madras and even farther north.

Ambitious as he was to shake off his vassalage under the Chōjas, Rājarājā III's weak rule came to him as a veritable boon which he did not fail to use to the best of his advantage. Thus, when the Pāṇḍya king Māravarman Sundara I invaded the Chōla empire and defeated its king, Rājarāja III, Kopperuñjingga took the latter as his captive and only released him after he was compelled to do so by the fearful Hoysala invasion of the Kāḍava country. The defeat of Kopperuñjingga at the hands of Hoysala Narasimha in 1230-31 curbed the Kāḍava's ambition only temporarily. He acknowledged the Chōla overlordship perhaps only up to the year A. D. 1243, for, from that year onwards, his inscriptions give his own regnal years which might mean that he became more or less an independent power by then.¹ Later on, Kopperuñjingga, according to his Vriddachalam inscription,² seems to have scored a victory over Vira Sōmēsvara, the Hoysala king and followed it up by taking an expedition against the Kākatiyas of Nellore, who under their strong king Gaṇapati, had extended their sway as far south as Kāñchi.³ Kopperuñjingga's clash with the Kākatiyas and their feudatory, Vijayagaṇḍagopāla, took place sometime between 1255 and 1262 A. D.⁴ In this war, Kopperuñjingga was probably helped by his son, Kāḍavan Komaran who is eulogised as the Lord of Mallai (Mahabalipuram), Mayilai, Kāñchi and of Tandahanādu (Tonḍaimaṇḍalam).⁵

1. K. A. N. Sastri: *The Chōjas*, P. 430. 2. 73 of 1908.

3. Dr N. Venkataramanayya: *Early Muslim Expansion in South India*, p. 1.

4. *Journal of the Madras University*, X, p. 56. 5. *Ibid.*

He is also said to have caused both Karunātars of the west (i.e. the Hoysalas) and the Telungars (the Kākatiyas) to perish. But on the contrary, we find the Draksharama inscription¹ implying that Kōpperuñjinga acknowledged the supremacy of the Kākatiya Gaṇapati. From these apparently irreconcilable evidences, it has to be inferred that Kōpperuñjinga did not make much headway against the Kākatiyas.² Nevertheless, his effective rule should have comprised the northern part of the modern district of Tanjore, the districts of South Arcot and North Arcot, besides a portion of the Chingleput district.³ It is in the context of Kōpperuñjinga's sway over Tonḍaimaṇḍalam and his expedition to Kāñchi sometime after 1254, that his inscriptions (dated 17th, 18th, 19th and 24th years of his reign) found in the vicinity of Madras, have to be viewed.⁴ And the claim of Kōpperuñjinga's son, already referred to, that he was the Lord of Mylapore, is also note-worthy in this connection.

But the Kāḍava Kōpperuñjinga, who had been very successful so far, could not hold his own against the strong Jāṭavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I, who decisively defeated the former soon after A. D. 1264. From then onwards, Kōpperuñjinga became a subordinate ally of Jāṭavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I, and even assisted the latter in his north Indian expedition.⁵ With the death of Kōpperuñjinga, the Kāḍava power, for all practical purposes, passed out of the footlights of history, even though some later chiefs of the 16th century claimed Kāḍava ancestry.⁶

1. 419 of 1893. 2. *Journal of the Madras University*, X, p. 56.
3. *Ibid.* p. 63. 4. See Appendix II under Kōpperuñjinga.
5. JIH. XVI, p. 150.
6. R. Sewell: *The Historical Inscriptions of South India*, p. 238.

Among the important officers and warriors, who helped Kopperuñjingga were Sōjakōn of Arasūr, his younger brother Vēnādūdaiyān and Piñlaiyār Nilagangarāyar.¹ Of these the second one is described in an inscription from Tiruvannamalai as the Lord of Mallai and Mayilai.² The last mentioned chief, Nilagangarāyar, who figures in Kopperuñjingga's inscription from South Arcot, was actively associated with the tract round Madras and he figures in the inscriptions found at Tiruvirmalai³ and Tirumijasai⁴.

Yādavarāyas: Like the Kāḍavarayas, the Yādavarāyas were yet another set of feudatory chiefs of the Chōjas, who became very influential in Tonḍaimaṇḍalam in the 13th century, claiming descent from the mythological Yādu, of the lunar race, through the Chālukya line of rulers. They at first served the Chōjas as royal secretaries and administrative officers for a number of generations.⁵ But the weakness of the Chōja central authority in the 13th century spurred them to aim at asserting their independence. Thus we find inscriptions issued in their own regnal years in places like Kālahasti, Rainagiri, Tiruppasur, Gudimallam, Tiruvannamalai and Venkatagiri.⁶ Near about Madras, we find them in Tiruvorriyūr and Koyambedu in Saidapet taluk.

1. SII. XII, p. xiv-xv.
2. SII. VIII, No. 6. Mr. K. V. Subramania Iyer wrote in his preface to the same volume that Sōla-Kon and Vēnādudaiyan were sons of Kopperuñjingga. SII. XII. Mr. K. S. Vaidyanathan also regards Vēnādudaiyan as Kopperuñjingga's son. EI. xxvii, p. 95.
3. 535 of 1912.
4. 14 of 1911; *Vide* Sewell; *op. cit.* p. 370. Also see Appendix I, below.
5. T. T. Devasthanam Inscriptions, Vol. I, p. 114.
6. JIH. XVI, p. 37. ARE. 1933-34, p. 42.

Though the first Yādavarāya ruler was probably Mahāmandalēśvara Ghattideva Maharāja *alias* Kulottunga Sōla Yādavarāyan,¹ who lived during the reigns of Kulottunga III and Rājarāja III, the most celebrated of the Yādavarāya rulers was Vira Narasīnga Yādavarāya, whose tenure of chieftainship occupied a considerably long period. He served the Chōla kings, Kulottunga III, Rājarāja III, and his jurisdiction covered the districts of Chittoor, North Arcot, South Arcot and Chingleput. Inscriptions found near Madras clearly bear out his close association with the region. Thus an inscription from Tiruvorriyūr dated in the 7th year of Rājarāja III, bears the orders (olai) of Vira Narasīnga Yādavarāya, for the collection of many taxes from Tiruvorriyūr and its surrounding villages (dēvamandalam).² Another epigraph, dated 9th year of the same king, records that Vira Narasīnga founded a *linga* shrine in the inner circuit of the Tiruvorriyūr temple, and called it as Vira-Narasīmēśvaramudaiya Nāyanār after his own name.³ We have also an inscription of Nārasīngadēva himself at Tiruvorriyūr, which was probably issued after he asserted his independence.⁴ But Narasīnga Yādavarāya was such a loyal friend of the Chōla power, that he did not hesitate to fight a battle at Uratti (A. D. 1222-3) against the Kādava Kopperuñjīnga, when the latter tried to subvert the Chōla authority.⁵ Because of this, he got the title, Taniniruvrenrān.⁶ He lived to see the decline of the Chōlas and the rise of the Pāṇḍyas under Jaṭavarman Sundara

1. 88 of 1922, T. T. D. Ins. *op. cit.* *Contra. JIH.* *op. cit.*, 39-40.

2. 199 of 1912.

3. 227 of 1912; ARE, 1913 pp. 111-112.

4. 244 of 1912. Also see ARE. 1929-30, p. 81.

5. SII. XII, p. xi.

6. 640 of 1904.

Pandya I. His latest year seems to be A. D. 1263.¹ In the time of Rajaraja III himself there were two more Yādavarāyas who are mentioned in inscriptions from Pāḍi near Madras. One of them was a certain Silambanindān Yādavarāyan of Paramēsvaramangalam in Sembūr Kōṭṭam, who gave a gift of money for lamp to the temple at Pāḍi. This inscription is dated in the 8th year of Rajaraja III.² Another inscription of the same king dated in the 9th year records the gift of two gardens and two houses made to the temple at Pāḍi by Salukki Nārāyaṇa-Yādavarāyan.³ We do not know the exact relationship between these two chiefs and Narasinga Yādavarāya. But the Yādavarāya title that they added to their names indicates that they also belonged to the Yādavarāya family.⁴

The next Yādavarāya chief whose inscriptions have been found near Madras was Sriranganātha Yādavarāya. He seems to be the last known member of the Yādavarāya family. His date of accession has been fixed as A. D. 1336-37 on the ground that his record⁵ from Tiruvorriyūr dated in his 16th year, mentions the cyclic year, Khara. The astronomical details of the Tiruvorriyūr epigraph are taken to work out correctly to the 24th May, 1351, which means, his first year after accession, was S. 1258 i.e. A. D. 1336-37, during which time he might have succeeded Tiruvenkatanātha Yādavarāya.⁶ He ruled for twenty four years, and as such, he was a contemporary of Rājanārāyaṇa Sāmbūvarāya and also the Hoysala Ballala

1. JIH *op. cit.* p. 50.

2. 219 of 1910.

3. 218 of 1910.

4. ARE. 1911, p. 75.

5. 242 of 1912.

6. T. T. D. Ins. *op. cit.* p. 111. ARE, 1933-34, p. 42.

III during his closing years.¹ His territorial jurisdiction appears to have extended over the northern portion of Tonḍaimaṇḍalam, comprising parts of Chingleput, North Arcot and Chittoor districts. He was for some time subject to the imperial authority of the Hoysajas. As he lived till about A. D. 1360, he might have also witnessed the beginnings of the Vijayanagara conquest of Tonḍaimaṇḍalam, which took place between 1360 and 1365.²

The Region Under The Pāṇḍyas

To return to the account of the Pāṇḍyan conquest of Tonḍaimaṇḍalam. We have already pointed out that Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I defeated the Chōla king Rājēndra III, Hoysaḷa Sōmēśvara, the Kāḍava Kōpperuñ-jinga and the Kākatīya Gaṇapati and thus, extended his sway as far north as Nellore, where he performed his Virābhishēka. Kāñchi became his second capital. The erstwhile feudatories of the Chōlas in Tonḍaimaṇḍalam transferred their nominal allegiance to Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I and his successors. The Pāṇḍyan sway over the region round Madras is well-attested by the provenance of their inscriptions there. Thus, the inscriptions of Jaṭāvarman Sundara I and his successors, like Māravarman Kulasēkhara (A. D. 1268-1208), Jata-varman Sundara II (1276-1290), Māravarman Vikrama and Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya III (acc. 1303) have been found in places like Triplicane, Tiruvōrriyūr, Tirumullai-vāyil, Tirunīrmalai, Tirusūlam, Kunnattur and Poona-malle.³ These inscriptions clearly show that the Nilā-gangarāiyans, who served as officers under the Chōlas, now worked for their new masters, the Pāṇḍyas.⁴ But

1. ARE. *op. cit.* 2. T. T. D. INS. *op. cit.*, p. 112.

3. See Appendix under Pāṇḍyas.

4. 537 and 555 of 1912 (Tirunīrmalai).

this splendid hegemony of the Pāṇḍyas, over a considerable portion of South India, and which spread as far north as Madras and even Nellore, could not prevail for long because civil war, which was the usual malady of the Pāṇḍyan kingdom, broke out soon after the death of Māravarman Kulasēkhara I in about 1308. The civil war took place between the latter's sons Vira Pāṇḍya and Sundara Pāṇḍya, the two rival claimants to the Pāṇḍyan throne. Having suffered a defeat at the hands of Vira Pāṇḍya, Sundara invoked the aid of Malik Kafur the general of Alauddin Khilji. Malik Kafur invaded the Tamil country in A. D. 1310, and raided many cities and temples. But his invasion did not leave any permanent results. At best, it was a military raid which got the Muslim general large booty through plunder and desecration. The Pāṇḍyan civil war did continue even after Malik Kafur's return to Delhi in 1311. The confusion that prevailed in the Tamil kingdom, as a result of the Pāṇḍyan civil war and the Muslim invasion, afforded a happy hunting ground for Ravivarman Kulasēkhara I, the ruler of South Travancore, who marched as far north as Poonamalle and Conjeevaram, in about A. D 1312 and 1313. An inscription of this Chēra king, has been found in the Aruṭālappерumāl temple, at Poonamalle, near Madras. It states that the Chēra king, who conquered Sundara Pāṇḍya, granted the village Chēra-Pāṇḍya Chaurvēdimangalam for the enjoyment of the Brahmans.¹ Another inscription from the same place, also gives to Poonamalle, the surname of Chēra-Pāṇḍya Chaturvēdimangalam.² This surname of Poonamalle, as well as the surmounting of the Pāṇḍya fish with the Chēra *ankusa*, (depicted in the same temple at

Poonamalle), shows distinctly the Chēra conquest of the Pāndyan territory.¹ But this Chēra hold on Tonḍaimaṇḍlam did not last long, for, the Kākatiya king Pratāparudra II, forced the Chēras to retire to their own kingdom and installed a Telugu Governor, Mānavīra, in Kāñchi in A. D. 1316.² Manavīra's rule also lasted only for a short time for, we see the old Chōla feudatories, the Sāmbūvarāyas, driving him out, and occupying the region of South Arcot, North Arcot and Chingleput, till the advent of the Vijayanagar kings.

The region round Madras contains inscriptions, which bring out in bold relief the association of the region with the Sāmbūvarāyas. The Sāmbūvarāyans of Sengeni, like the Kāḍavarāyas and the Yādavarāyas, were originally officers of the Chōlas who took advantage of the weakness of the Chōla authority, and became quasi-independent and began to issue inscriptions in their own regnal years. The exact origin of this dynasty and its correct geneology, are not free from obscurity.³ But they figure as early as Vikrama Chōla's period,⁴ and their sphere of activity seems to have comprised the districts of South Arcot, North Arcot and Chingleput. Thus, in an inscription of Rājarāja III from Tiruvoṇiyūr, we notice a certain Sāmbūvarāyan Alagiyasiyan, son of Sāmbūvarāyan Pullavandar giving a gift of 90 ewes, a ram and a lamp-stand for the Tiruvoṇiyūr temple.⁵ Subsequent to him, we have at Kunnatūr an inscription of Venrumankonda Sāmbūvarāyan, dated in his second

1. ARE. 1911, p. 79.

2. R. Sewell: *op. cit.* p. 179.

3. See R. Sewell: *op. cit.* pp. 388-89.

4. EI. XXVIII, p. 155.

5. 106 of 1912.

year, which corresponds to A. D. 1323.¹ The inscriptions of Sakalalokachakravartin Rājanārayaṇa Sāmbūvarāyan, who is taken to have reigned between A. D. 1337 and 1360,² have been found in large number in the vicinity of Madras in places like Pujāl, Kunnattur and Tiruvorriyūr.³ One of his inscriptions from Tiruvorriyūr, which is dated in the 7th year of his reign (i.e. A. D 1344), is of special interest to us, as it throws some light on how the region round Madras was affected by the Muslim inroads into South India in the 14th century. It alludes to the incursions of the 'Turukkar' (Muhammadans) in South India, and the consequent fear among the people of the possible havoc that they would bring on such a rich temple as Tiruvorriyūr. It relates how, many of its valuable belongings were buried under the ground for safety and how, even then they were removed and appropriated by the Muhammadans.⁴ It is interesting to note here that there is current among the local people at Tiruvorriyūr, a belief that there are still many untapped secret chambers in the temple which were once used to conceal the valuables from the destructive hand of the Muslim invaders. Even many of the images of the sixty three Nāyanmars in the temple, are said to have been taken from one such secret chamber. The Muslim invasion that the Tiruvorriyur record speaks of, was evidently the one that took place in A. D. 1327 during the time of

1. 206 of 1929-30.

2. ARE, 1921, p. 112: EI. XXVIII, p. 157 puts his last date as 1362-63.

3. See Appendix II under Sāmbūvarayas.

4. 203 of 1912; ARE. 1913, p. 128, S. I. T. I., No. 524.

Muhammad bin Tughlak.¹ This Muslim penetration of Tondaimandalam from about A. D. 1327 was cut short by the Hoysala king Ballala III, who ousted the Muslims from that area and entrusted its administration to the Sāmbūvarāyas, the influential local chieftains of the area. It was these Sāmbūvarāyas, who were in charge of a considerable portion of Tondaimandalam till it was conquered by Kumāra Kampāṇa II, the son of the Vijayanagar king, Bukka I (1344-77). The conquest took place about A. D. 1361.²

The Madras Region under the Vijayanagar

Kampāṇa served his father as the viceroy of the southern part of the Vijayanagar empire. Kampāṇa first made his power felt by the Sāmbūvarāyas, who were ruling over Tondaimandalam by storming their fort at Rājagambhīra and defeating them decisively in about A. D. 1361. He entered Kāñchi triumphantly and then proceeded farther south and drove out the Muhammadans from there, successfully. Kampāṇa's inscriptions, about five in number, have been found in the region under investigation. They come from Tiruvarxiyūr and

1. V. Rangacharya: *Topographical List of Inscriptions*, I, p. 451, No. 1072.
2. EI. XV, p. 8. R. Sewell: *op. cit.*, p. 195. Here mention should be made of the inscriptions of Sāyana Uḍaiyār at Tiruvarxiyūr dated in his 7th and 9th years (213 and 240 of 1912). He was the son of Kampāṇa I. The provenance of his epigraphs in places like Tiruvarxiyūr, Trippalaivanam and Kālahasti has been taken to show that the Vijayanagar empire on its southern side must have bordered on the northern fringe of Tondaimandalam which was under Sāmbūvarāyas at that time.

See *Vijayanagar Sexcentenary Com.* Vol. 1936, p. 171.

Kunnattūr.¹ Their latest date seems to be S. 1293 i.e. A. D. 1371.² One of them, informs us that one Tuṇaiyirundanambi Kōngarāyar was the officer of the state, put in charge of the Tiruvoṇṇiyūr temple to settle the order of precedence to be followed during the services there.³ Another officer of Kampana II at Tiruvorriyūr was Viṭṭappa of Ānegondi.⁴ Puliyūr Kōṭṭam seems to have been known as Kulōttungasōlavajanādu even in Kampana's time.⁵ Kampana II died in A. D. 1374, while his father, Bukka I, ruled till A. D. 1377.

After Bukka I came his son, Harihara II (A. D. 1377-1404), whose inscriptions, about twelve in number, have been found in places like Tiruvoṇṇiyūr, Tirumullaivāyil, Tirumaisai, Pāḍi and Kunnattūr.⁶ One of his epigraphs informs us that Tonḍaimandalam continued to be known in his days as Jayangondasōlamandalam, a name given to it in the time of Rajarāja I.⁷ One of Harihara's officers in the Madras region, was Mallappa Uḍaiyār, who was probably in charge of collecting taxes for the Central Government.⁸ In about 1398, Bukka II, the son of Harihara II, conducted a raid northward to the Bāhmani territory, with his father's permission, with a view to seizing the Raichūr Doab, which formed the bone of contention between Vijayanagar empire and the Bāhmani kingdom. In this, Bukka II did not meet with success.

1. Appendix II under Kampana.

2. 192 of 1929-30.

3. 195 of 1929-30.

4. 208 of 1912.

5. 190 of 1929-30.

6. Appendix II, under Harihara II.

7. 193 of 1929-30.

8. 221 of 1910.

Therefore peace was patched up by which he had to pay a heavy indemnity to the Bāhmani Sultan. But, as several inscriptions show, Harihara II's authority extended to a considerable portion of South India including Mysore, Kanara and the Tamil country.

After Harihara II's death in about 1404, there was a succession dispute between his surviving sons. Virūpāksha I, first succeeded in securing the throne between 1404 and 1405. In his time, according to Nuniz, 'Choromandal' rebelled against Vijayanagar authority and Virūpāksha had to re-conquer the provinces of Tundīra (Tonḍai-maṇḍalam), the Chōla and the Pāṇḍya. This account of Nuniz is confirmed by other sources also.¹ But Virūpāksha's rule was soon cut short by his brother, Bukka II, who ejected him and ruled the kingdom between A. D. 1405 and 1406. After him, his brother, Dēvarāja I became the king and ruled it till A. D. 1422. The inscriptions of all the three brothers have been found in the Chingleput district.² The inscriptions of Bukka II in our region come from Tiruvoṇiyūr, Tirumullaivāyil and Koyambēdu; while those of Dēvaraya I come from Puṭal and Pāḍi.³

The next Vijayanagar ruler, Dēvarāja II, ruled between A. D. 1422 and 1446. His inscriptions about eight in number come from Tiruvoṇiyūr, Tirumullaivāyil, Kunnattūr, Pāḍi and Māngādu.⁴ During his time, Tiruvoṇiyūr came under the Chandragirirājya.⁵ Dēvarāja II's authority spread far and wide. Abdur Razak and

1. See Mysore Gazetteer, II pp. 1541-42; ARE. 1913, part ii, para 52.

2. R. Sewell: *op. cit.*, pp. 204-210.

3. See Appendix II below.

4. *Ibid.*

5. 226 of 1912.

Nuniz, two contemporary writers, testify to the fact that Dēvarāya was supreme over the whole of South India and that his dominions even spread to Quilon and Ceylon in the south. But his relations with the kingdoms of Orissa and the Bahmani continued to be hostile.¹

One Pratāpadēvarāya is mentioned as the ruler in the inscriptions found at Tirumullaivāyil² and Māngādu.³ He has been identified by R. Sewell with Srigirīndra, the brother of Dēvarāya II.⁴ He was probably put in charge of this region to look after Dēvarāya's interests. An inscription from Tiruvorriyūr, registers the order of Dēvarāya's officers or representatives Āriyappa Danāyaka, Bhikkavrittī-Appa and of prince Dēvarāya-Uḍaiyar.⁵ The last was evidently Pratāpa Dēvarāya, the brother of Dēvarāya II and who is also mentioned in the Triplicane and the Māngādu inscriptions.⁶

Dēvarāya II was succeeded by Vijaya Rāya II (A. D. 1446-47) and, shortly after, by his son, Mallikārjuna, who ruled between A. D. 1447 and 1456. The period of Mallikārjuna's rule was one of great difficulty for the Vijayanagar empire, as it came to be threatened by the combined forces of the Bahmani king, Muhammad II, and the Orissa king, Kapilēśvara Gajapati.⁷ Not only did Kapilēśvara conquer Rājamundri and Kondavidu and

1. See Mysore Gazetteer, Vol. II, pt. iii, p. 15J3 ff.

2. 665 of 1904.

3. 330, 353 and 354 of 1908.

4. R. Sewell: *op. cit.* p. 216.

5. 226 of 1912.

6. ARE. 1913 para 54.

7. ARE, 1906, para 47, S. K. Iyengar, *op. cit.*, p. 6. R. Sewell: *op. cit.* p. 226 ascribes Kapilēśvara's expedition to Kañchi to A. D. 1464.

even a large part of the Kurnool district, he also penetrated Tonḍaimaṇḍalam region. By about A. D. 1462-63, he seems to have occupied Kāñchi and Trichinopoly. But his occupation was only short-lived.¹ The Oriya expedition of the south was only a sudden raid which disappeared as speedily as it came, so that we find Mallikārjuna's rule being recognised again in Chingleput district in A. D. 1465.²

Two inscriptions of Mallikārjuna have been found at Tirumullaivāyil³ and Kunnattūr,⁴ and the inscription from the latter place gives us the information that Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Sāluva Narasīngadēva made some remission of *Idangai* taxes due from a new settlement of Kaikkōlars in the village. It was this Narasīngadēva, who served as a chief under Mallikārjuna in the south, later on, usurped the Vijayanagar throne, and started the Sāluva line of Vijayanagar rulers.

After Mallikārjuna, the Vijayanagar throne passed on to the hands of his cousin Virūpāksha II (A. D. 1465-1485). The power of the Gajapatis of Orissa rose up again to threaten the Vijayanagar empire. They made rapid advance and were in possession of Nellore. It was at this critical time that the Vijayanagar empire was saved by Sāluva Naraśimha, the powerful Vijayanagar viceroy, who, along with his trusted generals, beat the invaders back, up to Rājamundry in A. D. 1474-75. But some years later, about A. D. 1480, the Bāhmani Sultān Muhammad III took an expedition to Kāñchi, surrounded the city and

1. S. K. Iyengar: *Sources of Vijayanagar History*, p. 65.

2. 37 of 1890.

3. 680 of 1904.

4. 207 of 1929-30.

looted much of its wealth. Sāluva Narasimha sent his general Is'vara Nāyaka to Kāñchi; the latter successfully drove the Sultan out of Kāñchi and even managed to recapture much of the booty which the Sultan had collected by his plunder of Kāñchi.¹

Virūpāksha ruled till A. D. 1485, after which he was killed by his eldest son, who, in turn, was killed by his younger brother, Praudhadēvarāya. Sāluva Narasimha, the powerful subordinate of the Vijayanagar empire, utilised this confused situation, entered the capital victoriously and made himself the emperor by about A. D. 1486. Till then he was only a chieftain in charge of the modern districts of South Arcot, North Arcot and Chingleput.² In fact, the inscription at Kunnattur, as we have seen, refers to him only as Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara. But after 1486 A. D. he became the emperor of Vijayanagar. An inscription issued by him as king and in his own name has been found at Tiruvoṇṇiyūr.³ When Sāluva Narasimha became the emperor, his local agent in charge of the Tiruvoṇṇiyūr region, was Is'vara Nāyakar.⁴ He was evidently the father of Narasa Nāyaka, the able lieutenant of Sāluva Narasimha.⁵ Though Sāluva Narasimha's hold over the Tamil portions of the empire was in tact, he suffered a defeat at Udayagiri at the hands of Purushottama Gajapati in 1489. As a result of that, Udayagiri went to the king of Orissa. Two years after this Narasimha died.

1. S. K. Iyengar: *Sources*, pp. 89-106.

2. ARE. 1910, para 54.

3. 244 of 1912.

4. *Ibid.*

5. V. Rangacharya: *op. cit.* I, p. 457, No. 1113.

After the death of Sāluva Narasimha (A. D. 1491), his general, Narasa Nāyaka, became the virtual ruler of the empire. He also crowned himself king later on, by putting to death Sāluva Narasimha's son Immādi Narasimha. The great achievement of Narasa Nāyaka was his march to the south against the recalcitrant chiefs, and the subjugation of the land up to the Cape Comorin. He also extended the Vijayanagar empire to the west coast.

The next Vijayanagar king, who is represented in the inscriptions found in the vicinity of Madras, is Krishnadēvarāya (A. D. 1509-1529). He succeeded his elder brother Vira Narasimha (1505-1509), the son of Narasa Nāyaka. All the three belonged to a new line of the Vijayanagar kings, called the Tuluva line. Under Krishnadēva Rāya, the Vijayanagar empire spread far and wide. It included practically the whole of South India. By his military prowess he made his authority felt by the rebel chieftain of Ummattūr, the Gajapatis of Orissa, Sultan Muhamud II of Bāhmani and the Sultān of Bijāpur. As far as Tundiramaṇḍala (Tonḍaimaṇḍalam) and Chōlamāṇḍalam in the south were concerned, they were so quiet and calm that Krishnadēvarāya could not only afford to embark on a long and arduous war with the Gajapatis in the north, but also could pay frequent visits to holy places like Tirupati, Kālahasti and Kāñchi.¹

The Portuguese at San Thomé, Mylapore

Certain important events that took place in the vicinity of Madras during the time of Krishnadēvarāya

1. Dr. N. Venkataramanayya: *Studies in the History of the Third Dynasty of Vijayanagar*, p. 449.

can be referred to here. Gasper Correa, who was in India between A. D. 1512 and 1561, gives an account of the relation of the Portuguese and San Thomé in his *Lendas da India*.¹ According to him, in A. D. 1507 Don Francisco de Almeida, the Portuguese viceroy at Goa, heard from the native Christians that the house or chapel of Apostle Thomas existed on the Coromandel coast and sent his men to find it out and make enquiries about it. Two of them gave a report, which was sent to the king of Portugal. Ten years later, two Portuguese named Diogo Fernandes and Bastiao Fernandes, visited San Thomé *via* Pulicat and saw an ancient church, which was believed by them to be the sepulchre of the Saint. In A. D. 1521, another party of the Portuguese arrived in San Thomé, and made some investigations and also additions to the chapel. In 1523, the king of Portugal ordered a strict enquiry into the relics. Money was provided for carrying out repairs and building new chapels. By A. D. 1524 Padre Penteado came from Portugal, became the Vicar and took charge of the relics. Thus from the end of the first quarter of the 16th century San Thomé began to develop into a busy settlement of the Portuguese.²

Krishnadēvarāya's inscriptions in our region come from Tiruvo~~g~~giyūr,³ Kunnattūr,⁴ Poonamalle⁵ and Māngādū.⁶ The epigraph from Poonamalle informs us about

1. See Love's *Vestiges of Old Madras*, 1640-1800, I. pp. 287-289, where Correa's words are quoted.
2. *Ibid.* pp. 290 and 291.
3. 134 of 1912.
4. 182 of 1929-30.
5. 300 of 1938-39.
6. 361 of 1908.

a gift of land made to the temple for the merit of one Tirumala Nāyaka, who had 'Pūvirundamalli' as his Nāyakkāṭṭanās'irmai. The epigraph from Māngādu records the gift of land made to the temple for the merits of one Vira Naras'inga Nāyakar *alias* Sellappa. Another epigraph of Krishnadēvarāya (dated S'. 1431=A. D. 1510) from Kunnattur informs us that a village in Kulōttungas'ōlanādu in Chandragirirājya was given as gift to Sāluvanāyakkar Sellappar, son of Tirukkalaindān-Bhaṭṭa, a Dēvakāṇmi of the temple of Tiruvekambam-Uḍaiya-Nāyinār at Kāñchipuram. This Sellappa who is mentioned in the inscriptions of Kunnattūr and Māngādu was a powerful and loyal chief of Krishnadēvarāya, and who was in charge of the Tamil provinces of the Vijayanagar empire.¹ He continued to serve Krishnadēvarāya's son Achyutadēvarāya (A. D. 1530-1542). Thus an epigraph of Achyuta from Puṭal near Madras (dated S'. 1451=A. D. 1531) records that Talukkalaindān-Bhaṭṭar of Kāñchipuram made a gift to the Tirumūlasthānam-Uḍaya-Nāyanār temple at Puṭal of two villages for the merit of Sellappa Sāluva Dandanāyakar.² This chief Sellappa who was loyal towards Krishnadēvarāya soon turned a rebel, in the hope of overthrowing the central authority and strengthening his own position.³ But according to the *Achyuta-Rāya-Abhyudayam*, Sellappa was defeated by Achyuta's forces. He therefore fled to Tiru-

1. S. K. Iyengar: *Sources*, p. 12.

2. 487 of 1920.

3. Dr. S. K. Iyengar (*op. cit.* p. 13) thought that Sellappa might have started giving trouble to the central authority even in the closing years of Krishnadēvarāya's reign. But Dr. Venkataramanayya (*OP. cit.* P. 25) holds they Sellappa began to rebel only in the time of Achyutadēva Rāya.

vādirājya to take asylum there. But he was pursued even there by Achyuta's brother-in-law who defeated the local king who gave protection to Sellappa and brought both of them as prisoners.¹ Achyutarāya's reign also witnessed the growth of resentment amongst many of the feudatory viceroys of the Vijayanagar empire like the Nāyak of Madura. Some of them joined Rāmarāya, Tirumala and Venkata of the Aravidu dynasty as against the influential nephews of Achyutarāya. This consequently plunged the country into troubles.

Achyuta died in about 1541 and was succeeded by his son Venkata I; but a few months after his accession he was murdered by his maternal uncle Salakarāju Tirumala. The latter's tyrannical rule was cut short by Sadāśiva, who ruled between A. D. 1542 and 1576. Sadāśiva's inscription dated S' 1486 has been found in the Sri Pārtha-sārathy Swāmi temple, Triplicane.² Sadāśiva was only a king in name for Rāma Rāya, his able minister, wielded all the power. He was the *de facto* ruler of the State.

It was during the time of Sadāśiva and Rāmarāya that the activity of the Portuguese began to increase greatly at San Thomé. One particular incident that took place in San Thomé and Mylapore enraged Rāmarāya and brought about the latter's expedition to Mylapore. Thus, according to Couto, in A. D. 1558 the Portuguese Franciscan friars at San Thomé destroyed some temples belonging to the Hindus and thereby roused the indignation of the Hindus generally. "The poor fathers of the glorious Order of St. Francis having seized all the coast from Nagapatam to San Thomé, they being the first who

1. S. K. Iyengar: *Sources*, p. 12.

2. 239 of 1903; S. I. I. VIII, No. 538.

had begun to preach the light of the Holy Gospel and having throughout that tract thrown down many pagodas, a thing which grieved excessively all the Brahmans these latter reported the facts to Rāma Rāya, the king of Bisnaga (Vijayanagar) whose vassals they were, and begged him that he would hasten to their assistance for the honour of their gods.¹ They also informed the Vijayanagar king about the vast riches of the inhabitants of San Thomé.² Rāma Rāya responded to their call and personally led an expedition with a huge army to San Thomé. There he demanded hundred thousand pagodas from the Christian inhabitants; obtained half of the stipulated sum; he took five chief inhabitants of San Thomé as hostages. But even they were sent back as soon as the king reached his capital.

Rāma Rāya, as said earlier, was wielding enormous power at Vijayanagar at this time. He had made Sadā-siva virtually a puppet and even a prisoner. But this great power that he wielded and his interference in the affairs of the Sultanates of Deccan alienated the latter

1. Extract from *Chronica dos Reis de Bisnaga* as quoted by R. Sewell in his *The Forgotten Empire*, pp. 193-94.
2. *Ibid.* But Father Heras corrects Sewell's reading and says that it was a Portuguese fidalgo who informed Rāma Rāya of the wealth of the Portuguese settlers; and that later on, when he found that all their property put together did not even reach one hundred thousand parodas, ordered the fidalgo to be brought and had him put to death for having deceived him. Rāma Rāya is also said to have returned the confiscated property to the inhabitants and, instead, demanded 1,00,000, pagodas. This account, according to Fr. Heras, is supported by two contemporary writers, Couto and Faria Y Sousa. But the account of Fr. Queyroz has it that Rāma Rāya robbed the Catholic Church of Saint Thomas. See Fr. Heras, *The Aravidu Dynasty* (1927) I pp. 67-69.

and brought about the disastrous battle of Talikotta in A. D. 1565. The battle ended in utter defeat of the Vijayanagar army; Rāma Rāya was taken prisoner and put to death. The city of Vijayanagar was largely devastated. But Rāma Rāya's brother Tirumala, along with the captive king Sadāśiva, made good his escape. Tirumala, in the hope of recovering what was lost at Talikotta, returned to Vijayanagar after the Muslims had left it in a ruined condition. After a short stay of two years there, he shifted his capital to Penugonda. He put Sadāśiva to death and had himself crowned as the emperor in about A. D. 1570. He also assumed the title 'Reviver of the Decadent Karnātaka Empire.'¹ One of the important acts of Tirumala was the division of the empire into three viceroyalties as a step to counteract the expansionist activity of the Muhammadians on the northern frontier. He appointed each of his sons as viceroy of a province for general control. Thus Srīranga, the eldest son, was put in charge of the Telugu country with his capital at Penugonda;² Rāma Rāya II, the next son, was in charge of the Kannada country with his capital at Srīrangapaṭṭana; and the youngest son Venkatapati was given the control over the Tamil country with the capital at Chandragiri.³

Shortly after this reorganisation of his empire was effected, Tirumala died and was succeeded by his first son Srīranga I in A. D. 1572. Srīranga's inscriptions dated in S. 1501 and S. 1507 have been found in the vicinity of Madras. The earlier epigraph comes from Kunnattūr⁴ and the later one from Triplicane.⁵ The epigraph from

1. See Heras: *op. cit.*, pp. 236 ff. 2. S. K. Iyengar: *Sources*, p. 302.

3. *Ibid.* pp. 217 and 302. 4. 255 of 1909.

5. 237 of 1903; SII. VIII, No. 536.

Kunnattūr records the gift of land at Kunnattūr to the Talas'ayanapperumāl temple at Kadalmallai (Mahabali-puram) for the merit of the king's (Sriranga's) brother Venkata II by the general Gobburi Tirumalai Nāyakkar. The Triplicane epigraph records the gift of two villages S'embiaīn and Nedumbari, besides a garden, by Tirumala Nāyangāru, the general of Venkata II. Perhaps both the names occurring in the Kunnattur and the Triplicane epigraphs refer to one and the same chief of Venkata II. who was in charge of the Tamil country up to A. D. 1586.¹ Sriranga's reign witnessed some more incursions of the Mussalmans into the Vijayanagar kingdom. The territory north of Penugonda was occupied by the Sultān of Bijāpur, while the province of Udayagiri was conquered by the Sultān of Golconda. The capital Penugonda itself came to be threatened. In the midst of these trying circumstances Sriranga died in A. D. 1585 and was succeeded by his younger brother Venkata II (A. D. 1586-1614). His association with the region round Madras is evidenced by the existence of his inscriptions at Triplicane, Kunnattūr, Māngādu and Tirunirmalai.² Two³ of the Triplicane inscriptions of Venkata II dated S. 1525 and S. 1527 describe the king as being seated on the jewelled throne at the city of Penugonda, whereas, in fact, at the time to which the Triplicane inscriptions refer, the capital was at Chandragiri. Though Venkata, as soon as he ascended the throne in A.D. 1585 removed the capital to Penugonda, he again shifted it back to Chandragiri in A. D. 1592.⁴ But perhaps, as Father Heras points out,

1. ARE. 1910, p. 115.

2. *Vide Appendix II under Venkata II.*

3. 235 and 236 of 1903; SII, VIII, Nos. 535 and 534.

4. R. Sewell: *The Forgotten Empire*, I. p. 150.

either the people were not aware of the change or that the old capital of Tirumala and Sriranga (*viz.*, Penugonda) was mentioned out of the respect that the people had for it.¹ The same inscriptions mention Gobburi Obarasaiyādēvamahārāja as being in charge of 'Srikāryam' of the Triplicane temple. This Gobburi Obaraja was evidently the father-in-law of Venkata II and he wielded great influence in the realm, by virtue of his relationship to the ruling king.²

The reign of Venkata II was marked by a revival of strength and prosperity in the empire. He successfully dealt with the Muslim trouble from the Deccan and recovered many of the territories like Udayagiri which had been lost to the Sultāns by his predecessors. But it was the internal troubles within the empire that absorbed much of Venkata's strength. Thus there were rebellions in Mysore and Rāyalaseema which Venkata managed to put down successfully. In the Tamil country too Venkata faced a revolt headed by Lingama Nāyaka of Vellore. Venkata gave the Perumbēḍu Sima (Chingleput and Madurāntakam taluqs) to one Yāchama Nāyudu as his 'amaram.' Yāchama came into clash with Naga of Uttiramērūr, who was a subordinate of Lingama. In the fight between Yāchama and Nāga, the latter was helped by Lingama and the Nāyaks of Gingee, Tanjore and Madura. Venkata, on the other hand, went to the rescue of Yāchama, sent a huge army, which marched victoriously as far south as the Chōla country and put down the rebels successfully. Lingama was defeated and deprived

1. Heras: *op. cit.*, p. 304, also see ARE. 1904, p. 15.

2. The Mysore Gazetteer II, p. 2214.

of his estate and Vellore was made the seat of the Kingdom.¹

Meanwhile, the Portuguese activity grew greatly in the city of San Thomé at this time, especially because of Venkata's friendly relations with them. The city of San Thomé was useful to the Portuguese both as a religious centre and a commercial port. San Thomé and Mylapore were immediately under the Nayak of Tanjore who was a subordinate of Venkata. The Nayak appointed an 'adigar' to be his representative at Mylapore. He collected revenue and administered justice. The Portuguese settlement of San Thomé paid a quarter per cent of the merchandise imported by sea as tribute, to the Vijayanagar empire. From A. D. 1600 it seems to have paid an additional tribute to the Nayak of Tanjore.² That San Thomé was an important port, which enjoyed considerable trade, is well borne out by Caesar Frderick's description of it.³ Round about the same period many churches also grew up, thus making San Thomé a stronghold of the Portuguese.⁴ But by the beginning of the next century, the Portuguese settlement of San Thomé was rent with internal qaarrels and external aggression. The accounts of the foreign travellers like Fr. M. Roiz (about A. D. 1606), Faria Y Sousa (about A. D. 1626-1629) bear testimony to the internal bickerings that stalked the Portuguese settlement in the 17th century.⁵

1. K. A. N. Sastri and N. Venkataramanayya: *Further Sources of the Vijayanagar History*, Vol. III, pp. 274-281 and also p. 296.
2. Heras: *op. cit.*, pp. 428-430.
3. Love: *Vestiges of Old Madras*, (1640-1800), I. 291.
4. See Chapter IV, Sec. I.
5. Love, *op. cit.* 296 ff. and Heras: *op. cit.* p. 439 for extracts of their accounts.

It was in order to put an end to this domestic strife that the Bishopric of San Thomé was set up in A. D. 1606 by the king of Spain (who was also the king of Portugal) through His Holiness Paul V. But later accounts show that the internal troubles were not put an end to completely, even then. Besides these quarrels amongst the Portuguese settlers themselves, there were also clashes with the inhabitants of the Hindu town, Mylapore. Thus in the year 1606, the Portuguese at San Thomé, in order to avenge a private quarrel, attacked the Hindu town, and set fire to the place where the Hindu *Adhikāri* had taken shelter and killed many Hindus. The *Adhikāri* reported this matter to the Vijayanagar king Venkata II who became very angry with the Portuguese. The latter, very much perturbed at this, sent a special mission under the Rector of the College at San Thomé, who not only appeased the king but also obtained permission to remove the existing Hindu *Adhikāri* and placing in his stead another, according to the wishes of the Portuguese.¹ Though peace was restored then, a fresh war broke out against the Portuguese at San Thomé in 1611; Venkata sent a large army to besiege the city of San Thomé. The exact cause is not known. Fr. Heras suggests that it was Venkata's greed of money that was the cause.² But the author of the *Mysore Gazetteer* says that Ragunātha, the *Nāyaka* of Tanjore, was evidently conspiring against his sovereign and possibly tried to get possession of San Thomé from which he was receiving rent for some years.³ In any case, Raghuṇātha *Nāyaka*

1. Heras: *op. cit.*, pp. 440-41.

2. *Ibid.* p. 448.

3. *The Mysore Gazetteer*, II, pp. 2212-3.

helped the Portuguese against his suzerain, for which he was warmly thanked by the king of Spain and Portugal.¹ Peace was eventually proposed and the Portuguese promised to pay 401 pagodas. But this event brought home to the Portuguese the necessity for fortifying San Thomé which they did subsequent to the death of Venkata II.²

Another event of considerable importance that happened during Venkata's reign and which was an additional source of trouble for the Portuguese at San Thomé was the establishment of the Dutch settlement at Pulicat, about twenty five miles north of San Thomé. They obtained permission from Venkata to carry on trade from there. They also built a fort there in 1610. The establishment of the Dutch Settlement so near San

1. Heras: *op. cit.* p. 448. But Mr. Vriddhagirisan (*The Nayaks of Tanjore*, pp. 93-4) disputes this point. He maintains that the supposed opposition of Ragunatha against Venkata is 'a figment of imagination in the minds of the Jesuit fathers.' He says that Raghunātha was loyal to Venkata and that the Nayak who helped the Portuguese against Venkata might have been the Nayak of Gingee and not Raghunātha.
2. According to an account of the place written probably in 1635, San Thomé was surrounded by fort, the walls of which, on the eastern side, were almost washed by the waves. It had three bulwarks on the sea-side. There were four gates piercing the walls which were equipped with a number of guns. Later on when San Thomé fell into the hands of the French in about 1672, the fortifications of the fort were greatly extended. But two years later, San Thomé was besieged and occupied by the combined armies of the Sultan of Golconda and of the Dutch. The latter, helped by the English at Madras, were instrumental in demolishing the fort at San Thomé completely lest it should be used by the French as their base. Even to-day we can see the old flagstaff of this dismantled fort standing at San Thomé. See Love: *op. cit.*, pp. 279-296 and 304.

Thomé brought in a new rival to the Portuguese in the field of commerce. Therefore, the latter watched them with jealousy and did not hesitate to rise in arms against the new settlement. Thus in about A. D. 1612-1613 they captured the Dutch fort and even expelled them from the place; but the Dutch returned soon, and Pulicat came back to their hands in 1614. After this the Portuguese gave up their attempts to recapture the Dutch fort; but the keen rivalry continued.¹

The English at Pulicat, Armagon and Madraspatam

Venkata II died in A. D. 1614 and a bitter civil war ensued soon after, in which his rightful nominee, Sriranga, was put to death by the rebel group. But the loyalists headed by Yāchama crowned Sriranga's son, Rāmadēva, who ruled till his death in 1630. During Rāmadēva's reign, his father-in-law Ethirāja - 'Ittnragie' of the contemporary Dutch letters-became the master of Pulicat on the east coast, where there was a Dutch settlement. It was again during Rāmadēva's reign about 1621 that the English set up their factory at Pulicat. The English first set up their trading house or factory at Surat on the west coast in 1612. On the east coast, their factory was situated at Masulipatam, the rich emporium of the kingdom of Golconda. In course of time, Masulipatam did not prove to be a conducive place for the English trade, as the rivalry of the Dutch and the Portuguese as well as the troubles from the Mussalman governors of the locality increased.² Therefore, the English were eagerly on the look out for a new and better place to house their factory. It was at this time that they planned to

1. Heras: *op. cit.*, pp. 460-463.

2. C. S. Srinivasachari: *op. cit.*, p. 1.

have a joint trade with the Dutch at Pulicat. But after the establishment of the English factory at Pulicat in 1621, the position was found to be a difficult one. The letters that the agents of the English Company wrote home, which have been published by William Foster, show clearly the many hardships and inconveniences that the English faced at Pulicat.¹ These included lack of cooperation from the Dutch and the enormous expenditure involved in getting the desired cloth for trade. So, the English abandoned Pulicat in 1623 and retired to Masulipatam. In 1626 again, the English, determined to concentrate on the Coromandel coast, obtained the grant of a small piece of ground at Armagon, about 35 miles north of Pulicat. They even erected their factory and fort at Armagon. But, soon, they found Armagon too extremely unsuited for their trade. The Nayak of Armagon proved unfriendly and the place itself was unresourceful. The fort also became more and more dilapidated and, in view of all these factors, the Directors of the English company sent definite orders in 1638-39 to Armagon to abandon the place. Thomas Ivie who was then the chief at Masulipatam authorised Francis Day, the chief at Armagon, to undertake an exploration of the coast to find out a better station. A Dutch letter of the times from Pulicat informs us that Francis Day was trying to get Pondicherry to establish the English settlement.² But the plan did not materialise, as just then offers came to the English from one Damarla Venkatappa for establishing their settlement at Madraspatam, three

1. William Foster: *The English Factory in India -A calendar of documents in the India Office, British Museum and the Public Record Office, 1622-23*, pp. 104-107.

2. *Ibid.*, 1637-1641, pp. 32 and 72.

miles to the north of San Thomē. Damarla Venkatappa was an influential chieftain under Venkata III (1630-1642), the successor of Rāmadēva. Damarla Venkata, Ayyappa and Anka were the three sons of Chenna, the famous general of Venkata II and they belonged to the Velugoti family of Kālahasti.¹ During Venkata III's reign, Venkatappa and Aiyappa were in charge of Wandiwash and Poonamalle respectively and, as such, wielded great influence with the king. It was these two Damarla brothers who offered to the English the small tract on the coast called Madraspatam for their settlement. The English gratefully refer to Damarla Venkatappa Nayak, the elder and the more influential of the brothers, as the 'Lord General of Carnatic' and 'Grand Vazier.' Venkatappa Nayaka had certain motives in allowing the English to have their settlement in his dominion. He thought that the English and their fort would be of great help to him in times of danger.² He also hoped that by encouraging the English to trade, his country would, to use the words of an English letter of the times, 'flourish and grow rich.'³

The grant of Madraspatam to the English

Francis Day, after obtaining permission of the Agent at Masulipatam to open negotiations, reached the neighbourhood of Madraspatam on July 27th, 1639 and he was well received by the Nayak and the local merchants, painters and weavers. Day examined the spot and its products and was greatly satisfied with the same. The merchants there showed him piece-goods of excellent

1. Dr. S. K. Iyengar: *Sources*, p. 21.

2. *The Indian Year Book of International Affairs*, 1953, p. 165.

3. W. Foster: *op. cit.*, p. xxxviii.

quality at prices far cheaper than those at Armagon.¹ He also found there what seemed to him an ideal spot for the proposed fort on a tongue of land protected by the sea on the east and by the little river of Cooum and another small stream on the south and the West.² The little village of Madraspatam according to the Dutch Dagh-Register, 1640-41, consisted of some fifteen to twenty fishermen's huts. It appeared to Francis Day to be a 'towne.....at present worth about 2,000 pagodas per annum.'³ Within a month from his arrival in the neighbourhood of Madras and on 22nd August, 1639, Francis Day secured from the Nayak the grant of Madraspatam and the license to build a fort, and form a settlement. The provisions of the grant were that the English could build a fort and a castle in or about Madraspatam', the charges in the first instance being met by him and then defrayed by the English on their taking possession of it; the English were to have full power and authority to govern and dispose of the fort of Madraspatam during the space of two years from the time of their occupation of it. The English were to receive a moiety of the customs and revenues of the port; the English were to import or export goods from Madraspatam for ever customs free; they were to pay customs duties on goods passing through the Nayak's territories; they were vested with the right

1. Cf. letter from Francis Day at Armagon to Agent Ivy and Council at Masulipatam, August 27th, 1639, Foster: *op. cit.*, 1637-41, pp. 154-5.
2. *Ibid.*
3. See the letter of the agent and Council at Masulipatam to the Company, dated October 25, 1639-Foster. *op. cit.*, xxxviii Mr. Foster thinks that Day is misrepresented here by the Masulipatam factors.

of perpetual free coinage; the Nayak was to make good money advances by the English to merchants, painters, weavers etc. in every case where he has guaranteed such repayments, or deliver up such persons if they were found in his territories; no duty should be payable on the provisions that the English might buy for their fort or ships; and if any ship belonging to the English should suffer shipwreck and be driven upon any part of the coast under the dominion of the Nayak, he would restore to them whatever could be found of the wreck.¹

The Building of the Fort St. George

Francis Day, after getting this grant from the Nayak, went to Masulipatam and secured the sanction of the Council there, as well as that of the Council at Surat to proceed to Madraspatam and to build their factory there. Francis Day, along with Andrew Cogan, the Agent, who was sent from Surat to take charge of the factories of the East Coast, arrived at Madraspatam on 20th February 1640, and started erecting the fort immediately. But the English experienced a great many difficulties in the initial stages of building the fort: The Nayak who was understood by the English to have promised to bear the cost of building the fort now informed that he never promised to do so.² But thanks to the dogged perseverance of Day and Cogan the inner part of the fort was completed by St. George's Day i.e. 23rd April 1640. It has been surmised that because of the day of its completion coincided with St. George's Day it was

1. See the original text of the grant in Foster's *Founding of the Fort St. George* (1902) pp. 6-8.
2. Foster: *The English Factories in India, 1637-41*, p. xli.

called Fort St. George.¹ However it was not before 1654 that all the walls of the Fort came to be completed.² This newly risen town of Madraspatam with its fort became the seat of the Agency in the place of Masulipatam from 24th September, 1641. Thenceforth, Madras became the chief of the English factories on the east coast. The earliest letter extant from 'Fort St. George' is dated 17th July 1642.³

Madraspatam and Chennapatnam—Origin of the names

The growth and development of Madras ever since the arrival of the English as well as the origin of the names like 'Madras' and 'Chennapatnam' have been fully dealt with by scholars like Foster, Divison Love and C. S. Srinivasachari. The fact that the place called 'Madraspatam' existed even at the time of the founding of the English settlement there, cannot be denied, for the name appears even in the grant made by the Nayak to Francis Day in 1639. But as to how exactly the name came to be applied to it, there are as many suggestions as there are writers on the subject. Thus a writer suggests that Madresan, who was the headman of the village of fishermen on the site persuaded Day to call the settlement after his own name;⁴ another thinks that it was

1. Foster: *Founding of the Fort St. George*, p. 13. But the same author in his later book, *The English Factories in India*, 1637-41, p. xli, note 4 revises his opinion and agrees with Davison Love that it is unlikely, and that the Fort was 'simply named after the patron saint of England.'
2. C. S. Srinivasachari: *op. cit.*, p. 16.
3. Love: *op. cit.*, pp. 35 and 41.
4. Bundla Ramaswamy Naik as quoted by W. Foster in his *Founding of the Fort St. George* - Appendix A, II, pp. 39-40.

named so after an old Mohammedan college called Madarasa at the place; another suggestion is that the church of St. Mary Madre de Deus which was built there prior to A. D. 1640 by the Portuguese, might have been the source for the name of Madras; or that it might have been called after Madra a prominent Portuguese family settled in the old village.¹ A Persian manuscript of the 18th century has it that the name Madras came from Mahraskuppam, the original name of the site granted to the English.² Col. Love attributes its derivation from Maddarazu, called after Madda Rāju who might have been some local chief of influence.³ But whatever be the truth in all these suggestions, it is useful to remember that no old inscription refers to this place by this name and the earliest mention of it is made only in 1639.

The origin of the name Chennapatnam is fortunately not shrouded in mystery as is that of Madraspatam. A contemporary Telugu work, *Ushāparinayam*, written by Anka, a brother of Damarla Venkatapa, who gave the grant of Madraspatam to the English in 1639, informs us that his brother Ayyappa built the town (Chennapatnam) called after his father, Chennappa, with the special object of interposing a town belonging to the emperor between Pulicat (*prāyakāvēri*) and Mylapore (San Thomé) and thereby to prevent the Dutch and the Portuguese of those places from fighting.⁴ This version of *Ushāparinayam* that Chennapatnam was built by Ayyappa in the name of

1. For all these suggestions see JIH. 1940, p. 138 and *Vestiges of Old Madras*, pp. 86 ff.
2. *Tuzuk-i-Walajani*, Translated by Dr. S. M. H. Nainar, pp. 98-99.
3. Love: *op. cit.*, p. 87.
4. Dr. S. K. Iyengar: *Sources, Extract from Ushāparinayam*, p. 308.

his father is also supported by the report of the Brahmin Venkatapati, the English Company's Agent at Golconda, who wrote it in January 1672.¹ What was the exact location of the town, Chennapatnam? Chennapatnam was the name given to the new town that grew immediately round the Fort St. George while the older plot called Madraspatam lay to the north of it. In all the available records of the time 1639-1645 a difference was maintained between the original village of Madraspatam and the new town that quickly grew up in and around the Fort. But later on, however, "the intervening space between the older northern site of Madraspatam and the new southern plot of Chennapatnam came to be quickly built over with houses of the new settlers as the town expanded, so that the two villages became virtually one town. The English preferred to call the two united towns by the name of Madraspatam with which they had been familiar from the first, while the Indians chose to give it the name of Chennapatnam."² In course of time, the exact original locations of the two towns came to be confused and even reversed. Madraspatam was regarded as the site of the Fort and Chennapatnam as the Indian town to the north.

Madras between A. D. 1642 and 1650.

The vicissitudes through which the vicinity of Madras passed between 1642 and 1650 can now be traced briefly. Venkata III died in 1642 and was succeeded by Sriranga III (1642 - 1649). His period of rule witnessed great difficulties, both domestic and foreign, which ultimately brought about the ruin of his empire itself.

1. Love: *op. cit.*, I, p. 346.

2. C. S. Srinivasachari: *op. cit.*, p. 40-41.

In the south the turbulent Nāyaks of Gingee and Madura were sources of great troubles. In the Madras region, Damarla Venkatappa refused to recognise Sriranga as a successor of Venkata III and even openly intrigued with the Sultān of Golconda against his own overlord. The Golconda army had advanced near Pulicat and even laid siege to it. But Sriranga showed great courage by beating them back and thus checked their advance.¹ The condition of South India in about 1642-'43 is very well summed up in a letter of Fort St. George dated January 4, 1643: "This country being all in broils, the old king of Karnataka dead. So is the Naik of Armagon, whose country is all in the hands of the Moors and who will ere long by all likelihood be masters of all this country; for our Naik (Venkatappa Naik) not finding the respect from the new king as he expected did make proper to assist the Moors; but ere he could bring his treason about, it was discovered and he was apprehended by the king, who hath seized great part of his country; but we believe that he will be forced suddenly to restore it again and release him, for our Nayak's brother and kinsmen are levying an army for his rescue, who, with the help of the Moors on the other side (who are within a day's journey of each other) will force his liberty or ruin the whole kingdom."² The mention of Moors in the letter is obviously a reference to the Golconda army which was advancing but which was driven back by Sriranga. It is clear from the letter that Damarla Venkata was disgraced. Sriranga seized the power and authority enjoyed by Venkatappa and conferred the same on the Mallai Chetty *alias* Chenna Chetty, an Indian

1. C. S. Srinivasachari: *op. cit.*, p. 29; JIH. 1939, p. 24.

2. Foster: *op. cit.*, 1642-45, p. 80.

merchant, who had been a broker to the Dutch at Pulicat.¹ So long as Mallai was a friend of the Dutch, he was looked upon by the English with distrust. But as soon as Mallai, by a curious turn of events, fell out with the Dutch, he was warmly supported by the English.² Sriranga had ordered a general taking over of all the goods belonging to the Dutch in the hands of the Hindu merchants within his dominions and Mallai, as the local feudatory, got them collected at a place, not far away from Madras. Here, they were sold on behalf of the Emperor and the English showed their friendship for Mallai by purchasing those goods. The Dutch threatened reprisals; but undeterred, Sriranga ordered Mallai to lay the Dutch settlement of Pulicat under siege.³ While this siege of Pulicat was in progress against their Dutch rivals, the English at Madras thought it opportune time to strengthen their friendship with Sriranga. So they sent a mission under Henry Greenhill to Vellore to win the Rāya's friendship and obtain a confirmation of their rights and privileges. Sriranga, for his part, also needed the friendship of the English in his campaign against the Dutch at Pulicat. He showed his friendship to the English at Madras by granting them a 'cowle' in October 1645 by which he confirmed their old privileges besides conferring some new ones. By that grant, he brought the town in which the English had settled under his protection and did not allow it to be, as hitherto, under the Nāyak of Poonamalli. He promised to encourage

1. Love: *op. cit.*, p. 59.

2. See the letter from Fort St. George to Surat, dated 8th September, 1645 as quoted by Col. Love, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-65.

3. Letter from Fort St. George to Hon'ble Company dated 1st October, 1645, *Ibid.* pp. 65-66.

their trade and 'amplify the town.' Moreover he agreed to 'surrender the government and justice of the town into your (English) own hands.' One noteworthy feature about Sriranga's 'cowle' is that it refers to the new settlement that had grown round the Fort, not as Chennapatnam, as it was previously called, but as Sri-rangarāyapatnam. Chennapatnam, as pointed out earlier, was called after Chenna, the father of Damarla Venkata. But now as Venkata had turned hostile toward Sriranga, the latter perhaps felt that he should bestow his own name upon the town and thus wipe out the memory of the family that was working against him.¹ But curiously, however, it is the older name - Chennapatnam - that has survived to this day whereas the name Srirangapatnam had long been forgotten.

The siege of Pulicat conducted by Sriranga's general Mallai was cut short by the invasion of the Muslim forces of the Golconda and the Bijāpur who had overrun a considerable part of Sriranga's dominion. The forces sent up against Pulicat had therefore to be withdrawn for opposing the Muslim invaders. This is clearly borne out by a letter dated 21st January 1645/6 from Fort St. George to Surat. It says: "Ever since the siege of Pulicat, which was begun the 12th August last, the king hath been in wars with the king of Vizapore (Bijāpur), and in civil wars with three of his great Nagues (Naiks); And now the king of Golcondak (Golconda) hath sent his Generall Meir Gumlack (Mir Jumla), with a great army to oppose this king, who is advanced to the Jentues (Hindu) country, where the king hath sent his Mallay,

1. For the full extract of the cowle see Foster's *Founding of the Fort St. George*, pp. 32-33.
2. Foster: *The English Factories in India, 1642-1645* p. xxxiv.

who hath got together 50,000 soldiers, as report says, whereof 3,000, he sent for from Pullacatt to keep the Mores from interenching upon this kings country."¹ But even the troops under Mallai from Pulicat could not stem the tide of the Muslim invasion. By about 1645 A. D. the combined forces of Bijāpur and Golconda laid siege to Vellore, the seat of Sriranga's residence. In this war Sriranga was defeated decisively and his royal residence was occupied by the Muslim forces. Sriranga had to seek refuge in flight leaving his defence operation to Mallai, who only proved treacherous to his lord. He, according to the Fort St. George letter of February, 1645/6, surrendered the "strongest hold in this kingdom to Mir Jumla upon composition to himself and all his people to go free."²

The invasion of the Muslim forces into the vicinity of Madras is very well gleaned from the letters of Fort St. George written in 1646 and 1647. Thus a letter dated January 4th, 1647 reports that the Golconda forces under Mir Jumla "hath taken the government of Pulicat and San Thome setting the country all in order as he goeth along, and is now within two days march of the kings court and nobody comes to oppose him, the famine having almost destroyed the kingdom..."³ Another letter dated 9th October of the same year informs us that the General of the king of Golconda "hath almost conquered this kingdom and reigneth as king under the title Annabob (i.e. Nawabs)."⁴ The same letter notes

1. Fort St. George to Surat, o.c. No. 1974, 21st January 1645/6. quoted in H. D. Love: *op. cit.*, I, p. 73.
2. O. C. Ko. 1975, 10th February, 1645/6 from Love: *op. cit.*, p. 76.
3. Foster: *op. cit.*, 1646-1650, pp. 69-70.
4. O. C. No. 2046, 9th October, 1647.

with satisfaction that Mir Jumla acted with great considerateness towards the English, and earned their allegiance and assistance. He even lent them 16,000 rails for 'one twelve month gratis; which debt we discharged at the arrival of the (ship) *Farewell*.' The English on their part gave him one of the newly imported brass guns. They under the clever Presidentship of Thomas Ivie assisted the Golconda army against the Portuguese settlement of San Thomé with whom they had many quarrels on the eve of the Muslim invasion.¹ After thus bringing Madras and its immediate surroundings under his control and after securing the allegiance and friendship of the English there, Mir Jumla continued his march towards Gingee and captured it with the help of Bijapur to whom it was ultimately given (A. D. 1649).²

Meantime, Sriranga who was defeated at Vellore and forced to flee, came back to his residence and recaptured it with the help of his loyal feudatory Sivappa of Ikkéri.³ This is supported by the literary work *Sivatavaratnakara*.⁴ "As we have a number of inscriptions dated from 1645-46 to 1649 A. D. signifying to the continued rule of Sriranga with his recorded capital at Penugonda, and probably his residence at Vellore, we have to infer that the restoration of the *status quo ante* by Sivappa Nayaka of Keladi helped him to continue his possession of practically all his territory with the exception of the Pulicat and Poonamalli

1. Foster: *op. cit.*, p. 1646-1650, p. xxvi and p. 54-55 for o. c. 2009 dated No. 26, 1646.

2. C. S. Srinivasachari: *History of Gingee*, p. 163; JIH. XVIII, p. 31.

3. C. S. Srinivasachari: *op. cit.*,

4. S. K. Iyengar: *Sources*, p. 347.

provinces on the coast, within which, the factories of the Portuguese, the Dutch and the English lay. These, it would seem, continued in the possession of Mir Jumla, the Golconda general, who appears to have called himself the Nawab of the Karnatic from about the close of 1647 A. D.¹

So, at the time with which we stop our present study of the history of Madras and its surroundings (i.e. A. D. 1650), the territory remained under the active control of the Golconda general Mir Jumla, whom the contemporary English records refer to as the "nabob." He even confirmed the rights and privileges that were given to the English by the previous Hindu king.² The interesting history of Madras and its surroundings from after the conquest of Golconda forces down to the period of absolute control of the English over it, falls outside the scope of our present study.

1. *Myore Gazetteer*, II, p. 2373.

2. JIH. XVIII, p. 29.

CHAPTER III

ADMINISTRATION, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL LIFE IN THE REGION

A study of the administrative institutions that were at work in the Madras region as well as of the economic and social life of the people there, is as important as the study of political history of the region which we have dealt with in the previous chapter. Indeed, the history proper of any region will not be complete if it does not tell us about the customs and habits of the people therein, their economic and social conditions as well as about the machinery of administration under which they worked. It is precisely this purpose that has been set in view in this chapter. Inscriptions are no doubt of the greatest help here also; nonetheless, the accounts of foreign travellers and other literary evidences also throw some interesting sidelights on matters like trade and commerce.

Section I

ADMINISTRATION

Territorial divisions :

One of the prominent features of ancient South Indian administration was the division of the land into many convenient territorial divisions. The largest of such divisions was the 'mandala' which was more or less the equivalent to the modern province or state. The Madras and its surroundings came under Tonḍamāṇḍalam which later on came to be called as Jayangondasōla-

maṇḍala. The *maṇḍala* was divided into many districts called *kurram*s or *kōṭṭams*. The region under our survey, for the most part, was included in Puliyūr and Puṭal or Puṭar *kōṭṭams*; even though Manamai near Kunnattur is mentioned as part of Āmūr *kōṭṭam*. The *kōṭṭams* were subdivided into many *nāḍus*, the equivalent of modern taluks. Thus Puliyūr and Puṭal *kōṭṭams* had a number of *nāḍus* within them such as Kōṭṭur *nāḍu*, Ejuṁūr *nāḍu*, Surattūr *nāḍu*, Kunnattūr *nāḍu*, Mangādu *nāḍu*, Nāval *nāḍu*, Ambattūr *nāḍu* etc. Below the *nāḍus* came the villages, *agarams* and *mangalams*. *Kōṭṭams* were also sometimes called *valanāḍus*. Thus many Chōṭa inscriptions call Puliyūr *kōṭṭam* as Kulottungas'ōlavaṭanāḍu¹ and Puṭal *kōṭṭam* as Vikramas'ōlavaṭa *nāḍu*.² The names of the divisions such as Jayaṅgondas'ōlamaṇḍalam, Kulottungas'ōlavaṭanāḍu and Vikramas'ōlavaṭanāḍu, which bear unmistakable Chōṭa impress on them, continued to be so called even after the conquest of the Tamil country by the Vijayanagar power.³ But *maṇḍalam* ceased to constitute any regular political division under them, for its place was taken by the *rājya*. Thus the Vijayanagar inscriptions inform us that Thiruvottiyūr

1. 120 and 122 of 1912; 353 and 355 of 1908. But it must be noted, however, that as far as Tonḍamāṇḍalam was concerned the relation between a *kōṭṭam* and a *raṭanāḍu* seems to have been changing constantly. Though the majority of the inscriptions in the region equate a *kōṭṭam* with a *raṭanāḍu*, there are a few inscriptions which make the *raṭanāḍu* a subdivision of a *kōṭṭam* and still others which make the *kōṭṭam* a subdivisions of a *raṭa nāḍu*. Thus an epigraph describes Kulottungas'ōlavaṭanāḍu as the subdivision of Puliyūr *kōṭṭam* (275 of 1909) whereas another one makes Puṭal *kōṭṭam* a subdivision of Vikramas'ōlavaṭanāḍu (369 of 1911).
2. 99, 197 and 242 of 1912; 214 of 1910.
3. 193 of 1929-30 (Kunnattur); 367 of 1911 and 486 of 1920.

(which was in Puļal kōṭṭam), as well as the Puliyūr kōṭṭam were in Chandragiri rājya¹ and that Kunnattur was in the Paḍaividū rājya.² At times certain changes and re-adjustments in the territorial divisions seem to have been carried out evidently for purposes of administrative convenience. Thus, for example, Tiruvallidāyam (Pāḍi) which is described in an inscription of Rājarāja I as being situated in Tudamuniyūr nādu in Puliyūr kōṭṭam,³ seems to have been transferred and brought under Ambattūr nādu, a subdivision of Puļar kōṭṭam in later times. We are not able to know the exact cause for this sudden change of *nādu* and *kōṭṭam*; but, as pointed out earlier, some administrative exigencies might have necessitated the re-adjustment.

Provincial administration :

The next question that naturally arises is: How were these territorial divisions governed by the central government which was situated hundreds of miles away? The king who was at the apex of the administrative structure usually appointed either his own relatives or senior officers of the realm as provincial governors or chieftains to be his representatives in the distant provinces to look after his interests there. Thus, the Chōla king Virarājendra is said to have appointed one of his sons as the governor of Tonḍamandalam with the title Sōlenoran.⁴ During Rājarāja III's reign, one Madurāntaka Poṭṭāpi Chōla, a very powerful chieftain, was in charge of a considerable portion of Tonḍa-

1. 226 of 1912 and 182 of 1929-20.

2. 255 of 1909.

3. 226 of 1910.

4. 113 of 1896.

maṇḍalam.¹ In fact, the Telugu-Choṭas, the Kāḍavarāyas, the Yādavarāyas and the Sambūvarāyas were local chiefs ruling over petty territorial divisions on behalf of the Choṭa monarch. But when the central authority weakened, that of the governors gathered such strength, that they could even omit to mention their overlords in their inscriptions and issue them in their own regnal years. In the Vijayanagar days, the provincial governors and chiefs were called by many names, according to their status, such as *nāyaka*, the *Danḍanāyaka*, *Odeya* or *Uḍaiyār* etc. Virūpāksha, the son of Harihara II, was put in charge of the Tūṇḍira, Choṭa and Pāndya countries. Similarly, Dēvarāya Uḍaiyār (probably the brother of the king Dēvarāya II)², Mahāmaṇḍalēsvara Narasīṅgadēva in the reign of Mallikarjuna³, Sāluvanāyakka Sellappa in the reign of Krishnadevarāya and Achyuta Rāya were also provincial governors in charge of the southern portions of the Vijayanagar empire. Though the provincial governors acted generally in the interest of the central government, instances of the provincial governor trying to aggrandise his own position against the interests of the king were not unknown. We need only recall here the activity of Sāluvanāyaka Sellappa against Achyuta Rāya, already alluded to in the previous chapter.

Provincial Officers : Besides the governors and chiefs, there was in the provinces a hierarchy of officers to look after the interests of the central government. In the Choṭa days these officers were called by various names like *Mūvēndavēlān*, *Nādālvān*, *Nūrāyan*, *Mudali* etc. and in the Vijayanagar days many of them were called by names

1. 198 and 534 of 1912.
2. 226 of 1912 (Tiruvoḍḍiyār).
3. 237 of 1929-30 (Kunnattūr).

like *adhikāri*, *Dalavay* etc. We have already given in the previous chapter a long list of officers who served in our region under various kings. It now remains for us to review here their functions and powers. As representatives of the central government in distant territories, they were the channel of communication between the king and the local people. Any order of the king was usually issued through them. It was the responsibility of the officers to give effect to those orders. Thus in Dēvarāya II's time, a circular (*rāyasam*) is reported (in an inscription) to have been sent through the officers Ariyappa Daṇṇā-yaka, Bhiksha Vritti Ayyal and Chandragiri Dēvarāja Odeyar to all the temples in the Chandragiri rājya, such as Kāñchipuram, Tiruvorriyūr, Tirukkālatti, Tiruvālangādu and Tiruppālaivanam by which the *vibhūtikāṇikai* (a voluntary tax paid to the temple by its devotees while receiving the sacred ashes) was asked to be remitted.¹ Another inscription from Tiruvorriyūr illustrates how officers directly in charge of the locality were consulted before certain orders were passed by the king. Thus, Kulottunga III, on the recommendation of Vanādarāyar, his officer at Tiruvorriyūr, declared that 80 *vēlis* of land given to the temple as gift by an individual be made rent-free. The charter setting out this order bears the signature of Neriyudaichchōla Mūvēndavēlān, the *Tirumandira-ōlai* or the royal secretary.² Special officers seem to have been appointed from time to time to conduct periodical enquiries in the Tiruvorriyur temple. Thus, in the time of Rājādhirāja I, two officers (*adhikāri*) of the king Vaļavan Mūvēndavēlān and Vikkiramasīṅga-Mūvēndavēlān held an enquiry into the

1. ARE. 1912, p. 78.

2. 201 of 1912.

affairs of the temple in the *mandapa* called 'Mannaikonda-s'ōjan' and sold the uncultivated waste lands of the temple to a military officer of the Chōja country, who brought the lands under cultivation and provided the necessary paddy for offerings in the temple.¹ Similar enquiries into the affairs of the same temple were carried out by Adhikari Thunaiyirunda-nambi Kongarāyar, Kāmarāsa Viṭṭappa and Mudaliār Amarkonār in Vijayanagar times.² These instances show how certain cases of dispute among temple-servants and other causes necessitated the interference of the Central Government through the agency of their officers.

By far the most important function of the officers of the king was the collection of taxes and dues. Thus, an inscription of Rājarāja III at Tiruvoṇiyūr contains the orders (*ölai*) of Vira Naras'inga Yādavarāya for the collection of a number of taxes.³ A Pāṇḍya inscription at Tirunīrmalai relates that Aruṇagiripperumāl Nilagangarāiyān was responsible for collecting taxes from the people who were living near the temple (*Purakkalanai-kudimakkal*).⁴ The instances where officers exercised the right to remit certain taxes are also available in this region. Thus, in the time of Rājanārāyaṇa Sāmbūvarāyan, one Tikkainā Nayaka passed orders declaring tax-free the land that was given as gift to the temple.⁵ Two inscriptions from Tirumālisai report the remission of taxes in favour of the temple ordered by Nilagangarāiyāns.⁶ During the reign of the Vijayanagar king

1. 193 of 1912.

2. 195 of 1912, 208 and 196 of 1912, ARE. 1913, p. 118.

3. 199 of 1912.

4. 537 of 1912.

5. 207 of 1912.

6. 5 and 11 of 1911.

Mallikārjunadēva, one Mahāmandalēsvara Sāluva Narasimhadēva remitted the taxes due from the Kaikkōlas of Kunnattūr.¹

Some of the other offices mentioned in the inscriptions of this region, are *Tirumandiraōlai*, *Tiruvāykkēlvi*, *Sirudanam* and *Perudanam*. Thus, a Tiruvorriyūr inscription of Kulöttunga III mentions Minavan Mūvendavēlān as the holder of the office of *Tirumandiraolai* in connection with the grant of 100 *velis* of land to the temple.² *Tirumandiraōlai* was first used to denote 'an order (*ōlai*) of the king and his council (*mandiram*).'³ But in course of time the term came to be applied to a person employed to take down the orders of the king. '*Tiruvāykkēlvi*' was also an officer who took down the oral orders passed by the king from time to time.⁴ But the difference between *Tiruvāykkēlvi* and *Tirumandiraōlai*, according to Dr. Mahalingam, lies in the fact that while the former took down the orders that emanated from the king alone, the latter took down from the king the orders which were issued after a decision had been taken in consultation with the Council.⁵ Two other sets of officers who functioned here were known as *Sirudanam* and *Perudanam*. Thus, one Kaduttalai Nāgamayyan, son of Singamayyan of Kālēsi Perundaram, is reported to have accompanied the Chōla king Gāndarāditya's son to Tiruvorriyūr temple.⁶ Another Chōla inscription from Tiruvorriyūr mentions a

1. 207 of 1929-30.

2. 209 of 1912; also see SII. VIII, No. 542, I (from Triplicane) where the office of *Tirumandira-ōlai* is mentioned.

3. This office of *Tiruvāykkēlvi* is mentioned in a Triplicane epigraph, SII. VIII, No. 538.

4. T. V. Mahalingam : *South Indian Polity*, p. 138.

5. 246 of 1912.

Perundanam Dandanayakan who served under Rājēndra I.¹ An inscription of the same king and from the same place mentions the gift to the temple made by an officer who styled himself as *Sirudaram - Perudaram - Mārāyan*.² These two terms Sirutaram and Perutaram have been taken to refer to lower and higher ranks of official hierarchy.³ Even many nobles, military commanders, and other officers came under these divisions. There seems to have been an intermediate class also between these two classes, known as *Sirutaram-Perutaram* or *Sirudanattu-Perundanam*.

King : Though much of the work like the collection of taxes, settling some of the local disputes, regulating the temple affairs etc. were looked after by so many officers, the king, as the repository of the highest authority in the realm,⁴ took personal interest even in local matters. Thus, an inscription at Tiruvoṇiyūr bears the order issued at the instance of king Kulottunga I, while he was in his palace at the Gangaikonda-Sōlapuram. By that order Māvanpakkam in Puliyūr kōṭṭam was named Ejuṭtarivārnallūr (evidently after the God at Tiruvoṇiyūr, one of whose names was Ejuṭtarivār) for feeding devotees in the Kulottunga-Sōlān matha there.⁵ Similarly when Rājādhirāja II was personally present at Tiruvoṇiyūr, it was reported to him that the *dēvadāna* village of the temple

1. 103 of 1912.

2. 141 of 1912.

3. ARE. 1913, II p. 97.

4. Here it may be of interest to note that according to the *Kural* the king was the pivot of administration and the most important of the seven elements of sovereignty - the other six being, minister, territory, fort, treasury, army and allies (*Kural* No. 381).

5. 200 of 1912.

was lying waste, evidently for want of tenants. Upon this, he ordered it to be leased out to a private individual.¹ We have also an instance of people making a direct petition to the king about a matter which concerned them immediately. Thus, when Kulottunga visited Tiruvarangiyur and held a meeting in a *mandapa* called 'Rājarājan' in the temple, the chief of the *mata*, the *Sthānathar*, the temple supervisor, the manager, the chief accountant and the tenants of the villages, owned by the temple, were present to make a petition to the king that a *dāvadāna* village had long been lying waste for want of cultivators. On this, the king ordered the village to be sold away to a few tenants on somewhat favourable terms.² Another case where the king himself decided whether certain villages were tax-free or not is also reported by an inscription at Tiruvarangiyur.³ An epigraph of the Vijayanagar king Devarāya II mentions his order that the lands that had been originally in the hands of the tenants and servants of the Tiruvarangiyur temple and which had been taken away from them under a new system of lease, introduced by the Government, be redeemed and restored at the State cost.⁴ The foregoing instances clearly show how the king exercised his personal supervision and authority, even in the distant provinces, especially for advancing the social and economic well-being of his people.

The profound reverence and love with which the king and the royal family were looked upon by the people is amply borne out by evidences. Thus, an inscription

1. 371 of 1611.

2. 368 of 1911; ARE. 1913, p. 68.

3. ARE. *op. cit.* iii.

4. 226 of 1912.

of Virarājēndra says that certain waste lands were brought under cultivation, designated as *Virarājēndra vilāgam* and their income was allotted under various items of expenditure 'for the health of Chakravartin Virarājēndradēva for the increase of his race, for the prosperity of the marriage-badge (*tirumāngalyam*) of the queen and for the glorious health of their children.'¹ The spontaneous affection and respect that the people had for the king can also be gleaned from the way in which they named temple-vessels, ornaments, gardens, not to speak of the villages and districts, after the king ruling at that time. Thus, a necklace (*pallitongal*) and a gold door in the Tiruvorriyūr temple were both called as *Rājarājan*; and a shell-like cup of gold (*ottuvattil*) in the same place was called *Mummudisōlan*². This was during the time of Rājarāja I who had the title Mummudichōla. Similarly, during the time of Virarājendra, the pedestal of the Natarāja image at Tiruvorriyūr was called as 'Virarājēndran' while the garden there was called as Virarājendra-nandavanam.³ During the time of Perumāl Sundara Pāṇḍya I, a private person donated a doorway to the Tiruvorriyūr temple for the merit of the king and called it as *Ellāndalaiyāna-Perumāl-tiruvāsal*.⁴ Instances of villages, *kōttams*, *mandalam* and even the grain measures being called after the kings and queens have been pointed out elsewhere in different contexts.

1. 128 of 1912; ARE. 1913, p. 103.
2. 235 of 1912.
3. 217 and 228 of 1912.
4. 237 of 1912. Ellāndalaiyānan Perumāl was the title of Jaṭavarmān Sundara Pāṇḍya I.

Local Government :

The power wielded by the Central Government and its officers can be more clearly appreciated when it is viewed in relation to the amount of local autonomy that was enjoyed by the villages which have formed the nerve-centres of peoples' activities, as well as the bedrock of Indian administrative structure. One of the most remarkable features of the administrative system that prevailed in South India, especially in the Chōla days, was the harmonious functioning of the institutions of the Central Government alongside of the vast network of village *sabhās* or assemblies which enjoyed considerable local autonomy and which were the real guardians of the welfare of the villages. The authority of the Central Government even under strong kings like Rājaraja I or Kulōttunga I never crushed or curtailed the local initiative and freedom that were prevalent in the villages.

Sabhās: Right from 9th century A.D., when the Pallavas were ruling over Tondaimaṇḍalam, assemblies were functioning in the Madras region. Inscriptions from Tiruvoṇṇiyūr belonging to later Pallava kings of 9th century, mention the assemblies of Maṇali and Ādanpakkam which, besides doing many other duties, were evidently looking after the interests of the Tiruvoṇṇiyūr temple also.¹ In subsequent times, the functioning of the *Sabhās* in places like Kurattūr, Tirumījīsai, Poonamalle, Pāḍi, Veṭachcheri is very well attested.² In Kōyambēdu near Saidapet there was the *Ur* which was

1. 163 and 189 of 1912.

2. 129 of 1912, 10 of 1911; 299 of 1938-39 (1.5); 220 of 1910; 305 of 1911.

a simpler type of assembly than the *Sabhā*.¹ Invariably the *Sabhā* was associated with villages in which the Brahmins were the largest landholders—such as Maṇali, Kurattūr, Poonamalle, Tirumajisai and Vēlachchēri. Though in these rural assemblies, like the *Ur*, *Sabhā*, and *nagaram*, all those who had a stake in the locality were entitled to be present, the leadership and prominence seem to have always fallen on those who possessed high qualifications by virtue of their age, property, character and learning.

Committees of the Assemblies:

Villages being 'little republics', their assemblies had a fairly wide range of powers with regard to the conduct of affairs, affecting the village. The fact that the assemblies had to deal with a variety of subjects can be very well inferred from the existence of many Committees within the assembly, each one being entrusted with a particular task. The Committees were generally known as *vāriyams* in the Chōla days. Among such *vāriyams* were the *eri vāriam* (to look after tanks) the '*totṭa vāriam* (in charge of gardens) and the *pon-vāriam* (to examine the fineness of gold, deposited with the assembly). There was also the *pañchavara vāriyam* which was perhaps appointed to collect a specific tax called *pañcha-vira*.² The executive authority of the *Ur* and also of some of the *Sabhās* appears to have been vested in a body called *ulunganam* the 'ruling group.' Thus, for example, Vēlachchēri which had a *Sabhā*³ had also

1. 7 of 1933-34.

2. 131 of 1912 (Tiruvoxkiyūr).

3. 305 and 317 of 1911; Also see 77 of 1941-42 from Maṇavaram.

an *ālunganattār*, the members of which appear to have been Brahmins.¹ An inscription records the gift made by a Brahmin lady, wife of one of the managing members of the *ālunganattar* of Vēlachchēri, to the local temple.² Not much is known about this body called *ālunganattār*, though its origin goes back even to the Pallava times.³ It might have been the executive committee of the village assembly.

Powers: The powers exercised by the village assemblies were great and varied. Some of the early Pallava inscriptions at Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr make it appear that the assembly and the *Āmrataganā* of Adanpakkam were in charge of the charitable endowments that were made to the Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr temple; while another records the gift of gold to the same temple being deposited for interest with the assembly of Maṇali. As regards the nature of the institution called *Āmrataganā* which is mentioned along with the assembly of Adanpakkam, there are different views. The Government epigraphist for 1912-13 connected it with the *ālunganattār* who were managing members of the village. But, Dr. C. Minakshi was of the opinion that the *Āmrataganā* was not connected with the village administration, but only with the temple and its management. She also opined that the *Āmrataganā* was a body of people peculiar to Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr temple which was a large and famous institution even in the time of Aparājita and which required the management by an organised Committee of people like the *Āmrataganattār*. The magnitude of the Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr temple and its affairs, at which Dr. Minakshi hints, is very well borne out by

1. 302, 308 and 312 and 315 of 1911.

2. 302 of 1911.

3. C. Minakshi: *Administration and Social Life Under the Pallavas*, p. 130.

the inscriptions of subsequent times also and we shall have occasion to advert to it later.

The *Sabha* of Maṇali, which was in charge of the charitable endowments to Tiruvarriyūr temple in the Pallava days, continued to be so even in the Chōla days. During the time of Parāntaka I, it received on behalf of the Tiruvarriyūr temple gift of gold on interest made by a private individual.¹ On another occasion, the assembly of Maṇali purchased lands from a private individual for conducting certain services in the temple.² We have another instance of the assembly of Kuraṭṭūr selling some lands for conducting daily services in the same temple.³ Yet another epigraph of Chōla days, records the sale of a particular land by the assemblies of Sundaraśōla-chaturvēdimangalam and Vānavan-mādēvi-chaturvēdimangalam for conducting certain offerings in the Tiruvarriyūr temple.⁴ In Vēlachchēri, we have an instance of two persons buying lands from the *Sabha* of that village and presenting them to the Siva temple in the same village.⁵ We also have an instance of assembly receiving money from an individual and agreeing to pay the interest on it. Thus, the assembly of Kāvanūr received 30 kās'u and agreed to pay every year the interest on that amount to be utilised for the expenses of Pañguni Uttiram festival at Tiruvarriyūr.⁶ It is noteworthy that in all the above

1. 125 of 1912; also see 156 of 1912.

2. 112 of 1912.

3. 129 of 1912.

4. 220 of 1912. This epigraph also serves to show that assemblies of different villages came together in co-operative endeavour to carry out certain common purposes.

5. 306 of 1911.

6. 137 of 1912.

instances, assemblies acted in close collaboration with the temples and did much to promote the interests of the latter. It is also clear from the above examples that the village assemblies possessed the right of buying or disposing of land or other categories of properties owned jointly by the villagers for them and on their behalf. In such cases, assemblies served as a common bond or the cementing force by which the corporate life of the villagers was maintained.

Another important power of the assemblies was to collect taxes either in their own behalf or as agents of central government for certain local purposes. An epigraph from Koyambēdu records that the assembly (*Ur*) of that village, levied some cess on lands with different kinds of produce for the maintenance of midnight service in the local temple, which was discontinued for sometime.¹ An instance of the assembly collecting taxes on behalf of the central government is seen in an epigraph from Tiruvor̄iyūr, wherein the assembly of Puṇṇaivāyil is reported to have been charged with the duty of collecting the land tax.² The power of the assembly to exempt lands from paying certain taxes is brought out by a record of Veṭachchēri which says that the assembly of that village sold 1,500 *kulis* of land to the temple of that place, making the land tax-free.³ Another feature that deserves to be noted about the assemblies is that each one of them had its own staff of officers which assisted it in various ways in carrying out its duties. Thus, there was the *madhyastha* who is mentioned in an inscription from Tirusūlam.⁴ The duty

1. 7 of 1933-34.

2. 202 of 1912.

3. 305 of 1911.

4. 306 of 1938-39.

of *madhyastha* was to commit to writing the deliberations of the assembly. Another officer of the *Sabha*, is mentioned in an epigraph of *Velachchéri Kāra-nāṭṭan*.¹ His duty was to maintain the accounts of the assembly.

So far, for the constitution and the powers of the assemblies. Though the measure of local autonomy enjoyed by the assemblies was considerable, it was never allowed to degenerate into local autocracy. Recalcitrant assemblies, which failed to carry out faithfully the orders of the central government, were brought to book and their members punished. Thus, we have an extraordinary case of the central government imprisoning the members of the assembly of *Puṇṇavāyal* for failure to collect the arrears of taxes from the people. The inscription in which this is reported comes from *Tiruvorriyūr* and it says that the aforesaid assembly was specially directed by the central government to collect on its behalf the *pon vari* from the cultivated as well as uncultivated lands. But, the assembly was not able to collect the whole amount, for the people paid only partially. For this, the members of the assembly were held responsible and imprisoned. Thereupon, some of the remaining members of the assembly caused 80 *vēlis* of land to be sold in public auction for 200 *kās'u* to clear up the arrears and to liberate the arrested members.²

Decline of the village assemblies :

The village assemblies continued to function in the Madras region even during the Vijayanagar days. Thus, the functioning of the assemblies in *Tirumajisai, Pādi*

1. 307 of 1911.

2. 202 of 1912; ARE. 1913, p. 109.

and Kovūr during the times of Harihara II, Virūpāksha Mahārāya and Kṛishnadēvarāya respectively are recorded.¹ The assemblies of Pāḍi and Kovūr are called as *Mahājanas*, a name, which came to be applied to the *Sabhas* during the Vijayanagar times. But considering the number of Vijayanagar inscriptions found in this region, the reference that we get in them regarding the assemblies and their work is extremely meagre in contradistinction to those of the Chōla days. In the region round Madras, as it was in the case of the rest of the Tamil country as a whole, the heyday of the village assemblies seems to have disappeared with the Chōlas. Under the Vijayanagar rule, there was an increasing tendency to expand the sphere of activity of the central government through the various systems like the *ayagār* system. Added to this, were many social and political factors of the times which underlined the need for strengthening the central government. This tendency naturally precipitated the decline, both in number and power, of the village assemblies that were the pride of the Pallava and the Chōla days.²

Law and Order: One important aspect of administration is the maintenance of law and order. It is interesting to note that there was a regular system by which the villages in ancient South India maintained their own watchmen to look after the peace and order, as well as the security of the property of the villages. Thus an epigraph from Tirunirmalai refers to the existence of two officers called *Pāḍi Kāval* and *Ūr Kāval*, which were responsible for safeguarding the villages.³ The watchmen were called as *kāvalkārān* or *Pūḍikappār*. The villagers themselves seem to have set apart certain lands for the

1. 10 of 1911, 220 of 1910 and 331 of 1939-40.

2. 559 of 1912.

watchmen as remuneration for the duty that they performed. Failure to do the *kāval* duty properly was severely dealt with. This is clearly borne out by an epigraph from Tiruvarriyūr. It speaks of some insecurity that prevailed in the region round Tiruvarriyūr in the reign of Sayana Odeyar, consequent on the negligence of the *kāval* duty by the *agambadiyārs* (viz., Kājīngarāyan, S'ediyarāyan Ādittan and others) of the chief of Pāduvūr. The epigraph says, that they had been doing the *kāval* duty for a long time, but suddenly neglected it for some unexplained reasons. As a result of this, disturbances and dacoities became common, causing much loss to the people. For this, as many as 48 *agambadiyārs* were taken to task and punished.¹

Justice: It now remains for us to review the judicial system that prevailed in the region. Even from very early times, the king was considered as the fountain of justice and, as such, it was expected of him to carry out that sacred duty without fear or favour. The great author of the *Kural* put the same idea in a nutshell when he affirmed that "not lance gives kings the victory, but sceptre swayed with equity."² And, we see in the Pallava and Chōla days, royal court of justice called *Dharmasana* being mentioned very often. Thus four early inscriptions from Tiruvarriyūr, belonging to the Pallava kings, inform us that the local assemblies like those at Manali and Adambakkam, which undertook to be the custodians of certain gifts made to the Tiruvarriyūr temple, bound themselves to pay fines to the *Dharamāsana* for failure to

1. 240 of 1912; Also see *Vijayanagar Sexcentenary Com.*, vol. 1936, p. 171.

2. வேலன்று வெள்ளி தருவது மன்னவன் கொல்தாழம் கோட்டை தெனின் (Kural No. 546).

discharge the functions to which they had agreed.¹ A Chōla record from Vēlachchēri also mentions this Council of Justice called *Dharmāsana*.² The exact nature of this court is not clear. But it seems to have been presided over by the king himself, who was assisted by many learned Brahmins who were conversant with the laws and who were also known as *Dharmāsanabhātṭas*.

All cases did not go to the king's court; cases where minor disputes were involved seem to have been decided locally by the village assemblies themselves by means of small committees called the *nyāyattār*.³ Besides these, certain disputes which arose among the servants of the temple, such as that of Tiruvoṇṇiyūr, were enquired into and settled by the king's specially deputed officers. One long-drawn-out dispute regarding the order of precedence to be followed during the services in the Tiruvoṇṇiyūr temple by *Ishabattaliyilār* and *Devaradiyār*, seems to have defied solution for quite a long time, for unsuccessful attempts at settling the disputes were made by one Muḍaliyār of Perumbaṇappuliyūr (Chidambaram) in the time of Rajanārayana Sambūvarāya and another by the temple trustees. Yet another attempt was made by Viṭṭappan of Anegondai in the time of Kampana Uḍaiyar.⁴ Even though the latter effected certain changes and settled a procedure to be followed in the temple service, it does not seem to have been satisfactory,⁵ for we see the same question cropping up three years hence and being settled by a compromise.⁶ The details of this memorable dispute

1. SII. XII, Nos. 70, 90, 91; and 189 of 1912;

2. SII. III, part iii, No. 116.

3. See 259 of 1909.

4. 208 of 1912.

5. ARE. 1913, p. 118.

6. 196 of 1912 and ARE. *Ibid.*

may well be studied in another context, as they give us a very good idea of a number of servants, who functioned in the Tiruvarriyūr temple and their multifarious duties. But what we need mention here is that temple-disputes were enquired into and settled by the agents of the central government. Another remarkable point to be noted in the above case is that the central government officers, when settling the dispute, invited the local authorities (like *nāttār*) of the village and the district to be present and to assist them in their task.

Crime and Punishment

So far for the various methods by which justice was administered. Now, let us see what was the nature of punishment that was given to the offenders. An epigraph of the 14th century from Tiruvarriyūr throws welcome light on this matter. Certain persons organised themselves and stole many of the properties of the temple and committed many similar acts of treachery against God (*Sivadhrōhies*). The *Mahēsvaras* and the Trustees of the temple instituted inquiries into the matter in the temple hall, called *Vyākaranā mandapa*. But as most of the culprits had died in the meantime, the lands and houses belonging to them had to be confiscated to the temple. The same epigraph refers to the sale of land and houses of another private individual who committed a state offence.¹

Another inscription of the locality, alludes to an interesting case where, when two persons went out on a hunting expedition, the arrow of one aimed at the game, hit and killed the other person. The record is unfortunately mutilated and we are not informed how the matter

1. 203 of 1912; ARE. 1913 II, SITI. I, No. 523.

was taken up and decided. But as the Government Epigraphist points out, the usual expiation for such unintended crime was to provide for a perpetual lamp in the temple for the merit of the deceased.¹

Revenue administration

What were the sources of revenue with which alone the government could maintain itself? Taxes on land, property, industries, trade and commerce, and other social communal taxes, besides fines and dues, constituted the sources of revenue. Of all these, the land-tax was the most important as well as the most extensive. Some of the general terms by which taxes are referred to in our inscriptions are *irai*,² *kudimai*,³ *vari*,⁴ *pattam*⁵ etc. Before taxes were levied certain factors such as the nature of the village, the tenure of the land, the fertility of the soil and the kind of crop grown therein seem to have been taken into consideration. Different grades (*taram*) of land were distinguished and taxes varied accordingly. Thus an epigraph of Chōla times from Tiruvorriyūr records that the *irai* (tax) paid to the temple on some lands was 28 *kalams* per *vēli*, while on others it was only 19 *kalams*. This shows that the rate of assessment differed with the fertility of the soil.⁶ The exact share of the state in the produce from a unit of land is not clearly known from these inscriptions. In Chōla days, the share due to the state appears to have been about one third of the gross produce. In the Vijayanagar

1. 257 of 1909 and ARE. 1910, p. 95.

2. 155 of 1912.

3. *Ibid.*

4. 5 of 1911 (Tirumilisai).

5. 154 of 1912.

6. 193 of 1912.

times the State's share seems to have been more than that.

From the epigraphs at Tiruvo^ggiyūr we get to know the names of the various taxes, the import of which, however, is not very clear. Thus a Chōla epigraph mentions the dues (*antarāya* and *kuḍimai*) such as *pūppon*, *pañchvāram*, *vēlikāsu*, *nirvilai*, *vetti*, *muṭṭaiyal*, *ccchchōru* and *kurrunel* which were levied on land.¹ Another Chōla epigraph mentions '*amanji*', besides similar land taxes like *Vetti* and *Kurrunel*.² *Amanji* meant 'free labour' while *vetti* denoted 'forced labour.' Both of them are mentioned as *irai* (tax) that were to be paid by the cultivators. Another land tax called '*Antarāyappattam*' is mentioned in a Chōla epigraph from Tiruvo^ggiyūr.³ A tax called *Sirupāḍkāval* levied on lands growing gingelly and cotton is mentioned in a record from the same place.⁴

Taxes on land were paid both in kind and in cash. Usually, taxes on wet lands such as *kadamai* was paid by grain, while the tax on dry lands was paid in cash. Barren lands or decadent villages used to be exempted from the obligation of paying tax. The land which was exempted from taxation was known as *iraili* (tax-free). Such of those lands as were completely exempted from paying taxes were also known as '*irangal*'. Thus an interesting inscription records that during the time of Rajarāja III, the question arose as to whether Tiruvo^ggiyūr and other villages belonging to it (*dēvamanḍalam*) were to be tax free (*irangal*) or not. The king, when approached, declared that they were not *irangal* but only

1. 131 of 1912.

2. 155 of 1912.

3. 201 of 1912.

4. ARE. 1913, p. 112.

niṅgal, in the sense that taxes collected in those villages had to be made over to the temple and not to the king.¹ Evidently, Tiruvoṇiyūr continued to be *niṅgal* even under the Vijayanagar rule, for an epigraph of Kampaṇa II refers to it as a 'niṅgal-village.'² These instances also serve to show that the temples were also vested with the right to tax in certain cases.³

Professional and social taxes

Taxes on profession and industry also filled the state treasury. An epigraph from Kunnattūr says that special tax of 4 *panam* was collected for every loom from the *Kaikkōlas* (weavers) of the village,⁴ while another from Pādi speaks of the *Idangai vari* paid by the *vaiṇiyars* and the *Idangai* community.⁵ Probably, *Sekkāyam* and *magamai* that are mentioned in the Tiruvoṇiyūr records⁶ were taxes on industry. *Sekkāyam* might have been a tax on oil-press (*Sekku*). Another useful epigraph from Tiruvoṇiyūr mentions taxes that were levied on looms, drummers (*Uvachchars*), dyers and oil-mongers. The tax on oil-mongers is called as *kārtikai-kāśu*. It also mentions taxes on salt-pans (*aririsi-kāśu*).⁷ An Inscription from Pādi refers to the fixing up of the taxes payable by 18 professional castes of the place to the local temple.⁸

1. 199 of 1912, ARE, *op. cit.* p. 111.

2. 210 of 1912.

3. In this connection see the epigraph (192 of 1929-30) from Kunnattūr also.

4. 221 of 1929-30.

5. 215 of 1910.

6. 244 of 1912.

7. ARE, *op. cit.* p. 112.

8. 221 of 1910.

Fines and dues: Apart from these taxes, there were certain fines and fees levied on those who committed certain breaches. They were also a source of income for the Government. For example, a Tiruvorriyūr record says that a fee known as 'Kālalavupattam' was collected from the man who committed mistakes (perhaps deliberate), when measuring gain in the temple granary.¹ *Kurradañdam* and *Pattidāñdam* mentioned in the Tiruvorriyūr epigraphs also appear to be the fines collected for certain minor offences.²

Arbitrary taxation: Oppression and arbitrary taxation by the tax-levying authority, though rare, are not altogether unknown. We have at least two cases of this kind, recorded at Tiruvorriyūr. One was in the time of Kulottunga III, when Pillaiyār Yādavarāyar imposed *pon-vari* tax uniformly on all lands in the country at $\frac{1}{4}$ *mādai* per *vēli* without exempting, as usual, the uncultivated waste lands in the village. This was considered as arbitrary and the land-holders paid only partially. For the uncollected balance of assessment the tax-collecting agent, namely, the *Sabha*, was held responsible and punished.³ Another case of oppressive taxation is reported by a Vijayanagar record from Tiruvorriyūr itself. It says that the *Mahēsvaras* of the temple complained to the king that the tenants, servants, and other residents of the villages owned by the Tiruvorriyūr temple, had been much distressed by the imposition of taxes such as *jōdi*, *mugampārvai*, *angasālai*, *sambadam*, and *visēshadāyan* and also by the introduction of a new lease system. On account of this excessive taxation,

1. 154 of 1912; ARE. *op. cit.*, p. 105.

2. ARE. *op. cit.*, p. 112.

3. SITI. I, No. 519.

even worship in the temple was not conducted as usual. The king, by way of concession to the temple, ordered that thenceforth the taxes mentioned above, together with *ariāi-kāñam*, *Nallerudu* (good bull) *Narpasu* (good cow), *vet̄ti*, and *kaṭṭayam* were to be collected by the Mahēśvaras of the temple and that the worship in the temple be revived as before.¹

Evasion: Information is also available regarding deliberate evasions being attempted by the people from paying taxes. An epigraph from Kunnattūr in the time of Kumāra Kampāṇa states that one Tiruvoṇiyūruḍaiyār Kākunyākkar, a tenant of Muṭṭikkunayakan Tennavarāyan, the headman of Kujattūr ran away without paying the taxes due to the temple. As a punishment for this offence of evading the payment of tax, his lands were sold as a *tirunāmatṭukāṇi*.²

The foregoing account will serve to show that in the region round Madras, there were all the essentials of an efficient and smooth administration. Its greatest merit was the ample scope that it offered for local freedom and initiative to the villages and their assemblies, subject to the general welfare and solidarity of the empire as a whole.

Section II

ECONOMIC LIFE

Agriculture has always been the mainstay of Indian economic system. The dignity and importance attached to the calling of husbandry by ancient Tamil literature and tradition affords proof of the vital role that land and

1. 226 of 1912; ARE. 1913, p. 120.

agriculture played in deciding the economic status of a person or a country. According to the *Kural* "husbandmen support all those that take to other work; they alone live who live by tilling the ground."¹ Land was the real wealth of the people and cultivation, their main occupation. The fact that most of the transactions recorded in the epigraphs such as grants, sales etc. centre round land, serves as an index to the importance attached to the land.

Private and Communal ownership of land :

That both individual and communal ownership of land existed in the villages round Madras, as elsewhere in South India, is borne out by inscriptions. The former is proved by a number of epigraphs which relate to the gift or sale of lands made by individuals to temples or private persons. Thus, in our inscriptions barbers, temple-servants, Brahman ladies, military officers, chiefs and other citizens are reported to have made gift of lands to the temples.² This shows the widespread prevalence of private ownership of land. At the same time, there were certain lands in the villages which were held in common by their residents. Numerous are the epigraphs in our region which speak of the sale, purchase or gift of lands made jointly by the residents of a village, or sometime of more than one village. To cite but a few examples, a Chōla epigraph from Tirumallaivāyil records the sale of land by the villagers of Ambattūr to an outsider.³ An epigraph from Tiruvoṇiyūr records that the residents of Vēsharupādi sold some *kulis* of land

1. *Kural* Nos. 1032 and 1033.

2. 220, 215 of 1929-30, 225 of 1912, 302 of 1911, 135 of 1912 etc.

3. 669 of 1904.

together with irrigation facilities and house-sites, to a Brahman lady who utilised them for some pious services in Tiruvo_{lli}iyūr temple.¹ The residents of Ennūr also sold some lands to the same lady.² The sale of a whole village by the residents of another village, who were probably the owners, is also recorded in an inscription from Tirunirmalai.³ Certain lands appear to have been owned jointly by the residents of more than one village. Thus, for instance, a Tiruvo_{lli}iyūr epigraph records a sale of land to a person by the residents of two villages.⁴ Cases where the entire body of villagers granted a piece of land as gift to the temples are reported in the inscriptions of Tirumallaivāyil, Pu_ṭal, Kunnattūr and other places.⁵ All the instances cited above serve to show that certain lands in the villages, apart from those that were under individual ownership, were the common property of the villagers as a whole.

In Brahmadēya villages such as Poonamalle, Vēlachchēri and Tirumajis_{ai}, certain lands were usually held by them in common. The system of tenure that prevailed in some Brahmadēya villages was known as *gāṇabhōgam* tenure. According to one type of this tenure, the lands of the village under joint ownership were cultivated in common by the community, the profits therefrom being shared among themselves in proportion to the number of shares each one had in the lands.⁶

1. 127 of 1912.
2. 132 of 1912.
3. 555 of 1912.
4. 155 of 1912.
5. 680 of 1904, 484 of 1920 and 225 of 1928-29.
6. T. V. Mahalingam: *Administration and Social Life under Vijayanagar*, pp. 209-210.

Irrigation: Closely allied to agriculture is the problem of water-supply or irrigation to lands. An epigraph from Tiruvariyūr dated in the reign of Kulottunga I gives us the important information that three ways of irrigation were known and practised by the agriculturists of the region. They were firstly, by damming the river, secondly, by using hand piccotas and thirdly, by using baskets.¹ As there were not many rivers in this region, the usage of hand piccotas and baskets for lifting water from wells and tanks seem to have been widely prevalent. Even some later Pallava inscriptions of the 9th century A. D. from Tiruvariyūr testify to their usage here. Thus, one of them mentions the land irrigated by one or two piccotas (*onriru pērēṭṭabhūmi*)², while another speaks of lands irrigated by four piccotas (*inilattirkē nallēttameduppadāga*)³. Evidently, the number of piccotas used in a well or a tank varied with its size as well as the area of the land to be irrigated. Besides wells, lakes or tanks constituted a useful source of water-supply. In this, Kunnattūr and its immediate surroundings seem to have been extremely fortunate. As many as four inscriptions from Kunnattūr refer to the big tank near the village, a large-sized *madagu* (sluice) belonging to it, as well as several channels dug for irrigating the lands.⁴ These references are evidently to the Sambarambakkam Ēri near Kunnattūr, one of the biggest and most useful irrigation tanks in the Chingleput district.⁵ Epigraphs from Koyambēdu on the west of Nungambakkam mention the lake (*cri*) of that village.

1. 133 of 1912.
2. 180 of 1912.
3. 372 of 1911.
4. 191, 194, 198 and 225 of 1929-30.
5. ARE. 1929-30, p. 80.

Famine: Famines which are usually caused by absence of rains or good water facilities etc. are not met with in the epigraphs of the Madras region, though lands, mainly those of the temples, being left uncultivated for want of tenants are frequently reported, especially, at Tiruvo~~kk~~iyūr. On such occasions, either the king or his chief sent personal orders leasing the fallow lands to certain private persons and asking them to cultivate them. Probably on such occasions some concessions with regard to land-tax were also shown to the newly appointed tenants. However, the English records of Fort St. George for the year 1647 give us horrid accounts of a severe famine that seems to have afflicted Madras-patam and its surroundings. The tragic impact of that famine cannot be described better than in the very words of the Factors at Madras in their letters to the Council at Surat. Thus in a letter dated January 4th, 1647 they say: "Out of our little town there have died no less than 3,000 people since September last; in Pulicat 15,000; and in San Thomé no less. So that all painters and weavers are dead; so there cannot be expected any quantity of cloth to be produced here this three years..."¹ Another letter of January 11th of the same year reads: "The famine is so great in this kingdom that we believe it will be the destruction thereof, for there has not fallen any rain this year for the increase of grain to relieve the people; and now the season of rains is past, so that if the Almighty does not send supply from other parts, the country will be so dispopulated that it will be impossible to recover itself again in five years time. Therefore we

1. Letter of Thomas Ivy, George Travell and William Gurney at Fort St. George to the President and Council at Surat. January 4th, 1647. Extract from W. Foster, *The English Factories in India, 1648-1650* pp. 69-70.

earnestly beseech you to send us, by the shipping you intend hither in April or May next, 100 or two tuns ordinary rice to preserve the lives of those few painters, weavers and washers which remain about us.....”¹

Land-measures: Two more features to be noticed regarding land and agriculture are the land-measures that were current in the region round Madras and the approximate yield of paddy from lands. The former may give us an idea about the meticulous care with which the people measured their lands and kept their boundaries; the latter gives us an insight into the fertility of the soil. The largest unit of lands seems to have been the *vēli* which was divided into a number of smaller units like the *Kāṇi*, *Kuṇi*, *paṭṭi*, *mā* etc. A Tiruvo_{kk}iyūr epigraph furnishes us with the ratio between some of the units of land. For example, it says that 14,648 *kulis* of land went to make 7 and 1/8 *vēlis*; and again 10,752 *kulis* were equal to 5 *vēlis* and 2½ *mās* of land.² Another epigraph from the same place of Chōla times tells us that one *vēli* of land was equal to 2,000 *kuṇis* of land, measured by the sixteen-span rod.³ The latter term, the *Padi-nārusān kōl* or the sixteen span-rod, is one of the units of measurement that was probably introduced by the government and that was current in the territory round Madras, as well as in many other places, elsewhere. The *pādinārusān kōl* is frequently mentioned in the Chōla epigraphs from Tiruvo_{kk}iyūr.⁴ Other land measures that were current in the Madras region are the twelve-span rod,⁵ *Amāittā-Nārāyaṇan-nilavalavu-kōl* and the *Gandarā*

1. Extract from the letter, o.c. No. 2019 from Love, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
2. 103 of 1912.
3. SII. III, No. 64.
4. e.g. 155, 156, 131 of 1912.
5. SITI. I. No. 523, p. 510 (Tiruvo_{kk}iyūr).

gāndan. The latter two are mentioned in an epigraph from Kunnattūr, which, unfortunately, does not bear either the date or the name of the king and his dynasty.¹ A Tiruvorriyūr record makes mention of *Sripāda* - a rod equal to the royal-foot as a unit of measuring lands.²

Yield of land: The yield of paddy from lands at Tiruvorriyūr does not seem to have been very encouraging. We know from an epigraph of Kulöttunga I that 12 *vēlis* of land yielded 576 *kalams* of paddy, which means that only 48 *kalams* were produced from one *vēli* of land.³ Another epigraph of the same king and from the same place reports of what seems to be a less fertile land than the one cited above, for it yielded only 35 *kalams* per *vēli* - a rather poor return.⁴ The low fertility of the soil at Tiruvorriyūr comes out in sharp contrast to that obtained in South Arcot, for example, where a *vēli* of land produced about 102 *kalams* of paddy.⁵

Grain-measures: Epigraphs from the Madras region also throw much light on many grain-measures prevalent there, as well as about the value of land and grain in relation to money that was used in the olden days. Among grain-measures that were used were the *Kalam*,⁶ *Marakkāl*,⁷ *Nāli*,⁸ *Kuruni*,⁹ etc. In Tiruvorriyūr a peculiar kind of *Nāli* known as *Kurunāli* was used for measuring

1. 228 of 1929-30.

2. 228 of 1912, ARE. 1913, p. 103.

3. 131 of 1912.

4. 133 of 1912; ARE. 1913, p. 105.

5. 118 of 1888 (Chidambaram).

6. See the footnote No. 4 in the same page.

7. ARE. 1913, p. 97.

8. 146 of 1912.

9. 148 of 1912.

rice.¹ Similarly the Pallava record from Triplicane mentions a unit of grain-measure called *Kāḍi*.² During the time of Rājāraja I the *marakkāl* that was current at Tiruvoṇṇiyūr, was called *Arumolidevan marakkāl*³ while the one that was prevalent in Rājendra-Chōla's period was known as *Rājakēsarimarakkāl*.⁴ But the two *marakkāls* need not be taken as referring to two different measures. It is quite possible that one and the same measure was called by different names in different periods. Similarly, the *Nūli* that was in use at Pāḍi in Chōla times was known as *Tirujñānasambandanāli*.⁵

Grain Price: The price of grains is mentioned in some rare records found in the region. Thus, the Triplicane epigraph of Danṭivarman makes us infer that 5 *kalāñjus* of gold fetched 45 *kāḍis* of paddy.⁶ An inscription of Kulottunga I from Tiruvoṇṇiyūr gives the cost price of 576 *kalams* of paddy as 144 *kāsus*; that is 4 *kalams* of paddy was sold for one *kāsu*.⁷

Land Value: We can also see the price of land in the region round Madras before we begin to explain some of the coins, mentioned above. The last mentioned epigraph (of Kulottunga I) itself states that the price of 100 *kuṭis* of land was 1 *kāsu* and that of 1 *vēli* was 20 *kāsu*⁸. But, when the land was auctioned to clear the arrears to government, the price realised, went down as low as 2½

1. 162 of 1912; SIL. XIII, No. 70.
2. EI. VIII, p. 295.
3. 103 of 1912.
4. 140 of 1912.
5. 214 of 1910.
6. EI. VIII. p. 295.
7. 131 of 1912, ARE, 1913, p. 104.
8. *Ibid.*

kāsu per *vēli*,¹ evidently because it was a forced sale. Much earlier than the above epigraph and in the time of Rājendra I one *vēli* of land (2,000 *kulis*) measured by the sixteen span-rod was priced at 8 *Madhurāntadēvanmāḍai*, i.e. for 4 *kāsus*.²

Coins and weights: Evidences are also available regarding the system of coins and weights that prevailed in this region. Perhaps the most frequently mentioned coin in the epigraphs here is the *kāsu*, which was in vogue even before and after the time of Rājarāja I. We have an epigraph (at Tiruvarriyūr) of the reign of Rājendra I which mentions the *Rājarājan kāsu* - evidently issued by Rājarāja I. As the same epigraph mentions that the interest on it was one half of that of *Madhurāntakadēvanmāḍai*, we can infer that *Rājarājan kāsu* must have been, in weight and value, one half of *Madhurāntakadēvanmāḍai*.³ The latter, which was perhaps issued by Rājarāja I's predecessor Madhurāntaka Uttama Chōla, was a gold coin of the full weight of one *kañju* and also served as the standard by which fineness of gold was tested.⁴ In Kulottunga III's time, the coin that seems to have been prevalent in this region was *Bhujabalamāḍai*. It occurs in the inscriptions of Kulottunga III from Kōyambēdu⁵ and Tirumullaivāyil.⁶ In the latter place, another coin called *palam-pulli-māḍai* was current in Rājarāja III's time.⁷ Another coin that was prevalent

1. 202 of 1912.
2. 156 of 1912.
3. 141 of 1912, ARE. 1913, p. 97.
4. 140 of 1912.
5. 5 of 1933-34, Report of the same year, II.
6. 667 of 1904.
7. 674 of 1904.

in the region in the reign of Kulottunga III was *Gāndagōpālan mādai* or *Gāndagōpālanpudumādai*, which was evidently issued by the Telugu-Chōda chieftains.¹ Two fragmentary inscriptions from Triplicane mention *Paṇam* and *Narapudukāśu*.² Among the weights of gold that were prevalent in the region were the *Kalañju* (which is mentioned even in the Pallava record from Triplicane), *Pon*,³ *mānjādi*⁴ etc. An epigraph from Tiruvoṇṇiyūr mentions another gold weight called *Nishka* and says that it was equivalent to *kalāñju*.⁵ *Mānjādis* on the other hand was a smaller unit and twenty *Mānjādis* made one *kalāñju*.⁶

Other occupations: Agriculture, though main, was not the only occupation of the people. There were in a village traders, weavers, goldsmiths, oil-mongers, blacksmiths, sculptors, barbers and others. In the coastal places like Triplicane, people were also engaged in salt producing industry. An epigraph from Tiruvoṇṇiyūr records the gift of a salt pan to the local temple. The salt pan was called as *Padambakkāṇyakappērālam* evidently after god Paṇimbakka at Tiruvoṇṇiyūr.⁷ The fact that a special tax on salt pans was collected from Tiruvoṇṇiyūr shows that salt industry was prevalent there.⁸ Much information is not available regarding the income or wages that the weavers, goldsmiths, potters, blacksmiths and others got; but a greater part of their income was probably in the form of paddy, though

1. 552, 562 and 560 of 1912 (Tirunirmalai).

2. SIL VIII, 543-A XI and XXI.

3. 141 of 1912.

4. 158 of 1912.

5. 181 of 1912.

6. 141 of 1912.

7. 367 of 1911.

8. ARE. 1913, p. 111.

payment in money was also in practice. People who did certain services in the temple were paid both in kind and in cash. Thus, two garland-makers in the Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr temple were paid 10 *nālīs* of rice each per diem together with 1½ *kalāñjus* of gold per annum for buying clothes. Brahmins who recited Vēdas in the temple were each paid 12 *nālīs* in addition to 1½ *kalāñjus* of gold per annum.¹ A Chōla epigraph from the same place tells us that a person employed to supply drinking water in a public place at Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr was paid 2 *kūs'ws* per annum, besides a daily wage of one *kuruni* of rice.²

Merchants and trade-guilds :

Trade and commerce formed an important source of livelihood for a number of people. Mylapore, Poona-malle and Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr in particular, seem to have been busy centres of trade where rich merchants lived. That many of the merchants were economically well off and also public-spirited is seen from a number of instances where they make numerous gifts to the temples. Thus, the merchants of Pūndamalli made gifts to the Siva temple at Tirusūlam near Pallāvaram in Kulottunga III's time.³ Two oil-mongers from the same place made gifts to the Vishnu temple at Tirunirmalai at two different times.⁴ Similarly, a merchant from Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr gave 30 *kalāñjus* gold, quite a big sum, to the Varāhapperumāl temple at Tiruvadandai.⁵ Merchants from Mylapore seem to have been considerably rich and munificent, for their many gifts to various temples get frequently

1. 146 of 1912.

2. 154 of 1912.

3. 311 of 1901.

4. 542 and 560 of 1912.

5. 267 of 1910.

mentioned in the epigraphs. For instance, an inscription of Rājarāja I from Tiruvadandai records the gift of money made by a merchant from Mayilārppil (Mylapore) to the Vaishnava temple there.¹ Another merchant who was a resident of Māḍaviddipperunderu at Tirumayilārpil (Mylapore) gave money as gift for the Sīva temple at Kaṭattūr, about five miles south of Chingleput.² Yet another epigraph registers the endowment of land made by Arulālan Dēvapperumāl, a merchant of Tirumayilāppur, to the Sīva temple at Kunnattūr.³ In addition to these charitable activities of these individual merchants, we get references to the functioning of merchant organisations or guilds (*Nagarattār*) in the region round Madras. Thus, an epigraph of Rājēndra I records that the merchants of Tiruvoṇiyūr (*Nagarattār*) jointly sold some lands to a private individual who gifted the same to the temple.⁴ Two instances of joint borrowing of money for interest by the merchants of Tiruvoṇiyūr are also recorded.⁵ Another similar merchant - organisation seems to have been working at Poonamallee.⁶ We also come across a remarkable instance of the merchant communities from Mylapore, Tiruvoṇiyūr, Pūndamalli, Nellūr, Nārāyanapuram, Ārkādu, Nedumpirai, Dāmankachēri and other places cooperating together to enquire about a village, and giving it as *dēvadāna* to the temple of Tiruppāsūr for constructing its enclosing wall.⁷ This was in the beginning of the 13th century A. D. That Mylapore

1. 261 of 1910.

2. 333 of 1911.

3. 195 of 1929-30.

4. 132 of 1912.

5. 140 and 141 of 1912.

6. 19 of 1911.

7. 20 of 1930.

was closely connected in the eleventh century with a prominent mercantile corporation, for whom national boundaries did not come in the way of trading, is very well proved by an epigraph from Kāttūr near Ponnēri.¹ It records that the community of merchants called the 'Nānādesis' held a meeting at Mayilārppil and declared the village of Kāttūr, which was formerly an Ayyapujal to be a Virapattiṇam and laid down certain rules of conduct to be followed by the members of the Vālañjiya community residing in the village. According to them, the town was not to be inhabited by such members of mercantile classes as demanded taxes or tolls by threatening people with swords or by capturing them and as wantonly deprived people of their food or otherwise afflicted them. They also declared that those who offended against this decision were to be placed outside the Vālañjiar community. This epigraph shows how a big mercantile corporation was active in the region and how Mylapore served as a venue of its meetings.

Maritime trade and commerce :

Besides, Mylapore had long been one of the important ports on the east coast, along with Mahābalipuram. Both tradition and the accounts of foreign travellers speak about Mylapore as a busy port from where merchants sent their goods by sea. Thus, the tradition which attributes Tiruvalluvar, the great Tamil poet, to Mylapore mentions the poet's friend Elēlasinga as a prominent merchant-prince who carried on trade across the seas from Mylopore.² In *Periapurāṇam*, a work of the twelfth century A. D., Sekkilār tells us about Pūmpāvai's father,

1. 256 of 1913, Report, pp. 99-100.

2. See chapter, IV, Sec. 2 below.

S'ivanēśan, a resident of Mylāpore who became wealthy by carrying on trade through ships.¹ These traditional descriptions of Mylapore as a busy port where goods were exported and imported by ships find confirmation in historical literature. The way in which both *Nandikkalambagam* and *Kalingattuparai*, works of the 9th and 12th centuries A. D. respectively, mention Mayilai along with Mallai, might hint at the possibility of the former being nearly as important a port as the latter. The accounts of the foreign travellers overwhelmingly prove the importance of Mylapore as a port in the mediaeval and modern times. Thus, in the 14th century, John De Marignolli wrote that ships from China used to go to Mylāpūr occasionally.² Durate Barbosa who visited 'Malāpūr' early in the 16th century confirms the truth of Marignolli's observation by writing that cloths from Mylapur and Pulicat were found in the markets of Malacca, Pegu, Sumatra and China. But they were costly and therefore Bengal cloths were in greater favour.³ In Dēvarāya II's time, that is in the beginning of the 15th century, there were in the Vijayanagar empire about 300 ports, each of which was equal to Calicut. One of the most important of these ports was Mylāpūr.⁴ In fact, as shown in an earlier chapter, one of the main reasons for which the Portuguese settled down at San Thomé was the facility that it offered for trading with places on the east coast. It was again the

1. *Periaparaiyam*, verse 2932.

2. Yule: *Cathay and the Way Thither*, III, p. 251, n. 3.

3. Durate Barbosa: *An account of the coasts of the East Africa and Malabar in the beginning of the 16th century* ed. by M. L. Dames, Vol. II, pp. 132, 146, 173, 215.

4. N. Venkataramanayya: *Studies in the Third Dynasty of Vijayanagar*, p. 288.

reason why they looked upon the Dutch settlement at Pulicat with jealousy and as a prospective rival to her commerce on the east coast. Caesar Frederic, who visited San Thomé, Mylapur, was also full of admiration for the great dexterity of the local people in managing mussoola boats in the sea. In his account of the place written in A. D. 1567, he describes with wonder how the people handled the boats. About the place itself, he writes: "Near unto this church (of Saint Thomas), the Portugals have builded there a city in the country subject to the king of Bezeneger (Vijayanagar), which city, although it be not very great, yet in my judgement it is the fairest in all the parts of the Indies..."¹ The importance of San Thomé, Mylapur as a commercial centre and a port is very well brought out in an account written in A.D. 1662 by John Nieuhef. He wrote: "The city (San Thomé) was quite desolate, when the Portuguese first came there, who rebuilt (it) in 1545. Since which it has encreased to that degree, that not many years after, she was Accounted one of the finest cities in all the Indies: Both in respect of the Magnificence of its Buildings and the Number of rich inhabitants. It is fortified with stone-wall strengthened by several Bastions and has hunder its jurisdiction about 300 villages and Towns. It is one of the Richest Sea Ports of all the East Indies, its situation being in the midst of all the best Harbours of those Parts, which renders it the more convenient for the East Indian trade."²

1. "Extracts of Master Caesar Frederike from his Eighteen Year Indian Observations" - *Purchas his Pilgrims*, 1905, Vol. X, p. 109
2. Churchill: *Voyages*, II, p. 245 quoted by B. A. Saletore: *Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagar Empire*, (1934), Vol. II, pp. 81-82.

Loans and rate of interest:

We have already noticed that there was a great amount of borrowing and lending of money for various purposes like trade, industry, etc. The interest at which money was lent varied from time to time. Thus, in Tiruvarriyūr in the 9th century A. D. the interest on one *kalāñju* of gold was 3 *manjādi* per annum which works out exactly to 15% of interest.¹ Interest remained at the same rate in the 10th century also, although there must have been some social insecurity consequent on the invasion and occupation of Tiruvarriyūr by the Rāshtrakūta forces under Krishna III.² An epigraph dated A. D. 1040 from the same place records an investment of 10 *kāsus* for interest of 4½ *kās'u* every year for feeding Brahmans.³ This gives us a rate of 42½% of interest per year - a rather unusual rate. An epigraph, six years later, records an investment of 30 *kāsus* for interest in kind, *viz.*, 75 *kalams* of paddy every year.⁴ There are also instances where the principal of the loan was some commodity, usually paddy, agreed to be repaid with interest in kind. Thus we see that in A. D. 1047, 10 *kalams* of paddy was advanced at interest of one *kuruṇi* of polished (*patteṭṭukkuttal*) rice.⁵

The Role of the Temple in the Economic Life of the People:

The above account of the economic life of the people of the Madras region will not be complete if it omits to take note of the vital role that the temples played in the

1. 158 of 1912, 174 of 1912.

2. 179 of 1912.

3. 151 of 1912.

4. 137 of 1912. Also see 140 of 1912.

5. 148 of 1912.

economy of the village by virtue of their wealthy and honoured position. The role of the temples in ancient South India did not stop with being a source of only spiritual inspiration; they were looked upon as a great source of succour for the economic, social and moral well-being of the people. One who goes through the inscriptions found in the territory round Madras will not but be struck by the commendable part that the temples played there as a bank and a lender of money to the needy, as an inducer or stimulator of cultivation and agricultural production, and as a great employer. These multifarious activities of the temples were greatly facilitated by their generally wealthy, stable and prosperous position. For one thing, they were great land-owners of the village. The epigraphs of the Tiruvoiyūr temple teem with the innumerable names of the villages which were the *dēvadāna* lands of the temple. To give only a few examples, Maṇali, Āḍampākkam, Iganaiyūr, Kandalūr, Vadugapperumbākkam, Ambilavāyil, Vēlsāru, Pirajpakkam etc. were the *dēvadāna* villages of Tiruvoiyūr.¹ Similarly, the whole village of Tiruvānmiyūr seems to have been a *dēvadāna* village of the local temple there.² The Pārthasārathy temple at Triplicane owned villages like Puduppākkam, Vēppēri, Vēsharupādi, Sembiam and Nedumbarai.³ Added to these were the numberless gifts of pieces of lands,⁴ money,⁵ gold,⁶ jewels,⁷ cows,⁸ sheep,⁹ bulls etc.¹⁰

1. ARE. 1913, p. 104; 234 of 1912; 368 and 371 of 1911.

2. 77 of 1909. 3. 239 and 237 of 1903; SII. VIII, Nos. 538 and 536.

4. 303, 306, of 1911, 180 of 1912 etc.

5. 137, 139, 151 of 1912 etc. 6. 158, 159, 161, 163, 169 of 1912 et

7. 120 of 1912; 217 of 1910 etc. 8. 123 of 1912.

9. 118, 184, 186 of 1912. 10. 115, 214 of 1912 etc.

The temples had their own granaries and treasuries where grains, jewels and money were evidently kept in reserve. But the money that the temples saved was not kept idle. There are many instances where temples lent money on interest to merchants and other private individuals and thus helped them by supplying capital. Thus, on two occasions in the time of Rājendra I the Tiruvorriyūr temple lent money on interest to be paid in paddy to the merchants (*nagarattar*) of the same place.¹ We also get many other instances of temples lending money to private individuals who might have utilised it for various purposes like irrigation, industries and trades. Instances of land and money being used for feeding the Mahēśvaras, the Brahmins, temple-servants and others are also not wanting.² Above all these, the temples gave opportunities for employment to a number of people. Inscriptions from Triplicane temple refer to the employment of priests (*kulangiliar*), *Nambimārs*, *parichārakās*, drummers, pipers, etc.³ It was, however, in the Tiruvorriyūr temple, which was undoubtedly the richest temple in this region under study, especially under the Chōlas, that a vast number of servants and officers served in different capacities. In the reign of Kulōttunga I, there were about 132 servants in the Tiruvorriyūr temple.⁴ A record of Virarājēnra gives a list of some of the servants of the Tiruvorriyūr temple such as twenty-two *taliyilar* who danced and sang before the god; a dancing-master who probably trained them to sing and dance; the sixteen temple girls (*Dēvaradiyār*)

1. 140 and 141 of 1912.

2. 222 of 1910, 151 of 1912 etc.

3. EI. VIII, p. 295; SIII. VIII, No. 536.

4. ARE. 1913, p. 86.

whose duty it was to recite *Tiruppaadiyam* in the low *agamārgam* style; a musician who sang *tirupalliyeluchchi* i.e. 'to wake up the God from his sleep' in the mornings. Besides these, it mentions 4 cooks and many priests who worked in the temple.¹ Another epigraph of Rājanārāyaṇa Sambūvarāya gives us an excellent idea of a number of servants in the Tiruvorriyūr temple and their many duties. It states that one muḍaliyār of the *Bhiksha matha* at Chidambaram presided over a meeting held in the Tiruvorriyūr temple and attended by the *Mahēśvaras*, the trustees, and the *nāṭṭar*. They found that a number of *Padiyilārs* of the temple had either died or had been reduced to straitened circumstances in life and appointed *Īshabhattaliyilars* to assist the *Padiyilār*. They also decided to exempt the *Dēvarādiyārs* from doing certain duties such as *tiruvalagu*, *tirumelukku* (cleaning with cow-dung) *taligaivilakku*, cleaning the rice required etc. which they used to do before. It was also decided that the dance (*Sāndikunippam*) in the shrine of the goddess and the duty of waiting upon the goddess with chauris on certain occasions were to be done jointly by the *Padiyilārs* and the *Dēvarādiyārs* - the former coming first and the latter following. The *Dēvarādiyārs* carried everywhere the plates, *tirunirṛukkāppu*, and *Pushapattaligai* while it was the duty of the *Īshabhattaliyilār* to display *agamārgam* and *Varikkōlam*. The latter term perhaps means that they were incharge of decorating the floor of the temple by drawing beautiful *kōlam*. *Īshabhattaliyilars* also supplied vocal music when the *Padiyilār* played 'sakkam' and performed the *Sāndikkunippam* (dance). The same record also furnishes information regarding the salaries

1. 128 of 1912, ARE, 1913, p. 103.

of the above-mentioned servants. Each *Padiyilār*, it seems, got 30 *kalams* of paddy per year, whereas each *Dēvaradiyār* received 1 *nāli* of cooked food everyday. The assignments of duties to these servants shows that the *Padiyilārs* were of superior status to the *Dēvaradiyārs* and they in turn were superior to *Ishabhataliyilār*.¹

Two other records which relate to the disputes that arose between *Ishabhataliyilar* and the *Padiyilār* over the precedence in services and their final settlements after a long time mention many of the officers and servants of the Tiruvarriyūr temple like the *Srīrudras*, *Srimahēsvaras*, *Sōkkattaliyilār*, *Muttukkārar*, *Viranukkar* and the *Kaikkōlar*, whose duties however are not clear. The *Srimahēsvaras* were perhaps the same as the *Mahēsvaras* who are frequently mentioned in the Tiruvarriyūr as well as *Pādi* records. They were evidently important officers who did responsible duties like the collection of taxes² for the temple, and also made representations to the king, whenever there was need, on behalf of the tenants of temple lands, regarding their conditions.³ A record of Rājēndra I gives the interesting information that there were 12 *Dēvaradiyār* in the shrine of the goddess Gauri alone in the Tiruvarriyur temple.⁴ Another Chōla record of later time tells us of the gift of five women and their descendants to the Tiruvarriyūr temple for husking paddy for the temple.⁵ The remuneration for the temple servants mainly consisted of paddy or rice along with cash paid annually for them to buy clothes and for other

1. ARE. 1913, p. 128.

2. 200 of 1912, ARE. *op. cit.* p. 120.

3. 226 of 1912; ARE. *Ibid.*

4. 153 of 1912.

5. 122 of 1912.

incidental expenses. Besides these servants, there were also many officers, employed in the Tiruvorriyūr temple. Thus, there were the temple supervisor, the *Srīkāryam* (Manager?), the *kōil Nayaka*, the *Sthānathār*, the Chief Accountant and the 'tiruvellaikkāval.'¹ The last mentioned officer was in charge of the precincts of the Tiruvorriyūr temple.² The head of the *mata*, called *matapathi*, seems to have had, say in the administration of the temple for he is described as attending important meetings.³ There was also in Tiruvorriyūr temple *maitrikāras* to engrave on stone the gifts that were made to the temple. Perhaps the *matapathi* scrutinised the temple accounts and looked after the proper acknowledgement of donations being made, for he is described in an inscription ordering the *maitrikāra* to engrave the gifts of lamps and cows that were made in previous years.⁴ Instances of men from Cholanādu being appointed as inmembers of the managing body at Tiruvorriyūr temple are also available.⁵

The foregoing account about the various officers and servants that served in the temples of this region goes to show that the temples fulfilled a useful role as a large-scale employer and the guardian of the welfare of the people.

1. 368 of 1911, 235 of 1912 and 204 of 1912.

2. 100 of 1912.

3. ARE. 1913, p. 94; SII. V, No. 1356; the *mathapati* also acted sometimes as the head of the executive of the village Sabha (EI. XXVII, p. 298).

4. 206 of 1912.

5. 133, 235 and 245 of 1912.

Section III

SOCIAL LIFE

Castes and Communities:

Even a casual perusal of the epigraphs of this region serves to show the existence of the traditional four castes into which the Hindu society was divided. The Pallava king Mahēndravarman II, according to Kūram grant, maintained the sacred law of the castes.¹ The division of society into castes, in ancient South India, worked more for bringing harmony than schism and division. The caste system served as the foundation on which the social set up was built.

Brahmans: That the Brahmans were held in high esteem, for their learning and culture is amply borne out by numerous endowments made in their favour and the provisions for feeding them in the temples.² Kings very often gave a whole village as gift to the Brahmans. Thus, Poonamalli (Chēra Pāndya Chaturvēdimangalam) appears to have been given as gift for the enjoyment of Brahmans by Ravivarman Kulaśēkhara, the Chēra king, after he conquered Sundra Pāndya.³ The villages in which the Brahmans were the principal land-holders were called the *Chaturvēdimangalams* or *Brahmadēya* villages or simply *Agarams*. There were many such Brahman villages in the territory round Madras. They were, Simhavishnu Chaturvēdimangalam (Maṇali).

1. SII. I., p. 152, line 17.

2. See 133, 140, 146 of 1912 and 163 of 1937-38. Also see below Chapter IV, Section 2.

3. 33 of 1911, ARE., 1911, p. 79.

Parāntaka Chatuvēdimāṅgalam (Kurattūr), Dinachintāmaṇi Caturvēdimāṅgalam (Vēlachchēri), Pukkatturāi vallava-Chaturvēdimāṅgalam (Tirumilis'ai), Vānavanmādēvi Chaturvēdimāṅgalam (Pallavaram). The word Chaturvēdimāṅgalam denotes a village inhabited by those who professed the four Vēdas. It is quite interesting to note that the more prominent places like Tiruvoiyūr, Mylapore and Triplicane are not referred to anywhere as being exclusively inhabited and owned by the Brahmins. It is evident that they were much bigger than the villages, perhaps corresponding to our towns, where there was freer mixing of population and where the ownership of land was not confined to the Brahmins alone. In the *Chaturvēdimangalams* too, people belonging to various professions, for example, goldsmiths, blacksmiths, potters, and others lived. But its peculiarity lies in the fact that lands of the villages were held mostly by the Brahman community. However, an inscription from Vēlachchēri, a Brahman village, speaks of a sale of land held by the non-Brahmans of Vēlachchēri with the permission of the king (Rājēndrachōla I).¹ This epigraph might serve to show that in certain Brahmadēya villages, the non-Brahmans also held some lands, perhaps with the special permission of the king.²

The Brahmins generally devoted themselves to learning, culture and religion. Many of them were priests in the temple. Thus, inscriptions from Tiruvānniyūr, Kunnattūr, Kovūr and Koyambēdu refer to the S'iva

1. 311 of 1911.

2. Dr. T. V. Mahalingam says that in Brahmadēya villages too, people other than the Brahmins held some pieces of land. But the Brahmins owned the largest number of shares in the lands and hence the village affairs were managed only by them. *South Indian Polity*, p. 340.

Brāhmaṇas as an important class of priests who were attached to the temples.¹ Inscriptions from Kunnattūr make it clear that S'ivabrahmaṇas had a voice in certain spheres of the temple administration. Thus, it appears, any gift for the burning of a lamp in the temple had to be agreed to by the S'ivabrahmaṇas.² A specific group or organisation of priests known as *Tiruvunnālīgai-Sabhai* was actively working in the Kunnattūr temple. It is frequently mentioned in the Kunnattūr records as having been responsible for receiving the gifts made to the temple and agreeing to burn lamps in the names of the donors.³

Brahmans seem to have been engaged in other walks of life also. A Tiruvorriyūr record of Chōla days mentions a Brahman who was a commander of the military forces (*Sēnāpathi*).⁴ Saluva Narasingarāya alias Sellappa, who was a chief under the Vijayanagar kings, was also a Brahman.

Other communities:

Besides the traditional four castes, there were numerous sub-sects and communities, mostly based on the kind of profession in which each one was engaged. The Kaikkōlas formed one such prominent community which is very often mentioned in the epigraphs of this region.⁵ Kunnattūr, in particular, appears to have been inhabited by a large number of Kaikkōlas.⁶ The main

1. 80 of 1909; 183 of 129-30; 329 of 1939-40; 2, 4, 6, and 10 of 1933-34.
2. 183 of 1929-30. Also see the Kōvūr and Kōyambēdu inscriptions cited above.
3. 196, 202, 205, 218, 220 of 1929-30 etc.
4. 119 of 1912; also see 121 of 1912.
5. 23 of 1911, 208 of 1912, ARE. 1913, p. 118 etc.
6. 207 of 1929-30.

occupation of the Kaikkōla was weaving. They seem to have been quite an influential community, who were also associated with the temples and their administration.¹ A Tiruvo^{ri}iyūr record tells us that the Kaikkōlas did some pious service in the temple there.²

The two major classes into which almost all sub-sects and communities were grouped were the *Valaingai* and the *Idaingai* classes or the Right Hand and Left Hand classes. An epigraph from Pādi says that *Idaingaivari* was collected from the Pallis of the village of Pādi and from the community of *Idaingai* classes and the Vaṇṇiyars living in the villages surrounding Chandragiri.³ A Kunnattūr record informs us that the *Idaingai-vari* was also collected from the Kaikkōlas of Kunnattūr.⁴ From this, it can be inferred that Kaikkōlas were included in the *Idaingai* classes. The Right Hand and Left Hand castes, according to a tradition, got their names in the time of Karikāla Chōla, when the two sections of people placed their disputes before the king, one party standing on his right side and the other on the left. But T. W. Ellis thought that the intercourse with foreign nations introduced changes in the habits of a section of the people of South India which was not liked by the conservative landed proprietors. This social dissension, according to him, brought about the two classes - the *Valaingai* including all the agricultural tribes and the *Idaingai*, the trading and the manufacturing classes.⁵ M. Srinivasa Iyengar opined that the division of the society into these groups was due to either, the desire of

1. 221 of 1929-30 (Kunnattūr).

2. ARE. *Op. cit.* p. 118.

3. 215 of 1910.

4. 207 of 1929-30.

5. T. W. Ellis: *Kural*, p. 44,

the lower orders to rise in the social scale, or the antipathy between the Jains and the Brahmans.¹ As to the composition of these two classes, Dr. B. A. Saletore says that even people of the highest caste, the Brahman class, as well as the lowest *viz.*, the Pariars, came within the scope of these two groups, and adds that the latter "was a sort of a challenge to the ancient *Varnāsramas* at least as far as petty social privileges were concerned."² But, according to Dr. Mahalingam, the Brahmans and a few other communities, who can be brought under the Kshatriya and the Vais'ya castes, kept themselves away from the fold of these two groups.³

The Right Hand and the Left Hand castes were jealous of their privileges and this very often brought about bitter quarrels among them even in the Vijayanagar days. Their quarrels in the streets of Madras, during the days of the East India Company, used to end in an outbreak of violence and bloodshed.⁴

A record of the Vijayanagar times from *Pādi* mentions the existence of eighteen professional castes living in the village and also certain taxes like *Patṭi*. Among them are included Settis, Kaikkōlas, Vanigars, oil-vanigars etc. The epigraph also mentions taxes like *Patṭāḍaiayam*, *Patṭādinūlāyam*, *mādaviratti*, *Sammādam* etc., as payable by those castes.⁵

Some Customs and Practices:

People were generally religious-minded and hospitable. Spiritual values had a profound hold on their

1. *Tamil Studies*, pp. 73, 92 and 108.
2. B. A. Saletore: *op. cit.*, II, p. 67.
3. T. V. Mahalingam: *op. cit.*, p. 251.
4. Love: *Vestiges*: I PP. 118-125.
5. 221 of 1910; ARE. 1911, p. 83.

minds. They believed in the efficacy of certain purificatory and religious rites like the *Pañchagāvya*.¹ The people held the cow in veneration. Gifts of cows to the temples as well as provisions for their daily feeding were many. At Tiruvarriyūr, we have an instance of a person giving money for providing every day a bundle of grass for a temple-cow.² The sacredness of the cow for the people is very well brought out by a number of epigraphs which state that violation of certain regulations set out therein would be tantamount to the killing of a cow on the banks of the Ganges (*Gangaikkarayil kūrāmpasuvai koira dhōsham*).³ People took pleasure in arranging periodical festivals in the temple and attending them. Thus, a record from Poonamalli describes how the persons of different sections took upon themselves the responsibility of celebrating a festival on each day during the annual festival.⁴ As a mark of their gratitude and joy at realising the first crop of the year, the people at Tiruvarriyūr celebrated a festival called *Paduyēdu* in the temple.⁵ There were also certain beliefs and practices which, to the modern mind, may look rather superstitions. Typical of this kind, is a remarkable case reported by a Tiruvarriyūr epigraph of the 11th century. It states that one Ganavadi Iduimban stabbed himself and died in order to alleviate the distress of, and avert the evil to, Gaṅgai-kondas'olan alias Uttamas'olanārāiyan, who was evidently the former's master. The latter when he came to know of this, gave 90 sheep for a lamp for the merit of the

1. 145 of 1912.

2. 151 of 1912.

3. 299 of 1938-39 (lines 9-10), 300 of 1931-39 (l. 68-69).

4. 297 of 1938-39.

5. 139 of 1912.

deceased.¹ We know from inscriptions of other parts that such cases of suicide committed by individuals for averting evil to their masters or for securing safety to the communities and villages were not uncommon.²

Women: The place of women in any society forms an interesting subject of study. Though, unfortunately, not much information is available on the subject, certain facts stand in bold relief as we go through the inscriptions. Family women seem to have been of retiring nature and modesty was considered as their hallmark. An epigraph from Manamai near Kunnattūr however speaks of a woman who served on the judicial committee of the village assembly.³ We have numberless instances of women giving lands and money as gifts to temples.⁴ This might show that women, especially of upper classes, owned property in their own right and even disposed of them as they chose. A record of Tiruvarriyūr gives us the information that women also became mendicants or ascetics. Thus, at Tiruvarriyūr, in the time of Kulottunga II, there was a woman mendicant, called Tiruvarriyūr-Ammai of 'world-wide fame.' She seems to have been an influential lady who got from the king several jewels and lands for the Tiruvarriyūr temple.⁵ Another epigraph from Tiruvarriyūr itself records that the mendicants (*tapasya*) of the local temple purchased lands from the assembly of another village.⁶ From this, it can be inferred that either the mendicants also possessed lands of

1. 131 of 1912.

2. See ARE. 1913, p. 96.

3. 259 of 1909.

4. 302, 305 of 1911 (Velachchēri); 322 of 1901 (Tirus'ulam) 214, 215 of 1921-30 (Kunnattūr); 225 of 1912 (Tiruvarriyūr).

5. 120 of 1912, ARE. *op. cit.*, p. 110.

6. 220 of 1912.

their own, or that they purchased lands only to give them as gifts to the temple.

Courtesans: Several women sought employment in the temples and did various duties like cleaning the temple premises, drawing *kōlam* (designs), making garlands, husking paddy etc. A special kind of duty done by a set of women called the *Dēvaradiyāls* (Courtesans) was to sing and dance in front of the god. The Tiruvo^miyūr temple employed even *naṭṭuvanars* (dancing masters) evidently to teach them dancing in a systematic manner.¹ The names of some of the *Dēvaradiyārs* at Kunnattūr were: Kannuḍai Nāchchiār, Vidiyar alias Nārpattenṇāyira Māṇikkam, Chitramēji Naṅgai and Uyyavandāl alias Tiruvunnāligai Naṅgai.² One of the *Dēvaradiyārs* of the Tiruvo^miyūr temple was called Ainnūḍuttalaikko^ji.³ Another Tiruvo^miyūr epigraph records a gift 90 sheep to the temple made by a *Dēvaradiyāl* called Chaturan-chaturi, wife (*ahamuḍaiyāl*) of Nāgan Perangādan.⁴ From this epigraph, it is evident that regular marriage and conjugal life existed among this class of women in those days.⁵ The fact that many of the temple courtesans made gifts of land, money and other things to the temples and that even some services in the temple were called after them⁶ might show their respectable standing in society. A Tiruvo^miyūr record even says that king Rājarāja III attended the dancing festival of *agamārga*, performed by a temple courtesan

1. 128 of 1912.
2. 213, 214, 215 and 219 of 1929-30.
3. 225 of 1912.
4. 147 of 1912.
5. ARE. 1913, p. 99.
6. 225 of 1912.

whose name was Uravākkinan-talaikkoli.¹ K. V. Subramania Iyer says that *talaikkoli* figures in ancient Tamil literature as the title that was given as a special mark of honour and public favour by the kings to the expert lady-dancers. The investiture of this title was preceded by a grand ceremony and the presentation of a staff embellished with nine gems and covered with gold plates.² The two courtesans of the Tiruvo^{kk}iyūr temple with that title - *talaikkoli* - were evidently recipients of such a coveted honour.

Dowry system: That the system of giving dowry at the time of marriage prevailed in this region is very well brought out by an inscription of Vijayanagar times from Māngādu. It records an agreement among the villagers of Māngādu not to alienate their lands to outsiders either by sale or as *Stridhana* (dowry).³ This epigraph also affords a unique example of the attempt at the preservation of the corporate unity of the village.

Ornaments: Inscriptions of this region also give names of many kinds of jewels that were fashioned in those days. Thus a private individual gave to the temple the following jewels: (1) a gold fillet (*pattam*) weight $2\frac{1}{4}$ kālañju of gold (2) one crescent (*tiruvilampirai*) weighing one kālañju (3) one *tirumāṅgalyam* made of one kālañju of gold (4) one necklace containing 8 superior pearls, 528 second-class pearls, 2 gold beads, 13 long corals, 40 round corals - all together weighing $10\frac{1}{2}$ kālañju (5) a plate of waving lights etc.⁴ A record from Tiruvo^{kk}iyūr also mentions a gift of gold necklace (*pallitongal*) to the temple by a resident of Urai^{kk}urkūgam in the

1. 211 of 1912.

2. Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report 1921-22 p. 117.

3. 354 of 1908. ARE. 1909, para 67.

4. 217 of 1910; ARE. 1911, p. 66.

Chola country.¹ Though these jewels are mentioned as being used in the temples they go to show the great many varieties of jewels that were known and fashioned in those days as well as the traditional love of Indians for jewels.

Inter-state movement and communications:

A fact that strikes us as significant, as we go through the epigraphs of this region, is the fairly easy movement of the people from one place to another that was possible even in those far off days. Thus, to cite but a few examples out of many that are available, two persons in the time of Gāndarāditya, came from Ārkkāttu-kūṇām in Sōnādu, purchased lands from the assembly of Vēlachchēri and gave them as gift to the temple of that place.² Many of the Tiruvarriyūr epigraphs mention people from Cholanādu, Pañdyanādu and even north India as purchasing lands there and giving them as gifts to that temple.³ Several officers came from Cholanādu and worked at the Tiruvarriyūr temple.⁴ Similarly, a merchant from Mylapore is reported in an epigraph as having gone up to Tanjore.⁵ These instances serve to show that there was free contact between people of one part and those of another. The inscriptions also render it clear that the traditional love of the people to visit the religious centres must have acted as a powerful incentive to encourage people's movement from one place to another. In this respect, Tiruvarriyūr and Triplicane

1. 235 of 1912.

2. 306 of 1911.

3. 115, 118, 135, 143, 145, 156, 167 and 188 of 1912.

4. 133, 235 and 245 of 1912.

5. 147 of 1895.

seem to have attracted people from many parts of South India.

Roads and streets: This movement of the people to various places was facilitated by the existence of trunk roads leading from one large division of the country to another. Thus, a Chola epigraph from Tiruvo^{ri}iyūr mentions *Va^dugapperuvali* among the boundaries of a particular land.¹ Literally, *Va^dugapperuvali* means the high road to (or from) the Telugu country (*va^dugu*). This road must have extended from the Tamil country along the east coast right up to the Telugu districts and passed quite close to Tiruvo^{ri}iyūr.² An epigraph from Poonamallee mentions a *Peruvali* while describing the boundaries of a land.³ Similar high roads like *Kongappерuvali*, the *Tanjavūr-Peruvali* also seem to have existed in other parts of South India.⁴

Within the villages themselves, there seems to have been well-laid streets, big and small, specified to various classes of people to reside. Thus in Tiruvo^{ri}iyūr there were the *Nārppattenñāyirapperunderu* for the exclusive dwelling of the sculptors and other artisans,⁵ *Tribhuvana-samudrappunderu* which was inhabited by the shepherds (*manrādi*) of the village,⁶ and the *Pānipendugal Teru* for the temple-servants.⁷ Other streets of Tiruvo^{ri}iyūr that are mentioned are the *Vādakku Tiruvi^{di}* (perhaps the street situated north of the

1. 131 of 1912.

2. ARE. 1913, p. 104.

3. 300 of 1938-39 lines 44-45.

4. 281 of 1911 and 363 of 1907.

5. SITI. No. 507.

6. ARE. 1913, p. 104.

7. SITI. *op. cit.*, p. 510.

temple).¹ Jayas'ingakulakālaperuñderu,² Sūras'ūlāmañipperunderu³ and Rajarājanpperuñderu.⁴ In Mylapore, a street called Mādavīqipperuñderu is reported to have existed in an epigraph of the Chōla times.⁵ The streets of Mylapore are eulogised for their high and palatial buildings in the religious literature, as noted already. In Tirumalīs'ai there were streets like Palāgguvenrāntiruvidi, Ponparappinān-tiruvidi and Nārpattenñāyira-Peruñderuvu.⁶

Social amenities: There were also provision for many social amenities in the villages. Thus at Tiruvoñiyūr there was a water-shed in the public road to supply water to the pedestrians⁷ and a *mata* in the temple to undertake public feeding. We have an interesting epigraph at Tiruvoñiyūr which bears an order of Kulōttunga I to the effect that alm-houses (*Sāla*) in the province of Jayañgondas'ōlāmañdalām should make provisions for free feeding. Accordingly, the *Kulottungasolā mata* at Tiruvoñiyūr made arrangements to feed 50 persons.⁸ At Kunnattūr there was provision for a medical practitioner to attend to those who were physically unhappy. This interesting fact is contained in an epigraph of Rājarāja III at Kunnattūr. It states that a certain Kulōttungas'ōla-Mangalādhirājan Sirājan of Kunnattūr, a Savarñña and Kās'yapa, was the recipient of a *vaidyakkāni* (i.e. land set apart for the service of a

1. *Ibid.*
2. 136 of 1912.
3. 187 of 1912.
4. 154 of 1912.
5. 333 of 1911.
6. 11 and 21 of 1911.
7. 154 of 1912.
8. 200 of 1912; ARE. 1913, p. 105.

physician) of Kunrattūrnādu.¹ The Government Epigraphist for the year 1929-30 thought that the epithet *Savarṇya* used along with his name was of special significance, as it probably denoted a class or caste on whom the duties of physicians usually devolved. He also adds: "The *Vaijayanti* gives the synonym of *Savarṇya* to be 'the son of a Brahman by a Kshatriya woman' or a Mahishya who had various duties, such as tending of cattle and practice of astrology and medicine."² This particular doctor seems to have served for the whole of Kunrattūr-nādu.

CHAPTER IV

THE GROWTH OF RELIGION AND LITERATURE IN THE MADRAS REGION

Section I

RELIGION

It is a well-known historical fact, that toleration and broad-mindedness had been the hallmark of the religious policy of the Hindu kings of Southern India. Under the patronage of such enlightened monarchs, South India presented a conducive atmosphere in which various religious faiths like Bhuddhism, Jainism, S'aivism, Vaishnavism and Christianity, found it possible to spread and flourish even at a pretty early age, without fear of emasculation or persecution. The religious history of the Madras city and its surroundings can, in a way, be said to reflect the general trends that were at work in the religious sphere of South India as a whole; all the above mentioned religious faiths had their following here in the past, as can be gauged by many of the vestiges that have been left behind in literature and architecture.

I. Buddhism and Jainism: Taking the growth of Buddhism and Jainism first, we find that both these religions, which rose up in North India, made their advent in South India, roughly in the 3rd century B. C., say during the times of Asoka.¹ That these two religions were widely prevalent in South India in the early

1. M. S. Venkataswamy: *Baudhamum Tamizhum* (Tamil) pp.19-33.

centuries of Christian era, is clearly borne out by the abundant references to them in the Sangam literature. The two great Tamil epics, The *Silappadikāram* and the *Maṇimēkhalai* are said to have been written by Jain and Buddhist authors respectively. The *Maṇimēkhalai*, testifies to the fact that Kāñchi was a very important Buddhist centre.¹ It relates how a king of Kāñchi constructed many buildings sacred to the memory of the Buddha, and how he received Maṇimēkhalai at Kāñchi and gave her a *vihara* with a *Chaitya*, where she learnt the teachings of the Buddha from the great Buddhist divine, Aravāṇa Adigal. Literary evidences like these, coupled with the numerous Buddhistic relics in places like Kāñchi and Nagapatam, go to show that Buddhism was at one time in a flourishing condition in South India.² Though Jainism too made rapid strides and tried to compete with Buddhism, it was the latter, which, at least, to begin with, had a profounder influence in South India. But this popularity of Buddhism began to decline in the course of 5th or 6th century A. D., and Jainism seized the opportunity to steal a march over Buddhism.³ In fact, the latter half of the 6th and the first half of the 7th centuries A. D., can be called a glorious period for Jainism in South India, for it was in that period, that it managed to have the Pāṇḍyan King Nīrasir Nēdumāran, and the Pallava king, Mahēndravarman I in its fold, and thus form a very real threat to the Vedic Hinduism. Stirred up to its depths, Hinduism, with its offshoots—Saivism and Vaishnavism, rose admirably to the occasion and took up the challenge, so that the 7th century can

1. *Maṇimēkhalai*, Canto XXVIII; lines 170-176.

2. I. A., 1915, p. 127.

3. K. R. Subramaniam: *The Origin of Saivism and its history in the Tamil Land* (1929) p. 40.

indeed be said to have witnessed a conflict between Jainism and Buddhism on one hand, and Saivism and Vaishnavism on the other. The cause of the latter was ably championed by the Saivite Nāyanmārs and the Vaishnavite Ālvārs, who determined to stem the tide of the heterodox religions, toured the country from end to end, and inculcated the *Bhakti* cult, through their simple and mellifluous language which had a direct appeal to the people. The results of this movement were far-reaching. It gave a severe set-back to the growth of Buddhism and Jainism and led to a tremendous revival of Hinduism. From about the end of the 7th century, began the slow but sure decline and fall of Buddhism and Jainism in South India. Though they did not die out completely and a sudden flash or two of their activities (as, for example, in the field of literature) were still to be seen till about the 13th or 14th century A. D., they ceased to be a source of threat to Hinduism thereafter. As between Buddhism and Jainism, the decline of the former had been more rapid than the latter. In any case, both the religions can be said to have lost much of their popularity in South India from 14th century onwards.¹

With this brief survey of the vicissitudes of Buddhism and Jainism in South India as the background, let us review the evidences that are available for their existence in and around Madras City. It was already pointed out that many Saivite Nāyanmārs and Vaishnavite Ālvārs toured all over the country to offset the influence of Buddhism and Jainism and enhance that of Hinduism. In doing so, they came to this region also and condemned the Buddhists and the Jains here. Thus Tirujñana-

1. M. S. Ramaswamy Iyengar: *Studies in South Indian Jainism* pp. 59-60.

2. M. S. Venkataswami: *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

sambandar, the opponent of the heterodox religions, in his *padikams* on Tiruvānmiyūr and Mylapore, indirectly refer to their existence there. He condemns them, as those who are cunning and who speak lies.¹ In his *Pūmpāvai Padikam* (sung at Mylapore) by the singing of which he is said to have restored to life the dead girl, Pūmpāvai, he refers to the fact that the miracle that he performed was witnessed by the Buddhists and the Jains with great astonishment. Sēkkijār who has written the life-history of Sambandar, adds that Sivanēsan, the father of Pūmpāvai and a prominent merchant of Mylapore, was a great opponent of the 'cruel religions,' Buddhism and Jainism, and that Sambandar came to Mylapore only to curb their influence.² The Vaishnavite saint, Tirumajisai Ālvār, who was a native of Tirumajisai near Poonamallee, is said to have been, first a Buddhist, and then, a Jain, before he became a Vaishnavite. He himself refers to this in his works. And after becoming a Vaishnavite, he condemned the Buddhists and Jains very severely.³ In fact, from the *Nalāyira Divyaprabandam* and the *Tēvāram*, one can easily infer that Buddhism and Jainism were in a flourishing condition in South India and that they must have been considered by the Hindus as a great menace to their religion.

Besides these indirect literary references, we have some Buddhistic relics near about Madras, which can legitimately be taken to confirm the existence of Buddhists here. Thus in a village called Kanikiluppai near Pallavaram, has been discovered an old image of

1. கைதவச்சமன் சாக்தியர் கட்டுரைக்களின்றுதே - Sambandar in his *Padikam* on Tiruvānmiyur (II Tirumurai, Pad. 140 V. 10).

2. See *Peria Purānam* verses 2935, 2974 and 2988-Published by Kovai Tamil Sangam No. 12.

3. See the Section on Vaishnavism, below.

Buddha lying on the banks of a lake. It was later on found that the image must have been originally situated near the present Vinayaka temple there, for the pedestal on which the Buddha image must have been originally fixed, is found even now there, and it is likely that the image was once removed from its original position and thrown into a lake. Besides this, a block of stone bearing the *Dharmachakra* of the Buddhists, has also been found in the same place.¹ In Māngādu near Poonamalle, three Buddhist statues have been found.² In the village, Kuvvam, have been found many Buddhistic antiquities, the most remarkable being, a very huge statue of Buddha, with the features of the late mediaeval period. The same is now kept in the Government Museum, Madras.³ These Buddhistic relics, along with the literary evidences quoted above, are a fair indication for the prevalence of Buddhism around the city of Madras.

The evidences for the existence of Jainism in this region are as plenty as they are varied and reliable. We have already pointed out how an old manuscript informs us about a tradition that Mylapore was inhabited by a large number of Jains and that there were many Jain pagodas there, one of them particularly dedicated to Tirthankara Nēminātha. We are also informed by the same source, that one of the Jain saints had a dream that the town would be swallowed up by the sea and therefore the idols in the Jain temples were removed further into the interior of the town. And the old temples, as predicted, were said to have been submerged by the sea.

1. M. S. Venkataswami: *Op. cit.*,

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Guide to the Buddhistic Antiquities*, Madras Government Museum edited by A. Aiyappan and P. R. Srinivasan (1952) p. 53.

Whatever the actual fact might be about the encroachment of sea, the tradition that Mylapore was an important Jain colony and that there was a Jain temple dedicated to the 22nd Tirthankara Nēminātha, finds remarkable confirmation in archaeological and literary sources. Thus in 1923, the Archaeological Department of India unearthed two Jain statues of about 40 inches in height from the vicinity of San Thomé. Both of them were male 'digambara' statues. One of them (Fig. 1) which is a little damaged is surmounted by a hood of a five-headed cobra, whereas the other one is without a hood.¹ Father Hosten reports that he found another Jain statue in the Saint Thomas Cathedral at San Thomé.² That there was a temple at Mylapore dedicated to the Tirthankara Nēminātha, is borne out by the following literary evidences:

Nēmināthan, a Tamil work of the 12th century A.D. by one Guṇavīra ḥāṇḍīthar of Kaṇḍai, has an invocatory verse in honour of Tirthankāra Nēminātha of Mylapore.³ The author was a Jain as he himself informs us in his work;⁴ and the way in which he has chosen to call this short treatise on Tamil grammar (*sinnūl*) after Nēminātha of Mylapore, proves to the hilt his deep attachment to the temple there. Another work called

1. Photographs of both these statues are available with the Archaeological department, Southern circle, Madras.

2. Hosten: *Op. cit.*, p. 182.

3. “பைம்பொறிவ் தென்மயிலைபுற்

சைத்தமையான் நேமிநாதன் என்று பெயர்ந்து”

See *Nēminātham*, edited by K. R. Govindaraja Mudaliar, The South India Saiva Siddhanta works, Publishing Society.

4. The Tamil work *Tonḍamajūḍalasadakam* also informs us that the author of *Nēminātham* was Jain poet from Kaṇḍai in Tondaimandalam (verse. 32.)

Tiru Nūrrāndādi by Avīrōdhāḥvar, a Jain poet of perhaps 14th century,¹ which has 103 verses in honour of Nēminātha mentions his shrine at Mylapore in the very first verse. In that verse, the author puts forth a fervent appeal to the God 'abiding at Mylapore'² to shower blessings on mankind. Besides these, there are said to be some more unpublished *Padikams* on Nēminātha, containing references to his shrine at Mylapore.³ The editor of *Nēminātham* gives a long verse of one such *Padikam* in which the poet waxes eloquent on the beaiful Jain temple which stands on the sea-shore at Tirumayilāpuri (Mylapore). Shorn of the possible poetic exaggerations, the verse clearly points to the inference that there was a Jain temple at Mylapore.

All the above evidences, the Jain statues found at San Thomé and the many literary references to Nēminātha of Mylapore, put beyond all doubt the inference that Mylapore had a Jain temple; and the fact that a fairly large number of poems has grown round it, in its honour, makes us think that it must have been of considerable importance among the Jains in the olden days. In fact, it is said, that even today, among the Jains of Madras, is current a *Padikam* on Nēminādāswāmi of Mylapore, which was once used as a sort of daily prayer-song.

1. *Vide - Kalaikajanjam*, vol. I (1954) p. 236.

2. “மறமே முனிர்த்து மயிலாபுரி சின்று மன்னுயிர்கட்டு
அமைய பொழியும் அருட்கொட்டுவே.....

3. Mr. Mayilai cheeni Venkataswami has recently published some of those unpublished *padikams* on Neminathar at Mylapore. See his 'Mayilai Nēmināthar Padikam' (1955) published by Nallariyu Manram, Arani. One of those *padikams* has 13 verses, each one of which ends as 'திருமலைமேனிய நெமிநாத சுவாமியே'.

Many other places near Madras, besides Mylapore, bristle with memories of old association with Jain religion. Thus, about nine miles north-west of Madras, in a place called Pujal (near the Red Hills), there is an ancient temple dedicated to Sri Ādhināda Bhagavān. The temple, though renovated of late, seems to have been an old one and the tradition that has gathered round it, has it that it was built on the insistence of a Jain saint. It seems, that when the saint came to the village of Pujal, he was invited by one of its inhabitants for food. But the saint told his host that he would take food only after worshipping God in the form of a Jain image. Hearing this, the anxious host ordered a sculptor to make a Jain image in accordance with the rules laid down in the Jain scriptures. The Jain saint afterwards offered prayers to it and broke his fast. While departing from the village, he asked his host to build a temple for the image, which he did.¹

In Villivākkam (about 6 miles north of Madras Central Station, on the way to Avadi) two beautiful stone images of Mahāvira the twenty-fourth Tirthankara, - one in the standing posture and the other in the sitting posture, have been found and the same are now kept in the Government Museum, Madras.² Similarly, an image of Mahāvira was discovered in Poonamalle also.³ An inscription found at Tirunāgēs'varam,⁴ a suburb of Kunnattur near Madras, and another at Māngādu,⁵ refer indirectly to the existence of a Jain Paṭṭi. All these

1. The Madras Tercentenary Commemoration Volume p. 358.

2. A. R. E., 1911 p. 5.

3. Archaeological Survey of Ind^{ia}, Annual Report 1926-1927 p. 231.

4. 224 of 1929-1930.

5. 358 of 1908.

evidences overwhelmingly support the view that the territory round about Madras City, was once dotted with Jain colonies here and there, and Mylapore, in particular, must have been a very sacred place for the Jains.

II. Saivism: Having reviewed the evidences for the prevalence of Buddhism and Jainism in and around the City of Madras, we have to trace the development of the Saivite religion there. The territory under our investigation containing as it did important and hoary Saivite temples as those in Tiruvorriyūr, Mylapore and Tiruvānmiyūr, must have naturally played a magnificent part in fostering the Saivite religion. Especially the 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th centuries were its palmy days, as it was in the rest of South India also; for that was the period in which a brilliant galaxy of Nāyanmārs like Appar, Sambandar, Sundarar, Kalianār and Vāyilār, as well as the great apostle Paṭṭinathu Adīga], were actively associated with this region.

The Pās'upatas at Tiruvorriyūr :

But before we deal with the growth of Saivism as expounded by the Nāyanmārs, we have to trace the vicissitudes of the heretical school of Saivism, which seems to have had some hold on this place. It is a well-recognised historical fact that the heretical form of Saivism, as represented by the Pās'upatas, the Kāpālikas and the Kālāmukhas, was becoming popular even in the days of Mahēndravarman I, who had ridiculed their cruel practices in his *Mattavilāsaprahasana*. Even the Tēvāram hymners often intersperse their songs with severe outbursts of condemnation of this sect. The Pās'upatas, the Kāpālikas and the Kālāmukhas, formed an extremely fanatical group of Saivites believing in

all sorts of repulsive practices. The Kālāmukhas, for example, marked their forehead with blackstreak. They believed that for the attainment of heaven one must eat food in a skull, besmear the body with the ashes of a dead body, eat the ashes, keep a pot of wine and worship the God as seated therein. They also believed in human and animal sacrifices and the offer of wine to God.¹ And this form of S'aivism seems to have had its influence over Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr and probably Mylapore also.²

In Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr, there was a shrine for Kāranai-Vitankadēvā.³ The Government Epigraphist for 1912-1913, thought that Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr 'was perhaps the home of the S'aiva sect of the Lakulis'a - Pās'upatas and was believed by them to be as sacred as the Karōhana of the north, where the founder of the sect is supposed to have incarnated. For this reason also, the place may have been called Kāranai which is an apparent corruption of Karōhana (Karvan) in the Bombay Presidency.'⁴ About the old image of Paḍambakka or Gaulis'vara in the Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr temple, the same writer says that it 'does not correspond to any of the forms of S'iva known to me and leaves it doubtful whether the image may not be one of Lakulisa of Karōhana with whom Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr may have been intimately connected.'⁵

Local tradition is strong in asserting that in the Tiruvo^{rr}iyūr temple were present many evil practices, like the offering of arrack and flesh to the goddess, the sacrifice of animals etc. The goddess of the place was

1. Bandarkar: *Vaishnavism, S'aivism and Minor Religious systems* p. 127.

2. J. I. H., 1949, Vol. 27.

3. 109 of 1912, also S. I. I. Vol. III p. 133, Note 12.

4. A. R. E., 1913, p. 86.

4. *Ibid:* P. 103.

believed to have had a fierce aspect, demanding animal and human sacrifices. And these crude practices were only put an end to by the great S'ankara who, it is said, personally went to Tiruvo^{xi}iyūr and threw away the all-swallowing spirit into a well and closed its mouth with a huge slab, so that it could never again come up and demand human and animal sacrifices. Even now by way of appeasing the goddess, as it were, religious rites are observed in honour of her. And Sri S'ankara's great service to the temple has been commemorated by placing his idol in the temple and offering daily worship.¹

Though due to S'ankara's influence, the evil practices were put an end to, Tiruvo^{xi}iyūr did not cease to be a centre of the Sōma Siddhāntha or the Pāśupata school of Saivism with, of course, more refined practices. In fact, inscriptional evidences are available to assert that a great apostle of the Sōma Siddhāntha, Niranjanaguru made Tiruvo^{xi}iyūr the seat of his activity. An inscription of the 10th century A. D. informs us of a gift of land by Niranjana-Guruvar an ascetic from Tiruvo^{xi}iyūr to the temple of Māhadēva (Siva), built by the Guru himself and named (after himself) *Niranjanēsvaram*. The god was called 'Niranjanēsvarattu - Mahādēvan.'² It seems quite probable that Niranjanaguru established a mata (monastery) of Sanyāsins or ascetics which attracted to it even royal *gurus* like Chaturānana Pundita. This is supported by an inscription of the 10th century belonging to the Rāshtrakūṭa king Krishna III.

1. A. R. E., 1912, p. 68. In connection with Sri S'ankara's visit to Tiruvo^{xi}iyūr, the interesting information that is contained in an epigraph (154 of 1912) of Kulothunga I can be noted here. It mentions a particular locality of Tiruvo^{xi}iyūr as Sankarappadī. Quite probably the name is commemorative of the Advaita philosopher's visit to the place.

2. 372 of 1911.

which gives in a detailed manner the life-history of Chaturānana Puṇḍita, a great exponent of the Pāśupata cult.¹ According to it, Chaturānana Pāṇḍita was a native of Kērala and was endowed with great qualities. Master of all arts and sciences, he rose to become a close associate and *guru* of Rājāditya, the son of the Chōla king Parāntaka I (907-953 A. D.) It was then that an important incident happened that proved to be a turning-point in the life of Guru Vallabha (as Chaturānana Puṇḍita was then known). It was the battle between his disciple, prince Rājāditya, and the Rāshtrakūta king, Krishna III, at Takkolam (940 A. D.) in which Rājāditya was put to death. Shocked and grief-striken at his disciple's death, Guru Vallabha became disgusted with this world and renounced it by turning into an ascetic at Tiruvoṇṇiyūr, after getting initiation from one Niranjana-guru. He took the name Chaturānana, became a Mahā-vritin and also the head of the *maṭa* at Tiruvoṇṇiyūr. It can well be gathered from the above inscription, that Niranjana-guru, from whom Chaturānana Puṇḍita obtained his 'vratas,' had a *maṭa* at Tiruvoṇṇiyūr, perhaps for propagating the Soma-Siddhāntha (i.e., the doctrine of the Pāśupatas). And, it seems, that after Niranjana-guru, his renowned pupil, Chaturānana Puṇḍita, became the head of the *maṭa*. Two inscriptions belonging to Rājendra Chōlādēva I (1012-1043 A. D.) refer to the gifts made by Chaturānana Puṇḍita on the birth-day festival of the king as well as his efforts in constructing the Vimāna of the temple.² Inscription of a much later date enables us to infer that a succession of Chaturānana Puṇḍitas presided over the *maṭa* at various times, so that it makes

1. 181 of 1912. A. R. E., 1913, II, Para 17. E. I. xxvii, No. 47.

2. 104 and 126 of 1912.

us think that Chaturānana was the title given to the head of the *maṭa* at Tiruvoṇiyūr. Thus, an inscription from Tiruvoṇiyūr, belonging to the later half of the 12th century gives us the important information that the Chōla king Rājādhirājadeva II, accompanied by two learned teachers Chaurānāna Puṇḍita and Vāgis'wara Puṇḍita, came to the Tiruvoṇiyūr temple during the *Panguni Uttiram* festival and listened to a religious discourse.¹ The above inscription itself informs us that Vāgiswara Puṇḍita was an exponent of the Soma Siddhānta or the doctrine of Kāpālikas, and that Chaturānana Puṇḍita was the head of the local *maṭa*. Thus, the temple at Tiruvoṇiyūr had an institution to propogate, and a teacher to expound, the Soma Siddhānta school of Saivism. The *maṭa* seems to have been called as *Tirumayānamāṭa* and it is said that the poet Kamban refers to it in one of his stray verses.² What popularity the doctrine of Soma Siddhānta had with the people especially in relation to the orthodox Saivism, it is indeed difficult to say. But the fact that there was a regular order of ascetics and a *maṭa* for the propogation of the doctrine, together with the fact that even a king like Rājādhirājadeva II heard a religious discourse in company with the followers of Soma Siddhānta philosophy, shows that the latter was not as much open to ridicule as in the days of Mahēndravarman I. The reason might well be that thanks to Sankara's preaching, the Pāśupatas, the Kāpālikas and the Kālāmukhas toned down their repulsive practices considerably and adopted more refined ways.

1. 371 of 1911, S. I. I. V. No. 1358. Also see 206 of 1912.

2. V. Rangacharya: Topographical List of Inscriptions vol. 1, p. 434 No. 973, and 399 of 1196, S. I. I. V. No. 1351.

Appar :

It was pointed out, at the beginning of this section of the chapter, that the territory under our investigation played a conspicuous part in fostering the Saivite religion, thanks to the Nāyanmārs and other saints, like Paṭṭinathār and Aruṇagirināthar. The first of these Nāyanmārs, who visited this region and made it his object of admiration, was Appar or Tirunāvukkarasar, who lived in the beginning of the 7th century A. D. He was born of a Vellāla family in Tiruvāmūr in South Arcot District and he is said to have been a staunch Jain before he became a Saivite. After becoming a Saivite, he went on pilgrimage to all the important Saivite shrines of the country with a great determination to stamp out the influence of Buddhism and Jainism. In the course of his pilgrimage, he went to Kāñchi and took the credit for having converted the Pallava king Mahēndravarman I from Jainism to Hinduism. The *Peria Purāṇam* gives a graphic account of Appar's visit to Tiruvānniyūr, Mylapore and Tiruvōṇiyūr. He first went to Tiruvānniyūr and worshipped Marundis'ar and His consort, Sokkanāyaki. The *Purāṇam* says that from there, he proceeded to Mylapore and then to Tiruvōṇiyūr, where he stayed for some days composing many of his highly emotional 'Padikams,' in honour of the Lord of Tiruvōṇiyūr. The importance of his visit to this region cannot be over-estimated. As Mr. C. V. Narayana Iyer wrote, 'his (Appar's) deep religious fervour, thorough scholarship, exemplary life and mellifluous poetry, were bound to have enormous influence over his contemporaries and advance the cause of Saivism by leaps and bounds. In combination with the other great luminary

of his days (Sambandar), he may be said to have practically driven Jainism out of the Tamil land."¹

Sambandar :

Tirugñānasambandar who also visited Mylapore, Tiruvānmiyūr and Tiruvarriyūr was a younger contemporary of Appar and a Brahmin by birth. Hailing as he did from Shiyali near Tanjore, Sambandar showed, even as a young boy, signs of deep scholarship and intense devotion to Lord Siva. Like Appar, Sambandar also undertook a tour of all the important places of South India to spread the influence of Saivism far and wide and to reduce that of Buddhism and Jainism. Such a confirmed opponent of those heterodox religions was Sambandar, that he made it a point to condemn them strongly in almost every one of his *Padikams*. In the course, of his tour he came to Tiruvarriyūr, Tiruvānmiyūr and Mylapore, Pādi and Tirumullaivāyil. It was in Mylapore that he performed one of his most wonderful miracles by bringing back to life the dead Pūmpāvai, the daughter of a rich merchant of Mylapore, Sīvanēśan. He did this by singing his soul-stirring *Pūmpāvai Padikam* in the Kāpālis'warar temple. The whole *padikam* has a pathetic ring about it, for in each verse Sambandar regrets how Pūmpāvai had gone without being able to enjoy the numerous gay festivals that were celebrated in the Kāpālis'warar temple from time to time. Thus in the second verse of the *Pūmpāvai Padikam*, Sambandar refers to the *Aippasi* *Onam* festival and to the feeding of the devotees on that occasion. In the third verse, he refers to the *Kārtikai* festival during

1. C. V. Narayana Iyer: *Origin and Early History of Saivism in South India* p. 388.

which time the whole of the town would be illumined by lights. In the fourth verse he mentions the celebration of *Thiruvādirai Nāl* in the month of *Mārgalī*. In the next verse, he mentions the festival of *Taippūs'am* which was celebrated in the month of *Tai*. In the sixth verse he refers to the *Māsi Magam* when the people of Mylapore would go in large numbers to the sea to have holy bath. In the remaining four verses, he refers to the festivals like *Panguni Uttiram* (in the month of *Panguni*). *Ashtami Nakshattiram* (in the month of *Vaigāsi*) and *Perunjāndi* (perhaps the *Pavitrōtsavam*.) The fact that almost every month of the year pulsated with religious activity, shows that Mylapore must have been quite a busy and active centre of S'aivism.

Sundarar :

About a century later came Sundaramurti Nāyanār, another *Tēvāram* hymner. He was born in a poor Brahmin family in Navalur in South Arcot District. A certain dramatic event that is said to have happened on the eve of his marriage with a girl of his own caste, diverted him from the path of worldly life to one of religion and piety. Intoxicated with great devotion to God, Sundarar, a true 'Samayāchārya' that he was, set out on a tour of pilgrimage to the S'aivite shrines of South India. Thus, he came to Tiruvorriyūr, where a significant incident in his life took place. In the temple, Sundarar met a girl who was doing pious service to God and he fell in love with her. She was a Vellāla girl, Sangali by name, who even as a young girl was so animated with the devotion to S'iva, that when her parents talked about a marriage-proposal for her, she went away to Tiruvorriyūr temple, saying that she

would marry only a true devotee of Lord Siva and until then, she would spend her days doing service to the temple at Tiruvarriyūr. The *Peria Purūnam* goes on to say how prompted by the Lord, Sangali extracted from Sundarar a promise to the effect that he would never part from her after their marriage¹ and how later on, Sundarar, driven by a passion to visit some more shrines of South India, had to break his promise by going out of Tiruvarriyūr and lost his eyesight completely as a penalty. Sundarar himself seems to allude to his blindness in his songs. Thus he says in one place 'O! you who blinded one of my eyes for the sake of Sangali.'² In yet another place he almost pathetically prays to God: "If it is right (on your part) that you should deprive me of my eye sight you will give me at least a staff."³ And the story goes that Sundarar regained his eyesight when he was in Kāñchi and Tiruvārūr.

Kalia Nāyanār and Vayila Nāyanar :

Besides being the scene of activity and the object of admiration of these three great Saivite Samavāchāryas, this region was also the birth place of two Nāinmārs - Kalianāyanār and Vayila Nāyanār - who lived earlier than Sundarar and later than Appar. Kaliyanāyanār was born in the caste of oilmongers in Tiruvarriyūr. He took upon himself the pious duty of supplying oil to the temple-lamps. In course of time, it is said that his resources began to dwindle, making it impossible for

1. Because of the marriage that took place between Sundarar and Sangali which was blessed by God, the Tiruvarriyūr temple is specially chosen today for conducting marriages.
2. Sundarar 63.3
3. *Ibid.* 54.4
4. C. V. N. Iyer, *Op. cit.*, pp. 125-126.

him to carry on his pious duty any longer. Yet, he did not hesitate to sell all his possessions and even hire himself out as a labourer in order to fulfill his duty. As he could not cope with the situation even then, he decided to offer his own blood instead of oil to the lamps. And when he was about to do it, the grace of the Lord descended on him and gave him the unique distinction of being revered as one of the sixty-three Nāyanmārs, so dear to the S'aivites. Another Nāyanmār who was born in Mylapore in a Vellāla family and who also won the sainthood by his silent and intense devotion to God was Vāyila Nāyanār (the dumb-saint). Even to-day in the Kapālis'warar temple, Mylapore, there is a special shrine for Vāyilā Nāyanār to perpetuate the memory of its association with the saint.

Paṭṭinathu Aḍigal :

Another leading S'aivite saint whose life is intimately connected with Tiruvoṇiyūr was Paṭṭinathu Aḍigal, ascribed to the 10th century A. D.¹ He was born in Kāveripūmpaṭṭinam in a rich Vaisya family. When he was leading a married life with all material comforts, a feeling that this world was extremely unreal and temporary suddenly flashed on him and made him renounce wordly life. He gave up all his riches and with them his desires and passions, put on a piece of loin-cloth and wandered from place to place, worshipping God. After visiting places like Chidambaran, Kāñchi and Kalahasti, he came and settled down at Tiruvoṇiyūr. He was so attracted to the Tiruvoṇiyūr temple and its surroundings that he spent the rest of his life there itself,

1. See the valid arguments put forward in favour of this date by Mr. S. Anavaradavinayakam Pillai in his *Tamil Perumakkal Varalaru* (1921) pp. 192-194.

singing some of the finest pieces of poetry like the *Tiruvarryūrtokai*, which enshrine in themselves a remarkably liberal conception of religion.¹ It is said that one day when he was seated on a high sandmound near the sea-shore at Tiruvarriyūr, he saw young boys playing merrily and joined them in the play. He told them that even if they buried him in a sand-grave, he would come out unscathed after some time. The boys accepted this challenge joyfully and buried him completely under the sand. Paṭṭinathār proved the truth of his claim by coming out of the grave twice. But when he was buried for the third time, he never rose up! On that spot, today, stands a temple commemorating the incident connected with the great poet and sage. 'Paṭṭinathār's Samadhi' as it is commonly known, attracts people in large numbers who go to pay their humble homage to the departed saint.

Sēkkijār :

In the 12th century another great figure in the history of the Saivite religion - Sēkkijār - hailed from Kunrattūr near Pallāvaram and did signal service to the cause of Saivism, by recording the life-stories of the Nāyanmārs in his immortal *Peria Purāṇam*. The detailed way in which he describes the actual routes by which Appar, Sambandar and Sundarar went to Tiruvānnimiyūr, Mylapore and Tiruvarriyūr and also about the exact situation of the temples there, shows that Sēkkijār must have had a fairly intimate knowledge of those places.²

1. *Sen Tamil Vol. xxxviii.*

2. His life is dealt with in greater detail in another section of the same chapter.

Arunagirinādar :

In the 15th century, Mylapore and Tiruvo_{ṇṇ}iyūr were visited and sung by another great S'aivite Saint and poet Aruṇagirinādar, the author of the famous *Tiruppugal*. Born in Tiruvaṇṇāmalai in North Arcot district, Aruṇagiri was given to easy morals in his youth. But soon he realised his folly and repented for the same by trying to fall down from the top-most point of the Gopura of the temple. But the Lord is said to have saved him. From then on, he became the truest devotee of Lord Muruga on whom he composed beautiful poems like *Kandar Andādi*, *Kandaralankāram*, *Kandaranubūdi*, *Vēl Viruttam*, *Mayil Viruttam*, etc. The work for which he is most noted is of course the *Tiruppugal*, a collection of his spontaneous outpourings on God. His peregrinations on Tiruvo_{ṇṇ}iyūr, Mylapore and Tiruvaṇṇmiyūr also figure in his *Tiruppugal*.¹

Monasteries :

The growth of the S'aivite religion under the fostering care and leadership of the Nayanmārs and other later saints has so far been dealt with. The development of S'aivism in this area was also greatly facilitated by the existence of a number of *maṭas* which had for their main aim the propagation of religion, besides catering to the literary and social needs of the people. Thus the Tiruvo_{ṇṇ}iyūr temple, quite in keeping with its greatness, had about six *maṭas* in its precincts. We have already referred to the *maṭa* called *Tirumayāna maṭa*, presided over by the Chaturānana Pūṇḍithas. Besides that, there was the *Rājēndrasōḍan* *maṭa* probably built by Āriyammai, a devotee from Northern India.²

1. *Kalaikkaṇṭjam*, op. cit., pp. 197-198. 2. 127 and 135 of 1912.

Another *maṭa* in the Tiruvoṇiyūr temple was called *Kulōttungasōlan maṭa* apparently called after the Chōḷa king Kulōttunga I. To this *maṭa* was given a portion of the village Pāvambakkam as gift for feeding fifty S'aiva devotees daily.¹ Then there was the *Tirugnānasaṃbandar maṭa* for which a whole village in the Puṭal Kōṭṭam was given as gift during the time of the Telugu Chōḷa king Vijayagaṇḍagopāladeva, which was to be used for feeding the Mahēś'waras.² During the same period the existence of another *maṭa* of Nandikēś'wara alias Āriyavrataī-Konḍa Mudaliyār and his pupils is also reported.³ In the time of the Vijayanagara king Harihara II, who was a staunch Saivite, sprang up another *maṭa* called *Angarayana maṭa* in the Tiruvoṇiyūr temple.⁴ In Tiruvānmiyūr, there existed the *Tirunāvukkarasu maṭa* during the days of Kulōttunga Chōḷa III.⁵ The importance of the existence of these *maṭas* in this region cannot be exaggerated. They played a significant part in propagating the tenets of S'aivism as well as by serving as a vital element in the social structure of the people. Indeed, the existence of a vast net-work of *maṭas* spread over almost all the important Hindu shrines is a chief characteristic of the state of Hinduism in South India in the medieval times.

Religious Festivals :

The flourishing condition of S'aivism in this region is also reflected in the numerous festivals that were

1. 200 of 1912.
2. 238 of 1912.
3. 239 of 1912.
4. A. R. E., 1913 p. 86.
5. 303 of 1911.

celebrated in this place frequently. We have already referred to the festivals that were celebrated in the Kapāliswarar temple, Mylapore, during the days of Sambandar. In the Tiruvo^{க்க}riyūr temple also, a good many festivals are reported to have been celebrated. Amongst them were the Tiruvādirai Nāl when the god Kāraṇai-Vitanka was taken in procession and was made to hear the recital of the *Tiruvempāvai*; the Arudra festival also called as Rājēndrasōlān Tirunāl (evidently in honour of Rājēndra Chōla I in whose reign this festival is reported to have been conducted), which was celebrated in the month of *Margali*; the *Panguni Uttiram* festival when the Chōla king Rājarājadēva II was himself present in the temple and the *Puduyidu* festival conducted during the first crop of the year. Besides these, there were many special services like the *Virarājēndran Tiruppallieluchchi* (during the time of Kulottunga I) the *Tribhuvanavīran-Sandi* (during the time of Kulottunga III) and *Kaliyurki lavan-Sandi*.¹

Greatness of Tiruvo^{க்க}riyūr Temple :

The two hundred and odd highly informative inscriptions from Tiruvo^{க்க}riyūr speak volumes about the tremendous influence that this temple must have exerted among the Saivites all over India. Devotees from Kashmir in the north as well as those of the extreme south were attracted to this temple. Thus, an inscription of the 12th century A.D. mentions the gift, made to the temple by one Āriyan Tiruchchikkambalam Udayār Māduman alias Kāttimān of Kāshmirapuram.² Another inscription men-

1. 104 of 1912; 371 of 1911; 139 of 1912; 130 of 1912, 209 of 1912, S.I.T.I. Vol. I No. 521 and 242 of 1912.

2. 369 of 1911.

tions the gift made to the temple by one Nimbalađēvi, wife of Indalađēva of Talaigrāma in Virāṭadēsa, the modern Hangal in Dharwār, near Bombay.¹ Another north Indian devotee who seems to have settled down in Tiruvōggiyūr and made enormous gifts to the temple was one Āriyammai, wife of Prabhākara Baṭṭa who came from Mārgālapura in the Āryadēsa.² She seems to have established a *maṭa* called *Rūjēndra-sōlān maṭa* and even maintained a flower-garden for supplying four garlands everyday to the temple.

In South India itself the temple was the object of attraction for many kings and queens, princes and military chiefs and common people, even from the extreme Pāṇḍyanādu and the Chēranādu, who lavished many gifts on the temple. Among the kings and chiefs who made a personal visit to the temple were: Rājādhīrāja II, Kulōttunga III, Rājarāja III, a military chief of Parāntaka I and Uttamasōladeva, son of the chola king Gandaraditya (949-959).³ Besides this, queens like Mahadēvi Aḍīgaṭ (during the time of Aparājithavarman),⁴ Patradhāni wife of Vairamēghan, perhaps the son of Aparājitha,⁵ Kāḍavan Mahādēvi, (wife of Kulōttunga I),⁶ Perumāl Nāchchi (senior queen of prince Pañchanadīvānan Nilagangarāyar)⁷ and princes and military chiefs like Kōdandārāmar and Arindigai Perumānār (son of the chōla king Parāntaka I),⁸ Sāttan Ulagan (a chief of

1. 138 of 1912 and A.R.E., 1913 II 22.

2. 107 of 1892, 127 of 1912, 141 of 1912 and 155 of 1912 S.I.I. iv.555

3. A. R. E. 1913 pp. 110-11 and S.I.I. iii, No. 115.

4. 163 of 1912.

5. 161 of 1912.

6. 111 of 1912.

7. 117 of 1912.

8. 164 of 1912 and 170 of 1912.

Vanadalañjēri of S'ōlanādu, in the time of Parāntaka I¹, Vira-choļa Illangovēļār², a Commander-in-chief of Kulōttunga I and Is'vara Nāyaka,³ the Tuluva chief, are among those who have made enormous gifts to the Tiruvoṇṇiyūr temple.

The foregoing facts about the Tiruvoṇṇiyūr temple, when taken together, afford eloquent testimony to the fact that right from the days of Appar down to those of the Vijayanagar it was one of the grandest citadels of S'aivism, shedding its light far and wide and challenging comparison with the great temples of Tanjore and Chidambaram. It is no wonder that the Madras region, having in its fold such an old and mighty temple as that of Tiruvoṇṇiyūr, besides the equally old temples of Mylapore, Tiruvānmiyūr, Pādi and Tirumullaivāyil, played a great part in fostering the S'aivite religion in South India.

III. Vaishnavism : If the Madras region was one of the foremost centres of S'aivism, it also proved to be a fertile ground for Vaishnavism to grow and flourish. It must be borne in mind that the Bhakti cult, as fostered by the Vaishnavite Ālvārs, had Tondaimandalam as its home, for it was from there that the first four Ālvārs hailed. Of these four, Pēy Ālvār and Tirumajisai Ālvār were born in Mylapore and Tirumajisai (near Poonamalle) respectively, while the other two, Poigai Ālvār and Būdattālvār, though not born here, are said to have visited Triplicane. Later on, Tirumangai Ālvār visited some shrines in and around Madras and made them the object of his admiration. Another great figure in the

1. 176 of 1912.

2. 806 of 1912.

3. 244 of 1912.

history of Vaishnavism in South India with whom the Madras region had the good fortune to be associated, was Tirukkachchinambi, an elder contemporary and a close associate of Rāmānuja. In the Vijayanagar times, the great Ettūr Kumāra Tātāchāriar, one of the leaders of the Vaishnavite sect, made Tirunirmalai one of the centres of his activity. Added to these facts, was the existence of places like Triplicane and Tirunirmalai which were included in the one hundred and eight Divyadēstams, so sacred to the Vaishnavites. Even to-day, the pilgrimage of a Vaishnavite is considered to be complete only when he has visited the above places. Inevitably, therefore, the territory under our investigation played a vital part in fostering the Vaishnavite religion.

Pēy Ālvār: Taking the life of Pēy Ālvār first, we find the tradition, as incorporated in the *Guruparamparai*, that he was born in Mylapore in a well, near Madavaperumal temple. Even to-day a huge well in Arundale Street, Mylapore, is shown and venerated by the Vaishnavites as the birth-place of Pēy Ālvār and even a festival is conducted there in his honour. One important fact to be noted is that among a very few places that find mention in Pēy Ālvār's verses, Triplicane is one. The *Guruparamparai* makes Pēy Ālvār a contemporary of Poigai Ālvār and Bhūdattālvār so that all the three are together called as the 'Mudal Ālvārs' or the 'First Ālvārs.' Poigai and Bhūtam were born in Kāñchi and Mallai (Mahābalipuram) respectively. All the three saints are said to have met one another at Tirukkōilūr (South Arcot) under remarkable circumstances and came to know of one another's greatness. After singing the praise of God at Tirukkōilūr, they came to Mylapore

and Triplicane where they met Tirumajisai Ālvār. Pēy Ālvār is said to have settled down in Triplicane itself, while the other two departed to their respective places. Among the four thousand verses that constitute the *Nālāyira Divya Prabhandam*, a hundred belong to Pēy Ālvār. His work goes under the name *Eiarpa, Mūnrām Tiruvandādi*, while the first and the second *Tiruvandādis* belong to Poigai and Bhūtam. Speaking about the Mudal Ālvārs, one significant fact has to be noted ; we do not find in their works even a tinge of what can be called as sectarian bitterness. We have to search their works in vain to find any adverse reflection on other religions like Buddhism, Jainism and S'aivism, which we may come across in some of the works of the later Ālvārs. The religious outlook of the Mudal Ālvārs was characterised by exceptional liberalism which transcended all sectarian barriers. To illustrate the above fact, we need only refer to Pēy Ālvār's famous verse (which begins as *Tul Saḍayum Nil Muḍiyum...*) in praise of Lord Venkateswara of Tirupati, wherein he described the Lord as appearing to be a combination of the forms of Vishnu and S'iva.

Tirumalisaī Ālvār:

Another Ālvār who had an intimate association with the Madras region was Tirumalisaī Ālvār, who is said to have become a disciple of Pēy Ālvār at Triplicane. Tirumalisaī was born in the village of that name near Poonamalle in a poor Sudra family. That he was born

1. "This fact, and their employment of the *venba* metre in their songs points to a really very early date for them not later than the fifth or sixth Century A. D." Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Saastri in *A History of South India* pp. 408.

in a low caste is supported by his own words¹ which really evoke sympathy in us. Though in his young days he was plying his caste profession of making baskets, he was endowed with an insatiable curiosity to know about the supreme Being. So he tried the worth of religions like Jainism and Buddhism. But not being satisfied with what these religions offered, he stepped into the fold of Saivism. When he was a Saivite his name was Sivavakkiar. The *Guruparambarai* says that even as a Saivite, he composed many verses and went on touring the country for the purpose of establishing the supremacy of Saivism. But, when he went to Mylapore and Triplicane, he met the great Vaishnavite saint Pēy Ālvār, under whose dynamic influence he turned to Vaishnavism. This traditional account of Tirumajisai Ālvār's varied religious affiliations at different times seems to find support in his own words. Thus in a stray verse attributed to him, he says: "We have learnt the religion of the Sākya, that of the Samaṇas and we have examined the *agama* work composed by Sāṅkara (Siva). But by our own good fortune, we have put our faith in the Black one with red-eye (Vishnu)". In the last verse of his *Nānmugan Tiruvandādi* he says: "I have realised now that you (Lord Vishnu) are the Lord.....of Siva and Brahma also. I have also realised that you are my lord"². In addition to the above instances, we also come across in his works some virulently angry remarks on other religions like Jainism, Buddhism and Saivism which make us think that he was a veritable convert. Thus in one place he says: "The Samaṇas (Jains) are dull-

1. குவங்களைய வீரன்டும் ஒன்றிலும் பிறந்திலேன்—*Tiruchchanda Viruttam*.
2. இனி அறிந்தேன் சாசங்கும் நான்முகனுக்கும் தைவம் இனி அறிந்தேன் எம்பெருமான்! உன் இனி அறிந்தேன்.....

headed; the Baudhas are in a delusion; and those that worship Siva are ignorant. Those who do not worship Vishnu are of low intelligence indeed.¹

Tirumangai Ālvār :

Another conspicuous landmark in the growth of Vaishnavism in this region, was marked by the visit of Tirumangai Ālvār in the 8th Century. A petty chieftain of Alinādu in Tanjore District, Tirumangai, is said to have even taken to highway robbery in his excessive desire to feed a thousand devotees everyday. And the tradition goes that Lord Vishnu and His consort came in the form of a Brahmin couple with rich jewels on them and when Tirumangai in his usual manner, began to plunder them and came to know who they were, he fell prostrate at their feet and became one of the foremost devotees of Lord Vishnu.

Of the four thousand verses which constitute the *Nalāyira Prabandham*, a big slice of 1,361 verses belongs to Tirumangai. His works are: (1) *Peria Tirumoli*, (2) *Tirukurundāndakam* (3) *Tirumeṇḍundāndakam* (4) *Siriya Tirumādal* (5) *Peria Tirumādal* (6) *Tiruvekkukkārirukkai*. It is in the *Peria Tirumoli* that we get his peregrinations to Triplicane and Tirunirmalai. The very ecstatic way in which he exclaims "I have seen Tiruvallikkeni!" at the end of every verse of his 'Padikam' on that place, shows that Triplicane must have been a venerable centre of Vaishnavism and that a visit to that place was considered as a coveted privilege among the Vaishnavites. We have sufficient grounds to believe that Tirumangai Ālvār was very much attracted to the lovely temple that stands even to-day on the Tirunirmalai hill. For, apart

1. *Nammugan Tiruvandadi*, 6.

from singing a whole 'padikam' in praise of it in his *Peria Tirumoli*, he frequently mentions the place even when he is singing the praise of other temples. Such references can, for example, be seen in his 'pasuram' on 'Tiruvadandai' as well as in the *Tirunegundāndakam*.¹

The significance of Tirumangai Āḻvār's visit to this region can hardly be over-estimated. In bringing about the mighty revivalism that pulsated Hinduism in the 8th century and in offsetting the rising tide of heterodox religions like Buddhism and Jainism in South India, Tirumangai Āḻvār had no small part to play. By his whirlwind tour of every nook and corner of South India and by his zealous inculcation of the Bhakti cult through his beautiful verses, he can be said to have done for Vaishnavism what Tirugnānasambandar did for Saivism.

Tirukkachchinambi :

The next great figure in the history of the growth of Vaishnavism with whom the Madras region was associated, was Tirukkachchinambi, who was an elder contemporary of the great Vaishnavite Āchārya - Rāmānuja. Born in a Vañiga chetti family in Poonamalle, he even sacrificed his family-duty, and lost himself, completely in meditation. Even as a young boy he visited Vaishnavite centres like Triplicane, Sriperumbūdūr and Kañchi. He had a special attachment to the Pēraruālaperumal temple at Kāñchi and it is said that he used to carry garlands daily to that temple from Poonamalle. He also went to Srirangam where he met Ālavandār and Perianambi, two of the greatest Vaishnavite Āchāryas of the time. He learnt from them

1. *Peria Tirumoli* II, 7, stanza 8.

2. Stanza 18.

the tenets of Vaishnavism, came back to Kāñchi and permanently settled down in the Pēraruļā]apperumāl temple. His deep attachment to that temple got him the names such as Pēraruļā]adāsan and Gajendradāsan. The *Guruparamparai* says that he was such an ardent devotee of Pēraruļā]apperumāl that even persons like Sri Rāmānuja went to him to take advice and to know the Lord's will and opinion. The fact that Rāmānuja, though born of a Brahmin family, approached Tirukkachchinambi and requested him to have him (Rāmānuja) as his disciple is itself a testimony to Tirukkachchinambi's greatness. And quite appropriately, there is a special temple dedicated to Tirukkachchinambi at Conjeevaram. His influence on the Vaishnavites can also perhaps be gathered from an inscription found at Tirunirmalai (dated 3rd year of Kulottunga III) which informs us that an oil-monger called Tirukkachchinambidāsan from Poonamalle made some gifts to the temple at Tirunirmalai. His real name as given in the inscription itself was Āyiravaṇṇan Ālkondavilli. But the fact that he adopted the name of Tirukkachchinambidāsan shows Tirukkachchinambi's influence over the Vaishnavites.¹

Tātāchārya :

Under the Vijayanagar rule this region came under the spell of a celebrated figure in the history of Vaishnavism in South India. He was Eṭṭūr Kumāra Tirumala Tātāchārya, also known as Lakshmikumāra Tātāchārya and Koṭikanyādānam Tātāchārya, a poet, philosopher, controversialist and preceptor of the Vijayanagar king Venkata II (1586-1614 A.D.) He was a descendant of Srisaila Pūrṇa who is said to have taught

Rāmāyana to Sri Rāmānuja. The members of the Tātāchārya family had all along wielded a profound influence on the Vaishnavites especially because they had the backing of the later Vijayanagar kings, who were mostly Vaishnavites. Thus the great Pañchanadibhanjanam Tātāchārya, the father of Lakshmikumāra Tatacharya was the royal *Guru* of Sadāśiva Rāya (1542-1576) and Sri Ranga I (1577-1586), while the son himself was the royal *Guru* of Venkata II. Of their many services to the cause of Vaishnavism were their personal management of Vaishnavite temples and the receiving of gifts or grants for the temples from the kings, using their influence with the latter. Thus, according to an inscription, Lakshmikumāra Tātāchārya was the manager of the Vaishnavite temple at Tirunirmalai near the modern Chromepeṭ during the time of Venkata II.¹ Another inscription from the same temple informs us that while Tātāchārya was managing (*Parupatyā*) the temple some grants were made to the shrine of Ajagiyangan.² The Tirunirmalai inscriptions suggest that he was supervising some other Vaishnavite temples of the Chingleput district as well.³ Lakshmikumāra Tatacharya or Kotikanyādanam Tātāchārya, as he was more familiarly known, was, like Tirumangai Alvar before him, evidently attracted to the beautiful little shrine at Tirunirmalai. Tradition says that he even performed a great 'yāga' in that temple. Even to-day a small hall in the temple is pointed out as the spot where he performed the 'yāga'.

Royal Patronage :

The attitude of the kings towards the Vaishnavite temples of the Madras region is worthy of notice here;

1. 565 of 1912. 2. 564 of 1912. 3. A. R. E. 1913 JL.

we have already seen how a Pallava king effected vast improvements and thereby beautified the Triplicane temple and how the same was gratefully acknowledged by the Vaishnavite saint Tirumangai Āḻvār. Subsequently, the Vaishnavite temples here seem to have been greatly patronised by a set of influential chieftains who invariably affixed the name 'Nilagangarāyan' to their names.¹ Thus, prince (*pillaiyār*) Kulōttunga-Sōla-Kannappan Nallanāyanār Pañchanadivānan Nilagangarāyan made a gift of 1.650 *kuli* of land to the temple of Tirumijis'ai Āḻvār at Tirumijis'ai near Poonamalle.² The same temple received gifts of land made by Pañchanadivānan Aruṇagiriperumāl Nilagangarāyan.³ It received gifts of land and tax from other Nilagangarāyans also.⁴ Similarly, the Vaishnavite temple at Tirunirmalai received a gift of six *vēlis* of land from Arunagiripperumāl Nilagangarāyan in 1292.⁵ In Rājarāja III's reign, Madurāntakappottāpi Gaṇḍagopālan, an influential chieftain, made a gift of land for maintaining a service called *Tiruvaliparappinān Sandi* (i.e., the festival of the man who spread Vaishnavism) in the temple of Tirunirmalai Emberumān.⁶ Later on, in the Vijayanagar days also, some signs of royal patronage being given to the Vaishnavite temples are visible. We have already referred to the fact that Tātāchārya, the Guru of Venkata II, was the manager of the Tirunirmalai temple. Gobbiri—Ōba—Rājayya, the father-in-law of the Vijayanagara king Venkata II, seems to have been very much attached to

1. See Appendix I.

2. 2 of 1911.

3. 4 of 1911.

4. See inscriptions, 2, 3 and 5 of 1911.

5. 537 of 1912.

6. 534 of 1912.

the Triplicane temple and he made a gift of two villages and a garden to it.¹ That in the Vijayanagar times the Triplicane temple was a prosperous centre of Vaishnavism is seen by the celebration of a number of expensive festivals. Thus an inscription dated in the reign of Venkata II (1586-1614) mentions the *Brahmotsavam* in the month of Chittirai. It mentions the Car Festival (*Tiruthēr*), floating festival, *Vasantha Tirumāl* and *Āndāl* festival.² Another inscription of the Vijayanagara times mentions the *Uriyadi* festival, *Jayanti* festival, *Vadāyatti* festival, and *Tiruppārvēṭṭai*, *Srirāmanavami* festival. The same inscription, which is rather long, mentions in a detailed manner the various expensive items that formed part of those festivals.³ It is also interesting to note that during the same period the images of *Tirumajisai Ālvār* and *Sri Rāmānuja* were installed and worship offered in the Triplicane temple.⁴

IV. Christianity :

Christianity too had its early growth and development in the Madras region. In fact, it figures as one of the earliest centres of Christianity in India. We have already seen in the first Chapter that a strong and persistent tradition attributes the introduction of Christianity in this region to the days of the apostolic mission of Saint Thomas, one of the disciples of Jesus Christ. Apostle Thomas is said to have founded a Church at Mylapore which flourished along with its bishops and priests for quite a long time. Gregory of Tours in the

1. S. I. I. VIII, No. 535, 536 and 537. Also M. E. R. 1909-1910, Para 56.

2. S. I. I. VIII, No. 534.

3. Ibid, No. 536.

4. Ibid, 535 and 539.

sixth century recorded the accounts which he heard from a monk called Theodorous about the church and monastary of 'striking demensions that stood near the tomb of Saint Thomas in India.' Bishop Medlycott thought that the church and the monastary referred to by Theodorous were those that existed in Mylapore.¹ Even the king of England, Alfred the Great, according to the early annals of England, sent his ambassadors to the shrine of Saint Thomas in India in 883 A.D.² The Arab travellers of the 9th and 10th centuries are also taken to refer to San Thomé Mylapore when they mention the place in India called Betumah i.e., the House of Thomas.³ Father Hosten maintains that the slender pillar fragments, the Cross and the stones bearing the Pahlavi inscriptions that were found on the Great Mount by the Portuguese excavators in 1547 go to show that they belonged to a church which stood on the top of the Mount in the 7th century A.D.⁴ But Dr. Burnell thinks that the Mount colony of Christians was established only in the 10th century A. D.⁵ About 1292 A. D. John

1. Medlycott: *Op. cit.* But W. R. Philips takes objection to the identification of the church described by Theodorous with that of Mylapore for Theodorous had not only not mentioned the name of the place he visited but also some of the features of his description hardly fit in with Mylapore (I. A., Vol. XXXII, P. 151.) Another writer points out that the church, if there had been one, must have come into existence only after the first half of the sixth century, A.D. for Cosmos who came during that period and who had much to say about Christians in South India had not mentioned the church of Saint Thomas (J.R.A.S., 1906, P. 1027.)

2. James Hough : *op. cit.* p. 105.

3. I. A. 1931, P. 109.

4. Hosten *op. cit.* pp. 37-38 and 187.

5. I. A. Vol. iii (1874) P. 311.

of Montecorvino, an Italian who became the first Archbishop of Peking passed through the country of India wherein stood the church of Saint Thomas on his way from Persia to China.¹ He stayed there for thirteen months and baptized about one hundred persons. His companion Friar Nicholas of Pisotia, of the order of the Preachers, is said to have died at San Thomé and was buried near the church that stood there. Marco Polo who was in Mylapore in 1293 reports the existence of a church there as well as of some Christians who were in charge of it.² Thirty years after Marco Polo's visit, that is in the beginning of the 14th century, Friar Odoricus found at Mylapore some fifteen houses of Nestorians, and a church filled with idols.³ A little later in the same century, John De Marignolli saw not only a church but also a monastary at Mylapore.⁴ For the 15th century we have the account of Nicolo Conti who reports the existence of "a large and beautiful church" and a thousand Nestorians who inhabited 'Mālepor' (Mylapore). But Barbosa in the beginning of the 16th century found the same church in partial ruin and tended by a Mohammadan 'fakir' who kept a lamp burning there.⁵ He also noted how the Christians in India held in great reverence the vicinity where Saint Thomas was buried and how they frequented it on pilgrimage to carry away some pellets of earth from the place where the tomb of the apostle was situated—a fact, which both Marco Polo and John De Marignolli have also recorded. Early in the same century in which

1. Yule: *Cathay and the Way Thither*. *op. cit.*

2. Yule: *Marco Polo* Vol. II P. 355.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Op. cit.*

5. Yule: *op. cit.* p. 357.

Barbosa visited Mylapore, also came the Portuguese who formed their settlement at the place which they called as San Thomé De Meliapor. From that time (about 1522 A. D.) San Thomé began to develop fast into a flourishing Christian settlement on the eastern coast.¹ In fact, the advent of the Portuguese on the soil of Madras can be said to have ushered in a glorious period for Christianity there because the Portuguese were greatly interested in building up the town of San Thomé particularly because they venerated it as a place associated with the activity of Apostle Thomas. Thus in 1524, they effected vast repairs to the old edifice and built new chapels at San Thomé.² The chapel that they built on the site which they considered as the tomb of apostle Thomas formed the nucleus of the present Roman Catholic Cathedral of San Thomé. In 1547, as pointed out in the first Chapter, the Portuguese made vast excavations in the Great Mount (Saint Thomas Mount), discovered an inscribed stone and the cross and re-erected a church dedicated to 'Our Lady of Expectation'. The Luz Church, which is situated west of the San Thomé Cathedral, was also probably built sometime after 1547 A.D., by a Franciscan monk.³ The tradition

1. Fr. Heras *op. cit.* p. 64.

2. Love *op. cit.* p. 289.

3. On the authority of an inscribed stone built into the South wall of the Luz church, Mr. J. J. Cotton (*List of inscriptions on Tombs or Monuments in Madras*, vol I, p. 155) asserted that the church was built in 1516 and that it was the most ancient European building on the coast. But, Colonel Love disputes this claim by pointing out that Correa who was in San Thomé in 1521 and who had so much to say about it had not a word to say about the existence of the church. He says that the Luz Church must have been probably built sometime between 1547 and 1582 A.D. (*op. cit.* pp. 289-290).

has it that some mariners who were caught up in a furious storm vowed to build a church to the Virgin if they were saved from the storm. Just then they saw a guiding light flashing out. They followed the light and landed safely on the shore of San Thomé. The light travelled a mile into the interior and finally disappear'd. On that spot they erected the church of our Lady of Light (De *Nossa Senh-Ora da Lus*).¹ Gasparo Balbi, a Venetian merchant who was in San Thomé in 1582, testifies to the existence of many more churches. He mentions the church dedicated to our Lady where the Fathers of Saint Paul "baptize the Gentiles (Hindus) and exhort and instruct them in matters of Faith". He also refers to the churches of "Our Lady of the Mount" and of Saint Lazarus (it is situated a few hundred yards south of San Thomé).² It was in the same century-about 1545 A.D.-that the great Christian saint of the Jesuit order, Francis Xavier, came to San Thomé and lived there for four months in the house of a vicar, close to the church of Saint Thomas. In a letter that Francis Xavier wrote from Malaya to Portugal he has stated that there were about a hundred Portuguese families in San Thomé and that Christians of the locality attached great reverence to the place where Saint Thomas attained martyrdom.³

In the first half of the next century also many Christian institutions cropped up round Madras. In the year 1606 the Bishopric of Madras was set up for the first time. The Capuchin Mission was founded in 1642 under

1. *Ibid.*
2. See the extract from Balbi's travel diary given by Love *op. cit.* pp. 292-293.
3. Xavier's letter is quoted in the book "*The Hand of Xavier*" pp. 116 and 125. Also see Heras, *Op. cit.* p. 65, foot note.

the sanction of the Pope, mainly for the benefit of the Catholic residents, who were mostly of the Portuguese origin. The Mission was granted a site adjacent to the Fort St. George for building its church. Its first priest was a French friar of the Capuchin order called Father Ephraim de Nevers, who was mainly instrumental in building the church dedicated to the Apostle St. Andrew. Father Ephraim even maintained a public school for children, several of whom were English. He was of such a pious nature that he is even said to have acted the part of the peacemaker in the disputes that arose between the English of the Fort St. George and the Portuguese settlement of San Thomé.¹ The needs of the Protestants in the English settlement of Fort St. George also began to receive attention in the first half of the 17th century. In 1646 the Protestant factors and soldiers of the settlement desired the provision of a chaplain and Master Isaacson who arrived at Madras from Surat in 1647 was made the first Resident Chaplain of Fort St. George.² Besides these, the Portuguese actually built a fort at San Thomé with parapet walls, five yards high. De Rezende who has noted the existence of this fort says that it was built by the Portuguese to protect the church of St. Thomas from the encroachment of the sea. He mentions a number of convents and churches like those of St. Paul, St. Dominic, St. Augustine etc., which were inside the fort. He notes the existence of 120 Portuguese and two hundred "black Christians" inside the fort, besides a number of servants and others. Outside the fort also there were numerous Christians, six hundred of whom were fishermen.³ Albert de Mandelslo who

1. Love : *op. cit.* pp. 47-50.

2. *Ibid.* pp. 73-74.

3. See the full extracts of their accounts given by Col. Love *op. cit.* pp. 297-299 and 304.

travelled in India between 1638 and 1640 has recorded the existence of six hundred Portuguese and some Armenians at San Thomé.

The attitude of the Vijayanagar monarchs towards the Christians of San Thomé was on the whole an enlightened one, despite the occasional quarrels between them, which we have noted in the second chapter. The above-mentioned De Rezende himself wrote: "the king appreciates peace, and shows himself a friend of the Portuguese though he is actuated by self-interest...". He himself mentions how the lord of the land granted two villages, one of which was called EJumūr (Egmore) from which the clergy derived 300 *pagodas* for their living.¹ The Vijayanagar king Venkata II was very liberal in making gifts to the Jesuits. He not only allowed them to establish their churches at Chandragiri and Vellore but gave a thousand gold pieces annually with which they maintained a College at San Thomé and their mission at Chandragiri.² Another striking example of the cordial relationship between the Portuguese of San Thomé and the Vijayanagar king Venkata II can be cited; when Rev. Father Simon de sa, Rector of the College of San Thomé went to Chandragiri for opening their mission there in 1598, he was warmly received by Ōba Rāya, the father-in-law of Venkata and introduced to the king, who received him in audience. On that occasion, the Rector was given large presents which included a golden palanquin.³

In spite of all these facilities for development, the sixteenth century was also a period of great stress and

1. Rev. Fr. Heras: *op. cit.* pp. 467, 470-471.

2. Rev. Fr. Heras: *op. cit.* pp. 464-485.

3. *Ibid.* pp. 464-465.

strain for the Portuguese settlement of San Thomé, because it was plagued with internal disorder and threatened by external attacks from the Muslim, the Dutch and French forces.¹ Indeed Col. Love calls the period between 1600 and 1672 as a period of decline and fall of San Thomé. Any way, Christianity had long taken root in the soil and the vicinity round Madras had a great share in fostering the Christian religion in our country.

Islam :

The growth of Islam round Madras before 1650 A.D. had not been prominent, even though its presence here even in the 13th century is well attested by Marco Polo who, as shown in an earlier chapter, has mentioned the existence of the Saracens. Durate Barbosa has referred to a Mohammadan fakir who lighted a lamp at the St. Thomas' church. The Muslim invasion of South India in the 14th century and that of Golconda forces in the 17th century must have increased the number of Muslims who settled down here. But the growth of Islam during the period under our study had not been spectacular by any means in this region.

Section II

LITERATURE

Sanskrit :

As learning and religion went largely hand in hand in India, a brief survey of the state of learning and literature in this region will not be out of place here. Numerous inscriptions, Sanskrit and Tamil, engraved on

1. See Chapter II above.

the walls of the temples, especially at Tiruvo^{க்கியூர்}, afford sumptuous treat of the literary excellence that was attained by those ancient people in those languages. The Sanskrit epigraph of Mahēndravarman I's time (7th century A. D.) at Pallavaram written in the *Grantha* characters, which describe the various colourful titles of the king, highlight their capacity for making fine and picturesque phrases of high literary taste.¹ Again, the famous inscription of 10th century A. D. at Tiruvo^{க்கியூர்}, which graphically describes the life-history of Chaturanāna Paṇḍitha, right from his boyhood to the time of his settling down at Tiruvo^{க்கியூர்}, is written in fine Sanskrit poetry.² Similarly, the numerous Tamil epigraphs of the Chōjas which, in their historical introductions, describe the various victorious acts of the kings bear testimony to their proficiency in the language. Such epigraphs are found in large number at Tiruvo^{க்கியூர்}.³ That Sanskrit learning was promoted and Sanskrit-knowing people encouraged at Tiruvo^{க்கியூர்} is amply borne out by the inscriptions there. There was at the Tiruvo^{க்கியூர்} temple a special hall called *Vyākaranadāna Vyākhyāna Mandapa*, where a regular school seems to have been conducted to teach Pāṇini's grammar. This grammar hall, according to local tradition, was the original place where Pāṇini, the great Sanskrit grammarian, received directly from Lord Siva the fourteen aphorisms called the 'Mahēsvara sūtras'.⁴ It is evidently

1. SII. XII No. 13.

2. EI. XXII, No. 47. Also see other Sanskrit inscriptions like 104 and 109 of 1892, 206 of 1912 etc.

3. See SII. IV, No. 555; SII. V, Nos. 1354, 1356, 1359 etc. Another inscription of Aparājita at Tiruvo^{க்கியூர்} is in Tamil poetry (SII. XII, No. 93). The Government Epigraphist calls it as a 'poetical record' (ARE. 1913, p. 90)

4. ARE. *op. cit.*, p. 110

because of this tradition, which seems to have been current at Tiruvo^{rm}iyūr even in the Chōja days, that a Chōja inscription calls the Lord at Tiruvo^{rm}iyūr as Vyākaraṇadāna Perumal.¹ One of the worshippers (*dēvakarmin*) of the Tiruvo^{rm}iyūr temple also called himself Vyākaraṇadāna Bhaṭṭa, in addition to his other name Sūryadēva.² At various times, rich gifts were lavished on the Tiruvo^{rm}iyūr temple for the upkeep and maintenance of this grammar school, its teachers and pupils. Thus, an inscription of Kulōttunga III informs us that one Durgaiyāndi Nāyakkan, agent of Sittaraisan, gave lands at Kuṭṭattūr for the maintenance of the *Vyākaranadāna Vyākhyāna mandapa*.³ Another epigraph of later date records that residents of the whole district of Puṭar koṭṭam granted the *pon-vari* collected both in the northern and southern divisions of Tiruvo^{rm}iyūr for the purpose of maintaining the same historic *maṇḍapa* where there was special provision for Vyākhyāna or exposition of doctrines.⁴ Another epigraph mentions the existence of a *maṇḍapa* called *Vakkāṇikkum maṇḍapa* at Tiruvo^{rm}iyūr, where evidently learned discussions were held.⁵

Another proof of patronage given to Sanskrit at Tiruvo^{rm}iyūr is seen in the provisions made there for the recital of the *Vēdas* and the numerous gifts that were given to those who recited them. From an interesting inscription of Rājēndra I, we learn that the provision for the grant of food and cloth to the Brahmans who recited the *Vēdas* formed an essential item of expenditure for the

1. 120 of 1912.

2. 116 of 1912.

3. 201 of 1912.

4. 110 of 1912.

5. 156 of 1912.

temple.¹ An epigraph of the same king, records the gift of money made to the Tiruvorriyūr temple for celebrating the Mārgaṇi-Tiruvādirai festival and for feeding three Brahmans learned in the *Vēdas*.² Instances of this kind where the learned Brahmans were patronised in the temple to recite *Vēdas* can be multiplied.³ But what has been said above is sufficient to show that an active interest in Sanskrit was kept alive by the temples, which had always been, in South India, great centres of culture and learning.

Tamil :

The evidences for the growth of the Tamil language in this region are far greater. We must observe that the Ālvārs and the Nāyanmārs and other saints like Paṭṭinathar and Aruṇagirinathar who visited many of the places in this region gave an impetus to the growth of the Tamil language. Great poets as they were, their simple, chaste and devotional language had a profound hold on the people for a long time to come. The singing of the *Tēvāram* and the *Tiruvembāvai* became a permanent feature in the Saivite temples. Thus an inscription of Virararājēndra I in the later half of the eleventh century says that some sixty *vēli* of waste land of the temple was reclaimed by the order of the king and their produce was utilised for services in the temple which included the recital of Manikkavasagar's *Tiruvembāvai*, the *Tēvāram* *Tiruppadiyams* and maintenance of priests, dancing masters and girls.⁴ A later epigraph belonging to the Vijayanagar times refers to the practice of reciting

1. 146 of 1912, ARE. 1913, p. 96.

2. 140 of 1912.

3. See for example 163 of 1937-38 133 of 1912 etc.

4. 128 of 1912, ARE. *op. cit.* p. 104.

Tiruppadiyam and *Tiruvembāvai* hymns by the Padiyilār of the same temple.¹ Apart from this, the life - stories of the sixty three Saivite Nāyanmārs were extant at Tiruvōrriyūr even from the time of Rājādhirāja I, for an inscription of his time refers to Sundarar's *Tiruttondattragai*, the original nucleus of the *Periapurāṇa*.² The same inscription also informs us that the sixty three Nainmārs were deified and offered worship in Tiruvōrriyūr temple. Similarly, on the Vaishnavite side, we have already seen Tirumajisai Ālvār, the author of *Tiruchchanda Viruttam* and *Nānnugan Tiruvāṇḍādi*, was deified in his birth place as early as the time of Kulottunga III.³ The Ālvārs' works also must have been quite familiar to the people in this region. We have an inscription of the Vijayanagar king Sadāśiva at Triplicane which mentions the existence of *Tiruvay Moli Mandapa* in the Sri Pārthasārathy Temple.⁴ The *Tiruvāyamoli Maṇḍapa* might have been so called evidently because Nammālvār's *Tiruvāyamoli* used to be either recited or commented upon there. Even to-day, the recital of the four thousand *Divyaprabhandas* is an indispensable feature on all important occasions including the annual ten-day festival at the Triplicane temple.

Tiruvalluvar :

So far for the epigraphical evidences regarding the growth of Tamil language in the tract round Madras. The flourishing condition of a language in a particular region is also gauged by the literary figures that it has produced from time to time. In this connection, it must be remembered that an old tradition attributes

1. 196 of 1212, ARE. *op. cit.*, 118.
2. 137 of 1912, ARE. *op cit.*, p. 99.
3. 2 of 1911.
4. SJI. VII, No. 538

to Mylapore the unique honour of having been the birth-place of one of the greatest of the Tamil poets - Tiruvalluvar - the author of the far - famed work *Tirukkural*. The exact time in which Tiruvalluvar lived is the subject-matter of controversy, even though the consensus of opinion seems to be in favour of placing him in the first three centuries of the Christian era.¹ His personal life also is rather obscure and all that we know about him is only through tradition as told by some of the late works like the *Kapilar Ahaval* and the *Tiruvalluvamālai*.² According to the former work, he was the son of a Brahman called Bhagavān by a Pulaya woman named Ādi. In accordance with the vow they had taken on the eve of their marriage, Bhagavān and Ādi gave away all their four daughters and three sons as presents to various persons. Valluvar was presented to one Valluva, a resident of Mylapore. The same work also states that Valluvar's profession was weaving. The other work *Tiruvalluvamālai* informs us that though Valluvar was a weaver by profession, he was endowed with profound scholarship which attracted to him a prominent and wealthy merchant - Elelasinga - who even became Valluvar's ardent disciple. It was at Elelasinga's request that Valluvar composed his immortal work - *Tirukkural*. The tradition of Elelasinga's association with Mylapore is also incorporated in an inscription of

1. According to M. Srinivasa Iyengar (*Tamil Studies*, p. 285). Valluvar lived in the closing years of the first century A. D. G. S. Duraiswamy (*Tamil Literature*, p. 89) also places him in the 1st century A. D. V. R. R. Dikshitar (*Studies in Tamil Literature and History*, p. 133) is inclined to place Valluvar in the first or second century B. C. But P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar (*History of the Tamils*, p. 588) says that Valluvar came later than sixth century A. D. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri (*History of South India*, p. 350) thinks that A. D. 450-500 is the best date for the *Kural*.
2. V. R. R. Dikshitar: *op. cit.*, pp. 127-129.

the 13th century found at Kovūr near Kunnattūr, belonging to the Telugu-Chōḍa king, Vijayagandagopāla. It says that the seventy Vellāla families that were settled by Karikāla Chōḍa in Tonḍamandalam included the family of Elelasingar at Tirumayilāppūr.¹ But, as pointed out earlier, the life-history of Tiruvalļuvar and his exact birth - place, are all facts that have been transmitted to us by tradition and, unfortunately, no early work throws any light on the life of that great poet. Even as regards tradition, there is more than one version. While one of them attributes Tiruvalļuvar to Mylapore, another holds Madura, the seat of the ancient Tamil S'angam, as his birth - place.² In the absence of authentic and conclusive materials, it is not possible to say which of these versions is correct, even though the former one seems to have greater degree of possibility.³ Tiruvalļuvar's work is remarkably impersonal and as such it throws little light on the personal life of the author. It is a comprehensive treatise on ethics, polity, and love. It consists of 133 sections, each section containing 10 distiches. The first 38 deal with ethics (*aram*); the following 70 with political and economic topics (*porul*) and the rest with love (*kūmam*). The ethical, moral and religious tenets embodied in the *Kural* are of such universal application that votaries of many a religion feel quite at home in them and claim the *Kural* as their own.

Thus, followers of Jainism, Buddhism, S'aivism and Vaishnavism and Christianity see in the *Kural* many tenets akin to their own. In fact, each one of the above religions claims the *Kural* as its own. So liberal and

1. 329 of 1939-40. Also see Part II of ARE. of the same year.

2. V. R. R. Dikshitar : *op. cit.*, p. 131.

3. H. A. Popley in his *The Sacred Kural or the Tamil Veda of Tiruvalļuvar* (1931).

flexible are the ideas and ideals that the *Kural* enshrines, that one is justified in saying that its author was acquainted with different creeds and faiths, took up the best in every creed, and thus primarily intended to be 'a moralist rather than a religious preacher'.

In the realm of Tamil literature, *Tirukkural* holds a distinguished place of its own. The freshness of its ideas, the striking metaphors to illustrate certain fundamental truths, its deep insight into many problems of life, - all these told in those terse and telling couplets, make it a great masterpiece of literature and 'one of the noblest and purest expressions of human thought'.

The greatness of the *Kural* as a literary work also lies in the fact that it had been the fountain-head of inspiration for later generations. It is one of the most widely quoted works in the Tamil language. Poets and writers of subsequent times freely drew upon the phrases and ideas found in the *Kural*. In fact, the thought and the language of *Tirukkural* have become part of the heritage of the Tamils. The fact that *Tirukkural* has been translated into many European languages, is also an eloquent tribute to its greatness as "Pothu Marai", a name which it has rightly earned.

Sēkkilār:

Another distinguished figure in the history of Tamil literature who rose from the immediate neighbourhood of Madras and to whom we have already made brief reference was Sēkkilār. Umāpati Sivāchārya's work *Sēkkilār Nāyanār Purāṇam*, the main source for the life history of Sēkkilār, clearly mentions that the latter was born in a Vellala family at Kunnattūr, in Puliyūr Kōṭṭam

in Tondamandalam. Sēkkijār was a gifted scholar and an ardent devotee of Siva. Knowing his greatness, the Chōla king of his day (Kulottunga II) honoured him by making him a trusted minister and conferring on him the title - Uttamasōla Pallavan. As stated earlier, Sēkkijār is held to have been responsible for infusing in the Chōla king an interest in the sacred lives of the great Saivite saints, so that the king himself persuaded Sēkkijār to write the life-stories of the saints in his celebrated work *Tiruttondar Purānam* or *Periapurānam*. Sēkkijār wrote it at Chidambaram with great inspiration. After having composed it, he himself expounded it before a huge concourse of people which included the king, who honoured him with the title *Tondarsir Paravuvar*, adorned him with the crown of knowledge and saluted him. The *Periapurānam* has been included as the twelfth book in the Saiva canon.

The greatness of *Peria Purānam* as a masterpiece of Tamil literature can hardly be overstated. The simple and melodious verses numbering about 4,253 and enshrining in themselves the epic stories of the Saivite saints have been a perennial source of inspiration for countless generations. Its dignified theme and chaste and simple poetry have made the work a favourite of the people, who venerate it as the Fifth Veda.

To-day, at Kunnattūr, the birth - place of Sēkkijār, there stands a small temple in the very place in which his house is said to have been situated. There is also the Pālaravayar tank at Kunnattur, called after Sēkkijār's brother Pālaravayar, who was also a great scholar and a devotee of Siva.

Mayilaināthar :

Another literary celebrity of our region was Mayilaināthar, who wrote his brilliant commentary on the celebrated work on Tamil grammar-*Nannūl*-which was written by Pavaṇḍi in the 12th century A.D. Pavaṇḍi was a Jain who wrote this manual of Tamil grammar according to the special wish of a chief called S'iyagangan. As S'iyaganga is known to us through inscriptions as a feudatory chief of Kulottunga III, the *Nannūl* must have been written in his time (A.D. 1178-1216).¹ It was to this book *Nannūl*, which is considered to be the best among the grammar - works in the Tamil subsequent to *Tolkappiam*, that Mayilaināthar wrote his commentary. Mayilaināthar was a Jain who hailed from Mylapore. Mayilainātha was another name by which the twenty-second Tirthankara Nēminātha, for whom there was a temple at Mylapore, was known. Evidently because of this, our commentator called himself after the Lord of Mylapore.² That Mayilaināthar was a Jain is amply borne out by internal evidences of the work, wherein we see frequent references being made to the Jain works and Jain religious tenets by way of illustrations. The unqualified praise that he offers to the Jain religion and its founder also points to the same conclusion.

Mayilaināthar's explanations and commentaries on the *Nannūl* are noted for their clarity and elaborateness. His exposition of the work through questions and answers

1. K. A. N. Sastri: *Chōlas*, p. 401. Also see preface for *Nannūl Mūlamum Kandikai Uraiyum*, Madras Govt. Oriental MSS Series, No. 14.
2. Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer, *Nannūl Mūlamum, Mayilaināthar Uraiyum* (1918), p. xvii; M. S. Venkataswami, *Mayilai Nēmināthar Padikam*, p. 11.

are very characteristic. His commentary also shows that he was a very widely read scholar, conversant with the earlier works on Tamil grammar like *Agattiyam*, *Avinayam*, *Tolkappiam*, *Yäpperungalakarikai* and others. Among the other literary works that he draws on are the *Ahanänuru*, *Puranänuru*, *Kalithogai*, *Kurunthogai*, *Kalavalinärpaththu*, *Tirukkural*, *Silappadikäram*, *Manimekhalai*, *Narrinai*, *Näladiyär*, *Paripädal* etc. The felicity with which he writes his commentary, as well as an unusually wide range of Tamil works that he quotes from, stand out as an eloquent proof of Mayilainäthar's mastery of Tamil language and literature.

The exact date of Mayilainäthar is not clear. But the facts that he must have lived when the Jain temple for Nëminätha or Mayilainätha was in existence at Mylapore, and that his commentary on *Nannül* is the earliest among those that are extant, may give him an early date.¹ Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer says that from the way in which Mayilainätha praises S'iyagangan in his work as well as the fact that he gives the Ganga family as an example of a family name, it can be inferred that he must have been patronised by S'iyagangan himself or one of the members of his family.² If this surmise is correct, as it seems likely, Mayilainäthar may be taken to have lived roughly between 12th and 14th centuries A.D.

Jñänaprakäśar of Tiruvorriyür :

Another striking literary personality of our region was Jñänaprakäśar of Tiruvorriyür who lived in the later half of the 16th century A.D.³ No reliable information

1. Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer, *op. cit.*, p. xviii.

2. *Ibid.* pp. xvii-xvii.

3. S. Somasundara Desikar, *Tamil Pulavargal Varlaru* pp. 133-136.

is available regarding his early life. But his birth - place appears to have been Sendhai or Sendhanūr. After learning the Saiva sāstras under the great Kamalai Jñānaprakāśar of Tiruvārūr, he went and settled down at Tiruvoṇgiyūr where he wrote many of his works including the *Tiruvorriyūr Purāṇam*. The Purāṇam, which describes beautifully the sanctity and the hoary traditions of Tiruvoṇgiyūr and its great temple in 568 *Tiruviruttams*, was based on the accounts contained in the *Padma Purāṇa* and the *Brahmānda Purāṇa*. This is acknowledged by Jñānaprakāśar himself in one of his verses. The same verse also makes it clear that he wrote the *Tiruvorriyūr Purāṇa* to fulfill the desire of his beloved *guru* of Tiruvārūr. The *Purāṇa* brings out clearly Jñānaprakāśar's deep attachment and reverence to Tiruvoṇgiyūr, and the Ādhipuris'varar temple therein. Evidently because of this and his long association with Tiruvoṇgiyūr, he came to be familiarly known as Tiruvoṇgiyūr-Jñānaprakāśar.

His two other works are *Sivajñāna Siddhiyar Parapakka Urai* and *Sankarpanirākarana Urai*. *Sivajñāna Siddhiyar* and *Sankarpanirākaranaṇam* were two classical treatises on Tamil Saivism written by Arunandi and Umāpati Sivāchārya respectively; and Jñānaprakāśar's learned commentaries on these works are considered to be very valuable.

1. பேதமிலார் பதுமத்தும் பிரம்மாண்டாங் தன்னிழுமே ஆதிபுளி பெருமைக் வறையுமதை நுமக்கியான் தீதகல உரைத் திடுவே னென்றீசைத்த மொழி தமிழாக ஒதென்றான் தென்னாரு ருவங்குரு நாதன்றான்.

CHAPTER V

ARCHITECTURE

Madras and its surroundings contain temples with hoary past. A careful study of them reveals some of the prominent architectural features that were prevalent in different epochs of South Indian history. The Pallavas, the Chōlas and the Vijayanagar rulers who ruled over the territory round Madras for a much longer time than did any other dynasty, have left their impress on the growth of temple architecture in the region. In this chapter, a brief study of as many as twenty temples in the region has been made; some of the temples which are either very small or dilapidated and which are comparatively less outstanding in their architectural beauty have been left out. But a description of these twenty temples itself will bear testimony to the architectural wealth of the region. The region also contains some good examples of European architecture in India.

Pallavaram :

The rock-cut monolithic cave at Pallavaram (Fig. 2), to which brief attention was drawn even in the first chapter, is considered by expert archaeologists as one of the earliest of its kind ever attempted by the Pallava kings in South India. It was cut in the time of Mahēndravarman I (600-630 A.D.) who has been called 'the founder of the Hindu architecture in South India'. The

1. See A. H. Longhurst; *Pallava Architecture* (early period), Memoir of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 17, p. 5.

Pallavas of the Simhavishnu line, and Mahēndravarman I in particular, did the pioneering work in scooping the rocks to construct temples, without using brick, mortar or timber. So much so, the history proper of temple architecture in the south is taken to have begun with the Pallavas. Thus, Jouveau-Dubreuil, divided the history of Dravidian architecture into five periods; the Pallava period, (A. D. 600-850) that of the sculptured rocks, the early Chōla period (A.D. 850-1100) that of the grand *Vimānas*, the later Chōla period (A.D. 1000-1350) that of the most beautiful *gōpuras*, the Vijayanagar period (A.D. 1350-1600) that of the *mandapas* (pillared halls), and the modern period after 1600 that of the corridors.¹ The growth of architecture during the first period, under the Pallavas, is further divided into 4 periods by A.H. Longhurst. They are (i) the early half of the 7th century A.D. when the style of Mahēndravarman I was prevalent (ii) the later half of the 7th century when the style of Māmalla was in vogue (iii) the period between A. D. 674 and 800 when the style of Rajasimha was popular and (4) the period between 800 and 900 when the style of Nandivarman was in practice.²

It is to the first period, that is, the first half of the 7th century A.D. that the Pallavaram cave, along with those at Daļavanūr, Mahēndravādi, Siyamangalam, Mandagappaṭṭu, Vallam and Trichinopoly belongs. All these were subterranean rock-cut excavations usually known as cave-temples. Some of the general features of these caves are: they have one external facade which is in the face of rock with a shrine - chamber excavated in one of the side-walls. The external ends of the facade

1. J. Dubreuil: *Dravidian Architecture*, p. 38.

2. A. H. Longhurst: *op cit.*, p. 8.

are usually provided with doorkeepers, one at each end, protecting the outer entrance. A characteristic feature of the pillars of these caves is that 'the upper and lower portions are cubical, while the middle portion of the shaft has angles bevelled off, which makes the middle third octagonal in section...' The brackets of the pillars are simple corbels supporting the architrave above. The lower or underside of the bracket is rounded upwards and sometimes decorated with horizontal rows of roll ornament. Each pillar has a corresponding side pilaster.¹

The cave at Pallāvaram has a pillared hall measuring 32 feet in length and $2\frac{1}{2}$ in breadth and 9 feet in height. On the back wall of the pillared hall in the cave are cut five niches about $2\frac{1}{2}$ ft. square in size. These niches might have contained stone *lingas* or images; the roof is supported by two rows of pillars of the usual cubical kind, each row containing 4 pillars. The facade has 5 openings of equal size and is free from all ornament. A flight of steps leads up to the central opening.

Two features that struck Longhurst as peculiar to the Pallāvaram cave are that there are no figures of doorkeepers at the entrance as in the case of the Mandagappattu cave and secondly, one of the eight pillars has the octagonal portion at the bottom instead of at the middle. But, he however adds that the shape of the upper portion of the shaft shows that this pillar is not a later addition.² The architrave above the capitals of the pillar contains inscriptions of Mahēndravarman I.³

Tiruvorriyūr : The Ādhipuris'varar temple at Tiruvorriyūr is a well-dated Chōla edifice built at the time of

1. *Ibid.* p. 9.

2. Longhurst: *op. cit.*, p. 16.

3. SII. XII, No. 13.

Rājēndra I. All the inscriptions prior to the time of Rājēndra I - those of the later Pallavas and Parāntaka I and Krishna III - are found built into the floor of the temple and are not in their original place. These detached slabs containing the older inscriptions might have formed part of the earlier temple that existed prior to the time of Rājēndra I. An epigraph of Rājēndra I on the southern wall of the *Garbagri* (sanctum) states that the *Srī-vimānam* was built in fine black stone (*atibahulatarairasmabhih krishna-varnina*) by the architect Ravi alias Virachōlatakshan under the orders of Rājēndra, the son of Rājarāja and at the instance of Chaturānana Paññita.¹ The inscription itself states that the *vimānam* was made of three tiers (*tritala*). The style of the *vimāna* (see fig. 3) also supports the Chōla date. Apsidal in form, it is built like the elephant back (*Gajaprishta*). The pillared verandah round the central shrine was also built in the Chōla times, evident along with the central *garbagriha*, for the pillars of the verandah contain many Chōla epigraphs on them, the earliest of which belong to Rājēndra I,² in whose time the central shrine was also built. An epigraph of 13 century belonging to Rājarāja III states that the Yādav rāyan chieftain Vira Narasimha set up the god Viranrasimhēsvaramudaiya Nāyanār in the verandah round the central shrine.³ In the same verandah to the north of the central shrine is the small shrine of Vattappar Amman, perhaps identical with Tiruvaṭṭapirai-Pidāriy and Durgaiyar referred to in the inscriptions.⁴ In front

1. ARE, 1937-38, para 23.

2. 126 of 1912; SII. IV. No 553.

3. 138 to 141, 143, 146, 153, 155, 155 of 1912.

4. 227 of 1912.

5. ARE, 1913, II, p. 86.

of the central shrine and facing the south is the shrine of Natarāja. Its walls contain the inscriptions of Rājādhīrāja I, Ādhirājēndra and Kulōttunga I.¹ The base of the stone pedestal of the Natarāja itself has an inscription which says that this pedestal called *Virarājēndran* was caused to be built by one Sīvalōkanādān of Tiruvēnkādu.²

To the south of the main shrine and in the outer court is the shrine for Tyāgarāja. In Tiruvoriyūr, we have a running (*ōḍum*) Thyāgarāja while at Tiruvānmiyūr we have a dancing (*āḍum*) Thyāgarāja. This shrine seems to be a later addition as it neither has inscriptions on its walls nor is it referred to in any other epigraph. But the pillars of the *maṇḍapa* in front of it, appear to be in the Vijayanagar style. The two front-pillars, in particular, which are carved in the form of magnificent horses with riding horsemen on them (Figs. 4 and 5) remind us of the pillars of the famous Kalyāṇa Maṇḍapam of the Vijayanagar times at Varadarājaśwāmi temple at Conjeevaram.

Behind the Tyāgarājar shrine is the small shrine for Gaulisvara or Paḍambakka. It contains Chōla inscriptions on the bases of its walls.³ One of them states that the shrine for Paḍambakka (evidently identical with Gaulisvara)⁴ was constructed in the fifth year of the Chōla king Virarājēndra I (A. D. 1063-1069).⁵ The Subramāṇia shrine on the eastern side of the central shrine, as well as the *madappalli* (kitchen) that is on its south east seem to be Chōla structures. There is an epigraph of Rājarāja III on the south base of the

1. 220, 219 and 221-222 of 1912.

2. 217 of 1912.

3. 228 to 233 of 1912.

4. See ARE, op. cit., p. 86.

5. 232 of 1912.

Subramania shrine.¹ It is referred to in another inscription as Pillai Subramaniyar and Kumārasvāmidēvan.² That the kitchen is also a Chōla structure is indicated by its pillar brackets or the corbels as well as by the inscriptions on them.³ A Tamil inscription the western wall of the outermost *prākāra* of the same temple, dated 31st year of Kulōttunga III, gives us the interesting information that the compound wall (*tirumadil*) of the Tiruvoṇiyūr temple was constructed by Ātkoṇḍanāyakan alias Chēdirāyadēvar of Ādiṁangalam. The work was supervised by Āndār Rudradēva.⁴ We cannot leave this short study of the architecture of the Tiruvoṇiyūr temple without quoting the expert opinion on it, according to which, "the perfect condition of its central shrine, the closed hall, the surrounding verandah, enshrining the minor deities, the *prākārās* and the group of small temples in its courtyard make the Ādhipuris'varar temple a perfect model of temples built in the orthodox style and must, in my opinion, be protected scrupulously from any possible danger to it by vandalistic hands."⁵

Tirumullaivāyil : The Māsilāmanis'varar temple at Tirumullaivāyil (near the Red Hills, Madras) is a noteworthy temple in the Madras region. Its central shrine, like that of Tiruvoṇiyūr, is apsidal in form. The epigraphs on the walls of the central shrine bear out its Chōla origin. The earliest of them (on the western wall) belongs to Uttamachōjadēva.⁶ The *vimāna* is a grand sight. It is about 36 ft. in height and has some excellent

1. 227 of 1912.

2. ARE. op. cit.

3. 235 of 1912.

4. 167 of 1937-38.

5. G. O. No. 919 dated 29-7-1912 and G. O. 961 dated 2-8-1913.

6. 669 of 1904.

sculptural representations of gods and goddesses on it. We can also see the figures of saints in standing posture with folded hands, carved on the cardinal points of the *vimāna*. It also has fine *kūḍus* and niches on its body.

The walls of the central shrine above the plinth have many niches with beautiful sculptures in them. Thus, on the southern wall, are the niches for Vināyaka and Dakshināmūrti; on the west wall is the niche for Mahāvishnu in the standing posture; on the northern wall there are niches for Brahma and Durga. The doorway at the entrance of the central shrine is flanked by two huge life-size four-armed Dwārapālakas with crossed legs. The *mandapa* in front of the central shrine is also a Chōla structure. Its two central pillars bear inscriptions of Rājēndrachōla I.¹ They also bear distinct Chōla corbel on their top. About the corbels of the pillars in Chōla times, it has been remarked that it "develops angular profile instead of curved one of the late Pallava style, and is often bevelled so as to leave a tenon-like projection, which in turn, starts on a long line of varied and interesting evolution culminating in the *pūmunai* of modern times." On the northern end of the *mandapa* are the small shrines for Vrishabhanāyakar, Natarājā and Bhikshādanār-all facing south. The bronze images of Vrishabhanāyakar and his consort, are tall and full of grace. In the outercourt there are also many shrines such as those for Sūbramaṇia (south-western side) and Sōlapuris'varar (northern side.) But of particular significance are the two small shrines for Vināyaka-one inside the temple near the entrance and the other, which is

1. 677 and 678 of 1904.

situated at south end of the street, in which the temple is situated-for they contain peculiar kind of pillars which are not met with in any other temple in the Madras region. Each pillar is about 5 feet high and round in shape. Lions carved majestically in squatting posture constitute the lower half of the pillars so that the pillars look as if they sprout from the heads of the lions. These pillars remind us of the lion pillars of Agastyēvara temple, an early Chōla temple, at Mēlapajuvūr in Trichinopoly district¹.

The Tirumullaivāyil temple has a *gopuram* of about 65 ft. in height at its entrance.

Pādi : The Tiruvallisvarar temple at Pādi is closely modelled on the Tirumullaivāyil temple having many of Chōla features of the latter. Particularly the *garbagriha* and the *vimāna* (in apsidal form) over it are the exact replica of those of the Tirumullaivāyil temple. There are well-cut niches on the central shrine-two on the south, one on the west and two on the north. In them are the fine sculptures of Vināyaka, Dakshināmurti, Mahāvishnu, Brahma and Durga. This scheme of distribution of niches and sculptural representation is also the same as in the Tirumullaivāyil temple.

The earliest inscriptions on the walls of the central shrine of the Pādi temple go back to Rājarāja III (1216-1246 A. D.)². But a pillar built into the deep well in the compound of the temple bears an inscription of Rājarāja I³ and another slab lying on the courtyard bears an epigraph of Pārthivēndravarman (10th century)⁴. These detached and broken slabs bearing the early

1. See plate V, Fig. 9 in K. A. N. Sastri's *Chōlas*. Also see pp. 697 and 750-51 of the same book for some remarks on the importance of such pillars.

2. 219 of 1910. 3. 226 and 227 of 1910. 4. 225 of 1910.

inscriptions might have been taken out of their original places when the temple was renovated later.¹

The *maṇḍapa* in front of the central shrine is also a Chōla structure. Its walls on the south and west, contain epigraphs of Rajaraja III, besides many of later date.² On the northern side of this *maṇḍapa*, are the shrines for Jagadambikai and Nataraja.

Tirusūlam: Another typical Chōla temple is the Dharmapurisvara temple at Tirusūlam which is within a mile to the east of the Pallāvaram railway station. It is a small temple, having no *gopura* at its entrance. But the *vimāna* (Fig. 6) on the sanctum is in a beautiful shape. Apsidal in form, as are those of Tiruvoṇiyūr, Tirumullaivāyil and Pādi, it is built in the style of *Gajaprishta*. The *vimāna* is about 25' from the ground level and has finely - wrought *kūḍus* and sculptural representations on its body. The smaller *vimāna* of the Annam shrine which is on the north is more or less a replica of the main *vimāna*; but the former is considerably smaller in size. The Chōla origin of the Tirusūlam temple is also well attested by the existence of Chōla inscriptions, the earliest of which belong to Rājādhirāja I³ and Kulottunga I.⁴

Velachcheri: Velachcheri, which is situated two miles south-east of modern Guindy, possesses two small Chōla temples. The Dandisvara temple and the Selliamman temple. The former is in extremely neglected condition, all kinds of plants making their way into its walls. The *vimāna* on the central shrine is a medium-

1. ARE. 1910, p. 67.

2. 214 to 218 of 1910.

3. 319, 321 of 1901. The Government Epigraphist is doubtful whether they belong to Rājādhirāja I or II.

4. 312, 316, 317 of 1901.

sized one, rising to a height of 25' from the ground level. Cubical in form, its *vimāna* has a prominent *kūdu* on each side. The *vimāna* does not contain niches or images as in the case of the Tirumullaivāyil temple, but is simple and shapely. Practically, all the walls of the sanctum are studded with Chōla epigraphs, the earliest of them going back to the days of Gaṇḍaraditya (10th century A. D.), the son of the Chōla king Parāntaka I.¹ This epigraph is carved on the west wall of the central shrine. Other epigraphs of later date, belonging to Rājaraja I (on the north wall), Rājendra I (on the north west and south walls), Kulottunga III (on the north and west walls) and others give us a fairly good idea of the antiquity of the edifice.²

The other temple - the Selliamman temple - is a very small one. Its *vimāna* is also a compact one; but it differs in its pattern from that of Dandisvara temple. It also has two early Chōla inscriptions belonging to Parāntaka I and Pārthivēndravarman on its south wall.³ The temple, being very small, does not contain *maṇḍapa* or pillars of any extraordinary elegance.

Among other things of interest at Vēlachchēri are the several beautiful stone - images of Vishnu and his Ubhayanāchchimārs that are kept in the open streets without a canopy or a cover. Three of the images are nearly 6 feet in height and they are in sitting posture. The villagers point to a ruined and empty temple as the place where these images were formerly kept. There is also a beautiful three-foot-tall bronze image of Veda-nārāyaṇar in standing posture in the local Narasimhar

1. 306 of 1911. Also see 315 of 1911 which is on the south wall.

2. 302 to 305 and 307 to 314 of 1911.

3. 317 and 318 of 1911.

temple. It is said to have been accidentally discovered underneath the ground some forty or fifty years ago.

Tiruvānmiyūr : Three miles south of Mylapore and a mile and a half east of Adayar, is the old and renowned S'aivite centre, *Tiruvānmiyūr*. The Marundis'ar temple there has been sung by the *Tēvāram* hymners. The first thing that strikes one who goes to see the temple, is the ruined and unused *gōpura* which is situated about 100' in front of the present modern entrance. It has no tower on it ; but it is said to have had one. The version of the local people is that that the tower as well as many other parts of the temple suffered greatly at the hands of Hyder Ali when he invaded Madras. One can see to-day many huge pillars, broken particles of finely - carved stones being strewn about in the temple. Even some traces of the foundation of a defunct *mandapa* can be seen just outside the present main entrance.

The main shrine dedicated to Marundis'ar faces west instead of east. It has a *vimāna* of about 30 ft. high. By the side of the main shrine on the south is the shrine for Tyāgarājar. The lovely *mandapa* in front of the Tyāgarājar shrine with the *pīmūnai* corbels on their pillars, is a modern structure built in this century. But the Annan (Tirupurasundari) shrine which is on the north eastern side of the temple and which faces the south is an older structure, probably of the Chōla days, for all the seven inscriptions found on its walls belong to the Chōla kings, the earliest as well as the largest among them belonging to Rājendra I (1012-1043 A.D).¹ There is a spacious eighteen-pillared *mandapa* in front of the shrine with beautiful carvings on its ceilings and cornices. The four central pillars of the *mandapa* alone exhibit some

outstanding artistic dexterity. The horses and the *yalis*, depicted in galloping posture with the riders on them, are in high relief. Two other pillars carved in the same fashion are found lying on the eastern side of the Amman shrine near the compound wall. These pillars with riding horsemen recall the similar ones found at Tiruvorriyūr. They might have been built in the Vijayanagar time. On the north-east of the temple is the large and beautiful tank with a sixteen-pillared *Nirājimandapa* in the middle.

Tirunirmalai: Tirunirmalai, near Chrompet, is a renowned Vaishnavite centre. The place has been sung by Bhūdattālvār and Tirumangai Ālvār. There are two temples in the place—one in the village itself and another on the top of the hill in the same village. The temple on the hill is dedicated to Sri Ranganātha.¹ It is said to be the original shrine sung by the Ālvārs. It has at the entrance a *gopura* which is a brick-and-mortar structure rising to about 35 ft. It has three stories. Inside the compound we see a compact little shrine dedicated to Rāganātha. On the west is the small shrine for Thāyar which faces east. Behind the main shrine are the shrines for Narasimhaśwāmi and Ulagañandaperumāl. The walls of Narasimhaśwāmi shrine (referred to in an epigraph as S'ingapperumāl²) contain epigraphs of Kulottunga III and Rājarāja III.³ The Yāgasāla, near that shrine, contains an epigraph of Venkata II on its walls.⁴

1. An inscription (562 of 1912) calls the Lord as Nirvāṇnar. The Government Epigraphist for 1913 says that the temple on the hill represents the original Nirvāṇnar shrine, sung in the Vaishnavite hymns. (ARE. 1913, p. 112).
2. 560 of 1912.
3. 560 to 563 of 1912.
4. 565 to 1912.

The temple down the hill is much bigger and, architecturally, more impressive than the one on the hill. The pilasters over the plinth of the *gopura* are finely designed. Near the corners of the roof, one can see faces of the lion (*Simhamukha*) being carved. But the *gopura* or the tower is only a modern addition, of recent date. On the outer walls of the main shrine one sees a rampant frieze of *yalis* being carved in an unending series. On each of the four corners, we see three faces of lion protruding. Inside, the upper roof of the Nirvañgar shrine (facing east) is a very low one, just about 6 feet in height. The pillars inside the shrine are round, with corbels cut in the tenon-like fashion. Opposite to the Nirvañgar shrine are placed 12 *Aljavars*. The walls of both these shrines are studded with inscriptions all over, the earliest of them belonging to Vikramachola (12th century).¹

On the southern side of the main shrine are the shrines for Chakravarti Tirumagan (i. e. Sri Rāma) and Āṇimāmalarnaṅgai Thāyār. Both of them face east. The shrine of Sri Rāma is about 60' by 20'. This has no *vimāna* on the sanctum. The frieze of *yalis* forms a recurring theme on the walls of this shrine. The walls also contain many epigraphs belonging to Kulottunga III and Māravarman Kulaśekhara Pāṇḍya I and Jatāvarman Sundara.² There are two four-pillared *mandapas* just outside of this temple, one in front of it, and another on the way to the hill.

Kunnattūr: Kunnattūr, a village west of Pallāvaram, has many old temples. The Vishnu and Siva temples, which are situated near each other are in ruined condition.

1. 553 of 1912.

2. 554 to 558 of 1912.

The Vishnu (Tiruvūragapperumāl) temple has an incomplete tower in front of it. In its full completed form, it appears, it would have been an imposing *gopura*. The top ceilings of the main entrance of the temple (*gopuravās'al*) contain some good sculptural ornamentations as well as the figures of Sri Rāma, Hanumān and others. But the sanctum walls and its surroundings are pitifully dilapidated. The central shrine is a small one; its eastern and southern walls bear inscriptions of Vijayagandagopāla, Kopperuñjīngadēva and the Vijayanagar king, Harihara.¹ The Māhāmaṇḍapa, in front of the central shrine, also seems to be an old structure, probably contemporaneous with the former, because one of its pillars contains an epigraph of the 13th century belonging to Rājarāja III (A. D. 1216-1246).²

The Kūṇḍalēś'war temple in the same village also appears to be a temple of later Chōla times. Its central shrine bears an epigraph of 13th century belonging to Kopperuñjīngadēva on its south wall.³ The plinth and pilasters of the central shrine are well-proportioned and shapely. A slab built into the south wall of the *maṇḍapa* in front of the Kūṇḍalēś'warar shrine, bears an inscription of the Mughal king Aurangzeb and dated S. 1621 (about A. D. 1700) which states that the renovation of the *maṇḍapa* and the Tiruvūragapperumāl *gopuram*, was effected by one Kūḍalnāyinār Mudaliār S'okkappar.⁴

In Tirunāgēś'waram, a suburb of Kunnattur, there is a S'iva temple which, according to the tradition, was built by S'ēkkijār in the 12th century A.D. It is in a very good condition. The *gopura* at the entrance is a recent

1. 177, 178 and 180 of 1929-30.

2. 179 of 1929-30.

3. 180 of 1929-30.

4. 181 of 1929-30.

addition, built in this century. The sanctum of the temple is rectangular in plan and is about 30' by 18'. On the north, south and the west walls of the shrine are engraved the inscriptions of kings like Kulottunga III, Rājarāja III and Kopperuñjinga.¹ The small *maṇḍapa* in front of the central shrine as well as the *Kalyāṇamaṇḍapa* in the same temple, are Chōla structures. The corbels on the pillars and the earliest inscriptions on their walls prove this.² The Amman shrine in the temple also belongs to the Chōla period; it has inscriptions of Kulottunga III on its eastern wall.³

There is also a ruined Sīva temple at Kunnattur, which is dedicated to Tiruvallisvarar. It also appears to be a Chōla structure, having inscriptions of Rājarāja III and the Telugu-Chōda king Viragandagopāla.⁴

Besides, there is a beautiful little temple for Subramanya on the hill at Kunnattūr. The entrance to it is crowned with a small but lovely *gopura*, which is about 30 feet high (Fig. 7). It has been sung by Aruṇagirināthar in his *Tiruppugal*. There are many ruined *maṇḍapas* in the temple. An inscription on the north wall of the *maṇḍapa* in front of the temple gives us an account of the construction of several structures like the Mahāmaṇḍapa, Vāganamaṇḍapa, Kalyāṇamaṇḍapa, a little *maṇḍapa* for the peacock etc. from S. 1619 onwards and also of the setting up of many images in the temple of Vēlar (Subramanya) by a certain Sokkarbhūpa, who was probably the Madura Nāyak Chokkanātha (1706-1732).⁵

1. See inscriptions 187 to 200 of 1929-30.

2. 202 to 209 of 1929-30; 212 to 221 of 1929-30.

3. 229, 230 of 1929-30.

4. 183 and 184 of 1929-30.

5. 185 of 1929-30. The inscription calls the temple as குந்தம் பதியிலே வளரும் வேலர் சன்னிதியில்.

Māngādu: In Māngādu there are four ancient though small temples. They are the Vallisvara temple, the Kāmākshiamman temple, the Māri Amman temple and the Vishnu temple. Of these, the last mentioned one is in an extremely dilapidated condition, and it is a very small one with a Vijayanagar epigraph.¹ Of the other three, the Valliswarar temple comprises an area which is about 250' in length and 125' in breadth. It has no *gopura* on its entrance. The central shrine, which is a medium-sized one, has two inscriptions belonging to the Pallava kings, Nandivarman III and Aparājita (9th century A.D.).² But they are not in their original places, for they are built into the floor of the central shrine. This might suggest that the temple had undergone renovation in later times. Moreover, the inscriptions on the walls of the central shrine belong to Rājarāja III and later period only.³

Kāmākshi Amman temple also does not possess a tower (*gopura*) at its entrance; but it has pials on either side of the entrance. The inner *prakara* is fairly big in size. There is a *vimāna* of about 25' on its main shrine. The inscriptions on the walls of the central shrine are of Vijayanagar times.⁴ Only two inscriptions other than those of the Vijayanagar period have been found - those of the Chōla king Parakesari-varman and Sundara Pāṇḍya I.⁵ But both these inscriptions are not found in their original places; they are built into the floor, an indication again of the possible later-day reconstruction of the temple which evidently

1. 352 and 351 of 1908.

2. 361 of 1908.

3. 348, 349 and 350 of 1908.

4. 353 to 356 of 1908 and 359 and 360 of 1908.

5. 357 and 353 of 1908.

took place in the Vijayanagar times. Of special iconographic interest is the bronze image of Pārvati in the form of doing penance. The icon depicts the goddess as standing on one leg over the five fires with *akshamālā* held in one hand over the head with a sublime countenance which admirably expresses the austerity of her meditation.¹

Poonamalle : About two miles from Māngādu is Poonamalle. According to the tradition embodied in the *Guruparamparai*, the Aruṭājapperumāl or Varadarājapperumāl temple at Poonamalle came into existence at the time of Tirukkachchinambi, an elder contemporary of Sri Rāmānuja i.e. about the 11th century A.D. Tirukkachchinambi was an ardent devotee of Pēraruṭājapperumāl (Varadarājar) temple at Kāñchi and is said to have spent all his time there. Once, when at the repeated requests of his parents, he went to his birth-place, Poonamalle, Aruṭājapperumāl at Kāñchi is said to have followed His devotee to Poonamalle, where a temple was constructed for Hīn. Like its counterpart at Kāñchi, Varadarāja temple at Poonamalle faces west. This temple is unique in one respect, when compared to the other temples of the region under investigation, for it possesses the most magnificent five-storied *gopura* at its entrance. Though the exact date of its construction is not known, it presents an age-worn appearance. It is broad-based at the bottom and rises in diminishing tiers to a height of about 75 feet from the ground level. It is quite an imposing structure and its architectural beauty is remarkable. There are three shrines in the same *prakāra* inside the temple. those of Sri Varadarāja facing west, Sri Ranganātha facing east and Tirukkachchinambi facing south. All the

1. ARE. 1939-40 to 1942-43, Part I, p. 11.

three shrine are adorned with *vimānas* of more or less equal height (about 30 feet). The south wall of the central shrine contains epigraphs of 13th, 14th and 17th centuries.¹ A later addition to the temple in the Vijayanagar times was the *Uñjal Mañdapa*, which was built by one Achyutappa Nāyaka.²

To the south-west of the main shrine and in the outer courtyard is the Thāyār shrine with its *vimāna* 35' high. The pillars in the shrine show some elegant architectural works. Some of the pillars which are lying loose near the compound resemble the pillars with riding horsemen that we noticed at Tiruvoxkiyūr and Tiruvānniyūr.

There is also the Vaidyanāthaśwāmy temple at Poonamalle a medium-sized temple. Two detached slabs on the eastern side of the second *prākāra* have an inscription of Rājarāja I³, whereas a stray pillar in the same temple bears an epigraph of Rājendra I.⁴ The temple appears to have undergone much renovation in the 18th century, for the inscription on the slab at the entrance of the temple informs us that the shrines of Vaidyanāthaśwāmy and Taiyalnāyaki-Amman were renovated by one S'wāmināthan, the son of Nalla Thambi Mudaliār who held the S'vastya right of the place. This inscription is dated S. 1692 i.e. about A.D. 1772.⁵ Another inscribed slab, which is dated eight years later than the above one, says that the same individual constructed the Kalyāṇa-

1. See 31 to 34 of 1911; 297 and 298 of 1938-39.

2. 299 of 1938-39.

3. 293 of 1938-39.

4. 292 of 1938-39.

5. 294 of 1938-39.

mandapa of the temple.¹ We also have at Poonamalle an old mosque which was built and completed by Rustom son of Dhulfiqar of Astrabad, a servant of Nawāb Jumlat-ul-Mulki Mir Muhammad Said (Mir Jumla) in the region of Sūltān Abdullāh Qutub Shah. This information is contained in a Persian inscription, dated A.D. 1653, that is found in the mosque.² In the margin of the stone, bearing this inscription, in slightly smaller characters, are inscribed Persian couplets which say: "The temple was pulled down and a mosque was erected". The temple referred to herein was a Hindu temple evidently built in the Chōla days. This is confirmed by the structure of the mosque of which the basement contains fragmentary Chōla records in Tamil characters of 10th century A.D.³

Tirumalisai : Very near Poonamalle is Tirumalisai which has two old temples respectively dedicated to Jagannātha Perumāl and Uttāndis'varar. Both of them appear to be Chōla temples and have Chōla inscriptions on their walls. The earliest inscriptions in Jagannātha Perumāl temple and the Uttāndis'warar temple belong to later Chōla days.⁴ The *mandapa* in front of the central shrine in the latter temple is a clear Chōla structure as proved by the pillar corbels as well as by the Chōla epigraphs on its pillars.⁵

Triplicane : It was already shown in the first chapter that the antiquity of Sri Parthasārathis'wāmi temple at Triplicane goes back to the days of Mudalālāvārs

1. 295 of 1938-39. The inscription calls the *mandapa* as 'Māpams'e *mandapa*' (See lines 12-13 of the epigraph).
2. 303 of 1938-39.
3. ARE. 1938-39, p. 94.
4. See 2 of 1911; 15, 17, 18, 19 and 25 of 1911.
5. 15 to 19 of 1911.

and Tirumangai Ālvar. Its existence in the 8th century is also supported by the provenance of the Pallava king Dantivarman's inscription there. But, however, this ancient temple seems to have undergone great many changes at the hands of later-day repairers and renovators, so that much of its ancient architecture has been lost. The very fact the Chōla and the Pāṇḍya epigraphs are found loose and misplaced show the nature of the renovation done in the temple. Even Dantivarman's epigraph is not evidently in its original place, but only built into the floor of the *garbhagriha* of the temple. The inscriptions of the Vijayanagar time, in the Triplicane temple, bear clear testimony for the large-scale renovation that was carried out then. Thus a private individual in the time of Sadāśiva (1542-1576) renovated the Ranganātha shrine, and constructed the shrine for Vēdavalli Nāchchiār, the *Tiruvay Moli Maṇḍapa*, the *Tirumadappalli* (kitchen) and the enclosing compound (*tirumadil*). He also installed the metal image (*utsava vigraha*) of Vēdavallithāyar.² Another Vijayanagar inscription of Venkata II (A.D. 1586 to 1614) refers to the installation of Sri Bhāshyagarār (Sri Rāmānuja) in the Mahāmaṇḍapa of the temple. The *maṇḍapa* is to the east of the central shrine and near the second entrance. The shrine of Rāmānuja, referred to in the Vijayanagar epigraph, is situated on the northern side. There are also shrines in the same *maṇḍapa* for Kūrathālvar, an ardent disciple and contemporary of Sri Rāmānuja, and Vēdāntadesika. The shrine for Telliasingar on the western side of the temple with a separate *dwajastambha* and *gopuravās* facing west, has an inscription which

1. ARE. 1904, p. 15.

2. SII. VIII, No. 538.

seems to belong to Vijayanagar times.¹ The *gopura* at the entrance to the Tejjasingar shrine is an unassuming one of recent date. The *gopura* at the eastern entrance of the temple has been completely renovated recently. The thirty six pillared *mandapa* immediately in front of the entrance is also a modern structure. But the beautiful four-pillared *mandapa* on the east, and in front of the thirty six pillared *mandapa*, as well as the Hanuman shrine on the eastern side of the tank appear to be in late Vijayanagar style. The four-pillared *mandapa* (Fig. 8) is about 30 feet in height and it displays some good workmanship. The stone rings or chains that hang from the four corners of the canopy are noteworthy and excite one's admiration.

Mylapore : We have already dwelt at length, in the first chapter, on the antiquity and the architectural characteristics of the Kapālis'varar temple, Mylapore. The temples of Kēśavapperumāl and Mādavapperumāl at Mylapore do not contain old inscriptions; moreover, they have undergone much reconstruction and renovation. But these temples are referred to in the *Divyasūricharitai* and *Guruparamparai*.

The Town temple situated in the heart of the Madras city (near Flower Bazaar) which houses the twin gods of Chenna Kēśava and Chenna Mallekēśvarar was built in A.D. 1757. Before that, it was located near the place where the present Madras High Court is situated. It was then known as the 'Great Pagoda' and it has been referred to in two old documents as having received endowments from one Nagapattan in 1646 and Beri Timmannā in 1648. The latter, who came down to

1. 240 of 1903; SII. *op. cit.*, No. 539.

2. 243, 243-A of 1903; SII. *op. cit.*, Nos. 543 and 544.

Madras from Armagon to help the English in establishing their settlement at Madras, is held to have constructed the temple in A.D. 1639. But this temple was later on demolished on account of some military exigencies and the present Town temple built in 1757.¹

The Mallikarjuna temple, which is situated at the north end of Muthialpet (situated between Thambu chetti street and Lingi chetti street) is referred to in the 17th century records as "Mally Carjuns old Pagoda".

Old churches and other buildings constructed by the Portuguese have already been referred to in chapter IV. The most important building constructed by the Europeans in Madras is the Fort St. George. It was built by the English. Its construction was begun by them in about 1640 but it was completed only after 1650.² It underwent many alterations and changes in later times.

1. Love: *Vestiges*, I, pp. 92-95.

2. See chapter II above.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

THE NILAGANGARĀIYANS IN THE VICINITY OF MADRAS

Nothing is more striking to one who goes through the inscriptions of the 13th century A.D. found in, and around, Madras than the frequent references in them to certain chieftains or officers called Nilagangarāiyans and their philanthropic activities. They seem to have been intimately connected with the Chingleput district as a whole, and as such, their activities here deserve special mention. The term Nilagangarāiyān was their common family name or title, which each one of those chieftains added to his own personal name. The names of such chieftains who figure in the inscriptions from places near Madras like Tiruvo^{க்க}iyūr, Tirumullavāyil, Triplicane, Tirunirmalai, Kunnattūr and Tirumajis'ai are: Rājā-dhirāja-Nilagangarāiyān, Pillaiyār Kulōttunga Chōla Kaṇṇappa-Nallanāyanār, Pañchanadivānan Nilagangarāiyān, Nallanāyan *alias* Chōlagangadēva Nilagangarāiyān Kadakkān-Chōlaganga, Pillaiyār Pañchanadivānan Nilagangarāiyān, Vallamerindān Pañchanadivānan, Pañchanadivānan Tiruvaṇṇāmalai Perumāl Lankēśvaradēva, Pañchanadivānan Aruṇagiri Perumāl Nilagangarāiyān and Pañchanadivānan Tiruvēgamban Nilagangarāiyān. The first mentioned chief in the above order figures in an inscription from Tiruvo^{க்க}iyūr, dated 28th year of Rājā-dhirāja I. The names of the next two chiefs occur in the inscriptions of Kulōttunga III found at Tirumajis'ai and

Tirunirmalai¹. The next chief, Nilagangaraiyan Kadakkan Chola-ganga figures in the inscriptions of Rājarāja III.² The succeeding three names occur in the inscriptions of the Telugu-Chola king Vijayagaṇḍagopāla found at Tiruvggīyūr, Tirunirmalai and Tirumajisai.³ The next chief Aruṇagiri Perumāl Nilagangaraiyan figures in the inscriptions of Vijayagaṇḍagopāla,⁴ Viragaṇḍagopāla⁵ as well as Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya,⁶ while the last-mentioned chief Pañchhanadivānan Tiruvēgamban Nilagangaraiyan figures in an inscription of the Pāṇḍyan king Māravarman Kulaśekhara taken from Tirunirmalai.

But these inscriptions throw little light on the exact relationship between these chiefs or officers who figure so prominently and who seem to have been extremely influential, as can be gauged by their various munificent acts. Nor are their origin and descent free from doubt. The fact that all of them took up the title *Gangaraiyan* might perhaps indicate that they belonged to the Ganga stock. And the fact that some of them call themselves as Chola-Ganga also reminds us of the part that the Gangas played in the Tamil country and their contact with the Cholas. Again, as Robert Sewell thought, the suffix *vānan* in the name Pañchhanadivānan which was assumed by most of them may point to their descent from the famous Bāṇas.⁷ However this might

1. 2 of 1911 and 557, 556 of 1912 (dated 1202, 1210 and c. 1217 A.D.)
2. 535 and 562 of 1912 (dated A.D. 1222 and 1235 respectively)
3. 117 of 1912, 5 of 1911, 547 of 1912 and 1 of 1911 (The dates of these inscriptions range between A.D. 1259 and 1276.)
4. 4 of 1911 (Tirnmajīsai dated c. 1280 A.D.)
5. 224 of 1929-30 (Kunnattūr).
6. 537 of 1912 (Tirunirmalai) (dated A.D. 1292).
7. 555 of 1912 (dated A.D. 1304).
8. R. Sewell: *Historical Inscriptions of Southern India*, p. 370.

be, the affix *Pillaiyār* added to their names, shows that they were probably junior members of the royal family. It has been surmised that because *Nilagangarāiyan* is referred to in an inscription as a *pillaiyār* of *Vijayagāndagopāla*, he must have been the son of the latter.¹ But this need not necessarily be so, for the term *Pillaiyār*, as in numerous cases in South Indian history, might have been simply a term of endearment to refer to important officers and chiefs.²

That such an important set of officers were the *Nilagangarāiyans*, is clearly borne out by the inscriptions found near Madras. They show that *Nilagangarāiyans* served the *Chōla* kings like *Rājādhirāja I*, *Kulottunga III*, *Rājarāja III*; the *Kāṭava* king *Kopperuñjīnga*; the *Telugu-Chōda* king *Vijayagāndagopāla* and the *Pāṇḍya* kings like *Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II* and *Māravarman Kula-sēkhara I*,—all of whom held sway over *Tondamāṇḍalam*, at various times. The dates of these epigraphs in which the *Nilagangarāiyans* figure range between the 11th and the 14th centuries A. D.³ The fact that no inscription has been issued in their regnal years is a clear proof of the fact that they were only chiefs or officers who acted in subordination to their overlords, who changed from time to time, according to the political climate of South India. In this connection, we can read with interest what seems to be the earliest epigraph in the vicinity of Madras to

1. ARE, 1913, II, p. 126.

2. *Ibid.* See also R. Sewell, *op. cit.*

3. R. Sewell does not appear to be quite correct when he wrote (*op. cit.*, 370) that their inscriptions range only between A.D. 1183 and 1306-7. Actually, an inscription from *Tiruvorriyūr* (102 of 1912), dated A. D. 1046 mentions a *Nilagangarāiyan*. This epigraph pushes the date of their origin farther back by nearly 137 years.

mention a Nilagangarāiyan.¹ It comes from Tiruvo~~kk~~iyūr and is dated in the 28th year of Rājādhirāja I (i.e. A.D. 1046.) It describes Rājādhirāja Nilagangarāiyan as a *Danḍanāyakam* (military officer) and as a resident of Sattimangalam in Inambūr-nādu, a sub-division of Rājēndrasingavaļanādu in Sōlamandalam. Though this record which mentions a Nilagangarāiyan belongs to the 11th century, it was only in the next two centuries that they seem to have attained great prominence, for only then, their official and public acts get frequently mentioned in the inscription, which mainly come from the Chingleput and South Arcot districts.

Even though some of their names like Aruṇagiri Perumāl Nilagangarāiyan and Tiruvēgamban Nilagangarāiyan may hint at the possibility of their having been followers of Saivism, their enlightened generosity and patronage were extended to the Saivite and Vaishnavite temples alike; and it is worthwhile to consider here how the Saivite and Vaishnavite temples near Madras were benefited by their contact with such liberal chieftains as the Nilagangarāiyans.

Thus, about five inscriptions from the Vishnu temple at Tirunirmalai speak about the various gifts made by the Nilagangarāiyan chieftains at different times. One of them, which is dated in Kulōttunga III's time, records a gift of money (*ten paṇam*) for maintaining a lamp in the temple made by one of the *agāmbadi-mudalis* of Pañchanadivānan Nilagangan *alias* Sōlagangadēva.² Another one³ records the gift of two lamps to the same

1. 102 of 1912.

2. 546 of 1912.

3. 535 of 1912.

temple made by Tiruchchūr-Kaṇṇappan¹ Abayampukkan Nilagangarāiyān Kadakan-Sōlagangadēva in the sixth year of Rājarāja III's reign. (1222 A.D.) Another epigraph dated in the 24th year of Vijayagandagopāla records the gift of money made by Vallamerinda Pañchanadivānan.² An inscription dated the 17th year of Jaṭavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya from the same temple reports the gift of six *vēlis* of land and taxes by Arunagiriperumāl Nilagangarāiyān.³ A later epigraph, dated 37th year of Māravarman Kulasēkhara I (about A.D. 1304) records the gift of the village of Vaḍakkupatṭu alias Kumāragopālanallūr to the Pammakha Nāyanār temple (in Pammal near Pallāvaram) made by Pañchanadivānan Tiruvegamban Nilagangarāiyān. The purpose of this gift was to celebrate a festival in the temple on his birth-day.

Tirumajis'ai, near Poonamalli, another sacred place for the Vaishnavites, was also greatly benefited by the patronage it received at the hands of the Nilagangarāiyas. In the 16th year of Kulōttunga III (about A.D. 1194) the temple of Tirumajis'ai Alvar received a gift of 1,650 *kuṭis* of land from *pillaiyār* (prince?) Kulōttunga-sōla-Kaṇṇappa Nallanāyanār Pañchanadivānan Nilagangarāiyān.⁴ This epigraph is taken from the Jagannātha Perumāl temple at Tirumajis'ai. Two more epigraphs

1. It is significant to note here that another member of the Nilagangarāiyān family is mentioned in an inscription as coming from Tiruchchūram in Puliyūr Kōṭṭam i.e. Tirusūlam near Pallāvaram, Madras. (See 275 of 1909 from Tirukkachchūr, Chingleput taluk).
2. 547 of 1912.
3. 537 of 1912.
4. 555 of 1912.
5. 2 of 1911.

from the same temple at Tirumājisai which relate to the gifts made by the Nilagangarāiyans are dated in the 26th year of Vijayagaṇḍagopāla's reign. The earlier epigraph records the gift of land made by Pañchanadivānan Tiruvaṇṇāmalai Perumāl Lankēsvaradēva¹ and the later one refers to that made by Aruṇagiri Perumāl Nilagangarāiyān.² Another epigraph of Vijayagaṇḍagopāla, which does not bear his regnal year, records an order of Nilagangarāiyān giving the lands in the village of Vaijattuvālviṭṭanallūr to the temples of Nirvāṇa Perumāl at Tirunirmalai and Tirumājisai Emberumān.³ Besides these, there are several other inscriptions at Tirumājisai which speak about the gifts made by Nilagangarāiyans but which do not bear either the date or the name of the king. Thus, to cite a few instances : an epigraph records a gift of land by Nilagangan to the *tānattūr* of the temple of Tirumājisai.⁴ Another relates to the gift of taxes on certain lands to the same temple made by one Nilagangan.⁵ Evidently because of the close association with the Nilagangarāiyans, some of whom also had the prefix Pañchanadivānan. Tirumājisai village even came to be called *Pañchanadivānan - Chaturvēdimangalam*.⁶ The Vishnu temple there was also known as a *Pañchanadivāna-viṇṇagar*.⁷

Another Vaishnavite temple in the vicinity of Madras which seems to have received patronage was the Sri Pārthasārathi temple of Triplicane. A mutilated

1. 1 of 1911.
2. 4 of 1911.
3. 14 of 1911.
4. 3 of 1911.
5. 11 of 1911.
6. 3 of 1911.
7. 14 of 1911; ARE, 1911, pp. 66-67.

epigraph from that temple just mentions '*Pañchanadivānan Nilathu*'.¹ Though, unfortunately, the epigraph is not full enough to give any more details, we can perhaps take it as a reference to some gift of land, evidently by *Pañchanadivānan Nilagangarāiyān* to the Triplicane temple.

The Saivite temples of the Madras region also received many gifts from the large-hearted *Nilagangarāiyāns*. Thus, a record from the Tiruvoxiyūr temple registers the gift of 93 ewes and 2 rams for a lamp by Perumāl Nāchchi, the senior queen of Pillaiyār *Pañchanadivānan Nilagangarāiyān*.² Similarly, the Saivite temple at Tirunāgēs'varam, near Kunnattūr, received gifts of lands from *Pañchanadivānan Aruṇagiripperumāl Nilagangarāiyān*.³ Two epigraphs from Tirumālis'ai also record the gifts made by the *Nilagangarāiyāns* to the temple of *Pammānakka Nāyanār*.⁴

To conclude, the epigraphs found in the territory round Madras overwhelmingly show that certain subordinate chieftains or officers called the *Nilagangarāiyāns* were active in the region in the 13th and early 14th centuries and that both Vaishnavite and Saivite temples there were immensely benefited by the patronage they received from them.

1. SII. VIII, No. 542, XXXVIII.

2. 117 of 1912.

3. 224 of 1929-30.

4. 555 and 556 of 1912.

APPENDIX II

The following is a select list of inscriptions that have been found in the Madras Region, arranged according to various kings and dynasties:

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
PALLAVAS			
...	Pallavaram	Mahēndravarman I (A. D. 600-630)	369 of 1908; SII. XII, No. 13
12th yr.	Triplicane	Dantivarman (795-845)	234 of 1903; EI. VIII, No. 291
17th yr.	Māngādu	Nandivarman III (844-866)	352 of 1908
18th yr.	Tiruvo xx iyūr	"	162 of 1937-38
18th yr.	"	Nṛpatungavarman (c. 855-896)	162 of 1912; SII. XII, No. 70
6th yr.	"	Kampavarman (?)	189 of 1912
9th yr.	"	"	188 of 1912; SII. XII, No. 100
19th yr.	"	"	372 of 1911; SII. XII, No. 105
...	"	"	174 of 1912; SII. XII, No. 103
3rd yr.	Māngādu	Aparājitaravarman (C. 879-897)	351 of 1908
4th yr.	Tiruvo xx iyūr	"	158 of 1912; SII. XII, No. 87
4th yr.	"	"	161 of 1912; SII. XII, 88
5th yr.	"	"	165 of 1937-38
6th yr.	"	"	190 of 1912; SII. XII, 90
7th yr.	"	"	163 of 1912; SII. XII, 91
8th yr.	"	"	159 of 1912; SII. XII, 92
12th yr.	"	"	180 of 1912; SII. XII, 93

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
CHÖLAS			
4th yr. Vēlahchēri		Parāntaka I (907-955 A.D.)	317 of 1911
5th yr. Tiruvox̄xiyūr		"	402 of 1896; SII. V, 1357
7th yr. "		"	175 of 1912
7th yr. "		"	165 of 1912
20th yr. "		"	173 of 1912
24th yr. "		"	176 of 1912
26th yr. "		"	184 and 187 of 1912
27th yr. "		"	167 of 1912
29th yr. "		"	169 and 182 of 1912, SII. III, 103
30th yr. "		"	164 and 170 of 1912; SII. III, 104 and 105
34th yr. "		"	160 of 1912
35th yr. "		"	168 of 1912
38th yr. "		"	236 of 1912
5th yr. "	Vēlahchēri	Gandaraditya (A.D. 949-50 to 957)	246 of 1912; SII. III, 115
"	Vēlahchēri	"	315 of 1912; SII. 116.
7th yr. "		"	306 of 1911; SII. III, 114
6th yr. Tiruvox̄xiyūr		Sundara Chōla Parāntaka II (c.A.D. 956-973)	163 of 1937-38 Report II, para 28
5th yr. Tirumullai- vāyil		Parthivendravarman (c. A.D. 956-969)	676 of 1904; SII. III, 174
6th yr. Pādi		"	225 of 1910; SII. III, 181
10th yr. Vēlechchēri		"	316 of 1911; SII. III, 191
13th yr. Tirumullai- vāyil		"	683 of 1904; SII. III; 196
...	Madras Museum	"	306 of 1938-39
14th yr. Tirumullai- vāyil		Uttarnachōla (969-70-985)	669 of 1904; SII. III, 141

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
15th yr.	Tiruvo kk xiyūr	Uttamachola	166 of 1912; SII. III, 143
16th yr.	"	"	245 of 1912; SII. III, 145
3rd yr.	"	Rājarāja I (985-1014)	235 of 1912
10th yr.	Vēlachcheri	"	304 of 1911
"	Pādi	"	226 of 1910
14th yr.	Tiruvo kk xiyūr	"	172 of 1912
"	Poonamalle	"	301 of 1938-39
19th yr.	Puliyūr	"	290 of 1895 and 291 of 1895
19th yr.	Madras Museum	"	512 of 1913
23rd yr.	Tripli cane	" (?)	242 of 1903; SII. VIII. 541
24th yr.	Tiruvo kk xiyūr	"	164 of 1937-38
25th yr.	Poonamalle	"	293 of 1938-39
	San Thomé		216 of 1923
3rd yr.	Vēlachcheri	Rājendra I (1012-1044)	308 and 309 of 1911
"	Tirumullai- vāyil	"	677, 681, 682 and 684 of 1904
4th yr.	Vēlachcheri	"	317 of 1911
6th yr.	Tiruvānmiyūr		302 of 1911
"	Tirumullaivāyil		81 of 1909
7th yr.	Tirumullaivāyil		678 of 1904
9th yr.	Tiruvānmiyūr		83 of 1909
10th yr.	Vēlachcheri		305 of 1911
14th yr.	Tiruvānmiyūr		77 of 1909
19th yr.	Poonamalle		309 of 1938-39
26th yr.	Tiruvo kk xiyūr		146 and 153 of 1912
29th yr.			139, 140 and 141 of 1912
30th yr.	"	"	138, 155, 156 of 1912
31st yr.	"	"	399 of 1896 and 104 of 1912 SII. V, 1354
32nd yr.	"	"	105 of 1912
"	"	"	105 of 1892 and 126 of 1912 SII. IV. No. 553

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
...	San Thomé	Rajendra I	328 of 1939-40
3rd yr.	Tiruvo ^g giyür	Rajadhiraja I (1018-1054)	127 of 1912
6th yr.	"	"	107 of 1912
22nd yr.	"	"	151 of 1912
26th yr.	"	"	103 of 1912
27th yr.	"	"	142 and 144 of 1912
"	Tiruvānmiyür	"	78 of 1909
28th yr.	Tiruvo ^g giyür	"	102, 137 and 220 of 1912
29th yr.	"	"	148 of 1912
31st yr.	"	"	107 of 1892, 132 and 147 of 1912; SII. IV. No. 555
33rd yr.	"	"	149 of 1912
38th yr.	"	"	129 of 1912
6th yr.	Tiruvo ^g giyür	Rajendra II (1052-1064)	150 of 1912
8th yr.	"	"	152 of 1912
11th yr.	Tiruvānmiyür	"	80 of 1909
2nd yr.	Tiruvorriyür	Virarajendra I (1063-1069)	136 of 1912
4th yr.	"	"	135 of 1912
4th yr.	Velasar- vakkam	"	111 of 1940-41
5th yr.	Tiruvo ^g giyür	"	228 and 232 of 1912
...	"	"	128 of 1912
3rd yr.	"	Adhirajendra	219 of 1912
2nd yr.	"	Kulottunga I (1070-1120)	106 of 1892; 163 of 1912; SII. III, 64
3rd yr.	"	"	133 of 1912
"	Tirus'ulam	"	315 of 1901; SII. VII, 541
7th yr.	Tiruvo ^g giyür	"	401 of 1896; 120 of 1912 and 154 of 1912. SII. V, 1356
10th yr.	"	"	230, 245, 221 of 1912
12th yr.	"	"	231 of 1912

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
17th yr.	Tiruvo ^{kk} iyür	Kulöttunga I (1070-1120)	154 of 1912
18th yr.	"	"	111 of 1912
23rd yr.	"	"	118 of 1912
28th yr.	"	"	229 of 1912
30th yr.	"	"	109 of 1892; EI. V, 106 and 119 and 121 of 1912
37th yr.	"	"	124 of 1912
38th yr.	Tirus'ūlam	"	317 of 1901; SII. VII, 543
39th yr.	"	"	312 of 1901; SII. VII, 538
45th yr.	Tirumilis'ai	"	190 of 1911
49th yr.	Tiruvo ^{kk} iyür	"	401 of 1896
6th yr.	Tirus'ūlam	Vikramachōla (A.D. 1118-1135)	322 of 1901; SII. VII, 548
9th yr.	"	"	314 of 1901; SII. VII, 540
14th yr.	"	"	318 of 1901; SII. VII, 544
...	"	"	324 of 1901; SII. VII, 550
...	Tirunirmalai	"	553 of 1912
4th yr.	Tiruvo ^{kk} iyür	Kulöttunga II (A. D. 1133-1150)	192 of 1912
6th yr.	"	Rajarāja II (A.D. 1146-1173)	157 of 1912
7th yr. (?)	"	"	123 of 1912, ARE. 1913, para 36
17th yr.	"	"	369 of 1911
...	"	"	193 of 1912
3rd yr.	"	Rājādhira ^{ja} II (1163-1179)	98 of 1912
4th yr.	"	"	101 of 1912
4th yr.	Tirus'ūlam	"	321 of 1901. Also <i>see</i> 319 of 1901, SII. VII, 545, 547
6th yr.	Tiruvo ^{kk} iyür	"	108 of 1892; SII. IV, 556

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
9th yr. Tiruvo kk iyür	Rājādhīrāja II (1163-1179)		403 and 495 of 1896; 376 of 1911; 206 of 1912; SII. V, 1358 and 1360
10th yr.	"	"	100 of 1912
2nd yr.	"	Kulōttunga III (A.D. 1178-1216)	125 of 1912
"	Kunnattür	"	200 of 1929-30
"	Tirunirmalai	"	551 of 1912
3rd yr.	"	"	560 of 1912
4th yr.	"	"	542, 545 of 1912
"	Kunnattür	"	230 of 1929-20
5th yr.	Madras Museum	"	297 of 1895
6th yr.	Kunnattür	"	229 of 1929-30
"	Tirunirmalai	"	552 of 1912
"	Tiruvo kk iyür	"	216 of 1912
9th yr.	"	"	108 of 1912
10th yr.	Tirumil is 'ai	"	25 of 1911
"	Tirunirmalai	"	548 of 1911
11th yr.	Tiruvo kk iyür	"	114 of 1912; SITI. I. No. 511
12th yr.	Tirunirmalai	"	540 of 1912
14th yr.	Kunnattür	"	194 of 1929-30
16th yr.	Tirumil is 'ai	"	206 of 1911
19th yr.	Kunnattür	"	215 and 220 of 1929-30
"	Tiruvo kk iyür	"	368 of 1911
21st yr.	Köyambēdu	"	1 and 10 of 1933-34
"	Tirumullaivāyil	"	667 of 1904
22nd yr.	Koyambēdu	"	4 of 1933-34
23rd yr.	Kunnattür	"	202 of 1929-30
24th yr.	Tirumullaivāyil	"	663 of 1904
25th yr.	Vēlachchēri	"	303 of 1911
25th yr.	Köyambēdu	"	6 of 1933-34
26th yr.	Tiruvo kk iyür	"	120 of 1912
27th yr.	"	"	209 of 1912; SITI. No. 521
28th yr.	Kunnattür	"	225 of 1929-30

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
30th yr.	Tirunirmalai	Kulöttunga III (A.D. 1178-1216)	539 of 1912
31st yr.	Tirus'lam	"	313 of 1901
32nd yr.	Tiruvox̱iyür	"	197 of 1912
33rd yr.	Kunnattür	"	222 of 1926-30
"	Tirunirmalai	"	557 of 1912
34th yr.	"	"	546, 556 and 558 of 1912
35th yr.	Tiruvox̱iyür	"	202 of 1912; SITI. I. No. 519
37th yr.	Tirus'lam	"	311 of 1901 SII. VII
"	Köyambödu	"	5 of 1933-34
38th yr.	Tiruvox̱iyür	"	201 of 1912; SITI. No. 518
39th yr.	Tirumullaivayil	"	673 of 1904
"	Triplicane	"	241 of 1903; SITI. No. 540
3rd yr.	Tiruvox̱iyur	"	116 of 1912; SITI. I. No. 513
4th yr.	"	"	214 of 1912. SITI, 529
6th yr.	Tirunirmalai	"	535 and 543 of 1912
7th yr.	Kunnattür	"	191 of 1929-30
"	Vēlachcheri	"	307 of 1911
"	Tirunirumalai	"	533 of 1912
"	Tiruvox̱iyür	"	199 of 1912
8th yr.	"	"	109 of 1912
"	Kunnattür	"	214 of 1929-30
"	Pädi	"	219 of 1910
9th yr.	"	"	218 of 1910
"	Tiruvox̱iyür	"	227 of 1912
10th yr.	Kunnattür	"	220 of 1929-30
"	Padi	"	223 of 1910
13th yr.	Tiruvox̱iyür	"	106 of 1912
14th yr.	Kunnattür	"	179 and 216 of 1929-30
"	Tirunirmalai	"	550 & 563 of 1912
15th yr.	Tirumiḻis'ai	"	15 of 1911
16th yr.	Tirunirmalai	"	544 of 1912

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
16th yr.	Tirumullaivayil Rājarāja III		674 of 1904
"	Tirus'ulam	,, (1216-1246)	320 of 1901
"	Mangadu	,,	349 of 1908
19th yr.	Tiruvo ^g giyūr	,,	211 of 1912; 122 of 1912; SITI. 520; SIL. IV, 558
"	Tirunirmalai		562 of 1912
21st yr.	Tiruvo ^g giyūr		113 of 1912
22nd yr.	Velachchēri		313 of 1911
"	Tiruvo ^g giyūr		198 of 1912
23rd yr.	Tirunirmalai		561 of 1912
"	Mangadu		348 of 1908
25th yr.	Kunnattūr		218 of 1929-30
26th yr.	Tiruvo ^g giyūr		115 of 1912
27th yr.	"		99 of 1912
28th yr.	Padi		216 of 1910
...	Tirunirmalai		549 of 1912
...	Tiruvo ^g giyūr		125 of 1912

RĀSHTRAKŪTAS

18th yr.	Tiruvo ^g giyūr	Krishna III (A.D. 939-966)	177 of 1912
19th yr.	"	"	178 of 1912
20th yr.	"	"	181 of 1912
22nd yr.	"	"	179 of 1912

PANDIYAS

...	"	Jaṭāvarman	
		Sundara Pandya I	
		(acc. A.D. 1251)	237 of 1912
5th yr.	Māngadu	"	358 of 1908
31st yr.	Kunnattūr	Māravarman Kula-	
		sēkhara I (1260-1308)	204 and 208 of 1929-30
36th yr.	"	"	226 of 1929-30
38th yr.	Tirus'ulam	"	323 of 1901

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
39th yr.	Kunnattür	Māravarman Kula-sēkhara I (1260-1308)	227 of 1929-30
49th yr.	Tripliçane	"	248 of 1903, SII. VIII, 537
10th yr.	Tirumullaivāyil	Jatāvarman Sundara II	666 of 1904
11th yr.	Tirunirmalai	"	538 of 1912
13th yr.	Tiruvox̄iyūr	"	400 of 1896 & 110 of 1912; SII. V No. 1355; SITI. I, No. 510
16th yr.	Tirunirmalai	"	554 of 1912
17th yr.	"	"	537 of 1912
18th yr.	Kunnattür	"	189 of 1929-30
"	Tirumullaivāyil	" (?)	670 of 1904
...	Tripliçane	" (?)	SII. VIII, 242-A of 1903. No. XII
...	Manamai	"	259 of 1909
5th yr.	Poonamalle	Jatāvarman Vikrama Pāṇḍya (acc. 1283)	31 of 1911
12th yr.	"	Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya III (acc. 1303 A.D.)	297 of 1938-39; ARE 1938-39, p. 62

CHERAS

... " Ravivarman Kula-sēkhara (attributed to, ARE. 1911, p. 79) 34 of 1911

TELUGU CHODAS

...	Tiruvox̄iyūr	Tammu-Siddhi (c. 1208)	104 of 1892; EI. VII, pp. 148-52
3rd yr.	"	Vijayagandagopala (c. 1250-1291)	239 of 1912
"	Pādi	"	217 of 1910
4th yr.	Tirumullaivāyil	"	672 of 1904
7th yr.	Kunnattür	"	177 of 1929-30

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
10th yr.	Tiruvariyur	Vijayagandagopala (c. 1250-1291)	117 of 1912
15th yr.	"	"	238 of 1912
16th yr.	Tirumijisai	"	8 of 1911
21st yr.	Tiruvariyur	"	243 of 1912; SITL I, 527
24th yr.	Tirunirmalai	"	547 of 1912
"	Poonamalle	"	32 of 1911
"	Tirumijisai	"	5 of 1911
26th yr.	Tirunirmalai	"	536 of 1912
"	Tirumijisai	"	1 of 1911
29th yr.	Puliyur	"	79 of 1941-42
30th yr.	Tirumijisai	"	4 of 1911
"	Tirumullaivayil	" (?)	662 of 1904
33rd yr.	Padi	" (?)	222 of 1910
"	Tirumijisai	"	14 of 1911
3rd yr.	Kunnattur	Viragandagopala (c. A.D. 1290-1316)	183 of 1929-30
4th. yr.	"	"	224 of 1929-30

KĀDAVARAYAS

17th yr.	Kunnattur	KoPeruñjingadeva	196 of 1929-30
"	Tirumijisai	"	13 of 1911
18th yr.	Velachcheri	"	314 of 1911
19th yr.	Kunnattur	"	213 of 1929-30
24th yr.	"	"	180 of 1929-30

YADAVARAYAS

...	Tiruvariyur	Narasīngayadava	244 of 1912
16th yr.	"	Sriranganātha Yāda-varaya (acc. 1336-7)	242 of 1912; SITL 527
"	Koyambedu	"	2 of 1933-34

SAMBŪVARAYAS

2nd yr.	Kunnattur	Venrumankonda Sambūvarāyan (A.D. 1337-1360)	206 of 1929-30
---------	-----------	---	----------------

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
4th yr. Puṣṭal		Rājanārayana s'āmbūvarāyan (A.D. 1337-1360)	484 of 1920
5th yr. Tiruvoxkiyūr		„	212 of 1912; SITI. I, 525
6th yr. Kunnattūr		„	195 of 1929-30
7th yr. Tiruvoxkiyūr		„	203 of 1912, SITI. 523
8th yr. Puṣṭal		„	483 of 1920
„ Kunnattūr		„	187 of 1929-30
10th yr. „		„	188 of 1929-30
12th yr. Tiruvoxkiyūr		„	207 of 1912; SITI. No. 508
„ „		„	194 of 1912

VIJAYANAGAR KINGS

7th yr.	„	Sāyaṇa Udaiyār	213 of 1912; SITI. I No. 526
9th yr.	„	„	240 of 1912
„	„	Kampana II (c. 1365)	
„	„	„	210 of 1912. SITI. I No. 522
S. 1290	„	„	208 of 1912
S. 1293	Kunnatūr	„	192 of 1929-30
	„	„	190 of 1929-30
A.D. 1381	„	Harihara II (1377-1404)	178 of 1929-30
„	„	„	193 of 1929-30
A.D. 1388	Tiruvoxkiyūr	„	196 of 1912
S. 1308	Tirumilis'ai	„	24 of 1911
S. 1310	Tirumullaivāyil	„	675 of 1904
S. 1312	Tirumilis'ai	„	7, 10, 12, 20, 20 of 1911
S. 1319	Pādi	„	221 of 1910
S. 1323	Tirumullaivayil	„	671 of 1904
S. 1326	„	„	664 of 1905
„	Kunnattūr	„	221 of 1929-30
„	Tiruvoxkiyūr	„	205 of 1912; SITI. I No. 509

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
...	Tirumilisai	Harihara II	21 of 1911
A.D. 1405	Koyambedu	Bukka II (1405-1406)	14 of 1933-34
S. 1328	Tirumullaivayil	„	671 of 1904
...	Tiruvoxgiyür	„	225 of 1912
A.D. 1408	Pujal	Dēvarāya I (1406-1422)	486 of 1920
S. 1342	Padi	„	224 of 1910
A.D. 1421-22	Māngadu	Dēvarāya II (1422-1446)	355 of 1908
S. 1346	Tiruvoxgiyür	„	367 of 1911; SITI. I. 514
S. 1350	Padi	„	215 of 1910
S. 1359	Kunnattur	„	197 and 201 of 1929-30
...	„	„	209 of 1929-30
...	Tiruvoxgiyür	„	224 of 1912
...	„	„	226 of 1912
...	Tirumullaivayil	„	676 of 1904
S. 1347	„	Pratāparudradēva- rāya (c A.D. 1427)	665 of 1904
...	Māngadu	„	350, 353 and 354 of 1908
S. 1374	Tirumullaivayil	Mallikarjuna (1447-1465)	680 of 1904
...	Kunnattur	„	207 of 1929-30
S. 1394	Tirumilisai	Virūpaksharāya (1465-1485)	9 of 1911
...	Tiruvoxgiyür	Sāluva Narasimha (1486-1491)	244 of 1912
S. 1431	Kunnattur	Krishnadevarāya (1509-1529)	182 of 1929-30
S. 1447	Poonamalle	„	300 of 1938-39
S. 1448	Tiruvoxgiyür	„	134 of 1912
...	Māngadu	„	361 of 1908
S. 1451	Pujal	Achyuta Rāya (1530-1542)	487 of 1920
S. 14... (?)	Tirumilisai	„	23 of 1911

DATE 1	PLACE 2	KING 3	REFERENCES 4
	Triplicane	Sadāśiva (1542-1576)	239 of 1903; SII. VIII No. 538
S. 1501	Kunnattūr	Sriranga I (1572-1585)	255 of 1909
S. 1507	Triplicane	„	237 of 1903; SII. VIII, No. 536
S. 1508	Māngādu	Venkata II (1586-1614)	360 of 1908
S. 1520	Kunnattūr	„	231 of 1929
A.D. 1600-1601	Tirunūrmalai		564 and 565 of 1912
S. 1525	Triplicane	„	236 of 1903; SII. VIII, No. 535
S. 1527	Triplicane	„	235 of 1903; SII. VIII No. 534

APPENDIX III

SOURCES

I. CONTEMPORARY

(a) *Archaeological and Epigraphical*

Annual Report of Archaeological Survey.

Annual Report of South Indian Epigraphy

Archaeological Survey of India: South Indian Inscriptions.

Archaeological Survey of India: Lists of Antiquarian Remains in the Presidency of Madras, R. Sewell, 2 vols. (Madras, 1882-1884).

A Topographical List of Inscriptions of Madras Presidency, V. Rangacharya, Vols. I and II (Madras, 1919).

Epigraphia Indica.

South Indian Temple Inscriptions, Vol. I ed. by T. N. Subramanian, Government Oriental MSS Library, Madras, 1953.

Tirumalai Tirupati Devasthanam Inscriptions, 4 vols and Introduction (Madras, 1931-36).

(b) *Chronicles and Travellers' Accounts*

Barbosa, Duarte: An account of the countries bordering on the Indian ocean and their inhabitants written by Duarte Barbosa and completed about the year 1518, Translated with notes by Longworth Dames, 2 vols. (London, 1918).

Caesar Frederik: Purchas Samuel, His Pilgrims, Vol. X (1906).

Jordanus: The Wonders of the East-Tr. by Col. Henry Yule.

Major R. H.: India in the 15th century, being a collection of narratives of voyages to India in the century preceding the Portuguese discovery of the Cape of Good Hope (1858).

McCrindle, J. W.: Ancient India as described by Ptolemy (Reprint from Indian Antiquary, 1883).

Sastri, K.A.N.: Foreign Notices of South India (Madras, 1939).

Yule, Henry: The Book of Ser Marco Polo, the Venetian concerning the kingdoms and Marvels of the East Tr. and edited by Yule, 2 vols (1903).

Yule, Henry: Cathay and the Way Thither, 4 vols (Hakluyt Society, London, 1913-1916).

Taylore, William: A Catalogue Raisonné of Oriental MSS. in Government Library, 3 vols. (1857-62).

Wilson, H. H.: "The Mackenzie Collection"—2 vols. (1828) also a summary in M. J. L. S. XIX, pp. 244 ff.

(c) Letters and other Records

Foster, William: The English Factories in India from 1618—a calendar of Documents in the India Office and the British Museum.

A Calendar of Court Minutes etc. of East India Company edited by E. B. Sainsbury.

Dutch Records—Dag Register (Batavia Diary).

(d) *Literary and Traditional*

Tēvāram

Divyasūricharitam

Guruparamparai

Kalingattupparai ed. by Palanivel Pillai, The South India Saiva Siddhanta Publications (1954).

Maṇimēkhalai ed. by Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer.

Nālāyara Divya Prabandham

Mayilai Nēmināthar Paṭikam ed. by M. S. Venkataswamy (Arani, 1955).

Nandikkalambakam

Nannūl - Mayilainathar Urāi ed. by U. V. Swaminatha Iyer (1918).

Nēminātham by Guṇavira Paṇḍitar ed. by K. R. Govindaswamy Mudaliar, South India Saiva Siddhanta Publications.

Paṭṭinappālai.

Periapurāṇam - Kōvai Tamil Sangam Publication.

Perumbanāṇupadai.

Puṇānāru - ed. by U. V. Swaminatha Iyer (1923).

Silappadikāram - ed. by U. V. Swaminatha Iyer and translated by V. R. R. Dikshitar.

Tamil Nāvalar Charitai - ed. by O. S. Duraiswamy. The Saiva Siddhanta Publications.

Tirukkurai.

Tirunūṇandādi by Avirōdha Ājvar.

Tiruppugāl by Aruṇagirināthar.

Tiruvo^{ri}iyūr Purāṇam by Jñanaprakas'ar.

Tondamandalas'adakam by Padikkas'upulavar.

Sthalapurāṇams of the temples.

II. MODERN WORKS

Anavaradavinayakam Pillai: Tamil Perumakka! Varalaru (Tamil, 1921).

Appadorai, A.: Economic Condition of Southern India, 1000-1500 A.D., 2 vols (Madras, 1936).

Arokiaswamy, M.: History of the Vellar Basin (Madras, 1954).

Bandarkar, R. G.: Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious systems, (1913).

Bruce-Foote, Robert: Indian Prehistoric and Protohistoric Antiquites (Madras, 1916).

Brown, Percy: Indian Architecture (Buddhist and Hindu)

Brown, J. Coggin: Catalogue Raisonne of Prehistoric Antiquities in the Indian Museum at Calcutta ed. by John Marshall (Simla, 1917).

Cunningham, Sir Alexander: Geography in Ancient India.

Crole, C. S.: Chingleput, Late Madras District Manual (Madras, 1879).

Cotton, J. J.: List of Inscriptions on tombs and monuments in Madras, 2 vols, Revised edition by Dr. B. S. Baliga (Madras, 1945-46).

Dikshitar, V. R. R.: Studies in Tamil Literature and History (Madras, 1936).

Dubreuil, J.: Pallava Antiquities (London, 1916)

- The Pallavas (Pondicherry, 1917).
- The Dravidian Architecture.

Elliot, Sir Walter: Coins of Southern India (London, 1885).

Ferguson, James: History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, 2 vols. (London, 1910).

Figredo B. A. Rev.: Voices from the Dust (Madras 1952).

Foster William: The Founding of the Fort St. George 1902).

Gopalan, R.: The History of the Pallavas of Kanchi (Madras, 1928).

Gopinatha Rao, T. A.: History of Sri Vaishnavas (Madras, 1923).

Hayavadana Rao, C: Mysore Gazetteer (Bangalore, 1930).

Heras, Rev. Fr. H: The Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagar, (Madras, 1927).

Hough, James: History of Christianity in India.

Hosten, Rev. H: Antiquities from San Thomé and Mylapore (1936).

Joseph. T. K.: Six Thomases of South India (1955).

Kanakasabhai Pillai, V: The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago (Madras and Bangalore, 1904).

Krishnaswami Iyengar Commemoration Volume, 1936.

Krishnaswami Iyengar, S: The Beginnings of South Indian History. (Madras, 1918).

- South India and her Muhammadan Invaders (Calcutta, 1921).

- Sources of Vijayanagar History (Madras, 1924).
- Manimekhala in its Historical Settings (London, 1928).
- Evolution of Hindu Administrative Institutions (Madras, 1931).
- Early History of Vaishnavism.

Lawson, Sir Charles: Memories of Madras (London-1905.)

Leighton, D: Vicissitudes of Fort St. George (Madras and Bombay, 1932).

Logan: Chipped Stones of India.

Longhurst, A. H.: Pallava Architecture (Memoir of Archaeological Survey of India, No. 17.)

Love, H. D.: Vestiges of old Madras (1640-1800), 4 vols. (1913.)

Mahalingam, T. V.: Administration and social Life under Vijayanagar (Madras, 1940.)

- Economic Life in Vijayanagar empire (Madras, 1951)
- South Indian Polity (Madras, 1955).

Majumdar, R. C.: The History and Culture of Indian People: The Classical Age (Bombay, 1954).

Medlycott Bishop: India and the Apostle Thomas (1905).

Minakshi, C: Administration and Social Life under the Pallavas (Madras, 1939).

Mitra, P: Prehistoric India (Calcutta, 1927).

Narayana Iyer, C. V.: Origin and the Early History of Saivism in South India (Madras, 1936).

Nilakanta Sastri, K. A. : The Pāndyan Kingdom (London, 1936)

- Studies in Chola History and Administration (Madras, 1932.)
- Chōṭas (First Edition, 1935, '37 ; Second Edn. 1955).
- A History of South India (1955)

Nilakanta Sastri : { Further Sources of Vijayanagar and History. 3 vols. (Madras, 1946).

Venkataramanayya:

Popley, H. A. : The Sacred Kural or the Tamil Vēda of Tiruvalluvar (1931).

Raghava Iyengar, M: Ajvārkaṇ Kāla Nilai (Tamil 1929).

Ramaswamy Iyengar, M. S.: Studies in South Indian Jainism (Madras, 1922).

Saletore, B. A.: Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagar Empire, 2 vols (Madras, 1934).

Satyanatha Iyer, R.: Studies in the Ancient History of Tonḍamandalam, (Madras, 1944).

- The Nayaks of Madura (Madras, 1924).

Sesha Iyengar, T.R.: Dravidian India (Madras, 1933).

Sethu Pillai, R.P.: Īrum Pērum (Tamil, Madras, 1946).

Sewell, R: List of Antiquarian Remains in the Madras Presidency (1882).

- A Forgotten Empire (London, 1924).
- Historical Inscriptions of Southern India (Madras, 1932).

Sivaraj Pillai, K. N.: Chronology of the Early Tamils (Madras, 1932).

Smith, V.A.: Early History of India (Oxford, 1904).

— Oxford History of India (1923).

Somasundara Desikar, S.: Tamil Pulavar Varalāru, 16th century (1936).

Srinivasa Iyengar, M. Tamil Studies (Madras, 1914).

Srinivasa Iyengar, P. T. The Pallavas (1922)

— Stone Age in India (Madras, 1926)

— History of Tamils from the earliest times to 600 A.D. (Madras, 1930).

Srinivasachari, C. S.: History of the city of Madras (Madras, 1939).

— History of Gingee and its rulers (Annamalainagar, 1943).

Srinivasan, C. K.: Maratha Rule in the Carnatic (Annamalainagar, 1944).

Subramaniam, K. R.: The origin of Saivism and its History in the Tamil land (1929).

Subramania Iyer, K. V.: Historical sketches of the Ancient Deccan (Madras, 1917).

Subramania Mudaliar, C. K.: Sēkkijār (Tamil, Madras, 1930).

Venkataraman, K. R.: Hoysālas in the Tamil country (1950).

Venkataramanayya, N.: Studies in the Third Dynasty of Vijayanagar (Madras, 1935).

Venkataswamy, Mayilai Cheeni: Bauddhamum Tamijum (Tamil, 1950).

- "Samagamum Tamilum (Tamil) 1954 (South Indian Saiva Siddhanta Publications).
- Wheeler Talboys J.: Madras in Olden Time, 3 vols 1861-62. Early Records of British India.
- A History of English Settlements in India (Calcutta, 1878).

III JOURNALS Etc.

Ancient India

Indian Antiquary:

Journal of Indian History.

Journal of Oriental Research.

Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, London.

Journal of Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society.

Madras Journal of Literature and Science.

Quarterly Journal of Mythic Society.

Sen Tamil.

Kalaikkañjiyam, Vols. I, II and III (1954-56).



ERRATA

Page	Line	Read	For
4	3	.	,
6	16	Koṭṭam	Koṭṭam
9	15	Satyanatha Iyer	Sātianathaier
11	f. n. 3	329 of 1930-40	329 of 1930. 40
12	6	S'angam	Tamil
29	1	(மாம்பூயாவது சீர்மகூடை)	மாம்பூயாவது சீர்மகூடை
36	14	infer	infeit
37	11	matās	mathas
39	28	600-630 A. D.	600-603 A. D.
41	14	century	centry
43	14	was	is
54	33	chālukyās	Cālukya
61	3	Pallavas	Pallava
128	20-21	Madras	The Madras
129	f. n. 1,6	Koṭṭam	Koṭṭams
129	f.n. 7	Subdivision	Subdivisiong
131	Para 2	Governer	Governor
151	7	grain	gain
172	8	had a say	had, say
246	2	curvilinear	cubical
246	2	vimāna	sanctum