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Foreword

The fruitfulness of the feudatory approach to Pallava History is demonstrated by the author who discusses the problems of origin, identification, achievement and failure with judicial impartiality and succeeds in throwing a good deal of fresh light on the Pallava annals of politics and culture. The historical role of the Banas, Muttaraiyars, Kodumbalur chiefs, Cholas of Uraiyyur, Palaiyarai and Renandu, Adigamans and Western Gangas is fully elucidated and a clue is provided for a better understanding of the Pallava decline. The thesis exemplifies the right method of historical investigation and the narrative is readable and free from flaws like padding. The diacritical marks have been placed with great care. In short, Sri Govindasamy's work is a fine piece of historical research, the first step in unfolding the role of feudatories in early South Indian History.

Annamalainagar, 27-2-1965  
R. Sathianathaier.
Preface

This thesis is the work done by me as Government of India Research Scholar in Humanities during the period 1954–56, under the supervision of Prof. R. Sathianathaier, Head of the Department of History and Politics, Annamalai University. In his well-known work, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, Dr. J. F. Fleet rightly remarks that the history of an imperial dynasty will be incomplete without a detailed notice of at least the important feudatory families. That this remark is true also of Pallava history will be evident in the following pages. In the account given below is discussed in detail the history of the Bāñas, Muttaraiyars, Koṭumbāḷur chiefs, Chōjas of Uraiyūr, Pāḷaiyāṟai and Renāṇḍu, Adigamāṇs and Western Gaṅgas with a view to ascertain their role in Pallava history. A separate chapter is devoted to individual feudatories whom one comes across in stray inscriptions. The role of feudatories in war and their exact responsibility for the decline and downfall of the Pallava power are examined as far as available evidences permit. The cultural services rendered by the feudatories particularly in fostering the Bhakti cult, architecture and sculpture are also noted. The original home of the Bāṇas, the origin of
the Muttaraiyars and the chronology of the later Pallava rulers are examined in separate notes appended respectively to Chaps. I, II, and VIII. I am grateful to Prof. R. Sathianathaier for suggesting the subject of research and guiding me throughout. I owe a deep debt of gratitude to the Vice-Chancellor Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar for the publication of my thesis under the U. G. C. scheme. I am thankful to the late Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar, the well-known Tamil scholar and historian, Mr. J. M. Somasundaram Pillai, Manager of Publications and Mr. R. Ayyaswamy Aiyar, Assistant Librarian, for their help and interest in the preparation and publication of this thesis. My thanks are also due to the Azhagu Printers Chidambaram for the neat execution of the printing of the work.

Annamalainagar,  |
27—2—1965        

M. S. Govindasamy.
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THE BĀNAS: (c. A. D. 350 – c. 895)

The Bānas were a prominent feudatory family figuring in inscriptions of almost all the great powers of Southern India from the fourth century A. D. to the sixteenth century. The history of the Bānas is peculiarly interesting in that it illustrates their dynastic drift in all directions in South India. The drift started so early that it is difficult to determine their original habitat. Inscriptions coming from different regions indicate the different territories over which the Bānas held sway at different times. Naturally the centre of their power shifted from one place to another.

It is presumed\(^1\) that the Bānas were originally feudatories of the Sātavāhanas and after the fall of the Sātavāhana empire became feudatories of the Pallavas of Kāñchi. The earliest epigraphical reference to the Bānas is found in the Tālāgundā pillar inscription of the Kadamba King Kākūsthavarman (c. A. D. 430–450). The inscription states that, having defeated the frontier-guards of the Pallavas, Mayūraśarman occupied the forest region upto Śripurvata i.e., Śrisailam (Kurnool district) and that he levied tribute from “the circle of kings headed by the Great Bāna.”\(^2\) It has been rightly inferred by Mr. V. Venkayya that “the Pallava dominions originally extended into the Ceded districts and that the Bānas were also ruling some frontier province in that part of

---

the country during the time of the Kadamba King Mayūra-
śarmaḥ. There is, therefore, no doubt that in the conflict 
between the Pallavas and Mayūraśarmaḥ (c. A. D. 340–370) 
the Bānas let the former down and became tributary to the 
latter. It is thus certain that, in addition to the difficulties 
of continuing the war in a distant, hilly and forest region, the 
hospitable attitude of the Bānas forced the Pallavas to make 
peace with Mayūraśarmaḥ.

Another probable outcome of the submission of the 
Bānas to the Kadambas was the rise of the Western Gaṅgas 
under Pallava supremacy. The Udayendiram plates of 
Prithivipati II state that Koṅgaṇivarman, the founder of the 
Western Gaṅga dynasty, was consecrated to conquer the 
Bāna-mandala or country. But this statement has not so far 
been confirmed by any contemporary W. Gaṅga record, 
though Pallava paramountcy over the W. Gaṅgas in the fifth 
century A. D. is borne out by the Penukonḍa plates and the 
Kūḍlūr plates of Madhavavarma. An Inscription of 
A. D. 459 from Dod-Ballapur taluk describes Koṅgaṇi- 
varman as “a wild-fire in consuming the stubble of the forest 
Bāna.” But no reference to the consecration by the Pallava 
King of Koṅgaṇivarman is found in this record. Thus the 
consolidation, if not the foundation, of the W. Gaṅga rule 
and the subsequent subordination of the early Gaṅgas to the 
Pallavas were the probable results of the acknowledgement by 
the Bānas of Kadamba overlordship.

2. See Dr. M. Arockiaswami – The Kongu country. p. 129.
In the middle of the fifth century A. D. the Bānas came again under the Pallavas of Kāñchi and held sway over Pañnarāshṭra which probably comprised a portion of the present South Arcot district. The Lōkavibhāga, a Digambara Jain work in Sanskrit, written by Simhasūri and dealing with Jain cosmography is said to have been copied by Sarvanandi in the village of Paṭalika in the Pañnarāshṭra. The Jain manuscript⁴ gives us Saka 380 corresponding to the 22nd year of Simhavarmaṇi, king of Kāñchi, as the year in which the copying work was completed. Paṭalika has been rightly identified with Paṭaliputtirām (Cuddalore N. T.) in the South Arcot district.⁷ The term Pañnarāshṭra indicates Bāna sway over that region, and the mention of the Pallava King's regnal year reinforces the view that by the middle of the fifth century the Pallavas succeeded in bringing the Bānas under their supremacy.

The history of the Bānas for the next two centuries is wrapped in obscurity. Their fate during the Kajabhra interregnum is not known. The inscriptions of the W. Gaṅga Avanīta and Durviniṭa do not make any reference to the Bānas though two records of Durvinīta⁸ mention his campaigns in the Coimbatore and Salem districts possibly against the Pallavas. Though contemporary Kadamba records make mention⁴ of Pallava-Kadamba conflicts, they tell us nothing of the Bānas. It is, therefore, clear that the Bānas were not, during this period, subordinate either to the W. Gaṅgas or to the Kadambas. The Kaśākkudi plates of Nandivarmaṇi II Pallavamalla⁵ while mentioning the success of Simhavishṇu

over the Malaya, Kāśabhra, Mālava, Chōla, Kēraṇa, Pāṇḍya
and Simhaṇa kings do not allude to the Bānas. This leads us
to the conclusion that the Bānas continued to be feudatories
of the Pallavas though their role in the conflicts of the latter
with the Kadambas and the W. Gaṅgas remains obscure.
Nothing more is known of the Bāna chiefs till they were
overcome by the Western Chālukyas.

Even at the initial stage of the Pallava–W. Chālukya
conflict, the Bānas appear to have thrown in their lot with
the W. Chālukyas. An undated Kannaṇa inscription\(^1\) of a
certain W. Chālukya Satyaśraya Śrīprithvivallabha found at
Peddavadugūru records the gift of the village of Nādanūru
and certain taxes in the country of Bānaraja by Ereyitiṣṭiga\(^1\)
who conquered Raṇavikraman\(^1\). Since Raṇavikraman\(^1\) is taken
to be the other form of Raṇavikrānta,\(^2\) a title of Maṅgaleśa,
the paternal uncle and enemy of Pulikesin II, and Ereyitiṣṭiga\(^1\)
is regarded as identical with Erey\(^3\) a surname of Pulikesin II,
it is highly probable that the Bānas became feudatory to
Pulikesin II. This view is further supported by the fact that
the successor of Pulikesin II do not claim in their records
the subjugation of the Bānas. The absence of any allusion
to the Bānas in the Aihoḷe inscription perhaps indicates that
they came under W. Chālukya supremacy after the year A. D.
635 when the record was issued. The change in Bāna policy
seems to be an outcome of the Pro–W. Chālukya policy of
the Chōlas of Renāṇḍu whose territory was adjacent to that
of the Bānas.

\(^1\) 343 of 1920.
\(^2\) Paragraphs 1–3 of M. E. R. 1921; contra Intro. to
\(^3\) Paragraphs 1 & 2 of M. E. R. 1921; E. I, Vol. VII
Appe. No. 16.
The vicissitudes of the Bāṇas during the Pallava interregnum in W. Chālukya history are not known though a shift in their policy in favour of the victorious Pallavas is not unlikely. An inscription of the Rēṇāṇḍu Chōja King Pūṇyakumāra dated in the first year of W. Chālukya Vikramāditya I states that Pōrmukharāma (i.e., Pūṇyakumāra) was ruling over Bāṇarāja’s territory bounded by the Pēṇnār. The fact that Pūṇyakumāra exercised his sway over Bāṇarāja’s territory seems to suggest a conflict between the Bāṇas and W. Chālukyas and their allies, the Chōlas of Rēṇāṇḍu. But the evidence is not sufficient to come to any definite conclusion. In any case, it is practically certain that Vikramāditya I who revived the W. Chālukya power must have received the allegiance of the Bāṇas.

Some of the records of Vijayāditya, the grandson of Vikramāditya I, show that the Bāṇas continued their subordination to the W. Chālukyas and were in charge of the Turamara and Vaṅganūr Vishayas. One of the records dated in the 23rd year of Vijayāditya and assignable to A.D. 719–20 refers to a fight in which the rulers of Turamara Vishaya were vanquished by Vikramāditya Bali Indra Bāṇarāja, son of Narasimha Bāṇarāja. The Government Epigraphist thinks that the event referred to here must have been the invasion either of the Pallavas or of their feudatories. But, Dr. T. V. Mahalingam regards it only as a local civil war which was

1. 284 of 1937–38. For a detailed analysis of the record see the chapter on the Rēṇāṇḍu Chōlas,
3. 359 of 1920.
4. Part or whole of the present Gooty taluk of the Anantapur District – vide paragraph 2 of M. E. R. 1921.
5. Ibid.
put down by the Bāṇa chief. ¹ Little is known of the part played by the Bāṇas in the military expeditions to Kāṇchi of W. Chāḻukya Vikramāditya I and his great-grandson, Vikramāditya II.

The history of the Bāṇas for the next two or three decades is not clear. They figure in the inscriptions of W. Gaṅga Śripurusha, W. Chāḻukya Kīrtivarman and Rēnāṇḍu Chōla Vijayaṇāditya. It is extremely doubtful if all these Bāṇa chiefs belonged to a single line.²

Bāṇa Jayanandivarman (c. A. D. 733–772):

It was during this period that the main line of the Bāṇas again changed their allegiance to the Pallavas. A Tamil inscription found at Guḍimallam³ and dated in the 23rd year of Nandipōttaraiyar mentions a certain Vikramāditya Māvali Vāṇarāyār who ruled over Vaḍugavaiṉi-mēḻku. On palaeographical grounds this inscription is assigned by Mr. V. Venkayya to Nandivarman II Pallavamalla.⁴ The identification of Nandipōttaraiyar of this inscription with Nandivarman II is strengthened by the fact that the inscription does not mention the conspicuous surname of Nandivarman III viz., Teḷḷāṭrērinda Nandi i. e., Nandi who was victorious at Teḷḷāṭrū, which we find in almost all the records dating from his 10th regnal year.⁵ Another inscription⁶ dated in the 62nd year of Vijayananandivikramavarman refers to a certain Māvali Vāṇarāya who ruled over Vaḍugavaṉi Twelve Thousand. On account of the high regnal year, this inscription is assigned

---

2. See the note appended to this chapter.
5. e. g., 52 of 1895 Tillatoranam inscription.
to Nandivarman II Pallavamalla. Māvali Vāṇarāya of this inscription is very probably identical with Vikramāditya Māvali Vāṇarāyar. Again this Vikramāditya is probably identical with Nandivarman or Jayanandivarman of the Guḍimallam, Udayendiram and Muṣṭiyanʿūr plates as the genealogy and chronology of the Bāṇas of this and subsequent period indicate. This conclusion is confirmed by the well-known practice of feudatories assuming the names and titles of their suzerains. It is, therefore, highly probable that Bāṇa Vikramāditya (c. A. D. 730) who became feudatory to Nandivarman II, assumed the name of his overlord manifesting his subordination.

The Bāṇa feudatory of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla seems to have assisted him in removing the W. Gaṅga menace to the Pallava empire. That the aggression of W. Gaṅga Śrīpurusha in the east included part of the modern North Arcot district is clear from the existence of a village called Śrīpurushamaṅgalam (Wandiwash taluk, N. Arcot district). In order to recover the lost portions of the Pallava empire, Nandivarman II undertook a military expedition against Śrīpurusha in his 52nd regnal year (c. A. D. 762) as

5. He must have felt it necessary to do so as his predecessors were feudatory to W. Chāḷukyas. Moreover Dr. D. C. Sircar thinks (N. I. A. Vol. I. p. 245) that he may be identical with Vikramāditya Bali Indra Bāṇarāja of 359 of 1920. This identification, though doubtful, is not unlikely.
evidenced by one of his inscriptions.\(^1\) This inscription records the death of Gaṅgadiyaraiyar Kaṁrādu perunagaṅgar, the chief of Kaṟkāṭṭur, who, at the instance of māmaṛi, (i.e., uncle) the Bāṇa king, fell on the day when the Pallava army marched against Perumānāḍigaḷ and destroyed the fortress of Peṅkuḷikkōṭṭai. It is clear from this inscription that the Bāṇas supported the Pallava King against Śripurusha.\(^2\) Kaṟkāṭṭur is identified with Kaḷakāṭṭur in the Chittoor district and Peṅkuḷikkōṭṭai with Kuḷidikki in the Guḍi-yattam taluk of the North Arcot district.\(^3\) The Pallava expedition must have been successful as the Taṅḍaṅṭṭam plates of Nandivarman\(_II\), dated in his fifty eighth year refers to his triumph over the W. Gaṅga King.\(^4\) We do not know if the Bāṇas occupied the Gaṅga Six-thousand as a result of this war. The reference in the Muḷiyanḍur plates\(^5\) to the crown and throne of Bāṇa Nandivarman\(_II\) and the prefix of his name, Jaya, mentioned in the Udayendiram plates\(^6\) seem to indicate his high political status and his part-of which we know a little, in the martial exploits of Nandivarman\(_II\). Bāṇa Nandivarman\(_II\) and his successors continued to be feudatory to the Pallavas ruling over the territory known as Perumbāṇappāḍi (also known as Vaḍugavaḷi mēḻku and Vaḍugavaḷi 12000) which comprised the western part of the Chittoor district, the north western part of the North Arcot district, the eastern part of the Kolar district and portions

2. But Mr. V. Venkatasubba Aiyar gives a very different interpretation. He thinks that the Bāṇa chief supported the Gaṅga cause and his relative fought for it (*E. I. Vol. XXII.* pp. 110–113). Obviously this is erroneous as it implies the unknown and unusual practice of erecting hero-stones for enemies.

of the Salem district. Tiruvallam, also known as Vāṇapuram, (N. Arcot district) appears to have then been the seat of their authority.¹

**Vijayāditya I** (c. A. D. 772–824):

Vijayāditya or Vijayādityadeva was the son and successor of Bāṇa Nandivarman. An undated Bāṇa inscription, found at Karshnapalle (Punganur taluk, Chittoor district) refers itself to the reign of a certain Bānarāsa who was also in charge of the Gaṅga Six–thousand province when Ballaha i. e., the Rāshṭrakūṭa King led a campaign against Kāduvetṭi for not paying tribute. The record states further that, on this occasion a certain servant of Vijayitta, while returning on horse near Kuntīala, died after slaying Gaṇamūrti.³ On palaeographical grounds this inscription is assigned to the ninth century.³ The Rāshṭrakūṭa King, mentioned in the inscription, is Gōvinda III⁴ and Kāduvetṭi evidently refers to the Pallava king. It is, therefore, reasonable to identify Vijayitta of this record with Bāṇa Vijayāditya I who was a contemporary of Pallava Dantivarman⁵ and Rāshṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III.⁶ We do not know when the Bāṇas occupied the Gaṅga Six–thousand. This territory lay just west of the Bāṇa country and was, for a long time, the bone of contention between the Bāṇas and the W. Gaṅgas. Another inscription found at the same village mentioning a certain Bānarāsa, who was the ruler of the Gaṅga Six–thousand may be ascribed to Vijayāditya I.⁷ A third inscription, much

---

2. 327 of 1912; No. 6 of *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I.
7. 323 of 1912.
damaged and dateless, found at Chālāmāṅgala (Punganur taluk) refers to a certain Bāṇaraśa and the death of a warrior in battle.1 This and another damaged record from the same place9 may be assigned to the same Bāṇa chief. Thus the participation of the Bāṇas in the Pallava–Rāṣṭrakūta war (c. A.D. 804) is clear but not the exact nature of their part in it. It is said that soon after the defeat of Dantivarman by Gōvinda III, the Bāṇas transferred their allegiance from the Pallavas to the Rāṣṭrakūtas.3 The Nandi plates of Rāṣṭrakūta Gōvinda III (A.D. 806)4 record the grant by Gōvinda III, at the request of Kshatriya Mahābali Bāṇarāja, named Śrīparama, of the village of Kandamaṅgala, to Īśvaradāsa, head of the Sthāna (i.e., maṭha) in the temple on the Nandi hill. The Kannaḍa portion of the plates states that the gift was made for the temple of Māṇikkabbe, daughter of Indapparasa. The Chik–Ballapur5 plates of W. Gaṅga Jayatēja state that, in the 17th year of Rāṣṭrakūta Gōvinda III (A.D. 810), while Īśvaradāsa was the head of the maṭha in the temple on the Nandi hill and while Paḍḍāge was the governor of the Kōyattūr 12000, Ratnāvaḷi, the mother of Bāṇarāsa Daḍḍa-naradhīpa and the beloved queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhara-raja, made a grant to the Śiva temple which she had caused to be erected at Nandi. The donee in both the grants is Īśvaradāsa, head of the maṭha or Sthāna on the Nandi hill. Māṇikkabbe is undoubtedley identical with Ratnāvaḷi, the queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhara. Śrīparama Bāṇarāja of the Nandi plates is probably identical with Bāṇa Vidyādhara of the Chik–Ballapur plates. This Bāṇa Vidyādhara is identified

1. 313 of 1912.
2. 335 of 1912.
with Vikramāditya I Bāṇa Vidyādhara, son of Malladeva.¹ No doubt the only Bāṇa chief, so far known to us, bearing this title viz., Vidyādhara, is Vikramāditya I, the father of Vijayāditya II. His earliest known record is dated in the 17th year of Pallava Nandivarman III (c. A.D. 843) and he is known to have ruled for about half a century. Apparently he could not be assigned to the early years of the 9th century. Moreover he was the son-in-law of W. Gaṅga Prithivipati I. Inscriptions of the time of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I mention his queens⁹ Kundavai and Mahādevī Adīgal⁹ but not Ratnāvali of the Chik-Ballapur plates. Therefore the identification is highly improbable and Bāṇa Vidyādhara of the Chik-Ballapur plates must be identified with Bāṇa Vijayāditya I.⁴

It is said that Indapparāsa, the father of Māṇikkabbe, mentioned in the Nandi plates, “may perhaps be identical with Govinda III’s younger brother, Indra, who founded the Gujarat branch. The supposition derives some support from the respect with which the Bāṇas are spoken of in the records.”⁸ If that be so, the matrimonial alliance between the Bāṇas and the collateral line of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas must have taken place some time before A. D. 806 when the Nandi plates were issued. But it is difficult to say whether the Rāṣṭrakūṭa-Bāṇa alliance preceded or followed Dantivarman’s conflict with Gōvinda III.

The outbreak of a revolt against Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amāghavarsha soon after his accession led to the withdrawal of Rāṣṭrakūṭa forces from Gaṅgavāḍi. Taking advantage

of this situation, W. Gaṅga Rājamalla I invaded the Pallava empire as evidenced by his Vaḷḷimalai inscription which records his foundation of a Jain shrine at Vaḷḷimalai, and by the mention in some inscriptions\(^1\) of Rājamallachaturvēdi-
maṅgalam. It may be presumed that in the course of this
invasion, Rājamalla I occupied the Gaṅga Six-thousand,
v vanquishing the Bāṇas.\(^2\) After that, the Bāṇas became again
the vassals of the Pallavas. This is confirmed by the Guḍi-
mallam inscription of Dantivarman\(_{ān}\) which mentions Bāṇa
Vijayāditya I.\(^3\)

Before proceeding further, we must pay some attention
to the political condition of South India in the 9th century,
for it will explain many of the events connected with the
history of the Bāṇas in the subsequent period. W. Gaṅga
Rājamalla I and his son, Nītimārga I, were engaged in liber-
ting Gaṅgavādi from Rashtrakūta occupation and in checking
the growing power of the Bāṇas. Rājamalla II and his
brother, Būtuga I, occasionally allied with the Pallavas
against the Pāṇḍyas. In the latter half of the 9th century,
the W. Gaṅgas waged wars with the E. Chālyukya king,
Vijayāditya III. Rashtrakūta Amōghavarsha was, for a long
time, at war with E. Chālyukya Vijayāditya II and his illus-
trieous grandson; his protracted war with the W. Gaṅgas
came to an end about A.D. 860 and was followed by a matri-
monial alliance between the two dynasties. The latter part
of his reign was full of rebellions. In brief, Amōghavarsha
found it exceedingly difficult to adhere to the forward policy
of his distinguished predecessors. The Pallava–Pāṇḍya strug-
gle for supremacy over the Chōla country persisted inter-
mittently. Taking advantage of this, the Chōlas were steadily

---

1. 227 of 1915; 292 and 322 of S. I. I. Vol. XIII.
rising to power. This state of affairs afforded opportunities for some of the minor dynasties of Deccan to enlarge their dominions at the cost of their neighbours.

*Malladēva* (c. A.D. 824–843):

Vadhuvallaba Malladēva Ṛṇḍīvarman, also known as Jagadēkamalla¹, was the son of Bāna Vijayāditya I. He was probably the same person as Daḍḍa-naradhipa, son of Ratnāvaṭi, mentioned in the Chik-Ballapur plates of Gaṅga Jayatēja.² He had left a few records of which the Muḍiyaṁur inscription³ is notable. An undated inscription of Malladēva is found at Chippili (Madanapalle taluk, Chittoor district). Its provenance is more important than its contents viz., the mention of a gift, for Chippili was at that time the capital of the Chōlas of Rēnāṇḍu. The record indicates Malladēva’s successful invasion of Rēnāṇḍu. The decline of Chōlas of Rēnāṇḍu coupled with Rāṣṭrakūṭa wars with the E.Chāḷukyas and W. Gaṅgas must have facilitated his ambition. As regards his Chōla adversary, we know next to nothing; according to Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri’s pedigree of Rēnāṇḍu Chōlas,⁴ Divākara Chōla was Malladēva’s probable contemporary. The course of this invasion is very obscure. We do not know whether on this occasion Malladēva came into contact or conflict with the Vaidumbas, a Telugu feudatory dynasty. But it is clear that before long the Vaidumbas were in possession of Rēnāṇḍu. It is highly probable that the Vaidumbas played a prominent part in compassing the ruin of the Rēnāṇḍu Chōlas and were later subordinate to the Bāṇas.

---

The Bāna invasion of Rēṇāṇḍu involved them in many wars in the subsequent period, and the Pallavas were deprived of Bāna assistance in their wars with the Pāṇḍyas. The Muḍīyaṇṇūr plates of Malladēva describe him as “a sun in awakening the lotus lake of the Bāna-vamsa” and as the “ruler of a seven and a half country containing 12000 villages in the Āndhra maṇḍala.”1 In short, Malladēva prepared the ground for the remarkable achievements of his son, Vikramāditya I Vidyādhara.

Vikramāditya (c. A. D. 843–892)

Bāna Vikramāditya I succeeded his father and assumed such surnames as Bāna Vidyādhara,2 Jayamēru3 and Bāna-kandarppaṇi.4 The efforts of Vikramāditya I to reconquer the Gaṅga Six-thousand coupled with his father’s invasion of Rēṇāṇḍu provoked the hostility of the W. Gaṅgas and the Noḷambas. The Noḷambas were feudatory to the W. Gaṅgas and ruled over the Gaṅga Six-thousand and Noḷambaṅge, the latter comprising the modern districts of Tumkur and Chitaldroog and part of the Anantapur district.5 They could not ignore the menace of Bāna power as their territory was adjacent to that of the Bānas. When Nītīmārga I Ereyagṅga ascended the Gaṅga throne, he and his Noḷamba feudatory, Poḷal Chōra, waged war with the Bānas and in the battle of Murggepāḍi the latter were worsted (c. A. D. 853).6 The Noḷamba army seems to have raided as far as Kāṇchi. The

Hindupur record\(^1\) of Nitimārga I dated Saka 775 (A. D. 853) refers to his unnamed Noḷamba feudatory who ruled the country extending upto Kāñchī. But the Bānas heroically rolled back the tide of Noḷamba aggression. The capture of Perunagar\(^2\) by Akañkattuvaraiyar, a soldier of Vāṉarāyar, mentioned in a 10th year inscription of Vijaya-Kampa-vikramavarma\(_B\),\(^3\) is regarded as an indication of the rapid recovery of the Bānas.\(^4\) But these events do not find mention in Pallava records. Though hostilities continued between the two parties, some of the inscriptions of Vikramāditya from the Punganur area\(^5\) show his successful efforts to re-establish his authority in the Bāna territory. Far from emasculating the Bāna power, the battle of Murggepāḍi merely checked their progress for some time. It is evident that the brunt of the battle against the Noḷambas was borne by the Bānas.

It appears that sometime after this event, Bāna Vikramāditya I reconquered the Gaṅga Six-thousand probably from the Noḷamba feudatory of the W. Gaṅgas as some inscriptions from the Punganur area describe him as the ruler of Vaḍugaveji-Twelve-thousand and Gaṅga Six-thousand.\(^6\) This is confirmed by the existence in the Kolar district of some inscriptions which may be ascribed to Vikramāditya I.\(^7\)

---

1. 588 of 1912,
5. e. g., 569 and 570 of 1906; Nos. 2 and 3 of *S. I. I.* IX. pt. I.
6. 164 of 1933–34; 196 and 197 of 1931–32.
This must have further aggravated the hostilities between the Bānas and the Nojambas as is clear from a number of Bāna inscriptions mentioning cattle-raids. An undated inscription of Vikramāditya I from Būdidepalle (Punganur taluk) refers to the attack on Pulinaṭu by the Nojamba army and the subsequent triumph of the Bāna chief over the Nojambas in the battle of Miniki (or Minuki). The date of this battle is not known.

We shall now devote some attention to the relations between the Bānas and the collateral line of the W. Gaṅgas who ruled over Kolar and the north-eastern portions of Gaṅgavādi. It seems that in the first half of the 9th century there was no conflict between the main and collateral lines of the W. Gaṅgas. The Udayēndiram plates of Prīthivipati II state that Prīthivipati I “saved Iriga and Nāgadanta, the sons of King (ko) Diṇḍi, who were afraid, the one from king Amōghavarsha, and the other from the jaws of death.” The next verse of the same plates refers to the battle of Vaimbalguri, but the enemy of Prīthivipati I in that war is not mentioned. Mr. M. V. Krishna Rao and Mr. M. Venkataramayya are of opinion that Prīthivipati I fought with Amōghavarsha. At any rate, it is clear that Prīthivipati I was not on good terms with Amōghavarsha. In the absence of any indication to the contrary, we may assume that Prīthivipati I co-operated with his cousin, Rājamalla I, in driving away the Rāṣṭrakūṭas from Gaṅgavādi. It appears

1. 584 of 1906; 164 of 1933–34; 187, 188, 196, 197, 229 and 230 of 1931–32.
4. The Gaṅgas of Talkad. p. 70.
that the rise of the Noʃambas under Poʃal Chora, the son-in-law of Rajaʃalla I, might have caused the rupture between the main and collateral lines of the W. Gaʃgas. Pṛithivipati I gave his daughter, Kundavai, in marriage to Bana Vikramaditya I.¹ This matrimonial alliance must have indeed weakened the main dynasty of the W. Gaʃgas for it strengthened their foes, the Banašas. The Pallavas gained a good friend in Pṛithivipati I.

Poʃal Chora Noʃamba was succeeded by his ambitious son Mahendra. A hero-stone at Jodi-Dalasigere² describes Mahendra as ruling over the Gaʃga Six-thousand.³ This record is assigned to A. D. 870. If this date should turn out to be correct, it would be the earliest record of Mahendra. It is known from this record that when Mahendra came to power, he wrested the Gaʃga Six-thousand from Bana Vikramaditya I. Another undated inscription⁴ from Modugala-palle (Punganur taluk) refers to the raid on Pulinaʃu by an unnamed Noʃamba king under the orders of Kṣunguniaraśar and the capture of Kṣyārur (i.e., Modern Laddigam, Punganur taluk). It is possible that the Noʃamba king and Kṣunguniaraśar of this inscription are identical respectively with Mahendra and Rajaʃalla II.⁵ It is not known if this Noʃamba attack on Pulinaʃu was connected with the battle of Minuki, mentioned above.

Two inscriptions of Pallava Nripatuṅga⁶ dated in his 26th year (c. A. D. 875) found at Āmbūr (Vellore taluk,

⁴. 318 of 1912.
⁵. Contra paragraph 16 of M. E. R. 1913.
N. Arcot district) mention a Nojamba cattle-raid on Āmaiyr; and the death of the son and the servant of Akalaṅkattuvārar who was a servant of Pirudi Gaṅgarāyar. The frequent raids of the Nojambas on the Pallava empire finally led to a number of wars between the Nojambas and the Bānas.

The Vaidumbas who were in possession of Renāṇḍu and hostile to the Nojambas and the the Renāṇḍu Chōlas cast in their lot with the Bānas.¹ They were further supported by a W. Gaṅga king,² most probably Prithivipati I,³ Mayindaņji or Mahāndravikrama,⁴ a Telugu Chōla prince of Būdili⁵ allied with the Nojambas. The latter were supported by the W. Gaṅga King, Rājamalla II.⁶

The combatants met on different fronts such as Māndāvu,⁷ Mudumaṉuvu⁸ and Sōremaṭi or Sōramaṭi.⁹ Māndāvu may be identified with Mānde in the Penukonda taluk of the Anantapur district.¹⁰ Mudumaṉuvu has been identified with

---

1. 314 of 1922.
8. 314 of 1922.
Mudimaḍugu in the same taluk.¹ Sōremaṭi has been identified with Chōjemari in the same taluk.² The fight at Sōremaṭi appears to have been the final phase of the war which resulted in a great victory for the Bāṇas and the Vaidumbas.

There is a keen controversy among scholars in regard to the date and result of this battle. If we fix at least the approximate date of this war, we can easily solve the problem of identification of the kings and chiefs who took part in it.

Mr. R. S. Panchamukhi is of opinion that the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought in A. D. 885.³ This is untenable because the Noḷamba–W. Gaṅga alliance did not exist at that time. Noḷamba Mahēndra had turned against Rājamalla II even before A. D. 885.⁴

According to Mr. Venkataramayya,⁵ the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought about A. D. 825. This view is based on the following grounds:–

(1) Rāchamalla, mentioned in some inscriptions relating to the battle of Sōremaṭi, must be identified with Rājamalla I because there is no record of Rājamalla II wherein a Noḷamba figures as a subordinate or ally. Noḷamba Mahēndra turned against Rājamalla even before A. D. 878.

(2) The matrimonial alliance between the Bāṇas and the collateral line of the W. Gaṅgas must have taken place in the first half of the 9th century for Pṛithivipati I belonged to that period.

---

4. See 348 of 1901.
(3) Kē-Vijaya Narasimhavikramavarnaṇ of the Baṅga-vāḍi inscription (which mentions certain combatants of the battle) must be assigned on palaeographical grounds to the first half of the 9th century.

Let us now examine these grounds in some detail. The earliest known date of the Noḷambas coming into hostile contact with the main line of the W. Gaṅgas, as cited by Mr. M. Venkataramayya himself,¹ is A. D. 892–3.² Dr. T. V. Mahalingam says that Mahāndra began his life as a feudatory of the W. Gaṅgas.³ We have already seen an inscription of Mahāndra⁴ describing him as ruler of Gaṅga Six-thousand. The possibility of the inscription being assignable to A. D. 870 strengthens Dr. Mahalingam’s view. It is improbable that Rājamalla II (A. D. 870–907) was not from the beginning of his reign on good terms with the Noḷambas. In other words, the possibility of the Noḷamba–W. Gaṅga alliance being in existence in the first decade of the reign of Rājamalla II cannot be denied. We have no evidence for supposing that Rājamalla I fought with Pṛithivīpati I. On the other hand, there is the possibility of the latter co-operating with the former in the wars against the Rāshtrakūtas. Thus Rāchamalla of the Sēremaṭī battle is in all probability Rājamalla II and not Rājamalla I (A. D. 817–853).

That Pṛithivīpati I was alive till the famous battle of Śrīpuṟambyam (c A. D. 880) shows that his reign belonged rather to the second half than to the first half of the 9th century A. D. This does not militate against the fact that he was a contemporary of Rāshtrakūta Amśghavarsha

1. Ibid. p. 198.
2. E. C. Vol. II. Nj. 139.
(A. D. 814–878) and is in harmony with the date we have given for Bāṇa Vikramāditya I (c. A. D. 843–892). It is, therefore, very probable that the alliance between Prīthivīpati I and Bāṇa Vikramaditya I took place in the early years of the second half of the 9th century. As regards the third point viz., the date of Kṛ- Vijaya-Narasimhavikramavarmaṇa it may be pointed out that the conclusions of Mr. C. R. Krishnamacharlu are solely based on vague scriptal considerations and have not been confirmed by any other evidence.

Thus these grounds are not so solid as Mr. Venkataramayya believes, for supposing that the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought about A. D. 825. Nor do the Maṇre plates of Rājamalla I (Saka 750) which Mr. Venkataramayya cites in support of his view, throw any light on this battle. The enemies of Rājamaulla, referred to in the plates were probably the Rāṣṭra-kūtas. The plates do not make any allusion either to the Bāṇas or to the Vaidumbas. The record is silent on the battle of Sōremaṭi. The fact of the matter is that the battle did not take place about A. D. 825. Dr. T. V. Mahalingam accepts this date with reluctance and owns that this conclusion is "based largely on indirect and circumstantial evidence."

Robert Sewell dates this battle at about A. D. 877–78 and states that Noṇamba–W. Gaṅga allies were vanquished by the Bāṇas and the Vaidumbas. This view is supported by Prof. R. Sathianathair. Sewell based his view mainly on the fact that in A. D. 878–79 Noṇamba Mahāndra occupied the

5. The Age of Imperial Kanauj. p. 162.
Tagaḍūr region which was far away from his own country and subsequently went to war with Rājamalla II. There are some other important facts which point to the same conclusion. The identification of Rāchamalla of the Sōremaṭi battle with Rājamalla II (A. D. 870–907) makes it certain that the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought in the first decade of his reign. This is to some extent corroborated by the date of Mahēndravikrama Chōja. According to Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, Mahēndravikrama Chōja who took part in the battle of Sōremaṭi must be assigned to a period slightly later than that of Śrikanṭha who appears to have begun his reign in c. A. D. 850.\(^1\) This is in consonance with the probable period of Bāṇa–W. Gaṅga alliance (c. A. D. 855–880) which synchronized with that of the rise of the Vaidumbas. Therefore the most probable date of the battle of Sōremaṭi is A. D. 877–78. Sewell’s view regarding the result of this battle is correct. The silence of the W. Gaṅga and Noṭamba records on the battle of Sōremaṭi points to the triumph of the Bāṇas and the Vaidumbas.\(^2\) One of the Vaidumba inscriptions\(^3\) seems to confirm this conclusion.

The split in the Noṭamba–W. Gaṅga alliance appears to have originated in their defeat at Sōremaṭi and was developed by the aggressiveness of Nolamba Mahēndra. It is not known whether his phenomenal triumph subsequent to that battle synchronized with Eastern Chālukya Vijayaditya III’s (A. D. 848–92) invasion of Gaṅgavādi. Rājamalla II’s attempt to check Mahēndra I’s military progress in the south is clear

---


from the Kaṭakattūr record. While Mahāndra was marching towards Talkad, his generals, Kaḍuveṭṭi and Mrīḍuva invaded the Bāṇa country and destroyed Permāvi which belonged to the Bāṇas. But before long, Virachūjamani, the son of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I, triumphed over them. The hostilities between the Bāṇas and the Noḷambas continued for a long time as some inscriptions indicate. Thus the north-western frontier of the Pallava empire was for a long time ably defended by the Bāṇas from powerful enemies and this saved the Pallavas from the trouble of fighting on two fronts.

It appears that some years after the battle of Śripuṭamambi (c. A.D. 880), the Bāṇas became independent. A Bāṇa inscription from Tiruvallam (N. Arcot dist.) dated Saka 810 (A. D. 888), mentions no overlord. Some records of Vikramāditya I Vidyādhara, which are dated in his regnal years, probably belong to this period of Bāṇa independence. The records of his son, Vijayāditya II are dated in Saka era, and mention no overlord, thus pointing to the same conclusion. The independence of the Bāṇas about A. D. 888 must have been a serious blow to the declining Pallava power, for the

2. The revised edition of the same record gives a different version of the events. A certain Mahārāja probably a Chōla, and not Noḷamba Mahāndra as H. Krishna Sastri said (paragraph 15 of M. E. R. 1913) was ordered by the Gaṅga king to attack Pulināḍu.
4. S. I. I. Vol. III. No. 44.
6. (e. g.) E. I. Vol. XI. p. 227.
Bañas were nearer to the seat of Pallava government than any other major feudatory powers. It is not known if the Báñas took part in Āditya I’s war with Aparājita. The silence of the records of Āditya I on the Báñas may be taken to indicate the continuance of their independence.

To sum up, the strategic position of Perumbñappādi enabled the Báñas to play an important part in the foreign affairs of the Pallava empire. The conciliatory policy of the Pallavas towards Mayūrasarma and the rise of the early W. Gaṅgas under Pallava supremacy were largely influenced by the hostile attitude of the Báñas towards the Pallavas. The initial success of the W. Chaḷukya invasions of the Pallava empire and the temporary weakening of the Pallava hold on Chōja country in the time of Dantivarman must be viewed in the light of Báña subordination to the W. Chaḷukyas and the Rashtrakūtas. The independence of the Báñas a few years before Aparājita’s fall facilitated Āditya I’s conquest of Tondaimandalam and thus contributed, though in some measure, to the collapse of the Pallava power.

But the services of the Báñas to the Pallava empire cannot be overlooked. They had rendered remarkable assistance to the Pallavas in checking the frequent W. Gaṅga and Noḷamba inroads into the Pallava empire and had borne a conspicuous part in the frontier wars thus relieving the Pallavas of the difficulty of fighting on two distant fronts. The Báñas were perhaps instrumental in bringing the collateral line of the W. Gaṅgas into intimate contact with the Pallavas. The triumph at Sōremaṭi of the Báñas and their ally, Prithivi-pati I, weakened the main line of the W. Gaṅgas and, to some extent, the Noḷambas and contributed to their mutual hostility. If the Báñas and their allies had been defeated in the battle of Sōremaṭi, it would have indeed brought the Pallavas into a serious danger. So far about the political role of the Báñas,
We shall now deal with their administrative and cultural services.

**Feudatory Status:**

The Bānas, like other feudatories of their times, dated their inscriptions in the regnal years of their Pallava overlords, and sometimes assumed the names of their sovereigns. They were hereditary rulers having a status higher than that of a governor. They had the right of waging wars with other chiefs and collected certain taxes.\(^1\) In brief, they were quasi-independent and this status had much to do with their role-political and cultural, in Pallava history.

**Administration:**

The Tamil area of Perumbāṇappādi, like other parts of the Pallava empire, was divided into Kōṭṭams, and Kōṭṭams into nāḍus, and each nādu contained several villages. It is not definitely known whether Vaṅgavaiya 12000 refers to 12000 villages or revenue units, though Bāna Malladēva’s Muliyanūr grant\(^2\) refers to his country containing 12000 villages in the Āndhra maṇḍala. The Bānas maintained harmonious relations with the village assemblies and promoted their growth.\(^3\)

**Military Tradition:**

Like the ancient Tamils, the Bānas also honoured their warriors who died in battles and cattle-raids by erecting Vīrakkal (i.e. hero-stone) and by granting lands. A number of Bāna inscriptions from the Chittoor district and Mysore state\(^4\)

---

1. 188 of 1937–38.
mention kalnaḍu or grant of land to the families of dead heroes, and in one case the whole village of Minuki was gifted away to a hero who distinguished himself in a battle at that place during the rule of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I. In some Bāṇa inscriptions the gift of land is referred to as bāḷgaśchū which means sword-washing. It seems that lands were gifted away with the washing of the deceased man’s sword. It was also known as Raktakoṇa. The place of the death of a hero was usually marked by a stone which was called Virakkal. The name and deeds of dead heroes were engraved on such stones.

It appears that these practices of honouring dead warriors were not widely prevalent in the Pallava empire. “In fact, we have no epigraphical proof of the setting up of a Virakkal before the time of Dantivarman. These Virakkals are restricted in their provenance, being confined to the North Arcot and Chingleput districts and the disturbance seems to have come from the side of the Noḷambas and the W. Gaṅgas.” In this connection, it is worthy of note that the Bāṇas were closely connected with some of the districts mentioned above.

Cattle-raid was another important feature of Bāṇa military tradition. “It is not known if cattle lifting was one of the reasons for the outbreak of hostilities or it was

1. 571 of 1906.
5. Dr. C. Minakshi — Administration and Social life under the Pallavas. p. 164.
6. Ibid. p. 166.
symbolical of the declaration of war by the aggressor and was the first phase of the war. 11

**Constructive Work:**

A few inscriptions contain references to the constructive work done by the Bāna chiefs and their subordinates. A Bāna inscription from Guḍimallam 3 dated in the 49th year of Dantivarman records a grant of land for making some repairs to a tank called Veḷḷēri. A Grantha-Tamil inscription of Vijayanandivikramavarman 3 dated in his 21st year and found on a slab in front of the Kapileswara temple at Avilāla (Chandragiri taluk, Chittoor district) records a gift of the taxes, Kallāṅakkāṇam and Viḍanāḷi leviable from the village, by Vikramāditya Mahabali Vānarāya, for the maintenance of the tank at Avilāli.4 A third inscription from Maṅampūṇḍi in the Tirukkoyilur taluk records that Anikovan Orriyurarpiratti, daughter of Viladaraya and wife of the chief Vairamaga Vāpakōvaraiyar excavated the irrigation tank at Nichchavinītamaṅgalam and provided a sluice for it. 5 It is not known whether Nichchavinītamaṅgalam is identical with Maṅampūṇḍi or not. It is possible that the tank Bāṇa-śamudram near Vallam (N. Arcot district) was excavated by the Bāṇas.6

**Jainism:**

We have already noted the existence of a Digambara Jain monastery at Pāṭaliputtiram (Cuddalore N. T., S. Arcot

3. 188 of 1937–38.
4. Kallāṅakkāṇam is tax on marriage; Viḍanāḷi also must be a tax.
5. 233 of 1934–35.
district) which was then situated in the Pāñcarāṣṭra. The Lōkavibhāga which deals with Jain cosmography was written in Sanskrit by Simhasūri who was well-versed in Prākrit as well. The work was copied in A.D 458 by Saravānandi who was proficient in Sanskrit and Prākrit and who was a contemporary of Pallava Simhavarman II.1 That the Digambara Jain monastery at Pātaliputtirām flourished till at least the reconversion of Appar to Śaivism in the 7th century is clear from the Periyaapurāṇam.

Vaḻḻimalai, near Tiruvallam (N. Arcot district), appears to have been an important place for the Jains.2 An inscription from that village3 refers to a certain Dēvasēna, the pupil of Bhavanandi, who was the spiritual preceptor of a certain Bāñcarāya. The date of this Bāñcarāya is not known. The image of Dēvasēna was perhaps founded by Ajjanandi, a well-known Jain preceptor who founded in the same place the images of some other Jain preceptors4 and who figures in some inscriptions from the Madura district.5

Hēlācārya (or Elācārya) who lived in the interval between the sixth and ninth centuries A. D. was a native of Ponṉar, a Jain village in the North Arcot district.6 He was a famous Jain preceptor and had many pupils, male and female. He was the inculcator of the Jvalamaliṇi cult of the Goddess of fire which was later expounded and spread by Indranandi-Yōgindra who flourished in the days of Rāṣṭrakūta Krishna III (A.D. 939-967).

3. Ibid: Ins. c: No. 6. of 1895.
4. Ibid.
Saivism:

The Bānas who traced their descent to Mahābali were the ardent votaries of Śaivism, though a few professed Jainism. The Parasurāmēśvara temple at Gudimallam (N. Arcot district) and the Bilvanāthēśvara temple at Tiruvallam (the same district) figure prominently in Bāna inscriptions. A Bāna inscription from Gudimallam dated in the 23rd year of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla records a gift of land for a lamp to burn in the Parasurāmēśvara temple at Tiruvippirambēdu i.e., Gudimallam. Another Bāna inscription from Tiruvallam dated in the 62nd year of the same king registers a gift of land to the temple at Vānapuram i.e., Tiruvallam. The Nandi plates of Gōvinda III record the grant, made at the request of Mahābali Bānarāya Śriparma (i.e., Bāna Vijayaḍitya I), of a village to the Śiva temple at Nandi while Īśvaradāsa was the head of the māṭha on the Nandi hill. The Chik-Ballapur plates of Jayateja dated in the 17th year of the same Rāṣṭhrakūṭa king state that when Īśvaradāsa, the chief disciple of the Kālamukha guru Kālasakti, was head of the māṭha in the temple on the Nandi hill, Ratnāvāji, the beloved queen of Bāna Vidyādhara (i.e., Bāna Vijayaḍitya I) made a gift of land to that temple which was constructed by herself. It is thus clear that the Bhōganandēśvara temple was constructed by and named after the Bāna queen Ratnāvāji, also known as Mānikkabbe, sometime before A. D. 806. The Kālamukhas were held in high esteem by the Bānas and the two inscriptions mentioned above refer to a Kālamukha māṭha in the Śiva temple on the Nandi hill.

A copy of an inscription of Nandivarman II dated in his 17th year and found in the Bilvanathesvara temple at Tiruvallam states that in accordance with the request of Bāna Vikramāditya I, the three villages of Aimbāṇi, Viḷattūr and Amarunimaṅgalam were granted to the Śiva temple at Tikkāli-Vallam i. e., Tiruvallam and the villages were clubbed together into one and was named Viḷelviduga-Vikramāditya-Chaturvēdi-maṅgalam. The provisions of the grant are interesting and deserve to be quoted in extenso. “The members of the assembly of this Viḷelvidugu-Vikramāditya-Chaturvēdi-maṅgalam shall have to pay two thousand kāṭi of paddy and twenty kaḷaṇju of gold which were being paid before by this Amarunimaṅgalam to this (temple of) Paramāśvara at Tikkāli-vallam. Of this paddy, six hundred kāṭi of paddy (are allotted) for offerings; five hundred kāṭi of paddy to the Śiva-Brāhmaṇas who desire to be fed, beginning with those in charge of the store-room of the temple; five hundred kāṭi of paddy to those who beat (drums before) oblations; four hundred kāṭi of paddy to those who perform various (other) services, including the singers of the Tiruppadiyam; and twenty kaḷaṇju of gold for the perpetual lamps, bark for anointing the idol and for repairing breaks and cracks, etc. It is very interesting to note the mention made here of persons who had to sing the Tiruppadiyam i. e., the Dēvāram in the temple. This is the earliest known epigraphical reference to the Dēvāram which was considered as a holy book even in the 9th century. Bāna Vikramāditya I’s queen, Kundavai made many gifts to the Śiva temple at Tiruvallam. An inscription of Vijayāditya II, son of Vikramāditya I,

1. S. I. I. Vol. III. No. 43.
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dated Saka 820 (A. D. 898) records the gift of his mother to the Śiva temple at Guḍimallam. Besides these, there are a number of other inscriptions mentioning the benefactions to several Śiva temples, of some individuals and subordinates of the Bāṇas. A Bāṇa inscription from Pudupatla (Punganur taluk) refers to a certain Jayanaṅgaṇḍa who walked into the sacred fire on the day of winter solstice and died.

In short, the Bāṇas did much for the growth of Śaivism and in some respects anticipated the religious policy of the Greater Chōjas. Their enlightened attitude towards other religions is worthy of note. The Bāṇas patronised learning by gifting away lands and villages to learned men.

*Architecture and Sculpture:*

The Chik-Ballapur plates of Jayatēja (A. D. 810) state that the Bhōganandī temple at Nandi (Kolar district) was constructed by Ratnāvaṇji, the beloved queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhara (Bāṇa Vijayāditya I). The same temple is referred to in the Nandi plates (A. D. 806) of Rāshtrakūta Gōvinda III. Therefore the temple must have been erected sometime before A. D. 806. Additions to the temple were made by the Chōjas, the Hoysalas, the Vijayanagar rulers and the Paḷlegars. The oldest part of the temple is undoubtedly the

1. *E. I. Vol. XI.* pp. 227 & 228 Ins. D.
Bhōganandīśvara shrine. “It consists of a garbhagriha, sukhanasi and a navaranga carved with small figures and two pierced windows opposite to each other and a ceiling decorated with ashtadikpalakas in their proper directions with Siva and Parvati in the central panel. The outer walls have pilasters and turrets, a frieze of large images representing the marriage of Siva and Parvati, with a smaller frieze of swans above, and conspicuously, two pierced windows which, unlike the perforated windows of other temples, have fine figures of Dakshinamurti, with holes in the interspaces to admit light.”1 In short, the Bhōganandīśvara shrine at Nandi is regarded as “the finest and the most ornate of the Dravidian temples in the province.”

The navaraṅga of this shrine deserves special mention. The four pillars of the navaraṅga are well ornamented in low relief. “The figures on the north-east pillar are particularly interesting, some of the panels illustrating the story of Bali and Vamana. The central ceiling of the navaraṅga contains nine panels with Umāmahēśvara seated in the centre and Dikpālas on their vehicles around. These figures have lithe body, graceful poise and dignified bearing characteristic of Pallava sculptures.”2 The Pallava architectural and sculptural influences that many temples in the Mysore State reveal to us, may be accounted for in some measure with reference to the temple at Nandi.

---

A NOTE ON THE HABITAT OF THE BĀNAS
(c. A. D. 350 – c. 900):

The most interesting dynastic drift in South Indian History is that of the Bānas. In a sense their history from the 4th century onwards till their merger with the Tamil population in the Pāṇḍya country in the 17th century is the history of their drift. So far as our evidence goes, their earliest known home appears to have been somewhere in the forest region of the Kolar district. We have already seen that an inscription of Avanīṭa,¹ describes Koṅgaṇivarmaṇa as “a wild fire in consuming the stubble of the forest Bāna, and that the Udayēndiram plates of Prithivīpati II² refer to the consecration of Koṅgaṇivarmaṇa by a Pallava king for the purpose of conquering the Bānāmaṇḍala. Since the testimony of the Udayēndiram plates has not been confirmed by any contemporary W. Gaṅga record, it cannot be utilized for our purpose with any certainty. With regard to the other evidence, it indicates Koṅgaṇivarmaṇa’s encounter with the Bānas. Seeing that in the middle of the 4th century the W. Gaṅgas could not have been so powerful as to attempt a distant conquest, we may very well conclude that in the time of Koṅgaṇivarmaṇa the Bāna territory must have been situated close to that of the W. Gaṅgas. The fact that the Bānas called themselves ‘Lords of Nandigiri’³ seems to indicate that their territory in the Kolar district must have comprised the region in and around the Nandi hill. Koṅgaṇivarmaṇa’s encounter with the Bānas must have resulted in the defeat of the latter. It was probably, on account of their defeat, the Bānas moved into the Kurnool district and settled in a region not far away.

from the Śriparvata hills (Srisailam). It must be noted that our view regarding the earliest known habitat of the Bāṇas is based on the probability that Mayūraśarman’s conflict with the Pallavas could not have preceded the foundation of the W. Gaṅga kingdom.

We know from the Tāḷāgūṇḍa inscription that Pallava rule was originally extended into the Ceded districts. As Mayūraśarman is stated in the record to have subjugated the Bāṇas after defeating the frontier guards of the Pallavas, it is certain, as we have stated above, that the Bāṇas were, at that time, ruling over a part of the Kurnool district. If, for argument’s sake, it is supposed that the Bāṇas continued to remain in the Kolar district throughout the 4th century A.D., it will be very difficult to explain how Maūraśarman, however powerful he might be, was able to conquer such a distant territory. Moreover, the Tāḷāgūṇḍa inscription does not warrant such a conclusion. Therefore our view that in the second half of the 4th century – before Mayūraśarman’s conflict with the Pallavas, the Bāṇas held sway over part of the Kurnool district cannot be ruled out.

It is very likely that some time after the cessation of hostilities between the Pallavas and Mayūraśarman, the Bāṇas left the Kurnool district and occupied the Paruvi vishaya which comprised a portion of the present Anantapur district. The exact date of this migration is not known, though there is possibility that it may have happened in the interval between c. A. D. 375 and c. 425. There is some indication that at the time when the Bāṇas were ruling over the Paruvi vishaya, they were in subordinate alliance with the Kadambas and hostile to the Pallavas. An inscription

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 239.
of Kākusthavarmaṇ shows that he received the support of the Bāṇas in his war with the Pallavas and Kekayas.¹ It was probably to crush the Bāṇas that the Pallava king Simhavarmaṇ I consecrated Harivarman, son of Mādhava II². That the Pallava king achieved his purpose is clear from the subsequent history of the Bāṇas. The Penukoṇḍa plates of Mādhava III make it clear that the Bāṇas were not in possession of the Paruvi vishaya and that the W. Gaṅgas held it.³ The identification of Pātalika mentioned in the Lōkavibhāga with Pāṭaliputtiram (Cuddalore N. T.) coupled with the fact that it was situated in the Pānarāṣṭra⁴ enables us to conclude that after their dislodgement from the Paruvi vishaya the Bāṇas must have settled in the South Arcot district. It is extremely doubtful whether Pānarāṣṭra mentioned in the Lōgavibhāga is identical with Perumbāṇappāḍi of later Bāṇa records.⁵ The subsequent history of the Bāṇas till they became subordinate to the W. Chāḷukyas is not clear. Yet it is quite possible that they continued to hold Pānarāṣṭra in subjection to the Pallavas.

From the middle of the 7th century onwards, we find the Bāṇas paying allegiance to W. Chāḷukya Pulikēsin II and his successors.⁶ During this period, the Bāṇas were ruling over portions of the Anantapur and Cuddapah districts.⁷ In the second quarter of the 8th century A. D., we find several Bāṇa chiefs figuring in the records not only of the W. Chāḷukya

2. The classical Age. p. 269.
7. Ibid.
kings but also of the W. Gaṅga, Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa and Pallava kings. Two inscriptions from Korrapādu (Jammalamadugu taluk, Cuddapah district) mention a Bāṇa feudatory of W. Chaḻukya Kīrtivarmabhū II. Another inscription from Čhāmalūru (Jammalamadugu taluk) refers to a Bāṇa chief who was a feudatory of the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa King, Pṛithivivallabha Vijayāditya (c. 750). An inscription of W. Gaṅga Śrīpurusha from Koṇḍrakahāḷḷi (Hoskote taluk, Bangalore district) mentions a Bāṇa chief. Another record of the same king from Huḷḷēnakahāḷḷi (Mandya district) mentions Diṇḍigalar who was of Bāṇa decent and who was the ruler of Kaḻbappunāḍu 1700. The Guḍimallam inscription of Nandivarmabhū II mentions his Bāṇa feudatory. These evidences unmistakably point out that there were several branches of the Bāṇa dynasty. But the main branch must be that which paid allegiance to Nandivarmabhū II.

We do not know the circumstances under which the main branch of the Bāṇas became subordinate to Nandivarmabhū II. The Bāṇa chief Jayanandivarmabhū and his successors are described as ruling over Vaḍugavaḷi mēṟku also called Vaḍugavaḷi Twelve Thousand. Vaḍugavaḷi means in Tamil the northern road and Vaḍugavaḷi mēṟku means the land to the west of the northern road. It is highly probable that there was in ancient times a road known as Vaḍugavaḷi connecting Kāṇchipuram and Nellore; and it was to the west of that road that the Bāṇa country was situated. But, for a clear understanding of the lay of the Bāṇa country in this
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period, we have to rely on the inscriptions of the Bāṇas. The existence of Bāṇa inscriptions in the western part of the Chittoor district, in the north-western part of the North Arcot district, in the eastern part of the Kolar district and in the north-eastern portion of the Salem district roughly indicates that these areas should have formed what was known as Perumbāṇappādi. Doubtless, the frontiers of the Bāṇa country must be at times varying.
II

THE MUTTARAIYARS (c. A. D. 650 – c. 860):

The Muttaraiyars were a line of powerful chiefs and were for a long time feudatory to the Pallavas, ruling over portions of the Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts and of the former Pudukkottai State. "The centre of their power was somewhere in the district of Tanjore. Šendalai, at present a small village near Tirukkāttupahāli, appears once to have been a flourishing town with the beautiful name Candralēkha, and either this place or Niṣamam in its neighbourhood was most probably the centre of Muttaraiya rule."1 As their territory lay between the Pāṇḍya and Pallava empires, they were involved in almost all the contests between the two powers. Their subordination was of great assistance to the Pallavas not only in their struggle against the Pāṇḍyas but also in holding the Čauḍās under subjection.

Perumbidugu Muttaraiyan alias Kuvāvan Maraṇ.
(c. A. D. 655 – c. 680):

The earliest known member of this feudatory dynasty was Perumbidugu Muttaraiyan alias Kuvāvan Maraṇ mentioned in one of the Šendalai pillar inscriptions.2 He was probably a contemporary of Pallava Paramēśvaravarma I. It is not unlikely that he established the Muttaraiya power over the Tanjore area. His role in the Pallava-Čauḍukya conflict in the Čauḍa country is not clear.

1. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - The Pandyan Kingdom p. 84. Also see the booklet 'Sendalai' by S. R. Balasubramaniyam.
Ilangoṭavadiyaraiyăn alias Māraṇ Paramēśvaraṇ.
(c. A.D. 680–c. 705)

Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyăn alias Māraṇ Paramēśvaraṇ was the son and successor of Kuvāvaṇ Māraṇ.¹ He was a probable contemporary of both Paramēśvaravarmaṇ I and his son, Narasimhavarmaṇ II. Šatapaṭṭi, a subordinate of Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyăn, constructed the original shrine of the Śiva temple at Nāṛttāmalai (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukottai State).²

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyăn II alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ
(c. A.D. 705–c. 745)

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyăn alias Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ was the son of Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyăn and a contemporary of Paramēśvaravarmaṇ II and his successor, Nandivarman II. He is very probably identical with Kāṭaka Muttariyar mentioned in one of the Vaikuntha Perumāḷ temple inscriptions³ in connection with the accession of Nandivarman II to the Pallava throne.⁴ Śuvaraṇ Māraṇ was thus a faithful subordinate ally of Nandivarman II from the beginning of his reign.

The Pāṇḍya support to Chitramāya, a rival claimant to the Pallava throne, led them to a war with Nandivarman II. The date and some other details of the war are not known. But it is clear that the war was a protracted one and in the earlier campaign, the Pallava army was worsted by the Pāṇḍya king Rājasimha I. The Sanskrit portion of the Vēḻvikkudi grant⁵ states that Pāṇḍya Rājasimha I defeated Pallavamalla who fled from the field of battle. The Tamil

¹. Ibid.
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⁴. The Classical Age p. 266.
portion of the same grant ascribes to the same Pāṇḍya king a series of victories at Neḍuvval, Kuṟumadai, Manikurichi, Tirumaṅgai, Pūvalur, Koḍumbālur, Kuḷumbur and Periyalur.¹ “There seems to be little room for doubt that here we get the Pāṇḍyan version of the campaigns which led to the siege of Nandivarman Pallavamalla in Nandigrama by the Tamil princes.”² It was probably during this period that W. Chāḻukya Vikramāditya II invaded Kāñchī with success.

While Nandivarman II was in such a predicament, his great general Udayachandra retrieved the fortunes of the Pallava empire. The siege of Nandigrama was raised; Pallavamalla was set free; the W. Chāḻukyas were driven away from Toppaimandalam. It was in the southern campaigns of Udayachandra that Ṣuvaraṅ Maṅgaṅ played a conspicuous part. His Sendalai records³ describe his triumph over the Pāṇḍyas and the Chēras at Koḍumbālur, Maṅalur, Tiṅgalur, Kāndaṅlur, Alundiyur, Kārai, Maṅgāṅ, Anṇalvāyil, Šempōrnāri, Veṅkodal (in Taṅjai-Sempulanādu), Pugaii and Kaṅnaṅur. But the Pāṇḍya records relating to this period are conspicuously silent on these battles. The Veṅvikkudī grant mentions only the battle of Koḍumbālur in which the Pāṇḍya king is said to have been victorious. The Sendalai records do not mention Udayachandra who had borne the leading part in the southern campaigns of Nandivarman II. Naturally, a doubt may arise as to the veracity of the claims of the Muttaraya chief. No doubt all the Sendalai records of Ṣuvaraṅ Maṅgaṅ, except a few, are poems composed by his court poets. Making due allowance for poetic exaggeration, we can state with certainty that the

martial exploits of Suvaranā Māraṇa described by his poets are not a figment of their imagination. As Suvaranā Māraṇa was the hero of these records, Udayachandra is not referred to in them. The success of Suvaranā Māraṇa over the Pāṇḍyas is attested by the omission in the Vēlvikkudi grant of the campaigns mentioned in the Sendalai records. The rapid recovery of Nandivarma II cannot but confirm this conclusion. There can, therefore, be no doubt about Suvaranā Māraṇa's victory in combating the Pāṇḍya aggression which was assisted by the Cheras and the Koḻumbālur chiefs.¹

Not only that. He seems to have recovered his lost territory in the Pudukkottai region as evidenced by his Kīḻukottai inscription (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) which mentions some of his well-known titles such as Satrubhāṣari, Kaḻavarkaḻvaṇa and Abhimāṇadhīraṇa.² A Vaṭṭeḻuttu inscription of (Pāṇḍya) Saḍaiyarmāṇa dated in his 21st (or 29th) year found in the Aḻagar temple at Sēvilipēri (Tinnevelly district) records a gift of sheep for a lamp to the temple of Niṟṟaruṅga Karumāṇikkadēvar at Teḻ-Tirumālirunjolai, a devadāna Kīḻaḻa-kūṟram by the queen of a certain Satrubhayaṅkara Muttaraiyaṇa.³ It is difficult to identify the Pāṇḍya king Saḍaiyarmāṇa. The Muttaraiya chief of the inscription has been identified with Perumbidugu Muttaraiyaṇa II alias

---
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Suvaraṇa Maraṇa. But the Sendalai records leave no doubt as to the latter's subordination to the Pallavas and hostility to the Pāṇḍyas. Further, there is no evidence that Perumbiṣṇug Muttaraiya II carried his arms as far as Seviliperi in the Tinnevelly district. Therefore the identification is highly improbable.

As regards the places where Suvaraṇa Maraṇa gained victories, Koḍumbāḷur (also called Koḍumbai) Anṉalvāyil, Kārai, Kāndalūr and Śempongārā are situated in the former Pudukkottai state. Tiṅgaḷur and Maṇalūr have been identified with the villages of those names in the Tanjore district. Kaṇḍalūr has been identified with Śamayavaram in the Trichinopoly taluk. Pūgaḷi may be identified with Pūgaḷiyūr in the Karur taluk of the Trichinopoly district. Maṅgaḷūr may be identified with Maruṅgūr in the Nannilam taluk of the Tanjore district. Aḻundiyūr may be identified with Adaṅjiyūr in the Tanjore taluk. We are unable to identify 'Veṅkaṭal in Taṅjai-Sembulanādu.'

Suvaraṇa Maraṇa had several surnames such as Satrukaśari, Abhimanaḍhirāṇa, Kaḻvarkalavaṇa, Atisahasāṇa, Śrī Tamaraḷayaṇa, Neḍumaraṇa, Veḻ-Maraṇa, Lord of Taṅjai and Lord of Vallam.

5. Ibid.
In brief Suvara\n Māra\n had a great share in stabilizing the rule of Nandivarman\n II and in safeguarding his empire from powerful enemies such as the Pāṇḍyas and the Chēras.

Viḍēlviḍugu Viḷuppēradi-Araiṣa\n alias Sāta\n Māra\n (c. A. D. 745 - c. 770):

Viḍēlviḍugu Viḷuppēradi - Araiṣa\n alias Sāta\n Māra\n may be treated as the immediate successor of Suvara\n Māra\n His mother Perumbiḍugu Perundēvi has been identified with the queen of Suvara\n Māra\n. So we may regard him as the probable son of Suvara\n Māra\n. Moreover, his assumption of the title, Viḍēlviḍugu which was borne by Nandivarman\n II makes him a contemporary of the latter, thus strengthening the probability.

During the period of this Muttaraiya chief the Pāṇḍya king Ne đuñjaḍaiya\n alias Parāntaka conquered the Chōja country, defeating the Pallava army at Peñāgaḍam near Tanjore. The role of the Muttaraiyars in this war is not known. It is, however, clear that their territory was for some time under the Pāṇḍyas. We do not know whether the Tirumayyam inscription\n of this chief belongs to the earlier or latter part of his reign.

1. 402 of 1906; C. L. I. P. S. No. 13.
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Mārppidugu alias Pėradiaraiyaṇ (c. A. D. 770 – c. 791):

The successor of Śatataṇḍ Māraṇ was Mārppidugu Pėradiyaraiyaṇ, a contemporary of Pallava Dantivarman. Though the two chiefs are mentioned in the Tiruvelḷāraï inscription, their relationship is not clear. The rapid but transitory recovery of the Pallavas, perhaps assisted by their Muttaraiya ally, from Pāṇḍya invasion is attested by the existence of an inscription at Kuṇḍāṅḍarkōvil, which is dated in the 5th year of Dantivarman and which mentions Mārppidugu Pėradiyaraiyaṇ. This must have happened either in the beginning of the reign of this chief or towards the close of the reign of his predecessor.

The period of Mārppidugu Pėradiyaraiyaṇ witnessed Pāṇḍya Neduṇjaṇaṇ’s second invasion of the Chōla country resulting in his triumph at Āyiravēli, Ayirūr and Pugaljiyūr over the Āḍigamaṇ of Koṅgu country who was aided by the Pallava and Kēraḷa rulers. As a result, the Pallavas lost the Kāvērī region. This is clear from the fact that no inscription of Dantivarman dated after his 16th year is to be found in that region. The part played by the Muttaraiyars in this war is not known. It is certain that the Mārppidugu-ēri (ēri=tank) of Ālambakkam and the Mārppidugu Perunţiyanū of Tiruvelḷāraï came into existence during the rule of this Muttaraiya chief. The history of the Muttaraiyars after this period is not sufficiently clear.

2. I. A. Vol. XXII. p. 73.
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Vidēlvidugu Muttaraiyan alias Kuvāvan Śāttan (c A. D. 791 – c. 826):

It appears that Mārppidugu Pāradiyaraiyaṉ was succeeded by Vidēlvidugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Kuvāvan Śāttan. The Malaiyaṭipatta inscription of Pallava Dantivarmanṉ dated in his 16th year mentions this chief. He is probably identical with the Vidēlvidugu Muttaraiyaṉ mentioned in the Sendalai inscription of Mārāṇjaḍaiyaṉ dated in his 10th year.² If this identification is correct, it will indicate the subordination of this chief to the Pāṇḍya. This change in Muttaraiya policy must have taken place a few years after the 16th regnal year (c. 791 A. D.) of Pallava Dantivarmanṉ.

It seems that the Pāṇḍya occupation of the Kāveri region was of short duration and was followed by Muttaraiya independence. Some inscriptions from the Tanjore district and Kulattur taluk (former Pudukkottai State) are dated in the regnal years of a certain Ilaṅgō Muttaraiyar.³ He seems to have been independent for at least eighteen years.⁴ He must be assigned to a period before the beginning of the reign of Srīmāra Śrīvallabha (c. A. D. 835 – 862) for the Pallava–Pāṇḍya wars in the Chōla country during and after the reign of Srīmāra precludes the possibility of the Muttaraiyars being independent there.

Our next problem is the identification of Ilaṅgō Muttaraiyar. It is suggested that Ilaṅgō Muttaraiyar is

---
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identical with Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyar II alias Suvaraḥ Māraḥ, son of Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraṇāyaḥ alias Māraḥ Paramēśvaraḥ. This is mainly based on the view that the name Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar would mean Muttaraiyar who was the son of Iḷaṅgō, and that Iḷaṅgovadiyaraiyan, the first name of his father, might have been abbreviated into Iḷaṅgō when it had to be prefixed to his own name. But the Śendalai records of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyar II alias Suvaraḥ Māraḥ do not mention the name Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar. Further, the Pallava-Pāṇḍya wars in the first half of the 8th century, to which we have assigned this Muttaraiya chief, set aside the possibility of any small power like the Muttaraiyars being independent in the Chāla country. Moreover, we know that the Pīḷāri temple at Niyamam was constructed by Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyar II alias Suvaraḥ Māraḥ. An inscription of Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar from Śendalai records a gift to the same temple, but makes no reference to its construction by Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar. If he were its real builder, he would have been certainly so mentioned in the inscription. It is, therefore, clear that this identification suggested by the Government Epigraphist is quite unsatisfactory.

It is not possible to identify Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar with Sāṭṭaḥ Pāḷiyili, son of Viḍēḷviḍugu Muttaraiyaḥ alias Kuvāvaḥ Sāṭṭaḥ, because Sāṭṭaḥ Pāḷiyili was a contemporary of Pallava Nandivarman III and none of the records of Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar mentions the name Sāṭṭaḥ Pāḷiyili. Considering all these facts, we may provisionally identify Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar with Viḍēḷviḍugu Muttaraiyan alias Kuvāvaḥ Sāṭṭaḥ.

3. 12 of 1899.
Sāttān Paļiyili (c. A. D. 826 - c. 851).

Sāttān Paļiyili was the son and successor of Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiya alias Kuvāva Sāttān. We do not have any record of this chief. The Kuṇṇāndarkōvil inscription (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukottai State) which is assigned to Nandivarman III indicates not only the end of Muttaraiya independence but also the re-establishment of Pallava supremacy in that area in or before the third year of the reign of that king. The Nārttāmalai inscription of Nṛiapatunga dated in his 7th year (c. A. D. 856) refers to a rock-cut temple excavated by Sāttān Paļiyili, son of Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiya. But the inscription does not give any title of Sāttān Paļiyili. This is significant because almost all his predecessors had borne such titles as Perumbiḍugu, Viḍēlviḍugu and Maṛppiḍugu indicating their subordination to the Pallavas. Moreover the conquest of Tanjore by the Chōla king Vijayalaya falls, according to our schemes of Muttaraiya genealogy and chronology, within the reign of Sāttān Paļiyili. It is therefore reasonable to doubt whether Sāttān Paļiyili was feudatory to the Pallavas. It seems quite probable that Sāttān Paļiyili began his reign as a feudatory of the Pallavas, and after the battle of Kuḍamūkku (i.e., Kumbakonam), paid his allegiance to the Pāṇḍya king, Śrīmaṭa Śrīvallabha (c. A. D. 835–862). The probability is strengthened by the fact that the Pallavas kept quiet when their Chōla feudatory, Vijayalaya, took Tanjore from the Muttaraiyars. The role of this Muttaraiya chief in the battles of Teḷḷāku and Kuḍa-mūkku is not clear.

Our knowledge of the immediate successors of Śattana Paṭiyili is very limited. An inscription from Naṛttāmalai dated in the 7th year of Nṛipatuṅga vikramavarma mentions Śattana Paṭiyili’s daughter and her husband. The inscription shows that Nṛipatuṅgavarma reasserted the Pallava supremacy over the Pudukkottai region some years after the battle of Kuḍamūkku or just after the battle of Arichit. As a result, the Muttaraiyars changed their allegiance again to the Pallavas. How long then they were feudatory to the Pallavas is not known. There is no evidence literary or epigraphical that can throw any light on the Muttaraiyars in the last quarter of the 9th century. Nevertheless, the gradual extension of Chōja influence into the Pudukkottai region as evidenced by the name of the Śiva temple at Naṛttāmalai, Vijayālaya Chōliśvaram, and by the matrimonial alliance between the Koḍumbāḷur chiefs and Āditya I and the speedy decline of the imperial power of the Pāṇḍyas after the battle of Sripurambiyam make it highly probable that the Muttaraiyars submitted to the growing power of the Chōjas.

In fine, the great eclipse of the Chōja power after the Kaḷabhara interregnum and the long Chōja subordination to the Pallavas must be explained with particular reference to the Muttaraiya rule over portions of the Chōja country. In other words, the Muttaraiyars were a formidable obstacle to the rise of the Chōjas. The removal of that obstacle in the middle of the 9th century ushered in an era of Chōja expansion. As long as the Muttaraiyars occupied a part of

2. For a different reading of the inscription see C. L. I. P. S. No. 19.
the Kāvēri region, the Pallavas had no serious trouble from the Chōlas of the Tamil country. But, when the Muttaraiyars were dispossessed of it, the most fateful danger to the Pallava empire came from the Chōlas.

Moreover, the Muttaraiya occupation of the borderland between the Pallava and Pāṇḍya empires was of great help to the Pallavas in combating the incursions of the Pāṇḍyas who were often assisted by the Chāras and the Koḻumbalūr chiefs. We have already noted the great services of Perumbidugu Muttaraiyān II alias Śuvaraṇa Māṟaṇa to the Pallava empire. It must be noted here that we do not have sufficient evidence to understand the role of other Muttaraiya chiefs in the long struggle between the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallavas.

We have some evidence testifying to the occasional Pāṇḍya-Muttaraiya alliances, and perhaps one such alliance paved the way for the conquest of Tanjore by Vijayālaya. These alliances would have often weakened the Pallava hold on the Chōla country.

Feudatory Status:

The Muttaraiyars dated their inscriptions in the regnal years of their Pallava overlords and assumed the names and titles of the Pallava emperors. Thus, for instance, Iļaṅgōvadiyaraiyaṇa, the father of Perumbidugu Muttaraiyaṇ II, was also known as Paramēśvaraṇa. As regards the titles Perumbidugu, Viḍēlviḍugu and Mārppidugu, these were borne by Pallava emperors¹ and were, as we have seen, assumed by their

Muttaraiya vassals. It must be noted that some Muttaraiya records, for example, the Sendalai records of Perumbidugu Muttaraiya II and the Tirumayam inscription of Virgelvidugu Vitudradi Araiyan are not dated in the regnal years of the Pallava emperors. But there is no doubt about the subordination to the Pallavas of the two Muttaraiya chiefs mentioned above, for their records mention their Pallava titles – a clear indication of subordination. Therefore this procedure appears to have been a privilege of powerful feudatories. The Muttaraiyars also fostered the village assemblies of their territory, and, like the Banas, enjoyed a large measure of independence.

Constructive Work:

Some inscriptions throw light on the constructive work done by the Muttaraiyars. The Marppidugu Perungiaru at Tiruvellai was constructed by Kamba Araiyan in the fifth year of Pallavan Dantivarman. Kamba Araiyan was probably a subordinate of Marppidugu Peradiyaraiyan. The

---

1. Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar says that “there are not sufficient grounds at present to decide whether the Pallavas borrowed these titles from the Muttaraiyars or lent the same to the latter” (E. I. Vol XIII. p. 136). But the close resemblance between these titles and Pagapidugu, one of the surnames of Mahendravarman I, of which Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar himself is aware, supports the latter probability.


5. According to Dr. C. Minakshi, Kamban Araiyan “was either a subject of the Muttaraiyar or a member of the Muttaraiyar family itself.” Administration and Social
Great Well was probably named after the latter. "The shape of the well is that of a Svastika with four entrances and hence the present name 'nālumūlaikkērī'... The size of the well suggests that it was used both for supplying water to the temple and for irrigating the devadāna lands near it." A Chōla inscription from Ālambākkam (Lalgudi taluk, Trichinopoly district) refers to a tank called Māṛppiṭugērī. This tank also must have come into existence during the period of the same Muttaraiya chief, and was probably named after him. An inscription of Pallava Dantivarmaṇ from Kuṇḍān-dārkōvil (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) dated in his fifth year records that Vāḻivaḍugāṇ alias Kalimūrka Iļavaraīyaṇ, a subordinate of Māṛppiṭugu Pēradiyaraīyaṇ, excavated a tank called Vāḷiērī. It is difficult to identify the tank. An undated inscription from Nārttāmalai (Kulattur taluk) records the construction of a sluice by Tamiḻadiyaraiyaṇ alias Mallaṇ Viḍamaṇ for the tank called Aṇinadhaērī. The Rāśalipāṭṭī inscription of Nandivarmaṇ II dated in his twentyfifth year states that Pullaya Kaṅdambaṇ, son of Āritham Pullaṇ, constructed a Kaṅkumīṇi (sluice or aqueduct)

*LIFE UNDER THE PALLAVAS. P. 101). The word Araiyaṇ means something more than an ordinary subject. It denotes, for example, a subordinate with or without official status. The names of Kambaṇ Araiyaṇ and his brother Vijayanallāyan are not like those of the Muttaraiyars. Therefore Kambaṇ Araiyaṇ could not be a member of the Muttaraiya family.

2. 712 of 1909; *S. I. I. Vol. XIII* No. 222.
4. *C. L. I. P. S. No. 17.*
for a tank. Dr. C. Minakshi is inclined to take Kaṟkumiṭi to be a stone aqueduct rather than a sluice.¹ These evidences show that the Muttaraiyars realised the importance of irrigation.

**Jainism under the Muttaraiyars:**

Despite the vigorous growth of Saivism and Vaishṇavism, Jainism was still an important religion in the Chōla country. Like other feudatories of this period, the Muttaraiyars also extended their benefactions not only to the Saivas and Vaishṇavas, but also to the Jains. The Jain poets who composed the Nālaṭiyār were probably patronised by the Muttaraiyars. This literary work makes specific reference to the high generosity of the Muttaraiyars.² It is not impossible that some Muttaraiya chiefs were followers of Jainism. The peculiar shape of the Māripūṭu Perunγināru at Tiruvelḷaṟai is worth noting. Mr. Mayilai Seenī Venkatasami says that the Svastik symbol is a Jain philosophic symbol and that it may be seen in Jain houses.³ In that case, we may regard the builder of the Māripūṭu Perunγināru or his feudal lord as a Jain. The Tamil verse of the Tiruvelḷaṟai inscription of Dantivarman⁴ seems to point to the same conclusion. Any casual reader of the Nālaṭiyār will not fail to note the striking

---

2. The Nālaṭiyār, poem No. 200:
   
   மார்பிப்புது பருங்கிருது
   குதிரைமுனை குமார் - குதிரைமுனை
   குமுக்பெருமை காலம்பெருமை
   "

4. *E. I. XI.* p. 158.
similarity of ideas between it and the Tamil verse of the inscription mentioned above. It is not improbable that Tiruveḷḷaṟai was one of the early Jain settlements in the Tamil country.¹ It appears that there was a Jain colony very near Śendalai.² The name of Tirukkāṭṭupallī, a village near Śendalai suggests that it must have been a Jain centre of learning in the Muttaraiya period.³ The discovery of an image of Mahāvīra Tīrthaṅkara at Vīshṉampēṭṭai, close to Tirukkāṭṭupallī, strengthens this view.⁴

Nārttāmalai (former Pudukkottai State) with Jain temples, monasteries, and schools was one of the most important Jain centres in the Tamil country. Dr. C. Minakshi discards the view that the Jains of Nārttāmalai came from Madura in the time of St. Sambandar.⁵ The hills of Nārttāmalai, Mēlamalai, Kāṭṭaimalai, Kaṇambarmalai, Māṇimalai, Poṇmalai, Paraiyaṉmalai, Uvachchaṉmalai, Āḷuruṭṭimalai - were from very early times occupied by the Jains and were most suited to the Jain ideals of austere life and vigorous pursuit of studies. Dr. Minakshi refutes the identification Samaṇqarkudagu with the Vīshṉu cave on the Mēlamalai and identifies it with a rock-cut cavern on the same hill above the Vīshṉu cave.⁶ Moreover, she says that the Jains must have utilized the Mēlamalai for their living and must have had the Āḷuruṭṭimalai as their place of worship and study. She thinks that in order to remove the Jains from this hill "the Śaiva devotees and the Vīshṉu-bhaktas of the time of

3. Paḷḷi means in Tamil a Jain school.
Nṛipatunāga excavated the two caves on this very hill.¹ But the date of the Vishnū cave is uncertain. We have no concrete evidence for supposing that it came into existence during the reign of Nṛipatunāga. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar, the editor of the Pudukkottai Manual (1944), is of opinion that the Vishnū cave was originally a Jain temple and was converted into a Vishnū temple in the 12th year (A. D. 1228) of Māravarma Sundarapāṇḍya I.² It is clear that there was a Jain temple on the Āḷuruttimalai.³

Śittanāravāsāl (former Pudukkottai State) was one of the well-known seats of Jain learning. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar says that it was never under the Pallavas.⁴ But the presence of Muttaraiya inscriptions as far as Tirumayyam⁵ in the south does not preclude the possibility that Śittanāravāsāl could have been under Muttaraiya influence at least for some time.

The rock-cut Jain temple and the old paintings here may be assigned to the epoch of Mahāndravarma. The new paintings that we now see at Śittanāravāsāl is assigned to the 9th century and is attributed to the Pāṇḍayyas.⁶ Dr. Minakshi, however, thinks that the Jain cave temple and its paintings must be the work of Mahāndravarman.⁷ There is some indication that Anāravāsāl, near Śittanāravāsāl was once a Jain centre.⁸

1. Ibid. p. 237.
3. No. 158 of *I. P. S.*
5. e. g., *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13.
Services to Saivism:

That many of the Muttaraiya chiefs adhered to Saivism and rendered remarkable services to its growth are clear from the epigraphical evidence at our disposal. A dateless Tamil inscription from Nārttāmali states that the Śiva temple at Nārttāmalai (later known as Vijayālaya Chōḷiśvaram) was originally founded by Sāṭṭaṇpūdi alias Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyar, was destroyed by heavy rains and was renovated by Malla Viṭumāṇ alias Teṉṉavaṉ Tamīḷadiyaraiyar. Sāṭṭaṇpūdi, the original builder of the temple, was a subordinate of Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyar alias Paramēśvara, the father of Perumbidugu Muttaraiya II. The later name of the temple viz., Vijayālaya Chōḷiśvaram suggests that the renovation noted in the record must have taken place in the time of the Chōḷa king Vijayālaya (c. A. D. 846–871).

The first of the Sendalai records of Perumbidugu Muttaraiya II alias Šuvara Māra states that he built a Piḍāri temple. Where he built it is not mentioned in the record. A Pāṇḍya inscription found on one of the Sendalai pillars records a gift of land to Mākāḷattu Piḍāri of Niyamam. Two other inscriptions found on the same place register gifts of land to the same temple. These prove that there was a Piḍāri temple at Niyamam which is situated close to Sendalai. This was very probably the Piḍāri temple that was built by Perumbidugu Muttaraiya II. The mutilation of the top portions of the Sendalai pillars and the presence on them of the inscriptions mentioned above lead one to believe that the

1. 216 of 1940–41.
2. E. I. Vol. XIII. p. 139.
3. 10 of 1899.
4. 11 and 12 of 1899.
Sendalai pillars originally stood in the Piḍāri temple at Niyamam and were later brought to Sendalai for constructing a maṇḍapa in front of the Sundarāśvara temple at Sendalai.¹ The Malaiyāṭipaṭṭi inscription of Dantivarmaṅa dated in his sixteenth year² states that Viḍēlvidugu Muttaraiyanaṅga alias Kuvāvaṅgaṭṭaṅga scooped out Tiruvāḷappimalai into a temple later known as the Vāgiśvara temple and consecrated Bhaṭṭarar in it.³ A Pāṇḍya inscription from Sendalai dated in the tenth year of Māraṅjaḍaiyanaṅga (identifiable with Varaguṇa I) states that a servant of the Muttaraiya chief mentioned above made a gift of land for a lamp and daily offerings to Mākāṭattu Piḍāri of Niyamam.⁴ An undated inscription of Iḷaṅgo Muttaraiyars found in the Ōdanavaṅgaśvara temple at Tiruchchēṭtuṅai (Tanjore taluk) registers a gift for burning a perpetual lamp.⁵ Another inscription of the chief dated in his thirteenth year, found in the Tirukkōṭiśvara temple at Tirukkōṭikkal (Kumbakonam taluk, Tanjore district) records a gift of sheep.⁶ A third inscription of the same chief dated in the same regnal year, found in the Uttamanaṭhasvami temple at Kīranaṅgar (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State), seems to record gifts of land by the assembly of Kīranaṅgar and by some private individuals for celebrating a festival in the temple of Uttamataṅga Iṣvanttu–Perumāṇadiga of Kīranaṅgar.⁷

2. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 18.
4. 10 of 1899.
Another record of the same chief dated in the same year found at Tiruchcheñampūndi (Tanjore taluk) records a gift of gold for a perpetual lamp.\(^1\) A fifth inscription (duplicate copy) of the same chief dated in his seventeenth year found in the Tirukkōṭīśvara temple at Tirukkōṭikāval registers a gift of gold for a lamp by Kaḷḷāṛṟṟūr Kandaṟṟpirāṭṭī of Kāraikkaḍu.\(^2\)

A fragmentary inscription of Dantivarmaṇ from Piḷḷai-pāḷayam (Kanchipuram taluk, Chingleput district) mentions a certain Kāḍuveṭṭī Muttaraiyaṛ at whose request an endowment of land was made to the old temple called Tirumēṟṟaḷi at Iraiyaṅchēri and to a maṭha, probably attached to it.\(^3\) The Tirumēṟṟaḷi temple is a Śiva temple. But Mr. V. Venkatasubba Aiyar regards it as a Vishnu temple.\(^4\) This is untenable because St. Appar had sung in honour of the God of Tirumēṟṟaḷi.\(^5\) “It is not unlikely that the Tirumēṟṟaḷi maṭha existed as early as the time of Mahēndravarmaṇ I, for it seems it was the presence of the maṭha that inspired St. Appar (Tirunavukkarasar) to glorify Kāṅchē as a great seat of learning in this particular padigam.”\(^6\)

As regards Kāḍuveṭṭī Muttaraiyaṛ, he seems to have been a Muttaraiya officer of the Pallava emperor. It is doubtful if he belonged to the main line of the Muttaraiya chiefs. Mr. V. Venkatasubba Aiyar identifies him with

---

3. 89 of 1921; S. I. I. Vol. XII. No. 44.
4. See Intro. to No. 44 of S. I. I. Vol. XII.
5. See the Fourth Tirumāḷai–Tirukkachimēṟṟaḷi.
Kāḍuveṭṭi Muttaraśaṇ, a Noḻamba general, who figures in a record from Punganur. But this is unwarranted.

An undated inscription from Kuṇṇaṇḍārkāvil records a gift of rice by a certain kōdai Mayindaṇ for feeding 110 Brāhmaṇs during the Ārdrā festival of Tirukkuṇṇakkuḍittēvar. Another inscription from the same place dated in the third year of Nandipōttaraiyar III records a gift of rice for feeding hundred persons on the day of Tiruvādirai by Gaṇavatimāṇ alias Pagaichchandra Visaiyaraiyaṇ of Vaṭuvūr in Mipulaṇaṇḍu.

The Nāttāmalai inscription of Nṛpatuṇḍa dated in his seventh year states that Sāttanaṇa Paḻiyili excavated the rock-cut Śiva temple at Nāttāmalai, that his daughter Paḻiyili Sṛiya-Nāḷgaṇi, the wife of Miṇavaṇaṇa Tamiḻjadiyaraiyaṇ alias Pallaṇaṇa Anantaṇa, enlarged it by adding a mukhamāṇḍapa, a balipitha, a rishaba and a rishabamāṇḍapa and that she made provision for worship and offerings to the God of Paḻiyiliśvaram temple. Obviously, the temple was named after its builder who was a probable contemporary of Nandivarman III. It may be noted in passing that there is an altar to Vallavaṭṭi-amman at Semmaṭṭiṇḍutti (Alangudi taluk, former Pudukkottai State). The Goddess is believed to have come from Vallam in the Tanjore district.

Anṇavāḍal is mentioned in one of the hymns of St. Tiruṇavukkaraṟṟar and this shows that there was an old Śiva

1. Intro. to No. 44 of S. I. I. Vol. XII.
2. C. L. I. P. S. No. 8.
temple here in the seventh century.¹ It is likely that the rock-cut Śiva temple at Kuṭṭāmārkkūr̥vil was built by the Muttaraiyars. It is possible that the rock-cut Śiva temple at Devarmalai (Tirumayyam taluk, former Pudukkottai State) came into existence during the Muttaraiya period.²

*Vaishṇavism under the Muttaraiyars:*

The Bakti cult of Vaishṇavism represented by the Āḷvārs in the Tamil country during the period under consideration did not fail to influence the Muttaraiyars. An undated inscription found in the Śatyagirīnātha Perumāḷ temple at Tirumāyam states that Perumbidugu Perundēvi, the mother of Viḍāḷviḍugu Viḷḷupperadi-Araīsaṇi alias Śattaṇi Māṟaṇi, repaired the temple and granted a village.³ Perumbidugu Perundēvi of this inscription may be identified with the queen of Perumbidugu Muttaraiyaṇi II alias Śuvaṇṇa Māṟaṇi.⁴ It may be noted that the hymns of Tirumaṅgaḷai Āḷvar refer to this temple.⁵ The rock-cut Vishnu temple at Malayaṭipattti (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) was probably excavated in the first half of the ninth century. It is not known whether it was excavated by the Muttaraiyars or by some other chiefs.

An incomplete inscription from Tirumukkūr (Kanchipuram taluk) dated in the twenty-fourth year of Nṛpatuṅgavarmaṇi states that the assembly of Śiyapuram in Uṟṟukkaṭṭukkōṭṭam

---

5. *Tirukkural* poems No. 19; *Periyātirumoli* III - vi - v. 9; VI - ix - v. 7; VIII - iii v. 3; IX - iii - v. 3; X - ii - v. 5; XI - vii - v. 5.
agreed to maintain a perpetual lamp in the temple of Vishnu-bhata at Tirumukkudal for the interest on 30 kañjju of gold received by them from Arigañda Perumār, son of Kadupattti Muttaraiyar. It is doubtful whether Kadupattti Muttaraiyar of this inscription is identical with the person of the same name who figures in a record mentioned above.

One more point to be considered in this section is about Tirumangai Aḻvar. Pandit M. Raghavaiyangar thinks that Tirumangai Aḻvar who belonged to the Kaḻvar community was a Muttaraiya chief ruling over Tiruvālī-nadu probably in subjection to the Chōlas. But this is not corroborated by any evidence literary or epigraphical. The Guruparampara is far from confirming it.

It is significant that in an age of great religious upheaval, the Muttaraiyars exhibited in religion a broad outlook by tolerating and patronising different denominations.

Patronage of Tamil Literature:

The history of Tamil literature during the seventh century is comparatively obscure. But in the following century, we find the Muttaraiyars figuring as the greatest feudatory patrons of Tamil literature. The court of Perumbidugu Muttaraiyañ alias Śuvarañ Mārañ was adorned by a number of poets such as Vēḷnambañ of Pachchil, Āchāryar Aniruddar, Iḷamperumār of Kōṭṭārū and Amaruṇilai of Pavadaiyamañgalam. Their poems are found on four pillars in the Sundarēśvara temple at Sendalai. Vēḷnambañ was a native

2. 89 of 1921.
4. E. I. Vol. XIII. pp. 139-149.
of Tiruppāchchil (āchchiramam) in the Maṅanādu of the Chōla country. It is possible that this poet belonged to the community of Vēḻir chiefs. Pandit M. Raghavaiyangar says that Āchāryar Aniruddar must have been either a teacher of Perumbidugu Muttaraiyān II or a Jain preceptor. The third poet Kōṭṭāru Ijāmpērūnār was a native of Kōṭṭāru. But Raghavaiyangar’s identification of Kōṭṭāru with Nagercoil (T. C. State) is not satisfactory. Kōṭṭāru must be identified with some place in the Tanjore or Trichinopoly district possibly with Kōṭṭāttūr in Musiri taluk. The fourth poet Amarunilai alias Kuvāvaṅg Kāṇjaṅ came from Pavadāya-maṅgalam which belonged to Kiḷār Kūrām of the Chōla country. It is doubtful if he occupied any military position as Raghavaiyangar thinks.

These poets composed their beautiful verses in praise of Perumbidugu Muttaraiyān II alias Suvaraṅ Mārāṅ. The verses are in Veṅbā and Kaṭṭaṅaikkalittūrai metres. Of the twenty-seven poems found on the Sendalai pillars, many are fragmentary and the remaining complete poems are of high quality.

The Yāpparunīgalam (Viruttī), a Tamil work on grammar, composed by Amritasākaraṅār “some time towards the close of the tenth century” mentions a literary work called Tamil-muttaraiyarkōvai. Nothing more than the name of the work.

2. M. Raghavaiyangar Sāsanat - Tamil Kavi Charitam. p.11
3. Ibid. p. 19.
4. Ibid. p. 20.
is at present known.\textsuperscript{1} It is not unlikely that it was composed in the time of Perumbidugu Muttaraiya\textsuperscript{II} alias Suvara\textsuperscript{II} Mara\textsuperscript{II}.

The Nala\dh\i\y\i\r’s references to the Muttaraiyars (vv 200 and 206) deserve careful examination. Dr. G. U. Pope, who translated the work into English, does not give any date for it, but simply says ‘that the seventh century A. D. .......... saw the beginning of Tamil literature under Jain auspices.’\textsuperscript{2} Mr. K. S. Srinivasa Pillai says that it is worth-considering whether the Nala\dh\i\y\i\r was composed in the fifth century A. D., when the Jain Tamil Sangam at Madurai was established by Vajranandi.\textsuperscript{3} Dr. M. Rajamanikkam thinks that the work may be assigned to the fifth century.\textsuperscript{4} Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar assigns the Nala\dh\i\y\i\r to the eighth century A. D. on the ground that no available record of the Muttaraiyars can be assigned to a period earlier than the eighth century.\textsuperscript{5} This view is highly probable and is in consonance with our view that the rise of the Muttaraiyar in the Chola country may be roughly dated from the latter half of the seventh century. It is not impossible that the Nala\dh\i\y\i\r was composed in the time of Perumbidugu Muttaraiya\textsuperscript{II}. It is also known as Nala\dh\i N\h\u\r\u\ru (‘Four Hundred Quatrains’) and Ve\j\j\a\l\a\r V\e\d\a\m (‘The Bible of the Cultivators of the Soil’). It deals with the ethical and social philosophy of the Tamil people and occupies a position next only to the Kura\l. ‘Though composed most probably by Jains, it contains

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Yapparungalam}; the chapter on ‘Olipiyl’, p. 486.
\item Intro. to the Nala\dh\i\y\i\r p. X.
\item \textit{Tamil Varala\ru} Vol. I. pt. II, p. 44 (1949).
\item \textit{Pallavar Varala\ru}. p. 43.
\item \textit{Tamil Ilakkiya Varala\ru}. (250–600) pp. 72 & 73.
\end{enumerate}
scarcely any traces of their peculiar tenets.”

All the poems are composed in veinbä metre and are noted for the terseness and vigour of their style. The echoes of the ideas of the Nālaḍiyār can be very well seen in the Tamil verse of the Tiruvelḷḷai inscription of Dantivarma.

**Contribution to Architecture and Sculpture:**

We have already seen how the Śiva temple at Nāṛttāmalai (later known as Vijayālaya Chōḷisvaram) was originally founded by Śattanpūdi alias Iḷāṅgōvadiyaraiya a subordinate of Māra Paramēśvaran alias Iḷāṅgōvadiyaraiyan. Subsequently, the temple was ruined by heavy rains and was repaired by Malla Viḍūmān probably in the time of the Chōḷa king Vijayālaya, as the present name of the temple suggests.\(^5\) One of the Sendalai records of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyan II alias Suvaran Māran states\(^4\) that he built a temple for Goddess Piḍāri. We have already seen that the temple must have been built at Niyamam and not at Sendalai. An undated inscription of Viḍūvīḍugu Viḷuppēradi-Araiṣaṇ alias Śattan Māran found in the Satyagiriṇātha Perumāḷ temple at Tirumayyam states that his mother repaired the temple and granted a village.\(^5\) This is a “rock-cut shrine containing the Yōgasayanamūrthi or the God in a recumbent posture....... The main idol is an imposing sculpture lying on a serpent couch; the five hoods of the serpent, which cover the God’s head as a canopy, are half-drawn backward. The God has two arms, one stretched behind him as if comforting

---

3. 216 of 1940-41.
the serpent Ādīśa, and the other represented as protecting Lakṣimi who is seated on his breast.”¹ The main idol is surrounded by a number of sculptures representing minor deities. This shrine may be assigned to the middle of the eighth century A. D.² The songs of Tirumāṅgai Āḻvār in honour of the Śatya-giriśinātha Perumāḷ of Tirumayyam,³ testify to the antiquity of the temple. An inscription of DantivarmaṈ from Malayaṉḍipatṭi (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) dated in his sixteenth year states that Viḍēlviḍugu MuttaraiyāṆ alias KuvāvaṆ Śattan scooped out Tiruvāḷattūr-malai into a temple and consecrated Bhaṭāraru in it.⁴ This temple exhibits some features of the Mahāendra style of architecture. “The upper and lower parts of the massive pillars are cubical while the middle is octagonal. The front half of the cave is a hall of the rock-cut shrine running east to west, while the rear half has a square cell, wherein is the liṅgam with a sort of ardhamanṭapam in front, wherein, the nandi is placed on a pedestal. On the walls are panels with figures in bas-relief including the Saptamātrikā group, Gaṅgēśa, Vīrabhadra, Śiva, Viṣṇu and Mahiṣāsurasamardanī. The Durgā or Mahiṣāsurasamardanī panel is of particular interest; and the Goddess here as at the Seven Pagodas is represented with a benign countenance eight-armed, astride on her lion, and aiming a spear at the Asura. The dvārāpālakas are, like all Pallava dvārāpālakas, two armed. One of them bears a bull’s horn and a coronet. Evidently this figure represents a person of rank probably the chief who

2. Slightly different is the view of Mr. K: R. Venkatarama Aiyar. See Ibid. p. 1211.
4. CLIPS No. 18
built the shrine."¹¹ This temple came into existence sometime towards the close of the eighth century A. D.

The Nārttāmalai inscription of Nṛpatugha dated in his seventh year² states that Śatana Paḷiyili, son of Viḍelviḍugu Muttaraiyān excavated the rock-cut temple called Paḷiyili-Īśvaram and that his daughter enlarged it by adding a mukhamañḍapa, balipīṭa, pīshaba and a pīshabamañḍapa.³ Paḷiyili Īśvaram is a small Śiva temple having "only a garbhagraham....... In front of it there is a moulded basement with a moulded beading above and frieze of dancing bhūtagaṇas. A cylindrical liṅgam and two dvārapālakas ......... belonging to this temple have now been excavated."⁴ It seems that the other parts of the temple mentioned in the inscription are ruined. This temple may be assigned to the second quarter of the ninth century A. D. for Śatana Paḷiyili was a probable contemporary of Nandivarman III.

The Pushpavarnaśvara cave temple at Pūvālaikkudi (Tirumayyam taluk, former Pudukkottai State) was excavated probably by Pūdikāḷari alias Amaruṇa Muttaraiyān who is mentioned in a fragmentary record found in the same temple.⁵ He is identified with Ilaṅgavadiyaraiyān alias Māran Paramaśvara, and with his son Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyān II.⁶

---

3. For a different interpretation see C L I P S No. 19. According to it a son of Śatana Paḷiyili constructed the mukhamañḍapa and consecrated the bull with its mañḍapa, and also the Balipīṭa. This statement is based on the wrong reading of the record.
5. 142 of 1907.
This seems to be improbable, for the Šendalai records do not mention the names Pūdikajari and Amaruṇī. It is likely that the chief bearing the two names was a subordinate of the Muttaraiyars. Or, in the alternative, he may have been a predecessor of Perumbiđugu Muttaraiyaṇ I. “The Puṣpa-vaṇṇēśvara temple consists of a cubical rock-cut cell which is the sanctum, with an entrance in front. There are shallow niches flanked by pilasters on either side of the entrance, carrying bevelled corbels. The arthamaṇṭapam is structural”¹ and belongs to a later period.

It is possible that the rock-cut Śiva temple at Kuṇṇāṇḍār-kōvil was built by the Muttaraiyars.² It is similar in plan to the Gōkarṇēśvara temple at Tirugōkarṇam (Alangudi taluk, former Pudukkottai State), and contains a Valamburi Gāṇēśa and a Sōmāskanda group. The two dvārapālakas found here are regarded as portrait sculptures. One of them found on the southern side is believed to be the portrait either of a Pallava king or of a Muttaraiya vassal. The other is taken to be “that of a noble man, probably the governor of the nādu, and his features exhibit humility and reverence.”³

It is suggested that the rock-cut temple at Dēvarmalai (Tirumayyam taluk, former Pudukkottai State) may be ascribed to the Muttaraiya chiefs.⁴ This temple contains some notable sculptures. One of them represents “a chief in regal robes with one hand placed on the hip and the other raised in adoration.”⁵

---

1. Ibid. p. 1187–88.
2. See Ibid. p. 1054.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid. p. 1137.
5. Ibid. p. 1136.
The other two are taken to be those of saints one of which is believed to be that of Perumiḻalai Kūmāra Nāyār. But this is very doubtful. There is also a Valamburi Gaṅgāsa, and the lingam here is placed on a square Yōhipītam. There are later additions to this temple.¹

We have already dealt with the Jain monuments at Sittāṉavāsal. There are some other rock-cut temples in the former Pudukkottai State which can be assigned to the Pallava period. These are the Gōkarṇēśvara temple at Tirugōkarṇam, the Vishṇu temples at Malayādipattī and Nārttāmalai, and the Śiva temples at Malayakkōvil. The architectural features of these temples do not help us in determining their dates. No evidence is at present available in respect of their builders. Nevertheless, it is not unlikely that some, though not all, of them owed their existence to the Muttaraiyars.

---

¹. Ibid.
A NOTE ON THE ORIGIN OF THE MUTTARAIYARS

There are different views regarding the origin of the Muttaraiyars. Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar regards the Muttaraiyars as a branch of the Kaḷabhras.¹ Mr. M. Raghavaiyanga, who rejects the view on the ground that the Muttaraiyars were subordinate to the Pallavas while the Kaḷabhras were hostile to the Pallava dynasty till the time of Nandivarman II, does not say anything about the origin of the Muttaraiyars.² The absence of any reference to them in the literary works of the Sāṅgam period may be taken to indicate that they were not in the Tamīḻ country in the Sāṅgam period. According to latest researches, as we have already noted, the Nālaḍiyar which mentions the Muttaraiyars is assigned to the 8th century A. D. and thus excluded from the Sāṅgam anthologies.³ The fact that the Pallava king Simhavishṇu is not stated in any record to have come into conflict with the Muttaraiyars is of some significance. The lithic records of Mahēndravarman I found in the chōḻa country do not allude to the Muttaraiyars. In short, the earliest known records of the Muttaraiyars are those of Perumbiṭugu Muttaraiya II alias Suvaraṇa Māravar who belongs to the first half of the 8th century and any history of the Muttaraiyars based on those records cannot go back by more than fifty years. In the light of these data, we may state that the Muttaraiya occupation of the Kāvēṟī region is not likely to have taken place prior to the time of Pallava Mahēndravarman II. In that case, the next thing that has to be examined is who the Muttaraiyars were? The fact that the liberality of

the Muttaraiyars is eulogistically referred to in the Nalaḍiyar makes it probable that it was composed under the patronage of the Muttaraiyars. Still G. U. Pope and Mr. V. Venkayya refer to a tradition according to which the Nalaḍiyar was composed by some Jain poets who were for sometime under the patronage of a Pāndya monarch. But not even a single reference to the Pāndyas is found in the Nalaḍiyar. There is no possibility of identifying the Muttaraiyars with the Pāndyas. May it be that the early Muttaraiya chiefs regarded themselves as rulers of the Pāndya country in spite of the fact that they were not in possession of it? The fact that Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiya II and his predecessors had such surnames as Mārak, Neḍumāran and Śrimārak renders our view possible. The interpretation of the term Muttaraiya as lord of the land of pearls indicates that the Muttaraiyars had some connections with the Pāndya country. If this surmise is accepted, we may conclude that the Muttaraiyars were a branch of the Kaḷabhras and held the Pāndya country during what is known as Kaḷabra interregnum. It seems quite possible that some time after the overthrow of their rule by Kaṭheṉgōr, the Kaḷabhras of the Pāndya country, later called Muttaraiyars, sought their fortune in the Kaveri region where the princes of the Chola line were maintaining their feeble authority in limited areas. The theory that the Kaḷabhras were identical with the Kaḷvar supports our conclusion for one of the Sendalai inscriptions describes

2. See Dr. M. Rajamanickam - *Pallavar Varalāṟṟu*. p. 43.
3. For a different interpretation of the term see M. S. Ramaswami Aiyangar - *Studies in South Indian Jainism*. 
Perumbidugu Muttaraiyar as Kaḷvarakaḷva. The Kaḷabhra enemies of Nandivarma II mentioned in the Koṟṟamaṅgalam plates must be the Koṟṟumbāḷur chiefs who were another branch of the Kaḷabhras and who were hostile to the Pallavas.

On the identity of the terms Mutturāju and Muttaraiyar, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and M. Venkataramayya take the view that the Muttaraiyars were Pallava princes. But there is no clear evidence for identifying the Muttaraiyars with the Pallavas. The suffix of the names of all Pallava princes after Simhavishṇu is 'varma'. This we do not find in the names proper of the Muttaraiyars. Moreover, the records of the Muttaraiyars do not hint at the view that they were of Pallava extraction. Therefore this view is quite improbable.

III

THE KOḌUMBĀḻUR CHIEFS (c. A.D. 600 – c. 900):

The Veḷir chiefs of Koḍumbāḻur were another great feudalatory dynasty of South India. We have only a few records about this dynasty. Of them, the Koḍumbāḻur inscription of Bhūti Vikramakēsari (C. L. I. P. S. No. 14), which gives in some detail the genealogy of his line, is very important. The beginning and end of the record are mutilated; the language is Sanskrit and the script Grantha. The inscription is open to different interpretations and its date is still discussed. In order to understand clearly the different points of view in regard to its interpretation, a translation of it is given below.

“There was .... .... .... .... the capturer of the herd of elephants of the lord .... .... .... .... ....

“Of his family was Pravīrajī; the glorious Vīratuṅga, the vanquisher of the Maṉava, was born of him; from him came Ativīra Anupama who gave birth to Saṅghakṛt; from him (came) the glorious Nṛpakēsari (Lion of kings) who as a child grew up with the serpents; his son was the celebrated Paradurgamardana (the destroyer of enemy forts), the conqueror of Vatāpi.

“Of him who had a divine splendour, Samarābhirāma (delightful in battle) was the son who attacked (or killed) the Caḷukki in the battle of Adhirājamaṅgala.

“Of him, who was the banner of the Yaduvaṁśa, Anupama (peerless) rightly so called, the daughter of the Cōḷa King, was the beloved (wife), who resembled Lakṣmī
(the wife) of Viṣṇu, Sarasvatī of the Lotus-born (Brahmā), and Girijā (Mountain-born) of Hara himself.

"Of her was born to him the glorious King Bhūti, who bore the alternative name Minnāmalā (?) and who earned in war the title of Vikramakēsari (the lion of valour).

"The water of the Kāverī was turned red with blood of the Pallava forces; and this warrior defeated Vīrapāṇḍya in battle and became death to Vaścīvē.

"After fighting the rutting elephants, viz., his foes, Vikramakēsari was living in the palace on the hill in the city of Koḍumbāḷār.

"While the earth was ruled by him, the Kalpataru to the learned, the moon to the lotuses. viz., the two hands of the (subordinate) kings (i.e., they closed their palms together in salutation) and the beloved of the goddesses of Earth, Victory, Prosperity, Fame and Speech, Sharpness was found (only) in the pair of eyes, instability in the two eyelashes and darkness in the hair (of women); weakness in their bodies; and jostling in the pair of (their) breasts."

"He had two good wives called Kaṭṭāḷī and Varaguṇā (and) Kaṭṭāḷi became the mother of two very beautiful (sons) Parāntaka and Ādityavarman."

"There was the glorious Mallikārjuna, born of the Ātrāyagōtra, a resident of Mathura, the master of the Vēda and the pupil of Vidyārāśi, the abode of austerity."

"Having raised the three Vimānas in his name and in the name of his two wives and having enshrined Mahēśvara, he (Vikramakēsari) gave to him (Mallikārjuna) a big mātha."
"The Yādava gave to that ascetic chief of the Kālamukha persuasion a big maṭha together with eleven villages attached to it."

"For the enjoyment of fifty Asita-Yaktra (Kālamukha) ascetics the big maṭha .... .... .... that King .... .... .... offerings, sandals, flowers, aksata, dhūpa, dipa, tām(būla), .... .... .... 1

Our purpose here is to examine whether the inscription belongs to the Pallava period or not. Fr. Heras assigns the inscription to the latter half of the seventh century A. D. on the ground that Bhūti Vikramakēsari who issued the record belonged to that period. His analysis of the date of Vikramakēsari is as follows. He states that "if the opinions of Mr. Radhakrishna Aiyar or Prof. Nilakanta Sastri, saying that Bhūti Vikramakēsari lived towards the close of the ninth century or during the tenth century, were true, then his father Samarabhīrāma must be placed about the middle of the 9th century or the beginning of the tenth. Now the Chalukya Empire was finally overrun by the Raṣṭtrakūtas shortly after the middle of the eighth century. Samarabhīrāma could hardly have killed the Chalukya Emperor when the Chalukya Empire did not exist any more." 2 He regards Prof. Sastri's view about the possible existence of Chālukya chiefs at Vātāpi

1. Taken from Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri's article on 'The Kōḍumbeḷḷar Inscription of Bhūti Vikramakēsari' (J. O. R. Vol. VII. 1933, pp. 9 and 10). It may be noted that according to Venkayya the beginning of the inscription refers to the "vanquisher of the Paṇḍya elephants" whose name is lost. (Paragraph 85 of M. E. R. 1908). But the name, Paṇḍya is not seen in Prof. K. A. N. Sastri's edition.

under the Rāshtrakūtas as absolutely improbable and unwarranted. 1 In Fr. Heras’s opinion, the Koḍumbāḷur chiefs were feudatory to Pallava Mahēndravarman I and his son Narasimhavarma II and took part in the Pallava expedition to Vātāpi. In other words, Fr. Heras thinks that the conquest of Vātāpi mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷur record is no other than the conquest of Vātāpi effected by Narasimhavarma II and that Paradurgamardana claims for himself the laurels obtained on the battle-field while fighting under his overlord. 2 In order to strengthen his view, the same scholar identifies Paradurgamardana with one of the three kings who, according to the Kurnool plates of Vikramāditya I 3 defeated Pulikēśin II.

Samarabhīrāma, who claims to have defeated or killed a Chālukya at the battle of Adhirājamaṅgala, is supposed by Fr. Heras to have borne a conspicuous part in the war between Pulikēśin II and Narasimhavarma II I. The same scholar thinks that the battle at Adhirājamaṅgala mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷur record may be identified with the battle of Manimaṅgala, mentioned in the Kūram plates of Paramēśvaravarma II. 4 “Indeed, there is nothing far-fetched in the supposition that Samarabhīrāma, as heir apparent, accompanied his father in the war of the Pallavas against the Chalukyas, and that in the midst of the turmoil of battle, he was fortunate enough to find himself in the face of the Chalukya monarch, near enough to deal him a death-stroke.” 5 This achievement of Samarabhīrāma as crown-prince is stated

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid. p. 36.
5. Ibid. p. 38.
to have been mentioned under his name as king. Long before Fr. Heras, Mr. S. M. Edwardes, expressed the same views about the achievements of Paradurgamardana and his son, Samarābhīrāma.

The chronology of the Koḍumbāḷur chiefs is fixed by Fr. Heras as follows:

"A. D. 630 — Reign of Paradurgamardana (continued).

A. D. 640-2 — Probable death of Paradurgamardana and beginning of reign of Samarābhīrāma.

A. D. 665-7 — Probable end of reign of Samarābhīrāma and beginning of reign of Bhūti Vikramakēsari."

Fr. Heras then proceeds to determine the date when Bhūti Vikramakēsari came into conflict with the Pallavas and the Pāṇḍyas. He states that the Chōla power was revived in the latter half of the seventh century A. D. by Kō-cheṅgaṇāṅ, who is described by Tirumāṅgai Āḻvār as "the vanquisher of the southern king and the lords of Kuḍagū, koṅgu and the lord of the Southern Tamil country and the Northern King," that the matrimonial alliance between the Koḍumbāḷur chiefs and the Chōlas of this period greatly contributed to it and that Bhūti Vikramakēsari was a subordinate of Kō-cheṅgaṇāṅ and helped the Chōla king in defeating the Pallavas and the Pāṇḍyas. Vikramakēsari's campaigns against the Pallavas,

1. Ibid.
2. See Mr. Edwards's article on 'The Kannāḍa poets'.
the Pāṇḍyas and the Vañjivēśas are thus taken to be the same as those of Kō-cheṅgaṇāṭī. The existence in the Chōḷa country of Pallava inscriptions of the 8th and 9th centuries is considered as indicating the serious set-backs experienced by the Chōḷas and the re-establishment of Pallava supremacy in the Chōḷa country in the reign of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla.²

As regards the architecture of the Mūvarkōvil temple (at Koḍumbāḷūr), Fr. Heras remarks as follows: "The only serious objection against our views as regards this Koḍumbāḷūr chronology is archaeological. The temples of Koḍumbāḷūr built by Bhūti Vikramakāśari seem to belong to a much later period. The general style of the temples, the technique of the sculpture and the system of construction appear Chōḷa rather than Pallava, and look more of the tenth century than of the seventh. Yet between this objection and the objection of the capture of Bāḍāmi and the slaying of the Chalukya king in the ninth or tenth centuries, the former seems to be more easily solved. As a matter of fact, the Koḍumbāḷūr temples may be classified as an "archaeological puzzle" or as "an architectural phenomenon." If those temples are finally placed in the tenth or even in the eleventh century, you will still have the square cupola-like umbrella of the top of the vimāna — without precedent and without consequent, totally unique in South Indian architecture — without a satisfactory explanation. Bhūti Vikramakāśari or his architect or perhaps both, were geniuses much beyond their age. Had the style of Koḍumbāḷūr found followers, a new style of architecture would have existed in South India. But now the temples are like an isolated instance of the work of a genius that found no followers."¹

---

1. Ibid. pp. 42–44.
2. Ibid. p. 38, Foot-note No. 3.
Fr. Heras’s interpretation of the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription requires careful examination. If Samaraḥbirāma was really the slayer of Pulikēśin II, he would have been so mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷūr record. Bhūti Vikramakēsari could not have forgotten such a great achievement of his father. The confirmatory evidence, which Fr. Heras cites in support of his view, is far from being satisfactory.

Fr. Heras’s view that Bhūti Vikramakēsari was a contemporary of Kō-cheṅgaṇaṇī is based on slippery ground, for the date of Kō-cheṅgaṇaṇī is still debated. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri¹ and Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar² assign this Chōla king to the Saṅgam period. Dr. Rajamanikkam says that Kō-cheṅgaṇaṇī belongs to the middle of the 5th century A. D.³ If Kō-cheṅgaṇaṇī lived in the seventh century A. D. and if he was so great a monarch as Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār describes, he would have certainly left at least a few stone records. But, to our great surprise, nothing has come down to us. In brief, Fr. Heras’s account of the resuscitation of the Chōla power in the latter half of the seventh century requires clear evidence.⁴

Fr. Heras has failed to identify Vīrapāṇḍiya who is mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷūr record. Nor does he give any explanation regarding the mention in the tenth century Chōla records of the names of the two queens of Bhūti Vikramakēsari, Varaguṇa and Karāḷi.

Mr. S. R. Balasubramanyam and Mr. K. Venkataranga Raju do not accept Fr. Heras’s views about the vimāna of the

---

3. Periyapurāṇa Āṟaiṭchi. p. 94.
Mūvarkōvil temple. According to them "the Kodumbāḷūr vimāna is not an isolated and unique work of a genius, but it has precedents and consequents. It will be seen that the Śikharas of Kāliyapaṭṭi, Koḍumbāḷūr, Ēṇādi, Tirukkaṭṭalai, Tiruppūr, Viṣalūr and we may add even the distant Saṅga-
meśvara temple at Paṭṭādakkal, of perhaps the 8th century –
are very similar."¹

Dr M. Arokiaswami, who concurs with Fr. Heras in interpreting the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription, suggests that Viṟapāṇḍya, who was defeated by Vikramakēsarī, may be identified with Arikēsarivarman (c. A.D. 670–c.710).² But it is not known whether Arikēsarivarman had the title, Viṟapāṇḍya.

It is, therefore, not possible to assign the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription to the seventh century A.D.

Mr. S. M. Edwardes holds a slightly different view. According to him, the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription of Vikramakēsarī is assignable to the eighth century, for, Vidyārāsi of this record is identical with the Śaiva preceptor of the same name mentioned in a Tagaḷūr inscription³ which cannot be of later date than the eighth century.⁴ The date of the Tagaḷūr inscription is based on the ground that it contains old Kannaḍa terminations such as "baredon vannipom, bannipom." Obviously, the conclusion is based on doubtful linguistic data and can be hardly regarded as final. Naturally, Edwardes’s date for the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription is very doubtful.

---

2. The Early History of the Veḷḷār Basin. p. 86.
3. 309 of 1901.
On the other hand, Mr. V. Venkayya refers the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription to the first half of the tenth century stating that the script of it belongs to that period and that Vira-
pāṇḍya, who was overcome by Bhūti Vikramakēsari, is identical with Vira-
pāṇḍya with whom the Chōḷa king Āditya II Karikāla, son of Sundara Chōḷa fought in his youth.¹ The Epigraphist refers to a Rājakēsari inscription from Tiruppalāṭtu (Trichinopoly district) which mentions Kāṟṇalipirāṭṭi,² one of the wives of Bhūti Vikramakēsari.³

In his learned article on the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription,⁴ Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri accepts Venkayya’s date for the record and furnishes some additional details in support of his view. He considers at some length the relations between the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs and Chōḷas of Vijayālaya line and comes to the conclusion that Bhūti Vikramakēsari was a subordinate of Sundara Chōḷa Parāntaka II (A. D. 956–70) and his son Āditya II Karikāla. The naming of Vikramakēsari’s sons after Parāntaka II and Āditya II and the references to the two wives of Vikramakēsari in some epigraphs of Āditya II⁵ are thus seen in harmony with the conclusion expressed above.⁶

Further, Prof. Sastri states that “the conquest of Vātāpī by Paradurgamardana has nothing to do with the two Invasions of Vātāpī in the seventh century, in the reigns of the Pallava kings Narasimhavarma II and Paramēśvaravar-
ma I,”⁷ that Samarābhirāma’s triumph over a Chāluḵya at

2. 273 of 1903.
5. 287 of 1911; 273 of 1903; E. I. Vol. XX, p. 54.
7. Ibid. p. 7.
the battle of Adhirajamaṅgalam is connected with the Rāṣṭrakūta invasion of the Chōla country in the first half of the tenth century and that Bhūti Vikramakēsari’s wars against the Pallavas and Vaṅjivēṣis were of the nature of local conflicts in which he got the better of other local feudatories less enterprising than himself. It is significant that Prof. Sastri’s date for Bhūti Vikramakēsari is in consonance with the fact that the architectural style of the Mūvarkēvil at Koḻumbāḷur belongs to the tenth century A.D. In brief, Prof. Sastri’s view on the date of the Koḻumbāḷur inscription of Bhūti Vikramakēsari is least objectionable and most probable. For our purpose, therefore, the record cannot be used with any certainty.

One of the Śendalai pillar inscriptions states that Perumbidugu Muttaraiyaṁ II alias Śuvaraṁ Māraṁ, an elder contemporary of Nandivarman II (c. A.D. 710–c. 775) destroyed Koḻumbāḷur. It was probably in the course of his wars against the Pāṇḍyās that Śuvaraṁ Māraṁ overpowered the Vēḷir chiefs of Koḻumbāḷur. It seems that the latter’s support to the Pāṇḍyās was the cause of the conflict mentioned above.

It is interesting to note that some Pallava inscriptions of the ninth century mention a few Vēḷir chiefs. An inscription from Tiruvalḷaṅgai (Lalgudi Taluk, Trichinopoly district) dated in the sixth year of Nandivarman III mentions a certain Mārppidugu Iḷaṅgōṛḷar Sāṭṭaṁ. It is not clear whether Mārppidugu Iḷaṅgōṛḷar was a Vēḷir chief of Koḻumbāḷur or, as Dr. Arokiaswami thinks, a Vēḷir officer under the

1. Ibid.
Muttaraiyars. The record, however, indicates the Muttaraiya-Vēlir connections during the period under consideration. Another inscription from Kīlūr (Tirukkoyilūr taluk, S. Arcot district) dated in the eleventh year of Nandivarman III seems to record a gift of gold for a lamp to the God of Tirukkövilūr in Malāṭṭukkuṟukkai Kūṟam by a lady, who was the wife of Sāṭṭan Maṟavaṇ and a daughter of Viṭelviṭugu Iḷaṅgō-Adhiyāraṇaṇ alias Vikrama Bhūti. Another fragmentary inscription from the same place dated in the sixteenth or eleventh year of the same Pallava king records a gift of gold by Teṟṟavaṇ ....... Maṟaṇ Bhūti. It is practically certain that this chief is identical with Vikrama Bhūti of the preceding record. Vikrama Bhūti was very probably a Vēlir chief of Koḍumbāḷūr. His title, Viṭelviṭugu, indicates his subordination to the Pallavas. Another fragmentary inscription from Tiruvorriyūr (Saidapet taluk, Chingleput district) dated in the regnal year of Pallava Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṇ records an agreement made by the assembly of Vaṅkaḷṭūr to provide offerings to the God Mahādēva at Tiruvorriyūr, on the day of Saṅkaránti, for the interest on 27 kaḷaṇju of gold received by them from Pūdi-Arindigai, wife of Viṭelviṭugu (Iḷaṅgōvē)ār of Koḍumbāḷūr. Very little is known of the role of these Vēlir chiefs in the Pallava-Pâṇḍya wars of the period under review.

It is suggested that Vikkiyanaṇḍaṇ, who assisted the Chōla king Āditya I in his military campaigns, was probably a

2. S. I. I. Vol. VII. No. 924; 295 of 102. The inscription is damaged at several places.
chief of Koḍumbāḷūr. But this is doubtful. It is, however, probable that before Āditya I’s conquest of Toṇḍaimanḍalam, the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs became the subordinate allies of the Cholaas of Tanjore. It is not known whether Mallaṇ Viḍumaaṇ alias Tenilavāṇ Tamiḻ-Adhiyaraiyan, who renovated the Siva temple at Nārttāmalai was a Vēḷir chief of Koḍumbāḷūr or a subordinate of the Muttaraiyars. If the former suggestion is correct, it would mean that in the time of Mallaṇ Viḍumaaṇ (c. A.D. 850–c. 875) the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs became feudatory to the Chola king Vijayālaya because the temple was named after Vijayālaya after renovation. It will be clear, from the foregoing pages, that the evidences at our disposal are not sufficient for any detailed investigation regarding the nature and consequences of Pallava-Vēḷir connections.

3. 216 of 1940–41.
THE CHŌLAS OF URAIYÛR AND PAĻAIYĀRAI

(c. A. D. 575 – c. 895):

The history of the Chōlas after the Saṁgam period till the capture of Tanjore by Vijayalaya in the 9th century is obscure. The Kaḷabhra occupation of the Chōla country resulted in the decline and dispersal of the Chōlas as evidenced by the existence of several Chōla princes in many places not only in the Kāvēri region but also in the Telugu country. As regards the Chōlas of the Tamil country we find them in the 7th century ruling from Uṟaiyūr and Paḷaiyārai.¹ It is not possible in the present state of our knowledge to make any separate study except in one or two cases of the role either of the Chōlas of Uṟaiyūr or of the Chōlas of Paḷaiyārai in the affairs of the Pallava empire. As far as our period of investigation is concerned it begins with Pallava conquest of the Chōla country.

According to the Kaśākkuḍi plates of Nandivarma II³ Simhavishṇu conquered a Chōla king along with the Kaḷabhra and Mālava rulers. The existence of a village called Simhavishṇuchaturvedimangalam, referred to in an inscription of

---

¹ Mr. V. Venkayya's view that Uṟaiyūr continued to be the capital of the Chōlas during all this period (A. S. I. 1905–6, p. 178) is supported by literary and epigraphical evidences. As regards Paḻayārai Prof. T. P. Minakshisundaram and Sri T.V. Sadasiva Pandarathar have brought out its importance as a Chōla capital. See the article on Paḻayārai in J. A. U. Vol. XVI. pp, 26–36

Uttama Chōḷa confirms the Kaśākkudi plates in respect of Simhavishnū’s conquest of the Chōḷa country. Though it is not clear whether the Pallavas conquered the whole or part of the Chōḷa country it is practically certain that the Chōḷas were reduced to a subordinate position.

The Tamil work *Periyapurāṇam* mentions a Chōḷa king of Paḷaiyarai in connection with St. Appar’s pilgrimage to that place. But his relations with the Pallavas are not clear. It is known from the hymns of St. Sambandar that Nedumāṉan, identifiable with Arikēsari Māṟavarmāḷ (c. A. D. 640-670), had a Chōḷa princess by name Maṅgaiyarkkarasi for his queen. This matrimonial alliance between the Chōḷas and the Pāṇḍyas seems to have been preceded by a conflict as the Vēḻvikkudi grant indicates. The Pāṇḍya-Chōḷa alliance, noted, above, appears to have had no adverse effect on Pallava sway over the Chōḷa country.

In regard to the role of the Chōḷas in the earlier conflicts between the Pallavas and the W. Chāḷukyas a few scraps of debatable information are available. The Aihōje inscription of Pulikeśin II states that he crossed the Kāvērī, made

1. No. 265 of 1907.
2. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar thinks that the Chōḷa country south of Trichinopoly was never under Pallava rule. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 347.
4. Vide *Tirunāvukkasar purāṇam*.
5. St. Sambandar’s Tiruvāḷavāy padigam Nos. 1 & 9.
alliance with the Chōlas, the Kēralas and the Pāṇḍyayas and defeated the Pallavas. The Kūram plates of Paramēśvaravarman I state that Narasimhavarman I "repeatedly" conquered the Chōlas along with other kings. This information coupled with the fact that the Chōlas had matrimonial connections with the Pāṇḍyayas may lead one to doubt whether in the first half of the 7th century the Chōlas had any alliance with the W. Chālukyas against the Pallavas. The veracity of Pulikēśin II’s claim regarding his alliance with the Chōlas and other powers can be considered only when authentic information about the route of his invasion of the Pallava empire is available. Moreover, the hold of the Pallavas on the Chōla country during this period appears to have remained undisturbed. Possibly the Aihoje inscription refers to the non-alignment of the three southern powers in the Pallava-Chālukya struggle of this period.

According to some W. Chālukya records Vikramāditya I, (c.A.D. 655–680) the son and successor of Pulikēśin II invaded the Pallava empire, captured Kāśichī, marched southwards and encamped at Uragapura i. e., Uṇaīyūr. But soon he was put to rout by Paramēśvaravarman I at Peruvallanallūr (Lalgudi

taluk, Trichinopoly district). Since the W. Chālukya records
cited above, describe the Chōlas as the ‘enemies’ of Vikra-
māditya, it is not unlikely that the former assisted the Pallava
king in vanquishing the W. Chālukya army.

Though the Pāṇḍya king Köchchaṭaiyaṇi alias Raṇa-
dhīraṇi, son of Arikāsari Māravarmaṇi is called Šebbiyaṇi8 and
is thought to have maintained supremacy over his Chōla
contemporary8 the exact nature of his relations with the
Chōlas is not clear. It is known from the Vēlvikkuḍi grant4
that Nandivarmaṇi II sustained several defeats at the hands of
the Pāṇḍya king Rājasimha I, son of Köchchaṭaiyaṇi, and,
according to the Udayēndiram plates5 was besieged at Nandipura
by the Dramiḷa (i. e. Tamil) princes. That the Pāṇḍya
and Chēra kings assisted by the Kōḍumbāḷār chiefs laid the
siege of Nandipura is practically certain,6 though it is not
specifically mentioned in the Udayēndiram plates. The role
of the Chōlas in the siege is not clear. The Vēlvikkuḍi grant
mentions Rājasimha’s renovation of the palaces and ramparts
of Kūḍal, Vaṇji and Kōḷi i. e. Uṟaiyūr.7 If the statement
is taken at its face value it would mean that a Chōla prince of
Uṟaiyūr was subordinate to the Pāṇḍya king. The conquest
of Māḷa-kōṅgu by Rājasimha I renders this view possible.
The possibility is strengthened by the fact that this Pāṇḍya

2. E. I. Vol. XVII. p. 307
king had matrimonial connections with the Chōlas.¹ If the possibility turns out to be a fact, it may be said, that the Chōlas assisted the Pāṇḍyas in the siege of Nandipura. But the Śenḍalai inscriptions of Svāraṇa Māḷaṇa alias Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṇa II,² an elder contemporary of Nandivarman II make no mention of the Chōlas among the enemies conquered by him. Possibly on the arrival of Udayachandra at Nandipura the Chōlas joined him deserting the Pāṇḍyas.

We have already stated that a branch of the Chōla dynasty was, during this period, ruling from Paḷaiyārāi. There is clear evidence that Nandipura was then a part of Paḷaiyārāi.³ Since a part of Paḷaiyārāi was called after Nandivarman, it may be presumed that the Chōlas of Paḷaiyārāi were feudatory to him before the siege. But whether they continued to be feudatory to the Pallava king or not, is not known. In other words, the role of the Chōlas in the siege of Nandipura is not clear, though their participation in it is quite probable. The subsequent re-establishment of Pallava supremacy in the Chōla country is borne out by the existence there of some of the records of Nandivarman II.⁴

Some years after the siege of Nandipura the Pallava power experienced another set-back. The Veṭṭivikkuṭi grant of Neṭuṇjaḍaiyaṇa, son of Rājasimha I, describes him as king of the Chōlas and mentions his success over the Pallavas at Peṇṇāgaḍam about A. D. 768.⁵ The absence of any reference

---

¹. According to Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar, the sister of Rājasimha I was given in marriage to a Chōla prince. (Pāṇḍyar Varalāṇu, p. 46.)
⁴. Nos. 33 and 36 of S. I. I. Vol. XII.
in the record to Pāṇḍya-Cholā conflict in this war seems to suggest that the Chōlas might have thrown in their lot with the Pāṇḍyas on the eve of or sometime before the war.

The Madras Museum plates of the same Pāṇḍya king dated in his 17th year (c. A.D. 782) mention his another remarkable victory over the combined forces of the Kērāḷa, Pallava and Adigamaṇ rulers at several places on the northern bank of the Kāverī. But the record is silent on the Chōlas. This seems to indicate that the Chōlas continued to be the vassals of the Pāṇḍyas and supported the latter in their wars with other powers.

The continuance of Pāṇḍya sway over the Kāverī region during and after the reign of Neṅuṇjaḍaiyaṇ is attested by the absence from that region of Dantivarman’s inscriptions dated after his 16th year and by the existence of several Pāṇḍya inscriptions there. There appears to be no room for doubt that during this period the Chōlas paid their allegiance to the Pāṇḍyas.

The accession of Nandivarman III ushered in another period of Pallava-Pāṇḍya struggle. The Kuṅnāṇḍarkōvil inscription dated in the third year of Nandivarman III perhaps indicates the transitory reassertion of Pallava supremacy in the distant south even before the battle of Tēḻḷāku. It seems that before this battle the Pāṇḍyas carried their arms as far as Araśūr on the northern bank of the Peṇnai in southern Tondaimanḍalam. But Nandivarman III’s triumph at Tēḻḷāku about A.D. 836 checked their progress.

1. I. A. Vol. XXII, p. 73.
2. e. g. 160 and 37 of 1931.
and was soon followed by his reconquest of the Chōla country as evidenced by the existence of some of his records in the Chōla country.\(^1\) The Tamil work *Nandikkalambakam* mentions Nandivarman III's victories at Pāḻaiyārāi, Kaḻambūr, Veṟiyalur Kurukkottai etc.\(^2\) It is very probable that the Pallava king’s fight at these places was connected with the battle of Teḻḷāṟu.

Now let us see whether it is possible to say anything about the part played by the Chōla king in the battle of Teḻḷāṟu. The Vellūṟpāḷayam plates of Nandivarman III dated in his 6th year mention a Chōla king by name Kumarāṇukūsa and the gift of a village made at his request.\(^3\) Apparently Kumarāṇukūsa was a feudatory of the Pallava king. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri regards this Chōla king as belonging to a separate line of Chōlas who “form the link connecting the early Cōḷas of the Tamil country and the numerous dynasties of petty chieftains in the Telugu and Karnataka country.”\(^4\) Nevertheless we may regard the Chōla king as a Tamil ruler for the inscription comes from a Tamil district and is written in Sanskrit and Tamil. Though his prowess is praised in the record, his martial exploits are not stated. Perhaps he might have fought against the Pāṇḍyas on some earlier occasion. It is not known if he took part in the battle of Teḻḷāṟu which is mentioned in most of the records of Nandivarman III issued from his tenth year.

The Tamil work *Nandikkalambakam* describes how Nandivarman III captured Pāḻaiyārāi destroying the hostile

---

1. e.g., *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 56.
armies.\textsuperscript{1} As has been already noted Paḷaiyārai was one of the centres of the Chōḷa power during the period under review. Since Nandivarmaṇḍa III is said to have taken Paḷaiyārai after a fight, it seems probable that the Chōḷas of this place had stood by the Pāṇḍyas in their war with the Pallava king. The capture of Paḷaiyārai was doubtless followed by the Chōḷa acknowledgement of Pallava overlordship for the \textit{Nandikkalambakam} describes Nanivarmaṇḍa III as the lord of the Chōḷa country, lord of Uraiyūr etc.\textsuperscript{2}

It may be noted in passing that some time after the famous battle of Teḻḷāru the Chōḷas under Vijayālaya took Tanjore from the Muttaraiyars who were probably at that time in alliance with the Pāṇḍyas. The event contributed much to the rise of the Chōḷa power and was responsible for the waning of the Muttaraiya power in the Kāverī region.

The battle of Teḻḷāru did not put an end to the Pallava-Pāṇḍya struggle for supremacy over the Chōḷa country. Some years after that war, Srīmaṇḍa Śrīvallabha, the father of Varaguṇa II, invaded the Chōḷa country, and according to the Śrīnīvamaṇḍūr plates, defeated the Chōḷas along with the Pallavas, Gaṅgas, Kaliṅgas and Magadhas.\textsuperscript{3} It is not known whether after this war the Chōḷas paid allegiance to the Pāṇḍyas or to the Pallavas. Whatever it may be, the Śrīnīvamaṇḍūr plates contain the first clear testimony for the Pallava-Chōḷa alliance.

The accession of Nṛpatuṅgavarmaṇḍa, the son and successor of Nandivarmaṇḍa III, was followed by his war with

\begin{enumerate}
\item “\textit{S. I. I.} Vol. III. p. 461.”
\item \textit{Ibid.} vv. 5 and 44.
\item \textit{S. I. I.} Vol. III. p. 461.
\end{enumerate}
the Pāṇḍyas. In the battle of Arichit Nṛipatuṅgavarman is said to have "burnt a confederation of enemies in a battle on the bank of the Arichit." Though the role of the Chōjas in this war is not clear from the evidence at our disposal, it is possible that they assisted the Pallava king.

There seems to have been no active hostilities between the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallavas for about two decades after this war. During this period the Chōjas were steadily strengthening themselves. The persistent efforts of the Pāṇḍyas to bring the Kāveri region under their control resulted in the great battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam about A.D. 880. In that final contest between the Pallavas and the Pāṇḍyas the Chōjas rendered remarkable assistance to their Pallava overlord, Aparājita. It has been aptly remarked that in this battle the Pallavas owed their success more to the might of their feudatories than to their own. The results of the war were far-reaching. The great benefits of the victory were reaped not by the Pallavas but by the Chōjas whose services in the war earned for them territories far beyond their traditional frontiers. The disappearance of the danger of Pāṇḍya imperialism which had for some time past been responsible

for the effective alliance between the declining Pallavas and the rising Chōḷas now made room for a conflict between them.

Some years after the victory at Śrīpuṟambiyam the relations between the Chōḷas and the Pallavas seem to have become strained in spite of the fact that Āditya I had a Pallava princess for his queen.¹ It seems that at the same time the Muttaraiyars and the Koḻumbāḷūr chiefs were steadily coming under Chōḷa control. The immediate cause of Āditya I’s attack on the Pallava empire is not known. Yet there is no doubt that it put an end to the Pallava power. The Tiruvālāṅgādu plates² and the Kaṇyākumari inscription³ describe how Āditya conquered Toṇḍaimandalam killing Aparājīta in a great fight. Many similar cases of overmighty feudatories superseding their paramount powers are found in Indian history. The early Kadambas were overthrown by their vassals, the W. Chāḷukyas, the latter by their feudatories, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas by their Chāḷukya feudatories.

In conclusion it may be said that on some occasions the Chōḷas of the Tamil country assisted the Pallavas in their campaigns against the W. Chāḷukyas and Pāṇḍyas and on some other occasions made common cause with the Pāṇḍyas against the Pallavas. Though the Pallava power was brought to a close by the Chōḷas, they were not wholly responsible for it for frequent wars on distant fronts greatly exhausted the resources of the Pallava empire. That apart, the Pallavas lost the support of almost all their feudatories even before Āditya I’s invasion of the Toṇḍaimandalam. The Bāṇas

3. T. A. S. Vol. III. No. 34. v. 55.
became independent of the Pallava power about A.D. 888. The Muttaraiyars, the W. Gaṅgas and the Kōḍumbāḻūr chiefs seem to have come under Chōḷa influence. The limited area within which Aparājita's inscriptions are found indicates the speedy decline of the Pallava power.¹ There can be, therefore, no wonder that Āditya I compassed the ruin of the Pallava power at one blow.

Religion:

The Pallava period witnessed great religious movements in the Tamil country in general and in the Chōḷa country in particular. All the important religions of the day had their zealous votaries there. Though the Chōḷas followed Śaivism and Vaishnavism, they tolerated the protestant faiths viz., Jainism and Buddhism.

Śaivism:

It is significant that a great majority of the sixty three Nāyānārs (i.e., Śaiva saints) belonged to the Chōḷa country.² It is beyond the scope of the work to give any detailed account of them. Nevertheless, something may be said about some of them. St. Sambandar, the first and foremost of the Čēvāram trio, was a native of Śīrkaḷi (Tanjore district). He espoused the cause of Śaivism throughout the Tamil country and was, to a considerable extent, responsible for the fall of Jainism and Buddhism from their proud position in the Tamil country. His majestic hymns and extensive pilgrimages greatly helped the growth of Śaivism. Śīruṭṭoṇḍar another celebrated Śaiva saint, came from Tiruchcheṅgāṭṭāṅkuḷi

(Tanjore district) and, according to the *Periyapurāṇam*, led the Pallava expedition to Vātāpi, the W. Chāḷukya capital. Māṇakkaṉārā and Kalikkāmar, two other Nāyārārs, are described by the same work as Chōḷa generals. It is also known from the *Periyapurāṇam* that when St. Appar visited the Śivā temple at Pāḷaiyārāi, the Jains of the place hid the Śivalinga and that the Chōḷa king (of Pāḷaiyārāi) intervened in the matter and had the liṅga restored to its original place. St. Sundarar is said in the same work to have been received at Madura by a Chōḷa prince along with Pāṇḍya and Chēra kings. The Velurpāḷayam plates of Nandivarmān III dated in his 6th year state that at the request of Kumarāṅkuśa, a Chōḷa prince, the village of Tirukkāṭuppaḷi was granted to the temple of Yājñēsvāra at the same place. The Chōḷa king Vijayalaya is known to have erected a temple in Tanjore for goddess Durgā. An inscription of Āditya I from Tiruppāḷaṇam (Tanjore district) dated in his 23rd year states that his queen who was of Pallava descent made a gift for a lamp to the god of Tiruppāḷaṇam. A similar gift was made by

1. “சோர்நாள் சோசுமப்புள்ள சமஸ்த வெளிப்புள்ள,
பெருமார் மீன முலகி வளைப்புள்ள வெள்ளிக்
ஆரங்க வங்கிய வல்லியுள்ள வங்கிக்குள்,
சுருங்கில் சோசும சுகிராண்டோ சுகிராண்டோ.”

“சுருங்கில் அச்சுன் கள்ளங்கள் சித்தாயிரம் நூற்றாண்டு
சோசுமப்புள்ள தேவகியன் தேவின் நோய்வெடை,
அளப்புள்ள சுருங்கில் வங்கியுள்ள வெளிக்
சுருங்கில் வளையுள்ள வெளியுள்ள வெளியுள்ள.”
vv. 91 and 92 of Kaḷarirṛgagivār purāṇam.


4. 161 of 1928.
the same queen to the Śiva temple at Tiruchchātturai (Tanjore taluk).  

It is worthy of note that there were many Śaiva māthas in the Chōla country during the Pallava period. The māthas at Tirumarukal, Tiruvārūr, Tiruvijimjialai, Vēdāraṇyam, Sīrkaḻi, Tiruppukalur and Tirukkaḍavūr were, according to the Periyapurāṇam, visited by St. Sambandar.

**Vaishṇavism:**

As regards Vaishṇavism it was professed by some Chōla rulers and was in general patronised by all. According to the Guruparambarāprabāvam, a late Vaishṇava work, Ṭonḍaraṇippōdi Āḻvār, Tiruppāṇ Āḻvār and Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār hailed from the Chōla country. Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār who belonged to a predatory class began his life as a Chōla general, turned against his master, became a freebooter and looted the Buddhist Vihāra at Negapatam. His most significant contribution to the Nālāyiraprabandham is the Periyatirumōṭi.

Ṭonḍaraṇippōdi Āḻvār, also known as Vipranārāyaṇa lived for a time with Dēvadāvī, a courtesan, got into trouble, but was finally saved by Lord Raṅganātha. Tirumālai and Tiruppaṭṭḷiṭuchchi are his contribution to the Nālāyiraprabandham.

Tiruppāṇ Āḻvār came of the lowest caste but his devotion to Lord Raṅganātha was so great that he asked his Brähman priest to bring the devotee to his presence. The Nālāyira-prapandham contains hymns - only 10 stanzas -, of this Āḻvār.

---

1. No. 351 of S. I. I. Vol. XIII.
Tondaraippodi Alvar and Tiruppān Alvar were contemporaries of Tirumālagai Alvar who was a contemporary of Nandivarman II.¹

A Chōla king of Uraiyr by name Dharmavarman is described in the Guruparambarāprabāvam as the father of the well-known Uraiyr-Nāchchiyār² “who declined to marry a mortal, and insisted successfully on her union with Lord Ranganātha.”³ An inscription of Pallava Dantivarman from Tiruchchānūr (Chandragiri taluk, Chittoor district) dated in his 51st year records the gift of gold by the Chōla king Ulakapperumānār of the Chōla country to the Visnu temple of that place.⁴ It appears that the Chōlas of this period did not erect any temple ‘that could survive the effects of time.’⁵

_Jainism:_

Attention has already been drawn to the mention in the Periyapurāṇam of the existence at Paḷaiyāḷai of Jains. The puranic testimony is confirmed by a poem in Yāpparunīgalam

---

1. See The Classical Age. p. 263.
2. The Guruparambarāprabāvam—Tiruppān Alvar Vaibavam.
5. Mr. V. Venkayya observes: ‘Like the W. Cāḷukyas during the period of Rāṣṭrakūṭa supremacy, the Eastern Cāḷukyas during the period of interregnum between A. D. 972 and 999 and the Pāṇḍyas at the time of Cōla supremacy, the Cōḷas at the time of which we are now speaking, probably did nothing worthy of permanent record and were apparently not in a position to erect any monuments that could survive the effects of time.” (A. S. I. 1905–6), p. 178.
(virutti). Tiruchchirāpalli, as the suffix of the name seems to suggest, was originally a Jain centre, but probably with Mahāndravarman’s conversion to Saivism the influence of the Jains of that place began to wane. Other centres of Jainism in the Chāla country have been dealt with in the chapter on the Muttaraiyars.

Buddhism:

It is known from the Periyapurāṇam that Bōdhimaṅgai3 was a great seat of Buddhist learning, that St. Sambandar was challenged by the Buddhists of that place, that he vanquished them in a theological disputation and that on their defeat they embraced Saivism. According to the Guruparambarā-prabāvam, there was a Buddhist vihara at Negapatam in the time of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār. Inscriptions of the Greater Chólas

1. “இந்த வருடம் எதிர்கொண்டு பூண்டிக்கு வந்துகொண்டே இந்தக் குறிக்கினை, மித்தின் முன்புது ஐந்தாண்டுகளில் கூறிக்கூர்வும், இறைவன் புரூர்வு யுவராச திதியாக குறித்து மாடம், அடை குரு வருணா ஆல்பா சித்திரையிலிருந்து லும்புத்தி சுருந்தி.’’


point to such a possibility.\footnote{1}{Pāñaiyārai is also known to have been a Buddhist centre during the Pallava period.\footnote{2}}

The data given above go to prove that the rapid progress of Śaivism and Vaishnavism during the Pallava period did not result in the complete extinction in the Chōla country of Jainism and Buddhism. But their great influence in the Chōla country was gone for ever. The religious policy of the Chōlas of this period was, to some extent, responsible for such a change.

\textit{Yāpparungal-alam (virutti)—quoted in J.A.U. Vol. XVI. p. 32. Prof. T. P. Minakshisundaram and Mr. T.V. Sadasiva Pandarathar think that ‘पुत्र’ is a contraction of Pāñaiyārai and that ‘चित्रालाक’ was probably a Chōla feudatory of the Pallavas. (Ibid).}
V

THE CHÖLAS OF RÉNÄNDU (c. A. D. 545 – c. 630)

The history of the Chölas of Rënändu during the period under review is not so obscure as that of the Chölas of the Tamil country. Besides a large number of stone records we have some copper-plate records of these Chölas. There is, however, much uncertainty about their chronology and, to some extent, genealogy.

As regards Rënändu Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri states that it "comprised the tract of land lying along the Kundërù river in the Cuddapah and Karnûl districts," though a slightly different view is expressed by the same historian and Mr. M Venkataramayya in E. I. Vol. XXVII (1947) p. 225. Dr. N. Venkataramannayya thinks that Rënändu comprised the whole of the Cuddapah district. Mr. V. Venkayya holds that the south-west of the Anantapur district was part of the Rënändu country. Since most of the records of the Chölas of Rënändu come from the Jammalamadugu, Proddatur, Kamalapuram, Pulivendla and Razampeta taluks of the Cuddapah district, it is certain that a major portion of the district was in the Rënändu country. Hiuen Tsang's description of Chu-li-ya i. e., the kingdom of the Chölas, makes it clear that the forest region of the Kurnool district was a part of Rënändu. The identification of Chirpali, the capital of

Puṇyaṅkumāra, with Chippili in the Madanapalle taluk of the Chittoor district makes it probable that portions of this district also formed part of Rēṇāṇḍu. It is quite doubtful whether Rēṇāṇḍu included any part of the Kolar or Anantapur district.

A word also about the origin of these Chōḷas will not be out of place here. Mr. V. Venkayya thinks that portions of the Kurnool and Cuddapah districts formed part of the dominions of Karikāla, that either the expansion of the W. Chāḷukyas under Pulikēśin II or the aggression of the Pallavas on an earlier occasion must have broken up the power of the Chōḷas and that in consequence of it, the Chōḷa power in the Telugu country was confined to a small territory known as Rēṇāṇḍu. On the other hand Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri rejects this view and states that “the Pallava dominion of the Simhavishṇu line may have been the medium through which the drift of the Cōḷas to the north took place.” Another suggestion made by the same historian and Mr. M. Venkataramayya on an earlier occasion is that the migration of the Chōḷas to the Telugu country was “part of a general northward movement caused by the conditions following upon the disturbances due to the Gupta raid into Eastern Deccan.” All these views are apparently based on uncertain presumptions. As far as available evidence is concerned there is no indication that the Chōḷas established their rule in the Telugu country before the 5th century A.D. What appears to be probable is that the establishment of Kaṭabhrā rule at Kāverippūmpatṭīnām referred to in the

2. A. S. I. 1905-6, p. 175, F. n. 8.
Vinayavinicchaya of Buddhadatta (5th century A. D.) caused the migration to the Telugu country of a branch of the Chōla dynasty. Deprived of their traditional territory the Chōlas sought their fortune in the far off northern region and eventually acknowledged the supremacy of the Pallavas.

Nandivarman (c. A. D. 540–c. 565.)

Nandivarman, the great-grandfather of Pūnyakumāra, mentioned in the Mālepāḍu and Dommar-Nandyāla plates is the first known Chōla king of Rēṇāṇḍu. Since he is named after the Pallava king, Nandivarman I, it may be surmised that he was a feudatory of that Pallava king who may be assigned to the first half of the 6th century A. D. There seems to be no difficulty in presuming that the father of this Chōla king was a subordinate of the Pallavas and hence named his son after a Pallava king. Little is known of the

5. Writing on the Mālepāḍu plates Mr. H. Krishna Sastri expresses “the possibility of some undefined relationship, political or otherwise, that may have existed between the Chōlas of the Cuddapah district and the Pallavas of Kāñchi” (E. I. Vol. XI. p. 341). The relationship is not too obscure to define. The ancient practice of feudatories assuming the names and titles of their overlords makes it easy to understand the nature of early Telugu Chōla-Pallava connections: The striking similarity in the names and titles of the early Telugu Chōlas and the Pallavas clearly indicates the subordination of the former to the latter. There seems to have been no matrimonial alliance between the two dynasties.
services of this Chōla king to the Pallavas. Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar suggests that either this Chōla king or his son, Sundarananda may be identified with Nandachōla whose benefactions to the Vishnu temple at Śrīraṅgam are noted in the Tamil Vaishnava work, Kōyiloṭhu.\(^1\) This suggestion is very doubtful.

Simhavishṇu (c. A. D. 565 – c. 575)

Nandivarman had three sons\(^2\) and was succeeded by the eldest of them, Simhavishṇu, obviously named after the Pallava king Simhavishṇu (c. A. D. 575–c. 600). Nothing is known about the political activities of this Chōla king.

Dhaṇaṅjayavarma (c. A. D. 585–c. 595)

The order of succession after the Chōla king Simhavishṇu is not clear though it is possible that he was followed by his two brothers in succession.\(^3\) Dhaṇaṅjayavarma, the youngest brother of Simhavishṇu, figures in an inscription from Kalamallīa (Kamalapuram taluk, Cuddapah district).\(^4\) Another inscription from Eṟṟagudipādu (the same taluk) is also assigned to this king.\(^5\) The latter record mentions Erikal Mutturaju and Vallava Dukaraju. Erikal Mutturaju is regarded as identical with Dhaṇaṅjayavarma and

---

Vallava Dukarajulu is taken to be a Pallava prince of Kanchi, probably Simhavishnu.¹

Mahendravarman (c. A. D. 595–c. 620).

Dhananjayavarman was followed by his son Mahendravarman I. The Malapadu plates of Punyakumara state that Mahendravarman acquired the title ‘Chola Mahârâja’ and was the lord of Pandya, Chola and Kera countries.² Two inscriptions from Kamalapuram taluk are assigned to this king.³ It is held by Dr. N. Venkatramanayya that Mahendravarman’s assumption of the title Chola Mahârâja indicates his assertion of independence.⁴ But the title Mahârâja was generally assumed by powerful feudatories besides independent kings. For instance, Kumarankusa, a Chola vassal of Nandivarma III, is called Chola Mahârâja in the Velarpalayam plates.⁵ Therefore Mahendravarman’s title, Chola Mahârâja, need not necessarily indicate his independent status. On the other hand his name and his contemporaneity with Pallava Mahendravarman I make it certain that he was a feudatory of the Pallava king.⁶ As this Chola king is called “the lord of Pandya, Chola and Kera

---

1. Ibid. p. 227. A certain Dhananjayavarman figures in some Kannaḍa records from the Tumkur district—E. C. Vol. XII. Mi. 97 and 100). He should be different from Dhananjayavarman of Rânaḍu for he is assigned to the 8th century A. D. See E. C. Vol. XII. Intro. p. 7.
countries" it is inferred that he probably helped the Pallava king Simhavishnu in his southern campaigns. If this inference is accepted, it may be said that while he was crown-prince, the Chola king assisted the Pallava king against the southern powers.

_Gaṇamudita_ (c. A.D. 620–625).

The Chola king Mahendravarman I had two sons, Gaṇamudita and Puṇyakumāra. Gaṇamudita, the elder, appears to have ruled only for a short period. The name Gaṇamudita is said to have been modelled on Gaṇabhara, a title of Pallava Mahendravarman I. If this view is accepted, it follows then that Gaṇamudita was named after one of the titles of his Pallava contemporary. It may be noted that this view is in harmony with the date given here for Gaṇamudita.

_Puṇyakumāra_ (c. A.D. 625–655)

Gaṇamudita was succeeded by his brother Puṇyakumāra. There is a difference of opinion among scholars in regard to the date of Puṇyakumāra. Mr. H. Krishna Sastri refers to the Mālepāḍu plates of this king to the end of the 8th century A.D. on scriptal grounds. Mr. H. K. Narasimhasvami assigns the Dommarā-Nandyāla plates issued by the same king in his 10th year i.e., five years after the Mālepāḍu plates, to the middle of the 8th century A.D. On the other hand

Dr. N. Venkataramanayya states that the Mālēpādu plates belong to the middle of the 7th century. On scriptal grounds the stone inscriptions of Puṇyakumāra are assigned by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and Mr. M. Venkataramayya to the first half of the 7th century. Dr. P. Sreenivasachari also holds the same view. Of these views Dr. N. Venkataramanayya's is most probable and is supported by other considerations. It has been accepted even by H. Krishna Sastri that "the adoption by Puṇyakumāra and his ancestors of titles and names which were current among Pallava kings of Simhavishnu line, makes it probable that they were either the subordinates of the Pallavas or succeeded them politically." It must be noted that in case a feudatory wished to assume the name or title of the supreme dynasty, he assumed for the most part the name or title of his contemporary overlord and not the name or title of his overlord's ancestors. It was in keeping with this practice that the Chōlas of Rānāḍu assumed the names and titles of their Pallava masters. In short, the names and titles of these Chōla rulers furnish a clue for determining their chronology. Thus, some of the titles of Puṇyakumāra which are akin to those of Pallava Mahēndravarman I, show that he was a contemporary—perhaps a younger contemporary, and a feudatory of the

5. Puṇyakumāra's titles Mārdavachitta and Mādāṇavilāsā "indicate some apparent affinity to Mattavilāśa and Vichitrachitta, the recognised birudas of (Pallava) Mahēndravarman I"—*E. I.* XI. p. 341. See also H. Krishna Sastri's view on the name of the Chōla king Mahēndravarman I—*Ibid.*
Pallava king.¹ All these facts go to prove that Krishna Sastri’s date for Puṇyakumāra is untenable.

Though Puṇyakumāra began his career as a subordinate of the Pallavas, he did not continue to be so to the end. In the Rāmēśvaram pillar inscription he bears the title Pṛithivīvallabha and his queen bears the name Vasantipōrī Chōla-mahādevī.² The title Pṛithivīvallabha was borne by the Chālukyas of Vatāpi.³ As regards Vasantipōrī it is said that the suffix of her name, pōrī, indicates her connections with the Chālukya dynasty of Vatāpi.⁴ In other words the word Pōrī is held to be peculiar to the royal ladies of Vatāpi.⁵ Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has shown the improbability of Vasantipōrī belonging to Pōrī family whose records⁶ are found in the Chittoor district.⁷ It is therefore probable that Puṇyakumāra had a Chālukya princess for his queen. His assumption of the Chālukya title Pṛithivīvallabha reinforces the view. The early Telugu Chōla—W. Chālukya matrimonial

---

1. E. I. Vol. XXVII, p. 251. Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, however, holds that Puṇyakumāra was an independent king and that his assumption of titles similar to those of Pallava Mahēndravarman I was due to his admiration for the latter (M. C. C. Mag. Jan. 1929, p. 17). This is unconvincing.


5. Ibid. The examples given by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya support the view. The names of Vijayamahādevi Pōrī, queen of Chandrāditya, son of Pulikēśin II, and Pṛithivīpōrī, daughter of the Eastern Chālukya king Māṇgi Mahārāja are worthy of note.

6. e. g., 307 and 329 of 1922.

alliance must have taken place sometime before the 5th year of Puṇyakumāra.¹ The alliance does not appear to have been preceded by any war as the Aihoḷe inscription of Pulikēśin II makes no mention of any conflict between the two powers. Puṇyakumāra’s subordinate alliance with the W. Chāḷukyas was not immediately followed by his abandonment of such titles which indicate his connections with the Pallavas.²

The Chōla king’s part in the Pallava–W. Chāḷukya contest of his period is not clear. But it is possible that he fought on the side of the Chāḷukyas in some of the campaigns. Of the three places where Pallava Narasimhavarmaṇ I, triumphed over Pulikēśin II, Maṇimaṅgalam is situated near Kāṅchī; Sūramāra may be identified with Sūramāla in the Kalahasti division of the Chittoor district; Pariyajā may be identified with Paidēla in the Proddatur taluk of the Cuddapah district.³ The identification of the last two places suggests that Rēnāṇḍu was also the scene of Pallava–W. Chāḷukya conflict.

The names of certain villages in the Cuddapah district seem to indicate that the Rēnāṇḍu country or part of it was occupied by the Pallavas under Narasimhavarmaṇ I.⁴ It is untenable to say that the Chōjas of Rēnāṇḍu were independent during this period when the Pallavas and the W. Chāḷukyas were engaged in a fierce struggle.⁵ An inscription from

1. The Rāmāśvaram pillar inscription is dated in the 5th year Puṇyakumāra.
4. Māmillaḷḷi and three villages of the name Narasimhapuram in the Badvel taluk and a village of the same name in the Rajampet taluk are worthy of note.
Tippalūru (Kamalapuram taluk) dated in the first year of W. Chāḷukya Vikramādiṭṭya Satyaśraya records a grant of Pannāsa at Marraḷūru to God Veṅgipāra-Īśvara made by Vāmbuḷu while Pōrmukharāma was ruling over Bāṇarāja’s territory bounded by the Peṇṇā river. ¹ Pōrmukharāma of this record is doubtless identical with Puṇyakumāra who alone in his dynasty had that surname. As regards Vikramādiṭṭya we come across two monarchs of the same name in the W. Chāḷukya dynasty one in the 7th century and the other in the 8th century. Both of them had the title Satyaśraya.² On scriptal grounds Vikramādiṭṭya of the inscription is identified with Vikramādiṭṭya II of the 8th century.³ But, as we have seen, it is not possible to assign Puṇyakumāra to the 8th century. Therefore Vikramādiṭṭya of this record must be identified with Vikramādiṭṭya I (son and successor of Pulikeśin II) who ruled in the latter half of the 7th century. The record makes it clear that Puṇyakumāra was a subordinate of W. Chāḷukyas and that his reign lasted till at least the first regnal year of W. Chāḷukya Vikramādiṭṭya I i. e., about A. D. 655. Another thing to be noted here is that Puṇyakumāra exercised his sway over Bāṇarāja’s territory bounded by the Peṇṇa – i. e., Peṇṇār river. The establishment of Puṇyakumāra’s rule over the Bāṇa territory was perhaps the result of Bāṇa subordination to the W. Chāḷukyas. As regards the successors of Puṇyakumāra they were most probably the subordinates of the W. Chāḷukyas.

It is not known whether the ‘descendants of Sundarananda, the second son of the Chōla king Nandivarmaṇ, had any contact with the Pallavas of Kaṇchi.

1. 284 of 1937–38.
It is not unlikely that the subordination of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu was of considerable assistance to the consolidation and rise of the Pallava power in the time of Simhavishnu. But their subordinate alliance with the Chāḷukyas of Vatapi in the first half of the 7th century greatly weakened the Pallavas. The Pallavas lost the powerful support of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu once for all. Like the latter, the Bāṇas whose territory was adjacent to Rēnāṇḍu threw in their lot with the W. Chāḷukyas. It was only in the reign of Nandivarma II that we again find the Bāṇas figuring as the allies of the Pallavas. The Pro-W. Chāḷukya policy of the two feudatory dynasties facilitated the frequent incursions of the W. Chāḷukyas into the heart of the Pallava empire.

Jainism:

It is not possible to give any detailed account of the cultural role of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu in the Pallava empire for the available evidences relating to this aspect are scanty. The account of Hiuen Tsang states that the people of Chu-li-ya (i.e., the Chōḷa country) were believers in the Tīrthikas (i.e., Tīrthaṅkaras), that Digambara Jains were popular and that there were several tens of Deva temples in the country.¹ The existence of Jainism in the Rēnāṇḍu country is also borne out by epigraphical evidence. A Sanskrit inscription found on the hill at Panikēlapāṇḍu in the Jammalamadugu taluk (Cuddapah district) states that the excellent teacher Vīrshabha who was cloud to the crops namely the righteous (Bhavyas) and who was an unshakable rock to his opponents in discourse, lived on this hill.² As

2. 401 of 1940–41.
the term Bhavyas is generally applied to the Jains, Vrīshabha may be taken to be a Jain sage. The conclusion is confirmed by another record. A Kannaḍa inscription from the Chik-Ballapur taluk of the Kolar district describes a certain Vrīshabha as “the most excellent of the Jainas”. It is certain that Vrīshabha of the latter record is identical with his namesake mentioned in the former record. The probable date given by L. Rice for Vrīshabha is A. D. 750. But, since the script of the former inscription is considered to be assignable to the 7th century the Jain sage may have lived in that period.

_Buddhism:_

The existence of Buddhism in the Rānāṭḍu country is borne out by the account of Hiuen Tsang. But at the time of the Chinese pilgrim’s visit, Buddhism was declining in Rānāṭḍu. There were several Buddhist monasteries. But all of them “were in ruins, and only some of them had Brethren.”

_Saivism and Vaishṇavism:_

Though it is certain that Saivism and Vaishṇavism must have large number of followers in the Rānāṭḍu country, much information is not available in respect of them. The Rāmēśvaram Pillar inscription of Pūryakumāra refers to a Siva temple (the temple of Vasantisvara) at Tārūmuṇḍi which

---

was endowed with two gardens by his queen. It is not known whether the temple was built before or after his alliance with the W. Chājukyas.

*Patronage of Learning:*

The Chōlas of Rānāndu were in general noted for learning and patronage of learning. The Chōla king Mahendra-varman I is described in the Mālepādu plates as having been "well versed in grammar and other sciences." Religious learning was much encouraged and a number of inscriptions record gifts of lands and even villages to pious scholars. It is interesting to note that these Chōlas patronised Telugu and Sanskrit. Most of their earlier records are in Telugu and are very valuable to students of Philology. Some of their copper-plate records like the Mālepādu and Dommara-Nandyāla plates are in Sanskrit prose and verse.

---

VI

THE ADIGAMĀNS (c. A. D. 550 – c. 880)

The history of the Adigamāns of Koṅgu is a long but chequered one. The Saṅgam works Puṭanāṉūṟu² and Aga-nāṉūṟu² contain poems composed in praise of Adiyamān Neḍūmān Anji, a contemporary of the celebrated poetess Avvaiyar. Tagadūr, now known as Dharmapuri (Salem district) was the capital of the Adigamāns. It is not clearly known whether the Adigamāns ruled over a part or the whole of the Koṅgu country.⁵

The Periyapurāṇam of Sakkilar describes at some length a fight between the Chōla king Pugazh Chōla and a certain Adigamān ruler.⁶ The Chōla king who is described as the

---

1. The word Adigamān appears to have been the dynastic name. It was also known as Adigamān, Adhiyamān and Adigān.
3. Poems 162 and 352.
4. It may be noted that Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar’s identification of Satiyaputa with an Adigamān ruler of Tagadūr is supported by T. Burrow (B. S. O. A. S. Vol. XII, pt. I. p. 475).
5. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri holds the former view (The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom p. 62) and Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandararathar the latter view. (Pāṇḍyar Varalāṟu. p. 52).
overlord of the Adigamān chief is assigned to a period between A. D. 300 and 500.¹ We do not know whether this Adigamān chief had any relations with the Pallavas.

According to some Kannadā inscriptions Durvinita who is assigned to the period c. A. D. 540 – c. 600² triumphed over a certain Kāduvetṭi,³ and his little son assumed the "Koṅgaṇī crown from the people of Kāduvetṭi."⁴ 'Koṅgaṇī crown' is taken to mean the Koṅgu crown i. e., the rule of the Koṅgu country.⁵ Kāduvetṭi apparently refers to the Pallava king. If these statements are taken at their face value, they would mean that before the accession of Durvinita, the Koṅgu country was under Pallava supremacy. But no indication of it is seen in the records of the early Pallavas. Nevertheless, it is very probable that Durvinita conquered the Koṅgu country. An inscription from Dod-Ballapur taluk⁶ mentions his successful campaigns in the Salem and Coimbatore districts.⁷ But, before long, the Koṅgu country passed into the hands of the Pallavas.⁸

According to the Kaśākkudī plates of Nandivarman II, Simhavishṇu (c. A. D. 575 – c. 600), the father of

---

8. The Tamil work Koṅgudāsarājākkaḷ which professes to give an account of the rulers of Koṅgu mentions the Raṭṭas among the earlier dynasties that ruled over Koṅgu. But little is known of the relations between the Raṭṭas and the Adigamān.
Mahēndravarman, conquered a Malava king. The Malava king mentioned in the record, is no doubt, the king of the Malavas who were well-known for their valour. According to Mr. K. S. Vaidyanathan Malanādu, the territory of the Malavas lay in between the Chōla and Koṅgu countries and Maṇa-Koṅgu, a part of Malanādu included the Kollimalais and its neighbourhood in the Namakkal taluk of the Salem district. That even as early as the Saṅgam period the Malavas were under the Adigamānīs is clear from the Puṇanānūṭu.

The Namakkal inscription which mentions Atiyēndra Vishnuṛiha besides the titles of Mahēndravarman I indicates that the Adigamānīs continued to exercise their control over the Malavas in the first half of the 7th century. There can, therefore, be no difficulty in identifying the Malava king mentioned in the Kaśākkudi plates with an Adigamānī ruler.

The Namakkal inscription cited above mentions the titles Nayapara, Prakṣitipriya, Narava(hana), Utpalakarnika and Udārachitta. Apparently the titles are those of Pallava Mahēndravarman I and indicate Pallava supremacy over the Malavas. As we have no evidence for thinking that Mahēndravarman I conquered a Malava king we may very well conclude that the subjugation of Malavas under the Adigamānīs was accomplished by Simhavishnu.

3. v. 88; Also see Dr. M. Arokiaswamy - The Koṅgu Country. P. H.
4. 7 of 1906.
5. Ibid.
It is not unlikely that Simhavishṇu's conquest of the Mañavas was followed by his conquest of the Chola country. The order in which the Kaśākkudi plates mention Simhavishṇu's achievements seems to render this view possible. But the fact that the plates belong to a much later period cannot be overlooked.

Very little is known of the role of the Adigamaṇis in the Pallava-Chalukya wars of the seventh and eighth centuries. It is not now possible to say how far the subordination of the Adigamaṇis to the Pallavas in the seventh century was responsible for the absence of any serious trouble to the Pallava empire from the W. Gaṅga side.

The proximity of the Koṅgu country to the Pāṇḍya, Pallava and W. Gaṅga kingdoms gave it a high strategic importance in the eighth century when the three powers were engaged in intermittent wars with one another. The Pāṇḍya incursions into Koṅgu seem to have begun in the reign of Kōchchaḍaiyaṇ Raṇadhīraṇ (c. A. D. 670 – c. 710) as he is described in the Vēḻvikkuṭi plates as Koṅgarkōmāṇ i.e., lord of the Koṅgas.¹ According to the same record his son Māṭavarman Rajasimha I (c. A. D. 710 – c. 765) subdued Māḷakoṅgam, worshipped the God Paśupati at Pāṇḍikkoṭumuḍi and presented heaps of gold and jewels to it.² From this it is clear that Pāṇḍya conquists in Koṅgu extended up to Koḍumuḍi (Erode taluk, Coimbatore district). Māḷakoṅgam or Māḷakoṅgu was, as we have noted above, a division of the Koṅgu country.³ The Vēḻvikkuṭi grant states that Pāṇḍya

2. Ibid.
3. Hist. Sk. An. Dek. p. 131. Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar states that Māḷakoṅgu was probably the eastern division (of Koṅgu) which extended eastwards from Karur.
Rajasimha contracted relationship with the W. Gaṅgas. This incident did not in any way bar the former's progress in Koṅgu as the Madras Museum plates of Jaṭilaivarman indicates. It seems that hitherto the Adigamāṅs did not come into conflict with the Pāṇḍyās. In case it had happened, it would have been so mentioned in the Vēḻvikkuḍi plates.

The Madras Museum plates of the Pāṇḍya king Jaṭilaivarman alias Neṭunjadaiya (c. A. D. 765 – c. 795) dated in his seventeenth year describe his fight with a certain Adigamāṅ ruler as follows: "Having seen Adiyan (who wore) a resplendent lance, turn to flight at Ayirūr Pugalīyūr and Ayiravēli (situated) on the northern bank of the Kāviri (which has) abundant waters (and which is) rich (in) fields, – (he) seized his (the enemy's) chariot (adorned with) sounding bells, along with a troop of horses (which were) fierce in battle; when the Pallava and the Kērāḷa (kings), having become his (the enemy's) allies, swelled and rose like the sea with numerous armies, so that the earth trembled, and when the western and eastern wings (of the army) joined, and were encamped (together), (the king) advanced against (the enemy) with a troop of spearmen and despatched a detachment, so that disaster befell both of them on both wings; captured the powerful king of western Koṅgu, along with (his) murderous elephants; placed (his) banner within the walls of Kūḍal (i. e., Maḍura) which has spacious halls decorated with precious stones; subdued Koṅgabhūmi so that the noisy drum was sounding his fame throughout Kaṅkabhūmi; unfastened the string of the cruel bow; entered the large village of Kaṅchivayal (?) (situated) in a woody region (that was) beautified by flower gardens; and built a temple resembling a hill to Tīrumāl (i. e., Vishṇu) (in which he) might joyfully

---

These events must have taken place sometime before c. A. D. 782 when the Madras Museum plates were issued. The three places where the Paṇḍya king defeated the Adigamānī ruler are said to have been situated on the northern bank of the Kāvarī.⁹

The Pallava king who along with the Kēraṇa king helped the Adigamānī chief was probably Nandivarman II or his son Dantivarman (c. A. D. 775 – c. 826). It is not improbable that the Pallava king was the overlord of the Adigamānī chief mentioned above. There is clear evidence that Nandivarman II held sway over, at least, part of the Koṅgu country. An undated Grantha inscription found on a rock near the Lakshminarasimha cave temple at Namakkal (Salem district) contains the words ‘Srīdhara’ and ‘Silabhṛtam.’¹³ The characters of the record are assignable to the eighth century A. D.⁴ Since Srīdhara is a well-known title of Nandivarman II,⁵ the record must be assigned to that Pallava king.

As regards the identification of the king of Western Koṅgu scholars differ. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri thinks that Adiyaṇi and the Western Koṅgu king of the Madras Museum plates were different rulers, and that the former was subordinate to the latter.⁶ But Mr. V. Venkayya,

Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar and Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar regard the two rulers as identical. The latter view is very probable.

The victory of the Pāṇḍya king was followed by the extension of the Pāṇḍya rule into Kōṅgu. It is evident that the Adigamān chief offered desperate resistance to the Pāṇḍya aggression.

We shall now examine the relations between the W. Gaṅgas and the Adigamān chiefs. A Tamil Vaiṭṭeḻuttu inscription of Śripuruṣar from Oṭṭapāṭṭi (Salem district) dated in his seventh year records that a certain Kūṇarundai-Vañgagā fell, perhaps in connection with a deer hunt. Another Vaiṭṭeḻuttu inscription of Śripuruṣaparumar from the same place dated in his 27th year states that Eṟumaiya Nakkaṉar, a servant of Teḻinīyār, fell while the latter captured Yeruvāyil. Obviously these are Vīrakkal inscriptions. It is suggested that Śripuruṣar and Śripuruṣaparumar of the two records may be identified with the W. Gaṅga king Śripurusha, that the latter record refers to one of the border fights between the W. Gaṅgas and the Adigamāns and that Teḻinīyār was a member of the Adigamān line. There is no difficulty in accepting the first and last suggestions. But the second

3. 212 of 1910.
4. 211 of 1910.
5. 211 of 1910.
7. The name Teḻinīyār may favourably be compared with Eḻini or Yavaṇika mentioned in the records of a later Adigamān chief (See *E. I.* Vol. VI. p. 331). It may also be noted that Adigamān Nedumān Aṉji’s son
is certainly wrong. The inscription\(^1\) is dated in the regnal year of Śrīpurusha and records the death of a servant of Teḷiṇiyār. These facts clearly show that Teḷiṇiyār was not an enemy but a subordinate of Śrīpurusha (c. A. D. 725–788).

It is not improbable that Śrīpurusha’s successful invasion of the Pallava empire\(^2\) took place at a time when the Adigamāṇs were feudatory to him. Attention has already been drawn to the existence of a village called Śrīpurusha- maṅgalam in the Wandiwash taluk (N. Arcot district). Two other villages in the same taluk are called Adiyāṅkuppm and Adiyaṅṭūr evidently after the Adiyamān chiefs. This perhaps indicates that the Adigamāṇs were connected with Śrīpurusha’s invasion of the Pallava empire. The existence of an Adigamāṇ inscription\(^3\) at Karaṅikkudī in the Vellore taluk of the N. Arcot district seems to lend support to this view.

The Adigamāṇs’ subordinate alliance with the W. Gaṅgas seems to have lasted only for short period for we soon find them in alliance with the Pallava and Kāraṇa kings. The Madras Museum plates of Jaṭilavarmaṇa alias Neṭuṇjadaiyaṇ was called Poguṭṭeḷiṇi (K. A: Nilakanta Sastri — *History of South India*. p. 118).

1. 211 of 1910.
2. In connection with the Bāṇas we have made a passing reference to a W. Gaṅga invasion of the Pallava empire in the time of Nandivarmaṇ II. That the invasion must have happened during the reign of Śrīpurusha is clear from insessional and other evidences. Possibly the invasion synchronized with the capture of Kāṅchi by W. Chāḻukya Vikramāditya II.
3. 65 of 1945–46.
refer to this alliance.\textsuperscript{1} This change in the attitude of the Adigamāṅs appears to have taken place after Nandivarman II's triumph over the W. Gaṅgas about A. D. 768\textsuperscript{2} and resulted in W. Gaṅga occupation of the Koṅgu country as far as Komāramāṅgalam (Tiruchchengodu taluk, Salem district) in the south.\textsuperscript{3} Consequently the Adigamāṅs were driven to the south-western part of the Koṅgu country. All these appear to have taken place sometime before A. D. 771.\textsuperscript{4} If we examine the reference in the Madras Museum plates to a W. Koṅgu king in the light of these events it will be easy to identify him with an Adigamāṅ chief. In that case the Pāṇḍya king Neṇudjadaiya cannot be said to have conquered the whole of the Koṅgu country.\textsuperscript{5}

The subsequent history of the Adigamāṅs is not clear. We find a certain Vijaya Iśvaravarna issuing records in his own name and regnal year in the Dharmapuri region.\textsuperscript{6} An inscription of the same ruler is found at Hebbini (Mulbagal taluk, Kolar district).\textsuperscript{7} Hebbini belonged to what was then called the Gaṅga Six-thousand which was a debatable ground for the W. Gaṅgas and the Bāṇas in the 9th century. The three epigraphs of Vijaya-Iśvaravarna are written in the Vaṭṭeluttu script of Tamil. We do not know whether this Vijaya-Iśvaravarna and Ko-Vijaya Śkandasishya of the

\begin{enumerate}
\item I. A. Vol. XXII. p. 73.
\item See S. I. I. Vol. II. pt. V. p. 529.
\item See the Salem plates of Śripuruṣha E. I. Vol. XXVII. pp. 145-8.
\item \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textit{Contra.} K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – \textit{The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom}. p. 62.
\item \textit{E. I.} Vol. VII. pp. 23 and 24.
\item \textit{Ibid.} p. 24. Ins. III.
\end{enumerate}
Rāyakōṭṭa plates (Krishnagiri taluk, Salem district) — were of Pallava or W. Gaṅga extraction. One of the Kīmmuttugūr inscriptions of Kṛś-Vijaya-Narasimhavarmaṇ (W. Gaṅga chief) dated in his 3rd year refers to a certain (Va)limadura, the chief of Tagadūr-naḍu. The record may be taken to indicate further the dislodgement of the Adigamāṅs from Tagadūr-naḍu and the establishment there of the sway of the W. Gaṅga chief. The circumstances under which these rulers came to exercise their sway over northern Koṅgu are not clear.

By A. D. 878 the Noḻambas under Mahendra occupied the Dharmapuri region and continued with success their war with the Bāṇas. It seems that during all these times the Adigamāṅs survived in obscurity. At any rate we find them again coming into prominence in the subsequent period of Chōla ascendancy.

To conclude W. Gaṅga Sripurusha’s invasion of the Pallava empire was most probably assisted by the Adigamāṅs who later co-operated with the Pallava and Kēraṇa rulers in combating the growing power of the Pāṇḍyas under Neḍuṇ-jadaiyaṇ in the latter half of the eighth century.

CULTURE:

Jainism:

It is interesting to note that in the Koṅgu country, Jainism, Vaishṇavism and Śaivism flourished side by side during the period under consideration. The Jain images

2. E. I. Vol. IV. No. 52.
found at Dharmapuri, Adamaṇḍakōṭṭai and Bastipuram, and the existence of a Jain monastery noted in an inscription from Dharmapuri show that Jainism had a considerable number of votaries in Koṅgu in general and at Dharmapuri in particular.

Vaishnāvism:

That the Adīgamāṇs had some leanings towards Vaishnāvism is clear from the evidence at our disposal. The Raṅganātha temple on the hill at Namakkal was erected by an Adīgamāṇ feudatory of the Pallavas. An inscription found in the central shrine of the temple refers to the Atiyendra-vishnu-griha and Atiyān-vavāyā. This makes it clear that the temple was originally called Atiyendra-vishnu-griha evidently after one of the Adiyamāṇs. Tradition embodied in the Koṅgumaṇḍalasatākam confirms the view. As the titles of Pallava Mahāndravarman I are mentioned in the inscription referred to above, it is certain that the temple must have come into existence during his time.

4. 7 of 1906.
5. *Poem 80.*
6. Another inscription found near the same temple (328 of 1938–39) mentions Manomaya in Pallava characters of the 7th century. We do not know the Pallava king
It is not unlikely that the Lakshmi Narasimha cave temple at Namakkal was constructed by an Adigamān ruler. The date of the temple is uncertain. Dr. M. Rajamanikkam assigns the temple to the reign of Narasimhavarman I. The Government Epigraphist thinks that it possibly belongs to the same period as that of the Raṅganātha temple mentioned above. Strangely enough neither of these two Vaishnava temples is mentioned in the Nālāyiratvaprapbandham, the Tamil scriptures of the Vaishnavas.

An undated Adigamān inscription from Karadiikkudi, (Vellore taluk, N. Arcot district) records an order of a certain Adigamān to the Uravar (people of the village) of Dharma-kuṟukkai in Āndai-nādu, communicating the remission of taxes on the land granted as tiruvāidaiyattam to the temple of Tiruvēṅgaḷamudaiyār in their village.

Sāivism:

As regards Sāivism it may be noted that a Śiva temple was in existence at Koṭumudi (Erode taluk, Coimbatore district) even in the first half of the 8th century. The temple is referred to in a hymn of St. Sundarar who sojourned the Koṅgu country. Though the temple of Mallikārjuna at

who bore this biruda. It is held that this biruda was borne by an Adigamān chief. (Paragraph 2 of M. E. R. 1939). This is improbable.

3. 65 of 1945–46.
5. முத்துப்பூரதைச் சிங்கிரிச் சிலம்பகம் பலிங்கு,
புராணபூரதைச் சிங்கிரிச் சிலம்பகம் மத்து

மத்துப்பூரதைச் சிங்கிரிச் சிலம்பகம் பலிங்கு,
Dharmapuri (Salem district) is, "in its style, so closely alike to Pallava structures of the 8th and 9th centuries A.D., that any casual observer with an eye to ancient architecture would not hesitate to pronounce it to be of the Later Pallava style,"¹ little is known of its builders. Mr. H. Krishna Sastri's view that the unique architecture of this temple is attributable to the Nojambas of the 9th century² is not based on any epigraphical or other evidence.

Architecture and Sculpture:

The central shrine of the Ranganatha temple at Namakkal "consists of rock-cut cave made up of (1) a raised platform with two pillars and two steps leading up to it, the base of the platform being cut into three tiers, (2) a hall with two pillars contiguous to (1) and (3) a small varandah beyond which the roof of the cave projects in a curve."³ The temple contains a number of beautiful images representing Vishnu, Brahma, Narada, Patañjali etc. The central shrine of the Lakshminarasimha temple on the hill at Namakkal "consists of a rock-cut cave with three sculptured cells, two pillars and a varandah in front."⁴ The sculptures in this temple represent stories of Lord Vishnu's different incarnations.

¹ M. E. R. 1911. p. 4.
² Ibid.
³ Paragraph 35 of M. E. R. 1906.
⁴ Paragraph 36 of M. E. R. 1906.
VII

THE WESTERN GAÑGAS

The subordination of some of the early W. Gañga kings to the Pallavas of Kāñchī is borne out by clear epigraphical evidence. Some scholars believe that even the founder of the W. Gañga dynasty, Koñgānivarman, alias Mādhava I was consecrated by a Pallava king to conquer the Bānas territory. But, as we have seen in connection with the Bānas, there is no clear evidence for supporting this view. In any case, it is certain that the rise of the early Gañgas was not viewed with disfavour by the Pallavas.

Harivarman to Mādhava III.

It is possible that, sometime after the cessation of hostilities between Mayūrasarma and the Pallavas, the Bānas occupied that portion of the Anantapur district which was then known as Paruvi vishaya and ruled from Paruvi which may be identified with Pargi in the Hindupur taluk of that district. At that time they are known to have been hostile to the Pallavas. It was probably with a view to crush the Bānas that Pallava Simhavarman I consecrated the W. Gañga prince, Harivarman (c. A. D. 445–c. 460), son of

2. See E. I. Vol. XIV. p. 331. It was because of their association, during this period, with Paruvi that the Bānas were called the lords of Paruvipuri (i.e. Paruvi) – S. I. I. Vol. II. No. 76, v. 24.
Mādhava II. There is no doubt that Harivarman was a vassal of the Pallava king. About c. A. D. 450, the Pallava king succeeded in subduing the Bāṇas. In his efforts the Pallava king must have certainly received substantial help from his W. Gaṅga feudatory. The Penukoṇḍa plates definitely indicate that the Bāṇas were dispossessed of Paruvi vishaya and that the W. Gaṅgas held it. The Digambara Jain manuscript, Lōkavibhāga which was copied in the 22nd year of Simhavarma i. e., Saka 380 at Pāṭalika in the Pāṇarāṣṭra makes it clear that at that time i. e., A. D. 458 the Bāṇas were subordinate to the Pallavas and that, having left Paruvi vishaya, they had settled in the Pallava empire. The existence of Pāṇarāṣṭra as part of the Pallava empire in A. D. 458 leads us to conclude that the date of the subjugation of the Bāṇas must be somewhere A. D. 450.

Vishṇugopa who succeeded Harivarman appears to have ruled only for a short period, say, five years. The Penukoṇḍa plates the Kūḍūr grant and the Chūkuttūr grant are conspicuously silent on Vishṇugopa though a number of


W. Gaṅga records refer to him.\(^1\) Like his predecessor Vishṇugopa also must have been a Pallava feudatory. Very little is known of his political activities.

Vishṇugopa was followed by Mādhava III (c. A. D. 465 – c. 500) who was crowned by the Pallava king Śkandavarma\(^a\) III.\(^2\) This W. Gaṅga king had another name, Simhavarma\(^a\), manifesting his subordination to the Pallavas.\(^3\) He married the sister of Kṛishṇavarma\(^a\) who belonged to the collateral line of the Kadambas.\(^4\) Mādhava III's matrimonial alliance with Kṛishṇavarma\(^a\) seems to have provoked the hostility of the main line of the Kadambas under Mṛigēśavarma\(^a\) (c. A. D. 475 – c. 490). The Halsi plates of Mṛigēśavarma\(^a\) dated in his 8th year states that he “uprooted the family of “Tuṅgagaṅga” and that he “was a very fire of destruction to the Pallavas”\(^5\). The identification of Tuṅgagaṅga cannot be attempted in the present state of our knowledge. But it is highly probable that the W. Gaṅga king who ruled at the time of the conflict was Mādhava III. The record clearly indicates that there was hostility between the Pallavas and the main line of the Kadambas during the period under consideration. It is not unlikely that the former supported their W. Gaṅga feudatory in the war. As regards the result of the war the allies must have sustained defeat as the inscription suggests.


\(^3\) \textit{Mys. Arch. Rep.} 1924. No. 81.

\(^4\) E. C. Vol. IX. Dod-Ball. No. 68.

\(^5\) I. A. Vol. VI. p. 25.
Krishnavarman, the father-in-law of Mādhava III, is known to have been defeated by the Pallavas. We do not know whether this in any way affected Mādhava III’s allegiance to the Pallavas. The coronation of Vishnuvarman (c. A. D. 485 – 497), son of Krishnavarman mentioned above, by a Pallava king may suggest the continuance of Pallava hegemony over Gaṅgavādi also. Still some records of Mādhava including the latest known one do not mention his connections with the Pallavas and this may raise a doubt whether he continued to be a Pallava vassal or not. But the evidences available do not help us in arriving at any definite conclusion.

_Avanita to Sivamāra II_

Mādhava III’s son and successor, Avanita (c. A. D. 500 – c. 540) ascended the W. Gaṅga throne in his infancy. It is not known if he acknowledged Pallava paramountcy. It appears that he was not hostile to the Pallavas. One of his records states that the mother of the Pallava king Simхаvishnu (c. A. D. 575 – c. 600) granted a village to a Jain temple for the benefit of her husband. Though it is certain that the Pallava queen belonged to the Gaṅga territory, her exact relation to Avanita is not clear.

Avanita’s son Durvinita (c. A. D. 540 – c. 600) exhibited hostility towards the Pallavas and his successors followed the same policy. In the first half of the 7th century Pulikēśin II conquered the W. Gaṅgas along with the Kadambas. From that time onwards till the overthrow of the W. Chālu kyas by

---

3. 1 of 1939–40.
the Rāṣṭrakūṭas we find the W. Gaṅgas figuring as the subordinate allies of the W. Chālukyas. The rise of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas was a menace to the W. Gaṅga kingdom. The danger made its first appearance even during the reign of Śripurusha. His son Śivamāra II was engaged in a protracted war with Gōvinda III (A. D. 794 – 814). The cessation of hostilities about A. D. 813 is said to have been followed by Śivamāra’s coronation by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Pallava kings of his time. The Maṇñe plates of Mārasimha I, son of Śivamāra II, refer to his father’s coronation by Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III and Pallava Nandivarman. The same information is also furnished by a later W. Gaṅga record. The implications of the Pallava king’s participation in the coronation of Śivamāra II are not clear. The supremacy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas over Gaṅgavādi was not disputed by the Pallavas. On the other hand the Pallavas themselves acknowledged in some form Rāṣṭrakūṭa supremacy. Whether the tribulations of Śivamāra II consequent on the invasion of his kingdom by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas made him acknowledge the hegemony of the Pallavas or whether he was in any way related to the Pallavas cannot be said in the absence of any concrete evidence. As regards the date of the record L. Rice thinks that the grant may have been made in A. D. 797 to which year the details given in the record correspond and that the record would have been issued about A. D. 813 for

3. E. C. Vol. IX. Nl. 60.
it mentions the reinstatement of Śivamāra II by Gōvinda III which took place about A.D. 813. In other words it is thought that the grant originally made at the time of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa – W. Gaṅga struggle was confirmed with all formalities after the cessation of hostilities. In that case the Pallava king mentioned in the Maṇe plates must be Nandivarman III (c. A. D. 826 – 849) son of Dantivarman. Dr. Fleet, however, thinks that Nandivarman of the Maṇe plates must be Nanivarman II and not his grandson. It must be noted in this connection that the inscription itself is regarded by some scholars as a spurious one.

Prithvipati II and his successors.

Śivamāra II was followed not by his son but by his brother Vijayāditya I and the latter was succeeded by his son Rājamalla I. The succession of the younger branch to the throne was probably due to the fact that Prithvipati I, son of Śivamāra, was very young at the time of his father’s demise. Prithvipati I’s elder brother, Mārasimha I, seems to have predeceased his father. We have seen in connexion with the Bāṇas the probable date of Prithvipati I’s contact with the Pallavas, his matrimonial alliance with the Bāṇas under Vikramāditya I and his chief part in the battle of Soremaṭi. It has also been noted that the Bāṇas were probably instrumental in bringing Prithvipati I into close contact with the Pallavas.

Dr. Hultsch thinks that Pīrūdigāṅgaraiyar of the two Āmbūr inscriptions of Nīripatunāṅgavarma may be identified

2. See paragraph 6 of M. E. R. 1912.
3. Ibid.
with Prithivipati I. This view is endorsed by V. Venkayya. But the identification is incorrect because Pirudigaṅgaraiyar of the Āmbūr inscriptions was a petty Gaṅga chief ruling over portions of the North Arcot district. He is identical with Prithivigaṅgaraiyar of the Tippasamudram inscription of Kō-Vijaya-Kampavarma. It is, however, certain that Prithivipati I was a subordinate ally of the Pallavas. He played a significant part in the final contest between the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallavas at Śripuṟambiya (Kumbakonam taluk) about A. D. 880. In that war Prithivipati fought and died for the Pallavas. The Udayendiram plates of his grandson describe his end as follows. "Having defeated by force the Pāṇḍya lord Varaguna at the head of the great battle of Śripuṟambiya', and having (thus) made (his) title Aparājita (i.e., the unconquered) significant, this hero entered the heaven of (his) friend (viz., Indra) by sacrificing his own life." Prithivipati I was followed by his son Mārasimha II (c. A. D. 880 – 895). During his period the relations between the Pallavas and the Chōḷas of Tanjore became strained. Mārasimha II seems to have sided with the Chōḷas. It is highly probable that Āditya I was assisted by the Gaṅga king in his conquest of Toṇḍaimandalam. The Takkōlam inscription of Āditya I dated in his 24th year (A. D. 895) recording a grant made by Prithivipati II, son of Mārasimha points to the same conclusion. It is worthy of note that the Chōḷa king Āditya I does not claim to have conquered

3. 174 of 1939-40.
the successors of Prithivipati I, probably because of his friendly relations with them after the battle of Sripurambiyam.

**Individual Gaṅga Chiefs.**

Apart from the W. Gaṅga rulers some individual Gaṅga chiefs also figure in Pallava records as the subordinates of the Pallavas. These chiefs were mostly confined to the North Arcot district. The Kuṭidikki inscription of Nandivarman II dated in his 52nd year mentions his Gaṅga feudatory by name Gaṅgadiyaraiyar Kaṇṇādu Perungaṅgar who was the chief of Karṇṭṭūr.¹ This chief fought and lost his life for the Pallava king in his war with the W. Gaṅgas.²

It is presumed that Śiyakaṇṇ who is mentioned in an undated inscription of Dantivarmaṇ from Tirupati was a Gaṅga feudatory of the Pallava king.³ An inscription from Paḷḷiṇḍa (Vellore taluk, N. Arcot district) of Nandivarman III⁴ dated in his 2nd year states that Selvaṇṇarp ritualiyar, son of Amanṭigāṅgaraiyar constructed a mukhamandapa probably for the Nāganāthasvāra temple at that place. It is not clear whether the chief mentioned in this record was a Gaṅga or Bāṇa chief.

The Śiyamaṅgalam inscription of Nandivarman III dated in his 3rd year refers to a Gaṅga chief called NṛguṭṭiPerumāṇ.⁵

---

2. *Ibid.* See also the chapter on the Bāṇas.
3. *T. T. etc. Devasthanam Insns.* Vol. I. No. 2 and Intro. p. 6. Another Gaṅga chief Raṇasiṅgaṇṇ who is mentioned in an inscription from the same place is presumed to be a Pallava feudatory (*Ibid.* No. 5 and Intro. p. 6).
The Śōḷapuram inscription of Kō-Vijaya-Kampavarmar̥ dated in his 8th year mentions a W. Gaṅga chief by name Prithivi Gaṅgaraiyar¹ who should be different from his namesake mentioned in the Āmbūr, Mēḷpaṭṭi and Tippasamudram inscriptions.² It is not clear in what way he was related to the W. Gaṅga dynasty, particularly to Prithivīpati I. Nor do we know his part in the frontier wars of the Pallava empire. His son Rājaditya is known to have been a subordinate of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmar̥.³

Prithivīgaraiyar, another Gaṅga feudatory of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṇ is mentioned in the Tippasamudram inscription.⁴ He is most probably identical with the person of the same name mentioned in the Mēḷpaṭṭi and Āmbūr inscriptions.⁵ He must be different from his namesake referred to in the Śōḷapuram record of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṇ for the latter passed away by the 8th regnal year of that Pallava king whereas the former figures in the inscriptions issued after that year.⁶ He played an important part in the frontier wars of the Pallava empire. The Mēḷpaṭṭi inscription⁷ which records a conflict between the Bāṇas and this chief indicates that on one occasion he turned against the Pallavas. The Tippasamudram inscription of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṇ issued seven years after Mēḷpaṭṭi inscription shows that Prithivīgaraiyar was reduced to obedience. The

---

4. 174 of 1939-40.
former record states that this chief and his wife, Ilāḍappērundēviyar constructed as the gift of their daughter, Ayyakkuṭṭi, a channel called Viḷappēraraḷiyar, from the river (S. Palar) to the tank at Valivalakkamaṅgalam which may be identified with Tippasamudram itself.1

Another W. Gaṅga chief known from inscriptions is Kō-Vijaya Narasimhavarma. He must have been a Pallava feudatory as his name indicates. The inference is supported by the fact that most of his records are found in the region over which the Pallavas exercised their sway. The dating of the records of this chief2 in his own regnal years shows that his status was higher than that of an ordinary feudatory. This Gaṅga chief is assigned to the first half of the 9th century on the ground that the script of his records is referable to that period.3 But he must have lived in the second half of the 9th century for his Baṅgavāḍi inscription4 mentions the combatants who met at Sōremaṭi about A. D. 878. He supported the Bāṇas in their skirmishes with W. Gaṅgas and the Noṭambas.5 It seems that he exercised his sway over Tagaḍūrnāḍu also.6

In fine the W. Gaṅga feudatories of the Pallavas helped them in subduing the Bāṇas in the 5th century and made common cause with the Pallavas against the main line of the Kadambas. The triumph of Prithivipati I and the Bāṇas in the battle of Sōremaṭi (A. D. 878) contributed, to a great

5. Ibid.
extent, to the rift in the W. Gaṅga-Nośamba alliance and thus averted possible dangers to the Pallava empire from those power. If the W. Gaṅga-Nośamba combination had not been defeated at that battle the condition of the Pallava power in the last quarter of the 9th century would have been more precarious than it actually was. By far the most remarkable service of Prīthivipati to the Pallava empire was his heroic part in the battle of Śriputambiyam. In that war he fell fighting to the end for his overlord, Aparājita. But the successors of Prīthivipati I followed a very different policy. They did not stand by the Pallavas and seem to have sided with the Chōḷas of Tanjore. It is very likely that they contributed, though in a small measure, to the Chōḷa conquest of Toṇḍaimanḍalam in the reign of Āditya I.

As regards the individual Gaṅga chiefs they were not of great help to the Pallavas. They were not sufficiently strong to combat the Nośamba inroads into the Pallava empire. Some of them played a hostile part as in the case of the later Prīthivigaṅgaraiyar. But their support to the Bāṇas must have contributed, to a certain extent, to the latter’s victory at Sōremaṭi.

Culture:

Our account of the cultural role of these feudatories is meagre on account of paucity of information. The early W. Gaṅga feudatories of the Pallavas were noted for their patronage of Sanskrit learning. Many of their records are in Sanskrit language though in Kannaḍa script.¹ The Penukoṇḍa plates describe Harivarmāṇ as having known “the essence of many Śāstras, Ithīhāsas and Purāṇas.”² The

---

1. e.g., A. S. M. 1930. Ins. No. 88 and E. I. XIV. No. 24.
Keregalur grant of Madhava III contains terms which are met with in the Arthashastra of Kauṭilya. The same record describes Madhava III's skill in polity as being "too deep even for those versed in the Arthashastra." These go to prove that even in the 5th century A.D. the Sanskrit scholars of Gaṅgavāḍi were familiar with the great work of Kauṭilya. There are a number of inscriptions recording the gifts to pious scholars of the Gaṅga kings and chiefs.

Buddhism:

The prevalence of Buddhism in Gaṅgavāḍi is borne out by epigraphical evidence. An inscription of Harivarmaṇa refers to a Buddhist disputant Vādimadagajendra who was vanquished by a Brāhmaṇa in philosophical disputation. A Sanskrit inscription of Madhava III records his gift of lands to a Buddhist vihāra i.e., monastery and mentions a certain Buddhhasatva who was perhaps connected with the institution. Owing to great royal support, Jainism overshadowed Buddhism in Gaṅgavāḍi.

2. Ibid. p. 124.
3. Ibid. p. 117.
Jainism:

In Gaṅgavāḍi Jainism was very popular and enjoyed the lion's share of royal patronage. Digambara Jains were numerous. They maintained close contact with their brethren in other parts of South India. There were several Jain temples and monasteries. An inscription of Mādhava III states that on the advice of Vīradēva, a Jain sage, the king made a grant of lands to the Arhad temple established by the Mūlaśaṅgha in the Perōbojāl village of the Mudukottūr vishaya.¹ Despite the fact that Pallava political influence in Gaṅgavāḍi disappeared in the middle of the 5th century, the Jains maintained close cultural contact with the Pallava empire as evidenced by the Pallava architectural and sculptural influences that we find in some W. Gaṅga Jain temples of later period.²

Śaivism and Vaishnāvism:

The epigraphs of the early W. Gaṅgas clearly show that there must have been large number of the followers of Śaivism and Vaishnāvism in Gaṅgavāḍi. Scholars belonging to these denominations were patronised by the kings. Mādhava III worshipped Śiva³ and was well-known for his renewal of Brāhmaṇ endowments long since ceased.⁴ An inscription from Śiyamaṅgalam (South Arcot district) of VijayaNandivikramavarma, dated in his third year states that Aḍavi, the headman of Tiruppāḷaiyūr, erected a maṇḍapa in front of the Sthambēśvara temple (at Śiyamaṅgalam) with the permission

1. E. C. X Malur 73.
2. The Paṅchakūṭā Basti at Kambadāhaṇṭi, Nāgamaṅgala taluk, is a good example. See A. S. M. 1939. p. 45.
of the Gaṅga king Nārguttī Perumān. Obviously Aḍavi was a subject of the Gaṅga chief who was feudatory to the Pallava king Nandivarman III. The Sāḷapuram inscription of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmar dated in his 8th year records that Rājāditya, son of Pṛithivīgaṅgaraiyar constructed a Siva temple in memory of his deceased father.

Vishnuḍopa who was celebrated for his saintly qualities was an ardent follower of Vaishnavism and was “devoted to the worship of Gurus, Cows and Brāhmaṇas.” We have already noted that Dantivarman’s feudatory, Siyakara, made a grant to the Vishnu temple at Tirupati. It is thus clear that in matters of religion the W. Gaṅga feudatories of the Pallavas were not merely tolerant but even liberal.

1. See E. I. Vol. VI. No. 32.
VIII

INDIVIDUAL FEUDATORIES.

Besides the feudatory dynasties noted above, some individual chiefs are also known to have been subordinate to the Pallavas. All the available information regarding such chiefs and their services to the Pallava empire is given below in chronological order.

The undated Vallam inscription of Mahêndravarmaṇ I mentions one of his vassals by name Skandasena, son of Vasantapriyaraja. Skandasena excavated the Siva cave temple at Vallam near Chingleput. This temple is one of the oldest temples of the Tamil country.

Some of the Muṇaiya chiefs or Muṇaiyaraiyars who exercised their sway over what was then known as Tirumuṇaippadi-nādu (S. Arcot district) were subordinate to the Pallavas. Narasiṅga Muṇaiyar, the foster-father of St. Sundarar, one of the Dēvaram trio, must have been a feudatory of the Pallava king Narasimhavarmaṇ II. Another Muṇaiya chief figures in an inscription of Nṛipatunṅavarmaṇ.

Much is not known about the chiefs of Chādi-naḍu (S. Arcot district) whose territory was probably subject to Pallava influence though no record of the Pallavas before the

2. Ibid.
time of Narasimhavarma II, is found there. According to the Periyapurāṇam, Meypporuḻ Nāyaṉār who lived in the interval between St. Sambandar and St. Sundarar, was a chief of Chēdi-nādu. It is possible that he was a Pallava vassal. In the period of Chōla ascendancy the Chēdi chiefs figure very prominently.¹

Udayachandra, the lord of the river Vēgavati and of the city of Vilvala,² was one of the leading feudatories of Nandivarma II. It seems that he held sway over portions of the Chingleput and North Arcot districts. The Udayēndiram plates which testify to his loyalty and prowess states that the Pūcha family to which Udayachandra belonged had been in uninterrupted hereditary service of the Pallavas. As regards his services to the Pallava king, the plates describe as follows: "when he (Udayachandra) perceived that Pallavamalla was besieged in Nandipura by the Draiṭa princes, unable to bear this, like the visible death of the crowd of the enemies of Pallavamalla, (he) slew with (his) sharp sword.........the Pallava king Chitrāmāya and others; he defeated the hostile army on the battle-fields of Nimbavana, Chāṭavana, Saṁkara-grāma, Nellūr, Nelvēli, Sāravundūr and so forth, and (thus) bestowed the whole kingdom many times on the Pallava ...... spilt the opposing Šabarā king, Udayana, in the terrible battle of Nelvēli, which could hardly be entered by a common man and seized (his) mirror-banner made of a peacock's tail; who in the Northern region also, pursued the Nishada chief, called Prithivivyāgra who desiring to become very powerful was running after the horse of the Aśvameḍha,

² This place is identified with Vilvalangara-Villivalam. in the Chingleput district. See R. Gopalan. Op. cit. p. 124. F.n. 3.
defeated (him) and ordered (him) out of the district (vishaya) of Vishṇurāja (which) he subjected to the Pallava, and seized faultless pearl necklaces of excellant lustre, an immeasurable heap of gold, and elephants; (and) who destroyed (the fort of) Kajidurga, which was protected by the Goddess Kāji and defeated the Pāṇḍya army at the village of Maṇṇaiikuḍi.”

As regards the places where Udayachandra achieved victories for the Pallava king, Nimbavana, Chūtavana, Saṃkaragrama and Maṇṇaiikuḍi may be identified respectively with Vēppaṅgadu, Kovilūr, Saṅkaraṅarkudikādu (Pattukottai taluk) and Maṇṇaiikuḍi (Arantangi taluk) in the Tanjore district. Sūrāvarundūr may be provisionally identified with Sūrāvīundur in the Chidambaram taluk of the South Arcot district. Dr. Hultsch regards the Sabara king as a Tamil chieftain and identifies Nelvēli with modern Tinnevelly. If the Sabara king was a Tamil chieftain, we may identify Nelvēli with the village of the same name in the Arantangi taluk of the Tanjore district. But, if as Mr. R. Gopalan says, the Sabaras are identical with the modern Sauras of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts, it would not be possible to identify Nelvēli with any place in the Tamil country; we must look for it either in the Telugu country or in the region bordering on it. As regards the Nishāda chief, he must be different from the Nishāda chieftains of the former Pudukkottai state for the campaigns against him are known to have taken place in the region to

3. Ibid.
5. The Pallavas. p. 125.
the north of Toṇḍaimanḍalam. It is possible that the battle between this chief and the Pallava general took place at Nellūr (Nellore district). Dr. D. C. Sircar suggests that Pṛithivīvyāgara, the Nishāda chief might be a Nala king.¹ Vishṇuraja mentioned in the plates may be identified with the Eastern Chāṇukya king Vishṇuvardhana III (A.D. 709–746).² It is not possible to identify the fort of Kaḷidurga which was destroyed by Udayachandra. Dr. Hultsch rejects its identification with Kaḷikkōdu (Calicut).³ Lastly our conclusion regarding the identification of the places and persons mentioned in the Udayēndiram plates are bound to be tentative in the present state of our knowledge.

There is, however, no doubt about the fact that Udayachandra had borne the chief part in stabilizing the position of Nandivarman II as a ruler and in crushing his powerful and numerous enemies. The Udayēndiram plates record the grant to one hundred and eight Brāhmaṇas of the village of Kumāramagala-Vellattūr in the Paśchimāśrayanadī vishaya and two water levers in the village of Koṭa agrāma and state that the gifted village was named after Udayachandra.⁴ The grant was made by the Pallava king at the request of Udayachandra.

Another copper-plate record from Pullūr (Polur taluk, N. Arcot district) dated in the 33rd year of Nandivarman II states that at the request of Avanichandra Yuvarāja, the lord of Vilvalapura, the Pallava king made the grant to one hundred and eight Brāhmaṇas of the four villages, Nelli,

3. *Ibid*.
Pullūr, Kuḍiyūr and Takkar in Pālkundra-Koṭṭam, clubbed them together into one unit and named it Nayadhīramaṅgalam after one of his surnames.\(^1\) There is no doubt that Avaṅichandra of this record was a vassal of the Pallava king. Vilvalapura mentioned in the record may be identified with Vilvala of the Udayēndiram plates. It is probable that Avaṅichandra was the son Udayachandra.\(^2\) The fact that the findspot of the record is close to the village of Udayēndiram seems to support this view.\(^3\) It is not unlikely that Avaṅichandra of the Pullūr record is identical with his namesake mentioned in an inscription from Kāṇchīpuram\(^4\) dated in the 17th year of Dantivarman.\(^5\)

Another feudatory of Nandivarma\(^n\) II was the chief of Maṅgala-nādu who is mentioned in the Paṭṭattālmaṅgalam plates.\(^6\) The plates record that at the request of Maṅgala-nāḍāḷvān and the Āṇatti of Ālappākka-Vijayanallāḷān, king Vijaya-Nandi-Vikramavarma\(^n\) issued an order in the 61st year of his reign to the nāṭṭār of Āravala-Kūṟram in Chōla-nādu, granting as brahmadēya 40 velis of land which included two old brahmadēyas granted in the 59th year of the same king at the request of Maṅgalanāḍāḷvān and the Āṇatti of Ālappākka-Vijayanallāḷān.\(^7\) It is also recorded in the plates that the brahmadēya was constituted as a new village under the name of Paṭṭattālmaṅgalam. As the villages in Āravala-Kūṟram are mostly found in the Negapatam taluk,
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Paṭṭattāḷmaṅgalam also must be in the same taluk.¹ Maṅgala-
nāḍu must have comprised the region in and around the
village Maṅgal in the Tanjore district. Though the chief of
Maṅgala-nāḍu is described as “a great hero, virtuous and
respected by the good”, his martial exploits are not known.

An inscription from Toṇḍūr (Ginjee taluk, S. Arcot
district) dated in the 6th year of Dantivarman II registers a gift
of 16 kajāṇju of gold by Viṅnakāvaraiyar, a feudatory chief,
to provide from the interest on the amount, offerings to Ēṟṟukkuṇṟaṟ Bhaṭṭāri for the merit of certain persons.²
The Kāṅchhipuram record of the same Pallava king refers to
a gift of gold made by Avaṟchendra.³

A fragmentary epigraph from Kāverippakkam (Arakonam
taluk, N. Arcot district) dated in the 13th year of
Nandivarman III records a gift of gold by the daughter-in-
law of Ayyakki Paṅgaḷa Aḍigaḷ.⁴ It is presumed that
Ayyakki Paṅgaḷa Aḍigaḷ was the chief of Paṅgaḷa-nāḍu which
comprised a portion of the present N. Arcot district.⁵ In
that case he must be a feudatory of the Pallava king.

The Marudāḍu inscription (Wandiwash taluk, N. Arcot
district) of Niṟpatungavarman II dated in his 12th year records
that a certain Koṅgaraiyar Niṟaperumāṇ constructed a weir
to the tank at Marudāḍu and renovated the sluice.⁶ It is not
known if this chief was a Gaṅga one. Another record from
Paramēśvaramaṅgalam (Madurantakam taluk, Chingleput

1. Ibid. p. 119.
5. Intro. to No. 50 of S. I. I. Vol. XII.
district) of the same Pallava king dated in his 16th year states that the committee (Gajapperumakka) of the temple called Sailśvaram agreed to provide offerings during the mid-day service of the god Mahādēva at Sailsvaram in Paramśvara-maṅgalam in lieu of the interest on 11 kāḷaṇju of gold received by them from Nandi-Nīraimati, son of Maṅnaikudi-Mārāmadakki Viḷup pérdaraiyar.¹ It is surmised that the title, Maṅnaikudi-Mārāmadakki, prefixed to the name Viḷuppēra-raiyar apparently refers to the battle at Maṅnaikudi in which a Pāṇḍya king was defeated by Udayachandra, the general of Nandivarma II and that one of the ancestors of Viḷuppēr-aiyar took part in that battle.² Mr. V. Venkatasubba Ayyar who does not contradict this view expresses another possibility; he thinks that Maṅnaikudi and Mārāmadakki might be the native village and hamlet of Viḷuppēraraiyar and as such find mention in the record. Villages having the same names are indeed found in the Arantangi taluk of the Tanjore district. Nevertheless the former view is probable for generally in inscriptions only one village of the donor is mentioned.

The Tiruvadi inscription (Cuddalore taluk, S. Arcot district) of Nripatunāgarvarman dating in his 16th year states that Muniyakodiavarraiyana, son of Muniippēraraiyar, a resident of Peruṅguḷattūr, repaired the temple of Tiruvirap-tānam and endowed gold for a perpetual lamp.³ As Muniippēraraiyar is spoken of in the record as living at Peruṅguḷattūr, he must be a contemporary feudatory of the Pallava king.
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The Tiruvorliyar record of the same Pallava king dated in his 18th year registers a gift of gold to the Śiva temple at Tiruvorliyar (Saidapet taluk, Chingleput district) by Paḻiyaṇi pilli, wife of Viṭṭelifugu Pallavaraiyar. Obviously Viṭṭelifugu Pallavaraiyar was a Pallava vassal probably in charge of Umbala-naḍu which is referred to in the inscription.

An inscription from Tiruchcheṇṇampūṇḍi (Tanjore taluk) of Nṟipatuṅgavarmaṇi dated in the 22nd year records a gift of gold for a perpetual lamp to the God of Tirukkaṭaimudimā by Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyar of Koṅḍa-naḍu. Another inscription from Tirukkoṭikāval (Kumbakonam taluk, Tanjore district) dated in the 24th year of the same Pallava king registers an agreement made by the assembly of Nārāṇakka-Chaturvedimahāgalaṃ to burn a perpetual lamp in the temple of Mahādēva at Tirukkoṭikāvu for the interest on 15 kaḷaṇjus of gold received by them from Veṭṭuvadairaiyaṇi alias Mallaṇi Vēṅgaṭavanaṇi of Koṅḍa-naḍu. It is practically certain that the chief mentioned in this record is identical with his namesake referred to in the preceding inscription. From other epigraphical evidences it is known that Koṅḍa-naḍu was a subdivision of Toṇḍaimanaḍalām. Two inscriptions from Kiḻūr (Tirukkoyilur taluk, S. Arcot district) of Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyars are dated in the 3rd year but do not mention any overlord. It is not impossible that these two records belong to the latter part of Aparājita’s reign. If this view is correct, the inscriptions may be taken to indicate the independent

1. S. I. I. Vol. XII. No. 70; 162 of 1912.
2. See Intro. to No. 70 of S. I. I. Vol. XII.
5. See S. I. I. Vol. VII. No. 933.
6. Ibid. Nos. 933 and 934.
position of the Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyars. Nothing is known of the part played by these chiefs in the overthrow of the Pallava power by Āditya I. But their subordination to the Chōjas in the subsequent period is borne out by some epigraphical evidence. It is highly improbable that the Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyars were identical with the Bānas.

Two epigraphs from Utṭiramāṭur (Chingleput district), one dateless and damaged⁸ and the other incomplete and dated in the 26th year,⁴ of Nṛpatuṅgavarman, refer to a feudatory chief by name Vijayanallūḷaṇ Kāḍavadiyaraiyaṇ alias Būdi-dhīraṇ who belonged to Kūkūr in Mīkūr uvīḷanādu in the Muttaraiya country. Vijayanallūḷaṇ of this record must be different from his namesake mentioned in the Paṭṭat-tālmaṅgalam plates of Nandivarmaṇ II. Būdi-dhīraṇ does not appear to be a Muttaraiya chief.

An inscription from Satyaṅḍu (Ponneri taluk, Chingleput district) dated in the 4th year of Aparājitavarman registers a gift of the village Tuṟaiyūr including its income in gold and kind for conducting worship in the temple of Mahādeva at Tirumataṅganpaṭṭi in Tekkūr-nāḍu, a subdivision of Paiyyur-iṅkōṭṭam by Kumārandai Kurūmbarāḍittāṇ alias Kāḍu-paṭṭippuraiyaṇ who belonged to Chēra-nāḍu.⁶ The village Tuṟaiyūr is identified with the village of the same name in the Madurantakam taluk of the Chingleput district.⁶ Another record from the same place dated in the 5th year of the same
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Pallava king records a gift of 100 sheep for burning a perpetual lamp in the same temple by Pōṟtinaṅgai, wife of Kumārandai Kuṟumbaraṅditaṁ alias Kāṟupatippēraraṅ.Obviously the chief mentioned in this record is identical with his namesake mentioned in the preceding record. He is stated to have belonged to Chēra-nādu. We do not know how he came into contact with the Pallava king. But there is no doubt about his subordination to the Pallava king for the two records are dated in the regnal year of the latter. It is suggested that the chief might be a member of the Pallava dynasty. Another inscription from Tiruvōṭiyūr (Saidapet taluk, Chingleput district) dated in the 8th year of Aparājita registers an endowment of 60 kālaṅju of gold by Paitāṅgi Kaṅḍan, chief of Kāṭṭūr in Vaṅkarai-Iṟnāmbar-nādu, a sub-division of Chēḻa-nādu for providing on the day of his natal star Svāti, offerings to the deity and for burning a perpetual lamp in the temple of Mahādēva at Tiruvōṭiyūr. The offerings included rice, ghee, plantains, sugar, vegetables, arecanuts, betel-leaves, tender coconuts, Paṅchagavya, sandal paste and camphor. Iṟnāmbar-nādu must have comprised the region in and around the present village, Iṟnāmbar in the Kumbakonam taluk of the Tanjore district. The record under consideration testifies to the continuance of Pallava supremacy over the Chēḻa country. A fourth record of Aparājita from Nemali (Tiruttani division, Chittoor district) dated in his 10th year registers a gift of land for playing musical instruments during Śrībali ceremonies in the four temples (of the place) by Sattandai Suttamallān alias Anuttirapallavaraiyān of Singapuram. A dateless inscription from

4. 154 of 1942–43.
Tirunāmanallūr (Tirukkoyilur taluk, S. Arcot district) records a grant of land as archanābhōga by Muṇaiyadaraiyan alias Aparājitaṇ Kulamāṇikkaṇ Mahādevaṇ. Since the record does not mention any overlord, it is doubtful if the chief mentioned in the record was a feudatory of Aparājita. If the inscription be assignable to the reign of Aparājita, it may be taken to indicate the assumption by the Muṇaiya chief of independence perhaps some time before Aprājita’s conflict with his overmIGHTy Chōja feudatory, Āditya I.

An inscription from Tiruvoṭṭiyūr dated in the 9th year of Kā-Vijaya-Kampavarmaṇ registers a gift of 30 kaḷaṇju of gold by Amarnidi alias Pallavadiyarayar of Kaṇjaṇūr in the Indalūr-nāḍu, and another gift of a similar amount by a person whose name is lost in the record, for two perpetual lamps in the Śiva temple at Tiruvoṭṭiyūr. Apparently Amarnidi must have been a minor feudatory chief. Kaṇjaṇūr may be identified with the village of the same name in the Kumbakonam taluk. Indalūr-nāḍu must have comprised the region in and around the village Indalūr (Tanjore taluk) including Kaṇjaṇūr.

1. 230 of 1939-40.
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A NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGY AND GENEALOGY OF
THE PALLAVAS FROM NANDIVARMAN II.

The chronology and genealogy of the Pallavas, like those of the Pāṇḍyas of the post-Saṅgam period, are still to a considerable extent uncertain. It is proposed here to analyse the chronology and genealogy of the Pallavas from Nandivarman II. Even for starting our analysis from Nandivarman II we have to go back a little. The present writer follows the schemes furnished by Mr. R. Gopalan in his work, ‘History of the Pallavas of Kāñchi’. But Gopalan’s schemes, particularly the chronological one, have been seriously modified by many scholars on different grounds. Some scholars are disposed to examine a particular aspect of the problem overlooking the other aspects. But such an approach will not solve the problems. We shall therefore make a comprehensive, but brief, study of the problems examining one by one the important views connected with them.

In his article on the ‘Date of the Accession of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla’ Dr. N. Venkataramanayya discusses Mr. K.V. Subramanya Aiyar’s date of the accession of Nandivarman II, dismisses it relying on the data of the Mallam inscription of Nandipattaraśar and the Maṅgale plates of Māra-simha I and assumes that A.D. 725 should be the first regnal year of Nandivarman II. The conclusions of Dr. Venkataramanayya are mainly based on the two records mentioned above. As regards the first the details must be fully analysed and for that a translation of the record is given below.

"Prosperity. In the 15th year of the reign of Nandipōttaraśar, we, the men of the district (nāḍu), the villagers and the heads of assemblies, gave at the order of Chaḻukkiaraśar on the petition of Āḻuvaaraśar to (the God) Subra-
maṇya at Tiruvānbur (situated) in Paiyyurilangottam, 35 Kajaṇju of gold given by Maduvār for (maintaining) lamps(?)."

Nandipōttaraśar referred to in the record is doubtless Nandivarman II. Since the record is dated in his regnal year it is certain that, at the time when it was issued, the Mallam area must have been under his rule. It is not clearly known whether the Chaḻukkiaraśar of the inscription was an ally or a vassal of the Pallava king. Dr. Venkataramanayya rejects Mr. V. Venkayya’s view that the Chaḻukkiaraśar of the record was an Eastern Chaḻukya subordinate of Nandivarma II and thinks that he belonged to the Bādāmi branch of the Chaḻukya family.² What made the Chaḻukkiaraśar acknowledge the friendship or overlordship of the Pallava king is not known. There is clear evidence³ that the Chaḻukyas of Bādāmi regarded the Pallavas as their hereditary enemies. If Dr. Venkataramanayya’s view is accepted the record under consideration may be treated as the sole evidence of the solitary instance of Pallava-W. Chaḻukya friendship. But the present writer thinks that the identification of Chaḻukkiaraśar suggested by Dr. Venkataramanayya is highly problematical. In fact Dr. Venkataramanayya himself states that “no instance of a Bādāmi Chaḻukyan king becoming a subordinate of a Pallava after the time of Narasimha I is known.”⁴

---

Identifying Chañukkiaśar of this inscription with Vikramāditya II (A. D. 733–45) and supposing that the inscription was inscribed during the course of his first invasion of Kāñchī in A. D. 733–34 Dr. Venkataramanayya states that the 15th regnal year of Nandivarman II falls in A. D. 733–34 and as such his accession could not have happened before A. D. 718–719. He further states that "at the same time we must keep in mind that his accession could have taken place at any time between this date and A. D. 730–31".

Now, two things remain to be noted here. One is the identification of Chañukkiaśar with Vikramāditya II. This is only a conjecture of Dr. Venkataramanayya and is not based on any definite evidence. The other is Vikramāditya II's invasion of the Pallava empire. He is known to have invaded the Pallava empire thrice. We do not know for certain whether the invasion referred to by Dr. Venkataramanayya was the first or second or third of the invasions of Vikramāditya II. Nor do we possess any evidence about the exact dates of these invasions. As regards Nandivarman II's last regnal year Dr. Venkataramanayya relies wholly on the Maññe plates of the Western Gaṅga prince Mārasimha I, son of Śivamāra II. Dr. Venkataramanayya believes that the release and coronation of Śivamāra II by Govinda III went together, that the coronation took place in A. D. 789 and that Nandivarman referred to in the Maññe plates must be Nandivarman II. Further, he assumes that the Pallava king must have died in A. D. 790 and therefore his accession must have taken place in A. D. 725.

1. Ibid pp. 4 and 5.
2. Ibid. p. 7.
Both Dr. Fleet and Louis Rice regard the Maññe plates as a spurious record. Both consider the coronation of Śiva-
maṇa II by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Pallava kings of his time as a probable one but both think that the event could not have taken place towards the close of the 8th century but must have happened in the early years of the next century. Further according to Dr. Altekar the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Gōvinda III came to power only in A. D. 793 and this precludes all possibility of Śivamāra II’s coronation taking place before that year. Obviously the conclusions of Dr. Venkataraman-
nayya are based on very doubtful testimony.

Without discussing the problem, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri gives the following chronology of the later Pallavas in his History of South India (p. 163)

``
Narasimhavarman II .... .... A. D. 680—720
Paramēśvaravarman II .... .... .... 720—731
Nandivarman II .... .... .... .... 731—795
Dantivarman .... .... .... .... .... 795—845
Nandivarman III .... .... .... .... .... 844—866
Nṛipatuṅgavarman .... .... .... .... .... 855—896
Aparājita .... .... .... .... .... .... 879—897``

Prof. Sastri’s views on the dates of Narasimhavarman II and Paramēśvaravarman II require careful examination on account of their bearings on the date of Nandivarman II. On the basis of some late Chinese evidence given and ex-
mined in his work, Foreign Notices of South India, Prof. Sastri assigns a long reign—40 years, to Narasimhavarman II. As for the evidence ‘Tso’ fou Yuan Kouei’, a great Chinese

---

encyclopaedia compiled about A. D. 1013, it contains many references to Narasimhavarma II’s relations with China. According to the first reference the Pallava king proposed in A. D. 720 to the Chinese emperor to place his war elephants and cavalry at his disposal for chastising the Arabs and Tibetans and asked him to give a name to his army, and the emperor named it “the army which cherished virtue”. It is surprising that Narasimhavarma II should have proposed to the Chinese emperor to extend his military assistance against the Arabs and Tibetans for they were not, as Prof. Sastri himself says, the enemies of any South Indian state either in the 7th century A. D. or in the next century. Prof. Sastri draws a very different inference from this datum. He surmises that the Chinese court was anxious to enlist Narasimhavarma II’s support in its plans against Tibetans. But it may be said that in the light of persistent hostility between the Pallavas and W. Chalukyas Narasimhavarma II would not have proposed to extend any military aid to the Chinese emperor. Prof. R. C. Majumdar is of opinion that the embassy of Yasovarman of Kanauj and of Lalitaditya of Kashmir, sent to China in the first half of the 8th century, might have asked for Chinese help against the Arabs and Tibetans. Since Yasovarman was at war with the Arabs he might have done so. In that case the Chinese chronicler must have confused in his account the activities at the Chinese court of the several embassies sent from different parts of India. But it must be accepted that there is nothing improbable in the statement that Narasimhavarma II sent

2. Ibid. p. 116.
3. Ibid. Intro. p. 17.
4. The Classical Age. p. 130.
an embassy to China, though the purpose, date and other
details of it are not known for certain.

In the second passage\(^1\) we find a reference to the tribute
made by the Pallava king to the Chinese emperor. This
need not be regarded as an evidence of Pallava subordination
to the Chinese. To make presents to the ruler of a country
by the envoy or ambassador of another country was very
common in those days. Some such presents made by the
Pallava embassy to the Chinese emperor must have been
mistaken by later Chinese chroniclers as tribute. According
to this passage the Pallava embassy was at the Chinese court
in A. D. 720.

According to the third passage\(^2\) the Chinese emperor
conferred on the Pallava king the title, 'King of the kingdom
of South India'.

*Kieon T'ang Chou*, another Chinese work, states that
Narasimhavarma\(_n\) II constructed a temple 'on account of the
Chinese empire' and addressed the Chinese emperor to give a
name to it. The Chinese emperor decided that the name of the
temple should be 'which causes return to virtue' – *(Koeihoa)*\(^3\).
The temple said to have been built by the Pallava king 'on
account of the Chinese empire' must have been a Buddhist one.
But no epigraph of Narasimhavarma\(_n\) II refers to his erection
of a Buddhist temple. It is very doubtful whether Narasimha-
varma\(_n\), one of the most ardent Saiva kings of the period,
would at a time when there was no love lost between the
Saivas and the Buddhists of the Tamil country, have

---

attempted to build a Buddhist temple in his country for the sole purpose of pleasing the ruler of a distant oversea empire from whom he had neither trouble nor assistance of any kind to expect.¹

The testimony of Ma-Twan-lin² which Prof. Sastri regards as confirmatory does not at all confirm the details given above regarding Narasimhavarma’s embassy to China. The account of Ma-Twan-lin does not mention the name of Narasimhavarma. According to it the Five Indias sent ambassadors to the court of the Chinese emperor and 'an ambassador from Central India proceeded three times as far as the extremity of South India and came only once (to the Chinese court) to offer birds of five colours that could talk’³ It is also said that he applied for aid against the Arabs and Tibetans that he offered to take the command of the auxiliary troops and that he was given the rank of General-in-Chief.⁴

It will be clear from what has been said above that the Chinese writers must have certainly confused the transactions at the Chinese court of the embassies sent from various parts of India. Naturally we cannot rely for fixing the date of the Pallava king on such a defective and late evidence. In fact Prof. Sastri himself points out some of the glaring defects of the Chinese evidences.⁵

3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid. Intro. pp. 16 and 17.
Again Prof. Sastri identifies Narasimhavarman II’s embassy to China with the mission of the Buddhist preceptor Vajrabodhi.1 While Prof. Sastri thinks that Vajrabodhi was a South Indian, Mr. P. C. Bagchi regards him as a North Indian, son of Isanaavarman, king of Central India.2 But Vajrabodhi’s contact with the Pallava king is highly probable. It is not known whether Vajrabodhi was identical with the ambassador sent from Central India to China and referred to in the pages of Ma-Twan-lin. Vajrabodhi’s voyage to China appears to have been prolonged. His arrival at Canton in A. D. 720 coupled with the long delay that occurred during his voyage indicates that he must have left the Pallava country some years before A. D. 720.3 If the exact date of his departure from the Pallava country were known, it can enable us to know a little better about the duration of Narasimhavarman II’s reign.

Above all we do not possess any lithic or copper-plate record of Narasimhavarman II bearing a higher regnal year than his 12th year. A recently discovered copper-plate inscription of Narasimhavarman II contains some astronomical data which indicate A. D. 711 for his 12th regnal year.4 Therefore we cannot accept Prof. Sastri’s view that the Pallava king ruled for 40 years till A. D. 720 for according to the record A. D. 720 must be his 21st and not 40th regnal year.

1. Ibid. Intro. p. 18.
As regards the date of Paramēśvaravarman II. Prof. Sastrī assigns to him a period of ten years. This view is probably based on the fact that W. Chāṇukya Vikramāditya II claims that while Yuvarāja he defeated the Pallava king Paramēś-
varavarman II. Since Vikramāditya II came to power in A. D. 733–34 the conflict mentioned above must have taken place before that. Paramēśvaravarman II referred to in the records of Vikramāditya is generally identified with Paramēś-
varavarman II, son of Narasimhavarman II. But we must not forget the fact that Nandivarman II Pallavamalla also had the name Paramēśvaravarman II. But it is not known whether even after his coronation he was called by that name by his enemies. Even after his coronation the Chōla king Kulottūhrāga I was called by his Pre-coronation name, Rājendrā. Further there is no record of Paramēśvaravar-
man II bearing his 10th regnal year. Definite evidence there-
fore of the duration of his rule is not available. With regard to the regnal periods of Nandivarman II and his successors Prof. Sastrī proceeds on the basis mentioned above. But in the case of Nandivarman III and his successors the learned historian lends his support to the theory of overlapping regnal periods. Thus, for instance, Nṛipatūnga is said to have been made heir-apparent or Yuvarāja in A. D. 855 though his father continued to rule till A. D. 860. As to the long reign of Nṛipatūnga, 41 years according to the recently dis-
covered Maṭhavalam (Chittoor district) stone inscription we shall discuss it at some length in due course.

1. A. I. 1946–47, No. 5, p. 54.
2. S. I. I. Vol. IV, No. 135, p. 11, Section C.
Dr. D. C. Sircar who concurs in Prof. Sastri’s dates of Pallava kings from Narasimhavarma II to Nandivarman II differs from him in regard to the duration of the reigns of the successors of Dantivarman. Prof. Sastri thinks that the rule of Dantivarman came to an end in A.D. 845, but Dr. Sircar holds that it continued for two more years.\(^1\) Again Prof. Sastri assigns to Nandivarman III a reign-period of 22 years from A.D. 844 while Dr. Sircar identifying Nandivarman III with Kampavarman gives him a reign-period of 25 years from A.D. 847.\(^2\)

There is no basis for identifying Nandivarman III, with Kampavarman. Nandikampa means only Kampa, son of Nandi or Nandivarman. The practice of prefixing part of father’s name to the name of the ruling king was in use in the 9th century. As for example Nandivarman III was also known as Danti-Nandivarman.\(^3\) Further the numerous lithic records of Kampavarman, some of them dated in his 26th and 32nd regnal years\(^4\) do not mention the well-known surname of Nandivarman III viz. Teḷḷaḷherinda which we find in almost all his records dated after his 10th year. Nor do we find the name of Kampa in any of the inscriptions of Nandivarman III. Obviously Dr. Sircar’s view is untenable and the latest known regnal year of Nandivarman III is 22\(^6\).

With regard to the reign-period of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṇ, Prof. Sastri gives the date A. D. 855–896 while Dr. Sircar gives a very different date, A. D. 872–913. Dr. Sircar’s view on this date is based on the grounds mentioned above and on others, the Maṭhavalam inscription of Nṛipatuṅga dated in his 41st year, the identification of Piṇudi Gaṅgarāyar of the two Āmbūr inscriptions of Nṛipatuṅga with Prithivipati I, and the identification of the Pallava mentioned in the Karandai plates with Nṛipatuṅga.

As regards the Maṭhavalam lithic record it may be a genuine one but no details other than the date are available. The identification of Piṇudi Gaṅgarāyar of the Āmbūr inscriptions with Prithivipati I, though supported by Dr. Hultzsch and V. Venkayya, is untenable as we have seen in connection with the W. Gaṅgas. As to the Pallava mentioned in the Karandai plates of Rājendra I it must be borne in mind that the name of the Pallava king is not given in that record. If Nṛipatuṅga were identical with the Pallava referred to in the inscription, his name would have been certainly mentioned. But the existence of Pallava princes after Āditya’s conquest of Tondaimandalam is very probable. Āditya I does not claim in any of his records to have extinguished the Pallava family. In case we accept Dr. Sircar’s view we must postdate the battle of Sṛipurambiyam or assign an unusually long reign – 86 years (A. D. 812–898), to Prithivipati I. Neither view can be supported in the absence of concrete evidence.

3. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*. p. 166;
4. See the Chap. on the W. Gaṅgas
The Tiruvadi inscription of Nṛipatuṅga dated in his 18th year mentions the Pāṇḍya king Varaguṇa Mahārāja who is doubtless Varaguṇa II (A.D. 862–880). This record proves that the 18th regnal yeal of Nṛipatuṅga falls before A.D. 880 when just after the battle of Śripurāmbiyam Varaguṇa II’s rule came to a close. Thus Nṛipatuṅga did not ascend the Pallava throne in A.D. 872 as Dr. Sircar believes, but much earlier.

The Tiruchcheṭṭampūṇḍi stone inscription of Nṛipa-
tuṅga contains some astronomical details which point out A.D. 867 for the 22nd regnal year of Nṛipatuṅga though according to Mr. M, Somasekhara Sarma a better alternative, A.D. 884, is also possible.

A Bāṇa inscription from Tiruvallam (N. Arcot district) dated in Saka 810 (A.D. 888) mentions no overlord thus indicating the independence of the Bāṇas. The political condition of South India after the battle of Śripurāmbiyam must have facilitated their assertion of independence. Now if Dr. Sircar’s date for Nṛipatuṅga is accepted it will be difficult to explain how after declaring their independence in A.D. 888 the Bāṇas again became feudatory to Nṛipatuṅga in (A.D. 872+24) A.D. 896 when the Chōla king Āditya I had already become master of Toṇḍaiṇadalam.

Again the date of Āditya I’s conquest of Toṇḍaiṇadalam is also a relevant fact in examining the date of Nṛipatuṅga.

1. S. I. I. Vol. XII, No. 71; 360 of 1921.
3. S. I. I. Vol. VII. Appendix C.
5. S. I. I. Vol. III, No. 44.
A Chōla inscription found at Tirumālpuram (Walajapet taluk, N. Arcot district) refers to a grant made in the 21st and 22nd years of a Chōla king called Tondaimānārūrtuṇjiṉadēva. This Chōla king is rightly identified by V. Venkayya with Āditya I and Venkayya’s conclusion is supported by Dr. Hultsch. Tondaimānārūr is identified with Tondaimānād near Kālāhasti. The details and find-place of the record indicate that by A.D. 891 or 892 Āditya I must have accomplished at least the major part of his conquest of Tondaimanādalam. Another record of the same Chōla king dated in his 24th year is found at Takkolam (N. Arcot district). A third inscription of the same Chōla king dated in his 27th year is found at Tirukkaḷukkuṇram (Chingleput district). All these records unmistakably point out that before the end of the 9th century Āditya I must have established his control over Tondaimanādalam. It is practically certain that before attempting the conquest of Tondaimanādalam Āditya I must have brought under his rule the entire Kāvēri region.

Two stone inscriptions of Nripatunaga dated in his 22nd year are found in the Saḍaiyar temple at Tiruchcheṭṭampūṇḍi near Kōvilaḍi in the Tanjore district. A third inscription of the same king dated the same year is found at Tirukkoḍikāval in the Kumbakonam taluk. Another lithic record of the same Pallava dated in his 24th year is

2. Ibid. p. 289.
3. Ibid. p. 289.
6. 300 and 301 of 1901.
found at the same place.\textsuperscript{1} Now, if the first regnal year of \textit{Nripatu\-\(\text{n}\)ga} be A. D. 872 we must believe that in A. D. 896 he was in possession of a part of the K\(\text{\=a}\)\(\text{\=v}\)\text{\=e}ri delta. We must further believe that before recovering the Ch\(\ddot{\text{o}}\)la country proper \textit{\(\ddot{\text{A}}\)ditya I} took \textit{Tond\(\text{j}\)aiman\(\ddot{\text{d}}\)alam} from Apar\(\ddot{\text{\(\j\)}}\)jita. Obviously these are untenable contentions. In other words if Dr. Sircar’s date for \textit{Nripatu\(\text{n}\)ga} is accepted it will be difficult to explain the existence of the Pallava king’s records in the heart of the Ch\(\ddot{\text{o}}\)la country. Nor will it be less difficult to account for the existence of \textit{\(\ddot{\text{A}}\)ditya I}’s records in the heart of the Pallava empire. It is therefore clear that \textit{Nripatu\(\text{n}\)ga}’s reign must have come to an end before \textit{\(\ddot{\text{A}}\)ditya I}’s conquest of \textit{Tond\(\text{j}\)aiman\(\ddot{\text{d}}\)alam}.

Further Dr. Sircar presumes that Apar\(\ddot{\text{\(\j\)}}\)jita and \textit{Nripatu\(\text{n}\)ga} simultaneously reigned over different parts of the Pallava empire.\textsuperscript{2} But it is very difficult to sustain this view for the find-spots of the records of the two rulers do not make such a suggestion. No doubt Apar\(\ddot{\text{\(\j\)}}\)jita’s inscriptions are not seen in the Ch\(\ddot{\text{o}}\)la country proper while those of \textit{Nripatu\(\text{n}\)ga} exist there. Nevertheless the existence of the records of two kings in some places in \textit{Tond\(\text{j}\)aiman\(\ddot{\text{d}}\)alam} (e. g. Chittoor and Chingleput districts) precludes the possibility of partition of the Pallava empire in the time of \textit{Nripatu\(\text{n}\)ga}.

A word about Apar\(\ddot{\text{\(\j\)}}\)jita’s position in Pallava genealogy must be said here. Though the exact relationship of Apar\(\ddot{\text{\(\j\)}}\)jita to \textit{Nripatu\(\text{n}\)ga} is not yet known it is practically

\textsuperscript{1} S. I. I. Vol. XII, No. 78; 22 of 1930–31.

\textsuperscript{2} The Age of Imperial \textit{Kanauj}. p. 166.
certain that he was the successor of the latter. The Udayendra-diram plates of Prithivipati II mention only Aparajita in connection with the battle of Sriputambyam, and are silent on Nripatungra. Similarly Chola records mentioning Aditya I’s conquest of Tonqaimanqalam do not refer to Nripatungra. On the other hand we have specific reference in the Tiruvanangadu plates to the fact that Aditya I conquered Tonqaimanqalam from Aparajita. If Nripatungra were then alive his name would have been certainly mentioned in the record. All these evidences point to the conclusion that Aparajita must have succeeded Nripatungra some years before the battle of Sriputambyam. There is absolutely no possibility of identifying Aparajita with Nripatungra though the name Aparajita was also a surname of Pallava kings like NarasimhavarmaII, son of ParamesvarvarmanI.

The possibility of overlapping reign-periods particularly from the reign of Nandivarman II cannot be ruled out. But it cannot be supported in the absence of essential details.

The foregoing pages show that there is much uncertainty about the dates of the Pallavas of the 8th and 9th centuries and that the chronological and genealogical schemes of the Pallavas furnished by Mr. R. Gopalan can still be regarded as a good working hypothesis till a satisfactory alternative is available.

   Vol. XXIV, p. 538.
4. 566 of 1912.
CONCLUSION

We shall now attempt to present in brief a connected account of the part played by feudatories in Pallava history. In the 4th century A. D. we find the powerful Bāṇas siding with Mayūrasarmaṇa and making the Pallavas come to terms with him. In the next century the W. Gaṅgas are seen helping the Pallavas in subduing the Bāṇās and in fighting the hostile Kadambas. The subordination of the Chōjas of Rānāṇdu was probably of considerable assistance to the consolidation and expansion of the Pallava power in the time of Simhavishṇu. But their subsequent alliance with the W. Chāḷukyas weakened the Pallavas. The Bāṇas following the Rānāṇdu Chōjas threw in their lot with the W. Chāḷukyas. The defence of the north-west region of the empire thus became a formidable problem for the Pallavas and the initial triumph of W. Chāḷukya invasions of the Pallava empire in the 7th and 8th centuries was, in a great measure, due to the hostile policy of the two feudatory dynasties.

We have mentioned the possibility of the Chōjas of the Tamil country assisting Paramāśvaravarmaṇa in his war with W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya I. In his struggle with Chitra-māya and the Tamil powers Nandivarmaṇa II was ably supported by his Muttaraiya feudatories. The part played by the Chōjas in the siege of Nandipura is not clear, though their alliance with the Pāṇḍyas in the initial stage of the siege is quite possible. The Adigamaṇs of the Koṅgu country appear to have played a hostile part in Śrīpurusha’s invasion of the Pallava empire in the time of Nandivarmaṇa II. The Bāṇas who became again feudatory to Pallavas helped them
against the W. Gaṅgas in the 8th century. In the second half of the 8th century we find the Muttaraiyars waver ing in their loyalty to the Pallavas. Their exact role in the Pallava-Pāṇḍya wars of this period is not clear. But evidence is not wanting to indicate their temporary subordination to the Pāṇḍyas. It is also clear that they were for a short period independent of the two imperial powers. At the same time the Chōḷas appear to have made common cause with the Pāṇḍyas against the Pallavas. The Adigamānis assisted in vain the Pallavas in combating the expansion of the Pāṇḍya power under Neďunjaḍaiyaṉ. Naturally the Pallava power was eclipsed for some time in the Chōḷa country in the time of Dantivarman.

The beginning of the 9th century witnessed further troubles to the Pallavas. The Bāṇas changed their allegiance to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Taking advantage of the internal troubles of Amōghavarsha the W. Gaṅgas invaded the Pallava empire. The accession of Nandivarman III ushered in another period of Pallava-Pāṇḍya struggle. The Chōḷas of Paḷaiyarai seem to have played a hostile part in the battle of Teḻḷāṟu. But at the time of the battle of Kuḍamukku they figure as the allies of the Pallavas. We do not know what part the Muttaraiyars played in the two wars. Their probable alliance with the Pāṇḍyas during this period must have afforded a good opportunity for Vijayalaya to seize Tanjore. The capture of Tanjore by the Chōḷas was the beginning of the end of Muttaraiya influence in the Kāverī region. The Bāṇas took an important part in the wars against the Noḻambas and the W. Gaṅgas. Prithivipati I’s alliance with the Bāṇas was helpful to the Pallavas inasmuch as it checked the rapid progress of the hostile Noḻambas and the main branch of the W. Gaṅgas. The rift in the Noḻamba – W. Gaṅga alliance which originated in their defeat at Sōremaṭi
(A. D. 878) enabled the Pallavas to bestow their whole attention on the Pāṇḍyās. Attention has already been drawn to the great services of Prithivīpati I to the Pallavas in the battle of Sripurambiyam (A.D. 880). The Chōḷas stood by the Pallavas at this time. It was the support of the feudatories that was largely responsible for the victory of the Pallavas at Sripurambiyam.

The rise of the Chōḷas after this war was very striking. Neither the Pāṇḍyās nor the Muttaraiyars were in a position to check it. The Chōḷas seem to have brought the Koṭum-bāḻūr chiefs and the Muttaraiyars under their control and succeeded in befriending the successors of Prithivīpati I. The Bāṇas became independent by A. D. 888. The growing weakness of the imperial authority is clear from the existence in a limited area of the inscriptions of Aparaḻita. As noted above, the immediate cause of Āditya I's conflict with his overlord is not known. But the natural tendency of a rising feudatory power to overthrow its declining paramount power may, to some extent, account for this conflict. Instances of this kind have already been cited. The downfall of the Pallavas was mainly, but not solely, due to their loss of the support of feudatories. The long struggle of the Pallavas against the W. Chāḻukyas and the Pāṇḍyās greatly exhausted them and left them at the mercy of their powerful vassals.

We have noted in detail the cultural services rendered by the feudatories. The growth of the Bhakti cult was the driving force in their cultural activities. Śaivism and Vaishnānavism made remarkable progress under the patronage of the feudatories. Jainism and Buddhism began to decline on account of the tremendous endeavours of the Nāyaṇmārs and the Āḻvārs. Attention has already been drawn to the notable contribution to Tamil literature of the Jain scholars under
the Muttaraiyars. In an age of great religious upheaval the Pallava feudatories exhibited not only tolerance but also liberality. Men of learning were patronised irrespective of their persuasions. Architecture and sculpture made great advance under the feudatories. It is interesting to note that the cave-architecture persisted much longer in the Muttaraiya region than in other parts of the Pallava empire. The high degree of Sanskrit learning that we find in Gaṅgavādi in the 5th century deserves special mention.

Now, the question may be raised whether on the whole the Pallava feudatories were unhelpful or helpful to the stability and progress of the Pallava empire. The answer is that they were both. The task of successfully governing a wide empire depended in those days largely on the loyalty of the local or subordinate powers. The Pallava empire was no exception. The Pallava feudatories had their own armies and were in possession of strategically important territories, and as such were able to influence the vicissitudes of the imperial dynasty. Like the other feudatories of their times, they generally acknowledged the supremacy of their powerful neighbour or the victorious enemy and rarely stood by their weak or vanquished masters. Thus when the Pāṇḍya king Neḍunjaṭṭaiahaśaśa (alias Parantaka) took the Kāvārī region from the Pallavas, the Muttaraiyars changed their allegiance to him. In times of civil war as in the reign of Nandivarma II, the feudatories ranged themselves on either side and contributed to the instability of the imperial power. If the imperial power was at any time weak, or if it began to decline, the feudatories either declared their independence as the Muttaraiyars and the Bānajas did in the 9th century, or tried to establish their own power by overthrowing the imperial power as the Chōla king Āditya I did.
But the reverse of the medal cannot be overlooked. We have already noted in detail the valuable military assistance rendered by the feudatories to the Pallavas. Nandivarma II owed much to Udayachandra and to Perumbiçugu Muttaraiya II for the stability of his rule. The support of the Bānas was very helpful to the Pallavas in the frontier wars and enabled them to check the incursions of the Pāṇḍyās. The part played by Prithivipati I in the battle of Śrīpuṇāmbiyam was a remarkable one. Lastly the cultural activities of the feudatories noted in previous chapters testify to their share in the cultural progress of the Pallava empire.
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