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PREFACE

Inscriptions are the main source for reconstructing the history and culture of the ancient people. For the past one hundred years when the study of Epigraphy has received attention, greater emphasis was laid on the political history of our country, a framework which is essential for the proper understanding of social, religious and cultural history. Now that this has been achieved to a great extent, it is now necessary to analyse these inscriptions to let us have a glimpse beyond the political horizon. Still there are many problems of absorbing interest regarding the accession of rulers, like whether one ruler ascended a few years earlier or later, which I leave for consideration of more competent scholars than myself. Presiding over one of the Seminars organised by the Tamilnadu State Archaeology Department, late Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri remarked "that these inscriptions should be studied from the point of view, of social cultural and administrative history. Some work has already been done and much more remains to be done. More new materials have come to light and these need evaluation". Following the footsteps of this great historian, an attempt is made in this work to analyse inscriptions from new angles. The main approach is that all these inscriptions are legal documents conforming to the various dictates of the dharma sūstras. Whether the ruler was a Pallava, Pandya, Chola or other Chief ain, there was an administrative uniformity, in respect of villages, guilds, civil courts etc. all deriving their authority from the dharma sūstras.

A careful analysis of the stone inscriptions reveal that upto the middle of 10th century, by and large the drafting of the gifts or endowments are simple, precise and direct. Some exceptions are there, like the Copper plate grants and the inscriptions like the famous record of Parantaka at Uttaramerur. But these are only few. Rajaraja I (985-1014) was the first to initiate accurate and detail drafting, as found in his Tanjore inscriptions. The experience of the society in drafting such deeds and the transactions getting more and more complicated is reflected in the records. Signatures of all the parties, witnesses etc. are detailed which help us in understanding various members of the village assembly functioning at the time of the record.

Another point of interest is the care with which the conquests and ideals of their rule are recorded in the prasasti part of the Chola and the
later Pandya records up to almost the end of the 13th century A.D. But one thing stands out prominently namely the personality of the village assembly. It retained its individuality and its role is felt in every record. But with the coming of the Vijayanagar a different trend is clearly visible. The Vijayanagar records give invariably the Saka era, and other details that it is easy to calculate the date accurately. But the prasasti part of the Vijayanagar (except in rare cases) does not give either the victories or the ideals of the rulers, but repeat vain glories which had nothing to do with realities. The individuality of the village assembly gradually shows a decline. So do the drafting of the records. The guiding principles were still the dharma sāstras, but the political unrest, contributed to the gradual loosening of its hold over the society. The Nayaks of Tanjore and the Nayaks of Madurai tried to uphold the path of the dharma sastras, but they were themselves the victims of this artificial halo. However, we find that the dharma sastras played a vital role in the Tamil society from 7th to almost the end of 17th century A.D. Its role in Sangam Tamil Society needs a separate study.

This book carries a number of articles on various aspects of Tamil society mainly from the point of view of the dharma sāstras. Some of the articles included here were published by me earlier in other Journals and some in Tamil. The articles on "Pay structure under Rajaraja", and 'an inscribed painting in Madurai temple” were published in the Hindu weekly edition, and I am thankful to the Editor for permitting me to include them in this collection. The article on "South Indian temple as an employer" published in the Indian Economic and Social History Review Vol. II, No. 4, 1965. This article has evoked considerable interest and many foreign scholars have asked me for a reprint. The same is included and I am thankful to the Editor of the journal for the same. The Chirrur copper plate of Nṛpatunga was originally published by Dr. N. Ramesan in the Andhra Pradesh, Department of Archaeology series. A revised version is published here. It is hoped that the articles included in this work will open more avenues of research in the investigation of South Indian Epigraphy and Society.

I am thankful to Selvi. Padmavathy, Epigraphist of the Department for patiently going through the proofs and to Sri Chengalvaroyan and other members of the Departmental press for seeing the work through the press.

Madras
Pongal day
14th Jan. 1978

R. NAGASWAMY
NEW LIGHT ON CIVIL JUSTICE
- IN THE PANDYA PERIOD

Introduction

The disposal of law suits—both criminal and civil was the primary responsibility of the king in ancient India. He is the supreme judge of his country, and is expected to hear law suits daily as a part of his duty. Two interesting epigraphs from Tamil country, dating back to 8th – 9th centuries A.D. give us a glimpse into the disposal of civil suits by the king himself. Both of them relate to the early Pandya period. One is the celebrated Velvikkudi grant of Parāntaka Neţunjaţaiyan and the other is the Dalavaypuram grant of Parāntaka Vīranārayanan. Both the copper plates have been edited earlier, but have not been analysed from the point of view of legal administration. An attempt is made in this paper to analyse the plates from this angle which throws new light on the administration of civil justice in ancient Tamil land.

Most of the copper plates so far found belong to the class of documents known as dānapatra (gift deeds).

Kinds of documents

There are ten kinds of documents according to Vyāsa and Prajāpati. They are:

1. Upagata — Receipts.
4. Sthiti patra — Perpetual conduct.
5. Sandhipatra — Compact.

7. Vibhaṇga patra — Partition deed.
10. Śīmā vivāda patra — Settlement of boundary dispute.

The Pallava copper plates and the Pāṇḍya plates, excepting the two mentioned above, refer to gift of lands either to individuals or to institutions like temples. In all these cases the king makes the gift either himself in order to increase his merit, or at the request of others. But the Vēlvikkudi grant and the Dalavāyapuram grant belong to a different class of royal records. In both the cases, gift of lands were made by one of the ancestors of the ruler; but the lands were subsequently lost by the descendants of the donees, who appealed to the Kings directly. Having examined the cases the Kings restored the lands to the descendants of the original donees. Thus they relate to the settlement of ownershhip right by the King in his capacity as a Supreme Judge. It would therefore be interesting to examine both the records in terms of ancient legal administration as reflected in the Dharma Sastras.

Vēlvikkudi Grants

The Vēlvikkudi grant of Parāntaka Neḍunjadaiyan, consists of two parts, the sanskrit and tamil parts (like the other copper plates). The sanskrit portion stops with the listing of the genealogy of Parāntaka. The tamil part begins straight away with the details of the appeal – that the village Vēlvikkudi was gifted to one Narkoṛṇan also known as Korkai Kiḷān, by the Pāṇḍya ruler, Pāḷgāgasālai Mudukudumip peruvaḷudi, when he completed a Yāga (Vēlvi). It is said that the village was in the long possession of the donee (ṇīdu bhukti tuyytaḷpin) when the Kali king, named Kalabhra, who overthrew a number of rulers (Ādirājas), deprived the donees of the enjoyment of the village.

A descendant of the donee, whose name is given as Korkai Kiḷān-Kāmakkanī Narasingan, went to the palace of the Pāṇḍya ruler, Parāntaka Neḍunjaḍaiyan, at Kūdāl and shouted at the outskirts (ākrōdhikka). The King himself heard this appeal, called him in
ம. பு. வேலாபாரனம் சாத்திக் காலி, சாத்திக் பீடம் காப்பிருந்து
and enquired into the matter. The appellant told the king that after they were deprived of their enjoyment (Kadungon, Avani sūlāmani, Selīyan Sendan, Arikeṣari, Koccaḍayan and Rājasimhan), six Pāṇḍya rulers had passed away. "This land was given by your ancestor Mudukudumī Peruvalludi. The name of the village is Velvikkudī situated in Pākanūrkrīram (territorial subdivision). This was removed by the Kalabhras" appealed Narasīgan. On hearing this, the King asked the appellant to produce evidence that this was actually in their possession. ὰπόλογον ἐμπορικὸν ἡμиюν βασιλεὺς. There upon the appellant showed evidence to prove his rights. The king having satisfied himself, ordered at the spot itself that the village gifted by his ancestor was reconferred by him as well. (structors ὀθέντικαν ἐπιθυμηταν ἡμίουν ἡμῖν ἀπόλογον ἐμπορικὸν ἡμίουν βασιλεὺς ὑπερεπετέικε οἰκτήρας)

The copper plate then details the boundaries of the village and mentions Mūvendamangalapperaraiyan as the Ἁγναπτὶ of the grant.

A few words used in this text are clearly legal terms employed in dharma sāstras.

Nidu Bhukti

In describing the village gifted, it is said that it was in their enjoyment for long Nidu Bhukti. Bhukti enjoyment (possession) is considered an important evidence in civil suits. The disputing party, when called upon should produce valid evidence (Pramāṇa) to prove his case. "Proof is of two kinds. 1. Human (mānushika) and 2. Divine (Daivika), Human proof is furnished by a) Documents (liṅkita), b) Witness (Sākshi) and 3. Enjoyment (Bhukti). The divine proof consists of ordeals.

"Bhukti (enjoyment comes therefore foremost as a mode of proof) in respect of rights to immovable property generally. As possession is an incident of ownership it is recognised as a mode of proof of ownership. Hārīta, describes title as the root and possession (Bhukti) as the branch of a tree. Mere possession however, is not proof of ownership. It is legal title Āgama, such as is required by gift, purchase etc. that really confers ownership. Such a title has greater validity than mere possession in determining ownership. According to Yāgnavalkya, title
however perfect, if unaccompanied by slight possession is of no value. Possession is insisted on by Kātyāyana and Brhaspati also for completing the legal title deeds. But in the case of mere enjoyment from generation to generation it is valid proof of ownership by itself though unaccompanied by proof of title. As such long possession raises the presumption of legal title. This exception applies only in cases of enjoyment for a period lasting beyond the memory of man or man’s memory. In the case of immemorial enjoyment or for over three generations, it is not possible to trace the existence or otherwise of title as the origin of possession and therefore mere possession is recognised as a mode of proof.”  

In the case of Velvikkudi grant, the owners have been deprived of their property for over six generations. There were two valid proofs. 1. documents which the descendants were able to produce. In the deed it is referred to as ‘Nattānin Paḷamaiyānata’. It probably refers to the records in the country accounts that it belonged to the family of Korkai Kilaṇs. It is not known whether the original dānapatra was lost or confiscated. In its absence the country accounts were shown as valid proof. 2. The second evidence was the actual enjoyment for a long period (Nīdu bhukti). The use of the word ‘bhukti’ in the Velvikkudi grant clearly indicates its legal implication. As two valid Pramāṇas were shown, the king had no hesitation in conferring the title back on the descendants.

In describing the Pāṇḍya ruler, Parāntaka, who heard the case, and conferred back the gift, the following significant titles are used. Manūpaman, Kanṭakanishturān, and Gūḍha Nirnayan, which are terms associated with Dharma. In the Srivaramangalam plates, the same ruler is described as ‘one following the path of Manudarsana, who extolled elders and did ‘Kanṭaka sodhana’.

“Kautilya’s Artha Sāstra describes two classes of courts called Dharma-sthiya and ‘Kanṭaka sodhana’ as prevalent at that time. The Dharmasthīya courts had jurisdiction over the administration of civil and criminal justice in respect of ordinary matter. The Kanṭaka sodhana which consisted of three commissioners seem to have exercised special jurisdiction over matters of commerce and industry and prevention of

1. Ibid – pp. 61-63.
breach of peace and determination of grave offences against the state. They saw to the enforcement of contracts among artisans and to the regulation of their wages and kept constant vigilance over the detection and prevention of heinous crimes.” In the famous Uttaramerur inscription of Parantaka ‘grāmakaṇṭakas’ criminals who have turned against the village are referred to. The fact that Pāñḍya Neḍunjadaiyan performed “Kaṇṭaka sodhana” himself shows that the concept was well known in Tamil country in 8th century and the king himself headed that council to hear heinous crimes against the state.

However, in the Velvikkudi grant, one point namely why the appeal was not prefered earlier, and why the descendants waited for nearly six generations is not clear.

**Dalavaypuram Plates**

The Dalavaypuram plates of Parāntaka Vīranārayana also refers to a dispute. In this case the gifted land was misappropriated and an appeal was made to the king. The king restored the right which is the purport of the grant.

The Dalavaypuram plates also consists of two parts, the first in sanskrit and the second in tamil language. Unlike the Velvikkudi grant, the dispute and the decision are recorded both in the Sanskrit and Tamil parts. Sanskrit portion is interesting because of its terminology.

The case is briefly as follows. The Pāñḍya ruler Kaṭumgona gifted a village Srimangalam as brahmadeyyi to twelve Brahma mins. Another Pāñḍya ruler, whose name is not mentioned but who is said to have died at Kaḻudur is said to have gifted the village Somāsikurucchi to one Kāṭaka Somayāji who became an exclusive owner of the Brahmadeyya. But both the dānapatras, (the copper plates) were lost during troubled conditions (marakkēdu) (probably referring to Kalabhra occupation). Part of this Somāsikurucchi was subsequently separated by a Sudra who appropriated it to himself under the new name Madhuratara nallur.

2. Epi. Indi. Vol. XXII
The Appeal

So the appeal was prefered to the King. The appellant was one Nārāyanān Kesavan of Sōmāsikkurucchi, who served as a confidential officer of the Pāndya, Vīranārāyanā. The appeal was that:

1. the new Village Madhurataranallur should be restored to Sōmāsikkurucchi,

2. The new Sudra occupant should be expelled from the land and

3. The boundaries of the villages Srimangalam and Sōmāsikkurucchi which are mixed up should be redefined and the two villages clubbed together and a copper plate charter issued confirming the grant.

The king immediately agreed and ordered accordingly. Neither in the sanskrit portion nor in the tamil portion, there is any mention of the production of evidence. The king did not ask for any evidence at all. Atleast the charter is not specific on this issue. The person Nārāyanan Kesavan who appealed, is referred to as a highly learned and a great scholar in political science Kshutramatam unaruntu and was a person of pure and high integrity (suddha sīla açāran) and above all was a trustworthy officer serving the king on various duties in Kōttam (Visvāsa Karmangatkāya tanamaiyan). In view of the fact that the appellant was a trustworthy person and also an officer of high integrity, the ruler should have decided the case considering him also as a sākshi. However, the land was not claimed by the appellant to himself but on behalf of the village assembly of Srimangalam and Sōmāsikkurucchi. The king giving the order is mentioned as Manucaritan which is interesting.

Sah Sōmāsikkurucchi iti khyātah-tasya eka desa bhūh Madhurasthāna sadgrāma nāmnā südrābhilanghitā. Tam ācchidyā tataḥ pūrva svāmibhog-yam prakalpya ca, tasyāḥ südrakrita ākhyānavyāvkritm upapādya ca, tadēkibhūta Sōmāsikkurucchih ekatām saha Srimangalenā sampādya Goddess pusatkalekhāyaat grāmānavya paurastya tāmrapatṭa pramānayoh nāsodo-shanirākārntum tayoh ca ekatva buddhaye aikyena grāmayoh kritvā simā-nam karinipadaith tāmrapatṭa pramānanca kalpayitva diyatām. (D. Plates line 43 to 47.)

In this case the Officer should be considered a sākshi-witness. According to Narada, King and King’s Officers could be made sākshi.
Here the king’s officer Nārāyanaṇa kēsavan is to be considered a witness, for he is described as belonging to a good family and follower of sṛauta and smārta path (Sṛauta Smārta adhvagaṇa). According to Yāgnavalkya, sṛauta smārta kriyaporā (followers of sṛauta and smārta path) satyavādi Kulīnas, etc. are to be considered as witnesses. It is interesting that in the copper plate the same words as sṛauta smārta advaga occurs.

In Case of loss of Document

When the document is in another country, wrongly drafted eaten away by ants, stolen, broken, burnt or lost, another document should be prepared.


When the document is lost, a new one should be prepared which is called suddhi.

In the Dalavaypuram plato, the document is lost and the ownership was in dispute. So the document has to be prepared a new which is called in dharma sastra Sandhigdha lekhya suddhi. In this copper plate the same term is found used as suddha pustaka lekhayā. Further in the D. P. Charter, the loss is called Nāsadosha, and the Suddhi was intended to remove this defect, refered to in the copper plates as nāsa dosha nirākartum. The request in the D.P. is mentioned as Tāmrapaṭṭa pramāṇam kalpayitva diyatām. Here also the technical term pramāṇa is used in a legal sense. The king is said to have got it written on a copper plate tāmrapaṭṭa.

In the Tamil portion of the plates the king is requested to issue a sāsana.

“According to Nārada, there are four ways of terminating a vyavahāra or dispute.

1. Yagnya Valkya – Lekhya V. 91.
2. Yagnya Valkya – V. 92.
They are 1. Dharma—abstract justice, 2. Vyavahāra—decision after contest, 3. Caritra—written law and 4. Rāja Sāsanam. — Order of the king. The command of the king which is not repugnant to sacred law or natural justice becomes the final word. The word used in this case is Rājasāsana and the Tamil portion of the copper plates uses the same terminology and in this case the king's sāsana was to be the last word.

Vyavahara Nīrnaya

Thus it is seen, that both the Velvikkudi and the Dalavaypuram grants belong to the vyavahāra nīrnaya class of dānapatras unlike the other copper plates. They clearly indicate that as early as eighth century A.D. the kings adopted in Tamil country the tenets of dharma sāstras in deciding disputes. This would also show in the day to day purchase, pledge, and all other transactions relating to property etc. the dharma sāstras were the guiding texts and this goes in accordance with the repeated assertion of the rulers that they were followers of Manu. This clearly prove that though different parts of India were ruled by different dynasties, often fighting with each other, in matters of civil and administrative justice they followed all over the country only the dharma sāstras, which is of utmost importance for the study of cultural unity of India.

A NEW PANDYA RECORD AND
THE DATES OF NAYANMARS AND ALWARS

An important Pândya lithic record, perhaps the earliest to have been noticed so far in the city of Madurai, was brought to light from the bed of the Vaigai river in 1961. This is now preserved in the Madurai temple museum. It has been edited by Sri K. G. Krishnan, Superintending Epigraphist—Government of India, in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXXVIII, pt. I. In his article Sri Krishnan, draws our attention to many points of interest and assigns this epigraph to one of the early Pândya kings Cëndan who ruled in the first half of the 7th Century A.D.

I had occasion to examine this epigraph recently and prepare an estampage. Sri Krishnan’s reading needs revision at some places which is attempted in this paper. The main amendment to Krishnan’s reading relates to the name of the king in line eight of the epigraph. Krishnan reads Kóc Cëndan märräimpadu (சென்னான் மாரைம்பது). The word after Cëndan has been read has märrij i.e. ‘and’, consequently it is taken to stand for the 50th regnal year of Kóc Cëndan. The ruler is identified with Cëndan, the son and successor of Märavarman Avanisülāmanī.

The revised reading according to me would be “Kóc Cëndan Märanaimpadu” which means the 50th regnal year of Cëndan Maran, son of Cëndan and not in the reign of Cëndan himself.

The Revised reading

1.  மாணவை தெளணி பிரிக்குமிடம் பார்த்து பார்வத்து வச
2.  பார்வத்து வச வாய்ப்புகளுக்கு வுண்டு மறந்து
3.  செந்தா காண்புவள் அகர்ந்து மல
4.  இறுதியும் திகட்டிட்டிச் சீராகுகிறது இல்ல இல்ல
5.  மாணவை தெளணியிலும் மேலும் நிகழ்த்து இல்ல
6.  குரிக்கடி முகலாயன் தற்காலக்

7. Cēndan Māran aimpatu
8. Cēndan Māran aimpatu
9. Cēndan Māran aimpatu
10. Cēndan Māran aimpatu
11. Cēndan Māran aimpatu
12. . . . . . . . .

I give the revised reading for the following reasons. The first letter is long mā and not short ma. Krishnan himself has noticed the presence of the long ā sign, added to the letter ma, and says in the foot note that this may be ignored. The form must be retained as it is present and is to be read mā. The second letter in the word is read as pure consonant r. But as pure consonants are marked with dots (pullis) in this epigraph and no dot is present in this letter, it is to be read as ra with the medial a. The third letter is nai and not rai. The form rai has a slightly different form as could be seen from copper plate 1 charters of the Pandyas. Thus the word will have to be read as mā ra nai (m ba tu). The revised reading of this line is Kōc Cēndan Māran aimpatu (Cēndan Māran aimpatu.)

The first part of the epigraphists the exploits of the king in whose reign the record was issued. Of the exploits of the king, the following deserve special notice. The king is said to have established many agrahāras, and performed mahādānas like hiranyagarbha, tulābhāra and gōsahasra. He is also said to have established Mangalapura as a nagara. Sri Krishnan has taken these exploits as those of Cēndan. But according to the revised reading the epithets are that of Māran.

From Copper plates 2 of the Pandyas, like the Velvikkudi, and smaller Sinnamanur plates we find that Cēndan’s son was a great ruler, who performed many hiranyagarbha and tulābhāra ceremonies. The performances of hiranyagarbha and tulaabhāra are invariably attributed to Māran in all the copper plates and not to Cēndan. This revised reading confirms the information gleaned from copper plates.

1. Ten Pandya Copper Plates. Madras.
Māran, the son of Čendan had many significant titles such as Arikēsari. The epigraph under discussion, refers to a madagu (sluice) constructed in the Vaigai river, which was named Arikēsari, after one of his own titles. This is a further confirmation that the ruler was Māran.

From the above it is evident that the ruler is identical with Arikēsari, Parānkusa, Māravarman, the son of Čendan. The Vaigai bed epigraph makes it clear that Māravarman ruled for fifty years. His rule is to be placed between 650 A.D. to 700 A.D. Three powerful predecessors, Kadungōn, Māravarman Avanisūlamani and Čendan, have occupied the Pāṇḍya throne before him. We may assign an average of 30 years to each and place the beginning of the first Pāṇḍya empire about 560 A.D. Kōccadayana Ranadhīrana, Māravarman Rājasimhan and Parāntaka Varaguna, ascended the throne in succession, after Arikēsari Māravarman. With the help of Kali era mentioned in Varaguna’s epigraph it has been established that he ascended the throne in 765 A.D.² Kōccadayana Ranadhīra and Māravarman Rājasimha ruled for about 65 years after Arikēsari. Thus Arikēsari’s rule is to be placed between 650-700 A.D.

**PANDYAN EMPIRE**
**GENEALOGICAL SCHEME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Kings</th>
<th>K. A. Nilakanta Sastri in his S. Indian History</th>
<th>Now being Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kadungon</td>
<td>590—620 A.D.</td>
<td>560—590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maravarman Avanisūlamani</td>
<td>620—645</td>
<td>590—620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čendan</td>
<td>645—670</td>
<td>620—650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arikēsari Parānkusa Maravarman</strong></td>
<td><strong>670—700</strong></td>
<td><strong>650—700</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōccadaiyana Ranadhīrana</td>
<td>700—730</td>
<td>700—730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māravarman Rājasimhan</td>
<td></td>
<td>730—768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parāntaka Nedunjadaiyana</td>
<td>730—765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varagunan I</td>
<td>765—815</td>
<td>768—815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srimara Srivallabha</td>
<td>815—862</td>
<td>815—862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varaguna II</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This brings us to an important factor. Siruttondar the saint whom Jnānasambandar met at Thiruchengattankudi, is identified with the commander of Mamalla Narasimha (630-668) in his Vaṭapi wars. Jannāsambandar should have lived between 640 and 655 A.D. The Pāṇḍya ruler whom Sambandar converted from Jainism to Saiva faith was a certain Neḍumāran also known as Kūn Pāṇḍya. Traditional literature ascribe to him a great victory at Nelveli and this earned him the title Nelveli venra Neḍumāran i.e. Neḍumāra the victor of Nelveli. It is evident that the monarch who was ruling at the time of Sambandar's visit to Madurai was none other than Māran, the son of Cēndan, of the Vaigai bed epigraph.

I have pointed out elsewhere, that this Neḍumāran is identical with the hero of the Tamil literary work Pandikkovai which also enumerates all these exploits. His titles as Arikesari Pāṅkusa, and Neḍumāra, his conquest of Nelveli, and the performance of hiranyagarbha and tulābahra are listed in the Tamil work, Pandikkovai. Thus the author of the Vaigai-bed epigraph is identical with the hero of Pāṇḍikkovai.

This epigraph mentions that Cēndan Māran established Mangalapura as a nagara. On this Sri Krishnan has made two suggestions. 1) The Mangalapura established by this ruler should be in Pāṇḍya territory and is likely to be Mangalam near Sattur. This suggestion, can be finally settled after the present village is examined for its antiquity and 2) Sri Krishnan identifies this Mangalapura with Mangalapura, conquered by Koccadaiyan Ranadhira, the son and successor of Arikesari.

The Vēlvikkudi grant states that Koccadaiyan Ranadhira the son of Arikesari Māravarman attacked the Mahārathas at Mangalapura and won a decisive victory. This Mangalapura has been identified with Mangalore in the west coast by Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, Dr. K. V. Ramesh in his recent book on History of South Kanara has pointed out, that Ālupas who were holding sway over Mangalore and who were aided by the Chalukyan forces faced this invasion at Mangalore.


2. The Pandyan Kingdom.
On the other hand Krishnan is of the opinion that the Pandyas did not invade Mangalore in the west coast, but were defending their own city of Mangalapura near Sattur against the invasion of the Chalukya forces in 674 A.D. The identity of Mangalapura, captured by Ranadhira with Mangalapura established by Cendan Maran as proposed by Krishnan is not acceptable for the following reasons. The Chalukyas never penetrated so far south as Sattur taluk of Ramanad District. The battle of Mangalapura in which Ranadhira distinguished himself, is identified with the invasion of Chalukya Vikramaditya in 674 A.D. by Krishnan. We have shown that the Vaigai bed inscription is a record of Cendan Maran, who ruled for 50 years. His rule, should have extended upto 700 A.D. Even if we allow some period of joint rule, Ranadhira’s conquest of Mangalapura cannot be placed before 700 A.D. Vikramaditya’s expedition, being decidedly a quarter of a century earlier had nothing to do with Ranadhira’s conquest.

In view of the fact that the Alupas of west coast ruling around Mangalore, claimed Pandyas lineage, and used the fish as their emblem, it is evident that Ranadhira’s conquest related to the capture of Mangalore, which left a permanent mark on the ruling dynasty there.

Dates of Saiva Saints

This brings us to an important field of enquiry, namely the date of some of the Alvars and Nayanmars. Before proceeding to examine this question in the light of new findings, it is necessary to notice a recent work on this subject. Sri K. R. Srinivasan and following him K R. Venkatrama Iyer in their latest publication, ‘Devi Kāmākshi in Kānchi,’ have discussed the dates of Appar and Sambandar in detail. In this work Appar’s date of birth is taken as 665 A.D. and he is not considered a contemporary of Mahendravarman. Sambandar’s date of birth is assigned to the close of 7th century, that is about 700 A.D.

A careful study of the above work shows that the views of the above authors are self contradictory and untenable. The following are the few.

1) No mention is made of Thiruchirappalli inscription of Mahendravarman, which is an important source for dating the Saivite saint Appar.
2) It is stated that Tilakavatiyār, the sister of Appar was betrothed to Kaliyanār (p. 65). This is wrong. Kaliyanār was a different saint who lived in Thiruvorriyur and was an oil merchant. Tilakavatiyār was betrothed to Kalippagaiyār.

3) It is stated that Kaliyanār was ordered to the front to fight against the invading northerners, the Chalukyas. There is no evidence to show that the northerners mentioned in Periyapuranam, were Chalukyas. They could be anybody. The dates assigned to the Nāyanārs are solely based on this assumption.

4) Three different dates are given to Appar in the same book. In page 66, his date of birth is given as 665 A.D.; in page 70, the beginning of Appar’s period is given as 660 A.D. and again in page 74, it is given as 650 A.D.

5) Regarding the age of Sambandar it has been said that he was born at the close of 7th Century, about the time when Narasimha II, ascended the Pallava throne (700–728) and lived upto the middle of Nandivarman Pallavamalla’s reign. If Sambandar was born in C. 700 A.D., he would have died in 716 A.D. in the reign of Rajasimha himself. The middle of Nandi’s reign would be 765 A.D., which would mean Sambandar lived for more than 85 years. Unless such a long life is given to Sambandar, for which there is no evidence, it is difficult to sustain this date.

6) It has been stated that when Appar met Sambandar at Sirkali, soon after later’s upanayana, he was sufficiently advanced in age. According to the same book, Appar’s date of birth is 665 and that of Sambandar is C. 700 A.D. Sambandar’s upanayanam was then performed in his 8th year, in 708 A.D. In that year Appar would be about 43 years of age which is certainly not an old age.

7) It has been stated that Sambandar converted the Pāṇḍya ruler Neṭumāran to Saivism, and he is identified with Māravarman Rājasimha, the father of Neṭunjāṇaiyan. This synchronism is also not possible according to the author’s own stand, for he assigns Rājasimha to C. 730–768 A.D. According to him, Sambandar was born in 700 A.D. If Sambandar lived for only 16 years, he could not have converted the ruler who came to the throne in 730 A.D.
The inconsistencies have cropped up because the contemporary of Sambandar is taken to be Māravarman Rājasimha. In the light of this new inscription of Cēndan Māran, the views expressed by K. R. Srinivasan needs revision.

The Periyapurāṇa of Sekkilar and the Guruparampara are all Purāṇas, which take one or two episodes from the life of the saints and weave beautiful myths around them. We must therefore be careful in utilising them for reconstructing history. Episodes corroborated by epigraphical or archaeological source alone should be taken into account and the rest left out to the realm of religious faith.

Date of Appar

One episode that needs examination is the conversion of the Pallava contemporary of Appar, from Jainism to Saivism. It must be seen whether there is any evidence to support this. All scholars assign Appar to the 7th century, though some would assign him to the first half of 7th century, and others to the second half. Mahendra I, Navasimha I, Mahēndra II, Paramesvara I, and probably Rājasimha were the Pallava rulers of the 7th century A.D. We do have an epigraphical reference to conversion of a Pallava in 7th century A.D., and this occurs in the Mahēndra’s inscription at Tiruchirappalli in which Mahēndra states that he changed to the Saiva faith from some other faith. No other Pallava of 7th century was a convert. Thus the tradition is corroborated by epigraphical evidence and should thus be considered an indisputable evidence testifying to the contemporaneity of Appar with Mahēndra I. Recent discoveries have shown, that Mahendra ruled for 40 years (590–630). So Appar may be assigned to Circa 580–660 A.D.

Date of Sambandar

Appar and Jnānasambandar were contemporaries according to all accounts. Jnānasambandar is said to have converted the Pandya ruler Nīnrasīr Neḍumāran to Saivism from Jaina faith. Literature refers to Neḍumāran as the victor of Nelveli. From the Velvikkudi & Sinnamanur copper plates we do get a Pāndya Māran in 7th century who is praised for his victory at Nelveli.
Some scholars identify him with Māran, the son of Čendan while others identify him with Māravarman Rājasimha I, the son of Ranaḍhīra.

It is therefore necessary to discuss this problem in detail. Scholars like K. V. S. Ayyar, T. V. Sadasivapandarathar and M. Raghava Iyengar have given the titles Arikēsari and Parānkusa to Rājasimha I, without any evidence as a result of which some scholars like K. R. Venkatrama Iyer and K. R. Srinivasan try to hold that Jnānasambandar was a contemporary of Pāṇḍya Rājasimha I. None of the copper plates of the Pāṇḍyas give the title Arikēsari or Parānkusa to Rājasimha. On the contrary only one ruler Māran, son of Čendan is given these titles. Some scholars assign even the conquest of Nelveli to Rājasimha I, but there is absolutely no evidence for this. As far as copper plates and literature are concerned the conquest of Nelveli is ascribed only to Māravarman, son of Čendan.

The Vaigai bed inscription proves that Čendan Māran ruled for 50 years and is to be assigned to circa 650–700 A.D. He was the only Naḍumāran, the victor of Nelveli, who was a contemporary of Sambandar. Sambandar’s date then would be circa, 640–656. This also shows that Sirutondar was a commander under Pallava Narasimha I and participated in his Vatapi conquest.

Date of Periyalvar

Among the VaishnaviteĀlvārs, Periyāḷvār refers in his verse to Pāṇḍya Ko-Naḍumāran.

\[ \text{That Periyāḷvār was a contemporary of Naḍumāran is thus established. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri says that “all that we can infer is that if this Naḍumāran is the same as the contemporary of Jnānasambandar, this Ālvār may also be assigned to their age and likewise his daughter Andāl. It seems more likely that the reference is to Śrīmāra Śrivallabha”. Śrīmāra Śrivallabha is assigned to Circa 815–862. According to} \]
Srivallabha and this probably influenced the learned Professor to prefer the later date.

T. A. Gopinatha Rao in his ‘History of the Sri Vaishnavas,’ has suggested that Periyāḻvār was a contemporary of Śrīmāra Śrivallabha, identical with Śrīvallabha Avanīpasēkhara of Sittannavašal inscription. Mr. Rao’s conclusion is based on the identity of the name Śrivallabha, said to be a contemporary of Periyāḻvār according to Guruparampara.

M. Raghava Iyengar in his ‘Age of the Āḻvārs’ differed from Gopinatha Rao and held that the contemporary of Periyāḻvār was Māravarman Rājasimha father of Parāntaka Neṇunjaḍaiyan. Parāntaka Neṇunjaḍaiyan was a Parama Vaishnava who erected a Vishnu temple at Kānchivāy Pēṟū. Raghava Iyengar held that Parāntaka derived his Vishnubhakti from his father Māravarman Rājasimha and that Rājasimha should have been converted to Vaishnavism by Periyāḻvār.

While discussing the date of Periyāḻvār two points deserve to be carefully noted. (1) The saint himself refers to a Pāḍnya Kō-Neṇumāran as his contemporary. (2) The Guruparampara refers to a Pāṇḍya Śrivallabha as his contemporary. We must look for a Pandya who had both these titles. Śrī Māra, the son of Parāntaka Neṇunjaḍaiyan is called in the larger Sinnamanur and Dalavaypuram copper plates as Śrivallabha. Śrivallabha seems to have been his abishekanāma, but whether he had the title Kō-Neṇumāra was not proved so far by any epigraph.

An epigraph coming from Ērukkangudi, Sattur taluk, Ramnad District, published recently throws valuable light on the problem. It refers to Pāṇḍya Śrivallabha who conquered the places from Kunnur to Ceylon. The point of interest in this epigraph is that this Śrivallabha is also called Kō-Neṇumāran.

“அஹி ஜெப்பி இலவாழ்மறும் மரியாண்டில் எழுதி உள்ளார் வாழ்மறும் பக்கமும் போர் முற்றிலும் பார்வையில் மீது பலிக்கப்பட்டுள்ள வெல்லை வெட்டும் அதன் காலத்து வெட்டும் காலம் காலத்து வெட்டும் வெஜால் தெய்வு அதன் காலத்து வெட்டும் காலத்து வெட்டும் என்றும் வாழ்மறும் அங்கு செல்லும் வெஜாலும்.” 44 SII-XIV.
According to Sinnamanur and Dalavaypuram plates, Srīmāra Srīvallabha, the son of Parāntaka Varaguna I, won significant victories at Kunnur, Vilinjam, Kumbakonam and Ceylon. The Erukkangudi, inscription is evidently that of Srīmāra Srīvallabha the son of Parāntaka Varaguna, and that he had also the title Kō-Neđumāran.

There can hardly be any doubt that Periyāḷvār was a contemporary of this Kō-Neđumāran Srīvallabha and should have flourished in the 9th century A.D. On the other hand no epigraph has so far been found which gives either the title Srīvallabha or Kō-Neđumāran to Rājasimha, whom Raghava Iyengar holds as the contemporary of Periyāḷvār. We therefore agree with T. A. Gopinatha Rao and K. A. N. Sastri, that the contemporary of Periyāḷvār was Srīmāra Srīvallabha and that the Vaishnavite Saint flourished in the 9th century A.D. Andāl, the daughter of Periyāḷvār should also be assigned to the same period.

Date of Thirumangai

Scholars have discussed the problem of the date of Thirumangai Āḻvār in detail and have arrived at a satisfactory date. The date of this Āḻvār can be fixed with certain amount of accuracy as he refers to his contemporary Pallava ruler Nandi. Thirumangai lists his conquests which are corroborated by copper plates.

Thirumangai sings the battle of Mannai where Pallavamalla is said to have defeated the Pāṇḍya. This is also corroborated by another copper plate. In the Udayēndram plates, Nandi’s general Udaya Chandra is praised for his victory over the Pāṇḍyasena at Mannaikkudmā. (Mannaikkudigrāme Pāṇḍyasēnām jītavān.) Udayēndram plate was issued in the 21st regnal year of Nandi (752). The Pāṇḍya ruler who opposed Nandi was Māravarman Rājasimha.

Thirumangai also refers to the battle of Karuvūr in which the Pallava is said to have won.
A new evidence has come to light regarding the battle of Karuvūr which has not yet received due attention. The Dalavaypuram plates mention that Parāntaka Varaguna, defeated the Pallava at Karuvūr. (పారాంతక వరగున పాలవ మొదట కారువాణి పరాంతక గ్రహణం) This gets indirect confirmation from another source. Sivaramangalam plates refers to Parāntaka’s fight with Atiya, at Pugaliyur and Ayirur on the northern bank of the river Kaveri. These places are situated near Karur. The same charter also states, that Varaguna defeated the Pallava and Keralan, who came to help the Atiya. Evidently the battle of Pugaliyur was followed upto Karuvur where an indesible battle was fought. Both the Pallava and the Pândya claim victory at Karuvur. Whatever the result of the war may be, one thing is certain, that Thirumangai who sings this battle, was a contemporary of Nandivarman Pallavamalla and Parāntaka Nežunjaḍaiyan.

Thus Thirumangai was a contemporary of two Pândya rulers Rājasimha I and Nežunjaḍaiyan. On the Pallava side, he was a contemporary of Nandivarman Pallavamalla. (731–796)

It must be mentioned that this Vaishnava Ālva, sings in one of his verse, Vairamēgha who is generally identified with Dantivarma Pallava, who ruled in the first half of 9th century A.D. Thirumangai is therefore taken to be a contemporary of Danti as well. But we have shown elsewhere that the title Vairamēgha was a title of Nandivarman himself. As such we may assign Thirumangai to the reign of Nandivarman. Thus Thirumangai’s date may be taken as 730–800 A.D.

Date of Nammalvar

Almost, the same period must be assigned to Nammālvār. Nammālvār sings Varagunamangai, and Srivaramangalam, both places established by Parāntaka Nežunjaḍaiyan. Madhurakavi is said to be a disciple of Nammālvār. A Madhurakavi occurs as a minister of Parāntaka I during the early years of his reign, as seen from the Anamalai epigraph. Madhura Kavi was dead at the time of Anamalai inscription. As such Nammālvār’s end could be placed about 780 A.D. His date of birth would be circa 745 A.D. Nammālvār had two other names which are significant. He was called Parānkusa and Máran. In all probability the names Parānkusa and Máran were derived after Arikēsari Parānkusa Māravarman of
the Vaigai bed-epigraph. Vaishnavite tradition makes Thirumangai and Nammāḻvar contemporaries. Our studies also seem to point to the same direction. While the Guruparampara, makes Periyāḻvar, also a contemporary of Thirumangai and Nammāḻvar, our studies show that Periyāḻvar lived in the 9th century A.D.

The Vaigai bed inscription of Cēndan Māran has opened up new avenues of enquiry relating to the chronology of the early Pandyas and the history of Saivism and Vaishnavism in South India.

As a result of the above study the following are our conclusions:

1) The Vaigai bed inscription is that of Cendan Maran who ruled atleast for 50 years (650-700 A.D.)

2) He was the hero of the Tamil work Pandikkovai.

3) The chronology of the early Pandyas could be placed at the beginning of about 560 A.D.

4) The city of Mangalapura established by Arikesari was located in the Pandya country.

5) But the Mangalapura where his son defeated the Maharatas is identical with Mangalore.

6) Appar was a contemporary of Mahendra, Mamalla and the Pandya Aikesari.

7) Appar's date would be circa 580-660 A.D.

8) Inanasambandar was a contemporary of Mamalla I, and Pandya Aikesari Nedumaran.

9) Sambandar's date would be circa 640-656 A.D.

10) Thirumangai was a contemporary of Rajasimha and Nedunjadaiyan of the Pandyas and Nandivarman Pallavamalla and may be assigned between 700 and 800.

11) Nammalvar's date would be about 745 to 780 A.D.

12) Periyalvar was a contemporary of Sri Mara Srivallabha and his date would be Circa 800-885.

13) Andal is to be assigned to the second half of 9th century.

14) The Vaigai bed inscription is an important landmark in the history of Tamilnadu.
MAHENDRA’S INSCRIPTION AT TIRUCHIRAPALLI

In a recent article "The philosophy of Mahendravarman’s Thiruchirappalli Epigraph" published in "Studies in Indian Epigraph" vol. 3 1976 Michael Lockwood states "Nagaswamy is quite right that there is an error in the reading of the word "Silākhara" (P. 92.) I am glad that the above authors have accepted their error and agreed to my revised reading. They persist however in their folly, when they state ‘This problem has not been solved by Nagaswamy’s article either.’ They want to solve a problem that does not exist at all, and in this they brand Hultsch as a misinterpreter of this inscription. They also conclude that it is ‘Philosophy which has allowed us such an insight’. Before we examine the philosophy that gave their insight, it is necessary to state that, they make no reference at all to an article written by me on the subject, in 1971, in Dr. V. Raghavan felicitation volume, though they are discussing the very same points raised by me in that article. we have to take it that the omission is deliberate (see my article below and their note, especially the title anumāna).

Before I take up the examination of their views, I reproduce the article I wrote in Raghavan’s felicitation volume.

‘Mahendra’s contribution to the development of South Indian culture is unparalleled in the field of art, music, painting and literature. He is the pioneer in propagating cave architecture in the Tamil country. His work on music is well-known. Mattavilāsa-prahasana composed by him is one of the best prahasanas in Sanskrit literature. His love of painting and his proficiency in the art is attested by his title Chitrakārapuli. Among the monuments he has left, the upper rock-cut cave at Tiruchirapalli, called Lālitānkura-Pallaveśvara-ṛham, named after one of his titles, is unique and is a landmark in the study of South Indian art and culture, for it is here that the best representation of sculpture of Mahendra is noticed in the Gāngādhara panel. There is here a unique example of Mahendra’s inscription expressed in ornate poetry. The
second verse of this inscription has been a puzzle to students of history and art. It is in this his embrace of Śaivism is referred to.

A study of the second verse of Mahendra's inscription in this cave is as much fascinating as it is important for the study of Śiva worship in South India. A re-examination of this verse is all the more necessary since some recent writers have suggested that the installation of Śivalinga in the sanctum sanctorum as the principal object of worship was unknown in the time of Mahendra. If the meaning of the second verse of Thiruchirapalli rock-cut cave is once properly understood, all doubts regarding the worship of Līṅga during the reign of Mahendra will be set at rest.

The verse under discussion reads as follows:

\[ \text{Guṇabhara-nāmanī rāja-} \]
\[ \text{nyanena līṅgena līṅgini jñānam} \]
\[ \text{Prathatām cīrāya lōkē} \]
\[ \text{vipakṣaṃṛtthē parāvṛttam} \]

In the verse under discussion, that ślesha (double entendre) is employed is patent. There are therefore necessarily two meanings which are to be understood here. The words Līṅga, Līṅgin, Jñāna and Vipakṣa have two meanings. Līṅga means Śivalinga and Līṅga means also hetu, reason, middle term or probans in an inference. Since the word is employed in ślesha, both the meanings should be taken into account and one of the two viz., Śivalinga, should not be rejected as is done by the protagonist of the view that Līṅga worship was not prevalent during the time of Mahendravarman I. It is not only the word Līṅga that is used here in ślesha but the whole verse is, as stated above, in ślesha giving rise to two meanings. If one meaning alone is accepted and the other rejected, it would mean that the composition is faulty. When the second import is quite meaningful, to brand this verse as a faulty composition will not be proper. Hence in this case both the meanings have to be accepted.

The first meaning of the verse is as follows:

\[ \text{anena līṅgena: Through the Śivalinga (established) here.} \]
\[ \text{Guṇabhara-nāmanī rājani: in the king named Guṇabhara,} \]
liṅgini: who bears the Liṅga (i.e. constantly adores Śiva)
jñānam: the knowledge
vipakshavṛttaḥ parāvṛttam: that he has turned away from the
hostile faith
loke chirāya prathatām: let it become well known in the world
for long.

There is a clear reference here to Mahendra's conversion, from Jainism
to Śaivism in the words Vipakshavṛttaḥ parāvṛttam. There is also an
unequivocal reference to the worship of Śivaliṅga in the terms Liṅga and
Liṅgin, Lingin meaning one who bears the Liṅga, i.e. worships Liṅga.

The second meaning of the verse will become evident when
it is understood in terms of the process of inference,¹ in which it
is couched. The King Guṇabharā is given here as the Liṅgin and he is
also the Paksha (the major and minor terms), i.e. the subject or minor
term in whom the Sādhya (probandum or major term) is sought to be
proved or in other words, he who is sought to be proved as possessing
the probandum, in this case knowledge, jñāna, related to Siva. If the
date and antiquity of inscripion is borne in mind, it could be appreciated.

---

1. Inferential cognition is accepted as a valid cognition by all systems
of Indian philosophy. A syllogism employed in this process of cognition
comprises the following elements:

(1) Hetu or Liṅga or the probans or the reason or the middle term e.g.,
smoke

(2) Sadhyā or Liṅgin the probandum or major term which is to be
established, e.g. fire.

(3) Paksha the subject in which the probandum is not known and is
to be proved, e.g. a mountain as having fire when smoke which
is noticed is relied upon as the probans.

(4) Sapaksha a similar instance in which the probandum is known for
certain, e.g. hearth where smoke and fire had been seen together
invariably.

(5) Vipaksha a counter example in which the non-existence of the
probandum is known for certain e.g., a tank where neither fire
nor its concomitant smoke is known
that the elements of the inference are stated here in the terminology of prāchīna (ancient) nyāya and not of modern logic. According to Gautama, the author of the Nyāya sūtras, the first limb of a syllogism, the statement of the thesis called Pratijñā is given as Sādhya-nirdeśa and this includes the minor and major term.1 The invariable relation between the Liṅga or probans or middle term, in this case between the Śivalinga established by the King in that temple, and the Liṅgin, the major term, viz., the knowledge of Śiva as existing in the King (the Paksha or minor term) should be free from any flaw; one of the flaws which would vitiate the inference is the presence of this in a counter-example; i.e., it should be vipaksha-vyāvṛtta; in the present case, this Śivalinga and knowledge and devotion to the same are absent from Jainism.2

King Mahendravikrama was evidently a lover of logic. Along with the other well-known titles related to his artistic activities Chēttakāri, Saṅkīrṇajāti and Chitrakārapuli, he assumed a significant title to commemorate his love for logic, viz., Anumāna. This title is recorded in the middle of the second pillar in the same cave temple of Tiruchirapalli. The same is also mentioned in the Pallavaram cave of Mahendra where besides the title Anumāna, the title Upamāna is also noticed which again proves his love for logic. Thus we may say that in second meaning of the verse, the King himself is inferred as Anumāna.

According to Śekkilār, a 12th century poet, the Śaivite saint Appar, also known as Tirunāvukkarasu, was a contemporary of a Pallava monarch whom he converted to Śaivism. All evidences point to the fact that Appar lived in 7th Century A.D. Mahendra I, Narasimha I, Mahendra II and Paramesvaravarman I were the Pallava monarchs who ruled in 7th Century A.D.

It is only in the Trichy inscription of Mahendra I, we have a positive reference to his conversion to Saivism from some other faith, while the inscriptions of other monarchs portray them as great Saivites. Thus we have both epigraphical and literary references, pointing to the contemporaneity of Saint Appar and Mahendra.

1. See also Mudrarakshasa Nataka, V. 10 Sadhye nischitam etc.
2. I am thankful to my Professor, Dr. Raghavan, for clarifying the meaning of the verse, particularly on the side of logic.
This is further substantiated by other evidences.

In many of his verses, Appar mentions the worship of Śiva in the form of linga.

It is therefore evident, that the worship of Śiva in the form of Linga was well established long before the time of Appar and Mahendra.

Thus the second verse of Mahendra, at Tiruchirapalli, is of historic interest. It refers to the conversion of Mahendra to Śaivism. It illustrates his love for logic and above all it points to the state of Saivism in Tamil country in early 7th century A.D.$"$

Hultsch's interpretation

Lockwood and V. Bhatt have brought out three points in their article on 'the Philosophy of Mahendra' and state that:

1 "Hultsch in his translation has wrongly interpreted the sanskrit word 'nidhāya' and says that King Mahendra 'placed' an image of Śiva in the cave temple.

2 Hultsch did not understand that when Mahendra had thefigure of Śiva Gangadhara carved, the figure was also fashioned as a portrait or representation of the King himself and

3 the expression, the daughter of the mountain actually refers to goddess Ganga who is depicted in the panel and not to Parvathi as all scholars have been assuming since Hultsch's day." (P 91-92)

Regarding item I, the word Nidhāya - i.e., placed, Hultsch has given the meaning of the word, and is absolutely justified in his meaning (See Monier William on the word Nidhāya).

Regarding the third point, Hultsch and others held that there are three girls in the picture. One is that beautiful girl (river) Kaveri, the second is the girl (river) Ganga and the third is Parvathi. Śiva as Gangadhara is already attached to Ganga. Parvathi cannot bear the
claim of another rival to his love in the form of Kaveri. So she runs
to this abode from Himalayas and diverts Siva’s attention.

This view cannot be held wrong, for this is fully borne out by the
inscription. Parvathi expressing her displeasure at the presence of Ganga
and Siva appeasing her as Gauriprasāda is depicted in thousands of
sculptures and literary compositions. The introduction of three maidens
as rivals, by Mahendra, certainly heightens the charm and aesthetic
delight, quite in conformity with the literary taste of the country.
Further the very fact that a separate garbhagraha has been excavated
by Mahendra, shows that some form of Siva, which (incidentally) would
be the main deity, to which at least a part of the inscription refers.

The second point, relating to the identity of Mahendra with
Gangadhara is discussed in detail here. In the Gangadhara panel,
certain features exist which are persistantly ignored by the above writers.
Apart from the central panel of Gangadhara, there are two human-figures
seated one on either side of Siva. Both of them are shown holding
their hand in adoration of the central figure and bending their head
slightly in supplication. It is suggestive of two points, (1) The central
figure of Siva, stands above the head of these figures and (2) They are
bowing down to the Lord.

It is against this background two of the verses in this inscription
should be understood.

Sailendra mūrdhani silābhavane vichitre
Sailīn tanūm gunabharo Nyapatiḥ nihāya
Sthānam vyadhatta Vidhirēsha yathārtha samjnum
Sthānur svayamca sahatēna jagatsu jātah.

King Gunabhara having fixed (or placed) the stone image in this
charming stone temple, on the top of the glorious mountain set sthānu
(Siva) true its meaning, and it is quite appropriate that he also became
sthānu (permanent) in this world.

This verse nowhere says that Mahendra merged with the image of Siva
and reflected in the figure of Siva. On the contrary it specifically
states that he also became permanent tena saka i.e. along with Sthānu. His
separate identity is not only retained but also emphasised.
The other verse reads

*Kr̥tvā sivam sirasai dhārāyati ātma samsthām
Uccaih ciratvam acalasya kṛtam kṛśāntam.*

Having made (the image of) Siva who was residing in his heart (ātma) now bears him on his head. By this, he made the meaning that Siva stands on his head appropriate. (There is also a second meaning referring to the mountain (acala). That by this Siva and temple on top, the mountain, quite appropriately has become a lofty mountain).

In this verse also there is no mention of Mahendra being identified with the figure Gangādhara. On the contrary there is a specific reference to Siva who was in his heart, is now borne on his head.

Bearing Siva on his head is only a figurative expression and it means that he has become an ardent devotee.

It is in this connection the human figures shown at the feet of the Gangādhara image assume significance. The figures are suggestive of bearing Siva on their head. That he stands above their head is suggested by the verse is also evident.

Sculpturally the seated figures (one of them or both being the reflection of the same), admirably confirm to the meaning of the verse of the inscriptions and probably represents the portrait of Mahendra. So the seated figure, (Mahendra), bears Siva on his head, becomes meaningful. Figuratively, Mahendra became an ardent devotee of Siva is suggested by the verse.

The usage, “I bear the Lord on my head” is an oft repeated expression in Saiva Siddhanta philosophy. Any elementary book on Saiva Siddhanta system will explain this concept. It is also called *Thiruvadi dīkṣa*, in Tamil (Sanskrit *Sripāda dīkṣa*). When the Lord bestows grace on the devotee, which makes him mature or ripe in his devotion it is called *Thiruvadi dīkṣa*. This is obtained by the devotee from the Lord himself psychologically or through one’s preceptor. That great Saivite saint Appar received this *Thiruvadi dīkṣa* from the Lord (placing the feet of Lord over the head of the devotee) is mentioned in many of his own Devarams.
Such usage is uttered both in the figurative sense and actual sense. There are instances where the devotee carried either a Linga or the pair of sandal on the head. There are sculptures which actually show the ruler carrying the pair of sandals of Siva on their head. A recent find shows a royal figure carrying such sandals. In the Gangadhara panel, Siva is not shown on the head, but is certainly suggested, being borne on the head of the seated figures. There is not even the remotest suggestion that Mahendra is identified with the standing Siva. In our opinion Hultsch has not misinterpreted the verses, but has given the simple straightforward meanings.

The authors also seem to confuse the meaning of dhvani (which they translate as alternate meaning) with slesha. Dhvani is that which is suggested; slesha is that which gives double meaning. In the verse under discussion, the intention of the poet is to give double meaning and so it falls under the category of slesha. As these are elementary exercises known to sanskritists, and Hultsch, an eminent sanskritist he was, has given the meaning of the verses in the right perspective.  

In this connection it is amusing to read an article on the subject by B.G.L. Swamy ‘the date of Devaram Trio’, in the Bulletin of Institute of Traditional Cultures published in 1975. It is not proposed to go into the points raised in this article in detail for there are many absurdities which call for no answer. A few are examined here.

Nothing can be more ridiculous than the following statement.

"The identification of the Pallava donor of the Trichy inscriptions as Mahendravarma I, rests largely on flimsy and legendary grounds"

In this cave temple, the name Mahendravikrama is inscribed in bold characters, which not a single visitor to the cave will miss. Of course

1. We do welcome academic discussions on various views, or subjects and postulation of diametrically opposite views which is essential for the proper appreciation of the subject. However we prefer a sober approach, especially in dealing with the views of pioneering and eminent scholars like Hultsch, whose contribution to our knowledge of South Indian Epigraphy is unparalleled.
Swamy can always say Mahendravikrama does not mean Mahendravarma but something else! But besides this title, there are a score of titles found here repeated in the Pallavaram epigraph. There can be no two opinion about the authorship of the upper rock cut cave of Trichy, that it is a monument of first class calibre of Mahendra.

There is another interesting assertion by Swamy, "They (The Devarams) speak of Andhakāsuravadha, Kāmadahana, Jalandharavadha which have no parallels in Pallava sculptures." All these representations are very much there in the Kailasanatha temple of Kanchi, and if Swamy cannot recognise them, it is not the fault of the Pallava sculptures.

Another amusing statement of Swamy is, "In the literary history of most languages in India the original and elaborate pieces of writing chronologically precede their respective abridged version - Thiruttonduattohai, and Thiruttondar Thiruvandāti are examples of abridgements of Sekkilar's Thiruttondar Purānam." So according to him Sankara's Bhāshya, should precede the Brahma Sutras! Sekkilar himself states at the beginning that he is enlarging the Thiruttonduattohai of Sundarar and also Nambi Andar Nambi's work. Of course it is possible for Swamy to say that, "Sekkilar the author of Periyapurānam does not know what he is talking!"
THE CHIRRUR COPPER PLATES OF NRPATHUNGA

Introduction

The Chirrur copper plates of Nrpathunga was first noticed by Robert Sewell. Subsequently it was in the collection of Mallampalli Somasekhara Sarma from whose family the grant was bought by the Andhra Pradesh Government. A study of this charter by N. Ramesan which forms part of his doctoral thesis has been published. The edition by Ramesan carries many inaccuracies, both with reference to factual presentation and readings. The text as published, particularly of the tamil portion, is full of mistakes, so much so it would be better to give the fully corrected reading rather than, correct each and every mistake. The sanskrit portion has however been read well and deserves praise. Even there some errors have crept in, which needs corrections for a proper study of the grant. My readings of the text, and their import are given in the body of the text and Mr. Ramesan’s are given in the foot note to facilitate easy reading.

Brief Summary of the Plates

The Copper plates, seven in numbers are fastened to a ring and carries a royal seal. The grant consists of two parts, the first in sanskrit, written in grantha characters and the second in tamil language written in tamil script. The seal bears a seated bull, above which is shown a Srivatsa symbol,¹ one of the ashtamangalas. This is surmounted by a parasol flanked by two chauris. On either side of the bull are shown lamps on stands.

Beginning from the mythical ancestry of the Pallavas, the sanskrit portion gives the geneology of the rulers till Nrpathunga the donor of the grant. One Paranjaya described as the ruler of three mountains, is said

---

¹ The symbol is not a Sivalinga as mentioned by Ramesan: Page. 4.
to have requested the King to grant lands to Brahmanas at the instance of his wife Prithivimānikka. Upon this request, Nṛpatunga granted the village of Chirrur, renaming it as Prithvimādevimangalam. One Dramiladhīrāja was the executor of the grant.

The tamil portion repeats the same detail regarding the grant and gives in detail, the boundaries, exemption of taxes, the names of donees etc.

The grant is interesting in many respects. Sewell and Mallampalli Somasekhara sarma considered this a spurious grant and did not edit it. Ramesan deserves our thanks for publishing it.

Sanskrit portion - some interesting points

While refering to Narasimha I, it states that he erected a Vishnu temple on the sea-shore. It could have been built any where in his kingdom. It makes no reference to Mamallapuram.1 Mahendra II, Paramesvara I and Rajasimha II are also mentioned. The charter interestingly refers to the construction of a stone temple to Siva at Kanchipuram. That the builder is mentioned as Rajasimha is also interesting. From him came Paramesvara II. Then is mentioned Nandi II. The wording tasyaḍhata in the text is obviously wrong and that the claim that Nandi was the son of Paramesvara can at best only be a conjecture.2

After Nandi came Danti, followed by Nandi III. His Son through Rashtrakuta Princess, was Nṛpatunga.3

Nṛpatunga

When Nṛpatunga was ruling the country, one Paranjaya described as the Balikulāmbara Bānumāli (obvious reference to Bana family) and

1. Ramesan asserts that this refers to the shore temple at Mamallapuram.

2. Ramesan asserts that text says that Nandi was the son of Paramesvara II and holds even some of the well known copper plates like Tandanottam as spurious. The text does not warrant such a conclusion.

3. The name of this Rashtrakuta princess is Sankha, known from Bahur plates of Nṛpatunga.
Chieftain of three mountains, agatrayesa, was requested by his wife Prithivimānikka to grant lands to Brahmanas. At the request of Paranjaya, Nṛpatunga gifted the village Chirurr renamining it Prithvimādevimangalam.¹

Vijnapti and Ajnapti

There has been some confusion in the work of Ramesan on the identity of Vijnapti and Ājnapti, the requestor and the executor. The following is my corrected version. The Vijnapti for this grant was Paranjaya, who was a connossieur of art, one who pleased his relatives and one who was free from the evils of Kali. Drahamātmaja, who resembled Drahamātmaja in fame, was the executor of this dharma. There is a scribal error here. Both the words Vijnapti and Ājnapti, are written wrongly as Vilupti and Ālupti, but later on corrected. The correction is patently visible in the word ājnapti, in the published illustration. A feele attempt is seen even in the case of the word Vijnapti. That apart, the tamil portion gives the name of Vijnapti as Kaduvetti Muttaraiyan and Ājnapti as Kaduvetti Tamilpperaiyan. The word Tamil Peraraiyan is mentioned as Drahamāthirāja in sanskrit portion. So there could be no doubt about that. These two persons are different from the grantor, Pallava Nṛpatunga.² The same Kadupatti Tamil peraraiyan the

¹ The identification of Queen Prithvimanimikam as the wife of Paranjaya and not as that of Nṛpatunga, as proposed by Ramesan is not only good but also fully borne out by the text.

² Ramesan reads the word Vijnapti as Vilupti i.e. one who does not know miserlines. He also identifies Drahamadhiraja, the ajnapti with Nṛpatunga the ruler. Consequently the meaning he attributes to this verse as “the order of the King in the Dravidadhirajya or the Dravida sub-kingdom became as it were the equal of fame of Dharmaraja or Lord Dharmaraja himself,” is obviously quite off the mark. Ramesan’s rendering of the Tamil portion “the King who is described here as Kadupatti Tamil Peraraiyan gave the orders of the grant on the submission of one Kadupatti Muttharaiyan” is equally wrong. Nṛpatunga is not identical with Kadupatti Tamil Peraraiyan and that both are different persons. Ramesan has also failed to establish the identity of the requestor (Vijnapti) and the executor (Ājnapti) mentioned in sanskrit and tamil portions.
Ājnapti of this grant occurs as Ājnapti of the Bahur plates of Nrpatunga. His full name is given as Videlvidugu Kadupatti Tamil peraraiyan in tamil part. The sanskrit part gives his name as Uttamasila. He was the minister to the King Nrpatunga and is praised for his accomplishments.

Kadupatti Muttaraiya - a Bana

It is interesting that the Vijnapti mentioned as Paranjaya, Balikulāmbara Bānumāli (of the Bana family) is called Kadupatti Muttaraiyan in tamil portion. The recently discovered Hero-stone inscriptions in the Chengam and Dharmapuri area, give the title Muttarasa to some Bana chieftains. The name, Perumbāna Muttaresa occurs in an inscription of the Ganga ruler Sripurusha in 8th century. Thus Paranjaya the Bana chieftain under Nrpatunga had the title Kaduvetti Muttaraiyan.

The scribe

The prasasti of this grant was composed by a poet Kumāra. The copper plate charter was inscribed by a silpin, who was known for his knowledge of scripts. His name was Nampa who hailed from the village Kūvam.

The name of the scribe is given in the tamil portion Kāshṭakāri Nampan, Aparājitan.

The Tamil portion - abbreviations

As mentioned early the tamil portion needs complete re-editing and I give the revised reading at the end. Here a few points of interest are mentioned. The tamil portion makes use of abbreviation in mentioning the names of gotras, sutras and the titles like kramavittan, shadangavid, caturvedi, bhattan etc. to reduce the length of the charter which is an uncommon feature.

1. Ramesan reads the village of the silpin as Kupa and locates it in the region of Chittoor. But the village is Kuvam near Madras.
2. Mr. Ramesan has read the name of the scribe in tamil portion as Avanapitian. By reading so he has mised the importance of the name.
For the title Kramavid, the common abbreviation used is the letter ‘Kra’. This has been consistently read wrongly by Ramesan as ‘Ku’. Kramavid is also sometimes abbreviated as ‘Krama’.

The title Caturvedi is abbreviated as ‘Ca’ and Bhatta as ‘Bha’ also, as ‘Bhat’. The word Shadangavid is written as “Cada” in its prakrit or tamil form where ‘Ca’ is substituted for ‘Sha’.

Another consistent misreading relates to the reading of the conjunct consonant ‘kka’. These two letters are written as one letter with two vertical strokes in the middle resembling the grantha ‘Ka’. For example the Devadānamākkī (அவ்வாறைசு) read as Devadānamākki (in 5th plate 2nd side). Also the village name Kāttuppākkā is read Kattupākam (4th plate I side)

There are other misreadings which are mainly due to the lack of understanding of the technical vocabulary used in Tamil epigraphs. This his led to many misinterpretations.

(VIII) “Young calves and animals (Manrum Kanrum)

(IX) Tanks (Palun Kulam)” (page 64)

The above separation of words and their meanings are wrong. The line as found in the plate is given below.

4. ... மன்று கன்று முருங்க கொன்று கொள்ளு ... 

This should be separated into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>மன்று</th>
<th>Manru</th>
<th>assembly area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>கன்று முருங்க கொன்று</td>
<td>Kanru mēy Pā!</td>
<td>grazing ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>கொள்ளு</td>
<td>Kulam</td>
<td>tank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some other wrong readings are

1. Tarukkāy for Tattukkāy. (4p. 2.8)
2. Uridukai for Urirukkai (4p. 2.3)
3. Rerupādu for manrupādu (4p. 2.9)

---
1. These words occur in hundreds of Tamil inscriptions.
4. Tāku for Taraku (4.2-9)
5. Nakari for tari (4.2-9)

The last page

The last page of the grant needs a thorough revision as below.

1. काळू = भृगु दान अवरूप अमाभिषित भृगु दान अवरूप अमाधिकारिता

2. काळू अभिनवविका अधारित [संधीशस्त्र] अभिनव अधारित [संधीशस्त्र]

3. काळू स्वाराजी नामक सम्बन्धित [संधीशस्त्र] अभिनव अधारित 

4. स निवृत्तेऽन्ताः कृतां स्वारं उपायमात्र सानी कृतां स्वारं उपायमात्र 

5. काळू स्वाराजी नामक सम्बन्धित [संधीशस्त्र] अभिनव अधारित 

6. पानिक्षण करतमुख कार्यालयमेव करतमुख कार्यालयमेव 

7. स अन्तः

From this a few important points are gathered.

1. Mahādeva Sarman an ācārya of Ālangadu, was given the share of the Siva temple for doing worship in the temple. (Ālangadu mentioned here is Thiruvalangadu, the famous Sivakshetra near Thiruttani. The village, Chirrur gifted in this grant was situated very near Thiruvalangadu.

2. The grant also provides one share for the village mandapa. (The village mandapa played an important role in the Pallava period. The Kuram plates of Paramesvara I, refer to provisions for the mandapa.

3. One Ikkattur[komam] received one share. We are not told for what purpose. Probably he was looking after the mandapa mentioned above.

4. The village madhyastha Devan, got one share.

Another point of persistent misreading is with reference to the numeral ‘one’ which is shown as the modern symbol for division ÷ That it stands for the number one, is known from various inscriptions. The recently found numerals on the steps of the Swastika well at Thiruvel-
larai, dug in the reign of Pallava Danti (800 A.D.) is exactly like the one in the present grant.

Some historical notes:— Aparajita

We have mentioned that the name of the scribe is given as Aparājita. This is important. It was customary in those days, for the royal servants like the scribe to bear the name of the ruling monarch. For example the Bahur plates of Nṛpatunga was inscribed by a tattān (Scribe) Nṛpatunga. The Pattattālmangalam plates of Nandi II was inscribed by a silpin named Danti. The plate was issued in the 61st regnal year of Nandi, by which time Danti has become the virtual ruler on account of his father’s advanced age. The Pullur plates of Nandi II was inscribed by a Silpin Nayadhira. Nayadhira was Nandi’s one of the titles. Such examples could be multiplied but suffice it to say; that the names assumed by the royal scribes clearly indicate the authority assumed by the ruler of that name. It would therefore be evident that the name Aparājita of the scribe, of this Chirrur copper plate of Nṛpatunga, shows that Aparājita has become not only powerful but also a ruler.

Aparajita and Nṛpatunga

From the recently discovered Velanjeri copper plate of Aparajita it is now clear, that Nṛpatunga was thrown out of his royal seat by Kampavarman, the father of Aparajita. Aparajita either succeeded his father or more probably had joint rule with his father Kampavarman. How Nṛpatunga fared during this period needs separate study. Here it is sufficient to say that before the sixth regnal year of Nṛpatunga, Aparajita has become a ruler so as to make the scribe assume the name Aparajita.

If Nṛpatunga’s accession is accepted as 869-870 A.D. as held by T. V. Mahalingam, then it would suggest Aparajita should have also come to the throne almost at the same time.

It is known that Aparajita was aided by the Ganga ruler Prithivipati I in his wars against the Pandya and others at Sripuramabiyam. In the Chirrur plates we find a Bāna Paranjaya mentioned as Chieftain. Aparajita destroyed the elephant corps of a Bāna Narādhipa. It is tempting to suggest that the Bāna defeated by Aparajita was this Paranjaya.
Srikumara-the poet

The Chirrur plates of Nrpatunga was drafted by one poet Kumara. A certain Mahadeva, son of Srikumara is said to be the composer of Aparājita’s Vēlanjeri plates. Srikumara is praised as a great poet, composer of many Mahākāvyas and a subduer of his opponents. We have seen that both Aparājita and Nrpatunga were contemporaries. It is not surprising, that Srikumara composed Nrpatunga’s charter, and Srikumara’s son Mahadeva composed Aparājita’s plates, both father and son were obviously serving in the royal court.

Ko-Vijaya

Sri. Ramesan holds that only from Nandi II onwards, the Tamil form of inscriptions like ‘Kō-vijaya’ in the Pallava grants occur. (P. 55). This view is not correct. The Tamil form Kō-vijaya etc. occurs even in the Paḷāṅkoil copper plate of Simhavarma (6th cent. A.D., two centuries earlier to the period mentioned by Ramesan). The hero-stones recently discovered by the Tamilnadu State Archaeology department also show that the form occurs, in the epigraphs of Simhavaranam, the father of Simhavishnu.

Perumpidugu Pallavesvaragrha

The Chirrur plates refer to a Siva temple called Perumpidugu Pallavēsvaragrha. Who is the Pallava who had the title Perumpidugu Pallava? The title Pidugu with various prefixes were assumed by the Pallava rulers of Kanchi. Mahendra had the title Pahāppidugu. Nandivarman seems to have had the title Viḍēviḍugu and Danti had the title Māripiḍugu. Paramesvaravarman I was the ruler who seems to have had this title Perumpiḍugu, for the canal dug from the river Palaru to Paramesvarataṭāga in his reign, was named Perumpiḍugu-kāl. It is therefore not improbable that the Perumpiḍugu Pallavēsvaragrha was named after Paramesvara I, being built either by him or in his reign.

Perumpidugu Muttaraiya

The Muttaraiya Chieftains who ruled Nemam and Tanjore in 8 - 9th century had the title Perumpidugu Muttaraiya. This title seems to have been the legacy, left by Paramesvara I. The Viṇnapti of the Chirrur plate, the Bāna Paranjaya was also a Muttaraiya. (Kadupatti Muttaraiya) The relationship of Perumbidugu Muttaraiyar of Sendalai and Kadupatti Muttaraiya of this grant requires further study.

1 Dr. R. Nagaswamy, Thiruttani and Velanjery Copper-Plates, 1977.
Fourth plate: I side

1. நூற்றல் இருறுக்குந்தையுடன் பாரசுந்த பூமியில் சுருந்து காணும் பார்வை
2. குளன்று விளைக்குறிகளின் காற்றில் கிடை ஐரோபாவின் அழகுகள்
3. பார் இருந்து தொன்றல் பொச்சுறுபொருள் தொடராற் காண்பது கிடைக்கும் கிருப்பன
4. பல்வேறு சட்டவிளக்க நிறைவு பொடி பின்னுள்ள நூற்றாண்டு பொருள் அறிக்கை
5. விலங்குத் துணையும் அடுத்தடுக்கியவற்றின் ஆயுதங்கள் பொறுப்பு மாற்றம்
6. பெரிதுரை வாக்கியம் மாற்றக்கூட கூறுமத கூறியும் பற்றி அடையம்
7. சில செய்து விளக்கங்கள் பற்றாக்கத்து பிள்ளைகள் சில நூற்றாண்டுகள் காணப்பட்டுள்ளன
8. புது தொடர் பல்கியம் பார்வை கூறும் காலப்பிள்ளைப் பற்றி ஆசை விளக்க பொருள்
9. பல்லை விளக்கத்து அகன்பினங்கள் பிள்ளைகளின் காலம் மன்னாரா உள்ளது
10. மாதம் பல்கியம் பிள்ளைகளின் பல்கியம் காலம் பிள்ளைகள் உள்ளன
11. இடக்கட பல்கியம் பிள்ளைகளின் காலம் பல்கியம் கூறியும் பிள்ளைகள் உள்ளன
Fourth plate: II side

1. மேலும் புதுக்காடி விளையாடிய காரணத் தீவுக்குறி படுத்திய தனிக் பட்டியல்
2. அதிகரி காரணத்து படுத்தியது வெற்றி விளையாடும் முறை வைத்துகளாகியது மட்டும்
3. மாலை மேம்பிட மின்ன விளையாடும் தம்பரா வைத்தூத்து விளையாடும் முறையே மேம்பிட
4. பட்டியல் மேலும் காரணத்து படுத்தியது வெற்றி வைத்தூத்து அவசம் அளிக்கிறது
5. காரணத் தீவுக்குறி படுத்தியது வெற்றி விளையாடும் முறையாக நெற்றுப்படுத்து அவசம்
6. தம்பரா வைத்தூத்து விளையாடும் தம்பரா வைத்தூத்து அவசம் அவசம் அவசம்
7. மேலும் மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து
8. மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து
9. மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து
10. மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து
11. மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து
12. மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து மேம்பிட வைத்தூத்து

Fifth plate: I side

1. குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு
2. குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு குறுக்கு
3. பொருட்கள்றிக்கரை ஆலோசிப் தொகுதிகளை தந்தைகள் பல்வேறு பட்டிகைகள் காற்று
4. தொல்பிள்ளைகளும் பல்தொகுதிகளும் தொடர்பான நிதி பதிவுகளை வெளியிடுக
5. தொகுதிகளின் திறந்தகான்சி தம்பருக பல்தொகுதிகளை குறிப்பிட்டுள்ளன
6. விளக்க நிறுத்தாமல் பல்தொகுதிகள் தொன்மையான பல்தொகுதிகளை பொறுப்பு
7. உள்ளிட்டு பல்தொகுதிகளும் பல்தொகுதி பல்தொகுதிகளும் தொகுதிகள் திட்டமிட்டு வைக
8. மே முளைப்பகுதியில் எந்தபொருட்களும் தொடர்பு கொண்டிருந்திருப்பிடிக
9. கூறு முன்னேற்பாட்டின் மேல்பகுதியில் பல்தொகுதிகளும் பல்தொகுதிகளை வைக
10. எனுகுள்ளூடே குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கும் அங்கீகாரம் முன்னேற்பாட்டில் இருக
11. குறிப்பிட்டு அமைச்சு தனிமைத்துணை முன்னேற்பாட்டின் வழியில் வேதிப்பாடு வைக

Fifth plate: II side

1. மேற்கு டொய் பகுதி . முதல் பன்னாட்டு பல்தொகுதியக்கை பொருளாக
2. பட்டிகப் பல்லாக தொடர்பு தவறுவிட்டிருப்பிடிக
3. பல்தொகுதிகளின் தொகுதிகள் கொண்டு பல்தொகுதிகள் பல்தொகுதிகளை பொருளாக
4. நிகழ்வுத் திட்டமிட்டு பல்தொகுதிகளின் வழியில் பொருட்கள் குறிப்பிட்டு
5. எனுகுள்ளூடே குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கும் அங்கீகாரம் முன்னேற்பாட்டில் இருக
6. பல்தொகுதியக்கை பைப்பாலியில் முன்னேற்பாடு எளியத்தாக
7. இரு வருடங்கள் பின் பாறைச் சூழல் சுருங்க வேண்டும்

8. மேலும் வேளியில் பாைச் சுருங்குகிறது பாறைச் சூழல்

9. மற்றும் காரணம் அல்லது சுருங்கம் பாறைச்

10. சேகர் விளையாட்டு மற்றமையில் பற்றியபோல்

11. குடும்ப கலந்தை என்று இல்லடல் இரண்டுபோல் சுருங்கிய பரா

Sixth plate: 1 side

1. பாறைச் சூழல் நிலை இன்று கொண்டு பாறைச் சுருங்கம் குறிக்கும்

2. மேலும் வேளியில் பாைச் சுருங்குகிறது பாறைச்

3. தொகையாக மற்றும் வேளியில் பாைச் சுருங்கம் ஆன

4. சேகர் விளையாட்டு நிலை இன்று கொண்டு பாைச்

5. மற்றும் வேளியில் பாறைச் சூழல்

6. சேகர் விளையாட்டு மற்றும் வேளியில்

7. பாைச் சுருங்கம் கால் = கால் = கால் =

8. பாைச் சுருங்கம் கால் = கால் = கால் =

9. பாைச் சுருங்கம் கால் = கால் = கால் = கால் =
10. திட்டிட்டி வெளி கோர்கு = பிள்ளை + பழக = சோல = கார் வைப்
நீங்க காரியங்கள் = பிள்ளை +

11. தோட்ட = சோல = எழும்பியியர் தோண்ட = பிள்ளை + வப்பு =
தோண்ட = குச்சார்கள் வேண்ட = பிள்ளை +

Sixth plate: 11 side

1. முன்ப் = கோர் = நிதி பொருள் அல்லது கோல யூரா = பிள்ளை +
நீங்க = கோர் = குறுக்கிக

2. குமாரராமசியா பிள்ளை + கோர்லி = சோல = பார்மா சின்னிய
தீபையும் = பிள்ளை +

3. பார்க்க = பிள்ளை = களையிலாம்புரத் தர்க்கக்கூற்று = பிள்ளை + பார்க்க
= சோல = குறுக்கிக

4. இ அன்னடானை = பிள்ளை + முன்ப் = கால் = கோர் நூற்றாண்
நீங்க சீரோம் பிள்ளை

5. குமாரராமசியா = கோர் = கார் வைப் பலகை அப்பா வைப் கால
= பிள்ளை + பார்க்க = சோல = குறுக்கிக

6. கோர் குளைய கார்க்க சோல = பிள்ளை + கோந்தரியும் = சோல = பிள்ளை + குறுக்கிக
அதாவது சோல = பிள்ளை

7. குமாரராமசியா = கோர் = பார்மா வன்ன மாறம் = பிள்ளை + கோந்தரியும்
= சோல = குறுக்கிக

8. பார்மா நூற்றாண் சோல = பிள்ளை + கால் = சோல = கோர்
நூற்றாண்டாகியுள்ள விளக்கம்

9. குமாரராமசியா = பிள்ளை + பார்க்க = கார்க்க நூற்றாண் சோல = பிள்ளை +
கால் = சோல = குறுக்கிக

10. குமாரராமசியா = பிள்ளை = கோந்தரியும் = சோல = கோல
நூற்றாண் கோர்களியும் = பிள்ளை =

11. குமாரராமசியா = பிள்ளை = கோர் நூற்றாண் தொலைக்கட்டுற்று கோன்று = பிள்ளை +
குமாரராமசியா = கோர் = பிள்ளை +

Seventh plate: 1 side

1. குமாரராமசியா = பிள்ளை + கோர் = சோல = கோர் நூற்றாண் கோர்களியும்
பிள்ளை = பிள்ளை
2. மாநிலம் = உணர் = தின்வகையான. பங்கள்ள மாநிலம் = பம்பை + குறு = விளக் = தின்வகை குழுவில்
3. குறு = பம்பை + முழு = மூல = தின்மண்டல குழுவில் குறு = பம்பை + விளக் = மூல
4. துணை குழுவில் பம்பை + குறு = மூல = நடுப்புறம் குழுவில் பம்பை +
5. அரங்கு = கருள் = துணையான வலுவை + முழு = பம்பை + விளக் = மூல = தின்மண்டல குழு
6. மற்றும் நடும் பம்பை + விளக் = மூல = தின்மண்டல குழு
7. குறு = பம்பை தின்மண்டலர். மற்றும் நடும் குழு + விளக் = மூல = தின்மண்டல
8. தின்மண்டலர் + பம்பை + விளக் + துணையானவர் குழு + பம்பை + விளக்
9. தின்மண்டல = தின்மண்டல மண்டலம் + வலுவைக் கருள் மற்றும் கருள் = சுருள் = நடுப்புறம் குழு
10. குறு = பம்பை கருள் குழு + மூல = தின்மண்டலச் சுருள் குறு = பம்பை கருள் குழு
11. பம்பை = தின்மண்டல மண்டலம் நடும் + பம்பை = பம்பை கருள் குழு = பம்பை உயர்பசை

Seventh plate: II side

1. குறு = பம்பை கருள் குழு வலையில் பம்பை சைக்கரும் விளக்
2. எவ்வளவும் முக்கியமான [மூன்றுபுறக்] வலையில் நடும் கருள் குறு =
3. குழுவின் மூலம் = நடு கருள் விளக்குடன் வலையில் பம்பை + மூலம் விளக்
4. பம்பைக் குழுக்கு வலையில் பம்பை + கருள்மண்டல எடுத்துக்
5. எம் பம்பைக் கருள் அல்லது லட்சுமி கருள்
6. பம்பைக் கருள் வலையில் மண்டலக்குழுக்கு அடையும் பம்பை
7. குறுக்கு
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CONSTITUTION OF JUDICIARY

A PANDYA EXAMPLE

The Mānūr inscription of Pāndya Varaguna, Māranjadayan, is well known. Writing on this epigraph, Prof. K. A. N. Sastri, states ‘this Mānūr record may be taken perhaps as giving a type of the constitution of village assemblies in this period in the south of the Pāndya country. Membership in the assembly was regulated by qualifications of property and learning very much as in the well known inscription of Uttaramerur in the early 10th century A.D.’

Sri. A. S. Ramanatha Iyer, the editor of South Indian Inscriptions, Volume XIV refering to this inscription, states:-

“This inscription is of interest as giving the rules and qualifications which governed the admission of members to the assembly Mānanilai-nallūr”.

All the scholars dealing with the inscription have taken this to refer to the qualification of members to be elected to the village assembly. But it seems to us that the inscription could be interpreted from another angle namely the constitution of the law court of the village. The use of words “Manru” and ‘manrādutal in the inscription is a pointer in that direction. It is needless to say that all the inscription are lēkhyā pramānas, written documents and as such use legal terminology. The word manru, etc. frequently occurring in epigraphs is used in connection with the courts. Even in literature the word is used in the sense of court dharmāsana (Periyapuram). From this angle the inscription of Mānūr assumes greater significance.

3. South Indian Inscriptions Vol. XIV. p. 28
Text

உலகின் நுழைவுக்கு ஒன்றளவு மாற்றன  முப்பத்தோர் நாடன் பார்வை மும்பிய குறுந்து குறுந்து

நாளையே அவர்களுடன் பொழுது பொழுது நீங்க இந்த இந்து முன்னேற்றம் செய்ய வேண்டிய பதில்கள்

இன்னும் பார்வையாளர் மறுக்கு எனினும் முயற்சியை வெற்றி வந்தது சுற்றுக்கோள்

இன்னும் சுற்றுக்கோள் எழுதியும் முயற்சியை வெற்றிவந்தது சுற்றுக்கோள் எழுதியும் சுற்றுக்கோள்

இன்னும் வாச்சுள்ள முயற்சியை வெற்றிவந்தது சுற்றுக்கோள் எழுதியும் சுற்றுக்கோள்

இன்றும் சுற்றுக்கோள் எழுதியும் முயற்சியை வெற்றிவந்தது சுற்றுக்கோள் எழுதியும் சுற்றுக்கோள்

இயற்கையை எழுதியும் புல்லியை பொழுது பொழுது உள்ளன இவர்கள் உள்ளன இவர்கள் உள்ளன இவர்கள்
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இயற்கை�
The Mahāsabha met at the Govardhana of the village and agreed upon certain decisions for constituting the court of justice. The translation of the text according to us would be as follows.

Translation

Svasti Sri

Four hundred and sixty ninth day and thirty fifth year of king Māranjaḍaiyan.

This day we the members of the Mahāsabha of the village Mānanilai-nallur, in Kalakkudi nadu met at govardhana after meeting as general assembly, passed the following resolutions relating to the constitution of the court of the Mahāsabha.

1. The representation in the court for the descendents of the share-holders of the village:– One, who is well-learned in Mantra and Brahmana, and one dharma sāstra, and is of virtuous conduct alone is eligible, that too only one representative for each share. They will enquire cases in the sabha.

2. Among those who bought a land in the village, received as a gift, or got it as a stridhana, only those learned in mantra brahmana, and one dharama sāstra, and of virtuous conduct are eligible to hear the cases in the sabha.

3. Further, those who got land, by purchase, gift or as a stridhana, will be eligible to serve as hearers, srāvanai puhvār. They will not be permitted or ordered to hear quarter, half or three fourth of the case (as hearers) but only the full case.

4. Among buyers of the shares, only those who pass an examination in all parts of one Veda, including its parisishtas, are to be admitted as hearers.

5. Further those who enter as hearers apart from this decisions should hear cases, only as directed in this kacca (stipulation).

6. One who does not become a full hearer, as per this stipulation should not be appointed for any Varyam, sub-committee.
7. Those who satisfy the above conditions should not refuse (or obstruct) to serve.

8. Those who obstruct or abet obstruction should be fined, five Kasu individually and even after paying the fine, they should serve as per this resolution.

We the members of the Sabha, took the decision as resolved above."

The above inscription raises many interesting points on the administration of justice in the Pāndya country in 9th century A.D. The Pāndya ruler in whose reign the decision was taken by the Manur sabha is identified with Parantaka Varaguna, who came to the throne in 768 A.D. The date of this inscription would then fall in 805 A.D. The Mahāsabha was functioning already in that village of Manur and the decision was taken by that Sabha.

The Sabha met in the Govardhana of the village, where it deliberated the resolution. At Uttaramerur, the Govardhana of the village was an active center from 9th century A.D. to 11th century and the presiding deity is mentioned as Mahāvishnu. The central sabhāmandapa of Uttaramerur, also housed Lord Vishnu in whose immediate presence the transactions were conducted. Vishnu being the presiding deity of dharma it is proper that the Mahāsabha of Manur took the decision relating to the law court in the Govardhana of the village. The presence of Govardhana, (connected with legal administration,) in villages separated by over five hundred miles, one in the northern part of Tamilnadu (near Madras) and another in the extreme south, in Thirunelveli, one under the Pallavas and the other under the Pāndya, both in 9th century, shows almost a uniform pattern of village set up.

That the Mahāsabha met and decided about the qualification for the members of the Court, illustrates, the dynamic role of the village assembly in ancient Tamil country.

1. The translation given above is this author’s own which is at variance with the one given by Sastri.
2. F. Gros and R. Nagaswamy. Uttaramerur. p. 84
3. Ibid. 68
The wordings of the Mānūr epigraph is indicative of two categorizes of judges; viz. the Manṛāduvārs and the srāvanai puhuvār. (hearers) The term sabhāsād occurs in some Vedic passages and in many of the dharma sāstras. The combined effect of various texts is to show that the members of the sabha fell into two categorizes, some of them having a more definite role than the rest”.1 “The differentiation between the two groups of the members of the sabha is emphasised in a passage of Vyāsa which speaks of them as the Niyukta and the Aniyukta. Kātyāyana also recognises a differentiation though he changes the terminology. According to him the select are the Sabhyas. That Niyājana was a deliberate process is shown by the passage in Nārada which refers to the Niyuktas, as well tested (Suparikshitas)”.2

In the Mānūr inscription, that the word Manṛāduvār stands for judges to hear disputes is quite clear. The word srāvanai puhuvār seems to stand for hearers, (srōtāraḥ) of the dharma sāstras. (srāvana means hearer, derived from the root sravana to hear). It is not known why the stipulation that, the srāvanai puhuvār will not be permitted to serve or ordered to serve for a quarter, half or three-fourth of the hearing. It is possible that the Mānūr sabha faced some difficulties in that, the srāvanai puhuvār dissociated themselves from the proceedings in the middle of the hearings. The tendency to dissociate oneself from civil or criminal cases especially so, when their role is not definitive is quite natural. So it became necessary for the Mānūr sabha to bind the srāvanai puhuvār to remain for the whole proceedings.

There is another stipulation in the Mānūr decisions. One who buys a share in the village, can be allowed to serve as a srāvanai puhuvār only after he passes a test in one Veda, inclusive of its parishtsa. The inscription reads parikshai tantārkke srāvanai panippadāhavum. That the Niyuktas should be ‘well tested ’ suparikshitas is refered to by Nārada.3 The use of the word Parikshai tantār, in Mānūr seems to conform to the dharma sāstra.

1. S. Varadachariar, The Hindu Judicial system, Lucknow 1946–p. 102
2. Ibid
3. The Hindu Judicature p. 105
The *sabha* of Mānūr seems to have experienced some obstruction or abetment to obstruction, which called for a fine being imposed.

The village Mānūr, called Mānanilainallur, seems to have been established as a *brahmādeya* with a number of families as share holders not many generations earlier. By the time of the record, the character of the village has undergone a change. New settlers came in either buying land or accepting land as gift and in some cases married the girls of the village and obtained land as *stridhana*. In the families of the original share-holders (they being joint families) many grown-ups with required qualifications were present. Since the original character of the village had undergone change, it became necessary for the *sabha* to deliberate and decide about constitution of the court, taking in to consideration the future changes as well. The interest of the descendents of original share-holders were safeguarded as well as those who came as new settlers.¹

Only those who were qualified for the full *srāvana* could be appointed for any Vārya. This decision shows that different types of Vāryas were functioning, as early as 8th century in the extreme south as well.

The inscription points to the vigorous functioning of the village assemblies in 8th century Tamil land, and that the village *sabhās* were free to appoint its own court and stipulate the requisite qualification. The absence of any royal order or officer, shows that the *sabhās* were free to act themselves. The Mānūr epigraph is a very interesting record of the early Pāṇḍya period showing the role played by the *dharma śāstra* in Tamil land. Whether it was the northern part of Tamil land or the southern most part, whether the territory was ruled by the Pallavas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Cholas or other dynasties, the village set up retained its constitutional authority derived from the *dharma śāstra*.

A comparison between the Mānūr record and the famous Uttaramerur record of Parāntaka would be interesting. The ‘U’ record relates to the constitution of various sub committees, to serve under the *sabha* while the ‘M’ record relates to the constitution of law court. In Mānūr, no royal officer was present when the *sabha* met and took the decision but in

¹. The inscription also indicates that the shares in a *Brahmādeya* village could be sold as early as 8th century A.D.
Uttaramerur, a royal officer, who was a brahmin was present. In Mānūr a knowledge of dharma sāstra was stipulated along with mantru and brahmaṇa for those who served as manrājuvār. In Uttaramerur, a knowledge of dharma sāstra is not prescribed. On the otherhand efficiency in administration (a nipaṇa in kārya) is prescribed. These sub committees being working committees, the insistence was more on working efficiency. The insistence on a knowledge of dharma sāstra at Mānūr, confirms our conclusion that the record deals with the law courts. Both Mānūr and Uttaramerur records, prescribe virtuous conduct (suvarṭtar in 'Mānūr' and Acārasīla in Uttaramerur) which is invariably mentioned in the dharma sāstras.
The Seal of Thiruvālangādu copper plate of Rājendra chola-I, showing two fish and a tiger placed on a bow
THE EMBLEMS OF TAMIL KINGS

Dr. D. C. Sircar, in his 'Political and administrative systems of Ancient and Medieval India,' says,

"The fish and the tiger are found on the seals, respectively of the Pāṇḍyās and the Cholas, though they appear along with other symbols and it is uncertain whether the dhvajas of the Pāṇḍyās and Cholas represented only the fish or tiger with the exclusion of the associate symbols on the seal."¹

The present article deals with certain aspects of this question. The Sangam literature, (the earliest body of literature) speak of the flags, and the royal emblems of the three crowned rulers, the Cheras, the Cholas and the Pāṇḍyās. The tiger as the emblem of the Cholas, the fish as that of Pāṇḍyās, and the bow as that of the Cheras are mentioned very frequently. The references are sufficiently clear that these symbols were employed seperately on their flags by the respective rulers.

The Chola King, Nalankilli, stamped his emblem of "roaring tiger" (Pēlavai uluvai) on the gates of his enemy forts.² The fort embossed with the emblem of tiger, and belonging to an ancestor of Malaiyamān Chōliya Enādí, is referred to in another poem.³

There is an interesting verse, in the Puram collections.⁴ The poet addresses the Chola, Thirumāvalāvān, and the Pāṇḍya Peruvāḻudi who were seated together. "Let the hills of opponent kings bear the emblem of your tiger and fish, incised together."

¹ Dr. D. C. Sircar, Political and Administrative systems of Ancient and Mediaeval India, Delhi 1974, p. 48.
² 'Purananuru,' verse 33-9.
³ Ibid v. 174.
⁴ Ibid v. 58.
Here is an idea of carving the emblems of two of the rulers (who were friendly) together on the hills of enemies. That this idea has taken deep root even in the beginning of the christian era is interesting.

The *silappadhihikaram* refers to the tiger banner of the Cholas, the bow banner of the Cheras, and the fish emblem of the Pāndyas.¹ It also refers to the Chera, who is said to have ruled the country between Venkatam in the north, and Kumari in the south, who had all the three symbols ‘bow, fish and tiger’ as the insignia.² “என்று அம்முனியுடன் கூம் தூண்டியது... குமாரக் குமரை குதிரை” That the Chera had all the three in his seal is referred to here. The Chera ruler Senguttuvan is said to have chiselled the ‘bow, fish and tiger’ emblem on the Himalayas. Alluding to the defeat of the Pāndya and the Chola, the work says that they surrendered their tiger and fish banner to the Chera.³ Villavankōdai, the commander of the Chera, requests the king to send letters to all the rulers of the north, with his royal seal bearing the “bow, fish and tiger” emblem, the emblem of the Tamils.

The *manimekhalai* refers to the lofty banners carrying the bow and fish of the Chera and Pāndya respectively, captured by the Chola Nalankiḷḷi.⁴

A few coins found, in Kaveripumpattinam, square in shape and assignable to the 2nd—3rd century A.D. bear on the obverse, the standing figure of a tiger, with one of its paw raised. It is also shown in a roaring posture. This being the heart of the Chola territory, it is not unlikely that it represents the emblem of the Sangam Chola, so frequently mentioned. A few coins bearing the figure of an elephant on the obverse with a

---

¹ *Silappadhihikaram* 3-29.
² Ibid – 3-29 25.
⁴ *Manimekhalai* 3-24.
few ashtamangala symbols like sriwatsa, svastika etc. are assigned to the Pândyas. But this suggestion is doubtful.

It is just sufficient to show that in the early period the kings of South India did have in their flags the emblem, fish, tiger or bow separately as gleaned from literature and suggested by coins.

It is known that all the Pallava copper plates, bear their seals, with either a standing or seated bull, they frequently also refer to Vrshabhadhvaja in their inscriptions.

When we come to the early mediaeval period, the picture is more clear The Pândikkovai, referring to the exploits of Pândya Arikosari Māravarman, refers to three different emblems of the king. The ruler is said to have carved the fish on the northern mountain. He incised the bow, tiger and fish insignia, on the Mōru mountain. It is befitting his greatness since he conquered both the Chola and the Pândya. But a point of interest is that the fish and tiger are said to be placed on a bow. The three emblems, embossed on copper plate seals of the Cholas of later period show that the fish and tiger, placed over the bow as described in this verse. (see illustration). In addition this Pândya of the 7th century had a flag with the figure of lightning.

Only one seal of the early Pândyas is now preserved. It is found on the Dalavaypuram plates of Parāntaka Viraṇārayana. The seal shows two fish and the tiger placed on a bow. The seal assignable to the end of 9th century is an example of the Pândya royal emblem. The same plate makes an interesting reference. The artisan who engraved the plate is

1. Pandikkovai Verse 222
2. Ibid - V. 114.
3. Ibid V. 18
4. Ibid V. 114
5. Ibid V. 138, 228
6. T. N. Subramaniam - 'Dalavaypuram copper plate grant' Transactions of the Archaeological Society of South India p. 962-65 p.2
said to have come from the family, which under orders of the Pāṇḍya, carved the symbols “two fish, a tiger and a bow” on Himalayas. Both in the seal and the text, we get a reference to a pair of fish which is note worthy. In the Sinnamanur larger plates,¹ the carving of the three emblems on the northern mountain is mentioned among the exploits of the ancestors of the Pāṇḍya. In the Madakkulam seal illustrated by Elliot are seen the seated tiger, and two fish placed on a bow, but this belongs to a later period.²

In this connection two coins deserve mention. One is the coin illustrated by Sir T. Desikachari.³ On the obverse it carries two fish and on the reverse the name ‘Avanipasekharan’. It is identified as an issue of Srimāra Srīvallabha, of 9th century. There is another coin assigned to Varagunam bought from a private collector now in the National Museum.⁴ Unless another coin is found in unquestionable surroundings this evidence cannot be used for scientific research.

But from the 13th century, we find the Pāṇḍyas. Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, issuing coins with two fish, with a new introduction a Cendu (a curved rod,) in between the two fish. Why this new device is not known. Probably it is the same ‘lightning’ emblem mentioned as a banner of Arikesari, in pandikkovai) which, assumed this form and got integrated, particularly after the sculptures representing Aiyanan, Krishna (as Rajamannar) and Sundaramurti which show this cendu probably the (curved liladanda) in their arms. Another important fact is the dropping of the tiger and bow from the coins. Though both Māravarman Sundara and Jatāvarman Sundara in 13th century, were great emperors, and practically ruled the entire Chola and Chera country, they dropped the tiger and bow from their emblem. Apart from their coins in a number of their stone inscriptions, the two fish and the rods are found chiselled. It is therefore evident that in 13th century the Pāṇḍyas did have fish alone as their emblem on their flags.

¹ S.I.I. vol. III pt IV No. 206
² Elliot, Coins of Southern India p. 12
³ T. Desikachari, South Indian coins F. 65, 66
⁴ C. Sivaramamurti, The Art of India p. 425
In the case of the Cholas new evidence has come to notice now. A copper plate of Parāntaka Chola, (10th century A.D.) the earliest Chola plate to be found so far, bears the seal. and the seal, shows the seated tiger and two fish placed on a bow. From the very beginning, the imperial Chola have adopted this device.

In a number of coins of the Cholas, we find the bow, tiger and two fish, all shown in one line. There are also coins, which bear the names, Madhurantaka and Uttama Chola which, show only one fish and one tiger but without the bow. We do not know whether this shows the shrinking state of the Chola power. However even in a stone inscription, found at Thiruppaccour, the three emblems are incised, in an inscription of Uttama.

There is one coin, in which only a seated tiger is shown below the arm of the standing king. It is an issue of Rajaraja. I have shown in an article that this was a special issue intended for circulation in the Chola country.

Regarding the Cheras we find that by the mediaeval period they included the palmyra tree and bow also an elephant as their emblem. But so far as the inscriptions are concerned, they speak of the banners of the individual rulers carrying their respective emblems. That they did carry their own emblem, namely the tiger, the fish and the bow by the Cholas, is beyond any doubt.

1. T. Desikachari, South Indian coins p. 68
2. R. Nagaswamy, Special issues, of Rajaraja’s coinage, Kalvettu No. 13
RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE
A HISTORIC PERSPECTIVE

A study of the ancient Sangam classics reveal that the rulers of the Tamil country respected all religions alike, irrespective of their personal affiliations. There was religious toleration among the people, as they were said to visit temples of various faiths without distinction. Describing the city of Madurai, in Madurai kānchi, Mangudi Marudanar, gives a graphic description of the temples of Hindu, Buddhist, and Jaina faiths existing side by side. Universal toleration of the highest order is found reflected in the celebrated Tamil classic, Silappadikāram, by Ilando Adigal, wherein a Brahmin lady, Malati by name, is said to have visited a Buddha caitya, and a Jaina temple (Nikkanta Kottam) besides visiting various shrines dedicated to Hindu deities. Asoka Maurya, solemnly warned his subjects in edict XII, 'to abstain from speaking evil of their neighbour's faith, remembering that all forms of religion alike aim at the attainment of self-control and purity of mind and are thus in agreement about essentials, however much they may differ in externals.' This is in consonance with the Vedic tradition ekam satvīprā bahudhā vadanti. The arthaśāstra prescribes that the king who has acquired a new territory should follow the people in their faith with which they celebrate their national, religious and congregational festivals or amusements. Though the Saka and Kushana emperors, who ruled over the North-western part of India were foreigners, they followed the worship of Śiva, Vasudeva, Buddha and Jaina, alike and have issued even coins bearing the figures of Śiva.

1. ஆசையாருக்கு கி.மீ. வெளிப்புறமுள்ள கி.மீ. பெருமாள்
பாரதநில்லிருக்கலாம் கி.மீ. பாரதநில்லிருக்கலாம்
கி.மீ.சோழன் கி.மீ. கி.மீ.சி.யன் கி.மீ.சி.யன்
கி.மீ.சி.யன் பெருமாள்குடமுகத்தில் ஊருகின்ற கி.மீ.சி.யன்
கி.மீ.சி.யன் கி.மீ.சி.யன் கி.மீ.சி.யன் கி.மீ.சி.யன்
— கைப்பிரித் 1.9
The Pallava dynasty, which has left a lasting impression on the history, art, and culture of the Tamil country was established in the middle of the 3rd century A.D. with its capital at Kanchi and held sway over the Northern part of Tamilnad for over six hundred years. This period witnessed the revival of Bhakti movement, throughout the length and breadth of the country, by the great works of Śaiva and Vaishnava saints. The Pallavas, by their pious works and administration, aimed at becoming great sages, Rajarshis, in the true Indian tradition. Purva Rājarśiprabhāvagūna samupāgataḥ is a title often repeated for many Pallava kings. A verse in the Kailasanatha temple of Kanchi clearly sets forth the high ideals lived upto by the rulers of Pallava dynasty.

They were performers of somayāga, vājapeya, agnīsthoma and aśvamedha sacrifices and styled themselves as parama brahmaṇyas, parama bhāgavatas and parama māheśvaras. Evidently performance of Vedic sacrifices and the worship of Śiva and Vishnu were considered an integral part of same living. Thus we find the Pallavas following all the three faiths and yet upholding other faiths like Buddhism and Jainism. Simhavarman, an early Pallava ruler, is said to have worshipped at the mahā caitya of Amaravati and endowed gifts. The mother of Simhavishnu, gifted a land for a Jaina temple built by her, for her own merit and for the well-being of her husband’s family. This Simhavishnu is said to have attained eminence by the study of Vedic and Āgamic traditions,

— Hosakote Copper plates
During the sixth regnal year of Simhavarman, the father of Simhavishnu (sixth century A.D.), a gift of land is recorded to the Jaina ascetic Vajranandi of Amanserkai. There are records, endowing lands and other gifts to Jaina Pallis in the eighth century A.D. Such universal tolerance, along with endowments to various religious faiths earned the Pallavas the title Dharma mahārājādhi rāja.

In this connection a cave temple, excavated by Mahendravarman at Mandagapattu, is interesting as it throws valuable light, on the religious harmony of the period. The cave has three cells at the back wall, which are dedicated to Brahma, Śiva and Vishnu. Mahendra's inscription in the temple, calls it, Brahmēśvaravishnu lakshitāyatanam. Two Dvārapālas, one representing Nāndikeśvara and the other Garuda, are seen flanking the cave, which is a unique feature of this temple. Mahendravarman is said to have excavated this cave soon after his conversion to Śaivism, by Apparswamigal. That Mahendra did follow some other faith and was converted to Śaivism is reflected in his own inscription at Tiruchirappalli. Yet we find Mahendra dedicating his first cave temple, not exclusively to Śiva, but to all the three deities. Those who perform sacrifices are the worshippers of Brahma as he is the Lord of Vedas Brahmanam Vṛtāmahe. Thus the three titles parama brahmaṇyās, parama bhāgavatas and parama māheśvaras have real significance with reference to the monuments erected by them.

It would be interesting to study a few cave temples at Mamallapuram in this connection. The famous Mahishāsuramardini cave is dedicated to Śiva where the great Lord is portrayed as Śomaskanda in the central cell. The south wall of the same cave carries the sculpture of Vishnu as Anantaśayi while on the other side is Mahishāsuramardini. Another cave in the same village dedicated to Varāha, is locally called the Ādivarāha cave, but according to inscription it is mentioned as paramēśvara Mahāvarāha Vishnugṛham. In this cave there are two interesting panels, one

1. etadaniṣṭakam adruman aloham asudham vicitracittena
   nirmāpitam nṛpema brahmēśvara viśhnv lakštāyatanam

2. guṇabhara nāmani rājani anena liṅgena liṅgini jñānam
   protathām cirāya loke vipakṣa vṛtten parāvyttam
representing Harihara, and the other Śiva as Gangādhara. An interesting inscription in the cave, taken to be contemporary with the cave, gives a verse enumerating the ten *avatars* of Vishnu, in which Buddha is included as one of the *avatars*.1 This is perhaps the earliest epigraphical reference to Buddha as one of the *avatars* of Vishnu. Another interesting verse in this Vishnu cave also of the same age, praises the greatness of Rudra and states, 'tie upon those who do not meditate upon Rudra'.2 The presence of Śiva panels, and the praise of Rudra, in this Vishnu temple, is based essentially on this unifying concept. Failure to grasp this underlying unity has given rise to various interpretations, with reference to the authorship of this cave and inscriptions. Another temple called Varāha cave in the same place, is interesting in yet another way. This cave, is ascribed to Narasimhavarman II, a great Śiva bhakta. He was called Śiva Chūdāmanī, and was well-versed in the *śaiva siddhānta mārga*.3 There is a panel of Varāhanārāyana in this cave, wherein Lord Śiva is figured adoring Vishnu. The same king has erected three temples at the sea-shore, which are known the world over for their architectural beauty. Of these three shrines, two are dedicated to Śiva and the third to Vishnu. The temples bear the various names of the king, as Kṣatriyasimha Pallavesvara grham, Rājasimha Pallavēśvara grham, and Narapatisimha Pallava Vishnugṛham. In the celebrated Kailasanatha temple of Kanchi, also built by this great Śiva bhakta, various sports of Vishnu, such as Trivikrama, Narasimha and others are portrayed on the southern side of the prākāra. A copper plate inscription of Nandivarman Pallavamalla should also be understood in this wise. Nandivarman is said to have been a great devotee of Vishnu and was a contemporary of the Vaishnavite saint Tirumangai Āḷwar. The first verse of the charter is dedicated to the Supreme Being.4 In the second, Vishnu is

---

1. matsyakūrma varāhaśca nārasimhaśca vāmanah
   rāmo rāmaśca rūmaśca buddhah kalki ca te dasāh

2. dhikteshām dhikteshām punarapi dhik dhik dhigastu dhikteshām
   yeshām na vasati hydaye kupathagati vimokshako rudraḥ

3. vidita bahunayaśsaiva siddhānta mārga

4. jayati jagattraya janmashthiti samhṛti kāraṇam para brahma
   satyam anantam anādi jñānātmaṇaṁ ekam amrtapadām
praised,¹ followed by a verse dedicated to Śiva.² Immediately after, as if suggesting the synthesis of the two faiths, the form of Harihara (Trivikramahara) is extolled.³ This Paramavaishnava begins one of his copper plates with salutations to Śiva.⁴

This religious tolerance is seen not only with the rulers of Pallava dynasty but also among all the contemporary dynasties of South India. An excavated cave at Bhairavunikonda, in Nellore district bears a lable, calling it Brahmesvara Vishnuगram. Another cave at Mugalarajapuram, near Vijayavada, is also dedicated to Brahma, Isvara and Vishnu. These caves are assigned to the Vishnukundin, and early Eastern Chalukya kings, who ruled in the beginning of the 7th century A.D. The Śiva and Vishnu caves at Bādāmi excavated by the early Chalukyas, also affirm the religious tolerance. In Ellora, caves of Buddhist, Hindu and Jaina faiths were excavated side by side. In the Hindu group of temples dedicated to Siva, sculptured panels of Vishnu are noticed on one side and Siva on the other side as in the caves of Ramesvara, and Rāvan-ka-khai.

In the extreme South the Pandyas of Madurai were equally powerful when the Pallavas were at their height in Tondaimandalam. They have left a number of cave temples which are generally ascribed to 7–8th

1. māyāvinī yena padatrayārthinā sadya pravṛddhena punarbaler-
mahke,
vicakrame trijagatas svasākṛtyah namostu bhūtyai Bhagavānstrivi-
krāmāh
2. maulavindudharah, phanādhara dharah skandhe, bhavāni dharah
vāme, kāmadharah pranāmanirato, gaṅgādharo mūrdhāni
mürtau dhūlidharah gale garadharah keśeshu veṇīdharah
pāνau śūladharah harah puraharah puśnātu vo maṅgalam
3. kaṇṭhe kaustubha kālikābharaṇayoh chāyām parām bibhratau
daiyadhvamsana cakrapaṭṭasadharau śyāmāvadātāu ruca
śri gaurīvilasat katāksavīśikha vyāyāma romāṇcitaau
pāyāstām bhavatāh trivikramaharau sampṛkta dehāntarau
   — Kasakkudi copper plates
4. pāyāt bāṇkarīmurtih saśārdhāṅkura ēkrahā
   pratipaddina paryante sandhyeva sakalānāta
   — Pullur copper plates
century A.D. The lower rock cut cave at Tiruchirapalli is in the form of a rectangular mandapa, with two excavated cells, one on each side of the cave. In one cell is enshrined Śiva, while on the other is Vishnu. On the rear of the same cave are panels in a row, representing Ganesa, Subrahmanya, Brahmā, Sūrya and Durga. At Tirumeyyam in the former Pudukkottai State, there are two excavated caves side by side, assigned to 7th century A.D. of which one is dedicated to Śiva and the other to Vishnu as Anantasāyi.

The Śaiva āgamas specify the erection of a parivārālaya (subsidiary shrine) in Śaivite temples. The worship of Vishnu, is an integral part of nitya pūja in Śaivite temples. Vishnu is invariably represented (in most of the cases as Yoga Narasimha) on the top of the vimāna at the back side, and is also seen at the lower back niche of the garbhagṛha. Of the other two sides, the south is allotted to Dakshinamurthi and north to Brahmā which again is a crystallization of the same concept mentioned above. The Śivalinga which comprises of the three parts, Brahmā, Vishnu and Rudra bhāgas, emphasize the same principle. Both the pāncarātra and vaikhānasa āgamas of the Vaishnavite faith, also specify the erection of a subsidiary shrine to Śiva in Vishnu temples. There are many ancient Vishnu temples in South India, where Dakshinamurthi is noticed on the vimānas. The Sundaravaradaperumal temple of Uttaramerur, built in the time of Nandivarman (750 A.D.) carries the figure of Dakshinamurthi in the upper storeys of the vimāna on its southern side. At Nagalapuram, there is a Vishnu temple dedicated to Vedanārāyana, built in the time of the great Vijayanagara ruler, Krishnadēvarāya, wherein we find the image of Dakshinamurthi on the south devakōṣṭha.

It is therefore evident, that the misunderstanding between various sects, reflected in some of our literature, should be taken to represent a small group of people who were extreme in their faith, and that such an occurence, in the long history of a great nation, is relatively insignificant and that our great teachers like Valluvar, Sankara and Rāmānuja sought to emphasize the underlying unity of all these concepts, by reflecting the sanātana dharma, Ekam sat viprā bahudhā vadanti.
PAY-STRUCTURE UNDER RAJARAJA CHOLA

Temple administration has received great attention at the hands of religious-minded people, administrators and economists. It would be interesting to compare the economy and administration of temples in ancient times and study the qualifications, wage structure and other service conditions of temple servants, in terms of modern currency.

We have enough epigraphical records to let us have a complete picture of the administrative set-up of a South Indian temple, about one thousand years ago. The great temple of Thanjavur, built by Rājarāja Chola I in about 1000 A.D. furnishes remarkable data about the temple set-up. The epigraphs engraved on the walls of the temple categorically state that they were orders issued directly by the head of the Government the Emperor himself.

A careful analysis of the epigraphs reveal the thoroughness with which the administration was organised by the emperor and his personal supervision in implementing the transactions. Rājarāja’s personal touch is perceptibly visible in every aspect of the administration of this temple.

The main tower of the temple was erected by Rājarāja and the enclosure was erected under his orders by his Commander-in-Chief, Krishnan Rāman alias Mummudichola Brahmamārāyan. The entire temple administration was under the control of one Ādittan Sūryan, alias Tennaṇṭan Mūvēndavēḷān, obviously a high ranking officer of the king.

Rājarāja gifted the taxes due to the royal treasury from a number of villages towards the maintenance of the temple. The epigraph listing each village, gives the total measurement of the entire village, the area exempted from paying taxes, the tax-paying lands and the actual tax to be paid in grain or cash per annum. The lands exempted from paying, tax include temples, the front yards of the temples, lakes, tanks and canals the residential areas of artisans, agriculturists and others whom we now bring under the scheduled castes. The cemeteries were also exempted from taxes.
The measurements given in the inscriptions are so detailed and minute, suggesting that the land survey under Rājarāja was at its best.

The Chola epigraphs clearly state and 1/6 of the produce (16.65 per cent) was levied as tax. Judging from that standard, one veli of land seems to have yielded a total of 550 to 600 kālamś of paddy per year. This, in modern assessment would be considered a bumper crop. A village like Turaiyur in Tiruchi district paid an annual tax of 15,000 kālamś of paddy which shows that the total paddy grown in that the village, was about 90,000 kālamś. It is not only indicates the fertility of the soil but also the efforts of the agriculturists to obtain the optimum from the lands.

Every object given to the temple, no matter however small, was entered in the temple records which accurate descriptions. From the minuscule spoon to the magnificent icons, all were counted, measured, weighed and entered not only in the temple registers but also on stone walls. The complete list of articles that the temple possessed together which their value and measurement can be straightway furnished even now.

The museum pandits of modern times would be surprised to know that each and every icon in the temple of Rājarāja had accurate descriptions, its measurements from head to foot, the number of arms, the length, breadth and height of the pedestal, the form of the pedestal, the metal with which the idol was made and even the weight, in detail.

Literally tens thousands of pearls and precious gems were gifted and every one of the pearl was counted; even broken pearls, pearls with skin peeled off were not exempted from entries. Sources from where these were obtained and the treasury in which they were deposited are mentioned, meticulously. When jewels were gifted the separate weight of gold, the number of pearls, precious gems, their weight and the total weight of the jewels, etc., are given for each and every ornament together with its cost of making.

All categories of temple servants, from the priests to the sweeper, are listed in the inscription. The temple servants may be broadly divided into three categories as (1) general administrators like treasurers, accountants, etc., (2) ritualists like the priests, singers of Tamil and Vedic hymns, musicians and dancers and (3) general servants like watchmen, sweeper, tailors, jewel stickers, architects, etc. For the appoint-
ment of all categories of temple servants, Rājarāja insisted (and makes special mention of) proper qualification and integrity. Only those who had landed property, sufficient wealth and circle of relatives, were appointed as temple treasurers and accountants. This condition seems to have been stipulated as a check or what may now be called surety, for handling money and property. In case of loss or defalcation, it should be possible for the temple to recover the value either from the incumbent or from his relatives. The treasurer received the highest pay while the accountant got about Rs. 1,600 per month in modern value. An assistant accountant got about Rs. 600 per month.

In arriving at the above value in modern currency, and also for the other wages given below, I have taken the market value of one Madras measure of rice as Rs. 4. Also one measure of rice as is equated approximately with two measures of paddy. The measurements given in the inscriptions are the old measurements as āḷākkū, vḷakkū, uri, nāḷi, kuruni, and kalam, which can easily be equated with modern measures, though there are some ambiguities and variations in some areas.

Rājarāja has simplified the pay structure of the temple servants by taking one share as 100 kalam of paddy per annum which approximately would come to about Rs. 800 per month. All the payments were calculated as one unit, etc.

The treasurers and accountants paid the wages of all the temple treasury; but were not permitted to draw their wages themselves from the same treasury. They have to receive it from the city treasury which was obviously a check on the paying officers.

In modern times a servant is kept temporary or permanent by the appointing authority, but in Rājarāja's time the option was given to the servant himself. One can choose to serve temporarily or permanently by those who took a vow to serve permanently received higher wages.

In the appointment of dancing girls, Rājarāja gives the well-drafted service rules which were applicable to all classes of temple servants. Even for the dancing girls, Rājarāja specifies proper qualification (Yogrāhyirup-pār). The due qualification for a dancing girl, according to the Nāṭya sāstra of Bharatha is that "she should know all aspects of music and must
be a musician herself. "She must know all aspects of dance and must be young and beautiful. She should never be lazy but must constantly be practising her art."

It was stipulated that in case of death or migration to other places, the immediate descendant or relative may do the service (what we may call hereditary right) but one who has not got the proper qualification cannot perform the duty. However they were given the right to choose a duly qualified person and get the duty done through him or her. The provision was made as a service security for the descendants of the temple servants. If qualified persons were not available, the temple administrators reserved the right to appoint a qualified person. This clearly shows the emperor's interest in the welfare and security of the families of the temple servants; at the same time, there was no question of any hereditary right without due qualification.

A dancing girl in the temple got a monthly emolument of Rs. 800. This is in addition to free quarters and an award of annual cash something in the nature of a bonus. Monthly remuneration of others are the dance-masters who were males, got Rs. 1600. The superintendents for the dancing girls, and the chief instrumentalists got Rs. 1600. Other musicians and instrument players got Rs. 1200. Singers of Vedic as well as Tamil hymns got an equal wage of Rs. 1200. A Vina player got 1400.

Wages for the other services are equally interesting. A washerman tailor or barber got Rs. 800 per month. A jewelsticker's wage was Rs. 1200. The architect whose name is given as Rājarāja perumtaccan, (obviously the sthapati who built the great temple) got Rs. 1200 and his assistant Rs. 600. The minimum wage in the temple was Rs. 400 per month.

To protect the temples and its valuables there were more than 125 watchmen. They were selected by various villages and took guard in rotation. Each watchman was paid Rs. 800 a month. In addition they must be paid a travelling allowance from their village to Thanjavur, when they have to go for their turn and also daily allowance during their period of duty.

For the purpose of providing various offerings, Rājarāja, his sister, queens, his commanders, soldiers, village assemblies, merchant guilds and even ordinary servants endowed properties in kind and cash. When cash
was endowed, the cash was not allowed to be locked up in the temple treasury but was put to productive use. They were taken on loan by recognised institutions like the village assemblies or the merchant guilds, the village assemblies investing them on agricultural operations and the guilds for commercial purposes. The investments yielded an annual interest of 12½ percent.

For burning lamps, goats, cows or buffaloes were gifted. For maintaining one perpetual lamp, 96 goats, or 48 cows or 16 buffaloes were the fixed rates. If one goat's value is taken as Rs. 100 (cow Rs. 200, buffalo 600) in modern currency, about Rs. 10,000 would have to be deposited for offering a lamp. One kasu of Rājarāj's time fetched three goats.

Temple properties—both land and cash—were entrusted to people of proven honesty and integrity; there was not much disparity between the wages of various temple servants and that their pay structure was not only attractive but also on rational footing.
Introduction

The life of the great Vaishnava saint Rāmānuja is intimately connected with Srirangam temple. The then Chola ruler, is said to have persecuted Ramanuja, which compelled him, to go to the court of the Hoysala ruler Vishnudevadhan in disguise, and after the death of the Chola ruler returned to Srirangam. Ramanuja’s date of birth is placed in circa 1017 A.D. that is in the reign of Rajendra Chola-I. If that be so, the only Chola ruler who could have persecuted him, would be Kulottunga I. Till recent times Kulottunga was believed to have ruled for fifty years (1070-1120). Recently the Tamilnadu State Department of Archaeology has found an inscription which gives 56 years of rule to Kulottunga I;\(^1\) so he should have reigned at least up to 1125 A.D. The legend of Rāmānuja’s persecution in the hands of the Chola ruler, portrays the Chola as an antagonist of Vaishnava faith.\(^2\) It would therefore be interesting to study the condition of Srirangam temple under this Chola ruler. This is only a study of the temple under Rāmānuja and does not attempt to solve any problem connected with the life of that immortal saint. But this study should necessarily be borne in mind while studying the life of Rāmānuja, for it is necessary to know whether the Srirangam temple in any way suffered in the hands of Kulottunga.

This study shows in no unmistakable terms, that the Srirangam temple suffered in no way during the reign of Kulottunga I. Among the Chola inscriptions found in the temple, by far the largest number, are in the reign of Kulottunga I. Among the 105 Chola inscriptions recorded in the temple, as many as 65 epigraphs are in the reign of Kulottunga I and 14 inscriptions are dated in the reign of Vikramachola, Kulottunga’s son. That means, the temple has received maximum benefactions, during Rāmānuja’s sojourn at Srirangam. (between 1070 to 1125).

---
\(^1\) Dharmapurai District, Salivaram inscription, T. N. I. 17/1976
\(^2\) Guruparampara
Kulottunga's inscriptions are found from his very first year to the end of his reign. Even among the 65 inscriptions, nearly 1/3rd of them are dated between Kulottunga's 40th and 50th years; that is the period when Rāmānuja is said to have been persecuted. Suffice it to say that the picture that emerges from the epigraphical study, is that the period of Kulottunga I, was the most prosperous period for the Srirangam temple under the Cholas.

Kulottunga's Personal Devotion

It is of great interest to note that on puṣam, that natal star of Kulottunga I, special festivals were instituted in the temple every month. In 1110 A.D. (46th year) Kulottunga himself purchased certain lands at Srudavur, which were under tirāppu tenure and converted it into a dēvatāna iraiyily, by paying a lumpsum amount and arranged for special festival, sacred bath and offerings on the day of puṣam, his natal star. The special offering began from the 40th year of the King. Another, but fragmentary epigraph refers to puṣatirunāl of Kulottunga performed every month. This shows Kulottunga's intimate connection with the temple of Srirangam. Two of the records, are personal orders of Kulottunga, making certain modification in the land tenure and taxes in favour of the temple. One of the queens of Kulottunga Lokamahādevi, was a great patron of Srirangam temple. Her officers bought some lands and made a gift of them to the temple at the request of one Nārāyanabhatta. Another royal lady, Tennavan Mahādevi, the queen of Rājendra (probably Rājendra II) made provisions in the temple for the expenses of certain specified festivals in Kulottunga's reign. She is called Rājarājan Arulmoḻi alias Tennavan Mahādevi the queen of Rājendra deva. in another epigraph also gave money for giving alms to devotees. These royal involvements in the temple show the keen interest taken by the Chola ruler in the Srirangam temple during the life time of Rāmānuja.

That Sriranganatha was called Pallikondaruliya Anantanārāyanasyami, in the reign of Parantaka I, (10th century A.D.) is mentioned in

2.          168-1951-52          5.          126-1947-48
3.          8-1948-49
one of Kulottunga's inscription. In Kulottunga's time also, Sriranganaśtha was called Ananthanārāyanaswāmi.

Thiruvaymoli Hymns

It is well known that the sacred hymns Thiruvāymoḷi of attracted great attention in many temples and Rāmānuja is said to have had a great hand in propagating this practise. Two inscriptions of Kulottunga refer to provisions made for singing, Thiruvāymoḷi hymns. The first was in the 15th year of Kulottunga I (1075 A.D.) which is perhaps the earliest reference to the singing of these hymns in the temple. The endowment was made by a Commander-in-Chief-Senāpatīgal Virachola Munaiyadaraiyan of Kottur, who gifted 50 Kalanju of gold for that purpose. The Thiruvāymoḷi was sung as Paḷḷi eluchi. It is of interest that the endowment was given in the hands of a group of Araiyan, who also had the name ‘mannar’ added to their names. The other record is dated in the 40th year of Kulottunga I (1110 A.D.) and refers to a gift of land for the recitation of Thiruvāymoḷi.

It must be noted that the name of Rāmānuja does not occur either in the epigraphs of Kulottunga I or his predecessors. In fact the first reference, so far as I could see, occurs in the 5th year of Rājendra Chōla III 1250 A.D., nearly 125 years after Rāmānuja's demise. The inscription referring to Rāmānuja also does not mention the great teacher, but refers to a land of Rāmānuja (ṝṇanārāyaṇa mūvendavēḻar).

Srikaryam

During the reign of Kulottunga I, four officers held the post of srikāryam in the temple. In 1075 A.D. (the tenth year) Bhuvana Nārayāna Mūvenda Vēlar was the srikāryam. From the 20th year (1096 to 1110 A.D.) to the 40th year, one Viravidyaḍhara Mūvendavēḻan hold that post. His surname was Sirālan Thiruchirrambalam Udaiyān. While Nitya Vinoda Mūvendavēḻar hold the post in the 44th year, a certain Nārāyana Bhattan is also mentioned as the srikaryam, but the date when he hold the post is not known as the regnal year is lost. While the last mentioned seems to be a Vaishnava Brahmin, the other three were Mūvenda Vēlārs, which

1. A. R. E. 18-48-49  
2. A. R. E. 120-47-48
indicates that the persons who hold this important post of (Chief Administrative Officer), Srikāyam may belong to any caste.

Flower Gardens

More than ten new flower gardens (nandavanam) were raised during the 30 years from 1085 A.D. Three of the gardens were endowed by ladies, one of them being a Pāndya princess. A land was purchased at the instance of one Nishadarājan, and endowed for raising a flower garden in the name of the Pāndya Princess, Neriyand Madōvi. Provisions were also made for the servants. A “Gunavalli nandavānam” was raised by a lady Gnanavalli alias Kadavur Udaiyal, by purchasing a land which was lying fallow for over one hundred years, due to floods in Kāveri. A lady Siriyândal Sāni, daughter of Ātreyan Damōdara Nārāyanan, and wife of Tāyanambi Pirān, raised a flower garden in 1115 A.D. Thirumalavadi Udaiyān alias Rājavallabha Pallavaraiya. Ātkondavilli of Adanur, Neriyand Mūvēndavēlān alias Vēdavanamuḍaiyān are other donors who raised new nandavanams. A husband and wife have endowed two flower gardens in their name. The male member was a Commander, Senāpati whose name was Taliyil Madhurāntaka alias Rājendra Chōla Kidārattaraiyan and his wife was Rājakēsarivalli, Provisions were also made for the two servants to maintain the garden. Another Senapati, Ilangōvēlar, purchased a land and gifted a nandavanam.

Floods in Kaveri

Over nine inscriptions refer to floods in Kaveri which laid waste a number of lands. One inscription says that the land was uncultivable for the past 50 years on account of sand silt, thrown by the overflow of the river Kaveri. Four inscriptions state that the lands were lying waste for over one hundred years and the others state, that the lands were follow for long, due to sand silt thrown by the overflooding of Kaveri. Generally, the Chola records are accurate. If we take the years 50 and 100 years recorded as nearly accurate, it would indicate that

overflooding of Kaveri has occurred at least twice in hundred years, causing considerable damage to the fields and crops. That means Kaveri has flooded disasterously in the reign of Rājendra I and earlier in the reign of Uttamachōla. The villages which were flooded like this were Karkudi in Vilathurnādu, Kāraikkudi in Vilanādu, Turaikkudi and Tandarai. These records also show that considerable attention was paid to the reclamation of sand silted, lands along the banks of river Kaveri in the time of Kulottunga.

In Tandarai, one Veli of such land cost one kāsu. In another case 4 Veli of land was bought for 220 Drammas.

Eight kalamś of paddy per veli of land was levied per annum by the temple treasury. In another inscription the quantity is not given. The lands were purchased by the individuals and brought under cultivation and paid certain quantity to the temple treasury towards the maintenance of the garden. All the lands sold, belonged originally to the temple but became waste lands due to inundation. Certain officers of Kulottunga’s queen Lokamādēvi, bought such lands, on behalf of the queen and brought them under cultivation. The lands were bought free of all taxes for the first five years from the year of purchase and there after to pay some specific quantity to the temple treasury. This was an inducement to the new cultivator: We have noted that one Veli of sand-silted land was sold at one Kāsu per Veli in Kulottunga reign. But in the reign of the same ruler (1085 A.D.) one veli of land was sold for two kasu, which seems to be the value of a cultivatable land.

Land tenure

There are three interesting records in the reign of Kulotunga relating to land tenure. In the year 1084 A.D, Kulottunga ordered certain modification in the levy of paddy to be paid to the temple treasury. In 1110 A.D, Kulottunga ordered the conversion of a tirappu tenure on certain lands at Sirudavur into a devatāna tenure by payment of certain lumpsum and utilise the same for the sacred bath of deity. The third transaction relates to a village assembly. The Perunguri Sabha, (village assembly) converted a iraiyili tenure (tax free tenure) into a irai kāval tenure in

1072 A.D. and for 40 years it continued to remain an *iraikāval* tenure. But in 1114 it was again reconverted into a *iraiyili* tenure.¹

There is an interesting inscription which deserves mention. The *Sabha* of Chandralekhai Chaturvedimangalam (Sendalai) borrowed 400 *Kalanju* from this temple in the year (916 A.D.) of Parāntaka Chola, but it did not pay the interest till the 10th year of Kulottunga I, for 165 years. The *Sabha* sold 6 *Velis* of land towards the interest on this sum, and the land was designated as *Poliyuttuparru* (i.e. land to pay interest).

One Thiru. Ānandamurtti Arulālan alias Vīrājēndra Pallavaraiyan bought a land and constituted it as a *brahmadeya* called *aundambākkilān brahmadeyam* after his own name in 1094 A.D. Another land gift was endowed by Vandālanjeri Udayān Vellālan alias Vānakōvaraiyan of Thirunaraiyur. The proceeds were to be utilised for the sacred bath of the deity on the day of Ekadasi. The donor comes from the same place Vandālanjeri, from where Karunakara Tondaiman, the general of Kulottunga, who conquered Kalinga on behalf of his ruler hailed from. The Vānakōvaraiyan was second in command to Karunakara Tondaiman and accompanied him to Kalinga. He is celebrated along with Karunakara Tondaiman in *Kalingathupparrani* of Jayamkondar.

Devoted Chieftains

The following are the chieftains who took keen interest in Srirangam temple in the reign of Kulottunga.

1. Adittanār alias Kādavarāya²
2. Villavarāyar³
3. Sadaiyan Sēndan⁴
4. Parthivēndra Brahmādirāyan⁵
5. Kaduvanguidaīyān Ādithān Thiruvarangadēvan alias Virudarāja Bhayankara Vijayapālan⁶
6. Rājēndra Mūvēndavelār⁷
7. Ponnambala Kūttan alias Kalingarāyar⁸

8. Isvarakulakāla Brahmarāyār
9. Rājendrachōla Adiyamān alias Araiyan Sevan
10. Udaiyār Kāraṇai Vilupparaiyar
11. Thirumalāpādi alias Rājavallabha Pallavaraiyan.
12. Neeriyan Mūvendavelān alias Vēdavanamuḍaiyān
13. Nishadarājan
14. Rājendra Chola Mahābalivānādhirājan
15. Thiruvanantamūrti Arulālan alias Vīrarājendra Pallavaraiyan
16. Koṭṭur udaiyan Araiyan Rājendra Chōlan
17. Rājendra Chōla Munaiyadaiyar
18. Kāraṇai Vilupparaiyar
19. Atkondavillī of Ādanur

Devoted commanders

Besides the above chieftains mentioned, six Commanders of Kulottunga I, are seen actively promoting the interest of the temple and endowing lands to the temple. They are:—

1. Sēnāpati Rājanārāvana Munaiyadaraiyan alias Koṭṭur udaiyan Araiyan Rājendrachōlan
2. Sēnāpati Kulasekaraṅkōn
3. Sēnāpatiyal Taliyil Madurāntakan alias Rājendra Chōla Kidārattaraicyar
4. Sēnāpati Ilangovēlan
5. Vandālanjeri Udaiyān Vellālan alias Vānakovaraicyan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>133-47-48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67-51-52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3-48-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>109-48-49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>131-47-48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>210-51-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>114-47-48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2-48-49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61-1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-48-49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>167-51-52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the above commanders the last mentioned was a Vellāla, while Senāpati Kulasekarakon was a shepered, who had risen to the status of a commander.

In the reign of Kulottunga, the names of certain measures used in the temple are preserved.

1. Pallikondān Marakkāl
2. Rājakēśari measure

An inscription refers to the existence of a Srivaishnava Vāryam.

There is an interesting record dated in the reign of Kulottunga. It refers to arrears amounting to 940 kasu, payable by some individuals to the temple treasury. An Officer Rājendrachola Mūvēndevēlār is said to have enquired into the case and settled the amount. One of the individuals involved in the case seems to have served a period of imprisonment (Sirai Irundu). Another record of interest refers to the coin Drammas. Four velis of land (fallow) were bought for a sum of two hundred and twenty Drammas. The Drammas is probably the name derived from Darchmas of the Roman coinage.

Another interesting record refers to one Thiruvarangadevan who was a barbar (ambattan) as a signatory of a document.

Conclusion

The study of Srirangam epigraphs of the time of Kulottunga-I the personal interest of the king in the temple, the devotion of the queens and their endowments, the provisions for the recitation of Thiruvāimōḷi twice in the same reign, the endowments of flower gardens the reclamation of silted lands, institution of festivals etc., show a period of great activity in the temple, and its prosperous condition, which is totally at variance with the popular notion and beliefs. This makes us to appeal for a scientific study of the subject.

1. A. R. E. 109-48-49
2. ,, 32-48-49
3. A. R. E. 168-51-52
4. ,, 108-47-48
A JUDGEMENT OF THE CHOLA PERIOD

An inscription recently copied by the Tamilnadu State Department of Archaeology throws some light on the administration of Justice in mediaeval period. The epigraph comes from the Agnisvara temple of Tamaraippakkam and belongs to 11th century A.D. It is dated in the reign of Rājendra Chola II.

Brief History

The history of the case is briefly as follows. Two brothers of a family quarrelled among themselves. The elder brother slapped the younger who retaliated and as a result the elder died. The father of them, took the case to the guild. The guild enquired into the case and delivered the judgement.

The brothers who quarrelled and their parents belonged to the Vellala community. The Vellalas had their professional guilds called Chitramēḷi Nāḍu. The Chitramēḷi guild, had its own prasasti like the rulers and seems to have derived constitutional authority to deal with matters of their own group. This particular guild was named after the ruling monarch and was called Rājendra Chola Chitramēḷi Perukkālar. The proceedings of the enquiry are recorded in the form of questions and answers.

Translation

Hail prosperity

The fifth regnal year of Parakesari Rājendra Chola deva, who was pleased to be seated on the heroic throne, having performed victory anointment, defeated Āhavamalla at Koppam on the banks of Peraru; captured his war elephants, horses, women and treasures; and also captured Irattappādi and Lanka.

The Chitramēḷi who are Bhūmidevi putrās (the sons of the earth) and born of the four varnās, order thus for the well being of all the worlds.
We the Chitramēḻī Perukkālar (the guild), the sons of Mother earth, striving for the growth of dharma and fame, and for the removal of Kali (the dark age), holding the sceptre of Justice as God, and administering the Chitramēḻī dharma, which echoes in all the directions heard the Vellāla, Taţik Konnavan of Tarupprelu, residing at Kannapura, in Putanalappādinādu, which formed part of Selururnāḍu, south of Pangalanādu, who came and represented:—

‘When my son Sankarattadiyān and my son, Periyān were quarelling among themselves, the elder brother, out of spite beat the younger and the younger returned the blow. The elder died by the blow of his younger’.

We enquired:—

‘Have you any other children apart from these two’.

He replied:—

‘No. I have no other children. Only myself and my wife, the mother of these sons are alive’.

We enquired,

‘Have you any property’?

He replied,

‘No property what-so-ever’

We order

Since a family has fallen into troubles, and as there was none to protect them and as they own no property, he (the younger son) should provide for half of a perpetual lamp, to Lord Mahadeva of Thiru Agnisvara, in Thiru Tāmaraippakkam. He should protect the aged father and mother. Having examined the course of justice (dharma) we order that he need not suffer capital punishment on account of this. This is a suddha paṭṭika.

Having examined this we order that he need not be attached any further for this.

This is the order of perukkālar. One who challanges the validity of this order, will be a sinner against the periya nāḍu. This is the signature of chitramēḻī nāṭṭu bhaṭṭa. The Vellāla, Kīḻavan Kesānpādi of Perambanur, residing at Kurāppākkam in Mānḍaiikkulanādu, give my consent to this (decision).
Conclusion

The following points emerge from the study of the above document.

The ancient Hindus recognised the authority of the professional guilds to settle matters of dispute. Bhrigu, recognises 15 kinds of courts among which courts presided over by professional guilds was also one. These courts are held by some authorities, as purely arbitration courts with no authority to try serious cases of crime relating to violence, theft etc.¹

In the case under study the professional guild chitramēli periya nāḍu enquired into the crime. It shows that by 11th century A.D., the arbitrary powers of guild have extended even to try serious crimes like murder.

The second point of interest in this inscription is the proceedings recorded in direct speech. The dharma sāstras make it clear that the statements of the parties should be written as uttered by them and in their very presence.

The third point worthy of note is that for such crimes as murder, the punishment prescribed seems to be the capital punishment though this

¹ Ancient Hindu Judicature p. 9
was not awarded in this case. But the statement in this record "He need not die for this" shows that capital punishment was prevalent during that period. The guild, in this case, took a sympathetic view of the case. The parents neither had property nor children or relatives to look after them. So the guild considered it sufficient if the offender was punished to burn a perpetual lamp in the local temple by paying certain amount which incidentally also served as an expiatory rite.

'The association of penances with punishment for crime, is itself a recognition of the distinction between the reparation or compensation aspect or the punishment or reformation aspect. According to the svadharma theory, a crime being a deviation from the offenders dharma involved not merely harm to society but also degradation or loss of caste to the offender and thus made him (1) unworthy of social communion and (2) unfit to perform spiritual acts. Hence arose the necessity for expiation'.

In coming to this decision, the guild says that they have deliberated on the provisions of dharma and arrived at the judgement. There is certainly a human touch to the case and the society cared more for the human values is evident in this case.

The guild also gave this charter as a sūdha paṭṭika purificatory deed. visuddhi patra was a document awarded to a party who underwent certain purificatory ceremonies for some offences. The charter also includes two clauses (1) The offender should not be attached any further for the same crime and (2) one who challenges the verdict is a sinner against the guild'. These two provisions were intended to assure, social equality and punishment for those who spoke ill of him. Such documents were given in written form as well as prescribed in dharma sāstra, is worthy of note.

The deed uses the word paṭṭāngu for the judgement. The scribe, who wrote the document was a brahmin, writing under orders of the guild.

The deed is a document of the visuddhi patra class, throwing valuable light on the administration of justice during the chola period.

A SOCIO - POLITICAL COMPACT
OF THE CHOLA PERIOD.

An inscription, dated 1258 A.D. from Chengam in North Arcot district throws interesting light on defections from parent party, the steps taken by the society to deal with the situation and the socio-political compact entered into by the society, which falls within the category of Sthithi or Samvid patra of the dharma sāstrās. The case as recorded in the inscription is briefly as follows, Karikālacakola ādaiyūr nādālvān was ruling the territorial division Ādaiyur Nādu, which comprises the present Chengam area. He was faithfully assisted by his brother Narasinga. But three sons of this Narasinga, whose names are given as Periyaudaiyan, Arasagal Nāyan and Amaṭṭālvan, left the parental party and joined the opposing party headed Karuppakkaṭṭi Nāyaka. This was considered a crime against the crown and also betrayal of the country (Rājadroha and desa droha: Engal Nāyanmārkum Engalukkum pahai tēdi,) This situation has to be met firmly. All the representatives of the territory, which included territorial commanders, legal professionals, soldiers, commanders, the members of the merchantile guilds, accountants, revenue professionals, artisan guilds, agricultural guilds, hunters, brahmins and members of all the communities and castes including Paraiabs, Pānars, Sakkiliyars, and others whom we now call Harijans. The inscription after detailing the representatives of all the castes, states specifically the entire community beginning from the highest caste to the lowest caste assembled. The assembly first decided that an opportunity should be given to the defectors to return to the parental party and so sent a written letter to them mentioning that they will be forgiven for their faults if they return to the parental party. They were assured that there will be no need to hesitation for fear of victimisation and some prominent members even gave a surity for the safe treatment. But this reconciliatory move was rejected and the defectors joined the opposing party which was despised. (veruppaṇapērūdanē kūḍī).

Now having offered an opportunity which the defectors refused, the assembly took far reaching decisions which are carefully recorded in the
inscription. Some of which are worth mentioning. The defectors were declared betayers of the country. They were betayers excommunicated and listed among those deprived of their wives. Neither those three nor their descendants would be allowed to enter the territory. The assembly should have no track with those who joined with the three or gave them asylum and those who joined would be considered, defaulters against the state and would meet with capital punishment. The ladies who agreed to marry or live as concubines of the three or their followers to be punished.

This interesting decision of the entire territory was taken in front of the Piḍāri temple of the village on a Tuesday after sacrificing goats and offering special worship. This decision of the assembly is called Nilaimai Pramāna in the inscription.

The decision is in confirmity with the dictates of the ancient dharma sāstrās. According to Vyāsa and Prajāpati, there are ten varieties of written documents prepared by the agreeing parties, which will form a source of evidence in the case of future disputes. Such written documents are called lekhyā pramāna, one of the three evidences in law disputes. Among the three varieties of documents, the agreement entered into between merchants, townsmen and other collection of individuals, fixing a certain mode of conduct among themselves, is called Sthitipatra. According Sukraniti the same is called Samvidpatra, which is taken to protect the integrity of the country.

Grāmah, desah ca yat kuryāl
Satya lekhyam parasparam,
Rajāvirodhī dharmārtham
Samvit patram tad ucyate'.

—Sukra nīḍhi

It is interesting to note that the same legal term used in the dharma sāstrās as sthitipatra is found in this 13th century inscription, (in its Tamil form) as nilaimai pramāna. It must also be mentioned that at the time of this record in 1258 A.D. the chola imperial power was shaken and there was real external danger for the territory which made the whole community to raise as one man and deal firmly with the defectors to safeguard the interests of the country.
Translation

_Hail prosperity_

In the expired Saka era one thousand one hundred and eighty, in the month of Avani (Simha), the dark fortnight, trithiyai (Third day) Sunday when Revati was the star, the (people of) foot hills, hills, nādus, falling within ........ to the west of the river Eliyara, in Adaiyurnādu and Nādus inclusive of hill and nādus falling within the territories to the east of Siningai and west of Mūvarai Venra Nallur in Tenkarainādu, the inhabitants of Nādus falling within these two banks who included Nāttārs the Nāyaks of these Nādus.

Administrators of justice
Pillai mudalis
individuals
Commanders of the army
the leaders of individuals
the paid soldiers
Kontaviccādira
the Tenparrunaṭṭār of Naviramalai
Nāṭṭu Mudalis
the Naṭṭar of Vadamalai
Nāṭṭumudali, and people of various communities
the Malaiyalas of the foot hills (hills tribes) Malaiyala Mudalis
the Mudunīr Malayālas.
Malaiyaran Mudalis
Chettis
Vanigas (business men)
Kanakkars (accountants)
Karumaperum pannāṭṭavar
Pannāṭṭu Mudalis
Porkorra Kaikkolar
Āndār
Sivabrāhmanas
Manrādis
Uvaccars
Vadatalaināṭṭār of Tenkarai.
The Nāṭṭārs of Tenmalaināḍu
Pulavars
Pannūvār
Nyāyattār
The twelve Panimakkal
Perum Vēdar (hunters)
Pānars
Paraiyars
Parai Mudali
Sakkilis
Irulas

People belonging to all these jatis beginning from Brahmin the highest, to Arippan the lowest
we entered into this perpetual compact (nilaimai pramāna)
When our ruler Aranā Ṭaṭṭa Nāḷakkāḷ Chola Āḍaiyur Nāḍālvān, was pleased to rule, obeying his orders, his younger brother Nāyanār Narasinga panmar was pleased to follow his steps
Periudāiyān, his brother Arasaga nāyan, the sons of Nāyanār Narasinga panmar, joined with Karuppakkaṭṭi Nāyaka, and lived in enmity, with our ruler and us
We pardoned their misdeeds, sent a written letter with a seal of authority, promising a surety of safety and removing their fears, invited them to come back
They refused to receive the letter, and became enemies of our ruler and ourselves and joined with the opponents whom we despise
and since these opponents belonged to the side of Prithivi Ganga
We declare that Periudāiyān, Arasagal nāyakan, and their younger brother Amatṭāḷvan, as Rājadrohi and Nāttudrohin (traitors of the King and traitors of the country)
and excommunicate them in the company of those deprived of their wives
The sons who are born through the daughters of Prithivi Ganga, married to our rulers, will not be recognised as rulers of this land
Only the other sons are entitled to rule as in days of yore
So long as the hill and earth remains, we and our descendants will not allow this Periuḍaiyān, Arasaganāyan and their brother Amatālyān, to enter this territory. We will not give asylum to these fellows.

We will not join those who give asylum to these fellows.

Neither we will say that they belong to this country nor will we join those who say that these fellows belong to this country. We will declare as traitors of the crown those who send letters to these fellows, give protection, or speak to the people of their camp, and pierce them like dogs and pigs.

We will sever the nose and breasts of the wives of these fellows.

We will do the same to the girl who goes to live as concubine with these fellows.

We will send out servants and kill the persons who goes our to their side, All of us including the village of Nandimangalam, give this Nilaimai Pramāna as per our surety bond.

If we fail to act like this or act contrary to this vow upon Vallavaraiya He (who acts otherwise) will be considered a co-habiter with his own mother.

(If we fail) we may be considered as those who give their own wives to the Paraiahs, who pluck grass to the horses of real traders.

If any one acts against this deed, he will receive the same treatment meted out to a goat, cut on a Tuesday, in the temple of Goddess Jayamkonda Nācchiyār.

We drafted this nilaimai pramāna (the perpetual compact) after cutting a goat in the temple of Jayamkonda Nācchiyār (on Tuesday, equal unto Panchami, 23rd day in the month of Simha) after offering worship.

We all the members also got this stone inscription engraved in the temple of Lord of Edavanturai.

One who acts against this stone inscription, will incur the sin of stabbing a Cow, in between the Ganges and Kumari.

As instructed by the members of all the nāḍus, I Nāṭṭāchārya inscribed this epigraph. This is my signature’

Stithi patra.

This inscription is thus an example of stithi patra of the dharma sāstras.