

THE EARLY PALLAVAS AND KANCHI

BY
T. G. ARAVAMUTHAN

REPRINTED FROM THE SILVER JUBILEE VOLUME OF
THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SOUTH INDIA.

THE EARLY PALLAVAS AND KANCHI

BY

T. G. ARAVAMUTHAN

1. INTRODUCTION

What we know of those Early Pallavas who are believed to have had for capital the well-known city of Kanchi-pura, some 15 miles south-west of Madras, is not yet free from uncertainty on material points. A re-examination and a revaluation of the available data are the objectives of this paper.

A sequence of succession is suggested here for these kings, taking note of both early and late evidence. The association of this dynasty with Kanchi-pura is sought to be elucidated on the hypothesis of a Kanchi in the Telugu land and of a Tamil city which, née Kachchi, got renamed Kanchi on its passing into Pallava hands about 525 A.D. The traditions of origins are shown to be befogged with legends already conventional. The connection with the Cholas, genealogically and politically, is shown to be different from what it has been taken to be.

2. THE EARLY RECORDS

The copper-plate grants of the kings of the early line of these Pallavas, now sixteen in number, are, almost exclusively, the sources of information about them. A few other records are usually taken to be of these early Pallavas but without adequate warrant.

To minimize verbal elucidation, the data and the inferences are marshalled in three Tables.

The kings of the sixteen early records are presented, in Table A, in a sequence that takes note of congruences of names in the several generations,—except in regard to the first two and to the last of the records, their positions being determined on palaeographical grounds. A few interesting particulars about the grants are also incorporated in the Table.

Palaeographically, the grants, except one of the latest to be discovered (Pl),¹ are assignable to the two hundred years from the

1. T. N. Subrahmanyam, in *TASSI*, 1958-9: 41-83.

middle of the fourth century A. D. to the middle of the sixth century A. D. Two of the latest grants (OS, Cu,) may be copies. The last (Pl) may be two centuries later in the style of the characters. Such information, however, as these three grants give in respect of the dynastic sequence turns out to be eminently acceptable.

Most of the grants mention the grantor,— king or prince, or even princess,— and the grantor's three immediate agnatic ancestors, namely, father, grand-father and great-grand-father. This is a formality prescribed by the frame of religious rituals, the principal participant in them having to think of himself in association with those three ancestors as representatives of the endless line of his forebears by way of tribute to them and to the culture by which they had lived and by which he himself hopes to shape his life. It is this formality that has been adopted in land-grants made to the stalwarts of that culture, the grants serving cultural, equally with religious and political, purposes. One of the grants (Dr) gives us the name of only the great-grand-father, but this is because the first alone of the three, or more, sheets of the grant has survived. In another grant (Ja)² the genealogy starts with the grand-father, the omission of the name of the great-grandfather being both unusual and unaccountable. In another of the grants (Hi), it is, not the name of the king's father but, a reverent appellation of the father's, or, perhaps, an earlier, ancestor's, that is recorded. When the grant is by a prince (Hi, Ur, Si), or by a princess (Gu)³, or by a king whose rod was swayed in effect by the heir-apparent (Pl), the ruling king's name and the regnal year in which the grant was made are also given.

From the circumstances that the names of four kings occur in sequence in each of a preponderating number of these grants, that two or more of the names in the sequences are similar, and that they are in different positions in the sequences, it has been

2. A paper by N. Ramesam on this grant finds place in this issue of this Society's *Transactions*. With the Honorary Secretary's kind permission I have taken a few data relating to this record from this paper.

3. The find-place of this grant was called Gunapadeya from a note made by, or for, Sir Walter Elliott to whom these plates had belonged: *IA.* (1890) 9: 100. No place so named being known, it has been assumed here that the correct reading should be as above, it being possible to point to a place that does go by this name.

assumed here that the sixteen sequences could be dovetailed into a genealogy running into generations greater than four. That the assumption was well founded will emerge as we proceed. Table C embodies the most probable sequentation. The Table embodies also, for convenience and in advance, such details as reconciliation with later records of the dynasty (see Table B) and the stages at which collateral lines branched off.

We are helped to a reconciliation by certain outstanding facts mentioned in these grants. A king Vira is mentioned in as many as eight grants and a prince Vishnu-gopa in as many as seven. Only one Vishnu-gopa who is uniformly styled Prince appears in these records and only one Vira appears in these or in the later grants of this dynasty. In six records these two occur together, and Vira is grandfather to Vishnu-gopa, and the father of this Vishnu-gopa is invariably Skanda. In the five grants in which Prince Vishnu-gopa's son is mentioned he is invariably called Simha. In the three grants in which Vira's father is mentioned he is invariably called Skanda. In the grant in which Vira's son Skanda is grantor (OT), the relationship of Vira is as father and that of Skanda is as grandfather.

Here is a series of sequences in relationships which enables us to establish a basic sequence of five generations (Nos 3 to 7 in Table A) which is as well attested to as could be expected.

Identities of names and partial equations of sequences in the several generations in three more of the grants (Ce, OT, Ja) serve,—as appears in Tables A, B and C, and more vividly than could be elucidated verbally,—to extend the primary sequence of five potentates to the much longer sequence of ten (Nos 2 to 11 in Table A), running from Vishnu-gopa,—not the prince, but his grandson, full-fledged king,—up to his ninth assendant, Skanda.

The validity of this extended sequence could not have been treated as above cavil so long as it was not beyond doubt if the king Simha in whose reign Prince Vishnu-gopa made his two grants (Ur, Śi), as recorded in them, was a paternal uncle, or a brother, the relationship having gone unmentioned in these two grants. The doubt has just been resolved by the discovery of a grant (Ja) from which Simha emerges indisputably as brother. This sequence of these ten generations may now be treated as established.

With Simha for brother to Prince Vishnu-gopa, another sequence of four kings (Ud) has to be accepted to run, not in the line of Prince Vishnu-gopa but, in that of the brother, King Simha, for the Skanda-Simha-Skanda sequence in this grant has no parallel in the other grants. So, not only were Prince Vishnu-gopa's son and grandson on the throne (Cu), but his brother and that brother's son and grandson also were on the throne (Ud). This suggests that the dynasty threw out a collateral line here. Palaeography does not permit of this branch being taken off any earlier Skanda.

Skanda, the earliest king in the sequence of the ten generations which has been evoked from ten of the grants, and his grand-son, Buddha (Ce), bear names which are found repeated in another grant (Gu) which speaks of Buddha as Yuva-Maha-Raja, names this prince's queen Charu-devi and refers to Buddhānkura⁴ as the son of this couple. There being nothing in this grant (Gu) to invalidate the relationship of grand-father and grandson between Skanda and Buddha, testified to by the oldest (Ce) of the ten grants, it is not unlikely that the two Skandas and the two Buddhas were identical and that the grant (Gu) which mentions the grand-son's son was issued when Skanda was king and his son, grandson and great-grandson were only princes,—a conclusion that is borne out by the other grant (Gu) stating that it was issued in Skanda's reign.

In the grant (Dr) which starts with mention of a Vira-kurcha as the great-grand-father of the royal sequence which it speaks to, the three names lower down are not to be known, the sheets in which mention of them must have been made being lost. This record being, palaeographically, as old as the grant that mentions Skanda and Buddha (Gu) we have to conclude that, genealogically, Vira-kurcha is as near as may be to this Skanda and to accept him, tentatively, for this Skanda's father.

Two other grants (Md,Hi), worded in Prakṛta,—the language of the grant (Gu) in which we have found Skanda and Buddhānkura mentioned,—and inscribed in characters slightly earlier,

4. This name has been read as 'Buddhyānkura': *EI.*, 8. 143-6). The form 'Buddhānkura' has, however, been adopted here for the additional, though not conclusive, reason that the corresponding name in the Vayalur King List, which we shall be studying lower down, has 'Buddha', not 'Buddhi', for its first component.

appear to be assignable to a period earlier than the Skanda we have been speaking of.⁵

It looks probable that the earliest of the grants in Samskrta to embody a sequence of four kings (Dr) was issued by Buddha and it looks equally probable that the latest of the grants in Prakrta (Gu) was issued by this Buddha's consort. It may be that Buddha's reign marks the season of transition from Prakrta to Samskrta as the medium in which grants were issued. To impute the change to the growing influence of the users of Samskrta over that of those who preferred Prakrta and, as a sequel, to conclude that till then Samskrta culture had been only penumbral in this region, is to misunderstand the working of human nature. When, for instance, in later times, we find a Chola king issuing grants in two styles,—one drafted in plain Tamil prose, and another drafted quite similarly but garnished with a prefatory eulogium (*praśasti*) in resounding Tamil verse which lauds the king and his ancestors to the vault,—we do not feel called on to postulate an ascendancy of a versifier over a prosifier in the royal chancellory. It is the king's taste for bombast that suggests to him,—or, to his Master of the Seals,—the inclusion of a *praśasti* in verse. The poet may be poet laureate basking in royal patronage or be only a hungry figure flitting about the purlieus of the chancellory a for call to break out into verse for a dole; but the determining factor is the taste of king or of Master of Seals. It is Buddha's tastes that probably dictated the change in the language of his grants and it is because of his descendants' approbation of that medium for so religious an act as a land-grant that the fashion of inditing grants mentioning four kings in sequence in each persisted for at least seven generations in this line.

This Skanda having issued a grant (Md) when he was a Yuva-Maha-Raja, in the reign of his father who remains unnamed, made another grant (Hi), when he had become king, of demesnes in another part of his kingdom in confirmation and enlargement of a gift that had formerly been made by his father, or on earlier ascendent, Bappa,—a sobriquet, rather than a proper regnal name. We ascend, thus, one step or more, in the genealogy to this Bappa, whatever his regnal name might have been.

5. Conjectures based on the occurrence of the epithets Siva and Vijaya in some of these have now become unsustainable as the latter epithet occurs in the Jalalpuram grant in a manner that knocks the conjectures out.

The grant that is palaeographically the latest (Pl.) mentions only two potentates, Simha the father and Simha-vishnu the son. From what it says of this son it is clear that he is the Simha-vishnu known to us as the founder of the later line of the Pallavas. The father, Simha, is apparently the last of the earlier Pallavas. Though the place of this king in the genealogical sequence cannot be determined from the materials available in these sixteen grants, we have other material which, as we shall see, enables us to locate him accurately.

The sixteen grants we have so far relied on have, thus, been very helpful. We have framed a consecutive genealogy ascending from Vishnu-gopa the king to Skanda the ancestor in the ninth ascent, postulated for Vira-kurcha a place which is about a generation higher and for ^{another} Skanda a relationship to Vira-kurcha which might be atleast that of father. We have come down to the last king of the early line of this dynasty,—even to the founder of the next line. Another line has indubitably emerged as a branch taking off in one of the intermediate generations.

3. THE LATER RECORDS.

The Later Pallavas,—the immediate successors to the Early Pallavas of the grants we have been considering,—propounded genealogies reaching back not only to Simha-vishnu, the propositus of their line, but to the first man to be created, and indeed, to the Creator himself. One of these genealogies,—in a stone inscription at Vāyalūr (Vā),—is both the fullest and the earliest. Two others, in the grants from Kāśākkudi (Kā) and Velūr-pālaiyam (Vē) may be abbreviations, while three others¹ are so brief as only to glance at one or two names in the long stretch between grantor and Creator.

In Table B are presented, in parallel columns. the three fuller genealogies, bringing out both the congruences and the discordances. The few bits of historical information vouchsafed in one of the three records are also indicated.

This Table makes it clear that the congruences are unmistakeable, as where the names Kālinda, Kālabhartṛ, Chūta, Vira-kurcha, Kāṇa-gopa, Kumāra-vishṇu, Buddha, Nandi and Simha appear. The same may be said of the few names which

1. The Pattat-tal-māṅgalam, the Bāhur and the Rayakotta grants

2. Yet another possibility is considered in Section 5.

are repeated in the two grants not covered by this Table,— Vimala and Koṭikanika of the Bāhūr grant and Vira-kurcha of the Paṭṭat-tāl-maṅgalam grant. The sequences are found to agree in the main. Variations also there are in the records, as where a Skanda presents himself high up in the Kasakkudi record (Kā. 10), or a Skanda-śishya ranges himself beside a Vira-kurcha in the Velur-palaiyam grant (Vē. 13), or a Vishnu-gopa in the Kasakkudi record (Kā. 13) intrudes himself between Kana-gopa and Vira-kurcha (Vā. 28, 29) of the Vayalur record. Even the longest list, that of Vayalur, must be an abbreviation, for no more than forty-nine generations suffice in it to cover the immense length of time running down from Creation to the 6th century A.D. Apparently, the author of each list framed his list in conformity with his own preferences. The Vayalur list turns out, thus, not only to be a genealogy foreshadowing the later ones but to be also a sequence in which it is legitimate to intercalate names from the still later genealogies.

Equations of kings and sequences in the three genealogies are indubitable in a number of cases. For instance, the Kalindas of Vayalur (No. 16) and Kasakkudi (No. 11) are identical, there being no other Kalindas in the six lists, and they occurring after the Asoka in both of them, and it follows that the kings in between in the Vayalur list (Vā. 10-15) cannot be deemed to be later than the Kalinda of the Kasakkudi list (Kā. 11).

The principle on which equations could be established being, thus, clear, it is necessary to consider only those cases which are typical among those that are out of the ordinary.

The Skanda who appears in an early generation in the Kasakkudi grant (Kā. 10) having no counterpart in the Vayalur record at that level,— that is, between its 9th and 16th kings,— is intercalatable in the Vayalur genealogy between any two successive kings of that genealogy, from the 9th to the 16th king, as either son or younger brother of the earlier of each successive pair.

The Skanda-śishya who appears in the Velur-palaiyam grant (Vē. 13) in juxtaposition to its Vira-kurcha (Vē. 12), has no counterpart lower down in the other records. Indeed, we know of no one of that name in them. We may retain this Vira-kurcha at the level of him of Vayalur (Vā. 23) and intercalate only Skanda-sishya between any two successive kings lower down,

though not lower than Kumara-vishnu (Vā. 31, Vē. 14). Or, we may bring down the Vira-kurchas and the Skanda-sishya to the level of the Vira-kurchas and the Skanda who appear lower down in the Vayalur list (Vā. 29, 30) and equate them, notwithstanding that the Skanda of the one record will have to be the Skanda-sishya of the other. Should we adopt the latter course, Vira-simha of Kasakkudi (Vā. 15) will have to be either located between Vira-kurcha and Skanda (Vā. 29, 30) or be intercalated lower down (between the 30th and the 40th kings of the Vayalur list). Perhaps, it is best to take Skanda-sishya for younger brother to Vira-kurcha (Vā. 23, 23a)

Though in a few cases the difficulties of intercalation may be considerable it cannot be missed that in no case does intercalation lead either to an impossibility or to an absurdity. A list reconciling the divergences in these six records of the Later Pallavas may be as authentic a genealogy as we are ever likely to have for this line.

4. THE GENEALOGY ON RECONCILIATION

Having obtained (in Tables A, C) an unbroken sequence of eleven generations in the main line and one sequence of four generations in a collateral line reconciling the sequences in fourteen out of the sixteen early grants and having also arrived at the conclusion that the lists in the six later records are susceptible of reconciliation among themselves (Table B), we may proceed to put the two sets of sequences together, the earlier and the later, in an endeavour to reconcile them too. The reconciliation has, in advance, been effected in Table C. It remains only to provide a little of elucidation.

The reconciliation, if it is to be successful, has to satisfy a few requisites. It has to be congruent with the data in the earlier and the later records. It has to accommodate comfortably the additional names in the three later records (Table B). It has to account for the occurrence of the name Simha in two consecutive generations in one of the records (Vā. 46, 47), it being unusual, both generally in this country and specifically in the records of this family, for father and son, or for two brothers, to bear the same name. It has either to accommodate appropriately a Prince Vishnu-gopa or to show that he could have no place in it.

The earliest three kings of the Chendalur grant (Ce), namely Skanda, Kumara-vishnu and Buddha, are found in unbroken sequence in the Vayalur record also (Vā. 30, 31, 32), but the continuity of the sequence in the Chendalur record down to Kumara-vishnu of the fourth generation in it is not reproduced in the Vayalur record, in which Kumara-vishnu (No. 34) is preceded by a Skanda (No. 33). While this predecessor cannot be father to Kumara-vishnu,— his father being Buddha according to the Chendalur sequence,— he may be uncle or elder brother : he cannot be younger brother as in the Vayalur enumeration he precedes.

By parity of reasoning, the Vishnu-gopa (Vā. 37) just below Skanda in the Vayalur list (Vā. 36) must be younger brother to Skanda (Vā. 36). This Vishnu-gopa being followed in the Vayalur list by a Vishnu-dāsa (Vā. 38) for whom we have, however, no counterpart in any of the sixteen early grants, his place is obviously as son to his predecessor. The next two names, Skanda and Simha (Vā. 39, 40), must fall into one of the following sequences of four each, according to the Vayalur list, taking note of both predecessors and successors (that is, the generations of Vā. 37-42).

Vishnu-gopa,	Vishnu-dāsa,	Skanda,	Simha	(Vā. 37-40)
Vishnu-dāsa,	Skanda,	Simha,	Vira	(Vā. 38-41)
Skanda,	Simha,	Vira,	Skanda	(Vā. 39-42)

None of these, however, is a sequence known to the sixteen earlier grants. Skanda and Simha go, therefore, with Vishnu-gopa and Vishnu-dāsa, inevitably becoming, in that company, a collateral branch not to be found in the sixteen early records which alone are now known to us.

It looks as if the author of the Vayalur list adopted,— to judge from this instance,— the method of accommodating the whole of a collateral line in the list immediately after the mention of the king from whom the branching off occurred, and of not coming back to the main line till the list in the collateral line exhausted itself. It will be noticed that this is the very principle adopted in the case also of the other branch (Vā. 43-6) spoken to by the Udayendram record.

The Vishnu-gopa who remained Prince to the end has, then, to be accepted for elder brother to the Simha of the Jalalpuram

and Udayendram grants. It has also to be agreed to that the younger brother was on the throne while the elder was alive (Si, Ur). We must confess to ignorance on how this had come to pass. It may be that the elder brother yielded, or that the younger brother seized, crown and sceptre.

King Simha and prince Simha-vishnu of the latest of the grants (Pl) are in the correct context on only two rungs of the Vāyalur record (Vā. 49, 50). The probable lateness of the characters of the grant of these two potentates does not serve to warp the sequence of succession.

These are indications of the *modus operandi* in settling the sequences. Further elaboration or illustration is superfluous.

While Prince Vishnu-gopa figures in the series of seven related grants of which the Chura grant is the latest (Si, Ur, Mg, Pi, OS, Vi, Cu), he is not to be found in the Vayalur sequence. Being grand-father of the king Vishnu-gopa (Vā. 45) who is the grantor of the Chura gift, and being father of Simha (Vā. 44) who is the grantor of the Omgodu-Skandhavara gifts, he is properly in place in the genealogical scheme in those grants. The practice in the grants is to record the names of the grantor's three agnatic ascendants, whether they were kings or not. This Vishnu-gopa, not having graduated into king, is out of place in the Vayalur record, which is one that confines itself to the succession of kings, and does not attempt an enumeration of ancestors. We are, thus, able to explain also how Buddhānkura, whom we know of as no more than prince in the Gurrapadeya grant, finds mention in the Vayalur sequence (Vā. 35): apparently, he did ascend the throne in due time, though in circumstances to which we have no clue.

Vira-kurcha of the Darsi grant, whose relationship to Skanda, the earliest king of the Chendalur sequence, had earlier to be left undetermined, turns out to be Skanda's father, if we place reliance on the Vayalur record in which they are in uninterrupted juxtaposition (Vā. 29, 30).

In a generation prior to this Vira-kurcha must be placed a Vishnu-gopa who appears in the Kasakkudi grant (Kā. 13), but he cannot be appreciably earlier in time as his place is just below that of Kāna-gopa who, in the Vayalur record, occurs

just above this Vira-kurcha (they being Vā. 28, 29). It may, therefore, be that this Vishnu-gopa is either younger brother to Kāna-gopa or elder brother to Vira-kurcha.

In immediate ascent from Kana-gopa occurs a Skanda-mūla in the Vayalur sequence (Vā. 27). Though one cannot be positive on whether this king is identical with the Skanda of the Mayidavolu and the Hirahadahalli grants, it is still to be borne in mind that the only Skanda further above is the Skanda of Kasakkudi (Kā. 10) intercalatable in the Vayalur list between its 9th and 16th kings, but this is a generation that is too early. Considering, however, that palaeographically the Skanda of the two earliest records (Md, Hi) points to a stage that corresponds to Skanda-mula's, it may not be improper to identify this Skanda of these two records with this Skanda-mula.

The name just higher in the Vayalur list, Vishnu-gopa (Vā. 26), a name not unknown to the grants we have considered, is, probably, that of the father of this Skanda or Skanda-mula (Vā. 27). He may, therefore, be the Bappa of one of the grants (Hi.) of this Skanda, if he cannot be ancestor yet higher up, or, perhaps, even spiritual preceptor.

Though for the rulers still higher up,—such as up to Kālabhartṛ,—we have testimony in the Vayalur (Vā. 21-3) and the Velur-palaiyam (Vē. 10-13) grants, we have no knowledge of how far they happen to be persons of history.

The two Simhas who occur in successive entries in the Vayalur record get separated in the reconciled genealogy, one getting into the main stock and the other falling into the collateral line.

The reconciliation attempted here has, thus, stood the tests that it has had to face.

It must not be overlooked that though, in this reconciliation, a person has been adjudged a paternal uncle or a brother, he has to be taken to have been king in status, the basis of the reconciliation being that every one who is in the Vayalur list, or is intercalatable in it, was, in fact, a king. Our inability to account for collaterals being on the throne occasionally cannot stand in the way of our having to recognise them as having reigned as kings.

5. IN TIME

The accession of the first king of the Later Pallavas, Simha-vishnu of Kanchi (Vā. 50), is generally placed in about 585 A.D. The sway of the early Pallavas must have come to an end with him. For only one of the grantors of the early charters do we get a regnal year as high as the 33rd (OT). For one alone of the others do we know of a reign of nineteen years. The highest regnal year in the other grants is 12. The early grants are otherwise free from clues that could help to date them and their kings. It is only by some rule of reign-lengths based on averages that we may hope to locate these kings in time. The average of sixteen years to a reign, yielded by a number of south Indian dynasties, is adopted tentatively in Table C. The reigns of two kings of one generation are taken to have covered 32 years.

An Asoka of about 150-250 A.D., mentioned in an inscription in what might be a piece from a Chaitya at Salihundam (Srikakulam district)¹ bears a name found in a very early generation of the Vayalur list (Vā. 9), but we have no warrant for either presuming that the Salihundam Asoka is a Pallava or for looking for a Pallava so far north as Salihundam.

An inscription of about 275-300 A.D. at Manchikallu (Guntur district) tells of a Pallava Simha.² Nothing is told of him, however, which enables us to link him with the line of Kanchi. Though we know of no Simha in the Vayalur and allied records till we come low down (as low as the 40th name) in the Vayalur record—too low for a personage of the close of the 3rd century A.D.—we may not still brush this Simha aside as a stranger to the Kanchi branch, the provenance of his record being within that region which is associated with these early Pallavas. It is wise to take it that the names high up in the Vayalur list are only a selection, in which this Simha has got ignored, unless we assume that he belonged to a collateral branch.

In the famous *digvijaya* of the illustrious Samudragupta, about 360 A.D., a Vishnu-gopa of Kanchi appears to have been an opponent. If it is permissible to take this Vishnu-gopa for a Pallava, in reliance on his name recurring frequently in the known Pallava records and on his being said to be of Kanchi, not-

1. *EI.*, 31 : 87-8.

2. *EI.*, 32 : 87-90.

withstanding that he is not specifically called a Pallava, he may be, not the earliest known Pallava Vishnu-gopa (Vā. 14), who is too early to have met Samudragupta, but one of the Vishnu-gopas who came later (Vā. 26, or 28a) in the Pallava King Lists.

Two Skanda-śishyas are mentioned in a grant from Rayakotta,³ the first as the progenitor of the line and the second as the grantor in a generation low down. The second is usually taken for a Pallava and is identified with the only Skanda-sishya in a King List (Vā. 13), but this is not likely, for, though the second Skanda-sishya's earliest royal ancestor is the first Skanda-sishya, this early Skanda-sishya's father is Asvatthaman, not Pallava. This Skanda-sishya must, therefore, be brother to Pallava. The later Skanda-sishya becomes an Asvatthamid, not a Pallavid, unless we assume that accident accounts for the omission of the name Pallava in the Rayakotta grant.

To one of these two Skanda-sishyas is frequently equated a Skanda-sishya mentioned as an early king in an inscription at Tiruk-kalu-kunram⁴, but there is nothing to show that this king is a Pallava. No happier is the suggestion that he is the Skanda-sena of the Vallam cave (Chingleput district),⁵ who is dateable about 600 A.D.

A Western Ganga inscription, believed to be dateable in the 5th century A. D., tells of a king of that line and his son,—Ayya and Madhava,—having been crowned, respectively, by a Pallava Simha and by his son Skanda. It is claimed that from a Jain work, the *Loka-Vibhāga*, the accession of this Simha is deducible as 436 A. D.⁶ If the genealogy of Table B is reliable, there is no Skanda as immediate successor to a Simha except in the two collateral lines,—that of Udayendram (Vā. 43, 44) and that other the four kings (Vā. 37-40) of which are not spoken to by any grants,—but these kings are all in generations too late to be taken to the middle of the 5th century A. D. It is noteworthy that these two Pallava kings are not stated, in the Western Ganga inscription, to be of Kanchi. It is also remarkable that the Pallavas of Kanchi do not lay claim to the achievement.

3. *EI.*, 5 : 49-53.

4. *EI.*, 3 : 277-8.

5. *SII.*, 2 : 341; 12 : 9; see also *MER.*, 1953 : p.55 : para. 5.

6. *EI.*, 14 : 334. See also *Mys. AS. AR.*, 1930 : 259.63; 1932 : 124.8; *EI.*, 24 : 236-7.

The genealogy in Table B may turn out to be unreliable, but the chances of this equation will not improve in the result. The regions to the west of Śrīśailam having been lost to the Pallavas from the days of the foundation of the Kadamba dynasty by Mayura-sarman, about 300 A.D., it is difficult to invest the the Pallavas of Kanchi with power enough to play overlords to rulers beyond their frontiers. Moreover, the reliability of the datum in the *Loka-Vibhāga* itself has been severely assailed.⁷ Nor is the possibility to be excluded of the Pallavas of a different stock,— such as those of an early Nolamba line,— having been in power in the region adjoining that of the Gangas.

An inscription of about the 11th century A.D. at Amaravati (Guntur district) tells of a Pallava line in which the earlier members bear names different from those we have been considering.⁸ Apparently, this line is testimony to the main stock having, even early in its history, put forth many other branches, of which we know of at least two as important,—that of Tri-nayana Pallava and that of the Nolambas.

Quite a number of Pallavas other than those spoken to by the earlier and the later records of the Pallavas of Kanchi have come to light. It is best to treat them as testifying to the scattering of members and lines of Pallava stock in widely separated regions though, however, they did not achieve prominence.

The chronology implied in the sequence presented in the Velur-palaiyam grant,— a record of the later Pallavas,— becomes difficult of acceptance when the sequence is taken along with the bits of information on history which are found tacked on.

While we have found that the Vishnu-gopa of Samudragupta's time, who is specifically assigned to Kanchi, is identifiable,— if he was a Pallava,— with only one of two namesakes of his in the Pallava King Lists (Vā. 26, or Vā. 28a), the taking of Kanchi by the Pallavas is assigned, in the Velur-palaiyam grant, to a successor, Kumāra-vishṇu (Vā 31, Vē 14). To put it differently, the taking of Kanchi by Kumara-vishnu (Vā 31, Table C) is in the fourth or in the sixth generation after the Vishnu-gopa,— hypothetically Pallava,— who already had Kanchi for capital (Vā 26, 28ā). This is a knot that cannot be unravelled,

7. V. Mirashi, in *IHQ.*, (1951) 27: 343-4.

8. *SII.*, 1: 25.8.

but it can be cut by refusing to identify the Kumara-vishnu who took Kanchi (Vē. 14) with the earliest namesake of his in the Vayalur list (Vā 31) and by intercalating him in the Vayalur list above the earlier of the two Vishnu-gopas of Samudragupta (Vā 26), but after both Vira-kurcha and Skanda-sishya (Vā 23, 23ā). Buddha (Vē. 15), next below Kumara-vishnu, will also have to be similarly intercalated, in spite of a Kumara-vishnu and a Buddha to correspond being present in the Vayalur genealogy (Vā. 31, 32).

The taking of Kanchi, being considered in this grant to be a significant event in the career of this dynasty, might not have been much later than the emergence of this line into the limelight. For the Vira-kurcha of the Velur-palaiyam grant (Vē. 12) the claim is made that he grasped power and the hand of a princess Nāgini, simultaneously, and for the Skanda-sishya who is presented as his immediate successor (Vē. 13) credit is claimed for seizing the *ghaṭika* of the Brahmanas from king Satya-sena. The *ghaṭika* is, in all probability, the organization which had the constitutional privilege of recognizing a claimant to a throne as legitimate heir, or successor, and of placing the crown on his head. We may, therefore, indulge in the conjecture that this Vira-kurcha, through his own conquests and through a marriage alliance, stepped into a chieftaincy and that this Skanda-sishya rose higher and, achieving greater power and attaining royal rank, compelled the *ghaṭika* to 'place the crown on his head.'⁹ Though we have no knowledge of who the Satya-sena is whom he deprived of the crown, it is not improbable, that he was one of the later Ikshvakus or a feudatary of that line.

The list would, then, yield a sequence such as what follows,—a sequence that does look probable.

Vira-kurcha, who took Nāgini and Royalty	Vā 23	Vē 12
Skanda-sishya, who took the <i>ghaṭika</i>	Vā 23a	Vē 13
Kumara-vishnu, who took Kanchi	Vā 23b	Vē 14
Chandra	Vā 24	
Karāla	Vā 25	
Vishnu-gopa, who opposed Samudragupta	Vā 26	
Skanda-(mūla), of Md, Hi grants	Vā 27	

9. For atleast the Tamil country this conclusion seems to have warrant, advertance being had to the function of the *ghaṭika* inferable from the account of events in the Vaikuntha-Perumal Temple inscription relating to the accession of Nandi-varman Pallava-malla of the Hiranya-varman stock (*ASI.M.*: No. 63) and the account, in Sekkilar's *Periya Puranam*, of the refusal of the Brahmanas of the Chidambaram temple to crown Kurruva-Nayanar, an usurper.

This scheme involves, however, reliance on intercalation as a mode of reconciliation in marked preference to reliance on equations. And, in this case, the earlier list of Vayalur is sought to be amended in the light of a later one which is farther in time from the facts. None the less, it is possible to plead for the acceptance of this scheme of sequentation on one important ground. If this Vishnu-gopa (Vā 26) is the antagonist of Samudragupta it is not unlikely that he, on the departure of that invader, claimed a victory and indulged in the celebration of that mark of victory over all, the Asvamedha. It is also likely that Vishnu-gopa's son Skanda (Vā 27), having partaken in that celebration, as by playing escort to the horse in its tour of challenge, felt justified, on his father's death, in claiming to have enacted the Asvamedha as his own, though applying a term of veneration, Bappa, to the father. It is in this Skanda's reign that the grant found at Gurrupadeya was issued. This place-name has the meaning 'The Horse's Foot'. An important feature in the ritual of the Asvamedha is the bringing of a horse to the altar and the making of offerings in the hoof-prints which it leaves behind.¹⁰ Gurrupadeya was evidently the scene of the Asvamedha, whether celebrated by Skanda by himself or as participant with Vishnu-gopa.¹¹

All speculation on these events is conditioned by the dating of Mayura-sarman's attack on Kanchi and foundation of the Kadamba kingdom. If Mayura-sarman did worst a Pallava of Kanchi and if this was about 300 A.D., the coming of the Pallava power to Kanchi must have been earlier still. This does give us the very early date for this event that we require for Vira-kurcha and his Nagini and Royalty.

10. *Satapatha-Brahmana*, 6. 3.3.9.

11. In the course of a study of the names of fields in Tiruk-Kannan-Gudi, a village about 8 miles west of Negapatam (in the Tanjore district), I found that not only the name Kudiraik-Kal-Adi,—in Tamil, the language of the region, meaning 'Horse's Foot-Print',—but also other names had associations with the Asvamedha, and fell into a close complex of adjoining fields. In a paper presented to this Society in about 1952, I suggested, in explanation, that either the sacrifice had been performed in the area which is now covered by those fields or that the names of the fields had been taken over from a village, directly or through more than one remove, where the sacrifice had in fact been performed.

A similar survey of field-names at Gurrupadeya may yield remains of the sacrificial altars and annexes, helping greatly to a study of the Asvamedha as a ritual.

Nandi, also of Udayendram (Vā 45, Vē 17), is credited, by the Velur-palaiyam grant, with making a *Dr̥shṭi-visha* dance. A *Dr̥shṭi-visha* occurring in a late record from Sindavāḍi, the exploit has been interpreted as a victory over a border chief.¹² This may well prove a shrewd guess, but we are yet to know that Nandi's Kanchi kingdom stretched far enough north or that the Sindavadi chief ventured far enough south.

We have, thus, to conclude that the scraps of information found in the Velur-palaiyam grant have not helped us to improve substantially on the sequence we have evolved through a reconciliation of the sixteen grants of the early rulers among themselves and with the Vayalur record and that in regard to the attribution of the achievements of the family to its kings the testimony is not as satisfactory as it could have been. For the present we shall not be wrong if we disregard the attributions of events found in the Velur-palaiyam grant. So, the intercalations in the Vayalur list introduced on the authority of this grant (Table C) may well be ignored, till confirmed by other evidence.

The Vayalur record, on the other hand, emerges as a trustworthy document. Its congruence with the sequence evoked from the sixteen early grants gives it unimpeachable authority and value. To Nara-simha II-Raja-simha must go the credit of propounding a very reliable King List,—indeed, the earliest of reliable south Indian genealogies.

6. IN SPACE.

Kanchi is found stated, in five of the grants of these Pallavas, to be the capital of four of their kings,—of the Skanda of the two earliest grants (Md, Hi), of Kumara-vishnu of Chendalur, of the Simha of the newly discovered grant (Ja) and of the Nandi of one of the two latest grants (Ud). The earliest (Md) of these grants is issued to an officer at Amaravati (Guntur District) and the property granted is in the neighbourhood. The grant next in time (Hi), though evidently of the same grantor, makes a gift of demesnes in the Bellari region, on the borders of the Andhra and the Karnataka states. Eleven other grants, two of them mentioning Kanchi, were found in, and relate to, estates in

12. Venkata-Ramanayya, in *JAHS.*, 12: 141-8.

the Guntur and the Nellore districts, which, lying in the south-east of Andhra-land, skirt the Bay of Bengal.

The famous Kanchi is in Tamil land and is about 50 miles to the south-west of Madras City. Away from this Kanchi, somewhat to north-east, lies Amaravati: much to north-west lies Bellari: to the north-west of Bellari lies Amaravati. The distance each way is about 250 miles.

None but the demesnes made gifts of under the two latest of the grants (Ud, Pl.) are situate round about this Kanchi or in the Tamil country. The demesne granted under one of the frants (Ud) is in Udayendram, a frontier out-post in Kongu land, forming the middle section of the western marches of the Tamil country. One of the demesnes under one of the earliest records (Hi.) is to north-west of Kanchi, lying as far off as 250 miles. All the other demesnes lie, as we have seen, along the north-east line from Kanchi to Amaravati,— that is, in the Nellore-Guntur region,— and they lie nearer Amaravati than Kanchi. What is more, the later the grantor the greater is the distance of the granted demesnes from Amaravati, and the closer the proximity to present-day Kanchi. Even so, the limits of the Tamil land are not reached till the time of the latest of this line of kings. The inferences from these circumstances are clearly that it is unlikely that the well-known Kanchi was effectively the capital of this line of kings till late days and that the Kanchi of the earlier kings could not have been so far south. Were the Kanchi of the Tamil-land unknown to us, we would be looking in the Nellore-Guntur region for the Kanchi of the earlier records.

Geographical dissociation from the region effectively ruled over is not the only difficulty. Literary and linguistic facts and political factors point unmistakeably to a dissociation of these Pallavas from the Kanchi of the Tamil country.

If it is at Kanchi of the Tamil land that these Pallavas had set up their throne from, say, 300 A.D.— so dating the Skanda of their earliest grants (Md, Hi)— or even from the earlier days to which we could take Vira-kurcha and Skanda-sishya (Vā. 23, 23a), they must have had Tamil-land for their ancient home, nothing being known definitely of their having belonged to any other region. This makes it difficult to account for Tamil literature, throughout its career, declining to accord them a place along with

the Cholas, the Pandyas and the Cheras as kings native to its region, though its members styled themselves kings and even the earliest of them claimed to have performed the Asvamedha. Indeed, it is difficult to account for the Pallavas being unknown wholly to early Tamil literature if their Kanchi had lain in Tamil land.

Later protagonists,— including modern ones,— of the view that these Pallavas had the Tamil Kanchi for their seat, from as early a time as we have knowledge of them, can rely on only two hypotheses in justification. One would be that the Pallavas were none but the Tiraiyans of early Tamil literature. But this does not account either for the Tiraiyans having failed to achieve the distinction gained by the other three dynasties or for the Tiraiyans being unknown to Tamil literature as great kings who had held sway up to Amaravati, if not up to Bellari too. The other would be that early Tamil literature,— known as Śaṅgam literature,— is later than 300 or 350 A.D. This hypothesis is even more futile, for, then, the Pallava dynasty and Sangam literature would have been contemporaneous, with a common home, and, yet, the Pallavas are not known to Sangam literature.

Nor have we any trace, in the Tamil literature contemporary with the early Pallavas, of the influence of either Karnataka, the language of the Bellari region, or of Telugu, the language of the Amaravati region, though Kanchi, as the capital of a kingdom extending to these limits, must have thronged with administrators, soldiers and commonalty speaking either language. When shortly after the inception of this early dynasty of Kanchi of the Pallava line, its territories to the west of the Prēhara and, of Śrīśailam,— a temple-town about few miles to the west of Amaravati,—were lost by it to Mayūra-śarman, founder of the Kadamba line, about 300 A.D.,¹ the Kannaḍa influence must have greatly declined at this Kanchi, but the Telugu influence must, *ergo*, have gained in intensity for lack of another culture to complete. No trace, however, is detectable of Telugu influence having affected the Tamil language. That it is not a little proper to expect vestiges of Telugu influence is brought out by records incorporating words ending with Telugu terminations having become current on the Later Pallava Mahendra settling down in the Tamil region, about 600 A.D., with the might of administrative and military

1. *EI.*, 8: 34-5.

contingents drawn from the Telugu country to maintain control over Tamil territories and, thereby, enabling Telugu to infiltrate Tamil.

Another problem too of south Indian history compels us to examine the possibility of all but the two latest kings of the early Pallava line having had the Kanchi of the Tamil country for their capital.

A line of Cholas is found established in Rē-nāḍu, the region that lies to the west of the Nellore country. The most distinguished member of the line is Punya-kumara, of about 625-50 A.D. A predecessor of his is attributable to about 550 A.D.² This line claiming to be descended from Karikala, a Chola of the Sangam Age, and glorifying him with an achievement that is generally taken to be one conceived in the mythic vein, it is reasonable to take it that Karikala is a figure of a period not later than 450 A.D.,—leaving out of account those considerations which would place him in a much earlier period. Karikala is accepted to have been of the Kaveri region. There is authority for his having held the Tondai country, of which Kanchi is the principal city, if not the capital, but the view is discounted by some. It is not improbable that a descendant of his, sometime about 450 A.D. marched north,—whether from the land of the Kaveri or from the Kanchi of the Tondai land,—into territories which formed the western part, or lay on the western margins, of the Nellore-Guntur region, approximating to Rē-nāḍu, then to the west of the dominions of the early Pallavas,—and settled down to the enjoyment of a well-earned kingdom. This possibility cannot be brushed aside except on a hypothesis of the Cholas of Re-nadu having come to that region from a quarter other than the south,—for which there is not a tittle of evidence.

The rise of this kingdom about 450 to 500 A.D. and its prosperity from about 550 A.D. onward pose the very intriguing problem of whether the early Pallavas were then in possession of Kanchi and the Tondai country round about it. The Pallavas, had they been then in Tondai land, would not have allowed the descendant of Karikala to pass past Kanchi itself, or the region round it, and reach Re-nadu, to be a thorn to them

in two sides,— in the north and in the west. The Cholas cannot be credited with a leap from the banks of the Kaveri that took them, high and dry, into the firmanent and beyond the Tondai land and deposited them neatly in the farther off Re-nadu. The foundation of the Re-nadu Chola kingdom by a descendant of Karikala about 450-500 A.D. is consistent only with Kanchi of the Tondai country having then been in the hands of the newly come Cholas to the exclusion of the early Pallavas.

The averment in the Velur-palaiyam grant that Buddha (Vā. 32, Vē 15) was a submarine fire to the Cholas has, therefore, to be taken to be testimony, from the Pallavas, not to a southward Pallava expansion from the Nellore-Guntur region to Tondai-nadu or to Chola-nadu but, to the northern advance of the Cholas of the Karikala line and to their settlement in Re-nadu.

The conclusions are inescapable that Karikala had occupied Kanchi of Tondai-nadu, that the expansion of his successors to the Re-nadu region was about 400-450 A.D. and that a counter expansion of the Pallavas, with the occupation of Karikala's Kanchi — of Tamil land,— took place under the only Skanda of the Udayendran line (Vā. 44),— that is about 440 A.D.

This hypothesis of a Kanchi in the Nellore-Guntur region distinct from the Kanchi of the Tondai region is necessitated by the considerations the weight of which is unquestionable.

7. KANCHI

The Tamil city now famous as Kāñchipuram is first called by that name in only the Udayendram grant, assignable to about 555 A.D. In early Tamil literature the city is spoken of uniformly as Kachchi. No indication is available, in that or in other literature, of how the name came to be also Kanchi. That Kachchi has come to be Sanskritized into Kanchi is no more probable than that the latter was an adaptation in Tamil in the former form.

The region of the Tamil country of which the now famous Kanchi was the principal city, in the early days we are concerned with, was known as Tondai, in Tamil,¹ and Tuṇḍira or Tuṇḍraka,

1. For instance : *Aha-Na-Nuru*, 213 : 1.3 ; *Kurnm-Tohai*, 260 : 4.6.

in Samskrta. Chola kings occasionally, and Pallava kings frequently, are found styled,— even called,— after this Tondai region. Was it because of their origin having been in that region or because of their having held sway over it ?

The name Tondai being identical with the name Tundrakai- (bhukti)² current in the second half of the 5th century A.D., for a region situate on the far off Mahānadi, might really have travelled north or south, but, in either case, the name, in the one form or the other, must have been more ancient than we have records for.

Migrations of names of important places into this Tondai land itself are not to be blinked out.

Aḍayār, then the name of a place which now is a suburb of Madras city, and of also another place near Vaniyambadi (North Arcot district),³ appears to be a name that had migrated, the name Aḍayāra having been borne, in the second half of the 6th century A.D., by a village near Balasore in Orissa state.⁴

Tumbavanam, now a quarter of the Kanchi of Tondai land, bears a name which is that of the Tumbavana famous in the distant Gwalior country.⁵

For many years now, it has been clear that the well-known name Mahā-bali-puram, a conventionalization of Mā-Malla-puram, is not to be derived from the title Mā-Malla of the famous Nara-simha I, later Pallava king, who is generally believed to have founded the city and given to it his name, for the *Avanti-Sundari-Kathā* has made it clear that at least the foundation of the city had been much earlier. Indeed, the name could be accounted for as an adaptation of a name which could have become Mā-malla in Tamil, Mahā-malla in Samskrta, and Mā-māla in the language round about Karle in Maharashtra,— all by about the second century A.D.,— for we know that the name 'Malla' is associated with this port in Tamil literature not later than the 6th century

2. *EI.* 9 : ; 283 : 265. See also *Ib.*, 13 : 107 ; *SII.*, 1. 146 ; 2. 342.—.

3. *EI.*, 5 : 50, 52, 53 ; 4 : 183 ; 5 : 52.

4. *EI.*, 23 : 199, 201.

5. *EI.*, 26 : 115 ; *ASI. R.*

A.D., and that Mā-māla is the name of an āhāra (administrative division) near Karle in the 2nd century A.D.⁶ Substituting 'pura' ('city') for āhāra ('division'), we get the name Mā-māla-pura,— just the name we expect to be borne by a port that has attained city status: it is also just the name that would get transformed into Mā-malla-pura after Mahā-malla's days.⁷

Considering that names are known to the Puranas which would give rise to place-names such as Kanchi, Kachchi and Kochchi, the probabilities are that names such as these kept travelling, assuming various shapes as they travelled, and becoming attached to more than one place in the country.

While the famous Kanchi-pura, in the Tamil land, is situated at 13° 40' N: 76° 25' E., we know of at least five other places bearing the same name and situate at different points.⁸

12° 20' N: 78° 55' E	19° 15' N: 78° 05' E
23° 05' N: 83° 55' E	23° 05' N: 85° 55' E
23° 05' N: 91° 05' E	

We know of numerous places in different parts of the country in the names of which 'Kanchi' is an element. Just a few examples should suffice.

Kanchi-bari	Kanchi-kudi	Kanchika-cherla
Kanchi-nagar-konda	Kanchi-Kuval	Kanchi-Tundam
Kona-Kanchi	Kanchi-parti	Perum-Kanchi
Kanchi-pītha	Kanchi-samudra	Penu-Kanchi-prolu
Kanchi-gadde	Kanchi-vay	

It need cause us no surprise, therefore, if the name Kanchi itself is a migration, from somewhere, to both the Krishna and the Palar regions.⁹

What, becomes clear on the evidence is that we have to infer the existence of a Kanchi from about the middle of the 4th century A.D. in the region immediately to the south of the Krishna as it reaches the sea, and that we do know of another Kanchi on the

6. *EI*. 7: Karle 19: 64-5; 4: Kanheri 5; 8 Nasik 3.

7. There will still be those who will continue to speak of Mahabalipuram having been founded by Nara-simha I Maha-Malla and of the Vaishnava Alvar, Bhuta, who has a hymn on the Vishnu enshrined there, being, therefore, later than that king.

8. *Gazetteer of India and Pakistan* (1950).

9. See also the last three paragraphs of the NOTE at the end of this paper

Palar though from only the middle of the 6th century. More : in both regions the name is that of the capital of the early Pallavas,— of the earlier members of the line in the northern region and of the later members in the southern region.

We have seen that the only early Pallava grant claiming expressly to be of a king with capital at Kanchi and dealing with property in the Tamil land is that known after Udayendram, the grantor being Nandi (Vā. 45). We have also seen not only that his grandfather, Simha (Vā. 43), but also that the three grantors in the other line down to him of his own generation,— that is, Prince Vishnu-gopa,— and kings Simha and Vishnu-gopa (Vā. 47, 48), issued grants from a Kanchi, disposing of estates in the Nellore-Guntur region. We know also that it is in the next generation after him and in the other line that Simha (Vā. 49) issues a grant of land nearer the Tamil Kanchi than the Nellore-Guntur region.

A fair reconciliation of these facts stands effected if we assume that developments occurred as below : after the earliest Simha (Vā. 43) of the Udayendram grant, his son Skanda (Vā. 44) probably lost control of the Nellore-Guntur region with its Kanchi, but acquired dominion over the Tondai-Tundraka region, with its Kachchi for capital and with Kachchi-vāy (Gate to Kachchi), which later became Udayendram, for frontier out-post : this Skanda gave the name Kanchi to Kachchi in commemoration of his advent into that region : this Skanda's line endured down into the days of his son Nandi, and grand-son, Simha (Vā. 45, 46), while the other line¹⁰ continued to hold sway under its Simha and Vishnu-gopa (Vā. 47, 48) over the Nellore-Guntur region with its Kanchi : the line of Kachchi-Kanchi becoming extinct with Simha, the last of its members (Vā. 46), his contemporary in the other line, Simha (Vā. 49), aided powerfully by his son Simha-vishnu (Vā. 50), annexed Tondai-Tundraka with its Kachchi-Kanchi to the hereditarily held region in the north : Simha-vishnu moved south and established his line in Kachchi-Kanchi, because of developments in the northern regions and of some loss of territory there and became the founder of the Later Pallava line.

Henceforth, the homeland of these Pallavas was that sector of the Tamil country that lies about Kachchi-Kanchi. The Later Pallavas grew up more as Tamilians than as Telugus,— a

10. It is not yet clear which of these two is the main line.

result that was promoted by the vigour with which the Western and the Eastern Chalukyas and the Rashtrakutas sought to confine them to their Tamil possessions.

The great power to which Simha-vishnu's line grew should have put Kachchi-Kanchi in the lime-light while the light that had beat on the parent Kanchi of the Nellore-Guntur region must have failed in some little while. Till about 845 A.D., the Pallavas, through their making of the Tondai country their homeland, kept Karikala's descendants in that region from rising into the importance for which Karikala had, in numerous ways, laid the foundations.

8. ORIGINS.

Of the many theories propounded on the origin of the Pallavas there is none that commends itself to acceptance. Attention is focussed here on only one of the traditions, it being the most discussed. The tradition turns out to be an adaptation on an adaptation. Other material is merely glanced at to bring out the complexities in the problem.

A tradition current in the Tamil country is presented in fractions in literary works. One part of the tradition relates how a Tiraiyan, prince sprung from a Chola-Naga royal liaison beyond the seas, was wafted to Chola shores by the waves of the sea, and how he was recognised for what he was, through his wearing at his wrist a sprig of the *tonḍai* plant, as had been agreed on in advance. Another part of the tradition tells of Kāvērip-paṭṭiṇam, the port at the mouth of the river Kāvēri in the Chola land, known in still earlier days as Kākandi, getting submerged through a swelling up of the sea in high wrath because of the Chola's neglect to perform the year's festival to Indra, through his having got distraught by hopes and fears over the fate, in a mishap to a ship on the high seas, of his princeling who, with a bit of the *tonḍai* creeper tied to him for identification, had been sent to him across the seas by Pili-Vaḷai, daughter of a Naga king, Vaḷai-vaṇan, she having borne the child as fruit of a liaison with that Chola. This princeling is taken for the first of the Pallavas.

The *tonḍai* creeper winds into the tradition for no purpose but that of accounting, in purely Tamil terms,—*tonḍai*, in Tamil, being a creeper, which, apparently, was taken as equivalent to,

TABLE A.—EARLY

PALLAVA CHARTERS: ANALYSIS

Names linked with

Brackets belong to same Generation

Grant Abbrevia- tion	Mayida- volu Mv	Hirahada- halli Hi	Darsi Da	Gurra- padeya Gu	Chenda- lur Ce	Omgodu- Tamrapa OT	Uruva- palle Ur	Singara- ya Konda Si	Jalal- puram Ja	Omgodu Skandha OS	Pikira Pi	Man- gadur Mg	Vilavatti Vi	Chura Cu	Udayen- dram Ud	Pallan- kovil Pl	No
Genera- tion																	Gn
11+ +	Skanda	Khanda	11+
11+	Virakur- cha	11+
11	?	Khanda	Skanda	11
10	?	...	Kumara- Vishnu	10
9	?	Buddha	Buddha	9
8	Buddhan- kura	Kumara- vishnu	Kumara- vishnu	8
7	Skanda	Skanda	Skanda			7
6	Vira	Vira	Vira	Vira	Vira	Vira	Vira	Vira	6
5	Skanda	Skanda	Skanda	Skanda	Skanda	Skanda	Skanda	Skanda	Skanda	Skanda	...	5
4	Vishnu- gopa	Vishnu- gopa	Simha	Vishnu- gopa	Vishnu- gopa	Vishnu- gopa	Vishnu- gopa	Vishnu- gopa	Simha	...	4
3	Vishnu gopa	Skanda	...	3
2	Nandi	...	2
1	Simha	1
Particulars																Simha- vishnu	
Provenance	Mayidavolu	Hirahada- halli	Darsi	Gurrapada- ya	Chendalur	Narasara- pet tk.	—	Singaraya -konda	Jalalpura	Narasara- pet tk.	Neletur	—	Vavveru	Daggu- padu	Udayen- dram	Pallan koil	
Regnal Year	(10 ?)	8	—	1	2	33	Simha's 11	Simha's 12	19	4	5	8	10	?	5	Simha 6	
Issue from	Kanchipura	Kanchipura	Dasanapura	—	Kanchipura	Tamrapa	Palakkada	Palakkada	Kanchi- pura	V. Skanda- vara	Menma- tura	Dasana- pura	Padduka	Palatkata	Kanchi- puram	Amanserk- kai	
Grant of	Viripara	Chillareka- kodumka	—	Kataka ?	Chendalura	Omgodu.	Uruvapalle	Modunga- raya	Vesanta	Omgodu	Pikira	Mangadur	Vilavatti	Chura	—	Venkun- ram	
In Rashtra	Andhra- patha	Satahani	—	—	Karma	Karma	Munda	Munda	—	Karma	Munda	Venigo	Munda	Karma	Adeyara	—	
Language	Prkrita	Prkta & Skta	Sanskrita	Prkta & Skta	Sanskrita	Sanskrita	Sanskrita	Sanskrita	Sanskrita	Sanskrita	Sanskrita	Sanskrita	Sanskrita	Sanskrita	Sanskrita	Skta & Tam.	
Reference:	EI. 6. 84-91	EI. 2-10	EI. 1. 397-8	EI. 8. 143-6	EI. 233-6	EI. 15. 251-52	IA. 5. 50-3	Bharati	TASSI.	EI. 15. 242-	EI. 8. 159-63	IA. 5. 154-7	EI. 24. 296	EI. 24. 137	EI. 3. 142-7	TASSI	

TABLE B.

LATER RECORDS: RECONCILIATION OF GENEALOGIES

VAYALUR	KASAKKUDI	VELURPALAIYAM
1 Brahman	1 Brahman	1 Brahman
2-6 (Five Names)	2-6 (Five Names)	2-6 (Five Names)
7 Asvatthaman	7 Asvatthaman	7 Asvatthaman
8 Pallava	8 Pallava	8 Pallava
9 Asoka	9 Asoka	9 Asoka
9a ...	10 Skanda	...
10-13 (Four names)
14 Vishnu-gopa
15 Dhrtaka
16 Kalinda	11 Kalinda	...
17-18 (Two Names)
19 Vimala
20 Konkanika
21 Kala-bhartr	...	10 Kala-bhartr
22 Chuta	...	11 Chuta
23 Vira-kurcha	...	12 Virakurcha (Nagini and Royalty)
23a	13 Skanda-sishya, seized Ghatika
24 Chandra
25 Karala
26 Vishnu-gopa
27 Skanda.mula
28 Kana-gopa	12 Kana-gopa	...
28a ...	13 Vishnu-gopa	...
29 Vira-kurcha	14 Vira-kurcha	...
29a ...	15 Vira-simha	...
30 Skanda
31 Kumara-vishnu	...	14 Kumara-Vishnu, seized Kanchi
32 Buddha	...	15 Buddha, <i>contra</i> Cholas
33 Skanda
34 Kumara-vishnu
35 Buddha
36 Skanda
37 Vishnu-gopa	...	16 Vishnu-gopa
38 Vishnu.dasa
39 Skanda
40 Simha	16 Simha	...
40a ...	17 Vishnu-simha	...
41 Vira
42 Skanda
43 Simha
44 Skanda
45 Nandi	...	17 Nandi, <i>contra</i> Drshti-visha
46 Simha	...	18 Simha
47 Simha
48 Vishnu.gopa
49 Simha

TABLE C — EARLY PALLAVAS : GENEALOGY : RECONCILIATION.

* Not included in the Vayalur List. Names in *italics* are those of Grantors.

Approximate Accession A.D.		Vayalur Sequence.
251	Kala-bhartr	21
267	Chuta	22
283	Vira-kurcha Skanda-sishya	23, 23a
299	Chandra	24
315	Karala	25
331	Vishnu-gopa	26
347	Md, Hi Skanda-(Mula)	27
363	Kana-gopa Vishnu-gopa	28, 28a
379	Vira-kurcha Vira-simha	29, 29a
395	Skanda	30
411	Kumara-vishnu	31
427	Dr Buddha Skanda	32, 33
443, 459	Ce Kumara-vishnu Buddhankura	34, 35
475	Skanda Vishnu-gopa	36, 37
491	Vira Vishnu-simha Vishnu-dasa	41, 41a, 38
507	Skanda Ja Skanda	42, 39
523	Si Ur *Vishnu-gopa Mg Pi Vi OS Simha Simha	* 43, 40
539	Simha Skanda	47, 44
555	Cu Vishnu-gopa Nandi Ud	48, 45
570	Simha Simha	49, 46
585	Pl Simha-vishnu (Later Pallava)	50

or synonymous with, *pallava*,— for the occurrence in the Tamil land of the regional name, *Tuṇḍraka*,— the country ruled by the Pallavas,— which has come from mid-India. The name *Pīḷi-Vaḷai* is the product of the Tamilization of *Mayūra-Bhañja*, just as the name *Vaḷai-vaṇan* is a transformation of *Bhañja*. *Mayūra-Bhañja*, in Orissa, is, par excellence, the land of the *Nāgas*, and a distinguished dynasty of some antiquity is that of the *Bhanjas* in the hinterlands of Orissa and Bengal. We know of more than one region in the country which was known as *Sagara* and of atleast one line of kings called the *Sagaras*, who could be *Sāgaras* because of descent from an eponymous *Sagara*: a princeling from *Sagara* would be a *Sāgara*, renderable in Tamil into *Tiraiyan*. We know also of kings with the name *Samudra*, which too signifies the sea.¹ The Chola port at the mouth of the *Kaveri* had borne the name *Kākandi* before it acquired the name *Kaverip-paṭṭinam*.² From early Tamil literature we know that *Pavattiri* was the capital of *Tiraiyan*³ and, from inscriptions, we know that *Pavattiri* was situate in a 'Kākandi district swallowed by the sea' and that *Pavattiri* is almost identifiable with the present-day *Reddipalaiyam*,⁴ a townlet that, being situate in the southern-most part of the *Nellore* district, is involved in the watery maze that is the *Pulicat Lake*,— rather, *Lagoon*,— which is an irruption of the waters of the *Bay of Bengal* into the southern-most portion of the *Nellore* district.

Kākandi was once a flourishing port of the *Sāgara* or the *Samudra* who then held sway over the south of the *Nellore* region. The *Pulicat Lake* is the result of an incursion of the sea into an area of low-lying land known as *Kākandi*, and *Kākandi* got submerged in consequence.

The inferences are not difficult of being followed, whether in regard to the genesis of the tale or its transmission.

A tale similar to ours originated, perhaps, in the *Nellore* region, a little after the submergence of its *Kākandi*,

1. *EI.* 12 : 273; 4 : 241, 228-9; 6 : 52; 2 : 168.

2. *Mani.Mehalai*, 22 : 24.39. Perhaps, the name was due to the presence in the port of an *ayuda-jivika* force. Of *Kakandis* in the *Andhra* country there seem to have been quite a number (*Rama.Rao*, in *IHC.P.*, 2 (1938) : 187-9.

3. *Aha.Na-Nuru*. 85, 340.

4. *Nellore District*,

Sāgara-Samudra having been of this region and royal alliances having been possible between the Sāgaras-Samudras and the Nāgas-Mayūra-Bhañjas, through geographical proximities, which covered Tundraka too. Evidently, the tradition of the incursion of the Pulicat Lake had it that it was a Sāgara or a Samudra, king of that region, that had had the liaison, that it had been with a princess of the Mayura-Bhañja line and that it was shortly after the birth of a prince to the couple that there had been the overwhelming of Sāgara's,— or Samudra's,— Kākandi, by nature allowing of the formation of the Pulicat Lake. The Mayura-Bhanja country is so close to the sea that in the relevant period it could have extended along the coast and a Mayura-Bhanja-Naga princess could, as mother, have sent her child to her husband Sāgara-Samudra, by sea and the fond father could have received him at his Kākandi, sea-port near Pulicat.

Kaverip-pattinam, a very flourishing port of the Cholas, in the south and at the mouth of the Kaveri, fell into decay, much later, perhaps through the attenuation of the Kaveri, following on a phenomenal increase in the use of the waters of the river for irrigation in its upper course. The people of decayed Kaveripattinam, among whom the tale of a submergence of a Kākandi must have been current, took it that the tale did, in fact, relate to their own town, misleading themselves into the belief that the Kākandi of the tale was their own Kākandi. Sāgara-Samudra being a name applicable also to the Chola as descendant from Vishnu, the god who had made a couch of the sāgara, samudra, ocean, the naming of a Chola as the father, in the tale, instead of the Sāgara-Samudra, was, perhaps, considered a rectification of an error that had gone unnoticed.⁵

From this complex of fancies and circumstances must have developed the tale of a Sāgara-(Chola)-Nāga alliance preceding and leading to a submergence of a Kākandi, with a further

5. For another example of the motif of this tale, see Kalhana, *Rajatarangini*, 3. 391-473, telling of a Chola king, Rati-sena, receiving Vishnu's *sakti* as girl-child from beyond the seas and of she, Rana-rambha, being wed by Ranaditya, king of Kashmir. The parallelism of the occurrence of Vishnu, the sea, child coming by sea, and the Chola, in this story of distant Kashmir,—though with the variation of the child yielded up by the sea being a girl,—is not to be missed. *This motif is embodied also in myths and*

So futile is the fancy of the legend maker that we may not be sure that these tales as we have them are not outgrowths from still earlier fancies.

development, round about a decayed Kaverip-pattinam of the Chola country, of a tale of a Sāgara-Samudra-Chola-Nāga princeling coming by the sea (sāgara, samudra) wearing a Tundraka (*tondai*) cognizance to his father (Sāgara-Samudra) at Kākandi-Kaverip-pattinam, and the ensuing of a submergence of that Chola port.⁶

Even so, the association with the Pallavas would not have taken place but for the Pallavas and the Cholas having both held sway, though at different times, over not only the Nellore region but also the Kaverip-pattinam area. The Pallava does not figure in the tradition except as the end-product of the workings of a fancy which, all too patently, had convinced itself of the validity of a theory of the descent, in the agnatic line, of the Pallavas from the Cholas.

NOTE

This paper incorporates a few the conclusions that had formed part of the background to the theme of my book, *The Kaveri, the Maukharis and the Sangam Age*, (1924). It is, in effect, an epitome of portions of a work on the Pallavas which I started on in 1948, on the discovery of further material, but which I laid aside, when I had gone only part of the way, for a variety of reasons, one of which was the inadequacy of material at crucial stages. The Epigraphist to the Government of India to whom I had sent, for advice, a copy of a tentative genealogy suggested by me, wrote, on October 22, 1948, that it was receiving attention, but he too must have faced uncertainties.

One of the uncertainties has just been removed by the discovery of the Jalalpuram grant of an Early Pallava (announced in the newspapers of October 23, 1961), Confirming as it did the soundness of the genealogy I had in 1949 drawn up for the Early Pallavas and enabling me, in consequence, to speak with confidence on certain of the relevant issues, I placed this paper before this Society, on February 5, 1962, sharing, with its members

6. The story in the *Mani-Mehalai* may incorporate legends that had, indeed, grown round the Kanchi of Nellore Guntur. It may also be that the Kanchi of the *Mani Mehala* is that of the Tamil land and that, therefore, the work is later than 525 A.D., and, so too, the *Silappadhikaram*. None the less, these works were close enough to Karikala and his times to have pictured the happenings connected with them with passable accuracy. What was recollection in the days of these works must be assigned historic value, while what was only legend, even then does deserve being ignored as history.

and with the scholarly public, the conclusions that had been known only to those who were in touch with me.

In this summary I have omitted elaboration of the suggestion that I made at the Meeting that it may be worth while looking for the earlier of the two Kanchis in the vicinity of a spot which, at one time, had been a great port in that region,— a spot crowded with the places now known as Pedda and Chinna Ganjams⁷ Frangula-dibbe, Motupalle and Kanuparti. I place reliance on the cumulative force of a variety of circumstances,— on reference by Hiuen Tsang to Kanchi as either a port at a river-mouth or as an inland emporium for maritime trade and as a place sacred to the Buddha and teaming with monuments raised in it by the famous Asoka and others, on Kanchi being, in fact, an inland capital, on its being devoid of Asokan or Buddhist monuments of any size or significance, of even the *Mani-Mēhalai* mentioning only a few Buddhist monuments as located in the city, and on the spot pointed to by me being the only one along the south Indian coast of the Bay of Bengal in which remains of Buddhist monuments, of as early a period as that of the Satakarnis, have turned up.

Readers familiar with the literature bearing on the antiquity of this spot will welcome the further information that has just come in. 'About a mile and a half from the Chinna-Ganjam railway station and located on the coast is

7. No reliance is placed here on the possibility of a philological relationship between 'Ganjam' and 'Kanchi' though it cannot be cavilled at by those who derive 'Kachchi' and 'Kanchi' from each other. Nor is any point made of the parallelism in the occurrence of the epithets Pedda and Chinna-Pinna (Great and Little) in connection with both. We do not know if at least the parallel sets of names, — implied also in the case of another place, Penu-Kanchi-prolu, — did not come into vogue in the period of Chola ascendancy over the relevant Telugu regions or in the period of Vijayanagara ascendancy over the Tamil country when culture from the Tamil land flowed fruitfully into the Telugu country. It is enough for the present purpose to point out that 'Ganjam' is a term for a treasury (Kalhana, *Raja-Tarangini*, 4.589, 5.177. 7.126) and that Pedda and Chinna (Pinna) Ganjams could have at least owed their names to their having been the seats of treasuries of a king or of a merchant-guild. It does not matter either that these are post-Pallava names. What is important is that the region is such that it could geographically have been the seat of a great port and, so, the centre too of faith and culture, and that when Amaravati did grow into a great centre of Buddhism there is no reason why the region of Pedda and Chinna Ganjams could not have developed into at least equal prominence.

a huge mound covering a fairly large area, cut into two halves by the Buckingham Canal (which runs parallel to the railway line here). In channels cut to drain cultivated fields, structural remains have got exposed, datable to the early centuries of the Christian era, such as brick-walls and broken shafts of pillars, some of them in Palnad marble with typical half lotus designs. One of the pillars bore an inscription of the Ikshvaku king Vira - purusha-datta (250-270 A.D.), dated in his 18th regnal year, referring to a lay Upasaka hailing from Dhanyakataka and to his donations to a Buddhist monastery. Three images of the Buddha, and carved, but broken heads, and small sculptured slabs and pieces, perhaps belonging to a Buddhist stupa or monastery, were also found. Here might have been a metropolis or, at least, a sea-port, of the early centuries, A.D.⁸

Hiuen Tsang indulged, it appears to me, in a mixture of what is very probably incorrect, with what is undoubtedly correct. Probably, this was not without either deliberation or shrewdness. His was the method that would be second habit to a pilgrim retailing edification to pious countrymen of his thousands of miles away, who had not the urge nor the inclination, nor the opportunity, to indulge in critical verification. To rely on Hiuen Tsang in support of the suggestion about a Kanchi in the Guntur-Nellore region is to accept one part of his testimony and to reject another part. I feel that this course is justified in regard at least to his accounts of Dravida and Malakuta. Hiuen Tsang's method seems to leave us no option. But, all this take us away from the main theme of this paper. The justification of this view is reserved to another occasion.

8. Note kindly furnished, on a perusal of the script of this paper, by Dr. R. Subrahmanyam, Superintendent of the Archaeological Department of the Government of India, for this area, till recently.