

ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA.

NEW IMPERIAL SERIES, VOL. X.

SOUTH-INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS

VOLUME II

TAMIL INSCRIPTIONS IN THE RAJARAJESVARA TEMPLE AT
TANJAVUR AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS
OF THE CHOLA, PALLAVA, PANDYA AND
VIJAYANAGARA DYNASTIES.

PARTS I TO III

BY

E. HULTZSCH, PH.D.,

EPIGRAPHIST TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS (RETIRED).

PART IV

BY

THE LATE RAI BAHADUR V. VENKAYYA, M.A.,

GOVERNMENT EPIGRAPHIST FOR INDIA.

PART V WITH INTRODUCTION AND INDEX

BY

RAO SAHIB H. KRISHNA SASTRI, B.A.,

ASSISTANT ARCHÆOLOGICAL SUPERINTENDENT FOR EPIGRAPHY, SOUTHERN CIRCLE.

MADRAS:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT PRESS.
CALCUTTA: THACKER, SPINK & CO. BOMBAY: THACKER & CO (LD.).
LONDON: LUZAC & CO.



P R E F A C E.

INSCRIPTIONS of Southern India were begun to be collected systematically by Professor Hultzsch from the latter part of 1886 when he was appointed Epigraphist to the Government of Madras. The publication of these documents with texts and translations was taken up simultaneously and the following fasciculi of *South-Indian Inscriptions* were issued between the years 1886 and 1903:—Volume I; Volume II—Parts i to iii; and Volume III—Parts i and ii. They include 321 records edited critically and supply all the material that may practically be found necessary for constructing the rough outlines of Chôla and Pallava history. In the year 1909, the late Mr. V. Venkayya, M.A., Rai Bahadur, Epigraphist to the Government of India, volunteered his services to continue the work of Professor Hultzsch and printed in Volume II, Part iv, such of the inscriptions of the Brihadiśvara temple at Tanjore, as had not been published already in Parts i to iii of that volume. Before issuing further volumes of *South-Indian Inscriptions* it is found necessary to complete Volumes II and III with an alphabetical index and a historical introduction. The latter, in the case of Volume II, had been already drawn up by Mr. Venkayya and appears under his signature. I have only added here and there some foot-notes to Mr. Venkayya's introduction, besides giving a complete index to the volume and the texts and translations of two Pallava grants which are expected to supplement materially, the information already supplied by the records of the family published in the earlier parts.

It will be found on perusal that Mr. Venkayya's introduction deals almost exclusively with the reign of Râjarâja I, though the volume includes many other records, *viz.*, 29 of Râjendra-Chôla I, one of Râjêndradêva, one of Kulôttunga I, one of Vikrama-Chôla, three of a probable Pândya king Kônêrinmaikondân, two of the Vijayanagara kings Tirumalaidêva and Dêvarâya I, one of the Tanjore chief Achyutappa-Nâyaka and one of a certain Mallappa-Nâyaka of about the same period,—all coming from the Tanjore temple, and nine Pallava and Chôla inscriptions from other places. Any attempt at giving a full account of these kings will only swell the introduction which is already big. I, accordingly, reserve my remarks on them for future volumes of the *South-Indian Inscriptions* which will deal with Chôlas (other than Râjarâja), Pallavas, Pândyas and the Vijayanagara kings.

MADRAS,
9th October 1916.

H. KRISHNA SASTRI.



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART I.

INSCRIPTIONS ON THE WALLS OF THE CENTRAL SHRINE.

	PAGE
INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—	
No. 1. On the north and west walls, upper tier	1
No. 2. On the west wall	14
No. 3. On the north wall, lower tier	21
No. 4. On the south wall, second tier	42
No. 5. On the north wall, upper tier	53
No. 6. On the south wall, second tier	68
INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJÊNDRA-CHÔLA I.—	
No. 7. On the south wall, second tier	77
No. 8. On the walls of the portico, second tier	84
No. 9. On the south wall, first tier	90
No. 10. Do. do.	93
No. 11. Do. do.	95
No. 12. Do. do.	97
No. 13. Do. do.	98
No. 14. Do. do.	99
No. 15. Do. do.	100
No. 16. Do. do.	101
No. 17. Do. do.	102
No. 18. Do. do.	103
No. 19. Do. do.	104
No. 20. Do. first and second tiers	105
INSCRIPTION OF KÔNÊRINMAIKONPÂN—	
No. 21. On the north wall, lower tier	109
No. 22. On the south wall, first and second tiers	112
INSCRIPTION OF TIRUMALAI DÊVA.—	
No. 23. On the south wall, first tier	117

PART II.

INSCRIPTIONS ON THE WALLS OF THE ENCLOSURE, THE CHANDÊSVARA AND THE BÎRHANNÂYAKÎ SHRINES.

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—	
No. 24. In the inner <i>gôpura</i> , on the left of the entrance	121
No. 25. Do. do.	125
No. 26. Do. on the right of the entrance	126
No. 27. Do. do.	131
No. 28. Do. do.	132
No. 29. On a pillar of the east enclosure, to the right of the <i>gôpura</i>	134
No. 30. On a pillar of the south enclosure	137
No. 31. On the north face of a pillar of the same enclosure	139
No. 32. On a pillar of the same enclosure	140
No. 33. On a niche of the same enclosure	141
No. 34. On a niche and a pillar of the same enclosure	142
No. 35. On a pillar of the same enclosure	146
No. 36. On the first niche of the west enclosure, first inscription	149
No. 37. Do. second inscription	150
No. 38. Do. third inscription	152

	PAGE
INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.— <i>cont.</i>	
No. 39. On two pillars of the west enclosure	161
No. 40. Do. do.	166
No. 41. On a niche of the west enclosure	169
No. 42. On a niche and a pillar of the same enclosure	169
No. 43. On the base of the same enclosure	172
No. 44. On a pillar of the same enclosure	174
No. 45. On a niche of the same enclosure	177
No. 46. On two niches and two pillars of the same enclosure	178
No. 47. On a pillar of the same enclosure	190
No. 48. On a niche and a pillar of the same enclosure	193
No. 49. On a pillar of the north enclosure	198
No. 50. Do. do.	199
No. 51. On two niches and two pillars of the north enclosure	203
No. 52. On a pillar of the same enclosure	217
No. 53. Do. do.	218
No. 54. On the base of the north enclosure	220
No. 55. On a niche of the east enclosure	222
No. 56. On a niche and a pillar of the same enclosure	224
INSCRIPTION OF RÂJARÂJA OR OF RÂJÊNDRA-CHÔLA I.—	
No. 57. On the outside of the east enclosure	227
INSCRIPTION OF KULÔTTUŅGA I.—	
No. 58. On the outside of the north enclosure	229
INSCRIPTION OF RÂJARÂJA I.—	
No. 59. On the east, north and west walls of the Chaṇḍêśvara shrine	236
INSCRIPTION OF RÂJÊNDRA-CHÔLA I.—	
No. 60. On the south wall of the Chaṇḍêśvara shrine	245
INSCRIPTIONS OF KÔNÊRINMAIKONḌAN—	
No. 61. On the west wall of the Brihannâyakî shrine	246
INSCRIPTION OF MALLAPPA-NÂYAKA—	
No. 62. On the west wall of the Brihannâyakî shrine	247

PART III

ADDITIONAL INSCRIPTIONS IN THE TAŅJÂVÛR TEMPLE AND OTHER
MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS.

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—	
No. 63. On the outside of the north enclosure	249
No. 64. Do. do.	251
No. 65. Do. do.	252
No. 66. Do. do.	259
No. 67. Do. do.	303
No. 68. Do. do.	307
No. 69. On the outside of the east enclosure	312
No. 70. Do. do.	328
No. 71. On the east wall of the central shrine	338
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE PALLAVA DYNASTY—	
No. 72. Cave inscription at Vallam	340
No. 73. Kâsâkuḍi plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla	342
No. 74. Udayêndiram plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla	361
INSCRIPTIONS OF PARÂNTAKA I.—	
No. 75. On a pillar at Uyyakkonḍân-Tirumalai	374
No. 76. Udayêndiram plates of Prithivîpati II. Hastimalla	375

CONTENTS.

vii

PAGE

INSCRIPTIONS OF KULÔTTUNGA I.—

No. 77. On the west base of the Anêkataṅgâpadam temple at Kâñchiparam	390
No. 78. On the south base of the same temple	392

PART IV.

OTHER INSCRIPTIONS OF THE TAÑJÂVÛR TEMPLE.

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—

No. 79. On three pillars of the south enclosure	395
No. 80. On a pillar of the same enclosure	400
No. 81. Do. do.	401

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJÊNDRA-CHÔLA I.—

No. 82. On the base of the south enclosure	402
No. 83. Do. do.	404

INSCRIPTIONS OF RÂJARÂJA I.—

No. 84. On a pillar of the west enclosure	405
No. 85. Do. do.	407
No. 86. Do. do.	409
No. 87. Do. do.	411
No. 88. Do. do.	412
No. 89. On a niche of the west enclosure	413
No. 90. In the second <i>gôpura</i> , left of entrance	415
No. 91. On the north wall of the central shrine, lower tier	424
No. 92. On the south wall, third tier	428
No. 93. Do. do.	436
No. 94. On the outside of the north enclosure	458
No. 95. Do. do.	498

INSCRIPTION OF RÂJARÂJA III.—

No. 96. In the second <i>gôpura</i> of the temple, right of entrance	498
--	-----

INSCRIPTION OF ACHYUTAPPA-NÂYAKA.—

No. 97. In the second <i>gôpura</i> of the temple, right of entrance	497
--	-----

PART V.

PALLAVA COPPER-PLATE GRANTS.—

No. 98. Vêlûrpâlaiyam plates of Vijaya-Nandivarman (III)	501
No. 99. Tandantôttam plates of Vijaya-Nandivikramavarman	517

INDEX TO VOL. II	537
--------------------------	-----

TITLE PAGE, PREFACE, TABLE OF CONTENTS, LIST OF PLATES AND ADDENDA AND CORRI-

GENDA	pp. i to xiii
INTRODUCTION	pp. (1) to (41)



LIST OF PLATES.

I. The Tanjore temple	Frontispiece
II. Inscription (No. 1) of Rajaraja.—First Section	To face page 2
III. Inscription (No. 20) of Rajendra-Chola.—First tier	106
IV. Do. do. Second tier	108
V. Inscription of Tirumalaideva (No. 23) (now, opp. p. 248)	118
VI. View of the Tanjore temple from the Sivaganga tank and the large Nandi in the same temple	121
VII. Inscription of Rajaraja' (No. 29)	136
VIII. Inscription of Konerinmaikondan (No. 61)	246
IX. Kailasanatha Inscription of Rajasimha ..	Supplementary to Vol. I, No. 24	249
X. Early Pallava stone inscriptions ..	Nos. 1 to 17 and No. 34	340
XI. Kuram plates of Paramesvaravarman I. ..	No. 151	342
XII. Do. do.	344
XIII. Kasakudi plates of Nandivarman	Between pages 348 and 349	
XIV. Do. do.	350 and 351
XV. Do. do.	To face page 352
XVI. Udayendiram plates of Hastimalla	Between pages 384 and 385	
XVII. Velurpalaiyam plates of Vijaya-Nandivarman III	508 and 509
XVIII. Tandantottam plates of Vijaya-Nandivikramavarman	520 and 521



ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

- Page 8, paragraph 2.—In this and the following inscriptions of Râjarâja I in parts I to III, the phrase கார்த்தனூர் சாலை கலமறுத்த has to be translated “who was pleased to destroy the ships (*at*) Kândaḷûr-Śâlai” as in Part IV, p. 432.
- Page 9, paragraph 18.—*For* kuṭa *read* kuḍam.
- Page 10, paragraph 34.—*śinnam* has been interpreted to stand for the Sanskrit *chihnam* ‘emblem’; but from the enumeration which follows it seems to denote ‘vessels’.
- In Telugu records it means a coin.
- Page 10, paragraph 37.—*For* kuṭa *read* kuḍam.
- Page 17, Translation, line 9.—*For* Śeriyas *read* Śeriyas.
- Page 17, paragraph 5.—*For* kuṭa *read* kuḍam.
- Page 40, foot-note 1.—The pearl necklaces *indrachchhanda*, *vijayachchhanda* and *êkâvali* (*êkâvali*) are mentioned in the *Arthaśâstra* of Kautilya (Chapter XI, page 87 of Mr. Sama Sastry’s Translation, Bangalore, 1915); *śrichchhanda*, *dêvachchhanda* and *kalâpachchhanda* were evidently other such ornaments of pearls.
- Page 63, paragraph 13 } *For* “Kâlâr and Pidâriyâr” *read* Kâlâ-Pidâriyâr.
- Page 64, paragraph 15 }
- Page 65, paragraph 17.—சிறுமுன்னியூர் எரியில் நீர்கொத்துப்பள்ளவாயாக கிடந்த நிலமும் has been translated “the land used as a pit (*pallavây*) which is dug (*for*) the water from the tank (*êri*) (of the village) of Śiru-Munniyûr”. The proper rendering is perhaps “the land which had become a pit owing to the accumulation of the water from the tank (of the village) of Śiru-Munniyûr”.
- Page 67, paragraph 24, line 1.—*sâlâbhôga* here translated as “(a village) enjoyed by the (royal) palace” is found on further examination of inscriptions to mean “gift (of land) made in favour of a feeding house”.
- Page 67, paragraph 25, line 1.—(Also in text on p. 59), Vênelvidugu may probably be a mistake for Vedêlvidugu (*i.e.*, Vidêlvidugu).
- Page 68, last paragraph of the introduction to No. 6, line 12.—*Omit* the words “the shrine of”.
- Page 68, last line.—*For* pujâri *read* pûjâri.
- Page 72, foot-note 1.—In place of this note *substitute* “*i.e.*, the king who died in the golden palace”. The father of Râjarâja I and of Kundavaiyâr, was Sundara-Chôḷa who from inscriptions is known to have borne the surname Ponmâligaittuñjinadêva.
- Page 81, paragraph 3.—*For* nêriya *read* neriyana.
- Page 92, paragraph 1, line 9 and in all following translations where this passage occurs.—*For* the crown of Sundara *read* the beautiful crown, as in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, p. 233, foot-note 4.
- Page 92, paragraph 2.—*For* “for feeding the god” *read* “for offering to the god.”
- Amudu* is here used in the general sense of offering.
- Page 94, foot-note 4.—*For* Pôlûr *read* Pôlûr.
- Page 108.—Takkanalâḍam which has been taken as the equivalent of Dakshina-Lâṭa has perhaps, more correctly, to be identified with Dakshina-Râdhâ, the Southern Bengal country; see R. D. Bannerji’s *Pâlas of Bengal in Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. V, No. 3, p. 71.

Page 109, line 11.—“Vijayam of great fame” has probably to be corrected into “Śrī-Vishaya”; see *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, p. 231.

Page 109, line 11.—Uttiralâdam has evidently to be interpreted as Uttara-Râdhâ and not as Uttara-Lâta; see additions against page 108, above.

Page 112, Introduction to No. 22, line 3.—For *Suṅgandavirtta* read *Suṅgandavirtta*.

Page 112, Translation, paragraph 3, lines 8 and 9.—For “(in) the flower-garden (*nandavanam*) (called after) *Geṅgaikonda-Śōraṇ* which forms part of *Karundittaikudi*” read “(in) the flower-garden (*nandavanam*) (in the village of) *Geṅgaikonda-Śōraṇ* which forms part of *Karundittaikudi*”.

Page 115, Translation, paragraph, lines 14 and 15.—For “and of the boundary of the sacred flower-garden (called after) *Geṅgaikonda-Śōraṇ* which forms part of *Karundittaikudi*” read “and of the boundary of the sacred flower-garden (in the village of) *Geṅgaikonda-Śōraṇ* which forms part of *Karundittaikudi*”. In this and in the previous instance, the existing translation seems to have been arrived at by taking *Geṅgaikonda-Śōraṇ* along with *tirunandavanam* which follows it; but it will be more appropriate to read *Geṅgaikonda-Śōraṇ* with what precedes. In this case, the expression *Karundittaikudi āna Geṅgaikonda-Śōraṇ* would be similar to *Karundittaikudi āna Suṅgandavirtta-Śōraṇallūr* and *Karundittaikudi āna Kulōttanga-Śōraṇallūr* which occur in text-lines 3 and 4 of inscription No. 22. The particle *āna* which usually means “alias” seems to be used here in the sense “forming part of”. This usage of it is quite unusual and deserves to be noted.

Page 115, Translation, line 10.—Insert the word “Brâhmaṇa” before “village (*agaram*)”.

Page 117, Introduction to No. 23.—For “Tikka, the founder of the second dynasty” read “Tikka, the elder brother of the Sâluva usurper Nṛsiṃharâya”; *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VII, p. 77, foot-note 2.

Page 117, line 9 from top.—*oru-pū* and *kaḍai-pū* are translated by “single flowers” and “flowers for the market”. The terms are applied in a technical sense to certain crops of lands growing paddy; cf. *iru-pū āru-pāyichchal-nilan* in text-line 2 and *oru-pū-nilan* in text line 3 on page 296 of *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX.

Page 117, foot-note 9.—After *Epigraphia Indica* insert Vol. I.

Page 118, Translation, line 7.—“*Vāriyan* the *Kāranattān*” has evidently to be changed into the “the headman of the village committee (*vāriyam*)”; see *Epigraphical Report* for 1913, Part II, paragraph 23. The word *kāranattān* may be compared with *kāraṇavan* now current in Malabar. *Avadāvagakkānai* and *Rājasapakkānai* in text l. 6 f. have perhaps to be read *Avadaravarttānai* and *Rājasavattānai*.

Page 119, line 1.—For *Tenālūr* read *Ten-Alūr*.

“ paragraph 3.—அளவுக்கு is translated by the phrase “to the extent to which they are granted”. Perhaps it has to be taken in the sense “because (we have) remitted”, etc.

“ foot-note 4.—After *Epigraphia Indica* insert Vol. I, and for 40 read 42.

Page 124, line 17.—For citizens read merchants.

“ 18.—For within the limits of read outside; see p. 446, note 2.

Page 138, Translation, paragraph 4.—For one pedestal (surmounted by) a lotus read one lotus(-shaped) pedestal.

Page 145, note 5.—Insert *naṅganai* after word.

- Page 169, Introduction to No. 42, line 2.—*For* line *read* lines.
- Page 171, Translation, paragraph 5.—*For* aureola *read* aureola.
- Page 174, paragraph 7.—*For* Siva *read* Śiva.
- Page 223, note 1.—*Before* Perundanattu-Valaṅgai *add* Niyāyam.
- Page 230, line 30 } *For* Kêrala *read* Kêrala.
- Page 231, line 10 }
- Page 242, line 1.—*For* diadem (*virapattam*) *read* front plate, as on p. 166.
- Page 243, line 5.—*For* karaṇu *read* karaṇju.
- Page 252, line 7.—*For* Kêra [la-Vî°] *read* Kô[n-Vî°] and correct the text accordingly on p. 251.
- Pages 283, 295, 296 and 299.—*For* the word “temple” coming after Brahmakuttam *read* quarter.
- Page 300, paragraph 465.—*For* god *read* king.
- Page 301, paragraph 472.—*For* Śembaṅgudai *read* Śembaṅgudi.
- “ “ 474.—*For* Kadaikkudai *read* Kadaikkudi.
- “ “ 476.—*For* Kîrkkudai *read* Kîrkkudi.
- “ “ 478.—*For* Māṅgudai *read* Māṅgudi.
- Page 311, line 22.—*For* Simhalas *read* Simhalas.
- Page 311, last paragraph.—*For* the jewel among the inhabitants of the forest country *read* whose smile was of (*white*) lustre (*like*) the jasmine.
- Page 312, line 14 from top.—The number marking foot-note 3 after Puduvudaiyāṇ Arayan Udayiṇ must come after Udayiṇ Kallālai in line 16.
- Page 325, line 1.—*For* Vembarrûr *read* Vêmbarrûr.
- Page 333, paragraph 14.—The village whose other name was Abhimānabhūshana-chaturvêdimāṅgalam was evidently Śītongamāṅgalam. The large Leyden plates read Śrītūṅgamāṅgalam in line 154.
- Page 336, paragraph 76.—*For* Emanallûr *read* Êmanallûr.
- “ “ 77.—*For* Vembarrûr *read* Vêmbarrûr.
- Page 338, paragraph 109.—*For* Veśālippâdi *read* Vêśālippâdi.
- Page 431, line 6, and page 342, line 4.—*For* Kâśâkûdi *read* Kâśâkudi.
- “ “ line 8.—*For* Lalita *read* Lalita.
- Page 356, (verse 20).—*For* Pândya *read* Pândya.
- Page 357, note 1.—*For* Anâthapindika *read* Anâthapindika.
- Page 359, note 15.—*For* वेगवता *read* वेगवती.
- Page 361, line 7.—“paradatti” evidently corresponds to “paradatti” of text line 63 of the Vêlûrpālaiyam plates, on page 509, and means an assembly (*parishad*).
- Page 371, line 9.—*For* Nala *read* Nala.
- Page 372, line 21.—*For* Kâlî *read* Kâlî.
- Page 376, line 37.—*For* Udayasandiramāṅgalam *read* Udayasandiramāṅgalam.
- Page 435, section 49, line 3.—*For* nālam *read* tālam and correct the text accordingly on page 431. The latter as a variety of ruby occurs on p. 81.
- Page 437, line 13.—Abhimānabhūshana was a surname of Rājāditya the eldest son of Parāntaka I; see *Archæological Survey Report* for 1911-12, Part I, p. 26.

INTRODUCTION.

As it is intended to write in the next volume of this series about the ancestors of Râjarâja I and the Chôlas generally, it is enough here to put together all that is known about the life and reign of this king. The nature of the materials available to us precludes any details about his private life. The personal history of a sovereign who lived in the eleventh century and about whose times no contemporary historian has left us any information must consist mainly of surmises and inferences from the few facts that are known of his public life.

The original name of the king was Râjarâjakêsarivarman or Râjakêsarivarman Mummadiśôradêva which occurs in his earliest Tamil inscriptions. The Tiruvâlângâdu plates¹ call him Arunmorivarman. This name, in the slightly altered form Arumoridêva, occurs also in some of the Tamil records of his reign. The composer of the Tiruvâlângâdu plates remarks that at the birth of prince Arunmorivarman² "the wives of the serpent (Âdisêsha who is supposed to carry the earth on his back) danced for joy in the belief that he would relieve their husband of the burden of bearing the earth." Râjakêsarivarman Mummadiśôra was the second son of the Chôla king Parântaka II *alias* Sundara-Chôla, who was also known as Ponmâligaittuñjinadêva³ "the king who died at the Golden Hall" (*i.e.*, the temple Chidambaram). According to the Tiruvâlângâdu plates, Sundara-Chôla's queen Vânavanmahâdêvî is stated to have committed *suttee*. Apparently the parents of Râjarâjadêva were spending their last days at Chidambaram as Śaiva devotees. It was evidently this aspect of their life that appealed most strongly to their daughter who set up images to each of them in the Tanjore temple and made an endowment for their worship (No. 6).

So far as we know Râjarâjadêva had an elder sister and an elder brother. The latter was called Âditya-Karikâla and all that is known of him is that he fought in his youth with Vîra-Pândya. In stone inscriptions he is known as "Parakêsarivarman, who took the head of Vîra-Pândya." The name of Râjarâja's elder sister was Kundavaiyâr. She had married a certain Vallavaraiyar Vandyadêvar (Nos. 2, 6, 7 and 8) about whom nothing more is known. It is evident that she spent her later life in Tanjore with her younger brother and that she

¹ These plates will shortly be edited in Vol. III of the *South-Indian Inscriptions*. An abstract of their contents is given in the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1906, Part II, paragraphs 11 to 18.

² From an inscription recently copied at Tiruvaṇḍandai (No. 274 of 1910) we gather that Râjarâja must have been born under the asterism Śatabhishaj in the month of Âvaṇi (*Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1911, Part II, paragraph 21). The twelve monthly festivals provided for, on the days of Śadayam (Śatabhishaj) in the Râjarâjêśvara temple (No. 26) were evidently also in honour of Râjarâja's birth-day. Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai in his notes on *Kalîṅgattu-Parani*, Canto 8, stanza 24 (*Ind. Ant.* Vol. XIX, p. 331) mentions a Chôla king 'who established the *Chatayam-feast* in the Uthiya (Chêra-maṇḍala)'. The reference is evidently to king Râjarâja I and the *Chatayam-feast* was the one celebrated on his birth-day asterism, the Śadayam.

³ No. 302 of 1908 refers itself to the reign of king Sundara-Chôla *alias* Pon[mâligaittuñjinadêva]. In a record of the twenty-seventh year of Râjarâja I (No. 116 of 1896), the ninth year of a Ponmâligaittuñjinadêva is referred to. This king can be no other than Râjarâja's father Sundara-Chôla.

even survived him. We may suppose that Râjarâjadêva entertained a high regard for her and that she exercised considerable influence over him and contributed in no small degree to the formation of his character.¹ These were the surroundings under which the king was brought up. It will now be necessary to briefly review the history of the Chôlas of Tanjore for a proper appreciation of the position which Râjarâja occupies in South-Indian history. The founder of the family was Vijayâlâya who established Tanjore as the capital of the dynasty. His son and successor, Âditya I conquered the Pallavas, and his son Parântaka I was continually fighting against the Pândyas and kept them effectually under control. Towards the end of his reign the Râshtrakûṭas under Kṛishṇa III invaded the Tamil country, killed the Chôla prince Râjâditya and seized Tondai-nâdu which they seem to have ruled for about a quarter century. During this period the Chôlas had to confine themselves to their hereditary dominions in the Trichinopoly and Tanjore districts. Âditya-Karikâla appears to have regained Tondai-nâdu, as inscriptions dated in his reign have been found in Ukkal and other villages of that province. Apparently on his death or on the death of his father—whichever was the later—the succession was disputed. The subjects besought Aruṇmorivarman, *i.e.*, Râjarâjadêva to become king, but he did not want the throne as long as his paternal uncle Madhurântaka Uttama-Chôla was fond of his country. Eventually Aruṇmorivarman was appointed heir-apparent while Madhurântaka “bore the burden of the earth”. It looks as if the former was a minor when his father or elder brother died.

It is not necessary to give a detailed account of how the date of accession of Râjarâjadêva has been arrived at. Professor Kielhorn has examined a number of dates of the king with astronomical details and has come to the conclusion that his accession took place between the 25th June and 25th July 985 A.D.

Turning to the military achievements of the king which are mentioned in thousands of his inscriptions found over a large part of the Madras Presidency, we find that until the 8th year of his reign = A.D. 994 he did not undertake any expedition. During this period he was probably engaged in recruiting an efficient army and otherwise preparing himself for the struggle which he must have thought he should undertake before the Chôla power and prestige could be restored.

In his first campaign the king is said to have destroyed a fleet in the port of Kândaḷûr, which appears to have been situated in the dominions of the Chêra king. The Tiruvâlângâdu plates which furnish a lengthy account of Râjarâja's campaigns do not mention this item at all. They begin with the war against the Pândyas and report that Râjarâja seized the Pândya king Amarabhujanga and that the Chôla general captured the port of Viriṇam. Perhaps Kândaḷûr or Kândaḷûr-Śâlai was near Viriṇam. It is not unlikely that the Chôla king fought, on more than one occasion, against the Pândyas. The Chêras and Pândyas appear to have been allied together in their war against the Chôla king, for in the Tanjore inscriptions reference is frequently made to the conquest of the Chêra king and the Pândyas in Malai-nâdu, *i.e.*, the West Coast (Nos. 1, 59, 91, etc.). Kândaḷûr-Śâlai which is stated to belong to the Chêra king in later inscriptions was probably held by the Pândyas when it was attacked by Râjarâja.

Before his 14th year = A.D. 998-99, Râjarâjadêva conquered Vêṅgai-nâdu, *i.e.*, the Eastern Chalukya territory, Gaṅgapâdi and Nuraṁbapâdi which formed part of the present

¹ An article on this subject was contributed to the pages of the *Indian Review*, under the heading “An imaginary conversation between Râjarâja and his elder sister Kundavai.”

Mysore State, and Taḍigaipāḍi, the situation of which has not been made out satisfactorily.¹ According to Eastern Chalukya copper-plate grants, the kingdom of Vēṅgī was without a ruler about this time. The interregnum in the Vēṅgī country which preceded the reign of Śaktivarman is said to have lasted 27 years. On a previous occasion² I pointed out that this interregnum probably came to an end in A.D. 999, when the Chôlas invaded Vēṅgī. Accordingly it may be presumed that Râjarâja restored order and peaceful government in Vēṅgī by placing Śaktivarman on the throne.

In the same period the Chôla king conquered Kudamalai-nâḍu. Professor Hultzsch has identified this country with Coorg,³ and we have actually an inscription at the village of Mâlambi in Coorg⁴ which belongs to the time of Râjarâja I and mentions his general Pañchavanmârâya. A place named Udagai is mentioned in connection with the conquest of the Pândyas (p. 250, note 3). The *Kalīngattu-Parani* refers to the "storming of Udagai" in the verse which alludes to the reign of Râjarâja. The *Kulōttunga-Śōṛan-ulā* also mentions the burning of Udagai. This was probably an important stronghold in the Pândya country which the Chôla king captured.⁵ As the Pândyas were the natural enemies of the Chôlas, Râjarâja seems to have gloried much in his victory over them. In the historical introductions of Tamil inscriptions where the above conquests are recorded it is stated that he was "always depriving the Śeriyas (*i.e.*, Pândyas) of their splendour." Having already overcome the Chêra king, probably while destroying the ships at Kândalûr or in the war against the Pândyas, Râjarâja assumed the title Mummudi-Chôla, *i.e.*, "the Chôla king who wears three crowns, *viz.*, the Chêra, Chôla and Pândya crowns" which occurs first in an inscription of the 14th year at Mēlpāḍi⁶ in the North Arcot district. After his conquest of the Pândyas and other enemies, the king must have thought that his future was to be very bright and imagined that the goddess of the Great Earth had become his queen along with the goddess of Prosperity. It is in inscriptions of the 8th year of the king's reign that the usual historical introduction beginning with the words *tirumagal* which was evidently composed after the conquest of the Pândyas, occurs for the first time. The *Vikkirama-Śōṛan-ulā* evidently refers to the reign of Râjarâja when it mentions the conquest of Malai-nâḍu and

¹ A record of Râjarâja's 8th year at Tiruvaṇḍandai mentions these conquests. So also a few others of the 10th year begin with the historical introduction *திருமகள் பேரல்*, *etc.* and register the above-named conquests of the king. Of the countries mentioned, Taḍigaipāḍi is located in the Mysore State. It is identical with the ancient district Daḍigavāḍi ruled over by Daḍiga a contemporary of one of the kings named Râchamalla of the Western Gaṅga genealogy (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VII, p. 22). Dr. Fleet writes a big note on Taḍigaipāḍi and identifies it with a part of Mysore including the present Kṛishṇarâjapêṭ, Nâgamangala, Maṇḍya, Seringapatam and Maḷavalli taluks. He also thinks that possibly it may be identical with Daḍigamaṇḍala ruled over by the Western Gaṅga chief Daḍigarasa (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XXX, p. 109 f). In the Hoskôṭe and Dêvanahalli taluks of the Bangalore district are a number of inscriptions which mention Daḍigavari or Taḍigaivari which in the Chôla period after Râjarâja bore the surname Vikkiramaśōṛa-maṇḍala and included within it the sub-division called Śennai-nâḍu.

² *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, p. 349.

³ Above, Vol. I, No. 40.

⁴ Mr. Rice's *Coorg Inscriptions* (new edition), No. 46.

⁵ The Kīṛṇ inscription of Râjarâja's 27th year (No. 236 of 1902), which is partly mutilated, supplies a historical introduction of the king in Tamil poetry, different from the usual *திருமகள் பேரல்*, *etc.*, and mentions the king's conquest of Udagai in his campaign against Malai-nâḍu. As already stated the Pândya country must have also included Malai-nâḍu at the time of Râjarâja's conquest.

⁶ Below, Vol. III, No. 19. The form Mummadi-Chôla (*not* Mummudi-Chôla) occurs in early inscriptions of the 3rd, 4th and 10th years. Consequently, the explanation of the name must be 'the thrice (powerful) Chôla' as in the similar Kanarese and Telugu epithets Mummadi-Bhîma, Nûrmaḍi-Taila, *etc.*

the killing of 18 princes in retaliation for the insult offered to an envoy.¹ The *Kulōttunga-Śōraṇ-ulā* also refers to the same Chōla king who “cut off eighteen heads and set fire to Udagai.” The conquest of Malai-nādu and the burning of Udagai refer evidently to the reign of Râjarâjadêva, but it does not appear when he cut off the heads of eighteen princes.

The king also subdued Kollam and Kalingam. The Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates mention Râjarâja's invasion against the country created by Paraśurâma, who had taken a vow to destroy all the Kshatriyas. This country is described as inaccessible on account of the mountains and the ocean which surrounded it. It is doubtful if the composer of the Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates refers here to the conquest of Kollam or to the subjugation of the 12,000 old islands of the sea mentioned in some of the inscriptions of the 29th year of the king's reign. If it is neither, there must have been an invasion of Malabar which does not find a place in the introduction of the king's Tamil inscriptions.²

As regards the conquest of Kalingam, it is not unlikely that this was effected by his son Râjêndra-Chōla. The Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates mention the defeat of an Ândhra king named Bhîma in describing the reign of Râjarâja. From the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant we know that Vimalâditya bore the surnames Mummaḍi-Bhîma and Birudaṅka-Bhîma.³ Besides, two inscriptions⁴ on the Mahêndragiri Hill in the Ganjam district which must have been included in Kalinga, record that a general of the Chōla king Râjêndra-Chōla defeated the Kulûta chief Vimalâditya, captured the Mahêndraparvata and caused a pillar of victory to be set up on the hill. From these it may be concluded that Râjarâja deputed his son Râjêndra-Chōla in his campaign against Kalinga. But the Chōla king had conquered Vêṅgî already and, as I have surmised, placed Śaktivarman on the throne, thus bringing the interregnum to a close. It is therefore unlikely that a member of Śaktivarman's family rebelled immediately after and had to be subdued. In the absence of evidence to the contrary I would suppose that the conquest of Kalinga by Râjarâja was earlier than the war of Râjêndra-Chōla's general with the Kulûta chief Vimalâditya and was intended to help Śaktivarman in consolidating his dominions after the interregnum. Some considerable time after the accession of Śaktivarman, there seems to have been fresh trouble in the Kalinga country. The Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu plates tell us that the Ândhra king had killed a certain Râjarâja and this seems to have been the cause of the war. Who this Râjarâja was we are not told. But he must have been some person in whom the Chōlas were interested. This I take to be the occasion when the pillar of victory was set up on the Mahêndragiri Hill. We find the Vêṅgî king Vimalâditya at Tiruvaiyâru near Tanjore about A.D. 1013-14 making gifts to the Pañchanadêśvara templ⁵ Shortly before or after this date he must have married the Chōla princess Kundavai, daughter of Râjarâja and sister of Râjêndra-Chōla.

¹ *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XXII, p. 142.

² No. 394 of 1911 refers to Râjarâja's conquests of Kollam, Kolladêśam and Koḍuṅgōlûr (Cranganore): *Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1912, Part II, paragraph 22.*

³ *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VI, p. 350.

⁴ Nos. 396 and 397 of 1896.

⁵ No. 215 of 1894. On the strength of this inscription it has been inferred that Râjêndra-Chōla took the Vêṅgî king captive to the Chōla country. But the king who was actually conquered by Râjêndra-Chōla (or by one of his Generals) is not clearly stated in the Mahêndragiri inscriptions to have been the Vêṅgî king Vimalâditya. The conquered chief on the other hand receives the epithet ‘the lord of Kulûta.’ It is again doubtful if at this time the Kalinga kingdom was subject to the rulers of Vêṅgî, although about a century later we know they were overlords of the whole country between Mannêru (in the Nellore district) and Mahêndra (in the Ganjam district). The political marriage between the Eastern Chalukya king Vimalâditya and the Chōla princess Kundavai must therefore have taken place quite independently of Râjêndra-Chōla's conquest of Kalinga.

Râjarâja must have simultaneously directed his arms against Ceylon. The king is said to have undertaken this expedition in order that "the eight quarters might praise him". This phrase occurs in the earlier inscriptions, but in later ones the personal appearance of the Singhalese seems to receive an uncomplimentary remark (e.g., in Nos. 4 and 65). We have at Padaviya in Ceylon a Tamil inscription of the 27th year of Râjarâjadêva corresponding to A.D. 1011-12 A.D. Several villages in Ceylon were granted by Râjarâja to the Râjarâjêśvara temple at Tanjore and had to remit their assessment to the temple in the shape of money, grain or *iluppaipâl* (No. 92). These facts show that the subjugation of the island by the Chôla king was complete¹. According to the *Mahāvamsa* (Chapter LV) Mahinda V ascended the throne in A.D. 1001. The trouble in Ceylon began in A.D. 1012 when the king was unable to maintain his army and all the men of Kêraḷa in his service went up to the palace and demanded their wages. Then the *Mahāvamsa* describes events in Ceylon which took place in A.D. 1037. According to Tamil inscriptions these must have happened about A.D. 1016. The *Mahāvamsa* does not mention the invasion of Ceylon during the reign of Râjarâja unless it be the expedition by Vallabha-Chôla during the reign of Mahinda IV (A.D. 975-991)². Thus there is no doubt that there is some mistake in the Chronology of the *Mahāvamsa*. Then comes a period of three years in the life of Râjarâjadêva about which we get no information from his inscriptions which are mainly concerned with his military exploits. This is the interval between the 18th³ and the 21st years corresponding to A.D. 1002 and 1005 respectively. It was evidently during this time that the king received the title Śrî-Râjarâja which occurs first in inscriptions of the 19th year (= A.D. 1003). According to the *Koṅgudêśarâjâkkal* the king made certain gifts to the Chidambaram temple in Śaka 926 = A.D. 1004. It is not impossible as will be shown later on, that the title Śrî-Râjarâja was conferred on him by the temple authorities at Chidambaram. Perhaps this was also the period when the king conceived the idea of building the temple at Tanjore and made arrangements for the operations to commence.

What the circumstances were that led to the war with the Western Chalukya Satyâśraya we are nowhere told. The Pallavas of Conjeeveram were constantly fighting with the Chalukyas of Bâdâmi. The Western Chalukyas of Kalyâṇi were descended from the latter and the Chôlas occupied Tondai-nâdu, the Pallava territory. Besides this fact we know of no cause which could have brought about the war⁴. The conquest of Gangapâdi and Nûrampâdi in the modern Mysore State must have brought them into direct contact with the Western Chalukyas. Besides, the rulers of these two conquered provinces were originally feudatories

¹ In the *Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1913*, Part II, paragraph 21, it is stated that Îṭam (Ceylon) was called Mummaḍiśôra-maṇḍalam, after the well-known surname Mummaḍi-Chôla of Râjarâja. Other names of temples and towns in Ceylon called after Râjarâja are also referred to.

² Chapter LIV. Professor Hultzsch has clearly proved in his contributions to Singhalese Chronology (*J.R.A.S.* for July 1913, pp. 521 to 524) that Vallabha-Chôla is a gratuitous mistake, that there is a discrepancy of 23 years in the chronology supplied by the *Mahāvamsa* and that Râjarâja's invasion of Ceylon must have taken place between A.D. 1001 and 1004.

A record of Râjarâja at Tenkarai in the Madura district (No. 132 of 1910) calls the king Râjâśraya and adds the qualifying phrase "the conqueror of the world." This indicates that with the conquest of Ceylon which Râjarâja must have completed in his 17th year, he had actually conquered all enemies whose dominions he thought of acquiring.

⁴ The Chôlas belonged to the Solar and the Chalukyas to the Lunar race. The former were generally Śaivas and the latter were Vaishnavas as they had the boar for their crest. Besides, the Chalukyas were also patrons of the Jains.

of the Râshtrakûṭas, the political predecessors of the Western Chalukyas in the Kanarese country. Both the Chôlas and the Western Chalukyas were powerful and strong and must have been looking for an opportunity to measure their respective strength. Under these circumstances any slight cause would have been enough to provoke a quarrel.

The victory over Satyâśraya is mentioned in the Tiruvâlaṅgâḍu and the large Leyden plates and in one of the Tanjore inscriptions (No. 1). In the Tamil records of the king, the conquest of the seven and a half *lakshas* of Rattapâḍi evidently refers to the same event. It must have taken place towards the end of the 21st (A.D. 1005) or beginning of the 22nd year (A.D. 1006), to judge from the references to the events in Tamil records. We have an independent confirmation of this expedition. According to the Hoṭṭûr inscription of Satyâśraya, dated in A.D. 1007-08, the Chôla king—here called Nûrmaḍi-Chôla and named Râjendra—having collected a force numbering nine hundred thousand had pillaged the whole country, had slaughtered the women, the children and the Brahmans, and, taking the girls to wife, had destroyed their caste¹. The Western Chalukya king claims to have put the Chôla to flight and acquired great stores of wealth and vehicles. The Chôla king evidently attached much importance to his victory over Satyâśraya, as he is said to have presented gold flowers to the Râjarâjêśvara temple on his return from the expedition.

The next period in the life of the king, *viz.*, the 23rd to the 29th year, was not characterized by any military exploits. The Chôla dominions probably enjoyed peace and the king apparently devoted his energies to the task of internal administration. The building of the Râjarâjêśvara temple in Tanjore and the multifarious endowments and gifts to it must have occupied a prominent place in the king's mind during these years.

We have reason to suppose that the king also carried out a revenue survey and settlement during the period.² The Tanjore inscriptions published in Part I of this volume bear ample testimony to the accuracy of the operations conducted by the king. Land as small in extent as $\frac{1}{52,428,800,000}$ of a *vêli* was measured and assessed to revenue. An inscription at Tiruvisâlûr in the Tanjore district, dated in the 24th year of Râjarâja³, refers to a revenue survey apparently carried out some time before the date of the inscription. The officer of Râjarâja who took an active part in the survey operations was perhaps the general (*sênâpati*) Kuravaṇ Ulagaḷandân *alias* Râjarâja-mahârâjan mentioned frequently in No. 95 below. His title Ulagaḷandân, "one who measured the earth", might have been given to him in recognition of his services in connection with the survey operations. It was apparently as a result of this survey and settlement that the king issued his order, dated the 124th day of the 24th year to the following effect⁴ :—

"The land of those landholders in villages of Brâhmanas, in villages of Vaikhânasas and in villages of Śramaṇas (*i.e.*, Jainas), in Śônâḍu, in the adjacent districts included in Śônâḍu, in Tondai-nâḍu, and in Pândi-nâḍu *alias* Râjarâja-valanâḍu, who have not paid, on

¹ *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 433. An inscription from Ūṭṭattûr in the Trichinopoly district (No. 515 of 1912) of the 3rd year of Râjendra-Chôla I mentions the fight with Satyâśraya and the death of a warrior on that occasion. Evidently it was prince Râjendra-Chôla I that actually fought the battle with Satyâśraya.

² This survey appears to have been conducted in the 17th year of Râjarâja by which time, according to the Tenkarai record, he had completed 'the conquest of the world'; see the *Annual Report on Epigraphy* for 1913, Part II, paragraph 21.

³ No. 44 of 1907.

⁴ See below, Vol. III, No. 9.

the land owned by them, the taxes due from villages, along with the other inhabitants of those villages, for three years (of which) two are completed between the 16th and the 23rd years (of my reign) shall become the property of the village and shall be liable to be sold by the inhabitants of these villages to the exclusion of the (defaulting) landholders. Also (the land of) those who have not paid the taxes due from villages for three years (of which), two are completed, from the 24th year (of my reign) shall be liable to be sold by the inhabitants of those villages to the exclusion of the (defaulting) landholders." This order of the king was written by the royal Secretary Râjakêsarinnallûr-Kiravaṇ and having been approved by the Chief Secretary Mummadi-Śôra-Brahmamârâyaṇ and by Mummadi-Śôra-Pôṣaṇ, was engraved by order on the 143rd day of the 24th year. The 29th was apparently the last year of Râjarâja's reign. Even then his warlike spirit does not seem to have abated; for, in that year an expedition was despatched against the twelve thousand islands.¹ Which group in the Indian Ocean was denoted by this name I am at present unable to decide.

Râjarâja bore several titles of which the following are the more important:—Mummadi or Mummudi-Chôla, Chôla-Arumori, Râjâsraya, Nityavinôda, Śrî-Râjarâja and Śivapâdaśekhara. He seems to have assumed the title Jayaṅgaṇḍa-Chôla towards the end of his life. These titles of his, figure in territorial designations occurring in the Tanjore inscriptions and one is tempted to think that in the names Kshatriyaśikhâmani-vaṇanâḍu, Pâṇdyakulâśaṇi-vaṇanâḍu, Kêralântaka-vaṇanâḍu, Râjêndrasimha-vaṇanâḍu and Uyyakkonḍâr-vaṇanâḍu, Kshatriyaśikhâmani, Pâṇdyakulâśaṇi, Kêralântaka, Râjêndrasimha and Uyyakkonḍâr² were titles of Râjarâja.

Râjarâja indulged in a pretty large number of wives. Lôkamahâdêvî,³ Chôlamahâdêvî, Trailôkyamahâdêvî, Pañchavaṇmahâdêvî, Abhimânavallî, Ilâdamâdêviyâr (Lâṭamahâdêvî) and Prithivîmahâdêvî are known from the Tanjore inscriptions⁴. Each of them set up a number of images in the Râjarâjêśvara temple and made gifts to them. Lôkamahâdêvî was probably the chief queen. She built the shrine called Uttara-Kailâsa in the Pañchanadêśvara temple at Tiruvaiyâru near Tanjore and made many valuable gifts to it. The shrine was in existence already in the 21st year of the king's reign and was then called Lôkamahâdêviśvara after the queen⁵. Only one son and one daughter of the king are known, viz., Râjêndra-Chôla I, whose accession took place one year before the death of Râjarâja, and Kundavâ or Kundavai, who married the Eastern Chalukya king Vimalâditya.⁶ The respect which Râjarâja showed to his elder sister Kundavai throws an indirect light on his domestic life. She is spoken as "the

¹ This last military campaign was perhaps as successful as the others preceding it. Evidently Râjarâja performed the *tulâbhâra* ceremony, i.e., "weighing one's self against (gold, pearls or other such costly material)" in this year in order to celebrate his victories. Queen Lôkamahâdêvî also performed the *hêmagarbha*, passing her body through a golden cow (*Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1907*, p. 75).

² The Uyyakkonḍân channel which is an ancient irrigation work in the Trichinopoly district was probably constructed during his reign and called after him. Besides the name there is, however, nothing to connect Râjarâja with the channel. On the head sluice of the channel is a broken stone belonging to the 28th year of the Chôla king Kulôttuṅga III (A.D. 1205-06). Though the channel is not mentioned in it, the sluice is referred to (No. 72 of 1890).

³ She is surnamed Dantisâkti-Viṭaṅki in the Tiruvalaṅjuri (No. 633 of 1902) and the Tiruvaiyâru inscriptions (*Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1895*, p. 4).

⁴ From a record at Tirukkalittattai (No. 301 of 1908) we learn that Vêmbaṇ Śîruḍaiyâr *alias* Mîṇavaṇ Mahâdêviyâr was another queen of Râjarâja. Prithivîmahâdêvî (in Tamil, Piridimâdêviyâr) is called by her other name Nakkaṇ Arumori in an inscription from Uyyakkonḍân Tirumalai (No. 455 of 1908).

⁵ *Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1895*, p. 4.

⁶ The Tiruvalaṅjuri inscription quoted above, also mentions a "middle-daughter" named Mâdêvaḍigal. Evidently Kundavai was the youngest of Râjarâja's children.

venerable elder sister." In the sentence which the king himself is said to have uttered when ordering all the grants made to the temple to be engraved on stone, the place assigned to his elder sister is next to himself and the queens are mentioned after her (No. 1). During Râjarâja's reign the walls of the central shrine seem to have been reserved for registering the king's grants. The gifts made by the queens and the Officers of State had to be recorded on the niches and pillars of the enclosure. But Kundavai's gifts were invariably engraved on the central shrine.

That part of Râjarâja's intellectual nature to which students of South-Indian history owe most is the desire on his part to record his military achievements in every one of his inscriptions and thus hand down to posterity some of the important events of his life. As far as we know at present Râjarâjadêva was the first king of Southern India to introduce this innovation into his inscriptions. Before his time powerful kings of the Pallava, Pândya and Chôla dynasties had reigned in the South, and some of them had made extensive conquests. But none of them seems to have thought of leaving a record on stone of his military achievements. For instance, we have many stone inscriptions in Southern India of the Chôla king Parântaka I, whose extensive conquests are well known. Of these the stone inscriptions refer only to the conquests of Madura. Even this item of information would probably be missing had it not been for the fact that the king bore the name of his grandfather Parakêsarivarman, and it was consequently necessary to add the epithet "conquerer of Madura" in order to avoid confusion. The idea of Râjarâjadêva to add a short account of his military achievements at the beginning of every one of his inscriptions was entirely his own. His action in this respect is all the more laudable because his successors evidently followed his example and have left us more or less complete records of their conquests. But for the historical introductions which are often found at the beginning of the Tamil inscriptions of Chôla kings the lithic records of the Tamil country would be of very little value, and consequently even the little advance that has been made in elucidating the history of Southern India would have been well nigh impossible. Early Tamil records are dated not in the Śaka or any other well known era but in the regnal year of the king to whose time the grants belong, and palæography is not always a very safe guide in South-Indian history. With the help of the names of contemporary kings of other dynasties mentioned in the historical introductions of the Tamil inscriptions, it has been possible to fix the approximate dates of most of the Chôla kings. Consequently, the service which Râjarâjadêva has rendered to epigraphists in introducing a brief account of his military achievements at the beginning of his stone inscriptions cannot be overestimated. The historical side of the king's intellectual nature is further manifested in the order which he issued to have all the grants made to the Râjarâjêśvara temple engraved on stone. That this order of the king was not due entirely to self-glorification is borne out by other records. For instance, an inscription of his reign found at Tirumalavâdi in the Trichinopoly district¹ records an order of the king to the effect that the central shrine of the Vaidyanâtha temple at the place should be rebuilt and that, before pulling down the walls, the inscriptions engraved on them should be copied in a book. The records were subsequently re-engraved on the walls from the book after the rebuilding was finished.

The prominence given to the army from the conquest of the Pândyas down to the last year of the king's reign is significant, and shows the spirit with which he treated his soldiers. Evidently Râjarâjadêva gave his army its due share in the glory derived from his extensive

¹ No. 92 of 1895 ; *Annual Report*, on Epigraphy for 1895, p. 5.

conquests. It was evidently this same army that was called "the great warlike army" during the reign of his successor Rājendra-Chôla I. The following regiments¹ are mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions :—

1. Perundanattu Ânaiyâtkal.
2. Paṇḍita-Śôra-terinda-villigal.
3. Uttama-Śôra-terinda-Andalagattâlâr.
4. Nigarili-Śôra-terinda-Udanilai-Kudiraichchêvagar.
5. Mummadi-Śôra-terinda-Ânaippâgar.
6. Vîra-Śôra-Anukkar.
7. Parântaka-Koṅgavâlâr.
8. Mummadi-Śôra-terinda-parivârattâr.
9. Kêralântaka-terinda-parivârattâr.
10. Mûlaparivâra-vittêru *alias* Jananâtha-terinda-parivârattâr.
11. Śingalântaka-terinda-parivârattâr.
12. Śirudanattu Vadugakkâlavar.
13. Valaṅgai-Parambadaigalilâr.
14. Perundanattu-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârappadaigal.
15. Śirudanattu-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârappadaigal.
16. Aṛagiya-Śôra-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
17. Aridurgalaṅghana-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
18. Chaṇḍaparâkrama-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
19. Ilaiya-Râjarâja-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
20. Kshatriyaśikhâmaṇi-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
21. Mûrtavikramâbharâṇa-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
22. Nittavinôda-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
23. Râjakaṇṭhîrava-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
24. Râjarâja-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
25. Râjavinôda-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
26. Raṇamukha-Bhîma-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
27. Vikramâbharâṇa-terinda-Valaṅgai-Vêlaikkârar.
28. Kêralântaka-vâsal-tirumeykâppâr.
29. Anukka-vâsal-tirumeykâppâr.
30. Parivârameykâppargal.
31. Palavagai-Parambadaigalilâr.

In most of the foregoing names the first portion, viz. :—Paṇḍita-Śôra, Uttama-Śôra, Nigarili-Śôra, Mummadi-Śôra, Vîra-Śôra, Kêralântaka, Jananâtha, Śingalântaka, Aṛagiya-Śôra, Aridurgalaṅghana, Chaṇḍaparâkrama,² Kshatriyaśikhâmaṇi, Mûrtavikramâbharâṇa, Nittavinôda, Râjakaṇṭhîrava, Râjarâja, Râjavinôda, Raṇamukha-Bhîma and Vikramâbharâṇa appear to be the surnames or titles of the king himself or of his son. That these regiments should have been called after the king or his son shows the attachment which the Chôla king bore towards his army. It may not be unreasonable to suppose that these royal names were prefixed to the designations of these regiments after they had distinguished themselves in

¹ It is doubtful if the community Râjarâjatterîṅja-Kaikkôlar mentioned in an inscription from Kônêri-râjapuram (No. 627 of 1909) was also connected with the military organisation of Râjarâja.

² Compare the titles Tennaparâkramaṇ and Kirtiparâkrama-Śôraṇ which occur in his Śêṇûr inscription; *Annual Report on Epigraphy* for 1912, Part II, paragraph 22.

some engagement or other. It is worthy of note that there are elephant troops, cavalry and foot-soldiers among these regiments. Thirteen of the above mentioned regiments belonged to the Valaṅgai-Vēlaikkāra-ppadaigal, i.e. the Vēlaikkāra troops of the right hand. It is difficult to determine if this designation is based on the distinction between the right hand and left hand castes of Southern India. No mention of any left hand troops of this class is made in the Tanjore inscriptions though their existence may *prima facie* be assumed. At any rate the origin of the term is obscure and must be left to future research. The Vēlaikkāra troops are frequently mentioned in the *Mahāvamsa*. The term *vēlaikkāra* is explained by Mr. L. C. Wijesinha as "a body of mercenary troops employed by the Singhalese." They figure in the history of Ceylon towards the close of the 11th century A.D. during the reign of Vijayabāhu (A.D. 1065 to 1120). They were despatched on an expedition against the Chōla country but refused to proceed and rebelled. Eventually they were subdued by the Singhalese king. This mention does not throw much light either on the origin or on their history in the Chōla country at the beginning of the 11th century. It is possible they were no mercenaries in the Chōla country but regular soldiers. If a conjecture may be offered, I would say they were perhaps volunteers who enlisted when the occasion (*vēlai*) for their services arose¹. In later times when their services were not required in the Tamil country they probably migrated into Ceylon during the period of interregnum when there were frequent Chōla invasions against the island. Eventually they probably developed into mercenaries. It is interesting to note that eighteen of the musicians of the Râjarâjêśvara temple belonged originally to one or other of the foregoing regiments and no less than twelve of them were from the Vēlaikkāra troops. Each of these twelve musicians got seventy-five *kalam* of paddy for his service in the temple. To some of these regiments, the management of certain minor shrines of the temple was entrusted and they were expected to provide for the requirements of the shrine. Others among them took money from the temple on interest which they agreed to pay in cash. We are not, however, told to what productive purpose they applied this money. At any rate all these transactions show that the king created in them an interest in the temple built by himself.

Among the officers of Râjarâja two generals are referred to in the Tanjore inscriptions, viz.—Kuravaṇ Ulāḡalandāṇ *alias* Râjarâja-Mahârâjaṇ and Kṛishṇaṇ-Râmaṇ *alias* Mummaḍi-Śōra-Brahmamârâyaṇ. The latter was the Chief Secretary (*Ōlai-nāyagaṇ* or *Tirumandiravōlai-nāyagaṇ*) from the 21st to the 24th year of the king's reign. Another such Secretary (*Tirumandiravōlai*) was Kârâyil Eduttapādam, the headman of Râjakêsarinaḡṭr. Amudaṇ Tîrttakaraṇ, the headman of Viḡattṭr, who drafted the Âṇaimaṅgalaṇ grant recorded in the large Leyden plates was also another Secretary; Îrâyiravaṇ Pallavayaṇ *alias* Mummaḍi-Śōra-Pōsaṇ must also have belonged to the secretariat staff as he signed both the Âṇaimaṅgalaṇ grant and the Ukkal inscription relating to revenue settlement. All of the above mentioned officers figure in the Tanjore inscriptions as donors. Kṛishṇaṇ-Râmaṇ built at least two of the enclosing verandahs of the temple. Another officer who belonged to the secretariat was Vēlaṇ Uttama-Śōraṇ *alias* Madurântaka Mûvêṇdavēlaṇ who figures among the signatories to the original order of the king in the Âṇaimaṅgalaṇ charter. Other officers are also mentioned in the large Leyden plates, viz.:—Five persons who are described as *Karumamârâyum*, i.e., "those who look after (the

¹ A Ceylon inscription of the time of Vijayabāhu I, gives some particulars about the Vēlaikkāra community; see the *Annual Report on Epigraphy* for 1913, Part II, paragraph 30.

king's) affairs." They were probably the king's executive officers. Four others who must have been Brâhmanas are described as *naḍuvirukkum* "those who are in the middle." These were perhaps arbitrators or judges. Two other officers are also mentioned, *viz.*, *puravuvāri* and *varippottagam*. The former was apparently the office dealing with taxes due from revenue-free villages and the latter with the rent-roll of the Chôla dominions. Another important officer of the king was the magistrate (*adhikārin*) Udayadivâkaraṇ Tillaiyāli *alias* Râjarâja-Mûvêndavêlân of Kâñchivâyil who figures both in the large Leyden plates and in the Tanjore inscriptions. Still another important person was the temple manager Âdittan Sûryan *alias* Tennavan Mûvêndavêlâr, who was the headman of Poygai-nâdu. He set up images of some of the sixty-three Śaiva devotees in the temple and made gifts to them. The king seems to have conferred the title Perundaram on the most important officers and men of note in his dominions. The title Perundaram is prefixed to Śirudanattu-panimakkal, *i.e.*, "the servants of the Śirudanam" which seems to denote a class of officers. Perhaps the term was used to denote subordinate officials. One of the officers is described as Śirudanattu-Perundaram. He probably belonged to the class of subordinate officials but received the title Perundaram.¹

The study of Râjarâja's inscriptions leaves on us the impression that he must have been an active man² and that he was probably successful in realizing some of the high aims of his life. Like most men who devote a considerable portion of their earlier years in the active pursuit of cherished earthly aims, this Chôla king spent the later portion of his life in works of devotion. The Râjarâjêśvara temple at Tanjore, which has evidently served as a model for a large number of other temples in Southern India, is a stupendous monument of the religious instinct of this sovereign. The enormous endowments in lands and gold made to the temple show that the king had one sole object in his later life, *viz.*, to leave no want of the temple unsupplied. Almost all the booty he acquired in wars he gave away to the temple. Utensils required for temple services; ornaments for the various images set up in the temple; villages for supplying the temple with the requisite amount of paddy; money for purchasing the various articles for temple use not omitting even camphor, cardamom seeds, *champaka*-buds and *khaskhas*-roots required for scenting the bathing water of the gods (No. 24); sheep, cows and buffaloes for supplying the ghee required for lamps; skilled musicians for singing the *Dêvâram* hymns; dancing girls; Brâhmaṇa servants for doing the menial work in the temple; accountants for writing the temple accounts; and temple treasurers, goldsmiths, carpenters, washermen, barbers, astrologers and watchmen were provided on a most liberal scale.³ The systematic way in which the various endowments to the temple were made and the principles laid down for their proper administration bespeak

¹ 'Śirudanattu-kkangâni-ttattân of the lord Śrî-Râjarâjadêva' occurs in line 17 of the third section of No. 66. Śirudanattu may also mean 'of the youth' and the whole phrase may denote the goldsmith who was in the king's service when he was young.

² Râjarâja's military officers appear to have entertained a very high regard and even dread for the great disciplinarian. No. 64 and its continuation No. 95 which evidently refer to military operations that were going on perhaps towards the close of Râjarâja's reign, state how some of his officers of the rank of *Perundaram* and others who were judges and arbitrators vowed themselves to put up lamps in the Râjarâjêśvara temple, if no disgrace betook them at the hands of the king on their return from the war.

³ This grand undertaking of Râjarâja must have created an admiration for him in the minds of his subjects. In later times the several incidents connected with the foundation of the Râjarâjêśvara temple and its equipment, appear by themselves to have become the theme of a popular story. For, in the 4th year of Râjêndradêva (*i.e.* A.D. 1055) we are told that provision was made for the performance of the drama *Râjarâjêśvara-Nâṭaka*, on one of the festive days in the temple (No. 67).

a genius for organisation which could not have been quite a characteristic feature of kings in general at the time. In spite of his sincere and deep-seated devotion to the Śaiva faith he was tolerant enough towards other religions. He permitted a feudatory of his to build a Buddhist shrine at Negapatam and granted the village of Âṇaimaṅgalam to it. This grant is registered on the large Leyden plates. In his order of the 24th year regarding revenue arrears, the villages of Śramaṇas (*i.e.* Jainas) are also included. This shows that the latter enjoyed equal privileges with Brâhmanas and Vaikhâṇasas.

The extent of Tanjore city during the reign of Râjarâja may be judged from the large number of big-streets, streets, quarters and bazaars mentioned in its inscriptions. The town proper as in the case of the large cities of the present day was not confined to the traditionary old limits (*ullâlai*) but extended far beyond (*purambadi*). The following streets, bazaars and quarters of which several were named after the king or the princes of the family are mentioned (Nos. 94 and 95):—

- (1) Abhimânabbûshana-terinda-vêlam.
- (2) Âṇai-âṭkal-teru.
- (3) Âṇaikkaḍuvâr-teru.
- (4) Arumoridêva-terinda-tirupparigalattâr-vêlam.
- (5) Brahmakuttam.
- (6) Gândharva-teru.
- (7) Jayaṅgondasôṭrapperunderu.
- (8) Kōṅgavâlâr-aṅgâḍi.
- (9) Madaippalli-teru.
- (10) Pâṇḍi-vêlam.
- (11) Paṇmai-yâr-teru.
- (12) Pañchavaṇmâdêviyâr-vêlam *alias* Kaidavakaidava vêlam.
- (13) Râjarâja-Brahmamahârâjaṇ-aṅgâḍi.
- (14) Râjarâja-terinda-Pâṇḍi-tirumaṇjaṇattâr-vêlam.
- (15) Râjavidyâdharapperunderu.
- (16) Raudramahâkâlattu-maḍaivilâgam.
- (17) Śâliyatteru.
- (18) Śivadâsanôsôlai *alias* Râjarâja-Brahmamahârâjaṇ-padaivîḍu.
- (19) Śûrasikhâmaṇipperunderu.
- (20) Tribhuvanamahâdêvippeṇaṅgâḍi.
- (21) Uttamaśîliyâr-vêlam.
- (22) Uyyakkondâṇ-terinda-tirumaṇjaṇattâr-vêlam.
- (23) Vâṇavaṇmâdêvipperunderu.
- (24) Villigal-teru.
- (25) Vîrasôṭrapperunderu.

The exact date of the building of the Tanjore temple is a question that deserves some attention. Stone temples were apparently not quite common in the time of Râjarâja. This is shown by the use of the word *tirukkarrali*, *i.e.* "the stone temple" in the order of the king to have all the gifts engraved on stone. The difficulties also of procuring stones for such a big building must have been very great, particularly as there was no hill in or very near Tanjore which could have supplied the requisite quantity. Such a monument as the Tanjore temple would take several years to build even with all the inventions of modern engineering. But at the time of which we are speaking mechanical appliances must have

been in a primitive state and hence the time taken to finish the building must have been much longer. Therefore we shall only try to fix when the building was probably begun and when it came to a close. We have some reason to suppose that the period between the 18th and the 21st year of the king's reign was not occupied with any wars. This was probably the time when the titles Śrī-Râjarâja and Śivapâdaśekhara were conferred on him as suggested already. The name Śrī-Râjarâja occurs first in an inscription of the 19th year of his reign. If, as is not unlikely, the name Śrī-Râjarâjêśvara was given to the temple in order to perpetuate the *biruda* Śrī-Râjarâja the king could not have conceived the idea of constructing the temple before the 19th year. The temple must have existed in some form or other in the 21st - 22nd year (= A.D. 1005-1006); because it was during this year that the king's expedition against Satyâśraya was undertaken, and on his return from this conquest Râjarâja is said to have presented some gold flowers to the temple. The whole structure, however, could not have been ready by that time. A very large number of gifts are stated to have been made between the 23rd and 29th years. The 23rd year was probably chosen because the building of the temple had in that year reached an advanced stage. Thus it appears that the construction of the temple began in the 19th year and that a considerable portion of it was completed by the 23rd year. On the 275th day of the 25th year the king presented a copper-pot to be placed on the pinnacle of the central shrine. We may conclude from this that the topmost portion of the central shrine must have been ready by that time; for, so far as the central shrine was concerned, the fixing of the copper-pot on the pinnacle would have been the last thing to be done.

A considerable part of the enclosure of the temple was, by order of the king, built by a Brâhmaṇa named Kṛishṇaṇ Râmaṇ who was a military officer. This fact is engraved twice on the south enclosure and once on the west enclosure. From this repetition we may conclude that these two enclosures were built at different times by the king's general. There is no such inscription on any part of the north or east enclosure, and it is not impossible that they were built by the king himself. The *gôpura* of the east enclosure and the Chaṇḍêśvara shrine must have been built before the conquest of the 12,000 islands by the king in the 29th year of his reign.¹

The circumstances which led to the building of the Śrī-Râjarâjêśvara temple may now be examined. In the *Dêvâram* hymns, the *Tiruvîsaippâ* and the *Periyapurâṇam*, the first place among Śaiva shrines is assigned to the Natarâja temple at Chidambaram which is designated *kôyil*, i.e., "the temple". The name Âḍavallân "one who is able to dance" which was given to one of the chief images² in the Râjarâjêśvara temple is derived from

¹ It is particularly noteworthy that unlike other Chôla temples of the south, the Bṛihadiśvara temple at Tanjore was built completely with its necessary adjuncts in the time of Râjarâja himself, the founder of that temple, "on a well-defined and stately plan which was preserved in till its completion" (Tanjore District Gazetteer, Volume I, page 270). The small temple of Subrahmanya within the courtyard of the temple is not referred to in the inscriptions though the adjoining Chaṇḍêśvara shrine is. Consequently, it seems to have been a later addition (See Fergusson's *Indian Architecture*, Vol. I, p. 365). The Bṛihannâyakî temple also in the courtyard, was constructed in the second year of a certain Kônêrinmaikondân, probably a Pândya king of the 13th century A.D. (No. 61). The Dakṣiṇâmûrti shrine abutting the south wall of the central shrine has been already suggested to have been a later addition. The Mahrâṭhî inscription on the inner wall of the south enclosure which is dated in Śaka 1723, Durmatî (= A.D. 1801-02) states that the Mahrâṭha king Sarphôji-Mahârâja executed elaborate repairs to the shrines of Gaṇêśa, Subrahmanya, the Goddess (Bṛihannâyakî), Sabhâpati, Dakṣiṇâmûrti and Chaṇḍêśvara, built one or two new *maṇḍapas*, and renovated the *prâkâra* walls, the temple kitchen and the flooring of the courtyard.

² Three of these are mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions, viz., Âḍavallân or Dakṣiṇamêru-Viṭaṅkaṇ Taṇjai-Viṭaṅkaṇ and Mahâmêru-Viṭaṅkaṇ.

that of the deity in the temple at Chidambaram and shows the importance attached to that temple during the time of which we are now speaking. From two of the Tanjore inscriptions (Nos. 65 and 66) it is evident that the names of the god as well as of the temple at Chidambaram and their various synonyms were very commonly borne by men and women during the time of Râjarâja.

Reference has already been made to the titles Śrî-Râjarâja and Śivapâdaśekhara. The second which means 'one (who has) the feet of Śiva as (his) crest' is a distinctly religious designation. Râjarâja being one of the names of Kubêra, the Hindu god of wealth and a friend of Śiva, the title Śrî-Râjarâja, "the glorious Kubêra" must have been conferred on him on account of his munificence. As it appears that both of these titles were conferred at one and the same time, it may be supposed that the king owed them to the authorities of the Chidambaram temple. Râjarâja's great grandfather Parântaka I. had distinguished himself by his devotion to that temple. He had either built or at least repaired the golden hall at the place. It was, therefore, quite natural that Râjarâja should try to imitate his famous ancestor in his devotion to the most important Śiva temple in Southern India. Practical as he appears to have been in everything he did, the king was not forgetful of his capital Tanjore when he wanted to demonstrate his devotion to the Śaiva religion, and accordingly built a temple there. In order to perpetuate the title Śrî-Râjarâja which he must have prized highly,¹ the temple was called Śrî-Râjarâjêśvara.

A study of the order in which the various inscriptions of the temple were engraved is not altogether unprofitable. It appears that the walls of the central shrine were reserved for recording royal gifts, including those of the king's elder sister about whom more will be said in the sequel. The inscription on the north wall (No. 1) which begins with the Sanskrit verse (*etat viśva-nrîpa-srêṇi, etc.*) was the first to be engraved and contains the order of Râjarâjadêva to have all the grants made by himself and others recorded on the walls of the central shrine. This order of the king is dated on the 20th day of the 26th year. The gifts which had actually been made prior to this date were, seven by the king himself and eleven by his elder sister as registered in No. 2. No earlier benefactions of any of the queens or other donors are known prior to this date. Accordingly when the king issued orders that the gifts made "by us, those made by our elder sister, those made by our wives and those made by other donors" should be engraved on stone, he himself intended to make in addition a large number of presents and expected that his queens and his officers would follow his example. Thus the order of the king referred more to future benefactions than to those which had actually been made prior to the date of the royal order. The earliest gift of which the date is definitely given is that of the copper-pot which was to be placed on the pinnacle of the central shrine. Though it was made on the 275th day of the 25th year, it is by mistake registered between a gift of the 34th day of the 26th year and another of the 104th day of the same year. Some at least of the numerous gifts which, in this inscription, are stated to have been made in the period from the 23rd to the 29th year of the king's reign may evidently have been anterior even to the date given at the beginning of the record. No. 2 likewise begins with the 310th day of the 25th year and registers gifts made by the elder sister of the king in that year and between the years 25

¹ A clear proof of his having highly valued these titles is found in No. 91 where the king is stated to have presented a large number of silver utensils to the temple, bearing the names Śrî-Râjarâja and Śivapâdaśekhara. The practice of engraving the name or title of the donor on vessels presented to a charitable institution, is still current.

and 29. It is apparent from this that no grants made could have been recorded on the temple walls prior to the 29th year of the king. This is also confirmed by the fact that all the inscriptions of Râjarâja in the Tanjore temple are either dated in the 29th year of the king or register gifts made until his 29th year.

One of the earliest inscriptions of Râjendra-Chôla found in the temple is on the Chandêśvara shrine quite close to the north wall. During the times of Râjendradêva, Kulôttunga I and Vikrama-Chôla, the north wall of the enclosure was chosen for recording grants. From these facts it may be concluded that the north wall was the most conspicuous portion of the temple. The gate on the north wall of the enclosure which is now practically closed must in ancient times have been considered as important as the *gôpura* on the east side. It is not unlikely that the royal palace was situated to the north of the temple,¹ and that the members of the royal family entered the temple by the north gate. At any rate, the foregoing facts show that the gate in the north wall of the enclosure was in ancient times as important as the *gôpura* on the east wall which is now most commonly used.

A few words about the importance of the Tanjore inscriptions for the history of Tamil philology may not be out of place here. In the first place the rules of *sandhi* are not uniformly observed. We have *ney amudu*, *ârakku âga*, *kari amudu*, *paruppu amudu*, *urakku âga*, *uri âga* and *para arisi*. Forms like *nârkkarañju*, *nârppattu* are not uncommon. The three forms *nâri uri*, *nâriyuri* and *nâduri* occur; also *tiṅgaḍôrum* and *tiṅgaṭṭiruvirâ*. These forms show that the rules were not unknown. Perhaps they were not commonly used in the popular dialect. The indiscriminate use of the two forms of dental *n* is also worthy of note *mûṇṇinâl*, *padinâṇinâl*, *iraṇḍinâl*, *aiṇḍinâl*, *âṇinâl*, *eṭṭinâl* and *pattinâl*. The addition of *y* after words ending in *e* and *ai* is common. Its use in the middle of a word occurs in *tirukkaiyakkârai*, *aiyṅgarañju*, *vaiyṭtu* and other words.

The use of the word *kaḍara* as a principal verb is common in monumental Tamil and occurs also in the Tanjore inscriptions. In modern Tamil it is only an auxiliary verb. The history of this word is analogous to that of the English *ought*. The word *arivu*² appears to have narrowed in its meaning. It occurs in the Tanjore inscriptions in the sense of 'expenditure' while its modern meaning is 'waste'. The termination *âl* in the word *pattinâl* of the sentence திருப்பொற்றூ ஒன்று பொன் ஒன்பதின் கழஞ்செய் முக்காலெ நாலு மஞ்சாடியாக திருப்பொற்றூப் பத்தினுற் பொன் தொண்ணூற்று ஒன்பதின் கழஞ்சரை is used in the sense of the dative case, though *âl* is only an instrumental termination. According to the Tamil grammar *Nannûl*, the instrumental termination *âl* is in rare cases used in the sense of *tôrum* and quotes the example *ûṛâl oru kôyil*. This use of the termination *âl* is very common in the Tanjore inscriptions. In the phrase நான் பதினானால் குடுத்த, *âl* is used practically as a locative termination. In கொயிலினுள்ளால் இருமடிசேழகின், etc. (No. 1, paragraph 1), கொயிலினுள்ளால் is used in the sense of கொயிலில். Again comparing the phrases காகின் வாய்த்திங்கள் அரைக்கால் அக்கப்பொலிசை and காசு ஒன்றுக்குத் திங்கள் அரைக்கால் அக்கப்பலிசை both of which occur in the Tanjore inscriptions, we have to conclude that *vâḍy* is practically a dative termination though it is generally treated as a locative ending. Phrases like பண்-

¹ No. 624 of 1902 from Tiruvalaṇḍuṇi dated in the 21st year of Râjarâja mentions his palace at Tiruvalam (*Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1903*, p. 3). It is not impossible that by this is meant the village Vallam 7 miles south-west of Tanjore, which is described as "a fortress of considerable strength and one of the great bulwarks of Tanjore."

² In early Kanarese inscriptions of about the 8th century A.D. *ûr-arivu* occurs in the sense of "destruction of the village (by enemies)."

டாரத்தில் பவழத்தில் கொத்த பவழம் ; பண்டாரத்துப் பவழத்தில் கொத்த பவழம், இரண்டாந் தரத்தில் முத்தில் and இரண்டாந்தரத்து முத்தில் and கிளி ஒன்றில் கண்ணில் show that the locative was often used for the genitive. The use of the words *tirumēni* and *pratimā* which are almost synonymous is interesting. The former is used with reference to an image of a god while the word *pratimā* denotes "an image of a human being". The word *polisai* or *polisaiyūttu* which occurs in the sense of "interest" is not quite common in modern Tamil. The word is however current in Malayālam. In modern Tamil it means "interest on grain lent for the season". Here, too, there has been a decided change in the meaning of the word. The Sanskrit phrase *chandrādityavat* becomes *chandrādityaval* in the first instance and then the final *l* becomes *r* according to a rule of Tamil grammar. This change of *t* into *l* is more frequent in Malayālam than Tamil. The Tamil words *tarpuruda* (Sanskrit *tatpurusha*) and *tarsama* (Sanskrit *tatsama*) are evidently formed on the same principle.

The rule of changing *l* into *r* is also applied in the case of a Tamil word ending in the consonant *l* combining with a purely Sanskrit word. Thus we have பள்ளியிற் ஸலெயார். The Sanskrit *padma* is always written *patma* in the Tanjore inscriptions; and the word *anyadēsa* occurs in the form *anādēsa*, while *ratna* is sometimes written *ranna*. The hard consonant is used for the soft in *Bhṛimkīsa*, *ardhachantra*¹, *Limkapurāṇadēva* and *Patañcholidēva*. In *Kshētrabāladēva* the reverse rule holds good. It is not apparent why the *k* is aspirated in *Trailōkhyamahādēviyār*. The use of the word *akkam* for *akkai* deserves to be noted. *Tammai* is used for *tam-ammai* and *tamappan* for "father". The latter occurs also in an earlier inscription at Śōrapuram near Vellore.² The use of finite verbs (*viḷakkirru* and *kāttirru*) as verbal nouns is not uncommon in modern Tamil (p. 208). The vulgar forms சொப்பு, எடுப்பிச்ச, மொழிஞ்சருள, பிடிச்சருளின, தைச்ச, எறிஞ்சு, வெட்டிச்ச, and ஐஞ்சு are worthy of note. அறிய உண்ணாதன is used for அறிய ஒண்ணாதன twice (pp. 78 and 85). The form விட்டன் occurs several times for வட்டம் or வட்டன். For the modern Tamil வெற்றிலை the Tanjore inscriptions invariably use the form வெள்ளிலை, which occurs also in the Ambāsamudram Vāṭṭeruttu inscription of Varaguna-Pāṇḍya.³ Note also the use of ஒரணை for ஓரிணை.

The art of making ornaments of gold and precious stones must have reached a very advanced stage in the Chōla country about the beginning of the 11th century A.D. A large number of ornaments which are mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions either go by other names at present or have no representatives in modern South-Indian jewel shops⁴. The nine gems are mentioned in one of the inscriptions (No. 93). Their names are: diamond⁵

¹ Compare also Chōḍa for Chōra in Telugu; தமிழ் + பொதியில் = தமிழ்ப்பொதியில்; *nārgāmunḍa* for *nāḍgāmunḍa* in Kanarese.

² *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. VII, p. 193, text-line 4.

³ *Ibid.* Vol. IX, p. 91, text-line 59 f.

⁴ One of the ornaments is called *Śōṇagachchidukkinkūdu* (No. 93), the first component of which indicates the influence of the Jōnakas (Greeks or Arabs) in Southern India in the 11th century A.D.

⁵ The following varieties of diamonds are mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions:—*mattadārai*, *mattadārai-chavakkam* and *mattadārai-chappadi* (p. 78, paragraph 3 and p. 79, paragraph 9). Another classification of diamonds appears to have been *sappadi* (flat diamonds) and *urulai* (round diamonds) (p. 185, paragraph 48 and p. 195, paragraph 25). In paragraph 8 on p. 78 reference is made to pure diamonds (*vayirantūyana*) and to the two other varieties *pandasāram* and *savakkam*. The flaws in diamonds are mentioned to be *porivu* (spots), *murivu* (cracks), *kāka-bindu* (black dots), *rakta-bindu* (red dots) and *rendana* (marks as of burning). *Palikkuvayiram* "crystal diamond" is mentioned on pp. 78, 87, 162 and 163, and *palingu* "crystal" on pp. 87, 143, 162, 205, 206, 207, 225, 226 and 237. *Rājāvartam* is mentioned after *pavaram* in three cases (pp. 69, 143 and 179). Of *rājāvarta* (lapis lazuli) Monier Williams says 'it is a kind of diamond or other gem of an inferior quality,

(*vayiram*), sapphire (*nīlam*), pearl (*muttu*), topaz (*pushyarāga*), cinnamon-stone (*kōmēdagam*), coral (*pavaram*), emerald (*pachchai* or *maratagam*), lapis lazuli (*vaidūrya*) and ruby (*mānikkam*). Four rings on each of which the foregoing nine jewels had been set were presented to the temple. The amount of gold, jewels and silver granted by the king is almost incredible. Several of the Tanjore inscriptions contain lists of gold ornaments set with pearls and other precious stones. The different parts of the ornaments are described in technical language and the number of jewels set on each, their total weight excluding threads and lac and the approximate cost of each ornament are registered in great detail.

The Tanjore inscriptions also throw some light on the economic condition of the people of the Chôla country about the beginning of the 11th century. The land assessment (*kānik-kadān*) was roughly one hundred *kalam* of paddy for each *vēli* of land. It would be interesting to compare this with the present rate of assessment. Paddy was sold at the rate of two *kalam* for each *kāsu* and three ewes could be purchased for one *kāsu*. The rate of interest was apparently $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It was actually $\frac{1}{8}$ *kāsu* per year for each *kāsu* or 3 *kuruni* of paddy for each *kāsu* per year. Table A at the end of this paragraph shows the grain value of some of the articles of daily consumption and table B the wages in kind. The latter includes learned professions as well as ordinary workmen. For Śivayôgins who had to attend the temple on certain festive occasions and who may be taken to represent the average middle-class men of the time, the allotment made for each meal is 1 *kuruni* and 2 *nāri* of paddy. Assuming that a middle-class man took two meals a day, the daily consumption for each man would be $2\frac{1}{2}$ *kuruni* of paddy per day. In table B the parasol-carrier may be taken as the type of the lowest class of manual labourers and each of them got 40 *kalam* of paddy per year and this would yield $1\frac{1}{3}$ *kuruni* of paddy for each day. We need not suppose that he was a full time workman of the temple. He would probably be earning extra wages during the time when his services were not required in the temple. It is worthy of note

said to come from the country of Virāṭa and regarded as a lucky possession though not esteemed as an ornament.' As regards rubies (*mānikkam*) the varieties are: *halahalam*, *halahalam* of superior quality (*halahalam gunaviyana*), smooth rubies (*kōmalam*), bluish rubies (*nīlagandhi*), unpolished rubies (*talam*), and *saṭṭam*, all of which are mentioned on p. 79, paragraph 8. They were also divided into big rubies (*pariyana*) and small rubies (*neriyana*). The flaws of rubies are recorded as: cavities (*kurivu*), cuts (*prahara*), holes (*rejjam*), white specks (*lasuni*), *trāsa* and such as still adhered to the ore (*karpazru*). As regards *potti*, which was either a kind of gem or part of a jewel, it has to be noted that it always occurs either with *paḷingu* or *paḷikkuvayiram* (pp. 143, 163, 196, 205, 206, 207, 225, 226 and 237). Other gems *taruppu* (p. 205), *uppalanīlam* evidently a variety of sapphire (p. 204) and *nāli-gaṅgapādikkal* (p. 196) are also mentioned. The name of the last is interesting as it appears to have been originally at least obtained from Gaṅgapādi. Dr. Hultzsch thinks it may be the same as beryl. As regards pearls the following varieties were recognised: round pearls (*vaṭṭam*), roundish pearls (*anuvattam*), polished pearls (*oppumuttu*), small pearls (*kurumuttu*), *nimboḷam*, *payiṭṭam*, old pearls (*paramuttu*), *ambumudu*, *oruppuravan*, *irattai*, *sappatti*, *sakkattu*, *karadu*, *pānichohāy*, *tōl-tēyndana* and *tōliḍandana*. Their properties were *varai*, *karai*, *kuru*, *suppiram*, *ippipazru*, *arāvina*, *śivandanir*, *kulirnda-nir* and *tiraṅgal*, which are also mentioned. The nine gems are referred to in the Tamil poem *Śilappadigāram* where the virtues and flaws of each of them are also given. Of diamonds the author mentions four flaws, viz., *kākapādam*, *kaṅgam*, *vindu* and *ēgai*, while the commentator refers to twelve flaws of diamonds, viz., *saraimalam*, *kizru*, *sambadī*, *pilattal*, *tuḷai*, *kari*, *vindu*, *kākapādam*, *miruttu*, *kōḍiyillana*, *kōḍimurindana* and *tāraimarungina*. The five characteristics of diamonds are: eight faces (*palagai*), six angles (*kōḍi*), *dārai*, *sutti* and *tarāsa* and the four colours, the Brāhmaṇa "white", the Kshatriya "red", the Vaiśya "green" and the Śūdra "black". Consequently the virtues and flaws of diamonds were known in the Tamil country long before the time of Rājārāja. Varāhamihira (6th century A.D.) describes the characteristics of a diamond in the following verse:—

सर्वद्रव्याभेद्यं लघ्दम्भासि तरति रश्मिवत् त्रिगुणम् ।

तद्विदनलशक्रचापोपमं च वज्रं हितायोक्तम् ॥

that chillies are not mentioned where they may naturally be expected and cocoanuts seem to have been unknown at least in the vicinity of Tanjore if not in the Chôla country. The *teṅgu* [*maram*] occurs on p. 56, paragraph 13, and in the large Leyden plates (text-line 314) the donee is authorised to plant cocoanut trees. Though the cocoanut was known, perhaps it was not quite common and therefore it is not mentioned among the offerings presented to the temple. Dhal exchanged with paddy in the ratio of 1 to 3 and curds in the same proportion. Some of the other articles in Table B are also mentioned in two other inscriptions (Nos. 6 and 35). But their prices vary in the three. This difference must be due to the varying quality of the articles.

TABLE A.

ARTICLES of daily consumption and their exchange value at the beginning of the 11th century A.D.

Number.	Items.	Quantity.	Price.
1	Cardamom seeds ..	1 kurūṇi and 4 nâri ..	1 kâṣu.
2	Champak buds ..	1 padakku ..	1 kâṣu.
3	Khaskhas roots ..	605 palam ..	1 kâṣu.
4	Dhal ..	1 nâri, 3 urakku and 1 ârâkku ..	5 nâri, 1 uri and 1 ârâkku of paddy.
5	Pepper ..	1 ârâkku and 1 3/4 ūveṇḍu ..	5 nâri, 1 urakku of paddy.
6	Mustard ..	1 ârâkku and 1 ūveṇḍu ..	2 nâri and 1 urakku of paddy.
7	Cumin ..	3/4, 3/5, 3/6 ūveṇḍu ..	1 nâri.
8	Sugar ..	3 palam ..	1 1/2 kâṣu.
9	Ghee ..	1 urakku, 1 ârâkku, 3 3/4 ūveṇḍu ..	1 kurūṇi and 7 nâri of paddy.
10	Tamarind ..	8 palam ..	1 nâri of paddy.
11	Curds ..	3 nâri ..	1 kurūṇi, 1 nâri of paddy.
12	Gram ..	3 ūveṇḍu ..	1 urakku of paddy.
13	Plantains ..	18 ..	5 nâri of paddy.
14	Salt ..	1 urakku and 1 ârâkku ..	1 urakku and 1 ârâkku of paddy.
15	Tender (plantain?) leaves ..	12 ..	2 nâri of paddy.
16	Arecanuts and betel-leaves	{ 30 } { 60 } ..	4 nâri and 1 urakku of paddy.
17	Bark ..	1 kâṣu ..	1 nâri of paddy.
18	Camphor ..	3 kaṇaṇḍu ..	1 kâṣu.
19	Pulse ..	1 nâri ..	3 nâri of paddy.

TABLE B.

WAGES in the Chôla country at the beginning of the 11th century A.D.

Number.	Nature of work.	Wages.
1	Brahmachârin, temple servant ..	2 kurūṇi of paddy per day and 4 kâṣu per year.
2	Permanent temple servant ..	3 kurūṇi of paddy per day and 4 kâṣu per year.
3	Garland-maker ..	2 kurūṇi of paddy per day and 5 kâṣu per year.
4	Accountant ..	200 kalam of paddy per year.
5	Dancing girl ..	100 kalam of paddy per year.
6	Dancing master ..	2 shares (i.e., 200 kalam of paddy per year).
7	Lute-player ..	1 3/4 shares (i.e., 175 kalam do.).
8	Musician who had to sing in Sanskrit	1 1/2 shares (i.e., 150 kalam do.).
9	Do. in Tamil	Do. do.).
10	Drummer ..	1 share (i.e., 100 kalam of paddy per year).
11	Temple Accountant ..	2 shares (i.e., 200 kalam do.).
12	Deputy Accountant ..	3/4 share (i.e., 75 kalam do.).
13	Parasol-carrier ..	3/5 share (i.e., 40 kalam do.).
14	Lamp-lighter ..	1/2 share (i.e., 50 kalam do.).
15	Washerman ..	1 share (i.e., 100 kalam do.).
16	Barber ..	1/2 share (i.e., 50 kalam do.).
17	Tailor ..	1 share (i.e., 100 kalam do.).
18	Jewel-stitcher ..	1 1/2 shares (i.e., 150 kalam do.).
19	Brazier ..	1 share (i.e., 100 kalam do.).
20	Master Carpenter ..	1 1/2 shares (i.e., 150 kalam do.).
21	Ordinary Carpenter ..	3/4 share (i.e., 75 kalam do.).
22	Goldsmith Superintendent ..	1 share (i.e., 100 kalam do.).
23	Tiruppadyam reciter ..	3 kurūṇi of paddy per day.

The following portions of villages were communal and as such free from assessment :— the village site, the village tank and its banks ; the portion occupied by the artisans and the Pariahs ; the burning ground ; the irrigation channels ; temples ; the shrines of Aiyan, Kâdugâl, Durgaiyâr and Kâlâ-Pidâriyâr ; the temple of Śēttai (Jyêshthâ), the shrines of the Pidâris Tiruvâl-udaiyâl, Kuduraivattam-udaiyâl, Punnaitturai-naṅgai and Poduvagai-Ūrudaiyâl ; ponds in the middle of fields ; flower-gardens ; streams ; the portion occupied by toddy-drawers ; the portion occupied by washermen ; the water-pond used by Pariahs ; the portion occupied by the polluting castes ; high roads ; rivers ; the sacred courts (*i.e.*, temples) ; the cremation ground of the Pariahs ; the stone fence (for cattle) ; the stables (*kottagâram*) ; the village threshing floor ; grazing ground for calves ; wells and cisterns.

A large number of villages in the Chôla country had *sabhâs* or regularly constituted village corporations which watched jealously over the internal affairs of the village. The Uttaramallûr inscriptions of Parântaka I published by me in the Director-General's Annual for 1904-05 lay down rules for the selection of members to the village committees which were apparently controlled by the village assemblies. We may presume that the same rules were in force in other village *sabhâs*. There were also villages where the villagers managed the business of the village without having been constituted into a regular corporation.¹ Whenever the village assemblies existed, their transactions must have been quite lively as there were periodical changes of members on these bodies. They seem to have been entrusted with civil and magisterial powers. In fact each village seems to have been a self-contained body jealously watching over its own interests as well as those of its members. The village assemblies generally managed temples and were trustees of public charities. A number of village assemblies are said to have received money on interest from the Râjarâjêśvara temple at Tanjore. In all probability the money thus borrowed was utilised in bringing waste lands under cultivation. From the produce of these lands the interest on the money borrowed was paid. The money itself was apparently never returned. Village assemblies could alienate lands whenever the liabilities incurred by them could not be otherwise discharged.

The reign of a powerful king like Râjarâja could not have been without its effect on South-Indian literature. The traditions about the life of the sixty-three devotees of Śiva which were in later times embodied by the Tamil poet Śēkkirâr in his *Periyapurânam*² were already current at the time of which we are speaking. The Śaiva hymns of the Tiruppadiyam were sung in the temple by 48 musicians accompanied by two drummers (No. 65). The king himself and one of his officers set up images of the most prominent of the Śaiva devotees and presented valuable ornaments to them. Râjarâja and his officers would thus have created a Śaiva revival even if it did not already exist.³ It is, however, more probable that in setting up these images they were only representing the religious fervour of the

¹ See the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1913, p. 98, paragraph 23.

² It was in the time of the Chôla king Anapâya that Śēkkirâr is supposed to have compiled the *Periyapurânam*. The record at Tiruvârûr, partly published on page 153 of this volume and allied inscriptions from other places prove that this Anapâya could be no other than the Chôla king Kulôttuṅga-Chôla II (A.D. 1133 to at least 1148) ; see the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1912, Part II, paragraph 27.

³ The great love entertained by Râjarâja for Śaivism must have been eagerly imbibed by his son Râjendra-Chôla. The latter's spiritual teacher (*guru*) was Îśâna-Śiva-Paṇḍita the *Śaivâchârya* of the Tanjore temple. No. 20 also mentions the *Śaivâchârya* Śarva-Śiva-Paṇḍita and makes provision of paddy for him, his pupils and his pupils' pupils who were natives of Âryadêśa, Madhyadêśa and Gauḍadêśa. In Trilôchana Śivâchârya's *Siddhântasârâvali* we are told that the Chôla king Râjendra-Chôla brought many Śaiva teachers from the banks of the Ganges and settled them in the Chôla country.

people at large to whom the lives of the sixty-three devotees of Śiva must have been quite familiar even before the time of Râjarâja.

It has been supposed that Nambi-Âṇḍâr-Nambi was a contemporary of Râjarâja.¹ It is true his patron is said to have been a Chôla king named Râjarâja Abhaya-Kulaśêkhara. But there is a very serious difficulty in identifying this Râjarâja with the builder of the Tanjore temple. Among the poems which Nambi-Âṇḍâr-Nambi is said to have classified, is the *Tiruvîsaippâ* which contains a hymn on the Gaṅgaikonda-Chôlêśvara temple built evidently by Râjarâja's son Râjendra-Chôla and called after his title Gaṅgaikonda-Chôla. The composer of the hymn himself must have lived after Râjarâja ; and Nambi-Âṇḍâr-Nambi who classifies it along with the sacred writings of the Tamil Śaivas, must certainly belong to a still later period.

The chief image of the Tanjore temple was called Âḍavallân.² Another name of the same image was Dakṣiṇamêru-Vidaṅgaṇ. Âḍavallân was also the name of a grain measure and of a weight for precious metals ; while Dakṣiṇamêru-Vidaṅgaṇ was the standard used in weighing precious stones. These two names were also borne frequently by ordinary individuals. Âḍavallân 'one who is able to dance' occurs as a name of the god at Chidambaram in the first hymn of the *Tiruvîsaippâ* which was composed by Tirumâligaittêvar. The name Dakṣiṇamêru-Vidaṅgaṇ as applied to a god is easily explained with the help of a hymn of the *Tiruvîsaippâ* where Mêru-Vidaṅgaṇ occurs as a name of the god at Chidambaram. Mount Mêru consists of gold and is supposed to be situated to the north of Jambudvîpa. The temple at Chidambaram seems to have been looked upon as the Southern Mêru, as it contained a large amount of gold on the roof of its golden hall. Thus it seems to me that the two names of the most important image in the Tanjore temple are traceable to the *Tiruvîsaippâ*. The names Eduttapâdam, Maralaich-chilambu and Nîranipavarakkunru which occur as the names of the temple women in the Tanjore inscriptions (No. 66) are also found in the *Tiruvîsaippâ*. A number of other names which occur in the former are also found in the latter. I am inclined to think, therefore, that one or more of the authors of the *Tiruvîsaippâ* must have flourished during the reign of Râjarâja. Karuvûrdêvar who composed the hymns on the Râjarâjêśvara and Gaṅgaikonda-chôlêśvara temples must have lived after Râjarâja. Gaṇḍarâditya, another of the authors of the *Tiruvîsaippâ*, has been identified with Gaṇḍarâditya, second son of Parântaka I. So little is known about this Gaṇḍarâditya that I am tempted to question this identification. It is true that in the hymn in question Gaṇḍarâditya calls himself 'king of Kôri' and 'lord of Tañjai.' But perhaps this means nothing more than that he belonged to the Chôla royal family.³ Another of the authors of the *Tiruvîsaippâ* is Nambi-Kâḍa-Nambi. A certain Nambi-Kâḍa-Nambi of the Âtrêya-gôtra is mentioned in an inscription of the 32nd year of the Chôla king Râjâdhirâjadêva.⁴ In the light of the foregoing facts it may be concluded that only some of the authors of the *Tiruvîsaippâ* flourished during the reign of Râjarâjadêva.

¹ *Christian College Magazine* for September 1896.

² See above, p. 13, note 2.

³ A certain Madhurântakan Gaṇḍarâdittanâr (*Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1907, Part II, paragraph 37) figures in several of the early inscriptions of Râjarâja making enquiries about the management of Śaiva temples, asking for their accounts and rectifying abuses. He was probably the son of Madhurântakan Uttama-Chôla, the predecessor of Râjarâjadêva. It is not altogether impossible that this Madhurântakan Gaṇḍarâdittanâr was the author of the hymn in the *Tiruvîsaippâ* under reference.

⁴ No. 221 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1894.

It has been already pointed out that Râjarâja's conquests extended over almost the whole of the present Madras Presidency and included also Ceylon, portions of the southern districts of Bombay and the 'twelve thousand old islands' whose identification is not quite certain. His inscriptions, however, are mostly confined to the Śôra-maṇḍalam, *i.e.*, the Chôla country proper which included the Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts; the Tondai-maṇḍalam or Jayaṅ-gondachôla-maṇḍalam to which belonged the South Arcot, Chingleput, North Arcot and Chittoor districts; the Pândi-maṇḍalam (surnamed Râjarâja-maṇḍalam) which included Madura, Ramnad and Tinnevely districts; Malai-nâḍu¹; Gaṅgapâḍi, Nulambapâḍi, Taḍigai-pâḍi, and Kuḍamalai-nâḍu which formed the whole of the present Mysore State, Coorg and a portion of the Anantapur district; and Îra-maṇḍalam (Ceylon) which was otherwise called Mummaḍiśôra-maṇḍalam. Consequently the conquests of Râjarâja such as those of Vêṅgai-nâḍu, Rattapâḍi, etc., where his inscriptions are not found, could not have amounted to anything like annexation of those kingdoms into the Chôla territory.

The main divisions and sub-divisions given below are taken from the inscriptions of Râjarâja copied so far by the Madras Epigraphist's Office.² It may be noted that while the sub-divisions are generally named after the chief village, the main divisions receive their names from the titles of the king. It appears also that the territorial limits of the divisions could not have changed with the change of rulers but often fresh names were conferred on them. Of the villages in each sub-division entered below, those enclosed in brackets are the modern names and those printed in italics are taken from the inscriptions of Râjarâja other than those of Tanjore.

A.—ŚÔRA-MANḌALAM.

I.—Arumoridêva-vaṇanâḍu (Teṇ Kaḍuvây)³—

(1) Aḷa-nâḍu:—Kîraiyl *alias* Paramêśvaramaṅgalam, Porundambondai and Śembiyanmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimamaṅgalam.

(2) Ârvala-kûrram:—Ârvalam (Alivalam), Mâlinûr, Tirutteṅgûr (Tiruttangûr) and Vadaviraiyânpallam.

(3) Idaiyaḷa-nâḍu:—Ariṇjigai-chaturvêdimamaṅgalam and Kundavai-chaturvêdimamaṅgalam.

(4) Inṅanâḍu:—Ârappâr (Ârppâr), Kaṇjâranagar (Kanjânegaram), Kîrandêvaṅkuḍi (Kîrankuḍi), Kîrvaḍugakkuḍi (Vaḍugakkuḍi), Kurukkai (Korukkai), Pâlûr *or* Pâlaiyûr (Pâlaiyûr), Râjakêsarinaḷlûr, Tannîrkkunram *alias* Râjarâjanallûr (Tannirkunnam), Uchchipâḍi, Vimalachittamaṅgalam and *Panrûr*.

(5) Maṅgala-nâḍu:—Maṅgalam (Mangal).

¹ That Râjarâja conquered the combined armies of the Pândyas and Chêras in Malai-nâḍu is clear from his inscriptions. But strangely enough no inscriptions of his appear to exist in the Chêra country, *i.e.*, the present Malabar and Travancore. The only place mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions as belonging to Malai-nâḍu is noted in the list.

² Chôla inscriptions subsequent to the time of Râjarâja supply the names of many more divisions and sub-divisions. These will be published in a later volume of Chôla inscriptions.

³ Kaḍuvây is perhaps identical with the river Kaduveiyâru in the Negapatam taluka. The villages mentioned under this head are found in the Negapatam, Nannilam, Tirutturaipundi, Mayavaram and Mannargudi taluks.

(6) Nenmali (Nemméli)-nādu :—Ārārrūr, Kunriyūr (Kunniyūr), Nedumanal *alias* Madanamañjari-chaturvêdimangalam (Tiruvaramésvaram), Palliyil, Śurāṅkuḍi, Kōttūr (Kōttūr) and *Paruttikkūḍi* (Parittikudi).

(7) Puliyūr-nādu :—Muruganallūr and *Tirukkārayil* (Thirukkāravásal).

(8) Puraṅgarambai-nādu :—Arumōḍidēva-chaturvêdimangalam (Arimuḍidēvan or Arumolitévan), Kalappār (Kalappar), Keruvattūr, Kōri, Kōyilār-Pudukkūḍi *alias* Kōḍaṇḍa-rāma-chaturvêdimangalam, Pallavaṇmahādēvi-chaturvêdimangalam (Sembiamahādēvi), Panaiyūr (Panaiyūr), Perumbalamarudūr, Śembiyaṇmahādēvi-chaturvêdimangalam, Śingalāntaka-chaturvêdimangalam (Singalāṇḍi), Vaṅganagar (Vanganagar) ¹, Vaṅkorraṅ-guḍi Pāsippuram and *Tirukkalar* (Tirukkalar).

(9) Takkalūr-nādu :—Kodimangalam ² and Vēnelvidugu-Pallavapuram ³.

(10) *Valivala-kūrram* :—*Kīraṅguḍi*.

(11) Vandārai-Vēlūr-kūrram :—Konṇūr, Kūrūr and Kurumba . . . , Dānatoṇag chaturvêdimangalam.

II. ⁴ Kshatriyaśikhāmaṇi-valanādu (Vada-Kaḍuvāy or Vada-nādu) :—

(1) Ala-nādu :—Pāppārkuḍi (Pappakudi), Peruṅgaḍambūr (Perunkadambanūr) and Porundambondai.

(2) Ingaṇādu :—Ingaṇ (Enkan).

(3) Marugal-nādu :—Marugal (Tirumarugal), Pūḍaṇūr (Pudanur), Tañjāvūr (Tanjore) and Vaippūr (Vaippūr).

(4) Muraiyūr-nādu :—Kundavai-chaturvêdimangalam.

(5) Panaiyūr-nādu :—Pugalôgamāṇikka-chaturvêdimangalam.

(6) Paṭṭina-kūrram ⁵ :—Kallūr (Kallūr) *alias* Śaṇṇamaṅgalam ¹, Kōttārakkūḍi (Kottārakkūḍi), Tirukkannanguḍi ⁶ (Thirukkannankudi), *Ānaimangalam* (Anaimangalam), *Kōvūr* (Kókūr), *Śivalaiyikkūḍi*, *Muñjikūḍi* (Munjikudi), *Pīrambil* (Pirambil), *Mūṅgirkūḍi* (Mungilkudi), *Nallūrchehēri*, *Kaḍambanūr* (Agarakkadambanūr), *Nāraṇamaṅgalam* (Nāranamangalam), *Vēlaṅguḍi* (Velangudi), *Narimaṇṇam* (Narimanam), *Śāttamaṅgalam* (Sathamangalam), *Uttūr* (Uttur), *Nannimaṅgalam* (Nannimangalam), *Peruvanūr*, *Ālaṅguḍi* (Ālangudi), *Turaiyūr* (Turaiyur), *Śēndamaṅgalam* (Sendamangalam), *Śiruchchēndamaṅgalam*, *Kurrālam* (Kuttālam), *Tiruvāvūr*, *Uvarkūḍi* (Ovarkudi), *Kaḍambaivāḍagai*, *Pālaṅkorraṅguḍi* (Kottangudi) and *Venkidāṅgil* (Kidangil).

(7) Śērrūr-kūrram :—Kudavāyil (Kudavásal), Nālūr (Nalur), Śērrūr (Settūr) and Marudattūr.

(8) Tēvūr-nādu :—Ālattūr (Ālattūr).

(9) Tirunaraiyūr-nādu :—Śrītuṅgamangalam ¹ *alias* Abhimāṇabhūṣaṇa-chaturvêdimangalam, Arakkankūḍi (Arukakudi), Karkūḍi ¹ (Karkudi), Kūrūr, *Māḍānamangalam* *alias* *Pāradāyakūḍi*, *Paraiyāru* (Palaiyar), Piḍārasēri, Tirunaraiyūr ¹ (Tirunaraiyūr) and Vandārañjēri (Vanduvānjēri).

(10) Tiruvārūr-kūrram (on the north bank of the Kāvērī) :—Ādiyappimaṅgalam or *Ādiyappi-chaturvêdimangalam* (Ādiyakkamangalam), Kīrkkūḍi and *Vēlaṅguḍi*.

¹ This place is mentioned in the large Leyden grant.

² Tirumāṅkunram and Paruttiyūr were perhaps near this village.

³ This was close to the Pāṇḍavāy river.

⁴ The villages in this division are found in the Kumbakōnam, Negapatam, Nannilam and Māyavaram taluks.

⁵ In the large Leyden plates this name is spelt Paṭṭanakkūrram.

⁶ Kōcheṇṅaṇ built a Vishṇu temple here.

(11) Vêlâ-nâdu :—Maṇarkâlappalli (Manakkal), Penpalli¹, Perumbôr, Râjamalla-chaturvêdimangalam and *Tirunallûr* (Tirunallûr).

III. ² Kêralântaka-or Tenkarai Kêralântaka-valanâdu.

(1) Śûralûr-kûrram :—Śôra-Uttama-chaturvêdimangalam.

(2) Tattaigala-nâdu :—Karrali-chaturvêdimangalam and *Dēvaṇappalli* (Somur).

(3) Uraiyr-kûrram :—Ariṇjigai-chaturvêdimangalam, Karuppûr (Karuppûr), Râjâs-
raya-chaturvêdimangalam or Nandipanmamangalam (Uyyakkondan-Tirumalai)³, Vayalûr
(Vayalûr), Râjarâja-chaturvêdimangalam⁴, *Tirupparâytturai* (Tiruppalâtturai), *Vijayâṅkura-
chaturvêdimangalam*, *Îśânzmaṅgalam* (Tiruchchendurai), *Allûr* (Allûr) and *Śirrambal* or
Tiruchchirâppali (Trichinopoly).

IV. ⁵ Râjêndrasimha-valanâdu or Vadagarai Râjêndrasimha-valanâdu :—
Parântaka-chaturvêdimangalam, Puliyûr (Piliyûr), Śrî-Vîranârâyana-chaturvêdimangalam
or Vîranârâyana-chaturvêdimangalam.

(1) Adigaimangai-nâdu :—Perundôttam.

(2) Anđattu-kûrram :—Kavaiyattalai *alias* Panditaśôra-chaturvêdimangalam, Śatti-
maṅgalam, Torûr and *Tiruppurambiyam* (Tiruppirambiyam).

(3) Innambar(Innambûr)-nâdu :—Âdanûr (Âdanûr), Asugûr (Asûr), Êr *alias* Mum-
maḍisôramangalam (Eragaram), Kottaiyûr (Kottaiyûr), Paraiya-Vânavanmahâdêvi-chatur-
vêdimangalam, Śrî-Parântaka-chaturvêdimangalam, Karuppûr (Karuppûr) and Maruttuvak-
kuḍi (Maruttuvakkudi).

(4) Iruṅgôlappâdi :—Valavanmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam.

(a) *Paruvû[r]-kûrram* :—*Nerkuppai* (Neikkuppai).

(5) Kâr-nâdu :—*Dvêdaikômapuram* part of *Śrî-Vîranârâyana-chaturvêdimangalam*.

(6) Koṇḍa-nâdu :—Pañchavanmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam.

(7) Kurukkai-nâdu :—Kadalanguḍi (Kadalanguḍi)⁶, Kâṭṭiyâr-brabmadêyam,
Kâvirimaṅgalam, Kurukkai (Korokkai) and Varagûr.

(8) Maṇni-nâdu :—Êmanallûr *alias* Trailôkyamahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam, Idai-
yarnallûr (Edaiyarnallûr), Idavai, Nâttârmaṅgalam (Nattaramangalam), Panandâdi, Vêmba-
rûr *alias* Avaniârâyana-chaturvêdimangalam⁷ (Véppattûr), *Tirukkuḍittittai* (Tirukkalittattai)
and *Tiruviśalûr* (Tiruvisalûr).

(9) Mirai-kûrram or Mirai-nâdu :—Kâmaravalli or Kâmaravalli-chaturvêdi-
maṅgalam⁸ (Kâmarasavalli), Pârthivaśekhara-chaturvêdimangalam, Irâmanûr, Kallûr
(Kallur), Tirupparayanam (Tiruppayanam) and Tiruttêvankuḍi.

(10) Miralai-nâdu (also called Vadagarai Miralai-nâdu) :—Śêynallûr and *Ilachchikuḍi*
alias Virarpura.

(11) Nallârrûr-nâdu :—Kadavâymangalam and Mahêndrakôṭṭûr.

¹ This village adjoined Maṇarkâlappalli.

² The villages in this division are found in the Kulittalai and Trichinopoly taluks.

³ No. 455 of 1908 mentions this village in Pândyakulâsani-valanâdu. Perhaps Tenkarai Kêralântaka-
valanâdu was contiguous with or part of Pândyakulâsani-valanâdu.

⁴ Peruṅguḍi was a hamlet of this village.

⁵ The villages in this division are found in the Kumbakonam, Mannargudi, Mayavaram, Nannilam,
Shiyali, Tanjore, Trichinopoly and Udaiyarpalayam taluks.

⁶ This place is mentioned in the large Leyden grant.

⁷ In the last years of Râjarâja I it was called Śôramârttânḍa-chaturvêdimangalam.

⁸ Kottaiyûr was a hamlet of this village.

- (12) Nāṅgūr-nāḍu :—Kunram, Marudūr (Marudūr) and Nāṅgūr (Nāngūr).
- (13) Neluvūr-nāḍu :—Kumarāditya-chaturvêdimāṅgalam.
- (14) Piḍavūr-nāḍu :—Nayadīramaṅgalam and *Piḍavūr* (Tiruppattūr).
- (15) Poygai-nāḍu :—Gandarāditya-chaturvêdimāṅgalam ¹ (Kandirāditam), Perumbuliyūr (Perumpuliyūr), *Tiruvaiyāru* (Tiruvaiyaru) ² and *Tirumarapāḍi* (Tirumalavādi).
- (16) Tirukkarumala-nāḍu :—Tēnūr (Tenur), Tirukkarumalam (Shiyāli) and Udayāditya-chaturvêdimāṅgalam.
- (17) Tiruvāli-nāḍu :—Kuruvāṇiyakkudi ³ alias Parakēsaripuram, Mallikudi, Tiruvāli (Tiruvāli) and Tiruttēvaṅkudi.
- (18) Tiruvindalūr-nāḍu :—Kaṇjāranagar (Kanjagaram), Mārapiḍugudēvi-chaturvêdimāṅgalam and Tirunanriyūr.
- (19) Uttuṅgatuṅga-valanāḍu or Vaḍagarai-Kunra-kūrṛam :—Paruvūr (Paluvūr), Iraikkudi (Erakudi) and *Śiruparuvūr* (Kilappaluvur).
- (20) Vennaiyūr-nāḍu :—Mādulavēlūr, Pāppārkudi (Pāppākkudi), Peruṅganbūr, Śōḍiyakkudi (Sōḍiyakkudi) and Vellūr (Vélūr).
- (21) Vēśālippāḍi :—Jayaṅkoṇḍa-Śōra-chaturvêdimāṅgalam.
- (22) Vilattūr (Velattūr)-nāḍu :—Kāttūr (Kāttūr).
- V. ⁴ Rājāśraya-valanāḍu (Maṛa-nāḍu) :—Śāṅgatti-chaturvêdimāṅgalam.
- (1) Kalāra-kūrṛam :—Iraiyaṅśēri, Māndōttam ⁵ and Parākramaśōra-chaturvêdimāṅgalam.
- (2) Mīmalai :—Kshatriyasimha-chaturvêdimāṅgalam and Mahēndramaṅgalam (Mahendramangalam).
- (3) Pāchechir-kūrṛam :—Kārimāṅgalam
- (a) Mī-Palāru :—Āṇpaṇūr ⁶.
- (b) Kīr-Palāru :—Īṅgaiyūr (Ingūr), Perumarudūr (Perumarudūr) and Turaiyūr (Turaiyūr); Panamaṅgalavanakarai-parru :—Panamaṅgalam (Panamangalam) and Śāttanpāḍi (Sattanpadi).
- (4) Śemburai-kaṇḍam :—Śiru-Śemburai (Sembarai).
- (5) Vaḍavari-nāḍu :—Tiruvellarai (Tiruvallarai).
- (6) Venkōṅkudi-kaṇḍam :—Venkōṅkudi ⁷ (Vengangudi) and Māgāṇikudi.
- VI. ⁸ Nittavinōḍa-valanāḍu :—Rājākēsari-chaturvêdimāṅgalam ⁹.
- (1) Āvūr-kūrṛam :—Āmuttiravalli or *Amitravalli-chaturvêdimāṅgalam* (Amuttiraveli), Irumbudal alias Manukulachōlāmani-chaturvêdimāṅgalam (Irumbutelai), Kūnargal-Munpiyūr, Vilattūr ¹⁰, Naraśiṅga-chaturvêdimāṅgalam (Narasingampet), Pattam (Pattam) and Śembaṅgudi (Sembangudi).

¹ Kulamāṇikkam and Nakkapirāṅkurichchi were hamlets of this village.

² This place is identical with Tiruvādi near which is situated Tillasthānam of Vaḍagarai Rājārāja-valanāḍu. Evidently the place was on the border-land between the two districts.

³ This was a *dēvadāna* of the Rājārājēśvara temple at Taṇjāvūr.

⁴ The villages in this division are found in the Musiri and Trichinopoly taluks.

⁵ The river Agaiyāru passed through this village.

⁶ Śēttimaṅgalam and Tiruppaiṇṇīli were perhaps near this village.

⁷ Vaḍagarai Venkōṅkudi is mentioned in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 73.

⁸ The villages in this division are found in the Kumbakonam, Mannargudi and Tanjore taluks.

⁹ Māṅgudi was a hamlet of this village.

¹⁰ This place is mentioned in the large Leyden grant.

(2) Kândâra-nâdu :—Visaiyâlaya- or Vijayâlaya-chaturvêdimangalam and Ravikulamânikkanallûr.

(3) Karambai-nâdu :—Kundavainallûr.

(4) Kirâr-kûrram :—Perumâkkalûr, Perumilattûr (Melattur), Śûlamangalam (Sulamangalam), Kilimangalam (Kilimangalam) and *Tiruchchatturai*.

(5) Mudichehō-nâdu or Mudichehōra-nâdu :—Jananâtha-chaturvêdimangalam¹, Śirri-navâr *alias* Paramêśvara-chaturvêdimangalam.

(6) Nallûr-nâdu :—Mângudi (Mangudi), Nallûr *alias* Pañchavanmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam (Nallûr), Râjakêsari-chaturvêdimangalam, Perungarai (Perungarai) and Râjarâjapuram.

(7) Pâmbuni-kûrram :—Śirrambar (Sittambar), Araisûr² (Arasûr) and Pâmbuni (Pâmani).

(8) Poyir-kûrram :—Karachchêri.

(9) Venṇi-kûrram :—Kîrppûṇḍi *alias* Olôkamahâdêvi (*i.e.*, Lôkamahâdêvi)-chaturvêdimangalam (Pundi), Mîduvêli, part of Pûdamangalam (Pudamangalam), Nagarakârîkurichchi³, Perunaṅgaimangalam (Perumangalam), Pûvaṇûr *alias* Avanikêsari-chaturvêdimangalam (Pûvanûr), Vaḍatâmarai⁴, Venṇi⁵ (Kôyilvenni), Venṇi-Tirappânpalli⁶, Kottaiyûr (Kottayûr) and Śrî-Pûdi.

(10) Vîrasôra-valanâdu :—Kamugaṇjêṇḍangudi (Sêṇḍangudi), Kulappâdi, Pēṇḍadugalam and Śiruvēnni.

VII.⁷ Uyyakkondân-valanâdu (between the rivers Araṣil and Kâvêri).

(1) Âkkûr-nâdu :—Râjêṇdrasimha-chaturvêdimangalam, Talaichcheṅgâdu and Tirukkadavûr (Tirukkadayûr).

(2) Ambar (Ambal)-nâdu :—Adiyaraiyakurumbal, Ambapurattûr, Avvainallûr (Aivanallûr), Nallarundûr, Pirettaiḱudi, *Kurumbil* (Kurumbur) and *Tirukkadavûr* (Tirucadayûr).

(3) Kurumbûr (Kurumbûr)-nâdu :—Iraiyânsêri, Kâyâkkudi, Kurumbapurattûr, Neduṅgâdu, Talichchêri (Taliecheri) *alias* Parâkramasôra-chaturvêdimangalam and Tiruvidaiḱkari (Tiruvidakkali).

(4) Marugal-nâdu :—Marudavûr.

(5) Pâmbura- or Pâmbûr-nâdu :—Kadaikkudi (Kadakkudi), Nallâvûr (Nallâvûr), Pâmburam (Tiruppâmpuram) and Tirukkuḱamûkkil⁸ (Kumbakonam).

(6) (Tenkarai)-Tiraimûr-nâdu :—Nerkuppai, Śâttaṇûr (Śâttaṇûr), *Nadâr* (Nadar), *Nallûrchchêri*, *Tirukkuraṅgâḱuturai* (Aduturai) and Mahêṇḍramangalam (Mahêṇḍrapalli).

(7) Tirunaraiyûr-nâdu :—Tandattôttam *alias* Mummaḱisôra-chaturvêdimangalam (Tandantôttam).

(8) Tiruvarundûr (Tiruvilandûr)-nâdu :—Akkalûr (Akkalur), Ayirkâdu, Nallûr (Nâlûr), Pudukkudi (Pudukkudi), Varagûr (Valuvûr) and *Nallûr*.

¹ Kutṭimangalam was a hamlet of this village.

² This place is mentioned in the large Leyden grant.

³ Adjoined Mîduvêli.

⁴ This place adjoined Nagarakârîkurichchi.

⁵ Śirri-Munniyûr was a village near this.

⁶ This place adjoined Vaḍatâmarai.

⁷ The villages in this division are found in the Kumbakonam, Mayavaram and Nannilam taluks.

⁸ Tiruvalaṇjuri was a suburb of this village.

(9) Vennâdu :—Amaṅkudi *alias* Kêralântaka-chaturvêdimangalam (Ammangudi), Karuvili (Karuvēli), Maṛalai or Tirumaṛalai (Tiruvilimalalai), Tirunâllam (Kónérirâjapuram), Vaigal (Vaiyal) *alias* Vânavanmahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam, Vayalûr (Vayalûr) and Vaḍagarai-mangalam.

(10) Vilai-nâdu :—Pariyalûr, Perumulai, Tiraimûr and Vilainagar *alias* Nittavinôda-chaturvêdimangalam.

VIII. ¹ Pâṇḍya (Pâṇḍi) kulâśani-valanâdu (the later Pâṇḍikulapati-valanâdu, also called Tenkarai-nâdu) :—Parântaka-chaturvêdimangalam.

(1) Ârkkâttu-kûrram :—Âyirattali, Ôdavêli (Ombattuveli), Perumangalam (Perumangalam), Pirambil, Pûdikudi, Śandiralêgai ² (Sendalai near Tirukkâttuppalli), *Pêrârkkâdu* (Arkadu), *Pêraraiśûr* and *Tirukkandiyûr* ³.

(2) Eyi-nâdu :—Tiruppêr (Tiruppayar) and Attuppalli-Niyamam.

(3) Eriy- or Eriyûr-nâdu :—Karuvugal-Vallam and Vinṇanêri *alias* Mummaḍiśôṛanal-lûr (Mummudisolamangalam).

(4) Idaiyârû (Edaiyâr)-nâdu :—Idaiyârûmangalam (Edayâttimangalam), Tonḍavai-chaturvêdimangalam, *Nittavinîtamangalam* and *Tiruttavatturai* (Tiruttavatturaikkattalai) ⁴.

(5) Kiliyûr-nâdu :—Mâraṇêri (Márnéri) and Andavanallûr (Andanallûr).

(6) Kîr-Śengili-nâdu :—Maṅgalanallûr.

(7) Kîr-Śûdi-nâdu :—Arumadal (Arumadal), Kuṛukkai, Nâvalûr (Nâvalûr) and Vaḍavâidam.

(8) Mîy-, Mêl- or Mî-Śengili-nâdu :—Kadaikkudi (Kadayakkudi), Vaṅgâram *alias* Tirunârâyana-chaturvêdimangalam, Kaḷattûr (Kaḷattûr), Kâvaṇûr (Kâvanûr), Killikudi, Kôyilnallûr, Maṅgalam (Mangalam), Virârkudi and Viśalûr.

(9) Mîyvari-nâdu or Mîypori-nâdu :—Kâttiñāṛal, Kôyilnallûr and Mêrkudi.

(10) Paṇaṅgâdu-nâdu :—Paṇaṅgulam, Perumbuliyûr, Peruṅgôḷûr and Peruñjôlai.

(11) Tañjâvûr-kûrram :—Tañjâvûr (Tanjore); Tañjâvûr-parû :—Karundiṭṭaigudi (on the north bank of Vaḍavâru and outside Tañjâvûr ⁵).

(12) Puṇṇir-kûrram :—Maṛaiyûr, Paraïyûr, Śâttamangalam (Śâttamangalam) and Viraikkudi.

(13) Purakkiliyûr-nâdu :—Kâmadamangalam and Killikudi.

(14) Śuṇḍaimûlai-nâdu :—Korramangalam (Kottamangalam).

(15) Vaḍa-Kavira-nâdu :—Tiruneduṅgalam (Tirunedungalam).

(16) Vaḍaśiruvây- or *Vaḍaśiruvâyil*-nâdu :—Vâluvamangalam and Viraikkudi.

(17) Vilâ-nâdu :—Malari *alias* Śrîkaṇḍa-chaturvêdimangalam, Śôṛamahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam (Sôlamâdevi) and Uttamaśîli-chaturvêdimangalam (Uttamaséri).

IX. Vaḍagarai Râjarâja-valanâdu :—Kîr-Tenḡampûṇḍi *alias* Kumâramangalam (Kumaramangalam), Kôḍaṇḍapuram, Nâttârnallûr, Perumbulivây (*surrounding*

¹ The villages in this division are found in the Perambalur, Trichinopoly, Udaiyarpalaiyam and Tanjore taluks.

² Narikkudichchêri and Tugavûr were hamlets of this village.

³ The place was also known as Âyirattali in the time of Râjendra-Chôla I and was included in Kîrâr-kûrram of Nittavinôda-valanâdu.

⁴ This name is taken from an inscription at Lalgudi which is not far from it.

⁵ Sâmantanârâyana-chaturvêdimangalam and Virudarâjabhayâṅkara-chaturvêdimangalam were in the neighbourhood of Tañjâvûr.

⁶ The villages in this division are found in the Perambalur, Trichinopoly and Udaiyarpalaiyam taluks.

Ilambulivây), Tengampûndi *alias* Satyâsraykulakâla-chaturvêdimangalam, Umaiyûr *alias* Rattakulakâla-chaturvêdimangalam, Uppûr (Uppûr) *alias* Rattakulakâla-chaturvêdimangalam¹ and Vettiâr Padaivîdu *alias* Jayaṅgonḍasôranallûr.

(1) Êmappêr-kûrram :—Kannikudi.

(2) Kîr-Vēṅgai-nâdu :—Jayaṅgonḍasôranallûr, Kshatriyaśikhâmanipuram, Malaiyân-padaivîdu, Nambankârai, Pândyakulântakanallûr, Râjavidyâdharanallûr, Sundarasôranallûr, and Talaivâymanangalam.

(3) Kunrîr-kûrram :—Tiruvâvanam and Vîraikkudi.

(4) Panriyûr-nâdu :—Panriyûr and Perumullûr.

(5) Poygai-nâdu :—Tirunettânam (Tillasthanam).

(6) Poyîr-kûrram :—Aragiyaśôrapuram, Korramangalam (Kottamangalam), Mangalavâyil, Pâchehil (Tiruvâsi), Śîrukulattûr (Sirukalattûr) and Tenkudi.

(7) Pulivala-kûrram :—Kalaiyappâdi and Tirubhuvanam (Tiruppuvanam).

(8) Punril - or Punrîr-kûrram :—Kalamalai (Kalamalai).

(9) Śēṇṇimaṅgala-kûrram :—Kannikudi and Ôlamanangalam (Ôlappâdi).

(10) Varagûr (Varagûr)-nâdu :—Pâvâr (Pûvâlûr).

B.—TONDAI-NÂDU *alias* JAYANĠONḌASÔRA-MANḌALAM.

I. Malâdu *alias* Jananâtha-valanâdu :

(1) Kurukkai-kûrram :—Tirukkôvalûr (Tirukkoilur), Śîrriṅgûr (Siddhalingamadam).

(2) Pânûr-kûrram :—Iraiyanaraiyûr (Elvanasur).

II. Tirumunaiippâdi or Munaiippâdi on the north bank of Pennai—Pêringûr (Pérangiyûr).

(1) Mēlûr-nâdu :—Tirunâvalûr (Tirunamanallur).

III. Ôymâ-nâdu.

(1) Ânmûr-nâdu :—Manali (Manalpadi).

(2) Kîtkai-nâdu :—Gidaṅgil (Gidangil).

(3) Pêrayûr-nâdu :—Pêrayûr (Perâvûr).

IV. Aruvâ-nâdu :—

(1) Vâgûr-nâdu or Kîrvari-Vâgûr-nâdu :—Vâgûr *alias* Aragiyaśôra-chaturvêdimangalam (Bâhûr).

(2) Vâvalûr-nâdu :—Tiuvâmattûr (Tiruvamattur).

V. Vâṇagôppâdi :—Maruvûr (on the south bank of the Pennai) *alias* Vayiramēga-chaturvêdimangalam.

VI. Vâlaiyûr (on the north bank of the Pennai) *alias* Nittavinôdapuram (Jambai).

VII. Vadagarai-Vêśâlippâdi :—

(1) Vâgûr-nâdu :—Tâmanallûr.

C.—TONDAI-NÂDU, TONDAI-MANḌALAM or JAYANĠONḌACHÔLA-MANḌALAM :—Tribhuvanamahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam [*alias*] Tiruvakkarai.

I. Venkunra-kôttam.

(1) Perumandai-nâdu :—Perumandai.

¹ Paraṅgulam was a hamlet of this village.

II. Tâmar-kôttam.

- (1) Tâmar-nâdu :—Tâmar *alias* Nittavinôdanallûr.
- (2) Valla-nâdu :—Gôvindapâdi (Tirumalpur).

III. Kunravattana-kôttam.

- (1) Mênmalai-Taniyal-nâdu :—Jananâtha-chaturvêdimangalam.

IV. Âmûr-kôttam.

- (1) Âmûr-nâdu :—Mâmallapuram (Mahâbalipuram).
- (2) Kumiri-nâdu :—Talaîsayanapuram *alias* Taiyûr *alias* Râjakêsarinallûr (Taiyûr).
- (3) Paḍuvûr-nâdu :—Paḍuvûr (Paḍûr), Tiruvidavandai (Tiruvadandai).

V. Puliyûr-kôttam :—Mayilârppil (Mylapore).

- (1) Kôttûr-nâdu :—Velichchêri (Velachcheri).
- (2) Śurattûr-nâdu :—Tanniyâlattûr.
- (3) Tudamuni-nâdu :—Tiruvalidâyam (Pâdi).

VI. Ūrrukkâttu-kôttam.

- (1) Ūrrukkâttu-kûrram :—Uttama-Śôra-chaturvêdimangalam (Tenneri).
- (2) Nirvêlûr-nâdu :—Kûram *alias* Vidyâvinîta-chaturvêdimangalam (Kûram).

VII. Sengâttu-kôttam.

- (1) Mâganûr-nâdu :—Manimangalam *alias* Lôkamahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam (Manimangalam).

VIII. Kâliyûr-kôttam.

- (1) Kâliyûr-kûrram :—Uttaramêru-chaturvêdimangalam (Uttaramallur), Śivachûlmanimangalam (Ukkal) and Tiruvottûr (Tiruvottûr).

IX. Purar-kôttam :—Ninranûr

- (1) Pural-nâdu :—Tiruvorriyûr (Tiruvottiyûr).

X. Paḍuvûr-kôttam.

- (1) Paṅgala-nâdu :—Mugai-nâdu :—Uyyalkondân - Śôrapuram (Solapuram near Vellore).
- (2) Peruntimiri-nâdu :—Tiruppânmalai (Panchapandavamalai).
- (3) Miýâru-nâdu :—Tiruvallam (Tiruvallam).

XI. Manayîr-kôttam.

- (1) Panmâ-nâdu :—Tiruvûral (Takkolam)¹, Kayattâr (part of Tiruvûralpuram).

XII. Perumbânappâdi.

- (1) Tiruvêṅgada-kôttam :—
- (a) Ârrûr-nâdu :—Tirukkâlatti (Kalahasti).
- (b) Kudavûr-nâdu :—Tiruchchôganûr (Tiruchchanur).
- (c) Tûñâdu :—Mêrpâdi *alias* Râjâśrayapuram (Melpadi).

D.—PÂNDI-NÂDU *alias* RÂJARÂJA-MANḌALAM or RÂJARÂJA-VAḤANÂDU.

I. Perumbûr-nâdu :—Andakkudi (Andakkudi).

II. Tirukkânappêr-kûrram :—Pâlûr.

III. Mulli-nâdu :—Iyalâttimangalam, Râjarâja-chaturvêdimangalam, Śeramân mahâdêvi-chaturvêdimangalam or Nigariliśôra-chaturvêdimangalam (Sérmâdêvi).

IV. Nânji-nâdu :—Tiruchchivîndiram (Suchîndram).

¹ Śirûr formed a portion of Tiruvûralpuram.

- V. *Kīrkala-kūrram*:—*Tirumukkūdal* (or) *Tēn-Tirumālirunjōlai* (Sevilipéri), *Śrī-Vallabhamāṅgalam* (Gangaikondān).
 VI. *Kēraḷaśiṅga-vaṇanādu*:—*Tirupputtūr* (Tirupputtur).
 VII. *Śūraṅgudi-nādu*:—*Ādanūr* (Ādanūr).

E.—MALAI-NĀDU.

- I. *Vellappa-nādu*:—*Pudukkōdu*.

F.—GANGAPĀDI.

- I. *Padi-nādu*:—*Ālūr* (Alur).

G.—NUḶAMBAPĀDI *alias* NIGARILISÔRAPĀDI.

- I. *Parivai-nādu*:—*Kūdalūr* and *Kuśavūr*.

H.—ĪRAM *alias* MUMMAḌISÔRA-VAṆANĀDU *or* MAṆḌALAM¹ (CEYLON).

- I. *Kaṇakkaṇ-Kōṭṭiyāram* *alias* *Vikramaśōra-vaṇanādu*:—*Māśār*.
 II. *Māppisumbu-Kōṭṭiyāram* *alias* *Râjarâja-vaṇanādu*.

I.—MISCELLANEOUS DIVISIONS NOT DEFINED².

- I. *Vaḍa-Kōṇādu*:—*Turaikkudi* (Turaikkudi).
 II. *Śuttamalli-vaṇanādu*.
 III. *Venni-kūrram*:—*Śirumaṅgalam* (Sirumangalam).
 IV. *Vaḍagarai Râjâśraya-vaṇanādu*.
 V. *Kirâr-kūrram*:—*Niyamam* (Nemam).

As regards religion and mythology, the Tanjore inscriptions throw considerable light. That king Râjarâjadêva was a staunch Śaiva and that his whole court followed him is amply borne out. The temple at Tanjore which was built by the king was called Śrī-Râjarâjêśvara; the chief image of the central shrine was called Dakṣiṇamêru-Viḍaṅgaṇ or Āḍavallāṇ; and the images which were set up by the king, his elder sister, his queens and his officers were mostly Śaiva. It has been pointed out that the names Dakṣiṇamêru-Viḍaṅgaṇ and Āḍavallāṇ given to the chief image in the temple indicate clearly that the Śaiva creed derived its support at the time mainly from Chidambaram in the South Arcot district.

An image of Kirâtârjuna was set up in the Śrī-Râjarâjêśvara temple by the magistrate (*adhikâri*) Udayadivâkaraṇ Tillaiyâli. The detailed description of the image is not furnished. But it evidently represented the scene of fight between Arjuna and the god guised as a *kirâta* or hunter. The fight ended in the former obtaining the blessings of the latter together with the weapon known as *pâśupatâstra*.³

¹ *Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1913*, p. 96.

² The divisions mentioned under this head would have probably belonged to Śōra-maṇḍalam. *Venni-kūrram* and *Kirâr-kūrram* are mentioned as sub-divisions of *Nittavinōda-vaṇanādu*. The village *Turaikkudi* is in the Trichinopoly taluk while *Sirumangalam* and *Nemam* are in Tanjore. Consequently it looks as if the divisional names *Vaḍa-Kōṇādu*, *Śuttamalli-vaṇanādu* and *Vaḍagarai Râjâśraya-vaṇanādu* are only alternative names of some of the divisions mentioned already under Śōra-maṇḍalam, if not new ones.

³ *Kirâtârjuna-mūrti* is one of the 25 sportive incarnations (*līlā-mūrtis*) of Śiva mentioned in the *Kāra-nāgama*. It describes him as follows:—

चतुर्भुजं त्रिनेत्रं च जटामकुटसंयुतम् ।
 सर्वाभरणसंयुक्तं दिव्यांबरसमावृतम् ॥
 धनर्वाणयुतं रक्तं कृष्णापरशुसंयुतम् ।
 उग्रवीतसमायुक्तं समभंगतनुं कुरु ॥

वामे गौरीसमायुक्तं दक्षिणेत्यर्जुनं स्थितम् ।
 अर्जुनस्वरूपम्—
 एकवक्त्रं द्विनयनं जटामकुटसंयुतम् ।
 सर्वाभरणसंयुक्तं कृताञ्जलिपुटं स्थितम् ॥

Inscriptions on the pillars and niches of the enclosing verandah generally describe groups of copper images set up in the temple and the gifts made to them. The former comprise gods and canonized Śaiva saints. Among the gods the groups representing Pichchadêvar and Kalyânasundara are interesting from the view point of Hindu iconography. The first was set up by Râjarâja's queen Lôkamahâdêvî (No. 9). The group consisted of the god Śiva with four arms in a standing posture accompanied on one side by a standing goblin (called generally Guṇḍôdara) carrying the begging bowl on his head, and by an antelope on the other. This description agrees in the main with the figure of Bhikshâṭanamûrti which we find in Śiva temples.¹ In a niche on the south wall of the central shrine is a beautiful image of Pichchâṇḍâr but without the goblin and the antelope. It is worthy of note that there is a temple dedicated to Pichchâṇḍâr near Trichinopoly.

The group described in No. 48 was set up by queen Trailôkya-Mahâdêvî. The name Kalyânasundara means 'Sundara (preparing himself for the) marriage.' The group consisted of the god Śiva with four arms. Close to him was his consort Umâparamêśvarî. An image of god Viṣṇu with four arms was pouring water into the hands of the god Śiva, and Brahmâ was comfortably seated offering an oblation.² This is the usual representation of the marriage of the god Sundarêśvara of Madura with the goddess Mînâkshî and I remember seeing a good sculpture of it in the Kambattadi-maṇḍapa of the Sundarêśvara temple there which was built in the 16th century A.D. by the Nâyaka king Vîrappa-ofâyaka.

Another group designated Pañchadêhamûrtigaḷ³ is mentioned in No. 30. It consisted of one image with ten arms in the centre and four other images on the sides, each of the

¹ The same *Kâraṇâgama* describes Bhikshâṭana thus:—

चतुर्भुजं त्रिणेत्रं च नम्रं चैव स्मिताननम् ।
भस्मदिग्धं विदुमामं कट्यां पन्नगसंवृतम् ॥
आवृत्तालंकृतं भृंगीपादं पादुकसंयुतम् ।
दक्षिणं तत्कराग्रं तु हरिणास्यानुगं भवेत् ॥
दक्षिणेऽपरहस्ते तु डमरुं चैव कारयेत् ।
वामे त्वपरहस्ते तु त्रिशूलं पिच्छधारिणम् ॥
कुंचितं दक्षिणं पादं वामपादं तु सुस्थितम् ।
समभंगस्थानकं च गमनोन्मुखरूपकम् ॥

कपालोपेतहस्तं च वृषणाभिसमं भवेत् ।
एवं भिक्षाटनं प्रोक्तं गुडोदरमयो शृणु ॥
देवस्य वामपार्श्वे तु गुडोदरमयः स्थितम् ।
हस्तद्वयसमायुक्तं कपालं शिरसि न्यसेत् ॥
भूताकारसमायुक्तं कुंडले कर्णयोर्न्यसेत् ।
दंष्ट्राकरालवक्त्रं च पूर्वोक्तं लक्षणान्वितम् ॥

² Of Kalyânasundara also called Vaivâhikamûrti the following description is given:—

सिंदूराभं त्रिणेत्रं युगभुजसहितं हारकेयूरभूषम्
दिव्यैर्वस्त्रैर्वृतांगं वरकटकलसद्वेमकलहारभूषम् ।
शंभुं दक्षिणपार्वतीकरतलं सव्येन संगृह्यतम्
टंकं कृष्णमृगं धरं वरकरं चूडंदुवद्वादरम् ॥

जटामकुटसंयुक्तं चंद्रार्धकृतभूषणम् ।
त्र्यक्षं चतुर्भुजं नस्ये नवयौवनगावितम् ॥
समभंगयुतं देवस्थानकं संप्रकीर्तितम् ।
कुंचितं सव्यपादेन स्थितसव्येतरांग्रिकम् ॥

The figures accompanying Kalyânasundara are stated to be (1) Girijâ (*i.e.* Pârvatî) who is of well-formed limbs with two arms and two eyes; (2) Brahmâ of four faces and four hands wearing a sacred thread and scarf, holding in two of his right hands the rosary and the ladle and in the two left, the water-pot and the book, and seated on a lotus flower smiling, in front of a square sacrificial pit with blazing fire in it; (3) Mênakâ attending on Girijâ; (4) Himavat (mountain), holding a golden pot with water by the side of Girijâ and pouring the water through the spout into the hands of Śiva; (5) the sages Sanaka and Sanandana with folded hands on the left side of Śiva; and (6) Viṣṇu and other gods who come to attend the marriage. It may be noted that the description given in our inscription differs from the above in stating that Viṣṇu with four hands—not Himavat—was pouring water into the hands of the god Śiva.

³ With Pañchadêhamûrtigaḷ compare Pañchamukha one of the many names of Śiva. The five faces of Śiva are stated to be Sadyôjâta, Vâmadêva, Tatpurusha, Âghôra and Îśâna. The last according to the *Dêvîpurâṇa* is in the middle and higher than the other four. A figure with these five faces is also known as

latter having one face and four arms. The former was 22 *viral* and four *tōrai* in height while the other four were only fourteen *viral* in height¹.

Līngapurāṇadēva described in No. 44 is worthy of notice as we very often find a representation of the scene in Śiva temples. The Tanjore temple itself bears a sculpture on the west wall of the central shrine. The group is now known as Līngôdbhava.² The story is that Brahmā and Viṣṇu once had a dispute about their relative superiority. Both of them appeared before Śiva who had assumed the shape of a huge *līnga*. Viṣṇu had to find out the bottom and Brahmā the top of this *līnga*. The former became a boar and went on burrowing into the earth and the latter soared into the air in the shape of a swan to trace the top. Neither of them could achieve his object and accordingly it became evident that Śiva was superior to both of them. In the group set up by queen Abhimānavallī, the gods Brahmā and Viṣṇu figure. The latter is said to have the face of a boar. The swan form of Brahmā is not mentioned. The group must have closely followed the representation in stone of the same scene on the west wall of the central shrine.

Tradition asserts that the hill at Tiruvannāmalai in the South Arcot district represents the 'līnga' of the *Līnga-purāṇa*. Accordingly pilgrims who visit the temple at Tiruvannāmalai have to circumambulate the hill itself. It is worthy of note that the *līnga* at Tiruvannāmalai is believed to be one of the five *līngas* which are supposed to consist of the five elements (*pañchabhūta*). The Ēkāmranātha temple at Conjeeveram has the *prithvī-līnga* (made of earth) and the Jambukêśvara temple on the island of Śrīraṅgam the *ap-līnga* (made of water). The *vāyu-līnga* (made of air) is at Kālahasti in the North Arcot district; the *ākāśa-līnga* (made of space) at Chidambaram and the *tejō-līnga* (made of light) at Tiruvannāmalai in the South Arcot district. The ancient names of these five shrines offer

Sadāśivamūrti. According to the *Āgamas* it is crystal-white in colour, has matted hair, ten arms, one body and two legs. In the *Sivapurāṇa* the five *mūrtis* of Rudra are thus described:—

एका भगवतो मूर्तिरुद्धरोमा भयावहा ।
द्वितीया तस्य वै मूर्तिः सूर्यज्योतिःसमप्रभा ॥
तृतीया भगवतो मूर्तिः शशिनः परमात्मनः ।
चतुर्थी भगवतो मूर्तिः कुबेरस्य महातनुः ॥
पञ्चमी भगवतो मूर्तिस्तद्वै ब्रह्म परं पदम् ।
तत्तु पश्यन्ति विद्वांसः सूक्ष्मध्यानविचिन्तकाः ॥

इत्येष भगवान् रुद्रः पञ्चधा परिपठ्यते ।
लोके वेदे च संयुक्ता शैवी चैव पृथक् पृथक् ॥
क्रीडते प्रथमा मूर्तिर्द्वितीया तप्यते तपः ।
तृतीया हरते लोकांश्चतुर्थी सृजते प्रजाः ॥
पञ्चमी ज्ञानसद्भावं सर्वमावृत्य तिष्ठति ।
सर्वेशः सर्वभूतस्थः सर्गप्रलयविक्रमः ॥

The *Dēvipurāṇa* says:—

शिवस्तत्र स्थितः साक्षात् सर्वपापहरः शुभः ।
स तु पञ्चमुखः ख्यातो लोकसर्वार्थसाधकः ॥
पञ्चब्रह्मात्मको यस्मात्तेन पञ्चमुखः स्मृतः ।
पश्चिमे तु मुखं सद्यो वामदेवस्तथोत्तरे ॥
पूर्वे तत्पुरुषं विद्यादघोरं चापि दक्षिणे ।

ईशानः पञ्चमो मध्ये सर्वेषामुपरि स्थितः ॥
एते पञ्चमुखा वत्स पापघ्नो ग्रहनाशनाः ।
सद्योजातो भवेच्छुक्लो वामदेवस्तु पीतकः ॥
रक्तान्त(स्त)त्पुरुषो ह्येयोऽघोरः कृष्णः स एव च ।
ईशानः पश्चिमस्तेषां सर्ववर्णसमन्वितः ॥

¹ Nos. 274 and 275 of 1911 found on two mutilated pillars of the temple kitchen also describe images, the latter referring to a Pañchadēhamūrti.

² The *Kāraṇāgama* states:—

लिङ्गाकारस्य मध्ये तु चंद्रशेखरवस्तिर्तमे ।
नालकाधस्थितं पादं लिङ्गोद्भवसमन्वितम् ॥
विरिचिर्हंसरूपेण चोर्ध्वगो वामपार्श्वके ।
दक्ष वराहरूपस्य रूपेणाधोगतो हरिः ॥

वामदक्षिणपार्श्वस्थौ कृतांजलिममन्वितौ ।
स्वरूपेण द्विपादस्थावजविष्णु विभोः परे ॥

no justification for this supposition. Apparently the idea of tracing them to the five elements is a comparatively recent one.

An image of Ardhanârîśvara was set up by Kṛishṇaṇ Râmaṇ. The image is often met with among the sculptures of Śiva temples in Southern India, and is partly male and partly female. In one of the niches of the north wall of the central shrine of the Tanjore temple there is a figure of Ardhanârîśvara. This differs from the group described in No. 39, there being a bull in the former close to which the figure is standing. A later representation of Ardhanârîśvara in the Madura temple has no bull. In the group set up by Kṛishṇaṇ Râmaṇ and the sculpture on the north wall of the central shrine the Īśvara-half has two arms and the Umâ-half only a single arm. In the Madura sculpture each of them has two arms. Hêmâdri in the *Vratakhanda* of his *Chaturvargachintâmani* describes the figure of Ardhanârîśvara as having four arms.¹ The group set up by Râjarâja's general was made of copper but the Umâ-half was coated with brass. Closely connected with this group is No. 47 which records the setting up of an image of Bhṛiṅgîśa with three arms and three legs by Kôvaṇ Anṇâmalai *alias* Kêrâlântaka-Viṇṇupparaiyaṇ. It was the exclusive devotion of Bhṛiṅgîśa to the god Śiva that led Pârvatî to seek union with her consort in the form of Ardhanârîśvara.² This was perhaps the commencement of the worship of the deity in its feminine aspect.

In the group Umâsahitar described in No. 32, the god and goddess are separate images seated together and accompanied by a standing image of Subrahmanya and one of Ganapati. The donor was a certain Vêlâṇ Âdittan *alias* Parântaka-Pallavaraiyaṇ. This group is probably the same as that now known under the name Umâ-Mahêśvara, though in the latter Subrahmanya and Ganapati do not generally figure.³

¹ अर्द्धं देवस्य नारी तु कर्तव्या शुभलक्षणा ।
अर्द्धं तु पुरुषः कार्यः सर्वलक्षणभूषितः ॥
ईश्वराद्धं जटाजूटं कर्तव्यं चन्द्रभूषितम् ।
उमाद्धं तिलकं कार्यं सीमन्तमलकं तथा ॥
भस्मोद्धूलितमर्द्धं तु अर्द्धं कुकुम्भभूषितम् ।
नागोपवीतितं चार्द्धमर्द्धं हारविभूषितम् ॥
वामाद्धं तु स्तनं कुर्यात् धनं पीनं सुवर्तुलम् ।
उमाद्धं तु प्रकर्त्तव्यं सुवस्त्रेण च वेष्टितम् ॥

मेखलां दापयेत्तत्र वज्रवैद्यभूषिताम् ।
ऊर्ध्वलिङ्गं महेशाद्धं सर्पमेखलमण्डितम् ॥
पादश्च देवदेवस्य समपद्मोपरिस्थितम् ।
सालत्तकं स्मृतं वाममङ्गनेन विभूषितम् ॥
त्रिशूलमक्षसूत्रं च भुजयोः सव्ययोः स्मृतम् ।
दर्पणंचोत्पलं कार्यं भुजयोरपसव्ययोः ॥

² In his *Bṛihatsaṁhitâ* (chapter xi, verse 43) Varâhamihira describes Śiva as follows :—

शम्भोः शिरसीन्दुकला वृषध्वजोऽक्षि च तृतीयमपि चोर्ध्वम् ।
शूलं धनुः पिनाकं वामार्धे वा गिरिसुतार्धम् ॥

³ Hêmâdri's description of Umâ-Mahêśvara-mûrti is as follows :—

युग्मं स्त्रीपुरुषं कार्यं उमेशौ दिव्यरूपिणौ ।
अष्टवक्त्रं तु देवेशं जटाचन्द्रार्धभूषितम् ॥
द्विपाणिं द्विभुजां देवीं सुमध्यां सुपयोधराम् ।
वामपाणितु देवस्य देव्याः स्कन्धे नियोजयेत् ॥

दक्षिणंतु करं शम्भोरुत्पलेन विभूषितम् ।
देव्यास्तु दक्षिणं पाणिं स्कन्धे देवस्य कल्पयेत्
वामपाणौ तथा देव्या दर्पणं दापयेन्नुभयम् ॥

In the *Kêraṇâgama*, under *Saparivâr-Ômâmahêśvara-dhyâna* occurs the following :—

वामे शैलसुता पुरस्तु वृषभः पश्चात्सुरेन्द्रादयो
दैत्यारिश्च विधिश्च पार्श्वदलयोर्वीर्यादिकोणेण च ।
श्रीगानारदबाणभैरवगजास्यस्कंदवीरेश्वरा
मध्ये शुभ्रसरोजकोमलरुच शंभु भजे पांडुरम् ॥

Queen Śōramahādēvī set up an image of Rishabhavâhanadēva with the goddess Umâparamēśvarī and a bull (No. 46). The god Gaṇapati appears to have been a member of the group though he is not found in the usual representation of Rishabhârûḍhamûrti.¹

The image of Âḍavallân set up by queen Śōramahādēvī (No. 42), is a standing figure of the god with Muyalagan² under his feet. The image had four arms, nine braids of hair (*jatâ*), the goddess Gaṅgâ-bhaṭṭarakī, on the braided hair and seven flower garlands. The goddess Umâparamēśvarī who formed a part of the group was standing on a separate pedestal. This description corresponds to the representation of one of the many forms of Natarâja. Another queen of Râjarâjadēva named Pañchavaṇ-Mahādēvī set up an image of Śiva in the dancing posture and called it Tañjai-Aragar (No. 51). The image was apparently standing with Muśalagan under the foot on which the god stood; the other foot was apparently lifted upwards in dancing though this fact is not specifically stated. An image of Umâparamēśvarī and one of Gaṇapati were included in the group. The image of Patañjali and that of Vyâghrapâda both of which usually accompany the dancing image of Śiva (called Natarâja) are not mentioned here. The sages Patañjali and Vyâghrapâda are believed to have been present at the dance of the god Śiva. It is however worthy of note that the same Chôla queen set up a separate image of Patañjalidēva (No. 53). It was a solid image and measured "three-quarters and one-eighth (of a *muram*) in height from the tail to the hoods (*phana*). It had five hoods, one face in the midst of these hoods, one crown (*makuta*), two divine arms, above the navel a human body, and below the navel three coils".

No. 50, describes a group of copper images which the king himself had set up. The central image was Dakshinâmûrti with four arms seated on a mountain. The latter had two peaks on which there were two Kinnaras and two Kinnaris. Under the foot of the god was Muśalagan. On the mountain were four *rishis*, a snake, two *karnaprâvritas* and a tiger. A banyan tree was also on the mountain and had nine main branches and forty-two minor ones. A wallet was suspended from the tree and a bunch of peacock's feathers was one of the accompaniments of the god.

The four *rishis* on the mountain are Sanaka, Sanandana, Sanâtana and Sanatkumâra, the four sons of god Brahmâ. In order to expound the mysteries of the Vêdas to these four *rishis* the god Śiva is said to have assumed the form of Dakshinâmûrti. In fact

¹ According to one of the Śaiva legends it was the god Vishṇu himself that became a bull (*rishabha*) for Śiva to ride upon when the latter had to fight against the demon Tripura. In one of the sculptures of the Seven Pagodas (*Cave temples of India*, p. 147) is a representation of Rishabhavâhanadēva. Here Śiva and Pârvatī are seated on a couch each of them resting one of the legs on the back of a bull which is lying down. Pârvatī has Subrahmanya on her knee. Behind them is seen a figure of the god Vishṇu to the right and one of Brahmâ to the left. Behind the bull is a seated woman. A parasol is held over the head of Pârvatī. It is not impossible that this group represents the usual Sômâskanda in which, as the name denotes, the images of Śiva, Umâ (Pârvatī) and Skanda appear. The bull, however, is not generally seen in representations of Sômâskanda.

² Muyalagan or Muśalagan (known in Sanskrit as Apasmâra) is the name of a black dwarf who issued out of the sacrificial fire of the *rishis* of the Dârukâvana forest. The sacrifices were offered in order to discomfit Śiva; and Śiva came there to teach them a lesson. A fierce tiger and a monstrous serpent issued out of the fire one after the other and were quickly overcome by the god. Muyalagan appeared next. His form was hideous and malignant and he brandished a club with eyes of fire. Śiva pressed the tip of his foot and broke Muyalagan's back so that he writhed on the ground. With this last foe prostrate Śiva resumed the dance of which all the gods were witnesses. This is why Muyalagan is represented as lying under the feet of Śiva. He is also found under the feet of Chaṇḍêśvaraprasâdadēva, Dakshinâmûrti and Tañjai-Aragar. Muyalagan is also described as a kind of disease from which a woman of Pâchchilâchchiramam was suffering. She was cured by the saint Tirujñânasambandar according to the *Periyapurânam*.

Dakṣiṇāmūrti is the god Śiva in his capacity as a spiritual teacher.¹ Two aspects of Dakṣiṇāmūrti are described, *viz.*, Yôga-Dakṣiṇāmūrti and Vîṇâ-Dakṣiṇāmūrti. The following verse exemplifies the popular belief in Dakṣiṇāmūrti as a teacher :

नित्यशो दाक्षिणामूर्तिं ध्यायेत्साधकसत्तमः ।

शास्त्रव्याख्यानसामर्थ्यं लभते वत्सरान्तरे ॥

In South Indian temples at present Dakṣiṇāmūrti occupies a niche on the south wall of the central shrine with a stone structure in front of it. In the old ones, however, the niche appears to have remained alone without any clumsy addition made to it. For instance, in the Râjarâjêśvara temple there is a niche to Dakṣiṇāmūrti on the south wall. But the structure in front of this niche covers one or two sections of an inscription of Râjarâja (No. 4). It is therefore clear that, though Dakṣiṇāmūrti was worshipped in the beginning of the 11th century A.D., the practice of raising up a special structure for him had not yet come into vogue. It is also worthy of note that all the foregoing accompaniments are not found in the sculptures of Dakṣiṇāmūrti which we now find in Śiva temples.

Queen Prithvîmahâdêvî set up a seated image of Śrîkanṭhamūrtigaḷ with four arms (No. 80). The god Śiva got this name in consequence of his swallowing the *hâlâhala* poison produced at the churning of the ocean. The name Nilakanṭha of the god is also traceable to the same event.² An image of Pâsupatamūrti was set up by queen Ilâdamahâdêvî. The details are however not given. In fact her setting up the image is only incidentally referred to in No. 95 below. The scene relates to the gift of the *pâsupata*-weapon to the Pândava prince Arjuna for use in battle against Jayadratha.³ An image of Chandrasêkharadêva is said to have been set up by Râjarâja (No. 54). In this case too the details

¹ The following verse gives a description of Dakṣiṇāmūrti :—

प्रोद्यच्छास्त्रमहावटद्रुमतले योगासनस्थं प्रभुम्
प्रत्यकृत्त्वबुभुत्सुभिः प्रतिदिशं प्रोद्वीक्ष्यमाणाननम् ।
मुद्रां तर्कमयीं दधानममलं कर्पूरगौरं शिवम्
हयन्तः कलये स्फुरन्तमनिशं श्रीदाक्षिणामूर्तिकम् ॥

Hemâdri in his *Vrata khaṇḍa* has :—

दक्षेण मुद्रां प्रतिपादयन्तं
सिताक्षसूत्रं च तथोर्द्ध्वभागे ।
वामे च पुस्तामखिलागमायां
विभ्राणमूर्द्ध्वेन सुधाधरं च ॥

The *Kâraṇâgama* supplies the following information :—

नारदो जमदग्निश्च वसिष्ठभृगुदक्षिणे ।
भरद्वाजश्चौनकश्चाप्यगस्त्यो भार्गवस्तथा ॥
वामभागे विधातव्याः किन्नराद्यैस्सुसेविते ।
कैलासपर्वते तस्मिन्वटवृक्षस्य मूलके ॥

सिताम्बुजस्थं सितवर्णमीशं
सिताम्बरालेपनमिन्दुमौलिम् ।
ज्ञानं मुनिभ्यः प्रतिपादयन्तं
तं दक्षिणामूर्तिमुदाहरन्तम् ॥

आसीनं सकलेशं तं शान्तरूपं महेश्वरम् ।
दक्षिणामूर्तिमित्युक्तं ॥
अधोऽपस्मारं शाययेत् ॥

² Vishâpaharamūrti, 'the swallower of poison' is described in the *Kâraṇâgama* to have one face, three eyes, braided hair and four arms holding in the two upper ones the antelope and the axe. He is in the posture of drinking the poison which he holds in his right (lower) hand. On his left side is the goddess with two arms. With her right arm stretched round the neck of Śiva she shows anxiety in her face.

³ In the *Kâsyapa-Silpa*, a chapter of the *Ansumat-Tantra*, Pâsupatamūrti is thus described :—

त्रिणेत्रं चतुर्भुजं सौम्यमूर्ध्वकेशं महातनुम् ।
अभयं शूलहस्तं च दक्षिणे तु करद्वये ॥
वरदं चाक्षमाला च हि(वा)मपार्श्वे करद्वये ।
प्रवालसदृशप्रख्यं सौम्यनेत्रांतशीतलम् ॥

सर्वाभरणसंयुक्तं किंचित्प्रहासिताननम् ।

शूलं त्वघोमुखं धृत्वा कपालं वरदे धृतम् ॥

* * * *

रौद्रं पाशुपतं ह्येतद्वाल(ण?)लिर्गं तु पूजितम् ।

This description shows that Pâsupatamūrti is not connected with the gift of the *pâsupata*-weapon to Arjuna.

are not mentioned.¹ According to Śaiva legends the god Śiva came to wear the crescent on his head as the moon prayed for release from the curse of his father-in-law Daksha that he should gradually dwindle day by day and eventually die.

Seven images of Gaṇapati² are said to have been set up by the king, two in the dancing posture, three seated comfortably and the remaining two, standing (No. 84). With one of the second three, there was a tree. In describing gifts to Gaṇapati two separate forms are mentioned, viz., Âlaiyattu-Pillaiyâr and Parivârâlaiyattu-Pillaiyâr. The former was probably in the central shrine and the latter in the enclosure hall. According to the *Samkaravijaya* the Gāṇāpatya sect was sub-divided into six sub-sects who worshipped six different forms of the god, viz., Mahâ-Gaṇapati, Haridrâ-Gaṇapati, Uchchhishta-Gaṇapati (also called Hêramba-Gaṇapati), Navanita-Gaṇapati, Svarṇa-Gaṇapati and Santâna-Gaṇapati.³ A Tamil book entitled *Śīrpachintâmani* describes twelve kinds of Gaṇapati, viz., Bâla-Gaṇapati, Dhanur-Gaṇapati, Bhakti-Gaṇapati, Vîra-Gaṇapati, Piṅgala-Gaṇapati, Uchchhishta-Gaṇapati, Kshipare (Kshipra ?)-Gaṇapati, Êrâpâśa (Hêramba ?)-Gaṇapati, Lakshmî-Gaṇapati, Mahâ-Gaṇapati, Bhuvana-Gaṇapati and Nirttana (Nritta)-Gaṇapati. These varieties⁴ are due probably to the fact that he is a popular deity. His

¹ The *Kāraṇâgama* says of him :—

अभयवरदहस्तं सौम्यशृंगारभावं
विपुलवरदनेत्रं चंद्रविवांशमौलिम् ।
कजुतनुसमपादस्थानकं विद्रुमामं
हरिणपरशुपाणिं पद्मपीठोपरिष्ठम् ॥

² Kâśyapa quoted by Bhaṭṭôtpala in his commentary on the *Bṛihatsamhitâ* describes Gaṇapati—Vinâyaka as follows :—

एकदंष्ट्रो गजमुखश्चतुर्बाहुर्विनायकः ।
लम्बोदरः स्थूलदेहो नेत्रत्रयविभूषितः ॥

Hêmadri in his *Vratakhanda* has :—

विनायकस्तु कर्त्तव्यो गजवक्त्रश्चतुर्भुजः ।
स्थूलकक्षाक्षमाला च तस्य दक्षिणहस्तयोः ॥
पात्रञ्चोदकपूर्णञ्च परशुश्चैव वामतः ।
दन्तश्चास्य न कर्त्तव्यो वामे रिपुनिषूदन ॥

पादपीठकृतः पाद एक आसनगो भवेत् ।
पूर्णे चोदकपात्रे च कराग्रन्तस्य कारयेत् ॥
लम्बोदरस्तथा कार्य्यस्तच्च (?) कर्णश्च यादव ।
व्याघ्रचर्माम्बरधरः सर्पयज्ञोपवीतवान् ॥

In the translation of the *Bṛihatsamhitâ* by Mr. N. Chidambara Aiyar (Madura, 1884), Part II, Ch. 11, verse 57, the following occurs :

“The image of Gaṇêsa shall be represented with the face of the elephant, with a hanging belly, with an axe in his hand, with a single tusk and with the root of the Mulaka with its black leaves.” I do not find this verse in the Vizianagram Sanskrit Series edition of the *Bṛihatsamhitâ*. Vighnêśvara is represented in a sitting posture, with a big belly. His head is that of an elephant, and on it he wears a crown, while his ears are adorned with two flowers and two jewels, and his forehead with sacred ashes. Of his four arms he lifts two up, holding in the left hand the *pâśa* (i.e., a rope) and in the right a *kuthâra* (i.e., an elephant goad). In the right of his other two hands he holds a piece of his own elephant's tooth, which he once broke in a rage, and in the left a pancake, for he is said to be fond of pancakes. Round his neck he wears necklaces of pearls and precious stones, and likewise on his arms and feet, and from his shoulders a garland hangs down.

³ *Religious Thought and Life in India* by Mon. Williams, p. 217 f.

⁴ The *Mudgala-purâṇa* mentions 32 forms of Gaṇapati :—

बालस्तरुणभक्तौ च वीरः शक्तिर्द्विजस्तथा ।
सिद्ध उच्छिष्टविघ्नेशौ क्षिप्रौ हेरंबनामकः ॥
लक्ष्मिगणपतिश्चैव महाविघ्नेश्वरस्तथा ।
विजयः कल्पवृत्तश्चाप्यूर्ध्वविघ्नेश उच्यते ॥

एकाक्षरो वरश्चैव त्र्यक्षरः क्षिप्रदायकः ।
हरिद्राख्यश्चैकदंतः सृष्टिरुद्दिनामकः ॥
ऋणमोचनको हुंकारिर्द्विमुखस्त्रिमुखस्तथा ।
सिंहो योगश्च दुर्गा च देवः संकटहारकः ॥

The only Gaṇapati here who is connected with a tree is कल्पवृत्तगणपति, i.e., Gaṇapati dancing under the Kalpa-tree. In the inscription No. 84, however, Gaṇapati who is associated with a shrub (tree) (p. 407 below) is comfortably seated, not dancing.

image is found not only within all Śaiva temples but also in front of temples and even in the streets. He is also worshipped in the majority of Śūdra houses in the Tamil country. This fact is expressed in the following Sanskrit verse said to be extracted from the old version of Manu :—

विप्राणां दैवतं शंभुः क्षत्रियाणां तु माधवः ।
वैश्यानां तु भवेद् ब्रह्मा शूद्राणां गणनायकः ॥

How he came to be the remover of obstacles (Vighnêśvara) from his position as the commander of the celestial troops (gaṇapati), is a point on which no information is at present forthcoming.

The worship of the god Subrahmanya does not appear to have been so prevalent in ancient times as it is at the present day. His surnames Shanmukha, Skanda and Kârttikêya occur in Vêdic literature and there is also an Upanishad entitled Skanda-Upanishad. In the *Mahâbhârata* his origin from Agni is described and he is also known as Agnikumâra. Kumâra's birth is also briefly mentioned in the *Râmâyana*. Kâlidâsa's poem *Kumâra-sambhava* is a description of the birth of the god Shadânana and of his achievements. He is the commander of the good demon armies and is also known as Sênâni. He leads his troops against the hosts of their enemies, the evil demons. It was probably this aspect of his nature that led to some of his temples being built on hills, e.g., Tirupparaṅgunram, Parani and Kunnakkudi in the Madura district, Kaṛugumalai and Tiruchendûr in the Tinnevely district, Tiruttani and Vallimalai in the North Arcot district and Svâimalai in the Tanjore district. His temples are frequented by those who seek to be delivered from evil spirits or to obtain children. He is the patron saint of burglars and thieves as stated in the *Mṛichchhakatikâ*. Even now he is the deity adored by Kallars and Maravas who belong to the robber castes. He is also identified with the serpent in some mysterious way. This connection between the god Subrahmanya and the serpent probably arose at the village of Subrahmanya in the South Canara district where, according to Dr. Kittel, the god Kârttikêya was formerly worshipped. It is now a place of worship of the serpent Âdisêsha. Besides, the name Subba or Subbarâya which is applied to the serpent is a *tadbhava* of the Sanskrit *subhṛa*.¹ Owing probably to some mistake the word Subba or Subbarâya has been connected with the name Subrahmanya and the association of Kârttikêya with the serpent may be due to some such false etymology.

According to Varâhamihira's *Bṛihatsamhitâ* the image of Skanda should be made to appear young with the weapon known as *śakti* in his hand and mounted on a peacock.²

¹ The sixth *tithi* of the first fortnight is considered sacred both to Subbarâya and Skanda. The *Subbarâya-shashthi* is celebrated on the sixth day of the bright half of the month Mârgaśira when people pour milk, etc., into snake holes or offer presents to *brahmachârins* in the name of Subbarâya and take only one meal. Skanda-shashthi is the 6th of the bright half of Kârttika.

² This is the translation of Mr. Chidanbara Aiyar. The text of the Vizianagram edition (ch. 57, vol. 41), has स्कन्दः कुमाररूपः शक्तिधरो वह्निकेतुश्च.

Bhaṭṭotpala in his commentary on the *Bṛihatsamhitâ* has :—

मयूरवाहनः स्कन्दः शक्तिकुण्डधारकः ।
सुरूपदेहो विक्रान्तो देवः सेनापतिः शिशुः ॥

In his *Vratakhanda*, Hêmadri says :—

कुमारः षण्मुखः कार्य्यः शिखण्डकविभूषणः ।
रक्ताम्बरधरः कार्य्यो मयूरवरवाहनः ॥
कुण्डलश्च तथा घण्टा तस्य दक्षिणहस्तयोः ।
पताका चैजयन्ती च शक्तिः कार्य्या च वामयोः ॥

In South-Indian temples Subrahmanya has six heads and twelve arms. Oftener he has one head and four arms only, of which two are lifted and hold the lance while the other two are empty. On his head he wears a crown. To his right and left stand his two wives Valli and Devasênâ and near him is the peacock, his vehicle. The evolution of this god and his present attributes from the original conception of the celestial general, illustrates the way in which the Brâhmanical religion has been added to in course of time.

The Tamil work *Sirpachintâmani* describes eight different forms of the god Subrahmanya, viz., Jñânaśaktidhara, Daṇḍâyudhapâni, Sênâpati, Ârumugam (Skt. Shadânana), Śuppiramaniyar (Skt. Subrahmanya), Śaravanôrpavar (Skt. Śaravanôdbhava), Kumâra, Shanmugaṇ (Skt. Shanmukha) and Târukâriyân (Skt. Târakâri).¹ Another Tamil work entitled *Suppiramaniya-parâkkiramam* describes eighty-eight different feats of the god and the forms assumed by him on each of those occasions.

Only a single image of the god Subrahmanyadêva was set up by the king in the Râjarâjêśvara temple at Tanjore. He had only four arms and apparently a single head (No. 49). Even the epithet *pillaiyâr* which is prefixed in the case of the god Gaṇapati is omitted here.

The Kadambas are represented as meditating on the god Svâmi-Mahâsêna, i.e., Kârttikêya and Mayûraśarman, the first king of that dynasty, is said to have been anointed, by Shadânana.² The Chalukyas of Bâdâmi also meditated on the feet of the god Mahâsêna.

In the Timmâpuram plates of the first Eastern Chalukya king Vishṇuvardhana I, the Chalukyas are described as "having been rendered prosperous by Mahâsêna, who by his own arm had defeated the great army of the sons of Danu"³. In the Kailâsanâtha temple inscription of the Pallava king Râjasimha the king is compared to the god Guha also called Kumâra and Subrahmanya. The weapon *śakti* (lance) is also referred to here. The earliest epigraphical reference to a temple of the god Subrahmanya occurs in a Pallava inscription of Nandivarman at Mallam in the Nellore district (called Tiruvânbur in the inscription).⁴ In the early Tamil poem *Tirumurugârruppaḍai* six places sacred to the god are mentioned, viz., Tirupparaṅgunram, Tiruehchîralaivây, Tiruvâvinankuḍi, Tiruvêragam, Kunrutôrâdal and Paramudirsôlai. Modern temples dedicated to the god are found also at Tiruppôrûr in the Chingleput district, Pullirukku-Vêlûr (Vaidîśvarankôyil) in the Tanjore district, Sandur in the Bellary district⁵ and Kataragama in Ceylon.⁶ Tirupparaṅgunram and Pullirukku-Vêlûr are also mentioned in the *Dêvâram*. But there is nothing to show that there were Subrahmanya shrines in those two places at the time when the *Dêvâram* hymns were composed.

¹ The *Saivâgamasekharâ* mentions seventeen forms of Subrahmanya, viz., (1) Jñânaśakti, (2) Skanda, (3) Agnijâta, (4) Saurabhêya, (5) Gâṅgêya, (6) Śaravanôdbhava, (7) Kârttikêya, (8) Kumâra, (9) Shanmukha, (10) Târakâri, (11) Sênâni, (12) Guha, (13) Brahmaçârî, (14) Dêśika, (15) Krauñchabhêdana, (16) Śikhi-vâhana and (17) Vêlâyudha.

² *Dynasties of the Konarese Districts*, p. 287, foot-note 1.

³ *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, p. 319.

⁴ *Nellore Inscriptions*, Gûḍûr, 54. A record of the early [Gaṅga]-Pallava king Narasimhavarman from Kîr-Muttugûr (*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IV, p. 178) records a gift to a worshipper of Shânmatûra (Kârttikêya).

⁵ The village Subrahmanya in the South Canara district is also mentioned among villages sacred to the god Subrahmanya. According to Mr. Sewell the principal objects of worship in the temple are two images of a *Nâga* and a six-faced deity which stand side by side in the *garbhagriha*. But Dr. Kittel says Subrahmanya was originally a place for the worship of Skanda but has now become dedicated to serpent worship.

⁶ Parker's *Ancient Ceylon*, p. 115.

The other names of the god Subrahmanya are Muruga, Ārumugam (Shadānara in Sanskrit), Skanda, Kumāra, Vêlâyudha, Sênâpati and Kârttikêya. It seems to me that Muruga is not a new name but only a Tamil translation of the Sanskrit designation Kumāra. There is no reason to suppose that Muruga was an ancient Dravidian god afterwards assimilated with Skanda. The earliest references in Tamil literature to this god support the view that Muruga is only a Tamil rendering of the Sanskrit Kumāra.

In the ancient Tamil poem *Maṇimēgalai* the god Muruga is described as the son of Śiva and as having subdued the mountain Kiravuñjagiri (Skt. Krauñchagiri). In another ancient poem entitled *Tirumurugārruppadaḥ* he is described as having six faces and twelve arms. His consorts are referred to here and one of them, viz., Valli is actually mentioned by name. The peacock is also referred to as his vehicle and the cock as his banner. His priest carried a lance and was called *vēlan* or lancer. On festive occasions a bull was sacrificed to the god and boiled rice mixed with its warm blood, was offered.

There are various legends about the origin of the god Skanda.¹ But the original conception is apparently Sênâni or Mahāsêna, the general of the celestial armies. From this original idea was evolved Kârttikêya, as the month of Kârttika is best fitted for war. The name Kârttikêya naturally came to be connected with the six Kṛttikas and he was looked upon as the son of all six of them. Six faces came to be associated with his figure by a natural sequence of ideas and then twelve arms came to be attributed to him. As he was the god of war he became the object of worship for reigning kings and families like the Kadambas and Chalukyas.

Two more images require to be noticed before we pass on to the next section. The first is that of god Vishnu set up by the king himself (No. 52) and called Mahāvishṇukkal. The image had four arms.² No further details are furnished. But the fact shows that the king was no bigot, though he was a staunch Śaiva.³ The second image to which I wish to invite attention here is that of Sūrya, the sun-god. The image was one cubit (*muraṁ*) and two *virāl* in height and had two arms. It was set up by an officer of the king (No. 56) who presented a garland of rays to it. There is no reference to the seven horses which are represented as drawing his chariot.⁴ Neither are they mentioned in the *Brihat-*

¹ According to one legend he was the son of Śiva without the intervention of Pârvatî, the god's generative energy, being cast into the fire and then received by the Ganges. Hence Kumāra is sometimes described as the son of Agni and Gangâ. When born, he was fostered by the six Kṛttikas and these offering their six breasts to the child he became six-headed.

² Images of the god Vishnu may have 8, 4 or 2 arms. With the mole known as *Śrīvatsa* on the breast and the gem *Kaustubha* the body should be of the colour of the *atasi*-flower and the cloth yellow. The countenance should be cheerful and the image should wear pendants and a crown. The neck, shoulders and arms should be large. Three of the right hands should hold a sword, a club and an arrow respectively and the fourth shall appear stretched and held vertically in the attitude of offering protection. The four left hands should hold the bow, the target, the discus and the conch. If the image has only four arms, one of the two right hands should hold the club and the other raised as *abhaya-hasta*. The two left hands hold the conch and the discus. If the image has only two hands, one of them is the *abhaya-hasta*, while the other holds the conch (*Brihatsaṁhitā*, chapter II, verses 31 to 35).

³ No. 91 refers to three images of Śrî-Vāsudêva presented to the temple by king Râjarâja.

⁴ Sūrya is identical with Savitṛi, Ravi and Âditya, although these personifications are often distinguished from one another. He is the regent or guardian of the south-west quarter. He is generally represented as a ruddy man, seated on a lotus in a chariot drawn by either seven horses or a seven-headed horse, with the legless Aruṇa for his charioteer. He is surrounded by a halo or circle of light. In two hands he holds a water-lily; with the third he is forbidding fear, and with the fourth bestowing blessings. There is a temple dedicated to the Sun at Bêroda in Gujarat where he is known as Sūrya-Nârâyana. The *Makara-saṁkrānti* and *Ratha-saptami* are the days on which he is specially worshipped; Birdwood's *Industrial Arts of India*, p. 67.

*samhitā*¹ or Hēmādri's *Chaturvargachintāmaṇi*.² The earliest sculptures of the god so far found in Northern India contain four horses.³

As I have pointed out elsewhere⁴ the worship of Sūrya was probably introduced into the Tamil country from Northern India. The first temple dedicated to Sūrya in the Chōla country was built apparently during the reign of Kulōttuṅga I when, there was some intercourse between the sun-worshipping Gahadavālas of Kanauj and the Chōlas of Tanjore.

Of greater importance than the foregoing are the images of cannonised Śaiva saints set up in the temple. One of them we owe to the king himself and the others to the religious devotion of the manager of the Râjarâjêśvara temple. The first group (No. 29) consisted of (1) Chandêśvaraprasâdadêva with four arms; (2) Muśalagan with two arms; (3) Umâparamêśvarî; (4) Mahâdêva (*i.e.*, a *linga*) from which an arm was projecting; (5) Chandêśvara with two arms; (6) his father with two arms represented as having fallen down and lying on the ground; (7) Chandêśvara having two arms represented as receiving a boon; and (8) a flower garland given to him as a boon. The events of Chandêśvara's life represented in the foregoing groups are preserved to us in the Tamil *Periyapurāṇam* with the exception of a single item. Why a divine arm was projecting from the *linga* is not apparent. The part that the arm played in the story is altogether missing in the *Periyapurāṇam*. Another image of Chandêśvara was set up by an officer of the king (No. 55). The image had two arms and held an axe (*maru*). This is the usual representation of the Chandêśvara in Śiva temples. Chandêśvara is said in the *Periyapurāṇam* to have been made the chief of Śaiva devotees by the god Śiva. In epigraphical records all transactions connected with Śiva temples are represented as having been made in the name of Chandêśvara. In the case of endowments made to Śiva temples the documents used to be drawn up in the name of Chandêśvara. If any land belonging to the temple had to be sold, Chandêśvara is stated to have accepted the price of the land paid by the purchaser. In fact he was looked upon as the manager of the temple. This office Chandêśvara may be considered to hold even to this day. Any worshipper visiting a Śiva temple has to appear at the Chandêśvara shrine before leaving the temple premises and clap his hands evidently to satisfy the god that he is not taking away any temple property with him.

The manager of the Śrî-Râjarâjêśvara temple towards the close of Râjarâja's reign and during the early years of Râjêndra-Chōla's reign was Âdittan Sūryan *alias* Tennavan Mûvêndavêlân, a headman of Poygai-nâdu. In the second year of Râjêndra-Chōla's reign (A.D. 1013-14) he presented several gilt copper-pots to be placed on the shrine of Chandêśvara (No. 60). This gift alone would not have entitled him to our gratitude. Before the close of the twenty-ninth year of Râjarâja (A.D. 1013-14) Âdittan Sūryan set up images of Nambi Ârûranâr, Naṅgai-Paravaiyâr, Tirunâvukkaraiyar, Tiruñânaśambandaḍigal, Periya-Perumâl, his consort Olôgamâdêviyâr, *i.e.*, Lôkamahâdêvî and Chandraśêkharadêvar worshipped by Periya-Perumâl (No. 38). During the next year (*i.e.*, A.D. 1014-15) he made gifts to the images of Nambi-Ârûranâr, Tiruñânaśambandaḍigal, Tirunâvukkaraiyar and Periya-Perumâl (No. 41). He also

¹ The sun shall be represented as holding a lotus in each hand, as wearing a crown and pendants, with garlands hanging from his neck and as surrounded by gods. The face shall be bright as the lotus. The body shall be covered with stitched coats; the countenance shall be cheerful and the lustre of the gems shall add beauty to the image (*Bṛhatsamhitā*, chapter II, verses 47-8).

² *Dânakhaṇḍa* (chapter II, p. 757 f.) mentions the *ratha*, but not the horses.

³ See Dr. Vogel's *Progress Report* for 1909-10, p. 8.

⁴ *Annual Report on Epigraphy* for 1890, Part II, paragraph 60.

set up an image of the king of Milâdu who had said *Tattâ namarê, kân*, i.e., the Śaiva devotee Meypporu-Nāyanār (No. 40).¹ In the same year he set up another group of images illustrating the life of Śiruttonda-Nāyanār (No. 43). These were (1) Kshêtrapâladêvar with eight arms; (2) Bhairava-mûrtigal with two arms; (3) Śiruttonda-Nambi with two arms; (4) Tiruvenkâttu-Naṅgai; and (5) Śirâlādêvar. In the *Periyapurāṇam* version of Śiruttondar's life, Kshêtrapâla plays no part. It is only Bhairava that appears. Again in the name of Meypporu-Nāyanār there is a slight difference between the form of it given in the Tanjore inscription and that found in the *Periyapurāṇam*. Dr. Hultsch thinks that by Periyaperumâl, Râjarâja himself is meant and that Olôgamahâdêvî was his queen Lôkamahâdêvî. This seems to be very likely and both of them were probably dead at the time the images were actually set up. The fact that the images of the Śaiva devotees noted above had been installed during the early years of the eleventh century A.D. is of very great importance for the history of Tamil literature. Dr. Hultsch has pointed out its importance and consequently there is no necessity to repeat his statements.

Of Śakti deities (*grāmadêvatâ*), very few images are mentioned as having been established in the Tanjore temple. No. 81 records the setting up of a seated image of Kâlâ-Pidâri with four arms, and No. 79 of Durgâ-Paramêśvarî with four arms. In the suburbs of Tanjore there was evidently a pretty big temple of Rudra-Mahâkâlâ dedicated perhaps to Rudra-Mahâkâlâ, one of the terrible forms of Śiva (No. 64, paragraph 4). Among the villages whose revenues were assigned to the Râjarâjêśvara temple, a number of village deities and their shrines are incidentally referred to. These are Aiyar,³

¹ An earlier reference to Milâduḍaiyâr, i.e., Meypporu-Nāyanār is in an inscription from Tirunâgêsvaram which belongs to the time of Râjakêśarivarman, probably, Âditya I. (*Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1912*, Part II, paragraph 12).

² The life of Śiruttonda is intimately connected with the temple at Tiruchcheṅgâttāṅgudi in the Tanjore district; *Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1913*, Part II, paragraph 7.

³ The chief male deity among the *grāmadêvatas* is Aiyar or Aiyânâr. He is also named Ariyaputtiran (Hariharaputra), i.e., Vishṇu-Śiva's son, because he is said to owe his origin to the union of Śiva with Vishṇu, when the latter took the female form called Mōhinî. Aiyânâr is represented by a human form in a sitting posture, with a red skin, a crown on his head and pearls in his locks. On his forehead, he wears the sacred ashes, pearls on his ears and neck and a sort of ribbon on his breast. The arms, hands, feet and the whole body are full of jewels and ornaments. In his right hand he holds a ceptre, to indicate that he is the chief among village gods. Round his body and his left leg he wears a kind of belt called *bâhuppadaï* which is also used by sages and others when they sit. From his shoulders, garlands hang down. The upper part of his body is uncovered whilst the lower is covered with a motley garment.

Aiyânâr's two wives, viz., Pûrapai (on the right) and Puṭkalai (on the left) are represented as having, natural bodies of a yellow colour with crowns on their heads and flowers in their hands. Pûrapai wears on her forehead the mark of musk *kastûri* and Puṭkalai the sacred ashes. The temples of Aiyânâr stand usually at some distance west of villages in a grove. At the entrance stand two door keepers with crowns on their heads, thick clubs in their hands and lion's teeth in their mouth. In the first apartment stand seven small figures of the Sapta-Mâtris and two of Vighnêśvara. In the inner apartment is Aiyânâr with his two wives and round about them stand seven figures of stone representing virgins which are however not worshipped. In front of the temple is an altar of stone for animal sacrifices. Close by the temple on both sides of it are figures of clay among which are Aiyânâr's generals called *pâlaiyakkârar*. These figures are presented by the devotees in fulfilment of vows. Aiyânâr is worshipped as Śâstâ in Malabar. Aiyânâr is never asked for any positive good. He only protects from harm and his worship consists solely in propitiation. Like Gaṇêśa and Skanda, the popular deity Aiyânâr is a lord and leader of the demon host and his province is to guard the fields, crops and herds of the peasantry and drive away their enemies, the devils and fends who are ever on the alert to inflict disease, blight and other calamities. Accordingly outside every village in Southern India, may be seen the shrine of Aiyânâr, surrounded with rude clay or terra-cotta

Piḍāri¹, Śeṭṭaiyār (Jyēsthā), Kâlâ-Piḍāriyār, Piḍāri called Punnaitturai-Naṅgai, Piḍāri called Poduvagai-Ūrudaiyâl, Kâḍugâl, Durgaiyār, Piḍāri called Kuduraivattam-Uḍaiyâl and Piḍāri called Tiruvâl-Uḍaiyâl. The number of Piḍāris and their various designations are interesting. Each of them evidently had her own charge to look after. The shrines of the village deities (*tirumurram*) are distinguished from orthodox Brahmanical temples to which the term *śrîkôyil* is generally applied. Most of the village deities are mentioned in connection with villages in the Trichinopoly district to the north of the river Kâvērî. Of other temples mentioned in the Tanjore inscriptions one dedicated to Kuḍadêva, i.e., to sage Agastya is said to have existed at Tiruttēvaṅkudi in Tiruvâli-nâdu. There was a shrine of Tiru-Vanni-bhagavar (i.e., Śrî-Vahni-bhagavat) at Ânbanûr in Mî-Palâru. It is said to be a temple of Mahâdêva (Śiva) and is styled a *śrîkôyil*. Two shrines of Tiruvaḍigal are referred to, viz., one at Maṇarkâlappalli in Vêlâ-nâdu and another at Viḍêlviḍugu-Pallavapuram in Takkaḷûr-nâdu. In the latter case again the term *śrîkôyil* is applied. Perhaps both of them were shrines dedicated to the sixty-three Śaiva devotees. At Viḍêlviḍugu-Pallavapuram there was also a temple called Pugar-Īsvara-griham.

figures of horses and other animals often of life size on which he is supposed to ride when keeping guard. His image is roughly carved, sometimes in a sitting posture and at other times on horseback. When properly represented he ought to have a crown on his head, the Śaiva mark on his forehead, a sceptre in his hand, and ornaments on his person. Often images of Gaṇēsa are placed near him.

After recovery from sickness or to commemorate any piece of good fortune the villagers place fresh clay horses round the shrine of Aiyaṅâr, as thanks offerings or in fulfilment of vows. He is also at such times propitiated by offerings of the blood of swine, goats, sheep, cocks and other animals, or by cooked food and libations of strong liquor. Aiyaṅâr is only propitiated for emergencies. Every year after harvest time a festival is held in his honour when numerous animals are sacrificed and the images of the god are decorated with ornaments and drawn about through the village streets on rude clay horses.

¹ Piḍāri is represented in a sitting posture, fire issuing from her whole body, to indicate her great wrath. On her head she wears a crown, various ornaments in her locks, on her forehead the mark of Śiva, bulky jewels in the large holes of her ears and two flowers behind them. She has four hands holding in them respectively a drum with a snake, a trident, the skull of Brahmâ and a goad. Her throne is an altar. Piḍāri temples contain also an image of Vighnêśvara and the entrance is guarded by two horrible door-keepers called Mannadiyâr. She has eighteen generals. Châmuṇḍi is on the whole represented like Piḍāri. But the former is standing on the buffalo head of the giant Mahiṣa whom she is said to have slain with the conch and the discus of Viṣṇu. She holds these two weapons in two of her four hands. Durgâ is represented with a sheep's head standing on the giant Simhamukhâsura whom she killed. Her head is fiery and adorned with different jewels. On her forehead she wears a crescent made with sacred ashes of burnt cow-dung. In five of her six hands she holds, respectively, a ring, a sword, a trident, a goad and a skull. Piḍāri is said to be the chastiser of all evil spirits because those who hang or poison themselves, or die any violent death, are turned into malignant demons who would destroy the whole human race if not kept in check by Piḍāri.

V. VENKAYYA.

