

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS
THE SANKARA - PARVATI LECTURES, 1943-44

STUDIES IN THE ANCIENT
HISTORY OF TONDAMANDALAM

BY

R. SATHIANATHAIAER, M.A., L.T.

Lecturer, The Annamalai University

Sometime Asst. Professor, St. Joseph's College, Trichy

AUTHOR OF

History of the Nayaks of Madura

AND

A College Text-book of Indian History

ROCHOUSE & SONS, LTD.,
FRANCIS JOSEPH STREET, MADRAS
1944

Rs. 1/4

**PUBLISHED
WITH
THE
KIND
PERMISSION
OF
THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
MADRAS**

THOMPSON & CO., LTD., PRINTERS, MADRAS

PREFACE

These two lectures were delivered on the 28th and 29th of February last in response to the invitation of the University of Madras in December, 1943, to lecture under the Śaṅkara-Pārvatī Endowment before the end of February, 1944. The ancient history of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam is a well-ploughed field, and I have concentrated on some of its salient aspects. Several of the conclusions arrived at here are new, and the chief of them are as follows: (1) A radical revision is necessary of the southern boundary of Aśoka's empire so as to include within it the whole of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam. (2) The Pulindas of Aśoka's inscriptions should be identified with the Kuṟumbas of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam. (3) Bindusāra Maurya conquered Toṇḍamaṇḍalam with the active support of Kauṭilya, whose personal knowledge of South India is reflected in his sobriquet Dramiḍāchārya. (4) Samudragupta had nothing to do with the Ganjam or Vizagapatam District; he marched through the East Godāvārī, West Godāvārī, Krishṇā and Nellore Districts, and returned home *via* the Sātāra and Maṇḍlā Districts; his Dakṣiṇāpatha expedition was of a punitive character. (5) Toṇḍamaṇḍalam was unique among the regions of Peninsular India as the stronghold of Buddhism till the middle of the 7th century A.D.; it became the home of three streams of Indian culture, Buddhist, Brahmanical and Tamil, and these culture-contacts are of vital importance in its history. (6) The germs of the village Mahāsabhā of the Pallava and Chōḷa periods are found in the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya, and the *vāriyam* organisation, as distinct from

the *kudavōlai* system, must be regarded as an Indian rather than as a South Indian institution. (7) We are justified in thinking that a Buddhist *studium generale* or University existed at Kāñchī in the 7th century A.D. (8) The *aśvasamstha* of the Tālagunda inscription of Kākutsthavarman is not a horseman but a mounted spy, and this interpretation necessitates a revision of the story of Mayūrasarman's connection with Kāñchī. (9) The establishment of colleges at Enṇāyiram, Tribhuvani and Tirumukkūḍal in the 11th century and the connected erection of hostels and hospitals are suggestive of Buddhist (Kāñchī-Nālandā) influence.

In connection with these lectures and their publication, my thanks are due to (a) the scholars who have enriched Indian History, (b) the Founder of the Śaṅkara-Pārvatī Endowment Lectureship, (c) the University of Madras, (d) the Annamalai University and (e) Messrs. Roehouse and Sons, Ltd., Madras.

ANNAMALAINAGAR, }
11th March, 1944. }

R. SATHIANATHAIER.

Studies in the Ancient History of Tondamaṇḍalam

LECTURE I

Importance of the History of Tondamaṇḍalam. The Tamil country may be likened to a magnificent column, and Tondamaṇḍalam is its capital, the Chōla-Koṅgumaṇḍalam, its shaft, and the Pāṇḍyamaṇḍalam, its base. The base of the column was broader in the Śaṅgam Age as Kēraḷa was then a part and parcel of the Tamil country. The history of Tondamaṇḍalam is remarkable in some respects. It records a long series of invasions from the time of Bindusāra to that of Śivāji—Māurya, Śātavāhana, Chōla, Pallava, Gupta, Kaḷabhra, Chālukya, Rāshtrakūṭa, Pāṇḍya, Chōla again, Rāshtrakūṭa again, Pāṇḍya again, Hoysāla, Kākatīya, Muslim, Travancorean, Kākatīya again, Muslim again, Vijayanagar, Pāṇḍya again, Gajapati, Bahmani, Bijapūri, Marāṭha and Mughal. Further, Tondamaṇḍalam was the heart of the Pallava Empire and the helmet of the Chōla Empire; it was the scene of a triangular contest among the Pāṇḍyas, Hoysālas and Kākatīyas and of the ubiquitous activities of the Lion of Tondamaṇḍalam; it was the nucleus of Sāluva Narasimha's power; it was the grave of the Vijayanagar Empire; and it was the foothold of the English in South India. Besides its monuments and its contribution to Sanskrit, Pāli and Tamil literatures, Tondamaṇḍalam contains the best evidences

for the local government and educational organisation of the Pallavas and of the Chōlas.

The Buddha. According to Yuan Chwang "Talopiṭu had been frequently visited by the Buddha, and king Aśoka had erected topes at the various spots where the Buddha had preached and admitted members into his Order. . . . Not far from the south of the capital (Kanchih-pu-lo) was a large monastery which was a rendezvous for the most eminent men of the country. It had an Aśokan tope above 100 feet high where the Buddha had once defeated Tīrthikas by preaching, and had received many into his communion. Near it were traces of a sitting-place and exercise-walk of the Four Past Buddhas." ¹ Talopiṭu is Toṇḍamaṇḍalam; toṇḍa-toḍa-tola-talo; maṇḍala = a division; piṭa = a collection or division of the Scripture; cf. nilopiṭu = blue collection. The local tradition of the Buddha's frequent visits to Toṇḍamaṇḍalam recorded by the Chinese Pilgrim is to be rejected without the slightest misgiving, in spite of the fact that his account is circumstantial, because we know from the Pāli Canon the limits of the Buddha's itinerary after his enlightenment: Bōdh-Gaya, Benares, Rājagriha, Śrāvastī, Vaisāli, Rājagriha again, Śrāvastī again, Rājagriha again, Nālandā, Pāṭaligrāma, Vaisāli again, Pāva and Kuśinagara. Even his visit to Kauśāmbī is doubted, and there is absolutely no basis for his alleged visit to Kashmir or Ceylon. Before the time of Aśoka, Buddhism was confined to Northern India from Aṅga to Avanti.²

¹ T. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II, 1905, p. 226.

² N. Dutt, *Aspects of Mahayana Buddhism and Its Relation to Hinayana*, 1930, p. 14.

The small circle on the map of India in *The Outline of History*³ by H. G. Wells broadly represents the cradle of Buddhism. Therefore we have no reasons for connecting the Buddha with Toṇḍamaṇḍalam.

The Southern Boundary of Aśoka's Empire. The position taken by Smith is accepted by scholars: "The approximate southern boundary of the empire is easily defined by the existence of three copies of the Minor Rock Edicts in Northern Mysore (N. lat. 14° 15', E. long. 76° 48') and by the references in the Fourteen Rock Edicts to the Tamil states as independent powers. The frontier line may be drawn with practical accuracy from Nellore (14° 27' N.) on the east coast at the mouth of the Peṅṅār river to the mouth of the Kalyāṇapuri river (13° 15' N.) on the west coast."⁴ This solution of the problem is mechanical as the line is drawn right across the peninsula immediately to the south of the Mysore edicts. Further, Smith's reference to the Tamil states implies that their northern boundary was identical with the northern boundary of the Chōlas and with the southern boundary of the Maurya Empire. But the Chōla kingdom even in the period of Karikāla did not extend to the Pālār,⁵ and the northern boundary of the Tamil country according to the Śaṅgam Literature cannot be regarded as the northern limit of the Chōla kingdom, which "according to tradition ... comprised the land between two streams having the same name", viz., North and South

3 Cassell & Co., the Fourth Revision, p. 238.

4 V. A. Smith, *Aśoka* (1920), p. 80.

5 K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, *The Chōlas*, I (1935), map, p. 42.

Vellār.⁶ Therefore in the absence of definite evidence to the contrary, the Chōlas mentioned by Aśoka must be regarded as in occupation of the region to the south of N. Vellār, and their northern boundary must have been the same as the southern frontier of the Maurya Empire. Moreover, Smith's line was not redrawn even after he had given up the identification of the Satīyaputra country with the Tuḷu country. The southern boundary of Aśoka's Empire must be conterminous with the northern boundary of the Satīyaputra and Chōla countries.

Identification of the Satīyaputra Country. Rock Edict II mentions the Chōlas, Pāṇḍyas, Satīyaputra and Kēraḷaputra as independent southern peoples. Rock Edict V says that Dharmamahāmātras were employed among the subject peoples—Yavanas, Kāmbōjas, Gāndhāras, Rāshṭrikas and Pitinikas. Rock Edict XIII mentions the prevalence of Dhamma among the Yavanas, Kāmbōjas, Nābhāpantis, Bhōjas, Pitinikas, Āndhras and Pulindas. In the last two cases the order of enumeration is geographical; it must be so in the first case as well—Chōlas, Pāṇḍyas, Satīyaputra and Kēraḷaputra. Therefore the Satīyaputra country must be taken as a great country like the others, its next-door neighbours being the Pāṇḍya country and Kēraḷa. In other words the Satīyaputra country should be sought for between the Pāṇḍya country and Kēraḷa, which were however conterminous in the far south. Therefore the Satīyaputra country may be identified with Koṅgudēśa. Smith's suggestion to equate the Satīyaputra country with the Satyamāṅgalam country deserves support. Tradition regards Koṅgu, the

6 *Ibid.*, p. 22.

region from the Ānamalai to the Shevaroy hills (the Coimbatore District and most of the Salem District), as an independent political unit from the beginning of the Christian era.⁷ Roman imperial coins of the first century A.D. found in the Coimbatore District testify to the commercial prosperity of Koṅgu, whose beryl was widely welcomed in the western world.⁸ It is reasonable to suppose that such a kingdom came within the cognisance of Aśoka rather than the diminutive Tuḷu country with its notorious pirate coast. If the Tuḷu country were meant by that emperor, he would have mentioned Satīya-putra after Kēraḷaputra. One scholar identifies the Satīya-putra country with the Kāñchī region on the ground that a grant of A.D. 1686 refers to Kāñchī as the Satyavratākshetra,⁹ but Aśoka mentions Satīyaputra after the Chōlas and the Pāṇḍyas and before Kēraḷaputra. The other reasons already adduced militate against the identification of Satīyaputra with Toṇḍamaṇḍalam. As the Satīya-putra country is Koṅgudēśa, its northern boundary must have been identical with the southern boundary of the Maurya Empire. Therefore we may draw the line from Kāsaragōd (12° 30', south of Mangalore) along the Chandragiri and along the Kāvērī till it crosses North Latitude 12°, encircling the Shevaroy hills and along the North Veḷḷār to Porto Novo (11° 30'); instead of North Latitude 14° we have to regard North Latitude 12° as indicative roughly of the southern boundary of Aśoka's

7 H. Le Fanu, *A Manual of the Salem District*, Vol. I (1883), p. 16; S. K. Aiyangar, *Śēran Vañji* (1940), pp. 96 and 102.

8 Le Fanu, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-23.

9 *J.R.A.S.*, 1918, p. 542.

empire. In other words, the whole of Tonḍamaṇḍalam was included in that empire.

Northern Limit of the Chōla Country. Aśoka mentions the Chōlas, not the people of Tramiradēśa or the Tamil country. Therefore their northern boundary was North Vellār, the traditional limit. Secondly, Patañjali mentions four South Indian political units: Pāṇḍya, Chōla, Chēra and Kāñchī.¹⁰ The interval between his contemporary, Pushyamitra Śuṅga, and Aśoka is 232—188 = 44 years, and therefore the Kāñchī region must have been separate from the Chōla country in the time of Aśoka. Thirdly, the *Periplus* supports that separateness; Para 60 runs as follows: "Among the market towns of these countries and the harbors where the ships put in from Damarica and from the north, the most important are, in order as they lie, first Camara, then Poduca, then Sopatma; in which there are ships of the country coasting along the shore as far as Damarica; . . . those which make the voyage to Chryse and to the Ganges are . . . very large. There are imported into these places everything made in Damarica, and the greatest part of what is brought at any time from Egypt comes here, together with most kinds of all the things that are brought from Damarica and of those that are carried through Páralia".¹¹ Here the region in which were situated Camara, Poduca and Sopatma is differentiated from Damarica and from "the Coast Country, which lies on a bay," i.e. the Chōla country. Camara seems to be

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 541-42.

¹¹ W. H. Schoff, *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, 1912, pp. 46-47.

identical with Ptolemy's Carmara, an inland town in the Parali of the Sōrētai; his Poduca was in the country of the Arouarnoi. Sopatma has been identified with Maṛkāṇam. Therefore two at least of the three places mentioned in the *Periplus* belonged to Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, the importance of which in Chinese oversea trade is vouched for by Pan Kou.¹² Therefore the *Periplus* and Ptolemy's *Geography* support the separateness of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam from the Chōla country. Fourthly, if Toṇḍamaṇḍalam was no part of the Chōla country before Karikāla Chōla, who occupied it in the age of Aśoka? Rock Edict XIII mentions the Yavanas, Kāmbōjas, Nābhapantis, Bhōjas, Pitinikas, Āndhras and Pulindas, and this order of enumeration should not be disturbed. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar remarks: "It is true that the Pulindas were not confined to one single district, but are mentioned as occupying various separate provinces. But the fact that in Rock Edict XIII they have been associated with the Āndhras shows that we have to place them somewhere to the north or the north-east of the Āndhras."¹³ Why should the Pulindas be located to the north or north-east of the Āndhras and not to the south of them? Dr. Bhandarkar imagined the Chōla kingdom as extending to the Krishṇā. The Pulindas are mentioned by Aśoka after the Pitinikas and the Āndhras and should therefore be located to the south of the Krishṇā. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* mentions the Āndhras, Puṇḍras, Śabarās and Pulindas as Chaṇḍālas descended from Viśvāmitra (VII. 18). The *Mahābhārata* says that Saha-

12 K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, *Foreign Notices of South India*, 1939, pp. 44-45.

13 D. R. Bhandarkar, *Aśoka*, 1925, p. 35.

deva vanquished the Pulindas, proceeded southwards, fought with the Pāṇḍya king, defeated him, and moved northwards to Kishkindhā (II. 32. 17). The *Rāmāyana* in connection with Sugrīva's search for Sītā mentions the Āndhras, Puṇḍras, Chōlas, Pāṇḍyas and Kēraḷas¹⁴ The Pulindas and the Puṇḍras are bracketed with hill tribes.¹⁵ The term Pulinda is defined as a variety of Chaṇḍālas (The *Amarakośa*—Śūdravarga : चण्डालभेदाः किरातशबर-पुलिन्दा म्लेच्छजातयः)

“ Ptolemy's Agriophagoi ... indicates that the Pulinda was a tribe that subsisted on raw flesh and roots or wild fruits.”¹⁶ The Śabaras may be identified with “ the aboriginal Śavaras, a wild race who live in the woods and jungles without any fixed habitations, and whose country extended as far southward as the Peṇṇār River”¹⁷ We have seen Ptolemy's reference to the Arouarnoi, identical with the Tamil Aruvālar inhabiting Aruvānāḍu between the South and North Peṇṇār.¹⁸ Tamil tradition as recorded in the Mackenzie MSS. regards the Vēḍars and the Kuṛumbar as the earliest inhabitants of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, the latter of Kannaḍa origin ousting the former. The term Kuṛumbar means a wicked people, and the language of the Kuṛumbar today is allied to Old Canarese.¹⁹ The *Arthaśāstra* mentions the शबर पुलिन्दा चण्डालारण्यचराः ।

14 *The Rāmāyana* (Srirangam Edition), Vol. V, 41. 13.

15 S. Majumdar Sastri, *Cunningham's Ancient Geography*, 1924, p. 724.

16 S. Majumdar Sastri: *McCrinkle's Ancient India as described by Ptolemy*, 1927, p. 157.

17 *Ibid.*, p. 173.

18 S. K. Aiyangar, Introduction to R. Gopalan's *History of the Pallavas of Kāñchī*, 1928, p. xii.

19 A. F. Cox, *Manual of North Arcot District*, 1895, p. 221.

The term Pulinda occurs twice in the *Raghuvamśa* (XVI, 19 & 32), and the commentators Chāritravardhana and Mallinātha regard the terms Pulinda, Kirāta and Śabara as synonymous. Therefore we may equate the Pulindas with the Kirātas or hunters; in the *Arthaśāstra* also the term Pulinda is used in the same sense according to Dr. R. Shamasastri.²⁰ The term Kuṛumba means hunter.²¹ Therefore the Pulindas who were subject to Aśoka may be located in the Kuṛumbabhūmi or Toṇḍamaṇḍalam. Fifthly; the Jain settlements in the Hassan and South Arcot Districts during the Mauryan period can be understood better if they were included in the Maurya Empire. Aśoka's favour to the Jains is well known, and Bindusāra would have accommodated the followers of his father's final faith in his own empire. The Jains of Mysore and Toṇḍamaṇḍalam would have preferred for their activities a region included in that empire. Their strong position in those parts of South India can be explained better if they had been under Mauryan imperial patronage. Sixthly, the later ascendancy of Buddhism in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam can be better explained if it had been included in Aśoka's empire; cf. Buddhism in Āndhradēśa. Seventhly, in inscriptions giving the genealogy of the Pallavas, Aśoka or Aśokavarman is mentioned after the mythical names—*vide* Vāyalūr Pillar Inscription of Rājasimha: Brahma, Angirasa, Brihaspati, Śamyu, Bhāradvāja, Drōṇa, Aśvatthāman, Pallava, Aśoka, Harigupta, Āryavarman, Vimala, Koṅkaṇika, Kālabharṭṛ,

20 R. Shamasastri, *Kautilīyam Arthaśāstram*, 1924, p. 46; *Kautilya's Arthaśāstra*, 1929, p. 45.

21 *The Tamil Lexicon*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 1927, p. 1055.

Chūtapallava and Virakūrcha;²² the Kaśākkūḍi Plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla; and the Vēlūrpaḷayam Plates of Nandivarman III. In the *Amarakośa*, Aśoka is mentioned only as the name of a tree, not as a name of Vishnu as in the *Vishṇusahasranāma*. Therefore the mention of a historical name like Aśoka, as distinct from a mythological name, in Pallava genealogy is significant; it may be regarded as reinforcing the argumentation here.

Bindusāra. Who conquered Toṇḍamaṇḍalam if it was within Aśoka's empire? The evidence in favour of Bindusāra is overwhelming. Tāranātha's statement is specific, and the sixteen kingdoms overthrown by Bindusāra could be sought for only in Peninsular India. The possibility of his conquest of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam as heir-apparent is ruled out by the *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, which says that Bindusāra was a *bāla* when he was crowned king and that after attaining manhood he became warlike.²³ Therefore he must have invaded South India a few years after his accession in c. 301 B.C., say in 298 B.C. and before 278 B.C. The Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravēla says with reference to his eleventh regnal year that he dismembered the *tramiradēsa-saṅghātam*, which had been in existence for 113 years and which had been a source of danger to his country.²⁴ If we take Dr. W. W. Tarn's date, 168 B.C., for the Yavana evacuation of Pāṭaliputra in Khāravēla's eighth regnal year, and therefore 165 B.C. for his eleventh regnal

22 R. Gopalan, *History of the Pallavas of Kāñchī*, 1928, pp. 49, 185 and 196.

23 K. P. Jayaswal, *An Imperial History of India*, 1934, p. 16.

24 *Epigraphia Indica*, XX, pp. 86-89.

year, the League of Tamil States must have been founded in $165 + 113 = 278$ B.C. Therefore Bindusāra Amitraghāta's invasion of South India must have provoked that anti-Mauryan Tamil combination. According to the Śaṅgam Literature, the Mauryan invaders advanced as far south as Madura.²⁵ In the light of the victories claimed by the Tamil kings over the Āryan forces we are justified in thinking that the League of 278 B.C. must have expelled the Mauryan army from the Pāṇḍya and Chōḷa countries, which in consequence enjoyed independence during the reign of Aśoka. Further, the partial failure of Bindusāra's invasion of South India may account for the fact that he did not attempt the conquest of Kalinga. So Aśoka truly describes it as an unconquered country in his Rock Edict XIII. We may further hold that Bindusāra must have been accompanied to South India by Kauṭilya. His connection with Bindusāra is supported by Hemachandra, and the *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa* says that Chāṇakya served during three reigns including that of Bindusāra. Therefore the Arthaśāstrakāra must have been in office at the commencement of Aśoka's reign.²⁶ The probable active participation of the Indian Bismarck in the South Indian expedition of Bindusāra can well explain his title of *Dramidāchārya* in the sense of an expert in Dravidian affairs, though he belonged to North-Western India, and his *Arthaśāstra* is the first work in Sanskrit Literature which gives a comprehensive view of India, though it

25 S. K. Aiyangar, *The Beginnings of South Indian History*, 1918, pp. 87 and 90.

26 Jayaswal, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

cannot be held that the geographical outlook of that work is predominantly South Indian as Dr. Jolly holds.

Aśoka and After. If Toṇḍamaṇḍalam was a southern province of Aśoka, we need not question the statement of Yuan Chwang that that emperor erected topes in the Kāñchī region.²⁷ In any case, the acculturation of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam must have been the work of Aśoka and his missionaries rather than of Karikāla Chōla and his officers. After the death of Aśoka was asserted the independence of Kalinga and Āndhradēśa, and Toṇḍamaṇḍalam must have followed suit. Its new political position must have remained intact in the second century B.C.; *vide* Patañjali's reference to it. Its importance in connection with oversea trade including its relations with China in that century is clear from the account of Pan Kou and from the *Periplus*. The warlike activity of Khāravēla of Kalinga in 165 B.C. could have affected Toṇḍamaṇḍalam only temporarily. He aimed merely at warding off the danger to his kingdom emanating from the increasingly strong Tamil League. He was a knight-errant who shed his brilliance in three directions, without hankering after annexation or the consolidation of his position. We do not know when exactly Toṇḍamaṇḍalam came under the Āndhras. Karikāla Chōla's conquest of it in the second century A.D. must have contributed to its prosperity, though he could not be regarded as a pioneer in acculturation as far as Toṇḍamaṇḍalam is concerned. Its importance revealed in Pan Kou's account and in the *Mañimēkhalai* and the *Periplus* cannot be attributed to a ruler belonging to a century not earlier than the second.

27 Watters, *op. cit.*, II, p. 226.

Samudragupta's Dakshināpatha Expedition. The question is whether Samudragupta set foot on the soil of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, and a proper answer to it can be given only after identifying on definite principles the place-names in Dakshināpatha mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar inscription of that emperor. In connection with the problem of identification, the following points have got to be remembered. (a) We are concerned with the Dakshināpatha expedition of Samudragupta, and no identification of places with places outside that region may be made. (b) Secondly, it is said in the record that Samudragupta captured and liberated the rājas mentioned and all other kings of Dakshināpatha. Therefore the personal names mentioned are those of kings and rulers of men, not those of officers or mere soldiers. (c) Thirdly, to interpret the record in such a way as to confine the expedition to the Eastern Dakhan is to do violence to the responsible claim that the whole of Dakshināpatha came under Samudragupta, though we are not inclined to say that the kings of Dakshināpatha without a single exception felt his irresistible might as Dr. Hoernle thinks. The *Periplus* confines the term Dachinabades to the territory, coastal and inland, south of Barygaza up to Naura and Tyndis, the first markets of Damarica.²⁸ Therefore it is untenable to confine Samudragupta's warlike activity in Dakshināpatha to Kalinga and coastal Āndhradēśa. (d) Fourthly, the order in which kingdoms or their capitals are mentioned should not be tampered with. Therefore in identifying a place-name, we should look for its location near the previous place-name, avoiding long-jumps and bearing in mind that the conqueror could not

²⁸ Schoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-44.

be expected to march always southward. Mahādaṇḍanāyaka Harisena who composed the *praśasti* must be credited with the good sense to mention the kingdoms conquered by his master in the South in a particular order so that his generation and the succeeding ones might appreciate his achievements correctly. Therefore we must assume that the order of enumeration is the geographical order, just as the chronological order is observed in describing the Dakṣiṇāpatha expedition between the first and second wars in Āryāvarta. Much speculation is encouraged by the tendency to treat lines 19 and 20 in prose as containing a jumble of place-names, a tendency justifiable only if we had got to do with verses. (e) Lastly, the total number of kings mentioned is 12, not 11. There is no reason to suppose that Svāmidatta is associated with two places—Piṣṭapura and Mahendragiri-Koṭṭūr; are both his capitals or his strongholds? Did not the ruler of Kāñchī, or other princes, possess more than one stronghold? If there was the necessity to clarify the location of Koṭṭūr, why are Kosala and other regions not dealt with similarly? Therefore it is natural and grammatical to recognise two rulers instead of one in the compound **पैष्टपुरकमहेन्द्रगिरिकौट्टूरकस्वामिदत्त**. Moreover, the distance between Piṭhapuram and Mahendragiri-Koṭṭūr is so great that we need definite proof that Svāmidatta was master of an extensive territory like Viṣṇugopa of Kāñchī.

Coming to the problem of identification, South Kosala is Eastern C. P. from Amarkaṇṭak to Kānker—the Chhattisgarh Division consisting of the Drug, Bilaspur and Raipur Districts. At Sirpur in the Raipur District

there are archaeological remains assignable to the Gupta period.²⁹ The location of Mahākāntāra must be guided by the geographical position of Pishṭapura, and it may be identified with Kānker and Bastar.³⁰ Yuan Chwang passed through that region in his progress to the Āndhra country. The interval between Samudragupta and Yuan Chwang is less than 300 years. The Chinese Pilgrim's route to Andhra is illuminating in this connection. He refers to the utter depopulation of Kaliṅga in the past and its scanty population in his own time. From there he travelled through forest regions to Dakṣhiṇa Kosala, and thence travelling south through a forest to Andhra.³¹ Kēr(a)ḷa must have been between Bastar and Pishṭapura, and may be identified with Cherla (Nūgūr Taluk, East Godāvārī District) on the Tel near its junction with the Godāvārī. Pishṭapura or Pithapuram (East Godāvārī District) must have been Samudragupta's first conquest on the coast of the Eastern Dakhan, as in the case of Pulakeśin II later. Koṭṭūra is Koṭṭūru near Tuṇi (East Godāvārī District). Crossing the Godāvārī Samudragupta must have reached Eraṇḍapalla, which may be identified with (Eṇḍapalle, Errampalle or) Erragunṭapalle in the Chintalapūḍi Taluk of the West Godāvārī District,³² and the kingdom must have extended in a south-westerly direction. Beyond that kingdom, probably on the banks of the Krishṇā

29 *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, 1908, Central Provinces, p. 20.

30 Jayaswal, *History of India, 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.*, 1933, p. 137.

31 Watters, II, pp. 198, 220 and 209.

32 *Alphabetical List of Villages in the Taluks and Districts of the Madras Presidency*, 1928, p. 307.

(North Krishnā District), Samudragupta must have met Vishnugopa of Kāñchī, and we know that the early Pallava records are found in the Guntur and Bellary Districts. The capital of Avamukta must have been Pīṭhūṇḍa,³³ a place mentioned by Ptolemy, which may be located between Masulipatam and Bezvada in the South Krishnā District. Veṅgi is Peddavēgi, Ellore Taluk, West Godāvārī District. Crossing the Krishnā Samudragupta must have reached Pālakka or Pākkaī between Udayagiri and Venkatagiri in the Nellore District.³⁴ Now the question is where is Devarāshṭra, in the Vizagapatam District³⁵ or in the Sātāra District? The distance between Pālakka on the one hand and Yellamanchili in the Vizagapatam District and Khānapūr in the Sātāra District on the other is more or less the same. The Dakshināpatha expedition of Samudragupta would be unreal to a great extent if he did not cover the ground in the Western Dakhan. Moreover, there is at Devrāshṭa or Devarāshṭra in the Khānapūr subdivision of the Sātāra District a temple dedicated to Samudreśvara.³⁶ Therefore the case for Devarāshṭra in the Sātāra District is stronger than that for Devarāshṭra in the Vizagapatam District. The last place-name is Kusthalapura, which must be identified with some place in Dakshināpatha above Sātāra; its identification with a place in Kaṭhia-

33 Jayaswal, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

34 *The Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. I, 1925, p. 686.

35 G. Jouveau-Dubreuil, *Ancient History of the Deccan*, 1920, p. 60.

36 *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency*, Vol. XIX, 1885, pp. 463-65.

war³⁷ is objectionable because we are concerned with a place in Dakṣiṇāpatha. On the same ground we have to reject Dr. Barnett's identification of Kusthalapura with Kuṭṭalūr, near Pōlūr, North Arcot District.³⁸ We may think that the place in question is कुरावती or कुराखली or Rāmnagar, south of the Vindhyas and on the southern bank of the Narmadā, near Maṇḍlā (C. P.).

Samudragupta's military operations on the East Coast must have been confined to the East Godāvārī, West Godāvārī, Krishṇā and Nellore Districts. He had nothing to do with the Vizagapatam or Ganjam District. There are no grounds for supposing that one or more confederacies³⁹ confronted him. He must have defeated the kings mentioned, though their capitals need not have been converted into battle-fields. After their liberation he must have gone to their chief cities, which must have witnessed ceremonies of reinstatement. Therefore Sāmudragupta must have visited Kāñchī from Pālakka and gone to the Western Dakhan *via* the Bellary District in the possession of the Pallavas of Kāñchī. Therefore his connection with Toṇḍamaṇḍalam rests on no slender basis. It is said, however, that he was defeated because his alleged act of liberation of the so-called defeated princes would be ununderstandable if he had really conquered them, and secondly because he did not annex the conquered territories. If he had been defeated, he would not have entered Toṇḍamaṇḍalam at all. But the Allahabad

37 *I.H.Q.*, *ibid.*, p. 687.

38 *Ibid.*, p. 254.

39 *Jouveau-Dubreuil*, *op. cit.*, p. 61; R. N. Dandekar, *A History of the Guptas*, 1941, p. 55; Jayaswal: *op. cit.*, p. 139.

Pillar Inscription distinguishes clearly between his policy of reinstatement of fallen princes in Dakshināpatha and his policy of uprooting them in Āryāvarta. Further, the record reiterates the policy of liberation in two places: line 23—" whose fame was generated by establishing many royal families, fallen and deprived of sovereignty "; line 26—" whose officers were always employed in restoring the wealth of the various kings who had been conquered by the strength of his arms ".⁴⁰ The *Arthasāstra* recognises the role of the *Dharmavijayī*. Alexander the Great did not exterminate Poros but behaved towards him like a *Dharmavijayī* and even added to his dominions. Moreover, Samudragupta in order to perform the *aśvamedha* was not obliged to annex the territories of the conquered princes; conquest, not annexation, must precede the horse-sacrifice. If however Samudragupta was defeated in Dakshināpatha, the record of his success on an Aśokan column would become the record of a living lie, more infamous than the *Monumentum Ancyranum* of the Roman emperor Augustus. But almost all scholars have agreed not to countenance the theory of Samudragupta's defeat in Dakshināpatha and of his ignominious retreat.⁴¹

Why Samudragupta invaded Dakshināpatha. As regards the causes of Samudragupta's invasion of Dakshināpatha, we are told on the one hand that he was a high-minded sovereign who regarded the performance of *aśvamedha* as a means of salvation; he had no idea of annexation in South India, and it was his role of a

40 C.I.I., Vol. III, pp. 10-17.

41 *Jouveau-Dubreuil, op. cit.*, pp. 60-61.

digvijayī, preparatory to the celebration of the horse-sacrifice, that brought him into conflict with Dakṣiṇāpatha. On the other hand it is said that he was an aggressively ambitious monarch who regarded kingdom-taking as the business of kings.⁴² In other words, Samudragupta was a cross between Mars and Machiavelli. But "born aggressor nations never existed.... The spirit of aggression is not the cause of major wars."⁴³

The causes of wars in Ancient India are difficult to state precisely and fully because of the defects of the available sources of history. As regards mediaeval India, when Ferishta mentions the causes of the wars between the Rāyas of Vijayanagar and the Sultans of the Dakhan, they are trifling, as for example, the attempt of Devarāya I to abduct the beautiful and accomplished daughter of a goldsmith of Mudgal in 1406. On the other hand, Ṭabāṭabāi regards the Bahmani campaigns against Vijayanagar as *jihads* and does not trouble about the special causes. At the present day the Nazis say that they are fighting for *lebensraum* or living-space. The doctrine of *lebensraum* is much older than Hitler and may be found in the pages of Fichte, List, Ratzel, Naumann, Bernhardt and Moeller van den Bruck. Similarly the other Nazi doctrines may be traced back from Hitler to Herder, who started writing his work on the philosophy of history in 1783. But we regard the Nazi war as the outcome of their terrible ideology founded on Racialism and Narcism. For understanding the causes of the first and second World Wars, we have to dive deep into European History, and some

42 V. A. Smith, *The Early History of India*, 1914, p. 281.

43 *The New Review*, 1942, pp. 113 and 116.

European problems at the present day require to be placed in their historical setting if we are to understand them. Even where the facts necessary for a judgment are available, differences of opinion exist and are to some extent inevitable. Ultimately wars are caused by the Old Adam in man, but we want to get at the objective causative factors. As Burke says, in dealing with men, whose motives and needs are complex, no simple explanation may be sustained. Machiavellism alone cannot adequately explain wars, particularly wars of the type of *jihads* or *crescentades*, *mulkgiris* and *digvijayas*. Human nature is complex, and how can it operate under the exclusive influence of Machiavellism? Further, Hobbes's conception of human nature is "outrageously false,"⁴⁴ and he goes to the extent of saying that we hate those among our equals from whom we have received benefits which cannot be requited.⁴⁵ A Frenchman said that we derive pleasure from the misfortunes of our best friends. On the other hand, Locke presents us with a different picture of human nature, of man characterised by reason and good will to his fellow-men. He regards the aggressor as nothing better than a wild beast. Even in the case of the just conqueror, his rights are limited to compensation for injury previously done to him. He has no right to rule over the vanquished without their consent freely given, and if he rules without such consent, his yoke may be justly overthrown whenever a favourable opportunity presents itself.⁴⁶ But Locke's epitome of righteousness is

44 Hobbes, *The Leviathan*, (Oxford), 1929 edition, p. IX.

45 *Ibid.*, p. 76.

46 Locke, *Of Civil Government* (Everyman's Library), pp. 207-15.

pitched in an idealistic key. In history we find the son of a usurper treated as the rightful king and the law of prescription applied to conquests wrongly made; hence practical justice supersedes ideal justice, and attempts are made to revive old empires, to recover lost possessions, etc.

If Samudragupta conducted a *digvijaya* in Dakṣiṇāpatha in order merely to vindicate his position as supreme ruler prior to the performance of *aśvamedha*, he was in modern language an aggressor perhaps worse than the annexationist, because if he had annexed the conquered country, he might have healed the wounds inflicted by him as Aśoka did in the case of Kāliṅga. But *digvijayas* were not treated as improper in the age of Samudragupta, and benefits might accrue from the nominal subordination of the conquered to the conqueror. *Digvijayas* might be undertaken, not out of personal or dynastic motives, but in order to unify the country so that it might stand against the foreigner; it is however difficult to prove that the conqueror was actuated by altruistic motives.

Samudragupta conducted his Dakṣiṇāpatha expedition soon after his position was firmly established at Pāṭalīputra and in his other ancestral territories. So it appears that he wanted to assert his rights as the occupant of the imperial throne. Since he knew the history of *aśvamedha*, he must have known the history of Indian empires—Āndhra and Maurya. The Āndhra conquest of Pāṭalīputra and the Mauryan conquest of the Dakhan must have influenced Samudragupta, who however did not imitate the Mauryan annexationist. He probably aimed at punishing the successor-states to the Āndhra Empire, and reviving the Maurya Empire in his own

manner. Therefore Samudragupta, the emperor of Pāṭaliputra, walked broadly in the footsteps of his imperial predecessors. In other words, he carried out the traditional policy in his own way. The Āndhra imperialists would have justified their post-Mauryan imperialism in the light of the imperialism of the Mauryas. Similarly, the Mauryas could have quoted the example of the Nandas. In dealing with questions of this kind, when our sources are not ample, we are not justified in assuming that ancient Indian conquerors were unscrupulous aggressors.

Pulakeśin II. Pulakeśin II Chālukya is usually regarded as a *digvijayī* of the aggressive type, who set the ball rolling of Chālukya-Pallava hostility. No doubt the series of historical invasions of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam by the Dakhan powers was inaugurated by the greatest of the Western Chālukyas of Bādāmi, but his Aihole inscription of A.D. 634 says that "the lord of the Pallavas ... had opposed the rise of his power."⁴⁷ Here is the clue to his campaign against Mahendravarman I. The same record refers to Pulakeśin's conquest of the Kadambas and the Gaṅgas, and to the conquest of Banavāsi by his father Kirtivarman I. The Kadamba line of Banavāsi was founded in the latter half of the fourth century A.D. by Mayūraśarman, who exchanged the *kuśa* grass for the sword, rebelled against Pallava authority, and subsequently became feudatory to it. Pulakeśin I, the father of Kirtivarman I, was a feudatory of Harivarman Kadamba (537-47), and he revolted against him and established his own dynasty at Bādāmi about A.D. 547. Harivarman,

47 *E.I.*, Vol. VI, pp. 7-12.

the Western Gaṅga king, established his power at Talakāḍ about 435, though in subordination to the Pallavas. Madhava III (460-500) married a Kadamba princess. Durvīṇita (540-600) however came into conflict with the Pallavas. Thus the relations between the Pallavas and the Kadambas and between the Kadambas and the Western Gaṅgas were close; similarly were the relations between the Pallavas and the Western Gaṅgas in spite of their clash in the latter half of the sixth century A.D. In these circumstances the Pallavas of Kāñchī must have opposed the rise of the Chālukyas under the Pulakesīn I and his successors. Conflicting interests and misunderstandings arising out of dynastic and personal needs caused wars, and it is not fair to regard all ancient Indian wars as of the unscrupulously aggressive brand. "Strictly speaking, all the causes of war are psychological The psychological causes of war have their root in the unconscious...Dr. Glover asks for fifty years of intensive research into the human mind. Only then, he thinks, shall we know enough to be able to act with any real prospect of getting rid of the tendencies that make for war." 48

Buddhism in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam. Like early Āndhra history, the early history of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam was shaped by Buddhist influences. Corresponding to the artistic gems at Amarāvati and Nagārjunikoṇḍa there is in the case of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam the gem of the *Mañimēkhālai*, which makes Kāñchī the metropolis of Buddhism in South India. Just as Āndhradēśa produced Nāgārjuna, Toṇḍa-

48 Aldous Huxley in *The Causes of War* by W. R. Inge and others, 1935, pp. 48, 57 and 58.

maṅḍalam produced Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ, Āryadeva, Diṅ-nāga and Dharmapāla, the Vice-Chancellor of the Nālandā University.⁴⁹ Though Buddhism declined in Āndhradēśa after the Ikshvākus (c. A. D. 300), its position in Tonḍamaṅḍalam was strong till the days of Yuan Chwang (A.D. 640). He says : " There were more than 100 Buddhist monasteries with above 10,000 Brethren all of the Sthavira School. The Deva-Temples were above 80, and the majority belonged to the Digambaras." ⁵⁰ As regards India as a whole, the Chinese Pilgrim mentions the adherents of Hīnayāna as numbering 96,500; Mahāyāna, 32,000; both, 54,500; total, 183,000. In the monasteries Hīnayānism was predominant because Mahāyānism laid less stress on monasticism. In the seventh century A.D. three Hīnayāna sects were conspicuous—the Theravādins, the Sarvāstivādins, and the Sammitīyas, the last numbering nearly 44,000 outnumbered the other two sects. Yuan Chwang speaks of the local rather than of the general decline of Buddhism in India, but of its marked decline in North-Western India and South India, the only exception in the latter case being Tonḍamaṅḍalam. In the Āndhra country Buddhism started declining from the 4th century A.D., thanks to the Brihatphalāyanas, the Ānandas, the Śālaṅkāyanas, and the Viṣṇukunḍins. Yuan Chwang notes that there were about 20 Buddhist monasteries and more than 3,000 monks in the Veṅgi kingdom (A.D. 639).⁵¹ At Dhānyakaṭaka though there were many monasteries, most of them

49 S. K. Aiyangar, *The Buddhism of Maṅimēkhalai* (B. C. Law, *Buddhistic Studies*, 1931, pp. 24-25.)

50 Watters, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

51 *Ibid.*, p. 209.

were untenanted; only 20 of them were used by 1,000 monks. There were about 100 Deva-Temples and innumerable followers of various sects.⁵² In the Western Dakhan the Vākāṭakas turned the tide against Buddhism in the 4th century A.D. Yuan Chwang mentions the existence in A.D. 641 of 100 monasteries and about 5,000 monks, and says that the people of Mahārāshṭra “combined orthodoxy and heterodoxy.”⁵³ In the Kannaḍa country the fortunes of Buddhism were eclipsed in the 4th century A.D. by the Kadambas of Banavāsi, the line founded by the doughty and militant champion of Brahmanical orthodoxy, Mayūraśarman. The Western Gaṅgas of Taḷakāḍ rose to power in the same century, and the power of this Jain dynasty lasted in Mysore till the Chōḷa conquest of Taḷakāḍ in A.D. 1004. In the Pāṇḍya country, according to Yuan Chwang, there were a few Buddhist monks, and the numerous monasteries were in ruins, but there were hundreds of Deva-Temples and numerous Digambaras.⁵⁴ In Yuan Chwang’s Chōḷa country also the Buddhist monasteries were in a ruined condition; only some of them were tenanted by monks, but there were several tens of Deva-Temples.⁵⁵ Thus in Tonḍamaṅḍalam alone was the Buddhism of South India conspicuous. There were therefore three elements in the culture of Tonḍmaṅḍalam—Buddhist-Jain, Tamil and Brahmanical. The great Pallavas of Kāñchī who were the protagonists of Brahmanism, contributed to the harmonious blending of the three streams of culture, and

52 *Ibid.*, p. 214.

53 *Ibid.*, p. 239.

54 *Ibid.*, p. 228.

55 *Ibid.*, p. 224.

this cultural harmony was the great inheritance of the Chōlas of Tanjore and Gaṅgaikoṇḍachōlapuram, before whose advent Tonḍamaṅḍalam became ripe for their constructive labours in the field of local self-government and of higher education. In spite of the decline of Buddhism from the latter half of the seventh century A.D., thanks to the Pallavas and the Chōlas and to the Śaiva and Vaishṇava saints, its influence is not negligible.⁵⁶ The great part played by Buddhism in Tonḍamaṅḍalam up to the middle of that century cannot be forgotten in the study of its subsequent history:

56 V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, *Buddhism in Tamil Literature* (B. C. Law, *op. cit.*, pp. 673 and foll.)

LECTURE II

The Mahāsabhā. We study here the perfected type of rural self-governing institutions under the later Pallavas of Kāñchī and the Chōlas of Tanjore and Gaṅgaikoṇḍachōlapuram. The Pallava and Chōla inscriptions analysed below refer to the Mahāsabhā or its activities from the 8th to the 13th century A.D. We shall call them the Mahāsabhā inscriptions.

Pallava Inscriptions. The Pallava Mahāsabhā inscriptions are found in not less than seventeen places, seven belonging to the Chingleput District, six to North Arcot and Chittoor, one to South Arcot, one to Tanjore and two to Trichinopoly; total, 14 for Toṇḍamaṇḍalam and 3 for Chōlamaṇḍalam. Seven of the place-names in this connection reappear in the Chōla list—Uttaramērūr, Tiruvorriyūr, Kūram, Tiruttani, Ukkal, Tirukkōyilūr and Anbil. These records belong to the 8th and 9th centuries and exhibit the *vāriyam* system in its embryonic stage,¹ but the inscriptions of Dantivarman Pallava dated in 782, 784 and 786 A.D. reveal the well-developed character of the Mahāsabhā in general.² Their significance can be fully understood only if the institutions noticed in them are regarded as the precursors of the institutions perfected by the Chōlas.

1 C. Minakshi, *Administration and Social Life under the Pallavas*, 1938, p. 126.

2 K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, *Studies in Cōla History and Administration*, 1932, pp. 107 and 118.

Chōla Inscriptions. (a) *Numbers.* The 646 inscriptions analysed here are distributed as follows :— Chingleput District, 137; North Arcot and Chittoor, $65 + 7 = 72$; South Arcot and Pondicherry, $77 + 21 = 98$; Tanjore, 234; Trichinopoly and Pudukkōṭṭai, $65 + 1 = 66$; Madura, 1; Tinnevely, 16; Travancore, 8; Salem, 4; and Mysore, 10; the total for Toṇḍamaṇḍalam is 307, Chōlamaṇḍalam, 300; Pāṇḍyamaṇḍalam, 25; Kōṅgu-Kannaḍam, 14. The Tanjore District has 234 inscriptions on the whole, but only 16 in the period of Parāntaka I, 15 during the interval between Parāntaka I and Rājarāja I, 23 in the period of Rājarāja I, 22 in the period of Rājendra I, 16 during the interval between Rājendra I and Kulōttuṅga I, and 22 in the period of Kulōttuṅga I. For these six periods the figures for the Trichinopoly District are 5, 1, 5, 8, 5 and 7, and for Pudukkōṭṭai, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0. Therefore the total for Chōlamaṇḍalam from Parāntaka I down to Kulōttuṅga I is 145. The figures for Toṇḍamaṇḍalam are as follows:—Chingleput, 11, 34, 20, 16, 13 and 16; North Arcot and Chittoor, 14, 13, 15, 3, 10 and 1; South Arcot and Pondicherry, 3, 8, 16, 12, 10 and 18; total, 233. Therefore during the period in question the activity of the Mahāsabhā was greater in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam than in Chōlamaṇḍalam. Let us look at the figures from another point of view. In the Chingleput District 137 inscriptions are found in 32 places, and therefore the average for a place is $137/32 = 4.3$; for North Arcot and Chittoor, the average is $72/23 = 3.1$; for South Arcot and Pondicherry, $98/28 = 3.5$; for Toṇḍamaṇḍalam as a whole, 3.6; for Tanjore, $234/74 = 3.1$; for Trichinopoly and Pudukkōṭṭai, $66/22 = 3$; for Chōlamaṇḍalam as a whole, 3.05.

The average for Toṇḍamaṇḍalam and Chōlamaṇḍalam together is 3.3, and the latter falls short of it. Let us survey the figures from yet another point of view. Taking into consideration only the 50 places which have four inscriptions or more each, the total for Toṇḍamaṇḍalam is 216, and the average for a place is $216/24 = 9$; for Chōlamaṇḍalam, $202/26 = 7.7$. Taking only places having 10 or more inscriptions each, we have for Uttaramērūr, 56; Tiruvāduturai, 33; Tribhuvani, 16; Tirupugaḷūr, 15; Brahmadēśam, 12; Tiruvorriyūr, 11; Tiruvallam, 11; Tiruverumbūr, 11; and Tiruviḍaimarudūr 10; the average for Toṇḍamaṇḍalam is $106/5 = 21$ and for Chōlamaṇḍalam $69/4 = 17$. We have divided Chōla history from Parāntaka I down to Kulottuṅga I into six periods, and the following places possess records belonging to three or more of those periods. Madhurāntakam, 1, 0, 2, 0, 0, 1; Tennēri, 0, 0, 4, 0, 1, 2; Tirumukkūḍal, 0, 0, 1, 2, 0, 1; Tiruvorriyūr, 0, 0, 0, 1, 7, 1; Uttaramērūr, 7, 27, 5, 8, 0, 1; Brahmadēśam, 3, 3, 1, 0, 4, 0; Takkōlam, 3, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1; Ukkal, 1, 2, 2, 1, 0, 0; Tribhuvani, 0, 0, 0, 3, 5, 7; Eṇṇāyiram, 0, 0, 0, 2, 1, 2; Erumūr, 1, 0, 2, 1, 2, 0; Kīlūr, 0, 3, 1, 1, 0, 1; Uḍaiyārguḍi, 1, 1, 1, 3, 0, 0; Puñjai (Kiḍāraṅkoṇḍān), 0, 0, 1, 2, 3, 0; Śembiyanmahādēvī, 0, 3, 2, 2, 1, 0; Tirukkoḷambiyūr, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0; Tiruppugaḷūr, 0, 1, 1, 2, 3, 6; Tiruvāduturai, 6, 0, 5, 5, 0, 5; Tiruviḍaimarudūr, 3, 2, 0, 0, 0, 1; Tiruviḷakkuḍi, 0, 2, 0, 1, 2, 0; Kāmarasavalli, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 2; and Kīlappaḷuvūr, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1; total, 13 places and 132 inscriptions in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam and 9 and 71 in Chōlamaṇḍalam. Thus the primacy of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam in the history of the Mahāsabhā is clear.

(b) *Concentration.* Another noteworthy point is that the Mahāsabhā was concentrated in certain areas. In the Chingleput District we find its activity in 32 places: 13 in the Conjeeveram Taluk—Ārpākkam, Kāñchīpuram, Kāvantaṇḍalam, Kūram, Māgaral, Paḷaiyaśivaram, Parandūr, Pullallūr, Śīruvākkam, Tennēri, Tirumukkūḍal, Tirupparuttikkunṇam and Tiruppulivanam; 4 in the Madhurāntakam Taluk—Kaḍappēri, Madhurāntakam, Perumbēr and Uttaramērūr; 4 in the Śrīperumbūdūr Taluk—Maṇimaṅgalam, Pillaipākkam, Śivankūḍal and Śōmaṅgalam; 4 in the Saidapet Taluk—Pāḍi, Tirumullai-vāyil, Tiruvorriyūr and Vēḷachchēri; 4 in the Chingleput Taluk—Kāyār, Nattam, Tirukkaḷukkunṇam and Tiruvaḍandai; 2 in the Tiruvalḷūr Taluk—Kūvam and Tirup-pāchchūr; and 1 in the Ponneri Taluk—Tiruppālaivanam. We find a major concentration around Conjeeveram, from Uttaramērūr to Pullalūr and from Kūram to Paḷaiyaśivaram and Tirumukkūḍal, and a minor concentration encircling Madras—Vēḷachchēri to the south, Pāḍi and Tirumullaivāyil to the west and Tiruvorriyūr to the north. A large number of inscriptions belonging to the North Arcot District are found in the Arkōṇam and Cheyyār Taluks—Takkōlam, Tiruppārkkāḍal, Brahmādēsam, Ukkal, etc.; the Mahāsabhā area extended from Tiruttaṇi to Ukkal and from Takkōlam to Tiruppārkkāḍal, and was a continuation of the major concentration area in the Chingleput District. Therefore the grand Mahāsabhā area of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam stretched from Tiruttaṇi to Ukkal and Uttaramērūr and from Tiruppārkkāḍal to Tennēri. In the South Arcot District the area in question extended from Eṇṇāyiram and Trikkuvani to Uḍaiyārguḍi and Chidambaram. The Mahāsabhā area in Tanjore is the

triangle with its apex at Negapatam, the base being the Coleroon, particularly the Māyavaram, Nannilam, Kumbhakōṇam, Pāpanāsam and Tanjore Taluks; in the Trichinopoly District from Śrīnivāsanallūr and Mahādānapuram to Uṛaiyūr and from Tirumalavāḍi to Ālabākkam and Tiruveṛumbūr. In the Chōlamanḍalam the Mahāsabhā was active particularly on the banks of the Kāvērī and the Coleroon; in the South Arcot District, on the banks of the South Peṇṇār and the North Veḷḷār; in the Chingleput and North Arcot Districts, on the banks of the Pālār and the Cheyyār. Lastly, in the Tinnevely District there are 16 inscriptions in 9 places, most of which are in the neighbourhood of Tinnevely Town, which is one of them: Śērmādēvī, Maṇappaḍaiviḍu, Śevilippēri, Gaṅgaikoṇḍān, Attālanallūr, Mannārkōvil (both in the Ambāsamudram Taluk), Āttūr near the mouth of the Tāmraparṇī, and Vijayanārāyaṇam near Nāṅgunēri. Many of these places are on the banks of that river. Mānūr is near Tinnevely to the north of it and to the west of Gaṅgaikoṇḍān, but its importance belongs to the 9th century.

(c) *Relative Value.* We have so far seen the number and distribution of the Mahāsabhā inscriptions. An analysis of the contents of the records shows the supreme importance of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam in the history of the Mahāsabhā. The Chōlamanḍalam inscriptions early and later, particularly the latter, are valuable, but the records at Talaināyar, Ayyampēṭṭai, Śembiyanmahādēvī, Śēnganūr, Tirumeyṅānam, Kumbhakōṇam, Tirumalavāḍi and Mannārguḍi are only supplementary to the records in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam at Uttaramērūr, Tennēri, Tiruvoṛriyūr,

Tiruppārkkāḍal, Kāvērippākkam, Takkōlam, Ukkaḷ, Eṇṇāyiram, Tribhuvani, etc. Above all we have the two Uttaramērūr inscriptions of 919 and 921, and the latter exhibits the Mahāsabhā in its perfected form.

The Uttaramērūr Charter of 921. It is a much-discussed record, but its importance justifies further discussion. Though Tamil words are used in enumerating the excluded persons' relations, many Sanskrit words and expressions are employed in the inscription. It gives us an idea of the vernacular speech of the learned men of Uttaramērūr : arthasaucha, ātmasaucha, agamyāgamana, mahāpātaka, samsargapatita, sāhasika, para-dravya, kritaprāyaścitta, grāmakaṇṭhaka, sabālavridha, vidyāvridha, vayōvridha, anantaram, kūṭalēkha, chandrādityavat, abhyudaya, duṣṭa and viśiṣṭa. Some of these words might have been avoided, but not most of them. The use of another group of Sanskrit and Tamilised Sanskrit words is deeply significant: Vyavasthā, Mahāsabhā, Madhyastha, Kuḍumbu, Vāriyam, Panchavāravāriyam and Samvatsaravāriyam. No doubt *kuḍavōlai* is Tamil. Vyavasthā means a rule, law, regulation or decision. Madhyastha is an umpire or one who does not participate in the proceedings except as umpire, i.e. a Returning Officer. Kuḍumbu may be derived from कुट् or कुट्ट् = to divide, to cut, and means a division or ward. It is obviously better to derive the word *vāriyam* from the Sanskrit vārya (वृ, वर् = to choose or select) than from the Tamil vāri = income. Panchavāravāriyam is to be interpreted to correspond to Samvatsaravāriyam; panchavāra = five times or five days or always as in panchānana = lion, where *pancha* indicates width. There-

fore Panchavāravāriyam may mean a committee which meets frequently or a standing committee. The expression Peruṅḡṛi Mahāsabhā need not be regarded as tautological because Peruṅḡṛi may mean the Great Lot or Ticket (*vide* Malayālam *kuṛi* and *lēlakkuṛi*); it means the Mahāsabhā characterised by the Great Lot, though Peruṅḡṛi may also be taken as synonymous with Mahāsabhā.

The main object of the Uttaramērūr Charter of 921 seems to be the introduction of the *kuḍavōlai* system as it receives the greatest emphasis: இவ்வாண்டு முதல் சந்திராதித்யவது என்றும் குடவோலைவாரியமே இடுவதாக. Therefore the lot system was the innovation made in 919 and finally in 921. The elaboration of the committees and the increase in their number could have been arranged according to the requirements of the locality. Before discussing the origins of the Mahāsabhā, its character as revealed in the document of 921 should be noted. Membership of the committee required very high qualifications regarding age (above 35 and below 70), property, learning, capacity for committee work, and moral purity not only of oneself but also of one's relations; also no connection with any of the committees for the past three years. Such a personnel rendering honorary service would have been available only in prosperous, enlightened and virtuous villages. To run the Mahāsabhā the village should have men, honest and true, learned and capable, self-supporting and experienced. The lot system would produce the best results only in such an atmosphere.

The lot system was regarded by the ancient Greeks as a hall-mark of perfected democracy. Sparta was regarded

as an oligarchy partly because she would have nothing of that system. The Athenians knew the representative principle but their democracy was direct, and the lot system was widely employed by them. Their perfected democracy of the Periclean age was rendered possible by the resources of a great empire. They paid those who rendered public service, and modern democracy also requires payment of legislators at any rate as indispensable. The question is whether the lot system is democratic. Some classical scholars regard the ancient lot system as not intended to be a democratic device but as a means of ascertaining the will of the gods. But the system may give a chance to anybody irrespective of his qualifications; without the principle of rotation in office, however, it may do injustice to competent candidates. Uttaramērūr avoided the pitfalls of the lot system.

Origins of the Mahāsabhā. The predominance of the Mahāsabhā records from the point of view of their number and quality, the conspicuousness of the Mahāsabhā in the period of Parāntaka I, and its grand concentration in the Conjeeveram, Arkōṇam and Cheyyār Taluks establish a *prima facie* case for its origin in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam. The earliest inscription at Uttaramērūr recording the activity of the Mahāsabhā belongs to c. A. D. 782 in the reign of Dantivarman Pallava. Between that date and 921, more than a dozen inscriptions testify to the progress of the Mahāsabhā at Uttaramērūr.³ Its character as a well-developed institution in 782 justifies the view of its origin early in the 8th century. We have seen that in

³ Nilakanta Sastri, *Studies*, pp. 118-21; *The Pandyan Kingdom*, 1929, p. 93.

the later Pallava period there were Mahāsabhās in 14 places in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam and in three places in Chōla-¹ maṇḍalam, the earliest record belonging to the former region. Therefore the institution originated in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam during the later Pallava period. A word may be added here on the Mānūr Mahāsabhā pictured in an inscription of the 35th regnal year of Māraṇ Śaḍaiyan. “If this Māraṇ Śaḍaiyan were the same as Varaguṇa Mahārāja, as probably he is, then the record may be assigned to about A.D. 800.”³ It is also assigned to the period of Varaguṇa II who ascended the throne in c. A.D. 862.⁴ Assuming that its date is A.D. 800, the Mānūr Mahāsabhā seems to be a shooting star. Its subsequent history is unknown, and perhaps it came to grief consequent on the obstructionist tactics of some of its members, in spite of the penal provisions of the record—a case of premature constitutionalism. Still the value of the record is great as it illustrates the influence in distant places of the Mahāsabhās of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam.

Our next question is why did the Mahāsabhā originate in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam? This institution can be connected directly neither with the Tamil institutions of the Śaṅgam Age nor with the Northern Indian institutions of the Maurya and Gupta periods. Regarding the administration of the Pallavas we are told that “while the central administration seems in essence to be administration which has very considerable analogy to the administration of the headquarters, as in the *Arthasāstra* generally, we see there is a considerable

⁴ R. Sewell, *The Historical Inscriptions of Southern India* (edited by S. K. Aiyangar, 1932), p. 378.

development in rural administration, for which perhaps it would be difficult to find analogies in the *Arthaśāstra*.⁵ It is difficult to believe however that the *Arthaśāstra* influenced only the central administration. The Rigvedic village *sabhā* was a conspicuously active institution presided over by the *madhyamāsi*, a judicial officer; his designation reminds us of South Indian *madhyasthas*.⁶ The *Arthaśāstra* stresses the importance of villages and gives a few remarkable details about their administration. It is wrong to make a sharp and fundamental distinction between rural and urban administration. The *Arthaśāstra* describes the functions of the Nāgaraka or Superintendent of the City. But on the ground that it does not mention the committee system described in detail in the *Indica* of Megasthenes, a few scholars assign the former to a later age than the 4th century B.C. But the committees, municipal and military, dealt with by the Greek ambassador at Pāṭaliputra are prosaically symmetrical. According to him there was a Board of thirty members for the government of the imperial city and another of thirty for the administration of the imperial army, each divided into six committees of five: Industries, Foreigners, Census, Trade, Manufactures and their sale, and collection of the sales tax; Elephants, Horses, Foot-soldiers, Chariots, Navy, and Transport and Supply. This is only a wide application of the time-honoured *pañchāyat* principle. Kauṭilya also mentions the four limbs of the army, the navy and the commissariat. Unlike other writers on polity, he is sensible enough to say that

5 S. K. Aiyangar, *Evolution of Hindu Administrative Institutions in South India*, 1931, p. 129.

6 Nilakanta Sastri, *Studies*, p. 77.

the Mantriparishad should consist of as many members as the imperial business would require. He deals with Politics as a normative, not as a descriptive science. He lays down general principles and does not descend to details. He says that the four chief divisions of the army—Elephants, Horses, Chariots and Foot-soldiers—should be officered by **अनेक मुख्यम्** or headship in commission.⁷ He also refers to **बहुमुख्यमनित्यम्** *i.e.* many non-permanent heads.⁷ In emergencies even the king should act according to the view of the majority of his ministers (**भूयिष्ठाः**) or to what is conducive to success in their opinion.⁷ Kauṭilya further says that **ग्रामवृद्धाः** should safeguard **बालद्रव्यं** (property of minors without guardians), *i.e.* should function as a Court of Wards, and **देवद्रव्यं** ⁷ (temple property). Boundary disputes between two villages should be decided by **सामन्ताः**, **पंचग्रामी** or **दशग्रामी**; disputes about **क्षेत्र** (field) by **सामन्तग्रामवृद्धाः**; if they disagree, several pure and respectable men should decide.⁷ In the absence of owners of religious buildings, they may be repaired by **ग्रामाः** or **पुण्यशीलाः**: There is a reference to a **ग्रामिक** travelling on the business of the whole village.⁷ Moreover, it is laid down that the king should encourage people who jointly construct buildings for the benefit of the country, who make their villages beautiful (**ग्रामशोभाः**), and safeguard their interests.⁷

The municipal committees mentioned by Megasthenes do not correspond to the *vāriyams* of South India; the *udāsīna vāriyam* of Tiruppārkkāḍal reminds us of the

⁷ Shamasastri, *Kauṭilyam Arthasāstram*, pp. 57, 69, 29, 48. 168-9, 171 and 173.

committee at Pāṭaliputra concerned with Foreigners. An inscription from Tirumālpuram (North Arcot District), dated in the fourth regnal year of Rājarāja I, mentions an officer with a committee of five, who enquired into the affairs of the temple and found evidence of neglect and misappropriation of endowments.⁸ The absence of any committee of five from Uttaramērūr does not mean that the *pañchāyat* principle was unknown to the learned men of that Chaturvedimaṅgalam. Pañchāyat is a word like *pañchapātram*, losing ultimately the significance of *pañcha*. Practically there is no difference between Pañchāyats in general and the Shaḍāyats and Dvādaśāyats of Uttaramērūr; both were committees and might consist of any number of members. The choice of 30 members both at Uttaramērūr and Pāṭaliputra is an accidental coincidence. The additional *vāriyams* which functioned at Tiruppārkkāḍal and Kāvērippākkam could not make the system as such different from that prevailing at Uttaramērūr. Therefore the committee organisation is an Indian institution rather than a South Indian institution. I think that the *kuḍavōlai* system however was devised to suit the conditions of the Chaturvedimaṅgalams of South India. Where are the ideas of local government we may expect the Brahmans of Tonḍamaṅḍalam to be familiar with in the 8th, 9th and 10th centuries?—mostly ideas derived from Sanskrit Literature, sacred and profane. The Pallavas patronised the northern culture, and Kāñchī was a great centre of Sanskrit learning from the 7th century A.D. They founded Brahman settlements on the banks of rivers;

8 Nilakanta Sastri, *The Cōlas*, I, p. 478.

particularly in the neighbourhood of their imperial capital, and encouraged their progress in various directions, without however forgetting Chōlamanḍalam. The Pallava imperial resources were utilised for culture and rural administrative progress. But wars with the Chālukyas and the Pāṇḍyas limited the progress of the realm and of the Mahāsabhā, which reached the acme of its development under the Chōlas, thanks to their greater imperial resources and to their more successful effort in safeguarding the peace of the country. Thus the Pallavas prepared the way for the golden age of the Mahāsabhā under the Chōlas. Moreover, the work done by Buddhism or democratic Brahmanism in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam cannot be lost sight of in this connection; it was a potent factor in the progress of the country till the middle of the seventh century A.D. Toṇḍamaṇḍalam was the focus of three rays of light, Buddhist-Jain, Brahmanical and Tamil. It is not therefore surprising that the Mahāsabhā originated and attained the zenith of its progress in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam. Moreover, the concentration of Chaturvedimaṅgalams in certain areas, particularly in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, thanks to royal policy, must have acted as a stimulus to their progress, and we find in the Chōla period a glorious bazaar of Mahāsabhās. Lastly, the role of royal policy in the evolution of the Mahāsabhā cannot be regarded as an insignificant factor. The Mahāsabhā was no spontaneous growth in times of storm and stress, but an institution nurtured by benevolent royal policy and backed by the resources of a vast and opulent empire. Still it was not a mere creature of the royal will; the conditions precedent to its creation and the factors conducive to its smooth working could be shaped by royalty only in an

indirect way. It enjoyed maximum local autonomy consistent with the unity and strength of the empire.

The Golden Age of the Mahāsabhā. The period of exactly 200 years from A.D. 921 to A.D. 1120 may be called the golden age of the Mahāsabhā. For Parāntaka I's reign we have 28 Mahāsabhā inscriptions in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam and 21 in Chōlamaṇḍalam; during 953—985, there are 55 and 16 respectively. Of these 55 inscriptions, 34 are in the Chingleput District, 13 in the North Arcot District, 7 in the South Arcot District and one in the Pondicherry territory. Rājāditya, the son of Parāntaka I, was the Viceroy of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, and his defeat and death at Takkōlam in A.D. 949 resulted in the occupation of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam by Krishṇa III Rāshtrakūṭa for 15 years, if not for 25 years (943-968). The Rāshtrakūṭas were expelled from Toṇḍamaṇḍalam by Parāntaka II, the grandson of Parāntaka I and father of Rājarāja I. 13 inscriptions of Krishṇa III from his 5th to his 30th regnal year in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam show the activities of the Mahāsabhā:—Uttaramērūr, 3; Ukkal, 1; Kāvanūr, 1; Tirukkalukkunṇam, 1; Bāhūr, 1; Siddhalīngamaḍam, 2; Kīlūr, 3; and Tirunāmanallūr, 1. The progress of the Mahāsabhā in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam does not seem to have been appreciably affected by its conquest and occupation by Krishṇa III, the last great Rāshtrakūṭa (939-68) whose supremacy in Peninsular India surpassed that of Govinda III (794-814), the greatest of the line, who was supreme in India as a whole.

The reign of Rājarāja I is, from one point of view, of the greatest importance in the history of the Mahāsabhā; it witnessed the constitution of Mahāsabhās in all parts

of his extensive empire, and his Mahāsabhā records are remarkable for their wide distribution. During the 30 years of his rule (985-1014) we have 91 inscriptions; 51 in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, 28 in Chōlamaṇḍalam, 8 in Pāṇḍyamaṇḍalam, and 4 in the Koṅgu-Kannaḍa region; for the reign of Rājendra I (1012-44) the figures are 31, 30, 4 and 6 = 71; for the interval between Rājendra I and Kulōttuṅga I, 33, 21, 9 and 0 = 63; for Kulōttuṅga I, 35, 29, 3 and 1 = 68. The primacy of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam is thus maintained to the close of the reign of Kulōttuṅga I (1070-1120). The vast resources of the Chōlas and their enlightened policy from Parāntaka I down to Kulōttuṅga I consolidated the position of the Mahāsabhā and made it conspicuous.

Decline of the Mahāsabhā. For the period 1120 to 1216 we have 28, 61, 0 and 0 = 89 inscriptions, as against those for the period 1014 to 1120—99, 80, 16 and 7 = 202. The decline of the Mahāsabhā in the 12th century is more conspicuous in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam than in Chōlamaṇḍalam; this tendency became stronger in the following century, and the figures for 1216 to 1279 are 12, 28, 0, and 0 = 40. The decline of the Mahāsabhā in the 12th and 13th centuries is to be explained with reference to the internal troubles of the Chōla Empire in the 12th century and its external difficulties in the 13th century, coupled with the increased activity of *grāmakaṇṭhakas*. Early in the reign of Kulōttuṅga I, Ceylon became independent (1075), and towards the close of it Gaṅgavāḍi (1117) and Veṅgi (1118). The Tamil country as far as Rāmēśvaram was raided by Vishṇuwardhana Hoyśāla (1111-41). Troubles

in the Pāṇḍya country engrossed the attention of the Chōlas from 1169 to 1177 and from 1182 to 1189. The Telugu-Chōḍas seized Kāñchī, which was however recovered by Kulōttuṅga III about 1196. The growth of feudatory puissance during the 12th century weakened the central authority. In the 13th century the Pāṇḍya troubles revived, and the Chōla Empire was overwhelmed by Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya. Consequently the successors of Kulōttuṅga III were kings only in name—Rājarāja III (1216-46) and Rājendra III (1246-79). The Pāṇḍya imperialism provoked Hoysāla intervention in Chōla affairs, and Narasimha II (1220-35) liberated Rājarāja III from prison, into which he had been thrown by his over-mighty rebel-feudatory of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam—Kō-Peruñjiṅga. Sōmēśvara Hoysāla (1235-54), the son of Narasimha II, continued the policy of his father and established his power at Kaṇṇanūr, near Trichinopoly. Rāmanātha Hoysāla (1254-95) ruled from Kaṇṇanūr, and his inscriptions are numerous in the Tanjore and Trichinopoly Districts. Toṇḍamaṇḍalam was invaded by the Hoysālas, the Telugu-Chōḍas and the Kākatīvas, and an inscription of 1245 refers to Uttaramērūr as Gandagōpāla-Chaturvēdimaṅgalam, named after a Telugu-Chōḍa chieftain. In these circumstances the Mahāsabhā declined, though it must have been in a position to do something for the villagers in the absence of the activity of the central government. Though it could play some part in times of storm and stress, it could not flourish in such times. Therefore the encomiums bestowed on “the little village republics” reflect their minimum activity in periods of anarchy, but their prosperity would require peace and imperial protection. The Hoysāla occupation of the

Tamil country must have been prejudicial to its internal progress. Even the heart of the Chōla Empire was ill administered. An inscription of 1226 says that Narasimha Hoyśala ruined the country and its temples and carried away the images of gods.⁹ There are references in the inscriptions of the period of decline to the activities of mischief-mongers in villages. At Śembiyanmahādēvī (Tanjore District) night sessions of the Mahāsabhā were stopped about 1233 because of the inconvenience and the cost of lighting, and the *vyavasthā* was made that five years should elapse before one could be re-selected for office and that anybody who defied the rule should be treated as a *grāmadrōhī*. There are also other instances to show that *stasis* developed in village administration and called for legislation against *grāmadrōhīs*,⁹ and such a development of a general character would weaken rural administration.¹⁰ In this connection the fate of the Mānūr Mahāsabhā may be remembered; and Parāntaka I's legislation of 921 was directed against *grāmakanthakas*. There is also evidence in the period of decline of government officials intriguing with local factions and impairing the efficiency of village institutions,¹⁰ and further, undue palace influence in operating them had to be discountenanced by penal legislation against persons invoking such influence.⁹

Higher Education in Tondamandalam: A Buddhist University at Kāñchī. In the field of higher education as in that of local government the ground for the fertile activities of the Chōlas was prepared by the Pallavas..

9 Sastri, *The Cōlas*. Vol. II, Pt. II, pp. 733, 741-2 and 604.

10. *Ibid.*, Part I, pp. 287-8 and 290-91.

We have seen the part played by Buddhism in the history of Tondamaṇḍalam up to the middle of the seventh century A.D. It produced many scholars of eminence who spread the name and fame of Kānchī not only in Northern India, but also beyond the seas. The question now is whether we are justified in speaking of a Buddhist University at Kānchī. What is a University? "The notion that a University means a *universitas facultatum*—a school in which all the faculties or branches of knowledge are represented—has, indeed, long since disappeared from the pages of professed historians.¹¹.... The term which most nearly corresponds to the vague and indefinite English notion of a university as distinguished from a mere school, seminary, or private educational establishment, is not *universitas*, but *studium generale*; and *studium generale* means not a place where all subjects are studied, but a place where students from all parts are received¹¹.... In the main the term seems to have implied three characteristics (1) That the school attracted or at least invited students from all parts, not merely those of a particular country or district; (2) that it was a place of higher education; that is to say, that one at least of the higher faculties—theology, law, medicine—was taught there; (3) that such subjects were taught by a considerable number—at least by a plurality—of masters. Of these ideas the first was the primary and fundamental one: a *studium generale* meant a school of general resort.¹².... To the original conception of a

11 Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, 1895, edited by Powicke and Emden in three volumes, 1936; Vol. I, pp. 4-5 and 6.

12 *Ibid.*, pp. 7 and 8.

studium generale there was gradually added a vague notion of a certain ecumenical validity for the mastership which it conferred.'¹² The modern University, like the modern representative democracy, is a mediæval product, and the history of European Universities shows that a University is not necessarily a place providing for courses in universology. It is the concentration of educational effort at a particular place where courses are given in many subjects of general interest by a multiplicity of teachers. A University is a real University only if it attracts pupils and teachers from a large area, if not from the whole country or the whole world, and builds up a reputation of a more than local character. Therefore we may unquestionably speak of Nālandā as a University. Yuan Chwang says: "The people (of Talopiṭu)... esteemed *great learning*. There were more than 100 Buddhist monasteries with above 10,000 Brethren all of the Sthavira school.... Not far from the south of the capital was a large monastery which was a *rendezvous for the most eminent men of the country*."¹³ (Itals. ours) The greatness of that monastery is confirmed by the *Mattavilāsaprahasana* of Mahēndravarmān I. Nāgasēna, the Śākyabhikṣu, eulogises the magnificent liberality of the Upāsaka, Śresṭhī Dhanādāsa, the Anāthapiṇḍika of Kāñchī and patron of the Rājavihāra. Further the Kapālin's *parichārikā* (wench) Devasomā refers to the great wealth of the monastery derived from the revenues of many monasteries.¹⁴ The Rājavihāra is obviously

¹³ Watters, *op. cit.*, II, p. 226.

¹⁴ *Mattavilāsaprahasana*, Trivandrum edition, 1917, pp. 11-12 and 23; *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, London, Vol. V (1928-30), pp. 706 and 714.

identical with the large monastery mentioned by Yuan Chwang,¹⁵ and must have been founded by the Buddhist kings of Kāñchī before Simhavishṇu, some of whose names like Aśokavarman and Buddhavarman are available. Diṅnāga of the 5th century and Dharmapāla of the 6th century belonged to Kāñchī and migrated to Nālandā. The Buddhists of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam did not live in a state of isolation; they had intimate contacts with Nālandā and Ceylon. Therefore Kāñchī may be regarded as a Buddhist *studium generale*. Yuan Chwang stresses the artistic progress of Āndhradēśa;¹⁶ this emphasis is confirmed by the glories of Amarāvati and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. He refers to Malakūṭa as "indifferent to culture and only good at trade."¹⁶ The Ceylonese Brethren were "perfectly clear in meditation and wisdom."¹⁶ The people of Mahārāshṭra were "fond of learning."¹⁶ Therefore it is clear that the Chinese Pilgrim regarded Kāñchī as the greatest Buddhist educational centre of South India, because he refers to its "great learning" and to its being "a rendezvous for the most eminent men of the country." I think we are justified in saying that there was a Buddhist University at Kāñchī.

As regards the scholarship of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, we may apply to it the general remarks of Yuan Chwang on Indian scholarship: "There are men who, far seen in antique lore and fond of the refinements of learning, are content in seclusion, leading lives of continence. These

15 Minakshi, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

16 Watters, *op. cit.*, pp. 209 and 214, 228, 234 and 239.

come and go outside of the world, and promenade through life away from human affairs. Though they are not moved by honour or reproach, their fame is far spread. The rulers treating them with ceremony and respect cannot make them come to court. Now as the state holds men of learning and genius in esteem, and the people respect those who have high intelligence, the honours and praises of such men are conspicuously abundant, and the attentions private and official paid to them are very considerable. Hence men can force themselves to a thorough acquisition of knowledge. Forgetting fatigue they expatiate in the arts and sciences; seeking for wisdom while relying on perfect virtue, they count not 1000 *li* [about 200 miles] a long journey. Though their family be in affluent circumstances, such men make up their minds to be like the vagrants, and get their food by begging as they go about. With them there is honour in knowing truth (in having wisdom), and there is no disgrace in being destitute. As to those who lead dissipated idle lives, luxurious in food and extravagant in dress, as such men have no moral excellences and are without accomplishments, shame and disgrace come on them and their ill repute is spread abroad.¹⁷ It may be doubted if our universities now produce scholarship coupled with moral excellence, inordinate love of learning with supreme indifference to *kāminīkāñchana*, and above all a sturdy independence of character which will spurn aside every advantage accruing from dancing attendance on big guns and kotowing to them and from the cultivation of the slave mentality.

17 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 160-61.

According to Yuan Chwang, the Jains possessed the majority of the Deva-Temples numbering over 80. Their great institutions in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam were at Tirupparattikkunṇam, near Kāñchī, and at Pāṭaliputra (Cuddalore), patronised by the Pallavas.¹⁸ Therefore higher education in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam was largely controlled by the inmates of Buddhist and Jain monasteries till at least the middle of the 7th century A.D.

The Ghatikā Problem. The Tālagunda Pillar Inscription of Kākutsthavarman describes Mayūraśarman, the founder of the Kadamba dynasty, as a *dvijottama* who knew his branch of the Veda, who proceeded to the capital of the Pallavas along with his *guru* Vīraśarman in order to study प्रवचनं निखिलं (the whole of the Veda), and who entered the *ghatikā* directly (आशु) as a तक्कुक् or inquirer (or *yāchaka*). The relevant portion of the record runs as follows:—

एवमागते कदंबकुले श्रीमान् बभूव द्विजोत्तमः नामतो
मयूरशर्मैति श्रुतशील शौच्याद्यलंकृतः । यः प्रयाय पल्लवेन्द्रपुरीं
गुरुणासमं वीरशर्मणा अधिजिगांसुः प्रवचनं निखिलं घटिकां
विवेशाशु तक्कुक् । तत्र पल्लवाश्वसंस्थेन कलहेन तीव्रेण रोषितः
कलियुगेस्मिन्नहोबतक्षत्रात् परिपेक्ष्वा विप्रता यतः गुरुकुलानि
संयगाराध्य शाकामधीत्यपि यत्नतः ब्रह्मसिद्धिर्यदि नृपाधीना
किमतः पर दुःखमित्यतः ॥¹⁹

The first point to note here is that Mayūraśarman entered Kāñchī as a *vaidika* of eminence. He was accompanied by his *guru* because he had to be introduced

18 Minakshi: *op. cit.*, pp. 227-31.

19 *E.I.*, VIII, p. 32.

to another *guru* at Kāñchī, so that he might complete his study of the Veda, a single branch of which alone had so far been mastered by him. प्रवचनं निखिलं means the whole of the Scripture, not a critical study of the Veda. Mayūrasarman entered the *ghatikā*, the *ghatikā* of the Brahmans mentioned in the Vēlūrpalayam grant and other records. *Ghatika* is the diminutive of *ghaṭa*, a pot, a part of anything, a settlement, etc. *Ghatikāsthāna* is mentioned in the *Arthasāstra* of Kauṭilya as a room, according to the commentator Bhaṭṭasvāmin²⁰. Mayūrasarman entered the Brahman quarters of Kāñchī for *gurukulavāsa*. The word आशु is to be taken in the sense of *directly* (not soon) as will be clear from the sequel. तवकुक्क is enquirer; the house of the new *guru* had to be found out; the sense of *yāchaka* is not unsuitable as he was an *annārthī* as well as a *vidyārthī*. The Brahman *ghatikā* would be a place for *adhyayana* privately organised, not a *Vidyāsthāna*. Learning of a particular type was available wherever there was a colony of Brahmans, and the Pallavas acted on the *Arthasāstra* dictum²¹ that Ritviks, Āchāryas, Purohitas and Śrotriyas should be presented with Brahmadeya lands free of taxes. Such Brahman settlements were homes of Brahmanical ritual and *Vedādhyayana*. Mayūrasarman's attempt to complete his knowledge of the Veda proved futile because of his ferocious quarrel with a पल्लवाश्वसंस्थ. Prof. F. Kielhorn who edited the Tālagunda inscription in 1903 before the discovery of the *Arthasāstra* equated अश्वसंस्थ with *aśvāroha* = a horseman, on the analogy

20 Shamasastri, *Kauṭilyam Arthasāstram*, p. 110.

21 *Ibid.*, pp. 46 and 19.

of *gajastha*, *rathastha* and *syandanastha*.²² But *asvasamstha* means a mounted spy; *samstha* meaning spy is mentioned by Kautilya— पञ्चसंस्थाः प्रकीर्तिताः—²¹ in connection with संस्थोत्पत्तिः. अश्वदूतः means a riding messenger. Therefore अश्वसंस्थाः is a riding spy. The system of passports described in the *Arthasāstra* must have prevailed in the Pallava dominions. Whether Mayūrasarman was a Pallava subject or not, he would have been bound by the passport regulations. They would have been strictly enforced at Kāñchī, particularly after the Dakṣiṇāpatha expedition of Samudragupta, the period to which the rise of Mayūrasarman is to be assigned—the third quarter of the 4th century A.D. Therefore he would have been taken to task by a royal spy, and the militant Brahman deplored that he could not attain *Brahmasiddhi* owing to the king's regulations and proceeded to take vengeance on him by overthrowing his *antapālas* or frontier-guards. Therefore the Tālagunda inscription does not justify the assumption that Kāñchī was a great centre of Brahmanical higher education, though there is no denying the fact that the Brahman *ghatikā* of that city must have been conspicuous for its *Yajñadhūma* and *Vedaghosha*. The marked progress of Brahmanical learning in Tondamaṇḍalam must have synchronised with the advent of the great Pallavas of Kāñchī.

The Brahmanical Colleges. The Bāhūr Copper Plates of the 8th regnal year of Nripatūṅgavarman Pallava (849-75) record a grant of three villages to the *vidyāsthā-nattār* of Vāgūr as a *vidyābhoga* and Brahmadeya.²³ In

²² *E.I.*, VIII, p. 26.

²³ *E.I.*, XVIII, pp. 5-15.

spite of the difficulties regarding the expression *Chāturddīsagaṇa* or *Chaturddasagaṇa* and in spite of the absence of enumeration of the subjects taught, there is no doubt that the *ghaṭikā* of the earlier period developed into the *Vidyāsthāna* of the 9th century A.D. The Chōla inscriptions²⁴ at Enṇāyiram (near Villupuram), Tribhuvani (near Pondicherry) and Tirumukkūḍal (between Chingleput and Conjeeveram) dated in c. 1025, 1048 and 1067 A.D. respectively illustrate the development of the educational organisation indicated in the Bāhūr record.

This question has engaged the attention of two reputed scholars.²⁵ Still a few general observations may be made here. The subjects studied in those three institutions were not only the various branches of the Veda, but also philosophy, Vedānta and Mimāmsa, Grammar, Lower and Higher, and Āgamas and Tantras. The students numbered 340, 260 and 40 in the three colleges and the teachers, 14, 19 and 3 respectively. There were Hostels at Enṇāyiram and Tirumukkūḍal and a Hospital at the latter place. All the three records belong to the 11th century and to Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, to which also belongs the Bāhūr record of the 9th century. There was a separate institute of Vyākaraṇa at Tiruvorriyūr, noticed in an inscription of 1213. In the Chōlaṇḍalam, there were a few institutions of a minor character like the medical school at Tiruvāḍuturai mentioned in a record of 1121. Barring provision for feeding learned Brahmans, for reciting the Veda and reading the *Bhāratam*, etc., we

²⁴ A.R.E., Madras, 1918, pp. 145-47; 1919, pp. 96-97; E.I., XXI, pp. 220-50.

²⁵ S. K. Aiyangar, *Evolution*, pp. 288-305; K. A. N. Sastri, *The Cōlas*, II, Part I, pp. 464-70.

have 14 educational grants belonging to the Chōla period—8 in the Chingleput District (Uttaramērūr, 5; Tirumukkūdal, 1; Tiruvorriyūr, 1; and Kāñchīpuram, 1), 1 at Tribhuvani, 1 at Ennāyiram; 1 at Ukkal, total 11 for Toṇḍamaṇḍalam; 3 in the Tanjore District—Kumbhakōnam, Tiruvāḍuturai and Tiruvidāikkālī, omitting the *ghaṭikā* at Vēmbarrūr. Here also the predominance of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam is clear. Though the colleges at Ennāyiram, Tribhuvani and Tirumukkūdal illustrate the activities of the Mahāsabhās in those places, royal endowments were necessary because the financing of higher education was beyond the resources of village assemblies. Besides grants to colleges, we come across *Bhaṭṭavritti*, *Vyākhyāvritti*, *Bhāshyavritti*, etc. The importance of Vyākaraṇa was well appreciated at Nālandā, according to I-tsing. Its progress in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam must have been the basis of the etiological legend at Chidambaram connecting Patañjali with the local temple. Grammatical science was perfected in ancient India, which developed a philosophy of Grammar—*vide* Bhartrihari's *Vākyapadīya*, the reputation of which at Nālandā is vouched for by I-tsing. Now the question is why is the Brahmanical College organisation found concentrated in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam? The answer is that different streams of Indian culture met there and blended harmoniously. The Buddhist example must have affected the Brahmanical educational organisation in Toṇḍamaṇḍalam.

The Nālandā University was founded about the middle of the 5th century A.D. and had become famous by the commencement of the 7th century. It taught the Mahāyāna, the Hīnayāna, the Veda and other Brahmanical works, Grammar, Sāṅkhya, Yoga, *tantra*, medicine and

astronomy, the medium of instruction being Sanskrit. It earned an international reputation and evoked the patronage of the Śailendras of Insulinidia. It was a teaching and residential University devoted to learning and research, possessing an Observatory,²⁶ and a great library housed in three buildings. It inspired other educational efforts in Eastern India—chiefly Vikramaśilā. Even in the 11th and 12th centuries, Nālandā was great, in spite of the troubles of the Pāla Empire, and its end towards the close of the latter century was sudden and violent, and its place was taken in the mediaeval period by Mithilā and Navadvīpa. Paris and Bologna, “the two great parent Universities” of mediaeval Europe originated in the last quarter of the 12th century A.D.²⁷ A Spanish scholar, J. Ribera Y Tarrago, suggests that the mediaeval European University was a conscious imitation of the Arabian system, but his opinion is not widely shared by Western scholars.²⁷ We do not know what ideas of educational organisation the Arabs learnt from India during the 8th and subsequent centuries A.D.

Tonḍamaṇḍalam and Nālandā were in close contact with each other for some centuries. Therefore the theory of Buddhist influence may be advanced. The Brahmanical system adapted many Buddhist ideas, and Śāṅkara was not hostile to healthy Buddhist ideas. Brahmanical Tonḍamaṇḍalam must have got from the Buddhists the idea of concentration in educational effort and of the provision of all conveniences for students. It may be contended that the *gurukula* system contains all the

26 H. D. Sankalia, *The University of Nālandā*, 1934, p. 85.

27 Rashdall, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 and 3 n.

germs of educational expansion, the hostel and the hospital included, but historically Buddhist influence is not improbable.

These studies show that the natural mixture of different streams of culture produces the best results, that extra-provincial contacts are a great stimulus to progress, that Indian civilisation is a harmonious blend of many elements and is one and indivisible despite provincial or local variations, and that Indian History, political and cultural, is not a congeries of provincial histories, but a single unified history.

APPENDIX A

PROVENANCE OF MAHĀSABHĀ INSCRIPTIONS IN THE CHŌLA PERIOD

Chingleput Dt.	S. No.	Place.	No. of Inscriptions.
	1	Ārpākkam	.. 1
	2	Kaḍappēri	.. 1
	3	Kāñchīpuram	.. 7
	4	Kāvantaṇḍalam	.. 2
	5	Kāyār	.. 1
	6	Kūram	.. 3
	7	Kūvam	.. 1
	8	Madhurāntakam	.. 5
	9	Maṇimaṅgalam	.. 5
	10	Māgaḷal	.. 1
	11	Nattam	.. 2
	12	Pāḍi	.. 1
	13	Paḷaiyaśivaram	.. 1
	14	Parandūr	.. 1
	15	Perumbēr	.. 1
	16	Piḷḷaipākkam	.. 1
	17	Pullalūr	.. 3
	18	Śiruvākkam	.. 1
	19	Śivankūḍal	.. 1
	20	Śōmaṅgalam	.. 2
	21	Tennēri	.. 7
	22	Tirukkaḷukkunṅam	.. 3
	23	Tirumukkūḍal	.. 4
	24	Tirumullaivāyil	.. 3
	25	Tiruppāchechur	.. 1
	26	Tiruppālaivanam	.. 1
	27	Tirupparuttikkunṅam	.. 2
	28	Tiruppulivanam	.. 1

APPENDIX A,

S. No.	Place.	No. of Inscriptions.
29	Tiruvaṇḍandal	4
30	Tiruvorriyūr	11
31	Uttaramērūr	56
32	Vēlachchēri	3
Total		137
Chittoor Dt.		
1	Mēlpāḍi	1
2	Punganūr	1
3	Tiruttani	4
4	Tiruvālangāḍu	1
Total		7
North Arcot Dt.		
1	Brahmadēśam	12
2	Kaḷambūr	2
3	Kaḷattūr	2
4	Kalavai	1
5	Kaḷinjūr	1
6	Kāvanūr	4
7	Kiḷpākkam	1
8	Kōvalūr	1
9	Pallikoṇḍa	2
10	Periyavarikkam	1
11	Takkōlam	7
12	Tiruchchānūr	1
13	Tirumālpuram	3
14	Tiruppāṅkkaḍal	4
15	Tiruvallam	11

S. No.	Place.	No. of Inscriptions.
16	Tiruvöttür	1
17	Udayēndiram	1
18	Ukkal	9
19	Vēppaṅganēri	1
	Total	65
Pondicherry.		
1	Bāhūr	2
2	Tirukkāñji	1
3	Tiruvaṇḍārkōyil	2
4	Tribhuvani	16
	Total	21
South Arcot Dt.		
1	Agaram	5
2	Brahmadēsam	1
3	Chidambaram	4
4	Kaṇḍamaṅgalam	1
5	Elvānāśūr	1
6	Enṇāyiram	6
7	Erumūr	7
8	Jambai	2
9	Kiḷḷayanūr	6
10	Kiḷḷūr	7
11	Maṅkāṇam	1
12	Pēṇṇāḍam	3
13	Perāṅgiyūr	1
14	Siddhaliṅgamaḍam	3
15	Tiṇḍivanam	1
16	Tiruchchōpuram	1
17	Tirukkōyilūr	6
18	Tirunāmanallūr	1
19	Tirunāraiyūr	1

S. No.	Place.	No. of Inscriptions.
20	Tiruvaḍi	3
21	Tiruvāmāttūr	3
22	Tiruveṇṇainallūr	3
23	Uḍaiyārguḍi	9
24	Vriḍdhāchalam	1
	Total	77
Pudukkōṭṭai.		
1	Tiruvēṅgaivaśāl	1
Tanjore Dt.		
1	Āchchāpuram	4
2	Ākkūr	2
3	Aḷagādrīputtūr	2
4	Ālaṅguḍi	5
5	Ānāṅgūr	1
6	Āttūr	2
7	Ayyampēṭṭai	3
8	Kaḷappāl	1
9	Kaḷaperumbūr	2
10	Kaṇḍiyūr	2
11	Karuttatṭānguḍi	2
12	Kiḷaiyūr	4
13	Kōnērīrājapuram	3
14	Koṟukkai	1
15	Kōvilaḍi	2
16	Kōvilūr	2
17	Kuhūr	1
18	Kumbhakōṇam	7
19	Kuttālam	1
20	Maṅganallūr	1
21	Mannārguḍi	1
22	Muniyūr	1
23	Niḍūr	1
24	Pāllavarāyanpēṭṭai	2

S. No.	Place.	No. of Inscriptions.
25	Pandāravāḍai ..	5
26	Pudutturai ..	1
27	Puḷlamaṅgai ..	4
28	Puñjai (Kiḍāraṅ- goṇḍān) ..	9
29	Śambanārkoḍiyil ..	1
30	Śembiyanmahādēvi ..	9
31	Śendalai ..	7
32	Śēṅganūr ..	1
33	Shiyali ..	1
34	Śiyāttumaṅgai ..	1
35	Śūlamaṅgalam ..	1
36	Talaichchaṅgāḍu ..	6
37	Talaināyar ..	4
38	Tillaisthānam ..	8
39	Tiruchchengāṭṭāṅguḍi ..	3
40	Tiruchchirai ..	1
41	Tiruchchirāmbalam ..	1
42	Tirukkaḍaiyūr ..	7
43	Tirukkalittatṭai ..	1
44	Tirukkaṇṇapuram ..	1
45	Tirukkānūr ..	1
46	Tirukkōḍikāval ..	1
47	Tirukkoḷambiyūr ..	5
48	Tirukkurugāvūr ..	1
49	Tirumālkkōṭṭai ..	1
50	Tirumangalakkuḍi ..	1
51	Tirumanāñjēri ..	1
52	Tirumayānam ..	1
53	Tirumeyñānam ..	4
54	Tirunāgēs̄varam ..	3
55	Tirunaṇaiyūr ..	2
56	Tiruppaḷanam ..	1
57	Tiruppāmburam ..	1
58	Tiruppugaḷūr ..	15

APPENDIX A

S. No.	Place.	No. of Inscriptions.
59	Tiruppūndurutti	1
60	Tiruvāḍuturai	33
61	Tiruvālaṅgāḍu	1
62	Tiruvalanjuḷi	1
63	Tiruvārūr	3
64	Tiruvayāḷu	1
65	Tiruvēṅgāḍu	1
66	Tiruvīḍambārudūr	10
67	Tiruvīḷakkuḍi	9
68	Tiruvīḷimīḷalai	1
69	Tiruvīśalūr	2
70	Tirutturaiḷpūṇḍi	1
71	Tukkachchi	1
72	Tukkaḍaiyūr	1
73	Uḍaiyārkōvil	4
74	Vēppattūr	1
	Total	234

Trichinopoly Dt.

1	Ālambākkam	8
2	Anbil	2
3	Gōvindaputtūr	2
4	Kāmarasavalli	7
5	Kīḷappaḷuvūr	5
6	Lāḷguḍi	1
7	Mahādānapuram	1
8	Mēlappaḷuvūr	2
9	Naṅgavaram	1
10	Ratnagiri	2
11	Śrīnivāsanallūr	2
12	Śrīraṅgam	3
13	Tirumalavāḍi	6
14	Tirumaṅgalam	1
15	Tiruppalātturai	6

APPENDIX A

61

S. No.	Place.	No. of Inscriptions.
16	Tiruppangili	.. 1
17	Tiruppattūr	.. 1
18	Tiruveṟumbūr	.. 11
19	Uṟaiyūr	.. 1
20	Uṟṟattūr	.. 1
21	Uyyakoṇḍān	
	Tirumalai	.. 1
	Total	.. 65
Madura Dt.		
1	Śinnamanūr	.. 1
Tinnevelly Dt.		
1	Attālanallūr	... 1
2	Āttūr	.. 1
3	Gaṅgaikoṇḍān	.. 1
4	Maṇappaḍaiviḍu	.. 1
5	Mannārkōvil	.. 2
6	Śērmādēvi	.. 6
7	Śevilippēri	.. 1
8	Tinnevelly	.. 1
9	Vijayanārāyaṇam	.. 2
	Total	.. 16
Travancore.		
1	Kanyākumāri	.. 1
2	Suchindram	.. 5
3	Darśanakōppu	.. 1
4	Chēramaṅgalam	.. 1
	Total	.. 8

APPENDIX A

	S. No.	Place.	No. of Inscriptions.
Salem Dt.	1	Tiruchchengōḍu	1
	2	Valappuranaḍu	2
	3	Salem	1
		Total	4
Mysore.	1	Malūrpaṭṭa	9
	2	Honganūr	1
		Total	10

		NUMBER OF PLACES	
(a)	<i>Districts.</i>		
1	Chingleput	..	32
2	Chittoor	..	4
3	North Arcot	..	19
4	Pondicherry	..	4
5	South Arcot	..	24
6	Pudukkōttai	..	1
7	Tanjore	..	74
8	Trichinopoly	..	21
9	Madura	..	1
10	Tinnevely	..	9
11	Travaṅcore	..	4
12	Salem	..	3
13	Mysore	..	2
		Total	.. 198

		NUMBER OF PLACES	
(b)	<i>Maṅḍalam.</i>		
1	Toṅḍamaṅḍalam	..	83
2	Chōḷamaṅḍalam	..	96
3	Pāṇḍyamaṅḍalam	..	14
4	Koṅgu-Kannaḍam	..	5
		Total	.. 198

APPENDIX B

LIST OF PLACES HAVING FOUR OR MORE INSCRIPTIONS EACH IN TONḌAMAṆḌALAM AND CHŌḌAMAṆḌALAM

- I Period of Rājakēsari and Parakēsari inscriptions of unidentified kings.
- II Period of Parāntaka I, A.D. 907—53.
- III Interval between Parāntaka I and Rājarāja I, 953—85.
- IV Period of Rājarāja I, 985—1014.
- V „ Rājēndra I, 1012—44.
- VI Interval between Rājēndra I and Kulōttuṅga I, 1018—70.
- VII Period of Kulōttuṅga I, 1070—1120.
- VIII Interval between Kulōttuṅga I and Rājarāja III, 1120—1216.
- IX Period of Rājarāja III and Rājēndra III, 1216—79.
- X Total.

Chingleput Dt.

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
1 Kāñchīpuram	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	1 =	7
2 Madhurāntakam	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0 =	5
3 Maṇimaṅgalam	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0 =	5
4 Tennēri	0	0	0	4	0	1	2	0	0 =	7
5 Tirumukkūḍal	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0 =	4
6 Tiruvaḍanadai	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0 =	4
7 Tiruvoḅḅiyūr	1	0	0	0	1	7	1	1	0 =	11
8 Uttaramērūr	6	7	27	5	8	0	1	1	1 =	56

Chittoor Dt.

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
9 Tiruttani	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0 =	4

North Arcot Dt.

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
10 Brahmādēśam	1	3	3	1	0	4	0	0	0 =	12
11 Kāvanūr	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0 =	4

APPENDIX B

65

12	Takkōlam	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	=	7
13	Tiruppārkkāḍal	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	=	4
14	Tiruvallam	0	0	0	7	0	3	0	1	0	=	11
15	Ukkal	3	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	=	9

Pōndicherry

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	
16	Takkōlam	0	0	0	3	5	7	1	0	=	16

South Arcot Dt.

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X		
17	Āgaram	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	=	5	
18	Chidambaram	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	=	4	
19	Eṇṇāyiram	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	=	6
20	Erumūr	1	1	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	=	7
21	Kiḷḷiyanūr	3	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	=	6

Tanjore Dt.

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X		
22	Kiḷḷūr	0	0	3	1	1	0	1	1	0	=	7
23	Tirukkōyilūr	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	=	6
24	Uḍaiyārguḍi	2	1	1	1	3	0	0	1	0	=	9
25	Āchchāpuram	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	=	4
26	Ālaṅguḍi	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	=	5
27	Kiḷḷaiyūr	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	=	4
28	Kumbhakōṇam	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	=	7
29	Paṇḍāravāḍai	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	=	5
30	Puḷḷamangai	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	=	4
31	Puḷḷai	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3	0	=	9
32	Śembiyan- mahādēvi	0	0	3	2	2	1	0	0	1	=	9
33	Śendalai	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	=	7
34	Talaichchangāḍu	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	=	6
35	Talaināyar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	=	4
36	Tillaisthānam	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	=	8
37	Tirukkaḍaiyūr	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	0	=	7
38	Tirukkoḷambiyūr	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	=	5
39	Tirumeyānam	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	=	4
40	Tiruppugaḷūr	0	0	1	1	2	3	6	2	0	=	15

41	Tiruvāḍutugal	3	6	0	5	5	0	5	9	0 =	33
42	Tiruvīḍai- marudūr	4	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	0 =	10
43	Tiruvīḷakkuḍi	3	0	2	0	1	2	0	1	0 =	9
44	Uḍaiyārkoṅvil	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0 =	4

Trichinopoly Dt.

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	
45	Ālambākkam	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0 =	8
46	Kāmarasavalli	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	1 =	7
47	Kiḷappaḷuvūr	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0 =	5
48	Tirumalavāḍi	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0 =	6
49	Tiruppalāttuḡai	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0 =	6
50	Tiruveḡumbūr	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 =	11
	Total	78	36	56	54	45	43	40	50	16 =	418

APPENDIX C

DISTRIBUTION OF MAHĀSABHĀ RECORDS DURING THE ABOVEMENTIONED NINE PERIODS OF CHŌLA HISTORY

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
1 Chingleput Dt.	13	11	24	20	16	13	16	8	6	= 137
2 Chittoor Dt.	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	= 7
3 North Arcot Dt.	9	13	13	13	3	10	1	2	1	= 65
4 Pondicherry	0	0	1	3	3	5	8	1	0	= 21
5 South Arcot Dt.	10	3	7	13	9	5	10	15	5	= 77
6 Pudukkōṭṭai	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	= 1
7 Tanjore Dt.	39	16	15	23	22	16	22	56	25	= 234
8 Trichinopoly Dt.	27	5	1	5	8	5	7	5	2	= 65
9 Madura Dt.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	= 1
10 Tinnevely Dt.	0	0	0	5	3	5	3	0	0	= 16
11 Travancōre	1	0	0	3	0	4	0	0	0	= 8
12 Salem	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	= 4
13 Mysore ..	0	0	0	3	6	0	1	0	0	= 10
Total	103	50	71	91	71	63	68	89	40	= 646

NUMBER OF RECORDS

(a) Tonḍamaṇḍalam	307
(b) Chōlamaṇḍalam	300
(c) Pēṇḍyamaṇḍalam	25
(d) Koṅgu-Kannaḍam	14
Total	646

APPENDIX D

PROVENANCE OF IMPORTANT EDUCATIONAL RECORDS OF THE CHŌLA PERIOD

	S. No.	Place.	No. of Inscriptions.
Chingleput Dt.			
	1	Kāñchipuram	1
	2	Tirumukkūḍal	1
	3	Tiruvorriyūr	1
	4	Uttaramēṛūr	5
North Arcot Dt.			
	5	Ukkal	1
Pondicherry.			
	6	Tribhuvani	1
South Arcot Dt.			
	7	Eṇṇāyiram	1
Tanjore Dt.			
	8	Kumbhakōṇam	1
	9	Tiruvāḍuturai	1
	10	Tiruviḍaikkaḷi	1
		Total ..	14

INDEX

- Aihoje Inscription, 22.**
***Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, 7.**
Allahabad Inscription, 13, 18.
***Amarakośa*, 10.**
Amarāvati, 23.
Āndhras, 4, 7, 12, 24.
Aravaṇa Aḍigaḷ, 24.
***Arthasāstra*, 8, 11-12, 18, 35-37, 49-50.**
Āryadeva, 24.
***Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, 10-11.**
Aśoka, extent of his empire, 3-5.
Aśokavarman, 9, 46.
***aśvamedha*, 18, 21.**
***aśvasamsthā*, 49-50.**
Augustus, 18.
Avamukta, 16.

Bādāmi, 22.
Bāhūr, college at, 50-51.
Barnett, 17.
Bhandarkar, 7.
Bhartrihari, 52.
***Bhāshyavritti*, 52.**
Bhaṭṭasvāmin, 49.
***Bhaṭṭavritti*, 52.**
Bindusāra, 10-11.
Bologna, university of, 53.
Brahmanical Colleges, 50-52.
Buddha, 2.
Buddhavarman, 46.
Buddhism, spread of, 2-3, 23-26.
Burke, 20.

Chārītravardhana, 9.
Chōḷa Kingdom, extent of, 3-4, 6-7.

Dantivarman, 27, 34.
Devarāshṭra, 16.
Devarāya I, 19.
Devasomā, 45.
Dhanadāsa, 45.
Dharmapāla, 24, 46.
***digvijaya*, 21.**
Diḡnāga, 24, 46.
Dramiḍāchārya, 11.
Durvinita, 23.

Eṇṇāyiram, college at, 51.
Erandapalla, 15.

Ferishta, 19.

Gaṅgas, Western, 23, 25.
Ghaṭikā Problem, 48-50.
Govinda III, 40.
***grāmakāṅṭhakas*, 41, 43.**
***gurukula*, 53-54.**

Harisena, 14.
Harivarma, 22-23.
Hāthigumpha Inscription, 10.
Hemachandra, 11.

Herder, 19.
Hitler, 19.
Hobbes, 20.
Hospital, 51.
Hostel, 51.
Hoyśālas, 42-43.

- Ikshvākus, 24.
 Indian History, unity of, 54.
 I-tsing, 52.
 Jains, 9, 48.
jihads, 19-20.
 Jolly, 12.
 Kadambas, 22-23.
 Kāñchī, 2, 6, 12, 23; university of, 44-46; ghañikā at, 48-50.
 Kannaḍa, 25.
 Kañṇanūr, 42.
 Karikāla, 3, 7, 12.
 Kaśākkuḍi Plates, 10.
 Kauṭilya, 11, 36-37, 49-50.
 Kerla, 15.
 Khāravēla, 10, 12.
 Kirtivarman I, 22.
 Koṅgu, 5.
 Ko-Peruñjiṅga, 42.
 Kosala, 14.
 Koṭṭūra, 15.
 Kriṣṇa III, 40.
Kuḍavōlai, 33, 38.
 Kulōttuṅga I, 41; III, 42.
 Kuṟumbas, 8-9.
 Kusthalapura, 16-17.
 Locke, 20.
 Lot System, Athenian, 33-34;
 see Kuḍavōlai.
 Mādhava III, 23.
mādhyaṃsī, 36.
madyastha, 32, 36.
Mahābhārata, 7-8.
 Mahākāntāra, 15.
 Mahārāshṭra, 25.
 Mahāsabhā, inscriptions relating to, 27-32; origins of, 34-40; golden age of, 40-41; decline of, 41-43.
 Mallinātha, 9.
Mañimēkhalai, 12, 23.
 Mānūr Mahāsabhā, 35.
 Māraṇ Śaḍayan, 35.
 Māravarman Sundara, 42.
Mattavīdsaprahāsana, 45.
 Mayūraśarman, 22, 25, 48-50.
 Megasthenes, 36-37.
 Mithilā, 53.
 Nāgārjuna, 23.
 Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, 23.
 Nāgasena, 45.
 Nālandā, university of, 52-53.
 Nandas, 22.
 Narasimha II, 42-43.
 Navadvīpa, 53.
 Nripatuṅgavarman, 50.
 Pālakka, 16.
 Pāli Canon, 2.
 Pallava Genealogy, 9-10.
Panchāyat, 36, 38.
 Pan Kou, 7, 12.
 Parāntaka I, 34, 40, 43.
 Paris, university of, 53.
 Pāṭaliputra, administration of, 36-38; (Cuddalore), 48.
 Patañjali, 6, 12, 52.
Periplus, 6-7, 12-13.
 Piṣṭapura, 15.
 Ptolemy, 7, 8.
 Pulakeśin I, 22-23; II, 22-23.
 Pulindas, 7-9.
 Puṇḍras, 8.

- Pushyamitra, 6.
 Rājāditya, 40.
 Rājarāja I, 40-41; III, 42.
 Rājavihāra, 45-46.
 Rājendra I, 41.
 Rāmanātha, 42.
Rāmāyana, 8.
 Rock Edicts, 4, 11.
 Śabara, 8.
Sāhā, Vedic, 36.
 Sahadeva, 8.
 Śailendras, 53.
 Samudragupta, Dakṣiṇāpatha expedition of, 13-22.
 Śaṅkara, 53.
 Satiyaputra, identification of, 4-5.
 Sītā, 8.
 Smith, 3, 4.
 Someśvara, 42.
studium generale, 44-46.
 Sugrīva, 8.
 Svāmidatta, 14.
 Takkōlam, battle of, 40.
 Tālagunda Inscription, 48-50.
 Tālakāḍ, 23.
 Tamil League, 10-12.
 Tāranātha, 10.
 Tarn, 10.
 Tarrago, 53.
 Telugu-Chōḍas, 42.
 Tirumukkūḍal, college at, 51.
 Tirupparuttikkunṅam, 48.
 Tiruvāduṭuṅai, medical school at, 51.
 Tiruvogḍiyūr, institute at, 51.
 Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, importance of the history of, 1-2; under Aśoka and after, 12; Buddhism in, 23-26; primacy of, 29; origin of Mahāsabhā in, 35; Rāshṭrakūṭa occupation of, 40; higher education in, 43-52.
 University, definition of, 44-45.
 Uttaramērūr Charter, 32-34.
 Vākāṭakas, 25.
 Varaguṇa II, 35.
Variyam, 37-38.
 Vāyalūr, Inscription, 9-10.
 Vēlūrpaḷayam Plates, 10.
 Veṅgi, 16, 24.
 Vikramaśīlā, 53.
 Viraśarman, 48.
 Viṣṇugopa, 14, 16.
Viṣṇusahasranāma, 10.
 Viṣṇuwardhana, 41.
 Viśvāmitra, 7.
Vyākhyāvṛitti, 52.
 Wars, causes of; 19-21.
 Wells, 3.
 Yuan Chwang, 2, 12, 15, 24-25, 45-48.