

CHAPTER - I

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW - RETROSPECTIVE OF SOUTH INDIA

INTRODUCTION

Art forms do not just 'happen'. Their formation is the result of a continuous series of experiments in 'succession'. The nature of succession presupposes different concepts of time. These concepts may mean a general movement, staticity or a continuing mobility. A historical overview to a large extent resolves this antimony and helps us in perceiving the nature of a culture. Taking the concept of 'time' as a continuing mobility, it is always in a state of 'becoming', fluid and complex. Mobility does not necessarily mean a unilinear synchronisation in the same direction or at the same moment. It has its own pace and position. The historical overview is not used here to pre-establish a harmony, and neither is it an exercise in self denial. It is used here because it is 'evidence and reality'. Actions and their justification obey their own impulse coming from both within and the external. They always place in juxtaposition 'survivals , anticipations, their merging and losing'. There is no isochronism, but certainly a predilection and wavelength.

"History is the study of what goes into the make up of an age, art history as 'humanities' is a study of what comes out of it".

ORIGIN OF THE EARLY CHŌLA

I.1 THROUGH THE SAṅGAM AND MEDIEVAL AGE

It is indeed good fortune that the Saṅgam 'like a meteor--left a blazing trail' for us to follow. Saṅgam as a word suggests 'homogeneity' which is a perceptible part of south India. The schema of anthologies and synchronisms show a unity, that gives an identity to the Dravida. This unity germinates from the many cross currents and diversity in thought and action, in that they cause a certain commonality or temper. In its molded time and setting a pageant unfolds cross sections of life and culture. The climax, is one of intrigue and mystery that places three major kingdoms as the leading and conflicting protagonists.

Two kinds of anxiety are attested. One is towards tracing a lineage to mythical antiquity and the other towards a compelling urge to heroism. These are evident in anthologies like Pūṛaṇānuru, Cilappadikāram, Padirru-p-pattu and Pattu-p-pattu. The last also translated as the 'Ten Idylls' celebrates in song heroes, of whom Karikāla Chōla, 190 A.D., is pre-eminent. A characteristic descent shrouded in mystery is eased with nearer maritime ancestors in songs of valour, enhancing the Chōla lineage and pride. The Paṭṭiṇa-p-palai with the Chōla capital Kāvēri-p-paṭṭinam

as the focus eulogises this Karikālan. Needless to say his prowess and heroism made him legendry, central to many texts like the Cilappadikāram etc.(1) The other kings as attested by the Saṅgam do not carve such a niche for themselves. Karikāla caused the establishment of a hegemony among these 'crowned Kings' by his prowess'(2). The only other Chōḷa personage who equals such mention was the Śaiva devotee Ceṅkaṇṇān.

Being anthological in nature, these contexts becomes sources for information, compilation and interpretation. They posit a homogeneity or compositeness of the period as one of the distinct Āryan Tamil accretion. We are confronted with contradictions and compatibility simultaneously. Adoption and adaption merge into one another. Taking for example the organisation of society, it can be said that they were hereditary groups encouraging both occupational and economic solidarity. Hereditary monarchy which prevailed encouraged this to preserve perhaps a social and economic balance. But does this answer our question about a distinct origin and chronology?

Chronologically the Chōḷa history is best split into four periods - the Chōḷa of the Saṅgam, the Chōḷa during the Kālabhira interregnum (the interval between the last

decades of the Saṅgam) and the rise of the Vijayālaya Chōḷa in the mid 9th Century A.D. upto Rājarāja I and lastly the Cālukyan Chōḷa line of Kullōtunga I (from the third quarter of 11th Century to the mid 13th Century A.D.).

The cause of major concern is the lacuna or dark phase of two centuries before the emergence of Vijayalaya in the vicinity of Tañjāvūr. We are aware of different claimants for the same ancestor. The Chōḷa of the Telugu areas around Cuḍḍapah, Kurnool and Anantapūr districts also claim their descent from Karikāla. The question that arises is what is the relationship between the Telugu and Tamil Chōḷa, or were they the same? Colophons and anthologies are silent about this, and leave us with nagging doubts.

Studies in etymology show that Chōḷa perhaps derives from the Saṅskrit Kāla or black, indicating the dark pre-Aryan races of South India. The Tamil Chōḷa derives from Chōḷam or millet. Another supposition is that the name could be a corruption of the Saṅskrit Chōra which means the thief(3) who stole upon their opponents unaware.

- Another semantic observation is the prefixing or affixing of names like Killi- the one who cleaves or digs, Vāḷvan-

the one ruling the fertile land and Sembiyaṇ- one descended from Śibi, the legendary hero of the Śibi of Jātaka. Karikālan translates as the one with charred legs(4). References to the Chōḷa are found in the works of the grammarian Kātyāyana and even the Āsokan inscriptions which speaks of more than one type of Chōḷa.

Early sources make mention of ruling chieftains like Neḍuṇ-killi and Nalaṅkilli of Uraiṇūr and Puhār who were in continuous civil war, defeating the Pāṇḍyans and Cēra. (5). The Pūṇaṇūru suggests the Chōḷa hegemony too(6). G.U. Pope writes of a Killivāḷavan, the important Chōḷa king whose 'greatest' political achievement was the capture of Karūr, the Cēra capital(7). Kōperum Chōḷan was another important ruler from Uraiṇūr while Pērunārkilli was probably the only monarch to perform the Rājasūya(8). Ceṇ-kaṇān was glorified both in the Pūṇaṇūru - puram 74 and the forty verses of Poigaiyār. Appar, Suṇḍara, Tiru-tondar Tirumaṅgai Āḷvar and Sundaramūrti extol his religious fervour(9).

The later medieval inscriptions of the Chōḷa are a curious mixture of myth and reality. Even they looked upon themselves as descended from the 'Sun.....' A point that received much emphasis and incorporated in the copper

plate charters of the 10th and 11th Century A.D., of the Kanyākumāri stone inscription of Vīra Rājēndra, the literary Kalingthuparaṇi and Vikramaśōlan Ula(10). The Malēpadu plates of Puṇyakumāra mention a Chōḍa, Telugu king of the 7th or 8th Century A.D.(11). With support from the late Telugu Chōḍa plates we are drawn to the legends around a Trinētra Pallava which eulogises him thus, "He who caused the banks of the Kāvēri to be constructed by all the subordinate kings led by the Pallava Trinētra whose third eye was blinded by his lotus foot.(12)

The Chōḷa predilection towards temple building and Śaivism is seen best in Ceṅkaṇān's period. This staunch Śīva believer was supposed to have built seventy temples to Śīva, and yet had the grace to offer worship to Viṣṇu at Tirunaraiyūr(13). The hymns of Suṇḍarar and Sambaṇḍar extol his founding temples at Ambar-a-Vaigai and Nanīlam. The Anbil plates of Sundara Chōḷa and the Tiruvālangādu plates support this.

Thus far it is only by surmise from poetic hyperbole and synchronisms we draw an image of kings, their deeds, society and its religious and political leanings. Even when encapsulated it is only safe to be open minded and not treat events unlinearly. However, the heartening

factor is the picture of the communal mind. Thus, 'the most striking feature of the (Saṅgam) culture, of the age is its composite quality. It is the unmistakable blend of the two originally distinct cultures; best described as Āryan and Tamilian(14). Inscriptions discovered by Hultz, Venkayya and Krishna Sastri have not been able to clear the partial eclipse. To be precise K.A.N. Sastri says of this lacuna, a settled and continuous narration of the political history of the Chōḷa appears, therefore not merely quite possible to undertake, but likely to be of more than transient interest(15). Somewhere here lies part of the sources that are likely to be responsible for the high watermark attained by the Chōḷa in the Medieval period. The mist over the Kālabhra interregnum has not risen, and neither have we found a peep hole for unaccounted centuries. The Vēlvikuḍi grants of the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallava charters mention the evil force of the Kālabhra, marked by political and other disturbances. The sudden resurrection occurred towards end of the sixth century A.D. by the determined efforts of the two. Marching through victory with a vengeance there began a new phase in South Indian History. And, it was when the super powers had spent themselves that the Chōḷa emerged. It is still a bone of contention between scholars if there was any link between the Kālabhra in the Vinaya-

viniccaya of Buddhadatha, a Pali writer from Uraiyūr; it says that Acchchyūtavikrānta of the Kālabhra kula ruled from Acchchyutavikranta of the kalabhra kula ruled from the Chōḷa Kāvēripakkam. This 'evil genius' was a Buddhist who kept the three royal families in captivity(16). Could these mysterious clan be the Muttaraiyār or Karnāṭa , Vellāla. (17). If they were the Muttaraiyār then there is a clear case of nemesis.

The Chōḷa before the ascent of Vijayālaya can be best described as in 'suspended animation'. In the Drāviḍadēśa, they burst like an egg and floated into the abdominal cavity, a vast space in which they risked being lost altogether. The survival instinct, in near total darkness, like within a womb, where like the sperm thrashing its tail they swam to pierce and reach the egg, till they conceived to become embryonic in their state - was the beginning. The initial formation of the foetus and the faint heart beats were sustained and nourished by the 'Mother', Saṅgam.

I.2 THE RISE AND EMERGENCE OF THE CHŌḶA OF THE VIJAYĀ-LAYA LINE

The Saṅgam which nourished the embryo, through stress gave a stormy birth to the Chōḷa of the Medieval period.

Genetic or inherited characteristics were already transmitted, the fingerprints engraved, a blue print to disposition predertermined. Armed with these rose Vijayālaya. With a strong instinct for survival the Chōḷa through the following centuries learnt to adapt to environment. Traits and tendencies altered with environment, but environment only acted on the 'basic genetic code' which unfolded and reproduced itself in different ways.

A long and dormant winter, perhaps a hibernation dramatically gave way to 'spring' for the Chōḷa in the mind-ninth century A.D., under Vijayālaya. There was no looking back since. Surprisingly this change of fortune did not involve any super powers. Instead this obscure vassal referred to as Parākēsarivarman ruled from either Uraiyūr or Palaiyūr near Kumbakonam. Within proximity lay Tañjai (Tañjāvūr) and Vallam, the Muttaraiya stronghold of Kō-Iḷḷaṅgo. The first known independent attack of Vijayālaya was upon Kō-Iḷḷaṅgo Muttaraiya(18). Momentous victory and thoroughness of political strategy paved the way for all future success, conquests and expansions. South India was replete with lesser known and obscure feudatories. At such point of time before their emergence Vijayālaya was also a Pallava feudatory and Uraiyūr his capital, which finds uniform mention in the Saṅgam and

after. From feudatory to an independent power is a politically diplomatic move when seen in retrospection. Thus around 850 A.D. Tanjavur was captured and the founding of the Nisumbasūdani temple commemorated the victory.

Historical opportunity, change of affiliations and betrayal were no new game. If the Chōḷa were Pallava vassals, the Muttaraiya were the allies of Varaguṇa Pāṇḍya. It was not surprising then when the cats were away, the mice were at play. The Kāvēri region faced troubled times with feuds between the lesser powers. The timely recognition and rising of Vijayālaya caused a setback in the Pallava Daṇṭivarman III and Varaguṇa Pāṇḍya III period. Quelling the reborn Chōḷa became a preoccupation. Varaguṇa III occupied Arasūr on the Pennār river. A reversal of fortune was in the offing. Nandivarman Pallava III's successor Nṛpatuṅga caused much of family feuds and intrigues; and all this laced with political uncertainty caused an irreversible synergy, opposing tensions and a turbulent period in history. S.R. Balasubramanyam used available inscriptions to bring to light a bird's eye view of Vijayālaya's power and political domain(19). K.A.N. Sastri limits the northern boundary of Vijayālaya's kingdom to the Vellār(20). The area between Kāñcīpuram and Nārttamalai was consolidated. The extent of his

kingdom spread as far as Tiruvellārai, Vīrasōlāpuram, Kīlpuṭhūr, Kīlūr, Kāñcī and Uttaramērūr. The northern regions were consolidated later during Parāntaka I and Āditya I. The area called Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam from Puḍukōṭṭai, Enādi, Tiruvellārai, Tiruttani etc. were also subject to this political change.

The historical situation from about 869 A.D. needs an overall view. To study it in isolation is limiting and narrowing it down. For, what affected one major power affected the feudatories. The death of Nandi II Pallava precipitated a dynastic crisis through major family rifts between Nṛpatunga and Aparājita. Kampavarman the third Pallava heir lay low. If Nṛpatunga took Varaguṇa III Pāṇḍya for an ally, Aparājita solicited the services of Gaṅgā Prithivipati I and possibly Āditya I Chōḷa, heir apparent to Vijayālaya. It is at this historical juncture that a second major victory occurred for the Chōḷas.

The accession of Āditya I in 879 A.D. saw a relatively peaceful period for over a decade. It was with the famed battle of Śrīpurambiyam, some fifteen years later in 885 A.D. that Nṛpatunga and his Pāṇḍyan ally were defeated. Aparājita secured the throne, Gaṅga Prithivipati died a valourous death in action. absence of Nṛpatunga

inscriptions between the 26th and 41st year coincides with the reign of aparajita from 885 A.D. to 903 A.D. It was during this same span that Āditya I too, further consolidated and added to his kingdom in Tonḍaimaṇḍalam with scant respect or regard for Aparājita(21). Further conquests included the Koṅgudēśam, capture of Talakkād, the capital of Western Gaṅgā Prithivipati II. He crossed the Southern Vellār (river) into the Pāṇḍyan territory and conquered Pāṇḍyan Varaguṇa II. Paying homage to the Chōḷa became a culture(22).

The editing of the Anbil plates by T.A.G. Rao takes us a step further, from inscriptions of political nature to one of individual nature. The other side of Āditya I, shows him as a staunch Śaiva, credited with the building and reconstruction of temples in stone, on either sides of the Kāvēri(23). It is not advisable to take this verbatim, nevertheless it is known that Āditya I added new structural stone temples, and also reconstructed the old brick ones in stone 'in-situ'. His death near Kāḷahasti saw the succession of Parāntaka I.

Parāntaka I, was the successor of Āditya I. His father's prowess and strategic foresight were inherited alongwith a growing kingdom. Forty eight years of undisturbed

and relatively calm period allowed maximum scope for all around development. Not content he expanded his territories further and added birudas to himself. Madurāntaka, Madurai Koṇḍa, Maduraium Ilamum Koṇḍa Vīra Chōḷaṇ(24). He forced Rājasimha II, his contemporary Pāṇḍyan adversary to flee(25). The area fenced by Āditya I, Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam was further consolidated(26). He not only vanquished the Pallava, but appropriated his kingdom (rāśtrāni), wealth (Vāsuni) and vehicles (Vāhanāni)(27). All these historic victories occurred within the first twenty regnal years. The suppression of Pallavas, Pāṇḍyas and Simhalas in 915 A.D. at the battle of Vellore and smaller feudatories like Bānās and Vaidumbas also paid homage. With a staunch ally in Prithivipati II Gaṅgā he fought the battle of Tiruvallam or Vallāla. Kṛṣṇa II of the Rāṣṭrakūta was surmised to have headed the coalition, Parāntaka then assumed the title Vīra Chōḷa(28). The empire extended from Nellore to Kanyakumāri, till the stormy entrance of Rāṣṭrakūta Kṛṣṇa III came to eclipse the Chōḷa Power.

947 A.D. called a screeching halt to their territorial expansion. An avenging Kṛṣṇa III with the Western Gaṅgā Būtaga invaded Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. This is marked by the famous battle of Takkōlam in 949 A.D.(29) where the Chōḷa suffered a crippling defeat, and the crown prince

Rājāditya died. Tonḍaimaṇḍalam and the Pāṇḍyan territory were lost to the Chōḷa. This was the historical 'Rāṣṭra-kūta Interregnum'(30). The conquest of Tāṇjāvūr and Kāñcī both broke the Chōḷa hegemony. A political setback put them in a temporary convalescence or retirement. And this saw the flowering of a more spiritual pursuit. Prolific temple building and matters pertaining to religion were given a boost. The prasāsti of the Anbil plates of Sundara Chōḷa eulogise Parāntaka. "..... the earth had a good king and poetic art a proper seat, skill in the fine arts found a common shelter(31). The Tiruvālaṅgādu Copper plates further extol his religious zeal. "..... the bee at the lotus feet of Parāntaka Śiva" and mentions that he built for Purāri, the Lord of the silver mountain (Kailāśa) a golden house. Dabhra Sabhā, whereby C idambaram was the Hēma Kanaka Sabhā or Ponambalam". This earned him the title Pon Veinda Perumāl (the one who covered with gold). It was at this point that Naṭarāja or Ādavallan became the Kula daivam of the Chōḷa (32).

The post-Parāntaka I phase, after his death leaves much to be desired till the Rājārāja phase politically. The death of the crown prince Rājāditya, the short lived reign of Gandārāditya, the one year rule of Arinjaya

till the succession of Sundara Chōḷa was a political debility. The light of hope and sustainance came from the Queen of Gaṇḍārāditya, Sembiyaṇ Mahādēvi who held a haloed position. Piety, religiosity and munificence came to the fore than active polity.

Sundara Chola - the one whose beauty surpassed 'cupid' was better known for his battle of Chevūr (Sévūr) against Vīra Pāṇḍya, after which he assumed the title 'Madurai Koṇḍa Parākēsari or Madhurāntaka. His allies were Bhūti Vikramakēsari and Parāntaka Siriya Vēlan of Koḍumbālūr(33). The Larger Leyden grant calls him 'Tripurāntaka - an avatāra of Manu to re-establish the laws of Kaliyuga. The earliest 4th year Anbil plates record Devadāna and Brahmadēya gifts. His benevolence was seen in his gifting land for the construction of a Jaina Temple for the benefit of male and female monks(34). Sundara's son Āditya II was the victim of sibling jealousy and Uttama was crowned king despite the presence of Arulmōḷi, Rājarāja I. The human 'flaw' gave place to retribution, Uttama and his mother Sembiyaṇ Mahādēvī installed Rājarāja as heir apparent. He took the burden of the earth, performed worship and spent his life constructing temples(35). The piety of his mother, guilt and repentance helped him seek solace in religion.

The ascent of Rājarāja I in 985 A.D. marks a new chapter in the history of the Chōla .

I.3 THE EARLY CHŌLA QUEENS

Women in history are generally given a low profile. This is partly circumstantial and partly oversight. If one can just compile all the female personages in South India alone, perhaps we may have to change many of our historical perceptions and pre-suppositions. Be it on the domestic front or at the altar of worship they have played key roles in the cultural history of India. The avenging wife, the wronged Kannagi, the mysterious *ganikā* who radiate a presence, *Āṇḍāl* or *Gōḍa* who combines the sensual with spiritual, portray the changing faces of woman. The *Saṅgam* portrayed and characterised women in the 'Pattini Cult' , the worship of Kannagi, symbolising the 'Ideal wife'. These are seen in stone and votive figurines for the divine and chaste wife. The essence of woman's varied nature existed in the *Kanyā*, *Dēvī* and *ganikā*.

Coming closer to the Medieval period we are aware of the two famed Cālukyan queens, *Lōkamahādēvī* and *Rajini Trailōkya* of *Vikramāditya II*. These queens were well versed and great builders of religious insti-

tutions like the Virupākṣa and Trailōky svara(36). Similarly we are aware of Pallava Rājasimha's wife Raṅgapatāka who interested herself in the construction of the Kāñcī Kailāsanātha. Besides being well versed in the fine arts, the Rāṣṭrakuta queens also bore birudas like Paramēśvari and Paramabhattārika. They had the powers to make land grants, issue royal orders etc. We have evidence of a Muttaraiya princess Paliyili Siriya Naṅgai who added architectural components in Mēlmalai, at Nār ttamalai and making land grants as 'arc'ana bhōgam' at Paliyili Isvaram.

The Early Chōḷa period boasts of several women on the cultural forefront. They are Paliyilī Siriya Naṅgai, the Muttaraiya princess; Puḍi Aḍitta Piḍāri an Irrukuvēl princess and builder of the Śiva temple at Tiruccēndurai, a donor of land, gold, perpetual lamps etc.(37) The Tillaisthānam inscriptions refer to cultured concubines called Bhōgiyar, and one of whom, called Naṅgai Sattap Perumānār offered Kalanjus of gold for perpetual lamps and for the construction of a snāna or snāpāna maṇḍapa. The Āditya I queens Kilāṇḍigal Tennavān Mahādēviyār, Alisi Kattadiyāl, Tirunaraya Mahādēvī and mistress Kil mānikka Nampirathiyār donated for the burning of perpetual lamps and bore gifts to the lords of the

different temples. Tattān Śendi of Āditya I phase built the Tiruvērumbur Piplisvara(38).

The Parāntaka period alone has as much as ten inscriptions relating to women. The Tiru Alāndurai Mahadeva at Kīlappaluvūr and the Vaṭa Tīrthanāthar at Andanallūr were partly constructed by Puliyūr Nāṭṭadigar and Śengan Nimmadigal who were the consorts of a Sembiyaṇ Irrukuvēl alias Pudi Parāntakan. Another Chōḷa consort of Parāntaka Sōḷapperundēviar or Perunaṅgai gifted gold to the temples(39). The other queens of Parāntaka, Udaiya Pirathuṣur, Kīlandigal and Rājādityaś queen made gifts at the Kṛṣṇa Rukmini temple at Tiruvellārai(40). Donations at Āditya I temples at Tiruvaivyāru were made by Parāntaka queens. The Puṣṭapāvanesvara at Tiruppaṇṭurutti has a 33rd year inscription whereby even his mother-in-law Mullūr Naṅgai made gifts. She also made gifts to neighbouring temples at Tillaisthānam Tiruvaivyāru and Tirupāllanam(41). Tennaival Illangovelar or Maravaṇ Puḍi's daughter Puḍi Aḍicha Piḍāriyār who constructed the Śiva temple at Tirucchendurai(42), was the same Nakkan Vikramasēri - Karrali who belonged to Sundara Chōḷa's reign.

One of the most remarkable key personages in South India was the Great Mother Sembiyaṇ Mahādēvi. Daughter

of Mālavārāyan, queen of Gandārāditya, mother of Uttama and aunt of Rājarāja she held an exalted position in court. Pious and munificent, early widowhood left her life dedicated to nobler pursuits. Sixty active years saw the reconstructive and constructive phase in temple buildings, rich endowments and profile development in metal casting. Her earliest recorded gift was made in the 34th year of Parañtaka at Uyyakoṇḍan Tirumalai. Her donations to Sāmavēdisvara temple at Tirumaṅgaḷam is also well known(43). South India owes its preeminent place in the field of bronze casting to the patronage of this saintly lady whose tragic personal life was the reason and provocation for the expression of her piety and devotion to her husband in concrete art forms(44). There is none to parallel her as far as her contributions to art and architecture go. The Ujjīvanātha temple at Uyyakoṇḍan Tirumalai makes the earliest reference to this noble lady, and the last during the 16th year inscription of Rājarāja - Spanning 60 years. The extent of her enterprise needless to say shall appear in practically all the phases, but the last phase is an honour to this Queen for it is the famous 'Sembiyaṇ Mahādēvi' phase. Her insatiable urge to make rich endowments in gold and jewellery is only surpassed by her gifting of bronze images.

52-

She also founded a village, Gandārādittam in honour and memory of her husband, who was also pious and authored the 'Tiruvīśaiappa'. This was a crucial phase in Chōla history an ebbing tide and lack of credibility within the royalty. Unerring devotion to Sembiyan was perhaps the only moralising factor. Her charisma won her the affection, devotion and indulgence of the entire household. She in turn encouraged and expended her energies in dedicating herself to the lord. She stood as an example of 'innate and inherent Bhakti'.

B. Venkataraman gives us exhaustive inscriptional evidence about this queen(45). She was unique in that she also introduced portrait sculpture (figs. 247, 248) in the Chola period, and new sculptures in the niches, (fig. 191). While plentiful utsava bheras were also offered as donations.

Her genius not only created the Sembiyan Phase due to her simple donorship, but there are stylistic formal grounds which she possibly encouraged. Her contributions can be seen in the portrait sculptures at Konēri-rājapuram, Uma Mahēśvara temple. she also reengraved old inscriptions or lakṣhaṇa in the Āpatsahāyēśvara temple at Ādudurai in stone. Kuttalam saw the rebuilding

of Chōlīśvaram and the village of Sembiyaṇ Mahādēvi was constructed as a new settlement for the Brāhmins. She reconstructed the Kailāsanātha there, and encouraged the growth of charitable and learned institutions.

Gesture and ritual were apparently perpetuated and preserved by the Chōḷa Queen. They were sort of social workers or almoners, who sanctioned religious licence. In fact, active participation in religious matters, conforming to them, bhakti and religious compassion are the most human ways of creating rapport and communication within a society or community. They aided in the coming together of the nobility, common and clergy under one motivation and force, the temple. Political dynamism and religious benevolence culminated in a profound cultural unity.

A point to moot is the male members of royalty perhaps conceived to a large extent the need of architecture; but it was apparently left to their women, their innate interests and ability to enrichen, that gave the Chōḷa temples a touch of feminine grace and understatement.

I.4 POLITICAL ANNEXATION, MARRIAGE ALLIANCES, FEUDAL- TORIES AND CULTURAL MIGRATIONS

Historically, Uraiṇūr and Palaiyāru near Tiruṇī and

54

Kumbakōṇam were the earliest Chōḷa capitals. It is in the mid ninth century, about 850 A.D. that the first major expansion and conquest occurred. The capture of Tañjāvūr by Vijayālaya, followed by territorial acquisition between the North and South Vellār river, alongwith the lower Kāvēri and Kollidam including Vallam, spelt doom for the Muttaraiyar, specially the ruling Kō-Iḷlaṅgo(47). Nārttamalai marked the southern limits of the Chōḷa under Vijayālaya. We are aware of the consolidation of Toṇḍaimanād by Āditya I, and the conquest of Koṅgu dēśa and Tallakād, the capital of the Western Gaṅga. He entered the Pandyan land south of the Vellār upto Kaṇṇanūr. Parāntaka I, however, as seen in the Sucindram inscriptions of his 34th year proved to be a great conquerer - for he penetrated deep south and crossed the ocean to conquer Iḷam (Śrī Laṅka). The Chōḷa kingdom extended from Nellore in the north to Kanyākumāri in the south. The post-Parāntaka period till the ascension of Rājarāja I saw a reversal of fortunes. Yet the nature of the annexations are valuable and show intrusions or extensions of style in architecture and sculpture. An assimilation of different features occur, showing a predilection for and towards a certain aspect of style, if not a total absorption. A Pallava, Muttaraiya or Paluvēṭṭaraiyar predilection for the Chōḷa style

or vice versa is seen. In the heart of one region may be found a dominant or stray pulse of another.

The power politics between the seventh to tenth centuries A.D. saw the rising of several feudatories in South India. A strategic geographic location enhanced the Chōla status politically and economically. Located between the Kāvēri and Kollidam, it saw nature's bounty. On all sides were smaller and larger kingdoms. The northern side was Tonḍaināḍu, to the north west Koṅgunāḍu, to the south Kōnāḍu, the principality of the Ilḷan-gōvel or Irrukuvēls, of Koḍumbālūr. Deeper south lay Pāṇḍināḍu, while the hilly tract to the south was controlled by the Muttaraiya of Nēman. The sea in the east, the Vellār, the hilly tract Kōṭṭaikarai in the west and the Kāvēri formed natural boundaries. However, what is of greater interest to us is the Chōla exposure to a multitude of physiography and diversity of local cultures that gave them ample scope to elaborate and form their own distinct style.

Geopolitics led to the growth of cultural organisms, the tension of the opposites yielded to an attraction and interaction. One mainstream was formed thus from the various tributaries through constant exposure.

The Tirucirāpalli Rock cut inscription(48) refers to the Pallava sway over the Chōḷa country. The Kūram grant of Paramēśvaravarman I includes the conquest of Chōḷa lands(49). Raṇadhīra Pāṇḍya in the Tiruci inscription claimed that the Chōḷa were under his sway(50). Similarly the Nesarika grant of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda III's invasion and victory over the Chōḷa, Pāṇḍya and the Cēra alike is well known(51). Dantivarman Pallava claims to have had the Northern Chōḷa under his sway, while Jatila Parantaka Nedunjadaiyan Pāṇḍyan, the southern Chōḷa in the last decades of the eighth and first quarter of the ninth centuries. All this time the royal household at Uraiyur was lying low. During the last few years of Dantivarman rose Vijayālaya like phoenix reborn from its own ashes. With the defeat of the Muttaraiyaṁ and the rise of Vijayālaya there are no records of the Pallava Dantivarman, nor his successor Nṛpatuṅga, from his 7th to the 21st regnal years, which are approximately from 866-880 A.D. The Pallava connection is seen only between Āditya I, Aparājita and Gaṅga Prithvipati I.

The Paluvēṭṭaraiyars ruling from Mēlapaluvūr, Kīlapaluvūr and Kīlaiyūr were closely connected with the Chōḷa. It is claimed that they rose and fell with

the Chōḷa and figured as feudatories. They were the only feudatories of the Chōḷa (52). They aided Parāntaka I alongwith Gaṅga Prithvipati II against the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kannaradēva Kṛṣṇa at the battle of Vellāla (Tiruvallam). It is strange that an area abounding with feudatories, and the Chōḷa had only the Paluvēṭṭaraiyars as their feudatories or vassals. A major reason could be lack of loyalty and defection. Taking just one example of the Bāna, their fickleness is seen with the quick succession with which they changed camps from the Pallava to Pāṇḍya to the Chōḷa. Historical drifts were not uncommon, while chieftains enrolled as generals and officers according to their status in various armies. The Bāna, as Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa II's allies suffered defeat at Parāntaka I's hands and lost their territory to him. Historical conjecture is that the Bāna under Vijayāditya III were vassals to Parāntaka I, however, under Būtuga they once again joined forces with Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III and saw victory in the battle of Takkōlam. Similarly, the Nōlāmba who called themselves Pallava-Nōlāmba became Rāṣṭrakūṭa allies. One Vīramahēndra whose regnal years were 976 - 980 A.D. had a biruda as the conqueror of Chōḷa-nāḍu(53). The Western Cālukyan allegiance is also a historical reality; whereby they occupied the Rāṣṭrakūṭa

territory in 973 A.D. and also led a campaign against the Chōḷa . The 9th year inscription of Parāntaka I recorded the Chōḷa occupation of the Bāna and Vaidumba territories before 916 A.D.(54).

The historical puzzle comes to us in the form of the Muttaraiyaṛ of Sēndalai. There is a non-committal agreement that their descent is from the Kālabhra (55). It is also believed that their defeat at the hands of the Pallavaṛ and Pāṇḍyaṛ left them crippled and in vassal position. Interestingly, Jain composers, the Naṭadiyaṛs mention them(56). A Tamil work of Grammar, Yappāruṅgalaviruthi by a Jain ascetic Amitasāgara contains a 'Muttaīāyakorai'. Were they of Jain patronage, specially when we seen Jain shrines at both Nārttamalai and Sittanavāsai?

Despite the fact that the Muttaraiyaṛ were not Chōḷa vassals, Nārttamalai and Tañjāvūr were the bones of contention. The final Muttaraiyaṛ overthrow by the Chōḷaṛ created a new relationship, the post Muttaraiya early Chōḷa one of harmony and diplomacy, which is perhaps best reflected in their marriage alliances and art forms, specially architecture. Political warfare was an intrinsic urge to control and command an impersonal

territory. There was no religious or communal disparity that would hamper a cultural force. The other side of human nature perhaps craved to seek a balance and harmony in tolerance, acceptance and assimilation.

Closer home to the Chōla were the Velir of Koḍumbālūr ruling over Kōnāḍu, lying between Uraiyūr and Madurai. Pallava feudatories once, they were conquered by Vijayālaya and later figured as officers and generals in the Chōla army(57). This area like the Muttaraiyār tracts was also known for its Jain centres. Both suffered much defeat. It would not be surprising that the Chōla with their partiality towards Śaivism, and the roving Kāpālīka and Kālamukha rejuvenated the people with the dynamism of these cults. An austere and remote Jainism more or less was eclipsed. The Chōla, we have thus seen came into contact with many other feudatories and powers. These were satellite or orbital contacts. However, certain nascent bonds developed. The ethnic, local and religious expressions began to manifest with identities per se, as well as a part of a larger over all. The timing and conjoining of these with the Chōla lent it an identity and took forth from that very identity in establishing an 'œuvre'. Seeking solutions to political problems were not always political.

The mergers often occurred, or were agreed upon as marriage alliances. Respect to marriage as an institution made a political relationship binding. A deliberate kinship was being developed. Matrimonial alliances were thus popular.

Āditya I married a Pallava princess who bore him two sons. We are also aware of Puḍi Aḍichcha Piḍāriyār who was the daughter of Tennavān Ilḷaṅgōvēlan an Irrukuvēl Chief. She was the queen of Arikular Kesariyar son of Parāntaka I, and father of Sundara Chōḷa. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa connection is justified, for one of the chief causes was to avenge the injustice done to his grandson. The attack by Kṛṣṇa II at the battle of Vallāla (Tiruvallam) was to espouse the cause of his grandson Kannaradēva who did not share the Chōḷa throne. About the same time Gaṅga Prithvipati II was a strong ally of Parāntaka I. Soon after his death Būtuga sought to strengthen his ties with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa, by marrying Kṛṣṇa III's sister. There is evidence of one Ilḷaṅgōn Pichchi, the daughter of a Vāḷḷavaraiyar who could be Kṛṣṇa II. If so this Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess could have been Āditya I's wife, as she is referred to as 'munnum pugunda mūtha deviyār' - i.e. the senior queen. Another queen of Āditya I, Alisi Kāṭṭaḍigal was the daughter

of a Kachchippēṭṭu Kudiraichchēri Ammakkanār, where Kachchippēṭṭu is Kāñci king Siriyavēlar referred to as the Iruṅṅōla Kula Pradīpa - was the son of a Chōla princess, perhaps the daughter of Parāntaka I. This is again reference to the matrimonial alliance with the Irrukuvēl of Koḍumbālūr. Similarly there was a Arinjigal Pirathiyār, a Bāna queen and daughter of prince Arikulakēsari - who is Arinjaya son of Parāntaka I. Another daughter of Parāntaka I, Vīra Mahādēviyār married Gōvinda Vallaraiyar who is identified with Gōvinda IV, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler.

The brother of Parāntaka I, Kannaradēva and perhaps the son of Āditya I was half Rāṣṭrakūṭa-Chōla. Nampirathiyār Arumōli Naṅgaiyār the daughter of a Paluvēṭṭaraiyar chief was also a queen of Parāntaka I. The Gaṅga connection is possibly valid too because we hear of a Pidāri Kōyil erected at Sōlāpuram by a Naṅgaimaṇi, daughter of Prithivi Gaṅgaraiyar. The Irrukuvēl alliance is very prominent and occurs in many inscriptions and is best seen in S.R. Balasubramanyam's analysis(58) regarding Naṅgai Karṇali, Tennevān Illaṅgōvēlar, Nakkan Vikramakēsari, Puḍi Adichcha Pidāri, Varaguṇa, Karṇali etc.

Having taken samples of marriage alliances, it is only fair to add that a temple was much above political

warfare, consanguine or any other alliance. Religious sanction was open to all. There was a uniform and continuing reverence shown throughout South India for these temples; and it is fortunate that these endowments are recorded. A few brief examples have been taken, Tiruppāraiturai Dārukavanēśvara was a recipient of gifts from Naṅgai puḍi Mādēvigal, an Irrukuvēl noble woman, Umaiyaḷ the Chōḷa princess, and even from the later Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya.

Aḍigal Kaṇḍan Marambāvai, queen of Nandivarma III Pallava gifted Kalangjus of gold at the Nēmam Piḍāri Kōil. She also made endowments for elaborate offerings and other causes related to temples. A mistress 'bhogiyār' and queen Alisi Kaṭṭadigal of Āditya I made endowments to the Tiruvaīyāru Parama Mahādēvar at the Pañcānādisvara there, and so did the Paḷuvēṭṭaraiya general Kaṇḍan amudan Tennavān Mahādēviar make endowments at Tiruppālanam etc. Irrukuvēl women made numerous endowments. The queen of even Nṛpatuṅga, Vīra Mahādēviar performed the Hiranyagarbha and Tulābāra ceremonies at the Tirukkodikāval Tirukkōṭisvara.

In his introduction to 'Royal conquests and cultural

Migrations in South India' C. Sivaramamurti says "..... these conquests as such have always been of an ephemeral nature and only of momentary importance. The more abiding and permanent consequences have been cultural. Success and defeat in a battle was a personal loss or gain to the sovereign but the effect of either profoundly affected very often the territory of the victor and the vanquished. A great empire knit together different peoples, introduced them to common institutions and spread a common culture - though some individuality was still retained according to the genius of the people, their special predilections and idiosyncrasies. Some times long after the break up of such an empire the political successors in different areas continued the earlier common culture, and this accounts for the strong similarity about the same period in different parts politically, independent at the time, but component parts earlier of a larger unit intercourse between different states for various purposes enlarged the cultural vision of the people maritime enterprise, colonial expansion and religious migration together with the changing boundaries of larger and smaller kingdoms and empires due to political movements in the warpath have their own story to tell to elucidate several details of the little understood chapter of Indian culture"(59).

Frequent inroads of politic nature left a cultural impress on both the victor and the vanquished. And thus far we have seen in how many different ways powers joined forces for and against each other. The previous nature of these people is a 'tour de force'. The Chōḷa kingdom in its exploits extended itself far and wide; while the Rāṣṭrakūṭa occupation of Chōḷa lands after the Battle of Takkolan is well known.

The less publicised inroads were the wandering tradesmen, ascetics and itinerant minstrels, artists and artisans. The royal intercourse is much glorified, but perhaps the other inroads touched the people more, both directly and indirectly. These cultural fusions are the more romantic moments of history, which Sivaramamurti describes as "..... the victor stooped to gather blossoms of culture from the land of the vanquished"(60). There are numerous instances which point to homage and endowments made to different temples, and which can be found in many South Indian inscriptions. It would even suffice if one reads these in S.R. Balasubramanyam's volumes on Chōḷa Temples. Close ties born of love and war between the Cālukya , Pallava , and Rāṣṭrakūṭa found remanescent fragrance in the land of the Chōḷa . Proximity and propinquity played a key role in deter-

mining some of the aspects of style. The immediacy of an influence or its occurrence through a middle source still points to an 'imbibing of forms' that go forth to create a style. Coomaraswamy says it is one that 'imbibes and gives in an enhanced degree of excellence the earlier traditions of the Pallavas and Pandyas, with an admixture of Cālukya Rāṣṭrakūṭa ornamentation. The triple Pallava-Pāṇḍya-Cālukyan culture accounts for the charming diction in the art of the Chōḷa sculptor. "This statement is only an example; it is better to temper it to a 'flow of different streams and their comingling to make a motif almost universal(61). What is important is not the motif alone, but how and where it stands. What is its role as a pun (Slesha). Although to borrow is not uncommon, it is the way in which it is used, as a shared experience and expression of a community that transforms and gives it an identify. This is also a factor that goes in the making of a style. The Chōḷa naturally acknowledged, but also tried to modify some of these forms and motifs.

What I would like to point out here is the 'Potential' and its 'Outcome'. One can easily recognise the intelligence and insight of the Chōḷa polity. It shows their capability to combine a set of items into a single organised

whole. The Gestalt would call their intelligence as insight; after all their very meaning can be loosely translated as form, organisation or configuration; to manage ambiguity and paradox at the same time calls for Scott Fitzgerald's words.

"The test of first rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in mind at the same time and still retain the ability to function".

I.5 STATE CRAFT AND ADMINISTRATION

Shared experiences, similar needs and occupations by and large, created a 'mental frame' not altogether unique or exclusive. The day to day life was guided by internal economy which was close to the local self government. However, the king was a divine patriarch, preserver and perpetuator of law, order and balance. The *biruḍa*, as we see in inscriptions, the endowment records, and to some extent the *Tevaram* all bespoke the relevance and import of things. A *biruḍa* which was often conferred in triumph over an adversary also shows us capitals and subcapitals in its content.

It is known through the *Saṅgam* and writings of *Periplus* that *Uraiyūr* was a great centre of urban life, the seat

and capital of the Chōḷa . Physiography provided a diversity of local cultures. The hilly tracts had its hunters and herdsmen of militant nature, and cultivating peasant population in the fertile Kāvēri delta. Sugar cane, paddy, coconut etc. were staples. Even in the early Saṅgam 'Pattina-p-pālai', the Chola industrial magnitude of the town is highlighted. Artisans, gold and ironsmiths, carpenters etc. came to work, along with the Tamil craftsmen. The Āryan Tamil culture dovetailed and evolved.

To govern all this the king had a co-regent or yuvaraja who acted on behalf of himself. In a hierarchy were officers like Mahādandanāyaka (Commander-in-chief) and other administrators. The Chōḷa administration was relatively complex. The king had councillors called Karuman araikinra adhikārigal, officers who executed grants - anaṭṭi, revenue officers - puravu vari, royal secretaries - vāykkēlvi, the accountants - varippottāgam and even a royal engraver called mugavēṭṭi. If any order or instructions were to be taken the executive officer to local bodies called Tiruvaiykkēlvi did the needful. It was after the oral that a record of the transaction was drawn up and attested by local witnesses of stature.

At the local or village level, the units of administration were the Ūr-assembly, and the ālēṅganam executive body. Besides this the villages were represented by the Brāhmaṇa who had their own sabha and committees called 'Variyam' (chosen ones). The 12th year Uttaramēṛūr inscription of Parāntaka is a complete draft for the process of election by ballot with an expert committees.

We are also aware of self governing villages called Kuṟṟam, Nāḍu, Kōṭṭam and Taniyūr - a town apart. Smaller Kuṟṟam made kōṭṭam and many together made valanāḍu or nāḍu. These villages were usually headed by elders or assemblies, corporate groups looking after its welfare. The Mūlaparudaiyār are important members, because they are in direct charge of the temple. They called themselves Śaiva Brāhmāṇa or Vaikhānasa. Kumāragānam and Kṛṣṇagānam were groups in charge of single shrines from where they derived their name. The village organisation was so methodical that the common man was not left out. The village which was divided into sēri (streets) had a group representing it. The fairly liberal views allowed a person by birth, residence, occupation or even choice to become a member of any governing body. Mutual agreement goodwill, circumstantial assessments and group decisions were taken.

If the Ūr were village assemblies, the nagaram was confined to the merchantile towns. The king usually dispatched emissaries and auditors at regular intervals to the two; extending cordiality and balance between the centre and village. This also established a link. If business and diplomacy are seen here; the flair for encouraging learning and excellence are seen in the creation of a sabha of a Brahmin settlement by royal grant, the Caturvēdi maṅgalam. These are created to encourage the unique merits of faith and learning. They are pious endowments or dēvadāna and bhūdāna, causing colonies of learned Brahmins to settle down under the tutelage of the king. In return for this honour they propounded and propogated the culture and religion. The temple was the town hall and the meeting place of all the sabha, if not their were neighbouring mandapas called Brahmastāna was used. The political spirit of the time aimed at securing the harmony of classes rather than their euquality"(62). Social life was generally dominated by custom and quasi-religion.

The temple was then not only a religious institution but took on the herculean task of an 'all round' institution, with an economy that multiplied and regenerated. Putting it very briefly it was the centre of learning, it was the library of vedas, alied studies and the fine arts.

Endowments were made to maintain staff and students. Excellence was encouraged, whereby lands were endowed for vedic studies by Parāntaka I at Kappalūr. Sundara endowed for the recitation of a 'Jaiminiya Sāmavēda' in the temple of at Kōyil Tevarāyanapēṭṭai. Expounding the Mimamsa of the Prabhākara school was prevalent in the Nāgēsvara at Kumbakōṇam. In the 37th year of Parāntaka I a gift of land was made to Brahmins for reciting the Tirupatikam at Lālgudi, and later at Tiruvērumbūr during the days of Sundara.

The Tiruviḍaimaruḍūr inscription of Āditya II not only mentions the provision made for Āryakūttu which could perhaps be Bharatanatyam. The more interesting aspect is that it was an official order that had to be executed for the purpose of which the sabha, nagaram (merchant guild) and dēvakanniṣ met in the Nāṭakasāla. The payment for the performance were also decided. The enduring and powerful draw of the temple was found suitable to create a 'culture and identity'. Further enhancement was seen in the favours granted by kings to special temples and their dieties, which was their Kula deivam. An example is Parāntaka I's famous performance of Hēma-garbha and Thulābhāra at the Sundaravarada at Uttaramērūr.

Gifts and endowments were managed by the temple, of which resources were kept aside for the maintenances of the temple architect, carpenter, blacksmith etc. It worked towards the material and spiritual benefit of the people. The administration received royal attention and was subject to enquiries. There are evidences of misappropriation of funds where the defaulters were fined, and the fine went towards the embellishment of architecture and ornamentations of the diety, both during the Āditya II and Parāntaka I at Tillaisthānam. Endowments of stone slabs engraved with the donor's piety were also preserved and re-engraved on the stone walls of the renovated temple. A continuous survey shows the special creations of Brahmin settlements to inculcate and maintain a high order of dignity. The village Sembian Mahādevi, after the great queen is such a creation. There are records of royal sanction for rebuilding and re-engraving which was carefully considered by the sabha of elders. It is not surprising that the temple was a 'Public Record Office', and historical summary in stone of a particular period.

The Madras Museum plates of Uttama Chōḷa(63) is evidence of a very important Chōḷa feature. It shows the relationship and link between merchants, artisans and other

Sabha. An example is in the Ulagāṇḍa Perumāl Temple(64), which points the efforts of harmony of classes and their interdependence on each other in Kāñcīpuram. The status of prestige of merchants and artisans, their active role in public service, interpersonal relationships and close interaction between the masses and the royalty are seen. Just as the royalty were sanctioned divine rights in the support and patronage of the temples, so did the merchants and artisans seek a ceremonial legitimacy by their association with these institutions. They become the guardians and protectors of their heritage. The Nagaram which was a self governing body involved itself in the commercial exchanges, craft productions and internal economy. Tradition listed six occupations which craft relevant to us, The tacca (carpenters), Kollār (blacksmiths) maṇi vinaimār (gemotologists), tattār (goldsmith), oviyār (image makers) and vannakammiyār (painters). Kenneth Hall makes a sound reconstruction of the geneology and occupation of the Rathakāra of Uyyakoṇḍan Tirumalai. He claims their occupation as architecture, chariot building, erecting gōpura, making images, sacrificial instruments for Brahmins, building maṇḍapa etc. Despite their non-Brahmin status they were entitled to the exclusive duties of the Brahmin and were given the titles 'acarya'. They were well versed in the sacred texts. Their vṛtti

and dharma was to construct and adorn the temples and the images. They were experts in cutting linga, carving images, building of four kinds of prasada with the help of geometry or kshētra. For services rendered to the local community they were rewarded lands, homes and reduced taxes(66). There is mention of the community having fled Kilaiyūr due to stress, possibly into the Chōḷa land(67). Itinerant trade during the period was prolific and promoted by merchant guilds and fraternities. Hall sums it up thus "the existence of such relationships allows to conclude that supra village levels of social integration were important in the period of South Indian history. Local social and economic units as represented by the Nāḍu and Nagaram did not exist in isolation but were integrated into a system which articulated the distribution of agricultural and high order commodities through out the hinterlands"(68).

The Chōḷa did not rid themselves of either their past or their neighbours, neither did they build their foundation upon them. They introduced a tonal change, with historical cultural inflections and accents. Open to all change and adjustment they tried to be judicious. It may well be said in the words of Focillon that "culture is not a reflex, but a progressive appropriation and renewal".

REFERENCES

1. K.N. Sastri, A History of South India, Madras 1976, pp.124,125 discusses the gist of Saṅgam literature and the content of the texts.
2. K.N. Sastri, The Cōḷas, Madras 1955, pp.32-37.
The establishment of the Chōḷa hegemony by the defeat of the Pāṇḍya and Cēra at the battle of Venni is traced to Pattina-p-pālai II 220-228 Porunār II 131.
3. Ibid, p.19.
4. Ibid, p.31.
5. Ibid, p.37. The Maṇimēkhalai XIX Ch.125.7 describes the defeat of the Cera and is quoted here.
6. Pūṇānūru, Puram 31, Kanat, p.73.
7. E. Hultzsch, SII, ii, pp.152-153, 253, 377-379, The 10th and 11th century A.D. copper plates extol his virtues.
Pūṇānūru, Pūram 74 is a song legend of this king. Poygaiyār in Kalavali composed in 40 verses his life and legend.
Appar's Kurukkai V 4, Tiruppāsar Tirutoṇḍakam V 6 emphasises the religious attitude of the king. Verses are sung by Sundarar, Tiruvāduturai V 2, V 43.
The Tiruvālaṅgādu plates of Vīra Rājendra repeat them.
10. K.N. Sastri, The Cōḷas, Madras 1955, pp.30-31.
11. E.I. XI, no.35,11, pp.3-5.
12. K.N. Sastri, The Cōḷas, Madras 1955, p.36. The Telugu-Chōḷa Plates describes this king thus:
Carāṇa-sarōruha vihata vilōcana-pallava trilōcana pramukha-khilaprithvisāra-karuta-kāvēri tīra.
13. Tirumangai Ālvar in his hymns of Tirunaraiyūr extols the largesse of Cenkaṇān and his spiritual attitude.
14. K.N. Sastri, The Cōḷas, Madras 1955, p.63.
15. Ibid, p.2.
16. Navalār Caritai, VV, 154-57. glorified one Accūta who could be Accūtavikkānta of the Kālabhrakula.Amitasāgara

the author of Yapparūṅgalak-karikai, 10th century A.D. has also written a few verses about him. The Vēlvikuḍi grant of the Pāndyas expresses a hatred for this Accūta.

17. R. Sathianatha Iyer in his article in the Journal of Indian History (JIH) VIII, p.74-80 ponders over the Kālabhra identity. Perhaps they were the later Muttaraiyar of Koḍumbālūr or the Karnāṭa Vellāla .
18. Historians generally agree that Kō-Iḷlaṅgō Muttaraiya was perhaps the last Muttaraiya chief who was overthrown by Vijayālaya Chōla. He was apparently the only chief to also have his own regnal year. These are seen in the 18th year Nēmam inscription of 1899; the 13th and 17th year Tirukkoḍikāval inscriptions of 1930-31; and the 13th year Koyilaḍi inscription of 1901.
19. S.I.I., I, 85. A Parākesari inscription identified with Vijayālaya is on the walls of the Kāñci Kailāsanātha relating the conquest of Kāñci. The Madras Museum plates of Uttama confirms it. The Tiruneduṅgūlam (Tirucirāppali) inscription 675 of 1909 mentions a certain Tribhuvana Cakravartin Konērimaikonḍan in which a gift of land is granted by Parākesari Vijayālaya. A 3rd year inscription of a Parakesarivarman at Tiruvellārai refers to a gift of land, assignable to Vijayālaya. The Vīrasōlapuram 3rd year inscription of Parākēsarivarman 51 of 1935 mentions of the one who took Tañjai. A hero stone in the Madras Museum with the figure of a warrior with bow and arrow is carved on the relief slab and engraved on it is 'Tañjai Kōṭṭa Kop Parākesari panmārkūyaṇḍu'.
20. K.N. Sastri, The Cōlas, Madras 1955, p.116, n77. for further reference.
21. The Anbil Plates of Sundara Chōla make mention of Āditya I's enterprise in building temples on either banks of the Kāvēri, while his political annexations of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam are found in - The 24th year Takkōlam inscription, 5 of 1987; the 27th year Tiruḷkaluḷ unṇam inscription, 167 of 1894, E.I., III, p.279 and the 14th year Tirumalapuram inscription, 286 of 1906 of Uttama mentioning a gift of land by Āditya I in Arūr in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam.
22. The Kaṇṇanūr inscription of Āditya I evidences his southern expansion; and Kaṇṇanūr was the extreme southern boundary of the Chōla during his reign.
23. S.R. Balasubramanyam, Early Chola Art I, Bombay 1966, p.82 discusses at length the authenticity of this statement.

24. The Kanyākumāri inscripton of Vīra Rājēndra refers to him as Vīrasī - the one in whom the goddess of valour resided. He is described bright as Arjuna he conquered Kṛṣṇa II, and his conquest of Iḷam won him the biruda 'Sīmhalāntaka'.
25. This Parākesari according to Hultzsch as seen in his 34th year Sucindram inscription is Parāntaka I and not Vijayālaya.
26. Epigraphy Report (E.R.), section A, 1949-50, no.57-58, pp.3-5 Kārandai Tamil Saṅgam Copper Plate of the 8th year of Rājēndra I.
27. S.R. Balasubramanyam, Early Chola Temples, New Delhi 1971, p.2.
28. E.I., IV, p.221. 9th year Shōlingūr inscription
E.I., XXVI, no.10. The 6th year Pullamaṅgai inscription of Parāntaka I, 559 of 1921; and the Kanyākumāri inscription of Vīra Rājēndra.
29. The Ātakūr inscription of Būṭuga II recording the death of Rājāditya helps in fixing the date of this battle.
30. K.N. Sastri, A History of South India, Madras 1976, p.178.
31. S.R. Balasubramanyam, Early Chola Art I, Bombay 1966, p.3.
32. Ibid, p.
33. RIE, 1949-50, Kārandai Tamil Saṅgam Plates 57 and 58 A.
34. T.N. Subramanyam, Transactions of the Archaeological Society of South India (ASSI), 1958-59, p.84 and 101 refer Sundara śōlap - perumpalli.
35. SII, III, Pl III, 205; pp.383-489, Tiruvālaṅgādu Copper Plate grant of Vīra Rājēndra.
36. R. Sathianathaiyer, The History and Culture of the Indian People, vol.III, Bombay 1955-63, p.249.
37. S.R. Balasubramanyam, Early Chola Art I, Parakesari inscription of S.I.I. 316 of 1903.
38. Ibid, p.116; S.I.I., XIII, 18 of 1914; 19th year inscription of Rājakēsarivarman.

39. Ibid, 10th year inscription of a Parākēsarivarman 337 of 1903.
40. S.R. Balasubramanyam, Early Chola Temples, New Delhi 1971, p.63, 212 of 1911.
41. S.R. Balasubramanyam, Early Chola Art I, Bombay 1966, p.165 for larger references on inscriptional details.
42. S.R. Balasubramanyam, Early Chola Temples, New Delhi 1971, pp.114-115.
43. A.R., 251 and 503 of 1929-30.
44. B. Venkataraman, Temple Art under the Cholas, New Delhi 1976, p.8.
45. Ibid, Chapter II on Sembiyaṇ Mahādēvi.
46. S.R. Balasubramanyam, Early Chola Temples, New Delhi 1971, p.166 for further reference.
47. S.R. Balasubramanyam, Early Chola Art I, Bombay 1966, p.7.
48. S.I.I., ii, p.508.
49. S.I.I., i, p.151.
50. A.S.I., 1903-4, p.275.
51. J.I.H., Vol. XXIX, p.159 M.S. Govindaswamy, The Role of Feudatories.
52. V. Balambal, Feudatories of South India, Allahabad 1978 The Paluvettaraiyars for further reference.
53. A.R.E., I & II 325 of 1912 - 1913, S.I.I., Vol. IX, 39, p.
54. S.I.I., Vol.II, 76, pp.386-387 and E.I. Vol.IV, 32.
55. J.S. Aiyangar, M.S. Govindaswamy, K.G. Krishna and V. Balambal have contemplated this issue and have agreed that Muttaraiyar descent has much to do with the Kālabhra .
56. T.V. Sadasiva Pandarthar, Tamil Ilakkīya Varalāru (250-600 A.D.), nd, p.63.
57. V. Balambal, Feudatories of South India, Allahabad 1978, The Koḍumbālūr Vēḷir for detailed references, p.151.

58. S.R. Balasubramanyam, Early Chola Temples, New Delhi 1971, pp.110-137.
59. C. Sivaramamurti, Royal Conquests and Cultural Migrations in South India, Calcutta 1955, p.1.
60. Ibid, p.7.
61. Ibid, p.12.
62. K.N. Sastri, The Cōlas, Madras 1955, p.508.
63. S.I.I., 3, 128.
64. K. Hall, Trade and State Craft in the Age of the Cholas, New Delhi 1980, pp.90-91.
65. Ibid, p.108 and J.D. Derret, K.N. Sastri Felicitation Volume, 1971. 'Two Inscriptions Concerning the Status of Kammalas and the Application of Dharmasastra', pp.32-35.
66. T.J. Hopkins, The Hindu Religious Traditions, Elcino 1971, pp.113-115.
67. 91 of 1946-47.
68. K. Hall, Trade and State Craft in the Age of the Cholas, New Delhi 1980, p.155.