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CHAPTER I:

THE ROMAN ORIGIN OF PALLAVA ART.

I do not know if any author has so far attempted to ascertain what kind of art flourished at the time of the first kings of the Pallava dynasty. That is what we shall try to determine in this chapter.

There is a document which is particularly important for a study of the early history of the Pallavas; it is the Viripara plates discovered at Mayidavolu, a village situated at a distance of 12 miles from Narasarapopet in the Guntur district which lies on the southern bank of the Kṛishṇa.

From his capital, Kāñchipurā, and in the 10th year of the reign of his father whose name is not given, the heir-apparent (Yuva-Mahārāja) Śivaskandavarman, of the Pallava dynasty and of Bhāradvāja Gōtra, sent to the governors of Dhaññakaḍa an order concerning the village of Viripara, situated in the province of Āndhrāpatha (Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 84.)

There is no doubt that this prince belongs to the dynasty whose history we are studying, for it is expressly stated that Śivaskandavarman lived at Kāñchi, and was of the family of the Pallavas and of Bhāradvāja Gōtra.

Again, as the plates were discovered in the Guntur District and the village for which they were engraved was in Āndhrāpatha, and as the order was issued to the officers of Dhaññakaḍa, that is to say, the town of Amaravatī, it is certain that the Pallava princes of this period reigned not only over Tōṇḍai maṇḍalam, that is to say, the province of Kāñchi, but also over the country up to the banks of the Kṛishṇa which was occupied by the Āndhras and in which was situated the town of Amaravatī where, in the middle of the 2nd century, King Puḷumāyi II. built the white marble Sūtpa, the sculptures of which, almost entirely Roman in workmanship, now adorn the Madras Museum.

The Pallavas have thus succeeded the Āndhras on the banks of the Kṛishṇa; but how long after and at what epoch?
We shall now show, that, in all probability, the father of Śivaskandavarman of the Pallava dynasty reigned at Amarāvatī shortly after Puḷumāyi II. had built the famous Stūpa.

The gift of the village of Viripara bears only the date of the year of the king's reign; however, the alphabet in which it is written would enable us to determine the date, if we have any points of comparison.

Fortunately, in this case, we have such points of comparison: The Mayidavōlu plates are written in the same alphabet as the plates found at Konḍamūdi (a village situated in the Tenāli Tāluk, Guntūr District). And in its language and its phraseology the Konḍamūdi document resembles so much the Kārlē inscription of Gautamiputra Śatakarni, and the Nāsik inscription of Vāsishthiputra Puḷumāyi, that there cannot be any great difference of date between them:

«The alphabet of this inscription shows that he must have lived in the same period as the Pallava prince Śivaskandavarman who issued the Mayidavōlu plates. Further, the language and phraseology of the inscription are so similar to the Nāsik inscriptions [a still closer resemblance exists between Jaya- varman's plates and the Kārlē inscription No. 19 (A. S. W. I. Vol. IV, p. 112) of Gautamiputra Śatakarni (Nos. 4 and 5) [Dr. Bhagwanlal Indrajī's in Bombay Gazetteer Vol. XVI, and Inscriptions from the cave temples of Western India—Kārlē] of Vāsishthiputra Puḷumāyi (No. 3), that Jayavarman's date cannot have been very distant from that of those two Āṇdhra Kings.» (Ep. Ind. Vol. VI, No. 31, p. 315).

If we bear in mind that it was Vāsishthiputra Puḷumāyi who built the Stūpa at Amarāvatī, we may conclude that the Pallava king, father of Śivaskandavarman, who engraved the Mayidavōlu plates, reigned at Amarāvatī shortly after Puḷumāyi II.

A strange coincidence indeed: the son of this Puḷumāyi reigned from 177 to 184 A.D., under the name of Śivaskanda which was also the name of the son of the Pallava king.

Is this coincidence something purely accidental? We may believe it is not. In fact it is possible that the Pallava king had married the daughter of Śivaskanda Śatakarni and that the "Yuvamahārāja" of the Pallava dynasty received, according to the custom of the Hindus, the name of the Āṇdhra king who was his grandfather.
Since we are now dealing with suppositions, we shall say a few words here about the theory of the Persian origin of the Pallavas.

The father of Puḻumāyi II. had fought with the Pahlavas, and this same Puḻumāyi had to struggle against the satrap Rudradāman, who, about the year 150 A.D. had for minister a Pahlava called Suviśākha. (Ind. Ant., VII, 257—Junagadh Insce.) Relying upon the analogy of names, certain authors think that these Pahlavas, who fought with the Andhras, succeeded in establishing a kingdom for themselves between the Kṛishṇā and the Pālar and founded the Pallava dynasty.

This theory is subject to variations in its details. For example, we may suppose that the Pahlavas took possession of one part of the Andhra empire not by conquest but by marriages such as the one that is supposed to have taken place between the father of Śivaskandavarman and the daughter of the Andhra King of the same name.

Similar marriages between the Andhras and those of other dynasties have surely taken place; we know that Puḻumāyi II. married the daughter of the satrap Rudradāman, whose minister was a Pahlava.

All these hypotheses are based on the similarity of names: Yuvamahārāja Śivaskandavarman and Śivaskanda Śātakarṇi, Pahlavas and Pallavas; but they are contestable.

All that we can consider as certain is that the Pallava King who reigned at Amarāvatī when the Mayidavōlu plates were engraved lived shortly after Puḻumāyi II. who built the Stūpa at Amarāvatī; but it is not possible to say exactly how long after.

The Andhra dynasty came to an end about 236 A.D. There is nothing, however, to prove that the Pallavas did not succeed the Andhras many years earlier at Amarāvatī, and that the prince Śivaskandavarman was not the contemporary of the last Andhra kings whose kingdom had now become much smaller. In that case, the Mayidavōlu plates may be dated about 200 A.D. If, however, the Pallavas succeeded the Andhras after 236 A.D. it must have been immediately after, for the resemblance between the Mayidavōlu plates and Jayavarman’s plates discovered at Koṇḍamūḍi is so close that we cannot suppose that more than a century would have elapsed between Śivaskandavarman and Puḻumāyi II.
We can therefore conclude that the Pallava kings reigned at
Amaravati in the first half of the third century after Christ, that
is, about 50 years after the famous Stūpa was built. These kings
reigned over a very extensive territory: their empire extended
from the banks of the Pālār to those of the Kṛishṇā. They were
therefore powerful and glorious.

What about the art in this kingdom? There is no doubt
about the answer. Pallava art at the time of Śivaskandavarman
cannot be very different from that which flourished at the time
when Puḷumāyi II built the Stūpa at Amaravati.

A visit to the remains that are kept in the Madras Museum is
enough to convince one that this art had attained great perfection.

The subjects are Buddhistic, the costumes and the ornaments
are Hindu, but their workmanship is European.

But, above all, it is in the representation of the human body
that the European influence manifests itself. The hair is curled
in the Greek manner, the face is symmetrical, the limbs are
sculptured according to the rules of Anatomy with conspicuous
muscles, and some of them are dressed in clothes that remind us
of the Roman toga.

This Indo-European art was not peculiar only to the banks of
the Kṛishṇā; it was found throughout India and specially in
Gandhāra.

At this epoch, the Roman Empire extended its influence over
almost the whole of the civilised world and was also connected
with India in various ways.

How long did this influence last? There is no doubt that it
disappeared from South India in the VII century, whereas it was
probably not introduced there before the Christian era. It attained
its zenith probably in the II and the III centuries. There is no
doubt that in its origin the Pallava art was strongly influenced by
the principles of the Latin Art.

In many places on the banks of the Kṛishṇā, we find sculpt-
tured marbles of which the subjects are Buddhistic and the
workmanship Roman. These are the bas-reliefs that once adorned
the Stūpas or the mutilated images of Buddha. Up to the present
they have always been attributed to the Āndhras. This view,
I am sure, is not always correct.

The Graeco-Buddhist art did not certainly disappear with
the Āndhra dynasty. It is not likely that the technical methods
Roman head of Buddha
(Discovered by the Author near Bezwada.)
employed by the sculptors who built the Stūpa at Amarāvatī, disappeared completely in the space of a few years. It is almost certain that this art that flourished in the middle of the II century lived on for more than one century and that it was only very slowly that the sculptors abandoned the ancient models and forgot the noble methods that they had been taught by the artists that had come from Rome. To be more precise, I believe that the Indo-Roman art attained its zenith in the II century with the stūpa of Amarāvatī; that throughout the III century, the art used on the banks of the Kṛishṇā was entirely Indo-Roman; that in the IV century there were still very evident traces of this influence and it was only in the V century that all vestiges of Latin influence disappeared completely.

Indeed, many of the marbles that have been discovered on the banks of the Kṛishṇā do not date from the time of the Āndhras, but have been sculptured when the Pallava kings reigned over this country.

On the 1st January 1917, I went to Bezwada with the object of visiting the caves of Undavalli. When going about those regions, I luckily discovered the ruins of a Buddhist temple at Vijjadiādpuram, a village half a mile to the west of Bezwada. Amongst the remains of the brick walls, there were two heads of Buddha and a trunk dressed in the Roman toga. One of these heads was very beautiful. I bought it from the owner, a temple priest, for two rupees and have it now in my possession.

Plate I represents it. Were it not for the elongated ears and the sign of Buddha on the forehead, one would take it for the face of a Roman of the earliest times. The hair is curly, the eyes have no pupil, the general aspect is Roman, and this image is made of white marble like the antique models of Europe. I think that this work done in India by an Indian is strong proof of the great influence that Latin Art exercised in the early centuries on the banks of the Kṛishṇā.

I shall not certainly affirm that it was the work of a Pallava sculptor, but we are not sure either that this statue dates from the time of the Āndhras. I believe that even if the sculptors of the time of Śivakandavarman have not made this head, they had at least the habit of making similar ones.

On my return to Madras, I informed the archaeological Department of the existence of the Buddhistic remains that I
had discovered at Bezwada. The other head and the trunk have since been brought over by the Government to the Madras Museum.

Was this Indo-Roman art confined to the banks of the Krishṇa, or did it extend through the whole Pallava empire? The latter is very probable; the Buddhists at Kāṅchīpuram built, in their capital, Stūpas that were perhaps in the same style as those in the north of the Empire. The only researches, so far attempted, into the Buddhistic remains at Kāṅchī have been made by M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao when on a short visit to the town, and his rapid investigation has been very fruitful in as much as he has discovered, in the last prākāra of the Kāmākṣhī-dēvi temple, a Roman statue of Buddha which is shown in Fig. I of the article "Bauddha vestiges in Kāṅchīpura" by T. A. Gopinatha Rao (Ind. Ant., Vol. XLIV, Part DLVII, June 1915). If we compare the head of this statue with that of the one I have found at Bezwada, and the trunk with the one since brought over to the Madras Museum, we shall find that the resemblance between them is complete.

We can therefore conclude by saying, that, at Kāṅchīpuram as well as at Amarāvatī and Bezwada, the Pallava Art, inspired by Roman models, attained great perfection at the time of those early Pallava kings.
CHAPTER II.

THE VÂYALÛR INSCRIPTION.

The record found at Mayidavôlu is written in Prâkrit. There are also two others of the same kind; but the other Pallava records are in Sanskrit; the former are surely the oldest and can be considered to belong to the III century.

One of these two records (Ep. Ind. Vol. I, p. 2), that of Hîrâhaḍagalli, is dated in the 8th year of the reign of Sivaskandavarman, King of Kâñchi, who is of the Pallava dynasty and Bhâradvâja gôtra and who by this document confirms a gift made by his father Bappa-dêva. We may suppose that this Sivaskanda was the person who was "Yuvamahârâja" when the Mayidavôlu gift was made, but we are not quite sure of it.

This record is specially important as it shows the extent of the Pallava empire. These plates (discovered in the Bellary District) mention the province of Sâtâhani (Sâtâhani-rattha) as forming part of the Pallava kingdom. This province comprised a portion of the Bellary District. Thus, we know that the Pallavas reigned over an empire, which, having Kâñchipuram for its capital, extended not only along the Coromandel coast up to the mouth of the Krishnâ, but also to the West, in the Deccan, up to the banks of the Tungabhadra river.

Here also the Pallavas had succeeded the Ændhras. The inscription discovered at Myâkadoni, in the Bellary district, (G.O. No. 99, 29th August 1916.—Report on Epigraphy for 1915-1916) says that King Pułumâyi II. reigned about 140 A.D. over the province of Sâtâvahani-hâra which is none other than Sâtâhani-rattha of the Hîrâhaḍagalli copper-plates.

We see then that, at first, the Pallava empire extended more in the Deccan than in the Tamil country; there is nothing to prove that it comprised the banks of the Kâvâr; the Trichinopoly region was probably occupied by the Chôlas; on the contrary, we are sure that the Pallavas reigned over the country extending from Bellary to Bezwada, that is to say, over an
important portion of the Andhra empire. These geographical considerations lead to the probability of the theory that the Pallavas were a Northern dynasty, who, having contracted marriages with the princesses of the Andhra dynasty, inherited a portion of the Southern part of the Andhra empire.

The other record was discovered in the District of Guṇṭūr (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 143). In the reign of Vijayaskandavarman, Chārudēvi, wife of “Yuvamahārāja” Vijaya-Buddhavarman, a Pallava prince of the Bhāradvāja gōtra, and mother of Buddhyaṅkura, made a gift to the temple of Nārāyana at Dālūra.

The alphabet of these plates resembles that of the Hiraḥaḍagallī plates. However, as the name of the king is not exactly the same, we cannot, with certainty, identify Vijaya-skanda with Śivaskanda.

We shall conclude by saying that the three Prākrit records (those of Mayidavōlu and Hiraḥaḍagallī, and the grant made by Chārudēvi) found in the districts of Guntūr and Bellary, prove that many princes of the Pallava dynasty of Kāṇchipuram—(1) the father of Yuvamahārāja Śivaskandavarman [called Bappa-dēva in the Hiraḥadagallī plates], (2) Yuvamahārāja Śivaskandavarman, (3) Mahārāja Śivaskandavarman, (4) Mahārāja Vijayaskandavarman, (5) Yuvamahārāja Vijaya Buddhavarman, (6) His son Buddhyaṅkura (2 and 3 being perhaps one and the same person)—reigned towards the III century, not only over Toṇḍai Maṇḍalam, but also over the lands bordering the Kṛishṇa and Tungabhadra, and so over a great part of the Telugu country.

We know from the inscription on the pillar at Allāhābād that about 340 A.D. the great emperor Samudragupta vanquished Vīṣṇugōpa, King of Kāṇchi.

Certain authors have supposed: (a) that Vīṣṇugōpa was a Pallava; (b) that Samudragupta advanced as far as Kāṇchi (Conjeeveram) in the Tamil country.

I think that the last conclusion is not correct. I believe that Samudragupta never entered the Tamil country but that Vīṣṇugōpa was, in fact, a Pallava king. We know that the kings of Kāṇchi reigned on the banks of the Kṛishṇa; it is, therefore, very likely that events happened as mentioned below: Samudragupta came from the North of India and vanquished
the kings who reigned at Pithâpuram, Mahândragiri, and Kothûra. When they saw him advance to the South of the Gôdâvarî, Mantarâja who reigned near the Colair lake, his neighbour, the King of Vengt, Vishnûgôpa, King of Kâñchî who reigned on the right bank of the Kâñchî and his neighbour Ugrasêna, King of Pâlakka, formed a coalition to stop the invader. But he affirms that he was the victor; and until the contrary is proved we have to believe in his words.

Be that as it may, it is probable that Samudragupta did not care to advance more to the South in a country which must have been difficult of access, and so returned to the North.

Let us now examine the Sanskrit records.

Five copper plates:

1° Ómgôdu No. 1 (G.O. No. 99, 29 Aug. 1616, Part II, No. 3),
2° Uruvupalli (Ind. Ant. Vol. V, p. 50),
3° Ómgôdu No. 2 (G.O. No. 99, 29 Aug. 1916, Part II, No. 4),
4° Pikira (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 159),
5° Mângalû (Ind. Ant., Vol. V, p. 154),

enable us to establish with certainty the following genealogy:

Kumâravishnû
   Skandavarman (I)
      Viravarman
   Skandavarman (II)
      Yuvamahârâja Vishnûgôpa
   Simhavarman.

These six princes belonged to the Pallava dynasty and Bhâradvâja gôtra. There is nothing, however, to prove that their capital was Kâñchîpuram. It is also probable that, had Kâñchî been their capital, they would have dated their grants from there. But Skandavarman II. was encamped at Tâmbrâpa when he made the Ómgôdu No. 1 grant; Yuvamahârâja Vishnûgôpa was at Palakkâda when he made the Uruvupalli grant; Simhavarman was at Dañanapuram when he made the Mângalû grant and at Mênmatura at the time of the Pikira grant. It is therefore probable that these three sovereigns never reigned at Kâñchîpuram. The geographical position of these towns from which the several
grants have been made is not known; but we know accurately a region which formed one of the provinces of their kingdom. The two Ōṅgōḍu records mention "Karmmā-rāṣṭra" as forming part of their empire, and this district is often mentioned in the grants made by the Eastern Chālukyas. We know also that the village of Chendalūr (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 233) which is only another name for Chandalūru, a village in the Ongole taluq of the Guntūr district, was situated in this province. Besides, it is also probable that the village of Ōṅgōḍu was adjacent to Santarāvūru where the plates were discovered. Santarāvūru is in the Bāpatla taluq of the Guntūr district.

There is therefore no doubt that the environs of the present town of Ongole watered by the river Gundlakamma was named Karmmā-rāṣṭra at the time of the ancient Pallavas. There is no other information about these kings except their genealogy.

The word "Yuvamahārāja" preceding the name of Vishnugōpa shows that he never reigned. He has however made a grant to the village of Uruvupalli in the 11th year of the reign of Śimhavarman. So, Vishnugōpa was probably the brother of a king named Śimhavarman.

The grant of the village of Chūra (G. O. No. 920, 4th Aug. 1914, Part II, No. 1) enables us to suppose that the donor Vijaya-Vishnugōpavarman was the son of Śimhavarman and grandson of Yuvamahārāja Vishnugōpa, though he is called in the Chūra plates "Mahārāja" and not "Yuvamahārāja".

An isolated copper plate relating to a grant made at Daśanapuram by the great-grandson of King Śrī-Vira-Kōrcha-varman, has been discovered at Darśi (Nellūr District) [Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 397]. Be that as it may, we must bear in mind the incontestable fact that a dynasty of six or seven Pallava kings reigned over the Telugu country about the V century of the Christian era.

But what connection had they with the kings of Kāńchīpuram? we do not know it exactly.

We may suppose that the Chōlas occupied Kāńchī for the time being and about the V century drove back the Pallavas to the north of the kingdom.

The existence of a dynasty of Chōla princes in the Telugu country seems to confirm this presumption (G. O. No. 518, 18th July 1905, Part II, No. 5).
written in characters which are not very ancient; there is no means of knowing if it is a forgery or a copy of a genuine document.

The Jain work called “Lokavibhaga,” discovered by M.R.Ry. R. Narasimhachar, is dated Ś. 380 (458 A.D.), the 22nd year of the reign of the Pallava king Simhavaran; this evidence is rather suspicious, and besides it does not say which Simhavaran it was and to what branch of the Pallava family he belonged.

The Penugonda plates (G.O. No. 920, 4th Aug. 1914. Part II., No. 4 and J. R. A. S. Oct. 1915) mention two Pallava kings Simhavaran and Skandavaran, but the age of these plates is not known.

The Pallavas themselves have attempted to answer the important question who were the ancestors of the Pallavas of the Simhavishnu dynasty. The Kaśakudī plates give a few of the names of kings (S.I.I., Vol. II, Part III. p. 356).

The Vēlurpalaiyam plates (S.I.I., Vol. II, Part V, p. 510) give us more information; but, unfortunately, they do not give us a complete list. On the contrary, this author warns us that the kings he mentions, are only a few among the numerous predecessors of Simhavishnu. These isolated names do not enable us to build up a genealogy.

Moreover this record which is dated in the IX century, not being relatively ancient, we do not know how far we can rely on it.

The Vāyalūr inscription presents much greater guarantee as it is the most ancient genealogy of this kind. Whereas the Kaśakudī and Vēlurpalaiyam plates are dated during the time of the princes of the dynasty of Nandivarman, the Vayālūr inscription is of the time of a prince of the dynasty of Simhavishnu.

Besides, this inscription gives the names of such a large number of kings that it seems to be a complete list of them in the order of their succession.

It is for these two reasons that the Vāyalūr inscription becomes extremely interesting.

The Vāyalūr inscription (No. 368 of 1908) is very much damaged: The report on Epigraphy for 1908-09 (G.O. No. 536, 28th July 1909—Part II, No. 17, p. 77) speaks of it only in a very summary manner. The order of succession of the predecessors of Simhavishnu is not given in the report, but it is precisely this order that it would be interesting to know.
The report says:

«The pillar in the Vyâghrapurîśvara temple is a very interesting one on account of the genealogical record which is engraved on it. The latter begins with the usual mythical names Brahma, Ângiras, Bṛihşpati, Śañyù, Bharadvâja, Drôṇa, Âśvatthâman, and Pallava. Then, the quasi-historical names Asòka, Harigupta, Âryavarman and others are mentioned. After these, the names of nearly twenty-five kings are registered whose relations to one another are not specified. The order in which the known names are mentioned at the end suggests, however, that these twenty-five are also to be taken in the order of descent. Among these occur the following which are already familiar to us from copper-plate inscriptions:—(1) Mahêndravarman (once), (2) Karanda (Kalindavarman ?) (once), (3) Vishnu-gòpa (thrice), (4) Kumāravishṇu (twice), (5) Buddhavarman (twice), (6) Skandavarman (five times), (7) Siñhavarman (four times), (8) Viravarman (once), and (9) Nandivarman (once). In many places the record is damaged and the names are not legible. If, however, the whole of the inscription is made out, it will perhaps establish a connection more definite than that hitherto set forth by the copper-plates between the Pallavas of the Prâkrit records, those of the Sanskrit records, and those of the Siñhavishṇu line. The Amarâvatî pillar epigraph (which is evidently a copy of some older record) gives a list of early Pallava Kings some of whom also occur in the Vâyalûr inscription. After mentioning the twenty-five names above referred to, the latter introduces Siñhavishṇu for the first time. From him were descended apparently in the order of father and son, Mahêndravarman I, Narasimhavarman I, Mahêndravarman II, and Paramêsvaravarman I. His son was Râjasisînha ‘the (very) king of lions on the high mountain (viz.) the prosperous Pallava family’...».

Seeing the importance of the Vâyalûr inscription for a history of the Pallavas, I went over there with the object of studying it myself on the spot.

It is engraved on a cubical pillar of the Pallava style and runs round it in the form of a helix. It begins with the well-known series of names: Brahma, Ângiras, Bṛihşpati, Śañyù, Bharadvâja, Drôṇa, Âśvatthâman, Pallava, Asòka, Harigupta
Aryavarman, and then two or three names hardly legible, and then Kālinda, Byāmallā, [E]kamalla.

After this last name begins a series of 36 names. The estam-page of this part of the inscription is given in Plate II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Vimala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Koṅkaṇika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kālabharti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Chūtapallava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Virakūrcha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Chandravarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Karāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Vishṇugopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Skandamūla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kāṇagopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Virakūrcha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Kumāravishṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Buddhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Kumāravishṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Buddhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Vishṇugopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Vishṇudāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Viravarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Nandivarman (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Vishṇugopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Simhavishṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Mahēndravarman (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Narasiṁhavarman (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Mahēndravarman (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Paramēśvaravarman (I).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A fact of very great importance is that in the legendary series of ancestors of the kings belonging to the dynasty of
Plate II.

The Vayalar inscription.
Simhavishnu there are personages called Aryavarman and Konkanika, names that are surely of Western Gaṅga origin.

The Penugonda plates (G. O. No. 920, 4th Aug. 1914, Part II, No. 4, p. 83) which are the only authentic records that we have about the ancient W. Gaṅgas give the dynasty:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Konkanivarman} \\
\text{Mādhava} \\
\text{Āryavarman} \\
\text{Siṃhavarman}.
\end{align*}
\]

The presence of names of Gaṅga origin in the legendary portion of the list of Pallavas goes to confirm the fact that those kings had political relations with the Pallavas as is shown by the Penugonda plates: (Āryavarman and Siṃhavarman were crowned by Pallava kings).

Let us now compare the Vāyalūr inscription with the Kaśākūḍī plates.

The series of names is the same up to Pallava.

Between Pallava and Siṃhavishnu the list of names given in the Kaśākūḍī plates is rather short. However, as at Vāyalūr, we read: Aśoka, Kāṇagōpa, Skandavarman, Vishṇugōpa, Vira-kūrcha, Simhavarman. Kalindavarman of Kaśākūḍī is probably none other than Kālinda of Vāyalūr.

If we compare the Vāyalūr inscription with that of Amarāvati (S. I. I, Vol. I, p. 25) which, we know, is not an ancient one, we find little resemblance between them.

On the contrary, the Vāyalūr inscription exactly coincides with that of Vēlūrpālaiyam. The Vāyalūr list is complete; but in the Vāyalūr plates, we have many "et cætera" in place of names.

After a few names which are all of them found in the Vāyalūr list—Aśoka, Kālabhartṛi, Chūtapallava,—the coincidence becomes complete:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vēlūrpālaiyam.} & \quad \text{Vāyalūr.} \\
\text{Virakūrcha} & \quad (11) \text{Virakūrcha} \\
\text{Skandaśishya} & \quad (12) \text{Skandavarman} \\
\text{Kumāravishṇu} & \quad (13) \text{Kumāravishṇu} \\
\text{Buddhavarman} & \quad (14) \text{Buddhavarman}
\end{align*}
\]
The Velupāḷaiyam plates say that (11) Virakūrcha was the first who "grasped the complete insignia of royalty", that is to say, that his predecessors were not kings and that Virakūrcha was the first Pallava king.

In fact, with these four kings we enter into the domain of history leaving the series of legendary names behind.

The existence of a king called Virakūrcha is proved by the plate discovered at Darśi (Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 397). The existence of a king of the name of Skandaśishya is established by the Tirukkaḻukkuṟṟam inscription. [Ep. Ind., Vol. III, p. 277].

This king is identified by the Vāyalūr inscription with (No. 12) Skandavarman. This identification admits of no doubt since in both the inscriptions he is mentioned as the son of Virakūrcha, and father of Kumārabāṣṇu and grand-father of Buddhavarman.

It is to be noted that the name Skandavarman given in the Vāyalūr inscription to the second Pallava king (Virakūrcha being the first) is also the most ancient name known to history. In fact, the donor of the Mayidavōlu plates is called "Yuvamahārāja" Śivaskandavarman; the donor of the Hiraḥadagalli plates goes under the name of Śiva-Skandavarman; and the names Skandavarman and Buddhavarman figure in the grant of Chāru-dēvi that has been found in the Guntūr district (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 143).

The list:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Skandavarman} & \\
\text{Kumārabāṣṇu} & \\
\text{Buddhavarman} & 
\end{align*}
\]

is the same as the one found in the genealogy given in the Chendalūr plates (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, No. 23, p. 233) which we have supposed to be a copy of an ancient record; so we have to note that the Velupāḷaiyam and the Vāyalūr records place them among the earliest kings.

Let us now conclude by saying that with (11) Virakūrcha we deal no more with the legendary series of descendants of Pallava but with the historic line of kings.
What makes the coincidence existing between the Vāyalūr and Vēlūrpāḷaiyam records interesting is that the latter gives an important information:

«(V. 6)... Virakūrcha, of celebrated name, who simultaneously with (the hand of) the daughter of the chief of serpents grasped also the complete insignia of royalty and became famous.»

We have already concluded from this passage that Virakūrcha was the first Pallava king.

Here we have to make a remark: the Vēlūrpāḷaiyam plates together with the Vāyalūr inscription lead us to think that, in the Pallava family, there existed the following tradition which was probably perpetuated from century to century. “The earliest Pallavas were not kings, and they were alien to South India. One of them married the daughter of one of the kings of that country and thus became a king himself. Skandavarman was a son born of this marriage.”

Is it not strange that this tradition coincides exactly with the theory that we have propounded in the preceding Chapter?

A Pahlava married the daughter of the Ândhra King Śiva-Skanda and thus became the first king of the Pallava dynasty. The son born of this union was Śiva-Skandavarman.

We should not rely too much on the order of succession of the kings given in the Vāyalūr inscription after (11) Virakūrcha. It has to be noted, however, that among the early kings we find (19) Vishṇugṛpa who must be identified with Vishṇugṛpa of Kāñchī who was the adversary of Samudragupta about the year 339 A.D.

But, from which king does the order of succession given in the Vāyalūr inscription become trustworthy? I believe it is from (23) Viravarman. In fact, if we compare the Vāyalūr series with the genealogies given in the undermentioned plates:

- Ōṅgōdu No. 1 [O., 1]
- Uruvupalli [Ur.]
- Ōṅgōdu No. 2 [O., 2]
- Pikīra [P.]
- Māṅgarūr [M.]
- Chūra [C.]
- Udayendiram [Ud.]
we obtain the following table in which the numbers indicate those of the Vāyalūr list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximative dates: A. D.</th>
<th>Dates:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) Viravarman</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[O., 1] [Ur.] [O., 2] [P.] [M.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Skandavarman</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[O., 1] [Ud.] [Ur.] [O., 2] [P.] [M.] [C.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Simhavarman</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ud.] [Ur.] [Ur.] [O., 2] [P.] [M.] [C.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26) Skandavarman</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ud.] (29) Simhavarman</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[O., 2] [P.] [M.] [C.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) Nandivarman</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ud.] (30) Vishnugopa</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) Simhavarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) Simhavarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32) Simhavishnu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think that the Vāyalūr record is extremely important on account of the series:

(24) Skandavarman
(25) Simhavarman
(26) Skandavarman
(27) Nandivarman

which exactly coincides with the genealogy given in the Udayendiram plates (Ep. Ind., Vol. III, p. 142). We have already said, that, the alphabet of these plates not being ancient, we cannot say how far they can be trusted. The deciphering of the Vāyalūr inscription has shown that this genealogy is quite right and that the Udayendiram plates are a true copy of an earlier record.

The succession list:

(29) Simhavarman
(30) Vishnugopa
(31) Simhavarman
(32) Simhavishnu
unites the dynasty of Śiṅhavishṇu with that of Viṣṇugopā of the Chūra plates, (G. O. No. 920, 4th Aug. 1914, Part. II., No. 1).

The Ūruvupalli plates prove that (25) Śiṁhavarman was the brother of Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopā and that both of them were the sons of (24) Skandavarman and grandsons of (23) Viravarman.

It is probable that (24) Skandavarman did not reign at Kāṇchī, since the Ōmgōdu No. 1 plates are dated from Tāmbrapā camp.

It is also probable that his son (25) Śiṁhavarman resumed possession of Kāṇchī and confided to his brother Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopā the government of the Northern provinces (Guntūr and Nellore Districts) in which were situated Palakkada, Daśanapura and Mēnmāṭura as well as the districts of Veṅgorāṣṭra, Muṇḍarāṣṭra and Karmārāṣṭra. Viṣṇugopā was never crowned and always remained a subordinate of his brother; that is why he is called Yuvamahārāja.

His son (29) Śiṁhavarman became independent.

So there were two dynasties simultaneously: in fact, when (30) Viṣṇugopā reigned at Palakkada (Chūra plates), (27) Nandivarman reigned at Kāṇchī.

It is probable that (31) Śiṁhavarman or (32) Śiṁhavishṇu took possession of Kāṇchī.

Śiṁhavishṇu is then a descendant of the dynasty that reigned at Palakkada. That is why the Vāyalūr inscription gives first the names of the kings of the dynasty of (27) Nandivarman of Kāṇchī, and then of those of the dynasty of Palakkada.

Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopā is not mentioned in the Vāyalūr list as he was never crowned king.

In the preceding table, we have given in the margin the approximate dates of the predecessors of Śiṁhavishṇu. Starting from Śiṁhavishṇu who lived at the end of the VI century, about 590 A.D., we have given to each generation an average duration of 28 years.

This calculation seems to be correct, for we find, that, according to it, (25) Śiṁhavarman must have lived in 470 A.D. And if we can depend on what is said in the "Lokavibhāga" discovered by M. R. Ry. R. Narasimhachar, there seems to have been a king of that name in Ś. 380, i.e. 458 A.D.
Dr. Fleet has assigned the date of about 500 A.D., to the Penugonda plates, which is the date we give to (26) Skandavarman, son of (25) Simhavaran who crowned king Madhava II alias Simhavaran.

The name Simhavaran given to a king of the western Ganga dynasty shows that Aryavarman who had been crowned by the Pallava King (25) Simhavaran had married his daughter and his son Madhava II. received the name of his grandfather, the Pallava king Simhavaran.

The Vâyalûr inscription enables us to believe that the Penugonda plates belong to about 500 A.D.

In the Vâyalûr list, the predecessor of Simhavishnu is called Simhavaran, and this name is engraved very clearly. This is a remarkable fact, since it confirms what is stated in verse 10 of the Vâlârptâlaiyam plates.

« Then from the king named Simhavaran, who wiped off the pride of (his) enemies, was born the victorious Simhavishnu whose prowess was widely known on earth. »

If we admit: 1° the identity of (19) Vishnugopa with the adversary of Samudragupta in A.D. 338—and, 2° the identity of (21) Skandavarman with Skandavarman (I), of the Ómgodô No. 1 plates, we obtain the following chronology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vishnugopa</td>
<td>Vishnudasa (Kumârarishnu)</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vâyalûr</td>
<td>Skandavarman (I)</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ømgodô No. 1</td>
<td>Viravarman</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skandavarman (II)</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chûra</td>
<td>(Y. M.) Vishnugopa</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simhavaran</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vishnugopa</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simhavaran</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simhavishnu</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahendravarman I</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narasimhavaran I</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not necessary, in conclusion, to say what a flood of light the deciphering of the Vâyalûr inscription has thrown on the history of the early Pallavas: the importance of the inscription is naturally very great as it gives us the most ancient and complete list of kings.
CHAPTER III.

TELUGU ORIGIN OF THE MAHENDRAVARMAN STYLE.

The deciphering of the Vāyalūr inscription has led us to think that the genealogy of the predecessors of Simhavishṇu stood thus:

(29) Simhavaranman
(30) Vishṇugopa
(31) Simhavaranman
(32) Simhavishṇu.

It is certain that the father of Simhavishṇu was (31) Simhavaranman who seems to have been so named after his grandfather, (29) Simhavaranman. Again we have admitted the identification of (30) Vishṇugopa with the one who granted the Chûra plates, from Palakkada. It is also highly probable that (29) Simhavaranman, the donor of the No. 2 Ōṅgōdu, Pikīra and Māṅgalūr plates was not king of Kâñchī but reigned in the districts of Nellore and Guntûr. From this we have to conclude that the direct ancestors of Simhavishṇu and Mahendravarman lived perhaps in the Telugu country. We shall now proceed to show the importance of this detail.

When, last year, I wrote the first volume of "Pallava Antiquities", I was struck by the fact that king Mahendra-Vikrama whose inscriptions I copied at Pallavaram (Pall. Ant., Vol. I, Plate XXI, A.) and at Trichinopoly (Pall. Ant., Vol. I, Plate XXIII.) and who in all probability cut the caves containing these inscriptions had many surnames; such as Chivibhundurdu, Nilvilōnayyambu, Ventulavittu, Pasarambu, etc., which seem to be all of Telugu origin. Those who have studied the inscriptions at Trichinopoly (Archæological Survey of India—Annual Report for 1903-4, p. 271) and at Pallavaram (G. O., No. 538, 28th July 1909—Part II, No. 14, p. 75), have mentioned this fact, but they have not drawn any conclusion from it.
I believe that Mahendravarman I. had names of Telugu origin because he or his father perhaps reigned over the Telugu country.

Now the following important question presents itself: What was at the time of the Pallavas the line of demarcation between the Tamil and the Telugu countries?

Epigraphy has furnished an answer to this question:

« It is worthy of note that the earlier inscriptions at Tondamanād, Kālahasti, Guḍimallam, Tirupati, Tiruchchānūr and Yōgi-Mallavaram in the North Arcot district are in Tamil, though the prevailing language is at present Telugu. The same was the case at Nellore in the 12th and 13th centuries. We may, therefore, conclude that the tract comprising these villages and the southern portion of the Nellore district was originally Tamil country and the change of language into Telugu probably began during Vijayanagara times. » (G. O., Nos. 678, 679, 12th Aug. 1914, p. 7).

From the above, it follows, that at the time of the Pallavas the region now forming the Nellore district served as the frontier between the Tamil and the Telugu countries.

We have therefore to conclude that we find Telugu names in the caves of Mahendra because either Simhavishnu or Mahendra himself reigned over the country lying to the north of the modern town of Nellore. In Vol. I. of ‘Pallava Antiquities’ I have said that in the Tamil country there is not a single antiquity which could with certainty be attributed to the time anterior to that of Mahendra; I have therefore been led to think that it was this king who, by his own initiative, spread in the Tamil country a taste for sculpture in general and rock-cut temples in particular.

But whence did Mahendravarman himself get this taste for temples sculptured in rocks?

The reply can be easily found if we take the two preceding propositions together. As Mahendra reigned in the Telugu country it was probably in the banks of the Kṛishṇā that he acquired a taste for rock-cut temples; and so the Pallava Art of the time of Mahendravarman had its origin in the Telugu country.

It is but a hypothesis, but a hypothesis that can be verified by studying the art that flourished in the VI century on the banks of the Kṛishṇā. It is certain that this art existed: There are rock-cut temples at Bezwada and at Mogulrazapuram on the northern
bank of the Krishiṇā; and on the southern bank there are the
temples of Sittanavasal and Undavalli. It must however be
admitted that this art has remained quite unknown up to the
present: only, the Undavalli temple has been described not very
distinctly but in such a manner that it is impossible to form a
correct idea of the style of those sculptures.

For these reasons I thought it necessary to go and see the
caves on the banks of the Krishiṇā and particularly the temple of
Anantaśayana at Undavalli.

We know that this temple does not contain any very ancient
inscription and that the age of this monument can be ascertained
only from its architectural style.

And the authors who have handled this subject hold such
different opinions that it is very difficult to arrive at a decision on
this matter.

Sir Walter Elliot (Ind. Ant., Vol. V, p. 80) was struck by the
resemblance they bore to the sculptures at Mahābalipuram; but
there he speaks only of the general impression; this author does
not seem to have made a minute study of these monuments; at
all events, he gives no arguments in support of his thesis.

Mr. Sewell (List of Antiquities, Vol. I, p. 77) is of opinion that
it is the work of the Chālukyas. And M. R. Ry. H. Krishna Sastri
who visited these caves on the 20th and the 28th December 1908
says very correctly that it does not seem to be the work of the
Chālukyas, because, not a single cave is known to have been dug
by them (G. O., No. 538, 28th July 1909, Part II, No. 13, p. 74).

He remarks a resemblance with the Pallava sculptures:
« The ornamental designs on the tops of four of the niches in this
hall resemble very much those on the “Rathas” at Mahābalipura. »

M. R. Ry. H. Krishna Sastri remarks, however, certain points
of resemblance with the caves of Orissa and thinks that the
temple at Undavalli « might have come into existence in the
Andhra period. »

Thus we see that the opinions of the various authors differ
much. Mr. H. Krishna Sastri attributes these sculptures to the
Andhra period, i.e., the I or II century of the Christian era; Mr.
R. Sewell, on the contrary, dates them in the VII or the VIII
century. From this we may conclude that a general impression
will not do for fixing the age of these sculptures and that only a
most attentive study of the minutest details of ornamentation can lead to any adequate result.

In 1912 I visited the caves of Bādāmī which are the works of the ancient Chālukyas. I examined the style of these temples very attentively and have given my impressions about them in my book (Archéologie du Sud de l’Inde, Tome I, Architecture, pp. 173, 174, 175 and Pl. CLVIII, B). The style of these caves differs entirely from the Pallava style and there is no resemblance between them. Again, the old theory that the Chalukyan artists were the authors of the Pallava temples cannot at all be admitted and I do not believe that anybody will dream of maintaining it to-day.

It was not without curiosity that I visited the Undavalli caves. What was the style of these sculptures and what did they resemble? The Āndhra or the Chālukya or the Pallava style?

What was my surprise when I stood before those sculptures at Undavalli! The Undavalli sculptures belong entirely and even in the minutest details to the style of Mahēndravarman.

We have given a description of this style in Chapter II, Vol. I of “Pallava Antiquities”; and the resemblance between the caves of Mahēndra and those at Undavalli is so complete that there is no difference to be pointed out.

The plans are the same. The principal cave at Undavalli is a four-storied one. The ground-floor and the top floor remain all unfinished. The last story but one where the image of Ananta-sayana (Vishnu lying on a serpent) is placed, is also left unfinished. There is thus but one story that has been completed. Here the plan is very simple: they are three caves of Mahēndra placed beside one another.

The middle cave is almost in the same plan as the rock-cut temple at Pallāvaram (Pall. Ant., Vol. I, Plate XX). The right and the left caves have the same plan as the Maṇḍagapattu cave (Pall. Ant., Vol. I, p. 56) and the left cave at Māmandūr.

Besides, there are many other caves in this very rock at Undavalli; they are almost all of them in ruins but their plan is easily ascertained. It is the very simple one used in all the temples cut in the rock during the time of Mahēndra.

The pillars belong to the well-known type represented in Plates IX, XII, XIII, XV, XVI, XIX, XXI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX of Vol. I, of “Pallava Antiquities”. They are square in
section and adorned with lotus flowers as at Mahêndravâdi and Dalavânûr. The Dvârapâlas resemble neither those of Râjasimha nor those of Mahâbalipuram. They are like those found in the caves of Mahêndra. Some of them have their hand raised in sign of adoration as at Tirukkalukkunram (Pall. Ant., Vol. I, Plate XXVI), at Singavaram, at Mâmandûr and at Dalavânûr (Pall. Ant., Vol. I, Plate XVI, B). But most of them rest it on a club with the same pose that we have noticed at Trichinopoly (Pall. Ant., Vol. I., Pr. XXII), at Vallam (Pall. Ant., Vol I., Pl. VIII) and at other places: Dalavânûr, Mandagapattu, Tirukkalukkunram, Mâmandûr, Siyamangalam, etc.

The niches are ornamented with a very special kind of framework that we have noticed at Dalavânûr (Pall. Ant., Vol. I., Pl. XVI,) and at Siyamangalam (Pall. Ant., Vol.I., Pl. XVIII) and which we have called ‘double-arched tiruvatchi’ (Torana).

The shrines are empty—as elsewhere in most of the temples of Mahêndra—but there exist on the right side of the temple at Undavalli certain niches that contain lingams.

At Undavalli we find kûdus with the head of Gandharva resembling those seen in the Pallava temples (vide the kûdus of Dalavânûr represented in Pall. Ant., Vol. I, Pl. XVI, A.)

The floors of these temples are ornamented outside with pavilions resembling those at Mahâbalipuram; they are the “Kârnakûdu” and the “Śâlai” like those represented in Fig. 23 of our work on “Dravidian Architecture.”

Besides, the small niches, mentioned above, which are found to the right of the façade, are but small “Rathas”. They exactly resemble the small shrine seen in the middle of the bas-relief, “Bhagiratha’s penance,” at Mahâbalipuram. The style of architecture is identically the same.

All the authors that have spoken of the temple at Undavalli have believed that it was dedicated to Vishnu; it is not so. No doubt the Vishnu cult occupies a predominant place there but there are also many shrines dedicated to Śiva. We have already said that the small “Rathas” to the right of the façade contain lingams.

The principal image in the temple is indeed that of Ananta-śayana; but this image is found also in the temples of Śiva.

At Mahâbalipuram in particular, the bas-relief representing Vishnu lying on the serpent is not in a temple of Vishnu. It is
found in the cave near the light-house which was undoubtedly dedicated to Śiva; god Anantaśayana is represented in the same form both at Undavalli and Mahābalipuram. Unfortunately at Undavalli almost the whole of the body of the god has disappeared; it may be due either to the wear and tear of time or to the iconoclastic work of the Mussulmans. The image we now find there, is a rough figure made of cement. However, a close examination of it shows that at one time the god had his arm stretched out as at Mahābalipuram and Singavaram.

In short, the caves of Undavalli differ completely from those of Bādāmi and resemble much those of the Pallavas.

However they are not exactly like those of Mahābalipuram: Nowhere do we see the squatting lions supporting the pillars [we have said that these squatting lions should have been an invention of the artists of the epoch of Narasiṃhavarman I]; the Dwārapālas at Undavalli do not resemble those of Mahābalipuram.

On the contrary, the sculptures of Undavalli very much resemble those of the caves of Mahêndra.

(a) The plan of the caves is the same.
(b) The pillars have cubical parts ornamented with lotus flowers.
(c) The doors and the niches have a kind of framework which is different from the 'doubled-arched tiruvatchi'.
(d) The Dvarapālas have the same pose.

In short, the caves of Undavalli belong to the style of Mahêndra.

We have said above, that, during many centuries, many generations of Pallava kings had reigned over the country near the banks of the Kṛishṇā in the districts of Guntūr and Nellore. We have also observed that the caves of Trichinopoly and Pallāvaram contain the surnames of Mahêndra which are all of Telugu origin and we have supposed that Mahêndravarman I reigned over the Telugu country and imported into the Tamil country the art that existed on the banks of the Kṛishṇā.

Undavalli is in the Guntūr taluq of the Guntūr district. The caves are situated on the southern bank of the Kṛishṇā. In the absence of any inscription enabling us to know the origin of these caves, we might suppose that they are the work of the Pallavas who reigned over this country before it was conquered by the Châlukyas.
Well, that is not my opinion.

I do not think that the caves of Undavalli were dug by the Pallavas. On closely examining the sculptures, I have made a discovery which I believe will prove to be of great importance in ascertaining the origin of these temples.

On the cubical portion forming the foot of two of the pillars I have found the image of lions (Fig. 1).

At the foot of another pillar I have observed the image of a vase.

It is true that these lions resemble very much those of Śiyamangalam, an image of which is given in Vol. I. of Pallava Antiquities (Pl. XIX).

Lastly certain coins bearing the images of a lion and a vase have been attributed to the Pallavas (vide Vincent A. Smith’s Early History of India, Plate facing p. 1).

It would therefore be possible to use this argument to affirm that the caves of Undavalli are the work of the Pallavas.

My opinion, which is quite different, is that the Caves of Undavalli are the work of the Vishnukundins.

There is no doubt that this dynasty reigned on the banks of the Godavary and the Kṛishṇā before that country was conquered by the Chāluksyas. The village of Peruvāḍaka in the district of Plaki-rāṣṭra, which belonged to the Vishṇuṇuṇḍins at the time when Indravarman granted the Rāmatīrtham plates (Ep. Ind., Vol. XII., No. 17, p. 133), passed into the hands of the Chāluksya king Vishṇuvardhana I. while he was still a vassal of Pulakēśin II. (Timmapuram plates—Ep. Ind., Vol. IX., p. 317).

The Vishṇuṇuṇḍins were therefore the predecessors of the Chāluksyas in the Vengi country. One of their capitals was Lendulūru (Dendulūru in the Ellore taluq). The cradle of this family was probably Vinukoṇḍa in the Kṛishṇā district. They were fervent worshippers of the god at Śrīparvata (Śrīsailam) in the Kurnool district.

As it is certain that the Eastern Chāluksyas reigned in the Guntūr district when Sarvalōkārāya granted the village of Chandalūr in 673 A.D. (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, No. 24), we may affirm
that the Vishnukundins reigned before this epoch, probably towards the end of the VI century.

From our point of view, the Chikkula plates (Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, No. 25, p. 195) are very interesting.

1° The seal represents a lion exactly like the one we have remarked at Undavalli. The Chikkula seal is represented in Ep. Ind., Vol. IV., to face page 244. This seal is analogous to the Râmatîrtham plates which M. R. Ry. H. Krishna Sastri has described as follows:

« An advancing lion or tiger with its left fore-paw raised, its neck erect, mouth wide open and the tail swung over the back so as to end in a loop. (G. O., No. 538, 28th July 1909). »

It must be noted that coins bearing a lion and a vase are found on the banks of the Godâvary and the Krishnâ; and I am convinced that they do not belong to the Pallavas but to the Vishnukundins.

2° The village gifted away by these plates is Rûgonrâm which is situated to the south-east of the village of Râvirêva on the bank of the Krishnâ : « Rûgonrâm, which was south-east of the village of Râvirêva on the bank of the Krishnâ beîna, i.e., the river Krishnâ. »

So it is beyond all doubt that the Vishnukundins reigned on the banks of the Krishnâ.

3° The following genealogy is found in these plates:

Mâdhavavarman
Vikramêndravarman I.
Indrabhattârakavarman
Vikramêndravarman II.

We know also that the mother of Vikramêndravarman I. belonged to the family of Vâkâṭakas. Indeed, it has been said of Vikramêndravarman I. that his « birth was embellished by the two families of the Vishnukundins and Vâkâṭakas. »

On the other hand, a donation of the Vishnukundins discovered in 1914 (No. 7 of Appendix A., G. O. No. 920, 4th Aug. 1914—Part II, No. 35) shows that the name Vikramêndra is a corrupted form of Vikramahêndra.
If we remember, then, that in the Śiyamaṅgalam cave there is the image of a lion resembling the one found in the seal of the Chikkula plates, that the Undavalli sculptures resemble those of the Pallava caves, that Undavalli stands on the banks of the Krīshṇā where the Vishṇukunḍins had reigned, and that the inscriptions of Mahēndravarman I. at Trichinopoly and at Pallāvaram contain Telugu epithets, we shall be struck with these coincidences.

But there is another point of coincidence. Among the Pallava kings that have reigned before Śimhavishṇu, there is not one named Mahēndra. It would appear that this name was not hereditary in the Pallava family and that Mahēndravarman I. was really the first king of that name.

The account given of the Vāyalūr inscription in the report on Epigraphy for 1908-09 mentions Mahēndravarman (once) among the 25 predecessors of Śimhavishṇu. Now that the Vāyalūr inscription is completely deciphered, it is manifest that that name is not there, but we find the name (6) Chandravarman. Perhaps it is the ending “ndravarman” that led to the reading [Mahē]ndravarman.

In the Trichinopoly and Pallāvaram inscriptions this king is called Mahēndra-Vikrama. But then, there were Vishṇukunḍin kings who bore the name of Vikramahēndra.

In my opinion, these coincidences can all be explained in a very simple manner: The Pallavas at the end of the VI century reigned in the districts of Nellore and Guntūr; their neighbours were the Vishṇukunḍins who reigned on the banks of the Krīshṇā; Śimhavishṇu married probably the daughter of a Vishṇukunḍin king named Vikramahēndra and gave his son the name of his grand-father, Mahēndravikrama.

We know that Vikramēndravarman I. was the son of a Vākātaka princess; and the inscriptions of the Vākātaka kings are found engraved in the caves of Ajanta. It is probable that it was owing to their Vākātaka origin that the Vishṇukunḍins had the idea of digging caves on the banks of the Krīshṇā—caves that we see even now at Bezwada, Mogulrazapuram, Undavalli and Sittanagaram. The Pallava king Mahēndravarman I., who was the grand-son of a Vishṇukunḍin king, having had many occasions to admire those caves that had been dug by his relatives, had similar ones cut on the rock around Kāñchipuram.
CHAPTER IV.

THE DYNASTY OF SIMHAVISHNU.

§ I.—The Vēlūrpalaiyam plates coupled with the Vāyalūr inscription inform us that Simhavishnū was the son of (31) Simhavarman.

The Vēlūrpalaiyam plates say of Simhavishnū:

« He quickly seized the country of the Chōḷas embellished by the daughter of Kavira (i.e. the river Kāvēṟṟī), whose ornaments are the forests of paddy (fields) and where (are found) brilliant groves of areca (palms).»

From this it would appear that the Chōḷa country did not belong to the Pallavas before Simhavishnū and that it was he who conquered it.

This military operation was perhaps difficult, for it seems that all the southern kings opposed it: the Kāśākuḍi plates say, indeed, that Simhavishnū vanquished « The Malaya, Kaḷabhra, Māḷava, Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya (kings), the Siṁhala (king) who was proud of the strength of his arms, and the Kēraḷas.»

§ II.—Mahēndravarman I. is the first king about whom we have precise information.

It is probable that Mahēndra gained a victory at Pullalūra [according to the Kāśākuḍi plates]. It is thought that this town can be identified with Pullalūr (Chingleput District—Conjeeveram taluk) which is at a distance of 15 miles north of Kāṅchī. No one knows for certain who was his adversary; it is supposed it was Pulakēśin II.

The Aihole inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, No. 1, p. 11) praises Pulakēśin thus:

(V. 29) « .......... He caused the splendour of the lord of the Pallavas, who had opposed the rise of his power, to be obscured by the dust of his army, and to vanish behind the walls of Kāṅchipura.
(V. 30) « When straightway he strove to conquer the Chôlas, the Kâvêrî, who has the darting corps for her tremulous eyes, had her current obstructed by the causeway formed by his elephants whose rutting-juice was dripping down, and avoided the contact with the ocean.

(V. 31) « There he caused great prosperity to the Chôlas, Kâralas and Pândyas, he being the hot-rayed sun to the hoarfrost—the army of the Pallavas.»

We have said in the preceding chapter that the country lying between the towns of Ellore and Guntûr probably formed part of the kingdom of Mahêndra.

Again, it is certain, that, in the middle of the VII century, this country belonged to the Chãlukyas.

It is, therefore, likely that Pulakêśin II conquered it about 610 A.D., i.e., at the beginning of the reign of Mahêndravarman I.

The latter, thus dispossessed of the northern provinces of his kingdom, lived in the Tamil country during the latter part of his reign and it was then he encouraged the arts of that country as we shall presently show.

In Pallava Antiquities (Vol. I. p. 40), we have admitted with V. Venkayya (Ep. Ind., Vol. III, p. 277) that Mahêndra who was first a Jain, was converted to the Siva cult by saint Appar (Sêkkiḻâr's Periapuranam, Madras, 1870); we have also said, though without any positive proof, yet, owing to our moral conviction, that it was Mahêndravarman I. who was the author of the rock-cut temples that we have described in Chapter II. of the aforesaid book.

In the course of this year (1916-17) we have learnt much more about Mahêndravarman I.

In "Pallava Antiquities" Vol. I., I have spoken about the right side cave at Mâmândûr (ps. 53, 54, 55.). Judging from the style of Architecture, I have attributed this cave to Mahêndravarman I. and have described the inscription found there in the following terms: « Mr. E. Hultzsch who mentions this inscription (No. 38—G. O., No. 424, 20th April 1888), declares that it is "illegible". However, one important remark has to be made here: the alphabet is identically the same as that of Mahêndra-vâdi. Pl. XXVII, B. is a photograph of a small part of the inscription which will enable us to judge of the form of the characters.»
So then, relying on:
1° the style of architecture,
2° the palæography of the inscriptions,
I concluded that this cave must be attributed to Mahêndravarman I.

When I examined the inscription, it seemed to me that, though it was very much damaged, it would perhaps be possible to make something out of it.

Mr. Hultzsch, when he copied it, did not understand it, but that is not a reason why it should be abandoned for ever.

I believed that a more attentive study of it might enable us to obtain some interesting information.

So, in January 1917, I went to Mâmandûr to copy the inscription.

This labour was well rewarded:
In the midst of many incomprehensible phrases I read the words: “Mattavilâsâdipadamprahasana” (see Pl. III, A). I did not understand their meaning; but I was at once struck with the name Mattavilâsa which is a name of Mahêndravarman I. that I have seen engraved in the caves of Trichinopoly and Pallâvaram (Pall. Ant., Vol. I, p. 39); and I was glad to have discovered a new proof of what I had asserted in attributing the Mâmandûr cave to Mahêndravarman I.

I sent a copy of the Mâmandûr inscription to M.R.Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao requesting him to tell me what he made out of it.

A few days after, I received from him an article which he had published in February 1917 in the “Madras Christian College Magazine” which mentioned the following important discovery:

“Paṇḍit T. Gaṇapati Śâstri,” the curator of Śaṅskrīt Manuscripts, Travancore, has very recently discovered a manuscript called “Mattavilâsa-prahasana”.

What is very remarkable is that the author of this Śaṅskrīt poem is a king named Mahêndravarman. It is specified that this king belonged to the dynasty of the Pallavas of Kâñchi, that he was the son of Siṁhavishṇu, and that he had the surnames of: Avanibhäjana, Mattavilâsa, Guṇabhara, Śatrumalla.

As soon as I received this communication I replied to M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao by a letter dated 12th April informing him that I was very pleased with the discovery he
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A. Māmandār cave insc.

B. Kūram Siva temple inscription.

C. Kānchipuram Airāvatēśvara temple insc.
words that I had read at the end of the 6th line of the Mâmandûr inscription seemed to confirm the fact that the poet king Mahêndravarman I. was the author of the earliest rock-cut temples. Besides, as the musical inscription at Kuḍumiyamalai (Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, p. 226) is written in an alphabet resembling that of Trichinopoly (Pall. Ant., Vol I, Pl. XXIII), we may suppose that Mahêndravarman I. was also a musician.

Mr. Gopinatha Rao in his reply dated 19th April said:

« No doubt the discovery of the burlesque Mattavilâsa-pahasana is important; but what is more important is the mention of this work very definitely in the mutilated inscription of Mâmanḍûr. The musical composition discovered and copied for the Epigraphist's office by me [at Kuḍumiyamalai], is not a composition of Mahêndravarman though it belongs no doubt to the same period. It was composed by one Rudrâchârya. »

Mr. Gopinatha Rao in his reply dated 19th April said:

No doubt the discovery of the burlesque Mattavilâsa-prahasana is important; but what is more important is the mention of this work very definitely in the mutilated inscription of Mâmanḍûr. The musical composition discovered and copied for the Epigraphist's office by me [at Kuḍumiyamalai], is not a composition of Mahêndravarman though it belongs no doubt to the same period. It was composed by one Rudrâchârya.

Mr. Gopinatha Rao in his reply dated 19th April said:

No doubt the discovery of the burlesque Mattavilâsa-prahasana is important; but what is more important is the mention of this work very definitely in the mutilated inscription of Mâmanḍûr. The musical composition discovered and copied for the Epigraphist's office by me [at Kuḍumiyamalai], is not a composition of Mahêndravarman though it belongs no doubt to the same period. It was composed by one Rudrâchârya.

And in a letter dated 28th April, he added:

The inscription was apparently engraved at the instance of an unnamed king, who was a disciple of a certain Rudrâchârya and who composed these "svaras" for the benefit of his pupils. We may only suspect if the unnamed king be not Mahêndravarman, but cannot be sure of it.»

And in a letter dated 28th April, he added:

The inscription was apparently engraved at the instance of an unnamed king, who was a disciple of a certain Rudrâchârya and who composed these "svaras" for the benefit of his pupils. We may only suspect if the unnamed king be not Mahêndravarman, but cannot be sure of it.

And in a letter dated 28th April, he added:

The inscription was apparently engraved at the instance of an unnamed king, who was a disciple of a certain Rudrâchârya and who composed these "svaras" for the benefit of his pupils. We may only suspect if the unnamed king be not Mahêndravarman, but cannot be sure of it.

The village of Mahêndramaṅgalam in the subdivision of Mâvanḍûrpparīl mentioned in the inscription No. 41 of 1890 on the store-room (northern wall) of the Vardhamâna Temple at Tirupparuttikkûṇṟu (Ep. Ind., Vol. VII, No. 15, p. 115) has certainly been named after Mahêndravarman I.

The tank at Mâmandûr was named Citramēga, probably after a "biruda" of Mahêndra.

The discovery of the similarity of architectural style existing between the caves of Mahêndra and those at Undavalli and the other discovery that in the Mâmandûr cave there is mention of Mattavilâsaprahasana,—these two discoveries taken along with
others enable us to conclude that King Mahendravarman I. is one of the greatest figures in the history of Tamilian civilisation.

1° From a military point of view, he has checked at Pullalur the invasion of the Chālukyas.

2° As for religion, he has given a new impulse to Saivism.

3° As for the arts, being himself a royal artist, he has glorified poetry and music.

4° As for the plastic art, he has transported the taste for rock-cut temples from the banks of the Kṛishṇa to those of the Pālar and the Kāvēri.

5° As for the administration, he built the tanks at Mahēndra-vādi, Māmandūr, and probably also at Dalavānūr.

Mahēndravarman I. has opened a new era whose apotheosis we shall see in the reign of his son Narasiṁhavarman the Great.

§ III.—In 640, the Chinese pilgrim Huien Tsang stayed at Kāñchipuram and it is probable that this year falls within the reign of Narasiṁhavarman I. The chronology of the Chālukyas says indeed that it was about 642 that this king took possession of Vatāpi (Bādāmi).

The Kūram plates (S.I.I., Vol I., p. 152) give us information about this event. They say first that Narasiṁhavarman I. vanquished Pulakēśin in the battles of Pariyālla, Maṇimaṅgalā, Šuramāra, etc. Probably Maṇimaṅgalā is nothing but Manimangalam (Saidapet taluk, Chingleput district) which is at a distance of 20 miles from Kāñchi. In that case it would appear that the Tamil country was invaded a second time by the same Chālukyan king. For the second time Pulakēśin II. was repulsed by the Pallavas. The glorious Chālukyan emperor who had vanquished Harsha Vardhana and whose friendship had been sought by the King of Persia was thoroughly routed and his capital Vatāpi was destroyed.

In regard to this last point, all documents (Kūram, Kāśākuḍi, Udayendiram, etc.) agree. The Vēlūrpāḷaiyam plates add also a detail: Narasiṁhavarman (I) took (from his enemies) the pillar of victory standing in the centre of (the town of) Vatāpi (S.I.I., Vol II., part v., p. 511). This fact is confirmed by the inscription at Bādāmi (Ind. Ant., Vol IX) the alphabet of which is the same as that of the Pallavas and which mentions Narasiṁhavishṇu, alias Mahāmalla as also a commemorative column (Jayastambha).
Speaking of Narasimhavarman I., the Kāśākudi plates say: «Who surpassed the glory of the valour of Rāma by (his) conquest of Lāṅkā.»

This event is confirmed by the Chronicles of Ceylon (Translation of the Mahāvaṃsa by Wijesinha) and it took place after 642 A.D., because, according to these chronicles, the Singhalese prince Māṇavamma aided Narasimha in repulsing Vallabha (Pulakēsin) and the two expeditions to Ceylon took place only after that.

It was perhaps during these expeditions that Narasimha vanquished the Chōlas, Keralas, Kālabhras and Paṇḍyas as mentioned in the Kūram plates.

It is probable that the navy took part in the conquest of Ceylon, for the Mahāvaṃsa says that Māṇavamma crossed the sea in ships.

We may suppose that the port of Māmallapuram served as the naval station for the Pallava fleet. Even now Mahābalipuram serves as a landmark for all vessels.

In the first volume of Pallava Antiquities I have proved that the monuments at Mahābalipuram do not belong to the style of Mahēndra, that this town did not probably exist before the time of Narasimhavarman I., and that it is this king that founded it and gave it the name of Mahāmallapuram after his own name of Māmallā and began the cutting of the "Rathas" and "Caves" there.

I am convinced that in the year 650 A.D., the sculpturing of the rocks of Mahābalipuram was being executed.

The second expedition to Ceylon was crowned with success; the Pallava army conquered Ceylon; and Māṇavamma cut off the head of King Hattha-datta II.

In what year was Ceylon conquered? Since we know that after the capture of Bāḍāmi there were two expeditions to this island, this conquest probably took place several years after 642 A.D., and I would put it after 650 A.D.

The chronology of Mahāvaṃsa affirms that the death of Hattha-dāta and the coronation of Māṇavamma took place in 691 A.D. What value are we to attach to this information?

I think we may affirm that for the X century (900 A.D.—1000 A.D.) the chronology of Mahāvaṃsa is very correct but on condition that the dates are all reduced by 24 years.
Does this rule apply to the VII century? If we take away 24 years from 691, we get 667, i.e., 17 years more than 650.

We have said that Ceylon was conquered perhaps after 650, but it appears that it was less than 17 years after that date.

I think that the following hypotheses may be admitted:

1° Ceylon was conquered about 660 A.D., at the end of the reign of Narasimhavarma I.
2° The chronology of Mahâvaṁsa is accurate enough provided we reduce the dates by nearly a quarter of a century.

We shall have occasion later on to utilise this result.

§ IV.—The reign of Mahêndravarman II, was probably short and uneventful. The Kûram plates, dated in the time of his son, only say that his reign was prosperous and that he was a legislator « who thoroughly enforced the sacred law of the castes and the orders ».

§ V.—The Kûram plates give a long description of the military exploits of Paramêśvaravarman I. and also mention the name of his royal adversary: « He made Vikramãditya, whose army consisted of several lakshas, take to flight, covered only by a rag ».

On the other hand the Udayêndiram plates (S.I.I., Vol. II, Part III, p. 371) give us the name of the battle: « Paramêśvara-varman, who defeated the army of Vallabha in the battle of Peruvalanallûr ».

An extremely important detail, which, in my opinion, has not so far been noted well, is the date of the conflict between Paramêśvaravarman I. (called Ugrañda and Lokâditya in the inscriptions of the Kailâsanâtha temple at Kâñchîpuram, S.I.I., Vol. I.) and Vikramâditya I. (Rañarasika).

From 1910, we have been in possession of a document which gives this date with great certitude,—I mean the Gadval plates. This grant (Ep. Ind., Vol. X, No. 22, p. 101) has been made when Vikramâditya I. was encamped in the Chôla kingdom on the southern bank of the Kâvêrî.

Besides, they bear the date of the year of the reign and of the Śaka era. The exact date is incontestably 674 A.D.

We shall now proceed to determine a second point of very great importance.
Mr. Hultzsch who edited these plates has said:

« When Vikramāditya made this grant, his army had invaded
the Chōlakavishaya, i.e., the Chōla province, and was encamped
in Uragapura on the southern bank of the Kāvērī river (l. 25 f.).
In sending me the impressions, Mr. Venkayya drew my atten-
tion to the fact that Uragapura is mentioned in Kālidāsa's
Raghuvaṃśa (vi. 59) as the capital of the Pāṇḍya king, and
proposed to identify it with the ancient Chōla capital Uraiyyūr
near Trichinopoly; I rather think that Uragapura, "the snake-
city" is a poetical equivalent of Nāgapattanam (now Nega-
patam) ...........».

But, I believe that Mr. Hultzsch is entirely mistaken.

In connection with this subject I have made a discovery
which appears to me to be decisive: I have spotted the village of
Peruvalanallūr where was fought the battle between Paramēśvaravarman I. and Vikramāditya. This village is in the
Trichinopoly Taluq of the district of the same name, on the left
bank of the Kāvērī, and at a distance of 10 miles north-west of
Trichinopoly.

I am of opinion that it is not possible to doubt that the town
of Uragapuram where Vikramāditya I. was encamped is any
other place than Uraiyyur (Trichinopoly).

In the inscription of Rājasimha found at the base of the
p. 13) Paramēśvara is named « Ugradaṇḍa the destroyer of the
city of Raṇarasika ». It is to be noted that in the Gadval plates
the surname of "Raṇarasika" is given to Vikramāditya. But
which is the town designated by the words « the city of Raṇa-
rasika »?

I do not think it could be Bādāmī, for, in that case, Para-
meśvara would not have failed to assume, as his grand-father,
the title of "Vatāpikoṇḍa ".

I believe that "the town of Raṇarasika" is Uragapuram
(Uraiyyur).

The Gadval grant which was made when Vikramāditya was
encamped at Trichinopoly gives us a detailed description which
is very life-like of the third invasion of the Chālukyas into the
Tamil country.

The Pallavas are called there "The family of Māmalla" (verse 5).
How did Paramēśvaravarman I succeed in repulsing the Chāluukyas?

The Kēndūr plates (Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, No. 29, p. 205) tell us that the Chāluukyas had to contend against the Pāṇḍyas, the Chōlas, the Kēraḷas, the Kaḷabhras and the kings of Kavēra, Pārāśika, Siṃhāla. It is therefore probable that all the people of the south combined together against the invaders. The aforesaid plates themselves say that there was a confederation of three kings. One of these was perhaps the king of Kāñchi. Maṇa-vamman, the king of Siṃhāla, was probably another. The Mahāvaṃsa says that this king reigned 35 years. We have said that he ascended the throne about 660 A.D. So he must have surely reigned in 674 A.D. He had been Minister to Narasimha-varman I. and he was perhaps attached to Paramēśvaravarman I. by ties of friendship. If our suppositions are correct, by 674 A.D., only 14 years would have passed since he ascended the throne with the aid of the Pallavas. And at a time when the latter were in danger it was his duty to act according to the dictates of the simplest feelings of gratefulness.

The third king that entered the coalition against the Chāluukyas was probably the king of the Pāṇḍyas. We shall refer to this question again when we examine the history of the Pāṇḍyas later on.

It is certain that Paramēśvaravarman lived some time after the defeat of Vikramāditya, for the Kūram plates are posterior to this event, but unfortunately they are not dated.

The object of the Kūram record (S.S.I., Vol. I., p. 154) is a gift made to the temple of Śiva called Vidyāvīnīta-Pallava-Paramēśvara which had been built at Kūram by Vidyāvīnīta-Pallava.

There is a temple of Śiva now at Kūram. The Epigraphical Department have copied an inscription of Nandivarman Maharāja found in this temple (No. 38 of 1900); the writing seems to belong to the IX century, but they have not found any inscription which could be attributed to the epoch of Paramēśvaravarman I.

When I visited this place, I discovered an inscription which has not been mentioned by any one till now. I do not know how it has escaped investigation so long, seeing that it is well preserved and the letters are all cut fair and deep. This inscription which is reproduced in Plate III, is the following:
The name of the king is not given, but the alphabet employed leaves no doubt as to the antiquity of the inscription. The letters ‘Śrī’ and ‘va’, in particular, are so formed that we may say that the inscription belongs to the VII century.

So, the Śiva temple at Kūram is certainly the Vidyāvinīta-Pallava-Paramēśvara temple mentioned in the plates, but alas! in what a dilapidated condition! No doubt the adjoining maṇḍapam has been rebuilt with the old stones. As for the sanctuary itself, only the ground-work remains, which, however, enables us to know two important facts:

1° The temple was apsidal in form as the Sāhadēvaratha at Mahābalipuram.

2° The entrance into the sanctuary was set towards the west which is a peculiarity frequently seen in Pallava temples; almost all the temples of Mahābalipuram and many of the Pallava temples at Kāṇchipuram face the west.

The discovery of the temple of Paramēśvara at Kūram is important from two points of view:

1° It is interesting to identify the temple that was the object of the Kūram grant.

2° This temple is in ruins; however, what remains of it constitutes the most ancient monument in South India which is known to have been built of stones placed one above another.

§ VI.—In Chapter I of “Pallava Antiquities” we have spoken about the son of Paramēśvaravarman I., Narasimhavarman II. surnamed Rājasimha. He is perhaps the only Pallava king who had a long and peaceful reign. He does not seem to have done any thing else during his reign except loading the Śivite priests with favours and building the temples mentioned above, the Kailāsanātha temple at Kāṇchipuram, the Shore temple at Mahābalipuram and the Panamalai temple. To this list we may add the Airāvatēśvara temple at Kāṇchipuram. This temple with its rearing lions, the image of Śomāskanda and the prismatic lingam
presents all the characteristics of the style of Rājasimha. Mr. A. Bea, relying upon its general aspect, has attributed this temple to the Pallavas. However, Epigraphy has as yet furnished no proof that will allow us to classify this temple definitively among the works of the reign of Rājasimha.

This temple whose Pallava origin is doubted has never been visited, however, by the officers of Epigraphical Department. When, in January 1917, I went to Mâmandûr, I stopped at Kâñchipuram and visited all the temples there hoping to make some discovery.

The temple of Airâvatêsvara stands amidst a group of houses found opposite to the entrance of Kakhêsvara temple.

On examining this monument, I found all round the base of the temple some inscriptions which are very much damaged. One part is written in Tamil and the other in Grantha.

To the right of the entrance and at the base of the temple I found a fragment of an inscription and copied it as its importance cannot be questioned: the name Narasimha is written very clearly (vide Pl. III, C.).

§ VII.—Parmēsvaravarman II, son of Rājasimha, is probably the author of Vaikuṇtha Perumal temple at Kâñchipuram.

The temple of Vîrattânêsvara at Tiruvâdi contains an inscription (No. 56 of 1903) belonging to the reign of Parmēśvarar-Pōttaraiyar. In p. 72 of "Pallava Antiquities" Vol. I., I have spoken about the resemblance between the Vimâna of the Tiruvâdi temple and that of the Kailâsanâtha temple at Kâñchipuram. Therefore, we must perhaps attribute the Śiva temple at Tiruvâdi to King Parmēśvaravarman II. However, this temple seems to have been repaired many times (we know, from inscription 35 of 1903, that it was done during the reign of Nṛipatuṅga).

The Tiruvâdi inscription is dated in the 3rd year of the reign of Parmēśvaravarman. It is probable that his reign was short.
CHAPTER V.

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE DYNASTY OF NANDIVARMAN.

§ 1.—The Ganga-Pallava theory.

In 1887, there lived in India a gentleman who has rendered eminent service to the history of the Pallavas and whose name must not therefore be forgotten: It was Mr. J. Delafon, who was a Magistrate at Pondicherry. He discovered at Bāhūr (near Pondicherry) the plates of Nīpatuṅga and at Kāśakūḍi the plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla.

These two important discoveries are not due to chance; they are the happy result of the active and disinterested researches of a savant who studied the history and the languages of India for a long time.

Mr. Vinson, Professor in the School of Oriental Languages, Paris, has given the complete text, Sanskrit and Tamil, of the Bāhūr plates, in an article that forms part of the memoirs published by the above School for the Congress of Orientalists held in 1905. However, the works that are published in French are generally ignored by the scholars of India.

So, the Bāhūr grant came to be known only by a short summary of it given by Mr. Hultzsch in his article No 23, page 180 in Vol. IV. of Epigraphia Indica.

The text was republished a few days ago, but without translation, in Part V, Vol. II of S.I.L., p. 514.

This text is incomplete: it is the work of a Pandit who lived at Pondicherry at the time of Mr. Delafon, and in many places the transcription is defective.

I thought it necessary to give the readers of this book the translation of the Bāhūr plates. So, I requested M. R. Ry T. A. Gopinatha Rao to translate for me the Sanskrit portion of the text as published in Vol. II of S.I.L., and he has been good enough to send me the following version of it:
THE BÂHÛR INSCRIPTION.

Text.

(Please retain the text as it appears in Part V, Vol. II. of *South Indian Inscriptions*, with Mr. Kâśîapa Śāstri’s footnotes also. In addition to these, please add the following):—

1. For निगृह in l. 1 of verse 1, read निगृह.
2. The words बन्दियुज्जावन् in l. 1 of verse 11, is an incorrect reading of the passage by the original transcriber, the Paṇḍit. As it is, the passage is not clear.
3. For खण्डानि in l. 2 of the same verse, read कण्डानि.
4. For कस्वान् सम्रेः, I propose to read कस्वासम्रेः, in the battle of Kalâva or Kalâpa, a place which requires identification.
5. For सरस्यथ्री in l. 2 of verse 16, read सरस्यथ्री. The river Arichit is the same as the Ariśilâru. It is usual for the final t of Saṅskṛit words being read in Tamil countries as 1. This custom is still retained in its entirety and often in a ridiculous manner in the Malabar country. For example, in almost all Tamil inscriptions it will be found that the phrase *chandrādityavat* written as *chandrādityaval*. In Malayālam, words like *tasmdāt* is pronounced as *tasmdāl*; *kēchit, kiṃchit*, as *kēchil* and *kiṃchil* respectively. On this analogy we may argue that the Tamil name Ariśil or Arichil was Saṅskṛitised into Arichit. It must be remembered that almost all the battles between the Pallavas and the allied armies of the Pāṇḍyas and the Chōlas, were fought in the vicinity of Kumbhakōṇam, near which is also the river Ariśilâru.
6. For देववत् in l. 1 of verse 20, read देववत्. It is only then the passage makes any sense.
7. For आष्टवा in l. 2 of verse 20, read आष्टवा.
8. For द्विाःपते: in l. 2 of verse 20, read द्विाःपति:.
9. For भाषयं in l. 1 of verse 21, read भाषययं.
10. For *राकर्षेन* in l. 2 of verse 27, read *रकर्षेन*; and
11. For *स्मेधेः* in l. 2 of verse 29, read *स्मेधेः*.
Verse 1.—May Madhusūdana, whose lotus-feet are rubbed by the 
kirttas of the dēvas, who is the cause of the destruction of the Rākshasas who are dreaded by all the worlds, who is eternal and whose eyes resemble the petals of the lotus, give you prosperity.

V. 2.—........From his naval rose the lotus flower which is the origin of every (created) thing; from it came Brahmā.

V. 3.—From the lord of the world, the four-faced (Brahmā), was born Aṅgiras. From him, Bṛhaspati, the minister of Śakra (Indra), the destroyer of (the asura) Vala.

V. 4.—From him Saṁyu; from him was born Bharadvāja. From him the great archer Drōṇa, who was as powerful in battle as Indra.

V. 5.—(Then) came into existence from Drōṇa Aśvatthāman of great power who was well-versed in the use of all weapons and who was a (partial) incarnation of Pīnākin (Śiva).

V. 6.—From Aśvatthāma was born the king named Pallava. He protected every one, from the cultivators up to the kings, in the Navakhaṇḍa (the nine divisions of the earth?).

V. 7.—In his lineage were born the host (of kings), Vimala, Koṅkaṇika etc., before whom the wives of the enemies bowed, whose commands were obeyed by other kings also, who were most dear (to their subjects?) and who were ever attended by the sound ‘jaya’ (be ye victorious.)

Vv. 8-9.—After Vimala and others, having ruled the earth which is girdled by the four oceans, by their prowess had gone to heaven in celestial chariots (vimānas), there lived the king Dantivarman, who was equal to Indra (in his power), who was an intense devotee of ‘Mraadvish (= Murāri, Vishnu), who was powerful and who was worshipped by their crowns by (other) kings.

V. 10.—This sovereign, on account of his ruling the earth even in this Kaliyuga with justice and of his pouring gifts, shone like Indra.

V. 11.—(This verse is incorrect. It appears to convey the following idea in it. Nandivarman cut his enemies’ heads which resembled parcels of food offered to their souls.
which were preparing to pay a visit to the house of Yama).

V. 12.—From Dantivarman was born the powerful Nandivarman, who, singly and unaided, took the earth in battle.

V. 13.—Just as Lakshmi was (the wife) of Muradvish (Vishṇu), the queen named Śaṅkhā, who was born in the Rāṣṭra-kūta family, was the wife of Nandivarman.

V. 14.—Śaṅkhā, the queen of the king, who resembled the earth in forbearance, who was kind to the people like a mother, was resplendent as Lakshmi incarnate.

V. 15.—Nṛipatunγadēva who was esteemed for his high birth, who was lord of the three worlds, who was resplendent as the rising sun and who was victorious in the battle of Kalāva (?) was born of that queen who had intelligence, beauty, learning etc.

V. 16.—The army (of the Pallavas) which on a former occasion sustained defeat in the hands of the Pāṇḍya, was, by the grace of this king (i.e., by being led by him), able to burn down the hosts of the enemies together with the prosperity of their kingdoms, on the bank of the river Arichit.

V. 17.—This illustrious king named Nṛipatunγa though he was young (in age) was not only famous in this, but also in the other worlds, as Rāma was.¹

V. 18.—Mārttāṇḍa of Vesāli who was born in the race of Kuru and who was solicitous in protecting his subjects, was bound by obligation to this king (Nṛipatunγa.)

Vv. 19-20.—He was great in the world like the moon; in majesty etc., he resembled the ocean; he was an asylum to the world (the people) inasmuch as he afforded protection (to it) like the sun. Therefore it is but right that there should be similarity between his body and name.² Or, he is certainly a king because it is quite patent at sight (?)

¹. Just as Rāma, even as a boy, had conquered Rākshasas for Visvāmitra and become famous in this world and was held as an object of praise even by gods, Nṛipatunga became famous as a boy-warrior and king even in the world of gods.

². He is named Mārttāṇḍa (meaning the sun); he exerts his energy in protecting the country; in this act he resembles the sun which sustains life on the earth by its warmth and energy. So, Mārttāṇḍa of the Vesāli family and of the race of Kuru is akin in name and action to the sun. Here the reading has been slightly altered; instead of ḍevaḥat, I am inclined to read ḍevaḥat which makes sense.
Vv. 21-23.—He, who was increasing (the prosperity of) the Kuru race, having petitioned Nṛpatuṅga and duly obtained permission through the Secretary (ājñapti), granted to the vidyāsthāna the three villages, namely, Chētpākkam, Viḷāṅgādirēphāntam (i.e., Viḷāṅgāttūr) and Iṛiappuṇaich-chēri situated in his province (Vēśālippādi).

Vv. 24-29.—Just as Dūrjaṭi (Śiva) bore on one of his jātas (the river) Gaṅgā who was descending with a large number of waves, similarly the river of learning consisting of fourteen gunas (or divisions of knowledge) was spreading round the abode of the residents of the Bāhū-village: because it is the abode of learned men, it is called a vidyāsthāna.

This king, having given them (the learned men of Bāhūr) by his ājñapti the villages to the extent marked by the circumambulation of an elephant, freed from all taxes and protected thereby, honored himself.

The minister of the king Śri Tuṅgavarman, who has reverential awe for the commands (of the king), who is of a charitable disposition, who is held in regard by the lord of the three worlds (perhaps this refers to the king), who is famous like Bṛhaspāti (the minister of the lord of the celestials Indra), exhorts the future kings to protect this charity (made by him).

V. 30.—Dāśaya, the servant of the vidyāsthāna of the resident of Bāhū and who is himself learned in the principles of the ṣāstras, wrote this eulogistic document.

[TAMIL PORTION, LEFT UNTRANSLATED.]

V. 31.—“If equal merit accrues to both the giver of a charity and its protector, then do you protect it.”—so saying, the king Nṛpatuṅgavarman, by bowing lowly his head which bears on it the feet of Mukunda (Vishṇu), exhorts future kings.

V. 32.—The goldsmith Nṛpatuṅga, who was an ornament to the family of Uditōdita, who was well-versed in all ṣāstras and who was an hereditary servant of the Pallavas wrote this document.

The Bāhūr plates were discovered at a time when the Epigraphy of South India was yet unborn. The dynasty: Danti-
Nandi-Nripatuṅga, was quite new. No sooner had a few stone inscriptions been copied than Mr. Hultzsch tried to reconcile the new records with that of Bāhūr.

Owing to an unlucky chance, there was, among the discoveries that were made first, the Kil-Muttugūr inscription which Mr. Hultzsch has published with the following remark (Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 177):

«The inscription is dated in the eighteenth year of the reign of the king, the Victorious Narasimhavārman. The same name occurs among the Pallava kings of Kāṇchi. But the two centre figures of the bas-relief below the inscription make it impossible to attribute this record to the Pallava Dynasty, whose crest was a bull and whose banner bore a club. The elephant appears at the top of three stone inscriptions of the Western Gaṅga dynasty which have been published by Mr. Kikel, and the goose (hamsa) is said to have been the device on the banner of the mythical Gaṅga king Koṅkaṇi.»

In editing the two inscriptions of Nripatuṅga found at Ambūr (Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 180), Mr. Hultzsch has said:

«Besides, the Bāhūr plates mention among Nripatuṅga-varman’s remote ancestors Koṅkaṇika. This name seems to be a reminiscence of Koṅkaṇi, who is believed to have been the ancestor of the Western Gaṅgas.»

And again (Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 182):

«The Kil-Muttugūr inscription of the latter (Narasimhavārman) bears, however, the emblems of the W. Gaṅga kings and its alphabet is more archaic than that of the two Ambūr inscriptions of Nripatuṅga. If it is kept in mind that the Bāhūr plates represent the latter [Nripatuṅga] as a descendant not only of Pallava, but also of Koṅkaṇi, the ancestor of the Western Gaṅga kings, we are driven to the conclusion that the old dynasty of the Pallavas of Kāṇchi came to an end with Nandivarman, the opponent of the Western Chālukya king Vikramāditya II; that Narasimhavārman, a Pallava by name, but Western Gaṅga by descent, succeeded them; that two of his successors, Dantivarman and Nandivarman, were the contemporaries of the Rāṣṭrakūta kings Gōvinda III. and Amoghavarsha I; and that Nandivarman’s son, Nripatuṅgavarman or Nripatuṅga-Vikramavārman, who ruled over North Arcot,
Tanjore and Trichinopoly, discarded the emblems of the Western Gangas and adopted those of the Pallavas.

The Gaṅga-Pallava theory that has been imagined by Mr. Hultzsch is very simple; it can be summarised in a few words:

Nṛipatuṇga is not a descendant of Naṇḍīvarman Pallavamalla; he is not a Pallava; he has usurped this title; the name Koṇkaṇika, found in the genealogy given in the Bāhūr plates, proves that he is a descendant, not of Naṇḍīvarman Pallavamalla, but of certain chiefs of Western Gaṅga origin.

The whole of the Gaṅga-Pallava theory is, therefore, based on the word Koṇkaṇika. Was this name quite enough to justify the creation of a new dynasty?

Mr. Hultzsch has made a supposition, a hypothesis, based on a very weak argument, which cannot be admitted unless confirmed by other discoveries; and until this is done, it must remain what it really is, viz., a simple conjecture.

The inscriptions dated during the reigns of kings like Dantivarman (e.g., inscription No. 80 of 1898), Naṇḍīvarman (e.g., No. 72 of 1898), Nṛipatuṇga (e.g., No. 81 of 1898), ought to be classed among the Pallava inscriptions up to the time when the Gaṅga origin of Nṛipatuṇga and his ancestors is proved in an irrefutable manner.

Mr. Hultzsch has not had the discretion to do so. In his report on Epigraphy for 1897 (G. O., Nos. 1093-1096, 29th Aug. 1898) inscription No. 304 of 1897 of Vijaya-Nandivikramavarman—17th year—is classed under the head of "Gaṅga-Pallava".

So, even when there is not sufficient evidence to confirm this imprudent theory, it has received official sanction.

The Gaṅga-Pallava dynasty was ranked with the great Pallava, Chōla and Pāṇḍya dynasties.

For that, and that alone, Mr. Hultzsch deserved to be reproached.

He had every right to imagine that Nṛipatuṇga was of Gaṅga origin and write in the "Epigraphia Indica" the sentences we have quoted.

But he had no right to put during 6 years (from 1897 to 1904) a great number of inscriptions in the Gaṅga-Pallava category, as if the existence of this dynasty had been completely established.

First of all, it must be proved:
1° that Nṛpatuṇḍga was actually descended from a king named Koṅkaṇika;
2° that the above Koṅkaṇika was no other than the Gaṅga king Koṅkani;
3° that Nṛpatuṇḍga was not also a descendant of Nandivarman Pallavamalla.

M. Hultzsch seems to have thought such proofs useless: similarity of names, vague suppositions, unfounded identifications based on imaginary genealogies, all these have formed a respectable whole for enabling him to consider the Gaṅga origin of Nṛpatuṇḍga as something conclusively proved.

It was not necessary, since then, to prove the Gaṅga-Pallava theory; the hypothesis of Mr. Hultzsch need not be confirmed by other discoveries: *it was true by supposition.*

So, we have to lay much stress on the fact that "*the Gaṅga-Pallava theory has been admitted without any demonstration.*"

We have so far examined "The Hultzsch theory." We shall now enter into the second stage and examine what we may call "The Venkayya theory."

In editing the inscription of Dantivarman found at Triplicane, V. Venkayya has written (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. VIII, No. 29, p. 291):

«The [inscription..........is dated during the reign of King Dantivarma-Mahārāja, who was "the ornament of the Pallava family" and belonged to the Bhāradvāja-gōtra. There is thus no doubt that he belonged to the Pallava dynasty.»

In his report on Epigraphy for 1905-06 (*G. O.* No. 492, 2nd July, 1906) V. Venkayya mentions inscription No. 541 of 1905 dated during the «reign of Dantivarman of the Pallavatilaka family, which sprang from the Bhāradvāja-gōtra»: «From other inscriptions we know that the queen of a certain Nandippōta-raiyan of the Pallavatilaka family lived as late as the time of the Gaṅga-Pallava king Nṛpatuṇḍga and the reign of the Chōla king Rāja Kēsarivarman (Annual Report for 1900-01, paragraph 10). Consequently, the original Pallavas of Conjeeveram seem to have continued in some form or other long after the defeat of Nandivarman Pallavamalla by the Western Chalukya Vikrama-māditya II., when they apparently ceased to be the dominant power in Southern India. The political relationship of the Pallavas to the Gaṅga-Pallavas, who gradually took their place, is not known.»
So V. Venkayya lays down a principle: «When, in an inscription, a king is said to belong to the Pallava dynasty—there is no doubt that he belonged to the Pallava dynasty.»

Applying this principle, V. Venkayya affirms that kings like Dantivarman of Triplicane and Tiruvelḷaiṟai and Nandippōttaraiyaṉ “of Pallavatilaka family” are really Pallavas, and that, therefore, the Pallava dynasty has continued to exist after the death of Nandivarman Pallavamalla.

If V. Venkayya had been logical, he would have carried his conclusions further. In the Bāhūr plates, it is distinctly stated that Danti, his son Nandi and his grandson Nripatun̄ga are all descended from the Pallavas and belong to the Bhāradvāja-gōtra.

If here V. Venkayya had applied the principle laid down by him, he would have said of Nripatun̄ga: «There is thus no doubt that he belonged to the Pallava dynasty.»

But V. Venkayya could not agree to it. The name Koṅkaṇika found in the genealogy given in the Bāhūr plates has been considered by Mr. Hultzsch as positive proof of the Gaṅga origin of Nripatun̄ga. It is not therefore possible to doubt it. The descendants of Nandivarman Pallavamalla could not therefore be identified with the ancestors of Nripatunga; there were therefore two different dynasties reigning at the same time.

Then, V. Venkayya created a new theory founded on the following principles:

1° The Pallava dynasty existed after Nandivarman Pallavamalla. Dantivarman of Triplicane and Nandippōttaraiyaṉ are their representatives. They differ from the “Gaṅga-Pallavas” by their epithets “Pōttaraiyaṉ,” “pōtavarman” [pōta in Saṅskrit and pōttu in Tamil mean ‘the sprout (of a plant)’ and are thus synonymous with pallava, “a sprout”—S.I.L., Vol. II, p. 341]. “Pallava-kula-tilaka”: “The title Pallava-Kulatilaka of the former (Dantivarman) which occurs in the Triplicane inscription might have furnished the family name Pallavatilakakula of his successors, which must have been invented in order to distinguish them from the rising Gaṅga-Pallavas (G. O. No. 492—2nd July 1906).”

2° At the same time there existed a dynasty of chiefs of Gaṅga origin, such as Narasimhavarman of Kīl-Muttugfir, Danti, Nandi and Nripatun̄ga of Bāhūr. These chiefs have succeeded
by degrees in supplanting the true Pallavas. They are distinguished by the prefix "Vijaya" or the suffix "Vikramavarman".

When V. Venkayya enunciated this theory, there was but one person who strongly protested against it.

In an article published in April 1907 in the "Christian College Magazine" under the heading "The Pallavas and the Gaṅga-Pallavas"—M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao, Superintendent of Archæology, Travancore State, Trevandram, has enunciated the following propositions:

1° The Gaṅga origin of Nṛipatunğa which « has been treated » as a sort of axiomatic truth by later epigraphists (p. 1) » is a wrong supposition.

2° There existed but one dynasty, that of the Pallavas; the descendants of Nandivarman Pallavamalla must be identified with the ancestors of Nṛpatunğa.

3° Dantivarman, the grand-father of Nṛpatunğa is the son of Nandivarman Pallavamalla.

The last hypothesis is very remarkable. M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao was the first to affirm that Pallavamalla was the father of Dantivarman. So, the genealogy of the Pallavas stands thus:

```
Nandivarman Pallavamalla
   | Dantivarman
   | Nandivarman
   | Nṛpatunğa
```

However, no one cared for what was said by M. R. Ry. Gopinātha Rao. V. Venkayya continued to maintain his own opinion, and the public, relying on the authority of the Government Epigraphist, continued to believe in Gaṅga-Pallavas.

This was in 1907. Ten years have rolled on since and new discoveries have only confirmed in a striking manner the theory of M.R.Ry. T.A. Gopinatha Rao.

1° Although we possess a large number of documents, we have not as yet found any proof of Nṛpatunğa being related to Narasiṁhavarman of Kil-Muttugfr or to the Gaṅgas.

2° In none of the numerous known inscriptions has it been possible to find the least trace of any internal struggle enabling
us to believe that the Gaṅga-Pallavas supplanted the descendants of Nandivarman Pallavamalla. There has been no civil war, no revolution, no dissension in the Pallava Kingdom.

3° The inscriptions of the Pallavas and the so-called Gaṅga-Pallavas are found scattered all over the country, and it must be admitted that these two different dynasties reigned over the same country at the same time:

«There would be an insuperable difficulty in locating these two contemporary dynasties in proper geographical regions.» (The Pallavas and the Gaṅga-Pallavas—p. 8).

4° It has been proved that Nṛpatuṅga had the name that marks his Pallava origin: «The ending “pōttaraiyar” which is applied to [Nṛpatuṅgappōttaraiyar of the Valuvūr inscription No. 68 of 1908] without the characteristic prefix Kō-viśaiya, makes it suspicious if we could include his name among the Gaṅga-Pallavas (G.O. No 538, 28th July 1909).»

Moreover, the discovery of the Vēḻūṟpāḷaiyam plates has shown (G.O. No. 832, 28th July 1911) that the descendants of Nandivarman Pallavamalla had the prefix Kō-vijaya and the suffix Vikramavarman added to their names.

The same Vēḻūṟpāḷaiyam plates have proved the following genealogy in an incontestable manner:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Nandivarman-Pallavamalla} \\
\mid \\
\text{Dantivarman} \\
\mid \\
\text{Kō-vijaya-Nandivikramavarman.}
\end{array}
\]

If we bear in mind, that, in 1907, i.e., 4 years before the discovery of these plates, M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao had affirmed that Dantivarman was the son of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, we shall see the barrenness of the Gaṅga-Pallava theory and the fecundity of the theory propounded by M. R. Ry. Gopinatha Rao.

And still, up to this time, it has been possible to doubt it, as the conclusive argument in favour of Mr. T. A. Gopinatha Rao’s theory has not been found. What was, in fact, the origin and basis of the Gaṅga-Pallava theory? It was the name Koṅkaṇika in the genealogy given in the Bāhūr plates.

Mr. Hultzsch said, and V. Venkayya repeated with him, «Nṛpatuṅga is not a Pallava; he is a Gaṅga because he is descended from Koṅkaṇika». That was the only reason. M.R.Ry.
T. A. Gopinatha Rao said that that reason was good for nothing; he gathered proofs to try to demolish the Gaṅga-Pallava theory, but its supporters retorted, « Nṛipatuṅga is not a Pallava; he is descended from Koṅkaṇiṇa.»


Rao Sahib H. Krishna Sastri then says distinctively: « Against this, the only objection is the ancestry which, in the » one case includes the clear Western Gaṅga name (or surname) » Koṅkaṇiṇa, while in the other it does not. »

To-day (June 1917) this objection does not exist any more: the deciphering of the Vāyalūr inscription has cleared all doubt.

We have said in Chapter II of this book that the Vāyalūr inscription gives us a complete genealogy of the ancestors of Narasiṁhavarman II (Rājasiṁha).

After Pallava, Aśoka, Harigupta, Āryavarman and some others, we have the following series: Kālinda, Byāmalla, [E]ka-
malla, Vimala, Koṅkaṇiṇa, Kālabharti, Chūtapallava, Vīrakūrcha.

We have reproduced in Pl. II the estampage of this part of the inscription.

We have said that the presence of names of Western Gaṅga origin, such as, Āryavarman and Koṅkaṇiṇa, in a genealogy of the Pallavas engraved on stone in the VII century, shows the political relations and perhaps also the bonds of affinity that existed between the Western Gaṅgas and the Pallavas in the VI century of the Christian era. The Penugonda plates (G.O., No. 920, 4th Aug. 1914, Part II, No. 4, p. 86) confirm this hypothesis, as they say that the grandson of Koṅkaṇivarman who was called Āryavarman was installed on the throne by the Pallava king Siṁhavarman and that perhaps he married the daughter of this Pallava king since we see that his son was named Siṁhavar-
man. The son of Siṁhavarman, alias Madhava II, was Koṅkaṇi-
varman II alias Avinita [Śrīṅgēri plates—Mysore Archæological Report for 1916, p. 33.]
Genealogy of the W. Gangas.

A.D.

420  Konkanivarman (I).

450  Madhava (I).

480  Aryavarman (installed on the throne by Simhavarman, a Pallava king).

510  Simhavarman alias Madhava (II) (installed by Skandavarman, Pallava). (Penugonda plates).

540  Konkanivarman (II) alias Avinita  
[Śringeri plates—Mysore Report for 1916, p. 33.]  
[E.C. 10, Mālūr 72.]

580  Druvinita  
(Mulbagal plates—Mysore Report for 1916, p. 44.)  
[Gummareddipura plates—Mysore Report for 1912 dated the 40th year.]

We have proved with the help of the Vāyalur inscription that the names Vimala and Koṅkanīka existed in the Pallava genealogy from the VII century.

The presence of these names in the Bāhūr genealogy goes only to confirm the purely Pallava origin of Nṛipatunga.

Thus then, from the moment that the Vāyalur inscription was deciphered, the Gaṅga-Pallavas ceased to exist; full light has been thrown on the dynasty of Nṛipatunga; the truth is seen to be clear and simple, and it can be summed up in the following words: M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao was right in affirming that—

1° in the VIII and the IX centuries there existed but one dynasty, that of the Pallavas;

2° the Vēḻurpālaiyam plates coupled with those of Bāhūr give us the following genealogy:

Nandivarman (Pallavamalla).

Dantivarman

Nandivarman (donor of the Vēḻurpālaiyam plates).

Nṛipatunga (donor of the Bāhūr plates).
§ 2. Chronology.

Let us first determine the duration of each reign. This question presents no difficulties in regard to Dantivarman and Nṛipatūṅga.

The inscription (No. 262 of 1904) at Tiruchchāṅūr is dated in the 51st year of Dantivarman. That implies a long reign and we shall admit that Dantivarman reigned little more than 51 years.

It is certain that Nṛipatūṅga reigned 26 years, for the inscriptions of this king, which are very numerous, do not go beyond the 26th year.

The question is not so simple in the case of the two other kings. We know, as a matter of fact, that both of them bear the name of Nandivarman.

How to distinguish the one Nandi from the other? and how long did each of them reign?

I hold a very definite opinion on this subject. I shall now proceed to prove my proposition, which is quite different from what has been imagined till now. I am the first to enunciate it and I strongly affirm it as I am quite convinced of it.

Nandivarman Pallavamalla reigned 62 years. His grandson reigned for about 24 years.

My demonstration is based on the Taṇḍantottam plates.

In the 58th year of his reign, a king Vijaya-Nandivikramavarman has made this grant (S.I.I., Vol. II, Part V, No. 99, p. 517).

These plates have been, till now, attributed to the king that granted the Vēḻurpāḷaiyam plates, viz., to the son of Danti. My opinion is quite the reverse.

The donor of the Tandantottam plates is Nandivarman Pallavamalla. Here are my reasons for thinking so:

1° From the palæographic point of view:

(a) If the donor of the Taṇḍantottam plates were the same as the donor of the Vēḻurpāḷaiyam plates, as the first is dated in the 58th year and the second in the 6th year, the alphabet of the Vēḻurpāḷaiyam plates must be more archaic: but it is just the reverse: The alphabet of the Tandantottam plates is more archaic than that of the Vēḻurpāḷaiyam plates.

In the Saṃskṛit portion of the Taṇḍantottam plates, the letters, ā, kha, ga, da, dha, na, ya, va, ēa, sa, ha, nā, mu, tē, to,
show signs of archaism, when compared with the corresponding letters in the Velupalaiyam plates.

It is the same case with the Tamil letters: ्ñā, ्ta, ्na, ्ya, ्la, ्tā, ्nā, ्yī, ्mū, ्lai, ्ko, ्to.

It must therefore be admitted that the Nandi of the Tanḍanṭottam plates was a predecessor of the Nandi of the Velupalaiyam plates.

(b) If, instead of examining the letters separately, we observe the general aspect of the writing, we shall find that the Tanḍantottam plates remind us of the Kāsākūḍi plates, whereas the Velupalaiyam plates resemble those of Hastimalla found at Udayendiram. For example, vertical lines predominate in the Tanḍantottam plates; besides that, the secondary ्i is almost circular; on the contrary, the vertical lines are scarcely visible in the Velupalaiyam plates and the secondary ्i is semi-circular.

(c) If, instead of comparing the plates, we view them individually, we are led to the following considerations:

If we suppose that the Tanḍantottam plates were dated in the 58th year of the reign of the son of Danti, they would evidently belong to the end of the IX century.

We know, in fact, that Danti was vanquished about 804 A.D. by Govinda III (G. O. No. 919, 29th July 1912, p. 59, Part II, No. 7). Granting that this date falls at the end of Danti's reign and that he died in 805, the 58th year of the reign of his son would be 805 + 58 = 863.

So, if we admit that the Tanḍantottam plates are dated in the reign of Nandi, son of Danti, they would be dated 863 or some years after, i.e., at the end of the IX century. There would then be a difference of 50 years between them and the plates of Bānā King Hastimalla (S.I.I., Vol. II, Part III, plate facing p. 385.)

Any one who has a look at the Tanḍantottam plates (S.I.I., Vol. II, Plate XVIII) will, I think, admit that the alphabet of the Tanḍantottam plates is much too archaic to be attributed to the second half of the IX Century (about 870).

I think that these plates are one century older and belong to the second half of the VIII century (about 775).

2° A reign of more than half a century is rare in history; and there is no room to doubt that the inscription (No. 10 of 1895) at Pañchapāṇḍavamalai dated in the 50th year of the reign of
Nandippottarasar belongs to the same reign as the Taṇḍantōttam plates which are dated in the 58th year of the reign of Nandi.

If then this king was the son of Danti, it must be admitted that the Paṇchapaṇḍavamalai inscription belongs to the second half of the IX Century. I think it is absolutely impossible to do so. The alphabet of this inscription is archaic: for example, in the latter half of the IX century, the letter va began with a curve; in the Paṇchapaṇḍavamalai inscription there is no curve (Vide Plate: Ep. Ind., Vol IV).

3° From the genealogical point of view, we know that there was only one Pallava prince who was called Hiraṇyavarman. The inscription (No. 37 of 1888) on the wall of the southern verandah in the Vaikuntha-Perumāl temple at Kāṇchipuram leads us to believe, and the Kāśākuḍi plates say very clearly, that this prince was the father of Nandivarman Pallavamalla.

And the Taṇḍantōttam plates say distinctly that Nandivarman, the donor, is the son of Hiraṇyavarman.

There is therefore no room for any doubt. Nandivarman, son of Hiraṇyavarman, who, in the 58th year of his reign, made the Taṇḍantōttam grant is no other than Nandivarman Pallavamalla.

4° When Nandivarman Pallavamalla granted, by the Kāśākuḍi plates, the village of Koḍukolli, it received the new name of Ėkadhiramaṅgalam; from this we may conclude that Pallavamalla was surnamed Ėkadhīra.

And Nandi, the donor of the Taṇḍantōttam plates, is designated in verse 4 of these plates by the surname Ėkadhīra.

M. R. Ry. H. Krishna Sastri says: "Dantivarman mentioned in No. 88 of Appendix C from Tiruvellai is reported to have belonged to the Brahma, kṣattra family and to have been entitled Pallava-Mahārāja. Evidently, the double name Dantinandivarman has to be understood in the sense of Nandivarman, son of Dantivarman......The title Pallava-Mahārāja borne by him, may point to the fact that he was a Pallava king, and perhaps identical with Nandippottaraiyar of the Tiruchchennambūṇḍi inscription, No. 283 of 1901, "who was victorious at Teḷḷāṟu."

This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that the inscriptions of the victor of Teḷḷāṟu are written in an alphabet which is not
archaic enough to be attributed to the epoch of Nandivarman Pallavamalla.

Besides, the Nandikkalambagam gives a description of the victor of Tēlḷāṟu which cannot apply to Nandivarman Pallavamalla.

And M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao, relying upon the fact that a certain Kāduvetti-Tamilappēraraiyān was a contemporary of both the victor of Tēlḷāṟu and Nṟipatuṅga, concluded, as early as 1907 (Madras Christian College Magazine April 1907, page 8), that the former (Nandi) was the father of the latter (Nṟipatunga).

It is therefore probable that the Victor of Tēlḷāṟu was the son of Dantivarman and the father of Nṟipatuṅga.

As, on the other hand, we do not know of any inscription of this king dated after the 22nd year of his reign, we may conclude:

1° Nandivarman Pallavamalla reigned 62 years.
2° Nandivarman Tēḷḷāṟṟēṇḍa reigned only a little more than 22 years.

As I am convinced that the Gudimallam inscription (No. 229 of 1903) is dated in the 23rd year of the reign of this latter king, [the alphabet of this inscription mostly resembles that of the inscription No. 228 of 1903 dated during the reign of Nṟipatuṅga] I think we can give him a reign of about 24 years.

The inscription of Tiruvallam (No. 76 of 1889) being dated in the 62nd year of the reign of Nandi, we come to the conclusion that Nandivarman Pallavamalla reigned 62 years.

We have now determined the duration of the reigns:
Nandi-Ekadhiṇa-Pallavamalla: 62 years.
Dantivarman: 51 years.
Nandi-Tēḷḷāṟṟēṇḍa: 24 years.
Nṟipatuṅga: 26 years.

It would be desirable to know approximately when these kings reigned.

We can at once say for certain that they have reigned after the VII and before the IX Century.

1° Pallavamallā began to reign after the VII century.

In the preceding chapter, we have established, in an irrefutable manner, the fact that Paramēśvaravarman I. repulsed the Chāḷukyās in A.D. 674. Here we have a correct date. And
between this and the accession of Nandivarman Pallavamalla there have passed away:

(a) the end of the reign of Paramēśvaravarman I;
(b) the whole of the reign of Narasimhavarman II. (Rāja-simha), which was probably long enough;
(c) the reign of Paramēśvaravarman II., which was probably short.

I think these events must have taken 40 years, and so I conclude that it is unlikely that Nandivarman Pallavamalla began to reign before 716 or 717.

2° Nripatunga's reign came to an end before 900.

(a) Inscription No. 28 of 1903 is dated in the 24th year of the reign of Nripatuṅga, during the reign of his feudatory, the Bāna king Vāṇavijjādhara; and the inscription No. 223 of 1903 is dated during the reign of the son of the Bāna king and in the Śaka year 820, i.e. 898 A.D. We must therefore conclude that the 24th year of Nripatunga's reign is anterior to 898 and that the 26th and last year is before 900.

(b) Inscription No. 735 of 1905 at Grāmam assures us that the Chōla king Parantaka I. began his reign in the first half of 907. (G.O. No. 492, 2nd July 1906, p. 68).

The year 906 is therefore the last year of the reign of his father Āditya I. But the Tirukkalukkuṇṭam (Ep. Ind., Vol. III., p. 277) and the Brahmadeśam (No. 230 of 1915) inscriptions are dated in the 27th year of a king called Rājakēsarivarman, who must unquestionably be Āditya I., for he is the only king named Rājakēsari who was able to reign so long before Rāja-rāja. It is thus certain that Āditya I. ascended the throne about 880.

This king, who was surnamed Toṇḍai-māṇḍarūr-Tuṇjiṇa-Uḍaiyār gave his donations, in the North Arcot District, in the 21st and the 22nd years of his reign (G.O. No. 503, 27th June 1907, p. 71, part II, No. 29.) There is no doubt that this king was Āditya I., for an error that had been made in the donation was rectified during the reign of his son Parantaka I.

It is thus established that the Pallava empire was conquered by Āditya I. before the 21st year of his reign, i.e., before 900 A.D.

So, it is between 717 and 900 that we must put the four reigns: Nandi, 62 years; Danti, 51 years; Nandi, 24 years; Nripatunga, 26 years.
The length of these four reigns put together gives a period of \( 62 + 51 + 24 + 26 = 163 \) years, and from 715 to 900 there are 185 years.

I therefore consider the following result as something certain:

The coronation of Nandivarman Pallavamalla took place between 717 & 737.

- Dantivarman do. 779 & 799.
- Nandi of Teḷḷāru do. 830 & 850.
- Nṛipatuṅga do. 854 & 874.

These figures are confirmed by the following two facts which we shall prove later on:

1° Nandivarman Pallavamalla was vanquished by the Chāluṃkyas about 741.
2° Dantivarman was vanquished by the Rāshtrakūṭas about 803.

If we now take the average of the two dates in which these kings might possibly have been crowned, we find that:

Nandivarman Pallavamalla was crowned in cir. A.D. 727.
Dantivarman do. do. 789.
Nandi of Teḷḷāru do. do. 840.
Nṛipatuṅga do. do. 864.

These figures may be considered to be approximately correct, allowing for an error of 10 years, more or less. This result must be considered sufficient.

I believe, however, that these 10 years can be taken away from the figures I have given above. I give below the reasons that have led me to this conclusion:

1° The Ambūr inscriptions (Nos. 7 and 8 of 1896—Vide also Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, pp. 182 & 183) which are dated in the 26th and last year of the reign of Nṛipatuṅga mention Pirudi-Gaṅgaraiyar as a contemporary of this king.

It is probable that this Pirudi-Gaṅgaraiyar is no other than Prithvipati I. whose last known date is 879. If we admit that the 26th year of Nṛipatuṅga almost coincides with this epoch, we must admit that Nṛipatuṅga ascended the throne about 854, which is 10 years before the approximate date we have given to it.

2° Inscription No. 222 of 1911, dated in the second year of Rājakēsarivarman and found at Tirunāgēsvaram in the Tanjore
district, has been attributed by M. R. Ry. H. Krishna Sastrī to Āditya I.

Inscriptions Nos. 101, 104, 105, 127, 130 and 133 of 1914 have been admitted by Diwan Bahadur L. D. Swamikannu Pillai (G.O. No. 1260, 25th Aug. 1915, p. 72, Appendix F.) to be “earlier than 907 A.D.” and attributed by M. R. Ry. H. Krishna Sastrī to Āditya I. (Part II, No. 20, p. 96, of the same Report).

These inscriptions are dated in the 5th, 6th, and 7th years of his reign and are engraved in the temple at Tiruvejumbur in the Trichinopoly district.

If, then, we admit that these inscriptions are dated during the reign of Āditya I., we must also admit that this king was from the very beginning of his reign, i.e., in 882 (2nd year of his reign) and 885 (5th year of his reign) the supreme lord of the districts of Tanjore and Trichinopoly.

But we must also bear in mind that Nṛipatuṅga reigned at Kāṇḍiyūr, near Tanjore, in the 21st year of his reign (insc. No. 17 of 1895) and that in the 22nd year he reigned at Lālgudi (insc. No. 83 of 1892) and at Kōvilađi (insc. Nos. 300 and 301 of 1901) which are situated not far from Tiruvejumbur near Trichinopoly.

Thus then, the districts of Tanjore and Trichinopoly formed the kingdom of Nṛipatuṅga at the end of his reign and of Āditya at the beginning of the reign of the latter.

My impression is that Āditya I. began to reign after the death of Nṛipatuṅga who ceased to reign about 880. He should therefore have ascended the throne in 854, i.e., 10 years before the approximate date (864) we have fixed for it.

3° The Udayendiram and the Kāśākuḍi plates which are dated in the 21st and the 22nd year respectively of the reign of Nandivarman Pallavamalla do not mention the Chālukyan invasion that took place about 741. We may therefore conclude that those years of that king’s reign are anterior to this event, and that Nandivarman Pallavamalla began to reign before 719-720.

For these reasons, I think that the approximate dates we have settled must be reduced by 10 years and I therefore fix the following chronology:

Nandivarman-Pallavamalla: from 717 to 779 A.D.
Dantivarman: " 779 to 830 "
Nandi of Teḷḷāru: " 830 to 854 "
Nṛipatuṅga: " 854 to 880 "
§ 3. The History of the Pāṇḍyas.

We have said that, about 741, during the reign of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, there was a Chālukyan invasion and that about 803, king Dantivarman became a tributary of the Rāshtrakūṭas.

Apart from these two events, I believe that most of the wars that the Pallavas had to wage were against the Pāṇḍyas; so, in writing the history of the Pallavas we must speak of the Pāṇḍyas.

We shall begin the history of the Pāṇḍyas by putting the genealogy of Vēlvikuṭi by the side of that of the two Śīnṇamaṇḍūr as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vēlvikuṭi grant</th>
<th>[Report for 1908]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Kadungōn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Māravarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avaniśulāmaṇī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Śeḻiyāṉ Śēndan - 1) Jayantavarman</td>
<td>Smaller Śīnṇamaṇḍūr plates [Report for 1907]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Arikēsarīn</td>
<td>2) Arikēsarīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Māravarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Māravarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Kōchchādaiaṇ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Ter Māran</td>
<td>1) Arikēsarīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parāṅkuśaṇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Jatila</td>
<td>2) Jatila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parantāka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Rājasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Varaguṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Māra, Ėkavīra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Srivallabha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parachakakolaḥa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first king that seems to be a little known to fame is No. 4 Arikēsarīn Māravarman.

The Vēlvikuṭi plates say: «He overcame the ocean-like army of Vilvēli at the battle of Nelvēli and conquered the army of the king of Kērala»; and the Tiruttodattogai of Sundaramūrti Nāyaṇār (verse 8) mentions a king named “Neḍumāran, who was victorious in the battle of Nelvēli,” who was first a Jain,
was afterwards converted to Śivism by Tiruṅṇaṇasambandar and became one of the 63 devotees. If therefore this saintly king is identified with No. 4 Māravarman, he will be the contemporary of Sambandar. The latter was a contemporary (Periyapuranam—p. 318) of Śiruttoṭḍa - Nāyaṇar who conquered Vatāpi with Narasiṁha-varman I. King No. 4, Māravarman would therefore have lived about 650.

His son, No. 5 Kōchchadaiyan would have lived about 675. The Vēḻvikuḍi plates say of him: « He destroyed at Marudūr the ocean-like army and at the great city of Maṅgalapuram the Mahāratha was overcome and destroyed. » This victory at Marudūr, this ocean of enemies, this “ Mahāratha ”, what are all these?

We have said just now that Kōchchadaiyan lived probably about 675. Strange coincidence! It is precisely in 674 that Vikramāditya I. was encamped at Uragapuram, i.e., at Trichinopoly. And the Kēndūr plates (Ep. Ind. Vol. IX, No 29, p. 205) say that Vikramāditya I. fought with the Pândyas; we have also supposed that the Pândya king was one of the three confederates who gained the victory at Peruvāḷanallūr. The “ Mahāratha ” will then be the Chālukyan king.

The son of Kōchchadaiyan was Rājasimha. Here we find a new coincidence: we have supposed that Kōchchadaiyan and Paramēśvararvarman I. were friends allied together against Vikramāditya. The son of Kōchchadaiyan and the son of Paramēśvararvarman I. both bore the same name of Rājasimha. This can be explained by supposing that the Pallava prince Rājasimha (who was a lion to his enemies, probably the Chālukyas) fought under the orders of his father, Paramēśvararvarman I., on the side of Kōchchadaiyan; Kōchchadaiyan married the daughter of Rājasimha and the son of the Pândya king was given the name of his grandfather, the Pallava king.

There again we shall find a new coincidence:

The Udayendiram plates (S.I.I. Vol. II, part III, p. 376.) say that Nandivarman Pallavamalla faced a great danger. He was attacked by the Pallava prince Chitramāya and other princes among whom was the Pândya king who fought the battle of Man-ṇaikudi. Nandivarman Pallavamalla repulsed his enemies in the battle of Gaṅburgrama.
Since Pallavamalla seems to have been an usurper, it is probable that Chitramâya was no other than the heir to Paramêśvaravarman II., who had called his relative Râjasimha Pâṇḍya to help him.

As Kôchчаdaiyan lived at the end of the VII century, his son Râjasimha lived in the first half of the VIII century at the time when Nandivarman Pallavamalla usurped the throne.

Let us now examine the Vēlvikuḍi plates; from the Tamil portion, we learn that the son of Kôchchađaiyan gained a victory at Maññikurichchi (perhaps Maññakuridi) over the Pallavas; and the Sañskrit portion says that Râjasimha «defeated in battle King Pallavamalla». Here, there is no room for any doubt, as the name of the king is stated clearly.

Again, the “bigger” plates of Śiññanaṁûr say that Mâravarman Arikēsarîn Parâńkusa subdued the Pallavas at Sañkaramaṅgai, a village which has been identified by V. Venkayya with Sañkaragraṁa.

These events took place in the first half of the VIII century. It is also natural to identify Jatila Parântaka, son of Arikēsarîn Parâńkusa Râjasimha, with Mâraṅjâdaiyan Parântaka of the inscriptions (Nos. 453 and 454 of 1906) found in the Āṇaimalai cave which give 769-70 as the exact date of this king.

This identification is justified by the fact that the poet who composed the Āṇaimalai verses was called Mârângari, alias, Madhurakavi Mûvêndamaṅgalappêraraîyan, exactly as the «Âjâñe» who composed the Vēlvikuḍi record. Both of them lived at Karavandapura: We may therefore conclude with V. Venkayya that these two personages are but one and the same.

Jatila - Parantâka according to the Vēlvikuḍi plates «conquered the Kâḍava in battle at Peñnâgaḍam on the southern bank of the Kâvēri; the Âyavēl and the Kuṟumbas at the battle of Nâttukkuṟumbu.»

We know that the Pallavas were also called Kâḍavas.

Jatila is probably the donor of the Madras Museum Plates, the king mentioned in the Tirupparaṅkuṟam and the Trivan- dram Museum stone inscriptions (according to M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao) and the donor of the smaller Śiññanaṁûr plates whose name must have been mentioned in the missing plates.
In the bigger plates of Śinḍamaṇḍūr, we find no details either about the son of Jatila called Rājasimha (who was named after his grandfather) or about his grandson Varaguṇa.

The son of Varaguṇa was Śrimara Parachakrakolāhala. The Saṃskṛit portion of Śinḍamaṇḍūr plates say that he vanquished Māyā-Pāṇḍya, the Kērāḷa, the king of Śīṃhala, the Pallava and the Vallabha. The Tamil portion says that he was victorious at Kuṇḍūr, at Śingalam, at Vilīṇam and that he repulsed the Gaṅgas, the Pallavas, the Chōḷas, the Kāliṅgas, the Māgadhas who attacked him at Kuḍamūkku.

V. Venkayya has written: «At any rate the mention of a Pāṇḍya prince as an enemy of the reigning king implies the existence of conflicting interests in the family.» We have also remarked that the Singhalese are mentioned among the enemies of Śrimāra. The king of Ceylon joining Māyā-Pāṇḍya enables us to make an identification:

In chapter LI of Mahāvaṃsa (Translation of Wijesinha) it is said (No. 27): «Now, it came to pass that at that very time a prince of the royal family of Pāṇḍu was come hither, having formed a design to overthrow that kingdom because he had been ill-treated by his king.»

Sena II., king of Ceylon, allied himself with the rebel Pāṇḍya prince and began to lay siege to the town of Madura.

The king of Pāṇḍyas (No. 38) «fled from the field of battle on the back of an elephant, and gave up his life in the wrong place, and his queen also died with him at the same time.»

According to Mahāvaṃsa, the king Sena II reigned from 866 to 901.

Here, we have to speak again about the chronology of Mahāvaṃsa.

The Chōḷas had to wage wars frequently with the kings of Ceylon and invaded that country several times.

And we know the exact dates of two of these invasions:

1° Parantaka I. invaded Ceylon a little before the 37th year of his reign (Tiruppalāturai inscr.), about 943.

2° Rājarāja conquered the island about 1002.

These invasions are of course mentioned in the Mahāvaṃsa, the first under the reign of Udaya III and the second under the reign of Mahinda V.

But to make the dates given in the Mahāvaṃsa agree with
the correct ones, we must reduce the numbers of the Singhalese chronology by 24 years.

Besides, when we spoke of the invasion of Ceylon by Narasimhavarman I., we saw that the dates coincided, when we took away a little more than a quarter of a century from those given in the Mahāwamsa.

Subject to this condition, we may safely depend upon the Mahāwamsa chronology and admit that Sena II. reigned from 841 to 876 and that the Pāṇḍya king who was dethroned by his relative was probably Śrīmāra Parachakrakolāhala.

We must here note a new coincidence. The Sinñamaṇṭur plates say that Śrīmāra encountered the Pallavas in the battle of Kuḍamukku.

There is no doubt that in the time of the ancient Pāṇḍyas, in the IX century, the town of Kumbhakōṇam was called Kuḍamukku; in the inscription of Māraṇjaḍaiyaṇ-Pāṇḍya (No. 13 of 1908) in the Nāgēsvara temple at Kumbhakōṇam, this town is called Tirukkuḍamukku.

And we have also learnt from the Bāhūr plates, that, in the first eight years of his reign, i.e., from 854 to 863, if our chronology be correct, Nṛpatuṅga gained a victory over the Pāṇḍyas on the banks of the river Arichit which M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao has identified with Ariśilāru that runs near Kumbhakōṇam.

We have said that Śrīmāra was a contemporary of Sena II who reigned from 841 to 876 and that the first eight years of Nṛpatuṅga’s reign fall between 854 and 863.

We may therefore suppose that the Pallava Nṛpatuṅga profited by the invasion of the Pāṇḍya kingdom by the Singhalese, to march against Śrīmāra who was defeated at Kumbhakōṇam. The alliance of Nṛpatuṅga and Sena II. seems to be confirmed by the Bāhūr plates which say that Nṛpatunga’s fame had spread beyond the seas as that of Rāma.

The Singhalese chronicles say that the Pāṇḍya king was slain. It was perhaps about 860.

In the foregoing pages we have tried to show the importance of a knowledge of Pāṇḍya history for the proper understanding of that of the Pallavas.
THE PALLAVA DYNASTY.

The father of "Yuvamahârâja" Śivaskandavarman (cir. A.D. 200)  
(King of Kâñchi)  
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Kumâravishṇu (I)
Buddhavarman
Kumâravishṇu (II)  
(King of Kâñchi)  
Chendalûr.

Kumâravishṇu (cir. A.D. 366)
Skandavarman (cir. A.D. 394)
Viravarman (cir. A.D. 422)
Skandavarman (cir. A.D. 450)
Skandavarman (cir. A.D. 506)
Nandivarman I. (cir. A.D. 534)
(king of Kāñchi)

Siṁhavarman (cir. A.D. 506)
Vishṇugōpavarman (cir. A.D. 534)
(king of Palakkada)

Siṁhavarman (cir. A.D. 562).

Siṁhavishnu (cir. A.D. 590)
Mahēndravarman I. (cir. A.D. 618)
Narasīṁhavarman I. (cir. A.D. 646)
Mahēndravarman II. (cir. A.D. 660)
Paramēśvaravarman I. (cir. A.D. 674)
Narasīṁhavarman II. (cir. A.D. 700)
Paramēśvaravarman II. (cir. A.D. 715)

Bhīmavarman
Buddhavarman
Ādityavarman
Gōvinda varman
Hiraṇyavarman
Nandivarman II. (cir. A.D. 742)
Dantivarman (cir. A.D. 800)
Nandivarman III (cir. A.D. 840)
Nṛipatuṅga (cir. A.D. 875)

Aparājīta (end of the IX century).
CHAPTER VI.

ESSAY ON THE HISTORY OF THE DYNASTY OF NANDIVARMAN.

§ 1. NANDIVARMAN PALLAVAMALLA (ABOUT A.D. 717-779).

When Paramēśvaravarman II. died, the succession was probably disputed. There was perhaps an heir belonging to the dynasty of Simhavishṇu who is called "Chitramāya" in the Udayāndirām plates. There was, however, at this time, a Pallava prince, called Hiranyavarman who claimed to be a descendant of a brother of Simhavishṇu and had great power in the kingdom. He was supported by some nobles: one of his friends was the "Muttaraiya", a vassal of the Pallavas, who governed the principality of Tanjore which served as a buffer state between the Pallava and the Pāṇḍya territories (vide: Some insc. of the Muttaraiyars by T. A. Gopinatha Rao—Journal of the S. I. Association—July 1911.)

Another friend of Hiranyavarman was Udayachandra who governed Vilvala (probably Villivalam) on the banks of the Vēgavatī, not far from Kāñchīpuram. (Udayāndirām plates).

Hiranyavarman succeeded in having his own son Nandi, then a minor, crowned at Kāñchi. (G.O., No. 492, 2nd July 1906, p. 61).

Chitramāya, however, managed to obtain the help of many kings among whom were Rājasiṃha (Tēr Māraṇ), king of the Pāṇḍyas who was related to him, and perhaps also the king of the Mālavas (father-in-law of Rājasiṃha) and the king of the Western Gaṅgas, a relation of Rājasiṃha Pāṇḍya.

The Pāṇḍyas were overthrown at Śankaramangai and Maṇṇaikudi (Maṇṇikūrīchchi) which is probably Maṇṇi near Tiruvivisalur and Iduvai (not far from Kumbhakōṇam).

The other enemies were beaten back in all directions up to the confines of the Eastern Chāluukyan kingdom in which Vishṇuvardhana III was reigning (A.D. 709 to 746).

About 741, Vikramāditya II. (733 to 746) led the fourth Chāluukyan invasion to "Tuṇḍāka" (Toṇḍai-Maṇḍalam).
In the Kândâr plates (Ep. Ind. Vol. IX, No. 29, p. 205), the Châlukyas say that Vikramâditya II. beat and put to flight, at the opening of the campaign, the opposing Pallava king named Nandipôttavarman, took possession of particular musical instruments, called Katumukhavâditra and Samudraghôsha, the Khat-vânga-dhvaja, many excellent and well-known intoxicated elephants and a heap of rubies, which dispelled darkness by the brilliancy of the multitude of their rays, who entered, without destroying it, the city of Kâñchî, which was, as it were, a girdle adorning yonder lady, the region of the south, who had rejoiced Brâhmanas and poor and helpless people by his uninterrupted liberality, who acquired high merit by restoring heaps of gold to the stone temples of Râjasimhâesvara and other gods, which had been caused to be built by Narasimhapôttavarman, who distressed Pândya, Chôla, Kérala, Kalabhra and other kings.

The last phrase seems to show that the Pândyas joined the Pallavas.

The donations made to the Kâilâsanatha temple at Kâñchi-puram by Vikramâditya II. are confirmed by an inscription caused to be cut in this temple by this king (Ep. Ind. Vol. III., No. 48, p. 359.)

That Nandivarman Pallavamalla reigned for a long time is confirmed by five documents:

47th year: inscription No. 55 of 1887 at Virîñjipuram.
50th year: No. 10 of 1895 at Pañchapatrâdâvatamalai.
52nd year: No. 27 of 1887 at Sadupperi.
58th year: Tânďanttottam copper plates.
62nd year: inscription No. 76 of 1889 at Tiruvallam.

The last inscription mentions that the Bâna king Mâvali Vanarayar was a vassal of the Pallavas.

§ 2. Dantivarman (about A. D. 779-830).

The Vêlûrpâlaiyam plates (S.I.I., Vol. II, Part V, p. 511) tell us that Nandivarman Pallavamalla had for wife Rêvâ, « who, like (the river) Rêvâ, had (her) birth from a great king (or, from a high mountain) »; and it was of her that Dantivarman was born. The name Danti seems to be of Râshtrakûta origin; and Rêvâ was probably the daughter of a Râshtrakûta king named Danti.
This will explain the political relations that subsisted at this period between the Pallavas and the Rāṣṭrāyāṇas.

In 780—probably at the beginning of the reign of Dantivarman—the king of Kāñchī helped Gōvinda II. in his struggle against Dhruva. The latter succeeded however in dethroning his brother. (Ep. Ind. Vol. III., No. 17 p. 104).

There is no doubt that at this epoch the Pallava kings reigned not only in Kāñchī, but also over the region on the banks of the Kāvērī up to the modern Pudukōṭta State. In fact, in the 5th year of his reign, donations have been made at Kunnāndārkoīl (Pudukotta) (No. 348 of 1914) and at Tiruvellārai (near Trichinopoly) (No. 541 of 1905).

Inscriptions were engraved in the 6th year at Tondur, near Gingee (No. 283 of 1916), and in the 7th (No. 80 of 1898), 9th (No. 74 of 1898) and 10th years (No. 51 of 1898) of his reign at Uttaramallur (Chingleput district.)

The inscriptions at Triplicane (Madras) [No. 234 of 1903—Ep. Ind. Vol. VIII., No. 29, p. 291], and at Kāram (No. 35 of 1900) near Kāñchī are dated in the 12th year of his reign.

In the 16th year, Dantivarman was still reigning in the Muttaraiyar kingdom, for we see that Viḍelviḍugu Muttaraiyaṇ declared himself a vassal in two of the Malaiyadipatti inscriptions (Nos. III and IV, p. 23—Some inscriptions of the Muttaraiyars—Journal of S. I. Association—July 1911.)

Inscription No. 61 of 1892 at Uttaramallūr is dated in the 21st year of his reign, i.e., in 800 according to our chronology.

It is about this time that Govinda III, «having conquered Dantiga, who ruled over Kāñchī,» forced Dantivarman to pay him tribute (Ind. Ant. Vol. XI., p. 127).

It is probable that this event considerably weakened the power of the Pallavas. It is, in fact, very remarkable that there is no inscription dated between the 21st and the 49th years of the reign of Danti 800-828.

We have two inscriptions dated at the end of Danti’s reign. In the 49th year of his reign, a grant was made to Gudimallam (No. 226 of 1903) when the Bāna king Vijayāditya was the vassal of the Pallavas; and the Tiruchchānūr inscription is dated in the 51st year (No. 262 of 1904).

It is remarkable that no inscription dated at the end of Danti’s reign has been found in the southern portion of the
Pallava empire and particularly in the Tanjore and the Trichinopoly districts.

The name of Danti is not mentioned in any of the monuments found on the banks of the Kāvērī, for a period of 35 years, i.e., from the 16th year (Malaiyaḍipatti) to the end of his reign.

This period extends from 795 to 830 and it is strange that not a single donation was made during this time. We shall now proceed to make a remark:

A dozen inscriptions have been found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which seem to prove that the southern part of the Pallava kingdom was occupied by the Pāṇḍyas, from the 4th to the 16th year of the reign of a Pāṇḍya king called Māṇaṅjadaiyan; it appears to have been a military occupation.

It is impossible to suppose that this occupation took place during the reign of the Pallava kings that succeeded Dantivarman, for, from the beginning of the reign of Nandi of Teḻḷāru to the advent of the Chōla king Parantaka, we have a series of inscriptions that will not allow us to suppose that the Pāṇḍya invasion took place at this epoch.

There are, in fact, inscriptions in the Tanjore and the Trichinopoly districts dated in the 6th (Tiruvellārāi), 10th (Tillas-thānam), 12th (Śendalai), 18th (Kōvilaḍi and Tiruchcheṇṭambūṇḍi), 22nd (Tiruppalatturāi) years of the reign of Nandi, son of Danti; in the 7th (Nārthāmalai), 18th (Kōvilaḍi), 21st (Kaṇḍiyūr), 22nd (Lālgudi and Kōvilaḍi) years of the reign of Nṛipatuṅga; in the 2nd, 5th, 6th, 7th (Tiruverumbur) years of the Chōla king, Āditya.

We cannot, therefore, possibly suppose that the Pāṇḍyas occupied the banks of the Kāvērī after the reign of Dantivarman.

So, we think that this occupation took place at the end of Danti’s reign, about 825; and it is precisely this date that we have given to Varaguna when we studied the lists made from Hāḷāsyā-Mahāṭmyān and Tiruvalliyādai Puraṇam].
Perhaps, it was the same Varaguṇa that during the reign of Sena I, i.e., from 821 to 841 (the Mahāvamsa dates being reduced by 25 years) conquered Ceylon.

Be that as it may, the inscriptions enable us to give a history of the invasion of the Pallava kingdom.

The attack began with an expedition into Iḍavai (insc. No. 690 of 1905) «in the Chōla country» which can be identified with the town of the same name in the Maṇṇi-nādu (S.L.I. Vol II., part V, Introduction, page 23), i.e., in the same nādu as Tiruvīsalūr where there is an inscription (No. 17 of 1907) of Varaguṇa-Mahārāja. And the Trichinopoly and the Ambāsamudram inscriptions tell us that Varaguṇa destroyed Vembil which is probably Tiruvīsalūr that was originally called Vēmbaṅrūr.

All the Chōla country was conquered; for, the inscriptions found at Tīlaštāṇam (No. 51 of 1895) and at Trichinopoly (No. 414 of 1904) that are dated in the reign of Māṛaṅjaḍaiyaṇ mention Varaguṇa.

All these inscriptions being dated in the 4th year, it is probable that the campaign was conducted at that time.

Other inscriptions:

- 4th + ? year at Trichinopoly (No. 413 of 1904),
- 6th year at Āḍutūrāi (No. 364 of 1907),
- 8th year at Āḍutūrāi (No. 358 of 1907),
- 8th year at Kumbhakōṇam (No. 13 of 1908),
- 10th year at Śendalai (No. 10 of 1899),
- 13th year at Tiruveḷḷaṛai (No. 84 of 1910),

prove that the occupation of Pallava territory was durable.

The Śendalai inscription, methinks, is specially important for fixing the date of Varaguṇa. We see that Vidēlvērudu Muttaraiyaṇ lived in the 16th year of the reign of Dantivarman (Malaiyāḍippatti inscriptions) and that he made a donation at Niyaman (Śendalai) in the tenth year of Māṛaṅjaḍaiyaṇ’s reign.

That shows well that the invasion of Varaguṇa Pāṇḍya took place in the reign of Dantivarman.

The Ambāsamudram inscription which is dated in the 16th year of the reign of Varaguṇa Mahārāja (No 105 of 1905) is the latest in date concerning the occupation of Pallava territory. It says, that, at this period, Varaguṇa was encamped in the town
of Araiśur which is situated in the Toṇḍai-nādu, on the banks of
the Pennar.

At this time the Pāṇḍyas had overrun half the Pallava empire and probably were preparing to march on Kāñchipuram.

Who was the Pallava king that repulsed the invader? We shall now try to discover it.

§ 3. Nandi of Teḻāru (about 830-854).

The mother of Nandi, son of Danti, was a Kadamba princess named Aggaṇanimaṭi. The Vellurpāḷaiyam plates that contain this information add that he had to fight for the throne of his father: «(V. 20). This (Nandivarman), puffed up with the »prowess of his arms, acquired the prosperity of the (Pallava) »kingdom, not easy for others to obtain, by killing (his) enemies »on the battle-field ». There is here perhaps an allusion to the battle of Teḻāru which was fought within the first ten years of his reign, since the Tillaṇthānam inscription (No. 52 of 1895) dated in the 10th year gives Nandi the title of Teḻārreṇinda.

Who was the enemy with whom he fought this battle? Very probably, it was the Pāṇḍyas. The poem Nandikkalambagam, the hero of which is Teḻārreṇinda, tells us, in verse 64, that he was victorious on the banks of the Vaigai (river in Madura) [Ind. Ant. Vol. XXXVII, page 172].

The town of Teḻāru is undoubtedly the village of Tellār which was once the capital of Teḻāṟṟupparṟu (insc. No. 73 of 1908) and now forms part of the Wandiwash tāluq of the North Arcot district. The existence of this town during the Pallava period has been proved in Pallava Antiquities Vol. I. page 69: I have, in fact, found in this place numerous remains of temples built in the Pallava style.

Is it rational to suppose that the Pāṇḍyas advanced as far as Tellār which is only at a distance of 30 miles south of Kāñchipuram?

It is, on the contrary, very probable, if we admit that, at the end of Danti’s reign, the southern portion of the Pallava empire was invaded by the Pāṇḍyas. We know that at the end of this occupation, Varaguṇa was encamped at Araiśur which is situated on the Pennar river in Toṇḍai-maṇḍalam (Ambaṣamudram insc., No. 105 of 1905).
We may suppose, that, at the accession of Nandi, Varaguṇa tried to seize the rest of the Pallava empire and marched on Kāñchī. Nandi stopped the invader at Tellār, inflicted many defeats on him, notably at Palaiyāru (Nandikkalambagam, verse 31) alias Palaiyārai near Kumbhakōṇam and pursued him up to the banks of the Vaigai.

This glorious campaign in which Nandi earned the surname of Tellārerinda enabled him to reign peacefully not only at Kāñchī, (insc. No. 12 of 1895) but also on the banks of the Kāvērī.

In the country round Tanjore and Trichinopoly, we find some inscriptions of the victor of Tellāru, in the 10th year of his reign, at Tillaṣṭhānam (No. 52 of 1895), in the 12th year, at Śendalai (No. 11 of 1899), in the 18th year, at Kōvilādi (No. 283 of 1901), and in the 22nd year, at Tiruppalātturāi (No. 180 of 1907).

The Vēḷārpalāiyam plates tell us that he reigned in the Nāyar region (Saidapet tāluk- Chingleput district).

More in the north, he reigned at Gudimallam where the Bāna king Vikramādiṭṭya was his vassal: (insc. No. 229 of 1903 and No. 1, a of 1890—S.I.I. Vol III., No. 42, page 93).

His reign was also rich in poets. We have already referred to Nandikkalambagam; there were also other works:

« It was probably during the reign of this Pallava king that the poet Perundēvaṇār, the author of a Tamil poem entitled Bāratavēṇbā, flourished, because in the invocatory verses of the Uttiyōgaparvam of this poem, he refers to his patron as the Pallava king “who conquered his enemies at Tellāru”.......... 

«The invocatory verses prefixed to the Tamil works Puṟaṇāṇūr, Aganāṇūr, Naṟṟinai, Kuṟondogai and Aiṅgūrūṇūr are believed to have been composed by the same Perundēvaṇār » (G.O. Nos. 922, 923, 19th Aug. 1899, p. 6).


The Bāhūr plates give us a minute account of the birth of this king. Nandivarman (III) had married Saṅkha, a princess of the Rāṣṭhrakūṭa family, and their son was Nṛpatuṅga. This name having been borne by the Rāṣṭhrakūṭa king Amōghavarsha I. who reigned from 815 to 879, there is little doubt that Saṅkhā was the daughter of Amōghavarsha I. (Ep. Ind., Vol. IV., p. 181)
The Bāhūr plates tell us that Nṛpataṅga was young when he came to the throne and that the beginning of his reign was glorious, for, he overcame the Pândyas on the banks of the Arichit.

We have already spoken about this event. M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao has identified this river with the Arisil which is only another name for the Araśil (Vide S.I.I. Vol. II., p. 52); and the Arasil or the Araśileiyāru is but the well-known Arsalar that flows eastwards near Kumbhakonam and falls into the sea at Karikal.

We have already said that the adversary of Nṛpatuṅga was Māravarman Parachakrakolahala who encountered the Pallavas at Kudamukku (Kumbhakonam), on the banks of the Arichit (Arisil).

The Bāhūr plates compare the glory of Nṛpatuṅga to that of Rāma which calls to our mind the island of Ceylon; we have already mentioned that Sena II. and Māyā-Pândya were allied with Nṛpatuṅga and that it was at the end of this campaign (about 861) that Madura was taken.

The Bāhūr plates belong to the 8th year of his reign, and, if our chronology is correct, their date must be about 862 shortly after the capture of Madura.

Nṛpatuṅga seems to have been a peaceful and glorious king, as a great many inscriptions dated during his reign are found scattered all over the Pallava kingdom from Tiruvālanḍagu (Nos. 460 and 461 of 1905) and Tiruvarvīṭhe (No. 162 of 1912) in the north, to Kaṇḍīvīṭhe (No. 17 of 1895), Kōvilāḍi (Nos. 303, 301 and 300 of 1901) and Lālgūḍi (No. 84 of 1892) in the south. Besides this, the Gudimallam (No. 228 of 1903) and the Nārthāmalai (No. 365 of 1904) inscriptions show that the Bāna king [Vidyādhara] in the north and the Muttaraiyaṇ king [Śattam-Paliyili] in the south were his vassals, so that Nṛpatuṅga’s domination extended from the river Swarnamukhi in the north to the Southern Vellaur in the south, i.e., from Kālahasti to Pudukkōṭṭa.

Again, as these inscriptions are dated at the beginning as well as at the end of his reign, we have to conclude, that, during all the 26 years of his reign, the glory of Nṛpatuṅga was never
§ 5. Aparâjita.

We have a dozen inscriptions in which Aparâjita is mentioned; he was a Pallava king, since, in inscriptions Nos. 159 and 190 of 1912, we find the title "Pôtta raiyaru" affixed to his name.

These inscriptions are dated between the 3rd and the 19th year of his reign.

They are:

3rd year No. 351 of 1908 at Mâṅgâdu,
4th year No. 158 of 1912 at Tiruvorâiyur,
4th year No. 161 of 1912 at Tiruvorâiyur,
4th year No. 31 of 1912 at Satyavêdu,
5th year No. 32 of 1912 at Satyavêdu,
6th year No. 190 of 1912 at Tiruvorâiyur,
7th year No. 163 of 1912 at Tiruvorâiyur,
8th year No. 159 of 1912 at Tiruvorâiyur,
12th year No. 180 of 1912 at Tiruvorâiyur,
18th year No. 435 of 1905 at Tiruttaṇi,
18th year No. 433 of 1905 at Tiruttaṇi.

There is also an inscription dated in the reign of Tribhuvanavrîra-dêva found at Uttaramallur which refers to the 19th year of the reign of Aparâjita.

We may add here that the village of Ukkal (near Mâmaṇḍûr) bore the name of Aparâjita-Chaturvēdiângalam (S.I.I., Vol. III, p. 2).

We know with certitude of two events that took place in the reign of Aparâjita:

1° The battle of Srîpuṟambiya (Tiruppirambiyam).

The Udayêndiram plates tell us that the Pâṇḍya king Varaguṇa fought at Srîpuṟambiya with king Aparâjita and his ally, the western Gaṅga Prîthvîpati I. (G. O. No. 492, 2nd July 1906—Part II, No. 9, p. 64). The latter was slain in that battle.

As the last inscription of the reign of Prîthvîpati I. is dated 879, it must be admitted that the battle of Srîpuṟambiya took place after this date, i.e., after 879.

Varaguṇa has been identified with a Pâṇḍya king of that name who ascended the throne in 862-63 (insc. No. 705 of 1905).
The Chōlas were perhaps the allies of Varaguṇa, for, inscription No. 337 of 1912 seems to mention the Pāṇḍyas and the Chōlas as the enemies of the Western Gaṅga Priduvayya.

2° The downfall of the Pallavas and the conquest of Āditya.

The Tiruvālaṅgādu plates say (Verse 49) that the Chōla king Āditya I. defeated the Pallava king Aparājīta in battle and took possession of his kingdom (G. O. No. 492, 2nd July 1906, p. 65).

Inscriptions Nos. 286 and 287 of 1911 seem to show that, in this campaign, Āditya, had as his ally the Chēra king Sthānu-Ravi (G.O. No. 919, 29th July 1912, Part II., No. 11, p. 61).

We have said above that Toṇḍai-Maṅḍalam was conquered before the 21st year of the reign of Āditya, i.e., before 900 A.D. (G.O. No. 503, 27th July 1907—Part II., No. 29, page 71).

It is therefore incontestable that Aparājīta lived at the end of the IX century and that he was the last king of the Pallava dynasty.

There is another interesting question: What place does Aparājīta hold in the Pallava genealogy?

There are two theories concerning this subject:

1° V. Venkayya (G.O. No. 492, 2nd July 1906, Part II., No. 9, page 64) has supposed that Aparājīta was the son of Nṛpatuṅga.

In that case we must admit that Nṛpatuṅga was killed in the battle of Śṛipurambiya and that his son who was present at the battle succeeded to the throne and assumed at the same time the title of Aparājīta (the unconquered.)

The provinces of Tanjore and Trichinopoly would have remained in the possession of the Chōla prince, who, at the battle of Śṛipurambiya, was crowned king of Chōlas under the name of Āditya I.

But Toṇḍai-Maṅḍalam continued to belong to Aparājīta who reigned there for about 20 years from 880 to 900 A.D., and it was only in the 20th year of his reign and that of Āditya that the latter succeeded in taking it with the help of the Chēras.

In support of this theory, we may point out that the inscriptions of Aparājīta are found only in the northern parts of the Tamil country, at Mangādu, Tiruvōrśiyūr, Satyavēdu, Tiruttaṇi, Uttaramallur, and none are known to exist in the Tanjore and Trichinopoly regions.
On the contrary, we know from inscriptions No. 222 of 1911 (2nd year—Tiruñâgęśvaram) and Nos. 101, 104, 105, 127, 130, 133 of 1914 (5th, 6th and 7th years—Tiruverūmbur) that Āditya I. held sway on the banks of the Kāvērī in A.D. 882, 885, 886, 887. On the other hand, «It is not possible to explain why Tiruvorriyüṛ, in which so many Gaṅga-Pallava epigraphs have been discovered, should not contain any record belonging to the reign of Rājakēsarivarman (Āditya I). Perhaps, the northern corner of Toṇḍai-Manḍalam in which Tiruvorriyüṛ is situated had not yet been completely brought under subjection by him............... (G.O. No. 961, 2nd Aug. 1913; Part II. No. 18, p. 94).»

It must, however, be noted that the Tiruvorriyüṛ temple contains 6 inscriptions dated in the 4th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 12th years of the reign of Aparājīta while there is none belonging to Āditya.

2° M. R. Ry. T. A. Gopinatha Rao (the Pallavas and the Gaṅga-Pallavas—Madras Christian College Magazine—April 1907) has put forth the theory that the name Aparājīta was but a pseudonym of Nripatuṅga.

In favour of this, we may say that in case Aparājīta was no other than Nripatuṅga there would have been only one battle, that of Śrīpurambaṇya.

If, on the contrary, Aparājīta is supposed to be the son of Nripatuṅga, there must have been two conflicts: 1° the battle of Śrīpurambaṇya about the year 880 where Aparājīta would have defeated the Pāṇḍya king Varaguṇa; 2° the conquest of Toṇḍai by Āditya about the year 899 in which Aparājīta would have been himself defeated.

It is to be hoped that new discoveries would be made that might go to confirm one or other of these two hypotheses.
CONCLUSION.

In the preceding pages, we have tried to increase our knowledge of the history of the Pallavas.

No doubt, there are still many points that are obscure, many details that must be stated with precision, but I am convinced that the main facts are, after all, known to us.

1° The Pallavas before Simhavishnu.

A large number of copper plates (Mayidavolu, Chendalur, Chundu, Udayendiram, Chitra, etc.) have proved the ancientness of the Pallava family; but these records mention isolated dynasties which it was difficult to connect with one another; and the relationship existing between these kings and the dynasty of Simhavishnu was completely ignored. The Vayalur inscription has given us the key to most of these mysteries.

We have assumed that the first Pallava who became king wed his position to his marrying the daughter of the Andhrâ king around the end of the 2nd century of the Christian Era.

The Vayalur inscription seems to indicate that kings Skanda-varman - Kumâravishnu - Buddhavarman, whose names have been revealed to us by the Chendalur plates, must have reigned before Simhavîgopa, the adversary of Samudragupta, about 339 A.D.

The Udayendiram plates give us the genealogy: Skanda-imha-Skanda-Nandi; but these plates have been looked upon with suspicion. It was not known if they were a copy of an authentic record or a forgery committed by an impostor.

The Vayalur inscription that has given us an absolutely identical pedigree has proved the authenticity of the Udayendiram genealogy.

Besides, the discovery, in the Vayalur inscription, of the series, Vira-Skanda-Simha, which is identical with Urvupalli genealogy, proves that Simhavarman who reigned at the time of the Urvupalli grant was but the grandfather of Nandi of the Udayendiram plates.

Lastly, the Vayalur inscription, in which we find the series Simhavarman - Vishnugopa - Simhavarman - Simhavishnu, is the
first record that gives a correct list of the names of the immediate predecessors of Simhavishnu.

The deciphering of the Vāyalūr inscription has given us results which are of capital importance for the history of the predecessors of Simhavishnu.

2° The dynasty of Simhavishnu.

The important discovery made in the State of Travancore of the work called "Mattavilāsa prahasana", and the reference to this comedy in the Māmanḍūr inscription have thrown much light on this portion of history.

There is no longer any room to doubt that it was Mahendravarman I., son of Simhavishnu, that cut the caves of Māmanḍūr, Vallam, Dalavānūr, Śiyamangalam, Mahēndravādi, Pallāvaram, Trichinopoly.

So, we now possess very precise information about the saintly king Mahendravarman I., poet, musician, architect and administrator, who introduced in South India the art that obtained on the banks of the Kṛishṇā and gave a new impulse to religion and literature in the Tamil country.

In «Pallava Antiquities» Vol. I, I have asserted, that, to determine the age of the sculptured rocks of Mahābalipuram, it is absolutely necessary to study the whole of the Pallava art.

In making this study, I have shown that the style of the «rathas» and caves of Mahābalipuram belongs to the stage of transition from the style of Mahēndra to that of Rājasimha; there remained however a doubt: Was the Mahēndra of Trichinopoly and Pallāvaram the same as Mahēndravarman I., son of Simhavishnu?

Now that all doubts on this point have been cleared, we can definitively attribute to Nārasiṁhavarman I. most of the sculptures in the rock at Mahābalipuram.

These works that were continued during the reign of Paramēśvaravarman I., were probably suspended at the time of the Chālukyan invasion which took place in 674, when Vikramaditya I., was encamped at Uragapuram (Trichinopoly).

3° The dynasty of Nandivarman.

There was no history of the Pallavas for the VIII and the IX centuries. The one name "Koṅkaṇīka" found in the Bāhūr
plates had led the historians completely astray. M. R. Ry. T. A.
Gopinatha Rao was the only one that understood the question
clearly: he had affirmed that the Gaṅga-Pallava theory was quite
wrong.

The defenders of that theory, however, could still argue that
the name Koṅkaṇika found among the names of the ancestors
of Nṛipatunāga seemed to prove that he was not a descendant
of Nandivarman Pallavamalla but of the princes of the Western
Gaṅga family.

The deciphering of the Vāyalūr inscription has completely
elucidated the question.

This inscription, which is dated in the VII century and during
the reign of a king belonging to the dynasty of Simhavishṇu,
mentions Vimala, Koṅkaṇika among the ancestors of the Pallava.

So, the Vāyalūr inscription has removed all doubts and the
genealogy of the last Pallava kings now stands established in a
definite manner.

20th June, 1917. G. JOUVEAU-DUBREUIL.