CHAPTER IV

TIRUKKOYILUR UNDER THE PALLAVAS

The Kalabhra interregnum

It is generally believed that at the end of the Sangam age, the whole of the Tamil country was subjugated by an alien people called the Kalabhra. They are said to have overthrown many of the adhira-jas of the Tamil country. Even the origin of the Kalabhra is much debated subject among scholars. The period of their rule is considered as a dark one and is generally referred to as Kaalabhra interregnum.

No source of information is available to settle at rest the problems concerning the political and cultural history of the Tamil country during the Kalabhra interregnum. One Akyuta of the Kaileppala (variant of Kalabhra) family is said to have kept in confinement the three crowned kings of the Tamil country. We do not know for certain whether the Tirukko-yilur region came under the Kalabhras or not.
Slru Mllyllug and the early Pallavas

One Sarvanandi at a village called Pat alike (modern Cuddalore in South Arcot district) in Penuarshtra is said to have finished copying the Lokavibha, a Jain work on cosmology in Saka 380 (AD 458) corresponding to the twenty-second year of Pallava Simhavarmen identified with Simhavarmen of the Uruvapalli, Neungareya, and Vesanta plates. However, these plates are silent about the Pallava king's activity to the south of Kanchipuram, or about Kalabhras in this part of the country.

However, the Pallankovil plates of Simhavarmen III say that the crown prince Simhavishnu conquered the Chola country watered by the Kaveri river. The Kasakudi plates of Nandivaram II Pallavanalla further add that the king Simhavishnu conquered the Kalabhras. From the Velvikkudi plates of Parantaka Neungjaqsiyen it is learnt that his predecessor Koungaon, who may be taken to be a contemporary of Pallava Simhavarmen and Simhavishnu, overthrew the Kalabhras and rescued the Pandyas country. Thus we see two forces viz, those of the Pallavas in the North and the Pandyas in the South working against the Kalabhras. When the Pandyas were able to revive their pristine glory and the kingdom, the Pallavas were able to push their frontiers further south.
It would be reasonable to surmise that Tirukkōyilūr, situated in between Pallava capital, Kāchīpuram, in the north and the Kaveri delta in the south, came under the control of the Pallavas during the time of Simhevarman III and Simhavishnu who flourished during the closing decades of the sixth century A.D. From this period onwards, the Tirukkōyilūr region formed part of the Pallava empire until it was annexed by the Chōlas in the later half of the ninth century A.D.

Tirukkōyilūr and the later Pallava

Even though the Tirukkōyilūr region was absorbed into the Pallava kingdom during the closing decades of the Sixth century A.D., no records of the Pallava kings prior to that of Dantivaman is noticed at Tirukkōyilūr proper. However, a few early Pallava inscriptions are available in Tirukkōyilūr region indicating their sway over this part of the country.

The Pallava epigraphs of the 9th century A.D. at Tirukkōyilūr refer to the chiefs belonging to the Bēṇa and the Vēṭṭuvadāraiya families. A careful analysis of the epigraphs of the Bēṇa and the Vēṭṭuvadāraiya families reveal that they at times fought among themselves...
and tried to expand their rule and influence at the expense of one or other, in spite of the fact that both were subordinates of the Pallavas. As will be seen in the sequel, these fights among the Pallava subordinates of the period were, a part of the struggle between the Pallava rulers themselves.

Inscriptions of Dantivarman and Nandivarman III from Tirukköyilur mention about a family of the Bana called Vānakōvareiyars. It is known that the Bana ruled as subordinates of the Satavahanas before they rose to power. The earliest epigraphical reference to the Bana is found in the Tālaguṇḍa Pillar Inscription of Kadamba king Kakusthavarman (AD 430-50). The Bana were feudatories of the Chāḷukyas of Bāṇā from the time of Pulakesin I. Later on they were forced to change their allegiance to the Pallavas of Kōṇṭi. They seem to have moved south and settled in the region referred to as Perumbāṇappādi with modern Tiruvallam as their capital.

A branch of this family appears to have moved further south and settled in the southern Peneér region which came to be known as Vānakōppādi. It is difficult to fix the date of this event for want of evidence. While the Perumbāṇappādi Bana ruled with the title 'Mamālīvēneriyar', the Vānakōppādi Bana called themselves as
The chiefs of the latter family figuring in the inscriptions at Tirukkōyilūr and the surrounding region are discussed below.

Vānākōvaraiyar Siddhavaḍavaṇar (A.D.813-851)

The earliest reference to the chief of the Vānākōvaraiyar family is found in a Pallava inscription from Tirukkōyilūr, dated in the Seventeenth year of Dantivarmen (A.D.813). The record registers a gift of gold for a perpetual lamp by the bhūgiyar (mistress) of the chief named merely as Vānākōvaraiyar. Much is not known about this chief.

In a record of Nandivarmen III dated in the fifth year (A.D.851) from Nāṉalūṟpet in Tirukkōyilūr taluk figures a chief named Vānākōvaraiyar Siddhavaḍavaṇar. His daughter Mahādevaṇgal is said to have made a gift of a village with the permission of her brother Vaiyiramaṇgar. Since the lady is stated to have taken the permission of her brother Vaiyiramaṇgar, it may be inferred that Vānākōvaraiyar Siddhavaḍavaṇar has ceased to rule in A.D.851, and he was succeeded by his son Vaiyiramaṇgar. This Vānākōvaraiyar Siddhavaḍavaṇar may in all probability be identified with Vānākōvaraiyar figuring in the Tirukkōyilūr record of Dantivarmen.
Therefore it may be inferred from the above that Vāṇakōvaseiyaṇ Siddhavaṭaveṇar was active in the region up to A.D. 851.

**Vayiremēgānēr (A.D. 851-862)**

Vayiremēgānēr seem to have succeeded Vāṇa-
kōvaseiyaṇ Siddhavaṭaveṇar by about A.D. 851 and continued to rule for about 12 years i.e. A.D. 862-3. An epigraph27 of Nandivarman III from Tirukköyilūr dated in his seventeenth regnal year (A.D. 862-3) refers to a certain Vāṇakōvaseiyaṇ whose bhaṅghivar (mistress) Kēṅakkaṇar made a gift of gold to the temple of Tiruvirattēnā at Tirukköyilūr.

Considering the proximity of the place and the date of the above inscription, we are tempted to identify the Vāṇakōvaseiyaṇ mentioned in the Tirukkö-
yilūr record of Nandivarman III (A.D. 862-3) with Vayire-
remeṅgāér, son of Vāṇakōvaseiyaṇ Siddhavaṭaveṇar figuring in the record of the same king dated A.D. 851 from Mon-
lūrpet28 in Tirukköyilūr taluk as stated previously.

The name Vāṇakōvaseiyaṇ mentioned in the Tirukköyilūr inscription may be said to be a title borne by Vayireme-
ngāér.
In the year AD 1862-3, the Banas of Vāṇaṅkōppādi appear to have lost control over the Tirukēyilur region. Inscriptions of Ḫripatunga dated in his third and twenty-first years from Tirukēyilur refer to a Vēṭṭuvadareiayar chief instead of Vāṇaṅkōvareiayar.

To explain this change effected by Ḫripatunga, the son and successor of Nandivarman III in this region, it is necessary to take stock of the political condition in the Pallava country after Nandivarman III to understand the part played by these local chiefs viz., Vāṇaṅkōvareiayars and Vēṭṭuvadareiayars.

Repercussions of Ḫripatunga's accession

The recently discovered copper plates of Aparājitā from Vēḷaṅchēri near Tiruttani (Chingleput district) dated in his ninth year is of immense help in solving some of the problems connected with the period.

The position of Aparājīta in the later Pallava genealogy is made clear by the Vēḷaṅchēri plates. Hitherto it was believed that he was also a son of Pallava Nandivarman III through the queen Adigal Kandaṅ Mēṟṟappēval. The above plates give us the valuable information that Aparājīta was a son of Kampavarman through a Gaṅga princess called Vijaya and hence a grandson of Nandivarman III.
From the epigraphical data available at present, it is known that Nripatunga, Kampevarman and Agarjita ruled for $41^{32}, 32^{33}$, and $18^{34}$ years respectively. If these reign periods are added to the last known date of Nandivarman III, the predecessor of the kings mentioned above, the Pallava rule has to be extended to A.D. 960 by which time the conquest and annexation of the Pallava country by the Cholas was an accomplished fact. Obviously, it is necessary to envisage that they ruled contemporaneously with one another.

The evidence of the Velancheri plates goes a long way in strengthening the above suggestion. The prasasti of the plates clearly says that Kampevarman seized the Pallava country from Nripatunga suggesting the facts that (i) Nripatunga had succeeded Nandivarman III and (ii) there was some feud between the two brothers probably after the death of their father Nandivarman III, if not earlier.

For the accession of Nripatunga, we have his inscription from Tiruchchenmampundi dated in his twenty-second regnal year which furnishes some astronomical details such as Dhanus, Jyestha and Friday. These details are said to yield A.D. 845, A.D. 859 and
AD 869 as the probable equivalent dates for the accession of Uripatunga. The year AD 845 may not be suitable since the ruling king in that year was Dantivarmar, grand-father of Uripatunga.

The history of Tirukkoilur points to the unsuitability of the date AD 869 as the date of accession of Uripatunga. If his accession is placed in AD 869, his third year epigraph at Tirukkoilur would fall in AD 872-3. We know that the Vānakovaraiyars were controlling the Tirukkoilur region upto AD 862-3. Then there will be a gap of about a decade in the history of the place. If AD 859 is taken to be the date of accession of Uripatunga his third regnal year would fall on AD 862-3 which fits into our chronological framework. It is likely that Nandivarmar III could have associated Uripatunga as heir apparent in the year AD 859. Uripatunga's participation in the campaigns in the Pāṇya country in the reign of his father, Nandivarmar III, adds strength to the above dating.

In this context the evidence of the Vēlañcheri plates is significant since it proves the existence of a feud between Uripatunga and Kappevarman. The inimical relationship is reflected in a record of the tenth year
of Kampavarman from Melpatti which registers the death of a certain Kavadi, 'who took Perunagar' and the soldier of Vānarāiayar while attacking and defeating the army of Prithvīgarāiayar stationed at Kāvānūr. Prithvīgarāiayar was a subordinate of Nripatungas as indicated by the Ambūr records\(^4^6\) of the letter.

Kampavarman appears to have carved out a kingdom for himself in A.D.869 after the death of Nandivarman III, in the northern part of the Pālava country as suggested by the provenance\(^4^7\) of his records.

When the power of Nripatunga appears to have declined after his 23rd regnal year (A.D.882-85) the Tirukkōyilūr region passed into the hands of Kampavarman and his subordinate Vayiramēgavarman alias Vānakōvāriyar. Kampavarman's record from Vīrānasm\(^4^8\) datable to A.D.883-4 clearly indicates that Vayiramēga alias Vānakōvāriyan was controlling Tirukkōyilūr region during the above mentioned year.

We may now turn our attention to the accession of Aparājitā\(^4^9\) Kampavarman should have associated his son Aparājīta in the administration of his kingdom from the early years of his reign. Even though an inscription\(^4^9\) of Kampavarman dated in his fifteenth year mentions Aparājīta as Perumānaṅgala (king), the clue to the accession
of Aparajita is supplied by the presence of three inscriptions engraved on a slab found in the Tiruvovvur temple. These epigraphs are engraved in continuation of one another. Unfortunately the name of the king in the first record is lost, the second one is that of the seventh year of Kampa varman and the third is that of the sixth year of Aparajita. Hence it is likely that within a year of his accession, Kampa varman should have associated Aparajita as co-ruler.

Therefore the accession of Aparajita may be placed in A.D.870 as suggested by K.V. Subrahmanya Ayyar. He ruled for 18 years and the year A.D.888 would mark his death at the hands of Chola Aditya I. Interestingly it was the year in which the Banes of Perumbanappad and Veyakoppadi seem to have declared their independence. This again serves as a cross check to the chronology mentioned above.

In all these discussions we have refrained ourselves from mentioning the Sri puramabiyam battle variously dated A.D.879 by K.G. Krishnan, A.D.880 by V. Venkatasubba Ayyar, A.D.885 by K.A. Millekanta Sastri and A.D.895 by T.V. Mahalingam. Scholars have surmised that the twenty sixth regnal year of Nripatunga and the accession of Aparajita are intimately connected with the
results of the Śripurāṃbhiyam battle. However the battle does not seem to have any bearing on the accession of Aparājita. The very phraseology of the prasasti of the Udayandram plates of Prithivipati II denotes that Aparājita was the ruling king and Prithivipati fought on behalf of him against Pāṇḍya Varagaṇa II. If the Śripurāṃbhiyam battle was really responsible for the accession of Aparājita naturally it should have been recorded in the Vēlaṃchēri plates which is silent about it.

The accession dates mentioned above for the last three Pallava kings viz., Nripatunga, Kāmpavaram and Aparājita are followed in the following pages to fix the chronology of the chiefs of Tirukkōyilūr region, figuring in the epigraphs of one or the other Pallava rulers.

Tirukkōyilūr lost to Vēṭṭuvadaṇaraiyēr

Nripatunga (A.D.859-900) ascended the throne during his father's life time / put Vēṭṭuvadaṇaraiyan in charge of Tirukkōyilūr and probably the territory south of it under his control replacing the Bēnas.
An inscription dated in the third year of an unknown king from Tirukkoilur refers to a gift of gold by Maru ..., alias: Ngul, mother of Vēṭṭuvavadaraiyar, the chief of Kōṇḍa-nāṉ. A second record from the same place dated in the third year of an unspecified king registers a gift of gold by Marudakkan, mother of Kōṇḍanāṉaiyar for burning a lamp in the Tiruvirattānasamudaiya-Mahādevar temple.

It is obvious, that Kōṇḍanāṉaiyar of the second inscription and Vēṭṭuvavadaraiyar of Kōṇḍa-nāṉ mentioned in the first record are identical. Though the name Marudakkan is not clear in the first record, the same may be inferred with the help of the second one. Even though the king's name is not mentioned in these two records, he may be identified with Nripatunga for, the chief Vēṭṭuvavadaraiyar figures as a subordinate in yet another record of Nripatunga dated in his twenty first year (A.D. 880) from the same location. This record refers to a gift of gold by Nāṉai Korran, a servant of Vēṭṭuvavadaraiyar for a perpetual lamp in the temple of Tiruvirattānathu-Mahādevar at Tirukkoilur in Kurukkal-Kōrrum, a sub-division of Milāṇu.
The same chief figures in two more epigraphs of Uripatunga found at Tiruchchennampundi\textsuperscript{64} and Tirukk"udikk"aval\textsuperscript{65}, both in the Thiruvallur district and are dated respectively in the twenty second (A.D.881) and the twenty fourth (A.D.883) years.

From the Tirukk"udikk"aval inscription, it is learnt that Vēttuvadiyayaiyan was also known as Mallan Veng"adaven and that he belonged to Kondanēgu. Kondanēgu is known to be a sub-division of Tonḍai-mandalam. The exact territorial extent of it is not definitely known.

The provenance of this chief's inscriptions indicate that he was fairly powerful. However, his power and influence appear to have lasted only till A.D.883 in which year the region controlled by him came under the rule of Vayiramegan alias Vēnakōvaiyan of the Vēnakōvaiyar family. The exact relationship between Vayiramegan alias Vēnakōvaiyan and Vayirameganēr (A.D.851-862) mentioned earlier\textsuperscript{66} as the son of Vēnakōvaiyan Siddhavēdavēr is not known.

Vayiramegan alias Vēnakōvaiyan (A.D.872-891)

An inscription from Vīremūm\textsuperscript{67} (North Arcot district) dated in the fourteenth year (A.D.883) of
### TABLE NO. II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Chiefs name as recorded in the inscription</th>
<th>Overlord king and regnal year</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Tiruvorriyur (Chingleput Dt.)</td>
<td>S.I., xii.57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Aparajita, ry.4.</td>
<td>A.D.874.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>ibid., 88</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>A.D.874.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Manampundi (South Arcot Dt.)</td>
<td>ARE, 1934-35, no.233</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(No. overlord)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Poyyamur (North Arcot Dt.)</td>
<td>S.I., xii.113</td>
<td>Vayiramagaovarman, ry.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kambakonam (Chingleput Dt.)</td>
<td>ARE, 1944, no.173</td>
<td>Vayiramagaovarman, ry.9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Chiefs name as recorded in the inscription)
Kampavarman (A.D. 869-901), brother of Nripatunga, states that one Yayiramegan alias Vēnakōvaraiyan, was ruling over Vēnakōppadi, Ilādedpadi, Kīluṇu and the region north of the river Kēvērī in Chēla-nāgāu.

This chief also figures in some more epigraphs of Kampavarman and his son Aparājita. We also come across the name of one Vēyiramēgavarman in the epigraphs of the region. The epigraphs referring to the above mentioned names are listed in Table No. II.

Scholars have attempted to identify Yayiramegan alias Vēpakōvaraiyan and Vēyiramēgavarman figuring in the above epigraphs. But these identifications and suggestions made by various scholars in different contexts differ widely from one another since so far no one has attempted to study all the available records mentioning these names at one place and arrive at a proper conclusion.

According to one view, Yayiramegan alias Vēnakōvaraiyan was the son of the Pallava King Aparājita and he might have been given the title of Vēnakōvaraiyan for holding charge of the Bāana country. T.V. Mahalingam opines that Yayiramegan alias Vēnakōvaraiyan figuring
in Aparājita's epigraphs from Tiruvorriyur (Nos. 2 and 3) refer to a Bāna prince. It is also suggested that Vaṭīrāmēgan alias Vāṇēkōvariyaṇ mentioned in the Tiruvorriyur records (Nos. 2 and 3) may be identified with his namesake figuring in Mānampūṇḍi inscription (no. 7).

The editor of the Poyyamūr and Keḻpulam records (Nos. 8 and 9) has taken Vaṭīrāmēgaṇvarman to be a member of the Pallava family, though it is said that his relationship with the main Pallava family is not known. But in another place he states that Vaṭīrāmēgaṇvarman is an illigitimate son of Aparājita.

In view of the title Vāṇēkōvariyaṇ assumed by the Bānas of Vāṇēkoppāḍi, there is greater strength in the argument that the chief might have been a Bana. On the other hand, there is practically no evidence to suggest that he was a member of the Pallava family.

The title Vaṭīrāmegha was no doubt borne by both Pallava Dentivarmāṇ and Rashtrakūṭa Dentivarmāṇ. It is also true that Tirumāṇgaḷ-Āḻvār in his hymn on the Ashtabhujaṅkaram temple at Kāṇchipuram mentions one Vaṭīrāmēgaṇ. Yet one need not arrive at a conclusion that the Pallava subordinate of that name under discussion was a member of the Pallava family.
It is not uncommon to find instances where subordinates assumed the titles or names of their overlords. For instance, Bāna Nandivarman76 (Jayanandivarman) assumed such a name or was named after the then Pallava king (Nandivarman II). We come across such a practice very commonly all through the medieval history of South India. Thus it is difficult to accept the view that Vayiramēgana was a Pallava king. The view that he was an illegitimate son of Aparājita-varman is only a surmise with no supporting evidence.

V. Venkatesubba Ayyar has identified77 Vayiramēgana alias Vāṇakōvarsaiyaṁ, figuring in Manampūndi record (No. 7) with Vāṇakōvarsaiyaṁ mentioned in fifth year record78 of Parakōsari varman from Tirukkōyilur and Vāṇakōvarsaiyaṁ Tongal Maṅavaṁ figuring in a Rājakōseri record79. It is not possible to accept V. Venkatesubba Ayyar’s identification since Vāṇakōvarsaiyaṁ mentioned in the Tirukkōyilur record was the son-in-law of one Kṛṣṇar Perumānār, the chief of Mīḷāḍu who was a subordinate of Parāntaka I (A.D.907-955). It is evident that these two chiefs flourished during different periods and cannot be identified with each other.

Likewise his identification of this chief with Vāṇakōvarsaiyaṁ Tongal Maṅavaṁ figuring in a Rājakōseri
record is also not acceptable for this Rājakāraśi has been identified with Āṉgarāditya whose known date is A.D.950-57. If this identification is accepted, then, Vayiramēgaṇa has to be assigned nearly seventy-eight years of rule which is definitely on the higher side.

Further V. Venkatesubba Ayyar's identification of Rājakāraśi mentioned in this record with Āṉgarāditya itself appears to be doubtful, since the signatory of this record is called Hambalī Sundarachólaṇ, evidently named after the father of Rājarāja I. Therefore it would be more appropriate to assign this Rājakāraśi record to Rājakāraśi Rājarāja I than to Āṉgarāditya. If so, it would be certainly impossible to identify Vayiramēgaṇa alias Vāṇakōveraiyan with Vāṇakōveraiyan Toigal Māyēvan.

The problem may easily be solved if we take all the names in the epigraphs shown in the above table as referring to a single Bāṇa chief and take Vayiramēgaṇ as his name and Vāṇakōveraiyan his family title.

Incidentally it may be pointed out that all these inscriptions are datable within a short span of period and confined to a comparatively smaller area. The
only difficulty is that the chief's name is not mentioned uniformly in all the epigraphs. He is referred to as Vayiramēgaṇa alias Vānakōvēraiyar in some inscriptions and in some as Vayiramēgavārman.

It is shown in the sequel that Vayiramēgaṇa alias Vānakośvēraiyar became independent and started issuing records in his own regnal years. At that time Vayiramēgavārman's rule was not confined to Vēkkōrēppāṭi alone. Hence he might have dropped the title Vānakośvēraiyar and like his erstwhile Pallava overlords added the suffix 'varman' to his name.

Therefore we may say that Vayiramēgavārman mentioned in the Poyyānur, Kilpulam, Kalambākam and Perumbuliyyakkam epigraphs and Vayiramēgaṇa alias Vānakośvēraiyar mentioned in Chinnaiyampanṭṭi, Tiruvorriyar, Ta-Velur, Viranam and Manampudi refer to one and the same person.

We may now briefly state the sequence of events that led to this chief's independence. When there was a struggle for power between Vēppōṭuṅga and Kempavārman, both sides looked for allies. Vayiramēgaṇa alias Vānakośvēraiyar appears to have supported the cause of Kempavārman and attacked Vēṭṭuvādīaraiyan,
the subordinate of Hripatunga and managed to dislodge him. He captured Tirukkoyilur and the region south of it, the territory formerly controlled by Hripatunga's subordinate.

This seems to have taken place in A.D. 883, the last known date of Vetu vadaraiaan and coincides with the date of the Viranam inscription of Kampavaran. Vayiramégaan alias Vankéveraiyaan appears to have acknowledged the overlordship of Kampavaran and his son Aparajita till A.D. 883.

An inscription from Menaumundi from Tirukkoyilur taluk states that Anikovaan Orriyur-piratti wife of Vayiramégaan alias Vankéveraiyaan and daughter of Viladaraaya dug a tank and built a sluice for it. The Viladaraaya described as the father of Anikovaan Orriyur-piratti is identified with Anikovaan, son of Guharatnasindhu of the Lata family.

A record from Perumbanappadi region of Bänahziraaya dated in Saka 810 (A.D. 888) also does not mention any overlord.

It is quite probable that taking advantage of Aparajita's death in A.D. 888 and Hripatunga's disappearance from the scene after his twenty-sixth year.
(A.D.885) Bānādhīrāja of Perumbānappādi and Vayiramēgan of Vāṇakōppādi declared their independence some time in A.D.885. Having become independent Vayiramēgan alias Vāṇakōvaraiyen ventured to issue records in his own regnal years. As seen in the table above, his available four records are dated in his second and third regnal years falling in A.D.890 and A.D.891 respectively. During this period he appears to have dropped the title Vāṇakōvaraiyen and called himself merely as Vayiramēgavarmen denoting his independent status.

But this seems to have lasted only for three years. Epigraphical evidence of the period suggests that Vayiramēgavarmen’s rule was terminated in A.D.891 probably by Chōla Āditya I. In the same year one Vāṇako-Vēṭṭuvadāreigai figures in a record dated in the 20th year of a Rājakēsāvarman assignable to Āditya I at Malayonār in North Arcot district.

We know that the family of Vēṭṭuvadāreyar served Rājakēsa and that they were displaced by the Vāṇakōvaraiyers in A.D.885. Since the present member of Vēṭṭuvadāreyar family has the title ‘Vāṇako’ we may infer that they inturn came in possession of Vāṇakōppādi
by ousting Vayiramēgan. It is possible that they were able to gain this position by changing their allegiance to Chōla Āditya I and deserting Nīpātunāgā who was a weakling after his 26th regnal year (A.D.885) as his records are not available until his 41st year, probably the last year of his reign. Thus when Aparaṇīta and after him Vayiramēgan were defeated respectively in A.D.888 and 891 by Āditya I in his concerted attempt to expand the Chōla power Vēṭṭuvedaraïyars got the authority over Vāṃkōppēdi by helping Āditya I. The prefix 'Vēṅkō' in his name was probably conferred on them to indicate their authority over the Bēna country. A near analogy to this is furnished by a later event in which Āditya's son and successor Parāntaka I after defeating the Bēnas at the battle of Vēḷḷēḷa handed over their territory to his ally Gāṅga Prithvipati II and conferred on him the title Bēṅādirāja.
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