CHAPTER II
POLITICAL BACKGROUND

PREAMBLE:

Of late regional history has come to assume major importance and the present trend is to study the regional history in its proper perspective. In other words, the aim is to emphasise all the factors that have a bearing on regional history and to highlight them, the way in which they shaped its history.

Tiruvāpaikkā, an important Śaivite centre in the common parlance, is held out to be a place where a spider and an elephant obtained salvation. The present name was derived from the above episode.

Our aim is to study the political history in its various facets, and to analyse the political condition and turmoil, that was witnessed in the place.

The paucity of evidence pertaining to the political history of this area during the early periods makes the reconstruction of the political history of that period very difficult. However an attempt is made here to give a picture, though incomplete, on the basis of literature and a few later references to the same.
The area around Tiruvāṇaiķkā is well known to have been ruled by the Chōlas. Ancient classics of the Śāṅkag period contain numerous references to Uṟaiyūr (Kōli) as the capital of the Chōlas which is very near to Tiruvāṇaiķkā. Their connection with Tiruvāṇaiķkā temple however is not known.

A complete consideration of the references to Kōchcheṅgappan indicates that there were more than one king bearing that name. One Kōchcheṅgappan is known to have defeated Cērāmā Kapaikkāl Irupākai in the battle at Kārumalām near Kuruvūr in the Kongu country and imprisoned him. The Cērāman's life could not be saved even at the intercession of the Chōla court poet Poygaiyār, as the Cēra king preferred to die on account of the insult in the prison. While this king might have ruled from Uṟaiyūr, his religious leanings are not known.

The second king of that name was the one honoured in a hymn by the Śaiva saint Appar, thus placing him to be a predecessor of Appar i.e. long before the 7th century. Appar records in the above hymn the belief of his own as well as that of his contemporaries that this Chōla king was a spider in the previous birth, wove a canopy above
the deity of Tiruvāṇaikka and was reborn in the Chōla family as Köchchengappān. It is to this very same king that the Vaishpava saint Tirumāngai Āḻvār refers in his hymn. He states that this king raised seventy high-rise (mādam) temples for Lord Śiva, the most important being that of Tiruvāṇaikka, Tiruambar, Nangilam, etc.

The third of the same name about whom we know pretty little was the grand father of Vijayālaya according to Velañjōri copper plates of Parāntaka I.

While all these kings might have had their capital at Uraiyūr, only the second king of that name as seen above was connected with Tiruvāṇaikka. His devotion was so great that he was canonised as one of the sixty three Nāyanmārs.

The next important ruler, Pugalandchōla Nāyanār, like his predecessor was a king of great fame. Sekkīlar in his Periyapurāṇam informs that he had conquered several regions. In his region, Tiruvāṇaikka and its environs must have been a flourishing centre of economic prosperity.

Both Śaivism and Vaishnavism should have also been flourished side by side as the songs of Āḻvārs stand a testimony to the above fact. The name of this king does not give us any clue regarding his identification with any of the known kings. There is no specific evidence from this region on
the impact of the Kajabhra rule though Tamilnādu is generally known to have been affected.

The great Śaiva king Varaguṇa Pāṇḍya II (862 - 660 A.D.) had made lavish endowments to Lord Śiva, the presiding deity on the Rock Fort. He had sent the gold for the endowment through his trusted officer Aṇḍāṭṭu Vēḷān. Before making this endowment he is stated to have camped at Niyamam after destroying the Fort at Vēmbil i.e. Vembakkūr. He had also endowed for two lamps for the deity in the Śiva temple at Lālgudi and at Tiruvelliyāi. But the inscriptions pertaining to the Rock Fort are engraved prominently on the pillars of the Rock cut cavo, a Pallava creation on the way to the main Śiva temple. It is apparent from these that the Pāṇḍya had full control over this area including Tiruvāṇaikkā. The dates of these records range from the 11th to the 13th year (873 to 875 A.D.). It is possible that his control over this area was short lived, for very soon after this before 878 A.D., he had to withdraw from the Chōla area on account of his stunning defeat at the battle of Śrīpurambiam with Pallava Aparājitha and his ally Gaṅga Prithivipathi. A great Śaiva devotee that he was, he would not have failed to patronise the Tiruvāṇaikkā temple which would not have been less popular than the one on the Fort.
Before further discussions we may have to explain the paucity of the records of the Pallavas and the predeces-
sors of Parāntaka I in the Tiruvāṇaikā temple. It is to
be borne in our mind that Īrāṅgam, Tiruchchirāpallī and
Tiruvāṇaikā are interrelated geographically. The absence
of the record of a particular king in one of these locali-
ties does not mean that he had not ruled the other two area.
For example, we get Pallava records in the Rock Fort at
Tiruchirappallī, whereas we do not get any record of the
Pallava kings either from Īrāṅgam or Tiruvāṇaikkā.
Similarly we notice two records of Āditya I from Īrāṅgam
Likewise, we do not get any record of Āditya I either from
Tiruvāṇaikkā or Rock Fort. Therefore, it is ludicrous to
presume that either the Pallavas in general or Āditya I in
particular were not in possession of these places. Thus,
we can account for a continuous history from the later half
of the sixth century to the advent of Parāntaka I at Tiru-
vāṇaikkā. Chōla Āditya I’s inscription at Īrāṅgam point
to his rule over the entire area. He is said to have built
numerous temples in stone (karmali) all along the banks of
Kāverī which of course, include Tiruvāṇaikā. The stone
structure raised by him might have undergone renovation
leading to the disappearace of evidences including that of
inscriptions. However a few images now traceable in the
temple are attributed to his time, this confirming his connections with the Tiruvāṉaikka temple.

A stray inscription of Parāntaka with his characteristic epithet Maduraikinda Parakēsari is engraved on the wall of the east verandah in the second prakāra of the temple. Fragmentary in character this record mentions the gift of a perpetual lamp to god ‘Mahadeva Bhaṭṭārara’ probably indicating the chief deity, Jambukeśvara. The record is dated in his (Parāntaka’s) 40th regnal year (947 A.D.) and it stipulates that the sabhaiyāra of this temple made provision for oil to burn a lamp. Other two records of the same king are mere fragments and they do not contain any new or novel information except the date portion as 3rd year and Malaināgu in one record and [P]uraiyūr-nāgu in another record. Though his usual title Maduraikinda Parakēsari was conspicuous only by its absence but on palaeographical grounds it can be safely attributed to Parāntaka I. The reference to sabhaiyāra in the inscriptions of Parāntaka I signifies the continued interest of the king in the institution of local self government mainly the sabhai constituted by the Vēlic scholars residing in the area, as elsewhere in the Chōla kingdom. The provision made by them for burning a lamp evidently in the temple at
Tiruvāṇaiṅka points to the interest shown by the sabha in the affairs of the temple.

During the period under review this temple was the centre of not only religious persuasions, but it also functioned as a meeting place of the Judicial body. As in the case of other big temples in the classical period which assumed various roles. Temple was a centre where education was imparted and a place for cultural programmes etc. During the period of Sundarachōla Parantaka II, Tiruvāṇaiṅka executed such functions as it was evident from an inscription.

The Mahāsābhā of Uttamaśilīchaturvedimāṅgalam met at the western side of this temple on May 28, 961 A.D. Tuesday discussed the endowment of some lands made by one Bālasiriyam Bhāṭṭaṉ Śivankūṭṭaṉ of Ādāṉūr to another temple of Tirupāppazavai-mahādeva at Uttamaśilīchaturvedimāṅgalam to provide for the maintenance of some servants in the temple for burning a perpetual lamp before the deity and for the midday offerings. It is evident from this record, lands were utilised for the conduct of some endowments in the local temples involving the sabha or mahāsābhā in the affairs of the temples by making them responsible for the maintenance of the same, apparently with the royal approval.

When the continuity of Chōla rule is attempted we are confronted with the problem of conspicuous absence of
Chōla records between 961 and 1116 A.D. or till the 47th year of Kulōttunga I. During this period, the region was under the active control of the successors of Parāntaka I, such as Uttama Chōla, Rājarāja I, Rājendra I, Rājānirāja I, Rājendra II, Virarājendrā, Adhirajendrā as attested by a host of inscriptions at Śrīraṅgam. However, attention may be drawn here regarding a few Śrīraṅgam inscriptions of Rājarāja I which have got direct bearing on Tiruvāṇaikka temple. These records which are fragmentary seem to refer some transactions of the Peryṅuri-sabba of Uttamaśīli chaturvēdimaṅgalam in respect of Tiruvāṇaikka temple.

A solitary record of Kulōttunga I, which commences with the pāśāsti 'Pugal ᪈ulanda pūpārī' etc., is dated in his 47th regnal year (1116-17 A.D.). The inscription devān records the setting up of the images of Rishabhavāhana and an image of Pārvati by one Villavarāyan of Valambakkudi. The donor is stated to have purchased the lands from the temple authorities (Ādichepḍēśvāra), of Tribhuvanapati, who is pleased to take his seat under the tree (tiru-veppāval) in the Tiruvāṇaikkāval which is a brāhmaṇēra of Mīgalai in Pāḍḍi-Kulāśanivalanaṇāḍu. The donor who hails from Valambakkudi in Āśeṅgili-naṇḍu of Jayasimhakula-kālavālanāṇḍu seems to have purchased the land and made over the income of the land for the tiruvaṁjanam and tiruvamirdu
on two festive days and for the procession of the deities
donated by him. Villavarāyan seems to have agreed to
measure out the paddy at the rate of 5 kalams of paddy
per vēlti in the standard measure called Rājakesari-marakkal.
From the phrase Idanai-nāyakar alias Rishabhadēva, it can
be inferred that the donor might have been a member of
Idanai group. An inscription of Kulottuṅga III gives
the earliest account so far known of the beliefs and customs
of the Idanai class, their origin and their prominent role
in the time of the Chōlas.

The turbulent period of Chōla politics under
Kulottuṅga III temporarily eclipsed the fortunes of the
Chōlas. The feudatories and subordinates of Chōlas
shifted their allegiance according to their whims and
fancies. The adversaries of the Chōlas were bent upon
acts of aggrandisement and expansion of their territories
at the expense of the Chōlamappāḷam, with the active conniv-
ance of the subordinates. Trust, agreement and friendship
were cast to the winds before cunningness, treachery and
diplomacy.

Of the nine records of Kulottuṅga III he styles
himself in a majority of records as Tribhuvanavīradēva or
Tribhuvanachakravarti or Kōneripmaikopāṇ. But three records of his contain his prasaṇṭi namely Maduraivum Pandiyanaudittalaiyukopāṇ. It is only from the 7th year (1185 A.D.) onwards we get his record - the highest regnal year being his 21st year (1198-99 A.D.).

An important record of this king dated in the 18th regnal year (1195-96 A.D.) is damaged. It unequivocally records the political compact nilaimeittittuy between Raja Rajadevaṇa Pop-parappināṇa Vanavārāiṇa and Siyan uṣaiya pillai alias Akaḷankaṇaṇāḷvāṇ.

The important features of this agreement of this record are that no actions like "olai kattal", "ololai-pokkal" i.e. (the intercourse with the enemies) and that in times of distress army and the cavalry will be made available (vinaiyukil nāḍaiyum kudraiyum pugavittum). A similar agreement was made in the next year i.e. 19th year (1196-97 A.D.) between Uṣaiya pillai alias Akaḷanka Naḷalvāṇ and Sēman alias Rājaraja Mūvaiṇaṇ. The former was already noticed in the 16th year. In this inscription the latter undertakes to stand by the former against any harm from some communities like muḷaligaḷ, urāḷigaḷ, and vannivara on the same terms as in the former record.
The internal dissensions, the external aggression and the expansionist activities of the alien powers such as the Hoysalas and Pandyas, the fluctuating allegiance of the subordinates such as Kopperuṇjīngas, Bāpas, Telugu Chōla, Sambuvarayas, Chēdirāyas etc. were tormenting Rājarāja III during his three decades of rule between 1216 and 1246. Geographical position of Tiruvāṉaikkā is also one to be reckoned with for writing the political history of this period, because Kappanur, the capital of the Hoysalas and its proximity to Tiruvāṉaikkā definitely would have created a flutter in the control over the region. This proximity induced the Hoysalas to meddle in the Chōlamandalam. Kopperuṇjīnga, the subordinate of Rājarāja III was the first man to rise the banner of the revolt against the Chōlas. He openly defied his sovereignty declared his independence and detained the emperor himself at Sendamangalam fort, a feat which could not be accomplished by any of their feudatories. In this hour of crisis, help come from an unexpected quarters. The Hoysalas released him from the prison and extended their help. The Hoysalas entered into a matrimonial alliance with the Chōlas, provided them with a military contingent to safeguard the provinces of the Chōla domain. The Pandyas, who were hand in glove with Kopperuṇjīngan started fishing in the troubled waters. They created series of troubles to the Chōlas, organised revolt, crippled the resources of the
Chōla empire. Rājarāja III had a tough time in facing these outbreaks of his faithless subordinates, ingratitude of the feudatories and disloyal chiefs.

We have to analyse, examine and interpret the subsequent events in the light of the inscriptions at Tiruvāṇaikā. It is the lesson of history, that whenever there is a rise, there must always be a fall. It is applicable not only to the individuals, but also to the great historic empires of various parts of this world.

The accession of Rājarāja III was indeed rather unfortunate, because he had neither the capacity nor the calibre to control the forces of disintegration. It was during his reign, the forces of disintegration were let loose which sapped the vitality of the Chōla empire. The reign of Rājarāja III, began badly and these initial misfortunes were, but the precursors of much greater calamities.

Great changes were taking place in the political map of South India and the emergence of several feudatories and minor dynasties put the Chōlas in grave peril. The Chōla country was greatly harassed by these powers, and the entire country was plagued with internal dissension and external aggression. Only an exceptional ruler of
extraordinary calibre could check the reactionary forces which poisoned the body-politic of Chōla rule, but the empire is bound to collapse like a pack of cards, when its destiny was controlled by men of lesser merit. So was the case with the Chōlas.

In the present chapter, our aim is to analyse the political conditions of the Chōla kingdom in the light of the epigraphic evidences available in this temple. The inscriptions of Rājarāja III numbering 30, recorded in the temple, give a vivid account of the unsettled political conditions, the role of the feudatories, etc. in clear terms. A few records are however, related to the political pacts among the latter. Commencing from the year 1229 A.D. i.e., 13th regnal year of the king onwards, ending upto 1245 A.D. i.e. 25th year, we consistently get records of Rājarāja III.

It is interesting to note, that a majority of the inscriptions of the Chōla kings belonged to Rājarāja III. It showed that in the later period, the temple occupied an importance place, in the Chōla society. The importance of the temple was known by the generous donations, given by the feudatories recorded on the walls of the temple. One inscription unambiguously notes the appointment of 18 watchmen to safeguard the temple.
As stated earlier, the Chōlas were on the verge of decline and the subordinates had field-day as they were bent upon converting their gubernatorial status into royal one.

The inscription informs us the role of the Nilaganga Araiyyars and Pañchaneedi Vāpars of Bāpa extraction. Some of the feudatories championed cause of the Chōlas. Their benevolence, the role they played as arbitrators, etc. were all well brought out by the epigraphs of the temple.

One reason that can be adduced to the appearance of the feudatories, who frequently figure in the inscriptions, is the fact that the king began to rely more and more on them, notwithstanding the fact, that this itself became a cause for the decline and fall of the Chōlas, atleast in the long run. As the Chōla territory was often subjected to raids by various rulers, more particularly so by the Pāṇḍyas, who carried fire and the sword into the Chōla-mandalam, who let loose an orgy of carnage, arson and loot of beggarine description, it had become imperative on the part of Rājarāja III to seek the help of dynasties like the Hoysalas, and the request was promptly complied with. Besides, the proximity of the Hoysala headquarters, Kappanūr to Tiruvānaikkā enabled the Hoysalas to come to the rescue
of the Cholas whenever the situation so warranted. Particularly the friendship with the Hoysalas, put the emperor in good stead in his violent encounter with the Pandyas and Kopperunjinga. It seems the Hoysalas were given a free hand to collect revenues, as we have got epigraphical evidences to illustrate the above point. An inscription reveals the transaction of the temple with the agent, who was the subordinate of a Hoysala general one Bhogaya Daçanayaka, who was sent by the Hoysala king Narasimha II to assist Rājarāja III in his campaigns against the Pandyas and who in 1237 A.D. granted eleven villages conferred on him by prince Somesvara evidently for their valour. It would not be inappropriate to mention here, that when the king Rājarāja III was imprisoned by the recalcitrant chief-tain Kopperunjīnga it was the Hoysala ruler Narasimha II that freed the emperor from his confinement after defeating Kopperunjīnga at Sendamaṅgalam, the place of his captivity.

As stated earlier, the later Cholas, particularly, from the time of Rājarāja III, began to rely more on their feudatories against their adversaries. Notably, the part played by the Hoysalas in maintaining the balance of power in such a way to promote their own interest and to make both the Pandyas and Cholas to look upon them in times of
emergency and thus to secure for themselves a unique place in the South Indian politics.

RAJENDRA III AND THE HOYSALAS:

The Chola ruler Rajaraja undoubtedly owed his throne to the aid of the Hoysalas, but for whose help, he would have been passed into oblivion long back. It was the Hoysala ruler, Vira Narasimha, who rescued Raja Raja III in 1232 A.D. after defeating the notorious feudatory Koppeprunjiinga. Between 1233-46 A.D. the entire Cholamandalam was virtually the protectorate of the Hoysalas, as the inscriptions from Tiruvangaikkai, Sirlingam Kamrarasevalli and Tirumalavadi corroborate the above view. The Dapjanayakas of Hoysalas also wielded considerable influence in the politics and administration of the Cholas, as epigraphy bears testimony to it. Many vital parts of the Chola empire were more or less under the control of the Hoysalas.

The friendship between the Cholas and the Hoysalas lasted till the accession of Rajendra Chola III. The later, unlike his predecessor was a man of better settle, but he lacked the qualities of statesmanship and diplomacy. A study of his inscriptions reveals that he chalked out an ambitious programme of expansion to revive the pristine glory of the ancient Chola house. His first intention was
to avenge the humiliation to Chōlas, caused by the
invasion of the Pāṇḍyas under Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I.
Accordingly he marched against the new and incompetent
ruler Māravarman Sundarapāṇḍya II, defeated him and reduced
him as his vassal. He also assumed the vainglorious
epithet, "Iruvar-Pāṇḍivar mudittalai kopparulina" and he
had the solid support of Telugu Chōgas in this ambitious
adventure. He also assumed the title Mānukulamaduttuneri
Sūdi-aruliva Kopparakēsarrivarman. It seems that he also
successfully kept the Hoysalas at bay because, so far no
records of the Hoysala king, Sōmēśvara, have been discovered
at Kappanūr or Śrīraṅgam, or Tiruvāpaikā between the 9th
and 20th years (between 1242 and 1253 A.D.) of Vīra Sōmēśvara.
But three epigraphs of Rājendra III at Tiruvāpaikā temple
record his royal orders. His last inscription dated in the
5th regnal year of the king (1251-52 A.D.) connected with
a royal order of the king making into a tax-free dēvadānam,
25 vāli of land at Muttam alias Vilavanallūr in Nittavinōda-
valanaḍu granted as tirunāmatthū-kāni. Besides a record
from Cuddapah and another from Śrīraṅgam style him, as
'death to the Kārnāṭa king'. Thus epigraphical evidences
clearly demonstrate that in the initial years, he fared
well without the backing of Hoysalas.
It was the avowed policy of the Hoysalas to maintain a sort of balance of power, so that no state was strong enough to gulp the other. They played this game of shifting allegiance very cleverly to promote their own interests. Naturally, the power, prestige position and popularity of Rajendra III was an eyesore to the Hoysalas, and they aimed at keeping the Cholas at check.

It was at this juncture, the incompetent Pandyas ruler, Maravarman Sundara Pandyas II was defeated by Rajendra III and the Hoysalas who watched the progress of the power of the Cholas immediately made a common cause with the aggrieved party, Pandyas against the victorious Cholas. In some epigraphs, Vira Somesvara was styled as Pandyakula-samrakshana daksina-dakshina-bhrma or whose right arm is skilled in protecting the Pandyas, evidently against the onslaught of the rising power of the Cholas. A Mysore record mentions that Somesvara uprooted Rajendra Chola III in a battle and reinstated him, and Somesvara's records are to be found at Sembattur-Alattur and Tirunanganjeri in Tamil Nadu.

However, this antagonism between the Hoysalas and the Cholas lasted till 1251 A.D. when the redoubtable,
Jaṭāvarman Sundarapādya I, ascended the throne, "He was one of the ablest sovereigns of his age and his policy of expansion threw the South Indian political system out of gear. Both the Chōlas and the Hoysalas felt the strength of arms of the Pāṇḍyan ruler. His Tirumālāvaiḍi records reveal, that he entered into the Chōla-Assamalam itself and defeated the Chōlas and his Tiruppundurutti record reveals, that he did not spare even the Hoysalas.

Against this common adversary, the Chōla Hoysala differences were patched up. The Tiruvāṇaikkā inscriptions throw abundant light on the Chōla-Hoysala relationship.

Of the eight inscriptions of Rājendra Chōla III, only a few highlight the political conditions and the relationship between the Chōla-Hoysalas. During this period, the temple and its environs was bubbling with political activity. The temple was a silent spectator of the radical political changes that took place in the history of South India. A damaged inscription which contains a portion of his prasāṣṭi registers the sale of land to the temple by Araiyan Sundālvan alias Īrāman of Vāpakoppāḷi. This record is rather important because he hailed from Vāpakoppāḷi, and the Vāpakōvaraiyars of this place had rendered
meritorious services to the Chōlas, right from the early days by their loyalty and constant and continuous cooperation. They championed the cause of the Chōlas and stood by them in times of crisis.

With the exception of this record, the other records, throw light on the Chōla-Hoysala relations. An epigraph engraved on the west wall of the third prakāra of the temple, attributes to the king Rājendra Chōla III a royal order granting a tax-free devadāna lands in seven different villages for worship and offerings in the temple of Pōsaliśvaram-uḍaiyār built by māmādi, Vīra Śomeśvara at Kappāpur, a hamlet of Tiruvellalarai, which was a brahmadeya in Pāchchīrākṣam a sub-division of Rājarāja-valanāḍu. The epigraph clearly establishes the Chōla-Hoysala relationship by the mention of māmādi, Vīra Śomeśvara who was the architect of the temple and Rājendra III's liberal gift to the said temple constructed by his māmādi. It is a vital point to be noted that why Rājendra III gave gifts to this temple and recorded the same endowment on the walls of this temple.
Incidentally this record also shows the meritorious services rendered by the *tirumandira-ñalai*, Næjunaichchēla Mūvendavelan, who figures in the records of Rājarāja III and Rājendra III and for the first time we are able to infer that this royal secretary rendered service under two Chōla kings for 35 years.

The other two records engraved on the walls of the temple again mention the Chōla-Hoysaḷa relations. Those two records dated in the 6th regnal year, refer to one Somaladēva in connection with the gifts of land for a flower garden. The other record which is dated in the 6th year corresponding to 1251 A.D. records the gift of land in Tiruvellai in Pāchchirikkaṟam by purchase by Singappadaṇḍanāyaka a Hoysaḷa general for offerings and worship to god, Siddheśvaram Udaiyar consecrated by him at Tiruvellai Pidāgai in Pāchchirikkaṟam of Rājarāja valanaṭu. An interesting point in this record is the mention of Pōsala-Vīra Narashima-Chaturvedimangalam, an agrahāra in Tiruvāpaikkā Tirupati. This record shows, that Vīra Narashima was able to found an agrahāra after his name in the heart of Tiruvāpaikkā. It is to be noted that the Singappa mentioned in this record is the same as the general of Vīra Sōmēśvarā, who is also mentioned in an
inscription at Vedārapālam at Tanjāvūr district. In 1241 A.D. when the Chōlas were at odd with Hoysalas, the same Sīngappadapṭanāyaka invaded the Chōlamappālam as a result of which worship was stopped in the temple of Kōdikulā but was revived some time later. Now the construction of the temple by the same chief in the Chōla territory and provision for worship therein suggests, that Rājendra III’s overlordship was acknowledged by Viṇa Somēśvara, and the former had sufficiently consolidated and recovered the prestige lost during the time of his predecessors.

It is rather amusing to note, that inspite of a reasonably longer reign of Rājendra Chōla III (1246 - 1279 A.D.), we do not get any inscription of the king after 1252 A.D. at Tiruvāṇaikā. This riddle cannot be explained in any way except by the advent of the powerful Pāṇḍya ruler, Jātāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya I to the throne, who threw Chōlas out of Tiruvāṇaikā and its suburbs.

Besides the two records of the Pāṇḍya king at the temple, and his munificent gifts to the nearer temple, Śrīraṅgam all confirm - that definitely Tiruvāṇaikā and its environs passed into the hands of Pāṇḍyas.
An interesting feature of the study of temple inscriptions, is that during the period under review, we also get the records of Vīra Sōmeśvara from 1253–1259 A.D. with the exception of two years 1256 and 1257 A.D. This shows that although Jaṭāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya I conquered Trivāṇaiikkā, he did not care to consolidate his rule and it seems that he had allowed the Hoysalas to run the administration of the territory. We know well that during the time of Rājāraja the local administration and revenue matters were manned by the Hoysalas. An epigraph reveals the part played by the Hoysalas in the local administration. When Jaṭāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya I captured the territory he allowed the old order to continue without any disturbance. This may be the reason that we get inscriptions of the two powers Pāṇḍyas and Hoysalas, side by side at the same time, at the same place.

The ascendency of the "Evening Star" of the Pāṇḍyas viz., Jaṭāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya I put all the southern powers out of gear and their fortunes were at low ebb. The chain of victories scored by him as far as Nellore in the course of his campaign across the Chōla country brought Tiruvāṇaiikkā under his yoke. The alliance
of the Chōlas with the Hoysalas, proved no match before
the devastating attack of this Pāṇḍya ruler. He invaded
the Chōla territory in 1257 A.D. defeated Rājendrachōla
III, reduced him as his vassal and compelled him to pay
tribute. He routed the Hoysala forces, and killed Vīra
Somēśvara himself in a bloody battle fought at Kappānūr
in 1263 A.D. The entire South was swept by the mighty
force of the new power, Pāṇḍyas.

With the defeat of this Chōla ruler Rājendra III,
the Chōla rule, virtually came to an end, and the entire,
Chōlamandalam passed into the hands of the Pāṇḍyas.
However, Rājendra III, continued to rule till 1279 A.D.
with his death, the Chōla rule became a memory of the past.

THE KĀKATĪYAS:

The Chōlas were annihilated. The feudatories were
scrambling for power. They were joining hands with import-
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ant powers of the day and one such power was Kākatīyas and
they had intervened in the south twice i.e. during
Kākatīya-Gopapatī’s (1199–1262 A.D.) period and Kākatīya
Pratāparudrā’s period (1295–1323 A.D.). We will
explain the reason for the existence of Pratāparudra’s
inscription at Tiruvāṇaikā. The record from Tiruvāṇaikā
is highly damaged and the purport of which is not clear from the available two lines. Luckily the other record of the same king engraved on the walls of the Śrīraṅgam temple comes to our rescue. A comparative and an analytical study reveal that both the inscriptions bear one and the same text. The Śrīraṅgam record enables us to know more about the contents of the inscription. It is now necessary to give a short introduction about the political situation of this period. As it has already been pointed out, the extinction of the Chōla power invited other powers to share the spoils of the Chōla empire. In addition to this, Ravivarman Kulasēkhara of Kerala raided Tamilnādu as far as Kāñchi, another at Śrīraṅgam.

During the same period, an altogether alien power namely the Mālik Kāfur, the distinguished general of Allā-ʿU-din with lightning speed undertook a depredatory tour of loot, arson, plunder and pillage. The alien power took advantage of the internal feud between the two brothers Sundara-Pāṇḍya and Vīrapāṇḍya, the legitimate and illegitimate sons of Maravarman Kulasēkhara in 1310 and 1311 A.D. who staked their respective claims to the Pāṇḍya throne. Kākatīyas at the instance of Allā-ʿU-din, were very much interested in elevating Sundarapāṇḍya to the throne. Vīrapāṇḍya seems to have sought the help of the Tiruvāṭi ruler,
Ravivarman as evidenced by the Śrīraṅgam inscription of the Kākatiya ruler who claims to have defeated both Vīrapāṇḍya and Ravivarman. Ballāla III was also simultaneously very busy in retrieving the losses of his possessions in Tamilnadu incurred during the period of his predecessors. This is the primary cause for the Kākatiyas to intervene in the politics of the deep South. Pratāparudrādeva (1295-1323 A.D.) sent his ablest general Muppyidi-Nāyaka and installed Mānavīra as Governor at Kānchi on June 11, 1316 A.D. He also sent a few generals to defeat Ravivarman an ally of Vīrapāṇḍya in (1316-17 A.D.) and one of the generals Dēvarināyanigaru son of Māchaya Nāyanigaru as evidenced by the Tiruvāṇaikā and Śrīraṅgam inscriptions undertook an "expedition to the southern territories against Paṇcha Pāṇḍyas, faced an array of elephants in battle, routed Vīrapāṇḍya and Nalayāla Tiruvāṇī Kulasēkhara on the battle field at Tiruvāṇikunru seised the elephants and all the wealth and established Sundarapāṇḍya at Vīradāvajam". On that victorious occasion (1317 A.D., March, 26, Monday, lunar eclipse) he gave some lands (?) as sarvamānya.

This inscription provides an indirect reference apart from the expedition of Kākatiyas and defeating of the Kāraḷa-ruler, it clearly affords evidence to the fact
that Tiruvāṇaikka and Śrīraṅgam were under the actual control of Jaṭāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya (1303-1319 A.D.) whose cause was championed by Kākatiya Prataparudradēva and thus we can account for the existence of the inscription dated 1317 A.D. at Tiruvāṇaikka.

THE HOYSALAS :

A study of the inscriptions from this temple gives a clear, and vivid account of the part played by the Hoysalas in those turbulent times. These inscriptions throw a welcome light on the various activities of the Hoysalas, their keen interest in maintaining a sort of balance of power in South India; some inscriptions reveal other aspects namely their religious policy, their enthusiasm in maintaining religious services particularly in this temple, architectural details and their style of iconography etc; besides the Hoysala interference in the internal affairs of the Chōla country, the effect of their southern expeditions on the political life of the entire Tamil country are all gleaned from the inscriptions.
As stated already, the Chola in the evening of their life began to bank upon the prop given, by their feudatories and also more notably that of Hoysalas who had a free rein in the Chola administration. The number of Hoysala inscriptions available in the temple confirm and corroborate their power and influence. Although many of these inscriptions are donatory in character, they reveal, the amount of influence they exerted and wielded in the Tamil country and it also exposed the weakness of the Cholas.

The Hoysalas, carefully but cleverly played the delicate game of shifting alliances to maintain a sort of 'status-quo', so as to push their own self-interest. The Hoysala ruler, Narashima II, who came to the throne in 1217 A.D. played a key-role in the politics of Tamil country - as the numerous inscriptions of this rule stands a testimony to this fact. His epithets like Cholarāiva pratishṭāchārya, Pandyasaiakāsari etc., reveal their aim to promote their self-interests by playing with one power against the other. They successfully but diplomatically maintained a balance-of-power, and became the arbitrators in South Indian politics.
In this chapter, we have to analyse and examine the history of those times, more specially, the Chōla Hoysala relations in the light of the temple inscriptions at Tiruvāṇaikā.

An important epigraph dated in the second year of Vīrasomēśvara reveals the genealogy of the Hoysalas for two generations. Engraved on the north wall of the third prakāra of this temple it records a string of epithets and mentions the image of the Lord Pōsaiśvara set up in Kappanūr north of Śrīraṅgam. The epigraph records the setting up of four images in this temple i.e. Vellaiśvara, Padmaśvara, Vīra Narasingiśvara and Somaśvara. They are evidently called after his grandfather, Ballāla II, his grandmother, Padma, his father, Nara-simha II and his queen, Sōma. This also shows the practice of naming the deities after the members of the royal family.

The Hoysala ruler, Vīra Sōmeśvara evinced keen interest in the matters connected with the festivals of the temple. His two records dated 3rd and 4th year refers to the assignment of 1000 kalam of paddy by the king from the villages Koppamaṅgalam and Aṭṭagiyampālānallūr in Rajagambira Vajanaḍu for worship and offering
to god Śaṅkaranāyana in the fourth
of the temple in the month of Maṅga, in the name of the
king. This record reveals their interest in conducting
worship and offering to the temple, notwithstanding the
fact, the temple was in a remote area, from their own
home region. Their zeal in religious matters, particularly
their generous gifts to temples highlight the prevailing
trend in religious matters of the day.

Another record of Vīra Śomēśvara gives details
of income of paddy from various lands to provide for wor-
ship and offerings to the deity in the temple of Śomālīś-
varan uḍaiyar at Purōśaikkudī in Pēchhilikurram which is
very near to Tiruvānaikka built by him as a pallīpadai
for Deviyār, who was perhaps the queen of Narasimha II.

An instance of royal patronage giving liberal
gifts is recorded in two inscriptions. They reveal the
exemption of taxes and grant of land made as an endowment
to the Śaṅgamallīśvaram-udaiya-ṇāyanār and to Śaṅgamadeva-
matha at Tiruvānaikka by Śomaladevi.

The interest evinced by the Hoysalas in building
shrines in and around Tiruvānaikka is portrayed by an
epigraph. This record dated in the 22nd year of the king,
Vīra Sāmēśvara, states that Tyāgavinōdiśvaramūdaiyar shrine in the 3rd prakāra of the temple was built and provided with an endowment of tax free land from the ānattār of Tiruvānaiikā temple by payment of 40,000 kāṇu by Kalvakūr-Tyāgapporumāḷ at Pōsala Vīra Narasimha-chaturvedimāngalam in Tiruvānaiikā for making a tiruvānāi for Chāpdeśvara.

Another record enables us to know the names of various villages, and it indirectly helps us in knowing the toponymy and topography of the Chōlamapālam. This epigraph dated in the 25th regnal year of Vīra Sāmēśvara wherein the income of paddy derived as tax from the villages, Narasingamaṅgalam, Kāppanūr, Ottamūr and Seṅgūvūr on the northern bank for the merit of his mother Kāḷaladeviyār for worship in the temple of Pōsaliśvaram udaiyar consecrated by him at Kāppanūr. The name of a village Narasingamaṅgalam, betrays the Hoysaḷa influence, as the village should have been named after the Hoysala king Vīra Narasimha II. The inscription also mentions the damage caused by the breach of Kāveṇi causing extensive silting of the wet lands in the four villages and the repair of these breaches by the king. This record thus gives a vital clue on the constructive and creative work done by the Hoysalas in the spheres of irrigation and revenue.
Another record of Vīra Somēśvara reveals an important construction in the temple. This record mentions the grant of dāvadāna lands for the construction of seven storeyed gopura for the Tiruvānapakkā temple.

All these generous gifts and construction made by the Hoysalas enable us to understand their attitude and approach to the temple. Inspite of the fact, that the temple was far away from their home country it did not prevent them to extend their generosity to the temple. Verily, the Hoysalas fostered and nurtured the concept of devotion, and really the Tiruvānapakkā temple enjoyed the patronage of the Hoysalas.

As these records, belong to Vīra Somēśvara, they quote only his regnal years - which indicates his independent status and the power he wielded in the Tamil country, in spite of the presence of the Chōla and the Pāṇḍya around this place.

Another interesting factor to be noted, is that we get Vīra Somēśvara's record from 1234-40, 1253-1259 A.D. There was a break of a period little over 13 years between 7th and 21st year of Vīra Somēśvara i.e. from 1240-53 A.D. This is due to the ambitious actions of Chōla Rājendra III who arose against both the Hoysalas and the Pāṇḍyas. The
rise of Jatāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I and his campaign against the Chōla gave a short respite for the Hoysala to assent his authority around the regions at Kappamūr and beyond and also at Tiruvāṇaikā.

The rise of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I on the political scene in the Tamil country and his attack on Chōla Rājārāja III to settle old scores brought the Hoysala. Narasimha II in support of the Chōla king who was matrimoniaally connected. He posted his son Śomēśvara at Kappamūr to make the local powers feel the presence of the Hoysala whose role in maintaining a balance of power began from about 1220 A.D. Tiruvāṇaikā had already fallen into the orbit of Narasimha's influence as proved by the establishment of posala Vīra Narasimha Chaturvēdimāngalam in which Tiruvāṇaikā was included. This is also supported by their connections with Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II, the excessive dependence of Chōla Rājārāja III on the Hoysala to protect himself against the attacks by the Kāḍava chief Köpperinjīnga on the north and Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I in the south gave the Hoysala enough scope to extend their power and influence.

With the local headquarters at Kappamūr, it did not take much time for Hoysala Vīra-Śomēśvara to cross the Kollidam river on the south and get interested in a
number of constructional activities at Tiruvānaikka associating them with his own name and the names of his female relatives. The Ranganāthasvāmi temple at Śrīraṅgam enjoyed equally the same patronage though to a lesser extent. We cannot dismiss these activities coupled with the Saivite leanings of the Chōla king Rājarāja III, of whom we get more records than in the reign of any other Chōla, as mere religious exercises without political overtones. For, very soon we find that a more ambitious king in the person of Rājendra III who succeeded Rājarāja III in 1246 A.D. did not take kindly to Hoysala domination. His Sanskrit praśasti, not available at Tiruvānaikka, a centre of Hoysala activity but available at Śrīraṅgam from the 7th year (= 1253 A.D.) of his reign contains the expressions “Karunāta-raja pratikūla kāla-danda, Vīra Somaśvara karṇāmuktaṇāda vīrabharana and more specifically “Nāma Somaśvara pratikūla kāla danda” which seem to smack of a disdainful attitude towards Hoysalas. This may explain the gap in the period when Vīra Somaśvara’s records are not traceable, but soon, as will be seen presently both Vīra Somaśvara and Rājendra III lost to the mighty Jata-varma Sundara Pāḍyā I, the one his life and the other his political power over this region. The Chōla-Hoysala relationship have been already analysed (Vide p. 27).
Vīra Rāmanātha, the son of Vīra Śaṅkara
succeeded to his father's territories in the Tamil
districts of the Hoysala kingdom. It was unfortunate,
that a territory which has once subjected to rapine and
plunder by the Pāṇḍyas, should have fallen to the share.
The menace of Pāṇḍya attack continued to haunt the ruler,
and even his capital, the city of Kappanur was seized by
the enemy.

Vīra Rāmanātha, right from his accession (1254
A.D.) to the throne was confronted with several perils.
His throne was neither a bed of roses nor was he a capable
man to prove himself as a man of better mettle, as the
events showed. He inherited a territory, without organi-
sation and without capital. Besides he had to struggle
against the bellicose attitude of his brother, who was
bent upon absorbing the Tamil territories of the Hoysalas.

The growing power of the Pāṇḍyas under Jaṭāvarma
Sundarapāṇḍya I necessitated Vīra Rāmanātha and the Chōla
ruler Rājendra III to narrow down their differences, to
meet the common danger. The danger can be better realised,
when Rāmanātha had transferred his capital to a place,
Kundāpi. The motive behind this move was to secure him-
self from the onslauht of the Pāṇḍyas.
In this context it is too appropriate to mention here, the co-regent of Jaṭāvarma Sundarapadhyya I namely Jaṭāvarma Virapadhyya, led an expedition and conquered several portions of the Chōla territory. Mahāravamman Kulasekharā completed the conquest and he claimed to have successfully occupied Kaṭṭanūr, in 1273 A.D. The last inscription of Viṭra Ramanāṭha at Kaṭṭanūr is in 1271 A.D. but no record of his is found after this date. We may safely guess by the absence of his inscriptions, that Tiruvānapikkā ceased to be his centre of activities as early as 1269 A.D. and in a decade (1279 A.D.) he lost his southern provinces and forced to go to his northern headquarters, as stated above.

Another important point to be noted here, though Viṭra Ramanāṭha came to throne as early as 1254 A.D., even before the retirement of Viṭra Somēśvara from actual politics, his records are seen engraved in the Tiruvānapikkā temple. Viṭra Somēśvara was not acknowledged as over lord, but Viṭra Ramaṭha assumed the epithet, 'Sārvabhauma Chakravartī'. Strangely enough we come across the records of Viṭra Somēśvara in the temple dated respectively in 1257-58, 1259-60 i.e. even six years after the accession of Viṭra Ramanāṭha.
The paradox can be explained, that during the life time of Vīra Somēśvara the kingdom had been divided between them and the records of Vīra Somēśvara on the walls of temple confirmed the above view. In the Pāṇḍya kingdom, the similar custom was in vogue, i.e. division of the kingdom between two or more brothers, and the Hoysalas might have followed this example. Vīra Rāmanātha's record on the Tiruvāṇaikā temple, his epithet Sarvabhūma Chakravarti, even when his father was alive can also be interpreted in another way. Apart from the division of his empire between his two sons, Vīra Rāmanātha and Vīra Narasimha, Vīra Somēśvara might have given the administrative control of his southern territories of the Tamil country to Vīra Rāmanātha. As Vīra Somēśvara, had pressing engagements elsewhere, he thought it prudent to allow the administration to be manned by his son, Vīra Rāmanātha. As stated earlier, the Pāṇḍyas proved a Democles sword, and Vīra Somēśvara, had to divert his attention to tackle the menace.

Altogether, there were nine records of the king, Vīra Rāmanātha, but most of them were donatory. The earliest record dated in the 2nd year of the king registers the sale of house sites by the temple of Tiruvāṇaikā Uḍaiya-nāyanār to a certain Gautama Śiva Rāvalar, for building a matha.
The fourth year record of Vīra Rāmanātha refers to the 23rd regnal year of his father as well as his own, regarding the sale of land by purchase for a gift to a matha and his gift both in kind and cash and conversion of the transaction as ‘sanyasānyam’, with effect from the 4th regnal year. This confirms the views stated earlier, the internal revenue administration was managed by Vīra Rāmanātha.

The 6th year record of 1260 A.D. refers to a gift of land by purchase of one Saṅkara-Bhāṭṭa of Pullalūr for offerings and worship to god Viśvēśvaradeva situated in the eastern prakāra of the temple of god Saṅgamēśvara-muḍāiyar at Vīra Narasimha Chaturvedimangalam, an agrahāra situated in Tiruvānapikā.

Yet another inscription engraved on the west wall of the second prakāra mentions the family members of Vīra Rāmanātha. The record mentions his queen Kamalādevi the daughter of certain Ariyappalai, Chikka Somaladevi the sister of the queen in connection with gift of some lands for the merit of both and for the mid-day worship of the deity of the temple. It is to be remembered that Vīra Rāmanātha had three queens Nāgalā, Kamalā and Somala. This epigraph is important in the sense that it throws
light on the members of the royal family. From this epigraph, we can assert Kamalādevi seems to be his second queen. For the first time we know that Somalādevi, the third queen was the younger sister of Kamalādevi as evidenced by the phrase "Kamalādevivār tānsiivār chikka Somalādevivārkkā". The prefix "chikka" means in Kannada younger is probably used to denote and differentiate Somalādevi who was one of the queens of Rāmanātha's father, Vīra Somēśvara.

Of the two records both dated in 14th year, the first is a fragment. The second is a customary donation of money for offerings and worship by one Nilakantha Nayakkār of Pālapallī to a local deity, PāsūpatĪsvaram-ūjñiyār which show the prevelance of Pāsupatha sect of Saivism as implied by the name of the deity. From the religious point of view this arrangement is significant.

The last record mentions the gift of a land by the servant of Nāgalā mahādevī, the senior queen to the shrine of Prasannāsvaram-ūjñiyār alīśa Rājākkal-nayapaṭr and the record is attested by the 'sign manual' of the king viz., Malara(ro)lga (ṇa) in Kannada characters. From this record we conclude, the Nāgalāmahādevī, the
It is rather curious to note, between 1261-66 A.D. we do not find any inscription of Vīra Rāmanātha in the temple. But we get the records of the valiant Pāṇḍya ruler, Jaṭāvarma Sundarapāṇḍya, between 1261-66 A.D. It goes without saying, the sweeping arms of Pāṇḍya engulfed Tiruvāṇaikā and Sundarapāṇḍya was virtually the ruler of Tiruvāṇaikā. But this view is untenable in the case of Śrīraṅgam for we find the records of both the kings, Vīra Rāmanātha and Jaṭāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya during the period under question thereby showing the subordinate position of Vīra Rāmanātha.

Now to summarise the substance of Vīra Rāmanātha's records at the temple.

1. He had inherited the kingdom during the lifetime of his father, and his control over the administrative spheres.

2. His queens participated in the day-to-day administration. They also donated liberally to the temple.
(3) His confrontation with the Paṇḍya ruler Jaṭāvarma Sundarapāṇḍya and the consequent absence of his record at Tiruvānikkā after 1266 A.D. proved the territory passed into the hands of the Paṇḍyas. Besides, the study of his inscriptions point to the continued interest of the royal household in the Tiruvānakkā temple.

THE PĀṇḍYAS:

The mighty fabric built by the emperor, Vijayājaya by his sword and statesmanship, reared by Rājarāja and Rājendra by their tact and diplomacy had to meet its decline. The presence of strong and ambitious rulers like Hoysalas, the recalcitrant feudatories, arrogant bureaucrats ruined the fortunes of the Chōlas. The decay was hastened by the powerful and virulent attacks of the emerging Paṇḍyas, under Maṇavarman Sundarapāṇḍya who was bent upon wiping out the disgrace and humiliation meted out to the Paṇḍyas by the Chōlas under Kulottunga III in their palmy days.

The later Chōlas were unable to arrest the forces of disintegration which ate the vitals of the empire. The Chōla government was highly centralised and only a few exceptional rulers, could effectively exercise the
sovereignty. Besides, during this period, the political climate of entire Tamil country, nay entire Deccan, underwent remarkable changes. Ability and statesmanship should go hand in hand, but in the absence of either of the aforesaid qualities, the empire was bound to fall. This is the irony of history, and Chōla empire could not be an exception to this rule.

After Jaṭāvarman Kṛlaṣekhara, Maṇavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya ascended the Pāṇḍyan throne. As stated above, the invasion of Kulōttuṇga III of Pāṇḍyanādu continued to rankle his mind and he waited for an opportunity to strike at the roots of Chōlas. As if to suit his wishes, after Kulōttuṇga came the imbecile ruler Rājarāja, in 1216 A.D.

Maṇavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya invaded the Chōlamandalam with ruthless severity and perpetrated untold atrocities and crimes and thus wreaked an awful vengeance. The entire Chōlamandalam reeled before the devastating attack of the Pāṇḍyas with the solitary exception of one 'Patinārukkālmapinām' and Rājarāja III had to run for safety. Thus the Chōlas were driven from pillar to post, a fate which the Chōlas often inflicted on their enemies.
The victorious Pāṇḍya proudly, pompously and gorgeously anointed himself at Āvirattali, and his eulogistic epithet 'Pīmarūviya tirumadandaiyum' further confirms his conquest and occupation of Chōla country. Rājarāja III driven from his ancestral territory by his traditional foe, had to seek refuge in Pāḷaiyāţai-nagar.

This was the condition of the extreme south, especially in Tamil country, during the period under review and in this chapter our aim is to study the history of Pāṇḍya occupation of Chōlamāṇḍalam through Tiruvāṇaikkā inscriptions.

An epigraph engraved on the east wall of the east gōmura in the third prākāra of the temple, begins with the high-sounding praśasti, of the Pāṇḍya ruler, Sundarapāṇḍya. It rings with a vibrant note that he, the undaunted among the foes on the earth was crowned at Āvirattali in the 3rd regnal year (= 1218-19 A.D.) of his reign. We can safely infer (1) the conquest and annexation of Chōla country was pre-planned by him, with a view to take revenge upon the Chōlas; (2) the Pāṇḍya influence was implanted in the very heart of Chōlamāṇḍalam and the defeat suffered by Rājarāja III at the hands of Sundarapāṇḍya was not only true, but it was also severe and the discomfiture was complete. For the Chōlas
it was a question of very survival, as the Pāñḍya ruler had the credit of bearding the lion in its own den. Thus Māravarman achieved a signal, singular, splendid substantial and spectacular success over the Chōlas.

Another important point to be noted here, that only a few months would have been passed between his victory and the engraving of this record. The absence of Rājarāja III's records from 1216-1229 A.D. clearly shows, without any shadow of doubt, that Tiruvāṇaiṅka and its environs were under the control of the Pāñḍyas.

Another epigraph begins with prasāasti of the Pāñḍyan ruler, Māravarman Sundarapāñḍya. It mentions the Pāñḍya king Māravarman Sundarapāñḍya who was pleased to take 'Sōnādu'. This epigraph records in the 4th regnal year (= 1219-20 A.D.) of the king, enumerates the ornaments etc., belonging to god Tiruvāṇaiṅka-udaiyar while the king is mentioned as staying at Madura. Yet another record unambiguously shows that he captured Sōnādu and was pleased to perform anointment of heroes and victors at Medikonda Chōlapuram (Sōnādu-kōṇḍu medikonda sōlawur Viṟṟbihiṣekkam Viṟṟbihiṣekkam mappivarulija). The first inscription informs us that the Pāñḍya king stationed at Madura, a place from which he exercised his control over a place as far as Tiruvāṇaiṅka, which unmistakably
shows, the above place was well-within the orbit of\nPañḍya occupation and the territory became a part of\nPañḍi-nāgu.
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These two records are very important as they\ngive a clear picture of the Pañḍya occupation of Chōla\nmandalam Tiruvānaikka and the anointment of Pañḍya king\nat Sōnādu. We are able to know the different and com-\nprehensive chronological events of his reign. Reading\nthe contents of the first epigraph, dated in the 3rd reg-\nnal year (1218-19 A.D.) it clinches the issue that Tiru-\nvānaikka was under his control in the 3rd regnal year\n
itself.
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Another epigraph dated in the 7th regnal year\n(1222-23 A.D.) registers the tax-free gift of land in\nKachchimaṅgalam, a hamlet in Māranēri alīaṃ (Di)nachintā-\nmandi-chaturvedimaṅgalam in Īyī-nāgu for offerings and\nworship during sandhi service was instituted by the king\nin his own name Sundarapāṇḍiyansandhi in the Tiruvānaikka\ntemple and for special festivals on the day of avittam\nthe asterism of the king in the month of Āvani. It reveals\nthe king's keen desire to perform worship and festivals,\nas the temple was popular enough to strike the attention\nof the Pañḍya ruler who was keen on celebrating his birth\nday in the temple.
We also get information about the officers of the Pāṇḍya administration from the inscription. It refers to a gift of land after purchase for a flower garden to the god by a certain Vēṇaṭṭaiyar and his brother Maduraippourumal. The names of the donors are very interesting as they reveal the identity of these persons who were perhaps officers under him.

An undated inscription engraved in Nāgarī script in Sanskrit language composed in Varāṣṭra metre in praise of a Bapa king, Vīraśāgadaṇa. In 10th century A.D. the Bāpas were brought under the control of Chōla by the king Parāntaka and the Bāpas appeared to have been divided into two branches, one branch moving towards the Telugu country another to the banks of Perār and settled at Vēṇaṭṭai. With the rise of the Pāṇḍyas they also shifted their allegiance to them turning against the Chōlas. A Tamil praśasti remarks that the Chōla crown was snatched and bestowed on Bāpas.

A damaged record palaeographically assignable to 13th century records the gift of the Chōla country by Sundarāpāṇḍya to the Bāpas. Two other inscriptions also refer to the same incident. Thus, it is evident the Bāpas played a key role in the politics of the time by joining with the Pāṇḍyas. In the former record Sundara
Pāṇḍya is compared with the famous king who gave the lands to Lord Viṣṇu while the Bāṇa king who receives the gift to that of Lord Viṣṇu who measured the earth with his three giant steps. This simile suggests the generosity and munificent gifts of the Pāṇḍya king.

An analysis of the temple inscriptions reveals the following events in Sundarapāṇḍya's reign.

(1) He carried fire and sword into the Chōlamanḍalam, ousted the Chōla king, and crowned himself at Ayirattali.

(2) He ungrudgingly donated gifts to the deity of the temple.

(3) He captured and retained Chōlamanḍalam, as is evident by the expressions 'Sōnāyukkōndarulina' and one who pleased to take Sōnādu.

(4) Both Bāṇas and Pāṇḍyas were allies.

(5) The Bāṇa king was given the Chōlamanḍalam.

(6) Besides, we do get some glimpses about the officials of the Pāṇḍya country.
The rule of Māravarman Sundarapāṇḍya II (1236-53 A.D.) was less colourful as he had no outstanding achievement or record of his own. He was a mere puppet in the hands of his mahārāja, the Hoysala ruler Vīra Somēśvara, who lost no opportunity to utilise the weak monarch to his personal ambitions. The Hoysala ruler often meddled with the internal affairs of the Pāṇḍya kingdom, so much so, that he influenced the Pāṇḍya monarch to name a village in Tirunelveli district after his name. Besides, there is another reference to another Hoysala chief, probably the brother-in-law of Hoysala ruler, who guided the charities of the Pāṇḍya king. To put everything in a nutshell, that his reign shed no lustre, as no exploit of his own, except that he had retained in tact, the solid empire which he inherited from his able predecessor to be bequeathed to his equally able successor Jaṭāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya I. In otherwords, his reign was eclipsed by the glories of two powerful monarchs, his predecessor and his successor.

The rule of Jaṭāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya, who succeeded to the throne in 1251 A.D. was indeed brilliant for he had a series of victories and conquests to his credit. It was during his reign that the glory of the Pāṇḍyas reached its highest water-mark as the entire south prostrated at his feet. By his valour and statesmanship,
he revive the pristine glory of the ancient Pāṇḍya house. In conquest, administration, and generosity, he carved out a covetable niche in the annals of the Pāṇḍyas.

His generosity and lavish gifts, to the great temples at Śrīraṅgam, Trivāṇaikkā, and Chidambaram, reflected in the epigraphs give an idea, about his catholicity as well as the prevailing trend in the matters of religion. He had the unique credit of gilding the temples of Chidambaram and Śrīraṅgam with gold, which earned for him the sobriquet [Ponmavida-parimal] and his tulabhāra ceremonies in the temples on the days of his astersism endeared him to the masses. These gifts stand as an outstanding monument to his unflinching generosity and unflagging religious enthusiasm, and in his own life-time he had almost become a legend, as every bard envied with other in praising his noble qualities of head and heart. A review of the Pāṇḍya history under Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya through the Tiruvāṇaikkā inscriptions gives us an insight into his life and times.

His first task was to subdue the Malainēdu. He routed the Chera king with losses and ruthlessly ravaged his territory. He then compelled the weak Chōla ruler,
Rājarāja III who was trying to recover his territories. He compelled him to pay tribute. This fact was vouchsafed by the paucity of records of the king Rājarāja III in 1251 A.D. coincides with the date of accession of this Pāṇḍya king. But curiously we find a few records of Vīra Sōmeśvara, who entered into the good-books of Maravarman Sundarapāṇḍya II. But his successor was too smart to be outwitted by these "matrimonial" and "cordial" ties, as he had seized Śrīraṅgam, Chidambaram and Tiruvāṇaikka, Kappanūr, etc. probably before his 7th regnal year. A long Sanskrit inscription of this king from Śrīraṅgam opens with a statement that he had just sent to the other world the moon of Karpāṭa i.e. Sōma (Sōmeśvara).

His records three in number engraved on the walls of the temple, give us an account of the conditions of his times.

An epigraph engraved on the south-wall of the second prakāra of the temple dated in the 10th year commencing with the prāṇastī samasta jagadādhāra, refers to an agreement (nilavilai-prāmāṇam) between the temple authorities (devarkarmpa) and an individual Sūryadēvan in connection with the sale of land by purchase at Tiruvāṇaikkā for the daily service at the temple from the sale proceeds of 400 kalanju of rādi panam. This record is of
immense value as it helps in fixing the date of the accession of the king, as it gives the name of his contemporaries like Chōla-kula-tilaka, Karnāṭarāja, Kākatīya ruler, Gapapati, and the Telugu-chōja ruler, Vīra Gapḍa-Gopaḷa. To quote this prāśasti, engraved in Grantha script.

He is Krishṇa to Tan-Madura. He destroyed and uprooted Kāraṇa-vamsa. He exhibited the martial qualities of Śrī Kāraṇa. He is an axe to the Chōla-kula-tilaka, probably Rājarāja III. He defeated the Karnāṭarāja. He is a lion to the Kāḍava elephants, and he captured the forts of his enemies. He subdued the ruler of Kānci, Gapapati. He is a tiger to the Kākatīya doors. He anointed himself at Helligore. He performed Vīrabhishaka. All the kings worshipped him and kissed his feet. He was Paramēśvara.

Thus these historical events recorded in the temple confirm and corroborate the evidences obtained elsewhere.

Another inscription though fragmentary contains the prāśasti of the king mentions his natal star Mūla in the month of Chittirai on which day the king seems to have instituted some gift for his own merit.

Jātāvarman's encounter with the Chēma king was also revealed by another record as there is a reference to Sarasaivanpran-tirumāl which unmistakably mentions his
successful encounter with the Chēra king. This record registers an exemption of taxes granted from the 21st year and 103rd day of the king's reign on the villages Muṭṭaiḷḷi, Vīratōṅgapuram and Pāgāṇkuḷi, which had been endowed by him, for offerings and worship to the god during the said festival at the temple on the day of the king's astroism at the instance of his nephew. An inscription from Tirunelveli dated in the third year of the king gives the name Rāviveṇa-chaturvedimangalam for a village in the neighbourhood and a Vīra Raviudnayamārṭṭāṉāvarmaṇ is known to have been ruling in Travancore in 1251 A.D. Thus it is evident the name of the village suggests Sundarapāṇḍya's victory over the Chēra king who was very probably identical with this Ravi Udayamārṭṭāṉāvarmaṇ.

It goes without saying that the temple was a silent spectator of the radical changes that were taking place in the political map of South India. The temple continued to attract the rulers of various dynasties, and the number of Pāṇḍya records available in the temple, showed the continued patronage of the Pāṇḍyas towards this temple.
The Pāṇḍya kings had the credit of renovating and building the temple complexes as is evident by a record, engraved on the north-wall of the vibhūti-prākāra stating that the wall (tirumāḷigaḻ) was donated by Tirumūrughu Sundarapāṇḍya.

The absence of the records of the twin successors of Jaṭāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya leads us to surmise, that they were mere representatives of the king. The two rulers, Jaṭāvarma Viṛapāṇḍya and Jaṭāvarma Vikramapāṇḍya, did not leave any records of their own.

The next ruler of some merit was the illustrious Māravarman Kulasekhara I, from 1266 A.D. - 1311 A.D. and his rule constituted a glorious epoch in the history of medieval Pāṇḍyas. He won a series of victories and his strength of arms was felt by even remote territories like Ilam, and he successfully put down the rebellion, organised to dislodge the Pāṇḍyas from the conquered territories. He brought under his sway Kollam, Malai-nāţi, Chōla-nāţi and Kōṅgu and evolved a clean and efficient administration.

An inscription of Māravarman Kulasekhara I engraved on the west wall of the second prākāra dated in the 5th January, 1278 A.D. refers to a grove it called Silandiyai Solakekkirān tiruttomu as one of the boundaries
of a land granted and this contains, a distinct allusion to the legend in Perivanurāṇam where the sacred grove called after the god, who transformed a spider into a king is mentioned.

This is a fact that the last record of Vīra Rāmanātha at Tiruvāṇaikkā was in 1269 A.D. and we know that the Chōlamapāṇiḷam passed into the hands of the Pāṇḍyaś, and we also know that Māravarman Kulasekhara was camping at Kappanīr, the headquarters of Hoysalas in 15th regnal year. The last record of Vīra Rāmanātha at Kappanīr is dated in 1271 A.D. and we are at a loss to fill up the gap between 1269 A.D., the year in which Vīra Rāmanātha's last record is obtained and 1276 A.D. — the record of the Pāṇḍya king Māravarman Kulasekhara. We cannot say anything with certainty whether Tiruvāṇaikkā passed into the hands of some other powers. We have to infer, that what Jaṭāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya had won was retained in tact by his successors Vīrapāṇḍya, Vikramapāṇḍya and Māravarman Kulasekhara I, though no records are found engraved during this period.

An analysis of the Pāṇḍya records undoubtedly reveals, after the Chōlas, the territory passed into the hands of the emerging power, the Pāṇḍyas. The Hoysalas, by shrewd diplomacy and matrimonial alliances wielded some
power, especially in the time of the weak rulers. The territory was indeed a bone of contention among the various powers, but the Pāṇḍyas by their valour and diplomacy captured and retained it for 60 years. The two powerful Pāṇḍya rulers, Jatāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya, and his able successor, Māravarman Kulasekhara, patronised the temple.

THE MUSLIMS:

It was explained that after the enjoyment of power and influence for a long span of more than four centuries the Chōla dynasty came to an end. The Pāṇḍyas who had been subjugated for a long time made many brave attempts to revive their rule but could succeed initially only with the help of Kongu and later with Hoysala rulers.

Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I, Jatavarma Sundara Pāṇḍya I and Māravarman Kulasekhara I, the three outstanding Pāṇḍya kings could keep up their lost glory, on their own nearly extending their sovereignty over entire Tamilnadu. History repeats itself. The taste of new powers and influence brought in its turn the decline. Disunity and dissenion plagued the fortunes of the new power, and the Pāṇḍyan throne virtually had become a bone of contention between the warring faction,
the imbecile Virapāṇḍya, and the degenerated Sundara Pāṇḍya, the two sons of Nagavarman-Kalasokhara. Sundarapāṇḍya appealed to Alau-din Khilji, the Delhi Sultan, who directed the Kākatīya ruler to curtail the cause of Sundarapāṇḍya.

The new power from the north began to cast his Argus-eyes of the fertile south. These sons of Islam, inspired by religious enthusiasm, infatuated by rich spoils, fired with enthusiasm, unleashed a brutal attack, hitherto unheard of. After subduing north, they focussed their greedy and cultured eyes on Deccan. The weak pockets of Deccan, that were divided and vacillated could not withstand the fiery onslaught of these marauding hordes and they succumbed to the invasion. Their brutal and violent invasion, was felt in the limbs and the nervous of south India.

Besides this, another power, as a reaction to the Muslim invasion arose. This new power, which championed the cause of the Hindus, which upheld the doctrines and dogmas of Vedic religion, which aimed at saving Hindustan from the onslaught of Muslims and which acted as a vanguard of traditional culture emerged. The tiny seed that was sown in 1336 A.D. on the banks of Tungabhadra,
by the two insignificant individuals, Harihara and Bukka became a mighty, marvellous and magnificent Vijayanagara empire, which acted as a bulwark of Hindu-dharma, which defied the challenges of Islam, which defended the land from the brutal and barbaric attack of the ruthless iconoclasts, who ravaged the fertile pockets of Deccan with such virulence which beggars description.

Before studying the history of Vijayanagara empire, it is necessary to study the part played by the Hoysalas notably their chieftain, Vīra-Ballāja who exerted himself to stem the rot but as he was isolated with the result he could not accomplish anything, and all his efforts ended in fiasco.

Vīra-Ballāja came to throne in 1292 A.D. Undoubtedly he was an accomplished ruler of some merit; Though aged nevertheless, he was a mature statesman and doughty warrior of no mean calibre. The presence of his records in Salem, Nilgiris and other places proved his sway over the North-western portion of Tamil Nadu. It seems he also won substantial victory in North Arcot district, and his authority was recognised in and around Kānchi.
Alau-ud-din Khilji, the great ruler of Delhi, who captured the throne, after stabbing at the back of his uncle and predecessor Jalal-ud-din, enamoured with the ostensible idea of spreading the light of Islam in Deccan, but his object was nothing but mere plunder, rapine and arson. The incessant Muslim raids in Deccan in medieval times led to the establishment of Madura Sultanate in 1323 A.D. and the local Sultan allied himself with the Delhi Sultan. Out of the four kingdoms of Deccan, Devagiri and Warrangal were brought under his fold and the local Rajas of these states guaranteed the Sultan with handsome yearly tribute, and the greedy and avaricious Sultan, who did not like to kill the goose that lay the golden eggs permitted them their independence. The remaining two, the Hoysala ruler of Malbar and the Pandyas of Madurai were well out of the orbit of Delhi Sultanate, and Malik Kafur was despatched to force these rulers to toe their line.

Accordingly Malik Kafur ravaged the territory with ruthless barbarity and Ballala who perceived the situation, realised that antagonism would invite sure disaster, surrendered and agreed to act as a Zimmi or feudal subordinate and reluctantly guided the Delhi army into Malbar. But he had to swallow up his pride in doing
so, and he waited for an opportunity to throw off the yoke of Malik Kafur. His association with Muslims was looked down with great odium and his fealty to the Khilji throne was not genuine and it was upto him to revoke loyalty with a change in the dynasty. A warrior of Ballala’s calibre could not act as an alien stooge. We get references of Ballala III inscription at Tiruvannamalai in 1318-19, 1328-31 and 1340-43 A.D., showing us indirectly his attempts to capture Kappanur.

Added to these, the rule of the Madura Sultan was totally oppressive. They systematically followed a policy of extortion and exploitation. The Hindu land lords were deprived of their possessions, while the peasants were denied the fruits of their labour. Every where there was lawlessness, bloodshed and disorder. This was the state of affairs that were seen in Deccan. Srirangam temple and other temples including Jammukeshvaram were in a ruined condition due to Muslim occupation.

It was at this juncture that both Telangana and Kampili rose in rebellion and the shrewd Ballala deemed these examples as precedents to be followed. Prudence and statesmanship dictated that he should throw his lot with other powers, which had exhibited extraordinary vigour. The Pandyya ruler of obscure identity and Ballala made
conscious efforts to throw the alien power. An intense wave of religious enthusiasm to preserve and protect the Hindu temples from desecration, swept the entire Deccan and every ruler vied with others in religious zeal, and Ballāja could not shut his eyes before this movement, but to join the mainstream, which was calculated to revive the Hindu civilisation in the pristine purity of the past.

In this period of unrest, turmoil, turbulations, the Madura Sultan, Ala-u-din Udaiji was killed, and his death came handy to the rulers to rise in rebellion. The wave of Muslim conquest swept away the entire country and Ballāja was bent upon recovering the territories lost by him. He made elaborate preparations, marched towards Kappanīr, routed the Muslim army on his way and besieged it for full six months. He dictated a term by which he would raise the siege on condition that Kappanīr would be ceded to him back. But the local sultan was too clever to be outwitted by such manoeuvres, despatched an additional troop of 3000 swift cavalry which trapped the poor old man, Ballāja, flayed him alive after he was robbed off his riches and the Sultan then true to his fashion and upbringing stuffed his skin with straw and hung up on the walls of Madura.
THE VIJAYANAGARA RULERS:  

An analysis of the inscriptions recorded on the walls of this temple, reveals at once the Vijayanagara rulers, were not only able to stem the rot of the Muslim invasion, but they also succeeded in recovering the entire South under one banner. The numerous inscriptions which throw light on the munificent gifts ungrudgingly donated by the rulers make it apparent, that under the aegis of the Vijayanagara rulers, Hinduism obtained a new lease of life. Verily, the vedic-dharma witnessed its hey-day, and the history of Vijayanagara constitute a fertile epoch not only in the political history but also in the religious history.

Most of the rulers made one or other gifts to the temple. Some of them donated in kind to the temple, while the others made an additional construction. With the help of these epigraphs we are in a position to reconstruct the political history of Vijayanagara rulers.

As stated earlier, the Vijayanagara empire came as a big challenge to the alien rule of the Muslims, continued the unfinished task of the Hoysalas in unifying the entire South under one banner. The two rulers of Vijayanagara, Bukkapa and Kambapa exerted themselves to extricate the territories from the Muslim rule. After
the disappearance of Alau-ud-din, court conspiracies and internal dissensions ruined the fortunes of the Muslim rule and in 1317 A.D., the Muslim rule virtually came to and end for a short spell.

106
An epigraph engraved in the west wall of the mandana in the second prakara of this temple records the construction of a mandapa by one Sanaka, at the instance of Appappayyan son of Shirupparaśar. This Appappaya was a dayanavāka and Shirupparaśar a mahāpradhāni. This record belongs to the king, Devarāya I (1406-22), and it shows the temple continued to enjoy the patronage and support of Devarāya I and his subordinates.

The rulers also revived the worship in the temple, by remitting taxes due to the king from the devadana lands. 108
An epigraph of Devarāya II (1422-46), refers to the arrangement of the revival of worship and it amply demonstrates the ruler were keen on reviving the fallen glory of the temple during the Muslim interregnum.

It was during the reign of Virapratapa Devarāya, the revenue officials, the adhikāras and the sānaināvoaras harassed the people to part with more money as taxes. But the people were unable to put up with this extortion left their holdings and migrated elsewhere consequently
worship in the temple came to a halt. However the 

सहस्यवरस of Jambukeshvaras brought to the notice of the 

king, the gross irregularities in the collection the king 
in turn directed his officer, Sirupparaśar, to set the 
matters right and services in the temples were once again 
restored as in the time of Bhupati, and this was accepted 
by the people at large and the demand to revive the old 
order was met by his successor, Devarāya II. The offic-
cials also took part in the festivities of the temple, 
and they showed beyond any shadow of doubt, that, they 
were not lagging behind in donating riches to the temples. 
The temple which was a silent spectator of radical changes, 
that has been taking place in the South, attracted the rulers 
and the ruled, kings and officials alike. 

An undated epigraph engraved right of entrance 
through the south wall of the fourth prākara, refers to 
the construction of the tirumadil by Appa Chavupjappa 
Ujaiyar son of Aditta Ujaiyar. The construction of this 
tirumadil i.e. the fourth prākara wall is a substantial 
addition to the temple giving a protected enclosure. The 
donor who is known to have made elaborate provisions for 
garlands, daily offerings and a perpetual lamp to god 

Rāganātha at Śrīraṅgam and for the celebration of a
car festival for the merit of his father Adityadeva Udaiyar and also an elephant for service and 30 cows for a lamp in Saka 1355 (1434 A.D.) has paid equal attention to the Siva temple at Tiruvanosikka. Besides this Tamil inscription at the southern entrance, another in Sanskrit language and in grantha characters engraved on the right of entrance at the western gopura now called Mallappan gopura records that Chaundappa constructed the 

112 An epigraph dated in Saka 1375 (1453-54 A.D.) refers to the gift of an ornament for the deity Akilapdi-
nayaki by Suluva Tirumalaraja son of Suluva goppara sa. This record may be assignable to the reign of Mallikarjuna, as the person Suluva Tirumalaraya was the governor of Tanjavur district. He was also appointed as the Governor of Cholamapdalam during the reign of Devaraya II.

115 The next Vijayanagara record that merits our attention refers to the sale of the right of worship for 400 Virachampankuligai in the temple of Jambukanvara to a Bhagavanar Apparperumal of Kaitavanallur in Topdaimapdalam. The record which is dated in Saka 1392, corresponds to December 28, 1470 A.D. The king under whom the trans-
action was made was Praughadева-maharaya, son of Mallikarjuna,
him we can make a surmise that he was a minor chieftain of Chōla stock under Vijayanagara rulers.

As stated in the beginning the period under review, witnessed the emergence of recalcitrant, hostile and suspicious subordinates, who defied the central authority. More particularly so, during the reign of Virupāksha, the feudatories began to adopt an aggressive and agitational attitude. The Bāpa chieftain Bhuvanēkavīra Samarakòlāhalan who was once loyal and subordinate of the Vijayanagara rulers took advantage of the weakness of the rulers, and during the struggle between Mallikārjuna and Virupāksha (1447-85 A.D.) he asserted his independence.

During this period, the Bahmani Sultān Muhammad III (1463-82 A.D.) ravaged the fertile territories of the South upto Kañchī, 'Oḍḍīyaṇ Kaḷābai' caused by oriyan invasion under Harṇāra Ṭahāpātra devastated the entire Tamil country as far as Śrīraṅgam. These events gave a jolt to the otherwise smooth of Vijayanagar rule in the 15th century. The then rulers Mallikārjuna and Virupāksha were not capable enough to arrest the effect of the intrusion of these forces.
We are to examine next the two epigraphs of Krishnapadévarāya (1509-29 A.D.). His first record dated Śaka 1441 (= 1519 A.D.) engraved on the north wall of the second prakāra of the temple, refers to the gift of 12 vāli of land in three villages to the temple for the daily requirements of worship to the god and goddess by Timmappa Nāyaka, son of Vāsāl-Mallappa-Nāyaka, an officer of Krishnapada-maharāya whose pāvakattanaṇa comprised Tiruchirappalli-Rārmai in Chōlamandalam. It demonstrates that the temple continued to enjoy the patronage and support of the successive Vijayanagara rulers. While the other record dated Śaka 1441 (= 1519 A.D.) engraved on the same wall of the temple records a gift of one vāli of land at Vajavūr in Rājagambhiravanāḍu, for the expenses of worship and offerings on the second day of the annual festival in the temple by the same Timmappa-Nāyaka for the merit of his overlord, Krishnapadēvarāya.

A survey of Vijayanagara records found in the temple ranging from 1406-1519 A.D. gives a connected account of the history of the period. Particularly the part played by his generals and ministers, are well portrayed. The number of records of this dynasty in this temple, though few show that Śaivism also received encouragement along with Vaishnavism. Except for a stray incident, during the period
of Sājuva Narasimha (1486–91 A.D.) as evidenced by the Śrīraṅgam temple chronicle, Kōyiloḷugu that one Kōnērirāja (1450–94 A.D.) taking advantage of the pre-occupation of Sājuva Narasimha and Narasaṇāyaka in the northern part of the empire seems to have asserted his independence in the Tamil country and also oppressed the Vaishpavas of Śrīraṅgam favouring saivities of Tiruvāṇaikka and seized the villages belonged to Śrīraṅgam and donated the same to one Kōṭṭai Sāmantan Śenpappa Nāyaka. He also collected taxes from the citizens who ultimately reported the matter to their overlord Narasanāyaka, who invaded the territories of Śrīraṅgam in 1499 A.D. and once again the villages were restored to the original donees.

To conclude we may say, during this period Tiruvāṇaikka and its environs continued to enjoy the patronage of the Vijayanagara rulers. They revived the worship and gave economic support to the activities in this temple, as they did elsewhere. Some minor disturbing events in the course of their rule did not however affect the activities in this temple.

THE NĀYAKAS OF MADURAI:

The Vijayanagara rulers, including Kṛishpadēvarāya began to rely more on the Nāyakas, who were entrusted with the difficult and onerous task of governing the outlying and
remote areas from their headquarters. The Nāyakas who served as governors of Vijayanagara rulers, had their headquarters at Tanjavūr and Madurai. They also brought Ramanathapuram, Tiruchirāpalli, Salem and Coimbatore under their control.

The region around Tiruvāpaikkā passed into the Nāyakās of Taṅjavūr initially and the inscriptions of Śrīraṅgam bear ample testimony to the endowments made by Kumara Achuta i.e. Achutappa Nayaka son of Sevappa Nayaka of Taṅjavūr. While the inscriptions of Śrīraṅgam maintain a continuity in recording the benefactions made by the Nāyakas of both Taṅjavūr and Madurai, Tiruvāpaikkā does not have inscriptions which reflect on the same of continuity. This however does not prevent us from surmising that the same patronage as found in the Renganathaswami temple at Śrīraṅgam was present in the case of this temple also, though on a lesser scale as proved by the few records.

With the advent of the ruler, Viśvanātha Nāyaka (1529-6+ A.D.) a new chapter was opened in the annals of Nāyakas. He was undoubtedly a man of great character and calibre. He served with great distinction and devotion, during the Orissa campaign and captured Raichur in 1520 A.D. Ultimately he was nominated as a viceroy of South
with the high sounding title 'Chief of the Pāṇḍya country' and 'Lord of the southern Throne'. In 1529 A.D., he became the governor of Madura and cemented his position.

We get Nāyakas records elsewhere ranging from 1566-1721 A.D. But, we do not get any record of Viśvanātha Nāyaka (1529-64 A.D.) at Tiruvānapikkā. As he was left with the task of consolidating his rule, he had to direct all his time and energy to tackle internal dissension and external aggression.

Viśvanātha seems to have taken the earliest opportunity to provide for safety of Tiruchirāpalli. He maintained law and order, by clearing jungles on either side of the river, Kāverī. The necessary police arrangements were made to safeguard the life and property of the pilgrims. He paid particular attention to the temples of Trichchirappalli and Śrīraṅgam and the Teppakkulam seems to owe its existence to him. He ordered extensive repairs and erection of some new structures. The Kōvilollu records that he spent about three lakhs of pūruṣ for the temple. He built many houses and encouraged habitation all around. Since Viśvanātha Nāyaka's control over Tiruchirappalli is clear, we will not be far wrong if we say that both Śrīraṅgam
and Tiruvāṇaikkā would have had the benefit of his benign rule, though there are no records bearing on this.
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The first epigraph of the Nayaka dynasty of the temple belonged to Kṛishṇapāpa, engraved on the base of the northern verandah of the second prākāra of the temple. It records that Mummudī Timmarasa and his son installed the images of the deities Valampuri Vināyaka, Subramanyya etc., as the gift of Mahāpradhāna Vīra... Dapjanāyaka Udaiyār and the inscription is dated in 1566 A.D. It is appropriate to mention here, with the installation of the deity Vināyaka, the expeller of impediments, the Nayaka connection with the temple was inaugurated and this tie had lasted till the last ruler of the dynasty, Vijayaraṅga Chokkanātha.

Although we are helpless to fix the identity of this mahāpradhāna, we may infer that he also served under the Vijayanagara ruler, Sadāśiva. The latter continued to rule till 1567 A.D. and it seems that he had spent his last days at Śrīraṅgam. Kṛishṇapāpanāyaka, his subordinate had rendered meritorious service to Sadāśivarāya. The epigraph is assignable to Kṛishṇapāpa-Nāyaka and a mahāpradhāna Dapjanāyaka figures in it as the donor of the images. Kṛishṇapāpa Nāyaka was praised in the Kṛishnaṭūram
plates of Sadasivaraṇa. It was in this period the ruler of Vijayanagara launched an expedition against Ceylon and this mahāpradhāna Dāmḍanāyaṇaka rendered a signal service to the imperial rulers. Krishṇappa himself was associated with the invasion of Ceylon, and he even assisted the general. An interesting point to be worth noted here is, the expedition against Ceylon might have passed through Srīraṅgam.

The next epigraph belonged to the period of the next ruler, Vīrappa Nāyaka, and it registered the food offerings to god and goddess of the temple from the interest derived on the cash (kāśu) deposit made by a Vellāla native of Tōḻaimandalam and invested in a village. This shows that irrespective of the royal involvement in the activities in the temple, private people continue to have interest. As an ardent devotee of Śiva Vīrappa Nāyakka (1572–95 A.D.) had constructed many buildings and made renovations. An interesting piece of information was the name of the deity has been changed to Āḷagiya Tiruvāgaikka Ujaiya Tambirāṇār.

The Nāyaka rulers were concerned with the constitution and management of the temple as it is evident from
an epigraph of the same ruler which refers to an order of the deity Chapdesvara conferring the headship upon one Chandrasekharaguru udaiyar of the Paunata-mutt. It is possible that the local dignitaries and prominent devotees of the temple might have had a role in making this decision at the instance of the then ruler putting it in the form of an order from the representative deity (Chapdesvara) who is considered to be the head of the administrative set up in the temple. It is evident that such orders which were issued in the temples were really decisions resulting from the deliberations of the local bodies connected with the administration of the temples, mostly with the knowledge of local ruler. The inscription belongs to 1585 A.D. Another inscription dated November 20, 1595 A.D. in the reign of Virappanayaka mentions the royal gift of annual income of 47 pong due to the chief from the valajkara i.e. fishermen family settled in Tirucchirapalli for worship and offerings on one of the days during the principal festival to the deity Kaikalanatha whose image was set up by the king in the temple. Two other records which are on the pedestals of the metallic Dwarpala images placed in the first prakaara of the temple is an illustration to the above point. These images were the gifts of Deivarigalperumal, the son of a Karajaka of Visvanatha nayaka Virappanayakkaraayyanna.
An epigraph in Telugu characters mentions one Tirumalamma, the wife of the above donor. Since the record is very badly damaged, we can hardly make out any useful information.

We do not get records of the Nayakas from 1595 A.D. till the accession of Tirumalai Nayaka (1623-59 A.D.) at Tiruvāpaikkā. We cannot offer any explanation to fill this vacuum except the fact, that the Tamil country under the Nayakas did not witness serious political turmoil. Nor is there any authentic evidence to say that the Nayakas had lost their suzerainty in these place. Under these circumstances we have to construe the non-availability of any records during this interregnum, as an indication that worship in this temple was normal, with nothing of note to specify.

There are two spurious copper plates claimed to have belonged to Tirumalaināyaka and Chokkanātha nāyaka. But the dates of these copper plates and the reigns of the above sovereign do not coincide, we can brush them aside as unworthy of any historical importance. The earlier plate, dated in 1662 A.D. falls beyond the reign of Tirumalaināyaka, who exercised his sovereignty between 1623-59 A.D. while the latter plate belongs to 1653 A.D., but
the rule of Chokkanāthanāyaka was from between 1659-62 A.D. Under these circumstances, we cannot consider them for our purpose. The contents of the plates are the usual donations to temple. But as a source they fail to serve our purpose.

It was during the reign of Chokkanātha (1659-62 A.D.) that the capital was shifted in 1665 A.D. from Madura to Tiruchchirāppalli. As a matter of fact the similar change was effected during the reign of his predecessors viz., Tirumalaināyaka (1523-59 A.D.) and Muttuvirappanāyaka (1609-23 A.D.) in 1634 and 1616 A.D. respectively due to political exigencies. By this change and proximity of capital, Tiruvāṇaikā would have been largely benefited.

The last ruler of the dynasty was Vijayarānga Chokkanātha. Several new additional constructions were made by one Vaidyapēyya, son of Venkaṭēśvarayya an instructor in the Nātakaśāla. His two records fall between 1721 and 1722 A.D. From these we came to know this Nāyaka ruler was an ardent devotee, a connoisseur of fine arts.
The Śrīraṅgam temple epigraphs contain numerous references about the gift of gold jewels and vessels made to the temple by the king Vijayarāga Chokkanātha and his royal house.

It is worth mentioning verbatim the views expressed by R. Sathiyanatha Iyer the doyen among historians who wrote "The History of the Nāyakās of Madurai". Continuing on the catholocity of Vijayarāga Chokkanātha, he writes "Vijayarāga's excessive religious fervor made him unmindful of his duties as king. Besides criminally neglecting his proper functions, he wasted the resources of the kingdom in lavish donations and frequent royal tours to principal shrines. His inscriptions of 1708, 1715, 1716, 1717, 1724, 1727 and 1728 record grants of lands and villages to temples and charities. One in two years he is said to have moved with a large following to Śrīraṅgam, Jambukēśvaram, Madura, Timnevelly, Āḻvār Tirunagiri and Śrīvaiṅkupṭham and made liberal gifts to the gods. When he was grieved that the presents of jewellery and other gifts he had made on a previous occasion were all missing, he would not do so much as institute an enquiry into the malversion, but would repeat his donations. In thus draining the public treasury he showed little sense of responsibility. His ministers, Naravappayā and Venkaṭarāghavacārya,
took advantage of his weakness and pilfered the public revenues unscrupulously. At a time when the country was hastening to ruin, Vijayarāṅga Chokkanātha was the last man to be at the head of the realm. Like Vijayarāghava, the last Nāyak of Taṅjavūr, his essentially religious temperament dug the grave of his reputation as a ruler, and accelerated the collapse of his kingdom. He was too weak to control the destructive elements which had been eating into the vitals of the state for sometime past. He sealed the fate of kingdom irretrievably).

Though the Nāyakas were powerful, still they consider the Vijayanagara rulers as their suzerain. They did not secede from the central authority completely. A copper plate, which was issued by the king in 1708 A.D. mentions his overlord, the ruler of Vijayanagara, ruling from his headquarters, Ghanagiri. The Vijayanagara ruler styles as Rajādhirāja. This amply bear evidence that the rulers continued to maintain their diplomatic ties with the rulers of Vijayanagara.

To summarise,

(1) After Vijayanagara rulers, the sovereignty of South devolved upon Nāyakas.
(2) They donated liberal gifts and riches to the temple, which shows that the temple continued to command the attention of the officials probably at the instance or on behalf of the rulers or with their knowledge.

(3) It also shows, the Nayakas, gave a sort of political stability to the area which included Tiruvāpaikkā.
It is possible that Appar's verse implies that the Kuruikkai Viṭattāna temple was one of the seventy shrines. It seems that the Śiva temple at Tiruvkkarai in South Arcot district called Śivalōgam was also built by this king (Referred to as Kō-Chōla in SII., Vol.17, No.227 identified with Kōchchengappān by K.V. Raman). It should be noted that all the temple constructed by him were in brick.

According to M.Rajamanikam, who has made use of the Tamil sources both in detail and depth has arrived at the clinching conclusion that Kōchchengappān flourished in the middle of the fifth century, The Development of Śaivism in South India, (unpublished thesis of the Madras University), App. C, p.6. Contra. T.M.Narayanaswami Pillai, Tiruvānaikkākōvil (Tamil), Madras University, (1976), pp. 2–6. Examining this problem in very great
detail, this recent writer places him to the later half of the 2nd century.
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