CHAPTER V

THE RIGHT AND LEFT HAND DIVISIONS (VALANGAI AND IDANGAI)

This chapter aims at discussing the origins and development of the Right hand and Left hand divisions of the society in South India. The nadu, the basic territorial unit in the South Indian region, gave to the agrarian system of the Chola period a highly fragmented character, elements of this remain to this day. Cultivated land and the nexus of relationships involving land exercised a strong centripetal influence upon the structure of social relationships in South India as in other pre-industrial agrarian contexts. Added to this, however, are the distinctively regional characteristics of spatially compressed marriage, kinship, and political relationships resulting in cores of peasant settlements which were discontinuous and relatively small. These settlement units remained small and isolated until the thirteenth century in most parts of the Coromandel plain and even longer in the western uplands, assuring to the nadu-locality its primacy as a structural unit.

Two factors tended to offset the isolation of the nadu without diminishing its integrity. One was the network of brahmadeyas from whence, during the tenth to the twelfth century, emanated a general, highly aryanized culture spreading from the Coromandel plain over the entire macro region. These were powerful, corporate institutions which exercised continuous
influence for several centuries. The other was the emergence, by the eleventh century at least, of dual social divisions rooted in the numerous *nadh* societies but capable of transcending the isolation of these localities. These were potential social formations which could be activated for a variety of purposes, but which were not corporate or continuous in character. What the Brahmana settlements of the region did to foster integrative cultural bonds among dominant peasant folk within the macro region, the divisions of the ‘right-hand’ and ‘left-hand’ peoples or castes appeared to do in forging significant social links among a variety of dependent peoples of diverse localities. In both cases, cultural and social integration beyond the level of the *nadh* was the consequence although it was not until after the thirteenth century that the *nadh* began to lose some of its early primacy as the focus of society and culture in the macro region.

Labels for the dual social divisions have persisted for almost a millennium. *Valangai*, the Tamil word for ‘right-hand’ or ‘right-side’, as a social designation dates from the tenth century when contingencies of Rajaraja-I’s armies, *Valangai-velaikkara-padaigal*, are mentioned.1 During the early eleventh century, persons calling themselves Valangai, made endowments to temples as in the case of the temple at Vembarrur, alias Sri-Cholamattanda-chaturvedimangalam in Tanjavur.2 References to groups of the ‘left-hand’ or ‘left-side’, *Idangai*, appear somewhat later; one of the earliest recorded an
affray between people of the right and left hand in 1072 C.E. This record reads in part: ³

“.….in the second regnal year of the king (Kulottunga I) there was a clash between the right-hand and left-hand communities in which the village was burnt down, the sacred places destroyed, and the images of deities and the treasure of the temple (Mummudi-Chola-Vinnagar Alvar temple) looted.”

Thus, by the late eleventh century, there is evidence of two broad and at times hostile divisions of the population in at least some parts of the Coromandel plain; shortly it was to cover almost the whole of Tamil country. These divisions appear also to have existed in other parts of the macro region at about the same time though there is less convincing inscriptive evidence. In Southern Karnataka, the equivalent Kannada terms for right and left-hand, balagey and edagey, were used as designations for the division. ⁴ Other designations later used among Kannada speakers were: desa, for right-hand people and nadu for those of the left-hand division.⁵ Among Telugu-speaking people of the macro region, slightly different designations were used. One, kampulu (literally ‘protector’ but in common usage, ‘agriculturist’), appears to have had the same meaning as the terms used in Tamil country and Karnataka for the right-hand designation while the terms pahchahanamvaru and panchanulu were the same as the left-hand division elsewhere.⁶ The latter term in Telugu inscriptions refers to five artisan-trader groups usually
consisting of goldsmiths, blacksmiths, braziers, and stone-and-wood sculptors, hence, pancha, or five. In later centuries especially, but apparently even in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, another way of referring to the dual division among Telugu speakers was by their sectarian affiliations. Adherents to Vishnu worship, srivaisnavas, being the counterpart of the right division and Siva adherents allegedly corresponding to the left division.

Analysis of the origins and functions of the dual divisions of peoples have posed difficult problems. Though the subject of serious scholarly speculation for almost a century, the origins of the divisions remain obscure. Classical poetry contains no references to the divisions, and the terms have little, if any, contemporary currency. A note on origins is appended to this chapter. It has proven just as difficult to understand the functions of the right and left divisions, for the dual divisions resist analysis according to such Chola cultural categories as caste, sect, and territorial (nadu) affiliation.

While each of these categories may be found at times to have been related to the dual divisions, the divisions are essentially different. Thus, ranking seems present at times, as in an inscription of 1227 CE in which newly admitted groups to the division in a part of modern South Arcot are declared ‘the eyes and the hands of the ilangai’, body images suggesting the performance of service for other members of the division. Generally, however, the divisions give the appearance of being non-ranked groupings of local
social groups. Also, while certain elements of sect organization may be seen at times in the references to an \textit{Idangai} perceptor or a \textit{mandapam}, the divisions are not essentially religious groupings. Finally, while the divisions have territorial focus—there being no macro region-wide divisions as such—that territory appears always to have been greater than the \textit{nadu}.\textsuperscript{11}

The categories of caste, sect, and territory fail to help in an understanding of the dual divisions in South India because the divisions are different from each and all, and because, at least in the early period under consideration, the scope of these three social categories was very highly localized whereas the dual divisions appear to be essentially supra-local in character. It is therefore little wonder that where the divisions have been considered as something to explain by historians, these divisions are often treated together with other, so-called, ‘corporate’ institutions in a modest genre of historical literature dealing with what is called, ‘corporate’

But, two persistent features of the early right-left divisions militate against their dismissal as ‘corporate groups’ in presumed ensemble with other like groups of a caste, sectarian, or territorial in kind. One is the importance of references to the simulation of previously outside people to the left division and their alliance with other generally similar groups; the other is the military and life’ or ‘local government’\textsuperscript{12}
Viewed as a ‘corporate institution’, the dual division is looked upon as guild-like organisation, or as a *sreni* i.e. a multicaste body of traders, artisans, and agriculturists. This guild conception is based upon the well-recognized association of the right division with agriculture and related activities, including trade and some processing of agricultural commodities, as well as the equally consistent association of left division groups with artisan-trader activities. The guild or *sreni* notion also fits well with the general Indian institution usually called ‘the ‘*jajmani* system’\(^{13}\) - localized exchanges of goods and services centered on the ritual and economic dominance of agricultural patrons (*jajman*, Sanskrit : yajaman) and their clients. However, any essentially cooperative and interdependent model, whether guild/*sreni* or *jajmani* fails to deal with the often conflicting relations between the divisions which are attested in ‘historical records from at least the eleventh century, as noted above. Thus, some scholars, cued by conflict between the right and left divisions, have applied the term ‘faction’ following the usage of some British administrators.\(^{14}\)

‘Faction’ denotes an alignment of persons for the purpose of attaining some objective in competition with others to Conflict is the business of factions, and the term fits, most aptly, certain of the activities with which the right and left divisions in South India have been associated during recent centuries certainly and possibly from a much earlier time.\(^{15}\)
As sociological elements, factions have been viewed in many ways by modern scholars, though all might agree with the humorous observation of Nicholas that ‘the faction is a troublesome form of social organization’.\(^{16}\) Factional alignments can and have ‘been relatively persistent in some societies, particularly at times of special internal strain and external stress.\(^ {17}\) And, however unstable they may be, factional systems can achieve some important objectives through means not usually considered appropriate and often in contravention to norms regarding conflict resolution. This would seem especially true in cultures which emphasize ‘harmony and unanimity’ or where ‘cooperation’ among social groups is given high value as it is in caste culture according to many scholars.\(^ {18}\) Lastly, even if factions may be evanescent, ‘their component cliques and families may be stable groups’.\(^ {19}\) Accordingly, the dual division of social groups in the South Indian region may plausibly be seen to lend itself to analysis as factional systems even as it is recognized that there were important changes in the composition, purposes, and context in which the divisions operated in the course of perhaps eight centuries.

But, neither ‘faction’ nor ‘guild’ appear to be fully satisfactory terms for discussion of the early phase of the dual division of social groups in South India. If one were to adopt Nicholas’ definition of faction-‘a non corporate political conflict group, the members of which are recruited by a leader on the basis of diverse ties’\(^ {20}\) - it would be necessary to reject the term during the Chola period or at any time prior to the seventeenth century. The dual social
divisions in South India were not solely nor primarily conflict groups at this earlier time, and, while ties among each of the divisions may have been varied, the core of the interests defining each are persistent and clear. ‘Moreover, to the extent that factions may be viewed as ‘ego-centred’, essentially individual-participant ‘quasi- groups’, as Mayer has called them, the South Indian dual divisions would not qualify. The constituent units of the divisions are always localized caste groups. 21

So as neither the concept of ‘faction’ nor ‘guild’ which have been used to describe the right and left divisions appear to fit certain of the important characteristics of the divisions, some other way of speaking about them is necessary. A recent essay about the right and left division by “Arjun Appadurai” postulates a cultural model to deal with the conflict of right and left castes, especially in Madras city during the seventeenth century where he also uses the concept of faction. However, for the Chola period, the stress upon conflict is misconceived. Conflict appears a minor aspect of the divisions during this early period however important it becomes later. To emphasize conflict between the divisions at this early period is to impose later characteristics upon the divisions of the Chola period and thus to distort an understanding of the institution in Chola times.

Most Chola inscriptions pertaining to the Valangai and Idangai do not refer to conflict, but to the typical subject matter of inscriptions: gifts to
Brahmanas and temples. From these references, we learn of various kinds of
groups cooperating beyond their local bases. Among the most prominent
were the *Valangai-masenai*\(^{22}\) and *Idangai-masenai*:\(^{23}\) the great armies of the
right-hand and left-hand. Trade activities and especially relations with
important itinerant trade organizations were other reasons for extra-local
cooperation among locality people. Thus there are the numerous inscriptions
referring to nanadesi merchants meeting together with local merchants of the
*nadu* and *nagara*, i.e., merchants of ordinary agricultural villages of a locality
as well as special trade settlements, including *Valangai* weavers.\(^{24}\) And, there
are rare Chola records of agreements by lower caste people of the *Valangai*
and *Idangai* divisions, in some places at least, for resistance against ‘the
Brahmanasas Vellalas who hold the proprietary rights (*kani*) over the lands of
the district’.\(^{25}\)

The divisions thus, appear not as ‘absolute’ social entities, for example,
as ‘super castes’ as suggested by the terms ‘right-hand castes’ and ‘left-hand
castes’, but as ‘relative’ or ‘potential’ groupings of established local groups.
Such aggregate groupings were capable of dealing with extra local problems
beyond the scope and capability of existing locality institutions of the time and
capable of being called into existence in response to a variety of problems,
including conflicts, requiring extra-local cooperation.\(^{26}\) At any time and place,
the composition of right and left divisions would vary according to the exigent
condition which brought them into being, and they would lapse into latency with the passing of that condition.

Viewed as relative or potential groupings rather than as enduring corporate ones (e.g. guilds) or as ad hoc conflict groupings (i.e. factions), the dual divisions of Chola times assume an anachronistically modern appearance. That is, the Valangai and Idangai divisions of the Chola period appear as broad ethnic coalitions which were neither internally ranked in the manner of castes into subordinate sub-castes nor externally ranked with respect to the other bloc or division. Rather, in the manner of horizontally integrated South Indian caste associations of the recent past—the Nadars and Vanniyakula Kshatriyas— an absolute quality is claimed on the basis of birth into a named group and the ascriptive right to certain emblems and insignia. Hierarchical bases of status or moral condition are ignored. The whole or part of such large groupings are capable of acting together for certain purposes; but they do not lose their localized bases of organization and, typically, intermarriage among the constituent groups does not occur. 27

The need for such supra-local coalitions was particularly great until well into the thirteenth century by which time urbanization provided a reliable supra-local focus at least for leading artisan trader groups, usually designated ‘left-hand’ people. By the same time, the widespread merging of nadu-localities into the periyanadu, or great nadu, provided for collaboration among
leading agrarian people—those of the right-hand on a supra-local level. Prior to the thirteenth century, however, the dual divisions, with their varied constituencies from place to place, represented perhaps the sole means by which groups other than Brahmanas and some military chiefs could on occasion transcend the borders of the nadu-locality.

One of the major reasons for viewing the dual divisions as ‘relative’ or ‘potential’ structural entities, rather than ones which had an absolute (i.e. ‘corporate’) existence in particular places is that, neither division finds mention among those groups named in the detailed Chola inscriptions dealing with matters requiring the assent of or the cooperation from important local groups. In Brahmadeya inscriptions, these local bodies inevitably include, the nattar; assemblies of neighboring brahmadeyas represented by their spokesmen (or headmen), the brahmadeya kilavar; assemblies of villages (ur) part of whose income was previously granted to support Hindu temples (devadana), Buddhist and Jaina shrines (pallicanda); assemblies of villages which were trade centres and under merchants’ control, nagarattar or nagaragalitar; and assemblies of villages (ur), some portion of whose income was diverted to other forms of special purposes (kanimuruttu and vettiperu). Other Chola inscriptions refer to other bodies, including kil kalanaigal, who are described as including carpenters (taccan), blacksmiths (kollar), goldsmiths (tattar), and koliyar (weavers?). Seen in these references are the various caste groups comprising the agrarian-centred division of the Valangai in Tamil country and
the mobile artisans of the Idangai, but there is no mention of these divisions themselves.

Hence, instead of using terms such as ‘faction’ or ‘guild’ to speak of the dual division, the term ‘division’ will be used. The meaning attached to the term ‘division’ is that of the occasional combination of agrarian centred groups, on the one hand, and artisan-traders on the other at levels beyond the localities in which both kinds of groups lived.

One of the most important functions of the Idangai division was the assimilation of groups to the expanding order of the Chola period. From the tenth to the thirteenth century new tracts of land not previously committed to sedentary agriculture were being brought into the expanding ambience of the Chola agrarian order. Whether by conquest or by the peaceful extension of the Chola agrarian system, people of these new tracts were brought into the dual divisions, and the groups thus included in the dual divisions might be agriculturists who had previously practiced shifting cultivation or they might be artisans or they might be any one of the various kinds of occupational groups which were not already aligned with one or the other dual divisions. In either case, the newly recruited groups could henceforth make alliance claims upon others in their division and even cause the division in any place to change from potential to actual groupings for a variety of purposes.
This process of assimilation is well exemplified in two early thirteenth century Idangai inscriptions. The first, from the Uttamacholan temple of Urrattur, fifteen miles north of the Kaveri River (Lalgitdi taluk, Tiruchirapalli), is dated A.D. 1218 and reads in part as follows:

_In order to kill the demons that disturbed the sacrifices of Kasyapa [the priest of Visvakarma, patron god of artisans] we were made to appear from the agni-kunda (sacrificial fire pit) and while we were thus protecting the said sacrifice, Chakravartin Arindama honoured the officiating sage priests by carrying them in a car and led them to the Brahmanaa colony (newly founded by himself). On this occasion we were made to take our seats on the back of the car and to carry the slippers and umbrellas of these sages. Eventually with these Brahmanaa sages we were made to settle down in the [same] villages._

. We received the clan name Idangai because the sages (while they got down from their cars) were supported by us on their left side. The ancestors of this our sect having lost their credentials and insignia in the jungles and bushes, we were ignorant of our origins. Having now once learnt it, we the members of the 98 sub sects enter into a compact, in the fortieth year of the king [Kulottunga III] that we shall hereafter behave like the sons of the same parents and what good and evil may befall any one of us, will be shared by all, if anything derogatory happens to the Idangai class, we shall jointly assert our rights until we establish them. It is also understood that only those who, during their congregational meetings to settle communal disputes, display the
insignia horn, bugle, and parasol shall belong to our class. Those who have to recognize us now and hereafter, in public, must do so from our distinguishing symbols - the feather of the crane and the loose hanging hair. The horn and the conch shell shall also be sounded in front of us and the bugle blown according to the fashion obtaining among the Idangai people. Those who act in contravention to these rules shall be treated as the enemies of our class.

Those who behave differently from the rules (thus) prescribed for the conduct of the Idangai classes shall be excommunicated and shall not be recognized as srutiman (members of the community). They will be considered slaves of the classes opposed to us.

Another record is from Varanjam (Vriddhachalam taluk, South Arcot) and is dated AD 1227 which reads as follows:

We, the nadus (assemblies of eleven localities) having assembled at the village of Tiruvalanjuram... got the following resolution engraved on the Tiruvalanjuram-udaiyar temple: ‘the malaiyamakkal and the nattamakkal of these nadus shall henceforth be admitted into the Idangai-talam (left hand class of men); they shall be considered the eyes and hands of the Idangai; if we violate this resolution, we shall be considered as wrong-doers to the caste.

The resolution was endorsed by Brahmanas, and other leaders of the locality as well as by those calling themselves of the Idangai-talam including kaikkolars and saliyar (weavers), vanigars (merchants) and others.
These records of the thirteenth century postulate the existence of an established supra-local social entity into which new groups could be initiated. In the first inscription it is not clear who those of the lost credentials and insignia were, though the ignorance about origins and the references to the jungle suggest persons who, in other circumstances, would be low in ritual status. Those mentioned in the second inscription are more clearly identifiable and interesting cases to which reference shall be made in the proceeding pages.

A point which must be noted up first pertains to the apparent lack of emphasis upon stratified relations within either the Idangai or the Valangai division. It seems as if the divisions were homogeneous, pluralistic aggregates in which all constituent groups shared a common status and common symbols of rank. There are two ways in which this apparent homogeneity among the constituent units of the divisions is expressed. One way is in shared natural substance that is in attributes ascribed to the divisions as living things which possess unique endowed qualities arising from how they came into existence. Thus, according to a later source, the IdangaiValangai Puranam of CE 1692-93, both divisions were created or brought into being by the actions of gods. In one context, Siva and Indra are made responsible for the left-hand division and Brahma and a rishi (bhrigu, Tamil: piruka) for the right-hand division; in another context, the divisions are seen as the result of a disagreement between Siva, as Paramesvara, and his
consort Parvati. More specifically, the *Idangai-Valangai Puranam* assigns to each division different somatic markers. To the left division, the most important are blood, skin, and eye-balls; to the right division, bones, nerves, and brain. The other symbolic way in which the constituent units of the divisions appear to have been accorded equal status and thus to constitute a pluralistic aggregate of equivalent units, was in the common emblems each division possessed even though each constituent unit had its own emblems.  

In the *Urratur* inscription above, several insignia were given prominence. According to the *Idangai-Valangai Jatiyar Varalaru* of the Mackenzie collection, the ninety-eight castes of the right division had common emblems of the ‘Brahmanai’ kite (Garuda?), the half-human, half-animal form (‘purusha-mirukam’), the elephant, ass, and eagle, while the left division had the tiger, fox, the male bird (*potu*), sword, crow, ‘Brahmanai’ kite, horse, lion, and a mythological animal with a face bearing features of the lion and elephant (yali).  

Thus, such shared insignia and symbols of common ‘natural’ attributes among units of the divisions may appear to entail ‘corporateness’ in the sense that castes are corporate. That is, the dual divisions may be supposed to have been something like ‘super-castes’ with the same quality of durable and diffused solidarity which characterized a caste. However, this would be incorrect. Rather, the divisions were groupings with quite specific elements of
solidarity, such as possessed by sectarian groups. The religious sect, with certain exceptions like the Lingayats, was comprised of persons of many castes (though excluding the very lowest castes), but stratified interactions were irrelevant when sect votaries acted in religious contexts. Thus, in the confines of the sect centre, all sect members, regardless of their caste affiliations, interacted as equals in ritual activities.

However, differences between the twofold divisions and sects are important. The religious sect was an absolute, not relative social form. Its enduring character was *sampradaya*, a tradition passed from sectarian leader, *acharya* to disciples; its institutional base was the *matha* or sect centre. In relation to the *sampradaya* and the *matha* all laic members suspended their caste identities though such identities obviously continued. Similarly, the twofold divisions were composed of localized caste/occupational groups who interacted according to caste norms in their own localities. These norms could be altered to enable joint action with others in a broad, essentially occupational, alignment on a variety of matters. Cooperation in military ventures and in support of religious institutions is how the divisions are usually seen. These other activities must be seen as ancillary to the maintenance of occupational interests at the supralocal level and, of course, at the local level where it most counted. In disregarding caste distinctions among their constituent units, the dual divisions were not denying caste in the sense that sects did in obedience to *bhakti* principles. Religious bodies of the medieval
period often acknowledged the supernatural order prevailing at the sect
temple centre by suspending the ‘natural’ order of caste relationships. For the
right and left divisions it is rather that caste, whether viewed as localized
ethnic groups or as ritually ranked parts of a moral order, was not salient for
the supra-local, occupational functions of the divisions, at least at this early
time. Thus, caste groups are mentioned, but appear to have little to do with
the way in which the divisions were transformed from latency to deal with the
issues they did.

The endorsement of Brahmanas and other prestigious members of
local society in the Varanjuram record cited above does not clarify the matter
of internal stratification of the divisions. Along with Brahrnans, referred to in
that inscription as andaiar, there were ekayar, i.e. ascetics, and niyayattars,
i.e. local persons of prominence.\textsuperscript{36} Weavers and merchants who endorsed the
resolution have the appearance of being persons of wealth, but there is no
definite attribution of their superior status in the record. Since Brahmanas are
outside the divisions in most accounts, the association of Brahmanas in both
the inscriptions tends to confirm the equality of status that existed among the
constituent castes of the divisions. It is as attendants of ‘Brahmanaa sages’ or
through the endorsing function of Brahmanas that the claim of respectability
and membership in one of the divisions is made and justified.\textsuperscript{37}
The absence of references to stratified divisions within the twofold divisions does not eliminate the possibility of internal strata. For some scholars such strata appear at times to exist. References to groups like the kaikkolar and other weavers and merchants, who are mentioned along with Brahmanas in the endorsement, suggest this to C.S. Srinivasachari. In his pioneering work on the dual divisions he states that there were indeed strata and that the divisions reveal a process of ‘low castes striving for higher social positions’. Further support for this view is provided by the nattamakkal folk discussed in the Varanjuram inscription.

Thirty years after the date of the Varanjuram inscription cited above, the nattamakkal claimed for themselves the status of pumiputtirar, ‘sons of the soil’, in two inscriptions from Vengur and Tirukkovilur, near the site of the Varanjuram record. The title pumiputtirar is significant since it is claimed by Vellalas, the dominant peasants of the right division, the Valangai. For the nattmakkel, their membership in the left division but lately attained (i.e. 1227 C.E.) this, was an ambitious claim indeed! But such claims became more common later. That the nattamakkal of modern South Arcot made this claim is supported by usage in Jaffna, northern Sri Lanka, where nattamakkal are called ‘kings of Vellalas (arusar velala)’ indicating that those migrating from what is now South Arcot to Sri Lanka during the medieval period may have carried this relatively exalted designation. However, during the nineteenth century, the nattamakkal as well as the malaiyamakkal mentioned in the 1227
CE inscription were still closely linked territorially and in matrimonially. This suggests that while the men from plains (nattaman) of this part of South Arcot might have sought to differentiate themselves from the hill folk (malaiman) by arrogating to themselves titles such as pumiputtirar, and by association. The nattamakkal remained a peasant people below the status of the Vellala and were often identified as part of the Palli caste, a peasant group incongruously of the left division.

Military actions by the twofold divisions occupy a conspicuous place in the early records of the divisions and pose most sharply the question of the potential or relative character of the divisions. There are references to the ‘great army’ (masenai) of Valangai and Idangai, and to fighting men called velaikkara which comprised part of the Chola army in Sri Lanka during the late eleventh century according to a Tamil inscription at Polonnaruva. Inscriptions of the middle of the eleventh century from Tiruvenkadu in Tanjavur and Tiruvallam in North Arcot also refer to grants by members of both divisions to temples, notwithstanding the fact that in other places, notably Kanchi, though perhaps not at this early time, the two divisions used different temples, halls, and dancing girls.

The term Valangai is first mentioned in connection with military contingents under the first of the great Cholas, Rajaraja I. An analysis of Chola military organization, with the meagerness of the evidence, leads to the
conclusion that the designation valagai could have referred only to armed contingents raised and commanded by the dominant peasantry of the Chola heartland of Cholamandalam and Tondai-mandalam. Inscriptions from Tanjavur enumerate regiments of the army of which almost one-half (thirteen of thirty-one) were entitled Valangai during the time of Rajaraja-I (985-1014 CE) and Rajendra-I (1014-44 CE). Other forces included household troops and troops recruited from territories on the borders of Chola country, vadugan from the northern Telugu tracts and malaiyalar from the hill borders of modern Kerala in the west. These forces serving the Cholas bore the designation velaikkarar, and the Valangai were further identified by the addition to their titles of one of the many pseudonyms taken by Rajaraja and a connective word, terinda, (selected). Thus, there was the unit called nittavinoda-terinda-Valangai-velaikkarappadaigal, [Nittavinoda’s (Rajaraja’s) select right-hand warrior regiment].

The meaning of velaikkarar has confused the historians and it is still not clear. That it refers to warriors is clear-cut from the contexts in which it is mentioned in inscriptions and literary sources of the tenth to the twelfth centuries. Even whose soldiers they were is still at question. The central problem involving this term is whether the velaikkarar were special and permanent troops of the Chola overlords or whether they were enlisted for extraordinary or occasional military service as is suggested by the velai, one of the meanings of which is occasional (or time), If they were the permanent
troops of the Chola overlords, the *Valangai* units cannot simultaneously be considered local peasant militia units. On the other hand, if the *Valangai velaiikkarar* were recruited to the military adventures of the Cholas from existing military units among the peasantry controlled and led by the peasantry then the association of the *Valangai* with the peasantry would appear as strong in the early period as it is in the lists of the eighteenth century.

The prevailing view of the *velaiikkarar* is stated most clearly by “*Nilakanta Sastri*”. He says that they ‘were the most permanent and dependable troops in the royal service…. they were ever ready to defend the king and his cause with their lives when occasion (velai) arose’.\(^{51}\) This view is supported by the editor of the Tamil Lexicon who writes, under the entry, *velaiikkarar*: ‘devoted servants who held themselves responsible for a particular service to their king at stated hours (velai) and vow to stab themselves to death if they fail in that’.\(^{52}\) As evidence for this view, “*Nilakanta Sastri*” refers, with uncharacteristic vagueness, to later literary sources while the Lexicon cites the commentary of Periyavachchapillai on Nammalvar’s *Tirumoli*, to the effect that these soldiers committed suicide for their king.\(^{53}\)

This view of the devotion of the *velaiikkarar* to their king, whom they served presumably on a permanent basis, replaced an older, less heroic, view held by the epigraphists Hultzsch, Venkayya, and Krishna Sastri. They spoke
of ‘troops of servants’, ‘volunteers’, or simply, soldiers of lower status ('working classes') who fought in Chola armies.\textsuperscript{54} Other scholars have suggested that the \textit{velaikkarar} were mercenary troops as were others in the Chola forces.\textsuperscript{55}

The question here is that whether these warriors, representing half of the known regiments enumerated in inscriptions of the great Cholas, could be considered a permanent force, supported from the resources of the Chola overlords or whether the Valangai velaikkarar were mobilized from among existing peasant military units for some limited purpose, and were thus an extension of the Valangai (or Idangai) as a potential social formation. The former view is congenial to that of “Nilakanta Sastri” and others who have tended to place heavy reliance upon the comprehensiveness and effectiveness of the Chola state. However, there is no evidence of the basic means of supporting a large army any more than there is for maintenance of an elaborate bureaucracy. Neither, of course, was necessary. Just as locality institutions provided most of the administrative functions required at the time, so, too, it must be supposed that the major forces involved in the wars of the Cholas were supplied from the existing organizations of the locality-based society of the time.

To the core of household troops maintained by the Cholas, who may indeed have held a special loyalty to their overlord, and some mercenary
troops from the western and northern forests, those under the control of peasant locality leaders alone, during the tenth and eleventh centuries at least, could have provided the military units under Chola command. By the twelfth century, Idangai forces were added to this pool of militarily organized folk within the macro region who could be mobilized to join the Chola kings in defensive and predatory campaigns.

The connection of the Coromandel peasantry with Valangai military forces is supported by an important record of the time of Kulottunga-I, 1072 CE, at Avani (in Mulbagal taluk of Kolar district) in Gangavadi. As discussed above, the claim of the dominant locality folk in this area to membership in ‘48,000 bhūmi’ of Tondaimandalam makes their identity as Vellalas from that adjoining territory relatively firm. The central intention of the record bears out the unmistakable peasant interests of these locally dominant folk.56 This Kolar inscription records how various local agrarian groups were to be taxed in a locality, called the ‘eighteen vishaya of Rajendra-Chola’, under the control of persons identified as Valangai of Tondaimandalam. According to Professor “Nilakanta Sastri”, this epigraph records a unilateral modification of revenue arrangements imposed upon the local peasantry by a Chola revenue administrator.57

The order passed by the people in control of the Avani locality, calling themselves Valangai of Tondaimandalam was addressed to the local ruling
groups over whom the control of Tondaimandalam soldiery had been extended by conquest at some earlier time. “Nilakanta Sastri” in his discussion of this record, has treated it as a protest ‘against unusual levies’ of a ‘self-willed and autocratic ruler or chieftain’. 58 But, the inscription is cast in quite usual terms with a laudatory preamble dedicated to the Chola ruler; it is not an apparent record of protest though it does declare that an order of the adigargal-sola-muvendavelar would not be followed. The muvendavelar referred in the inscription as having promulgated this new and inappropriate revenue regulation could of course have been an agent of the Chola overlords or perhaps a higher military officer acting on his own behalf. 59 But, it is most likely that this person was a leader of the conquering Tondaimandalam Valangai forces claiming to exercise the superior prerogatives of a chief. In any case, as “Nilakanta Sastri” has noted, defiance of his orders are clear: ‘ . . . there being no tax on cows and she-buffaloes since the rise of the sacred family of Cholas in the Solamandalam nadu (or) in the Jayangonda-Sola-mandalam…. no such tax should be paid in accordance with the order of the Sola-muvendavelar….. 60

The Idangai or left hand division of lower social groups during the Chola period was as certainly associated with mercantile and craftsmen population as the right-hand division was with agrarian population. The core Idangai groups in all parts of the region were certain merchants and craftsmen conventionally expressed by the numeral ‘five’ as in the terms panchalar
(panchalattar or panch-kammalar) and anjuvannam. These usually included goldsmiths, silversmiths, blacksmiths, and skilled carpenters and stone cutters. Others characteristically associated with the left division, according to evidence of the eighteenth century, were oil processers using presses operated by two or more bullocks, implying supplies of raw materials and markets which might be found in urban places. Certain weavers were also included in the division according to later evidence, though most of them were in the right division. In the case of weavers, there appears to be no particular reason for the association with the left division unless scale of operation and production for the market (rather than for a fixed clientele) was a factor for weavers as it appeared to be for oil producers.

It is possible to venture the seventeenth and eighteenth century occupational alignment of the left division backward in time. One important link is found in rathakara inscriptions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Craftsmen identified as rathakara had enjoyed an ancient honourable status according to Vedic and later Vedic sources, but by the early centuries of the Christian era they had come to be regarded as Sudras according to the Amarakosa. Reflecting the early high status of rathakara in South India, a late Fourth century Pallava copperplate inscription found in the Krishna district of modern Andhra, dated in the fourteenth year of Nandivarman I, records the grant of an agrahara to one of the rathakara caste who was called a chatuvejja, that is, one who has studied the four Vedas.
The craftsmen of later period occasionally used the rathakara designation mostly in an attempt to strengthen their claims to high status. A well known inscription of Uyyakondan-Udaiyar (Tiruchirapalli taluk) of 1118 CE records a gathering of learned Brahmanas (bhatta) at Rajasraya-chaturvedimangalam to consider the status of a group of craftsmen, including goldsmiths and silversmiths, carpenters, stone cutters and masons calling themselves rathakarar. Having examined sastric authorities, the Brahmanas concluded that since rathakarar were of high and correct birth (mahishya and anulōma), they were entitled to the sacred thread investiture and access to other important rituals. Another rathakara inscription from Alangudi, or Jananatha-chaturvedi-mangalam (Nannilam taluk, Tanjavur) of 1264 CE records an agreement among craftsmen calling themselves rathakarar, to raise a fund from among their number in specified localities for the construction of a pavilion in that brahmadeya.

The fund was to be raised from a special cess, inavari upon craftsmen, and it was to be collected by Saivite temple functionaries, in the named localities. It may safely be assumed, with the epigraphist K.V. SuBrahmanaya Aiyer, that the four classes of artisans referred to in the Alangudi inscription were Panchalar or Kammalar, the core group of the left hand division of that early time and later.
Another matter of evidence linking those using the ancient rathakarar title with left hand division artisans of the medieval period is to be found in the identification of rathakarar as kil-kalanai, subordinate professional people, who seem to have lived in separate residential quarters (ceri) in larger villages. An inscription of 1036 CE from Chidambaram distinguishes between non-Brahmana inhabitants of superior status, kudigal, and those of inferior status, kil-kalanai. The kudigal included two merchant groups, sankarappadiyar and vyaparin, plus three groups usually associated with the right hand division: Vellala, Saliyar (cloth merchants) and Pattinavar (fishermen). The subordinate workmen, kil-kalanai, were taccar (carpenters), kollar (blacksmiths), tattar (goldsmiths), and koliyar (weavers). Epigraphist Hultzsch, while discussing some inscriptions of a slightly earlier period, (1013 CE), noted the term ‘kammanacheri’ and hazarded that this was the residential quarter of the kammalar, or artisans; the propinquity of the artisans’ quarters to those of the paraiyan, paraicceri, suggested the low status of the artisans. Thus, whatever the high status of the rathakarar was in ancient times, and notwithstanding the use which craftsmen of the Chola period sought to make of this ancient status in assuming the title of rathakarar, they had come to be identified with middling and even poor rank in the eleventh century.

However, during the twelfth century, the status of artisans and merchants associated with the left division began to change. The Polonnaruva
(Sri Lanka) inscription of the first quarter of the twelfth century speaks of the
Idangai velaikkaran for the first time and merchant groups later to be
mentioned prominently.\textsuperscript{76} This record strongly suggests that the Idangai
velaikkaran were the military arm of the merchants marking the beginning of
the rise to prominence of the great itinerant guilds whose military power was
so conspicuous for the next two centuries.\textsuperscript{77} At the same time, artisans of the
left division began to demand and to receive privileges which marked an
enhancement of their status. A series of inscriptions from the Kongu country
during the late twelfth century refer to the Kammalar of vengalanadu (modern
Karur taluk) who claimed for themselves the right to use the double conch and
drums at times of marriages and funerals, to use footwear (ciruppu), and to
cover their houses with plaster as a mark of their high status.\textsuperscript{78} The
interpretation by Dr M. Arokiaswami of these Kongu inscriptions, is that
Valangai colonists of the region, including Vellalas and Kaikkolars, had
oppressed those of the left-hand faction until the intervention of the Chola
ruler, Kulottunga III was brought by the left division leaders there, the
Kammalar.\textsuperscript{79}

Similar developments were taking place in Andhra and Karnataka as
well as in Tamil country. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries, merchants
and artisans of Andhra attained strikingly public presence for the first time,
particularly in the relatively densely settled parts of the Andhra plain called
Vengi, comprising modern East Godavari, Krishna, and Guntur districts. In
these places there are numerous temple inscriptions which record gifts of merchants calling themselves, ‘the lords of Punugonda’ and often citing their gotras. Wandering merchants plying extensive trade networks between Karnataka and Andhra endowed temples in these regions as well as in Tamil country. These endowments are recorded in inscriptions which extol the virtue, bravery, and dharmic pursuits of their members. Artisans of Karnataka, calling themselves Vira Panchala, had formed special relationships with certain temples and seminaries (mathas) such as the Airiya-kula-matha in the Hoysala capital of Dwarasamudra (modern Halebid, Hassan district); artisans of Andhra, with the name panchanamuvaru, were also associated with particular temples of the time and even referred to themselves as a corporate group. Among the most self-consciously striving groups of the time were the oil-mongers (teliki) of Bezwada and its vicinity. They called themselves, ‘the one-thousand’, and in their records of the eleventh and twelfth centuries boast of being the hereditary servants of the Eastern Chalukya rulers of the area. According to a copperplate inscription of 1084 CE, teliki bridal couples were given the special right to visit the king on horseback and to obtain offerings of betel from his hand.

Changes in the status of the left division people during the twelfth century were dependent upon changes in South Indian society. New importance was accorded to urban artisans and merchants as a result of the temple urbanization of the period. With that came a fundamental modification.
of the position of mercantile and craft groups from that of the previous centuries when they were not only constrained to accept a subordinate place in relation to the dominant peasantry, but to suffer the indignity of a corporate status of pollution which is ineluctably associated with the left-hand.

The terms Valangai and Idangai and balagai and edagai literally mean ‘right hand and left hand’ in Tamil and Kannada. The Gazetteer of Mysore and Coorg give the list of them as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Right Hand Caste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Banajiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vokkaliga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ganiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rangare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gujerati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kamati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kuruba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kumbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Agasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Besta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Padmasale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Uppara Salt makers
16. Chitragara Painters
17. Golla Cowherds
18. Holey The Lowest Right hand Caste

B. Left hand Caste

1. Panchala Comprising
2. Badiga Carpenters
3. Kanchagara Copper or Brass Smiths
4. Lohara Iron smith
5. Waddar Stone Massons
6. Akasala Gold smith
7. Bheri A Class of Nagarta Traders
8. Devanga Weavers
9. Hegganiga Oilmen, who yoke two bullocks to the mill
10. Golla/
    Dhanapala Cowherds
11. Beda Hunters
12. Yakula/Koreya Cultivators
13. Pall/Tigla -----
14. Madiga The Lowest Left hand Caste.
The Banijiga Caste led the whole party of Right hand class, whereas the Panchalas commanded the whole party of the left hand classes. The Holeyaru were the warrior group for the Right side castes and the Madigaru were the most active combatants in all disputes among the two divisions.

A few inscriptions state that each group constited of 98 sub sescts. Perhaps, the 98 sects were subdivisions of these 18 castes.

Most of the scholars opine that the list differs from place to place. Interestingly Brahamanas, Kshatriyas and the greater part of the Shudras take no share in the dispute of the rival and they are not included in this list also.86

Different explanations have been presented for the left-and right- hand designations. “Macleane’s” suggested that the ‘hands’ imagery arose from the fact of five artisan groups of the left division, the panchalar or Kammalar, as opposed to five non artisan castes i.e. as fingers on a hand. This is clearly unacceptable, for the number here, ‘five’, is as conventional as the number ‘ninety eight’ which is used for each division in many of the sources.87 The more usual explanations about the right and left hand are positional: people of the Valangai being on the right-hand side of gods, sages, Brahmanas, or kings in some legendary context in which status was determined.88 “G. Oppert” appears to have been the first to notice the implication of ritual pollution in the right-and left-hand division. He attributed the dual division with
its pollution implications to the conflict between Jainas and Hindus during the pre-Pallavan period, in this connection, Oppert stated ‘The influence of Jains was perhaps strongest in the towns where artisan classes form an important portion of the population, while the Brahmanas appealed to the land owning and agricultural classes.’

While Brahmanas remained neutral with respect to the divisions, Jainas were apparently associated with the left-hand division, 
edagai, in Karnataka until 1368 CE when the Vijayanagar ruler, Bukka Raya, intervened in a dispute involving Vaishnavas and Jainas over sect emblems and decreed that Jainas were to be considered members of the right-hand division. As advocated above in the discussion of the Pallava period, the nominally religious conflict which was bitterly carried out during that early period was based upon important ideological factors. Under the Pallavas and their peasant and Brahmana supporters, Jainism was treated as a dangerous error, and association with Jaina teachers and institutions polluting. Oppert pointed to a similar orientation of the Chola rulers toward the Jainas and the Jainas supporting Hoysalas.

Regarding the disgrace of pollution which was attached to the left hand, it is to be wondered that those of the 
Idangai would have acquiesced in the title. It is clear from the Urrattur inscriptions cited above and numerous other inscriptional and literary documents of the 
Idangai which are to be found in all
parts of the region. There are numerous references to regular local dues collected from the left-hand people as *Idangaivari* as well as subscriptions collected from and on behalf of the division, the *Idangai-magamai*.  

During the earliest period for which there are records, it appears that the *Idangai* occupied an inferior and perhaps despised position among people of the region. Later, in the twelfth century and after, when *Idangai* groups undertook to alter their positions with respect to the dominant peasant population, they continued to identify themselves by the *Idangai* title notwithstanding that this title might have originally been a sign of their degraded status in the society of the macro region. The title was retained until the nineteenth century in most places.

Apart from “Oppert” and “Arjun Appadurai”, few modern commentators on the right-left divisions in South Indian society recognize the signification of impurity or pollution which accompanies left symbolism; none of these including these two addresses the question of why those of the left division accepted its derogatory designation. “Appadurai notes”, ‘As in other cultural systems, the left hand in South India has connotations of impurity whereas the right hand has powerful and positive normative associations…’ Where “Oppert” explains the designation as originating in the success of the Brahmana led Hinduism of agriculturists over the ‘heretical’ Jaina artisans and merchants of pre-Pallavan trade centres, he does not ask why the presumed denigrating ‘left’ title persisted and especially, why those of the left
division continued to use it in their own records later on. Nor does “Appadurai’s” thoughtful and bold explanation of the division as a ‘root paradigm’ of conflict allow us to understand finally why if, as he says, the left hand connotes impurity, those of the *Idangai* use that title.

A potential explanation of this puzzling phenomenon is that the utility of the *Idangai* title as a well established symbol of identity outweighed for its users of the Chola period and later any stigma which might have attached to the title from an earlier time. It is after all not only in the labels which are affixed upon or chosen by a group that basic significance in here is, for new myths can be made to offset older meanings. The capacity of ethnic labels to serve as symbols of identity and mobilization-whatever the origin of the labels and their possibly once derogatory connotations-explains as well as any reason why the title ‘left’ or ‘left-hand’ continued to be used by a substantial number of South Indians even after the twelfth century when those using the title found impressive new opportunities and importance.

**Why this problem is selected**

The “Caste System” in ancient south India is one of the interesting and challenging topic. It is very tempting to know how caste root has evolved in size, shape and colour, since the beginning of the civilizations and the migration of the Aryans and Sankritization of the Aryans. Till today also it is one of the burning topic we can say. The changes that occurred in the north
and south due to caste system. The caste concept is closely related with the social term, cultural term and historical term. It depends on one how he views about this problem. In the earliest the caste system was not at all considered it as problem. Each and every individual carried their order in the society. But later before the British after they stepping out of India this problem rised to a greater extent. Many reforms, movements were taken against it. The perspective of historians varies from person to person about the caste system. The reason for selecting such a problem is that, even till today the caste system is existing at the bottom level or the village level. Though many acts have been implemented in the constitution, still this heneous act is present in the village level. They are denied of their basic rights such as entry into the temples, going to the shed hotels, drawing water from the wells, keeping distance from the higher caste people. For instance Dr. B.R Ambedkar has done voluminous work on caste system. He condemned the Hindu philosophy and took the stand against the Hinduism. He also said that practising of untouchability is a serious crime, but thanks to the lead taken by the social reformers, religious reformers, thinkers and philosophers. They awakened the minds of the ignorant and fought for their rights and justice. The ultimate solution to this problem right now is that each and every individual should think in a positive way irrespective of any caste, colour, creed and race. The attitude of each and every human beings should change for the betterment of the society and community.
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