



HAL
open science

Forerunners of Cōla meykkīrttis

Emmanuel Francis

► **To cite this version:**

Emmanuel Francis. Forerunners of Cōla meykkīrttis. T.S. Ravishankar; S. Swaminathan. Abhyudaya: Recent Researches in Epigraphy and Numismatics: Commemoration Volume in Honour of Dr. K.V. Ramesh, Bharatiya Kala Prakashan, pp.27-42, 2016. halshs-01492387

HAL Id: halshs-01492387

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01492387>

Submitted on 18 Mar 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Forerunners of Cōla *meykkīrttis*

Emmanuel Francis

As a tribute to Dr. K.V. Ramesh, who has been a forerunner for establishing a dialogue between Indian epigraphists and foreign scholars, I would like to present him this paper about other forerunners from a remote period, those that went ahead of the well-known Cōla *meykkīrttis*.¹

It is commonly supposed that the *meykkīrtti* genre was invented under Rājarājacōla I (r. ca 985-1014) with his famous panegyric beginning with the words *tirumakaḷ pōla* and appearing from his 8th regnal year onwards. *Meykkīrttis* are found mostly at the beginning of stone inscriptions, less often in copper plates. They consist in versified subordinate clauses dependent upon the name of a king, itself generally dependent on an internal date, and are composed in Tamil.²

The invention of the *meykkīrtti* under Rājarājacōla I was not a spontaneous phenomenon. Actually one can discern a long thread of royal panegyrics in Tamil – starting with the Puṇam poems of Caṅkam poetry – that lead to the *meykkīrtti* genre. We know for instance of smaller prose “epithets” (strictly speaking subordinate clauses ending with a relative participle) for many predecessors of Rājarājacōla I as well as for himself and his successors even after the full-fledged verse *meykkīrtti* had appeared.³ I here intend to give a more detailed presentation of two particularly important late forerunners of Rājarājacōla I, namely Nandivarman III Pallava (r. ca 850) and Kṛṣṇa III Rāṣṭrakūṭa (r. ca 939-967).

Tellārr’ erinta Nantippōttaraiyar

A later Pallava king named Nantippōttaraiyar (i.e. “the bull-king” or “sprout-king Nanti”) is known in inscriptions as the victor in Tellāru.⁴ His name is the subject of either a relative participle or an absolute derived from the root *eri-*, itself governing the oblique *tellāru*, standing for a locative. The whole clause means “who cut” (*erinta*) or “having cut (*erintu*) into pieces” or “smashed” or “destroyed (his enemies) at Tellāru.” The name Nantippōttaraiyar prefixed by this “epithet” is sometimes dependent upon the internal date of the records, but this is not always the case. I have found instances of this epithet in ten Pallava stone inscriptions, sometimes with small variants:⁵

Tillaisthānam, Ghṛtasthāneśvara temple (10th regnal year, seemingly of Nantippōttaraiyar): *svasti śrī* [/*] *yāṅṭu pa[t*]tavātu tiruṇettānattu m[ā*]t[ē*]varkku tellārr’ e[rī*]nta na[nta]p[ō*]ttaraiyar⁶ tiruviḷakku[k*][ku] [ku*]tutta tiypp[ō*]kkuceṃpon⁷ arupatiṅ kalañcu...⁸ ”Prosperity! Fortune! In (his) tenth year, sixty kalañcus of refined gold that Nantippōttaraiyar who destroyed (his enemies) at Tellāru gave for a sacred lamp to the Mahādeva of the Tiruṇettānam...”*

Centalai, Sundarēśvara temple (12th regnal year, seemingly of Nantippōttaraiyar): *svasti śrī* [/*] *yāṅṭu 12āvatu tellārru °eriñcan⁹ nantipp[ō*]ttaraiyar niyamam[ā]kālattu piṭāriy[ā]rkku 400 paḷānkācu kuṭuttu...¹⁰ ”Prosperity! Fortune! In (his) 12th year, Nantippōttaraiyar who destroyed (his enemies) at Tellāru having given 400 old coins to the Piṭāri of the Niyamamākālam...”*

Āṇāṅkūr, on a loose stone found in Āṇāṅkūr and preserved in the J.G. Matriculation School at Viḷuppuram (12th regnal year): **śrī** [/*] **tellārr'** *erinta nantipp[ō*]ttaraiyarkku yāṅṅu panniraṅṅāvatu...*,¹¹ “Fortune! In the twelfth year of Nantippōttaraiyar who destroyed (his enemies) at Teḷḷāru...”

Kāñcīpuram, Ulakaḷantaperumāl temple (18th regnal year): **svasti śrī** [/*] **tellārr'** *erinta nantipp[ō*]ttaraiyarkku yāṅṅu patinetṅṅāvātu*^{12, 13} “Prosperity! Fortune! In the eighteenth year of Nantippōttaraiyar who destroyed (his enemies) at Teḷḷāru...”

Tiruccennampūṅṅi, Caṅaiyar temple (18th regnal year): **svasti śrī** [/*] **tellārr'** *erinta nantipp[ō*]ttaraiyarkku yāṅṅu 18āvatu*...¹⁴ (fig. 1), “Prosperity! Fortune! In the 18th year of Nantippōttaraiyar who destroyed (his enemies) at Teḷḷāru...”

Tiruvorriyūr, Vālmīkinātha temple (18th regnal year): text unpublished.¹⁵

Cennivāykkāl, on a hero-stone near the ruined *gopura* of the Śiva temple (21st regnal year): **svasti śrī** [/*] **tellārr'** *erintu rājya[mu]ṅṅ koṅṅta nantipp[ō*]ttaraiyar[k*]ku yāṅṅu irupattoṅṅāvatu*...¹⁶ “Prosperity! Fortune! In the twenty-first year of Nantippōttaraiyar who, having destroyed (his enemies) at Teḷḷāru, took the whole kingdom...”

Tiruppālātturai, Ādimūleśvara temple (22nd regnal year): **svasti śrī** [/*] **tellārr'** *erinta nantipp[ō*]ttaraiyar (y)yāṅṅu irupattiraṅṅāvatu*...¹⁷ “Prosperity! Fortune! In the twenty-second year of Nantippōttaraiyar who destroyed (his enemies) at Teḷḷāru...”

Tiruvatikai, Vīraṅṅāneśvara temple (no regnal year): **svasti śrī** [/*] **tiruviraṅṅāṅṅattu**¹⁸ **mahādevarkku tellārr'** *erinta nantipp[ō*]ttaraiyar tiruviḷakkīṅṅukku kuṅṅṅta poṅṅ...*¹⁹ “Prosperity! Fortune! The gold that Nantippōttaraiyar who destroyed (his enemies) at Teḷḷāru gave for a sacred lamp to the Mahādeva of the Tiruvīraṅṅāṅṅam...”

Tiruvaiyāru, Pañcanadīśvara temple (no regnal year): **svasti śrī** [/*] **tiruvai ārru mahāt[ē*]varkku tellārr'** *erinta nantipp[ō*]ttaraiyar kuṅṅṅta poṅṅ arupatiṅṅ kalaṅṅcu*...²⁰ “Prosperity! Fortune! The sixty *kaḷaṅṅcu*s of gold that Nantippōttaraiyar who destroyed (his enemies) at Teḷḷāru gave to the Mahādeva of Tiruvaiyāru...”

Nantippōttaraiyar, victor at Teḷḷāru, is also mentioned in an inscription at Lāḷkuṅṅi dated to the reign of an unnamed king who must be a Pāṅṅṅya as shown by the specific “compound” style of the date:

svasti śrī [/*] **yāṅṅu 4vatiṅṅ etirāṅṅ āṅṅṅu iṅṅaiyārru nāṅṅṅṅu tiruttavattuṅṅai mahādevarkku**²¹ **tellārr'** *erintu veṅṅra nantipp[ō*]ttaraiyar kuṅṅṅta paḷaṅṅkācu 60tu*...²² “Prosperity! Fortune! In the year opposite to 4 (i.e. in the fifth year current?), the 60 old coins that Nantippōttaraiyar who, having destroyed (his enemies) at Teḷḷāru, vanquished gave to the Mahādeva of the Tiruttavattuṅṅai in the *nāṅṅu* of Iṅṅaiyāru...”

There has been a debate about the identity of this Nantippōttaraiyar who gained a victory Teḷḷāru. Some scholars identified him as Nandivarman III who reigned for more than twenty years in the middle of the 9th century,²³ while others conjectured that he was Nandivarman IV, a supplementary Pallava who outlived the last of the great Pallavas (Aparājītavarman) during the period of nascent Cōḷa hegemony in the first half of 10th century. This hypothesis of a Nandivarman IV has been put forward by T.N. SUBRAMANIAM (1955, pp. xlvi-lx). He has been followed by K.R. SRINIVASAN (1964, p. 18) and, more recently, by S. SWAMINATHAN (1995; 1998, p. 47). K.R. SRINIVASAN ascribed very precise dates to Nandivarman IV (r. ca 904-926) and considered him as the father of Kampavarman (r. ca 948-980) whereas SUBRAMANIAM (1955, pp. lviii-lix) placed his accession around 925. Several arguments lead these scholars to suppose his existence.

SUBRAMANIAM (1955, pp. xlvi-lx) argued that some inscriptions attributed to this Nantippōttaraiyar victorious at Teḷḷāru mention names referring to Cōḷas of the first half of the 10th century.²⁴ The hero-stone at Cennivāykkāl (SII XII, No. 56; IP, No. 141) mentioned above, which based on palaeography may be dated to the 10th century, mentions the *parāntakapurattu arintikai-īśvaragrha*, “the temple of Īśvara (i.e. Śiva) (built by or for) Arintikai in Parāntakapuram.” SUBRAMANIAM believed that this temple and this place-name had been named after the Cōḷa kings Ariṅṅjaya (r. ca 956-967) and his father Parāntaka I (r. ca 907-955).²⁵ He concluded that this inscription cannot be earlier than these

Cōlas and, consequently, that Nantippōttaraiyar cannot be Nandivarman III but is a supplementary and later Nandivarman. Moreover an inscription at Tiruvaikāvūr (SII XII, No. 58; IP, No. 143) dated to the 22nd year of Nantipmarājan (read Nantivanmarājan, i.e. Sanskrit Nandivarmarāja) mentions Tiripuvanāmātēviccaruppetimaṅkalam, which is an alternative name of Tiruvaikāvūr known only in inscriptions later than Nandivarman III.²⁶ SUBRAMANIAM (1955, p. xlxviii) believed this place had been named in reference to the queen of Parāntakacōla I and arrived at the same conclusion as with the Ceṅṅivāykkāl inscription concerning the identity of Nandivarmarāja, i.e. that he is Nandivarman IV.

SUBRAMANIAM (1955, p. xliii) remarked also that the Karantai copper plates of the 8th regnal of Rājendracōla I (ca 1020) describe Parāntakacōla I as having captured the fame, territory, wealth and vehicles of the Siṃhala, Pāṇḍya, Keraḷa and Pallava kings.²⁷ He concluded that in contradistinction to what was already known, i.e. that Ādityacōla I killed the last Pallava king Aparājitavarman,²⁸ this Cōla king did not wipe out the Pallavas who were able to recover their kingdom for a short time at least. SUBRAMANIAM (1955, pp. xlii ff.) hypothesised then that Nandivarman IV, allied with the Bāṇas and maybe helped by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Indra III, got back his kingdom (see phraseology of the Ceṅṅivāykkāl inscription: *rājyamuṅ koṅṭa*) through his victory at Teḷḷāru against the Cōlas.²⁹ He would have been defeated later on by Parāntakacōla I and he should be the Pallava referred to in the Karantai copper plates.

K.R. SRINIVASAN (1964, p. 12) added that the Vākūr copper plates of Nandivarman III³⁰ do not mention in connection with him any victory at Teḷḷāru, which was manifestly a great feat since it is referred to in Tamil stone inscriptions. This absence confirmed, according to K.R. SRINIVASAN, that Nandivarman III is not the victor at Teḷḷāru.

SWAMINATHAN (1995, p. 94) further suggested that the Irukkuvēḷ chiefs of Koṭumpālūr helped Parāntaka I to defeat Nandivarman IV. His argument is based on the famous Koṭumpālūr inscription of Bhūti Vikramakesarin³¹ in which this king declares that he made the Kāvēri river red with the blood of the Pallava army (verse 5: *kāverivāri śoṇaṃ samakṛta rudhiraiḥ pallavasya dhvajinyāḥ*). SWAMINATHAN noted moreover that the same Bhūti Vikramakesarin in the same verse also claims a victory over a Vīrapāṇḍya (*yo vīro vīrapāṇḍyaṃ vyajayata*), a king who has been identified as ruling in the middle of the 10th century. Furthermore an inscription from Kīlūr³² dated to the 16th regnal year of Kōvijaiyanantivikkiramaparuman, whom SWAMINATHAN identifies as Nandivarman IV, establishes that he was a contemporary of Bhūti Vikramakesarin (named Māravam Pūti in the concerned inscription). According to SWAMINATHAN, Nandivarman IV would have taken advantage of the political instability at the end of the reign of Ādityacōla I. But after his victory against the Cōlas at Teḷḷāru he would have been vanquished by Parāntakacōla I. He might even have acknowledged the Cōla authority, if he is the Pallavaracaṅ who offers gold for maintaining a lamp in the 3rd regnal year of a Parakesarivarman who must be Parāntakacōla I in an inscription from Tiruvēṭtikkuṭi (SII V, No. 623).

Despite this apparently convincing argumentation, this theory of a Nandivarman IV is open to criticism for several reasons. I will not use arguments based on palaeography in accordance with the advice of our honouree K.V. RAMESH (1984, p. 62) to allow one hundred years leeway for any date fixed on palaeographic grounds. I can sum up my counter-arguments as well as those of T.V. MAHALINGAM (1969, pp. 197-201) in seven points.

First, it is no longer possible to consider – as K.R. SRINIVASAN proposed – this hypothetical Nandivarman IV as the father of Kampavarman, whose date, moreover, is earlier than previously believed. This is made clear through the genealogy available in the Vēḷaṅcēri copper plates (R. NAGASWAMY 1979) discovered after the Nandivarman IV hypothesis had been advanced. This genealogy clarifies that Nandivarman III is the son of Dantivarman and father of Nṛpatuṅgavarman and Kampavarman, who were rivals.³³ Still, this does not preclude the possibility of a Nandivarman IV.

Second, as for the Ceṅṅivāykkāl and Tiruvaikāvūr inscriptions the following remarks have to be taken into account. If the Ceṅṅivāykkāl inscription dates to the 10th century as its palaeography indicates, it does not automatically follow that this inscription concerns a gift made in the 10th century. V. VENKATASUBBA AYYAR (1943, p. 23) proposed this date and suggested first that the place and temple of this record were named after the Cōla kings Ariṅjaya

and his father Parāntaka I. Noticing that Nantippōttaraiyar, whom he identified as Nandivarman III, was earlier than these Cōlas, he concluded that this inscription “therefore appears to be a later copy of the original record.” It is remarkable also in this connection that this the only inscription which has the supplementary expression *rājyamūṅ koṅṭa*. As for the Tiruvaikāvūr inscription, it is beyond doubt a copy as indicated in its eighth and last line (*itu kalveṭṭuppaṭi*, “this is in accordance with [an earlier] stone inscription”). As the place-name Tiripuvaṇamātēviccaruppetimaṅkalam is otherwise known only in inscriptions later than Nandivarman III, VENKATASUBBA AYYAR (1943, p. 24), who ascribed the Tiruvaikāvūr inscription to the 11th century on palaeographic grounds, judged that this was not an exact copy. It is thus possible that the Cennivāykkāl inscription is, like the Tiruvaikāvūr inscription, a copy. Its use of the otherwise unattested expression *rājyamūṅ koṅṭa* tends to substantiate this view. It is thus conceivable that in both records the temple and place-names were revised at the time of the copy and did not figure as such in the original records. *Contra*, SUBRAMANIAM (1955, p. xlix) believed that copies are always true to the original and argued that “we have not come across a single instance wherein the text of the original record was altered or tampered with when re-copying.” However I do not know of any instances where we possess both an original stone inscription and its later copy which would be required to substantiate this statement.

MAHALINGAM (1969, pp. 199-200), for his part, while considering the Cennivāykkāl inscription to be authentic and accepting SUBRAMANIAM’s statement concerning true copies in relation to the Tiruvaikāvūr inscription, rejected that the names in both inscriptions refer to persons dating to the period of Parāntakacōla I. He pointed out that the equation of Arintikai with Ariṅjaya is not satisfactory, since the former is a female name; that Arintikai is the name of an Irukkuveḷ queen of the second half of the 9th century; that the name Parāntaka is borne by a Pāṇḍya one century earlier than Parāntakacōla I; that Tiripuvaṇamātēvi (i.e. Sanskrit Tribhuvanamāhadevī) is also known as the name of the daughter of a Kāṭupattikaḷ Tamarmēttiyār in two records of the time of Ādityacōla I.³⁴ Therefore MAHALINGAM believed that the temple and places in both these inscriptions were named in reference to people prior to Nandivarman III or contemporary with him.

Third, the absence of mention of the victory at Teḷḷāru in Sanskrit copper plates is not really a surprise.³⁵ Sanskrit *praśastis* indeed refer less often to actual military victories than do Tamil inscriptions. Rather we tend to find there lists of vanquished dynasties in conformity to the ideal of the world conquest (*digvijaya*). In the case of the later Pallavas I have found mention of actual victories – by which I mean place-names of battlefields – only in five out of the eleven available sets of copper plates.³⁶

Fourth, the idea that Nantippōttaraiyar who vanquished at Teḷḷāru got his kingdom back through this victory is based on the Cennivāykkāl hero-stone inscription. But this inscription might not mean that Nantippōttaraiyar got his kingdom *back* but instead that he got the *whole* kingdom (*rājyam-um*). It could be a reference to the recovery of a portion of his dominion at the expense of a vassal who declared independence from the great Pallavas or at the expense of a dynastic rival who encroached on the Pallava kingdom.³⁷

Fifth, there is no reason to believe that the verse 17 of the Karantai copper plates has to be taken at face value: it lists four great kings as vanquished in a boasting enumeration, common in royal panegyrics. Moreover none of these kings are named: instead, dynasties are aimed at in a general way. Furthermore these plates describe Ādityacōla I in one and a half verse (verses 15 and 16ab) only, while five and a half verses (verses 16ab-21) recount the feats of his son Parāntakacōla I. Finally in the short description of Ādityacōla I there is no mention that he killed Aparājitavarman or conquered the Pallava country, in contradistinction to other inscriptional records. It is thus possible that the poet of the Karantai copper plates attributed unhistorical feats to Parāntakacōla I whether deliberately – in order to minimise the achievements of Ādityacōla I and boost those of Parāntakacōla I – or by ignorance.

Sixth, if the Kīlūr inscription proves that a Pallava king named Nandivarman was contemporary with Bhūti Vikramakesarin, he could well be Nandivarman III. As noted by SWAMINATHAN (1995, p. 94), Bhūti Vikramakesarin appears in inscriptions of Ādityacōla I (r. ca 871-907). The Vīrapāṇḍya over whom he claims victory in the

Koṭumpālūr inscription may not be the personal name of a Pāṇḍya king of the middle of the 10th century but a generic name (“the heroic Pāṇḍya”) for any Pāṇḍya of the second half of the 9th century. It is thus possible that the Pallava king’s army with whose blood Bhūti reddened the Kāvēri was not that of an hypothetical Nandivarman IV, but that of Aparājitavarman, the last great Pallava against whom Bhūti would have sided with Ādityacōla I. Apparently, after having been a vassal of Nandivarman III as the Kīlūr inscription seems to indicate, Bhūti sided with the Cōlas. As for the Pallavaracaṇ of the inscription of Parāntakacōla I, there is no certainty that he is a great Pallava. Pallavaraiyar and variants titles were indeed common titles for officers or vassals under the Cōlas.³⁸

Seventh, the Lālkuṭi inscription provides the information that Nantippōttaraiyar, the victor at Teḷḷāru, is contemporary with an unnamed Pāṇḍya king. This Pāṇḍya has been identified as Varaguṇa I by the editor of this inscription (K.V. SUBRAHMANYA AIYER 1933, p. 51), who fixed the date of his accession in 812. MAHALINGAM (1969, p. 202) thought this Pāṇḍya is Varaguṇa II whose initial regnal year is, according to him, 862. He based his argument on the fact that the Lālkuṭi inscription in question is directly followed by another one – “looking as though it is a continuation of it” and “apparently by the same scribe” – dated to the fourth plus nine year (i.e. in the ninth year of rule as Rāja, after four years of rule as Yuvarāja?) of a Varaguṇa whom he identified as the second one. If this identification is correct, it matches the accepted regnal period of Nandivarman III (around 850).³⁹

For these seven reasons, I do not subscribe to the hypothesis of a Nandivarman IV living in the first half the 10th century. I consider that the Nantippōttaraiyar who smashed his enemies at Teḷḷāru is Nandivarman III who reigned about the middle of the 9th century.

If so, Nandivarman III is one of the first kings – in fact maybe the first one – to assume in local Tamil inscriptions a recurrent and specific Tamil “epithet” (namely a subordinate clause ending with a relative participle governed by his name) hailing his military conquest.⁴⁰ The use of such epithets is known also for early Cōla kings and even for later Cōla kings when verse *meykkīrttis* were in use. For instance,⁴¹ Vijayālayacōla (r. ca 850-871), a contemporary of Nandivarman III, is *tañcai koṇṭa*, “who took Tañcai (i.e. Tanjore)”⁴² and his grandson Parāntakacōla I is *maturai koṇṭa*, “who took Maturai”.⁴³ Such epithets used by Nantippōttaraiyar and early Cōla kings can be considered as proto-*meykkīrttis*. Although short and in prose, they foreshadow the invention of the verse *meykkīrtti* of Rājarājacōla I, that begins with the words *tirumakaḷ pōla*. This *meykkīrtti* is in fact an enlargement of a proto-*meykkīrtti* of Rājarājacōla I, namely the shorter epithet (*kāntālūr*) *cālai kalam arutta* (or *arutt’ aruḷiya*), which is attested earlier and is incorporated as the third metrical line in the *meykkīrtti* of Rājarājacōla I. It is important to remember that, like such proto-*meykkīrttis*, proper *meykkīrttis* too are subordinate clauses ending with a relative participle governed by the name of the praised king.

If one thus considers that *meykkīrtti* is in fact a verse development of such short prose proto-*meykkīrttis* and agrees that the Nantippōttaraiyar who smashed his enemies at Teḷḷāru is Nandivarman III of the middle of the 9th century, this king could in fact be the one for whom the proto-*meykkīrtti* was invented, a practice soon to be adopted by the early Cōlas and later to develop into *meykkīrttis*. The content of some of the inscriptions where Nantippōttaraiyar is described as victorious at Teḷḷāru, i.e. records of his own donations,⁴⁴ suggests that he may have been personally involved in the introduction of the proto-*meykkīrtti* even though one may doubt that these inscriptions are strictly royal (in contradistinction to Sanskrit copper plates).

In any case, the victory of Nantippōttaraiyar at Teḷḷāru is not hailed only in Tamil stone inscriptions. It is also referred to many times in the *Nantikkalampakam*,⁴⁵ the earliest surviving example of the *kalampakam* genre, a poem composed in honour of Nanti, i.e. Nandivarman III. The epigraphical epithet even occurs once *verbatim* in the *Nantikkalampakam*.⁴⁶ Besides this, a peculiar stanza of this poem eulogising Nandivarman III as a warrior stands out as a forerunner of the *meykkīrtti* of Rājarājacōla I. In the stanza 65 of the *Nantikkalampakam*, presumably genuine and not interpolated because it fits in the *antāti* scheme,⁴⁷ the poet plays with roots that he uses two times with different subjects:

tiruviṅ *cemmai*yum *nilamakaḷ* *urimai*yum
 potuv *iṅṅi* *āṅṅa* *polam* *pūṅ* *pallava*
 tōḷ *tūnai* *āka* *māvellāṅṅu*
mēvalark *kaṅṅanta* *aṅṅāl* *nanti* *niṅ*
tiru *varu* *neṅṅuṅ* *kaṅ* *civakkum* *ākiṅ* 5
cerunar *cērum* *pati* *civakkummē*
niraṅ *kiḷar* *puruvam* *tuṅṅikiṅ* *niṅ* *kaḷal*
iraṅcā *maṅṅarkk'* *iṅam* *tuṅṅikkummē*
*mai*yil *vāḷ* *urai* *kaḷikkum* *ākiṅ*
aṅṅāṅkār *peṅṅtir* 10
pūṅ *mulai* *muttap* *pūṅ* *kaḷikkummē*
kaṅṅuvāy *pōḷ* *vaḷai* *atira* *ninṅṅoṅu*
maruvā *maṅṅar* *maṅṅam* *tuṅṅikkummē*
mā *mata* *yāṅṅai* *paṅṅiṅ*
utiram *maṅṅṅu* *niṅ* *etir* *malaintōṅṅkē* 15

“O Pallava with golden ornaments, who ruled (or: cherished), without sharing (them), the excellence (or: beauty) of Tiru (i.e. Śrī) and the possession of Nilamakaḷ (i.e. Bhū),

o Nanti, great man who overcame the enemies in Māvellāṅṅu (i.e. the big Vellāṅṅu) with the help of his arms, if your large eyes where beauty (*tiru*) dwells become red (*civakkum*), the place where the (enemy) soldiers gather also becomes red (*civakkum*).

If your bright-coloured eyebrows quiver (*tuṅṅikiṅ*), the left side of the kings who do not bow to your feet (literally: anklets) also quivers (*tuṅṅikkum*).⁴⁸

If you remove (*kaḷikkum*) your bright (or: flawless) sword from its sheath, the wives of reluctant (kings) also remove (*kaḷikkum*) the pearl-ornaments of their ornamented breasts.⁴⁹

When conchs similar to your *kaṅṅuvāy* (“harsh voice”, i.e. Nanti’s bellowing war-drum) resound, the determination of the kings who are not on your side falters.

If you prepare your big intoxicated elephant(s) (for battle), the blood of the kings opposing you congeals (i.e. their blood runs cold).”

From the metrical, thematic and structural points of view, this stanza recalls the Cōḷa *meṅṅkīrttis*: it is in *āciriyaṅṅā*, opens with the mention of goddesses as spouses of the king, and mentions a concrete battlefield (Māvellāṅṅu) where the praised king gained victory. These features are similarly found in the Cōḷa *meṅṅkīrttis*, which are also set in *āciriyaṅṅā* and consist almost exclusively—after the mention of the goddesses—in the enumeration of victories, if not actually historical at least set in an historical context.⁵⁰

If we thus consider the stanza 65 of the *Nantikkalampakam* side by side with the *tellāṅṅ' erinta* proto-*meṅṅkīrtti* of the stone inscriptions, the epigraphic and belletristic creations produced under Nandivarman III stand out as important forerunners of the *meṅṅkīrtti* of Rājarājacōḷa I. In this context one has to recall that Cōḷa *meṅṅkīrttis* are mainly encountered in local Tamil stone-inscriptions, in which the Cōḷa king sometimes plays no other role than furnish a regnal date. Cōḷa *meṅṅkīrttis* can thus be considered as a development of the Tamil panegyric of Nandivarman III: they are a versified development of epithets like *tellāṅṅ' erinta* and a thematic avatar of a poem like *Nantikkalampakam* 65.

Kṛṣṇa III Rāṣṭrakūṭa

Approximately one century later than Nandivarman III, we encounter another important milestone towards the *meykkīrtti* of Rājarājacōla I, viz. in a Tamil inscription dated to the 25th year (963-964) of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III.⁵¹ This inscription is engraved on a pillar planted in a field at Caṅṅkavāṭi (Pōḷūr tāluk, undivided North Arcot district, today Tiruvaṅṅāmalai district) where I was able to see it in August 2009 on the occasion of an EFEO field trip with N. Ramaswamy and Charlotte Schmid (fig. 2). At the time of our visit, the field had fortunately been harvested, so that we could actually find the pillar. This pillar is 140 cm high (for the portion we had access to, that is from top up to the lowest engraved lines), 33 cm wide and 20 cm thick. Its inscription is entirely composed in *ācīriyappā*.⁵² It runs from lines 1-29 on the front face (fig. 3-4) and from lines 30-57 on the back face (fig. 5). The front face has undergone some deterioration since the Archaeological Survey of India made the impression used by K.G. KRISHNAN (1986): lines 11-12 are now completely missing, while the left portions of lines 13-18 has been trimmed. The back face has been slightly damaged at the beginning of line 32 where the first character is now missing. The inscription reads (fig. 4-5):⁵³

- (1) *svasti śrī* ||-
- i *tiru[maka](2)l muyan̄kac cīrmakaḷ [vi](3)laṅkaḷ*
- ii *porukata[l u](4)ṭutta pūtalamu[luva](5)[tu]ñ*
- iii *ceṅkō[l] [xxx]*
- (6-10) [xxxxxxxxxxxx]
- (11) [xx]tta[xxxxxx]
- (12) [xxx]ṭu[xxxx]{vi?}
- (13) laṅkiya [xxxxx]
- (14) pāṭikka⁵⁴[xxxxx]
- (15) tiyoṭu[xxxxx]
- (16) la mānilaṅ ka[xxx]
- (17) **gajamallaṅ** āṅa [xxxx]
- (18) cīr °akāḷavaruṣa{ṅ?}[xxx]
- x (19) **pr̄itivallabhamah[ārā]**(20)jan̄
- xi [°ē*]rp poli **rājā**(21)**dh̄irājaparamēśvaraṅ**
- xii [ta](22)rāṭalam pukaḷuñ calaka(23)nalātaṅ
- xiii *kāṅṭaku kacci(24)yun tañcaiyuñ koṅ(25)ṭ' aṅk⁵⁵*
- xiv *āṅṭa yāṅṭ' [ō*]ri(26)rupattañciṅuḷ*
- xv *pal(27)lavar k[ō*]māṅ palla(28)vāparaṅṅ*
- xvi *kall uya(29)r tiṅṭ[ō*]ṭ kāñci**bhu**(30)[ja]ṅkaṅ*
- xvii *nulampa[ṅ a](31)ṅṅikaṅ vaḷaṅ taru ma(32)ṭalai*
- xviii (°i?)yāru c[ē*]r araṅ a(33)[ṭi] matakaṅ mantākani⁵⁶
- xix *ki(34)[x]ru⁵⁷ mayintaṅ kāṭala(35)[r?]reḷi⁵⁸ tara*

- xx *veṅṅe(36)[xx]kalaiyum iruñca*
 (37) [xxxxxx]ṅa
 (38) [xxxxxxxx]me⁵⁹
 (39) [xxxxxxxx]vañ
 (40) [xxxxxx]ṛru
 (41) [xxxxxxxx]larāṅ
 (42) [xxxxxx][m]paramai⁶⁰
 (43) [xxxxxx]la
- xxiv *vaḷan (44) taru[m][xxx][ke] vaḷla(45)l tulaṅkāt*
- xxv *talama(46)li caḷukkipāṭiy ākiya*
- xxvi *(47) kalaimalikalakkili(48)k kaṭikaimaṅkalattu(49)l*
- xxvii *maṅumayaviccū(50)vakaṅmā nīḷ maṅai(51)y*
- xxviii *eṅa mikav ulaki(52)l eḷil peṅa viyaṅ a(53)ṛav⁶¹*
- xxix *ampalam amai(54)ttāṅaṅ eṅpar*
- xxx *(55) cempor kamala(56)ttut tiruvaḷar ta(57)ṛav[ē*]y ||-||-*

“Prosperity! Fortune! [line 1]

So that Tirumakaḷ embraces (him, i.e. Kṛṣṇa III), so that Cīrmakaḷ shines [aṭi 1; lines 1-3],

so that the entire earth encircled by the dashing sea (is under the protection or authority) of his upright sceptre [aṭis 2-3; lines 3-5]

...shining (*viḷaṅkiya?*) [lines 12-13]

...while bringing about (*pāṭikka*) [line 14]

...the great earth (*mānilam*) [line 16]

...alias Gajamallaṅ (i.e. he who is a wrestler to the elephants that are the other kings) [line 17]

...the glorious Akāḷavaruṣaṅ (Sanskrit Akāḷavarṣa, i.e. he who is an unseasonable rain) [line 18],

the great king beloved of the earth (*prativallabhamah[ārā]jaṅ*) [aṭi 10; lines 19-20],

the supreme lord emperor of the kings (*rājādhirājaprameśvaraṅ*), who abounds (or: shines) (*poli-tal*) with beauty (*ēr*) [aṭi 11; lines 20-21],⁶²

Calakanalātaṅ⁶³ whom the earth praises (or: who is praised [throughout] the earth) [aṭi 12; lines 21-23],

took (*koṅṭu*⁶⁴) Kacci, which is excellent (*taku-tal*) in beauty (*kāṅ*) (or: which is pleasing to the eye), and Tañcai [aṭi 13; lines 23-25].

In the 25th year when he ruled there (*aṅku*) [aṭi 14; lines 25-26],

the king of the Pallavas (*pallavar kōmaṅ*), the ornament of the Pallavas (*pallavāparaṅaṅ*, i.e. Sanskrit *pallavābharāṅa*) [aṭi 15; lines 26-28],

the lover (**bhujāṅka**, i.e. Sanskrit *bhujāṅga*) of Kāñcī with strong shoulders that are as high as a mountain [aṭi 16; lines 28-30],

Nuḷampan̄ Aṅṅikaṅ, the son (*matalai*) who gives prosperity⁶⁵ [aṭi 17; lines 30-32]

as the foot (or: feet) of Araṅ (i.e. Śiva) who joins (*cēr-tal*) with rivers (*āru*)⁶⁶ – that powerful one (*mayintaṅ*), (her) lover (*kātalaṅ*) – gives beauty (*teḷi*, literally “clearness”) to the (many-)sluiced (*mataku*) Mantākini (i.e. the Ganges)... [aṭi 18-19; lines 32-34]⁶⁷

...in Kaṭikaimaṅkalam, which is devoid of tumult (or: affliction) (*kalakku+ili*) and plenty (*mali-tal*) of arts (*kalai*) [aṭi 26; lines 47-49],

alias Caḷukkipāṭi, which abounds (*mali-tal*) in sacred places (*talam*) which are not shining (*tulaṅkā*) thanks to (any) liberal donor (*vaḷḷal*)...giving riches (*vaḷan*) [aṭi 24-25; lines 43-46],⁶⁸

in order that it abide (*ara*) (in) the sky (*viyaṅ*) and get very much (*mika*) beauty/height (*eḷil*) in the world like (*eṇa*) a lofty house (*maṅai*) (made by) Maṅu (i.e. Manu), Maya (architect of the Daityas) and Viccuvakaṅmā (i.e. Viśvakarman, the architect of the Devas) [aṭi 27-28; lines 49-53]

(he, i.e. Nuḷampan̄ Aṅṅikaṅ) created (*amaittaṅaṅ*) a hall (*ampalam*). So they say [aṭi 29; lines 53-54].

(This is) a gift (*taravu*) that makes Tiru prosper on her red-golden lotus [aṭi 30; lines 55-57].”

Lines 6-15 are unfortunately damaged and full of lacunae. Otherwise we would have at the beginning of this inscription a complete *meykkīrtti* of an estimated extent of thirteen *aṭis*. What is striking here in this preserved portion is, on the one hand, its setting in *ācīriyappā* which is the metre of *Cōḷa meykkīrttis* and, on the other hand, the opening mention of the goddesses, which is a feature common to most *meykkīrttis*. Moreover it is noticeable also that Tirumakaḷ (i.e. Śrī) is named first, as in the most common *meykkīrtti* of Rājarājacōḷa I, which starts with the words *tirumakaḷ pōla*. This unique eulogy of Kṛṣṇa III at Caṅṅikkavāṭi appears in this regard as the immediate forerunner of the *meykkīrtti* of Rājarājacōḷa I.⁶⁹ It is actually in both content and form a *meykkīrtti*⁷⁰ and it could truly have been a direct model for the *meykkīrtti* of Rājarājacōḷa I. In this connection it is remarkable that Kṛṣṇa III also has a proto-*meykkīrtti* that is prefixed to his name in inscriptions (*kacciyun tañcaiyuṅ koṅṭa*, “who took Kacci [i.e. Kāñcīpuram] and Tañcai [i.e. Tanjore]”) and that this longer Caṅṅikkavāṭi eulogy is in fact a much expanded verse development of this proto-*meykkīrtti* (see *kacciyun tañcaiyuṅ koṅṭu* in its lines 23-25), in the same manner as the usual *meykkīrtti* of Rājarājacōḷa I is the elaboration of a proto-*meykkīrtti*, as we have seen above.

Conclusions

By way of conclusion I will consider the nature of these sources providing forerunners to *Cōḷa meykkīrttis*. By nature, I mean whether these are literary compositions directly patronised by the eulogised king or creations produced at a local, non-royal level.

While the *Nantikkalampakam* can be considered as a court poem composed in the royal household of Nandivarman III, one may question the royal character of the epigraphic sources. Were they directly commissioned by the eulogised king or the product of a local initiative? We have seen that some of the inscriptions of Nandivarman III hailing him as victor at Teḷḷāru record his own donations of gold. Moreover the number of inscriptions containing this epithet is proportionally high compared to the total amount of the inscriptions of Nandivarman III (more than 20 %). Both observations lead me to infer that Nandivarman III was personally involved in the invention or introduction of a proto-*meykkīrtti* to these records. As for the Caṅṅikkavāṭi inscription, which is an isolated instance of a Tamil eulogy of Kṛṣṇa III, it seems plausible that it was composed at the initiative of Nuḷampan̄ Aṅṅikaṅ, the vassal of Kṛṣṇa III whose foundation is recorded in the inscription.

But whoever commissioned these inscriptions, the epigraphic and belletristic production under Nandivarman III Pallava (middle of the 9th century) and under Kṛṣṇa III Rāṣṭrakūṭa (middle of the 10th century) stand out as forerunners of the *meykkīrtti* composed for Rājarājacōḷa I. Nandivarman III as well as Kṛṣṇa III were endowed with proto-*meykkīrttis*, that is “epithets” that clearly foreshadow fully fledged *meykkīrttis*. The stanza 65 of the *Nantikkalampakam* in honour of Nandivarman III and the Caṅikkavāṭi inscriptional poem in honour of Kṛṣṇa III Rāṣṭrakūṭa can be seen as models for the *meykkīrtti* of Rājarājacōḷa I. These remarkable literary pieces help to bridge the gap between Caṅkam Puṛam poetry and Cōḷa *meykkīrttis*.

Notes

1. I wish to thank the EFEO (French School of Asian Studies) through which a field trip to Caṅikkavāṭi was made possible in the summer of 2009. N. Ramaswamy alias Babu and Charlotte Schmid from the EFEO accompanied me on this field trip. Arlo Griffiths and Whitney Cox read a draft of this paper, making useful comments and polishing my English. My understanding of the Caṅikkavāṭi inscription has been especially improved thanks to many observations made by Whitney Cox. My sincere thanks to all of them.
2. For a detailed definition of *meykkīrtti*, see E. FRANCIS & C. SCHMID (2010, pp. viii-xii).
3. About the antecedents of Cōḷa *meykkīrttis*, see FRANCIS & SCHMID (2010, pp. xii-xvi).
4. M.K. NARAYANASAMI AYYAR & T.A. GOPINATHA RAO (1908, p. 173) place Teḷḷāru in the Wandiwash tāluk of the North Arcot district (i.e. nowadays Vantavāci tāluk, Tiruvaṅṅāmalai district).
5. These ten inscriptions amount to more than 20 % of the inscriptions dated to the reign of Nandivarman III, provided that he is, as I believe, this victor at Teḷḷāru. For the edition of epigraphic sources, the following conventions are adopted: engraved letters that have been damaged but remain to some extent readable stand between []; missing letters are indicated by [x]; restored letters, that is unengraved letters that are supplied or vowels with unmarked length, stand between [] and are marked by an asterisk; letters entirely worn and restored on the basis of parallels or meaning stand between {}; letters engraved that ought to be erased stand between (). The sign ° marks independent vowels in the original script. The elision of overshoot *u* is indicated by '. Grantha letters are printed in bold face.
6. Read *nantip[ō*]ttaraiyar*.
7. Read *tippōkku*°.
8. SII V, No. 609*; IP, No. 122. An asterisk marks the edition of reference in this and the following notes.
9. Read °*erinta*.
10. SII VI, No. 447*; IP, No. 125.
11. ARE 1992-93, appendix B, No. 391; Kō. MUTTUCĀMI 1994*.
12. Read *patineṭṭāvatu*.
13. *MCC Magazine* 8, pp. 98 ff.; SII V, No. 567; IP, No. 135*.
14. SII VII, No. 503*; IP, No. 137. This inscription records an arrangement for supplying *ghee* to the temple priest in order to burn lamps with 60 *kaḷaṅcus* of gold seemingly given by the king.
15. ARE 1937-38, appendix B, No.162 and § 23, p. 87; IP, No. 329. This inscription records an arrangement for burning two lamps with 105 *kaḷaṅcus* of gold given by the king.
16. SII XII, No. 56*; IP, No. 141.
17. SII XII, No. 57*; IP, No. 142. This inscription records an arrangement for burning two lamps with 60 *kaḷaṅcus* of gold seemingly given by the king.
18. Read *tiruvīraṭṭāṇattu*.
19. SII VIII, No. 309*; IP, No. 123.
20. ARE 1995-96, appendix B, No. 107; Īla. TIYĀKARĀCAṅ 1994; S. SWAMINATHAN 1995*.
21. Read *mahādevarkku*.

22. EI XX, No. 3A*; IP, No. 269.
23. For the consensual date of Nandivarman III, see C.R. SRINIVASAN (1979, p. 25). His twenty three-year rule started at the earliest in 826 and came to an end at the latest in 872.
24. See also K.R. SRINIVASAN (1964, p. 12), SWAMINATHAN (1995, pp. 93-94).
25. Following V. VENKATASUBBA AYYAR (1943, p. 24).
26. See VENKATASUBBA AYYAR (1943, p. 24).
27. See K.G. KRISHNAN (1984, p. 70 and 195, verse 17): *nirjjitya siṃhaḷapatim yudhi pāṇḍyārājam prakhyātakī[r*]tim atha keraḷam apy ajayyam [r*] vīras sa pallavaripaṇ ca yasāṃsi [read yasāṃsi] teṣām rāṣṭrāṇi cādita vasūni ca vāhanāni ||*
28. See the Tiruvālaṅkāṭu copper plates (SII III, No. 205, verse 49), the Kaṇṇiyākumari pillar inscription (EI XVIII, No. 4, verse 55), the Cārāla copper plates (EI XXV, No. 25, verse 55), and a stone inscription in the Ghṛtasthāneśvara temple at Tillaisthānam (SII III, No. 89, line 1).
29. See also SWAMINATHAN (1995, pp. 93-94; 1998, p. 47).
30. EI XVIII, No. 2; IP, No. 155.
31. See IPS, No. 14; K.A. NILAKANTA SASTRI (1933); SII XXIII, No. 129, pp. 101-102.
32. EI XXXII, No. 10; SII VII, No. 125; IP, No. 129
33. K.R. SRINIVASAN (1983, pp. 87-88) rejected the Nandivarman IV hypothesis after the discovery of the Vēḷaṅcēri copper plates.
34. ARE 1927-28, appendix B, No. 161 and SII XIII, No. 351
35. See also T.V. MAHALINGAM (1969, pp. 200-201).
36. The Utayēntiram copper plates of Nandivarman II (SII II, No. 74; IP, No. 76) exceptionally provide many battlefield names (more than ten) while the other copper plates (SII II, No. 73; SII II, No. 98; EI XVIII, No. 2; R. NAGASWAMY 1979) have one or two names (Vātāpi being mentioned in several different copper plates).
37. On the identification of the vanquished king at Teḷḷāru, see MAHALINGAM (1969, p. 204).
38. See N. KARASHIMA (1984, pp. 62-63) and, for instance, an inscription at Tanjore (SII II, No. 32, lines 5-6) that mentions a Pirāntaka[p*]pallavaraiyaṇ, “the Pallava king (at the service) of Pirāntaka (i.e. Parāntaka).”
39. An inscription at Tiruvatikai (SII XII, No. 71; IP, No. 167) records a reverse situation, that is a donation of [P]āṇṭi Varaguṇa Mahārājaṇ – identified as Varaguṇa II – in the 18th year of Nṛpatuṅgavarman, the son of Nandivarman III.
40. If one would still believe that Nantippōttaraiyar who smashed his enemies at Teḷḷāru is Nandivarman IV, this king would still be among the first kings to bear such epithets. But in that case he would have adopted a practice introduced by the Cōḷas.
41. For a longer list of such epithets of Cōḷa kings, see FRANCIS & SCHMID (2010, p. xv, n. 55).
42. See NILAKANTA SASTRI (1955, p. 111) and, for instance, ARE 1936, No. 51.
43. See NILAKANTA SASTRI (1955, p. 121) and, for instance, SII III, No. 12 and SII XIX, No. 181.
44. This is the case explicitly at Tillaisthānam, Centalai, Tiruvorriyūr, Tiruvatikai, and Tiruvaiyāru, and seemingly at Tirucceṇṇampūṇṭi and Tiruppalātturai.
45. See *Nantikkalampakam* 32, 33, 37, 42, 53, 56, 57, 68, 75, 79, 82, 84, 85, 90, and 91.
46. See *attellārr’ erinta māṇōtayaṇ* in *Nantikkalampakam* 85.
47. The *Nantikkalampakam* as edited yields more stanzas than expected for a poem in honour of a king. Hence the probability that some of the stanzas are interpolated. See NARAYANASAMI AYYAR & GOPINATHA RAO (1908, p. 170 et n. 2).
48. A left-side shaking is a bad omen.
49. As widows do not wear any more ornaments, one has to understand that Nanti kills all his enemies leaving their wives widowed.
50. See FRANCIS & SCHMID (2010, pp. xvii-xviii).

51. See ARE 1939-40 to 1942-43, appendix B, No. 132, and pp. 235-236; K.G. KRISHNAN (1986), with facsimile; A. KRISHNAN (1998, p. 27); SWAMINATHAN (2000, inscription No. 72, pp. 59-62); Leslie C. ORR (2009, pp. 105-106).
52. The metre is precisely *nēricai āciryappā* according to K.G. KRISHNAN (1986, p. 49).
53. The text given here is my own reading from *in situ* examination of the pillar as it is today and from the facsimile published by K.G. KRISHNAN (1986). Letters no more readable from the stone but only legible on this facsimile are not italicised. The lines on the stone are indicated by Arabic numerals between (). The text is disposed metrically when possible and metrical lines (*aṭis*) are indicated by Roman numerals in the left margin. Otherwise it is arranged according to the lines as on the pillar.
54. *Contra* K.G. KRISHNAN (1986): *paṭikka*.
55. *Contra* K.G. KRISHNAN (1986): *āṅku*.
56. Read *mantākini* according to K.G. KRISHNAN (1986). But it seems possible to read *mantarikaḷiki* or *mantarikaṅiki*. Actually the exact reading of the whole *aṭi* and the proper division of its words are not clear at all.
57. Read *kiṇaru*? Or read with the last word of the preceding *aṭi* as *mantākinikk' i[x]ru*.
58. *Contra* K.G. KRISHNAN (1986): *[xx]roli*.
59. *Contra* K.G. KRISHNAN (1986): *mum*.
60. *Contra* K.G. KRISHNAN (1986): *mparamē*.
61. *Contra* K.G. KRISHNAN (1986): *urav*.
62. As pointed out to me by Arlo Griffiths, the *birudas* in lines 18-21 are attested for Kṛṣṇa I Rāṣṭrakūṭa. See for instance EI IV, No. 18, lines 20-21: *akālavaraśaśrīprithivīvallabhamahārājādhirājaparamēśvarabhaṭṭārakasy[a]*.
63. The meaning of Calakanalātaṅ – otherwise unattested, as far as I know – is not clear. Could it be a Tamil *biruda* meaning “he whose soul (*ātaṅ*) is water (*calam*) and fire (*kanal* standing for *kaṅal*)”? Alternatively, as suggested to me by Whitney Cox, it could be a Kannada epithet: “he who is a good (or: noble) bull.” See F. KITTEL & M.M. BHAT (1968-1977, s.v. *salaga*).
64. The absolutive *koṅṭu* is translated here as a finite verb for the sake of clarity, even though it is dependent on *āṅta*.
65. One could also translate, as pointed out to me by Whitney Cox, as “the pillar (*matalai*) who gives prosperity” and consider that this refer to Śiva who is mentioned in the next *aṭi* and is often called Sthāṅu (“the Pillar”).
66. Viz. Śiva loves rivers. See for instance EI I, No. 9A, verse 1, where Śiva is *nadīpriya*.
67. It is difficult to make sense of these *aṭis* 18-19. In the translation proposed I take *mantākaniki[x]ru* as *mantākinikk' i[x]ru*. Alternatively, if *kiṇaru* is to be restored, these lines could refer to some irrigation work named in connection with the myth of the Ganges falling onto the earth through the intercession of Śiva.
68. I understand here that Nuḷampaṅ Aṅṅikaṅ claims to patronise a place that has not enjoyed many endowments. Alternatively, as suggested to me by Whitney Cox, one can disconnect, on the one hand, “the generous man (*vaḷḷal*)...who gives prosperity (*vaḷan*)”, as referring to Nuḷampaṅ Aṅṅikaṅ, and, on the other hand, “Caḷukkipāṭi, which abounds (*mali-tal*) in sacred places (or: lands) (*talam*) which are undisturbed (*tulaṅkā*).” In that sense Caḷukkipāṭi is presented as a quiet place, fit for endowments since it is not subject to any kind of threat. The same place is presented in the next *aṭi*, under its alternative name Kaṭikaimaṅkalam, along the same lines.
69. This has already been pointed out by K.G. KRISHNAN (1986, p. 47) in regard to the mention of the goddesses.
70. For K.G. KRISHNAN (1986, p. 47) the inscription cannot be called a *meḷkkīrtti* or *praśasti* since it is entirely in verse. But I consider that there is a *meḷkkīrtti* from the beginning of the inscription up to the mention of the date in *aṭi* 14, whether the rest of the inscription is in verse or not.




Fig. 1: Tiruccenampūṇṭi, Caṭaiyar temple. Inscription dated to the 18th regnal year of *Tellārr' erinta Nantippōttaraiyar* (SII VII, No. 503; IP, No. 137), lines 1-8. Photo by Charlotte Schmid.



Fig. 2: Caṅikkavāṭi, pillar in a field with inscription dated to the 25th regnal of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III (EI XL, No. 9). Photo by the author.



Fig. 3: Caṅikkavāṭi pillar inscription, front face. Photo by the author.




Fig. 4: Caṅikkavāṭi pillar inscription, front face, i.e. lines 1-29. Photo and computer processing by the author.




Fig. 5: Caṅikkavāṭi pillar inscription, front face, i.e. lines 30-57. Photo and computer processing by the author.

Abbreviations

EI: *Epigraphia Indica*.

IP: *Inscriptions of the Pallavas*, see T.V. MAHALINGAM (1988).

IPS: *Inscriptions of the Pudukkottai State*.

SII: *South Indian Inscriptions*.

Bibliography

FRANCIS, Emmanuel & SCHMID, Charlotte

2010 “Preface”, in *Pondicherry Inscriptions. Part II. Translation, Appendices, Glossary and Phrases*, edited by G. Vijayavenugopal, Pondicherry: École Française d’Extrême-Orient & Institut Français de Pondichéry (Collection Indologie; 83.2), pp. v-xlvii.

INSCRIPTIONS OF THE PUDUKKOTTAI STATE

1929 *Inscriptions (Texts) of the Pudukkottai State arranged according to Dynasties*, Pudukkottai: State Press.

KARASHIMA, Noboru

1984 *South Indian History and Society. Studies from Inscriptions. A.D. 850-1800*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

KITTEL, Ferdinand & BHAT, M. Mariappa

1968-1977 *Kittel’s Kannaḍa-English dictionary. Revised and enlarged by Prof. M. Mariappa Bhat*, 4 volumes, Madras: University of Madras.

KRISHNAN, A.

1998 *Literature and Epigraphy of Tamilnadu*, Delhi: Bharatiya Kala Prakashan.

KRISHNAN, K.G.

1984 *Karandai Tamil Sangam Plates of Rajendrachola I*, New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India; 79).

1986 “Sanikkavadi Inscription of Rashtrakuta Krishna III”, *Epigraphia Indica* 40, Part II (July 1973), inscription No. 9, pp. 47-50.

MAHALINGAM, T.V.

1969 *Kāñcīpuram in early South Indian History*, Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

MUTTUCĀMI, Kō.

1994 “Pallavar kāla Āṅṅānkūr”, *Āvaṇam* 5.12, pp. 41-44.

NAGASWAMY, R.

1979 *Tiruttani and Velanjeri Copper Plates*, Madras: Tamil Nadu State Department of Archaeology (Tamil Nadu State Department of Archaeology Publications; 55), pp. 3-22.

NANTIKKALAMPAKAM

1955 *Paṭṭuṭaittalaivaṇ tampiṇṇaruḷ oruvar pāṭiya Nantik kalampakam uraiyuṭaṇ*, edited by Pu. Ci. Puṇṇaivaṇaṇāta Mutaliyār & Ce. Re. Iramacāmi Piḷḷai, Tirunelvēli – Ceṇṇai: Tirunelvēlit teṇṇintiya caivacittānta nūṇṇatippuk kaḷakam.

NARAYANASAMI AYYAR, M.K. & GOPINATHA RAO, T.A.

1908 “Tamil Historical Texts. N°1 – Nandi-kkalambagam”, *Indian Antiquary* 37, pp. 170-173.

NILAKANTA SASTRI, K.A.

1933 “The Koḷumbāḷūr Inscription of Vikrama-kēsari”, *Journal of Oriental Research Madras* 7, pp. 1-10).

1955 *The Cōḷas*, 2nd revised edition, Madras: University of Madras.

ORR, Leslie C.

- 2009 “Tamil and Sanskrit in the medieval epigraphical Context”, in *Passages: Relationships between Tamil and Sanskrit*, edited by M. Kannan & Jennifer Clare, Pondicherry: IFP & Tamil Chair, University of California at Berkeley (IFP Publications Hors série; 11), pp. 97-114.
- RAMESH, K.V.
- 1984 *Indian Epigraphy. Volume 1*, Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan.
- SRINIVASAN, K.R.
- 1964 *Cave-temples of the Pallavas*, New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India (Archaeological Survey of Temples Series; 1).
- 1983 “Middle Toṇḍaināḍu Style, c. A.D. 800-900. Pallavas of Kāñcī. Phase II”, in *Encyclopaedia of Indian Temple Architecture I.1. South India. Lower Drāviḍadēśa. 200 B.C. – A.D. 1324*, edited by Michael W. MEISTER & M.A. DHAKY, New Delhi: American Institute of Indian Studies & Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 87-106.
- SRINIVASAN, C.R.
- 1979 *Kañchipuram through the Ages*, Delhi: Agam Kala Prakasham.
- SUBRAHMANYA AIYER, K.V.
- 1933 “Three Tamil Inscriptions of Lalgudi”, *Epigraphia Indica* XX, No. 3, pp. 46-54.
- SUBRAMANIAM, T.N.
- 1955 “A historical Survey”, in *South Indian Temple Inscriptions. Volume III. Part I*, edited by T.N. SUBRAMANIAM, Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (Madras Government Oriental Series; 131), pp. xxxiii ff.
- SWAMINATHAN, S.
- 1995 “Tiruvaiyyaru Inscription of Tellarerinda Nandivarman Pallava”, *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society* 86.4, pp. 92-98.
- 2009 *Rashtrakuta Inscriptions in the Tamil Country*, Hampi: Prasaranga, Kannada University.
- TIYĀKARĀCAṆ, Ila.
- 1994 “Nantivarman kalveṭṭu”, *Āvaṇam* 4.1, pp. 1-2.
- VENKATASUBBA AYYAR, V.
- 1943 *South Indian Inscriptions. Volume XII. The Pallavas (with introductory Notes in English)*, General Editor C.R. KRISHNAMACHARLU, Author V. VENKATASUBBA AYYAR, Madras: Government Press.

Figures

Fig. 1: Tiruccenṇampūṇṭi, Caṭaiyar temple. Inscription dated to the 18th regnal year of *Tellārr’ erinta Nantippōttaraiyar* (SII VII, No. 503; IP, No. 137), lines 1-8. Photo by Charlotte Schmid.

Fig. 2: Caṇikkavāṭi, pillar in a field with inscription dated to the 25th regnal of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III (EI XL, No. 9). Photo by the author.

Fig. 3: Caṇikkavāṭi pillar inscription, front face. Photo by the author.

Fig. 4: Caṇikkavāṭi pillar inscription, front face, i.e. lines 1-29. Photo and computer processing by the author.

Fig. 5: Caṇikkavāṭi pillar inscription, front face, i.e. lines 30-57. Photo and computer processing by the author.