

Madras University Archaeological Series No. 6

LAND GRANTS AND AGRARIAN REACTIONS
IN CŌLA AND PĀNDYA TIMES

R. TIRUMALAI

This book is the result of intensive original research into an aspect of the economic conditions of South India in the Cōḷa and Pāṇḍya times (from the 9th to the 14th century). The subject is one on which not much work has been done-on the land-grants, and management, and the reactions of the different segments of the agrarian community. It is almost entirely based on the texts of inscriptions, published, and mostly unpublished, and seeks to interpret several terms occurring therein for the first time or afresh.

The study mirrors the changing trends of the agrarian economy, and the growing stress and strain it had faced, especially during the Cōḷa-Pāṇḍya wars, and when the Cōḷa monarchy had weakened.

The two lectures are presented in a manner which could be of appeal to a general reader, and the explanatory notes to the specialist and the students of South Indian history and epigraphy.

Rs 4 5 0 0

General Editor :
Professor K.V. RAMAN

LAND GRANTS AND AGRARIAN REACTIONS
IN CŌLA AND PĀNDYA TIMES

R. TIRUMALAI

LAND GRANTS AND AGRARIAN REACTIONS
IN CŌLA AND PĀNDYA TIMES

(Sankara—Parvati Endowment Lectures—1983)

BY

R. TIRUMALAI., I.A.S. (Retd.)

Jawaharlal Nehru Fellow



UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

1987

PRINTED AT PUNITHA OFFSET PRINTERS, MADRAS-14.

954.8
TIR

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS
1981

DEDICATED

to

THE MEMORY OF MY PROFESSORS,

the late Prof. K.A.Nilakanta Sastri,

the late Prof. S.Vaiyapuri Pillai,

and

the late Prof. R.P.Sethu Pillai.

CONTENTS

	Pages
Editor's introduction	i
Preface	v
Abbreviations	ix
LECTURE-I	
<i>Land Grants and Agrarian Reactions —</i>	...
<i>Terms and conditions of Grant; Reactions of the townships</i>	1
LECTURE-II	
<i>Land Grants and Agrarian Reactions —</i>	...
<i>The Characteristics of occupancy, the occupants</i>	41
<i>and their obligations</i>	
<i>The tenants under the occupants, and their obligations</i>	
APPENDIX-I Explanatory Notes	
1. <i>Some concepts and terminology explained</i>	...
	81
2. <i>Land reclamation, and concessions granted to</i>	...
<i>the occupants, and for the cultivation of preferred crops</i>	98
3. <i>The Cōḷa land assessment modes - some noteworthy</i>	...
<i>features</i>	103
4-A. <i>Alienation of land grants, and the checks introduced</i>	...
<i>in the Cōḷa kingdom - a historical survey</i>	116
4-B. <i>Rājarāja's punitive action - a view in perspective</i>	...
	124
5. <i>Distress conditions in the Cōḷa and Pāṇḍya</i>	...
<i>times: a sketch history</i>	128
6. <i>Relief afforded to the occupants, and its forms</i>	...
	141
7. <i>Relationship between the occupants and the tenants</i>	...
<i>and the relief afforded to the latter</i>	157
8. <i>Modern Revenue Settlement modalities (vide last</i>	...
<i>paragraph of Lecture-II)</i>	179
9. <i>Further notes</i>	...
	180

ANNEXURE-II

<i>Original text of the Tirukkarugāvūr (Shiyali taluk)</i>	...	181
<i>inscription (in Tamil) - ARE Number 429 of 1918.</i>		
Bibliography	...	187
Index	...	189
Errata	...	205

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

Thiru R. Tirumalai, the author of this monograph represents a rare combination of being a distinguished administrator and a versatile scholar equally at home in the fields of history, epigraphy and literature. After a brilliant academic career in the Hindu College, Tirunelveli, and the Presidency College, Madras, he joined as a research scholar under the late Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri from 1945 to 1947. In 1948, he joined the Indian Administrative Service ranking first and served in the districts, formed the Kanyakumari district, and later worked as Secretary, Public Works Department and Industries, Member of Board of Revenue, Government of Tamil Nadu (1960-1970) and held various important assignments in the Economic Ministries of the Government of India including Secretary (Co-ordination), Cabinet Secretariat and finally was Member, Economic Administration Reforms Commission with the rank of a Minister of State, in the Government of India (1970-1983). He was also awarded the prestigious Jawaharlal Nehru Fellowship for his research project on the Pandyan Townships. He has a number of publications to his credit including several books like *Rajendra Vinnagar* (1980) and *Studies in the History of Ancient Townships of Pudukottai* (1981) and numerous research articles. The University of Madras invited him to deliver the Sankara - Parvati Endowment Lecture for the year 1981-82 and, appropriately, he has taken up the interesting theme in the area of his specialisation, viz., "Land Grants and Agrarian Reactions in the Cōla and the Pāṇḍyan times."

The agrarian history of South India in ancient and medieval times has been a complex field of study. It suffers from lack of sufficient source - materials and also the vagueness in the denotation of several terms occurring in the inscriptions. However, thanks

to the steady increase in the number of published inscriptions and the painstaking researches of eminent scholars like Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri and Dr. A. Appadorai, many of the main currents in the agrarian situation in the Cōla and the Pāṇḍyan times have begun to emerge. But with the evolution of better tools of research and interpretative models there is a great need to study the original sources with a broader perspective making a comparative analysis. There are many areas which need further research, and many terms which await satisfactory analysis and interpretation. This is exactly what is attempted in these pages by Thiru R. Tirumalai. As he himself observes: "The present case studies bring out a variety of experiences, a good part of them new which need to be fitted into the picture to make it complete. When their results are woven into the historical framework, a fuller and truer understanding of the agrarian conditions would emerge therefrom."

Thiru Tirumalai's long and varied experience as an I.A.S. Officer in the Land and Revenue Administration of the erstwhile Madras Presidency and later of Tamil Nadu has given him an excellent opportunity to study in field the problems connected with the land grants and agrarian practices of South India. This together with his intimate knowledge of South Indian inscriptions and the medieval Tamil idiom and terminology, has enabled him to provide a clear explanation of many abstruse terms occurring in the inscriptions such as *Kuḍi*, *Kuḍinikki*, *Kāraṇmayiālar*, *Kiḷkuḍi*, *Kuḍimai*, *Mēlātcī*, *Uḷukuḍimakkal*.

He has brought fresh insights into the understanding of these terms. For instance, he observes: "In the Cōla and the Pāṇḍyan times, tenurial changes and changes in the tenancy were not infrequent. But expressions like "*Kuḍinikki*" should not be taken to mean that there was an area-wise exclusion from the grant-deed,

Nor can it mean physical eviction of tenants from the township; what was intended was to extinguish the subsisting terms of occupancy so that the new grantee could enter into mutually acceptable terms afresh with the occupant, consistently with the terms of the grant. In actual practice, too, their residential attribute conferred a preferential claim on them. It acted bothways: the occupant's choice was restricted, so too was the tenant's".

There are many interesting observations and original interpretations presented in these lectures. He has shown that the tenants and the cultivators had their distinctive rights and obligations. The insistence was on the tenants' obligations to the king and his men, the *Nāḍu*, the township, and the temple. But according to him, from about the 13th century, there is evidence of increases being made in the rates of land levies due to the state, and also multiplicity of levies, substitution of cash for services, additional obligations, were all characteristics of the growing burden of land-dues cast on the occupants. The agrarian community was in distress, and a number of regulatory measures were adopted by the townships and the *Nāṭṭār* in the heartland of the Cōla and the Pāṇḍyan country.

The author has presented a critical analysis of the various factors that contributed to the distress conditions, and their effect on the townships. One effect of such conditions was that the townships had to resort to large-scale borrowing for land reclamation and maintenance. He has given a chronological sequence of the events leading to the distress and economic decline from the middle of the 13th century. The lectures are well supported by detailed appendices developing the theme on several topics, the conclusions of which alone could be incorporated in the lectures, and original extracts from unpublished inscriptions.

This work makes a distinct and original contribution on this complex subject, and we have much pleasure in publishing it to bring it to the notice of a wider circle of scholars and the reading public.

University of Madras, Chepauk.
16th May 1987.

} K.V. Raman,
Professor, and Head of the Department
of Ancient History and Archaeology.
and General Editor.

— * —

PREFACE

The University of Madras had invited me to deliver two lectures under "The Sankara-Parvati Endowment" in 1983. I chose a subject on which "not much work had been done", "*The land Grants and Agrarian reactions in the Cōḷa and the Pāṇḍya times*". The text of the lectures delivered on the 21st and 22nd January 1983 are now printed in this monograph, and published by the University of Madras.

The lectures, within their frame, could only bring out the conclusions, and set out in brief the basis therefor. They afford a kaleidoscopic cross-section of the tenurial complexity, and the varied agrarian reactions.

The subject is important. Some of the conclusions have not been brought out hitherto. Others are "startlingly modern". Hence I felt it will be of interest to the scholars if I present the subject in a more fully documented and self-contained, analytical frame. The agrarian history of the tract and of the period has not been attempted yet. Even the sinews of such an account are not available in a conspectus. The relevant chapters in a volume purporting to be an "Economic History" published by a reputed foreign University, dealing with South India, afford an index of this felt want.

The explanatory notes appended aim, in some measure, to supply the data. In this, I have followed the model of F.W. Maitland in his Ford lectures (1897) on "Township and Borough" (Cambridge University press : 1964) The Notes on each topic is sought to be selfcontained, though this has entailed some repetition.

The notes deal with the trends in the agrarian conditions in South India in the Cōḷa and the Pāṇḍya times-its attributes, and the reactions of the several segments of the agrarian community, the problems and the travails arising out of the changes wrought by time and men, and how the king and his men and the community had endeavoured to meet and solve these problems.

I trust that the book throws some light on these aspects, and brings out fresh facts, and new features of the subject. I have also taken the opportunity to further reflect on the data, and have modified, where necessary, the interpretation I had offered on some aspects / points in the text of the lectures. This attempt can only be said to be the beginning of a more intensive work that the subject, undoubtedly, would warrant.

The work is necessarily based on the texts of inscriptions. Many of them are unpublished. I have pleasure to acknowledge the unstinting help of the Director of Epigraphy, Dr.K.V. Ramesh, Dr. Katti, Chief Epigraphist to the Government of India, and other officers of the Department of Archaeological Survey of India in making available the texts of the unpublished inscriptions required for this study, and permitting me to publish the text of one important inscription as an appendix to this work. (Vide D.O. Letter DE/4/87-598 dated 8.4.87 of the Director (Epigraphy), Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore.) My thanks are due to them. The note on the land revenue system of the Cōḷa and the Pāṇḍya times was presented as a paper in the 14th All India Epigraphical Congress at Patna of which I was the General President, and is also being published in its Journal for 1988.

I thank the University of Madras, and Prof, C.E. Ramachandran and Prof. K.V. Raman - in the Departments of Indian History, and Ancient History and Archaeology, for inviting me to deliver the

Endowment Lectures which prompted me to undertake this study, and for publishing it under the Madras University Archaeological Series.

I thank Sarva Sri .T.Ramamurti, and P.D. Balaji for kindly preparing the Index, and the Printers, M/s Punitha Offset Printers for printing this highly technical work with such care and attention as they had been able to bestow upon it.

The work is essentially guided by the spirit of enquiry of my Professor, the late Sri. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri; it has brought to bear on it the discipline I have undergone in adhering to the texts of the inscriptions, and interpreting them in their authentic import under the guidance of savants like the late Sri. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai, and Sri. R.P. Sethu Pillai in the University of Madras. As an act of my grateful homage, this book is dedicated to the memory of these savants.

ABBREVIATIONS

A.R.E.	—	Annual Report of Epigraphy
A.S.S.I.	—	Archaeological Survey of Southern India
E.I.	—	Epigraphia Indica
E.C.	—	Epigraphia Carnatica
I.P.S.	—	Inscriptions of Pudukkottai State
S.I.I.	—	South Indian Inscriptions
S.I.T.I.	—	South Indian Temple Inscriptions
T.A.S.	—	Travancore Archaeological series.

LAND GRANTS AND AGRARIAN REACTIONS IN THE CŌLA AND THE PĀṆDYAN TIMES

BY

SRI R. TIRUMALAI

LECTURE - I

Introduction : Scope

The purpose of these lectures is to illustrate from case studies (i) the factors that influenced land grants made in the Cōla and the Pāṇḍyan times, and (ii) the reactions of the agrarian community to such grants, and to the terms and conditions of the land holdings. The term "agrarian" is used in its wider sense, that is, relating to land, especially cultivated land, its management and distribution. It is not used in the more restrictive sense of "relating to tenancy" which it has come to acquire in popular usage. The subject will include the reactions of the collective bodies administering the township affairs - the *Sabhā*, the *Ūr*, and the *Nagaram*, and also those of the occupants or the holders of the lands, (the *Kuḍi*, or the *Kārāṇmaiyālar*), and the tenants under them (*Kīl Kuḍi - Kaḷilār*) including those cultivating the lands (*Uḷukudigaḷ*).¹

-
1. Throughout, the terms "*Kārāṇmaiyālar*" or the *Veḷḷān-vagai* holder or *Kuḍi*" is rendered as the "Occupant". While there were different attributes for these terms, the one common trait among them is their inextinguishable occupancy of the land. The term "tenant" is used to denote the persons holding the lands under them (*Kīl - Kuḍi - Kaḷilār*) and those under engagement with the occupants, and the "cultivating tenants" to denote "*Uḷu Kuḍi - Makkaḷ*" or "*Kuḍimakan*" or "*Uḷudān Kuḍi*".

The subject then, has three distinct aspects: first, the factors which influenced and conditioned the land-grants; secondly, the interaction among the grantors and the grantees and among the latter and the townships. These aspects are dealt with in the first lecture.

A third aspect is the reaction of the occupancy-holders, whether directly under the State, or under the grantee, and of the tenants holding lands under them including the cultivating tenants. These aspects form the subject of the second lecture.

Reactions, to have meaning have to be related to the situational context in which they occurred, and to the varied compulsions that surfaced from area to area, and time to time, in each case. The function of history is to identify such features and relate the facts to their context. The same episode may bring out the reactions of the several segments of the agrarian community. While the reactions of the participants are explicit in some episodes, in others they have to be inferred from the response or the remedy applied to a situation.

The phrase "some case studies" in the title is purposive. Already an overview of the land-tenures and land-obligations has been set out by scholars like Prof. K. A. N. Sastri² and Dr. A. Appadurai.³ Some attempts at reinterpreting the data in some aspects have also been made of late.⁴ The over view delineates, in general terms, the salient features as discerned at the time.

2. *The Cōlas*, Vol. II - Part I. Chapter XXI - Prof. K. A. N. Sastri (M. U. Publn.) (1937 Edn.)

3. *The Economic Conditions of Southern India* - Dr. A. Appadurai, Vol. I. Chapter II (2) (M. U. Publn.) (1936)

4. *Peasant State & Society in medieval South India* - Chapters III, IV & VIII Prof. Burton Stein - (OUP) 1980.

The picture was drawn naturally, in broad brush. But historical experience, in its entirety, remains still to be reconstructed. The present case studies bring out a variety of experiences, a good part of them new, which need to be fitted into the picture to make it complete. When their results are woven into the historical framework, in due perspective, proportion and context a fuller and truer understanding of the agrarian conditions would emerge therefrom. The data gathered here provide some sinews of the fuller agrarian history of the period and the tracts that needs to be worked out. The presentation made here is, essentially to balance the additional data with the known facts. Together they could mirror the complexity of the agrarian situation, and the varied reactions of the severalty of the people who worked it out, or worked within it. By and large, the evidence of both the Pāṇḍya and the Cōla periods has similar characteristics, and can be dealt with alongside. The period covered is roughly from the 10th century to the beginning of the 14th century.

2. Background to the subject :

At the outset, the distinguishing features of the land-tenures, and the conditions of holding in the Cōla and Pāṇḍyan times have to be recognised. There was a split conceptual focus as between the medieval* and the modern land-systems. The medieval system was intent on creating occupancy-holders, the *Kuḍis* - a term which had more than one denotation - with inextinguishable rights on land. But even among such holdings there were several occupancy-patterns, and tiers. They did not correspond exactly to the present day types. The basic characteristic of that land system was this: It created a number of intermediaries or shared interests in land-yield. Subject only to their fulfilling their

*The term "medieval" is used, for short, to denote the Cola and the Pāṇḍyan times in these lectures.

obligations to the State, or its assignees, the temple or other beneficiary, the Nāḍu and the township, and any other subsisting interests, the Kuḍis could appropriate their share of the produce.⁵ They need not themselves be the cultivators of the lands. In fact, some of them (like a *Kramavittan*, a Brahmin who knows the proper performance of the rituals and rites in sacrifices, a *Sarvakṛtukkaḷ*, a Brahmin competent to do all sacrifices and the chieftains from afar) could not be.

Land grants or the assignment of the land-dues could, of course, be made by the King. But such grants were only confined to the obligations due to him. There were, alongside, land-dues⁶ payable in cash or in kind or in the form of services to be rendered to the Nāḍu, and the township. The townships also held lands in common out of which they could grant or endow parcels to institutions or sell or assign to the benefactors who wished to endow and for temple-services or for any other public or charitable purposes. In all such cases, the townships could either waive the dues, themselves undertaking to pay up the King's demand and fulfil the obligations due to the Nāḍu and to themselves. Or they could meet such dues from out of the interest-proceeds or the capitalised deposits made with them by the benefactors or the beneficiaries. The King's revenue was paid in tact by these methods. The *Dēvadāna* or the *Brahmadēya* grants were themselves only a fraction of the total assessment-bearing lands

5. Please see my analysis of "Tenures, Sub-tenures and their obligations" in my '*Studies in the History of Ancient Townships of Pudukkottai*' p.200 (Tamilnadu Department of Epigraphy Publication, 1981)

6. The term "land-dues" is used throughout and preferred - For "land-revenue" is only one component of the total land-dues. Also the dues were rendered to several agencies and in a variety of forms in cash and in paddy including service-obligations.

But even among such lands on favourable tenure, a majority of cases did not involve any loss of revenue to the king⁷

There was a plurality of organisations. These were the king or his chieftain (or one who held the township or a portion of the lands as his *Jivitam* for his maintenance), the *Nāḍu*, one or more of the varieties of the Township organisation that existed, the *Ūr* consisting of the agriculturists, the *Brahmadēya Sabhā*, of the land-based literati the *Nagara*, comprising predominantly the merchant landholders or the *Paḍaipāṇṇu*, with the landholders having the obligation to render military service when required by the King or his Chieftain, besides the temple in *Dēvadāna*, villages. In some larger townships (as for example *Tiṇaimūr*) there were more than one constituent depending on the complexion of the population, and the diversity of occupation. The organised social bodies like the “*Samaya*” or the collective bodies of merchants or other groups could also levy a portion of the land-yield or of the income from trade for any common purpose. Voluntary grants by the holders of the lands were also made from the interests held by them, collectively or individually.

Consequently, a variety of obligations came to be fastened on land severally, and progressively. These could be all graded in order of their ascertainable priority as follows:—

- (1) The King's share - *Kaḍamai*, *Iṇai* and *antarāyam*
- (2) The *Nāḍu* and township obligations - *Nāṭṭu viniyōgam*, *ūrviniyōgam*)
- (3) The temple's dues where an interest had been created in its favour, which might comprise of items 1,2, and 4 according to the contents of the grant (*Variśai - Kaḍamai*)

7. The quantitative estimate implied in a “majority of cases” is impressionistic.

- (4) The share of the *Mēlāṭci* or the *mēlvāram* belonging to the occupancy - holders (*Peruṅguḍi-makkaḷ*)
- (5) *Kīl-kuḍigaḷilār* — share of the tenants under the occupants 3, 4 and 5 above either, severally, or together, might have had *Kārāṇmai* rights.
- (6) *Uḷukuḍimakkal* or cultivating tenants or cultivators at-will.

The categories (5) & (6) had the *Kuḍimai* obligations, the obligations of occupant-cultivators, or of the tenants, including the cultivators. The same occupant or the institution might have held parcels of land with more than one manner of rights and certainly would have had different parcels of lands carrying different rights in the township.

The typified heirarchy⁸ listed above should not be predicated of every bit of land. Often, one or more of the tier could be absent. There could also be a combination of several of these interests. That would indicate the intricate and complex pattern of the land-holdings that had come to be evolved in the Cōla and the Pāṇḍyan times. Townships had examples of dual tenures and multiplicity of interests converging on the same parcels of land. Any one segment of that pattern should not be mistaken for the whole.

3. Land-grant : Their terms and conditions, and the factors that influenced them

It is common place to state that the land-grants were made to the temples, to the Brahmins and the Buddhist and Jaina *Pallis*, for religious merit or for a charitable object. But there was an economic function and purpose — to bring land under cultivation, to create facilities for irrigating them, and undertake wet

8. Please see the paradigm of land-tenures and sub-tenures in my "*Studies in the History of Ancient Townships of Pudukkottai*" (after page 382.)

cultivation. Where lands were sand-cast by river-floods, or relapsed into shrub jungle or waste, they had to be reclaimed. Lands reverting as *Ūr-podu* (village common) to the township, due to relinquishment, escheat or forfeiture or due to the lack of heirs had to be regranted to the occupants or to the service-holders. Without such effort, there might be diminution of revenue to the king. Alternatively, an added burden would be cast on the townships to pay up the King's dues, and themselves bear the other obligations proportionately on the lands that had become common-holdings. Land grants made due to mistakes of title or resumed due to political changes, were also restored, and re-granted where the aggrieved moved for redress, establishing his title.⁹ The chieftains, royal and local officers, and the palace-servants and also men of influence having access to the king interceded on behalf of the supplicants or the aggrieved, or the temple or other beneficiaries. The king's command was largely in response to such supplication. Discretion and the influence of personalities could have weighed much in the grants made.

By the beginning of the 10th century, a large part of the riverine tracts in the Cōla heartland and in the Tāmbraparṇi-fed areas in the Pāṇḍyan country had been already brought under the plough. Agricultural settlements had become well-established. The *Dēvadāna* lands were taken up on occupancy, the holders agreeing to deliver the stipulated rates of yield to the beneficiaries. The townships were undertaking the collective responsibility

9. The Vēlvikkūḍi grant restores the title and possession to an aggrieved who proved that the earlier grant by the Pāṇḍya Palyāgamuduguḍumi Peruvaḷudi was resumed by the Kaḷabharas. Pāṇḍya Parāntaka Neḍunjaḍayan restored it (in about A.D. 770) *Epigraphia India*, Vol.XVII, p.p.291-309). Also the Nandalūr Case-See infra in Lecture II.)

for collection and remittance of the land-dues. Lands nearer the township-habitat and hence accessible were coveted. Outlying lands on the fringes were less productive or more costly to cultivate but they were progressively being taken up for cultivation due to the pressure of population, or the stress of the land-demand or political compulsions. This process had continued till the end of the 13th century as in the less fertile tracts like Pudukkottai,¹⁰ and in the area in between the Tāmbraparaṇi on its southern bank and the foothills which was thick with jackfruit trees in the head-reaches of the river.¹¹

Though the temple lands were enjoined as not to be alienated still, instances have, off and on, come to notice.¹² Some Brahmadēya grants expressly prohibit the sale or *oṭṭi* (making a usufructary mortgage) of the land; the Sabhayār were to watch adherence to this prohibition.¹³ Land-dues from some Brahmadēya villages had fallen into arrears. In A. D. 926, the Sabhā of Ninṇavūr (Chingleput District) decided *inter alia* to sell the lands for which the taxes due had fallen into arrears and to pay up the taxes from the sale-price. They also strengthened the collective system of tax-realisation and decided that the taxes shall thence-forward be paid through the Committee of the Sabhā.¹⁴ Even temple lands came to be misappropriated by the Sabhā itself, as in Puduppākkam.¹⁵

10. Please see on this the author's Studies on Nārttāmalai and 'The Burden of land-dues' in "*Studies in the History of Ancient Townships of Pudukkottai*".

11. Please see author's "*Rājēndraviṇṇagar*" Pages 39-40

12. T.A.S. Vol. III, p. 71 - Sucīndram

13. (Eg. S.I.I. Vol. VII - 742 : Tiruppādirippuliyūr - Cōḷa Parakēsari - 3rd year)

14. A.R.E. 1929-30, p. 78, para 16 and No.176 of 1929-30

15. See *infra* - p.22

It was Rājarāja I who tightened the administration by several measures. He was strict in enforcing discipline and proper accounting. Delinquent accountants were punished and their lands were brought to sale as at Tiruviḍaimarudil in A.D. 1001.¹⁶ The purchaser was Queen Parāntakadēvi, the wife of Sundara Cōla Parāntaka II.

In A.D. 1002, he ordered that the lands alienated by the Brahmin holders in *Brahmadēya* villages (except those held on service-tenure) shall be sold. The Mahāsabhā of Rajakēsaricaturvēdimangalam (Kauntaṭṭānguḍi), on the outskirts of Tāñjāvūr, accordingly sold such lands, one of which was purchased by Kundavai, the sister of Rājarāja I for making an endowment.¹⁷

It was noteworthy that in both the cases the vendees were the scions of the royal family. It could be, perhaps, inferred that the unoccupied wet lands available for grants or endowments were hard to come by in the heartland of the Cōla kingdom already early in the 11th century. There was little justification for condoning unauthorised alienations of lands held on favourable tenure. The policy of resuming and acquiring lands alienated in the *Brahmadēyas* was continued by Rājendra I.¹⁸ The inelastic availability of land could also have led to the migration of families down south, to the Pāṇḍyan country where, at this time, a number of new settlements had sprung up.¹⁹

16. S.I.I.Vol. V, 723, p. 16-17 (Tiruviḍaimarudil)

17. S.I.I. Vol. V, No. 1409 - Karuntaṭṭānguḍi

18. Vēlaccēri record - A.R.E. No. 311 of 1911, 6th year (Chingleput District)

19. Please see the author's "*Rājēndraviṇṇagar*" pp. 2-3 (Tamilnadu Department of Archaeology Publication 1980)

The third step Rājarāja took was in about A.D 1008 to resume and bring to sale lands in the townships held by the Brahmins, the Vykhānasas and the Jains in Cōṇāḍu, Toṇḍainaḍu, in Pāṇḍya-nāḍu, alias Rājarājivaḷanāḍu, belonging to those occupants who had not paid the taxes due on these holdings for 3 years, of which 2 were completed - between the 16th and 23rd years of the reign, and also those which would fall into similar arrears from the 24th year. The defaulters were prohibited from repurchasing the lands resumed by the township.²⁰

In addition he instituted several checks on the temple affairs, and the administration of the temple endowments. The objects were to see (1) that the services instituted or endowed for were actually conducted properly; (2) to allocate any unutilised portion of the proceeds for additional services, and (3) to ensure that the grant-share of the deity from the lands endowed were fixed properly and realised fully. He himself personally checked these aspects during his tours and visits to the temples and his personal imprint was noticeable on the temple administration in the Cōḷa heartland. In the outlying areas of the empire this check and supervision were effectively carried out through the royal officers or through the township organisations. The intensity and time-spread of this check are brought out by a number of records, from A.D. 987 to almost the end of the reign, spread all over the empire, from Kāḷahasti to Sucīndram.²¹

20. S.I.I. Vol. III, No.9, Ukkal.

21. On this please see my paper on "Rajaraja's measures for administrative control of endowments and temple services" the journal of the Epigraphical Society - Vol.13. George W.Spencer has also noticed this point: Pl. see his article "Royal Initiation under Rājarāja I - The auditing of temple accounts - IE & SHR Vol.VII - No.4

Such an intensive check had its reactions in outlying areas on the occupants, and the tenants under them which will be noticed later in the second lecture. The effective administrative checks and measures to resume, sell, or redistribute the lands were healthy and necessary. For the objects of the grant had to be subserved, and the benefits of any favourable grant could not be frittered away.

Lands reverted to the Township also when the grantee or the occupant died without heirs, or when he absconded without paying the land-dues. In such cases, too, the Sabhā could sell the property²² or alternatively the king could regrant the land to a near relation of the previous occupant on the subsisting conditions.²³

One issue which often arose in the 12th and 13th centuries was if a person had no male issue how the service tenure or the enjoyment of the lands attached to it were to be regulated. The practice had become settled in that period that in such cases, the daughter and through her the son-in-law (through *Strīdhana*) or in other cases the descendants of the original service holder, through the female line, could inherit the property and perform the service. This issue was specifically raised at Tirukkaḷar in A.D. 1165 and referred to the Srimāhēśvaras and Kanakarāyar. The Mahēśvaras decided that the obligations would devolve on the descendants of the undertaker through the female line (*Aṟudipaṇṇugiṟa Idattu Poliyūṭṭu penṇaliyum varum enṟu Śrimāhēśvarar niccayittamayil*). This was accepted and implemented.²⁴

22. S.I.I. Vol. XIII, No. 73, Tiruviḷākkudī

23. S.I.I. Vol. V, No. 579, Kaṇḍiyūr

24. S.I.I. Vol. III, No. 210, Tirukkaḷar

The law crystallised this custom when Dēvaṇṇabhaṭṭa embodied this practice into a settled principle of law in Smṛticandrikā.²⁵

4. The content of the Grant

The content of a grant varied from case to case. It could be either of the land or of the land-dues payable to the State assigned in whole or in part to a temple or to any other grantee. The lands granted could be free of assessment, or on a favourable assessment. Rājadhiraṇya I ordered in A.D. 1048 the lands belonging to the temple of Tiruvāypāḍidēvar to be taxed according to the lowest grade (*Taram*) as in the case of some other Viṣṇu shrines at Eṇṇāyiram.²⁶

In another instance it was restrictive. Lands endowed in Kuḍavāyil *alias* Cōlakulavallicaturvēdimangalam were separated, and renamed as Narasingamaṅgalam; about 150 and odd *kalams* were fixed as *Iṟai* on the extent granted, and declared as *Dēvadāna Iṟaiyili*. The *Iṟai* was assigned for maintaining supply of hay to the cows in the temple-dairy, at Tiruvārūr. The lands had not been classified, and *Taram* fastened thereon at the time of the grant. It was stipulated if and when the *Taram* was assigned to these lands after classification, the demand in paddy on the basis of the *Taram* shall be got reduced from the township demand (*ūriṟi Suṟukki*). If the demand was in excess of the old demand assigned on the basis of the extent of the land the excess over the old demand should be paid as *Iṟai (Iṟaikkaṭṭu)*²⁷. A distinction

25. Smṛticandrikā, Vol. III, Part II, Vyavahāra-kāṇḍa. p.682 - (Edited by L. Srinivasacharya - Mysore Oriental Literature Series (1916) - "Duhitrādiviṣayāni"

26. A.R.E. 330/1917

27. S.I.I. Vol XVII No.597, Tiruvārūr

was made between the demand due on the extent of the land (*Nilōpādi*) based on area-measurement, and the demand due on the basis of Taram or productivity-classification (*Tarōpādi*) of lands.*

On the same principle, the king reserved his right to collect the land-dues on the prospective accretion to revenue when cultivable wastes were reclaimed and occupied. In such and even in other cases the King's dues could be purchased on payment of a capitalised amount [in cash (*Karpūravilai*). Thereafter the King's dues would accrue to the beneficiary. This left the occupancy-share (*Kārāṇmai*) in tact with the occupant for his enjoyment. *Karpūravilai* should be distinguished from *Iṟai-Kāval* (tax-vigil). The latter was a lumpsum deposit from the interest on which the land-dues and obligations were rendered every year by the township. There was no grant of the land dues. The payment of *Karpūravilai*, in lumpsum, determined the King's claims to the land-dues but only his claims. It could be, perhaps, a favourable price analogous to a commuted quit-rent.²⁸

Mention has been made of the role of discretion, of predilection, possibly, coming into play in making land-grants. Not all endowments made were benevolent by modern notions. In Tiruvā-māttūr (South Arcot dist.) sixteen blindmen were enjoying a land-grant for singing *Tiruppadiyam* (the Tamil hymns), before the deity thrice a day at time of worship (*Sandhis*). They had two escorts (*Kaṇkāṭṭuvār*) who led them before the deity. Each was receiving *padakku* paddy per day, and 1 *kāśu* for supply of clothing. The total wages were to be realised from the produce of the land-grant.

* In further examination, I would render (*Tarōpādi*) as "assessment-classification". Please see explanatory notes in the appendix.

28. On this aspect, please see a full examination in the author's "*Studies in the Ancient Townships of Pudukkottai*" under "Tenures, Sub-Tenures and their obligations", pp.214-224 (Tamilnadu Dept. of Archaeology publication, 1981.)

In A. D. 1135, Kulōttunga II ordered that the 16 blindmen and their escorts be disbanded (*Tavirtu*). Instead he appointed one Poyyādaśēvaḍi Dēvaganādan alias Rājarājapiccan who was also rendering Tēvaram and Tiruppadiyam in the temple and his descendants in the male line as the first service-holder on the same scale of remuneration. The 12 *vēlis* of land in the Dēvadaña village of Kaḍuvanūr were resumed from the 16 blindmen and their two escorts, and made over to the new appointee for him to enjoy the paddy-yield from the lands.²⁹ Discretionary appointments of the supervising managers to the temples and service-tenure holders and land-grants were made by the King or the chieftains in other places as well.³⁰

Discretion could be indiscreet. In the later Cōla times it had come into greater play, in enlarging, varying and increasing the land-dues and obligations. Their effects on the agrarian economy were grave, and the community's reactions were pronounced. These will be dealt with in the second lecture.

5. Cases from the Pāṇḍyan country :

The riverine tracts of Tāmbraparṇi and its tributary, Gaṭana were actively colonised during the reign of Rājarāja and Rājeṇdra (A. D. 985 — 1044). The Vaigai tract was similarly the scene of intensive activity between the 11th to 13th century during the reign of Jaṭavarman Srivallabha (a contemporary of Kulōttunga I), Vikrama Pāṇḍya and Jaṭavarman Kulaśēkhara I (a.cc. A.D. 1190). The townships to the west of Madurai, Vikramangalam, Kōil Kuruvitturai, were developed in the reign of the first two

29. S.I I. Vol. VIII, No. 749, Tiruvāmāttūr

30. Eg: Allūr: S.I.I. Vol. VIII, 675

rulers. Tiruppācōṟṟi³¹ and Rājagambhīram³² were developed in the reign of Vikrama Pāṇḍya and Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkhara. While the tract was being developed, a few Malayāḷa Kannaḍiga Brahmanas had migrated and settled at Tiruppācōṟṟi. The Sabhayārs of Tiruppācōṟṟi were enjoined to distribute some parcels to them in their township. Candrabhaṭṭa Vikkaṇṇa, a Kannaḍiga Brahmin took a leading part in the colonisation. They were exempted from the payment of land-dues for the initial period of their settlement but were to bear the taxes at the usual rate from A. D. 1209. The initial exemption was, in consideration of the capital and labour to be deployed in forming fields, excavating channels, building sluices, laying house sites and constructing houses.

A striking case - history of grant, resumption and regrant could be re constructed from the twelve records of Jaṭāvarman Śrīvallabha in Kuruvittuṟai.³³ There were two estates in the village. One was lying to the south of the river Vaigai and was an earlier grant. There was a channel (Perāṟu) excavated from the Vaigai river which commanded these lands called "Parākrama Pāṇḍyan Kaṭṭalai". The channel took off from a stone - masonry anicut across the river Vaigai. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa Vājapēye was inducted on *Kuḍiniṅgākārāṇmai* tenure into these lands, in the 9th year of Jaṭāvarman

31. A.R.E. 1928-29: pages 68-69, para 3.

A.R.E. No. 78, 1928-29 – Tiruppācetti and Rājagambhīram are stations in between on the Madurai - Manamadurai railway line.

32. A.S.S.I. Vol. IV - Tiruppūvaṇam copper - plates (A.D. 1214)

33. On this please see the author's paper "Grant, resumption and regrant" contributed to M.M.S. Kuppaswami Sastri Commemoration Volume (part II) - pp.302-317.

Koil Kuruvitturai is Village No.32, Nilakkottai Taluk, Madurai Distt - A.R.E. Nos. 318 to 329 of 1908; S.I.I. Vol. XIV, No. 198, 215, 223, 224, 229, 236

Srīvallabha. He had full inextinguishable occupancy rights, and had the obligation to pay $\frac{1}{4}$ *kāśu*, and measure 5 *kalams* of paddy per *mā* to the temple.

A second estate was purchased and endowed to the temple by a benefactor from Māṅgāḍu in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. The lands were interspersed on the northern and the southern banks of the river Vaigai. The estate had an obligation to pay *antarāya* to the township. It was in three parcels:—

(1) The temple site and appurtenant lands	...	5 <i>vēlis</i>
(2) Lands to the south of the river		12 <i>vēlis</i>
(3) Lands to the north of the river		
lying detached	... 5-13/160	<i>vēlis</i>

This hindered the beneficial enjoyment of the lands. In the 11th year, Jaṭavarman Srīvallabha resumed the third bit (Tirappu) and it was made liable to pay the land-demand to the King. Instead he gave an extent from within the resumed lands within the first estate, to the south of the river. Though the temple lost 3 *vēlis* in the aggregate the substituted lands had command facilities. But only $3\frac{1}{2}$ *vēlis* therein were readily cultivable lands, and 1 and odd *vēlis* were waste to be reclaimed. A *Sarvakṛtukkaḷ* (a Brahmin competent to do all sacrifices) had been granted the occupancy rights in these lands (*Kuḍiningākārāṇmai*) He excavated a new channel from the river Vaigai, with a head above the channel-head of Parākrama Pāṇḍyan channel. His action intercepted the supplies to the already established riparian owners of the *Brahmadēya* village. They preferred their objections to the king at Madurai who upheld their contention, and the new channel was closed and filled up.

In the 16th year, the Sarvakṛtukkaḷ represented that without the new channel he could not cultivate the lands, and pay the dues stipulated to the temple. He relinquished the lands exchanged five years earlier. The King restored the original grant-extent and the lands located on either side of the river to the temple. As some of the lands were not commandable he remitted the *Antarāyam* dues for four years.

Six years later, the 5 *vēlis* of land to the south of the river forming part of the commandable area of Parākramapāṇḍyan Channel granted and later resumed in the 16th year, were again granted, and the *Antarāya* dues on the lands on the north bank were also permanently assigned to the temple for renovation and expansion of the temple buildings.

This episode brought out the determining role of the commandability of the lands for irrigation. The Vaigai river had mostly irrigated lands to its south and only marginally so to its north. The attempt of the Sarvakṛtukkaḷ to excavate a new channel which interfered with the earlier and lower riparian owners was promptly and effectively objected to. The temple was ultimately the gainer as the entire lands were granted to it by the Pāṇḍyan ruler.

Extensions of cultivation and settlements had continued in the Tāmbraparṇi tract upto the 13th century. Even near Tirunelvēli, there were unoccupied long wastes in Kunnattūr, on the banks of Tāmbraparṇi. They were Dēvadāna lands. In the reign of Kulōt-tuṅga I, the Sabhayār of Uttamacōḷacaturvēdimangalam were inducted into the occupancy of these lands, so that *Kaḍamai* could be realised by the temple. No other obligations of the tenants (*Kuḍimai*) were to be collected in cash or in kind. A new sluice on the Uttamacōḷan channel was also provided.³⁴

34. S.I.I. Vol. V, No. 436 - Tirunelvēli.

New Brahmadēyas were formed on the lower course of river Tāmbraparṇi as Pōśala - Vīra - Sōmidēvacaturvēdimangalam (Muṭap-panāḍ) in A. D. 1248. The Brahmadēya occupants had to pay $\frac{1}{4}$ *kāsu* and 3 *kalams* per *mā* as *Kaḍamai*. If water was lifted by a baling stand, the rates were halved. If two crops were grown the rates were doubled. For gingely and horsegram in one grant it was 1 *dramam* (16 *mēni*) and in another it was 2 *dramams*.³⁵ This new township lay on the eastern extremity of Tāmbraparṇi beyond which lay the Vallanāḍ ridge. The difficulty in direct command was reckoned with, when supplemental irrigation by baling was allowed, and a 50% concession in the rates was granted.

Conversions of tenures were also noticed, perhaps, affording a measure of the inelasticity of readily cultivable unoccupied land. In A. D. 1246 - 47, a *Jivitam* grant enjoyed by an Angavaiśya was resumed in Kalijayamangalam.³⁶ The entire extent of 1 *vēli* of land, seed-bed 1/16, garden-land 2 *mā* and a house-site were assigned to a new deity, Āluḍaiya Pillaiyār set up in the temple at Tirunelvēli. When regrants were made, changes of habitat had also occurred.³⁷

When conversions took place, the prior title or the rights of erstwhile owners were apt to be ignored. One parcel of land in Kunnattūr village had a history.³⁸ In earlier times there was a

35. S.I.I. Vol. V, No. 446, 448, Tirunelvēli.

36. S.I.I. Vol. V, No. 440-41, Tirunelvēli.

Kalijayamangalam is identical with Kariṣūḷndamangalam (Sermadevi Taluk)

37. S.I.I. Vol. V, No. 411 -(lines 8 & 9) Kunnattūr village is to the south of Tirunelvēli, about 3 miles away on the banks of the river Tāmbraparṇi at the foot of Tirunārāyaṇan Kōil hillock - Also, S.I.I. Vol. XXIII - 392 - Maruttuvakkudi.

38. S.I.I. V No. 411 lines (18-20).

rained tank collecting surface drainage, and an ayacut under it called Āyar - kuḷam. The Sabhayār of Kulaśēkharacaturvēdimangalam who enjoyed these lands gave them over as 'Uḷaoṟṟi' (usefructory mortgage of the cultivation rights) to the King or the prince ("Dēvar" "Perumāl") on payment of cash. Later the prince constructed a new tank called "Paṇḍitappēreṇi", and the cultivable lands become its waterspread. As they became uncultivable in lieu of the yield-share the Bhaṭṭas were paid *Svāmibhōgam* i. e., a share acknowledging their title to the lands, and a fee for diverting the land from productive use to unproductive use. Subsequently, even the payment of *Svāmibhōgam* came to be discontinued. The lands and the new source which fed them were appropriated as the Crown lands or the palace estate of the Prince "*Kaṇḍuḷavu*".³⁹

One year prior to the deed, (dated 8th year of Maṇavarman Kulaśēkhara), the Prince granted 1 - $\frac{1}{2}$ *vēlis* in the ayacut as *Paramadāna* to the Bhaṭṭas settled in Anavaradadānacaturvēdimangalam, a new Brahmadēya township founded in Tirunelvēli to its west. The Sabhayār of the mother township confirmed the grant including a share of the waterspread and irrigation rights. The new settlers had to pay a fixed levy of 4 - $\frac{5}{8}$ *accu* to the temple at Tirunelvēli. In this instance the earlier holders had to bear with the appropriation of their lands by the prince for use as tankbed though they had been subsequently denied even the *Svāmibhōgam* or the 'diversion fee paid earlier. They, either, could not protest, or did not. Ultimately, the benefit of a part of the betterment - ayacut was granted as Brahmadēya to a few new settlers.

39. On the term "*kaṇḍuḷavu*", please see the author's paper on the subject contributed to the Conference of the Epigraphist Society of India at Gorakhpur, 1983. Journal of the Epigraphist Society of India Vol. X pp.55-60

The King, also, granted parcels of land out of his own crown lands, as Māṇavarma Sundara Pāṇḍya I did in A.D. 1224, to a new shrine built in his name on the western side of Tirupparankunṅam hillock.⁴⁰ Temple lands too had been paying *kaḍamai* or land-tax to the king. The temple's obligation could have arisen out of subsequent conversions of waste, or grants by the occupants who had not terminated their liability to pay the land-dues on the endowed land, nor had funded for their payment. The lands could be converted as tax-free on payment of the capitalised deposit with the township or else the land dues could be assigned by the King for a new service (*Sandhi*).⁴¹

6. Multiplicity and overlap of the tenures : The reactions of the Townships

The township had a crucial role to play in not only giving effect to the King's grants, but also in effectively ensuring the beneficial enjoyment of such grants. Its functions were manifold in this respect. The formal demarcation of the boundaries and putting the beneficiary in possession of the grant-extent were the township's responsibility. These also applied to the lands granted out of the common holdings of the township.

The townships, too, were progressively creating assets out of unoccupied lands. Lands were granted in exchange where the donor wished to increase the extent of grant,⁴² or where the occupied holdings got submerged by tanks,⁴³ or where they were damaged due to floods and were sandcast.⁴⁴ A painstaking reclamation of

40. *Ibid*; Also S.I.I. Vol. IV, No. 372

41. S.I.I. Vol. XVII, No. 127

42. S.I.I. Vol. VII, No. 171 - Tirukkantīśvaram

43. S.I.I. Vol. VII, No. 207, Muniyūr

44. S.I.I. Vol. III, No. 156, Tiruppārkaḍal

lands sandcast and damaged by the floods and breaches in the Cauvery embankment is noticed in Allūr (Tiruchirāpalli District). The process extended from Parāntaka I's reign (in A. D. 937) —when the floods occurred—to almost the end of Rājēndra I's rule. Concessions were shown to new occupants willing to take small parcels for progressive reclamation and the township waived, in consideration of the heavy labour involved, the customary contribution of labour for earthwork to strengthen the river embankments, and for the annual *Korambo* works across the river to divert water into channels, and for the silt-clearance of field-channels for receiving the freshes.⁴⁵

While selling lands, the townships either undertook the obligations or received deposits in cash. From the proceeds thereof they undertook to defray land-revenue (*Kaḍamai*) and other obligations due on the land, in perpetuity. This meant they had to keep an account of all individual parcels of land and the capital-deposits received, and the obligations due therefor. But their accounts could have omissions.⁴⁶ Grant-epigraphs would have been erased. The township memory could be short. They could slip up. On occasions they did.

Where the lands were not divided by metes and bounds, they had also to apportion the yield among the beneficiaries, in many cases, among the Brahmādēya-grantees, and the temples. Also conjoint action was called for in the management or disposal of such lands.

45. On this, please see the author's "*ALLŪR AND ISĀNA-MANGALAM REVISITED*" Paper contributed to "*Svasti Śrī*" Dr. Chhabra Felicitation Volume; published 1984

46. S.I.I. Vol. VII - 774 - Tiruvēndipuram- "*Ivvur munbu nir nilattukkam, Puñjey nilattukkum Iṟai Kaṭṭinapaḍikku Kanakku Kaṇḍirāmayil, Cōlakulavallinallūrukku Iṟai Kaṭṭinapaḍi*".

Where the grantee-institution was located away from the township in which the lands granted were located the township also undertook to collect, transport, and deliver the paddy and other dues assigned to the grantee. By and large, they discharged their obligations faithfully and adequately. But instances are not wanting in which the interests of the township, and those of the temple had clashed. Some of these disputes were settled by the townships themselves, giving up their claims in favour of the temple. In others they hotly contested the claims of the temple. A few disputes even resulted in self-immolation by the Mahēśvaras to safeguard the temple-interests. The King himself had to intervene or have the disputes enquired into, and call the township Sabhas to order.

In A.D. 892-3, Siṅṅirāyuṛ was granted 'as *dēvadāna* but one holding therein was excluded from the grant. An omission to enter the grant was rectified nineteen years later. In A.D. 943 the excluded holding also was added to the grant. But the Mahāsabhā of Puduppākkam occupied the additional grant-land, and appropriated the revenue yield to themselves. The temple was denied the income. The temple executives, the priests and the Mahēśvaras represented to Uttama Cōḷa that the Mahāsabhā were doing a great injustice (*Adyāyamiḍugirārgal enṇu*) The King himself enquired into the case, hearing both sides in A.D. 985. The Mahāsabhā admitted their misappropriating the temple-dues. They were ordered to deliver 3000 *Kāḍi* of paddy due from the additional land granted to the temple. The order was given wide publicity and endorsed to all the Brahmādēyas, the Dēvadānas, Nagaras and other townships held on favourable tenure. It held a mirror up to the default of Puduppākkam. Public knowledge and responsibility were intended to serve as a guarantee against future recurrence of similar default.⁴⁷

In A.D. 1036, a Mahēśvara Ānnadānayōgi complained to the Emperor Rājeñdra I that the Sabhā of Tirukkoḷikkāḍu, for thirty-five years, had misappropriated the land belonging to the deity. The Emperor caused an enquiry to be made by his officer. The allegation was found to be correct. The Sabhayār were ordered to pay double the amount of 200 *kāśu* they had received for the transfer of the land to the temple. They had no money to pay. Hence they transferred a piece of land in lieu thereof. The sale price was 100 *kāśu*, but the remaining 300 *kāśu* were taken as the deposit to pay the land-dues from the interest-proceeds.⁴⁸ Revenue-interest was also involved in and subserved by the proper maintenance of an endowment.

Sometimes, the disputes reached tragic proportions. In A.D. 1250, a land registered in the name of the deity of Anbil was resumed. For about 5 years the Mahāsabhā added the land-dues demand to the collective liabilities of the Township, and had themselves borne the dues. Subsequently they claimed the land-demand, and took more than the proportionate dues to the Township from out of the yield due on the lands registered in the name of the deity. Protesting against the illegal exaction, Paḷudai-āṇḍār a devotee (*Āṇḍār*) attached to the temple sacrificed his life and his body was lying in state. His passive resistance had paid. (*Ippaḍi Ānyāyam Sēydom enṟu Ivvūrukku paḷiyāga-kālam śeyda Tirumēni Paḷudayāṇḍār innāḷvaraiyum singādanattilē paḷḷikoḷkayil*) This was enquired into by Śrī Mahēśvaras and the head (Mudaliyār) of the maṭha and the Nāṭṭavar. The Mahāsabhā, to atone for this tragedy, agreed to accept the liability for the dues, and the obligations of the temple as entered in the temple account, and to desist from the excess collection, that raised the cause of action.

48. Tiruttuḡaipūṇḍi Inscriptions, 1976/122
(Tamilnadu Department of Archaeology Publication, 1978)

They also installed the deified image of the deceased Paḷudaiyāṇḍar in the temple. To defray the expenses for the service to this new deity they granted a land as *Tirunā mattukkāṇi*, bearing the land-dues thereon themselves.⁴⁹

In Tiruppādirippuliyūr (South Arcot District)⁵⁰ in the 3rd year of Vikrama Pāṇḍya, one of his generals Kālingarāyan had installed a new deity, Subrahmaṇya. He also purchased and endowed 2 *mā* of land (66 cents) for services to the deity. The Brahmin land-holders of the township contested the title of the temple to sell the land, claiming it to be the land held by the Brahmins (*Brahmakṣētra*). The Mahēśvaras joined together in protest and one of them fell into the fire, and immolated himself. This reached the ears of the King. He ordered two of his chiefs to enquire into the case calling the Nāṭṭār of all the surrounding villages and release the land to the Mahēśvaras. The chiefs assembled all the Nāṭṭār, and the Brahmin claimants. They asked the Brahmins to prove their averment of title, by producing the grant-deed. They queried "if you claim the land as *Brahmakṣētra* how come the lands were not cultivated and the land demand not paid by you? But the Veḷḷāḷas, Āḷavar and the Paḷḷis and Parambar and others included had been cultivating the lands year after year, and they were also redistributing the fields among themselves year after year. So, enjoyment does not substantiate your claims". They then pointedly asked the Brahmins: "Could you show any epigraphic evidence that these were your occupied holdings which you had given to the temple as *Tirunā mattukkāṇi*". The Brahmins replied that they could not adduce any original documentary evidence to

49. S.I.I. Vol. VIII, No. 193 - Anbil (Tiruchirāppalli Dist.)

50. S.I.I. Vol. VII, No. 759 - Tiruppādiripuliyūr (South Arcot Dist.)

prove their title, but averred that they had, among themselves, sold, and made a usufructory mortgage of the lands and showed some documents to that effect. The chiefs rejected their statement stating that “making *inter se* transactions among yourselves is of no consequence, nor could it be binding (on the third parties)”.

They turned to the temple authorities and asked for documentary proof. They replied “The very Brahmins who claim ownership of the land have year after year negotiated the land rent (Nilavari) and seed-capital (vittu mudal) for taking them on cultivation” and showed the counterfoils therefor. “Even in the days of Kōpperuñjīnga the land rent had been paid to the temple” and attested counterfoils for such payments were also shown. They clinched their claims by recalling “In fact, the King had ordered that the entire lands in Tiruppādirippuliyūr shall be tax-free from the 5th year, and the land sold was also recorded as Tirunā-mattukkāṇi. This royal epistle was taken in ceremonial circumambulation in the township in which the Brahmins also had participated. It was recorded on stone, and the land has been enjoyed as such.” The chiefs decided that the land had belonged to the temple and the Brahmins also attested the decision.

Though the extent involved was only 66 cents, its sale had sparked off a controversy which caused self-immolation by a Māhēśvara. Eventually the claims of the Brahmins were found to be not sustained.

The evidence let in is through the slit. Even on such specific and admitted lapses, the character of the township bodies, as a whole or as a type, cannot be denigrated.

For centuries they had administered public affairs and endowments. They were not slow to appreciate and help in the benefac-

tions to their township or to the temples within.⁵¹ The volume of evidence of such constructive approach and activity on their part should be given weight. On the totality of their performance, the integrity of the individual townships could pass muster. As a type, the townships could stand erect on their own record.

But the qualitative intensity of the evidence on the Township's default could attest one fact. Frictions even between the temples within, and the townships could, and indeed, these, did occur despite even the townships' claims being unsustainable. It would warrant a caution that human institutions, men conducting the affairs of men, could not lend themselves to any idealisation (certainly not for any romantic idealisation).

It is more relevant to examine the modes by which such frictions were solved. There was a composite interaction of checks and balances. Some documents are even explicit on this.⁵² Where the temple authorities or the residents of the Township failed to fulfill the obligations of service, the Ūrar as a body undertook to correct them and enforce the due observance of the services. Where one among the township members obstructed, the rest of them would discard them, (or even ostracise them). Where the township bodies went amiss, the King would call them to order and penalise them. The Māhēśvaras kept vigil on the proper

51. S.I.I. Vol. VII, No. 761 - Tiruvēndipuram (for e.g.)
(Jaṭ. Sundara Pāṇḍya - 10th year)

52. E.g. S.I.I. Vol. VII-761-Tiruvahīndrapuram. Jaṭ. Sundara Pāṇḍya - 10th year - "Inda Danmattil Tiruvagindrapurattu Tānattarādal, (Tala) Kāriyam śeyvaralādal Virōdam Paṇṇinār uṇḍāgil nām ūrāha eḷundirundu Tīrttukkuḍukka Kaḍavōm. Nam ūril oruttar virōdam paṇṇinār uṇḍāgil nammil oruttarāgāvārāha kaḍavatāgavum". (ll. 10-12)

observance of the obligations and the services by the temple servants, as well as by the townships. Where default persisted for long and persuasion (presumably) was of no avail, the Māhēśvaras, on occasions, did not hesitate to resort to the ultimate remedy of selfimmolation. That compelled the King's attention and redressal was sought at his hands. Where the Māhēśvaras or the temple servants failed in performing the endowed services, the King and the townships would check and insist on their proper observance. Later, when the King's demands, even on the temple lands, became the more exacting, the townships and the *Nāṭṭār* could assert themselves and insist on the adherence to the customary levies and obligations.

This is not an ideal portrayal, but the cumulative effect of the evidence which becomes severally available from the reactions of the different constituents of the agrarian community.

In fairness, it should be noted, sometimes, disputes were settled amicably by the Townships themselves. In Tirumaḷappāḍi an extent of 9 *mā*, *araikkāni* and odd (in terms of Taram or assessment-classification) was agreed to be divided equally between the *Sabhā* and the temple in A.D. 1044. The temple had to bear the land-dues on its half, but the quantum was agreed to be immutable. If any future increase in land-dues was made that excess would be to the account of the Township. The ancilliary levies (*Silvari*) and labour obligations also would be borne by the Township and the temple was exempt. The other half was the *Sabhā's* holding on which they would bear the land dues, but the net-yield was allocated for a special festival on the birthday of Rājeṇdra Cōḷa I, the Emperor.⁵³

53. S.I.I. Vol, V, No. 633 - Tirumaḷappāḍi (Tiruchirapalli Dist.)

The township was often saddled with small bits and parcels of land, unproductive or uncoveted lands or lands needing heavy capital outlay for improvement or reclamation. Escheated lands, lands relinquished by the occupants or the service holders, or lands bought in for default in payment of land dues, or lands reverting to the township where the occupants had no heir, all became the township's common holdings. They, in their turn, had tried to palm off such bits and parcels to others granting them for new services or service-holders,⁵⁴ or for the temple - endowments. When the grantees found the lands to be a liability and sought redress, the township had to substitute more productive lands.

The *Mahāsabhā* of Śrībhūticaturvēdimangalam admitted that the lands endowed earlier as tax-free for the temple were of various measurements, tail-end lands, of least fertility, some of which were not commandable (for irrigation) and hence were not yielding. In A.D. 1086, they agreed to exchange those inferior parcels they had palmed off to the temple earlier, and give an equitable extent of good lands in the village.⁵⁵

Lands in dispute between one township and another were sometimes transferred to the temple by joint consent. The *Mahāsabhā* of Srikanṭhacaturvēdimangalam and the *Ūrār* of Erumbiyūr jointly sold a land which was disputed between them (*Sīmāvivāda*) to a benefactor who built the *Śrīvimāna* of the Tiruverumbūr temple in the 3rd year of Rājakēsari.⁵⁶ Similarly, lands under

54. For example, please see the endowment for piper service at Tirumeyyam of such relinquished lands in fragmented small parcels, (pp. 123-124 in "Studies of Ancient Townships of Pudukkottai.")

55. S.I.I. Vol. VII, No. 1032 - Uḍaiyānkōil (Tanjore Distt.)

56. S.I.I. Vol XIII, No. 50 - Tiruverumbūr.

dispute between the *Ūrār* of Puliyūr, the *Nagaram* of Avanimārtāṇḍapuram and the *Sabhayār* of Śrīvallabhacaturvēdimangalam were ultimately endowed to the Kulaśēkhara shrine added at Rājēndra Viṇṇagar in about A.D. 1209.⁵⁷ This was a good method of cutting the Gordian Knot.

Royal intervention and the good sense of the townships are both evidenced by some transactions involving private holdings. The *Sabhayār* of Kalappāl resumed the land and the house-site granted for the apothecary service. The aggrieved service-holder appealed to the King. The royal officers acting on the corroborative testimony of another resident, upheld the claim of the apothecary (*vaidya*). The enquiry revealed the earlier land granted was a waste and no crop could be raised. The officers directed the parcel to be substituted by the ready yield from the lands held in common (and not divided by metes and bounds) within the township.⁵⁸ This was in the later half of Rājēndra Cola II's reign. In Mēlsevūr (South Arcot District), the *Ūrār* had earlier sold a house-site, some cultivable land, and a garden to a chieftain, Ammayappan Kulamāṇikkam. His successors were in enjoyment. In A.D. 1167 Rājādhirāja III ordered that the old occupants of the township shall redistribute the lands among themselves. The *Ūrār* of Arkarāmūr had the good sense to confirm the enjoyment by the grandson of the original vendee, according to the terms of the original sale, while implementing the royal order.⁵⁹

57. Please see pp. 24 - 27 of the author's "RĀJĒNDRA VINNAGAR"

58. Tiruttuṅgaipūṇḍi Inscriptions - 1976/76 - Kirākkaḷūr (Tamilnadu Department of Archaeology Publication, 1978)

59. S.I.I. Vol. XVII, No. 244, Mēlsevūr

7. The Pandyan Kingdom

Similar mixed reactions of the townships were also noticed in the Pāṇḍyan kingdom.

In about A.D. 1140 the King Māḡavarman Śrīvallabha had assigned taxfree lands in Pullamangalam for Nataraja deity at Sucīndram at the request of the *Sabhayār* of that township. The residents (*Ūrār*) of Irukkanduḡai point d out that the King's predecessor had already assigned 10 *mā* of wet land to the Śiva shrine at Irukkanduḡai. The king reconciled the two clāims by excluding the share of the earlier grant, and directed the *Kārāṇmai* and *Antarāyam* dues shall be taken on the residual share of the lands not divided by metes and bounds, by the Sucīndram shrine.⁶⁰

Where dual tenures were involved, the two tenure-holders had to act conjointly, more so when the lands were not divided by metes and bounds or were unreclaimed. The temple authorities of Śrī Sundarēśvarar at Madurai sold one half-share granted to them to a wēaver attached to the temple for reclaiming the lands in Mudithalai.⁶¹ The owners of the other half, the *Brahmadēya* share, followed suit, and sold their half share to the same vendee within two months of the first sale.⁶²

In Vijayanārāyaṇam the earlier epigraphs of the temple had been obliterated. In A.D. 1193, a levy of 2 *dramam* per *mā* came to be unjustly demanded on the *Dēvadāna* land, and collected from the temple lands. Consequently some services in the temple had ceased. Two temple

60. T.A.S. Vol. IV. pp. 125-126 - Irukkanduḡai is a village in Rādhāpuram sub-taluk, Nāngunēri Taluk.

61. S.I.I. Vol. IV, No. 371 - Koḍimangalām (Madurai Taluk)

62. S.I.I. Vol. IV, No. 370

servants represented this hardship to Jaṭavarman Kulaśēkhara I, the Pāṇḍya ruler, who cancelled the levy of his officers.⁶³

The King's intervention was also found necessary to correct the wrong done to Nālāyira Viṇṇagar Emberumān at Kallidaikurucci. A benefactor-builder had acquired and endowed lands to the Viṣṇu temple. The *Sabhayār* of Rājarājacaturvēdimangalam took possession of the temple lands, and had been collecting *Kaḍamai* on the land. This was reported to the king who commanded that the *Sabhayār* had no business to collect *Kaḍamai* on the lands granted already as tax-free. He also directed that no sooner they saw the command than they should desist from collecting the land-dues and restore the lands tax-free to the temple.⁶⁴

A case in Kiranūr was heavily contested. It was a dispute among several townships and the temple of Uthamadānīśvara of Kiranūr (Pudukkottai District). The *Ūrārs* involved were Nāñjil, Pērūr, Sēvur, Virakkudi, Sunaiyakkudi and Oduvur. This was in A.D. 1311 (?) 43rd year of Māḍavarman Kulaśēkhara.

Vāḷuvamangalam (Oḷippāl) was a *Dēvadāna* grant made in the reign of Kulōttunga III in A.D. 1186. The royal grant was also engraved on the temple-walls of Kiranūr.⁶⁵ Ignoring this grant in about A.D. 1311 (?) the above *Ūrārs* demanded *Kaḍamai*. The *Māhēśvarars*, the *mudalis* of the *Saiva* worshippers, the *Sthānathār* of the Nāḍu, the *Kaikōḷas* of the temple all gathered in a big congregation. They contested the claims of the *Ūrārs* (*Inda Vāḷuvamangalattai nānga! kaḍamai iṟukkavēṇḍumenṟu Sollukaiyālē,*

63. A.R.E. 1926-27, Para 89, Para 41, No. 14/1927

64. S.I.I. Vol. XXII, No. 105-106, Kallidaikurucci

65. P.I. 145; A.R.E. 'B' No. 290, 1968-69

munbil āṇḍu illādadonṛai nīngal ippaḍi Sollukaiyāvaden enṛu solli) They also pointed out that three images had become old, and due for substitution. This dispute was settled before the temple authorities of Kunnāṇḍārkōil, and one of the chieftains of the Pāṇḍya Kingdom, Kulaśēkhara Vānavadaraiyar. The *Ūrār* granted 1200 *paṇam* (in cash) and 20 *mā* of land distributing the land and the cash contribution among themselves. The lands were rendered tax-free, the townships agreeing to bear the taxes. The temple's claim was conceded, and an additional cash grant was also made for reinstating the three images in replacement.⁶⁶

It is also necessary to note that the townships had also parted with a portion of the yield they were enjoying from lands granted to them in favour of temples. In the 13th year of Māgavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, a chieftain Arumbōruḍayān Tirucciṅṅambalam Uḍaiyān alias Viḷuppādarāyan from Miḷalai *Kūṛṅṅam* had installed a new deity Āvuḍaiyār Alagiya Siṅṅambalamuḍayār in the temple at Tirunelvēli. The *Mahāsabhā* of Kōḍānūr alias Kulaśēkharacaturvēlimangalam agreed to measure out 15 *kalams* per year from the main crop together with the *Kaḍamai* to the Treasury.⁶⁷ Two months later, the *Mahāsabhā* of Suthavalli alias Vīra Vinōdacaturvēdimangalam followed suit, agreeing to measure 30 *Kalams* each for the *Kār* (first) and *Piśānam* (second) crop. The paddy was to be converted into cash at prevailing rates in *Arpaṣi* (October-November) for *Kār* and *Cittirai* (April-May) for the second crop, and paid to the King's (or the temple's) agents who collected *Antarāyam* from the township.⁶⁸ The *Nagaram* of Kulaśēkharapuram

66. P.I. 546 - Also please see the author's "Studies of Ancient Townships of Pudukkottai." pp. 309-11.

67. S.I.I. Volume V, No. 437, Tirunelvēli

68. S.I.I. Volume V, No. 438, Tirunelvēli

also agreed to pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ *accu* per each crop, or 3 *accu* per year (equal to 39 *Diramam* of 13 *mēni*). This amount was to be paid to the officers who collected *antarāyam* to the principal deity at Tirunelvēli.⁶⁹ All the three townships dipped into their own resources to pay out for services to a new deity installed by the chieftain. The corpus of the benefit derived earlier by the townships stood diminished.

8. A Summing up and Conclusions

Two aspects have been dealt with in this first lecture. The terms and conditions of land grants, and the factors that influenced them.

It is necessary to emphasise that though the motivation was religious, the land grants were essentially economic instruments for land-reclamation and development. The grants were religious or charitable in form but economic in content. The economic interests, whether of the grantor or the grantee, or the occupant definitely came to the fore, and conspicuously influenced their actions. Social benefits also had accrued. Concessional terms, especially in the initial period of heavy outlay for reclamation, had been granted in many cases, but the full rate of land demand was attained within a few years of stabilisation of agriculture. Cultivation had been progressively extended to high level lands where surface flow needed to be supplemented by baling, and to the extremities of the foot-hills in the Tāmbra-parṇi and Ghaṭana tract by the 13th century. Irrigation played a determining part in land grants. Lands were resumed, substituted or regranted or added, to provide for such betterment and irrigation. Unoccupied wastes or the common holdings of the township, on occupation and cultivation, brought more

69. S.I.I. Volume V, No. 439, Tirunelvēli

and more revenue - yield. Even the Crown lands, the personal property of the King, were granted for public purposes. Conversions of tenures and transference of the assigned land-dues were not infrequent. In such conversions, some of the prior claims were apt to be ignored which had to be regularised later. Where lands were turned to non-agricultural use, a diversion fee (*Svāmibhōgam*) in recognition of title to the land was payable to the grantee-occupants. While the grantees in one instance had to bear with the discontinuance of their dues even of *Svāmibhōgam*, the grantees in another case were zealous of their riparian rights. They protested to the King against taking off a channel ahead of their channel-head from the river Vaigai and their contention was upheld. Claims to land were largely settled with reference to the documents of title, and prescription, and long and valid possession.

The contents of the grant were referable to the grant-deed. Land-dues were fixed on the basis of the extent but were revisable when the lands were classified, and the rates were redetermined. The right to the incremental increase when the *Taram* was fixed or revised could be reserved by the grantor. When the initial grant had unreclaimed waste, the land-dues were payable on reclamation. But they could be determined by payment of a capitalised levy (*Kaṭṭpurūvilai*) to the King. This applied also to the lands under cultivation. This payment had the effect of transferring the State-dues to the beneficiary. In that sense, the *dēvadāna* grants augmented, and did not diminish the King's revenue. But the cultivating rights (*Kāraṇmai*) were left in tact with the occupant, or the reclaimer. The grantee in such cases could stipulate a fixed quantum of paddy and/or cash from the occupant.

In the generality of cases, to repeat, a grant as *Dēvadāna*, or *Brahmadēya*, did not *ipso facto* render it tax-free. The *Brahmadēya*

too had to pay a stipulated rate of *Kaḍamai* and land dues to the King. Besides the land-dues were to be rendered to a plurality of agencies, each one of which could assert its claim unless it expressly remitted its own dues. The quantum of lands granted to the temples and rendered absolutely tax-free could on a closer analysis, turn out to be far less than apparent. For the township took on the obligation to pay the King's dues, either from out of its own resources or against the receipt of the capitalised deposits from the benefactor or the beneficiary, besides the payment of *Kaṭpūravilai* direct to the King.

Even prior to the 10th century, alienations of lands on beneficial tenure had occurred. Land-dues from *Brahmadēya* holdings had fallen into arrears. Also alienations of *Brahmadēya* lands to those ineligible had occurred. Corrective steps were needed. Rājarāja I took conscious and effective steps to meet these irregularities. He ordered all lands unlawfully alienated to be resumed and sold for market price and the realisation to be remitted to the State. Lands in arrears of land-dues were brought to sale and sold to those other than the erstwhile defaulters. The rates of land-dues on *Dēvadāna* lands were appropriately revised upwards. Intensive checks of the utilisation of the endowed properties, and appropriation of the yield therefrom for matching services, and of the proper upkeep of those services were also undertaken. The rigours of such check were not without local reactions in some places which will be discussed later. These policies were continued by his son, Rājendra I.

Perhaps, the inelasticity of land available in the Cōḷa heart-land, even for the high royal personages to acquire and bestow land had also occasioned the need to revoke the unauthorised alienations. Migrations to attractive riverine tracts down south

had also occurred, thanks to the expansion of the Cōla Empire under Rājarāja I and Rājeṇdra I.⁷⁰

One of the question frequently raised in the 12th and 13th centuries was the inheritability of rights and liabilities through the female line where there was no male heir. This was found to be permissible, and decreed accordingly, and formulated in law.

In a personalised manner of functioning, the effect, beneficial or adverse, could be direct and perceptible. The initiative and influence of high personages and officers and individuals of standing were admittedly the instruments or channels for securing royal grants. Discretion had played a large part. At least one case would not appeal to the modern ethical and social values as benevolent. Kulōttuṅga II resumed a grant enjoyed by 16 blindmen singing *Tiruppadiyam* and their two escorts and bestowed it on another individual instead.

Discretion became indiscreet later, and led to exacting demands with effects adverse to the economy and the community had to work out relief-methods.

The second aspect examined is the reactions of the townships to some land-grants. The township was the accredited organisation through which the land-grants were implemented, and maintained. They acted as the agents of the King for collecting his demand, and as the agents of the grantees situated afar, to collect and deliver the assigned yield. But instances were not wanting where

70. Such migrations had also occurred even to Śrī Laṅka - Please see the author's Paper: "Glimpses of Cōla Townships in Śrī Laṅka" - Journal of Asian Studies - Vol. II-2 (1982)

the townships disputed the title and claims of the temple. This evidence, even if only in its qualitative intensity more than in the quantitative output, is striking. They were not above preferring claims even when they could not, and were conscious that they could not sustain their claims against the temple. Despite the prevailing notions of the times that temple properties, especially attached to Śiva shrines, were not to be touched, the enjoyment of those properties and the resistance of the townships to the temple's claims illustrated by these cases was the more surprising. The tenacity of the collective bodies to hold on to the land was no less intense than those of the individuals.

Disputes were taken to the King by the worshippers or the temple executives and in the cases cited the decisions went against the townships. The King corrected and penalised the townships when they appropriated, or even misappropriated the temple lands and the yield. In others the dispute reached tragic dimensions, involving the self-immolation of the Āṇḍārs. The King and his chiefs or officers enquired into these cases. Going by their results the townships concerned did not illustrate perfection. Historical analysis should pertinently examine not only how the disputes arose but also the modes of relief availed of to resolve them. A composite interaction of checks was invoked. The King, the *Nāṭṭār*, the township the *Ūrār* or the *Sabhayār*, the *Mahēśvaras*, besides the temple authorities—one or more among them kept vigil on the conduct of all others; and *vice versa*. It helped to detect and correct any default or wrong done. Prolonged dereliction of duty even entailed the extreme form of protest, namely self-immolation. It compelled the King to interfere, and remedy the wrong. It also kindled the remorse in the defaulter. Many guilts wrought admissions and rectification by the townships.

Medieval pluralism implied essentially a dispersal of obligations. But it had within itself processes of mutual rectification and corrective intervention. When an actionable wrong was committed by any one agency, it was cognizable by any or all others. Social, moral, and legal action were all brought to bear together on the persistently recalcitrant.

Disputes settled by the townships themselves amicably speak for their good sense. In fairness to them, it should be noted that the townships also made over a portion of their own grant-yields to new shrines or other public purpose. These could be voluntary gifts or on involuntary compulsions or perhaps, a judicious mix of both.

Lands held on dual and multiple tenures necessarily needed cooperation among and conjoint action by the different categories of the assignees; more so when they were not divided by metes and bounds on ground. The beneficial enjoyment of such lands or their disposal had to be done conjointly or in sequence. But common holdings and mixed enjoyment were progressively diminishing. Individual occupancies, and sub-tenorial holdings were increasing apace all through the period.

This was not only the change. Changes had occurred in the tenures and in the land-levies by the King and the townships. Their burden was increasing all through the 12th and 13th centuries. The terms and conditions of occupancy, and of the tenants, both directly and consequentially, had been varied to the disadvantage of them all. Distress was felt and voiced by them. Relief, sometimes slow, and at other times on self-regulations or on the initiative of the *Nāṭṭar* and the *Brahmadēyas*, was afforded in varied

and even in unorthodox forms. These changes and the reactions of the occupants and the tenants will demand our attention. They are already waiting on the wing, and will have to wait for the morrow.

and even in the most remote parts of the country and the
of the people and the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for

the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for

the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for

the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for

the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for

the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for

the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for

the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for
the day when the people will have to wait for

LAND GRANTS AND AGRARIAN REACTIONS IN CŌLA THE PĀNDYA TIMES — LECTURE II

9. Reactions of occupancy - holders and sub - occupants including the cultivators

In the first lecture, the factors that influenced the land-grants, and the grantor's own reactions as well as the collective reactions of the townships, as revealed in the case studies, were brought out.

The medieval structure of land holdings was pivoted upon the creation of inextinguishable occupancy rights. Progressive accretion to occupancy had occurred with the conversion of waste lands in the township, or on conversion of tenures, or when the unoccupied lands of the institutions were reclaimed. Many grants specify that the earlier holdings were changed, and the old names were discarded. Some tenures are also categorised as '*Kuḍinikki*' and '*Kuḍi-nikka*'. These have been interpreted to mean "evicting the earlier occupants or without evicting the earlier occupants."⁷¹ They have also been rendered as "transferring the labour employed therein".⁷² Sri T.N. Subrahmaniyan has interpreted the terms as below: "*Kuḍinīṅā-dēvadāna*" — "endowment to a temple of lands already in the occupation of the cultivating tenants, i.e., only the mēlvāram

71. The Cōlas - Vol. II Pt. (i) page 396. The Pudukkottai Manual, Vol. II, Part-I

72. A. R. E. 1925 - 26, page 107

share alone was granted to the temple.” *Kuḍi-nīngā Iṟayili* - Taxfree land or village without evicting the existing tenants, thus making the grantee only enjoy the proprietary right and the *mēlvāram*”. “*Kuḍinīngiya dēvadāna*” — “land or village endowed to a temple” after removing the previous tenants, thus making the temple enjoy both the proprietary and cultivating rights”.⁷³

In interpreting these terms, regard should be paid to the normally inward-looking economy of the townships. The residential population were normally to be deployed; occupants from outside (*Puṟakkuḍi*) were discriminated against by a cash levy (*Puṟavari*). Mobility was not the normal characteristic either of the township population. More noticeably, mobility was the result of unbearable exactions, and adverse economic conditions. Under such conditions displacement of labour would not have been an easy and persistent feature as the terms would lead one to imagine. Any interpretation of these terms should therefore be consistent with the known tenurial characteristics. A few case studies of how such transfers had occurred, and the reactions of the occupants should help. They would also unravel the intention behind the use of these terms.

(a) The import of ‘*Kuḍinīkki*’ and ‘*Kuḍinīkkā*’

In 11th year of Parakēsarivarman (circa A.D. 918) Sembian Irukkuvēḷ alīas Bhūti Parāntakan (son of Bhūti Vikrama-Kēsari) supplicated his King (Parāntaka I) for 3 *vēlis* of wet land to be granted as *Kuḍinīkkiya dēvadānam* in Aṇḍanallūr. With the subsisting occupancy thus extinguished, the lands were charged to pay 120 *kalams* per *vēli* - in all 360 *kalams* to be measured to the temple. Seven years later, the King however directed that Arayan

73. Please see the annexure of “South Indian Temple Inscriptions” - Vol. III - Part II pages xxix, xxx

Vīra Cōḷan should be inducted as an inextinguishable occupant *Kuḍinikkā dēvadānam* into the land. Accordingly, Sembian Irukkuvēḷ directed his Revenue Officer, (Tiṇai) of Uṇattūr Kūṇṇam to give effect to the royal command. Vīra Cōḷan was, however, to measure out 180 *kalams* plus 120 *kalams* in all 300 *kalams*.⁷⁴ The customary irrigation rights were to be enjoyed, but no obligations to render free labour were to be demanded;⁷⁵ perhaps, sixty *kalams* were left to be appropriated by Vīra Cōḷan. Seven years thereafter Arayan Vīra Cōḷan re-inducted the Ūrār of Aṇḍanallūr as the occupants into the 3 *vēlis* of land on the same terms as he had been granted, and had been enjoying and released the lands from his possession (“*Vittukkuḍuttēn*”)⁷⁶

This case brings out the following: When a subsisting occupancy was extinguished, the grantor or the grantee was free to stipulate fresh terms which were more beneficial to the temple or the grantee. A higher share of 360 *kalams* was stipulated. Subsequently when a chieftain, at the behest of the King, was conferred inextinguishable occupancy on the land, the land-dues were reduced to 300 *kalams*. He, in his turn, conveyed his rights in entirety to the Ūrār, the agriculturists of the township. (Perhaps they were still cultivating the lands *de facto* as sub-tenants.) They had successfully got themselves reinducted into the lands though as sub-occupants under the occupant, Arayan Vīra Cōḷan, but on more favourable

74. S. I. I. Vol. VIII, No. 668 & 669 - Please see the author's Paper on “ALLŪR & ĪŚANAMANGALAM REVISITED”; ‘310 *kalams*’ indicated in the text appears to be an error.

75. S. I. I. Vol. VIII, No. 668

76. Ibid : 669

terms of inextinguishability, and a lower quantum of paddy to be delivered to the temple which Vīra Cōḷan had secured and transferred *in toto* to the agriculturists. The use of the term “*Viṭṭukkuḍuttēn*” clearly denoted his relinquishment of his rights in favour of the *Ūrār*, who had, for nearly fourteen years, not reconciled themselves to the extinguishment of their occupancy. They seem to have had their way, at last, and on more favourable terms than what they would have to contract had they directly tenanted under the temple, after the lands became *Dēvadānā*.

This interpretation gets confirmed by another case from the multiple-tenure township, Tiruviḍaimarudūr. In A.D. 959, a royal official, on enquiry, found that the grant of *dēvadānam* Tiṟaimūr was on *Kuḍinikki* tenure. Hence the Brahmadēya-holders in the same township had to measure out 256 *Kalams* for the *Pañcavāram* share to the temple. Actually, they had been paying only 160 *Kalams* on the plea that the Tiṟaimūr *Dēvadāna* was not on *Kuḍinikki* tenure (“*Kuḍinikkicillai*”). But a verification with the original grant-deed clearly negated their contention. Hence from the 3rd year onwards (A.D. 958) the *Brahmadēya* was directed to measure every year 256 *Kalams* to the temple, and additional services were instituted for the increment of 96 *Kalams*.⁷⁷

Prof. Sastri was inclined to state that this “looked very much like a deliberate fraud”⁷⁸ on the part of the *Sabhayār*. It might or might not have been. But it clearly brought out the higher

77. S.I.I. Vol. III, No. 203 - Tiruviḍaimarudūr. Please see Explanatory Note (I) for an additional instance from the same township.

78. The Cōḷas - Vol. II, part I, p. 402 (1937 edition)

burden and its incidence, if prior occupancies had been extinguished. In such cases, the share of the grantee was distinctly higher, and that of the occupant was less. It also confirmed that there was no displacement of the inhabitants but the same residents could hold the lands depending on the attributes of the terms of engagement, whether the earlier occupancies were extinguished or not (*nikki, nīnga*).

Other instances could be cited to support the view. In the 11th year, 302nd day of Rājadhiraṇya the village Vāraṇavāsi alias Kīlār was granted as *Irāiyili*. But the King directed that the *Manṛāḍis* already having occupancy in the lands shall continue thereon, but deliver 70 *māḍai* of cash and *antarayam* and *pāttam* included to the temple.⁷⁹

A new Brahmadeya was established at Tiruvayīndirapuram. The King authorised the Brahmin settlers to have the lands cultivated and raise any crop, they would desire. They could also have water baled, and have a picottah stand for lifting water. They were to deliver 20 *kalams* per *vēli* and cash levy at the prevailing rate in the *Nāḍu*, to the temple for a new service. The lands were on *Kuḍinīṅā Tiruviḍaiyāttam* tenure.⁸⁰

It will be clear from this and the Kōilkuruvitturai case that even the Brahmin Bhaṭṭas were inducted as the occupants with inextinguishable rights into the *Dēvadāna* lands. Other instances could be cited which make it clear that the *Kuḍis* were only occupants. They need not be, and in these cases cited, could not be, the cultivators.

79. S. I. I. Vol. V, No. 663 - Kīlappaḷuvūr

80. S. I. I. Vol. XVII, No. 170

In Māravarman Kulaśēkhara's reign one Dēvar Āryacakravartigaḥ had taken "on lease"⁸¹ some lands. The Sivabrāhmaṇas stood surety for him as *Kuḍipunai*. The Āṇḍārs performing services at the temple stood surety for the cash dues (*Porutpunai*). A Brahmin was murdered in the village, and the township was evacuated as a result. The temple dues were not paid. The Āṇḍārs, to discharge their surety, borrowed 350 *paṇams* from the temple. The lands taken on lease were given back to the temple, and demarcated with the trident-stone as a consideration for the amount borrowed. After some time when the original "lessees" returned together with Āryacakravarti they demanded the reason for this change. The trustees enquired into the matter. Recovering the moneys due from the defaulters they gave back the lands to them as *Kuḍiṇinga Iṇayili*. In addition to *Rājakaram*, (the King's taxes) at 1 *kalam* 1 *tūṇi* of paddy per *mā* on cultivated land, they were to measure the balance to the temple at Sivapuri. The learned Epigraphist concludes that "the tenants enjoying tax-free lands stipulated as *Kuḍiṇinga Iṇayili* should be reinstated in their holdings in spite of their dereliction, if they agreed to discharge their liabilities during the period of their absence and neglect".⁸²

The terms "*Kuḍinikki*" and "*Ninga*", then could be interpreted as "extinguishing the terms and rates of levy in kind and cash" payable by the former occupants or without extinguishing them. Where they were extinguished, the grantee could stipulate fresh terms which the erstwhile occupants could accept or reject. Where the prior occupancy had not been extinguished, the grantee would be entitled only to the subsisting rates of land dues and obligations which could not be varied.

81. I have followed the rendering in the A.R.E. The text is unpublished.

82. A.R.E. 1928-29 - P.71 - para 16 - No. 21 of 1928.

Generally, the obligations of the occupants holding *Dēvadāna* lands were more favourable to the temple. Where the King's share (*Kaḍamai*) had been assigned to it, it not only secured the paddy and *antarāyam* (in cash) but the occupants had other obligations - to deliver the paddy to the temple at its premises. The drriage and the storage and the transportation charges were to the account of the occupant. The farther the lands were situated the greater would be the costs.⁸³ The occupants, and more so, the tenants under them, might have been - in many instances were - exempted from customary labour obligations to the township, and attendance in royal camps. But they had instead the obligation to attend to the services in the temple. Rājarāja I even caused an obligation on the non-service holders residing in the house - sites belonging to the temple to attend the temple daily, and hold the lamps before the deity.⁸⁴

(b) Reactions to the tightening of control by Rājarāja and Rājendra

Reference has already been made to Rājarāja I tightening the control and check on the lands endowed for temples, all over the empire, and throughout his reign. While his commands were generally complied with, there appeared to be some reaction in Sucīndram. Nṛpaśēkharanallūr was a *Dēvadāna* village endowed to the temple at Sucīndram. In A.D. 999, Periyān Mūveṇḍa Vēlār

83. In Tiruvākkarai (S.A. Dt.) in A.D. 1001 for one *podī* (load) of 2 *Kalam*, 1 *Tūṇi* 1 *Paḍakku* from *Maṇali* to Tiruvākkārai, the transport charge was *Paḍukku* paddy - i.e., 6-2/3% of the paddy transported. — (S.I.I. Vol. XVII No 222 - page 81)

84. S.I.I. Vol. V, No. 610 - On Rājarāja's control measures please see explanatory notes in the appendix.

had ordered that the tenants having sub-occupancy *Kiḷ-kārāṇmai-uḍaiya Kuḍigal*)⁸⁵ with cultivating rights and their coparceners shall deliver to the *mēlātciudayār* (the principal grantees) at 3 *kalams* per *mā* (or 33 cents). He later revised his own orders and increased the rate to 3 *kalams* 1 *tūṇi* per *mā* all single crop yielding land to be measured at the temple excluding the *Muṇai-paḍi*. For double-crop lands the rate was doubled. This worked out to an increase by 11% on single crop, and 22% on double-crop lands. Lands on which occupancy had not been fastened shall be supervised by the temple servants direct.⁸⁶ The subsequent conduct of the *Mūlaparudayār*, the *Sabhā* administering the temple affairs and the suboccupants, next year at the commencement of the main crop cultivation (*Kanni* month - September-October) could be, perhaps, linked with the revision in A.D. 999.

In A.D. 1000, in the presence of the *Mahāsabhayār* of Sucīndram the *Mūlaparuḍai Sabhayār*, administering the temple, delivered into the hands of the *Mahāsabhayār*, i.e., handed over charge of the temple and the *Dēvadāna* lands to the *Mahāsabhayār* of the Township stating as follows :-

“We could not pay the land-dues to the deity on the *Dēvadāna* lands, nor could we administer the temple affairs. The occupants under the *Paruḍai* and those inducted by them would not pay the

85. Prof. Sastri has observed (Tht Cōlas II part (i) p. 395) “As the landlord might himself be the actual cultivator, the class of *occupant* cultivators was sometimes distinguished by the name *Kiḷ-Karāṇmai - uḍaiya Kuḍigal*, i.e., the occupants with subordinate cultivation rights”.

I have ventured an alternative interpretation of the term. Please see the explanatory note in the appendix.

86. T.A.S. IV. Pt. 2 - Pp. 128-129

land dues to the deity". They swore besides: "Having thus ourselves relinquished the holdings and our functions, if any of us individually claim any rights (hereafter), we shall be liable each to pay a fine of 10 *kaḷaṇḍju* of gold as penalty. If any of the others while tenants claim any rights they shall collectively pay 50 *kaḷaṇḍju* of gold as fine. Even after paying the fine they shall not prefer any claim towards (or on) the temple affairs, and the property - (management) and, on our oath, sworn to by us, the temple affairs are left with the *Mahāsabhā*"⁸⁷.

The *Mahāsabhā*, thereupon, appointed a Committee of two, and an accountant to directly supervise the cultivation of these lands and the lay affairs of the temple. Medieval piety and dedication to the deity were pronounced, but their price could not be inelastic.

Two other instances of land-grants in the Pāṇḍya country throw further light. In A.D. 1026, the Cōḷa-pāṇḍya Viceroy, Jaṭavarman Sundara, granted the revenue-yield from Mānābharanacaturvēdimangalam to the deity at Rājendra Viṇṇagar, named after his father. Even 10 years later (A.D. 1036) when the Cēra prince, Rājarāja, the son of the builder of the temple, Rājasimha, visited the temple he noticed the revenue-demand of 3840 *kalams*, 2 *tūṇi*, 7 *nāḷi* were not still fully realisable, as the lands had not been taken up for cultivation by the occupants. The lands were assessed but still unoccupied. He, hence, added, once again, 10 *vēlis* in the same village and simultaneously allocated them to six individuals as *Kuḍiṇiṅgakkārāṇmai* with inextinguishable occupancy and cultivating rights. This had the effect of instantly augmenting the actual receipts for the temple.⁸⁸

87. T.A.S. Vol. II, pp. 2-9

88. Please see annexure in the author's RĀJĒNDRA VINNAGAR and the texts of inscriptions; S.I.I. Vol. XIV No. 133 & 154

An even more striking case of the reactions of the occupants comes from Kallūr village. In A.D. 1037 the same ruler converted two *vēlis* of land in Kallūr village in Mēlavēmbunāḍu on the east bank of Tāmbra-parṇi (identical with Mēlakkallūr in Tirunelvēli Taluk). He fixed the assessment (Kāṇik kaḍan) at 16 *kāśu*, and 6 *mā*, and paddy at 219 *kālams*, 1 *tūṇi*, 1 *padakku* and 4 *nāḷi* per *vēli*. This extent was separated and accounted for as a separate entity, renamed as Śivapādaśēkharanallūr and was a *Dēvadāna* to Śrī Kailāsamuḍāiyār temple at Śeranmādēvi, across the river Tāmbra-parṇi on its west bank.⁸⁹

Two years later, the revenue authorities received a relinquishment deed by the holders of these lands, by name Nakkan Baladēvan, a Vellāla, Mādavan Īsan, Subrahmaṇyan Karuṇākaran, Śāttan Dēvan, Śāttan Tiṭṭai, Nakkan Pēraṇ, Nakkan Śēndan, Dēvan Tāntōṇḍri, Tittai pattan. They all swore and gave a final relinquishment deed (*Mānavīraparāntaka Kaḍaiceṇṇittu Kuḍutha Pariśu*) to the following effect :

“They (the occupants) could not raise crops, and pay the land-dues (*lṛai*) on the 2 *vēlis* separated from their village Kallūr and constituted into a separate entity, and endowed as *Dēvadāna lṛaiyili*, to Śrī Kailāsamuḍāiyār temple in Śeranmādēvi. On account of their inability they stated that they did not want those lands, and relinquished them before the royal officer, Nālandu Uḍaiyar. In the circumstances (they agreed) those lands shall be caused to be raised with crops, and cultivated by tenants (at will) whom the *Dēvakanmis* or the temple executives shall themselves induct. The signatories-*Ūrārs* also agreed to bear the penalty inflicted on those who disobeyed

Mānaviṛaparāntakan or the royal command if they proceeded in future against the tenants inducted by the Dēvakanmis and who were cultivating the 2 *vêlis* and paying the land dues to the temple or claimed any rights on these lands as theirs, or themselves hindered those who were ploughing and cultivating the lands or caused hindrance through others.”⁹⁰

This evidence helps to reveal the course of action open to the occupants if they could not abide by the changes in tenurial terms. Occupants relinquished their holdings when there was a conversion of tenure, if the stipulated terms of the *Dēvadāna* grant were not acceptable to them. In such cases the temple authorities could induct fresh occupants on agreed terms or have the lands directly cultivated by the tenants-at-will under their direct supervision and appropriate the full yield.

This was not civil resistance but a voluntary relinquishment. It was an episode and an episode cannot afford, in itself, sufficient basis for an inductive generalisation.

Though the relinquishment is on record, this did not appear to have interfered with the cultivation of the lands. In the 3rd year of Jaṭavarman Cōla-Pāṇḍya the Viceroy gave effect to the command of his father, Vīra Rājeṇdra (A.D. 1063-69) to add more lands abutting Sivapādaśēkharanallūr which were also converted from *Veḷḷānvagai* into *Dēvadāna*.⁹¹

90. S.I.I. Vol. XIV, No. 164 - The similarity in the language employed in the Sucīndram relinquishment and this document is note - worthy.

91. S.I.I. Vol. XIV, No. 164

Prof. Sastri has posed the question: "It is clear that the *Vellānvagai* villages fell, in the reign of Rājeṇdra I, into at least two broad classes; one directly remitting a variable revenue to the State, and the other paying dues of a more or less fixed and standardised character to the public institutions, like temples to which they were assigned. Which of these benefitted the cultivator more, if at all, we lack the means of determining".⁹²

It could be inferred that at least the persons involved in these instances cited thought that the *Vellānvagai* tenure, paying the land-dues direct to the State, was, to them, the preferable form of land-holding.

It should be added that this arose less out of the variable nature of revenue to the State, and the fixed or standardised nature of the land-dues payable to the institutions. In either categories of land both the modes of land-assessment, variability of demand based on actual crop-yields (*Variṣai*) as well as fixity of demand (*Vāḍakkaḍan*) were prevalent. The latter was more in vogue in the sub-tenure termed "*Kuḍiṇiṅakkārāṇmai*" under which reclaimable temple lands were taken up for occupancy. Occasionally State demand too was on a fixed immutable basis (*ṇilai-Iṟai* or *Vāḍakkaḍan*), especially in lands newly reclaimed. The generality of *Kuḍiṇiṅgaddēvadāna* lands had variable demand, usually referable to the crop-yields actually estimated or assessed. Also, periodical revision of *Taram* on assessment-grouping entailed the revision of demand as well, on both the temple and State lands, unless the grant itself had pegged the rates.

92. The Cōlas, Vol. II, pt. I, p. 389

What could be the reasons for this preference? It would be interesting to speculate on this aspect. The share payable to the temple contained the assigned land-dues payable to the State prior to the grant. But in several grants a fraction in recognition of landlordship (*mēlatci* or *miyatci*) was specifically added. A direct occupant could deliver the paddy dues to the township straightaway even at the threshing floor (when the prices would be ruling lower). In the case of a temple-grant the occupant had to keep it, himself bearing the driage and the wastage and also the transportation charges. These charges could be the more, the more distant the lands granted were located. If a river intervened, as in the case of the Kallūr grant, the floods (usually in the monsoon months of October when the first crop harvest would be over), and the hot weather (in March-April) when the second crop yield had to be transported would be the more troublesome and costly, particularly for the bullocks to slog and drag the cart across the water and slush or the hot sand. In the Kallūr case, besides, the land itself was inherently infertile (*Kaḷanilam*). Thirdly, even in cases where the miscellaneous levies and labour and services were remitted by the king or the Township and the Nāḍu it only meant they were transferred and had to be rendered to the temple. The latter could demand them the more punctually, recurringly, even daily, than the casual, contingent or occasional demands made by the former. Lastly, as additional obligations in labour and cesses came to be imposed on the townships and even the temple lands such obligations were passed down to the occupant-holders and the tenants. This was particularly the case in the later Cōḷa times. We have direct evidence of this occurring, and the felt need for relief.

The grantee had also the latent right to vary the rates of the land-dues. Though the variations could have occurred only in sympathy with the changes in the State demand, the occasional increases even if

rarely noticed supported the existence of this latent right.⁹³ The change in tenure, then, reduced an occupant under the State to a tenant with occupancy under the temple.

Speculation could yield this inferential reasoning. This hypothesis needs strengthening with more definitive evidence. Even under the temple, however, the occupant was assured of permanency or inextinguishability of tenure, and transferability, and vendibility of his rights. He was also allotted a house-site to reside. In the case of default and desertion, the occupant could recover the land on full settlement of the amount in default.

10. The characteristics of Townships and holdings therein :

Collective or individual

Impressed by the vestiges of the Teutonic village communities and of the collective holdings in some provinces in British India, Sir Henry Maine circulated the idea that collective or communal ownership of land was widely prevalent not only in ancient India but even in the west.⁹⁴ That drew the demur of the historian of Townships, F. W. Maitland. He entered a caveat based on his intensive study of the open-field system in Cambridge that individual holdings, more so, the sense or consciousness of individual holdings in medieval England was

93. In Virayāccilai the *Varisai* - scale of demand made on the occupant, the *maṭha* - head, was increased on the ground that the earlier "occupancy deed had some equivocality" (*ivargal śāsanattil eṇṇai uṇḍeṇṇu* - P.1. 412 - Also S.I.I. Vcl. XXII, No. 163)

94. Sir Henry Maine - "Village Communities, East and West" - (John Murray - 1887) - Lectures III & IV

unmistakable.⁹⁵ This caution is equally well-placed in regard to the agrarian conditions of South India in the Cōḷa and the Pāṇḍya times. It is easy to magnify the dimensions of collective or communal holdings in South India in those times.

Scholars in South Indian epigraphy basing themselves on the data analysis thrown up by modern technological aids have projected a possible dichomatic contrast between different types of townships some where communal holdings were said to be in vogue, and others (the *Brahmadēya*) in which individuals held the lands.⁹⁶ They are inclined to suggest similar variations in the nature of holdings as between the early Cōḷa and later Cōḷa times.⁹⁷

For one thing, many community functions and obligations were, themselves, collectively undertaken but severally discharged. It was indeed, necessary, for the community to collectively manage the unoccupied lands or lands held in fractional shares or where occupation was being rotated periodically until the lands were finally and separately divided by metes and bounds. Collective management there was, but it was of the affairs of the townships in the aggregate, and of lands not divided by metes and bounds (*nilam Kalandapadi*). The recorded sale of lands by townships in the early Cōḷa period were largely from their

95. F. W. Maitland - "Township & Borough" (pp.24-25) (Ford Lectures - 1827)

96. See for e.g., 'Allūr & Īśānamangalam' by Dr. N. Koroshima - IE&SHR : Vol. III, No. 2

97. "The prevalence of private landowning in the lower Kāvēri valley in the late Cōḷa period and its historical implications" - Dr. Korohima's paper at a joint seminar of Indian and Japanese scholars held at Madras Univesity on 5.3.1980. "Studies in Socio-cultural change in Rural villages in Tiruccirappalli Dt. - Tamilnadu - No. 1 (1980) (pp- 8-9)

common holdings. They were sold to the temples or to the individual benefactors for reclamation and beneficial enjoyment. The conversion of the common waste or the unoccupied land synchronised with the extensive founding of temples in that period. Indeed, the latter accelerated the pace of conversion.⁹⁸ Also common lands were more and more receding to the extremities of the township. The residual lands could be of lower productivity (*Kaḍainilam*) or *Kaḷar*, alkaline, or sand-cast or have less of irrigation command. Progressively the lands were being parcelled out into separated enjoyment. The land settlement, after survey, (*Nāḍu vagaiṣeydal*) in Rājarāja I's reign stabilised the process.

When we get closer to the arable field, this pattern of separated and individual enjoyment was the more noticeable. It was the more established in the settled villages with stable irrigation facilities and modes. This could be noticed even in early Cola times as in Tiruccendurai, Andanallūr and in Allūr and elsewhere. The land sold from the village common were, in many cases, surrounded on one or more sides by private holdings. Lands were cultivated, bought and sold, gifted or endowed, for public purpose, lands were granted as *Strīdhana* to daughters as in that township of the in-laws, Iśānamangalam. When the daughters joined their husbands elsewhere the former through the latter as the guardians sold the lands in their parental village even in the 10th century. Wells were sunk and private investments were made increase the yielding capacity of fields.⁹⁹

98. The large number of extant epigraphs are most representative of this process, and typical of this segmental experience.

99 On the conditions in early Cōla times please see the author's paper on "Allur & Isanamangalam Revisited" contributed to Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra Felicitation Volume 1984. publication *Svasii Śrī*

Separated enjoyment was the *preferred* form of landholding as well.¹⁰⁰ Let the deity of Tiruvārūr testify. There were 100 *Āṇḍars*, performing service in His temple. They had been allocated lands for their maintenance from out of the *Dēvadāna* lands in three villages, measuring in all 31-3/4 and odd *vēlis*. Three of the 100 *Āṇḍars* had been allocated lands even earlier, and the remaining 97 were allotted the residual extent of about 30-3/4 *vēli* and odd spread over two villages, Cōlakēraṇanallūr and Kalaśāttankuḍi. From the date of the allotment, the 97 *Āṇḍars* could not agree among themselves to equitably or proportionately decide the respective individual shares of paddy or even the lands. Every year the proportions were being altered, and every year the shares of yield were also being revised. Hence none was enthused to cultivate the lands and a deficit in yield had also resulted. The problem appeared to be that because of the varying yields from the different parcels no agreed pattern of sharing of the land or the yield could be evolved, nor was there a localised parcel assigned to each *Āṇḍar*. Hence it was submitted that the lands and the shares of yield should be localised and equitably apportioned together and distributed among the 97 *Āṇḍars*. The deity granted this request so that the 97 *Āṇḍars* and their heirs or successors in title could enjoy the assigned share of the holdings and/ or the yield. The revised arrangement took effect from A.D. 1201.

“(Nām aḍaitta nāl mudal nellum nilamum tangalil okka kūriḍāmayālē āṇḍugaḷ tōrum alittu kūriṭṭuvarugayālē innilamgaḷ oru-varum utsāham paṇṇāmayālē taṭṭuppaṭṭu vārāninṇadenṇum tangalil nellum nilamum okka sērtuc sērtta paḍiyē amubhavikkapperavēṇum eṇṇu)”

100. The argument only emphasises the prevalence of individual enjoyment and holdings vis-a-vis the concept of collective community-holdings. But such individual enjoyment could well be a joint one of several coparceners in a family.

and enthused none

Epigraphist.

102. A.R.E. 300/1923; 311/1932 - Tirukōṣṭiyūr

Land-grants were made, sometimes, on mistake of fact. Kāṅgēyarāyan, a Pāṇḍya Chieftain was informed that some lands in Maruṅgūr in Kōṇāḍu purchased by Viḷumiyan *alias* Bhuvanamuḷuduḍaiyān Pallavadarayan was without any occupant, as the vendee and his progeny had deserted the village. The chieftain granted the lands to the new shrine set up for the goddess Āḷuḍaiyanācciyār in Kuḍumiyāmalai. A claimant, Uḍayanayar *alias* Jayatuṅgarayan produced his title-deed to show that he had purchased the lands from the heirs of Bhuvanamuḷuduḍaiya Pallavadarayan. Thereafter, the chieftain, Kāṅgēyarāyan revised the grant; the claimant would enjoy the occupancy rights (*Kārāṇmai*) and *Kaḍamai* or the land-dues share was to be enjoyed by the new shrine.¹⁰³

These instances would suffice to bring out the deep-rooted sense of individual sense of holding and enjoyment of the land. Private holdings were the preferred pattern for obvious reasons of facility of enjoyment. Communal holdings, or lands collectively held by the township existed, and were managed by the townships. But they were increasingly getting diminished with their conversion progressively into individual and separate occupant holdings.

11. Disputes between the occupant and the tenants

A piquant situation arose in the distant Nandalūru in A.D. 1257-58. Perungaṇḍūr was a *Brahmadēya* granted as early as in A.D. 808 by Mukkaṇṭa-Kāḍuveṭṭi to 52 Brahmins. The donees were in enjoyment for long, when some Velamas from Irumbrōlu migrated on account of *Mārijvaram* (plague [?]) in their habitat.

They engaged themselves as tenants, and agreed to pay rent for the *Brahmadēya* lands, together with the residents of Sākali-Kōḍūru who had also migrated to Perungaṇḍūr on account of riots in their place. During a famine the Brahmin occupants left the place. When they returned later, they found themselves displaced by the newcomers who renamed the settlement as Kōḍūru and refused to hand over possession and pay the rent. The Brahmin occupants represented to the Chief, Manumasiddhi. The chief enquired into the complaint summoning the cultivators and the witnesses. He directed that the Velamas of Irumbrōlu should undergo the fire ordeal or alternatively have the ordeal undergone by the Brahmins to establish their respective title. As they were not agreeable to either, an adverse inference was drawn, and the Brahmin occupants were held to have had the lands for a long time past (*pūrvakālam*) and the grant was renewed to them for the merit of his father.¹⁰⁴

12. Obligations of the occupants and the tenants — the growing burden and the modes of relief.

Moving down the pyramidal structure of the land-tenancies, below the occupants were the sub-occupants or those who tenanted with them (*Kiḷkuḍigaḷilār*). Also the cultivating tenants (*uḷukuḍi-makkaḷ*). Perhaps we could expect the proportion of those who were actually cultivating the lands themselves to increase the lower down we move and *vice versa*. But this was not always the case.

Kaḍamai was the land-dues obligations payable by the occupants (*Perunguḍimakkaḷ; mēlkuḍi*) to the king or to an assignee. It was a charge on the land-holding (*Kāṇikkaḍan*).

104. S.I.I. Vol. XXIII, 580 - Nandalūru - (Rajampet Taluk, Cuddapah Dt.) For a similar restoration of prior settlers who claimed the land and even were prepared to take the fire ordeal, please see *I bid* No. 577.

Kuḍimai were the obligations of those who held the lands under the occupants, including the cultivating tenants, or cultivators-at-will. These, from early times, had comprised the following : (i) free labour for raising or maintaining or strengthening the embankments for the rivers (as for the Cauvery river - *Kulai*); (ii) putting the *Korombo* works across the river for diverting the waters into the open-head channels (iii) clearing the silt, and digging up the field-channels (*Sennīr-veṭṭi*), when freshes arrived.¹⁰⁵ To these should be added the contingent services, due when the King visited any place on tour. When a messenger of the King or of the *Nāḍu* arrived he had to be fed. Other occasional demands were the proportionate obligations required by the *Nāḍu* or the township as and when a breach had occurred to a water-course⁶ or the services and obligations at the festivals in the township temple. Sometimes the ancillary taxes in cash (*sillirai*) were also demanded from the tenants.¹⁰⁶

The Mannarguḍi inscription stipulates "No part of the *Kuḍimai* shall be collected from the Brahmins and the *Vellālas*."

Tenants from outside the township were discriminated against and they had to pay a cash levy (*Puṟavari*) but they were allotted house-sites to reside from the *dēvadāna* or the township lands when needed, but sometimes with added counterveiling obligations.¹⁰⁷

Land-grants to the temples, especially those to be reclaimed and to be brought under cultivation, afforded incentives by waiver

105. Please see the author's paper on "Allur & Īsānamangalam Revisited" in Dr. B.Ch.Chhabra Felicitation Volume

106. S.I.I. Vol. IV, No. 555 - Tiruvorṅgiyūr (Line 30 - which grants immunity to the cultivating tenants in this case) Also S.I.I. Vol. VII, No. 97 - Tiruvottūr (N.A. Dist)

On the distinction between *Kaḍamai* and *Kuḍimai* please see explanatory note (i) on 'concepts and Terminology' below, in the Appendix I.

107. Confer S.I.I. Vol. XIII, No. 170, 3rd piece, lines 29-32 - Kuttālam (Tanjore District)

of these obligations.¹⁰⁸ In rarer cases even the cash levy (*Puṇḍavari*) on the tenants from without was remitted. There were, of course, cases to the contrary. In Tiruveṇṇambūr, in A.D. 992, the cultivating tenants (*uḷukudigal*) had to measure paddy at one *Kuṇṇi* per *mā* of land for tank excavation.¹⁰⁹

Concessions were also shown for raising the preferred crops, like arecapalms. In A.D. 1010-11 the *Sabhā* of Uttama-cōḷacaturvēdimangalam waived 50% of the *Iṇṇai* on lands raising plantains till they came to yield, and for 10 years on areca-palms planted, and to be planted thereafter.¹¹⁰ In A.D. 1174 a count of areca palms trees bearing fruit was kept to be charged at the full rate, and the trees newly planted were charged at a concessional rate till they reached full-fruit-bearing stage. Even cultivable wet lands raising arecapalm were charged as for wet lands and not at the rates appropriate for areca-palms.¹¹¹ Considering the general scheme of assessment, based on crops grown, prevailing at the times this was, rather, exceptional.

From the reign of Kulōttuṅga I, the land-dues and the miscellaneous service obligations had tended to increase. They cast a heavier burden on the occupants and on the tenants and the cultivators. The symptoms of hard-ship and the incapability of the townships to pay the land dues could be traced to the 44th year of Kulottunga I (A.D. 1114), if not earlier. The *Ūrār* of Kalaśapākkam had to sell their land to Vāgiśan maṭha from whom they had borrowed the previous year to pay up the *Kaḍamai* demand.¹¹² The conditions worsened in the subsequent reigns of

108. S.I.I. Vol. VI, No. 555 - Tiruvōḷḷiyūr (line 30)

109. S.I.I. Vol XIII, No. 165 - Tiruveṇṇambūr.

110. S.I.I. Vol. VII, No. 412 - Tennēri (Kāñcīpuram Taluk)

111. S.I.I. Vol. VI, No. 438, Ālanguḍi (Tanjavūr District)

112. S.I.I. Vol. VIII, No. 324 - Tiruvadi (Cuddalore Taluk, S. A. Distt.)

Vikrama Cōḷa (A.D. 1118 to A.D. 1135) and his successors and the distress surfaced from different townships at different times. Siṅṅ-puttūr¹¹³ in A.D. 1122, Akkalamumadicaturvēdimangalam¹¹⁴ in A.D. 1124, and in A.D. 1125 Raṇadhīracaturvēdimangalam all had to sell lands to meet the land-demand due to the King. Even when a flood had damaged the crops, there could be no let-up in the payment of land-demand, and the Ūrār of Kuḍanagar were obliged to sell their land.¹¹⁶ In 1126 the Ūrār of Ariyāvūr lamented there was a shortfall in the payment of *Iṇṇai* for the township. The King's officers declined to remit the next year's demand. They had to sell some lands from their common holdings to pay the demand.¹¹⁷

In A.D. 1141-42, unable to pay the land-demand made, even though about 12 *vēlis* and 8 *mā* were lying waste and uncultivated for long, the *Mahāsabhā* of Kēraḷāntakacaturvēdimangalam sold lands in varied *Tarams*, ranging from 10th to the 13th to one Tirunarayūr Nāṭṭukkōṇ of Taṇḍantōṭṭam (in Kumbakonam Taluk). They agreed to retain the demand of *Kaḍamai* and *Antarāyam* on the lands sold at the same rates, even if a higher demand was fastened on the lands based on reclassification, and the revision of *Tarams* or on the basis of area-measurement “(*Taramaḷiṇṇu Taramiḍilum, Taramiḍātē Parappilē Iṇṇukilum*). The excess over the subsisting demand was agreed to be borne by the Township itself distributing that quantum among the other lands in the township.¹¹⁸

113. S.I.I. Vol. VIII, No. 305 - Tiruvadi (Cuddalore Taluk, S. A, Distt)

114. S.I.I. Vol. VIII, No. 304 - Tiruvadi (do)

115. S.I.I. Vol. VIII, No. 303 - Tiruvadi (do)

116. S.I.I. Vol. VII, No. 96 - Tiruvottūr

117. S.I.I. Vol. VII, No. 97, - Tiruvottūr

118. S.I.I. Vol. XXIII, No. 303 - Tiruviḍaimarudūr

In the 1(5) th year of Rājārāja II (A.D. 1148), the residents of Vānavanāyakapperunderu unable to bear the taxes migrated from the place. *Kaḍamai* rates appear to have been revised at 60 *kalams* per *vēli* and the evacuees were induced to settle again.¹¹⁹

A number of documents especially in the reign of Rājārāja II, Rājādhirāja II, Rājēndra III contain a set of collective decisions on the “do’s” and “dont’s” for the demands to be made on the occupants or the tenants’ obligations.

(a) Regulation of the occupant’s obligations *inter se* and to the King’s men

Two sets of regulatory measures could be distinguished. The first was the regulation of A.D. 1118 on the payment of the land-dues and their distribution among the township occupant holdings,¹²⁰ and the Townships’ obligations to the king and his men. The *Māhasabhā* of the *Taniyūr* Rājādhirajācaturvēdimangalam (Mannārguḍi) met under the mango-tree in front of the Viṣṇu temple. They resolved that the 30,000 *kāṣu* levied on the lands, included in the *Nagaras*, the holdings of the *Kaḷḷars*, and the *Nāḍu* shall be distributed among them on the basis of the *Maḍakku mā* (or standard *mā* or a conversion-factor based on assesment and land-classification) at a joint meeting of the assembly at the *Ambalam* together with the king’s officers. Payments shall be made on authorisation or deposited into the collection pot (*kuṇḍigai*) against signed receipts, in current *kāṣu*, and the entire amount settled at the end of the crop-year annually. *Iraikūli* or cash wages for collection of tax from the cultivating tenants (*Kuḍimakan*) shall cease to be

119. A.R.E. 234/1927 - Tirumāndurai (Tanjavūr Distt)

Also Part I for 1926-27 - p.82; para 26

“Please see appendix I - Explanatory note 5 for a short history of the distress conditions in the Cōḷa country.”

120. S.I.I. Vol. VI, No. 57 - Mannārguḍi (Tanjavur District)

collected, and if collected shall be refunded with a multiple, of the collected amount as fine. The Veḷḷālas' contribution for customary labour for *Korombu* work shall also be based on the *maḍukku mā*. No part of the *Kuḍimai* shall be collected from the Brahmins and the Veḷḷālas. They proceeded to regulate the obligation they owed to the King's officers on visits on duty. In this resolution, in the main, the *Mahāsabhā* were regulating their own obligations to the king and his men.

(b) Regulation of the obligations of the tenants and the cultivators vis - a - vis the township, the occupants and the king and his men

But the accretion to the land dues and the obligations had not abated in the subsequent reigns. That called for remedial action. The second set of measures¹²¹ regulated the dues and obligations cast on the tenants including the cultivating tenants. They were the outcome of the proceedings of a much larger assemblage in which not only the *Mahāsabhā* but the *Nāṭṭārs* of the five *Pēriḷamaināḍus* together met. They distinguished between the legitimate obligations that could be demanded from the tenants and the cultivators, and those which could not be. The irregular levies had taken the following forms :

- (a) the collection of cash in lieu of or in addition to the services that could be demanded on specified occasions or for particular tasks. In all such cases the restitution of services and the discontinuance of the collection in cash was insisted upon.

121. S.I.I. Vol. VI, Nos. 48, 50, 58 - Mannārguḍi (Tañjāvūr District)

- (b) Additional services were demanded over and above the customary obligations, and other than those on specified occasions or in stipulated forms.
- (c) Additional allowances not authorised by prescription were collected in cash and in paddy by various agencies severally the – soldiery, the revenue-collectors, and the chieftains or the king's men. The townships too, in their turn, added to the obligations distributed among the occupants and the tenants under them, reflecting, perhaps, the additional demands made on them.
- (d) demanding surety for liabilities from those other than the resident holders.
- (e) enforcing vicarious responsibilities for land-dues from the Brahmin holdings on the Vellālas and for the dues from both on the under-tenants.
- (f) severalty of levies or allowances claimed instead of an aggregate levy.

Cumulatively, these could have added to the burden, and more to the irksomeness due to the frequent, unpredictable or indiscriminate possibilities of levies and services demanded. The obligations were becoming numerous and elastic. The rigours of these levies were felt by all the townships, the occupants, and the tenants and the cultivators under them. The conduct of particular officials or agents could well have turned them into engines of oppression. What with the prevalent skewed distribution of the land-yields the impact of these burdens should have been disproportionately the highest on the lowest tiers of the agrarian formations. The Mannārguḍi inscription describes the distressing situation that arose as follows:

“As within this township collection in cash and in paddy on the area measurement of the lands are being made, that is, without regard to *Taram* and assessment classification arbitrarily, and without uniformity, by many in any manner they liked, and as these are unbearable, the *Veḷḷālas* have resolved that they will not reside in the township, as it was impossible to cultivate the lands any longer. The *Nāṭṭārs* have represented to us to this effect, and consequently the township has been facing an unbearable situation.” “*Nammūr Parapilē Kāśum neḷhum āha palavagai vandapaḍi taṇḍi kkoḷḷukaiyālē enḷukku Taripparudiyālē Veḷḷāḷmai śēydu kuḍi irukka pōkudillai enṟu nāṭṭavar vandusollukaiyālum ippaḍiyakaiyāl ūr taripparudi - uṇḍāyirukkayālum*” ¹²²

In A.D. 1169, regulations were made by the *Mahāśabhayār* and the *Nāṭṭār* together on the propriety of, and manner of discharging the *Kuḍimai* obligations, that is of the tenants and the cultivators, to the occupants, the township, and the king and his men.

Services for royal requisitions and for maintaining the Cauvery embankments shall be borne by the *Veḷḷālas* in proportion to the extent of the occupied holding of each. The obligations for feeding the royal messengers or clearing the field channels for the freshes shall be done and, in turns, by each (*āḷākacceyyavum*) and collectively (*aḷakka*) respectively. For remittance of collections to the Treasury at *Rājarājapuram* and check they shall detail at the rate of 1 person per *mā*, and not more. Only such additional hands as were actually needed at the receiving centre shall be sent. No wages or fee for the beasts of burden (for carrying the revenue-collections) shall be payable. For attendance on the scions of royal family (*Makkaḷ-śēvagappēru*), their servants shall collect at *Kuruṇi* paddy per *mā*, on area measurement and meet the expenses. No cash collection

shall be made. 1 *kāśu* and 1 *nāḷi* of rice per *mā* of area-measurement shall be paid each for the festivals of the Siva and the Viṣṇu temples. The soldiery shall collect cash from the sureties for the revenue in default only as per the memorandum (*Ninaippu*) of the King's officers. No other distribution of obligations or commands shall be entertained for cash and paddy collection on the total area of the lands. Only so much of hay and hayropes as were needed for the repairs and re-roofing of the common-place, the *ambalam* shall be taken and utilised. No other cash or paddy on various other sundry items, and for the collectors of revenue, for the accountants of field revenue registry, and for the soldiery, shall be levied or collected. Every year the incumbents for the wards (*Kuḍumbu*) shall be changed, and only the worthy shall be inducted. The hamlets shall not be grouped with *Brahmin-Kuḍumbus*. The rate of distribution for the Township obligations shall be as was in vogue upto the *Kār* (first crop season) of A.D. 1160 - at 30 *kāśu* per *maḍakku mā* (standard *mā* based on productivity) and for *piśānam* 50 *kāśu*. The collection of the distributed obligation at *kāśu* per 1 *mā* in area measurement (*Parappu*) shall be discontinued. None shall carry tales to the King's officers and the chiefs, against the Brahmins or the *Vellālas* or the accountants and those who did so shall be deemed to be the enemies of the *nāḍu* and the township. Only levies authorised by the *Mahāsabhā*, by written resolutions shall be made for any other common purpose.¹²³

In the 3rd year of Rajendra (III ?), similar concessions to the tenants were also extended in Uḍayārkōil by the temple authorities.¹²⁴

123. S.I.I. Vol. VI, Nos. 48, 50, 58

124. S.I.I. Vol. VII, No. 1039

In A.D. 1176, the scale of land-dues (*Varisai*) to be paid by the occupants was reduced in Tirukkarugāvūr and Āccālpuram (Tañjāvūr District). Also the rates on lands held on crop-sharing basis or under lease from the temple were lowered.

Upto the year of the record	From the year of the record	Reduction	Remants
(All in Kalams per <i>śey</i> $\frac{1}{4}$)			
80	70	10	
75	65	10	
70	60	10	
60-45	55-35	5	
40-30	35-25	5	K T P
25	21- $\frac{1}{2}$	3- $\frac{1}{2}$	3 1 1
20	18	2	

(K—*Kalam*; T—*Tūṇi*; P—*Padakku*)

In other tenures like Vellālanparṛu (peasant-occupants under the State), *Dēvadāna* and *Purāparṛu* (land held by occupants from outside (?), $\frac{2}{5}$ of the yield shall be taken inclusive of wages for labour. For lands under *Kuḍiparṛu* (held by the cultivating tenants-at-will), the cultivator shall be entitled to $\frac{1}{3}$ of the produce. For lands irrigated by baling the cultivator shall take $\frac{1}{2}$, to compensate the additional labour and cost entailed. In lands left uncultivated, if catch crops like gingeley & greengram were grown, $\frac{1}{2}$ *Vāram* shall be taken by the cultivator. Transport charges, and labour for taking out the paddy for measurement in the *Kār* season shall be borne by the cultivators. The occupants shall supply the seed-paddy for sowing.

Dry land demand was also reduced :

Upto the year of the record	From the year of the record	Reduction
(All in <i>Kasu</i> for <i>śey</i> $\frac{1}{4}$)		
20	17	3
18 to 10	16 to 8	2
10 to 5	8 to 3	2
5	4	1

When *Kaḍamai* was being realised the State officials shall not enter any dwelling houses or levy fines nor torture any (*aravaḍaṇḍam*). One cultivator shall not be made liable for the dues of another. Persons not agreeing to these terms shall relinquish or be removed from their tenancy”¹²⁵, and the lands shall be entrusted to those who abide by these terms.

The Cōḷa kingdom had been weakened by the Cōḷa-Pāṇḍyan wars in the reign of Kulōttunga III. A famine in A.D. 1201 added to the distress when even at Tiruppuḷambiyam paddy was sold at 3 *nāḷi* per 1 *kāśu*, and children died for want of food.¹²⁶ It was recognised in about A.D. 1200 that if *Kuḍimai* were to be levied (without resuming the lands) and at the prevailing cash rates, the collection would show a deficit (*Tiṭṭum*). Hence *Kuḍimai* was to be collected as for half of the total extent cultivated, in the aggregate. This arrangement continued till the 28th year (A.D. 1206). But in 1207 the revenue collectors insisted on cash payment at the rates specified in the accounts and caused hardship. On

125. A.R.E. 1919, Part II, Para 19 - ARE 429, 538 of 1918
The term “*aravaḍaṇḍam*” is better interpreted as “use harsh words.” Pl. see explanatory note below.

126. A.R.E. 1911/86
A.R.E. for 1910-11, p.74

representations made to the King he restored the concessional rate prevailing upto A.D. 1206.¹²⁷ This happened in Kaḷappāḷ in the Cauvery delta itself.

As a policy, 40% remission of the land-demand appears to have been made even in the 16th year (A.D. 1194).¹²⁸ Similar remission was ordered expressly in A.D. 1209.¹²⁹ The distress was so great that even the Subrahmanya temple at Śāḷuvankuppam had to dip into its own treasury to make good the deficit in land-dues payment (*uḷḷūril Iṟai Iṟippu aridāi S'ribhaṇḍārattil Taṭṭiṟai Iṟukkayil*) and sold some lands in A.D. 1215 so that the arrears might not compound and be recurring.¹³⁰

The policy of realising only 60 kalams against 100 kalams for Iṟai was continued by Rājarāja III. the ill-fated successor of Kulōttunga III, Even the *Antarāyam* was directed to be reckoned on the basis of the reduced Iṟai in A.D. 1238.¹³¹ In A.D. 1258-1259, due to the additional imposts of *Ponvari*, *Antarāyam*, and *Kōiltamarppēru*, i.e., tax in cash, cash-levy on the tenants, and a cess for the king's servants even on *Dēvadāna lands*, no tenants undertook the cultivation of the temple lands at Paṭṭukkōṭṭai. The temple fell into disrepair, and the worship and the services therein ceased. The Chieftain Kaḷappāḷan abolished these exactions, and the services were resumed.¹³²

127. S.I.I. Vol. VIII, No. 263 (Kaḷappāḷ, Tirutturaipūṇḍi Taluk)

128. S.I.I. Vol. XXIII, No. 392 - Maruttuvakkuḍi (Kumbakonam Taluk)

129. S.I.I. Vol. XXIII, No. 373, 375 - Māyūram

130. S.I.I. Vol. IV, No. 381 - Śāḷuvankuppam

131. S.I.I. Vol. XXII, No. 388 & 391 - Maruttuvakkuḍi

132. A.R.E. 1925/339 - Paṭṭukkōṭṭai

The whirligig of Time brings in its revenges. Rājarāja I enforced the prohibition of alienation of *Dēvadāna* and *Brahmadēya*, lands granted on concessional terms. By the time of Rājarāja III, the excessive demands made even on such tenure-holders compelled them to alienate their lands as the only possible means of meeting such excesses.

It is legitimate to infer if the *Dēvadāna* lands, admittedly on favourable tenure, were burdened with such exacting levies, the direct holdings of the occupants should have fared equally badly if not worse.

The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom

Additional imposts were also noticed in the Pāṇḍyan kingdom. This could be expected. The Cōla-Pāṇḍya wars had debilitating effects on both the Kingdoms impartially. A devaluation of currency had also occurred.¹³³ The need for resources could have been equally exacting in the Pāṇḍyan Kingdom at the time of Māḡavarman Sundara I. Revision of *taram*, consequential increases in demand, and additional levies came to be effected, and the townships were visibly feeling the strain.¹³⁴ The Brahmin holders of (Tirunelvēli) Kulaśēkharacaturvēd-imangalam had been, from time immemorial, (*anādiyāga*) paying cash and paddy as *Kaḍamai* at rates fixed in 8 tarams in which their lands were classified and grouped). In A.D. 1227 this was done away with, and *Kaḍamai* was demanded on the basis of area (*Virivile*) measurement. The change was represented against to the King, who countermanded the higher levy by the officers, and ordered the continuance of the earlier rates.¹³⁵ Two years later, (1228-29) a further concession ordered by

133. Please see my "Studies in Pudukkottai Townships" - page 83; footnote 95 at page 110.

134. On this growing burden of land-dues, please see the study on the subject in the author's "Studies in the History of the Ancient Townships of Pudukkottai" (pp. 181-187)

135. S.I.I Vol. V/413 - Tirunelvēli

the King was to regroup the lands into three *Tarams* instead of eight.¹³⁶ This was a case where relief was afforded at the instance of a highly-placed chief Kaṇḍiya Thēvar, a scion of the Pāṇḍyan royal family.

Land demands made in the Periccikōil and Kaṇḍramāṇikkam (Tiruppattūr Taluk) were even more exacting, and led to more serious consequences and even curiouser remedies. In A.D. 1225 Śigupericciyūr and Kaṇṭāppūr were so reduced to straits that the residents began to feel life in the woods would be preferable; already, they were suffering for four years.¹³⁷ It was not till the 19th year of Sundara Pāṇḍya I that adequate relief was afforded; perhaps the relief afforded earlier was inadequate.

Kaṇḍan Āluḍaiyan Gāṅgēyan realised the people were unable to pay the revenue at the old rates in force from the 5th year. The modes of relief he afforded were curious. He did not alter the rates of levy. But he changed the unit of area-measurement of land, and the area content (perhaps based on or assessment *Taram*), and varied the rate of exchange of the *Diramams* to *Kāśu* to the advantage of the occupants from 5 *mā Diramams* to a *Kasu* to 7 *mā Diramams* to a *Kāśu*.

Hitherto 1 *mā* was 18 span square. It was changed to 24 span square which would be equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ *mā* and 1 *mundirigai*. Thus the area content was doubly increased per unit of *Kaḍamāi* levy.

Again, the supplemental tax of *Antarāyam* was paid in cash, in *Diramam*. The value of *Diramam* was varied from 5 *mā* to 7 *mā* of *kāśu*, an advantage of about 40% for the payer.

136. S.I.I. Vol. V, Tirunelvēli - A tank near Tirunelvēli even today bears his name.

Thirdly, the standard grain measure was changed from 6 *kalams* to 7 *kalams* and 3 *Kuruṇi* - an excess credit of 20.8% on this account for the tendered paddy was given. The rates, however, continued to be the same, and in the same proportion for *vāram* (crop sharing) as was in vogue. Allowance was made for any deficit in the actual yield from the lands. Everything else was variable but not the rate.¹³⁷ Gāṅgēyan was a pastmaster in the art of fiscal fiction.

A record from Tirukkaḷar¹³⁸ detailed the obligations of the cultivating tenants vis-a-vis the occupants. It was an agreement given by more than five Brahmadēya residents, and the *Nāṭṭār* of Puṛakkarambaināḍu. It is addressed to the leader of the cultivating agriculturists - Kārāḷa Kaṇṇapa - Sāmaya - cakravarti of Pūmpuhār, Padinenbhūmi in 79 Vaḷanāḍu. Though there are local variations among the different signatory-townships, the gist of terms are as follows:

Two main categories of land engagements were in vogue. One, based on the graded crop-wise scale of levy (*Variśai*), for which the cropwise rate of *Kaḍamai* was to be collected according to the written engagement (*Aḍaiōlai*). The *mēlvāram* or the occupants' share shall be taken on the actual yield based on the assessed estimates in field (*Pullipārta*). The crop assessment shall

137. - A.R.E. 91/1924 - *Periccikōyil*. Working backwards from the date of the inscription 9th year, the distress commenced in the 5th year; that gives the clue. The Pandya ruler was mustering resources and the forces for the continuous onslaught on the Cōḷa empire.

- A.R.E. 73/1924. *Periccikōyil* Also please see para 31 of A.R.E. Report 1923-24

138. S.I.I. Vol. VIII, No. 251 - Tirukkaḷar (Mannārgūḍi Taluk)

be done together with the cultivators, and the assessed yield shall be noted in the field itself. The lands not on *variśai* shall be estimated and supervised in field and $\frac{1}{4}$ *vāram* shall be given for the share of the cultivator. No *Kuḍimai* shall be taken on these lands. For *Kuḍimai* on *Variśai* lands and for house-site cess (Manaivarivagai).

For Kār & single crop lands ... 1 *paṇam* per *mā*
to $\frac{3}{4}$ *paṇam* per *mā*
(according to the
different ayacut - rates)

For the II crop & post-
cultivation (catch crops)

Kuḍi - Kuḍaiyiḍu ... $\frac{1}{2}$ *paṇam* per *mā*

These shall be paid in cash. For additional varieties of crops (*Kūṭṭum* - *vargattukku*) 1 *kalam* per *mā* was the rate to be collected. A wastage and driage allowance of 4 or (in some places) 3 *nālīs* per *kalam* shall be added. No other miscellaneous levies as *Māppaṇam* (cash levy per *mā* on land), *Manaippaṇam* (for house-site) and *Paṇavattam*, (for any currency variation ?), *vēlippaṇam* (lavy of *paṇam* per *vēli*) and *Nāṭṭusammadam* (levies by sanctions of the *nāḍu*) shall be collected. The seeds, (if supplied by the occupant at the commencement of the cultivation) shall be recovered out of the harvest-produce. If paddy were to be tendered in the form of rice after hulling, the hulling and transport charges shall be paid by the occupant. Securities shall be taken only from among the residents of the township, and the hamlets comprised within and not from outside. The cash to paddy nexus rate shall be at the prevailing market prices. Receipts shall be passed then and there for each day. The engagements shall be renewed or re-entered into each year and the accounts settled in the month of *Vaikāśi* or *Āni* (May-June; June-July). They shall not be carried over

but settled then and there and receipts issued. If there was loss of yield, a proportionate reduction in *Kuḍimai paṇam* shall be granted. The superintending fee (*Nettāl Kūḷi*) for harvest and threshing operations, shall be paid and his servants shall be fed by the cultivators. No billeting or feeding of the soldiery on the move (*Paḍayli-ānavaḷi*) shall be borne by the cultivators. This was dated in 44th year of Māḡavarman Kulśekhara, and if assignable to the first ruler of that name, it could have been made in A.D. 1311-2.

An episode of about the same time, A.D. 1312, from Kariśūḷṇ-damangalam could be recalled. There was a *maṭha* in that township headed by Śrīpādatīrthasvāmi. A competent manager of the properties of that *maṭha* Irvuṭṭukkāl Maṇiyan, died. His son, Nārāyaṇan, proved unequal to the task. The land dues to the *maṭha* fell into arrears. This affected the conduct of the *maṭha*. The admonitions by the Head of the *maṭha* to the new incumbent and the intervention of the *Sabhā* of Kōḍānūr (across the river Tāmbraparṇi) proved of no avail. Nārāyaṇan surrendered the responsibility for managing the *maṭha* and the temple lands stating "in these days they (the tenants and the cultivators) would not pay the dues in paddy and money (*Ikkālattu nellum paṇamum Tārār enṇu śolli*). Thereafter the head of the *maṭha* had to appoint another capable and ardent devotee of his to manage the properties.¹³⁹

This instance would bring out that without competent and effective management the realisation of dues from the tenants and the cultivators was not all that easy even in the early 14th century.

139. A.R.E. 203, 204, 205/1932-33. Please see the author's history of this township in South Indian Studies, Vol. II, published by Dr. R. Nagaswami (SAHER Publications, Madras, No 4 - 1979) - Kōḍānūr is identical with Kōḍavanallūr in Tirunelveli Taluk.

13. A Summing Up

In the Cōla and the Pāṇḍya times, tenurial changes and changes in tenancy were not infrequent. But expressions like '*Kuḍinikki*' should not be taken to mean that there was either an area-wise exclusion from the grant deed. Nor can it mean physical eviction of the tenants from the township. What was intended was to extinguish the subsisting terms of occupancy so that the new grantee could enter into mutually acceptable terms afresh with the occupant, consistently with the terms of the grant. In actual practice, too, their residential attribute conferred a preferential claim on them. It acted both ways; the occupants' choice was restricted and so too, was the tenant's. This could account for the limited exercise of the option of relinquishment.

The rates of land dues and obligations to a grantee were more favourable, when the subsisting rights were extinguished than in cases in which they had continued. The permanency of occupancy, with latent rights to recover possession even after temporary breaks was an added attraction to the occupants. A few cases studied seem to suggest a direct-holding under the King, was in the view of the participants a preferred and more attractive form of holding than tenantry under an assignee. But this depended on the situational context such as the rates of demand, the productivity of the soil, and the location of the field vis-a-vis that of the beneficiary. In two cases in the reign of Rājarāja I and Rājendra I, the occupants and sub-occupants voluntarily relinquished their holdings, due to the terms of engagement being unfavourable to them. But these are episodes and, in themselves, too inadequate for an inductive generalisation.

Undoubtedly, the Townships were intent on converting common lands held by them into the occupant-holdings of individuals, even offering inducements in appropriate cases. The consciousness of individual holdings was too deep-rooted even in the early Cōla times, to be

ignored, and its advantages were recognised by the occupants. In case of disputes between the occupants and the tenants, the prescriptive title, even if interrupted by temporary break in possession, was the determining factor. Resort to ordeal to prove the respective averment was enjoined on the disputants where documentary proof or other evidence was not available.

The tenants and the cultivators had their distinctive rights and obligations. The insistence was on the tenants' obligations (in the form of labour or service) to the King and his men, the *Nāḍu*, the township and the temple. From about the beginning of the 12th century there is evidence of increases made in the rates of land levies due to the State. Perhaps, the grantees also could have marked up the land-dues payable by the occupants and tenants to them in sympathy. Changes were occurring, and for the worse. Multiplicity of levies, substitution of cash for services, additional obligations in cash, kind, and in labour, were all characteristics of the growing burden of land-dues cast on the occupants, and both through them and directly too, on the cultivators. The agrarian community were in distress, and a number of regulatory measures were adopted by the townships and the *Nāṭṭār* in the heartland of the Cōḷa country in the second half of the 12th and the 13th centuries. Similar experience in the Pāṇḍyan country was also in evidence.

The whirligig of Time brings in its revenges. Rājarāja I enforced the prohibition of alienation of *Dēvadāna*, and *Brahmadēya* lands granted on concessional terms. By the time of Rājarāja III, the excessive demands made even on such tenure-holders compelled them to alienate their lands as the only possible means of meeting such excesses.

Relief was also sought and afforded in the rates of levies due to the King. But relief was afforded in varied forms. Two modes of land-demand were in vogue – one based on the area-measurement (*virivilē*;

parapilē) and the other on the telescopic rates for the different grades (*Taram* of land) based on assessment classification which appear to have been reduced into a standard conversion unit or scale (*maḍakkumā*) for lack of money - rates table perhaps. The latter could have been, perhaps, the more equitable if not favourable to the occupants and the cultivators. The relief afforded took the following forms :

- (1) To Peg the *taram* rates at the pre-existing levels, exempting them from future increases on revision of *taram*.
- (2) To reduce the *tarams*, thereby affording a benefit in the average incidence of land-demand.
- (3) To afford a flat rate of reduction. The most persistent rate of reduction was 40% in the rate of *Kaḍamai*. This should have had a more ready application, where land-demands had been fixed as a lumpsum.
- (4) Defining the relative obligations of the occupants and the tenants and the cultivating tenants :
 - (i) to contain the labour/service obligations, and to the authorised occasions/contingencies,
 - (ii) to limit cash levies,
 - (iii) not to substitute cash levies for services, and
 - (iv) to stipulate their respective shares in share-cropping system, and
 - (v) to insist on written engagements to be renewed or re-drawn at the end of each harvest year, and
 - (vi) settlement of accounts to reach finality at that time every year.
- (5) Varying the unit of measurement, the area-content, and the rate of exchange for the currency by revaluing the tendered Diramam, and devaluing the Kāśu, and the content of the standard grain measure - in fact all ingredients, except the rate - to secure a cumulatively favourable reduction, in real terms, in the quantum of land-dues cast on the occupants.

(6) The respective obligations of the occupants and the tenants too were getting at once more and more complex and defined by the beginning of the 14th century. An exasperated cry if only a lone incompetent Manager of the occupant - institution was already audible - that "the tenants and the cultivators would not these days, deliver land-dues in paddy and cash on the assigned lands." It could easily result from incompetent management or at any rate the management could cite it as a convenient excuse and cover for its own incompetence.

Some of these features described my appear to be startlingly modern. But economic motivation and forces at work could hardly distinguish a rigid periodisation of Time. To an actual participant in the revenue settlement proceedings at practised even in contemporary times, they would not come as a surprise. As one unsympathetic administrator put it, there was always room for "a lot of hocus - pocus in field revenue settlement". It is as true of the British times when soils "as red as Chepauk"¹⁴⁰ in the red uplands of Sivakasi were classified as black, as it could be of the revenue modalities of the middle ages!

140. The phrase is D.T. Chadwick's in his Resettlement Report for the Sattur - Srivilliputtur Taluks.

APPENDIX—I

EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. Some Concepts and Terminology Explained :

(i) The term "Township"¹ has come to be appropriated in modern usage by a part of the human settlements in urban concentrations. Etymologically, it is derived from the German word "Tun" meaning a hedge. It not only refers to a well-marked-out territorial area but also to the community inhabiting that area. It connotes the agrarian character of the community, and denotes the land, the habitation, and the organised form, in which the community living in its confines, had acted and behaved. The term "Township" is an apt rendering of the term "Ūr" or the "Grāma". The Cōḷa and the Pāṇḍya inscriptions refer to the planting of prickly pear or/and stones to demarcate the boundaries of the townships or a grant-village. In other cases, an earthen wall enclosed the habitat, and its appurtenances.

(ii) There were several varieties of the townships. Each type was largely determined by the predominant composition of the community residing within it.² The "*Brahmadēya*" the comprised predominant population of the land-based literati, the Brahmins as land-holders or the occupants.

1. Prof. F.W. Maitland - "*Township and Borough*" Ford Lectures; Oxford University press (Revised Edition; 1964).

2. For illustrative histories of different types of townships, please see the author's "*Studies in the History of the Ancient Townships of Pudukottai*" (Institute of Epigraphy, Tamil Nadu State Government Department of Archaeology; 1982)

The “*Nagara*” was the township where *par excellence* the merchants had occupancy rights in the land. The “*Ūr*” had the agriculturist-occupants either directly paying land-dues to the State, or to the assignees in whose favour they were granted in whole or in part. The “*Paḍai Paṟṟu*” was only a species of the “*Ūr*”, with this difference that the agriculturist-landholders therein had the obligation to render military services in times of war either to the chieftain to whom the land-dues or a portion thereof had been assigned as “*Jivitam*” (for his subsistence) or to the king. The term “Township” is, then, a generic term applied to any or all of these varieties.

In a work on “agrarian reactions,” it will be necessary to indicate the different sections of the agrarian community that occur in the inscriptions. Various terms are used. “*Kārāṇmaiṭṭālar*”, “*Veḷḷān vagai*,” “*Kuḍi*,” “*Kāṇiyālar*,” “*Kiḷ - kuḍigalilār*,” “*Kiḷ - kārāṇmai Uḍaya Kuḍigal*,” “*Mēlātci - Uḍayār*,” “*Uḷugudi Makkaḷ*,” “*Uḷudān Kuḍi*,” “*Kuḍi-makan*” are some of them.³ At the outset it will be necessary to have some conceptual clarity as to whom these various terms refer, and also, if possible, to fix the denotative purport of each term. This is attempted below :

(iii) “*Veḷḷān Vagai*” denotes holdings in which an occupant has full rights on the land subject only to the payment of the land-dues direct to the king, through the collective agency of the *Naḍu* and the *Ūr* or to the assignees in whose favour the king had granted his share of the dues.

(iv) “*Kārāṇmaiṭṭālar*” could also refer to such occupants. But it has a distinction. The land-obligations - to pay *Kaḍamai* (the principal levy on land) could be due to an assignee. The proceeds or yield of

3. There is a peculiar elusiveness in the meaning of some of these terms in medieval usage; the characteristics of each have to be derived largely from the context.

cultivation *minus* such obligations could be held by an occupant, who may himself cultivate or cause it to be cultivated for himself. Briefly, the term “*Kārāṇmayālār*” denotes an occupant, having the right to enjoy the fruits of cultivation after paying the land-dues.

(v) “*Kāṇiyālār*” is also a term denoting an occupant either under the king or under a grantee. He had an inextinguishable right over the land which is his holding (*Kāṇi*) and had to bear the obligation fastened on the land (*Kāṇikkaḍan*). This term, as the following one, “*Kuḍi*” also occurs in various other meanings such as a service-holder, service-tenure holder, or having a right to any particular privilege, or franchise.

(vi) “*Kuḍi*” is used in a variety of meanings: it has to be understood only with reference to the context in which it occurs. The term, in its generic sense, could mean a tenant and more particularly, an occupant. It is also used to denote a cultivating tenant, a service holder or a tenant-at-will or a mere cultivator hired for labour. The specific sense of the term could be ascertained only from the context in which it occurs. It is not necessary that the *Kuḍi* should himself be the “actual” cultivator of the land, as was presumed or predicated of this term by Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri.⁴ In fact, the epigraphs apply this term to a Brahmin (*Sarvakṛatukkaḷ*) and to a chieftain from afar, who could not be the actual cultivators themselves.⁵ Hence it will be more appropriate to interpret this term “*Kuḍi*” as an “Occupant”; but it should be added it occurs also elsewhere in the sense of a sub-tenure holder, a cultivating tenant, or a cultivator-at-will.

4. “The Cōḷas,” Vol. II, pt. i, p.402 f.n. (1937 Edn.)

5. Vide pp. 200-201 in my “Studies in Ancient Townships of Pudukottai” for a discussion on this term.

In this treatise, the terms are rendered for the sake of uniformity as below:

<i>Vellān vagai</i>	}	"The occupant"
<i>Kārāṇmaiyālar</i>		
<i>Kuḍi (unless, otherwise indicated)</i>		

Broadly, the term "Kuḍi" occurs in the sense of an occupant in the first lecture, and the first part of the lecture II, and in the sense of a tenant under him or a cultivating tenant or a tenant-at-will in the second part in lecture II and in section 7 of these notes.

The different shades of the meaning attached to the other terms are brought out below:

(vii) "*Kiḷ kuḍigalīlar*" or "*Kiḷ kārāṇmai uḍaiya kuḍigal*" This term occurs in a significant inscription at Sucindram..⁶ Prof. Sastri has observed as follows:

"As the landlord might himself be the actual cultivator, the class of occupant-cultivators was sometimes distinguished by the name *Kiḷ kuḍigalīlar*, that is, the occupants with subordinate cultivation rights."⁷

There is scope for revising the interpretation of this term. If the occupant-cultivators are meant, the term "*Kārāṇmai uḍaiya kuḍigal*" will suffice. The rate of levy stipulated in the Sucindram inscription cited as due to them is 3 *kalams/tūṇi* per *mā*. This appears to be far less than what an occupant-cultivator could be expected to pay. This quantum is to be delivered to the "*Mēlāṭci Uḍayār*".

6. Travancore Archaeological Series, Vol. IV, pt.2, pp. 128-129.

7. "The *Ēṇḷas*" - Vol. II, pt.i, p.395 (1937 Edn.)

The term could be better interpreted as “the tenants having sub-occupancy rights.” as distinct and separate from the “main occupant” (the *Kuḍi*) under the *Dēvadāna* tenure of lands.

This interpretation gains strength from the circumstantial evidence of the case examined below. The rate above, at which the “tenants having sub-occupancy rights” had to pay was stipulated in A.D. 999. In the next year the *Mūlaparuḍaiyār*, or the Committee members attending to the temple affairs relinquished their lands. The text reads:

“*Srī kāryam āraikiṅṅa mūlaparuḍai Sabhayār iddēvar dēvadānaṅ-
gaḷukku Iṟai Iṟukka vuṇṇā-denṇum paraḍai kuḍigaḷāyittu paruḍai
kuḍi-yilārum Iddēvaṟṟkku Iṟaiyum Iṟukka vuṇṇādu*” etc.⁸

Here the term “*Paruḍai kuḍigaḷ*” could be equated with “*Kiḷ-
kāraṇmai uḍaiya kuḍigaḷ*,” i.e., the tenants with subordinate rights engaged under or by the *Paruḍayār* who were the principal occupants.

Alternatively, the temple itself might be the *Kāraṇmai* holder. The *Kiḷ-kāraṇmai-uḍaiya kuḍigaḷ* should then refer to the tenants under or deriving their cultivation rights (*Kiḷ kāraṇmai*) from the *Kāraṇmai* holder, the temple. The prefix “*Kiḷ*” in “*Kiḷ kāraṇmai*,” thus, is significant. It denotes the subordinate interest of this category of the tenants as distinguished from the principal interest of the occupant from whom the former interest is derived.

There could even be a class of intermediaries in between the occupant and the sub-tenants, or the cultivating tenants, in some cases, depending on the nature of the tenure and the manner of enjoyment of the land.⁹

8. T.A.S., Vol. II, pp.2-9

9. For a fuller discussion on this aspect, please see pp. 200-201 of the author's “Studies in Ancient Townships of Pudukottai” (1981), Tamil Nadu Department of Archaeology publication.

The term “*Uḷugudi makkaḷ*” or “*Kuḍi makan*” or “*Uḷudān kuḍi*” are rendered as the “cultivating tenants” or actual cultivators.

We thus have a four-tier organisation of landholders and tenants as set out in the paradigm below:

1. Principal occupant / grantee / assignee
Dēvadāna, Brahmaḍēya
2. Sub - occupant under him / the institution
(Kāṇiyāḷar, Kārānmaiyāḷar)
3. Occupant - Tenant
(Kiḷkuḍigaḷilār, Kiḷkārāṇmai uḍaya kuḍigaḷ)
4. Cultivating Tenant or Tenant - at - will
(Uḷuguḍimakkaḷ, uḷudān kuḍi)

In this schematic pattern, the “*veḷḷānvagai*” holder could be equated with (i), where he holds the lands directly under the king, and the *Kuḍi* or *Kāṇiyāḷar* with (2), where the land-dues from the lands held by him had been assigned to a beneficiary.

(viii) “LAND DUES” -- This term is consistently used in preference to ‘land-revenue’. The latter was only one component of the varied obligations that an occupant, and to the extent he reflected them on or to the extent such obligations devolved on them, the tenants including the cultivators had to render. These were varied in their form - in cash, in kind and in services. They were also due, in different components, to the different agencies. The *Kaḍamai* was payable to the king or his assignee. The distributed contributions were due proportionately to the *Naḍu* (*Nāṭṭu Vinīyōgam*) and *Sillīṟai* - smaller payments or obligations and services due to the townships. Thus the severalty of the obligations had to be

rendered to the plurality of institutions depending on the terms of the grant. The totality of the obligations is referred to as the ‘land-dues.’

(ix) “*Kaḍamai*” and “*Kuḍimai*”: Prof. Sastri has rendered “*Kaḍamai*” and “*Kuḍimai*” literally as “duty” and “tenancy-dues”. He observes: “*Āyam*” had apparently the same wide application as “*Iṟai*” and a number of minor dues were grouped together under the general description of “*S’ittāyam*” or “*S’illīṟai*”, both sometimes found used together in the same inscription. But the most significant grouping of the taxes and dues, that which provides a key to the whole tax system is that contained in the phrase like the following from an inscription of the 20th year of Rājarāja-I¹⁰:

“Any kind of *Kuḍimai* due at the sacred victorious gate, the taxation (*Varippāḍu*) levied by the Ūr (town or village) and any other type of *Kuḍimai*.”

The same inscription expands the last of the three items into “*Iṟai*” on those lands on which “*Iṟai*” was due, and “*eccōṟu*.”

Prof. Sastri distinguishes “the first division of taxes due at the sacred victorious gate,” i.e., at the king’s palace, as the taxes levied by the king’s government.

Then came dues levied by the local assembly, the Ūr, the *Sabha*, or the *Nagaram* and these were grouped under “*Ūriḍu varippāḍu*”, taxes levied by the town or the village. Lastly, it is to be noticed (he adds), that *Kuḍimai* was applied to all the groups without distinction; thus understood, *Kuḍimai* stands for the duties of the *Kuḍis* or the burdens of citizenship and is quite close in meaning also to *Kaḍamai*.¹¹

10. A.R.E. 121 of 1925 (Tiruvāvaḍuturai)

11. “The Cōlas, Vol. II pt.i, (1937 Edn.), pp.316-317.

The inscription referred to is an agreement by the Sabhā of Sāttanūr in Tiṟaimūr nāḍu and Siṟṟānaiccūr in Tiruvaḷundūr nāḍu to pay the taxes on the temple lands situated in their villages in lieu of the interest on the amount due from them to the temple which they were unable to pay. In other words, the townships took on themselves some of the obligations which still subsisted on the lands granted to or held by the temple.¹²

Sri T.N. Subrahmanyam renders “*Kuḍimai*” as a general term denoting all taxes with the exception of land revenue payable to the State for the protection it offers to the civil rights, tenancy tax.”¹³ This closely follows the explanation of the term by Prof. Sastri extracted above.

A closer analysis of the composite phrase “*Kaḍamai* and *Kuḍimai*” and the implications of each can be made with reference to the context, and the content of each as they occur in the inscriptions. *Kaḍamai*, is the land-revenue *per se* fastened on the land, due from the occupant to the king or his assignee. It could be pre-fixed on it even prior to the induction of an occupant or when the lands were graded for assessment. The obligation to pay *Kaḍamai* becomes effective only on the induction of an occupant. It is payable in kind (usually in paddy), or in cash or both, in the case of irrigated crops. It is a primary charge on the land and its occupant.¹⁴

12. Please see the abstract at page 505 - “The Cōlas” Vol. I (1935)

13. South Indian Temple Inscriptions, Vol. III, pt. (ii), Annexure at p.(xxix)

14. Please see my note on the phrase “*Kaḍamai koḷḷa kaḍan paṟṟāmayil*” - appended to “*Rājendra Viṇṇagār*” published by Tamilnāḍu State Department of Archaeology (1980).

Kuḍimai has to be distinguished from *Kaḍamai* by the nature of the obligation as well as the persons on whom the incidence fell. More often, *Kuḍimai* took the form of services to the king, or to the deity or to the Nāḍu and the township. It included within it the communal obligation of raising, protecting and maintaining the river embankments (*Kulai*), or cross-bunding the river for diverting water into the supply channels (*korombo*) and also for periodical silt clearance of field-channels when the freshes arrived (*Ṣennūr veṭṭi*). To these should be added the contingent services due, the attendance on the king and his entourage (*Tiruveḷucci-kkuḍimai*), when on tour, or at the palace gate (*Tirukoṟṟa vāśal*, *Tiruvāśal pōnda kuḍimai*). Every village had to depute its quota of men for watch and ward at the palace.¹⁵ In a Dēvadāna village, these services, in lieu of those due to the king, were made renderable to the deity. Even where the obligations due to the king were remitted they were merely transferred to the deity for whom the land-grant was made. Instances in which the *Kuḍimai* was payable in kind or in cash are also noticed but their quantum was far smaller than *Kaḍamai*. When a messenger of the king or the Nāḍu arrived he had to be fed. Other occasional demands were the proportionate obligations required by the Nāḍu and the township, as when a breach had occurred on a water course, or the service obligations at the festivals in the temples of the townships.

When the occupant was himself a tenant and or cultivator, these obligations were borne by him. In cases where the occupant himself was not or could not be a cultivator such as a *Brahmadēya* landholder or a

15. S.I.I. XXII No.33 - Tirukkaḍaiyūr - Rājarāja III 21st year (A.D. 1236-37) "*Tiruvāśalile engalūrkkāha niṟkinṟa meykkapār vaḷiyāha.*"

chieftain from afar, or was an assignee of land demand(*Kaḍamai*) with or without a share in the land-interest or land-yield(*kārāṇmai*) or an institutional beneficiary, then the tenants under them or the tenants-at-will or the cultivating tenants had to bear those obligations, and discharge them on behalf of the occupant. In other words, *Kuḍimai* obligations could and did befall a person who was not necessarily an occupant. The Mannārguḍi inscription is explicit that “No part of the *Kuḍimai* shall be collected from the Brahmins and the Vellālas” (S.I.I., Vol. VI, Nos. 48, 50, 58)

In addition to these services, miscellaneous levies usually clubbed as “*Ṣilliṟai*” like Antarāyam (paid oftener in cash, and rarely in kind as well) and the apportioned share of the levies made by common resolve or consent by the Nāḍu or the townships (Nāṭṭu viniyōgam or Ūr viniyōgam) had to be borne by the tenants or the cultivators. This latter included delivery of hay by each required for tatching the village meeting place, the *Ambalam*, besides the community services indicated, above.

Of course, where there was a failure on the part of the tenant or the cultivator, the obligation could be got discharged by the occupant or at his cost. For ultimately, the obligations were fastened on the land(*Innilattāl vanda*).

So then, the primary obligation of *Kaḍamai* or land-demand was that of the occupant. The primary obligation for the services and the miscellaneous levies(*Kuḍimai*) was that of the tenants and the cultivators under the occupants. The evidence summarised in lecture II and section 7 clearly confirms this interpretation.

In the Tiruvāvaḍuturai inscription cited, by Prof. Sastri the three items referred to are all of the nature of *Kuḍimai*, first the services due to the king, the second at the instance of the *Nāḍu* or the *Ūr* and the third others. They are all varieties of the same species - *Kuḍimai* and the townships agreed to relieve the

temple tenantry of these obligations. They have to be distinguished from *Kaḍamai* and cannot be clubbed with it. In fact, in the 13th century, as pointed out in section 7, the incidence of *Kuḍimai* had so disproportionately increased that the tenantry cried aloud for relief.

The main points that emerge from above the analysis are:

Kaḍamai was essentially an obligation cast on land and the attribute of occupancy.

Kuḍimai were the obligations varied in their nature, contingent, seasonal or communal in their character, and invariably borne by the tenants and the cultivators, especially in cases where the occupants or the landholders were not themselves the cultivators.

When a land was made tax-free (*Iṟaiyili*) in Uttiramērūr, the Mahāśabhā added that they shall not demand *Veṭṭi* (free labour), *Amañji* (labour for communal services), *Iṟai* and any other kind of levy from the *Kuḍis* (the tenants and cultivators):

“*Kuḍiyilār veṭṭiyum, amañjiyum, Iṟaiyum*
Eppērppaṭṭadum koḷḷapperāḍār āgavum.”¹⁶

Similarly, specific immunity was granted to the cultivating tenants in Tiruvoṟṟiyūr (Chingleput district)¹⁷ and Tiruvottūr¹⁸ (North Arcot district) from such obligations. An inscription from Tiruvoṟṟiyūr (31st year of Rājādhiraṇya, A.D.1049) is almost explicit on this point. The Brahmadēya sold the land to one Brahmin lady (Brāhmaṇi) of Āryadēśa who had endowed it to the temple.

16. S.I.I., VI, p.297, Uttiramērūr: Rājakēśari 15th year.

17. S.I.I., Vol. IV, No. 555, 1.30

18. S.I.I., Vol. VII, No. 97, 1.23

The cultivators who resided in the land and cultivated it were exempted specifically from *Sillirai* (subsidiary levies), *Sōru-māṭṭum* feeding the royal servants or messengers from the *Nāḍu* or *Ūr*, *Veṭṭi* (free labour), *Amañji* (free labour included):

“*Innilathil kuḍiyirundu innilam vulum kuḍigalai Sillirai sōru māṭṭum, veṭṭi, amañjiyum ullittana eppēpaṭṭa Iraikaḷum kāṭṭa peṟāḍōm āgavum viṟṟukkuḍuttōm*”¹⁹

The obligations of all kinds are clubbed under the generic term “*Irai*” here.

Prof. Sastri’s observation that the term *Kuḍimai* was applied to all the groups without distinction, and thus understood *Kuḍimai* stands for the duties of the *Kuḍis* or the burden of citizenship stems from the rendering of the term “*kuḍi*” not merely “as the occupant” which is sustained, but, as he has added,” the term implied the actual cultivator of the soil and not merely a lessee.”²⁰ This equation of the term with an actual cultivator swings the pendulum too far, and it was not the case in many instances.²¹ There was a clear distinction, even a contra-distinction, in a manner of speaking, between the occupant who need not be a cultivator, and a tenant under him or a cultivating tenant or a cultivator-at-will under the occupant. *Kuḍimai* were the obligations borne by these latter *Kiḷ kuḍigalilār* and *uḷukuḍimakkaḷ* and these could be demanded of them in the first instance.

The implications brought out here are implicit in the rendering of these terms by Prof. Sastri himself, and T.N. Subrahmanyam

19. S.I.I. Vol. IV No. 555 - 1.30, Rājādhirāja- - A.D. 1049.

20. “*The Cōlas*”, Vol. II, pt. (i), p.402 f.n.58

21. Please see the elaboration of this point at p.200 of the author’s “*Studies in Ancient Townships of Pudukottai*”.

elsewhere. While providing the gist of another similar Tiruvorriyūr inscription perhaps by the same donor, dated 30th year of Rājendra-I²² Prof. Sastri has rendered the purport as follows :

“The land purchased included house - sites for the tenants, who cultivated it, and it was also specified in the deed that the tenants were not liable to pay any kind of Iṭai such as (*the Kuḍimai of other inscriptions*) *Vetṭi Amañji and Kuru-nel.*”²³

T.N. Subrahmanyam renders “*Kuḍimaippāḍu*” as “Service, common work of the village”.²⁴ The use of the word “*pāḍu*” would connote the distribution of the share of obligation among every one of the tenants and the cultivators.

These would take the interpretation closer to the analysis I have made above. It would also corroborate the different shades of meaning in which the term “*Kuḍi*” occurs in the epigraphs.

It is necessary to emphasise that these conceptual contents of the terms should be kept in view while extracting the evidence from the epigraphs.

“*Kuḍi Nikki / Kuḍi Nīkkā*”

Some tenures are categorised as “*Kuḍi nikki*” and “*Kuḍi nīkkā*” These terms have been interpreted to mean “evicting the earlier occupants” or “without evicting the earlier occupants.”²⁵ They have been rendered differently as “transferring the labour employed therein.”²⁶

22. A.R.E. 155 of 1912 and A.R.E. 1913 II-22

23. “*The Cōlas*,” Vol.I p.567 - (1937 Edn.) italics mine

24. S.I.T.I., Vol. III, pt (ii), Annexure at p. xxix

25. “*The Cōlas*”, Vol. II, pt.(i), p.396. Also the “*Pudukottai Manual*”, Vol. II, pt. (i), p.662

26. A.R.E. 1925-26 - p.107

Sri T.N. Subrahmanyam has interpreted the term as follows :

“*Kuḍi Niṅga Dēvadāna*” - Endowment to a temple of lands already in the occupation of the cultivating tenants, i.e., only the MELVARAM share alone was granted to the temple. “*Kuḍi Niṅgā Iṟaiyili*” - tax free land or village without evicting the existing tenants, thus making the grantee only enjoy the proprietary right or the *Mēlvāram*.”

Kuḍi Niṅgiya Dēvadāna - Land or village endowed to a temple, after removing the previous tenants, thus making the temple enjoy both the proprietary and (the) cultivating rights.”²⁷

Burton Stein has taken the term “*Kuḍi Niṅgia*” to mean that “the temple was granted the land expressly without the benefit of cultivating labour.” He proceeds to state “this may have meant that the temple-donoree as part of the locality society had access to the local argrestic labour force or it may have meant that there was no shortage of such labour and it was the responsibility of the donee to acquire additional workers.”²⁸ In the view taken below, this statement would require revision.

In interpreting these terms, regard should be paid to the normally inward looking economy of the townships. The Perunguṭi Sabhā of Śrīraṅgam expressly prohibited the non-residents or those who had left the township (*Ivvūr Iṟandār*) to take on holdings in the Dēvadāna lands and flower gardens and cultivate them. If any transgressed this, the *Bhaṇḍāravāriam*, the treasury committee which

27. Annexure of S.I.T.I., Vol.III, pt.ii, pp xxix, xxx

28. The Cambridge Economic History of India (A.D.1200-1750), Vol. I(1982), Chap. II, p.31.

had authorised such transactions, and the accountant who wrote the agreement deed and those who left the township but took up such holdings shall severally pay 20 *pon* fine for oil for the temple lamp. The *Kaḍamai* or the land demand shall be borne by the committee members and the accountant (*Karaṇattān*).²⁹

This is a typical condition for induction to occupancy. The residential status of the occupant was a prerequisite. Occupants from outside (*puṛakkuḍi*) were discriminated against by a cash levy (*puṛavari*).

Based on the interpretation offered here they are rendered as “after extinguishing the subsisting occupancy rights”. or “without extinguishing the subsisting occupancy rights”. In the former case, the grantee could stipulate revised terms for occupancy. In the latter case, the grantee could only demand the subsisting rate of land-dues from the occupants.

This interpretation gets confirmed by two other cases, both from Tiruviḍaimarudūr. The first case is dated in the 6th year, 280th day of the king, probably Uttama Cōḷa, and if so, of A.D. 977.³⁰ The king granted the request of Arayan Parāntakan *alias* Śembian Cōḷia-arayan. The request was that the *Jivitam* grant he had earlier in *Nallaḍi* village in Tirunaṅgaiyūr Nāḍu shall be resumed (*Tavirndu*) and that the earlier occupants be changed,

29. S.I.I., Vol. III, No. 516--When an attempt was made to sell to an outsider a piece of land, the *Ūrār* of Turumā (Pudukottai) objected to it, and insisted on the prescriptive right of purchase by a resident of the township itself. I.P.S. 638 : Durvāsapuram.

30. S.I.I., Vol. XXIII - 257.

and the lands be granted as *Janmakkāṇi*, changing the earlier classification of lands as *Veḷḷān vagai*. The village was to be granted as *Dēvadāna Irāiyili* to Tiruviḍaimarudil Mahādēvar. The extent of the land so granted was 15 *vēlis* which were compressed (*Maḍakki*) and folded into $1/3$, as 5 *vēlis*, on the basis of assessment classification to measure at 120 *kalams* per *vēli*, in all yielding 600 *kalams* for the Śiva temple at Tiruviḍaimarudil. The lands shall be held by the suppliant and his descendants as *Kuḍinikkā Dēvadānam*. Even if the Dēvadāna occupants were charged any *Kātcivēlikkāśu*, *vēlikkalaviruddariśi*, and *Ūrkaḷaṇju* as *Āntarāya Kuḍimai* or these levies were varied, the fixed lumpsum levy on these lands shall not be changed or varied, nor shall the new or additional levies be saddled on these lands or the tenants cultivating them “*Uḷḷitta antarāyakkkuḍimaigal dēvadānam kāṇi terikkum iḍattu idu teriyāditāgavum*” The king assigned these fixed land dues at 600 *kalams* to meet the expenses of a monthly festival on his natal star, *Viśākham*. The grant was of both *Kārāṇmai* and *mīyatci* to the suppliant. The king also granted the request that the *antarāyakkkuḍimai* shall not be chargeable.

On a close analysis of the contents of this grant, the following inferences can be drawn:

(i) The prior *Jivitam* was only a grant of the share of the land-demand of the king. The *Veḷḷānvagai* tenure of the land with the peasants having the occupancy rights, was unaffected. The *Jivitam* was a superimposition, and a diversion or assignment of the king's demand or a portion thereof only. The other obligations of the *Veḷḷānvagai*, a direct holding of the occupants under the State, remained intact.

(ii) When the *Vellān Vagai* tenure was determined, the occupancy rights got transferred to the supplicant. The erstwhile *Vellān Vagai* holders would have had to continue as under-tenants or sub-occupants under the grantee.

(iii) The grantee had secured two additional benefits:

(a) A fixed lumpsum land-demand at 120 *kalams* per *vēli* for which *Tarōpādi* or Taram-based constructive extent was fixed at 5 *vēlis*. The area-equivalent measured 15 *vēlis*, Assessment-wise the constructive optimal demand was reckoned at 1/3 of the area-extent, at the normatic scale of land-dues reckoning with the varied classifications of the lands involved. This could be a concessional rate or it could reflect the lower classification for assessment that the lands had borne;

(b) The *Antarāyam* dues were not chargeable on these lands even if they were charged on other *Dēvadāna* holdings nor could the fixed quantum of demand be varied.

(iv) The “*Karāṇmai*” and the “*mēlāṭici*” rights were granted to the supplicant. The *Dēvadāna* grant was limited to the assigned land - demand at 120 *kalams* per *vēli* for 5 *vēlis* (constructively commuted extent on the basis of graded assessment).

(v) The tenure is described as “*Kuḍinikkā dēvadānam*” -i.e., the grant of the land with permanent occupancy for the grantee and his descendants, with assignment of land-demand to the temple.

(vi) The term “*Maḍakki*” in the context in which it occurs signifies the constructive extent, commuted on the basis of the

graded-classification of the land based on the differential rates (*Taram*) applied to different extents. This is distinct from the gross extent by area measurement. In this case, the former works out to 1/3 of the gross area extent. Was the levy of 120 *kalam*s itself concessional? The internal evidence available is inadequate to answer these questions.

The second instance also from Tiruviḍaimarudil throws some more clarification on this sub-tenure. This case is analysed already in the text of the lecture-II.

2. Reclamation Activity and Concessions to the occupants and the cultivators

Activity was intense in the villages of Allūr and Īśānāmangalam on the south bank of the river Cauvery from the time of Parāntaka-I to the time of Rājendra-I (A.D.907 to 1044) to reclaim the lands damaged by floods and sandcast.³¹ Similar intense activity was noticed in the *Dēvadāna* villages of Kāraikkūḍi and Taṇḍurai, farther east of Allūr and Īśānamangalam, also on the south bank of the Cauvery river, endowed for the kitchen expenses of the Śrīraṅgam deity. This activity was later, in the reigns of Kulōttuṅga-I and Vikrama Cōla (A.D.1070 to 1135). These latter could have been taken up as a result of the land surveys conducted in A.D. 1086.³²

31. Please see the author's Paper on "Allūr and Īśānamangalam Revisited" in *Svasti Sri*; Dr. Chhabra Felicitation Volume; (Agam Kala Prakashan, Delhi; 1984) pp. 25-55

32. Pl. see the author's paper on "Land Reclamation of sandcast lands of Śrīraṅgam Dēvadāna Villages" - Journal of the Epigraphical Society. of India, Vol.XI, 1984; pp.65-87)

The reclamation process had also extended to the uplands in the dry, rain-fed tract, south of Kālayārkōil (Sivaganga taluk) in Muḍikkarai. The lands endowed named Sūlāmaṇinallūr had been earlier assigned to a Brahmin of Mangalam (a village nearby) but it was still lying waste, and scrub jungle had overgrown on the lands. The tank had also been in ruin. In order to realise some capital for the repairs and renovation of the temple, the authorities decided to reinduct some Brahmins as occupants in return for realisation of the capital amount.³³ Muḍikkarai is a remote and inaccessible village beyond Mangalam in a dry and infertile area depending on rainfed tanks. The fact that the settlements and land occupancy had extended even to such remote areas in the 12th - 13th century could be an index of the pressure on land and reclamation activity even extending to marginal lands.

The occupants inducted for land-reclamation or waste lands to be brought under cultivation were afforded incentives by way of waiver of the *Kuḍimai* obligations.³⁴ In some rarer cases even the cash levy on the occupants or tenants from outside the township (Puravari) was remitted. They were also allotted house-sites to reside from the *Devadāna* or the township lands where necessary, but this allotment had some counter-veiling obligations.³⁵ These were reflected by the occupants to the tenants or the cultivators, as well. The *Orār* of Ennūr sold two *vēli* and 1½ *kaṇi*

33. The inscriptions were copied at my instance in 1983-84. They are dated in 8th year of Māḡavarman (sic) for Jaṭavarman Kulaśekhara (A.D.1198). The *Meykīrti* begins with "Pūvin Kiḷatti" [usually attributed to Jaṭavarman Kulaśekhara.

34. SII. Vol. IV, No.555 - Tiruvogḡiyūr (p.30)

35. SII, Vol.XIII, No.170, 3rd Paragraph; 11.29-32; Kuttālam

of land and 50 *kuḷi* for providing residence for the cultivating labourers or tenants (*Uḷukuḍi*) for 40 *kāsu* in A.D. 1073, the *Urār* bearing the *Kaḍamai* and *Antarāyam* obligations.³⁶

In A.D. 1200, an agreement was reached between the temple authorities of *Acyutamangalam* and the resident tenants, who had built houses on temple lands, which were not classified (*taramili*) in order to widen the street around the temple by forming a new street. The temple bore the cost of putting up the dwelling houses in the new street, in the case of their own occupancy or service holders (*Kāṇiyālar*), and it agreed to sell land as *Caṇḍēśvarapperuvilai* for others, who built dwelling houses thereon. The king ratified the remissions of taxes on the houses in the newly formed street.³⁷

In *Tiruvaṇṇāmalai*, in A.D. 1204, the *Mahēśvaras* ruled that when owners of houses sold their houses or sites in the lands appurtenant to the temple-site and owned by it they should fix their price, in consultation with the superintendent of the temple treasury. Out of the sale price realised, 50 per cent shall be paid to the treasury of the temple, and only 50 per cent shall be retained by the owner of the house-site. Those who objected to this rule shall pay double the amount and lose their house-sites as well.³⁸ This implied the application of the betterment levy principle.

When lands were lying waste for long, the *Mahāsabha* inducted occupants to bring them under cultivation. Lands in *Tribhuvani*

36. A.R.E. 133. of 1912

37. A.R.E. 407, 408 of 1925.

38. S.I.I., Vol. VIII - No.75.

were lying fallow for over 15 years. A *taram*-assessment fixed 30 years ago, had not left much even for paying the taxes. The *Sabhā* hence reclassified the land under the 12th class, reducing the rates of assessment in the 5th year of Kulōttuṅga-I (A.D. 1075).³⁹

A telling instance is from Tiruviḍaimarudūr in A.D. 1141-42 in the reign of Kulōttuṅga-II. In that year, the *Mahāsabhā* of Kulōttuṅgacōḷamaṅgalam, a Dēvadāna village, which was separated from Kēraḷāntakacaturvēdimāṅgalam, a *Brahmadēya* in Veṇṇāḍu in Uyyakkoṇḍān Vaḷanāḍu, executed a sale-deed in favour of Vāmanan Anbarkarasan *alias* Tirunaṅgaiyūr Nāṭṭukkōn of Taṇḍantōṭṭam. The lands sold were 12 *vēli* and 8 *mā* in area measurement. According to the prior *Taram* account, the lands were classified as under :

10th <i>Taram</i>	:	3 $\frac{3}{4}$, 4 <i>Mākkāni</i> , <i>Araikkāni</i> <i>Mundirigai Kiḷ arai</i>
11th <i>Taram</i>	:	5, 6 <i>Māvin kiḷ arai</i>
12th <i>Taram</i>	:	2 $\frac{3}{4}$, 4 <i>Mā-mukkāni</i> <i>Mundirigaḷi</i> <i>Kiḷ arai</i>
13th <i>Taram</i>	:	2 <i>mā varai</i>
Total	:	<i>vēli</i> 12 and <i>mā</i> 8

By rolling the different *Tarams* assigned to different parcels of land the the commuted consolidated *taram* extent was 4 *Mā*, *Mukkāni*, *Araikkāni Kiḷ* $\frac{1}{2}$

For one *Maḍakku Mā* - the rate of demand of *Kaḍamai* was : 150 *kalams*, 2 *Tūṇi*, *Padakku*, 4 *Naḷi* per *Mā*. *Antarāyam* per *Maḍakku mā* - at *Kaṣu* 4, 6/20,

Total demand : 21 *Kaṣu* and 778 *Kalam*, 1 *Tūṇi*, 1 *Padakku*

On the area basis, the demand was :

1 *vēli* — by *Ūrkāl* measure,

62 *kalam*, 2 *tūṇi*, 1 *Kuruṇi*, 4 *nāḷi*

Antarāyam basis : 1 *vēli* : $11/12 + 4/20$ *Kāṣu*.

These lands upto that time were uncultivable, and lying waste and none among the residents of the township could remove the shrubs and cultivate the lands and pay the land demand and the *antarāyam* had to be paid to the temple. Hence the sale.

The Mahāsabhā stipulated, while inducting the vendee into occupancy, that even if the existing *Tarams* were done away with and new *Tarams* were fastened, these lands shall be charged at the same *Taram*-rates as at the time of the sale. The vendee could raise any crops he desired, and shall remit on the basis of this *Maḍakku Mā* only the *kaḍamai* and *kuḍimai* and no higher demand shall be shown against him. Even if the *Taram* were revised, or if assessment was refixed not on the basis of *Taram* but on the basis of the area-measurement (*Taramaḷiṇṇu Taramiḍilum*, *Taramiḍāte Parapile Iṭukkilum*) the total demand for the village shall include only the demand specified above in paddy, and in *Kāṣu* in respect of the lands sold, and any excess of demand arising out of any revised assessment in future shall be distributed on the residuary lands of the township and borne by it.

This is an important document in many respects. Its features are explained in Section 3 in the Note on the Cōḷa land assessment modes. In this context, it is noteworthy, that the Sabhā had agreed to a fixed demand on the then existing basis, taking on the fluctuations on themselves consequent on any future revision of assessment.⁴⁰

In a contrary case, in Tiruveṟumbūr in A.D.992 the cultivating tenants (the *Uḷugudigaḷ*) had to measure paddy at one *Kuṟuṇi* per *mā* of land for the tank-excavation.⁴¹

Concessions for preferred crops

Conscious efforts to raise plantains and areca-palms were undertaken, and concessions were shown for such efforts in view of the longer time taken for the trees to come to yield. An additional instance is from Tribhuvani where the cultivation of areca-palms was encouraged in A.D.1098 by making the lands planted with palm, *Iḷaiyili*, not liable to land-demand, by the *Sabha* in accordance with a written order (*Kaḍaiyidu*) from the royal officers. Also lands in exchange were sanctioned for growing the areca-palms.⁴²

3. A note on the land assessment modes in the Cōḷa and the Pāṇḍya times

The Cōḷa land assessment mode has several intricate features which need to be unravelled. The available evidence is inadequate to set at rest all issues that are thrown up in the investigation of the subject. For one thing, the evidence is scattered, and fragmentary. For another, no exact ratio could readily be established between the classification and assessment. This note sets out the salient features as far as can be ascertained from the available data with reference to the present state of understanding of the problems.

First: Land records maintained were very detailed and intricate. The *Oḷugu* was the register of occupancy and enjoyment, *Vari* or

41. S.I.I., XIII No.165: Tiruveṟumbūr

42. A.R.E. 201 of 1919

Varipottagam was the register of assessment of land showing the tenure of the land, and the occupants from whom the land-dues in respect of each holding had to be collected. Whenever changes in tenure occurred they were promptly ordered to be entered in the *Vari*, and the authenticated extract of the mutation (*Uḷvari*) made by the *Variyilar*, the authorities in-charge of land-tax register, was conveyed to the grantees. It was the official basis for the grant and its conditions. The *Puravu* was, perhaps, the land-register showing lands assessed to full demand. In addition, there was a *Tarappottagam*⁴³ maintained. This showed such of those lands classified on the basis of the assessment rate charged for it, and consequently, the *Taram* classification to which a classified land belonged. As the *Tarappottagam* was not traceable, assessment was reckoned at the rate applicable to area-measurement of the same command area in Ambāsamudram (*Tarap (po)ttagam Kāṇāmayil puravu nilattōpadi mudal*).⁴⁴

It follows that in the same township, nay in the same command area (*puravu*), there were at the same time lands classified on the basis of assessment, and non-classified lands (*Taramiḍu* and *Taramili*). The tank water-spread and other areas not cultivable were also *Taramili* and had no assessment classification. In fact, there are reasons to believe that the assessment classification (*Taram*) was fixed only when lands were reclaimed, and brought under cultivation.⁴⁵ (*Tiru ttippaylrṣeydu inneḷhukku okka taram Iṭṭukkolḷak kaḍavōmāgavum*).

Thus in Mayuram, we have both lands bearing assessment-classification, and those which did not according to accounts.⁴⁶

43. S.I.I., Vol.XIV - 245: Ambāsamudram. Also S.I.I., Vol.XXIII, - 1.4: Tiruviḍaimarudūr

44. S.I.I., Vol.XIV - 245: Ambāsamudram

45. S.I.I., Vol.XVII - 600: Tiruvārūr

46. S.I.I., Vol.XXIII - 375: Mayūram

Within the command area itself, lands were localised and grouped under each channel (*Kaṇṇāru*) and *Sadiram* (block or square) or *Sadukkam* and within each such block there were both *Taramiḍu* and *Taramili* lands located alongside.⁴⁷

From what has been stated, two broad bases for land-demand had existed side by side. Those which had been assigned assessment-classification (*Taramiṭṭa*) and those which had not been (*Taramili*). These latter could be either unoccupied or occupied. Temple sites, house-sites, tank-beds could be unassessed. But those assessed which did not bear, however, an assessment-classification (*Taram*) were charged on the square area or extent measured by the standard measuring rod or pole in use in the township (*Virivile* or *Parappile*). In order to equitably distribute the lands among the different rates of demand and to equitably distribute their spread among locations with differential advantages the lands when granted were located, some at the head, and some at the middle, and others at the tail-end of the command areas.

In some inscriptions, the extent in terms of square-area, as well as in terms of *Taram*-classification are given, for example, 15 *vēlis* of land were reckoned as 5 *vēli* in terms of different *Taram* classifications or *maḍakku mā*⁴⁸ (*munronrāha maḍakki*).

47. S.I.I., Vol.VI - 440; Ālaṅguḍi - lines 79, 84

Kannar

Saduram

1
3

3
3

48. S.I.I., Vol.XXIII - 257: Tiruvidaimarudūr

S.I.I., Vol.VIII - 248: Tirukkaḷar

S.I.I., Vol.IV - 223: Chidambaram

S.I.I., Vol.V - 633: Tirumalaḷappāḍi

S.I.I., Vol.XXIII - 303: Tiruvidaimarudūr

While the area measurement is understandable, the computed or commuted area in terms of the assessment-classification needs some scrutiny. Lands of various *Tarams* or assessment-classification fastened on them were folded into a standard *Mā* (*Maḍakku mā*) and the total assessment in terms of paddy and *Kāśu* were given at the rate applicable to *Maḍakku mā*. This seems to arise for the following reason:

In modern revenue settlement (in the British administration which adopted and preserved many of the indigenous features), the *Taram* is the assessment-classification which grouped together lands bearing the same assessment - rate though the lands might bear different classes and sorts. This is possible because the assessment-rates were expressed in terms of a money-rate based on the commuted value of grain. But in the Cōḷa and the Pandyan times this was not possible. For one thing, demand was both in terms of grain and cash. The rates under both had varied. The currency also consisted of *Kāśu*, *Dramam*, etc., of varying exchange-value and even intrinsic value. There was no uniform monetary currency system. If several parcels of land bearing varied assessment rates were owned by the same holder, they had to be reduced to a standard measurement which was a co-efficient of both the area-measurement and the assessment-rate classification each parcel in the holding had borne, to arrive at some common standard of equivalence. This is explicitly conveyed by the phrase "*Taramiṭṭu Maḍakki*"⁴⁹ or '*Taramaḍakki*' that occurs often in the inscriptions. The *Maḍakku mā* is then the constructive unit of assessment computed on the basis of the assessment-classification-wise distributed area, and the total area (by measurement) was reduced in terms of such unit of assessment-area.

49. S.I.I., Vol. V - 633: Tirumalappāḍi

But it is not easy to establish the correlation between the area-assessment and the *Maḍakku mā*. A computation made by Sri Subbarayalu gives quite a bewildering variety of ratios.⁵⁰ Some are explicit and straight forward. Thus in Tiruviḍaimarudūr case, the text says 15 *vēlis* were reduced to 5 *vēlis* under *maḍakku* (15 *Vēliyum sur.ru mur.rum muntronrāha maḍakki vanda nilam 5 vēli*).⁵¹ In another case, 12 *vēli*, 8 *mā* were reduced in terms of *maḍakku* 4 *mā mukkāṇi*, *araikkāṇi*, *Kiḷ arai*.

The *Taram* classification as per *Taram* account were :

10th Taram — $3\frac{3}{4}$ 4 *mukkāṇi* $\frac{1}{2}$ *kāṇi* *mundirigai Kiḷ arai*

11th Taram — 5 - 6 *mā* / *Kiḷ* $\frac{1}{2}$

12th Taram — $2\frac{3}{4}$ 4 *mā mukkāṇi* *mundirigai Kiḷ arai*

13th Taram — 2 *mā* $\frac{1}{2}$

Folding up the several *tarams* in terms of *maḍakku*, the extent was 4 *mā mukkāṇi*, $\frac{1}{2}$ *kāṇi* *kīḷ* $\frac{1}{4}$.

The rates as per *maḍakku mā* were

Paddy: 158 *kalam*, 2 *tūṇi*, *padakku*, 4 *nāḷi*

Antarāyam 4 *kāśus* - 6 *mā*

Total demand : 21 - 2 *mā* in *kāśu*, and

778 *kalam* - 1 *tūṇi* - *padakku* 1 in paddy.

In terms of area measurement, the demand was expressed as

1 *vēli* = 62 *kalam* 2 *tūṇi* *kurūṇi* 4. *nāḷi*

Antarāyam = $1\frac{1}{2}$ 4 *mā*

50. Please see his paper "Classification of the Land and Assessment of Land Tax from A.D.950 to 1300 a Study" - Proceedings of the Indian Historical Congress, XXXVIII Session 1977; f/n 13 & 14, pp.341-46.

51. S.I.I., Vol.XXIII - 257: Tiruviḍaimarudūr

52. S.I.I., Vol.XXIII - 303: Tiruviḍaimarudūr

If could be inferred that unless we know the *Taram*-wise classified extent, and the rates applicable to each as well as the area-measurement and the rates it will not be easy to tally the extents and assessments under either of the modes, nor will it be possible to get at the co-efficient to establish the ratio between the two extents. But the contra-distinction between the *Maḍakku mā* and *virivile* or *parappile* as the basis for assessment is clearly borne out.

A distinction was made between the demand due on the extent of the land(*Nilōpādi*) based on area-measurement, and the demand due on the basis of *Taram* or classification of lands for assessment - grading(*Tarōpādi*). This distinction is very essential to be kept in view. For it had its repercussions on the quantum of land-dues and also on the manner in which it devolved on the tenants and the cultivators as against the occupants.

Both systems appeared to be in vogue, generally the area basis in the case of unoccupied lands, and the *Taram* mode in the case of the occupied lands; but this was not certain nor uniform. Also based on *Taram* rates on different parcels, a constructive standard of *Maḍakku Mā* as distinguished from the *Virivu* or *Parappu* or area - mā was evolved. The available data is inadequate to work out the mode of deriving the standard mā or *Maḍakku mā*. But circumstantial evidence would not support any generalisation that *Maḍakku mā* was more favourable than the *virivu*, area-mā. Whether the *taram* was all that scientifically applied based on strict productivity is open to serious doubt. For the instances cited are enough to show that they were arbitrarily pegged or lowered.

Two issues arise :

I. Whether the *taram*-classification is based on productivity ?

To this the answer appears to be clearly in the negative.

The *Taram* in this note has been correctly rendered as “assessment-classification” and not a classification based on “productivity”.⁵³ True, when an assessment is fastened on the land, the nature of the soil, its productivity and the yield and the number of crops and irrigation facilities enjoyed by the parcel having regard to the location of the field, whether at the head-reach or the middle or tail- end of the irrigation system - are all factors which should or could have been taken into account. But, there are far too many instances noticed where the *Taram* has been arbitrarily adopted, pegged or reduced to limit the assessment on the land. In fact the quantum of demand had been fixed first, and then the *Taram* worked out on that basis:⁵⁴ (*Tirutti payir śeydu in nellukku okka taram iṭṭukkoḷḷak kaḍavōmāgavum*). Land purchased in the 14th *Taram* were assessed at the 20th *Taram*, the difference between the two being treated as remission of *iṭṭai* - in other words, the rate was reduced *ad hoc*.⁵⁵ The *Nāṭṭār* of Mēlappaḷuvūr fixed the demand at 25 *Kaḷañju* when they inducted on occupant and undertook not to fix the *Taram* when they assigned the assessment-classification of lands at any rate higher than the demand fixed at 25 *Kaḷañju*.⁵⁶ In A.D. 1048 Rājādhirāja ordered that the lands belonging to the temple of Tiruvāyppāḍi-dēvar be taxed

53. I have, it should be noted, revised my interpretation and the rendering of this term from what I had originally adopted in the text of the Lectures on the subject. The main argument in the Lectures, remains unaffected.

54. S.I.I., XVII - 600 Tiruvārūr

55. S.I.I., XXIV - 57 : Śrīraṅgam

56. S.I.I., XIX - 378 : Mēlappaḷuvūr

according to the lowest grade (*Taram*) as in the case of the (lands of) Viṣṇu shrine at *Eṇṇāyiram*.⁵⁷ In A.D. 1041, the Mahāsabhayār of Tribhuvani agreed not to change the classification of the land or levy on it any *ēri āyam* or *S'ēṇuvāri*.⁵⁸ In A.D. 1048 Rājādhirāja stipulated that the *Taram* of the land granted to the temple and the college at Tribhuvani should not be altered even when the general classification of the lands in the township was effected.⁵⁹ The Mahāsabhā of the same township altered the classification of the land in accordance with the command of Rājādhirāja-I, in A.D.1053.⁶⁰ Five years later (A.D.1058), the same *Sabhayār* altered the classification of the land at Puttūr already granted for the merit of *Uḍaiya- Pirāṭṭiyār Pirāntakan Ulōgamādēviyār* in accordance with the mandate of Rājarāja-II.⁶¹ Lands granted to two deities. Tiruvayindrapurattu Āḷvār and Virānārāyaṇa Viṇṇagar Āḷvar(A.D.1079)⁶² and a third granted to a poet(in A.D.1097)⁶³ were all pegged at the 12th *Taram* by the Sabhā of Tribhuvani obeying the orders of Kulōttunga-I. He ordered in A.D. 1103 that the *Dēvadāna* lands in Peṇṇāḍam should be charged at half the rates.⁶⁴

57. A.R.E. 330 of 1917

58. A.R.E. 187 of 1912: Tribhuvani; also "The Cōḷas," Vol.I (1935 Edn.) p.566.

59. A.R.E, 176 of 1919

60. A.R.E. 188 of 1919: Tribhuvani; also "The Cōḷas," Vol. I, p.583 (1935 Edition), by Prof. K.A.N. Sastri.

61. A.R.E. 111 of 1919: Tribhuvani

62. A.R.E. 178 of 1919: -do-

A.R.E. 186 of 1917 -do-

63. A.R.E. 198 of 1919 -do-

64. A.R.E. 238 of 1929

In Tiruviḍaimarudūr, in A.D.1141-42, the *Mahāsabhā* agreed to retain the assessment classification permanently even if the existing *Taram* was done away with, and assessment was based on a revised classification, or in the alternative, even when *Taram* was not adopted at all, but demand was charged on *Parappu* or area-measurement basis--“*Taram aḷindu taram iḍilum taramiḍāte parappile iṟukkilum.*” The township agreed not to alter the rates fixed at the time of the sale.⁶⁵

After fixing the land-demand at Tiruvārūr at 150 and odd *Kaḷams* per *vēli* from the 12th year of Kulōttuṅga-II(A.D.1143-44), the land being *Dēvadāna Iṟaiyili*, the Sabhayār agreed to maintain the demand at the rate, as the lands were not classified. But even if subsequently the lands were to be classified resulting in an excess demand, the excess shall be borne by the township (*ūriṟ śūṟikki*) and not shown on the temple lands.⁶⁶

The king had ordered that lands in the occupancy of Subrahmaṇya temple at Cidambaram bearing assessment-classification (*Taram peṟṟa nilam*) shall not be revised higher than what they would have to pay at the 8th *Taram*.⁶⁷ He further ordered lands assessed higher than at the 8th *taram* be brought down to the 8th *Taram* and those bearing an assessment-classification below 8 be continued as before. This was executed by the *nilam aḷarpōr perumakkaḷ*(the land survey committee) of Kulottuṅga-II.

In Tirunelvēli, Māḡavarman Sundara-I restricted the assessment to the 8th classification as was revised earlier, and further brought down the *Taram* with a view to reduce the rate of land-demand.⁶⁸

65. S.I.I., Vol. XXIII: 303 – Tiruviḍaimarudūr

66. S.I.I., Vol. XVII -No.597

67. 262 of 1913

68. S.I.I., Vol. V, No.413, 414: Tirunelvēli

The instances cited are enough to show that the classification has been argued on the basis of assessment, and that the *Taram* classification does not *ipso facto* denote the productivity of land or other objective norms. There have been distortions deliberately introduced in the numerous instances cited. As the evidence forthcoming is from temple grants deliberately charged concessional rates, it will not reveal the mode of *Taram*-fixation adopted for the fully charged lands paying full land revenue to the State. It is also evident that the assessment-classification was liable to revision, and at the time of such revision some lands were deliberately pegged at the *Taram*-rates assigned to them originally at the time of the grant to a temple or sale to a benefactor. Lands not earlier assigned *Taram* could also be assigned later, and the resultant assessment-classifications could be folded into the *Maḍakku* or the constructive conversion-factor of the assessed lands of the township.⁶⁹ Also, perhaps, the higher the number of *Taram* the higher was the rate of assessment.

II. Which of the two assessment modes, one on the basis of the *Taram*, and the other on the basis of area-measurement *Virivu* was more favourable to the occupants and the cultivators?

On this point, Sri Subbarayalu seems to suggest that the *Maḍakku mā* rates were unusually excessive.⁷⁰ This is not self-evident. If the assessment rates are fixed and the co-efficient established, there has to be internal consistency between the rate per unit of extent, and *Maḍakku mā*. They cannot vary qualitatively. Where assessment-classifications adopted were deliberately or consciously made favourable and concessional, the *Maḍakku mā* that resulted from the constructive computation could also have been only

69. S.I.I., Vol. VIII, No. 236: Muniyūr

70. op. cit., p. 344

favourable. Also we notice in the inscriptions of the period the occupants, the tenants and the cultivators were deliberately preferring the *Maḍakku mā* as the basis for calculating some of their obligations, in their attempt to contain the higher demands made on them. This preference would have been acceptable only if the basis had been at least equitable to them. Hence one cannot be dogmatic on the qualitative excess of the rate under the *Maḍakku mā* computation.

Substantial evidence from some inscriptions indicate that the cultivators and the tenants insisted on the *Maḍakku mā* being the unit-basis for the fixation and demand of the obligations due from them. When this was altered on the basis of *Virivu* or *Parappu* or area extent, they protested and urged the *status quo ante* to prevail. There are other instances where the *Virivu* was adopted as the basis. This is clear from the joint deliberations of the occupants and the cultivating tenants at Mannārguḍi.⁷¹

71. S.I.I., Vol.VI, Nos.48, 49 50, 57 and 58 Please see p.68 *supra*, and the note 7 that follows in Appendix-I.

Note : After I wrote the text of the main lectures, Sri Subbarayalu brought to my notice his learned paper on land-assessment in which he has taken pains to examine the concept of *maḍakku mā*. The lines of thought of both of us, though each worked them out independently lead to the same conclusion on the content of the *Maḍakku mā*. I have also re-examined the evidence and have made a significant departure from my earlier interpretation of *Maḍakku mā*, as based on productivity. I now feel it safer to treat it and interpret it as based on assessment-classification (without bringing in the concept of productivity). But my other conclusions on the preferential character of one mode over the other, somewhat, differ from Sri Subbarayalu's for the reasons set out above.

Note contd.

I might add that Sri Subbarayalu's interpretation of Prof. K.A.N. Sastri's statement in "The Cōlas", at p.529 - (2nd Edition 1955) is not what the great Professor had in mind. He was clearly aware of the "Cowle" system or gradual enhancement of tax over a period on reclaimed lands or the plantation crops which took longer time to yield. The Ālaṅguḍi inscription on which the Professor's statement is based (ARE 3 of 1899), though fragmentary, refers not only to arecanut-palms but also to wet lands which were on a fixed rental basis (oṭṭu). That was revised and the demand in terms of grain and cash were fixed. This was a change in the form of holding or tenure, when it was assessed to pay at the rates at which the Nāḍu collected the dues (*kāśu nāḍu koḷḷa niccayitta paḍiyē*) and paddy at the rates prevalent (in the Nāḍu). The reference to areca-palms in the inscription has, perhaps, led Sri Subbarayalu to equate the Professor's general statement on the periodical revision of classification with concessional graduated scale of demand, taken for areeapalms and plantains. But the periodical revision of assessment of all cultivated lands was clearly in evidence and even the inter-change of the basis from *Maḍakku* to *Virivu* and vice-versa are attested by the instances cited in this note. As such the Professor's general statement "That the revenue from agricultural lands was periodically reassessed, and the classification of the land revised from time to time"

is, indeed, amply borne out by the inscriptions.

If the *Maḍakku mā* had been more onerous as the basis for levy of the rate of obligations and cash-dues, there is no reason why the cultivators, the tenants and others who had to render the *Kuḍimai* obligation should prefer that to the *Virivu* in some cases, especially when they sought to reverse the changes in demand made on the basis of *Virivu* and to restore the *status quo ante*. Indeed to the extent the *Tarams* of individual parcels of land were artificially depressed, the *Maḍakku mā* as a consequence could also have been cumulatively favourable.

The conclusion is that both the bases for assessment were in force side by side, one the *Maḍakku mā* and the other *Virivu*. The former expressed the cumulative effect in terms of a standard *Maḍakku mā* - the different *Tarams* and the extents under each contained in a grant or holding. Both have had their points of preference, and it is difficult to categorically state that one was more advantageous than the other. It follows, as Sri Subbarayalu mentions, that any quantum or rate of land-demand can only be interpreted and quantified only when the basis adopted, whether it was on *Maḍakku* or on *Virivu* was known.

Note contd.

But whether such revisions were in accordance with the changes in cropping fertility(*et al* and so on) is an aspect on which further evidence will be necessary, and investigations should be directed on this aspect.

Thirdly, to argue classification on the basis of assessment is no medieval deflection. It was adopted even in modern revenue settlement in British times as explained in my last note in appendix-I.

I am grateful to Sri Subbarayalu for his courtesy and furnishing me with a copy of his learned paper which is very incisive in its analysis, and written with clarity.

4-A. Alienation of land-grants and checks introduced

Land-grants of the eleemosynary tenure to the temples as *Dēvadāna* or the *Jaina Paḷḷis* and *Brahmādēya*, the Brahmin literati were generally inalienable. They were in the nature of "estates upon condition". This was understandable. For one thing, the purpose of the grant would be defeated if the alienation resulted in an occupant other than the beneficiary-category taking possession of the land. The service could fall into disuse or be rendered incapable of performance. For another the township and its accredited organisation, the *Sabhā*, were closely-knit. If any outside the homogeneous class of occupants were to come in, this cohesion and the collective obligation to pay up the land-dues could be impaired.

Some *Brahmadēyas* expressly prohibited the sale or (*orṇi*) usufructory mortgage of the land, and the *Sabhayār* were enjoined to watch the adherence to this prohibition. In A.D.926, the *Sabhā* of Ningavūr (Chingleput district) decided *inter alia* to sell the lands for which the taxes due had fallen into arrears, and to pay up the taxes from the sale price. They also strengthened the collective system of tax realisation and declared that the taxes shall be thenceforward paid through the committee of the *Sabhā*.⁷² In A.D.954-5, the *Sabhā* of Vikrama Caturvēdimangalam (Ukkal) met in the Mukhamaṇḍapa of the Viṣṇu temple. They took note of the lands which were granted on occupancy (*Kuḍuppōlai*) and since reverted to the *Sabhā* (*Sabhāmadhyam*). They resolved that those lands be sold to those occupants who were willing to pay the land-dues on these lands. They also ruled that none shall lay any claim on lands so sold on the basis of any prior assignment--deed of occupancy or sale-deed.

72. A.R.E. 1929-30; p.78 para.16, and A.R.E. 176 of 1929-30

If anyone laid such claims, he shall pay a penalty of *Kaḷaṇḍu* of gold to the *Sabhā* as also a fine in a court of justice (*Dharmāsanam*). If anyone did not inflict the penalty, or remove the hindrance on the enjoyment by the new assignee, the members of the annual administering committee shall pay each (*Vēṇṇu vagai*) a fine of 24 *kāṇams*. The township was intent on bringing the unoccupied lands under occupancy so that they could realise both the land-value of, and/or the *Iṇṇai* or land-dues from the land.⁷³

In the 28th year of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kannara Dēva, (*Kṛṣṇa-III*) (A.D.966-7), the *Sabhā* of Kāvānūr laid down that the seller and the purchaser, the mortgagor and the mortgagee of lands must be of the same community in the case of lands gifted to the physicians, and the Ājivikās, a sect of Jains.⁷⁴

In the 3rd year of Parakēsarivarman, a Brahmin of Bhāradvāja Gōtra, Bhaṭṭa Sabyadīpa Sōmayājiyār of Tiruppādirippuliyūr had granted a Brahmadēya to 5 Brahmins, 3 pieces of land, 15 mā, 2 mā, $\frac{1}{4}$ vēli or 5 mā in extent, and the Vēlanpulam with 700 arecanut-palms laid in rows(pātti). He also provided a street, and habitat-(Ūr), in which they could get usufructory mortgage of houses, and enjoy these lands. He, however, stipulated that the grant-lands and property shall not be liable to be sold or made an usufructory mortgage of. The *Sabhā* of Pādirippuliyūr was enjoined to enforce the terms of the grant.⁷⁵

In addition, the *Sabhās*, in the presence of royal officers, had drawn up rigid qualifications for membership and for franchise,

73. S.I.I., Vol.III, No.7

74. Kāvānūr (North Arcot district) A.R.E. 159 of 1921

75. S.I.I., Vol. VII - 742

as in Uttamacaturvḍimangalam where land-holding was an essential condition among others.⁷⁶ The Sabhā of the Brahmadēya of Tennēri decreed that none other than those well-versed in *Mantras* even if they held or had acquired the Brahmadēya lands, shall be eligible for appointment as members of the Committee.⁷⁷ This was in A.D.998 in the reign of Rājarāja-I.

In these instances, the prohibition of alienation and other restrictions had the sanctions of the Sabhā or of the grantor. Despite these injunctions, temple lands had been alienated. In Sucīndram in the 19th year of Vīra Pāṇḍya(Cōḷan Talaikoṇḍa), Dēvadāna lands were sold and mortgaged by one Vaṅgaṇṇa Dēvar, and the Sabhayār's attention was drawn by the Royal official (Adhikāra Mēleḷuttu), Sēralāntaka Brahmārāyan and the Sabhā enquired into this unlawful alienation.⁷⁸ Even temple lands came to be misappropriated by the Sabhā itself as in Pudupakkam and Uthama Cōḷa himself had to intervene.⁷⁹ Such specific cases of delinquency noticed were rectified on enquiry.

76. A.R.E. No.2 of 1898 (A.D.919) and of A.D.921 (No.1 of 1898)

77. A.R.E. No.240, 241 of 922 (Tennēri)

78. T.A.S., Vol.III, pt.i, p.71. I have taken the phrase "Adhikāramēleḷuttu" to refer to a royal officer, superintending the chancery and as the designation of Sēralāntaka Brahmārāyan reading it with the name which follows. This differs from the rendering of TAS as "The authorised writing of the great assembly."

79. On this and other instances, please see pp.22-25 of the text of the lecture-I. Also S.I.I., Vol.III, No.142 - Tirumalpuram.

Check on the accountants and the township executives

The accountants of the townships appear to be particularly suspect. Even in A.D.923, the assembly of Añjaṣṭam Brahmādēśam fixed the remuneration of the tank accountant. While presenting the accounts every year, the accountant had to undergo the ordeal of red-hot iron (*Maḷu*); if he passed the ordeal successfully he got *Pada Sēṣa* (quarter of the surplus or $\frac{1}{4}$ reserved quantum) as bonus. Otherwise he was fined 10 *Kaḷañju* gold but no corporal punishment was to be inflicted.⁸⁰

In Tillaisthānam in the 25th year of Parāntaka-I(A.D.932), Bāratāya Nakkanār, on an authorisation by the king, caused an enquiry into the conduct of the earlier superintendents, and collected a fine of 12 *Kaḷañju Pon* from those who had defaulted in the convening of the committee of Nagara :

*“Nagara vāriyam kūṭṭam cāṇṇa vārā viṭṭārai
varakoṇḍa daṇḍappon.”*⁸¹

In A.D.1117-1118 (48th year of Kulōttunga-I), it was noticed that two township accountants, presumably brothers, Iḷamai Vēṅgaḍam Paṇḍita-piriyān, and Iḷamai Karumāṇikkam *alias* Bhaṭṭa-piriyān had absconded two years earlier without remitting land-dues to the king, and failed to render accounts. The Sabhayār of Śrī-Cōḷakulacaturvēdimaṅgalam (Elavānāsūr, South Arcot district) were asked to remit the dues. Hence they sold some lands, and a well within, and the house raised by the delinquents in the plot assigned to the accountant, and the garden as per royal order and remitted the proceeds to the king.⁸²

80. A.R.E. 226 of 1915

81. S.I.I., Vol.V - 588.

82. S.I.I., XXII - 164 (No.164 of 1906: Elavanasur.)

The measures of Rājarāja-I for tightening of administration

Rājarāja-I took specific steps to enforce discipline all-round. He tightened the administration by taking several measures and enforced proper accounting of endowed lands and the appropriation of such endowments for the objects for which they were made.

In A.D.1001, at the instance of Rājarāja-I, the Sabhā of Mahēndra maṅgalam in Tiṟaimūr Nāḍu was ordered to collect the cash dues from Namaccivāyam *alias* Attāṇam of Mūlaiyūr, who was the accountant-scribe working for/under Sindamangaḷamuḍaiyān who wrote the treasury account. For some reason the Sabhā was hesitant and they were pressed to bring to sale the lands of the delinquent accountant. The purchaser was Parāntaka Dēviyar, the Cēra Princess, and queen of Parāntaka-II Sundara Cōḷa for endowing it to a temple.⁸³

In A.D. 1002, Rājarāja-I ordered that the lands alienated by the Brahmin holders in *Brahmadēya* villages, except those held on service tenure, shall be sold. The Mahāsabhā of Rājakēsari-caturvēdimangalam (Karuntaṭṭānguḍi) on the outskirts of Tañjāvūr accordingly sold such lands, one of which was purchased by Kundavai, the sister of Rājarāja-I for making an endowment.⁸⁴

In addition, right from the very commencement of his reign, Rājarāja-I had instituted a periodical check and audit both personally when he was on tour, and through the royal officers and townships all over the empire. In the 2nd year (A.D. 987) at the instance of Arayar Ācara Kaṇṭa Brahmadēvarāyar, the

83. Please see Note 4-B for a detailed examination of this case. S.I.L., Vol.V - 723

84. S.I.L., Vol.V, No.1409 - Karuntaṭṭānguḍi

Mūlaparuḍaiyār of Mahēndramangalam agreed to his suggestion and set up a committee and an accountant to allocate for the various requirements and services of the temple the yield from the tax-free land endowed for the temple.⁸⁵

In addition, the Arayar introduced several checks on the temple endowments. The objects were to see (i) the services instituted or endowed for were actually conducted properly; (ii) to allocate any unutilised portions of the proceeds for additional services; and (iii) to ensure that the grant share of the deity from the lands endowed were fixed properly and realised fully.

This policy of the check of temple lands and their utilisation was continued by Rājendra-I. While residing at Paḷayārai, he ordered the survey of the temple lands of “Uyyakkoṇḍān Tirumalai” and ordered the “change of the tenants.”⁸⁶ He also continued the policy of resuming and acquiring lands alienated in the Brahmadēyas.⁸⁷

85. S.I.I., Vol XIII, No.3, Srinivāsanallūr. George Spencer has also noticed this point - Please see IESHR Vol.VII No.4, Royal initiative under Rajaraja-I: “The auditing of temple accounts.” Also please see my paper on the subject published in the journal of the Epigraphical Society Vol.XIII - 1986. pp.59-67.

86. A.R.E. No.463, 473 of 1908

87. A.R.E. No.311 of 1911 (6th year A.D.1018) - Vēlāccēri

But the sale of land by the Brahmin occupants to the deity in the townships was allowed unaffected by the prohibition of alienation.⁸⁸

In A.D.1026, Rājēndra-I resumed the lands from the earlier grantees in Emappērūr (South Arcot district) who had not settled in Tirumaṅgaippāḍi-nāḍu and had migrated elsewhere. He re-granted the lands to others who undertook to cultivate the lands, so that the objective of the grant might be fulfilled soon for realisation of the land-dues.⁸⁹

In the 7th year of Parakēsari Rājēndra Cōḷadēvar (A.D.1059) the officer Koṟamaṅgalamuḍaiyān caused an enquiry of the Tirumalai temple affairs in front of his office at Tirucenganūr (Tiruccānūr) summoning the subordinate executive in charge of land settlement of Kuḍavir-nāḍu and the temple executives of Tiruvēṅgaḍam. He found only two lamps being burnt against 21 instituted. He ordered the Sabhā to deliver to the temple executive and superintendents of the temple at Tiruvēṅgaḍam the endowment of 23 *Kaḷaṅju pon* for them to maintain the services.⁹⁰

Rājadhirāja while remitting taxes on some of the temple lands had ordered that the assembly of Talaicceṅgāḍu take over the management of the lands hitherto in possession of the temple.⁹¹

The intensity and repetition of the check noticed in the reign of Rājarāja-I recurred in the reign of Kulōttuṅga-I. This check

88. S.I.I., Vol.V 1407, 1-08: Karuntaṭṭānguḍi (A.D. 1015)

89. A.R.E. No.531 of 1921

90. S.I.I., Vol.IV, p.293

91. A.R.E., No.183 of 1925

extended to the farther regions of the empire as Kōlār. Till the 2nd year (A.D. 1072) there was no proper allocation of income from the endowed lands for the different services in the Piḍāri temple in that township. A royal officer, Vīra Sikhāmaṇi Mūvēnda Veḷār, hailing from Pāṇḍiyūrpakkām in Kaḷiyūr Kōṭṭām in Coḷamaṇḍalam enquired into the affairs, and set up a committee to make proper allocations for the various services.⁹²

Such intensive check could not but have had its reactions in the outlying areas on the occupants, and the tenants under them. These have been noticed already. But these administrative checks and measures were necessary and healthy. For the objects of the grants had to be subserved, and the benefits of any favourable grant should not be frittered away.

Despite all such prohibitions, the alienations of Dēvadāna lands, noticeably, have continued. For there was an express prohibition reiterated in A.D. 1203 by Kulōttunga-III against the sale of land of the temples as Caṇḍēsvarapperuvilai at Tirukkōḍikkāval. Attempts to take possession of temple lands by force also appear to have been made. Lands unlawfully seized were ordered to be recovered.⁹³

In the same reign an even more serious incident had occurred close to the old capital, at Dārāsuram itself. The Tirunā mattukkāṇi (the deity's occupancy-lands) both wet and dry including the gardens of Rājarājēsvaramuḍaiyar were illegally enjoyed by many including the garden-tenders (Tirunandavanakkuḍigal) on the plea that

92. S.I.I., Vol.III, No.66, Kōlār.

93. A.R.E. No. 48 of 1931.

these lands were theirs by purchase (*Vilai koṇḍa nilam*). The king ordered their restoration to the deity. He also issued an injunction restraining the occupants by proclamation broadcast by beat of drums in specified places under advice of the State officers.⁹⁴ This was an indication of the Governmental authority getting weakened even in the heart of the kingdom.

But the prohibition of alienation did not operate against the temples inducing occupants to cultivate especially the unreclaimed wastes or flood-affected lands or the uncultivated lands. The sale of lands for such occupants was beneficial in more ways than one

- (i) Capital funding was possible from sale proceeds :
- (ii) Unproductive lands were turned to productive use ;
- (iii) A recurring yield or revenue was realised ; and
- (iv) Additional services could be instituted.

4-B. Rājarāja's (I) action in Tiruviḍaimarudūr - in proper perspective

There appears to be some misconception regarding the true import of an episode that had occurred in Tiruviḍaimarudūr in the reign of Rājarāja-I. This case is cited as one of oppression, and harassment of the people and an unsuccessful appeal made by them to the king's officials.

The record under examination is dated in the 16th year. It is a sale-deed by the Sabhā of Mahēndramaṅgalam, a Brahmadēyā in Tiṟaimūrṇāḍu. The king had ordered that the cash-dues shall be collected from Namaccivāyam *alias* Attanan of Mūlaiyūr who was the accountant-scribe working under/and for Śendamaṅgala-muḍayan, who wrote the treasury documents. The soldiery of the

94. A.R.E. No. 291 of 1978-79 - The year is lost.

king, with the king's leave, and on his written orders, were to execute the command to the effect that the holding of the sub-accountant (for some unspecified delinquency or defalcation, presumably) after being localised, be sold at the market price at which an occupant will sell such lands to another (*Kuḍivilai*) and that the sale proceeds be remitted to the treasury. Rājarājamārāyan conveyed this command, and the soldiery put the Sabhayār to the torture of being exposed to water and sun. Unable to bear this strain they went under escort to Rājarājamārāyan at Tañjāvūr who directed them to the revenue officers responsible for giving effect to this order of the king. The officers also confirmed the original order of the king to localise and sell the land. Accordingly, the Sabhayār located 1 *vēli* and 2 *mā* of the land of the sub-accountant's holdings equitably among the best, middling and the worst lands and fixed the value at 62 *kāśu*. Again the soldiery pressed them to sell the lands and pay up the amount. The Sabhayār tried to do so, but none of the agnates or the adjoining occupants came forward to buy the land. One Māḍaḷan Mādavan Āpramēyan who had an usufructory mortgage on the land and was in the enjoyment of 2 *mā* of land was willing to buy up that parcel, and pay the sale-value as fixed by the Sabhā. The remaining lands including 4 *mā* of land already reverted to the Sabhayār were in all, $\frac{3}{4}$ *vēli*, $4\frac{1}{2}$ *mā* in extent. They were put up for auction. Parāntaka Dēviyār, the Cēra princess, and queen of Sundara Coḷa, purchased the land.

From the above facts, it would be apparent that the erstwhile sub-accountant who held the lands was in arrears of dues, and had allowed a part of the holding to revert to the township, and another parcel to be in possession and enjoyment of a usufructory mortgagee, and the mortgage had been unredeemēd.

Perhaps, he was in default of payment of his dues to the treasury, though this could only be a circumstantial presumption. As neither the agnates nor the adjoining occupants were willing to buy the lands, the Sabhayārs were saddled with the reverted holdings and were obliged to bring them to auction to realise the dues to the treasury. The insistence on the Sabhayār to comply with this requirement might be due to two factors: (i) the amount in arrears and (ii) the default or an unspecified offence. The language of the inscription would lend support to this inference. The Sabhayār were apparently reluctant to buy in the land themselves as that would add to their own liabilities. They also seem to have explored the possibilities of a less severe action which was not countenanced by the royal officers (*Adikāri*) and their head, Rājarājamārāyar at Tañjāvūr. This was understandable as the original order had issued on the command of the king himself (*Perumāṇaḍigaḷ Aruḷicceyda*). Also from the persistent attempts to get the orders revised made by the Sabhayār, their peculiar softness towards the sub-accountant, and the tardiness on their part to implement the king's orders were explicit. These were not countenanced by the royal officers and their head. There was no appeal made to Rājarāja-I himself. The cause of action could, indeed, have been grave, as the Sabhayār were under surveillance of the soldiery, the emissaries and the watch-staff (*Paḍaiyārōḍum, Dūdarōḍum, Kāvalōḍum* 11.70-72).

-
95. S.I.I., Vol. V - 723. I have taken Rājarājamārāyar to refer to a high official of State, and he conveyed the royal command (*Varakkāṭṭa*) and it was to him that the Sabhayār had gone to wait upon him at Tañjāvūr. The king himself has been referred to as '*perumāṇaḍigaḷ*.' (11.41-42).

Rājarāja-I was equally strict in enforcing the recovery of debts. By a written promissory note a Brahman, Bhāradvāriyan (Bhāradvāja Gōtra) Pullān Vira Nārāyaṇan *alias* Brahmaśrī Rāyan had owed 30 *pon* which is the amount doubled on the principal which he had borrowed from a lady of the palace Kō-ṇila-kaṇṭi of *Mañjanattār Vēḷam*. This apparently was overdue and not repaid. The creditor had invoked the assistance of the royal officer Rājarājamārāyar, who directed the battalion, Samara Kēsari Terinda Kaikōḷar (weaver contingent) to recover the gold. The soldiers deputed from the Kaikōḷar force directed the Sabhayār to recover the amount, and even put them under water and sun, and tortured the Sabhayār tying them with ropes to the mango tree, The Sabhayār under such duress searched for the agnates of the debtor who was dead (*Kaḷindu*) and none of the agnates or *Sāmantas* (neighbours) came forward to discharge the debt. Even his son, Vira Nārāyaṇan Sivan, son of Brahmaśrīrāyan and his cousin Pullān Vīranārāyaṇan were absconding. Hence the lands belonging to them were sold by the Sabhayār and the amount due to the lady of the palace-attendant was remitted.⁹⁶ The period of the currency of the debt could have been about 4 to 5 years, within which period the amount could have doubled (at 25 per cent to 20 per cent per annum) and the Brahmin who had contracted the debt was dead. The execution proceedings of recovery were instituted by invoking the intervention of the soldiery, and the Sabhayar's collective obligation to recover the debts due was enforced with vigour and without any compunction.

96. S.I.I., Vol.XXII, No.27 (27 of 1906) : Tirukkaṇṭavūr

5. Distress conditions in the Cōla and the Pāṇḍya times and their effect on the townships.

There are repeated reference to the rigours of revenue collection, the accruing arrears, and the obligations of the townships collectively to pay up the demand where the occupants had individually defaulted. The evidence gathered in this section helps to fix the periods of such distress, the intensity of the hardships, and the steps taken to meet the difficulty in the payment of land-dues are set out in the following sections.

Distress conditions due to seasonal failures or drought (*Kāla Dōṣam*) are referred to as early as in the 3rd year of Vijaya Rājendra (Ānaimēl Tuñjiya Dēvar), i.e., Rājādhirāja-I (A.D.1021) which falls actually in the reign of Rājendra-I. The *Sabha* of Ālanguḍi had borrowed gold ornaments and silver vessels from the temple in a very large quantity. The purpose was to raise cultivation; they had to buy paddy for seed-beds, and needed capital for raising embankments, and for *Korombo* works. They borrowed gold articles, 1,011 *Kaḷaṇḍu* in all, by weight. Silver articles borrowed were of the weight of 464 *Palam*. The articles so borrowed, included a *Koḷkai* (350 *Kaḷaṇḍu*) *Koyugam* (150 *Kaḷaṇḍu*) *paṭṭam* (25 *Kaḷaṇḍu*), 3 *paṭṭams* in addition (15 *Kaḷaṇḍu*), *Tiruccari*, and *Tiruudarabhandanam* (belt) and *Nāgapaṇam*, and *Koccogam*, *Tiruccilambu* of Naṭarāja (*Kūttāḍum dēvar*) (285 *Kaḷaṇḍu*), the ornaments of Rṣabhavāhana Dēvar weighing 186 *Kaḷaṇḍu* including 4 *Tiruccari*, and *Makara* earrings (*Makaran kuḷai*); silver vessels - plate 5 (360 *Palam*), *Vaṭṭil* and one silver *Kāl* (37 *Palam*), silver *Vaṭṭil* for sandalpaste *Maḍal* 9 *Palam*, *Tiruvēṣāmarai* (fly - whisk handles) 2 (58 *Palam*) - in all 464 *Palam*. The *Sabhayār* rendered lands measuring $8\frac{3}{4}$ *vēli* tax-free in lieu of the capital, and the interest thereon, taking the land-dues obligation on themselves. They also recalled that in about A.D. 1062,

in the 3rd year of Rājamahēndra's reign they had transacted a sale accordingly, i.e., some 41 years after the date of borrowing. But the lands were all scattered over many hamlets. In the 35th year of Kulōttīṅga-I (A.D.1105) 43 year later, they so exchanged the lands, which were earlier taken over for default in payment of taxes by the township, with lands originally allotted to the temple so as to form a contiguous and adjoining block. These latter were rendered tax-free as *Kāśukoḷḷā Irāiyili*, i.e., the township undertaking the obligation to pay the land-dues themselves without any compensation or capitalisation.⁹⁷ This was recorded in the 6th year of Rājarāja-II (A.D. 1152) some 48 years later, adding some more land-grants rendering them as *Irāiyili*, on the township taking on the obligation to pay the land-dues.

The case brings out the long period of over a century and a quarter which had occurred in which the borrowings and the interest thereon had been finally settled. The township had no qualms in borrowing and utilising the golden jewellery and the silver articles actually in use for decorating Naṭarāja and Rṣbha - Vāhana - Dēvar and other deities. The land dues obligations of the Dēvadāna lands themselves had been equal to the interest accrual on the value of such a large number of items of gold and silver of large value. The capital borrowed had been applied to the productive works for recommencing agricultural operations, and maintaining irrigation works, and embankments in good repair.

The instance would bring out that even in the reign of Rājādhirāja - I, the townships had felt the need for large-scale borrowings for land reclamation and maintenance.

97. S.I.I., Vol. VI - 440

The symptoms of hardship and the incapability of the townships to pay the land-dues, could be traced from the latter part of Kulōttuṅga-I's reign onwards almost continuously. The *Ūrār* of Kalaśapākkam in the 43rd year (A.D. 1113) had fallen short of the land-demand, and they borrowed the amount in deficit (8 *kāśu*) and paid up the dues. To repay the amount to the *Vāgīśan-maṭam*, they sold 2,000 *kuḷi* of land in the next year.⁹⁹

The conditions had worsened in the next reign of Vikrama Cōḷa (A.D. 1118-1135) and his successors. In the 2nd year of Vikrama Cōḷa (A.D. 1120) the *Sabhā* of *Tiruvāvaḍuturai* had to sell the lands for which they were called upon to pay the taxes, as the *Veḷḷālas* had left the village owing to some feuds.⁹⁹ Next year the *Sabhā* of *Tirunaṅgaiyūr* had incurred expenditure in excess of their income (*Marapīnda kāśukku mēl eṇṇamāga sabhai viniyōgamaga aḷindamayīl*) and being unable to raise the money by taxation they gave away the land to the temple as *Iṇṇaiyili* in lieu of the money received.¹⁰⁰ The difficulties of the *Sabhā* to balance their budget was apparent and the *Sabhā* could liquidate their debts only by liquidating their capital assets, and borrowing from the temple.

The *Mahāsabhā* of *Siruputtūr* had no other resources to meet the deficit in collection by proportionate levy, and the next year's apportioned amount had also to be met by selling some lands (*Engaḷ Ūrukku viniyōgakku aippāḍutta Sabhā viniyōgattukku vēru dr̥vyam illāmayāl engal Ūrile Sīrudu nilam viṇṇāgilum aḍutta vinigōyamum viniyōgikka veṇḍina mayil*), they sold 1 *vēli* of land in A.D. 1122.¹⁰¹

98. S.I.I., Vol. VIII, No. 324: Tiruvadi, South Arcot district.

99. A.R.E. 158 of 1925

100. „ 171 of 1908

101. „ Vol. VIII, 305: Tiruvadi

Next year the *Mahāsabhā* of Karikāla - Cōla - Caturvēdimangalam sold lands as *Sabhā vilai*, and made others as *Iṟaiyili Dēvadāna* (Tax-free Dēvadāna lands) so that they could pay the dues on the lands held by those who were in default of payment of taxes or had deserted the village.¹⁰²

In A.D: 1124, the *Ūrār* of Kuḍanagar had sold 200 *Kuḷi* for 25 current *Kāśu* as they had to raise money for payment, of taxes as a big flood had destroyed the crops in that year (*Peru vellam Koṇḍu Ūrum Bhōgamum aḷindu anardhappattū Ivvūr Iṟai Iṟukkaikku uḍalillāmayāl*).¹⁰³ In the same year Akkala - Mummaḍi - Caturvēdimangalam also felt the deficit in their resources, and were obliged to settle some lands out of the common, 750 *Kuḷi* in extent and made the lands tax-free.¹⁰⁴

In A.D.1125, the *Mahāsabhā* of Raṇadhīra Caturvēdimangalam sold lands in their village to a merchant from out of the common holdings (*Samudāya nilam*) as they had a deficit in the amount due as *Kaḍamai* for the township (*Kaḍamaittaṭṭū*) in the previous year.¹⁰⁵

In A.D.1126, the *Ūrār* of Ariyāvūr sold 4,250 *Kuḷi* of land for 20 *Nāṟkāśu* as *Iṟaiyili*. They had faced deficit in the payment of the land-dues, and the royal officers declined to remit the next year's dues and to defray the amount of *Kaḍamai* obligations they sold these lands (*Engaḷūr Paṭṭiṟai paṭṭamayālum aḍutta*

102. A.R.E. 4 of 1914

103. S.I.I., Vol. VII - 96: Tiruvēṭṭūr

104. S.I.I., Vol. VIII, No.304: Tiruvadi (South Arcot district)

105. S.I.I., VIII, No.303: Tiruvadi

*vāṇḍai eccelavu Kōyiltamar Tavirāmayālum nāṅgaḷ eṅgaḷūr ambalattirundu
ivvūrkkku kāṇi koḷvārku viṭṭukkūttum.....Iṭai Iṭuppōme eṅṅu).*¹⁰⁶

In the 11th year (A.D. 1129) the Sabhā of Tiruppēr (*Kōvilāḍi*) lamented that the times were bad, and the township had become dilapidated, and the tenants had deserted the village (*Kālam pollāḍai nanmūr aḷindu kuḍi oḍippōykiḍandamayil*). A benefactor, Vāsudēvan Śrīdhara Bhaṭṭan *alias* Madhurāntaka Brahma-mārayār took steps to afford protection to the township. To invoke the blessings of God Śiva on his efforts, and for the fulfilment of his desired objective he gave out of his own holding 500 *Cinnam kuḷi*. The townships agreed to bear the land-dues obligations there-on from their common funds.¹⁰⁷

The *Mahāsabhā* of Kulōttunga Cōlamangalam had become separated from Kēraḷāntaka Caturvēdimangalam. They had some lands, 12 *vēli* and 8 *mā* in extent which could not be cultivated all the previous years. There was none who could root out the shrubs, and cultivate the land which was lying waste. Nevertheless the king's land revenue and *Antarāyam* were demanded. Hence, in the 8th year of Kulōttunga-II (A.D. 1141-42), the *Mahāsabhayār* sold the lands to one Vāmanan Anparkaraīsan *alias* Tirunaṅaiyūr Nāṭṭukōn of Taṇḍantōṭṭam (a township 6 miles east of Kumbakōnam).

106. S.I.I., Vol. VII, No. 97: Tiruvottūr

107. S.I.I., Vol. VII, No. 496: Kōvilāḍi (Tanjavur district)-- Please see another instance of a grateful township instituting 2-5/8 lamp-service for the merit of a benefactor who had relieved them of the exactions in Tirukkaḍayūr, S.I.I., Vol. XXII, No. 33 in A.D.1236-37.

Taking into consideration the condition of the land they agreed that the demand in paddy and in cash shall be borne as per the same classification and assessment then obtaining at the time of the sale even in future. If at any time the lands in the townships were reclassified and the old classification was discarded, even then the lands sold should continue to be charged at the rates already so stipulated, and the *Taram* shall not be altered. The *Sabhā* further declared even if there was a reclassification or without such reclassification the land-demand was fixed for the extent on the basis of linear area measurement, the township shall set off the credit for the dues stipulated above and bear the the excess over it themselves, by distributing the burden among the other lands of the township.¹⁰⁸

The *Sabhā* of *Uṇmūr* (*Eṇmūr*) had borrowed from the temple-treasury cash on account of bad times and scarcity of grain. In the 7th year of *Rājarāja-II*(A.D.1153), they agreed in return to pay the taxes of *kaḍamai* and *Pāḍikāval* on some *Dēvadanā* lands endowed for the temple.¹⁰⁹

The *Nagarattar* of *Tirukkaḍayūr* had lost both the crops in succession in the year, and they had no resources to pay up the deficit in the land-demand. Hence, they sold a land to the temple

108. The details of this transaction have already been described above. Please see S.I.I., Vol. XXIII - 303: *Tiruvīḍaimarudūr*. The use of the phrase "*Taramaḷindu, Taramiḍilum, Taramiḍāte Parappile Iṇukkilum*" is noteworthy. It puts the two modes of land assessment in contre-distinction.

109. A.R.E. 397 of 1913.

as “*Ūr kiḷ kāśu koḷḷā iraiyili*,” remitting the taxes, which were to be borne by them. This was in A.D. 1159-60.¹¹⁰

In A.D. 1161 (1(5) th year of Rājārāja-II), the residents of Vānavanāyakapperunderu unable to bear the taxes migrated from the township of Tirumāndurai. *Kaḍamai*-rates appear to have been revised at 60 *Kalam*, per *Veli*, and the evacuees were induced to settle again.¹¹¹

In A.D. 1175 in the next reign of Rājādhirājā-II, several townships in Uṛattūr-kūṛṇṇam had found the *Nāḍu* had been granted as *Paḍaiparṇu* or garrison-townships and the *Kāṇiyālar* (occupants) had not cultivated the lands as the demand was excessive.¹¹²

In A.D. 1191 (Kulōttuṅga-III - 13th year), the Peruṅguṛi Mahāśabhā of Pelangāvūr in Kīḷpilāru in Pāccikkūṛṇṇam had to sell lands to the temple of Pirivaliccaram-uḍaiyār in Rājārāja-vaḷanāḍu to pay off their tax-obligations (*Karabādai*) in respect of some lands which had been by the deserted landholders who could not fulfil their obligation to the Sabhā, in their turn, due to failure of crops.¹¹³

A famine in A.D. 1201 added to the distress when even at Tiruppuṇambiyam, paddy was sold at 3 *Nāḷi* per 1 *Kāśu* and children died for want of food,¹¹⁴ A century earlier (in A.D. 1115), a *Kāśu* could procure 13 *Kalams* of paddy in Niḍāmangalam.

110. S.I.I., Vol. XXII - 41.

111. A.R.E. 234 of 1927: Tirumāndurai (Tanjavur district); also part-I for 1926-27 A.R.E., para. 26 - p. 82

112. A.R.E. 257 of 1926

113. A.R.E. 688 of 1962-63

114. A.R.E. 86 of 1911, ARE Report 1910-11, p. 74.

But whether the *kāśu* was of identical value needs to be investigated. About the same time (A.D.1202), famine had also occurred in Tiruvaṇṇāmalai where rice was sold at $\frac{1}{4}$ measure for *Kāśu*.¹¹⁵

Inability of the *Kuḍimakkal* (tenants and cultivators) of Vālikaṇḍapuram to pay *Agara viniyōgam* (the dues distributed among and demanded by the Brahmin land-holders) had hindered the worship in the temple, and one Iḷakkanan took steps to restore the worship in the 28th year of Rājarāja-III (A.D.1224).¹¹⁶

The symptoms of hardship and the incapability of the occupants to pay the land-dues had thus surfaced from different townships at different times, throughout the 12th and even upto the middle of the 13th century; by the mid 13th century the Cola emperors had lost control over the situation.

The situation persisted and indeed worsened when the Pāṇḍyas gained control over the Cōḷa territory. The Periya-nāṭṭār or leading representatives of the *Nāḍu* met and regulated the tenancy conditions at Vālikaṇḍapuram in the 2nd and 5th year of Jaṭavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya.¹¹⁷ Even later in A.D.1301, in the 34th year of Māḡavarman Kulaśēkhara, the Brahmin occupants in Agara Brahm-adēyas and the Veḷḷāla residents in the Kiḷkūrṇu the eastern divisions of Jayaṅkoṇḍacōḷavaḷanāḍu met and reviewed the situation. For long their *Nāḍu* had been in chaos (*Kalagam*) and the occupants and the tenants had left the *Nāḍu* and migrated to other areas and were subjected to suffering. This was aggravated by the

115. S.I.I., Vol. VIII - 151

116. A.R.E. 267 of 1943-44

117. A.R.E. 282, 286 of 1943-44

king making over this tract to his brothers, and presumably they had made exactions which led to these adverse consequences. The Pāndyan king again took back the tract under his own direct control, and re-inducted the erstwhile residents, occupants and others into their native townships. Hence, they prayed for the health of Māgavarman Kulaśēkhara by setting up 108 lamps to Kālakāladēva on the occasion of their re-occupation.¹¹⁸

This distress had several causes and consequences. Partly seasonal failure accounted for it. The land-damands had become quite exacting. The burdens were heavier on the occupants and were passed on to the tenants and the cultivators. Individual defaults had entailed enforcement of the collective responsibility of the townships to pay up the king's demands. This, in turn, obliged the townships to resort to the sale or pledging of jewellery of the deities in some cases to raise capital. Unable to pay back the loans, they had to sell the lands of the defaulters or the common lands of the townships. But they saddled themselves with the recurring obligation to pay the land-dues on the lands so transferred to the deity. Two consequences of all these transactions can be deduced. First, the townships were dipping into their capital assets to pay up the revenue demand. This was felt by all the different varieties of townships, the *Brahmadēyas*, the *Nagaras*, the *Ūrs* and the *Paḍaiparṇus* - in fact, the *Nāḍu* in general. Secondly, they added to their recurring obligations of paying the land-dues on the lands sold. These, together, would have the effect of straining their fiscal resources. Their fiscal resources too had a greater component of annually recurring,

118. S.I.I., Vol. XXII. No. 46: Tirukkadaiyūr (Tañjāvūr district)

but lapsable services than payment in kind and cash which later would have helped them to conserve, and carry over the collections in reserve from one year to another. Cumulatively the townships had to face a great strain in measuring up to the land-demand for which there was no real remedy other than a sizeable and real reduction of that demand. The Pāṇḍyan supremacy had also contributed to the increasing exactions, and it was clearly recognised that remedies had to be found.

This difficulty and strain had been experienced both in the Cauvery-fed delta area, or the Cōḷa heartland and also across the Coleroon (in modern Tiruchirapalli and South Arcot districts) in the region to the north of Cauveryriver. The distress appeared to be of greater intensity in the latter region, judging by the repeated desertions and sales in that region. To add to these tensions and perhaps even prompted by the distress sales of lands, the chieftains, and scions of the royal family, or those claiming to belong to it, and other men of resources from the region south of the Cauvery region had grabbed lands as at Kīlappaḷuvūr and at Tirukkaḍayūr (in Mayuram taluk). A specific embargo on such purchases from the old established occupants by the new men, claiming to be the scions of the royal family or those who purchased more than two *Velis* of land had to be laid by the townships.¹¹⁹

Rājarāja-I prohibited the alienation of lands granted on favourable tenure. Despite repeated prohibition, such alienations had occurred even subsequently. But by the time of Rājarāja-III,

119. S.I.I., Vol. XXII - 31: Tirukkaḍaiyūr:
A.R.E. 259 of 1926: Kīlappaḷuvūr.

the occupants and the townships were left with no other resources than selling their lands or their rights therein (in whole or in part) to pay up and settle the land-dues demand repeatedly falling into arrears. This situation, indeed, aggravated by natural calamities and by over-zealous king's officials and executives had cried aloud for remedy.

But one paradoxical factor has to be mentioned. Paddy was sold at 10 *Kalams* per *kāśu* in Uttama Cōla's reign, but was less at 8 *Kalams* per *kāśu* in the period from Rājarāja's reign to Vīra-rājendra. It improved to 10 *Kalams* from A.D.1117 in Kulōttuṅga-1's reign and even, to 13 *kalams* in Ālanguḍi (in Tañjāvūr district) and to 15 *Kalams* per *kāśu* by A.D.1259 (at Cidambaram) in Kōpperuñjiṅga's time (A.D. 1259).¹²⁰ Of course, the caveat has to be entered that *kāśus* of different values were in use; but even considering that progressively the value of *kāśu* was less and less, in terms of real price the paddy availability was only the more favourable. Also *kāśu* could have been used as a normative coinage for purposes of expressing exchange value. Could it be with the weakening of the king's authority in later Cōla times the availability of paddy in circulation was more, and hence was priced more favourably to the consumer? This is an aspect which requires further investigation. The distress conditons so widely prevalent due to heavy land-dues demanded and repeatedly noticed in inscriptions is only one part of the story. The dip in paddy prices is another part. To establish a correlation or reconciliation between the two it needs further investigation.

120. Please see Annexure-V, to the Author's paper on "Land reclamation of Śrīraṅgam Dēvadāna lands - A study in prices, rentals and wages" - Journal of E.S.I. Vol. XI; pp. 65-87.

But there was also a rise in wages from the time of Uttama Cōla to the first part of the reign of Kulōttuṅga-I (A.D. 1090). The wages in terms of capitalisation for clothing had, however, halved from A.D. 1090, and the trend had continued during Vikrama Cōla's time. But both grain wages and capital requirements for supply of annual clothing had got doubled from that level some 120 years later during the decline of the Cōlas (A.D. 1246-60).¹²¹

These facts as gleaned from the limited sampling of available data in particular locations are set out here to indicate the possible areas for further probe into the economic conditions. A matrix of the distress conditions evidenced in the later Cōla time described above, and the trends of prices and wages viewed in that contextual setting, still leaves many gaps to fill and needs to be worked out more fully. We could, for the present, only invite attention to the varying trends that the limited analysis of data would indicate.

Distress in the Pāṇḍyan Kingdom

In the first half of the 13th century, the strain of land-demand was equally felt in the Pāṇḍyan kingdom. Additional imposts were noticed in that tract as well. This could be expected. The Cōla-Pāṇḍya wars had debilitating effects on both the kingdoms impartially. A devaluation of currency or the *Kāṣu* struck in copper instead of in gold (*Pon*) finds its occurrence about this time in both the kingdoms.¹²² The need for resources would have been equally felt in the Pāṇḍyan kingdom in the

121. Ibid Annexure-IV.

122. On this, please my "Studies in the History of Ancient Townships of Pudukōṭṭai" page 83; fn. 95 at p. 110.

time of Māgavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya-I. Revision of *Taram* or assessment - classification, consequential increases in demand and additional levies came to be enforced, and the townships were visibly feeling the strain, especially in the uplands of Pudukōttai and Ramanāthapuram districts, as in Kaṇḍramāṇikkam and Periccikōyil.¹²³ The distress conditions and the relief afforded are described in the succeeding sections.

The remedial measures for the felt distress and strain had many facets. In some townships the occupants of the townships defined the obligations due to the king and his men, to contain and limit their demand to the customary levies. Several measures were worked out by the *Nāṭṭār*, the composite community of the *Naḍu* containing representatives of the several varieties of the townships. In a few others, the *Mahāsabhā* and the *Periḷamayār*, the elders of the agriculturists (*Vellāḷas*) together resolved on the remedies especially. on the concessions to be shown to the tenants and the cultivators. Above all, tangible relief had to be afforded in the rate of land-demand by the king's intervention or at the instance of some sympathetic chieftains or royal officers. The details of the different arrangements entered into could be analysed under two broad categories:

- (i) arrangements to define the terms of occupancy and the land-dues payable to the king and his men or the chiefs by the occupants; and
- (ii) arrangements to define the obligations of the tenantry and the cultivators to the occupants.

123. This strain in the Pudukōttai tract which lay sandwiched between the Cōla and the Pāṇḍyan kingdoms has been described in the Chapter on "Burden of Land-dues" - pp. 181-187 in of Pudukkōttai, "Studies in the History of Ancient Townships."

The relief measures to the occupants and the tenants or the cultivators are often intertwined and occur together in some of the epigraphs. But for the sake of clarity in treatment, the relief afforded to either of the categories is treated in the sections that follow.

6. The Relief afforded to the occupants

Natural calamities like floods and seasonal failure of crops due to drought had been noticed off and on in the reigns of Rājendra-I and Vīra Rājendra. But the latter half of the reign of Kulōttunga-I seems to mark a turn for the worse. Thereafter, a series of changes had occurred. Changes in the composition of the agrarian holdings, and the occupancy patterns, and the obligations of the occupants could also be noticed. Higher demand on land by the king's men and chiefs, had diminished the share in yield for the tenantry and the cultivators. The latter were exerting the more to be left only with the less. Also, the distress of and strain on the occupants naturally should have been transmitted to, and felt by the tenants and the cultivators under them.

Together, the effect on the agrarian community was one of stress and strain, distress and desertions. The community was stirred into action to remedy this state of affairs. They were, on the one hand, aiming at the diminution in the quantum of the *Kaḍamai* and other obligations payable to the king's men and the beneficiary-occupants. On the other, they were earnest in restoring the customary obligations, the modes of rendering them, and their quantum, resisting attempts to enlarge upon them made by the king's men. These latter, being the obligations largely borne by the tenantry and the cultivators, had caused considerable hardships to them, and they were crying aloud for remedy and relief.

It is possible to trace the measures affording relief to the occupants even from the reign Rājendra-II. In A.D. 1058 an order of the *Tirumandira Ōlai* (the Chancellor) Pallavan Pallavarāyan stands recorded at Tribhuvani (Pondicherry). It was made at the request of Vāṇādhirāyar (the commander of the forces?) Sēnāpati and to this effect. Nobody except the residential Vellālas of Vakkur should levy or pay any kind of dues within the village, and those who transgress this order of the king will be considered to have transgressed the law.¹²⁴

But a number of documents, especially in the reign of Rājarāja-II, Rājādhirāja-II and Rājendra-III contain a set of collective decisions on the “dos” and “don’ts” for the demands to be made on the occupants, and secondly on the tenant’s obligations.

The first was the regulation of A.D. 1118 on the payment of the land-dues and their distribution among the township occupant-holders, and the township’s obligations to the king and his men.¹²⁵ The *Mahāsabhā* of the Taniyūr Rājādhirājacaturvedi-mangalam (Mannārguḍi) met under the mango tree in front of the Viṣṇu temple. At a joint meeting of the assembly at the *Ambalam* together with the king’s officers, they resolved that the 30,000 *Kāṣu* levied on the lands included in the *Nagaras*, the holdings of *Kaḷḷars* and the *nāḍu* shall be distributed among them, on the basis of the *Maḍakku mā*.¹²⁶ Payments shall be made on

124. A.R.E. 180 of 1919.

125. S.I.I., VI, No. 57: Mannārguḍi.

126. The *Maḍakku mā* is a “standard mā”, based on a conversion factor, in terms of the assessment-classification of the land, applied to the area measurement. Please see note 3 above

authorisation or deposited into the collection pot (*Kuṇḍigai*), against signed receipts, tendered in current *kāṣu*, and the entire amount due and the account shall be settled at the end of the crop annually. *Iṛaikūli* or cash-wages for collection of tax from the cultivating tenants (*Kuḍimakan*) shall cease to be collected, and if collected shall be refunded with a multiple of the collected amount as fine. The Vellālas contribution for customary labour for *Korombo* work shall also be based on the *Maḍakku mā*. No part of the *Kuḍimai* shall be collected from the Brahmins and the Vellālas. They proceeded to regulate the obligation they owed to the king's officers on visits on duty. In this resolution, in the main, the *Mahāsabhā* were regulating their own obligations to the king and his men.

But the accretion to land-dues and the obligations had not abated in subsequent reigns. That called for remedial action.

In the 1(5)th year of Rājarāja-II (A.D.1161), the residents of Vānavanāyakapperunderu, unable to bear the taxes migrated from the place. *Kaḍamai*-rates appear to have been revised at 80 *kalams* per *vēḷi* and the evacuees were induced to settle again.¹²⁷

In A.D.1174-5(11th year of Rājādhirāja-II and 219th day), a royal order was promulgated at the instance of Pallavarājan addressed to the residents of all the townships in Uttuṅgatuṅga-Vaḷanāḍu. It prohibited the possession and enjoyment of any lands in the townships of that *Nāḍu* by any members claiming to belong to the royal family, or any purchaser from the region south of

127. ARE 234 of 1927: Tirumāndurai (Kumbakonam taluk, Tañjāvūr district). Also ARE Part-I for 1926-27, paragraph 26, page 82.

the river Cauvery, or any claiming purchase by being bought in at public auctions (*Rājarājaperuvilai*) after the 19th year of Rājarāja-II (*Alvānukku*), or by direct purchase from the occupants or by purchase from those who had bought in at public auctions. Nor shall any from the region to the south of the Cauvery be eligible to purchase lands thereafter. In townships which are on “*Kuḍinikki Dēvadāna*” tenure, *Paḷliccandam*, or otherwise enjoyed tax-free, such as *Kiladacār alias Vāraṇavāsi*, *Sirukaḷūr*, *Kallagam*, *Tuḍari*, *Kuruñjipāḍi*, only the occupants who were previously occupying the lands prior to their being declared *Iṟaiyili* shall take over the occupancy and possession, and pay the *Kaḍamai* to the temple, and where any occupant from the south of the Cauvery river enjoyed those lands none but the old (erstwhile) occupants shall enjoy these lands and none shall interfere with those who so enjoy these lands.¹²⁸ In effect the tenure got changed as *Kuḍinikka Dēvadāna*, with the proviso that the holders agreed to pay the stipulated *Kaḍamai*

A further order was issued some 65 days later, signed by the same Tirumandiraolai, Neriudayacōla Mūvēnda Vēḷār, and attested by three other officers, Nilagaṅgarāyar Vānādarayar, Nandipanmar Malaiappiyarāyar, Karkarājar Dīpattaraiśar Villavaraśan. It declared: “The lands in the townships which were resumed (*Tirappu*) and the *Dēvadānas* in the same *Vaḷanadu* (i.e., *Kunrakkūṟom alias Uttuṅga-tuṅgavaḷanāḍu*) were earlier held by soldiery, and no occupants cultivated the lands. This was reversed from the 10th year (A.D. 1173) and the occupants (*Kāṇiyāḷars*) were paying *Kaḍamai*. The prevailing rates of *Kaḍamai* were revised by the order promulgated as below:

128. A.R.E. 259 of 1926: *Kilappaḷuvūr*. (Tiruchirapalli district)

<u>Lands paying</u>	<u>To pay hereafter</u>
80 Kalams and more :	at 80 Kalams only.
60 Kalams and more :	at 60 Kalams only.
40 Kalams and more :	at 40 Kalams only.

The paddy dues so fixed shall be treated to be a lumpsum contract or lease (*Oṭṭu*).

Lands growing (*Iḷanel*) inferior or short-term paddy shall pay $\frac{3}{4}$ of that rate as was already in vogue. If any new tank was excavated, and paddy cultivation was undertaken anew, there shall be an increment remission:

In the first year of reclamation :	No demand, tax-free.
In the second year of -do-	$\frac{1}{4}$ {
In the third year of -do-	$\frac{1}{2}$ { applied to the rate of
In the fourth year of -do-	$\frac{3}{4}$ { demand for <i>Iḷanel</i> .
In the fifth year of -do-	Full rate,

The king ordered accordingly, and directed that the accounts shall be drawn up on that basis, and the tax-collecting officers were also instructed accordingly.¹²⁹

In A.D.1176, the *Mahasabhā* of Tirukkarugāvūr, and Āccālpuram made revised arrangements for land-demand to be paid by the Vellālas who were cultivating the lands, reducing the *Kaḍamai*.¹³⁰

129. A.R.E. 257 of 1926: Kīḷappaḷuvūr (Tiruchirapalli district)

130. A.R.E. 429, 538 of 1918; A.R.E. 1919, Pt. (ii)--please also see section 7 below.

In A.D.1192-3, the land-demand, *Kaḍamai*, was revised for several parcels of Dēvadāna lands endowed for the deity of Tiruviḍaikuḷam Uḍaiyār, aggregating 4 *vēlis* in Dēvavinōdanallūr. In all these cases the land-demand measured in paddy was reduced by 40 per cent (*Pattārākki*, i.e 6 *kalams* in place of 10 *kalams*) and the reduced quantum was fixed for every parcel of land.¹³¹ In Kaḷappāl¹³² it was recognised by Annavāyil Udayār, Kāṅgēyar that if *Kuḍimai* were collected on the basis of cash accounts (*Kāśu Pottagam*) without a resumption of the lands there would be a deficit. Hence it was decided to collect *Kuḍimai* as for one half of the lands cultivated. This was ordered to be given effect as from the 22nd year (A.D.1200) and to be entered in the accounts and the *Kaṭṭāl kāśu* was fixed at 25. This continued to be in force from the 28th year (A.D.1206). In the 29th year (A.D. 1207), some over-enthusiastic officials had demanded from Mudivaḷangucōḷa Caturvēdimangalam in Puraṅgarambai Nāḍu (Kaḷappāl) that *Kaṭṭāl kāśu* payments shall be made as per the cash accounts. This caused hardship to the cultivators and the tenants. The king was moved to restore the conditions to the *status quo ante*, and he ordered the concessions be continued further.

Concessions similar to those extended to the occupants of the lands endowed in Maruttuvakkuḍi from the 16th year (A.D.1194) were extended to the occupants of the Dēvadāna lands at Māyūram from the 31st year of Kulōttuṅga-III (A.D. 1209).¹³³ But there were also other areas where demand was made at the full rates as in Śrīraṅgam, perhaps, because they were not affected by the distress.

131. S.I.I., Vol.XXIII, No 392; Maruttuvakkuḍi.

132. S.I.I., Vol.VIII, No. 263: Kaḷappāl.(Tiruttuṅaipūṇḍi taluk).

133. S.I.I., Vol.XXII, Mayuram - 374, 375.

In the 34th year of Kulōttuṅga-III (A.D. 1212), Gāṅgēyarāyan issued an order fixing the apportionment of yield payable to the temple at Śrīrangam from dry lands and lands reclaimed from the river *Paḍugai* and channels and ponds:

For lands yielding 2 crops of paddy : 100 *kalam* per *vēli* for each crop.

single crop : 100 *kalam*.

Reclaimed land : 50 *kalam* per *vēli*.

The rate of realisation shall be —

for the first year of reclamation :					$\frac{1}{4}$
-do-	second	-do-	-do-	:	$\frac{1}{2}$
-do-	third	-do-	-do-	:	$\frac{3}{4}$
-do-	fourth	-do-	-do-		Full

For the arecanut growing lands : at 2000 *Palm* per *vēli* per palm 400 nuts from the year of yielding.

For growing *Damana* (*Artemisia Abrotamum*) : 2000 *Kāṣu* per *vēli*

Dry lands : For dry crops 100 *Kāṣu* per *vēli*.

Garden lands shall supply flowers to the temple.

For plantains raised as heretofore per *vēli* - 3000 plantains.

For raising mangoes from the year they yielded

2 *Kāṣu* per *mā* excluding *Pāḍikāval*

For each coconut tree - 2 *kāṣu*

In 100 *Kuḷis*, 2 jack-fruit trees shall be raised. The raw jack-fruit shall be supplied to the temple kitchen. For *Nelli*(*amla*) - 2 *Naḷi* of *Nelli* fruits shall be supplied. For trees other than these, no levy shall be made.

In the river beds, the weeds for binding the soil shall be raised.¹³⁴

It will be noticed that the concessions extended elsewhere in the Cauvery delta were not extended to the lands in Śrīraṅgam. This should caution against any generalised application of the relief measures undertaken or ordered in one part of the empire to all others without specific evidence.

In the 16th year of Rājarāja-III (A.D. 1232), the Nāṭṭavar had represented to the king their grievances. Thereupon, the king issued an order to the big assembly (*Mahāsabhā*) and the assembly of Kulōttuṅga Cōlan-Tanināyaka Caturvēdimangalam was ordered to engrave it on the walls of the temple of Pārvatībhāgar at Talaināyar (Māyūram taluk). Concessions in the terms of tenancy were granted on the representations made.¹³⁵ In A.D. 1236-37, the king, Rājarāja-III not only ordered the *Kaḍamai* on the Dēvadāna lands of the deity at Maruttuvakkuḍi (Kumbakonam taluk) shall be reduced by 40 per cent, but the *Antarāyam* shall also be levied on the reduced basis.¹³⁶ Similar concessions were extended on another estate of 11 *vēli* and odd¹³⁷ remitting 40 per cent of the earlier demand.

As a policy, 40 per cent remission in the land-demand appears to have been made even in the 14th year of Kulōttuṅga-III (A.D. 1192) and from A.D. 1194 as at Maruttuvakkudi. This showed a quantumjump in the reduction of the land-demand over that extended in the earlier times in the reigns of Rājarāja-II and Rājādhirāja-II. While relief was noticeable in the lower Cauvery delta, the distress in Śāluvankuppam

134. S.I.I., Vol. XXIV, No. 147

135. A.R.E. 150 of 1927.

136. S.I.I., Vol. XXIII, Nos. 388; 391: Maruttuvakkuḍi

137. S.I.I., Vol. XXIII, Nos. 387 and 389.

(Chingleput district) was so great that even the Subrahmaṇya temple had to dip into its own treasury to make good the deficit in the land-dues payment (*Uḷḷūril Iṟai iṟuppu aridāi śrībhaṇḍārattil taṭṭiṟai iṟukkaiyil*) and it sold some lands in A.D. 1215 so that the arrears might not accumulate and be recurring.¹³⁸

The policy of realising 60 *Kalams* against 100 *Kalams* for *Iṟai* was continued by Rājarāja-III, the ill-fated successor of Kulōttuṅga-III. Even the *Antarāyam* was directed to be collected on the basis of the reduced *Iṟai* in A.D. 1239.¹³⁹

In A.D. 1258-59, due to additional imposts of *Ponvari*, *Antarāyam* and *Kōiltamaṟppēru*, i. e., the tax in cash, the cash levy on the tenants, and a cess for the king's servants even on the *Dēvadāna* lands, no tenant undertook the cultivation of the temple lands at Paṭṭukkōṭṭai. The temple fell into disrepairs, and the worship and the services therein had ceased. The chieftain Kaḷappālan abolished the vexatious exactions, and the temple services were thereafter resumed.¹⁴⁰

To repeat Rājarāja-I enforced the prohibition of alienation of *Dēvadāna* and *Brahmadēya* lands granted on concessional terms. By the time of Rājarāja-III, the excessive demands made even on such tenureholders had compelled them to alienate their lands as the only possible means of meeting such excesses. Cultivation also had ceased in many cases, and the land-demand had to be lowered and the migrant tenants were re-inducted on more favourable terms to cultivate the lands.

138. S.I.I., Vol. IV, No. 381: *Śāluvankuppam*

139. S.I.I., Vol. XXIII, Nos. 388, 391.

140. A.R.E. No. 339 of 1925: *Paṭṭukkōṭṭai*

It is legitimate to infer that if the Dēvadānal lands, admittedly on favourable tenure, were burdened with such exacting levies, the direct holdings of the occupant-peasants should have fared equally badly if not worse. If the extreme steps of relinquishment and desertions were the consequences the same remedies as described above could be inferred to have been applied to afford relief to the occupants.

Relief to the occupants in the Pandyan kingdom :

Additional imposts were also noticed in the Pāṇḍyan kingdom during the 13th century. This could be expected. The Cōḷa - Pāṇḍya wars had debilitating effects on both the kingdoms impartially. A devaluation of currency had also occurred.¹⁴¹ The need for resources could have been equally exacting, in the Pāṇḍyan kingdom at the time of Māgavarman Sundara-I. Revision of the *Taram*, consequential increases in demand, and additional levies came to be effected, and the townships were visibly feeling the strain.¹⁴² The Brahmin holders of Kulaśekharacaturvēdimangalam (Tirunelvēli) had been from time immemorial (*Ānādiyāga*) paying cash and paddy as *Kaḍamai* at rates fixed in 8 *taram* in which their lands were classified and grouped. In A.D.1227, this was done away with, and *Kaḍamai* was demanded on the basis of area measurement (*Virivilē*). The change was represented against to the king who countermanded the higher levy by the officers and ordered the continuance of the earlier rates.¹⁴³ Two years later, (A.D.1228-29), a further

141. Please see my 'Studies in the history of Ancient Townships of Pudukottai'; p, 83; fn. 95 at p. 110.

142. On this growing burden of land-dues, please see the study on the subject in the author's "Studies in the History of Ancient Townships of Pudukottai," pp. 181-187.

143. S.I.I., Vol.V, No.431: Tirunelvēli.

concession ordered by the king was to re-group the lands into three *Tarams* instead of eight. This was a case where relief was afforded at the instance of a highly-placed chief Kaṇḍiya Thēvar, a scion of the Pāṇḍyan royal family.¹⁴⁴

The distress conditions in the uplands of Ramanāthapuram tract and the relief afforded at Kaṇḍramāṇikkam and Periccikōyil have been referred to in the text. They are set out in fuller detail below.

The earlier inscription is from Periccikōyil in the 9th year of Māḡavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya-I (A.D.1225). The land-holders and the tenants of Śiruperucciyūr and Kaṇḡāppūr (*kuḍigaḷ*) had become impoverished (*Taḷarndu*) and felt living in a forest was better than living under such exacting conditons. Kaṇḍan Āḷuḍaiyān Kaṇḍan realised that the peasants were unable to pay the land-dues at the earlier rates in force from the 5th year. He hence gave a deed of relief :

The *Kaḍamai* for lands measured by *Kuḍitaṅgi* rod shall be paddy and 5 mā, in $1\frac{3}{4}$ *Diramam* for sugarcane.

For Aḡpasi short-term crop and Citrai short-term crop for yielded lands : $\frac{1}{2}$ of this *Varisai*.

For lands irrigated by baling and for lands sown with horsegram, mlilets, and gingelly, - for yielded lands : $\frac{1}{4}$ of this *Varisai*.

Kaḍamai shall be levied at these rates only on yielding lands, after excluding crops which did not come to yield or had been damaged

144. S.I.I., Vol.V, No.414; Tirunelvēli - A tank near Tirunelvēli even today bears his name.

(*Kaḷivu nikki*). For apportioned dues (*Viniyōgam*) due to the *Nāḍu* and the *Ūr*, the dues shall be distributed (*Pāvu ceydu*) on the basis of the *Maḍakku* (assessment classification as contrasted with area measurement); the apportioned quantum due to the *Nāḍu* shall be paid.

For the lands sold from his own occupied lands in Kanḡappūr by him, the measuring-rod and liquid measurement shall be in accordance with the terms of his sale-deed.¹⁴⁵

In the 19th year of Sundara Pāṇḍya, again, (A.D. 1235), Kaṇḍan Aḷagu Kaṇḍa Perumāḷ *alias* Kāṅgēyan had granted further concessions taking note of the impoverished state of the tenancy as they were in real distress (*Kuḍi Talarndu Aḷḷāmaiyaḷ*).¹⁴⁶

(i) He reckoned 1 mā by 18 Śāṇ kol in 224 kuḷi as $\frac{1}{2}$ mā *Mundirikai* (1/320) by 24 Śāṇ kol — in effect, he granted a concession of about 30 per cent.

(ii) With effect from the 6th year, the holders of land had been paying for land measured by *Kuḍitangi* per mā for the main crop on yielded lands, *Antarāyam* at *paḷam kāṣu* $\frac{1}{4}$. He appreciated the proportion of *dramam* (in which *Antarāya* was tendered) to the *Kāṣu* and reckoned it as 7 mā (7/20.) There was in effect a 10 per cent concession by this devaluation of *Kāṣu*.

145. A.R.E. No.91 of 1924: *Periccikōil*

146. A.R.E.No.-73 of 1924: *Kaṇḍaramāṇikkam*.

Similar concessions were granted in the 8th year (A.D. 1224) of Māḡavarman Sundara-I by Kaṇḍan Aḷudaiyān Kalvāyil Nāḍālvān to the occupants in *Adaḷayūr Nāḍu*, in the command area of Tēnār for the Naṭṭar inclusive of Kīḷ Kuṇḍāḡu, Tiru-arāḡḡāṅguḍi, Kōṇēri, Tiruvingaikkuḍi, Panaikkūḍi, Kuḡaṭṭi. Refer: ARE 174 of 1937: Kunnakkūḍi (Tiruppattur taluk.) Also ARE 406 of 1954-55: Kunrakkūḍi, for similar order of the same year by Adaḷayūr Nāḍālvān.

(iii) He changed the equation of the measure used for paddy from 6 *kalam* to 7 *Kalam Mukkurunī* by the measure in vogue in the township (*Urādu kālil vāsi ēṟṟi*) - in effect, a concession of about 20.8 per cent -- in all 60.8 per cent.

For main paddy and sugar-cane, the rates were the same.

For short-term *Aṟpasi* crop, $\frac{1}{2}$ of these rates. If the same was brought to maturity by baling, $\frac{1}{4}$ of these rates.

Lands which had yielded less or nothing shall be excluded after surveying the crop.

For the dues payable to the *Nāḍu* as *Ina vari*, etc., the rate shall be applied to the command area as computed in terms of *Maḍakku mā* or assessment-classification on the basis of *Kuḍitāngi* measurement.

It will be seen that the relief afforded was rather curiously worked out. The extent of the land was reduced *ad hoc* from the surveyed area-measurement. In effect, this meant the assessable classification of the lands was brought down by 30 per cent. There was a higher nexus adopted between the *Dramam* in which the tax was paid and the *Kāṣu*. Also the capacity of the measure was appreciated, retaining the rates of demand in tact, as already revised in the 6th year of Māḡavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya-I.

This evidence can bear some comments. The incidence of the high rate of land-levy was felt to be too oppressive and in the 6th year, relief was afforded. It should be recalled Māḡavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya-I was engaged in a bitter warfare in his first three years with the Cōḷa ruler, Kulōttuṅga - III and the Pāṇḍya ruler had to terminate the war, though successful, due to the intervention of the

Hōysālas. Perhaps, the high rates of land-levies could have been the result of war-time preparations of Māḡavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya. It was not till the hostilities ended, at least temporarily, that some relief was afforded in the 6th year. Again, there was resumed warfare from A.D. 1230-31 (from the 14th year onwards) ¹⁴⁷ though it resulted in a setback for the Pāṇḍya ruler, due to the Hōysāla intervention a second time.

It could be inferred the concessions granted in the 6th year were inadequate, or the distress was too great for the measures to have effect. The further instalment of relief in the 19th year, in a more complex form though, effectively afforded a constructive relief of about 60 per cent of the rates of land-levies in force. The sophisticated manner in which this relief was afforded is also noteworthy. Everything else was variable, but not the rate. Kāṅgēyan was a past-master in the art of fiscal fiction.

The methods adopted to afford relief though somewhat curious, appeared to be in vogue even prior to the times of Māḡavarman Sundara-I. In his predecessor's reign, land measurements were revised and fresh assessments were ordered from the 19th year of Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkhara at the instance of Kalavaḷi Nāḍāḷvan, by the king while he was seated on Maḷavarāyan throne in his place at Madurai ¹⁴⁸ Another record of the same year clarifies that the lands which were formerly measured by the standard *Kuḍitāṅgi* were now measured by a standard rod increased by $\frac{1}{4}$ of its length, and that the lands were re-assessed and taxes collected at the instance of Appāṭṭār Kalavaḷi Nāḍāḷvān.

147. "The Cōḷas," Vol.II, Part (i), p.179 -- f/n 23

148. A.R.E. 323, 329 of 1959-60: Vēmbattūr.

A Summing up

The growing incidence of the land-demand on the occupants, though felt, even earlier had received the attention of the Cōla monarchs from the time of Rājēndra-II (A.D. 1058). Relief was sought in two main areas : (i) the quantum of *Kaḍamai* payable to the king or his assignees by the occupants; and (ii) the varied levies in cash and in kind which mainly fell on the tenants and the cultivators. The occupants claimed for themselves immunity from the second category of levies. At the same time, they endeavoured to define these obligations, and contain them within the customary modes and quantum and occasions. As the incidence of these obligations was borne more by the tenantry, this aspect is dealt with in detail in the next section.

The tangible relief the occupants had secured was first, in the quantum of *Kaḍmai*. This took three forms: First, reduction in the *Kaḍmai* rates. This revision was the more compelling to induce the occupants who had evacuated from their old habitats. Secondly, the rates of *Kaḍmai* were pegged at a ceiling, and any demand in excess of the ceiling was waived. Also where lands were reclaimed, increment remissions were granted, spread over a five or four years period at the end of which, the full rate was chargeable. Concessions were shown for short-term paddy, or additional crops raised. Thirdly, when even these measures were not of avail say, from A.D. 1192-3, there was a quantum-reduction ordered, to collect only 60 per cent of the full demand. Supplemental levies (*Antarāyam*) were also reckoned on this reduced level of the demand. The reduced demand was broken down, applying it to each parcel, and this should have reckoned with the yielding lands to the exclusion of the parcels without yield.

In addition, steps were taken to re-assure the ryots in the more distressed areas which lay in the tail-end of the delta, and in the region north of the Cauvery and in the Coleroon belt. Here, even their security of holdings was in jeopardy. New rich men from the south were grabbing the lands, ousting the erstwhile occupants. The lands were restored to the latter, and an embargo laid on the acquisition of the lands by those who were not the traditional occupants, particularly against the residents of the townships south of the Cauvery river acquiring lands in the Coleroon belt and a ceiling on such acquisition was also ordered at 2 *vēlis*. Special concessions by way of house-sites and other incentives were provided for rehabilitation of the erstwhile occupants who came back and resumed cultivation. A special embargo on the scions of the royal family or those claiming to be so acquiring lands was also laid.

It should be noted, however, that relief seems to have been afforded in particular locations in the region north of the Coleroon and in the tail-end of the Cauvery delta. In the upper Cauvery region (illustrated by *Śrīraṅgam*), the levy of *Kaḍamai* appears to have been maintained at the subsisting rates in full. This would caution against any generalised application of the measures relatable to one tract to any other in the absence of similar evidence therefrom.

Distress was felt in the Pāṇḍyan kingdom as well. The jacking up of the rates and the severity of collection could also be due to the war-time demand in the reign of Māḡavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya-I who launched two successful but unremitting campaigns against the Cōla monarch, Kulōttuṅga-III. Here the relief afforded took more sophisticated, if complicated, forms. In Tirunelvēli it was afforded by reduction in the *Tarams* (arbitrarily or *ad hoc*) to lower the demand. The king had to intervene to mitigate the hardships imposed by the over-zealous officials.

In the less favourably situated trans-Vaigai region, the modes of relief applied were even curioler. The standard measuring rod was lengthened so that the unit-area may be larger, even if the rate applied to it be the same, but in effect affording a real relief in the land-demand. For the same rate for unit was applied after revision, to a larger unit-area than before. Again, the standard grain measure, the nexus of *Dramam*, (in which land-demand was tendered) to the *kāsu* were all tinkered with and modified to the advantage of the occupants. Cumulatively these should have afforded tangible relief to the extent of about 60 per cent. Also it was stipulated that this demand shall be applied only to the yielding lands, and the lands not coming to yield were excluded from the demand. That could afford a measure of the acute distress the occupants in the less-favoured area of the tract (in Ramanathapuram district) were experiencing. If the king's men were over-zealous and exacting elsewhere as in the Tāmbraparṇi ayacut, here at least, there were sympathetic chieftains who appreciated the need for tangible relief to be afforded to the occupants. A few of them stand out in the records of the early 13th century, Kalavaḷi-nāḍāḷvan, and Kaṇḍan Aḷagukanda Perumāl, Kaṇḍēyan besides Kaṇḍan Āḷudaiya Kaṇḍan, Kalvāḷi-Nāḍāḷvan, and Adaḷayūr Nāḍāḷvān.

7. The Relationship between the occupants and the tenants under them and relief afforded to the latter

The increasing demands made on the occupants by the king and his men, and the distress conditions that were described in the previous section could not but have had their effect on the tenants and the cultivators. For one thing, the occupants had, naturally, reflected the increasing demands made on themselves on the tenants, and the cultivators, and the *ad hoc* levies, the distributed obligations and the services newly sought or demanded had added to their burden. For another, the demands by way of *Kuḍimai* could be made directly on the tenants and the

the cultivators even by the king and his men and the township. These had increased and were also varied. Services and payments in kind were commuted into cash. Cumulatively they had increased and enlarged the obligations borne by the tenants and the cultivators. The levies had been made without regard to custom, and there was no set pattern or procedure in regard to such demands. These conditions were noticed even in the first half of the 12th century.

The situation was sought to be remedied consciously by both the occupants and the tenants and the cultivators deliberating together. To the extent the occupants secured relief from the king and his men, it could be expected that they, in their turn, extended similar concessions to the tenants and the cultivators. This is no surmise but is attested by the evidence. More specific and concrete means of affording relief to the tenants and the cultivators are also in evidence from the inscriptions spread over the Cōla heartland and adjoining areas. These are examined below in detail, in their chronological sequence.

The measures undertaken regulated the dues and the obligations of the tenants, including the cultivating tenants. These were the outcome of the proceedings of a much larger assemblage in which not only the *Mahāsabha*, the accredited organisation of the Brahmin-literati, but the *Nāṭṭārs* of the five *Pēriḷamaināḍus* together deliberated in A.D.1169.¹⁴⁹

149. S.I.I., Vol. VI, Nos, 48,50, 58: *Mannārguḍi* (Tanjavur district). There are as many as three copies of the same inscription engraved in the Śiva and the Viṣṇu temples at this place. This would attest the contemporary significance attached to this record.

They distinguished between the legitimate obligations that could be demanded from the tenants and the cultivators, and those which could not be. The irregular levies had taken the following forms :

(a) The collection of cash in lieu of or in addition to the services that could be demanded on specified occasions or for particular tasks. In all such cases, the restitution of the services and the discontinuance of the collection in cash was insisted upon.

(b) Additional services were demanded over and above the customary obligations, and other than those on specified occasions or in stipulated forms-

(c) Additional allowances not authorised by prescription were collected in cash and in paddy by various agencies severally the soldiery, the revenue-collectors and the chieftains or the king's men. The townships too, in their turn, added the obligations distributed among the occupants and the tenants under them, reflecting, perhaps the additional demands made on them.

(d) Demand of surety for liabilities from those other than the resident - holders.

(e) Enforcing vicarious responsibilities for the land-dues from the Brahmin-holdings on the Vellalas and for the dues from both of them on the under-tenants.

(f) Severalty of levies or allowances claimed instead of an aggregate levy.

Cumulatively, these could have added to the burden, and more to the irksomeness due to the frequent, *ad hoc* unpredictable or indiscriminate possibilities of the levies and the services demanded.

The obligations were becoming numerous and elastic. The rigours of these levies were felt by several townships, the occupants and the tenants and the cultivators under them, The conduct of particular officials or agents could well have turned them into engines of oppressions, what with the prevalent skewed distribution of the land-yields, the impact of these burdens should have been disproportionately the highest on the lowest tiers of the agrarian formations. The Mannārguḍi inscription describes the distressing situation that arose as follows :

“As within this township collection in cash and in paddy on the area measurement of the lands are being made (i.e., without regard to *Taram* and custom) arbitrarily and without uniformity by many in any manner everyone among them liked, and as these are unbearable the Vellālas have resolved that they will not reside in the township, as it is impossible to cultivate the lands any longer. The Nāṭṭārs have represented to us to this effect and consequently, the township has been facing an unbearable situation.”--

“*Nammūr parapilē kāsum nellum āha palavagai vandapaḍi taṇḍi kkoḷlukaiyālē engalukku Taripparuḍiyāle vellāmai śeydu kuḍi iṟukka pōkudillai enṟu nāṭṭavar vandu Sōllukaiyālum ippaḍiyā-kaiyāl ūr taripparuḍi uṇḍāyirukkayālum.*”¹⁵⁰

In A.D. 1169, regulations were made by the Mahāsabhayār and the Nāṭṭār deliberating together on the propriety of and the manner of discharging the *Kuḍimai* obligations, that is of the tenants and the cultivators, to the occupants, the township, and the king and his men.

Services for royal requisitions and for maintaining the Cauvery embankments shall be borne by the Vellālas in proportion to the extent of the occupied holding of each. The obligations for feeding the royal messengers or clearing the field channels for the freshes shall be done and, in turns, by each (*Ālāgacceyyarum*)-that is by turn, and collectively (*Aḷakka*) respectively. For the remittance of collections to the treasury at Rājarājapuram and check they shall detail at the rate of one person per *mā*, and not more. Only such additional hands as were actually needed at the receiving centre shall be sent. These were presumably, meant to measure the *Kaḍamai* collections in grain and check cash. No wages or fees, or fee for the beasts of burden (for carrying the revenue-collections in kind) shall be payable. For attendance on the scions of the royal family (*Makkaḷśēvagappēru*), their servants shall collect at *Kuruṇi* paddy per *mā*, on area measurement and meet the expenses. No cash collection shall be made. One *kāṣu* and 1 *Nāḷi* of rice per *mā* of area-measurement shall be paid each for the festivals of the Śiva and the Viṣṇu temples. The soldiery shall collect cash from the sureties for the revenue in default, only as per the memorandum (*Ninaippu*) of the king's officers. No other distribution of obligations or commands shall be entertained for cash and paddy collection on the total area of the lands. Only so much of hay and hayropes as were needed for the repairs and re-roofing of the common-place, the *Ambalam*, shall be taken and utilised -- This, perhaps, was the proverbial last straw. No other cash or paddy on various other sundry items, and for the collectors of revenue, for the accountants of field revenue registry, and for the soldiery, shall be levied or collected. Every year the incumbents for the wards (*Kuḍumbu*) shall be changed, and only the worthy shall be inducted.

The hamlets (where Vellālas and others resided) shall not be grouped with Brahmin-Kuḍumbus. The rate of distribution for the township obligations shall be as was in vogue upto the *kār* (first crop season) of A.D.1160 - at 30 *Kāśu* per *Maḍakku mā* (standard construtive *Mā* based on the conversion of the total area in terms of assessment-based extents comprised therein) and for *Pisānam* main crop 50 *Kāśu*. The collection of the distributed obligation at *Kāśu* per 1 *mā* in terms of area measurement (*Parappu*) shall be discontinued. None shall carry tales to the king's officers and the chiefs against the Brahmins or the Vellālas, or the accountants and those who did shall be deemed to be the enemies of the *Nāḍu* and the township. Only the levies authorised by the *Mahāsabhā* by written resolutions shall be made for any other common purpose.¹⁵¹

In about half a century thereafter, a number of records from about the 14th year of Rājādhirājā-II, detail the terms of revision in the tenancy obligations agreed upon as between the occupants and the tenants. The *Mahāsabhā* of Tirukkaḍavūr in Ambarnāḍu, a sub-division of Akkūrnāḍu, revised the conditions for collection of rents from the lands and the disposal of unclaimed property in the village and conveyed them agreeably to the 240 *Periḷamayār* (assembly of cultivator-elders) in A.D.1176.¹⁵² In the same year, the *Mahāsabhā* of Rājanārāyaṇacaturvēdimangalam (Āttūr) and the ryots had arrived at an agreement regarding the yield and other rights that each had for their share from certain cultivated lands.¹⁵³

151. The details here will discount the inference that the *Maḍakku Mā* was unfavourable to the cultivators.

152. A.R.E. 253 of 1925: Tirukkaḍavūr (Mayūram taluk)

153. A.R.E. 129 of 1927: Āttūr (Māyuram taluk)

But the agreement entered into regarding tenancy conditions by the *Mahāsabhās* recorded In the Tirukkarugāvūr and Āccālpuram inscriptions both of the same date are more detailed. Both were recorded in the 14th year of Rājādhirāja-II (A.D.1176). The record at Āccālpuram¹⁵⁴ states the communication was from the Perunguḷi Perumakkaḷ the elders holding the lands in Kulōttuṅgacōla caturvēdimangalam *alias* Pañcavanmādēvi, a Dēvadāna village in Veṇṇaiyūr Nāḍu in Rājādhirājavaḷanāḍu on the north bank endowed for the deity, *Tirucciṇṇambalam uḍaiyār*. It was addressed to the cultivating (*Uḷukuḍi*, *Veḷḷālas* in the hamlets of this Brahmadēya township, viz., Nilaittapār-paṭṭa-nallūr and Tillai Aḷaganallūr. They effected changes in the rates of grain to be measured to the occupants from the 14th year as the obligation for tenancy (*Aḍaipāḍi Kaḍamai*). For the highest grade or rate (*Talai variṣai*) for *kāl śey*, of the canal irrigated wet lands, the rates were reduced as follows:

<u>Old rates</u>	<u>Revised rates</u> (All in Kalams)	<u>Reduction</u>
80 kalams	70	10
75	65	10
70	60	10
65-40	55-35	5 kalams reduction at each stage.

For single crop for canal irrigated lands :

40 kalams to 30	35-25	5 at each stage
25 „	21½	3 Kalams, 1 Tūpi, 1 Padakku or 3½ Kalams.
20 „	18	2 Kalams.

154. A.R.E. 538 of 1918 and ARE. 429 of 1918 - The Tirukkarugāvūr record is better preserved (Shiyāli taluk).

For lands which were tenanted not on such graded yield-share and those taken on share-cropping basis (*Vāram*) for *Veḷḷālanpaṟṟu* (lands directly held by the *Veḷḷālas*) *Irāiyili Dēvadāna* lands and *Puṟappaṟṟu* lands, held by tenants from outside the village for actual cultivators (*Uḷudarkku*) (two fifths) $\frac{2}{5}$ share, inclusive of the wages of the plough-men engaged by the *Kuḍivāram* holder (*Kuḍivāratāṭkūli*). The cultivating tenants of the *Perunguḍi* (occupant land-holders) ploughing the land shall get one-third *Vāram* as *Uḍan-vāram.āt-kūli*, i. e., inclusive of the wages, or cooly for labour. The share for the *Kuḍivāram* including wages shall be $\frac{1}{2}$ where the lands were cultivated by baling water to compensate for the additional labour and cost entailed. The seed for sowing the command-area at the stipulated rate per *Mā* shall be supplied or foregone by the occupants of the township. For lands growing greengram, they shall measure greengram at the stipulated rate. In the cultivated land, when laid waste, (i. e., after the crop-season), when gingelly and greengram are broadcast, the yield shall be shared half and half. For grain taken in *Kār* for measuring to the royal treasury the occupants shall themselves bear the wages for labour.¹⁵⁵ They shall also make available the paddy at the current rates for paying cash dues into the *Kuṇḍigai* (a pot in which the king's dues are collected) and for the interest dues. When the individual tenants bring the *Sēnnel* (the paddy in the main crop), the occupant-landholders shall bear the cartage for half of the total paddy for *Pērkaḍamai*. That is the cartage shall be to the account of both the occupant-landholders, and the tenants in equal shares. When *Sēnnel* is measured on several occasions they shall all use the same or identical measure.

155. The *Mēlvāram* agreed upon in Mannaināḍu Mysore Plateau, may be set out for comparison; wet $\frac{2}{5}$; dry $\frac{1}{4}$ of the produce in A.D. 1051 at Maṇḍikere - ARE 505 of 1911; E.p. Car IX Ne.25

For dry crops the revised rates would be as follows for canal irrigated lands :

<u>Original</u>	<u>Revised</u>	<u>Reduction</u>
	<i>All in Kāśu</i>	
20	17	3
18 to 10	16 to 8	2
10 to 5	9 to 4	1

The dues or arrears (*S'ikhai*) upto the 13th year shall be borne to the account of the township as a whole. While realising the land-dues accordingly, the servants shall not enter the houses of the agriculturists, hurl harsh abusive words (*Arava daṇḍam*) or penalty *Āya* (*daṇḍam*)¹⁵⁶ on all but only those houses belonging to the defaulters who have the obligation to pay the land-demand, and the arrears shall be shown to the king's men. One cultivator or tenant shall not be liable to take on the land-demand obligations for another. If any did not agree to these terms of tenancy for land-demand and land-share, they shall relinquish their holdings, and only those who agreed to these terms shall be engaged on ploughing or cultivation. If any bonded labour of a landholder married another and if the landholder died, the land-holdings, bonded labour, personal ornaments, cattle and the wife of the bonded labour, shall devolve on the son of the landholder. If any land-holder got into debts prior to his death, all his above said belongings shall devolve on or sold to the purchasers of the land. The Brahmins shall not cultivate the lands themselves ploughing with buffaloes tied to the plough. The documents proceed to lay down some social regulations.

156. The word '*Arava daṇḍam*' is interpreted as "the harsh words of punishment inflicted by the servants of Yama" in the Īdu commentary on Tiruvōymoḷi - Periyālvār Tirumoḷi - 4th Tir. 5th Section - verse 3 (No.373) verse in Mayilai Māḍavadāsan Edition.

The service-holders or servants of the township shall not be eligible to receive some honours (*Veṇumar, araṣum*). The *Kāvidis* the potters, the pipers, the weavers, and the barber shall not sport a tuft, nor shall they have the privilege of beating the drum on occasions good and bad, nor shall they own bonded labour or slaves. If the shepherds take the cattle for grazing, and have temporary cattle-sheds, they shall keep the cattle in the sheds. The injunction was to see that the cattle by reckless treading did not damage the channel-bund. No paddy shall be raised on the house-sites in the township. The potters shall give earthen-lamps and pots and shall have food and clothing given to them. The service-holders shall not be eligible to have cattle and sheep reared except those who have received them and those who receive them.¹⁵⁷

The penalty for those who transgressed these injunctions shall be as for those who violated the royal command (*Tiruvāṇai*) and "1901 *Āṇai*." Four township accountants signed it--the *Accālpuram* deed--on behalf of and by command of the *Mahāsabha*; followed by 29 Bhaṭṭas (Brahmin-land-holders) including some temple priests.

The Tirukkarugāvūr epigraph contained an identical agreement arrived at by the Perunguḍi Perumakkaḷ (the Brahmin land-holders) of Ediriliḥcōḷa-caturvēdimangalam *alias* Tiruvāli in Tiruvālināḍu with the Vellāḷa cultivating tenantry of their hamlets including Śirukiḷay and Kumāramaṅgalam to whom it is addressed. Besides 5 township accountants, it was signed by 40 Brahmin landholders, 2 Vēḷārs and the township leaders (*Ūr Kiḷavan*) of Pālaiyūr, Āyanapuram, Maṇalūr and Niyamam and a few more Vellāḷas from other townships.

157. The prohibition is clear in the Tirukkarugāvūr text kindly supplied to me by the Director of Epigraphy. The texts are reproduced in the Appendix-II in view of their importance.

The large number of signatories and the engraving of this record in the temple walls of the two townships "for all to see", and the number of accountants attesting the document, all bespeak for the contemporary significance attached to this transaction. It gave the lie to the view that tenantry terms seldom changed in the middle ages in India. On the contrary, the agricultural structure had to grapple with the incidence of the levies, and the share of crops among the different constituents of the different tiers of land-interests. The document reveals the critical tenancy conditions that had been prevailing in the mid-12th century. Though the social disabilities listed bring out the unequal status accorded to the service-holders and under-tenants, the economic advantages that were conceded and had accrued to them were distinctly noticeable. Some of the inhibitions against cattle-straying on the channel-bunds, and against paddy cultivation in house-sites were salutary for the common good of the townships as a whole.

Similar revisions in tenancy terms had also occurred in the subsequent reigns of Kulōttunga-III, and Rājarāja-III, and Rājendra-III. The weakness of Rājarāja-III and his captivity for a time in Kōpperuñjinga's capital had encouraged the local chiefs and persons claiming to be the scions of the royal family to take advantage of the prevailing confusion and make exactions on the cultivators and the tenants and grab lands in the tract to the north of the Cauvery. The king, wherever he could, or when he was moved, afforded relief. In other cases, agreements between the occupants and the cultivators were arrived at. The details of the typical instances are examined below.

In the 16th year of Rājarāja-III (A.D. 1232) the king ordered the Mahāsabhā and the Sabhā of Kulōttunga-Cōla-Tanināyaka-caturvēdi-maṅgalam to engrave on the walls of the temple of

Pārvatibhāgar certain tenancy concessions granted to the residents (*Nāṭṭavar*) of the village on their presentation of their grievances.¹⁵⁸

In the same year on a Sunday, on Aṣṭami after the fullmoon in Kumbha month, the Peruṅguṛi Mahāsabhā of the Agaram, Śrī Rājaśikhāmaṇi Caturvēdimāṅgalam in Tiruvindaḷūrnāḍu. met at the temple of Puḡaḷābharāṇa Vināyagar temple, and conveyed their agreed terms to the Nāṭṭavars of the three *Naḍus*, the *Kuḍumbar* and the *Karaiyar* (shareholding occupants). They had set themselves to solve the problems of the tenantry, and the distress they were undergoing after Kōpperuñjinga had seized the territory, and redress the grievances they had brought to notice. The agreed terms were:

“As heretofore, the *Kuḍigal* (the tenants and the cultivating tenants) shall deliver as follows in the hands of the *Peruṅguḍis* (the occupants) per *Maḍakkunilam Mundirigai*, (1/320 *vēḷi*) per crop (*Bhōgam*). For *Kuḍimai* they shall pay 22 *Kāṣu*, *Vēḷḷi kāṣu* 5, and *Viniyōgam* (distributed obligations) 1 *Kāṣu*- in all 21 *Kāṣu*. The king's men shall not collect the amount. Those who yoke the ploughs and others who bring cattle for threshing(?) *Kaṭṭiyadḷppar*, *viṭṭu puṇaippār*) shall not receive the paddy from the occupants twice over. For measuring rice or greengram, the *Peruṅguḍi* occupants shall measure out the grain but the tenants and the cultivators shall carry them and deliver them. If they measure out the grain (for *Kuḍimai*) in lieu of the *Kuḍimai* in cash, the 22 *kāṣu* shall not be collected. For supervisory functions (*Netṭal*), they shall contribute one person free per (*Maḍukkunilam Kaṇi* per crop). If more than one is required, the additional hands shall be paid wages by the occupants. The tenants and the cultivators

shall not be caught or held responsible for the *Kaḍamai*-dues payable by the occupants. If there is any deficit in cash(?) (*Kuṟai Kāśu*), the occupants shall bear the levy. If the waste lands were cultivated with crops, the tenants and the cultivators shall get $\frac{1}{2}$ the crop-yield as their wages for subsistence. If for payment of *Kudirai Kāśu* (payment in cash for the king's cavalry?), any claim is made on the tenants and the cultivators in cash that shall be borne by the occupants. Whatever wages were paid by the cultivators or tenants (*Kuḍuppukūli*) shall be set off in the seed paddy they the (occupants?) give. For the bailiffs bringing the written commands they shall pay 4 *Kāśus*. For the royal servants or soldiery (*Kaiṭṭalaikai Kūṭṭam*), they shall pay as indicated in the (*Ninaippu*) memorandum of the king. If any insulted or blamed the *Nāṭṭavar*, they shall not be allowed to reside in the locality,"

The 700 *Perumakkaḷ* (the elders among the occupant-holders ordered this to be recorded on the stone wall of the temple. Under the orders of the township, the accountant (*Madhyastan*) Śrī Kuḍandaiuḍayān Appaṇṇan wrote this deed.¹⁵⁹

Two years later, the members of the assembly doing *Grāma Kārya* in Talaicceṅgāḍu (*Māyūram* taluk) defined the obligations and privileges pertaining to the *Vāram* lands in the 10 *Kaṭṭalais* or endowments of the village and its surrounding hamlets.¹⁶⁰

An interesting record of A.D. 1236-37 from Tirukkaḍaiyūr records the gratefulness of the tenants (*Aḍaippar*) who had engagements for

159. A.R.E. 536 of 1921

160. A.R.E. 210 of 1925

cultivation and the *Kuḍimakkal* the cultivating tenants, of Erukkaṭṭuccēri to a benefactor. The king's or the chief's head accountant (*Pillai Kaṇakkanār*) Āluḍaiya Nāṅgūrālvān Arayan of Sikār in Puliyūrnāḍu summoned them all collectively, and he saw to it that they did not get any apportioned levy (*Viniyōgam*) and that they did not suffer any grievance. He also retrieved an *Oḷugu* account which they had lost in neglect. That *Oḷugu* was written by Maṇalūruḍaiyān in the 13th year of Kulōttuṅga-III (A.D.1191). The accountant-benefactor, Nāṅgūrālvān searched for the lost *Oḷugu*, and restored it to the cultivators, and the tenants and re-wrote the account of the cultivators and the tenants who have had engagements and deposited the original *Oḷugu* through the palace-guards deputed from this township, with the palace chancery. This was a great safeguard for the township against possible unauthorised levies.

To express their gratitude, the township, the cultivators and the occupants agreed to burn 2-5/8 lamps in addition to 297-5/8 usual lamps in the temple for the merit of this benefactor. A number of signatories on behalf of the tenants (*Aḍaippar*) *Kuḍimakkal* signed the deed. A number of them were illiterate, and could not sign and on their behalf the *Nāṭṭukkōn* of *Kurumbūr* or other literates signed the document. They were all *Vēlārs* or agriculturists (*Vellālars*).¹⁶¹

In (A.D.1249?) the 3rd year of Rājendra (III?), similar concessions to the tenants were extended in Uḍayārkōil by the temple authorities.¹⁶² The temple authorities agreed that out of a total 120 *kalams* payable for 8 *Mākkāṇi* *Aṇaikkāṇi* land the quantum shall be

161. S.I.I., Vol. XXII, No.33

162. S.I.I., Vol. VII. No. 1039.

disbursed half and half. Out of that quantum, the levy as per the memorandum of the Nāḍu shall be deducted. One half of the net shall be delivered as paddy and the balance shall be paid at the most favourable prevailing rate (*Talai ahappaḍi*) in cash. The *Uṛaināli* and the levy for the king's men shall not be added to the burden on the occupant-cultivators. The tenants and cultivators shall pay for, or bear the *Kuḍimai* services at the monthly and annual festivals, at 3 *Kuruṇis* per *mā* and this shall be added to the paddy to be delivered by them. The hay and the hay-ropes hitherto delivered for the roofing of the Ambalam by the occupant-cultivators shall not be asked for thereafter.

These instances are by, and large, from the deltaic areas. Such relief measures are also evidenced in the uplands of Tiruchirapalli district. These date after the Pāṇḍya rulers overran the Cōla territory and have added significance to show that the resident-agriculturists had resisted attempts to increase the dues by the king's men. They agreed to pay from the 6th year of Jaṭāvarman Sundara, A.D.1257 *Kaḍamai*, for lands charged to *Kaḍamai* levy, based on the crops grown and distinguishing between the first and second crop, and wet and dry crops, and *Vāram* on *Vāram* lands and *Varisai* on lands held on *Varisai*, (i.e., in a graded scale), besides cash in Kārtikai month, *Kiṟṟu vari* (tax for re-roofing). The payment to the temple and the king's treasury shall be the first charge. But they shall not pay the *Surraḍai*, *Mugam pārvai* which were apparently subsequent additional levies. If anyone gave in to the demand of these levies by the king's men, they shall face ostracism and be treated as meaner than dogs and pigs. This was dated in the 5th year of Jaṭāvarman Sundara¹⁶³ (A.D.1256).

163. ARE 282 of 1943-44: Vālikaṇḍapuram.

The imposts objected -to were perhaps additional and vexatious. This could be inferred from a record made 3 years earlier in the reign of Jaṭāvarman Sundara-I (A.D.1254) .In that document the following of levy rates were stipulated crop-wise for cultivated lands by way of *Kaḍamai* dues with effect from the crops harvested in the 3rd year :

Paddy, Varagu, Cōlam (Sorghum), Koḷlu,	$\frac{1}{2}$ Vāram
Horsegram, Blackgram, Greengram, Gingelly,	
Groundnut / peanut	

If the waste lands or forest lands were reclaimed and cultivated —

First year	$\frac{1}{3}$ Mēlvāram
Second year	$\frac{2}{5}$ -do-
Third year	$\frac{1}{2}$ -do-

If gingelly is grown on wet and dry lands by baling or lifting water:

$\frac{1}{3}$ Mēlvāram

In wet lands - for the dry crops like Ragi (Kēḷvaragu) or Cumbu

25 *Kalams* of the crop grown

Dry land - for the same crops:

20 *Kalams*

In wet lands, Tiṇai, Pullu (grass),
Sāmai - per vēli

20 *Kalams*

In dry lands - for the same crops per vēli

15 *Kalams*

Brinjal, tubers (*Karuṇai*) —

in wet lands

800 *Kāśu*. per vēli

in dry lands

400 -do-

For turmeric, ginger, betel —

in wet lands

80 *kalams* paddy per
vēli

in dry lands and *kaḷa punjey*
(dry lands abutting threshing floors
or bunds)

40 -do-

For gārlic (<i>Veṅkāyam</i>) on wet lands	80 <i>kalams</i> paddy per <i>vēli</i>
-do- on dry lands	40 -do-

For sugarcane —	
in dry land	Paddy (lost)
and bunds	(Not available)

For cotton and Varagu —	
on wet (?)	500 <i>kāśu</i>
in dry lands	200 <i>kāśu</i>

For paddy irrigated with rainfed tank water	80 <i>kalams</i> per <i>vēli</i>
---	----------------------------------

Navarai (summer crop)	Not Available (lost)
-----------------------	----------------------

Aḍaimattuku (for leases?)	30 <i>Kalams</i>
---------------------------	------------------

For *Dēvadāna* lands for Śiva and Viṣṇu temples and other deities in Ugalūr and Tuṇḍanāḍu:

wet per <i>vēli</i>	40 <i>kalams</i> paddy
dry per <i>vēli</i>	17 <i>kalams</i> (Varagu)

For such lands on *Dēvadāna* tenure the cultivated lands shall be measured, and after deducting the *Dēvadāna* dues the residual quantities shall be measured for the king:

In Ugalūr Kūṟṟam $\frac{1}{2}$ of the yield on the cultivated lands shall be taken.

In Agaram villages As per customary obligations, *Kaḍamai* shall be fixed.

Excluding waste, the demand shall be shown only on the cultivated lands.

The township obligations (*Urīmai*) shall be shown separately for wet and dry lands as per custom.

If wet cultivation is undertaken on the forest reclaimed land—

	<u>for wet</u>	<u>for dry</u>
in the first year	100 <i>kāśu</i> per <i>vēli</i>	50 <i>kāśu</i> (?)
in the second year	200 <i>kāśu</i> per <i>vēli</i>	100 „
in the third year	300 -do-	150 „

These shall be the rates of dues apportioned per *vēli*. The proceeds of fisheries in the tanks shall be appropriated towards the expenses of tank repairs.

The rates set out appear to be still high, compared to modern assessment norm particularly having regard to the dry high-level lands in the locality. But the care and sense of detail to define the obligations of the tenants and the cultivators is fully attested by this document. ¹⁶⁴

A record from Tirukkaḷar ¹⁶⁵ is equally interesting and it details the obligations of the cultivating tenants *vis-a-vis* the occupants. It was an agreement by more than five Brahmadēya residents with the Nāṭṭār of Puṛakkarambaināḍu. It is addressed to the leader of the cultivating agriculturists, Kēraḷa Kaṛpakaśamaya Cakravarti of Pūmpuhār, Paḍiṇṇbhūmi in 79 *Valanāḍu*. Though there are local variations among the different signatory-townships, the gist of the terms are as follows :

164. ARE 286 of 1943-44: Vālikaṇḍapuram

165. S.I.I., Vol.VIII, No.251 : Tirukkaḷar (Mannārguḍi taluk)

"Two main categories of land engagements were in vogue. One, based on the graded crop-wise scale of levy (*Varisai*) for which the crop-wise rate of *Kaḍamai* was to be collected, according to the written engagement (*Aḍai Ōlai*). The *Mēlvaram* or the occupants' share shall be taken on the actual yield based on the assessed estimates in field (*Puḷlipārta*). The crop assessment shall be done together with the cultivators, and the jointly assessed yield shall be noted in the field itself. The lands not on *Varisai* agreed to by the cultivating tenants (*Kuḍi*) shall be estimated and supervised in field, and $\frac{1}{4}$ *Vāram* shall be given for the share of the cultivator. No *Kuḍimai* shall be taken on these lands. For *Kuḍimai* on *Varisai* lands and for house-site cess (*Manaivari vagai*).

For Kār and single crop lands : 1 *Paṇam* per *mā* to $\frac{3}{4}$ *Paṇam* per *mā* (according to the different ayacut rates)

For the second crop post-cultivation (catch crops) *Kuḍikadaiyidu* $\frac{1}{2}$ *Paṇam* per *mā*

These shall be paid in cash. It thus commutes the services or miscellaneous levies into a cash payment, payable at the end of each crop season. This has the merit of definiteness, and a clear quantification of the liabilities.

For additional varieties of crops (*Kūttum vargattukku*), 1 *kalam* per *mā* was the rate to be collected. A wastage and driage allowance of 4 or (in some places) 3 *Nālis* per *Kalam* ($\frac{1}{96}$ or nearly 1 per cent) shall be added. No other miscellaneous levies as *Māppaṇam* (cash levy per *mā* on land), *Manaippaṇam* (for house-site), and *Paṇavattam* (for any currency variation?), *Vēlippaṇam* (or a levy of 1 *Paṇam* per *vēli* of land in cash) and *Nāttusammadam* (levies by sanctions of the *Nāḍu*) shall be collected. The seeds, (if supplied by the occupant at the commencement of the cultivation), shall be recovered out of the

harvest-produce. If paddy were to be tendered in the form of rice after hulling, the hulling and the transport charges shall be paid by the occupant. Securities shall be taken only from among the residents of the township, and the hamlets comprised within and not from outside. The cash to paddy nexus rate shall be at the prevailing market prices. Receipts shall be passed then and there for each day. The engagements shall be renewed or re-entered into each year, and the accounts settled in the month of *Vaikāṣi* or *Āni* (May-June; June-July). They shall not be carried over but settled annually, then and there, and receipts issued. If there was loss of yield, a proportionate reduction in *Kuḍimai Paṇam* shall be granted. The superintending fee (*Neṭṭaḷ kūli*) for harvest and threshing operations shall be paid and his servants shall be fed by the cultivators. No billeting or feeding of the soldiery on the move (*Paḍayilāṇavaḷi*) shall be borne by the cultivators. A straight and final settlement and receipt shall be given for all outstanding liabilities upto the 44th year without being carried over at the end of the year (*Kaḍaittalai kaṅgu kaṭṭāmaḷ kaṇakkuppārtu nērkaiyiḍu taravum*). This was dated in 44th year of Māḡavarman Kulaśēkhara, and if assignable to the first ruler of that name, it could have been in A.D.1311-2.

An episode of about the same time, A.D.1312, from Kariśūḷṇa-mangalam (Ambasamudram taluk) could be recalled here. There was a *maṭha* in that township headed by Śrīpādatīrthasvāmi. A competent manager of the properties of that Maṭha, Iruvīṭṭukkāl Maṇiyan, died. His son, Nārāyaṇan, proved unequal to the task. The land dues to the *maṭha* fell into arrears. This affected the conduct of the *maṭha*. The admonitions by the head of the *maṭha* to the new incumbent and the intervention of the Sabhā of Kōḍanūr (across the river Tāmbraparṇi) proved of no avail. Nārāyaṇan surrendered the responsibility for managing the *maṭha* and the temple lands stating "in these days they

(the tenants and the cultivators) would not pay the dues in paddy and money" (*Ikkālattu nellum paṇamum tārār enṇu ṣolli*). Thereafter, the head of the *maṭha* had to appoint another capable and ardent devotee of his to manage the properties.¹⁶⁶

This instance would bring out that without competent and effective management, the realisation of dues from the tenants and the cultivators was not at all that easy, even in the early 14th century.

A Summing up

The strain on the occupants was mainly on two counts ; (i) the rising demands under *Kaḍamai* and (ii) the threat to the security of occupancy in particular tracts. But the cumulative effect of the levies in cash, in kind and in services demanded of the tenants and the cultivators under the occupants, and on the lower tiers of land-holding agriculturists was the more pronounced. As the modes of such levies were also several and, became non-customary, and indeterminate, they were the more vexatious as well. These were the strata left with a disproportionate share of the yield already, and the exactions made their position even more vulnerable and weak.

The remedy applied was by a series of revised engagements through collective deliberations of the occupants (*Peruṅguḍi Makkaḷ*), namely, the residents of the Brahmadēyas and the Veḷḷāḷas, and the temples and the affected tenants and cultivators, the *Pēriaḷamayār* and the Kārāḷar.

166. A.R.E.203, 204, 205 of 1932-33. Please see the author's history of this township in "South Indian Studies". Vol.II, edited and published by Dr. R.Nagaswamy (*Saheer Publications*, Madras, No. 4 - 1979) - Kōḍanūr is identical with Kōḍaga-nallūr in Tirunelveli taluk.

These efforts could be traced to the latter half of the 12th century-their spread and repetition in the 13th century became wider, and more numerous. The decline of the Cōḷa power at the centre had aggravated the situation. The scions of the royal family, the chieftains deriving or claiming to derive their authority from the king, severally and together contributed to the growing malady. The Pāṇḍyan aggression and extension of authority, and the caprice of the Pāṇḍyan princes entrusted with the particular tract to rule had only further increased the stress and strain on the cultivators and the tenants. By the end of the century, the tenants and the cultivators together with the occupants, were intent on defining their respective obligations *inter se* and together *vis-a-vis* the royal demands. This process is also an index of the complexity and severity of the tenurial obligations that had come about about this time.

But stray instances were not wanting in which the occupants complained of the difficulties in collecting their land-dues from the tenants and the cultivators, especially when the managerial agency of the religious and charitable institutions was weak.

At the beginning of the 14th century, then, the agrarian structure and community had undergone noticeable stresses and strain. The agriculturists at the lower tiers were feeling the impact of the vexatious and ever-increasing exactions of the king's men and the chieftains who were gaining control over particular tracts, and the obligations distributed by the *Nāḍu* and the townships, being a fall-out of the corresponding pressure on these latter. Collective deliberations to pull back the demands to the level of the *status-quo-ante* and to define them, and contain them at the customary level were noticed during the period. The facts set out in this section could afford indices of the growing burden of the land-dues, the society's anxious and conscious efforts to mitigate them, so that worse consequences to the economy by desertion of cultivators, laying the land waste could not follow. To what extent confidence had been restored and the worst apprehensions were staved

off could be brought out by the agrarian history of the 14th and 15th centuries which could also provide the measure of success that attended these efforts. But that belongs to the age of the rising Vijayanagar rule that followed, and its extension of power. The Vijayanagar expansion down south, however, had brought its own changes in the land tenurial structure and the agrarian economy, and they were not such as to bring about a greater amount of economic betterment to the cultivators and the tenants and even to the occupants.¹⁶⁷ These would merit a separate and fuller examination in an independent study.

8. Modern revenue settlement modalities (vide last paragraph of Lecture-II)

In the last paragraph of Lecture-II and Foot-Note 140 in the text of the lecture the allusion is to an event in the resettlement operations in the Tirunelveli district as then constituted which included Sattur and Srivilliputtur taluks (now in Kamarajar district). In the original settlement made in the last decades of the 19th century (1868-74), R.K. Puckle's assessment based on soil classification resulted in a diminution of revenue. The Government of Madras refused to approve the settlement proposals, and ordered raising the settlement revenue to the level of the pre-settlement demand. In order to implement this order, Puckle had to mark up the settlement rates. While so doing, as the highest Taram rate in the red ferruginous soil series (Class-VII) was only equal to the second highest under Regar soils (Class-IV Black Soil), he was obliged to classify even the red soils of the highest quality also as black soil in order that the highest Taram rates may be fastened on such lands.

167. For a sample, please see "the burden of land dues" pp. 189-197 in my "Pudukkottai Studies"

The anomaly was spotted out by D.T. Chadwick, the Resettlement Officer in 1911. To impress upon the Board Members at Chepauk and the Government in the Fort St. George, he reported that the red lands which extended as far as eyes could see from the Sub-Collector's bungalow at Sivakasi were red, "red as Chepauk" while in Puckle's classification they were put as "black" soils.

In the early decades of the 20th century, all the public Government buildings in Chepauk built of wire-cut burnt bricks presented an unrelieved red outer facade; the P.W.D. buildings, Presidency College, etc. or else they were colour-washed in red as the old Palace buildings of the Nawab of Carnatic then housing the Board of Revenue. The Lectures were also delivered in the University buildings with a similar outer red facade at Madras. The allusion forcibly brings out that arguing for classification from *a priori* assessment rates was prevalent in the Cōḷa and the Pāṇḍya times as even in modern settlement operations, not to speak of the local colouring that the phrase gave to the venue of the lectures!

9. Further Notes :

(i) P.57 "Let the deity of Tiruvārūr testify". —

This statement is made not for mere rhetorical effect. In medieval inscriptions the deity was a legal person, and transactions and documents were expressed as having been done or made by Him. The inscription cited records the decision of the temple authorities but is expressed as having been made by the Deity and by His command.

(ii) Annexure-II Tirukkarugāvūr inscription (ll. 79-81)

The embargo laid on the servants against the rearing cattle was perhaps, on (twelve *Panniruvar*) such servants (of the temple / township) and the reading *Panṇi* (Pigs) should be revised.

ANNEXURE—II

The text of the Tirukkarugāvūr inscription ARE. No.429 of 1918 — (Rājadhiraīa-II 14th regual year)

1. ஸ்வஸ்தி ஸ்ரீ கடல் சூழ்ந்த பார் மாதரும்
2. பூ மாதரும் கலை மாதரும் அடல் சூழ்ந்த
3. பொர் மாதரும் சிர் மாதரும் சுமந்து [வா]-
4. மு நாகடல் சூழ் புவி ஏழும் ஸார் கடலடுப்
5. . புகழ் பரப்ப ஆதியுகமென்ன சொ[தி]மு
6. டி புனைந்தருளி அறு சமையமும் ஜம்பூதமும்
7. நெறியில் நின்று பாரிப்ப தென்னவரும் செரல-
8. ரும் சிங்களரும் முதலாயமன்னவர்கள்திறை குண
9. ந்து வந்திண்டிச் செவிப்ப ஊழி ஊழி ஒரு செங்
10. கொல் எழுபாரும் இநிதளிப்பச் செம்பொன்
11. வீர சிம்மாசனத்து உலகுடை முக் [கொக்கிழா]-
12. நடிகளொ[டும்] விற்றிருந் தருளி[ய] கொ இ[ரா]சகெ
13. சரி பற்மரான திருபுவனச் சக்கரவத்திகள் மதுரையும் ஈழ
14. முங் கொண்டருளிய ஸ்ரீ [ராஜாதிராஜ] தெவற்கு யாண்டு
பதிநாலாவது உடை
15. யார் திருச்சிற்றம்பல முடையார் தெவதாநம் [இராஜாதிராஜ] வளநா
16. ட்டு திருவாலி நாட்டு திருவாலியான எதிரிலி [சதுர்வேதி] மங்கல
17. த்து பெருங்குறிப் பெருமக்கள் எழுத்து நம்மூர்ப் பிடாகை சிறு
கிழாயு
18. ம் குமார மங்கலமும் உள்ளிட்ட பிடாகைகளில் உழுகுடி வெள்ளா
19. ளர் கண்டு தாங்கள் பதிநாலாவது முதல் எங்களுக்கு அடைப்படி
20. கடமை அளக்கு [மீ] டத்து முன்பில் ஆண்டுகள் தலைவரிசை
கால் செ
21. ய்க்கு எண்பதின் கல வரிசை நிலம் எழபதின் கல மாகவும்
எண்பத்தை —
22. ங்கலம் அறுபத்தைங்கலமாகவும் எழபதின் கலம் அறுபதின்
கலமாகவும்

23. அறுபதின் கல வரிசை துடங்கி
24. நாற்பதின் கலவரிசை அறுதியாக வரி
25. சை தொறும் ஐங்கல நெல் தாழ்வதா
26. கவும் ஒரு பூவுக்கு கால் செய்க்கு ந [ர்ப்ப]
27. திந் கல வரிசை துடங்க முப்பதின் [கல]-
28. வரிசை அறுதியாக வரிசை தொறும் ஐங்-
29. கலநெல் தாழ்வுதாகவும் இருபத்தையங் கல
30. வரிசைக்கு முக்கலநெ தூணிப்பதக்கு நெல் தாழ்வுதாக
31. வும் இருபதின் கல வரிசைக்கு இருகலநெல் தாழ்வுதாகவும்
32. இவையிற்றில் வரிசைக்குப் பற்றா நிலங்களும் வாரத்துக்கு
33. அடுத்த நிலங்களும் வார முண்ணுமிடத்து வெள்ளான்
34. பற்றும் இறையிலி தெவதாநங்களும் புறப்பற் றுக்களும்
35. உழுதாற்கு ஐஞ்சில் இரண்டு வாரமுங்குடி வாரத்தாட் கூலி
36. ஆகவும் தன் பெருங்குடிப்பற்றில் உழுதாற்கு முன்றத் தொன்று
37. வாரமும் உடன்வாரத்தாட் கூலியாகவும் இறைத்து பயிற் செய்
38. த நிலங்கள் செவ்வாரமுங் குடிவறத்தாழ் கூலி ஆகவும் புறவி
39. றைமாநெல் ஊராகத் தவிரக் கடவுதாகவும் பயறு வினையு நில
40. ங்களுக்கு அளக்கவெண்டும் பயறு அளக்கக் கடவகளாகவும்
41. .. நிலத்துப்பாழில் எள்ளும் பயறும் விச்சின நிலங்கள் செ
42. வ்வார முண்ணக் கடவுதாகவும் காரில் பண்டாரத்து
எடுத்தளக் —
43. கு நெல் நாங்களெ கூலிபட்டு எடுக்க கட வொமாகவும் காரும்
44. பசானமும் குண்டிகைக்கு வெண்டுங்காசுக்கு விற்றவிலை நெல்
45. லும் பொலிசையும் சிலவிடக் கடவதாகவும் செந்நெல் எடுக்கு
46. மிடத்து முன்பில் ஆண்டுகள் தங்கள் பெருங் குடிகளுக்கு
47. பெர் கடமைக்கு எடுத்து வருஞ் சென்னெ லில் செம்பாதி நெல்
48. லுக்கு நாங்களெ சத்தக்கூலி பட்டு எடுக்க கடவொமாக
49. வும் குடிகள் சென்னல் அளந்து தருமிடத்து ஒக்கு மரக்கா
50. லாலெ அளக்கக் கடவகளாகவும் புன்பயிர் செய்யும் நிலத்
51. த்துக்கு கால் செய்க்கு இருபதுகாச இடும் நிலத்துக்கு பதி
52. நெழுகாச இடவும் பதிநெட்டுக் காசட்டு இருநிலந் துடங்கி

53. பத்துக் காசு இடும் நிலத்தளவும் வரிசை
54. தொறும் இவ்விரண்டுக் காசு தாழ்வும் பின்
55. பு ஐஞ்சு காசு இடு நிலத்துளவும்வர வரி —
56. சை தொறும் ஒரொ காசு தாழக்கடவதா
57. கவும் இப்படி கடமை புன் செய் நிலத்துக்கு
58. கொள்வதாகவும் பதின்மூன்றாவது வரை சிகை ஊராக இழ
59. க்க கடவதாகவும் இப்படியால் வந்த கடமை கொள்ளுமிடத் —
60. து செவகர் விட்டில் புக்கு அரவதண்டஞ் செய்யாதெ கடமை
61. கடவாணைக் கொமற்றமற்குக் காட்டி கொள்ளக் கடவதாகவும்
62. ஒருத்தர் உழவில் ஒருத்தர் கடமை எற்றிப் புக கடவந் அல்லாததாகவும்
63. இப்படியால் வந்த கடமைக்கும் வாரத்துக்கும் இசையாதாருண்டாகி
64. ல் விடுதிட்டுக் கொண்டு இசைந்தாற்கு உழபடுக்க கடவதாகவும்
65. பதிநாவாவது முதல் ஒருத்தன் அடியாறுக்கு ஒருத்தி வாட்கைப் ப —
66. ட்டால் அவன் மரித்தால் அவன் தெடின காணியும் அடிமையும்
67. அங்க [பூ]ஷெணமும் கன்றுகாலிமாடும் இவளும்
68. இவன் மக்களுக்குமெ மாடபுதுக்கு ஸொம மாவதாக இவற் மாடபுதுக்கு
69. புதட்டு பட்டாநாகில் இவந்தெடின அடி
70. மையுங் காணியும் இவன் விற்றற்கெ விசையாவதாகவும் [பிராம்]
71. மணர் எருது கட்டி ஆண்டு உழக்கடவதல் லாததாகவும் பணிசமக்க
72. ள் வெறுமர் அரசும் கொள்ளப் பெருதாராகவும் கக்வரிகளும் குசவரும்
73. [உ] வச்சரும் சாலிகரும் அ. பணவரும் குடுமி வைக்க கடவர்கள் அ-
74. ல்லாதாராரும் இவர்கள் நன்மைத் திமைக்கு பெரிகை கொட் —
75. டக்கடவதல்லாதாகவும் இவர்கள் அடிமை அளக்க கடவரல் —
76. லாதாராகவும் ஊர் வாய்க்கால் இடையன்த்து இ....த்து
77. க்கு தொளம் இட்டுக் குடுத்தால் தொளத் தெபுக அடி....க்க கட
78. வதாவும் ஊர் மனையில் நெல் நடக்கடல தல்லாதாகவும் குசவர்

79. அகலும் குடமும் இட்டுக்க...னாவுங் கொண்டு பரிசட்டமு
80. ஓடக்கடவந் ஆகவும் பணிமக்கள் ஆடும் மாடும் பன் நிரு
81. வரும் ஆளக்கடவர்கள் அல்லாதார்களாகவும் இப்படி செய்யக் கடவகளாகவுஞ்
82. சொந்நொம் இந்[நியோக]ப்படிக்கு அழிவு சொந்நார் திருவாணையுந் ஆயிரத்துதறுநூற்றுவர்
83. ஆணையு மறுத்தார் பட்டுது படக் கடவ கலகவுஞ் சொந்நொம் இந்[நியோக]ப்படியே இவ்வூர்
84. பிடாகை திருக்கருகாவூர் திருவெள்ளடை நாயநார் கொயில்.....ளியிலெ கல் வெட்டிக் கொ [ள்க]
85. பணியால் இவை ஊர்க்கணக்கு திருவாலியுடையாந் புற்றிடங் கொண்டாந் திருவரங்கமா .யற இ
86. ப்படி மழவராயந் எழுத்து பணியால் ஊர்க் கணக்கு திருவாலியுடையாந் அலங்காரப் பிரியந் எழுத்து
87. இப்படிக்கு இவை புல்லாலி வெளான் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை பெராங்குடையாந் எழுத்து
88. பணியால் ஊர்க்கணக்கு இவை மணலி உடையாந் [பிரம்ம]பிரியந் எழுத்து பணியால் ஊர்க்கணக்கு பெராவுடையாந் உய்யவந்தாந் ஆளுடையாந் எழுத்து
89. பணியால் ஊர்க்கணக்கு குறுக்கை உடையாந் இளமை நாயகந் எழுத்து
90. * இப்படிக்கு இவை கவிணியந் கெசவபட்டந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை வற....லூர் அத்தாழி [ப]ட்டநெ[ந்] எழுத்து
91. * இப்படிக்கு இவை பாலாழீ யந் [மாஹேஸ்வரன்] பெரிய நம்பிபட்டந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை பாரத்வாஜி பஞ்சநெதிவாணந் எழுத்து
92. * இப்படிக்கு இவை செட்டலூர் திருவெண்காடு பட்டந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை பிப....ரி [மஹாதேவ]பட்டந் எழுத்து
93. இப்படிக்கு இவை நம்பன் மாதெவபட்டந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை கெசவபட்டந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை சங்கரயபட்டந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை வங்கிப்புறத்து நாகய பட்டந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை உமி ஊர் திருச்சிற்றம்பல முடையாந் பட்டந் எழுத்து

94. இப்படிக்கு இவை பிரவர்கை ஸ்ரீ உருத்திர பட்டந் எழுத்து
இப்படிக்கு இவை பரித்திப்புறத்து உதைய திவாகர பட்டந்
எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை சாந்தார் திருவெண்காடபட்டந்
எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை கவிசியன் கைகந் ஆள் கொண்ட
நாயக பட்டந் எழுத்து
95. இப்படிக்கு இவை வெதகொம்புறத்து தாமொதரபட்டந் எழுத்து
96. இப்படிக்கு இவை கவிணியன் குஞ்சித்தபாதம்
[சுவேதவந வாஸ] பட்டந் எழுத்து
97. இப்படிக்கு இவை வங்கிப்புறத்து குமார [கிருஷ்ண] பட்டந் எழுத்து
98. இப்படிக்கு இவை பாற்புறத்து [தக்ஷிண] முத்திபட்ட
ஸொமயாஜியார் எழுத்து
99. இப்படிக்கு இவை வங்கிப்புறத்து திருவாரூர்
அடிகள் பட்டந் எழுத்து
100. இப்படிக்கு இவை பருத்தியூற்சது [ஸ்ரீதரப]ட்டந் எழுத்து
101. இப்படிக்கு இவை கவிணியந் திருச்சிற்றம்பல முடையான்
மாதெவ பட்டந் எழுத்து
102. இப்படிக்கு இவை வங்கிப்புறத்து [யக்ஞ]மூர்த்தி பட்டந் எழுத்து
103. * இப்படிக்கு இவை னிமிலந் திருச்சிற்றம் பலமுடையாந்
பட்டந் எழுத்து

* Read lines 90 to 92 here

104. இப்படிக்கு இவை இருங்கெண்டி செவ.....
105. இவை தாழைக்குடி [யக்ஞஞா]...பட்டந் எழுத்து
இப்படிக்கு இவை
106. கவிணியந் திருமூலந் மண்டையாழ்வி எழுத்து
இப்படிக்கு இவை
107. கவிணியந் திருச்சிற்றம்பல முடையாந் வாண்டாந்
எழுத்து இப்படி
108. க்கு இவை பொற்புறத்து பிச்சதெவ பட்டந்
எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை
109. நநில ஸ்ரீ திருவெண்காடு பட்டந் எழுத்து
இப்படிக்கு இவை முப்பிராலை இராமெ....
110. இப்படிக்கு இவை தில்லை நாயக படித எழுத்து
இப்படிக்கு இவைகண்ணு...

111. வந்தெ [பவ]நாராயணந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை
பிருந்தார் திருவெ[ண்] —
112. காடுபட்டந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை வங்.....
113. கன அத்தி கொவிந்தபட்டந் எழுத்து.....
114. சிராமபட்டந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவைச் சாந்தார்
அனந்த முத்திபட்டந்
115. இப்படிக்கு இவை கண்ணமங்கல முடையாந் எழுத்து
இப்படிக்கு இவை வகதாத
116. பாக்கமுடையாந் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை
பாலை ஊர் கிழவன் எழுத்து
117. இப்படிக்கு இவை அயனபுரங் கிழவன் எழுத்து
இப்படிக்கு இவை மணலூர்
118. கிழவன் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை சிற....டையாந்
எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இ
119. வை சொபுரமுடையான் எழுத்து இப்படிக்கு இவை
புடையமுழான் எழுத்து
120. இப்படிக்கு இவை நியமங்கிழான் எழுத்து

Note : (i) As the letters for the Tamil-grantha script is not available in the press the words or names in that script in the original are given in the Tamil script in square brackets.

(ii) The Kind courtesy of the Director (Epigraphy) Govt. of India permitting the publication of this unpublished inscription is acknowledged with thanks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. ORIGINAL SOURCES

Annual Reports of Epigraphy (1887 to-date)

South Indian Inscriptions, Vol.I to Vol.XXIV

Travancore Archaeological Series, Vol.I to IX

Kanyākumari Inscriptions (Department of
Archaeology, Government of Tamil Nadu)

Tiruthuraipūṇḍi inscriptions (-do-)

Nannilam inscriptions (-do-)

Inscriptions of Pudukottai State

Epigraphia Indica (All volumes)

Unpublished inscriptions, texts of which were furnished by the kind courtesy of the Director of Epigraphy, Government of India, Mysore and the Chief Epigraphist to the Government of India.

B. REFERENCE BOOKS

"The Cōḷas," Vol.I and II; by Prof. K.A.Nilakanta Sastri
(University of Madras; 1936; 1937)

"The Pandyan Kingdom," by Prof. K.A.N. Sastri
(Luzac & Co., London 1922)

"A History of South India" by Prof. K.A.N. Sastri (Second
impression; 1977)

"South Indian Temple Inscriptions," by T.N. Subrahmanyam

"The Cambridge Economic History of India," Vol.I (Ed.) Dharma
Kumar; 1982.

"South Indian History and Society" by Prof. N.Karashima
(OUP 1984)

"Studies in the History of Ancient Townships of Pudukottai" by
R. Tirumalai; (Department of Archaeology, Government of
Tamil Nadu) (1982)

"Rajendra Vinnagar" -do- (1981)

— * —

INDEX

- Āccālpuram Mahāsabhā 69, 145, 163, 166.
Acyutamangalam 100.
Adaḷayūr Nāḍālvān 157.
Agara Brahmadēya 135.
Agaram, Village 168, 173.
Ājīvikas 117.
Akkala-Mummaḍi Caturvēdimangalam 63, 131.
Ākkūrnāḍu 162.
Aḷagamānēri, deity at 58.
Ālanguḍi Sabhā 114, 128, 138.
Allūr 21, 56, 98.
Āluḍaiya nācciyār, deity 59.
Āluḍaiya Nāngūrālvān Arayan 170.
Ambalam 64, 68, 90, 142, 171.
Ambarnāḍu 162.
Ambāsamudram 176.
Ammayappan Kulamāṇikkam 29.
Anavaradadāna Caturvēdimangalam, 19.
Vāmanan Anbarkarasan *alias* Nāṭṭukkōn of Tirunaraiyūr 101.
Anbil, deity of 23.
Aṇḍanallūr 42, 43, 56.
Āṇḍārs 23, 37, 46, 57, 58.
Appadurai, Dr. A. 2
Appaṇaṇ, Kuḍandai Uḍayān 169.
Appāṭṭār Kalavaḷi Nāḍālvān 154.
Arakarāmūr 29.
Arayar 121.
Ariyāvūr Ūrār 63, 131.
Āryacakravartigaḷ, Dēvar 46.

Āryadēśa 91.

Āttūr 162.

Avanimārtāṇḍapuram 29.

Āyanapuram (ūr kiḷavan) 166.

Āyar-Kuḷam 19.

Baladēvan Nakkan 50.

Bāratāya Nakkanār 119.

Bhaṇḍāravāriam 94.

Bhaṭṭas 19, 45.

Bhaṭṭa, Sabyadīpa Sōmayājiyār 117.

Brahmadēya 4, 8 16, 19, 22, 30, 34, 35, 38, 45, 55, 81, 89,
101, 118, 121, 124, 177.

Brahmedēvarāyar, Arayar Ācāra kaṇṭa 120.

Brahmakṣētra 24.

Brahmarāyan, Sēralāntaka 118.

Brahmaśrirāyan 127.

Buddhist Paḷlis 6.

Cakravarti, Kāraḷa Kaṇṭakasaṁmaya 174.

Caṇḍēsvarapperuvilai 123.

Candrabhaṭṭa Vikkaṇṇa 15.

Cauvery 21, 61, 67, 71, 98, 137, 144, 148, 156, 161, 167,

Chadwick D.T. 180.

Chepauk. 80, 180.

Chingleput 8, 91, 116, 149.

Cidambaram 111, 138.

Cōlakēraḷanallūr 57.

Cōlakulavallicaturvēdimangalam 12.

Cōlamaṇḍalam 123.

Coleroon 137, 156.

Cōṇāḍu 10.

Dārāsūram 123.

Dēvadāna Iṟaiyili 12.

Dēvan Sāttan 50.

Dēvan Tāntōṇḍṟi 50.

Devanṇabhaṭṭa 12.

Dēvar 19.

Dēvavinōdanallūr 146.

Edirilicōḷa - caturvēdimangalam 166.

Elavanasūr 119.

Eṇṇāyiram 12, 110.

Ennūr, Ūrār 99.

Emappērūr 122.

Erukkāṭṭuccēri 170.

Eṟumbiyūr 28.

Fort St. George, 180.

Gāngēyan 74.

Gāngēyan, Kaṇḍan Āḷudaiyān 73.

Gāngēyarāyan 147.

Ghaṭana 14, 33

Hoysalas 154.

Iḷakkaṇan 135.

Iḷamai Karumāṇikkam *alias*

Bhaṭṭapiriyan 119.

Iḷamai Vēṅgaḍam Paṇḍita-Priyan 119.

Irukkandurai 30.

Irukkuvēḷ Sembian *alias*

Parāntakan Bhūti 42, 43.

Irumbrolu 59, 60.

Iśāna mangalam 56, 98.

Īsan, Mādavan 50.

Īraikkattū 12.

Jatāvarman Cōlapaṇḍya 51.

Jayaṅkoṇḍa Cōlavaḷanāḍu 135.

Kaḍuvanūr 14.

Kālahasti 10.

Kālakāladēva 136.

Kaḷappāl 29, 71, 146.

Kaḷappālan 71, 149.

Kalasapākkam 62, 130,

Kalasāttankuḍi 57.

Kalavaḷi Nāḍāḷvān 154, 157.

Kālayārkoil 99.

Kālingarāyan 24.

Kallagam 144.

Kallars 64.

Kalliḍaikuricci 31.

Kallūr 50, 53.

Kamarājar, District 179,

Kanakarāyan 11.

Kaṇḍanācci *alias* Mangayarkaraśi 58.

Kaṇḍan Āḷuḍaiyan Kaṇḍan 151, 157.

Kaṇḍan Āḷagukaṇḍa Perumāl 157.

Kaṇḍan Āḷagukaṇḍa perumāl *alias*
Kāṅgēyan 152.

Kaṇḍiya Thēvar 151.

Kandramāṇikkam 73, 140, 151.

Kaṇḍuḷavu 19.

Kāṅgēyan 154, 157.

Kāṅgēyar, Annavāyil Uḍayār 146.

- Kāṅgēyarāyan 59.
 Kaṅgāppūr 73, 151, 152.
 Kāraikkūḍi 98.
 Kārāḷa Kaṅpaka-Samaya-cakravarti 74.
 Karikāḷa - eōḷa - Caturvēdimangalam 131.
 Karisūḷndamangalam 76, 176.
 Karuṇākaran 50.
 Karuntaṭṭānguḍi P. 120.
 Kāvanūr Sabhā 177.
 Kēraḷānātaka Caturvēdimangalam 63, 101, 132.
 Kiḷadacār *alias* Varaṇavāsi 144.
 Kiḷappaḷuvūr 137.
 Kiḷkūṟṟu Veḷḷāḷa 135.
 Kiḷpilāru 134.
 Kīranūr 31.
 Kōḍānūr Sabhā 76, 176.
 Kōlikuruvitturai 14, 45.
 Kōlār 123.
 Kōnāḍu 59.
 Kōnilakaṇṭi 127.
 Kōpperuṅjīnga 25, 138, 167, 168.
 Kōṟṟamaṅgalamuḍaiyān 122.
 Korambu 21.
 Koḍanagar Ūrār 63, 131.
 Kuḍavāyil 12.
 Kuḍavūr-Nāḍu 122.
 Kuḍumiyāmalai 59.
 Kulaśēkhara 29, 31.
 Kulaśēkhara, Jaṭāvarman 14, 15, 58, 154.
 Kulaśēkhara, Māṇavarman 19, 26, 31, 46, 135, 136, 176.
 Kulaśēkharacaturvēdimangalam (Tirunelvēli) 150.

- Kulaśēkharapuram, Nagaram 32.
 Kulaśēkhara, Vānavadaraiyar 32.
 Kulōttuṅga I 62, 98, 101, 110, 119, 122, 130, 137, 139, 140.
 Kulōttuṅga II 36, 101, 111, 132.
 Kulōttuṅga III 31, 70, 71, 123, 134, 146 - 149, 153, 156, 167, 170.
 Kulōttuṅga Cōḷa Caturvēdimangalam 163.
 Kulōttuṅga Cōḷamangalam, Mahāsabhā 101, 132.
 Kulōttuṅga Cōḷa-tanināyaka Caturvēdimangalam 148, 167.
 Kumāramangalam 166.
 Kumbakōṇam 63, 132, 148.
 Kundavai 9, 120.
 Kunnāṇḍārkoil 32.
 Kunnattūr 17.
 Kunrakkūṭṭom *alias* Uttuṅgatuṅgavaḷanāḍu 144.
 Kurumbūr Nāṭṭukkōn 17.
 Kuruṅjipāḍi 144.
 Kuruvitturai 15.
 Kūttāḍumdēvar 128.

 Māḍalan Mādavan Āpramēyan 125.
 Madras 179, 180.
 Madurai 14, 16, 154.
 Mahēndramangala Sabhā 120, 121, 124.
 Māhēśvaras 22-27, 37, 100.
 Maitland F.W. 54.
 Mānābharaṇa Caturvēdimangalam 49.
 Maṇalūr Ūrkiḷavan 166.
 Maṇalūruḍaiyān 170.
 Manamasiddhi 60.
 Mānavīraparāntakan 51.

- Māṅgāḍu 16.
 Mangalam Village 99.
 Maṇiyan, Iruvīṭṭukkāl 76, 176.
 Mannārguḍi 61, 64, 66, 90, 113, 142, 160.
 Maṅḡāḍis 45.
 Malaiappiyarāyar Nandipanmar 144.
 Maḷavarāyan 154.
 Maruṅgūr 59.
 Maruttuvakkuḍi deity 146, 148.
 Mayūram 104, 137, 146, 148, 149.
 Mēlakkallūr 50.
 Mēlappaḷuvūr Nāṭṭārs 109.
 Mēlāṭci 6, 53.
 Mēlatchi Uḍayār 48.
 Mēlavēmbunāḍu 50.
 Mēlsēvūr 29.
 Muḍikkarai 99.
 Muḍithalai 30.
 Muḍivaḷangu Cōḷa Caturvēdimangalam 146.
 Mukhamaṇḍapa P. 116.
 Mukkaṇṭa - Kāḍuvēṭṭi 59.
 Mūlaiyūr 120, 124.
 Mūlaparuḍai Sabhayār 48.
 Mūlaparaḍaiyār P. 121.
 Nālandu Uḍaiyār 50.
 Nālāyira Viṇṇagar Emberumān 31.
 Nallaḍi Village 95.
 Namaccivāyam *alias* Attapaṇ 120, 124.
 Nandaluru 59.
 Nāngurāḷvān 170.

- Nāñjil Ūrār 31.
- Nārāyana Bhaṭṭa, Vājapēye 15.
- Nārāyaṇan 76, 176.
- Nārāyaṇan, Puttan or vīra, *alias*
Brahmaśrī Rāyan 127.
- Naraśiṅgamangalam 12.
- Naṭarāja 30, 128, 129.
- Nawab of Carnatic 180.
- Neriyuḍaya Cōla Mūvēnda Vēlār 144.
- Nīḍāmangalam 134.
- Nilakanta Sastri K.A., 2, 44. 83. 87, 88, 90, 92, 93, 114.
- Nilaittapārpaṭṭa nallūr, 163.
- Nilōpādi 13.
- Ninṭavūr Sabhā 8, 116.
- Niyamam, Ūr Kiḷavan of 166.
- North Arcot, 91.
- Nrpasekharamāttur P. 46.
- Oḍuvūr, Ūrār. of, 31.
- Pālaiyūr Ūrkiḷavan of 166.
- Pālayaṭṭai, 121.
- Pallavarājan, 143.
- Paḷudaiāṇḍār, a devotee, 23, 24.
- Paṇḍitappērēri, a tank, 19.
- Paṇḍiyūrpākkam, 123.
- Parakēśarivarman, 42, 117.
- Pārākrama Pāṇḍyan, Channel 16.
- Parākrama Pāṇḍyan Kaṭṭalai, 15.
- Parāntaka-I, 21, 42, 98, 119.
- Parāntaka dēvi P. 9.

- Parāntaka dēviyar, 120, 125.
 Parāntaka Sundara Cōḷa-II, 120.
 Pārvatibhāgar temple, 148, 168.
 Pattan, Tiṭṭai, 50.
 Paṭṭukōṭṭai, 71.
 Paṭṭukōṭṭai temple, 149.
 Paḍaipaiṇṇu, 5.
 Paḍiṇṇ bhūmi, 174.
 Pāccikkuṭṭam, 134.
 Pēlaṅgāvūr, 134.
 Peṇṇāḍam, 110.
 Pēran, Nakkan, 50.
 Periccikōil, 73, 140, 151.
 Pēriḷamaināḍu, 158.
 Periyān Mūvēnda Vēḷār 47.
 Perungaṇḍūr, 59, 60.
 Peruṅguḍi Makkaḷ, 6.
 Peruṅguḍi Perumakkaḷ, 163.
 Peruṅguḍi Mahāśabhā, 134, 168.
 Peruṅguḍi, Sabhā of, 94.
 Pērūr Ūrār 31.
 Piḍāri Temple, 23.
 Piriviliccam Uḍaiyār temple, 134.
 Pōśla - Vira - Sōmidōva caturvēdimangalam, 18.
 Poyyā sēvaḍi ēvaganādan, 14.
 Presidency College, 180.
 Puḍukōṭṭai, 4, 8, 31, 140.
 Pudupākkam 8, 22, 118.
 Puḷaḷābharana Vināyagar temple, 168.
 Puliyūr 29.

- Puliyūr nāḍu, 170,
 Pullamangalam, 30.
 Puḷḷān Vīra-nārāyaṇan 127.
 Puṇakkarambai nāḍu, Nāṭṭār, 74, 174.
 Puraṅgarambai Nāḍu (Kaḷappāḷi) 146.
 Rājādhirāja, 45, 109, 110, 122.
 Rājādhirāja - I, 12, 110, 128, 129.
 Rājādhirāja - II, 64, 134, 142, 143, 148, 162, 163.
 Rājādhirāja - III 29.
 Rājādhirāja vaḷa nāḍu, 163.
 Rājagambhīram, 15.
 Rājakēsari, 28.
 Rājakēsaricaturvēdimangalam (Karuntaṭṭānguḍi) 9.
 Rājamahēndra, 129.
 Rājanārāyaṇa caturvēdimangalam, Mahāsabhā of, 162.
 Rājarāja, 138.
 Rājarāja - I, 9, 35, 36, 47, 56, 72, 87, 118, 120, 122, 124, 126, 127, 138.
 Rājarāja - II, 64, 110, 129, 133, 134, 142, 144, 148.
 Rājarāja - III, 71, 72, 78, 135, 137, 148, 149, 167.
 Rājarāja, the Cēra prince, 49.
 Rājarāja caturvēdimangalam, 31.
 Rājarāja Piccan, 14.
 Rājarājapuram, 67, 161.
 Rājarājavaḷanāḍu, 10, 134.
 Rājarāja mārayān, 125, 127.
 Rājarājēśvaramuḍaiyār, 123.
 Rājasīmha, 49.
 Rāmanāthapuram, 140, 151.
 Ranadhīra caturvēdimangalam, 63.
 Ranadhīra caturvēdimangalam, Mahāsabhā, 131.

Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kannara dēva (Kṛṣṇa III), 117.

Rājendra - I, 9, 21, 23, 35, 36, 47, 59, 77, 93, 98, 121, 122, 127,
141, 149.

Rājendra - II, 149, 155.

Rājendra - III, 64, 68, 142, 167, 170.

Rājendra Cōla - I, 27.

Rājendra Cōla - II, 29.

Rājendra Cōladēva Parakēsari, 122.

Rājendra Vijaya (Anaimēl Tuñjiya Dēvar), 128.

Rājendra Viṇṇagar, 29, 49.

Rṣabha - vāhana - dēvar, 128, 129.

Sākali - Kōḍūru, 60.

Sāluvankuppam, 71, 143.

Samarakēsari Terinda Kaikōlar, 127.

Sāttur, 179.

Sēnāpati, 142.

Sēdamangalamuḍaiyār 124.

Sēndan, Nakkan, 50.

Sēranmādēvi, 50.

Sikār, 170.

Sindamangalamuḍaiyān, 120.

Siriānaiccūr, 88.

Sirūkaḷūr, 144.

Sirukiḷay, 169.

Siruperucciyūr, 73, 151.

Siruputtūr, 63, 130.

Sivabrāhmaṇas, 46.

Sivadēvanallūr, 58.

Sivaganga, 58, 99.

- Śivakāsi, 80, 180.
 Śivapādaśekharaṇallūr, 50, 51.
 Śivapuri, 46.
 South Arcot, 29, 119, 125, 137.
 Śrī Cōla - kula - caturvēdimangalam, 119.
 Śrībhuti caturvēdimangalam, 28
 Śrīmāhēśvaras, 11.
 Śripāda tīrtha svāmi, 76, 176.
 Śrī Rājaśikhāmaṇi caturvēdimangalam, 168.
 Śrīraṅgam, 94, 146, 147, 148, 156.
 Śrīraṅgam, deity of, 98.
 Śrī Sundarēśvarar, 130.
 Śrīvallabha caturvēdimangalam, 29.
 Śrīvallabha, Jaṭāvarman, 14, 16.
 Śrīvimāna, 28.
 Śrīvilliputtūr, 179.
 Subbarayulu, 107, 112, 114, 115.
 Subrahmaniyan, T.N., 41, 88, 92-94.
 Subrahmaṇya temple, 24, 71, 111, 149.
 Sucīndram, 10, 30, 47, 118.
 Sunaiykkuḍi, Ūrār of, 31.
 Sundara Cōla Parāntaka-II, 9.
 Sundara, Cōla, 125.
 Sundara, Jaṭāvarman, 49, 171, 172.
 Sundara, Māḡavarman, 72, 111, 150, 154.
 Sundara, Pāṇḍya-I, 73, 152.
 Sundara Pāṇḍya, Jaṭāvarman, 135.
 Sundara Pāṇḍya, Māḡavarman-I, 20, 140, 150, 153; 154, 156.
 Suthayalli' Mahāsabhā *alias* Vīra Vinōda caturvēdimangalam, 32.

- Talaicceṅgāḍu, 122, 169.
- Tāmbraparṇi, 7, 8, 33, 50, 76, 157, 176.
- Taniyūr* Rājādhirājā caturvēdimangalam, Mahāsabhā, of 64, 142.
- Taṇḍantōṭṭam, 101.
- Taṇḍurai village, 98.
- Taṇjāvūr, 9, 69, 120, 125, 156, 138.
- Tarōpādi, 13.
- Tennēri, Sabhā of, 118.
- Thēvar, Kaṇḍiya, 73.
- Tillai Aḷaganallūr, 163,
- Tillaisthānam, 119.
- Tiḷaimūr, 5, 44, 88, 120, 124.
- Tirunaraiyūr, Sabhā of, 130.
- Tiruccendurai, 56.
- Tirucciṅṅambalam Uḍaiyār, a deity, 163.
- Tiruceṅganūr (Tiruccānūr), 122.
- Tiruchirāpaḷli, 21, 137, 171.
- Tirukkaḍayūr, Mahāsabhā of, 162.
- Tirukkaḷar, 11, 74 174.
- Tirukkarugāvūr, 145, 163, 166, 180.
- Tirukkōḍikkāval, 123.
- Tirukkoḷḷikkāḍu, 23.
- Tirumalai temple 122.
- Tirumaḷappādi. 27.
- Tirumandira Ōlai, 142. 144.
- Tirumāndurai, township of, 134.
- Tirumaḷaippādi nāḍu, 122.
- Tirunāmattukkāṇi, 24, 25.
- Tirunaraiyūr Nāḍu, 95.
- Tirunelvēli, 17, 19, 50, 72, 111, 156, 179.
- Tiruppācōḷḷi, 15.

- Tiruppādirippuliyūr, 24, 25, 117.
 Tirupparankuṇṇam, 20.
 Tiruppattūr, 73.
 Tiruppēr (Kōvilāḍi) Sabhā, 132.
 Tirupuṇṇambiyam, 70, 134.
 Tiruvaḷundūr nāḍu, 88.
 Tiruvāmāttūr, 12, 13, 57, 58, 111.
 Tiruvārūr, deity of, 180.
 Tiruvayīndirapuṇṇam, 45.
 Tiruvayīndrapurattu Āḷvār, 110.
 Tiruvāyppāḍi dēvar temple, 12, 109.
 Tiruvēṇḡaḍam, 28, 62, 103.
 Tiruviḍaikulaṃ Uḍaiyār, a deity, 146.
 Tiruviḍaimarudūr, 44, 95, 101, 107, 111, 124.
 Tiruviḍaimarudil, deity of, 9, 96, 98.
 Tiruviḍaimarudil, Mahādēvar, 96.
 Tiruvindalūr, 91, 93.
 Tiṭṭai Sāttan, 50.
 Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam, 16.
 Toṇḍai nāḍu, 10.
 Tribhuvani Mahāsabhayār, 110.
 Tribhuvani (Pondichery), 142.
 Tribhuvani Sabhā, 110.
 Tuḍari, 144.
 Uḍayanāyanār *alias* Jayatuṅgarāyan, 59.
 Uḍayārkōil, 170.
 Ugalūr kūṇṇam, 173.
 Ulōgamādēviyār, 110.
 Uḷattūr kūṇṇam, 43, 134.

Uḡumūr (Eḡumūr) Sabhā, 133.

Uthamadānīśvara, 31.

Uttama Cōḷa, 22, 95, 118, 138, 133.

Uttiramērūr, 91.

Uttama Cōḷa caturvēdimangalam, Sabhā of, 17, 62, 118.

Uttuṅgatuṅga vaḷa nāḍu, 143.

Uyyakkoṇḍān Tīrumalai, 121.

Uyyakkoṇḍān Vaḷanāḍu, 101.

Vāḡīśan Maṭam, 130.

Vaigai, 14-16.

Vākkūr, Vellalas of, 142.

Vālikaṇḍapuram, 135.

Vallavaraśan, Karkarājan Dīpattaraisan, 144.

Vaḷuvamangalam (Oḷippāl), 31.

Vāmanan Aṇbarkaraiśan *alias* Tirunaraiyūr Nāṭṭukkōn of
Taṇḍantōṭṭam, 132.

Vānādhirājan, 142.

Vānādarāyar Nilagaṅgarāyan, 144.

Vangaṇṇa Dēvar, 118.

Vānavanāyakapperunderu: 64, 134.

Vāraṇavāśi *alias* Kiḷcār, 45.

Vāsudēvan Śrīdhara Bḡṭṭan *alias* Madhurāntaka Brahma
Mārayār, 132.

Veṇṇāḍu, 101.

Veṇṇaiyūr Nāḍu, 163.

Vikrama caturvēdimangalam, 116.

Vikramakēśari, Bhūti, 42.

Vikrama Cōḷa, 63, 98, 130, 139.

Vikramangalam, 14.

Vikrama Pāṇḍya, 14, 15, 24.

Vijayanagar, 179.

Vijayanārāyaṇam, 30.

Viḷumiyān *alias* Pallavadarayan Bhuvanamuḷududaiyān, 59.

Vīra Cōḷan, 43, 44.

Vīra Cōḷan, Arayan, 43.

Vīrakuḍi, Ūrār of, 31.

Vīranārāyaṇan Vinṇagar Āḷvār, 110.

Vīra Nārāyaṇan Sivan, 127.

Vīra Pāṇḍya (Cōḷan talai koṇḍa), 118.

Vīra Rājendra, 51, 88, 141.

Vīra Sikhāmaṇi Mūvēnda Vēḷār, 123.

— * —

ERRATA

PAGE	LINE	FOR	READ
4	16	endow and for	endow for
9	10	Kauntattangudi	Karuntaṭṭānguḍi
11	9	absconded	absconded
13	10	oecupant	occupant
13	17	eommuted	commuted
13	Footnote(*)	In further	On further
	-do-	explanaory	explanatory
16	11	5-13-160	5-13/160
22	21	Adyayamidugirargal enru	<i>Anyāyamidugirārgal enru</i>
24	14	sourrounding	surrounding
31	3	crroect	correct
32	25	collected	collected
	23	gatherd	gathered
44	15	thay	they
45	24	wear	were
47	fn. 84	explanatary	explanatory
48	fn. 85	explanatary	explanatory
49	30	inscriptious	inscriptions
51	2	aginst	against
52	4	hindred	hindered
52	18	Kudiningakkaranmai	<i>Kuḍinīṅākkārāṇmai</i>
53	1	perference	preference
55	7	differant	different
55	8	o be	to be
55	fn. 97	Korohima	Karashima
56	last line	interease	to increase
58	17	Jaṭavārman	Jaṭavarman

PAGE	LINE	FOR	READ
60	22	movei	move
61	16	stipulares	stipulates
64	fn. 119	explanatary	explanatory
67	1	collection	collection
68	17	productivity	assessment
70	last line	ratcs	rates
72	3	garnted	granted
72	4	snch	such
7	6	legitlmate	legitimate
72	7	levies	levies
76	23	would	would
79	10	reducc	reduce
80	4	only a lone	only of a lone
80	5	alredy	already
80	11	my	may
80	12	forccs	forces
80	14	at practised	as practised
81	15	the comprised	comprised the
82	22	Nadu	Nāḍu
83	fn. 5	Stndies	Studies
85	22	tn	to
85	14	whe	who
90	16	tatching	thatching
90	27	cited,	cited (Omit <i>Comma</i>)
91	15	commnnal	communal
96	26	prtion	portion
98	7	sccond	second
99	9	amont	amount

PAGE	LINE	FOR	READ
101	3	tha	that
109	17	on	an
109	19	clsasification	classification
112	16	The	The
114	17	arecapalm	arecapalms
116	2	Brahmadeya, the	<i>Brahmadēya</i> , to the
117	16	grnnted	granted
118	1	Uttamacaturvdi- mangalam	Uttamacaturvēdi- maṅgalam
119	6	tne	the
121	fn. 85	published	published
128	1	reference	references
128	13	templein	temple in
133	11		omit the last word 'the'
133	17	return	written
137	1	later	latter
137	4	measuriug	measuring
137	12	Cauveryriver	Cauvery river
	19	Tirukkaḍayūr,	Tirukkaḍaiyūr
138	last line	reconciliation	reconciliation
141	13		omit comma after 'chiefs'
142	18	the Taniyūr	delete the
143	6	Vellaḷas	Veḷḷāḷas
144	7	Kuḍinikki	<i>Kuḍinikki</i>
144	26	werc	were
146	10	orderd	ordered
147	9	realistion	realisation
148	21	quantumjump	quantum-jump.
149	1	templs	temples
149	16	exaetious	exactions

PAGE	LINE	FOR	READ
150	1	Devadanal	<i>Dēvadāna</i>
151	21	mlilets	millets.
153	17	Classification of	demand on
153	20	demand	demand
154	12	tht	the
154	21	place	palace
155	11	tenantry	Omit the full-stop after the word "tenantry"
158	15	abjoining	adjoining
159	9	oceasions	occasions
159	20	Vellalas	Veḷḷālas
160	3	under them,	under them.
161	13	payble	payable
161	13	attendence	attendance
162	5	construtive	constructive
162	fn. 151	unfourable	unfavourable
163	2	In	in
164	4		Omit <i>Comma</i> after land
164	fn. 155	Ep.Car.Ne 25	Ep.Car.NI.25.
166	23	it is addressed	it was addressed
167	16	townships	township
168	27		Omit brackets before 'Maḍakkunilam' and after 'crop.'
172	1	objected-to	Omit —
172	4	'of levy rates'	Omit 'of' before levy.
175	22	Kuttum	<i>Kūṭṭum</i>
178	27	ot the customary	at the customary

PAGE	LINE	FOR	READ
ANNEXURE—II			
180	6	ஐம்பூதமும்	ஐம்பூதமும்
182	25	ஐங்கல	ஐங்கல
182	28	ஐங்கல	ஐங்கல
183	78	கடலதல்லாதாகவும்	கடவதல்லாத
186	Note 11	Kind.	kind.

(Note by the author :

Despite the diligent correction of the proofs four times by, and the strain cast on the author, it is to be regretted that this long list of errata had to be compiled which speaks for the inadequacies of the press entrusted with the printing of this technical and original work of research. While the author has spared no pains to make the errata comprehensive there might be some more left unnoticed, which, it is hoped, will be rectified in any future edition.)

R. Tirumalai is a well-known scholar - administrator of India. He did research under the late Professor K.A. Nilakanta Sastri, and studied Tamil under the late Sri S. Vaiyapuri Pillai, and Sanskrit under Sri T.R. Chintamani.

Working for the Government for over 35 years in Madras State, and in the Government of India, he has had intensive experience in land revenue administration and settlement, for over twelve years of service. Entwining his discipline in scientific historiography, and literature with his field observations of rural practices and culture, and influenced by the Annals School of French historians, Sri Tirumalai brings to bear a fresh approach and outlook on his studies on the economic and agrarian history of the medieval South India based on authentic epigraphic evidence.

He has already published numerous papers, and several books such as "Studies in the History of Ancient Townships of Pudukkottai," "Rajendra Vinnagar", and "The Voice of Enterprise," this last tracing the history of the growth of commerce and industry in Madras, and the role of the Madras Chamber of Commerce (1836-1986.) He was also awarded the prestigious Jawaharlal Nehru Fellowship for his work on the "Pandyan Townships." Currently he has been conferred a Senior Fellowship by the Indian Council of Historical Research for a similar research on "the Townships of the Cola heartland."

