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FOREWORD

The period from the fifteenth century to the nineteenth century, till the entry of the East India Company was a tumultuous period in the History of South India. There were bitter wars waged by one dynasty against the another. It was also the period when the Muslim rulers and the Mahrattas entered the fray to get a firm foothold in this part beyond the Vindhyas and take maximum advantage from the internecine wars. We also find the arrival of the foreign companies ostensibly for trade and their gradual involvement in the political intrigues of the country which tilted the balance of power in their favour.

The period, however witnessed great Hindu revival under the dynamic rule of the Vijayanagar kings. The rulers of the Sangama, Saluva, Thuluva, and Aravidu dynasties of this empire considered Lord Venkateshwara as their tutelary deity and the liberal grants and endowments, they made are a measure of their piety to Lord Srinivasa. The temple of Tirumala - Hill reached its zenith of glory during the period of the illustrious king Krishnadevaraya, the scion of the Thuluva dynasty. He not only gave fabulous gifts to Thiruvengadamudaiyan but also undertook major renovation to the temple and personally supervised its day-to-day administration.

In this volume, the author deals with the History of Tirupati from the last phase of the Sangama dynasty to the early years of the 19th century. The History of the recitation of Alvars' 'Divya prabandham' also finds a place in this book. The Alvars' concept of the Archa form of Sri Venkateswara is also dealt with at length in this volume.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams
Tirupati
Venkaṭādri samaṁ sthānam
brahmāṇḍe nāsti kiñcana ı
Venkaṭeśa samo devo
na bhūto na bhaviṣyati ıı

“There is no place equal to Venkatadri in the whole universe. A god equal to Venkatesa, there never has been and there never will be”.

Published by the Executive Officer, T.T. Devasthanams, Tirupati and Printed at Ads Printers, T.Nagar, Chennai on behalf of T.T.D.
PREFACE

(TO THE FIRST EDITION)

This volume deals with the history of the temple from about the closing years of the Sangama dynasty of the Vijayanagar Empire, say from 1450 A.D. to the early years of the nineteenth century when the English East India Company at Fort St. George, Madras, after dispossessing the Nawab of Arcot in 1801 A.D., assumed direct management of the temple and carried out a systematic investigation into its affairs till about 1830 A.D. It is only for the period from 1450 to 1638 A.D., that sufficient materials of historic value are available from the inscriptions on the walls of the temple. Although the last king of the Vijayanagar Empire continued to retain the title till 1665 A.D., the Carnatic country and our temple passed into the hands of Mir Jumla, former commander of the Golkonda forces, in July 1656 as his personal Jagir granted by the Moghul Emperor Shah Jehan. The temple continued since then to be under the control of the Nawab of the Carnatic till 1801 A.D., except for a short period in 1758—59 as the French captured the temple in October 1758.

Materials for writing the history during the period of Muslim overlordship have not been obtained from inscriptions but from contemporary records of the English and the Dutch Factories in India and the East which came into existence in the early years of the seventeenth century. Foster’s Book on English Factories in India throws some indirect light on our temple affairs also. After the building of Fort St.
George in Madras in 1641 our position improves. The Diary and consultations Book, Military and country correspondence and Reports of secret committees throw more light on the political game in which our temple became a pawn.

The Marattas entered the South as the comrades of the Bijapur muslim king in his invasions and established a principality in Tanjore. Sivaji a little later came in as the ally of the Golkonda King in 1677. The net result of the ambitions of the Marattas was a treaty with the Moghul Emperor which secured for them one fourth of the revenues technically known as the chauth. For the annual assessment of the chauth amount, all the accounts and connected records, including land registers, came to be maintained in the Moḍi script of the Maratta language. This is of interest to us because all the important old records of our temple, whether in the Devasthanam office or in the Madras Records office, are in that language and script. Until they are translated into English or Telugu an authentic history of the temple during the Muslim and the East India Company rule could not be written. Chapter XXII deals with this period. There is not much to learn therein about the internal affairs of the temple, its festivals, the changes in religious practices and so on. All that we learn is that for the first time in its history the temple and its properties were farmed out annually by bid to a renter who managed to secure all votive offerings into his hands and pay the Nawab the bid amount. He seems to have devised the method of collecting the bid amount by such exactions as—poll tax, kanukas, varttanas,
ārjītams, etc. These have continued to be levied as a permanent source of income. We are loath to believe that Hindu pilgrims who are deeply religious would not voluntarily give large donations for charitable purposes connected with temple administration without exactions made.

Chapters XV to XXI register only such voluntary offerings and endowments from the days of Sāluva Narasimhadeva Udaiyar to the end of the Vijayanagar Empire in 1665 A.D. Saluva Narasimha laid the foundation for the fame and popularity of the temple. It assumed superb proportions during the days of Sri Krishnadevaraya, Achyutaraya and Sadasivaraya. The decline commenced with the battle of Talikota in 1565. But even during the decadent period the services in the temple retained their grandeur, those connected with Sri Ramanuja in particular.

One hundred and sixty eight inscriptions relate to the period of Saluva Narasimha and his son Immaḍī Narasimha (1445—1505 A.D.). Out of these only 136 are complete ones useful for writing a history. The others are either incomplete, fragmentary or undatable. The period of Sri Krishnadevaraya and his elder brother (1505 to 1530 )gets two hundred and twenty nine inscriptions, out of which only 165 are complete ones. Achyutaraya’s period (1530 to 1542) has two hundred and fifty one inscriptions, but only 176 are complete ones. Sadasivaraya’s period has one hundred and seventy six inscriptions, but only 134 are complete ones. It will be seen that there are too many fragmentary and incomplete inscriptions. They testify to our national defect of not realising the historical value
of inscriptions. A workman would mercilessly break to pieces a valuable inscription if only he could get one broken piece to fit into his new masonry.

The Aravidu kings of the Vijayanagar Empire ruled after the battle of Talikota for ninety years from 1575 to 1665 A.D. Although there are one hundred and eighty five inscriptions classed by the epigraphist as relating to this period, only thirty three complete ones can be used for historical purposes. The remaining 152 inscriptions are either fragmentary, incomplete or undatable. Very many of these may well be ascribed to any period of our history.

Throughout the Vijayanagar period the management of the temple was in the hands of the Sthanattar who as we know (Chap. XIII, p. 374) formed a self-constituted autonomous body of twelve members. After 1600 A.D. their strength got reduced to six. They were completely extinguished and along with them Tamil as the language of the temple, presumably when the temple passed into the hands of the Golkonda Muslims about 1656 A.D. An inscription of the year 1684 A.D. confirms their disappearance and the appearance of a body of Telugu Sthānālavāru of four members who however had not the power to receive endowments. There is in fact no Tamil inscription after 1638 A.D.

All the endowments made during the long period of rule of the Saluva and the Vijayanagar kings are marked by three distinct features. They are in a sense different from the endowments made during the Pallava, the Chola and the Pandyan sovereignty. The
latter devoted more attention to the burning of perpetual lights or *Nandavilakku* while the provision for food offering was limited to the requirements of the temple establishment in ordinary days and for any additional members taking part in festival celebrations. The feeding of the pilgrims who turned up on such occasions was catered to by private charities. The Saluva period made a distinct departure. It was recognised that temple worship provided a course of self-discipline and attuned the body and the mind of the worshippers for concentrated meditation. It was also recognised that managers of temples have a responsibility for providing amenities for the accommodation and feeding of the devotees. The *Taittirio-panishad* starts with statement that food is Brahman. Therefore, in Sri Vaishnava temples consecrated water or Tirtham and consecrated food or Prasadam were made essential features of temple worship. The herbs used for the cold infusion of the Tirtham have health giving and curative properties. The menu for Prasadams has a wholesome body building value. Annadānam or free distribution of food in the name of God worshipped in a temple engenders in the donor the spirit of self-surrender or non-egotism. In a place like Tirumala which pilgrims approach after trekking over long distances and after negotiating on foot with an empty stomach several steep ascents and descents of the hill, wholesome tirtham and prasadam have great physical and psychic value. Endowments therefore became phenomenally numerous. The festivals and calender days with which many of the endowments were associated appealed to the higher aesthetic sense of the pilgrims. The recitation of the Vedas and the
Tamil Prabandhams and the discourses which were conducted in the temple as well as in the homes and mutts of the religious preceptors served to awaken the desire for spiritual education. Thus tirtham and Prasadam, festivals and calender days, the recitation of the Vedas by Brahmans and of the Prabandhams by the Brahmin and the non-Brahmin Srivaishnavas on a footing of equality formed the three distinguishing features of the endowments made during the Vijayananagar period. Abuses did creep in the administration of these, but endeavours were being made from time to time for finding suitable remedies.

In this volume these aspects have been dealt with at length. The names of the donors, who came from all classes and all castes, have been given in annexures to the chapters wherein the purpose and nature of the endowments have also been described. They illustrate how in India those who amassed wealth in the material field applied their surplus wealth to encourage the activities of the spiritual workers who for that very purpose have to work in material poverty.

The recitation of the Prabandhams of the Alvārs has taken a deep root in the liturgy of Sri Vaishnava temples, although the Agamās did not contemplate it. The Prabandhams are also of special importance to the Tirumalai Temple as they alone bear the most authentic testimony for the Vishnu swatupam of Sri Venkatesvara. In Chapter XXIII, the history of the recitation of the Prabandhams in the Tirumalai-Tirupati Temples is given in Sec. 2. In Sec. 3 the authorities from the alvārs' songs have been profusely quoted for proving beyond doubt that even in days which the alvārs
speak of as ancient Sri Venkatesvara has been considered to be Sriman Narayana, Self-Manifest as an Image for the furtherance of the archa form of worship.

The numbering of the chapters and pages of this volume are in continuation of those of Vol. I.

As there are a few more chapters of collective interest to print, the Index for Volumes II and III together will, soon be published if Sri Venkatesvara so wills and grants me a modicum of eye-sight and health.

I am thankful to Sri C. Anna Rao Garu, Executive Officer and to the staff of the T.T.D. Press, for their kind co-operation and interest in bringing out this volume.

THE AUTHOR
## CONTENTS

### CHAPTER XV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saluva Narasimha</td>
<td>389—405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāluva Narasimha and Kandāḍai Rāmānuja Ayyangar</td>
<td>389—391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periya Raghunātha’s Temple</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugādi and Dīpāvali</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhyayanōtsavam</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavitrōtsavam</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāḍiya Veṭṭai</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōḍai Tirunāl and Tiruppalli-ōḍam</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food offerings increase</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruvāṇḍu Eḻutṭidal, or writing the New Year’s Accounts</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruvēṅkaṭa Mahātmyam</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puḷugukkāppu Murai</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Van Saṭḥakōpan Maṭham (Ahōbila Mutt)</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments and offerings mainly Kāmyārtha</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of villages endowed during Sāluva Narasimha’s period</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHAPTER XVI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kandāḍai Ramanuja Ayyangar and Saluva Narasimha</td>
<td>406—419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandāḍai Ramanuja Ayyangar</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandāḍai Ramanuja took full advantage of his influence</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attitude of other donors</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandāḍai Ramanuja’s activities after the death of Sāluva Narasimha</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note on the disposal of the donor’s share of prasadams by members of the Sāluva family</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

CHAPTER XVII

The Period from about 1492 to 1511 A.D. (Immadi Narasimharaya and Vira Narasimha Maharaaya) ... 420—426
Achāryapurushas ... ... ... 425

CHAPTER XVIII

The Tiruvengadam Temple and Sri Virapratapa Vira Krishnadeva Maharaaya (1509 to 1530 A.D.) ... 427—466
Krishnadevaraya’s Religious Beliefs ... ... 429
Krishnadevaraya’s attitude towards the Sthanattār ... 436
Nandavanams and Sāttāda Srivaishnavas ignored ... 439
Temple structures received no attention ... ... 440
Krishnadevaraya’s gifts to Tiruvenkatanātha ... ... 440
Endowments and gifts by the generals and officers of Krishnadeva and others ... ... ... 444
The Jiyars ... ... ... 453
The Vañ Saṭhakopan Maṭham ... ... 456
The Vyāsaraya Maṭham ... ... 458
Ekākis ... ... 460
Scholars ... ... ... 461
Yagna Narayana Bhaṭṭar ... ... 461
Doddaiyyangar Appai ... ... 462
Uḍaiyavarkoyil Anṇa ... ... 463
Merchants ... ... ... 463

CHAPTER XIX

Achyutaraya Maharaya and the Tirumalai Temple ... 467—505
Appointment of Muddu Kuppāyi for doing dancing service in the temple ... ... ... 470
Aḷvār Tirtham, construction of cutstone steps and Sandhyāvandana mantapams ... ... ... 474
CONTENTS

Achyutaraya performed Srinivasa Sahasranāmārachana with his own hands .............. 477
Lakshmīdēvi Mahōtsavam ............. 479
Sri Achyuta Perumāḷ and Achyutarayarapuram ............... 482
Achyutarayar Kōnēri in Tirumala .............. 483
Probable date of construction of Achyutaraya Kōnēri .......... 484
Palace influence ...................... 485
Transfer by sale in perpetuity of donor’s share of prasadams made by Sāluva Timmarasa to Tāḷḷapakkam Tirumalai Ayyangar .............. 489
Prasadams—article of trade .............. 496
Temple worship, Achārya purushās and other āchāryās .......... 499
Agreement among cloth merchants and lessees .............. 502
Annexure to Chapter XIX .............. 506—512
Other donors—Adaippam Baiyyappa Nayakar, Periya Timmappan and Chinna Ramappan, Dalavay Timmarasayyar, Lēpakshi Virapparungal, Angaraja Nāgapayyar, Salakayadeva Singaraja .............. 506
Villages endowed in Krishnadeva’s and in Achyutarāya’s reign compared .............. 508

CHAPTER XX

Sadasivaraya Maharaya’s Period .............. 513—546
The Sthanattar and the succession dispute—The Salakaraja and the Aravidu family as donors compared .............. 513
Prasadam Lessees-Prasadakkārar Mahamē dangal .............. 522
List of Prasadakkārar ...................... 522
Temple palanquin and portion of daily prasadams gifted away to Tiruvenkata Manickam .............. 524
New Minor temples and shrines .............. 525
New Festivals ...................... 528
Tabular statements of endowments made from time to time (explained) .............. 534
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

Statement I .......................... 538
Statement II-(a) ....................... 540
Statement II-(b) ....................... 542
Income and Expenditure from Endowments discussed .................. 545

Annexure to Chapter XX—Donors and their endowments
during Sadasiya Maharaya’s period .................. 547—576
Endowments by military and other officers .................. 553
Endowments by persons connected with temple .................. 557
Archakas or Namibimars .................. 558
Jiyars .................. 558
Acharyapurushas .................. 559
Tallapakkam Tirumalai Ayyangar, Tallapakkam Tiruvengada Ayyangar: .................. 562
Tiruninra-ur-udaiyars .................. 566
Emperumānaḍiyars .................. 567
Temple door-keepers (koyilaḍis) .................. 567
Vinnappam seyvār; Lessees of Temple Prasadams
(Prasādakkara Mahamēdangal) and Temple astrologers .................. 568
Endowments by persons unconnected with the temple .................. 571
Classified list of donors and their endowments .................. 574

CHAPTER XXI

The Aravidu Emperors of Vijayanagar and the Tiruvengadam Temple .................. 577—608
Venkatapatideva Maharaya (Venkata I) .................. 587
Sri Vira Rama Rāvudēva Maharaya (Rama IV) .................. 592
Sri Virapratapla Sri Rangarayadeva Mahāraya
(Ranga VI) .................. 599

CHAPTER XXII

The Post-Vijayanagar Period .................. 609—650
The temple passes into the hands of the Golconda
Muslim King .................. 609

xvi
CONTENTS

Cessation of Endowments explained 610
Maratta invasion in 1677 aggravated the situation 611
Sivaji Maharaja—His antecedents and aims in life 612
Sivaji’s conquest of the Carnatic and premature death in 1680 615
Aurangazeb’s conquest of the Deccan down to Trichinopoly 616
Economic chaos in the Carnatic country 617
A solitary inscription in Telugu in 1684 by a Maratta officer 618
Surmise as to the disappearance of most of the endowed lands 621
The office of the Kanungōs 621
Temple lands how treated 623
How the protracted Moghul-Maratta War ravaged and impoverished the country 623
Sadet-ulla-khan and Tōḍar Mullji 625
The sudden incursion of the Marattas in 1740 A.D.; Dost Ali killed in Dāmalcheruva battle 626
Bāji Rao’s mother and wife worship Sri Venkatesvara 628
Subsequent political events 629
Duplix and Clive 630–650
Tirumalai Temple income goes to further succour
Robert Clive 633
The motive for resumption of temple lands and the grant of tasdik allowances 643
Minor Temples 648

CHAPTER XXIII

The Alvars’ Prabandhams and the Tirumalai Temple 651–713

SECTION I

Temples and the Prabandhams of the Alvars 652
Portions of the Prabandham culled out for daily recitation, called Nityānusandhānam 653
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

Prabandham of the Alvars .......................... 655
Recitation of the Tiruvāyμoli is attributed to Sri Nāṭhamuni .......... 656
The superiority of Tiruvayμoli over the other three works of Sri Nammalvar and the works of all the other Alvars ........... 659
Commentaries on the Tiruvāyμoli .................. 663
The other three thousand verses of the Prabandham .......... 667
Other works comprising the Prabandham ............. 670
Pantheon of the Alvars .................................. 678
Why the Tiruvāyμoli is recited along side of the Vedas during the Adhyayanotsavam ........... 680
Temple visited and, or sung by the Alvars ............ 683—694
Shrines in the Vaḍa nāḍu .................................. 695
Shrines in Tonḍamanḍalam or Tonḍai nāḍu .......... 696
Shrines in Chōla nāḍu and Shrines in Nāḍu nāḍu .... 696
Shrines in Pāṇḍi nāḍu .................................. 697
Shrines in Malai nāḍu .................................. 697
Birth dates of the Alvars ................................ 700—706
The order of succession as gleaned from the Prabandhams .......... 703—713

SECTION II.

Recital in Tirumalai Temple .......................... 714—767
Tiruppāvai recital in Tirumala (about 1250-1255 A.D.) .... 715
Tiruvayμoli recital in Tirumala 1360 A.D. .............. 718
Tiruppāvai recital during Mārgaḷi month in Tirumala and next in Tirupati, 1390 A.D.; .......... 719
Srivaishnava terms used in connection with the Alvārs' songs ........ 721
Anusandhānam ............................................. 724
Adhyayanam, Sevai, Anusandhigal, Anusandhanam .......... 725

xvii
## CONTENTS

| Shrines for the Aḻvārs | 726 |
| Tirumangai Aḻvar's Tiruvadhyayanam in Tirupati 1475 A.D. | 727 |
| Uḍaiyavar Emperumānar's Tiruvadhyayanam in Tirupati 1475 A.D. | 728 |
| Sri Ramanuja’s twelve days Tiruvadhyayanam festival in Tirumala | 728 |
| Iyal | 729 |
| Adhyayanōtsavam explained | 730 |
| Adhyayanōtsavam of Sri Govindarajaswam, 1485 A.D. | 731 |
| Adhyayanōtsavam in Tirumalai, 1491 A.D. | 732 |
| Circumstances which helped Prabandham recital to gain ground | 735 |
| The beginnings of the Anusandhānam office and how it was viewed by some famous ācharyas | 736 |
| Change in the relationship between the Koyil-kelvi and the Van Saṭhakōpan Jiyar | 743 |
| Iyal Sāttumurai done at the Balipīṭham | 746 |
| Lakshmidēvi Mahōtsavam;—no recital of Prabandham | 746 |
| Attitude of Achyutaraya’s generals and chief officers towards Prabandham recital | 748 |
| Instances when Prabandham reciters were not remunerated | 748 |
| Payment for Anusandhānam | 749 |
| Post-Talikoṭa Period | 756 |

## SECTION III.

Sri Venkatesvara—Self-Manifest Archa Form of Narayana and Vengadam Hill, His Hallowed Spot | 768—820 |
Preamble-Alvars’ Devotion to Vishnu | 768 |
References by the Early Alvars to Vēngāḍam and to other places of public worship | 783 |
## HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanctity of the Vēngaḍam Hill and the Self-Manifestation of Vishnu thereon</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poygai āḻvār</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūdattāḻvār</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pey āḻvār</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumalīsai Āḻvār</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Tiruppānāḻvār</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Kulasekharā āḻvār</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Nāmmāḻvār</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPENDICES.

Appendix VI Copy of Firmans granted by Damarla Venkatappa (1639 A.D.) and Emperor Srirangaraya Maharaya (1645 A.D.) 35—38


Appendix VIII Edict of the Vijayanagar Emperor Devaraya Maharaya II, (1429 A.D.) in Kannada language and Telugu Script, Inscription No. 188. T.T. (Vol. I No. 192) 40—43

Appendix IX Elicit of Saluva Narasingayyadeva Maharaya (Inscription No. 8, G.T.) Vol. II, No. 30 in Kannada language and Telugu Script 44—48

Appendix X Extract from Devasthanam Tasdik Book, abstract of receipts and charges, Fasli 1233 (1823-24 A.D.)
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI
(The Tirumala Tirupati Temples)

CHAPTER XV.

SALUVA NARASIMHA.

It was left to Saluva Narasingayadeva Maharaya to open a new chapter in the history of the Tirumala and Tirupati Temples. His devotion to this God may, to some extent, be explained by the fact that he was the great grand-son of Mahamandalesvara Misaraganda Mangideva Maharaja, who however, had not the agnomen or birudu “Sāluva” prefixed to his name. It was he that gold gilt the Vimānam and the Sīkharam of the Tirumala Temple in 1359 A.D. The inscription being in Telugu with a Kannada tinge in the language we may infer that he was in touch with the people of both countries. The capital of his ancestral territory was known to be Kalyānapuram (in Nizam’s Dominions). We are aware that Yadavaraya Sri Ranganatha built a palace for himself in Tirumala in 1352 a short time before his death and that no Yadavaraya appears to have stepped into his place. Mangideva played the most prominent part in the military campaign against the Sultan of Madura under the command of Prince Kumāra Kempanna. We found that he was in Tirumala just about the time of Sri Ranganatha Yadava’s death and the return of the God of Srirangam towards Srirangam; and he also did the unique service of making the Vimanam and Kalasam lustrous. It may reasonably be presumed that he was given the governorship of the erstwhile Yādavarāya country by the Vijayanagar King Bukkaraya I. But there is nothing to show that he transferred his capital to Chandragiri. His great grand-son, Mahāmanḍa-lēsvara Mēdīni Misaraganda Kāṭṭāri Sāluva Narasingayyadeva Maharaja, is said to have done so, and to have kept the Mūlabalam
or the strongest and best tried section of his army at Chandragiri. He would have inherited his great grand father's piety and a special reverence to the God of Tiruvengadam. This seems to have been a characteristic of all the members of the Sāluva family. The word Sāluva seems to be the name for ‘hawk.’ If so, he must have been regarded as swooping down on his enemies as a hawk does on its prey. There is an edict of his (II. 30) issued in December 1467 making a grant of three villages, Mupaḍuvēṭa, Māngoḍuvelada and Mananūru for making sumptuous daily offerings to Sri Govindaraja in Tirupati. This edict also permitted the Sthānikas in Tirupati to appropriate to themselves daily a quantity of prasadams similar to the practice in Tirumala; to have the donor’s share of the Prasadams sent to his Rāmānuja-kūṭam to be distributed there to pilgrims by his agent Kandaḍai Rāmānuja Ayyangar and above all to have a certain daily service of supplying parimalam (refined camphor, musk and saffron) carried out in the Tirumala temple by the non-brahmin Sāttāda Sri Vaishnavas who were shown in return certain honours. The inscription is in Kannada showing that he wanted this important edict to be in his native language and not Tamil. *This unique privilege which he gave to the Sattada Sri Vaishnavas shows the catholicity of his religion.* The inscription also shows how ready he was to see that men doing service in the temple should be recompensed adequately.

In his political career, he withstood the temptation of making undue use of the power and influence which was his more than that of his overlord in Vijayanagar. He was able to keep himself above exciting the jealousy or envy of his numerous cousins and nephews, all of whom were powerful. He appropriated to himself no higher titles than they enjoyed. This self-control and consideration for others he seems to have evinced even in religious matters.

He was lucky in having as his co-workers in temple affairs a gentleman of wide understanding and experience in Sri Kandaḍai Ramanuja Ayyangar. He seems to have had implicit faith in his honesty, capacity and application to work. But it is too much to say that he was his spiritual teacher or guide. The terms in
which the Ayyangar is referred to in the inscriptions do not admit of that status being given. A separate chapter is devoted to considering in detail Sri Ayyangar and Saluva Narasimha.

He describes himself as the disciple of Alagiya Manavāla Jiyar of Kanchipuram. His life period is said to be from 1430 to 1496 A.D. and Saluva Narasimha’s rule from 1445 to 1492 A.D. They worked together in the prime of life. For the Ramanuja-kūţams which Narasimha started in Tirumala and Tirupati, Ramanuja Ayyangar was the unfettered manager. Appreciating his economical management of these institutions and the savings effected, he was made by Saluva Narasinga’s son the Officer-in-charge of the Por-Bhandaram for jewellery and the silver and gold vessels in the temple (Por-Bhandaram Kāṇiākshi- ‘‘QUT DUKM

LāT U G S N T GāNIT A’’)) so that they may be kept in good repair. For the festivals which Saluva Narasimha instituted the budget was drawn up by Sri Ayyangar. The Sāttāda Sri Vaishnavas were the exclusive disciples of Sri Ayyangar. They cultivated flower gardens and supplied parimalam everyday for the Alagappirānār Tiruman-ţanam of the God. Above all this, he made them share in the daily routine of temple service, the privilege of reciting Tiruvoymoţi in company with the Brahmins and to receive their share of the emolument. The credit for all these must be given to Saluva Narasimha and Ramanuja jointly. A very large part of Vol. II of the T.T.D. Inscriptions represents their joint work. Another instance of laying stress on social justice based on personal purity irrespective of the distinctions of caste created by the accident of birth is the importance attached to the reading of the Kaisikapuranaţ on the Utthāna Dvādasi Day before day-break by a member of the first Acharya purusha’s family. Although the celebration of the Kaisika Dvadasa is mentioned as early as in the year 1308 A.D., it became a regular festival only in 1494 (II. 115) as is seen from an endowment made by Tiruninra-ur-udaiyan Māru Nayinar Perumakkal and Govindar. These are outstanding developments in the administration of the temple in which the secular as well as the religious side seems to have heartily co-operated.
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Periya Raghunatha’s Temple.

Until Sāluva Narasimha entered the scene there was very little improvement in Tirupati and its Govindaraja’s temple. During his reign of about half-a-century the festivals and food offerings increased in number. There was also a new temple for Sri Raghunatha—called Periya Raghunatha to distinguish the deity from the other Raghunatha installed in Sri Ramanuja’s Shrine—constructed in 1480 (II. 73) by one Narasimharaya Mudaljar for the merit of Saluva Narasimharayar. An endowment for a supplemental food offering was also made on 29—10—1481 (II. 74).

Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar constructed a temple for Kulasekhara Alwar in November 1468 A.D. for which the Sthanattar endowed as Sarvamanya the lands in Ilamanḍaiyam Kūraikkāl.

Yugadi and Dipavali.

From Samavai’s days all festivals were being timed according to the solar calendar. It was only in 1... 1 A.D. (II. 914, 27-6-1491), that there is the first mention of the Yugadi and Dipavali festivals being celebrated with food offerings in an endowment by SriMAN Mahamandalesvara Baichchraja Timmaya deva Maharaja. This shows that to suit the customs of the ruler of the land, the Chāndra-Saурa-māna Panchanga was being brought into use. The Yugadi and the Dipavali were ultimately to throw the Chittirai and the Tula Vishus into the shade. They were to be classed among the principal Asthanam Festivals.

Adhyayanotsavam.

From the Sri Vaishnava point of view the most important festival introduced in Tirumala is the Adhyayanotsavam, although portions of the ‘Alvār’s Prabandhams were being repeated on occasions from about 1360 A.D. Tiruvadhyananam in the month
of Mārgali as a festival celebrated in Tirumala occurs only (and even that incidentally) in 1468 (II. 31) in an endowment by Saluva Narasimharaja Udayar. It reads, "‘வாயில் வாயில் வாயில் மத்தேய் சுமூக்காய் குறுத்து பிரமுது கொண்டு வந்தும்போற்று குறுத்தான்’"("on the Tiruvadasi-day occurring in the latter ten days of the Tiruvadhayananam in the Margali month"). An endowment by Saṭṭakōpadāsaar Narasimharaya Mudaliar in the year 1476 (II. 68) distinctly mentions that in the month of Chittirai Udayavar Emperumānār hears on the 12 days of his festival the Tiruvadhayananam. In both cases the donor’s share of the offered prasadavars went to the Ramanujakutam for distribution to Sri Vaishnavas by Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar. The Adhyayanotsavam is a festival repeated on two occasions in the year, that is, in the month of December as well as in April both being celebrated only in front of Udayavar (Sri Ramanuja) in his Tirumala Shrine. The festival in Tirupati is not being referred to here. The prasadavars are first to be offered to Tiruvengadamuḍaiyān and then to Udayavar.

Pavitrotsavam.

Pavitrotsavam was another festival newly introduced during this period in an endowment by Kaṭṭāri Saluva Mallayyadeva Maharaja in 1464 (II. 18) being a five day’s festival in the month of Āvani. It has a ritualistic form.

Padiya Vettai.

Padiya Vettai (Hunting) festival (பாத்யா வெட்டை) first commenced in 1456 although one would expect it to have been a very old festival seeing that the God is on a thickly forested hill of which the original owner is believed to be Sri Varaha Swami (the Boar Avatāram of Vishnu).

1. ‘சாலையுன்ற சத்தலுறைந ரிஷேத்துறைக்கு திதியுங்கள் கேளிப்பு பொருளிச் சூழ்குவே.’
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Kodai Tirunal and Tiruppalli-Odam.

*Kodai Tirunal and Tiruppalli-Odam*, (கோடை திருநாள் திருப்படல் தோட்டம்) or floating festival, in Tirumala is first heard of in 1468, when Sāluva Narasimharaya during 3 days of the latter ten days of the Kōḍai Tirunāl instituted a floating festival during which occasion the Utsava Murti is entertained in a Vasanta-maṇṭapam constructed by him in the middle of the tank or Pushkarini. But *Vasanta-utsavam* itself is an older festival and Erramanchi Periya Pemma Nayakkar is said to have attended the same in 1360 A.D. The festival is in the Vasanta Rtu (month of Masi). Allied to this is the Nāvalūṛṟu festival (*பாரிசை வந்தகம்*) in Panguni month.

*Dola Mahotsava Anna Unjal Tirunal* is another festival (*தோலா மகோத்ஸவ அனுஜல் திருனாள்*) introduced by Saluva Narasimha under the inspiration of Kandadai Ramanuja as a five days’ festival. It may have been in the month of Mithuna.

*Excepting perhaps the Pavitrotsavam, which his Vedic rituals associated with it all the others are of the luxury pattern.*

Food offerings increase.

In the matter of food offerings also this period showed a marked increase. Without taking into account the offerings made during festivals of one sort or another, the food offerings, between the years 1454 and 1494 A.D., were 177 marakkals of rice daily in addition to 24 marakkals daily which obtained at the end of 1450 A.D. This does not include the Mahanaivedyam (Tiruppāvaḍai) of 200 marakkals offered on certain special occasions. This was contributed not by Sāluva Narasimha alone. There are several others also as noted below. They include princes and devotees. Even emperumāṇaḍiyars have made their contributions. Sāluva Narasimharaya Uḍaiyar, his Queen, his mother and his sons, his brother and his military commanders, other members of the royal family (5) Feudatory chiefs and subordinates 16) Jiyars (5); Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar, Tōlappar, K.
SALUVA NARASIMHA

Appachchiyar Anṇa; Kumāra Tāttayangār; Ekakis (12); Brahmīns (7); Tiruchchukanur Subhaiyar (5); Temple accountants (18); citizens and merchants of Tirupati (4) viz., Sathakopadāsar Narasimharāya Mudaliar, Periyaperumal dāsar Ariyārāya Mudaliar, Puḍölīar Venkata setti Narayanan and Saranu setti; public works Officers of the temple (3) dancing girls (3) and others (7).

The list is given in detail to show that the Sri Vaishnava propaganda was having effect on the public at large and was not confined to a few prominent people.

The festival and the Visesha divasam days (special calendar days) on which food offerings were generally made to the Utsava Murti during this period are briefly summed up in an endowment by one of the Public Works Officers of the temple, Tiruvenkatāchcherukkaṇ Emperumanar, for the spiritual merit of Immaḍī Narasingarayar Maharayar (Narasimha’s son) II, 138; 20-9-1504.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For 7 Brahmotsavams @ 13 for each</td>
<td>91 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Tiruvadhyayanam from Iyalpatuvakkam to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannir-amudu</td>
<td>24 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodai Tirunal</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unjal Tirunal</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavitrōtsavam</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirukkārtikai</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpisi Pūrāḍam (Senai Mudaliar birth)</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirudvādasi (Mukkoti) for Venkatatturaivar</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Jayanti (to Periya Perumal)</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ani Pūrāḍam</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ani Pūsam</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Rama Navami</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasanta Paurnami</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total          153 days.

Thus in a year 153 festive days came to be observed.
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On these 153 days there were more than the 153 taligais which this one individual alone offered. We may multiply this by at least 2 so that in a year there would have been 306 taligais in addition to the daily tastik of 177 taligais and a number of 200 marakkals-Tiruppāvaḍai. The provision of food on the 153 festival days would naturally have been sufficient to feed $8 \times 484 = 3792$ persons a day. On the ordinary days the temple food would have been ample for $8 \times 177 = 1416$ persons. We thus have a rough idea of the number of pilgrims who may have been daily visiting the temple. The temple servants who had their mamool share of the food offerings, sold it in their turn to pilgrims. This seems to have been a recognised practice.

The cash endowments made during this period were 70 in number and amounted to 1,15,605 panams.

The names of some of the donor's are Saluva Timmaraja, Tōlappar Ayyangar and Kumāra Tāttayangar, sons of Sottai Tirumalanambi Tiruvenkattattayangar, Achārya Purushas, of Rs. 7000 and Rs. 5000 respectively; their disciples Ravu Pinnanna Bhūpālā Nrisimha Naranāyaka and Kēsa Nayaka each Rs. 4000, Saṭhakopadasar Narasimharaya Mudaliyar a number of endowments amounting to Rs. 13,200 panams and Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar's 10,300 panams in cash and the excavation of a large number of irrigation channels besides some villages.

Saluva Narasimharayar, his queen and the other members of his family also made endowments of lands. The total number of villages endowed during the period was 26$. Their annual income has, however, not been stated anywhere, the details of the services to be rendered alone being mentioned in each case.

"Tiruvandu Eluttidal" or writing the New Year's Accounts.

One other noteworthy point is that the Adiyānam has always (అద్యాయ) been associated with a special function in the Tirumala Temple. It is called now-a-days, Anivarai Asthanam. (అనివారై)
On this day, in the morning, after the usual Tiruvāradhanam or Nityarchana for Periyaperumal is over, the Utsavar, with the Nachchimar holds in the Tirumāmani mantapam what is really a Durbar. All the officers return the ensignia of their office and these are placed at the feet of Malaiikuniya-ninrapurumal, the Utsavar. A fresh investiture ceremony is then held when the Archakas, Jiyar and the Trustee receive their ensignia afresh. The accounts for the new year are opened afresh.

This opening of the new year account came to be known as "Tiruvandu Eluttidal (திருவான் எழுத்திட்டி) or the new year's writing (of accounts etc.). Although Aṭi ayanam has always been (from 966 A.D.) observed by offering Tirumanjanam to Periya Pērumal, it is nowhere mentioned in clear terms that the accounts for the year open afresh on that day. The first mention of it is in an inscription dated 9th March 1494 relating to an endowment made by the accountants, Mārunayinār Perumakkal and Govindan. It must have come into vogue some years earlier, although no mention is made thereof. In any case it seems to have attained an importance during Sāluva Narasimharaya's time.

TIRUVENKATA MAHATMYAM.

The most outstanding event during this period was the compilation (in what language we are not explicitly told, but must have been in Sanskrit) of a work called by its author Pasindi Venkatat turai var (alais Jiyar Ramanujayyan) 'Tiruvenkata Mahatmyam.' The compilation was for the first time solemnly announced and openly read out by the author in the presence of Malaiikuniyaninrān and the Nachchimar on 27th June 1491 (II. 95.). We have nowhere been given an idea of the contents of that work, but shall consider it in a separate note. The object of the author seems to have been to give a mythical origin of the Archavatara Tiruvengadamudaiyan on the Tirumala Hills which would appeal strongly to the religious sentiments of the Hindus.
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Pulugukappu Murai.

(புருவகுப்பு முறை)

Another event which has appealed strongly to the imagination of succeeding generations is what has been called pulugukappu which means smearing the entire body of Periya Perumal with scented civet oil which is specially prepared in the temple.

The custom of smearing the face of Periya Perumal every day at the time of the morning Tiruvārādhanam (Nityarchana) from the month Adi to Margali (6 months) with specially prepared civet oil was an innovation made by Mudaliar Tirukkalikanridasar Alagappiranar of Tirupati on 16—7—1434. This must have been done at the time of the daily Tīrumanjanam of the Silver image of Manavala Perumal. It has already been noticed that this daily Tīrumanjanam of the Silver Image was made more attractive to the devotees by the addition of perfumery to the sweet smelling herbs which from the earliest times were added to the water used for Tiruvārādhanam. This practice was inaugurated by Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar on 18—1—1465 and was financed by Sāluva Narasimhadeva Rayar (27—12—1467). This Tīrumanjanam came to be known as Alagappiranar Tīrumanjanam (II. 20 and II. 30).

Van Satha kopan Matham (Ahobila Mutt).

In Tīrumala as well as in Tirupati there existed from the beginning of the 14th century a habitation for the representative of this mutt, who enjoys certain honours and performs some services. It is perhaps worthwhile to find out something about the origin of this matham.

The earliest mention of a Van Satha kopan Nandavanam in Tīrumala is found in an inscription I. 104. dated 1339 A.D. which gives an account of the transfer of the Arisanālayam Tīrumanvantavanam and matham to a Jiyar who was charged with the duty of performing certain services to the temple. One of these was the offering of Amuduppadi and Sattuppadi to the Utsavar on the 4th festival day while seated in the Arisanalayam and the
Van Saṭhakopan Nandavanams. The endowment trust was made by Singayya Dannayaka in 1339. Singayya was a man from the Mysore country and was Maha Pradhani of the Hoysala King Vira Ballala-III. Therefore it may naturally be inferred that the Van Saṭhakopan Nandavanam was the creation of this man of the Mysore country. From the tradition of the Ahobila Mutt we learn that Adi Vaṇ Saṭhakopaswami was originally a native of Tirunārayanapuram. There is, however, some doubt as to the date of his birth, as to when he resided in Tirupati and when he went to Ahobilam where he was ordained as a Sanyasi by God Lakshmi Narasimha Himself. Epigraphically, it is certain that there was a Van Saṭhakopan Nandavanam at least from the date of Singayya’s sojourn in Tirupati i.e., from about 1320 A.D. It is possible that the dēsantari-in-charge of the Nandavanam was not a Sanyasi, but was only a celibate called Siyar (शैर). The next mention of a Van Saṭhakopa Jiyar (this time it is a Jiyar in clear terms) is found in an inscription II. 83 dated 6—6—1485 relating to the completion of the verandah of a mantapam in front of Sri Govindaraja’s temple by one Nallar Angāndai, the stone foundation of which had been laid by Van Saṭhakopa Jiyar some time previously (शैर स्वा) from the income of the Tiruvidaiyāṭṭam village of Pūngoḍu. As the village was temple property the Jiyar could only have supervised the construction of the Mantapam. The Tamil word ‘munnāl’ would only mean formerly. It may be that the Jiyar lived in Tirupati about the beginning of the 15th century. The traditional account places the first Jiyar in 1378 A.D. But that Jiyar could not have been the celebrated Adi Van Sathakopa Swami, who took sanyāsam in Ahobilam and founded the Ahobila mutt that is in existence to-day. The old Jiyars, who were his predecessors would have been just like any of the many ordinary Jiyars who had maṭhams in Tirumala and Tirupati to attend to the comforts of pilgrims coming from the Mysore country.

It is responsible to believe that the Van Sathakopan Jiyars of the Saluva Narasimha period were not the Ahobila mutt Jiyars, as their connection with Ahobilam is not mentioned in any of the inscriptions. A further account of the mutt will be given later.
Endowments and offerings mainly Kamyartha.

A history of the Tirumala Temple is not like other histories. Its main object is not to trace the material prosperity of a country and its peoples from age to age. The temple has been always considered a spiritually active centre to which those having faith resort generally at critical periods of their lives. Their visits and their offerings are more often for relief from troubles or for the achievement of their aims in life. As has already been pointed out, the Alvars have said that the God of the Vengadam Hill bestows on His devotees whatever they desire to have in this life or the life hereafter. So, it may not be improper if we attempt to understand the motives of the donors. The motive in most cases is safe in God's keeping. It is nowhere divulged in the preamble to an endowment except when it was the intention of the donor that some one for whose benefit it was made should be informed of it. Of this nature are some endowments and gifts made by the King's Officers and dependents. When the King himself makes a grant, the motive behind it is seldom mentioned. There are however exceptions to this. For instance, Tirukkalattidēva Yādavarāya while making a grant of Kudavūr, states clearly that he did so at the request of the Sthanattar. There are again grants which are Nishkāma Karma (done without the expectation of reward). Examples of these are Samavai's grants and the installation of Manavala Perumal; Parāntaka Devi's gift of a gold pattam and the grant of milk and curds by Rajendra Chola's Queen; so also the gift of a gold flower for the Vaikunṭha-hastham of Tiruvengadamudaiyan by King Hōbala. In most other cases a motive can generally be traced.

To the Yadavarayas in general Tiruvengadamudaiyan was a family deity. Their prosperity depended on His Grace. Their gifts do not appear to have been made at critical periods in their rules as votive offerings. But after the commencement of the Muslim incursions into the South most grants seem to have had some connection with their prayer for fulfilment of desires or achievement of ambitions. Mangideva for instance fixed a golden sikharam over the Vimanam just after his Military success over the Muslims and the assumption of office as Governor of Chandragiri Rajya.
Bukkaraya’s Sandhi of two Tirupponakam daily and his Brah- 
motsavam (I. 178, about 1365 A.D.) seem to have had some thing 
to do with his capture of Mudgal fortress; and Devaraya’s (II) grant 
of Vikramādityamangalam, Elamandiya and Kalaru Viḍḍale in 
1429 seems to have had a definite connection with his completing 
the fortifications of the seven walled City of Vijayanagar as part 
of his preparation for aggressive military operations. After the 
death of Devaraya II in 1449 A.D. and when the rather young 
Mallikarjuna was ruling, Saluva Narasimha’s operations in the 
east for consolidating and expanding the Empire and for curbing 
the Orissa King caused some apprehensions to Mallikarjuna who 
gone over to Penugonda about 1456 with his Minister on the delicate 
mision of finding out what Saluva’s activities and motives were. 
Saluva Narasimha began then in all likelihood to pray to his Guardian 
Deity to create a good impression in the mind of the Emperor. We 
find him making at this time a grant of Alipuram village as Sarva-
manyasa for offering 12 Tirupponakam daily. The misrule of 
Virupāksha who seems to have succeeded to the throne about 
1468 must have caused considerable anxiety to Saluva Narasimha 
who was engaged in the task of consolidating his own territory 
and therefore the Empire also right up to Masulipatam. Any 
interference from Virupāksha out of misunderstanding or jealousy 
would have caused him considerable embarrassment. So we find 
him making a grant on 16—3—14681 of five villages (Vanjikuppam 
etc.) for 30 daily food offerings. In 1472 the death of the Orissa 
King and the succession dispute between Mangal and Hamber 
gave room for the Muslims to interfere in the East Coast affairs. 
This meant that Saluva Narasimha had to encounter the Orissa 
and the Muslim forces at the same time. In the early months of 
1481 A.D., he was on the point of being attacked by Muhammad 
Shah III, but for some unaccountable reason the Muslim altered 
his plan and swooped down south, looted the Kanchipuram Temple 
and massacred the Brahmins there. Later on, after his return 
to Masulipatam, he attacked Saluva Narasimha; but suddenly 
turned his wrath against Hamber in Konḍavīḍ. It was when 
the danger first threatened him in 1472 that Saluva Narasimha 
took on an Utthāna Dvadasi Day, a vow to grant Durgasamudram 

\[1. \quad (II. \ 30).\]
village to the Deity for the special purpose of constructing and repairing the temple buildings evidently in order that his own domains may as a boon stand unimpaired. But he fulfilled this vow only in 1482 after the death of Muhammad III. Shortly after this, about 1485 A.D., he became the virtual Emperor and then he built a temple for Lakshmi Narasimhaswami at the foot of the Tirumalai Hill. We thus see that political tumults and human ambitions determined in a large measure the religious tempo of men to seek divine help and to make endowments in grateful acknowledgment of that help.

Names of villages endowed during Saluva Narasimha’s period.

A Sarvamanya grant of Alipuram village was made on 12—9—1456; Mupaḍuveta and Mangoḍuvula in Paḍavidu Rajya and Maṇamūru below the Tirupati Tank on 27—12—1467; Agaram Murukkampattu in Taṇigai-nādu of Chandragiri Rajya on 16—3—1468; Vanjipākkam, Mallimalai: Serulakkūr, Bhimapuram and Valaimankkondon on 16—3—1468; Dommarappaṭṭi in Padaivittu Seemai on 15—6—1473; Durgasanudram in Tirukkuḍavūr-nādu on 30—5—1482 as grant for constructions of buildings, gopurams, mantapams etc.; Gundipundi was endowed specially for Alagappiranar Tirumanjanam on 11—8—1484 A.D.

One Vallabhayadeva Maharaya endowed some village in Poṭṭapinādu whose name is missing in the inscription. One Pallikkondaperumal Karpūram Muvaraḷar endowed a village called Erṇavāsali in Soḷamandalam for the special benefit of Tirumangai Alvār Temple making Emperumanar Jiyar as the trustee on 27—11—1472. One Dhonakondā Singāram Nayakkar and another Somanātha Dikshitar of Purudagunta each endowed 215 kuli of wet land in Alipuram in August 1473 A.D. One Mukkappalam Nagama Nayakkar endowed the Tiruppanipuram village of Tiradam-pādī in Kachchipetṭu Seemai (which was given to him by Narasimharaya Uḍaiyar for military service) on 1—8—1487. Koil kēḷvi Emperumanar Jiyar secured from one Kōnēriraja two villages.
Maruttuvakkuli and Valaikulachcheri in Soḷamandalam on 19–8–1493 A.D.

Periya Timmaraja Udaiyar endowed Puduchcheri, which is a part of Veṭṭuvakkulattūr for Sri Govindaraja on 5–6–1494. Ayōdhyaṟṟama samudram (a new village being half of Pallam) was endowed by Kandaḍai Ramanuja Ayyangar for Tiruvēṅgaḍamudaiyan, Govindaraja and Kulasekhara Alvar on 8–7–1494. The villages of Kalavaiputtēri, Konurry and three other villages find place in the inscriptions as endowments; but the inscriptions being fragmentary the names of the donors and the date cannot be fixed.

A plot of land known as Onnatōndan paḷḷam in "Tirumāneri seemai was endowed by Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar on 26–8–1496 for certain food offerings to be made on the 10th festival day of each Brahmotsavam in a mantapam there. What is of special interest in connection with this endowment is an item of expenditure known as Tirukkaivaḷakkam or cash payments made to temple servants for the extra service rendered for such festivals. The same item occurs in a previous inscription (50) of the year 1473 in connection with Dōlamahotsava Anna Unjai Tirunal. The amount of Tirukkaivaḷakkam expenditure alone shown therein is 876½ panams during 5 days of the festival. This system of remuneration in cash was introduced in 1473; and it was left to be distributed at Sri Ayyangar's discretion. But after he became Porbhandāramdar in 1494 A.D., he systematised the expenditure and named the Officers eligible to receive the remuneration, including himself as one, being the Porbhandaramdar. In the present instance this item of expenditure for one day of the Pushpayāgam festival was 140 panams. It is of great interest as the details of the expenditure are shown, the recipients and their share. Thus—

60 panam for the 12 nirvāham of Sthānattār;
22½ " " for 4½ Vagai;
5 " " for Ramanujayyangar for Porbhandāram;
5 " " for Tiruppanţi Pillai(of Tiruppani Bhandaram);
4½ " " for Lachchinaikkarar;
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4 panam for Prabandham reciters (two);
2 ,, for Ramanuja Timmayyangar;
2 ,, for Kangānippān;
5 ,, for Vāhanam bearers;
1 ,, to Adhikari;
1 ,, to Pachchaḍikkārar (distributors);
2 ,, to Viṇṇappam Seyvār (seekers of permission to
start a function);
3 ,, to Tēvayal (temple cooks);
4 ,, to Sāttada Ēkāki Sri Vaishnavas of Ramanuja-
kūṭam;
2 ,, to Signamuraiyan (fuel supplier);
1 ,, to Tiruvettuvagai (announcer);
1 ,, to Kaikkōlar (servants);
2 ,, to Naṭṭuvar and Muṭṭukkārar (dance-master and
  tune keeper);
2 ,, to Emperumāṇaṇaḍiyār (dancing girls);
2 ,, to Dōlanāgasvarakkarar (drummers and pipers);
1 ,, to Pāḍuvār (songsters);
1 ,, to Paṇimurai (skilled artisans);
1 ,, to Tiruvidhimunaiyar (street sweepers);
1 ,, to Kuyavar (potters);
1 ,, to Sippiyār (Silpies);
1 ,, to Vāsāl Kollār;
1 ,, to Uvachchan (the man using the small hand
drawn);

140 , for 29 items (about 50 or 60 persons).

This item of expenditure exhibiting the persons eligible to receive
payment was an innovation made by Sri Ramanujayyangar. This
list gives an idea of the kind and number of servants employed
in the routine work of a temple. Even the food offerings (except
the ½ share due to the donor) seem to have been distributed duly
among these leaving very little for the desantari viniyogam (or
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distribution among pilgrims). It also gives a rough idea of how temple administration was becoming more and more cumbrous. It is worth noting that while payment was made for reciting Prabandham (Tamil Tiruvâymoli recital), there is no mention of such payment being made for reciting Vedaparayanam till the end of the 15th Century A.D., in spite of the fact that Devaraya Maharaya made herculean endeavours to establish Vedaparayanam Service in the temple. The office of Sthânattar became a remunerative one and was losing its old prestige. The twelve mantapams constructed by them on the way to Onnatônda pañâm Nâvalûṟṟu and the endowment of 390 panams as capital for offering 12 vadaipadi each year appear to be the only endowment made by them.

From the above account, it appears that even Sâluva Narasimha and the members of his family did not make any large cash or jewel endowments. Besides the villages granted by Sâluva Narasingarayar, there are numerous instances of endowment in the shape of excavating spring channels to improve the irrigation of the Tiruviḍâiyâṭṭam villages. The members of his family and Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar also have made such improvements. The additional income derived by means of such repairs was applied for such services as are detailed in the respective inscriptions. It was only where the donor had not the facilities to carry out such works himself that payment was made in cash, which was again used by the Sthanattar for improvements and repairs to irrigation works.
CHAPTER XVI.

KANDADAI RAMANUJA AYYANGAR AND
SALUVA NARASIMHA.

From the point of view of temple worship in general it is worth-while dwelling at some length on the career of Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar who as the trusted lieutenant of Sāluva Narasimharaya made full use of all opportunities to gain distinction. Ramanuja Ayyangar is illustrative of a class of men found among all castes of Hindus even to-day. These men invariably start their career under an honest impulse to serve the cause of temple worship and strive for its furtherance and grandeur. As the years roll on they acquire influence and have generally also to handle some money. As it often happens with men similarly placed, in course of time they succumb to the insidious influence of vanity and personal ambitions. Ramanuja Ayyangar’s career in Tirumala and Tirupati amply illustrates this. His patron Sāluva Narasimha started life as the devoted adherent of the Vijayanagar Empire. He was obviously trusted by Deveraya II and Mallikarjuna. However owing to the vicissitudes of power politics and in the interests of the Empire, Hindu religion and culture, he had to play the role of the de facto Emperor. Some say he even made himself the de jure Emperor. Whatever that might be, these two ambitious men were brought together. After the accession of Mallikarjuna to the Vijayanagar throne, the struggle between him and the Bahmini Kings made it imperative that Sāluva Narasimha should be away from Tirupati in his own interests and in the interests of the Empire. But as a devout (perhaps even superstitious) Hindu and with an inherited attachment to God Tiruvēṅgaḍamudaiyān, whenever difficulties and doubts faced him, he seems to have turned to Him for guidance and protection, resolving at the same time to make votive or thanks offerings. Owing to his long absence from Tirupati he entrusted to Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar the work of giving effect to his grants and
offerings. There was also another Srivaishnava in Tirumala by name Hastigiri Ayyan whom he trusted, who did not however possess the dynamic power of Ramanuja Ayyangar and had therefore to circumscribe his field of activity to the satram (Choultry). How Ramanuja Ayyangar was able to magnify the extent of his influence, how he was able to make even the Sthānattār endow some of the temple lands to him for cultivation and for carrying on some charities in the temple according to his desires and how courtiers made endowments in his name instead of in their own name, will now be shown. It will also be shown that after Sāluva Narasimha's death the Ayyangar's personal ambition and vanity were openly manifested. About Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar, the T.T.Devasthanam Epigraphist has made certain surmises which seem to be unwarranted and incorrect. In note (3) on page 278 of Vol. III of the inscriptions he surmises that Kandadai Doḍḍappa Ayyangar was probably a member of the collateral branch of the family to which Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar belonged. Doḍḍa Ayyangar is described in the inscription as belonging to Vādhula-gotra, Apasthamba-Sūtra and his father's name is also given. In none of the many inscriptions relating to Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar do we find mention of his father's name, his gotra, sutra and sākha. It is only a sanyasi who is prohibited from making any reference to his pūrvāśrama pravaram. A sanyasi would describe himself as the disciple of the guru who gave him the Presha mantram and the kāshāyam. Ramanuja Ayyangar is described (or prefers to describe himself) as the sishya of Aḷagiya Manavala Jiyar. We know however that the sishya was a Grihastha. Why he did not disclose his parentage and gotra is more than we can answer. We can see from his career that he was an ambitious man and over-fond of self-glorification. It may have stretched to the extent of his desire to be aligned with the three Mudal Alwars and Tirumalisai whose parentage and pravaram nobody knew, or that of Andal; He was not one of the āchārya purushas or a spiritual teacher as the Epigraphist would make him out to be.

His disciple Mādhava Ayyangar is described by the Epigraphist as an āchāyrapurusha and the disciple and successor of
Ramanuja Ayyangar. The former is described in the original inscription in Tamil as "இராமனுஜ ஆய்யாங்காரர் ராமணேஷ்வர போர்னாண்டர என்னும் பெயர்காட்டின். There is nothing in this wording to assume that he was his successor to the Ramanujakutam and Por-Bhandaram. Even in III-153 dated 2-4-1522 A. D. he does not style himself the Kartar of the Ramanujakutam but as only one among the managers. There is no reference to the por-bhandaram as having been in his charge.

Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar.

Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar was a deśantari or stranger, of Tondaimandalam who after his discipleship under Āḻagiyar Maṇavaḷa Jīyar, went on pilgrimage to all the 108 Vaishnavite shrines in the country. He observed in detail how temple worship and the various festivals were carried on in the famous temples of the South. He is said to have done some notable service to the Kānchipuram and the Srirangam temples, as may be gathered from the incomplete memorial tablet on the east wall of the Paṭikāvali Gopuram in Tirumala. In what year he first came to Tirupati is not mentioned in any of the inscriptions. That he must have come in some year immediately preceding the date on which Sāluva Narasimha appointed him as the Kartar (or manager) of the Rāmanujakūtams started by him in Tirumala and Tirupati may however be reasonably presumed. By his earnestness and personal magnetism he seems to have created a very favourable impression on Sāluva Narasimha and thereafter continued to exercise a decided influence over him in all matters relating to the temple so far as his endowments were concerned. His influence seems to have extended to the Sthānattār also. We will therefore do well to examine together everything that was done by Sāluva Narasimha and Kandadai Rāmanuja Ayyangar jointly and severally.

Sāluva Narasimha's endowments are eight in number. Six of these make direct mention and two indirect mention of him. They range from 1456 to 1473 A.D. although one of them which was gifted in 1472 A.D. was actually incised on stone and given effect to in 1482 A.D. The indirect mention made in inscriptions
dated 1484 and 1494 A.D. goes to show that the grants were made much earlier than those dates.

The first inscription (II. 4) which shows the connection between these two men is dated 12–9–1456 A.D. We learn from it that some years earlier Sāluva Narasimha had made a sarvamānya grant of Alipuram village situated in Vaikunthāvalanādu of the Chandragiri Rajya to Tiruvengaḍamuḍaiyān and that he proposed to set apart the svarnādayam and the dhānyavargam taxes of this village for a daily food offering of twelve Tirupponakam, one Appapadi and one Tirukkanāmadai as Udayakāla sandhi; to send the one fourth part of these prasadams representing the donor’s share to the Ramanujakutam established by him in Tirumala and Tirupati and to make Kandadai Ramanujayyan the Kartar of these institutions and the agent to see to the feeding of Sri Vaishnavas therein. The inscription shows that the office of Kartar was to descend to his ‘Sishya paramparai’ or line of disciples. These details are given to show that the credit for establishing the Ramanujakutam is claimed by Sāluva Narasimha to be his own. We have to note the termination in the name Ramanujayyan in the singular to form a correct impression of the relationship between the employer and the employee, to be Sishyaparamparai Manager and to feed all Sri Vaishnavas going to the Ramanujakutam. The precise Tamil expressions are ‘‘இத்தாலியா கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்டாயணகர் இவரே இவரே கண்...’; The T.T.D. Epigraphist seems to have been under the impression that Kandadai Ramanujayyar, was the spiritual Guru or Achārya of Sāluva Narasimha. There is nothing in any of the inscriptions to warrant such an assumption. K. Ramanujayyanger was, however, a trusted lieutenant and his influence grew as the years rolled on. On 24–3–1467, Sāluva Narasimha made another endowment in the name of his queen Srirangāmbādevi (II.25) for offering daily 4 Tirupponakams to Tiruvengaḍamuḍaiyān and the donor’s share of the prasadam was made over by him to
a Sri Vaishnava named Hastigiridasar, who was maintaining a
choultry and also cultivating Sāluva Narasimha's flower garden
known as Ramanujan Tirumandavanam. During the next year
(1468), Sāluva Narasimha made another endowment (II.31), dated
16th March) of the village of Agaram Murukkampaṭṭu for offering
daily one atirasam and one vādai padi and also for certain other
food offerings on the Tirudvādasi day and on the first day of the
floating festival. In this case the donor's quarter share was given
away to the Ramanuja Kutam founded by Narasimharaya and
managed by K. Ramanuja ayyangar and his Sishya paramparai.
On the same day (15–3–1468), he made yet another and larger
endowment (II.34) of five villages Vanjipakkam, Mallimālai,
Sērulakkūr, Bhimapuram and Vālālmanṇkonḍān) for making
daily food offerings of 30 sandhis, one appapadi, one sugiyān
and one Tirukkanāmadāi. The donor's quarter share was in this
case given away to Hastigiri dasar. He was also to be given
daily 3 panam as mēlvechcham.1 The next recorded endowment
(II.50) was on 15–6–1473 and related to the grant of the village of
Dommarapatti for the celebration of a new annual festival to be
called Dōla-mahōtsava anjanjīl tirunāl lasting for five days.
The total expenditure of rice on prasadams on account of this
endowment was about 1500 marakkals. The donor's quarter
share was to go to the Ramanujakutam and all items of expenditure
for the festival were left to Ramanuja's discretion. All these go
to show that Ramanuja Ayyangar had gained considerable influence
over Narasimha between 1467 and 1473 A.D.

From the above account, we are justified in concluding that
Sāluva Narasimha did not have a blind faith in Kandadai Ramanuja
Ayyangar and that the latter was only his trusted agent for certain
purposes. The Ayyangar, however, did not fail to make use of
and even magnify that influence for his own purposes.

Kandadai Ramanuja took full advantage
of his influence.

On 9–1–1467 he entered into a covenant with the Pallis (II.24),
who were the proprietors of certain lands, to excavate irrigation

1. Concomitant sundry articles required for feeding pilgrims.
channels therein to cultivate the lands thereby, to pay the proprietors a certain agreed rent and to utilise the balance for upkeep of the Ramanujakutam. The arrangement was to hold good in the case of his sishyaparamparai also. On 25–4–1467 a similar arrangement (II.26) was made by him with the Sthānattār for cultivation of lands in Kōṟramangalam village, which belonged to the temple, after excavating two channels in it. Here also the quarter share of prasadams was to go to the Ramanujakutam sishyaparamparai. In November 1468 he installed an image of Kulasēkhara Āḻvar in Tirupati (II.36) for whose food offering every day he persuaded the Sthānattār to grant as sarvamanya certain lands in Elamanḍiyam Kūraikkāl which was temple property. On 20–2–1469 (II. 38) he entered into a similar agreement with the Sthānattār to excavate an irrigation channel for the cultivation of lands in the temple village of Tiruvēṅkatanallūr, and arranged for offering 4 dadhyodanam taligai daily to Tiruvengadamudaiyān at the time of Tirumānjanam. The donor’s share was in this case also to go to the Ramanujakutam sishyaparamparai. On 7–1–1470 (II. 44), the Sthānattār gave away to the Ramanujakutam as sarvamanya or tax free certain lands of the temple to the west of Tiruapti. This also was to be enjoyed by him and sishyaparamparai. On 4–5–1470 (II. 45) the western half of the temple village of Munnaippūndi was allowed to be cultivated by Ramanuja Ayyangar sishyaparamparai for offering in the name of Sāluva Narasimha some food offering during Kōḍai Tirunal in Tirupati. On 28–12–1470 (II. 47) another such agreement was entered into for irrigation channels to cultivate certain waste lands so as to make an ardhamam offering to Sri Govindaraja.

During all this period it must be noted that Sāluva Narasimha was far away from Chandragiri and near Masūlipatam engaged on vital military preparations for the defence of his own territory and of the Vijayanagar Empire. It could have been only by a show of his influence with Sāluva Narasimha that the Sthānattār and the others were made to agree to all arrangements proposed by Ramanuja Ayyangar although it must be admitted that they were all in the interests of the temple and of his Ramanujakutam.
The following is an instance of the magnitude of his influence over others:—One of the Sri Vaishnavas of Tirupati by name Sāthakōpādāsār Narasimharāya Mudaliar made certain endowments not in his own name but in the name of Kandādai Ramanuja Ayyangar. These are 5500 panams (II. 64) on 30—12—1475, 1500 panams (II. 67) on 9—5—1476 and 5200 panams (II. 68) on 23—11—1476. The first one is for offering one atirasappadi daily to Sri Govindaraja Swami, the second for one Tirupponakam daily to Uḍaiyavar and the third for the celebration of a number of Sāttumurais of Ālvārs. In all these cases the donor’s share went to the Ramanujakutam sishyaparamparai. The last named endowment is of special interest to us. This is the first time that the birth stars or Tirunakshatrams of all the Ālvārs happen to be celebrated in front of Sri Ramana’s shrine in Tirumala accompanied by the recitation of the portion of the prabandham of each Ālvār. It was an innovation which if it had been attempted in Sāthakōpādāsār’s own name would have met with opposition from the Vaikhanasa Archakas and the Sthanattar. But these men dared not go against Kandādai Ramanuja Ayyangar. The Dāsār’s zeal to have his heart’s desire accomplished brought Kandadai Ramanuja’s name into the endowment. That Sāthakōpādāsār was a fervent Sri Vaishnava can be seen from other special endowments he made for Uḍaiyavar and Tirumangai Ālvār temples in Tirupati. His endowment (II. 68) dated 23—11—1476 has the further interest to us that it was on that date that the Sāttāda Sri Vaishnavas appear to have commenced sharing with the Sāttina Sri Vaishnavas the privilege of reciting the Prabandhams in front of Sri Ramana’s Shrine and of receiving their own share of the prasadams as emoluments. Without Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar’s influence, it would have been well nigh impossible for the Dasar to make these two innovations in Temple practices.

In every one of the above instances, one point was made clear that the donor’s share of the prasadams was to be enjoyed by Ramanuja Ayyangar’s sishyas in the Ramanuja kutam after his lifetime. The sāttāda Sri Vaishnavas were exclusively his disciples. There is no evidence of his having had any Brahmin disciples.
The attitude of other donors.

So far we have seen that Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar was successful in making his influence with Sāluva Narasimha recognised by the Sthānattar and by Sathakōpadasar. But during this period there were also other notables, who made endowments for food offerings. It is worthwhile and even necessary, to find out whether they extended their patronage to Ramanuja Ayyangar.

Most of them were Sāluva Narasimha's kith and kin and in the usual course would have been expected to patronise the Ramanujakutam which their kinsman and chief had brought into being. That they did not patronise the Ramanujakutam will be plain from a reading of the note attached (at the end of this chapter). If Sāluva Narasimha gave 10½ prasadams daily to the Ramanujakutam, he gave to Hastigiri Dasar's Satram 20 prasadams (including 1 by his queen). The total prasadams distributed daily in places outside the Ramanujakutam amounted to 34 prasadams by the end of 1494, whereas in the Ramanujakutam it was 15½. The latter seems to have been mainly for the benefit of Sāttāda Sri Vaishnavas, whereas the others catered to all, irrespective of caste or creed. But the bulk of the income for the Ramanujakutam must have been by the sale of appam, atirasam, vadai, etc., which it got during the various festivals as Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar himself has shown later.¹ Sāluva Narasimharayar’s interest seems to have slackened after about 1473 A.D. He, probably, realised that the Ramanujakutam was not fulfilling his expectations.

There was really far too much food cooked in the temple than was needed to feed the pilgrims. So we find that more of baked and fried prasadams, such as appams, atirasams, vadai, Tirukkanāmadai and such other things as could be preserved for a longer period for sale and as could be taken by the pilgrims to their home as God’s prasadams, came into vogue. By the sale of these the Ramanujakutam made money; and also those in

1. II. 1494 A.D.
the temple service who were entitled to a share in the offered prasadams. From the point of view of the religious sentiments which the temple was intended to spread it is doubtful if this development was healthy.

Whether this institution, known as Ramanujakūtām, founded by Sāluva Narasimha Dēvarayar for the benefit and uplift of the Sāttāda Sri Vaishnavas stood the test of time and made itself appreciated by the public could best be judged by its life after the death of Ramanuja Ayyangar and Sāluva Narasimha. We have reason to believe that even in their lifetime it was not patronised by the majority of temple goers who made endowments.

Üdiyam Ellappa Nāyakkar who made an endowment of three villages (III. 109; 2—6—1516) as Krishnadevaraya’s dharmam stipulated that the quarter share of prasadams due to him should be delivered to the Ramanujakutam. This coming within about 22 years of the last mention of Saluva’s Ramanujakutam might be taken to refer to Saluva’s institution or it might refer to Rāmānāyakkar’s Ramanujakutam (III. 88 of 1514 A.D.). The next mention is in 1520 when Kandadai Madhava Ayyangar, the disciple of Ramanuja Ayyangar apportioned to the Ramanujakutam only a portion of the donor’s quarter share after deducting the share allotted to the Iyal chanting Sri Visahnavas (III. 142; 28—11—1520).

Subuddhi Rāmadāsar allotted 3 nāli of prasadam to the managers of the Ramanujakutam who were cultivating his flower garden. We may presume that Sāttāda Sri Vaishnavas were cultivating his flower garden (III. 147; 1—11—1521). Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar (presumably the son of the late Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar) who styled himself kartar of Tirumala Tirupati Ramanujakutam and the Por-Bhandaram, stipulated that the quarter share of prasadams due to him on his endowment (IV. 3) dated 31—3—1530 should be delivered to the Dharmakarta of the Ramanujakutams. The implication seems to be that he had appointed some one else to be the Dharmakarta, himself being the Kartar.
The word Ramanujakutam occurs incidentally and for the last time in an inscription V. 47 dated 3—7—1545. Whether it refers to Ramanuja Ayyangar’s institution or to the other Ramanujakutam of Ramanayakkar (already referred to) mentioned in connection with an endowment by Periya Obala Nayakkar Ramanayakkar on 8—1—1514, we cannot be sure of. But as the donor Tallapakkam Tirumalai ayyangar offered one padi in front of the Ramanujakutam it might refer to Ramanuja ayyangar’s Ramanujakutam.

There is, therefore, reason to believe that the institution founded by Saluva Narasimha and managed by Ramanuja was not popular and that it did not fulfil its purpose. It ceased to exist in the second half of the sixteenth century. So much space has been devoted to this subject so that any one who cares to speculate may form his own ideas as to how the Sattada Sri Vaishnavas who were drawn from all classes of the non-brahmins and specially trained by Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar obviously at the instance of Saluva Narasimha for religious duties, who were accorded the privilege of providing every day the articles of perfumery for the Tirumanjanam and Tiruvârâdhanam of Tiruvengaçamudaiyân, and receiving in return the daily honours and emoluments due to such service; who also enjoyed the privilege of reciting the Alvar’s Prabandhams in the temples on a footing of equality with the Sattina Srivaishnavas and received a share of the emoluments, and who were so well provided for with endowments by the King himself in the Ramanujakutam, failed to retain what all was theirs by right. That perfumery, which it was their right to supply, is now being taken by Brahmins with all temple honours round the pradakshinam before being presented in the shrine. They failed to become the successors of Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar as Kartar of the Ramanujakutam. They were his sishyas and should have been the kartars of the Ramanujakutam and the Por-Bhandaram in preference to Kandadai Madhava Ayyangar. They should have been allowed to recite Prabandham in Gōshti.

Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar’s activities in the temple after the death of Saluva Narasimha possibly throw some light on how the Sattada Sri Vaishnavas went into oblivion. Saluva
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Narasimha seems to have died in 1492 A.D. and was succeeded by his son Immadi Narasimha.

Kandadai Ramanuja’s activities after the death of Saluva Narasimha.

Ramanuja Ayyangar was obviously not content with being the Manager of the Ramanujakutam distributing food and selling appams and atirasams. In the secular administration of the temples, the management of landed properties and the construction and repairs of buildings had already become a separate department called the Tiruppaṇi Bhandāram. There was still in the hands of the Sthanattar the treasury of gold, silver jewellery, costly silks, etc. Some of these required annual repairs. Ramanuja Ayyangar projected a plan for carrying out these repairs without a single panam being expended from the Sri Bhandāram. He placed before the Emperor Immadi Narasimha Rayar his scheme. Every year he could save 1000 panams from the sale amount of prasadams in the Ramanujakutams. He could save another 1000 panams from out of the income from endowments made for Kulasekhara Alvar temple, after conducting the daily worship. Also from certain other villages granted for specific services he could scrape another 1000 panams. With these 3000 panams he would be carrying out yearly all the repairs needed. The Rāyasam was obtained from the Emperor appointing Ramanuja Ayyangar as the kartar of gold and jewellery (which office he later called ‘Por-Bhangaram’ Sishyaparamparai). This (II. 133) was on 1st July 1495 A.D. All articles which needed repairs were to be selected conjointly with the Sthanattar, the repairs carried out in their presence and returned to them after due accounting. If 3000 panams were found insufficient for the purpose, the balance was to be met from the temple funds.

In the very next month of the same year (31—8—1495) he made an endowment (II. 134) not in cash, but by way of certain adjustments for celebrating some festivals. The noteworthy point in this endowment is that he himself made a provision of 20 panams for tying parivaṭṭam to four dancing girls (Emperu-
mānadiyar) who were engaged for singing the Ula songs in praise of himself on occasions when Sri Malai Kuniyaninra perumāl and Sri Govindarajan were taken out in procession (or stroll) round the Sanctum during Kōḍai Festival. If he was a highly respected person, his own Sāttāda Sri Vaishnava disciples and the Brahmins reciting Prabandham would have agreed to sing these songs just as they do Ramanuja Nūrrandadi and Vāḷi tirunāmams. The singing of such songs in his praise by dancing gīrls in the presence of the Deity and himself making payment therefore would have been highly distasteful to all religiously minded Sri Vaishnavas. Furthermore his cousin Kandadai Appachchiyar Anna made an endowment (II. 136; 21—12—1496) for offering 2 atirasappadi on every alternate puḷḷugukkāppu murai Friday just after the singing of Ramanuja Ayyangar’s Ula while Sri Venkateswara was being smeared with Puḷḷugukkappu. Again in another endowment made by K. Ramanuja Ayyangar after he became Por-Bhandaram Officer (II. 140—the precise date of the endowment is missing in the inscription) he celebrated his annual birth star in a manner which must have been revolting to all orthodox Sri Vaishnavas. To receive the appapadi sent down from Tirumala for the occasion he made Sri Andal being taken in procession to the foot of the hill in Tirupati and to accompany the appapadi and parivattam procession to Govindaraja’s temple. Even his own disciples, the Sāttāda Sri Vaishnavas do not appear to have shown their enthusiasm or loyalty to him in these celebrations which were introduced after the death of Saluva Narasimha. Did he not sell away the prasadams which Saluva Narasimha intended for their exclusive benefit so that he might become the Por-Bhandaram officer?

When it came to the appointment of a Sishya (Disciple) as his successor, as Kartar of the Ramanujakutam and of the Por-Bhandaram he did not find after forty years tutelage a Sāttada Srivaishnava to be fit for selection. Kandadai Madhava Ayyangar (possibly a cousin of his) was appointed. He was succeeded by Kumara Ramanuja the son of Ramanuja. So the stipulation ‘sishya paramparai’ gave place to ‘Vamsa paramparai.’
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Note on the disposal of the donor's share of prasadams by members of the Saluva family.

We have seen that Saluva Narasimha's queen ordered the handing over of the donor's share of her own endowments to the satram under the management of Hastigiri Ayyan and that Saluva Narasimha also gave away the major portion of his share for the same. Saluva Ramachandrayya arranged that the donor's share of his own endowment (one fourth of four taligas) should be distributed to pilgrims during the Sandhi Adappu in the temple itself.

Prasadams.

Saluva Mallayyadeva Maharaja did the same; . 1

Saluva Parvataraja distributed his share among those maintaining his flower garden and the water shed at Mulankal murippan mantapam constructed by him; . 1

Saluva Timmaraja gave his share to the Dasanambi cultivating his flower garden; . 1

Siddhanayar (Saluva Narasimha's Secretary) did not give anything to Ramanujakutam; . 1½

Saluva Timmaraja expended his share during Sandhi Adappu. So also Ahobiladeva Kampayadeva Maharaja; . 1½

Timmayyadeva Chola Maharaja also distributed his share during Sandhi Adappu (full); . 1

Erramaraja gave his share to the Dasanambis cultivating flower gardens; . 1

Timmayyadeva Maharaja of Bijjavada gave his share to the Sri Vaishnavas tending his flower garden; .

Vallabhayya dēva Maharaja gave his share to Tiruppani Bhandarattar; . 2

Rauv Pinna Bhupala Narasimha and Kesaya Nayaka gave their share to their ācharya Kumāra Tātayyanger; . 1
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Kommaraja Siru Timmaraja Udaiyar gave part of his share to Sthanattar and part for free distribution and to those tending his flower garden; ...  ..

Baichraja Timmayyadeva Maharaja gave his share to nirvaham in part and for Sandhi Adaippu distribution  ..  ..

Kommaraja Siru Timmaraja Udaiyar gave part to... Nirvaham and part to flower garden keepers;  ..

Kommaraja Periya Timmaraja Udaiyar for Tirunadavanam, Sañdhi Adaippu and Nirvaham;  ..  4

Lakshmi amman gave for Sandhi Adaippu and flower garden cultivators;  ..  4

Periya Timmaraja Udaiyar gave 500 kuli of land as sarvamanya for feeding 12 Sri. Vaishnavas to Ramanuja Iyangar and 1/ share Tiruppatiayar, Sabbaiyar, Desantries and Tiruninra-ur-udaiyar, garden cultivators, etc.;  ..  1

Narasaraja Udaiyar likewise to Tirupatipayar Sabbaiyar, desantries, etc.  ..  .

It will thus be seen that most of the dignitaries do not seem to have appreciated the Ramanujakutam, if not its management by Ramanuja Ayyangar. Queen Srirangambadevi gave her share to Hastigiridasar’s choultry  ..  1

Timmayyadeva Maharaja gave his 1/ share to Sri Vaishnavas looking after flower garden;  4

Sundry endowments;  2 1/4
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The prasadams made over to the Ramanuja Kutam from 1456 to 1473 amounted only to 13 prasadams excluding 10 1/ given by Saluva Narasimha and 2 1/ more in 1494.
CHAPTER XVII.

THE PERIOD FROM ABOUT 1492 TO 1511 A.D.
(Immađi Narasimharaya and Vira Narasimha Maharaya.)

It is generally believed that Sāluva Narasimha Maharayar died in the year 1492 A.D. and that his son Immađi Narasimha succeeded him and ruled till about the middle of 1505 A.D. With him the Sāluva ascendancy came to an end. Narasa Nāyaka, the Commander-in-Chief and Chief Minister under Sāluva Narasimha, had been the de-facto ruler even when Immađi Narasimha Maharayar was the ruler. But he seems to have predeceased Immađi Narasimha. We are told by historians that his son Vira Narasimha usurped the Imperial Throne on the death of Immađi Narasimha some time in 1505 A.D. and that he ruled as Emperor till his death in 1509 A.D.

Sāluva Narasimha as well as his son Immađi Narasimha had the suffix ‘Maharayar’ attached to their names. But the prasasti (pedigree) prefixed to their name was not that of the Vijayanagar Kings, which was ‘Srīman Maharajadhiraṇa Raja-paramesvara Sri Viraprataṇa.’ They preferred to retain their own family pedigree ‘Srīman Mahāmanḍalēśvara Médini Misaraganda Kaṭhāri Sāluva Sāluva.’ Neither of these therefore could have had succession legally as representing a branch of the old Sangama family. But not so Vira Narasimha. In one of our inscriptions III. 13 of the year 1508 A.D. (Saka 1430) he is described as Vira Narasimha Maharayar. There is no other inscription where his name appears. But we know that he was a more powerful man than Immađi Narasimha and that during the short period he was on the throne he was fully engaged in putting down insurgents within the Empire. He claimed (at any rate his brother Sri Viraprataṇa Krishnadevaraya did) kinship with the old Sangama line of kings as will be shown later when writing about Sri Krishnadēva Maharāyar.
THE PERIOD FROM ABOUT 1492 TO 1511 A.D.

So far as the history of the Tiruvēngadam temple is concerned the period of these two Emperors (1492—1509 A.D.)—we may even say the period from about 1492 to 1511 A.D.—has a special significance. The activities of Sri Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar had brought into the temple some undesirable innovations as well as some beneficial changes. But none of these took permanent root. The latter are:

(1) The status accorded to the Sāttāda Sri Vaishnavas by giving them the privilege of supplying certain articles of perfumery required every day for the Alagappirāṅār Tirumanjanam (or daily Abhishēkam for Bhōga Srinivasa).

(2) The status accorded to them by authorising them to recite the prabandhams in front of Sri Ramanuja’s shrine in Tirumala in company with the Brahmins and also to receive prasādams.

The undesirable ones are given below.

(1) It has been pointed out that after the death of Sāluva Narasimha the prasādams representing the donor’s share which used to be fully utilised for the benefit of the Sāttada Srivaishnavas were diverted in part in 1494 A.D. by Ramanuja Ayyangar to enable him to become the Por-Bhandārām (Por-bhandaram) officer in Tirumala.

(2) The employment of Emperumānādiyars (dancing girls) for singing ula songs in praise of Sri Ramanuja Ayyangar for which parivaṭṭam (piece of sacred cloth) was tied to their head on payment of the necessary fee to the temple (II. 134; 1495 A.D. and II. 136, 1496 A.D.). This innovation was however not continued after his death.

(3) Taking Sri Andal to the foot of the Hill to receive Tiruvēngadamūḍaiyān’s appa prasādam and parivaṭṭam in honour of Ramanuja Ayyangar’s birth day. This also was not continued after his death. (II. 140; date missing).

(4) The institution of a special festival (called Nāval ūṟṟu) after he became the Por-bhandaram in 1496 A.D.
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(II. 135). In connection with this festival he introduced an elaborate system of making cash payments under the heading Tirukkaivalakkam, to all the members of the temple establishment from the Sthānattar down to the sweeper. The object in doing this appears to have been to include his own name in the establishment as the Por-Bhandram officer. But as this was likely to raise some opposition, he included in the list the Tiruppaṇi Bhandāram, the dancing girls, the naṭṭuvars and the prabandham reciters. This inclusion of Prabandham as being entitled to receive cash payment under the appellation Tirukkaivalakkam, marks the beginning of the attempt of Sri Vaishnavas to achieve for the Prabandham of the ālvārs a permanent status in the Temple. In 1504 there appears a jīyar by name Anusandhanam Tiruvenkatayyan. He obtained for Prabandham a permanent status in 1512. The history of the Prabandham will be dealt with in the chapter, ‘Alvars and Acharyas’. The only persons who were omitted in the list were the Vedapārāyanam reciters whom Sri Virapratapav Devaraya had with so much enthusiasm introduced in 1433 A.D. In the Dōḷa Mahōtsavam introduced by Saluva Narasimha and conducted under Sri Ramanuja Ayyangar’s supervision, there was incurred a lump sum expenditure of 896 panams under Tirukkaivalakkam. The details of distribution were not given. We find however that in similar expenditure incurred in connection with the Pavitrōtsavam by Mallayya Dēva Maharaya (1464 A.D.) payments were made only to the Purana Bhattar and the Vedaparayanam reciters and that nothing was given to the Sthanattar, the prabandham reciters or the dancing girls. Again later in 1508 A.D. we find that one Appa Pillai instituted Dōḷa Mahōtsavam for Sri Govindarajaswami in Tirupati as the dharmam of Sri Vira Narasimha Maharayar and that in connection with this utsavam many of the items of cash payments started by Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar were continued by him, the only omissions made being the Tiruppaṇi Bhandarattar, the Por Bhandarattar and the Prabandham reciters. The Vēdapārāyanam reciters were however brought in by him and the dancing girls (Tiruvedhi sanis) were given a larger share.1

---
1. For a single day’s festival in 1496 A.D. the Sthanattars were paid 60 panams as fee for the 12 Nirvahams; 22 1/2 panams for 4 1/2 vaṅgai; 5 panams each
We are therefore in a position to surmise that the precedent set up by Sri Ramanuja Ayyangar did not appeal in full even to the people who were more or less his contemporaries. Some seem to have favoured Vēda pārāyanam and some the Prabandham. But the dancing girls whom Sri Ramanuja Ayyangar brought into prominence began to acquire increasing importance in the temple, as we will have occasion to notice in greater detail when we come to deal with the reign of Achyuta deva and Sadasiva Deva Maharayas. It is probable that these innovations would not have been made if Saluva Narasimha and his successors had lived in times of peace and had the leisure to pay some personal attention to the affairs of this temple to which they had a great attachment.

(5) The Sthanattar’s complicity in the alienation of Temple lands to Sri Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar ostensibly for the benefit of Saluva’s Ramanujakutam and the temple of Kulasēkhara Āḻvār and the subsequent shufflings of the income from these lands which enabled him to create and occupy the office of Por-Bhandaram has already been noticed. There is reason to think that the Sthanattar suffered in reputation in consequence of these transactions. We see this reflected in the endowments made by the public after 1494 A.D. The members of the mercantile community in Tirupati and Chandragiri represented by Saranusetti, Sittanna Setti, Tippu Setti and Lingi Setti who were donors during the period however gave away the donor’s share of the prasadams to the 12 nirvaham of the Sthanattars as usual. They would naturally have been looking to them for getting orders for supply of provisions to the temple. Ramayyan, son of the late Satha-kopadāsar also continued to be loyal to the Sthanattar till 1507. But in his endowment made in 1508 he received the donor’s share himself. Udanaṭā Rāyan Ulagappan and Appa Pillai, two of the independent persons who have made several endowments

for Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar and the Tiruppani pillai Bhandaram; 4 panams for the prabandham and 2 panams each for the Nattuvar and the Emperumanadiyar. For the five days, festival in 1508 A.D: Appa pillai, however, paid only 36 panams for the 12 nirvaham. He paid none for the Vaijai or for por Bhandaram, or for prabandham; 6 panams for dancing girls and 6 panams for Vedaparayanam.
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during this period, appropriated to themselves the donor’s share. Again Periya Öbala Nåyakkar Råmânayakkar, who was one of the Emperor’s generals, assigned his share of the prasadams to a new Ramanujakutam established by him without giving any portion to the Sthanattar. There are also three other private endowments (II. 124, 126, 127) where the donors distributed their share among the Tirupatiyars, the Sabhaiyars and the Tiruninraur-Udaiyars, excluding the Nambimars and the Jiyars. These indicate that the Sthanattar as such were losing credit.

The above analysis has been made so that we may correctly appreciate why Sri Vira Krishna Deva Maharaya ignored the claims of the Sthanattar and of Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar’s Ramanujakutam, when he came to dispose of the donor’s share of his own endowments.

In this place we may describe the new festival called Nåvalûru (Nêvârû, Ñuvû) introduced by Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar. Sri Ayyangar constructed a tank and a mantapam on the way to the Nåvalûru or spring channel in a tank called Tirumâneri. The processional Deity Malaikuniya-ninra-Perumal with the Nachchimar was taken to that mantapam on the tenth day of the Panguni Tirunâl called the Pushpa yagam day. The place seems to have been situated at some considerable distance from the temple. Twelve mantapams were therefore constructed along the route at the rate of one by each of the twelve nirvahams. At every mantapam food offerings were made on the return journey. The entire temple paraphernalia seems to have accompanied the Deity to the Nåvalûru. We have festivals of this kind in almost all the temples in Southern India. At the fountain head of the spring channel a pavilion is usually put up to accommodate the Deity. The spring channel itself is made expansive so that by night there may be a slow procession known as Patti Ulâvudal (ûvû...) to the accompaniment of music and dancing by the Emperumanadiyars. The festival is commonly known as Ural Festival. In Tirumala we hear of this festival for the first time in August 1496 A.D., but it may have been in vogue even earlier. Almost all the festivals started by K. Ramanujayangar after the death of Saluva Narasimha are of a type which
would induce lasciviousness in weak minded worshippers; what with the dancing and abhinayan of the emperumāṇaḍiyars and the scents, flowers and rich food on a full moon day.

The varieties of prasadams prepared in connection with the festivals during this period were about the same as were prepared during the reign of Saluva Narasimha. These were Tirupponnakam, Rājāna Tirupponakkam, Paruppaviyal Tirupponakam, Dadhyodanam, Appam, Atirasam, Sukhiyan, Godhi, Siddai and Vadai.

Acharyapurushas.

We shall next examine the activities of the Acharyapurushas attached to the temple. These seem to have been carrying on their evangelical work. Some of their more prosperous disciples were making pilgrimage to Tiruvengadam. Among the Achāryapurushas the brothers, Tōljappar and Kumāra Tāttayyanger, sons of Soṭṭai Tirumalai Nambi Tiruvenkata Tāttayyanger appear prominently. Both have made fairly large endowments in addition to what their disciples have done. Kumara Tattayyanger seems to have been held in great esteem by his disciples. The Tiruninra-ur-udaiyars stipulated in their endowment deeds that a part of the donor’s share of the prasadams should be delivered in their acharya’s Tirumāligai (or house). The social etiquette of those days would however have made it impossible for an āchāryapurusha to be one of the Sthanattar of the temple. Their work was more evangelical in character.

A point of some importance is made clear by the inscription relating to Kumara Tāttayyanger’s endowment of Rs. 3,500 in the year 1493. We learn therefrom that he constructed a mantapam at the south-west corner of the outer prakaram of the Tirumala Temple where the Utsava Murti during procession in connection with the Adhyanotsavam the Kodai Tirunal etc. was to alight. The Iyal tuvakkam (or commencement of the recital of the Prabandham) used to take place in front of this mantapam. This is another attempt of the Sri Vaishnavas to
obtain for the recital of the Prabandhams a permanent status or usage. We have previously noticed an inscription dated 1360 A.D. which stated that the Prabandham was recited in front of the main gate of the temple. So between 1360 and 1493 A.D. a development had taken place and the starting point of the Iyal had been definitely fixed as Kumara Tattayangar’s mantapam. Within the walls of the temple itself there was no recital of the Prabandham at any time.

In regard to the commencement of the Veda recital there does not appear to have been any definite rule.

The relationship which generally subsisted between the Acharyapurusha and his disciple can be understood by a reference to the prasasti given in II. 58 and II. 60 to the brothers Rāvu Pinna Bhūpāla Nṛśimha Naranāyaka and Rāvu Pinna Bhūpāla Kesānāyaka. The prasasti in Sanskrit could not have been composed by the Tiruninra-ur-udaiyar who invariably composed the material portion of the text of every inscription in Tamil. No other person in Tirupati would have been interested in extolling the prowess, achievements and virtues of these two men than their Acharya Sri Kumāra Tāttayangar. Exaggeration in such matters seems to have been consistent with the dignity as an Acharyapurusha.
CHAPTER XVIII.

THE TIRUVENGADAM TEMPLE AND
SRI VIRAPRATAPA VIRA KRISHNA DEVA
MAHARAYA 1509—1530 A.D.

There was a distinct change in the character of the administration of the temple soon after Sri Krishnadeva ascended the Vijayanagar throne. To apprise it correctly we must have an idea of the man, his religious beliefs as revealed in our inscriptions and how he dealt with those who were conducting the secular and the religious affairs of the temple.

He was well-known for his accomplishments as a man of letters, a lover of fine arts and a patron of poets and artists even before he sat on the throne. There is a story that his predecessor and elder brother with a view to making the throne secure for his young son, ordered his minister Sāluva Timmarasu to put out the eyes of Krishna Devaraya and thus incapacitate him for life, but that Timmarasu allowed him to escape from this calamity as he thought it was in the best interests of the Empire and Hindu religion and culture that he should become the King. Whether for his part Krishna Deva was responsible for the death or disappearance of his brother’s sons, no one can definitely say. Perhaps the only one who may have known the truth was Sāluva Timmarasu. Our inscriptions reveal that the great minister was reduced to the plight of selling to Tāllapākkam Tirumalai Ayyangar the donor’s share of the prasādams which as a large donor he was receiving. He must have fallen on evil days. Otherwise he would not have done so. But this was done when Sri Virapratāpa Achyuta dēva Maharaya was the Emperor. The story is that Timmarasu was suspected of complicity in a plot which brought about the untimely death of Krishna’s young son about the year 1525 A.D. and that eventually Timmarasu was removed from office and lost royal favour. In February 1536 he first sold to Tirumalai ayyangar
the donor's share of prasadams due to his brother Govindaraja (donor), then he sold to the same gentleman the prasadams due to his brother and himself and lastly he sold his own share of the prasadams due to him as donor. The last act exposed in all nakedness the misery to which he had sunk. Within a fortnight thereafter Achyutarayar came to his rescue and instituted an endowment, the quarter share thereof being ordered to be delivered to Timmarasu's son-in-law Appayya (IV. 89. 12-1-1537). During Krishnadeva's reign we do not find that he ever allowed any of his near relatives to occupy any place of importance or influence in the Empire. The story goes that Achyuta and his brother were kept in detention in the Chandragiri Fort. He seems to have known well what amount of mischief palace intrigues can do and therefore probably preferred to take no risks. Historians seem to be unanimously of the view that he was just and even generous. He was at the same time feared by everybody. But he seems to have always been suspicious of the intentions and motives of those who tried to ingratiating themselves into his favour. We can reasonably infer this from the fact that two of his high placed officers, Appa Pillai, and Sāluva Govindaraya who made endowments as the dharmam of Sri Krishnadeva in 1511 and 1522 A.D. respectively, disappear from our view thereafter. In fact Sāluva Govindaraya like his brother, the great minister Saluva Timmarasu, was reduced to the condition of selling away to Tallapākkam Tirumalai Ayyangar the quarter share of the prasādam due to him as donor.

During Krishnadevaraya's visits to Tirumala, his party seems to have consisted of only his two queens, his two purohits Ranga Dikshitar and Siva Dikshitar, his udigam servant Bagüri Mallarasu his secretary (rāyasam) and engraver Sripati son of Peddayyāsāri. In all the inscriptions relating to his gifts and endowments his prasasti is given in full. In the endowments made by his personal servants like Ekkādi Timmanman and his door-keepers Narasayya and Timmayya also, the full prasasti is inscribed. But all his officers and the Sthānattār avoid, perhaps deliberately, making any reference to his regnal year. It is likely that they considered it the safest course.
THE TIRUVENGADAM TEMPLE.

KRISHNA DEVARAYA'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.

Krishnadevaraya was as has already been stated a great patron of arts and literature. He is credited with having held assemblies of poets and pundits during the Vasanta Ritu every year in Vijayanagar and to have rewarded them according to merit. His admiration for Alasãni Peddana's attainments were according to stories which are still credited so great that he offered to be the foremost bearer of the palanquin in a procession held to honour the great poet. But it has nowhere been said that he attracted great philosophers to his court, or that he paid his obeisance to any ácârâya or saint, although all great Hindu Kings have generally done so. Sivaji is, for instance, said to have placed his whole kingdom at the feet of his guru and to have received it back with blessings to administer in strict accordance with Hindu Dharma. Hindu Kings have from ancient times also tried to emulate as their ideal the court of Janaka, King of the Videhas, where periodical discussions took place between Yagnavalkya, the Saint and others. But Krishna Deva's tastes seem to have been confined to arts and literature. We however gather from our inscriptions that although he desired to propitiate other Deities like Kâlahastiśwara, the Supreme Deity in whom he had the greatest faith was Tiruvengatanãtha. Therefore on important and critical occasions he first propitiated Tiruvengatanatha and then rode off to Kâlahasti also to worship the God there. The Deity of Sri Govindarajaswami in Tirupati did not evidently attract him as he did not pay even a single visit to His temple. Tirumalai and Kâlahasti were not however the only shrines visited by him. He visited several of the celebrated temples in Southern India, made gifts at each place bathed in the sea at Rameswaram and washed his blood-stained sword in its waters believing obviously that he was thus washing away all his sins. He seems to have been by training a firm believer in the Karma Kânda of the Vedas. The Gnâna Mârga and the Bhakti Mârga do not seem to have been studied or practised by him. His much admired poet laureate Alasãni Peddana was a great Sri Vaishnava and Bhakta. He was the famous disciple of the Saint Adi Van Satagopaswami who founded the Ahôbila Matham. Peddana's poetry alone seems to have commanded the admiration of Krishnadevaraya. It may however be asked whether he did
not write the Telugu Kāvyā Amuktamālīyaḍa. The answer to this is that it is not definitely established that he wrote it and that it is held by some that the real author of it was Peddanna. Nevertheless, unless Krishna Deva considered that he could conscientiously subscribe to the tenets of Sri Vaishnavism, he could not have written or agreed to father the work. It is however a fact that he had no Sri Vaishnava acharya or purohit to initiate him into the Sampradāyas peculiar to that sect. This is noticeable from Vol. III inscription No. 65, which gives his genealogy. The text of it with the exception of the first verse and a slight alteration in the second verse, is a copy of what appears on a stone tablet in the Pompāpati Temple in Hampi, dated Māgha Suddha 14, Sakha 1430. In that inscription the first verse is in adoration of Sambhu and the second is in adoration of Ganesa. It is stated there that Ganesa is worshipped even by Hari (Harināḍi cha pūjyate). In our inscription the adoration is addressed to (Sri) Varāha, the lilavatara of Hari. This is because Tirumala is considered to be Varāhakshetram, and not Venkatesa Kshetram. But the second verse is addressed to Ganesa and not to Vishvaksena. A Sri Vaishnava would naturally propitiate the latter. There is however a slight alteration by the substitution for the words “Harina-pi cha pujyate,” of the words “Panchasyenāpi lālitam,” which means that Ganesa is being caressed or fondled by Panchasya (Siva). If there had been a Vaishnava, not necessarily a Sri Vaishnava, in Krishnadevaraya’s entourage, the second sloka would undoubtedly have been dedicated to Vishvaksena.

One other feature which distinguishes Krishnadeva from his successor is his omission to end the inscription relating to his endowments with the usual charge ‘Sri Vaishnava Rakshai.’ We are not here referring to gifts of Tiruvabharanam, but only to the endowments for performance of puja, festivals and other charities in a Vishnu Temple. It was Sāmavai who started in 966 A.D. the practice of ending the endowment with this charge. The practice was followed by others except in the case of gifts of ornaments, (Tiruvabharanam). Vira Narasinga Yādavarāya adhered to it. Sriranganatha Yādavarāya used the same terminology. But when we come to the Vijayanagar Kings we do not
find the practice followed which would go to show that they were not initiated into the Sri Vaishnava āchāra properly. Devaraya Maharaya simply ends his inscription with the words “This is the dharma Sāsanam” (I. 192, 5-12-1429 Ṛṣṭaṅgaḥ Ṛṣṭaṅga Ṛṣṭaṅgaḥ). Bukkarāya, the first of the Vijayanagar Kings, ended with the following admonition in Tamil,

\[\text{\begin{quote} \text{இன்று கூடுதலில் இல்லையே உள்ளேயே கொண்டுள்ள காலத்தை விளக்க வசதியை பாதிக்கும் பொழுது விளக்க வசதியை.} \end{quote}}\]

\[\text{இன்று கூடுதலில் இல்லையே உள்ளேயே கொண்டுள்ள காலத்தை விளக்க வசதியை பாதிக்கும் பொழுது விளக்க வசதியை.} \]

(I. 178, p. 167)

(“Whoever frustrates this charity shall beget the sin of killing a tawny cow on the banks of the Ganga. To preserve a charity endowed by others is twice as meritorious as instituting a new one; misappropriation of other’s gifts nullifies the benefits of one’s own gifts”.

Krishna Devaraya’s imprecations are worse; he holds out the curse of incurring the sin of killing one’s parents and Brahmins. His queen Tirumala devi uses more persuasive language. She says “Dāna Pālanayor madhye dānāt sreyo’nupālanam: Dānāt svargamāyāpnoti pālanāt achyutam padam” (By making a gift one attains svarga. But by preserving (the charity already in existence) one attains the state of immortality, Achyutam).

But the Sāmavai went further and said: “the feet of those who protect this charity I place on my head” (I. 8)—no threats, no imprecations and no persuasions were used by her. She had full faith that there will be real Bhaktas at all times in this world to protect religious trusts.

We cannot however belittle the fact that Krishnadevarayar’s gifts are incomparably large and costly; but as a devotee he was half-baked. He sought no guru and no one came forward to
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initiate him, because he was not spiritually right-minded for the guru to take Krishnadeva into his charge.

The language used in our inscriptions relating to endowments for food offerings and similar services to the deity deserves special study. We will first take up one of Krishnadeva Raya’s endowments (III. 65) and compare it with others. We select this inscription because it gives his ancestry both mythical and historical. The text of this must have had his approval. Mythically his ancestor is claimed to be Turvasu, the younger brother of Yadu of the lunar race. Yadu is the latest mythical ancestor claimed by the Vijayanagar rulers of the Sangama line. Krishna Deva’s kinship with Turvasu is therefore evidently claimed to show that neither Vira Narasimha nor Krishna Deva Raya were usurpers. Historically, the two brothers were aware of the names of only their father, grand-father and great grand-father of Tuluva origin. The inscription credits Vira Narasimha with having made valuable gifts at all imaginable sacred places in India including Venkatadri. We have however no inscription showing any of his gifts made in Tirumala. Krishna Devaraya’s greatness alone is dealt with at length. Coming to the object of the inscription namely the charity, we find that it is worded as follows: 

Krishna Deva Maharaya’s Dharmasasanam is in favour of Srinivasa or Venkatësa abiding on Seshachala, who has taken up the protection of this world I make this Dattam.”

What property was given as dānam is not mentioned in the inscription which is entirely in the Sanskrit language. The Devasthanam Epigraphist has tacked on to the Sanskrit portion a Telugu inscription of which the first thirteen lines are missing. But there is a Kanarese version of this which shows that it is complete in itself without any indication of its being a continuation of the Sanskrit portion. It may be that in the Sanskrit portion there may be a few lines missing as well, which might have contained the details of the dānam made. We have to bear in mind that

1. Bhuvana bharana sāvadhānāya Venkatēsabhidhānāya Seshāchala
niyāsāya Srinivāsāya dattamidam dharmāsāsanam.”
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the Sanskrit portion was composed and inscribed in Hampi on the occasion of the festival of Krishna Devaraya’s coronation on Magha Suddha 14, in Saka 1430 (say 4th February 1509). It is not unlikely that the same text, with the slight alteration we have already noticed, was inscribed in Tirumala temple also on or about the same date in 1509. The Kanarese and the Telugu inscriptions which were made in June 1513, making a grant of certain villages for the Thai Brahmotsavam may be quite unconnected with the grant made as mentioned by the Sanskrit inscription. The Kanarese inscription shows that the grant was made to the Sri Bhandāram of Tiruvengadamudaiyan and not to Tiruvengadamudaiyan Himself as shown in the Sanskrit inscription. In the Telugu inscription this piece of information is however missing. To say that it was given to the Sri Bhandaram is also not quite the appropriate expression. We would rather put it as the Sri Bhandaram of Tiruvengadamudaiyan’s Temple, not His Sri Bhandaram.

It is something unusual, if not unthinkable for a mortal to say that he gives away (dattam) anything in favour of, or to, God. One may make a Dharmasāsanam using such words in the case of a grant for another mortal or for a charitable purpose. The usual form is to say that the dharma sāsanam was being executed for the purpose of certain offerings to be made, or for certain services to be rendered to the Deity. We may here refer to the language used in the Sanskrit portion of the Hampi inscription wherein Singanayakanuhalli village was granted to the Virupaksha swami temple. It reads “Bhuvana bharana sēvādhānāya Virūpākṣhābhidhanāya vītirna viniṭājana hēma kūṭāya Hema kūṭa yatana syālinē Sūline Madhuraphalāpūpādi hrida pa neivedyaya Singenayakana hailiti vākyāna nāma chatussi mābhirāmō grāmō dattō vittōpakārīnā.”

“Gave a village, which was famous by the name of Singanayakanahalli and which was adorned with its four boundaries, for (providing) pleasant oblations (naivēdyā) (consisting of) sweet fruits, cakes etc., to Sūlin (śiva) called the holy Virūpaksha, to whom pious people have presented heaps of gold, who abides on the Hēmakūta and who is diligent in protecting the world.” The
wording adopted in the Hampi inscription is in the spirit in which a gift should be made for oblations to God. The failure to use similar language in the grant for Sri Venkatesvara’s temple can be explained only on the assumption that a Sri Vaishnava (or the Sthanattar) was not called in to draft the inscription suitably. This defect is noticeable in the dharmasāsana issued by his predecessors of the Sangama dynasty also. And they also had no Sri Vaishnava training: Bukkaraya I uses the words “..... இவ்வுரையான தானியான திருவர்க்கல் மாலையாகக் கற்றிருந்து எதிரியன் (I.178). (We give away to Tiruvengadamudaiyan as Sarva manyam”) treating the God as the grantee. Sri Devaraya Maharaya’s language is இந்த மயக்க அண்டு நாட்டலை எடுத்து வைக்க வேண்டும் இல்லை பல மகராஜா இன்று செய்து என்று என்று (I. 192, p. 182) (This is the dharma sāsana issued for Srimat Tirumala Dēvaru). It is worth trying to find out in what spirit the Pallavas, the Chola and the Pandyan Kings and the Yadavaraya ruler, made their grants. We have no inscription in Tirupati of any Pallava King; but there is an inscription of Vijayaditya whose ancestors were the feudatories of the Pallavas as well as the Cholas. He made a grant, though it was a small one. The fragmentary inscription relating to it reads:  ‘இவ்வுரையான உள்ள ... இவ்வுரையான உள்ள ... இவ்வுரையான உள்ள ... இவ்வுரையான உள்ள ..’ (I. 4) (“I. Vijayaditya offered as my humble service including Kalanju...”). Mention of the services for which the grant was made follows immediately. In all the inscriptions in Vol. I (Nos. 22 to 25, 38) which relate to the grants made by individuals, the donee is not the God Tiruppapaladisvaramudaiyan, but only the Sivabrahmanas who were doing the services. The purpose of the grant is always given in detail. During the Pandya period, Sri Vira Narasinga Yadavarayar made a grant of Pādirivēdu for the amudupadi of Tiruvengadamudaiyan.” இதன் பொருளிலும் பண்டையக் குட்டை நீர் பலரளகம் கூறுகிறது என்று புள்ளித்தது என்று புள்ளித்தது என்று புள்ளித்தது என்று புள்ளித்தது (I. 44). The purpose of the grant is fully specified. It is in no case given to the God, but for God’s services.

Tirukkālattideva Yadavarāya’s grant (I. 81) of Kudavūr reads: ‘ ‘... இவ்வுரையான உள்ள ... இவ்வுரையான உள்ள ... இவ்வுரையான உள்ள ... இவ்வுரையான உள்ள ..’ 434
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"All the nanjai and punjai lands within the four boundaries of Kuavūr together with... Having accordingly granted with libations of water for the nimandam, we have directed that Sudarsuna stones be planted along the boundaries. So be it done."

Sri Tiruvenkatapantha Yadavaraya's grant converting Tirupati into a Sarvamanyam reads:—(I. 100) "... "

"The language in which the grants are couched shows a refinement which is characteristic of the Sri Vaishnava Sampradaya. It is this spirit that we find absent in the inscriptions detailing the grants made by the Vijayanagar Kings down to the days of Krishnadeva Maharaya. It may perhaps be said that we have inferred too much from the language of a single inscription and that we are not warranted in coming to the conclusion that Sri Krishnadevaraya's religious education was no better than that of the average Hindu, who has faith in a personal God, whom he must propitiate to get on well in this world and escape troubles and miseries. Krishna Deva Raya's numerous and costly gifts really appear in no better light. He washed his sins in the waters of the Rameswaram sea like any other Hindu. He made dānams as many do to ward off evils. But we look in vain when we wish to find out what he did for the propagation of Hindu religion and for the advancement of spiritual culture. He trusted solely Tiruvenganatha for the achievement of his ambitions in this life. During none of his seven visits to Tirupati did he go to the temple of Sri Govindaraja swami there; nor is there anything on record to
show that he offered a namaskaram before Sri Ramanuja’s image which is within the temple precincts of Tirumala.

**Krishna Devaraya’s attitude towards the Sthanattar.**

We have next to examine from the inscriptions how he treated the Sthanattar who were in charge of the secular administration of the temple and how they regarded him. We have seen that ever since the reconstituted Sthanattar came into existence about 1390 A.D., it became increasingly customary for donors of food services in the temple to hand over to the Sthanattar a portion, if not the full quarter share of the donor. Donors who were residents in Tirupati and Chandragiri, the merchants in particular, seem to have considered that the Sthanattar should be duly respected in this manner. To the Sthanattar it became more or less a question of prestige. They were not salaried servants of the temple. They took it as honorary work. But gradually a share in prasadams came to be considered as the perquisite of office. The term Nirvāham used to connote this share implies that it was their source of livelihood. So also the dakshinas they received during special festivals and during the tirukkaivalakkam distribution of cash. We also saw that after the death of Sāluva Narasimha Maharaya, due to some of the activities of Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar and the complicity of the Sthanattar therein, the prestige of the Sthanattar suffered to some extent. Some of the donors ignored the Sthanattar and distributed the donor’s share among others, to the Tiruppani Bhandarattar in particular. Some started their own chatrams where the donor’s share was distributed to the pilgrims. Sāluva Narasimha’s Ramanujakutam, managed by Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar, was also ignored. The prestige of the Sthanattar suffered much more by the treatment which Sri Vira Pratapa Krishnadeva Maharaya gave them. Krishnadeva Maharaya made seven visits to the temple. On three occasions alone he made endowments for food offerings. As one of these inscriptions is an incomplete one, we do not know the quantity and the varieties he offered. But from the inscriptions we see that out of 2½ prasadams due to him, he gave one to Ranga Dikshitar,
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one to Siva Dikshitar (both being his purûhîts) and ½ to Tiruppani Bhandarattar. He however sent to his own satram kept under the management of the Tiruppani Bhandaram 2 Tirukkanâma dès. 26 appams etc. His two queens gave more to the Tiruppani Bhandârattâr and what remained thereafter to the satram. Thus the Sthanattar were completely ignored. There are many cases in which the donors who had other commitments gave only a small portion to the Sthanattar to respect their claim. Krishna Deva Raya’s action would have been construed as a positive insult. We have to draw this inference from the manner in which the Sthanattar reacted. Their reaction consisted in ignoring the Emperor while inscribing endowment deeds. Except in the inscriptions directly made by Sri Krishna Devaraya’s personal composers and engravers in almost all other cases the Emperor’s name was omitted. Even where it had to be mentioned, the usual prasasti did not find a place. The rare instances where the prasasti are given are:

(a) His palace door-keepers Narasayya and Timmavayya describe him as “Sri Virapratapa Sri Vira Krishnaraya Maharyar” (III. 26).

(b) Udigam Ellappa Nâyakkar endowed three villages for the merit of Krishnaraya Maharaya (III. 109, 1516 A.D.). What is the Prasasti? (ஷ்டூமஸ்சந்தமந்தந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாம�...)

(c) Ekkâdi Timmamman, daughter of Nalla Gangamman, made an endowment of 1500 Panam (III. 124) as Krishna Devaraya’s dharma and calls him “Sriman Maharajadhí raja Raja Paramesvara” (அச்ச்சந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாமசொந்தந்தாமஸ்சம்ஸந்தமந்தாதேஸ்தாம�...)

(d) In giving effect to Sri Krishna Devaraya’s Rȳyasam to make over to Srimat Vyãsa tirtha Sri Pãda Udaiyãr, the Sthanattar gave the prasasti as “Sriman Maharajadhí raja Rajaparamesvara Sri Virapratapa Sri Vira Krishnaraya Maharayar” (III. 159).

(e) In an endowment of only 300 panams, one Yatirajan disciple of Alagiya Mañavala Jiyar and manager of a flower garden,
commences his inscription with "Hail, Sriman Maharajadhira Raja Paramesvara Sri Virapratapa." It is presumed this refers to Krishna Deva and not to his successor as the year is Sarvajit (1527 A.D.).

(f) In a similar endowment of 300 panam (III. 172) one Sriramayyan starts with "while Sriman Maharajadhira Raja paramesvara Sri Virapratapa Sri Vira Krishnaraya Maharayar was ruling the earth."

(g) One Perumal making an endowment III. 180 of 1500 panams got the inscription to start with "When Sri Vira Krishnaraya Maharayar was ruling the earth." 1450.

(h) Adaippan Bhaiyappa Nayakkar endowed for 6 Tirupponakkam for the combined merit of his own father and Krishna raya Maharayar. (III. 135) "......"

(i) Sinnappa Reddi of Putilapattu endows "for the merit of Krishnadeva Maharaya" (III. 167 17—1—1527). "......"

There are 229 inscriptions in Vol. III. out of which 55 have been inscribed by Sri Krishnadevaraya's own men. There thus remain 174 relating to endowments, etc., by others. There are only 7 in which the Emperor's name or prasasti is given. None of his officers seem to have shown an anxiety to give his name and the full prasasti. These are given only in his own inscriptions. Until the victorious campaign against the Kalinga country was completed the Emperor is described as Sriman Maharajadhira Raja Paramesvara Sri Virapratapa Sri Vira Krishnadeva Maharayar. Thereafter he styled himself, "Sri man Maharajadhira Raja Paramesvara Muvarayagaranda Ariyarayar Vibhata Ashtadikraya manobhayankara Bhashaga tappuvarayar Purva-Dakshina-Pashima

1. III. 73, (6-7-1514) gives the old prasasti and III. 76, (25-10-1515) gives the prasasti after the conquest of Kalinga raya.
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-Samudradhisvara Yavanarāja-Sthāpanāchārya Gajapati Vībhāta Sri Vira Krishnaraya Mahārāya.” Even his own officers showed no inclination to quote all these titles in any of the inscriptions relating to their endowments.

Nor did Sripāda Uḍaīyar to whom he gave with libations of water (ဝဝဝဝဝဝ) a piece of land to build his matham and to whom he made over his own share of prasādams (Vide III. 158 and 159)—15½ prasadams, 26 atirasams, 1½ palam chandanam, 75 areca nuts and 150 betel leaves daily, sufficient to feed about 200 persons—mention even the Emperor’s name in the endowments made by him. (III. 165, 8—11—1524 and III. 175. 2—4—1528).

Krishnadeva Maharayar took no notice of the religious heirarchy of the temple, the Achāryapurushas. It is a well-known fact that a member of the family of Soṭṭai Tirumalai nambi had settled down in Anagundi as the hereditary guru of the Sangama line of kings, and that the members of that family came to be known as Rāyagurus. Their descendants are living there even now. But Sri Krishnadeva does not seem to have given any recognition to the members of that family who have been the first āchāryapurushas of the temple (his successors did not copy his example). Much less did he take notice of the other āchāryapurushas. In their endowments therefore none of these ever mentioned the name of the Emperor although, as we have seen, some of them extolled the achievements of even princes who were their disciples.

Nandavanams and Sattada Srivaishnavas ignored.

It was usual for the rulers, princes and the wealthy classes to establish and maintain nandavanams in Tirumala to supply flowers to Tiruvengadamudaiyan. The Sātada Sri Vaishnavas used to be placed in charge of these and to be paid in cash as well as by being given a portion of the donor’s share of prasadams. They were also expected to take part in the Prabandham recital and in providing Sāttupadi. Krishnadeva did not follow this usage.
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TEMPLE STRUCTURES RECEIVED NO ATTENTION.

We shall next see whether he took any interest in the improvements to the temple structures. There is nothing to show that he took any interest. Not even a mantapam was constructed by him. He did nothing in the shape of providing facilities to pilgrims. His attachment to Tiruvengatanatha appears purely to have been a business affair. He showed his gratitude by showering gold on the Murti and by presenting Tiruvabharanam on a lavish scale; but these have mostly disappeared. The Prabha-vati, the Kiritam and the swords alone remain. While King Hôbala Yâdava of Tanjai presented a gold flower for his Vaikunthahastam which promises salvation to mankind, Krishna's sword reminds us of punishment and vengeance. This perhaps indicates the difference in religious outlook between the two.

KRISHNADeVARAYA'S GIFT TO TIRUVENGATANATHA.

All the gifts made by the Emperor at Tirumala seem to have been engraved on stone by his own engraver Sripati, son of Peddayâ-sâri, and the draft of the edicts was also composed by his own men either Gindi Basavarayulu or Baguri Mallarasa. The Sthannattar do not figure in any of these inscriptions except in III. 80, wherein they were empowered to collect certain taxes. In the disposal of the donor's share of the prasadams it was the Tiruppanipillai that was empowered to appropriate to himself 1/5 share of the prasadam in each and to distribute the remainder to pilgrims in the choultries established by the Emperor and his two queens. The total quantity of the food offerings by the three is 20 tirupponakam, 4 tirukkanâmañdai and 4 appapadi. The two purohits who accompanied the Emperor, Ranga Dikshitar and Siva Dikshitar, also got each a large share of the prasadams.
Gifts and Endowments made by Krishnadeva and His two Queens.

A. Gifts made on 10—2—1513 A.D.

1. One Navaratna Kirīṭam, the total weight of which was 3308 carats, Vommecchu 1555, Kundanam gold 1076.

2. One Trisaram (three-stringed necklace) containing pearls, mānīkyam, saphires etc. With addīgas all weighing 225 carats and one padakam weighing 61 carats.

3. Twenty-five silver plates for offering camphor harathi.

By Queen Chinnajiamma.

4. One gold cup for offering milk (क्रियासाधना घरकूट गतिं) at the nightly Ekanta Seva, weighing 374 carats (करः).

By Tirumaladeviamma.

5. One gold cup for offering milk as above weighing 374 units.

B. On 2nd May 1513.

6. One Vuḍudhara ornament weighing in all 66 units, inclusive of 5 diamonds, 17 addikas, set with emeralds, rubies, old diamonds, gems and gold string.

7. One Kaṭhāri (sword) with sheath set with diamonds, rubies, suphires; tassel for sheath composed of small pearls, big pearls and rubies. Total weight 326 units. In these the rubies, diamonds and emeralds alone weigh 165 units.

8. One Nichchala Kaṭhāri sheath for daily use 132 units set with rubies on top.

9. One small sword for daily use with tassel of pearls.
10. One sheath for above sword containing rubies, pearls and diamonds.

11. One padakam or pendant weighing 87 carats set with diamonds, rubies, emeralds etc.

12. One pair of Bhuja Kirthi or vanki weighing 573 units set with pearls, rubies, saphires and old diamonds.

13. One Bhuja Kirthi for daily use weighing 198 units.

14. Two pairs of Bhuja Kirthi for daily use.

15. One gold string with 17 adigas, 30 more adigas in shape of peepul leaves, pearls, rubies, diamonds and emeralds weighing 205 units in all.

16. Another similar string weighing 276 units.

17. For the Utsava Murti and Nachchimar—Three crowns weighing 380 units in total, containing pearls, old diamonds, rubies, cat's eyes and saphires, (See III. 60, 61, 62, 63).


18. Kanakabhishekam with 30,000 gold varahans (Chakrapan), to Sri Venkatesa;

19. Three stringed ornament (මොත්තුරු අභින්වේ) weighing 250 units inclusive of gold wire, gold clips, rubies, pearls saphires;

20. One pair kadaayam (Bahuvalayam) (Talilpakkam village was granted for daily food offering).

By Queen Chinnavidevi Ammal.—(See III, 70, 71, 72).

21. One kanta mala (necklace) with a padakam set with diamonds, rubies, emeralds and pearls weighing 200 units.

Mudivur village also granted for daily offering.
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By Queen Tirumaladevi.—(See III, 73, 74, 75).

22. One Chakra padakam weighing 225½ units and containing diamonds, rubies, emeralds and pearls.

(Pirattti Kułattur granted for daily food offering):

By Krishnadevaraya—(See III. 76, 77, 78.)

D. On 25th October 1515—Yuva Kartika Bahula 3, after returning from his victorious eastern expedition against Kalinga.

23. One Navaratna Prabhâvali or Makara Toranam total weight 27,287 units; containing 25 kiritumukha leaves ąścyan, 13835 vommachchu beads (nâśyan); gold wire weighing 16; solid gold 7978, silk and gold fringes hanging on the head of the makara-toranam 20 weighing 5474. The above contains 10994 red stones, 754 emeralds, 530 sapphires; 40 cat’s eyes; 45 agates, 74 topazes, 920 old diamonds; 3933 pearls; 4 large sapphires fixed as eyes; 6 corals and 30 conch shells.

The total weight of the arch of the Makara Toranam weighs 14711 units. Grand total of the Prabhavali in weight is 31124 units.

The above is for the Lord who gave Krishna Deva Katakapuri (Orissa).

E. On 2nd January 1517 (After returning from Simhâdri Potnûru where he set up his triumphal pillar (Kalinga desa capture). (See III, 80, 81).

24. One Kantha mälai.

25. One Padakkam.

26. For gilding Vimanam 30,000 varahas; (also ordered the Sthanattar to collect 1000 varahas from Godagûrûdu for the weekly puñûgukâppu expenses for Tiruvengadâmudaiyân, and certain other taxes of Godagûrûdu amounting to 500 varahas for conducting daily morning offerings).
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(Gold gilding of the vimanam completed on 9—9—1518)

F. A Kamalapuram inscription seems to say that he paid a visit to Tirumala with Queen Tirumaladevi on 16th October 1518. But there is no inscription in Tirumalai or Tiruapti to support this.

On 17th February 1521: (with Tirumaladevi alone accompanying). (See III. 83, 84, 85, 86).

27. Pitambaram set with nine kinds of precious stones.

28. Kullāvu (or head dress) set with pearls, rubies, emeralds and sapphires;

29. Two chāmaras (fly whisks) set with nine kinds of gems; and 10,000 gold varahas.

30. One padakam.

31. By Tirumaladevi, a Navaratna Padakam.

H. In addition to the above mentioned gifts he made in the early period of his reign during his third visit on 13—6—1513, certain endowments for the merit of his parents, (father Narasa Nāyaka Uḍaiyār and mother Nāgalammangaru), which consisted of some ornament set with nine kinds of precious stones (portions of inscription are missing), and an annual Brahmotsavam in the Tamil month of Tai for which he endowed the villages of Chatrāvādi, Tūrūru and Karikambādu, in Godagūrnādu.

Endowments and Gifts by the generals and officers of Sri Krishnadeva and others.

Besides the Emperor and his two Queens, there are a large number of his officers (numbering 24 in all), who visited the shrine and made endowments, some on more than one occasion. It is worth noting what form their gifts took and how they looked at the Sthanattar and the others who served in the temple. There are also the Jiyars, Acharya purushas, temple servants, merchants
and citizens who made endowments. A comprehensive view of the form in which it was the fashion to make endowments and gifts may be useful for our estimate of the nature of temple worship during this period.

Considered in chronological order the first officer to make an endowment during Krishnadevaraya's reign was a general of the army, named APPA PILLAI son of Karavattippuli ālvār and a resident of Uttaramērur (Mahipāla Kulakālachchēri). He had made three endowments previously during the reign of Krishna Deva's elder brother Vira-Narasimha: the first, on 19—5—1506 for four tirupponakam to Tiruvenkatamudaiyan, a second on 30th December 1506 of a capital sum of 3180 nar-panam for food offerings to Sri Govindaraja, on a number of festival days while seated in the Nīralī Mantapam constructed by him and third on 18—7—1508 for the celebration of an Anna Unjāl Tirunal to Sri Govindaraja (similar to the one in Tirumala). The last endowment was specially meant for the merit and welfare of Vira Narasingaraya Maharaya.

It has to be remembered here that Vira Narasingaraya had great difficulty in putting down revolts and rebellions, particularly around Kānchi and in Kongu nādu. Appa Pillai was the general in charge, at any rate of the country around Kānchi. He may therefore have considered it desirable to express his loyalty to his sovereign in this manner.

Soon after Krishna Devaraya succeeded to the throne one of his first acts was to turn his attention to the same part of his kingdom and to bring the Ummattūr Chief and the Sambuvarayas to subjection, where Appa Pillai continued to be the general even after this. He made a grant of Virakampanallur to Tiruvengadambudaiyan on 7—4—1511 for the merit of Sri Vira Krishnaraya Maharayar. The days selected for food offerings are his own birth day, Pūraṭṭādi in Adi month, the Sraddha day of his mother, every new moon day, every māsa Sankranti and a fairly large number of other festival days. Such days are, according to Hindu conception selected to ward off evils. The usual prasasti of the
Emperor however is not given in this inscription. This was probably because Krishnadevaraya himself had not yet made his first visit to Tirumala. But before the end of 1512 Krishnadevaraya set matters right in the South and thereafter we have no more endowments made by Appa Pillai. Nor do we find his name mentioned again. From the offerings mentioned above, Appa Pillai received his share of the prasadams and gave one appam to Kumāra Tātayyangar. Nothing was sent to the Ramanuja Kutam.

B. Mahānāyakāchārya (or Commander-in-Chief) PERIYA OBALA NAYAKAR RAMA NAYAKAR is the next officer whose endowments have to be noticed. He had formerly on 4—9—1504, during the reign of Immadi Narasimharayar, made a grant of Kaḍalūr in Tirukkuḍavur nāḍu—the grant was authorised by the rāyasam of the Rayar—and 100 cows for offering to Tiruvengadamudaiyan daily, 24 taligais and one Iddali padi, besides lighting a lamp before Raghunatha. He gave the donor’s share to the 3½ vagai. During Krishna Deva’s reign he made two endowments one on 14—7—1512 and the other on 8—1—1514. In the former he granted Sengödupalli to propitiate Tiruvengadamudaiyan and Garudalvār with 4 tirupponakam daily and one atirasappadi, when the Garudadhvaja is hoisted during all the Brahmostsavams. He also offered one atirasappadi on every Visakha nakshatra, which was his birth star. He presented 50 cows to afford ghee for one lamp. This endowment was made by him just before the beginning of the campaign for the capture of the eastern possessions of the Orissa king. The Mahanayakacharya whose duty and ambition was to hoist the Vijayanagar flag on the Udayagiri fortress, obviously sought the grace of Garudalvar (the emblem of Vishnu’s flag), but he did not forget to mention his own birth nakshatra. The donor’s share in this case went to the Tiruppaṇi Bhandarattar. The endowment dated 8—1—1514 (III. 88), was made by the Commander-in-Chief after he had accomplished his task and had crushed the Gajapati forces. We therefore find him presenting 200 cows for a daily offering of Pāleḍukkuḷambu (milk boiled with spices and sugar until it becomes semi-solid) as an expression of his gratitude to Tiruvengadamudaiyan. The donor’s share was in this case ordered to be sent to his own
Ramanujakutam so that his kinsmen and followers may partake of it. The point to note is that these are made not for Krishnadeva’s merit.

C. (1) The next officers to make endowments were PRA-DHANI SALUVA TIMMARASAAYYANGAR and his brother SALUVA GOVINDARAJA. Thimmarasa was the famous Chief Minister who saved the eyes, and therefore, the very life of Krishnadevaraya. It is not unlikely that he knew more about the inner life of the Emperor than any other man then living. Timmarasa was also a general. His wife IAKSHMI AMMANGAR who seems to have been a pious lady made an endowment for offering one tirupponakam daily in her own name and she ordered that the donor’s share should go to her son-in-law Nādindla Appa who seems to have been then living in Chandragiri. In less than a month after this, that is on 13—1—1512, Saluva Timmarasa himself made an endowment by making a grant of Parantālūr in Poṭṭapināḍu for offering daily 8 tirupponakams and 1 atirasappadi to Tiruvengadamudaiyan and certain other vagai paṭis to Sri Govindaraja on certain festival days. But he took the donor’s share himself except for one prasadam which he gave to the Sattāda Sri Vaishnava Singayyan who maintained his flower garden. An undated inscription on the south wall of the Kalyana mantapam in Sri Govindaraja’s temple in Sanskrit verse (grantha characters, composer’s name not stated) very much praises Timmarasa for his great qualities of head and heart and loyalty and also the brilliance and beauty of the Pitambaram dress which he presented to Sri Venkatesa. It might have been engraved soon after the coronation of Sri Krishnadeva Raya.

C. (2) A brother of Saluva Timmarasa, named SALUVA GOVINDARAJA made an endowment on 27—8—1522 for the merit of Krishnadeva Maharaya ( Antarāsampurnam udayam Prasanna Bhāratam) by the grant of Mēlpādi village in Gandikkoṭai sirmai for propitiating Sri Venkatesa and for Sri Gopalakrishnan which was installed by Govindaraya in Tirupati, and for a number of other festivals. The donor’s share in this case went to the 12 nirvaham and the 3½ vagai in equal shares.
D. RAYASAM KONDA MA RAMASAYYAR:—After the capture of Udayagiri, this officer seems to have been its first Governor between June 1514 and February 1516. He also appears to have been the first Governor of Kondavidu and Kondapalli till about the beginning of 1519 A.D. He constructed a tank and a temple in Kaluvai in Nellore sirmai. The temple was consecrated on 14—4—1519. His endowment to Tiruvengadamudaiyan is dated 17—4—1519 (III. 130). It is probable that the endowment was made in absentia, as the installation ceremonies in Kaluvai would have taken about ten days from 14—4—1519, seeing that they were made for the spiritual benefit of his father and mother. The endowment consisted of the grant of Mulumpidi (probably a Tamilised form of Mulumpidi), a village with an irrigation tank attached to it. The grant was obviously made in the later period of his official career when by God’s grace he was the Viceroy in the land of his birth. The daily offering out of this grant was 16 tirupponakam, 1 appapadi and 1 tirukkanamadai, by no means an insignificant offering. The donor’s share of the prasadams was arranged to be sent to the satram which he have maintained in Tirumala. He too evidently did not wish to send the prasadam to the Ramanujakutam or to add to the income of the Sthanattar or the Tiruppani Bhanjärattar. Nor did he dedicate his endowment “for the merit of Sri Vira Krishnadeva Maharaya.”

E. MANNAR PILLAI the brother of Appa Pillai seems to have been one of the officers in Krishna Devaraya’s service. His first endowment (III. 23) was made on 27—6—1512 and was in connection mainly with a flower garden and a mantapam constructed below a tank known as Mannasamudram tank. The name suggests that it was excavated by Mannar Pillai or that it was named after him. The offerings were meant for Tirumangai Alvär and incidentally to Sri Govindaraja. His next endowment (III. 29) was made on 20—12—1512, that is six months after the former. This was for Malaininraperumal, Nāchchimār and Sēnai Mudaliar. His preference for Tirumangai Ālvār and Sēnai Mudaliar strongly suggests that he had a reverence for acharyas

1. Nellore Inscription Atmakur No. 28.
and deities of a military disposition or antecedents. The endowments were of the value of 1000 and 1200 panams respectively. The distribution of the donor's share was arranged to honour Kumāra Tātayyangar, the Tiruppani Pillai, the 12 nirvahams, the Vagai and the Tirupati Sri Vaishnavas, himself receiving a share. These arrangements show his devotion to God.

F. **ELLAPPA NAYAKKAR AND TIRUMALAI NAYAKKAR.**

Tirumalai Nayakkar was presumably in Krishnadevaraya's service. The first is the father and the second the son. The interest evinced by Tirumalai Nayakkar in all classes of people in Tirupati, shows that he was a native of Tirupati.¹ The father must be presumed from the inscription to have endowed 4600 panams for the offering of one tirupponakam daily and some atirasappadis on certain festival days to Sri Govindaraja, the donor's share being received by himself. The son Tirumalai Nayakkar (as the name would suggest) was named after the God of Tiruvengadam out of devotion and piety. In 1512 A.D. Tirumalai Nayakkar excavated an irrigation channel in Parittiputtur lands and from the extra income which accrued by this cultivation, he made a variety of offerings to Sri Govindaraja in the mantapam constructed by him in his flower garden in Tirupati. The most noteworthy feature of his endowment² is the distribution of the donor's share very widely so as to give satisfaction to all the men of his native town Tirupati. They were Kumāra Tātayyangar Appachchiyar Anna, Pāpavināsam Ayagal, the 12 Nirvaham and 3½ Vagai, Nambimar, Tiruniräur-uḍaiyar, Viṇṇappam saivar, Nōṭṭakkarar, Mudrai Manishi, Mahajanams, Dasa Nambis, Muṭṭukkārar, Naṭṭuvar, Kaikkōlar, Kammālar, Kusavar, Tevaiyai, Singamurai, Tiruchchukanūr Nambimar, Sabhaiyar, Ammaiappa Nayanar etc. He must have been a popular figure in Tirupati; he makes no reference to his sovereign Krishnadevaraya. He seems to have been a great devotee of Sri Govindaraja Perumal.

G. **TAMMU NAYAKKAR AND TIRUVENKATAYYAR.**

These were sons of Jillella Basava Nayakkar and grandsons of

---

¹. III. 106. Uttiram, 10th thithi, year missing.
². III. 127.
त्वदिति। भजतां पुंसां तत्सात्कृतः। तदायतीतीकृतः। त्वदीये विभववृपपुरुषः। विभवः। रूपं विग्रहः। गुणः। ज्ञानशक्तियदः। तत्पराल्पकः। स्वं भक्तपराधीनत्वादतः भवगत इति भावः। तत्साम्यं त्वथा समानज्ञानार्थमवत्तं अभिवाच्छसि उत्पादितु मिति शेषः। ततो हेतो हि तव परमाणु साम्यं मुक्तिमाहु। “निर्देशं परमं साम्यं मुपैति”, “मम साधृणं मागता。” इत्यादा। श्रुतिस्मृतयं। इति भावः। विदुः भगवदन्यायांशेषत्ववृष्ट्वप स्वात्मयायात्मभाजनवतां तत्‌ तादृशशेषत्वनुसरूपत्या प्रसिद्दं त्वद्यां स्वदीयकैज्ञर्थं मेव परमं उत्कृष्टं मम। नीरन्द्रेण संश्चेरो नाम परमसाम्यं मिति भावः॥ ६५॥

तदेव शौर्यत्वं कारणान्तरेणानुसर्यते।
तदैव तथास्तु, कठमोचयः महोऽस्वभावो।
यावन्यथाविधिगुणो भजते भवन्तम्।
तावान् सत्याविधिगुण सद्यनार्थत्रति।
स्वसंस्कृत्यमस्ति त्व मिह तेन समानार्थम॥ ६६॥

tदिति। श्रीभाष्येः “तत्रक्तुष्क” इति सूत्रत्रस्विषयवाक्यतत्या, यथा क्रृतु स्मिन् लोके पुरुषो भवति तथा इतः। प्रेत्यं भवति।” इति श्रुति मुपादाय। यात्राशस्वरूपपुरुषगुणादिविशिष्टत्या चेतनो भगवन्त मुपास्ते, तादृशस्वरूपादिविशिष्ट येव भगवन्तं प्राप्तोत्तित्यं तत्पर्यार्थं। प्रतिपादित्। स एवार्थं। प्रतिपाद्यतेन नेन्नौकेन। तदैव तथास्तु, पूर्वोऽस्तो शौर्यत्वं हि तथा भवतु। यावान् यादृशार्थपरीमाणानादिन्युक्तः। पूर्वः। यथाविधिगुणः। स्वकीयरूपनुगुण मुपास्तत्या। परिगृहीतत्यादृशाप्रकारागुणविशिष्टविद्यासाधारणानादिगुणो वा, तत्तद्धारामात्रत्रप्रतिपादित् समानत्रतन्मदिगुणो वा यथा समस्यो स्तन्, यं गुणं यादृशाप्रकारविशिष्टमुपास्तयाश्रीकुर्वृत्त मनो इत्ययः। भवतं भजते। इह शूर्वोऽस्तं मुक्तिविशिष्ये। तावान् तज्ज्ञानादन्यागुणविशिष्टवृष्ट्वप, तथाविधिगुणः। तदुपासित्यगुणः।
called bhētaṇikkai (bhētaṇikkai) with 1½ marakkal black gram, 1/2 marakkal wheat flour and 8 nali of ghee and one ollock cumen seeds. The donor's share was divided by him equally between the 12 nirvahams and 3½ vagai. Neither of these inscriptions makes any mention of Krishnadeveraya's name.

J. UDIYAM ELLAPPA NAAYAKKAR. Father's name is unluckily missing in the inscription relating to his endowment. This Udiyam Nayakkar must have been a personal attendant on Krishnadeveraya. His endowment (III. 109) made on 2—6—1516 was for the merit of Krishnaraya Maharayar and consisted of three villages, Kaṟṟalaippaṭṭu Nelväy and Kollidumbai for food offerings of eight tirupponakam daily to Tiruvengadamudaiyan. From the fact that the one-fourth share of the donor was entirely given away by him to the Ramanujakutam (presumably of Periya Obala Nayakkar Ramanayakkar), it may reasonably be inferred that they were related to each other.

K. EKKADI TIMMAMMAN, daughter of Nalla Gangaṇaman. She seems to have been a trusted servant in the harem of the Emperor and her endowment (III. 124) of 1500 panams for one tirupponakam daily to Tiruvengadamudaiyan made on 4—10—1518 distinctly states that it was for the dharmam of Srıman Maharajadhiraja Raja Paramesvara Sri Virapratapa Sri Vira Krishnaraya Maharayar. From the absence of such a description in the other inscriptions, excepting the edicts of the Emperor himself, it looks as if she insisted on the full description being engraved. She gave away her share of the offered prasadam as charity to a certain Vaikunṭha Dikshitar of Tekkalur (probably one of the Tēvaiyars).

L. ADAIPPM BHAIYAPPA NAAYKKAR, son ofTimmappa Nayakkar of Kasyapa Göтра. He was doing adaiappam service (betel leaf-bearer). His endowment for offering 6 tirup-

1. In the T.T. Devasthanams Report on the Inscriptions (p. 201) he is identified with Vasalam Ellapa Nayakkar, but there is no authority for doing so. Nor is there any justification confusing him with another Ellappa Nayakkar, who was the father of Tirumalai Nayakkar. Neither of the individuals was doing Udiyan service.
ponakam daily to Tiruvengadamudaiyan was for the combined merit of Krishnaraya Maharayar and his own father Timma Nayakkar. This was made on (III. 135) 16—4—1519. The portion of the inscription relating to the manner of disposal of the donor's share is missing. It might have been just like Ellappa Nayakkar's inscription.

M. TRYAMBAKA DEVAR, son of Tipparasar. He is said to have been a military officer who commanded a regiment in the battle of Raichur in May 1520. He is stated to have been a resident of Sivanasamudram. He made an endowment (III. 116. 12—10—1517) of Morandai village in Tirumanichchirmai for offering to Tiruvengadamudaiyan daily 1 tirupponakam and other offerings on other visēsha divasams, aggregating to 47 Nayaka taligai and 13 atirasappadis. The donor's share was to be taken by the donor. Such an endowment ignoring Sri Govindaraja shows that he was quite a Desantari and followed Sri Krishnadevaraya in his faith.

N. BAHUR MALLARASAR AND LAKKU NAYAKKAR. These are two subordinate officers. The former made an endowment (III. 127. 16—10—1516) of 360 panams and the latter one of 1500 panams (III. 137) on 4—10—1519 for food offerings. The donor's share was given away to the nirvahams and vagais.

O. SUBUDDHI RAMADASAR AND AMBIKAMUDUSILA. The former was the son of one Sankaradāsar and the latter of Bhimarayar. They belonged to different gotras, but both were originally in the service of Gajapatiraya of Orissa and must have gone over to Vijayanagar as attendants on the daughter of that king when she married Krishnadevaraya. Tanḍalam and Taḍapalam were two villages which were granted to these two persons respectively by Krishnadevaraya by a copper plate grant. Tanḍalam's income gave enough for 2 tirupponakam and Taḍapalam's for one. They made a gift of these to Sri Venkatesa, by an endowment (III. 147) made by the two on 1—11—1521. The donor's share went to the managers of their flower gardens and to a Ramanujakutam. Perhaps they did not like the idea of
THE TIRUVENGADAM TEMPLE

enjoying villages gifted by Krishnadevaraya and therefore got rid of them in this manner without hurting the feelings of the Emperor.

Before giving an account of endowments made by those who were attached permanently to or who had an abiding interest in the temple as devotees, it is desirable to find out the general trend of the endowments made by the Emperor, his officers and dependants.

The Emperor’s attention was evidently fixed on Tiruvengadamudaiyan and not the temple or its environments or its festivals. The temple servants and the management received little or no encouragement from him. Many of his high ranking officers followed suit. Just as the Emperor had his own satram, the chief minister, the commander-in-chief and several others maintained their own satrams or Ramanujakutams. But officers who were sons of the soil did not fail to evince their attachment to the Tirupati Govindaraja’s Temple also. Nor did they overlook the temple establishment in the disposal of the donor’s share of the prasadams or in the payment of cash as Tirukkaivalakkam during minor festivals instituted by them. Ellappa Nayakkar and Appa Pillai showed beyond doubt that they held the temple servants on a plane higher than that of mere servants earning wages. The daily food offerings contributed by these officers amounted to 58 tirupponakam (food offerings of cooked rice) and the donor’s share thereof would have been about 15 taligais enough to feed about 150 persons daily. This is exclusive of the large quantities of appams, atirasasm, vadais, gōdhi and tirukkanāmaḍai padis for which about 2,400 marakkals of rice besides other ingredients were used and which would have been enough to feed daily 60 more persons. A large part of this food went to maintain the Sattada Sri Vaishnavas who were maintaining flower gardens and probably managing some of the satrams.

THE JIYARS

During this period we notice the existence of three separate mathams in Tirumala and Tirupati. The earliest of these is the
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ARISANALAYAM NANDAVANAM AND MATHAM which as was already noticed came into the possession of one Mullai Tiruvenkata Jiyar sometime between 1387 and 1390 A.D. He was the first manager and Jiyar of that matham. He subsequently acquired the additional office of Koil Kelvi Jiyar and was one of the Sthanattar of the Temple. He had a Junior Jiyar under him since one individual could not perform the daily duties of the Tirumala and the Tirupati temples. The religious portion of these duties consisted in rendering the paricharakam service to help the archakas during puja. The Kōyil Kēlvi, which was the secular portion of his duties consisted in exercising general control and superintendence over the temple stores, that is receiving and issuing provisions for the temple use.1 During the period covered by Krishnadevaraja's reign, we come across the name of Anusandhanam Tiruvenkata Jiyar. In III. 2 (19—7—1504) he is known as Anusandhanam Tiruvenkata Jiyar, manager of the Tiruvenkatanāthan Tirunandavanam. The inscription also shows that he had a matham in Tirupati called the Tiruvenkatanāthan Matham. These indicate that he was the founder of the Matham and the flower garden. He made an endowment of 2000 panams. From the interest thereon certain food offerings were to be made annually in Tirumala for Venkateswara, in Tirupati for Sri Govindaraja and for Udayavar. The beneficiaries of the donor's share in Tirumala were the Ekāki Sri Vaishnavas, managing the Matham and in Tirupati his own Matham. In III. 107, 9—5—1516 he is described as Kōyil Kēlvi Tiruvenkata Jiyar, manager of the Tiruvenkatanathan Mathams, showing that he had by then become Kōyil Kēlvi Jiyar. He made an endowment of 1,000 panams this time and another Jiyar called Madhava Jiyar made an endowment of 850 panams (the total is however put down as 2850 panams in this inscription). In this inscription we come across the names of Perarulalan matham and Van Sathagopan Matham, as recipients of portions of the donor's share of the prasadams. The point to notice is that Anusandhanam Tiruvenkata Jiyar became Kōyil Kēlvi Tiruvenkata Jiyar in 1516. In III. 139, 6—10—1520. A.D.

1. Appendix I to Vol I shows that he continued to be the Store-keeper even during the period of management by the East India Co.
he is known a Periya Kōil Kēlvi Tiruvenkata Jiyar, manager of Perarulalanar Tirunandavanam and Matham. The inference is that he became the senior Jiyar. He made this time an endowment of 1510 panams as capital for certain food offerings to Sri Venkatesa, Sri Govindarajaswami and for Udaiyavar. A portion of the donor’s share of this goes to the reciters of Prabandham, to the 12 nirvahams of the Sthanattar and to the 43 vagais. These endowments seem to have been made to commemorate his rise in the religious order which he had entered. On (III. 143) 5th December 1520, he made a fourth endowment of 1,000 panams for making similar offerings. In the inscription relating to this he is styled as the Koil Kelvi Tiruvenkata Jiyar, manager of the Pankayachchelli Tirunandavanam at Tirumala, entitled “Srimad vēda mārga pratishṭāpanāchārya” and “paramahamsa parivarājaka-chārya.” We notice also changes in his managership of Tirunandavanams from Tiruvenkatanathan to Perarulalan and again to Pankayachchelli. More will be said in the Chapter on Alvars about this Anusandhanam Tiruvenkata Jiyar and his contribution to the task of making Prabandham recital a part of the liturgy in Tirumala and Tirupati temples.

Still later in III. 173, 19—7—1527 we find that Ramanuja Jiyar is described as Kōil Kēlvi and the manager of Pankayachchelli Tirunandavanam in Tirumala. We have to infer that sometime between 1520 and 1527 or just about July 1527, Tiruvenkata Jiyar died and was succeeded in that matham by Ramanuja Jiyar. But the latter is not styled Periya Kōil Kēlvi. The inscription shows an endowment of 500 panams and another 350 panams was paid by one Yatirajyyan, making a total of 850 panam. We are told that he was a disciple of Alagiya Manavala Jiyar. These Jiyars and their mathams stand on a different footing from the Jiyars of the Van Sathagopan matham and the mathadhipatis of the Vyasatirtha matham. The latter render spiritual service to large circles of disciples. The Van Sathagopan matham caters to a part of the Vadagalai community of Srivaishnavas and the Vyasatirtha Matham to a part of the Madhva community scattered all over the Madras Presidency and the Hyderabad State. The Jiyars attached to the Tirumala Temples have no such function. Their activities are restricted to their daily duties in the temples.
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THE VAN SATHAGOPAN MATHAM.

We have noticed that Singayya Dannāyaka, who founded the Arisanālayam Tirunandavanam and matham, founded at the same time the Van Sathagopan Tirunandavanam. While he handed over the former to a Jiyar, there is no record to show how he disposed of the latter. There must have been a celibate or a sanyasi for managing it also. This was about 1339 A.D.

The next reference to a Van Sathagopa is in the year 1485 A.D. when one Nallār Angāndai1 an accountant of the Tirumala temple, is stated to have carried out the completion of the verandah of the Vasanta mantapam, in front of Sri Govindaajaswami temple in Tirupati, which some time before (1485 A.D.) was commenced by Van Sathagopa Jiyar from out of the income of the Tiruvidaiyattam (or temple) village of Pūngōdu, but left incomplete. He (Angāndai) paid 2000 panams to the Sthanattar as value of the work done up to the date of his taking over the further execution of the work. The exact wording of the inscription is ‘‘(…) 2000 panams paid as value (…)’’. If in the year 1485 the period is described as some time in the past (1485 A.D.) we might perhaps be justified in assuming that it was at the commencement of the 15th century that Van Sathagopa Jiyar commenced the work. From I. 185 (1311-1388) we find that Pūngōdu was or had become a temple village on that date. The Ahōbila Mutt account which says that Van Sathagopa Jiyar was born in 1378 and lived up to 1488 may not therefore be inaccurate. The fact that he left the Vasanta mantapam verandah half-built and that it was completed by Nallar Angāndai need not be taken to indicate that the Jiyar died and that therefore the work was left incomplete. We further infer from the wording of the inscription relating to an endowment made by one Dattirāja Tammayan (II. 101. 15-6-1493 A.D.) wherein he makes over a portion of the donor’s share of the food offerings to Alagiya Singar (Narasimha-1. II. 88 dated 6-6-1485.
swami) in Tirumala temple, to the disciples of his acharya Van Sathagopa Jiyan. The Tamil wording is ‘‘ச தா நாராயணன் ஐயர், ஸ்ரீபுரா சோஃ ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக சென்ஸ்பூராவ் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டு வாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டுவாக செங்சுரா் மும்பே நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டு ve the dotted portion might have denoted the name of the acharya Van Sathagopa Jiyan or they might have simply contained the usual ச தா நாராயணன் என் ஸ்வா புருங்குடன் குண்டு, or சயணானார் குண்டு. The latter is the more probable of the two. If so we may take it that Van Sathagopa Jiyan was alive in 1493 A.D. That he was not frequently visiting Tirupati is a fact which must be accounted for from the nature of the responsibility he had undertaken. He seems to have left Tirupati and gone to Ahobilam somewhere about the year 1420 during the reign of Devaraya II, assumed the Sanyasa asramam there and went about preaching the gospel of Sri Ramanuja in the country round that place. We have reasons to believe that he was responsible for making the Sattada Srivaiyayanas the archakas of the new temples which were then being constructed in several places in the Rayalascema and Nellore. He was likewise responsible for creating the class of persons called mala dasaris and konda dasaris, for instructing them in the language of the country and making them the religious teachers of the depressed classes. Van Sathagopa Jiyan, being a man of the Kannada Desa was best fitted to undertake and carry out this task with success. We know that he also became the acharya of Allasani Peddana, who later adorned the Court of Sri Krishnadeva Miharaya.

The earliest inscriptions which relate to endowments made directly by one of the Jiyanars of the Van Sathagopan matham are those made during Krishnadevaraya’s reign. The Jiyan is called, in the first of these inscriptions, Sriman Narayana Jiyan, disciple of Sri Van Sathagopa Jiyan, and in the next he is described as Sriman Narayana Jiyan the disciple of Sri Van Sathagopa Jiyan entitled Vedantacharya. Although his acharya made a great name for himself. Narayana Jiyan displays humility 1. III.110; 20-8-1519, III. 114, 7-11-156.
and simplicity. The only title he claimed for his great Acharya was “Vedantacharya.” The value of his endowments were only 1860 and 3800 panams respectively. The offerings were for Tiruvengadamuḍaiyān, Govindarajan, the Alvars and Uḍaiyavar. From the second inscription we learn that he had constructed a mantapam in a flower garden in Tirumala. From the inscriptions of Anusadhanam Tiruvenkata Jiyar also we know that he had his mathams in Tirumala and Tirupati. We hear no more about him as his mission was a peripatetic one and as he had no services to do in the temple in Tirumala or Tirupati.

There was no contact between the Van Sathagopan matham Jiyars and the Vijayanagar Kings as far as we can make out. The Jiyars’ work seems to have been almost entirely confined to the public, cultured as well as the illiterate. They did not look to royal patronage, although in course of time, some of the petty rulers became their disciples. The matham is now-a-days known as the Ahobila matham; but in our inscription, it is described simply as Van Sathagopan Matham.

THE VYASARAYA MATHAM.

The third matham which comes to notice is the Vyāsārāya matham. The Swami of the Matham who first appears in our inscription, is Srimat Vyāsa Tīrtha Sripāda Uḍaiyār. He bore the titles of Srimat Paramahamsa Parivrājakāchārya Pada vākya pramāṇagnya, Dhurvāda garva sarva svā pahāra, Srimad Vaishnava Siddānta Pratishṭāpanāchārya Sakala vidvajjana-manah padma-vanasaupastikar. There are three inscriptions, Nos. III. 157, 158 and 159 all dated 12th January 1524 which relate to the grant of house sites in Tirupati and Tirumala respectively with libations of water, by Sri Virapratapa Vira Krishnaraya Maharayar to this Swamiji for the construction of mathams in the two places. The Sthānattar of Tirumala on the authority of the āyamasam sent by the Emperor; it is stated, handed over the sites to the Swamiji. In the third inscription they were also ordered to hand over daily to the Swami the donor’s share of the prasadamds due
to the Emperor, viz., 15½ prasādas, 2 akkāli manḍai, 26 appam, 26 atirasam, 1½ palam chandanan, 75 areca nuts and 150 betel leaves, for the maintenance of the matham. How there came to be a donor’s share is also described. Krishnadevarayar had previously granted to Sri Venkatesa the tax known as periyam collected every year during Puraṭṭāsi Brahomsavam at Tirumala. He had also granted half the village of Kaḍaikittanpadi situated in ul-manḍalām and the six villages of Tāḷḷapakkam, Pirāḍam, Dārattür, Muḍiyür, Satrapādi and Turaiyür situated in pura manḍalām. It was from the offerings made out of the income from these sources that the quarter share of the prasādas became due to the Emperor and it was this quarter share that was transferred to Vyasa Tirtha Sri Pada Udaiyar to be used in his Matham, obviously for feeding his Sishyas, although not specially so stated in the inscription. 

It is not known whether Sripāda Udaiyār who was the founder of this matham had come to Tirupati from any other place where he had already a matham. It is generally believed that the first matham established by him was at Tirumala and Tirupati and that it was established in 1524 A.D. Whatever that might be, we find him making in that year an endowment of 14000 panams (III. 115; 8—11—1524) to be expended on the excavation of irrigation tanks in the temple villages and from the proceeds of these villages to make certain food offerings to Tiruvengadamudaiyan and Govindarajaswami. The days selected for festivals in Tirumala were 222 in number made up of 96 days of the eight Brahomsavams. Summer festival, Kōdai Tirunal 20 days, Adhayaṇotsavam 24 days, Unjal Tirunal 5 days, Tiruppavitra Tirunal 5 days, Ekadasa Tirunal 25 days, Sahasra Kalasābhishēkam 5 days, Māsa sankramanams 12 days, Amavasya 13 days, Yugādi and Deepāvali 2 days, Pādiya Vēṭṭai 1, Tirukkārtigai 1, Krishna’s Rōhini 13. Total offerings 222 appa padi. Similarly in Tirupati his endowment made provision for food offerings on 132 days. Besides the above, he also granted Siyala pāndur and Pasuvāsam villages in Paḍainādu Sirmai for daily offering to Sri Govindaraja, of 8 tirupponakam, 40 areca nuts, 80 betel leaves and one palam chandanan. The donor’s share of all the appams he took himself. From, what
was offered on Yugadi and Deepavali days in Tirupati to Sri Govindaraja, he gave a portion to some temple servants and the rest to the 12 nirvahams and 4½ vagai. From out of the 8 prasadams to Sri Govindaraja daily and from other sources given by the Sthanattar the Vyasaiyaya Matham was to get 4 prasadams daily for free distribution in the Matham. That Sri Vyasatirtha Sripada Udaiyar, who could not be expected to attach any importance to the Tamil prabandhams included 24 days of Adhyayana Utsavam among the festivals of his benefaction shows that he desired to respect the sentiments of the Sthanattar and the Sri Vaishnavas. The recital of the Vedas was only on 10 days of this festival.

He made a second endowment (III. 175; 2nd April 1528) by granting the Village of Oḍḍampatṭu for conducting festival to Sri Govindaraja on the 13 full-moon days in the year with torch light procession. The food offering on each occasion was 14 tirupponakam. There are three points of special interest in this inscription.

(1) He describes himself as (the disciple of) Karakamala Sanjāta Srimat Brahmanya tirtha. Sripada Udaiyar. (2) This is the first instance we have in our inscriptions which gives the cash rent or income of a village. Here Oddampatti is stated to give 60 rekhai pon as the annual income. (3) Full details are also given of the provisions to be supplied for the festival. The Swamiji received the donor’s quarter share in full. We are able to appreciate the Swamiji’s attempts to make himself acceptable to all Sri Vaishnavas. He did as much in Sri Govindaraja’s temple as in Tiruvengadamudaiyan’s.

**EAKIS.**

Two of these named Ekaki Tiruvenkatayyan and Ekaki Pattarpiran Ayyan, made three endowments amounting in all to 690 panams between 4—5—1514 and 21—10—1523. These were made in connection with certain festivals in Nammāḻvār temple and for Sri Venkatesa. The beneficiaries of the donor’s share were the donors, the Iyal chanters and the Sthanattar.
It will be seen from the above analysis that the Sri Vaishnava Mathams favoured their own Iyal reciters and sect people, and that Vyasaraya preferred his own followers. Ekakis are Srivaishnavas who are widowers left in this world all alone without any family encumbrance which is the root meaning of the word. It should not be confounded with the term Ekāṅgis which in later times came to be used to designate the four assistants to the Jiyaars who were also to be selected from amongst widowers but not men without the encumbrances of brothers and children dependent on them. There were among these Ekakis Brahmins and also Sāttāda Sri Vaishnavas.

**SCHOLARS.**

Among the great scholars who came to Tirumala in Sri Krishna-devaraya’s train in 1514, were: (1) TALLAPAKKAM PEDDA TIRUMALA AYYANGAR scholar, poet and musician, son of Tallapakkam Anṇamācharya whose sankirthanams are so well known in Tirumala and Ahōbilam; (2) Yagna Narayana Bhattar, son of the Emperor’s personal purohit Ranga Dikshitar.

We learn from No. 66, Vol. III that the former’s native village Tallapakkam was granted to Tiruvengadamudaiyan by the Emperor on 6—7—1514. He is said to be a member of the well-known Nandavarika Brahman family, the family to which the poet-laureate Allasani Peddanamātya belonged. His first endowment to Tiruvengadamudaiyan was made on (III. 122) 30—11—1517. It consisted of 1500 panams for providing one food offering daily. The amount was to be utilised for improvement of the water supply in the Tiruvvidaiyattam villages and the increased proceeds used for the offering. Like many of the Desantri donors he gave away 1 uri out of the donor’s share to be shared by the Sthanattar and the Vagai people and reserved for himself the remaining uri of prasadam.

**YAGNA NARAYANA BHATTAR.**

He was as has already been stated, the son of Ranga Dikshitar, the Emperor’s Purohit, and might have accompanied his father
in 1514 A.D. during the time of the Emperor’s visit. In III. 89: 10—7—1514 he made an endowment of 10000 panams to be utilised for the improvement of irrigation in temple villages and with the income so accruing, for offering 8 tirupponakams daily to Tiruengadamudaiyan. The donor’s share of 2 prasadams was taken by himself. He made another endowment on (III. 152) 9—3—1522 of 1850 panams for offering atirasappadi on the 13 birth day stars of his father and on new moon and māsa sankramanam days. Even out of these, he took to himself the donor’s share excepting 3 atirasams which he ordered to be given to one Sīṟayyanger.

This Bhattar did not recognise the importance of the Sthanattar, the Mathams and Ramanujakutams. He was a true follower of Krishnadeva Maharaya in this respect.

**DODDAIYANGAR APPAI.**

Another great man who made an endowment was Doddaiyangar Appai (Vedāntāchārya) son of Venrumālaiyiṭṭa Perumal Nayinar of the Vadhūla Gōtra, Apasthamba Sūtra Yajus Sakha and of the Kandadai family of Sṛivaishnavas. On (III. 132) 13—6—1519 he made an endowment of 2520 panam for making certain Vagaippadi offerings etc., to Tiruengadamudaiyan and Sri Govinda-raja on certain days of the Brahmostavam and on his own tiru-nakshatram days. Out of the donor’s share he gave away one atirasam, one sidai and one dadhyodanam to Sṛivaishnavas and took the remainder for himself. He too did not give anything to the Sthanattar.

Udayavarkoyil Anna made an endowment of 2000 panam on 17—8—1514 and made the Sri Vaishnavas chanting the Iyal, share a portion of the donor’s share.

There were also a number of endowments by other Brahmins (such as III No. 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 90, 91, 113, 172, 108, 142 and 163). In most of these cases the donor’s share was taken away by the donors themselves.
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These endowments though small individually amounted on the whole to about 14175 panams, 3 villages (Tivalaipündi, Hanumāniṉūṇṭa and Gangalapūḍī) and 1630 kulis of wet land.

TIRUNINRA-UR-UDAIYARS OR THE TEMPLE ACCOUNTANTS.

They made a number of endowments aggregating to 7800 panams (between the years 1517 and 1530; III. No. 121, 134, 138, 141, 160, 161, 179 and 181) for food offerings. Excepting for some small quantities of padi which they assigned to their achārya Kumara Tātāyyangar and some Nambrār, the entire donor’s share was being taken by themselves.

MERCHANTS.

As was usual with the merchants, the endowments made by them were handsome. And as they invariably aimed at keeping the Sthanattar well pleased, the donor’s share of the prasādam was invariably made over by them, to the 12 nirvaham and 3½ vagai in equal proportions. The names of the donors etc., are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>4 and 118</th>
<th>Sittamu Setti</th>
<th>18090 panams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 and 12</td>
<td>Tippu Setti</td>
<td>8305 „</td>
<td>„</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pachchi Lingu Setti</td>
<td>5030 „</td>
<td>„</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pappu Setti Ayyan</td>
<td>2500 „</td>
<td>„</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Kondu Setti</td>
<td>(Chinatayapalli village half)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Sarunu Setti</td>
<td>3700 panams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not necessary for our purpose to enter into the details of the prasādams and the occasions on which they were to be offered. The point to note is that so far as the Desāntī or the bonafide pilgrim was concerned, there was no free distribution. He was always forced to purchase the prasādams from one or the other of the Sthanattar, the Vagai people, the Nambimar or the Jiyars.
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There are seventeen more inscriptions showing endowments made by devotees amounting in the aggregate to 32800 panams. Out of these one is for 11000 panams and another is for 4700. The others are mostly for about 1200 panams each. In six out of the 17 instances the donor took to himself the quarter share. In one case the donor handed over his share to his spiritual Guru Eechambadi Appayyangar. In all other cases it was the Sthanattar and the Vagai who were made the beneficiaries.

It is noteworthy that in two instances the Tiruphani Bhandarattar stepped in as Trustees and executed the silasasanam accepting the gift. The position of the Sthanattar appears to have been thus challenged. In one case the donor was one Sinnappa Reddi of Putalapatti, who on the occasion of a Solar Eclipse (III. 167: 17—1—1527) made a gift of valuable wet lands for the merit of Krishnadeva Maharayar. He gave the donor’s share of the food offerings to the Tiruphani Bhandarattar. In the other case (III. 178: 19—11—1528) the disciples of the Van Sathagopan Matham deposited 260 panams into the Tiruphani Bhandarni Treasury as capital for certain paruppaviyal food offering. The donor’s share in this case was divided between the Iyal reciters and the Tiruphani Bhandarattar. It was therefore becoming clear that the Tiruphani Bhandarattar were setting themselves up as rivals to the Sthanattar perhaps encouraged by the attitude of the Emperor.

There are two more inscriptions. III. 180: Saka 1450 and III. 206, which deserve notice since they make reference to ‘Sri Vira Krishna Maharayar’ and ‘Rajaparamesvara Sri Vira Pratapa Sri Vira Krishnadevarayar ruling the Earth.’ The latter is an endowment by one Pilaiporuttar and the former by one Perumal Nedungunram, both private individuals. They are both incomplete inscriptions.

We may safely infer from all the above facts that the Sthanattar were losing their moral and even their legal status in the temple administration during the reign of Sri Krishnadevaraya and that the Tiruphani Bhandarattar were rising in importance. We shall examine the reason for this in greater detail at a later stage.
The points to be noted in connection with the administration of the Tirumalai, Tirupati Temples during the reign of Sri Virapratapa Sri Vira Krishnadeva Maharaya are:

(1) Tiruvengadamudaiyan was embellished with jewels and ornaments in an unprecedented manner. His Ananda Nilaya Vimanam was gold gilded and costly pīṭāmbaram, kulḷāvū etc., were presented to Him.

(2) In memory of his late father and mother Krishnadevaraya instituted the Tai Brahmostsavam. Like his predecessors he and his two queens instituted daily sandhi offerings, known as Krishnaraaya avasarams. The quarter share of the prasadams due to the donor were, excepting such portion as was given to his purohits, transferred to his own satram to be expended there under the supervision of the Tiruppandi Bhandarattar (6—7—1514). Later in 1524 even this arrangement was superceded by handing over the prasadams to Sri Vyasa Tirtha Sripada Udayiyar to be utilised in his Matham for the feeding of pilgrims.

(3) Krishnadevaraya does not appear to have paid a visit to the temple of Sri Govindaraja in Tirupati nor did he make any endowments for that temple.

(4) None of the shrines dedicated to the Acharyas and Saints or Alvars received his notice;

(5) He did nothing to create the suspicion or impression that he had a special leaning to any of the Hindu religious sects.

(6) His making a gift of house sites in Tirumala and Tirupati to Sri Vyasa Tirtha Sripada Udayiyar as dānam (შუნახლ. უმღობრი) and issuing a rayasam (or edict) to the Sthanattar, does not indicate any reverence for an acharya of Vyasa Tirtha Sripada Udayiyar’s sanctity. The permission to construct a matham and the handing over of prasadams for feeding pilgrims there may connote only a certain amount of trust in a Sanyasin, at a time when the Sthanattar of the Temple had lost the Emperor’s confidence.

(7) The Emperor as well as his senior officers, showed, in dealing with the disposal of the donor’s share of their endowments’
a tendency to see if the Tiruppani Bhandarattar would prove a more trustworthy agency for the free distribution of food to pilgrims.

(8) The usual tendency of those seeking the favour of the Emperor to make endowments “for the merit of” the king was less noticeable during Krishnadevaraya’s reign. But a full statement of the prasasti is rarely met with excepting in his own inscriptions or those made by men in his personal service.

(9) It may be specially noted that the inscriptions relating to the grant of house site etc., to Sri Vyasa Tirtha are in the Tamil script and executed by the Sthanattar and not by the Emperor directly by an edict.

(10) No temple functionary and no native of Tirupati seems to have acquired any influence with the Emperor or to have approached him for any favour. None of the Acharyapurushas made any endowment during his reign. No one seems to have approached him or sought any favour of him.

(11) Krishnadevaraya instituted no new festival which could go to benefit the Sthanattar and the other temple servants either in the way of paniyaram or cash payments (Tirunum Kanikkai or Tirukkai Valakkam).

(12) The one festival, if it may be so called, which he instituted was the conversion of the bi-monthly Puljugu Kappu function (Friday Tirumanjanam) into a weekly one (Friday) (పలుంగు కప్పు సాయాంది అందులో ప్రసాదం) by allocating therefor the sunkam from Godagirinadu amounting to 1000 varahas yearly. This is the only function which has stood the test of time. He also set apart 500 varahas for conducting morning food offerings (ప్రసాదం నికాః)

As a far-seeing man Krishnadevarayar kept even those for whom he had the greatest affection viz., his brothers and their children away from his capital Vijayanagar and amidst the religious surroundings of Chandragiri and Tirumala evidently in order that no mischief maker could poison their minds and make them commit evil acts, or entertain evil designs, which might endanger the peace and tranquillity of the Empire. But this had its own disadvantage for the Empire and for the Temple, as will be seen when we examine Achyutaraya’s period.
CHAPTER XIX

ACHYUTARAYA MAHARAYA AND THE TIRUMALA TEMPLE.

In writing the history of this temple during the Vijayanagar period, it is convenient to divide it into periods which correspond to those of the Emperors of Vijayanagar. During the period when Saluva Narasimha was the Viceroy in Chandragiri, say from 1450 A.D. till he became the de facto Emperor in 1485, the history of the temple is concerned more with Saluva Narasimha than with the Emperor at Vijayanagar. His son became the Emperor and was in turn succeeded by Narasa Nayaka's son Vira Narasimha. Neither of these played a great part in the history of our temple. Vira Narasimha is said to have planned an attempt to put out the eyes of Krishnadeva and thereby assure the throne for his young son. But God willed it otherwise and Krishnadeva succeeded in ascending the throne. His faith in Tiruvengadamudayan was very firm as we have seen. But that faith did not prevent him from trying in his turn to put out of the way all who were likely to contest his claim to the throne. He therefore kept under detention and surveillance his late brother's young son as well as his half-brothers Achyuta and Ranga in the fortress at Chandragiri. Some go to the extent of saying that the latter were actually imprisoned. There is however nothing to support such a statement. On the other hand, Achyutaraya seems to have had all opportunities and facilities afforded for religious and cultural studies and also for relaxation by acquiring a taste for Abhinaya and Bharata Nātya. Achyuta has given ample proof in our inscriptions to justify the assumption. It seems to have been a carefully thought out scheme of Krishnadevaraya to place before Achyuta two avenues of instruction and enjoyment. There was on the one side the quasi spiritual side, the details of temple worship and the study of Vaishnavism and on the other side there was the Bharata Nātya and music of the Emperumānaḍiyārs of the temple. Achyuta was probably expected to follow one of these avenues. But he
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seems to have followed both. We see him giving tangible proofs of this the moment he ascended the throne.

Achyutaraya was as much the son of the great soldier Narasa Nāyaka as were Vira Narasimha and Krishnadevaraya. But his virtual internment in the Chandragiri fortress and his association for a period of about 16 years of the most impressionable period of his life, with temple worshippers and Emperumānaḍiyārs, seem to have so deadened the warlike instinct in him that, when after ascending the throne, he led an expedition against his rebel subordinates into the Tiruvaḍi Rājyam, his brother-in-law Sālakam Timmarāja found it expedient to treat him more like a ‘Uttara Kumara’ and make him stay behind at Sri Rangam, worshipping the God, and to take into his own hands the prosecution of the campaign to a successful conclusion. Krishnadevarāya after the death of his young son in or about 1525 A.D. liberated Achyuta and the whole family from the Chandragiri fortress and commenced the process of educating Achyuta in the art of Government.

What would have been Achyuta’s feelings when on one fine morning he was taken out of the fortress and asked to play the part of a Regent of the Crown? He had been continuously worshipping Tiruvengadābudaiyān for about 16 years and had no idea of individual freedom, much less of being associated in the Government of the Empire. His belief would have been that Tiruvengadābudaiyān made Krishnadevaraya to relent and that it was the reward for his continued devotion to God. Forgetting the past, Achyuta proved faithful to Krishnadevarāya. And in 1529 it is said that he was with the best wishes of his brother ordained in Tirumala as the future Emperor and given an Abhishēkam in the presence of Tiruvengadamudaiyān with the sacred water of the Sankham used for God’s service. We have to realise the importance of this consecration and why Krishnadevaraya preferred that way of celebrating the event. He knew that he had worked against such an event ever coming to pass and had done all he could to retain the succession to his own son. But God had willed it otherwise. Krishnaraya would have realised it when his son died. Achyuta was fully aware that it was not through
any effort on his part that he was going to become the Emperor. It was something unexpected. It was God's will. So it was in the fitness of things that his first Paṭṭābhishekap should be done by Tiruvengaḍaṁuḍaiyān Himself. When next it was repeated in Kalahasti, we have to note it was because Krishnadevaraya had faith in the God there and had paid many visits to that temple also. Achyutaraya was too much of a Sri Vaishnava to have thought of going to Kālahasti of his own free will.

Before going up the Tirumala Hill for the Paṭṭābhishekam, Achyuta would necessarily have taken a purificatory bath in the waters of the Alvar Tirtham. He should have found the pond in a condition not worthy of its sacred tradition. It is therefore likely that he would on that occasion have given orders for the construction of the cut-stone steps and the Sandhyavandana Mantapams. A trilingual edict shows that the work was completed and opened for the public on 25—6—1531 A.D.

The Devasthanam Epigraphist (page 220 of the Report) remarks: "Thus Achyutaraya appears to have been crowned thrice successively once at Tirumala immediately on release from his confinement in the Fort at Chandragiri, for the second time at Kalahasti and finally with all ceremonial and pomp at the capital city of Vijayanagar, all the three within an interval of about a month during October-November 1529 A.D." But Dr. S. Krishna-swami Iyengar states (page 201, part II of History of Tirupati), "the son (Krishnaraya's son) died early in 1525 A.D. Soon after, records in the name of Achyuta begin to appear. Achyuta seems to have been carrying-on the administration for his brother during a period of, it may be illness, or perhaps absence. Whatever it was, during the last five years of Krishna's administration, Achyuta was associated with him." "Another person who comes into view about this critical period is Ramarāya already spoken of as the son-in-law; whether he was actually the son-in-law or not we find him associated with the administration from 1525 A.D." "The coming of Aliya Ramaraja to power along with Achyuta coincided with the fall of the great minister Saluva Timma from power, all apparently the result of the death of the prince Tirumala.
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It seems the administration was actually carried on by Achyutaraya, even when Krishna was actually exercising authority."

From the above extracts we may perhaps opine that Krishna suspected that in some way or other his prime minister Saluva Timma was privy to the untimely death of his son Tirumala, that he realised the folly of keeping Achyuta, Ranga and the other members of his own family in prison and that since Achyuta would be the lawful successor to the throne and since his conduct during the long term of imprisonment showed no sign of hatred or disloyalty he immediately associated him in the Government of the country. Achyutaraya's apparent devotion to Tiruvengalanatha and the orthodox way of life which he had acquired during his detention might have made a favourable impression on Krishna. So he had him consecrated in the Tirumala temple by having water from the hand of God Himself sprinkled over him with the appropriate mantras for Paṭṭābhishēkam. We have every reason to believe that he had panchasamskāram, for one of our inscriptions refers to his Queen Varadajiamman giving away her quarter share of prasadams to her acharya (perhaps Sottai Tirumalai Nambi Kumāra Tāttayyanga). Her brothers were also the spiritual disciples of the same acharya.

Achyutaraya has had no training either on the battlefield or on the administrative side. On the religious side he was not well read. All his knowledge seems to have been limited to a superficial acquaintance with the āchārams or practices and the general outline of temple worship. We will have occasion to point out the blunders he committed in connection with temple worship in Tirumala.

Appointment of Muddu Kuppayi for doing dancing service in the temple.

The first act of Achyutaraya perhaps even before he was formally crowned in Vijayanagar in November 1529, was to order the construction of the cut-stone steps, Sandhyavandana mantapa etc., for the Alvar Tirtham pond. We shall have to say mor
about this later. But his first formal act as Sriman Mahārajādhirāja Rājaparamēsvara Sri Vira Pratāpa Sri Vira Achyutarāya Maharaya was to send to Tirupati one Muddu Kuppāyi, daughter of Vidvat Sabhārāya ranjakam Kuppāsāni on Tuesday Bahula Sashti of the Tamil month Mithuna in the cyclic year Khara, Saka 1453 with a rāyasam fo the Sthanattar of the Tirumala Temple, ordering that Muddu Kuppāyi was to perform ūḍigam (service) in the Tiruvengadamudaiyan temple from that day onwards as long as the Sun and the Moon last and that she and her descendants should be in receipt of one taligai prasādam daily from the temple of Sri Govindaraja in Tirupati for doing the service. The remuneration of one taligai expressed in money value of those days would be \( \frac{1}{2} \) panam (say 3 annas) per day. The prasādam should therefore not be considered as fair or adequate remuneration. It was more a mark of honour for one who was perhaps the then living best exponent of Bharata nāṭya. Her mother Kuppāyini or (Kuppāsāni) was the daughter of Ranjakam Srirangaraya and grand daughter of Tirumalainātha, all of whom were the most famous exponents of Bharata nāṭya and great devotees of Tiruvengalanātha. Kuppāyini had made in June 1512 A.D. an endowment of 1000 panams for one Sandhi offering. Srirangaraja had made in December 1514 an endowment grant of Eraluppundi for offering one tiruppomakam daily. The family must have considered it a mark of honour that Muddu Kuppāyi should have been singled out to do service to Tiruvengalanātha and to be honoured with one taligai of prasādam daily. Achyutarāya Maharaya must have been under the impression that so famous a temple should have so famous a sāni attached to it.

There may be readers who would like to know why the existence of these Emperumānadiyārs or Tiruvidhi Sānis (vestal virgins) was tolerated. According to the Agamas (all the agamas seem to be agreed on this) at a certain stage of the puja, music and dancing should accompany the Kumbha Hārathi. Also during street processions at important places and at street corners there should be music and dancing. Before the Deity is taken back into the temple from the Vāhanam, Kumbha Harathi should be offered
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and the whole party including the vestal virgins carrying the Kumbha Hārathi should perambulate the vahanam and the Deity before the Hārathi is actually handed over by the Emperumāṇaḍiyār to the Archaka. But from the days of Sāluva Narasimha (we should rather say from the days of Emperumāṇār Jiyar) these women acquired greater importance. We have already seen how Kandāḍaī Ramanuja Ayyangar made use of them to sing ‘ula’ songs in praise of him in the presence of Tiruvengaḍamuḍaiyān. Although as a class they degenerated into prostitution, some of them have been known to be remarkably praiseworthy women. To render an Emperumāṇaḍiyār eligible for doing service, she must have had chakrāṅgitam (branding with red hot Sankham and Chakram) at the hands of an āchāryapurusha of the temple. Every such woman must therefore be a disciple of one of the āchāryapurushās. They maintain a code of morals and good conduct which they invariably have been known to observe. They were serving in these temples in the early part of the 13th century. They were later known as Tiruvīḍhi Sānis. Emperumāṇār Jiyar gave them (I. 220; 1446 A.D.) a portion of the donor’s share of the prasadams. Venkaṭavalli, daughter of Savaripperumal, who, was a damsel attached to the Vira Narasimha swami temple in Tirupati made an endowment of 1000 panams in 1457 (II. 5). Jakkula Kannāyi, daughter of Tammu Nayakkar made in 1481 A.D. (II. 77) an endowment of 1400 panams for food offerings. Vālandi, daughter of Tiruvidhisani Anaimaḍai is another donor of 300 panams in 1486 (II. 86).

‘During the reign of Krishnadevarāya, Kuppāyini (the mother of Muddu Kuppāyi), accompanied the Emperor to Tirupati. She seems to have visited Tirumala as a pilgrim in 1512, even before Krishnadevaraya’s advent to the place (III. 24). After her visit in 1515 there seems to have been a change in the status of the Tiruvidhisānis in Tirupati. Before that date they accompanied the temple processions and received wages therefor. After Kuppāyini’s advent, there is no mention of Tiruvidhisānis accompanying the procession or of being paid therefor. They seem to have restricted the display of their proficiency to within the temple limits only.
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During the reign of Achyutaraya there were some notable women of this class who made endowments for food offerings. Govindasāñi made an endowment (IV. 5.) of 300 panams in 1530. Again in 1534 (IV. 33.) she made an endowment of 1620 panams for a daily food offering to Sri Govindaṇa. A third time along with her sister Chikkāya Savāyi she endowed 1750 panams in 1535 (IV. 39) for offerings to Sri Govindaṇa. There was another woman by name Pēruchchi (இன்றுச்சி) daughter of Sevī who endowed 230 panams (IV. 44). Another lady Bejji, daughter of Selvi endowed 200 panams (IV. 16). Hanumāṣāni was another lady specially sent by Achyutaraya and she made an endowment of 820 panams in 1540. (IV. 142).

But the most remarkable figures were one Tiruvēnkaṭa Māṇickam and her sister Lingāṣāni, both daughters of one Tippāṣāni or Tiruvenkaṭadāsi. They owned a garden and mantapam in Tirumalā. They made a series of endowments of 330 panams, 230 panams, 1650 panams and 1600 panams between the years 1533 and 1545 A.D. The climax was reached by Tiruvenkaṭa māṇickam during the reign of Sadāsivarāya Mahārāya, when Tiruvengaḍamudaiyān’s own palanquin or Dandigai was presented to her by the Sthanattar for her personal use. We shall have to refer to this in greater detail in the next chapter. She was also allotted one taligai of prasadam daily in Tirumalā and in Tirupati to be taken and delivered at her door. The advent of such remarkable women to Tirupati began in the time of the Emperor Sri Viraprātāpa Achyutarāya Maharaya in 1531 A.D. The last we hear of them was in 1548 A.D.

After about 1548 A.D. they do not figure in any of our inscriptions either as donors or as beneficiaries. The star seems to have set with Tiruvenkaṭamāṇickam. Achyutaraya’s special interest in introducing Muddu Kuppāyi seems to have resulted in their complete exit from the temple after 1548 A.D. There is nothing in the inscriptions to warrant us to draw the inference that any one of them exercised an undesirable influence in the temple. On the other hand, they seem to have been ardent devotees of Tiruvengaḍamudaiyān making endowments for food offerings

473
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

on festival occasions in garden mantapams constructed by them. The donor's share of the prasadams was distributed by them for deserving Sri Vaishnavas engaged in temple services and for their own āchāryas.

Alvar Tirtham, construction of cutstone steps and Sandhyavandana mantapam.

During the many years of his internment in Chandragiri, Achyutarāya Maharaya would have been attending the Vaikasi and Ani Bramhotsavams of Sri Govindaraja including the Tirthavāri function in the pond formed by the waterfall which at least since the days of Sri Ramanuja seems to have been called the Chakra Tirtham, or the (Tiruvāli) Alvār Tirtham. The only early reference to this pond in our inscriptions is in Grantha characters on the inner west wall of the Nammāḷvār shrine at Alvār Tirtham (I. 58; 1287 A.D.). The inscription does not name the pond. It simply says (tata parisāre) on the bank of the pond (a muni lives). It must have been originally just like the other ponds formed by the numerous waterfalls on the Tirumalai Hills, say like the Mālavāni Gūṇḍam in Tirupati. Again on the north wall of the first prakaram of Sri Govindarajaswami temple in Tirupati is an inscription in Sanskrit (Grantha characters) which gives the year in chronogram and is made out to be Saka 1389 (corresponding to May-June 1467 A.D.). The gist of the inscription seems to be that with the holy waters of that pond wherein a bath purifies the devas and mortals of all sins, Snāpana Tirumanjanam (bath according to Āgama rites) as prescribed by Sri Ramanujarya was performed for Sri Govindaraja, Bhū Devi and Sri Devi.

It is a known fact that the Govindaraja temple had no Pushkarini (or holy tank) attached to it till the present Govinda Pushkarini (or Krishnarayan Koneri) appears to have been excavated and consecrated. From the day of installation of Sri Govindaraja in Tirupati, the waters of the Alvār Tirtham after consecration by Sri Ramanuja were used for His daily bath and Tiruvārādhanam.

1 (II. 29: Saka 1839)
Every Sri Vaishnava is familiar with the daily consecration of the water in which he bathes, invoking all the 33 crores of sacred waters sanctified by the Devas to flow into the water in which he is bathing. Sri Ramanuja must obviously have done this consecration once for all associating therewith the Chakrattalvar (Sudarsana) known in Tamil as Tiruväli Alvar. Hence the pond was familiarly known as Alvar Tirtham. The name has perhaps nothing to do with Nammälvār whose temple was also consecrated close by on its banks. Achyutaraya may have feared that if left uncared for, the new Govinda Pushkarini in Tirupati might eventually gain greater importance than Alvar Tirtham.

It was the rather untidy condition of this sacred pond where every year during the two Brahmotsavams, Sudarsana Alvar bathed to sanctify the waters for the public to have their bath on the occasion of the Tirthavari, that engaged the personal attention of Achyutadeva Maharaya, even before he actually ascended the throne. He had the holy tank properly constructed with flights of cutstone steps (రంగస్థాపా), and Sandhyavandana mantapam all round (పంతం) and had Sudarsana stones planted at the four corners (చిరామాయ). The inscription1 is in three languages, Telugu, Kanarese and Tamil. The Telugu and Kanarese call it the Divya Tirtham of Tiruvengalanatha. The Tamil version says Tiruvengađamudaiyan’s Divya Tirtham called Alvar Tirtham in Tirupati. Achyuta Maharaya (the inscription says) for his own four-fold purushartham, got performed the punahpratishtha (reconsecration). Even the Telugu inscription calls it ‘Tirupati Chakrathirtham which is Tiruvengalanatha’s Divya Tirtham.’ All inscriptions say that the function was Punah pratishtha.

The construction of the cutstone steps with the conduit for the exit of the flowing waters and the Sandhyavandana mantapams on three sides would have taken at least a year’s time. The reconsecration of the tank was performed on 25-6-1531 A.D. and the orders for construction should therefore have been given

1. IV. 8, 9, 10, all 25-6-1531 A.D.
soon after Achyutaraya’s coronation in Tirumala about November 1529 A.D.

The term Tiruvengalanātha Divya Tirtham requires some elucidation. The Tirumala Hill contains many waterfalls and every one of these is considered sacred. This is because the Hill itself is sanctified by the Holy Feet of Tiruvengaḍamudaiyān who is standing thereon. Every water stream therefore issues from His Feet and becomes His Divya Tirtham.

That the Tirthavāri festival of Sri Govindapparamāl takes place in ‘Alvār Tirtham’ is distinctly mentioned in another inscription also (IV. 49. 1535). Sri Govindaraja being taken to “Alvar Tirtham” on Garudavāhanam is also specifically mentioned in yet another inscription (IV. 169, 1542). In connection with Nammālvār festival celebrated by Tāḷapākkam Tirumalai Ayyangar, distinct mention is made of the fact that on the bank of the Alvār Tirtham Nammālvār’s car festival took place (V. 34 19—3—1544). Again there is reference to Tiruvāḷi Alvan being taken to Alvār Tirtham on Kārtikai festival day in Tirupati (V. 66 1546) and also of Sri Govindaraja on Makara Sankrāmanam day. The installation of Sri Lakṣhminārāyana Perumāl in the Tirthavāri mantapam situated on the bank of Alvār Tirtham is of a later date (V. 68; 1546). That Alvār Tirtham is Tiruvengaḍamudaiyān’s Divya Tirtham got accentuated by the construction of His Shrine in the fourth cave above the waterfall and Potlapāṭi Timmaraja made a daily food offering for the Deity there (V. 92; 3—6—1547). In 1628 Matla Anantaraja established an annasaṭram at Alvār Tirtham (VI. 25; 1628 A.D.). For the first time on 10—2—1865 Mahant Dharma Dass called it ‘Kapila Tirtham.’

It was Achyutaraya Maharaya that made the appearance of this tank worthy of its sacred character. It really seems to have had no name until Sri Ramanuja sanctified its waters with the aid of Sudarsana Alvān. To call it Kapila Tirtham is a misnomer, but Saivites may prefer that name.

1. VI. 13.
ACHYUTARAYÄ MAHARAYA

The Silasāsanam is trilingual and made by the Emperor himself and not by the issue of Rāyasam to the Sthanattar. It is a misstatement when, in the Report of the inscription (by the T. T. Devasthanam) p. 224, it is mentioned that Achyutaraya renamed Kapila Tirtham as Chakra Tirtham.

ACHYUTARAYA PERFORMED SRINIVASA SAHASRANAMA ARCHANA WITH HIS OWN HANDS. IV. 16: 31—1—1533 A.D.

What was however quite out of the ordinary and the only instance in the history of this temple was Achyutaraya’s performing Srinivasa Sahasranāmā archana personally while the Nambimar (Archakas) were asked to recite the Sahasranāmams.¹ This took place about a year after the successful termination of his campaign against the ruler of Tiruvādi Rajyam (Travancore). It is common knowledge that the performance of the Archana is the special prerogative of the Archaka in any temple and that it would be considered an act of pollution necessitating a Samprokshana if any other person did it. Perhaps such a purification ceremony was performed after Achyutaraya finished doing the Archana and before the remaining items of daily worship were taken up. It may even be that after the daily worship was finished, Achyutaraya was allowed to do his own Archana, in which case also there must have taken place a purificatory Samprokshana. Achyutaraya during the period of his internment in Chandragiri would have witnessed the performance of the Sahasranāmarchana soon after Tomālaseva every morning and might have felt thrilled. The desire to do it himself must be attributed to his ignorance of or disregard for, Āgamic propriety in such matters. Or what is more likely, Achyutaraya sincerely believed that having been chosen by God and consecrated with the waters from His Hand for the throne, he was spiritually fit to perform the archana in person. Krishnadevaraya instituted the weekly Friday Tiru-

¹ The right to recite the 1008 names and to perform the archana seems to have belonged to the archakas. A separate person is employed in recent times to recite the names.
manjanam in place of the bi-weekly one, but did not attempt to do the Tirumanjanam himself. Neither the Archakas nor the Sthanattar could have stood in his way if he had insisted on doing it. On this occasion Achyuta presented as his Ubbhayam a Svarna Varsham for Tiruvengaḍamudaiyān just as Krishnadevaraya also poured 30000 varahālu as Svarna Varsha. Snāpana Tirumanjanam might have been performed for the processional Deity also in the Mukha mantapam. He presented a large number of ornaments.¹ The details given in the Tamil inscriptions are not identical with those given in the Telugu, which latter happens to be much damaged.

What is of special interest in connection with this visit is his abnormal action of doing the archana himself, displacing the archaka.

From the way the inscription ends, we have to conjecture that the Sthanattar would rather have suppressed incising the incident on stone but that they were probably commanded to inscribe.

1. (a) Two pairs of (some) gold ornament; (b) One pair of eye ornament (贳Markup). (c) One string of tanikkay beads, each bead weighing 10 units of gold, probably 62 beads, (d) one string of validilaikkāi beads each bead weighing 10 units of gold (62 beads); (e) two Kapila pasu; (f) svarna Varsham (shower of gold); (g) a garland of 900 pearls; (h) one big kapha (garment) set with 200 pearls, 33 rubies, 10 emeralds and 18 diamonds (i) gold bangles ( Markup); (j) Markup; (k) one pair Uchchippū for the head set with 122 pearls, 16 rubies, 2 emeralds and 4 diamonds including 11 selected gems; (l) one Kūṭtam ornament over the sikharam set with 709 black pearls ( Markup), emeralds 3, rubies 30, sapphire 1 (m) one pearl garland (Markup) containing 600 pearls and 10 units of superior gold weighing 21 units of gold. Total 785 units gold weight including the Sārihāi (gold lace) made of 8 3/4 carat gold. (...Markup ... Markup ...

The Telugu script mentioned;
The Tamil inscription ends with the words:

"As ordered this silasasanam" (அழல்பழியான கருணையின ஸேலம்), The usual ending should be "தீர்த்திங் கடந்து வந்திருந்த லாத்தின் உரிய முனையில் வெளியில் கொள்ளி மீட்பின் ஆத்திரை வந்து காண்கு. நீ நடுவில் வாசு.")

Although the two inscriptions give no indication of any daily food offerings having been instituted on this occasion, it has to be presumed that Achyutaraya did not fail to do it. Perhaps he did it on the occasion of his coronation in Tirumala in October 1529 itself. Every Emperor from the days of Bukkaraya had done so.

**LAKSHMIDEVI MAHOTSAVAM.**

*(IV. 54: 55; 26—12—1535 A.D.)*

The fourth incident that deserves notice is a new festival called Lakshmidevi Mahotsavam. The first of the two inscriptions describes it as, "tirunāl (festival) for Tiruvengada Muruḍaiyan and Alaimelangai Nāchchiyar" (திருவந்தற்குச்சமயன் எசுமைசு காத்திருந்த வெள்ளிக்குறிச் சிட்டையை). But the next inscription appears as a sort of post script or correction calling it "Lakshmidevi Mahotsavam" to commence on (ankurarpam) in Uttirattādi day and Sāttumurai Rohini Nakshatram. What is noteworthy in the inscription is the manner in which Achyutadēva Maharaya's name is mentioned. He is described as "Swami Achyutarāya Mahārāya" in every place to the inscription where the donor's name has to be mentioned. There seems to be a sting, rather grim humour, in it. Achyutaraya's fancies appeared to the Sthanattar as being strange and he is described as "Swāmi" which is a term usually applied when referring to a spiritual leader. In another endowment also by Sriranga Nayakkar for the

---

One Trisaram, six single sarams, containing 3 pearls; chakralu 500, some pratima, probably of Achyutaraya, etc, which are not quite intelligible; some gold in the name of Achyutaraya Maharaya, some in the name of his son are also mentioned. These show that Achyutaraya was accompanied by his Queen Varadajimman and his son Kumāra Venkatādri.
merit of the King, Queen and the Prince, Achyutaraya is called "Swāmi" (IV. 79: 15-12-1536).

In the first inscription (No. 54) the festival is described as ‘Tirunāl for Tiruvengaḍamudaiyān and Alaimelmangai Nāchchiyar’ but when the details of the festival were being worked out there was no room there for Tiruvengaḍamudaiyān. So they seem to have obtained the Rāyar’s consent to call it (No. 55) "Lakshmidevi Mahotsavam." Alaimelmangai was only a human incarnation of Lakshmidevi according to the Venkatāchala Māhātmyam. So Alaimelmangai’s name was replaced by Lakshmidevi. Somehow they wanted to introduce a festival and provide all the paraphernalia therefor. First and foremost a Lakshmidevi pratima had to be manufactured (as there was no such idol in Tirumala) at a cost of 16 Rekhai pon. A pratima of Brahma for 1 R. P.; Samprokshana 1 R. P; for Soma Kumbham 5 panams, Brahma Mandalam and Sesha and other pratimas, cost 12 R. P. There was Achārya Dakshina, dakshina for Ritwiks; invocation according to Srisūktam; Kalpa mantram, Lakshmisahasranāma Japa and Archana, Lakshmi Gāyatri, Navāgraḥa Pratimas 12 R.P.; Havis, Pāyasam etc., for homam every day. Dakshina and Vastram for 10 Sumangalis; Veda pārāyanam, Purānam reading etc., daily 60 taligai, Tirukkanamadai. 200 for 5 days, Atirasam daily 1 padi, appam, Vadai, godhi, sukhiyan etc. These are to be offered while the installed Lakshmidevi was taken in procession to the seven mantapams constructed for the purpose; two each in the name of Swami Achyutaraya and Varādajiamman svami, Kumara Chikka Venkatadri mantapam, Narasanāyakkar and his wife Obachchi, one mantapam each. There was cash payment to be made for this new festival for yāgasālāi, tiruppani pillai, potters, kaikkolar, sippiyar, carpenters, tevaiyāl, singamurai, the twelve nirvaham, panimurai, anusandhānam, tiruman kānikkai, kangā- nippan, viṇṇappam saivar, and kādaikkūṭtu. Also Brāhmaṇa samarpana. It is refrshing to note that Emperumāṇaḍiyar did not find a place in this function.

(The day of inscription is Sravana Nakshatra; the festival may have commenced in Uttaraṭṭādi, say Panchami tithi in Margali month).
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The Ankurarpanam was to be in Uttarattdi Nakshatram and Sattumurai Rohini Nakshatram. But the month is not mentioned. We presume it to be in the month Margali. To celebrate this festival in Tirumala for Lakshmi devi as apart from Tiruvengadamudaiyan must have appeared incongruous even to the most accommodating Sthanattar. But Svami Achyutat raya Maharayar had ordered it and allotted 300 Rekhai pon yearly being the Uttarayam of Kondavidu Seema.

Because Achyutadeva Maharaya instituted this festival in Tirumala in 1535,\(^1\) we find Naminetti, a merchant of Krishnaraya pa\(\overline{\text{t}}\)tanam, Chandragiri town; making an endowment of 1575 panams for a similar festival for Sri Govindaraja (in January 1537 A.D.).

In connection with this festival in Tirumala, one of the Archakas Venka\(\text{\u093c}\)atturaivar handed over his portion of the dakshina in connection with the festival as fund for the performance of certain Kainkaryams to Tiruvenga\(\text{\u093c}\)damudaiyan on other festival days.\(^2\) So he thought that he washed his hands off any sin he may have committed in accepting the dakshina. Ek\(\text{\u093f}\)ki Srinivasayyan appears to have been the only Srivaishanava who approved of this festival and he provided 1 dossai padi for the last day of the festival.\(^3\)

Somebody must have pointed out to the Emperor that while instituting a festival for a non-existent Lakshmi in Tirumala he forgot the existence of Sri Rama with his consort Sita Devi and his brother Lakshmana. So on the same day 26—12—1535 another Silasasanam was made for 60 Rekai Pon,\(^4\) being Uttarayam from the same K\(\text{\u093d}\)davidu S\(\text{\u093f}\)mai for the celebration of a festival on every Punarvasu Nakshatra day with Panchakavya Abhishekam, street procession and food offerings soon after abhishekam.

Lakshmidevi festival in Tirumala looks like copying Saluva Narasimha’s Anna-Unjal (Dola Mahotsavam) Tirunal there for Malaikuniya ninra perumal and Nachchimar in 1473 A.D.

\(^1\) IV. 95. 31—1—1537  \(^3\) IV. 157 13—2—1541
\(^2\) IV. 138. 17—9—1539  \(^4\) IV. 58 26—12—1535
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SRI ACHYUTA PERUMAL AND ACHYUTARAYAHPURAM.
(Suburb of Tirupati).

The earliest inscription which tells us of the existence of a temple for Achyuta Perumal in Tirupati is to be found on the north wall (outer side) west entrance of a verandah of the old kitchen of Sri Govindaraja's temple. It is not anywhere in Achyuta Perumal temple and is dated Sāli Sakha 1458, Durmukhi, suddha navami of Makara month, Asvini Nakshatra (17—1—1537). The Achyuta Perumal Temple at that time should therefore have been a new one with walls not yet fit to be inscribed upon. Considering that Achyutaraya Maharaya constructed the stone steps and Sandhya vandana Mantapams of Alvar Tirtham close by in 1531 and that he constructed the Achyutarāyan Koneri in Tirumala about 1533 A.D., it is not too much to assume that the Achyutaraya temple in Tirupati was consecrated at least sometime soon after these two. Anyhow it is found that in 1537 Nāmi Setti of Chandra-giri (merchant) made provision for food offerings to Achyutaperumal on the Pādiyaveṭtai festival day in his mantapam in Pongalveli. The Deity was therefore having the usual festivals also.

Nearly two years thereafter1 on 8—2—1539 there was the temple with walls fit to be inscribed upon. On the south base of the ruined gopuram of this temple, there is now found an inscription which states that “Sriman Mahārājadhirāja Rājaparamesvara Sri Achyutarāya Mahārāya” erected the temple of Achyuta Perumal in a site of Koṭṭur village purchased from Sri Venkateswara’s Temple by paying 2400 panams as compensation for the site. For the daily worship of the Deity he granted the village of Parittiputtur, dividing it into 20 shares. He made a gift of 100 houses to Brahmins with full rights of possession, sale, mortgage, succession, transfer and gift. The other 20 house sites he gave to Brahmins who enjoyed also the 20 shares of the village assigned to the temple. The boundaries of the site are also given in detail.

Mention of this temple and village are also made in subsequent years.

1. IV. 123, 8—2—1539
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Vol. V.  17, p. 43, 14—6—1544
,,  53, p. 134, 15—7—1545
,,  68, p. 176, 20—6—1546 (Tirthavari mentioned)
,,  133, p. 336, 10—3—1552

The last one mentions that Achyuta Peṭṭai is a suburb of Tirupatī. The temple and the village have however fallen into ruins within four centuries of their construction. The site would have been highly malarial. The construction of a new temple while there was already one for Sri Govindaraja, requiring greater attention and five centuries older, must have also been against the wishes of the local people. The attempt proved a failure and led to waste of money. Achyutaraya’s Koneri in Tirumala also fell into disrepair, was filled up in recent times at huge cost and converted into a flower garden. Alvār Tirtham alone prospered.

ACHYUTARAYAR KONERI IN TIRUMALA.

There is no inscription to show the year of construction of the Achyutarayan Koneri in Tirumala. The first reference to it is in connection with an endowment by RAYASAM RAMACHANDRA DIKSHATAR dated 1—7—1533.1 His native village Agaram Kaḍalāḍi (which even today is its recognised name) received the surname of Kumāra Venkaṭādri Samudram in memory of Achyutaraya’s son. He made a grant of Tāmarapākkam village with an annual income of 200 Rekai Pon for offering 8 tirupponakam daily and for certain other festivals to Tiruvengaḍa-muḍaiyān. On one of these Brahmotsavam festival days, the Utsava Murti is said to be seate on the bank of Achyutarāyan Köneri. The same donor ond 13—8—1533 made a further endowment of 5000 panams for 4 tirupponakam daily and 13 iddili padis for the processional image while seated in the same mantapam on the 13 Rohini Nak shatram days in the year, being his own birth star. He made another endowment (IV. 59) on 26—12—15352 of 5000 panams which provides among other

1. IV. 23. 1—7—1533
2. IV. 24. 26—12—1535
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things I appapadi to Sri Krishna in his mantapam on the said Kōneri on every 5th festival day of all the Brahmotsavams.

**ADAIPPAN VISVANATHA NAYKKAR** was another officer of Achyutaraya who constructed a mantapam on the bank of this Kōneri and arranged out of his endowment of 15000 panam to offer one appa padi per day on the 13 days of all the 9 Brahmotsavams.¹ *This donor was the founder of the Madura Nāyak dynasty.*

On the same date¹ as above **KRISHNAPPA NAYKKAR**, son of Chinnappa Nayakkar made a similar endowment of 15000 panams wherein also there was provision for exactly similar appa-padi offering (117) in a mantapam constructed by him on the bank of the same tank. **BĀCHCHARASAYYAR**, son of Sriramayyangar repeats the same³ in his own mantapam on the tank bund. So also **RAMABHATTARAYAN**, son of Bhūtnātha (Sishta) Sitta Bhaṭṭar; and **IMMADI ELLAPPA UDAIYAR**, also.⁴ **SALAKARAJA SINGARAJA** made an endowment of 15000³ panams for exactly similar purposes, but the inscription does not mention any mantapam constructed by him on the tank bund.

**Probable date of construction of Achyutaraya Koneri.**

Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar (Junior) who was the first to endow a wooden car for Sri Periya Raghunatha of Tirupati for the merit of Achyutaraya, made another endowment wherein provision was made for food offerings to Tiruvengadamuḍaiyān on several festival days and in various places, including a mantapam on the bank of Malluraju’s tank. Tāḷḷapākkam Tirumalai Ayyangar while endowing 4½ villages in 1530 A.D. for a number of offerings on various occasions, included among the latter one appa padi

¹ IV. 81, 11—1—1537
² IV. 82, 12—1—1537
³ IV. 83, 12—1—1537
⁴ IV. 84, 86, 12—1—1537
⁵ IV’ 88, 12—1—1537
ACHYUTARAYA MAHARAYA

on the day of what is called Achyutaraya Tirunāl and in front of his Sankirtana Bhandaram in the temple; also for 13 appa padi on the 13 birth Nakshatras of Achyutaraya, Mrigasirsha. There is no reference to any mantapam or even the Achyutaraya Kōneri. Rayasam Ramachandra Dikshitar among the objects of his endowment of Tāmarapākkam village mentions the offering of appa padi on each 7th festival day of the 9 Brahmotsavams, while the processional Deity was seated in the mantapam constructed by him on the Achyutarayar Kōneri Bank.

We may therefore assume that the Kōneri was constructed after 31-10-1530 and before 1-7-1533. From another inscription of the year 1532 (Saka 1454) we gather that Achyutaraya commissioned Tallapakkam Tirumala Ayyangar to reconstruct the old tank ཀེ་མོང་ོད་ སྐེའི་ རོ་ རེས་ དཔོན་ སྐེལ་ རེང་ ༢༠༠ མཚན. We have to consider whether Achyutaraya who in June 1531 completed the reconstruction of the Alvār Tirtham tank in Tirupati would have left the sacred tank of Tiruvengadaṇḍaiyan in Tirumala in disrepair and would have asked Tallapākkam Tirumala Ayyangar in 1532 to carry out the repairs, but himself undertook to construct a new tank in his own name, which he would have completed before 1-7-1533. There will however be nothing strange if he had done so. In that case he may have commenced the excavation of his own tank some time in 1532, completing the same by about the middle of 1533 A.D.

Ramachandra Dikshitar may have superintended the construction, and built his own mantapam on the bank as the first one for the merit of Achyutaraya. There were subsequently as many as six mantapams all built before January 1537.

Other endowments of the value of 15000 panams by some of the other officers are shown in the annexure at the end of this Chapter.

PALACE INFLUENCE.

While so many officers instituted food offerings endowing the amount required therefor, there were two ladies Adaippam
Padmada Amman and Adaippam Rukmini amman who (their official designation indicates they were betel-bearers to the monarch) made no payment but arranged to get food offerings made on certain festival days every year at the expense of the temple itself, for their individual merit. The Sthanattar purchased from the temple funds two gardens, constructed stone compound walls therefor, raised garden in each, paying monthly wages for 3 gardeners and constructed a mantapam in each which Malaikuniya ninra Perumal should visit on the occasions referred to for receiving food offerings. The capital cost of each of these was 518 Rekhai Pon. From the date of the inscriptions, we have to infer that they accompanied the Emperor during his visit to the temple.¹

There is yet another inscription² of more or less of this type which does not state that any amount was actually deposited with the Sthanattar for the services. This was in favour of one Araviţi Lakshmi amman whose precise status in the harem of the monarch is missing in the inscription. The inscription provides for the purchase of a garden site for 25 Rekhai pon, the construction of a mantapam costing 500 Rekhai pon and pay of one gardener 6 R.P. yearly, for offering one appa padi on a day during each of the ten Brahmostsavams, one atirasa padi on Huatung festival days and on another day also perhaps Mannasamudram festival. The date of this inscription must be some time after Periya Tirumalai Ayyangar instituted his Brahmostsavam in March 1539.

Another incomplete one whose date can be guessed (but the donor's name missing), mentions the payment of 557 Rekhai Pon for the purchase of a garden site at Tirumala for 500 R.P. the remaining amount being the cost of a mantapam and stone compound walls and pay of a gardener. For offering 10 atirasa padi during the 10 Brahmostsavams every year and another 15 appa padi, the capital amount deposited was 143 Rekhai Pon (Total 700 Rekhai Pon). The mention of 10 Brahmostsavams leads us to infer that the date must be soon after 1539 A.D.³

---

1. IV, 56 and 57; 26—12—1535
2. IV, 125, perhaps late in 1539
3. IV, 188, after 1539
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There were also many endowments made by other classes of devotees besides the officers. It may be of interest to see if during Achyutaraya Maharaya's reign the temple had greater patronage from the public than in the reign of his predecessor, Krishnadeva Mahārāya. During both the periods in some cases the endowments were in the shape of grant of villages. Those endowed during Krishna's period do not state the annual net income whereas in Achyutaraya's period the annual income is given in Rekhai Pon in most cases. Again during the reign of Saluva Narasimha, the endowments were neither in cash nor in the shape of villages, but by the excavation of irrigation channels in the then existing temple lands (Tiruvidaiyāṭṭam and Sarvamāṇyam villages). What amount was expended on the excavation of these channels is in no case stated. Donors of this type were invariably men who had official influence as feudatory chiefs, or influential men like Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar. After the Saluva period this type of endowment is not in evidence, but is replaced by a cash payment to the Sthanattar (or the Tiruppaṇi Bhandāram only during Krishnadeva Raya's time) charging them to utilise the amount for the excavation of, or repairs to, irrigation channels in temple villages. It was also pointed out that there was an appreciable number of endowments by the Emperor's officers which gives an impression of having been forced contribution. All such amounts also were used for the improvement of irrigation sources, leading one to suspect that the exaction was for that purpose only.

It is worth-while giving comparative figures of the endowments made during Krishnadhevaraya's and Achyutaraya's reign, under such headings as from Feudatory chiefs, officers of all grades, merchants etc.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>during Krishna's</th>
<th>Achyuta's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in panams.</td>
<td>in panams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feudatory Chiefs</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>37,625</td>
<td>43,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>41,080</td>
<td>3,09,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poets and scholars</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>24,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Jiyars and Ekakis .. 14,800 7,880
Maṭṭhādhipatis .. 14,000
Achāryapurushās and other Brahmins connected with
Temple .. 14,175 21,925
Nambrimars .. 350 305
Temple servants (accountants etc.) .. 7,800 7,910
Emperumanadiyars .. 1,000 8,030
Other Devotees .. 32,800 38,753

1,67,150 4,96,478

There is no inscription to show whether and what amount or which villages Achyutaraya gave for any food offering although his Queen has stated that her own food offering should be immediately after the offerings in the name of Krishnadeva and Achyuta; 'துர்கைப்பரிசையார் தொலை மழ் அதூ போன்றவருடன் ஆர்வம் நிற்பழ் அரசூரும் ஆர்வம் அரசூரும் ஆர்வம் அரசூரும் ஆர்வம் கைற்றவிய அம்மன் அம்மன் (para 2 of inscription). But Varadaji amman's offerings were to the value of 920 Rekhai pon annually for which she endowed six villages in 1534 A.D. (IV. 29; 5—4—1534 A.D.).

Chinna Maṭṭapalur (income) 200 R.P.
Muttukur .. 200 "
Paliva .. 200 "
Valli .. 35 "
Munganur .. 35 "
Pamdappalle .. 110 "
Other sources .. 140 "

Yearly Total 920 Rekhai Pon.

For this amount 20 tirupponakam, 1 tirukkanamaḍai, 1 atirasapedi, 1 vaḍai, 1 siḍai, and 1 sukhiyan were to be offered daily. It will be seen that private endowments have been more
lavish than those of the Emperor and the Empress in the matter of food.

The endowments made in cash as well as in the shape of villages have been far more in Achyutaraya’s period than in Krishnadeva’s. Figures relating to the number of sandhi offerings during the early periods, the period of Saluva Narasimha and those of Krishnadeva and all his successors will be shown separately at a later stage (see Sadasivaraya’s period.)

In the method of the disposal of the donor’s one-fourth share and also of the other three-fourths share, there appears to be some change during Achyutadēva Mahāraya’s period. In Saluva Narasimha’s days and also for some time previous to that, the one-fourth share of the donor used to be distributed among a number of people, even the Iyal Prabhandam people sometimes coming in for a share along with the 12 nirvahams, the 3½ vagais, the nambimars etc. But we found that Krishnadeva Maharaya and some of his generals gave away the donor’s share to the Tiruppani Bhandārattār also or even exclusively to them. A possible explanation for this deviation has already been suggested. But soon after Achyutadeva Maharaya became the Emperor a definite change is observed. It can be seen from almost every inscription that the donor’s quarter share was appropriated by the donor. There is nothing to show how the donor disposed of his share. We have reason to believe that most of these donors were not residents of Tirumala or Tirupati and could not therefore possibly have received the prasadams daily in person. A few like the Emperor, maintained their own sattrams where the food would have been distributed free to the pilgrims. The smaller donors however could not have maintained any such agency. It might be that donor’s share was taken over by the Sthanattar by private purchase or annual lease. Sale and lease of donor’s share of the prasadams have been a feature of the temple.

Transfer of donor’s share of prasadams by sale in perpetuity made by Saluva Timmarasa to Tallapakkam Tirumalai Ayyangar.

But an outright sale of donor’s daily share of prasādams of all kinds for value received in cash would have been considered
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at the time an unusual and even unthinkable transaction between respectable men. Donors have been usually men in well-to-do circumstances who would consider it a pious act to distribute their share free to pilgrims in a holy place like the Tirumalai Hills. Even minor donors including the Emperumānadiyārs assigned their share (or a portion thereof) to deserving poor brahmans and Srivaishnavas who maintained flower gardens for the benefit of the temple, or appropriated the entire quantity for their own use. It was only the perishable variety of prasādams which accrued daily to the Sthanattar, Nambimar, Jiyars and the temple cooks that was (in full or in part) leased out to men who made a living by the sale of these prasādams. These men went by the name Prasādakkārar Mahāmēdangal. Such leases were given from year to year and the Sthanattar as a body were not concerned in the transaction. An outright sale of the donor's share in perpetuity was an unheard of thing until in 1536 A.D. three such sales were registered by inscriptions made by the temple accountant (Tiruninra-ūr-udaiyar) on the walls of the temple. Although the name of the Sthanattar does not find place in the inscription their purpose was to have the transactions recognised and approved by them. There is no other instance of a similar sale in the history of this temple. These three sales therefore deserve special notice for more reasons than one—the circumstances which necessitated the sales and their registration by the temple accountant; the high social standing of the vendors and the vendee and the rather immediate reactions to such a transaction by, what appears to be, Achyutarāya Maharaya, the Emperor.

The vendors were the great Ex-Pradhāni Sāluva Timmarasa (Appaji of the Rayar appaji fame) and his younger brother Govindaraja. Timmarasa served as Pradhāni not only Sri Vira Krishnadeva Maharaya but also his elder brother Vira Narasimhara- rayar. Maharayaar and possibly Immadi Narasimharaya also. According to accepted tradition he was responsible for saving Krishnadēva's eyes from being gouged out as planned and ordered by his elder brother. Timmarasa therefore helped him to become the Emperor in succession to his brother. He was also Krishna's respected, trusted and famous Pradhāni. The sudden death of
Krishnadeva's only son, the young prince Tirumala, in 1525 A.D. resulted in suspicion being cast against Timmarasa or complicity in a plot for poisoning which brought about the death. Timmarasa was removed from office and lived thereafter in obscurity. The sales we are now considering bear testimony to the financial ruin which overtook the famous Pradhāni. His younger brother Saluva Govindarāja continued to be in the service of the Emperor. The two brothers had made jointly and severally certain endowments between the years 1512 and 1524 A.D. in the temples of Tirupati and Tirumala. Timmarasa's wife Lakshmi Ammanār also had made an endowment in 1511 in Tirumala and the daily donor's share due to her on that account was assigned by her to her son-in-law Nāḍīndla Appayyan presumably living in Chandragiri. Timmarasa presented probably in 1512 A.D. a valuable pitāmbaram cloak for Sri Venkatesa. He was greatly praised for this excellent gift in Sanskrit verses in an inscription in Govindarajaswāmi temple. He was also maintaining a flower garden in Tirumala. Between the years 1525 and 1535 A.D. he seems to have got on somehow in his seclusion. But his poverty was gradually driving him to the necessity of finding money by the sale of the one fourth share of prasadams which as a donor he was receiving all these years and which was being used for maintaining the flower garden and feeding a few hungry pilgrims. His own poverty was being kept under a veil. The great pradhāni had ultimately to veil the donor's share in perpetuity to Tāḷḷapakkam Tirumalai Ayyangar—son of the great poet, bhakta and philosopher Annamayyangar—who perhaps was the only one in Tirumala who could afford to purchase. The sale went in three instalments. The first sale was not of the donor's share on his own endowment but on that of his younger brother Govindaraja who was in service. Timmarasa acted for his brother, probably with his consent. It was probably hoped that it would not be construed as a sale forced by poverty or want. The next sale is in inscription IV. 74. The date is not known as that part of the inscription is at a height of over 35 feet in the Tirupati temple. This endowment had been made jointly by

1. The story is told by Nuniz and repeated in Sewel's Forgotten Empire p. 359–361.

2. IV, 72: 26—2—1536
the two brothers. The third and the last sale\(^1\) was the donor’s share of Timmarasa’s own endowment to Sri Venkateswara made in 1512 A.D. at a time when he was the mahâpradâhi of Sri Krishnadeva maharaya. This was the last straw. The world came to know in all nakedness the depth of Timmarasa’s poverty. There would have been great sympathy and astonishment. Thus within a period of ten months Timmarasa not only sold his brother’s share of the prasadams and their joint shares but also the donor’s share on his own endowment. Apart from these sales (Vikrayam) there were some prasadams, such as appams, atirasams and vadai, according to Timmarasa on festival occasions which he gave away as free gift with libations of water to Tirumalai ayyâṅgar and not as sale. The only stipulation to the gift was that Tirumalai ayyâṅgar should continue to reside in Tirumala and do service (Nitya sêva) to the Lord. “இறார்களின் வெளியில் கேவலமான பல்வேறு மகாகால் உலக கால்களின் தொட்டுக்கு முந்தைய முய்யாமை முற்போக்கம் பெற்று மகாகால் உலக கால்களின் தொட்டுக்கு முந்தைய முய்யாமை முற்போக்கம் பெற்று மகாகால் உலக கால்களின் தொட்டுக்கு முந்தைய முய்யாமை முற்போக்கம். இந்நியா கொண்டு காண்க மிகுத்த வீடுக்களின் கொல்லடை ப்பூசு.” The amounts realised by the vendor by the three sales were 4600, 5203 and 1900 panams (total 11,703 panams).

These transactions probably reached the ears of the Emperor Achyutaraya Maharayar and touched his heart. There is an inscription which probably records his reaction to the news. It is dated (IV. 89) 12th January 1537 (Friday sukla dvitiya of Makara month of Durmukhi year) and records that under the orders (or as desired by) of Achyutarâya Maharârayar ‘அச்சுரட்டை ஆன்மாராயன் அம்பாய்வண்டு புத்தெக் என்சார்த்தவுள் வாக்கில் அன்னையர். இறார்கள் வேறுப்புப்புக்கு சிறிய மலை பெண் கிளமாக வாக்கில்மிகை பெண் வாக்கில்’ . The structure of the passage in Tamil gives no room for asserting that the name of the donor is lost in the inscription. Mallâpuram has always been a Tiruvidaiyaṭṭam village of the temple. In 1475 A.D. (II. 134) Kandadai Ramanuja ayyâṅgar made some irrigation improvements and from the extra income thereby accruing

\(^1\) 1V, 93; 28—12—1536.
ACHYUTARAYA MAHARAYA

performed certain daily services. Now in 1537 A.D. Achyutaraya ordered the execution of a fresh Silâsásanam (inscription) for utilising the income from the village for certain food offerings to be made on the 7th festival day of all the eight Brahmotsavams and for handing over the donor’s one fourth share of the prasadams to ‘Appayyan’ after giving a portion to the gardener who was maintaining the flower garden, probably the one which was being maintained by Timmarasa. Appayyan’s identity is not described in the inscription, for at the time every one would have known that it was Nadindla Appayyan, the son-in-law of Timmarasa. Achyutaraya’s action was meant to be an indirect help to Timmarasa, done in a manner which would not wound his feelings.

The statement made in pp. 194, 195 of the T.T.D. Report (on the inscriptions) that Timmarasa served as Pradhani during Achyutaraya’s time also is not borne out by the inscriptions. From IV. 153 dated 31—12—1540 it is seen that one Sômarasayyar, father of Dalavây Timmarasayyar (Kâsyapagotra, Āsvâlayana sutra and Rik-Sakha) was the Pradhani under Achyutaraya. He was probably appointed as Pradhani in 1525 A.D. after Sâluva Timmarasayya’s dismissal. That Saluva Timmarasa was not Pradhani in 1536 A.D. when the sale transactions of the prasadams were made is gathered from the description given by him as vendor, viz., Rachiraja’s son Saluva Timmarasayyar (V.93 तिरुवाचिरजाज बहुवा वै दृशायणां तिरुवाचिरजाज). In his wife’s endowment made in December 1511 (III. 19) and in his own endowment made in 1512 (III. 21) he is described as Pradhâni Sâluva Timmarasayyangâr. His brother Govindaraja made one endowment in 1522 as the dharmam of Krishnadevaraya and another in 1524 for the merit of his daughter. These endowments made by the brothers were all before 1525 when Krishnadeva’s son was poisoned and Saluva Timmarasa was dismissed. When numerous endowments of large sums of money (15000 panams each) were made by Achyutaraya’s officers and courtiers in 1536 and 1537 A.D. the names of Saluva Timmarasa and Saluva Govindaraja are not found among the donors. On the other hand they were selling away the donor’s share of the endowments made in Krishnadevaraya’s reign. Govindaraja’s next endowment IV. 166 was made on 5th November 1541. There
is nothing in the preamble of the inscription to show that he was then an officer under Achyutaraya. It probably was a thanksgiving offering to Sri Govindarajasvāmi on the eve of his safe retirement from service. The donor’s share of the prasadams he took to himself and distributed the three quarter share to the temple servants and the 12 nirvahams. If in 1536 A.D. Sāluva Timmarasa was the Pradhani he would not have committed (what would certainly have been considered) the unbecoming act of selling away even his brother’s share of the prasadams.

We next turn to the vendee in the above transactions.

Tallapakkam Tirumalai Ayyangar was himself a munificent donor; he reconstructed a ruined temple in his village Alamel-mangapuram and instituted worship therein; he reconstructed the Svāmi Pushkarini in Tirumala with cutstone steps and also the prakaram and gopuram of the Varāhaswāmi temple there. He instituted a new Brahmôtsavam in Ani month in Tirumala at a capital cost of 2000 varahans. Such a man could not be mistaken for one who made a living by sale of temple prasadams. There is really something more interesting in the transaction. Tirumalai Ayyangar was getting his own quarter share from his endowments for food offerings. If he purchased something more from others, it should have been that he needed it not for cornering. There were more men of his kind in Tirumalai during those days and even later. They generally had large living quarters where pilgrims accommodated. Any one with pretensions to being a representative of theocracy of the day became the centre of attraction for pilgrims who in addition to some intellectual feast were treated also to temple prasadams to satisfy sentimental craving and hunger. Such prasadams as could stand transport to their native village were taken with them by the pilgrims. The spiritual teacher received valuable presents in return and would have been largely advertised abroad by the pilgrim who received the kind attention of the spiritual teacher at Tirumala. Prasādam as an article of immediate sale was restricted to the cooked perishable class and was mostly handled by lessees whose presence in Tirumala will also receive our attention shortly. The deal in this case was advantageous to both parties. Prasadams (baked and fried)
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which are less perishable have a higher value as transportable prasādams; so also God's chandanam, betel and nuts. Sripādarēnu is another rare article.

We can well understand why the Sthanattar made a scramble to obtain the donor's share of the prasadams and how the Tiruppani Bhandārattar came in for their share also. During Achyutaraya's reign an attempt was made to put an end to this. It is likely that the donor in several cases sold his share or transferred the same for consideration.

For the unfailing and punctual performance of these trusts, the genuine co-operation of the Sthanatar and the Tiruppani Bhandārattar was essential. The Sthānattar should expend conscientiously the monies entrusted to them for the repairs of existing irrigation sources and for the construction of new ones. The Tiruppani people were responsible not only for the proper execution of the works, but also for the collection of the produce or rents as the case may be. They could report failure of crops, or impossibility of collecting rents. Where rents were not realised, the trust failed to function. Such cases were not infrequent in the history of this temple.

When we review the extent and volume of the different food offerings for which endowments were made from time to time, we begin to doubt whether all these offerings were daily cooked in the temple kitchen. Some may not have been offered to the Deity by collusion between the Sthanattar, the cooks and the Nambimars. Their own individual shares may have been appropriated in the raw state itself. We cannot blame them for what was perhaps impossible of accomplishment in a day of 24 hours. When Krishnadeva Maharaya gave a portion of his quarter share to the Tiruppani Bhandarattar it was with a view to making sure of the food was cooked. A portion had also to be sent to his choultry for distribution to pilgrims. While this can ensure part performance daily, it cannot ensure full performance if the Tiruppani Bhandarattar also collude with the others. But the baked and fried vagai padi and chandanam are prasadams which it is to the advantage of all to offer.
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It appears to have been decided therefore in Achyutaraya’s time that the best method was to see that the donor’s share was given to the donor; and that none of the temple authorities should appropriate that share. The donor would thus be assured that his endowment was functioning.

How the three-quarters share of the prasadam which became temple property was disposed of has not been mentioned in any of the inscriptions. All that is invariably mentioned is that it should be appropriated for distribution in “Sandhi adaippu” time. Whatever might have been the ancient practice, we are told in one of Saluva Govindaraya’s endowments¹ that the three-quarters share should be distributed first amongst Tevai, Singamurai, Panñimurai, Kaikkōlar and the balance among the twelve Nirvāham. The donor’s quarter share went to the donor. The inscription stands damaged in parts and complete information is therefore not available. The existing practice will be fully detailed in the chapter dealing with “prasadams.”

But it was not always the case that the three-quarters share was appropriated for distribution in Sandhi Adaippu. There are instances which go to show that the three-quarters share was perhaps distributed to pilgrims. The usual wording of the inscription would be, with reference to the disposal of the three-quarter share of the prasadams “we will receive them at Sandhi” ஓர்குபு மண்டலம் மாவுலிருந்து வாசிகுமாரருக்கு உட்கூறு.

PRASADAMS—ARTICLE OF TRADE.

How Prasadams became an article of trade in Tirumala deserves some explanation at length. We have noticed from our inscriptions that in the early days, perhaps even up to the end of the third quarter of the fourteenth century A.D., there was not enough prasadams in the temple to feed the Sthānikas and other casual employees, not to speak of the pilgrims. For the benefit of the last named satrams and mathams were established, and a portion of the donor’s quarter share was used there to feed the pilgrims

¹ IV, 166, 5—11—1541.
free. After the Sthanattar came into existence about 1390 A.D. and after the preparation of vagai padi (such as atirasams, appams, vaṭai etc.) increased, a portion of the donor’s share was given by the donor for their maintenance or nirvaham. This practice seems to have been started in 1390 A.D. But some of the Sthanattars (Jiyars, Nambimars, Sabhaiyar, Tiru-ninra-ur-Udaiyar) held another status also in the temple as Sthānikas. In the latter capacity they had a share of three-quarter share of every food offering. A clear distinction must be made between Sthānikas and Sthanattars. The former form a group of all the temple employees who were there from long before the advent of the Sthanattar. So some of the Sthanattar secured for themselves prasadams in two capacities.

We also found that the Sthānikas of the Govindarajaswami temple complained to Sri Sāluva Narasingadeva Udaiyār that their emoluments were insufficient for their maintenance and had an edict issued that they may follow the Tirumala Temple practice and distribute among themselves all the three-quarter share of the prasadams offered in the Tirupati Temple. Even before the issue of this edict we found that Tirumalainambi Tōlappar Ayyangar distributed, from out of the donor’s share of 13 appams, 6 appams among the 12 nirvaham of Sthanattar in Tirupati also. From a close study of the inscriptions thereafter, we have had ample reasons to infer that the Sthanattar got demoralised and began to appropriate for themselves and for the vagai people, the entire one-fourth share due to the donor in very many instances. We also noticed how Krishnadēva Mahārāya tried to remedy this state of affairs by making the Tiruppani Bhandārattār act as a check on the vagaries of the Sthanattar. In Achyutaraya Maharaya’s time a further attempt was made by making the donor receive his share himself. This was the rule except in a few cases where the donor (mostly Tirupati merchants who had to be in the good books of the Sthanattar) of his own accord distributed his share between the Sthanattar and Vagai-people; and in some case the Tiruppani Bhandārām also came in for a share. We have also seen that Achyutaraya and some others did not specifically hand over even the three quarters share usually appropriated by the Sthanattar
during Sandhi adaippu. That portion may have been distributed in open assembly or āstānam to bonafide pilgrims and devotees.

Above all we have seen that two very respectable persons, responsible officers of Achyutaraya’s Government, sold their quarter share for valuable consideration to another respectable person who was a poet, philosopher and devotee, who was assigned several villages by Achyutaraya who himself made many valuable endowments and services to the temple and who styled himself “Srimad veda mārga Pratishṭāpanāchārya...”, the upholder and establisher of the vedic religion and particularly Ramanuja’s Siddhantam. He was not a hotel-keeper or sweet-meat seller. But he did represent a class of people who found by experience that temple prasadam is really money and therefore power. He saw how the Nambimars and the Jiyars were drawing to themselves large crowds because they had with them large stocks of cakes (panyāramis), chandanam, Sripādarēnu, betel leaves and nuts, all rendered sacred by having been offered to God. Religious sentiment which became second nature to the devout Hindu attached great value to these. The traffic in these articles of divine relics brought with it very many advantages to the possessor.

But we have not seen so far in these inscriptions any member of an Achāryapurusha family lining himself up with this fraternity. Their article of trade was their ancestry, or pedigree. They would have lost the respect which they commanded from princes and people if they had descended to exchanging prasadams for money. They were therefore mostly poorer than the other classes and we therefore find fewer endowments from them; and even such as were made were for smaller sums or were made by their disciples. Among the Acharyapurushās some members of the Toḷappar family have made large endowments. But these are mostly transfer of grants or gifts made by the kings or feudatory chiefs on some auspicious or inauspicious occasion, (such as an eclipse occurring perhaps on one’s birth star day) to ward off the evil. The Acharyas were not slow to lay such grants and gifts at the feet of Tiruvengada-mudaiyan, and thus avoid the sin of receiving such gifts.
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Temple worship, Acharyapurushas and other acharyas.

We have necessarily to direct our thoughts towards the trend of temple worship—in this temple at any rate—from the days when Sri Álavandar and Sri Ramanuja organised the same (11th Century A.D.) to about the middle of the 16th century A.D. Their aim appears to have been to encourage the Archa form of worship as a necessary preliminary to self-discipline and spiritual culture. To this end a theocracy of Acháryapurushas was created for this temple and they must have been functioning in the earlier days at least as propagandists. They gathered around them a large circle of disciples hereditarily. But what exactly they did in the temple is not mentioned in any of the inscriptions. We get a glimpse of a succession of these men from inscriptions recording their endowments or gifts to the temple and from inscriptions of endowments made by some of their disciples either for the merit of the Acharya or by mentioning them for receipt of a portion or the entire amount of the donor’s quarter share. None of the Acharyapurushas seems to have had a hand in the administration of the temple. Nor do they appear to have been sharers in the three-quarter share of the prasadams reserved for those who were doing the kaïnkaryams. They occupied an honoured position in the temple worship and they obviously went about the country reminding people of the greatness of this temple.

But the great Acharyas who were the propounders of Ramanuja’s philosophy and the cult of temple worship in its present form are nowhere mentioned in our inscriptions directly. Pillai Lokáchárya, Védánta Desika, Manavála Mahámuni and their successors, Adi van Sáthagopa Jiyar, Brahma-tantra swami, and others do not appear to have been recognised by the Sthanattar who administered the temple affairs. There is no inscription singing the glory of any of these, but we find only incidental mention of their names in some inscription or other by an ardent follower of their tenets. On the other hand we found Vijaya Gandagopala’s greatness being magnified many times. The Pandya’s glory was sung in glowing terms and so also the fame of the Yádavaráyas, even when the last of them was fading into silence. Guruparampara accounts tell us stories of Védanta Désika’s miraculous birth, as
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being connected with the disappearance of the inner temple bell. But his visits to Tirumala do not find mention in any inscription. There have been the Vaṇ Saṭhagōpan maṭham and the Pārakāla-swāmi maṭham. There is no record to show when these actually came into existence in Tirumala. The great Madhwa mutt is figured as the gift of charity of a great monarch to the pleading of a sanyasi for some space to found a mutt. We seem to miss the religious spirit in the inscription. It is a matter of doubt whether the temple was really serving as a centre for radiating spiritual culture. While there is much about prasādams, festivals and dancing, there is no sign of a college or synod for religious instruction or research. When one goes to the Kānchipuram Varadaraja swami temple, attention is invited to the part of the temple where Naḍādūr Ammāl was holding his kālakshēpam classes of religious instruction. Srirangam was famous for the great assemblage of learned men during festivals for holding religious discussion. But this most famous temple of ours in Southern India can lay no claim to fostering spiritual culture at any period of its history, if we are to judge by the tenor of our inscriptions.

It may have been the policy to leave religious instructions to the Acharya purushas and the Acharyas who were doing it in their homes and in muṭṭs. The chronology of some of these may be inferred from some of the inscriptions.

Doḍḍayyangar Appai (Doddacharya of Sholinghur) was himself a donor in 1519 A.D.

Koyil Kandāḍai Annan was the ācharya of Periya Kommamman (Queen of Salakaraja Periya Tirumalayya Dēva). His name is found in 9—7—1475 as the Acharya of Amudan Tiruvenkatayya, a donor.

Kandadai Periya Appa’s son was Kandadai Appa and his grandson was Tiruvenkatayyagar. Alvān Koyil Tiruvenkatayyan was the disciple of Appa (1539). Periya Appa’s birth star was Kēṭṭai in Masi month; Appa’s birth star Āvaṇi Bharani. There is perhaps another Kandadai Appa (Acharya of K. K. Ramanuja Jiyar) whose birth star is said to be Makha.
Prativādi Bhayankaram Anna’s son was P. B. Appayyanger; and the latter’s son P. B. Emperumānār Appa whose annual birth star was Vaikasi Puradam. Ėkāki Perumālayyan was the disciple of Emperumanar Appa.

Paravastu Anna’s disciple was the Sattada Sri Vaishnava Ėkāki Pattarpirān Ayyan.

Van Saṭhagōpan Matham comes to notice in 1485—1506; one Tippu Seṭṭī (perhaps a disciple) assigned one atirasam to the matham. Sriman Narayana Jiyar, the disciple of Adi Van Saṭhagōpa Jiyar, appears as a donor. The disciples of this matham made an endowment of 260 panams with the Tiruppani Bhandarattār. Van Sathagopa Jiyar’s birth star is Kettai.

Kōyil Kēḷvi Vaḍa Tiruvenkata Jiyar’s acharya was Tiruvōimoli Perumal Nayinar whose annual birth star is Puraṭṭāsi Dhanishtha. Vada Tiruvenkata Jiyar’s annual birth star is Kārtigai Mrigasira; Parankusa Jiyar’s birth star is Sathabhishak. Alagiya Manavala Jiyar’s (Paramacharya) birth star is Ani Asvini.

Sirrayyanger was the son of Kōmāndūr Tiruvenkata Chakravarti whose annual birth star is Adi Mrigasira.

The following appear as Sottai Tirumalai Nambi Kumara Tattayyanger’s disciples:—Feudatory Chiefs Pinna Bhupala Narasa Nayaka and his brother Kesa Nayaka, and the temple accountants represented by Vignēsvara Sriman. Appa Pillai, (one of the generals of the Vijayanagar Empire under Saluva Narasimha and Krishna Devarayar), Tirumalai Nayakkar; Mannar Pillai; other temple Accountants Kuppa Venkatattarasu, Tiruvenkatavan and some other accountants also; and Panditar Purushottamayyan, Salakaraya Singaraja was the disciple of Kumara Tattayyanger’s son Tirumalai Tattayyanger.

Instances like these go to show that the acharyas did exercise some religious influence over their disciples who were votaries of this temple. The Sthanattar, although some of its members such as the Nambimars and the Jiyers had also religious duties in the temple, seem to have functioned strictly as the secular managers of the temple.
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Iyyunni Appa, we learn, was the temple astrologer for fixing muhurtams. There was also another member Iyyuni Ramayyan, son of Tiruvenkatanatha Bhattar of the same family.

Agreement among cloth merchants and lessees.
IV. 112; 9—10—1538 A.D.

Among the numerous inscriptions there is one of peculiar interest to us. It is on the east base (outer side) right of entrance of the first (inner) gopuram of Sri Govindarajaswami temple in Tirupati and is dated Wednesday, Bahula Dvitiya in Tulā month of the year Vijambi, Krittika nakshatram, Saka 1460 (9—10—1538) during the reign of Sriman Mahāmaṇḍalēsvaram Hariyarāya Vibhāṭa Bhāsekkatappuvarāyaram- ganda Mūvarāya-ganda Pūra Dakshina Paschima Uttara Samudrādhhipati Sri Vira Pratapa Sri Vira Achyutaraya Maharaya. It is an agreement between the cloth and yarn merchants of Tondaimandalam, Puramandalam and Uḷmandalam on one side and the cow holders (lease holders) of Vijayanagaram, Magudhu paṭṭanam, Vidhura paṭṭanam and Pūranapuru on the other. In the weaving of coarse (कृत्सन्धल,广泛应用) cloth on handlooms, the Sadisarakku vaḍam (warp yarn) and the weft (ज्योति) should be in the proportion of 1 to 2 in numbers. Such weaving should be left to the muslim weavers exclusively. For any infringement of this agreement by members of either party, a fine of 12 gold vārahans shall be levied which shall be collected and credited to the Sri Bhanḍāram of Tiruvēngadamuḍaiyān. This was to hold good for all countries south of Tirupati and Conjeevaram.

It may be observed that there was no state interference in arriving at this agreement and that the agency for enforcing strict compliance and for collecting and crediting the fine to Sri Bhandaram was the assembly of the merchants only.

This inscription throws some light on the concern of the Hindus for the welfare of their fellowmen, the muslim converts. It also shows that the merchants had full faith in the organising capacity and commercial honesty of their own assembly to enforce the terms of the agreement. This was the state of affairs just about
400 years ago. The merchants were proud of the prāṣasti of their sovereign and the inscription gives it in full.

Another fact which we have to note is that neither Achyutaraya Maharaya, nor his Queen Varadaji Amman made any endowments to the temple of Sri Govindaraja; nor have they shown any zeal for the temples of Sri Ramanuja in Tirumala and in Tirupati. Their endowments like those of Krishnadevarāya have all been for Sri Venkatesa’s temple. A close reading of the inscriptions IV, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 54, 58, 123 and 29 will make this clear. The Devasthanam epigraphist presumes that IV, 97 refers to an Endowment by Queen Varadaji Amman. It is an incomplete inscription and the endowment was made by someone in the name of Varadaji amman “இரவன்கு மந்திரி ஓவிய அம்மன் எழுத்து கையேற்றியார்.” The wording in IV, 29 (which is an endowment by the queen) is அம்மன் ஆதிபத்திரிக் கம்பிகையில் கன எழுத்து அம்மன் ஆசம் கையேற்றியார் (‘To Varadaji devi amman the queen consort of Achyutaraya Maharayar, we the Sthanattar of Tirumalai...’). Inscription IV, 97 however records something done in her name (or for her merit). The same inscription includes another item of endowment by one Villiyar in para 35 of the inscription. This Villiyar is probably the son of the temple accountant Venkatatturaivar and he made an endowment of 200 panam for some festival on the Kanu festival day in a mantapam constructed by him on the bank of the Govinda Pushkarini in Tirupati in January 1530. Soon after Achyutarayar acceded the throne, there is nothing unlikely in some of the accountants making an endowment wherein some of the items were in the name of the Queen and for her merit. It was a well-established form of showing loyalty.

We may therefore feel assured that following the footsteps of his predecessor Krishnadeva Rayar, Achyutarayar and his Queen limited their worship to the God in Tirumala and they did not show any attachment to Sri Ramanuja’s temple. Achyutaraya takes care to describe the Tirupati Alvar Tirtham as the Divya Tirtham of Tiruvengadamanudaiyān and makes no reference to Govindarajaswami for whose special service Sri Ramanuja consecrated that waterfall. No wonder that the Srivaishnavas
in their turn let down Achyuta Perumāḷ temple and the agraharam founded by Achyutaraya.

It must be remembered that the temple of Sri Govindaraja was from the beginning entirely affiliated to the Tirumalai Temple and dependent thereon for financial assistance. But devotees from time to time did institute separate endowments for daily Sandhi offering as well as special offerings on tingal divasams and visesha divasams (special festival days) inclusive of the two Brahmotsavams. Having been consecrated by Sri Ramanuja himself, the temple was held in high esteem by all Srivaishnavas. It received special attention during the reign of the Yādvarāyaṇa and Sāluva Narasimha. But Sri Vira Krishnadevaraya did not extend his royal patronage. There were however a few officers of his who made endowments in its favour. Taking only the daily sandhi offering endowments into consideration, this temple received endowments for 21 tirupponakams during Krishnaraya’s period, while the Tirumalai temple received 129 Tirupponakams. The panyārams are not taken for purposes of comparisons, as in fact Govindaraja got nothing excepting during the Visesha divasams. Mannar Pillai seems to be the only officer, who made an endowment of one Tirupponakam. All the other offerings were by private devotees including the one by Narayana Jiyar

During Achyutaraya’s reign, there was the same indifferent attitude. Sri Govindarajaswami secured only 23 tirupponakams and one atirasam daily, while the Tirumalai temple got 276 tirupponakams, 3 atirasams, 3 vadai, 3 dosai, 1 sidai, 1 sukhiyan etc. The offerings on days of tingal and visesha divasams are not considered here, as they are too numerous to go into a summary. Among the officers of the State the two who contributed to Sri Govindaraja temple are, Rāyasam Timmarasar, (16 tirupponakam and one atirasam) and Perungonḍai Virappannan (one tirupponakam daily). The others were all private donors.

As for the temples of Sri Ramanuja and the Āḻvārs, royal patronage was nil. The officers followed suit. But the Sri Vaishnava devotees as a class celebrated the Adhyayanotsavam of Sri Ramanuja and the Āḻvārs in a befitting manner. The endowment
made by Paradēsi Tiruvēnkatayyan describes in detail the manner of the celebration. It is rather strange that Sri Vira Achyutarayar, who was so prompt in reconstructing the Āḻvār Tiratham in a befitting manner, should have failed to extend his patronage to the festivals of the Āḻvārs and Sri Ramanuja. Nothing but the want of zeal on the part of the Srivaishnavas of Tirupati,—no doubt justifiable from their point of view—could account for the sorry fate of Achyutaperumal temple and the agraharam in Tirupati and the Achyutarāyan Kōnēri and manatapams in Tirumala, which have now completely vanished. The reaction of the local residents showed itself in greater attachment to the temple of Sri Govindaraja and to the celebration of the Adhyayanotsavams. We will see more of this in Sri Sadasivarayar’s reign.

Achyutaraya was certainly a staunch and sincere worshipper of Vishnu, particularly Tiruvēnradamuḍaiyān. But he failed to recognise that a temple consecrated by himself cannot flourish when in the same place there is a more ancient temple consecrated by Sri Ramanuja, wherein the Deity installed was one with a long tradition behind, dating to the Chola period. Nor was he able to realise the foolishness of creating a new Pushkarini in Tirumala to compete with the Swami Pushkarini which had all the ancient traditions behind it. When he practically pushed aside the archaka who had an Agamic halo around him and performed the archana himself every Hindu accustomed to pay unquestioning obedience to the rules and procedure enjoined in the Agamas would have set him down for an eccentric, if not an arrogant ruler.
ANNEXURE TO CHAPTER XIX.

(Vide page 486)

ADAIPPAM BAIYAPPA NAYAKKAR. Son of Timmappa Nayakkar, paid 15000 Panams on 16—1—1537 and another sum of 630 panams on 6—9—1538 for offering in all 300 appa padi a year and 9 atirasam padi, 309 palams of chandanam, 15450 areca nuts and 30900 betel leaves. The atirasam padis were to be offered in his own mantapam. He had already made an endowment of 53320 panams on 9—11—1535 and (perhaps another 9000 panams) on 16—4—1519 the two together being for 26 Tirupponakam daily.

PERIYA TIMMAPPAN AND CHINNA RAMAPPAN, sons of Basava Nayakkar endowed 15000 panams for a series of food offerings among which the main item is 117 appa padi to be offered during 9 Brahmostsavams at the rate of one appa padi on each of the 13 days of the Brahmostsavam in his own mantapam in Narasā Nāyakkar Street, Tirumala.

DALAVAY TIMMARASAYYAR (Commander of the Chandragiri Forces), not only paid 15000 panams, but also endowed Samapuram Tinnai village with an annual income of 150 Rekhai Pon for food offerings, chief among which are 117 appapadi, during 9 Brahmostsavams in his own mantapam in Narasā Nayakkar Street.

Similarly, LEPAKSHI VIRAPPANNAGAL endowed 1500 panams for food offerings, 117 appa padi being in his own mantapam in Narasā Nāyakkar Street;

and ANGARAJA NAGAPPAYYAR, 15000 panams, chief item of offering being 117 appa padi during the 9 Brahmostsavams in his mantapam in Narasā Nayakkar Street;

SĀLAKAYADEVA SINGARĀJA endowed 15000 panam for offering 300 appa padi in the year, the beneficiary of the donor's share being his āchārya Kumāra Tāttayyangar. He had already
endowed a similar 15000 panams on 12-1-1537, donor’s share to be given to his sisters’ (Queen) acharya.

It will be noticed that there were at least 4 mantapams constructed by the officers in Narasā Nayakkar Street. And there were as many as twelve endowments each of the value of 15000 panams by Achyutarayar's officers for food offerings whether on the Koneri bank or in Narasā Nayakkar Street. They were all between the years 1537 and 1542 A.D. The natural inference would be that they were made to please Achyutadevaraya.

The occasions on which the food offerings were made were practically the same.

117 appa padi (on 13 days of each of the 9 Brahmotsavams)

9 atirasā padi on one day of each:
4 appa padi on certain car festivals of "
5 " on 5 days of Anna-Unjal Tirunal
5 " on 5 days of Pavitrotsavam:
1 " on Sahasra Kalasabhishekam day.
5 appa padi on Vasantotsavam days.
20 appa padi on 20 days of summer festival.
9 " on 9 Floating festival days.
25 " on 25 AdhyayantoSavam days.
12 " on 12 Māsa Sankrantis.
25 " on 25 Ekadasis of the year.
12 " on 12 new moon days.
12 " on 12 full moon days.
13 " on 13 Mrigasira days.
13 " on 13 Punarvasu days.
13 " on 13 Uttiram days.
1 " on Srijayanti day.
1 " on Uri-adi day.
1 " on Arpasi Pūrādam day.
1 " on Hunting Festival.
1 " on Sri Rama Navami.

300 appa padis Total.
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Some add 1 appa padi on Uttāna Ekadasi day, 3 appa padi on Sri Ramanuja’s Adhyayanotsavam, 1 on Mannasamudram festival and 1 on Vanni Maram day.

It looks as if there was a pre-arranged list by the Sthanattar to whom the money was paid as a matter of routine or necessity. We have to entertain this suspicion because the Yugādi and Deepavali festivals stand omitted. Vyasa Tirtha Sri Pada Udaiyai did not fail to include these two festivals so essential for those who observe the Luni-Solar Calendar, which the Vijayanagar Kings followed.

Villages endowed, Krishna’s time.

BY OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Rekkai Pon year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kondamaraju</td>
<td>Mulumudi 1519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saluva Timmarasa</td>
<td>Parantalur 1512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saluva Govindaraya</td>
<td>Melpadi 1522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rama Nayakkar</td>
<td>Sengodipalli 1512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appa Pillai</td>
<td>Virakampanallur 1511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udigum Ellappa Nayakkar</td>
<td>Karralalpatu 1300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nelvay 1516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kollidumbai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trymbaka deva</td>
<td>Morandai 1517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subudhi Ramadasar</td>
<td>Tandalam 1521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambikamudusila</td>
<td>Tadapalam 1521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Officers 11 villages for offering daily 64 tirupponakam, 2 appa padis, 3 atirasa padi etc.

BY OTHERS

Kandadai Madhava ayyangar 1630 kuli of wet land. 1520
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**BY OTHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village.</th>
<th>year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tivalaipundi</td>
<td>1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangalapudi</td>
<td>1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanumani gunta</td>
<td>1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlampudi</td>
<td>1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintayapalli</td>
<td>1517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pūtalapaṭṭu lands</td>
<td>1527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 17 villages, 1630 kuli of lands Pūtalapaṭṭu lands Annual Income about 300 R.P. yearly.

Total by officers and others = 1600 R.P. yearly.

**KRISHNADEVARAYA’S:**—Tāllapākkam, Pirāḍam, Dārattur, Muḍiyūr Satrapaḍi, Turaiyūr and 1/2 of Kaḍaikkūttanpaḍi, also Pērayam during Purattasi Brahmostavam. These were for offering daily 62 tirupponakam, 8 akkali mandai, 2 appa padi, 2 atirasa padi, 5 palams Chandanam, 300 areca nuts, and 600 betel leaves. Value of property $62 \times 1500 = 93,000$ panams.

**Villages endowed in Achyuta’s time.**

**BY OFFICERS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village.</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>R.P. yearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tāmarapakkam</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samapuram</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**BY OFFICERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Probably) Achyutaraya’s orders (for 8 appa padi yearly)</th>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>R.P. yearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penugondai</td>
<td>Mallapuram</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virappannan</td>
<td>Pāsigalapād</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāyasam Timmarasayya</td>
<td>Chirāla, Peralā &amp; Anḍupalle</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saluva Govindaraja (for 2 tirupponakam)</td>
<td>Village name not given (say)</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellappayyan</td>
<td>Rathagevalli</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uttannapalli</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(For 18 tirupponakam, Total 300 R.P.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Villages by officers—Yearly say</td>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BY OTHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tallapakkam P. Tirumalai Ayyangar</th>
<th>Sōmayajulapalli, Rayalapudi, Tippanapalli, Kaṭṭamavaripalli and one half of Erraguntayapalli</th>
<th>1530</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(for offering daily 4 tirupponakam and 365 atirasa padi in the year and daily 150 areca nuts, 300 betel leaves and 2 palams of chandanam.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallapakkam P. Tirumalai Ayyangar</td>
<td>Pūndi and Sangamakkōtai villages worth 1000 Rekhai pon (10000 panam)</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(for offering daily 40 tirupponakam, 1 atirasa padi, 2 palams perfumed chan-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>R.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tallapakkam P. Tirumalai Ayyangar</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maruvakarai &amp; Kāvanur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for daily one Kandā sarkarai and sambāra Elpodi)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallapakkam P. Tirumalai Ayyangar</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallipuram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for daily one godhumai tiruppaniyaram)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallapakkam P. Tirumalai Ayyangar</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuppam and Kilanguirram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for daily 4 Tirupponakam and 126 more in a year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yândalur Venkatadri</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayyan village (no name)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for 24 tirupponakam and 24 nāyaka taligai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidyarthi Krishnayya</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 kuli wet land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sālaipakkam Naga Ayyar</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muttukur village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for 7 tirupponakam daily)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trīvedi Mahadeva Somayaji</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaḷitiraṭṭī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for 14 tirupponakam daily)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yândalur Malayapparāyan</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panchavanmadevi village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for one tirupponakam daily)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 833
**HISTORY OF TIRUPATI**

**BY OTHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>R.P. yearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achyutarayapuram</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for 3 tirupponakam daily)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gollapalli</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for 8 tirupponakam daily)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-village</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perumālpalli</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penniyapalli</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittaru</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marumani Gaundapuram</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for 20 tirupponakam daily)</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ellāppillai**

4000 kuli wet land worth 2500 panams for one tirupponakam daily.

_Total:_—22½ villages + 4020 kuli of land; income yearly say, 2300 Rekhai Pon.

Approximate total income per year from landed property gifted during Achyuta’s period by officers as well as others, 32½ villages + 4020 kuli of wet land.

Annual income .. 3600 Rekhai pon.
CHAPTER XX

SADASIVARAYA MAHARAYA’S PERIOD.

The exact date of commencement of Sadāsivarāya Maharaya’s reign is not definitely known. The Devasthanam’s report quotes from the Archaeological Department’s Annual Report for 1908—19 (page 193) by the Director-General of Archaeological Survey and states that Sadasivaraya was nominated as co-regent of Achyutaraya in 1537. But there is no indication in the Devasthanam inscriptions to support this view. The last available date in our inscriptions for Achyutaraya’s reign is 23—3—1542. On that date one Malai Perumāl, a disciple of Sri Vaṇ Saṭṭhagōpa Jiyar, made an endowment of 1600 panams for some appa paḍi offerings on behalf of himself and of his Acharya. There are also two other inscriptions both of the same date viz., 23—2—1542 to be considered in this connection. They were both executed just one month previously. One2 records an endowment by Penugonḍa Virappanṅagal, son of Lēpakshi Nandi Lakkiṣetti and the other3 by one Appayyan. Virappanṅagal’s endowment of 600 Rēkhāi Pon (6000 panams) does not mention the name of the ruling monarch. Knowing, as we do, that Virappanṅagal was closely connected with and was largely dependent on the King for his prosperity during Achyutaraya’s reign it is rather strange that the King’s name should be omitted in this inscription of 23rd February 1542. In an endowment made by him on 27—1—1541 (one year before) of 15000 panams the name of Achyutaraya is mentioned as Emperor.4 But on the same day, i.e., 23—2—1542 Appayyan did not fail to have it recorded that his endowment of 300 panams was made in Achyutaraya’s reign. Yet another inscription dated5 about a fortnight prior to that of Virappanṅan, recording an endowment of 15000 panams by Singaraja, son of Sālakayyadeva Maharaya, mentions the name

1. IV. 174. 23–3–1542: 2. IV. 172. 3. IV, 173
4. IV. 158 5. IV, 170. 20–2–1542.
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and the prasasti of the monarch as Achyutaraya. We are aware that the Sālaka family members were the de facto rulers in Achyutaraya’s reign.

We however find that the name of Sadāsivarāya is mentioned as the Emperor in some earlier inscriptions. One of these inscriptions records an endowment by one Sri Rama Bhaṭṭar, son of Yāndalūr Tirumalai Jōyar and shows that on that date, 21—7—1541, Sadasiva was the ruling sovereign. The prasasti and name as given there are “Sriman Mahārājaḍhirāja Rāja paramēsvara Sri Vira pratāpa Sri Vira Sadāsiva raya when ruling the earth. “सदासिवराय राजा प्रतापाचार्य भारतराजस्वायतेः...”. This Tirumalai Josyar was presumably the Tirumalai Temple astrologer. There is another son of his named Venkaṭādri Ayyan, who made an endowment, wherein Achyutaraya is mentioned to be the ruling monarch. When we find his brother Sri Rama Bhattar stating on 21—7—1541 that Sadasivaraya was the ruling monarch, we have to conclude that Sadasivaraya was the monarch on that date. Köyil Kēlvi Jiyar (presumably Yatiraja Jiyar) in an endowment records that Sadāsivarāya was the ruling monarch. But one Gangu Reddi, son of Bhasava Reddi of Ógamapādi village, who made an endowment of 10,080 panam on 11—9—1542 does not mention the name of the King at the time. The same Gangu Reddi made an endowment on 19—2—1525 and on that occasion mentioned in full the name of the ruler at the time, Achyutaraya. The omission of the ruler’s name in the endowment of September 1542 A.D. might not have been unintentional. It may be due to the doubt whether Achyutaraya’s son or Sadasivarāya was the Emperor.

Two temple accountants viz., Kuppa Venkatattarasu and Tiruvannantālvār Kuppayyan in their endowments (V. 5 and 6) dated 5th February and 16th February 1543 mention Sadasivaraya as the ruling sovereign. All inscriptions thereafter mention the name of Sadasivaraya.

It may therefore be surmised that between 21—7—1541 and 11—9—1542, there were some succession disputes. The Tirupati

1. V. 1. 2. IV. 115, 24-11-1538; 3. V. 2. 27-1-1542
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and Tirumala inscriptions throw no light on this, nor would the matter have been of great importance to the Sthanattar of the temple. We have to look at it from one point of view only. The Sthanattar seem to have been indifferent, or preferred to be neutral so far as the rival claims were concerned. They could not have done better when such men as Penugonda Virappan nan and Ògam-pādi Gangu Reddi preferred not to name anybody as the emperor. It was only in 1543 (February) that the accountants of the Tirumala Temple considered it desirable and safe to mention the name of Sadasivarāya as Emperor. No special favours were shown by Achyutaraya to the Sthanattar and to the local Srivaishnavas to endear him to them. They seem to have preferred to mention in the inscriptions the name which the donors chose or to mention none.

Another point worthy of note is that the endowment made by Singaraja already referred to was the last endowment made by a member of the Salakarāja family. After the unsuccessful attempt made by Salakaraja Timmaraja and his brother to usurp the throne in the name of Achyutaraya’s young son, Venkatadri, (whom Timmaraja himself is supposed to have killed later), the name of no member of this family appears as donor or as beneficiary among the inscriptions of the Devasthanam.

It is an assured fact that from February 1543 Sadasivaraya was the undisputed successor to the throne of Vijayanagar. It seems also to be accepted of all hands that Aravīti Aliya Rāmarāja (son-in-law of Krishnadevaraya) and his younger brother Tirumalaraṇja, were the de facto rulers as they were mainly responsible for securing the throne for Sadasivaraya. If during Achyutaraya’s reign the Sālaka family was the power behind the throne, the Aravīdu family may be said to have snatched that power from them by placing Sadāsiva on the throne. Whatever might have been said by certain poets unfavourable to Ramaraja, our inscriptions show that so far as the temple is concerned he and the other members of the Aravīdu family have been greater benefactors than the Salaka family.
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The total benefactions made by the members of the Salaka family amounted to only 34,600 panams and out of this the share of Singarāja alone was 30000 panams. No member of the Aravidu dynasty made any endowment during Achyuta’s reign, (except 531 Rekhai-Pon made in the name of one Aravidu Lakshmiamman). During Sadasivaraya’s reign no member of the Sālakam family made any endowments. But those made by the Aravidu family were substantial and numerous as will be shown later. Aliya Ramaraja and one Konḍarāja felt that it was the moral responsibility of the rulers to make adequate provision for the feeding of the pilgrims coming to the temple. They therefore made arrangements for this on a scale which was unprecedented in the history of the Devasthanam. The inscriptions show that although Sadasivaraya never took the initiative, he was not slow to approve of Ramaraja’s arrangements.

It is interesting to note that the endowments show that the country was then passing through an economic crisis and that money was scarce, or perhaps was shy to come out owing to fear of impending political troubles which ended in the disastrous battle of Tālikota or Rākhasatagdi.

The most noteworthy point about Sadāsivarāya Maharaya is that he did not directly make a single endowment large or small, for any of the temples of this Devasthanam. It cannot however be said that he was not as great a devotee of Tiruvengaḍamuḍaiyān as any of the others. He seems to have visited Tirumala only once, that is, on a Makara Sankramanam day, 27—12—1553 (Vide V. 154; 2—7—1554). On this occasion, he made a free grant in favour of Konḍarāja’s Nammālvār Ramanujakūtām in Tirupati of the income from 12 kinds of taxes in sixteen sirmais or provinces. He also made grants of villages to several deserving persons who in their turn endowed them for charities in the Tirumalai temples. There can therefore be no doubt about his religious temperament. We may then try to see why he failed to make any direct endowment. Perhaps the circumstances under which he became the Emperor account for this. From Firishta’s account of the events which happened at the time of the civil war
between Sālakarāja Timmaraja and Aravidu Aliya Ramaraja, in which the former backed the claims of Venkaṭādri, the young son of Achyutarāya and the latter took up the cause of Sadāsivaraya, we learn that Sālakarāja summoned to his aid the common enemy, Adil Shah of Bijapur, but that Ramaraja succeeded in inducing Sālakarāja to send him back to Bijapur by paying 56 lakhs of Rekhāi pon (2 million sterling). It is therefore likely that when Sadāsivaraya ultimately found himself firmly established on the throne, the treasury was much depleted, if not altogether empty. He must have been aware that Krishnadevarāya showered on the Deity on each of two occasions, thirty thousand gold varahans. He must also have known that his gifts of jewels, vessels etc., were befitting the emperor of Vijayanagar. He must likewise have known that Achyutarāya spent money lavishly on this temple by constructing in Tirumala a pushkarini and a number of pavilions on its bank and a new Achyuta Perumal temple and agraharam in Tirupati besides making improvements to the Āḻvār Tirtham. It would no doubt have been painful to him that he could not follow their example. Although his reign was very much longer than those of his predecessors, he seems to have made only one pilgrimage to the temple in Tirumala. Even on this occasion, he does not seem to have been in a position to make gifts of jewels or any large sum of money to the temple. All that he could do was to make a perpetual grant of a number of taxes as and when they came to be collected; and this he did not in favour of the temple, but in favour of the Ramanujakutam in Tirupati. Therein by this grant about 1500 pilgrims would have been fed daily with a sumptuous meal. It would thus seem that it was not the want of will but the want of money which made Sadasivaraya pay but one pilgrimage to the temple and even on this occasion to act in a humble manner. But we find his adherents of the Aravidu family and quite an army of religiously minded men who were benefited by his munificence filling up the gap.

It must be admitted that the explanation given above may not account sufficiently for Sadāsivaraya's failure to make endowments to the temple in his name. It was customary for the Hindu rulers including the Vijayanagar Emperors, soon after their accession
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to the throne to make an endowment for a Sandhi offering called 'vasaram' for Tiruvengalanātha. We have thus the Narayanan Sandhi (Yadavaraya's), Sāluva Narasinga's Sandhi, Bukkarāyān Sandhi, Krishnadēvarāyan Sandhi, and Acliyutarayan Sandhi. Some of these were large endowments while others were comparatively small. In the name of Sadasivaraya however, we do not find an endowment made for any Sandhi offering. It could not be accounted for merely on the score of a depleted treasury. He ascended the throne in 1542 or 1543 and was perhaps co-regent with Acliyutaraya for some years before that. He visited Tirumala on 28th December 1553 on Makara Sankramanam day, that is, ten years after his accession. On 3—2—1554 Aliya Ramayadēva Maharaja executed (in an inscription) a charity with libations of water on the banks of the Svāmi Pushkarini in Tirumala by which two prasadams and four appams from out of the donor's share of what is known as Acliyutarayar Sandhi, were to be daily handed over to Vaikhanasa Archaka Srinivasan and some others residing on the north bank of the Pushkarini. This was ordered in fulfilment of the dhāra pūrvaka dānam made by Sadasivaraya. We have to infer that the occasion was his visit to Tirumala in December 1553. If Sadasivaraya had any vasaram instituted in his own name Ramaraja would not have ordered the charity to be met from Acliyutaraya's vasaram. It is usual for the Archakas and other permanent servants of the temple to approach important personages coming on pilgrimage for some mark of favour. When such personages make endowments for food offerings it is also usual for them to hand over a portion or even the entire quantity of the donor's share of the offerings to the applicants. It must have been in some such manner that the gift of a portion of Acliyutaraya's share of his Sandhi offering was made over to the Archakas on this occasion. Judging from our inscriptions, the largest number of grants of villages to deserving men was made during Sadasivaraya's reign. But he did not endow a single village to the temple nor even to the archakas who approached him. The latter would very much have liked that Sadāsivaraya should make a large endowment of Sandhi offerings with provision for the donor's share being made over to them. They would have preferred assignment of prasādams to assignment of a village-
There was always the difficulty in collecting rents or lease amounts from villages. But prasādams could always be sold at the door of the temple itself.

But Sadasivaraya seems to have thought otherwise. That he was liberal can be seen from his giving away a large number of taxes collected from sixteen different provinces to Konḍarāja’s Ramanujakutam. Other considerations must have weighed with him in determining his attitude in the matter. Out of every Sandhi offering, three-fourths share was appropriated by the temple establishment. It is nowhere stated whether any part of this was ever distributed free to the pilgrims. With his knowledge of the administration he must have known that even the quarter share of the donor ultimately went partly into the hands of the Nirvāham and the Vagai people either as outright gift made by the donor or by sale and what was left went into the hands of those who exploited others in the name of religion. He must have known that a bonafide pilgrim had to purchase his prasadam at the temple gate from the leaseholders of prasadams, or from quasi-religious managers of mathams and choultries, who while supplying prasadams free, extracted kānukas and presents from those to whom they gave the prasadams. Aravidu Kōnēṭiraja Konḍaraja saw through this and with a view to alleviating the sufferings of the pilgrims started a Ramanujakūtam in Tirupati where it was more needed than in Tirumala. In the latter place, prasadam could be purchased. But in Tirupati it could not be had even for money. There were no hotels in those days. There was also, the difficulty of inducing orthodox people, Brahmins in particular, to partake of mass preparation and distribution of food known as saṅghānnam. To overcome this objection Konḍarāja first built a Nammālvār Temple in Sri Bhashyakār Street, (the present G. North Mada Street, Tirupati) and as an adjunct thereto, a free feeding house for Srivaishnava pilgrims. And as the manager of the institution had to be one who could freely enter the kitchen and whose sight or touch of any article of food would not be taken objection to by even the most orthodox Brahmin, he appointed to this office one Soṭṭai Tirumala Nambi Srirama Ayyangar, a junior member of the First Acharyā purusha
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family attached to the temples in Tirumala and Tirupati. No part of the three-quarter share, not even the ‘Aḷḷḷu’ of the prasadams offered to the Deity in Nāmālvār temple, was to be appropriated by anybody. Nor was the quarter share to be appropriated by the donor. The entire quantity of 125 taligai which was enough to feed about 1200 Srivaishnavas was to be utilised for feeding such pilgrims. The food was likewise to be prepared with great care and samba rice was used. Four kinds of vegetables, green gram, ghee, curds and fruits were to be served. Payasam was to be served on all the 13 Visakha Nakshatrams in a year; gingelly oil and soap-nut powder were to be supplied for oil bath on all the 53 Saturdays in the year. Tāmbūlam and chandanam were also served on all days.

The Ramanujakutam servants were well paid. There were 15 cooks who were paid 180 R.P. yearly. The archaka for the Nāmālvār Temple was a paid servant. Store-keeper, watchman, those who supervised the feeding, Brahmmins who supplied drinking water, the accountants and even the Adhikari were all paid servants. The entire cost of this establishment was 3365 panams yearly and the total annual expenditure was 57130 panams. The first Kartar (dharmakarta) was Srirama Ayyangar. Aravidu Vōperlīja Kondarāja made for this an endowment of ten villages with an annual income of 5713 Rekhai Pon (Tarkolam, Tāyanūr, Malaiyanūr, Āttiyūr, Āsūr, Palandai, Mullappaṭṭu, Kūdaippakkam. Mayyūr and Toruppādu). It may be remembered that there was already in Tirupati near the Alvar Tirtam a Nāmālvār Temple. Aravidu Kondaraja seems to have felt the necessity of constructing another temple in Tirupati near the Govindaraja temple and to make such arrangements as to make the prasadams in the Ramanujakutam acceptable to all Srivaishnavas going on pilgrimage to Tirumala. It was because all temple prasadams whatever may be the quantity, were being exploited by the temple employees, that this Ramanujakutam seems to have been established. It was quite unlike the Ramanujakutam of Śāluva Narasingadeva and its arrangements were different from those which Krishnadevaraya and the others made for feeding the pilgrims. The idea may have emanated from the Achāryapurushās, who were free
from any self-interest in the prasadam distribution of the temples. They have always been entitled to a pidades or handful, if present in person and that too on occasions when the distribution was made in an Asthanam or durbar. This was why one of their number was made the Kartar of the new institution.

That this arrangement was approved by Aliya Ramaraja (the man behind the throne) and by the Emperor Sadasivaraya himself, can be seen from a reading of inscriptions No. 155 and 154 of Vol. V. The latter has been already referred to and it states how twelve kinds of taxes from 16 provinces were ordered to be handed over to the Ramanujakutam. It was the Emperor’s order to the Sthanattar of the Temple to see that the collections were used for the Ramanujakutam only. We are however not told what these taxes amounted to every year.

In November of the same year 1554 A.D. Aliya Rama Raja made an endowment of 4 villages, (Singalabhavi in Raichur Sirmal, Valagolil in Mudgal, Yaralachchi and Makkalipatru in Periyapalayam Sirmalai) with an annual income of 4000 Rekhai Pon for a daily sandhi offering of 200 Vejrai tirupponakams to Tiruvengalanatha to be made soon after the Alagappiranar Tirumangalanam in the morning (V. 153). He ordered that the donor’s share of 50 Tirupponakams or pongal taligai should be handed over to the Tirupati Nammalvar Ramanujakutam by adjustment with the offerings made in Govindaraja’s temple. This additional quantity of 50 tirupponakams would have fed perhaps 500 more pilgrims daily. But we may ask why Aliya Ramaraja made provision for perhaps the largest single Sandhi offering in his own name, and not for the merit of Sadasivaraya. He could as well have augmented Kondaraja’s 125 tirupponakams with his own 200 tirupponakams instead of handing over only the donor’s share of fifty. The reason may be this, Sadasivaraya’s endowment of the taxes to the Ramanujakutam was made in December 1553. The Sthanattar would naturally have represented to Aliya Ramaraja that it was unfair to overlook the Temple in Tirumala where every Emperor had made provision for an avasaram. Knowing perhaps full well Sadasivaraya’s views on this matter, Aliya Rama-
raja would have made the endowment of 200 tirupponakam in November 1554 in his own name. In this connection we may note that Aliya Ramaraja made an endowment (V. 29) on 19–1–1545 (two years after Sadasivaraya become Emperor) by the grant of Pudupaţtu village in Ārya Sirmai with an annual income of 200 Rekhai Pon for the merit (తొట్టు శిష్యానివ్య) of the Emperor Sadasivaraya for certain services being performed in Tirumala and Tirupati Temples, of which the reading of Tiruvenkaṭa Mahātmyam in Tirumala and Tirupati at the time of the Tiru-

Prasadam Lessees—Prasadakkara Mahamedangal.

It was mentioned above that pilgrims had to purchase the prasadams required by them from lessees who got their supply from the Sthanattar and others by a system of regular annual lease. That such a system was in vogue is evident from inscription No. 88, Vol. V. dated 6—2—1547. The names of as many as eleven lessees are mentioned therein. They do not seem to have been confined to any one particular caste or sect. Some also seem to have been richer than the others. But all of them seem to have considered themselves as belong to a fraternity with common interests to safeguard, and were known as Prasādakkārar Mahā-

List of Prasadakkara.

KUNJAPPUR SRINIVASAN son of Nallān was the most prominent of them. He contributed 3590 panams while the other ten contributed from 60 panams (the lowest by one Nayinar) and 400 panams (by Sevvu Nayakkar). Their names and their caste give an idea of the kind of persons who plied this trade.
1. Kunjappur Srinivasan: He might have been a Brahmin.
2. Veṭṭamaru Venkatatturaivar Annan: He too might have been a Brahmin.
3. Anpanār Pērāyiram alias Settalur Kuppan: He might have been a Brahmin.
4. Nayinar, son of Koneri Appan of Tanjaneri Kandāḍai family: He was also a Brahmin.
5. Nāchchi Annan, Bhasvayyan (or Sevayyan) son of Tiruvenkata Setti: He was a Trai-varnika.
7. Nāchchān, son of Tondi Angandai: He was a Kaikkolar.
10. Vangāpura Narayana Setti Narayanan: He was a Trai-varnika of Tirupati.
11. Panchalattar are the smiths of Tirupati.

Out of their earnings they contributed the funds required for the celebration of certain festivals yearly for Viṭṭalesvarapperumāl and Govindarajswami in Tirupati.

The sale of prasadams directly or through lessees was thus a recognised source of income for the temple servants. Sadasivaraya does not appear to have interfered with this practice.
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Temple palanquin and daily prasadams gifted away to a dancing girl Tiruvenkata Manikkam.

There was also another evil which although it may have been in vogue from more ancient times, reached its climax in Sadasivaraya’s reign. This is the prominence which the sānis (dancing girls) gained in the temple on account of their skill in Bharata Nātya. It was already mentioned that one Tiruvenkata Mānikkam was marked for exceptional honours by the Sthanattar under the influence of Poṭlapāti Timmaraja (the local chief). She was not only given the very Dandigai (or palanquin) in temple use but in addition was allotted daily one taligai of prasadam, without any allu or alivu being appropriated by the archakas and cooks in Tirumala and one taligai likewise in Tirupati as a free gift for her and for her descendants in perpetuity. It was also ordered that the Prasadams should be given after the first bell and that the Tirupati prasadam should be delivered in her house. This happened about 3 years after Sadasivaraya’s accession to the throne, and is recorded as a Dharmasasanām (V. 74; 23—7—1546). How this act, whatever the merits and character of the damsel might have been, was received by Sadāsivaraya, we are not in a position to know. But from the fact that this damsel does not figure in any of the subsequent inscriptions, and that except for an endowment made by her sister, Lingāsāni on 23—3—1546, these sanis as a class disappear from the temple inscriptions, we may perhaps infer that it was Sadāsivaraya who ordered their removal from the temple. Sadasivaraya’s standard of moral conduct thus appears to have been of a higher order than that of Achyutaraya. But dancing girls seem to have continued to be attached to some other temples in Tirupati. For we hear in an inscription dated 30—1—1563 that one Sevvusāni described herself as an Emperumānadiyar of Tirupati.

This incident deserves special attention in these days when some of the great protagonists of Bharata Natya are agitating for its revival in temples. They are not content with the exhibition of their skill by artistes on the stage and the cinema. Have our morals far excelled those of our predecessors of the sixteenth century?
SADASIVARAYA MAHARAYA

NEW MINOR TEMPLES AND SHRINES.

During the period covered by Sadasivaraya’s rule, particularly between 1542 and 1550 A.D. a large number of minor temples and shrines came into existence in Tirupati. It was an inevitable result of the dissatisfaction felt by the residents of Tirupati at the difficulty experienced in receiving an appreciable part of the donor’s share of the prasadams. We have seen that almost the entire quantity was being taken away by the temple employees and the Sthanattar. So far as the inconvenience experienced by the pilgrims as a result of this practice was concerned, it was to a great extent attempted to be removed by Kondaraja’s Ramanujakűtam. The residents of Tirupati also sought relief for themselves by building new temples and shrines all over and endowing them as far as they could. Some of these are mentioned in our inscriptions.

(a) Govinda Krishna’s Temple. V. 6; 16—2—1543.

The temple accountants resident in Tirupati headed by one Tiruvanantāṉ Kuppayyan constructed a shrine for Govinda-krishna inside a mantapam in Bhashyakar Street on 16—2—1543 and made an endowment of 1500 panams for offering daily one Tirupponakam at the shrine. He also made an endowment (V. 58; 31—10—1545) of 2210 panams for making a night offering. Among the contributors to the endowment was one Bhattar Malaiyannan, alias Vēlaikkadainda Perumāl Dāsar, one of the Sthanattar (and obviously a Sabhaiyar of Tiruchchukarur). Two other contributors were Chēdiyarāyar Emperuman and Tirtar Tirumalai Appar Govindan.

(b) Sri Tiruenkata Gopalakrishnan.

This shrine was also constructed in the same street in a mantapam (V. 82; 25—10—1546). There must have been some reason for the construction of a separate shrine for Tiruenkata Gopalakrishnan in the same street. Perhaps it was the result of some personal misunderstandings. An endowment of 2240 panams for offering one Tirupponakam daily was made for the Deity.
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It was constructed by Sāmiyār Govindan Periya Sōlai. There were also two Ubhayamddars, Tīrtar Tirumalai Appar Govindan and Marappan Bhima Nāthar. It must be noted that in the case of both the temples it was arranged that the prasādams should be prepared in the kitchen of Sri Govindaraja’s temple and brought over to the respective temples for offering.

(c) Tiruvenskatamudaiyan in Jiyar Matham.

Koyil Kelvi Vānamāmalai Ramanuja Jiyar constructed a temple of Tiruvengadamudaiyan in the eastern wing of his matham in Govindarajaswami Sannidhi Street on 13—10—1546 A.D. (V. 80) and endowed it with 2000 panams for daily offerings and lighting.

(d) Sri Vitthalesvarappuṟumal.

V. 66; 25—3—1546 and V. 89; 6—3—1547.

Attached to the temple of Hanumān at the eastern end of Govindaraja Sannidhi Street, was constructed a shrine for Sri Viṭṭhalēsvara Perumal by one Udayagiri Dēvarāya. Bhattar who was the Vāsal Kāryam (Superintendent of the gateway) of Potlapāṭi Siru Timmarāja, son of Aravidu Bukkaraya Timmaraja. On 25—3—1546 (V. 66) he made an endowment of some lands irrigated by a tank called Chennappaḍaiyan-ēri. He granted 4 shares of land in Nedunādu Kuḷattür and 10 Rekhai Pon to be collected from the Komatis and the merchants of Tirupati and from the merchants of Köttapāḷaiyam. The inscription gives details of the services to be performed at this temple daily and as ubhayams. What was the income from the sources mentioned above, we are not told. But the services covered lamp lighting and paruppaviyal offering on almost all the tingal divasams and visesha divasams, and 6 tirupponakam food offering daily. Govindaraja had also some share of these. The prasadams and panyarams were to be distributed freely to the pilgrims. That this temple became popular is seen from three inscriptions of the
very next year. The ones made on 2—2—1547 and 6—2—1547 (V. 87, 88) show that Vithalesvara perumal was provided with offerings on 1st Chittirai and during the Mäsi Brahomsavam and for Pädiyavettai festival. These offerings were made by Sättalur Kuppayyan and by the Prasädaikkara Mahämedangal. The other inscription (V. 89; 6—3—1547) deals entirely with the budget estimate of receipts and expenditure of the temple. The amount of this estimate is stated to be 870 Rekhai Pon. Whether it represented the capital amount subscribed by the merchants of Tirupati, or whether it represented the annual recurring contribution, we are not told. It is however not necessary for our purpose to go into these details. We learn that this small shrine which has gone out of existence now, was at that time made a popular place of worship by the endowments of Udayagiri Devaraya Bhattar.

(e) Lakshminarayana Perumal in Alvar Tirtam
Tirthavari Mantapam. V. 68; 20—6—1547.

Tällapäkkam Periya Tirumalai Ayyangar consecrated a shrine of Lakshminäräyana Perumal in the Tirthaväri mantapam on the bank of the Äḻvär Tirtham on 20—6—1546 and made an endowment of 2300 panam for a food offering of one Tirupponakam daily and a total of 44 more Tirupponakams on certain occasions (visesha divasams etc.). This shrine exists even now.

(f) Sri Janardhana Perumal. (V. 101, 24—11—1547)

In 1547 the Kömatis of Tirupati consecrated an image of Sri Janärdhanasvämi in a temple constructed by them in Kotta-pälayam, a hamlet of Tirupati. We have seen that they had already made contributions to the Vithalesvara Perumal of Dëvaräya Bhattar. They now made an endowment of 1565 panams for Sri Janardhana Svämi raised by subscriptions, for the merit of Potlapati Ramaraja Chinna Timmaraja Maharaja. In addition thereto Aravidu Ramaraja Timmâyadeva Pappu Timmâyya Maharaja also made an endowment grant of Kollur village yielding
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100 Rekhai Pon yearly. With these two endowments provision was made for lighting and for offering two vellai tirupponakam daily in this temple. Provision was also made for tirumanjanam and food offerings on most of the tingal and vishesha divasams.

Thus in the small town of Tirupati as many as five small temples were constructed in the course of 5 or 6 years to satisfy class and communal aspirations. The only purpose they could have served was to make sure that the prasadams offered were distributed in full among the local residents. Incidentally the archaka in charge would have been in a position to earn some money from pilgrims who would have been regularly invited to visit these shrines, a practice which is prevalent even now.

NEW FESTIVALS.

From Saluva Narasimha's days, it was usual for each Emperor to make an endowment for one or more new festivals in Tirumala and in Tirupati. Whether the idea was their own, or whether it was under the inspiration of people in whom the Emperor had some confidence, it is not known. All endowments for food offerings, called Sandhi offerings or offerings on tingal and vishesha divasams, benefited almost exclusively the Sthanattars and the other permanent employees of the temple. But there were also a large number of brahmins and non-brahmins who made a living by doing odd jobs in the temple and by catering to the pilgrims. Festivals gave an opportunity for such men also for deriving some pecuniary benefit by officiating in the Vedic and Agamic rituals connected with the proper conduct of such festivals. A detailed analysis of even one festival will be sufficient to elucidate this statement and to show that these festivals served to reduce economic inequalities to some extent. We shall take the Lakshmidevi mahotsavam instituted by Achyutaraya Maharaya as an example and consider how the bounty of the King's endowment was spent, They were: — Anugraham (blessing); Iyunni Appa (the astrologer who fixes the auspicious moment for commencement); Lakshmi pratima (the image would have been made of gold), Soma Kumbham (perhaps of silver), Soma pratima, female cloth for the Kumbham,
Brahma maṇḍalam and Sesa and other pratimas concomitant thereto; Āchārya, 8 Vitvīks; Bhūdānām; the japams with Sri Sūktam and Kalpā mantrams; Lakshmi Sahasranāmam; Lakshmi Gāyatri; persons connected with the performance of daily hōma and daily archana; 10 Sumangalis; Vedapārāyanam by as many persons as were available; and the reading of Puranas. Besides these there were the daily street processions in connection with which those who made flower garlands for decorating the Utsava-mūrti and Nāchchimars, those who bore torches, the musicians and dancers, and the makers of fire works came in for a share. The potters who supplied mud pots for cooking, the firewood supplier and the cooks received extra remuneration. It may be stated here that no pot is used twice for cooking. New ones are procured every time and immediately after a single use they are broken. Thus by design or accident, festivals helped in the wider distribution of wealth and patronage among the people. The members of the permanent establishment of the temple and a few learned men were benefited by the cash payments under the headings. Tirukkaivalakkam and Tirumunkainikkai. During the reign of Sadāsivaraya (before the battle of Talikota) a larger number of such festivals were started, although the Emperor himself did not institute any in his own name. Very many of the old festivals were also rendered more elaborate in style. Some of these festivals are indicated below:—

(a) One Kālatti Setti, resident of Srinivasapuram, a suburb of Tirupati, made an endowment for a NITYOTSAVAM for Tiruvengadamudaiyan for 30 days during the Tai-Masi month every year (V. 10; 31—12—1543).

(b) Mukkoti Dvādasi in Tirumala was made a grand festival day by Aliya Ramaraja by granting Puduppatṭu village yielding 200 Rekhai Pon for the merit of Sadāsivaraya (V. 29; 19—1—1545; Saka 1466 Krōdhi, 8th day of Makara month, Aśvini nakshattiram).

(c) Vanabhojanam festival was instituted by Tallapakkam Periya Tirumala Ayyangar (V. 47 A; 3—7—1545). This was to be celebrated for Tiruvēṅgamudāiyān on Kārtikai Paurnami day of the year. In connection with this festival we learn the
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interesting fact that Malayappan (the utsavamūrti) halted at the 12 mantapams or pavilions built by the twelve nirvāhams and received food offerings at each of them.

(d) Pallavotsavam (V. 51; 5—7—1545) for Tiruvengadamudaiyān was instituted by Vitthalēsvara Mahāraja. This was to last for five days in the month of Vaikhasi.

(e) Kalyānōtsavam (V. 153; 19—2—1554) was instituted by Tāḷapākkam Tirumala Ayyangar for Tiruvengadamudaiyan. This was celebrated for five days in the month of Panguni. Three villages yielding 620 Rekhai Pon a year were granted for this festival.

(f) Phalōtsavam in Tirumala, Brahmotsavam for Sri Govinda-raja in Tirupati in the month of Māsi, Mārgali Nirāttōtsavam for Andal in Tirupati and Adhyayantotsavam for Tirumalai Udaiyavar and several other minor ubhayams were instituted by Sottai Eṭṭur Tirumalai Nambi Srinivasayyangar. He granted the village of

---

1. (Sottai Eṭṭur Tirumalai nambi) Srinivasa ayyaṅgar is described in this inscription of 1547 A.D. (IV.92) as the son of Sottai Eṭṭur Tirumala nambi Kumāra Tatayaṅgār of Sathāmarāshana gōtram Āpastamba sūtra and yojus Sākha, one of the Tirumalai āchāryapurushas. There is another Eṭṭur Tirumala Kumara Tatachariya ayyaṅ who appears as donor in inscription VII 5 dated 25-9-1583. He is also of the same gōtra Sutra and Sākha as the Kumāra Tatayaṅgār above mentioned. The name of the father of Srinivasa ayyaṅgar is Sottai Eṭṭur Tirumalai nambi Kumara Tataiyaṅgār, achāryapurusha which may be different from Eṭṭur Tirumalai, Kumāra Tatachariya ayyan (not called an achāryapurusha). Tirumalai nambi Kumara Tatayaṅgār comes to notice in our inscriptions as the achārya of two men of the princely order as early as 1475 A.D. He himself made two endowments one in 1485 and the other in 1549 (or 1554, the year is doubtfully recorded). He had two sons, Srinivasa ayyaṅgar being one (perhaps the younger) and Tirumalai Tattayaṅgār the other. Srinivasa ayyaṅgar's endowments are two, one in 1547 and the other in 1562 A.D. Eṭṭur Tirumalai Kumāra Tatachariya ayyan's activities in Kanchipuram are said to commence in 1754 A.D. and extend to about 1516 A.D. It is a strange proposition to state that the person whose activities commenced later in the 1754 A.D. was the father of the person whose activities commenced before 1547 A.D. and in 1562 A.D.

The Devaṭhānam Epigraphist obviously created a confusion for himself by certain false assumptions. There is a Tolappar ayyaṅgar (brother of the above mentioned Sottai Eṭṭur Tirumalai Nambi Kumāra Tattayaṅgār and therefore uncle of Srinivasa ayyaṅgar) who made an endowment (II. 20)
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Periya Ekkalur yielding 2000 Rekhai Pon yearly for these festivals. This village was given to him as a free gift (dhārāpūrvaka dānam). This Srinivasa ayyangar instituted in Tirupati for Sri Govindaraja another Brahmotsavam in the Tamil month of Avaṇī (V. 171: 28—7—1562) and also costly atirasappadi offerings to be made in front of his house in Tirumala on all the festival days, tingal divasams, and visesha divasams occurring in a year. These would cost 900 Rekhai pon per year. The inscription being incomplete other charities included therein are unascertainable. The genealogy of this donor is incorrectly given in the report on the T.T.D. Inscriptions pp. 311 to 313 and on page 34 of Vol. VI Part II. The accompanying foot note gives correct information.

(g) Vasantotsavam for Tiruvengadamudaiyan for 5 days in the month of Masi was instituted by Pendlikoḍuku Timmarājaya.

dated 7–3–1464. He appears again in the inscription of Srinivasa ayyangar's endowment of 1547 A.D, from which it is seen that Tolopper ayyangar's disciples gathered round Srinivasa ayyangar probably because Tolapper had no son, and all show honour to Tolappar in the distribution of the donor's share of prasadams, etc. There is another Tolappachariar who was the grand-father of Tirumalai Kumara Tatchariyyar ayyen and the father of one Ayyāvan ayyan. He is not described as acharapurana. The Epigraphist assumed that the two names Tolappar ayyan and Tolappachariar refer to the same person and that therefore Srinivasa ayyan was the son of Kumara Tatchariyyar ayyan.

The fact is that Kumara Tatchariyyar are collaterals descended from the same ancestor Tirumalai nambi, the former from Pillai Tirumalai nambi the first son and the latter from Purḷān (Tirukkunrakaippirān purḷān) the second son (and ġnanaputra of Sri Kamanuṇa). Soṭṭai Ėṭṭur Tirumalai nambis Kumara Tattayyan namb and his brother Tolapper ayyan represent the fifteenth generation from Pillai Tirumalai nambi Ėṭṭur Tirumalai Tolappachariar of the Purḷān family may represent about the same degree from Pillan in which case the members of the two collateral families just ceased to be Tirūrāṇāris. How a member of the original family was granted the three villages Ėṭṭur, Immadi and Bodipad, or (Rayadurgam) was already narrated in Chap. XIV p. 55. The name of the village where a member of the family had his holding added the village name as aśnomene to his usual family name. Thus there are Ėṭṭur Tatchari, Immadi Tatchari and Rayadurgam Tatcharis. Ėṭṭur Tirumalai Kumara Tatchariyyar who is said to have done the coronation ceremony of Venkata pathi I, in 1616 would have been different from Immadi Tirumalai Kumara Tatchari who did the same for Venkata II, in 1630.
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Three villages yielding 200 Rekhai Pon were granted by him for celebrating this festival (V. 93; 8-6-1547).

(h) Vaivāhikōtsavam (marriage festival) was instituted in Tirupati by Tāllapākkam Chinna Tirumalai Ayyangar for five days in Chittirai month (V 99; 17-8-1517). The village of Neđiyam and Veṭumapālaiyam were granted for the festivals of Sri Govindaraja, Lakshminarayana, Kaṭṭāri Hanumān, Nara-simhaswami, Achyuta Perumāl, Periya Raghunathan etc.

(i) Sahasranāmārchna festival for Tiruvengadamudaiyan for 5 days was started by Sūrappa Reddi. He granted Villiyanallur, yielding 400 Rekhai Pon for this festival (V. 127; 10-5-1557).

(j) Aravidu Konētirāja Kondarāja endowed for the celebration of Sri Rāmānuja's Sāttumorai festival in the Ramanujakūṭam

---

The correct genealogy is given hereunder:

Periya Tirumalai Nambi
(son of Taivattukkarasu nambi, Alavandar's second son)

1. Pillai Tirumalai Nambi

2. Sudorsana Tatārya

3. Mitra Tatārya (Tolappar)

4. Sri Venkata Tatārya (Tiruvenkata Tattayyanār)

5. (a) Kumara Tatārya (Kumāra Tattayyanār) 1475-1554 or 1549.

6. (a) Srinivasa Tatārya (Srinivayyanār) 1547-1562

7. Mitra Tatārya (Tolappar)
Nammâḻvār temple, Tirupati by granting 10—⅓ share in Nagari village. The annual income from these was 400 R.P. yearly (V. 141; 25—5—1553).

(k) Mārgali Nīṟāṭṭam festival in Tirupati was instituted by Tiruvadi Raja (Travancore) by the grant of half of Kuḷayapaṭṭam village on Tambaraparani banks. This endowment covered also the Friday festival of Aṇḍāl. (V. 158; 16—9—1557).

(l) A shrine for Sudarsana āḻvār was consecrated on the west bank of the Govindapushkarini and food offerings were instituted by Tāḷḷapākkam Tiruvēnanathan, son of Tirumalai Ayyangar by granting Koṭṭur village, yeilding 280 Rēkhai Pon annually (V. 159: 13—1—1558).

(m) Endowment was made for civet oil ablution on all the 53 Fridays in Tirumala by Rāyasam Venkatādri by grant of 2 villages yeilding 646 R.P. This must have supplemented or superceded the grant made by Krishnadevaraya. (V. 117; 5-2-1561)

(n) Ratha Saphthami festival in Tirumala and Pallavōtsavam for Sri Govindaraja in Tirupati for 5 days were instituted by Kāranikkam Appaḷayyar. He granted Sengalteru, yielding 150 R.P annually for conducting these festivals. (V. 173; 26—1—1564).

A longer recital of such festivals may not be of interest to the average reader. It is therefore unnecessary to go here into the details of even the festivals enumerated above. They will however be described in detail in a chapter dealing with Festivals.

The dates given refer to the dates of endowments wherein the names appear. Members of the Pillān family are not acharyapurushas of Tirumala, and Tirupati.

Note :—Mitra Tatśrya (or Tolappar ayyangar) represents the fifteenth generation from Pillai Tirumalai Nambi. He and Tirumalai Tolappachariar of the Pillān family would have crossed the degree of agnate-ship known as Trirātra gnāṭi.
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Tabular statement of Endowments made from time to time.

The statements given hereunder summarise the endowments made during the various periods from two view points. The first has been prepared from the point of view of the quantity of Prasādams and Panyarams offered, which are the primary needs of the pilgrims. The second gives at a glance the endowments made during the same periods, whether in the shape of cash which the Sthanattar were authorised to utilise for repairs to and for the improvement of irrigation sources in the temple-owned lands or in the shape of whole villages and other lands endowed with the object of their yearly income being utilised for the performance of specific services, such as celebrations of festivals, daily and occasional offering of prasādams, burning of akhanda dipams, maintenance of flower gardens, repairs to temple buildings etc.

The first statement differentiates the food offerings made in Tirumala temple from those in the Tirupati temples. The former includes also offerings exclusively meant for Sri Varahaswami, Sri Narasimhaswami, Sri Ramaswami, Sri Krishna, as in almost all cases they were actually offered in the main shrine of Tiruvengadamudaiyan. In Tirupati although the main Temple is that of Sri Govindarajaswami, there are a number of minor shrines including that of Sri Ramanuja and some of the Aḻvārs not to speak of the independent temples of Periya Raghunatha, Achyuta Perumal, Sri Narasimhaswami and several smaller ones. Wherever the food offerings might have been made, they were all ultimately distributed among or sold to the pilgrims. It was only in the Ramanujakutam of the Nammāḻvār temple that food was served freely to every Srivaishnava.

Endowments by individuals for the offering of what was known as sandhi tiruppōnakam, came into vogue only from about 1328 A.D., when the Sita araganḍam Sandhi was first endowed. This was followed by the Nārayanan Sandhi in 1332. Previously there were some villages which had been endowed by the Yādana-rāya rulers, in particular, for the conduct of temple worship in general. There were also two villages on the banks of the river
Kāvēri which had been endowed by the old Chōla or Pandya Kings, one in Manavirkoṭṭam and the other is Payurkoṭṭam. Even the names of the villages have however disappeared in the inscriptions. In 1193 A.D. Vira rākshasa Yādavarāya gave some lands in Kuḍavūrṇādu, the particulars of which are missing in the inscription. In 1209 A.D. Tirukkālattidēva Yādavaraya made a grant of all the nanjai and punjai lands within the limits of the village of Kuḍavūr. In 1253 the Yādavarāya ratified the edict of the Pāṇḍyan kings granting some lands as determined by the residents of Kuḍavūr nadu, Tonḍapaḍipāṭu and the Vāriyamanattān of Agarapaṭu as asked for by the Sthanattar. The extent is not stated. In 1234 the second half of Payinḍipalli village was granted to Sri Govindarājaswāmi Temple, the other half being stated to have been already the property of Tiruvengadamuḍaiyān. There may not have been much of wet cultivation in these villages since we notice that irrigation channels were excavated more in the 15th century A.D. The income from all the above properties may have been just enough to keep up the establishment. In 1365 A.D., three were only 5 Sandhi offerings including two by Bukkaraya, the first king of the Sangama dynasty of Vijayanagar. Dēvaraya Mahārāya–II instituted 32 Sandhis daily in Tirumala in 1429. By the end of 1454 A.D., the sandhi offerings rose to 49 a day.

It will be observed from Statement I, how inadequate had been the arrangement for the food supply to pilgrims in Tirupati as compared to Tirumala. The town of Tirupati and the Temple of Sri Govindaraja were founded by Sri Rāmanuja to serve as a base for the pilgrims before they commenced their ascent of the hill. But it was only during the reign of Sadasivarāya that this defect was attempted to be remedied. It must have been this defect which was responsible for the emergence of the large number of pilgrim receivers who came into existence in Tirupati. Konaḍa- rāja's Nammālvār temple and Ramanujakūṭam seem to have been the only place where decent and wholesome food were supplied to the pilgrims. But it catered only for Srīvaishnavas.
Statements II (a)\textsuperscript{1} and II (b)\textsuperscript{2} enable us to form an idea of the financial aspect of temple management during the periods shown therein. Statement II (a) gives the total amount of endowments in cash and in the shape of lands during the six periods into which the history of this temple has been divided in Volumes I to VI of the T. T. D. Inscriptions. Statement II (b) shows the value of endowments by the Kings, their officers, the temple heirarchy, the religious heirarchy, merchants and all other Bhaktas. The difference between the two is only in the classification made. Till we reach the reign of Sadasivaraya, details are not given as to the yearly income from the whole villages and other lands endowed but only the services which the endowment was expected to meet are mentioned. The value or cost of the service is not clearly stated. The cash endowment for offering one tirupponakam or taligai per day perpetually on all the days of a year which was in earlier times 1000 panams or 1200 panams came to be fixed at 1500 panams from the 15th century onwards and till the end of Sadasivaraya’s reign. Judging from small endowments for one taligai on a festival occasion in a year, we have reasons to presume that the rate of interest was 12\% per annum. Even when the endowed amount was meant to be expended on the excavation of or repairs to a source of irrigation the increased yield was taken to be equivalent to 12\% rate of interest on the capital expended. Thus if 1500 panam was capital endowment for 1 taligai, the amount being expended for improvements to a kasakkal, the increased yield would be valued at 180 panam, the rate of interest being 12\%. This would give the cost of 1 taligai per day to be equivalent to 180/365 panams. But from several large scale endowments for which details are given in the inscriptions, what is called a Vellai tirupponakam made with 1 marakal rice and 1 ollock greengram, etc., cost only 1/3 panam per taligai. But 1/3 panam may on the average be taken to be the cost of 1 taligai. During Sadasivaraya’s reign a number of varieties of prasadams called ‘Ogarais’ Ven pongal came into vogue which cost from 1 3\ fraction panam to 2 panams a taligai on the average. For purposes of forming an idea of the finances of the temple, 1/3 panam is taken

1. See pag: 540.  
2. See page 542.
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as the cost of 1 tirupponakam. There were also cakes which were offered in the shape of iddali, dosai, vadai, manoharam, sukhian, atirasam, appam, tentolai, godhi, payasam etc., which varied in cost from 2 to 3 panam for dosai; to 6 to 10 panams for atirasam, appam and tentolai. The costlier preparations were usually lesser in quantity than the cheaper varieties. They were all classed as vagai padi. The average cost per padi has been taken for our purpose at 4 panams per padi.

The annual income from lands endowed, wherever not specifically given in the inscription, has been estimated on the assumption that the cost of the service would have been entirely met from the annual income. Some of the inscriptions however lead us to think that in several instances the village failed to yield the estimated income and that the donor, or one of his descendants had to endow some other village or pay an additional sum in cash. There is no inscription which states that any part of the income was set apart as contribution for a reserve fund for repairs to buildings and for repairs and maintenance of irrigation sources. Such repairs whenever found necessary seem to have been carried out from cash endowments made by another donor, entirely unconnected with the original donor of the village. Just as barren cows gifted to a temple and the temple is made to maintain them, so also villages whose maintenance was a burden seem sometimes to have been endowed to a temple. It then became the responsibility of the managers of the temple to do the necessary repairs to irrigation works and get such annual income as the lands might yield. If the income was not sufficient to meet the cost of services, the latter ceased to be performed. Instances of these have been referred to in this history.

A consideration of the figures shown in Table I would perhaps lead to the following conclusion. At about the end of 1565 A.D., the number of daily taligais of cooked food which should have been cooked in the temple kitchen in Tirumala amounted to 958. Each taligai is prepared with 4 measures (nali) of rice. As has already been stated, in a temple metal pots are not used. And mud pots are generally so fragile that most of them break soon after the
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### TIRUMALAI TEMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Daily Ubbayams</th>
<th>Yearly Ubbayams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prasadams Taligais</td>
<td>Vagai Padi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.T.D. Inscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 1365 (from 1328 A.D.) including Bhukkarayan Sandhi.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On 1454 (after Bukka)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II. Saluva Narasimha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1454 &amp; in or about 1500 A.D.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. III. Krishnadeva Raya's period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1500 A.D. and on 1528 A.D.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. IV. Achyutharaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1528 &amp; on 1540 A.D.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. V. Sadasivaraya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1540 &amp; on 1565 A.D.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. VI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1565 and on say 1640 A.D.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## SADASIVARAYA MAHARAYA

### I.

**TIRUPATI TEMPLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ubhayams</td>
<td>Ubhayams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasadams</td>
<td>Vagai Padi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taligais</td>
<td>Taligais</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 and feeding 32 Brahmins

| 3 | 399 | 18 |

| 34 | 4 | 1027 | 587 (a) |

Includes (a) 116 panyarams

| 25 | 24 | 2038 | 1334 (c) |

(b) 58 panyarams
(c) 299 panyarams

d) 397 panyarams.

| 19 | 2 | 1178 | 716 (e) |

(e) 398 panyarams

| 373 (f) | 4 | 7005 | 3984 |

(f) 50 deducted from Tirumalai & added on to Tirupati as per arrangement.

(g) 99 panyarams

| 35 | 53 | 778 | 1449 (h) |

(h) 605 panyarams
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### History of Tirupati

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>In Cash Rekhai Pon</th>
<th>Number of Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vol. I. T.T.D. Inscriptions.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From about 1193 &amp; on 1454</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 villages and Tiruchukanur lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vol. II. Saluva Narasimha’s time.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1454 &amp; upto 1500 A.D.</td>
<td>15890</td>
<td>31½ villages +4600 kuḷi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vol. III. Krishnadevaraya’s time.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1500 to 1528 A.D.</td>
<td>16720</td>
<td>23½ villages +61000 +1630 kuḷi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Krishna devaraya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vol. IV. Achyutaraya’s time.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1528 to 1540 A.D.</td>
<td>49630</td>
<td>38½ villages +4020 kuḷi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vol. V. Sadasivaraya’s time.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1540 &amp; upto 1565 A.D.</td>
<td>19590</td>
<td>64 villages +144 shares +10000 kuḷi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vol. VI. After Sadasivaraya upto 1640 A.D.</strong></td>
<td>525</td>
<td>11 villages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual income</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rekhai Pon</td>
<td>Includes 7100 and old kuli of wet lands gifted by Samavai. Annual income not possible to assess. The value of prasadams and Panyarams may be worth about 1400 R.P.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4700 | 12 irrigation channels were excavated at an approximate cost of 36500 panams included in the cash shown. |

| 4000 | 17 villages + 1630 kuli of land by the public would yield about 2000 R.P. yearly. Krishna-devaraya's 6½ villages would yield about 2000 R.P. judging by the extent of services to be performed. |

| 4520 | Includes villages granted by Varadajiamman 6 villages; yield 920 R.P. |

| 23800 |

| 5030 | In addition to village grants, irrigation channels were renovated in 11 cases. |
**HISTORY OF TIRUPATI**

Table showing Endowments in cash, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saluva Narasimha’s time.</th>
<th>Income from villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>R.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.P.</td>
<td>R.P.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Endowments made by the king, his feudatory Chiefs and his officers and palace officials
   - 3760
   - 1650
   - 4124 (irrigation channels)

2. Endowments by those connected with the temples and dependent thereon viz., Jiyars, Nambimars, Acharyapurushas, Mathadhipathis, Accountants and Emperumanadiyars
   - 2300
   - 2300 (irrigation channels)

3. Merchants and residens of Tirupati and Chandragiri indirectly depending on the temples
   - 2228
   - (1650 kuji of lands)

4. Other Devotees.
   - 40

Total .. 16492 4164
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II (b)

by *Excavation of irrigation channels.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Krishnadevaraya’s time.</th>
<th>Achyutaraya’s time.</th>
<th>Sadasivaraya’s time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Income from villages</td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.P.</td>
<td>R.P.</td>
<td>R.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35108</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>34380</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5565</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7024</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4370</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3290</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2875</td>
<td>3620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(approximately)</td>
<td>(approximately)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47716</td>
<td>3760</td>
<td>49649</td>
<td>7730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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cooked rice is poured on a specially erected stone platform. For facility of handling, pots capable of cooking about 2 measures would generally be used. This means that about 1900 pots would have been used every day. If the pots were twice as large, half the number of pots would have been used. In any case 1900 pots (or 950 if bigger), must have been on the oven each day for the unfailing daily offerings called Sandhi offerings. Considering the space available in the kitchen, not more than 100 pots would have been on the hearth at a time. If each cooking takes 45 minutes, the hearth must have been worked $19 \times 45$ minutes every day; or 14 hours per day. Major part of the sandhi offerings (say $\frac{3}{4}$th) are made before 2 P.M. Unless the kindling of the fire starts at about 4 A.M., in the morning it would not have been possible to complete the three-fourths portion of the cooking before 2 P.M. This is unlikely since we have seen that there came into vogue as many as 439 Visesha divasams in a year of 365 days, when special offerings had to be prepared in addition. In some cases what is known as Tiruppavadai and Periya Tiruppavadai had to be prepared necessitating the cooking of 200 marakals of rice, all to be offered before sunset at least.

We may therefore conclude that some at least of the daily sandhi offerings for which endowments have been made were not really cooked and offered. A perusal of the figures given in Part E, of the Chapter on Prasadams would show how the price of food stuffs went on increasing from year to year and century to century and along with it the cost of cooked food offerings and vagai padi. The Sthanattar would have been put to the necessity of discontinuing very many of the food offerings for which endowments had been made in the past in cash or as lands. There is also the other consideration that in Tirumala alone there should have gathered daily at least $958 \times 8 = 7664$ pilgrims even in the months of June and part of July; but we know that even in recent times there would have been less than 1000 pilgrims a day resorting to Tirumala.
SADASIVARAYA MAHARAYA

Income and Expenditure from Endowments.

Note:—The income from cash endowments has been calculated at 12% interest per annum and the annual income from lands (which are explicitly given only during Sadasivaraya's reign) has been calculated from a valuation of the services to be met from the income. The periods covered are approximately in accordance with the division made in the different volumes of the T. T. Devasthanam publications of the inscriptions.

Vol. I. from about 870 A.D. to 1450 A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (Rekhai Pon)</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400 (approximately):</td>
<td>Daily 58 Taligais @ 18 R.P. per annum each 1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1070 yearly @ ½ panam each .. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Vagai daily @ 4 panams each .. 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 R.P.</td>
<td>R.P. 1304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vol. II. (1450—1500)

| Interest on 1590 @ 12% @ 1907 | 192 daily @ 18 .. 3456 |
| From lands (about) 4700 | 3511 yearly @ ½ .. 175 |
| 7377 Vagai @ 4 per annum each .. 2950 |
| 6607 | 6581 |

Krishnadevaraya

Vol. III. (1500—1530)

| Interest on 47720 @ 12% .. 5706 | 184 daily @ 18 .. 3312 |
| From villages about .. 4000 | 5467 yearly @ ½ each .. 273 |
| 15258 @ 4 P. each .. 6103 |
| 9706 | 9688 |
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Achyutaraya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (Rekhai pon)</th>
<th>Vol. IV.</th>
<th>(1530—1545)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on 49650</td>
<td>328 daily @ 18</td>
<td>.. 5904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.P. @ 12%</td>
<td>4164 yearly @</td>
<td>.. 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From lands about</td>
<td>½ each</td>
<td>.. 4457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11143 vagai @ 4 P. each</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sadasivaraya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol. V.</th>
<th>(1545—1565)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on 19590</td>
<td>556 Daily @ 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ 12%</td>
<td>11155 @ ½ each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From lands</td>
<td>23800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9134 Vagai @ 5 P. each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above approximate estimates, the cost of a vagai padi has been taken to be 4 panams per padi down to the end of Achyutaraya's reign. During Sadasiva's period, it has been assumed at 5 panam per padi, for the reason that the more costly ones were offered in larger quantities and also because the prices seem to have risen.

It looks as if the income and expenditure just balanced till we reach Sadasivaraya's period. To realise the amount needed for the services it should have been necessary to expend all the cash endowments for keeping the sources of irrigation of all the endowed lands in good repair. We however find no inscription to give us an idea of how, when and on what works the cash was spent.
ANNEXURE TO CHAPTER XX

DONORS AND THEIR ENDOWMENTS DURING SADASIVARAYA MAHARAYA’S PERIOD.

We will now go into the endowments made during the reign of Sadāsivarāya, the men who made them and the purpose for which they were made. We have already noticed that during the reign of Achyutarāya Mahārāya, the only Feudatory Chiefs who made endowments to the temple were Achyutarāya’s father-in-law Timmaraya Salakaraja and his three sons Periya Tirumalaraja, Siria Tirumalarāja and Singaraja. Of these the largest were those made by Singaraya. He made endowments amounting to 15000 panams on two occasions. The father-in-law’s endowment was only 600 panams for a water shed in the Chittēkkudū hill, the second ascent on the way to Tirumala. Periya Tirumalai, his wife Tāthukkōnamma and Siria Tirumala made endowments of 1300, 1500 and 1200 panams respectively. The last named was for laying out a street in Tirumala called Ankanam street for the merit of his sister, Queen Varadajiamman. Excepting these members of the Salakaraja family, there were no other feudatories who made endowments. When however we go to the period of Sadāsivarāya, we find that the members of the Aravidū family, the Maṭṭa family and Manamapōli family appear as donors and presumably therefore all of them were the supporters of Sadāsivarāya. Aravīṭi Aliya Rama Raja, who was the Mahāpradhānī and the brother-in-law of Sadāsivarāya Mahārāya made the largest endowments. The very first one (V. 29) made by him on 19—1—1545 shows signs of the solidarity of the Aravidu family. Aliya Ramaraja is the son of Sri Rangaraja and the latter’s brother is Poṭḷapāṭī Timmaraja. The inscription not only shows that Aliya Ramaraja endowed Puduppatti village for the celebration of the festival of Mukkoti Dvadasī in Tirumala and Tirupati for the merit of Sadāsivarāya, but also mentions a smaller endowment by Poṭḷapāṭī Timmaraja of 50 panams for the reading of Tiruvēńkaṭa Māḥāṭmyam in Tirumala and in

1 IV. 31 of 1534, IV. 66 of 1536 and IV. 168 of 1541 A.D.
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Tirupati during the time of God’s Tirumanjanam for the combined merit of Sadasiva Maharaya and the Rayar’s father-in-law Sri-rangaraja (the donor’s own brother and father of Aliya Rama Raya). Tiny as that contribution is it serves as a solemn declaration made in the temple that Poṭlapāṭi Timmarāja and his sons will be faithful allies of Sadāśiva Mahāraya and Aliya Ramaraya. In furtherance of this we find that all the sons of Poṭlapāṭi Timmaraja, viz., Timmarājayaṇa, Viṭṭalēsvara Raja, Chinnar Timmaraja and Pappu Timmaraja, made their own endowments.

TIMMARAJAYYAN’S endowment of 13220 panams (V. 53; 15—7—1545) mentions that it was for the merit of Sadasivarāya and Aliya Ramaraja. It provided for a special panchāmrita offering in memory of Krishnadevarāya in order perhaps to please at the same time Aliya Ramaraja’s wife who was one of the daughters of Krishnadevaraya. This endowment was followed by another of a larger amount in cash (the amount is missing), for several services to Sri Venkatesvara and to Govindarāja, all for the merit of Aliya Ramaraja (V. 78; 21—9—1546).

PAPPU TIMMAYYA DEVA MAHARAJA made an endowment (V. 101; 24—11—1547) of Kollūr village yielding an annual income of 100 Rekhai pon plus a cash amount of 1565 panams, which was paid by the Kōmaṭis of Kottapālayam, Tirupati for the merit of his elder brother Chinnar Timmeyyadeva Maharāja, the income from the endowment to be utilised for the upkeep of the temple of Janārdhanaperumāl in Kottapalayam, Tirupati. He also endowed Vēṇaḍu village on 14—4—1555 with an annual income of 250 Rekhai Pon for the tirumanjanam of the Utsava murti and Nāchchimār while seated in his mantapam at the end of Sannidhi Street, Tirumala.

VITTALESWARA MAHARAJA made a grant of three villages (Pālamangalam Paranūr and Venakkattūr) yielding annually 500,250, 250 Rekhai Pon respectively, for the celebration of a new festival Pallavotsavam for Sri Venkateswara for 5 days in the month of Vaikasi and ending in Rohini Nakshatra which was the donor’s birth star. There are also other offerings included in this endowment. (V 51; 5—7—1545).
MATLA VARADARAJA who married another daughter of Krishnadevaraya and who was therefore the shaddaga of Aliya Ramaraja, showed his adherence to Aliya Ramaraja by making an endowment of 312 Rekhai Pon in cash early in 1544 A.D. for offering daily one tirupponakam to Sri Venkatesvvara, besides some other ubhayams (V. 11; 1544).

MANAMAPOLI SRIRANGARAJA, son of Öbalaraja, made a grant of half the village of Eranapäkkam yielding 100 Rekhai Pon annually for offering 5 tirupponakam daily to Sri Venkatesvvara. (V. 27; 19—1—1545).

SRIPATI ÖBALESVARA RAJA, son of Märuräju Ramaräja made a grant of Pëdur (income 300 ghatti varahams) in Konäkarai Sirmaii for offering daily to Sri Venkatesvvara one junnu padi and 8 vellai tirupponakam. (V. 75; 13—8—1546) (Junnu is prepared by boiling down to thick consistency two marakkäls milk with one viss white sugar and some refined camphor).

TIRUVADI RAJA OF TRAVANCORE also showed his adherence to Sadasivaräya by the grant of half the village Kuläiyapäṭṭam on the banks of the Tampraparni (குலையப்பட்டம்) having an annual income of 350 Rekhai Pon for the merit1 of Vittalesvara Mahäräja for offering daily 12 tirupponakam to Sri Venkatesvvara and similarly for Sri Govindaäraja. (V. 158; 14—9—1557).

PENDLI KODUKU TIMMARAJA son of Manampoli Kampa-raja obtained from Erra Timmaraja three villages (1) Bangäram yielding 100 Rekhai Pon yearly (2) Viṭṭaséri, yielding 50 R.P. and (3) Bhüdapuram including Kuppam, yielding 50 R.P annually. He endowed these for the purpose of conducting annually Vasan-tötsavam for Sri Venkatesvara for five days in the month of Masi ending in Sravana Nakshatram (V. 93; 8—6—1547).

NANDYALA NARAPPA RAJA endowed two villages Pallipaṭṭu and Gündippündi, yielding 100 Rekhai Pon for offering

---

1. (குலையப்பட்டம், விட்டசேரி, பங்காரம் நான்வில்லை, கவ்பம் நான்வில்லை போன்றவைகளுக்கு பெயர்விப்புத்த காலமானது)
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4 vellai tiruppōnakam daily to the Dvarapālakas, whom he installed in Sri Govindaraja’s Temple. (V. 122, 18—3—1549).

*TIRUMALAI RAJA*, the brother of Aliya Ramaraja, made a cash endowment of 16500 panams for offering 515 atirasa padi on 515 festival occasions to be offered in the Unjal mantapam constructed by him in Tirumala (V. 168; 15—12—1561) called the Tirumalarayan mantapam.

*ARAVIDU RAMARAJA KONETIRAJA KONDARAJA* was the step nephew of ALIYA RAMA RAJA. There are four inscriptions which give particulars of his endowments *viz.*, Nos. 125, 133, 141, 154, (Vol. V). The first endowment V. 125 was made by him on 2—10—1550, by granting ten villages for the purpose of making daily food offerings to Sri Nammāḻvār for whom he constructed a new shrine in the present Govindaraja North Mada Street. The annual estimated income from these villages was 5713 Rekhai Pon. Their names are:

1. Tarkoḻam
2. Tāyanūr
3. Malaiyanūr
4. Attiyūr
5. Asūr
6. Palandai
7. Mullappaṭṭu
8. Kūdaippākkam
9. Mayyūr
10. Tiruppāду.

The food offerings so made were to be used for feeding Sri Vaishnava pilgrims in the Ramanujakutam attached to the temple. Every arrangement was made to make the food acceptable to even orthodox people. The second endowment (V. 133) was made on 10—3—1552. This consisted of $10\frac{1}{2}$ shares of land in six different places, yielding 30 Rekhai Pon annually and 27 Rekhai Pon to be collected as taxes in Āḻvār Mudaliyar Palayam etc. The total sum of 57 Rekhai Pon was to be used for the Sāttumurai festival of Sri Uḍaiyavar in Tirupati (costing 51 R.P. and 9 panam) and for certain ubhayams for Sri Govindaraja, Nammāḻvār, Südikkōduṭṭa Nāchchiar, etc., costing 6 and odd R.P. The third endowment (V. 141) was made on 25—5—1553 by the grant of Nagari village and Viḍu Grāmam with an annual income of 400 Rekhai Pon for the purpose of conducting Adhyayanotsavam
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of the Nammalvar installed by him and for the Ani Car Festival and the celebration of the tirunakshtaram of all the twelve Āḻvārs and Acharyas installed in Tirupati. The fourth endowment (V. 154) was made on 27—1—1554 in appreciation of the charitable work that was being done by Kondaraja. The Emperor Sadasivarāya on the meritorious occasion of his visit to Tirumala on the previous Makara Sankramanam day made a dānam with libations of water of several kinds of taxes. A rayasam was issued on 2—7—1554 enumerating these taxes and charging the officers in the provinces enumerated therein to collect the taxes and to hand them over to the Trustees of the Tirumalai Temple for conducting the charities in Kondaraja’s Nammālvār Temple and Ramanujakūṭam. The Emperor also presented 200 bulls bearing the Hamsa mudra for drawing the provision carts such as Teppēdu1 Pachchaivaḍām, ghee, oil and vegetables. (இன்னும் சுற்றுநிறைந்த கொள்க) The taxes to be collected and handed over were:

Navasaranyāsa Vargam  .. நவாசரணையசன் வர்கம்
Tēppāṭṭu Sarakku       .. தேப்பாத்து சரக்கு
Mēlakai                .. மெளகை
Magamai               .. மகாமை
Kōdai                 .. கோதை
Āyam                   .. அயம்
Aṟuppu                .. அறுப்பு
Uḷḷāyam               .. உழலயம்
Pērāyam                .. பேராயம்
Magamaik              .. மகாமைக்
Mulavisam             .. முளவிஸம்
Taragu                .. தரங்

The sīrmai, nādu and rājyam where these taxes were ordered to be collected for the benefit of the Ramanujakūṭam were:

Padāividu Rajyam       .. படையிடு ராஜம்
Senjee (singe)          .. செங்கீ

1. We do not know what these names of Taxes indicates.
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Tiruvadi
Bhavanagiri
Paṭṭanam
Solamanḍalam
Tiruvannamalai
Kāṅchipuram
Chandragiri rajaṃ
Paḷaiyam
Paḷaverkādu
Mudupankaṟai pattanam
Penukonda sirmai
Vaḍaraṇyam
Udayagiri
Konḍaiṉidu sirmai

ALIYA RAMARAJA: Aliya Rama Raja made an endowment in his own name (V. 155; 11—11—1554) besides the one already mentioned, (V. 29 in 1545) which was for Sadasivaraya’s merit of four villages (1) Singala bhāyi (in Raichur Sirmai (2), Vala Koil (in Mudgal sirmai), (3) Yāralachchēri (in Periyapākkam sirmai), (4) Mākālipaṭṭu (in Periyapākkam sirmai), with an annual income of 4000 Rekhai Pōn for offering daily 200 tirupponakam to Sri Venkatesa as the Mudal or first prasadam after the dadhyodanam (Matrai) offering. It was also arranged that the donor’s share of 50 taligais should be daily handed over to Konḍarāja’s Ramanujakutam in Tirupati from out of the offerings in Sri Govindarajaswami’s temple.

The total of the endowments made by Aliya Ramaraja and his kinsmen during the reign of Sadasiva Maharaya was 34585 panams in cash and 24½ villages and 10½ shares of sarvamāṇyam lands having an annual income of 13040 Rekhai pon (130,400 panam). The endowments made by the Sālakarāja family during Achyutaraya’s reign¹ amounted only to 34600 panam in cash.

¹ The Devasthānam epigraphist seems to have been under a misapprehension that Sriпанتجارaja Maharaya (mentioned in V. 143) was a feudatory chief under Sadasiva Maharaya (vide page X. Vol. V). The prasasti of
No lands were endowed. The Aravidu chiefs showed great solidarity and loyalty to Sadāsivarāya and to Alīya Ramaraja. In this respect we may compare Alīya Ramaraja to Saluva Narasimha, who had the support of all his cousins and kinsmen.

Endowments by Military and other officers.

Another set of people who usually made endowments during the reign of every Emperor are the Generals or Military officers serving in the Empire. Some of them usually mentioned that the endowments were for the merit (धन्यता) of the Emperor at the time. During the reign of Achyutaraya Maharaya almost all of them uniformly made endowments of 15000 panams each. Even the Ubhayams for which the income from the endowment had to be utilised became stereotyped so that 3000 appa padi were offered in the aggregate during the year in each case. Adaiappam Bhaiyappa Nāyakkar also had to make such endowment.

Srirāngharaja Maharaya therein given is “Sriman Maharajadhī Raja Raja Paramēsvara Sri Virāpratapa Sri Vira Sri Rāngharaja Maharaya”. This is unmistakably the prassasti of the Emperor of Vijayanagara. The year mentioned is Visvāvasu. There are three Visvāvasu years which may be considered for deciding the identity of the person viz. 1548 A.D., 1605 A.D. 1665 A.D. The only Srirāngha or Rāṅga who can with any pretense bear the titles of the Emperor was Sadasiva Maharaya’s own father, who died before Sadasiva ascended the throne in 1542. In the year 1605, Venkatapati I. was the ruling monarch and not Srirāngharaja. In 1665 A.D. Srirāngharaja was the Emperor and he was at the time according to historians trying to guard against the treachery and intrigues of his own Provincial rulers the Nāyaks and the Golconda Sultan. It is very likely that he worshipped Tiruvēṅgāsinatha on the 10th day of the dark fortnight of the Jyeshta month in the year Visvāvasu (may be 29th May 1665) as is mentioned in the inscription. That inscription should have found a place in Vol. VI. and would fill in the gap between the years 156–1638 (VI 23) and (No. 24, Vol. VII.) 19–3–1684. In 1638 Srirāngharaja is mentioned in the inscription with the full prassasti of the Emperor. In 1684 there is no mention of any Emperor. The former inscription is in Tamil and the latter in Telugu. Inscription No. 143 of Vol. V. is also in Telugu and mentions Srirāngharaja (with the full prassasti at the Emperor) as having visited Tirumalai (1665 A.D.).
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although he had already made a much larger endowment of 53,300 panams. During the reign of Sadāsivarāya we do not find military officers making any such large endowments. Whatever they did seems to have been done out of their free will. Some of these endowments furnish us with interesting information about the economic condition of the country.

(a) **ATTILANGU NAYAKKAR** of Vemapaṭṭi pālayam endowed 550 panams for making 11 appa padi offerings during the course of a year and for offering 11 palam chandanam, 550 areca nuts and 1100 betel leaves during the 10 Brahmotsavams and the Nāvalūṟṟu festival. (V. 13; 5—6—1544).

(b) **MURTI NAYAKKAR** of Kumārapalli purchased $4\frac{1}{2}$ shares of land in Rajendra Singanallūr village yielding an annual income of 50 Rekhai Pon and half the village of Puduppaṭṭu Konēṭi Kālvay with an annual income of 25 Rekhai Pon and endowed them for certain services among which were the Tōppu festival in his garden mantapam in Tirumala on Sravanam in Ani month. A number of food offerings in the name of his parents, brothers, sisters, his secretary and others were also to be made on specified days out of this endowment. The cost of several articles are given in the inscription. Perhaps it is this Murti Nayakkar who constructed the Murti nayakkar tank in Tirumala (V. 19; 7—8—1544).

(c) **KRISHNAPPA NAYAKKAR** made an endowment of 780 panams. The inscription is however not complete. (V. 30).

(d) **SEVVU NAYAKKAR** of Prangnā đu (along with six others) made an endowment of 2480 panams for the Pādiya vēṭṭai festival of Petiya Raghunatha in Tirupati. He supplemented this by another endowment of 50 Rekhai Pon so that the Pādiyavēṭṭai festival of Sri Govindaraja and Sri Krishnan also may be celebrated. Potlapāṭi Chinna Timmayya deva Maharaya contributed 15 Rekhai Pon to this endowment which would show that Sevvu Nāyakkar was an important person. His endowments were confined to Tirupati. (V. 86; 13—1—1547 and 102; 4—1—1548).

(e) **SEVVAPPA NAYAKKAR** of Maḍippākkam Village made an endowment of his own village Maḍipākkam yiedling an annual
income of 70 Rekhai Pon for offering daily to Sri Venkatesa 2 vellai tirunponnakam and to Sri Viṣṭalesvara in Tirupati one appa padi on each Amavasya day. *The point to note about this endowment is that he retained in his own hands hereditarily the management of the village (Kāniyākshi) and only agreed to pay 70 Rekhai Pon every year to the temple.* (V. 98; 8—7—1547).

(f) *SURAPPA NAYAKKAR* made an endowment of the village of Villiyanallur in Viḷḷuppuram Sirmai having an annual income of 400 Rekhai Pon for offering daily 4 vellai tirunponnakam to Sri Venkatesa and in addition for the celebration of a *Sahasra-nāmārchna festival for Sri Venkatesvara* for five days in the month of Masi with ankurarpanam in Makha Nakshatram and ending in Chitta nakshatram. The details of the festival are given in the inscription. He also owned a garden and mantapam in Tirumala. The details show that he was a man conversant with Sri Vaishnava forms of worship. (V. 127; 10—5—1551).

(g) *ARANI TIRUMALAI NAYAKKAR* made an endowment of the village of ATTIMALAIPPATTU on the bank of Seyyāru River, (in the district of Tachchur attached to the Ganḍagōpālan division of Raja Gambhira Nādu in Pālugunrakoṭṭam in the province of Paḍaiviḍu in Jayangonḍa Sōḷa manḍalam), yielding an annual income of 80 Rekhai Pon for offering daily 3 sandhi tirunponnakam to Sri Venkatesvara. (V. 138; 1—8—1552). *He however reserved to himself and his heirs the right of Kāniyākshi (Kudivaram) and paid only 80 Rekhai Pon annually to the temple.* This is the third instance we notice of such an arrangement during Sadāsivaraya’s reign. We know that Ogampadi Gangu Reddi did the same (in V. 84 dated 3—11—1546).

Besides the above Military Officers, there are also civil officers who have made endowments. Some of these endowments are on a liberal scale for special festivals instituted by them.

*RAYASAM HARIAPPAR’S* endowment is for offering daily 1 vellai tirunponnakam to Sri Venkatesvara and the amount therefor was 1580 panams. (V. 21; 11—9—1544).
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RAYASAM VENKATADRI and his younger brother RAYASAM KONAPPAYYAR (sons of Timmarasayyar who was the son of Viramarasayya) of Musalimağugu, made two endowments. The first one was made (V. 129) on 8—7—1551 and was by Venkatadri. It consisted of 2½ villages, viz., Dēṣur grāmam, Velanjineru grāmam and half of Timmasamudram. These yielded an annual income of 1030 Rekhai Pon. The services consisted of a daily offering of 4 vellai tirupponakam and one atirasappadi on the 110 days of the ten Brahmostavams; similarly 134 atirasappadis on 134 tingal divasams and 6 more for some vīseśha divasams. All these were for Sri Venkatesa only. He seems to have considered that his endowment was defective. He therefore made a further provision in V. 167 dated 5—12—1561 for 104 atirasappadi for 52 Pulugukkappu days in a year and also for 13 Purvaphalguni nakshtram which might have been his birth star. He did not omit making offerings to Sri Govindaraja. So he made provision for one alankara taligai daily (costing 117 Rekhai Pon in a year), also for one appa padi daily. His brother KONAPPAYYAN made in the same endowment a provision of 120 Rekhai Pon yearly for offering daily 4 vellai tirupponakam to Sri Govindaraja. He also granted a number of villages and shares of land (or vritti) in some villages—Āpyūr, Ākāsa Śuriyampaṭṭu, Ghantakāna kuppam, Ilaiyāndānaṭṭu, and Perumanāmbaṭṭu, 16 vritti in Satravāḍa, 20 shares in Vēpagunta, 4 shares in Sri Ramachandra puram, 28 shares in some village the name of which is missing; 10 shares in Panaippākkam and two shares in Puttūr village. The annual income from these villages and lands is stated to have been 646 Rekhai pon. These endowments and the ones made by Karanikam Appalayyar and Karanikam Bhasavarasar are of interest to us for the detailed information they furnish of the Sirmái Nadu, Kottam and Province in which the endowed villages were situated in those days and also for the division of shares in villages (presumably inam villages). They also furnish detailed information about the cost of every item of service.

KARANIKA APPALAYYAR, son of Kāmarasappa made two endowments one V. 161 on 19—5—1508 and the other V. 173 on 26—1—1564. They were in the shape of lands and a village. The income from the lands was 155 Rekhai Pon and 8 panams.
The village gave a yearly income of 150 Rekhai Pon. In Tirumala, his ubhayam was during the summer festival in the mantapam in his flower garden and also on Brahmotsavam days. For Sri Govindaraja his ubhayam was on all Hastha nakshatra days. The second endowment (annual yield of 150 Rekhai Pon) was for celebrating Rathasaptami festival in Tirumala with day as well as night processions. In Tirupati he endowed for the celebration of Pallavotsavam (as was being done for Sri Venkatesvara in Tirumala for 5 days. The total cost of the Pallavotsavam was 114 R.P and 5 panam. The village of Sengallēru in Gandikkōṭai Sirmai was endowed for these. The details of lands endowed are:

(V. 161) 1 share of land in Tāyanur (income 20 R.P.)
2 shares in Vīragaṇḍananallur " 22 "
100 Kuli mānyam land in
   Pēraviyal village " 30 "
12 Vṛitti in Tālimarappūr " 51-2 "
5 Shares in Alli.tuṇai " 11-6 "
3½ shares in Dēvarasappalli " 21 "

155-8 R.P.

KARANIKKA BHASAVARASAR seems to have made two endowments. As the inscriptions are incomplete, we do not know what these were, in detail. (V. 145 of 1553 and V. 147 of 1554 grant of Kālyanūr). The sum total of the endowments made by these civil officers consisted of cash+6½ villages and 96 shares of land; their value was 1580 panam plus 1981 Rekhai Pon annually. They compare rather unfavourably with the endowments made by men of this class during Achyutarāya’s reign, which amounted to 309186 panams in cash and 10 villages with an annual income of 1300 Rekhai Pon.

ENDOWMENTS BY PERSONS CONNECTED WITH THE TEMPLE.

We have so far considered endowments by persons who had some connection or other with the Emperor and Aliya Ramaraja.
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We will next see what endowments were made by those who were hereditarily connected with the temple.

Archakas (or Nambimars).

VENKATATTURAI VAR, son of Malaininran Bhattar Appayyar made a cash endowment of 2657 panam to be utilised for irrigation improvements to temple lands and from the increased income to perform ubhayam in connection with the Uri-adi festival, for Vannimaram, Vijayadasami and Pādiyavēṭṭai in Tirumala; also for certain festivals in Tirupati for Govindaraja and Periya Raghu- natha (V 60, 26—11—1545).

APPAYYAN VENKATATTURAI VAR, son of Govindan. He made an endowment (amount not known) for food offering during Tiruppalli-ēļuchchi days to Sri Govindaraja.

Jiyars.

One KOYIL KELVI JIYAR, who was Kartar of Alagiya Manavāḷan matham and tirunandavanam and who was the disciple of Vānāmāmalai Jiyar and another Vānāmāmalai Jiyar, the disciple of Ramanuja Jiyar, jointly endowed in cash 2500 panam for ubhayams in connection with Sri Ramanuja’s āṭṭai tirunakshatram; the āṭṭai tirunakshatram of Ramanuja Jiyar, for offerings during Brahmotsavam in Tirumala etc. (V. 2; 27—1—1542).

The second endowment, V. 80 dated 13—10—1546, was by Vānāmāmalai Ramanuja Jiyar (who was, Koyil Kelvi also) of 2000 panam for one Tirupponakam to be prepared in Sri Govinda- raja’s temple and to be offered to Sri Tiruvengaiadamudaiyan installed by him in his matham at Tirupati. This obviously was meant to enhance the reputation of his matham in the eyes of the pilgrims. This is in fact not an endowment to any of the Temples directly attached to Tirumala. VADA TIRUVE NKA JIYAR (not described as Koyil Kelvi nor does he appear to have owned a matham or tirunandavanam) made an endowment of 840 panam (date not mentioned) for offering manoharappadi to Tiruvengada-
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mudaiyan in connection with Koyilalvar Tirumanjanam during the 10 Brahmotsavams and some other ubhayams (V. 94 no date or year). We know that Vangapuram Narayana Setti, one of the merchants of Tirupati made elaborate provision for the conduct of Koyilalvar Tirumanjanam. (Vide V. 25, 19—10—1544).

The total of the three endowments made by the Jiyars is 5340 panams.

Acharyapurushas.

We next go to the āchāryapurushas. The earliest endowment was made by Anandāmpillai Appayyangar, son of Singamayyangar of Bharadwaja Gotra, Yajussakha etc. This consisted of the interest on a sum of 500 panams and was for offering during Adhyayanotsavam I tiruvolakkam in Tirumalai as well as in Tirupati on the Kannianun siruttambu day. V. 7; 1–9–1543. His disciple Vangapuram Narayana Setti made a large endowment of 48900 panams which will be noticed later.

KANDADAI SRIRANGACHARIAR, son of Kandadai Bhāvanachāriar (Vādhūla gōtra, Apasthamba Sūtra, Yajussākha), made an endowment of 1500 panam, V. 48; 5–7–1545, for making dōsai offerings to Sri Venkatesa and to Sri Govindaraja on certain occasions, such as his father’s monthly tirunakshatram Visakham, Kandadai Appan’s birth star Avanī Pūram, Kandadai Appu-Aannān’s, Chittirai Mūlam, his own nakshatram (Ani Svati), Sri Ramanuja’s Attai Nakshatram etc. From V. 51; 5-7-1545 we know that Viṭṭalēsvara Maharaja was his disciple and that he made over to his acharya the quarter share of prasadams due to him as donor.

SOTTAI ETTUR TIRUMALAI NAMBI SRINIVASAYYAN-GAR. He was the son of Kumara Tattayyangar Saṭhamarshana Gōtra, Āpasthamba Sūtra, Yajussākha) and one of the Tirumalai Acharyapurushas. He made an endowment of a village called Periya Ekkalur in Jagadabhi Gotti sirmai yielding an annual income of 2000 Chakram Pon, V. 92; dated 3—7—1547, which was granted to him by the Emperor Sadasiva Raya with libations of water
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and copper plate grant. He made provision for the under-
mentioned services:—

(a) one Alankāra taligai daily for Sri Venkatesa consisting
of 2 rajāna tirupponakam, 4 küttūkari; 4 porikkari,
4 sauces, 1 cup of milk, 1 cup rasāyanam etc., costing
207 Rekhai Pon per year.

(b) celebration of Phalotsavam at Tirumala, lasting for
5 days, costing 240 Rekhai Pon.

(c) celebration of K][aroji—i]lamai day of Adhyayanotasvam
(2nd day of latter 10 days) of Sri Venkatesa and cele-
bration of Taṇṇpiramudu festival in Tirumala. The two
together cost 64 Rekhai Pon.

(d) certain other ubhyams for Sri Venkatesa and Sri Ramanuja
costing 29 Rekhai Pon. The total cost of the Ubhayams in
Tirumalai was 540 Rekhai Pon.

For Sri Govindaraja at Tirupati.

(e) 4 vellai tirupponakam and 1 alankāra taligai daily as
in Tirumala;

(f) 2 tirupponakam to be offered daily to Sri Venkatesa
installed by Pōṭlapāti Timmaraja in the 4th cave of the
Ālvār Tirtham. These two items cost 617 Rekhai Pon per
year.

(g) celebration of a new Brahmostavam for Sri Govindaraja in
Tirupati in the Tamil month of Māsi (13 days) commencing
with Ankurarpana in Arudhra Nakshatram (being the birth
star of Sri Ramanuja) and ending with Tirthavari in Visakha
nakshatram being the birth star of Sri Nammālvār. The
expenditure on this festival was 670 Rekhai Pon and
1½ panams. There was an additional endowment of 85
Rekhai Pon by some of his disciples mentioned in the
inscription and several other minor ubhayams. Srinivasa-
ayaangar made another endowment (V.171); on 28–7–1562
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(the latter portion of the inscription which is on the south wall of the second prakara of Sri Govindaraja Temple, is missing). The name of the villages granted commences with அதிராசப்படி... and there the inscription is left incomplete. But the cost of the services amounts to not less than 930 Rekhai Pon a year. The endowment provided for offering atirasappadi on 205 visēsha tirunals 217 tingal divasams, 14 visesha divasams altogether 436 atirasa padis costing 482 Rekhai Pon; also for offering daily 4 tirupponakam to Sri Govindaraja along with 2 palam chandnam.

**SOṬṬAI ETTUR TIRUMALAI NAMBI KUMARA TATTAYANGAR** is the father of Srinivasaayyangar. We have noticed that during the reign of Krishnadevaraya and Achyutaraya, he was the most prominent man among the Acharya Purushas. He made certain endowments and was the recipient of the donor's share in the offerings made by his numerous disciples. He should have been far advanced in age when he made an endowment (V. 123) (either of 1549 or 1554 A.D.) of 3420 panains during the reign of Sadasivaraya making provision for offering 2 vellai Tirupponakam daily to Sri Venkatesa and also to Sri Govindaraja on the occasion of the sattumurai of Senai Mudialiar on Arpasi Puradam. The day of the inscription is given as Thursday, Bahula Dasami and Satayam Nakshatram. The Tamil numeral given for the year is கண்டிசூடஸ (saka 1471). No Thursday in the Saka year 1471 has Bahula Dasami and Sataya Nakshatra concurrent. On March 29, 1554 (Masa 2, Saka 1476) there is Bahula Ekadasi, 52 day and 97 day Satayam. The error being one tithi; but such an error is possible. He seems to have had two sons. One of them Tirumalai Tattayyangar came to notice as the Acharya of Singaraja, son of Salakayadeva Maharaya, during the reign of Achyutaraya Maharaya (IV. 170; 10–2–1542). The other son whom we noticed above was Srinivasa Ayyangar who was honoured by Sadasivaraya with the munificent grant of Pedda Ekkalur village. The two brothers occupied the place of Acharyas to one or the other of the two powerful rival political parties.
The Endowments made by the three Acharya Purusha families (Anandampillai, Kandadai and Sottai Tirumalai Nambi) during Sadasivaraya’s reign amounted to 5420 panams in cash and villages yielding annually 2930 Rekhai Pon.

The Devasthanam Epigraphist has shown one Ramanuja Timmayyan as an Acharyapurusha (I. 26; 22-10-1544) which is a clear mistake. Neither in this inscription nor in No. 3 of Vol. III is he described as an Acharyapurusha.

TALLAPAKKAM TIRUMALAI AYYANGAR and the members of his family: (Bhāradwāja gōtra, Āsvalāyana sūtra and Rik. Sākha). Their endowments are to be found in inscription Nos. V. 34, 47, 47-A, 55, 68, 71, 99, 153; and 159. Their names are Pedda Tirumalai Ayyangar, Tiruvenkatanāthar, Chinna Tirumalayyanger, Tiruvenkatayyan and Tiruvengalayyar. The total amount of their endowments was 7932 panams in cash and 2060 Rekhai Pon by way of annual income from villages. The family has been connected with the temple from the later days of Sri Krishna Devaraya, as poets, musicians, and propagandists of Sri Vaishnavism in Rayalaseema. TIRUMALAIYYANGAR made an endowment (V. 34; on 19—3—1545) of 1020 panams for celebrating the sattumurai of Āḻvār Tirtham Nammālvār (Visakham nakshatram being the 10th day of his Adhyayanotsavam). Again he obtained from Sadasiva Maharaya and Aliya Rama Raja, orders for validating the grant of the village of Muttiyālappatti which he had made sometime earlier for the celebration of ubhayams during Ani Brahmostavam in Tirumala, but which had to be discontinued subsequently as the village did not yield the income (V. 54 dated 3—7—1545). He made now in V. 47 dated 3—7—1545 a last payment of 386 Rekhai Pon to repair the tank and to carry on the ubhayams uninterruptedly. Besides the ubhayams during the Ani festival, the endowment provided for offering 6 vellai tirupponakams daily to Sri Venkatesa. There was also provision made for the announcement of Arulappādu in front of his Sankirtana Bhāndāram, for singing songs on the occasion of Nachchiyar tirumanjanam on all the Fridays and for the supply of turmeric powder for the bath. Provision was made for the daily tiru-
manjanam of the Utsavar and Nachchimar of Sri Govindaraja also. The cost of these services was 280 Rekhai Pon a year. The next endowment V. 47-A made by him was probably on the same day. It was for the celebration of a Vana Bhōjanam festival in Sravana nakshatra of Kartikai month for Sri Venkatesa; 50 dadhyodhana taligais and 19 vaḍai padi were to be offered in this connection. The noteworthy information contained in the inscription is the mention of 12 mantapa padi in the names of the twelve nirvaham people (Sthanattar of the temple), the $4\frac{1}{2}$ vagai people, one in the name of Nārana Setti and the last in the name of Tiruppaṇi Pillai. He appears to have attempted to appease all those who had influence in the management of the temple. The names of the Sthanattar according to the inscription are: Āḻvār Mudaliar, Narasingaraya Mudaliyar, Ilaiya Mudaliar, Ariyārāya Mudaliar, three Nirvaham Sabhaiyar (names not given), two Nirvaham Nambimar (names not given), Periya Kōyil Kēlvi Jiyar and Ilam Kōyil Kēlvi Jiyar (names not given), and Nirvaham of temple accountants. Although this list gives two places for Nambimar and one for accountant, we know that the original and the correct apportionment was two seats for the temple accountants and one for Nambimar. The four and half Vagai as noted in this inscription are: Tirupati residents; $\left(\overline{\text{ RCMPW}}\overline{\text{W}}\right) 1$, Sabhaiyar $\left(\overline{\text{QMY}}\overline{\text{W}}\right) 1$, Nambimar 1, Desantries 1, Tiruninra-ur-udaiyar (accountants) $\frac{1}{2}$—total $4\frac{1}{2}$ Vagai.

There were also some honoured recipients of prasadam who were not concerned with the administration of the temple. Their names as given in the inscription are Narayana Setti, Tālāpakkam Tirumalayyangar (himself), Kumara Tattayyangar, Chakravarthi Appayyangar, Kandādai Appayyangar, Anandāmpillai Ayyangar, Tirumalayyangar, Doḍḍayyangar Appai, Sukavaṣṭu Annan, Appu Annan Appan, Appu Tiruvenkatayyangar Jiya, Annan Nayinar, Venkatatturaiyār, Appāchchi Annan Appan, Paḷḷiḥaṭṭar Malaiyannan, Tiruppaṇi Pillai, managers of Ramanuja-kutam etc. We see from this distinctly that at least four acharya-purusha families were then in existence. We also see that the Prativedhi Bhayankaram family was one of these acharya purusha families. As there is neither a date nor a separate endowment
mentioned as having been made for this festival, it must be presumed to have been included in the preceding endowment. The next endowment (the third in fact), V. 55 dated 2—8—1545, was the grant of the village of Gandama Timmapuram yielding an annual income of 100 Rekhai Pon and a cash payment of 14 Rekhai Pon and 2 panam, for offering daily 2 tirupponakam taligai and one alankāra taligai to Sri Venkatesa. Two of his Sāttāda Srivaishnava disciples also made separate endowments amounting to 16 Rekhai Pon for making food offerings as ubhaiyam. The fourth endowment of Tirumalaiyyangar, V. 68 dated 20—4—1546, was a cash payment of 2300 panams for making daily food offerings to Sri Lakshminarayana Perumāl, whose image he had installed in the Āḷvār Tirtham mantapam at Tirupati and also for ubhayams on the Tirthavari days of the three Brahmostavams for Sri Govindaaraja, for floating festival, Kartikai Sankramanam etc.

The next endowment, V. 71; 17—7—1546, was made by Pedda Tirumalayyanga's son Tallapakam Tiruvenkaṭanāthan. It consisted of the grant of the two villages Sēndalūru and Malla varam, yielding an annual income of 500 and 120 Ğhaṭṭī Varāhāns respectively for the celebration of a marriage festival (Vaivahikōtsavam) for 5 days for Sri Venkatesa. It was to commence in Anuradha nakshatra and end in Uttarādham in the month of Panguni. He made provision for certain ubhayams also. Among these were a hunting festival for Tiṭṭuvanakatakkrishnan in Tirumala, the celebration of Panguni Uttiram for Aramel Mangai Nāṭchchiyār in Tirumala, the celebration of the Avatārā nakshatra of Sri Varahaswami in Sravanakshatra in Araspi month, an ubhayam in Chittrai Mrigasira being the aṭṭai tirunakshatram of his father Pedda Tirumalayyanga, the Sraddha day of his mother Arpasi Bahula Traiyodasi, the aṭṭai tirunakshatram of Sri Vedanta Desika, the Sraddha day of his elder brother on Ani Sukla Chathurthi, Vaikasi Vaisakham, the tirunakshatram of his grand father Annamayyanga etc. Ubhayams were made for Sri Govindaaraja also on the Hunting festival day. The next endowment, V. 99 dated 17—8—1547, made by a member of the family was by Siru Tirumalayyanga (another son of Periya Tirumalayyanga). He made a grant of half the village of Neṭiyam, yielding an annual
income of 150 Rekhai Pon for the celebration of a Vaivahikotsavam for Sri Govindaraja for five days in the month of Chittirai, the sattumurai being in Rohini nakshatra. The same inscription mentions an endowment of the village of Veḻumapākkam for making daily food offerings to Sri Govindaraja, Lakshminarayana-pperumāl and Vira Narasingapperumāl within the temple of Kaṭṭāri Hanuman. Numerous other festival offerings are also mentioned. The grant by Kandādai Appan of Vādhūla Gotra, of half the village of Puṇṇiyam with an income of 60 Rekhai Pon for making certain pāṭi offerings on certain festival days is also included in this inscription. The inscription also shows that several persons holding high places in the temple were anxious to add their own quota of service.

**TALLAPĀKKAM TIRUVENGADAYANGAR**, son of Siru Tirumalayyangar and grandson of Periya Tirumalayyangar, made his own endowment V. 153 dated 19—2—1554. Mallavaram which he endowed in 1546 (V. 71) for celebrating the Vaivāhi-kotsavam of Sri Venkatesa, failed to yield the anticipated income. So he endowed in place of it Devarayapalli in Vinukonda Sirmai yielding an annual income of 470 Rekhai Pon. Out of this amount 140 Rekhai Pon were to be appropriated for the Vaivāhi-kotsavam leaving 330 Rekhai Pon for certain new services. These new services consisted of a daily offering of navaṇitam (3 olocks butter 1 olock honey, one uri ghee and ½ visai sugar) and one rājāna tirupponakam all costing 109 R.P. and 5 panam and 2 Bhagālabāth taligai daily costing 39 R.P. and 5 panam yearly. These were daily offerings for Sri Venkatesa. Besides these he arranged for certain ubhayams and for cash payment to those who sing Iyal Prabhandams and his father’s Sankirthanams during the processions. The inscription also mentions the grant of 20 shares of wet land in Tūppil agraharm by Tallapakkam Tiruvengalappa, son of Chinna Tirumalayyangar, for certain ubhayams. An endowment of Ambattūr village with an annual income of 400 Rekhai Pon is also included in this inscription. One point of interest is that a Tiruvenkadamaḍaiyan was installed by him in the Pedda Chimuugu Hill and 2 tirupponakam taligai were offered daily to this Deity for the merit of his mother Pedda Mangamma.
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_TIRUNINRA-UR-UDAIYARS._ The temple accountants have also made their endowments, _KUPPA VENKATATTARASU_ made an endowment of 1282 panams, V. 5; 5-2-1543, for the merit of his mother Piramatal for making offerings to Alarmel-Mangaḷ and Gnānappirān. He made a second endowment for 530 panam V. 64 on 11-3-1546, mainly for Varahaswami. A third endowment was made by him and some other members of his family (V. 67; 11—3—1546). This was partly in the shape of an irrigation channel costing 400 panam and a cash payment of 565 panam. The object of the endowment was the celebration of Nūrrandadi (நுர்பாண்டதி) festival during Adhyayanotsavam in Tirupati for Sri Govindaraja.

_TIRUVANTALVAR KUPPAYAN._ He made five endowments in all. His first endowment, V. 6; 16—2—1543, was made in 1543 and consisted of a sum of 1500 panam for offering one tirupponakam daily to Govinda Krishnan, installed by him in Bhashyakar street, in Tirupati. The second endowment (V. 15) was made in 1545 and consisted of 300 panams presumably for the Tirumanjanam of Govinda Krishnan every Rohini nakshatra, for food offerings during Adhyayanotsavam of Sri Uadiyavar in Tirupati, for Tannir amudu festival etc. The third endowment (V. 52 A) is found in an inscription which mentions neither the date nor the amount, but mentions only the nature of the services. They were tirumanjanam and paruppaviyal offering for Sri Hanuman. The fourth endowment (V. 58; 31—10—1545) was made on 1545 and was for an amount of 2210 panam for offering 1 tirupponakam daily to Sri Govinda Krishna. The fifth endowment is found in an inscription V. 115 which does not give the date or the amount, but mentions only certain dosai padi offerings.

An endowment of 2240 panams for offering one tirupponakam daily to Tiruvenkata Gopala Krishnan (V. 39; dated 18—11—1545) installed by another donor Periyasōlai (a temple accountant) in the Bhashyakar Street in the eastern end. This was probably in competition to the former. A second endowment (V. 82), was made by the same donor on 25—10—1546 for food offerings to the same Deity including a night offering of one tirupponakam.
The total of the endowments by the temple accountants was 11702 panams.

**EMPERUMANADIYAR.**

The vestal virgins were not behind the others in making endowments. Among them were Selli, Hanumasañi, Lingásañi, Tiruvanatamanikkan, Senbaka Vengu, Nágásañi and Sevvu Sañi.

_Selli_ (belonging to the Kaikkolar caste) made an endowment of 1120 panams for the tirumanjanam of Utsavar in Tirumala in Rohini in the month of Tai at the time of the harvest festival. (V. 9; 21—11—1543).

_Lingasani and Tiruvenkata Manikkam_. They were the daughters of Tiruvenkata dāsi and disciples of Kumara Tattayyangar. They made an endowment of 1600 panam for food offerings during the summer festival in the stone-car mantapam in Tirumala. There is another inscription in favour of Lingasani, but this does not show the amount. (V. 32 dated 26—2—1545 and V. 104 dated 23—3—1548).

_Senbaka Vengu_. She was the daughter of Tungachelveli Timmi and the disciple of Kumara Tattayyangar. She made an endowment of 600 panam for making food offerings.

_Nágasañi_. She was sent by Achyutaraya. She made an endowment, but the amount of it is missing in the inscription. (IV. 46; 20—7—1547).

**TEMPLE DOOR-KEEPERS OF THE BIG GOPURAM.**

_(Koyiladis)._ 

The temple door-keepers headed by Tirumalikaran, made an endowment of 570 panam for food offering on the Yugadi day and on a Brahmotsavam festival day. (V. 70; 20—6—1546).

_Vinnapam Seyvar._

One of the Vinnappam Seyvār Tiruvenkata Bhayakkāra Ayyapaṭṭar, son of Tiruvenkatappurumālaraiyar constructed a
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mamantapant in front of his house and made an endowment of 2455 panams for making food offerings to Utsavar during festival. He was obviously performing in Tirumala the same function which the Araiyyars have been doing in the Srirangam Temple.

Lessees of Temple Prasadams (Prasadakkaran Mahamedangal).

The lessees of temple prasadams made endowments of 1850 and 3260 panams for making food offerings to Sri Viṭṭalēsvaramswami and for Sri Govindaraja. (V. 88; 6—2—1547).

Temple Astrologers.

We came across during the latter part of the reign of Achyutaraya one Venkatadri Ayyan, son of Yāndalūr Tirumalai Josyar (Vishnuvardhana Gōtra, Asvalāyana Sūtra, and Rīk Sākha) who on 20—11—1538 endowed a village (name missing) in Poṭṭapinādu Sirmai with an annual income of 700 Rekhai Pon for offering daily to Sri Venkatesa 24 vellai tirupponakam, 24 nāyaka taligai and one Akhandam fed with one marakal of ghee. Another son of Tirumalai Josyar by name Sri Rama Bhattar endowed (V. 1) on 21—7—1541 two villages, Muttūr in Siddhavattam Sirmai with an annual income of 100 Rekhai Pon and Pudukkal in Padavidu Rajyam yielding annually 200 Rekhai Pon for offering daily 4 vellai tirupponakam. A third son by name Malayappar made an endowment (V. 131; 30—7—1551) of two villages Tadapālām in Silakonda Sirmai (Uttara rajya) and Tandalam in Padavidu Rajyam with annual incomes of 100 Rekhai Pon and 200 Rekhai Pon respectively for a daily offering of 4 vellai tirupponakam.

The endowments of the three brothers would have yielded annually 1300 Rekhai Pon. It does not appear that they were in any way connected with the Tirumalai temple administration. But considering that the villages endowed by them were situated as far apart as Paḍavidu and Uttara rajya, the family should have had a high reputation as astrologers and should have been in affluent circumstances.

Another donor who deserves notice is UDAYAGIRI DEVARAYA BHATTAR, the son of Udayagiri Narasinga Bhattar of
Vasishtha gotra, Asvalayana Sutra and Rik Sakha. He was evidently an Archaka by birth. But we are not sure whether he was so by profession. He appears first as the recipient of 1½ taligai of prasadam daily in Tirumala. Manamapoli Singaraja bestowed on him which on 19-1-1545 (V. 28) as charity. We next find him on 8th January 1546 as the donor of 1600 panam for maintaining two water sheds (V. 61). In this connection we are told that the Sthana-ppoduvu in Govindaraja temple, Tirupati. Part of this (1½ taligai) was to be used by him for feeding those employed in his water shed. The latter were paid monthly wages of 4 panams. The water sheds were situated in the Vyasaraya mantapam in Govindaraja North Mada Street and in a mantapam constructed by him in the Sanna kanava near the first ascent of the Hill. He appears next as one invested with some authority. In V. 66 dated 25-3-1546 he is described as the (managers of affairs outside the palace doors) of Potlapati Chinna Timmayyadéva Maharaja. He founded a small village below the Chennapaéiyän tank, named it Vițhoresvarapuram, received a gift of 4 shares of land in another village called Neďunáługulattur and obtained the right to collect 30 Rekhai Pon from the Tirupati Komatis and from the Tirupati and the Kottapalayam merchants. He also excavated an irrigation channel Vittalesvarapuram Kàlvay for the cultivation of certain lands in Varadarajapuram alias Tiruchchukunan. All these he endowed for the maintenance of the temple of Vittalesvarasvámi and for Sri Govindaraja. This shrine of Vițhoresvara was in a part of the Hanuman Temple opposite to Sri Govindaraja Temple. The Tirumanjanam and food offerings were arranged with great discrimination and included several tingal divasams, vishesha divasams and festival days. We are not told what the total income from the endowment was; but the services are listed in the inscription. He evidently wanted to do more, for we find him (V. 89) on 6-3-1547 (i.e., 1 year later) making another endowment by raising subscriptions from the merchants of Tirupati. The amount is not mentioned in the inscription, but the total expenditure amounted to 1280 Rekhai Pon a year. This inscription is of very great value to us, as it gives in detail all the items of expenditure which an ordinary temple
had to incur in a year in those days. We also see at a glance the various services to be performed. These details will be used in considering with the economic condition of the country during that century. He made two other endowments, one (V. 90; 12–5–1547) for an expenditure of \(104\frac{2}{3}\) panams yearly for the 5th day festival of Kodai Tirunal for Sri Govindaraja, and the other (V. 91; 1547) of a capital sum of 2800 panam for certain Ubbhayams for Sri Govindaraja and Achyutaperumāl and for certain food offerings during Sri Venkatesa’s Puraṭṭāsī Brahmostavam.

We have seen that the merchants of Tirupati responded to Devaraja Bhattar willingly. On his account some of them have made large endowments.

He made a last endowment (V. 100 dated 14–11–1547) for the benefit of Sri Vittalesvara temple by collecting yearly 52 Rekhai Pon from the merchants of Tirupati 30 R.P. to be paid as magamai by the merchants trading in the ankanam of Periya Rājavīdhī constructed by Poṭlapaṭi Timmaraja; 10 Rekhai Pon to be paid by the pearl merchants and 12 Rekhai Pon by the merchants who trade during Puraṭṭāsī Brahmostavam in the Viṭṭhalesvaraswami temple site. There was already surplus of 70 Rekhai Pon on hand to be added to this.

*Kālatti* Setti made an endowment of 1085 panams on 31—12—1543 for certain food offerings on days selected by him for Sri Venkatesa and Sri Varahaswami.

*Vangāpuram Narayana Setti*, son of Periya Nāgu Seṭṭiar made an endowment of 48,900 panams of which 43,900 was by him and the remaining 5000 by 17 members of his family. *He was the disciple of Anandampillai Ayyangar*. It is also seen that he was a shroff dealing in gold (Kāsukkaḍai). Even in those days it seems to have been the practice for pilgrims to purchase ‘Kāsus’ in exchange of current coin, so that those who have taken a vow (particularly children to put into the hundi or Koppara, handful or dōsuḍu of Kāsulu) may do so. The ubhayams were in Tirumala as well as Tirupati. In Tirumala he instituted his ubhayam of *Koyilālvār tirumanjanam*. For Sri Govindaraja he arranged a daily offering of one Vaṭai paḍi and pānakam etc., every day
during the evening tōmāla seva (cost of Tirumala and Govindaraja offering 187 R. P); one Sandhi offering daily to Tiruvāḷi Āḻvān, 160 Rekhai Pon a year, etc. He did not forget to offer some in the name of his achārya. His achārya was the recipient of a large portion of the donor’s share.

One Appayya Setti made an endowment of 850 panam for food offerings on occasions.

One Govindi made an endowment of 2180 panams for making food offerings to Sri Venkatesa and Sri Govindaraja on festival days. She was a shepherdess and the endowment was for the merit of her parents and sister. She owned a garden and mantapam in Tirumala.

Two others of shepherd caste Ellan and Narasayyan (Vadukkur Idaiyar) made an endowment of 850 panams for the purpose of food offerings to Sri Govindaraja and Sūdikōḍutta Nāṭchār and Tiruvāḷi Āḻvān on festival occasions.

Endowments by persons unconnected with the temple administration.

Endowments were made by persons who were mere devotees and who had no financial interest in the temple. The more prominent of these were:—Bhayakkara Ramappayyan, Gangu Reddi, Nagara Padandaiyian, Vangāpuram Timmana Udaiyar, Channamman, daughter of Pratapa Ellamarasar.

BHAYAKKARA RAMAPPAYYAN. He was the son of Rayasam Timmarasayyar, who flourished during the reign of Achyutaraya Mahārāja and made endowments in his time. One of these was the grant of the villages of Chīṟāḷa, Perāḷa and Anṭu-palle on 8—9—1538 with an expected annual income of 500 Rekhai Pon for the purpose of offering daily 16 tirupponakam and one appaḍi to Sri Govindaraja. After a few years the Sthanattar found that it was not possible to realise the income from these villages and that the services had to be stopped. Therefore his son Bhayakkāra Ramappayyar granted in lieu of these three villages half of the villages of Kulattūr (east of Neṭunāḍu Eechambāḍī,
village) with an annual income of 150 Rekhai Pon and the whole village of Koppoli in Manamapoli Sirmai with an annual income of 350 R.P. In this manner he made sure that his father’s endowment did not fail. (V. 17; 14—6—1544).

The same inscription includes other endowments made in his own name—an endowment of the villages of (1) Parachur in Addanki Sirmai yielding 150 R.P. yearly, and (2) Karuchchuru in Gandikotai Sirmai yielding 80 Rekhai Pon (Total 450 R.P.). With this amount he arranged for offering 19 more tirupponakam taligai daily to Sri Govindaraja, (15 in his own names and 4 for the merit of Rachcharasayyar’s son Krishnappayyar). He also arranged for offering daily one tirupponakam to Tiruvâli Alvân, Lakshminarayana, Sri Andal and Achyutaperumâl. The total was 26 tirupponakam daily.

GANGU REDDI of Ògampâdu village. He made three endowments. The first for which 1500 panams was made in Achyutaraya’s time on 19—2—1535. His second and third endowments were made during Sadasivaraya’s reign. They consisted (V. 3) of 10080 panams on 11—9—1542 and one village and a half (Koralagunta ½ and Alamelmangai full) V. 84 on 3—11—1546 with an annual income of 120 R.P. The ūbhayams on the former were 6 tirupponakam daily to Sri Venkatesa and to Tiruvâli Alvân, Govinda Krishna and Govindaraja in Tirupati on certain occasions. Tiruvengaâdamudaiyan was offered 4 tirupponakam daily and certain ūbhayams on other days.

NĀGARĀ PADANḄIYAR. He seems to have obtained a gift of some village with an annual income of 300 Rekhai Pon from Sadasivaraya and to have endowed it to the Tirumala Temple for offering daily 4 tirupponakam to Sri Venkatesa. As this village failed to yield that income he endowed instead half the village of Tippanapuram in Penukonda Sirmai with an annual income of 300 Rekhai Pon. He also paid in addition 100 ghaṭṭi varāhan for improving the tanks and channels in that village. (V. 77; 10—8—1546).

This is the only inscription in which Sadasivaraya is mentioned with the prasasti “ Purva Dakshina Paschima Uttara Samudradhi-
"swara" in addition to the usual Maharajadhiraja Rajapramesvara Sri Vira Pratapa. It is however an exaggeration to include Uttara Samudram as having been under Sadasivaraya’s rule.

**VANGAPURAM TIMMANNA UDAIYAR.** He made an endowment (V. 81; 13—10—1546) of 12000 panam for offering daily 6 vellai tirupponakam to Sri Venkateswara. The donor’s quarter share was to be delivered to Vangāpuram Narayana Setti, a merchant of Tirupati, for the purpose of maintaining a water shed in a mantapam which had been constructed by his father Ellappa Udayār at the foot of the Tirumalai Hill.

**CHINNAMMAN daughter of PRATAPA ELLAMARASAR.** She made a grant of the village of Vankayalapattu (Sriramachandrapuram) in Kondavidu Sirmai with an annual income of 300 Rekhai Pon for offering daily 10 vellai tirupponakam to Sri Govindaraja and 2 to Sri Viṭṭhalesvara (V. 118; 8—7—1547).

There are also a number of other donors whose endowments are noted below. They are for various services and not exclusively for services to Sri Venkatesvara.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ättukuru Singarayya (21–3–1545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vangapuram Tiruvanakattayyar (1–5–1545) Kaṭṭilarpattu village income yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sēttaluru Kuppayyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dēsantri Pēruralālayyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Eṭṭur Srinivasar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—8 6. Ellappa Pillai (3–10–1543)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—12 7. Sevvu Setti (11–5–1544)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—24 8. Ārumilli Appayyan (13–9–1544)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—31 9. Tirumalamman (15–2–1545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—42 10. Periya Kōnēri Setti, 1545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—44 11. Singarayya (21–3–1545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—56 12. Hanumayyan (26–10–1545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—49 13. Tiruvanakata Kouri (5–7–1545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—76 14. Tirumalamman (18–8–1546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—108 16. Timmayyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Tiruvanakadadasar (1545)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26,990
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V—29 Aliya Ramaraja</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Puduppattu</td>
<td>.. 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—53 P. Timmarajayyan</td>
<td>13220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V—78 do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Pappu Timmaraja</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>Kollur</td>
<td>.. 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 do.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>Venadu</td>
<td>.. 2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Vittalesvara Maharaya</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>{Palamangalam, Paranur, Venakattur}</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Matla Varadaraja</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Manapoli Sriranga-raja</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>Errapakkam</td>
<td>.. 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Sripati Obalesvarappa</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>Perur</td>
<td>.. 3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 Tiruvadi Raja</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>Kulaiyapattam {Bangaram, Vittaseri, Bhudapuram}</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Pendlikoduku Timmaraja</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 Tirumalaraja</td>
<td>16500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 Araviti Kondaraja</td>
<td>Ten villages</td>
<td>57130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 do.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 do.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>Nagari &amp; Vidu</td>
<td>.. 4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 Aliya Ramaraja</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>Four villages</td>
<td>40000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 34455 | 27½ villages | 126700 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generals, etc.</th>
<th>Cash.</th>
<th>No. of villages.</th>
<th>Annual income in panams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Attilangu Nayakkar</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Murti Nayakkar</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$ village + $4\frac{1}{2}$ shares</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Krishnappa Nayak</td>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Sevvu Nayak</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Sevvappa Nayak</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 Surappa Nayak</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 A. Tirumala Nayak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4310</td>
<td>$3\frac{1}{2} + 4\frac{1}{2}$ shares</td>
<td>6250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Civil Officers.**

| 21 Rayasam Hari-appar | 1580 |                  |                          |
| 129 ,, Venkatadri     | 2$\frac{1}{2}$ | 10300            |
| 167 ,, do. his brother| ..   | 4 $+ 96$ sh.     | 6460                     |
| 161 Karanika Appalayar (two) | .. | 1 + lands | 3058                  |
| 145, 147              | ..   | 1                |                          |
|                     | 1580 |                  | 19818                    |

**Archakas.**

V—60 Venkatatturaivar 2657

**Jiyars.**

V—2 Koyil Kelvi Jiyar 2500
80 Vanamamalai Ramanuja ,, 2000
V—94 Vada Tiruvennon-kata ,, 840

5340
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acharyapurushas.</th>
<th>Cash.</th>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>annual income in panams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V— 7 Ananda Appayyar</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandada Srimangachariyar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 Sottai Tirumalai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 nambi Srinivasaayyangar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 do. Kumara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattayyangar 3400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others connected with the Temple.

| Tallapakam Tirumalai Iyengar |   7932   | 20600 |

Tiruninra-ur-Udaiyar.

| V— 5 Kuppa Venkattarasu | 1282 |     |
| do. | 530 |     |
| do. | 1065 |     |

Tiruninra-ur-Udaiyar

| Kuppayyan | 1500 |
| do. | 300 |
| Another | 2210 |
| Periyasala | 2240 |
| do. | 2575 |
| 11702 |     |

| Emperumanadiyar | 3329 |
| Door-keepers | 570 |
| Prasadakkarar | 2455 |
| Tirumalai Josyar sons | 13000 |
| Udayagiri Devaraya Bhattar | 13320 |
| Merchants | 53865 |
| 69920 | 1 | 26320 |
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CHAPTER XXI

THE ARAVIDU EMPERORS OF VIJAYANAGAR
AND THE TIRUVENGADAM TEMPLE.
1565—1665.

HISTORIANS have not told us what was the fate of Sadāsivadeva Mahārāja after the battle of Rākshasa tangadi or Tālikota in 1565 A.D. and when he died. It is also doubtful whether Araviḍi Bukkarāja Ramarāja Srirangarāja Tirumalarāja (the brother of Aliya Ramarāja) really ascended the throne as Emperor in succession to Sadāsiva Mahārāja and if so when. Whether Sadāsiva Mahārāja left any sons whose claims were superceded is also not known. Nor is there any inscription in Vol. V or in Vol. VI of the Devasthanam inscriptions to show that Tirumalarāja was at any time recognised as the Emperor. The first member of the Aravidu dynasty to appear in the inscription as Emperor is Srirangarāja. This inscription is dated (V. 3) 16—1—1583.

The period between 1565 and 1583 deserves scrutiny in the light of two of our inscriptions, viz., No. 174, of Vol. V and No. 2 of Vol. VI. We have already noticed that No. 173 (Vol. V) dated 26—1—1564 which was made one year before the battle of Talikota distinctly states in the preamble that Sriman Mahārājadhirāja Rājaparameswara Sri Virapratāpa Sri Vira Sadāsivarāya Maharayar was the Emperor ruling at the time. The next inscription in Vol. V. No. 174 is dated Friday the 7th tithi of the pūrva paksham in Kumbha month and Bharani Nakshatra of the cyclic year Srimukha, Śaka 1495 (29th January 1574 A.D.). In this inscription the preamble gives a prasasti slightly different from the usual form. It omits or leaves blank the name of the Emperor ruling at the time. It reads: "When Sriman Mahāmanḍalēsvara Rājādhirāja Rajaparamēsvara Sri Virapratāpa Sri Vira............ was ruling the kingdom."

The birūdu Mahāmanḍalesvara Rajadhiraṇa denotes perhaps a lower dignitary than Mahārājadhirāja. It would not have been
used if at the time Sadāsiva Maharayar was alive, or was ruling the kingdom. Reading through the text of the inscription, another peculiarity is noted. The Sthanattar, evidently acting under the orders of some one whose name is left blank, but who is described as the son of "Aravīṭṭu Bukkarāja........dēva mahārayar of Atrēyagōtra, Apesthamba Sūtra and Yajus Sākha," are stated to have made over in perpetuity to two persons Arulālar and Karunākarayya (related to Marudūr Appan) the one-fourth share (donor's share) of the prasadams which were being offered in the name of Achyutarāya Mahārāya. The name of the then Emperor, who was evidently not Sadāsivaraya, is omitted. The order authorising the Sthanattar to dispose of once for all Achyutaraya's share emanated not from the Emperor but from the son of a certain Aravīṭṭi Bukkarāya....Maharayar. We know that at this time Araviti Bukkarāya....Tirumalarāya was the most prominent man in the Empire, even if he was not the Emperor. We may therefore conclude that Tirumalarāya was the Emperor at this time and that it should have been one of his sons, either Sriranga or Venkaṭapatidēva, who empowered the Sthanattar to act in the manner they did. But though Tirumalarāya was the Emperor, he was evidently not for his name being mentioned in the inscription as Emperor. Considering the tragic circumstances of the Empire when he was called upon to ascend the throne and the uncertainty of retaining the Empire such an attitude may be considered natural in a person of Tirumalarāya’s nature. The omission of the names in the inscription might have been deliberately made.

The next inscription relating to this transition period is VI.2 of the date 27—11—1579. The preamble in this inscription shows a clean break from all the previous and the subsequent ones. There is no reference to any ruling Emperor. It starts with 'Subhamastu, Svasti Sri' and proceeds to recite the date of the inscription as Śaka 1501, Pramādi samvatsaram, Vrischika māsam, purva paksha dasami, Friday, Utiṭraṭṭādi nakshatram. The details about the donor are given next, Komāndūr Appayan, son of some Appa Ayyangar of Jayangoṇḍa Sola maṇḍalam. Next come the details of the food offerings to be made and the nature of the endowment, this being the excavation of a spring channel for irrigation (kasakkāl).
The Sthanattar in Tirumala state that they accept the endowment under the orders of the Sri Vaishnavas of Tirumala. This is not the usual form of subscription in inscription. The usual ending is "இப்புரை இல்லை கற்றைக்காண் பலிவாள் வரவிற்கு கசைக்கு சிறி
கிராம வாதம்பார் சமத்து. விளக் வாள்வேலன் விளங்கார்." But this inscription ends thus "இத்தென்றெல்லை கற்றைக்காண்
பலிவாள் விளக்கல் கசைக்கு சிறி...இப்புரை இல்லை
கசைக்கு சிறி கிராமம் வாதம்பார் சமத்து. விளக் வாள்வேலன்
விளங்கார்." In the next inscription viz., VI. 3 (16—1—1583) the usual preamble "Subhamastu Svasti Sri SrIman Mahārājādhīrāja Rājaparamēsvara Sri Virapratāpa Sir Vira Srirangadēva Mahārāyar, ruling the kingdom..." makes its appearance again.

The confusion during the interval might have been due to the fact that the capital of the empire was somewhere away from Vijayanagar or Chandragiri and that the Sthanattar did not get any authentic information about the state of the Empire and the Emperor.

The Devasthanam Epigraphist in his note on page 2 (Vol. VI) and in his Report (page 309) states that Tirumalarāya ascended the throne about 1575 A.D. having at the same time shifted his capital to Penugonda and that his reign was a brief one lasting for two or three years during which time his second son Srirangaraja (Ranga II) was co-regent with him. Dr. S. K. Ayyangar also states on pages 308, 309 of Vol. II. of his History of Tirupati that as the battle of Talikota went against the Hindus, Tirumalarāya removed the capital from Vijayanagar to Penugonda and that his reign commenced about 1575 A.D. Dr. Ayyangar also states that Tirumalaraya in his own life-time appointed his third son Venkatāpati as the Governor of the southern part of the Empire with headquarters at Chandragiri. We have seen that in inscription VI.2 which is dated 27—11—1579 there is no mention of an Emperor. If an Emperor was believed to be ruling, the Sthanattar would not have omitted all references to him.

Inscription No. 3 (16—1—1583) reverts as has already been pointed out to the recognised pattern of preamble. It therefore
looks as if for nearly 18 years after the battle of Talikota, the Sthanattar did not definitely know whether the Hindu Empire continued to exist or not. The donor in No. 3 is one Tillappa Nayakkar, residing in Vijayanagar City. This perhaps shows that although the capital of the Empire was removed to Penugonda, people were still living in Vijayanagar leading a normal life. He owned a garden in Tirupati and there was a mantapam in that garden. He is therefore likely to have been a native of Tirupati residing in Vijayanagar, probably as one of the Officers under Srirangarāya. His endowment was in the nature of excavating an irrigation channel in the (tiruvīdayāṭṭam) Temple village of Pāḍi in Ulmanḍalam. It was expected that this improvement would yield 85 putties of paddy valued at 34 Rekhai Pon at the rate of 4 panam per putti of paddy. His ubhayams consisted of festivals on the Hunting festival day and on the day of his own birth star (āṭṭai nakshatram) both being celebrated in Govindaraja’s temple. This inscription affords interesting information about the prices of several kinds of grains and provisions as well as of cooked and baked food offerings current at the time.

All the inscriptions from 3 to 8 of Vol. VI mention Srirangadēva Mahārāyar as the Emperor. Their dates lie between January 1583 and 1588 A.D. (Saka 1510). The next inscription (No. 9) which is dated 14th July 1592 mentions Sri Vira Venkatāpatidēva Mahārayar as the ruler of the Kingdom. The date on which Srirangaraya’s reign came to an end and Venkatāpatidevaraya’s reign commenced cannot be definitely stated. In regard to the end of the rule of Sri Venkatāpatiraya also there is some uncertainty. Dr. Ayyangar states that it ended in 1614, whereas inscription No. 19 shows that it extended even to 1616 A.D.

There really is no need for us to know for certain the names of the rulers in whose time the inscriptions in Vol. VI were made. All that we have to note is that the Tuluva dynasty came to an end with Sadāsivarāya Mahārāya. When it actually ended is not definitely known. We are also not certain whether Tirumalarāya actually reigned as Emperor. Inscription No. 1 in Vol. VI mentions his name as Tirumaladēva Mahārajulungāru and Tirumalarājaya. He is not called Tirumalarāya Mahārāyar in any
inscription. It is likely that after the calamities that had happened to the empire he was not inclined formally to crown himself as the Emperor and assume all the prāsasti. But it is significant that the Aravidu family assumed the Government of the Empire as the undisputed successors of the Tuluva family even though the Tuluvas belonged originally to the Kannada country, and the Aravidus hailed from the Telugu country since known as Rāyalaseema. We do not also find any sign of the Kannada language in any of the inscriptions of this period.

As ministers of Sadāsivarāya Mahārāya, Aravīṭi Aliya Ramārāja and Tirumalarāja made munificent endowments to the temple. But after ascending the throne of the decadent Empire, not a single endowment was made by any member of the Aravidu dynasty. The endowments made after 1574 A.D. were made by some of the officers serving under them, by the Achāryapurushass and Jiyars attached to the temple or by well-to-do devotees. This dynasty ruled for nearly a century from 1575 to 1665 A.D. It is stated that Venkatāpatirāya got himself crowned in Tirumala, that he made Chandragiri his capital and that he was frequently visiting the Tirumalai Temple. Certain Vijayanagar coins bearing the inscription ‘Sri Venkatēsvarāya Namāh’ are referred to as evidence of his close association with Tirumala. But none of the Aravidu Emperors made any endowments.

Another feature worth noting is that out of 192 inscriptions clubbed together in Vol. VI, it is only in the case of 32 inscriptions that a date can be assigned with certainty and only eight of these inscriptions find a place on the walls of the Tirumala Temple, the last one belonging to the year 1616 A.D. All the others are found on the walls of Sri Govindarājasvāmi Temple in Tirupati or on the Alipiri structures at the foot of the hill ascent. THE CENTRE OF INTEREST THEREFORE SEEMS TO HAVE SHIFTED TO TIRUPATI AFTER 1616 A.D. This might have been due to the want of adequate feeding arrangements in Tirumala, perhaps on account of the failure of the annual income from the lands endowed to the temple caused by the ruined or neglected
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condition of the irrigation channels. We however find that Rama-
rajaya's avasaram (sandhi offering) of 200 taligai was being offered
in Tirumala in 1616 (page 116, Vol. VI) and that from out of
the Sthanattar's share of this the Srivaishnava Ramanujakutam
was allotted 12 taligais from that date. We also find from Narayana
dasari's endowment that in 1606 A.D. (page 96. Vol. VI) the
Ramanujakutam in Tirupati was providing food to pilgrims at a
cost of 50 Rekhai Pon. The only Ramanujakutam in Tirupati
was the one started by Araviti Kondaraja in 1547 A.D. This
was the one which provided food for nearly 2000 pilgrims a day.
How these pilgrims fared after 1616 A.D. we cannot say for certain.
The bulk of the food offerings made during the century following
the battle of Talikota was made for specific festivals or ubhayams,
most of which were in Tirupati. The food offerings would therefore
have benefited the natives of Tirupati more than the visiting pilgrims.

After the death of Venkatapatidivaraya I, say in 1616 A.D.,
there was no peace in the country for a long time. The observations
contained in "the English Factory records" against the dates
shown bear out this statement. They were in search of suitable
places for establishing factories:—July 20, 1620 (From Batavia
to the company). "........We referred the sending of people
to remain in Pulicat until we are better furnished with factors,
being unable to spare any from hence until the President's coming.
Were it not for future hopes, that factory at Pulicat were not worth
the establishing, being at present all in wars with one another.
It is in time of peace the place of best cloth and paying in all
coromandel coast."

Again about the invitation the English had from the Naick
who owned Amagaon (Dugiraja patam) to seat themselves within
his territory, they stated that when they visited him on January 26,
1626 he was conducting a siege of some fort twenty miles away.
They presented him a cannon and got the concession; but at the
same time they felt doubtful about the Naick continuing to hold his
possessions. They observed that "the Naick stood on doubtful
terms whether he shall keep his country or he is an usurper and that
the true king doth daily take from him and his fellow confederates."
A letter dated August 29, 1629 contains the Statement that the
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great king of the jentues (Chandragiri rajah) reduced all the Naicks
to submission save the one in whose territory Amagaon was situated
and they feared that the latter would not long be able to hold
out.”

On January 23, 1633, Christopher Read wrote: “Masulipatam and Amagaon are sorely oppressed with famine, the living
eating up the dead, and man durst scarcely travel in the country
for fear they should be killed and eaten.” The Golkonda army
subsequently overran the whole country and Amagaon itself was
occupied by a neighbour. There was confusion everywhere when
Venkatapathy I died in 1642. There was always the trouble from
Golkonda particularly from about 1638 A.D. This was made
worse by civil wars of succession. Rama IV, Venkata II, and
Sriranga II. had all to fight for the throne in succession. The
agricultural economy of the country would have been much upset
by these wars. There was also a great famine about 1630 A.D.
These circumstances possibly account for the absence of inscriptions
(particularly in Tirumala) showing any endowments made. Dr.
S. K. Ayyangar says (page 373, History of Tirupati, Vol. II),
“...the wealth of Mir Jumla was enormous because of the vast
plunder that he got from the South Indian temples that he con-
quered, while among the temples which came within the purview
of his conquests, the temple at Tirupati would be one of the mos.
prominent one and surely it must have been one of the richest
Temples like Kālahasti, Conjivaram and a number of others that
could be mentioned certainly do come within the sphere of his
activity. This is about all that we could hear of regarding Tirupati
in these campaigns in addition to the fact that Sriranga made three
efforts on separate occasions to recover Tirupati. He succeeded
in recovering it in 1656 and perhaps lost it again so that it remained
under Golkonda’s possession afterwards.” Mr. Ayyangar does
not however specify the three occasions referred to above. But
it was pointed out already (while reviewing the inscriptions shown
in Vol. V. of the T. T. Devasthanam Inscription No. 43) that on
Jyeshta Bahula 10 in the cyclic year Visvāvasu Sriman Mahārajādhi-
rāja Rājaparamesvara Sri Virapratāpa Sri Vira Srirangaraja Mahā-
raja visited the Tirumalai Temple. “$\text{பானி முளை வேண்டும் கொடும்}
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and that the Visvavasut YEAR can be only 1665 A.D. when one Srirangaraya was the Emperor. Unless the Tirumalai Temple was within his Empire, he would not have paid a visit to it. But it is curious that the inscription on a separate slab in Tirumala and not on the walls; and that no mention is made of his attempts to reconquer Tirupati from the Muslims. Nor did he make any thanksgiving offering to the Deity.

There is mention of a Koil Kelvi Van Saathakopan Alagiya Manavala Ramanuja Jiyar in the inscription No. 12 dated 19th April 1596 A.D. relating to an endowment made by Silambidaiyar setti, one of the merchants of Ramapuram. This Van Sathakopa Ramanuja Jiyar seems to have been the Jiyar of the Ahobila Mutt about the same period. This matham being a Vadagalai matham its Jiyar must have been a Vadagalai. In the Ahobila matham there used to be three Jiyars, ranking according to seniority. This Van Sathakopa Alagiya Manavala Ramanuja Jiyar was presumably the Vadagalai Jiyar and Koyil Kelvi also, though not Periya Koyil Kelvi. Even now there is invariably a Vadagalai Ekaangi attached to the Periya Jiyar in Tirupati. The Devasthanam Epigraphist translates the expression Koil Kelvi Sathakopan and Koil Kelvi Alagiya Manavala Ramanuja Jiyar, as if the Tamil words indicated two different persons. He completely ignores the prefix ‘van’ to Sathakopa. The translation is obviously incorrect. There was friendly relationship between the Vadagalai and the Tengalai Jiyars in those days. For instance in Vol. VI. 10 dated 16—1—1594, it is stated in the endowment by Koyil Kelvi Annan Ramanuja Jiyar that the Tirumanjanam and the food offerings to Sri Govindaraja were made while seated in the Van Sathakopan matham which is a Vadagalai matham. Thereafter we do not find Ramanuja Jiyar as making endowment or receiving any Prasadams as donee. The name occurs again in No. 18 dated 4—11—1614 to describe a mantapam as one constructed in the name of Periya Timmappan through the agency of Tirumalai Tirupati Periya Koyil'
THE ARAVIDU EMPERORS OF VIJAYANAGAR

Kelvi, Annan Ramanuja Jiyar. The use of this expression for describing a place and a mantapam would not by itself mean that he was alive in 1614. It may be that the Van Saṭhakopan Jiyar was his junior in 1594 and that in 1596 he became Koyil Kelvi Jiyar. We note from these inscriptions that there was harmonious relationship between the Tengalais and Vadagalais in those days.

This Van Saṭhakopa Alagiya Manavala Ramanuja Jiyar is probably the same as the Van Sathagopa Jiyar who in 1584–1585 was instrumental in liberating the Ahobilam temples from the hands of the rabid Seivites known as Hundais and the Muslim Ibrahim Qutab Shah of Golkonda. The temples were captured by the Muslims with the assistance of the Hundais in 1578. The village was pillaged and the temple structures mutilated, a fact to which the carved figures in the unfinished Kalyāṇa mantapam bear testimony. Upon this the Srivaishnavas deserted the place. And although Van Sathakopa Jiyar persuaded Srirangaraja to reconquer the place under the generalship of Kondarāju Venkatarāju and plant a Vijaya Sthambham in the Temple, the village soon became depopulated. Van Satakopayati himself might have left for the branch matham (rather the original home) in Tirumala sometime after 1586. Here in consideration of the great service he had done for the cause of Srivaishnavism, he might have been appointed as Koyil Kelvi Jiyar in succession to Annan Ramanuja Jiyar who died sometime about 1594 A.D. At any rate we find that he was the Jiyar in Tirumala, when Venkatapatidevarāyā, the spiritual disciple of Eṣṭur Tirumalai Kumāra Tatadhariar (a Vadagalai), was the ruling Emperor. This is a matter of some importance to the two sects of Sri Vaishnavas in Southern India.

1 One of the predecessors of this Jiyar, Vedānta Saṭhakopa Jiyar, was the recognized recipient (sishyaparaṁparatī) of betel leaves and nuts which represented the donor’s share of his sīhya. name not given in the inscription (V. 65) nor the date. The T. T. D. Epigraphist presumes, in the footnote furnished by him to the inscription, that the sīhya was Nārāyana Naraparājya (V. 122) who made his endowment in 1549 A.D. One Parankusa Jiyar is said to have been his successor and predecessor to Van Sathakopa Alagiya Manavala Ramanuja Jiyar.
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ETTUR TIRUMALAI KUMARA TATACHARIAR\(^1\) mentioned above was a prominent person among the Srivaishnavas of the day. He is known to have made several endowments in Kânchipuram and his descendants have always been holding the key position in the temple of Sri Varadarajaswami there. He is stated to have had the Vimanam of Sri Venkatesvara's temple regilded. But there is no inscription in Tirumala or Tirupati which mentions so important an event. There is however an inscription which enumerates the villages endowed by him from the income whereof several festivals and services were arranged to be celebrated every year. This endowment (VI. 5; 25—9—1583) was made when Sriman Mahārajādhirāja Rājaparamesvara Sri Virapatapra Sri Vira Srirangarāyadeva' Maharāyar was ruling the kingdom and perhaps before he became the ācharya or guru of Sri Vira Venkata-pathideva Maharāya, the successor of Sri Rangarāyadeva Maharāyar. It is possible that he was the guru of Venkatapati even before he became the Emperor and that the ritualistic portion of this coronation was performed by him as is generally believed. He did not make any endowments during the period when his sishya was the Emperor. There is only the legend that he did the regilding of the Vimanams. But four entire villages were endowed by him (in 1583), just fifteen years after the battle of Talikota. The expected annual income from these villages was 720 Rekhai Pon.\(^2\)

1. The correct genealogy of Ettur Tirumalai Kumāra Tatachariar is given as footnote in connection with Seṭṭai Ettur Tirumalainambi Śrinivasayangar in Sadasivayya's period. Chap. XX pp 760, 161.

2. 1. Ayyambakkam in Pālavettu Sirmai near Terku magannai division income 300 R. 1'.
   2. Pisāttur in the same Sirmai 210
   3. Pulivāyi in the same Sirmai
   4. Mullai váví in Tulai parivāyi

The e village were endowed for the following purposes:

(a) two Pog 1 talangus to be offered daily to Sri Venkateswara at the time of the Ṛadhyedana Sardhi after Tirumanjanam costing 146 R. 1'.

(b) the celebration of a Tirukkoḍittirūrāl yearly in the month of Arpasi. Among the vahanams to be used during this festival specific mention is made of Nanji (Hamsa), Garuda and Anai (elephant) vahanams. The expenditure
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Etur Tirumalai Kumara Tatarchariar ayyan is described as the grandson of Tolappachariar and the son of Ayyavayyanger of the Sathamarshaana gotra, Apastamba Sutra and Yajus-sakha. But he is not described as an acharyapurusha. This shows that his ancestors had separated themselves from the main family of Tirumalainambi long before and had lost the right to be called acharya purushas of the Tirumala Temple. But the branch family has been allowed to retain the right of reading the Kaisika purana in Tirumala while the main family does it in Tirupati. This will however be dealt with at greater length when we come to the Acharyapurushas of this temple.

We see that in this period except for the endowment made by Kumara Tatarchariar, the others were all of minor importance. But they show that the irrigation sources stood in need of repairs and that the Sthanattar were prepared to celebrate ubhayams in exchange for repair work done to these irrigation sources. No cash endowments were made during the period of Srirangarayar i.e., (till 1588 A.D.).

Venkatapatidevaraya Maharayar I.

We next pass on to the period of Venkata I. The inscriptions of this period are those numbered from 9 to 19 (July 1592 to

on this festival including the various food offerings on all the 11 days, amounted to 410 R.P., 8 ½ panams

(c) the flower crown festival (Tirumugakkaţtu) for 11 R.P. and 5 ½ panams.

(d) the provision of a special Pulugukkappu murai for the Mula Beram on the Friday occurring during the Tirukkodittirunāl. The manner in which this is performed has already been described in the chapter on daily worship. This costs 136 R.P. and 1 ½ panam.

(e) a Uriadi festival for Malayappan and Srl Krishna at a cost of 8 R.P. and 7 panams;

(f) the most significant item is however the provision made for the Kaisika Puranam ubhayam in Tirumala at a cost of 6 R.P. and 7 ½ panams. This consists in the reading of the Kaisika puranam (already described) on the early morning of Kaisika or Uttana dvācāsī day. The right of reciting the puranam on this day is a right which has been since then and is still being exercised by the Kanchipuram Tatarchari family. Distribution of Jyalaṛaṇi offerings at Sri Ramanuja’s shrine to those who recite the Prabandhams during the Prahmostsavam.
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November 1616). There are only three endowments showing grant of villages for the performance of ubhayams. In two cases services alone are mentioned, but not the endowment. In other cases, irrigation channels are stated to have been excavated. Nine such channels are mentioned, all being in temple villages. There was no endowment in cash.

A small endowment (VI. 17; 8–11–1613) which consisted of the re-excavation of a spring channel in Pundi village was incised on stone in the presence of Venkatapatideva Maharayar. The irrigation channel was called Nāṭtu Kālvāy in Pundi village and it entitled the donor for offering one tirupponakam daily in the Tirumalai temple (Inscription No. VI. 17; 8–11–1613). The presence of the Emperor himself on that day probably made the Sthanattar mention that fact. It is also for that very reason that it is specially noticed here. It is generally believed that Venkatapatiraya having removed his capital to Chandragiri, was frequently visiting the temple and that he was so great a devotee of Sri Venkatesa that he even issued coins bearing the figure of Sri Venkatesa with the words “Sri Venkatēśāya Namah” inscribed. But in view of the fact that he made no endowments to the Temple it is doubtful whether the belief is well founded. We have seen that money was scarce in those days and that the restoration of irrigation channels was the only manner in which the temple services could be kept going. But Kānukās or voluntary gifts of money, coins of various kinds, jewels, etc., put into the Koppara (or hundi) of the temple would have continued to be made by the pilgrims, for this was a long established practice. It is not unlikely that the Emperor was reduced to the plight of making use of all the surplus income of the temple for maintaining an army in defence of the Empire. He and his spiritual mentor Kumāra Tatāchariar would have considered such a diversion of temple funds as having Sri Venkatesvara’s sanction. The coin might therefore have been issued in the name of Sri Venkatesvara. This is a possible explanation of the coins bearing the inscription “Sri Venkatēśāya Namah.”

It is worth noting that during this period there were three instances of endowment of whole village. The first of these (VI. 9;
14th—7th—1592) was made by one Periya Timmappa Nāyakkar residing in Vijayanagaram in 1592 A.D. The village endowed by him was known as Agaram Pūndamallī situated in Pālaiyam Sirmai of Terku Magamai (Southern Province) yielding an annual income of 320 Rekhai Pon. All the ubhayams of this endowment were in the temples of Sri Govindarajaswami and Sri Ramanuja in Tirupati. The second endowment (VI. 10; 16—1—1594) was that of the village of Timmānāyakapuram situated in Kondavidi sirmai of the Vaḍakku Magamai (Northern province) yielding an annual income of 200 Rekhai Pon. It was made by Kōyil Kēlvi Annan Ramanuja Jiyar in 1594. Some of the ubhayadars of this endowment were in Tirumala and some in Tirupati. The third instance was the endowment (VI. 15; 2—3—1607) by one Nārayana Dāsari Nāyakkar of Timmāpuram village situated in Chandragiri Rajyam (Uḍanḍalām) and yielding an annual income 600 Rekhai Pon. All the ubhayams of this endowment were in Tirupati for Sri Govindarajaswami and for Sri Raghunathaswami installed by him on a mantapam on the banks of the Govinda-pushkarini.

There is however a defect or flaw in the recording of the inscription relating to the last endowment. The preamble states that the date of record was “Parābhava Samvatsara Mina month, aparapaksha panchami, makha-nākshatram, Saka 1528, when Vira Venkatapati deva Maharayar was ruling.” The week-day is missing. Neither the aparapaksha nor the purvapaksha panchami of that month in that year was concurrent with makha nakshatram. There is an error of 6 nakshatras. Aparapaksha panchami is concurrent with Visakha nakshatra. So large an error can be explained only by assuming that the inscription was made a long time after the grant. It may also be that the grant itself is spurious.

The endowment of villages situated in the Northern, the Central and the Southern provinces may be taken as evidence of the existence of a stable government in the country and the absence of the turmoils of war. The provision made in the endowments for the celebration of ubhayams in the temples of the Alvars and of Sri Ramanuja, indicates the influence which Venkatapati-devaraya, as a Srivaishnava, was exercising over his officers.
Endowments in the shape of grants of whole villages cease with the cyclic year Parābhava Saka 1528 (1606—1607). Thereafter the endowment is invariably made in the shape of re-excavation of old spring channels or the excavation of new ones for the irrigation of the lands in the tiruviḍaiyāṭṭam villages, all of which are situated in Ulmanḍalam, near to Tirumala and Tirupati. Between the years 1596 (Saka 1518) Durmukhi, and 1616 (Saka 1538) Nala ten irrigation channels were re-excavated in this manner by six donors. Silambiḍaiyar Setṭi of Rāmāpuram (VI. 12; 19–4–1596) renovated the disused channel called Rayaneri Kāḷvāy in Rāmāpuram, so as to increase the yield annually by 140 Rekhai Pon. Bokkasam Narasayyan of Vijayanāgaram (VI. 13; 31–3–1606) improved an irrigation channel so as to make the lands watered by it yield annually 27 Rekhai Pon more than the former yield. Hanumayyar Annangar, commander of the Vijayanagar forces, stationed at Mālyavantam Hills, Vijayanagaram, (VI. 14; 28–11–1606) re-excavated three irrigation channels in Kallaru and Nariyaru river limits and also granted 3/4 share of a new village founded by him called Aṭṭangāṛpālayam the annual income derived out of the endowment being 365 Rekhai Pon. Singayananakan re-excavated (VI. 17; 8–11–1613) the Nāṭṭukāḷvāy in Pūṇḍī village and also gave 2 shares of Pallam lands and in return for it obtained the right to offer 1 tirupponakam daily to Sri Venkatesa. Noṭrakkāra Venkatayyan of Dānṇāyaka Achyutapuram village founded by Venkatapatirayadeva Mahārayar (VI. 18; 4–11–1614), re-excavated two irrigation channels in 1614, one in Nāyakan Kāḷvāy village in Kuḍavūr nāḍū which gave an increased yield of 400 puṭṭis of paddy, the price of which was 4 panam per puṭṭy. Lastly Sriman Mahāmaṇḍalesvara Chinna Timmarājyyan through his agent Ghaṭṭu Tiruvēṇkaṭa Ayyangar of Tirunārāyanaapuram (VI. 19; 4–11–1616) excavated two irrigation channels, one in the temple village of Ilamanḍaiyam and the other in a village, the name of which is missing in the inscription. The lands irrigated by the channels yielded paddy valued at 281 Rekhai Pon and 6 panams over and above what they were previously yielding.
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In all the above cases, the excavation of channels in the villages of Ulmandalam would have been done only at the request or the suggestion of the Sthanattar. The donors were men of influence, who could muster local labour and execute the repairs. This form of endowment shows to some extent the pitiable economic condition into which the country was drifting after 1606 A.D.

Another reason for making endowments of this kind might have been the impossibility of realising income from lands situated far away from Tirupati owing to the disturbed state of these regions. For aught we know the Sthanattar and the Tiruppani Bhandaṭaratṭar had to supervise the management of more than 200 villages situated in different nāḍus, sirmais, and magamais of the Vijayanagar Empire. It does not however appear that any serious difficulty was felt in the management of landed estates even so late as 1616 A.D. For instance, Mahāmandalesvara Chinna Thimmayyan’s endowment states that Ramarajayyan’s avasaram of 200 taligais every day was regularly functioning in November 1616 A.D. It may be remembered that two out of the four villages granted for the purpose, Singalabāvi and Valākōlij were situated in Raichur and Mudgal sirmai, which were then distracted by war and that the other two villages Yāralachcheri and Mākālipāṭṭu, were situated in Periyapākkam sirmai (probably in Terku magamai). We also learn (VI. 9) that by the year 1616 A.D., the number of annual Brahmotsavams for Sri Govindarajasvami had risen from three to four, and that the other festivals were also being celebrated as usual. Eleven Brahmotsavams were likewise being celebrated in Tirumala every year. Ubhayams were plentiful, many of them being those which were instituted after 1580 A.D. The Ramanujakūṭams in Tirumala and in Tirupati were functioning. The irrigation sources and channels alone appear to have been much neglected, either on account of the disturbances or an account of the continuous failure of rains.

There are two points worth noticing from these inscriptions:
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Lakkappa Nayakkar granted three fourths share of his new village called Anangarpalayam and reserved\(^1\) the remaining one-fourth share for the maintenance of his own men. A very large part of the prasadams was also ordered to be distributed free to the pilgrims in front of Sri Ramanuja's shrine in Tirimula to the detriment no doubt, of the Sthanattar's māmūl rights.

The second point to note is that the re-excavation of the spring channels did not always add, in any marked way, to the original yield of the lands. The increase in yield was generally expected to be something more than the old. To that extent the donor was entitled to making food offerings in his own name. But in several cases it was only a portion of the offering of the old endowment that was transferred to the name of the new donor. This is found clearly stated in Sri Chinna Timmarajayyan's endowment. Twelve taligais out of the two hundred taligais of Ramarajyan's old endowment was transferred to the credit of the new donor (Chinna Timmarajayyan) in consideration of the re-excavation of the channel done by him.\(^2\) These twelve taligais were sent to the Ramanujakutam. But the Sthanattar took out of this, 2½ taligais as their share, leaving only 9½ taligais with the necessary adjuncts of Kuttu, kari, ponkkari, curds etc., for distribution to the desantris.

Sri Vira Rama Rauv deva Maharaya (Rama IV).

We next pass on to the period of Sri Vira Pratapa Sri Vira Rāma Rāvu dēva Mahārāyar. Although it is the general belief

---

1. The Tamil expression used for this reservation is "காலங்கால் வாகத்தில் மாசூர்கள் மற்றும் நான்கு தாய்களை தந்து இருக்கிறது". The Devasthanam Epigraphist translates this as reserving one-fourth share of the land and the rights of the channel "for the purpose of maintaining your officers and army". The Tamil expression can hardly mean all this. Under the Vijayanagar Emir, so far as we know, no private army was maintained by any of the commanders.

2. "இன்றுமீற்றின் கிளாந்திகளுடன் பார்வூல் அவ்வுருபர் பல்வேற்று கிளாந்திகளின் விளையாட்டுக்கு முதல் பல்வேற்று. கிளாந்திகள் கிளாந்திகளை கையூர் கிளாந்திகள் ராமநாதர் குளிர்ச்சியின் போது இருக்கிறது பெருமான் அன்னோ கி கோடைப்பள்ளியாக்க."
that Venkaṭatapatidēva Mahārāyar I died in 1614, we found from inscription No. 18 that he must have been alive on 4—11—1616. It has also been generally accepted that he was succeeded by Ranga III, son of his elder brother Rama III,² whom he had actually nominated as his successor and that the latter shortly after he ascended the throne, was murdered, along with all his adherents, by the Gobbouri chief Jaggarāya, the brother of one of the queens of Venkaṭatapati. The only one who escaped is stated to have been surreptitiously removed by a washerman by concealing him among soiled clothes and subsequently crowned in Kumbakonam as Rama IV. Historians presume that Ranga III was murdered some time in 1614 after Venkatapati’s death and that after a civil war of succession, Rama IV was crowned as Emperor in 1616. But according to our inscription Venkatapati was alive till November 1616. His death, the succession of Ranga III, and the massacre must therefore have taken place after 1616 and the ultimate coronation of Rama IV must have taken place in 1618 A.D.

There is only one inscription (VI. 20; 25–5–1627) of the reign of Rama IV, or Sriman Mahārājadhīrāja Rājaparameswara Sri Vira Pratāpa Sri Vira Rāmārāvu dēva Mahārāyar as he was styled. He is believed to have been the Emperor till 1632 A.D. when he was succeeded by Kumāra Venkaṭatapatiāya, or Venkata II. We however find that Venkata II was the reigning monarch on 20—9—1631. Some correction therefore seems to be necessary in the generally accepted dates of accession of these Emperors.

The donor of the endowment (VI. 21) mentioned above was one Nottakkara Narāyanan, son of Venkatayyan and grandson of Konappayyan all of whom were attached to the Tirumalai Temple as Nottakkarar (apprisers). He executed repairs to two irrigation channels in Kuḍavūru nādu, so as to make the land irrigated by them yield an additional produce of paddy valued at 440 Rekhāi Pon a year. The price of paddy was calculated at the rate of 6 panam per putty. According to the previous inscriptions the price was only 4 panams per putty. (Vide VI. 4—11—1614). There was thus a fifty per cent rise in the price of paddy owing

². Rama III was one of Tirumalārāya’s sons.
perhaps to famine conditions. The festivals for which the amount was to be used were all celebrated in Tirumala only. There were no new festivals, but only the proper performance of the old ones, such as Vasanta navami, ubhayams during Brahmótsavams and festival ubhayams on all the 53 Fridays and 53 Sundays. A perusal of the long list of food offerings and processions contained in the inscription shows that there was no lowering of the standard in the celebration of festivals in spite of the rise in prices.

It was during the reign of Rama IV that inscriptions describing the numerous gifts and charities made by Maṭla Kumara Anantaraja, son of Tiruvengalanātha and Chennamma, were made in Tirupati. He belonged to the Dēva Chōla family of the solar race and was perhaps related to Krishnadevaraya, one of whose sons-in-law was one Maṭla Varadaraja.

Maṭla Anantaraja’s gifts and charities were made in 1628 A.D. and are described in two inscriptions. Of these Inscription VI. No. 25 is on the east wall of the Pādāla (Sripāda) mantapam in Telugu script and No. 26 is on the west wall of the mantapam in grantha script, the language being a mixture of Telugu and Sanskrit. The Sripāda mantapam itself was constructed by him at the foot of the Tirumalai Hill. The gifts and charities mentioned in the inscriptions are numerous and should have cost several lakhs of varāhans. The most noteworthy point about them is that not even a single item of endowment was left to the management of the Sthanattar of the Tirumala, Tirupati temples. The inscriptions also enumerate gifts and charities to be administrated in religious centres other than Tirupati and Tirumala. One aspect of these endowments deserves our attention. They were made at a period of history of the Vijayanagar Empire when there were succession disputes and massacres in the royal family. He does not seem to have been affected by them. The country which he ruled lay as stated in the inscription between Ahobilam and the Tirumalai Hills. It lay to the north and west of the Velugōti

1. Pulīpparai, ulunduṭṭarai, appam, atirasam, tēntalai, maṇḍharam, vaṇḍai, kuṇukku; eḻḷundai, manipparuppunudai, iḍḍalai, doṭsai, tiruppaniyāram, pori, dadhyōḍanam.
Yāchamanāyak’s territory and perhaps to the south and east of the Gobbūri chief’s territory. It cannot be considered to have been at any time so rich a tract of country as to spare the enormous amount of money which Anantaraya was able to spend on charities. The inscription says that he fought a number of battles and overcame his enemies at the places mentioned in the inscription—Pālagiri, Alimēla, Pilēru, Chappalli, Vēnupalli, Koṭṭikala, Dalakaḍa, Guṇḍlēru, Muvvēru, Kumālla kālvāy. It is not stated whether these battles formed a part of the civil war in connection with the succession dispute. Historians also state that a certian Maṭlarāja proved treacherous to Sri Rangarāya Mahārāya in 1578 A.D., when Ahōbilam was captured and looted by the Muslims. All that we know for certain is that he had the wealth and that he spent it in gifts and charities lavishly.

There is a story connected with the construction of the big gopuram in Govindaraja Sannidhi Street in Tirupati, built by him. It is stated that the architect, a man belonging to the southern country, was ordered to accompany the bandies which were loaded with bags of coins at Matla and despatched to Tirupati. The bags formed the first batch. To test the financial capacity and the earnestness of Anantaraya, the architect cut some holes in the bags so that when the bandies reached Tirupati, it was found that the bags were not full and that there was leakage along the route. Anantarāya was however not perturbed by this loss. He sent word that whatever money was needed would be supplied promptly, and that no delay should occur in the execution of the work on that account. Upon this the architect assured his patron that he might regard the work as good as executed. The story would seem to show that the Rajah was not only very rich, but that he was also generous. Various structures are enumerated in the inscription as having been executed by him. At that time of famine these works would have afforded great relief to the poor. The Rajah’s gifts and charities were distributed among both Vaishnavite and Saivite temples. They are mostly in the region, now called the Cuddapah district—at Udayagiri, Nandalūr, Vontimitta, Siddhavaṭṭi, Rāyachōṭ, Pushpagiri, Anantarājampet and Cuddapah. The gopurams and prakaram walls of most of these temples were constructed by him. In some of these temples he
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made provision for the daily worship also. In Tiruvallur (Chingleput Dt.) he constructed the Vasanta mantapam. To Kālahastīśvara he presented a golden peacock and a mōhana vimanam. To Sri Venkatesvara he presented three vāhanams (golden horse, elephant and Sarva Bhūpāla Vahanams); he presented a Ratnādhya makuta (gemset crown). He also constructed a flight of stone steps to Tirumala, the agra gopuram and a Unnata Kēli Mantapam. His charity consisted also in establishing free feeding houses for pilgrims in as many as twelve places, most of which lay in the Cuddapah district besides the two in Tirupati, one at Alvar Tirtham and the other on Sēshachala Kuruva on the Hill.

For the proper supervision of his charities, he employed his own agent Konḍayya. He should have commenced his numerous works long before 1628 A.D. They would have normally taken about 10 years to execute. Tirupati did not form part of his own territory, but lay just outside it. It formed a part, and the most important part of the Vijayanagar Empire. Rama IV commenced his reign in 1618. But Matla Kumara Anantaraja makes no mention of the Emperor’s name in the inscription of his endowments. He seems to have acted independently of even the Sthanattar of the temple.

It is believed that Rama IV was not certain that he would rule long and that therefore he-nominated in 1622, two persons as his successors. One of these was Peda Venkaṭa II, son of Ranga IV and grandson of Aliya Rāmarāja; the other was Sriranga, a nephew of Peda Venkata II. It is not certain in what year Rama IV died. It cannot be 1632 as is generally believed. Contemporary records of the English Factories in India and the Dutch go to show that after the death of Rama IV there were succession disputes between Peda Venkata II and his nephew Sriranga in or about August 1631. These disputes or civil wars were rather between the adherents of the two claimants than between the uncle and the nephew, Damarla Venkatappa, the brother-in-law of Peda Venkata espousing the cause of Venkata, and the northern chiefs espousing the cause of Sriranga. In an inscription dated 29–9–1631 (VI. 21) Kumara Venkatapatideva Maharayar (Peda Venkata II) is named with the usual prasasti of the emperor and as being the
ruler on that day. Peda Venkata II was perhaps actually crowned as the Emperor in 1632, as is generally believed. He continued to rule till 1642 A.D. Although Sriranga succeeded him as Emperor only in 1642, he seems to have from the commencement of 1632 considered himself to be the emperor. For we find that in inscription No. 23 dated 15-6-1638, Sriranga is mentioned as being the ruler\(^1\) and his name is associated with the Emperor's prasasti. The possible explanation for these inconsistent statements by the Sthanattar would be that so far as they were concerned, both had equal claims and that they had no business to take sides.

For our purposes it may be taken that Kumāra Venkaṭapati (Venkata II) ruled from about September 1631 to October 1642. Srirangaraya succeeded him as Emperor although the Damarla Nāyak and some of the other Nāyaks were opposed to Sriranga. The Golkonda King was at this time invading the territories of Sriranga. The English were also fortifying the factory which they built in Madras, having obtained a grant from Damarla Muddu Venkatappa on 22 August 1639 and confirmed by Venkata II subsequently on a gold plated cowle deed which was lost in the sea in 1693. A fresh grant was also made in November 1645 corresponding to the month Karthikai and in the dark fortnight of the cyclic year Parthiva. True copies of these documents as given in the English Factory records are given as Appendix.

There are three inscriptions relating to the period of the reign of Peda Venkata II, or Sriman Maharajadhiraja Raja paramesvara Sri Vira Pratapa Sri Vira Venkaṭapatirāya dēva Maharaya, as he was styled. The first is VI. 21 dated 29–9–1631 and describes an endowment made by one Ramachandrayyan who excavated an irrigation channel in the temple village of Vādirājapuram and thereby increased the annual yield from the irrigated lands. Out of the additional income a number of ubhayams were arranged to be celebrated in Tirumala and Tirupati. We learn from the

1. “..........இருந்து வருவாரும் [வருந்துவாரும்] குறிப்பிட்டு
செய்யப்பட்ட இடம்பெற்ற உட்பெண்களை
இருந்து அமக்கும் உட்பெண்கள் உண்டாக்கியுடன்..........”
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inscription that the matham of the Ilan Koyil Kelvi Jiyar in Tirupati was situated in the street south of the south sreni of the Govindaraja Sannidhi street. It is now in the south sreni of the Sannidhi street itself and west of the big gopuram. The second inscription VI. 22 dated 2-1-1636 gives details of an endowment by Prativadi Bhayankaram Arangaracharyar, one of the Acharya Purushas of the temple. He lived in the Ayyangar tiruvidhi, also called Bhashyakar Agraaram and now known as Govindaraja North Mada Street. A spring channel in the temple village of Avalali was renovated by him. He also made a contribution of 25 Rekhai Pon on the occasion of the installation of Lakshminarayana- pperumal and Periya Ajvair in a temple built by him in the South Mada Street. From the increased yield ubhayams were arranged to be celebrated. All these ubhayams had a definite Sri Vaishnava complex about them. In this inscription there are three points of interest to us. (1) the number of Nirvahams of the Sthanattar which was 12 till 1631 A.D. was reduced to 4. There was no share in the nirvaham for the Sthanattar. But there was one for Tirupatiyar, one for Nambimar, one for Periya Koyil Kelvi Jiyar and one for the Sthalakarnam. This is a significant change. (2) Nathamuni temple in Nathamuni Street in Tirupati is mentioned for the first time. (3) We learn that land was being measured with a rod of 32 spans, one such square rod making up one kuji of land.

The third inscription is VI. 23 dated 15-6-1638. Although the Emperor’s name is given in this inscription as Srimangadheva Maharaya with the usual prasasti we know that Venkatapatidheva was the real Emperor at the time. The name of the donor is missing, but we learn that he was a brahmin living in Kundanala village, in Uravakonda Sirmai. From these details, we see that his village lay in the territory which was under the governorship of Srimangaraja. He therefore seems to have regarded him as the Emperor. He excavated two irrigation channels in two temple villages. One of these villages was called Agaram Maniyakkon pattu. The name of the other village is missing in the inscription. He was a man of some status and owned a garden with a mantapam in it in Tirumala. The main point of interest in this inscription is the information that it furnishes about the re-arrangement of
the nirvakams of the Sthanattar. Their composition according to the earlier inscriptions was Tirupatiyar 4; Sabhaiyar 3; Nambimar 1; Jiyars 2; Tiruninra-ur-udaiyar 2; total 12. We learn from this that the new Sthanattar was composed of 6 persons and that the Nambimars, Jiyars, Tirupatiyar Sabhaiyar and the Tiruninra-ur-Udaiyars did not form members of that body. We also notice that the Tirupatiyars were reduced from 4 to 1, the Sabhaiyars from 3 to 1, and the Tiruninra-ur-Udaiyars from 2 to 1. This change must have taken place some time between 1636 and 1638 A.D.

Sriman Maharajadhiraja Raja Paramesvara Sri Vira
Pratapa Sri Rangaraya deva Maharayar or Ranga VI.

Sri Rangarāya dēva Mahārāya ascended the throne in October 1642 and probably reigned till 1665. He was previously i.e., from about 1632, the Governor of the province of Chandragiri which included all the districts lying to the north of that place. The ascendancy of DamarlaVenkatappa, brother-in-law of Venkatapatī deva and the grand vizier of the Empire, and the ill-feeling subsisting between Venkatappa and Yāchama Nāyakka, who was the supporter of Srirangaraya, resulted in a permanent estrangement between the Emperor Kumāra Venkatapati and his nephew Srirangaraya. The two factions in the Empire which first made their appearance soon after the death of Venkatapati I in 1616 and during the succession dispute and the consequent civil war, seriously affected the Empire. Destruction of life and property and the uncertainty in the country about the security of private property, brought about dislocation in trade and agriculture. Foreigners, like the Portuguese, the Dutch and the English found it risky to make advance payments to local merchants and middle men. Their trade on the east coast in handwoven fabrics was in a flourishing condition till the troubles arose within the empire. Famines caused by failure of rains and the frequent wars made agriculture a risky undertaking. There was a great famine in 1630–31 which lasted some years. Such in short was the state of the country up to the year in which Srirangaraya VI ascended the throne.
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This explains why there were so few endowments after 1616 A.D. Between 1616 and 1638 there were only four endowments; but none of these could be compared to those made during the pre-Talikota period. During Srrangaraya's (VI) reign there was not even a single endowment. It could not have been due to any growing lack of faith in temple worship among the people. All through the centuries the class of people who made endowments were Emperors, and their kinsmen, the feudatory chiefs, the rich land owners and merchants from all parts of the Vijayanagar Empire and Telingana country, the residents of Tirupati and its surroundings, religious leaders, acharyas, acharya-purushas and all others connected with the temple including the servants. Every one owed his prosperity to the flourishing condition of agriculture, trade, industries and commerce and safety to pilgrim traffic. There was complete dislocation of these as the result of the unwise and unpatriotic conduct of the members of the ruling family and the Nâyaks who were the provincial governors. Their differences made it easy for the Muslim kings of Golkonda and Bijapur to extend their conquests to the South and to divide the Hindu Empire between themselves. Srrangarâya was the last victim of this unwise policy of the Hindus.

The observations and events chronicled from time to time by the English and the Dutch Factors are the main sources of information relating to this period. In 1642, soon after Srranga became the Emperor, Damarla Venkatappa opened negotiations with the Golkonda invaders with the object of making them act against the Emperor. The treason was found out and Venkatappa was seized, imprisoned and stripped of most of his territories. His brother Ayyappa then raised an army to effect his release. When Srranga found himself harassed on one side by the Muslims and on the other by Ayyappa he pardoned and released Venkatappa. The English Factors at Pulicat wrote on August 25, 1643: "The country hath been and still is at present in broyles, one Nâgue against another and most against the King; which makes all trade at a stand. But the king by means of the king of Vizapore (Bijapur) who for 15 lakh of pagothas and 24 elephants, has sent some thousands of horse for his assistance, is likely to have the better." In 1644 Damarla Venkatappa again proved treacherous and rose
in open rebellion. There was also a fresh invasion of the Carnata country by Mir Jumla, the vizier of the Golkonda king well known for his iconoclastic frenzy and plundering propensities. Damarla was then replaced by one Mallaya (a rich merchant and agent of the Dutch). This man in his turn proved treacherous and was likewise dismissed, after he had, without a struggle, surrendered in 1646 the strong fortress of Udayagiri to Mir Jumla. The country was distracted by the war between three of the chief Nayaks on the one side and Sri Ranga on the other. The latter was at the same time being attacked by Bijapur on the west and by the Golkonda forces under Mir Jumla on the east. Eventually Sri Ranga after suffering a severe defeat under the walls of Vellore, was forced to pay a large sum as indemnity to the leader of the Bijapur army. The Nayaks sobered by the successors of the Muhammadans, returned to their allegiance and promised to assist the king in maintaining the independence of the country. These events happened before May 1646 A.D. To the turmoil of war and the troubles on the coast was now added a great famine as a result of which the people gave themselves for slaves to any man that will but feed them. The price of food rose to an excessive extent.

"Before the end of 1646 Mir Jumla conquered all the neighbouring districts and came within two days march of the King's court."

"In October 1647 the English factors bewailed the fact that the company sent them no liquor to drown the stench of the corpses that lay unburied wherever they went and the cries of the dying people." They stated that Mir Jumla had almost entirely conquered the kingdom and that the English would do well to get their grants made by the fled Jentue king (Sri Ranga) in 1645 (November) confirmed under the great seal of the king of Golkonda, which was made possible by the offer of a brass gun to Mr. Mir Jumla.

This was in the middle of October 1647. In January 1652 hostilities broke out between the two Muslim kings of Golkonda

and Bijapur and Mir Jumla was surrounded by the Bijapur troops. The poor Vijayanagar king was watching his opportunity to break off his miserable yoke. The factors wrote that these events so distracted the country that they could not adventure the company’s monies abroad. The war in the Carnatic was continued strenuously. The Bijapur Commander-in-Chief captured the fortress of Penukonda in March 1653 and wanted Mir Jumla’s permission to pass through his territories on his march to Gingee (Chenji). Thereupon Mir Jumla became alarmed at the successes of Bijapur and therefore instigated the Nayaks of Mysore and Ikkeri to take up arms and proceed to Vellore to his help. The Bijapur General however succeeded in capturing Vellore after a long siege and concluded a treaty with Srirangaraya by which Chandragiri with the revenues of some districts was left to the Raja. This happened about November 1654 and Tirupati would therefore have nominally remained in the hands of the Raja. For in fact it formed a part of the countries conquered by Mir Jumla, the Golconda commander.

In September 1654 an open breach however occurred between Mir Jumla and the King of Golconda, Abdulla Kutubshah. This drove Mir Jumla into the arms of Aurangzeb and proved disastrous to Golconda. In 1656 Golconda which was attacked by Aurangzeb and Mir Jumla had to enter into a humiliating treaty with Aurangzeb. Mir Jumla was kept in Delhi and was rewarded with a grant of the Jagir of the Carnatic held directly under Shah Jehan the Emperor and the king of Golconda was asked to recall all his officers in the Carnatic (July 1656) so that the now Nawab Mir Jumla might appoint his own men. The retention of Mir Jumla by the Emperor in Delhi was taken in the light of a political detention and the Hindus in the Carnatic were consequently encouraged by the King of Golconda to revolt against Mir Jumla’s Officers. There was a strong expectation that the Chandragiri Raja Sriranga would seize this opportunity to recover his ancestral throne. The English factors at Pulicat, Greenhill and Chambers, writing about these events say on 19th November 1656, “The Nawab’s (Mir Jumla’s) absence gave occasion to jentues rising in several places of the kingdom, some part whereof
is reduced to the King and Naiques obedience, who have sent forces to these quarters and are now at the siege of Pulicat and Pundamalle. What the issue will be we know not; but the Nawob's party are very much disheartened and weak." In another letter to Surat dated 5-11-1656, they say. "All these countries formerly conquered by the Nawob are now of late on the revolt, the Jentue King with divers Naiques being in arms. Here is nothing but taking and retaking of places. On 10-11-1656 it was stated by the English that the king of Golkonda had let the country of the Carnatic to the Rayalus upon which the Rayalus father-in-law took possession of part of the country and came to Peddapalam." Greenhill and Chambers however wrote on 28-1-1657 that it was gathered that Conār Chetty who was the Rajah's General treacherously delayed attacking the Nawob's (Mir Jumla's) party until the latter which was led by commander Tuppakki Krishnappa Chetti gathered his forces and then fled from the town with his army pursued by the enemy. They add that he allowed himself to be captured and was treated well as he was related to Tuppakki Krishnappa. A letter from Batavia of January 1657 said that the Chandragiri Raja with an army of 8,000 men had captured the pagoda of Tirupati and tried to conquer Conjeevaram, Chengleput etc. This shows that Tirupati had gone out of the Rajahs' control in 1646 when Mir Jumla conquered the Carnatic.

In 1657 Mir Jumla's commander-in-chief Tuppakki Krishnappa laid an ambush, defeated and dispersed a party of the Chandragiri Raja's house which was returning to Vellore from a plundering expedition. The king and his adjutant Shangee with 1000 horses managed to retreat to Arni. There they tried to recruit a fresh army with the help of Bijapur and again take the field. Tuppaki Krishnappa also besieged in August 1658 Pundamalli which was in revolt against Golkonda. Kūli Beig, commander of the Golkonda forces, inflicted on him a severe defeat; he was wounded and took him prisoner. During this period the fight for power was between the Vijayanagar King, Mir Jumla's commander Krishnappa Chetty, the King of Golkonda and the King of Bijapur. As the English sided Golkonda and had captured Mir Jumla's jank, Krishnappa Chetty laid siege to Madras between September 1657 and April 1658 when a treaty was concluded according to
which the English were to pay annually 380 pagodas in satisfaction of all demands. Such was the disturbed condition of the country during these years.

Mir Jumla died in July 1663 and Neknam Khan became the Nabob of the Carnatic in succession. In his turn he came to the Carnatic with an army of 40,000 men to bring to submission all the recalcitrant elements. He kept one Chennampalli Mirza as general of the army at Madras and also as his agent. He subdued the whole country by about 1668. From Nagalapuram camp he dictated terms to the English Factors at Chennapatnam also in December 1663. The English Factors wrote about him and his men thus: "They are of such insulting disposition that unless curbed, we shall daily find it worse and worse." In a letter of December 1664 the factors wrote "The Jentues are now gathering to a head against the Moores and if they should be victorious they would endeavour to do us a discourtesy."

Sri Rangarayulu's visit to Tirumala at this juncture to worship Tiruvengalanatha in the summer of 1665 A.D. Visvasavas (V. 143) might have been to appeal to God to grant Divine help for victory in his attempt to regain his kingdom. In fact this is the only inscription in Tirumala made during the reign of Sri Rangaraya and is given below as foot note.¹

The inscription records this visit or it may also be that he did not actually visit Tirumala but only sent the slab bearing the inscription to be deposited in the temple. The year of the inscription is given as the cyclic year Visvasavas and the corresponding Sali Saka is not mentioned. But the prasasti shows that it refers to the Vijayanagar Emperor Srirangaraya.²

---

1. V. 143.

1. మహాహితంతురిష్టుని శివి రా 10 స
2. సాధారణంతురిష్ట దురితు యుగం....... శివి
3. పాలనాసరాసరి తా రామిలిచు రాధి
4. ......... ....,తిమిపంతు రామిలిచు

2. The Devasthanam Epigraphist has erroneously placed this inscription as No. 143 in Vol. V. which records the inscriptions of Sadasivaraya's period.
He lost his territories to the Golkonda and the Bijapur Muslims. It went to the share of Mir Jumla, commander of the Golkonda army, in 1656 as a jageer held directly under the Moghul Emperor Shah Jehan. Tuppakki Krishnayya Chetti was Mir Jumla’s commander of the army and Syed Ali was his agent in Madras during his absence in Delhi and Bengal between 1656 and 1663 when he died. Neknam Khan was appointed as Nawab in succession. He had therefore to bring to submission all the revolted elements. Tirupati temple could not have been a revolted element. Sriarangaraya is said to have captured it in 1657. But it is not known if he was in actual possession in 1663 when Neknam Khan succeeded Mir Jumla. In any case Neknam Khan came with an army of 40,000 men. Even the English and the Dutch Factors had to agree to the payment of rents to him. He even increased it from 380 pagodas to 1200 pagodas a year in the case of Madras. Neknam Khan’s agent was Chennampalli Mirza who camped in Tirupati in 1668 A.D. Sriarangaraya’s visit in 1665 lies between the dates 1663 and 1668. If he had been the ruling Emperor at least of Chandragiri in 1665 his visit would have been recorded in language with greater flourish and the inscription could have been on the wall of the temple and not on a separate slab.

This inscription is a landmark in the history of our temple. It is not couched in the usual style with the preamble to such inscriptions. It is not in the Tamil language and script. The last inscription which was in the year 1638 (15th of June) was in Tamil language and script. The next inscription is this one of the year 1665, in the Telugu language and script. It is also in a different style, a style which an ordinary private pilgrim would adopt to record his visit. The prasasti also is rather an abridged one. The purpose of the visit, rather the inscription, is to state that he will be always worshipping Tiruvengalanatha. உதவு செய்தலை பேசு நாமை (Tiruvengalanātha dēvuni sadāsēva). We have to remember here that there are only two classes of people who do Sadā sēva or always think of God. Yogis and Bhaktas who

But as there is no Emperor of the name Sriarangaraya in whose reign the cyclic year Visvuvasu would come, except the one which corresponds to 1665 A.D., the inscription records Sri Ranāgaraya’s visit.
have attained a certain stage of mental development do so. The other class consists of those who in spite of their best endeavours have miserably failed to achieve their desires and who realise that faith in God is their only prop in life. He made his last great effort in 1664 to regain his kingdom, but failed to muster sufficient strength. Mysore let him down. The inscription of 1665 A.D. has therefore to be construed as a final appeal to the mercy of Tiruvengalanatha deva. There was no hope but to pray incessantly to Him. This year 1665 might be taken to make the end of the Vijayanagar Empire.

The second point to note is that the Tamil language ceased to be the official language of the temple perhaps from even before 1665 A.D. Mir Jumla completely conquered the country in 1646. He and his men came from the Telingana. He would have placed the secular management of the temple in the hands of Telugu knowing men of the locality or from among his Hyderabad men to ensure the receipt of the income from the temple.

He was a rapacious adventurer in the service of the Golkonda King as his vizier. He was himself a military genius. The commander of his army was an equally able and unprincipled Hindu, whose nearest kinsmen were the army leaders under Srirangaraya Maharaya. They were all intent on feathering their own nests even at the expense of the interests of their master. When the king of Golkonda envied his wealth and became suspicious he turned against his master and went into the arms of Aurangazeb (the son of Emperor Shah Jahan) in 1655 and invaded Golkonda. But the Emperor was not for extinguishing Golkonda. Aurangazeb managed to send him over to Delhi to convert the Emperor by working on the latter’s cupidity by the offer of the famous Telingana diamond Kohinoor as a specimen of the wealth that was waiting for the Emperor’s touch. It is no wonder that under such conditions there were very few endowments. Pilgrimage to Tirupati would have been a dangerous attempt for Hindus.

The connection of the history of our temple with the Hindu kings of Vijayanagar may be considered to have commenced with the gilding of the Vimanam of Sri Venkatesvara’s temple by Sri
Mangideva Maharaja in 1359 A.D. and to have ended with the memorial slab left by Srirangaraya Maharaya in the temple in 1665 A.D. It lasted for just over three centuries. The sway of the Shah Muslim Kings of Golconda and Bijapur over the Carnatic country was but a passing phase. Aurangzeb after he became the Emperor at Delhi was keen on extinguishing the former for the reason that they were Shah Muslims. The other overpowering ambition of his was to capture and annex the Deccan and the Carnatic countries to his empire and destroy Hinduism. He captured the Carnatic but failed to annex it to his empire. Nor was Hinduism destroyed. The inscrutable Will of God checkmated his ambitions by the rapid insurgence of the Maratta power, by the entry of Shahji under the aegis of his Bijapur Muslim king into the south and the establishment of a Maratta principality in Tanjore and later by the entry of his son Sivaji on the plea of settling succession disputes with his brother Venkaji over their father’s estates and finally by the daring attempt to establish a Maratta supremacy over the entire Carnatic by baulking the ambitions of his personal enemy Aurangzeb. As in the days when the Vijayanagar Prince Kumārā Kempāna fought the Sultanate of Madura so also when Sivaji and his successors had to fight against the Muslim armies of Aurangzeb the fortress of Chengi (Jingee) played a prominent part. The mutual destruction of the Muslim and the Maratta powers and the consequent rise of the British power were inevitably connected with the fortunes of our temple which stood in need of a thorough overhauling to purge it of those evils which the accumulation of lands and wealth from the votive offerings of devotees had brought with them. The next chapter will be devoted to a short account of this.

Before closing this chapter we have only to bear in mind that the members of the Aravidu dynasty failed to realise that the Hindu Empire was a sacred trust and that its governance could be successfully done only by the combined effort of all its members and not by mutual jealousies and civil strife with blood stained hands. The inevitable Divine punishment had to be borne with resignation by Srimad Rajadhīrāja Rāja Paramēsvara Sri Viraprātāpa Sri Vira Srirangaraya Maharayar. Before the end of
1646 his kingdom in the Carnatic was conquered by Mir Jumla for the Muslim king of Golkonda. The king of Bijapur was at the same time invading and capturing the Mysore plateau and marching down to Chengi and the Maratta Shahji, father of Sivaji, was in his employ having been sent by God to establish a foothold for the Marattas first in Tanjore and later in Chengi. Owing to the clash of interests between the King of Bijapur and Golkonda, the former while capturing the Vellore Fort from Sriranga in 1654 agreed to the latter holding possession of Chandragiri and some adjoining districts which had been conquered by Mir Jumla. Tirupati therefore temporarily was reoccupied in 1658 by Sriranga. The final struggle which he organised against the Muslims in 1664 seems to have proved an abortive attempt. In the summer of 1665 (Jyeshta Bahula Dasami of the year Visvavasu) he bade good bye to his kingdom and devoted himself to offering unceasing prayers to his god Tiruvenγanathα (Sadā sēva). The whole of South India was ravaged by four armies and there was no safety for Hindus going on pilgrimage. Mir Jumla and his successors would not have been slow to appropriate the endowed lands of our temple or the annual income therefrom.
CHAPTER XXII

THE POST—VIJAYANAGAR PERIOD.

The Temple passes into the hands of the Golkonda Muslim King.

It was surmised at the end of the last Chapter that June 1665 marked the end of the Vijayanagar Empire. It seems to be certainly so with reference to our temple. We know that after the death of Mir Jumla in 1663 one Neknam Khan was appointed Nawab of the Carnatic Country. But we do not know whether he held it on the same terms as his predecessor, that is as a Jageer bestowed directly by the Delhi Emperor Aurangzeb, or was appointed by the King of Golkonda with the approval of the Emperor. In any case he came with an army of 40,000 men and took effective possession of the Jageer. Early in the year 1668 Nawab Neknam Khan was again at Pundamally with his army for the purpose of appointing as a symbol of his overlordship an Avuldar in the town of Madras; and Chennampalli Mirza was appointed as the general of the army and his agent at Madras. About the end of that year the English in Madras sent their Brahmin agent Venkatapati to Tirupati where Mirza was camping to obtain a fresh Cowle or Firman for the fort and town of Chennapatnam and for fixing the annual rent to be paid. Mirza sent the brahmin to Golkonda where Neknam Khan was staying. These were actually settled only in April 1672. The rent was raised to 1200 pagodas a year from 380 pagodas which Mir Jumla had settled before. Soon after this, Neknam Khan died in the same month and his successor Musa Khan also confirmed the cowle or Firman. These transactions serve to show that the Muslim Nawab was in full possession of the Carnatic before 1668. There is also a note in the Diary & Consult-Book dated 28–8–1673 which states

HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

that great quantities of cloth of three former years were lying upon Kasa Viranna’s hands by reason of the troubles in the country. Again from the fact that the English factors were put to the necessity of conforming to the practice of making annual mamul payments or presents to the Golconda King and his officers it is plain that the Nawab of the Carnatic was enjoying in fact a subordinate position.¹ By the end of the year 1676 one Lingappa, nephew of Maddanna, and some other Brahmin officers became very powerful and were considered so corrupt and unsympathetic that the English Factors have recorded thus: “Since thus Bramany Government of Maddanna and his complices with whom neither promises, cowls nor phirmands do appear to be of any validity, they minding nothing but interest and advantages.”

Cessation of Endowments Explained.

The receipts of our temple from the votive offerings of pilgrims have always been dependent on the economic prosperity of the country—its agriculture, manufacture, trade and the availability of currency. The long continued wars had ruined production, manufactures and trade. In the matter of currency also Aurangzeb’s policy depleted the country of its standard gold pagoda and the consequent currency manipulations of which he was a past master made the country poorer. “They advise there is great scarcity of money and the people are so fleeced and harassed by the Governors that there is no quick market for anything. And the King having got almost all the pagodas in his country into his own hands, for want of them to pay in their rents have raised their value to a strange height, giving a while since seven rupees for an old pagoda and near 170 new pagodas for 100 old when the real value of an old pagoda, give it a knock with the hammer, is not worth more than a new. By this device the King makes as much more of his country’s (letting them still out for as great a quantity of old pagodas as formerly) as will serve to pay his

¹ For the King 495 pagodas worth; Maddanna, the great Mazundar and the chiefest person in power, 184 pagodas Pullapalli Yenanna, controller general 52½ pagodas, Narasa Viṭṭala and other great men 98 pagodas: muskima Nabob 98½ paś; Mahamad Ibrāhim Sarkail. 98½ pagodas
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tribute to Aurangzeb; and by this means makes the manufactory of his country, where old pagoda is the thing all things are valued by, to be 40 per cent dearer than it used to be, paying but the same quantity of old pagodas and no more, for it than they did before."

**Maratta invasion in 1677 aggravated the situation.**

It was while the country was in this deplorable condition that Sivaji, King of the Marattas, invaded the country of the Carnatic in May 1677 and marched past Tirupati, Kalahasti and Kanchipuram with an army of 40,000 foot and 5000 horse. The English refer in their Diary & Consult Book (9-5-1677) to the sad experience of all countries and places where he used to frequent. He is stated to have then entered the service of the Golkonda King, perhaps as an ally, to capture the fortress of Chengi (Jingee) which from about 1669 was in the hands of the Bijapur King with whom Golkonda was at war.

But Sivaji’s ostensible object was stated to be to settle with his half-brother Venkajee a partition of the family properties left by their father Shahji Bonsle. As Sivaji and his successors played a dominant part in counteracting the ambitious programme of Aurangzeb to conquer and annex the whole of the Southern Peninsula to his Kingdom, to destroy all Hindu temples and Hinduism and make the entire population embrace the religion of Islam, it is necessary to go into the antecedents of Sivaji and the Marattas in general, their ambitions and their zeal as the champions of Hinduism. The Marattas inhabited, as is well known, the Konkan country lying between the Western Ghats and the Arabian sea. Their strength lay in the inaccessible fortresses of the ghats. From being peaceful and frugal husbandmen mostly of the Sudra caste they were transformed into a hardy race of warriors. The Muslim kings of Ahamadnagar and Bijapur were mostly responsible for this change. They were first employed in the revenue department where their language, an offshoot of Sanskrit, and script came to be the official ones. Then they were employed in the army on garrison duty and then

---

1. English Factores India 1665–1669 (December 1667).
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in the light cavalry or troopers where they displayed extraordinary aptitude. Some of them rose to offices of importance in Bijapur and Golkonda after the annexation of Ahmadnagar by Aurangzeb in the early years of the Seventeenth Century. Their religious reformers rose from all castes, including the Mahars. Birth and caste counted very little in their ideals of love of mankind and love of country. They achieved a remarkable community of language, creed and life even before Shahji and Sivaji were born. A cake of millet flour was all they wanted while engaged in active war.

Sivaji Maharaja—His antecedents and aims in life.

The tradition relating to the birth of Sivaji might largely have been responsible for moulding his character and mission in life. His grandfather Malloji Bhonsly was a native of Verol near Daulatabad and was the son of the Patel of the place. At the age of twenty five in 1577 and under the patronage of Lookji Jadow Rao, a Maratta chief (Deshmuk of Sindkar and a descendant of the Rajah of Devagiri) he entered the service of Murtiza Nizam Shah of Ahmadnagar. His patron-deities were Mahadev and Devi Bhavani. For a long time he had no sons; and due to the blessings of a Muhammadan saint (peer) named Shah Sharif a son was born in 1594, who was named after the saint as Shahji. The father Malloji was rising in favour and in 1599 A.D., on the occasion of the Holi festival was invited by his patron Jadow Rao, to attend the fifth day festival in his house when his young son Shahji aged about five, accompanied him. Jadow Rao's daughter Jeeji Bai and Shahji happened to sit together and in a temper of good humour Jadow Rao remarked that they would make a good match. He asked his daughter whether she would marry him, when it also happened that they splashed the coloured water on each other. The company present considered it a good augury. But when Malloji was next invited to a dinner he said he could do so only if Jadow Rao would consider Shahji as his son-in-law. As there was considerable social disparity between Jadow Rao and Malloji there was some perplexity caused. To overcome this Malloji acquired more wealth, which he alleged
was due to his patron-goddess Bhavani bestowing on him a vast treasure. Wealth brought with it more power and a higher social status. He became Malloji Rajah Bhonsly in command of 5000 horse and Jajeerdar of Poona and Sopa. The Sultan himself attended the wedding of Shahji with Jeeji Bai. Shahji subsequently took a second wife by name Tooka Bai. By the latter Venkaji was his son; by the former Sambaji and Sivaji. While bestowing the treasure on Malloji, Goddess Bhavani is said to have appeared to him and told him, "there shall be one of thy family who shall become a king; he will be endowed with the qualities and attributes of Sambhu; he will re-establish and preserve justice in Maharashtra and destroy all who molest Brahmins and desecrate the temples of the gods. His reign will form an epoch and his posterity will mount the throne for twenty seven generations." Sivaji was born in May 1627 in Seonir fort; his greatness was due to forts and his death was in a fort. His father lived more with his second wife Tooka Bai Mohitay. His elder brother Sambaji who as the favourite of his father was always with him died early in life. Sivaji who was neglected by his father lived with his mother in Poona and one Dadaji Kondeva was his guardian. His education was all from his mother who fed him with tales of bravery from the Epics an^ the Puranas and inspired him with zeal for protecting the four castes and cows. She thus moulded his character. The words of Goddess Bhavani would have been inspiringly narrated to him by her. He commenced his independent career in 1646 by attacking and taking the hill fort of Torna.

After the extinction of the Ahmadnagar kingdom Shahji entered the service of the Bijapur king with the cognizance of Emperor Shah Jahan. He entered the Carnatic along with the Bijapur troops in 1637 and marched right down to Chengi Fort and to Tanjore. As a result of the enmity between the king of Madura and king of Tanjore, Shahji's son Venkaji is said to have defeated both and to have occupied Tanjore. We are not sure of the date and year. The point to remember is that in the early years of the Seventeenth Century the Marattas found a footing in Tanjore. Shahji is said to have visited Sivaji in the ghats in 1662 along with his son Venkaji. At one time Shahji was arrested by Bijapur and was released on sureties being given for the good conduct
of his son Sivaji. But Sivaji went on extending his dominion playing upon the enmity between the Delhi Emperor and the Bijapur king. He was consequently taken captive but the Emperor treated him with such undisguised contempt that the former opponent escaped in 1666 to be the sworn enemy of Aurangazeb. He resumed war in 1669; sacked Surat for the second time in 1670 and demanded 'chanth' in 1672, crowned himself in 1674 as Chatrapati Sivaji and pledged himself to fulfil his obligations as a devout Hindu king as foretold by Goddess Bhavani. Meanwhile, the death of his father and the settlement of the family properties with his brother Venkaji in Tanjore gave him a plausible excuse for entering the Carnatic country with an army in 1677, having become an ally of the king of Golkonda. The other reason was to wrest the fortress of Chengi from the king of Bijapur who had been occupying it from 1669.

There is no doubt that the complications created in Hindustan by Aurangazeb largely favoured and even encouraged Sivaji in his bold campaigns. Aurangazeb was a stern Puritan of the Sunni school of Islam. "For religion he persecuted the Hindus and destroyed their temples....For religion's sake he waged his unending wars in the Deccan, not so much to stretch wider the boundaries of his empire, as to bring the lands of the heretical Shiahs within the dominion of orthodox Islam...." Further the Marattas were getting their funds from the Bijapur and Golkonda kings who paid blackmail to the brigands. Aurangazeb's plan was first to exterminate these two Shiah kingdoms. His religious persecution set the whole of Hindustan in a ferment. Learning that the Brahmins of Benares and other places were in the habit of teaching their Upanishads and the Yoga practices to Muslims also, he wreaked his vengeance in 1669 by destroying the temple of Vishnu in Benares and razing to the ground the shrine in Mathura and building a mosque thereon. The idols removed from there were brought to Agra and buried under the steps of the mosque so that pious Muslims might tread over them. There was subsequently an insurrection in Mewat of the Satnamis (expounders of the eternal truth) several thousand strong who perished in the

1 Lane Poole's Mediaeval India under Muhammadan Rule—p 359.
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struggle as martyrs. He reimposed the poll tax on Hindus which his predecessors had abolished. The Rajputs were in revolt for these reasons and also because their sons were being taken away to Delhi to be educated in Islamic culture and to be converted thereafter. Such was the situation created by Aurangazeb.

While Aurangazeb’s plan was to destroy the two Shia kingdoms first and then exterminate the Marattas, Sivaji’s plan was to play Golkonda against Bijapur and extend his own territories and power. He therefore entered the Carnatic in 1677 as the friend of Golkonda, because the Carnatic was far away from Delhi where the affairs in Hindustan were engaging Aurangazeb’s attention.

Aurangazeb’s religious zeal resulted in forced conversion, mass executions, rape and plunder of the Hindus and destruction of temples. The lessons which Sivaji had learnt from his mother made him behave in a humane manner, particularly to captured Muslim women and children. Everything that would go to provision and feed the enemy forces was destroyed and wealth looted (scorched earth policy). Aurangazeb’s policy was similar to the policy of our western nations who use the atom bombs to destroy life, property and all. Sivaji’s policy was similar to that adopted by the vânaras (monkeys) to destroy everything that would go to feed the enemies’ forces. The Marattas would allow the enemy to march through territories where even the grass for fodder had been cut down and burnt and at the end of the campaign find himself starved. They avoided facing the enemy for a decisive battle unless their numerical strength was far superior to that of the enemy. “To fight such people was to do battle with the air or to strike blows upon water.”

Sivaji’s conquest of the Carnatic and premature death in 1680.

In February 1678 peace was however concluded between Bijapur and Golkonda and the former intended to send an army to re-take Chenji from Sivaji. In April 1678 Sivaji’s general
Santoji concluded a firm peace with Ekkaji (son of Venkaji) and his territories were handed back to him. Santoji was feasted in the Tanjore castle and sent back to Chenji. In the middle of August 1678 Abdulla Khan the commander of the Bijapur forces in the Vellore castle surrendered to Sivaji's forces after a siege. Before the end of 1678 Sivaji had got full and quiet possession of all the countries between Chenji and Vellore, having 72 strong hills and 14 forts with a revenue of 22 lakhs of pagodas a year. It was feared that very soon he would conquer the whole of the Golkonda country. But his ambitions came to an end by his premature death in 1680 by a sudden illness. "There was nothing of the libertine or brute" about him. He was moral and religious; a staunch and devout Hindu, he was tolerant to the Muslims and venerated their saints and the Koran. Ramdas and Tukaram were his gurus.

Aurangzeb's conquest of the Deccan down to Trichinopoly.

Aurangzeb pursued the fulfilment of his aim to conquer and annex the Bijapur and Golkonda kingdoms. The great unpopularity of the two corrupt Brahmin Ministers of Golkonda (Madanna and Akkanna) helped greatly to detach the Muslim subjects and officers of Golkonda from their allegiance to the king. Although the Carnatic country was the Jageer of Musa Khan (after the death of Neknam Khan in 1672) Madanna interfered in its affairs and appointed his nephew Podeli Lingappa as Collector of rents. Both were corrupt and oppressive. When Madanna's brother Akkanna went over to these parts in 1681, and was camping for seven days in Tirupati, the agent of the English at Golkonda was sent over by Madanna to Tirupati to arrange for the payment of adequate presents to Akkanna. The merchants of Pulicat who declined to make adequate presents were seized and put in irons. Madanna was also attempting in vain about 1685 to bring about a triple alliance between Sambaji (Sivaji's son and successor) Bijapur and Golkonda. Aurangzeb's son Prince Mo'azzam besieged the capital of Golkonda in 1685 and consented to a treaty of peace. On this occasion Madanna and Akkanna were called
to a durbar and dismissed. On their way home they were mobbed and beheaded. There was a general slaughter of Brahmins. Aurangzeb again invaded Bijapur and Golkonda and conquered them in 1686 and 1687 respectively. Bijapur city was completely ruined. Sambaji was also captured and put to death in 1689. The Moghul army continued the campaign and conquered the Southern Peninsula right down to Trichinopoly. Thereupon the Maratta forces from Chenji began to plunder the villages which lately belonged to Golkonda and to lay waste the country. They took the Akkara fort and killed its Muslim governor. Their flying squad captured three forts and a hundred towns in few days, robbing and plundering everywhere. Kanchipuram was plundered on 13th January 1688.

One of the life guards of the Moghul's had to apply to the English at Ft. St. George for a guard of horsemen and soldiers up to the river Krishna to transmit safely large revenue collections made, since the whole country had become extremely unsafe. The captive King of Golkonda Abul Hasan was beheaded in July 1688 on suspicion that a Maratta relief force was coming to capture the fort where he was lodged. In the Southern Peninsula the struggle for power was now between the Moghuls, the Marattas and the Hindu principalities. The Dutch, the English and the Portuguese suffered in their trade.

**Economic chaos in the Carnatic country.**

The chaotic condition of the country is well described in a reply which the newly formed first Joint Stock Company of the native merchants of Madras gave to the President in Council of Fort St. George on 1—5—1690 when they were called upon to explain why they failed to fulfil old contracts entered into. They stated that they made a Joint Stock Company with 50,000 pagodas subscribed capital and had suffered losses. In 1688 also they suffered losses. "They sent kanakapillays and peons with 20 merchants to the several parts for the provision of cloth, but the Moghul's visiting these parts together with the sad mortality and famine put a check thereto by the weavers going over to other
parts which necessitated them to solicit their return by promising houses, looms, yarn and money beforehand in those hazardous times when Yetta Matara Timmappa, a general of the Moghul was at Cuddapah. The Marattas in the interim sent Vittala Ballara Gopal Pundit to Conjeevaram to rob and plunder that Government, afterwards taking it upon themselves.” “The present troubles and revolutions in the country is such that which side so ever gets the victory they will plunder and ransack the houses, men, women and what else they meet with; so ravenous are they grown none escapes them. Of late one Brahma Pundarikaksha is come to Conjeevaram and has rented the said country forcing money from merchants, weavers, etc., and therefore they have all relinquished the place some coming here (to Madras) and others absconding in woods. The Marattas also at Chenji forced money from the people there for defraying the charges of the army which has made them leave that place too as the others. The Sadraspatam, Tegnapatam merchants complaining of their losses.”

“The countries Adoni and Gutti whence comes all the cotton and cotton yarn is embroiled in war and troubles, which is the reason none comes from thence and what remains in these parts is all spent. If your honour commands us in anything we shall readily obey to the utmost of our powers provided the Hon’ble company runs the risk of our trade in the country from their war with the Moghul.” The company agreed that the troubles in the country were daily increasing, that trading would be hazardous owing to robberies, seizures and obstructions. The same conditions prevailed in the Porto Novo and the Northern country (Circars). For the safety of their goods the English decided on purchasing the Tegnapatam Fort from the Rajah of Chenji.

A solitary inscription in Telugu of 1684 by a Maratta officer.

From the above passage we can well understand why there were no inscriptions of endowments on the walls of the Tirumalai and Tirupati temples during all the years after 1638. There is however a solitary inscription dated 19th March 1684 (Sali Saka 1606, cyclic year Raktakshi, Chaitra Sudha 14, Angaraka varam
Hasta nakshatram\(^1\)). It is on the south wall of the second prakaram of the Tirumalai temple and is of special interest to us. The language and the script are Telugu of the ordinary grāmya style and not Tamil. The preamble is not in the old grand style giving the name of the King with prasasti. The reason would have been the difficulty to state who the King at the time was, the country being in a distracted state of war although the Golkonda Muslim had become de facto ruler. We have seen that Madanna and Akkanna had been to Tirupati about 1681 making a fairly long stay. The endowment with which we are now concerned was for a food offering of the Suddhānna Alankāram variety, that is cooked rice, some cooked green grampulse, and curds, for Sri Venkatesvarā and for Sri Varahasvami and one pot (goon) of pāyasam and pacchadi and dosaippadi. The distribution of the offered prasadam was to be made among the persons actually doing services such as singamurai (fuel supply), pānimurai (public works of the temple), the two jiyangars, sthānāla varu, kāningipān and dēsayi (or strangers), paḍikāvali, uttara parapatyam, adhyapakam and sundries and also for viniyōgam or free distribution to pilgrims in gōshṭi; also sthala Srivaishnavas. The time-honoured procedure for distribution had thus been broken by 1684. The measurement of rice continued to be by the time-honoured sōla and half sōla (Kōvila sōla, the temple sōla, and not the bazar measure). The endowment amount was not placed in the hands of the old or the new Sthanattar. The new managers were called Tirumala Tirupati Sthānālavāru. The endowment was not in cash but in the shape of a gold Khanti of aparanji gold (ornament worn round the neck). It was already pointed out how the value of the old varāhan had gone up by more than 40% and was rare to obtain, owing to the rapacity of Aurangzeb to corner all the old varāhans to play a currency fraud on the people. Even the Kanthi was left in the possession of one Kunrapākkam Ayyavāru Timmanayyavaru who was expected to supply the articles required for the performance of the services, the Sthānālavāru being responsible for making the offering to God daily,

---

1. Tuesday however was Suddha Dvadasi and Purva Phalguni Naksharam and 18th March.
Towards the expenses 200 is kept in the possession of Kunrappakam Ayyavaru. This endowment...may be enjoyed. In this manner this may go on through your posterity. The Khanti was of aparanji gold weighing 25 varāhan weight and valued at 525 Srirangaraja gaga (सौ). The donor is one “Raja Sri Sivarāja Ramachandra Yadamāḷēra Dabirs of Srivatsa gotoa, Āsvalāyana sutram and Rik Sākha.”

The prasadam was asked to be offered to the Deity immediately after another one for which endowment seems to have been made by one Mahārāja Sri Shūda Bhānuji Pantulu garu. From the details given for distribution of the prasadams it is inferred that the sthānālavaru (which we take to be the same as the word Sthanattar) had been reduced to four in number from the number six which they were in 1638 and that the new managers were Telugu people. Previously the inscriptions were used to commence with the words “Subhamastu; Svasti Sri......” This inscription commences with “Sri Vēṅkatēsa, Subhamastu.” The word ‘Nirvāham’ as referring to the share of the Sthanattar has disappeared and no distribution of the prasadams on that account was made. The donor himself stipulated how the distribution should be made; it was not left to the old manual procedure. Those who were doing the actual manual work were given the lion’s share. The Sthānālavaru were given a nominal share. The dēsāntarīs received a share. The terms Periya Koyil kelvi and Ilam Koyil kelvi to designate the jiyars gave place to Peda Jiyangaru and Chinnà Jiyangaru. This would indicate that the Koyil kelvi office was abolished. A new office Uttara Parapatytam had come into existence. The donor’s share called Viṭṭavan viḷukkāḍu was only a nominal one. Adhyāpakam and Sthala Srиваishnavas got a share. The traditional subscription to an inscription disappeared and the new one is “...sthānattaru sūthi...”

The old Sthanattar and the Tiruninra-ur-udaiyar seem to have gone out of the temple and Telugu seems definitely to have supplanted Tamil.
Lastly even the very name by which a food offering to the deity was usually known came to be altered. Formerly, from the earliest days, the food offering used to be designated as Tirupponakam or Sandhi Tirupponakam whether it was Suddhannam (cooked rice only) or other preparation. The name given in this inscription is ‘Avasaram’ (அவசரம்). One of the meanings given for the word ‘Avas’ in a Sanskrit Vedic dictionary is Āhāram or food. This term is noticed also in three previous inscriptions of the years 1554, 1579 and 1616. The inscription also tells us that there was a similar food offering (avasaram) instituted by one Maharaja Sri Shudāji Bhanuji Pantulu. There seems to be some justification to infer from this inscription that Aliya Ramaraja’s food offerings ceased after the conquest of the country by the Golkonda Kings and that the few who were continuing to do service in the temple stood in need of some wholesome food like Suddhannam.

Surmise as to the disappearance of most of the endowed lands.

It is not improbable that all the endowed lands scattered over the country were taken over by the Nabob of the Carnatic as they, according to usage, formed part of his Jageer and were treated as part of the Jageerdar’s property. Aurangzeb after he conquered the Deccan is said to have divided his Empire into a number of Subhas, Jageers etc. The limits of each Subha, Jageer etc., were settled and entered in registers maintained by an officer known as Kanungo. The information given about this office in the Diary and Consultation-Book of F.S.G. 11—7—1695 is worth quoting in this connection.

The office of the Kanungos.

“By the conquest of Golkonda and Vizapore (Bijapur) Aurangzeb’s dominions consisted of 56 Kingdoms or Principalities divided under several Kanungos who kept an account of the value
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and contents of all lands and always resided with the King and gave directions for the distribution of lands to the several Subhas and Principal officers as they were appointed by the King, and resolved questions and disputes that arose among the Subhas concerning their limits: and once a year each Kanungo presented unto the King a general state of the accounts of the lands under the several Subhas; viz., the value and contents of lands distributed into jageers, rented by the formers and remaining in the King's hands, the Subhas being accountable for the two latter, but the Jageers being lands allotted to the general for the maintenance of a proportionate number of horses they were accountable for their own Jageers.

These Kanungos receive no salary from the King, but are allowed to take one or two per cent upon the produce of the lands, not out of the King's part but the part belonging to the farmers and husbandmen whereby they are enabled to keep a great number of servants in all parts for gaining intelligence and keeping accounts.

Among the head Kanungo is Banpany Maha Dev, Maratta Brahmin, as most of them are either Marattas, Guzerattis or Coity, the Moors and Persians being very ill-accountants who about seven years ago were taken by Sambaji and by the King made Kanungos of Golkonda and Bijapur Kingdoms to Aurangzeb among whom is Vissagu Banchurra Kanungo of the Carnatic country from Kistna river to the extent of Chengee country, viz., all that part wherein lies the Kingdom of Golkonda and the part of the Kingdom of Bijapur. The latter is by them termed the new conquered Kingdom wherein by the Moghul's order the Kanungos receive 2 per cent, but in the part which lies within the Kingdom of Golkonda they receive but 1½ per cent. This Vissago doth attend constantly (either himself or men of his own family) with the Nawab, Diwan or other officers of the King's revenues and sometimes travel from place to place to oversee and regulate the particular accounts of towns and countries, and whenever the Nawab has occasion to make out a jageer or farm the Kanungo's accounts do determine the particular towns to be assigned and their value, so that it is much in his power either to favour or prejudice. Therefore those that are concerned in the King's lands take care not only to get the lands right entered in his
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accounts, but to engage him to declare in their favour when any question arises relating to these lands.”

Temple lands how treated.

The English had to experience difficulties in some cases by their neglect to keep the Kanungo in their favour. From the fact that in later days we have rewards to show that the temple lands were farmed out by the Nabob treating them as his own lands, we may safely assume that they were so treated during the closing years of the seventeenth and the early years of the eighteenth century after conquest by Aurangazeb who converted the Carnatic into a Jageer under a Nawab within the Golkonda Subha. The revenues from the villages would naturally have been appropriated by the Nawab leaving the temple services to be carried on from a portion of the votive offerings received from time to time. Owing to the great insecurity for pilgrims traffic and the dearth of money the services in the temple would have been reduced to the lowest scale possible. This perhaps explains the endowment of Dabirsia in the shape of a gold ornament to provide an income for the simple food offering described in the inscription.

How the protracted Moghul–Maratta war ravaged and impoverished the country.

Aurangazeb’s campaign in the Carnatic was under the command of his son Kam Baksh and his minister Asid Khan, father of Zulpikhar Khan who was the general in Command. Santoji Gharpura who came with Sivaji continued to be the Maratta commander throughout the campaign even after the death of Sivaji and Sambaji. Santoji well understood the weakness of Zulpikhar Khan viz., his love of plunder. The latter’s aim was to prolong the war and make up as much wealth as he could by plunder, ransom and such other means. Santoji gave full opportunity for this and thereby wearied out the Moghul army driving it even to the verge of starvation. When a siege threatened to become so effective as to end in a capture, the general of the weaker side was allowed the facilities to escape. It became a public scandal and was even reported to Aurangazeb. He
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suspected even Kam Baksh of traffic the King’s imperial honour with the Marattas. The English (F.S.G.) wrote on 28-10-1696 that Zulphikar Khan (Nawab of the Carnatic) pursued Santoji till he came to north of Trivellore and Santoji went on plundering the country right up to Kistnapatam. The Nawab made his halt at Trivellore and Santoji went away to Tirupati, having an eye on some treasure at Kaveripak. Another statement is to the effect that on 30th September 1696 the Nawab went out from Arcot to fight the Marattas who were 25000 strong and who surrounded the Muslim’s camp. The Nawab’s provision having been spent (after he had sent messages to Santoji) made his way through the thinnest of the Marattas and went back to Arcot;

“there hath hitherto seemed to be an understanding between the Nawab and Marattas and perhaps it will end in a good piscash.”

It was the Divine Will that the Moghulls and the Marattas should only ravage and plunder the country but not fight a war to the finish. Throughout this war which lasted for over twenty years the Marattas do not appear to have transgressed the rules of warfare and adhered to Sivaji’s principles. The sufferings of the populace was limited to the plunder of provisions and fodder for feeding the army. Even the merchants of Madras complained only to that extent against the Marattas. They respected the Muslim mosques, their Koran, their women and children who were non-combatants. Zulphikar khan’s avarice made him prolong the campaign and plunder the country of its wealth and even desecrate the temples. It was only when peremptory orders came from Delhi due to complaints received that a decisive action was fought and Chenji captured in 1698. Even in doing this he allowed Rama Raja (Raja Ram) King of Marattas to escape to the Vellore Fort. Gusafarkhan was appointed governor of Chenji Fort and country. He pursued Rama Raja as far as Sirpa and then marched to Gurramkonda and returned. During this campaign the population of every other religious centre in the south suffered but not so in Tirumala. The finance of the temple however suffered because pilgrims could not possibly undertake a journey. In this connection the prayer of Sri Vedanta Desika to Sri Ranganathaswami of Srirangam offered in his Abhitisthavam about
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1360 A.D., after the successful campaign of Prince Kumara Kempanna and the return of the Idol to Srirangam may be quoted here:—

"Abhi pranidhi lakshanaiah kalita sakya lokayaataih
Tulushka yavanadi bhiragati jrumha manam bhayam
Prakrsata nijasaktibhih prasabhamayudaih panchabhih
Kohiti tridasa rakhshataih kshapaya Ranganathakshana."

(22nd Slokam)

It became a war of attrition to the Moghuls. "The Deccan was a desert, where the path of the Marattas was traced by pillage, ravaged fields and smoking villages. The Moghul army was enfeebled and demoralised; those 'infernal foot soldiers' were croaking like rooks in an invaded rookery, clamouring for their arrears pay. The finances were in hopeless confusion and Aurangzeb refused to be pestered about them." There was much less blood of the Hindus shed.

After Aurangzeb's death in 1707, the scene of war and confusion was confined to Hindustan. The Marattas played a great part in it. Zulphikar Khan who played the game in the Carnatic became Bakshi of the whole empire under Bahadur Shah in the middle of 1711. About the same time a Rajaput by name Svarup Singh was appointed Governor of Chenji. Owing to war between him and the English there was much loss of property to the Hindus in those parts. When Farruksaiyar became Emperor at Delhi Zulphikar Khan was beheaded by his orders about 1713 and all his treasures which were kept in Ft. St. George were confiscated. That was the fate of the man who plundered the Carnatuka country during the protracted campaign which he conducted.

Sadat-ulla Khan and Todar Mull.

Sadat-ulla Khan was appointed in October 1713 as the Nawab of the Deccan country and Phousdar of Carnatak Golkonda countries. The Jageer of Zulphikar Khan was made over to him. 

He was a peace-loving man. One Todar Mullji was considered to wield the greatest influence with. The Statue of this Todar
Mull with those of his mother and wife is in the Tirumalai temple from which we may infer that he did some real good to the temple during his life-time. The English in Ft. St. George in sending some presents to him wrote (January 4, 1714) that he was very influential with the Nabob and would manage to prevent the Nabob’s marching towards Chennapatnam side. The Nabob was at that time besieging Chenji and calling upon Svarup Singh to surrender. Sadat-ulla Khan died in 1733 and one Dostali-khan was appointed as Nawab and Gulam Hussain Khan as the Divan. The appointment was made by Chinchiklis Khan by order of the Emperor Muhammad Shah Patcha Gausji. We have no information about the affairs of the Tirumalai temple during all this period. The political conditions in the whole of India were such that there would have been no safety for pilgrim traffic, nor were the ryots in a condition to accumulate wealth. But the Tirumalai temple and the surrounding country seem to have enjoyed a fairly quiet period.

The sudden incursion of the Marattas in 1740:
Dost Ali killed in Damalcheru battle.

This tranquillity was however disturbed in 1740. An invasion of the Carnatic country seems to have been thought of under the command of Baji Rao (during the reign of Sahu) in the year 1738 to avenge an insult offered by the Moghulls to the Maratta Royal family in Tanjore. But it was put off due to Nadir Shah’s invasion into the Empire of the Mughulls. So in August 1739 the Maratta invasion of Carnataka matured into a fact after the departure of Nadir Shah. This invasion seems to have also been instigated by Nizam Ali, the son of the Nizam of Hyderabad who as the Subhedar of the Deccan and the Carnatic had some

1. In 1737 one Aycoji Raja (Baba Sahib) died after a reign of only one year. His minor son Pratap Singh succeeded him and the mother Seejan Bye acted as regent. The Nawab of the Carnatic, Dost Ali captured Trichinopoly and interfered in the affairs of Tanjore, dethroned her and appointed one Sahuji a distant relation. This is the insult offered to the Tanjore family. Sahuji himself was nearly stabbed to death by the Muslim minister of the Nawab of Arcot in 1741.
time about 1731 entered into a treaty with the Marattas agreeing to the payment of the chanth and sardeshmukhi contribution to them to avoid war between the two. Dost Ali Khan did not pay this contribution ever since he became the Nawab of the Carnatic in 1733 nor did he pay his tribute due to the Nizam. He was thus six years in arrears to the tune of 60 lakhs of rupees. The Nizam agreed to the Marattas invading the Carnatic to collect the arrears. The Maratta force consisted of 50,000 horse and came by the Kallur pass via Damalcheruyu on the western flank of the Tirumalai Hill.

Dost Ali had previous intimation of this. The Nawab of Cuddappa had struck up a peace with the Marattas by making a present of two lakhs of rupees and two elephants. He had also withdrawn the forces he had sent to guard the defiles of Guvvalacheruvu kanama which opens a way to Arcot. Bangar Yachamma Naik, Meer Asad and other Poligars however went and drained the Piter tank of all water so that the Marattas might suffer for want of drinking water. The Chikka Rayulu (Prince) of Punganuru acted as guide to the Maratta army 10,000 strong through a narrow defile with sharp thorns on both sides. The rest of the Maratta army was in the rear and came down the Hill’s rear. The Nawab was attacked both in front and rear and was killed along with his second son and some other nobles. The money and riches which the Nawab kept in the tents were plundered by the Marattas. The eldest son Safdar Ali Khan who was coming from Lalapet to succour his father heard of the incident and retired to Vellore Fort for safety and was pursued by Bhaskar Roy, Narahari Roy and Bheem Roy. This happened on 9th May 1740. The President of the Council of Fort St. George in recording this incident in the Diary an Consult-Book on 12th May 1740 states that he saw no room to doubt that the Marattas will range over the whole province. He made defence arrangements for the Fort by mounting 200 guns. Kanchipuram, Trivellore and all the villages between Madras and Arcot were plundered and burnt. Poligars joined in the looting. Muslims with their families took refuge in Ft. St. George. Subsequently villages adjacent to Ft. St. David, such as Manalurpet, Kalasapakkam, Wulundore and even Porto Novo were plundered on 14th May. The kil-
ing of Nawab Dost Ali and his son was a serious matter and Nazir Jung, the son of the Nizam and the instigator of the expedition, did not contemplate such acts being perpetrated. The Maratta commander who was called upon to explain replied that he did it and Nazir Jung might do what he pleased. It was considered certain that the Marattas would soon capture Chenji also. Portions of the broken up Muslim army proved as dangerous to the people in the villages as the Marattas were to the towns.

**Baji Rao's mother and wife worship Sri Venkatesvara.**

In a letter dated 18th May 1740 written by Ravanutla Audiappah, spy of the English at Kojakanti near Arcot, there is a piece of information that on that date Baji Rao’s mother and his wife had arrived at Tirupati (to worship Sri Venkatesvara) and that Krishnaji Pantulu had gone out from Arcot to receive them. Their accompanying an army of invasion might have been more to fulfil a social obligation of offering condolence to the Queen Regent Seejan Bye who lost her husband in 1767 and whom the Nawab of Arcot (Dost Ali) had insulted by deposing her from the Regency. The same spy Ravanutla Audiappa wrote to the English a letter on 27th September 1740 received on 1—10—1740 (Country Correspondence) from which it is seen that the income from the Tirupati temple was big systematically appropriated by the Nawab of Arcot and that a sum of rupees fifty thousand was ordered to be handed over to the Vakils of the Marattas as an urgent and partial measure of satisfaction of demands. Out of this amount the Vakils had the sanction of Baji Rao to distribute Rupees Twenty thousand on charities in the Tirumalai temple. The distribution might have been in compliance with the intentions of Baji Rao’s mother and wife when they worshipped the deity on 18th May last. This letter of Ravanutla Audiappa is of interest as it shows the difficult plight in which Safdar Ali (Nawab) was placed at the time “The Vakils belonging to the Marattas have already made a very urgent demand of the Nawab for their money. Although he was much displeased with them for their ill-behaviour yet used them civilly, and allowed them some money for their expense and promised to pay them one hundred thousand rupees
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on account of their Masters—fifty thousand rupees is already ordered to be paid them at Tirupati out of the money that place produces to the Sircar. I am told the Vakils before mentioned sent their people to Tirupati to receive the money and to distribute twenty thousand rupees for charity there at the Pagoda (agreeable to their masters orders) and to bring the remainder to them. The other fifty thousand rupees it is not yet known when or in what place it will be paid.¹

Subsequent Political Events.

About the state of the Province there is a letter dated July 9, 1740 written by the President (F.S.G.) to Bombay which states:—

"There remains a considerable sum yet due to Marattas of that which was stipulated to be paid them upon which account their vakils talk in very high terms. The Maratta army which consisted upward of 40000 horse under the command of Futta Sing and Raghju have since been joined by 20,000 more under the command of Siddhoji. They are now in the dominion of Mysore and have raised great contributions. They seem inclined to march further southward before they return again to northward. This province continues still without any Government and without any force to protect it. The late Nawab and his son were greatly indebted to their soldiers who refuse to list again until they are paid their arrears." The Marattas captured Trichinopoly on 13th March 1741 and Chanda Saheb had to agree to pay 14 lakhs of rupees, half of which cash down on the spot and the other half after he went to Pondicherry. Murari Gadbeda was made temporary Governor of Trichinopoly with an army 30,000 horse. Safdar Ali Khan was murdered on October 6, 1742, in the Vellore Fort by his brother-in-law Gulam Murtaz Ali Khan who proclaimed himself Nawab of Arcot. On hearing this Murari Gadbeda plundered a large number of villages around Walikandapuram. But Nizamul-mulk Asaf Jah² recaptured Trichinopoly from the

¹. Quoted from the letter of Ravanutla Audiappa.

². Anandarangam Pillai in his diary of the 21st February 1743 writes that the Nizam with his sons, kinsmen and nobles advanced, as though the sea was rising, with an overwhelming force of 70,000 horse and ........ foot
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Marattas in August 1743 and finally appointed Anwar ud-din (Anvardikhan) as the Nawab of Arcot.

Although the Marattas did not make any serious attempt to recapture Trichinopoly and establish their supremacy in the South, there was the scare that at any moment they might do so. On 4th January 1744 came the news that when the Nizam and his son were near the Kistna river crossing on their way to Golkonda, they were faced with a Maratta army on the other bank and therefore withdrew three days march to Pocatore. The Marattas crossed the river and some skirmishes took place. Kajee Niyamatulla Khan (temporary Governor of Chenji) was sent back so as to prevent the Marattas going to Trichinopoly. The whole country was alarmed at this. Again on November 25, 1745 the Nizam sent a letter to the Nawab of Arcot when he was at Trichinopoly asking him to repair at once to Arcot and from thence to join the Subhas of Cuddappah and Kandanur (Kurnool) to oppose the passage of the Marattas who were gathering to invade the Carnatic. Again on 7th February 1746 news was received that the Nizam was facing a Maratta army on the banks of the Kistna river. In the meantime war was declared between France and England and the news was received in Madras on January 18, 1745. This was the beginning of the end of the Muslim and also the Maratta power in India and particularly in the South. Dupleix and Clive are the heroes of this struggle.

DUPLEIX AND CLIVE.

Siege of Arcot, Tirumalai money for Clive's relief.

Historians, some at least, are of the view that if Baji Rao had not cast his eyes on conquering the North (Hindustan) but had followed up his successes in the South and had consolidated the Maratta supremacy there, there would have been a permanent

and elephants (about 500). About 14 Polijars with 5,000 horse and 10,000 foot accompanied him. The Marattas accompanied the Nizam with 20,000 horse under the command of Raja Chandra sen and Raja Nimbal Sinh. The latter proceeded to Tirupati to worship the God of that place.
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Hinduraj in this province. His successor Balaji Baji Rao committed another blunder. He deviated from the old ideal of having a purely Hindu army of lightning-speed cavalry and of improving and consolidating its strength with artillary men. Men of other religious persuasion having different ideals in life were allowed into the army and predatory warfare caught his imagination more largely. The truth is that it seems to have been the Divine Will that the Muslims and the Marattas had to fulfil their mission of mutual destruction. The fanaticism of the one and the crude philosophy mixed up with lust of power of the other were equally unsuited to the systematically developed philosophical Hinduism of South India and its norm of temple worship. The Sri Vaishnava temples of the South in particular would have lost their special features if the Marattas had established their supremacy here. The latter could possibly never have accepted the Visishtadvaita philosophy of Sri Ramanuja and the Tamil Alvars. Aggressiveness and violence in thought and word are opposed to Sri Vaishnavism. It seems to have been the Divine dispensation that men of an alien religion owing allegiance to similar principles of love and service (when smitten on one cheek to show the other also) should hold sway for some time lured by the opportunities for appropriating the surplus income of the temples but all the while looking at our faith with contempt. The English made it their policy not to interfere with our religious beliefs and practices. Their own Christian Missionaries went a step further and insisted on complete withdrawal from the management of our temples, leaving it to us to manage or mismanage our religious institutions. Such an attitude the Marattas would not have taken.

How the English happened to interfere with the affairs of the Tirumalai temple will now be explained. The English and the French were the two powers who were rising in importance in the South from the time Monsieur Dupleix became Governor of Pondichery in 1742. His dream was to establish the French power here. When war broke out in Europe in 1745 between France and England it was extended to India as well and the Nawab of Arcot had to warn both not to carry on their sea fight within his territorial waters. The Nawab was an ally of the English. Madras was captured by the French on 21st September 1746 and
was restored to the English on 18—8—1749 under the terms of the treaty of Aix-la-chapelle. The power of the French and their influence with one faction of the Muslims was considered to be more than that of the English even before Madras was captured. When Nizam-ul-mulk recaptured Trichinopoly from the Marattas, in 1743 the English from Fort St. George sent their congratulations; and handsome presents. The envoys who went to Trichinopoly were made to wait several months before they could get an interview and the presents could be got accepted. But the French had easier access. Even the Zamindar of Bommarazupalem (the present Karvetnagar) tried to court the favour of Dupleix through his principal Dubash Ananda Rangam Pillai as is told, in his Diary dated 17th May 1746. Kärvetiraja of Bommarázupalaiyam sent the following presents through his palace priest Aiyábirálayan and Srinivasachari, the son-in-law of his áchārya (priest) and four temple archakas of Tirupati, viz., sacred offerings from the shrine of Sri Venkateswaraswami, an Arab horse, an embroidered silk cloth, a Guzarati sash, a silk turban, a shawl and a dagger inlaid with gold. These were taken to be presented to Ananda Rangam Pillai who lodged them in his country house at Tiruvengadapuram near Pondicherry. The purpose of the visit was to get Bommarazu Zamindar into the favour of Dupleix through Ananda Rangam Pillai. The full story need not be repeated here. It is enough for us to know that the temple hierarchy considered it expedient to be friendly with Dupleix as he was the rising man who might one day take over the management of the temple from the hands of the then Nawab. The Zamindar of Bommarazupalaiyam was the spiritual disciple of one family of the first acharyapurushas of Tirupati and Anandarangam Pillai was the disciple of another branch’ (his acharya’s name being Singarachariar). Srinivasachari who was one of the envoys was the son-in-law of Singarachariar. The Bankers Bukkanjis were the bankers of the Tirumalai temple and also of the Nawab of Arcot. So one of their men Hari Sankar Tarvadi went as if casually to visit Anandarangam Pillai after visiting Tirumalai. And Mr. Pillai sent his Siddhavaidyá Pandaram to see the Bommarazu Zamindar and administer medicine for his ailment. These were not mere courtesy visits.
THE POST–VIJAYANAGAR PERIOD

Consequent on the death of Asaf Jah (the Nizam) Nazir Jung, his son and Muzaffar Jung his grandson both claimed the Subhaship of the Deccan. For the Nawabship of Arcot, after the death of Anwar-uddin in the battle at Ambur on 21st July 1749, Muhammad Ali and Chunda Sahib were the contestants. Nazir Jung and Muhammad Ali joined hands and were supported by the English. Muzaffar Jung and Chunda Sahib joined hands and gained the support of the French. The war centred round Chengi and Trichinopoly. The French were meeting with more success. Muhammad Ali whom the English were supporting was closely besieged in Trichinopoly by Chanda Saheb in 1751 and the English were unable to relieve him. At this critical moment the genius of Robert Clive saved the situation. With a view to draw Chanda Saheb away from Trichinopoly Clive marched with a small force of 200 Europeans and 300 Indian sepoys and seized Arcot. He successfully and gallantly defended it against Rajah Saheb (son of Chanda Saheb) who invested the place.

Tirumalai Temple income goes to succour Robert Clive.

It is in this connection that Tirupati figures. Captain Clive was despatched to Arcot in the expectation that Nawab Muhammad Ali’s agents at Tirupati would send him money from the collections made in the temple and that although about two lakhs of rupees had been collected nothing was handed over to Divan Sampat Rao who had the orders to send the money1. Clive stood blockaded and wrote to the Deputy President of the Council (F. S. G.) that he would be unable to act unless the money was sent expeditiously. Delay would be giving time to the enemy to gather strength. The Zamindar of Bommarazupalaiyam who had undertaken to send 1000 peons of his to see that the money was conveyed safely, pleaded that as he was being threatened by Chunda Sahib he could not do so. Finding that the Zamindar could not be relied on the English sent their own men. Sampat Rao handed over Rs. 32500 and Pagodas 5000. He said that the remaining amount could be realised as soon as it is known that Muhammad Ali’s affairs are taking a better turn. In that year the collection is said to

1. (Diary and Consult F.S.G. dated Wednesday 12th November 1751).
have amounted to fifty thousand pagodas and that Bukkanji's shroffs were ready to receive the collections and send bills for payment to the English. The amount is inclusive of the collection from lands farmed out for cultivation. This is clear from the letter dated Monday 9th December 1751, which also stated that Nawab Muhammad Ali's men collected all the monies and that Chunda Sahib never had to the value of one rupee. Again on 20th December 1751 the English wrote, ...."though the Tirupati money has been collected by your people yet the best part of it is not paid which Sampat Rao must know of."

To those who fully believe that the hand of Providence guides and shapes the destinies of men and nations it would be clear that it was His Will that brought success to the English in the person of Robert Clive. From this year (1751) onwards there are records to show what amounts were collected every year, the agency employed for doing it and how eventually the management of the Temple and its lands was handed over by the Nawab of Arcot to the English. The large collections made annually lured the French to aspire mastery over the temple. In this connection Anandarangam Pillai's statement in his Diary that the renter Srinivasachari absconded without paying the Kists due and that one Vasudevachari was appointed in his stead as the renter for three years from 1750—51 on condition of paying one lakh of pagodas towards outstanding dues and 47,000 pagodas every year, had not taken all facts into consideration. But Vasudevachari did not actually enter into a contract. The political conditions at the time were such that Srinivasachari could not have been sure whether Chanda Saheb would be the Nawab of Arcot or whether Muhammad Ali would continue. The best course for him was to procrastinate payment. Vasudevachari seems to have served as a screen. Srinivasachari seems however to have continuously been the renter so far as the temple was concerned. There is an entry\(^1\) on 3rd January 1752 which states that "Shanavas Archaloe" had promised to pay the remainder of the Tripetty money to Boeconjae cosidoss. The excuse which the renter pleaded for the delay was due to the removal of

\(^1\) F.S.G. Diary and Consultations.
THE POST—VIJAYANAGAR PERIOD

Buccanji's people to a place "Vencatygary" on account of the troubles in the country. By November 6, 1752 the President acquainted the Board of Directors that he had received bills from Tirupati to the amount of Rupees 41,250 and Pagodas 10,000 which was carried to the credit of the Nabob, Muhammad Ally Khan. The revenues came to be assigned in due course to the English who punctually and vigorously collected every rupee received in the temple. They were received in three principal instalments known as the September, December and June kist (Brahmotsavam, Mukkoti and Anivarai Asthanam).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Collections received in Pagodas</th>
<th>Collections received in Rupees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1753—54</td>
<td>56,432</td>
<td>92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754—55</td>
<td>59,124</td>
<td>58,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755—56</td>
<td>52,665</td>
<td>53,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756—57</td>
<td>45,296</td>
<td>51,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757—58</td>
<td>45,245</td>
<td>50,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On October 27, 1755 Mr. Pigot reported to the Select Committee F. S. G. that Capt. Polier had escorted with his troops the Nawab to Arcot where he made a splendid entry. The Arcot poligars were subdued by Kilpatrick. Bangaru Yachama Naik settled for 1,40,000 rupees and Bommarazu for Rs. 2,37,000 a year.

The despatch from the Select Committee at Madras to the Secret Committee at F.S.G. states:—

"November 20, 1756. The Nawab has again assigned to the Company for the current year 8 lakhs of rupees from the Arcot country. Bommarazu - palayam poligar paid 7994 Palliput pagodas and will pay Rs. 70,000 more in four months time. The Tirupati renter paid regularly in 3 instalments yearly rent of 45,000 Sadut-ulla Khan Pagoda (4 or 5% better than current pagoda) and 52,000 North Arcot rupees."

There is an entry dated October 13, 1757 “the Superiority of the French forces compelled the English to recall the troops

1. Dodwell’s statement of this referred to on p. 515 both of Dr. K. Iyyenâr’s History of Tirupati is from this source:
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

from Conjeevaram to Madras and to order back Polier who was marching north to protect Tirupati from Nazib-ulla-khan....” Information obtained from some subsequent entries is given below. November 10, 1757:—The Nabob’s debt on April 1756 stood at 13, 71, 906 pagodas; by June 30 last it had fallen to 11, 91, 324 pagodas; this was rendered possible by his paying his assignment in full, the full receipt of Tirupati rents and the mortgaged countries of....October 2—15—1758. The Tripetty rent has been regularly paid, the principal collection is now beginning and it is hoped will not be interrupted by the French. Post Script to the above says. “The French have occupied Arcot, Tripetty and Conjeevaram.”

A letter from Mr. Pigot to the company dated July 28, 1759 while estimating revenues of various provinces etc., says “..... Other revenues are reckoned as follows: Tripatty, 2,50,000 Tripassore, 2,00,000; Conjeevaram 1,50,000.”

It is therefore a safe assumption to say that the English Company was getting annually about 2½ lakhs of rupees from the Tripetty temple and the lands attached to it.

Note:—Dr. S. K. Ayyangar’s version found on p. 519, Vol. II. of his History of Tirupati, is that Madam Dupleix sent one Raja-gopala Pandit ousting Vasudevachari to be Amuldar of Tirupati about the end of the year 1751. The Diary & Consult-book of the F.S.G. however goes to show that throughout the year 1751 Sampat Rao the Diwan of the Nabob was collecting and remitting the revenue of the temple to the F.S.G. to keep Robert Clive’s forces actively engaged.

From the entries of the diary dated 3rd January, 11th, 24th, February and 23rd March it is seen that Srinivasachari was the renter for the year 1751—52 and that he continued to be the renter in 1753 also. The lease was being renewed every year. In 1751 the English complained that there was negligence on the part of Diwan Sampat Row in taking steps to have the Tripetty collections sent to the Governor of F.S.G. punctually by means of Sowcar’s Bills. The Nabob thereupon sent special instructions
to Sampat Rao to pay personal attention to the matter since it affected the safety of his country. Money used to be collected by one Abdul Bob Khan a relative of the Nabob stationed at Chandragiri. The English Governor wrote to him on August 18, 1753. “You tell me that you will order your people to send the Tripatty money; May I not with reason ask you how you could order than to receive it; how often do you call me your Brother and tell me the Nabob owes his welfare to my assistance.” Abdul Bob Khan’s reply to this dated 7th September 1753 reads, “I am extremely pleased to receive your letter wherein you was pleased to desire me to send the Tripatty money.” In July 1753 Abdul Bob Khan had intercepted 50,000 rupees and the Nabob had to write a severe letter on 31st July 1753 to Bob Khan to see that his men did not collect any money from the renter, but that the latter should be allowed to hand over to Diwan Sampat Rao who would settle all accounts. Bob Khan threw the blame on one Yeklas Khan. The lease for the year 1753—54 was actually given to Srinivasachari about the middle of September 1753 and at the request of Sampat Rao the English sent a detachment of some Europeans and Sepoys. They also wrote to Kumara Yāchama Naik, Damarla Venkatappa and Guruvaraz to assist the renter in collecting the money during the approaching annual festival. Srinivasachary was asked to pay the full amount of the collection to the English. Srinivasachary reached Tirupati on the 6th day of the festival. In the meantime Mahamad Kamal an adventurer from Nellore turned up to capture the temple and appropriate the income. Nazeb-ulla, Captz Hott and Damarla Venkatappa engaged him in battle on the plains of Tirupati and cut off his head on 2nd October 1753. Srinivasachari complained that Mahamad Kamal had collected already 13049 pagodas and another Esarar Khan had received Rs. 60,000/-. He therefore requested the English to write to Anwarde Khan and excuse the renter from paying Rs. 50,000 to the Nabob which amount represented also charitable gifts made by the pilgrims to the renter. This latter is of interest to us. These charitable gifts really represent collections made from the Tirukkaivaljakkan and Tirumun kanikkai amounts which in former times used to be paid to the Sthanattar and which in later times were given to the Nabob and the renter.
on the occasion of the numerous festivals, etc., celebrated by the pilgrims.

Nazibullah and Bob Khan however complained that the real income for the year was very large and that the renter was duping the English. Thereupon the English guards at Tirupati seized the renter on 18th December 1753 and carried him to Madras whereon the Governor had all the accounts audited by Diwan Sampat Rao in Kanchipuram. The accounts were settled and he was permitted to go back to Tripatty which he did on 9th May 1754 after paying star pagodas 35383 and odd to the company in settlement of all dues to the end of December 1753. In September 1754 the Nabob formally assigned in full the rents of the Tirupati Pergana to the English. Srinivasachary was again confirmed in September 1754 as renter for the following year and one Krishnaji Pant was appointed and joined on 23—8—54 as Tahsildar to assist him. On 28th July 1755 Srinivasachary reported to the English that the army of the Nabob of Cuddappah with a Maratta named Narasinga Rao, was camping near Avedula sanna Canama with a view to capturing Tripatty at the time of the September festival. But actually there was no disturbance caused. In July 1757 the Tahasildar, the renter and Damarla Venkatapathy wrote to the Governor of Madras that Nazibullah Khan had written to Venkatapathy that he was the Deputy of the Moghull and that he would be marching to take possession of Tripatty and settle the revenues of Tripatty, Kalahasti and Venkata-giri. The Nabob of Arcot also wrote on 22nd July 1757 that Nazibullah had been induced by the French at Wandiwash to join them and to proceed against Tripatty. He wanted the English to send some Europeans and sepoys to Tripatty. In the meantime Balvant Rao, the Maratta commander informed the renter that he would be going to the Hills with an army of 2,000 horses to worship the God on 13th August 1757. The Governor wrote to him “you are sensible that the place has been under the care and management of the English for some years past and not to cause any disturbance considering the friendship between him and the English.”

1. On p. 522 and 523 of History Vol. II. Dr. K. Ayyanagar speaks of Nazebulla marching on Tirupati in 1756. But neither Srinivasachari nor the company’s diary mentions the incident. Srinivasachari was the renter.
But Keiredy Khan wrote to the Nabob that Balvant Rao, intended to take possession of the place. The sepoys sent by the Company arrived in Tripatty on 30—7—57. Balvant Rao who came on 12th August with 3000 Horse, was met by the renter at a distance of 4 crousus (8 miles) from Tripatty where the army was left and Balvant Rao went alone to the Mount and paid his devotion to God and then marched with his army to the Canama. But in fact an attempt to capture Tripatty was made by Nazibullah who according to Srinivasachari’s report to the Governor of Madras was camping on 26—8—1757 at Cadwar (perhaps Kodur) after capturing the fort there. On 29th August an army of Europeans and sepoys was despatched to Naidupet to join there Damarla Venkatapathy and Bangaru Yachama Naik and to oppose Nazibullah. Nazibullah is said to have coaxed the renter to join him, but in vain. Perhaps no attack was actually made on Tripatty.\(^1\) From the beginning of 1758 however real danger was apprehended. Abdul Bob Khan entered Chandragiri with 1000 horses, 1000 sepoys and 5000 peons on 28th January. Acting on the complaint made by the renter the Governor of Madras wrote to Bob Khan to desist from doing any harmful act. Balvant Rao and Amrita Rao were molesting Damarla Venkatapathy and the other Zamindars and Poligars for payment of more than the legitimate ‘chanth’ amount. The renter wrote that Balvant Rao had occupied the Siddhaut Fort and that Abdul Hamid Khan had handed over to his Diwan Vasaji Pant the Gurramkonda Fort with half the country. The Diwan also intimated to the renter that he would go to Tripatty with 4000 horses in five or six days to pay his devotion to God. Abdul Bob Khan was in correspondence with the Marattas and residing in Chandragiri. So mischief was suspected. Bangaru Yachama Naik complained that the Marattas were insolent and obstinate and that they protect the Zamindars who were friendly to the French but molest those who were friends of the English.

1. We are told in the Madras Despatches (p. 126) from the Select Committee dated October 13, 1757, that the superiority of the French forces compelled the English to recall their troops from Conjeevaram to Madras and to order back Polier who was marching north to protect Tripatty from Nazibullah Khan.
Meanwhile Amrita Rao, the Maratta, died in Tiruppattur while fighting on the side of the English. There were also two other individuals, viz., Balakrishna Sastri and Raghavachari, who on the alleged authority of a Sannad granted by Balaji Rao came to demand the Chanth in the Carnata country. They approached Balvant Rao for help; but he declined on the plea that the people of Arcot were his friends. At the end of March 1758 after waiting for a while at Cumbum and Cacarla, they came via Settigunta and Karakambady with the help of the Matlavar Raja to capture Tripatty. In a battle fought on the plains to the east of Tripatty Raghavachari was killed by Srinivasachari the renter on 5th May. Abdul Bob Khan who was then in Chandragiri did not go to the help of the renter although approached. On the other hand he had applied to the French for assistance being given to him by sending troops to Chandragiri. It was also reported by the renter to the Governor of Madras that Monsr., Bussy jointly with the chief of Matchelipatam had crossed the Kistna and was camping with his army on the other side of the Pennar at Nellore. He requested that English troops might be sent to intercept him at Naiduropet. Damarla Venkatappa wrote another letter that Balaji Rao had written to him to seize Tripatty and Chandragiri Fort. The attempt was to see that the temple and Chandragiri Fort were surrendered to Balakrishna Sastri and 2,000 Maratta horse had already arrived at Rayachoti and more were coming. Monsr. Bussy also sent letters to all Zamindars. Jaffar Hussain Khan and the Chittoor Zamindars enlisted troops. On 3rd September 1758 it was learnt that Bussy was on his way and that Nazibullah Khan was coming with him via Kalahasti to join Abdul Bob Khan at Chandragiri. The renter warned the Governor of Madras against the evil consequences of Bussy’s taking possession of the Pergana and wanted that troops should be sent to intercept the army. The Governor wrote back that the Poligars must be persuaded to resist and that this should be sufficient for the occasion. Balaji Row however wrote to Damarla Venkatappa through his general Gopal Hari that his design was to join Venkatappa and act against the French. There was also the false belief that Jaffar Hussain and Abdul Wahab who were kinsmen of the Nabob would not join the French. On the 7th October 1758 the Tahsildar...
informed the Governor that the French with the help of the chief of Machlipatam, Nazeabulla Khan of Nellore, and Abdul Wahab Khan of Chandragiri having entered into a confideracy took possession of the Tripatty Pergana. Abdul Wahab fixed his standard and employed his people to maintain security. But the French demanded that Abdul Wahab should first furnish security and rent the Pergana. He was unable to comply and Srinivasachari was sent for and the Pergana was rented to him after obtaining security for the first feast kist and Seerapaw and Sanand given. This was on the 7th October 1758 which was the fifth day of the Brahmotsavam. The Tahsildar wrote to the Madras Governor to send troops and recapture the temple and the Pergana. The Governor found fault with Srinivasachari for betraying his masters. But Damarla Venkatappa replied that he used his discretion wisely so that the Pergana did not pass into the hands of Abdul Wahab. It may be stated here that when the French entered Tripatty on 6th October the company's troops dispersed and went via Rayalcheruvu to Madras. On the 16th October Nazibullah and the French Chief went to Chandragiri. The Governor found fault with Bangaru Yachama Naik and Damarla Venkatappa for having allowed the small French force to pass through their territory without any attempt to prevent the entry. He wanted them to show better fidelity to the Nabob and the English. He indicated that further action would be taken after the rainy season was over. The sanad of Srinivasachari was given by the Chief of Machelipatam. Abdul Bob Khan obtained in the name of his son the Tahsildari of Tripatty. Srinivasachari was not agreeable to this and found his affairs in confusion. The capture of Tripatty by the French was not an unexpected event. The despatch from the Select Committee to the Secret Committee of F.S.G. dated October 2nd and October 5th 1758 reads, "The Tripatty rent has been regularly paid; the principal collection is now beginning and it is hoped will not be interrupted by the French." The post-script says that "the French have occupied Arcott Tripatty and Conjeevaram."

The Diary and Consultation-Book and the Country correspondence after 1758 do not yet appear to have been printed by
the Government yet. A reliable history relating to the further period cannot therefore be written until they are available. It is however seen from a report made by Pigot to the English at (F.S.G.) dated April 8, 1762 that after the surrender of Vellore by the French the English army marched to the Nellore country. Nazibullahkhan, Killadar of Nellore was attacked and he took refuge with the Poligar of Udayagiri who, out of fear delivered him up. Bangaru Yachama Naik, Poligar of Venkatagiri compromised for 2½ lakhs rupees; Damarla Venkatapati Naik, Poligar of Kalahasti made peace for 1½ lakhs and Bommarazu settled in a few days. Tirupati was thus rendered safe and secure for the English. It continued to be the sure and unfailing source of income for them even till September, 1800, as we have seen from Lord Clive's letter to the Nawab of Arcot in connection with the arrangements to be made for the pilgrimage of Raja Raghottama Rao to Tirupati although the temple along with the pergana of Tripatty was nominally the property of the Nawab of Arcot. The revenues stood assigned to the English. In 1801 the East India Company dispossessed the Nawab and assumed the administration. Vigorous steps were then taken to look into the internal administration of the temple. The religious and the secular office holders of the temple were examined. The details of these are contained in what is known as the Savāl Javabpatti, that is, register of questions and answers. The duties of all the parties were set down in what is known as the Kaṇkaryapatā (register of services to be rendered). Then a set of rules known as the Bruce's Code (from the name of the civilian officer who drew it up) was drawn up and approved by the District Collector on 25th July 1821. It was meant to regulate all the usual affairs of the temple. It does not however appear to have been sanctioned by the Government by a formal Government Order after due consideration by the Governor in Council. These were however the registers consulted by the executive authorities in all cases of doubt and acted upon. But they could be and were challenged by the affected parties in law courts. For purposes of history this was the first time an attempt had been made to set the affairs of the Temple on a logical basis. All the events that take place from day to day during the 365 days of a year are recorded by the Parapatyadar in the day
book called *Amulnāma*. This is meant to ensure that ancient usages are duly adhered to and that no innovations creep in by the back door. The power which the Parapatyadar possesses may be misused to record innovations continuously, thus giving the innovations in course of time the colour of ancient usage. This may well be compared to the power which the Kanugoes wielded with the Nabobs in the matter of effecting alterations in land registers to favour or injure a land owner or Jageerdar. For, what the Parapatyadar writes in the day book is known at the time only to him. Twenty or fifty years later it may be summoned in a law court and be considered valid evidence.

**The motive for resumption of temple lands and the grant of tasdik allowances.**

The immediate result of the administration passing into the hands of the English Company was the resumption of all temple lands all over the country as a matter of determined policy. The motive appears to have been to ruin all Hindu temples and to destroy once for all the influence of the Brahmins in this country. There was probably some reason for this hatred against the Brahmin. The brahmins of those days considered the European to be a *mlechcha*. If he had to converse with a *mlechcha* the sacred thread which he wears should be shifted from the Upavita to the Nivita posture. After the interview he should, even if he does not take a bath, wash his hands and feet then shift the sacred thread back to the upavita posture and then do āchamanams (sipping water uttering the prescribed mantram). It is also on record that the Acharyapurushas declined to meet the District Collector in his cutchery when under instructions from the Government he wanted in 1841 to investigate the possibility of forming them into a committee to whom the management of the Devasthanam could be handed over. They preferred to see that the District Collector meets them at the temple gate. The District Collector keenly felt the insult.

It is worth referring here to the extract from the article of the Asiatic Quarterly which is added as Appendix I to Vol. I of this
book. The repetition here of extracts therefrom may be excused:—
"...The annual nett proceeds from this source is about eighty-
seven thousand rupees. In 1822–23 the collections were one
lakh forty two thousand and odd; but this is exclusive of expenses
wherewith twenty thousand may be deducted. In 1820—21 or
fasli 1230 the collections were 1,02,000."

"You may perhaps start at such organised system of religious,
or rather you will say profane, plunder on the part of the Govern-
ment; but such, strange as it may appear, is far from the case.
Those who without just reflection join the spiritless cry against
our government are rejoiced in soul to start such a topic as this,
as an admirable specimen of what, with other things, should draw
down vengeance of heaven on us. The fact is this: we find that
the resources of the pagoda were legitimately enjoyed by musalman
government, for services earned with blood and pressure, and
that at the risk of losing our trade on the Coromandel coast. One
of the first rewards, or rather poor payment, was this revenue,
and it has been paid unremittingly eversince. We found the
allowing the temple to support itself upon its own funds lead to
the grossest imposition upon settlement of kists; more than that,
the only cultivation in that part of the country was in the hands
of Brahmins who cannot legally touch a plough; and therefore
all other castes of riots were virtually their slaves; and it was absurd
for them to dream of holding lands when embraced competition
with Vishnu’s Brahmin’s, under the very nose of the sacred Hill;
the consequence was, the priests had it all their own way; labour
was drawn towards their district to the comparative impoverishment
of the surrounding ones; and such was found to be the case all
over the presidency. Every village pagoda was the petty oppressor
of its range, and the influence only stopped when the effects of a
neighbouring one interfered with it. It was a strange but deter-
mined piece of policy when throughout the country the pagoda
lands were resumed by the company and tustik allowances granted
in their place; the lands passed into other hands and the riches
solely grasped by the brahmin are diffused amongst the real
cultivators of the soil and the coffers of the state replenished by
the new stimulus thus offered to every branch of native manufacture.
Our tenure of the country was then very precarious; and while as to the Hindu he has fought and will fight again perhaps sooner than we think of; and the experience of ages tells us what religious enthusiasm or fanaticism—or call it what you will—will do when wrought up to despair. What did we? Why, we secured them in the exercise of their religion—tolerated it—we never encouraged it. We could not if we would. Now let us contemplate the result of this plan. From one end of the country to the other pagodas are ruined, unmaintained. Brahmins are in trade, serving in the army and generally learning that even to them begging is no livelihood. The oppressive hand of the Brahmin was removed from the neck of the people, and the influence they once had will never again be felt to a similar extent. The revenues of Tripatty are on a gradual decline and will die in the lapse of years a natural death. Some of the most celebrated temples in the country are worse off. But there are still, alas, many more strongholds of the devil."

We doubt whether the above extract really reveals the real motives of the East India Company for the resumption of temple lands. The impious wish of the writer of that article stands unfulfilled and will it is hoped for ever stand unfulfilled. The Tirupati revenues have been increasing marvellously not from lands but by kanukas from the willing hands of the votaries of all classes and sects. The oppressive hand of the old type Britisher has been removed from the neck of the Indian people and God willing Hinduism will thrive. The Hindu and the Britisher will live as honest and well intentioned friends. Not only have the revenues of the Devasthanam mounted to fifteen crores of rupees a year, the administration of its funds is in the hands of a devout and enlightened Board of Trustees and an Executive Officer subject to control by a popular Government having a minister for controlling Hindu Religious Institutions. Its funds are utilised for various philanthropic and charitable purposes. It would look like flattery if names are singled out for apportioning credit. The temple will do well to maintain a roll of honour.

The writer of that article gave the gross income of the Tirumalai temple as Rs. 1,47,000 for 1822 and Rs. 1,02,000 for 1820 A.D.
The expenditure for the temple he has shown to be about Rs. 20,000. He has not stated what the tasiik amount was which the Government gave in place of the resumed lands, whether it was in cash or in the shape of provisions shown in the moyne Japtha paditharam of fasli 1227 brought into force from 1819 A.D. There is available to us the Devasthanam Tasdik Book for ten years from Fasli 1233—34 to 1242—43 which gives an abstract of the sources and amount of income form each source, the total income and also the charges incurred under certain classified heads of account. As a sample the one relating to the year 1233—34 is attached hereto. This detailed statement (of the sources of income and the items of expenditure) shows that the income was made up of (a) Fasaki and other miscellaneous items (b) Kanukas and Arjitams (c) income through Dharmakartas for certain services (d) cash from circar. The last named item (d) would represent the cash payment made by the Government in place of the income from lands which were resumed. The expenditure side was made up of (e) Horavetsam, or daily ration of rice to certain persons (f) expenditure on Devasthanam religious services (g) circar establishment (h) income from inam lands in the enjoyment of sibbandhis (i) establishment maintained by Dharmakartas (j) payments to mirasdars (k) amount paid to other minor dependent temples. There are nineteen temples classed therein as major ones and eighteen classed as minor. The temple of Sri Venkateswara alone will be considered here as the others are really of little importance and have not been dependent on the former. Every other temple had its own sources of income which therefore limited its expenditure to suit its finances. We are concerned with the total income, the circar contribution in cash, kanukas and arjitams and the collections made by Dharmakartas. The Fasaki income has been a fairly constant amount ranging between Rs. 31,650 and Rs. 31,780. The contribution made by the circar should have been a fixed amount; but it is found to vary from year to year, probably due to the fluctuation in the price of commodities. But the quantities shown in the paditharam would have been fixed once for all. Kanukas and Arjithams would naturally vary from year to year.
# The Post-Vijayanagar Period

## Receipts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Circar contribution</th>
<th>Kanukas etc.</th>
<th>Dharmakast.</th>
<th>Total receipts</th>
<th>Nett income and circar.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1823-24</td>
<td>31,763</td>
<td>95,557</td>
<td>17,999</td>
<td>1,77,024</td>
<td>95,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824-25</td>
<td>34,972</td>
<td>1,46,356</td>
<td>14,933</td>
<td>2,27,976</td>
<td>1,46,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825-26</td>
<td>31,427</td>
<td>1,07,785</td>
<td>13,007</td>
<td>1,83,933</td>
<td>1,07,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826-27</td>
<td>24,511</td>
<td>1,24,138</td>
<td>11,907</td>
<td>1,92,258</td>
<td>1,24,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828-29</td>
<td>25,184</td>
<td>1,25,827</td>
<td>11,089</td>
<td>1,93,888</td>
<td>1,25,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829-30</td>
<td>25,403</td>
<td>1,18,246</td>
<td>11,124</td>
<td>1,87,504</td>
<td>1,18,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-31</td>
<td>25,360</td>
<td>1,17,447</td>
<td>13,029</td>
<td>1,90,567</td>
<td>1,17,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831-32</td>
<td>28,262</td>
<td>1,18,361</td>
<td>13,050</td>
<td>1,91,371</td>
<td>1,18,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-33</td>
<td>27,140</td>
<td>72,614</td>
<td>10,330</td>
<td>1,41,863</td>
<td>72,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833-34</td>
<td>31,210</td>
<td>59,468</td>
<td>14,672</td>
<td>1,37,021</td>
<td>55,468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under expenditure horavetsam, inam lands to udigamdars (about 31,500 Rupees), establishment charges by circar (varies from 4400 to 5000), establishment charges met by Dharmakartas (varies from Rs. 5500 to Rs. 6800). The expenditure incurred for the temple worship alone need be considered as compared to the total expenditure. It will be seen that the Circar contribution is less than the actual expenditure on temple worship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Temple expenditure</th>
<th>Total expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1823—24</td>
<td>37,848</td>
<td>81,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824—25</td>
<td>39,872</td>
<td>81,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825—26</td>
<td>34,358</td>
<td>76,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826—27</td>
<td>25,749</td>
<td>68,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827—28</td>
<td>25,781</td>
<td>68,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828—29</td>
<td>26,884</td>
<td>69,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829—30</td>
<td>30,178</td>
<td>73,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830—31</td>
<td>30,199</td>
<td>73,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831—32</td>
<td>27,027</td>
<td>69,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832—33</td>
<td>34,662</td>
<td>71,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It is observed that there is an item of expenditure called "Payable to other Devasthanams." It means that, that particular temple was paying a certain amount to one or more other temples for services rendered by the latter. There is only one temple of this kind, viz., Sri Kothanda Ramaswami temple in Tirupati which was paying Rs. 60 a year, probably to the Govindarajaswami temple to cover the expenses incurred for the latter Deity to visit the former on certain days of its festival. This practice has been commented upon in Chapters X and XI. Similarly the hereditary office holders of the Tirumalai temple do some service to the other temples for which they were being remunerated. These are shown under items (12) of the headings. Dharmakartas of certain endowment services had to maintain an establishment at their cost. These come under item (11).

Some of the temples, though classed as major ones, had no income from Kanukas, Arjitams and Dharmakartas. They depended entirely on the tas dik amount which the cir car gave and their expenditure was limited to that amount. (Examples are Kapilesvaraswami, Hanumantaraya, Sanjeevaraya, etc.). The expenditure on all these temples have mounted up enormously; Kapilesvaraswami temple enjoys more than fifty times the Circar tas dik. The Mahants after they became Vicharanakarta in succession to the East India company failed to claim the tas dik amounts from the Government, or failed to credit these amounts to the account of each temple. This statement is subject to verification and correction. It is not known whether all or which of the horavetsams are still being continued as there is no voluntary agency making collections from shopkeepers etc.

Minor Temples.

The East India Company took over for management eighteen minor temples in addition to nineteen major ones given in the statement. It is unnecessary to show the minor ones in the forms of a Statement showing annual receipts and expenditure. None of these temples was maintained by the Tirumala or the Tirupati temple; each had its independent finance. Even the East India
Company did not pay any tas dik amount for these, except for the Uttaradi mutt Sanjivara yaswami temple which received 6 25\(^{1}/\text{64}\) pagodas (\(=\text{Rs. 22—6—0}\) for its upkeep. It had no other income. Temples which derived income from shop rents, weaving tax, and kanukas are Sri Varahasvami temple, Bhashinga Narasimhaswami, Alipiri Narasimhaswami, Lakshminarayanaswami in Alvar Tirtham, and Bedi Hanumantarayaswami. Varahasvami temple had also income from its Dharmakartas (the archakas); so also Nathamuni temple. The temple of Sri Lakshminarayana Swami in G. South Mada Street, Tirupati, had inam lands which yielded about Rs. 402 including meras but excluding jodi. The following five temples shown in the list were not handed over to the Mahant in 1843 for maintenance. Sri Krishnaswami in Buggamutt; Sanjivara yaswami near Raghavendrachar’s house; Agastyeswaramswami on the bank of Ramachandra Gunta, Tirukkachchinambi, Tatayya Gunta Gangamma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Temples</th>
<th>Income and expenditure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tirumalai Sri Varahaswami</td>
<td>.. 229 (Kanukas and dharmakarta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bhashinga Narasimhaswami</td>
<td>.. 105 (Kanukas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alipiri Narasimhaswami</td>
<td>.. 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lakshminarayanaswami near Alvar Tirtham</td>
<td>.. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Venugopalasvami, near Alvar Tirtham</td>
<td>.. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sri Lakshminarayanaswami, G. S. Mada Street, Tirupati</td>
<td>.. 402 (Inam lands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bedi Hanumantarayaswami</td>
<td>.. 52 (Kanukas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sanjivarayaswami, Alvar Tirtham</td>
<td>.. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sanjivarayaswami, (Govindaraja temple)</td>
<td>.. —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sanjivarayaswami, (Ramaswami temple)</td>
<td>.. —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Minor Temples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Temple Name</th>
<th>Income and expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Nathamuni</td>
<td>74 Through dharmakartas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Nammalvar (Alvar Tirtham)</td>
<td>7 From Kanukas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Uttaradimutt Sanjivarayaswami</td>
<td>23 Circar tadik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Sri Krishnaswami in Seetaladas mutt (Bugga mutt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Sanjivarayaswami near Raghavendrachar’s house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Tirukkachchinambi in Beri Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the temples, whether classed as major or minor, had a claim on the funds of the Tirumala temple. Every temple was made to be self-maintaining. This principle was broken by the Mahants and their successors have been construing that all the constituent temples have to be maintained by the Tirumala temple, on a scale which the Trustees consider as equitable or desirable.
CHAPTER XXIII

THE ALWARS' PRABANDHMAS AND THE TIRUMALAI TEMPLE.

The Prabandhams of the Alvars are the Bhakti songs of those Tamil saints collected together. The appropriateness of devoting a chapter therefor has to be explained to readers who are unacquainted with the liturgy of Sri Vaishnava temples. The most noticeable feature of such temples is the unfailing recitation of verses from these works at certain stages of the daily worship as a necessary adjunct or complement to the vedic rituals, although logically there is no place for such recitation.

Who the Ālvārs are, why and how their songs came to be recited in temples where the form of worship is conducted according to āgama rituals are matters which require elucidation. This association of the Prabandham with Sri Vaishnava temples assumed peculiarly demonstrative forms in the shape of festivals. In Tirumala and Tirupati the start was made much later than in the temples of the south where the Tamil language was more prevalent. The stages by which and the manner in which this recitation and the festivals connected therewith became a permanent feature in these two temples could with some accuracy be traced from the inscriptions in the temples.

The Prabandhams are also of paramount historical interest to us as they alone furnish the materials for forming a correct picture relating to the accepted sanctity of the Vengadam Hill and the ancient belief that Sriman Narayana manifested Himself on this Hill in His Archa (image) form for affording to mortals and immortals alike facilities to worship Him on a footing of perfect equality. It must be remembered in this connection that these Ālvārs—the earlier Alwārs decidedly flourished in centuries before Sri Sankaracharya and his philosophy of Advaitam came to be known. (Sri Sankaracharyas life period is said to be from
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737—769). The only religious sects known to the Alwars were Vaishnavism, Saivism (Lingam worship), Buddhism and Jainism. All the Āḻvārs have unequivocally declared that Vengadam Hill is sacred to Vishnu who has manifested Himself there. We learn from their songs the condition of the Hill with its dense forests, its wild animals (elephants, panthers, monkeys, lions, and pythons), its rivulets and flowering plants and the kuravars or primitive huntsmen whose main occupation was capturing and taming the elephants. That the Dhruva Murti was standing without a walled structure around and that in later times a wooden structure was built are also vividly described.

The subject will therefore be dealt with in three sections. In the first section an over-all picture of the Āḻvārs, their Bhakti songs, how they came to be known to the world and the spiritual and social equality of all Hindus depicted therein will be given. In the second section the stages by which the recitation of these songs acquired a permanent place in the temple liturgy will be traced. In the third section the early history of the temple will be set out as is disclosed in the Āḻvārs’ songs, treating the Murti as the form of Vishnu as pictured by every alwar.

SECTION I.
TEMPLES AND THE PRABANDHAMS OF THE ALWARS.

The Alwars and how their works were given publicity.

In Chapter III a brief reference was made to the religious rivalries in South India which resulted in the upsurge of the Vaishnavite Āḻwars. Vishnu worship in temples and in homes was however more ancient perhaps than even the āgama form which was discussed at length in Chapter XII. It was surmised therein that the āgamas would appear to have been composed in that part of India which lies to the north of the Vindhyas mountains and brought into use in South India at some later date. The form of āgama worship is bound up with Sanskrit texts and Vedic Riks and gives no room for the intrusion of verses, songs
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or other forms of praise of the Deity in any other language. The only exception, which perhaps was made in later times, was that at a certain stage of the rituals in connection with the celebration of the Brahmotsavam open invitation is permitted to be made in the local languages along with the ritualist one in Sanskrit to all created beings in the universe to attend the festival and enjoy the hospitality. We however see in the present day form of worship that the recitation of portions of the Tamil Prabandham of the Āḻvārs is a prominent feature of daily worship and of festival processions.

When, how and why this was brought about, what are the portions of the Prabandham so recited daily and those pieces which sometimes stir the smouldering fire of sectarian controversy and hatred will be stated in this Chapter. The narrative will inevitably be mixed up with traditions which are implicitly believed in and are considered as absolute truths. Even the stages by which the songs of the Āḻvārs were recovered from the oblivion into which they had gone for some time and came to be recited in temples after overcoming the objections raised by the other worshippers of Vishnu (who however were not followers of the tenets of Sri Namalvar) are matters of tradition. The inscriptions on the stone walls of the Tirumalai and Tirupati temples however help us to trace with some degree of accuracy the stages by which the recital of all the four thousand verses of the Prabandham on a footing of equality with the recitation of the Vedas during the annual festival known as the Adhyayanotsavam was effected. So long as the Vedas alone were recited this festival lasted for ten days. But when the Prabandham recital also was tacked on it was extended gradually to twenty two and even twenty five days (divided into two parts popularly known as Pakalpattu and Rāppattu).

Portions of the Prabandham culled out for daily recitation, called Nityanusandhanam.

In every Vishnu temple where the daily worship is being performed by and primarily for the benefit of Sri Vaishnavas—
that is followers of the Visishtādvaīta philosophy of Sri Ramanuja—the recitation of these pieces is considered essential and even obligatory. They are wedged in so as to form a part of the liturgy of the temple. This is where the difference could be seen between the two sects of Vishnu worshippers, the Sri Vaishnavas and the Madhvas. The recitation of the Prabandham verses is not a part of the āgama form of worship. The archaka may be engaged in doing his puja but the Sri Vaishnavas would be reciting the verses.

The recital of these verses does not form a part of the Nityārāchana ritual as prescribed in the āgamas, but are recited while the archaka is engaged in his routine work pronouncing the appropriate mantras. The ritualistic work ends with the Nyvēdyam (food offering) and the Nityotsavam or the offering of Bali prasadam to the large number of attendant deities in the temple.

Soon after the Bali is done Sri Vaishnavas have a function known as the Sattumurai (இருத்துமுறை) or the recitation of portions of the Prabandhams in praise of God. This occasion

1. These are (1) the Tiruppallāndu (ஸூனுன்மூதாரரரத்மா, திருப்பள்ளாண்டு) of Periya Alvar; (2) the Tiruppallieluchchi (ஸூனுன்மூதாரரரத்மா, திருப்பள்ளியேல்ச்சியுடன்) of Tondadriippodi Āḻvār for wakening the Deity, (3) Nītattam (நித்தம், தாள்வழியடை) of Periya Āḻvār inviting for a bath, (4) Poochchoottal (பூச்சுட்டல், பூச்சுட்டாள்) from Periyalvar’s Tirumoli for flower decoration (5) Kāppiṭāl (காப்பிதல் காப்பிதல்), from the above Tirumoli for invoking protection to the idol under worship during the night from evil spirits and mischief makers. All these are devotional songs. There are also verses which describe Sri Andal’s dream of the Divine marriage called (6) Vāraññāyiram (வராங்கனியின்) (7) Tiruppāvai (ஸூனுன்மூதாரரரத்மா) are verses composed by Sri Andal for recitation during the thirty days of the Tamil month of Māṟgālī and (8) the ten verses composed by Madhura kavi Āḻvār (மதுராகாவள், மதுராகவள்) known as Kāṭṭunān siruvānibbu, the continued recital of which enabled Sri Nathamuni (நதாமுனி) to obtain direct from the spirit of Sri Nānmaiḻava the full text of the Tiruvaimoli by word of month. Other appropriate selections from Sri Nānmaiḻava’s Tiruvoymoli and the Amalanādippiran (அமலநாதிப்பீரன், அமலநாதிப்பீரன்) of Tiruppānāḷvār are also recited.
is now-a-days principally availed of for singing the praise of the acharyas of the particular sect of Sri Vaishnavas (Tengalai or Vadagalai) which has gained the upper hand in a particular temple. There is perhaps no temple where an agreed common formula has been arrived at in this matter. The commencement or prologue is known as Tođakkam and Pātram (ஸத்ஸாகம் and பாத்ரம் பெரியவர் நடப்பேணவேயில்). After this the selected portion of the Prabandham which is the same for both the sects, is recited. Then follows a sort of "long live" songs in commemoration of the particular acharyas, known as Vālī Tirunāmam (may their names be long remembered) (வாலி திருநாமம், மய் யாற்றும் திருநாமம்). This last may be called the epilogue. The actual text of the Prabandham which is common to both fades into insignificance when compared to the zeal for the Pātram and the Vālī Tirunāmam. It is not necessary for our history to go into the causes of the controversy which has developed itself into communal wrangle of the worst type.

Prabandham of the Alwars.

The word Prabandham only means "the works" or compositions (of the alwars). It has come to be accepted that there were only twelve Āḻwārs (whose names will be given later) and Sri Ramanuja is taken as the thirteenth. They lived at different times and their works were therefore not composed simultaneously. They do not seem to have been called Āḻvārs in their own days; nor would they have imagined that twelve of them would be deified and formed into a pantheon with Ramanuja as the thirteenth. The distinctive names given to the works of the Āḻwārs were obviously coined by the acharyas who ferreted out the works and catalogued the whole for the benefit of posterity. They are mostly devotional songs about different deities in different temples and have therefore been called Tirumoḻi or sacred songs or words (ஸத்ஸாக திருமோழி). Thus there are the Tirumoḻi of Periya Alvar; the Tirumoḻi of Sri Āṇḍāl called Nāchchiār Tirumoḻi; Kulasekhara ālvār's Tirumoḻi and Tirumangai Alvār's Tirumoḻi. These sacred words were probably first written on cadgeon leaves. The sacred words of Sri Nammāḻvār however has been called Tiruvoymoḻi (ஸத்ஸசோ}}
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because it was not written but revealed by word of mouth directly to Sri Nathamuni by the spirit of Nammālvar. In fact Sri Nammalvar's Tiruvomoli appears to have been the first of the Prabandhas made known to the Tamil world. The works of all the ṝṟvārs had gone into oblivion and Sri Nathamuni resuscitated the Tiruvomoli first and the others were discovered later by others from time to time.

Resuscitation of the Tiruvomoli is attributed to Sri Nathamuni.

The date of birth and the life period of the Alvārs and the date of composition of their works could not be ascertained with certainty. An attempt to fix approximately the period of time when they might have flourished will however be made in due course in this chapter. The dates of recovery from oblivion of the works which make up the Prabandham are also equally uncertain except in the case of Sri Nammalvar's Tiruvomoli about which there is an accepted tradition.

Sriman Nathamuni was a great Yogi, a great scholar in Sanskrit and Tamil, a Vedantin and musician. He had travelled all over India bathing in all the sacred waters and visiting all the famous sacred places of worship. He finally settled down in what is believed to be his native village of Viranarayanapuram in the present South Arcot District. Some devotees of Vishnu who came as pilgrims to his place visited the local shrine and sang some devotional verses in Tamil commencing with "இயறாக்கட்டு கூறுக்காறெலும் கிறித்தர சங்கமண..." "என்றார்: எனைக்கெண்டு அல்லவேலு்...". Deeply stirred by the spirit of the verses Sri Nathamuni desired to hear more of those songs of Sri Nommālvār. But although the pilgrims were natives of the birth place of the ṝṟvār they 'told him that they first heard and learnt by heart the verses only when they went to Tirukkuḍandai (Kumbakonam) to worship the Deity Arāvamudan where the verses were being daily recited. On going to that place to learn more Nathamuni was told that not more than those ten verses were known to them and that by going over (Tirtoōkkurugur (தற்குக்குரு, தெற்குக்குரு) now called Alvar Tirunagiri — Sriman
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Nathamuni could have his desire fulfilled. There one Parānkusa dāsar (a disciple of Madhura Kavi ālvār who was the disciple of Sri Nammalvar) advised him to repeat the eleven verses of Madhurakavi ālvār's Kāṇṭināṭu siruttāmbu twelve thousand times deeply meditating on Sri Nammalvar when his spirit would appear to him. Even that was only a tradition and no one had tried it before. Sri Nathamuni being a Yogi went through the exercise and established direct contact with the spirit of Sri Nammālvār. The thousand verses of his Tiruvaymōḷi were then revealed to Nathamuni by word of mouth. He being an Ekaśanta-grāhi (one who could remember well what was once heard) mastered the same. It is also believed that the Brahma Sutras, the central truths of all the Upanishads and other sacred scriptures, were also revealed to him on that occasion.¹

Sriman Nathamuni was the first to make known to the Tamil world the greatness of Sri Nammalvar and his Tiruvaymōḷi in a Sanskrit verse which is invariably recited as a Taniyan² or prefatory verse by all those who commence to recite or study the Tiruvoymōḷi.

The Taniyan composed in Sanskrit by Sriman Nathamuni for the recitation and study of Tiruvoymoli runs thus:—

1. The tradition goes a little further and attributes to Nāṭhamunigal the revival or resuscitation of the recitation of the Tiruvaymoli along with and on a footing of equality with the Vedas during a festival called Adhyayanotsavam held annually in the Tamil month of Mārgali (Mārgasira). The residents of Tirukkurugur gave him to understand that such annual recitation used to take place during the life-time of Tirumangai ālvār (the last of the alvars) and that for that purpose the idol of Nammalvar used to be taken over to Srirangam. But that story could hardly be believed by us since Tirumangai ālvār did neither ever visit Tirukkurugur nor sing a verse in praise of the Deity there although he visited and sang verses in praise of the Vishnu shrine in Tirukkurungudi (ஸிர்ப்புக்குருக்கு சுமார்) nearby. He has not in any of his songs mentioned the name of Nammalvar. For all we know he was not aware of the greatness of Nammalvar.

2. The greatness of every devotional literature and its worth is invariably summarised in a verse called ‘Taniyan’ தையியண் தையியண் (in Sanskrit or Tamil) composed by some great scholar and expounder who first sponsored the study of the same or who first rescued the work from oblivion.

¹

²
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“Bhaktāmrutam visva janānu mōdanam
Sarvārthhadam Sri Sathakopavāngmayam
Sahasra sākhāpanishad samāgamam
Namāmyaham Drāviḍa vēda sāgaram.”1

This verse gives in a nutshell all that is claimed for the Tiruvoymōḷi as sacred literature. Translated into English it would read:—

“My obeisance to those words which came from the mouth of Sri Sāthakopa and which make up the ocean called Dravida Vedam wherein are gathered together in harmonious blending all the numerous branches of the Upanishads, which confer immortality on Bhaktas, which elevate the mind and gladden the heart of all shades of men and which makes it possible for men to achieve everything imperishable and worth possessing.” The expression “Sāthakōpa vāŋmayam” assures us that the Tiruvoymōḷi was revealed to Nathamuni by word of mouth by Sri Sāthakopa, and that therefore it revealed unreservedly and unequivocally the whole truth. The expression ‘Vēda sāguram’ is construed to mean that the other three works2 of Sri Nammālvār were also revealed simultaneously. But the taniyans prefixed to them which were composed by others go to show that they were not revealed to Nathamuni but were discovered by others at a later period. Tiruvoymōḷi is said to give the essence of the

1. “अक्षामूर्तिं विश्वजनासुरमेवं सर्वायं वीश्वजनासुरवाद्यम्।
सहलस्वाभोपनियतमामाम् नमाम्यहि द्राविडवेदवाद्यम्।”

2. The other three works are Tiruviruttam (திருவிருத்தம், Tiruviruthama) which gives the essence of the Rīg Veda; Tiruvāsiriyam (திருவாசிரியம், Tiruvāsiriyam) which gives the essence of the Yajur Veda and Periya Tiruvandadi (திருவாண்டசி, Tiruvandāci) which is the essence of the Atharva Veda.
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Sama Veda and was therefore set to music in two styles\(^1\), one called the Dēvagānam and the other Manushya gānam. The latter represents the Ragam, Tāḷam etc., now used by the musicians. The Devagānam follows the style and tune of the Sama Vedam copied by those who recite the verses in temples.

The Superiority of Tiruvoymoli over the other three works of Sri Nammalvar and the works of all the other alvars.

The importance attached to a religious and philosophical work may be judged by the number of ‘Taniyans’ recited before commencing its study and also by the number of commentaries which later ācharyas have written on it. Judged by this standard no other work which forms a part of the four thousand verses of the Prabandham can be said to be a close second to the Tiruvoymoli. A taniyan is usually composed by an ācharya who first discovered the existence of the work or who for the first time gave publicity to its excellence and the greatness of its author. In the same manner a commentary is usually written by an acharya of ripe experience, age and learning bringing out clearly the beauty of language and diction, the esoteric meaning or meanings and the great truths which are enshrined in the original text. This is done to awaken the spirit of enquiry in the readers. When a work has a number of taniyans and a number of commentaries written by acharyas of commanding spiritual stature, it may safely be assumed that the work deserves serious study. Judged by this standard Sri Nammālvar’s Tiruvoymoli stands unrivalled among the works forming the Tamil Prabandham. Besides the Sanskrit taniyan composed by Srīman Nathamuni there are as many as five taniyans in Tamil, the authorship of some of these being however attributed to different acharyas by the protagonists of

---

1. It is also the tradition that Nathamuni trained two sets of people to recite in the two styles both of which were exhibited before the Chola King in Gangai Konḍa Chōlapuram. The King is said to have appreciated the manushya gānam. Gangai konḍa Chōlapuram was built by Rajendra Chola I (1013-1045) who assumed the surname Gangai konḍa Cholan. As he lived at least two centuries after Srīman Nathamuni, the tradition reduces itself to a fable.
the Tengalai and the Vadagalai sects. The taniyans are however undisputedly recited by all.

The difference of opinion about the authorship has perhaps been the work of those who were interested in creating and maintaining points of dispute between the two Sri Vaishnava communities—Vadagalai and Tengalai. It is worth pointing out here that neither Sri Alavandar (Yamuna muni), Tirumalai Nambi, Sri Ramanuja nor his cousin and disciple Embar contributed a taniyan for the Tiruvaymoji. Nor was a commentary written by any one of the above. Sri Alavandar no doubt acclaimed Sri

---

1. 1. 

(enumeration)

(author Sri Nathamuni about 900 A.D. or Madhurakavi about 760 A.D.)

---

2. 

(enumeration)

(author either Nathamuni 900 A.D. or Sottai Nambi 950 A.D.)
Nammalvar as the progenitor or kulapati of the Sri Vaishnava sect.¹

3. ஐந்திரவர் இந்திக் கிளம்பர என்எனிய கல்விக்குது
சாதையை வாய்ப்புமான அன்னுக்காரரே — ஐந்திரவர்
நாய்க தன்னினரை சுத்திருக்கின்றன அதிகாரத்
வரைய அக்காரை நம்ப.

(தூத்தைப் போக்குறையார்,
நைட்டிருக்க ஒரு குறிப்பிட்டு. தன்னை
நூர் வானை விளையுள்ள வகைகளை,
செய்திருக்கின்ற)

(author Tirukkkurukaippiran pillan born 1061 or Ananthalvar born 1043).

4. ஏனையே இந்திகும் கிளம்பர என்எனியே
குறிப்பிட்டால் செய்திருக்கிற
tன்னுக்காரரே — காரம்
மாடியும் சாதையை சுத்திருக்கின்றன அவனின்
செய்திருக்கின் விளையாட்டு வறுக.

(தூத்தைத் தன்னை மாற்றுகிறது,
நூர் வானைவேற்றி வைகலி,
செய்திருக்கும் வானை விளையுள்ள
செய்திருக்கின்)

5. பெரும் தூத்தைப் போக்குறையார் நம்பும் பெரும் தூத்தையும்
நாய்க தன்னினரை சுத்திருக்கிற — காரம்
மாடியும் சாதையை சுத்திருக்கிறான நாய்க தன்னினரை
செய்திருக்கின் விளையாட்டு வறுக.

(தூத்தைத் தன்னை மாற்றுகிறது,
நூர் வானைவேற்றி வைகலி,
செய்திருக்கும் வானை விளையுள்ள
செய்திருக்கின்).

(author Tirukkurukaippiran pillan born 1061 or Bhaṭṭar born 1062).

1. Mātā pita yuvatayastanaya vībhūtih
Sarvam yadeva niyamena madanavyānām
Ādyasya nō külapātēr vaṇkābhirāmam
Srimattadanghriyagajam pranamāmi mūrdhṇā.
This was written as a prefatory verse to his Sanskrit devotional work known as 'Stōtra ratnam' but not as a taniyan in connection with the recitation and study of the Tiruvoymoḷi. These acharyas were not perhaps great Tamil Scholars for one thing. It is even doubtful if Sri Ramanuja studied closely all the verses of the Tiruvaymoḷi as will be pointed out later. The Tiruvaymoḷi alone came to be well known as the standard work of devotional literature, or the Bhakti form of worship of Vishnu. The works of the other āḻvārs were obviously not known, or less known and could not have been classed as philosophical, but only devotional. Sri Nammalvar's Tiruvoymoḷi was compared by Sriman Nathamuni to an ocean which had received the essence of all the Upanishads. There was however no philosophical work in Tamil or Sanskrit which could counteract the influence of the new Advaita philosophy of Sri Sankaracharya. Nammalvar's Tiruvoymoḷi makes no reference to and does not attempt to refute the Advaita philosophy. The fact may be that the latter sprang on the world in full force after the days of Sri Nammalvar. It was left to Sri Ramanuja to promulgate his Visishtadvaita philosophy to counteract Advaitism. And he is said to have done it in fulfilment of one of the three injunctions of Sri Alavandar during the last moments of his life by keeping three of the fingers of his hand folded the meaning of which was understood by Sri Ramanuja. Bhakti is the basis of his Visishtadvaita philosophy. His treatment of the subject is based solely on the Vedic texts and Smritis. Ramanuja has not quoted a single Tamil verse from the Tiruvaymoḷi as authority, or even as a parallel. This might have been due to his desire that his work should find acceptance in the whole of India and not merely in the extreme south. So it could not with justification or in fairness be said that his philosophy was to any extent inspired by the teachings of the Tiruvoymoḷi. Another of the folded fingers of Sri Alavandar was taken to represent his desire that a commentary on the Tiruvaymoḷi should be written to make known that its teachings are quite in consonance with the Vedic religion and the philosophy of the Bhagavat Gita for which Sri Alavandar himself had written a short commentary. Sri Ramanuja has also written his commentary on the Gita. There was no dearth of great Tamil
scholars among the four castes in South India who could well have written splendid commentaries in a style of Tamil which the rank and file could easily understand and appreciate. (Great philosophical truths had been expressed in verse by Bhutattalvar who prided himself as one who could sing in Gnana Tamil. Such men might have lived even during Alavandar’s days).

The reason behind Ramanuja being asked to undertake this work is easily seen. Sri Nammalvar was born in the fourth caste and whatever may be the merits of his work and philosophy there would have been a natural hesitation on the part of the members of the three higher castes to acknowledge him as the ‘Kulapati’ of all Sri Vaishnavas, which Sri Alavandar’s aim was to overcome. It was imperative that all those who look to the Vedas in the Sanskrit language as the fountain-head of all spiritual culture should be made to appreciate and acknowledge the greatness of the Tiruvoymoji. Any Tamil commentary on it to achieve this end should be replete with parallel quotations from the Upanishads and Shrutis written in a high style. All the commentaries were therefore written in the Composite Tamil-Sanskrit or ‘mani-pravilam’ style. This would have appealed strongly to the Brahmin and the other Sanskrit scholars and helped to regard Sri Nammalvar as one who had the Divine spark in him (an amsa of God). There were serious objections raised in later days by great Sanskrit pandits to the recital of the Tiruvaymoji until Sri Vedanta Desika overcame them and gave to the Tiruvoymoji the name ‘Dramidopanishad’ (the Dravida Upanishad).

Sri Ramanuja commissioned his gnanaputra Sri Tirukkurukaippiran Pillan (the younger son of his uncle Sri Tirumalai Nambi) to write this Commentary and fulfil the second of the injunctions given by Sri Alavandar. This was done because he was a great scholar in Tamil as well as Sanskrit, one of the best exponents of Sri Ramanuja’s Sri Bhashya and a descendant of Sri Alavandar.

Commentaries on the Tiruvoymoli.

Sri Ramanuja and Embar (also known as Govinda Bhattar) were the sons of Tirumalai Nambi’s two sisters. Neither of these
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has written any original religious work in Tamil though they might have been good enough to understand and appreciate the writings in that language. Tirukkurukaippiran Pillan became the Gnana-putra and a disciple of Ramanuja. One Kūrattālvar, a devoted disciple of Sri Ramanuja, had his twin sons, named as Parasara Bhattar¹ and Sriram Pillai. Bhattar was a genius and within his short life of about 28 years wrote many mighty philosophical works in Sanskrit. His Commentary on the Vishnu Sahasranamam had the approval of Sri Ramanuja. The twins were the disciples of Embar.

One Nanjiyar, also known as Vedanti jiyar who was a native of Tirunarayananapuram went about the country in great style challenging any one who could hold disputation with him in Vedānta. The young Bhattar worsted him and made him his disciple. Nanjiyar does not appear to have been descended from any of the disciples of Sri Alavandar or his immediate predecessor. Nanjiyar’s birth date may be 1053 while Bhattar’s was 1063 A.D. Tirukkuru-kaippiran Pillan was born in 1062 A.D., and his commentary on the Tiruvaymoṇi known as the Ārāyirappadi (அராயிரப்பக்கிழ) is likely to have been composed when he was about 60 years of age. That commentary was undertaken as desired by Sri Ramanuja, and had received his approval as correctly representing the ideas of Sri Nammalvar and in consonance with his own Sri Bhāshya. It was therefore named ‘Bhagavad Vishayam’ or ‘Concerning God.’ This was probably why none of the other disciples of Sri Ramanuja attempted to write a Commentary. Nanjiyar however became a free lance after the untimely death of Bhattar. He therefore wrote his பிளிற்றாயிரப்பாய் புடைய (Nine thousand paḍi) as against the Six thousand paḍi of Pillan. He wrote also some other commentaries (viz., two thousand paḍi on Tirupavai, Tiruppallandu etc., works which were not mentioned or not known to Sri Nathamuni). They

¹ The second son of Sri Tirumalai Nambi was renamed as Tirukkurukaippiran Pillan and one of the twin sons of Kūrattālvar as Parasara Bhattar in compliance with wish of Sri Alavandar who wanted that two of the most promising boys in the family of his disciples should bear the names of Parasara and Tirukkurukaippiran or Nammalvar to whose greatness he has paid tribute in his Stotra ratnam.
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had not received the approval of Sri Ramanuja and were perhaps composed after his death (or after 1137 A.D.).

Nampillai who was one of Nanjiyar's disciples wrote commentaries on the Tiruviruttam, etc. His disciple Periya achchan pillai wrote a commentary on the Tiruvaymoḷi known as தூற்று சிற்பானாம்பிரியா (the twenty four thousand padis) besides a number of commentaries on the other twenty three works which make up the Prabandham. He is a great commentator and was the first to write about all the works of the Prabandham. His birth date was 1227 A.D., and his commentaries might have been written about 1280 A.D. The fourth commentary on the Tiruvaymoḷi was by Vaḍakkku Tiruvidhi pillai (வாடங்கு திருவித்தி பிள்ளை) and is known as செவ்வாய் (செவ்வாய் சுருக்கக் விகாரசி or செவ்) the thirty six thousand padi. The year of its composition may be taken to be about 1290 A.D. Each succeeding commentary is more voluminous than the preceding one. The natural inference is that a section of the Sri Vaishnavas felt that Tirukkurukaippiran Pillan's commentary though it had the approval of Sri Ramanuja and was considered the standard one, did not do full justice to Nammalvar's Tiruvaymoḷi, or that it was not illuminative. Those who wrote the subsequent commentaries did not come from among the disciples of Pillan, but from disciples of Nanjiyar. This appears to be the starting point of the cleavage among the followers of Sri Ramanuja. In later times two of the Vadagalai³ acharyas wrote commentaries based on Pillan's Arṇīrappadi (Sri Vedanta Desika and Sri Vedanta Ramanuja-swami).

The point is clear that Nammalvar's Tiruvaymoḷi was considered to be a work of so high an order that numerous commentaries were written on it. The other twenty three works did not receive so much attention. It was left to Periya Achchan Pillai to write an omnibus commentary so late as 1280 A.D., a century after the death of Sri Ramanuja.

I. The terms Vadagalai and Tengalai although used in this connection are really of recent origin. It will be seen from section 2 of this chapter that the terms do not occur in any of the T. T. D. Inscriptions even till 1684 A.D.
A word has to be said about the origin and the style of recitation of the Prabandham. The tradition is that Sri Ramanuja received tuition in this from Tiruvarangapperumāl araiyar (திருவரங்பேருமாள் அறையார்), one of Sri Alavandar's sons and disciple born in 947 A.D. who was considered an expert in abhinayam and the fine arts. The study of the text was made under Tirumalai Andan who was also one of Sri Alavandar's disciples. It has therefore to be presumed that the recital received special attention as early as about 1100 A.D. Those were days when there was no printing of a large number of copies of a valuable literary work. With the steel style on the cadgeon leaf every one had to transcribe what was read out or recited by another. Memorising of religious and other valuable works was done by studying under a teacher and by a large number of learners reciting together what was uttered by the teacher. Congregational recitation gave opportunities for acquiring the correct pronunciation etc. Whether the recital was done systematically and daily in the Srirangam temple is a moot point. The Araiyar was known as Ramanuja's Chintana āchārya. The Prabandham goshti that we now witness may be said to have been started in the days of Araiyar and Sri Ramanuja.

There is the tradition that the recitation of the Tiruvaymōli on a footing of equality with the Vedas was commenced in Srirangam. This seems to be confirmed by an inscription which is said to be referable to the reign of Kulottunga Chola I which records that in a certain festival in Srirangam the recital of some portion of the Tamil Prabandham was permitted by the King.¹ The date may be taken to be 1117 A.D., i.e., twenty years before the death of Sri Ramanuja and at a time when he was an exile in the Mysore country. The practice has been to commence the recitation on the Sukla Ekādashi tithi of the Tamil month of Margali and continue it for ten days as is done in the case of the recitation of the Vedas and alongside of it. This was presumably done only in the Srirangam temple and not in other places. The other

¹ Vide Vol. I, p. 274 of Dr. S. K. Ayyangar's History of Tirupati who however does not give the full text or even the gist of the inscription nor the regnal year of the inscription.
three thousand verses of the Prabandham were tacked on later, two thousand being recited on the preceding ten days and one thousand on the succeeding two or three days. The Ramanujan Nūṟṟandādi was also a later day suffix.

So far as Tirumala and Tirupati are concerned there are a large number of inscriptions which help us to prepare a regular history in Section 2 of this Chapter.

The other three thousand verses of the Prabandham.

The taniyans prefixed to the other three works of Sri Nammalvar and to the other works of the Prabandham show that these works were discovered by later acharyas. The commentaries on these are of still later dates. They do not appear to have been known to Sri Ramanuja. The names of the authors of the taniyans, their date of birth, the names of the commentators and their date of birth are given in the accompanying statement. The average date of the tanians may be taken to be 1100 A.D.; Nanjiyar's commentary on the Periya Tiruvandādi would have been made about 1180 A.D., and Nampillai's commentary on the Tiruvirutam about 1250 A.D. Periya Āchchān pillai's commentaries would have been composed about 1280 A.D. and Tiruvaymoli pillai's about 1360 A.D.

The large number of commentaries on the Tiruvaymoli should not be taken to mean that the first one written by Tirukkurukaippirān Pillan and which bore the seal of approval of Sri Ramanuja as representing the intentions of Sri Nammalvar and as being in accord with the teachings of the Brahma Sutras of Sri Vyasa Bhagavan and the mythology expounded in Sri Parasara Bhagavān’s Vishnu Puranam (both of which are well expounded in Sri Ramanuja’s Śri Bhashya) is in any way defective. The other commentaries only go to show the pre-eminent position which the Tiruvaymoli had attained to. Each commentator studied the text independently and expounded his own views on what he considered to be the real intentions of Sri Nammalvar. So also every scholar who in our age studies the original text seriously
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

could throw new light on many essential points based on the
development of Bhakti form of worship in other parts of India
and in other countries. Pillan's commentary is the standard
one and has been honoured as "Bhagavad Vishayam" by Sri
Ramanuja.

The Prabandham of the Āḻvārs was considered by the acharyas
to be as sacred as the Sanskrit Vedas with the added advantage
that the meaning would be intelligible to the reciter. Despite
the fact that all the works are in Tamil great Andhra poets and
thinkers like Alasani Peddanna, Tallapakkam Annamacharya
and his sons and grandsons (Pedda Tirumalai Ayyangar, China
Tirumalai ayyangar etc.), studied the Tamil language for under-
standing the Prabandhams in original. Like the Hebrew Bible
and the Tamil Tirukkural they are worth translating into other
languages if only men gifted with the spiritual fervour of the Alvārs
would undertake the task.

Commentaries on the Tiruvaymoli.

The taniyans to the Tiruvaymoli and their authors with birth
dates have already been given on pages 659–661. The names of
the commentators with birth dates are given below.

(1) Tirukkurukaippirān Pillān, the second son of Sri Tirumalai
Nambi who is the maternal uncle of Sri Ramanuja and the grandson
of Sri Ālavandar (Yāmuna Muni). Pillān's birth date is 1062
A.D., (K. Y. 4163, Plava) and birth place Tirumalai (Vengadam).
His commentary known as Ārāyirappādi may be assigned a date
between 1100 and 1130 A.D.

(2) The next commentary was by Nanjiyar (or Vedanti jiyar)
whose birth date is rather difficult to ascertain. He is considered
to have become the disciple of Bhattar who was born in 1062
(K. Y. 4163) Subhakrit year and died when 28 years of age in
1090. Nanjiyar's commentary known as (நாண்பர் பூந்தவர்
காவலர் காவலர்) does not appear to have been known to Sri Rama-
nuja, in which case, it must have been written after Pillan's com-
mentary or after about 1100 A.D.
THE ALWARS' PRAHANDHAMS

(3) The third commentary is by one Periya Āchchān pillai who was one of the disciples of Nampillai alias Lokacharya alias Varadaraja alias Tirukkaḷikanri dasar who was Nanjijyar's disciple. His commentary is known as தென்பெருமாளறுபயன் மற்றும் செய்தும். He was born in 1227 A.D., (K. Y. 4328, Sarvajit year) and lived for 95 years; his commentary might have been composed about 1280 A.D. He wrote commentaries on all the 24 works of the Prabandham.

(4) The fourth commentary was by one Vaḍakku Tiruvindicci Pillai (வாடக்கு தறுவிடது பழி பிள்ளை) who is said to have been born in K. Y. 4328 (the same year as that of Periya Āchchān Pillai 1227) and lived for 75 years. His commentary is known as உம்பிதாராசுரபியன் (ேண்கூறுரைலாம் 36000 padi). He is also one of Nampillai's disciples. His commentary would have come sometime after Periya Āchchan Pillai's say about 1290 A.D. Besides the above there are two more commentaries by acharyas who could claim lineal discipleship from Sri Ramanuja and Tirukkurukaippiran Pillai and perhaps represent the present day Vadagalai views. One is by Sri Sākshāt swami (alias Srimad Vedantā Ramanujaswami) known as காஷ்சக முடியம்பயப் (சூன்ப்வைவ் வைவகம்பையும்) and the other known as the வாயுவ்கை சயங்குமப் சியாமலோழ் or Nigamaparimalam by Sri Vedanta Desika. The latter is said to have been lost. Its date would have been about 1340 A.D. Besides the above Sri Vedanta Desika has written two works one called Dramidōpānīṣhaṭ Tātparya Sārāvali and the other Dramidōpānīṣhaṭ Sāram.

Nanjijyar wrote in addition commentaries on Tiruppāvai, Tiruvandādi, Kaṇṇinuṅ Siruttāmbu and Tiruppallāṇḍu.

Periya āchchan pillai wrote on all the other twenty three work of the Prabandham.

One Tiruvaymōli Pillai alias Tirumalai ālvān born in 1325 A.D. (K. Y. 4426) Vibhava year) wrote a commentary on Periya ālvar's Tirumōli. He is the son of Pillai Lokacharya.
**OTHER WORKS COMPRISEING THE PRABANDHAM**

**Poygai Alvar’s.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of work</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mudal (First) Tiruvandādi, துவை திருவாண்டாதியது</td>
<td>Taniyan by Mudali āndān or Dāsarathi (born 1033 A.D.) about 1100 A.D. (நாதக பூண்டு கொண்டு வந்த ஆன்டாண்டியது)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budattalvar’s.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of work</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Irandām (second) Tiruvandadi, குறைந்த குறைந்த திருவாண்டாதி</td>
<td>Tirukkurukaippiran Pillan (born 1062) about 1100 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peyalvar’s.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of work</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Tirumalisaippiran's.

4. Tiruchchanda viruttam

Tirukkachchinambi திருக்கஞ்சிந்தமர் திருக்காஞ்சியனும்
Coeval with Priyanambi about 1100 A.D.

120 verses, கால் மூன்றாம்

Periya Tirumalainambi 1100 A.D.

நெய்யாக திருமாலைப்பேரும், அந்நியத்துடன்்

“ஏற்பறவை முன்னுண்டும்...” ஒன்று நூற்றுவுடையதோ

5. Nānūkkan Tiruvandādi, Nānūkkan Tiruvandādi

Sirampillai (சிரம்பிள்ளை) சூர்யீ (born 1062)
1100 A.D. “பார்த்தவன் புன் துண்ட தங்கும்...”

வேட்டுகள் முன்வெட்டு

Tondaradippodi Alvar's.

6. Tirumālai (திருமாளை); Tiruvarangapperumalaraiyar (திருவரங்கப்பூர்மளரையர்)

Pillai about 1280 A.D.

45 verses, அக்கேட்டு

(1280) 1000 “மதமால முதல் தென்றும்”

50. நூற்று விசை

1. In column three the first few words of the taniyan are only given; the date of birth and the probable date of composing the taniyan are also given.
7. Tiruppalli eḻuchchi
(இறைவன் எழுச்சிக்குத்)
10 verses

Tirumalai ānḍān (திருமலை ஆண்டன்)
(born 988) 1040 A.D.

“Tāmēvāmatvā paravāsudevam” சிவனேஸ்வர பாவசூதேவம்
Tiruvanantapuram Pillaiyar (born 947) 1000 A.D.

“மூகேைைை தெருற்குரு” தெருறுர்கு

Do.

8. Amalanādippirān
(அமலானாதிபிரான்)
10 verses

Periya nambi (பெரியாம்பி) பெரியாம்பி
(born 937) 1000 A.D. “Apādachūḍamanubhūya”

Periya Tirumalai nambi பெரியா திருமாலை பெரியாம்பி
(born 973) 1030 A.D.

“சுனையாகுமை வருகை” சுனையாகுமை

Do.

9. Tiruppallāndu (திருப்பல்லாண்டு)
12 verses

Nāthamuni (born 823) 900 A.D. “Gurumukham
anadhitya” குருமுக்கம் ஆனத்தியா

Pāṇḍya Bhattar “எழுச்சித் திரும்பூர்க்குறிப்பு”

Nanjiyar (1170)
Nampillai
1280 A.D.
Periya ஆச்சந்
1280 A.D.
10. Tirumoli (திருமோழி)  பண்டாய் பாஷ்டர் பங்க்ளை தைந்த இராசர்

11. Tiruppāval (திருப்பவல்) 30 verses அசருகிள்
Parāsara Bhattar (பாராசரர்) (born 1062)
1090 ஏபர் குடா “Nilā tumga” என்கின்ற
“அனேந்தோ புத்தான” என்று கூறின்
Uyyakkondar (உய்யாக்கோந்தர்) (born 826)
900 A.D. நவிறூர் குடா “தேவனேதரங்கள்
னல்மையும் வணிகம்” என்று கூறின்

12. Tirumolī (திருமோழி) 143 verses அசருகிள்
Tirukkaṇṇamangai andan (திருக்காண்கன் மாணகை
ஆணாரர்) நவிறூர் குடா 900 A.D.
“அனேந்தோ புத்தான” என்று கூறின்

Kulasēkhara alvar’s.

13. Perumal Tirumolī (திருமோழி) 105 verses அசருகிள்
Udayavar (1100) or Maṇakkāl nambī
cv “உய்யாக்கோன்ன் என்று” என்று கூறின்
(பாராசரர் அசரு புத்தாண்டு கிறிஷம்
(born 831) 900 “அனேந்தோ புத்தான” என்று

Tiruvaymoli Pillan
about 1380 A.D.,
Manavalamuni
1420.

Sri Andal’s.

Nanjyiar 1170 A.D.

Periya āchchān
1280

Do.
14. காந்திநுன் கோவில் காந்திநுன் காந்திநுன்

Santhiramuni 823 A.D. 900 A.D. "Avidita
Vishayantara

"நீங்கே காத்தால் பார்க்கிறாய்" விரித்துள்ளது

Nanjiyar 1170
Nampillai 1260

15. Periya Tirumoți

Tirukkōṭṭyur nambi (born 927) 1000 A.D. "Kalayami Kavitvamsau" ஒண்டு ஒண்டு

Periya achchan

16. Tirukkurrumtandakam

Emperumanar (1100 A.D.) (சற்றுமையாளர்)

Do.

17. Tirunmedum tandakam

Alvan "கோண்டால் சிறிது கொட்டினால்"

Embar 1100 "நீங்கே காத்தால்" மலர் கொல்ல
18. Tiruvellukkurirukkai
Manavalamamuni 1420 "உடற்கிச் சதீப்பந்தை"

19. Sriya Tirumadal
Sriya Tirumadal 77½ verses

20. Periya Tirumadal
Periya Tirumadal 148½ verses (15 to 20)

Sri Nammalvar.

21. Tiruviruttam (திரு

22. Tiruvasiriyam 7

Kidambi achchan (born 1058–1100) or Sirampillai
or Alavandan "கொட்டீராதை தீபகாதை" 57th to 65th
4 verses

Aruniplapperuman 1100 A.D. "கூரத்தி
1100 A.D. "பூம் தீபம்" எழுத்து செய்த
23. Periya Tiruvandadi Emperumanar (சுமார் 1100 A.D.) 1100 A.D.
87 verses இலக்கணங்கள்

24. Tiruvoymoli 1102 v.

Sri Nammalvar's 1296 Grand Total 4000 v.
THE ALWARS' PRABANDHAMS

Whether the *Tiruvaymoṭi* was seriously studied before the appearance of the commentary by Tirukkurukaiippiran Pillan and whether the other twenty three works which make up the Prabandham were known to and were studied by Sri Ramanuja are matters open to doubt. To illustrate this point let us consider the anecdote, which even some Sri Vaishnavas believe in, that when a dispute arose whether the Dhruva Murti in Tirumala represented Vishnu or Siva. Sri Ramanuja had the Sankham and Chakram of Vishnu and also the Trisūlam and Damarakam of Siva placed before the Deity on a night before closing the temple doors to see which of these would adorn the Deity the next morning. The anecdote is that Sri Ramanuja being the avatar of Ādiseśha became a cobra, went into the Garbhagriham through the Gomukham or the drainage hole in the north wall and put on the Deity the Chakram and Sankham. He is also said to have carved on the chest of the Murti the Sri Devi. How absurd such a story looks is plain to us who know that Sri Andal and Sri Nammalvar have both referred to the presence of Sri Devi on the chest. These Saints lived about three centuries before Sri Ramanuja. The presence of Sankham and Chakram has been mentioned in the *Silappadhikaram* also which again is three centuries before Sri Ramanuja’s time. The works of the three Mudal Alvars and of Tirumalasisai Alvar distinctly show that the Murti in Tirumala has always been considered to be Sriman Narayana manifesting Himself in Tirumala. If the early Sri Vaishnavas, at any rate in that part of South India known as Tondaimandalam, had been conversant with the meaning of the verses in the Prabandham the absurd anecdote mentioned above would not have gained currency. The appearance of commentaries in times so late as 1220 A.D. to 1360 A.D., leads to the suspicion that in the early days the recitation of the Prabandham (or adhyayanam) alone was practiced without knowing the meaning of the verses just as is being done even to-day. The recitation of the Vedas without knowing anything about what is recited is another example of this.
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Pantheon of the Alvars.

It is also doubtful if Sri Ramanuja was responsible for the creation of a pantheon of twelve Alvars. He has nowhere said one word about the Āḻvārs not even about Sri Nammāḻvār (Sri Sathakopa). Tradition ascribes many things to him. The Tamil word Āḻvār was honorifically used to designate Sri Nammalvar only and for the first time by Sri Tirukkurukaippiran Pillan in his commentary on the Tiruvaṉmoṭi which might have been composed a few years before the death of Sri Ramanuja. Pillan does not say any where therein that he executed the work in obedience to Sri Ramanuja’s command and that it had the seal of his approval. There is not even the usual “Mangala Slokam” prefixed to it. There is one Sanskrit verse which stands prefixed. Its authorship is vicariously attributed in recent times to Tirukkurukaippiran Pillan by the Vadagalais and to Parasara Bhattar by the Tengalais. It however cannot appropriately be considered to be a prefatory verse to a commentary on Sri Sathakopa Muni’s Tiruvaṉmoṭi. This will be considered in detail presently.

Pillan commences his commentary on the first Tamil verse of the Tiruvaṉmoṭi “‘அமைத்து அமைத்து’” (அமைத்து அமைத்து) thus.

“இந்த தென்மேற்கத்தை இனித்து குற்றாகவும் தண்டும் வாழ்களை எதிரே கையும் கொண்டு தீர்த்து ஏற்பட்டு அல்லது திரும்ப முடியும் குட்டிகளுக்கு என்றால் இது செய்யப்பட்டது இல்லை. இருபது முகிலுடன் வளர்ந்து குற்றாகவே தண்டும் வாழ்களை எதிரே கையும் கொண்டு தீர்த்து ஏற்பட்டு அல்லது திரும்ப முடியும் குட்டிகளுக்கு என்றால் இது செய்யப்பட்டது இல்லை. இருபது முகிலுடன் வளர்ந்து குற்றாகவே தண்டும் வாழ்களை எதிரே கையும் கொண்டு தீர்த்து ஏற்பட்டு அல்லது திரும்ப முடியும் குட்டிகளுக்கு என்றால் இது செய்யப்பட்டது....”

அப்பெயர் குரூராந்து குரூராந்து கிழப்பு பல்வேறு மாடவை பிற்பு மகா விருதாமு விளையாடம் குற்றாக தண்டும் வாழ்களை எதிரே கையும் கொண்டு தீர்த்து ஏற்பட்டு அல்லது திரும்ப முடியும் குட்டிகளுக்கு என்றால் இது செய்யப்பட்டது....”

It is in this commentary that Sri Saṭṭhakopa is referred to as “Alvār.” Neither Sri Nathamuni nor Sri Yamuna muni (Alavandar) gave that name to Sri Sathakopa muni. This word is not used in the Tiruvaṉmoṭi or in any of the Prabandham works.
The selection of twelve great Tamil Vishnu Bhaktas to form the pantheon of Alvars and naming them in a certain order (apparently meant to point to their chronological order of birth) was not the work of Sri Ramanuja. The order in which they are mentioned in a Sanskrit verse prefixed to the Tiruvaymoli and attributed differently to Pillan or Bhattar is given below.

"கிர்கி வணவை சந்திரநாதரை சேற்கொ
நூற்றாண்டை நூற்றாண்டை முன்னாண்டை
நூற்றாண்டை நூற்றாண்டை முன்னாண்டை முன்னாண்டை
நூற்றாண்டை நூற்றாண்டை முன்னாண்டை முன்னாண்டை"

"Bhūtam Sarascha Mahadahvaya Bhaṭṭanātha
Sree Bhaktisāra Kulasekharā Yogivāhān
Bhaktānghrirēnu Parakāla Yatindra Misrān
Srimat Parānkusa munim praṇatōsmi nityam"

The verse says that the thirteen saints mentioned therein (including Sri Ramanuja) should receive daily our obeisance. It does not show that it has any connection with the Tiruvaymoli or the commentary thereon. The authorship of this verse is also a debated point. The Saint Bhuta is placed before Sarascha or Poygai ālvar. The current general belief is that Poygai ālvar was the oldest of the Ālvārs. In fact the arrangement of the other Ālvārs also is not in chronological order. Sri Ramanuja’s name (yatindra) is also mixed up in the verse. It was possibly composed by some acharya after the death of Sri Ramanuja. There is the further consideration that none of the Ālvārs excepting Sri Nammāḻvar and Sri Ramanuja figure in the acharya parampara which every Srиваishnava reminds himself and meditates upon as part of his daily duty. Even Bhaṭṭanātha (or Periya Āḻvār) is not considered to be one of the acharyas. The acharyas in the ascending order are thus given—“Asmad dēsikam asmadiya paramāchāryan asēshān gurin; Srimal Lakshmana yogi pungava Mahāpūrṇau Munim Yāmunām Rāmam Padma vilōchanam Munivaram Nāṭham Saṭhadvēshiṇam Sēṇēsam Sṛiyam Indirā sahacharam Narāyanam samśraye.” One’s acharya is mentioned
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first and then right on in a chain are mentioned other ācharyas up to Sri Ramanuja; thence Mahā Pūrna (alias Periya Nambi), Yāmunāchārya, Rama (or Maṇakkāl Nambi); Padmavilochana (or Uyyakkondar), then Srīman Nāthamuni, Sri Śaṭhakopa (alias Sri Nammalvar), then through Vishvaksēna, Sri Devi and to Narāyana. This is the order of gurūs who obtain salvation for a Śrīvaishnava.

The other āḻvārs are not treated as ācharyas. They were however considered to be very venerable elders, Bhaktas and Bhagavatas. The latter seems to be the place assigned to them in the Sanskrit verse “ Bhutam sarascha...........” There is yet another consideration. Tiruvaymoli has been the only portion of the Tamil Prabandham which was permitted to be recited along side of the Vedas during the ten days of the Adhyayanotsavam commencing with Sukla Ekadasi of the Margali month. The recital of the other three thousand verses (as prefixes and suffixes to the Tiruvaymoli) was a later innovation. In Tirumala it was adopted only about the end of the fifteenth century A.D. The natural inference therefore is that Sri Nammalvar and his Tiruvaymoli only were given preference in the very early days.

Why the Tiruvaymoli is recited along side of the Vedas during the Adhyayanotsavam.

Srīman Nathamunigal compared the Tiruvaymoli to an ocean which has received the essence of all the Upanishads and his grandson Sri Yamuna muni (Alavandar) acclaimed its author Sri Saṭhakopa muni as the Kulapati or progenitor of all Śrī Vaishnavas, although Sri Saṭhakopa was by birth a Sudra. These should have been sufficient to show to men of all the four castes that Śrī Vaishnavism was a broad based religion. We may wonder whether there was any urgency or necessity to hold a special festival every year during which the Tiruvaymoli and the Vedas should be recited together. In this connection it is worth stating that in temples dedicated to the worship of Siva, worshippers of the four castes used to be accommodated in the caste order in separate compartments one behind the other in the mukha mantapam
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in front of the Lingam or the Mula Beram. But in Vishnu temples the members of all castes have always been accommodated together in one compartment only. The very thought of touch pollution within the precincts of a temple was considered a sin. The Tamil devotional songs of the Saivite Nayanars were not permitted to be recited during the daily puja in Siva temples. The result was that independent non-brahmin mutts sprang up known as Pandāra Sannidhis or Adhinams where separate worship was conducted reciting the Tamil songs of the Saivite saints. In Vishnu temples although all castes were allowed to stand in one compartment in the mukha mantapam Bhakti songs in Tamil were not permitted to be recited in the early days. That there was a touch of grievance on this score may be inferred from one of Sri Kulasékhara álvar’s songs.1 Therein he gives expression to his intense desire to see the day when those Bhaktas to whom Tamil and Sanskrit are equally sacred could do as they desired best and worship with flowers gathered with their own hands. That there was congregational singing in praise of God in Srirangam in Kulasékhara’s days (the early years of the eighth century A.D.) is seen from stanza 11 of the Tírumóli.

We may therefore reasonably assume that there was a real desire in the minds of the non-brahmin bhaktas that devotional songs in their mother tongue should be recited in the same way that the Vedas and Sanskrit devotional verses are done. Sri Nammalvar’s creed is that even a chandāla by birth is a person fit to receive our obesiance if he is only a Narayana Bhakta; caste is no barrier. It therefore appears to have been considered incumbent that the principle of equality should be observed not merely in words but in practice also by giving Tírúvaymólí a status equal to the Vedas. The celebration of the Adhyáyanotsavam

\[
\text{अम्बिप्रति त्रिविक्रिया अधिकृपणे दशम्}
\]
\[
\text{परिदैर्घ्य आयुर्वा तेर्पुपेक्षितकरं}
\]
\[
\text{मृत्युभरं क्षिप्रस्वेदना पारं दक्षिणकरं}
\]
\[
\text{दिक्षितीति नवमु नवेकुश चालं नादिकं}
\]
\[
\text{विकाम्पेक्षात् कृपान्ति वर्षिषयं कालात् सम्पन्नात।}
\]
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appears to have been considered a necessary demonstration of that equality. Acharyas who came after Sri Ramanuja extended this equality by wedging in the recitation of selected pieces from the works of the other ālwars as well in the course of the daily puja called Nityarchana without in any way interfering with or impairing the grandeur of the agama rituals. The experiment seems to have been first tried in Srirangam in the twelfth century, its extension to Tirumala was achieved only in the fifteenth century in connection with the Utsava Mūrti. In Srirangam this equality was and is still being observed by a member of this Sattada Srivaishnava family being served with the tirtham (consecrated water) preferentially. In Tirumala the Sattada Srivaishnavas recited the Prabandham along with the Brahmīn Srivaishnavas and received prasadam on a footing of equality, They enjoyed also the privilege of supplying all the prepared articles of perfumary for the daily abhishekam of the Deity and to receive emoluments therefor.

The course adopted by the Sri Vaishnava acharyas brought together the four castes in the sphere of religious practices and obviated the creation of separate non-brahmin mutts and temples which was a feature of the Saivite religion in South India.

Sri Ramanuja's genius also created a decentralised administration in the religious sphere. Before his death he created seventy four Holy sees. Four of these were given jurisdiction for the exposition of his own Sri Bhāsyā in Sanskrit. The other seventy were given jurisdiction for the exposition of the Tamil Prabandhams. His gnanaputra Tirukkurukaiippiran Pillan was given a two fold jurisdiction, for the exposition of Sri Bhāshyā as well as the Tiruvaymoḷi, Pillan was made in fact the central and final authority. Thus Ramanuja created seventy four acharyapurushas with hereditary right of succession. They were called Simhāsanādhipatis, Their duty was to spread throughout India the tenets of the Visishtadvaita philosophy of Sri Ramanuja and maintain the form of temple worship of the Vaikhanasā as well as the Pancha-ratra system as modelled by him. While the recitation of the Vedas was the monopoly of the Brahmīns the recitation of the
Prabandham was made the common right of all the castes and both sexes.

The bulk of the people in South India have always been non-brahmins and therefore was the creation of seventy sees for the Tamil Prabandham. Besides he also pressed into service an army of seven hundred ascetics to go out and preach his philosophy. For the benefit of the yet uncivilised people living in forests and on hills some Sattâda Sri Vaishnavas were given the seal of authority to preach and to convert.

The recitation of the Tamil Prabandham was therefore made an essential feature in Vishnu temples administered by the Sri Vaishnavas and every endowment made for their maintenance was under their control (Sri Vaishnava Rakshai). It is the symbol of the observance of equality in the religious field in whatever part of the world the temple might be. The Adhyayanotsavam is an annual demonstration of this principle.

Temples visited and/or sung by the Alvars.

The Prabandham or works of the Alvars give us an idea of the type of Vishnu worship current during their days and how they themselves practised it and were successful in having God realisation in this life itself. They laid great stress on a high standard of morality, implicit faith in God and a strict routine of personal worship by concentrating the mind on a material image made of stone or metal, a carving or painting or an image formed in the mind, when one rises to that level of concentration. No definite type of worship seems to have been current then. All that was required was complete concentration on the image, with eyes fixed thereon, and to worship the image with flowers, incense and light. The thousand and eight names of Narayana are to be uttered and meditated on. If one had not mastered these names a single name say Narayana, Madhave, Govinda, may be repeated endlessly. Control of the five senses is the essential requisite for success. They had full faith in all the anecdotes of the Vishnu Purana. It is Tirumalisai āḻvār who for the first time
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seems to mention the Bhagavat Gita and the essential feature of its teachings.¹ Sri Nammāḷvar however is the only Āḻvār who has given a systematic exposition of his philosophy based on Bhakti.

As a recreation and also to re-enforce Bhakti they visited some shrines where worship was being carried on regularly and in an impressive manner and have referred to them in the songs recording their itinerary. The Srivaishnava cataloguing of the places so visited by them shows that there are one hundred and eight shrines of this character spread all over India. All these were not visited by any of the twelve Āḻvārs, nor even by Sri Ramanuja who is taken as the thirteenth Āḻvār. The itinerary as recorded in the songs of each Āḻvār shows that some places only were visited by each. Their ambit was in most cases limited to the region in which they were born and wherein their work in the main lay. The names of the 108 sacred places and those visited and sung by each Āḻvār are given in the accompanying chart. The × mark against a place shows that the places was visited by the Alvar whose name appears on the top of the column.

In those early times South India was divided into regions ruled by kings of the Pallava, the Chola, the Pandya and the Chera clan.

1. செருண்டு அன்றியன் நிறைந்து பிப்பிரியார்
 செருண்டு ஆணையன் கனவன் திருப்பு—லோக்பா ஆண்
 நூற்று வர்த்தகியும் செம்பர் எல்லாதிகில்
 சூரியன் பிரம்மக்கனே

(Nan. Tiru. An. 71)

He is Anor aniyan Mahato mahiyan. Those who have not learnt the lessons he gave on that day (when he came as the king of Dvaraka) will remain in darkness without true knowledge.

1. பிரம்மசு வங்கு குறுவிசு வங்கையும்
 மேலன், அப்பாண்டேங்கு மேலாண்மை—உள்ளே
 மேலேசெயும் பாதemploiம் முக்கூர்வு பாசைசுகீ

பாசவூ குறுவிசூ காமையான்?

(Nan. Tiru. An. 72)

Diverged from Grihastradharmas there can be no Sanyasam or giving up of all the dharmas ordained. All good acts ordained in the Vedas are to be done in the name of Narayana. Who can deny this?
A—PLACES OF PUBLIC WORSHIP SUNG BY THE EARLY ALVARs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Kshetram, or Place (sung)</th>
<th>Mudal alvars</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Poygai álvar</td>
<td>Sri Búdat álvar</td>
<td>Sri Pey álvar</td>
<td>Sri Tirumalisai álvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Vada Nadu (Country north of Vengadam Hills)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tiruvengaḍam</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singavelkunram (Ahobilam)</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Tondai Nadu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vehka</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kachchi (Attigiri)</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ashtabhujakaram</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vēlukkai</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pāḍagam (Pandavadutar)</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Üragam</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tiruvevvul (Trivellore)</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tirunīrmalai</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Māmallai</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>Kshetram, or Place (sung)</td>
<td>Sri Poygai ālvār</td>
<td>Sri Bcdat ālvār</td>
<td>Sri Pey ālvār</td>
<td>Sri Tirumalisai ālvār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tiruvallikkeni</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tirukkaṭigai (Shola Singapuram)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tirukkovalūr</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tiruvaramam</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tanjai (māmanikkoyil)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tiruvaṇbil</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tiruppanagaram (Kōvilaṭi)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tirukkuḍandai (Kumbakonam)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tiruvīṇṭagaram</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kapistalam</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pandi Nadu

22 Tirumālirimsōlai
23 Tirukkoṭṭiyūr
24 Tiruttankāl
25 Tirukkurungudi

.. × × ..
.. × × ×
.. × .. ..
× .. .. ×

Total 5 12 12 13

Note:— Tiruppāṇālvār who sung in praise of Tiruvarangam incidentally mentions Tiruvengadam and Paramapadam. His 13 hymn is not shown although he may be considered to be one of the early Alvārs.

All the four Alvar's sang Ksheerabdhi and Paramapadam also.
### B—PLACES OF PUBLIC WORSHIP SUNG BY OTHER THAN EARLY ALVARs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Kshetram, or Place (sung)</th>
<th>Sri Periya Älvār</th>
<th>Sri Andal</th>
<th>Sri Nam-mālvār</th>
<th>Sri Tirumangai Älvār</th>
<th>Sri Kula-sekhara Älvār</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tiruvengadam</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singavēlkumaram (Ahobilam)</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ayōdhya</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Naimisāranyam</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sālagrāmam</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Badrī (Kāsramam)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Devī payāg</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nanda prayag (Tiruppiridi)</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dvāraka</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gōvardhan</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gōkulam</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kshērābdhi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Paramapadam</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Vaḍu Nāḍu | 10 | 5 | 6 | 12 | 3 |

**History of Tirupati**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tirukkachchi (Attigiri)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ashṭabhujam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tiruttankā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vēlukkai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pāḍagam (Pāṇḍavadhutar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tirunīrakam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nilātingal tunḍām</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Uragane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Vehka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tirukkārakam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tirukkarvāṇam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tirukkalvanūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tiruppavalavaṇṇam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Paramesvara Viṇṇagaram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tiruppuṭkulī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tirunaravūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tiruvedvuḷ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tiruninmalai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tiruvīḍavendai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tirukkaḍalmallai (Māmallai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Tiruvallikkēṇi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Tirukkaḍigai (Sholasingapuram)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Tondā Nāḍu** 21
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Kshetram, or Place (sung)</th>
<th>Sri Periya ālvār</th>
<th>Sri Andai ālvār</th>
<th>Sri Nam-mālvār</th>
<th>Sri Tiṟumangai ālvār</th>
<th>Sri Kula-sekhara ālvār</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tiruvayindirapuram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Tirukkōvalūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nadu Nadu**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiruvangampuri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uraiūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanjavī mānānīkoyil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanjavī ālī ēri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruvanbil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirikarabambanur (Uttamar koyil)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruvellārai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulālam pūdamguḍi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruppēnāgar (Kovilādī)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiru-ādanūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirupaḷandūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruchchirupuliyiūr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruchchērai (Sārakshētram)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Nadu Nadu**

2

**Sola Nadu**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

HISTORY OF TIRUPATI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Talaichchanganāṇmadiyam (Talachangādu)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Tirukkudandai</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Tirukkāṇḍiyūr</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Tiruviṇṇagar</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Tirukkaṇṇapuram</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Tiruvi Tirunagari</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Tirunagai (Nāgappaṭṭanam)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Tirunaraiyur (Nāchchārkovil)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Nandipura Vinnagaram (Nādan koyil)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Indalūr (Tiruvaḷandūr)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Tiruchchitrakūtām (Chidambaram)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Kāli Srirāma Viṇṇagaram (Tādālān)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Kūḍalur (Aḍuturaiperumal)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Tirukkaṇṇangudi</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Tirukkaṇṇamangai</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Kapistalam</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Manimāḍakkōyil (Tirunāṅgur)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Vaikuntha Viṇṇagaram</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Arimeyaviṇṇagaram</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Tiruttēvanārtogai</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Vanpurushottamam</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Sempoṣey kōyil</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Tiruttēṭṭiambalam (அறுறுத்தி இம்பாலம்)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Tiruṇāṇikkūdam</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>Kshetram or Place (sung)</td>
<td>Sri Periya ālvār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Kāvalambādi</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Tiruvellakkulam (Kaṇṇan koyil)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Tiruppartan paḷḷi</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Sōla Nāḍu</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pandi Nāḍu**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Kshetram or Place (sung)</th>
<th>Sri Periya ālvār</th>
<th>Sri Andal ālvār</th>
<th>Sri Namālvār</th>
<th>Sri Tirumangai ālvār</th>
<th>Sri Kula-sekhara ālvār</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Tirumālirum Sōlai</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Tirukkōṭṭiyur</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tirumeyyam</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Tiruppullāṇi (Darbhasayanam)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Tiruttanākā</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Tirumōkur</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Tirukkūdal (Tenadurai)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Srivilliputtur</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Tirukkurukur (Alvār Tirunagari)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Tolai villimangalam</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Sirīvara mangai (Vānāmāmalai Nāṅguneri)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Tiruppulingūḍi</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tirupperai</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Vaikuntham</td>
<td>Varaguṇa mangai</td>
<td>Tirukkulandai (Perungulam)</td>
<td>Tirukurungudi</td>
<td>Tirukkolūr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Pādi Nāḍu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Malai Nāḍu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tirumūlijkkaḷam</th>
<th>Tiruppuliyur kuttanāḍu</th>
<th>Tirunāvāy</th>
<th>Tiruvallavāḷ</th>
<th>Tiruvanantapuram</th>
<th>Tiruvaṇparisāram</th>
<th>Tirukkāṭkarai</th>
<th>Tiruchchengunrūr</th>
<th>Tiruvanandur</th>
<th>Tiruvattaru</th>
<th>Tirukkaṭittānam</th>
<th>Tiruvāranvilai</th>
<th>Vittuvakkūḍu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Total Malai Nāḍu</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th>12</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE:—Places sung exclusively by one ālvār.

By Kulasekhara (Vittuvakkudi No. 108)
By Nammālvār (Pandi nāḍu ten, No. 83, 86 to 93 and 95) } In Tondaināḍu and nāḍu nāḍu Nammalvār has sung none.
By Nammālvār Malai nāḍu eight Nos. 100 to 107

By Tirumangai ālvār exclusively

in Vada nāḍu one; No. 4.
in Tondai nāḍu eleven, (Nos. 16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32
in Sola nāḍu thirty one (39, 43, 45, 47 to 51, 53, 56 to 77) Pāṇḍi nāḍu two (80, 82).
In between the Pallava and the Chola country lay an undefined small region called the Naḍu nāḍu or mid country. The Pallava country was also known as Tonḍaimanḍalam or Tonḍai nāḍu which was bounded on the north by the Svarnamukhi river and on the south by the South Pennar. The Chola country known as Sōja nāḍu lay between the South Pennar and the Cauvery rivers. The Pandyan kingdom lay South of the Cauvery right down to the sea. The western half of the extreme south (ruled by the Chera king) extending to the Arabian sea was called the Malai nāḍu or Hill country. The remaining part of India to the north of the Tonḍai manḍalam was known as the Vaḍa nāḍu or Vaḍugar nāḍu (the country of the northerners). The chart shows the sacred places arranged on the above regional basis adopted by the Sri Vaishnavas.

Shrines in the Vada Nadu, Nos. 1 to 13.

Out of the thirteen places shown, Nos. 12 and 13 are imaginary ones (Ksheerabdhi and Paramapadam) which nobody has seen or could visit with this human body. Nine more, viz., Ayōdhya, Naimisāraṇyam, Sāligrāmam, Badri, Dēviprayāg, Nandaprayāg Dvāraka, Gōvardhan, and Gōkulam are in North India which the early Alvārs neither visited nor sang about. It is not certain whether the other Āḻvārs who have sung had actually visited the place or places, or composed verses in praise of them as a matter of convention.

There remain only two more places in Vaḍa nāḍu viz., Singa-vēḻkunram and Tiruvēṅgaḍam. The former lay and is in an unfrequented part of the Eastern Ghats in the present Kurnool district. It was visited and sung only by Tirumangai, the last of the Alvars.

Tiruvēṅgaḍam is the only holy place of the Vaḍa nāḍu which was sung as ‘the Gloria in excelsis’ by all the early āḻvārs and by the later ones also excepting Madhura kavi āḻvār and Tonḍaraḍippodi Āḻvār. The itinerary of the Āḻvārs shows that Tiruvengaḍam (this holds good of many other shrines also) was probably visited only once by each āḻvar excepting Sri Nammālvār who
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has sung more than four times and has visited at least twice. This will be commented on at length later in the third section of this chapter.

Shrines in Tondaimandalam or Tondai Nadu.

In Tondai nādu there are twenty two places which were visited and sung in all by five ālvārs. Out of these only eleven places were visited by the four early ālvārs all of whom belonged to that region. The other eleven places were sung by Tirumangai ālvār only. In fact none of the ālvār who belonged to the Pandya and the Malai or Chēra nādu visited any of the temples in Tondai nādu, although some of them (particularly Sri Nammalvar) managed to visit Tiruvengadam after visiting Tiruvinnagaram and Tirukkudandai (Kumba konam). This would justify the assumption that the Tamilians of the extreme south had not in those days an attachment to the northerners and did not care to assess the greatness of the early ālvārs in combating the heretic religions of Buddhism and Jainism long before the people in the extreme south had to face the problem.

Shrines in Chola Nadu.

There are forty sacred places in the Chola country. The more famous ones are Tiruvarangam (Srirangam), Tirukkuḍandai (Kumbakonam), Tiruchchitra kūṭam (Chidambaram), Tirukkanṉapuram and Tiruvinnagar. Some of the four Mudal ālvārs visited eight of these places. Kulasekhara alvar visited in the Chola country only two places, viz., Tirukkanapuram and Chitrawathaitam. From the latter place he went straight to Vēngadham. Periya alvar visited only five places and Sri Andal two and Sri Nammalvar five. Tirumangai was the only one who visited thirty eight out of the forty places and he hailed from the Chola country. The chart shows the details.

Shrines in Nadu Nadu.

Nadunādu has only two places viz., Tirukkōvalūr and Tiruvēndipuram. The former was visited by two out of the four
early alvars and later by Tirumangai alvar, who visited Tiruvendiyapuram also. None of the Pāndinadu ālvārs visited these two shrines although Tirukkovalur is a very ancient one.

Shrines in Pandi Nadu.

It has eighteen sacred places, the more famous ones being Tirukkurungudi, Tirumalirumsoilai and Tirukkottiyur. Tirumalaisai alvar (one of the early alvars from Tonḍaimandalam) visited Tirukkurungudi and Tirukkottiyur but not Tirumalirumsoilai probably because the last named had not become prominent in his days. Nor did Kulasekhara visit the shrine.1 But it has been visited by the later alvars (four). It will also be noticed from the chart that except in the case of Tirumalirumsoilai and Tirukkurungudi the shrines which were visited by Sri Nammalvar were omitted by Sri Periya Alvar and Sri Andal. Apart from the circumstance that the two ālvārs belonged to different castes there may have been some other reason also for this noticeable attitude. There is also the fact that they did not visit the place of birth of each other as they seem to have been contemporaries. If they were not contemporaries we would expect the one who was born later to honour the older’s birth place by a visit. The Deities in their birth places (Alvar Tirunagari and Srivilliputtur) were not visited or sung by any other ālvārs excepting themselves. This leads to the suspicion that the greatness of Sri Nammalvar and Sri Periya Alvar was recognised only after their death and perhaps due to the publicity given by Sri Nathamuni and some of the later āchāryas.

Shrines in Malai Nadu.

It has thirteen sacred places and all of them including Tiruvanantapuram owe their importance to the visit by Sri Nammalvar. Tirumangai visited some of these places, all being to the east of the ghats.

1. This may be due to the fact that it was consecrated by a Pandyan King whose image was in the temple. Tirumalaisai would not bow to a human being.
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The above analysis shows that the āḻvārs were not great itinerants and that Tirumalisai āḻvār may perhaps be considered the more adventurous one considering the times in which he lived.

During the days of Poygai āḻvār there appear to have been only five sacred places or those so considered by him. During Būdattalvar’s days the number increased to fourteen; but he visited only twelve and omitted even Vehka in Kānchi the birth place of Poygai, his senior in age. He however visited (in Kānchi) Pāḍagam. His own birth place Māmallai was sung by him but by no other āḻvār excepting the last one Tirumangai. During the days of Pēyāḻvār (the third one) the number rose to 17; but he visited only twelve, including Triplaccine (Tiruvallikkeni) which is near his birth place, also Tiruvallūr (Tiruevvul), Pāḍagam, Uragam and Vehka, the last three being in Kānchi. Tiruvarangam (Srirangam) and Vēngadam were visited by all of them. Tirumāḷirum-solai was visited by Budattāḻvār and Pēyāḻvār, but not by Tirumalisaį and Poygai āḻvar. During Tirumalisai āḻvār’s days the number rose to 23 but he visited only thirteen. Tirukkurungudi was visited by him alone among the early āḻvārs. But Tirumalirum-solai which was visited by Budattāḻvār and Peyalvar was not visited by Tirumalisai. He might have considered that Tirumalirumsoilaį was only a recent temple probably consecrated by a Pandyan King and having no ancient traditions and that Tirukkurungudi though situated in the southernmost corner of South India had traditions behind it.

Kulasekhara āḻvār’s itinerary is worth pondering over. He was a ruling prince who had to carry the burden of governing his territory. But he found time to visit some sacred places of hoary tradition. Vittuvakkudi he visited in Malainādu probably because it was within his territory. The next place is Tiruvarangam in the Chola country. He did not set foot on the Pandyan soil. Even in the Chola country after visiting Srirangam (Tiruvarangam) he went to Tirukkaṇṇapuram and Chidambaram (Chitrukūṭam) which are in the border land. From Chitrikūṭam he went to Tiruvēngadām, ignoring all the holy places of Tonḍaimanḍalam. Out of forty sacred places in the Chola country Sri Periyalvar and Sri Nammalvar each visited only five places of which Tiruva-
rangam, Tiruppērnagar, Tirukkuṇḍandai and Tirukkaṇṭapuram were considered worthy by both. Sri Andal visited only two places, Tiruvanarangam and Tirukkaṇṭapuram. Out of the eighteen places in Pândi nādu only two were visited by both Sri Periya alvar and Sri Nammālvar. Ten more were visited exclusively by Nammalvar; and two more exclusively by Sri Periya alvar.

If the sacred places of North India, which probably have been sung out of veneration even without visiting, are not taken into account Sri Periya āḻvār may be said to have visited only eleven places, Sri Nammalvar thirty places and Sri Tirumangai alvar seventy four places. Of the last mentioned seven only are in Pândi nādu and four in Malai nādu.

It will now be apparent that the āḻvārs were not great itinerants nor were they mendicants and sanyasis as Dr. Svamikannu Pillai has presumed. Each had a calling in life. Kulasekhara was a ruling prince; Nammalvar was a feudatory of the Pandyam king; Periya alvar was a lordly priest with a following of disciples; Tirumangai āḻvār was a petty ruler. At the end of every ten songs sung by these āḻvārs the eleventh one shows who each is and some evince a pride in their profession. It is only the early āḻvārs of Tondaimandalam who refrained from disclosing their name, parentage, and calling. But Poygai āḻvār makes it plain that he did not practice beggary. He distinctly says that he never coveted another man's belongings (தமிழ் நேருக்கு முந்தையின்). Their spare time alone was devoted to visiting sacred places. Their object obviously was to make the Agama form of worship in temples acceptable to the Tamil loving people of the country. Sri Alavandar in latter times acclaimed Sri Nammalvar (a sudra) as the Kulapati of Sri Vaishnavas of all the four castes and even of those outside the pale of caste. At the same time he recommended universal acceptance of the Vedic Agama form of worship. He worked for a fusion of the Sanskrit and the Tamil cultures in the religious and social field. He was only following the footsteps of Sri Nammalvar. The latter's visits to temples and his unqualified praise for the Brahmins who were re-setting the Vedas

1. See Appendix VI of Dr. Svamikannu Pillai's Indian Ephemeris.
and performing punctually the Vedic rites were mainly intended to make the people accept the agama form of worship. Before his days Tirumalisai älvär laid stress on accepting the precepts of the Bhagavad Gita¹ and he was the first to travel down even to Tirukkurungudi in the extreme south.

**Birth dates of the Alvars.**

A few words have to be said about the birth dates of the Alvars and of the Acharyas as well. Among the scholars who devoted earnest attention to an investigation of this Dr. Svamikannu Pillai stands foremost. He inevitably came to the conclusion that the pursuit was of a Will-o’-the wisp nature. He depended for dates upon a work known as the Divya süricharita of Garuḍavāhana Pandita who is said to have professed himself a contemporary of Sri Ramanuja. He seems to have been responsible for the traditional dates which assigned the Mudal alvars and Tirumalisai to Dwāpara yuga and Sri Nammalvar to the commencing months of the Kali yuga and so on. If Dr. Svamikannu had only perused (1) the taniyan composed by Tirukkurukaippiran Pillan (the gnanaputra of Ramanuja) commencing with “Bhutam Sarascha ...........” (2) the order in which the alvārs stand arranged in the Ramanuja Nûṟṟandădi (நூற்றாண்டாதி) composed by Tiruvanantattu amudanār, one of the disciples of Sri Ramanuja (3) the order assigned to them by Sri Ramanuja (3) the order assigned to them by Sri Vēdānta Desikar in his Prabandhasaram (பிரபாண்டகம்) which gives also the calendrical details of month and asterism (4) the order assigned to them by Sri Periya jiyar (alias Manavāla mahāmuni) in his Upadesaratnamālai (உபதேசர் பத்தாண்டலை) which adopts the appasi month as the starting point of his chronology and (5) the Vaḷi Tirunāmam (வளி திருணாமம்) of the alvārs composed by Appillai who was one of the disciples of Sri Manavāla Mahāmuni, he would not have attempted to find the birth dates of the alvārs. Ramamujanûṟṟandădi may be assigned to the second quarter of the twelfth century after the death of Sri Ramanuja. Tiruk-

¹. Nanmukhan Tiruvantadi 71, 72.
The first to assign in writing a month and asterism of birth for each āḻvār was Sri Vedanta Desika probably in some year after 1330 A.D. Neither Pillān nor Tiruvarangattu amudanār who were contemporaries and disciples of Sri Ramanuja gave the month and asterism of birth. If the information had been available in their days Amudanar who wrote 108 verses would not have failed to incorporate such a valuable piece of information. The order in which the alvars are arranged by these two is also not the same. Pillān's arrangement is Bhuttatalvar, Poygai, Peyalvar, (Bhattanātha or) Periya alvar; (Sree) Andal; (Bhaktisāra alias), Tirumalēisai; Kulasekhara, (Yogivāha alias) Tiruppānan; (Bhaktāṅghrireñu, alias) Tonḍaraṇippodi; (Parakāla, alias) Tirumangai; Yatindra (Sri Ramanuja); Misra (Madhurakavi) and Parāṅkusa.

Sri Tiruvarangattamudanār's arrangement is—Poygai, Bhūtam, Peyan, Tiruppānan Tirumalēisai, Tonḍaraṇippodi, Kulasekharan, Periya alvar, Āndāl, Tirumangai, Mathurakavi, (Satakopa) Nammalvar, Nāthamuni, Yāmunamuni, and Sri Ramanuja.

There is considerable difference between the two arrangements. The only point on which both agree is about the Mudal alvars and even there there is a slight difference. The inevitable inference is that nothing definite was known during Sri Ramanuja's days about the birth dates of the āḻvārs nor was there any anxiety to ferret out the information. There obviously was some speculation during the two succeeding centuries. Among Hindus the month and the asterism of birth used to be noted or remembered in the case of most births since even the name of the person is deter-
minded generally by the asterism of birth. So Sri Vedanta Desika probably accepted a tradition of a certain order of birth which perhaps was current in his days or he himself devised such an order and assigned to each a month and nakshatra as a matter of convention. His arrangement is:—Poygai (in Kanchi Arpasi Sravanam); Bhutam (in Kadalmallai or Māmalar—Arpasi Aviṭṭam); Pey (in Mayilai, Arpasi Satayam); Tirumalisai (in Malisai; in Tai Makham); Nammālvar (in Kurukai; Vaikāsi Visākham); Mathurakavi (in Tirukkōṭur, Chittirai, Chitta), Kulasekhara (in Vanjikkalam in Māsi, Punarvasu); Periya āḷvār (in Sri Villiputtur Āni Svāṭi); Sri Andal (in Sri Villiputtur, Āḍi Pūram); Tondaradippodi (Māndamkudi, Margali Jyeshta); Tiruppānān (Uraiyyur, Kārti, Rohini); Tirumangai (Kannamangai, Kartigai, Krittikai). The place of birth also is given in the above.

The next arrangement was by Sri Manavālamāmūni who, it is no surprise to find, made yet another arrangement of the names keeping only the month and the asterism as before for each alvar. His arrangement in the Upadesaratnamalai is—

Poygai, Bhutam and Pey (in Arpasi Sravanam, Aviṭṭam and Satayam respectively); Tirumangai (in Kartigai Krittikai), Tiruppānān (Kartikāi Rohini); Tondaradippodi (Mārgali, Jyeshta); Tirumalisai (Tāi, Makhā); Kulasekhara (Māsi, Punarvasu); Nammālvār (Vaikāsi, Visakam); Periyālvar (Āṇi Svāṭi); Sri Andal (Āḍi Pūram); Mathurakavi (Chittirai, Chitta); Sri Ramanuja (Chittirai, Arudra). He omitted the place of birth.

The Vaiṭi Tirunamam by Appillai arranges thus:—Poygai, Bhutam Pey alvar, Tirumalisai, Nammalvar; Kulasekhara, Periyalvar, Tondaradippodi; Tiruppanan, Tirumangai, Mathurakavi, Āṇḍal. This is more in accordance with Vedānta Desika’s arrangement.

The arrangement by Manavālamāmūni differs from that of his disciple Appillai. The only possible inference is that even to the end of the fifteenth century there was no agreement about the dates of birth of the alvars. The month of birth and the
Nakshatra only were agreed upon. If Dr. Svanikannu Pillai had only read these works he would not have made the Will-o’-the-wisp attempt to fix the dates of the alvars. The accompanying chart shows all the arrangements which have been discussed above. It may be added here that the celebration of the festival known as Āṭṭai-Tirunakshatram (annual birth star) of the alvars was commenced in Tirupati only in 1468 A.D. with the one for Kula-sekhara alvar. Sri Andal’s Tirunakshatram was not celebrated till 1496 A.D., although she was being given a holy bath every Friday. Even Sri Ramanuja had his Tirunakshatram celebration only 1475 A.D. in Tirupati. All the Āḻvārs got it in Tirumala in 1476 A.D. These will be discussed in Section 2 of this chapter. The coining of a birth day for the alvars might have been due to the desire to celebrate it as a festival. Whether in the South Tamil country the Āṭṭai-tirunakshatrams of the Āḻvārs were being celebrated earlier than in Tirupati has to be ascertained from other evidence.

It may be noted that in no case have the acharyas told us on what considerations “the order of succession” (if such an expression may be used) shown by them was adopted. How the month and the asterism of birth of each Āḻvār was ascertained is also not given. Sri Manavala māmuni arranged them in the order of the month commencing with aippasi (Tula). His disciple Appillai arranges the succession for Vāḷi Tirunāmam obviously in the chronological order of birth, but places Mathurakavi and Sri Andal at the end.

The order of succession as gleaned from the Prabandhams.

But certain features noticeable in the Prabandhams seem to warrant an arrangement or order of succession of the Āḻvārs. This order is given in column 7 of the chart.

Poygai Alvar.

From Poygai Āḻvār’s “First Tiruvandadi” it is seen that in his days the Vengadam Hill was the habitat of elephants which
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart Showing Speculations about the Birth Dates of the Alvars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillai’s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tanjore</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1130 A.D.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bhuddat-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>talvar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poygai</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>avvar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>719 A.D.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pey avvar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>719 A.D.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Periya avvar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Bhattachartha).</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Sree Andal | Tirumalaisai | Nammalvär in Karur; Vaikasi, Visakam | Tiruppānan in Kurukur; Kartigai Rohini | Nammalvär in Kurukur Vaikasi Visakham | Periyalvar 725 A.D. | Tiruppānan | 105 |
|------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|
|           | Tondaradippodi | Mathurakavi in Tirukkolur Chittirai, Chittira | Tondaradippodi Margali Jyeshta | Kulasekhara in Vanjikkalam Masi, Punarvasu | Kulasekhara 767 A.D. |                      |          |
| (Bhākthiśāran) | Kulasekharai | Kulasekhara in Vanjikkalam Māsi, Punarvasu | Tirumalaisai Tai, Makha | Periya alvar in Villiputtur Ani, Svati | Andal 776 A.D. | Tondaradippodi |          |
|            | Periya alvar | Periya āḻvar in Villiputtur Āni Svāti | Kulasekhara Masi, Punarvasu | Tondaradippodi in Mandangudi Margali, Jyeshta | Tīrumanvangai 776 A.D. | Periyalvar |          |
| Tiruppānan (Yūgi vāhan) |            |                                      |                                        |                                        |                   |            |
|            | Tondaradippodi (Bhaktangirēnu) | Sri Andal in Villiputtur Ādi, Puram | Nammalvar in Urayur Kartikai, Rohini | Tiruppānan in 787 A.D. | Tondaradī | Andal |            |
| Pillan’s Tanian 1130 A.D. | Amudanar’s Ramanuja Nurranda 1150 A.D. | Vedanta Desika’s Prabandhasram about 1330 A.D. | Manavalamamuni’s Upadesaratnamalai 1440 A.D. | Appillai’s Vali Tirunamam 1500 A.D. | Dr. Swami Kanna’s On critical consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tirumangai (Parakāla)</td>
<td>Tirumangai</td>
<td>Periyalvar Tondaradippodī in Mandangudi Margali, Jyeshta</td>
<td>Tirumangai in Uraiyalur Kartigai, Kritika</td>
<td>Mathura Kavi 797 A.D.</td>
<td>Mathura Namalvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misra (Mathura Kavi)</td>
<td>Namalvar</td>
<td>Tirumangai in Kannamangai Kartigai, Kritikai</td>
<td>Mathurakavi Chittirai, Chitta</td>
<td>Anjāl, in Villiputtur Adi Puram</td>
<td>Tirumangai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parankusamuni, alias Namalvar</td>
<td>Nathamuni, Yamuna Muni and Sri Ramanuja</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Ramanuja Chittirai, Arudra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the ‘Kuravars’ or Kurbas who inhabited or frequented the hill used to capture and tame by a certain primitive and ingenious method\(^1\) and also how they scared away huge pythons\(^2\) which sometimes obstructed their path. The autogenous and all bamboo forests are also described. It is also stated that wise Vedic scholars from all parts of the country who were engaged in evolving from the Srutis an agreed philosophical system would go to the hill and worship the Deity seeking enlightenment on the real import of seemingly conflicting Srutis (bhedābheda Srutis).\(^3\) There is no reference made in the songs to Buddhism, Jainism or Saivism, not to speak of Advaitism. The last named does not appear to have been current during the days of any of the ālvārs. Sri Sankaracharya’s life period is presumed to be from 737—769. Therefore not only Poygai ālvār but all the other ālvārs as well seem to have flourished before the date of death of Sankaracharya and before Advaitism had any large following. None of the ālvārs refers to it in the Prabandham. The date of Poygai ālvār may therefore be assigned to a time when the Vengadam Hill was an unexplored forest infested by elephants and inhabited by kuravars (or the kurbas).\(^4\) Nor was there a temple structure then.

Bhudattalvar.

The description of the hill, the wild animals and the primitive inhabitants given by Bhudattalvar is similar to what was given

1. First Tiruvandādi I. 40.
2. First Tiruvandādi I. 38.
3. First Tiruvandādi 37.
4. The Tamil term Kuravar used by the early Algārs is presumably a corruption of ‘Kurava.’ These Kurabas seem to have been inhabiting this part of the country as also Kurnool, Mysore, Salem, Coimbatore and the Nilgiris. Kurabalakota is an existing village in the Madanapalli taluk of the Chittoor District (Lat 13°-39’ North, Long. 78° 25 East). Kurbalapatti is in Ooty Lat. 11°-34’ North and Long. 77°-41’ East. Kuraba Nagalapuram in Kurnool Lat. 15°-45’ North and Long 77°-54’ East. Kurumba palayam in Coimbatore. Kurumbapatti and Kurumbarahalli in Salem. The Kurubas (Kuravar) appear to have been a virile set of people who were in possession of the Tirumalai Hills and the surrounding country even before the Pallava conquered it. Poygai Alvar’s may thus have flourished even before 550 A.D.
by Poygai ālvar. The only improvement is that he found the Deity decorated with flower garlands (Tulāyalangal) and dressed up as Bālakrishna with the tuft tied up into a knot (O.śivārya mōḷ-) over the forehead. There were flower bearing creepers on the banks of the hill streams Bhudattalvar's birth place was "Māmallai" (the present Mahabalipuram) a flourishing seaport during the reign of the Pallava King Narasimha Varman I, surnamed Māmalla 630—660 A.D. The place got to its name from the name of its king but was subsequently known as Kadalmallai. Bhudattalvār prides himself on his skill to express in chasty Tamil the philosophic ideas of the Upanishads "(nārāyaṇanā ṣamām iṣṭaṁ jñānanā) Bhudattalvar may therefore be presumed to have flourished about 600—650 A.D. Poygai ālvar would have been his senior. His date may be taken as 500 or 550 A.D.

Pey alvar.

Pey ālvār describes the hill in about the same way as did the other two. He says in addition that the Kuravars were taking to the cultivation of dry crop (Italian Millet or Tinai or Koṟṟa) in addition to their Shikari occupation of capturing elephants. Pey ālvār's date may be put down a few years after Bhudattalvar's.

Tirumalaisai alvar.

Tirumalaisai ālvār's description is more elaborate. He definitely has stated that the Deity was standing on a deforested plot of ground, had flowers placed on Him by worshippers and that the image was standing tall and clearly visible from all directions. His description of the hill shows that elephants, lions and panthers were infesting the forests. He changed his religion from Buddhism to Jainism and Saivism successively and at last found rest and salvation by pinning his faith in the worship of Narayana. He

1. Second Tiruvandādi 53.
2. Second Tiruvandādi 33 and 76.
3. Third Tiruvandādi 89.
4. Nanmakhan Tiruvandādi 45.
had studied the Bhagavat Gita in Sanskrit and his work shows that he was well versed in the Puranas etc., and had great reverence for the Vedic religion and culture. In fixing his date we have to take note of the description given in the Tamil classic *Silappadhiyakaram* which describes the Vengadam Hill and the Deity as having been decorated with flowers and having Sankham, Chakram and Bow in hand which are not mentioned by Tirumalaisai. *Silappadhiyakaram* is assigned to 756 A.D. by Dr. Swamikannu Pillai. Tirumalaisai might have flourished about a century earlier.

Tiruppanalivar.

His successor or contemporary or predecessor in point of time may be *Tiruppanalivar*. The description which he gives in his "Amalanadippiran" of the image of Sri Ranganatha of Srirangam has to be taken into consideration in this connection. He describes the Deity from foot to head as he worshipped for the first time in his life. He does not mention the image of Sri Devi on the form of the Deity. The description given in *Silappadhiyakaram* distinctly mentions the existence of the image of Sri Devi (இல்பெட்டிக்குடில் செய்யப்பட்டுள்ள மரத்தில் சிவன் பூமியில்). Therefore Tiruppanalivar should have flourished before 756 A.D. The use of a relatively large number of Sanskrit words within the short space of his ten verses and the strict adherence to the use of chaste Tamil words (as far as could be managed) by Tirumalaisai and his predecessor would warrant his being placed next to Tirumalaisai in point of time, or about 700 A.D. although Dr. Swamikannu gives the date 610 A.D.

Kulasekhara alvar.

*Kulasekhara alvar*’s Tirumoli shows that Sri Ranganatha in Srirangam was being worshipped six times a day (as prescribed in the agamas); whereas in Tirumala such was not at that time the case. In his days elephants seem to have become scarce in Tirumala. The use of the ‘Tambaka’ wood is mentioned in his song, leading to the inference that there was a wooden temple
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(or makeshift for one) with doorstep etc. The use of a gold cup for receiving the water used during worship is also mentioned. His visit would therefore have been after 756 A.D. He was a ruling Prince and his rapid marches avoiding the Pandyan, Chola and even the Pallava country have also to be given consideration. While in Srirangam he gave expression to his dissatisfaction that worshippers were not singing and praising God in their own mother tongue in addition to the routine agamic Sanskrit texts. Tonḍaraḻippodi āḻvar has composed verses in Tamil for waking up the Deity in Srirangam from sleep, for adorning with flower garlands and so on. His description of Sri Ranganatha shows that many additional images were added to the pantheon so as to make up what, in the language of the agamas, is called Bhoga Sayana Murti. He therefore might be placed next after Kulasekharā āḻvār. He refers also to Buddhists, Jains etc., in his songs.

Periya āḻvār.

Periya āḻvār’s reference to the Pandyan King Neḍumāran alias Varaguṇa Maharaja (765—815 A.D.) in Periya āḻvār Tirumoli IV. 2. 71 and his references to one Selvan, the purohīt and court pundit of that king in IV. 4. 8 and Tiruppallandu. 11. go to show
that he was their contemporary, as the references are made in the present tense.

Sri Nammalvar.

Sri Nammalvar sings the praise of Narasingaswami (Who however he said was far away from him) soon after singing the praise of Tirukkurun-gudi Nambi. His original name is Kāri Māran and he got the honorific name Sathakopan by virtue of his dispelling spiritual ignorance. The builder of the cave temple of Narasimha in the Anamalai Hill was Māran Kāri. This temple was consecrated by Mathurakavi in 770 A.D. Madhurakavi was a pious and learned Brahmin attached to Māran Kāri before he became the famous disciple of his son Kāri Māran Sathakopan. It is but natural that after singing the praise of Tirukkurungudi Nambi (Tiruvāy. I. 10. 9) at whose temple his father and mother did a long penance to be blessed with a worthy son he should sing (Tiruvāy. II. 4. 1 and 2) the praise of Narasinga the Deity whose cave temple was built and consecrated by his father and Madhura Kavi. Sri Nammalvar also sings the praise of Varaguna Mangai Deity. Varaguna Maharaja reigned from 765 to 815 A.D. He was also known as Māran Saḍayan, Neḍunjaḍayan Neḍumāran and atila Parāntaka (1). These references point to the probability that Sri Nammalvar was a contemporary of Varaguna Maharaja and also of Sri Periya alvar. Sri Nammalvar also specially mentions that the compound walls of the Tirukkaṇṇapuram temple were built of cutstone. A special mention of it warrants the inference that in older times the compound walls would have been of burnt brick. Building with cutstone commenced sometime after con-

1. பாலீசுருங்கம் கேட்டு க௃த்தத்திலிருந்து மலர்கு பெருந்து வங்கியுள்ள பங்கொனை பார்க்கு செய்கிறார்கள் பொருள்.

(Tiru. 9.2.4.)

2. குரலுக்கு கேட்டு கேட்டு முறையில் உயர்ந்து வளர்வினவிட காரணம்.

(Tiru. 9.10.10.)
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STRUCTION of cave temples hewn out of rock had become common
and therefore would have been a feature of the eighth century.

**Tirumangai alvar.**

*Tirumangai alvār:*—The period in which he flourished is
usually fixed with reference to two historical incidents referred
to by him in his *Periya Tirumoli.* In 2-8-10 he says that the Deity
Ashta-bhuja-karan is in Kachchi (Kanchipuram) where reigned at
that time one (Nilmuḍi Malai) Vaimēghan to whom the King
of the Tondaiyars (a Pallava) was paying obeisance. Kachchi
was twice conquered from the Pallavas—one from Nandivarman
II Pallavamalla (710—775 A.D.) by the Chalukya King Vikrama-
marka II in 743—746; for a second time from Nandivarman’s
successor Danti Varman (775—826 A.D.) by the Rashtrakūta
King Govinda III in 804 A.D. In 746 Nandivarman reconquered
the place from Vikramaditya and did not therefore continue it
to be subordinate to Vikramaditya. But Dantivarman submitted
to the Rashtrakūta King by paying a tribute. Perhaps Govinda III
was also known as Vaimēgha. It may therefore be taken that
Tirumangai alvar refers to the incident in 804 A.D. He was
therefore a contemporary of Dantivarman. The other reference
is contained in the ten verses about the Deity in Paramesvaram
Vīṇagaram (*Periya Tirumoli* 2-9) ten verses. In the first verse
the following occurs.

\[
\text{மலையாள் விளக்கம் விளக்கம் விளக்கம்}
\]
\[
\text{பார்வாம் பனிப்புத்த வாய்ச்சதுதுப்பு}
\]
\[
\text{பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம 
\]

(2. 9. 1.)

There is the further information in the next verse

\[
\text{மலையாள் விளக்கம் மலையாள் விளக்கம் மலையாள் விளக்கம் 
\]
\[
\text{பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம பார்வாம 
\]

(2. 9. 2)
THE ALWARS' PRABANDHAMS

A Pallava King is said to have defeated a 'Tennavan' Southern King (meaning Pandya King) in past time and the Pallava King who defeated him is said to have worshipped (also in the past) the Deity in the Paramesvara Vinayagaram temple. Early accounts of South Indian History tell us that Nandivarman II Pallavamalla (710—775) conquered the countries of Vallabha, Kalabra, Kerala, Pandya, Chola, Tuluva and Konkana. So far as Tirumangai alvar is concerned the conquest of Pandya was an incident at some past date by Nandivarman II. We may therefore assume that Tirumangai alvar flourished sometime after 775 A.D. and that he was not a contemporary of Nandivarman II but only of his successor Dantivarman (775—826 A.D.). There is one observation worth making. It is strange that he has not said one word about Periya alvar, Sri Andal, Madhurakavi and Sri Nammalvar. They were not perhaps considered great religious leaders in those days; or Tirumangai alvar had not a high regard for the kings and people of the extreme South. He calls Varaguna Maharajah by the name வரகுணா மகாராஜ் (the man of the South) which is not quite a respectable way of referring to a king. The same indifference may have been shown by him to the religious leaders of the South. He did not visit Srivilliputtur and Tirukkurukur (Alvar Tirunagari).

The order of succession of the alvars as deduced from incidents mentioned in their songs is shown in column 7 of the chart.
CHAPTER XXIII—(Contd.)

SECTION—2.

TIRUMOLI RECITAL IN TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI TEMPLES.

In this section an attempt will be made to trace the stages by which the recital of the Prabandham of the Alvars was introduced in the Tirupati and the Tirumalai temples.

The first attempt was made by some one whose name is not given in the incomplete inscription (I. 61) but who endowed lands for which the Kaikkolars attached to the temples of Sri Govindarajaswami and Sri Venkatesvaraswami were made the permanent tenants who were to deliver annually certain quantities of paddy from the lands which were in their enjoyment for the purpose of making food offerings to Sri Govindaraja during the annual Vaikasi festival for eight days i.e., from the second to the ninth day in connection with the recitation of Tirumoiti (called Tirumoliippadi) and to Sri Venkateswaraswami for Nimandam during the annual Chittirai festival. The inscription (I. 61) is dated the fourth regnal year of Vijayagandagopala and is to be found behind the Dvarapala on the proper right side of the entrance into the shrine. A few letters at the commencement of each line are stated to be covered by a stone pillar. Vijayagandagopala’s reign is presumed to extend from 1250 to 1285 A.D. The date of the inscription may therefore be taken to be 1253 A.D. He was not however the ruler of the Tirupati region at that time as Sri Vira Narasingayadavaraya continued to be the rular till 1265 A.D. The latter made in 1234 A.D., a golden Sikharam for the four faced wooden car of Sri Govindaraja (I. 86). It is not known whether within this period he was at any time conquered by Vijayagandagopala. It is also stated in this inscription that there was a Chittirai annual festival in Tirumala. It is only from a much later inscription (V. 129 p. 354 dated 8th July 1551) that we learn that this Chittirai festival was instituted by an accountant of the Temple whose name ends
with Mēluḍaiyar (கூறுகளுறும்... தமிழ் செய்திகள் இறைவன்).

Tiruppavai recital in Tirumala (about 1250—55).

The recital of Tirumolī was commenced in 1253 A.D., in Tirupati only but not in Tirumala. It is not stated whether the recital was done in street procession or in the temple itself. With the above inscription may be linked another one (I. 74) of which he first portion is missing and therefore the year could not be stated. But as the endowment was made in the shape of gold coins called Gandagopalan mādai (காண்டகோபகல் மாதை), it is reasonable to presume that it was made sometime during his reign (1250—1285). The inscription is now found on the north wall of the third prakaram of the Tirumalai temple. We have reasons to believe that some of the inscribed stones which were on the old prakaram walls of the Tirumalai temple were not properly reset in their original position when the renovation of the temple and the prakaram walls was made under Vira Narasinga Yadavaraya's orders about 1250 A.D. Stray ones found their place subsequently in all odd places. This inscribed stone is one such. It may therefore be assigned a date about 1250—1255 A.D. The inscription gives the information that Tiruppavai was sung in Tirumala during the Chittirai festival. Being a composition of 30 verses only it was sung perhaps when the utsava murti was in āsthanam or durbar. The food offering made in this connection was called Tiruppāvaippadi (திருப்பாவைப்படி). Tirumolī however was not sung then in Tirumala; nor was Tiruvaymoli. This was done perhaps soon after the renovation of the temple in 1250 A.D. (Vide I. 88).

We may remind ourselves here that the commentaries (Vyākyānams) for the several portions which compose the Tamil Prabandham excepting the first one for Tiruvaymoli were made by different ācharyas from time to time but all of them later than the one for Tiruvaymoli. For facilitating memorising, among other reasons, Adhyayanotsavam was taken advantage of to recite the Tiruvaymoli in particular on a footing of equality with the
Vedas. It would therefore be natural to expect that the *Tiruvaymoți* should have been the first to be recited in Tirumala and Tirupati. Such was not the case. The recitation of *Tirumoți* and *Tiruppavai* however happen to be the first attempts. The reason is not far to seek. It would have been a difficult matter to train a choir of singers to recite the 1102 verses of *Tiruvāymoți*. Those were days when there were no printed books and cadgeon leaf books too would have been rare as copying would have been a laborious task. So the shorter pieces of the Prabandham seem to have been selected for recitation. There is also the fact that Prabandham recital was not an enterprise of the local residents. It was an exotic adventure which had to be carefully nurtured. There was not in those days an indigenous Sri Vaishnava population worth mentioning in Tirupati and Tirumala. Strict measures had to be adopted to compel Sri Vaishnavas to build houses and reside in Tirupati if they desired to do service in the Tirumalai temple. They had also to feel satisfied with the kind and quantity of food which the temple supplied. Therefore for the recitation of the Alvars’ songs Sri Vaishnavas had to be got from other places during the festivals and endowments were made to provide such men with food. The number of men so imported would have been very limited nor would all of them have been men fully versed in all the prabandhams.

After Tirukkurukaippiran Pillan wrote the first commentary on the *Tiruvāymoți* called (6000 padi) Arāyirappadi, Nanjiyar (Vedanti) wrote commentaries on the *Tiruvāymoți* as well as on Tiruppāvai. His disciple was Nampillai, also known as Varada-raja, Tirukkalikanridāsar and Lokacharya. He was also a commentator. For our history he may be taken to be one of the four bhaktas who prevailed upon the Chola king Rajarajadevar in the 19th year of his reign to issue an edict asking the inhabitants of the villages of Kudavar nādu to contribute annually, as mēra for the shrine of Tirumangai ālvar newly installed in Tirupati, 5 tūmbu of paddy per acre of land (I. 40, 1234 A.D.). He was born in 1207 A.D. He may have been responsible for the endowment made (I. 61) for the recital of *Tirumoți* during the Vaikasi festival of Sri Govindaraja in 1253, he would then have been about 46 years old. He might equally have been responsible for
the singing of Tiruppavai in Tirumala about the same period (I. 74).

Inscription I. 61 speaks of Tirumolippadi but does not state which Tirumoli was recited. There are four Tirumoliś. One is called Periya ālvār’s Tirumoli, the second is known as Nāchchīyār Tirumoli by Sri Āndal; the third is known as Kulasekhara Alvar’s Perumāl Tirumoli and the fourth is known as the Periya Tirumoli of Tirumangai ālvār. Although the suggestion was made above that Nampillai might have been responsible for the installation of Tirumangai alvar in Tirupati it does not follow therefrom that he would have selected Tirumangai ālvār’s Periya Tirumoli for recitation during the Vaikasi festival in Tirupati. Seeing that Tiruppāvai was selected for recitation in Tirumala, it may be presumed that Sri Āndal’s Tirumoli was selected for recitation in Tirupati as it consists of only 143 verses. The commentaries on the twenty two works of the Prabandham were made by Periya Achchān Pillaī only about 1280 A.D. and they would have been available to the public in general very much later.

Tiruppavai songs were not composed for recitation in procession during a festival but for recitation during the early hours of the morning in the month of Margali (Margasira). The probability therefore is that Tiruppavai was sung while the utsava murti was in āsthānam or durbar and that immediately thereafter a food offering would have been made.

The above two are the only early instances when any portion of the Prabandhams was recited. In Tirupati it was soon after the presentation of the four-faced car by Vira Narasinga Yadavaraya and in Tirumala soon after the renovation of the temple. These would have been occasions which induced religiously minded men to undertake a pilgrimage and make endowment. Thereafter although endowments were made for daily sandhi food offerings and special ones during the Brahmostavam festivals (such as the ones mentioned in I. 98, 103, 104 and 106) nothing followed to encourage the recitation of the Prabandhams of the Alvars in Tirupati and Tirumala.
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Third attempt Tiruvaymoli recital in Tirumala
1360 A.D.

The recital of Tiruvāyemoḷi—and that in connection with the Tirunāḷs or festivals—is mentioned in an inscription (1. 107, 26–1–1360 A.D.) which is on the south wall (inner side) of the first (or inner) gopuram in Tirumala Temple. The inscription is incomplete and fragmentary, but sufficiently intelligible. It was made in the reign of Sri Ranganatha Yadavaraya which commenced in 1336 or 1337 A.D. The name of the cyclic year is also missing. It was on a Monday, 10th day of the bright fortnight in the Tamil month of Kumbha concurrent with the asterism Rohini. The 26th of January 1360 A.D. satisfies these data. The endowment was for a cooked food offering (Tirupponakam) to be made when the Deity was at the Tiruvasal or main gateway, seated in a (mantapam) on all the ten days and after bearing the Tiruvāyemoḷi recital.¹

The wording does not warrant the interpretation that the recital was done in the festival procession. It conveys the impression that it took place when the Deity was seated in a mantapam known in later centuries as the Tiruvāyemoḷi mantapam in front of or near the main gateway. The donor’s name is given as “the Chola Chēdirāyan of Kulatilaka Chaturvēdi mangalam in Cheyyur koṭṭam¹ (தோற்றி கூறிகளக்கு சுத்து கூற்று காண்டாடி காண்டு — சோதூ கூறற் சுறூ காண்டம்)”. The description is enough to show that the donor was subject to the Chola king and by race a Chera nobleman. He was not personally in Tirumala at the time. The endowment stood in his name (சுரூப்பூர்). So this attempt to recite the Tiruvāyemoḷi was not made by the natives of Tirupati or Tirumala. The donor did not take the initiative, but it was some other person whose name is not given in the inscription. It is however possible to guess the name. It has already been stated that a little before 1360 A.D., the Muslim

1. “...தோற்றி கூறிகளக்கு சுத்து கூற்று காண்டாடி காண்டு — சோதூ கூறற் சுறூ காண்டம்”
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power was annihilated in the south by the Vijayanagar Prince Kuñhara Kempanna and that Sri Gopanna (Gopanaraya) the Vijayanagar Commander and Viceroy at Chengi Fort safely conveyed Sri Ranganatha’s Utsava murti from Tirumala to Srirangam. The Prabandhams were recited there with great demonstrations after the objections raised by non-Sri Vaishnavas were overcome by Sri Vedanta Desika in a special assembly convened for the purpose. Among the younger enthusiasts of those days there was one Tiruvāyamoḷippetillai (also known as Tirumalai ālvān alias Tirumalai āndān). He is the grand-son of Nampillai (alias Lōkacharya, Tirukkalikanridasar) whose name we associated with the Tirumoli recital in Tirupati in 1253 A.D. Nampillai’s son was known as Pillai Lōkacharya whose name is associated with Sri Ranganatha’s utsava murti being conveyed to Tirumala about 1330 A.D. for safety. Tiruvāyamoḷippetillai is Pillai Lōkacharya’s son. His birth was perhaps in Tirumala and the date generally assumed is 1328 A.D. He therefore seems to have been named Tirumalai ālvān. His unrivalled skill in Tiruvāyamoḷi recitation seems to have got for him the popular surname Tiruvāyamoḷippetillai. He might have been responsible for the endowment by the Chēdirayan (a Chera prince) in 1360 A.D. The recitation was not done in a walking procession in the streets but in front of the Tiruvāsal (the main entrance to the temple). There was no gopuram at that time over the gateway, but was constructed in the fifteenth century by Saluva Narasimha who made a grant of the village of Durgasamudram for that purpose and for constructing the compound walls.

Tiruppavai recital during Margali month in Tirumala and next in Tirupati—1390 A. D.

The next important step was an endowment made by Sri Mullai Tiruvēnkaṭa jiya in 1390 (No. I. 187) when he had become one of the Sthanattar of the temple in addition to his office as the Kartar of the Arisanālayān tirunandavanam and matham. This inscription is an instructive one. It states that in connection with the recitation of the Tiruppāvai songs (of Sri Anḍāl) in the presence of the Utsava murti (Malaikuniyaninna perumal and
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Nāchchimārs) during the thirty days of the month of Margali (Dhanus) this jiyar made a provision for daily food offering (Tiruvolakkam) for the middle ten days of that month. The same inscription also states that during the Adhyayanam of Sri Govinda-raja in Tirupati one Tiruvolakkam food offering should be made on each of the ten days when Tiruppavai would be recited.¹

In speaking of the Tirumalai temple utsava murti the term "Tiruvadhayayanam" is not used but only 'இஸ்தாமீ தம்புத்தின் சுருங்ககுறி ஐயர்கோயில்' "Tiruppavai heard in the Mārgaḷi month"; whereas in reference to the Tirupati temple of Sri Govinda-rajaswami the month Margali is not mentioned but only the words 'Tiruvadhayayanam' days 'இதுவாரியகாகாசாக தாள்'. The inferences to be drawn are that in Tirumalai during the thirty days of the month of Margali (Dhanus) the Tamil work Tiruppavai consisting of thirty stanzas was being recited daily and that there was no Tiruvadhayayanam; that in Tirupati Tiruvadhayayanam was being celebrated but not in the month of Margali and that the Tamil Tiruppavai was sung for ten days in that month (which ten days not stated). The term 'Tiruvadhayayanam' has always been applied to connote the recitation of the Vedas in full during the month of Mārgaḷi (Dhanus). The commencement is on the first Sukla (bright) Ekadasi tithi of that month and the ending on the Bahula (dark) Panchami. This ritualistic festival was obviously not being observed in Tirumalai in 1390 according to the wording of the inscription. In Tirupati it was being observed but not in the month of Margali. The custom in Tirupati seems to have been that the commencement should be on the succeeding Sukla Ekadasi which may happen in Margali month or in the next month.

1. Lines 2 and 3 ".......இலைசலியதம் மைதுசுருங்ககுறி முக்கி மார்கத்தான் மார்கத்தின் சுருங்ககுறி ஐயர்கோயில் இச்சுருங்ககுறி ஓர்மந்த தாள் சிற்றோன்கிழமை இச்சுருங்ககுறி ஔர்த்தம்..."

Lines 4 and 5 ".......சுருங்ககுறி ஐயர்கோயில் இச்சுருங்ககுறி சூடியதான் தாள் சுருங்ககுறி வால் வழித்தீர்த்த தாள் சிற்றோன்கிழமை இச்சுருங்ககுறி ஔர்த்தம்..." "சுருங்ககுறிகளென பெயர்கோயில்..."
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(Paushya). It is so observed now and seems to have been the case in 1390 also. This festival is principally intended for the recitation of the Vedas. In Tirupati in addition to the Vedas, the Tamil Tiruppavai also was sung. Whether the latter was on the same ten days as the Vedas or on some succeeding days the inscription does not state.

It is a revelation to us that Adhyayanam was not being celebrated in Tirumala in the old days. This curious omission perhaps caught the attention of the Vijayanagar Emperor Devaraya Maharaya II (1422 to 1449 A.D.) when he visited the Tirumalai temple on Monday the 10th lunar day of the bright fortnight of Margasira in the Saumya year (Saka 1351) which corresponds to 5th December 1429. It was then the Margali month. His remark made on that occasion to the chief Srivaishnava of Tirupati (Tirukkalikanridasar Alagappirānār) resulted in an effective arrangement being made in 1433 (Nov. 22, I. 201) for the daily recitation of the Vedas by two persons. The arrangement was that twenty-four brahmins should receive a portion of the income from Siddakkuttai village (a temple village) and that by turns two persons should do the service each month. It is therefore a fact that till 1433 A.D. there was no recitation of the Vedas in Tirumala even during the Margali month, when there should be an Adhyayanotsavam. It was perhaps as a substitute that Sri Mullai Tiruvencata jiayar made his endowment in December 1390 for the recitation of the short Tamil piece known as Tiruppavai in the presence of the Utsava Murti. Even this Utsava Murti came to notice only in 1339 A.D. (I. 104, 1339 3rd year of the reign of Sriranganatha Yadavaraya).

Srivaishnava terms used in connection with Alvars' songs.

At this stage it is desirable to refer to and explain some of the expressions and terms used by Sri Vaishnavas which are also found in our inscriptions in connection with the recitation of the Prabandhams of the alvars. These are given as foot note below.¹

¹ The expressions used by Sri Vaishnavas in connection with the works of the Alvars, and their recitation on special occasions such as festivals to celebrate their annual birth star.
They called their composition as Pādhal and those who have mastered them as Pādavallar (நாய்க்கர் and நாய்களையர்).

Prabandham,—The Sanskrit word Prabandham means “a collection of outstanding sayings or works on a subject.” Synonymous expressions are Alvar Pāsurams, (நாய்க்கர் நாய்க்கர்கள்) Alvar Sri Sūkts (ஏழுறுவக்கர் ஏழுறுவக்கர்கள்) and Alvar Pādag (ஏழுறுவக்கர் ஏழுறுவக்கர்). The Alvars themselves did not give a Sanskrit name to their writings or songs.

Prabandham is the word used for the work or collection of songs of each ālvar.

Adhyayananam is the recitation of all the songs of an ālvār. This is usually done in connection with the celebration of the annual birth star or the Allai Tirunakshatram of the alvar. The term occurs in our inscriptions for the first time in 1475.

Iyal tuvakkam first occurs in 1476 (II. 68) and means the commencement of the recitation of a portion or portions of the works of the ālvārs. The reciters would join in a procession, make a commencement in the presence of the Utsava Murti at an appointed place. The songs will be recited in duet in the style known as Iyal (இயல் அல்லை) as distinct from Isai (இசை அல்லை). The Iyal or natural style is an adaptation of the manner in which Vedic texts are chanted. Correct pronunciation, punctuation, modulation and pause are its distinctive features. Isai style is singing to rāgam and tālam to the accompaniment of some musical instrument and with appropriate abhinayam or gestures.

Iyal Sevai (இயல் செவை, செவை அல்லை) refers to the course of recitation. Iyal Sāttu (இயல் சாட்டு அல்லை) is the termination or closing of the recital and is invariably done in the presence of the utsava murti at an appropriate stage of the procession.

Sattumurai (சதுமைருந்து) means the procedure observed on the closing or last day of the recital of an alvar’s works. (Sāttu—close or shut down). The word was first used in our inscriptions in 1475 in connection with Udayavar Sattumurai day in Tirupati.

Anusandhanam is prefixed to the name of a person who regulates the recitation in unison by the congregation. The persons who could function as such should be proficient in the recitation of the works of all the ālvārs (or the Vedas where the word refers to the Vedic recitation) should give the start and arrange the order in which the different portions should find precedence and be able to exercise due control over all the members so that the effect of the recital would be pleasing and grand. The reciters are known as Anusandhigal.

Adhyāyāpaka—means a competent teacher of the Vedas or the Prabandham. It is the same as Veda Bodhaka. The word occurs only once in the year 1684 A.D. (VI. 24).
The term Prabandham occurs in our inscriptions for the first time in II. 68; 23–11–1476 which gives particulars of an endowment by one Sri Sathakopadāsar Narasimha rāya Mudaliar in which provision is made for the recitation of the works of all the ālvars in Tirumala in front of Sri Ramanuja’s shrine. When the ālvārs’ works first came to be recited the description laid stress more on the food offering made than on how the recitation took place. Thus we have “towards tirumolippadi during the Vaikasi tirunāl from the second day to Tirthavari….” (I. 61; 1253 A.D.). “Towards Tiruppaivaippadi during the Chittirai and Purattasi tirunal…” (I. 74). The wording does not make it clear when and where the recitation was made. But in I. 107; 26–1–1360 the inscription clearly states that the endowment was for the recitation of Tiruvāyumoli and the offering of a paḍi (food) in that connection in front of the Tiruvāsal, or main entrance to the temple, on all the ten days of all the festivals after hearing the Tiruvāyumoli and while seated in the mantapam….” The wording lays stress on the point that the recitation was done to the hearing of the Deity and not far away somewhere. So also in inscription I. 187; 5–12–1390 the stress is on the recitation of Tiruppavai to the hearing of the Utsava Murti and Nāchchimār in the month of Margali. “… in Tiruppavai heard by Malai-kuniyaninran and Nāchchimār in Tirumala in the month of Margali

1. “…..புராணம் பிறக்க வருமான் வளப்பு வரிசுவர் குளாலாயிர் செல்லியிர்”

2. “…..காலக்குறைக்கு பிறக்க விளக்க உள்ளிட்ட உனிக் குறைப்பு நரமலை வருமான் முன்னாட்சிய ஓலைக்காதீ.”

3. “…..திருமால் வெளியாளர் காண்ட சித்திரைக்கு சித்திரையில் உன் புராணம் பிறக்கம் புராணம் புராணம் …”

4. “திருத்தாம்பிள்ளதம்…..குருகுரு கிருஷ்ண இன்ப பூங்காக—சித்திரையில் அப்தர்பாய அளை அராத்யமான் வள்ளக்கும் புராணம் அத் முன்னாட்சிய அளை என்று இறக்கையிர்” (I. 107, 26-1-1360). For

5. சித்திரையில் சிற்பாளின் மீது வெளியாளர் காண்ட உன் புராணம் பிறக்கம் புராணம் புராணம் புராணம் …”
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"Beginning from the Panguni Tirunal on every Pushpa-yagam festival day Malaikuniyanintra perunal hearing the Tiruväyamoli while being seated in the mantapam...."  

Anusandhanam.

It is only in the last named inscription that reference is made in line 11 to those who recited the Tiruväyamoli in the words ‘‘தமிழ்முறையில் அடுத்துள்ள உச்சலை கூறுதல் பற்ற வரும் பொருட்’’. Prasadam for the Sri Vaishnavas who recited (Anusanditta Sri Vaishnavas) the Tiruväyamoli. In the previous inscription the distribution of the food offerings to the reciters is not mentioned specifically. In later inscriptions these men are called ‘‘Anusandhigal’’ அணுவொடைப்பெண் and the recitation is called Anusandhanam. For a long time there seems to have been no definite expression adopted to designate the recitation.

The Aḻvars did contemplate the memorising and recitation of their songs and they used the Tamil word புறா (Odudal) and those who did it were known as புறார் (Oduvār). These words are still used by the Saivites who recite the Saivite Tamil works like Tiruvāchagam. Thus, Sri Nammalvar says—

``உருண்டை வரண்ட காரனாள் திருவாய்மோலி தென்னதியாரின் தமிழ்நாட்டில் நடைபெற்ற வரும் பொருட்

Tiruväyamoli I. 6. 11.

இதில் வாய்மோலின் தமிழ்நாட்டில் புறாய்மோலின் தென்னாரியின் வரும் பொருட்

Tiruväyamoli 9. 1. 11.

1. I. 220; 17-2-1446; ‘‘....... பாண்ட அடுத்துள்ள உச்சலை கூறுதல் பற்ற வரும் பொருட் கொன்ற மலக்கியின் பெண்கள் மலானாள் பண்ட குரு அடுத்துள்ள உச்சலை கூறுதல் பற்ற வரும் பொருட்.......’’
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Adhyayanam, Sevai, Anusandhigal, Anusandhanam.

Sri Vaishnavas however seem to have decided not to use the words Odal and Oduvar in connection with the recitation.
of the Alvar’s Prabandham. It may have been for two reasons. One, as hinted above, is that the words are in use in Saivite temples where Tamil songs are sung. The more potent reason might be that the Prabandhams having been considered to be as sacred as the Sanskrit Vedas and as it was settled that they should be recited side by side during the annual Vedic festival called Adhyayanothsavam, the recitation of the Tamil Prabandham on that occasion at least should also be designated as Adhyayanam. On other occasions it is called Sēvai (කාලාවාදය) and those who take part in the recitation as Anusandhīgal (II. 135, 26–8–1496) Anusandikkum Srivaishnavas or Sevikkum Srivaishnavas (II. 68, line 14 end).¹

**Shrines for the Alvars.**

It will be observed from what has been stated above that the Prabandhams of all the āḻvārs were not recited together at any one time. There were no shrines for all the āḻvārs in Tirupati. In Tirumala no āḻvār had a shrine whether within or outside the temple. Anything done to commemorate their name had to take place in front of Ramanuja’s shrine in the temple or in the presence of the Utsava Murti when He was taken out of the Garbha griham for asthanam or procession.

In Tirupati the first shrine for an āḻvar was that of Tirumangai alvar who was installed in 1234 A.D. Sri Nammāḻvar’s shrine which might have been in existence from earlier days was renovated and made a grand one in 1287 A.D. A shrine for Sri Āṇḍal was cordoned off a portion of the Chitrakūṭa mantapam in front of Sri Govindaraja’s shrine sometime after 1308 A.D. A shrine for Kulasekhara āḻvar was built by Kandāḍai Ramanuja Ayyangar and endowed in November 1468 A.D. (II. 36) for daily Naivedyam and for Satturai celebrated in Punarvasu Nakshatram in the Tamil month of Masi.² It was a one day function.

---

¹. *(அய்யல்லோக்கு வகுந்துச் சாலையில்* (I. 220, line 11 also II. 68 68 23-11-1476) II. 122, 2-4-1494).

². *(மூர்த்த குரு பிரதிநிதியான பவ்வதான் காஷு மரந்தன்.........*
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Tirumangai alvar’s Tiruvadhyayanam in Tirupati, 1475.

The first recognition of the greatness of an alvār by the Sthana­­nattar of the Tirumala temple was made on 20th October 1475 (II. 62)¹ in connection with the celebration of the annual birth asterism (or Āṭṭai Tirunakshatram) (krittikai in Kārtika month) of Tirumangai alvār when the Tiruvadhyayanam or recital of his works took place. This was also a one day function. A new convention was then set up of the alvār being taken in the morning to Sri Govindaraja’s temple for bringing by formal invitation Sri Govindaraja’s Utsava Murti with Nāchchimar to his own shrine, of giving the latter a ritualistic bath (or abhishekam) and food offering. In the meantime food offered (on payment) to Sri Venkateswara in Tirumala and appappañi, sandal paste, betel leaves with split nuts and a piece of cloth called parivaṭṭam first placed over the feet of the Deity² were all conveyed from Tirumala to Tirupati. At the foot of the Hill, the alvār would receive these prasādams and take them over in procession to his shrine. There would also be going on the recitation of his works (or Adhyayanam) throughout the day. In the evening there might or might not have been held a street procession of Sri Govindaraja along with the alvār. By what name the reciters were known and whether they received any special remuneration are not mentioned in the inscription. The kartar of the shrine was Emperumanar jiyar. It records in Tamil the events as detailed in English above. In line 10 the following expressions are used

1. "திருமல தர்ப்பான் சுதாரிச மாட்டியிய முத்ரை

2. "திருவாத்யன அம்மா ஒளி மாட்டியிய மாட்டியிய
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“...portion of the prasadam excluding the donor’s share and the akkâji prasadam shall be distributed at the time of the Tiruvelakkam distribution during the Adhyayanam.” The inscription also shows that the kartar of the ālvār’s shrine was one Emperumānar Jiyar and that the shrine had its own treasury.

Udaiyavar Emperumanar’s Tiruvadhyayanam in Tirupati, 1475.

There was likewise a Tiruvadhyayanam festival for Sri Udaiyavar Emperumanar in the Tirupati temple instituted by that same ardent Sri Vaishnava, Sathakopadāsaar Narasimharaja Mudaliar. The endowment was made in favour of Yatiraja Jiyar the kartar of the shrine of Udaiyavar (II. 63, 20–10–14751) for the celebration of the Sattumurai (closing day festival) of the Attai Tirunakshatram or the annual birth star day of Sri Ramanuja, Chitta in Chittirai month. This seems to have been a Tiruvadhyayanam lasting for some days. The inference is that Sri Ramanuja’s Sri Bhashyam and other works would have been read and recited on those days. But no attempt was made to bring prasadams etc., from Tirumala as was done for Tirumangai alvar’s Tiruvadhyayanam. It may be due to the fact that there was in the Tirumalai temple itself a shrine for Ramanuja and there would have been a celebration there though on a smaller scale. The celebration of the Tiruvadhyayanam was in itself an innovation.

Sri Ramanuja’s twelve days Tiruvadhyayanam festival in Tirumala.

The two innovations mentioned above seem to have been made more as feelers for doing what followed next on (II. 68)

1. “...portion of the prasadam excluding the donor’s share and the akkâji prasadam shall be distributed at the time of the Tiruvelakkam distribution during the Adhyayanam.....”
THE ALWARS’ PRABANDHAMS

23—11—1476. On that date an endowment was made by Sri Sathakopa dasar Narasimharaya Mudaliar for the celebration of Sri Ramanuja’s Tiruvadhyayanam in Tirumala for twelve days when his works would have been recited to his hearing during the twelve days “சூர்ய வாசனை செய்யும் வாழ்கூறு தொலை மதுவாகவே கருதியும் குண்டு கூறியும் பாண்டியாளர் பதியும்”. In addition to this provision was made for the recitation of the works of all the twelve alvars (including Sri Ändal) on the day of the birth asterism of the respective alvar in the solar month of his birth (called Ättai tirunakshatram, ஆட்டைதிருநக்ஷத்ரம் பெறும் நாளும்) and for the observance of the monthly asterism of Sri Ramanuja. These occasions are enumerated in detail in the inscription which gives also the name of the works of the concerned alvar which should be recited. The word used for ‘works’ is prabandhams (பிரபந்தங்கள்). The recitation should be made in every case to the hearing of Sri Ramanuja in his shrine “சூர்ய வாசனை செய்யும் வாழ்கூறு தொலை மதுவாகவே கருதியும் குண்டு கூறியும் பாண்டியாளர் பதியும்”. This inscription also tells us in clear terms as to who the reciters were and how they were treated in the matter of sharing prasadams. The dvija and the non-dvija Sri Vaishnavas called Sättina and Sättāda Srivaishnavas took part in the recitation and all received the prasadam due to them.1 This inscription makes it clear that the Prabandhams were equally open to all for recitation in the temple and that they were not the exclusive monopoly of the Brahmin Sri Vaishnavas or of any one section of them.

Iyal.

The expression இயல் இயாசத்தியர் ஐயர் தலையைத்தக்கத் (கூறு வள்ளியும் கூற்றுறுதியும்) appears for the first time but the word Iyal is not explained. The word இயல் (Iyal) is used when the recitation is made by a number of men walking in one or more lines in procession so that every word would be pronounced

1. Line 13 ‘“சூர்ய வாசனை செய்யும் வாழ்கூறு தொலை மதுவாகவே கருதியும் குண்டு கூறியும் பாண்டியாளர் பதியும்”
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clearly but not to the accompaniment of any musical instrument. That might have been the intended meaning. The wording given in inscription II. 109 (17-10-1493)\(^1\) brings out the meaning more clearly. The donor Soṭṭai Tirumalai Nambi Kumāra Tattayangar constructed a mantapam near the south-east corner of the madil or prākāram wall of the Tirumalai temple. On each of the twenty three days of the Adhyayanotsavam the Utsava murti would be taken in procession. After going upto the end of the blind lance called Sokkar kōdi and returning to the corner of the prakaram the Deity would be seated in the above mentioned mantapam. Those who took part in the recitation of the prabandham would have stood in a line called Iyal gōṣṭi and after prostrating before the Deity and receiving the Saṭhārī blessing the recitation would commence. The difference between the procedure given in II. 68 and that in II. 109 consists in the fact that in the former the recitation was not in procession nor in the presence of the Utsava Murti but before Ramanuja’s shrine whereas in 1493 it was done in the presence of the Deity and in walking procession.

Adhyayanotsavam explained.

It is not to be inferred from II. 109 that the Adhyayanotsavam in Tirumala was first instituted in 1493. In 1433 A.D. Sri Vira-pratapa Devaraya Maharaya II had made arrangements for 24 Brahmīns to recite the Vedas daily (two persons by turns being resident in Tirumala every month). The celebration of the Vedic ritual called Adhyayanotsavam would have been regularly celebrated since then. The recitation commences on the Sukla Ekadasi day in the Solar month of Dhanus (Tamil Margali) and the Sattumurai or closing day will be on the Bahula Panchami day of the same month. The period covered was only 10 days. It is

\(^{1}\) Line 8 'இத்துலவமண்டபம் விழாக்கின் திறந்த மலைக்கு கைகூடா இருந்து நூற்றாண்டுகளுக்கு விளையாடும் போல் பெருந்தாராஜ கல்வானை உள்ளிட்டு இயல் வல்லுப் பலன் விளங்கியது பலன் விளங்கியது...'}
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during these ten days that Sri Nammalvar’s Tiruvāyumoli consisting of 1102 verses came to be recited along side of the Sanskrit Vedas. The other portions of the Tamil Prabandham were tacked on later, the major portion (about 2000 verses) being recited on the ten days preceding the Sukla Ekādasi and some portion (about 1000 verses) after the Bahula Panchami day. The latter period was extended gradually from one day to three or four days. Thus the Adhyayanotsavam covered a period of 21 to 24 days gradually. It does not appear that the work known as Ramanuja Nūrrandādi (ராமநுஷான் நூர்நந்தை), hundred verses composed by one of Sri Ramanuja’s disciples known as Tiruvārangattu Amudanar (திருவாரங்கது அமுதனர்), was originally recited; but in later times it was added to be recited on one of the days from 21st to 25th days.

The wording of the festival as given in II. 31, 16-3-1468 shows that the Adhyayanotsavam covered only a period of 20 days (two tens).¹ Veḷḷai Tiruvōlakkam (food offering) was offered on the Tirudvādasi day (Mukkōṭi dvadasi) which occurs in the latter ten days of the Tiruvadhyayanam in the Margali month.

Adhyayanotsavam of Sri Govindarajaswami, 1458 A.D.

The next step was to celebrate the Adhyayanam as a Vedic ritual in Tirupati for Sri Govindarajaperumal and to attach thereto the recitation of the Prabandhams of all the Āḻvārs. There was already in Tirumala this Vedic ritual celebrated annually from about 1433 (as already stated). One Nallār Angāndai, one of the accountants of the temple and a disciple of Tiruvēṅkata Chakravarthi ayyangar, one of the acharyapurushas of Tirumala, constructed a mantapam in the Tirupati temple and made an endowment (II. 83; 6-6-1485) for seating the Utsava murti therein on several festival occasions. The Adhyayanam utsavam of Sri Govindaraja running for a period of twenty three days was one of the festivals. The portions of the Prabandhams to be recited

¹ “மார்க்கோண் முக்கோடி அர்ப்பனம் பெறுகின்ற ஈத்தற்கும் பொது பாண்டியம் ஆண்டுத் திருவாரங்கது”
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are, from Iyalpa to Nūṟṟandādi. In addition to this there is separate provision for food offering in connection with the Āṭtai Tirunakṣhatrams of Periya ālvār, Namālvār, Tirumangai ālvār, Kulasekhara ālvār and Udaiyavar on which occasions they would be taken to this mantapam (obviously accompanying Sri Govinda-rajaswamy). Thus the intimate connection of the ālvārs with the Adhyayanotsavam of Sri Govindaraja was established in 1485 by Nallar Angāndai’s endowment. The co-operation of Kumara Tattayyangar, the representative of the Prathamācharya purushas, was probably secured by tacking on to it the festival of “repairing the pathway to the water-fall for the Taṇṇir amudу function” (II. 85). It is a fragment of an inscription, but possibly of the date as the same former.

In August 1488 (II. 88) one Vignesvara Srīman, an accountant of the temple and disciple of Kumara Tattayyangar, installed in the Udaiyavar shrine an idol of Raghunatha (Sri Rama) and endowed for its daily worship and also the celebration of a large number of monthly and annual calendar days. The significance of this is that at any time the Udaiyavar temple could be freed from the control of the Sīhanattar. The recitation of Tiruppallī eluchchi and Tirumoli was a special feature. Food offerings were made to Sri Govindaraja and Sri Venkateswara on special occasions.

Adhyayanotsavam in Tirumala, 1491.

The celebration of the Adhyayanotsavam in Tirumala itself (for 23 days) is seen from an endowment made by one Pāsindī Venkattātutaivar, alias jiyar Ramanuṇa ayyān, (II. 95, 27–6–1491).²

---

1. வேந்தரைக்கன் திசையிலுணர்ச்சியின் விளக்கம் பக்தர் ஆமெய்கர்—முக்கிய வேறுபாடு இல்லை

2. புனிதச்சுவடயத்தில் குறிப்பிட்டு ஒவ்வொரு சாதனையும் சிறப்பு மிக்கும் குறையக்கும் வேறுவனால் முதல் விளக்கம் ஆயர் குண்டு விளக்கம் சிறுகிளியல் ஆயர் ஆயருக்கு விளக்கம் வேறுபாடு இல்லை
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Herein Jiyar Ramanuja ayyan associates himself with the festival of Taṅniramudu which commemorates the tradition that Sri Tirumalai nambi (the progenitor of the Prathamacharya purusha family of which Kumara Tatayyanger was the most prominent member at that time) was throughout his life-time bringing daily a pot of water from the Akāsa ganga water-fall for the abhishekam and puja of Sri Venkateswara. The same inscription refers to the publication in open assembly in the Tirumalai Temple of a work called Venkatachala Mahatmyam which the jiyar compiled. Again Yatiraja jiyar, kartar of a private flower garden called the Malaikuniyanimrān Nandavanam made an endowment (II. 107, 21–8–1493) for special food offering on the third day of the second ten days of the Adhyayanotsavam in Tirumala (called Ojīvilkāla chirappu). The Prabandham reciters were not given any share in the prasadams.

As was already discussed at length the most noteworthy endowment (II. 109, 17–10–1493) was made by Soṭṭai Tirumalai nambi Kumāra Tatayyanger, because it made the recitation of the Prabandham an organised affair with a definite place where the commencement should be made not only on all the 23 days of the Adhyayanotsavam but on 41 other festival occasions as well. Thus the Iyal recitation in walking procession came to be as important as the Vedas during all festivals and it was made to commence with the blessings and sanction of the Utsava murti at the mantapam constructed for the purpose by Kumara Tatayyanger. But he did not set up the practice of distributing among the Iyal reciters any portion of the donor's share of the prasadams.

Although the recitation of the Prabandhams in Iyal had become a regular feature of the festivals in Tirumala and Tirupati the reciters' claim to a share in the donor's share of the offered prasadams does not appear to have been considered. Koyil kelvi Ramanuja jiyar in his endowment II. 122 dated 2nd April 1494 (on behalf of his disciple Aruvilli Anantayyan Abhayan) for food

1. The tradition is that consequent on the hearing of an exposition of the ten verses by Sri Alavandar, Tirumalai Nambi went over to Tirumala and commenced doing the service of bringing water from Akāsa Ganga.
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offerings to be made on a number of festival occasions in Tirumala and Tirupati made provision for the distribution of two appams out of thirteen for each padi of the donor’s share to the reciters of Tiruvāyimooli. But his example does not appear to have been followed by other donors of the same period. One Periya Perumal dāsar, disciple of Periya Perumal Jiyar of the Pinsenravalli Nandavanam, did not apportion anything from out of the donor’s share of the food offering provided by him in II. 123 dated 8–4–1494 on the occasion of the Tiruvāyimoli Sattumurai (Adayavalam) in Tirumala in connection with the second ten days of the Tiruvadhyayanotsavam. So also Mahamandalesvara…Narasaraja Udaiyar (the first donor from among the princes to make an endowment in connection with the Adhyayanotsavam among other festivals) in his endowment II. 127 dated 5–6–1494 did not distribute any portion of the donor’s share of the prasadams to the reciters of the Prabandham. Other endowments of this type are II. 129 dated 6–11–1494; II. 130 dated 24–12–1494, and II. 138 dated 19–9–1504. The first is an endowment by the Sahaiyar of Tiruchchukanoor known as the Nūrreṇmar (நூரேன்மார்) or the assembly of 108 persons. The inscription tells us that the Adhyayanotsavam in Tirumala was only for twenty two days. The last one is an endowment by one Tiruvenkata chirukkan as the dharmam of Immaṇi Narasimharayar the son of Narsimharaya Maharaya which tells us that in 1504 the Adhyayanotsavam in Tirumala lasted for 24 days, that is from Iyala tuvakkam to Tanṭirāmudu tiruttunāl. On the same date there is another inscription (which is included in Vol. III of the T.T.D. inscriptions) III. 2 which gives details of an endowment by one Anusandhānam (அனுஷன்னஞாம்) Tiruvenkata jiyar of the Tiruvenkatanathan Tirunandavanam. Among the items of his endow-


II. 122; 2-4-1494.

2. (திருவல்லூரா பிரதான தவுக்கம் தொல்லியல் விள்ளையில் அஸ்தித்திருநூரேன்மார் விள்ளையில் வீதியான் தேவியில் விள்ளையில் அஸ்தித்திருநூரேன்மார் விள்ளையில் வீதியான் தேவியில் விள்ளையில் அஸ்தித்திருநூரேன்மார் விள்ளையில் 
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ment were food offerings called Iyalpa tuvakkam Sirappu, special offerings on the day of commencement of the Tiruvadhyayanotsavam in Tirumala and also certain offerings in Udayiyavar's temple in Tirupati on the days of the monthly birth star of the ālvārs. Those who took part in the recitation of the Prabandhams were given a share in both places.¹

It will be seen that so far as the Iyal was concerned those who took part therein were called அணுண்டிக்க இயல்தவ்ரகள் and with reference to the Srivaishnavas who recited each ālvar's Prabandham the term used is அணுண்டிக்கியன். The latter number would have been very limited. The difference in phraseology may be noted. The donor styled himself as Anusandhanānām Tiruvenkata Jiyan. It is the first time that such an epithet was used to describe a person.

Circumstances which helped Prabandham recital to gain ground.

It may be noted that Prabandham recital has been gaining ground from about 1468 A.D. It achieved marked success in 1476 A.D. as the result of the combined efforts of Srivaishnavas of all castes. In other religious centres there is stated to have been some opposition from devotees of other sects who were also worshippers of Vishnu. In Tirumala and Tirupati the case was

---

1. “Line 5. அணுண்டிக்க இயல்தவ்ரகள் பூமியக்க பூமியக்க மூடி இயல்பார் அர்எடு வேர்புரே இல்திருப்பீர்மாய்ந்த…”

Line 6. “இறுவந்தி இயல்பார்த்தயது வேர்புரே வேர்புரே இன் இறுகப்பிரேத்தான் இவ்வார்த்தை வேர்புரே அர்எடு வேர்புரே அர்எடு…”

Line 13. “அணுண்டிக்க இயல்பார்த்தயது பிள்ளாவுக்கிக்க கேள்வ நிலையில் பிள்ளாவைக்க கேள்வை இந்தச் சங்கமான் பற்றியால் இப்பட்டையில் இன்னையும் பிள்ளாவைக்க கேள்வை இந்தச் சங்கமான் பற்றியால் அணுண்டிக்க இயல்பார்த்தயது பிள்ளாவுக்கிக்க கேள்வ இந்தச் சங்கமான் அர்எடு…”
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different. From the days of the earliest ālvārs (say from about 500 A.D.). Tirumala was exclusively a Vishnu Kshētram. No Saivite saint has claimed Tirumala as a place sacred to Siva. There were no Saivite mathams (nor even Advaita mathams) there. The Vaikhanasa archakas were the only class of Vaishnavas who did not recognise the ālvār’s worth. They wielded great influence in the early days. But the lure of greater emoluments melted their opposition. They were the sole Dharmakartas of the temple of Sri Varahaswami in Tirumala and of the Āndāl’s shrine in Tirupati which added to their emoluments. One member of that family (Siṟṟappayyan) was accused of stealing the temple jewels. It was during Saluva Narasimha’s rule, that is, between 1460 and 1492 A.D. He was expelled from the temple, his properties and houses were confiscated then. Subsequently the house sites were granted in 1524 to Sri Vyasa Tirtha Sripāda Udayar (founder of the Uttarādi mutt in Tirupati and Tirumala) by Sri Krishnadevaraya Maharaya for building his mutt. The Archakas were consequently under a cloud during the rule of Saluva Narasimha. It was obviously during this period that the recitation of the Prabandhams received the recognition of the Sthanattar of the temple. Saluva Narasimha the ruler, was far away from Tirupati between the years 1472 and 1492 and his trusted lieutenant in temple matters Sri Kandadai Ramanuja ayyangar, with the cooperation of Sri Sathakopadasar Narasimharaya Mudaliar, Pasinḍi Venkatathuraivar and Kumara Tattayyangar, brought about rapid developments. After Saluva Narasimharaya’s death in 1492, the weakness of his son’s administration made further advances easier. His successor the Tuluva Vira Narasimha could not bestow any attention to the temple and his religious tenets as all his time till his death in 1509 A.D. was taken up with quelling insurrections in the Empire. It was during this period from about 1468 to 1509 A.D. that Prabandham recitation to Tirumala firmly established itself.

The beginnings of the anusandhanam office and how it was viewed by some famous acharyas.

During the reign of Immadi Narasimha, Sri Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar instituted a new festival (II. 135 dated
The Utsava Murti with the Nachchimar was taken over to a distant place called Onna tondān pāllam for a day and a host of temple servants accompanied the Deity. Cash remuneration was paid to the twenty nine members who accompanied and two of these were called Anusandhanis (அனுநுண்டி சாதனை). This shows that Prabandham recital had come to be recognised as a part of the temple ‘liturgy’; and recognition was given to two persons for doing this work. This enables us to surmise how Tiruvenkata jiyyar came to call himself Anusandhanam Tiruvenkata jiyyar in the inscription of 1504 A.D. He was not one of the two Koyil kelvi jiyars. He assumed a different role called Anusandhanam. Others who took part in the recitation were presumed to join him. The Sthanattar seem to have had no objection to the assumption of the title Anusandhanam by a person but the donors were not obliged to pay a cash emolument or even a portion of the prasadam to the person. Several inscriptions which record endowment of food offerings during the 23 days of the Adhyayanothsavam show that there was no distribution made to the Prabandham reciters nor is any person mentioned as the Anusandhanam officer.

One Mannar Pillai (III. 29; 28–12–1512) made an endowment for a festival in his flower garden in Mannasamudram village where amongst other temple servants the anusandhanam officer was paid a cash remuneration of one panam. But such an office does not appear to have been recognised by all Srivaishnavas. In subsequent endowments for food offerings during Adhyayanothsavam the claims of even the reciters for a portion of the food offerings were not recognised; but food was distributed to all Srivaishnavas present. One instance worthy of notice is contained in the endowment (III. 97; 17–8–1514) made by one Ekāki Tiruvenkatayyan, manager of the Tiruvāḷiparappinān tirunanda-vanam and disciple of Prativādi Bhayakaram Appāvayyangar (son of Vedantacharya P. B. Annan). He distributed the prasadams to all Srivaishnavas who took part in the Iyal and took no notice of the Anusandhanam officer. So also in III. 98 dated 17–8–1514

I. III. 9; 30-12-1506; III. 11; 4-10-1507; III. 13; 8-7-1508; III. 14; 19-9-1508. III. 16; 31-10-1508; III. 28; III. 12-9-1512.)
an endowment by Anusandhanam Udayavar Kovil Annan. He seems to be a rival claimant for the Anusandhanam office, “நூற்றாண்டுகளின் மற்றையன்று ஆண்டுகள், சுவாத்துச்சிற்றுக்கான மண்டவியல் விளைவுகள் பெரும்பாலும் சுட்டின், தாயகிவர் அவ்வரிகள் புனரமைந்ததும். Yatiraja jiwar Kartar of the Nammalvar temple accepted an endowment (III. 102; 4–5–1514) made by one Sattada Srivaishnava Pattar piran ayyan for food offerings to be made on the 11th day of the Adhyayanotsavam in that temple and distributed a portion among the Prabandham recitors “நூற்றாண்டு ஆண்டுகள் சுட்டின்...”. One Karnika Bhasavarasars made an endowment (III. 105; 12–9–1515) for taking out the Utsava Murti in Tirumala to his garden. The temple servants who accompanied the Deity were paid in cash for the extra labour involved. Among these were two anusandhanis who were paid two panams. It is probable that one was the agent for the recitation of the Vedas and the other for the Prabandham.

In the meantime Anusandhanam Tiruvanam jiwar of the Tiruvenkatanathan nandavanam who made an endowment on (III. 2) 19–9–1504 which provided for the distribution of a decent portion of the donor’s share of the prasadams and panyarams to Iyal reciters (one prasadam, two appams, two atirasams and one akkali mandai per day) became one of the Kovil kelvi jiyaars and therefore one of the Sthanattars of the temple. He made another endowment (III. 107) on 9–4–1516 perhaps to commemorate that event. It is seen from this inscription that he was attempting to fraternise with the jiwar of the Van Sathakopan mathan in Tirumala by giving over to the agent of that mutt—the jiwar of the Van Sathakopan matham was not a resident of Tirumala—a portion of the donor’s share of the food offerings ignoring in this manner the claims of the numerous nandavanam jiyaars resident in Tirumala and Tirupati. There might have been some jealousy displayed by the other nandavanam jiyaars which made Tiruvanam jiwar to retaliate in this manner. The Kovil kelvi jiyaars were also cultivating nandavanams and playing the part of respectable pilgrim receivers. The other Jiyaars were all competitors in the same field. Tiruvanam jiwar might have
looked to the help and co-operation of the absentee Van Sathakopan jiyar in his possible desire to be the anusandhanam officer in addition to the Koyil kelvi office to which he had been recently called. But the jiyar of the Van Sathakopan mutt, Sriman Narayana jiyar, did not reciprocate. He made two endowments (III. 110; 20–8–1516 and III. 114; 7–11–1516) which were in connection with the Adhyayanotsavams of Sri Venkateswara, Sri Govindaraja, the alvars (Nammalwar, Tirumangai alvar and Kulasekhara alvar) and Sri Udaiyavar. There were food offerings made on these occasions. But no portion of the donor’s share was given to Koyil kelvi Tiruvenkata jiyar nor even to the Prabandham reciters in those temples. He made only these two endowments. They were probably intended to show that while he was not behind the Koyil kelvi and any of the other jiyars in making the Prabandham recital a permanent feature of the Tirumalai temple he had no desire to entangle himself and his disciples in the unseemly wrangle for the anusandhanam office and its probable emoluments. The anusandhani would commence the recital in a formal manner, he would select the portions to be recited and keep order. Therefore there was a glamour about the office, if one such had been recognised by the Sthanattar. One Sittamusetti of Narasingapuram (III. 118; 27–11–1517) who was probably a disciple of the Van Sathakopan mutt did not distribute the donor’s share to the Iyal reciters. The temple accountants (III. 121; 31–10–1517) did not recognise the anusandhanam office, while the Iyal reciters were recognised. But Koyil kelvi Tiruvenkata jiyar continued to show his regard for the Van Sathakopa jiyar even till November 1520 as will be shown presently.

The famous Vedantacharya Doḍḍa ayyangar Appai\(^1\) made an endowment (III. 132; 13–4–1519) which mainly provided for the recitation of Tirumangai alvar’s Tirumoḷi while the Utsava Murti (Malai kuniya ninra perumal) would be seated in the Shrine

---

1. ‘‘

    ‘
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of Sri Varahaswami on 40 days during eight Tirukkoḍi Tirunals (Brahmotsavams) and also for the recitation of the portion of Sri Nammalvar’s Tirovāyamolī known as Kilaroli-įḷamai during the Adhyayanotsavam. The wording of the inscription shows that a portion—one atirasam and two sidai—out of 13 of each which was the donor’s share was distributed among Srivaishnavas in general but not exclusively to the reciters. That this famous achārya preferred not to single out the reciters for preferential treatment is probably because neither the Vedas nor the Tirovāyamolī should be recited for profit whether in the shape of food or of coins.

An endowment by one Perumāḷ Mudaliar of Nāgalapuram (III. 136; 10—9—1519) tells us that the Adhyayanotsavam in Tirupati lasted for 25 days and no portion of the donor’s share was distributed among Srivaishnavas. Kuppa Venkatattararasu and Venkatattraivar Siddhayyan, accountants made a special endowment (III. 138; 11—12—1519) in connection with the Nuṟṟandādi Sirappu in Tirumala and in Tirupati during the Adhyayanotsavam. In Tirumala no portion of the donor’s share was distributed whereas in Tirupati a portion was distributed among all Srivaishnavas.1 In another endowment of Venkatattarasu (III. 141; 24—11—1520) for Tiruppalli ėḻuchchi recital no part of the donor’s share was distributed.

Koyil kelvi Tiruvenkata jiyar later became Periya Koyil kelvi jiyar and an endowment made by him (III. 139) on 6th October 1520 shows that he continued his regard for the Van Sathakopan matham by handing over to the manager of that matham the donor’s share of the food offering made in connection with the celebration of his own annual birth star Uttiram. In Tirupati he had it distributed to the Sri Vaishnavas who took part in the recitation of the Prabandham. In the next endowment also (III. 140) made on 24th November 1520 in connection with the Tiruppallanḍu Sirappu and the Ārāvamudu Sirappu during the

1. ‘‘இந்தியருணால் ஆதிக்கவிளை கிருட்பிணி 
 காரணிக்கு பக்தப்பிரிந்த இரு. க..........’’
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Adhyayanotsavam in Tirumala the donor’s share was given away to the brahmin in charge of the Van Sathakopan matham. In two other items of food offering the donor’s share was distributed to the reciters of the Prabandham (அந்நிதிக்கும் செய்துற்றுக்கூண்டு).

In his endowment (III. 143; dated 5th December 1520) he is described with the titles “Srimad Vēdamārga Pratishīpanāchārya Paramahamsa parivrājakāchārya.”  Therein provision was made for food offering on a number of days of the Brahmustsavams and in the Tirumangai alvar temple. The Van Sathakopan matham is not one of the beneficiaries of the donor’s share. It is divided among the managers of the Pankayacheli-matham, Malaininran matham, Tirumangai alvar koyil jiyar and the reciters of the Iyal.

This inscription indicates the high water mark of Tiruvenkata jiyar’s life, for by the month of December 1520 the differences which existed between him and the other Nandavanam jiyars seem to have been solved. There was no necessity to court the friendship of the manager of the Van Sathakopan matham.

How the Prabandam recital was viewed by some great Vishnu Bhaktas who were not Sri Vaishnavas is contained in Inscription (III. 165; dated 8th December 1524) which records a munificent endowment made by Srimat Vyāsatirtha Sripāda Udaiyar, Srimat paramahamsa parivrājakāchārya Padavākya pramāngā, Durvādi-garva sarvasvāpahāra, Srimat Vaishnava Siddhānta pratishthāpanāchārya and Sakala Vidvat jana mana padmavana Saupastika.

1. “இறைவன் நிற்க ஓவியம் பரம்மவன் வாழ் விருதாக்கம் விளக்கின் விதன்...”

2. “இறைவன் நிற்கும் விளக்காக்கும் அம்மல் என்று இறைவன் வாழ் விருதாக்கம் விளக்கின் விதன்...”

3. “இறைவன் நிற்க ஓவியம் பரம்மவன் வாழ் விருதாக்கம் விளக்கின் விதன்...”
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

He was granted on 12th January 1524 (III. 157) two sites for building his mathams in Tirumala and Tirupati which during the reign of Saluva Narasimha were confiscated from one of the Archakas (SIRRAPPAYYAN) as he stole some temple jewels. He was also shown some other favours by Sri Krishnadeva Maharaya the grantor. He made endowment to Sri Venkateswara and to Sri Govindarajaswami for food offerings on a number of festival occasions. These include the ones made in connection with the Adhyayanotsavams in Tirumala for 24 days and in Tirupati for 22 days. The noteworthy point about these offerings is that no portion of the donor's share was distributed to the Sri Vaishnavas, not to speak of those reciting the Prabandhams. The Sthanattar and the other temple servants were given their usual shares. This shows that although Sri PADA Udaiyar respected all festivals celebrated in the Temples, he did not countenance the Prabandham recital to any extent.¹

Koyil kelvi Ramanuja jiyar, kartar of the Pankayachchelli nandavanam who seems to have succeeded Tiruvenkata jiyar in that matham made an endowment (III. 173; 19—7—1527)—probably to commemorate that event—which provides for food offerings to Sri Venkatesa, Sri Govindaraja and in the alvar temples. From the donor’s share the reciters of the Iyal Prabandhams were remunerated.²

Some of the disciples of the Van Sathakopa jiyar also made an endowment (III. 178; 19—11—1528) through one Ulagapperumānār of Paramesvara mangalam for food offerings in connection with the Arāvamudu Sirappu celebration during the Adhyayanotsavam.

---

¹ 'அுருண்பாலவுக்கு வச்சிருந்துள்ள வீரவியன் கிலா கிலா பேர்கல்லு படுத்தமும்'
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savams of Sri Venkatesa, Sri Govindaraja and Udayavar. They divided the donor’s share equally between the Tiruppani Bhandarattar and the Iyal reciting Srivaishnavas. This was done probably to show that they had as much interest in the Prabandhams as the Koyil kelvi and other jiyars although their own acharyas was not a resident of Tirumala.

**Change in the Relationship between the Koyil kelvi and the Van Sathakopan jiyar.**

A close reading of inscriptions (III. 143; 5—12—1520; III. 173, 19—7—1520 and III. 178, 19—11—1528) shows that a change was taking place in the relationship between the Koyil kelvi jiyars and the Van Sathakopan matham. Tiruvenkata jiyar who was fraternising with the Van Sathakopan matham till the 24th November, 1520 ignoring the existence of the numerous other jiyars of his own tenets seems to have changed his attitude on 5th December of the same year which is to be seen in his endowment (probably on the occasion of his assuming the honorifics of Srimad veda marga etc.) wherein the distribution of the donor’s share of the prasadam was made to jiyars of his own tenets. Sriman Koyil kelvi Ramanuja jiyar (probably his successor in office) made an endowment on 19—7—1527 which shows that although the food offerings were made for Sri Venkatesvara and Sri Govindaraja the donor’s share was not distributed to the Iyal reciters in general in these temples. They were taken over to Tirumangai alvar shrine to Udayavar Shrine and to the shrines of the other alvars to be distributed there among the Iyal reciters in those shrines.¹

---

1. "..."
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

There was thus a new policy adopted with the result that the Iyal reciters in general did not enjoy the benefits. This might have been done with a view to make the āḻvār's shrines places where also the Prabandhams should be recited on such occasions before food distribution is done. The endowment made by the disciples of the Van Sathakopan matham (III. 178; 19—11—1520) seems to express their disapproval of the above disruptive tendency. The trustees for this were not the Sthanattar but their rivals the Tiruppani Bhandarattar. The latter were given prominence in the temple by the Emperor Sri Krishna Deva Maharaya himself. In the eyes of the Van Sathakopa matham’s disciples the presence of the Koyil kelvi jiyars as members of the Sthanattar was sufficient to make them veer to the Tiruppani Bhandarattar to whom they assigned one half of the donor’s share. The other half was distributed in the temple itself among all Srivaishnavas who recited the Prabandham.¹

On 31st March 1530 (IV. 3) Kandādai Ramanuja Ayyangar manager of the temple gold treasury and karta of the Ramanujakutam made a large endowment providing for food offerings to Sri Venkatesvara and Sri Govindaraja on many festival occasions and also during the Adhyayanotsavams of Sri Nammalvar, Sri Tirumangai alvar, Sri Kulasekhara alvar and Udaiyavar. He did not distribute to the Iyal reciters any portion of the donor’s share, but had it all sent over to the Ramanujakutam to be distributed there to pilgrims. But Sri Tallapakkam Tirumalai Ayyangar made a distribution of two atirasams out of thirteen

¹ ""சீலை விளக்கார் பெய்மையாக குளிர்மை போன்றாலால் தெருவில்லாத் தமிழ் தமிழ் வாகன அந்தாரசுடைய பசுண்டித்ததன் பயன்களையும்..."

1. ""சீலை விளக்கார் பெய்மையாக குளிர்பாரைகள் போன்றாலால் தெருவில்லாத் தமிழ் தமிழ் வாகன அந்தாரசுடைய பசுண்டித்ததன் பயன்களையும்..."
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per day which was the donor’s share of atirasappadi to the Iyal reciters (IV. 6; 31—10—1530) in the temples only.¹

One Rama Bhāṭṭar son of Bhūtānātha Sishta Bhattar of Chāndragiri made an endowment (IV. 18) on 18—2—1532 for the celebration of certain festivals for Sri Govindaraja and Sri Rama when the Utsava Murtis were taken out in procession. In this connection cash payment called Tirukkai vaḷakkam (திருக்கை வாழ்க்காம்) was made to the temple servants engaged in the task. One panam was paid to ‘Anusandhani’ (அனுந்தாண்டனி). The word being in the singular number, whether it refers to the person who recited the Vedas or to the one who recited the Prabandhām is not clear. The probability is the latter, in which case the policy adopted by Ramanuja jiyyar had the effect of uniting all the discordant jiyar elements in Tirumala to acknowledge one man to be the anusandhanam officer in the temple. Whether it was one of the Koyil kelvi jiyars or some other person is not clear.

The next endowment (IV. 31; 3—7—1534) by Srimati Periya Kommamman, queen of Sriman Mahamandalesvara Sālakarāja Periya Tirumalayya deva Maharaya and spiritual disciple of Sriman Koyil Kandādai Anṇan (of Srirangam) is interesting as it is the first instance of a member of the royal family making an endowment in which the recitation of the Prabandhām of the alvars was formally recognised. She constructed a mantapam in a flower garden called the Varadanāṟaṇān Nandavanam (probably for the merit of Achyutaraya Maharaya’s queen Varadajī amman). She provided for food offerings to be made there on some festival occasions. THE ERECTION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE SHRINE FOR THE THREE MUDAL ALVAR S IS ALSO MENTIONED IN THIS INSCRIPTION FOR THE FIRST TIME. She made over twelve atirasams out of thirteen which was the donor’s share of the food offerings to the Iyal reciters and one atirasam

¹ “திருநாள் வாழ்க்காம் புல்லாமணி மகாரங்க அமர்நா”
to the desantri in the Tiruvālīparappinān Tirunandavanam. The nandavanams in which she seems to have been interested are சிவவக்கயந்தக் குடம்ப இத்துறவாவ, and கில்லை பாண் ஏன் இத்துறவாவ.

**Iyal Sattumurai done at the Balipitham.**

Periya Koyil kelvi Yatiraja Jiyar of the Perarulālan Nandavanam and Koyil kelvi Vaḍa Tiruvēnkalata Jiyar made endowments (IV. 45; 19—10—1535 and IV. 46; 7—7—1535 respectively) wherein food offerings to be made in Tirumala and Tirupati are mentioned. Out of the donor’s share of thirteen in the latter endowment nine were made over to his acharya Tiruvāyomipperumāl Nayinar; two only for distribution to the Iyal reciters and two to the Pankaya chelli matham. From another offering a small portion was given to the Iyal reciters in the Udayavāy shrīne. The former inscription does not show clearly what portion the Iyal reciters received.

*The second inscription dated 7th July 1535 is interesting for we learn therefrom for the first time that the Iyal recital took place at the Balipitham in Sri Venkatesvarā’s temple after the Utsava Murti’s return from the street procession during the festival.*

2. The old procedure was to recite the Tiruvāyomli when the Utsava murti was seated in a mantapam in front of the main door-way of the temple (Tiruvāsal) after returning from the street procession.

**Lakshmidevi Mahotsavam—no recital of Prabandhams.**

The Emperor Achyutaraya Maharaya made an endowment IV. 54 dated 26th December 1535 for the annual celebration in

1. ‘அம்ம சமுர்நத்தில் அரவதியில்கால சிறை காட்டு அதிரடி மாடுக்கட்சியே விளக்கம் வெளிவங்கை அத் தவறு பாம் கில்லை பாண் இத்துறவா உத்தீர்த்த குடம்ப பாண் ஆதி ரூபா அதிரடி எோ.’

2. Line 4 ‘மகாரூர்ந்திற்கு பாணுக்காக சிறை வட்டத்தை செய்யவிடு விளக்கம் வெளிவங்கை அம்ம சமுர்நத்தில்கால வெளிவங்கை உத்தீர்த்த குடம்ப பாண் ஆதிரடியோ...’
THE ALWARS' PRABANDHAMS

Tirumala of a new festival commemorating the marriage of Sri Venkatesvara with Alarmel Mangai Nāchchiyar, also called Lakshmīdevi Mahotsavam. In that connection payments for the recitation of the Vedas and the reading of the Puranas were provided (4 and 3 rekhai pon respectively) but none for the recitation of the Prabandhams or Iyal. While making payments for the paraphernalia and the persons composing the daily procession the members of the temple establishment were given cash. The anusandhanam was paid 2 panams in this connection. Whether this amount was paid to the leader of the Vedaparayananam or the Prabandham or to both is not clear. What is clear is that Prabandham was not placed on a footing similar to the Vedas and the Puranas in the marriage ritual.

When street processions were taken out for the Útsava Murti and when he was taken over to gardens outside the usual temple limits it became the practice to engage the Iyal reciters as part of the paraphernalia and the anusandhanam officer, or head of the Iyal reciters, was paid one panam. Thus Rayasam Rama-chandra Dikshitar of Kaḍalādi and Ramabhaṭṭar ayyan of Chandragiri (IV. 59 and IV. 61 dated 26—12—1535) paid one panam to anusandhanam in connection with their ubhayams in their garden mantapams during the Summer festival and a portion of the donor’s share was distributed among the Iyal reciters. One Ellappāpillai (IV. 67; 23—3—1536) paid one panam for anusandhanam during his Brahmotsavam ubhayam. One Ramanuja dāsar (obviously a Sattāda Srivaishnava and disciple of Kândur Appaiyangār) in connection with his ubhayams on similar occasions (IV. 69; 16—3—1536) not only made no payment for anusandhanam but also distributed three iddali out of thirteen which was the donor’s share of prasadams to the Nāṭṭu Srivaishnava Iyal reciters and another share to the Sattada Srivaishnavas. From IV. 77. 15—12—1536 it is seen that Vaḍa Tiruvenkata jiyar was cultivating a flower garden which belonged to one Perunkonḍai (Penukonḍa) Virappanṇan, son of Lepakshi Nandi-Lakki Setti and received a portion of the donor’s share of prasadam for that work; that Periya Koyil kelvi jiyar got another share and so on. In this race the Iyal reciters got nothing.

747
Attitude of Achyutaraya’s generals and Chief officers towards Prabandham recital.

There are more than a dozen principal officers under the Emperor Achyutaraya Maharaya who made large endowments for the celebration of ubhayams on numerous festival occasions such as the nine Brahmotsavams and the 25 days of the Adhyaya-notsavams (including the one for Udayavar). In no instance was a portion of the donor’s share of the prasadams distributed among the Iyal reciters.¹

Instances when Prabandham reciters were not remunerated.

One Koyil kelvi Tiruvenkata jiyar of the Perarulālaṇ nandanavanam made an endowment (V. 137, 8-11-1539) for celebrating Tiruppallandu and Neḍumārkadimai sirappu during the Adhyaya-

¹. The names of the officers are:—

IV. 81. 12-1-1537; Adaippam Visvanātha Nayakkar (the founder of the Madura Nayak dynasty). Gardener is the recipient.

IV. 82; 12-1-1537; Krishnappa Nayakkar. Recipient Perarulāla Nayinar Appai.

IV. 83; 12-1-1537; Bāchcharasayyar son of Srirāmayyangar Recipient, self.

IV. 84; 12-1-1537; Rāmābhattarayan son of Bhutanātha Sishta bhattar of Chandragiri. Recipient self.

IV. 86; 12-1-1537; Immadi Ellappa Udayiar of Vāṅgāpuram. Recipient flower gardener Narayanan.

IV. 88; 12-1-1537; Salakaraja Singaraja, Recipient his sister’s ācharya.

IV. 110; 6-9-1538; Adaippam Baiyappa Nayakkar. Recipient self.

IV. 152; 31-12-1540. Periya Timmappan and Chinna Timmappan sons of Basava Nayakkar. Recipient, Sattāda Srivaishnava Tiruttani Appayan cultivating his flower garden.

IV. 153; 31-12-1540; Dalavāy Timmarasayyar (commander, Chandragiri Fort). Recipient self.

IV. 158; 27-1-1541; Perunkondai Virāppannagal. Recipient self.

IV. 161; 28-5-1541; Rayasam Kondamarasayyar. Recipient self.

IV. 166. 5-11-1541; Saluva Govindaraja. Recipient self.

IV. 170; 10-2-1542; Sālakaraja Singaraju. Recipient his acharya Tirumalai Tāttayyangār.
notsavam in Tirumala (நோடச்சாம்பிரபாந்தம்) and பிரபாந்தம் பல்வேறு போற்று. Even he did not distribute the donor’s share among the Iyal reciters. There are also other notable instances where no portion of the donor’s share was distributed among Iyal reciters.\(^1\)

**Payment for Anusandhanam.**

A perusal of the endowments made in Vol. V. of the T.T.D. Inscriptions shows that whenever the Utsava Murti was taken out to a flower garden or similar place payment was made for anusandhanam as was done for the other services. Wherever Vedapārāyanam and Prabandham were recited the payment was 2 panams, but where Prabandham alone was requisitioned one panam was paid. The distribution of a portion of the donor’s share of the prasadams offered to the Deity was a matter which the donor decided according to his discretion. In some cases the distribution was made among all Sri Vaishnavas, in some to Nāttu Sri Vaishnavas only and in some to the Iyal reciters only. There seems to have been no hard and fast rule in the matter. The Anusandhanam seems to have been generally paid for; but who the recipient was is not mentioned in any case. It probably was not one of the Koyil kelvi jiyars. If one of the two jiyars was the recipient the fact would have been stated since both were members of the committee of Sthanattar and commanded influence.

In V. 2. (27—1—1542) which provided for the celebration of the annual birth star of Sri Ramanuja in Tirumala, anusandha-

\(^1\) Sri Tāḷḷapākkam Periya Tirumalai Ayyangar’s (IV. 155. 1-2-1541) ubhayams for Tiruppalli eluchchi and during Adhyayanotsavam in Tirumala.

Ekangi Pērarulālayyan disciple of Prativadi Bhayankaram Emperumānār Appa grandson of P. B. Annan (IV. 156, 13-2-1541).

Srimati Venkatattar daughter of acharyapurushas Siru Tiruvencata Chakravartti Ayyangar (IV. 162; 8-6-1541).

Periya Koyil kelvi Yatiraja jiyar disciple of Alagiya manavāla jiyar of the Perarulālan matham. (IV. 163; 21-6-1541) Recipients Nāttu Srivaishnavas, Periya Koyil kelvi Yatiraja jiyar and the gardener of Perarulālan garden. There is also a payment of one panam for anusandhanam because the Utsava Murti was taken to the Perarulālan flower garden in connection with the Vidāyarri festival of the Ani Brahmostsavam.
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nam was paid one panam. The donor being one of the Koyil kelvi jiyars, Vedapārāyanam was obviously not paid for. A portion of the donor's share of the prasadams was distributed among all Srivaishnavas and other portions were given to Anandam pillai jiyar, Koyil kandañai Aññan, kartar of the Alagiyamanavalan matham etc.

Anandampillai Appayrangar, one of the acharyapurushas of the temple who made an endowment (V. 7; 1—9—1543) in connection with the 11th day of the Adhyayanotsavam (Kaṇṇinun Siruttāmbu Sirappu) distributed one prasadam and one appam out of thirteen which was the donor's share of the offered prasadams in Tirumala and Tirupati among the Nāṭṭu Srivaishnavas who recited the Iyal Prabandham. Mañṭla Varadaraya made an endowment (V. 11; 5—1—1544) for ubhayams during Brahmotsavam in Tirumala, also for Hunting and Vannimaram festivals. From out of the donor's share of the prasadam the Nāṭṭu Srivaishnavas reciting Iyal Prabandham were given one appam out of thirteen which was the donor's share. But payment was not made for anusandhanam.

So also Sevvu Setti (V. 12; 11—5—1544) whose endowment was in connection with festivals when the Utsava Murti was taken to different mantapams far away from the Tirumalai temple gave two vadai out of thirteen which was the donor's share for distribution among the Nattu Srivaishnavas while the major share was given away to Kumara Tattayyangar and Tirumalai Appayyangar. Nothing was set apart exclusively for the Iyal reciters. Anantālvān Kuppayyan (V. 15; 1545 A.D.) made an endowment in connection with Sri Ramanuja's Adhyayanotsavam including Nūṟṟandādi and Tanniramudu festival. He was himself the recipient of the donor's share and there was no distribution made of the prasadams to Iyal reciters. One Kañṭha Mūrti Nāyakkar (V. 19; 7—8—1544) made a large endowment for food offerings in connection with his ubhayams during the Āni Brahmotsavam in Tirumala. The donor's share of the prasadams was distributed freely to all devotees Srivaishnavas getting of a portion of the better varieties. There was a payment of 2 panams for anusandhanam which would mean that the Vedas and Prabandham were both remunerated.
One Vangāpuram Narayana Setti, a merchant of Tirupati and disciple of Anandam pillai Ayyangar made a large endowment (V. 25; 19—10—1544) for celebration of Damarārohana Vasan-totsavam festival for Sri Govindaraja, Koyal alvar Tirumanjanam etc. Among the payments for special services rendered by the temple staff there was 5 panams for recitation of the Vedas, one panam for Tiruvāymoṭi and one panam for anusandhanam (the last mentioned would refer only to the Prabandham recitation). The major portion of the donor’s share of the prasadams and paniyarams was distributed among prominent men like Kumara Tāttayyangar, Anandam pillai Ayyangar, Sthanattar etc. There was a small portion i.e., two panyarams out of 13 which was donors’ share to be distributed among Naṭṭu Sri Vaishnavas and dēsāntaris. But the Iyal reciters did not receive special attention

One Ramanuja Timmayyan (V. 26; 22—10—1544) whose endowment was in connection with the Adhyayanotsavam in Tirumala did not distribute any portion of the donor’s share among Iyal reciters nor even to Srivaishnavas in general. The donor’s share was divided between the donor and his flower gardener.

Aravidu Bukkaraja Aliya Ramaraja made an endowment in connection with the Mukkōṭi Dvadasi festival in Tirumala and in Tirupati (V. 29; 19—1—1545). The temple servants who had to do extra work were paid therefor. But Prabandham recital does not appear to have been made. There was no payment for anusandhanam nor was any portion of the food offerings given to Prabandham reciters.

Sri Tāḷaḷapākkam Periya Tirumalai Ayyangar made an endowment (V. 34; 19—3—1545) for celebrating the Sattumurai festival of Sri Nammalvar’s Adhyayanotsavam in Alvār Tirtham, Tirupati. Payment was made to all the temple servants for the extra labour involved. The Iyal reciters do not find a place nor the anusandhanam. The donor received the entire quantity of prasadams due to him. He made another endowment V. 47-A. (1545 A.D.) for celebrating a Vanabhojanam (garden party to the Deity). Large quantities of food offering were made. All the temple servants were given extra remuneration. There was
a payment of 2 panams for anusandhanam which would mean that Vedic and Prabandham recitation were both paid for. The omission of this payment in two previous endowments of his was remedied by its inclusion in this endowment. Thus Anusandhanam was fully recognised by Tirumalai Ayyangar although there was some delay or hesitation in the matter. There was however no distribution of food offerings to Iyal reciters.

Kandadai Srirangachariar, son of Bhavanacharya, made an endowment to commemorate the birth nakshatrams of his forebears and his own and the annual birth star of Sri Ramanuja and also in connection with the car festival in Tirumala during Brahmotsavam (V. 48; 5—7—1545). There would have been Prabandham recital on these days. There was no distribution of food offerings to Iyal reciters as such but two dosais per padi were distributed to Naṭṭu Srivaishnavas. There was no payment made for anusandhānam.

Araviti Bukkaraja Ramaraja Tirumalarajayyan disciple of the above Kandadai Srirangachari instituted a new festival called Pallavōtsavam on a grand scale (V. 51; 7—7—1545). There was provision made for Vedic recitation at a cost of 15 panams; Tiruvāymoḷi at 4 panams among other items. Anusandhanam was paid one panam. The donor’s share of the prasadams was giving away entirely to his acharya.

One (Potlapāṭi) Timmarajayyan (V. 53; 15—2—1545) made a large endowment for food offerings in connection with several festivals. Although the major part was given away for special services the food offerings made in connection with the singing of Tiruppaḷṭi eluchchi during the Margali month were distributed freely to all devotees, and not exclusively for Sri Vaishnavas. There was no payment for anusandhanam.

Udayagiri Devaraja Bhaṭṭar (V. 66; 25—3—1546) made a large endowment for celebration of certain festivals for Sri Venkatetesvaraswami and Sri Govindarajaswami in Tirupati. Payment was made to all the members of the temple establishment for extra work done in that connection. There was no payment.
for anusandhanam nor was Prabandham recited in Vithalesvarsu-
swami temple. All the prasadams offered on the days of the
Brahmotsavam were distributed freely to all devotees. So also
Tallappakkam Periya Tirumalai Ayyangar distributed freely the
donor’s share of the offered prasadams to the devotees in connection
with the installation of Sri Lakshminarayana Perumal in Alvar
Tirtham (V. 68; 20—6—1546). There was no payment for anu-
sandhanam. In connection with the celebration of the Vaivāhikōt-
savam of Sri Venkatesa instituted by Tallappākkam Tiruvēnkat-
nathar, son of Tirumalai ayyangar (V. 71; 17—7—1546), several
special services were paid for among which ‘anusandhanam:2
panams’ is one; again in connection with Hunting festival one
panam for anusandhanam was paid.

Araviti Timmarajayyan, son of Timmaraja in his endowment
(V. 78; 21—9—1546) for food offerings to be made on several
occasions has included one iddali padi per day on all the 12)
Brahmotsavam festival days for Tiruvāymoilisāttu when the Utsava
murti arrives at the main entrance on Vahanam presumably after
the street procession. It was also the occasion when the Tiru-
vāymoil was first recited in Tirumala and food offering made
in that connection (Vol. I. 107; 26—1—1360). Perhaps the old
endowment made by one Chedirayan was defunct and Timma-
rajayyan renewed it. That part of the inscription which would
show how the prasadam was distributed is covered by a mantapam.
Tiruvēnkatā Bhayakkara Ayyā Bhaṭṭar built a mantapam in front
of his house in Tirumala called Tirumōlpāḍi (V. 83; 11—11—1546)
mantapam where the Utsava Murti would be accommodated and
Tirumōli sung after parivaṭṭam was tied to his head on payment
of fees. The dosaiippadi offered on this occasion was distributed
freely to all as was the old usage “நூற்றாண்டு தேசியாராக
சலவாடுமே”. One panam was paid for anusandhanam. Sevvu
Nayakkar (V. 86; 13—1—1547) paid one panam for anusan-
dhanam in connection with the Hunting festival of Periya Raghun-
natha in Tirupati. There was no distribution of food offering to
Iyal reciters.

In connection with the Hunting festival celebrated for
Vithalesvarapperumal in Tirupati by the Prasādakkārār Maha-
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médanga (V. 88; 6–2–1547) payment was made for all other services. Anusandhanam was omitted and there does not appear to have been Iyal recital. Udayagiri Devaraja Bhattar does not appear to have encouraged Prabandham recital. For it is found that in his endowment (V. 89; 6–3–1547 and V. 90; 12–5–1547) making provision for payment to every kind of service for daily worship of Sri Vithalesvaraperumal Prabandham recital has not found place. For daily Vedaparayanam 1 Rekhai pon and 2 panams were paid per month. But in his endowment (V. 91; of 1547) for celebrating certain festivals for Sri Venkatesvara, Sri Govindaraja, Sri Achyuta perumal etc., he provided that three prasadams out of every taligai offered to the Deity should be distributed to the Iyal reciters as per the ancient usage. It is thus learnt from the above wording that Iyal recital in festival processions had become a usage and also distribution of a certain portion of the food offerings to the reciters an established usage.

Sottai Eṭṭur Tirumalai Nambi Srinivasa ayyangar son of Kumara Tattayangar (acharyapurusha) endowed a large village yielding an annual income of 2000 Rekhai Pon called Periya Ekkalur for the celebration of a number of festivals when food offerings were made (V. 92; 3–6–1547). Phalōtsavam was a new festival instituted by him in Tirumala. In this connection Vedaparayanam was paid 5 panams and anusandhanam 2 panams. For the Tanniramudu festival in Tirumala anusandhanam was paid 2 panams. In connection with the newly instituted Brahmotsavam for Sri Govindarajasvami in Tirupati in the Tamil month of Masi anusandhanam was paid 4 panams. It is learnt from the details given of this endowment that during Brahmotsavams when Sri Govindarajasvami arrives in front of Sri Ramanuja’s shrine Iyal recital had become an ancient usage. In the festival processions Tirumoli was recited and food offering therefor made.

1. "இவர் சத்திக்கு நித்தீயமாக அதிகாரமாக மரபிக்கும் முற் காத்து மிக்கும் நே லப்பக்..."


3. இத்ரையம்பத்தில் இந்தும்பியை 40.
It is learnt from this endowment that it was the practice (presumably of Kumara Tattayyangar and his sons only) to distribute all the offered prasadams freely to all those who were present on such occasions.¹ This privilege of distributing the entire quantity of food offerings freely to all the pilgrims was enjoyed only by Kumara Tattayyangar and his son Srinivasa Tattayyangar. The Sthanattar and the servants of the Devasthanams allowed this procedure out of their free will. The practice of taking over the prasadams to the Akasaganga on the occasion of the Tanniramudhu festival (காசாகாணக வெள் மறைவு) — the transport charges being borne by the temple—and of distributing them freely to all including the Sthanattar and other employees, was started in 1491 (Vide II. 95; 27-6-1491) in connection with the endowment made by Pasindi Venkatattur ivar when the Tiruvenkata Mahatmyam compiled by him was first read in the temple.² From Srinivasa Ayyangar’s endowment it is seen that the entire quantity offered by him to the Deity was taken over to Akasaganga and distributed.

1. கூடுதல் இருப்பினும் அனைத்து சிறுவர்களுக்கு பிறந்தவையை கொடுத்துக்கொள்ள காண்டது சிலீமூர்கள் வலமே விளைவடையும் ஒன்று விளைந்தாலும்......பொறியைய இணைந்து பேண்ய பொறியை�
freely. Thus a practice commenced in 1491 A.D., became an ancient usage (அந்தந்தைந்துற்றக்) in 1547, that is within 56 years. The hearing of the Prabandham of the Alvars which was commenced in Udayavar Emperumanar’s shrine in Tirupati in 1475 (II. 63) extended to the Tirumalai Udayavar shrine and became a common feature in 1476 (II. 68). In inscription II. 95; 27—6—1491 the Adhyayanotsavam of Tiruvengadamudaiyan is distinctly mentioned. That the Utsavamurti was hearing every night the recital of the Prabandham of the alvars is mentioned in V. 92 of 1547 as an ancient usage. The payment for anusandhanam whenever a festival procession was held had also become an ancient usage. We saw that Tallapakkam Tirumalai Ayyangar made good his past neglect. An endowment for the Sahasra nāmārcharana festival for Sri Venkatesa in Tirumala newly instituted by one Sūrappa Nayakkar (V. 127; 10–5–1551) shows that Iyal recital was held in Sri Ramanuja’s shrine and food offerings were made to Sri Venkatesa in that connection as an ancient usage. There was also a payment of 3 panams for anusandhanam. An endowment V. 141; 25–5–1553 made by Araviti Kondarāja for the celebration of the Adhyayanotsavam of Sri Nammalvār enshrined by him in the temple he built in G. Mada Street, Tirupati (which was in direct competition with the Alvar Tirtham temple) shows that payment was made for anusandhanam.

Post Talikota Period.

We next pass on to the period which followed the battle of Talikota in 1565 when the Vijayanagar Empire received a rude

---

1. "என்பது புது குட்டால் வெற்றி பாண்டகிரி அரஞ்சனை துவாரத்தின் காரணம் முடிகிறது. நாம் கூறியது குழாய் குட்டால் வெற்றி பாண்டகிரி அரஞ்சனை பெருநோக்கிய பாண்டகிரி இறைவி நோக்கிய..."

2. "குட்டால் காரணம் வெற்றியின் புது குட்டால் வெற்றி பாண்டகிரி அரஞ்சனை துவாரத்தின் பெருநோக்கிய பாண்டகிரி..."
shock from which it did not recover, although it struggled on for about a century more. There were fewer endowments to the Tirumalai temple during this period. Such as were made were mostly by Srivaishnavas many of whom were in the king's service.

The Period of the Aravidu Kings.

The payment made to the anusandhanam officer during festivals having street procession and journeys to mantapams was continued even after the battle of Talikota. From two inscriptions VI. (3) and VI. (4) both dated 16th January 1583, the donor for the former being a resident of Vijayanagaram City and for the latter a native of Kunravardhana Kottam in Jayankonda sōla manḍalam, it is seen that anusandhanam was paid one panam as in the case of the other service holders of the temple.

The next inscription VI. 5; dated 25th September 1583 furnishes more interesting information. The endowment was made by Srimad vēda mārga pratistāpanācārya Udbhaya Vedantacharya Kumāra Tātācāryar Ayyan son of Ayyāvayyangār and grandson of Tōlappācāryar of Sathamarshana gōtra āpasthamba sūtra and yajus sākhā during the reign of Srirangadeva Maharayar. He was not an ācāryapurusha of the Tirumalai–Tirupati temple. This is the first time in our inscription that the title Udbhaya Vedantacharya is prefixed to a person's name. It shows that being a lineal descendant of Pillān he had perfect claim to do so. His endowment provided for the celebration of a Brahmostsavam in Tirumala in the Tamil month Arpasī, Pulugukkāppu Tirumanjanam on the Friday falling within the festival period, the Uriyadi festival and for the reading of the Kaisika Puranam in Tirumala by himself and his descendants. Another interesting piece of information is that Tirumoli was sung during the Brahmostsavam and seven iddalipadi were offered to the Deity in that connection. It also refers to the ancient practice of distributing 21 iddali padi froi to all Srivaishnavas in the shrine of
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Sri Bhashyakar (Ramanuja) during that period.¹ There was also the ancient practice of the free distribution of prasadams (cooked food) in that shrine to all Sri Vaishnavas on the 12 days of the Brahmotsavam.² There are other ancient practices also referred to therein. The necessity for making specific mention of these in the inscription might have been due to the fear or suspicion that as a consequence of political changes they may be discontinued on the plea that they might be new innovations. There was also payment of one panam for anusandhanam, small though the amount may appear.

One Venkamarasa Reddiar of Avilala (near Tirupati) made an endowment (VI. 6; 18–10–1584) for a festival for Sri Govindaraja in his garden mantapam and in that connection one panam was paid to anusandhanam. But no portion of the donor's share of prasadams was distributed either to Sri Vaishnavas or to Iyal reciters. One Avasaram Chennappar, resident of Naasilikkur village endowed (VI. 7; 22–4–1586) for certain Vidyaarppi festivals during Brahmotsavams in Tirumala. Although payment was made for the service rendered by other temple servants nothing was paid for anusandhanam nor was any food distributed.

During the reign of Venkatapatideva Maharaya.

There is an endowment VI. 9 dated 14th July 1592 made by one Periya Timmappa Nayakkar, resident of Vijayanagaram. There is a sub-endowment in this by one Meykkotti Timmappa

1. "... pāṭippug. ивания, ṭiṭṭuraṇṇulu. र (7);
प्रहर्षकारमत्र विदिरवन विलिनित जलधर्म ताराकानांके  
पालिकापलक अ (21)........ "

2. ".........अपम ओस्थात्तिकता उपग्रह वयनां विशेषमात्र ख्यात राजस्वलाभमात्र पुत्र विशेष तथा अविर्भाती सुभाषितापुरे नित्यासीमालक जी जयकालमात्र रा जीत्तिकेम जीत्तिकेत मौली भवि मौली भवि मौली (१२)-विश प्रत्यः सामान्यवादक िपिपुः अ (4)
........ "
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Nayakkar. The principal festival for which the endowment was made is the Adhyayanotsavam of Sri Ramanuja in Tirupati for twelve days. An interesting ancient practice is referred to here. On the 12th (or last) day of the festival when Sri Govindaraja with His consorts and also Sri Ramanuja arrive at the temple gate-way the accounts of the temple relating to Tiruvengada-mudaiyan would be read out.¹ The village of Pūndamalli (near Madras) was the endowed village mainly for the purpose of celebrating Sri Ramanuja's Adhyayanotsavam in Tirupati for 12 days. The major part of the prasadams offered to the Deity was distributed freely to all devotees. The Iyal recitors were singled out for on all special favours. Anusandhanam was paid 1 panam occasions when procession took place.²

*Koyil kelvi Annan Ramanuja jiyan* made an endowment (VI. 10; 16–1594) of the village of Devarayapalli (income 150 R.P.) for celebrating the Chitrā Paurnami festival in Tirumala in the Van Sathakopan matham. This perhaps indicates that there was not even till 1594 any sectarian differences between the Koyil kelvi jiys and the Van Sathakopan mutt jiyan. There were also other ubhayams celebrated in his own garden mantapam in Tirumala such as Uriyadi festival, Sri Jayanti festival, Vidayaṛṭi festival and others in Tirupati. There were other festivals endowed for by sub-donors (Mādabhūshi Appayyangar, Kuppayyangar and Tiruvenkatayyan). Anna Ramanuja jiyan did not make payment for anusandhanam but the sub-donors did so. From this we may draw the inference that the Koyil kelvi jiyan was himself the anusandhanam officer. The wording of the inscription does not show clearly how the food offerings were distributed. The Iyal

---

¹ “சாவைனாவார் தீர்த்தவித்து முழும் (12) கிலோ கி வாழியில் வர்த்தகர் வாயில் கொண்டிருப்பதால் தங்களின் கெட்டிடக்கல் மயே தேவார்க்கூள் வேட்டை என்று.. அப்பர் கூடாக வெளிய வந்து பிறங்கூள் சாய்வும் எ ல..” (பிற.. the word might have been விட்டத்துடன், to elucidate.

² “அப்புர் ஆப்புர்காிசு பாய் மருவலிங்கவிள்ள பதிப்புகள் என்று 12 கி பல் பிஸ்கங்கி என்று (72) மிளை என்று (12)....”
reciters are not mentioned in the inscriptions, but all Sri Vaishnavas are mentioned.¹

In inscription VI. 11; 13-3-1594 being an endowment by an agriculturist Dharasi Nārāyanār Reddi for celebrating a number of Visesha diwasams in Tirupati payment of one panam was made for anusandhanam. The Iyal reciters are not mentioned; at any rate the inscription is incomplete in the concluding portion. Inscription VI. 12; 19-4-1596 (Emperor was Venkatapati Devaraya Maharayar) gives details of an endowment by Silambidiāyār Setti of Ramāpuram. He built a shrine for Sri Varadarajaswami and Tirukkachchi Nambi in Tirupati and instituted festivals wherein Sri Govindarajaswami was also associated. There was no payment for anusandhanam nor is Iyal sāttu mentioned. There was payment made for extra service rendered by the members of the Temple establishment. The more interesting portion, of it is the one which mentions one Koyil kelvi Van Sathakopan Alagiya manavāla Ramanuja jiyar as a sub-donor for the Chitṛā paurnami festival of Sri Govindaraṇa. The name occurs in two places, in one as donor and in the other as beneficiary of prasadams.² Both descriptions refer to the same jiyar. It is seen from this that a jiyar of the Van Sathakopan mutt or a jiyar who bore the name Van Sathakopa Alagiya Manavala Ramanuja was the sub-donor. There was no sub-sectarian import in the name. There was no payment for anusandhanam nor was food distributed to Iyal reciters. The jiyar took the donors' share himself.

The next inscription VI. 14; 31-10-1606 being endowment for offering daily five Sarkaraippongal (Sweetened pongal) taligai

1. "...ஏற்றத்தல் கோபுரத்தல்...பாறனையல்... தொட்டுதொண்டு பால்கால்... தொண்டு ஐந்து முறையில் புரக்கல் பார்க்கையும்..."

2. "......கோபுரம் கோபுரம் அசுரிமமண்டலம் திரிப்புத்து திரிப்புத்து கோபுரத்தல் திரிப்புத்து கோபுரத்தல் திரிப்புத்து கோபுரத்தல் ஆய்மா ஆய்மா ஆய்மா ஆய்மா......"

"......ஏற்றத்தல் கோபுரத்தல்...பாறனையல்... தொட்டுதொண்டு பால்கால்... தொண்டு ஐந்து முறையில் புரக்கல் பார்க்கையும்..."
was made by Hunumayyar Annangar son of Lakkappa Nayakkar, commander of the Vijayanagar forces stationed on Malyavanta Hills. The inscription mentions that the distribution of a portion of the offered prasadams freely to all devotees in front of Sri Ramanuja’s Shrine in Tirumala was an ancient practice and that in this case two out of the five taligais were so distributed. It is not possible to trace from previous inscriptions how such distribution made on some occasions grew to be an ancient usage (Tonmaiya). 

From a lengthy inscription (VI. No. 18 dated 4–11–1614) during Venkatapatideva Maharayar’s reign of an endowment by one Nottakkar. Venkatayyan, it is seen that a mantapam in front of the gopura vasaal was known as the TIRUVAYMOLI MANTAPAM and that on every day of the 10 Brahmotsavams Tiruvaymoli was recited there and 132 Dadhyodlan taligais were made in all. On the day of the Vasantotsavam during the Chittirai Brahmotsavam anusandhanam was paid two panams. Iyal reciters are not mentioned as receiving any special treatment. But there was free distribution of a certain quantity of the offered prasadams excluding the quantity of 44 sandhi offerings which old but then defunct endowments had provided for.

Inscription VI. 19; 4–11–1616 also gives details of an endowment by Mahamandalesvara Chinna Timmarajayyan for celebration of some festivals in addition to the old ones by the re-excavation of certain irrigation channels so as to increase the yield from the temple lands served by them. The services covered by the prior endowments had to be carried out before the new ones were executed. The old endowments are referred to by the epithet, ancient (காந்தசத்ஸர). The old endowments which were benefitting the reciters of the Prabandham reserved 21 iddali padi in Tirumala and Tirupati during the Tiruvadhyayanam festival. “Twenty

1. ..... அல்லே காந்தசத்ஸர அப்பால்கில் காந்தசத்ஸர காந்தசத்ஸர காந்தசத்ஸர காந்தசத்ஸர காந்தசத்ஸர ....." 

2. ..... காந்தசத்ஸர காந்தசத்ஸர ..... காந்தசத்ஸர காந்தசத்ஸர காந்தசத்ஸர காந்தசத்ஸர காந்தசத்ஸர ..... காந்தசத்ஸர காந்தசத்ஸர .....
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one iddali padi to be distributed among Sri Vaishnavas who take part in (Anusandhikkum) Tiruvadhyayanams in Tirumala and Tirupati”. There was no payment of money toanusandhanam officer.

Similarly, Noṭakkāra Nārayanan, (VI. 20; 25-7-1627) excavated irrigation channels in certain villages of Kuḍavur nādu and increased the yield. The old services were given precedence not only in the quantity to be offered to the Deity but also in the quantity which had to be, as an old usage, distributed freely to pilgrims.¹ There was no payment for anusandhanam or distribution of food to Iyal reciters exclusively. There was free distribution to all devotees. This inscription was made during the reign of Sri Vira Rama Rāvu deva Maharāyay. The next endowment (VI. 21; 29-9-1631) made in the reign of his successor Sri Vira Kumara Venkatapatiraya deva Maharāyayar (Venkata II) was by one Ramachandrayyan. This also consisted in renewing the irrigation channel in Vadirajapuram in Kuḍavur nādu so as to increase the yield and make old endowments workable. There is provision for observing all old commitments in the distribution of the food offerings to pilgrims. There is no reference to anusandhanam nor to Iyal reciters. The next inscription (VI. 22; 2-1-1636) also in the reign of Venkata II, of an endowment made by Sri Prativādi Bhayankaram Anṇangarachariar son of Alagarayyangar and grand son of Venganacharya is of interest from the Prabandham point of view. He installed a new Deity, Lakshmi Narayana Perumal, and also Periya ālvar in Tirupati and instituted Adhyaya-notsavam in that connection. There were also festivals celebrated for Sri Govindarajaswami and for Sri Āndāl. A portion of the

¹...
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offered food was distributed to pilgrims and a portion to local Sri Vaishnavas. But Iyal reciters as such were not singled out nor was anusandhanam paid for. This endowment by an acharyapurusha of the Tirumala, Tirupati temples made in 1636 is a pointer to the hold which Iyal recitations and the anusandhanam officer failed to have on men who had a stake in the customs and usages of the temple during those days.

The next one happens to be the last inscription in the Tamil language and script composed by the accountants called Tiruninraur-udaiyar and the old Sthanattar (though reduced in numbers). It was made as if in the reign of Virapratapa Srirangadeva Maharaya by some… Ayyan (whose name is missing in the inscription but who was a Brahmin of Kundanāla village in Urvakonda Seema, on 15th June 1638 (VI. 23). The only point of interest to us is that during the ubhayams in Tirumala on the 4th day of each of the eleven Brahmostavams in his garden mantapam anusandhanam was paid 1/16 panam and during the ubhayams in Tirupati to celebrate the asterism of his birth Mulam the payment for anusandhanam was 1 panam. There was no distribution of food offerings to the Iyal reciters.

The last inscription with which we are concerned is VI. 24; 19–3–1684. This inscription was discussed at some length in Chapter XXII. p. p. 885 to 889. The details of the distribution of the food offering in Tirumala called Avasaram (sandhi Tirupponakam) therein made show a complete departure from the old practice. The Sthanattar had disappeared long before 1684, possibly in 1646 or thereabouts when Mir Jumla captured the country for the Muslim king of Golkonda. Those members of the staff who were actually doing work in the temple got each a share. The dosai padi was distributed as below. Singamurai 4 Dosais, Panimurai 6, Pedda jiyyangar 1, Chinna jiyyangar 1, Sthanalavaru 4, Kanganippan 1 (நையாந்தம்), Desantris (pilgrims) 1, …4 (name missing) Paḍikavali 2, Uttara Pārapatyam 1, (ஒற்றைத்தூர்) Adhyapakas 2, Sundry 1, Viniyogam or free distribution 18, Vitthavana (Viṭṭavan Vilukkadu) 1. A similar scale of distribution is shown in the case of prasadams.
The term *Adhyapaka* appears for the first time and its plural *Adhyapakulaku* denotes that more than one got a share. It is a Sanskrit word used to denote a person who is competent to teach the Vedas to others (Adhyapaka is equivalent to Veda bōdhaka). It was not used in any of the previous inscriptions as a name for a Prabandham reciter. The only possible explanation for the adoption of this new name is that after the complete conquest of the country and the temple by Mir Jumla about 1646 A.D., all the endowed villages of the temple were taken away by him and that the daily services in the temple had to be carried on with the help of endowments of the kind shown in this inscription made by devotees. There was no land endowment. But gold ornament was entrusted to a private trustee who invested the sale proceeds of the jewel and from the interest which it earned provided for the conduct of the service. The old anusandhanam officers who were perhaps by usage receiving a portion of the prasadam and some cash during ubhayams were deprived of their earning. When a Maharashtra military officer like Ramachandra Dabirsa made an endowment it would have been difficult to make him realise that the recitation of the Tamil Prabandham by an anusandhanam officer was an essential part of the liturgy of the temple. A great pandit who could recite well the Vedas and teach others also has always been known as an Adhyapaka. So the Sri Vaishnavas of the day would have represented the reciter of the Veda and the Prabandham as two Adhyapakas and so got for both a portion of the food offering. This word has in the centuries after 1684 come to denote exclusively the Prabandham reciter and we therefore now call the Veda reciter Vedapārāyanika and the Prabandham reciter Adhyāpaka. As an analogy the change in the import of the term Emperumānadiyar from a devotee of Vishnu to a vestal virgin therein may be noted.

The distribution made in 1684 by Sri Ramachandra Dabirsa was not however the last word on the subject. In subsequent periods there were alterations therefrom which deprived the Adhyapakas of a share in the daily kattala. When free distribution is made in āsthānam they appear to have received a share.

The continued and persistent efforts of the Sri Vaishnavas to establish a right for the recitation of the Prabandham and for a
share in the offered Prasadams resulted in making the recital tolerated and even considered a very desirable factor in the liturgy of the temple. It was optional on the part of the donors to recognise or ignore distribution of their share of prasadams for the Prabandham. The efforts to obtain recognition for the anusandhanam office did not also succeed fully. We have seen that Prativadi Bhayankaram Ananthagarachariar an acharya purusha of the temple in 1636 did not recognise the Prabandham recital and the anusandhanam in the festivals which his endowment provided for.

But usage was asserting itself in favour of Prabandham recital on festival occasions, but not as a part of the daily liturgy of the temple. The Iyal Sāttu which in 1360 A.D. was conducted in front of the main-gate way of the temple in Tirumala gradually came to be done at the Balipiṭham inside the temple. There were also recitals held in front of Sri Ramanuja’s shrine and in the presence of the Utsava Murti. But there does not appear to have been any instance of a recital having been held in the Garbha griham in front of the Mūla Beram. Nor was there a daily Sāttumurai in the wake of the daily puja. These innovations were perhaps made during the Muslim and the British rule. But we cannot be dogmatic. The terms Vadagalai and Tengalai; Pātram and Vālī Tirunāmam of either variety are nowhere mentioned in the inscriptions. Rivalry between the resident jiyars and siyers in Tirumala and Tirupati for the anusandhanam office is indicated. The Sthanattar seem to have taken a neutral attitude in the matter. It was purely a matter for settlement by Sri Vaishnavas without distinction of caste. During the Muslim rule by the Nawab of Arcot and in the early years of the British rule it would have been an easy matter for Sri Vaishnavas to establish new conventions, since no member of the ruling class set foot on the Tirumalai Hill. They were interested in getting the maximum possible annual income from the renter who was a Sri Vaishnava.

NOTE—1.

Referring to the Tiruvaymoli recital in Tirumalai for the first time in 1360 A.D. (vide pages 1021 to 1023) an assumption
was made therein by the author that one Tiruvaymolippillai may have been the young enthusiast who lead the recital, the basis for it being his ancestry. The endowment for food offering in that connection was made in the name of a prince (இஸ்தலும் சுதாருவன்) Chëdiyarayan of Chaturvedi mangalam of Seyyur koṭṭam. As it was not directly made by the prince himself a further suggestion was thrown out (lines 11, 12, of p. 1023) that Tiruvaymolippillai might have been responsible for getting the endowment made. While re-reading the printed matter for preparing the ‘Index’ it struck the author that there was no plausible basis for this assumption, considering that Tiruvaymolippillai would not have at his young age attained to that eminence and fame which alone would enthuse people to carry out his wish or request. There was however during those days Sri Vedanta Desika who, by his great learning, immaculate life and unparallelled service for the spread of Sri Vaishnavism had attained to the pinnacle of fame. He successfully resuscitated Prabandham recital in Srirangam shortly before 1360 A.D. (Vide page 1022). He would more likely have been responsible for the Chedirayar’s endowment for the Tiruvaymoli recital in Tirumala also. The only consideration which precluded mentioning his name in the first instance was that he was so high-souled that he never sought a favour or accepted an offer from any one. His Vairagya Panchakam is sufficient to prove this. For establishing the excellence of the Prabandhams he however induced his disciple Gopanna (Governor and commander of the Chengi fortress and country) to convene a religious assembly. Again, for the benefit of a single person Singayya (Dannayaka) son of Madappa he composed his Tamil tract “Srimat Tatva sandēsam.” (Inscription 104 of Vol. I gives Singayya’s name as Immaḍī Rāguttarayan Mādappan Singayya Dannayakar. The father’s name is given by Sri Vedanta Desika as Mādhavan). It is therefore more probable that the Chëdi-rayan whose territory was likely under Gopanna’s jurisdiction had the endowment made in his name agreeably to or anticipating the wishes of the great spiritual preceptor Sri Vedanta Desika.
NOTE—2.
Vide Page 731 (lines 7 to 9)

There are indefinite and even contradictory statements in
the inscriptions about the period or number of days of the
Adhyayanotsavam, what was being recited on each day and when
Ramanuja Nurrandadi came to be recited. This subject will
appropriately be fully considered in the Chapter on Festivals.
CHAPTER XXIII—(Contd.)

SECTION—3.

SRI VENKATESWARA, SELF-MANIFEST ARCHA
FORM OF NARAYANA

AND

VENGADAM HILL, HIS HALLOWED SPOT.

SRI Nammālvār’s firm faith that the Supreme Being has of His own choice and for the spiritual benefit of mortals settled Himself on the Vengadam Hill and that therefore the hill itself is a hallowed spot for mankind has been stated in chapter II p.p. 41 to 43. It was also mentioned that Sri Nammālvār alone has given his mystic reason for His manifestation as an Idol. That statement should not be taken to mean that the other ālvārs have not expressed the same belief. They have said the same thing but not in the manner that Sri Nammālvār has done. In this section (of Chapter XXIII) the religious faith of all the other ālvārs, and particularly of the early ālvārs, in the worship of Vishnu will be considered at some length. This is necessary to show that from the earliest times Vengadam has been considered to be the most hallowed spot on earth for worshippers of Sri Vishnu and that the Idol on the hill has been taken to be self-manifest Para Brahman to make it possible for bhaktas to do the archa form of worship for, obtaining salvation without resorting to the more arduous methods which were extensively practised in the previous ages.

Preamble.

As a preliminary to a correct appreciation of the Ālvār’s Prabhandaams with reference to Vengadam a few points have o be borne in mind. The Hill is referred to as Vengadam and
not by any other name except in two stanzas of Pey ālvār's Third Tiruvandādi (Nos. 63 and 75) where the term Tirumala is used. The genuineness of these two stanzas is open to doubt and will be discussed later. The other names with which we are acquainted, viz., Seshādri, Seshāchalam, Vēnkaṭādri, Vrishādri, Vrishāchalam etc., do not appear to have been known to the ālvārs. These seem to have been in use even in the Fourteenth century A.D. They became more common after the compilation of the book 'Venkatachala Mahātmyam' about the end of the 15th century A.D. Even a cursory reading of the Prabandhams will show that the ālvārs were well versed in the Puranas and that they frequently refer to incidents connected with the different avatars of Sri Vishnū. But there is not a single reference in the Prabandhams to any of the anecdotes mentioned in the Brahmanda and other Puranas mentioned in the Venkatachaila Mahatmyam which assign a reason for the manifestation of Vishnu on the Vengadam Hill.

None of the numerous rivulets and water-falls on the hill is mentioned by name in the Prabandhams. They are collectively mentioned as the cool and swift flowing tortuous torrents of the hill streams. Anecdotes connected with the sanctity of each water-fall or stream seem to be of later origin. The ālvārs do not mention the existence of any village or of any other place of worship on the hill or nearby in the plains. It was either that none existed or that they were too insignificant to be mentioned. Even the Deity Sri Varāhaswāmi has not been mentioned by any of the ālvārs; nor Tiruchanooor and the Deities therein; nor Tirupati and the Parthasarathyswami there. The names of Kings are not given by them (except by Tirumangai, the last of the ālvārs). They do not refer to their compeers or contemporary great men. Tirumalisai ālvār plainly states, "My tongue will not sing a human being." Poygai ālvār says that he will approach only God's feet, will sing every day only His praise, will place flowers only at His Feet (the feet of the one who has the Chakram in his hand)—

1. These terms have been used by Sri Vedānta Desika in his Dayāsatakam and other works.

2. "‘‘ kartādāraś ca lītāndā lītī lītī’’"
“what care I about what happens to me.” None of the early śvārṣas has described even cursorily the form and the features of the Image, the divine ornaments depicted thereon and the divine weapons borne. We have to draw the inference that they attached little importance to these. But they were all staunch Vishnu bhaktas and their faith in Narayana as the Supreme Being was unwavering. They attached great importance to concentration

1. “

2. 

Fearing the consequences of my hard past acts (karma), the only way open to me to escape it is to seek salvation at your feet. To reach it I learnt to worship with my sweet songs about Namō Narayana (T. A. 57).

I. T. A. 95).
There is therefore the way (open to all) to obtain salvation by uttering ceaselessly His name Namō Narayana. Why then should any one go to Hell? (I. T. A. 95).

Worship Sri Vishnu as long as you possess the power of speech and till the body falls dead. Do it with flowers, with rituals, tantras, mantras and his thousand names. It will do you good.

When the tongue could not speak, when the mouth could not open, when the eyes swim in vacancy and when those around in the death chamber in helpless sorrow give up all hope, even then, O thou my mind, fix yourself with cheer on the golden feet of the One who wields in His hand the flaming Chakram. (II. T. A. 7).
After having worshipped with loving devotion our Lord, the tall one with red eyes, I would not care to be the ruler of the earth nor would I desire to enter the abode of the celestials. (II. T. A. 90.)

I had the beatific vision of Narayana by day, again by night in my dream I saw Him very well; for truth, I saw him well. There was the brilliant form of the Chakram, His shining feet and the Jyoti of His Form which lit the whole sky. (II. T. A. 81.)

I found the way to salvation only after by placing myself entirely at His Feet. (III. T. A. 59.)
of all the senses\(^1\) on the image during worship, whether that

At all times and under all circumstances our support is the One who wields the Chakram, whose breast is adorned with tulasi garlands and whereon resides on the lotus flower Sri Devi. (III. T. A. 100).

O, My Lord! I have now realised you. I have learnt that you are the God of Isa and of the Four Faced (Brahma). I have realised that you are Narayana, all that is known and all that is worth knowing. You are everything that is good. I have realised you, O Narayana (N.T.A. 96).

1. மரற்குடிய ராமகுரு இனத்திருப்பு
மரற்குடிய ராமகுரு—சுவாமி
மரற்குடிய ராமகுரு வாழ்த்து கூறியவர் மன்னாவுணர்த்து
சுவாமி குற்றகரை கல்லூர். (I. T. A. 47).

II. சுவாமி குற்றகரை
சுவாமி குற்றகரை—சுவாமி
சுவாமி குற்றகரை சுவாமி குற்றகரை—சுவாமி
சுவாமி குற்றகரை கூறியது. (I. T. A. 47).
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God-realisation can be achieved only by keeping chained in the stand the five rogue elephants, not allowing them to run amuck about the chéri (or village) and by acquisition of true knowledge in the approved manner (I.T.A. 47).

By control of the five precious sense organs and by doing worship with the choicest flowers and with loving devotion, it is easy to realise Him who deigned to receive from the proud Maha Bali a gift with libations of water (I.T.A. 50).

This is similar to I.T.A. 50.
image be a painting or sculpture or metal casting. The image should be to the best taste of the worshipper, should be identified as Narayana and treated in every respect as God Himself.

God realisation is achieved by those who with wise discrimination slam the door of right conduct against the five senses, put on the hasp and staple and study well and with understanding the scriptures (Vedas) III. T.A. 12.

By worship of Him who is adorned with the tulasi garlands with wise discrimination and in the choicest manner one could root out the seven births (III. T.A. 79).

1. अभवत शर्मकाम अविकतायामकुमारी
विवीकाना स्वामिनामा सारम्—कार्तिके
कपिलकुमारा निवेदनां विद्वानयाम् क्रियया
भर्तृहरी हृदयविशेषम् (I. T. A. 14).

Every worshipper would worship according to the best of his understanding an image placed resting against a wall or seated on a base and consider it his God. The original Murti which these represent is however the One who measured the earth with His Feet (I. T. A. 14).

2. कामकुलक्रम शर्मकामयाम अविकतायाम शर्मकामा
विवीकाना स्वामिनामा शर्मकामयाम—कार्तिके
कपिलकुलक्रमयाम निवेदनां विद्वानयामम्
अनुभवयान निरूपयायम्. (I. T. A. 44).
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There are however a few verses of Poygai āḻvār and one of Pey āḻvār which may raise a doubt whether after all these two āḻvārs were not as much votaries of Siva as they were of Vishnu. The verses of Poygai āḻvār are Nos. 5, 74 and 98. If they are read along with verses 7, 11, 15, 28, 46, 52, 67, 75 there will be no reason to doubt that the āḻvār was a devoted bhakta of Sri Vishnu alone. The former make a bare statement of the fact that

The One who bears the chakram manifests Himself to the worshipper in that form which pleases him most. He bears that name which is most dear to the worshipper and in whatever posture or disposition the worshipper concentrates his attention in that manner would He be seen (I. T. A. 44).

1. 

1. మనిషిని సిద్ధం చేసిన ప్రాణం సహితం‌

మనిషిని సముఖం సముదాయం—అంత అతనిగా కలసాయి రామాయణం కలసాయి కారితా

అపారం పాలకం మాత్రం. (I. T. A. 7)

పురావస్సులు పురావస్సులు పురావస్సులు పురావస్సులు

పురావస్సులు పురావస్సులు పురావస్సులు—పురావస్సులు

అవకాషాలు అవకాషాలు అవకాషాలు అవకాషాలు పురావస్సులు మాత్రం. (I. T. A. 46).
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உனக்க புரிகுளம் கருது தோண்டு உண்டாய்ச் சவேய கூறுலி கல்லளர்களோ—தலையிட்டி
நூற்றாண்டு பாண்டியங்கள் வம்சம் தேர்வு வந்து
குறுநாட்டுக்காக செங்குத்து வந்தேர். (I. T. A. 52).

ஆன்டு சாம்பள் நாணாண் மலர்ச்
சாலில் வணக்கம் — செறி
கனம் சாம்பளெனவை வருகை
சாலுக்கு நூற்றூறு இருக்கிறே.

ஆதாரம் பார்க்கும் என இல்லைதோகு வணங்கு
ஆதாரம் குறிப்பிட்டு நிகழ்கது இருக்கும்
தமிழ்ப் புராணம் சீர்கலன் கருவிலை வருவத்தின்
தமிழ்ப் புராணத்தில் வணங்கது. (I. T. A. 67).

நெல் நண்பர் வாழும் பாலை
நெல் தெயில் குறிப்பிடுகிறான் — செறி
நெல் குறிப்பிடுகிறான் நெல் தெயில்
செறியின் நெல் தெயில் செறியின்.

நாட்டில் குரை புனரூர்கள் குயில் அழகிக்கோர்
நாட்டில் குரை புனரூர்கள் அழகிக்கோர்—பபய் வரிகை
அமர்ப்பிட்டு கின்னியொச்சியேற் கல்லளர்களோ
மாண்டைப்பிட்டு கல்லளர்களோ. (I. T. A. 75).

ஞாய் பெறு சாம்பள் எழுதியுள்ளே
ஞாய் எழுதியுள்ளே என பாதுகாக
சாம்பளெனவை வருகையடுத்து தன்மை
சாலுக்கு நூற்டூறு இருக்கிறே.

மனிதும் தொன்மையும் மாண்டைப்பற்று மாண்டைப்பும்
மனிதும் தொன்மையும் மாண்டைப்பும்—அன்னும்
மனிதும் தொன்மையும் மாண்டைப்பும் மாண்டைப்பும்
சாலுக்கு நூற்டூறு இருக்கிறே. (I. T. A. 88).

அன்னும் நூற்டூறு என்று எழுதி
அன்னும் நூற்டூறு என்று எழுதி
சாலுக்கு நூற்டூறு என்று எழுதி
சாலுக்கு நூற்டூறு என்று. 777
Siva and Vishnu have each distinctive functions and appurtenances. Thus (verse 5) one is called Hara and the other Narayana, one rides the bull and the other flies on the eagle; one has given us his 'Nūl' or āgama and the other the Vedas; one resides on the hill (Kailas) and the other on the ocean; one works destruction and the other gives protection; one has the Trident in his hand and the other the Chakram and lastly one is of the hue of flaming fire and the other of the colour of the sky (5).1 Again verse 742 says, one rides the bull and the other the eagle, one burnt to ashes the Tripuram and the other tore open the breast of Hiranya; one smears his body white with ashes and the other is bright sky blue in colour; one shares his body with his spouse and the other keeps her on a flower over his chest; one has long matted hair (jata) and the other wears a high peaked crown; one wears the Ganga on his head and the other receives the waters safely on his feet. Verse 98

1. அரிதார் பூனிதமாம் அுத்தியில் பார்த்துடி அந்த நான் மகமுமணவூர் கவலை—அன்னித் கொலையாம் அவ்வயா அரிப்பக் கவலை உலகில் வெள்ளி கார்த்திகை வெள்ளாடை (I. T. A. 5).

2. புறமுன்புள்ள கத்தியுடன் பார்வையில்லையான் பெற்றியில்லை இறைய்க் கொலையாம் தம்மைக் கொலையாம்—அரிப்பக் கவலையாம் பூனிதமாக்கும் பெற்றியில்லையா கவலையாம் மணவூர் கவலையாம் கார்த்திகையாம் வெள்ளாடை (I. T. A. 74).

3. பாருமீது பாருமீது புராணகாலம் புராணகாலத்தும் விளையாடும் கரு சங்கமுடைய—சருபானம்
says that although the golden hued Siva (Punniyan) with the matted locks of hair and Nedumal (Vishnu) who strode the earth may be considered by us to have two different bodies, one has his abode only within the body of the other. The precise relationship between the two is given by the alvar in verses (15 and 28). The first and foremost beings in creation (in the manifested universe) are three and of these the highest is the one who manifested himself on the primeval waters (Mūr-nīr vannan). Without His grace the good offices of the others will be of no avail for salvation (verse 1.

1. "Kālumkē mānur anumma kāvānubhūt
   kālumkē mānur aukāmītam avaram
   jātan ālum dantānām učīmītām
   avaram avaram učīmītam ālum kākām
   pañcata śaktam pañcam. (I. T. A. 15).

   2. "Avaram avaram učīmītam ālum kākām
      avaram avaram učīmītam ālum kākām
      avaram avaram učīmītam ālum kākām
      avaram avaram učīmītam ālum kākām
      avaram avaram učīmītam ālum kākām. (I. T. A. 28).
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15): O Thou of the dark hue! in thine hands are the right winded Sankham and the Chakram (Nemi); She who is seated on the flower is on your body (Chest), (Brahma) who gave the four Vedas is in your navel and He who destroyed the three castles (Tripura) has his residence in your body (verse 28). (Verse 11)\(^1\) says that the älvār’s mouth would not praise any other Deity, nor his hands worship another. In verse 46 reference is made to the Puranic account that Siva had to get his sin of nipping off one of the heads of Brahma absolved only by the grace of Vishnu. In verse 52 we are told that the eight Dikpālas, the Ekādasa Rudras, the Dvādasa Adityas and the matchless two (Brahma and Siva) daily worship Tīrumāl (Vishnu) with flowers gathered with their own hands. Verse 67 says that all rivers direct their course to the ocean; the flower turns its face to the rising Sun; life looks to Yama (Dharman); so also True knowledge seeks the Lord of Padmavatī. Verse 75 says that by prayerful meditation of Tīrumāl all evil spells and incantations vanish and so also the oppressive effects of all bad karmas are destroyed; weakness of old age not felt and the way to salvation is assured.

It will be clear from a reading of the verses quoted above that Poygai älvār being an out and out Narayana bhakta has only given a reply to those who in his days entertained the notion that Siva and Vishnu are only different aspects of the one Supreme Being. He flourished in days when the relative merits of the ritualistic worship of Siva and Vishnu were being seriously discussed and also the philosophy on which such worship was based. Even

1. பாபானவி போன்ற பாம்ப்னதா செஞ்சமை

2. பாபானவி போன்ற பாம்ப்னதா செஞ்சமை -- பாபானவ் போன்ற பாம்ப்னதா செஞ்சமை

(I.T.A. 11).

3. பாபானவி போன்ற பாம்ப்னதா செஞ்சமை -- பாபானவ் போன்ற பாம்ப்னதா செஞ்சமை

4. பாபானவி போன்ற பாம்ப்னதா செஞ்சமை -- பாபானவ் போன்ற பாம்ப்னதா செஞ்சமை

5. பாபானவி போன்ற பாம்ப்னதா செஞ்சமை -- பாபானவ் போன்ற பாம்ப்னதா செஞ்சமை
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the Agamas recognised the worship of the Trimurtis and Dvimurtis and temples were constructed accordingly.

Bhūdattāḻvār’s (second) Tiruvandādi gives no room for doubt in the matter. In verse 17¹ he says that Siva who wears the Moon on the matted locks of his head waited on (Māl) Vishnu and got his sin expiated. Pey āḻvār commences his (Third) Tiruvandādi with a description of the beatific vision of Sri Devi and Narayana in dazzling golden colour, the Sankham and Chakram in the Hands—and worshipped His Feet (III. T.A. 1 and 2). He restates his conviction in the last verse (III. T.A. 100) by stating that we depend only on the One who bears the Chakram in hand for our Salvation.

There is however one verse (III. 63) which describes the form of Sri Venkatesa as a composite one of Vishnu and Siva. This verse will be duly considered a little later in this section of the chapter while dealing with what each of the āḻvārs has said about Vengadam and its presiding Deity.

Tirumalīsai āḻvār’s views given in his Nannukhan Tiruvandadi are more emphatic than the views of his predecessors. Poygai āḻvār stated the Puranic version that Sri Devi, Brahma and Siva all have their abode in the body of the Supreme Being, Narayana. But in what order they emerge during creation-is not mentioned.

1. "திருத்தம் தையன்று? தருக்கணின்றார் தம் முதல்தம்
தம் முகல் தம் முடில் தம் முடிவுல்
பிள்ளையுடைய இருப்பிடமான்று பார்த்தும் மூன்று
தம்மன்றிடம் கூறும் காந்தரா வல்லாயிரம். (II. T.A. 17).

1. "திருத்தம் தையன்று? தருக்கணின்றார்க் தம் முதல்தம்
தம் முகல் தம் முடில் தம் முடிவுல்லே
பிள்ளையுடைய இருப்பிடமான்று பார்த்தும் மூன்று
தம்மன்றிடம் கூறும் காந்தரா வல்லாயிரம்."
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Tirumalaisai however commences his *Tiruvandadi* with the un-equivocal statement that “Narayana created the Four-faced One (Brahma) and the Four-faced One from out of his forehead created Sankara (Siva). I am commissioned to let the world know this great truth through this Andadi of mine. Take every bit of what is said herein as tested truth” (Nan. T. 1). With reference to the Trimurtis he says that all those who have become Devas and from among them the three who stand out as the foremost, in fact they are what all they appear to us to be only because they represent Nedumal. All the learning of those who do not realise this truth is rubbish *kaḍai* (Nan. Tiru. 54<sup>1</sup>). We infer from this that in the view of this Āḷvār sincere and consistent Upāsana or worship of any Deity is worship offered to Narayana because it ultimately leads the worshipper to become a Narayana Bhakta.<sup>2</sup> The Āḷvārs were all out and out Narayana bhaktas because their spiritual evolution had reached that stage.

The early Āḷvars have given in their works greater importance to the direct offer of individual daily worship than to resorting to temples for attending the worship offered there. The number

1. *Tiruvāyuman* காதிக் காதிக் காதிக் காதிக்
   மாவட்டம் காதிக் காதிக்—பாவட்டம்
   காதிக் காதிக் காதிக்—காதிக்
   காதிக் காதிக் காதிக்—
   (Nan. Tiru. 54).

2. See pages 513 and 514 of Vol. I of this History may be perused in this connection. See also Tiruvāyumolī 3-9-6.

' தேவிகுடிக்கையால் மாவட்டம் முடி தெளம் மேதிகள்,
நாயக்கின் காதிக் காட்டுக்கள் திகட் காட்டுக்கள்.'

2. தேவிகுடிக்கையால் மாவட்டம் முடி
   தெளம் மேதிகள் —
   நாயக்கின் காதிக்
   காட்டுக்கள் —
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of places of temple worship seem also to have been very limited in those days.

An analysis of the number of verses devoted by them in praise of the presiding Deity in temples will now be presented. It will be seen there from how greatly Tiruvengadam loomed large in their eyes in comparison with other places.

References by the early Alvars to Vengadam and to the other places of public worship.

Poygai ālvār's Mūdal Tiruvandādi consists of one hundred verses. Five Temples only are referred to in eleven verses. Eight out of the eleven verses are exclusively in praise of Vengadam.¹ Tiruvarangam or Srirangam is referred to in verse 6; and Tirukkōvalūr in v. 86. In the eleventh one (v. 77) four places (Vēngādam Viṇṇagar, Vehka and Kōval) are sung in one lot to illustrate the different postures of Images for worship, viz., the standing, the sitting, the reposing and the walking.

Bhūdattālvār's second Tiruvandādi also consists of one hundred verses. Twelve temples are referred to in seventeen verses. Seven verses out of the Seventeen are devoted exclusively in praise of Vengadam.² Srirangam is referred to in v. 88; Pādađadam in v. 94; Kachchi (Attiyūr) in v. 95 and 96; Tirukkōṭṭiyur in v. 87; Tirukkuḍandai in v. 97; and Tirumāl-irum-solai in v. 48. The other places, viz., Tanjcay, Taṇkāl, Vēlaï, Māmāllai and Koval occur in combination with Vengadam, Srirangam, Tirumālirum-solai, Tirukkudandai and Tirukkottiyur in verses 28, 46, 54 and 70. It will be seen that Vengadam has been largely sung exclusively as well as in combination with other places.

Pey ālvār's Third Tiruvandādi also consists of one hundred verses. Twelve temples are referred to in nineteen verses. Ten verses

1. Verses 26, 37, 38, 39, 40, 68, 76, 82 and 99.
2. Verses 25, 33, 45, 53, 72, 75 and 76.
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

out of the nineteen are exclusively devoted in praise of Vēngādam.\textsuperscript{1} In five more verses it is sung in conjunction with other places.\textsuperscript{2} Tiruvallikkeni is sung exclusively in verse 16 and Ashtabhujam in v: 99. In v. 62 Srirangam, Tirukkōṭiyur, Vehka, Tirukkuḍandai Katigam (Sholinghur) are sung together; in v. 64 Vehka, Velukkai and Kachchi are sung together and in v. 30 Padagam shares with Vengadam.

Tirumaḻisai āḻvār’s Namukhan Tiruvandādi consists of ninety six verses only and his Tiruchchanda viruttam one hundred and twenty verses. The total number of his verses are Two hundred and sixteen. Thirteen temples are sung in twenty-six verses (seventeen in the Tiruvandādi and nine in Tiruchchanda viruttam). Fourteen verses out of the twenty-six are exclusively in praise of Vengadam.\textsuperscript{3} Srirangam, exclusively in v. 3, 30, 60, of N.T.A. and v. 49, 55 of T. Viruttam; Tirukkuḍandai exclusively in T.V. 56, 61, 62, Tiruvallikkeni in N.T.A. 35, and Kapisthalam in N.T.A. 50. In N.T.A. 36 and 34, Srirangam, Vehka, Tiruvevvullur, Tiruppennagar and Tiruvanbil occur in combination. In T.V. 63, 64 Pāḍagam and Uragam are exclusively sung.

In the final analysis out of a total contribution of 517 verses by the four āḻvārs, seventy-three verses only refer to temples (or places of public worship). Out of the seventy-three verses thirty-nine are exclusively in praise of Vengadam and its presiding Deity. In nine more it occurs in conjunction with other places. Srirangam is exclusively sung in seven verses only. Our Deity is invariably referred to as Vēngāḍattān or Vengāḍattu mēyan and not by any of the other names with which we are now familiar (Sri Venkaṭesvara, Srinivasa, Seshachalapati etc.). They likewise call Ranganātha, as Arangattu mēyan and the Deity in Tirukkōṭiyur, Tirukkōṭiyūr mēyan. The āḻvārs do not describe the features of any Murti nor do they state if there were any attendant deities.

1. Verses 14, 39, 40, 45, 58, 63, 68, 73, 75 and 89.
3. N. T. A. 34, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 90; Tiruchchanda Viruttam 60 and 87.
THE ALWARS’ PRABANDHAMS

It will be plain from the above analysis that to the early Ālvārs Vengadam was the foremost place of Vishnu worship. That they considered the Murti to be the self-manifest Image of the Supreme Being Narayana, will be clear from their verses. A clear exposition of this from their songs is necessary to set at rest the vague impression in the minds of some people that at some period in the remote past the Image represented a form of Siva or Sri Subramanya although positive proof of it is not till now forthcoming and that Sri Ramanuja by some device converted the image into one of Vishnu. The early Ālvārs flourished at least six centuries before Ramanuja and bhaktas have to be told what these alvars considered the deity to represent and to which deity Vengadam has been considered the hallowed spot.

SANCTITY OF THE VENGADAM HILL AND THE SELF-MANIFESTATION OF VISHNU (TIRUMAL) THEREON.

Poygai Alvar.

Poygai Ālvār’s songs seem to be the earliest literary authority on the subject. From verse 261 it is seen that even in his days those who strove whether for material or spiritual advancement (தமிழ், முறை, Ālvār) and those who desire to have and who wait for the Divine grace in response to their higher desires (வித்தியாசம் வேதமா; வாங்கு; Viśāi kolvār) would daily worship the One who wears the fresh Tulasi garlands (துண்டு வைத்தையா உரம், அருள்மித்தாய்), with unswerving faith on that hill Vengadam because it destroys the effects of all past karmas of the terrestrial and invigorate the spiritual faculties of the

1. தமிழி வேதியத்தில் குண்டு பாரிய
tமுன் வேதியான சத்வா–அதுமுறை
வித்தியாசம் வே துண்டு வைத்தையா உரம் மரங்கு கைப்பெற்றிய தாதுலை. (I T A 26)

முறை வேதியா உரம் வைத்தையா
துண்டு வைத்தையா உரம் மரங்கு
கைப்பெற்றிய தாதுலை. தாதுலை
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celestials. From verse 37 it is gathered that (in his days) great Vedic scholars of the different parts of the country who were applying their mind to the proper elucidation of those extremely abstruse srutis which appear to be in conflict with the main ones (bheda-abheda srutis) would all go to Vengadam carrying with them incense, light, flowers and water and with prostrations pray for enlightenment. They did so because Vengadam is the hallowed spot on earth for Māl (Vishnu) whose mouth once (as Sri Krishna) blew the white Sankham (as the sure sign of banishment of fear and spiritual ignorance)—it was He who dispelled Arjuna’s confusion about what is dharma and what is adharma. These two verses are enough to convince us that in Poygai āḻvar’s days the Deity was considered to be Vishnu who specially selected this Hill as the hallowed spot for His Archāvatāram. The Āḻvar had obviously in mind the assurance vouchsafed by Sri Krishna’s after-death apparition in the Sun’s disc that He was appearing on earth in that archa-form for being worshipped by all (Vide page 257, Vol. I): “Bhūmaugatam pūjayatām prameyam” (Mahabharatam Mausala Parvam). In the next verse 38 Vengadam is described as the place selected by Māl (Vishnu) whom the Asuras claimed as their dear one—that is during his avatar as Mōhini (మహోధుంగులు మూహిం దుర్బుధులు మామాలంబు సంఘమాయి సంఘమాయి మామాలంబు మామాలంబులు). In verses 39 the Deity is identified with Sriman Narayana reposing on the waters of the wide ocean. There He is reposing, while in Vengadam He is standing (స్వామి నరాయణే స్వామి నరాయణే స్వామి నరాయణే స్వామి నరాయణే స్వామి నరాయణే స్వామి నరాయణే). In verse 40 the hill is

1. అతితయం కన్నా కర్దము తాళ్ళకడపటాడ నరాయణం

ప్రతిభాదిందం పుప్పాడి గిద్ద పిచ్చి—హితంశయునిపినం

హిందిలింపాలం లేదుపాలం ప్రతిభాదిందం మత్తంపనిసంభవించి

విచేషం ప్రతిభాదిందం దానం. (I T A 37)

సుమారు కూడా చింతాశర్యంలో మల్క

షుపారుషులు జాగ్రత్తం పిందు— అంశానం

హిందాలు ఇతర్వం ఇతర్వం జాగ్రత్తం

హిందాలు ఇతర్వం ఇతర్వం జాగ్రత్తం
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identified as the place selected by Him who killed the mighty king of the asuras Rāvana (மாம்மாவும் மாம்மாயும் சரண சூர்ய கோவில்கள் அக்கீல்; பாலூர் பாலூர் எழுத்துக்குள் கொண்டே). The idea that the Hill is sacred to Sri Rama is repeated in verse 82\(^1\) in the words "the hill (sacred to Him) who once in the past shot the elusive deer to death" (......... பராசி தோட்டங்கள், காரணமான தோட்டத்தின் வரதம்; தோட்டத்தில் கருநாசும் கொண்டு). The same verse also tells us that the Pārasi or Mukkōṭi dvādasī attracted to Vengadam large concourse of pilgrims, women in particular who took with them flower garlands and incense for the worship. The belief expressed in verse 39 that the Deity in Vengadam and He who is on the ocean are one and the same is reiterated in verse 99\(^2\) which affirms—"my good heart know Thou that He is Immanent," that He is the Highest (the Living God on High), know thou in truth that He who is on the waters of the ocean and He who lords over all from Vengadam is also

1. பாராசின் தோட்டங்கள், காரணமான தோட்டம்
   பிள்ளை இல்லயம் தூத்திய காயம்—யின்றி செய்திகள்
   மூலமான மரகுந்தை வகைகளை மூன்று முறைகளின்
   மை காண்பது மீது குறுக்கு வரதம். (I.T. 82).

2. மாம்மாவும் மாம்மாயும் கோவில்கள் அக்கீல்
   மாம்மாவும் மாம்மாயும் கோவில்கள் அக்கீல்—மாம்மாவும்
   மாம்மாயும் கோவில்கள் அக்கீல் மற்றும் மாம்மாவும்
   மாம்மாயும் கோவில்கள் அக்கீல் மற்றும்
   கோவில்களின் மை காண்பது வரதம் வரதம். (I.T.A. 99).

787
the one who is our hearts "நராயண கிளை நராயண பலன் சமந்தனாம் சமந்தனாம் பலன் நராயண கிளை " நூற்றாண்டு நூற்றாண்டு நூற்றாண்டு நூற்றாண்டு நூற்றாண்டு நூற்றாண்டு நூற்றாண்டு நூற்றாண்டு. In verse 76,\textsuperscript{1} the Deity is also identified with Trivikrama who measured the worlds with His Feet. It says that Tiruvengadam, the abode of Him who measured the earth will without placing obstacles grant us Heaven (Vin); also that those who keep to the righteous path and worship in the ordained manner will rise to be Murtis (Brahma and Rudra) who stand steadfast to truth.

It will be seen from the above quotations that the Deity on the Vengadam Hill is identified by Poygai alvar with the avatars of Krishna, Rama and Trivikrama. The Archa form of Sri Krishna which was observed in the Sun's disc seems to have had neither Chakram nor Sankham in hand. Sri Devi alone was on the chest. The marks on the shoulders of Sri Venkateswara may be taken to indicate the marks left by the slings which carried the arrow packs of Sri Rama. The lower right hand pointing to the right foot reminds us that for the salvation of our souls we must depend on that foot which gave salvation to Maha Bali.

Lastly the alvār addresses the Deity in these words in verse 68\textsuperscript{2} "who can comprehend your greatness and your form even

1. அப்பிரியார விநாயக ஐந்தாண்டாய் வாயாய
   அப்பிரியார விநாயக நாமாய்—கநூற்றாண்டாய்
   வாயாய் ஒளி மகாவிய திருமகாிய மணமாம
   வாயாய் நூற்றாண்டாய் கடம.  (I. T. A. 76).

2. மணமாய மணமாய தீஸ்வரவிழுக்கிருந்த ஄றிமுகாய
   மணமாய மணமாய கிளையாய—கநூற்றாண்டாய்
   மணமாம கேநாம! பாலானாம கேநாம! கேநாம கேநாம! (I. T. A. 68).
contemplating over them from aeon to aeon. O Soul of the Heavens, Soul of the Earth, the Lord of Vengadam, Soul of the Four Vedas and of the Hymns, who knows the place You lie in."

Bhudattalvar.

Bhudattalvar also identifies (in verse 25) the Deity in Vengadam as Sri Rama who killed Ravana in battle. He stands on the Vengadam Hill clothed with the tall bamboo forests on its sloopse and He is loudly praised by the celestials. In verse 28 He is identified with Sri Krishna who tore the mouth of the horse—"He is in our hearts. He is in Vengadam, He is on the ocean, also in Arangam island; He is called the Deva of all Devas." In verse 33 he expresses his joy that he fixed his faith in Him who

1. "తమన్నం అనూకు కారం కరువు కనుమిలుసం"
   "బగిబాగా మనిషనం అతిమనిధ్రువం, నిర్భయం"
   బయాతి మనిషనం హిద్దీ చెప్పాడు మనిషా వయస్

2. బ్రహ్మాండారు సమానము పుణ్యక్షి మనిషి
   సర్వత్రరేఖ మార్గం పదార్థం

3. కథిబింది కథినం కథిసమనం కాయం
   అదిక్రమంపల్లి సాంపత్తుల మార్గం—ప్రతిభ కనం
   దసంపరపల్లి కరం బిందువు కలిచాక మరియు మరు
   మనిషితాకు భావంయుము భాష.

(I.I.A. 33).

కథింత ఒడ్డం కథింత అండ్
అశ్చాడు నిర్భయం—మిథభాషి
చెప్పారు భాగు పది ఈంటాకు
మార్గాలు ఒకం సత్.
wears the Tulasi garlands and who is the Lord of Vengadam whose slopes are studded with tall bamboo forests. Him the āḻvār says that his voice praised to the best of its powers. In Bhūdattāḻvār’s view, the Deity is undoubtedly Vishnu wearing the Tulasi garlands. In verse 45¹ he says that those that worship His feet would never be proud of their possessions (wealth); nor would they feel dejected on account of their poverty when they become poor. Vengaḍattān is enshrined in the boundless Vedas and at His Feet all celestials place their crowned heads. Verse 53 states how he found the Deity decorated to look like the young Krishna with the forelocks done up into a knot over the forehead and the rear tuft hanging behind. He looked like a hillock. Vengadam with its hill streams studded with flowery creepers entwined on either bank was the very place which he adored most. It has to be inferred from this that in Bhūdattāḻvār’s days it was usual to decorate the Image to look like Bālakrishna, probably in the belief that the Deity is Sri Krishna. In verses 72 to 77 the āḻvārs

1. எல்லாம் பிரமாணருக்கு அனுமந்து நூற்றாண்டு
   கேந்த் குவல்பத்துத் தாரும்—அந்தக்
   பின்புறத்தில் பொறிக்க தாரும் விளக்கியது இம்முறையும்
   மறுத்தும் பார்த்து போனினார். (II. T. A. 45).

2. அந்தோரத் தமிழகத் தலைநாடி பொரியாடும்
   ஆண்டிய பி.லிங்கபிள்ளியை மைசர்பை—பிரிசு கு
   புனோகாணானாக தமக் பாயும் காண்டு வந்து கற்று காண்டு
   இரண்டும் பார்த்து போனினார். (II. T. A. 53).
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reveals in contemplation of Vengadavan. Monkeys going back to their rendezvous in the caves, plucking and strewing the flowers, appeared to him as if they worshipped Vengadavan there. To his mind it was an appeal that he should also worship with flowers repeating all His names. In the next verse 73, he feels proud that as a sincere devotee he could recite His thousand names from beginning to end, in the reverse order and also from any place in the middle. In the next verse 74 he expresses his conviction that as successful tapasvi of seven continuous births he with pride laid at His feet the garland of his inimitable songs in the purest high class Tamil. Verse 75 describes Vengadam as the hill where the he-and the she-elephants exchange courtesies by the former presenting to the latter tender bamboo shorts dipped in the honey of the honeycombs for repast. In verse 76 we are told that the Deity is no other than the Omniscient Being (Sri Vishnu—Ariyan, veedu veedu) who in the hoary past (Adikkan) beyond our ken of his own Will took His stand there and that thenceforth He

1. அமுத்தாம்பராந்துமறைமையுறுந்துமறைமை அன்புத்தான் குமாரி வீலகவுரு—நம்பிந்து
   நல்லூர் முன்னிலை நவன்வாகந்து
   ஜோதிலிங்கம் காணின் வாகனை

2. பாரிசு குமாரியாமல் குமாரியாமல் தம்பாங்குமல்
   பாரிசு குமாரியாமல் தம்பாங்குமல்—பாரிசு
   திருத்தின் பாரிசு திருமாலந்து தாராமலாம்
   பாரிசு கிலியும் பாரிசு பாரிசு
   (II. T. A. 74).
   சார் நந்திலே வாழையும் வாழையும்
   சார் நந்திலே வாழையும்—சார்
   ஜோதிலிங்கம் காணின் வாகனை

3. பாரிசு திருத்தின் பாரிசு தூன்றுக்குதலை தாராமலாம்
   பாரிசு தூன்றுக்குதலை தாராமலாம்
   சார் நந்திலே வாழையும்—சார்
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should be worshipped in the proper manner by repeating (His thousand) names. The Image is described as being smeared all over with the paste of the hill grown sandal-wood, as being adorned with the divine ornaments (Divyābharanams), dressed in silk and profusely decorated with highly fragrant white jasmine flowers.¹ This is the first time that such a description is given in the Prabandhams. In verse 77 he exhorts himself to feel assured that He is the Highest (Uttaman) and that He should reverently be worshipped daily reciting his thousand names.

Bhudattalvār's firm belief was that the Image is self-manifest Brahmam who deigned to stand on this Hill to give facilities to all men to worship Him and that He has been there from times unknown to man. He seems to have worshipped Him on two occasions—once when the Image was decorated to look like the youthful Krishna perhaps on a Srijayanthi day: again when the Image in the natural state was dressed in silk, covered over with sandal paste and profusely decorated with jasmine flowers. This profuse decoration with flowers is mentioned in Silappadhikaram also. Tulasi garlands would have been a part of this decoration. It was given the name Poovalangal or Pūlangi sēva in later times. The divine ornaments referred to by Bhudattalvār are the ornaments which are integral with the Image and mentioned in the Puranas and Agamas as (not the ones made by human hands and put on the Deity) those always on the body of Para Vāsudeva in Vaikuntham.

**Pey Alvar.**

Pēy ālvār also represents the Deity on the Vengadam Hill as self-manifest Vishnu and associates it with His incarnations

---

¹. विष्णु स्वरूप तीर्थस्थ ताम्रपात्मक चंद्राणि स्वरूपमापित्रविद विष्णुपारवालं भक्तिवद्भवेत।

**I.** असरकर्ककः श्रीमानं श्रीमलस्मृतं लिपिको।

---
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as Trivikrama and Krishna. Himself being a bhakta who achieved God Realisation he tells us in verse 14 of the only way to achieve it—to concentrate one’s thoughts on Māl (Vishnu) one must observe strict celibacy by giving up associating with women, should worship the Holy Feet of Vengadattān who shines in the four Vedas and at whose Feet the celestials place their heads in worship and take to the serious study of the sacred texts.

In verses 36, 37 and 38 he praises Narayana whose bhakta it was his good fortune to be by recounting His divine weapons (Divyāyudhas)—the flaming chakram, the pure white sankham which came out of the ocean, the Gada, the Saṅgam and the sharp sword and then the eagle (Garuda); how He measured the worlds and the seas (v. 37). His bhakta he was proud to be. He pervades our hearts, also every thing else outside and the briny waters of the ocean. On His chest shines the coral-colour-lipped Lady seated on the flower and the brilliant Hāram of many coloured gems (v. 38). He is incomparable. All things are of His Form, He is Tapas, He is the sustainer; He is the flaming-fire and the great mountains, the eight dikś (cardinal directions) and the twin fires of the Anādam. In v. 391 he says that this Supreme Being is Vengadattān, the Rakshaka (आर्कानक), the worlds (विश्वार्क), the eight dikś, (दक्षिण दक्षिण), the Vedas (वेदार्क), the soul of Vedas (वेदार्कार्क) and the Skies. He is (there on the hill) surrounded by the sparkling and the gurgling waters of the hill streams. “He is filling the innermost recesses of

1. शामस्यमा प्रकाशनी रामस्य विष्णुव्रतम् कर्तर्थः
शामस्यमा प्रकाशनी रामस्य विष्णुव्रतम् अतःपुरुष—विष्णुप्रवर्तन
शामवत् रामाय रामायानमानं गंगाहि इति उपराहस्य-क्रतां
काराय यो गंगाहि सञ्जीवनि वर्णे। (III. T. A. 39).
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my heart.”1 In v. 402 he exhorts his heart (நெற்குறி), “Know that He is Real (எந்த என்று), He is the Highest (என்று என்று) He resides in the hearts of those who meditate on Him. Vengadattan stands Real on the hill which rises touching the skies; He is the one who measured the entire earth with His foot.”

There is therefore no room to doubt that the Deity on the Vengadam Hill was considered by this āḻvār to be the self-manifest Image of Sri Vishnu. In verses 45 and 58 and 61 he identifies the Deity as Vishnu in his previous avatars.3

1. நெற்குறி என்று என்று;

2. நெற்குறி என்று என்று என்று என்று என்று

3. நெற்குறி என்று என்று என்று

III. T. A. 40.

3. நெற்குறி என்று என்று

III. T. A. 45.

3. நெற்குறி என்று

III. T. A. 58.

3. நெற்குறி என்று

III. T. A. 61.
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Verse 61 to 64.

Then the names of several places where Vishnu deigned to manifest Himself in the alvar's days are mentioned in 61, 62 and 64.

Then the names of several places where Vishnu deigned to manifest Himself in the alvar's days are mentioned in 61, 62 and 64.

III. T. A. 61.

III. T. A. 62.

III. T. A. 63.

795
The long hanging Jāta and the High peaked crown; the shining mālu (axe) and the Chakram; the encircling (or coiling round) serpent and the gold waist thread are seen (on the form of the Deity); Therefore in my Father on the Tirumalai (hill), where flow the winding streams swollen with water, the two forms seem harmoniously to combine into one. The inference is that the Image was decorated with the long flowing Jāta of Hara, the high crown or Kireetam of Hari; the serpent coiling round half the body of the image and the gold waist-thread over half the loins; and in one hand the mālu while in the other hand there was the Chakram. It is an absolute truth that the Image has no jata
depicted integrally on the Image, there is no serpent coiling round any portion of the body. There is however the waist string (kaṭi sutram) depicted on the body. Neither Chakram, Sankham or Maṇḍu is an integral part of the Image. Not one of the Mudal alvars (Tirumalisai also is included in this term) has mentioned Chakram and Sankham or any other weapon as being a part of the Image. These are invested under certain conditions only and may be omitted in other cases. This matter has been fully explained in Vol. I in Chapter VIII (Murti Svarupam) and in Chapter XII. It is possible that in the early years of the Seventh Century the image was sometimes decorated in the above manner because there probably was in those days the belief that Brahma, Vishnu and Siva are only different forms of the One Being. Peyāḷvār says that when he worshipped he found that the Deity was decorated 'n that manner. But he did not subscribe to the theory that the two represent the same Being. There is however the strong probability that this verse and another one 75 are spurious interpolations made during the Chola period, that is after 1000 A.D. The name used in these two verses for the hill is Tirumalai. In the Prabandham of the Āḷvārs covering the period from about 500 A.D. to about 800 A.D., this name is not used but only Vengadām. Sri Nammalvar uses the term Tirumalai to designate the hill adjoining the Tirumalirumsolai temple (Tiruvoy. 2–10–4 and 10–7–7), but not for the Vengadām Hill. Even in Peyalvar's songs the term Vengadām alone is used in all other places.

From the inscriptions in Tirumala, Tirupati and Tiruchchanūr it is seen that the term Tirumalai is used for the first time in an inscription dated the seventh day of the reign of Rajendra Chola I (Vol. I 19, 1013 A.D. para 3) ‘ஏழாம் சாத்தா சூரேனானாசு சும் சீலலூக்கை சான்றாக தான்...'}
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was living in Kalahasti as a zealous Saivite nayanar attached to that temple. Again it was in those times that Sri Ramanuja was asked to affix his signature assenting to the slogan "Sivāt parataram nāsti" which emanated from the court of the Chola King and which resulted in his voluntary exile to the Mysore country of the Vira Ballalas. It was later in the same period that Sri Ramanuja had to establish that the weapons on the Image should be Chakram and Sankham. If these circumstances are taken into consideration the probability of a spurious interpolation (or substitution) of this verse gains ground.

That verse 63 is a later day interpolation being a substitute for the original verse which appears to have been deleted will be apparent if verses 61 to 64 are read together. It will now be shown that the present verse 63 creates a sudden break in the continuity of thought which should obviously have existed from verse 61 to 64.

In verses 61 and 62 the āḻvār gives what is practically the origin of temple worship. He states in verse 61 that "in days of yore (கோயில் நூற்று, கோயில்), His Koyils for worship were on the Vengaḍam Hill, the milky ocean (மெல்லாது, மெல்லாது) and Vaikuntham. The great one who condescended to receive a gift with oblations of water has also made the following places His abode—Nil solai Tirumāl-irum-solai, Katigai or ghaṭikachalam, Viṇnagar (of the young Kumara which is perhaps the name for Paramesvara¹ Vinnagar (61); Viṇnagar (perhaps the name for Uppiliyappan temple or Kāḷīchirama Vinnagar), Vehka, Vēngadam (with its rivulets); Vēḻukkai, Ten Kudandai (Kumbakonam), Tiruvarangam (Srirangam); Ten Kōṭṭiyur (Tirukkoṭṭiyūr) (62).

In verse 64 the āḻvār continues in the same strain and speaks of the three postures (நாயசவர் தன்னுடன் ஆயம்) in one place. In Kachchi and Vehka, the standing and the reposing postures are referred to. The sitting posture in அமைவு i.e., Kāṇchipuram itself, remains unsaid. It is this that was obviously given by the āḻvār in a verse for which the present verse 63 has been substituted.

1. Paramesvara Potavarman reigned from 670 to 690 A.D.
It will be evident that the mind of the āḻvār was devoted to making a list of the places of temple worship which had since come into existence in his days and the posture of the Image. In 61 and 62 the places were listed. In 64 the recent places for the standing and reposing postures are given. For the sitting posture, corresponding to the one in Vaikunṭham, a temple in Kanchipuram should have been given. The original verse 63 probably gave that. It is now missing having been replaced by the substituted verse “குருநகர் பாதியாம் ஸிஂர நயில் பாதியாம்...”. The āḻvār commenced by giving Vengadam, the milky ocean and Vaikunṭham as the original places for the three postures. The recent one for the standing and reposing posture, have been stated, but not for the sitting posture. He would have devoted a verse for this also. As the āḻvār has given instances from the temples in Kancheepuram the probability is that Pāḍagam¹ was given for sitting posture.

Verse 62 ends with the word குருநகர் and the present verse 63 commences with குருநகர் தலம் (குருதலம்) and ends with குருநாதி. Verse 64 commences with குருநாதி (குரநாதி). The original verse 63 would have commenced with குருநகர் and ended with குருநாதி. The temple of Pandava dutar could well have been described commencing with குருநகர் and ending with குருநாதி. A reading of the 95th Adhyaya of the Udyoga Parva of the Mahabharata shows that Sri Krishna deigned to appear before Dhritarashtra as the ambassador of the Pandavas and actually stood as a suppliant (a Yāchaka) for peace with a view to save the lives of the great princes who were present at the durbar and of the millions of the subjects of the Empire which a war was bound to destroy. He reasoned out his case convincingly (குருநாதி). The present verse 63 commencing with குருநகர் is decidedly a spurious interpolation.

In verse 75² குருநகர் appears to have been substituted for குருநாதி just to show that the āḻvār has used the term குருநாதி.

1. Pāḍagam being for the sitting posture. See also verses 29 to 32.
2. குருநகர் குருநாதி குருநாதி குருநாதி குருநாதி—குருநாதி
twice in his work. The conception in v. 75 that the hill shot up to touch or graze the heavens (கார்பாக்க இச்சும்பாழிய வலும் சன்னதி கண்டை) would be better expressed by calling it உயரமையா (or great hill) than பெருங்குறிச்சியமையா (Tirumalai). In verse 68 Vengadam Hill is said to belong to the one (Sri Krishna) who in times of yore pelted a calf to make a wood apple fall from the tree “எங்குமேயங்குமின்றி விளக்கிக்கானச் சூர்யாசன வலும்; சோஸ்கு சோஸ்கு, வர்த்தகம் பெருங்குறிச்சியமையா.” In verses 70, 71, 72 and 73 also the hill is said to be the place of Sri Krishna.

Verse 73 gives the further information that during his northerly course the sun moves over to the Vengadam hill. This perhaps shows that the Āḻvār visited Tirumalai in Uttarayanam, just after the Rathasapthami, since the seven horses of the sun’s chariot are referred to therein “Having directed Ravi’s Ratha yoked to the seven (horses) right and left. He rests in the Vengadam Hill in the north.”

“எங்குமே சல்லு வலும் விளக்கிக்கானச் சூர்யாசன வலும்—...........

“வர்த்தகம் பெருங்குறிச்சியமையா... வர்த்தகம் பெருங்குறிச்சியமையா—...........”

Verse 89 distinctly says that Vengadam is the hill of the one who applied the exquisite flute to His lips (Sri Krishna) and that the Kurabas or Kuravars when they could spare time ploughed the ground and sowed the seeds of Tinai (தினையூடாம்) which sprouted and grew to the size of tall bamboos piercing the skies. We thus learn that in Pey Āḻvār’s days the Kuruvars were taking
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to the raising of dry food crops when they could spare the time from their elephant capturing occupation.

"... முதுறை வாரசை தவற்சை சென்று
பொறுக்குச்சால் குர்க்குசதாந் விளக்க—முதுறையும்
எழுந்துதல் வர்த்ததின் வேலானை வேறுபாடு வேறுபாட்டின்
நேரியான வன்னான விளைவு..." (II. T. A. 89).

There can be no doubt that Sri Peyálvar considered Vengadam as the sacred place of Vishnu for His archa form.

Tirumalisai Alvar.

Tirumalisai alvár's Nanmukhan Tiruvandádi and Tiruchchanda viruttam contain verses which give a realistic picture of the hill, its rivulets and the wild animals leading their natural life therein. It is unnecessary for us to go into details about these. They are however interesting. He seems to have visited the hill on more than one occasion and to have made a close study. The unexploited virgin forest of the hill is described in Tiruchchanda viruttam, v. 60. "He stands on the Vengadam hill characterised by its dense fog. The autogenous tall bamboos fall to the ground, dry up, decay, sprout again and grow to great heights."

"... கோவில்பக்க வாரசை வாரசை விளக்கி
சீரும் செழியும் விளக்கி இன்பல்கள் செழியும் விளக்கி
"...செழியும் விளக்கி இன்பல்கள் செழியும்
செழியும் விளக்கி இன்பல்கள் செழியும்..."

About the wild life therein he says (Nan-Muk, Tiruvandádi v. 47) that therein live lions and lionesses; therein are precious
stones, pearls, flowering plants and trees in the forests through which roll the cool waters of the rivulets, and therein also thrive in plenty elephants and monkeys.”

It is interesting to read about his pilgrimage to Vengadam. In verse 34 he says that his desire (தீரம் செய்த) was to go to Tirukkoṭṭiyur to worship the Deity there (தாவர குறையுடன் இசைத்தோடு குறையுடன் நன்றி போன்று வேண்டும்); but how could the Deity on the Vengadam Hill be ignored? (தீரில் இல்லை என்று மறைத்திருக்கும், இல்லை என்று வேண்டும்). He has the power to protect us from the ill-effects of the karmas of our life (முற்றிலிருந்து சுமார்த்தினை அடைந்து உள்ளாமல் வந்து தான், தமிழ் பூங்கா உருவாக்கிய இரும்பு ஐந்து நூற்றாண்டு தலை) N. M. T. 34. He then says that He used to call Tiruvengadattan in order to see him (அம்மனின் குறையுடன் பட்டுத்தமனை குறையுடன், இல்லை என்று வேண்டும்) to go to his Hill (v. 39). He corrects himself and says I sang it as Hill! I stand here looking forward to go to Heaven (பீடு மித்தாக்கு மித்தாக்கு பத்தாக்கு, இல்லை என்று கூறுது), standing here I contemplate on it. I am caught in the net of the Feet of the Consort of the Lady (Lakshmi), லக்ஷ்மியை செய்து குறையுடன் (மையனா வாழ்ந்து) caught in the net of the form of sacred Lore, v. 40. He continues in v. 41: “I long to attend the Önam festival so vociferously celebrated and see the rivulets which shed pearly stores along their beds. O Vëngaḍava, you are lovingly approaching me. By going over to Vengadam You have got into my heart.” The äḻwār could not contain himself. He wants every Bhakta to share his joy. So in verses
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42 and 43^1 is the exhortation to all men to go and worship the high Vengadam hill because it possesses the virtue of steadily rooting out all Karmas—there the Four-faced one seated on the lotus and the Three-eyed one daily worship His Holy Feet (of the Deity there). Siva (who wears the Moon on his Jata and Brahma who is on the Lotus flower go there by night holding aloft the umbrellas befitting their position to seek salvation (ஆதும் புருஷிகள் ஆம்பகுமுள்ள ஆலயம், சோய்ந்த புருஷேதும் குருங்கரை). In verse 44 he exhorts all men who have children (family) (மீது மலராட்பெரும் புருஷருகு குழாயினரே) to go and worship there. He then describes in verse 45^2 where and how the Image is. He says that the great One deigned out of His loving concern for our salvation to rest His Holy Feet on deforested ground which was decorated with the choicest flowers placed by devotees and is standing out prominently so as to make Himself visible from everywhere. That place Vengadam with the cool waters of its rivulets is (therefore) the most valued sacred asset for celestials and terres-

---

1. மன்னர்களும் குழாயினரும் குழாயினரும் குழாயினரும் குழாயினரும்—குறிகள்

2. மன்னர்களும் குழாயினரும் குழாயினரும்—குறிகள்

3. மீது மலராட்பெரும் புருஷருகு குழாயினரே

(N.T. 43).

4. பாசிச் சாஸ்நத் பாசிச் சாஸ்நத்

5. பாசிச் சாஸ்நத் பாசிச் சாஸ்நத்—சாச்செச்செச்செச்செச்செ

6. சாச்செச்செச்செச்செச்செச்செ—சாச்செச்செச்செச்செ

(N.T. 45).
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trials alike. We learn from this description that there was not in those days any structures enclosing the Image, but that the Image stood high and was visible to bhaktas coming from every direction. In verse 48 the ālvar reaffirms that it is a fact that Vengadam is the place where celestials go to for worship, that Vengadam is really the place which destroys the ills of Karmas, and that Vengadam is the hill which is the (earthly) abode of Him who with his chakram and other weapons destroys the Dānavas and assures protection to the celestials. From verse 46 it is seen that in the ālvar's days elephant hunt by the Kuravars (Kurabas) was common.

The benefit accruing from an unwavering faith in and sincere worship of the Deity on the Vengadam Hill is thus summed up by the ālvar in verse 90—"Those whose ambition it is to sit in state and reign in the heavenly regions have been with unfaltering devotion placing the choicest flowers at the Feet of Vengadattān in sincere worship and those who prefer to lead a higher and nobler life have been at all proper seasons doing sincere worship in the proper manner and with humility."¹

Tiruppananalvar.

There is only one point worth noting about Vengadam in the ten verses sung by this ālvar. Vengadam is the place where

---

1. The நிற்பாடி means நிற்பாடி கம்பு, forest which has been felled down. பூமி means in loving condescension; கம்பு means a legacy or bequest.

2. பூமி பேச்சு சிறந்தவள் சுமார்ப்பயின் சலைகளிலும் கைடுகோட்டத்தைப் பாதம் பூமி மையக்குள் பூமிக்கு பூமி மையக்கு வந்தவள் அலங்காரமும் பூமிக்கு கட்டு வந்து பின்புறமாக நுழை. (N. M. T. 90).

புவி பேச்சு சிறந்தவள் சுமார்ப்பயின் சலைகளிலும் கைடுகாட்டின் பாதம் பூமி மையக்குள் பூமி மையக்கு வந்தவள் அலங்காரமும் பூமிக்கு கட்டு வந்து பின்புறமாக நுழை.
Vānavar or the celestials worship the Supreme Being at Sandhāi (at dusk and dawn). "He who in Arangam is reposing on the
Serpent, is standing on the monkey infested Vada Vengadam Hill to be worshipped by the celestials at the Sandhis." (v. 3) His impression probably was that terrestrials worship in Srirangam and only celestials in Vengadam Hill.

Kulasekhara alvar.

From the songs of Kulasekhara aḻvār known as Perumāl Tirumoli (IV. 1.) we learn that in his days there was some sort of a Koyil or temple in Vengadam wherein the timber of the Tumbaka and Champaka trees were used. The Kōṇēri or sacred pond is referred to, Rudra, Brahma and Indra daily turn up to worship the Lord of Vengadam (Vengadakkōn) (IV. 3).

It is also seen from this verse that there was some kind of daily worship carried on by an archaka and that devotees had to stand outside the door-step of the NīlvāsaL.

Sri Nammalvar.

To Sri Nammāḻvār the Vengadam Hill and the Deity thereon are as sacred as to the Early aḻvārs. At the different stages of
his spiritual advancement and psychic experiences Tiruvengada-
mudaiyan (Sri Venkatavesara) has been considered as the archa
(Image) manifestation of the Supreme Being Narayana for our
benefit.

The first hundred verses of his Tiruvayamo is devoted to
a concise exposition of the Upanishadic philosophy and the Puranic
account of the celestial and the cosmogetic creations—how the
Formless Supreme Being assumed innumerable forms having
special attributes and powers concomitant thereto and compre-
hensible to the appropriate jiva as—

"He who is Pure Sat (having no form) and assumed a Form
which is the seed from which sprang the Three (Mûvar) and the
numerous Heavenly Beings (Nityas), Munis, others and all else
without exception. Further It manifested itself on the unfathomable
waters and took its abode thereon. He is the Inscrutable One
(Mâmây an), Vaikunthanathan, the Lord of the Nityas and my
Lord."

The Āḻvār sings the glory of the Lord and how the Nityas
and the other heavenly beings enjoy His company. Mortals
can have no more than an imaginative conception of it. For
the maintenance of the Dharmas, for the protection of His bhaktas
and for the destruction of Adharmas (evil forces) He manifested
Himself in His Vibhava Forms at different times. Jivas of those
times enjoyed His company. Sri Nammalvar then says that for
the benefit of mortals of this age He has manifested Himself on
the Vengadam Hill in a Form adored equally by the celestials and the terrestrials (immortals and mortals). The Hill itself is sacred to the heavenly beings as it is to terrestrials. Tirumalaiyä alvär has characterised the hill as legacy for celestials and terrestrials.

" அருளத்திருக்கும் மலையே இன்று குறுக்கை வந்து வந்தது "
ரு, ரு, குருரு கேறு.

It has to be noted that Vengadam is the first place on earth mentioned by the alvar whereon the Supreme Being deigned to manifest Himself as an Image. In verse 1—5—4 His manifestations on the ocean and in Vaikuntham (the Heavens) were referred to. The same assurance has been given us by Sri Pey-alvär in verse 61 of his Mûnra Tiruvandâdi already referred to on page 1129 infra. The psychic experience of Sri Nammalvär at the time he made this statement about the sanctity of Vengadam should be duly taken into account. The feeling was that God had taken complete possession of his body and soul purely out of His grace and not as the direct result of the alvar’s wish or attempts. How then

1. குடறன்று நாகன் நெங்க மலை வந்து குறுக்கை வந்துது

(Tiruvay. 1-8-3).

"He who has at all times been equally the most beloved (Kaṇṇāvän or the apple of the eye) of the celestials and the terrestrials has manifested Himself on the Vengadam Hill (which is also) so dear to the celestials ".

2. பாபா முத்தாவை வந்து குறுக்கை வந்தது

(Tiruvay. 1-7-7).

3. பாபா முத்தாவை வந்து குறுக்கை வந்தது

(Tiruvay. 1-7-7).
could He ever desert him.² "For those who (seek Him for a boon and then) part from Him He will be far off, for those who approach Him (for no boons) He will always be with them.... Let us without a feeling of fatigue or satiety sing His glory by day and by night ceaselessly."

Incidentally it is worth mentioning here that the second archa form of the Supreme Being which the āḻvār glorifies is Tirukkuriungudi Nambi¹ (1-10-9). The tradition is that not having a son for many years the āḻvār’s parents made a long penance before Tirukkurungudi Nambi to be blessed with a worthy son and that Sri Nammalvar (Kārī Māran) was the Divine gift in answer to their prayers. No wonder that the āḻvār sang the glory of that

---

1. "Saḷvai ṣatpurū ṣatraṇṭi ṣaṇṭiṇṭi
raudhu mṛmāṇaṁ māḥātmaṁ āṭhamaṁ
jñānaṁ āṣṭiṣṭiḥ māṇum. vibhūti-vibhūti
bhūtum bhūtum bhūtum bhūtvā. (1-7-10).

vah saṃśaṅgaṁ saṃśaṅgaṁ
caIVA bādhiḥ bhārata rājāṁ
mahāvān bhūtaṁ hi deśāṇiṁ
tatāḥ bādhiḥ bhārata rājāṁ.

2. "Tiruvilsumūṁ ṛṣṭivānāṁ rṣivānāṁ añāṁ
śeṣamāṇeṣam śīvīppaṁ śīvīppaṁ
māṇamāṇeṣam bhikṣuṇāṁ bhikṣuṇāṁ
śeṣamāṇaṁ bāṭārōṁ bhikṣuṇāṁ bhikṣuṇāṁ. (Tiruvāy. '1-16-9).

māṇaṁ aṁ māṇaṁ aṁ māṇaṁ
dvāraṁ dvāraṁ dvāraṁ
dvāraṁ dvāraṁ dvāraṁ
dvāraṁ. (1-16-9).
Deity next after Vēngadām. But for his faith that on the Vengadām Hill the Deity is self-manifest Brahmān he would have placed Tirukkurungudi first (see also verses 1 and 2 of Tiruvāyumolī 3-9).

The second centum is devoted to a detailed descripton of the stages of spiritual development experienced by the ālvār. He appreciates that this was made possible only by the association of the soul with the perishable body which in itself is a divine gift as much as the spiritual experiences made possible thereby. In the short period of a single birth it was by the Divine grace that he was enabled to achieve all that he did which in the normal course could only be accomplished by the successful practice of Karma yoga, Jñāna yoga and Bhakti yoga over a series of births.¹

He glorifies in Tiruvāyumolī 2-4 and 2-5 this achievement in the company of a congregation of bhaktas singing, dancing and describing in detail the numerous forms and names of the Supreme Being, His divine ornaments and weapons. Although beyond description by our limited knowledge, still He allows Himself to be seen in the only manner open to His bhaktas. The different stages of spiritual conception are described in (2-6) until the ānanda stage is reached (2-6-8).²

1. தறிகையன தயாரங்க தலாசின பூதி விபசாமயம்
   தறிகையன புப்பைப்பை தவுரை தவுரைசேதர்
   தறிகையன் தாவுரையம் தவுரைத்தாவு

2. மார்தை மார்தை பலணமும் மீரும் பலணம் பலாத்தாங்கித்தும்
   கோயில் சிறிய சிறிய சிறிய சிறிய சிறிய

(Tiruvāy. 2-3-4).
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It is at this climax that the ālvār sees in the Deity on the Vengadam Hill his Father, the Supreme Being and the one who destroyed Vāli. "You have rubbed yourself into me. How can you go elsewhere hereafter." ¹

In the next verse (2-6-10) he again says that He the Paraman is on the Vengadam Hill; the Paraman the Lord of the three worlds who in the past, the present and the future is his mother, father and saviour has got into his heart and that He will not be allowed to depart therefrom (செங்க காவா குத்தையால் கைத்திருந்து, உள்ள சிக்கி பார்வாஷிர்த்தியுயம்). Immediately after reaching this stage the alvar sings his ‘Hallelujah’ of the twelve sacred names of Narayana (dvādasa nāmam) — Kēsava, Narayana, Madhava, Govinda, Vishnu, Madhusūdana, Trivikrama, Vāmana, Sridhara, Hirishikēsa, Padmanabha, and Dāmōdara. The ālvār was not

¹(Tiru. 2-6-8).

 altitude கற்பின இடையின் வளையற்று பின் ஒப்பிலைப் பாப்பரம் வந்த பெண் ஆல்வார் கற்பின இடையின் வளையற்று பின் ஒப்பிலைப் பாப்பரம்.

(Tiru. 2-6-9).

 altitude கற்பின இடையின் வளையற்று பின் ஒப்பிலைப் பாப்பரம் வந்த பெண் ஆல்வார் கற்பின இடையின் வளையற்று பின் ஒப்பிலைப் பாப்பரம்.

 altitude கற்பின இடையின் வளையற்று பின் ஒப்பிலைப் பாப்பரம்.
content with reciting verses in praise of the twelve names only; he wedges in the Deity on the Vengadam Hill (வெங்கடம் மலைம் வேங்கடாம் மலை பத்மனாபனின் மலையில் வந்து விளைக்கும்) between Padmanabhan and Danodaran, because the Supreme Being is self-manifest on the Vengadam Hill and should be remembered at the proper moment. The spiritual experiences of the Alvar mount to the highest pitch. He prays to God to admit him to be always under His Holy Feet and keep him away from evil thought and deed. He gives expression to his realisation of the relationship between God and man in verses 2-9-8, 9 and 10. “Take full possession of me as my Eternal Father and abide therein. I will never wish for anything more unable to realise myself I have been under the delusion ‘I and Mine.’ “I am Thyself and am Thine” “Take me to Thy Feet. Do not allow me to be separated therefrom.” He was in the prime of life at this period. The mind had achieved the highest spiritual development. He was anxious that the activities of the sense organs of the material body should also be diverted from the material to the spiritual plane. Image worship offered the only possible means for this diversion. The nearest hallowed place for such worship was Tirumal-irium-solai. He repaired to this famous temple, worshipped and sang verses in praise of the Deity—who like the Deity on the Vengadam Hill is a standing Murti. The desire grew in him to worship the Deity on the Vengadam Hill itself. So he repaired thereto. His firm faith in the Lord of the Vengadam Hill and the stirring appeal which his devotional songs in praise of that Deity made to the hearts

1. பத்மனாபன் பாடத்தியமாய் பங்குத்திருந்தேன்
 வெங்கடம் மலைமலை வேங்கடாம் மலையில் வந்து விளைக்கும்
 வந்து விளைக்கும் வந்து விளைக்கும்
 வந்து விளைக்கும் வந்து விளைக்கும்
 வந்து விளைக்கும். (2-7-11)
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of Sri Tirumalai Nambi and to Sri Anandālvar are of classic importance to all Sri Vaishnavas (Tiruvaymoli 3-2, 3-4 and 3-5). In the ten verses of 3-2 he exhorts bhaktas to repair to Vengadam before old age sets in and to worship Sri Vengadattan carrying on their head water, flowers, deepam and dhāpam just as the celestials are said to do for worship there. These verses will be found in Chap. II (Vol. I). He describes the Deity as seen with his spiritual eyes in the ten verses of 3-4. Those who feel puzzled about the identity of the Murti may well be referred to verse 10.1 “He is every thing living and non-living in creation and yet He is untouched by their respective conditions of life, He is beyond description by our senses; He could be perceived by the mind, He pervades all embodied souls but unaffected by their acts and desires. If one rises to the height of complete detachment from the material body and its weal and woes, He could be got at.”

In the height of joy to sing the praises of Vengadam he advises all to forget themselves, their position in life, and how others will look at them, but go on singing His names and dancing through towns and deserts² (3-5-8). Such men will be worshipped by

1. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது

2. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

3. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

4. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

5. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

6. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

7. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

8. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

9. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

10. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

11. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

12. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

13. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

14. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

15. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

16. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

17. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

18. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

19. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அயசும் கோவல் தோளியும்
கோண்டிய புலளிய தோளும் அந்தம்பார்கள் கார்கள் குறிக்கிறது.

20. "பதிபணம் மன்னே நந்தே அய chassis
the Immortals. This visit of the āḻvār to Vengadam marks the third stage of his spiritual advancement and is his first visit. In the pattern of Bhakti worship which Sri Nammāḻvār describes and which exacts the admiration of even the celestials all can take part without distinction of caste—caste has no place therein. The āḻvār posits that even to a non-caste chandala who is a Vishnu Bhakta he would with pride be a slave

He implores all to become Vishnu bhaktas. In his appeal to poets not to prostitute the great gift of the Muse to sing the praise of men just to make a living, he says that he for one would sing only the praise of the God on the Vengadam Hill (3-9 ten verses) and next of the Deity in Tirukkurungudi (his family Deity). He found it desirable and even necessary to start a propaganda campaign to wean away men from the worship of the lower deities for obtaining temporary and temporal boons. There were also other religions which have no faith in the Vedas and the Vedic Deities. The-āḻvār realised that his evangelical work should not end with preaching to those who believe in the Vedas and in Vishnu worship. He therefore inaugurated his campaign in the Vishnu

1. Ṛṣiṇिमयम् नासिरिबिनयम् | आधिष्ठनिकम् आधिस्वरूपम् | अधिष्ठितम् कालाधिपिन | कालाधिकरिणे ।

1. 

कालाधिकरिणे आधिस्वरूपिणे आधिष्ठितम् आधिष्ठनिकम्। (3-7-9).
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temple of Adinātha in his own village Tirukkurukur (4-10 ten verses) and addressed himself specially to Saivites, Lingaits, Jains, Buddhists (followers of Śākya muni) and in fact to followers of the six systems of philosophy (ஆழ்த்தும் தமயவும்). His efforts met with success which he exultingly sings in the verses of 5-2.¹ He says that 'Kali Yugam has ended and Krita Yugam has set

---

1. பார்த்து பனித்து பார்த்து பார்த்து பார்த்து எனும் போதுமிக்கு காரம் நகரும் புருந்தும் காரம் முகுன்றும் காரம் காரம் எனும் போதுமிக்கு காரம் முகுன்றும் காரம் காரம் (5-2-1).

என்னவில்லை என்ன என்னவில்லை என்ன

னோன்ற வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு

பொருந்தி வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு

சான்றானது சான்றானது சான்றானது சான்றானது சிலையானது

சான்றானது

துணையானது துணையானது துணையானது துணையானது துணையானது துணையானது

......................................................... (5-2-2).

சான்றானது சான்றானது சான்றானது சான்றானது சான்றானது சான்றானது

......................................................... (5-2-3).

சிலையானது சிலையானது சிலையானது சிலையானது சிலையானது சிலையானது (5-2-4)

அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன்

.........................................................

அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன் அம்மன்

.........................................................

பொருந்தி வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு

பொருந்தி வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு வரையத்திற்கு

.........................................................
in; Yama has no more work and the angels of the Lord are come and are dancing in ecstasy because the heretical seats have been destroyed. May this gain in strength and glory. He found that Vishnu bhaktas had grown in numbers and in strength.

He exhorts all to worship Achyuta the true God reciting the Vedic Riks without swerving from the path prescribed for jñāna mārga (true knowledge) with flowers deepam, dhūpam, chandanam and water\(^1\) (5. 29).

He continued to carry on unabated his evangelical mission, visited and sang the praise of the Deity in many temples some of which were probably newly consecrated at his instance. He sang about Tirukkurungudi Nambi who gave the āḻvār a distinct vision while yet awake (5-5 ten verses); about the Deity in Sirivara mangalam (Vānamāmalai) (5-7 ten verses); about Sri Arāvamudan of Tirukkudandai (5-8 ten verses); and about the Deity in Tiruvallavāl (5-9 ten verses). His prayer, in addition to the evangelical work, was to see God face to face; and therein he did not succeed. He
sang about the Deities in Tirunāṉandūr (6-1 ten verses); Tiruvinnagar (6-3). Tiruttolaivilill mangalam, (6-5) Tirukkōḻur (6-7). He could not rest content without seeing God. He did Saranāgati to the Deity in every temple he sang. As his desire remained unfulfilled he sang in great distress and in the highest pitch the ten verses of 6-9. (அஞ்சும்பெட்டு பரணார்யார் செய்தென்). There was no response.

It was in this predicament that he decided to throw himself at the Feet of Tiruvengadattān. From the wording of the last line of every verse (6-10) it does not appear that he actually went to Vengadam for this Saranāgati. But his body and soul would have been psychically at the feet of the Lord. He appeals to Him through Goddess Sri Alarmēlmangai who is on his chest, to Him of matchless glory, the Lord of the three worlds, to Him whom the Immortals and Munies adore, as He is his only Saviour.¹ (6-10-10).

Note:—These ten verses as well as the twenty verses of 2-3 and 2-4 distinctly describe the features of the body, the divine ornaments and the divine weapons which the ālvār had observed. These have been briefly dealt with in Vol. I. Chapter VIII (section 3). The presence of Sri Devi on the chest, the Sankham, Chakram and Sarṇgam in the hands, the posture of the right lower hand

1. வந்தெ பலகை பன்மூம்பாய அபரைமல் மூலம்
   மகாபாலம்
   மண்டிகள் பலகை, உணக்கம் மூலம், கம்னை
   மானவானை
   மண்டிகள் பலகையில் நாயகள் பலகைப் பலகைக்கான நூலிவிழா
   பலமையிட இருந்த அருளால் கீழுள்ள நூலிவிழா
   பலகைமூல் (5-10-10)

சைத்த்டை கத்த்டை எர்஍ச்டம் குன்னு கல் மறியும்
சைத்த்டை கத்த்டை குன்னு கல் விளையாடும் நூல் வருடு
சைத்த்டை கத்த்டை எர்஍ச்டம் குன்னு கல் மறியும்
சைத்த்டை கத்த்டை எர்஍ச்டம் குன்னு கல் விளையாடும்
சைத்த்டை கத்த்டை எர்஍ச்டம் குன்னு கல் மறியும்.
pointing to the Feet for Saranāgati as the only means to obtain salvation are the principal ones.\(^1\)

This saranāgati proved ineffective because the Ālvār himself was aware that he was still the servant, if not the slave, of the five senses. Complete detachment had not been achieved (7-1 ten verses). Sri Ranganatha is praised in (7-2) as if by the mother of the Ālvār. He sings about the Deity in Tirupperai (7-3) and goes through more psychic and spiritual experiences; and one of these opened his eyes to the fact that it was the divine command that he should sing for the benefit of mankind his philosophy fully in the Tiruvaymoli (7-9). Ālvār expresses his gratitude to the Supreme Being ‘for singing His praise through his tongue,’ the words however are all His own.\(^2\)

---

1. Ālvār: Kasthitā pātanām ānandam! |  
   māyānāmeśvarānām  
   māyākāla bīrāvāmbub cintāmeśvarānām  
   cintāmānām  
   pīcchikātā pīcchikātā cintāmaṇi bālaśrī māyānām  
   māyā prapāyātā pīcchikātā bālaśrī (6-10-11)

2. Ālvār: Kasthitā pātanām ānandam! |  
   māyānāmeśvarānām  
   māyākāla bīrāvāmbub cintāmeśvarānām  
   cintāmānām  
   pīcchikātā pīcchikātā cintāmaṇi bālaśrī māyānām  
   māyā prapāyātā pīcchikātā bālaśrī (6-9-1)

---

1. Ālvār: Kasthitā pātanām ānandam! |  
   māyānāmeśvarānām  
   māyākāla bīrāvāmbub cintāmeśvarānām  
   cintāmānām  
   pīcchikātā pīcchikātā cintāmaṇi bālaśrī māyānām  
   māyā prapāyātā pīcchikātā bālaśrī (6-10-11)

2. Ālvār: Kasthitā pātanām ānandam! |  
   māyānāmeśvarānām  
   māyākāla bīrāvāmbub cintāmeśvarānām  
   cintāmānām  
   pīcchikātā pīcchikātā cintāmaṇi bālaśrī māyānām  
   māyā prapāyātā pīcchikātā bālaśrī (6-9-1)

---
"It is by His sheer Grace that Sri Vaikunthanatha selected me to be the medium for His sweet songs in preference to the several eminent poets who exist. How can I repay this? I am myself His property. There is therefore no way of repaying His grace either here or there" (7, 9—2, 6, 10).
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His unsatisfied spiritual craving to see God face to face so much disabled him physically that his attempt to reach Tiruvāranganvilai and read out his Tiruvaimoḻi in the presence of the Deity there proved abortive. He meditated and came to the conclusion that his failures were due to the material attachments which he still had. He therefore swore to have complete detachment from all material ties. He confesses that his unfulfilled desire to see Vengadavanãn had completely broken down his physical body (Tiruvay 8-2-1). It should be clear from this that it was Sri Nammāḻvār’s conviction that Sri Venkatesvara is Self-manifest Brahman in the Archa form.

Thereafter he had some exhilarating spiritual experiences including visits to the temples in Tiruchengurūr (Chitṭatụmkarai) (8-4) and Tirukkaḍittānām (8-6). In (8-8) he describes his vision of the Brahmam within his own heart. In (9-3) he sings in great satisfaction and exhorts his heart to be always with Narayana who is everything. In this climax he again refers to the Deity standing on the Vengadam Hill and affirms that He alone destroys all karmas, good and bad, puts an end to this body (with its the

2. "Ayyira Akṣaraṣṭrya bhūmāya līkthayē
Ayyira Akṣaraṣṭrya bhūmāya līkthayē Akṣaraṣṭrya
Ayyira Akṣaraṣṭrya bhūmāya līkthayē Akṣaraṣṭrya bhūmāya līkthayē. (9-3-2)
"
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cycle of birth and death) and gives salvation even to the Devas who for that purpose daily go and worship Him there (9-3-8).

In the advice which in (10-5) he gives to those who have attained a state of detachment from material ties he refers to the Deity in Vengadam who is none other than Madhava.

In the course of his praise of the Deity in Tirumāl-irum-solai (10-7) he again thinks of Tiruvengadam (10-7-8).

NOTE:—The subject has been dealt with at some length for the benefit of bhaktas who would like to know what the ālvārs have said about the sanctity of the Hill and the Murti standing thereon in days of yore when there was not even a temple structure to house the Image.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX VI.

(Vide page 597 of the text)

"Extract from the English Factories in India
by W. Foster."

Firman granted to Mr. Day for priviledges in Madras-
patam by the Nague Damarla Venkatappa.
Copy dated 22nd aug. 1639.

Firman granted by Domela Venkatadri Nague unto Mr. Francis Day, cheife for the English in Armagon, in behalf of the Honorable company, for their trading and fortifieing at Madraspatam, to this effect as followeth, whereas Mr. Francis Day, captain of the English at Armagon, upon great hopes by reason of our promises often made unto him, hath repaired to our port of Madraspatam and had personal conference with us in behalf of the company of that nation, concerning their trading in our territories and friendly commerce with our subjects, we out of our speciell love and favour to the English, doe grant unto the said captain, or whomsoever shall be deputed to idgitate the affairs of that company by vertue of their firman power to direct and order the building of a fort and castle in or about Madraspatam, as they shall think most convenient; the charges where of until fully and wholly finished to bee defrayed by us, but then to bee repaid when the said English shall first make their entrance to take possession thereof. And to make more full expression of our affection to the English nation (wee) do confirm unto the said Mr. Francis Day or whatsoever other subjects or agents for that company, full power and authority to governe and dispose of the government of Madraspatam for the term and space of two years next insueing after they shall be seated there and possessst of the said fortifications; and for the future by an equal division to receive half the custom and revenewes of that port. Moreover whatsoever goods or merchandize the English company shall either import or export, for as much as concerns the dutyes and costomes of Madraspatam,
they shall not only for the prementioned two years in which they enjoy the government, but for everafters, be customfree. Yet if they shall transport or bring any commodities up into or through my country, then shall they pay half the duties that other merchants pay, whether they buy or sell the said commodities either in my dominions or in those of any other Nauge whatsoever. Also that the said English company shall perpetually enjoy the priviledges of mintag, without paying any dewes or duties whatsoever, more than the ordinary wages or hire unto those that shall quoyne the moneyes. If the English first acquaint us before they deliver out any money to the merchants, painters, weavers etc., which are or shall hereafter reside in our prementioned port or territories and take our word for their sufficieny and honest dealing, then do we promise in case those people faile in their performances, to make good to the English all such sums of money ...3 shall remaine upon their accounts, or else deliver them their persons if they shall be found in any part of my territories. That whatever provision the English shall buy in my country, either for port or ships, they shall not be liable to pay any custom or dutyes for the same. And if any ship or vessel belonging to the English or to any other country whatsoever which tradeth in that port shall by mis-adventure suffer shipwreck and be driven upon any part of my territories, they shall have restitution upon demand of whatsoever can he found remaining of the said wreck."

The above grant was confirmed by the Emperor Venkatapati-raya Maharaya at some date which is not ascertainable now. Among the title deeds handed over by Governor Gifford to his successor in 1687 was one gold plated cowle from Venkataputty Roywelly. It seems to have been lost at sea about 1693 A.D. The new settlement which was growing up near the Fort was given the name of Chennappattanam after Venkatadri's father.

Owing to the changes in the political set-up of the country the English factors considered it desirable and necessary to get the old privileges reconfirmed by Srirangaraya Maharaya, the successor of Venkatapati devaraya Maharaya by obtaining a fresh grant in November 1645 A.D. at Vellore.
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Contemporary version of Srirangaraya’s grant
November 1645.

"In the year Parteeva, the month Carthida, the moon in
the wane the King over all Kings the Colliest (Holiest) and among
all caveleers the greatest, Zree Ranga Raya, the mighty King-
God gives this cowle unto agent Thomas Ivie, chief captain of the
English and the company of that nation.

For as much as you have left Armagon and are come to Zree
Ranga Rayapatam, my towne at first but of small esteeme and
have there built a fort and brought trade to that port; therefore
that you may bee the better encouraged to prosecute the same
and amplifie the town which bears our name, we do freely release
you of all customes or dutyes upon whatsoever goods bought
or sold in that place appartaining to your company. Also we
grant unto your company half of all the customes or dutyes which
shall be received at that part; and the rents of the ground about
the village Madraspatam as also the jacall ground; we give you
towards by way of piscash. Moreover for the better managing
your business, we surrender the government and justice of the
towne into your hands. And if any of your neighbours of Pundam-
allee shall injure you we promise.you our ready assistance. And
for what provisions shall be brought out of that country, we will
that no junckam (झंकम) be taken thereon. If it fortune that
any of your companyes ships shall by accident of weather or otherwise
be driven ashore at that port, whatsoever can be saved shall remain
your own. And that the like touching all merchants that trade
at that port, if the owners come to demand it; but if the owner
bee not to be found; then our officers shall seize on the same to
our behoofe. We also promise still to retayne the towne in our
protection and not to subject it to the government of Pundamallee
or any other Nague. And whatsoever merchandise of yours
that shall pass through the country of Pundamallee to pay but
half custome. In confidence of this our cowle you may cheerfully
proceed in your affairs; wherein if any our people shall mollest
you, wee give you our faith to your cause into our own hands to
doe you right and assist you against them; that your port and
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this our cowle may stand firm as long as the sunn and moone endureth.

Zree Rama.

Note:—The above is in all probability a translation made of the Telugu original grant by Paupas Brahminy (Avadānam Paupiah) the old linguist of Madras under the orders of the East India Company (Diary and Consult. F. S. G. September 24, 1750 A.D.).
APPENDIX VII.


The earliest inscription in the Telugu language and script is No. 179 of the first volume of the inscriptions 237 T. T. which records the fixing of gold gilt sikharam over the Vimānam of the Tirumalai Temple by Mahamandalesvara Misaraganda Maha-raya on 14th June 1359 A.D. during the reign of the Vijayanagar Emperor Bukkaraya I of the Sangama dynasty.

No. 179.
(237—T.T.)

(On the north base (front left side)) of inner gopura in the second prakāra of Tirumala Temple).

Text.

1. నంత్రిత్తు సైతాకంతు కర | 9 |
2. కందుకండ తాడి | మేరు | 3
3. జంతుకు అత్యంతు కండం | 0 |
4. అందుక నంత్రిత్తు | కర | కరుత్రాణం | 3
5. శరు విపత్తిసర మాముత్రాణం
6. శర గరుత్రాణం తాడి కర
7. [ః] స్త్రమం స్త్రమం తాడి
8. శర గరుత్రాణం తాడి
9. నంత్రిత్తు కర

Translation.

Hail, Prosperity! On Saturday, the 10th (lunar) day of the bright fortnight in Ashādha in the (cyclic) year Vikāri, corresponding to the victorious Śaka year 1281, the illustrious Mahāmanḍalēśvara Misaraganda Maṅgideva Mahārāja fixed a golden sikhara (vase) over the Vimāna (dome) of Tirumaladēva (Tiruvēngalānaṇātha). May prosperity abide!
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(Vide page 400 of Vol. II of the History).

The edict of the Vijayanagar Emperor Devaraya Maharaya II of the Sangama dynasty numbered I. 192 (No. 188—T.T.), is in the Kannada language and Telugu script, and the date corresponds to 5th December 1429 A.D. It records the grant of three villages and a cash endowment for a sumptuous daily food offering and the celebration of a Brahmôtsavam in Asvija month to Sri Venkatesvara.

No. 192

(No. 188—T.T.)

(On the Baṅgāru-vākili, i.e., door jamb covered with gilded copper-plate, at the entrance to the Central Shrine in Tirumala Temple).

Text.

1. చణంతెనవాయం రావు ప్రస్తావించిన ఉద్యయనం
2. లిథ్యంము మత్తు కనపు పరిశ్రమ ప్రస్తావించిను
3. యమన్నను మత్తు కనపు పరిశ్రమ ప్రస్తావించిను
4. కాశను కాశ ను పరిశ్రమ ప్రస్తావించిను
5. కాశను కాశ ను పరిశ్రమ ప్రస్తావించిను
6. సహితంగా ఆంధ్రం సంచారం ప్రస్తావించిను
7. అంతంగా ఉపనిషాదుల సంచారం ప్రస్తావించిను
8. అంతంగా ఉపనిషాదుల సంచారం ప్రస్తావించిను
9. అంతంగా ఉపనిషాదుల సంచారం ప్రస్తావించిను
10. అంతంగా ఉపనిషాదుల సంచారం ప్రస్తావించిను

---

1. Read నిడం
2. Read నిడం అందాను పరిశ్రమాను.
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11. [ఎం] కూడా సొంతంగా ఇది లేకుండా కదా?
12. [స] నిండం సుమారు అడవి అయించండి
13. [డి] తనంతు కు లేదు తినంచిన స్థానం[అడవి]
14. రేఖ ఉద్ధరి రెండు రెండు రెండు రెండు
15. ....శఖా కల్గో సొంతం మాత్రమే అడవి
16. [ని] ఎందుకు కాలుడినంతటిపోయినా....
17. .........[సంవత్సరం] ఉపయోగించి శఖా తయారుచేయి[డి]
18. సంవత్సరం అంతా మాథి ఉండా....అంతా[డి]
19. 30 సంవత్సరాలు వచ్చి ఎంచినంతటిపోయినా[డి]
20. [డి] బండులు సాగించడం [డి] మందిపోచిపోయినా
21. హింది సంఖ్యలాలు కదా మంచిపోయినా
22. . రెండు ఎండు అడవి పరిమితమైనా.
23. ముడిగా మనానం సాగించడం తయారు కాదు మాత్రం[డి]
24. తండ్రిక నాటి అంగం కాసియం. అమి.
25. సంఖ్య మందిపోచి మాత్రమే అడవి
26. ....పోవడం [డి] హింది పరిమితానం
27. . రెండు ఎండు అడవి పరిమితమైనా
28. . సంవత్సరం[డి] కంపెంట దినం కల్గో
29. [డి] తనంతు కాలుడి ఉండా తయారుచేయి[డి]
30. [డి] తనంతు కాలుడి ఉండా తయారుచేయి[డి]
31. [డి] తనంతు కాలుడి ఉండా తయారుచేయి[డి]
32. [డి] తనంతు కాలుడి ఉండా తయారుచేయి[డి]
33. అ సంఖ్యలు నిండం కాదు మాత్రం[డి]
34. [డి] తనంతు కాలుడి ఉండా తయారు
35. ....హింది సంఖ్యలాలు మంచిపోయినా....

1. Read పరిమితులకు.
36. ......... కాశిధార నియరికించి....
37. ............పత్ర నిడానమిన
38. ....మాతాపలనం తిని తే [ట్రె]
39. . [డా] మాతతాయశయం....
40. నీ మఠం మాతాడుడు మధ్
41. ............................డెడ్[డ్]
42. [ట్రె] వస్తా................
43. . ధానిలేని శాంతిదేశ
44. [ట్రె] న ........................

Translation.

1-7. This is the dharma-sāsana (record of charity) issued for the propitious God of Tirumala (i.e., Sri Vēṅkaṭeśvara) by Śrīman Mahārājadhirāja Rājaparamēśvara Śrī Vīrapratāpa Dēvarāya Mahārāya, after his visit, on Monday,¹ being the 10th lunar day of the bright fortnight of Mārgaśīra in the Saumya year, current with the victorious Saka year 1351.

8.—to the Bhaṇḍāra (treasury) of Chandragiri.
9.—out of the income of the Rāja-Bhaṇḍara.

10-14. thousand and two hundred honnu (pon or varaha), and the villages of Vikramādityamaṇgalā, Elamaṇḍiya including Chiṟukūraķālu belonging to the Chandragiri-Bhaṇḍāravāda, and the village of Kalaru viḍḍāle previously (granted) to God, totalling three villages....

15-16. one thousand honnu, the two (gifts of) varahā together making two thousand and two hundred honnu....

17-22. the arrangement stipulated, avasara (offering) to be made in our name is 1 padi, 30 platefuls of.....harivāṇa (offering),

Note 1:—The equivalent English date is 5th December 1429 A.C.
1 plateful of pāyasa (rice boiled in sweetened milk), I plateful of appa (sweet cakes), totalling 33 plates; for the holy water prepared of the fragrant herbs two big (cups) for offering puṇugu (civet) are presented.

22-34. a festival to be conducted during the month of Āśvayuja commencing from (the day of) the star Punarvasu to (the day of) Svāti star being the tīrthavārī (day) with various platefuls of offerings during the different sandhis (occasions), (the expenses thereof being met) from the honnu now paid and (from the income of the villages) granted with gold through libations of water on the meritorious occasion, sacred to Hari (Vishnū), of the Uṭṭhiṣṭha-dvādaśi¹ (day) in the bright fortnight of Kārtika in the Saumya year, so as to serve for the offering of (holy food), incense and civet for smearing (the holy body) during the festival....

35-37. for the honnu shall continue to be offered platefuls (of holy food), platefuls of fresh food....

38-44. This is the dharma-śāsana issued for the grant of the three villages as sarvamānya (tax-free) after a visit, so as to last as long as the moon and the sun endure.

1. Note:—On this day God Vishnū is believed to wake up to activity after His four months' repose.

The English date is Tuesday, the 8th November 1429 A. C.
APPENDIX IX.


The edict of Mahamanḍalesvara . . . . Saluva Narasingayya-deva Maharaya contained in II. 30 (No. 8-G.T.) (pp. 48, 49, 50) is in the Kannada language and Telugu script bearing a date corresponding to 27th December 1467. It records the grants of three villages for the daily food offerings on a sumptuous scale to Sri Govindarajaswami in Tirupati.

No. 30.
(No. 8—G.T.)

(On the north wall, outer face, of the central shrine of Sri Govindarajaswami Temple in Tirupati).

Text.¹

1. .... మండలు శిష్యలు ఉన్న [కై] సమాచార నమస్చాయానం ఉంటుంది. అత్యంత పోసు స్థాయిలో నిషేదను చేసినప్పటి పోయి శిష్యులు తయారు చేసిన శిష్య కర్తులు ఉన్నపుడు అత్యంత పోసు స్థాయిలో ఉన్నపుడు వింతలంభించడం మాత్రమే ఉంటాయి. .... కర్తులు ఉన్నపుడు తయారు చేసిన శిష్యులు ఉన్నపుడు వింతలంభించడం ....

2. ......... శిష్యులు .... కర్తులు ఉన్నపుడు శిష్యులు ఉన్నపుడు [కై] అంటే కర్తులు తయారు చేసిన పోసు స్థాయిలో ఉన్నపుడు ఉండాలి. ......... కర్తులు ఉన్నపుడు తయారు చేసిన శిష్యులు ఉన్నపుడు వింతలంభించడం ......... కర్తులు ఉన్నపుడు తయారు చేసిన శిష్యులు ఉన్నపుడు వింతలంభించడం .........

¹ Note:—Some of the inscribed slabs are much damaged and the letters on them are almost obliterated.
3. ... ఇది హుద్ధారక సంస్కరణలు మాత్రమే సమాధాన వచ్చింది. దీనిని అభివృద్ధి చేయవచ్చు అంటే అది సమాధానం తాను తినండాం. దీనిని తినినప్పటికి చేసాం. ఇది సంప్రదాయ ప్రశ్న తినాలించడం లాంటి మనం మాత్రం చేసాం. ఇంకా ఇది సంప్రదాయ ప్రశ్న తినాలించడం లాంటి మనం మాత్రం చేసాం. ఇంకా ఇది సంప్రదాయ ప్రశ్న తినాలించడం లాంటి మనం మాత్రం చేసాం.

4. ... హుద్ధారక సంస్కరణలే అహ్మద్మద్ ఆధిపత్ర సమాధానం నిషిద్ధమైన విధానాలు ప్రతి సమాధానం వచ్చింది. ఇవి చాలా మాత్రమే అహ్మద్మద్ ఆధిపత్ర సమాధానం ప్రతి సమాధానం వచ్చింది. కానీ ఈ రీతి సమాధానానికి మనం సమాధానం ప్రతి సమాధానం వచ్చింది. కానీ ఈ రీతి సమాధానానికి మనం సమాధానం ప్రతి సమాధానం వచ్చింది. కానీ ఈ రీతి సమాధానానికి మనం సమాధానం ప్రతి సమాధానం వచ్చింది. కానీ ఈ రీతి సమాధానానికి మనం సమాధానం ప్రతి సమాధానం వచ్చింది.
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

Translation.

1. May prosperity abide! Hail! On Sunday,¹ the first lunar day of the bright fortnight of the Pushya (month) in the (cyclic) year Sarvajit, current with the Saka year 1389, Śrīman Mahāmanḍa-lēśvara Medinimisaraganda Kaṭhāri Sāluva Narasingayadēva Mahārāya (issued) an edict to the Sthānikas (Sthānattār) of Tirupati ....(complying with) their request to us (Narasingayadeva) that they might be permitted to distribute amongst themselves the prasāda offered to Gōvindaṛajadēva, similar to the practice (obtaining) at Tirumala, so as to maintain themselves therewith...

2. ....In the manner of the practice (of the temple) of Tiruvēṅgajanaṭhadēva for Gōvindaṛajadēva shall hand over at Tirumala. We (have granted), as a present to the men of Tirupati, the prasāda offered to Gōvindaṛajadēva....hariharivāṇa (platefuls of cooked rice)....that five harivāṇa out of the harivāṇa to be distributed, as already ordered to be served for eating, shall be reserved from the vilukkāḍu (donor's share) during the sandhia-ḍaippu (hour of distribution of the offered prasādam)....On the occasion of the Makara sankranti (winter solstice) for (the offerings of) Gōvindaṛajadēva, as our (charity)....

3. ....for the conduct of the stipulated naivēḍya (offerings) having granted the villages Mupaduvēta and Māṅgoḍuvelada in

¹ Note:—The equivalent English date is 27th December 1467 A.C.
the Paḍavīdurājya as well as the taxes on property and wares (i.e., octroi duties) (hitherto) collected towards our palace, and also granted Maṇanūru below the tank of Tirupati to cover (any additional expenses), having provided, for the offering to the deity, of twenty six harivāṇa, one (appa)-harivāṇa and one tiruk-kaṇāmaḍai as the naivēdyā, . . . six and a half harivāṇa thirteen appa-prasāda and . . . akkāli prasāda forming the share of the donor out of the offered harivāṇa-prasāda and prasāda-harivāṇa.

4. . . . our queen . . . this prasāda will be delivered each day, through the disciples in succession of Kanḍāla Rāmnāujayya, to our Rāmānujakūṭa situated within the temple of Gōvindarājadēva in Tirupati, for being distributed among the Srivaishnavas, both local and outside.

Towards the refined camphor, musk and saffron stipulated (to be offered) from (our) Rāmānujakūṭa to Tiruvēṅgaḷanāthadēva at the time of the holy bath . . . .

5. . . . crude camphor for waving a light, areca-nuts and other articles offered in homage . . . the Sāttāda-Srivaishnavas, the disciples of Rāmnāujayya, in succession, shall supply from our Rāmānujakūṭa.

Just as we have stipulated, (the perfumery) shall continue (to be supplied) as our service to the above Gōvindarājadēva. And this duty shall be discharged by his disciples in succession in consonance with our stipulations to Rāmnāujayya.

From this time onwards (an equivalent of) the offerings made to Gōvindarājadēva will be appropriated from the offerings (made) at Tirumala, and this practice will be observed both in the case of the daily, monthly and other (occasional) rites (contributing) to the splendour (of worship) of the deity.

The offering of two platefuls of butter which we have stipulated to be made to Alagiya-Perumāl of Tiruchănūr from the stores of Tiruvēṅgaḷanāthadēva will be accordingly carried on.
HISTORY OF TIRUPATI

It is also ordered that the fees and perquisites (pertaining to the office) of the men of Tirupati ... in Tirupati...shall be paid in accordance with the prevailing custom.

May (the Sāttāda-Srīvaishnava) thus live happily, rendering service to Tiruvēnagālanāthadēva and Gōvindarājadēva!

Sri Rāmachandra!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of Devasthanam</th>
<th>Total of Fuhi etc.</th>
<th>Kavuris and suryam</th>
<th>Total through circur (3+4)</th>
<th>Through Dharman-</th>
<th>Cash from</th>
<th>Total (5+6+7)</th>
<th>Hoivastavavam</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Establishment</th>
<th>Establishment</th>
<th>Payable to</th>
<th>Payable to</th>
<th>Total including</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(A) MAJOR TEMPLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Devasthanams,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sri Venkatarama Swami Devasthanam</td>
<td>31,714 13 2</td>
<td>95,576 11 1</td>
<td>1,227,221 8 3</td>
<td>17,994 8 4</td>
<td>11,382 10 11</td>
<td>1,770,023 10 11</td>
<td>562 15 7</td>
<td>37,648 7 11</td>
<td>5,019 15 7</td>
<td>6,894 0 6</td>
<td>51 2 11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>81,476 15 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sri Govindanarayanan</td>
<td>85 1 6</td>
<td>1,160 0 0</td>
<td>1,245 1 6</td>
<td>435 2 2</td>
<td>2,469 13 5</td>
<td>4,150 1 1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,568 15 7</td>
<td>336 0 0</td>
<td>65 1 6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Salu Nachar</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chakraduthu Nachar</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kothandaramaswami</td>
<td>214 13 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Krishnaswami</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Patравati Thayar (Trichanur)</td>
<td>212 0 9</td>
<td>92 8 11</td>
<td>303 9 6</td>
<td>1,386 2 0</td>
<td>353 8 5</td>
<td>2,043 3 1</td>
<td>1,356 0 7</td>
<td>21 1 0</td>
<td>36 0 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>144 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Suryanarayanaswami</td>
<td>12 11 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12 11 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23 10 0</td>
<td>36 0 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kapilaswaraswami Devasthanam</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Haranatha swami</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sundararayanaswami</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Munirathie Mahamuni</td>
<td>23 0 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23 9 0</td>
<td>9 9 3</td>
<td>38 0 0</td>
<td>58 0 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Narnalav</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11 1 9</td>
<td>44 3 3</td>
<td>164 17 7</td>
<td>93 12 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vedanta Desikar</td>
<td>52 10 7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ullavar</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tirumala Namb</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Karunakar</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bhaktavatkar</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Thirumangai Alwar</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32,396 9 7</td>
<td>59,938 12 0</td>
<td>1,29,234 5 7</td>
<td>20,532 9 2</td>
<td>36,174 4 3</td>
<td>1,86,061 3 0</td>
<td>662 15 7</td>
<td>56,876 7 4</td>
<td>200 15 7</td>
<td>1,90,900 9 0</td>
<td>7,473 0 6</td>
<td>276 9 2</td>
<td>60 3 11</td>
<td>89,333 0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct</td>
<td>—35 0 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—35 0 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>32,360 9 7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,29,259 5 7</td>
<td>20,587 9 2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX X

### DEVASTHANAM TADIK BOOK, ABSTRACT OF RECEIPTS AND CHARGES, TALUK TIRUPATI, DISTRICT CHITTOOR, FASLI 1233 — A.D. 1823-24.

FROM DUFTER No. 6, PHERSAT No. 395 (Referred to in the last three lines of page 925).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Devasthanam</th>
<th>Total of Fasli etc. Miscellaneous Items</th>
<th>Kasuks and arighams</th>
<th>Total through Dharman-karhis.</th>
<th>Through Dharman-karhis</th>
<th>Cash from occur.</th>
<th>Total (5+6+7)</th>
<th>Horasavannas to other temples except Sanyasa Swamy</th>
<th>Total Devasthanam Expenditure</th>
<th>Establishment charges (cost) through occur.</th>
<th>Inam lands etc., in the enjoyment of Udaygiri</th>
<th>Establishment charges not by Dharman-Laktha (Pay)</th>
<th>Payable to Devasthanam Members</th>
<th>Payable to other Devasthanams</th>
<th>Total including Devasthanams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) MAJOR TEMPLIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sri Venkateswara Swamy Devasthanam</td>
<td>31,714 13 2</td>
<td>95,556 11 1</td>
<td>1,227,231 8 3</td>
<td>17,999 4 8</td>
<td>31,262 14 1</td>
<td>17,023 10 1</td>
<td>502 15 7</td>
<td>13,048 7 11</td>
<td>5,019 10 3</td>
<td>31,665 10 3</td>
<td>6,894 0 6</td>
<td>51 2 11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sri Govindasayavanam</td>
<td>85 1 6</td>
<td>1,260 0 0</td>
<td>1,245 1 6</td>
<td>435 2 2</td>
<td>2,469 13 5</td>
<td>4,150 1 1</td>
<td>2,588 15 7</td>
<td>370 0 0</td>
<td>85 1 6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21 0 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21 0 0</td>
<td>21 0 0</td>
<td>12 8 4</td>
<td>83 2 11</td>
<td>110 12 2</td>
<td>95 1 2</td>
<td>239 6 2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>70 0 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sri Raghavendra Swamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td>93 11 9</td>
<td>106 10 1</td>
<td>109 0 2</td>
<td>1,105 1 1</td>
<td>43 0 0</td>
<td>65 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>40 0 7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sri Subhadracharya</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>38 0 0</td>
<td>235 5 0</td>
<td>458 7 6</td>
<td>658 6 1</td>
<td>1,100 2 7</td>
<td>164 10 1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>60 3 11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,141 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sri Venkata Rama Swamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>214 13 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,125 0 1</td>
<td>160 14 1</td>
<td>160 14 1</td>
<td>1,356 0 7</td>
<td>11 1 0</td>
<td>85 1 11</td>
<td>59 0 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sri Raghavendra Swamy</td>
<td>213 0 9</td>
<td>92 8 11</td>
<td>203 9 6</td>
<td>1,866 2 0</td>
<td>333 8 5</td>
<td>2,843 3 1</td>
<td>23 10 0</td>
<td>36 5 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>36 5 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>12 11 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12 11 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7 1 0</td>
<td>175 14 0</td>
<td>7 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>69 0 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sri Subramanyaswamy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>10 1 0</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 1 0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|     | Total                | 32,396 9 7 | 96,938 12 0 | 1,20,334 5 7 | 20,852 9 2 | 36,174 4 3 | 1,18,061 3 0 | 562 15 7 | 44,214 7 0 | 5,409 11 3 | 31,800 0 8 | 7,471 0 6 | 276 0 2 | 60 3 11 | 89,331 0 7 |
ADDENDUM TO VOL. I.

Page 378, Andal Shrine:—Acid the accompanying note after
Thus it is only from 1495 A.D. that Andal emerges into full notice.”

In addition to inscription I. 98 of the year 1308 A.D. (No 51.
G.T.) there is another inscription II. 141 (No. 50 G.T.) on the same
north wall, inner side of Andal’s shrine which was made when
Kandadai Ramanuja Ayyangar was in high light. A portion
of every line of this inscription is covered by the rear wall of the
Sanctum and the latter part by the masonry pedestal or base
of the Idol. The best years of Sri Ayyangar extended from 1470 to
about 1500 A.D. Therefore, the sanctum would have been
constructed sometime after 1470. The inscription states that it was
made on a Monday of the Mesha month Sukla ashtami
and the Ayyangar was only the kartar of the Ramanujakutam. He
became the kartar of the Por-Bhandaram also on 1st July 1495.

In inscription II. 83 (No. 70 G.T.) dated 6–6–1485 food offerings
on the occasion of the sättumurais of Nammalvar Periya alvar,
Kulasekhara, Tirumangai alvar and Udayavar are mentioned.
As Andal is not included in the list the inference is that there was
no shrine for her till 1485. Again II. 118 (No. 66 G.T.) (paras 7,8
(page 261) dated 9—3—1494 provides abhishekam and food offering
to Sita Devi in Hanuman’s shrine on the Kanu festival day sacred
to Andal which indicates that Andal had not come into existence
till March 1494. An undated inscription II. 140 (No. 624, G.T.)
made after the Ayyangar had become Por-Bhandaram kartar
mentions Andal and weekly abhishekam for her which show that
the shrine was constructed sometime after 1495 and before 1500 A.D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Gains and Glories of the Gita</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹15-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>108 Vaishnavite Divyadesams Vol. I</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹35-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>108 Vaishnavite Divyadesams Vol. II</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹60-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>108 Vaishnavite Divyadesams Vol. III</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹60-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>108 Vaishnavite Divyadesams Vol. IV</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹60-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>108 Vaishnavite Divyadesams Vol. V</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹70-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>108 Vaishnavite Divyadesams Vol. VI</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹19-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>108 Vaishnavite Divyadesams Vol. VII</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹30-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Stotramalika</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹25-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Stotra Ratna</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹15-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Goda Stuti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹10-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Spiritual Heritage of Annamacharya</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹30-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Tirumala The Panorama of Seven Hills</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹10-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Pancharatragama</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹35-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>T.T.D. Inscriptions Vol. II</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹120-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>T.T.D. Inscriptions Vol. III</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹125-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>T.T.D. Inscriptions Vol. IV</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹130-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>T.T.D. Inscriptions Vol. VI</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹100-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>History of Tirupati - Vol. I</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹40-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>History of Tirupati - Vol. II</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹40-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>History of Tirupati - Vol.III</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>₹10-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Geetha Makarandam - Part III</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>₹20-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Geetha Makarandam - Part IV</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>₹20-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Chittir Tiruppavai</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>₹15-00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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