

# Revisiting Periodisation: Coherence and Compliance in Pre-modern Historiography of Kerala

BINU RAJ

**ABSTRACT:** Kerala's academic historiography is influenced by the tripartite model of ancient, medieval, and modern periods, which includes pre-historic, ancient/early, medieval periods and their subdivisions. However, this model has not been uniformly acknowledged in Kerala's historiography. The study aims to unravel the coherence enabled and compliance followed by the perception of pre-modern\* via periodisation in Kerala's historiography. The modern period in Kerala's historiography is rooted in European historiography and its adaptation to Indian historiography. The British occupation of Kerala in 1792 marked the end of feudalism and theocracy, introducing a new modern era. Studies on the modern period in Kerala have been largely embraced by the concept of colonialism, with colonial interventions being exploitative and affecting the economic relationship between Kerala and the British. Pre-modern Kerala's history is primarily focused on *Tamilakam*, early medieval, and medieval periods. The *Tamilakam* construct, based on an ethnic and linguistic divide, has become a common pre-modern divide in Indian history. Early medieval interest in Indian historiography began in the 1960s, with debates on feudalism and the development of a closely knit early medieval for South India. The study proposes the concept of 'premodern' as a perspective in doing historiography in pre-modern, extending the 'being modern' aspects to the enquiries of historiography done on pre-modern in a self-reflexive manner. Premodern historiography has the potential to upset the conventional divide of modern and pre-modern historiography.

**KEYWORDS:** *Historiography, Pre-modern Kerala, Periodization, Colonialism*

## **The Enquiry**

Any academic historiography of Kerala (the landmass now identified as Kerala) representing a linear time scale in its studies is influenced by the historiographical vocabularies of periodisation in one way or another. The periodisation in mention is that of the tripartite model of the ancient, medieval, and modern periods widely accepted in historiography since the nineteenth century.<sup>2</sup> Academics further adhere to a twofold division of modern and pre-modern in the historiography of Kerala. The tripartite scheme of thinking about the past can be seen as implicit in the perception of pre-modern time span in historiography. In accordance with this reasoning, what makes pre-modern are different combinations or selections of the widely acknowledged pre-historic, ancient/early, medieval periods and their subdivisions. (Recently a change from the usage ancient to early has been insisted to highlight a possible continuity of early to the next period. However, such exercise seems to be nominal in its appeal since it is not aimed at distorting the category of triparted periodisation whatsoever.)<sup>3</sup> The focus of the current analysis is on unravelling the facets of coherence enabled and compliance followed by the perception of pre-modern via periodisation in the historiography of Kerala. The final section of the study points towards a possible perspective of premodern(unhyphenated) while considering the pre-modern in the historiography.

## **Prelude**

The appearance of Kerala in the landscape of historiography pertaining to India is of recent origin. To cite an early case in this respect is how Kerala suffered an evident omission in the historiographic exercise of KA Nilakanta Sastri while writing a general history of south India.<sup>4</sup> The work ironically claimed a position against confining Indian history only to that of the northern part of India. Kerala is evoked in the text as having paucity of evidence for its historiographic representation. The representation of Kerala in this text gives out an impression of periphery. The recent appearance of this west coast in the southern end of the peninsula (Kerala

since 1956) as a unit of analysis cannot be equated with a comprehensive recognition of this unit in several studies. *Genre* of general history of India bears this testimony. However, the historiography of Kerala since the independence of India or even before for various reasons has been eager in relating 'Kerala' to a larger unit called 'India'.<sup>5</sup> We can also see in due course that the tripartite scheme of periodisation adhered in the historiography of India at large as influencing the historiography produced for Kerala.

It is observed that "For five or more centuries Western history has been dominated by the ancient-medieval-modern periodisation, which arose from the conception of a "middle age" between ancient cultural splendor and its modern recovery by the humanists of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and by Protestant Reformers reacting to the intellectual "barbarism" of medieval scholasticism."<sup>6</sup> The seminal tripartite thinking of India's past inspired from the above noted ancient-medieval-modern scheme of periodisation goes to James Mill who represented the idea of philosophical radicalism or utilitarianism in his writings. His work, 'The History of British India' conceives a tripartite division of India's past as Hindu civilisation (lasting till 1190), Muslim civilisation (lasting till 1760), and a subsequent British period. The time span presented by this tripartite model with little alterations still serves as the dividing line of historical time in understanding India's past. Thus, this widely acknowledged model of the ancient, medieval and modern periodisation in Indian historiography in practice today can also be viewed as mere nomenclature substitution for Hindu, Muslim civilisations, and British period expounded by Mill in his work. This is not to suggest that both these divisions share a similar understanding of the past.

The historiography of Kerala has largely been perceived as part of south Indian historiography. Interestingly, the tripartite construct of Hindu civilisation, Muslim civilisation, and the British period put forward by James Mill went unappealing for the historiography of what is today accepted as the south Indian historiography. The tripartite identification as we see today was neither readily apparent nor logically binding to suit the historiographical findings from south Indian historiography. The

earlier works on south India can be seen as bearing this testimony. For instance, despite the availability of periodisation schemes for a general history, early historians such as KA Nilakanta Sastri never adhered to it in his history of south India. The situation underwent a change in time along with the growing reception of the tripartite ancient, medieval, and modern in the historiography of India. With the changing tide, south Indian historiography too sailed towards the new domain of arranging things. However, one may also note that the time schedule externalised by the tripartite scheme of periodisation for 'south' Indian historiography received critical attention from historians over time. Questions were raised against the compatibility of the time schedule exercised by the periodisation in relation to 'north' and 'south' in Indian historiography. The general scheme of periodisation followed for India is claimed to be unacceptable in the case of the deep south and for south India in general.<sup>7</sup> Doubts have been casted concerning the difficulties in determining the break of ancient and beginning of medieval in south Indian history on a similar line with that of the north.<sup>8</sup> What these critics are focusing on here is the incompatibility of the time schedule applied to ancient, medieval, and modern in 'south' Indian historiography when compared to its 'north' Indian counterpart. If such a comparison of time schedule is the major thrust of enquiry, we can show that the historiographic circles have never uniformly acknowledged tripartite scheme under discussion. An inference to this observation is apparent from the mismatch apparent in the time schedule ascribed for 'north' India by historiography to that of the western European scheme of the tripartite periodisation. Noticeably, it is the historiography of Europe in the first place that has promulgated the tripartite scheme. The disjunction evident in the temporal readings of the periodisation schedule can therefore be considered as an implicit feature of the same. What is important here is to note that the critical counts against the temporal disjunctions can be seen as overlooking the coherence enabled and compliance followed by the periodisation and concepts put forward by the same.

It would be desirable at this point to enquire into the coherence enabled and compliance followed in the practice of periodisation in the historiography of Kerala. The coherence and compliance under review are

primarily focused on the analysis of the epochs that are placed under the rubric pre-modern (i.e., that of *Tamilakam*, early medieval, and medieval periods) in the historiography of Kerala. What makes pre-modern in historiography at large are different combinations or selections of the widely acknowledged pre-historic, ancient/early, medieval periods and their subdivisions. Even though pre-modern is the major concern, it seems desirable to brush through the usage of modern in the historiography of Kerala before detailing the pre-modern in mention.

### **Modern Period in the Historiography of Kerala**

The acknowledgement of modern or a modern period in the historiography of Kerala is rooted in the tripartite periodisation carried out in the European historiography and its gradual adaptation to the 'north' Indian historiography. The beginning of the British occupation of Kerala in 1792 is regarded as the key factor in ending the influence of feudalism and theocracy i.e., the two outstanding and inseparable features of middle age in Kerala and hence seen as inaugurating the new modern era.<sup>9</sup> In another study, Marthanda Varma is hailed as the founder of modern Travancore, and the beginning of his regnal year is considered as the beginning of modern period in the history of Travancore.<sup>10</sup> Noticeably, the scholarship on modern period in the historiography of Kerala has been largely embraced by the concept of colonialism adhered by the Marxian perspective. An illustration of this can be cited from a study that traces the functioning of the colonial economy in Kerala from 1721 to 1947.<sup>11</sup> The economic relationship experienced by Kerala during the colonial period is observed in the study as exploitative in nature.<sup>12</sup> The study considers the time span since 1721 as a period "falling under direct and manipulative type of intervention particularly by the British, in the Kerala Kingdoms".<sup>13</sup> The colonial interventions with its changing nature are illustrated with the aid of selected events from the past as follows.<sup>14</sup> Accordingly, the year 1721 is seen as important for the agreement between the British and the Rani of Attingal. The year is also cited as one that forced the Dutch to move to East Indies. Following this is the year 1792 i.e., the year of Sreerangapatannam treaty, and the time marker in the introduction of land revenue collection by the British. Next in the sequel

is 1850s, the decade that marked the beginning of plantation agriculture under Europeans and the opening of the regions of Tiruvithankur, Kochi, and Madras for free trade. The study thus rolls up different events beginning with the treaty of the British and Rani of Attingal in 1721 to portray a unified Kerala experience of colonial exploitation.

Yet another study depicts a crisis in the production relation of an identified Feudal-*Naduvazhi* system of the medieval period. The crisis is spotted to have happened by the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Centuries and is seen as coinciding with the colonial interventions to mark the beginning of a new age. This new age is represented variously in the text in accordance with different contexts as 'State feudalism', capitalism, modern (case of *Tiruvithankur*), and colonial.<sup>15</sup>

The colonial experiences of 'Kerala' detailed in both studies cited above are represented as forming a part of an Indian experience of colonialism.<sup>16</sup> Apart from the identification of the modern period from the perspective of colonialism readings there exist other readings of this period. We can find studies that identify the modern period from the perspective of an identified 'reform' movements of 'Kerala'. Here the 'reform' movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are cited as a point of departure from pre-modern to modern.<sup>17</sup>

The representation of modern period in the historiography of Kerala either from the colonial perception or from the reformist movement is catapult from the notion of 'part of a whole' perception. Not to mention that 'the part' in the above respect is historiographically identified 'Kerala' and 'the whole' is that of 'India'. It is equally important to note at this point that the conceptualisation of modernity remained outside the concern of all the studies cited above. Discussions on modernity in the context of studies on Kerala emerged from the enquiries which were resonating with the possibilities opened up by poststructuralism and related thinking. Modernity in the context of the scholarship on Kerala can be seen as forming a subject matter of a wider and vague rubric of postcolonial, subaltern, gender, cultural and other studies. A few noteworthy exercises in the above respect are as follows: Modernity has been conceptualised as "something shaped by the invariable negotiations over [t]ensions

between region and nation, caste and community and men and women”.<sup>18</sup> Possibilities of critically analysing the claims of modernity by placing them under the lens of en-gendering individuals in the foreground of the public sphere of the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Kerala have also been worked out extensively.<sup>19</sup> Attempts are made to understand the trajectories of the slave caste’s experience of modernity in colonial Kerala.<sup>20</sup> Development discourse that began in Kerala by the turn of nineteenth century has been analysed along with its distinct notions of development, developmentalism, science, progress, modernity, modernisation and truth comprehending them from the axis of the concept of developmental modernity.<sup>21</sup> The discussions of modernity in the context of Kerala can also be noted as transgressing the ‘part of the whole’ footing of past in historiography.

### **Pre-modern Period in the Historiography of Kerala**

As noted, before, what makes pre-modern in historiography are different combinations or selections of the widely acknowledged pre-historic, ancient/early, medieval periods and their subdivisions. Pre-modern in the historiography of Kerala is chiefly concentrated on *Tamilakam*, early medieval and medieval periods.

#### ***Tamilakam* Epoch**

Historians have considered the period of Tamil heroic poems or the ‘Sangam age’ in detail in the historiography of pre-modern Kerala. In the history of Kerala this period refers to the interregnum between the late phase of the Iron Age and the emergence of Perumal rule.<sup>22</sup> The concept of *tinai* present in the Tamil heroic poems has been instrumental in the historiography produced for the period of ‘Sangam age’. Even the earlier historiographic texts concerning the period of Tamil heroic poems bear the above noted aspect.<sup>23</sup> A relative knowledge about the *aintinai* is regarded indispensable in understanding the *sangam* age.<sup>24</sup> The region called *Tamilakam* has been agreed upon by recent historians in situating the concept of *tinai* found in the heroic poems. *Tamilakam* is understood as the Tamil macro-region with a distinct linguistic identity and cultural homogeneity.<sup>25</sup> The ‘active space’ of *tinai* has thus been situated within an identified *tamilakam* region.



The *Tamilakam* construct based on a separate ethnic or/and linguistic divide are shared by a good number of historians and has by now become a taken-for-granted divide of the pre-modern period.<sup>26</sup> However, in certain studies, the perception of *Tamilakam* as a divide of pre-modern period is well-grounded in theoretical insights. Observation made by one such study are as follows:

*Archeologists speak about the Iron Age culture or/and megalithic culture; epigraphists about heterodox religious groups; numismatists and specialists on classical accounts about a civilization of maritime commerce; and specialists on ancient Tamil literature about the Sangam society. These specialists sometimes borrow from certain other categories of sources also for discussing the cultural-type behind the category of their specialization. But all of them conveniently forget the fact that these different categories of sources point to one phase or other of the same social formation.*<sup>27</sup>

This social formation approach is also qualified as surpassing the anachronistic reading while considering political integration of geographical entity without presupposing a nation-state for the epoch under consideration.<sup>28</sup> Interestingly, the nexus derived from this social formation angle for a coherent *Tamilakam* proves to be problematic when approached from another perspective. For instance, from an archaeological point of view, the coherence gained by this social formation for an identified *Tamilakam* seems problematic.

*Even this cursory overview of the sites and material culture from Kerala and Tamil Nadu highlights a key point: despite the common tendency for South Indian historians and archaeologists to speak of “Tamil” material culture, the archaeological evidence that sets Tamilakam as a region apart from the rest of South India has never been clearly identified. If one evaluates Tamil cultural identity ... the claims of ethnic difference appear to falter, since nearly all the material culture found in Tamilakam—that is, in Kerala and Tamil Nadu—can be found elsewhere in peninsular India. Similarly configured urban*



*centres and habitation sites are located throughout South India and Sri Lanka. And, although the majority of Iron Age burials are situated in South India, they are widely distributed throughout the Indian subcontinent, and only one or two types are unique to Tamilakam. In the same way, the distribution of ceramics, iron, and other artefacts are dispersed across the alleged past cultural-ethnic, linguistic, and geographic boundaries of South India.*<sup>29</sup>

What can be churned out from two excerpts is an evident incompatibility between theoretical readings and archeological findings. The coherence of *Tamilakam* via theoretical considerations can be understood as based on selective reading of certain source materials. A continuum to the above aspect of source selection and theoretical guideline is struck again in the way how the transition from the epoch of *Tamilakam* is depicted in certain literature.<sup>30</sup> Thus the pre-modern classification of a coherent *Tamilakam* is neither an unproblematic nor a placid choice of demarcation made by historiography.

## **Early Medieval and Medieval Epoch**

By the 1960s interest in early medieval began gaining momentum in Indian historiography. Early medieval, to begin with, was first identified by Vincent Smith in his work 'The Oxford History of India' (1919) to whom it was the period of the medieval Hindu kingdoms. By the 1960s the period of early medieval identified by Smith became the focus of attention in 'Indian' historiography. The focus of attention on early medieval was pertaining to the theoretical engagement and debates on feudalism. "A by-product of the debates around 'Indian Feudalism' was readiness to look for an 'early medieval' at the far end of 'ancient' period of Indian history."<sup>31</sup> It is also to be noted that the pre-existent identified for 'Indian feudalism' such as the age of '*kali*' is in tandem with the ancient period of Indian history so goes to the culmination of this period i.e. from c A.D.300-1200.<sup>32</sup> Then an obvious question will be why not 'late ancient' as a period marker, which is more in tune with the existing scheme of periodisation followed? A very brief answer would be European feudalism, the medieval period and Marxist historiographic

combination with a final output resulting in feudalism for early medieval India and this pattern if needed could be unlocked by a key of power/knowledge play. Anyway, 'Indian feudalism' for the early medieval period became an extensive subject over which many debates and discussions succeeded in the following years of the 1960s. Though south Indian historiography too delineated this period and produced enough literature, its association with the debates over feudalism was minimal or even absent. What is interesting to note here is that like its northern counterpart, though following a different pattern, scholarship produced on south India too aspired for binding a closely knit early medieval for South. This noteworthy aspect is both disclosed and embedded varyingly across a majority of academic literature produced on south India. An externalised form of such an adaption is as follows.

There are compelling reasons to identify an intelligible early medieval period in south India as revealed from the broad pattern followed.<sup>33</sup> The details of this pattern are as follows.

1. Transformation of an economy characterised by cattle keeping and subsistence agriculture into one of wet rice cultivation and a considerable surplus,
2. Replacement of simple exchange with the instituted process of trade and subsequent development of urbanism,
3. Transmutation of a relatively undifferentiated society into one divided sharply into castes and the consequent 'casteisation' and peasantisation of tribe,
4. Acceptance of an organised religion with its ideas and institutions suited to the new economic and social order,
5. The emergence of the state to suit the newly evolved social order, and
6. A large number of other attendant developments, including the defining of the regional as in the case of Kerala and Karnataka.

Undoubtedly the early medieval for south India behaved totally different from its northern feudal counterpart. However, what it finally ensures in a certain way was something that feudalism ensures for north, i.e., a close-

knit unit of early medieval south for historiographical consideration. Not to mention that any attempt for a coherent south India will be at the cost of compliance.

If the historiography of Kerala got caught in the early medieval south for a coherent south Indian history, the medieval historiography of Kerala got caught in the early medieval historiography in the visualisation of its medieval history. The derivations from the early medieval in the case of Kerala unlike historiography of 'north' India thus proves to be the starting point and a methodological decider for the medieval period in the historiography of Kerala. A detailed substantiation to the above observations is as follows.

The time span from the disintegration of *Cera* of Mahodayapuram to that of the modern period is designated as medieval or late medieval in the historiography of Kerala. This period can also be considered as a break from the early medieval from the perspective of source materials used for the study. It is observed that "the medieval centuries—those spanning the disintegration of the *Cera* kingdom of Mahodayapuram on the one side and the deep involvement of the colonial power in the politic of Kerala on the other — are not as clearly illumined as the early or late periods in the history of this part of the country".<sup>34</sup> It is noted that, "In most part of Kerala, the availability of inscriptions abruptly stops with the disappearance of the *Cera* state, depriving the historian of the most important historical source in early medieval Kerala history".<sup>35</sup> It could be the unavailability of inscription compared with the earlier period that might have made the medieval period less illuminating to certain historiographic readings. The period after 1500 A.D. is however noted as rich in sources in the form of traveler's account, native literature, family records of ruling houses and private landlords, etc."<sup>36</sup> So it is apparent that there are *granthavaries* from households or temples and other sources like that of collections of *churanas* at the archives across Kerala that can be considered as sources for the period in mention. Despite the availability of *granthavaries* and sources like *churanas* an understanding of the period is vested on intelligent guesswork relying on the findings of subsequent earlier and late periods in historiography.<sup>37</sup> The above

observation is not to suggest that sources such as *granthavaries* were never used in constructing history of the period but this is to reveal the primacy of certain approaches and source material in the historiography of Kerala. Historiography of Kerala in the above respect has developed a perspective more focused on early medieval seeking its continuity to the entire medieval period of Kerala. An outcome of such an understanding is evident in the following observation.

*The differences between the Cera and post-Cera periods have for the most part been exaggerated. First, decentralization presumes a prior centralization that simply did not exist in the Cera period. Second, the continuities between the two periods, especially in the structure and power of Brahmin communities, are more striking and interesting than change. Third, “the view from below” in the case would appear to be largely the same in the sense that similar tax collections, relations of production, policing system, and authority structure held true for both periods.<sup>38</sup>*

Further, the society of medieval Kerala is theorised as one with *jathi-janmi-naduvazhi* arrangement which is a continuum of *janmi-kudiyar* arrangement of the early medieval epoch with the only striking difference of having *jati* intensification and *naduvazhi* political structure to add upon.<sup>39</sup>

## **Openings: Towards the Perspective of Premodern**

An obvious doubt here would be concerning the other possibilities of pre-modern, outside the order that we have discussed so far. It should be made clear at this point that the intention of the observations made in this study is not to write off or explore other possible orders of periodisation. The intention is to find the coherence and compliance evident in the periodisation scheme that is followed in the academic historiography of Kerala at large. The analysis of periodisation made so far has led us to unravel the interplay of various ideological submissions leading to certain omissions in historiographical readings on one hand and over-emphasis on certain source readings on the other. Periodisation has also

facilitated a coherent view of historiography with a preferred 'part of a whole' perspective. The 'part of a whole' perspective remark made above is a reminder that historiography, as it is practiced, is nothing more than a 'modern' endeavour. The mentioned perspective and its deep-seated visualisation can be problematised by pushing an imaginative line of thought. For instance, imagine what happens if the modern state of Kerala was part of Sri Lanka or even if a separate country altogether or countries within, the history it produces would have been different in each case and not to mention that the above patterns of periodisation (pre-modern in particular) we discussed in length would have been unthinkable. The implication of periodisation discussed so far in the study compels us to think about periodisation as something more than a mere marker of time in historiography.

An understanding of coherence and compliance offered by pre-modern (or different combinations or selections of the widely acknowledged pre-historic, ancient/early, medieval periods and their subdivisions) reminds us about the modern footing of historiography. The above noted understanding of pre-modern fuels the present study to conceptualise an unhyphenated 'premodern'. The concept of 'premodern' is to be perceived as a perspective in doing historiography in pre-modern.

If we consider the literal expression of the term 'pre-modern/pre modern' the prefix 'pre' which signifies time can be seen as corresponding heavily to its root word i.e., 'modern' for its derivations. Every term with the prefix 'pre' or 'post' whether it is a noun or adjective in this regard can be spotted as following this rule. But the historiographic obsession to discipline the time theme of the past overshadows this literal aspect and thus the prefix 'pre' gets emphasised over modern in historiography. The coherent view in the historiography of pre-modern Kerala with a preferred 'part of a whole' perspective facilitated by periodisation is one such example. Not to mention that such coherence come at the cost of certain compliance that we disused. Given the 'modern' status of historiography, it becomes inevitable at this point to remind historiography on pre-modern about its 'modern' footage. This can be effectively done by bringing up a new coinage namely an unhyphenated noun of 'premodern' to the midst of our

discussion on periodisation. It needs no repetition that modern, unlike in existing historiography, is the 'go to' part of premodern coinage. In other words, 'modern' is relied upon as a qualifier of 'pre' in the composition of premodern. Unlike in pre-modern, modern in its usage here is not devoted entirely to signify the strict classification of time in history. The association of the coinage premodern is more to the insights provided by the scholarship on modernity. The literature on modernity has its footholds on various conditions of 'being modern'. The conditions here attribute varyingly to a certain state of existence and to the requirements to be modern. A vital aspect of the coinage of premodern is its potential to contemplate the methodology practised from a modern subjective position beheld by the enquirer. This aspect is not the concern of the enquires made by pre-modern historiography that we have discussed so far. In other words, the premodern as it is coined here is to extent the 'being modern' aspects to the enquiries of historiography done on pre-modern in a self-reflexive manner. Premodern as a perspective not only has the potential to upset the conventional divide of modern and pre-modern but also to check the anachronistic readings operational in the pre-modern historiography.

---

**Binu Raj** is the author of this article.

## Notes and Reference

1. Though the usages of premodern and pre-modern signify time spans in historiography, the researcher chooses to use the hyphenated 'pre-modern' instead of the other. This is because there exists appreciable precedence in relation to the usage of post-colonialism when compared with Postcolonialism. "The hyphenated 'post-colonialism' is seen as more appropriate in denoting a particular historical period or epoch", for details in this regard see John Mc Leod, *Beginning Postcolonialism*, (UK: Manchester University Press, 2000) p.5.
2. Vide, William A. Green, 'Periodizing World History', *History and Theory*, Vol. 34, No. 2, Cambridge 1995.
3. For the usage of 'early' Vide Romila Thapar, *The Penguin History of Early India: From the Origins to AD 1300*, New Delhi, 2002, p.30. Vide Romila Thapar, *Cultural Past*, New Delhi, 2000.
4. Vide, K.A Nilakanta Sastri, *A history of south India: from prehistoric times to the fall of Vijayanagara*, New Delhi 2009 (first pub 1955).



5. K.P Padmanabha Menon, *Kocchirajyacharithram*, Calicut, 1989 and William Logan, *Malabar Manual*, Thiruvananthapuram, 2000, first pub 1887 are examples.
6. New dictionary of historic ideas Vol. 4, Farmington Hills, 2005.
7. Vide, Kesavan Veluthat, *The Early Medieval in South India*, New Delhi, 2009, p.21. Vide, Sumit Sarkar, *Writing Social History*, New Delhi, 1997, p.40.
8. For the questions raised Vide, Kesavan Veluthat, *The Early Medieval in South India*, New Delhi, 2009, pp.19-26.
9. Vide, P.K.S Raja, *Medieval Kerala*, Calicut, 1966, pp.vii-xii.
10. V. Nagam Aiya, *The Travancore State Manual Vol-1*, Trivandrum, 1906, p.333.
11. Vide, P.K. Micheal Tharakan, *Perspectives on Kerala History*, Thiruvananthapuram, 1999, pp.328-401
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 328-401.
13. *Ibid.*, p.357.
14. *Ibid.*, pp.328-401.
15. K.N Ganesh, *Keralathinte Enmalekal*, Thiruvananthapuram, 1990, pp.70, 129, 326-37.
16. K.N Ganesh, *Kerala Samootha Padanamgal*, Pathanamthitta, 2002, p.46.
17. Vide Satheese Chandra Bose, Shiju Sam Varughese (eds), *Kerala Modernity* New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 2015, pp3-5. Vide, G. Aloysius, *Interpreting Kerala's Social Development: A Historico-Sociological perspective*, New Delhi, 2004. Vide, Sunil. P. Elyidom, *Cross-currents Within: A Cultural Critique of Kerala Renaissance*, New Delhi 2009. A similar attribute to this period is also found in A. Shreedhara Menon, *Keralasamskaram*, Kottayam, 1992 and A. Shreedhara Menon, *A Survey of Kerala History*, Kottayam, 2015). Though the qualifier used in the latter is that of 'towards a New Society', the impression is definitely that of 'modern'.
18. Vide, G Arunima, *'There comes papa: colonialism and the transformation of matriliney in Kerala'*, Hyderabad, 2003.
19. Vide, J. Devika, *En-gendering Individuals: The language of Re-forming in Early Twentieth Century Keralam*, Delhi, 2007.
20. Vide, P. Sanal Mohan, *'Modernity of Slavery: struggle against cast inequality in colonial Kerala'*, Delhi, 2015.
21. Vide, Raju.S, 'Developmental Modernity: Man and Nature in the Discourse of Wealth and Labour' in *Contemporary India* Vol 2, No 1, New Delhi, 2003.
22. Rajan Gurukkal, Raghava Varier, *History of Kerala: prehistory to the present*, Telangana, 2018, p.51.
23. Vide, V.R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, *Studies in Tamil Literature and History*, Madras, 1930. Vide, N. Subrahmanian, *Sangam Polity: The Administration and Social Life of The Sangam Tamils* Bombay, 1966. Vide, Xavier S Thani Nayakam, *Landscape and Poetry: A Study of Nature in Classical Tamil Poetry*, London, 1966.
24. Elamkulam Kunjanpillai, *Keralam Sanghakalath*, Thiruvananthapuram, 2005, p.9.



25. Rajan Gurukkal, Raghava Varier (eds), *Cultural History of Kerala Vol-1*, Thiruvananthapuram, 1999 p.157. Rajan Gurukkal, Raghava Varier, *History of Kerala: prehistory to the present*, Telangana, 2018, p.51.
26. This reference is shared by many historians, Vide, Romila Thapar, *The Penguin History of Early India: From The Origins to AD 1300*, New Delhi, 2002). Vide, R.Champakalakshmi, *Trade, Ideology and Urbanization: South India 300BCto AD 1300*, New Delhi, 1996.
27. Rajan Gurukkal, M.R. Raghava Varrier, *Cultural History of Kerala, Vol-1*, Thiruvananthapuram,1999, p.159. Vide, Rajan Gurukkal, *Rethinking Classical Indo-Roman Trade*, New Delhi, 2016, p.17.
28. Vide, Rajan Gurukkal, *Rethinking Classical Indo-Roman Trade*, New Delhi, 2016, pp.15-18.
29. Shinu A. Abraham 'Chera, Cholla,Pandya: Using Archaeological Evidence to Identify the Tamil Kingdoms of Early Historic South India', *Asian Perspectives*, Vol. 42, No. 2, 2003.
30. Vide, Rajan Gurukkal, M.R. Raghava Varrier, *Cultural History of Kerala, Vol-1*, Thiruvananthapuram,1999, pp.257-62. Vide, Rajan Gurukkal, *Social Formation of Early South India*, New Delhi, 2010, pp.242-54.
31. Kesavan Veluthat, *The Early Medieval in South India*, New Delhi, 2009, p.20.
32. Vide, Ram Sharan Sharma, *Indian Feudalism*, Delhi, 1998.
33. Kesavan Veluthat, *The Early Medieval in South India*, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009) p.14.
34. Kesavan Veluthat, *Perspectives on Kerala History*, Thiruvananthapuram, 1999, p.79.
35. K.N. Ganesh, *Irreverent History: Essays for M.G.S. Narayanan*, Delhi, 2014, p.34.
36. M.R. Raghava Varier, *Perspectives on Kerala History*, Thiruvananthapuram, 1999, p.79.
37. Kesavan Veluthat, *Perspectives on Kerala History*, Thiruvananthapuram,1999, p.62. This 'situation' mentioned above is the current historiographic situation that compels the historian to rely on the said technique, despite the availability of sources (which the historians agree upon) for the period.
38. Donald R. Davis, Jr, *The Boundaries of Hindu Law: Tradition, Custom and Politics in Medieval Kerala*, Italy, 2004, p.50.
39. Vide, Raghava Varier, Rajan Gurukkal, *Kerala Charithram part one*, Edapal 2011. Vide, Raghava Varier, Rajan Gurukkal, *Kerala Charithram part two*, Edapal, 2012, pp.241-253.