OLD BRAHMI INSCRIPTIONS
“प्रभिघात्वशात् सिंवा द्रव्यशिलिनिविष्णुयते ।
पतो मकरसुरस्वं माधवाशमवलम्बाताम् ॥
कर्सिप्रश्रोते प्रौनिवेष्मुञ्जा चरक-सुखुतोऽ ।
मेड़ाव्यः किं न प्रवले तत्भादृ याद्या सुभाषितम् ॥”
OLD BRAHMĪ INSCRIPTIONS
IN THE UDAYAGIRI AND KHAṆḌAGIRI CAVES

Edited with new readings and critical notes

12085

BY

BENIMADHAB BARUA, M.A., D.LIT. (LOND.)

PROFESSOR IN CHARGE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PĀLI, HONORARY LECTURER IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF SANSKRIT AND ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE, CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY, FORMERLY A GOVERNMENT OF INDIA RESEARCH SCHOLAR IN PĀLI

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUJTAA

417.9 341 1929
To
All of those
who paved the way
for this work
in token of
respect and gratitude
PREFACE

The preparation of a critical edition of fourteen old Brāhmī inscriptions and one table of Brāhmī alphabet in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves, such as has been attempted in the present volume, is an undertaking, which could not be faced without a feeling of diffidence. So far as I am concerned, it had never been in my contemplation to undertake this difficult work before the task of teaching the Hāthī-Gumpha inscription of Khāravela was thrust upon me by the Boards of Higher Studies in Pāli and Ancient Indian History and Culture in the session 1924-25, during the absence on leave of the colleague in charge of the subject. I proceeded, however, with the task, examining the facsimiles of this baffling epigraph, reading and discussing its text and interpretation, week after week, in a class of pupils, all of whom readily co-operated with me, and yet the prospect of solving its riddles was far from being bright. After many fruitless attempts I took it up in all earnestness in 1927, devoting myself wholly to it during the Poojah holidays with the firm determination to come to a definite solution. It was only towards the middle of October that the faded lines of the document appeared to me in a somewhat clear light.

I was aware that since Mr. Stirling published the first notice of this inscription in 1827 in a volume of the Asiatic Researches, James Prinsep, General Cunningham and Rājendra Lāla Mitra grappled with it without even succeeding in ascertaining the name of King Khāravela, in whose name it stood. The study of it obtained, no doubt, a right direction and received a fresh impetus when Dr. Bhagawanlal Indraji
published his edition in 1907 in the *Acts du Sixième Congrès International des Orientalistes*.

I knew quite well that Mr. K. P. Jayaswal stood foremost amongst those who had tried, in recent times, to carry on the work commenced by Indraji, and that he was the scholar and epigraphist to whom the Indologists would ever remain indebted for his untiring energy in leaving no stone unturned to make the contents of Khāravela’s inscription known to the world and to emphasize their importance and value. In spite of the fact that he achieved much by way of orientation of the opening and concluding paragraphs of the Hāthi-Gumpha text, I felt that his treatment of the subject left room for a good deal of revision and supplementation.

Making it a point of duty to take best guidance from the publications of previous scholars and epigraphists, from Stirling, Kittoe and Prinsep to Jayaswal and Banerji, I essayed since 1925 with the aid of Locke’s plaster-cast in the Calcutta Museum and with the aid of the eye-copies and estampages within my access to probe into secrets of the Hāthi-Gumpha text. And realising that the study of this important text would be incomplete without that of other old Brāhmī inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves, I thought it would be worth while also to carefully examine their readings and renderings published by Prinsep, Cunningham and Indraji, and finally by Mr. R. D. Banerji in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XIII. Examining and re-examining these shorter inscriptions as they appeared on original stones, plaster-casts and facsimiles, I was able to detect certain palpable mistakes in previous publications standing badly in need of correction.

This in itself, as I believed, was a sufficient justification for venturing a fresh undertaking. But it seemed to be no less a justification that Khāravela’s inscription in the Hāthi-Gumpha and the remaining old Brāhmī inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves, were not studied before in
their inter-connection, as well as in their connection, with the table of Brāhmī alphabet in the first Tattva-Gumpha on the Khaṇḍagiri hill.

It will be noticed that all the shorter inscriptions have been treated in the present work, together with the table of Brāhmī alphabet, as appendices to the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription, while the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription itself has been treated as the main text serving as a complete Khāravela-Carita,—anyhow, a Prakrit panegyric (prāṣasti) of King Khāravela in ancient Indian epigraphy, composed by some unknown Harisena or Bāṇa in an elegant prose diction clearly anticipating the prose style of the Pāli Milinda-Paṇha. The scheme of treatment has been conceived in such a manner that it includes Khāravela’s inscription as the first text, Khāravela’s chief-queen’s inscription as the second text, Kadampa-Kudepa’s inscription as the third, and so on and so forth till the series closes with the Tattva-Gumpha table.

And yet I am afraid that the sense of incompleteness is apt to remain in view of the fact that some four or five caves which have sunk down showing just their covering roofs on the slopes of Udayagiri have not, as yet, thanks to the goodness of the Department of Archæology, been completely exposed to view, affording a chance to the visitors to satisfy themselves as to whether they bear inscriptions or not, and if they bear any inscriptions, what their contents and characters would be. Pressure of work and shortage of funds would be lame excuses, I venture to submit, in this case, for just a few strokes of the pick and shovel are what is required to accomplish the needful work.

Even though some of the inscriptions in some of the buried caves do not find place in this volume, for the reasons stated above, it may be hoped that their contents and characters, when made known, will not have much to add to the information culled from those records which find place in it.

True it is that I have found it expedient to be guided,
nay, even misguided, by Mr. R. D. Banerji, to treat the table of Brâhmi alphabet inscribed in scarlet colour, not to say written in red ink, on a dressed portion of the back wall of one of the chambers of the Tattva-Gumphâ on the Khaṇḍagiri hill as of the same date as the Hāthi-Gumphâ and other old Brâhmi inscriptions in the Udayagiri caves. On my visit to Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri, the caretaker appointed by the Archaeological Department informed me that the late lamented Mr. Panday doubted the contemporaneity of this table with Khāravela’s inscription. Mr. Panday might be right, but he did not substantiate his opinion with any definite evidence. Till nothing was found to upset Mr. Banerji’s assumption, I thought I should make the best use of it in including the fourteen old Brâhmi inscriptions, as well as the Tattva-Gumphâ table in a complete and coherent scheme of treatment. Whatever be the actual date of this curious table, it is certain that the general forms of the Brâhmi letters which appear in it closely resemble those of the Brâhmi characters in the Hāthi-Gumphâ and other old Brâhmi inscriptions. Certainly the importance of this table lies in the fact that it clearly indicates the first step to the engraving of inscriptions with chisel and by means of whetting on pieces of stone or rocky surfaces. It goes at once to show that the engravers used first to make designs of the letters to be engraved in some sort of colour or ink. As the Hatthipla-Jataka (Fausboll, Vol. IV, p. 489) goes to prove, inscribing in letters of vermilion upon a wall (jâtihingulakena bhittiyâ akkharâni likhanam) was a common practice in India. It was not, moreover, unusual, as some of the Central Asian manuscripts attest, to annex a table of alphabet as a key to the reading of the manuscript. Whatever be the actual date of this table, I find no difficulty in supposing its purpose to be that of serving as a key to the reading of the whole set of old Brâhmi inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves. I am sure that it will not make any differ-
ence to the scheme of treatment adopted in the present work, even if the Khandagiri caves, their old Brahmi inscriptions and table of old Brahmi alphabet prove to be posterior to the Udayagiri caves with their old Brahmi records.

The present work comprises two books, the first of which consists of texts and translations of the inscriptions, and the second of notes or dissertations. It is evidently a departure from the usual practice of introducing the texts, translations and word-notes by an introduction dealing appropriately with the points of general importance. In reversing the usual order, my sincere desire is to enable the reader to form his own opinion before reading the author's opinion developed in the notes. It will, nevertheless, be seen that with the text and translation of each of the inscriptions has been attached a short preface or introduction dealing with matters of textual importance and containing a full bibliography.

The reader's attention must also be drawn to the fact that as regards the Hathigumpha inscription, I have preferred the paragraphic arrangement of its text to the usual and mechanical "line" arrangement. But the "line" arrangement, too, has not been ignored; it has simply been subordinated to the paragraphic arrangement.

I confess that in building up the dissertations I have had to take the old Brahmi inscriptions at their face value. If King Kharaavela had really recorded falsehood in his inscription, there is no means of checking it. But to raise the slightest suspicion as to the veracity of the Hathigumpha inscription is, to my mind, to be over-indulgent to unnecessary scepticism.

Taking the records as they are, or as they can be made out, I have been concerned to discuss, in a threadbare manner, their historical bearings and importance, showing all possible sides and keeping an eye to consistency of the data yielded by them. What I mean by consistency of the data may be best understood in the light of an example. If, as recently
done by Mr. Jayaswal, Namdarāja in the expression Namdarāja-tivasasata-oghāṭita-panādi be taken to signify the Nanda-era, one has got to show that the same Namdarāja in another expression, viz., Namdarāja-nīta-Kāliṅga-Jināsana, can be taken to convey the same meaning. If it can be shown, I say there is consistency; if not, I say there is no consistency.

As regards the disputed points admitting of two alternative readings or renderings, there are one or two instances (e.g., Goradhagirin ghatātpayita), where I have indicated my predilection differently in the two books. I humbly request the reader, therefore, not to take anything to be my final opinion without considering the position taken up by me in the book of notes.

While I leave the whole of this work to be judged for what it is worth, I may confidently hope that if the readings proposed by me stand the test of time, they will serve to lay many old ghosts for ever, and to convince the reader once for all (1) that there is no statement in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription as to the population of Kalingā; (2) that there is no allusion to Rṣi Khibra; (3) that it contains no statement as to the Greek king Dimiṭa-Demetrios retreating with his troops and transports to abandon Mathurā; (4) that there is no mention of Avarāja; (5) that there is no statement as to Pithuḍa being ploughed with an ass-plough; (6) that there is no statement as to the existence of a league of the Tamil powers; (7) that there is no mention of the Maurya-era; (8) that there is no allusion to the Nanda-era; (9) that there is no reference as to the corpus of the Jain canon with its various divisions; and lastly (10) that there is no such epithet of Khāravela as Bhikhorāja. On the other hand, I shall not be surprised if in the illegible portion of the twelfth year's record (I. 13), the name of Sātakaṇi recurs as one of the kings subdued by Khāravela in a second campaign undertaken by him.
Mr. R. D. Banerji says (JBORS, Vol. III, Part IV, p. 487) that he prepared, in 1917, two inked impressions of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription. One of these two must be the impression reproduced in JBORS, Vol. III, Part IV, p. 472, Plate I. Mr. Jayaswal has, on the other hand, published a plate (JBORS, 1927, Vol. XIII, Parts III-IV) reproducing photographs of select portions of two impressions, which are said to have been prepared by Mr. Madhosarup Vats. And I had the privilege of separately examining the two impressions, one of which resembled the impression reproduced in JBORS, 1917, and the other resembled the extracts from one of the impressions claimed to be of Mr. Vats and reproduced in JBORS, 1927. Although I failed to unravel the mystery which shroud these impressions, I was very happy to find that one of the impressions examined by me clearly showed my reading of cece-yatī-adhasatikāṃ instead of ca coyathī agasarikāṃ (I. 15), to be quite correct. As for the reading (silā)-thambhāni ca cetiyāni ca kārāpayati (I. 14), I have largely relied upon a small plate published by Mr. Jayaswal in JBORS, 1918. As for the rest of the new readings and interpretations, grounds have been stated in proper places.

A plate prepared by patching up select portions of two impressions, such as one published by Mr. Jayaswal in JBORS, Dec., 1927, is bound to be misleading. The sounder procedure in a matter like this is to compare the results obtained from the study of both after carefully studying each of them separately. So far as published estampages go, one has still to place greater reliance upon one published previously by Mr. Jayaswal in JBORS, Vol. III.

I could not but congratulate myself to be able, when the printing of the book of notes was far in progress, to check the errors into which I was at first led by the symmetry of the reading of the text of the inscription of Khāravela’s chief-queen Hathisāhasa papotasa dhutunā offered by Indraji and
Banerji. There can be little doubt, as the original stone clearly proves, that the correct reading is no other than Hathisā(ī)ha-sampa(n)ātasa dhutunā.

I cannot, however, claim that finality has been reached or can be reached. If the following pages serve to guide the study of the Hāthi-Gumphā and other old Brāhmī inscriptions along the right path, I shall have sufficient reasons to rejoice.

But I deeply regret an omission on p. 46, namely, the rendering of Arahato nisāṇīya samīpe pavhāre (I. 15), “on a slope in the vicinity of the Árhatā (cave)-dwellings.” The “Additions and Corrections” will indicate where this is to be inserted.

My grateful thanks are due to Prof. S. Radhakrishnan, President of the Council of Post-Graduate Teaching in Arts, in urging me to prepare a critical edition of the old Brāhmī inscriptions, making it useful to the students and discussing the readings and interpretations of all previous scholars and epigraphists. Mr. Narain Chandra Kundu, Conseil Agrée, Chandernagore, has rendered me a distinct service by translating for me required passages from M. Sylvain Lévi’s article in JA. Among my colleagues in the University, Mr. Sailendranath Mitra, Dr. N. P. Chakrabarty, Dr. P. C. Bagchi, Dr. S. K. Chatterji and Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri have helped me with their valuable suggestions but for which my treatment of the subject would have been, in some places, far different from what it now is. I am indebted also to the Hon’ble Mr. Ramaprasad Mookerjee, Mr. (now Prof.) R. D. Banerji, Dr. Radhakumud Mookerjee, Prof. S. K. Ayengar, Dr. G. N. Banerji, Mr. Charu Chandra Roy, and Rai Bahadur Ramaprasad Chanda for the keen interest taken by each of them in this work. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Stella Kramrisch for her note on the reliefs in the Udayagiri and Khandagiri caves without which the treatment of the question of chronology of the old Brāhmī inscriptions, their authors and receptacles would
have remained incomplete. Among the younger scholars, Mr. Prabodh Chandra Sen, M.A., Mr. Raman Chandra Bhattacharyya, M.A., Mr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, M.A., Mr. Devaprasad Ghosh, M.A., P.R.S., Mr. Sitis Chandra Basu, M.A., and Mr. Mrinal Kumar Ghosh, B.A., have assisted me in various ways, and but for their youthful zeal it is doubtful if I could have made a sustained effort. But I am in no way less indebted to Mr. J. C. Chakravorti, the Assistant Registrar, Mr. A. C. Ghatak, the Press Superintendent, and the Press Staff for their readiness to oblige me while this life-killing work was being seen through the press.

Calcutta University,
The 16th December, 1928.  B. M. Barua
ALTERNATIVE READINGS AND RENDERINGS

[The asterisk mark indicates preference.]

I. 1—Airena* or Verena.
I. 1—caturāṃta-(rakhaṇa)* or caturāṃta-(luṭhana)*.
I. 3—Asaka or Asika.
I. 4—dampa or dapa.
I. 5—(ā)hatapuva* or Arakatapuva.
I. 9—“having stormed Gorathagiri (the hill-fortress)”* or “having killed Gorathagiri (the man)” as a rendering of “Goradhairīṁ ghatāpayitā.”
I. 12—anupa or janasa.
T(i)mira or Tamira.
I. 14—kāya-nisidhiyam (rājupa)jivakehi* or kāya-nisidhiyāya (rāja)- bhatakehi.
rāja-putehi or rāja-sutehi.
III.—Airasa* or Verasa.
III.—Kadampa* or Kudepa.
IV.—Vadukha* or Varikha,
X.—“The cave (which is an excavation) of the High Func-
tionary Nākiya of Bāriyā” or “The cave (which is an
excavation) of Mahāmada, Bāriyā and Nākiya.”
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

P. 10, Para. 2—Set in the marginal space the Svastika symbol, the symbol, No. 2, reproduced on p. 141.

P. 29, Para. 16—Set at the end the Tree-symbol, the symbol, No. 4, reproduced on p. 141.

P. 32, L. 8, Para. 9—Read "परशुराण" for "विष्णुनारीपूजन.

P. 33, L. 3, Para. 15—Read "वेदरिह" for "वेदरितय.

P. 46, L. 7, Para. 15—Insert after "stone-pillars to be made" —"on a slope in the vicinity of the Ārhata (Jain) cave-dwellings" as a rendering of Arahata-nisīdiya-samipe pabhāre.

P. 47, L. 5—Read "invincible" for "undaunted."

P. 47, L. 6—Read "troops and transports" for "carriers of the realm of royal command" omitting f. n. 4.

P. 81, L. 3—Read "koṭhā" for "koṭhā.

P. 93, L. 3—Set the Tree-symbol, the symbol No. 1, reproduced on p. 144, to the left of Kāmmasa.

P. 99, L. 3—Enclose the text between the symbols, Nos. 2 and 3, reproduced on p. 144.

P. 155, Foot-note 1—Read "Mālayehi" for "mālayehi."

P. 161, L. 10, P. 171, L. 32—Read "pasādānāḥ" for "pasāddāyaṁ".

P. 161, L. 11, P. 171, L. 33—Read "Hathisa(h)asampanātāsa dhutunā" for "Hathisāhasa papotasa dhītunā."

P. 211, L. 3, L. 5—Omit "wrongly" and reference to p. 300.

P. 211, L. 6—Read "from another passage in the same Nikāya (III, pp. 299-300)" instead of "from the Pāli passage."

P. 211, L. 14—Add before the sentence—"If Berar and Konkan were the principalities etc."—"It cannot certainly be maintained that Prof. Bhandarkar has succeeded in establishing yet a decisive interpretation on the evidence of the first passage relied
upon by him (A. III, pp. 76, 78). He has sought to establish that the two words, *raṭṭhika* and *pettanika*, represent one item of enumeration in the statement, *yadi vā raṭṭhikassa pettanikassa*, in the same way as the three words, *rājā, khattiya* and *muddhābhitisita*, do in the immediately preceding statement, *yadi vā raṅno khattiyassa muddhābhisittassa*. The falsity of analogy between the two sets of words is clear from the second passage (A. III, pp. 299-300) in which the distinction between the two has been brought out by embodying the series of the three words, *rājā, khattiyō, and muddhābhīsito*, in one paragraph, and the series of *raṭṭhiko, pettaniko, senāpatiko, gāma-gāmiko* and *pūga-gāmanika* in another. It is impossible to draw any other inference from the enumeration in the second paragraph than that *raṭṭhika, pettanika* and the rest are intended each to form a separate item. And Buddhaghosa, too, has precisely treated each of them as a separate item. The argument by analogy is weak because the association of two or more names or designations in a stock enumeration in Pali and Aśokan texts (e.g., in R. E. V and R. E. XIII) is generally meant to balance up the expressions and, no less, to indicate the contiguity or similarity of places, persons or functions, denoted by them.

P. 219, L. 33—Read ""Nātya"" for ""Nātya.""
P. 225, F. n. 3—Read ""pabhatā"" for ""pabhatā.""
P. 267, L. 22—Read ""dūrādaya"" for ""dūrādasya.""
P. 292, L. 35—Read ""samuthāpitāhi"" for ""samthā.""
P. 293, L. 38, L. 40—Read ""suite"" for ""suit.""
P. 295, L. 31—Omit (Choṭha-Hāthi-Gumphā).
P. 293, L. 9-10—Read ""Pāvana-Gumphā"" for ""Choṭha-Hāthi-Gumphā.""
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

I. 12—Read *Janasāda-bhāranaṇaḥ* for *anupa-dabha-sūnaṇaḥ*, and translate it by "the demon's habitat," interpreting *Janasāda* as the same word as the Pāli *purisa-sūda* or *purisaṇaḥ* which literally means "a man-eater."

P. 210—Add: "*Vijādhara-dhīcuṇaḥ* is evidently an expression similar to *Vijāghara-nagaravāsa* (Jaina Jambudvīpa-Prajñāpti, Ch. I), which means 'the Vidyādhara capital (*rājakūṭa*).’ The Jambudvīpa-Prajñāpti alludes to 50 Vidyādhara cities in the south, situate on two sides of the Vatadhāna range, extended lengthwise, dividing South India from the Northern, and to 60 cities in the north, situate along the spurs of the Himalayan mountain. The cities are described as rich, secure, prosperous and delightful, where the inhabitants of the towns and districts lived happily. Their inhabitants who were human classes of Vidyādharas represented diverse physical types."

P. 267—Omit the opinion attributed to Prof. Chatterji and insert: "Prof. S. K. Chatterji inclines to think that *Khāraśāla* is just an Aryанизed spelling of a name of Dravidian origin, and that it may be taken to mean 'be of the black lance,' deriving it from the Dravidian *kāra*, meaning 'black' and *vel*, meaning 'a lance,' which both occur in Tamil, and that the Kalibga people inspite of the early inscriptions in the Aryan languages seem to have been non-Aryan speakers down to a late period."

P. 312—Read L. 27, *if for a*; L. 28, *is for in* and *in rows for rows.*
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TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS
No. I
INSCRIPTION OF KHAＲAVELA
IN THE HATHIGUMPHĀ
INSCRIPTION OF KHĀRAVELA

The following inscription, noticed for the first time by Mr. Stirling, is engraved "on the overhanging brow of" the Hāthi-Gumpha, better the Baḍa-Hāthi-Gumpha, which is "a natural cavern, very little improved and enlarged by art," and, therefore, "not important from an artistic and architectural point of view." "From the remains which can still be traced in its floor," Dr. Bhagawanlal Indrají is led to think that "the cave had at one time been destroyed, whether by violence or neglect, and had afterwards been repaired and added to."

"The inscription is carved," says Dr. Indrají, "on the rock which is not perpendicular but bends in. The inscription itself is in seventeen lines occupying a space about eighty-four feet square. The face of the rock does not appear to have been well-smooth for the work, but the letters are large and deeply carved. Time and weather have wrought ravages. The first six lines are well preserved. The last four, partly so. The greater part of the intervening space has been much spoilt, portions of it being entirely weather-beaten, while in other portions single letters or groups of letters can still be made out. The left corner of the inscription, in especial, has been greatly injured, and the initial letters of eight lines in that direction are entirely lost."

Mr. K. P. Jayaswal, who has made the reading, restoration and interpretation of the contents of this important epigraphic record his life's work, writing in 1917, says: "The rock was roughly dressed on the right-hand side. The chisel marks of the dressing are misleading; they tend to produce misreadings. These long and irregular marks left by the original dressing, are not the only pitfalls. Rain-water which trickles down the roof of the cave has cut into the letters and produced a few letter-like marks. Natural decay produced by time has given misleading turns to numerous letters......even hornets like to take liberty with the record of the Emperor Khāravela with perfect impunity and have added a few irregular marks on it...... The inscription is weather-beaten. The first four lines are completely readable. The fifth line has about 13 syllables obliterated by natural decay. Half of the record of the 6th year (L 6) and the entire record of the 7th year (L 7) have disappeared. From the 8th up to the 15th lines, every line has got large gaps wrought by decay. The 16th and 17th lines are comparatively well-preserved except for the
loss of about 12 initial syllables. There are visible signs of a progressive decay."

proposed by Sylvain Lévi as to the reading of L 11 in JA, 1925, pp. 57-62; certain corrections proposed by Sten Konow as to the reading and interpretation of the inscription in Acta Orientalia, Vol. I, 1923, in his paper—Some Problems raised by the Khāravela Inscription; Locke's cast preserved, in a broken condition, in the Indian Museum, Calcutta; the plaster cast prepared by H. Panday for the Patna Museum; and, above all, the plate published by K. P. Jayaswal in JBORS, 1927, Vol. XIII, Parts III-IV, reproducing photographs of judiciously selected portions of two impressions prepared by Madhosharup Vats.
INSCRIPTION OF KHĀRAVELA

TEXT

1. Namo ar(i)hamtānam 1 [:] Namo sava-sidhānam [:] 4
Airena 2 mahārajena mahāmeghavāhanena 3 ro Ceta 4 -rāja-
vamsa 5 -vadhanena pasatha-subhā 6 -lakhanena
caturānta-(rakhaṇa) 7 -guṇa-upetena 8 Kalimgā-
dhipatinā 9 siri-Khāravelena 10 [1 1] pandarasa-
vasāni siri-kādjāra 11 -sariravatā kājitā kumāra-
ktikā 12 [ ] Tato lekha-rūpa 13 -gaṇanā-vavahāra-
14 -vidhi-
visāradena sava-vijāvadātena 15 nava-vasāni 16
yovarajam 17 va sāsitam 18 [ ] Sampuṇa 19 -catu-
visati 20 -vasa 21 (so) dān(i) 22 -vadhamāna 23-
vesayovanābhivijayo 24 tatiye 25 [1 2] Kalimg-
rājavamse 26 purisa-yuge mahārajābhisecanam 27
pāpunati 28 [ ]

† Cf. the Jainā formula of namokkāra or nōkāra, the Jainā form of
invocation, met with on the first page of a Jainā book and quoted by
Rājendra Lāla Mitra and Bhagawan Lal Indraji:

Nāma arīhamtānam||Nāma sidhānam||
Nāma āyariyānam||Nāma uvaṭṭhāyānam||
Nāma lōc savā-sūbhāyānam||

† Cf. Makhādeva-Jātaka (Fausbōll, No. 9): Aṭṭhe Vīdhā-ratthi
Mithilāyāṃ Makhādeo nāma rūjā ahosi dharmiko dharmarūjā. So catur-
siti-vassa-nassāni kumāra-kilom tathā oparaṇjāṃ tathā mahārajjam
katvā.

Cf. Vikrama-Prabandha, verses quoted in the Patṭhāvallis of the
Digambaras, edited and translated by Höernle in IA, Vol. XXI, p. 67:

Sattari cadusadajutto tiṇa kāle Vikkamohavai jammō |
Athā-varasa vāla-līlā sāsana-vasa hi dharmie dese||
Rasapana-vāsā rajjam kunanti micchāvādesa samjutto |
OLD BRĀHMĪ INSCRIPTIONS

1. Prinsep and others read arahantānāṃ. In Banerji’s impression there appears a vowel-mark, the ā-mark, which may be taken to stand for an i-sign, yielding the reading arithanānāṃ which, in arđha-Māgadhī or Jaina Prakrit, is just a variant of arahantānāṃ.

2. Prinsep, Mitra and Indrājī read Vērenā, Indrājī wrongly suggests that Airēna is not to be found in Pāli or Prakrit. See Lüders’ List of Brāhmi Inscriptions, No. 1276—Airā Utāvīpabhāti: No. 1280—Cāla Ayīra, Ayīra Bhūta-rahkhiyā, Ayīra-Buddharakhita. See Fausboll’s Jātaka, Vol. VI, p. 300: Aśīro hi dāsasa janīndā issara. See, also, the Old Oriyā Text quoted by Jayaswal, where one finds such expressions as “Ahibh nāma rājā,” “Ahibh jitarānā bhavet,” “Ahibh Utkalbharavah.” Banerji reads Khārena, which is out of the question. The first letter is far from being kha. Cunningham, Lüders, Jayaswal and Sten Konow correctly read Airēna.

2(a). Jayaswal finally reads māhāmegha.

3. Prinsep, Mitra, Cunningham, Lüders, Banerji and Jayaswal read Cēta. Ram-prasad Chanda justifies this reading by the evidence of the Vessantara-Jātaka (Fausboll, Vol. VI, pp. 514-528), in which the kings of the Ceta royal family are said to have reigned in Kalīga. Sten Konow reads Ceti, which he thinks is absolutely certain. He says that both Mr. Jayaswal and Dr. Thomas, who have examined the stone, agree to accept it. He maintains that the reading Ceti (= Cedi) is quite in keeping with the adjective rājā-vanēsa-kula-vinasita in L 17 whereby Kharavela claimed to have descended from an ancient family of royal sages. Locke’s cast shows, indeed, a deep cutting on the top of the letter ta, which one may take to be an i-mark. But on a closer examination it appears that this cutting is either due to the flowing of water or may be simply a slit in the rock. Jayaswal finally reads Ceti. I have always been tempted to suggest such a reading as [Ka]linga-rājā-vanēsa-radhanena on these three grounds: (1) That there is the faintest trace of a letter after mahāmegha-rājanena, which is no other than ka; (2) that the letter read as ce looks also like a damaged li; and (3) that the letter read as ta or ti is, strictly speaking, the upper vertical line standing on the left arm of the angle rather than on its apex, as it should be, had the letter been ta. The appearance of an upper vertical line with an i-mark may just be due to some mysterious erosion around the suṣṭ̐āra-mark. See Plate in JBORS, 1927, Vol. XIII, Paris III-IV.

4. Prinsep, Mitra and Cunningham wrongly read kā for rā.

5. Prinsep and Cunningham read chadhanena. Nothing is more likely than the mistaking of the Brāhmi letter ca for ca or cha.

6. Prinsep and Cunningham read zuke, which is meaningless.

7. Prinsep reads caturāṃṭala-thāṇa; Cunningham, caturāṃṭaka-thāṇa; Jayaswal, caturāṅṭala-thaṇa, correcting his former reading caturāṃṭala-thaṇa. I maintain that there is no such word as caturāṅṭala, the usual literary expression being caturāṅta or caturānta, cf. the classical Pāli expression caturānta-vijitivi. The fifth letter is clearly ra or la. The supposed u-mark appearing below the is nothing but a lower extension of the letter kha or erosion on the inscribed surface of the rock, having no organic connection with the main letter. So I propose to read rakahṣa or lūḍhāna. Jayaswal finally reads caturāṃṭalaṭhīṭa.

8. Prinsep fancifully reads gananakha te va. Jayaswal reads gunḍapahitena, correcting his former reading gunḍapagotena, which accorded with the reading proposed by Cunningham and Indrājī. I accept Chanda’s guna-upetena, which serves as an instance, where the two words of a compound are juxtaposed without being combined according
to the rule of the Sandhi. Jayaswal finally abandons the reading -opahita in favour of -opapitena.

9. Prinsep reads Kalimadhapati, and Cunningham Kalimadhipati cā, both of which are incorrect.


11. Indraji reads kumāra, which is evidently an oversight. Jayaswal in his revised reading, accepts Prinsep's khāra, in preference to his former reading kaḍāra.

12. Indraji reads kīḍākā. Cunningham omits ḍa through mistake.

13. Jayaswal's former reading was rupā.

14. Prinsep reads vauparā and Cunningham, vaçepāra. Jayaswal adopts vañahāra, giving up his former reading vañahāra. Locke's cast has ve, and I see no harm in reading vañahāra.

15. Cunningham reads tiyāvadātana-i, which is fantastic.

16. Prinsep reads vañsa, and Cunningham, vasati, both of which are incorrect.

17. Prinsep reads hovaraja; Cunningham, yovaraja; Indraji, hovarajya; Jayaswal, correctly yovarajya.

18. Prinsep reads pumāsīya(ça), separating sa from Sampuṇa following; Cunningham, pumāsīyaṇa. Indraji and Jayaswal read pumāsītaṇa. But the first letter which is somewhat fissured seems to be us rather than pa.

19. Prinsep reads pusa, separating it from sas preceding. Cunningham is the first to read sampuṇa.

20. Prinsep reads cava-risati, also visati; Cunningham, catuvinisati. Jayaswal reads catuvînati, correcting his former reading catubisati.

21. Prinsep reads vase; Cunningham, vaše(vu). Indraji correctly vaśo.

22-23. Prinsep reads dānasadhamena, which is accepted by Cunningham and Indraji. Jayaswal reads tadāni-vadhamāna, correcting his former reading ti aana cu dhāmensa. I am also inclined to read samāna for tadāni.

24. Indraji reads viṣaya. Jayaswal in his revised reading, accepts Prinsep's yovendhīvija, suggesting that the s-mark in ve is the result of an abrasion. Jayaswal finally reads sesyo Venaḥvidvija, taking Venaḥvidvija to mean "a conqueror like Vena, a Vedic personality."

25. Indraji reads tatiya. Others read tatiya.

26. Indraji reads vaṃsa; Jayaswal, vaṃsa, correcting vaṃsa.

27. Jayaswal finally reads māhā.


1. Prinsep alone reads "mate. Others read "mato.  
2. Prinsep reads ca ; Cunningham, caṃ ; Indrajī, correctly ca, though ca is more idiomatic.  
4. Prinsep and Cunningham read to pura, which is incorrect.  
5. Indrajī reads nāgarinī ; Jayaswal, nāgarī, correcting his former reading nāgaram. Both Prinsep and Cunningham read nāgarī.  
6. Prinsep reads Khidra ; Cunningham, khīṃbīra ; Indrajī, khībīra, suggesting that the reading should be khīṃbīraṃ ; Jayaswal, 'Khi-bīraṃ correcting his former reading khībīra. Jayaswal finally reads Khībīra, taking it to be the name of a sage. Locke's cast helps us to account for the appearance of ga as khi. It shows that rain-water trickling down from or along the u-mark in pu of sampuṣa in L 2, has cut into the right arm of ga, lengthening it and making the whole letter look like khi. The second letter appears, at first sight, as bi.  
7. Prinsep and Indrajī read sitala. Cunningham reads isitāla ; Jayaswal, isitala, correcting his former reading sitala.  
10. Prinsep reads bathapayaṣi or bathapayaṣi ; Cunningham, thāpāpayaṭi ; Indrajī, baḍhāpayaṭi ; Jayaswal, correctly baṃdhāpayaṭi.  
11. Prinsep reads sa ca yāni ; Cunningham, sa ca yānāṃ ; Indrajī, saavyāna ; Jayaswal correctly, saavyāna.  
12. Prinsep and Cunningham read paṭisamthaṃpanam ; Indrajī and Jayaswal, paṭisam-thāpanam. Jayaswal finally reads paṭi⁷.  
13. Prinsep fancifully reads panatisirāṣṭi ; Cunningham parṇīlabāṣṭi. Indrajī is the first to correctly read panatisāṭi.  
14. There is a large space between sahaṣṭhi and pakatiyo.  
16. Both Prinsep and Cunningham omit ca.  
17. Cunningham reads ijayāta ; Indrajī, rajayati. Prinsep and Jayaswal correctly read ramjayati.
3. Dutiye ca vase acitayita Satakani pachima disam haya gaja nara-radha-bahulam damdham pathapayati ka(limga)gataya ca senaya vitas[e]ti Asaka nagara[.]

1. Prinsep and Cunningham read ditiye. Indraji reads ditiye; Jayaswal, dutiye, correcting his former reading ditiye.

2. Jayaswal accepts the reading ca of Prinsep, Cunningham and Indraji, in preference to his former reading cu.

3. Prinsep and Cunningham read case; others vase.

4. Cunningham reads acitayata; Indraji, abhitayita. Prinsep is the first to correctly read acitayita.

5. Prinsep reads Satekari or Sotekari; Cunningham, Sotakini; Indraji, Satakani; Jayaswal, satakani, correcting his former reading satakaniṃ.

6. Prinsep reads pachima. Others read pachima.

7. Prinsep reads haya or haye; Cunningham, inha; Jayaswal, haya.

8. Cunningham alone reads yejam; others read gaja.

9. Prinsep and Cunningham read babhula; Indraji and Jayaswal, bahulam.

10. Prinsep reads darim or dam مج; Cunningham, nam te; Indraji, correctly damdham.

11. Prinsep reads pathapayati; Cunningham pathapanati; Indraji, pathapayati; Jayaswal, pathapayati, correcting his former reading pathapayati.

12. Prinsep reads Kamsabanadgataya; Cunningham, sabanağataya; Indraji, Kusamhandan khatiyam; Jayaswal, Kishhabenad gataya, correcting his former reading Kasapana khatiyam. Jayaswal finally reads Kishhaben. I maintain that the reading cannot but be Kishhabenad. There are three holes between ka and la, and one or two holes between la and ga, which are, after all, responsible for the appearance of a letter like ḍha, and for the appearance of gā as be. I concede Kamsavagataya as an alternative reading.

13-14. Prinsep reads qasanaya; Cunningham, qisenaya; Indraji, ca sahaya; Jayaswal, ca senaya, correcting his former reading ca sahaye.

15. Prinsep reads vatinam; Cunningham, vatinamta; Indraji, (sahaya)atā patam; Jayaswal, vitapati, correcting his earlier reading vitopati. Jayaswal finally reads vitasitam.

16. Prinsep and Cunningham read Saka, ignoring the first letter. Indraji reads Masika. Jayaswal finally reads M(uk)sa. That the first letter is a, an not ma or mu, is certain. I am unable to decide whether the name of the place is Asaka or it is Asika. Water has trickled down in a continuous stream from or along the left arm of ti of bandhapayati in L 3 reaching as far as the top of sa of Asaka or Asika.

17. Prinsep and Cunningham read nagara; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly, nagraṇ.

1. Prinsep reads gūsino; Cunningham, nācīye; Indrajī, tatiye ca; Jayaswal correctly, tatiye.
2. Prinsep, Cunningham and Indrajī read Gāndhava. Jayaswal reads at last Gāndhava, correcting his former reading Gāndhava.
3. Prinsep and others read damba.
4. All read nata.
5. Prinsep and Cunningham read gīta; Indrajī and Jayaswal correctly, gīta.
6. Prinsep reads kīḍāpayati; Cunningham, kāḍāpayanti; Indrajī is the first to correctly read kīḍāpayati.
7. Prinsep reads nāgari; Cunningham, nagari; Indrajī nagaraṇi; Jayaswal correctly, nāgariṇī.
5. Tatha' cavuthe² vase³ Vijādhārādhīvāsam⁴ A(raka)ta⁵-puram⁶ Kalimga⁷-puva-rājāna(m)⁸ (dha)m⁹ na⁸ va nitinā va pasāsa(yati)⁹ savata dhamakute(na)¹⁰[ , ] bh(i)ta-tasite¹¹ ca nikhitā¹²-chata-(l5)-bhim márā¹³ hita¹⁴-ratana¹⁵-sāpateye¹⁶ sava¹⁷-rathika¹⁸-bhojake pāde¹⁹ vandāpayati²⁰ [ . ]

1. Prinsep and Cunningham read tatha. Indraji reads itha ; Jayaswal, tathā, correcting his former reading itha.

2. Prinsep and Cunningham read cievute ; Sten Konow reads cievute ; Indraji, cavuthe ; Jayaswal, too, cavuthe, correcting his former reading cievute. The appearance of ca as ci may be accounted for by the fact that rain-water trickling down from the space between bahulam and pochimam in L 4, has formed a canal reaching the top of ca below.

3. All read vase.

4. Prinsep reads "cūsāc ; Cunningham, "vāsā̄ ; Indraji correctly, "vāsām.

5. Prinsep reads a(ra)hata. Cunningham and others read ahata. In one of the impressions three letters are prominently brought out, the middle one as ha. It seems that the two letters, ra and ka, being somehow connected at the base, appear together as one letter, which is ha. Immediately after Vijādhārādhīvāsam, anyhow somewhere in the sentence, we must expect to get the name of a place. But if the word coming immediately after Vijādhārādhīvāsam be read as an adjective, as ahata-pumā, we get no place-name to stand as the object of the verb pasāsatyī following.

6. Prinsep reads puve or puba ; Cunningham, pūca. Indraji and Jayaswal read pumā. I think the supposed ca is nothing but a fissured ra.


8. Prinsep reads rājana e satu ; Cunningham, rājān... ; Indraji, rājā-namamāsitaṇ ; Jayaswal, rājā-niceṣitaṇ, correcting his former reading rājā-mamaṃṣitaṇ.

9. The reading from dhamaṇa to nitinā is tentative.


11. Prinsep reads (sa)rā...rite ; Cunningham, doubtfully taṣajitite ; Indraji, pujita ; Jayaswal, (sa)bimāñghitite, correcting his former reading sabichidate.


13. Prinsep reads (s)bhīgāre(hi) ; Cunningham, hīgāre(hi) ; Indraji, bhīṃgāre(hi) ; Jayaswal, correctly bhīṃgāre.

14-15. Prinsep reads taratana ; Cunningham, tarataman ; Indraji, tiratana(sa) ; Jayaswal, hita-ratana, correcting his former reading hita-ratana(sa).

16. Prinsep reads sapattena ; Cunningham, sāpattayā ; Indraji, 'patayo ; Jayaswal, sāpateye, correcting his former reading (ratana)ā pateye.

17. Prinsep and others read sava. Jayaswal, too, reads sava, correcting his former reading sīva.

18. Prinsep reads rathika or rathike. Cunningham and others read raṭhika.

19-20. Prinsep reads (bhojake) pā devaṃ dāpayati ; Cunningham, bhojakepā devaṃ dāsayaṇī ; Indraji, too, devaṃ dāsayaṇī ; Jayaswal correctly reads vandāpayati.
6 Paṃcama¹ cēdāni² vase Namdarāja-tivasasata³-oghāṭitam⁴ Tanasuliya⁵-vāṭa⁶ panādim⁷ nagaram⁸ pavesayati⁹ ['] sata-(saha)sehi ca (khanā)pa(yati)¹⁰ [.]

1. Prinsep reads paca or pacata; Cunningham, paṃcāpaṃ. Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read paṃcama.

2. Prinsep, Cunningham and Indraji read dāṇī. Jayaswal reads dānī. One cannot be sure about the second vertical stroke in front of i-mark of ni. It appears that rainfall water trickling down from the letter ca of dutige ca in L 4, has formed a canal, which has cut through the letter ki of kīṣāpayati in L 5, and flowed down as far as and parallel to the i-mark of ni. Dāṇī may be accepted as an alternative reading.

3. Prinsep and Cunningham read tivasasata; Indraji and Jayaswal, tivasasatan. I find no dot-stroke denoting ṃ in front of ta.

4. Prinsep and Cunningham read ughāṭitam; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly, oghāṭitam. Ramaprasad Chanda rightly argues in favour of the reading tivasasata-oghāṭitaṃ, instead of tivasasatan oghāṭitaṃ, when he points out (1) that there is no anusvāra-sign (ṃ) either above or beside the final ta of tivasasata, and (2) that the absence of a suffix after tivasasata is due to the fact that it forms part of a compound word Naṃdarāja-tivasasata-oghāṭitaṃ, an instance like guṇa-upotena, where the two words, sata and ogha are not combined according to the rule of the Sandhi. To these arguments of Chanda, I may add (1) that unless Naṃdarāja-tivasasata be treated as part of a compound word, it becomes meaningless, and (2) that Naṃdarāja-tivasasatan has no meaning at all as a separate word in the present context. Sten Konow, too, reads Naṃdarāja-tivasasata-oghāṭitaṃ.

5. Prinsep reads tanūnsaraliya or tanasaraliya; Cunningham, tanūṃsaliyaṃ; Indraji Tanasuliya; Jayaswal correctly, Tanasuliya.

6. Prinsep reads vaṣa; Cunningham, vāṣa. Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read vāṭā.

7. Prinsep and Cunningham omit ṃ.

8. Prinsep and Cunningham omit ṃ.

9. Prinsep reads pavesa rise; Cunningham, pavesa vīso. Jayaswal reads the last letter as ṛī.

10. Jayaswal reads the concluding words as so pi vase chadany, completing his former reading so ² ... vi., and treats them as the opening words of the record of Khāravela’s 6th regnal year. I think there can be little doubt about the correctness of the reading proposed above to complete the statement regarding the 6th year.
7. Abhisito¹ ca [chaḍhe]² vas[e]³ (rāja-sirim)⁴ saṃdam-
sayaṃto⁵ sava-kara-vana⁶-[16]-anugaha-anekāni⁷ sata-saha-
sāni⁸ visajati pora⁹-jānapadam [ . ]

1. Prinsep reads sabbhāsari; Cunningham sabhīsori; Jayaswal correctly, abhisito.
2. The gap containing space at least for three letters has altogether been lost sight of by Jayaswal.
3. The letter just beyond the gap appears to be sa.
4. Prinsep reads pūṣaca; Cunningham, hāsa ca; Indraji, rājaseyaṃ; Jayaswal, rājasuyam, correcting his former reading rājaseya. I maintain that the word is neither rājaseyaṃ nor rājasuyam; it is rājasirīṃ.
5. Prinsep reads sadasa te; Cunningham, saṃdasayanto; Indraji, saṃdaṃsrayato; Jayaswal, saṃdaṃsrayanto, correcting his former reading saṃdaṃsrayato.
6. Prinsep reads pada karavasa; Cunningham, sa vakara vana; Indraji, sava-karāvasaṃ, which is accepted by R. D. Banerji; Jayaswal, sava-kara-vanaṃ, correcting his former reading sava-bharāvasa[ṃ]. I was inclined at first to read sava-bharāvani. But it is certain that the letter after ra is va.
8. Satame¹ ca vas(e)² (a)si-chata³-dhaja-ra(dha)-rakhitu(remga)⁴-sata⁵-ghaṭāni⁶ savata⁷ samdasanam⁸ sava⁹-(mangaḷani)¹⁰ kārāpayati¹¹ [—]¹² sata-sahasehi  [ . ]

1. Prinsep and others read satamam. But the e-mark attached to the final letter of satame is distinct.
2. Prinsep reads tisam⁴; Cunningham, vesam. I do not find the anusvāra-sign along with the second letter.
3. Prinsep and others read Paṇḍasato. It is certain that the first letter which is somewhat obscured by fissure is not pa; it is either ma or a, more likely the latter. The third letter is prominently cha.
5. Prinsep reads satam⁴; Jayaswal, (Dhi)si ti. The appearance of ra as si may be due to fissure. To me, the reading (Dhi)si is meaningless.
6. Prinsep and Cunningham read gharini⁴. Jayaswal reads gharini, correcting his former reading gharinī. None may doubt that the second letter is ta, and not ri.
7. Indraji reads savitu; Jayaswal, samātu(ka), correcting his former reading savitu. Prinsep and Cunningham correctly read savata.
8. Prinsep reads kahadopana or kahadopama; Cunningham, kahadopana; Indraji, kula . . . . ; Jayaswal, (mātu)ka-padopama, correcting his former reading upādopama.
10. Cunningham reads pa ketana. Jayaswal reads the first letter as ma.
11. I have little doubt about the correctness of this reading.
12. The gap must have contained a word denoting a number.

1. Prinsep reads thame, omitting the first letter: Cunningham, ye thame. Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read athame.
2. Prinsep omits ca.
3. Prinsep reads manamna-n; Cunningham, mananti mana-ca; Jayaswal, mahati-senaṣa, correcting his former reading manatino dhamani. Jayaswal finally reads mahatā.
4. Cunningham reads...tapabhate; Jayaswal, mahata-bhitti, which is nowhere. The occurrence of such a conjoint consonant as tti in the orthography of Khāravela's inscription is yet a discovery to be made. Mr. Jayaswal seems to have thought of such a reading under the influence of a latent bias that Goradhagiri was an impregnable hill-fortress guarding an entrance to Rājagaha.
7. Prinsep and Cunningham read rājagabham (or, rājagamba) upsīdīpayati; Cunningham, rājgaṃbhī upsīdīpayati; Indraji, Rājagaha-napām piḍīpayati; Jayaswal, Rājagaha-ṃupsīdīpayati, correcting his former reading Rājagahā-napām piḍīpayati. Sten Konow finds no objection to reading na instead of upa. I find that the horizontal base stroke of na is really in line with that of pa of piḍīpayati, and that it stands out, at least in Banerji's impression, as the horizontal base line of na. Rājagahānām in the sense of the people of Rājagaha is an expression of the same kind as Māgadhānām signifying the people of Magadhā. This reading can well account for the use of (e)tinam following.
8. Prinsep and Cunningham read dhatnam; Indraji reads etinam; Jayaswal, etinā, correcting his former reading etinam. One may read etinā, but etinām gives a better grammatical construction of the sentence. Sten Konow, too, reads etinā. Jayaswal finally reads etinam or etinā.
11. Prinsep reads sāṃbāta; Indraji, savata; Jayaswal, sāṃbāta, correcting his former reading sabata. The second letter is undoubtedly bhi.
12. Prinsep reads sena-sāhayati(ti) or sena-sāhanā(ti); Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read sena-sāhane; Jayaswal finally reads "cāhano.
13. Prinsep reads 2ti pamucitau or 2ti pamucita; Cunningham, pamacita; Indraji, vipamucita; Jayaswal, vipamumcitum, correcting his former reading vipamumcitum.
14. Prinsep, Cunningham and Indraji read Madhuraṃ. Jayaswal reads Madhuraṃ, correcting his former reading Madhuraṃ. Sten Konow, too, reads Madhuraṃ. It is certain that the reading is Madhuraṃ, and not Madhura.

15. Prinsep reads aparato or apanata; Cunningham, apayato; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read apayāto. Sten Konow reads upayāti, which is doubtful. The o-mark attached to the final letter is very distinct.

16. Cunningham reads navānār ānā; Indraji, navame ca esse; Jayaswal, yeśa narido, correcting his former reading navame ca esse. Here Sten Konow would read Yavana-rāja which is ingenious but uncertain. The fifth letter is distinctly da and not ja. Jayaswal finally reads Yavana-rāja.

17. Jayaswal reads nāma; Sten Konow, fancifully Dima(ta). Jayaswal finally reads Dīma or Dīmiti. I cannot offer a better reading than sava-gho?.

18. The gap may perhaps be filled in by rāja-bhaktānanām ca.

19. The gap may be filled in by Bāmbhaṁyaṃ ca Arāhaṇaṃ.

20. The gap may be filled in by samaṇānaṃ ca.

21. Prinsep and Cunningham read mora dadāti; Jayaswal reads mo yaṣaṭi, correcting his former reading mo. ya chati.

22. These five letters appear to be above palacabhāra, with which the line closes. Jayaswal finally reads (yachati-e) palava... corrected his former reading palacarika.

23. Cunningham reads palacanake; Indraji, paccaro; Jayaswal, palacabhāre, correcting his former reading palacarika.


25. Prinsep traces three letters after gaja, which he doubtfully reads ralure. Cunningham suggests two letters, Indraji and Jayaswal read radhu immediately after gaja, which seems to be skipping over a fissured short space containing room for two letters, which I propose to read nara.

26. Prinsep reads ralure; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read radha.

27. Prinsep and Cunningham read saḥāya े; Indraji reads saha-yata; Jayaswal, saha-yanpte, correcting his former reading saha-yate.

28. Prinsep and Cunningham read saca; Indraji reads sacaṇ; Jayaswal, correctly saca.

29. Prinsep reads gharā-cusapa; Cunningham, gharasasya; Indraji, gharacasadhaṃ; Jayaswal, gharasa-sa-pa, correcting his former reading gharacasadhaṃ.

30. Cunningham reads anatika-gava yasu(sa); Jayaswal, sa-agināthigā, correcting his former reading agināthiye.

31. Prinsep reads sahanam ca kā(ra); Cunningham, gahanam ca kā(ra); Indraji, (yasawa) gahanam ca kāra; Jayaswal, gahanam ca kāra.

32. Prinsep reads (kāra)yitum ba imanānam; Cunningham (kāra) yitum ba imanānam; Indraji, (kāra)yitum Bāmaṇam; Jayaswal, (kāra)yitum Bāmaṇānam.

33. Prinsep reads (ja)tapa para; Cunningham, (ja) puha sāra; Indraji (ja)mhi radhi-sūram; Jayaswal (ja)ti-pamti pariḥāraṃ, correcting his former reading jaṭharaṃ bhi paraṃ. Jayaswal finally reads jātita pariḥāraṃ.

34. The gap may be filled in by pāna-bhejanaṃ.

35. The record of the 8th year may be taken to close with an expression, which was preceded by another denoting a numerical adjective.
0. Na(vame) ca vase [1 9] veḍuriya -Kali[m]ga-
raja-nivāsam Mahāvijaya-pāsādaṁ kārayati aṭha-tīśya sata-
sahasehi `[.]

1. Jayaswal reads only the first letter as na.
2. Jayaswal reads giya.
3. Prinsep reads ra-i; Cunningham, venaṭi; Jayaswal, kei, correcting his former reading abhaya.
4. Prinsep reads mānati or manati; Cunningham, manati; Jayaswal, mānehi, correcting his former reading prūci-toṭe. Jayaswal finally reads māna[ti]. The third letter, as it appears in Banerji’s estampage, must be read as ga.
5. Prinsep reads paṇḍaraśa or raini rasa; Cunningham, paṇḍarasa; Indraji, nivāsan; Jayaswal, saṅgaṇīsan, correcting his former reading nivāsan, which was really correct.
6. Prinsep reads kārayati or derayati. Others read kārayati.
7. Prinsep reads ṭhatasaya, omitting the initial letter; Cunningham, aṭha hīta du; Indraji, aṭha-tīśa; Jayaswal correctly, aṭha-tīśya.
8. Prinsep reads sata sarelahi; Cunningham, (du)earvasahasehi. Indraji is the first to correctly read sata-sahasehi.
11. Dasame' ca² vase³ (Kalinga-rāja-vamsānam tati(ya)-y[u]ga-sagāvasāne (Ka)linga⁴ -pu(varājanam⁵ ya)sa-sakāram⁶ kārāpayati⁷ sata-(sahasehi)⁸ [.]

1. Prinsep and Cunningham read dasāme; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly dasame.
2. Prinsep omits it.
3. Prinsep reads case; Cunningham, tuse; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read vase.
4. From Kālipa to Kālipa Prinsep reads dava...rara gacusopa; Cunningham, datibhisara... karathavasa p-na; Indraji,... Bharadvās-a-puṭhāna; Jayaswal, mahādhi-ta'bhīsaṁaya Bharadvās-a-puṭhānaṁ, correcting his former reading daṇḍasa...naṇasa Bharadvās-a-puṭhāna. Jayaswal finally reads daṇḍa-saṇḍki-sāma-mayo⁹.
5. Prinsep reads puṇayaṣa; Cunningham, mahājaṇa; Jayaswal, mahi-jaṇanaṁ.
6. The reading suggested is tentative.
7. Cunningham reads rācābyati; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read kārāpayati.
8. Both Indraji and Jayaswal take the sentence to close with kārāpayati, which seems incorrect.
12. (Eka)dasame ca vase¹ [—]² -maṇi-ratanāni³-saha
yāti⁴ [ ] [1 10] [—]⁵ (Kalim)ga⁶ -puvarāja⁷ -niyesita⁸-Pithuḍaga-dabham Nagale nekāsavyati⁹ [ ] (a)nupa-dabha-
vanaṁ¹⁰ ca terasa-vasa-sata-katam bhidati¹¹ Timira-daha-
samghātām¹² [ ]

1. The opening words of the record of the 11th regnal year are not effaced. Even the first three letters, e, kā and da, can be read, though, to some extent, obscured by dust.

2. Prinsep reads the letters to be made out in the gap as vaharunatanara; Indraji, uṇatana ca; Jayaswal, niritaṣa uṇatana, correcting his former reading ... pusa ca. I shall not be astonished if the letters were meant to inscribe Kaparukha-haya-gaja-nara- radha.

3. Prinsep reads manetana; Cunningham, soti yo ru-ni; Indraji, manoradhāni; Jayaswal, maṇi-ratanāni, correcting his former reading manoradhāni. Here I have tentatively accepted Jayaswal’s reading. Jayaswal finally reads mani.

4. For saha yati Prinsep reads upahī; Cunningham, upalabhata; Indraji, upalabhata; Jayaswal, upalabhata, correcting his former reading upalabhata.

5. Indraji points out that “the beginning piece of lines 11-17 is lost, and about ten letters are lost in each.”

6. Jayaswal reads maṇḍa ca. He finally reads maṇḍaṁ. I maintain that the reading is no other than Kaliṇgā.

7. Cunningham reads pusa rāja; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read puvarāja.

8. Cunningham reads niyesitaṁ; Indraji and Jayaswal read niyesitaṁ.

9. Prinsep reads pithu ṣaḍa dwambha nagare nakāsavyata; Cunningham, pithuḍa daṇḍha nagare nakāsavyata; Indraji, pithuḍaṃ Gadaṃbha nagare nakāsavyata; Jayaswal, Pithuḍaṅga-dalḥa-nagarne nakāsavyati, correcting his former reading Pithuḍaṅga-dalḥa-nagarne nakāsavyati. Sylvain Lövi and Sten Konow read pithuḍa[m] gadabha-na[ḥ m] gajena kāsavyatī. The reading kept in view by Lüders is pithuḍaṇḍ gadaḥbha-nāyagalena kāsavyati (“Pithuḍaṇḍ, ploughed with an ass plough.” Fleet takes pithuḍaṇḍa to be pīṭhūḍaṇḍa, “a market-town for the convenience of travellers.” It is certain that there is no anusvāra along with ṣaḍa. Jayaswal finally reads pithuḍa-gadabha-nāyagalena kāsavyati.

10. Prinsep reads janapade bhāvana; Cunningham, janapuḍa bhāvana; Indraji, Jayaswal, R. C. Mazumdar and Sten Konow read janapada-bhāvanam. The reading kept in view by Lüders is Jinaṇḍa-bhāvanaṁ (“the meditation on the feet of Jina”). Jayaswal finally reads ṣ(t)ama daṇḍhāvamaṁ. Read janamaṇḍa as a variant.


12. Prinsep reads tatemara-dehasopāta; Cunningham, tamaṛadehasopāta; Indraji, tamaṛa-dehasamghātām; Jayaswal, titamara-dehasamghātām, correcting his former reading titamara, etc.; Sten Konow, i[t]e[maradeha[i]ya]n[gh]ātām. Mazumdar reads deha-
samghātām.

Cf. Mahābhārata, II. 30. 27-29 : —
Sa sarvān mleccha-nṛpatiṃ sāgarāṇūpavāsinaḥ
Kāṇḍaḥ varadādāna ratnāni vividhāni ca
Candanaṅgu-vraṅgati maṇi-mauktika-kambalam
Kāṇcaṇam’ rujataḥcaiva vidrūmaḥca mahādhanaṃ
Te koṭiśata-saṁkhyena Kaunteyaṃ mahatā ladā
Abhayavarṣan mahātmānaṃ dhanavarṣeṇa Paṃḍavam

Cf. Mahābhārata, II. 31. 71-72, 75-76 : —
Pāṇḍyaṃśca Dravidā-ścaiva Sahitāṃścorya-Keralaih
Andhaṃstālanāṃbocaiya Kaliṅgānustakarāṇikān
Āṭāvinca purim ramyām Yavanānam puram tathā
Dūtair eva vaśe caṅkraucinānudāpayat
Tataḥ sampraśāyāmaya ratnāni vividhāni ca
Candanaṅgu-kūṣhāni divyāṇyabharaṇāni ca
Vāsāmś ca mahārānī maṇimācaiva mahādhanaṃ
Nyavarttata tato dhīman Sahadevaḥ pratāpavān

1. Prinsep reads Barasma, Cunningham, Bārasama; Indraji, Bārasamaṃ; Jayaswal correctly Barasame.
2. Prinsep reads ca; Cunningham, ḍa; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read ca.
3. Indraji reads vasaṇa; Jayaswal correctly case.
4. The letters are so much effaced that it is impossible to attempt to make out what they are.
5. Here I have relied upon Banerji’s impression reproduced in JBORS, 1917. For sehí of sahasakhi Cunningham reads phahi. Jayaswal finally reads hasa-keda sasasehi.

6. Prinsep reads vitisayato; Cunningham, vitisigyá; Indraji, vitisáyanto; Jayaswal, vitāsāyati, correcting his former reading vitisāyanto. Jayaswal finally reads vitāsāyato.

7. Prinsep reads Utrīrithi; Cunningham, Utrāpatha. Indraji and Jayaswal read Utrāpatha, which I accept as an alternative reading.

8. Prinsep and others read rājāno. But there cannot be any serious objection to reading it as rājāṇaṃ, the singular Accusative form.

9. The beginning piece of L 12 is lost for ever. It is likely that such an expression as Amgānaṃ ca or simply Amga—preceded Māgadhānaṃ.

10. Prinsep reads maculāsa; Cunningham, madhaṇānaḥ; Indraji and Jayaswal read, perhaps correctly, Māgadhānaṃ.

11. Prinsep reads vipula; Cunningham, vipula(ya); Indraji and Jayaswal read vipulām.

12. Prinsep reads leyaṃ. Cunningham is the first to correctly read bhayaṃ.

13. Prinsep and others read janeto. The o-mark seems to be quite clear.

14. Prinsep reads kithasān gangāsa; Cunningham, kathasaṃ Gomgāya; Indraji, kathisa Gomgāya; Jayaswal, kathisu Gomgāya, correcting his former reading kathisu Gomgīya; Sten Konow, Sugāṇḍīya, suggesting that Sugāṇḍa or Sugāṇḍi is certainly the ancient Maurya palace in Pāṭaliputra which is called Sugāṇḍa in the Muddrākṣaṇa. Jayaswal finally reads kathis Sugāṇḍīyaṃ). Sugāṇḍīya does not suit the context of the Hāthī-Gumphā inscription of Kharavela.


16. Prinsep reads .dha; Cunningham,...ma; Indraji, Maqadhāṃ; Jayaswal, Māgadhāṃ, correcting his former reading Maqadhā.

17. Prinsep reads rājāna. Cunningham is the first to correctly read rājānaṃ.

18. Prinsep reads ibahāya sāśita; Cunningham, bahasaṭi sita; Indraji, bahu pariśasita; Jayaswal, Bahasaṭimitaṃ, correcting his former reading Bahapatiṣitān.

19. Prinsep reads ca dapayata; Cunningham, pā deva dāpaṃ yati; Indraji pāde vadāpayaṭi; Jayaswal pāde vaṃdāpayaṭi.

20. Prinsep reads rāja nita; Cunningham, Namḍarājāṇita; Indraji, Namḍarāja-nita; Jayaswal, Naṃḍarāja-nitāṃ, correcting his former reading Namḍarāja-nitānī.

21. Prinsep reads ca a ga; Cunningham, cāmga; Indraji, sa a ga; Jayaswal, Kāṁga, correcting his former reading ni Aga.

22. Prinsep reads jinasana; Cunningham, jīnaṣa; Indraji, Jīnaṣa; Jayaswal, Jīnasāṃścāsaṃ, which has no meaning. Jayaswal finally reads Jīnaṃ.

23. The bracketed reading is tentative. For āneti Cunningham seems to read ma atā.

24. For senavahana-sahasakhi Prinsep reads makhana paṃḍa pakhari; Cunningham, rota na sūha; Indraji, gaha-ratana-paṇihārehi; Jayaswal, gaha-ratanāna-paṇihārehi, which is an unintelligible jargon.

25. Prinsep reads dē muḍaḍhā; Cunningham, mariga Maqadhā; Indraji, a Maqadhā; Jayaswal, Amga-Maṅḍaḍhā, correcting his former reading Amga-Maṅḍaḍhā.

26. Prinsep reads ca jaca; Cunningham, vasaṣa; Indraji, vasiṣa; Jayaswal, vasaṃ ca.

27-29. For ca pāde vaṃdāpayaṭi Prinsep reads naghari; Indraji, nayari; Jayaswal, nayati.

30. The beginning piece of L 13 is lost.


33. Prinsep reads *nicsayati*; Cunningham, *ni ca iya(ni)*; Indraji, *nicsayati*; Jayaswal, *nicsayati*, correcting his former reading *nicsayati*, which was really correct.


35. Prinsep reads *(m)asariya*; Cunningham, *(m)asariya*; Indraji, *(m)akariya(n)*; Jayaswal, *(m)ahariya(n)*.


37. Prinsep reads *paripara ara*; Cunningham, *pariha*; Jayaswal, *paripurañ upa*. Cunningham's reading is nearer the mark.


39. Cunningham reads ...na-pîsa*; Jayaswal, *ratanâ-mânikam*, correcting his former reading *ratanâ-janâna*. *Ratanâ-mânikam* as an adjective of *Paṇḍarâja* may be Indian epigraphy but no Indian language.

40. Prinsep reads *Paṇḍarâja(no)*; Cunningham, *mahâ ra(ri) (ne)*; Jayaswal *Paṇḍarâja*.

41. Prinsep reads *dâvi aneka nã*; Cunningham, *anekâni*; Jayaswal, *edâni anekâni*. Jayaswal finally reads *edoña for edâni*.

42. Prinsep reads *dato manorata rana*; Cunningham, *dato mani ratanâni*, adding *muta* to his former reading.

43. Prinsep, Cunningham and Jayaswal read *aharâpayati*; Indraji reads *aharâpayati*.

44. Prinsep reads *idha satasa*; Cunningham, *idha saunte ribha*; Indraji, *idham satasa*; Jayaswal, *idha satasa*. Jayaswal finally reads *sato for satasa*.

45. The beginning piece of L 13 is missing.

14. Terasame ca\(^1\) vase supavatavijaya\(^2\)-cake\(^3\) Kumāri-pavate\(^*\) Arahato\(^4\) parinivasato hi\(^5\) kāya\(^6\)-nisīdiyāya\(^7\) (rāja)-bhatakehi\(^8\) rājabhātihi\(^9\) rāja-ñātihi\(^10\) rāja-p(u)tehi\(^11\) rāja-mahisihi\(^12\) Khāravela-sirinā satadasa-leṇa-satam\(^14\) kārā-pitam\(^13\) [\_\_] [1 14]


2. Prinsep and Cunningham read vijaya; Indraji and Jayaswal, vijayi. Jayaswal finally reads vijayo.
4. Prinsep reads arahite; Jayaswal, too, arahite, correcting his former reading arahato. Cunningham and Indraji correctly read arahato.
6. Prinsep reads kāra; Cunningham, kāya; Indraji, kāyaṃ; Jayaswal, kāyya, correcting his former reading kāya, which was really correct. Jayaswal finally reads kāya.
7. Prinsep reads nisīdiyāya; Cunningham, nisīdinaya; Indraji, nisīdiyāya; Jayaswal, nisīdiyāya, correcting his former reading nisīdiyāya.
8. Prinsep reads yāpuhavakehi; Cunningham, yāpujakehi; Indraji, yapujake; Jayaswal, yāpaṇāvakehi, correcting his former reading yāpūjavakehi.
9. Prinsep reads ra. atan; Cunningham, ra-lāṭatini; Jayaswal, rāja-bhitini, correcting his former reading rāja-bhitāni.
10. Prinsep reads cenam devani; Cunningham, cemam daceni; Jayaswal, cinaṭatini.
11. Prinsep reads sasastani; Cunningham nase sitāni, Jayaswal, vaśātini, correcting his former reading vaṣa-satāni. Jayaswal finally reads vaśātāni.
12. Prinsep reads ujana uṭasā; Cunningham, uṇjana kaa uṇdā; Jayaswal, pūjāni kattuṇā, correcting his former reading puṇjani sa ba ta. Jayaswal finally reads puṇjaya-rata-uṇāsa.
13. Prinsep reads yarava ladirana; Cunningham, yaravalaḍirana; Jayaswal correctly, Khāravela-sirinā.
14. Prinsep reads ji ātē dakararikheti; Cunningham jīvaṃ-kopuri khitā; Indraji, ...kule; Jayaswal, jīvadeva-sirik-kalpāṃ. Jayaswal finally reads jīva-deka-sirikā.
15. Jayaswal takes the line to close with rakhitā. He finally reads parirakhitā.
15. [———]²¹ sakata²-samaña-suvihitānaṁ² ca sata-disānaṁ⁴ (yat)tinam⁵ tāpasa-(i)sinam⁶ lenaṁ⁷ kārayati⁸ [.] Arahata⁹-nisidiya¹⁰-samīpe pabhāre¹¹ varākara¹²-samuthāpitāhi¹³ aneka-yovanāhitāhi¹⁴ panatisāhi¹⁵-sata¹⁶-sahasāhi¹⁷ silāhi¹⁸ silā-thambhāni¹⁹ ca cetiyāṁ²⁰ ca kārāpa(yati)²¹ [.] [1 15] [——]²² paṭalika²³-cetare²⁴ ca²⁵ veduriya²⁶-gabhe²⁷ thambhe²⁸ paṭīthāpayati²⁹ panatariya³⁰-sata-sahase(hi)³¹ [.] (vedu)riya³²-nila³³ vochīmnam³⁴ ceca-yathī³⁵-adhasatikam³⁶ t(i)riyam³⁷ upā-dayati³⁸[.]

1. The beginning piece of L 15 is missing. Jayaswal traces the remnant of a letter before sakata which he reads as tā. There is, indeed, such a remnant, but precisely of what letter I cannot say. One thing is certain that the sentence embodying the record of the 13th regnal year and running up to the end of L 14 is in Passive Voice, while the statement filling up L 15 and the first half of L 16 is in Active Voice. This cannot be consistently accounted for unless one assumes (1) that the record of the 13th year end in L 14, and (2) that the missing words in the beginning piece of L 15 constituted the introductory phrase, such as Cudasame ca case, indicating the particular regnal year to which the record in question refers.

2. Prinsep and Cunningham read sakata. Indrajī reads the last two letters as kata; Jayaswal, (tā)sa kataṁ, correcting his former reading sakata, which was nearer the mark. Jayaswal finally reads sakati.

3. Prinsep reads same rasavihitaṁ; Cunningham, samelasa vihitenaṁ; Indrajī, samāya suvihitāraṁ; Jayaswal, samāya-suvihitānaṁ, correcting his former reading samana-suvihitānaṁ.

4. Prinsep reads suta disānaṁ; Cunningham, suta āsinaṁ; Indrajī sava-disānaṁ; Jayaswal correctly, sata-disānaṁ.

5. Prinsep reads jāṣṭa; Cunningham, tanāpeśi; Indrajī, yāninaṁ; Jayaswal, āṭānaṁ, correcting his former reading khatiyam. I accept Jayaswal's as an alternative reading. Jayaswal finally reads ānīnāṁ.

6. Prinsep reads yeve-sampa; Cunningham, mapusa isu pu; Indrajī, tāpasaṁ saṁha; Jayaswal, tāpasa-isinaṁ saṁghā₂.


8. Prinsep and others have missed kārāpayati.

9. Prinsep reads arahasa; Cunningham, cahasa; Indrajī is the first to correctly read arahata.

10. Prinsep reads nisidiya; Cunningham, nisidaya; Indrajī, nisidiya; Jayaswal nisidiyā.

11. Prinsep and Cunningham read subhāre; Indrajī and Jayaswal, pabhāre.

12. Prinsep reads vasāca; Cunningham, va. bha; Indrajī, varakāru; Jayaswal correctly, vardāka.
13. Prinsep reads samathaghisipā; Cunningham, sa matha ghisipā; Indraji, samatha-
    thapatibhi; Jayaswal, samathāpitiḥ.
14. Prinsep reads anakayā yasanā pitī; Cunningham, anake yojanā pitā ghi; Indraji,
    aneka- yojanāḥ; Jayaswal correctly, aneka- yojanāḥitāḥ.
15. Prinsep reads the five letters of which there are traces as pa... ra; Cunningham,
    as pa... pipe. Indraji and Jayaswal wisely leave a blank space. Jayaswal finally reads
    pa. sio.
16, 17. There can hardly be any doubt about the given reading.
18. Prinsep reads silaha; Jayaswal, silāhi, correcting his former reading silahī.
19, 20, 21. Prinsep reads sopapatha dharaśi dhasayani nānī; Cunningham, bhagapatha...
    dhadayana; Jayaswal, Sīnhapatha-Rāṇiya Dhūsiya nisayānī, correcting his former reading
    sopapatha... Jayaswal finally reads rānī Sidhūśāyā.
22. The beginning piece of L 16 is missing.
23. Prinsep reads patałake; Jayaswal, patałiko. Cunningham and Indraji read patałake.
    Jayaswal finally reads ghanapālakto.
24. Prinsep reads catapa; Cunningham, catarā; Indraji, Cetake; Jayaswal correctly,
    catarē.
25. Prinsep and Cunningham read ce; others, ca.
26. Prinsep reads vāruriya; Cunningham, teghariya. Indraji is the first to correctly
    read vēguriya.
27. Prinsep and Cunningham read gabha, Indraji and Jayaswal correctly, gabhe.
28. Prinsep and Indraji read thabhē; Cunningham and Jayaswal, thambhe.
29. Prinsep reads patipa-yati; Cunningham, pattipapayati. Indraji and Jayaswal
    correctly read pattipapayati.
30. Prinsep reads panattanusa; Cunningham and Indraji read paṃnatarīya. Jayaswal
    reads panatarīya, correcting his former reading paṃnatarīya. In Sten Konow's opinion
    panatarīya is the correct reading.
31. Prinsep reads saca... raṣa; Cunningham, sa ca vasa; Indraji, māthī-vasa-sata raṣa;
    Sten Konow, sacaśahite, partly accepting and partly modifying Fleet's reading paṃnata-
    riya sacasața; Jayaswal, sata-sahasahi, correcting his former reading saṭṭha-vasa-sata
    Rāṣa. Jayaswal has, I believe, placed the reading beyond all dispute.
32. Prinsep reads —riya; Cunningham, ... ya; Indraji, Muriya; Jayaswal, too, Muriya.
    Banerji also offers the reading Muriya. Sten Konow thinks that the reading Muriya is
    certain. Where is the certainty of such a reading? None need be misled by Banerji's
    impression. Locke's plaster cast shows that the stone has been peeled off just where
    some letter was engraved, presenting a socket, which is apt to delude the eye with the
    appearance of a ma or mu, or to come out in an estampage as a ma or mu. His cast also
    shows that there is a short space after sahasehī, just enough for engraving one letter. I
    have carefully examined this space where I find the faint trace of a letter, which is no other
    than ve. The same has also been made out from one of the two impressions within my
    access. See pl. I in JBORS, 1937, Vol. XIII, Parts III-IV. The letter lost or obscured
    in the socket is found to be, both in Locke's cast, rather ḍu than ma or mu.
33. Prinsep reads la; Cunningham, kalā; Indraji, āle; Fleet, too, kāle, Jayaswal,
    kalāṃ, correcting his former reading kalē or kāle. I doubt very much if the first letter
    can be read as ka or kā. I say it is not at all ka or kā. Locke's cast clearly shows how
rain-water trickling down along the vertical line of as or ni and flowing to some distance along the right hand side of its horizontal base line, flows down at last cutting deep into the rock and serving to transform the as into a ka-shaped hobgoblin. I shall be the last man to mistake this apparition for ka in which two vertical strokes of equal length go to meet the horizontal base line from two sides at two distant points.

34. Prinsep reads machinam; Cunningham, ca cinam; Indraji, vechine; Jayaswal, vechine or vochinam, correcting his former reading vechine.

35. Prinsep reads ca coyatha; Cunningham, caca yatha; Indraji, ca coyatha; Jayaswal, ca coyathi, correcting his former reading ca-cheyathi. The first letter, as it appears in Locke's cast or in Banerji's impressions, in either ce or ka, and the second letter, ignoring the vowel mark, is ca or ta. One may correctly read the four letters together as cca-yathi or latā-yathi.

36. Prinsep reads aqi sati ka; Cunningham, aqesati ka; Indraji, aqesati ku; Jayaswal, agasatikam, correcting his former reading Argasi ti kam. Sten Konow, A(m)gasatikam-tariyam. Jayaswal finally accepts Sten Konow's reading. I frankly confess that it is very difficult to resist the temptation of the reading of the second letter as ga. It is only after a prolonged examination that one will be inclined to read it as dha. I can press these three arguments in favour of reading it as dha: (1) that it is so unlike other forms of ga in the Hāthī-Gumpha inscription; (2) that Locke's cast also shows the dha, and (3) that in one of Vats' impressions it stands out almost as a dha.

37. Prinsep and Cunningham read ka tariyam, which is quite possible. Indraji reads ku tariyam; Jayaswal, austryiyan, correcting his former reading kaṃ tariyam. Sten Konow accepts Jayaswal's reading satikantariyam. Jayaswal finally reads turiyam. I find no difficulty in reading tiriyan.

38. Prinsep reads napadayati; Cunningham, napadachati; Indraji, cipayati, Jayaswal, upādhyati, correcting his former reading upādiyati. Sten Konow correctly reads upādayati. I am tempted to read the concluding words of the record of the 14th year also as cetiya-thambhagasatam kutariyam upādayati.
16. Khema¹-rājā sa [.] Vadha²-rājā sa [.] (Imda³-rājā sa ⁴ Dharma⁵-rājā * pasamto ⁷ sunamto ⁸ anubhavamto ⁹ kalāṇāni ¹⁰ [l 16] [ — ] ¹¹ guṇa ¹² vīsesa ¹³ kusalo savapāsaṁda-pūjako ¹⁴ sava-devāyatana ¹⁵ saṁkāra ¹⁶ kārako ¹⁷ apatihata ¹⁸ caka ¹⁹ vāhana ²⁰ balo ²¹ caka-dhar(o) ²² guta-cako ²³ pavata ²⁴ cako rāj(i)si ²⁵ vamsa ²⁶ kula ²⁷ vini(s)ito ²⁸ mahāvijayo ²⁹ rājā Khāravela ³⁰-siri ³¹ [.] [l 17].

* Cf. Manus-Saṁhitā, VII. 7:
Sau'gīrī bhavati Vāyuś ca so'raṁ Suomaḥ sa Dharmarāṣṭ; 
Sa Kuveraḥ sa Varuṇaḥ sa Mahendraḥ prabhāvataḥ.

1. Prinsep and Cunningham read agama. Indraji is the first to read Khema.
2. Prinsep and Cunningham read vatha. Indraji reads vadha; Jayaswal, Vadha, correcting his former reading vadha.
3. Prinsep reads rese; Cunningham, bhi? Indraji and Jayaswal read bhikhu. The portion of the rock where the two letters were engraved has been peeled off, presenting a socket, which deludes the eye with the appearance of two letters resembling bhikhu, I find that bhikhu is but an apparition of Imda.
4. Prinsep reads rāja; Cunningham, -ja. Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read rājā.
5. All have missed sa.
7. Prinsep and Cunningham read pasata. Indraji is the first to correctly read pasamto.
8. Prinsep reads saṭite; Cunningham, sanamto; Indraji, sanato; Jayaswal, sanamto, correcting his former reading sunamto.
9. Prinsep reads apadhaśa; Cunningham, anubhavato; Indraji, anubhavato; Jayaswal, anubhasamto, correcting his former reading anubhavato.
10. Prinsep reads laṇoni; Cunningham, -rāṇāni; Indraji is the first to correctly read kalāṇāni.
11. The beginning piece of L 17 is missing.
12. Prinsep reads virono; Cunningham, rutapana; Indraji is the first to read guṇa.
13. Prinsep and Cunningham read vīse, omitting sa; Indraji and Jayaswal, correctly vīsesa.
14. Prinsep reads saṣa-paśaṇḍa-pūjano; Cunningham, saṣa-paṭhābhi-pujako; Indraji is the first to read saṣa-paśaṇḍa-pūjako.
15. Indraji reads -tana; Jayaswal, devāyatana, correcting his former reading ... tīna.
16. Prinsep reads kara; Cunningham, mahara. Indraji and Jayaswal read saṁkāra. The second letter might also be treated as a broken kha.
17. Prinsep and Cunningham read kara; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly, kārako.
18. Prinsep reads vasato; Cunningham, padahata; Indraji and Jayaswal correctly read apathihata.
19. Prinsep reads lakì; Cunningham, cako; Indraji, caki; Jayaswal, caki.
21. Prinsep reads bale; Cunningham, thalo. Indraji is the first to read bolo.
22. Prinsep reads sakadharo; Cunningham, cargo dhara; Jayaswal, caka-dhuro correcting his former reading sakadharo. Indraji correctly reads sakadharo.
24. Prinsep reads ghasata; Indraji, pasanta; Cunningham, para; Jayaswal, too, pasata, correcting his former reading ghisaanta.
25. Prinsep reads rajasa; Cunningham, rajasa. Indraji and Jayaswal read rajasi.
27. Prinsep reads kala. Cunningham is the first to read kula.
28. Prinsep reads vinarihato; Cunningham, viniqato; Indraji, vinicuito; Jayaswal, viniśrito, correcting his former reading vinicuito.
29. Prinsep reads mahashayase; Cunningham, mahavishayo. Indraji and Jayaswal read mahāsījaya.
30. Prinsep reads kharacela; Cunningham, kharacela. Indraji is the first to read Kharacela as a name.
31. Prinsep reads saṇḍara; Cunningham, sirino. Indraji is the first to read siri.
१। नमो भरणंतर [२] नमो सव-सिसान [६] ऐरिन वैरिन डैट वा महाराजन महानिम्न-वाहनन चतुर=वाकान भवनहन वस्तुदेव शंकर शंकरन चतुर=राम गुप्त देवताः तिरु-सर्विन भगवान शंकर अनुप्रयोग तन्त्र शंकर शंकरन तर्क शंकर शंकरन शंकर शंकरन

२। चम्मिसितांतर च पढ़नी वो बान विश्व-गोप-पाकर-निविसन परिव-संपारण विकलिन अगर [५] गंगोर-शोवक-ताडा-पाडीयो व वंदा पणति [८]

३। दुःशि च वो विचित्रिता दातकरिण पड़िम दिबं हव-गण-नर रा-बालों दंदे पणति [७] कालिन गरीय व बेनाय विनािता भक्ष-नगर ( चिदिका विकरमित वा ) [६]

४। तत्रियो पुन वो गंधव-बेद-बुधों तंद-नात गीत वापित चंदन राजक चंदन राजक नगरो व [१]

५। तथा जुधि वो विजय राजवंश भरखपुर कालिन गुप्त राजहन जहीन व जितिना र पसारि पवत धनहसिन [४] भैत-तबि च निकिति-हस-भिरगी नित-रतन-सावरवे सब-रत्न-भोजस पारे वंदापण 

६। पंचम च दाणि वो नंदराज-लिखित-भोजरितं सनसुलियवादी पनाली नगर विवेति [५] चंद्र-सहाय च नवापण [१]

७। चम्मिसितो [कटे व] च राज-सिद्धिं संस्करण तो वव-राज-व्रष बनुपह-पनीकानी सत-सहाय विजयती पोर-जानय [३]

८। सत्वी च वो चम्मिसित-धर-धर-सुंदर-सत-चटान मवत संदेहम चंद्र-संगलान्न कारणी [१] सत-सहाय [१]

80. नवसे च बसे वेदुद्दय-कन्या[३] ग-राज-निवासं मध्यविजय-पार्श्वं कार्यति परोऩिसाय सत-सहसेिह [१]

81. दसमे च बसे कल्यंग-राजवंङ्सान वतित्व-युग-सागवसानं कल्यंग-पुर-राजान वस-सकारं कार्यति सत-सहसेिह [१]

82. एकादसे च बसे [१] मणि-रतनानि सव याति [३] [३] कल्यंग-पुरवाज-विवेकित-पियुकड-दमे मनी नेतायति [३] भनुपद-वरं च तेजस-वस-सत-कां भद्दति तिसरिद्ध-संधानं [१]


84. तेसरे च बसे सुपव-विवजय-चे कुमारे-पवें भरंटयो परि निवाणीहि कावयनिष्ठीयाय राजवतकः राज-भाटीिह राज-जातिहि राज-महिषिहि खार्बेल-मिरिना सतदस्य-शेत-नतं कार्यति [३]

85. [३] सकत-समण-सुविदितानं स सत-दिसानं यतिः सव-मिसानं लक्ष्यं कार्यति [३] चरश्वत-निष्ठीय-समारे परिधो वराकर-सुमाध्याबिताचि भ्रिज्ञ-योजनानांिहि पनतीसानि-सत-सहसानि शिलाहि सिल-स्वभानि च
INSCRIPTION OF KHĀRAVELA

चेतियानि च कारापयति [.] [—] पत्लिक-चतरे च बेड़ रिय-गमि यमि पति
ढापयति पनतरिय-सत-सवसिंधि [.] [वेः] रिय-नील-वीकिरं चेच-यठि-श्रध
सतिंं तिरिं उपादयति [1]

१५। खःमराजा स [.] वध-राजा स [.] चृःद-राजा स [.] धम-राजा
परंतो सुनंतो बतुभबंतो काजाणि [—] गुण-विषेष-कुस्को सव-पारसंक-पूजको
सव-देवाय्तन-संकार-कारको भपरिहत-चक-वाहन-बलो चकधरो शुल-चको
प्रवत्चको राजिनि-वष्ट-कुल-विनिदिनो महाविजयो राजा खारवेश-सिरि (१)

[Signature: Repair]
TEXT AS IT READS IN PĀLĪ

11. नमो चरिष्ठान् [II] नमो सम्भ-सिद्धान् [II] प्रचिरिन (बीरिश कः वा) महाराजेन महामित्वाधिनेन चेतराजवंस-वधिनेन पस्यवः-सम्भलक्ष्णेन चतुरस्त-रक्षणगुणोपेतेन कलिङ्काधिपतिना सिरि-खारविसेन पवरस-वस्सृसानि सिरि-कलार-सरोरतता कृमि-कौलिका [I] ततो लेख-रूप-गणना-वीणार- विच्छ-विमारासेन सम्भविन्योन्दरिन स्नव-वस्सृसानि बोबरज्ज व शासिं [I] संपुषण- चतुर्गोति-बस्सृसो दानि-वहमन-सस्योज्यनानाभिविजियो ततिये कलिङ्क- राजवंसे पूर्व-युगी महाराजाभिषेकन पापुषारि [I]

12. अभिषिक्त-मनो च पठिमे वस्सृसि वात-विज्ञ-गोपुर-पाकार-विवेखन पर्वस्तिक्षारितत्व कलिङ्क-नगरे [I] गम्भीर-रूपव-लन्दन-वालिको च बम्बायरि [I] सम्भु-प्रान-पितरसर्नापण च कार्यवित्त प्रक्षशेषित सद-सहस्सृसि [I] पक्षियो च रज्जयति [I]

13. दुःखः व यस्य धर्माचारिला सातकांसि पक्षविम-दिनं हय-गज-नर- रथ-बुल्लि दशर् पहापि [I] कलिङ्कान्तात्य च चिंदाय वितासित्वहस्स-नगरे [I] ( इस्किक-नगर-सिति वा ) [I]

14. ततिये पुनवस्सि गजन्तो-वेद-वुल्लि दप-नदी-मोत-वादित-सुधरितानि उक्कव-समम्या-कारानालि च कोलायपति नगरि [I]

15. तथा चतुर्कांसि वस्सि विज्ञावाचहिष्ठसं शरकतत्सर् कलिङ्क-पुर्वराजप ध्वनि व नौतिन व पस्यवयति सम्भवः चतुर्खतो [I] भौत-समस्ति च सिद्धव-कस्त-भिन्नवें सिद्ध-रतन-सापयिये सव-रहिको तारे वन्दपयति [I]

16. पञ्चमे चेतानि वस्सि नन्दराज-नवायवोरयाचा तन्नुसिय-वदा पान्ती नगरि पवेयति [I], सद-सहस्सृसि च संययति [I]

17. अभिषिक्तो च [ कहि व] नसे राजसिसि सन्नादयतौ सम्भ-कर-पण- प्रबुद्ध-भनीन्ति मत-सहस्सरि विस्तरति पोर-जानपर्य [I]

18. चतुर्कांसि च यस्य धर्माकुल-धर-रक्षातकु तुरः-सत-दतालि सम्भवः सन्नादयतौ सम्भ-सहस्सरि कारयति [—] सद-सहस्सरि [I]

1. पादाने—कषुपिपुष्यावयु...सुक्षिक-नगरे।

(34)

80. नवमे च वस्से वेश्वरिय-कलिङ्ग-राजविवासं समझविवाय-पासर्यं कार्यति प्रदिशेनि सत-सहस्रेणि [१]

81. दसमे च वस्से कलिङ्ग-राजविवासं तत्तिय-युग-समावसाहि कलिङ्ग-पुरब-राजानं यस-वस्त्रार्चार्यति सत-सहस्रेणि [१]

82. एकादसमे च वस्से [—] मणिर-रतनानि सह यायि[४] [—] कलिङ्ग-पुरबराज-निवेदित-पुष्टक-दत्त्यं गृहीते नेकाययि[५] पुष्पश्रीभवलव तेरस-वस्त्र-सत-कसां भिन्नृति विसर्गदं-वंचात [१]


84. तेरसमे च वस्से सुपवस-विज्ञ-वसे कुमारो-पवनं बराहति परिनिववसतो च प्रकार-निसविद्याय राजभत्तिकशि राज-वायुतिकशि राज-पुष्टिकशि राजमहतिकशि वर्तेन-मिरिन चत्तदस-लेख-सत-कारायति [१]

85. [—] सफल-ममण-सुविशिष्तान्तं सत-दिशानं यतीम सपथ-वश्यों लेख्यं कार्यति [५] परिनिसविद्य-समस्यों पवभारेव वराकर-समुतायविताभि
भैनक-योजनाविवाहि पञ्चतंसाहि-सतसक्षाहि सिलाहि सिला-वश्वानि व
पैतियानि व कारापायति[१] [१] पटलिक-चक्रि व बहुरिय-गंगी ध्येये
पातिडापायति पञ्च-सतानि-सतसक्षाहि[२] [२] लुरिय-नौल-बोधियुं चेत्य-मही-प्रभासिनां तिरियं उपाद्यति [१]

१५) वेमराजा स[१] कुड़राजा स[२] इन्द्राजा स[३] भस्मराजा यस्मानी
पञ्चभवली कल्याणानि [१] गुण-विशेष-कुसली सच-पासंड-पृजकी सच-नैवयतन-संख्यार-कारको भण्टिलिख-चक-वाहन-सङ्की चकरत्रो गुरुभक्षी पवत्त-चक्रो राजिसि-वसं-कुल-रिनिश्चितो सशानविजयो राजो खारवेल-सिरि [१]
१। नमोऽहमा: [II] नम: सर्वसिद्ध्यः [II] चाययः (वेरिः प्रति वा)
महाराजिन महामिभावाहिन मेवऽ-राजवश्रव्यि ग्रामवशष्टि-चमः-रच्छि-गुणोविनि कलिञ्चाघितयिता ची-खाविनि पञ्चदश-वर्षांशि
शो-कड़ार-मशोविता कृद्धि: कुमारकृद्धि: [I] ततो लेल्ल-रुप-गणवाना-
यवहार-विष-विशारदेण सर्वविष्टवादाचि नव-वर्षांशि वीराजायिने ग्रामितम् [I] सम्पूर्ण-चतुर्विशिष्ट-वळ्यः स इदानी वमाना-श्री-वीवानाभिविज्ञाय-
ततोऽस कलिङ-राजवंशे पुरुष-युगी महाराजाभिनेन प्राप्ति [I]

२। प्रभिमित-मालय प्रथः वयं चात-विवेक-गोपुर-प्राकार निवेशार्य
प्रतिशंकार्थम् कलिङ्गनामरे [I] गंभीर-भौति-तड़ाण-पालीता वभयति [I]
स्वीयराना-प्रतिशंकार्थपद मार्यति पञ्चदश-शतसहान्त्र: [I] प्रकतीक 
राजग्निम् [I]

३। पितायें ज वयं प्रचन्तितविला शातकारः पश्चिमा म विश्वासण च्वय-गण-नर-
रवच-रसोऽदुः दशं प्रभापरि [I] कलिङ्गाग्निका न 'सैनया चिट्टायितिक प्रमाण-
नगरम् [I] (स्वयंक-नगरम्नितिक वा) [I]

४। बड़ीये पुरवें गम्बव्यें दुःधु: दश-नार-गौत-वादित-सत्त्रेकाष्टतुम-माज-कारनामिभाविक और्जयिति नगरमृ [I]

५। तत्वा चतुर्व Yale विवाहारिविवारं चक्तेन्द्र कलिङ्ग-पूवेंराजानां
भास्ये वै नौत्ता वै प्रामाण्याय च चावर्या धम्मेकृतिम् [I] भौत-स्वतान्त्र च 
निदेश-कल-भक्तः पूवेंराजानां च राज्य-राजी-भोजकान्य पादी वन्द्यति [I]

६। पनि चेदानी वयं नन्दराजिन विवाहारिवार [II] पूवेंसुराघितत मन्त्रि-बयमः
भाषण: प्रशाली नामग्न प्रवेशितिक [I] गतसब्सकै ख्याति [I]

७। प्रभिमिताव [पचे व]वें वाजिविविहत शत्त्रेण शत्त्रेण कारणानिकानु-
पहान्तु गतसब्सकै ख्याति ख्याति पौर-जानपदे [I]

1. पाठाने—रचितत्वागत्या मुख्यक-नगरम्।

(87)
८। सभी च वर्णे चसिभवत-अञ्ज-रथ-रचि-तुरङ्ग-शत-घटानां सवंब 
सन्द्रगी वर्ण-माण्डलाने च कार्यानि शतसहस्रे। [१]

९। सभी च वर्णे महंक्षिण सेनाना मधूरांशुङ्गः गोरखगिरिः 
घातियं हरजस्यातमाकः प्रपोष्यति। [२] एतेषाश्च कर्म-प्रदान-प्रशादिन सभीतानां 
सेनालायणान्ते विप्रमोक्तं मधूरांशुङ्ग्या चबे च [३] 
गृहपतिभः [४] स [५] वान-भोजणे ददाति, [६] [कः]नः याति [७] पाण्डः 
भार-कापडः-हय-गज-नर-रक्तः सह याति [८] सर्वः-सर्वदासीथ्य वर्षे-राज 
अंति-यथाभिषेकः सर्वः-राजस्यां सर्वः-सर्वभिषेकः पानभोजन ददाति [९] पार्थनेभः 
विमणिभः [१] ददाति [१०] शतसहस्रे। [१]

१०। सभी च वर्णे वैष्णवे कलिज्ञ-राजनिवार्य महाविजय-प्रासार्य कार्यानि 
स्श्रीरक्षेत्रसहस्रे। [१]

११। दस्मुं च वर्णे कलिज्ञ-राजश्यामानं तीर्थ-युगस्मर्गसाने कलिज्ञ- 
पूर्वराजानं वयस्मभूतां कार्यानि शतसहस्रे। [१]

१२। एकाधि च वर्णे [११] सिंह-रथः सह याति [१२] [१३] कलिज्ञ- 
पूर्वराज-निविषित-पुष्करंद्वं चाकिली निवासस्थिति [१४] चतुर्दशभवन्न लघुदश्च- 
वर्षे-गत-तत्त्वे भिन्नानि शिभिरकल्पसंख्याः [१५]

१३। हादशे च वर्णे [१६] शतसहस्रे। विक्रास्यति उत्तरायण-राजान् [१७] 
[१८] समानान् च विपुलं भर्त जनयति हस्तस्य गंगायां पाययति [१९] सागराधारा 
राजा इद्यंतिमानं पारदी वन्द्यति [२०] नदराज-नीति कलिज्ञ-जिज्ञासतमस चके 
मगविभः कलिज्ञायनं हय-गज-सेनावाहनसहस्रे। [२१] प्रजः-महाग-वासिनिः 
पारदी वन्द्यति [२२] [२३] वीरी-कल्प-पलिदान गोपुरणि शिखरणि 
निवेशयति [२४] शरं सामस्कारो रश्म प्रपेत्यति [२५] चके तानाध्यायनं हस्तस्य-पशुम 
परिचारकयति [२६] चुंग-हय-स्तिन: उपनामयति [२७] पार्श्वराजा विविधाभरणानि 
सुजन्त-सिंह-राजानि भाषायित इति शतसहस्रसंख्यकानि [२८] [२९] -सिन: 
वशीकारयति [१]

१४। वर्योदये च वर्णे सुप्रस्फर-विजय-चक्षे कुमारो-प्रयोत्त सम्भवः परिनिर्विश्वते 
हि काय-निवीदी राज्यस्ये। राजभाषेः। राजपुरवः। राजमण्डियोमः खारवेलि 
श्रीमता संसदेः-लयन-शतं कारितम् [१]
१५। [—?] सतृक-समणिङ्गः सुर्विहित-भ्रमण शताभ दिशां यतं तत्वः नापरिवर्तः लयं कारयति [.] श्रविदियोः समीपे प्रामाणी वराकर-समुपातिताभिरनक-योजनाहिताभि: पश्चिमलंकस्तममसाभि: शिलाभि: शिलास्तब्धान् च चैत्यानि च कारयति [.] पाटलिक-चतुर्वी च दैविक-गभरं सधारान् प्रतिकालयति पद्मसति-गतसहस्: [.] [वैद्युत-नील-व्यविचित्रं चैत्ययमानि-शतकं तिथियक् छत्पदायति [1]

१६। चेमराजः स [.] वर्ध-राजः स [.] इन्द्रराजः स [.] धर्मराजः पवंनु गुरूजन-वन् कल्याणानि [—] गुण-विशिष्ट-कुशलः सवः-पाष्ण-पूजनकः सर्व-दैविकतन्त-संख्याकरः अप्रतिहत-चक-वाचन-वल: चक्षु: गुष्टक: प्रवर्त-चकः राजबिं-वंश-कुल-विनंदीती महाविजयो राजा खारावल-श्री: [1]
INSCRIPTION OF KHĀRAVELA

TRANSLATION

1. Let the head bend low in obeisance to Arhats, the Exalted Ones. Let the head bend low (also) in obeisance to all Siddhas, the Perfect Saints.

By His Lordly Graceful Majesty Khāravela, the mighty ruler, the Sovran Lord of Kaliṅga, whose vehicle is Mahāmeṣha (the great-cloud-like state-elephant), who is the increaser of the Royal House of Ceta, who is possessed of the noble and auspicious bodily marks, who is gifted with the capacity for protecting the earth extending as far as the four seas, were played, for fifteen years, the games befitting the young age of the prince, with a body lovely and of fair brown complexion. Thereafter,

1. Adoration or salutation as a rendering of namo does not precisely convey its meaning. The Indian nāmakāra primarily signifies the bending of the head in token of respect. Here namo is a symbolical expression, into which a whole sentence has been abbreviated.

2. Here Aīra has been taken to be a synonym of Ārya or Svāmī, Lord or 'Master.' I am against equating it with Aīla, a derivation from Ilā. Adopting the reading Verena, I may offer 'By His Heroic, etc.' as an alternative rendering.

3. The English rendering of Sīri is Graceful rather than Gracious.

4. Or, who vies with Mahendra, the mighty king of the gods, whose vehicle is cloud. For the epithet Mahāmeṣhasūhana, cf. the Mahābhārata, Sabha-Parva, Ch. XIV, Verse 13: Vahredanta Karṇā ca Karahbo Meghaśūhanaḥ. Jayaswal seems to think that the Megha in the Purāṇas is nothing but a shortening from Meghaśūhana. In the Arthaśāstra, 11. 2. 20, the elephants of Kaliṅga, Aṅga, Prakya and Karuśa are said to have been of the best breed: 'Kaliṅgāṅga-gaṇijā ṛṣṭhāḥ Pracyāḥ ṛṣṭi Karuśaṣaḥ.'

5. The Royal House of Ceta is the same expression as Jayaswal’s the House of King Ceta." Adopting the reading Ceti-rājasūhena, one may translate "of the Cedi ruling race."

6. That is, the marks or features that are of importance to the astrologer, diviner, palmist or physiognomist.

7. Adopting the reading caturāṅgala-thuna, one may render with Jayaswal—"the support of the whole land"; or, adopting the reading caturāṅgala-laṭhuna, one may render with Sten Konow—"provided with virtues famous to the four ends (of the world)."

8. Jayaswal’s "princely games" may be preferred for its brevity.

9. With Childera kaṭāra or kaṭāra is "tawny" or "tan-coloured." Sten Konow suggests that Sīri-kaṭāra is the same Prakrit expression as Sīri-kaṭāra, which means, according to the Śabdamālā, nāgara and kāmī. From this he is led to think that "Sīri-kaṭāra is the lover of Śīrī, i.e., Kṛṣṇa," and that "Khāravela’s boyish games are compared with Kṛṣṇa’s pranks and sports in Vyndāvana." Jayaswal
for nine years, just the office of a Crown-Prince was administered by (His Royal Highness) who became an expert in (matters relating to) writing, coinage, accounting, administration and procedures, whose self was purified by proficiency in all (Indian) ‘polite learning’. On completing then (his) twenty-fourth year, he who, as he waxed great, passed the rest of (his) manhood in making conquests, gained the high state implied in the coronation of a great king, in the royal dynasty of Kaliṅga, in the third generation of two kings.

2. And as soon as he was anointed, in the very first year, (His Majesty) caused the gates, walls and buildings that had been damaged by stormy wind to be repaired in the city of Kaliṅga, and caused the embankments of the deep and cool tanks to be built up, and (also) caused the work of restoration of all the gardens to be done at the cost of thirty-five hundred thousand (coins), and (thus) enabled the people (his subjects) to be pleased.

finally accepts Stem Konow’s explanation and renders Siri-kañjāra “the lover of Śri (Viśnu).” I think it will not be judicious to commit ourselves so far as that. “Kañjāraṃ trya-bahy-i-vat” is a quotation made by Jayaswal just to the point. Cf. Kañjāra-Jaimini, Kañjāra-Janaka, and Kañjāra-mattukū.

1. See Notes passim.

2. I mean, the whole body of useful sciences and arts. See Notes passim.

3. The expression vañgamāna involves the metaphor of the moon waxing day by day. Cf. Kālidāsa’s Kumāra-Sambhava-Kavya, I. 25:

Dye dīne śa parivardhamāna labdhōdayā candramāva lekhā

4. For mahārājābhīṣecana, cf. yuvarājābhīṣecana in the Artha-Sāstra, II. 36.

5. Jayaswal takes totiya Kaliṅga-rājācāmśa purīsa-yuge to mean “in the third dynasty of the Aīra line of the kings of Kaliṅga.” According to B. C. Masmudar, the phrase does not mean any more than “in the third generation of the Kaliṅga kings, the third generation of the same reigning dynasty.” In accordance with the above rendering, the phrase means “in the third generation of the same reigning dynasty of Kaliṅga, each generation of which was considered as consisting of two kings.” Jayaswal’s rendering is evidently based upon the authority of a few Sanskrit stanzas quoted by him from an old Oriya manuscript, which according to Prof. Haraprasad Shastri, belongs to the 14th century A.D., These stanzas clearly state that a king named Aīra, who was the lord of Utkala, had defeated King Nanda in a battle, and that he was a great friend or enemy of Aśoka. There is nothing definite to show that Khāravela belonged to the third dynasty of the Aīra line of Kings. For further discussion, see Notes passim.

6. Jayaswal connects pana-tīsāki satasahaseki with pākātiyo, taking it to denote the total number of the subjects, the citizens of Kaliṅga, whom Khāravela sought to please. He cites with confidence, in his support, the authority of the Siddhānta-Kaumudi which
3. And in the second year, not (at all) bringing Śatakarni into (his) thought, (His Majesty) caused a multitudinous troop of horses, elephants, foot-men and chariots to move on to the western quarter, and with the aid of the army from Kaliṅga, struck terror, into the city of Asaka.¹

4. Again, in the third year, (His Majesty), who was versed in the science of music—the Gandharva-lore, caused the capital (the city of Kaliṅga) to be amused by exhibiting ‘combats,’² and dancing, singing and musical performances, and (no less) by arranging festivities and ‘merry gatherings.’³

5. Likewise, in the fourth year, (His Majesty) caused the city of Arakata which was the habitation of Vidyādharas, the spell-muttering denizens, to be governed in accordance with the principle and usage of the former kings of Kaliṅga, all over by the highest kind of law, and compelled all the ‘local chiefs’⁴ and ‘headmen’⁵ who were robbed of their wealth

sanctions the use of the expression “Śatena vatsān pāyaqati payaḥ,” applying śatena to mean “śatena parichidya.” Supposing śatena in this expression is connected with vatsān (calves, an’Accusative plural), what does it mean? Does it mean a hundred calves? I would say, No, here śatena vatsān just means “the calves divided into the groups of one hundred.” Applying this meaning of śatena vatsān to panatisāhi sata-sahasehi pakatiyo in Kharavela’s text, one has to say that Kharavela pleased his subjects, dividing them into the groups of thirty-five hundred thousand persons, a meaning, which hardly suits the context. See what Patañjali has got to say on this point. In commenting on Pāṇini’s aphorism, II. 3, 13, he says: “Devadrona dhāngyaṃ kriṇātāti...devadrona hiranyena dhāngyaṃ kriṇātāti” and so as to “pandakena paśūn, sākasreṇa dviṃ kriṇātāti.” Thus going by the authority of Patañjali, one may explain Kharavela’s clause as meaning “he sought to please his subjects by spending thirty-five hundred thousand coins,” if panatisāhi sata-sahasehi be at all connected with pakatiyo. For connecting panatisāhi satasahasehi with pakatiyo Jayaswal’s argument is that there is a large space between kārayati and panatisāhi. I can quite see that spaces in the Hathi-Gumpha inscription have some meaning. But that meaning is not in all places punctuation. The spaces are also intended to keep two words distinct. Even it is found that spaces are not where they should be, e.g., in L 4, before tatiye puna case.

1. Note that in the Nāsik Cave inscription, Cave No. 3, Śatakarni has been described as the lord of Asika and Asaka among other places mentioned by name (Asika-Asaka.....pati). Adopting Jayaswal’s reading kaśāvenāgatāya.....Musika-nagarant, one may translate “with the aid of the army which advanced as far as the Kṛṣṇaṅgā river, struck terror into the Māsika city.”

2. For the meaning of dampa or darpa, see Notes passim.

3. For the meaning of samajya, see Notes passim.

4, 5. For the meaning of rathika-bhojaka, see Notes passim.
and jewels, whose insignia consisting of umbrellas and golden vases had been cast away, who were frightened and terrified, to bow at (his) feet.

6. And, then, in the fifth year, (His Majesty) caused the canal opened out by King Nanda, a hundred-and-three years' back, to be brought into the capital from the Tanaśūlī road, and caused (it) to be dug at the cost of a hundred thousand (coins).

7. And in the sixth year since he was anointed, (His Majesty), while displaying the royal fortune, bestowed (an unprecedented) favour on the inhabitants of the towns and districts by remitting all taxes and duties amounting to many hundred thousand (coins).

8. And in the seventh year, (His Majesty) caused a hundred kinds of pompous parade of swords, umbrellas, flags, chariots, guards and horses, and all ceremonies of victory to be performed at the cost of some hundred thousand (coins).

9. And in the eighth year, (His Majesty) having killed Goraṭhagiri on reaching Mathurā with a mighty army, caused a terrible pressure to be brought to bear upon the people of Rājagaha (Rājagṛha), and, in order to release the troops and vehicles terrified by the uproar of counter-attacks.

1. Or, three hundred years.
2. To me, Tanaśūlī is the same expression as Tanaśīca. I am not sure if Tanaśūlī is the same place as Tosaši mentioned in Asoka's two Separate Rock Edicts.
3. Adopting the reading rājasūya, Jayaswal translates "showing Rājasūya."
4. Jayaswal seems to go too far in explaining Pura-Jānapada as meaning the Paurā and the Jānapada as two corporate bodies. See Notes passim.
5. Here kara-caṇa has been taken as an equivalent of the Sanskrit kara-paṇa or kara-paṇy. Jayaswal translates "all Government taxes (lit., tax money)."
6. Or, remitted all taxes and duties and did many hundred thousand (other) kinds of favour.
7. Note that in the Sutta-Nipāta, maṅgala has been used as the opposite of parābhava. The idea of victory attaching to the word maṅgala is clearly brought out in the concluding verse of the Maṅgala-Sutta which reads:—

Etādisāni katvānā sabbattham aparājīta
Sabbatthām sothīma gacchanti tassā maṅgalamuttamanti

8. Suggesting the reading mahata-bhitti Goradharin ghatāpayita, Jayaswal translates "having got stormed the Gorathagiri (fortress) of great enclosure." For arguments for and against taking Gorathagiri as the name of a hill fortress or as a personal name, see Notes passim.
10. Adopting the reading Rājagahaṃ upapāḍapayati, Jayaswal translates "causes pressure around Rājagṛha (lays siege to Rājagṛha)."
on their part, as he, the lord of men, retreated to Mathura, offered food-and-drink as a means of entertaining all the inhabitants (of the place), and all the royal servants, all the householders, all the Brahmans and Arhata (Jain) recluses, returned to Kalinga, marching back with Kalpavriksha, the Wishing Tree, burdened with foliage, and the troop of the horses, elephants, footmen and chariots, offered (on return) food-and-drink by way of entertaining all the inhabitants, and all the royal servants, and all the householders, and all the Brahmans, and offered food and drink (also) for entertaining the Arhata (Jain) recluses, at the cost of [so many] hundred thousand (coins).

10. And in the ninth year, (His Majesty) caused Mahavijaya-Pasada, the Great-victory Palace, the Beryl House of the King of Kalinga, to be built at the cost of thirty-eight hundred thousand (coins).

11. And in the tenth year, on the termination of a part of the period of reign of the third generation of two kings of the royal dynasty of Kalinga, (His Majesty) caused homage and honour to be paid to the memory of the former kings of Kalinga at the cost of a hundred thousand (coins).

12. And in the eleventh year, (His Majesty) went in procession with jewels, precious stones, etc. [—] caused the grassy jungle of Prathudaka, founded by the former kings of Kalinga, to be driven into the Langa river, and destroyed the watery jungle of grass called Timira-daha, the Dark-swamp, which grew up in one hundred and thirteen years.

1. Jayaswal translates “on account of this report of the acts of valour (i.e., the capture of Goradhapuri, etc., the king so called to forsake the invested (saṃbhita) division of his army, went away to Mathura indeed.” Reading Yavana-raja Dhamat, Sten Konow translates “and through the uproar occasioned by the action the Yavana king Demetrios went off to Mathura in order to relieve his generals who were in trouble.”

2. It is mentioned in some of the Jain books that only the paramount sovereigns were entitled to perform the ceremony of installing the Wishing Tree.

3. Some of the scholars prefer lapis lazuli as a rendering of teṣāriya or vaidūrya.

4. Reading mahadhisthabhasmayo Bharadhavasa-paṭhānamahi-jayaman...ti kārāpayati, Jayaswal translates “he having by sacred rites undertaken war, causes... departure for Northern India to conquer the land.”

5. Indraji reads the name as Pāṭhuḍa; Fieo, as Pāṃṭhuddāṇa; Sylain Lévi, as Pīṭhūḍa (Pithuda); Sten Konow, as Pīthūḍa; and Jayaswal, as Pithuda.

6. Sylvain Lévi and Sten Konow read gadahamanḍgalena kāsagati and translate, “caused to be ploughed with the donkey plough,” which means “to be destroyed.”

7. Or, “abounding in dark swamps.”

8. Adopting the reading terasa-raṣa-sata, Indraji, Jayaswal and Sten Konow translate “thirteen hundred years.” Adopting the reading terasa-khaśa-sataḥ, R. C. Mazumdar translates “thirteen hundred Khaḍas.”
13. And in the twelfth year, (His Majesty) caused [something to be done] with the aid of [some] hundred thousand, produced consternation among the rulers of Uttarapatha, while generating a great fear for the people of [Aṅga and] Magadha made the elephants and horses to drink at the Ganges, and compelled Bahapatimita, the king of Magadha, to bow at his feet; caused the honoured seat of the Jina belonging to Kāliṅga which was taken away by King Nanda to be brought back from Aṅga and Magadha to Kāliṅga by a procession of the horses and elephants and a thousand troops and vehicles, and compelled the inhabitants of Aṅga and Magadha to bow at his feet; [—] caused the streets, courtyards, gate-bars, gates and temples to be set up; one hundred Vāsukis (Dragon Chiefs) sent (him) precious stones, supplied (him) with rare and wonderful elephants, horses and such other animals, and made presents of antelopes, horses and elephants; the king of Pāṇḍya had procured the various kinds of apparels and ornaments, hundreds and thousands of them, for use here (in the city of Kāliṅga); [—] brought (some ones) into submission.

14. And in the thirteenth year, on the Kumāri hill, in the well-run realm of victory, one hundred and seventeen caves were caused to be made by His Graceful Majesty Khāravela, by his queens, by his sons,
by his relatives, by his brothers, by the royal servants\textsuperscript{1} for the residing Arhats desiring to rest their bodies.\textsuperscript{2}

15. [And in the fourteenth year,] (His Majesty) caused a cave to be built for the honoured\textsuperscript{3} recluses of established reputation\textsuperscript{4} as well as for the yatis,\textsuperscript{5} hermits\textsuperscript{6} and sages\textsuperscript{7} hailing from a hundred directions;\textsuperscript{8} caused the shrines and stone-pillars to be made with stone-slabs quarried out of the best quarries and collected from an extensive area of many leagues; [- -] caused the pillars to be set up in a beryl-hall with ornamental floor and ceiling\textsuperscript{9} at the cost of seventy-five hundred thousand (coins); and caused half-a-hundred shrine-posts (votive pillars)\textsuperscript{10} inlaid with the alternate settings\textsuperscript{11} of beryl\textsuperscript{12} and emerald (lotuses)\textsuperscript{13} to be produced across (alongside).\textsuperscript{14}

16. He who was the lord of security, he who was the lord of bounty, he who was like Indra-rāja, the lord of power, [he who was] like Dhamma-rāja, the lord of justice, perceiving, hearing and experiencing the

---

1. Reading Yāpa-ñāvokhe, Jayaswal translates "to the Yāpa professors who are actively engaged in Yāpa and Khema practices."
2. For the meaning of kāya-nīdisīyāya, see Notes passim.
3. Reading sukata, Jayaswal translates "virtuous."
4. Jayaswal translates "well provided for."
5. They are the spiritually advanced Brahmanical ascetics of the fourth stage of effort. Yati is but a synonym of bhikṣu and parivatsaka.
6. They are the Brahmanical religious of the third stage of effort.
7. They are the high-famed Brahmanical teachers, whether belonging to the second stage of effort or to the third.
8. Reading samp-atanaḥ with Indraji, one may translate "of all quarters."
9. Buddhaghosa explains the term paṭalikā as meaning "ghanapuppho uṇṇamayo attarūko" "a woolen coverlet thickly woven with flowers." He informs us that a paṭalikā was also known as āmālaka-pattā (Childers, sub voce Paṭalikā). Jayaswal suggests that paṭalikā-avacana, meaning "on the lower roofed terrace" is the Sanskrit equivalent of Khāravela's paṭalika cature.
11. The literal rendering of vachinña is "divided alternately into."
12, 13. The vaidūrya and nila varieties of gems are thus enumerated in the Artha-śāstra, II. 11.29: (1) Vaidūrya—utpalavarnaḥ, sīrṣapuspakaḥ, udakavarnaḥ, vanśarāgaḥ, sukapratarāgaḥ, puṣygarāgaḥ, gomūtrakaḥ, gomedaḥ. (2) "Nilāvaliśa—indranīśa, kalāga-puspakaḥ, mahānīśa, jambarābhāḥ, jīmūtraprabhāḥ, nandakaḥ, savanmādhyāḥ, aitaści, sūryakāntātī ceti manavāḥ.
14. For justification of the rendering of the concluding clause of the record of the 14th year, see Notes passim.
things that are conducive to welfare,¹ [—] was His Graceful Majesty Khāravela, the great conqueror, who was descended from a family of the dynasty of royal sages, who kept up the realm of royal command,² the protector of³ the realm of royal command, who was strong with undaunted carriers⁴ of the realm of royal command, who was the repairer of all abodes of the gods,⁵ the honourer of all sects, who became an expert by the possession of special qualities.

1. The five mahākalyāṇas, according to the Jinas, consist of the Descent, Birth, Initiation, Attainment and Final Release in the life-history of a Jīna.
2. Cakka is the ājñācakra or ājñācakra.
3. Literally, by whom is protected.
4. i.e., ministers and officers,
5. i.e., shrines and temples.
No. II

INSCRIPTION OF KHAṆAVELA'S CHIEF QUEEN

RELATING TO

THE VAIKUNTHAPURA CAVE
INSRIPTION OF KHĀRAVELA'S CHIEF QUEEN

The following record is connected with the cave which is called Vaikunṭha Cave by Mr. James Prinsep and Vaikunṭhapura Cave by Rāja Rājendra Lāla Mitra. The cave concerned "is in reality," says Mr. R. D. Banerji, "the upper story of a cave with stories and a side-wing, but the local people very often give different names to different parts. It was known as Svarapura sometime ago. In the plan printed with the Puri volume of the Bengal District Gazetteer, the whole group is called Mañcapuri. I have found that the local names of these caves vary with each generation. As one name is forgotten, a new one is immediately invented. The record is incised on the raised space between the second and third doorways in front. This raised space represents a house or verandah with a pointed roof and spires supported little dwarfs who act as brackets. (The record itself) consists of three lines which have suffered much from exposure. The characters of this and the following two inscriptions are slightly later than those of the Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravela."

Regarding this and the following two caves, and regarding this and the following two inscriptions, we have the following authentic account in Rāja Rājendra Lāla Mitra's Antiquities of Orissa, Vol. II, pp. 14-15:

"Further north-west of (the Gopālapura and Mañcapura caves), a little above the level of the surrounding country, we come to a two-storeyed range designed somewhat in the style of the Queen's Palace (Rāni-nūr), but on a smaller scale. The storeys are so arranged as not to rest directly one above the other, but the upper recedes so as to have the top of the lower one open to form a terrace. The upper storey is called Vaikunṭhapura, and the lower Pātālapura. The lower storey comprises a suite of three rooms, two on a line facing the west, and one on the south, projecting considerably beyond the line of the former, the whole protected by a verandah in front. The eastern rooms are of a trapezoid shape, the extreme length before and behind differing by about 1 foot, the breadth being 7 feet. Each room has two doors opening into the verandah. The southern room is also a trapezium 10 feet in length on the western side, and 11' 6'' on the southern, the breadth being, as before, 7'. It opens into the verandah by a single door. The doorways are framed with pilasters and semi-circular arched
bands on the top as in the Queen’s Palace, but without any intervening frieze. The two ends of the verandah project forward to the extent of about 5 ft. Its pillars are now very much decayed, and mis-shapen, but originally they were of the Queen’s Palace type, square above and below, and octagonal in the centre. The architrave once had a deep frieze formed of basso-relievo figures of men and animals, but it has been very much defaced by the ravages of time."

"A little beyond the northern projection of the verandah, there is a narrow flight of steps reaching to the upper storey which is an exact counterpart of the lower floor except that on the east side, there is only one room running along the whole length of the verandah, and having three doors, and the side room has, in the middle of the western wall, a window of a much larger size than any that I have seen on this hill. The dimensions of the eastern room are 22’ × 6’ 6”, that of the southern room 9’ × 6’, both average, and that of the verandah 24’ × 3 ft. The doors measure 3¼ ft. by 2, and have the usual side pilasters and semi-circular arched bands, but no frieze. The verandah had a range of four detached and two attached pillars, of which the last only are visible. On the architrave on the top of the verandah, there was a frieze of angels, elephants, devotees, the Bo tree, the wheel of law, etc., but they are hardly distinguishable now."

"To the west of the southern room and forming the right wing of the Pāṭalapura cave, there is a small room running east and west, with two doors and a verandah divided into two intercolumniations by a heavy pillar in the middle. At the corner where the verandah starts from the Pāṭalapura range, there is an alto-relievo figure against the side pier, in imitation of the sentinel before the right wing of Queen’s Palace. The cave is in a very ruinous condition now, and bears the appropriate name of Yamapura or Hades. The exterior view of a vihāra on the Udayagiri hill in Mr. Fergusson’s Illustrations of the Rock-cut Temples of India represents the three caves of Vaikunṭhapura, Pāṭalapura and Yamapura."

"On the right hand pier of the centre door of the Vaikunṭha range (the upper storey of the Maṅcapurī cave in Mr. Banerji’s description), there is a Pāli inscription in the Lāṭ (Aśokan) characters, which is very carefully and deeply cut."

The text is based upon Major Kittoe’s facsimile read and reproduced by James Prinsep in JAS 3, old series, Vol. VI, Pl. LVII, Cave No. 8 called Vaikunṭha Cave; Rājendra Lāla Mitra’s copy of Prinsep’s transcript
in his Antiquities of Orissa, Vol. II, p. 15, the Cave called Vaikunṭhapura; Alexander Cunningham’s eye-copy reproduced in Corpus inscriptionum Indicarum, old series, Vol. I, Pl. XVII, Cave No. 9 called Vaikunṭha; Bhagawanlal Indraji’s eye-copy reproduced in Actes du Sixième Congres International des Orientalistes, Part III, Sec. II; Lüders’ List of Brāhmī inscriptions in E I, Vol. X, Appendix, No. 1346, the Cave called Svargapura; Haridas Dutta’s inked impression read and reproduced by R. D. Banerji in E I, Vol. XIII, Udayagiri and Khandagiri Cave-inscriptions, Pl. I, No. 1, the Cave denoted by the expression “the upper storey of the Mañcapuri Cave”; and, above all, A. E. Caddy’s cast preserved in the Indian Museum, Calcutta.
INSCRIPTION OF KHĀRAVELA’S CHIEF QUEEN

TEXT

Arahāṁta-paśādā(ṇa)m¹ Kālīṅga(ṇa)m² (sama)n[ā]-
naṁ³ leṇaṁ⁴ kāritāṁ⁵ [,-]rājino⁶ L[ā]lāka(sa)⁷
[l. 1] Hathisā(i)ha-sampa(ṇa)ṭasa⁸ dhutuna⁹ Kālīṅga-
ca(kavatino)¹⁰ (siri-Khārave)lasa¹¹ [l. 2] aga-mahisi(n)ā¹²
kā[r]i-(tam)¹³ [.] [l.3]

1. The fourth letter is not at all noticed in Kittoe’s facsimile. Cunningham and Indrajī correctly read paśādānaṁ. Stein Konow thinks that the reading may be paśādāya, a Dative form of paśāda in the sense of prasāda or “gift.” Lüderz contemplates a similar reading when he renders the word “in honour of.” Banerji reads paśādāyaṁ, treating it as a Locative form of paśāda, which is taken to be the equivalent of prasāda, “temple or palace.” His argument in support of his reading paśādāyaṁ is this: “There is a short vertical stroke attached to the right end of the horizontal base line of the letter,” and “there are indications of a similar vertical stroke at the left end.” But paśādāyaṁ as a Locative form of paśāda in the sense of prasāda, “temple or palace” is unexpected in the language of an inscription of this kind, paśāda being a neuter stem. Were Banerji’s reading at all correct, paśādāyaṁ might have been treated as a Sandhi of paśāda (= Sk. prasādā, “by the grace of”) and ayaṁ, a pronominal adjective qualifying leṇaṁ, although here, too, one would expect śdaṁ or imaṁ instead of ayaṁ. So far as I am able to ascertain, neither the plaster cast nor the original stone shows any trace of a short vertical stroke attached to the end of the left extension of the horizontal base line. The appearance of such a stroke above the right extension of the horizontal base line may be due to the mysterious work of a hornet. The letter, as we see it, is neither ya, nor pa, nor na. The reading of it as pa (paśādāyaṁ) yields no intelligible meaning. The reading of it as na (Arahāṁta-paśādānaṁ, “of the Ārhaṭa [Jaina] faith”) yields an intelligible meaning. The letter with a short vertical stroke appearing above the right extension of the horizontal base line resembles the third letter after Hathisāha in l. 2 which Prinsep reads no, Cunningham reads nā, and Indrajī and Banerji read po. It resembles the third letter of pāpṇāṭi in l. 1 (l. 3), and the first letter of nagari in l. 4 (l. 5), see Pl. 1, J.BORS, Vol. III, Part IV, p. 472.

2. Prinsep reads Kālīṅga; Cunningham, Kālīṅganāṁ. Indrajī and Banerji correctly read Kālīṅganāṁ.

3. The first letter is represented in Kittoe’s facsimile as ya, and the second letter is not at all noticed. Cunningham is the first to correctly read samasānaṁ. In Dutt’s.estamapage, the lower half of the letter sā is missing on account of abrasion.

5. Prinsep reads kāḍataṇḍ, mistaking the second letter ri for ḍa. It seems to appear, at first sight, as ḍa. Cunningham is the first to correctly read kāritaṇḍ.

6. Prinsep reads rajina. But Kittoe’s facsimile has clearly; the ā-mark in the first letter.

7. Prinsep reads lāsa.....Kittoe’s facsimile shows the traces of four letters which are clearly set forth in the eye-copies of Cunningham and Indraji. Both Cunningham and Indraji read Lālakasa. In Dutta’s estampage, as noted by Banerji, “the ā-mark is more prominent in the second syllable than in the first.”

8. Prinsep reads hethisahasampanotasa. Kittoe’s facsimile has hethisahasam. Cunningham reads hathisāhanampanatasa; Indraji, Hathisāhasa papotasa, suggesting that the intended name must have been Hathisa; Banerji, Hathisāhasa papotasa, suggesting that the intended name is either Hathisāhā or Hathisāha. The inscribed surface of the original stone distinctly shows that the four letters after Hathisāha or Hathis[i]ha are sam-pa-(n)ā-ta-sa. It showed the same even a century ago when Kittoe prepared a facsimile of it. It is certain that the third letter may be read as (p)ā but by no means as (p)o. When the fourth letter is a clear ta, we need not presume it to be a mysterious transformation from ya, in order to make out sampanāgasa (sarpanāgasya) after Hathisāha or Hathis[i]ha. For a similar compound in which a noun is preceded and followed by two adjectives qualifying it, cf. sakata-samaya-suvhitā in I. 15.

9. Prinsep reads only the first letter as ya. Kittoe’s facsimile has ya.una. Cunningham reads ca.tino. Indraji and Banerji correctly read dhutunā. Jayaswal fails to find out in Dhutinā the name Dhati(=Sk. Dhṛṣṭi) of King Lālaka’s daughter.

10. Cunningham reads only the first letter as ca. Indraji proceeds so far as cakacati. Banerji hits the goal by reading cakacatino.

11. Prinsep reads the last three letters as velasa. Indraji reads the last five letters as Kharavelasa. Banerji reads all the seven letters as siri-Kharavelasa.

12. Prinsep reads mahi pita; Cunningham, mahi pīḍa. Indraji correctly reads mahisīnā.

13. Prinsep reads kaḍā; Cunningham, kaḍa; Dutta’s estampage bears out Banerji’s reading kāritaṇḍ.
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL

चरणसाधनेन कालिङ्गानि समनानि लेख कारिति [...] राजिनो लक्ष्मण हिरस[२]चरण-(न)ास हुथुना कालिङ्गकविनिमो सिरि-खार्वेलस ध्य-महिसिना कारिति [१]

TEXT AS IT READS IN PÂLI

चरणसाधनेन कालिङ्गानि समनानि लेख कारिति [...] राजिनो लालकांख हिरस[२]च-चम्पक्तस धोतुना कालिङ्गकविनिमो सिरि-खार्वेलस ध्य-महिसिना कारिति [१]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT

चरणसाधनेन कालिङ्गानि समनानि लेख कारिति [...] राजीनो लालकांख हिरस[२]च-चम्पक्तस धोतुना कालिङ्गकविनिमो सिरि-खार्वेलस ध्य-महिसिना कारिति [१]

TRANSLATION

The cave has been made for the Kālinga recluses ¹ of the Ārhat (Jain) faith,²—caused to be made by the chief queen of His Graceful Majesty Khāravela, the (King) Overlord of Kālinga,—by the daughter of the high-souled ³ King Lālārka ⁴ Hastisāha or Hastisimha.

---

1. Treating samanānaṃ as a Genitive case, one must translate: "The cave of the Kālinga recluses of the Ārhat (Jain) faith."
2. Adopting the reading "Arahaṇta-paśādaya," one may translate with Sten Konow and Lüders: "In honour of." and adopting "Arahaṇta-paśādayaṃ," one may translate: "By the grace of the Arhat or Arhats, this (cave)."

3. The word sampannāta is equated with the Sk. sampannātma, which literally means "self-endowed," "one whose self has prospered by the attainment of desired objects." For the meaning sampannātma, cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VIII, 3: "Yam yam antam abhi-kāmo bhavati, yam kāmo kāmayate sa'ya samkalpād eca samuttijeṭhati, tena sampanno mahīgates. Śahkara explains sampanna thus: abhipretārthaprāptyā ca sampanno.

4. Lāḷāka or Lāḷāka means "glorious like the rising sun," apparently as an earlier synonym of Bālāditiya. For the use of Lāḷāka as a biruda, cf. Yasalālaka-Tissa occurring in the Mahāvamsa (XXXV. 50) as the name of a king of Ceylon. But it may not be going too far to treat Lāḷāka as a local epithet signifying that Hastisāha or Hastisipha was "the sun of Lāla."
No. III
INSCRIPTION OF KADAMPA OR KUDEPA
RELATING TO
THE PĀṬĀLAPURA CAVE
INSCRIPTION OF KADAMPA-KUDEPA

The following 'record is incised on a raised band between the third and fourth doors from the left' in the verandah of the lower storey of the Mañcapuri group of three caves which are designated by Mr Fergusson and Rājā Rājendra Lāla Mitra as Vaikuṭṭhapura, Pāṭalapura and Yamapura. There is every reason for believing that the inscription was meant to record the excavation and dedication of the second cave of this interesting group by sīri-Kadampa or sīri-Kudepa, the Sovran Lord of Kaliṅga, who may have been either the contemporary or immediate successor of sīri-Khāravela.

INSCRIPTION OF KADAMPA-KUDEPA

TEXT

Airasa¹ mahārājasa Kālingadhipatino² maha(megha)-vāha(nasa)³ Kadampa⁴- sīrīno⁵ leṇam⁶ [ ]

1. Prinsep, Rājendra Lāla Mitra and Indraji read Verasa. Banerji reads Kharasa, which is impossible. Cunningham, Jayaosal and Sten Konow read Airasa. I am strongly inclined to read the royal epithet also as Verasa. The first letter bears the closest possible resemblance to the first letter of the name Vaiśhidari in the Pabhosa inscriptions of Ṛṣaḥhasena edited by Führer in EI, Vol. II.

2. Prinsep reads Kālingadhipatino; Cunningham Kālingadhipatino, Indraji is the first to correctly read Kālingadhipatino.

3. Prinsep reads only the first letter as ma. Cunningham reads mahameghavāhana ; Indraji, mahāmeghavāhana; Banerji correctly, mahāmeghavāhana.

4. Prinsep reads Kadepa. Cunningham reads the last two letters as depa, Indraji and Lüders read the name as Vakadepa. Banerji reads Kādepa. In Dutta's estampage and in the cast one may read the first letter as Kū or Kā, but I do not see how the second letter might be read as ṭe. The second letter is unmistakably ṭe or del.

5. Banerji is perfectly justified in reading sīrīsō as it appears in Dutta's estampage or in the cast. But there is nothing to prevent one reading sīrīsō with Prinsep and others.

6. Prinsep and Rājendra Lāla Mitra wrongly read loṇam.
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL

ऐरस (विरस उति वा) महाराजस कलिङ्काधिपतिनो महामेघवाहनस कदंप-
गोरीनो (कूदेप-सिरिनो उति वा) लेश [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN PĀLI

चनियसस (विरस उति वा) महाराजसस कलिङ्काधिपतिनो महामेघ-
वाहनसस कदम्भ-सिरिनो (कूदेप-सिरिनो उति वा) लेश [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT

धार्यस्य (विरसा उति वा) महाराजस्य कलिङ्काधिपतिः महामेघवाहनस्य
श्री-कदम्भस्य (श्री-कूदेपस्य उति वा) लयन [1]

TRANSLATION

The cave (which is an excavation) of His Lordly Graceful Majesty Kadampa or Kudepa, the Great King, the Sovran Lord of Kaliṅga, whose vehicle is Mahāmegha (the great cloud-like state-elephant).
No. IV
INSCRIPTION OF VADUKHA OR VARIKHA
RELATING TO
THE YAMAPURA CAVE
INSRIPTION OF VAĐUKHA-VARIKHA

The following inscription, consisting of one line, 'is incised on the right wall of the verandah of the lower story, to the right of the entrance to the righthand side-chamber of the main wing' of the Mañcapuri group of three caves designated Vaikuṇṭhapura, Pāṭalapura and Yamapura by Mr. Fergusson and Rājā Rājendra Lāla Mitra. There is every reason for believing that the inscription was meant to be a record of the excavation and dedication of the third cave of this group by Prince Vaḍukha or Varikha.

INSCRIPTION OF VAḌUKHA-VARIKHA

TEXT

Kumäro¹ -Vaḍukhasa ² lenam³ [.]

¹ Banerji rightly points out that the ñ-stroke in the second letter is added to the middle instead of the top. This phenomenon may be observed also in some instances afforded by the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription. The ñ-stroke in the third letter is quite distinct. It is difficult to decide all at once whether the retention of the singular masculine Nominative case-ending in Kumäro, the first word of a compound, is a dialectical peculiarity or a mistake of the mason-engraver. In one of the Barhut Jātaka-labels we have Suṭata-gahuto-Jātaka, but in another, Migā-Jātaka.

² Prinsep wrongly reads Pattakasa; Cunningham, Vaddakasa or Vaḍukasa. Indraji is the first to read Vaḍukhasa. Regarding the second letter, Banerji remarks: "The medial u in Vaḍukha is very small in size but quite distinct"; and regarding the third letter, he observes that here the kha "has neither a triangle nor a circle at its base." It is not impossible that the intended name is Pariśka, the ü-stroke being only an accidental chisel mark. It is remarkable how Prinsep and Cunningham have mistaken ri for ða in the inscription of Khāravela’s chief queen, the Inscription No. II.

Prinsep and Rājendra Lāla Mitra wrongly read loṣam.
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL

कुमारो वडुखस्म ( वरिखस्म द्रति वा ) लेष [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN PĀLI

कुमार-वडुखस्म ( वरिखस्म द्रति वा ) लेष [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT

कुमार-वडुखस्म ( वरिखस्म द्रति वा ) लययं [1]

TRANSLATION

The cave (which is an excavation) of Prince Vaḍukha¹ or Varikha.²

¹ Vaḍukha is apparently a pet name of the prince like Tivula in Asoka's "Queen's Edict."
² Varikha may be equated with Vareṣa, and taken to mean "one of excellent look."
No. V

INSCRIPTION OF VAṆUKHA OR VARIKHA
IN THE CHOTA-HATHIGUMPHA
INSCRIPTION OF VAḌUKHA-VARIKHA

The following inscription noticed for the first time by Mr. A. E. Caddy, when he was taking casts of the inscriptions of this class for the Indian Museum, Calcutta, "consists," says Mr. R. D. Banerji, "of a single line, very much mutilated, on the outer face of the tympanum of the arch over the doorway."

The text is based upon Hari Das Dutta’s inked impression read and reproduced by R. D. Banerji in EI, Vol. XIII, Udayagiri and Khandagiri Inscriptions, Pl. II, No. IX, the cave called Choṭa-Hāthigumpha.

I regret that Caddy’s cast of the inscription, which Mr. Banerji saw in the Calcutta Museum, is no longer to be seen there.
INSCRIPTION OF VAĐUKHA-VARIKHA

TEXT

?? kha ?? ?? sa 'leṇaṃ [.]

1. Banerji doubtfully reads the first three letters as Agikha. The first letter might be read as Va or Ta, but never as A. The second letter looks like ḍa or ri, even like ta or sa, but never like gi. The letter after kha might be made out as ka or k[ṣ]. The next letter which was probably mā has been split up into two parts, one appearing as dā and the other as na. The letter immediately before sa seems to have been ra. I shall not be surprised if the record was meant to read Vaḍukha (Varikha) kumārasa leṇaṃ [.]
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL

?? ख *** स लेंग *** [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN PĀLī

?? ख *** सस लेंग *** [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT

?? ख *** ख्य लयन *** [1]

TRANSLATION

The cave (which is an excavation) of Prince Vajukha or Varikha (?).
No. VI

INSCRIPTION OF CŪLAKAMMA

OVER THE DOORWAY OF THE SARPA-GUMPHA OR SNAKE-CAVE
INSRIPTION OF CŪLAKAMMA

The following "inscription, consisting of one line, is incised," says Mr. R. D. Banerji, "over the doorway of the Sarpagumpha, which is very close to the Bājā-Hāthigumpha (No. 14 of the plan published in the Bengal District Gazetteer, Puri)."

Regarding the cave which is a notable excavation on Udayagiri, Rājā Rājendra Lāla Mitra in his Antiquities of Orissa, Vol. II, p. 30, says:

"Retracing our steps now to the west of the Hāthi-Gumpha, the first cave worthy of notice occurs on the most protruding ledge of the fracture between the Udayagiri and the Khandagiri hills. It is remarkable for having in front, on the top of its entrance, a rude carving of the hood of a three-headed cobra, whence its name Ajāgara-Gumpha—ajāgara, a serpent able to swallow (gara) a goat (ajā). Under the hood of the serpent, the cave is cut in the form of a cube of 4 ft. with a door just large enough to admit a man crawling in, and framed in the usual style."

For a similar authentic description of Sarpa-Gumpha, see Mr. Mano Mohan Ganguly's Orissa and Her Remains—Ancient and Medieval, p. 46, where one reads:

"It is a small cave consisting of a single cell and a verandah; the latter having in the front tympanum of the door, the carving of the hood of a three-headed serpent, and hence the name. The level of the verandah is higher than the ground in front. Drs. Fergusson and Burgess (in their Cave Temples of India, p. 697), have taken the Tiger and the Serpent Caves to be 'the oldest sculptured caves in the hills.' This cave is important for containing an inscription, which, however, does not throw any light on the probable date of its construction."

INSCRIPTION OF CULAKAMMA

TEXT

Cūlaka[m]masa¹ Koṭhājayā² ca [pasādo]³ [ . ]

1. In Dutta’s inked impression, the letter a appears to be le, the letter ka to be ko, and the letter ma to be me or mo. These vowel-marks must at once be dismissed as chisel-marks or fissures. Kittce need not be blamed for having represented kaṃmasa as kaṃmessa. Cunningham reads Cūlakāṃmasa. But the ū-mark attached to the first letter is prominent. Sten Konow says, “The first word looks like Cūlakemessa, owing to the abrasions on the inscribed surface. The estampage seems to read Cūlakremesa.”

2. Prinsep and Rājendra Lāla Mitra read koṭhājayā. Cunningham reads koṭhājayā; Lāders, koṭhājayā; and Banerji, koṭhājayā.

3. The occurrence of the Copulative Conjunction ca is indicative of the loss of another word, which seems to be no other than pasādo = pāsādo.
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL

चूळक ['"] मस कोठाजिया च पासदोऽ [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN PĀLI

चूळकभास्म कोठाजिया च पासदोऽ [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT

चूळकभास्म कोठाजियव [प्रासादः] [1]

TRANSLATION

The façade¹ and the unconquerable² cells (which are the meritorious works) of Cūlakamma (Kṣudrakarma).³

1. Banerji agrees with Prinsep, Rājendra Lāla Mitra and Cunningham in rendering pasāda (=pāṣāda) 'temple or palace.' But it seems that a temple or palace is too high an honour to be accorded, in all cases, to any part of a cave-construction. What seems to have been meant by pasāda or pāṣāda here is a frontal outer construction consisting of a roofed, pillared and ornamented verandah and having the appearance of a palace. Pasāda or Pāṣāda is the same word in sound and meaning as façade.

2. Kothājeva is treated as a sandhi joining kothā and ajeva. Here 'unconquerable,' as suggested by Prinsep, rather means 'impregnable,' than 'unequalled' or 'unsurpassable,' Banerji observes: 'Kothā and ajeva have been separated by Dr. Lüders, most probably because (the compound kothājeva) is followed by the conjunction ca, kothā, Sk. Koṭṭha, is still in use in modern vernaculars to denote a brick or stone-built house or chamber, or even a fort. Jeyā may have a technical meaning and may denote the verandah or some other part, while kothā denotes the main chamber. But it is also possible to take it in another way, in which there is a sandhi between this word and ajeva, 'unconquerable,' qualifying kotha or kothā. The only difficulty is the use of the conjunction.' The suggested difficulty can be removed, if it be assumed that the conjunction was followed by a word like pasādo or pāṣādo. It is quite possible that jeyā is a separate technical term denoting some kind of building work. Cf. jeyakah kārāpitaḥ in the inscription No. V from Northern Gujarāt, EI, Vol. II. The term kothājeva may be taken to mean either 'a cellular shed' or 'chambers with arched entrances.'

3. According to Prinsep, Rājendra Lāla Mitra and F. W. Thomas, Cūlakamma = Cūḍākarma, which is apparently absurd. I agree with Lüders in equating the Prakrit form of the name with the Sk. Kṣudrakarma.
No. VII

INSCRIPTION OF ČŪLAKAMMA
IN PĀVANA-GUMPHĀ OTHERWISE CALLED HARIDĀS-GUMPHĀ.
INSCRIPTION OF CŪLAKAMMA

The following "record," says Mr. R. D. Banerji, "consists of a single line and is incised over one of the three entrances to the main chamber of the cave from the verandah. The characters belong to the first century B.C. and are distinctly later in form than those of the Mahārājūta inscriptions (meaning Nos. II-IV)."

Of the cave itself which is an excavation on the Udayagiri hill, we have the following useful information from Rājā Rājendrā Lāla Mitra's Antiquities of Orissa, Vol. II, p. 30:

"Immediately to the north of the Elephant-Cave (Hāthī-Gumphā) there is a small excavation which is known under the name of Pāvana-Gumphā or the 'Cave of Purification.' It is of no importance whatever as a work of art."

INSCRIPTION OF CŪLAKAMMA

TEXT

Cūlaka[m]masa¹ pasāto² koṭhāje(yā)³ ca⁴ [.]

1. Prinsep and Rājendra Lāla Mitra read Cūlakamasa. Cunningham reads Cūlakramasa; Banerji Cūlakramasa. I cannot conceive of the occurrence of a letter, such as kru, in this series of Jain Cave inscriptions.

2. Prinsep and Rājendra Lāla Mitra read paseta. Kittoe’s facsimile has pasātā, Cunningham and Banerji read pasāto. The correct reading must be either pasāto or pasātā, pasāto deserving to be treated as a noun, which is the equivalent of pasādo (or pāsādo), and pasātā deserving to be treated as an adjective qualifying koṭhā.

3. Prinsep and Rājendra Lāla Mitra read Koṭhāja(yā). Cunningham reads koṭhāja. Lüders reads koṭhāje(yā); Banerji Koṭhāje(yā).

4. If it be that a word is effaced after the conjunction ca, the reading of the inscription must be this: Cūlaka[m]masa pasātā koṭhāje(yā) ca [pasādo] [.] , the word pasātā being an adjective qualifying koṭhā.
TRANSLATION

The façade¹ and the unconquerable cells (which are the meritorious works) of Kṣudrakarma.

¹. In the cast, as well as in Hari Das Dutta’s estampage, the word is pasūto. There is absolutely no ā-mark in the first letter. If pasūto be a phonetic equivalent of pasūdo, and the clear estampage of this inscription guarantee the certainty of the reading pasūto, it is to be seen whether pasūto or pasūdo is the same word as pāsūdo or prāsūdaḥ, or it is a word to be equated with a word like prachādaḥ, meaning a projecting cover, that is, a ‘verandah with an overhanging roof.’ Sten Konow suggests: “If we should read pāsūdo (or pasūto), this word is perhaps Sk. prasāda, a gift.” To my mind, the use of the word in the sense of a gift is altogether out of the question. Such a word with such a meaning cannot fit in with the context.
No. VIII

INSCRIPTION OF KAMMA AND KHĪṆĀ
TO THE LEFT OF THE

DOORWAY OF THE SARPA-GUMPHĀ OR SNAKE-CAVE
INSCRIPTION OF KAMMA-KHĪṆA

The following "record," says Mr. R. D. Banerji, "consists of two lines and the characters used in it are about a century later in date than those of the other epigraph in this cave (Sarpagumphā). The characters belong to the first century B.C."

INSCRIPTION OF KAMMA-KHĪṆĀ

TEXT

Kāmāsa¹ (koṭhā)² ca Khī-[1 1]-ṇ(a)yā³ ca⁴ pasāḍō⁵ [.] [1 2].


2 & 3. Prinsep reads rikhinaya; Cunningham, ra...khi Nayu(co); Banerji, Halakhinaya. Dutta’s estampage yields, at first sight, the reading suggested by Banerji: Halakhinaya= Sk. Ślākaṇāyāḥ (F. W. Thomas), = doubtfully Hraukina (Lüders). But it is certain that the letter after kha is ya or y[a]. Examining Dutta’s estampage closely, I detect that the second letter is ṭhā.

4. Kittoe’s facsimile has co, and Cunningham’s hand-copy co. The o-mark appears also in Dutta’s inked impression, which is undoubtedly an abrasion. Banerji correctly reads co.

5. Prinsep, Rājendra Lāla Mitra and Cunningham read pasāḍe, which is incorrect. Kittoe’s facsimile has paśāḍe. Dutta’s estampage, too, yields the reading paśāḍe. Sten Konow remarks: “The plate (reproducing Dutta’s estampage) has, however, paśāḍe though the ă-stroke is indistinct and perhaps erased.”
ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΙΑ και ΣΗΜΕΙΩΣΕΙΣ

1. Ο Στρατηγός Καλλικλήτης και ο Μπόμπολας (I).
2. Η Αποπερατώσεις ή Συμπληρώσεις (II).
3. Η Επιστμήνος ο Μπόμπολας (III).
4. Η Εκκλησία και ο Κάρατζικ (IV).

ΣΥΝΟΨΗ:

1. Ο Στρατηγός Καλλικλήτης και ο Μπόμπολας (I).
2. Η Αποπερατώσεις ή Συμπληρώσεις (II).
3. Η Επιστμήνος ο Μπόμπολας (III).
4. Η Εκκλησία και ο Κάρατζικ (IV).

ΣΗΜΕΙΩΣΕΙΣ:

1. Ο Στρατηγός Καλλικλήτης και ο Μπόμπολας (I).
2. Η Αποπερατώσεις ή Συμπληρώσεις (II).
3. Η Επιστμήνος ο Μbpολας (III).
4. Η Εκκλησία και ο Κάρατζικ (IV).

ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ:

1. Ο Στρατηγός Καλλικλήτης και ο Μbpολας (I).
2. Η Αποπερατώσεις ή Συμπληρώσεις (II).
3. Η Επιστμήνος ο Μbpολας (III).
4. Η Εκκλησία και ο Κάρατζικ (IV).
INSCRIPTION OF KAMMA-KHĪNĀ

TEXT

Kammasa₁ (koṭhā)² ca Khi-[11]-ṇ(ā)ya³ ca⁴ pasādo⁵ [.] [12].

1. Prinsep wrongly reads Kamasa. Kittoe's facsimile has Kamasa. Cunningham reads Kamasa; Banerji correctly, Kammasa.

2 & 3. Prinsep reads rikhinaya; Cunningham, ra...khi Naya(co); Banerji, Halakhinaya. Dutta's estampage yields, at first sight, the reading suggested by Banerji: Halakhinaya = Sk. Śīkṣāyū́ḥ (F. W. Thomas), = doubtfully Harakina (Lüders). But it is certain that the letter after khi is na or na[ā]. Examining Dutta's estampage closely, I detect that the second letter is ṭhā.

4. Kittoe's facsimile has ca, and Cunningham's hand-copy ca. The o-mark appears also in Dutta's inked impression, which is undoubtedly an abrasion. Banerji correctly reads ca.

5. Prinsep, Rājendra Lāla Mitra and Cunningham read pasāde, which is incorrect. Kittoe's facsimile has pasādo. Dutta's estampage, too, yields the reading pasādo. Steu Konow remarks: "The plate (reproducing Dutta's estampage) has, however, pasāde though the ā-stroke is indistinct and perhaps erased."
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL
कमस कोठा च खीणाय च पासादो [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN PĀLi
कमस कोठा च खीणाय च पासादो [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT
कमस खोठब खीणायाय प्रासादः [1]

TRANSLATION
The cells (which are excavations) of Karma and the façade (which is a meritorious work) of Khīṇā.¹

¹ Accepting the reading Halakkhinaya, one must render the record: "The cells (or chambers which are excavations) of Karma and glaksā.
No. IX

INSCRIPTION OF BHŪTI

IN THE VYĀGHRA-GUMPHĀ OR TIGER-CAVE
INSCRIPTION OF BHŪTI

The following “record is incised,” says Mr. R. D. Banerji, “on the outer wall of the inner chamber of the Bāgh or Tiger cave (No. 15 of the plan published in the Bengal District Gazetteer, Puri). It consists of two lines. The characters used are as old as the inscriptions in the Mañçapurt cave and belong to the second century B.C.”

Of the Bāgh-Gumphā or Tiger-cave which is an excavation on the Udayagiri, we have the following interesting description in Rājā Rājendra Lāla Mitra’s Antiquities of Orissa, Vol. II, p. 31:

“In size it is similar to the (Alakāpura cave), but its exterior is cut into the shape of a tiger’s head. The distended jaws of the animal form the verandah, and the entrance to the cell occupies the place of the gullet. The head is remarkably well-formed, and the chiselling is excellent. By the right of the entrance (we have) a short inscription in the Lāṭ (Aśokan) character.”

For a similar description of the cave, see Mr. Mano Mohan Ganguly’s Orissa and Her Remains—Ancient and Medieval, pp. 45-46, where one reads: “The Tiger cave, on the west of the Hāti Gumphā is a small one consisting of a verandah, and a single cell. It is situated higher up the hill than the Ganesā or the Hāti Gumphā. The roof of the front verandah is formed by the upper jaw of the animal. In this cave, the eye, nose and upper jaw of the tiger have been represented; the two canine teeth on the two sides of the incisors have been shown; the number of incisors is greater than what is noticed in the animals of the feline species. The cell is provided with one door flanked by pilasters resting on raised platforms and surmounted by a semi-circular arch-band.”

For a short description of the cave, see Dr. W. W. Hunter’s Statistical Account of Bengal, District of Puri and the Orissa Tributary States, p. 73.

The text is based upon Major Kittoe’s facsimile read and reproduced by James Prinsep in J A S 18, old series, Vol. VI, Pl. LVII, Cave No. 5, called Tiger-cave; Rājendra Lāla Mitra’s copy of Prinsep’s transcript in his Antiquities of Orissa, Vol. II, p. 31; Alexander Cunningham’s handcopy reproduced in Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, old series, Vol. 1, Pl. XVII,

The inscription is interposed between two symbols, a tree-symbol representing a *vṛkṣa-cāitya* or woodland-shrine and marking the commencement, and a *Svastika* marking the close.
INSCRIPTION OF BHŪTI

TEXT

Nagara\(^1\)-akhadamsa-[1 1]-sa\(^2\) Bhūtino\(^3\) lenam\(^4\) [.] [1 2].

---

1. Prinsep, Rājendra Lāla Mitra and Cunningham read Ugarā. Lüders and Banerji correctly read Nagara.

2. Prinsep and Rājendra Lāla Mitra wrongly read avedasa, aveda being taken to mean an anti-Vedist, and the Genitive case-ending sa being regarded as the initial of the donor's name which they read Sasuei. Cunningham reads akhadamsa and Banerji, akhadamsa, both agreeing with Prinsep and Rājendra Lāla Mitra in treating the sixth case-ending sa as the initial of the donor's name which they read Sabhūti (Subhūti). Lüders correctly reads akhadamsasa. Banerji's argument is: "There is plenty of space after the last letter of the first line and so it cannot be said that the possessive case-ending had to be incised in the lower line for want of space. Generally a mason does not mutilate words when there is no dearth of space." Sten Konow's counter-argument is: "The two lines have been kept of the same length, and that is apparently the reason why the termination of akhadamsasa has been written in L 2." I find that, in spite of there being no dearth of space, the mason has written, in one of the Barhut inscriptions, the sixth case-ending in L 2 (Hultzsch's Bharhut Inscriptions in I. A. Vol. XXI, No. 90):

(1) Bhadata—Budharakhītasa Saṭupadāna-

(2) sa dānaṃ thakho.

3. Prinsep and Rājendra Lāla Mitra read Sasuein; Cunningham and Banerji, Sabhūtino. Lüders correctly reads Bhūtino. Caddy's cast, which I have carefully examined, clearly bears out Lüders reading.

4. Prinsep and Rājendra Lāla Mitra wrongly read lenam.
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL

नगर-प्रचंडसम्म भूतिनो लेख [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN PÂLI

नगर-प्रचंडसम्म भूतिनो लेख [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT

नगर-प्रचंडशास्र भूति लेखर [1]

TRANSLATION

The cave (which is an excavation) of the Town-judge ¹ Bhūti.

¹ Nagarā-akhadaṃśa is obviously the same official designation as Nagala-Viśahālaka or Mahāmātā-Nagalaka in Aśoka's First Separate Rock Edict, and Nāgarika or Nāgarika-Mahomātra in the Arthasastra of Kaútya-Kaúṭalya, Bk. II, Ch. 36 and Bk. IV, Ch. 6.
No. X

Inscription of Nākiya
In the Jambeśvara Cave
INSCRIPTION OF NĀKIYA

The following "record is incised," says Mr. R. D. Banerji, "over one of the entrances to the inner chamber of the Jambeśvara Cave (No. 16 of the plan published in the Bengal District Gazetteer, Puri). The characters of the inscription are of the same age as those used in the Maheapuri inscriptions." The cave itself is one of the excavations on the Udayagiri hill.

INSCRIPTION OF NĀKIYA

TEXT

Mahāmadasa¹ Bāriyāya² Nākiyasa³ leṇa[m]⁴ [.]

1. Prinsep reads Māpūmadāti; Cunningham, Māpūmadāsa; Lūders, Mahāmadasa; Banerji, Mahāmadāsa. Banerji is of opinion that the ā in dā is superfluous. I think that the ā-stroke is an appearance rather than a reality.

2. Prinsep reads bākāya (Ya); Cunningham, bānīyāya; Lūders, bāriyāya; Banerji, too, bāriyāya, treating it as a mistake for bhāriyāya. I take Bāriyā to be the name of a locality, the native place of the donor, or the name of a lady donor.

3. Prinsep reads (Ya)nākiyasa; Lūders, Nākiyasa, Cunningham and Banerji correctly read Nākiyasa. Nākā, according to Lūders, or Nākiya, according to Banerji, is the name of the wife of Mahāmāda. Had it been so, there would have been a feminine Genitive case-ending āya in the declension of Nākā or Nākiya. But we have, instead of Nākiyāya, a masculine Genitive form Nākiyasa. I take Nākiya to be the name of the donor, Bāriyā to be his native place, and Mahāmāda to be his official designation, or all the three of them to be personal names.

4. Prinsep wrongly reads loya.
The cave (which is an excavation) of the High Functionary 'Nākiya' of Bāriyā.

* Another possible rendering is:—

"The cave (which is an excavation) of Mahāmada, Bāriyā and Nākiya."

1. Both Lüders and Banerji take Mahāmada to be the personal name of a man whose wife 'Nāki' or Nākiya dedicated the cave in question. Mahāmada seems to me to be the same official designation as the Pāli Mahāmatha or the Sk. Mahāmātrā, which literally means "Great-measure" or "Magnate."

2. Nākiya is evidently the same name as the Pāli Nāgīta.

3. I am unable to identify the locality. It must be some place, a village or a town in Kaliṅga.
No. XI

INSCRIPTION ON THE ARCHITRAVE
OUTSIDE THE ANANTA-GUMPHĀ
ANANTA-GUMPHĀ INSCRIPTION

The following "inscription is incised," says Mr. R. D. Banerji, "on the architrave outside, between the left ante and the first pillar. The characters of this inscription are certainly later than those used in the inscription in Tatwa Cave, No. 2. No other notice of this inscription has been published except that which has appeared in Mr. Mon Mohan Chakravartti's Notes on the Remains in Dhaul and in the Caves of Udayagiri and Khandagiri."

The following description of the cave with which the inscription is associated is an extract from Mr. Mano Mohon Ganguly's Orissa and Her Remains—Ancient and Medieval, pp. 56-60:

"The Ananta-Gumphā (which is the most important cave on the Khandagiri Hill) consists of an ante-chamber (24' × 7') having a covered verandah 26' × 7' in front. The ceiling of the chamber at the rear is curved, the rise of the arch or curve being about a foot; originally there were four doors leading to the room; these have been reduced to two doors, and one window. The doorways are surmounted by circular arches ending in horizontal bands at the springing. Two fillets of the circular band enclose ornamental figures. The horizontal friezes resemble those noticed in Rāṇī Nūr and Ganeṣa Cave. The crown of the arches is formed by the interlaced tails of serpents." "A long line of Buddhist rails runs over the arches unlike those in Rāṇī Nūr and Ganeṣa cave broken at intervals by battlemented pyramids, the like of which we notice in the Bharhut sculptures. On the back wall of the ante-chamber are carved the characteristic Baudha symbols of Swastika, Trisula, etc., and also a standing figure of Buddha (?). The tympana of the arches are carved with representations of various scenes. The scene of Gaja-Lakṣmi...is exquisitely beautiful... . The pilasters by the sides of the doorways have striking features characterised by animal capitals and a profusion of sculptures not noticed elsewhere in the locality."

"We agree with Drs. Fergusson and Burgess in detecting similarity between the sculptures of the Ananta-Gumphā and those of the Bharhut Stūpa, built sometime between the 2nd and 3rd cent. B.C......the probable period of the excavation of the cave cannot be earlier than the third
century B.C., and not second or third century A.D. as fixed by Beglar in the Archæological Survey of India, Vol. XIII (p. 81)."

The text is based upon Hari Das Dutta's inked impression read and reproduced by R. D. Banerji in EI, Vol. XIII, Udayagiri and Khandagiri Inscriptions, Pl. II, No. XI, the cave called Avantagumphā, and A. E. Caddy's cast preserved in the Indian Museum, Calcutta.
ANANTA-GUMPHĀ INSCRIPTION

TEXT

[— — —]?

1. The letters representing the opening words of the inscription are irrevocably lost.

2. The stone is peeled off and shows just the sockets of three letters which are read by Banerji as Dohada. I doubt very much the correctness of such a reading. Any one attempting to guess the letters from the outlines of the sockets is apt to glide into a fatal error. Anyhow, the outline of the first socket resembles rather that of sa than that of do. Kaliṅga or Kaliṅga is the word which may be supposed to have preceded samaṇaṇaṁ in an inscription of this kind.

3. samaṇaṇaṁ in Dutta's estampage.
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL


TEXT AS IT READS IN PĀLI

[—] ??? समषणां लेय[1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT

[—] ??? समषणां ल्यानम् [1]

TRANSLATION

The cave (which is excavated for) the recluses [of Kaliṅga?] [——].

(112)
No. XII
INSCRIPTION ON THE ROCK
OUTSIDE THE VERANDAH OF
THE ANANTA-GUMPHA
ANANTA-GUMPHĀ INSCRIPTION

The following "record," says Mr. R. D. Banerji, "is incised on the rock outside the verandah of the Anantagumphā."

ANANTA-GUMPHĀ INSCRIPTION

TEXT

[—]₁ kot(th)āje(yā)₂ [—]₃ [ ]

1. It may be safely assumed that a few letters recording the name of the donor or donors are missing.

2. Mon Mohan Chakrabarti reads Dajacāra. Banerji differing, remarks: "It is really something like a mason's mark. There are three symbols, of which a central one is the Brāhmī letter ja, while the other two may resemble, but are not, letters." It is not too much to say that Banerji's is a cheap explanation, which has the merit of avoiding any difficulty that confronts a man attempting to read an old Brāhmī inscription wherein the letters are effaced and obscured. As far as I can make out, the first letter is ka or ko. The second letter is a fissured ñā. The third letter is distinctly je. And the fourth letter is an obscured ya.

3. If the proposed reading kothājeyā be correct, it is easy to understand that it was followed by the conjunction ca and a word like pāsādo or pāsādo.
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL

[...] कोठावय [—] [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN PĀLI

[...] कोठावय [—] [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT

[...] कोठावय [—] [1]

TRANSLATION

The [...] unconquerable cells¹ (which are the meritorious works of) [—].

1. In commenting on pasatā and koṭhā occurring in the Inscription No. VII, Banerji observes: "It is interesting to note that here two words denoting almost the same thing, i.e., pasatō (Sk. prāśāda and koṭhā or koṭha, have been used, and that we here find the word pasādo. The Sarapagumphā has only one small chamber but the Haridāgamphā has a verandah, a large inner chamber with three doorways and one small side chamber on each side. So it is quite possible that the word pasatā refers to the main chamber and the word koṭhā to the side chambers." I am unable to accept such a suggestion for the simple reason that the word koṭhā, as plural form of koṭha, denotes all the cells or chambers, and that there is not a word to denote the verandah which is an outer construction.
No. XIII

INSCRIPTION IN THE TATTVA-GUMPHA No. 1
TATTVA-GUMPHĀ INSRIPTION

The following "inscription is written or painted," says Mr. R. D. Banerji, "on the back wall of the inner chamber of the cave (the Tatwagumphā, No. 1), and on prolonged examination I found that, in addition to a row of letters which I cannot make out, it was a repetition of the Indian alphabet."

These observations of Mr. Banerji led me to examine Mr. Hari Das Dutta's estampage closely, and have ultimately enabled me to detect an inscription consisting of one line and a table of Brāhmaṇ alphabet consisting of no less than six rows of letters. The table has been separately presented as the last of the present series (No. XV) of inscriptions in the caves on the Udayagiri and Khandagiri hills.

TATTYA-GUMPHĀ INSCRIPTION

TEXT

......???? ripu(tasa) kayā......???? [-]
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL

......???रूपुत्स्थ कब्या... ??? [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN PĀLI

......???रूपुत्स्थ कब्या (?)...??? [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT

......???रूपुत्स्थ कब्या (?)—??? [1]
No. XIV

INSCRIPTION OF KUSUMA

IN THE TATTVA-GUMPHA No. 2
INSCRIPTION OF KUSUMA

The following "inscription," says Mr. R. D. Banerji, "is the oldest of the inscriptions in the Khandagiri caves. Most of the caves on the Udayagiri are ancient, as proved by their inscriptions; but, with the exception of Tatwagumphä, No. 1, Tatwagumphā, No. 2 and Anantagumphā, all other Khandagiri caves appear to be mediæval, as the inscriptions in them are not earlier than the ninth or tenth century A. D. The record in this cave is incised over one of the entrances to the inner chamber and consists of one line. The cave is No. 1 of the plan of the Gazetteer (the Bengal District Gazetteer, Puri)."

The text on this page is not clearly visible due to the condition of the image. It appears to be a page from a book or a document, but the text is not legible.
INSCRIPTION OF KUSUMA

TEXT

Pādamulikasa¹ Kusumasa² leṇ[ā]ni³ [•]

---

1. Prinsep and others correctly read Pādamulikasa. Kittoe's facsimile has "kasa.
2. Kittoe's facsimile is responsible for Prinsep's reading Kutamāsa instead of Kusumasa. Banerji reads Kusumasa, and remarks that the ā-mark in mā is superfluous.
3. Prinsep wrongly reads leṇāṃ. Banerji doubtfully reads leṇ[ā]ṃphi, remarking that the last syllable (phi) in this record is superfluous and devoid of any significance. The cast in the Indian Museum clearly shows that the reading is nothing but leṇāni,
TEXT AS IT READS IN THE ORIGINAL

पादमुलिकष्ट कुसमस्य नेषि [1]नि [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN PÂLI

पादमुलिकष्ट कुसमस्य नेषणि [1]

TEXT AS IT READS IN SANSKRIT

पादमुलिकष्ट कुसमसा लयनानि [1]

TRANSLATION

The caves (which are the excavations) of Kusuma of Pâdamûlika.¹

1. Pâdamûlika has been rightly explained by Banerji as signifying either the locality or the professional designation of the donor. As a professional designation, it cannot but mean a 'server of the feet,' that is, a menial. Accepting the second meaning of the word, I may render the record:—

"The caves (which are the excavations) of the menial Kusuma."
No. XV

TABLE OF BRAHMI ALPHABET
IN THE TATTVA-GUMPHA No. 1
The following inscription containing a table of Brāhmī alphabet “was noticed for the first time,” says Mr. R. D. Banerji, “by the late Mr. J. D. Beglar in 1882, who published an eye-copy of it with his report (Arch. Surv. Rep., Vol. XIII, p. 82). But unfortunately the eye-copy was printed upside down. Mr. Monmohan Chakrabartti tried to read it from this plate, but apparently did not succeed. The whole inscription is written or painted on the back wall of the inner chamber of the cave, and on prolonged examination I found that, in addition to a row of letters which I cannot make out, it was a repetition of the Indian alphabet. Some young monk had used the back wall of the cell as a (slate or) copy-book and improved his knowledge of the alphabet by writing on it. The characters belong to the first century B. C. or first century A. D.”

The table is based upon Hari Das Dutta’s inked impression read and reproduced by R. D. Banerji in EI, Vol. XIII, Udayagiri and Khandagiri Inscriptions, Pl. II, No. XIII, Cave called Tatwagumpha No. 1.
TABLE OF BRĀHMĪ ALPHABET

1. .................................................. kha ga gha? ca cha.......................................................... 1
2. ............................................. ya ta tha da dha na.........................................................
3. ............................................. ya ta tha da dha na pa pha...sa sa sa ha........... 2
4. ............................................. ya ta tha da dha na pa pha ba bha...sa sa ha....
5. ............................................. ta tha da dha na pa pha ba...sa sa sa ha....
6. .................................................. ta tha.......................................................... 3

1. In L 1, Banerji reads just one letter, which is gha.
2. In L 3, Banerji does not read the two letters after na. They look like ya and ra, but they may be pa and pha.
3. In L 6, Banerji reads just the second letter.
NOTES
NOTES

1. THE INSCRIPTIONS AND THEIR AUTHORS

Of the fifteen old Brāhmī inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khandagiri Caves, No. I is the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription of King Khāravela; No. II, the Vaikuṇṭhapura Cave inscription of Khāravela’s chief queen; No. III, the Pāṭalapura Cave inscription of King Kadampa-Kudepa; No. IV, the Yamapura Cave inscription of Prince Vaṭukha-Varikha; No. V, probably the Choṭa-Hāthigumpha inscription of the same prince; No. VI, the Sarpa-Gumpha inscription of Cūlakamma; No. VII, the Pāvana or Haridās-Gumpha inscription of the same donor; No. VIII, the Sarpa-Gumpha-side Cave inscription of Kamma and Khīṅgū; No. IX, the Bāgh-Gumpha inscription of the Town-judge Bhūṭī; No. X, the Jambeśvara Cave inscription of the High-functionary Nākiya of Bāriyā, or it may be, of Mahāmada, Bāriyā and Nākiya; Nos. XI and XII, the Ananta-Gumpha inscriptions of some donors; No. XIII, the inscription of some donor in the Tattva-Gumpha No. 1; No. XIV, the inscription of the menial Kusuma, or it may be, of Kusuma of Pādamūla; and No. XV, a table of Brāhmī alphabet in the Tattva-Gumpha No. 1.

2. THE RELATIVE TOTAL OF THE CAVES
AND INSCRIPTIONS

The fifteen inscriptions edited in the present volume, and arranged serially as No. I, No. II, and so forth, are the oldest known Brāhmī inscriptions which have hitherto been discovered as epigraphic records relating to different caves on the Udayagiri and Khandagiri hills in Orissa. The first ten of them belong to the caves on the Udayagiri and the remaining five to those on the Khandagiri hill.

Though, as a general rule, each of these inscriptions is meant to refer to a particular cave, it will be a mistake to presume that there are as many caves as inscriptions. For instance, there are two inscriptions, one of which (No. XI) is incised on the architrave outside the Ananta-Gumpha, and the other (No. XII) on the rock outside the verandah of the same cave. The concluding words of No. XI, समप[ः]नम् लेनम्,
refer to the cave as a cave (lēṇa), and not in terms of its component parts, while the surviving word of No. XII, kothājeśyā, refers to the cave not as a cave but in terms of its component parts. Here the presumption cannot but be that these two inscriptions, one referring to the cave in term of the whole and the other in terms of the parts, belong as well as refer to one and the same cave.

Secondly, there are two inscriptions in the Tattva-Gumpha No. 1, one of which (No. XIII) is meant to commemorate the name of the excavator of the cave, and the other (No. XV) to serve as a table of Brāhmī alphabet. In this particular instance, the two inscriptions belong to one cave, one referring to the cave as an excavation of some donor and the other serving altogether a different purpose.

Thus it may be shown that the total of the caves falls short of the total of the inscriptions at least by two, Nos. XI and XII being taken as referring to one and the same Ananta-Gumpha, and No. XV being left out of consideration as an alphabetic table.

We maintain that even further reduction of the total of the inscribed caves is possible. For No. XIV refers not to one cave but to caves in the plural number (lēṇāmi), which were all the excavations of Kusuma.

Why, it may be argued, if the inscription of Cūlakamma (No. V) is incised over the doorway of the Sarpa-Gumpha and that of Kamma and Khīṇā (No. VIII) to the left of the doorway of the same cave, should we not take these inscriptions as referring to one and the same cave? Here we have got to distinguish between “belonging to” and “referring to.”

These two inscriptions belong to the Sarpa-Gumpha in the sense that both are incised over and to the left of the doorway of the same cave. But they refer to two caves, each cave in terms of its component parts, kothājeśyā and pasāda. The incising over the doorway of the cave goes to show that the inscription of Cūlakamma is meant to refer to the Sarpa-Gumpha. The incising to the left of the doorway of this cave may be taken to indicate that the inscription of Kamma and Khīṇā is meant to refer to another cave, which lay on the left side of the Sarpa-Gumpha and would not at once be seen from its entrance. The Sarpa-Gumpha being unicellular and provided with one verandah, it is difficult to think that a second inscription was needed to refer to it in terms of its cell and verandah.

This argument may be substantiated by the study of a parallel case of the Maheapuri group of three caves and three inscriptions. The inscription of Khāravela’s chief queen (No. II) belongs and clearly refers to
the Vaikunṭhapura cave in the upper storey of the Maṇṇcapuri group. The remaining two inscriptions are both incised in the verandah of the Pātalapura cave in the lower storey, the inscription of King Kadampa-Kudepa (No. III) being incised on a raised band between the middle pillars, and that of Prince Vaṭukha-Varikha (No. IV) on the right wall of the verandah. Here the inscription of Prince Vaṭukha-Varikha refers undoubtedly to the Yamapura cave forming the right wing of the Pātalapura. That is to say, two inscriptions belonging to one cave refer indeed to two caves.

The local tradition asserts that there were formerly about 750 caves on the Udayagiri and Khandagiri hills. This is surely a much exaggerated number, should it be treated as the total of the caves excavated during the reign of King Kharavela and thereabout. For we have a definite statement in the Hāthī-Gumphā inscription (No. I) regarding the total number of the caves excavated on these two hills during Kharavela’s reign. In accordance with this statement, just 117 caves were constructed (sattadasa-leko nāmak kāmapriyō) in the thirteenth year of Kharavela’s reign.

We cannot say that all the 117 caves were inscribed. If each one of them might be supposed to have an inscription referring to or labelling it, the total of the inscriptions would have been not less than 117. But if all of them were not inscribed, the total of the inscriptions must have been less than 117. Probably all or most of them were not inscribed. Even the famous Rāni Nūr or Queen’s Palace is found without an inscription. Though the local tradition ascribes the construction of this cave-architecture to King Lalatendu-Keśari who reigned about the year A.D. 617, the general style of its architecture and the technique, motifs and other details of its basso-relievo are strongly in favour of dating it as old as the Tiger and other inscribed caves which may be supposed to have been excavated during the reign of Kharavela or thereabout. Moreover, many of the surviving caves being natural cavities little improved by human hand, are likely to have been left uninscribed.

In these circumstances, it is not unreasonable to think that the original total of the inscriptions stood far below that of the caves, although the exact ratio of the two totals cannot be determined, nor is it possible to say how many inscriptions have been actually lost due to the ravages of time.

In the Hāthī-Gumphā record of the thirteenth year of Kharavela’s reign, we read that His Majesty caused 117 caves to be constructed on the Kumārī hill, obviously a common name for designating the twin-hills of
Udayagiri and Khandagiri by himself, by his queens, by his sons, by his relatives, by his brothers, and by the royal servants. Among the caves of his queens, we get just one inscribed cave of his chief queen; among those of the princes, we get just two inscribed caves of Prince Vajukha-Varikha; so on and so forth.

It may be expected that at least those caves which were excavated by the members of Khāravela's royal family were inscribed. We mean that some at least of the inscriptions must have disappeared with the destruction of the ancient caves. And yet the fact would remain that the original total of the inscriptions stood far below that of the caves.

We have wrongly assumed so far as if the inscription of Khāravela (No. I) were meant to refer exclusively to one cave, namely, the Hāthi-Gumphā on the Udayagiri hill. It is far from being the case. It is not distinctly stated in the record of Khāravela's thirteenth regnal year how many out of 117 caves were constructed by His Majesty, how many by his queens, and how many by others. We would think that the majority of these caves were constructed on the strength of the donations made by His Majesty. We shall be doing injustice to him to suggest that the inscription standing in his name was meant to relate exclusively to a cave which is of little importance as a work of art. To suggest this is to leave the acclaimed costly and excellent works of art and architecture accomplished by him altogether unexplained. The so-called Hāthi-Gumphā inscription of Khāravela was, indeed, meant to refer not to one cave but to all the works of art and architecture done by him on the twin-hills of Udayagiri and Khandagiri. As a matter of fact, the Hāthi-Gumphā record was meant to refer in a general way to all the 117 caves with their inscriptions and architectural constructions.
3. THE SYMBOLS

The Hāthi-Gumphā inscription of Khāravela is enclosed between two pairs of symbols. Two symbols are to be seen on its left side, and two on its right. The first symbol on the left stands over against its second line. The fourth symbol on the right stands over against its seventeenth line. These two symbols were apparently intended to mark respectively the beginning and end of the inscription. The second symbol on the left appears below the first, and stands over against the fourth and fifth lines of the inscription. And the third symbol on the right appears at the end of and between the first and second lines of the inscription.

It is not correct to say that the third symbol appears immediately after the name of Khāravela with which the first line terminates. Even if this symbol figured just after the name of Khāravela, I do not see how any importance might have been attached to it because of such a position. The symbol, as it now stands, seems to have been set off on the right against the first and second symbols on the left, as an equipoise. In theory, of the four symbols, the first and the fourth were intended to mark the commencement and close of the inscription, and the second and the third to stand, somewhere in the middle, on two sides, enclosing the inscription between them. I believe that this arrangement would not have been departed from, if the right upper corner had not appeared bare as a result of the third symbol having been placed far below the position in which it appears.

What are these four symbols? The first symbol is what the Jains call *Puddha-mangala* translated by Dr. Coomarswamy as “Powder-box.” The second symbol is the well-known *Śvastiṣṭha*. The third symbol is what has been labelled as *Nandipada* or “Bull’s foot-mark” in a Buddhist

---

1. Jayaswal says, “This symbol is inscribed just after the name of Khāravela in the first line.” *JBORS*, 1917, Vol. III, Part IV, p. 428.
inscription on the Padaṇa hill near Kanheri. The fourth symbol is what may be aptly described as Rukkha-cetiya or Vṛka-caiṭiya, "Tree-device" or "Woodland-shrine."

The first symbol, which looks like a modern crown figures, as pointed out by Dr. Bhagawanlal Indraji, in sculptured decorations carved over the doorway arches in some of the Udayagiri caves. It is one of the auspicious devices adorning the doorway of a Jain cave at Junāgad. It stands over the third figure on the Sānchi gateway. It is found in some of the Buddhist cave inscriptions in Western India, e.g., in the second inscription at Junnar, the first inscription at Karle and the third inscription at Bhāja. It is not uncommon in necklaces (candrahāra). It is still very popular as one of the aṣṭa maṅgalas or "eight auspicious symbols" among the Jains in whose modern representation, it appears as "a beautiful bowl with a lid surmounted with three pinnacles."

What this first symbol actually signifies none can tell. Nothing is to be inferred as to its meaning from the name Paḍḍha-maṅgala offered by the Jains. With regard to its external feature, the Jains may describe it as Paḍḍha or "closed," and the modern scholars as a "shield," or a Triśūla, or a tri-ratna device, or a "powder-box." These do not carry us far. But it may be worth while to inquire if any clue might be obtained from the study of some of the devices on the ancient punch-marked coins. On some of these coins, the second, third and fourth symbols of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription appear around and in association with a device which Sir Alexander Cunningham took to be a representation of Mount Meru, and other numismatists take to be the representation of a mountain. On some of these coins, this device occurs alone, and on some, it figures in association with one or another of the second, third and fourth symbols of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription. A prototype of this device is met with on the Sohagaura copper-plate where it appears in the middle in association with the third and fourth symbols of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription and with a crescent-mark in its upper curve. So far as this copper-plate and the punch-marked coins are concerned, I have been strongly inclined to explain it as signifying a caravan-camp

1. JEBRAS, XV, p. 320.
3. Archaeological Survey of Western India, separate pamphlet, X, pp. 23, 28, 42.
5. Ganguly’s Orissa and Her Remains, p. 40.
under a canopy. This explanation of mine has been partly based upon a Buddhist description in the Vaṃśputha Jātaka (Fausböll’s No. 2) of a caravan journey across a desert.

Though there are some points of likeness between this device and the first symbol in the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription, the two are not identical. Nor does it appear that the same symbolic device suggested the same idea to all and in all connexions.

As regards the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription, I would, for a proper consideration of their nature, divide the four symbols into two groups, one group consisting of the first and fourth symbols, and the other of the second and third. Taking the first and fourth symbols, one may not be far wrong, I believe, in thinking that these were designed, in this particular connexion, to represent a hilly woodland in which the cave with its inscription was situated. The naming of a hill-cave by a tree adjoining it was an ancient convention, which is evident from the names of certain caves in some of the old inscriptions, e.g., Nigoda-kubhā, “the Banyan cave,” in the first Barābar Hill Cave inscription of Aśoka, and Iyādasāla-guhā, “the Shorea Robusta Cave,” in one of the Barhut inscriptions.

Similarly taking the second and third symbols together, it may be said that, whatever may be their origin, as they stand in this inscription, they are intended to convey respectively the idea of svasti (well-being) and that of maṅgala (victory). The association of these two ideas in Buddhism, and á posteriori in Jainism, is clearly brought out in the concluding verse of the Pāli Maṅgala-Sutta which reads as follows:

Etādisāni katvāna sabbattham aparājitaḥ
Sabbattha svastih gagchanti, taṁ tesam maṅgalamuttamanti

If the Jains and Buddhists associated these two symbols to convey the ideas of svasti and maṅgala, one need not be surprised if the Vedic religionist associated them to convey his ideas of auspiciousness. I mean to say that Mr. Harit Krishna Deb’s suggestion, that these two symbols served, perhaps, as epigraphic devices for representing the mystical formula “OM,” need not be dismissed as a mere ingenuity.

There are divergent theories regarding the origin of these two symbols, which are, however, too well-known to need repetition. For a general information about the Svasti symbol, the reader is referred to
Dr. Bhagavvanlal Indraji’s note in Actes du Sixieme congres International des Orientalistes, Part III, p. 137. And for the discussion of different theories about the origin and explanations of the form of the Nandipada symbol, he is referred to Dr. Fleet’s paper on the Sohgaura copper-plate inscription which he published in JRAS, 1907, pp. 529-32.

Regarding the second of these two symbols, it remains to be seen whether its name Nandipada was suggested in the Buddhist inscription from its external resemblance with the bull’s foot-mark or from some other circumstance. There is something to be said for the second alternative. The Cullakāliṅga-Jātaka (Fausboll’s No. 301) says that the tutelary god of Kalinga was represented in the shape of “a white bull,” and that of Assaka in the shape of “a black bull.” Dr. Indraji is right to say that the Buddhists, giving it the name Nandipada, meant to represent it as a “Bull symbol,” and not as a mere “foot-mark of a bull.”

One tree-symbol marks the beginning of the inscription of Kamma and Khīṭā in the Snake Cave (No. VIII), and another tree symbol that of the inscription of the Town-judge Bhūti in the Tiger Cave (No. IX). These two symbols are just two different varieties of the fourth symbol in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription. The inscription in the Tiger Cave has, indeed, a second symbol at its end. It is again a Svastika mark carved in a somewhat different form. These three symbols appear as represented in the following table:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![Symbol 1]</td>
<td>![Symbol 2]</td>
<td>![Symbol 3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. THE LETTER-FORMS

In the present edition we have so arranged the fifteen old records in a progressive numerical order as to make No. I, the Hàthi-Gumphà record of Khâravela, to appear as the peg, and to make the rest, Nos. II-XV, to appear as hanging upon No. I. Looked at from this point of view, Nos. II-XV, are to be taken as subservient to No. I, which is the principal record. In our plan, Khâravela’s Hàthi-Gumphà record stands first and the Table of Brâhmi Alphabet stands last, the series starting from the former and being closed by the latter. Considered in the light of this plan, a special importance has been meant to be attached to the first, as well as to the last number of the series. The special importance of the first is that it furnishes the key to the appreciation of the contents of the records, Nos. II-XIV; and the special importance of the last is that it furnishes the key to the understanding of the letter-forms of the preceding records, Nos. I-XIV.

The table is found on the back wall of the inner chamber of the Tattva-Gumphà, No. 1. It presents some six straight rows of Brâhmi letters carefully incised one below the other and all below the inscription attached to the cave. The succession of the letters that may yet be read, especially in the right half of the table, indicates that in each row a complete set of the Brâhmi alphabet was intended to be shown, and that the letters were meant to be alphabetically arranged, each set beginning with the letter a and ending with the letter ha.

Mr. R. D. Banerji seems to think that the dressed surface of the wall of the cave was used by a young monk as a sort of copy-book for improving his knowledge of the alphabet by writing on it. This is, no doubt, a very plausible explanation for the possibility of the table as it is. It also might be that the mason who was employed to incise the inscription, after having incised the short inscription of one or two lines, found sufficient unfilled space on the dressed surface which he eventually thought of filling up with the rows of Brâhmi letters. That the table was the manipulation of a practised hand cannot at all be doubted. And the practising hand of a young monk cannot be expected to have produced such a good specimen.

As bad luck would have it, not a single row of letters in the table is legible to-day from beginning to end, and not a single row can be wholly deciphered. The consequence is that, as regards orthography, we cannot
say precisely how many vowel-letters were incised in each row. That the vowel-signs were not separately shown and that, at least, these vowel-
letters, $ā$, $i$, $ē$, $u$, $ū$, $e$ and $o$, were incised in each row may be taken for
granted. In the texts of the old Brāhmī inscriptions, we have the use of
the following vowel-letters and vowel-signs:

1. Vowel-letters—$a$, $ā$, $i$, $u$, $e$, $ai$ (?), and $o$;
2. Vowel-signs for $ā$, $i$, $ē$, $u$, $ū$, $e$ and $o$.

Precisely from what period of time the Brāhmī alphabet was adapted
to the needs of Sanskrit language we do not know. If Mr. Jayaswal's
"Sunga Inscription of Ayodhya" may be presumed to have been incised
actually during the reign of Puṣyamitra, or, at least, during the Sunga
reign, the second century B.C. is the earliest period to which the date
of a Sanskrit record in Brāhmī characters can be pushed. But the
Junāgarā inscription of Rudradāman I (circa 150 A.D.) is certainly the
earliest known lengthy Sanskrit royal record in Brāhmī characters.

In accordance with a statement in the Artha-Śāstra of Kauṭilya-
Kauṭalya, the orthography of royal writs (in Sanskrit) comprised some
sixty-three letters.¹ The commentator accounts for this total by the
summation of twenty-two letters for representing the vowel-sounds and
forty-one for representing the consonant-sounds.² Thus the dictum in
the Artha-Śāstra might be taken to imply that, at the time of its com-
pilation, twenty-two was the conventional maximum of the total of
vowel-letters required for orthography of royal writs (in Sanskrit). But,
in reality, Kauṭilya-Kauṭalya thought not so much of the orthography
of the royal writs as of the letters, signs and notations of Sanskrit
phonology. The notations required for representing nine $plūta-svāra$s
were quite out of place in the general orthography of Sanskrit royal
writs. Leaving aside the nine $plūta-svāra$s, we get thirteen as the con-
ventional maximum total of Sanskrit vowels.³ It is impossible to think
that the orthography of the Tattva-Gumpha table comprised so many
letters as were required to represent all the thirteen Sanskrit vowels.
Here the important inquiry is whether this orthography included in it
the letters required for representing the two diphthongs, $ai$ and $au$, or

---

1. Artha-Śāstra, II, 9, 28: Ākārādayo svṛṇāḥ triṇāṭṭikṣ.
tathäṣṭau, pañca hrasvāḥ, plūtā naṁva.
not. The point might be partly decided if we could ascertain that Airena was the opening word of the main portion of the text of Khāravela's inscription.

The first letter of the opening word, as it appears in the plaster-casts and estampages, is the diphthong ai, and we have agreed with Mr. Jayaswal and others in reading the opening word as Airena, and have differed from Mr. R. D. Banerji who proposed to read Kharena, as well as from Sir Alexander Cunningham who read it as Vereena. As we have noted, the name of the king of Utkala who defeated king Nanda in a battle was known to the author of the Sanskrit verses, quoted by Mr. Jayaswal from an Old Orīyā MS. of the 14th or 16th century A. D., to be Aira and Ahira. If Airena be at all a correct reading, one must not forget that it is the only instance where a Brāhmī letter representing the diphthong ai is met with in our old Brāhmī inscriptions.

But our faith in the correctness of the above reading has, to a large extent, been shaken by the consideration of two facts, one brought to our notice by Sir Alexander Cunningham and the other gleaned by us. Sir Alexander has pointed out that Vena in the sense of Vira (Heroic) occurs as a royal epithet in some of the coin-legends of Ancient India. And we find, in corroboration of the soundness of Cunningham’s argument, that the first letter of the opening word of Khāravela’s inscription exactly resembles the first letter of a proper name in the two Pabhosa inscriptions of Āṣādhasena, which the epigraphists have agreed to read as Vaihidari. It is certain that the first letter of Vaihidari could not be read other than as Vai. If the first letter were meant to be read as Ai, we would have found the letter e with one e-sign attached to it instead of a letter resembling e with two e-signs. But for these two e-signs attached to the first letter, the name would have been read as Veshdari. If this be correct, it goes without saying that the Brāhmī letters to represent the diphthongs ai and au, were unnecessary for incising our old Brāhmī inscriptions. Further, we should remember that there was no occasion for the scribe or scribes of our old Brāhmī inscriptions to make use of the ai or au sign. These signs were, indeed, needed for incising the Barhut E. Gateway inscription of Dhanabhūti and the Pabhosa inscriptions of Āṣādhasena, for inscribing such words as panteņa and Vaihidari.

Apparently the number of consonants represented in the Tattva-Gumpha table seems to have fallen short of the total, forty-one, contemplated in the dictum of the Artha-Sāstra for the orthography of Sanskrit royal
writes, nay, of Sanskrit language, by as many consonants as eight. For in each row of letters in the table we are not to expect to see more than thirty-three letters intended to represent the following consonants in such order as-ka, kha, qa, gha, na | ca, cha, ja, jha, ha | ta, tha, da, dha, na | pa, pha, ba, bha, ma | ya, ra, la, va | sa, sa, sa, ha | , that is to say, the five consonantal groups of five each, the two semi-vowels, the two liquids and the four sibilants. It is impossible to conceive that the consonantal signs for representing the Sanskrit reñ, ra-phañ, ga-phañ, anusvāra, visarga, as well as for indicating that the pronunciation of qa is as in vidāla, or that the pronunciation of dha is as in gātha, or that the pronunciation of ta is as in matsya were meant to be displayed. We have the frequent use of the anusvāra-sign (ī) in our old Brāhmī inscriptions. In point of fact, the predominant tendency of the orthography of our old Brāhmī inscriptions is to represent the nasals of all the five consonantal groups by ṣa in all cases of conjoint consonants. There was no occasion for the use of the visarga-sign (ḥ). But this does not mean that the Brāhmī alphabet was wanting in this sign. For we have a clear use of this sign in Mr. Jayaswal's 'Sunga Inscriptio of Ayodhya.'

There was yet no necessity for having a separate letter for representing the Sanskrit ṣaṣa, or for having separate conventional signs for representing the r, ra and ya sounds of conjoint consonants. Looked at from this point of view, it would be wrong to say that the consonantal system covered by the Brāhmī alphabet fell short of the orthography of Kauṭilya-Kaustubha's royal writs in Sanskrit. Even the Brāhmī alphabet used for the inscriptions of Asoka, especially for those at Girnar and Kalsi, was adequate for the entire Sanskrit consonantal system minus the visarga-sign. Anyhow, it is certain that, like the orthography of the Kalsi rock inscriptions of Asoka, the orthography of the Tattva-Gumpha table included three letters representing ṣa, ṣa and ḷa.

So far as the language of our old Brāhmī inscriptions goes, the letters representing ṣa and ḷa were of no use. Mr. Jayaswal makes out two words in Khāravela's inscription, one affording a singular instance of the use of the letter ḷa, and the other that of the use of the letter ṣa. The two words are respectively rājini-vamso-kula-viniścrito (I. 16) and Tramira-deṣa-samghatam (I. 12).

Mr. Jayaswal depends for these readings on the stampages taken by Mr. Vats. We can quite see that in Mr. Vats' stampages, at least, in one of them, the letter meant to represent si appears, by some mysterious work of erasure and fissure, as ṛa, and that ha of dāha appears, for some
reason or other, as qa and no less as Aśokan ka. But the first letter cannot undisputably be read as de in view of the fact that it presents to view two similar e-signs, attached one to the upper end and the other to the lowerend.

Depending on Mr. Vats' estampages. Mr. Jayaswal makes out a word, Śimāhuḷāya (I. 14), affording a singular instance of the use of a letter representing the Vedic cerebral la which is frequently used in Pāli as a substitute for ḍa. We have to reject his reading on these two grounds: (1) that the Tattva-Gumpha table has no place for such a letter, and (2) that the three letters read by him as dhulāya can be better read, with the aid of the estampages previously published by him, as silāhi. As a working hypothesis, it may be taken for granted that, as regards the main letters, what is to be found in the Tattva-Gumpha table may be found in the texts of our old Brāhmī inscriptions and what is not to be found in the Tattva-Gumpha table cannot at all be found in the latter 1.

Prof. Sten Konow reads Cūlakramasa for Cūlakamasa. If, indeed, the intended reading were Cūlakramasa (Cūlakarmasa), we might have used it as a remarkable evidence to prove that the scribe or mason-engraver, employed to incise the inscription belonged to the Uttarāpatha, or more particularly, the Gandhāra-region where the prevailing tendency was to spell dharma as dhrama, and darśi as draśi.

The letter-forms of our old Brāhmī inscriptions show a stage of development of the Brāhmī alphabet, which is posterior to that of the Brāhmī inscriptions of Aśoka. Dr. Bhagawanlal Indraji notices the following as the chief points of difference between the two sets of Brāhmī letter-forms:

"While Aśoka's ka has the vertical and horizontal strokes equal in size, here the vertical stroke is longer than the horizontal stroke; qa originally angular now becomes arched; gha, pa, la and ha originally with a rounded base now becomes flat; ma and va with a well-rounded base now becomes triangular; the two base-strokes of ta originally making an angle now tend to be an arch; ikāra-strokes making an angle no longer

---

1. We are indebted to Dr. Niranjan Prasad Chakrabarty of the Calcutta University for drawing our attention to a number of manuscripts found in E. Turkestan, each of which has in it a Table of Alphabet, obviously as an aid to the reading of it. Here, too, the table was annexed apart from the consideration that all the letters included in it were actually required for the Ma. concerned.
do so and go up higher. These are all points which prove that the character is later than Aśoka's."  

Rai Bahadur Ramaprasad Chanda points out the following as the most notable characteristics of the Hāṭhi-Gumpha alphabet: "(1) A considerable number of letters with thick-headed vertical or serif; (2) ka with the lower part of the vertical prolonged; (3) invariably rounded ga (4) cha of the butterfly type with two loops; (5) ta's having in most cases rounded lower part."  

It may also be noticed that in the Hāṭhi-Gumpha alphabet, the letter a is made up of two side strokes meeting the vertical leaving a wide space between them; the vertical of ḷha which in its earlier forms had nothing at its base has invariably a triangular or circular base; the letter ra which in its earlier forms was of a cork-screw pattern has become a straight vertical; and the letter ḷa has no longer a short horizontal stroke attached a little below its right vertical.

Applying all these prominent characteristics as a test of chronology of the letter-forms, and observing that the Hāṭhi-Gumpha inscription shares them, to a considerable extent, with the inscriptions on the Sanchi Gateways, Rai Bahadur Chanda finds indication to be able to say that the Hāṭhi-Gumpha inscription "is later in date not only than Aśoka's edicts and the Besnagar Garuḍa pillar inscriptions, but also later than the Bharhut toraṇa inscription and the Nānāghāṭ inscription of the time of the Andhra king Sīri Śātakaṇi I."

The Rai Bahadur has sought, indeed, to deepen the significance of Dr. Indrajī's observations by conceiving as many as seven stages in the evolution of the Brāhmī letter-forms from the Edicts of Aśoka to the Sanchi Gateway-inscriptions, the sixth being represented by the Hāṭhi-Gumpha inscription of Khāravela and the fifth by the Besnagar Garuḍa Pillar inscription of Mahārāja Bhāgavata, the Nānāghāṭ Cave inscription of Nayanikā, the widow of Śātakaṇi I, and the Bharhut E. Gateway inscription of Dhanabhūti, taken in a chronological order.

In the opinion of Prof. Bühler, the characters of the Sanchi South Gateway inscription wherein a king Sīri-Śātakaṇi is mentioned were almost identical with those of the Nānāghāṭ Cave inscription of Nayanikā. As against this opinion, Rai Bahadur Chanda maintains that the characters of the Nānāghāṭ Cave inscription of Nayanikā and also those of the

Näṣik Cave inscription of king Kaṇha differ from the Sānehi Gateway inscriptions in these two essential features: "(1) Letters with the so-called serif or thick-headed vertical are quite conspicuous by their absence in these records. (2) In place of ta's with the invariably round lower part of the Sānehi Gateway inscriptions, we have in these earliest Andhra inscriptions and in the coins of king Sirī Śāta (rightly identified with Sirī Sātakaṇi of Nāṇāghāt) ta's with mostly angular lower part."

Sometime ago Mr. R. D. Banerji read, at one of the monthly meetings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, a carefully written paper embodying the results of his study of the letter-forms of the Nāṇāghāt Cave inscription of Nayanikā and the Hāṭhi-Gumphā inscription of Khāравela. His paper, which has been meant for publication in JASB with copious illustrations, showed that he had made a most painstaking analysis of the letter-forms of the two inscriptions. He said, in the course of discussion, that he could see in Khāравela's inscription the engraving of three separate hands. He tried to point out that in all cases ga's and ta's were not arched or rounded but angular, and that, as a matter of fact, there were a number of letter-forms bearing the characteristic features of Aśokan Brāhmaṇī, and that, on the other hand, there were certain letter-forms in the Nāṇāghāt Cave inscription that anticipated those of the Kuṣāṇa inscriptions. Thus he found reasons to differ from Rai Bahadur Chanda who assigned an earlier date to the alphabet of the Nāṇāghāt record. He seemed to think that as, on the ground of anticipation of some of the letter-forms of the Kuṣāṇa inscriptions, the Nāṇāghāt record might be dated later, so, on the ground of lingering resemblance with the letter-forms of Aśokan Brāhmaṇī, the Hāṭhi-Gumphā record might be dated earlier. He inclined to explain the occurrence of different types of Brāhmaṇī letters in the Hāṭhi-Gumphā inscription by the fact that of the scribes employed, one was well-practised in the Eastern variety, one in the Southern variety, and so on.

Mr. Banerji's analysis of the Brāhmaṇī letter-forms of the two inscriptions leaves nothing to be desired in the way of industry and precision. It convinces us that all the ga's in Khāравela's inscription are not arched; that the lower parts of all the ta's are not invariably rounded; that it has a number of letter-forms bearing the characteristic features of the alphabet of the Maurya inscriptions; and that the Nāṇāghāt Cave inscription shows some letter-forms anticipating those of the Kuṣāṇa inscriptions.

1. Some of the Hāṭhi-Gumphā letter-forms may be Aśokan or Mauryan, but none of the Aśokan or Mauryan letter-forms has a serif or thickened top.
His analysis serves so far as to enable us to think that Rai Bahadur Chanda's statement has erred in facts. But he himself has failed to produce a convincing proof to substantiate his position as to the currency of the Northern, Southern, Eastern and Western varieties of the Brāhmī alphabet precisely at that period of time which had seen the engraving of the inscriptions concerned. In dealing with the language of Khāravela's inscription, he has taken the substitution of ḍha for ḍha to be a characteristic of the Southern dialect, the dialect which was current in Kaliṅga and Andhradeśa. Is it a right assumption that because the inscription of Khāravela and that of Nayanikā are found engraved in Southern countries their language must have been a Southern dialect? Can we seriously take, on the same ground, the letter-forms of the Nānāghāṭ Cave inscription as representative of the Southern variety of the Brāhmī alphabet? We cannot. We find that for the engraving of the most southern copies of his Minor Rock Edicts, King Aśoka employed a scribe, named Paṭa, who hailed from a country, say the Gandhāra region, where Kharoṣṭhī was the script in common use. The same remark holds true of the scribe or mason-engraver employed to inscribe Dhanabhūti's record on the Barhut E. Gateway.

We are prepared to entertain Mr. Banerji's hypothesis in so far as it leads us to believe that the scribes employed to incise Khāravela's inscription represented different localities. In examining the letter-forms of the Barhut inscriptions, we found some clear data compelling us to think on similar lines,—to feel that certain carvings and inscriptions were the workmanship of a particular group of artists, and others those of other groups. We were constrained to think that Rai Bahadur Chanda's view of the development of the Brāhmī alphabet was defective in so far as it did not consider what effects might have been produced if different groups of artists-scribes hailing from different parts of India were employed to do work on the same piece of stone, either at the same time or at different times. The Rai Bahadur failed to notice that, so far as the Barhut Inner Railing was concerned, there were two carvings with a number of inscriptions, in which the letter cha was of the butterfly type with two loops, the letter pa had a

1. We mean the period anterior to the date of composition of the Lalita-Vistara which mentions various local alphabets.
2. Cunningham's Stūpa of Bharhut, Pl. XIV
flat base, and the letters tended to show thickened tops or *serifs*. Although we felt that these were the workmanship of one group of artists who represented a particular locality, we found no means of ascertaining what locality of India was actually represented by them.

We have now, thanks to the continued efforts and successes of the explorers and epigraphists, a good number of inscriptions, the letter-forms of which show a close resemblance in many respects, to wit: (1) our old Brāhmī inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Kanjīlagiri caves; (2) Mr. Jackson’s second Barābar inscription recording the name of the rock on which it is engraved as *Goradīhāgiri*; (3) the Sanchi Gateway inscriptions incised during the reign of one King Sīrī-Sātakaṇi; (4) two Pabhosa inscriptions of Āśālhasena referring to *Bahāsatimita*; (5) Gotamimitra’s inscription referring to King Viṣṇumitra; and (6) Mr. Jayaswal’s “Sunga Inscription of Ayodhya,” referring to Pusyaśmitra. Curiously enough, while these epigraphs, especially the inscriptions of Khāravela and Āśālhasena, all referring to *Bahāsatimita*, show all the signs of later development, later than the Mauryan, Yaśamita’s Brick Tablet inscription referring to *Bṛhāsvatimita* is found in Brāhmī characters which are decidedly Mauryan.

If *Bṛhāsvatimita* of Yaśamita’s Brick-tablet was, as Dr. Vogel takes him to be, the same person as *Bahāsatimita* of Āśālhasena’s inscriptions, or the same person as *Bahāsatimita* of Khāravela’s Hāthi-Gumpha record, we get at last a fact, which altogether upsets Rai Bahadur Chanda’s chronological order of the Brāhmī inscriptions. And we are inclined also to think alike with Mr. Jayaswal who says: “The Śunga both in inscription and on coins used a script whose letter-forms are of a different style, and more advanced than the letter-forms of the later Mauryas. In the Besnagar inscription of the later Śunga Bhāgabhadra, we have the Maurya forms. There being thus more than one style of writing in vogue at one and the same time, the chronology of the records of the second century B.C. and thereafter is not deducible merely from letter-forms.”

---

1. Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. II. No. 3, p. 56.
3. JRAS, 1912, p. 120.
5. JAYASWAL'S FIVE CORRECTED READINGS

The third instalment of corrections published by Mr. Jayaswal in JBORS, Vol. XIV, Part I, pp. 150-1, goes to show that he keeps yet an open mind as to the reading of the text of Khāravela's inscription. The fact that he has so far revolved like a weather-cock at every gust of wind is indicative of nothing but his indecision. We shall consider below five of the corrected readings which he has offered and see whether and how far they bear scrutiny.

First, he proposes to read Māhāmeghavāhana, instead of Mahāmegha-vāhana, as a common patronymical epithet of King Khāravela and King Kadampa-Kudepa in the old Brāhmi inscriptions Nos. I and III. He seems to think that the patronymic Māhāmeghavāhana implies that Mahāmeghavāhana was the personal name of Khāravela's grandfather. Even if his reading be correct, we do not see how his conclusion is correct. There are numerous instances in the Brāhmi inscriptions where for a we have the use of a, e.g., Bṛhaspāti for Bṛhaspati in Yaśamata's Brick-tablet inscription. Even supposing that in Māhāmeghavāhana, a has not been represented by ṣa, where is the evidence to prove that Khāravela's grandfather was succeeded by his father and that his father was succeeded by him? Seeing that, whether as Māhāmeghavāhana or as Mahāmeghavāhana, it occurs as a common epithet of two kings of the same Kaliṅga royal family, we may say without much fear of contradiction that Mahāmeghavāhana was a common epithet of King Khāravela and King Kadampa-Kudepa, as well as that of their predecessor. But here his reading itself is open to dispute. As bad luck would have it, exactly that portion of the inscribed surface of the rock is fissured which contains the letters inscribing the epithet. So far as No. I is concerned, the choice lies not only between ma and mā, but also between mā and mo. As regards No. III, the ṣa-stroke is not where it should be. A similar apparition can be noticed in the inscription of Kusumā (No. XIV) inducing one to read Kusuṃara as Kusuṃūra. We do not see much use making fuss over ma and mā.

Secondly, he proposes to read in I. 9 sa-b(t)a-senavāhana vipamun-citum Madhuram apayāto, correcting samb(t)a his previous correction to sa-b(t)a, and to translate sa-bīta-senavāhana: "with his army and transport having lost their morale." He thinks that bīta is the same word as vīta, which has a technical military significance,
as may be proved on the authority of the Amarakośa where (in Bk. Kṣatriya, 48) we read: viṭāma tu asāram hastyaśvam. Here viṭa is explained as a substantive. But Mr. Jayaswal interprets bita as an adjective qualifying sena-vāhana, which is impossible on the authority of the Amarakośa. Another objection is that after panūdena there must be a verbal form to denote the effect of the action implied, while Mr. Jayaswal’s reading and rendering serves to remove the verbal form altogether. Moreover, one can be sure more about ne as the final syllable than about no. We do not deny the possibility of the reading sabita as it appears in the estampages. What we deny is the possibility of Mr. Jayaswal’s interpretation of it. Even sabita must be taken in the same sense as samabhīta. For the appearance bha as ba, one may compare gabhira in I. 2. For sabita = samabhīta, one may compare sanukāra = sanukhāra in I. 16.

Thirdly, he proposes to read in I. 2 maṃḍaṃ Āvarāja-nivesita-Pithuḍam gadabha-nāmgalena kāsāyati, correcting his previous correction maṃḍaṃ avarāja-nivesitaṃ pithuḍa, and takes it to mean “He (Khāravela) razes to the ground (lit. ploughs down) with an ass-plough Pithumḍa the market-town (maṃḍa), founded by (the) Āva king.” In support of his reading Āva-rāja, he argues: “There was an ancient Tamil race Āya (Cam. H. I., p. 596) and a kingdom called Āva-mukta, to the north of Kāñceh, in the time of Samudragupta (Allahabad inscription), and a people spelt as Āvarni and Arunni below or by the Kistna as described by Ptolemy.” He also puts forward as an argument: “The Bhāgavata records an Āva dynasty (xii, 2-29) which the Viṣṇu (iv. 24. 13) equates with Andhra. This agrees with Ptolemy. The Āvas were in the Andhra country at the time.” We have looked in vain into the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa (iv. 24. 13) for the equation of any dynasty by the name of Āva with the Andhra. The letter read as ā in Mr. Jayaswal’s Āvarāja cannot be read as ā in view of the fact that in it the two left strokes do

1. A statement in the Nasik Cave inscription No. 10 (El, Vol. VIII) goes indeed to prove that panūdena may be used even without a verbal expression after it to denote the effect produced by the action implied in it. But it is difficult to understand that in the Hāthi-Gumpha statement the verbal expression viṣamucitum (to release, to relieve) governs madhurā instead of senavāhanas. The statement in the Nasik Cave inscription reads: “Bhatāraka anāśati ca gotosim varṣaratam mālayehi rudhāṃ Utamabhādram mocaṣitaṃ ca Mālayā pranādena eva apayāt,” which Senart translates: “And by order of the lord I went to release the chief of the Utamabhadras, who had been besieged for the rainy season by the Mālayas, and those Mālayas fled at the mere roar (of my approaching) as it were.
not meet the vertical leaving a space between them. We doubt the correctness of his reading maṇḍam. Mr. R. D. Banerji’s estampage clearly shows that the first letter of Mr. Jayaswal’s Āvārāja is pu. We make bold to dispute naṃgalena kāsayati because the letter after naṃgale or naṃgale is ne and is intended to be connected with kāsayati.

Fourthly, he proposes to read in I. 12 Tramira-deṣa-saṃghātaṁ, correcting his previous correction taṃara-deha-saṃghātaṁ, and takes it to mean “the combination (or league) of the Tramira (=Tamil) countries.” His reading Tramira has come very near to our tamira or timira. Mr. Jayaswal does not at all consider that here the word saṃghāta may also be interpreted in the sense of saṃkhaṭa meaning “called”. Regarding his reading deṣa, our first objection is that in the estampage of Mr. Vats, the letter ṣa shows similar ValueCollection strokes on both ends. Our second objection is that the use of the cerebral sibilant ṣa is unexpected. Mr. R. D. Banerji’s estampage tends to produce the appearance of the first letter as ṭi, and the estampage of Mr. Vats that of tra. We cannot think that here Tramira occurs as a spelling for the Tamil (Tāmila or the Sk. Drāviḍa), due to the fact that ṭa or ṭa is in all cases represented by ṭa, and nowhere by ra.

Fifthly, he proposes to read in I. 16 vinisṛto, correcting his previous reading vinis(i)to. He has evidently relied too much on the estampage of Mr. Vats, forgetting that in taking an impression, a man, however careful and cautious he may be, is apt to exercise his own discretion in determining the outlines of the letters. If we were the men engaged for the purpose, we would have found ourselves quite at liberty to mark out the letter as s(i). Anyhow, it is certain that the letter was never meant to be ṣṛ, cf. the letter ṣṛ in Bhāṣāvāti on Yaṣamita’s Brick-tablet (JRAS, 1912, p. 120).
6. THE LANGUAGE

Judged by the sound-system and syntax, the language of the old Brāhma inscriptions is very nearly Pāli, the language of the Buddhist Tipiṭaka preserved in Ceylon, Siam and Burma. Leaving the spelling and pronunciation of a few words out of consideration, we can say that their language is Pāli, and nothing but Pāli. The exceptional cases of spelling and pronunciation are important as enabling the reader to detect the under-current of a dialect having affinity, in respect of its phonetics, with Ārdha-Māgadhī, the language of the extant Jaina Agama.

Broadly speaking, the differences between the language of the old Brāhma inscriptions and Ārdha-Māgadhī are the differences which exist between Pāli and the Jain Prakrit and have been specified by Prof. Jacobi. For example, in the Jain Prakrit, in final syllables, as well as in the middle of words, o is frequently represented by e, while in the language of the old Brāhma inscriptions and in Pāli, o is nowhere represented by e. At the same time, the language of the old Brāhma inscriptions shows a complete agreement with both Pāli and Ārdha-Māgadhī in its tendency not to replace the Sanskrit r-sound by the l-sound.

The language of the old Brāhma inscriptions differs from Ārdha-Māgadhī and agrees with Pāli also in its main tendency not to indiscriminately cerebralize the dental nasal.

Now let us examine the exceptional cases of spelling and pronunciation and see what results we obtain and how we can account for them. Let us, first of all, examine the invocation formula as it occurs in Khāravela's inscription. This was obviously a rendering from a current Jain formula, which probably survives in the later full-fledged formula: Ṉamo arihaṃtaṃ, Ṉamo siddhaṃ, etc. In the inscriptive formula, the cerebral nasals are replaced by the dental, but the spelling arihaṃta is yet retained, while the commoner spelling, as evidenced by the inscriptions of Khāravela and Khāravela's chief queen, is arahamta. Both of these two spellings are met with in Ārdha-Māgadhī, the spelling arīhanta being met with more frequently than arahamta, while only one spelling, arahanta, is met with in Pāli. We also notice that, in the second clause, the cerebral

sonant aspirate ḍha has been replaced by the dental ñha, and we have, for the Sk. saṣāva, saṣāva (= ṣava), precisely as in ardha-Māgadhī, instead of saba (= sabbha) as in Pāli.¹

The language of the old Brāhmī inscriptions shows an agreement with Ārdha-Māgadhī in its tendency to retain the Sk. ḍ-sound instead of substituting for it the Vedic cerebral sound ḍ as in Pāli: kaḍāra (I. 1) = Ārdha-Māgadhī kaḍāra = Sk. kaḍāra = Pāli kaḷāra; kiḍikā, kiḍitā (I. 1) = Ārdha-Māgadhī kiḍiyā, kiḍā, kiḍiyā = Sk. kiḍā, kiḍitā = Pāli kiḷikā, kiḷitā; kiḍāpayati (I. 4) = Ārdha-Māgadhī kiḍāpayaya = Sk. kiḍayati = Pāli kiḷāpayati; piḍāpayati (I. 9) = Ārdha-Māgadhī piḍāpayaya = Sk. piḍayati = Pāli piḷāpayati; taḍāga (I. 2) = Ārdha-Māgadhī taḍāga = Sk. taḍāga = Pāli taḷāka; veḍuriya (I. 10, I. 15) = Ārdha-Māgadhī veḍuriya = Sk. vaṭḍūrya = Pāli veḷuriya.

Further, as to the exceptional cases of spelling and pronunciation, the language of the old Brāhmī inscriptions differs from Pāli and agrees with Ārdha-Māgadhī in its greater tendency to replace the surd by the sonant of a consonantal group: taḍāga (I. 2) = Pāli taḷāka = Ārdha-Māgadhī taḍāga; padhame (I. 2) = Pāli pathame, pathame = Ārdha-Māgadhī padhame; padhaka (I. 13) = Pāli padthaka = Ārdha-Māgadhī pahā (a change from padhaka); radha, Goradh (I. 3, I. 8, I. 9) = Pāli ruddha, Goraṭha = Ārdha-Māgadhī ruddha, Goradh (changes from ruddha, Goraḍha); Pithudaga (I. 12) = Pāli Pithudaka = Ārdha-Māgadhī Pithudaga, Pithudaga; samghāta (I. 12) = Pāli samkhāta, samkhyāta = Ārdha-Māgadhī samkhaṭa ²; Madhuram (I. 9) = Pāli Madhuram = Sk. Mdhvām = Ārdha-Māgadhī Mahuram (a change from Madhuram).

The language under discussion differs from Pāli and agrees with Ārdha-Māgadhī also in its tendency to form a gerund by adding tā (= Ārdha-Māgadhī tā) instead of vā to the verb; acintayitā (I. 3) = Ārdha-Māgadhī acintayittā = Pāli acintayitvā; ghāṭāpayitā (I. 9) = Ārdha-Māgadhī ghāṭāpayitvā; in its tendency to change p into v in the middle of a word: kara-vaṇa-anugaka (I. 7) = Pāli kara-paṇa-anugaka; in its tendency to frequently use pana (= Ārdha-Māgadhī pana, Pāli paṇa, paṇa, paṭha) for paṅca: panatisāhi (I. 2) = Pāli paṅcatisāhi; panatisāhi (I. 15) = Pāli paṅca-sattati; in its tendency to represent the r of

1. Cf. also pūva (I. 5, I. 12) = Ārdha-Māgadhī pūva = Pāli pūva i savata (I. 8) = ārdha-Māgadhī savattha = Pāli sabbattha; govena (I. 1) = Ārdha-Māgadhī govena = Pāli gobbana.

2. Here samghāta may be equated also with Sk. and Pāli saṃghāta.
a conjoint consonant by ṣ : dampa (I. 4) = Pāli dappa = Sk. darpa 1; sandamṣayaṃto (I. 7) = Pāli sandamṣayaṃto = Sk. sandarśayāṇa; akhaddāṃsa (IX) = Pāli akkhaddasā = Sk. akṣadarśa 2; in its tendency to dispense with t-sound in the middle of a word ; cāntthe (I. 5) = Ārdha-Māgadhī cāntthe = Pāli cāntthe; and in its tendency to represent kh by h : sīharāṇī (I.13) = Ārdha-Māgadhī sīharāṇī = Pāli sikharāṇī.

If Mr. R. D. Banerji's reading dhū[ṇ]a be correct, we find in it another point of agreement between the language of the old Brāhmi inscriptions and Ārdha-Māgadhī: dhūntā (II) = Ārdha-Māgadhī dhūntā = Pāli dhūntā.

In pādiyo (I. 2) = Sk. pātiḥ = Pāli and ardha-Māgadhī pāliyo, one has an exceptional instance, where l is represented by ṣ = Pāli ḷ. In veḍīṛya (I. 10, I. 15) = Sk. veḍīṛya, one has a case, in which ṣ is represented by ḷ. In vaṇa (I. 7) = Sk. vaṇa and in dapa (if it is a correct reading) = Sk. drava, we have a case, in which p and v are interchanged. In pālikaṇi (I. 13) = Sk. pārīghāṇ and in sāṃghāṭam (I. 12) = Sk. sāṇkhyaṭam, one has a case, in which kh and gh are interchanged. In lēṇam = Sk. lāyaṇam, one has a case, in which the dental nasal is represented by the cerebral. In Madhuraṃ (I. 9) = Sk. Mathurām, one has a case, in which th is represented by dh. But these are exceptions which are met with equally in Pāli.

Regarding the use of two spellings of pāli as pālī and pālī, of Lāla as Lāla and Lāla, and of lēna as lena and lēṇa in Pāli, Dr. E. Müller's observations are worth quoting: "It is very difficult to give exact rules for the use of ḷ as the manuscripts are even less consistent in this respect than with regard to the dental and cerebral ṣ." 3

As regards pālikaṇi = Sk. pārīghāṇ, the usual Pāli spelling is pālikaṇa or pālikaṇi. The pālikaṇa spelling occurs in one of the Jātaka verses (Fausbōll's Jātaka, Vol. VI, p. 276):—

Esikā parikhāya ca pālikaṇam aṣṭalāni ca.

The commentator suggests pālikaṇa as an alternative reading: pālikaṇa ti pālikaṇam, ayam eva vā pāṭho. "Here pālikaṇa means pālikaṇa. This pālikaṇa may also be the intended reading."

---

1. If dapa be the correct reading, the word must be equated with Pāli and Ārdha-Māgadhī dava, and Sk. drava.
2. The only exception in Pāli is lomahāṃsa = lomahāraṇa.
3. E. Müller's Pali Grammar, p. 27.
As for samghata = Sk. samkhyata, we find a parallel instance in Pāli Maghādeva (Culla-Niddesa, p. 80) = Makkhādeva, although here both the forms may be regarded as phonetic changes from Mahādeva, which is the usual Pāli spelling.

No hypothesis regarding the character of the language should be built on the basis of the readings etinān (I. 9) and sānikārakārako (I. 16). For it seems that etinān is but the engraver’s mistake 1 for etiṣānām = Pāli etiṣānām, and sānikāra for sānikāra, cf. paṭisānikārayati (I. 2).

One need not be surprised if the intended reading in Khāravela’s inscription (I. 9) was bramhapānān or brahmapiṇān, which is the same in pronunciation as the Pāli brahmapiṇān. So far as the present inscribed surface of the rock goes, one has to read bhamhapānān or bhamapiṇān.

Apart from the question of chronology, the following Brāhmi inscriptions may be so arranged as to indicate a march of the official language of ancient India from a stage of old Māgadhi towards Sanskrit through a Pāli stage reached in the language of Ānanda’s Sanchi Gateway inscription of Sātakarṇi’s time and in that of the old Brāhmi inscriptions:

I. Piprahwā Vase Inscription—

Iyām salila-nidhane Budhaka Bhagavate Sakiyanām sukti-bhatinām sahaginikanām saputadolanām.

II. Asoka’s Rummindet Pillar Inscription—

Devānampaṇiṇa Piyadasina lājina viśātvasābhīhitena atana āgūca...silāvijātibhācā kālāpita silāṭhābhhe ca usapāpīte.

III. Yaśamatā’s Brick-tablet Inscription²—

Jivaputāye rājaharyāye Bhāsvatimitadhitu-Yaśamatāye kāśi-twin.

IV. Gotamiṇḍrā’s Pillar Inscription³—

...mitrasa-putrasa-ṛṇa-Vinumstranadhitu-Idragibhadāye dhūtiye Gotamiṇḍe Mitrāye duṇam thanābhō.

1. Etinān may be a genuine genitive plural form from etisa.
2. JRAS, 1912, the inscription edited by J. Ph. Vogel.
V. Dhanabhūti's Barhut E. Gateway Inscription—

Sugamāṁ rāja raño Gāgīputasa Visadevasa pataṇa Gopīputasa
Āgarajusa pataṇa Vācśiputenā Dhanabhūtina kāritaṁ tora-
ṇāṁ silākaṁvamito ca upaṁṇa.

VI. Ānanda's Sanchi Gateway Inscription—

Rāṇo siri-Sātakaṁśa āvesañisa Vāsithiputasa Ānandana dā-
ṇam.

VII. Khāravela's Chief-queen's Inscription—

Arahaṁda-parāddyaṁ Kālīṁgaṁ samānahāṁ leṇāṁ kāri-
tāṁ—rājina Lādhakaṁ Hāthiśhastha papaṁsa dhītunā Kālīṅ-
ga-cakavanṛtīva siri-khāravelasa agamahisinā kārītaṁ.

VIII. Āśūṣhasena's Pabhosa Inscription, No. II—

Adhichatrāṇa rāṇo bhauśayanaputraṇa Vaiśṣapālaṇa putraṇya
raṇa Varaniputraṇa Bhūgavatasya putreṇa Vaihidaraṇi-
putreṇa Āśūṣhasenena kārītaṁ.

IX. Sunga Inscription in Ayodhya 1—

Kosaladhipena dvirāvīnemahājinaṁ Senāpatēḥ Pusyamitra-
ṛṇa gaṇṭhena Kauśikiputreṇa Dhana...dharmarājinaḥ 2 pituḥ
Phalgudevasya ketaṇāṁ kārītāṁ.

We maintain that, from the point of view of antiquity of the Pāli
language, the foregoing setting of the Brāhmi inscriptions is of little
importance. For going back to earlier times, we find that, upon the
whole, the sound system and grammatical forms of the language of the
Girnar version of Aśoka's Rock Edicts are strikingly similar to those of
Pāli. It appears that, for the adaptation of wordings of Aśoka's edicts to
the local dialects, arrangements were made in Aśoka's Imperial Secretariat
to have the drafts prepared by the drafters who were supposed to have been
conversant with the local dialects of different centres, for which the edicts
were intended. In theory, the Girnar copies of the fourteen rock edicts
were meant to be drafted by the drafter familiar with the local dialect of
Girnar. But in practice, in some instances, the drafters by a mutual

2. Jayaswal reads dharmacāṭihā.
arrangement worked for one another or, for some reasons or other, the drafter employed to prepare drafts for one place was called upon to do the work for another place, and, in some instances, the draft prepared for one place was despatched by mistake to another place. For example, by the sameness of opening words, Devānampiṭhaka vacanena, we may ascertain that the Dhauli copies of Aśoka's Separate Rock Edicts and the copy of Queen's Edict were drafted by one and the same drafter. We think there is no better way than this of explaining the irregularities of spellings and grammatical forms in the Girnar copies of Aśoka's fourteen Rock Edicts.

Among distinctive characteristics of the sound system, we notice that the Girnar language invariably retains the st-sound instead of assimilating it into th(=tth), and the st-sound instead of assimilating it into th(=tth): asti, nāsti, saṁśtuta, śīta, tīṣāṅki, anusṭiti, niśṭānāya; invariably retains the r-sound in the word saṃcata or saṃcatra and optionally in the word purva, while in savva, dv is assimilated into v(=ve); and shows a greater tendency to optionally retain the ra-stop: prāṇa, priya, saṃcatra, brāhmaṇa, sramaṇa, parākrama. The last characteristic, viz., the retention of r-stop has its vestiges in such Pāli words as yatra, tatra, atra, aṇṇatra, anuntra, bhadra, brāhmaṇa, gadrabha. In Pāli, we have sm and mh as two alternative forms, while in the Girnar language, we have the use of only one form, namely, mh: vijitamhi, apakaraṇamhi. The retention of the ya-stop is another point of agreement between the two languages: Girnar—katavya, vyanjanato, divyāni; Pāli—Sakya, vākyā, vyanjanato, saṁkhyaṭa.

This may suffice to convince the reader of the fact that the Pāli language was modelled on a western form of the Indian Prakritic dialect as typified by the language of the Girnar version of Aśoka's rock edicts. And if the language of our old Brāhmī inscriptions is found to be very nearly Pāli, we cannot, for that reason, be justified in thinking either that it was representative of a dialect, which was prevalent in the kingdom of Kaliṅga, or that the Pāli language was based upon the Kaliṅga dialect presupposed by it. Apart from other arguments advanced by other scholars against Prof. Oldenberg's view, we find that, unlike Aśoka's

edicts, our old Brāhmī inscriptions bear no proof of adaptation to local dialects. In many essential points, the language of our old Brāhmī inscriptions bears likeness to that of the Girnar version of Aśoka’s rock edicts. We can account for this likeness without resorting to Prof. Oldenberg’s hypothesis. The likeness might be simply due to the fact that our old Brāhmī inscriptions were drafted by a Jain recluse who came to live in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves from Gujrat, or that the Jain recluse who composed our old Brāhmī inscriptions was won over from the Buddhist faith and utilised his knowledge of the Pāli language. To render an adequate explanation for the Pāli diction, as well as for the exceptional cases of spelling and pronunciation, we see no better way than to presume that the old Brāhmī inscriptions, as we now have them, were a rendering in a kind of Girnar language or of Pāli from an original draft prepared by a Jain recluse in an eastern dialect presupposed by Ardha-Māgadhī or Jain Prakrit, and that this rendering was done by another Jain recluse in the course of rewriting it, the Jain recluse who was either born and brought up in the Girnar region or won over from the Buddhist faith having an opportunity of being conversant with a dialect similar to the Girnar language or with Pāli itself.

Whether or not the spoken dialect of the people of Kaliṅga was originally a Dravidian form of speech is a disputed question. But it seems certain that the language of our old Brāhmī inscriptions was not the spoken dialect of the people of Kaliṅga. The Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves where these inscriptions were engraved are situated in the heart of the Puri District of Orissa. The spoken dialect of the inhabitants of this District is now known as Oriyā. The spoken dialect of the people of Utkalavarṣa, the country of Utkala, was known to the outsiders, say to the cultured people in Magadha, as an unintelligible and uncouth jargon as might be inferred from the expression Ukkalāvassa-bhaṇṇā which has been used as a term of contempt in one of the passages of the Pāli Tipiṭaka.1 Buddhaghosoṣa, the Pāli commentator, has altogether missed the significance of this expression. He takes it to mean “two men of Utkala, Vassa and Bhaṇṇa by name.”2 This meaning is out of the question in the Pāli passage where, while speaking of the philosophers propounding

---

views contrary to his own, the Buddha has referred to them as Ukkala-
vassa-bhaṃṭa, that is, as persons speaking in terms of the unintelligible
and uncouth jargon of the country of Utkala.

Our old Brāhmī inscriptions' is a conventional language, which tended
to remain clear of Māgadhisms, the elements of eastern dialects.¹ Prof.
S. K. Chatterji rightly observes: "The Aryan language...came in the
wake of the North Indian religions, Brahmanism, Buddhism and Jainism,
and was used by royal patrons of these religions among Dravidians and
other non-Aryans, merely as a sort of religious language, in documents of
a religious, and often of an administrative character."²

We have sought to maintain that the Pāli language, too, tended to
remain clear of Māgadhisms. It is most astonishing that Prof. Bapat freely
admits attakāre, parakāre, sukhe, dukkhe, jīva-sattame, and the like to be
the genuine Pāli forms,³ forgetting that these Ardha-Māgadhisms are
clearly associated in the earliest Pāli texts, notably the Sāmaññaphala-
Sutta of the Āṭṭha-Nikāya, Vol. I, with the doctrines of such recluses
teachers as Pūrṇa-Kassapa, Pakudha-Kaceḍyana and Makkhali-Gosāla,
and that, as such, these are meant to have been put within inverted com-
mas as a means of being kept distinct from the Pāli forms, attakāro, para-
kāro, sukham, dukkham, and jīva-sattamo.⁴

It is interesting to observe how scholars after scholars have erred
on the wrong side in subsuming that all that is in Pāli is Pāli. The
spelling of Rēgirī as Isigili, met with in the title and body of the Pāli
Isigili-sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya, is cited by Prof. Lüders as a
notable instance of lingering old Māgadhism in Pāli, and no less as an
evidence in support of his theory about the rendering in the existing Pāli
canon of old Māgadhi texts in a western dialect. But what can be more
misleading than this? As we have sought to show elsewhere,⁵ the
usual Pāli name of the hill would have been Isigirī, and the Isigili form had

1. The word paḷihāṇī which occurs in Kāravela's inscription as an equivalent of the
Pāli palihāṇī or paḷighāṇī, and the Sk. paṇighāṇ, might be cited as an exception. But
the alternative Pāli spelling of paḷīgha as paḷīgha, met within the Vāsetṭha-Sutta, Sutta-
Nipāta, indicates that the case is not that of replacement of the ra-sound by the la-sound
but that of an inter-consonantal change effected through śa or ṭa.
4. See Barua's paper—The Āṭṭikās—in the Calcutta University Journal of the
to be adopted for a very special reason, meaning it to be put within inverted commas. The reason for adoption or retention of the spelling Isigili has been stated in the Sutta itself:

"Bhutapubbaṃ, Bhikkhave, pañca-Pacceka-buddha-satāni imasmiṃ Isigiliṃm pabbate ciraniśino ahesuṃ. Te imas pabbataṃ pavisaṇṭā dissanti, paviṭṭhā na dissanti. Tam enam manussa diṣṭā enam āhamsu: 'Ayam pabbato ime isi gilatēti Isigili,' Isigili tuvaṃ samaṇāna uḍapāḍi."!

"Formerly, O Bhikkhus, some five hundred Egotistic Buddhas (hermit teachers) came to live for ever (i.e., to cast off their bodies) in (the dark caverns of) this Isigili mountain. They could be seen entering (the caverns of) this mountain, and once they entered into the mountain, they could no longer be seen. Observing this strange happening, the people said: ‘This mountain swallows these sages,’ and hence arose the name of the hill—Isigili, ‘the swallower of sages.’"

The explanation offered by the Buddha enables us to understand that the real name of the mountain which was Ṛṣigiri or Isigiri, “the Mountain abode of the Hermits,” was locally pronounced as Isigili, and acquired a new association of ideas in the fanciful etymological derivation “Isi-gilatēti Isigili,” “the Hermit-swallower because it swallows the hermits,” and that this new association could not be embodied without coining such a longer name in Pāli as Isigili-giri = Ṛṣigili-giri, “the Hermit-swaller-mountain.”

As we have seen, the substitution of the Dental sonant aspirate for the Dental surd aspirate in such words as padha, radda, Goradhā, padhama, and Madhurā is a characteristic of the dialect presupposed by the language of our old Brāhmī inscriptions, that is to say, of the language of the supposed first draft. Among the later Prakrit dialects, the Śauraseni, the vernacular of the people of Śūrasena or Mathurā region, has alone been characterised by this kind of phonetic change in Vararuci’s Prākrit-Prakāśa, in the aphorism (XII. 3): “The Dental consonants ta and tha which are not the initials of any words and are not conjoined with other consonants change respectively into da and dha.”

One need not be astonished if the first draft of Khāravela’s inscription was prepared in the dialect of the Mathurā region by a Jain recluse who

was familiar with it. The two inscriptions discovered and published by Mr. Jackson in the Barābar Hills offer us an instance of the substitution of dha for tha. In the earlier inscription, the letter-forms of which are similar to those of Aśokan inscriptions, the name of the particular hill to which it is attached is recorded as Goradhagiri, while in the later inscription, the letter-forms of which are strikingly similar to those of Khāravela’s inscription, the name of the same hill has been recorded as Goradhagiri.

Mr. R. D. Banerji offers this explanation for the use of the spelling Goradhagiri in the second inscription: "The substitution of dha for tha shows that the second record was incised by an inhabitant of Southern India. It is quite possible that this record was incised by an inhabitant of Kaliṅga, probably one of the men who had accompanied Khāravela in his first campaign against the king of Magadha."

We find it difficult to agree with Mr. Banerji in thinking this kind of substitution was a peculiarity of the spoken dialect of the people of Kaliṅga in view of the fact that in none of Aśoka’s inscriptions in Kaliṅga we notice it. If it be true that the second record was actually incised by one of the men who had accompanied King Khāravela in his campaign against the people of Rājagaha, the fact may be explained differently. The author of the record might be a man who was brought up in Mathurā or the Mathurā region. Our explanation is more plausible on the ground that, according to the Hāthi-Gumphā record, Mathurā was used by King Khāravela as the military base in his campaign against the King of Aṅga-Magadha, and no less in his campaign against the kings of Uttarāpatha.

We may, on another ground, maintain that the presupposition of the language of the supposed first draft of Khāravela’s inscription was not the spoken dialect of the people of Kaliṅga. In Khāravela’s inscription, we have cavathe (I. 5) for the Pāli catuthe. We find that cāvudasa occurs in all the versions of Aśoka’s fifth Pillar Edict as a common spelling for catuddasa. The dialects of all the versions of Aśoka’s Pillar Edicts point, beyond any doubt, to the existence of a widely prevalent lingua franca, or language of the cultured laity as Professor Rhys Davids would like to

4. See for fuller discussion passim, under Geographical Allusions.
call it, in the third century B.C., in the Middle Country extending as far, say, as Kauśāmbi and Mathurā. It is apparent that the dialects of these Pillar Edicts are full of Māgadhisms. And if we go by the verdict of Vararuci, the predominant tendency of the Māgadhī dialects was Śaurasenī,¹ that is to say, of the dialect of the people of Mathurā.

Thus we are led to assume that the Udayagiri-Khaṇḍagiri caves in Orissa, Mathurā and Ujjjeni-Girinagara were the three important centres of Jainism during the reign of Khāravela, and that the language of Khāravela’s inscription is, so far as its grammatical forms go, the same as the dialect of the Girnar version of Aśoka’s Rock Edicts, and, so far as its sound system goes, a combination of the Girnar and Mathurā dialects.²

The substitution of dha for tha cannot be said to be a peculiarity of the Pāli language on the ground that in Pāli, too, we have Madhurā as a spelling for Mathurā, just in the same way that we have in it Isigili as a spelling for Isigiri, and Makkhādeva and Maghādeva as two spellings for Mahādeva. All these were locally current proper names retained in Pāli, and meant to be put within inverted commas, that is to say, to be kept distinct from the standard Pāli spellings. The spelling of the name Mādhava-Videha as Māthava-Videga occurring in the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa (I. 4. 1) is an apt parallel in Sanskrit literature. This spelling shows that the personal name Mādhava-Videha was locally pronounced, most probably by the inhabitants of Videha or Mithilā region, as Māthava-Videga.

We mean to say that the spelling Madhurā was not due to a Pāli rendering of the Sk. Mathurā,—that, in other words, Madhurā was a jana-pada-nirutti or deśi-nāma, that is to say, a locally current proper name, which found recognition in Pāli. In accordance with a significant statement made by the Buddha in the Araṇavibhanga-Sutta of the Majjhima-Nikāya (Vol. III, Part III), one locally current proper name, if it signifies an object for which it is intended, is as good as the other, and there is no sound reason for regarding one of them as more correct than the other. The importance of his statement lies also in the fact that it contains a reasonable explanation for the recognition of a particular form of the proper name not from any intrinsic superior value of its own but on account

¹ Vararuci’s Prākṛta-Prakāśa, XI.2: Prakṛtiḥ Śaurasenī.
² See Actes du Sixième Congrès International des Orientalistes, Part III, p. 140, where Bhagawanlal Indrajit remarks: “The whole inscription is in prose. Its language is Prakrit, different from the Lāṭ (Pillar) inscriptions of Aśoka, but resembling the old Maharāṣṭra Prakrit of the Western India cave inscriptions.” This characterisation is too general to need comments.
of local adaptation. We quote below his statement in extenso to enable
the reader to judge for himself what it is and what it implies:

Janapada-niruttinā nābhīnīveseyya, samaññānaṁ nātīdhāveyyāti—iti kho
pana etam vuttam. Kiṁ c'etaṁ paţicca vuttam? Kathā ca, Bhikkhave,
janapada-niruttitiya ca abhiniveso hoti samaññāya ca atisāro? Idha, Bhik-
khave, tad ev a' ekaccēsu janapadesu 'Pātīti saññājanti, 'Pattan'iti, 'Vithtan'
iti, 'Sarāvan'iti, 'Dhāropan'iti, 'Pōnan'iti, 'Pīsilan'iti saññājanti. Iti yathā
yathā naṁ tesaṁ tesaṁ janapadesu saññājanti tatha tathā thāmasā paŗāmassa
abhinivissa voharati: "Idam eva saccaṁ, mogham aññān" ti. Evam kho,
Bhikkhave, janapada-niruttiyā ca abhiniveso hoti samaññāya ca atisāro.3
Kathā ca, Bhikkhave, janapada-niruttiyā ca anabhiniveso hoti sam-
āññāya ca anatisāro? Idha. Bhikkhave, tad ev a' ekaccēsu janapadesu
'Pātīti saññājanti, 'Pattan'iti, 'Vithtan'iti, 'Sarāvan'iti, 'Dhāropan'iti,
'Pōnan'iti, 'Pīsilan'iti saññājanti. Iti yathā yathā naṁ tesaṁ tesaṁ janapa-
desu saññājanti "Idam kira me āyasmanato sandhāya voharanti" ti tathā
tathā voharati aparāmasanā.4 Evam kho, Bhikkhave, janapada-niruttiyā
anabhiniveso hoti samaññāya ca anatisāro. Janapada-niruttinā nābhīni-
veseyya, samaññānaṁ nātīdhāveyyāti—iti yaṁ taṁ vuttam idam etam
paţicca vuttam.

"The local form of a proper name is not to be dogmatically adhered
to, the local designation is not to be pressed too far." Such is the rule as
stated. For what reason is the rule so stated? And how is it, O Bhik-
khus, that a man becomes inclined to dogmatically adhere to the local
form of a proper name, and to press the local designation too far? Here,
O Bhikkhus, it so happens that in some locality a utensil is known by the
name of Pātī, in some by the name of Patta, in some by the name of Vithora,
in some by the name of Sarāva, in some by the name of Dhāropa, and in some by the name of Pīsa. The
inhabitant of a particular locality having strongly embraced and dogmat-
cally adhered to a particular form of the proper name whereby the utensil

yec a bhājanām.
esa, evam evadhi" ti abhinivissa voharati.
bhājanām 'Pāti'i vuccati, ime pana naṁ 'Pattan'iti vadanti. Tato pathhāya janapada-
vocharaṁ muṇcetio pattaṁ 'Pattan' tesa aparāmasanto voharati.
is known in this or that locality, boastfully says: 'This is the only correct form, and the others are incorrect.' Thus it is, O Bhikkhus, that a man becomes inclined to dogmatically adhere to the local form of a proper name, and to press the local designation too far. How is it, O Bhikkhus, that a man does not become inclined to dogmatically adhere to the local form of a proper name, and to press the local designation too far? Here, O Bhikkhus, it so happens that a utensil is known by different proper names in different localities, in some by the name of Pāṭi, in some by the name of Patta, and so on and so forth. The inhabitant of one locality, when he is in another locality, realising 'that the gentlemen of the second locality conventionally use this form of the proper name to designate this object,' wisely use that particular form whereby the object is known in that particular locality without any local attachment (that is, abandoning the form whereby the object is known in his own locality). Thus it is, O Bhikkhus, that a man does not become inclined to dogmatically adhere to the local form of a proper name, and to press the local designation too far. It is for this reason that the rule is so stated as: 'The local form of a proper name is not to be dogmatically adhered to,—the local designation is not to be pressed too far.'

1. Here we have refrained from introducing a discussion as to the origin and antiquity of Pāli language, reserving it for a separate monograph. But it is our decided opinion that a conclusion about the antiquity of Pāli drawn from the similarity observed between it and the language of Khāravela's inscription is bound to be a dogmatism and dangerous presumption. Truman Michelson's paper on 'Māgarisms in the Language of the Girnar, Shabzagarhi and Mansurra Inscriptions' (American Journal of Philology, 1909, pp. 234 ff., and JAOS, 1909, I, pp. 77 ff.) will receive full attention in the proposed monograph.
7. THE STYLE

Our old Brāhmi inscriptions are all written in prose, a rhythmic prose abounding in alliterations, elegant expressions, and balanced sentences, clauses and phrases. In reading these inscriptions, especially those which stand in the names of King Khāravela and his chief-queen, one cannot but be tempted to make out verses in them. We venture to say that all attempts made in this direction are destined to end in failure. Their diction is metrical prose without revealing the actual process of versification. In reading out the inscription of Khāravela one is apt to feel as though one were chanting verses in marked cadences, the invocation formula in a variety of Kumāra-Lalita metre, and the main text in a kind of Simphavikīṭā.

Scan the invocation formula as carefully as you may, you cannot confidently class it as a metrical composition in any of the known metres, and yet your inclination will all along beto trace in it a process of versification in the Kumāra-Lalita metre. The fact is that the desire to produce a complete rhythmic effect has led the composer to balance up the groups of sounds in successive sentences, clauses or phrases, inducing a tendency to versification within a prose construction. So far as its greater rhythmic effect goes, the insessional formula || Namo arihamtāvan || Namo savasidhāvan || shows an improvement upon an earlier Jain formula || Namo arihamtāvan || Namo sidhāvan || which seems to linger in the later full-fledged Jain formula || Namo arihamtāvan || Namo sidhāvan || Namo āgariyāvan || Namo uvajhāgāvan || Namo loe saarva-sāhūvan || quoted on p. 8 (ante). Comparing the insessional formula with the later Jain formula, we detect that after the monotonous repetition of four similar clauses, the latter is closed with a clause || Namo loe saarva-sāhūvan || constructed so as to maintain the rhythm of the whole, and that, in this final clause, one has a two-syllabic word in addition to those contained in the second clause of the former. In the formula consisting of two clauses, the insertion of one two-syllabic word suffices for the purpose, while in the formula consisting of five clauses, the insertion of an additional word is needed.

I. Insessional formula—
|| Namo arihamtāvan || Namo savasidhāvan ||

II. Later Jain Formula—
|| Namo arihamtāvan || Namo sidhāvan || Namo ājariyāvan ||
|| Namo uvajhāgāvan || Namo loe saarva-sāhūvan ||
NOTES

A similar Buddhist formula of invocation consisting of three clauses can be traced in the Peṭakōpadesa which is one of the extra-canonical works presupposed by Buddhaghosā's Atthasāli, and probably also by the Milindapañha.

III. Buddhist Formula in the Peṭakōpadesa—

|| Namo sammāsambuddhānam || Paramatthadassīnām ||
|| Sīlādīvya-pāramippattānām ||

In the Buddhist formula, the first two clauses joined together read like a line of a verse, while the third clause shows that the composition is yet rhythmic prose. The real character of the composition will be manifest if we supply the omissions and read it as follows: —

|| Namo sammāsambudihānam || [Namo] paramatthadassīnām ||
|| [Namo] sīlādīvya-pāramippattānām ||

Coming to the main text of Khāravela's inscription, we find that the effect of rhythm is heightened by a mathematical progression of the volumes of sound, and that the main statement commences from the point where the climax is reached. In such a text as this the verbs are bound to be sparingly used, and a rhyming process is bound to play its part as will be evident from the following quotation: —


The rhyming process plays its part also in a sentence consisting of several clauses, each with a separate verb: —

1. (2)—pākāra-nivesamaṇi paṭisaṃkhūrayati || tadāgapaḍīyo ca bama-dhāpayati || savyūṇa-patisaṃṭhāpanaṇi ca kūrayati || pakatiyo ca ram-jayati ||

In the text of the inscription of Khāravela's chief queen, the same verb is repeated for the sake of rhythm and emphasis: —

II—|| Arahantapāśadāyaṃ Kaliṅgānāma saṃpañnam leṇam kūra-tāṃ || rājino Lālākasa Hathiśhasa papotasa dhiṭunā Kaliṅgacakavatino siri-Khāravelasa āga-mahisinā kūritaṃ ||

The rhythm is sought to be maintained even in such a short inscription as that of Kamma and Khīṇā: —

VII—|| Kammasa koṭhā ca || Khīṇāya ca pasādo ||
For the sake of rhythm the words are left as they are without being joined according to the rules of Sandhi, e.g., guna-upetena (I. 1), and tivasatsu-oghāṭitam (I. 6).1

So far as these peculiarities are concerned, our old Brāhmī inscriptions clearly anticipate the Pāli prose style of the Milindapañha, another of the extra-canonical works presupposed by Buddhaghosa’s commentaries, which, even according to the tradition embodied in it, was not composed within the first five centuries of Buddha’s demise. And so far as these peculiarities are concerned, there is nothing save a few long-drawn compounds within the four corners of the Pāli Tipiṭaka to anticipate the prose style of our old Brāhmī inscriptions. The Milinda descriptions of the city of Sāgala and the earthquake signalising the memorable character of Vessantara’s charity, quoted below, will, we believe, show how close is the resemblance of its prose style with that of Kharavela’s inscription, in spite of the fact that the prose style of the latter has not, as yet, attained the maturity of the prose style of the former:—

I. Description of Sāgala—

Atthi Yonakānaṁ nānāpuṭahedanaṁ Sāgalaṁ nāma nagaraṁ nadi-pabbata-sobhitam ramaṇīya-bhūmipadesabhāgam ārūm-uyyānāpavana-taḷāka-pokkharāṇi-sampannaṁ nadi-pabbata-vana-rāmaṇeyyakaṁ, etc.

II. Description of the Earthquake—

Hetthā mahāvattā saṅcalanti, saṅikaṁ saṅikaṁ sakim sakim ṛkulaṅkula vāyanti, onamanti unnamanti vinamanti, sinappattā pādappā papatanti, gumbagumbam valāhakā sandhāvanti,...rudanti yakkhā appesakkhā, hasanti yakkhā mahesakkhā kampamānāya mahāpatthavīyā.

Our old Brāhmī inscriptions’ is not the prose style of the Pāli Tipiṭaka, nor that of earlier portions of the Jaina Āgama, nor that of the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas, older Upaniṣads, Kalpa-Sūtras, Niruktas and Prāti-sākhya. So far as their prose style goes, they stand out, in point of time, as a notable landmark in the literary history of India. Just as with reference to the accidental unconscious beginning and maturer development of the style of Kāvyā poetry Aśvaghoṣa’s Buddha-Carita stands midway between

the Prologue of the Pāli Nālaka-Sutta as found in the Sutta-Nipāta on one side and Kālidāsa’s Kumāra-Sambhava on the other, so with reference to the accidental unconscious beginning and maturer development of the rhythmical prose style, our old Brāhma inscriptions represent a link of transition between some of Pāli set formulas of Buddhist precepts and the Milinda’s descriptions of the city of Sāgala and the earthquake. The Pāli formulas representing an accidental unconscious beginning of the prose style of Khāravela’s inscription are being quoted below:—

I. Pāli Formulas of Buddhist Precepts——

(a) Nacca-gītā-vādita-visūka-dassanā-veramaṇī

[Vinaya Mahāvagga]

Nacca-gītā-vādita-visūka-dassanā-veramaṇi-sikkhāpadaṁ

[Khuddaka-Pāṭha]

Nacca-gītā-vādita-visūka-dassanā-veramaṇi-sikkhāpadaṁ samādiyāmi

[Khuddaka-Pāṭha-Comy.]

(b) mālā-gandha-vilepana-dhāraṇa-maṇḍana-vibhūsana-tṭhānā veramaṇī

[Vinaya Mahāvagga]

mālā-gandha-vilepana-dhāraṇa-maṇḍana-vibhūsana-tṭhānā-veramaṇi-sikkhāpadaṁ

[Khuddaka-Pāṭha]

mālā-gandha-vilepana-dhāraṇa-maṇḍana-vibhūsana-tṭhānā-veramaṇi-sikkhāpadaṁ samādiyāmi

[Khuddaka-Pāṭha-Comy.]

1. We mean that the Sutta-Nipāta contains one of the two versions of the discourse in Indian languages, the other version being found in the Mahāvastu, III, pp. 386-87. If Dhammananda Kosambi’s identification be correct, as we believe it is, this is the very discourse which was recommended for study by King Akoṭa in his Bhābru Edict under the title “Moneya-Sute.” The verses of the Prologue appear to be a supergrowth and later addition. As to the relation between the Pāli Prologue and the Buddhacarita, the following quotations will suffice:—

(a) Pāli Prologue——

Dadāliyamāṇi sīriyā anomačyamāṇi
dassesi puttaṁ Asitaḥcaxa Sassya.

Dīva kumāraṃ sikhim iha paṭjalantam
tūrtamanaṃ ca nabhāsyaṃ naiva vissuddham.

(b) Buddha-Carita, III, 23 :—

Drōṭṭā ca taṁ rājasutam sīriyastā jājevyamāṇaṁ ca vupūṣā sīriyā ca.
II. Khāravela's Inscription—

I. 4—Dampa-nata-gīta-vādita-saṁdasaṁaṁ kiḍāpayati nagarimā.
I. 7—Sava-kara-vana-anugaha-anekāni-saṭa-sahasāni visajati pora-jānapadām.

Striking, indeed, is the resemblance in respect of the prose style and letter-forms which exists between the Barhut inscriptions attached as labels to two companion scenes depicting one of the Buddha-legends presupposed by those in the Lalita-Vistara\(^1\) and the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription of King Khāravela, although the latter shows a maturer development:

I. Barhut Inscriptions—

(a) Utaram disa tini savata-nisisāni.
    Dakhinaṁ disa cha-kāmāvacara-sahasāni.
(b) Sādikaraṁmadam turaṁ devānām.

II. Hāthi-Gumphā Inscription—

(a) I. 8—Ṣālakaniṁ pachima-disāṁ haya-gaja-nara-radha-bahulaṁ
damāṇāṁ.
(b) I. 12—Anupadabhavanāṁ ca terasa-vesa-satu-kataṁ bhidati
tamiradaṁ-samghūtāṁ.

---

\(^1\) Cunningham's Stūpa of Bharhut, Pl. XIV, S. Gate. Prasenajit Pillar, Middle and Lower Bas-Reliefs. The point is discussed by the author in the Buddhist India, a Buddhist Quarterly edited by Barua and Dharmaṣtrya, Vol. I, No. 3.
8. THE CONTENTS

The contents of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription entitle it to a unique position. Among the remaining inscriptions, No. XV contains, as we saw, a table of Brāhmī alphabet and the rest are short epigraphs to label the caves to which they are attached, or to which they are intended to refer, with records commemorating the names of their excavators or builders, that is to say, of their donors. In two instances (Nos. II and XIII), the records expressly mention the class of persons for whom the caves are built,—the donee to whom the caves are meant to be dedicated. In so far as these records commemorate the names of the donors and the donee, they remind us of the Barābar Hill Cave inscriptions of King Aśoka and of the Nāgarjuni Hill Cave inscriptions of King Daśaratha. And in so far as these records stand without the expression dāna or dina signifying the act of dedication, and emphasize the excavation or building work in the verbal expression kārita, they remind us of the Rummindei Pillar inscription of King Aśoka and the Barhut E. Gateway inscription of King Dhanabhūti. But in the majority of the cases the inscriptions are so worded as to indicate that the caves are intended to bear the names of their excavators,—to be known as the caves of so and so, of King Kadampa-Kudeda, of Prince Vaḍukha-Varikha and the like.

The reader will entirely misjudge to differentiate the bulk of the remaining inscriptions from Nos. II and XIV on the ground that they commemorate the names of the excavators or builders of the caves but not those of the persons for whom the caves are excavated or built. We would say that the mention of the persons for whom the caves are excavated or built is unnecessary in these inscriptions. The fact that these caves are all meant for the residence of the recluse in Kaliṣga (Kāliṅgaṇarāja samapā-nah) is implied in each one of these inscriptions. For reading with reference to the context supplied in the Hāthi-Gumpha record of Khāravela’s thirteenth regnal year, we find that all of the 117 caves are meant to serve as kāya-nisidhi or resting places of the Arhats who happen to dwell on the Kumārī hill (Kumārī-pavate Arahato parinivasato hi kāya-nisidhiyāya).

It is not only for finding out the context of the remaining inscriptions and for understanding the specific purpose of the 117 caves excavated during the thirteenth year of Khāravela’s reign that one is to turn one’s attention to the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription. One has to read the last-mentioned
inscription as well for a general record of all the architectural constructions done during Kharavela's reign and under his auspices. This is again not all. This inscription presents a systematic record of all the notable achievements of Kharavela, including all the works of art and architecture done under his auspices. And this, too, will be but an imperfect and inaccurate characterisation of the contents of this inscription.

The Hathi-Gumphā inscription appears to be a systematic record of Kharavela's personal history and successive achievements. The recorded facts are presented in the garb of an autobiographical sketch. The concluding paragraph is so designed as to make the record appear as closed with the name of King Kharavela-siri, that is, to create the impression that the record is written and signed by the king with his own hand. The invocation formula with which the record begins is meant to indicate the nature of the religious faith of the king.

The opening statement contains a succinct account of how King Kharavela spent the first twenty-four years of his life, the first fifteen years as a young prince and the remaining nine years as a crown-prince, previous to his installation in the throne of Kalinga, which took place after he had completed his twenty-fourth year. Here certain relevant details are given as to the physical features and other kingly qualities of Kharavela, the name of the royal family of which he was the scion, and the useful sciences and arts in which he acquired proficiency.

This is followed by the first year's record containing an account of how, in the very first year of his reign, King Kharavela undertaken to repair the capital of Kalinga, and to do all in order to please his subjects. The record expressly mentions the large amount of money spent by the king to do this work.

The second year's record contains an account of how the king, in the second year of his reign, defied King Satakarni in marching towards the western quarter with a large army to attack the city of Asvaka or Rāšika.

The third year's record contains an account of how the king, in the third year of his reign, entertained the city of Kalinga with musical performances and general feasts and festivities.

The fourth year's record contains an account of how the king, in the fourth year of his reign, consolidated his rule in Arakatapura or some other place which was inhabited by the Vidyādharas, an aboriginal race of men.

The fifth year's record contains an account of how the king, in the fifth year of his reign, facilitated communication by effecting an extension
of the old canal opened out by King Nanda so as to lead it into the capital city from the Tanasuliya or Tanasuli road. This record indefinitely hints at the amount of money spent for the purpose.

The sixth year's record contains an account of how the king, in the sixth year of his reign, showed unprecedented favours to inhabitants of the towns and districts by remitting all taxes and duties.

The seventh year's record contains an account of how the king, in the seventh year of his reign, performed all the ceremonies of victory as a public demonstration of his royal pomp and power.

The eighth year's record contains an account of how the king, in the eighth year of his reign, after having killed or stormed Gorathagiri, brought a heavy pressure to be brought upon the people of Rājagṛha and effected a timely retreat to Mathurā in order to relieve his troops terrified by the uproar of counter-attacks, and sumptuously feasted, in Mathurā as well as in Kaliṅga, all sections of people, those who kept to household life or those who turned ascetics, those who belonged to the Brahmanical orders or those who belonged to other religious orders. This record, too, mentions the large amount of money spent for the purpose.

The ninth year's record contains an account of how the king, in the ninth year of his reign, undertook to build a magnificent royal palace known by the name of "Great-Victory-Palace." This record expressly mentions the large amount of money spent for carrying out the project.

The tenth year's record contains an account of how the king, in the tenth year of his reign, paid proper homage to the memory of the former kings of Kaliṅga at the cost of a large amount of money.

The eleventh year's record contains an account of how the king, in the eleventh year of his reign, reclaimed and rehabilitated Prthudaka, founded by the former kings of Kaliṅga, by arranging to drive out its watery jungle of grass into the Lāṅgala river.

The twelfth year's record contains an account of how the king, in the twelfth year of his reign, terrorised the rulers of Uttarāpatha, subdued Bṛhaspatimitra, the king of Magadha, forced the inhabitants of Aṅga and Magadha into submission, brought back the throne of Jina from Aṅga-Magadha to Kaliṅga, and made improvements of the capital city by opening new roads and squares and adding gate-bars, gate-houses and towers. This record also contains an account of how the Vāsukis and the king of Pāṇḍya sent valuable presents to Khāravela.

The thirteenth year's record contains an account of how the king, in the thirteenth year of his reign, completed the excavation of 117 caves
under joint auspices of himself, his queens and others on the Kumārī hill for the resting of resident Jain saints.

The fourteenth year's record contains an account of how the king, in the fourteenth year of his reign, excavated a special cave for the residence of the recluse, ascetics and hermits from all quarters, caused stone-pillars and shrines to be made with stone-slabs quarried out of best quarries, and set up ornamented pillars in beryl chambers at the cost of a huge sum of money.

The concluding paragraph which is but a long string of nicely worded and choicest adjectives heaped upon the name of King Khāravela-siri is evidently a literary device to represent the sovran lord of Kaliṅga as the noblest type of kingly personality and the greatest and best of earthly warrior heroes. He is styled Khemarāja, the Lord of Security. He is styled Vadharāja, the Lord of Prosperity. He is styled Īndarāja, the Lord of Kingly Power. He is styled Dhammarāja, the Lord of Justice. He is represented as a person who had the ripeness of understanding and judgment of the nature of what is conducive to human welfare. He is represented as a person gifted with special qualities; as one who honoured all sects and denominations; and as one who repaired all religious temples. He is represented as a descendant of a family of royal sages. He is represented as a great conqueror. He is represented as a most powerful king who maintained the prestige of his illustrious predecessors, who had the ability to protect his kingdom, and who secured services of the ablest and fearless ministers and officers. The Pāli Upāli-Sutta in the Majjhima-Nikāya goes to show that this mode of praising the acknowledged high personality or this exaggerated mode of hero-worship was Jaina, as will be evident from the following quotation:

The householder Upāli who happened to be formerly a Jain by faith is represented as saying to Nigaṇṭha-Nāṭaputta, the historical founder of Jainism, in praise of the Buddha in whom he subsequently took refuge:

Dhṛrassa vigatamohassā pabhinnā-khilassā vijita-vijayassā
anighassā susamacittassā vuddhaslassā sādhupaññassā
vessantarassā vimalassā Bhagavato tassa sāvako’ham asmi
g * * *
Taṇhacchidassā buddhassā vītadhummassā anupalittassā
āshuneyyassā yakkhassā uttampuggalassā atulassā
mahato yasaggappattassā Bhagavato tassa sāvako’ham asmi

It is interesting indeed that most of the high-sounding adjectives in the Hāthi-Gumphā record are to be found in Upāli’s eulogium of the Buddha: khemarāja = khemāṅkarṣa; vadhārāja = vuddasīla; imbārāja = purindada sokka; dhammarāja = dhammatthā; mahāvijaya = vijitavijaya; apatihata-caka-vāhana-bala = appatiśripuṭala; rājisi-vamsa-kula-vinirutta = inisattama; gupṣa-visesa-kusala = visāradanipuṇa; parasuṇa ānubha-vanta kalāṇī = satimā vipassī vidiśaveda.

The concluding paragraph clearly brings out the fact that Khāravela’s autobiographical epigraph was composed for him by a skilled composer, to whom the task of composition was entrusted. The composition must have received the warm approval of His Majesty before it was incised on the rock and set up on a hanging brow wherefrom it might attract the visitors and pilgrims of the Kumāri hill. Thus in one important respect the Hāthi-Gumphā record of Khāravela differs from the edicts of Aśoka, and the Dialogues of the Buddha, namely, that in it one misses the personal touches of the personage in whose name it stands. Both the edicts of Aśoka and the Dialogues of the Buddha make one feel as though their texts were written to dictate by some reporters and were afterwards edited by certain agents with slight changes here and there, either in the sound-system or in the expressions, the general method of the editorial agents having consisted in (1) the use of Devānampiyē Piyadāsi Lājā hevaṃ āha or a similar set clause as a literary device for paragogic divisions; and (2) the conversion of a direct narration into an indirect one by substituting Devānampiyē for lājā, Devānampiyēna Piyadāsinā lājinā for me, mayā and manayā, and Devānampiyēsa piyadāsinō lājino for me and māma, precisely in the same way as in the Dialogues of the Buddha Tathāgato is substituted for aham, Tathāgatena for me, mayā, and Tathāgatassa for me, māma.

The Artha-Śāstra of Kauṭalya-Kauṭilya (II. 10, 31) prescribes certain rules of composition to be observed in drafting the royal writs. It specifies the principal qualities and defects of composition and handwriting. In accordance with the prescription in the Artha-Śāstra, the defect of composition (lekha-dosa) consists in (1) vyāghata—irrelevancy; (2) punaruktam—repetition; (3) apaśabda—non-grammatical and unidiomatic use of words and expressions; and (4) samplava—irregularity. According to the same authority, the qualities of composition (lekha-guṇa) consist in (1) arthakrama—the maintenance of syntactical order and logical sequence; (2) sambandha—consistency of meaning; (3) pari-purṇalā—sufficiency; (4) mādhurya—elegance or exquisiteness; (5)
audārya—refinement or propriety; and (6) sparśatva—lucidity or expressiveness. The fourteenth rock edict of Aśoka goes to show that, as early as the third century B.C., the Maurya emperor was aware of these merits and defects, at least of the fact that repetition was a defect of composition in a royal writ which might be excused only if it was needed for emphasis and elegance.

Explanations were required for repetitions and certain omissions, errors and irregularities in the edicts of Aśoka. But as regards Khāravela’s inscription, the composition of its text is free from all the defects mentioned above and is bright with the required qualities.
9. THE RELATIVE CHRONOLOGICAL POSITION

The Hāthi-Gumpha inscription was heretofore judged as an epigraph, the final record of which did not extend beyond the thirteenth year of Khāravela’s reign. But a weighty reason has now been found compelling us to believe that its final record extends beyond the thirteenth year, though by no means beyond the fourteenth. Its record of the thirteenth year opening with the words Terasame ca vase begins in the middle of the left half of l. 14 and continues to the end of the same. This particular record cannot be said to run as far as l. 15, nay, to extend as far as the left three-fourths of the total length of l. 16 as previously supposed. The thirteenth year’s record in l. 14 contains a statement about the construction of 117 caves on the Kumārī hill, the twin-hills of Udayagiri and Khandagiri, a joint work of Khāravela and others, while the record in l. 15 and l. 16 contains a statement about some costly works of art and architecture done by Khāravela himself on the defilement of the mountain, in the proximity of the resting place of the Jain saints. Further, the thirteenth year’s record in l. 14 presents a grammatical construction in Passive Voice, while the record in l. 15 and l. 16 presents a construction in Active Voice.

1. L 14—Terasame ca vase......salada-sa-lepa-salam kārāpitaṃ.
2. L 15 and 16 kārayati......patiṭhāpayati...upādayati.

If the foregoing reasoning be sound, there is little doubt that the final record of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription extends as far as and not beyond the fourteenth year of Khāravela’s reign. And in the absence of anything to prove the contrary, there is little difficulty in representing the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription as an epigraph, which was incised or put up in Khāravela’s fourteenth regnal year. That is to say, this inscription was set up on a hanging brow of rock on the Udayagiri hill, in front of the Hāthi-Gumpha, about a year after the excavation of 117 caves with their inscriptions and architectural constructions.

In accordance with the thirteenth year’s record, some out of 117 caves were excavated by Khāravela’s queens, some by his sons, some by his relatives, some by his brothers, some by the royal servants, and the rest by himself. Going by this statement, we cannot help thinking that the caves and inscriptions standing in the name of Khāravela’s chief queen, of King Kadampa-Kudepa, of Prince Vajukha-Varikha, of the Town-judge Bhūti, of the menial Kusuma, and of others were works, which were
commenced and finished in Khāravela's thirteenth regal year. If so, is it correct to argue on the peculiarity of certain exceptional letter-forms and to draw such a conclusion therefrom as that one among the fifteen old Brāhmī inscriptions containing an exceptional letter-form reminding us of one in the inscriptions of Aśoka is earlier by a century than the other? Will it be correct, for instance, to say with Mr. R. D. Banerji that inasmuch as in the inscription of Prince Vajukha-Varikha (No. IV), the u-sign is quite distinct, though very small in size, and the letter kha "has neither a triangle nor a circle at its base," the inscription itself is anterior to that of King Kadampa-Kudepa (No. III)? We may venture to think that Mr. Banerji can no longer maintain his position, and that he will be prepared to appreciate the force of our argument pressed in favour of accepting the inscriptions standing in the names of Khāravela's chief queen, King Kadampa-Kudepa, Prince Vajukha-Varikha, and the rest as [contemporary votive records, the records incised in Khāravela's thirteenth regal year.
10. THE ŠLOKAS CONCERNING KING AIRA OF UTKALA

Mr. Jayaswal's search for light from literature on the history of Khāravela has proved a success, at least, in so far as it has enabled him to obtain a few Sanskrit šlokas from an Orīyā MS., which is lying unedited in the archives of the Indian Museum, Calcutta. These are seven in number, and the MS. itself, though described as "old," may, in the opinion of experts, be safely assigned to the 16th century A.D., and can by no means be dated earlier than the 14th century. The šlokas, as cited by him in JBORS, 1917, p. 482, and reproduced by Dr. Sten Konow in Acta Orientalia, Vol. I, read as follows:—

MS. LEAF B (OVERSE)

1. Ahiro nāma rājābhūt cōtkale vidyate purā
   abhimśā-dharmamāśṛtya Buddha-dharma-parāyaṇah 

2. Nandarāja suvikhyātaḥ Magadhe vidyate tadā
   sākāra-pāsako Nandah Veda-dharma-parāyaṇah

3. Nandasya sāhito yuddhe Airo jītavān bhavet
   Airo jayam āpnoti mahāhrṣṭena mānasah

4. Svadharma cōtkale khyātiḥ Veda-dharma-vināśakaḥ
   Aśokasya mahāmittraḥ Airaḥ Utkaleśvarah

5. Eka-prastara-khaṇḍe tu purāṇaḥ parvatottamaḥ
   Khaṇḍagiriśī nāmaśan pavitra cōtkale bhuvi

6. Nivāsa-karaṇaṛthāya daiva-bāṇī tu prāptavān
   "Asmin nivasatu rājan yāvat tiṣṭhāti medini
   tāvat kālasu paryyantaḥ tava kiritthiḥ virājate"

7. Daiva-bāṇī śrute Airaḥ harsa-nirbhara-mānasah
   Kosalā-nagaram tyaktyā Khaṇḍaśaila-samipatū

The substance of the verses, as made out by Mr. Jayaswal, is as follows:—

"(a) That Kaliṅga had been conquered by the kings of Magadha, and that it was liberated by one Aira (king) who defeated a Nanda king of Magadha.

(b) That the Nandas were Vedic, orthodox Hindus; and the Aira was heterodox (Jaina or Buddhist).

(c) That the Aira was a great enemy of Aśoka."
(d) That the former capital of the Aira was Kosalā (South Kosala), and that the Aira removed his capital to the Khandagiri at 'Ekaprastara' spot."

We have nothing to say against or to add to Mr. Jayaswal’s fourth point. But his first three points are misleading, and need correction.

As to his first point, we find in the verses no indication whatsoever of Kalinga having been conquered by the kings of Magadha and liberated afterwards by King Aira. The implication of the verses obviously is that King Nanda of Magadha who tried either to conquer Utkala or appeared as a rival in his attempt to conquer some other country, was defeated by King Aira of Utkala in a battle.

As to his second point, what the verses state is that King Nanda of Magadha who was defeated by King Aira of Utkala in a battle, which ensued between them, was an adherent of the Vedic system. The verses are reticent about the religion of other Nanda kings of Magadha.

As to his third point, it does not appear from the verses that King Aira of Utkala was a great enemy of Aśoka. Rather as a destroyer of Vedic religion and a promoter of his own faith, which was non-Vedic or anti-Vedic, he bore comparison with King Aśoka, and the greater probability is that by mahanāmitra, as pointed out by Dr. Sten Konow, the verses were intended to represent King Aira as "a great friend of Aśoka."

In the inscriptions No. 1 and No. 3, Aira occurs as one of the distinctive royal titles prefixed, in the same manner, to the names of both Kharavela and Kadampa-Kudapa, the remaining titles being Mahārāja, Mahāmeghavāhana and Kaliṇgpāhipati. Seeing that both Kharavela and Kadampa, two kings of one and the same dynasty, bore these titles in common, especially the epithet Aira, it may be surmised that Aira was a hereditary royal title or epithet of all the kings of this dynasty reigning in Kaliṇga, in the same way that Brahmadatta was a hereditary royal title or epithet of all the kings of a particular dynasty reigning in Benares. But we are unable to see how such a surmise as made by Mr. Jayaswal could reasonably be made from the Sanskrit verses in the applauded Oriya MS. In support of this surmise, he argues, saying, "It is apparent that the Aira, who lived from the time of Nanda up to Aśoka could not have been one and the same Aira. Aira therefore indicates a series of kings."

This argument of his, the force of which has freely been acknowledged by Dr. Sten Konow, is, in our opinion, unconvincing. For, in the first place, from the quoted verses, it is not at all clear that King Nanda of Magadha, referred to therein, was a pre-Mauryan Nanda king. And,
secondly, in describing King Aira of Utkala as a mahamitra (great-friend) of Asoka, the intention of the author of the verses does not appear to be to say that he was also a contemporary of the latter. The purport of the verses seems to be to the effect that in so far as King Aira of Utkala was a destroyer of Vedie religion and promoter of his own faith, which was non-Vedie or anti-Vedic, he deserved, in the opinion of the author of the verses, to be described as “a great friend of Asoka.”

As to the genuineness of two traditions embodied in the Sanskrit verses—(1) that King Aira of Utkala removed his capital from the Kosala-city to the Ekaprastra-tract around the Khajagiri hill in Utkala, and (2) that the former capital of King Aira, who was a contemporary and victorious rival of King Nanda of Magadha, was in Kosala or South Kosala—Mr. Jayaswal has urged two separate arguments, which are as follows:—

(1) That the capital of Kaliṅga before Asoka and after the Nandas is called Parthali (by Megasthenes) which corresponds with the Prastara of the Sanskrit verses, the Parthali which, by its location in the Khajagiri, seems to have been identical with Dhauuli (Toṣali).

(2) That, according to the Purāṇas, amongst the local dynasties which arose during the Andhra-period, there was:—

(a) the dynasty of Kosala (South Kosala, which, as described in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, adjoined Udra or Orissa, and, as described by Hwen Thsang, adjoined Kaliṅga to the north-west and above the Andhra country);

(b) who were commonly known as the Meghas, Megha having been a shortened form of Meghavāhana;

(c) who were very “powerful” and “wise”; and

(d) whose kings were nine in number.¹

It is possible that Megha was a shortened form of Meghavāhana or Mahāmeghavāhana. It is not impossible that nine kings of the Megha or Meghavāhana dynasty, including Khāravela and Kadampa-Kudepa, reigned in Kaliṅga during the Andhra-period of Indian history. But there is

¹. Kosalāyam tu rājāno bhaviṣyanti mahābalaḥ

"Meghā" iti samākhyāta buddhimanto navaiva tu
nothing in the inscription of Khārvela and Kadampa-Kudepa to corroborate the tradition that the Mahāmeghavāhana kings of Kaliṅga removed their capital from Kosala to Ekapрастara-tract.

It might be, if the information supplied in the Indika of Megasthenes be at all reliable, that Parθhalis corresponding with Ekapрастara of the verses, was the capital of Kaliṅga before the reign of Aśoka. But there is nothing in the Indika of the Greek ambassador to the court of Chandra-gupta to indicate that Parthali was the capital of Kaliṅga when King AIRA of Utkala was its lord. The occurrence of the name of the hill as Khana-giri is enough to show that, whatever the source, the tradition is of a late origin. Mr. R. D. Banerji has conclusively proved by the evidence of the inscription of Udyotakeśari that the ancient name of the Khana-giri hill, up to the 10th or 11th century A.D., was Kumāra-parvata, the expression embodying the name of the hill being Śri-Kumāraparvata-sthāne. It is for Mr. Jayaswal to say when the name of the sacred hill changed into Khana-giri or Khana-śaila.

This is not all. In the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription of Khārvela, Kaliṅga-nagara, "the city of Kaliṅga," occurs as the name of the capital of Kaliṅga. This city, as the description goes, was not far removed from the Tanaśuliya or Tanaśuli road. That Tanaśuliya or Tanaśuli is the same geographical name as Tosaḷa or Tosaḷi is a conjecture, which awaits confirmation from independent evidence. Mr. Jayaswal has still to prove that Khana-śaila in the Ekapрастara-tract is identical with Kaliṅga-nagara, which is mentioned in Khārvela's inscription as the capital of Kaliṅga.

Lastly, we notice a wide discrepancy between what is stated in the Sanskrit verses and what in Khārvela's inscription concerning King Nanda of Magadha. In accordance with the statement in the Sanskrit verses, King AIRA of Utkala defeated King Nanda of Magadha. And from the three statements in Khārvela's inscription, (1) that there was an aqueduct in Kaliṅga opened out by King Nanda 103 years back (Nāṃdarāja-tivasāsata-oghāṭitam panaḍīm), (2) that the Throne of Jina belonging to Kaliṅga was carried off by King Nanda (Nāṃdarāja-nitam Kaliṅga-Jindāsanam), and (3) that Pṛthudaka, founded by the former kings of Kaliṅga, became a dark pool overgrown with a jungle of grass in 113 years (Kaliṅga-puvarāja-nivesitām Pithudaga-dabham anupa-dabhasanam ca terasa-vasa-rata-katam Tā(i)mira-daha-samghātanam), it is clear that the then reigning king of Kaliṅga was defeated in a battle by the then reigning King Nanda of Magadha,
It seems that the story in the Sanskrit verses is a curious medley of a certain result of the misreading of Khāravela’s inscription and a certain legend in the Purāṇas. We are, no doubt, at one with Mr. Jayaswal to think that these verses are important as confirming the correctness of the reading of the first word of Khāravela’s inscription, after the invocation formula, as Airena instead of Verena or Kharena.
11. THE GEOGRAPHICAL ALLUSIONS

The old Brāhmī inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khandagiri caves contain certain geographical allusions, the value of which has not, as yet, been systematically discussed and fully ascertained. What are these allusions?

Of the fourteen Brāhmī inscriptions, the first ten are attached to the caves which were excavated by different donors on the hill now known by the name of Udayagiri, and the remaining four are attached, together with the table of Brāhmī alphabet, to the caves which were excavated on the hill now known by the name of Khandagiri. The two hills “form,” says Major Kittoe, “part of a belt of sandstone rock, which, skirting the base of the granite hills of Orissa, extends from Autgar and Dekkunāl (in a southerly direction) past Kurda and towards the Chilka lake, occasionally protruding through the beds of laterite.”

These belong, according to Mr. Stirling, to a group of four small hills, which are severally called the Udayagiri, Dewalgiri, Nilgiri and Khandigiri, “are composed of a silicious sandstone of various colour and texture, and are all curiously perforated with small caves, disposed in two or three irregular stories.” This group of four hills, from 150 to 200 feet in height, is situated “about five miles west of Bhubaneswar, near the village of Jaymara, in the Charsudhi Khandaiti of Khurda, and still within the limits of the Khetr.”

The Khandagiri is just four or five miles north-west of Bhubaneswar and nineteen miles south-west of Cuttack, and is separated from the Udayagiri by a narrow glen about a hundred yards in width. Mr. R. D. Banerji has rightly suggested that the twin hills of Khandagiri and Udayagiri were known to the authors of the cave-inscriptions as Kumāra-Kumāriparvata, the Kumāra and Kumāri mountains. The ancient name of Khandagiri as Kumāra-parvata is met with in Udyota-Keśari’s inscription in Lālatendu-Keśari’s cave on the Khandagiri, and that of Udayagiri as Kumāri-parvata is met with in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription of Khāravela.

Mr. Banerji has made a mere suggestion without bringing forward any arguments to prove his point or offering any explanations for its orientation. That the ancient name of Khāṇḍaṅgirī was known to the author of Udyota-Keśāri’s inscription to be Kumāra-parvata is beyond dispute. The internal evidence of this inscription which must be assigned to the 10th or 11th century A.D. is enough to prove the identity between Kumāra-parvata and the modern Khāṇḍaṅgirī. The inscription, dated in the 5th regnal year of Śri-Udyota-Keśāri, records the re-excavation of an old tank, the repairing of an old cave-temple and the installation of the images of the twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras on the sacred site of Kumāra-parvata as meritorious works of the donor. The text of the inscription embodying this record reads as follows:—

Śri-Udyota-Keśāri-vijaya-rājya-saṁvat 5
Śri-Kumāra-parvata-sthāne jirnna vāpi jirnna ṭasana udyotita
Tasmina thāne caturviṃśati Tīrthaṅkara sthāpita.

Here the tank referred to is no other than the one which exists up till to-day on the eastern face of the Khāṇḍaṅgirī, hewn out of the rock and sacred to both the Jains and Hindus, and the caves with images of the twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras installed therein are no other than those which are known now-a-days as Navamuni, Durgā and Hanumān on the same hill.

In the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription of Khāṛavela (I. 14), it is stated that His Majesty caused one hundred and seventeen caves to be made on Kumāri-pavata in the well-run realm of victory (supavata-vijaya-caka). Mr. Jayaswal and other scholars have sadly missed the real sense of the phrase supavata-vijaya-caka. As we have sought to show, this is just another and earlier form of the phrase śrī-vijaya-rājya. We mean that supavata is not to be equated with supavata, “the noble mountain,” but with suparvatta or supavṛtta, “well-run,” “well-conducted,” and that here the word caka is not to be taken in the sense of a belt, but in that of a realm of command (āṇā-cakka). The manipulation of such an expression as supavata-vijaya-caka is perfectly in accord with the two of the royal epithets, pavata-caka and mahā-vijaya, attached to the name of śrī-Khāṛavela in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription (I. 16). It cannot finally be decided whether the designation Kumāri-pavata was restricted to one hill, the Udayagiri, or was used to denote the twin hills of Udayagiri and Khāṇḍaṅgiri. It is more probable that the author of the inscription intended to denote both the hills by a general name, just in the same way that the fashion
now-a-days is to denote both the hills, if brevity demands it, by one name, the name of Khanḍagiri. But this is not to deny that the Khapḍagiri was possibly known, as early as the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription, by a separate name such as Kumāra-pavata. Here the case made out of the twin hills designated by a group name is on a par with that of Nārada and Parvata, the twin hills or mountain peaks designated by a common name as Nārada. If it be true, as we believe it is, that the earlier group-name was Kumāri-parvata, that is, Udayagiri, and the later group-name was Kumāra-parvata, that is, Khanḍagiri, the historian has to find out a solution of the problem how was it that the name of Khanḍagiri came to receive a greater sanctity than, and gain precedence over, that of Udayagiri.

Thus it is clear that Khāravela’s kingdom has been praised in his inscription as a supavata-vijaya-caka or “well-run realm of victory” (I. 14), an expression, corresponding to śri-vijaya-rājiya in Udyota-Keśari’s inscription, and a grandiloquent substitute for such a simple and earlier expression as vijita1 in Aśoka’s B. E. II, rāja-visaya in Aśoka’s B. E. XIII, or rājā (rājya) in Dhanabhūti’s inscription on the Barhut E. Gateway, in such a phrase as Suganām rāje (Śuṅgānām rājye). What was the kingdom for which the high-sounding phrase supavata-vijaya-caka was coined?

One of the royal titles attached to the name of King Khāravela in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription is Kalimoddhipati, “the Sovran Lord of Kaliṅga” (I. 1). The same royal title adorns the name of King Kadampa-Kudepa in his inscription (No. III). Khāravela figures in the inscription of his chief queen as Kalimga-cakavati, “the (King) Overlord of Kaliṅga” (No. II). These go at once to show that the intended kingdom was no other than Kaliṅga.

The Hāthi-Gumphā inscription strikes throughout a patriotic note about Kaliṅga. In it, Khāravela is styled Kalimga-dhipati, “the Sovran Lord of Kaliṅga” (I. 1). In it, he is said to have been consecrated as a Mahārāja or “Great Majesty” in the third generation of two kings in Kaliṅga-rāja-vaṃsa, “the royal dynasty of Kaliṅga” (I. 1). In it, he is said to have caused terror to the Assaka or Asika city2 with the aid of the army from Kaliṅga (Kalimga-gatāya senāya, I. 3). In it, he is said to

2. Note that Jayaswal reads Musika.
have governed Arakatapura, in the manner of the former kings of Kaliṅga (Kalimga-puvarajānam dhamaṇa va nitina va, I. 4). In it, he is said to have built the Great-victory-Palace which was the Kaliṅga-royal-residence (Kalimga-rājanivāsa, I. 10). In it, he is said to have done due honour to the memory of the former kings of Kaliṅga (Kalimga-puvarajānam-yaasakāram, I. 11). In it, he is said to have rehabilitated Pithuḍa or Pithuda, founded by the former kings of Kaliṅga (Kalimga-puvarajā-naivesita, I. 12). Lastly, in the same record, he is said to have triumphantly brought back to Kaliṅga (Kalimga-aneti) the Throne of Jina belonging to Kaliṅga which was carried away by King Nanda (Namdaraja-nitam Kaliṅga-Jindasanam, I. 13). And in the inscription of Khāravela’s chief queen, a cave is said to have been made by Her Majesty for the residence of the honoured recluses of the Kaliṅgas (Kaliṅgānaṁ samanānam, II).

The Ḍāthi-Gumpha inscription clearly shows that the capital of Kaliṅga during the reign of Khāravela was Kaliṅga-nagara, “the city of Kaliṅga,” which has been satisfactorily identified with Mukhalingam on the Vampoḍhārā and the adjacent ruins in Ganjam District, Madras Presidency.” The Purle Plates of Indravarman, dated in the Gaṅga year 149, go to show that the kings of the Gaṅga dynasty had generally granted their donations from Kaliṅga-nagara, the self-same city of Kaliṅga which Prof. Sylvain Lévi seems inclined to identify with Kalingapatam, 20 miles north-east of Srikkakola or Chikakol.

We read in the Ḍāthi-Gumpha inscription that as soon as he was anointed, in the very first year of his reign, King Khāravela repaired the gates, walls and buildings badly damaged by stormy wind in the city of Kaliṅga (Kalimga-nagari), raised the embankments of the deep and cool tanks, and restored all the gardens at the cost of 85,00,000 (coins), thereby enabling his subjects to be pleased (I. 2). We also read in the same inscription that His Majesty spent the first fifteen years of his life playing the princely games, and nine as a crown-prince, well-versed in the art of writing, coinage, and the rest; and also that he belonged to the third generation of two kings belonging to the royal dynasty of Kaliṅga (tatiye Kaliṅga-rājavanse purisa-yuge), the kings of which may be

1. Note that another possible reading is ahatapuva or ahatapuva.
3. EI, Vol. XIV, p. 36.
4. JA, 1925, T. CCVI, pp. 50, 53, 57.
5. Cunningham’s Ancient Geography of India, S. N. Majumdar’s edition, Notes, p. 735.
supposed to have been all distinguished by such royal titles as *Aira-Siri*, *Mahāmeghavāhana* and *Kaliṅgādhipati* (I, II, III). It may be safely inferred from these that the city of Kaliṅga was the capital of Kaliṅga also during the reign of the preceding two generations of two *Aira-Meghavāhana* kings each, at least, during the reign of the second generation of two kings. The city of Kaliṅga has been referred to in the records of the third, fifth and eighth years of Khāravela's reign, and there is nothing in any of the fourteen old Brāhmī inscriptions to suggest that this city ceased to be the capital of Kaliṅga during the reign of the third generation of two kings, of whom Khāravela was one.

What was the capital of Kaliṅga, the land of the Kaliṅgas, when King Aśoka of Magadha conquered it and permanently annexed it to his empire, no one knows. What is manifest from his edicts, especially the two copies of his two Separate Rock Edicts, is that Tosali and Samāpā were two principal towns in the Kaliṅga Province of his empire, of which the former was a seat of Maurya viceroyalty. One set of his Rock Edicts and one copy of his Separate Rock Edicts have been found “inscribed on a rock called Aswastama, situated close to the village of Dhauli,” and the modern village of Dhauli which is no other than the town of Tosali is “about seven miles to the south of Bhuvanesvar,” but one must endorse the opinion of Prof. Vincent A. Smith that the exact position of Tosali, as known then, “has not been ascertained.”

A second set of Aśoka's Rock Edicts and a second copy of his Separate Rock Edicts have been found “engraved on the face of a picturesque rock in a large old fort called Jāungāla (Lac-fort), near the bank of Rṣikulyā river, about eighteen miles to the west-north-west of the town of Ganjam.”

Though we have no means of ascertaining the exact position of Samāpā, this much is certain that it was a District town of the second division of Aśoka's Kaliṅga Province, and that it was situated somewhere in the vicinity of the Jāungāla Fort in the Ganjam District.

The ancient name of the rock on the face of which the Dhauli version of Aśoka's Rock Edicts and Separate Rock Edicts was engraved was embodied in the Dhauli copy of his Rock Edict I. But, as bad luck would have it, exactly that portion of the inscribed surface is broken off which bore the four letters inscribing the name of the rock, and there is no means of restoring the lost name. In the present state of our knowledge, we have to be

1. D. R. Bhandarkar’s *Aśoka*, p. 255.
satisfied with the fact that, whatever was the actual name of this rock, it had consisted of four syllables. We are very fortunate to have intact the Aśokan name of the Jaugālā rock in the Jaugālā copy of Aśoka's Rock Edict I, in the statement: ।

Iyāṃ dharmalīpi Khapīṅgalśi pavatasi ।

Devānampiyena Piyadasinā lājina likhāpita.

"This Edict of the Law was caused to be inscribed by His Gifted Majesty and Grace the King on Mt. Khapīṅgala." Thus the recorded name is found to be Khapīṅgalapavata, "the Khapīṅgala mountain."

Now, comparing the two statements, one in the Dhauli copy containing the lost Aśokan name of the Dhauli rock and the other in the Jaugālā copy containing the Aśokan name of the Jaugālā rock, and noticing how closely these agree with each other, and bearing in mind that the missing name in the Dhauli copy, precisely like Khapīṅgala in the Jaugālā version, consisted of four syllables, one cannot help feeling inclined to think that the same also was the name in the Dhauli copy. ।

If these were correct, one might have reasonably taken Khapīṅgala to be the name, not of an isolated rock, but that of a range or group of hills representing the northern extension of the Eastern Ghats and extending along the sea-coast of Kaliṅga in its eastern extremity. We are not pressing this as an established fact, but just what is possible, if Khapīṅgala occurred as a common name in both the copies. Even if this were an established fact, the problem would have remained, whether the Kumāraparvata of Udyota-Keśari's inscription and the Kumārīpavata of Khāravela's inscription would have been included in the Khapīṅgala range known in Aśoka's time.

The Fragment LVI of the Indika of Megasthenes mentions Parthalīs as the royal city of the Calinga representing the tribes that dwelt by the Ganges, nearest the sea. Partualīs is the spelling of the name which appears in one of the foot-notes of the Fragment XX. B in Prof. McCrindle's translation. Portalis is evidently a simpler form of the spelling Partualīs, which has been suggested in the second foot-note of the Fragment LVI. M. de St. Martin would identify the royal city of the Calinga with Vardhana (contraction of Varddhamāna), now Burdwan. Prof. McCrindle thinks that the Calinga were a great and widely diffused tribe that settled mainly between the Mahānādi and the Godāvari, and that their capital was situated "on the Mahānadī, higher up than the site of Katak." And Mr. Jayaswal, as we saw, takes Parthalīs in good

1. Dhauli : Iyāṃ.........i pavatasi.

Jaugālā : Iyāṃ dharmalīpi Khapīṅgalśi pavatasi.
faith to be the correct and only spelling, and identifies Parthalis with the Ekaprastara tract which, according to the story of the Sanskrit verses quoted from an old Oriyā MS., was the site of the new capital of King Aira of Utkala, around Khaṇḍagiri. Because Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador at the court of Chandragupta Maurya, happened to mention Parthalis as the royal city of the Calinga, he safely assumes that Parthalis was the capital of Kaliṅga in the time of Chandragupta Maurya, nay, also during the reign of King Nanda who is mentioned in the Hāṭhi-Gumphā inscription, and who, according to him, was no other than Nanda referred to in the Sanskrit verses as the king of Magadha defeated by King Aira of Utkala in a battle fought between them. The implication of this is that Pithuḍaga or Pithuḍa became abandoned to its fate 102 years (113-11) previous to the consecration of Khāravela.

In the same inscription (I. 6), we read that His Majesty brought into his capital, from the Tanasulīya or Tanasulī road, the canal which was opened out by King Nanda 103 years back (Nandarāja-tivasasata-oghāḷitaṁ, panāḍim). This canal must have been opened out 98 years (103-5) previous to the consecration of Khāravela.

In the same inscription (I. 13), we also read that His Majesty brought back to Kaliṅga, from Aṅga-Magadha, the throne of Jina which had been carried off from Kaliṅga by King Nanda (Nandarāja-nītaṁ Kaliṅga-Jināśanam).

Now squaring up these three statements, it becomes easy to understand (1) that Kaliṅga was under the sway of King Nanda of Aṅga-Magadha, at least, from the 102nd to the 98th year previous to the reign of Khāravela; (2) that Pithuḍaga or Pithuḍa, founded by the former kings of Kaliṅga, became abandoned to its fate with the advent of King Nanda in Kaliṅga; (3) that here by the former kings of Kaliṅga Khāravela wanted to mean those kings of Kaliṅga who had reigned before Kaliṅga was conquered by King Nanda; and (4) that the rule of King Nanda in Kaliṅga ended when the dynasty of Kaliṅga kings to which Khāravela himself belonged came into power.

It cannot be confidently maintained that Parthalis or Partualis, mentioned in the Indika of Megasthenes as the royal city of the Calinga, was a Greek pronunciation of the name of the tract called Eka-prastara or Prastara which, according to the Sanskrit verses in Mr. Jayaswal’s Old Oriyā MS., became the site of the new capital of King Aira of Utkala, whose former capital was the Kosala-city, and that in other words, Parthalis or Partualis was the capital of Kaliṅga in the days of King Nanda of
Magadha who is supposed to have been a pre-Mauryan Indian monarch and a contemporary of King Aira of Utkala.

A presumption without convincing proofs may be utterly devoid of truth in sober history. In order to maintain (1) that Parthalis or Partialis in the Indika was a Greek spelling of Eka-prastara or Prastara in the Sanskrit verses, (2) that King Nanda of Magadha mentioned as a contemporary of King Aira of Utkala was a pre-Mauryan Nanda king, and (3) that Parthalis or Prastara was the capital of Kaliṅga when King Aira of Utkala reigned there in the days of Chandragupta Maurya when Megasthenes was in India, one must be sure (1) that Parthalis or Partialis is mentioned in the Indika as a tract, like Eka-prastara, around the Khandagiri, and (2) that there is mention of any Aira King of Utkala or Kaliṅga as a contemporary of a Nanda king of Magadha who was a precursor, ad posteriori, of Chandragupta Maurya. But nothing is surer than that one cannot be sure about these two points. We are entirely in the dark as to who, among the kings of Kaliṅga, were contemporaries of the pre-Āśokan Maurya kings and pre-Mauryan Nanda kings of Magadha.

In Khāravela’s inscription (1. 12), we have mention of a place founded by the former kings of Kaliṅga and known by the name of Pithuḍa or Pithuḍa, which had become, in 113 years, a watery jungle of grass.

The city of Kaliṅga could not have been very far from the Tanasuliya or Tanasuli road wherefrom the canal opened out by King Nanda 103 years back was brought into it by King Khāravela in the fifth year of his reign. The reading Tanasuliya is certain. The plaster casts and estampages of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription leaves no chance for the reading of the second letter as u. If the inscribed name might be read as Tausaliya or Tausali, it could have been easily equated with Tosalī. But read as Tanasuliya or Tanasuli, it remains to be seen how the name could be equated with Tosalī (passim). We have noted that tana, the first member of the compound, occurs in one of the verses of the Mahāvamsa as the opposite of mahā: Mahāśiva, Śiva, Tanasiva. And suliya, the second member of the compound, must be treated either as an equivalent in an eastern dialect of the Pāli suriya, or of the Sk. sūrya, or as a form of suli conjoined with the suffix ya. The first alternative is less likely for the reason that the general tendency of the dialect of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription is to replace r-sound by r-sound, unless it be supposed that the name has been retained as it was locally pronounced. If Tanasuliya be regarded as an equivalent of Tanasuriya, it must be rendered in English: “the Little Sun-temple (road).” If, on the other hand, it be regarded as a form of
Tanasuli conjoined with the suffix ya, it must be rendered: "the Little Siva temple (road)," sulī being one of the epithets of Siva. Anyhow, it is certain that the opposite of Tanasulīya or Tanasuli is Mahāsulīya or Mahāsulī. If so, it may be shown that Pithuḍa or Pithuḍa, the site of the former capital of Kaliṅga, was just in the neighbourhood of the city of Kaliṅga.

Pithuḍa is the same name as Prthuḍaka in Sanskrit, and Pithuḍa is but a shortening from Pithuḍa, a word which is the same in meaning as bahūḍaka, "abounding in many waters," "the watery." The same significance of the name may be gathered, I think, from a legend in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa regarding the origin of the name of Prthuḍaka or Pehoa, "Prthu's pool," an old town near Thaneswar. The Gaṇḍavyūha which is a Buddhist work in Sanskrit and counted among the mahā-vaiṣṇava-sūtras by the Buddhists of Nepal, contains an interesting account of the wanderings of a Buddhist seeker of truth in the Deccan (Dakṣiṇāpathe). In it, the Buddhist learner concerned has been represented as travelling from Mūlaka (on the bank of the Godāvari, near Patiṭhāna or Paithan) to Naladhvaja, from Naladhvaja to Suprabha, from Suprabha to Sarvagrāma of Tosala in Amitatosala, and from thence to Prthuḍastra. This Prthuḍastra is apparently not different from what Ptolemy in his work on geography (VII. 1. 93), calls Pitundra-metropolis, Pitunda, the capital, Pitunda which was a Greek spelling, as shown by Prof. Sylvain Lévi, of Pithunda. The following note on Pitunda from the pen of Prof. Sylvain Lévi is worth quoting in this connection:

"Ptolemy," says Prof. Sylvain Lévi, "describing the towns situated in the interior of the country of Maisoloi (VII. 1. 93), designates its capital Pitundra-metropolis. The country of Maisoloi or Maisolia (VII. 1. 15) lent its name to the river Maisolos which represents the group of the mouths of the Godāvari and the Kṛṣṇā. The Periplus writes Masalia instead of Maisolia. Since a long time the scholars have equated Maisoloi or Maisolia with Masuli, the denomination in the first word contained in the well known name of Masulipatam (patam=pattana, the town)

1. Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India, edited by S. N. Majumdar, p. 335.
2. Sutta-Nipāta, Pārāyana-Vagga, Vatthagāthā, verse 977. Asakassa vieaye Aṣakassa (Mula-kassa) samāsane, Godhāvari-kule. For the discussion of the information contained in the Sutta-Nipāta-Commentary, see passim.
3. JA, 1925, T. CCVI, p. 61.
near the mouths of the Krṣṇā). Maisolos extended in the north up to Paloura, or more accurately, up to the equator in the neighbourhood of Paloura. . . . . Ptolemy locates Pitundra in the interior of Maisolos, between the mouths of (the two rivers) Maisolos and Manudas, to put it otherwise, between the delta of the Godāvari and the Mahānadi, nearly at an equal distance from both. It would, therefore, be convenient to search for its location in the interior of Chikakol and Kalingapatam, towards the course of the river Nāgāvali which bears also the name of Lāṅguliya, the 'River of the Plough.' The Imperial Gazetteer of India itself indicates this etymology: Lāṅgala, Sanskrit; nagula, Telugu. This denomination evokes, bringing nearer the souvenir of Pitundra, the text of the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription in which Khāravela flatters himself having ploughed with the plough the soil of Pitunda, or as we prefer to read and interpret it, having let out the grassy jungle of Pitunda into Namgala, the river Lāṅgala (Lāṅguliya).

Prof. Sylvain Lévi draws attention to the story of Samudrapāla in Lec. XXI of the Jaina Uttarādhyayana-Sūtra, in which there is mention of Pitunda as a sea-coast town reminding us at once of Khāravela's Pitunda-Pitundaga and Ptolemy's Pitundra. This story clearly shows that Pitunda was an emporium of trade which could be reached from Campa by the merchant vessels that had to follow a sea-route to complete their voyage. Campa, as we all know, was the capital of Aṅga, situated on the lower course of the Ganges, and the story in question relates that a Jain merchant named Pālita, who was a native of Campa, had a son born to him at sea (samudra) when he was returning home with his wife from Pitunda, where he went for the purpose of trade and happened to win the hand of the daughter of a merchant of the place. The father chose Samudrapala, "the Protège of the Sea," as the name of the boy then born at sea. There can be little doubt that Pitunda in Ardha-Māgadhī is the same geographical name as Pitunda-Pitunda in Khāravela's inscription, Ptolemy's Pitunda, the capital of Maisoloi-Maisolia, and Piturāstr in the Ganaśavyūha.

1. For the historic name and etymology of Masulipatam, see Yule-Burnell, sub voce.
3. Named Lāṅgaliya in the Mārkapḍeya-Purāṇa.
According to the unanimous testimony of the Jātakas, particularly of two versions\(^1\) of the Mahāgovinda-Suttanta which represents one of the earliest forms in which one finds the Jātakas in Buddhist literature, Dantapura was the earlier capital of Kāliṅga, as early as when Kāśi was an empire with Kāliṅga as one of its provinces. The couplet in the Suttanta-Jātaka\(^2\) mentioning Dantapura as the capital of Kāliṅga,\(^3\) the land of the Kāliṅgas, is found to be a quotation from an earlier chronicle of seven Purohitas in the Aṅguttara-Nikāya,\(^4\) embodied in a prose-story, which has not, as yet, assumed the character of a Jātaka.\(^5\) Dantapura, which is no other than Dantakura in the Mahābhārata\(^6\) and Dantagula in Pliny's Natural History, has been definitely identified by Prof. Sylvain Lévi with Ptolemy's Palonra and modern Paloura near Chicacole in the Ganjam District. When exactly Dantapura-Palonra ceased to be the capital of Kāliṅga we cannot say. But it is certain that it had been the capital of Kāliṅga before Pitunda-Pitunda became the royal city. It may be safely concluded from the foregoing discussion that the transfer of the capital from Dantapura to Pythudaka must have taken place before the advent of King Nanda in Kāliṅga and before the establishment of the rule of the royal dynasty of Kāliṅga to which Khāravela himself belonged.

The Sarabhaṅga-Jātaka (Fausböll's No. 522) refers to a time when Kāśi was just an independent kingdom, which existed side by side with the kingdom of King Daṇḍak. The city of Kumbhavati was the capital of Daṇḍak's kingdom, of Daṇḍaka, measuring 60 yojanas long. Daṇḍak was a powerful emperor, whose supremacy was freely acknowledged by Kāliṅga, the king of the land of the Kāliṅgas (Kaliṅga-rāja). King Kāliṅga is described as one of the lords of the subordinate kingdoms (antararathaṭhūdhipatina). The prosperity of the Daṇḍaka empire and the

---

3. Dantapura Kāliṅganam Assakānanaṁ ca Potanam |
Māhiṣatī Asamānanaṁ Sovāranaṁ ca Borukan |
Mithilā ca Videhanam, Campā Aṅgese māpītā |
Bārānaśī ca Kāśiṇanaṁ ete Govinda-māpītā |
5. That is, it has not the concluding identification.
subordination thereto of Kaliṅga are the annals, if we are to believe the Jātaka, of the political history of ancient India before the rise of Kāśi to the status of an empire. The Sarabhaṅga-Jātaka which contains a pathetic story of the dire calamity that befell the kingdom of Daṇḍakī and brought utter destruction upon it, indicates a turning point in the political history of ancient India, in the subsequent chapter whereof the historian is to look for the annals of the rise and influence of the Kāśi empire. If it be true that the Buddhist Birth-story in the Mahāgovinda-Suttanta is an annal of the full flowering of the Kāśi empire with Kaliṅga, Aśvaka, Avanti, Sauvīra, Videha and Anāga as the six subordinate kingdoms under it, we have to understand that Dantapura became the royal city of Kaliṅga during the supremacy of Kāśi, and not before.

The Sarabhaṅga-Jātaka does not mention the name of the capital of Kaliṅga when it was a subordinate kingdom under Daṇḍaka. The Mahābhārata speaks of a time when a matrimonial alliance came to be established between the Kuru kingdom and Kaliṅga by the marriage of the Kuru prince Durvyodhana with the Kaliṅga princess Citrāṅgadā,—when Hastināpura was the capital of the Kuru kingdom and Rājapura that of Kaliṅga.¹

Some of the Indologists are inclined to identify Rājapura with Rajamahendri on the Godāvari river, '251 miles to the south-west of Ganjam,' which became the capital of the junior or eastern branch of the Chalukya princes of Veṅgi from the time of the conquest of Kaliṅga by the Chalukya king of Veṅgi in circa 750 A.D. and the removal of the Chalukya capital from Veṅgipura to Rajamahendri. The remains of the former "still exist at Vedi, 5 miles (more accurately, 7 miles) to the north of Ellur, and 50 miles to the west-south-west of Rajamahendri."²

Mr. Manomohan Ganguli doubts the soundness of the identification proposed evidently on the basis of an 'accidental coincidence of prefixes.'³ Rājapura is phonetically the same geographical name as the modern Raipur. As regards the connection of Rājapura in the Mahābhārata with Rajamahendri, some light might perhaps be obtained from the Mahāvastu which professes to be the first work of the Vinaya-Piṭaka of the Lokottaravādā section of the Mahāsāṅghikas. This great Buddhist work in Sanskrit, dealing with a previous birth-story of three Kāśyapa brothers who are to be counted among the first Buddhist converts and

1. Mahābhārata XII, 43.
2. Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India, edited by S. N. Majumdar, pp. 590.592.
immediate disciples of the Buddha Sākyamuni, relates that they were born, in a former life, as three half-brothers of the previous Buddha Puṣpa or Puṣya and sons of King Mahendra of Hastināpura, by one mother (ekamātykā trayo bhrātaro), and reigned together amicably in the city of Simhapura, in the land of the Kaliṅgas,¹ Simhapura which is identified by Prof. Dubreuil with modern Singupura near Chicacoel.²

The source from which the tradition in the Mahāvastu was derived is unknown. The Pālī version of the previous birth-story of the three Kāśyapa brothers, as found in Buddhaghosa’s Manoratha-Pūraṇi, Part I, speaks of King Mahendra without any reference to Hastināpura, and speaks of the three half-brothers of the previous Buddha Puṣya without any reference to Kaliṅga and Simhapura, and, curiously enough, in this respect, the Pālī version of the story is completely in accord with the narration in the verses quoted in the Mahāvastu.³ Moreover, the Buddhavamsa which is a Pālī canonical work belonging to the Sutta-Piṭaka and the Nidāna-Kathā of the Pālī Jātaka-commentary present a life of the previous Buddha Puṣya, which differs entirely in its details from that in the Mahāvastu or in Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the Aṅguttara-Nikāya. In these circumstances, the Mahāvastu tradition of the reign of Rājā Mahendra in Hastināpura and of the reign of his three sons in the Simhapura city of Kaliṅga must be regarded as the growth of an age later than the date of composition of the Buddhavamsa and earlier than the date of composition of Buddhaghosa’s Manoratha-Pūraṇi and of the Mahāvastu in its extant form. Be that as it may, the importance of the prose version of the story in the Mahāvastu lies in the fact that it enables us to account for the foundation of a royal city in Kaliṅga commemorating the name of Rājā Mahendra.

The historical fact behind the Buddhist story in the Mahāvastu is not probably far to seek. We learn from the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta that Kosala or South Kosala was the first kingdom in South India (Dakṣināpatha) against which the great invader from the north directed his first attack, and that the first king in South India

3. Mahāvastu, T. III, p. 433:

Rājño Mahendraya mahīṃ praśāsato |
Dharmena jānanaṃ ca samādāya-cvertino |
Trayo bhrātaro asya samānacārino ||
who was defeated by him was King Mahendra of Kosala. This Kosala or South Kosala as may be now ascertained, "comprised the modern Bilaspur, Raipur and Sambalpur districts, and occasionally even a part of Ganjam."1 "Its capital was Śrīpura, the modern Sirpur about 40 miles east by north from Raipur."2

None need be surprised that the Buddhist story under notice3 grew up round the tradition of King Mahendra of Kosala or South Kosala who was a contemporary of Samudragupta, and that Hastināpura, which is said to have been the capital of King Mahendra, was just another name for Śrīpura. The story distinctly says that Kaliṅga was conquered and governed by the three sons of King Mahendra for their father. We may understand from this that Kaliṅga proper was treated as a seat of viceroyalty with its official headquarters at Simhapura or Singupuram near Chiecaele.

Thus our enquiry concerning the successive capitals of Kaliṅga leads us to a point where we have to recognise (1) that the capital of the kingdom during the reign of Khāravela and other kings of the Aira-Meghvāhana dynasty was Kaliṅga-nagara, the modern Mukhaliṅgam on the Vamśadhrā in the Ganjam district; (2) that Pithuḍa-Pithuḍa was the capital of the former kings of Kaliṅga before the advent of King Nanda of Aṅga-Magadha in Kaliṅga and the reign of the kings of the Aira-Meghvāhana dynasty; (3) that Tosali-Dhaulī and Samarāpā were respectively the official headquarters of two divisions of Kaliṅga during the reign of King Devānampriya Aśoka of Magadha; (4) that the still earlier capital of the kingdom was Dantapura-Palouna near Chiecaele; (5) that the capital of the kingdom under Dāṇḍaka is unknown; (6) that Śrīpura-Hastināpura and Simhapura-Singupuram were respectively the seats of government in South Kosala and Kaliṅga proper during the reign of Rājā Mahendra in the middle of the 4th century A.D.; (7) that Rājamahendrī became the Chalukya capital in Kaliṅga in the 8th century A.D.; and (8) that the city of Kaliṅga again became the capital of the kingdom in the 11th century A.D. when the kings of the Ganga dynasty made themselves masters thereof.

Now we shall pursue an enquiry concerning the territorial extension and political divisions of Kaliṅga during the reign of Khāravela, as well

3. According to the Buddhavaṇṇa and the Jātaka Nidāna-Kathā, the previous Buddha Pusaṇa, was the son of King Jayasena of Kāśi,
as concerning the ranges of Khāravela’s military expeditions and conquests. It will be our interest also to indicate the regions where the influence of his military powers was felt and openly acknowledged. As regards all these points, we are to attempt to draw our conclusions from the following data that may be gathered from the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription and other sources, epigraphic and literary, which are now within our reach.

The old Brāhmi inscriptions are all found attached as labels to the caves on the Udayagiri and Khandagiri hills which are situated about five or six miles north-west of Bhuvaneswar and at a distance of a few miles from the village of Dhauli-Tosali that lies about seven miles south of Bhuvaneswar. That is to say, our old Brāhmi inscriptions and the Dhauli copy of Asoka’s Rock Edicts and Separate Rock Edicts are found engraved at a distance of a few miles on the rocks or hills that are included in the modern Puri District of Orissa.

It is clearly implied in the edicts of Asoka, especially in the two copies of his two Separate Rock Edicts, that his Kaliṅga province comprised two political divisions, the first or presidency division of which the official headquarters was Tosali-Dhauli, and the second division of which the official headquarters was Samāpā, and that adjoining thereto were the outlying unconquered tracts (saṃtā avijitā). The names of the two divisions of Asoka’s Kaliṅga province are not mentioned in his edicts. But we learn from the Gaṇḍavyūha account of the wanderings of a Buddhist seeker of truth in South India that Sarvagrāma was a locality in Tosala, while Tosala, undoubtedly a city corresponding to Asoka’s Tosali, was located in Amitatōgala, and that beyond Amitatōgala was Prthuṛcitra, which has been identified with Pithuḍaga-Pithuḍa in Khāravela’s inscriptions, Pihumḍa in the Jaina Uttarādhayayana-śūtra and pituṇḍra in Ptolemy’s work on Geography. It may be easily inferred from this that Asoka’s Tosali-Tosala was the chief town of a division of the same name, Amitatōgala, Tosali or Tosala. Here the crux is—does the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription offer us any information about the existence of a political division of Kaliṅga by the name of Amitatōgala, Tosali or Tosala? Whether it does or not depends solely on the accuracy or inaccuracy of the identification of Tanaṣuliya or Tanaṣuli with Tosali.

It is evident from the record of Khāravela’s fifth regnal year that Kaliṅga-nagarā, the capital of Khāravela’s kingdom of Kaliṅga, was not far from the Tanaṣuliya or Tanaṣuli road wherefrom a canal opened out by King
Nanda was led by extension into the city of Kaliṅga. We have seen that Tanasuliya or Tansuli is a name which stands in contrast to Mahāsuliya or Mahāsuli, tana or tanu being the opposite of maha or maha. We are to bear in mind that Kaliṅga-nagara is the modern Mukhalingam on the vanāsadhāra river and the adjacent ruins in the Ganjam district of Madras Presidency. We are to remember that Pithuḍaga-Pithuḍa referred to in the Hāṭhi-Gumphā inscription as the earlier capital of Kaliṅga is not different from Pṛthuṛśtra in the Gaṇḍavyūha which lay just beyond Amitasūla-Toṣala, from Pihumḍa in the Jaina Uttarādhyayana-Sūtra which was a sea-coast town reachable by the Indian merchant ships sailing from Campā, the capital of Aṅga, and from Ptolemy’s Pitunda which was the metropolis of Maisolīa-Maisoli and is located by Prof. Sylvain Lévi somewhere near Chiacone in the Ganjam district. We are also to keep in mind that the Periplus writes Masalā for Maisolīa-Maisolōi. Thus in Ptolemy’s Maisolīa-Maisolōi, written as Masalā in the Periplus, we trace the nearest Greek spelling of Mahāsuliya-Mahāsuli, which is the suggested antithesis of Tanasuliya-Tansuli.

Apparently Tanasuliya-Tansuli and Vahāsuliya-Mahāsuli stand, in their contrast, on a par with Tosala and Mosala, which, as noted by Mr. Jayaswal, are mentioned as two among the three divisions of Kaliṅga in the Kāvyaamalā edition of the Bhāratiya-Nāṭya-Sāstra, Ch. XIV, Verse 40, where one reads:

Kosalās-Tosalāścaiva Kaliṅgā yā ca Mosalāh.

The text of the quoted line may be so interpreted as to mean that the kingdom of Kaliṅga consisted of these three divisions: Tosala, Mosala, and Kosala. We have in M. Joanny Grosset’s edition Yavanosala instead of Mosala, which may not be copyist’s mistake but rather an interesting variant indicating that Mosala was known to some of the copyists as a locality associated with the Yavanas. The importance of the text in the Kāvyaamalā edition lies in the fact that here Mosala occurs as the final form of phonetic decay: Mahāsuliya, Maisolīa, Maisolōi, Masalā, Masuli, Mosala, three missing links being Mahāsuli, Masali and Mosali. We maintain that in a similar manner Tosala may be treated as the final form of phonetic decay from Tanasuliya: Tanasuliya, Tosali, Tosala, the missing links, among others, being Tansalia and Tansali. If so, we may draw this conclusion that Tansuli, Tosali or Tosala was that division of Kaliṅga of which the official headquarters was somewhere near the Kumārī-parvata or Udayagiri, and that it extended along the sea-coast, at least, from the
Nilgiri to the Chilka lake during the reign of Khāravela, and may be, also during the reign of Aśoka.

What was precisely the southern limit of the second division, called Mosaḷa or Mosalī in the Bhāratiya Nāṭya-Sāstra, whether during the reign of King Aśoka or during the reign of King Khāravela we cannot say. From the texts and location of the Rock and Separate Rock Edicts of Aśoka, it may be clearly ascertained (1) that Samāpā was the official headquarters of the second division, (2) that the second division occupied, if it was not co-extensive with, the modern Ganjam district, and (3) that his Kaliṅga Province was guarded along its eastern sea-coast, from the Jaṅgada hill-fort to the rock at Dhaulī, by a range of hills, which was perhaps known by the name of Khapin-gala-pavala. This range of hills was nothing but a northern or upward extension of the Eastern ghats, and, probably no other than what is called Palapiṇjara in the Bhāratiya Nāṭya-Sāstra.1 If it be correct, as Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar suggests, that the Kaliṅga Province of King Aśoka abutted in the south on the territory of the Andhras, counted among the vassal tribes within the dominions of the great Maurya emperor, and that the strips of territory occupied then by them included the Godāvari and Kistna Districts, we may safely conclude that the second division of Aśoka’s Kaliṅga Province did not extend in the south beyond the Godāvari river. And if King Aśoka had anything to do with the canal referred to in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription as an excavation of King Nanda near the Tanasuniya or Tosali road, we may understand that the second division of Kaliṅga extended during the reign of the Maurya emperor from the mouth of the Vaṃśadhārā to that of the Godāvari. It is clear from the inscription of King Khāravela that during his reign the Tanasuniya or Tosali road was not far from the city of Kaliṅga which is identified with Mukhalingam on the Vaṃśadhārā. If it was possible for King Khāravela to cause the grassy jungle of a swamp in Pithuḍa-Pitundra to be let out into the Naṅgala or Lāṅgala river, we must understand that Pithuḍa-Pitundra was situated somewhere near the course of the river Nāgāvalī which bears also the name of Lāṅguliya, “the river of the plough,”—the Lāṅgālinī river which finds mention in the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa along with the Vaṃśadhārā. We have seen that
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1. Bhāratiya Nāṭya-Sāstra, XIV:

Mahendraḥ Malavo Sahyaḥ Mekalaḥ Palapiṇjaraḥ.
Ptolemy locates Pitundra-Pithu'ca between the mouths of the rivers Maisolos and Manodas, which is to say, between the deltas of the Godāvari and the Mahānadi, nearly at an equal distance from both. Seeing that both Kaliṅga-nagara and Pithu'ca mentioned in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription lay outside of the Tanaṣuliya or Tosalī division and fell within the second division, we may be pretty certain about the extension of the second division of Kaliṅga during the reign of King Khāravela from the mouth of the Vamśadhārā to as far south as the mouth of the Godāvari, if not further south.

The manner in which King Aśoka mentions in his edicts the kingdoms that lay outside of, and the territories that lay within, his empire enables us to conceive that, as early as the 3rd century B.C., just beyond the land of the Kaliṅgas towards the south was the principality of the Andhras, that just beyond the latter was the independent kingdoms of the Cholas and Pāṇḍyas extending as far south as Tāmraparṇī (nicom Coṭā Pāṇḍīga avāṃ Tāṁbaparasīīīā).

Our old Brāhmī inscriptions are wanting in such clear data concerning the southern limit of the Mahāsuliya-Mosalī division of the Kaliṅga kingdom of King Khāravela. These are totally silent about the Andhras and the Cholas. But the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription records that, in the twelfth regnal year of King Khāravela, the King of Pāṇḍya supplied him with the most valuable presents of pearls, gems and jewels and various kinds of apparels (Paṇḍa-räuṇā vividhābhoraṇāṃ mutā-māṇi-ratanāṃ ākārāpayati idha sata-sahasāṇī). In the absence of any mention of the Andhras and the Cholas, there may not be much difficulty in imagining that the second division of Khāravela's Kaliṅga stretched along the sea-coast even beyond the Godāvari, and as far south as the mouths of the Krśhṇā, if it was then known, as supposed, by the name of Mahāsuliya-Maisolia-Mosalī-Mosalā. Anyhow, the problem remains why the Īndhras and the Cholas whose principalities lay to the north of Pāṇḍya have been passed over in silence in the inscription of King Khāravela.

A clear hint might be taken from one of the geographical allusions in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription in establishing the fact that the suzerainty of King Khāravela of Kaliṅga was felt in the south, along the eastern coast of the Deccan, into the very heart of the land of the Cholas, below the Krśhṇā, below the Pennar, as far down as the northern limit of the kingdom of Pāṇḍya. The allusion referred to above is in the record of Khāravela's fourth regnal year wherein we read that His Majesty caused Arakatapura, the city of Arakatā, inhabited by a race of magicians called
Vidyādharaś (Vijādaradhiśa Arakatapure), to be governed according to the established usage and administrative principle of the former kings of Kaliṅga, by the highest kind of law, and that he compelled all the tribal chiefs and village headmen of the place (sava-rathika-bhojakā) who trembled in fear, whose royal insignia consisting of umbrellas and golden vases were taken away, and who were robbed of their jewels and riches, to bow at his feet (1.5). Arakata or Arakaṭa is the same kind of geographical name as Parakaṭa Bhojakā, or Bibikanadikaṭa in the Barhunt votive labels, and phonetically it is the same name as the modern Arcot which is wrongly “believed to be quite modern.”¹ The Greek geographer Ptolemy speaks of a northern kingdom of Sorae Nomades, the Sora nomads, which lay between Mount Bettigo and Adeisathros.² With regard to the royal city of these nomads, in some editions of Ptolemy’s work, the statement is sorā regia Arcati, “Sora, the capital of Arcatos,” and in some editions, it occurs as Arcati regia Sora, “Arcatos, the capital of Sora.” The latter reading has come to be accepted as the correct representation of Ptolemy’s statement, and Dr. Caldwell identifies Ptolemy’s Arcati-Arcatos with the modern Arkad or Arcot. Sir Alexander Cunningham considers the Sora Nomades of Ptolemy to be a branch of the Sauras, a race of aborigines, “who are still located on the banks of the Kistna river³ while Prof. D.R. Bhandarkar is of opinion that the Sora of Ptolemy “can easily be recognised to be the Tamil Sora or Chola.”⁴ If Prof. Bhandarkar’s suggestion has any truth in it, one has to understand that the dwellers of Ptolemy’s Arcati-Arcatos were a race of the Chola nomads. Khāravela’s inscription also distinctly says that the inhabitants of Arakatapure were the Vidyādharas, an aboriginal people noted for their magical skill. The mention of Arakatapure in Khāravela’s inscription and that of Arcati-Arcatos in Ptolemy’s work set at once at nought the belief about the modern origin of the name of Arkad-Arcot, near Madras. If this identification be correct, it will be a mistake to suppose that the words rathika and bhojaka as used in Khāravela’s inscription have precisely the same implication as that in Aśoka’s edicts. As used in Khāravela’s inscription, the words are to be treated rather as titular designations than as names of any semi-independent tribes.⁵

1. Cunningham’s Ancient Geography of India, edited by S. N. Majumdar, p. 626.
3. Cunningham’s Ancient Geography of India, edited by S. N. Majumdar, p. 627.
4. Bhandarkar’s Asoka, p. 89.
But, upon the whole, one must take the river Godāvari as the southern boundary of Khāravela's Kaliṅga, which appears to have extended along the Vindhya range as far as the western valley of the Godāvari. In the western direction, the only great royal power which King Khāravela had to reckon with was that of King Saṭakarṇi, whose territories must have comprised a number of small states near about the western valley of the Godāvari. In the Hāthī-Gumphā inscription, in the record of King Khāravela's second regnal year, we read that His Majesty, without taking King Saṭakarṇi into his thought (acitayita Saṭakaṇanī) caused a large army consisting of all the four divisions of Indian troops to move towards the Western quarter (pachima-disān.....pathāpayati), and struck terror into Asakanagara, or it may be, into Asikanagara, with the army from Kaliṅga (Kaliṅgāgatāya senāya).

If Mr. Jayaswal's reading Kaṅkabēṁnāgatāya senāya vitāsitam Musikanagaranī be accepted as correct, we have to say either (1) that King Khāravela succeeded in striking terror into Musika-nagara, the Musika-capital, with the aid of the army that advanced on the banks of the Kṛṣṇa-nē river, or (2) that he achieved this military feat with the army that advanced from the Kṛṣṇa-nē river, the expression Kaṅkabēṁnāgatāya admitting of a twofold interpretation as suggested above. Taking the expression in the first sense, Mr. Jayaswal has sought to maintain that the presumed Musika-nagara was situated on the banks of the Kaṅkabēṁnē or Kṛṣṇa-nē river.

Mr. Jayaswal's notes on the Mūsikas and the Kṛṣṇa-nē, written in justification of his reading quoted above, are worth quoting in this connection. First, as to the Mūsikas, he has written: "They were a people of the south. The Mahābhārata (VI. 9. 58) mentions them in the company of the Vanavāsī. Their country could not have been far removed from Kaliṅga, for the Nātya-Śāstra (circa 100 B.C.-100 A.C.) describes the Tosalas (the people of Tosali), the Kosalas (the people of Southern Kosala), and the Mosalas (the Mūsikas) as the Kaliṅgas, implying that they comprised the Kaliṅga empire. This is a description naturally subsequent to the time of Khāravela. A more definite reference is in the Purāṇas (Wilson, Viṣṇu, IV, p. 221) where after a kingdom of some Vindhyan countries Strī-rājya and Mūṣika countries are mentioned as forming one princeedom. According to the Kāma-Sūtra Strī-rājya was a Vindhyan country towards the West. The Mūṣika country must have been between latitudes 20 and 22, between Paithana and Gondwana. As Kosala came
next to Orissa (North-West), the Mūsika-land must have been contiguous to it on the West."

Secondly, as to the Kṛṣṇa-veni, he has written: "The Purāṇas place this river near the Godāvari and treat it as distinct from the Southern Kṛṣṇa. The Kṛṣṇa-veni is mentioned in some authorities as if it were two rivers Kṛṣṇa and Vena. Mārkandeya derives it from the Vindhya range. It is evident from these details that the river is identical with the modern 'Wain River' or 'Wain-ganga' which has for its main tributary the Kanhan. The Kanhan and the Wain unite in the district of Bhandara and the united stream comes down to meet the Wardha in the district of Chanda. The capital of the Mūsikas, which the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription contemplates to be on the Kaṅhabeṇū, was situated somewhere within the districts of Bhandara and Chanda in the Central Provinces."

It cannot be denied that the Mūsikas were a people of the south. We are aware that the political division of Mūsika "lay to the south of Kerala or Chera, the country south of Kupaka (or Satya), extending down to Kanheri in Central Travancore." Mr. Jayaswal is the best person to say if he has not misled his readers by stating that the Mahābhārata mentions the Mūsikas "in the company of the Vanavāsīs." The Mahābhārata, as will appear from the following quotation, has not only mentioned the Mūsikas in the company of the Vanavāsīs, but also in that of the Drāviḍas and the Keralas or Cheras:

Athāpare jānapadā dakṣinā Bhāratasabhaḥ
Drāviḍāḥ Keralāḥ pṛācyā Mūṣikā Vanavasikāḥ

We are ignorant of Mr. Jayaswal's authority for his identification of the Mosalas of the Nāṭya-Sāstra with the Mūsikas. Vātsyāyana's Kāma-Sūtra, so far as we have read it, keeps us entirely in the dark about the location of Strīrāja. Yaśodharā in his commentary on the Kāma-Sūtra, says that the Strīrāja lay to the west of the country called Vajravanta,  

2. Vāyu-Purāṇa, LV. 103.
3. Mārkandeya-Purāṇa, LXVII. 26-27:
   Godāvari-Bhimarathā-Kṛṣṇa-veni-tathāpara
   Vindhyapāda-viniśkritā ityeta sariduttā
5. JAS, 1923, pp. 413.
6. Kāma-Sūtra, VI. 5.27: "Strī-rājya Kosalāyen ca," Strī-rājya iti—Vajravanta-
delāt pātīcāmena Strī-rājyaṃ.
and that the Grāmanārī-viṣaya was situated adjoining and on the other side of the Strīrājya. Hence, even if it be true that the Purāṇas mention Strīrājya and Mūṣika countries as forming one principality, Mr. Jayaswal has yet to supply us with a definite evidence for locating Strīrājya as “a Vindhyān country towards the West.”

It may be, as Mr. Jayaswal argues, that the Kṛṣṇa-vēpā is the same river as the modern Wain which unites with the Kanhan, its main tributary, in Bhandara District, and that the united stream comes down to meet the Wardha in Chanda District in the Central Provinces. But is there any independent evidence, we ask, to prove that the Mūṣika city or country was situated on the banks of the Kṛṣṇa-vēpā? Even assuming his reading Kaṅhabendagātāya to be a correct one, can it be definitely suggested that the Hāthī-Gumphā inscription contemplates Mūṣikā-nagara, the capital of the Mūṣikas, “to be on the Kaṅhabēnū”? Can it not also be suggested that King Kharavela struck terror into Mūṣikā-nagara with the army that advanced from the Kaṅhabēnū? While Mr. Jayaswal’s Hāthī-Gumphā inscription contemplates the capital of the Mūṣikas to be on the Kṛṣṇa-vēpā, Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri finds reasons to suggest that “the Mūṣikas were probably settled on the banks of the river Muni on which Hyderabad now stands.”

We have maintained that the intended reading is not Kaṅhabendagātāya but Kaṅningagātāya; not Musika-nagara but Asaka-nagara or Asika-nagara. Had the letter been intended to real ma, there is no reason why the m-mark should appear as the lower prolongation of a straight vertical line on the right. We have offered a good explanation for the probable appearance of the i-mark along with sa, in case such a vowel-mark was not in the intention of the engraver. We also have shown how a few holes on the inscribed surface, on two sides of the letter ti, are accountable for the production of a mirage of a letter, which Mr. Jayaswal reads śha in the estampages.

If our reading be correct, as we believe it is, a great advantage to be derived therefrom is that it does not compel us to resort to a number of assumptions without any proofs, that the Mūṣikas “were probably a subordinate ally of Śātakrṇi,” that the capital of the Mūṣikas was a city on the river Kṛṣṇa-vēpā, that Strīrājya and Mūṣika countries formed at
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one time or another one princeedom in a Vindhya region towards the West, and so on and so forth.

The foregoing discussion concerning Arakatapura will have no effect and the question as to the non-mention of territories of the Andhras and Cholas will remain undecided if the reading proves to be otherwise. Mr. Vats' estampage reproduced by Mr. Jayaswal in JBORS, Dec., 1927, clearly presents a word consisting of five syllables, the letter representing the second syllable appearing as ha and the letter representing the fifth syllable as ca. If so, we have to read the intended word either (1) as akatapuva (= akatap̄ūva, unhurt before), or (2) as (ā)hatapuva (= āhratapūva, acquired beforehand). Mr. Jayaswal reads akatapuva interpreting it in the sense of ‘unhurt before.’ Such an interpretation as this is utterly inappropriate in a statement where King Khāravela is said to have governed the Vidyādhara-abode (Vijādhārādīvāsa) in the manner of the former kings of Kaliṅga compelling all the Raṭṭhika-Bhojakas (sava Raṭṭhika-Bhojake) to pay due homage to him, no doubt as a test of their owing allegiance to him as they did to his predecessors. The statement, taken as a whole, indicates that the Vidyādhara-abode was an aboriginal tract of land, which was annexed to Kaliṅga previously, that is to say, by some Aira-Meghavahana king among Khāravela’s precursors. This sense can be brought out only if one agrees to read the intended word as (ā)hatapuva interpreting it in the sense of “acquired beforehand.”

Having regard to the fact that the statement just referred to has been made immediately after the statement in which Khāravela is said to have struck terror into the heart of the city of Asaka (Aśvaka) or Asika (Ṛṣika), we may maintain that the Vidyādhara-abode was situated somewhere near Aśvaka or Ṛṣika on the western border of the kingdom of Kaliṅga, and that this abode formed the territories of the Raṭṭhika-Bhojakas who find mention in the edicts of Asoka (R. E. V, R. E. XIII) as semi-independent ruling races dwelling somewhere in Western India. The Raṭṭhika-Bhojakas figure in Asoka’s edicts among westerners, the peoples of Western India (apalantā, aparāntā). In R. E. V. the Raṭṭhikas as a ruling race are mentioned in combination with the Pettanikas (Laṭṭhika-Pitenika), while in R. E. XIII, we have the mention of the Bhojas or Bhojakas in the same combination (Bhoja-Pitenika). It would appear from this either (1) that the Raṭṭhikas and the Bhojakas were two confederate clans, or (2) that one and the same ruling race was known by two different names, such as Raṭṭhika and Bhojaka. That the Raṭṭhikas and the Bhojakas were two separate clans is undeniable because, corresponding to them, we have
the mention of the Mahāraṭṭhis and the Mahābhōjasa in the records of the Sātavāhana kings. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar has wrongly maintained Pitiṇika to be an adjective of Rāṭṭhika or Bhoja on the strength of the Pāli passage in the Anguttara-Nikāya (III, pp. 76, 78, 300). It is clear from the Pāli passage, as well as from Buddhaghosha's explanations, that Rāṭṭhika and Pettanika were two different or titular designations. Buddhaghosha, for instance, says: Rāṭṭhiko' ti yo ratthaṁ bhunjati, “the Rāṭṭhika is one who enjoys the income derived from rāṣṭra (as defined in the Artha-Śāstra, II. 6. 24)"; Pettunikō' ti yo pitarabhunḍānabhunṭam bhunjati, “the Pettanika is one who enjoys the hereditary rights and privileges." The term Bhoja or Bhojaka may be interpreted either in the sense of rattha-bhojaka or rāṭṭhika, “the enjoyer of rāṣṭra,” or in that of gāma-gāwanika or gāma-bhojaka, “the village headman.” If Berar and Konkan were the principalities of the Rāṭṭhika-Bhojakas,2 we can say that the Vidyādhara-abode was co-extensive with the ancient kingdom of Daṇḍaka (Satrabhaṅga-Jātaka, No. 520) bounded on the east by the kingdom of Kaliṅga, on the west by the kingdom of Avantu, on the north by the kingdom of Kāśi, and on the south by the kingdom of Aṣvaka to the south of the Vindhyā range. We might go further and maintain that this Vidyādhara-abode was no other than what is mentioned in the Purāṇas as Strīrāṣṭra or Strīrājya. Depending on the reading in one of the Ms. of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, Mr. Jayaswal says that in the Purāṇas, Strīrājya and Muṣika country are said to have formed one principality.3 The Viṣṇu-Purāṇa is not all the Purāṇas. Even all the Ms. of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa do not offer the same reading. The different Ms., as noted by Mr. Pargiter, give different readings, one giving Muṣīna, one Muṅkhika, one Muṣīla, and one Mrṣika.4 The Purāṇas as a whole tell altogether a different story. In them, we read that Strīrāṣṭra and Bhokṣyaka formed one principality under a king named Kanaka.5 Curiously enough, we have precisely Bhojaka as a variant for Bhokṣyaka, which is significant as implying that Strīrāṣṭra and Bhokṣyaka formed the principalities of the Rāṭṭhika-Bhojakas.

1. Sitā bhāgo baleḥ karo vaṇik nadipālasto nāvah paṭṭanam vartani raṇjus corarajjus ca raṣṭram.
4. Ibid, p. 54, f.n. 25.
5. Ibid, p. 54; Strīraṣṭram Bhokṣyakāmi caiva bhokṣyate Kanakāhavāḥ. For the variant Bhojaka see ibid, p. 54, f.n. 24.
According to Khārvela’s inscription, King Sātakarni was the only powerful rival on the western border of his Kaliṅga kingdom whom he defeated in striking terror into Asaka-nagara or Asika-nagara, the capital of Asaka or Asika. Asaka is just a Prakrit form of the Pāli Assaka and the Sanskrit Asvaka or Asmaka, and Asika is nothing but a Prakrit form of the Sanskrit Rṣika or Rṛṣika¹ met with in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya (IV. 2.2). It is clear from Ptolemy’s Geography that the capital of Pulumāyi or Vasiṣṭhiputra Sri Pulumāyi of the Sātakarni Sātavāhana dynasty, was Baithan, Paithan, Patiṭṭhāna or Pratisthāna, which became, according to the Prologue (Vaṭthugāthā) of the Pārāyaṇavagga in the Sutta-Nipāta, the southern destination of a great trade-route called Dakhkhiṇāpatha or Southern Road.² The Pārāyaṇa-Prologue speaks of the hermitage of a hermit named Bāvari as a religious institution founded on the bank of the Godāvari river (Godhavārikūle), in the dominion of Assaka, in close proximity to Alaka or Mulaka (Assakassassa viśaye Mulakassassamāsane). The author of the Sutta-Nipāta-Commentary, writing in the 5th century, A.D., says that Bāvari’s hermitage was situated in a strip of territory, which stood midway between the two Andhra kingdoms of Assaka and Alaka or Mulaka, that is to say, in that region where the Godāvari having divided itself into two streams, formed a doab, between them, and where in former times, the Hermit Sarabhaṅga and others lived.³

In referring to the hermitage of Sarabhaṅga the author of the Sutta-Nipāta-Commentary kept evidently in his view the legend of the Sarabhaṅga-Jātaka which points to a time when the high road called Dakhkhiṇāpatha had not come into existence, when a traveller undertaking a journey from Benares to the bank of the Godāvari had to proceed by a one-foot-track, or a “road for a foot-passenger (eka-padi-magga) under the escort of a forester (vanavaraka).

This Jātaka legend is on a par with the Rāmāyaṇa account of Gāma’s wanderings from Ayodhyā in the north to Paṇevaṭṭi on the bank of the Godāvari in the south, which too, points to a time when a traveller
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from the north had to proceed to the south from hermitage to hermitage, following a forest track.

When exactly the high road was built and by whom we cannot say. But it is certain, as evidenced by several Pāli Dialogues, that some such high road was already in existence in the life-time of the Buddha, anyhow from Rājagaha to Kusinārā, from Kusinārā to Pāvā, from Pāvā to Kapilavatthu, from Kapilavatthu to Sāketa viś Setavya and Sāvatthi, and from Sāketa to Kosambi and further south. And yet the Prologue of the Pāraśa-vagga in the Sutta-Nipāta must be considered a later addition and relegated to a post-Asokan age for the simple reason that it did not find any place in the Culla-Niddesa which is a Pāli canonical exegesis on the Pāraśa group of sixteen poems and undoubtedly a composition of a post-Asokan time. Even this Prologue has nothing in it to indicate that Assaka and Ajaika or Mujaka were two Andhra territories. It is only in the Sutta-Nipāta-Commentary that we have the mention of Assaka and Mujaka as principalities of two Andhra kings. As to who these two Andhra-kings were, this commentary does not supply us with any information whatever.

The Cullakāliṅga-Jātaka (Fausboll, No. 301) presents in its quoted verses an old chronicle of a war, which ensued between the Assakas and the Kaliṅgas when King Aruṇa was the ruler among the Assakas, and ended in the victory of the former and the defeat of the latter. In explaining the historical allusions, the commentary version of the Jātaka in prose introduces certain details that are beyond the scope of the chronicle in verse.

According to the commentary version, the war alluded to in the chronicle broke out between Kaliṅga and Assaka when King Kaliṅga reigned in Dantapura, the capital of Kaliṅga, and King Assaka reigned in Potali, the capital of Assaka. It represents the then reigning king of Kaliṅga as a ruler who was equipped with a powerful army (sāmpanna-balā-rāhano) and a mighty warrior who was unrivalled in military prowess (nāga-balā patīyodhān na passati), a description worthy of King Khāravela of Kaliṅga as he appears in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription.

These three points are clearly brought out in the commentary version of the Jātaka: (1) that the war which ensued was an aggressive war inflicted on the king of Assaka by the then reigning king of Kaliṅga who suffered from the mania for war and love of conquests over the whole of India, a spirit so much extolled in Khāravela’s inscription; (2) that the battle was fought on a field between the boundaries of the two kingdoms
(dvinnam rajjasam antare), it implying that the kingdom of Assaka lay contiguous to the kingdom of Kalinga towards the west exactly as during the reign of King Khāravela; and (3) that the king of Kalinga was ultimately compelled to return to his capital, acknowledging his defeat, in spite of the fact that he started with a mighty army (mahatiya senaya nikkhami), a fate which is virtually the same as the final result of Khāravela’s attack on the capital of Assaka, if it had been recorded in an inscription of the King of Assaka.

Whatever be the period of time to which the evidence of the commentary version of the Jātaka refers, it cannot be doubted that this evidence is in some important respects similar to that of Khāravela’s inscription in the Hāthi-Gumphā. If its first verse, which appears to have been a later manipulation, be left out of consideration and be linked up with the prose story, the older chronicle in verse becomes reduced to a bardic narration of a tribal feud between the Assakas and the Kalingas, whereas the prose story in the Jātaka-commentary has for its theme the final result of a war, which ensued between two kings, viz., King Kalinga of Kalinga and King Assaka of Assaka. According to the first verse which we consider to be a later addition, Aruṇa was the family or personal name of the then reigning king of Assaka, and Nandisena was the name of his commander-in-chief feared for his valour. The Jātaka as a whole keeps us in the dark as to the family or personal name of the then reigning king of Kalinga and the name of his commander-in-chief. It is highly improbable that any king of Kalinga before or after Khāravela, up till the 5th century A.D., is known to have grown so powerful and ambitious as to make bold to stir out for effecting conquests all over India. As to the relationship of Aruṇa, the then reigning king of Assaka, either with the Andhras or with the Śatakarṇi-Sātavāhanas, the Jātaka has nothing to say. But it definitely says that the king of Kalinga ultimately suffered a defeat and failed of his purpose in waging war upon the kingdom of Assaka, in spite of his being a mighty warrior unrivalled in military prowess and equipped with a powerful army, in spite of the fact that he marched towards Assaka with a mighty army. The Hāthi-Gumphā inscription, too, clearly brings out the same fact, namely, that King Khāravela of Kalinga could do no more than striking terror into the heart.

1. Pivaratha imasam dvāraṃ, nagaraṃ pavisaṃtu | Arunarājassā sīhena suasathanā varakkhitam | Nandisenena ti |
of the capital of Asaka or Asika in spite of the fact that he caused a large army consisting of all the four divisions of Indian troops to move on towards the west without paying any attention to the presence of Śātakarṇi's power. It cannot be inferred from this inscription that Asaka or Asika was ever permanently annexed by Khāravela to his kingdom.

That the Śātakarṇi's and other kings of the Sātavāhana dynasty exercised suzerainty over Asaka, Asika and a number of other subordinate states, which clustered round the western Godavari valley to the west and south of Kaliṅga, cannot at all be doubted. For we find that in the Nasik cave inscription of Queen Gautami, dated in the 19th year of the reign of her grandson King Vāsiṣṭhiputra Śrī-Pulumāyi, her son King Gautamiputra Śrī-Śātakarṇi has been eulogised as the ruler of Asika, Asaka (Āśmaka on the Godāvari), Mulaka (the district round Paithan), Suraṭha (Kathiawar), Kukura (in Western on Central India, near the Pārīyātra or Western Vindhyas), Aparanṭa (North Konkan), Anupa (the district round Māhismatī on the Narmadā), Vīdabha (Berar), and Akāra-Avati (East and West Malwa), and no less as the lord of the Vījha, Charaṭa, Pāricāta, Sahya, Kaṇhagiri, Maca, Siritana, Malaya, Mahida, Setagiri and Cakorapavata, in short “of all the mountains from the Vindhyas to the Travancore hills.”

There is little doubt that in Queen Gautami's inscription the same eulogium was meant also for her grandson King Vāsiṣṭhiputra Śrī-Pulumāyi. Even after King Mahākṣatrāpa Rudradāman I of the Kṣaharāta family had wrested some five of the western territories, after A.D. 130 and before A.D. 150, from one King Śrī-Śātakarṇi, the lord of the Deccan, who was perhaps King Vāsiṣṭhiputra Śrī-Pulumāyi himself, Asika, Asaka and the rest of the subordinate states mentioned in Gautami's inscription remained included in the dominions of the Śātakarṇi-Sātavahana kings up till, we venture to say, the reign of Yajña-Śrī-Śātakarṇi, the last great king of the Sātavahana family. Even going back to earlier times, to a period of the Śātakarṇi-Sātavahana reign before the Kṣaharāta rule in Western India and the Deccan and occupation of Mahārāṣṭra in the


time of Nahapana, nay, to the reign of king Sri-Satakarni I, the son of Simuka who was the founder of the Satavahana branch of the Andhra family, the successor of King Krsna who was Simuka's brother, and the husband of Queen Nayanika, we find the same state of things. The Nanahat inscription of Queen Nayanika and the Sanchi inscription of Ananda, the leading artisan of one King Sri-Satakarni bear testimony to the rise and existence of the first great Satakarni-Satavahana empire in the western Godavari valley "which," as Dr. Raychaudhuri acutely puts it, "rivalled in extent and power the Suna empire in the Ganges valley and the Greek empire in the Land of the Five Rivers."1

Thus the epigraphic records connected with the Satakarni-Satavahana and Ksharartha Saka-Ksatrapa kings enable us to understand not only (1) why Ptolemy wrote to say that Baithan or Paithan (Patipthana on the Godavari, the southern terminus of Dakhinapatha, the Southern Road) was the capital of King Pulumayi Vasishtiputra Sri-Pulumayi, and (2) why Assaka and Mulaka or Alaka have been represented in the Sutta-Nipata-Commentary as two Andhra principalities in the western valley of the Godavari, but also (3) why the Hathi-Gumph inscription records that King Kharavela of Kalinga defying King Satakarni caused a large army consisting of all the four divisions of Indian troops to move on towards the west to strike terror into the heart of the capital of Asaka or Asika.

If it has been conclusively proved that Asaka or Asika, which was one of the subordinate states in the dominions of King Satakarni, lay to the west of Kharavela's Kalinga, there can be no denying the fact that the Kalinga kingdom of Kharavela included in it the third division, Kosala or South Kosala, "which comprised the modern Bilaspur, Raipur and Sambalpur districts, and occasionally even a part of Ganjam."2

Both Mr. Jayaswal and Dr. Sten Konow seem to think that Kosala or South Kosala was that division of the Kalinga kingdom in the time of King Ashoka which comprised anta avijita, the unconquered outlying tracts, referred to in two copies of Ashoka's Separate Rock Edicts. Even if it be so, we find it impossible to say that any Aina King of Utkala, associated in

the Sanskrit verses from an old Oṛiyā Ms. with Kosala, was the then reigning monarch of Kosala.

The denotation of the term antas or pratyantās has varied with different authorities. As used in Buddhist literature, it denotes the regions that lay immediately beyond what is called Madhya-deśa, the Middle Country. As used in the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta, it denotes such North-Eastern frontier states as those of Samatāta, Dāvāka, Kāmarūpa, Nepāla, Karttrpura and the rest. And as used in Aśoka’s inscriptions, it denotes the unconquered territories or tracts that lay beyond his dominions, whether in the north-west, or in the south, or in the east. In his Rock Edict XIII, King Aśoka has expressly mentioned the five Greco-Bactrian principalities as typical examples of antas in the north-west, and Chola, the land of the Cholas, and Pāṇḍya, the land of the Pāṇḍyas, as typical examples of antas in the south. In speaking of the independent dwellers of the antas with whom his Viceroy and High Functionaries at Tosali and Samāpā were to deal, King Aśoka has not cared to name any ruling chiefs, peoples or powers as worthy of mention. If by antas in connection with his Kaliṅga Province he really meant Kośala or South Kośala, it must have then comprised the feudal states of a number of tribal chiefs, instead of being one kingdom under the rule of King Khāravela.

It is recorded in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription that King Khāravela, in the eleventh year of his reign, caused the grassy jungle of Pṛthudaka to be driven out into the Lāṅgala river and caused the watery jungle of grass to be destroyed, the watery jungle which was allowed to grow up in one hundred and thirteen years. The statement is important as giving us some glimpses into the physical features of Kaliṅga, of which we are offered the following interesting description in Mr. Mano Mohan Ganguly’s Orissa and Her Remains, pp. 6-7:

“It was always a terra incognita, by reason of its geographical position and local circumstances. The whole country was a swamp intersected by a network of rivers with their feeders and tributaries carrying silt to the Bay of Bengal; impassable hilly jungles fringed its borders. The country was in a process of geological formation; there was a perpetual struggle between the different rivers and the sea, for the formation of the deltaic regions.”

In the Hāthi-Gumphā record of Khāravela’s twelfth regnal year, we read (1) that His Majesty was able to strike terror into the heart of the kings of Uttarāpatha, (2) that in generating a great fear for the
people of Ánga and Magadha he caused the elephants and horses to drink at the Ganges, (3) that he compelled King Bahasatimita of Magadha to bow down at his feet, (4) that he triumphantly brought back to Kaliṅga from Ánga-Magadha the Throne of Jina belonging to Kaliṅga which was carried away by King Nanda, (5) that he compelled the inhabitants of Ánga and Magadha to bow down at his feet, (6) that a hundred Vāsukis sent him jewels, procured for him the elephants, horses and other animals capable of exciting curiosity, and made presents of deer, horses and elephants, (7) that the king of Pāṇḍya supplied him with many valuable presents of apparels, pearls, gems, and jewels, and (8) that he subdued the inhabitants of some other place.

The significance of the geographical designation Uttarāpatha is to be understood in contrast to that of Dakṣiṇāpatha. As we noticed, the Prologue of Book V of the Sutta-Nipāta represents Dakṣiṇāpatha as a great trade-route, the Southern High Road, which starting from Rājagaha, the capital of Magadha (Magadhā-pura), passed through Nālandā and Pāṭaligāma (where the city of Pāṭaliputta was afterwards built), to extend northward to Vesāli across the Ganges and via Koṭīgāma, and extending as far as Kapilavatthu via Kusinārā and Pāvā, turned southward to reach Sāvatthī via Setavya, and proceeding southward passed through Sāketa to extend to Kosambi across the Yamunā, and proceeding further south, reached Vana or Vana-Sāvatthī, at which point it turned towards the west to pass through Ujjeni and Mahissati, and extended as far south as Patiṭṭhāna or Paithana across the Vindhya range. This Southern High Road lent its name to the region through which it passed, the whole tract of land lying to the south of the Ganges and to the north of the Godāvari being known, according to Buddhaghosa, as Dakṣiṇāpatha, the Deccan proper.¹ That this region was known up to a late period as Dakṣiṇāpatha is evident from these two literary references: (1) Dākṣiṇātye janapade Pāṭaliputraṃ nāma nagaraṃ, “Pāṭaliputra a city on the south bank of the Ganges in a Deccan district,” occurring in one of the stories of the Pañcatantra,² and (2) Avanti Dakṣiṇāpathe, “Avanti in Dakṣiṇāpatha,” occurring in one of the passages of the Vinaya-Piṭaka.³ This original significance of

---
¹ Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī, Part I, p. 256.
² Pañcatantra, Sreṣṭhi-Kṣapaṅaka-Nāpita-Kathā.
the name Dakṣiṇāpatha was gradually lost sight of with the result that in later times the location of Dakṣiṇāpatha came to be shifted to the south of the Vindhya range, to finally cover the whole of the modern South India lying between the Vindhya range and the Cape Comorin, the Deccan proper still being the region between the Godāvari and the Kṛṣṇā. It may be easily inferred from the Nasik cave inscription of Queen Gautami, from the list of countries included in the dominions of Gautamiputra Śrī-Śātakāruṇi, that, as late as the first two centuries of the Christian era, the kingdom of Avanti was located in Dakṣiṇāpatha.

A similar historical process can be conceived with reference to Uttarāpatha or Uttarāpatha. For Uttarāpatha, too, may be supposed to have been originally a great trade-route, the Northern High Road, while extended from Sāvatthi to Takkarisalā in Gandhāra, and have lent, precisely like the Southern High Road, its name to the region through which it passed, the region, broadly speaking, covering the north-western part of the United Provinces, the whole of the Punjab Province and the North-Western Frontier Provinces. That this region was known up to a late period as Uttarāpatha is evident from these three literary references: (1) Uttarā-Madhura-Uttarāpatha, "the Northern Mathurā, the Mathurā proper on the Yamunā, in Uttarāpatha," occurring in Dharmapāla's Paramathadīpani, a commentary on the Petavatthu; (2) Prthudakāś parataḥ Uttarāpathah, "Uttarāpatha lies (towards the west) beyond Prthudaka (near Thaneswar)," occurring in the Kāvyā-Mīmāṃsā; and (3) the following verse occurring in the Mahābhārata, XII, 207, 43:

\[
\text{Uttarāpatha-jaunmanāḥ kirtayatīyāmi tān api}
\]
\[
\text{Yauñā-Kamboja-Gandhāraḥ Kirāṭa Barbaraḥ sakaḥ} \]

Buddhaghosa in his commentary on the Kathāvatthu, attributes certain views in the Kathāvatthu to two Buddhist schools called Hemavatika and Uttarāpathaka. Hemavatika and Uttarāpathaka were the local or

territorial names of two post-Asokan Buddhist schools, the former being derived from Himavanta, and the latter from Uttarāpatha. We have reasons to say that the Himavanta region consisted of a number of Himalayan states to the north of the Southern High Road in its extension from Vesāli to Sāvatthi and beyond the northern boundary of the Middle Country as defined in Buddhist literature. Thus Uttarāpatha may be accurately defined as a tract of land, which lay to the west of the Himavanta region, extending westward from Thaneswar, and which lay to the north-west of the Buddhist Middle Country and to the north of the Dakṣināpatha, extending north-west from Mathurā, the capital of Śūrasena. Whatever be its later territorial extension, it is certain that Khāravela's Uttarāpatha signified nothing but the region specified above, the region including Mathurā in its south-eastern extension. Anyhow, from the record of Khāravela's twelfth regnal year, it is clear that Uttarāpatha lay towards the west or north-west beyond Aṅga and Magadha. And should our reading be correct, from the use of the plural expression Uttarāpadha-rajāno, “the rulers of Uttarāpatha,” it may be inferred that when King Khāravela carried his campaign into Uttarāpatha, it was parcelled, precisely as it was when Alexander invaded the plains of India, into a number of small independent principalities, although the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription does not mention the names of their rulers.

According to the Mahābhārata account of the journey of the Pāñjaves from Hastināpura to Kaliṅga, Kaliṅga proper could be reached by the travellers journeying along the sea-coast from the mouth of the Ganges, and it was the country through which the river Vaitāraṇī flowed. On the strength of this Epic description, Mr. Mono Mohan Ganguly assigns the following boundaries to Kaliṅga proper: “On the North, the Vaitāraṇī; on the South, the Godāvari; on the East, the Bay of Bengal; on the West, the Tributary States of Orissa.” The reader can judge for himself whether and how far the geographical extension of Kaliṅga proper,

1. Mahābhārata, Vanaparva, Canto I:
   Tutoḥ samudra-tīraṇa jagāma vasudhādhīpaḥ
   Bhṛtrihśaḥ sahitā evaḥ Kaliṅgān prati Bhārataḥ
eva Lomaḥa uṇaḥ
eva Kaliṅgāḥ Kauṇṭeya yatra Vaitāraṇī nadiḥ
eva Tatrāyajata dharmopī deva-charaṇametya eva

2. Orissa and Her Remains, p. 9.
as may be inferred from the Mahābhārata account, coincided with that of the Kaliṅga kingdom of Khāravela. Apparently, as we have sought to show, Khāravela’s Kaliṅga kingdom with its three divisions comprised the Epic Kaliṅga as well as the modern Orissa with its Tributary States.

The countries of Aṅga and Magadha are too well-known to need any elaborate comments. The Hāthi-Gumpha inscription clearly indicates that both Aṅga and Magadha were situated side by side with each other on the south bank of the Ganges, which is to say, that the Ganges formed the natural northern boundary of both the countries. Aṅga lost her independence and became a dependency of the kingdom of Magadha as early as the reign of King Bimbisāra, who is said to have been one of the elder contemporaries of the Buddha. The Hāthi-Gumpha inscription indicates that Aṅga continued to be the same old dependency of the kingdom of Magadha as during the reign of King Bahasatimita as during that of King Nanda.

The Vāsukis referred to were not fabulous beings. There would be no reason for mentioning them in a serious document if they were fabulous. The Vāsukis were the Nāga kings who had established principalities in all parts of India. “The prevalence of Nāga rule over a considerable portion of Northern and Central India in the third and fourth centuries A. D., is amply attested by epigraphic evidence.” ¹ The name of the Chota-Nagpur District situated between Bihar in the north and Orissa in the south may be taken as a reminiscence of the Nāga principalities that existed at one time between Aṅga-Magadha, on one side, and Khāravela’s Kaliṅga kingdom, on the other. There are inscriptive records to show that Mathurā and the countries around it were occupied in circa 300 A. D. by the Nāgas. The statement that the Vāsukis sent precious jewels to King Khāravela, procured for him the elephants, horses and other animals capable of exciting curiosity, clearly indicates that their principalities comprised those jungle tracts which abounded in the wealth of precious stones, and wild elephants, horses and other animals.

The statement that the king of Pāṇḍya supplied King Khāravela with many valuable presents of pearls, gems and jewels and various kinds of apparels, requires a word of explanation. One might say this could be explained without having to assume that the kingdom of Pāṇḍya was at any time invaded by King Khāravela; the statement might be justified

either (1) on the ground that the kings of Pândya were the less powerful allies of the Aíra-Meghavāhana kings of Kaliṅga from earlier times, or (2) on the ground that alarming reports of the irresistible force of Khāravela’s victorious arms compelled the then reigning king of Pândya to make an alliance, acknowledging the supremacy of King Mahāvijaya Sri-Khāravela of Kaliṅga.

As to whether Khāravela had at any time invaded Pândya, we should bear in mind that the fact of sending presents by the king of Pândya to King Khāravela is stated in the record of Khāravela’s twelfth regnal year. Whether or no, the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription bears testimony to the invasion of Pândya by King Khāravela depends, to a large extent, upon the nature of the reading and rendering of the record of Khāravela’s eighth regnal year. The following are the three successive readings and renderings of this record that have been offered by Mr. Jayaswal: —

I (a)—First Reading: Athame ca vace (manatino ?) (āha ma ni ??) ...... Goradha-giri ghātāpāyitā Rājagaha-napam piḍāpayati etinaṃ ca kamu-padāna-paṇādena sabata sena-vāhane vipamunācītaṃ Madhuraṃ apayāto [.]

(b) First Rendering: “In the eighth year, the ministers (?)...at Goradha-giri...having got killed, (he) causes oppression to the King of Rājagrya who by the report of (Khāravela’s) offer of marching forward, was made to retire to Mathurā, leaving behind everywhere his troops and vehicles.”

II (a)—Second Reading: Athame ca vace mahati-senāya mahata-(bhittiṃ) Goradha-giriṃ ghātāpāyitā Rājagahaṃ upapiḍāpayati [.] etinaṃ ca kamu-padāna-paṇādena sambita-sena-vāhiniṃ vipamunācītaṃ Madhuraṃ apayāto seca narido (gāma) ......(mā?) (yacati) vichā—palava-bhar(e) ...[.]

(b)—Second Rendering: “In the eighth year, he (Khāravela) having got stormed the Gorathagiri (fortress) of great enclosure by a great army, causes pressure around Rājagrya (lays siege to Rājagrya). On account of this report of the acts of valour, (i.e., the capture of Gorathagiri, etc.), the king (so-called) to forsake the invested division of his army, went away to Mathurā indeed, ...”

III (a)—Third Reading: ... eti(aṃ or oṣ) ca kamu-paṇāda-samnādena samb(i)ta-sena-vāhane vipamunācītaṃ Madhuraṃ apayāto Yavana-rajj(a)-Dīmīta or oṣi)yachati...vi-palava...... [.]

(b)—Third Rendering: “on account of the report (uproar) occasioned by the acts of valour (i.e., the capture of the Gorathagiri
fortress and the siege of Rājagrha, etc.) the Greek king Demetrius drawing in his army and transport, retreated to abandon Mathurā."

It will be seen that all the three renderings offered by Mr. Jayaswal show an agreement in representing Goradhagiri not as a personal name but as the name of a hill-fortress at Goradhagiri, the modern Barābar range of hills in the District of Gaya. These also show an agreement in representing Rājagaha as the earlier capital of Magadha, and Mathurā as a city on the Yamunā in Northern India. The difference between his first and second renderings is that whereas in the former, accepting the reading Rājagaha-nāpaṁ piṭāpayati......, the king of Rājagrha is represented as the timid warrior who retired to Mathurā, in the latter, accepting the reading Rājagahaṁ upapiṭāpayati......yeva narido, indefinitely the king so-called is represented as the warrior who went away to Mathurā. And the difference between his third and earlier two renderings is that while in the latter either definitely the king of Rājagrha or indefinitely and sarcastically the king so-called is represented as the warrior who went away to Mathurā, in the former Dimita-Demetrius is represented as the Greek king (Yavana-rājā) who, drawing in his army and transport, instead of advancing towards Rājagrha, retreated to abandon Mathurā.

Before we decide one way or the other, we ought to thresh out the matter carefully. We have nothing to say against Mr. Jayaswal's reading and rendering of the opening words of the eighth year's record up to senāya. These, taken by themselves, clearly indicate that King Khāravela started on a campaign with a mighty army in the eighth year of his reign. His reading Goradhagirīṁ ghatāpayītā cannot be challenged. This expression may be rendered either as (1) "having caused Gorathagiri to be killed," or as (2) "having caused Gorathagiri to be stormed," according as we take Goradhagiri to be a personal name or the name of a hill-fortress or mountain-fastness.

Whether Goradhagiri is a personal name or the name of a hill-fortress might have been decided at once if the words preceding it could be accurately read. From the faint traces of the letters, Mr. Jayaswal made out māhata-bhitti, "of great enclosure," as an adjunct of Goradhagiri, keeping in his view Mr. V. H. Jackson's identification of Goradhagiri or Gorathagiri with the modern Barābar hills. But he has given up at last this reading, declaring it to be uncertain. Mr. Banerji's estamping published in JBORS, 1917, enables us to make out Madhurāṁ a[napa]to, "as he reached Mathurā."
We say that the use of Goradhagiri as a personal name in Khāravela’s
inscription is not impossible. For in the Mahāvamsa, Giri occurs as the
name of a Nigaṁṭha or Jain contemporary of King Vaṭṭagāmanī of
Ceylon. In one of the ancient Brāhmī inscriptions, Yosagiri occurs as the
name of a Buddhist monk.1 In Jain literature, Mahāgiri and Siṁhagiri
occur as the names of two Jain apostles.2 And none need be surprised
if Mahendragiri occurs as the name of the king of Piṣṭhapura in the Allahābād
Pillar inscription of Samudragupta.3

The use of the verbal expression ghālāpayita in the sense of “having
causd to be killed” is appropriate, if Goradhagiri is a personal name.
It may be argued that the use of the same verbal expression in the sense
of “having caused to be stormed” is equally appropriate, if Goradhagiri
is the name of a hill-fortress or mountain-fastness. We cannot but agree
with Mr. Jayaswal when he maintains that the use of the expression
Goradhagiriṃ ghālāpayita, even where Goradhagiri is the name of a hill-
fortress, is sanctioned by literary usage, and calls our attention to the Pāli
expression Dipaghātaka  Đàmilā, “the Tamil devastators of the Island of
Laṅkā.”4

The Mahābhārata is the only Indian work where we have the mention
of Gorathagiri as a hill or mountain from which one might have a view of
Girivraja or Old Rājagṛha, the first or most ancient known capital of
Magadha.5 Mr. Jackson is inclined to think6 that this Gorathagiri is no
other than the mountain which Hwen Thsang saw between Pāṭaliputra and

1. Lüders’ List of Brāhmī inscriptions, No. 601.
2. P. C. Bagchi “On the Pūrvas”, Calcutta University Journal of the Department of
3. It is only by suggestio falsi that Fleet represents Mahendragiri of Samudragupta’s
inscription as the name of a hill or mountain. From the system of using the patronymic
of a place-name as an adjunct of a personal name which has been consistently maintained
in the whole list of the kings subdued by the Indian Napoleon, it is easy to understand,
as D. R. Bhandarkar points out, that Mahendragiri is a personal name, nothing but a
personal name, Kausalaka—Mahendra—Māhākāntāra—Vyaghrarāja—Kaurālaka—Maṇḍarāja—
Piṣṭhapuraṇa—Mahendragiri—Kauḍāraka—Svāmidatta, etc.
4. Attention might be drawn to a better instance in the Dāthārāmāsa, III. 16 (JPTS,
1884, p. 126): Kusena ghālāpayi dantadhātum, “he caused the tooth-relic to be smashed
with a hammer.”
Gayā, and on the eastern summit of which the "Tathāgata formerly stood for a time beholding the country of Magadha." 1

Seeing that the names Goratha and Baithan are both connected with cattle and having regard to the fact that there is no hill near enough to Rajgir besides the Baithan hill, Mr. J. D. Beglar found reasons to think that the hill named Goratha in the Mahābhārata could not but be the same as the present Baithan hill. 2 And with reference to Isigili or Rṣigiri, Buddhaghośa says that the Blessed One was once upon a time seated in that place sitting where he could behold all the five hills (that stood close to one another surrounding Rājagaha). 3 The Isigili-Sutta of the Majjhima-Nikāya records the names of these five hills as the Vebhāra, the Paṇḍava, the Vepulla, the Gijjhakūṭa and the Isigili. In the opinion of Mr. Oldham, Māgadhapura referred to in the Mahābhārata as the capital of Magadha which could be seen from the summit of the Gorathagiri hill might have been "a town close to the east of the Barābar hills, on the site of what is now known as Ibrahimpur." But the description in the Mahābhārata leaves no room for doubt that this Māgadhapura was no other than Girivraja, which precisely like Rājagaha of the Isigili-Sutta, was guarded by the five lofty-peaked and cool-planted hills, the vipula-Vaihāra, the Varāha, the Viṣābha, the Rṣigiri and the kubha-Caityaka. 4 Further, the Sutta-Nipāta-Commentary takes Māgadhapura to mean Rājagaha. 5

We must carefully note that Gorathagiri, according to the Mahābhārata, was the hill which stood at some distance from Girivraja or Old Rājagṛha and could be reached by the travellers journeying from the land of the Kurus through the Kuru-jungle, proceeding to the beautiful lotus-lake and getting beyond the Kālakūṭa mountain, and likewise going by degrees across the Gapjaki, the great Sone and the Sādāntri, the rivers taking their rise from one and the same mountain, crossing the charming

---

4. Mahābhārata, II, 21-23:
   Vaihāra vipulā ṭailo Vārāho Vṛṣabhas tathā |
   Tathā Rṣigiris tābha kubhā Caityaka-paścanaśā |
   Ete paśca mahārghgya parvatāḥ śītalā-drumāḥ |
   Raktantiesbhāṣumhatyaṃ hotaṃ Giriṟvaṇaṃ |
5. Paramatthajotikā, II, p. 584; Māgadhama puranti Māgadhapuraṃ Rājagahakanti adhippayo.
Sarayū and beholding the Eastern Kośala, going beyond Mithilā, crossing the rivers Māḷā and Carmaṇvatī, crossing the Ganges and the Sone, and proceeding further eastward to get from Kuśacetraechada to what was called Magadhā-ḳsetra, the Magadha-territory (literally, "the Magadha-field").

There can be little doubt, as Mr. Jackson has sought to prove on the strength of two short Brāhmi inscriptions, that Gorathagiri was but one of the two ancient names of the Barābar hills, the other being Khalatika-pavata, which latter is met with in two of the Barābar Hill-Cave inscriptions of Aśoka and in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya (I. 2. 2). As the ancient capital of Magadha was known at the same time by two names, Girivraja and Rājakṛṣṭha, so, Mr. Jackson thinks, the Barābar hills were known at one time by two names, Gorathagiri and Khalatika-pavata, while, later on, they came to be known by the name of Pravaragiri, Pravara wherefrom the modern name Barābar was apparently derived.

The two Brāhmi inscriptions, relied upon by Mr. Jackson in proposing his identification, are engraved on rocks in two different places, both of which are not far from the well-known caves dedicated by Aśoka to the Ājītvikas,” and consist each of five syllabic letters, one of them recording the name of the hill as Gorathagiri and the other as Goradagiri, the letter-forms of the former bearing a close resemblance to those of the dedicatory inscriptions of Aśoka, and the letter-forms and spelling of the latter to those of the Hāthi-Gumptā inscription of Khāravela. On paleographic grounds, Mr. R. D. Banerji assigns the former to the Aśokan age and places the latter a century later, going so far as to believe that the latter was actually engraved by one of the men who accompanied King Khāravela and took part in His Majesty’s first invasion of Magadha. If it be as Mr. Jackson presumes, that the earlier inscription recording the name of the hill on which it was engraved as Gorathagiri was of the same age as two of the dedicatory inscriptions of Aśoka recording the name of the hill on which they were engraved as Khalatika-pavata, we do not see any necessity for

speculating if Khalatika was a phonetic transformation of Goratha, or Goratha that of Khalatika. In such a case as this, one is compelled to think that neither Khalatika-pavata nor Gorathagiri was intended by Aśoka to serve as a name for the whole of the present Barābar range but as names for two separate hills of this range.

The close likeness between the Brāhmī letter-forms and the spelling Goradhagiri as found in the second inscription and as found in the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription is, beyond a doubt, a strong point in the argument pressed by Messrs. Banerji and Jayaswal for taking Goradhagiri of Khāravela’s inscription to denote the Barābar hills. And yet in justifying the use of the verbal expression ghatāpayitā in the sense of “having stormed,” one has to prove that Gorathagiri or Goradhagiri was at all, at any time, a hill-fortress. It is certain that “the Mahābhārata which mentions the Gorathagiri in connexion with the earlier period of Rājagṛha, does not refer to any fortifications there.” “Inside the Barābar enclosure stone foundations of buildings can be seen in various places, notably upon and to the east of the artificially raised area at the foot of the Siddheswaranath hill due north of the caves, and in the jungle towards the southwestern end of the valley. The whole enclosure is too small to have been the site of any large town, but the natural strength of the position and the fact that the defences are strengthened at all vulnerable places by stone walls render it reasonable to suppose that it formed a refuge used in times of danger by the people who ordinarily lived in the plains and valleys outside.” These reflections and the fact that the local tradition speaks of the hills as those which in ancient days formed a stronghold or fortress enable Mr. Jackson to opine “that as Pāṭaliputra was open to an attack from the south, the Gorathagiri which lay on the way to the capital was made a fortified position,” and that “it must have been treated as the first line of defence on the southern side of Pāṭaliputra.”

We need not attach to the local tradition quoted by Mr. Jackson any more importance than what we should attach to his inference from a study of the ancient remains. The question still is whether the stone-enclosure and other remains are the relics of a rocky stronghold or hill-fortress or those of a rocky shrine, stūpa or temple. Evidently, the Barābar hills were a sanctified rather than a fortified position. For it is here that King Aśoka dedicated certain caves for the residence of the Ajivikas. It is again here that Hwen Thsang saw a Buddhist stūpa on the eastern summit of the

mountain where the Tathāgata formerly stood beholding the country of Magadha. The Chinese pilgrim’s mountain with the stūpa on its summit is connected with “the country of Magadha.” The Mahābhārata connects Gorathagiri with Māgadha-kṣetra or Magadha-territory. And we find that the Sutta-Nipāta-Commentary locates Pāśānaka-cetiya, the site of the rocky shrine, in Magadha-khetta (Magadha-khetta Pāśānaka-cetiyaṃ),¹ and says that in spite of the fact that it became, during the dispensation of the Blessed One, a Buddhist retreat, the spot where there was formerly a shrine of Deva-worship continued to be designated by its ancient name as Pāśānaka-cetiya or Pāśāga-caitya.² The identification thus sought to be established between Gorathagiri and Pāśāga-caitya may receive its confirmation also from the fact that just as in the Mahābhārata, Gorathagiri has been mentioned as the mountain standing on which the travellers coming from the Kuru-country to Mithilā and finally getting into the Magadha-territory by a southward journey through Kusaṇa-raschada, could have a view of Girivraja or Old Rājagṛha, so in the Sutta-Nipāta and its commentary, Pāśāga-caitya has found mention as a Buddhist retreat, which could be reached from Rājagaha by the travellers starting from Kapilavatthu along the great high road, reaching Pāṭaliputta from Vessāli by a southward journey and proceeding further southward, along the same high road, via Nālandā. Thus it may be shown that all the available evidences conspire only to prove the contrary of Mr. Jackson’s inference that Gorathagiri was a rocky stronghold or hill-fortress. If Gorathagiri was a hill noted for its rocky shrine, stūpa or Deva-temple, it is difficult to justify the use of the verbal expression ghatāpayita in the sense of “having stormed.” Why should Khāravela storm Gorathagiri if it was not used as a fortress or stronghold of the Magadhan army?

Strangely enough, the Hāthi-Gumpā expression following Goradhagirin ghatāpayita is one involving a reference to Rājagaha. These are the three possible readings of this expression: (1) Rājagaha-napam pidiyayati, “caused the king of Rājagaha to be harassed”; (2) Rājagahanupapiṇḍāpayati, “caused pressure around Rājagaha”; or (3) Rājagahanam papiṇḍāpayiti, “caused a heavy pressure to be brought to bear upon the people of Rājagaha.” The first reading does not suit the context in view of the
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fact that in the twelfth year’s record, the king of Magadha is alluded to as “the king of Magadha” (Māgadha-rājā), and not as “the king of Rāja-
gaha,” and no less for the reason that Rājagaha ceased long ago to be the
capital of Magadha. The second reading, too, cannot justify the use of
etunāṇa, a pronominal expression with a genitive plural case-ending, imme-
diately after uparatāpayati. The third reading alone fulfils all the require-
ments. There were at least two Rājagahas or Rājagṛhas in India, one
which was the earlier capital of Magadha and the other which was the
capital of the Kekayas “located in the Rāmāyaṇa on the other side of the
Vipāsā (Beas) and stretching up to Gāndhāra.” The latter Rājagṛha also
bore a second name, Girivrāja. By the people of Rājagṛha we may under-
stand as well the Māgadhás as the Kekayas. And there were Kekayas
in the north-west, in Uttarāpatha, as well as in the south, in the Daksinā-
patha.

The Kekayas of Uttarāpatha “were settled in the Pañjāb.” It is
evident from the Rāmāyaṇa that their territory “lay beyond the Vipāsā
(Beas) and abutted on the Gāndhāra or Gāndhāra Viśaya.” And it may
be surmised from a number of inscriptions discovered on the ruins of the
Jagayyapeta Stūpa in the Krishnā District and belonging, according to
some of the archaeologists, to so early a date as the second century A.D.,
that the Kekayas of Daksināpatha who were matrimonially connected with
the Iksvākus of South India were “probably a ruling family of ancient
Mysore.”

These are then the three possible interpretations of the Hāthi-Gumphā
record of Khāravela’s eighth regnal year: (1) That His Majesty having
stormed Gorathā-giri, a stronghold of the Magadhān army in the Bārābar
hills, caused a heavy pressure to be brought to bear upon the citizens of
Rājagaha, the earlier capital of Magadhā; (2) that His Majesty having
causèd Gorathagiri, the king or general of Mathurā in Uttarāpatha, brought
a heavy pressure upon the Kekayas whose capital was Rājagṛha beyond the
Beas; or (3) that His Majesty having caused Gorathagiri, the king or
general of Mathurā, the capital of Pāṇḍya in Daksināpatha, brought a
heavy pressure upon the Kekayas who founded a territory in Ancient
Mysore.

1. Cunningham’s Ancient Geography of India edited by S. N. Majumdar, Notes.
2. Rāmāyaṇa, II. 63. 19-22; VII. 113, 114. Raychaudhuri’s Political History of
Ancient India, 2nd edition, p. 36.
3. Dubreuil’s Ancient History of the Deccan, pp. 88, 101; Raychaudhuri’s Political
History of Ancient India, p. 315, fn. 1.
Each of these interpretations has its strong and weak points. The strong points of the first interpretation are obvious: (1) the contiguity of the kingdom of Magadha to that of Kaliṅga; (2) the discovery of two Brāhmī inscriptions, as old as the Barābar Hill Cave inscriptions of Asoka and the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription of Khāravela enabling us to identify Gorathagiri with the Pravaragiri or Barābar hills; (3) the exploration of the lingering remains of an ancient enclosure; (4) the local tradition asserting that there was a fortress or stronghold in the Barābar hills; and (5) the Mahābharata describing the Gorathagiri of Māgadhakṣetra as the hill or mountain from which one could have a view of Girivraja or Old Rājagṛha, the earlier capital of Magadha. Its weak points are: (1) the Mahābhārata describing Gorathagiri simply as a hill or mountain, and not as a stronghold or fortress; (2) the stone-enclosure and other supposed remains of an ancient fortress being explained also as vestiges of an ancient shrine, temple or stūpa; (3) it being inexplicable why, if Pāṭaliputra were at that time the capital of Magadhā and Gorathagiri had served as its first line of defence on the south, Khāravela had directed his attacks towards Rājagṛha, unless it be presumed that the capital had to be removed from Pāṭaliputra to Rājagṛha in fear of an attack from the north as formerly done during the reign of King Munḍa or that the army of Magadha having been gradually driven southward, was finally concentrated in Rājagṛha.

The strong point of the second interpretation is that it enables us to understand how Khāravela could venture to carry his expeditions into the very heart of Uttarāpatha after having made himself the master of Mathurā even before he planned his attacks on Aṅga and Magadha. The weak point of it is that there is no other authority but the Rāmāyana to establish that there was a Rājagṛha in the Uttarāpatha as distinguished from Rājagṛha, the earlier capital of Magadha.

The strong point of the third interpretation is that it enables us to understand how the king of Pāṇḍya was compelled to send valuable presents to Khāravela, which is to say, to acknowledge the supremacy of the king of Kaliṅga. Its weak point is that there is yet no evidence to prove the identity of the Kekayas with the Rājagahikas. Another point in its favour is that if it could be established, we might have clearly seen that Khāravela turned his attention to Northern India only after he had subdued the powers in the Deccan.

But weighing the matter carefully, we feel that the balance of probability lies, after all, with the first interpretation, and, to some extent, with the second interpretation. And it follows from either of these two interpretations
that Khāravela had to effect a timely retreat to Mathurā to relieve his army terrified by the alarming reports of counter-attacks from the inhabitants of Rājagaha, while his twelfth year's record goes to show that he made a second attempt, which proved entirely successful.

12. KHĀRAVELA'S PERSONAL HISTORY

Many interesting facts concerning the personal history of Khāravela can be gleaned from the old Brāhmī inscriptions, particularly his own inscription in the Hāthī-Gumpha, so much so that the Hāthī-Gumpha inscription itself may be judged as a Khāravela-Carita, "The Life of Khāravela," in Indian epigraphy, and no less as an Aśokāvadāna, "The Edifying Legend of Aśoka," in Jain records. The text of the Hāthī-Gumpha may be judged also as a kind of mahā-vīra-carita, "the annal of a great hero," taking Khāravela to be the great warrior hero. There can be little doubt that the composer of the Hāthī-Gumpha text has sought all along to extol Khāravela as a mighty earthly hero who was destined to conquer, to rule, to protect and to please. Anyhow, no other inference can be drawn from the honorific epithets adorning the name of His Graceful Majesty Khāravela.

In the Hāthī-Gumpha inscription (I. 1), Khāravela is described as paṇatha-suṣṭha-lakhaṇa, "one who bore the noble and auspicious bodily marks," and as caturanta-rakhaṇa-guṇa-upeta, "one who was endowed with the qualities of a ruler capable of protecting the whole of this earth extending as far as the four seas." A less likely alternative of the reading of the second epithet may be caturanta-luṭhana-guṇa-upeta, "one who was endowed with the qualities of a warrior capable of undertaking expeditions over the whole of this earth bounded by the four seas." The expression caturanta was the current old Indian idiom to denote indefinitely the whole extension of the earth conceived as an island in the seas or oceans.

Corresponding to caturanta-rakhaṇa-guṇa-upeta or caturanta-luṭhana-guṇa-upeta, we have the familiar Pāli expression caturanta-vijitāvi-janapadathāvāriyappatta, "the ruler of the whole earth bounded by the four seas, the Upholder of the Realm by the Right of Conquest and the

1. Here caturanta is the same expression as caturanta maḥī (Artha-Śāstra, III. 2.60), and āsamudra-keśita.
consolidator of his hold on his territories," which is an oft-recurring epithet of a king overlord (rājā cakkavattī). Buddhaghosa explains cāturanta as meaning "the lord of the earth bordering on the four seas and comprising the four island-like continents." He explains vijītāvi as meaning "one who has quelled the rebellious agitations within, overpowered the inimical rebels without and conquered all other kings." And lastly, he explains janapadakāvariyaappatā as meaning "one who has established so sure and permanent a hold on his territories that no one is able to move it an inch, or having retained a permanent hold on his territories, remains engaged in his duties unworried, unshaken and unmoved."

That pañthasubha-lakkhaṇa and the other epithet are meant in the Hāthī-Gumphā text to represent Khāravela as a king overlord is beyond dispute. For in the inscription of his chief queen (No. II), Khāravela is freely represented as Kaliṅga-cakkavati, "the King Overlord of Kaliṅga." But this is not enough to bring out the real significance of the two epithets. As used in the first paragraph of the Hāthī-Gumphā text, the epithets signify what the expert astrologers, palmists and diviners (lakkhaṇa-patīgghahakā, uṇkhatta-pāṭhakā), after reading the bodily marks and making a thorough study of the birth-star and other factors and signs connected with the birth and person of the child-prince Khāravela, declared him to be in future.

Let us now see how Khāravela is represented in the Hāthī-Gumphā text and, to some extent, in some of the remaining old Brāhmī inscriptions to have fulfilled other conditions of a person destined to become a king overlord, the conditions specified in such ancient texts as the Pāli Cakkavatti-Sīhanāda-Sutta in the Dīgha-Nikāya, and Rājavagga in the Aṅguttara-Nikāya, and the Lalita-Vistara (Ch. VIII).

2. Ibid: "Affhatam kopādi paccatthike bāhiḍḍhā ca sabbarājana vijītattī vijītāci,"  
3. Ibid: "Janapade dhusabhāsaṁ thāvarabhāsaṁ pattos, na sakkā kenaic cāletum janapade vā tamhi thāvarkappatto anussavo sakammanī rato acalako asampabedhi,"  
4. Cf. Nidāna-Kathā in Fauböll’s Jātaka, Vol. I, p. 56, where the Lakkhaṇapatiṣgghahaka Brahmin astrologers and diviners are said to have declared with regard to the future of Prince Siddhārtha: "Imahi lakkhaṇehi samasaṅgato agāraṁ ajjhaṇasaṁmāno rājā hoti cakkavatti pabbajjamāno Buddhho ti," "If one endowed with these marks choose to keep to household life, one is destined to be a king overlord, and choosing to renounce worldly life, one is destined to be an Enlightened Master."
The nobility of origin is one of the primary conditions. Regarding the nobility of Khāravela’s origin, we read in the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription (1) that he was Četarājavamśa-vadhana, “the increaser of the royal House of King Četa” (I. 1); (2) that he was rājisivaṁsakula-vinisita, “emanated from the family and line of royal sages” (I. 16); and (3) that he was installed as a great king in the third generation of two kings belonging to the reigning dynasty of Kalinéga (tatiyé Kalinégrējavanṣe purīsa yuge mahārājābhisekanāṁ pāpunātī).1

Prof. Sten Konow prefers, in agreement with Mr. Jayaswal and Prof. F. W. Thomas, to read Cetirājavamśa-vadhana. We fully appreciate the force of his argument that the reading Četi (Četi) is quite in keeping with the adjective rājisivaṁsakula-vinisita whereby Khāravela claimed to have descended from an ancient family of royal sages. In adhering to the reading Četa, our own point is that it is equally in keeping with the very same adjective, and does not at the same time make itself open to dispute from the palaeographic point of view.

In the Vessantara-Jātaka (Fausböll, No. 547), Četa occurs as an alternative spelling of Četiya, Četarāṭhya being the same kingdom as Četiyarāṭhya of the Četiya-Jātaka (Fausböll, No. 422). In the same Jātaka, the ruling people of the Četa or Četiya Kingdom are represented as Četiyā, Četa and Četaputtā, which conclusively proves that Četa was an alternative spelling of Četi, and that the Četas or Četis as a ruling people were known as the descendants of King Četa. The information thus derived from the Vessantara-Jātaka is doubly significant inasmuch as the references are all found in the verse-quotations. The prose narrative which is peculiar to the commentary-version of the Birth-story contains an additional information concerning a land-route connecting Četuttaranagarā, the capital of the Śivi kingdom, with the Brahmīn village Dunnivīṭṭha, situated in the kingdom of Kalinéga. We are told that the mountain named Suvaṇṇagiriṭāla was at a distance of five Yojanas from Četuttaranagarā, that the river named Kontimārā was at a distance of five yojanas from the Suvaṇṇagiriṭāla mountain, that the mountain named Araṇjaraṅgiri was at a distance of five yojanas from the Kontimārā river, that the Brahmīn village named Dunnivīṭṭha, situated in the kingdom of Kalinéga, was at a distance of five yojanas, that the capital of the Četa kingdom was at a distance of ten yojanas from the Dunnivīṭṭha Brahmīn village, and that the total distance

between Jetuttaranagara and the capital of the Ceta or Cetiya kingdom covered thirty *yojanas*.1

The Vedabhâ-Jâtaka (Fausböll, No. 48) points to the existence of a high road (*mahâmagga*) from Benares to Cetiya-rajâ, which was not safe in all parts, "being infested with roving bands of marauders."

The Cetiya-Jâtaka (Fausböll, No. 422) represents Upacara or Uparicara as the king of Ceti (*Cetiya-râjâ*) whose genealogy could be traced back to Mahâsamata, the first known king of the Solar line, who reigned in the kingdom of Ceti (*Cetiya-rajâ), in the city of Sothivat, and who was gifted with four supernormal faculties. He was known also by the name of Apacara. His five sons are said to have built after his death five cities in five directions, to wit, Hathipura in the east, Assapura in the south, Sihapura in the west, Uttarapâñcâla in the north, and Dadarapura in the north-west. And the great Brahmin named Kapila is said to have been his family priest.

In referring to the above Jâtaka, the Milinda-Pañha mentions the name of the king as Suraparicara, and says that he reigned in the land of the Cetis (*Cetisa*).2

Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri seems to be perfectly justified in identifying the Ceti-king Upacara, or Suraparicara with Vasu Uparicara, who is mentioned in the Mahâbhârata (I. 63. 1-2) as the Paurava king of Cedi.3 And there is probably nothing to object to Prof. Rapson's identification of the Cedi-king Vasu Uparicara with Kasu Caidya, the king of the land of the Cedis, who is praised in the Rg-Veda (VIII. 5. 37-39), in a hymn containing *dânapustû* at its end. Dr. Raychaudhuri rightly observes that in the Mahâbhârata account, too, the five sons of the Cedi-king are said to have founded the five different imperial lines of kings,4 Brhadratra among the Magadha people, Pratyagraha, Kuśâmba the Mañivâhana, Mâvella and the unconquerable Yudu. The tradition in the Hâmâyâna (I. 32-6-9) "associates the scions of Vasu's family with the cities of Kausâmbi, Mahodaya and Girivraja."

All these are legendary accounts of Ceta and the Cetis or Cedis. But these are not without their bearing on the Hâshi-Gumphâ text. These enable us not only to grasp the significance of Khâravela’s epithet

---

3-4. H. C. Raychaudhuri’s Political History of Ancient India, 2nd edition, p. 82.
Cērājavanśa-vadhana or Cērājavanśa-vadhana but also to appreciate why he has been praised as rājisivamakula-vinisita.

The third statement as to Kāravela being installed as a mighty king in the third generation of two kings belonging to the then reigning dynasty of Kaliṅga, implies that he ascended the throne of Kaliṅga by the lawful right of succession, which is to say, that he was in no sense a usurper of the royal power. Differences of opinion are bound to be as to the correct interpretation of the phrase tatiya Kaliṅgarājavanśe purisa-yuge. Mr. Jayaswal explains it as meaning “in the third dynasty of the Aira line of the kings of Kaliṅga,” while with Dr. R. C. Majumdar it means “in the third generation of the Kaliṅga kings.” Both the interpretations have obviously missed the technical sense of the expression purisa-yuga. As for the ordinal tatiya meaning “the third,” there is no doubt that it qualifies purisa-yuga. For in the Hāthī-Gumpha record of Kāravela’s tenth regnal year (I. 11), we come across the expression Kaliṅgarājavanśānam tatiya-yanuganāvanāne which, as a slightly different manipulation of the phrase tatiya Kaliṅgarājavanśe purisa-yuge, leaves no room for doubt that the numerical adjective tatiya was intended to be applied to yuga or purisa-yuga. Here the plural form of Kaliṅgarājavanśa might seem to bear out Mr. Jayaswal’s interpretation. But we must not forget that the word purisa is understood, and that the expression Kaliṅgarājavanśānam may be better interpreted as meaning “of those of the royal dynasty of Kaliṅga.”

The yuga, sarga (sarga) and vamsa are three of the main subject-matters of a Hindu Purāṇa. The term tatiya-yuga presupposes the Indian tradition of caturyuga, “the four yugas,” each of the yugas implying, according to Hindu cosmogony, a distinct “age” in the development of the world-system, the term “age” being used in the same sense as in “the Golden Age,” “the Iron Age,” and so forth. Thus it may be shown that the Hindu sense of yuga or of caturyuga is primarily cosmogonic.

The term sarga or sarga signifies, according to Hindu cosmogony, a stage or landmark in, or a sectional presentation of, the creative evolution of the cosmos. It is precisely in the sense of sectional presentation or chapter-division that the term sarga has been used in both
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1. Śrīdharaśāṃti in his Čīkā on the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, I. 2. 66, explains sarga as a synonym of śṛṣṭi: sargādikartā aśeṣamārṇīḥ śṛṣṭyādirūpaḥ cf. the terms Brahmāsarga, devasarga, bhūtasarga, and the like used in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, I. 5. 18-24.
the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa, it being conveniently rendered
in English as "canto." Several sargas or cantos go to make a book
called pārva or hānda. Thus it may be shown that we are justified
in interpreting the term sarga in yugasaga in the sense of a "part,"
"portion" or "period" of a yuga.

Keeping the tradition of cosmogonic caturyuga as a presupposition,
the Buddha or the Buddhist conceived four yugas (cattāri yugāni) of
Ariyapuggalas, "those of the Aryan lineage," 1 which is the same as
to say, the Buddha or the Buddhist conceived four purisa-yugas (cattāri
purisa-yugāni) in Ariyavamsa, "the Aryan lineage," understanding
the term yuga in the sense of yugga (couple) or yamaka (twin). Thus
with the Buddhists the four yugas or purisa-yugas denote the four couples
of Aryan personalities (purisa-puggalas) representing the eight notable
stages in the progress of the Buddhist pilgrim towards Arahatship,
which is his final destination. A notion of sequence or succession is
implied in the Buddhist enumeration of four yugas or purisa-yugas as
paṭhama (the first), dutiya (the second), tatiya (the third) and cattāri
(the fourth). But each yuga or purisa-yuga considered by itself,
eliminates altogether the notion of sequence or succession, for a yuga,
to be worth the name, requires as a sine qua non the co-existence of
two persons, one representing, as the Buddhist put it, the stage of
inception (maggathā), and the other that of fruition (phalaṭṭha). 4

Corresponding to yuga or purisa-yuga in Pāli, we have the use of
yuga or purisa-yuga in the Hāthī-Gumpha text. And the expression
tatiya-yuga or tatiya purisa-yuga suggests the same kind of gradational
enumeration as that of four yugas or purisa-yugas in Pāli. If so, there
is no other alternative but to interpret the expression in the Hāthī-Gumpha
text in the sense of the third couple of royal personages, one representing
the fifth king and the other the sixth king of one and the same reigning
dynasty of Kaliṅga. This is precisely the sense sought to be conveyed
by the rendering "the third generation of two kings."

1. Ratana-Sutta in the Sutta-Nipāta and the Khuddaka-Pāṭha, verse :
Ye puggalā athasaṭa-pasotṭhā | Cattāri etānā yugāni honti ||
2. Mahāparinibbāna-Suttanta, Dīgha-Nikāya, Vol. II : Cattāri purisa-yugāni attha-
purisa-puggalā.

3. Cf. Pāli sarvaka-yuga. The chapter which bears the name of Yamakavagga in
the Pāli Dhammapada is entitled Fugamagga in the Sanskrit Udānavarga.

4. Paramatthā-Jotikā, Khuddaka-Pāṭha-Commentary : Sotāpattimaggathophalaṭṭho'ti
ekaṃ yuṇāṃ, evam tāva Arahatto maggatho phalaṭṭho'ti ekaṃ yuṇāṃ cattāri
yugāni honti.
Does it imply a conjoint rule of two kings of the same royal family reigning at the same time, and if so, in what sense? In upholding the interpretation offered by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar and Prof. R. C. Majumdar of the text of the Andhau inscription as implying a conjoint rule of King Chaṣṭana, the grandfather, and King Rudradāman I, the grandson, of the same Kaṣaharāta royal family, Dr. H. C. Raychandhuri calls our attention to a number of facts deserving consideration: (1) the account given by Diodorus of the political constitution of Tauala (Patala), the Indus Delta, as having been drawn on the lines of the Spartan, enjoining the conjoint rule of two kings representing the two eldest representatives of the ruling clan and as vesting the command in war in two hereditary kings of different houses; (2) the mention of dvirāja in the Atharva-Veda (V. 20. 9) in the sense of a conjoint rule of two; (3) the danger of dvairāja, the conjoint rule of two kings, in the event of their disagreement and mutual enmity and hostility, discussed in the Artha-Śāstra (VIII. 2. 128); (4) the system of doraīja (dvairāja), referred to in the Jaina Āyārama-Sutta; (5) the case of King Dhṛtarāṣṭra, the father, and King Duryodhana, the son, reigning together, to be cited from the Mahābhārata; (6) the case of Eukratides and his son reigning together to be cited from Justin's work; and (7) the conjoint rule of Strato I and Strato II or that of Azes and Azilises, to be cited among other instances.

The overwhelming evidence thus produced goes to prove that there is no inherent improbability of a conjoint rule of two kings in each generation of the then reigning dynasty of Kaśiṅga being implied in the two Hāthi-Gumghā expressions: (1) tatiye Kaśiṅgarāja-ramise purisa-yuqe, and (2) Kaśiṅgarājavanmānum tatiyayugasadāvasāne. But

1. N. N. Law in his well-informed article on "Technical Institutions" (Indian Historical Quarterly), maintains that dvairāja or "the rule by two kings" was, according to the Artha-Śāstra, a vṛṣama or "distress" of the royal state, it implying rather an abnormal than a normal state of things. The dvairāja form of government must have been ushered in as a means of avoiding the crown-prince waiting indefinitely till the death or retirement of the reigning king.

2. Political History of Ancient India, 2nd edition, p. 308. Attention has also been drawn to an anecdote in the Mahāvastra (III, p. 432), in which three sons of King Mahendra, the three uterine brothers, are said to have jointly reigned in Siphapura, the capital of Kaśiṅga. But attention might also be drawn to the Buddhist tradition of nine Nanda brothers, the nine kings of the pre-Mauryan Nanda dynasty, reigning conjointly in Magadha.
to be sure about it, as well as to form an idea of the personal relation of
the two reigning kings in each generation in the aforesaid sense, we
must carefully take the Lalita-Vistara use of the term *puruṣa-yuga* into
our consideration.

The Lalita-Vistara mentions the following characteristics, among
others, of an ideal royal family fit to be graced by the birth of the Buddha:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Puruṣayugasampannam ca tatkulaṁ bhavati.} \\
\text{Pāruṇapuruṣayugasampannam ca tatkulaṁ bhavati.} \\
\text{Abhijītapuruṣayugasampannam ca tatkulaṁ bhavati.} \\
\text{Abhilakṣitapuruṣayugasampannam ca tatkulaṁ bhavati.} \\
\text{Maheśākhyāapuruṣayugasampannam ca tatkulaṁ bhavati.}
\end{align*}
\]

Rāja Rājendra Lāla Mitra translates these:

"Such a family is......remarkable for having two generations (living
at the same time). It has two predecessors, as well as two successors
(living at the same time). It has two special generations living, and hav-
ing a member of the name of Maheśa in two successive generations."

We offer the following as a correct rendering of them:

"Such a family is noted for having throughout a connecting link
between two successive representative men. It has in its previous gen-
eration a connecting link between two successive representative men. It has in
its present generation a connecting link between two successive representa-
tive men. It has also in its coming generation a connecting link between
two successive representative men. It has throughout a connecting link
of two greatly powerful successive representative men."

The idea of an uninterrupted continuity of the royal line from father
to son is contemplated in the Lalita-Vistara passage concerning *puruṣa-
yuga*. In the life-time of the grandfather and father, the son and grand-
son are to be in full vigour of life ensuring the prospect of the birth of
the great-grandson and great-great-grandson. Considered in this light,
if the grandfather and father represent the first *puruṣa-yuga*, the son and
grandson represent the second, and the great-grandson and great-great-
grandson represent the third. And if, as is recorded in the Ṣāhī-
Gumpha text, the third *puruṣa-yuga* of the then reigning dynasty of
Kaliṅga was completed with the birth of Prince Khaṇḍavala, it follows that
Prince Khaṇḍavala was the great-great-grandson of the first king of this

1. Literally, a coupling of.
dynasty, and that the part of the third couple (tatiya-yuga-saga) could be over only with the death of his father. Keeping consistency with this meaning of puruṣa-yuga, as used in the Hāthi-Gumpha text, we might say that Khāravela’s father remained joined as a king with his grandfather when he had been discharging the administrative functions as the crown-prince for nine years from his sixteenth to his twenty-fourth year; that on the death of his grandfather he himself became joined with his father as a king as soon as he completed his twenty-fourth year; that his father died in the eleventh year of his reign in the record whereof we are told that the part of the third couple was over by that time and he paid proper homage to the memory of the former kings of Kaliṅga, which is to say, he performed the śrādh ceremony; and that Kadampa-Kudepa came to be joined with him as a king after the death of his father in the eleventh year of his reign. If the cave standing in the name of Kadampa-Kudepa was one of the 117 caves excavated in the thirteenth year of Khāravela’s reign, it is evident from the epithets, Aira, Mahārāja, Mahāmeghavāhana and Kaliṅgadāhhipati, adorning the name of Kadampa-Kudepa in the old Brāhmī inscription No. III, that Kadampa-Kudepa as the son of Khāravela was then joined with him as a king of Kaliṅga in the fullest sense of the term.¹

Like the nobility of origin and ancestral line, the brightness, perfection and dignity of the bodily form and appearance is a primary condition to be fulfilled by a prince destined to be a king overlord. The Indian popular feeling on this point has found a pithy expression in the following stanzas quoted in English translation from the Ulūka-Jataka (Fausboll, No. 270):

"The owl is king, you say, o’er all bird-kind:
With your permission, may I speak my mind?"

"I like not (with all deference be it said)
To have the owl anointed as our Head.
Look at his face! if this good humour be,
What will he do when he looks angrily."

¹ The meaning made out is this: A and B represent the first puruṣa-yuga; after the death of A, the first yuga comes to be partly over and C comes to be joined as a king with B; after the death of B, C and D combine to represent the second puruṣa-yuga; after the death of C, the second yuga comes to be partly over and E comes to be joined as a king with D; after the death of D, E and F combine to represent the third puruṣa-yuga; after the death of E, the third yuga comes to be partly over (tatiya-yugasaga-saga) and G comes to be joined as a king with F."
The Mūgapakkha-Jātaka (Fausböll, No. 538) bears testimony to the fact that bodily infirmity or deformity was considered an unbearable disgrace to a royal family. The Aṣokan legends, as found in the Divyāvadāna and the Mahāvamsa-Ṭīkā, bring out the fact that the ugliness of appearance stood greatly in the way of Aṣoka when he was still a prince. The description in the Hāthi-Gumpha text (I. 1) goes to prove that Khāravela as a prince had the very best bodily form “glowing with graceful majesty, so lovely as to captivate the heart of Grace herself, a veritable god Viṣṇu in the human garb.” So much is implied indeed in the adjective siri-kadāra-sariravā.

Proficiency in polite learning is another primary condition. Here the term ‘polite learning’ involves the study and practice of various useful sciences and arts. Proficiency in sciences implies the sound theoretical knowledge of the principles and details of the systems, and proficiency in arts implies the intelligent and skilful use or application of those principles and details. As to proficiency in polite learning in the above sense, the pronouncement of the Artha-Śāstra (I. 5. 2) is:

Vidyā vinīto rājā hi prajānāmi vinaye rataḥ
Ananyām prthivīm bhuvākṣe sarvadhūtahite rataḥ.

“The king who is well brought up in the discipline of sciences and arts, and engaged in bringing up his subjects in discipline, enjoys the earth without sharing it with others, doing good to all living beings under his rule.”

The Artha-Śāstra (1.5.2) prescribes the following courses of study for a prince: (1) a prince should learn the alphabet and practise writing (līpi), and should learn counting and arithmetic (saṃkhya) from the ceremony of tonsure to that of investiture with sacred thread, that is to say, from the third or fifth year to the ninth or tenth year; (2) from the ninth or tenth year to the sixteenth year, a prince should study the Brahmanical treatises based upon the Three Vedas (trāyī) and the systems of speculative philosophy (Āneśkaśi) under the teachers of acknowledged authority, should acquire the knowledge of the science of wealth (Vārtā) under the superintendents of various departments, and should acquire the knowledge of the science of government (Dauḍanitī) under those who are adepts in theories as well as in practical application; and (3) from the sixteenth year onwards, a prince should spend the forenoon in receiving lessons in military tactics concerning the proper handling of troops and of weapons, and the afternoon in hearing the Purāṇa, the Itivṛtta, the Ākhyāyikā, the
NOTES

Udākaraṇa, the Dharma-śāstra, and the Artha-śāstra, all of which go by the name of Itiḥāsa.

To the same effect we read in the Mīlindaṇāha (Trenckner’s edition, p. 178):—

“Mahīyā rājaputtānaṃ hatthi-assa-ratha-dhanu-tharu-lekha-muddā-
sikkhā-khattamanta-suti-muti-yujjha-yujjhapana-kiriyā-karaniyā.”

“The princes of the earth are to learn the arts of writing and counting and of handling the weapons and troops, and are to put into practice the principles of polity, Śruti, Smṛti and the sciences of war and warfare.”

This is but a rough and ready way of enumerating in one breath the list of sciences and arts, which the Indian princes were required to learn, and make judicious and skilful use of. We may take it for granted that the list in contemplation of the author of the Mīlindapāṇa is virtually the same as that in the Artha-Śāstra. The Mīlindapāṇa furnishes us with a list of nineteen sciences and arts in all, in which King Mīlinda-Menander, its ideal Indo-Bactrian Greek prince, gained high proficiency. We read:

“Many were the arts and sciences he knew—holy tradition and secular law; the Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Nyāya, and Vaiśeṣika systems of philosophy; arithmetic; music; medicine; the four Vedas; the Purāṇas, and the Itiḥāsas; astronomy, magic, causation, and spells; the art of war; poetry; conveying—in a word, the whole nineteen.”

Mahāksatrapa Rudradāman I is represented in his Junāgal inscription (circa 150 A.D.) as a prince who “gained fame by studying grammar (śabdā), polity (artha), music (gāndharva), logic (nyāya), etc.”

As to Prince Kharavela’s education and ability, the Hāthi-Gumpha text (I.1) represents him (1) as one who was lekha-rūpa-gaṇanā-vanahāra-
vīkī-nisārada, and (2) as one who was savavijādāta. It will be a mistake to suppose that the second adjective, savavijāvadāta, “one whose self was purified by proficiency in all Indian polite learning,” has been used in apposition with the first. The term savavijā (savavāvītyā), the whole of Indian polite learning, is meant to include lekha, rūpa, and the rest enumerated in the body of the first adjective but not to be exhausted by them. There are two very strong arguments against taking savavijā as limited or exhausted by lekha, rūpa and the rest. First, we find

1. This is Rhys Davids’ rendering of the Mīlinda text (pp. 3-4) which reads: bhūmi c’assa satthāni uggahīsā honti, seyyathādā; suti sammuti saṅkhya yogā nīti viseṣā pañikā gandhabba tīkicchā āṭṭubbedā purāṇā itiḥāsa jotiṣā māyā hetu manṭaṇā yuddhā chandaśā muddā, vacanema ekānāvīsati.
that the Hāthi-Gumphā text (I. 4) has praised him as Gandhavaveda-budha, "one who was versed in the science of music—the Gandharva-lore." This goes at once to show that sava-viśā of Khāravela's inscription includes the science of music which is not mentioned in the first adjective.

Secondly, the fact that King Khāravela ventured, in the very second year of his reign, to defy so powerful a rival as King Śatakarnī in triumphantly marching with all the four divisions of his army amply attests that he excelled, even while he was yet a prince, in the art of war and warfare (yujjha-yujjāpana-kiriṣā), which is to say, that sava-viśā in Khāravela's inscription is meant also to include yuddha-viśā. The same inference may be drawn from the many acts of valour recorded in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription.

Nevertheless, the expression sava-viśā, as employed in Khāravela's inscription, suffers from vagueness and indefiniteness. What was precisely the traditional total of viśā (sciences and arts) prescribed for the education and training of Indian princes in the days of Khāravela we cannot say. The Milinda-pañha (circa first century A.D.) mentions the total as nineteen (vacanena ekānvaṇīsaṭi), while the Nidāna-kathā of the Pāli Jātaka-commentary (Fausböll, Jātaka, I. p. 58) speaks of twelve (dvādasaviṇḍham sippam), including archery (dhanunγgaka).

The Vatsyāyana Kāma-Sūtra enumerates the ancient Indian sciences and arts called yogas under sixty-four heads (caturhaṣṭṭhikā yogā), implying that by the time the Sūtra was compiled in the extant form (circa 3rd or 4th century A. D.), the traditional total came to be reckoned at sixty-four. This total, once established, continued to be in use and gained a proverbial character in the later Hindu expression caturhaṣṭṭi-kalā. The Kāma-Sūtra enumerates, as pointed out by Rājā Rājendra Lāla Mitra,¹ the sixty-four yogas as sciences and arts to be learnt and practised by "the young maidens aspiring for the position of court-ladies or for that of expert court-zans, either alone or in the company of their tutors, fellow students, friends of the same age, etc." Strangely enough, Śrīdhara Svāmī in his commentary on the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, represents the Yadu-princes Baladeva and Vāsudeva as learning the sixty-four science and arts.

Although references to all or most of the sciences and arts can be traced in such an ancient Buddhist work as the Dīgha-Nikāya, Brahmajāla-Sutta,

---

it is difficult to conceive the total sixty-four as coming into existence much before the third or fourth century A.D.

The Hāthi-Gumpha description of Prince Khāravela’s proficiency in learning, lekha-rūpa-gaṇanā-varahāra-vidhi-visārada and saṇvijāvadāta, seems to correspond almost to a description of Prince Siddhārtha’s education in the Lalita-Vistara (Ch. X), which runs as follows:—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sāstrāṇi yāni pracaranti manusyaloke} & \\
\text{Saṃkhyā lipiś ca gaṇanāni ca dhātutantram} & \\
\text{Ye śilpavagha prthu laukika aprameyāḥ} & \\
\text{Teśveṣu śikṣītā purā bahukalpakotyāḥ} &
\end{align*}
\]

The parallel thus quoted from the Lalita-Vistara enables us to interpret the Hāthi-Gumpha expression saṇvijā (sarpa-vidyā) as implying “whatever subjects of study are current in the world of men, the various multitudinous sciences and arts that are of use to the generality of mankind,”¹ that is to say, “the whole of the Indian polite learning prevalent at that time.”

Of the four enumerated subjects of study, saṃkhyā, lipi, gaṇanā and dhātutantra, the first two are met with in the Artha-Śāstra (I. 5.2); and the second and the fourth are met with in the Milindapañha (p. 178) in the form of lekha and muddā. The Lalita-Vistara and the Artha-Śāstra have used the term saṃkhyā or saṃkhyāna in the simple meaning of counting the numbers. All the three texts have used the term lipi or lekha in the simple meaning of the knowledge and writing of alphabet or alphabets. The term dhātutantra, as used in the Lalita-Vistara, does not seem to convey the idea of the knowledge of verbal roots, the meaning in which Rājā Rājendra Lāla Mitra has interpreted it. The term dhātutantra appears to have been used just as another expression for muddā (mudrā) in the Milindapañha.² Buddhaghosa has explained muddā as meaning hatthamuddā-gaṇanā, which may be rendered as “counting the totals on one’s fingers.” The word hatthamuddā is generally taken to mean a ‘sealing.’ But none need be surprised if in hatthamuddā (hastamudrā) we trace a word similar to kilamudrā in the ancient Kharoṣṭhī documents, and if

---

¹. For the enumeration of the science and arts, see the Lalita-Vistara, Ch. XII, pp. 156-157 (Lefmann’s edition).

the same was a current name for ‘a punch-marked coin.’ If so, the dhātutantara was no other than a mudrāsāstra dealing with the rules of calculation applied to monetary transactions,—to transactions by metallic media of exchange.

We think that the enumerated four subjects of study may be conveniently reduced to three to make them correspond to three in the Hāthi-Gumpha text, the term lipi corresponding to lekha, the term dhātutantara or mudrā to rūpa, and the terms samkhya and gaṇanā to gaṇanā.

Mr. Jayaswal is in the right to suggest that the three terms lekha, rūpa and gaṇanā, as used in the Hāthi-Gumpha text, were intended to have a deeper significance than what they generally implied in popular usage. The term lekha was not used to mean simply the knowledge of the alphabet and the practice of alphabet-writing. The learning and writing of alphabet has been proscribed in the Artha-Śāstra as a course of study for a beginner, for a prince of three or five years of age. Lekha in the sense of mere knowledge and writing of alphabet is evidently inconsistent with the adjective lekhavisārada, representing Prince Khāravela as ‘an expert in the art of writing’ in the Hāthi-Gumpha record giving an account of the nine years spent by Khāravela as a crown-prince, from his fifteenth to his twenty-fourth year. The Hāthi-Gumpha inscription says that Khāravela passed the first fifteen years of his life just playing the games befitting his young age. But we shall misinterpret this statement to assume that Prince Khāravela commenced to learn ka, kha, ga just after he completed his fifteenth year and not before. The statement goes rather to show that he commenced his career as a crown-prince when he passed as ‘an expert in all matters relating to the art of writing.’ The statement as to his spending the first fifteen years of his life in princely games has no meaning except as implying that he spent these years unmindful of and without being called to the responsibility of administration.

This may suffice to justify us in interpreting the term lekha in the Hāthi-Gumpha text in the same wider and deeper sense as lekha or bāsana (royal write) in the Artha-Śāstra (II. 2-28).

Similarly we are not to take rūpa as a simple term for the counting of the totals of stamped coins but in the wider and deeper sense of all matters relating to coinage and currency, all transactions in which the medium of exchange is a factor, more or less in the same sense rūpa in the Artha-Śāstra.

In the same way we are not to take gaṇanā as a simple term for counting or calculation but in the wider and deeper sense of all matters
relating to accounting, more or less in the same sense as *gaṇana* in *Aśoka*’s R. E. III and in the *Artha-Śāstra* (II. 7. 25).

Over and above *lekha, rūpa* and *gaṇana*, we have the use of two other words, to wit, *vavahāra* and *vidhi*. In the compound *lekha-rūpa-gaṇavaṇa-vavahāra-vidhi*, *vidhi* may be either combined with each of the preceding words and interpreted in the sense of “rule,” *lekha-vidhi*, “the rule of writing,” *rūpa-vidhi*, “the rule of coinage and currency,” etc., or treated as a separate term *per se*. We have tentatively translated *vavahāra-vidhi* by “administration and procedures,” which is somewhat vague and misleading. The Sanskrit term *vyavahāra* corresponding to *vavahāra* has been clearly defined in the *Artha-Śāstra* (III. 1. 58) as *vyavahārika-śāstra*, “judicial, administration and procedures in accordance with established conventions.” Treating *vidhi* as a separate term, Mr. Jayaswal has sought to interpret it in the sense of *dharma-śāstra*. There is no inherent improbability of this sense of *vidhi*. The term *vidhi* has been used in the *Artha-Śāstra* in the sense of *kriyā-vidhi*, “the rule of action.” But *vavahāra*, too, is just a “rule of action,” the difference between the two being that while *vidhi* implies state-action in accordance with the established laws of human conduct and duty, *vavahāra* implies state-action in accordance with established conventions. In the two enumerations of four things in the *Artha-Śāstra* (III. 1. 58), *caritra* has been replaced by *saṃstha* or *dharmaśāstra*, and *rājaśāsana* by *nyāya* or *daṇḍa*. It is quite possible that *vidhi* in the *Hāṭhi-Gumpha* text is just a synonym for *nyāma* (Artha-Śāstra, I. 5. 2), or *caritra* or *saṃstha* or *dharmaśāstra* (Artha-Śāstra, III. 1. 58).

*Vavahāra* of Khāravela’s inscription is obviously the same word as *viyohāla* of *Aśoka*’s P. E. IV, in which *viyohāla* stands in contradistinction to *daṇḍa* : *viyohāla-samatā* ca *daṇḍa-samatā*. We fully agree with Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar in interpreting *viyohāla-samatā* in the sense of “uniformity of procedures” but differ from him, as well as from Prof. Bühler, both of whom take *viyohāla* to be a synonym of *abhihāla* (*Pāli abhihāra*). Prof. Bühler seems, however, to be right in interpreting the *Aśokan* expression *abhihāle vā daṇḍe vā* as signifying “in the awards of reward or punishment” on the authority of the Sambhava-Jātaka (Fausbōll, No. 515) where *abhihāra* is paraphrased by *pujā*. We prefer to take *daṇḍa* of *daṇḍa-samatā* as an equivalent of *nyāya* or *rājaśāsana* of the *Artha-Śāstra*, to interpret *daṇḍa-samatā* in the sense of “uniformity of decisions,” and to explain *abhihāla* and *daṇḍa* as meaning respectively “decisions for” and “decisions against.”
There is nothing in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription to indicate that Prince Khāravela was sent out of Kāliṅga for his education to such a place as Taxila, which was famous as an ancient seat of learning. On the other hand, the recorded facts go to show that he spent the first twenty-four years of his life in Kāliṅga. In all probability he was placed during the first fifteen years of his life under an experienced tutor,—a vyddha in the language of the Artha-Sāstra, just in the same way that Prince Siddhārtha was placed, according to the Lalita-Vistara, under a tutor named Viśvāmitra, and the Yadu princes Balarāma and Vāsudeva were placed, according to the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, under a tutor named Sāndtapaṇi. It also seems probable that, while a crown-prince, he received a practical training in the art of administration at the hands of the high functionaries in charge of various departments, and acquired the knowledge of the systems of religion and philosophy at the hands of the saintly and far-famed ascetic and recluses in Kāliṅga.

The numerical strength of family members, relations and retinues is another primary condition to be fulfilled by a prince destined to be a king overlord. On this point we are supplied with some information in the Hāthi-Gumphā record of Khāravela’s thirteenth regnal year where we read that his queens, sons, brothers, relatives and the royal servants cooperated with him in excavating one hundred and seventeen caves on Kumārī-pavata, the Kumārī hill, to provide resident Arhats (Jain saints) with accommodations and shelters for resting their bodies.

The old Brāhmī inscription No. II records the upper cave of the Mañcapuri group as an excavation of Khāravela’s chief queen and a dedication to the recluses in Kāliṅga. Thus this inscription furnishes us with a corroborative evidence of the truth of the Hāthi-Gumphā record of Khāravela’s thirteenth regnal year. The expression “the recluses in Kāliṅga” may be viewed as explanatory of the Hāthi-Gumphā expression “resident Arhats.”

The very fact that she has been honoured as the chief queen (agamahisi) of His Graceful Majesty Khāravela, the king overlord of Kāliṅga, goes to prove that King Khāravela had queens more than one, that his chief queen was not the only queen, and that she was just the queen consort, the chief one among the queens, although we cannot definitely say among how many queens in all. Although this is a fact that Khāravela had queens more than one, we do not know altogether how many caves were donated by his queens. Aśoka’s “Queen’s Edict” introducing Kāluvāki as his second queen (dutiyā devi) enables us to say that King
Aśoka had at least two queens of whom Kāluvāki was the second in rank. The old Brāhmi inscription No. II, containing a reference to Khāravela’s chief queen, leaves the question as to the number of his queens entirely open.

Some of the caves on the Kumāri hill were excavated by Khāravela’s sons in the thirteenth year of his reign, and King Khāravela became thirty-seven years old in his thirteenth regnal year. If he had married in the sixteenth year of his life and a son was born in that very year, his eldest son could not be older than twenty-one years when the caves were excavated. He had sons more than one, but altogether how many sons he then had, and how many by each of his queens we cannot say. In the Mañcapuri group of three caves, the cave in the upper storey was an excavation of Khāravela’s chief queen, the corresponding cave in the lower storey was an excavation of King Kadampa-kudepa, and the side cave in the lower storey is said to have been an excavation of Prince Vaṭukha-Varikha. In the inscriptions of King Kadampa-Kudepa (No. III) and Prince Vaṭukha-Varikha (No. IV) their personal relationship with King Khāravela is not at all indicated. But the grouping of the three caves in the manner just described seems to indicate that even in the works of art and architecture the mother has sought to be combined with her two sons, of whom King Kadampa-Kudepa was the elder1 and Prince Vaṭukha-Varikha the younger.

The brothers of King Khāravela have been referred to as excavators of some of the caves in the record of his thirteenth regnal year. No caves have, as yet, been discovered with inscriptions recording their names. Had there been found out any such inscriptions, as princes of the same royal house, their names would have been recorded each as a “Kumāra-Prince,” precisely as in the case of Prince Vaṭukha-Varikha.

As regards Khāravela’s kinsfolk among the excavators of the caves we have no definite information from the old Brāhmi inscriptions. Two of these inscriptions (Nos. VI-VII) record the name of one Cūlakamma (Kṣudrakarma, Junior Karma) as the excavator of two separate caves. The inscription No. VIII records the name of Kamma (Karma) as the gentleman who donated the chambers of one of the caves, and the name of Khīṇa (Kśiṇa) as the lady who donated the frontal building construction.

---

1. R. D. Banerji observes: “A minor inscription mentions a king of Kaliṅga named Kūdapa-sirī who may be a descendant or a successor of Khāravela as he bears the same titles as Khāravela” (JBOCS, Vol. III, Pt. IV, p. 505).
The association of the two names in one and the same inscription as well as in one and the same work of art and architecture is significant, and it may be taken to indicate that the gentleman was the husband and that the lady was his wife. It may be inferred from the two names, Kamma and Cūlakamma, that the gentlemen known by these two names were related to each other as brothers, of whom Kamma was the elder and Cūlakamma the younger. It seems probable that Kamma, Cūlakamma and Khiṇā were counted among Khāravela’s kinsfolk.

With regard to the royal officers and servants among the excavators of the caves, we have one inscription (No. IX), in which a gentleman named Bhūti has been distinctly mentioned as a Town-judge (Nagara-akhaṇḍama)—a designation corresponding to Nagalaka-mahāmāta or Nagalavijayatika-mahāmāta in Aśoka’s S.R.E.I., and to Nagaraka in the Artha-Sāstra (II. 35. 56); one inscription (No. X), in which Nākiya of Bāriyā has been represented as a High-functionary with ministerial duties (Mahāmada); and one inscription (No. XIV), in which the donor Kusuma has been described as a Pādamūlika. Kusuma, as his inscription shows, donated more caves than one (leṇāni).

It is suggested that Pādamūlika may be regarded as a local patronymic signifying a man belonging to a locality named Pādamūla. But we must draw the reader’s attention to the Asadisa-Jātaka (Fausboll, No. 181) in which the Rāja-pādamūlikas (“Servers of the royal feet”) figure as the attendants who were in close touch with the king. Prof. Cowell and Mr. Rouse in their English translation, have rendered Rāja-pādamūlikā as “slaves,” and we, following Mr. R. D. Banerji, have rendered Pādamūlika of the inscription as “Menial.” Now it would seem that the Rāja-pādamūlikas or Pādamūlikas were not slaves or menials of an ordinary kind. For, according to the Buddhist Birth-story, they were the persons who slandered Prince Peerless to the king, his brother. In Mr. Francis’ rendering of the Sarabhaṅga-Jātaka (Fausboll, No. 522), the Rāja-pādamūlikas stand forth as “king’s attendants.” This Birth-story relates that on his return home from Takkasila as a master of archery, Sarabhaṅga, the royal chaplain’s son, was appointed a Rāja-pādamūlika by the king of Benares in compliance with the request of his father. He daily attended on the king (upatīhaṇi) and daily received a thousand pieces of money, a much higher honorarium than “the king’s attendants” could ordinarily expect. On the display of his skill in archery, he was soon promoted to the post of commander-in-chief, a fact which clearly proves that the king’s attendant’s rank was a lower status than that of a commander-in-chief.
The inscription No. X is capable of an interpretation, according to which Mahāmada, Bāriyā and Nākiya may appear as joint donors of one and the same cave. Should this be accepted as the correct interpretation, it may be inferred from the order of the three names that Mahāmada, the father, Bāriyā, the mother, and Nākiya, the son, were associated in one and the same work of art and architecture.

In the inscription of Khaṛavela’s chief queen (No. II), Her Majesty has been represented as rājina Lālākasa Hathisāh(a)sa-sampanatasa dhūtā, “the daughter of the high-souled king Hastisāha or Hastīsimha of rising glory.” In this reading and rendering, it is difficult to ascertain whether Lālāka is a royal epithet derived from the name of the kingdom of which Hastisāha-Hastīsimha was the king or it is just a title of praise similar to Pasalālaka in the name Pasalālaka-Tissa of a king of Ceylon mentioned in the Mahāvamsa. If it be a royal epithet derived from the name of the kingdom, it is easy to understand, first that Hastisāha-Hastīsimha was the king of Lāla, and, secondly, that the royal families of Kaliṅga and Lāla were united by a matrimonial alliance. In accordance with the location suggested in the Mahāvamsa, Lāla or Lāla was a kingdom situated between Kaliṅga and Magadha, in which case Lāla or Lāla cannot but be identified with Lāla or Rālha. Accepting the other interpretation of Lālāka, we fail altogether to understand of what kingdom Hastisāha-Hastīsimha was the king. Whatever the correct interpretation, it is certain that Khaṛavela’s chief queen was a princess born of a distinguished royal family.

The possession of a superb state-elephant is one of the tests for determining the status of a king overlord. The royal style Mahāmeghatavāhana adorning the names of Khaṛavela and Kadampa-Kudepa goes to show that the state-elephant of the kings of the royal family of which they were the descendants was known by the name of Mahāmegha, “the Great Cloud.” Mahāmeghatavāhana is also an epithet of Indra, the king of the gods. This royal epithet may accordingly be taken to imply that Khaṛavela and other kings of the Mahāmeghatavāhana family were very powerful, each of them bearing comparison with Mahendra. Every Indian king was

1. Mahāvamsa, Ch. VI.
2. For the arguments in favour of the identification of Lāla or Lāla with lāta in Western India, see S. K. Chatterji’s “The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language, Vol. I, p. 72, n.n.
regarded as an earthly representative of Indra or Mahendra. This is corroborated by the royal title Ḫudarāja occurring in the concluding paragraph of the Ḫāthi-Gumpha text. The reading Bhikharāja suggested by Mr. Jayaswal and others is out of the question. The elephants of Aṅga and Kaliṅga have been praised in the Artha-Sastra (II. 2.20) as those of the noblest breed. The Kurudhamma and Vessantara Jātakas (Fausböll, Nos. 276, 547) bear testimony to the fact that a kind of religious sanctity was attached by the peoples of India to state-elephants.

The possession of enormous wealth in the shape of a large amount of ready money, vast stores of food-stuffs, precious stones, rich apparels, horses, elephants and other live-stocks is a test of the high fortune and prosperity of a king overlord. Fortunately, the Ḫāthi-Gumpha text is not lacking in information on all these points.

First, as to ready money and solvency of His Majesty's government, we find that King Khāravela possessed a sufficiently large amount to be in a position to spend 35,00,000 pieces, in the very first year of his reign, to repair the capital of Kaliṅga (I. 2); to spend 1,00,000 pieces, in his fifth regnal year, to bring the canal near the Tanasuliya or Tanausuli road, into the capital (I. 6); to remit within the kingdom of Kaliṅga all taxes and duties in his sixth regnal year, the taxes and duties amounting to many hundred thousand pieces (I. 7); to spend some hundred thousand pieces, in his seventh regnal year, to organise a hundred kinds of pompous parade and to perform all ceremonies of victory (I. 8); to spend some hundred thousand pieces, in his eighth regnal year, to feast all sections of the people in Mathurā as well as in Kaliṅga (I. 9); to spend 38,00,000 pieces, in his ninth regnal year, to erect the 'Great-victory Palace' (I. 10); to spend 1,00,000 pieces, in his tenth regnal year, to pay due homage to the memory of the former kings of Kaliṅga (I. 11); to spend 75,00,000 pieces, in his fourteenth regnal year, to erect certain religious edifices (I. 15); to carry out, in his eleventh regnal year, the costly work of reclamation of Pithuḍa-Pithuḍaja, which had become converted into a watery jungle of grass (I. 12); to excavate, in his thirteenth regnal year, as many as 117 caves on the Kumārīt hill (I. 14); and, last but not the least, to finance, in his second, fourth, eighth and twelfth regnal years, the expensive undertakings of military expeditions all over India (I. 3, I. 5, I. 9, I. 13).

In this connexion, three points of importance deserve consideration: (1) that in the Ḫāthi-Gumpha records of Khāravela's regnal years, just the amounts, 35,00,000, 38,00,000 and 75,00,000, are mentioned without any indication as to what sort of money, Kāryāpaṇa, Sunāpa or Satamāṇa,
was current at that time in Kālīṅga; (2) that the treasury of the government inherited by King Khāravela was full of ready money to enable him to spend 35,00,000 pieces, in the very first year of his reign, for repairing the capital city; and (3) that the annual income of His Majesty's government from the taxes and duties collected from his subjects in the kingdom of Kālīṅga, from the inhabitants of the towns and districts (pura-jānapada),¹ amounted to many hundred thousand pieces. Even leaving a good margin for hyperboles and exaggerations in the specified figures, one cannot but gather this impression from the Hāthi-Gumphā record, that Khāravela was a fabulously rich king or that Kālīṅga was a prosperous kingdom under his rule.

Secondly, as to food-stuffs, we find that King Khāravela possessed vast stores to be in a position to sumptuously feast, in his ninth regnal year, all sections of the community—the religieux of Brahmical and non-Brahmical orders, the ascetics and householders, the officials and non-officials once in Mathurā and subsequently in Kālīṅga (I. 9); and to arrange for similar feasts on several other occasions, such as at the time when he was formally installed in the throne (I. 1), when he organized festivitīs and merry gatherings (I. 4), when he performed all ceremonies of victory (I. 7), when he paid homage to the memory of his predecessors (I. 11), and, lastly, when he dedicated the caves and other religious edifices (I. 14, I. 15). King Aśoka in his R.E. I, says that formerly many hundred thousands of living beings were daily slaughtered in his kitchen for dainty dishes, while subsequently the number was reduced to three, two peafowls and one deer. Although he has expressed in it a pious wish to stop even the daily slaughter of three living beings, there is nothing in his inscriptions to indicate that he was an advocate of vegetarian diet. What is clear from his edicts, especially R.E. I, is that he undervalued sacrificial slaughter of life, killing living creatures in the name of religion. The Hāthi-Gumphā text is altogether silent on this point. If King Khāravela were a scrupulous Jain layman, it might have been expected from him that he would strictly observe vegetarian practice.

1. Jayaswal has taken infinite pains to establish that in contexts, such as that of the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription, where the terms pura and Jānapada are used in singular number, they are intended to denote two representative bodies of citizens and peoples. See, for a lengthy and detailed criticism of such an interpretation, N. N. Law's instructive paper—"The Jānapada and the Paua," in the Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. II, Nos. 2-3.
Thirdly, as to precious stones and the rest, we read in the Hāthi-Gumpha text that King Khāravela received abundant supplies of pearls, gems, jewels and various kinds of appræls as tribute from the then reigning king of Pāṇḍya whose kingdom was noted for those products and received as well precious stones and horses, elephants and antelopes as presents from a hundred Vāsukis (I. 13). The Vidyālāhara-abode was apparently another territory wherefrom the precious metals were collected for filling the royal storehouse with the treasures of value (I. 5). It may be inferred from the occurrence of such expressions as veḷuriya...Mahā-vijaya pāśāda (I. 10), veḷuriya-gabha (I. 15) and veḷuriya-nilā-voχīma (I. 15), that the precious stones treasured up in Khāravela’s royal storehouse belonged to these two classes, viz., (1) the beryl (if lapis lazuli is not the correct rendering of veḷuriya), and (2) the emerald (nila). Lastly, from the Hāthi-Gumpha record of Khāravela’s fourteenth regnal year, it is evident that the kingdom of Kaliṅga abounded in the best quarries of stone extending over many leagues (varākara-samsthāpitā aneka-yojana-āhitā silā, I. 15). We do not know, as yet, where these stone-quarries were to be found, whether in the Tosali division of his Kaliṅga kingdom or elsewhere. It is clearly brought out in the record of Khāravela’s fourteenth regnal year that the stone-slabs quarried out of those quarries were best available materials for making stone-pillars, shrines and shrine-posts.

The numerical strength and equipment of the army constitute a good test for determining the status of a king overlord. As to the numerical strength of Khāravela’s army, we read in the Hāthi-Gumpha record of his eighth regnal year (I. 9) that His Majesty marched out with a mighty army (mahati-senā) enabling him to bring a terrible pressure to bear upon the people of Rājagaha. The second year’s record (I. 3) says that the Kaliṅga army of King Khāravela consisted of a multitudinous troop of the horses, the war-elephants, the foot soldiers and the chariots (haya-gaja-nara-bahulaṃ damaṇa), that is to say, of the traditional four divisions of an Indian army. The fact that King Khāravela was able to undertake, in the very second year of his reign, such a campaign towards the western quarter in defiance of so powerful a rival as King Śātakarni, distinctly proves that his fighting army was, more or less, the fighting army of his predecessors, the kings of the Aira-Meghavāhana dynasty.

Senā or army is a general term for denoting the fighting strength of a king. The horse (haya), the elephant (gaja), the footman (nara) and the chariot (radha) are the four terms to represent the four divisions of an
army, while senā and vāhana (troops and conveyance) are the two terms to distinguish the fighting warriors and soldiers from horses, elephants and chariots considered as vehicles and conveyances. We have the use of all these technical terms in Khāravela’s inscription. As to the equipment of Khāravela’s army, we find that, in the concluding paragraph of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription (I. 16), His Majesty has been represented as apatikata-caka-vāhana-bala, a mode of praise, which we have rather wrongly rendered (ante, p. 47) as “strong with undaunted carriers of the realm of royal command,” suggesting in the footnote that by these carriers were intended to be meant “the ministers and other royal officers.” We now detect that such an interpretation as this is not borne out by the expression actually used. Caka-vāhana is evidently the same expression as sena-vāhana, which occurs in the eighth year’s record (I. 9). Can there be any doubt that by sena-vāhana, the drafter of the inscription intended to signify the troops and transports? In the Culla-Kāliṅga-Jātaka, King Kāliṅga of Kaliṅga, precisely as Kaliṅgādhipati Khāravela in the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription, has been described as a warrior who was in a position to march out for conquest with a mighty army (mahatiyā senāya), equipped that he was with multitudinous troops and transports (campaṇna-bala-vāhana). If this reasoning be at all sound, it clearly follows that ‘undaunted’ or ‘invincible’ (apatiḥkata) was the character of Khāravela’s fighting army.

There is nothing distinctly on record to indicate whether, when and how King Khāravela increased the number and fighting equipment of his army. It may be easily inferred, however, from the eighth year’s record (I. 9) that the troops and transports with which he attacked the people of Rājagaha did not suffice to withstand the fear of counter-attacks. He must have sufficiently reinforced his fighting army and increased its equipment before he marched out again in the twelfth year to produce consternation among the rulers of Uttarāpatha, as well as to subdue Bahasatimita, the then reigning king of Magadha (I. 13).

Thus it may be shown that the Kaliṅga army of King Khāravela was sufficiently well-equipped and enormously large. And yet the fact remains that the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription does not supply us with the actual figures relating to Khāravela’s troops and transports. A tolerably clear idea of the numerical strength of his fighting army may, however, be formed from a few collateral evidences.

We know, for instance, “from the earlier account of Megasthenes (Indika, Frag. I. 6) that the king of the Kaliṅgas was protected by a
standing army, numbering 60,000 infantry, 1,000 cavalry, and 700 war elephants.” Prof. Radhakumud Mookerji rightly suggests that “this army must have been considerably expanded by the time of Aśoka when the number of casualties alone is stated to be at least 4 lacs (taking the number of those who ultimately succumbed to the wounds of war to be, say, 3 lacs).”¹¹

Prof. Mookerji’s reference is evidently Aśoka’s R. E. XIII containing, as it does, an account of the heavy casualties suffered by the kingdom of Kaliṅga in the aggressive war waged by the Maurya emperor in the eighth year of his reign. This account goes to prove that the fighting army of Kaliṅga in Aśoka’s time could afford to suffer the losses of 150,000 men as deportees, of 100,000 men as those killed in action, and of “many times as many” men as those who died of wounds received in the fight.¹²

Here the expression “many times as many” is vague and indefinite, and guilty, no doubt, “of an exaggeration.” The following seems to be a reasonable estimate of the fighting army of Kaliṅga, which has been recently suggested by Prof. Mookerji: “If the number of those (who died of wounds received in the fight) be taken to be at least thrice that of the killed, the total number of casualties would be 4 lacs, and adding to this the number of the deportees, the number of the army that fought on the battle-field would be at least 5½ lacs.”³

Having regard to the fact that in the case of Aśoka’s Kaliṅga war, the army of Kaliṅga fought in defence against a foreign invasion, and that in the case of Khāravela’s campaigns, the army of Kaliṅga marched out to produce a marked impression all over India, it may be safely presumed that the total number of the standing army of Kaliṅga during Khāravela’s reign was by far the greater and by no means less than 5½ (or 3½?) lacs. In accordance with Plutarch’s statement (Life of Alexander, Ch. XII), “Androkottos (Chandragupta Maurya) was able to overrun and subdue the whole of India with an army of 600,000.” If it was possible

---

¹. Aśoka, p. 16.
². If Aśoka’s statement be taken to refer to the casualties suffered by two armies, the army of Kaliṅga and the army of Magadha (which is not likely), the number of the Kaliṅga army in Aśoka’s time must have been much less than 5½ lacs, the number fixed by Radhakumud Mookerji.
³. Aśoka, p. 162, f. n. 3. It seems that Aśoka’s expression bhaṅgūvantaka may be interpreted, with reference to the just preceding figure of 1 lac, also as meaning “as many as that (1 lac),” in which case the total will be 3½ lacs (1½ + 1 + 1).
for Chandragupta Maurya to overrun and subdue the whole of India with an army of 6 lacs, there is no reason why it would be impossible for Khāravela to undertake military campaigns all over India with an army numbering thereabout.

It cannot be supposed that King Khāravela marched out with the whole of the standing army of Kaliṅga without leaving a fraction of it for the defence of his kingdom in his absence. This fraction must be added to the number of the units with which he marched out in order to determine the total number of the standing army of Kaliṅga during his reign. In the case of Chandragupta Maurya, we find that he proceeded to conquer the whole of India with an army of 6 lacs, while the standing Maurya army during his reign consisted of 700,000 men in round numbers, 600,000 infantry, 30,000 cavalry, 9,000 elephants attended by 36,000 men, and 8,000 chariots managed by 24,000 men. It is impossible to think that the total of the standing army of Kaliṅga during Khāravela's reign exceeded 6 lacs.

The idea of militia was not, perhaps, altogether absent. The account given by King Aśoka of his Kaliṅga war tends to create an impression in favour of the opinion that the conquest effected by the Maurya conqueror proved ultimately to be a defeat to the people of Kaliṅga. If the general people of Kaliṅga had not somehow taken part in the battle, there is no reason why King Aśoka would feelingly dwell upon the suffering caused to the civilian population by "violence or slaughter or separation from their loved ones."

In the Hāthi-Gumphā record of Khāravela's eighth regnal year (I. 9), we read that he effected a timely retreat to Mathurā in order to relieve the troops and transports of his army terrified by the uproar of counter-attacks from the people of Rājagaha. If our interpretation of this particular record be correct, it clearly follows that the citizens of Rājagaha took up arms in defence of their city against a foreign invasion. The twelfth year's record (I. 13) shows that His Majesty's conquest of Aṅga-Magadha was not completed until he was able to force into submission the inhabitants of these two countries (Aṅga-Magadhavāsirinam ca pāde vamāpayati) after subduing King Bahasatimita. It is evident from many of the records in the Hāthi-Gumphā text that in undertaking military campaigns all over India, King Khāravela tried by all possible means to evoke the patriotic sentiments among his subjects, the inhabitants of the kingdom of Kaliṅga in general and the citizens of his capital in particular. The record of his seventh regnal year (I. 8) says that he caused a hundred kinds of pompous
parade of swords, umbrellas, flags, guards and horses, and all ceremonies of victory to be performed. The eighth year's record (I. 9) says that he sumptuously feasted all sections of the people once in Mathurā and subsequently in Kaliṅga, and organised triumphal processions as a means, no doubt, of impressing the idea of victory on the minds of the people. The erection of a new royal palace known by the name of Mahā-vijaya-pāsāda, "the Great-victory Palace," the assuming of the self-conferred title Mahā-vijaya, "the Great Conqueror," the bringing back by a triumphal procession from Aṅga-Magadha to Kaliṅga of the Kaliṅga Throne of Jina which was carried off by King Nanda as a trophy, the receiving of tributes and valuable presents from the king of Pāṇḍya, as well as from a hundred Vāsukis, the entertaining of the citizens of the capital of Kaliṅga with feasts, festivities and musical performances, the remitting of taxes and duties, the adorning of the capital with new roads, squares, gate-bars and towers—all helped him to keep the people always in excitement, and induce them, as we may say, to join the army to fight for the glory of their country.

It seems that Mr. Jayaswal and Prof. Radhakumud Mookerji* have tried the impossible in endeavouring to infer the total of the population of Kaliṅga from the total number of its standing army. Whether assuming with Goltz that "every 15th soul of the population can take up arms in defence against a foreign invasion," or slightly altering with Prof. Mookerji, the proportion of its fighting strength to its total population from six per cent. to eight per cent. one counts 75 or 60 laes as a reasonable figure of the population of Kaliṅga in Aśoka's time against the present population of 50 laes, we must treat it as nothing but an ingenuity without proofs. To infer the total of the population from the total of the standing army of a country, no matter whether it is Kaliṅga or any other land, is to forget that history is neither logic nor mathematics. Anyhow, we may assure Prof. Mookerji that Khāravela's inscription keeps us entirely in the dark about the population of Kaliṅga.

The soundness of administrative policy and method is another test for determining the status of a king overlord. The Hāthi-Gumpha inscription bears a clear testimony to the fact that it was a declared policy of King Khāravela to govern his kingdom in accordance with established customs

2. Aśoka, p. 162, m. n. 3.
and not departing from the traditional methods of his forefathers. In order that his subjects might have no misgiving on this point, he did not forget to remind them of the fact that whatever he did, he did in consonance with the noble tradition of the former kings of Kaliṅga. For instance, the fourth year's record of his reign (I. 5) says that he governed the Vidyadhara country in accordance with the principle and usage of the former kings of Kaliṅga, everywhere by the highest kind of law (Vijñadhara-vāsam...Kaliṅga-purarājanaṁ dhamena va uññāna va pasārayati savata dhamakūṭena). Similarly in the tenth year's record (I. 11), we read that he caused proper homage and honour to be paid to the memory of the former kings of Kaliṅga, as a public demonstration, no doubt, of his loyalty to the tradition of his royal predecessors (Kaliṅga-purarājanaṁ yasa-sakāraṁ kāraṇayati). The eleventh year's record (I. 12) says that he reclaimed and rehabilitated Pṛthudaka, founded by the former kings of Kaliṅga, by arranging to drive its grassy jungle into the Śāṅgala river (Kaliṅga-purarāja-nivesita-Pṛthudaga-dabhaṁ Nagale nekārayati). In the very opening paragraph of the Hāthi-Gumpha text (I. 1), he has been represented as "an increaser of the fame and prosperity of the royal House of King Ceta" (Cetarājavana-sa-vadhana). The same opening paragraph goes to show that he felt much pride in declaring his connection with the reigning dynasty of Kaliṅga. And the same inference can be drawn from the concluding paragraph (I. 16) where he figures as a king who descended from a family of the dynasty of royal sages (rajaṁ-vamsa-kula-vinīsaṁ).

It is clear from the records in the Hāthi-Gumpha text that King Kharavela successfully followed all the traditional methods of Indian kings to please his subjects. For instance, the first year's record (I. 2) says that as soon as he was anointed, in the very first year of his reign, he undertook to repair the capital of Kaliṅga, to build up the embankments of the deep and cool tanks and to restore all the gardens, avowedly as a means of pleasing the people, his subjects (pakatiyo ca rāṇaṁjayaṁ). In the sixth year's record (I. 7), we read that he showed a great favour to the inhabitants of towns and districts by remitting all taxes and duties, which, too, was one of the traditional methods of gaining popularity by a king with his subjects. The third year's record (I. 4), goes to show that he tried to entertain the citizens of the capital of Kaliṅga by musical performances and festivities and 'merry gatherings.'

It is equally clear from other records in the Hāthi-Gumpha text that King Kharavela spared no pains and left no stones unturned to win the
heart of his subjects by convincing them of the fact that he gave them the full benefit of a good and efficient government, and that he enhanced their happiness by administering justice with an even hand, by increasing the wealth and prosperity of his kingdom, by the maintenance of internal peace and order, by guarding the kingdom well against foreign invasions, by facilitating communication with the capital, and no less by securing for the people a fertile tract of land for agricultural purpose.

The details of Khāravela’s administrative machinery are unknown. The Hāthi-Gumpha text records (I. 14) that the royal servants (rāja-bhataka) co-operated with him in excavating caves for the Jain saints and recluse on the Kumārī hill. The reference to the royal servants is to be found also in the record of his eighth regnal year (I. 4). As regards these royal servants, we have mention of a Nagara-ākhadoma (Town-judge) in the old Brāhmi inscription (No. IX), of a Mahāmada (if it is the same official designation as Mahāmatta) in the inscription (No. X), and of a Pādamulika (if it is the same official designation as Rāj-pādamulika in the Jātakas) in the inscription (No. XIV). We have no information as to whether there were any separate boards and departments, and as to whether any innovations were introduced by King Khāravela in the existing administrative system. Khāravela was evidently too much pre-occupied with the ideas of military campaigns and expansion of dominions to be able to think of administrative changes, and Kaliṅga was too small a kingdom compared with the Maurya empire to require any very elaborate administrative arrangements.

As regards attitude towards the tradition of the former kings, there are some important points of difference between King Khāravela and King Aśoka. As is well-known, King Aśoka has not cared at all to refer to his royal pedigree in his edicts. His reference to his brothers, sisters and relatives (R. E. V) has no bearing upon the question of his ancestry. Even the name of the Maurya royal dynasty to which he belonged does not find mention. In his famous Bhabru Edict, he has simply introduced himself as “the king of Magadha” (lājā Māgadhe). In the inscription of Khāravela’s chief queen (No. II), Her Majesty has been represented not by her personal name but as the chief queen of Khāravela-siri and the daughter of the high-souled King Lālārka Hastisāha-Hastisimha (rājino Lālākasa Hothisāha-sampanātasa dhulā), while in Aśoka’s ‘Queen’s Edict,’ he has issued instructions to his high functionaries to commemorate all the works of benevolence done under the auspices of his second queen by inscriptions recording them as “donations of his second queen
Kāluvāki, the mother of Tīvala” (Dutiyahe deviye ti Tīvala-mātun Kāluvākiye [dāne]). Thus the same difference of Aśoka’s mental attitude has been clearly brought out in his “Queen’s Edict,” in his instructions to commemorate his second queen’s donations by inscriptions representing her by her personal name and as his second queen and the mother of Prince Tīvala.

In as many as five of his edicts (R. E. IV, R. E. V, R. E. VI, R. E. VII, P. E. VII), King Aśoka has discussed his own position as a ruler with reference and in contrast to that of the former kings “who reigned in the past, during many hundred years.” Like all great reformers, Buddha, Christ, and others, he has declared himself with reference to those who had gone before him to the effect that he came rather to fulfil than to destroy the Law. He says (P. E. VII) that he was able to recognize that the underlying motive of the former kings was to see the Law prosper sufficiently among the people, but the means adopted by them was not well-suited to the end. True to this underlying motive or spirit, he proceeded to devise, as a ripe fruit of his own reflections, certain new methods, such as the appointment of Dharma-mahāmātras, the public proclamations conveying happy royal messages, the formulations of moral principles, the enactment of many legislations, the introduction of quinquennial and triennial tours of official inspection, the arrangements for a prompt despatch of business, the granting of the power of discretion to the high judicial officers, whereby he could see the Law prosper sufficiently among the people. So far as those methods went, he claimed that he had played the most difficult part of a pioneer (ādikara).

On the other hand, King Khāravela, as he is represented in his inscription, appears to have followed the traditional methods of the former kings of Kaliṅga without exercising any discrimination on his own part. He did not play the rôle of a critic and reformer. He carried out a set programme of royal duties under the prompting of noble instincts and impulses, rather mechanically, without ever realising the need of a conscious adjustment of new methods to changed conditions of a progressive people. Thus in spite of the splendid success attending his administration, the credit must go to the time-honoured tradition which, as one might say, he had the prudence enough not to question.

The ability to foster all religions and to vouchsafe protection and extend patronage to all religious sects and institutions constitutes just another test for determining the status of a king overlord. If the invocation formula of the Hāthī-Gumpha inscription, Namo arthāntūnaṃ, namo
sarvadādānam, be indecisive as to whether Jainism was the religious faith of its composer or it was the religious faith of King Khāravela, for whom the text was composed, the contents of the Hāthi-Gumphā and other old Brāhmī inscriptions clearly prove that Jainism was the religious faith of King Khāravela and other excavators of the caves on the Kumārī hill. For instance, the inscription of Khāravela’s chief queen (No. II) records that the cave commemorating her name was made for the sake of the Kāliṅga recluses of Ārhatā persuasion (Arahaṁta-pasūdānam Kuṭėṅgūnām sahamūnānam). Similarly, the thirteenth year’s record of Khāravela’s reign (I. 14) says that 117 caves were built on the Kumārī hill to serve as resting places of the Arhats or Jain saints residing there (Arahatu parini-vānato hi kāya-nisādiyāya).

Buddhism became the state religion of India when King Aśoka embraced it and vigorously espoused its cause. His father and grandfather were supporters of religions other than Buddhism. Even when he espoused its cause, it is difficult to prove that all the members of his royal family favoured Buddhism. If there are Buddhist legends in Pāli as well as in Sanskrit asserting that some of his wives, sons, daughters, brothers and relatives had become Buddhists, there are both inscriptions and legends to prove that some or most of them had not become Buddhists.

On the other hand, the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription goes to prove that Jainism had become the state religion of Kāliṅga even long before the reign of Khāravela. With the royal support at its back, it had become the predominant faith in Kāliṅga. The thirteenth year’s record (I. 14) clearly brings out three facts of importance in this connection: (1) that when King Nanda had conquered Kāliṅga, he carried off the throne of Jina belonging to Kāliṅga as the highest trophy (Nāmdaya-sīta Kāliṅga-Jīnsana); (2) that King Khāravela signalised his conquest of Aṅga-Magadha by bringing back that Throne of Jina to Kāliṅga by a triumphal procession; and (3) that King Khāravela professed Jainism in common with his queens, sons, brothers, relatives and royal servants. One cannot mistake that, somehow or other, the affection and honour of the royal family, as well as of the people of Kāliṅga, became bound up with that Jina-throne.

This is not to say there were no other religious and religious shrines in Kāliṅga. The Hāthi-Gumpha inscription clearly proves that there were other religions and religious edifices. If the remaining religions, including the different forms of animism, be designated in the lump as Hinduism, one can say that during the reign of King Khāravela, as also during the reign of his predecessors, Hinduism flourished side by side with Jainism, and the Hindu temples dedicated to various deities shone forth along with the cave dwellings of the Jain saints and recluses.

The royal epithet savā-pāsamēṭa-pūjakā occurring in the concluding paragraph of the Hāthi-Gumpha text (I. 16), attests, beyond doubt, that King Khāravela of Kāliṅga unknowingly followed in the footsteps of King Devānampiya Piṭadasi Asoka of Magadha in declaring himself as a ruler “who honoured all denominations.” There would have been no necessity for the use of such an epithet, if there were no adherents among the people of Kāliṅga of different denominations. King Asoka in his R. E. XIII, definitely says, while speaking of the spread of Aryan religions in India in his time, that there was no other place but the Yona-region, where the sects of the Brahmaṇas and Śramaṇas were not, nor was there any other place where the people had not adhered in faith to one or the other of those sects.

Similarly, there would have been no necessity for the use of the epithet savā-devyatuṇa-samkāra-kāraṇa, “the repairer of all temples of the deities”, if there were no worshippers among the people of Kāliṅga of those deities at the temples dedicated to them. The second epithet representing Khāravela not as a builder, but only as a repairer of those temples, goes rather to show that those places of worship had existed from an earlier time. What those temples could be and where they were actually to be found, unfortunately, the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription does not clearly specify. And no Hindu temples have as yet been discovered with inscriptions or tablets recording that they were caused to be repaired by King Khāravela.

Who could the recognised representatives of the different religious denominations be is also a question at issue. Fortunately, the answer is not far to seek. For the fourteenth year’s record of Khāravela’s reign (I. 15) says that apart from 117 caves excavated on the Kumārī hill for the residence of the Jain saints and recluses, King Khāravela constructed a separate cave for the accommodation of the honoured recluses of established reputation (ākata-samāṇa-suvihitā), as well as for the accommodation of the gātis, hermits and sages hailing from a hundred directions.
(satadvatam yatim i agas-i transit lein karyat). Here the yatias, hermits and sages must be taken as representatives of the fourth and third Brahmical stages of effort (ārahamas), that is to say, of the orders of Brahmanical ascetics. It is somewhat difficult to decide whom the king actually meant by referring to them as sakata-samaṇa-suvihita, "the honoured recluses of established reputation."

Mr. Jayaswal contends for the reading sukata-samaṇa-suvihita, taking sukata to be the same word as sukta, "virtuous." Kata-samaṇa occurs indeed in the Upāli-Sutta, Majjhima-Nikāya, as a Jaina mode of praise applicable to a recognized recluse teacher. Buddhaghosa explains it as meaning "a recluse who has fulfilled the aims of recluse life." Taking sukata to be the correct reading, it is easy to tend to equate it with Sugata, which is a well-known epithet of the Buddha. But it would be risky enough, in the absence of clear evidences, to suggest that the Buddhist teachers gained a foothold in Kaliṅga either during the reign of Kāravela or before. We have reasons to think that by sakata-samaṇa-suvihita or sukata-samaṇa-suvihita the composer of Kāravela’s inscription rather kept in his view the Jain recluses who, as occasional visitors, had to be distinguished from those who permanently resided on the Kumārī hill. Anyhow, the thirteenth year’s record of Kāravela’s reign (I. 14) says that 117 caves on the Kumārī hill were excavated to serve as resting places of the Jain saints who resided there (Kumārī-pavate arahato parinirāsato hi kāya-nisidhitya). In the edicts of King Aśoka, notably in his P. E. VII, the Jains (Nigamthā), the Ājivikas and the Buddhists (Samghathā) have been mentioned as typical representatives of the orders of the recluses as distinguished from those of the Brahmical ascetics, while in Kāravela’s inscription, the yatias, tāpasas and iśis are mentioned as representatives of the Brahmical orders, and, as regards the representatives of the brahmanas, the Buddhists and the Ājivikas are passed over in silence. The eighth year’s record of Kāravela’s reign (I. 9) says that His Majesty feasted all the inhabitants (gharaṇaśi), all the royal servants (rājabhakata), all the householders (gahapataya), all the Brahmins (bhamana), as well as the Jain recluses (arhata-samaṇa) once in Mathurā and subsequently in Kaliṅga. It will be noticed that in the above enumeration, the royal servants have been

distinguished from the general population (*gharavāśī*), in the same way that the Brahmins and the Jain recluses have been distinguished from those who kept to household life (*gahapatayo*). Here the Jain recluses have been specially mentioned as representatives of the *śramaṇas*, while the Buddhists and the Ājñāvikaś have found no recognition. Seeing that the same sort of statement occurs in the Hāthi-Gumphā record (I. 9) with regard to feasting in Mathurā and to that in Kaliṅga, we may be led to think that even Mathurā proved to be up till the reign of Khāravela an impenetrable region for Buddhism, although this faith was destined to thrive there together with Jainism during the reign of the Kuṣāṇa kings.

It is quite clear, we think, from the foregoing discussion that King Khāravela was a Jain from his very birth. King Aśoka was not born in a Buddhist family. It can be established by the evidence of his own inscriptions and Buddhist legends that he was converted to Buddhism, his conversion itself being a gradual process of mental change,¹ and that he possessed and displayed all the zeal of a new convert. Khāravela does not appear to have taken religion so seriously as Aśoka.

If Khāravela was a Jain, what sort of Jain was he? The education which he received was purely secular and did not differ from that received by other Indian princes. His coronation ceremony was celebrated, as may be easily imagined, in accordance with Brahmanical rites. The principles and methods which he adopted in governing his kingdom were precisely those prescribed in the Brahmanical treatises on Hindu royal polity. Jainism did not compel him to exercise any scruples in undertaking military expeditions and aggressive wars for territorial expansion and world domination. The patriotic spirit which underlay all his activities was not inspired by Jainism. As for Jainism, he caused a large number of caves to be constructed on the Kumārī hill to provide the resident Jain saints and recluses with resting places, and erected ornamented stone-pillars, shrines and pillared halls on a slope of the same hill. As for Hinduism, he made donations for repairing the temples dedicated to various gods and goddesses, and feasted alike the Brahmin ascetics and Jain recluses. Is it not to be inferred from all these that so far as this world was concerned he was a Hindu, and that so far as the other world was concerned, he was a pious Jain?

Khāravela differed indeed from Aśoka in beating the drum of victory by sword (bherighosa) rather than in proclaiming the glory of conquest by Dhamma, the higher and higher ideal of progressive humanity. He was proud to give out to the world that he excelled in his knowledge of the science of music (Gaṇḍhava-reda-budha) rather than in that of the deeper truths that Jainism had to teach. He caused to be organized a pompous parade of swords, umbrellas, flags, guards and horses, in short, of emblems of royalty (kakudhas). He differed from Aśoka also in his endeavour to entertain the citizens of his capital even by pandering to their taste, by dampa-dapa, by dances, songs and instrumental music, and by festivities and merry gatherings (dampa-nata-gīta-vādita-ṣaṇḍasaṇāhi uṣava-samāja-kārōpanāhi). If dampa be the correct reading, it is, without doubt, the same word as darpa, which is mentioned in the Artha-Śāstra\(^1\) as a sport and pastime (kriḍā) along with madya-kriḍā. The Artha-Śāstra prescribes a fine of three paṇas for the ladies of good society going to witness these two sports and pastimes. There must have been something inherently wrong in them for which the Artha-Śāstra found it necessary to prevent the ladies of good society under penal laws from witnessing them.

The word madya ("spirituous liquor") suggests that in the sport and pastime bearing its name, there was a good deal of drunkenness, a good deal of licentiousness, a good deal of intemperance, a good deal of midnight revelry. The exact significance of dampa or darpa-kriḍā is unknown. Bhaṭṭasvāmi's commentary on the Artha-Śāstra does not throw any fresh light. It may be a general name for a number of sports and pastimes in which challenging, boasting, competing and betting play an important part. The name dampa or darpa seems to convey the idea of combating such as in wrestling, boxing, mock-fighting and gladiatorial feats. Anyhow, there must have been in this kind of sport and pastime a good deal of excitement, a good deal of noise and tension, for which the ladies of good society were prevented from witnessing it.

If dapa be the correct reading, it is, without doubt, the same term as davakamma, which is mentioned in the Mahā-Niddesa (p. 379) as an example of vacasīka khaḍḍā along with nāṭika (dramatic acting), gīta (singing) and lāsa (dancing by women) precisely in the same way that in the Artha-Śāstra darpa and madya-kriḍā are mentioned along with prekṣā.

\(^1\) Artha-Śāstra, III. 3'58: Pratiṣṭhāstrī darpa-madya-kriḍāyān tripanam danaṁ dadyāt.
(dramatic performances, operas). The commentary explains dava[kammas in the sense of 'comics' (kūsa-karaṇa-kiḷā).

Whatever be the correct reading of the word, it is certain that Khāravela did not refrain from pleasing the citizens of his capital by 'combats' or 'comics,' and by dancing, singing and instrumental music, which were against the doctrine of Jainism. There is no evidence to prove that he exercised discrimination, like Aṣoka, in selecting and encouraging only those 'samājas' or 'joyous gatherings' which were approved ways of educating the people even through amusements and festivities.

It is true that Khāravela, too, honoured all denominations, which is to say, that he, too, observed the principle of religious toleration. But his idea of religious toleration was essentially of a Hindu nature. In his case, just as in the case of a Hindu, toleration implied the idea of non-interference, non-intervention, not meddling in another man's religion. He found it to be a wise policy on his part to leave each sect to follow its own creed without taking the trouble of considering the details of each faith. He does not appear to have made an attempt to bring all sects on a common platform for a free and frank discussion, and an interchange of ideas for discovering the common ground and mission of all religions, as well as for determining the merits and defects of each religion. Aṣoka and Akbar had their own ideas and programmes of religion. But Khāravela had no such ideas and programmes. How Aṣoka's idea of religious toleration differed from that of Khāravela will be manifest from Aṣoka's R. E. XII, the relevant portion of which is quoted below:

"His Sacred and Gracious Majesty the king is honouring all sects, both ascetics and house-holders; by gifts and offerings of various kinds is he honouring them. But His Sacred Majesty does not value such gifts or honours as how should there be the growth of the essential elements of all religious sects. The growth of this genuine matter is, however, of many kinds. But the root of it is restraint of speech, that is, there should not be honour of one's own sect and condemnation of others' sects without any ground. Such slighting should be for specified grounds only. On the other hand, the sects of others should be honoured for this ground and that; concord alone is commendable in this sense that all should listen and be willing to listen to the doctrines professed by others. This is, in fact, the desire of His Sacred Majesty, viz., that all sects should be possessed of wide learning and good doctrines."

1. For the meaning of this term, see Radha Kumud Mookerji's "Asoka," p. 129, f. n. 1.
13. SOME POINTS CONCERNING PERSONAL HISTORY

Our rendering of Aira as “Lordly” requires a word of explanation. The first letter as it appears on the stone or in the estampages cannot but be read as at. The correctness of such a reading is confirmed, no doubt, by the Sanskrit ślokas quoted by Mr. Jayaswal from an old Oriyā MS. But one must not lose sight of the fact that in these ślokas, Ahira has been used as an alternative spelling. We have, moreover, sought to show that a similar letter occurring in the two Pabhosa inscriptions of Āśādhāsen ṣa has been read by Dr. Vogel as va, the letter serving as the initial of the personal name Vaiḥidari. Should Aira be read on this ground as Vera, we have mentioned that there is no other alternative but rendering it “Hero” or “Heroic,” vera being the same word as vīra. Even if we adhere to the reading Aira, we do not quite understand why it should be interpreted as signifying “a descendant of Ila.” Rather keeping the two alternative spellings Aira and Ahira in the Sanskrit ślokas from the old Oriyā MS. in view, we have to think of a royal title, which can account for both of them. Such a royal title is undoubtedly Ayira which has been explained in the Jātaka-Commentary as meaning sāmi, “master” or “lord,” “a master as distinguished from a slave,” that is to say, “an Ārya, whose condition, according to the Artha-Śāstra, is not servitude.”

We still feel that Mr. Jayaswal’s first note on Aira (JBORS, Vol. III, Part IV, p. 434) is something to the point: “The first word of the royal style is Aira. This word occurs in a Sātavāhana inscription and has been translated by M. Senart as ‘noble’ (Ārya). I am inclined to take it as indicating the ethnic difference of Khāravela from his subjects (who were mostly Dravidians, or the mixed Aryo-Dravidians, for according to the Nāṭya-Śāstra, the people of Kaliṅga were dark but not black).”

The personal names occurring in our old Brāhmī inscriptions have an importance of their own. We find that most of them are obviously Aryan names, viz., Kamma, Cūlakamma, Kusuma, Nākiya (Nāgīta), Hāthisāha-Hathisīha and Khīnā (misread Halakkīnā-Śalakṣṇā). Vāḍukha or Varikha, too, appears to be an Aryan name, Vāḍukha being a Prākrit equivalent of Vāḍavākṣa, and Varikha that of Vāsikṣa. As regards Kadampa or Kudepa (misread Vakadepa) by Dr. Indrāji, and Kudepa by Mr. Banerji),

1. Barhut Inscriptions edited by Barua and Sinha, sub voce “Aya.”
we are inclined to think in the same way. Kadampa may be equated either with Kadamba or with Kandarpa. Kudepa as an alternative reading may be treated as an equivalent of Kudeva (the “Lord of the Earth”).

Mr. Jayaswal explains the name Khāravela as meaning “the Ocean” (lit. “one whose waves are brackish”). Prof. S. K. Chatterji prefers to explain it in the sense of Kāda-vilvai, “the Black-lanceer,” kāda being the same word as the Sk. kṛṣṇa, meaning “black.” Kāla-vilvai occurs in the Mahāvansa2 as the name of a Yakkha, and in the Jātaka-Commentary as the name of a village in Ceylon, the spelling in the latter case being Kālavai.3 The word kālavai is met with in the Mahāniddesa where it is explained in the sense of “one who speaks words befitting the time.”

We can quite see that khāra is the same word as kāla or kṛṣṇa, and velai is an equivalent of vilva, cf. Uruvala-Uruvilva. Whatever the sense in which the name is interpreted, Khāravela may be equated with Kṛṣṇavilva. But, as suggested in the Mahāniddesa, velai of Khāravela may have been derived from velai meaning “the shore” or “the wave breaking upon the shore.” If so, Khāravela must be equated with Kṛṣṇavela meaning “the Sea,” “the Ocean” (lit., “that which is girt by watery black shores”). Kālidāsa’s famous description of the sea or ocean may serve, it is hoped, to clear up this meaning of Khāravela or Kṛṣṇavela:

Dūrādasyaśacakranibhasya tanvi
tamāla-tālt-vanarājī-nilā |
Ābhāti velai lavanātmurāser
dhārānibaddheva kalanāka-rekhā 5 6

5. Raghuvaṃsa, Canto XIII. Velai śīrābhūmiḥ dhārānibaddhā cakrākritā kalanākarekhā mālīnyarekhā ca abhāti (Mallinātha). “ Velai syāt śīrānārayoḥ ” iti Viśvā.
14. KHARAVELA'S PLACE IN HISTORY

Kharavela is one of the most striking figures in the annals of Indian kings. Although he cannot claim the proud position enjoyed by an Aśoka or an Akbar as a world-figure, even as a provincial figure, he represents a remarkable and charming personality. He maintained the noble tradition of Aśoka as a successful builder of such sacred and artistic monuments as rock-cut caves, stone-pillars, shrines and ornamented shrine-posts, as a ruler who honoured and favoured all religious sects, and no less as a king who did his level best to work and strain all his resources for the good and happiness, or as is put in his inscription, for the pleasing of the people, his subjects, while he became, by his warrior-like spirit, valour and victory, the worthy precursor of Samudragupta. As an expert in the science of music (Gandhava-veda-budha) and a patron of fine arts, too, he played well the rôle of a precursor of the imperial Gupta monarchs. From the chronological point of view, too, he stood just midway between Aśoka, on one side, and Samudragupta, on the other. In respect of its style and contents, his inscription in the Hāthi-Gumpha, too, must be accorded a similar intermediate position between the notable inscriptions of Aśoka and the Allahabad pillar inscription of the lion-like Samudragupta. But unique is his position in Indian history as an unsurpassed patriotic king of Kalinga, just in the same way that unique is his inscription of seventeen lines on the hanging brow of the Hāthi-Gumpha roof in its presentation of systematic records of his successive regnal years. King Aśoka followed, as shown elsewhere, a quinquennial system in issuing his edicts and in all of his other undertakings from his twelfth regnal year onwards. So far as the edicts of Aśoka go, these are far from presenting a systematic record of the events of his successive regnal years except, as one might say, with regard to the release of prisoners from the imperial jail (P.E. V). But, nevertheless, the chronological system of presentation followed in Kharavela's inscription goes to connect it historically with the edicts of the Maurya emperor rather than with the inscriptions of the Gupta emperors. It is the Jains and Buddhists who dated their votive offerings in the term of the successive years of the reign of the Kuśāna kings, precisely in the same way that in

the subsequent phase of Indian History the universal custom became to date all public and private records and works in the term of an era known as the Śaka-era.

Khāravela was the greatest known king among the monarchs of the Meghavāhana or Aira-mahāmeghavāhana dynasty who exercised their suzerainty over the kingdom of Kaliṅga, nay, among all the monarchs who reigned in Kaliṅga before King Aśoka and after the Meghavāhana kings. The memory of his predecessors in the Meghavāhana line would have been completely obliterated from the pages of history but for allusions to them in his inscription as his predecessors.

With regard to the part played by his predecessors in the Meghavāhana line, it may be clearly inferred from certain statements in his inscription that since the first king of this line succeeded in freeing the kingdom of Kaliṅga from the yoke of a foreign rule, they successfully maintained its independence till they safely handed it on to him in the third generation of two kings (tatiye purisa-yuge). If our reading āhatapuva in the sense of āhṛtapūrva, "previously annexed," be accepted as correct, the Hāthi-Gumpha record of his fourth regnal year (I. 5) may be so interpreted as to imply that the Vidyādhara-country was already annexed to the kingdom of Kaliṅga by some one of his predecessors, while the task that was left to him was just to consolidate the Meghavāhana rule over it. In the absence of any clear record in his inscription as to his conquest of Pāṇḍya kingdom, the record of his twelfth regnal year stating that the king of Pāṇḍya supplied him with pearls, gems, jewels and rich apparels cannot be accounted for without some such supposition that either the king of Pāṇḍya was an old ally of the Meghavāhana kings or the king of Pāṇḍya was compelled to acknowledge his supremacy, even as an ally, in fear of the consequences of an invasion contemplated by him. Further, he could not have used Mathurā as a military base of his attacks on Uttarāpatha, on one hand, and on Aṅga-Magadha, on the other, as it appears from the records of his eighth and twelfth regnal years (I. 9, I.13) that he did so, if either he himself had not conquered it or it had not been an old dependency of the kingdom of Kaliṅga.

It is very clear from the record of his first regnal year (I. 2) that the city of Kaliṅga with its gates, walls, residential houses, deep and cool tanks and all kinds of gardens was used as the capital of the Kaliṅga kingdom also by his predecessors. If Dantapura-Paloura was the most ancient known capital of Kaliṅga, and no evidence be forthcoming as to the city of Kaliṅga being used as the capital by any pre-Meghavāhana
kings, some one among his Meghavāhana predecessors must be credited with the building of this as the capital city.

The Hāthi-Gumpha inscription contains the following two significant statements indicating under whose sway the kingdom of Kaliṅga had remained before the Meghavāhana kings rose into power: (1) Paṃcane cēdāîi vasa Naṃdaraṇā-tivasasata-oṣṭhitam Tanasuliya-vātā panḍuṇīṃ nasaram pavesayati, "And then in the fifth year, King Khāravela caused the canal opened out by King Nanda 103 (or 300) years ago to be extended into the capital city;" and (2) hārasame ca vasa......Naṃdaraṇā-ṇītam Kaliṅga-Jindanaṃ (Aṅga-magadhato) Kaliṅgam āneti, "And in the twelfth year, he caused the throne of Jinā belonging to Kaliṅga which was carried off by King Nanda to be brought back (from Aṅga-Magadhā) to Kaliṅga."

To us the two statements are important as indicating (1) that some king associated with Aṅga-Magadhā and known as Nandarāja had invaded and conquered Kaliṅga before the Meghavāhana kings established their sovereignty over it; and (2) that Nandarāja opened out a canal or aqueduct near the Tanaśuliya, Tanaśuli or Tosaḷī road while the kingdom of Kaliṅga was under his sway.

Now, the Sanskrit ślokas from the Old Orīya MS. tell us that King Aira or Ahira of Utkala proved to be the victor in a battle, which ensued between him, on one side, and King Nanda of Magadha, on the other. These represent King Nanda, as we saw, as a staunch supporter and King Aira-Ahira as a ruthless destroyer of the Vedic religion or Brahmanism. As a destroyer of the Vedic religion, King Aira-Ahira is said to have been a great friend (mahāmitra) of King Aśoka. The ślokas credit King Aira-Ahira with the transfer of the capital of Utkala from the main city in South Kośala to the Ekapraṣṭara-tract around the hill of Kaṇḍalagiri. Thus Utkala itself is described as a kingdom, which extended so far as to include in it Kośala and Toṣaḷa, forming two main divisions of Khāravela's kingdom of Kaliṅga. And if we are to believe the story of the Sanskrit ślokas, it is from the hands of King Nanda of Magadhā that King Aira-Ahira of Utkala freed the kingdom and people of Kaliṅga. All these may be true, but until we have the opportunity of examining the nature and credibility of the original source of information, it is likely to be injudicious to attach undue importance to them.

It is too late in the day of Indian historical research to attach any importance whatever to the opinion of Rājā Rājendra Lāla Mitra assigning Khāravela to the 4th century B.C. and claiming him, a fortiori, to
be a pre-Aśokan king. It is impossible to regard Khāravela as a pre-Aśokan king in the face of these two facts: (1) that his inscription in the Hāthi-Gumpha distinctly represents him as a contemporary and rival of Sātakarṇi, whose territories lay contiguous to the western border of his Kaliṅga kingdom (I. 3), and (2) that whatever the actual date and identification of this Sātakarṇi, he was undoubtedly one of the Andhrabhṛtya Sātavāhana kings who rose into power on the decline of the power of the earlier Andhra kings and years after the reign of King Aśoka. It is equally impossible to regard Khāravela as a pre-Aśokan and not as a post-Aśokan king in view of the fact that his inscription distinctly alludes to Bahasatimita (Bṛhaspatimitra) as a contemporary king of Magadha, subdued by him in the twelfth year of his reign, while there is neither tradition nor insessional evidence as to Bahasatimita’s rule in Magadha before or immediately after Aśoka’s reign.

If our interpretation of the two expressions, tatiya-purisa-yuga and tatiya-yugaragadvāsana, be correct, Khāravela was unquestionably the sixth king of the Mahāmeghavāhana family with whose accession to the throne of Kaliṅga the third couple of its two successive representative men was completed, and with whose father’s death, the reign of the third couple of kings was at an end, and his son and successor Kadampa-Kudepa came, as the seventh king, to be joined with him. The records of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription take us as far as the fourteenth year of his reign and, by no means, beyond it, and there are neither inscriptions nor traditions to inform us who among the Mahāmeghavāhana kings and how many kings of the Mahāmeghavāhana family reigned in Kaliṅga as successors of Khāravela and Kadampa-Kudepa, when actually the reign of Khāravela came to an end, or what befell the Mahāmeghavāhanas after Khāravela’s death.

Looking back, we find that Khāravela remained an ordinary prince for fifteen and a crown-prince for nine years, which is to say, the tenor of his life as a prince and crown-prince covered full twenty-four years of the reign of the Mahāmeghavāhana kings. From the foundation of the rule of the Mahāmeghavāhana dynasty right up to the accession of Khāravela we have to conceive the successive reign of (1) the first couple, (2) the first couple and a half, (3) the second couple, and (4) the second couple and a half. Even allowing twenty years as the average period of each reign, we do not get more than eighty years to represent the total length of the reign of Khāravela’s predecessors in the Mahāmeghavāhana line.
It is very likely, as suggested by Mr. Jayaswal, that 'Megha' in the Purāṇas is but a shortening from 'Meghavāhana' or 'Mahāmeghavāhana,' which is the high-sounding epithet whereby Khāravela and other kings of the same royal family were designated. The traditions in the Purāṇas unanimously assert that among the different Indian kings who reigned in various parts of India as contemporaries of the Andhra or Andhrabhṛtya-Sātavāhana rulers were the kings who reigned in Kośala or South Kośala, who were just nine in number, very powerful, intelligent and well-known as 'Meghas.' And it is expressly stated in the Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa that seven Kośala kings of the Megha-Meghavāhana dynasty and seven Andhra-Andhrabhṛtya-Sātavāhana kings reigned as contemporaries.

Thus the traditions in the Purāṇas lead us to understand that altogether nine kings of the Megha-Meghavāhana family reigned in South Kośala, which, as we have sought to show, formed one of the three principal divisions of Khāravela's Kālīṅga kingdom. And if it can be elicited from the Ṣāthi-Gumphā and other old Brāhmī inscriptions that Khāravela reigned as the sixth king and Kadampa-Kudepa as the seventh king of the Mahāmeghavāhana family, we can say that just two other kings of this family reigned after their death, which is to say, the rule of this family came to an end within thirty or forty years of Khāravela's death.

The determination of the age of Khāravela depends, to a large extent, on a satisfactory identification of King Nanda, Sātakaṇi and King Bahasatimita of Magadha, all of whom find mention in the Ṣāthi-Gumphā inscription. As to the identification of King Nanda, this inscription furnishes us with a key in the two facts stated by it: (1) that a canal or aqueduct was opened out near the Tanasuliya, Tanasuli or Tosali road by him 103 or 300 years ago, the years being counted back from the fifth year of Khāravela's reign (panicme cēdāni rase Naṉḍarāja-tivasasata-oghāṭita-pañāḍim tanasuliya-vāṭā); and (2) that the Kālīṅga throne of Jina, carried off by him (Naṉḍarāja-nita Kālīṅga-Jināsana) was brought back from Aṅga-Magadha to Kālīṅga by King Khāravela by a triumphal procession. Here ambiguity arises from the possibility of two alternative explanations of the compound ti-vasa-sata as meaning either 103 or 300

1. Fargiter's Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 51: Koḷalāyāṁ tu rājāno bhaviṣyanti mahābulāḥ |
   ‘Meghā’ iti samākhyaśa buddhiṁanto navoiva tu ||
2. Fargiter's Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 51, f. n. 16; Eka kālāḥ ime bhūpāḥ sapta Andhrāḥ sapta Kauśalāḥ.
years. Admitting both the alternatives to be equally possible, we have to look out for a King Nanda of Magadha who conquered Kaliṅga, carried away the Kaliṅga throne of Jina as a trophy and opened out a canal in the Tosali division and not far away from the city of Kaliṅga, either 98 (103—5) or 295 (300—5) years before Khaṅravela’s accession.

The only key to the identification of Sātakaṇi furnished in the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription is that he held territories contiguous to the western border of Khaṅravela’s kingdom of Kaliṅga, comprising, as it did, South Kośala as one of its three main divisions. The tradition in the Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa leads us to think that the first seven Meghavāhana and the first seven Sātavāhana kings reigned as contemporaries, in which case if Khaṅravela was the sixth Meghavāhana king, Sātakaṇi must have been the sixth Sātavāhana ruler. It remains to be seen whether the tradition in the Purāṇa can be so rigorously interpreted as to mean that the first king of one dynasty was a contemporary of the first king of the other, the second of the second, and so on.

Regarding Bahasatimita our information from the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription is that he is the king of Magadha whom King Khaṅravela subdued in the twelfth year of his reign. In Yaśamitā’s Brick-tablet inscription, found in Mathurā, Queen Yaśamitā is described as the daughter of Bṛhāsvātimita, the royal personage whose name is taken by Dr. Vogel to be the same as Bahasatimita or Bṛhaspatimitra. In one of the two Pabhosā inscriptions of Aśājhasena, King Aśājhasena, the king of Adhichatrā, is represented as the maternal uncle (mātula) of King Bahasatimita. The same Pabhosā inscription records the construction of a cave in the tenth year of Udāka whom Mr. Jayaswal identifies with Odraka, Odruka or Ārdraka, mentioned in the Purāṇas as the fifth king of the Śunga dynasty, suggesting that King Aśājhasena of Adhichatrap was feudatory to the Śunga kings of Magadha. A coin, too, has been found with a Brāhmaṇ legend recording the name of Bahasatimita. The legend in the Divyāvadāna speaks of a Bṛhaspati as a Maurya king among the successors of Samprati, the grandson of King Aśoka. It remains to be seen whether King Bahasatimita, mentioned as a contemporary of King Khaṅravela, is the same personality as Bahasatimita of the coin, King Bahasatimita of the Pabhosā inscription, Bṛhāsvātimita of Yaśamitā’s Brick-tablet, and Bṛhaspati of the Divyāvadāna, or he is a king of any neo-Mitra dynasty, which came possibly into existence sometime after the Kāṇyas.

The data of chronology which may be collected thus from the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription and other sources are insufficient to determine
undisputably the date of Khāravela. In the present state of our knowledge, we can do no better than stating the three views put forward by three eminent Indian scholars, drawing the reader’s attention to certain strong and weak points in the assumptions and arguments of each of them.

First Mr. Jayaswal’s latest publication on the subject 1 assigns Khāravela’s accession to 182 B.C., taking him to be a contemporary of Puṣyamitra, the founder of the Sunga-Mitra dynasty, whose accession is placed in 188 B.C. The validity of this view is claimed primarily on the soundness of identification of Bahasatimitra or Brhaspatimitra, mentioned in the Hāthi-Gumpha text as a contemporary Magadhan king whom Khāravela subdued in the twelfth year of his reign, chiefly on the ground that Bahasati or Brhaspati finds mention in the Sāṅkhya-Sūtra (I. 26. 6) as the presiding deity of the Puṣya constellation of stars.2 King Bahasatimitra or Brhaspatimitra is sought to be connected with the Śuṅga-Mitra kings of Magadha by the argument that a king of this very name figures in a Pabhosā inscription as the nephew of King Āśādhhasena of Adhichattrā (in North Pañcāla), while the main text of this inscription records the excavation of a cave by Āśādhhasena for the Kāśyapīya Arhats in the tenth year of Udāka (Odraka, Odruka or Ādraka3) who happens to be counted in the Purāṇas as the fifth king of the Śuṅga-Mitra dynasty.4 The reign of a king known by the name of Brhaspati among the successors of King Aśoka and of his grandson Samprati can be inferred as well from a legendary list in the Divyāvadāna.5 The reign of a king known by the name of Brhaspatimitra towards the end of the Maurya rule can be inferred equally from Yaśamitā’s Brick-table, in which Queen Yaśamitā (of Mathurā?) is described as the daughter of Bhāsvatimita, a name that can be equated either with Brhaspatimitra or with Brhatsvatimitra, the Brāhmi letter-forms of this record appearing to be in their essential features still Mauryan.6 The coin-name Bahasatimitra for Puṣyamitra is explained by the fact, that in other Śuṅga-Mitra and Śuṅgabhṛtya-Kāṇva coins, the names of some of the Śuṅga and Kāṇva kings agree with and differ from those in the Purāṇas:—

The objection arising from the Hāthi-Gumpha statement *Namdarāja-tivasasata-oghātitaṃ Tanasuliya-vālā paṇādīṃ nagaraṃ pavesayati* which must be ordinarily rendered as “He (King Khāravela) caused the canal opened out by King Nanda 103 (or 300) years ago to be extended from the Tanasuliya or Tanauli road into the city (of Kaliṅga)” is sought to be met by the argument that here the expression *Namdarāja-tivasasata-oghātita* should be taken to mean “opened out in 300 Nanda-era (the era founded by King Nandavardhana, the grandfather of Mahāpadma Nanda, in 485 B. C.).” The existence of such an era is sought to be proved by the fact that Alberuni, writing his Indika in 1030 A. D., “found this era in actual use in Mathurā and Kanauj,” and “heard the local tradition that the founder of the era lightened the taxes by obtaining wealth from the under-soil (which reminds us of the story of the buried treasures of the Nandas).”

The same is sought to be proved also by the evidence of the Yedarava inscription of the Chalukya king Vikramāditya VI, stating: “Having said, why should the glory of the Kings Vikramāditya and Nanda be a hindrance any longer? he with a loud command abolished that (era) which has the name of Śaka, and made that (era) which has the Chalukya counting” (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part II, p. 437).

In accordance with Mr. Jayaswal’s chronological interpretation of the fact of Khāravela’s ‘marching against the west disregarding Sātakarṇi,’ one must identify Khāravela’s Sātakarṇi with Sātakarṇi I, who is no other than Śrī-Sātakarṇi mentioned in the Purānas as the third king of the Andhrabhṛtya-Sātavāhana dynasty founded by Simuka, the father of

Sri-Satagarṇi, and Satagarṇi mentioned as the Lord of the Deccan (Dakṣīnāpata-pati) in the Nānāghāt Cave inscription of Queen Nāyanikā, the daughter-in-law of Simuka. Further, one must assign this Satagarṇi’s accession to 172 B.C., placing the foundation of the Satavāhana dynasty in 203 B.C., on the strength of the expert opinion of Dr. Bühler who found Nāyanikā’s Nānāghāt Cave inscription to be, on palaeographic grounds, slightly older than Khāravela’s inscription in the Hāthi-Gumpha.¹

Our difficulty in accepting his interpretation of Nāṃdarāja of the expression Nāṃdarāja-tivasasata-oghāṭita in the sense of “Nanda-era” is that the same construction cannot be applied to Nāṃdarāja in Nāṃdarāja-nīta Kālinta-Jināśana, which, too, is an expression in the Hāthi-Gumpha text and must be rendered as “the Kālinta throne of Jina carried away by King Nanda.” We cannot appreciate the presumption in the Cambridge History of India suggesting even the possibility of Nāṃdarāja being a local ruler, that is to say, one of the earlier kings of Kālinta, in view of the clear suggestion in the Hāthi-Gumpha record that this King Nanda took away the throne of Jina from Kālinta and was somehow connected with Aṅga and Magadha.

Thus the interpretation of Nāṃdarāja as Nanda-era failing to hold its ground, the only alternative left is to expound the compound Nāṃdarāja-tivasasata-oghāṭita-paṇāḍi as signifying “the canal opened out by King Nanda 103 or 300 years ago.” Though there is much to be said in favour of the presumption that “103 years” is the primā facie construction of tivasasata, and that if “300 years” were the intended sense, the expression would have been differently worded, the compound, as it is, must not be expounded excluding the possibility of the sense of “300 years.”

Proposing to expound the compound tivasasata in the sense of “103 years,” counted back from Khāravela’s fifth regnal year and to identify Khāravela’s contemporary King Bahasatimita of Magadha with Puṣya-mitra, the founder of the Śungra dynasty, none can escape from the conclusions that “Khāravela’s Nanda” was no other than King Aśoka Maurya who conquered Kālīnta in 261 B.C., in the eighth year of his reign, and that Khāravela’s accession took place in 163 (261-98) B.C. But there is no other plausible reason for the supposed representation of King Aśoka as King Nanda except the fact that his grandfather, Chandragupta

Maurya, is described in the Vāyu-Purāṇa as a scion of the Nanda family (Nandendu). 1

To us, the proposed identification of ‘Khāravela’s Nanda’ with Nandavardhana or Nandivardhana, the first king of the pre-Mauryan Nanda dynasty, is arbitrary. It is difficult to prove that Nandavardhana either conquered Kaliṅga or reigned in 458 B.C. to be able to found an era in that year.

We find it difficult to agree with Mr. Jayaswal in thinking that “Khāravela’s Śatākārṇi” holding territories that lay contiguous to the western border of Khāravela’s Kaliṅga kingdom, was a contemporary of Puṣyamitra, the founder of the Suṅga-Mitra dynasty, in the face of these two facts: (1) that the traditions in the Purāṇas assert that the Andhrabhṛtya-Satavāhana rulers established their suzerainty after the reign of the Suṅgabhṛtya-Kāṇya kings had come to an end, 2 as well as after the destruction of the Andhra power; 3 and (2) that the territories to the west of Khāravela’s Kaliṅga kingdom were included in the Suṅga empire during the reign of Puṣyamitra and governed by the Suṅga Viceroy Agnimitra, the son of Puṣyamitra. 4

Vidiśā was governed, according to the Mālavikāgnimitra, by Prince Agnimitra acting, no doubt, as the Viceroy of his father, King Puṣyamitra. One of the Barhut inscriptions records the first pillar of the Barhut stone-railing as a gift from Cāpādevi, the wife of Revatimitra of Vidiśā. 5 Another inscription records another gift from Vāsiṣṭhi, the wife of Velimitra of Vidiśā. There can be little doubt that both Revatimitra and Velimitra were connected with the Mitra family in Vidiśā. The Barhut E. Gateway inscription clearly proves that even when King Dhanabhūti invested the Barhut stone-railing with the gateways, Barhut continued to be included in the Suṅga dominions (Suṅgarnā ṛaj). 6

The Purāṇas definitely state that Śiṣuka (Simuka of the inscription), the founder of the Andhrabhṛtya-Satavāhana dynasty, came to rule the

---

1. B. C. Mazumdar’s Orissa in the Making, p. 56. In the Mudrā-Rākṣasa, too, Chandrā Gupta Maurya is described as a son of the Nanda king by a Śādra woman. In the Buddhist tradition, the origin of the Moriyas is traced to the Moriya warriors of Pippalivana.
2. Pargiter’s Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 35.
3. Pargiter’s Dynasties of the Kali Age, pp. 45-46.
5. Barhut Inscriptions (Barna and Sinha), No. 4.
6. Barhut Inscriptions (Barna and Sinha), No. 1.
earth by destroying the lingering remains of the Śuṅga power represented by Suśarman, the last of the Śuṅgabhṛtya-Kāuṇa kings. On the termination of the Śuṅga reign, Vidiśā came under the rule of Śiṣunandi who was succeeded by his younger brother Nandiyaśa or Yaśonandi, and Nandiyaśa was succeeded in his turn by three kings of his line, while his daughter’s son Śiṣuka became the ruler of Purikā. Curiously enough, as Dr. Raychaudhuri observes, Śiṣuka is precisely the Purāṇa spelling of the name of Simuka, the founder of the Andhrabhṛtya-Sātavāhana dynasty. Here two important facts can be gleaned from the Purāṇa chronicles: (1) the rise in Vidiśā of a neo-Nandi or neo-Nanda family of kings who struggled for supremacy within the Śuṅga dominions, it being quite possible that either Śiṣunandi or Nandiyaśa temporarily seized the throne of Magadh, and even conquered Kaliṭhā and opened out a canal 98 years prior to Khāravela’s accession and after the termination of the rule of the Śuṅga family, and (2) the rise of the Sātavāhana dynasty after destroying the vestiges of the Śuṅga power represented by the last of the Kāuṇas, say, in 27 B.C.

The evidence of the Pabbosā inscription of King Āśājhasena of Adhichatras, representing Āśājhasena as the maternal uncle of King Bṛhaspatimitra and recording the construction of a cave for the use of the Kāśyapīya Arhats in the tenth year of Udāka who is mentioned in the Purāṇas as the fifth king of the Śuṅga-Mitra family, is really a strong point in favour of Mr. Jayaswal’s identification of Khāravela’s Magadhan rival Bṛhaspatimitra with Puṣyamitra. But there are certain inscriptive evidences to dispute the correctness of the inclusion. It is difficult moreover, to account by Mr. Jayaswal’s theory of two sets of names in literature and epigraphy for a number of kings bearing ‘Mitra’ as a common surname, e.g., Viṣṇumitra of Gautamimitra’s inscription, Bṛhammitra whose wife Nāgadevi donated a corner pillar of the old stone-railing at Buddha-Gaya, and Indrāgniimitra whose wife Āryā Kuraṅgī donated a large bulk of the Buddha-Gaya stone-railing. There may seem to be much truth in Dr. Raychaudhuri’s suggestion that these Mitra kings belonged, perhaps, together with Bṛhaspatimitra, to a neo-Mitra dynasty, which arose sometime after the destruction of the Kāuṇa power.

1. Fargiter’s Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 49.
must bear always in mind that so far as Puṣyamitra is concerned, he is designated Puṣyamitra both in literature and in inscription (Jayaswal's 'Suṅga Inscription of Ayodhyā'), and so far as Brhadaparimitra is concerned, he is designated Bahusatimitra in the inscriptions and in the coin-legends. Secondly, in the opinion of Rai Bahadur Ramaprasad Chanda, Namdarāja of the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription should be identified with Mahāpadma Nanda or with one of his sons on the ground that "it is not Nandivardhana but Mahāpadma Nanda who is said to have brought all under his sole sway and uprooted all Kṣatriyas or the old reigning families;" Sātakarṇi mentioned in the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription as a contemporary of Khāravela should be identified with "Sātakarṇi II whose reign may be tentatively dated between B.C. 75-20," partly on the ground that this Sātakarṇi finds mention in the Purāṇas without a qualifying adjective 'ārya' characterising his name, just in the same way that Sātakarṇi finds mention in Khāravela's inscription without such a qualifying epithet; King Śri Sātakarṇi of the Sanchi Gateway inscription should be distinguished as Sātakarṇi II from Simuka's son, Sātakarṇi I, referred to in the Nānāghāt Cave inscription of Nāyanaikā for the simple reason that on palaeographic grounds the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription of Khāravela must be placed between the Nānāghāt Cave and Barhut E. Gateway inscriptions, on the one side, and the Sanchi Gateway inscription, on the other.

Identifying 'Khāravela's Nanda' with Mahāpadma Nanda or with one of his sons who reigned in the 4th century B.C. and explaining ti-vasāṣata in the sense of "300 years," it is easy to conclude that the rise of Khāravela "probably synchronised with the fall of the Suṅga dynasty and the consequent weakening of the power of Magadha."  

Our main objection to the proposed identification of 'Khāravela's Nanda' with Mahāpadma Nanda or with any other pre-Mauryan Nanda king is that it is almost conclusive from the statements in Aśoka's R. E. XIII that Aśoka was the first among the Indian kings reigning after the Buddha's demise to conquer the theretofore unconquered land of the Kaliṇga (aujītām vijīṇitum) and to annex the same to his own kingdom. Kaliṇga has been described as 'a recently annexed territory' (adhunā-ladāhā Kaliṇgā), it being conquered just in the eighth year of his reign (261 B.C.). Serious reflections on the terrible consequences of his war with

Kaliṅga are said to have brought about a great turning point in his life and career. It is evident from his two Separate Rock Edicts that he governed the province of Kaliṅga by his viceroy and high functionaries. It is certain that this province remained under his rule for at least twenty-nine years (261-232 B.C.). It is manifest from all his statements that he really found the conquest of Kaliṅga a hard nut to crack, and that, in spite of his most determined attacks, he failed to conquer and annex all the tracts covered by Khāravela’s kingdom of Kaliṅga. He had to leave out certain parts demarcating them as unconquered outlying tracts (aṅtā avijitā) and placing them in charge of his high functionaries known as ‘Wardens of the Marches’ (Aṃtapāḷa-mahāmātā). The digging of a canal near the Tosali road may be regarded as a possible work of his. And, lastly, there were two sets of inscriptions, one set incised on the Dhauli rock separated by an open plain from the hills of Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri and the other incised on the Jaugarā rock within a few miles from Khāravela’s capital to remind the inhabitants of Kaliṅga of the fact of its conquest by an outsider. The personal name of King Asoka having not been recorded in these inscriptions, it was not impossible for the local people to identify the author of the inscriptions and the excavator of the Tosali road canal with a Magadhan king Nanda whom the growing spurious Brahmanical traditions made them familiar with.

Two of the stories of hell in the Petavattthu which is one of the post-Asokan Pāli works included in the Buddhist Tipiṭaka alludes to the kingdom of a fabulously rich Nanda king abounding in the wealth of all kinds of apparels. The commentary on the Petavattthu identifies Nandarāja of these stories with a pre-Buddhistic king of Kaśi. The Jaina Bhagavati Sūtra (XV. 1) speaks of a powerful King Jayasena Vimalavāhana Mahāpadma (Mahāpaṁma) reigning in the city of Satadvāra at the foot of the Vindhya mountain long long after the death of the Ājivika teacher Gośāla who predeceased Mahāvira by sixteen years. As a mighty persecutor of the Jains, this King Mahāpadma is represented as an embodiment of the evil spirit of Gośāla. None need be surprised if this Jayasena

1. Petavattthu, II. 1, III. 2 :—
Yācata Nandaraśasīa viṣṭasmin paticchadā.
2. Paramatthā-Dīpan, the volume containing the Petavattthu-Commentary, p. 73. Somehow, it is to this King Nanda that the legend in Alberuni’s Indika of the Nanda king, rich with buried treasures, may be traced.
3. None need be surprised if some such king was behind the story in the Sanskrit ślokas from an Old Oriyā MS. of a vedadharmā-parāyaṇa Nanda rival of the Jain King Ajīra-Ahira of Utkala.
Vimalavähana Mahäpadma who held his kingdom at the foot of the Vindhyä mountain was the same king as Pravira, the son of Vindhyäsakti, whom the Puràñas praise as a ruler who reigned in the city of Känkanakä for sixty years and performed a horse sacrifice.¹

Under the circumstances, particularly having regard to the hard facts recorded by King Aśoka, it may be far safer to err by identifying Khāravela’s Nanda with Aśoka Maurya and assigning Khāravela’s accession to the second quarter of the 1st century A.D., interpreting ti-vasa sata in the sense of “300 years,” or by identifying him with Siśunandi or with Yaśonandi who snatched away Vidiśä from the Suṅga dominions on the fall of the Suṅga power and assigning Khāravela’s accession to the same second quarter of the 1st century A.D. interpreting ti-vasa-sata in the sense of “103 years,” than falling into endless difficulties by proposing to identify Khāravela’s Nanda’ with Mahäpadma Nanda and to assign Khāravela’s accession to the period covered by the reign of the Känvas in the 1st century B.C. and identifying Khāravela’s contemporary King Bṛhaspatimitra of Magadha with none.

Khāravela’s Sätakarṇi may have been the sixth Sätavāhana king mentioned in the Purāṇas, that is to say, Rai Bahadur Chanda’s Sätakarṇi II. This identification is borne out by the tradition in the Bhavisya-Purāṇa representing the first seven Meghavāhana and the first seven Sätavāhana kings as contemporaries. We may even concede that Sätakarṇi II was King Sri-Sätakarṇi during whose reign and within whose kingdom the Sanchi gateway was donated by a donor. But how can we think that this Sätakarṇi reigned in the Vidiśä region after the fall of the Suṅga power when it is expressly stated in the Purāṇas that King Siśu-nandi and his four successors reigned in Vidiśä contemporaneously with the Känva rulers of Magadha, and that Siśuka-Simuka founded the Sätavāhana dynasty only after he had succeeded in destroying the lingering remnants of the Suṅga power represented by Suśarman, the last of the Känva kings, —Siśuka-Simuka of Purikä who is described as Yaśonandi’s daughter’s son?²

Thirdly, in the opinion of Dr. Raychaudhuri, ‘Khāravela’s Nanda’ should be identified with Mahäpadma Nanda on the authority of the Purāṇas extolling Mahäpadma, the third pre-Mauryan Nanda king, as “the sole monarch who brought all the ruling powers under his way,”³ and ‘Khāravela’s

---

¹ Pargiter’s Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 50.
Satakarni should be identified with Satakarni I, while Satakarni I himself should be identified with (1) Simuka's son, King Satakarni, the lord of the Deccan, mentioned in the Nanaghāt Cave inscription of Nāyanikā, (2) King Sri-Satakarni of the Sanchi Gateway inscription, (3) the elder Sargonus mentioned in the Periplus, and (4) Satakarni, the lord of Pratiśṭhāna and father of Saktikumāra mentioned in Indian literature. Regarding Mahāpadma Nanda, he seems to think that the traditions in the Purāṇas can be liberally interpreted so as to imply that even the old ruling family of Kaliṅga was subdued by the all-powerful Nanda monarch. In short, he does not think it improbable that Mahāpadma Nanda effected a conquest in Kaliṅga, which is said to have been ruled by thirty-two or a similar number of kings who reigned independently as contemporaries of the Saśu-nāgas. At the same time he seeks to maintain that Śiśuka-Simuka, the first king of the Satavāhana family, was able to found the Satavāhana dynasty only after the destruction of the Kāṇva power in 28 B.C.

We have already disposed of the boasted claims in the Purāṇas for Mahāpadma Nanda. If 'Khāravela's Nanda' be Mahāpadma Nanda, the all-powerful pre-Mauryan Nanda monarch of Magadha, if 'Khāravela's Satakarni' be the third king of the Satavāhana family, and the Satavāhana dynasty were founded not earlier than 27 B.C., and if "300 years" be the correct rendering of ti-vāsa-saṭa, it is for Dr. Raychaudhuri to explain how Khāravela's accession can be placed in the last quarter of the 1st century B.C. We must still hold that one should take the presumption created, on the strength of the tradition in the Purāṇas, in favour of the possibility of Mahāpadma Nanda's conquest of Kaliṅga with a grain of salt, first, because this tradition does not tally with the more reliable tradition in the Pāli chronicles, including the Mahābhodhivamsa, and, secondly, in the face of a clear evidence of Aśoka's R. E. XIII tending to prove just the contrary of what is elicited from the Purāṇas. Dr. Raychaudhuri has attempted indeed in vain to invest the tradition in the Purāṇas with cogency and authenticity by reducing the length of Mahāpadma Nanda's reign from 88 to 28 years on the strength of the reading astāvīṁkats in a solitary manuscript of the Vāyu-Purāṇa. So long as the reading about the total length of the reigns of Mahāpadma and his successors remains satam samāḥ ("one hundred years"), the reduction of the length of Mahāpadma's

2. Ibid., pp. 142.
reign from 88 to 28 in a single manuscript of a particular Purāṇa is unavailing as a proof of authenticity and cogency of the tradition.

We cannot, however, help appreciating the general tenor of Dr. Raychaudhuri’s arguments persuading us to assign Kháveral’s accession to the second quarter of the 1st century A.D. by placing the commencement of the Sātavāhana rule in 27 B.C., identifying Sātakarnī of the Hāthi-Gumphā text with the third king of the Sātavāhana dynasty and relegating King Brhaspatimitra of Magadha to a neo-Mitra dynasty.

This chronological conclusion may derive support from a few collateral evidences, which are as follows:

(1) The style of the Hāthi-Gumphā text is closely similar and slightly anterior to that of the Milinda-Pañha which is one of the extra-canonical Buddhist texts quoted by Buddhaghosa in his commentaries (ante, pp. 172), which, in its turn, presupposes all the Pāli canonical texts as we now have them,—the texts which were committed to writing during the reign of King Vaṭṭagāmaṇi towards the close of the 1st century B.C., and which according to a tradition embedded in it, was not compiled earlier than 500 years from the Buddha’s demise,—an event placed now-a-days in 483 or 484 B.C. The Milinda-Pañha was compiled when the memory of King Milinda-Menander was still green in India with that of his courtiers Anantakāya-Antiochus and Damayanta-Demetrios, his capital Sāgala or Śākala, and his birthplace Alasandadipa (Alexandria). The political position of the Grecobactrian king is well brought out in a passage in which he is represented as comparing himself to a lion in a golden cage surrounded by many enemies. Just as the authenticity of the tradition about the compilation of the Kathāvatthu as a Pāli canonical text in the 18th year of Asoka’s reign and 236 years after the Buddha’s demise may be proved by the close

---

1. According to the Purāṇas, Simuka, the first Sātavāhana king, reigned for 10, Kṛṣṇa, the second king, for 10 or 18, and Śrī-Sātakarnī, the third king, for 10 years.
5. Trenchner’s Milinda-Pañha, p. 13; Buddhaghosa’s Atthasālinī, p. 6, wrongly places the event 218 years, while the Mahāvaṇṇa (V. 278-280) rightly places it 236 years, after the Buddha’s demise.
resemblance, among other evidences, between the most peculiar dialectical style of the Kathāvatthu and that of Aśoka's R.E. IX, so, perhaps, the authenticity of the tradition about the compilation of the Milinda-Pañha some 500 years after the Buddha's demise may be proved by the observed close resemblance of its style with that of the Ṣāthi-Gumpha text. As regards the similarity of style between the Kathāvatthu and Aśoka's R.E. IX, the following quotations may here suffice:—

1. Kathāvatthu, 1.6—Aṭṭhi sīyā atītaṃ sīyā uvaṭṭītaṃ. Hatte aṭṭaṃ atti, aṭṭhi sīyā atītaṃ sīyā uvaṭṭītaṃ tenaṭṭaṃ uvaṭṭītaṃ uvaṭṭītaṃ atti, etc.


(2) The invocation formula, Namo arihantānam namo sava-sidhānaṃ, used at the commencement of the Ṣāthi-Gumpha text is closely similar to and somewhat simpler than the formula, Namo sammā-sambuddhānaṃ paramatthadassinaṃ siddhiṣṭappamappamittānaṃ, occurring at the commencement of the Peṭakopadesa. It may be noted that the Sātavāhana inscriptions have mostly Siddham for their benedictory formula. Another form of the convention characterising such works as the Netti-Pakaraṇa, the Milinda-Pañha and the Kaṭṭhīya Artha-Sāstra is the epitome of the text presented in one or more verses. This twofold convention which became a universal phenomenon in Indian literature dating from


2. Netti-Pakaraṇa, p. 1:—

Yaṃ loko pājāyate salokapālo sada naṃsati ca
Tass'eta sūsanavaram viḍūhi nēyyaṃ noracarassa

Milinda-Pañha, p. 1:—

Milindo nūma so rāja Sāgalāyam puruttama
Upagaṇchi Nāgasena Gaṅgā va yathā sāgaran

Artha-Sāstra, p. 6:—

Sukha-grahaṇa-vijñāyam tatdvārāpado-miccitam
Kaṭṭhīya n itam sāstraṃ vivaktegranta-vaśitaram

3. The rule that a treatise should be commenced with either benedictory invocation or the specification of the thesis (āśvinmaśkriyā vastu-nirdēko vēpi tammūlam) which is prescribed in the Kāvyya-Prakāśa and other Indian works on poetics must have been suggested by the twofold convention that came into vogue.
the 2nd or the 3rd century A.D. cannot be traced either in Indian literature or in Indian epigraphy prior to the beginning of the Christian era. The Peṭakopadesa and the Netti-Pakaraṇa are the two extra-canonical Pāli companion works ascribed to Mahākācāra. Of them, the former may be shown to have been quoted by name in Buddhaghosa’s Atthasālinī,¹ and the latter may be shown to have been presupposed by the Milinda-Pañha and Buddhaghosa’s Atthasālinī.² Prof. Hardy, the editor of the Netti-Pakaraṇa, fixes the 2nd century A.D. as the date of composition of this work. We have taken these two Pali works with the Arthaśāstra because, in our opinion, the Arthaśāstra, as we now have it, cannot be dated earlier than the 2nd century A.D. The concluding chapter of the Arthaśāstra deals with 32 Tana-yuktis representing the terminology of textual methodology. Curiously enough, a precisely similar treatment has been accorded to the same number of Tana-yuktis in the Suśruta-Saṃhitā (Uttaratantra, Ch. LXV) which is, in its extant form, a compilation of the 2nd or the 3rd century A.D., while the total number of the Tana-yuktis has been increased to 34 in the Caraka-Saṃhitā.³ So far as Pāli literature is concerned, the Netti-Pakaraṇa and the Peṭakopadesa are the two well-known treatises on textual methodology. It will be noticed that the twofold convention combined in the opening verses characterises also the Mādhyamika-Kārikā of Nāgārjuna who was associated with one of the Sātvāhana rulers:—

\[ \text{Anirodham anupādayaṃ anucchedāṃ aśāswatam} \]
\[ \text{Anekārthatāṃ avāṅdathāṃ anūgamaṃ avirgamam} \]
\[ \text{Yah pratitiya-samutpādaṃ prappāṇāpāsāmaṃ śivam} \]
\[ \text{Deśayāmāsa sambuddhas taṃ vaṇde vaḍatāṃ varam} \]

(3) The Barhut stone-railing which is a purely Śuṅga architecture bears two sculptural representations of Aśokan pillars.⁴ There are instances of imitation of Aśokan pillars in Śuṅga architecture among the ruins of Buddhist monasteries and monuments at Sarnath. The pillars

---

1. Atthasālinī, p. 165.
2. See the characterisation of sattā in the Netti (p. 28), the same in the Milinda (pp. 34 foll.), and the quotation of both in the Atthasālinī, pp. 119-120. See, also, how the simple characterisation of sattā by upāpana-lakāraṇa satīti in the Netti has been elaborated in the Milinda (pp. 37-38).
3. Caraka-Saṃhitā, Siddhiḥṣāna, Ch. XII.
4. Cunningham’s Mahābodhi, Pl. III.
with octagonal shafts and Aśokan capitals as typified by the pillars of the Barhut E. Gateway represent the final stage in the development of the Śūṅga style of architecture. The old stone-railing at Buddha-Gaya, mostly donated by the queens of the later Mitra dynasty, bear sculptural representations of the typical Śūṅga pillars at Barhut,\(^1\) while the typical Buddha-Gaya pillars go to show a considerably modified form of the Śūṅga pillars at Barhut.\(^2\) The shrine-posts on the hills of Udayagiri and Khayyagiri, ornamented according to their description in the Hathi-Gumpha text (I. 15), alternately with two different flower-designs, indicate a wide departure from the Śūṅga style established at Barhut.

Thus we dispose of the vexed question of Khāravela’s date, remembering all the while that Indian chronology is a house of cards, which may break down at any moment. But it cannot be doubted that the sun of the royal power of Kaliṅga reached the zenith during the reign of King Khāravela, though the light which dazzled the eyes was destined to set for ever. The warrior-like spirit of Khāravela and his bold undertaking of military campaigns all over India clearly prove that militarism was in full vigour in the country in spite of Aśoka’s advocacy of the ideal of conquest by the dhamma. But what has been the final result of the wars and warfares that served to keep Khāravela ever busy and the people of Kaliṅga always in excitement? The final result has been this that Mahāvijaya Khāravela disappeared completely out of sight after the 14th year of his reign and the Meghavāhana dynasty came to an end within a few years of his death. The fateful career of Khāravela is enough to prove that the arms that hurl missiles may strike terror, but the arms that embrace that conquer for good. It is Aśoka who set up the ideal of conquest by the dhamma. Khāravela upset this ideal only to be forgotten even in the literature of the Jains, while the memory of Aśoka has all along been adored by the whole Buddhist world. The sigh of monarchs found its fitting expression in the verse singing the death-ode of the royal state and the everlasting glory of the nobler deeds of men:

\[ Jiṟanti ve rājarathā svacittā, atho sarīram pi jaram upeti \]
\[ Sataṁ ca dhammo na jaram upeti, santo have sabhī pavedayanti \]  

---

1. Cunningham’s Mahābodhi, Pl. IV, two square panels.
2. Cunningham’s Mahābodhi, Pl. IV, the pillar in the middle.
3. Dhammapada, Jarāvagga. Such is indeed the moral or central idea of the Mahāvamsa which is the greatest known epic chronicle of the kings of Ceylon, and of all the epics of the Hindus.
"The painted royal chariot falls indeed into decay; even the body (which passes as one's own) is sure to approach the same fate. The noble tradition of the virtuous alone does not go to decay. This is indeed the proclaimed opinion of those of tranquil heart who discuss with good men."

Khāravela, the sovran lord of Kaliṅga, was wise enough to beware of his royal state betimes and to take steps, when opportunity occurred, to build the costly works of art and architecture in glorification of his religion. And it is the lingering rock-cut caves on the hills of Udayagiri and Khāṇḍagiri which have immortalised him and raised up the people of Kaliṅga in the estimation of civilised humanity.

15. THE CITY OF KALIŃGA

Khāravela's inscription is not without a few interesting hints as to the plan, picturesqueness, internal life, joy and prosperity of the city of Kaliṅga which was the capital of his Kaliṅga kingdom.

As regards the plan and picturesqueness, we have mention, in the first-year's record (I. 2), of (1) gopura (gate-house), (2) pākāra (wall), (3) nivesana (residential building), (4) taddāga (tank), and (5) nyāna (garden) as features associated with the city of Kaliṅga. As to other features, there are allusions, in the ninth year's record (I. 10), to (6) rāja-nivāsa Mahāvijaya-pāśūda (the royal residence, the Great-victory palace); in the twelfth year's record, to (7) vithi (road), (8) catarā (square), (9) palika (gate-bar), and (10) sīhara (tower), besides gopura (gate-house); and in the fifth year's record (I. 6), to (11) panūḍī (canal). A few terms preceding vithi and denoting other features are now missing from the twelfth year's record.

So far as the twelfth year's record goes, the terms vithi, catarā, palika, gopura and sīhara are all used in plural forms (vithi-catarā-palikāṇi gopurāṇi sīharāṇī). We may with good reasons maintain that the terms gopura, pākāra, nivesana, taddāga and nyāna have been used in a plural sense also in the first year's record. The plural sense of the first three terms is not inconsistent with the copulative compound gopura-pākāra-nivesanaṁ. The plural sense of taddāga may be easily derived from the compound taddāga-pādiyo which is a plural expression. The plural sense of nyāna is conveyed by the pronominal adjective sava which is the first member of the compound savāyāna (sarvādyāna). Thus it may be established that the city of Kaliṅga, even as King Khāravela found it at the time of his anointment, contained many a gopura, many a
pākāra, many a niverana, many a taḍāga, and many a nyāna. But as regards Mahāvijaya-pāsāda and panāḍi, the implied sense is singular.

The general features implied by these terms go to show that the city of Kaliṅga was built, even before the reign of Khāravela, on the same plan, more or less, as other Indian cities, e.g., the city of Sāgala of which we have a vivid description in the Milinda-Pañha (Trencckner’s edition, pp. 1-2). It may be inferred from the hints given in Khāravela’s inscription that the palace used as the royal residence was the main centre of interest in the city of Kaliṅga, precisely as in other cities; that the residential buildings were all inside a city-wall provided with gateways and gate-bars, and themselves were provided with enclosures and gate-houses; that the various gardens, parks and groves added to picturesqueness of the city; that the roads, squares, court-yards and canals facilitated easy communication and intercourse; that the deep and cool tanks (gabhira-sīlā-taḍāga) served as reservoirs of water for drinking, bathing and washing purposes, while the spire-temples towering above the house-tops stood out as various centres of religious worship.

Comparing the plural expressions in Khāravela’s inscription with those in the Milinda description of the city of Sāgala, we cannot fail to notice that each of them falls short of the expected expression by one or two words, as the following table will indicate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K. I.</th>
<th>M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) gopura</td>
<td>gopura-torana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) taḍāga</td>
<td>taḷāka-pokkharani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) nyāna</td>
<td>ārāma-nyyāna-upavana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) viṭhi-catara</td>
<td>viṭhi-cacakara-calukka-sīṅghataka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) nivesana-sihara</td>
<td>antarāpāṇa-vividha-dānąggaśala-Himagiri-sikara-sānkhāsa-varabhavana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading between the lines, it is easy to understand that the purpose of Khāravela’s inscription was far from giving a connected description of the city of Kaliṅga, and that the features implied by the additional words in the Milinda description were meant to be covered by the plural sense of the words in the former. We say that where gopura in the sense of gate-house or gate-tower is employed, torana in the sense of gate or gateway is implied there. Similarly where taḍāga in the general sense of tank is
employed, pokkharani in the sense of small tank need not be separately mentioned. The Hāthi-Gumphā expression savāyana, interpreted in the sense of all gardens or all kinds of garden, may be said to include in it both ārāma (park) and upavana (grove). As regards vithi and catora, it is not unlikely that some term corresponding to the Pāli catukka-sīṅhātaka meaning cross roads has vanished with the missing words preceding vithi. Anyhow, where vithi in the general sense of road is employed, catukka-sīṅhātaka in the sense of cross-road need not be separately mentioned. And so as to the varieties of nivesana-sihara.

For details of the plans of Indian cities, the reader is referred to Dr. B. B. Dutt’s “Town-planning in Ancient India.” As for the technical architectural significance of the above terms, Dr. P. K. Acharya’s “Dictionary of Hindu Architecture” is sure to prove to be the best help. It will be evident from Dr. Acharya’s quotations that gopuras in the sense of gate-houses or gate-towers were not peculiar to religious edifices; but these formed the paraphernalia of religious temples, as well as of residential buildings. It is equally manifest from Dr. Acharya’s article on Prāsāda that the Great-victory-palace as a literal rendering of Mahā-vijaya-pāsāda in Kharavela’s inscription does not bring out the technical architectural significance of the term. The buildings of the Vijaya class were all two-storied. His quotations from the literary texts and the inscriptions make it clear that sihara or sikhara as a tower or turret was as much a crowning construction of a spire temple as that of a palatial building. Nevertheless, the terms gopurāni and sikhāni, as used in the twelfth year’s record of Kharavela’s reign, would seem to be associated with certain religious temples within the city of Kalinga.

As for the existence of temples dedicated to various deities, we have to look just into the concluding paragraph of the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription (I. 16) in which Kharavela has been praised as savā-devyatanā-samkāra-kāraka, “the repairer of all abodes of the gods.” Devyatanā is a technical term, the significance of which may be made clear from Dr. Acharya’s quotations sub voce—Āyatana, Devyatanā and Devālaya. It is not difficult to understand that the so-called ‘abodes of the gods’ were in reality nothing but the Hindu shrines which stood in the name of different deities or the Hindu temples in which the images of different gods, demi-gods, goddesses and demi-goddesses were enshrined for worship by the people. These shrines and temples were to be located, as Dr. Dutt’s book will show, in every Indian city. We shall entirely miss the force of savā (all) in the expression savā-devyatanā, “all abodes of the
gods," not taking it to denote all kinds of shrines and temples: those in which there were images and those in which there were no images.

If it can thus be proved that the Hāthī-Gumpha text clearly refers, in its concluding paragraph, to the existence of "Deva-temples," we may be justified in thinking, first, that the terms gopura and sīkara in its twelfth year's record were intended to be interpreted as well in connection with nivesana and pāsāda preceding them as with devyatana following them; and secondly, that the worship of idols in the Hindu temples and shrines had come into existence in Kaliṅga before the reign of Khāravela, and long before the Buddhists made the Buddha-images for worship during the Kuṣāna rule.

With regard to the part played by Khāravela in the building up of the city of Kaliṅga, we read in the Hāthī-Gumpha text (I. 2) that immediately after his consecration, in the very first year of his reign, he spent 35,00,000 (pieces of money) in thoroughly repairing the gate-houses, walls and residential buildings damaged by stormy wind in his capital, in raising up embankments of the deep and cool tanks, and in restoring all the gardens. From this it is clear that his first year's work was just a work of reparation and restoration. This record clearly proves that the royal city of Kaliṅga was bedecked with many gardens and many kinds of gardens; that it shone forth with its high walls, gate-towers and buildings; and that it abounded in the deep and cool tanks serving as reservoirs of good drinking water and as bathing places. So far as these tanks go, we may say that the kingdom of Kaliṅga is remarkable in its modern identity precisely as it was two thousand years ago.

King Khāravela did not, however, stop at the work of reparation and restoration. The extension of Nanda-king's canal from the Tanasuliya or Tanasuli road into the heart of the city was a costly work, which was accomplished by him in his fifth regnal year as a means of facilitating communication and irrigation, among other advantages. The two-storeyed new royal residence known by the imposing name of "Great-victory palace" and decked with beryl work,¹ for which he is said to have spent 38,00,000 (pieces of money), was, undoubtedly, a very costly addition made by him to the city architecture. But even this was not all. The

---

¹ The architectural significance of the expression veḷuriya-Mahā-vijaya-pāsāda may be understood in the light of veḷuriya-phala-santhata pāsāda in Fausböll's Jātaka, Vol VI, p. 279.
twelfth year's record goes to show that he made a good deal of improvement by constructing new roads and squares, by strengthening the gates with new bars, as well as by setting up new gate-houses and towers.

Now, with regard to the internal life, joy and prosperity of the city of Kaliṅga, it may suffice to observe that there are allusions, in the second year's record (I. 3), to (1) the location of multitudinous fighting army, consisting of all the four divisions; in the eighth year's record (I. 9), to (2) triumphal processions of victory characterised by the carrying of the Wishing-tree at the head and by the marching of the four divisions of the army at the back, as well as to (3) the feasting of all sections of the people, the general population, the officers, the religious sects keeping to household life, the Brahmanical ascetics and the Jain recluses; in the third year's record (I. 4), to (4) the entertainment of the citizens by combats or combats, by songs, dances, musical performances, as well as by feasts, festivities and joyous gatherings, the king himself being represented as an expert in the science of music; in the seventh year's record (I. 8), to (5) a pompous parade of swords, umbrellas, flags, guards and horses, as well as to (6) the performance of all ceremonies of victory; in the sixth year's record (I. 7), to (7) the wholesale remission of taxes and duties and the dispensing of many bounties as a display of the royal fortune; and in the twelfth year's record (I. 13), to (8) the receiving of jewels, antelopes, horses and elephants, as well as the elephants, horses and other animals capable of exciting curiosity (abhutam-achariya-hathisa-pasaṇa) as presents from the Vāsukis, and no less to (9) the supply of pearls, gems, jewels and rich apparel as tributes from the king of Pāṇḍya; and in the eleventh year's record (I. 12), to (10) the paying of homage to the former kings of Kaliṅga as a great public and social function.

The description is apparently incomplete. Nevertheless, it is full enough to portray a vivid picture of the joyousness of a happy, active, prosperous and crowded city. Here just one point calls for remark. In regard to the presents from a hundred Vāsukis (I. 10), we have these two statements, (1) abhutam-achariyam hathisa-pasaṇam pariḥaramti, and (2) migā-haya-hathī upanāmayamti, which would have been mistaken as overlapping. But from the adjective abhuta-achariya, "curious and wonderful," characterising the elephants, horses and such other beasts in the first clause, it appears that these were collected and preserved as curios, and reared in the royal enclosure for exhibition.
16. THE CAVERNS, SHRINES AND PILLARS

Khāravela's hard-earned fame as a builder was not confined to the
repairing of the city of Kaliṅga and the improvement of the same by
the rebuilding of embankments of the deep and cool tanks, the restoration
of all the gardens, the extension of the Nandarāja canal, the erection
of Mahāvijaya-pāsāda as a new two-storeyed and beryl-set palace, and
the addition of new roads, squares, gate-bars, gate-houses, and towers.
And we may note that his religious endowments were not exhausted
by the repairing of Hindu temples and the occasional feasting of the
Brahmins and Jain recluses.

The Hāthi-Gumphā and other old Brāhmī inscriptive records go
to prove that he showed his royal munificence to the professors of his
own faith, namely, the Jain saints and recluses who resided on the Kumārī
hill, in causing one hundred and seventeen caves (saḷadosa-lena-salāmī)
to be made as joint excavations of himself, his queens, his sons, his
relatives, his brothers, and his officers, sharing the merit and fame with
the rest of the pious donors and glorifying the tradition of Jainism with
the most ancient known landmarks of its art and architecture. All of
these 117 caves were intended to serve as resting places of the resident
Jain saints and recluses (Arahato parinivāsa.hs hi kāya-nisādiyāya).

Apart from what he accomplished jointly with other excavators of
the Jain cave-dwellings on the Kumārī hill, the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription
clearly shows (I. 15) that he caused to be excavated under his own
auspices and as the crowning glory of the recorded last year of his reign,
one cave for the accommodation of the venerated (Jain) recluses and the
(Hindu) yatī, hermits and sages visiting the place from a hundred direc-
tions. His last recorded munificence, amounting to seventy-five hundred
thousand pieces of Indian money current at that time in his Kaliṅga
kingdom, sufficed to enable him to make, along with the excavation of the
last-mentioned spacious cave, a number of stone-pillars and shrines on a
slope in the neighbourhood of cave-dwellings of the Jain saints and recluses
and by means of some hundred thousand slabs of stone, quarried out of
excellent quarries extending over several leagues (Arahato nisidiya-
samīpe pabhāre varākara-samaphitāḥ aukto-yojana-ākītāḥ silāḥ silā-
thambhāni ca cetiyāni karāpayāti).

The same amount just sufficed also to cover the cost of erecting an
edifice, providing it with a canopied court-yard adorned with a pillared
beryl-hall, as well as of causing one-half-hundred shrine-posts, ornamented
with the alternate settings of beryl and emerald, to be produced alongside
(पतालिकांसदस्योऽज्ञानेषु इत्यादि स्तवं वर्णितम् गुरुस्य विषयं पञ्चाङ्गम्)
किंतु तत्वापि वै नीलोऽणम् यथार्थीं अभिरुचिपरं निरूपितं गुरुस्य विषयं
पञ्चाङ्गम्).

With regard to the 117 caves jointly excavated on the Kumārī hill
by King Khāravela and others, the following questions are apt to arise
here: (1) Why all of them were not inscribed? (2) What was the sys-
tem of counting them? (3) What has befallen the missing caves? (4) How
to account for their modern names? (5) What are the component parts of
a cave? (6) What is the technical significance of the term leṇa? (7) What
are the purposes that these caves in particular were intended to serve?

First, the question as to why all the 117 caves were not inscribed
has been discussed at some length in connection with the problem of
the relative total of the caves and inscriptions. We have sought hitherto
to maintain that the caves excavated by the donors other than Khāravela
himself were labelled with inscriptions, recording in each of them the name
of the person or persons by whom the particular cave or group of caves
was excavated or the component parts of a cave were donated, while in the
case of the caves excavated by King Khāravela, as well as of other
works of art and architecture done under his auspices, we have a departure
from the general rule in that these, instead of bearing a separate inscription
each, are all collectively referred to in the records of a single inscription,
namely, the lengthy inscription of Khāravela incised on the hanging brow
of the projected roof of the Hāthi-Gumpha on the present hill of Udayagiri.
We have also pointed out that the thirteenth year's record in this in-
scription alludes in a general fashion to the caves excavated by his queens,
sons, brothers, relatives and officers, in which case the engraving of
separate inscriptions would have been superfluous were it not for keeping
them distinct from His Majesty's own works, and no less for satisfying the
natural but legitimate desire of the various donors to perpetuate their
memory and offering an incentive to others to similar acts of piety.

Secondly, as to the system of counting the caves, the general prin-
ciple seems to have been to count each of the one-storeyed caves consisting
of one or more cells or chambers confronted by an open or pillared veran-
dah as one cave, and to count each such suit on each floor of a two-storeyed
construction as one cave, e.g., in the example of the Mañcapuri group of
caves representing a two-storeyed construction, the suit in the upper storey
was labelled by an inscription recording it to be a cave excavated by Khārav-
ela's chief queen, and the corresponding suit in the lower storey was
similarly labelled by a second inscription recording it to be a cave excavated by King Kadampa-Kudepa. A puzzling complication has arisen from a third inscription inscribed over the doorway of a side chamber on the southern side of the verandah of Kadampa-Kudepa's cave and recording it to be a cave excavated by Prince Vaṣṭukha-Varikha. But it is somewhat difficult to decide whether the side chamber confronting the verandah of Kadampa-Kudepa's cave or a separate chamber provided with some sort of a verandah and situated on the southern side of the open enclosure or courtyard in front of Kadampa-Kudepa's cave was intended to be recorded in the third inscription as Prince Vaṣṭukha-Varikha's cave. In discussing the problem of the relative total of the caves and inscriptions, we have sought to maintain that although the third inscription was inscribed over the door-way of the former, it was really intended to refer to the latter, that is, to the suite on the southern side of the court-yard, and that the object of engraving the third inscription over the door-way of the former was to draw the notice of the visitor or pilgrim entering the verandah of Kadampa-Kudepa's cave and moving towards the right in peeping into the three chambers including that on the south side with the possibility of coming out without minding what was on the south side of the courtyard. If this argument be sound, we may make bold to say that the system was to count each suite of one or more chambers, whether in one line or not, but surely confronted by some sort of a verandah, as one cave.

Thirdly, as to the fate of the missing caves, we cannot but be astonished that so many of the caves on the Kumārī hill have vanished beyond recognition. Sir John Marshall says that taken together, the two groups of caves on the hills of Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri, "comprise more than thirty-five excavations." But we are not, as yet, aware what method he has adopted in counting the total of the surviving caves, and whether the number suggested by him includes the four or five caves which have sunk down showing still their roofs above the ground on two sides of the Udayagiri or not. We may, once again, draw the reader's attention to Mr. Stirling's paper in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XV, containing, as it does, all that we yet know of the miserable fate that overtook the missing caves.

As for the names whereby the caves are known at present, it is obvious that we require more explanations than one to account for them. In the

1. Manomohan Ganguly, in his Orissa and Her Remains, p. 84, has produced the following list of caves on the two hills: (1) Ḥāthi-Gumphā, (2) Vaikuṇṭhapura,
case of such names as Hāthi-Gumphā (the Elephant-cave), Choṭa-Hāthi-
Gumphā (the Small Elephant-cave), Vyāghra-Gumphā (the Tiger-cave),
Sarpa-Gumphā (the Snake-cave), Ajagara-Gumphā (the Python-cave),
and Beṇ-Gumphā or Bheka-Gumphā (the Frog-cave), we find that all of
them were suggested by the general shapes of the caves designated by
them, particularly their front views creating appearances of the foreparts
of the animals or creatures indicated in them. It is very striking indeed
that the front view of the cave known by the name of Hāthi-Gumphā
suggests the appearance of just the forepart of a royal elephant sitting
majestically on its front legs. Such an appearance was appropriate to
the cave which was to bear on the hanging brow of its projected roof the
famous inscription of His Graceful Majesty King Khāravela. Similarly,
the appearance of a small elephant was appropriate to the Choṭa-Hāthi-
Gumphā which was to bear an inscription of Prince Vaiṣṇuva-Varikha’s.

The most remarkable is the front view of the Vyāghra-Gumphā sug-
gestig the appearance of the head of a tiger with its distended jaws. No
one can mistake that the front view of the Sarpa-Gumphā suggests the ap-
pearance of the upraised large hood of a cobra, or that the front view of the
Ajagara-Gumphā suggests the appearance of the gaping mouth of a python.
In the same way, none can mistake that the front view of the Beṇ-Gumphā
or Bheka-Gumphā suggests the appearance of the open mouth of a frog.

In the absence of all of the caves it is difficult to say if there were
not, amongst them, some caves with their front views suggestive of the
appearances of animals other than the elephant and the tiger, and of
creatures other than the cobra, the python and the frog. One fact,
however, is certain that one can still trace shapes of the same creature,
whether it is snake or frog, in a set of two or more caves, say, for instance,
in the roofs of four or five caves that have sunk down on two sides of the
hill of Udayagiri.

(3) Pāṭalapura, (4) Maṇḍapuri (Yamapura ?), (5) Haridāsa Gumphā (Choṭa-Hāthi-Gumphā),
(10) Svargapuri or Alakāpuri, (11) Rāni-Gumphā, (12) Jaya-Vijaya, (13-20) eight
nameless, these being the caves on Udayagiri; (21) Ananta-Gumphā, (22) Navamuni,
(23-24) Sāthakhrā or Sāthgharā group of two caves—the Barbhuj and the Trīśula, (25)
supposed cave of Lālatendu, (26-27) two nameless, these being the caves on Khaḍgagiri.
Be it noted that one of Ganguly’s nameless cave on Udayagiri is known by the name of
Jambesvara or Beṇ-Gumphā, and that among the caves on Khaḍgagiri, one is known
by the name of Tattva-Gumphā I, another by that of Tattva-Gumphā II, a third by that
of Durgā-Gumphā, and a fourth by that of Hanumān-Gumphā.
If an inference can at all be drawn from the last mentioned fact, it will certainly be this that the underlying motive in the fashioning of the animal and creature shapes of the rock-cut caves was to represent the principal denizens of the Kumārī hill and to limit these shapes to them. Anyhow, the elephants, tigers, cobras, pythons and frogs are still the chief denizens of the two hills of Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri.

We are unable to unravel the mystery of the Frog-cave being otherwise known as Jambēśvara-Gumpha. But it is certain that the Choṭa-Hāthi Gumpha came to be otherwise known as Haridās-Gumpha on account of the fact that this cave was once tenanted by a Vaiṣṇava ascetic known by the name of Haridās.

Among the remaining names, Ganeśa-Gumpha may engage our first attention. This name which, like Haridās-Gumpha, is of Hindu origin, must have been suggested by the figures of two calves of elephants set up in the court-yard in front of the cave concerned. It was easy for the neighbouring Hindu inhabitants to associate these figures with Ganeśa, the elephant-faced god of the Hindu pantheon.

The name of the Ananta-Gumpha on the Khaṇḍagiri hill appears to have been suggested by the figures of the pairs of crawling triple-headed snakes lying over the arch-fronts of the cave which are ornamented with various reliefs containing, among others, one standing figure of Gaja-Lakṣmī, the Hindu goddess of Luck. A Vaishnavite must have been easily led by their association with a figure of Laks̄mī, the consort of Viṣṇu, to identify the trip le-headed snake with the famous Ananta or Śeṣa-nāga of his legend. Thus it may be proved that the name Ananta-Gumpha, too, was of Hindu origin, and that it must have come into existence when the Vaishnavite Hindu ascetics occupied some of the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves.

A more convincing proof of the Hindu origin of some of the names can be adduced from the modern designations of three caves forming a group on the Khaṇḍagiri hill. Of these three caves, one is known as Navamuni on account of the fact that the figures of nine Hindu sages were set up on the walls of the cave in parallel with those of twenty-four Jaina Tīrthaṅkaras set up, as recorded in a medieval inscription of the 6th or 7th century A.D. or of still later period in one of these caves, by King Udyota-Kēsari of the Kēsari dynasty; another is known as Durgā-Gumpha on account of the fact that the figures of the Hindu goddess Durgā came to be set up at the entrance of the cave containing on its walls in the interior the figures of twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras set up by
King Udyota-Kesari in a row; and the third is known as Hanuman-Gumpha on account of the fact that the figures of Hanuman of the Hindu legend came to be set up in a similar manner in the cave containing the figures of the Tirthankaras set up by the same king on its walls. Here we may add that the name Tattva-Gumpha whereby two of the caves on the Khandaigiri hill are designated can as well be treated as being of Hindu origin. The Vaishnava legend of Jaya and Vijaya as two attendants of Vishnu may be held responsible for the name Jaya-Vijaya designating one of the surviving caves on the Udayagiri hill, although there is no difficulty to regard this, along with Tattva, also as a Jain name.

At all events, there can be no doubt that the name Mancapurī designating a group of three caves, the name Alakapuri designating one of the surviving sculptured caves on Udayagiri and the Rani-Nur or Rani-Gumpha designating another richly sculptured cave on the same hill, were of Jain origin, although we are unable to say when these came actually into existence. The tradition about the Rani-Gumpha is that it came to be known as Rani-Gumpha on account of the fact that a queen of the Kesari family of kings lived in it.

The idea of naming the cave of Khara's chief queen in the upper storey of the Mancapurī group as Vaikunthapura (the Paradisiacal), of the cave of King Kadampa-Kudapa in the lower storey as Patalapura (the Infernal), and the side cave of Prince Vadhukha-Varikha on the ground floor as Yamapura (the Hidden) must have been suggested by the peculiarity of their relative position.

We have no means, as yet, of ascertaining whether these caves bore any distinct names as at the present time, and if so, by what names before and immediately after the reign of the Kesari kings. But it may be noted here that in Udyota-Kesari's inscription recording the fact of installation of the images of twenty-four Tirthankaras in the caves now known as Navamuni, Durga and Hanuman, the caves have not been referred to by any name.

Now with regard to the component parts of a cave (lopa) considered as a distinct structure of architecture, we have just a few hints from the inscriptions of Culkamama (Nos. VI-VII) and the single inscription of Kamma and Khinpa (No. VIII). In the inscriptions of Culkamama, we find that the structure has been represented in terms of its component parts instead of being denoted by a term, such as lopa, representing the whole of it. Kothajeyu and pasada or pasata are the two expressions that
have been employed in these records to denote the component parts of a cave-structure.

So far as the term *kothā* goes, there is little doubt that it was intended to denote the cells or chambers 'hollowed out at the back and at the end,' and that the term *pasāda* or *pasaṭa* was used to denote the open or pillared verandah presenting the appearance of the front view of a palace or building, of a façade as one might say.

The difficulty lies in clearing up the mystery of *kothājeyā* as to whether it was to be a combination of the two words, *kothā* and *ajeyā* (impregnable, unconquerable), treating the latter as an adjective of *kothā*, or it was to be a compound of the two words, *kothā* and *jeyā*, treating the latter as a term denoting altogether a separate construction within a cave.

Seeing that in the inscription of Kamma and Khīṇa, the two terms, *kothā* and *pasāda*, have been used without any word suggestive either of *ajeyā* or of *jeyā*, we may be justified in treating *jeyā* even as a distinct technical term. If so, we have to decide what particular construction was intended to be denoted by it. Dr. P. K. Acharya's Dictionary of Hindu Architecture makes it clear that *jeyā* in the sense of 'pent-roof' is a technical term, which may be equated with the Prakrit *jeyā*. One may notice that in some of the Udayagiri caves, there is a pent-roof in the form of a small projection from the side-wall of the verandah and a little below its main roof. It is possible that this small projection was intended to be denoted by *jeyā* in Cūlakamma's inscriptions.

As to the technical significance of the term *leṇa*, we are aware that each of the cave-dwellings on the Kumārīt hill which is designated *leṇa* in the old Brāhmi inscriptions is known now-a-days as *gumphā*, a term equating with the Prakrit *gumphā*, the Aśokan *kubhā*, and the Sanskrit and Pāli *guhā*. *Guhā* has been distinguished in Pāli literature as *matīka-guhā* (earthen cave) and *giri-guhā* (mountain-cave). In the Barābar Hill cave inscriptions of King Aśoka and the Nāgārjuna Hill cave inscriptions of King Daśaratha, the term *kubhā* or *guhā* has been employed to designate certain cave-dwellings of the Ājīvakas prepared by dressing up the mountain-caves and rocky dens of animals, polishing their walls and

---

1. The text is—Kammasa kothā ca Khīṇāya ca pasādo.
2. The term *pabhātānaṃ guhā* (cave formations in the mountains) is explained in the Mahā-Nīdesa (p. 406) as signifying (1) *kandarā* (caverns), (2) *giri-guhā* (mountain-caves), and (3) *pabhātā-gabdarā* (hollowed depressions in the mountains).
ornamenting their entrances with arches serving to lend to them the appearance of chapels. These cave-dwellings of the Ājīvikas have neither any verandah nor any properly shaped chambers hollowed out in the interior, and still bears the form of natural cavities and animal dens. These ancient cave-dwellings with their arch-entrances represent the ruder form wherefrom the later Buddhist cave-temples, with their infinitely superior workmanship and ornamentation in the interior, may be said to have developed. And with these ancient Maurya cave-dwellings may be sharply contrasted the caves excavated on the Kumārī hill by King Khāravela and his co-adju tors for the accommodation of the resident Jain saints and recluses as representing altogether a different architectural design and artmanship.

It is evident from their component parts mentioned in some of the old Brāhmī inscriptions, that each of the caves on the Kumārī hill was so designed as to make it appear like a regular cottage or residential building with an open or pillared verandah (pastāda) in front of one or more chambers (kothā) dug out in the interior in the shape of rooms, the verandah being provided, in some examples, with a pent-roof (jeyā). These cottage-like or palace-like cave-dwellings of the Jain saints and recluses may be judged with their peculiar roofs as Orissan patterns of the Buddhist monasteries at Sarnath and other places.

Now it remains to be seen whether the literary usages sanction the application of the designation lena to the kubhā or cave-dwellings of the Ājīvikas in the Barābar and the Nāgarjunī hills, and the application of the designation gumpha-guhā to the lenāni or cave-dwellings of the Jains on the two hills of Udayagiri and Khāṇḍagiri. So far as the Pāli literary usages go, we find that the term lena or lena has been employed in its generic, as well as in its specific sense. In its generic sense, it has served as a common designation for five kinds of monastic abodes, viz., (1) vihāra, (2) adhikṣayaoga, (3) pāsāda, (4) hammīya, and (5) guhā.¹ And in its specific sense, it has served as a designation for a particular kind of construction, which is distinguished, in the Vinaya Texts,² from guhā (cave) and lena-kutikā (straw-thatched cottage), and in the Milinda-Paṅha,³ from pāsāda (residential building), kuti (cottage) and guhā (ordinary cave) on the one hand, and from pabbhāra (cavity with a sloping projection as its covering

---

1. Vinaya Mahāvagga, I. 30. 4; II. 77; III. 8. 1; III. 5; VI. 33. 2; VIII. 7. 1; Vinaya Cullavagga, VI. 1. 2. See Pāli English Dictionary, sub voce—lena.
2. Vinaya Satīa-Vibhaṅga, IV. 1. 1; XIX. 1-2. 1.
roof), dari (grotto), bila (chasm), vivara (hole) and pabbatantara (crevice), on the other. It may be realised at once from the Milinda list that pāśāda, kuti and leṇa represent human art and architecture, while pabbhāra and the rest represent natural formations. As regards guhā, it may be treated either as a natural formation or partly as a work of human hand and skill. As for a natural cave, cavity or cavern improved by human hand, there can be no objection to applying to it leṇa as a designation or to applying the designation guṃpha or guhā to a leṇa in the sense of such a cave. It cannot be denied that the leṇa on the Kumāri hill sought to combine in its architectural design the structures of a pāśāda, a guhā and a kuti.

Another interesting point is that one of the Vinaya passages, stating, as it does, that a pabbhāra was being cleared for making a leṇa (pabbhāram sodhāpeti leṇaṃ kattukāmo),1 enables us to understand the connexion and difference between the pabbhāra and the leṇa, the pabbhāra (Hāthi-Gumpha pabbhāra) which ordinarily carries with it the idea of a slope or projection (ninna, poṇa)2 conveys also the idea of a pabbata-kucchi,3 that is to say, of a mountain-cave with a sloping projection as its covering roof. We can say that the leṇa as an excavation and form of architecture made by human hand is just a pabbhāra in its natural condition. At any rate, no other inference can be drawn from Buddhaghosa’s definition of a leṇa as “a habitation with an opportunity for sitting and lying, made either by excavating a house in a mountain or raising a wall where a pabbhāra is insufficient (to serve as a dwelling).”4

Lastly, as to the purposes to be served by the Orissan caves in particular, two years’ records in the Hāthi-Gumpha inscription state (1) that 117 caves were jointly excavated by King Khārnava and others to provide the Jain saints and recluses permanently residing on the Kumāri hill with shelters for resting their bodies (Kumāri-pavato Arahato parivivāsato hi kāya-nisīdiyāya), and (2) that one spacious cave was excavated by King Khārnava himself for the accommodation of the distinguished visitors among the Jain recluses and the yatis, hermits and sages among the Hindu

1. Vinaya Mahāvagga, VI, 15. 1.
2. See, for references, the Pali-English Dictionary, sub voce—pabbhāra.
4. Pabbhāram khaṇitevā vā pabbhārassā appahovakathāne kuḍānuṣ utthāpetvā vā kata-ṣenāsanaṃ. Quoted in the Pali-English Dictionary, sub voce—leṇa.
ascetics, coming from a hundred directions (sakata-samuna-suvihilānā ca sata-disūnam yatinaṃ tāpasa-isinām lepāṃ kārayati). In the fourteenth year's record (I. 15), the cave-dwelling on the Kumāri hill are collectively designated as Arahatu nisīdiya, "the Ārhatu (Jain) seats."

Mr. Jayaswal seeks to maintain on the strength of some later and mediaeval Jain authorities that the term nisidiya, as employed in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription, should be interpreted as signifying a "tomb." Accepting his interpretation of the term, we have to understand that King Khāravela and his compatriots excavated the 117 caves on the hills of Udayagiri and Khandagiri to provide the resident Jain saints and recluses with suitable places for entombing or burying their bodies.

We know perfectly well that his explanation of nisidiya, considered as another form of nisaddhi, nisidi, nisadyā, nisadyakā, nisiddhiyā, nisiddhikā, nisiddhyālaya or nisiddhyēga, may be justified by the use of the term in several mediaeval inscriptions, mostly found in South India, the references wherefor have been collected by Dr. P. K. Acharya in his Dictionary of Hindu Architecture. But the question is whether this later mediaeval meaning can be read into nisidiya of the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription or not, whether, if at all, the idea of a tomb can be associated with leṇa in its generic or in its specific sense.

In the first two Barabar Hill cave inscriptions, King Aśoka has not stated the purpose of the caves labelled by them and dedicated to the Ājivikas. But in the third inscription, if Dr. Hultzsch's reading of it be correct, the stated purpose of the cave was to provide its inmates with a retreat during heavy showers of rain (julaghonāgamathāti). Anyhow, we have the Nāgarjunī Hill cave inscriptions of King Daśaratha to clearly state the purpose of the dedicated caves to be to provide their Ājivika-dwellers with resting places during the rainy season (vān-nisidhiyā). As regards the thirteenth year's record in the Hāthi-Gumphā text (I. 14), the stated purpose of the caves may be taken to be, first, to provide the Jain saints and recluses with permanent residences as may be inferred from the expression Arahatu parinivāsato, and, secondly to provide them with solitary retreats for rest, bodily as well as mental (kāya-nisidiyāya, here kāya denoting both rūpa-kāya and nāma-kāya as the Buddhists would explain it). We have, moreover, seen that the Pāli commentator Buddhaghoṣa has explained leṇa as a synonym of sendosana, a term standing for all kinds of retreats of the ascetics and recluses affording an opportunity for lying and sitting. It may also be noticed that the various purposes of the five kinds of hermitages or
monastic abodes, commonly designated as lepa, do not include the idea of entombing the bodies. We read in the Vinaya Cullavagga (VI. 1. 3-5):

Sitaṃ uniqhanti patihanti tato vālamagani ca
Siripsapa ca makase ca sarire cāpi vuṭṭhiyo II
Tato vātattapo ghoro saṅjalo patihāṇhati
Lenattha ca sukhattha ca jāyitten ca vipassitum II
Vihāra-dānam saṅghassa aghum Buddhena vapihitam
Tasmā hi pandito poso sampassam athham attano II
Vihāre kāraye ramme vāsay'ettha bahussale

It is manifest from the quoted verses that the purposes of dedicating a lepa to the ascetics and recluse were to provide the learned teachers of religion with retreats with an accommodation for their residence, to provide them with shelters, comforts and suitable places for meditation and introspection, as well as with the means of protection as against heat and cold, wind and sun-light, ferocious animals, reptiles, mosquitoes and showers of rain.

We may understand that all these were precisely the purposes that the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves were intended to serve, and that in the curious animal or creature shapes of their roofs and front-views one can trace the motive of keeping off the ferocious animals and the venomous reptiles.

Turning to the works of art and architecture done under the auspices of King Khāravela in the fourteenth year of his reign, we have to confess that we are incapable of identifying the spacious cave excavated by him as a sort of rest-house for the distinguished visitors among the Jain recluse, as well as for the Hindu ascetics hailing from a hundred directions. The fourteenth year's record (1. 15), stating that some hundred thousand slabs of stone were collected from the excellent quarries extending over many leagues for the erection of stone-pillars and shrines in the neighbourhood of the Jain cave-dwellings on the Kumārī hill, eloquently speaks of the use of stone as an art-material, as well as of the free development of the stone-cutter's art in Orissa by the time of King Khāravela.

Although King Aśoka is generally credited with the use of stone (pavata, sila-thambha, sila-phalaka) as an enduring art and engraving material, the general consensus of opinion among the Indologists is tending to be in favour of an earlier existence of the stone-cutter's art in India which was called in requisition and brought to perfection by the great
Maurya emperor. If King Aśoka can claim the credit for the rock-cut figure of an elephant on Dhavalagiri, the hill of Dhauli, as the earliest known stone-carving in Orissa, King Khāravela can equally claim the credit for employing the stone-cutter’s art successfully on an extensive scale for conjuring up all manner of figures even on the roofs of the rock-cut caves.

In connexion with the stone pillars and shrines (śīla-thāṃbhāni ca cetiyāni), the important point calling for attention is whether the shrines stood apart from the pillars or the pillars and the shrines were combined.

The fourteenth year’s record goes also to show that the last great work of art and architecture done by King Khāravela was a pillared beryl hall erected in the centre of a canopied court-yard surrounded by fifty shrine-posts, which were ornamented with the alternate settings of beryl and emerald (vedurīga-nilā-vochिन्मु cecu-yathi-adhasatikam). We are unable to say where exactly this hall was erected together with the court-yard and the shrine-posts, and whether any traces thereof can yet be found.

With regard to ornamentation of the shrine-posts with the alternate settings of beryl and emerald (vedurīga-nilā-vochिन्म), we have sought to maintain that here by the beryl and the emerald were intended to be meant two different kinds of designs or floral devices. It is impossible to think that the shrine-posts were inset alternately with two varieties of precious gems in view of the fact that no such shrine-posts or pillars are to be anywhere found among the lingering remains of the Udayagiri and Khandagiri works of art and architecture. On the other hand, there survive some of the shrine-posts with two kinds of floral devices alternating each other on their shafts.

17. MARSHALL ON CHRONOLOGY OF THE CAVES

"Of the early caves along the east coast, the only ones that merit attention here are the two neighbouring and intimately connected groups

---

1. If the simile in the Aṅguttara-Nikāya (Part I, p. 283), "Seyyathā pī bhikkhave pāsāne lekhā na khippaṃ lujjati cāṭena vā, udakeṇa vā, ciratthikā hoti," "Just as, O bhikkhus, a writing on a stone is not quickly effaced either by the effects of wind or by those of water but becomes long-enduring," which is put into the mouth of the Buddha be earlier than Aśoka’s time, it is certain that the idea of employing stone or rock as a long-enduring material for engraving had not originated with Aśoka.


of the hills of Udayagiri and Khandagiri in Orissa. Unlike the rock-
holed monuments of Western India which were the handiwork of
Buddhists, these Orissan caves were both excavated and for many years
tenanted by adherents of the Jain religion, who have left behind them
unmistakable evidences of their faith both in the early inscribed records and in
the mediæval cult statues which are found in several of the caves. To this
sectarian difference is due many distinctive features of the architecture,
including, among others, the entire absence of Chaitya halls, for which,
apparently, there was no need in the ceremonial observances of the
Jains.

Taken together, the two groups comprise more than thirty-five excavations,
of which the more remarkable in point of size and decoration are the
Ananta-Gumpha and the Jaya-Vijaya caves on the Udayagiri hill. Besides
these, there are two caves in the Udayagiri group, namely, the Hati-
gumpha and the Manachapuri cave in which a special interest attaches by
reason of the inscriptions carved on them.

Of the whole series, the oldest is the Hati-Gumpha, a natural
cavern enlarged by artificial cutting on the over hanging brow of
which is the famous epigraph recording the acts of Khāravela,
king of Kaliṅga. This inscription was supposed by Pandit Bhagabānīlāl
Indraji and others to be dated in the 165th year of the Maurya
epoch, which, if reckoned from the accession of Chandragupta would
coincide with 157-8 B.C. Other scholars have, however, since denied
that any such date occurs in the inscription, and at the present time, there
is still a sharp division of opinion on the point. In the absence of the
undoubted date in this record or in the records of Khāravela’s queen and of
his successor in the Manachapuri cave, we must endeavour to determine the
age of these monuments from other sources of information. In the case of
the Manachapuri cave, the problem luckily derives some light from the
style of the sculptured reliefs of the interior. This cave, erroneously called
Vaikuṇṭha or Patalapuri by earlier writers, possesses two storeys, the lower
consisting of a pillared verandah with chambers hollowed out at the end;
the upper of similar design but of smaller dimensions and without any
chamber at the extremity of the verandah.

It is in the upper storey of this cave that the inscription of Khāravela’s
queen is incised, while in the lower are short records stating that the main
and side chambers were the works, respectively of Vakrādeva (Vakadepa-
siri or Kuḍevasiri), the successor apparently of Khāravela and of Prince
Vajukha,
It may be presumed, therefore, that the upper storey is the earlier of the two. The rail pattern which once adorned the broad band of rock between the two storeys is now all obliterated, but in the ground-floor verandah is a well-preserved frieze which confirms by its style what the inscriptions might otherwise lead us to suppose, namely, that next to the Hāti-Gumpha, this was the most ancient cave in the two groups. Compared with some of the reliefs of the sculptures in the locality, they are of poor, coarse workmanship, but in the depth of the relief and plastic treatment of the figures, they evince a decided advance on the work of Bhārhut, and unless it be that sculptures in this part of India had undergone an earlier and independent development (a supposition for which there is no foundation) it is safe to affirm that they are considerably posterior to the sculptures of Bhārhut.

Next in chronological sequence comes the Ananta-Gumpha—a single-storeyed cave planned in much the same way as the Mañchhapuri, which seems to have been the prototype of all the more important caves excavated on this site. Over the door-ways of this cave are ornamental arches enclosing various reliefs; in one standing figure of Lākṣmī supported by the usual elephants on lotus flowers; in another is the four-horsed chariot of the sun-god (?) depicted en face, with the crescent moon and stars in the field; in a third are elephants; in a fourth, a railed-in tree, and figures to right and left of it bearing offerings in their hands or posed in an attitude of prayer. The arch-fronts themselves are relieved by bands of birds or of animals and Amorini at play or of garlands intertwined, and over each is a pair of triple-headed snakes, while in the intermediate spaces are flying Gandharvas disposed in separate panels. The last-mentioned are more stiff and schematic than the similar figures in the Mañchhapuri cave. And this, taken in conjunction with other features such as the Chubby Amorini and the treatment of the sun-god’s chariot, seems to indicate for these sculptures a date not much earlier than the middle of the first century B.C.

A further stage in the development of this architecture is reached in the Rāni-Gumpha, which is at once the most spacious and elaborately decorated of all the Orissan caves. It consists of two storeys, each originally provided with a verandah—the lower 43 ft. in length with 3 cells behind, the upper 20 ft. longer with 4 cells behind; in addition to which there are chambers of irregular plan in the wings to right and left of the verandahs. In both storeys the façades of the cells are enriched with pilasters and highly ornate friezes illustrating episodes
connected with the Jain religion of which unfortunately the interpretation has not yet been established. The friezes resemble each other closely so far as their general treatment is concerned, but the style of their sculptures in the two storeys is widely different. In the upper, the composition is relatively free, each group forming a coherent whole, in which the relation of the various figures to one another is well expressed; the figures themselves are posed in natural attitudes; their movements are vigorous and convincing; and from plastic and anatomical point of view the modelling is tolerably correct. In the lower, on the other hand, reliefs are distinctly elementary and crude. The best of them, perhaps, is the group reproduced in Pl. XXVIII, 77, but even here the figures are composed as independent units connected only by their tactile congruity; their postures, too, are rigid and formal, particularly as regards the head and torso, which are turned almost direct to the spectator, and in other respects the work is stiff and schematic. At first sight it might appear that in proportion as these carvings are more primitive-looking, so these are anterior to those of the upper storey, but examined more closely, they betray traces, here and there, of comparatively mature art, which suggest that their defects are due rather to the clumsiness and inexperience of the particular sculptors responsible for them than to the primitive character of the plastic art at the time when they were produced. Accordingly, it seems probable that in this cave, as in the Māñchāpur, the upper of the two floors was the first to be excavated, though the interval of time between the two was not necessarily a long one; and there is good reason, also, to suppose that the marked stylistic difference between the sculptures of the two storeys was the result of the influence exercised directly or indirectly by the contemporary schools of central and north-western India. In this connection a special significance attaches to the presence in the upper storey of a doorkeeper garbed in the dress of a Yavana warrior, and of a lion and rider near by treated in a distinctively western Asiatic manner, while the guardian door-keepers of the lower storey are as characteristically Indian as their workmanship is immature. It is significant, too, that various points of resemblance are to be traced between the sculptures of the upper floor and the Jain reliefs of Mathurā, where, as we have already seen, the artistic tradition of the north-west, were at this time obtaining a strong foothold. The pity is that the example of these outside schools made only a superficial and impermanent impressions in Orissa—a fact which becomes clear if we consider some of the other caves on this site.
In the Ganesh-Gumpha, for example, which is a small excavation containing only two cells, the reliefs of the frieze are closely analogous in style and subject, but, at the same time slightly inferior to those in the upper verandah of the Rani-Gumpha.

Then, in the Jaya-Vijaya, we see the style rapidly losing its animation, and in the Alakapuri cave, which is still later, the excavation has become still more coarse and the figures as devoid of expression as anything which has survived from the Early School. The truth appears to be that the art of Orissa, unlike the art of Central or Western India, possessed little independent vitality, and flourished only so long as it was stimulated by other schools, but became retrograde the moment that inspiration was withdrawn."

18. STELLA KRAMRISCH ON RELIEFS IN THE CAVES

The reliefs that decorate the façades of all the Orissan caves have three main functions: (1) As friezes above a railing pattern, they stretch from tympanon to tympanon above the many small entrances into the caves. Mostly they are narrative. The frieze of the Ananta-Gumpha forms an exception. (2) As symmetrical compositions, on the other hand, they fill the intrados of the tympanon. This, however, is the case in the Ananta-Gumphā only. Otherwise the intrados are left plain. (3) As continuous rhythmical bands, containing animal, floral and human figures purely decorative, they rise as a lively decoration of the arch of the tympanon.

Besides these types of relief the Rani-Gumphā has two walls of its laterally projecting mandapa-like cells, especially on the one to the left of a large relief composition, depicting a forest scene, which reminds one of the Indra relief from Bhāja. It is one of the earliest renderings of an extensive "landscape" scene in Indian art.

Single human figures accompany the curve of bracket capitals and of the bracket supports of the railings. Single and coupled animal figures form the capitals of the entrance pilasters. Isolated male and female figures, standing as a rule and riding once (Rani-Gumphā, upper storey), rendered on a large scale, and in a variety of types, guard the entrances.

The style of the Mañcapurī-cave reliefs puts them right at the beginning of artistic activities in the rock-cut caves of Orissa. The relatively well-preserved portion of a frieze shows, above a railing pedestal from left to right, a group of four walking figures in three-quarter profile, the hands folded in añjalī-udrā. All of them wear loin-cloths and scarves and
heavy earrings. The first figure is considerably damaged, but seems
to wear a crown on the head. The second is decorated by a heavy
mural crown as worn by the Mauryan figures. The third has
locks curling into the face, a fashion much favoured during the
Gupta period and a heavy chignon to the left at the back of the
head, as is frequently seen in Medieval Indian sculptures. Above
these four isocephalous figures, two fat-bodied ganas disport them-
selves. Behind them appears a cross-bar, with a rope and an object
suspended from it. Next to it is a lotus-petalled sun-disc with
human-faced seed-pot. Divided from this group by a considerable interval,
the figure of an elephant is seen coming forward, emerging from the
background of the relief and turning into three-quarter profile, following
the procession. It is followed by an inpetuously flying Gandharva, hold-
ing a basket.

The spacing of the figures has the restfulness and simplicity by which
most of the Barhut compositions excel. A sameness of gesture makes the
mood of adoration impressive in a concentrated manner. The diction is
bold and simple, and denotes this relief as one instance in a long tradition,
of which, however, nothing is known, as most of its work, most probably
executed in a perishable material, has succumbed to the effects of time.

Besides these general features in common, what distinguishes this
relief from any of the Barhut reliefs is more important than what links it
up with it and with such other early Indian reliefs as those from Bhāja.
Here, however, as well as in Barhut, the transition from one artistic
attitude into another of quite a different temperament and outlook, is
well-marked. The four standing figures, short in stature, and treated
as dense rectangular volumes, are faintly reminiscent of that trend of
art which during the Maurya period was still alive and degenerated in
the following century into a stiff and lifeless awkwardness.

All the other figures are animated considerably. This animation,
playful and purposeless in the Gana-figures, is enhanced into energetic
speed in the onrush of the Gandharva-figure. The transition from the static
squareness of the Mauryan figures to linear vitality—peculiar to the 2nd
century B.C.,—is marked here as well as in Barhut. But there the movement
is of a hesitating grace and reverential, whereas here it is not only variegated
in speed and expressions, but is altogether more intense, untouched almost
by any scruples of the religious mind. The craftsmanship is mediocre. Yet
it took Indian sculpture eight centuries more to develop it, until at the end
of the Gupta period the flying movement could be rendered as convincingly
as it is done here. The way in which the movement is enhanced from the "kneeling" bent right leg of the flying figure to the raised and outstretched left in order to culminate in the graceful diagonal of the ends of the scarf is contrasted with the playful hovering of the yapas with their enlarged, rounded and inarticulate limbs. Altogether the anatomy of the figures is more suppressed even than in Barhut in favour of an all-round smoothness of limbs, which may be seen in the treatment especially of the forelegs of the elephant, as also in the way in which the drapery is arranged into serpent-body-like "folds" and streamers. This plasticity of limbs is subservient to an easy flow of movements. It gains in liveliness by addressing itself directly to the spectator. Whereas the Barhut figures, unconcerned about his presence, enacted their parts, intensely absorbed by them or by their own existence; the figures of superhuman beings, of men and animals alike, address the spectator in three-quarter profile, so to say, or else they turn their faces in full front-view towards him. Yet in spite of forcefulness and agitation, the work on the Mañcapuri cave, with its halting and economical way as far as spacing and description go, is on one level with the work of Barhut. The features last mentioned belong to the diapason of Indian sculpture in the second century B.C.; whereas the direct emotional appeal, liveliness of gesture, and smoothness of limbs belong to a somewhat later period and are fully developed in the first century B.C. (cf. the relief in Mahābodhi and Sanchi) and destined to become more and more emphasized in the work of the other caves.

Although undated and without inscriptions, the reliefs of the Ananta-Gumpha on the Khaṇḍagiri, of the Rāni Gampha, of the Jaya-Vījaya and Ganesa-Gumpha in Udayagiri are further documents for the potentialities and the successive stages of early Orissan sculpture. If the Mañcapuri reliefs are somewhat posterior to Barhut, the friezes and tympanon fillings of the Ananta-Gumpha appear to be subsequent to the early portion of the Mahābodhi railing reliefs.

The Śūrya-reliefs, here as there, apart from the similarity of subject-matter and composition, betray in either case a further step taken in the direction indicated in Barhut as well as in the Mañcapuri reliefs.

Freedom from the shackles of the static cubic form adhered to in the Maurya period had been reached partly and gained in Barhut in a painstaking and careful process, whereas this selfsame freedom was reached in the Mañcapuri reliefs with bolder vigour and impetuousness. This freedom, once gained in all the reliefs of the 2nd century B.C. and
of the succeeding period, asserts itself with ever-increasing ease. It lends to the monuments of Central India and Bihar a plastic roundness of limbs, able to display themselves with ever-growing liveliness. It adds in Orissa to such reliefs as those of the Ananta-Gumpha, a plastic volume of infinite curvilinear possibilities. The cobra-body running parallel with the extrados is the most abbreviated formulation of this inherent tendency. The chariot on which Sūrya with his two female companions are drawn is of similar construction in both the representations. The wicker-work front introduced in the Ananta-Gumpha relief facilitates the employment of smooth, elongated and rounded units. They appear again in the bent legs of the horses to which further company is added by the zigzag of the broader, serpent-like and rounded limbs of "Pingala" with staff and pot. The way in which his flabby body and face are modelled and are spread into the surface with great breadth, resembles the treatment of the ogress of darkness in the Sūrya relief from Bhāja. It stands in striking contrast to the relatively firm plastic form of Barhut and Mahābodhi reliefs, but it shows how the artistic traditions of Central, Eastern and Western India touched each other in certain features while yet retaining their local independence in the main.

Nothing indicates the peculiar idiom of the Ananta-Gumpha reliefs more distinctly than the sweeping variety of curves in which the necks of the prancing horses are bent hither and thither. In the corresponding Mahābodhi relief their movement is more uniform, more definitely connected with reality. The Ananta-Gumpha composition adding, as it does, the lotus disc of the sun and the bead-accompanied crescent of the moon to the figures with elbows, splayed out into the relief, obtains a peculiar fulness of an almost flowing and flat relief, which again strongly contrasts with the firmer discipline of the higher and more energetic Mahābodhi relief.

The Manēcapuri relief was remarkable specially for the direct and bold vigour of its movements. This vigour is not muscular. It is not rendered by a firm modelling, but by linear curve. The method remains the same in the Ananta-Gumpha reliefs, but what formerly expressed itself as vigour has been transmitted now into a tough pliability. The speed has slowed down. The movement unfolds itself in breadth instead of being stated in an outspoken and sharp curve (cf. the Gandharva, Manēcapuri). It appears as a continuation of that hovering playfulness that had splayed out the
clumsy limbs of the *gaṇas* there. But what was noticeable only in one type of figures and just in one variety there, is made now the exclusive principle of form. The boyish figures playing and rushing about in and between animal figures, amply betray this. The Lakṣmī relief, in the second tympanon of the Ananta-Gumpha corroborates it. The flying *Gaudharas* filling the single rectangular compartments of the frieze show a sweep of drapery; more to fill the surface than to express movement dynamically. The figures themselves in a flat, round and inarticulate modelling blissfully hover in their respective attitudes instead of rushing towards a goal.

The frieze of the Ananta-Gumpha deserves notice. Its main panels containing the flying *Gaudharas* suggests a barrel vaulted corridor supported in even intervals by the smooth shafts of round pillars stuck into pots. Above this runs a minor frieze, partly consisting of the usual railing pattern and partly of the combination of battlement and blue-lotus profile-pattern, well established in Barhat.

Next to these reliefs, those of the verandah, lower storey, left wing proper of the Rāni-Gumpha have to be placed. They stand in striking contrast to the few reliefs of the Mañcapuri lower storey that escaped defacement and specially to those of the upper storey. The complete scene with the dance, the other with the kingly person seated with his companions, as well as the minor scenes, such as the one of adoration recall the plastic treatment of the Ananta-reliefs. The contour, however is somewhat hardened, the proportions are somewhat more elongated than there. But a sameness prevails in the wide open and almost expressionless glance of the faces, in the splayed-out plastic, awkward in its flabbiness on account of the hard contour that limits it. These reliefs appear to be the work of a less-gifted hand and of a more harshly conducted tool as those of the Ananta-Gumpha, but otherwise they are the outcome of one and the same artistic mentality although they appear to be of later date.

Quite different are the scenes on the main wing and those on the corner portion of the left wing. The figures have grown in the height of the relief and in individual vivacity. Frequently one row is oversected by the other, groups of figures are formed as spontaneously and as religious with life as those in Sanchi. The faces have a happy smile, the movements are full of individual freedom. Their keen variety is supplemented by a factor that now becomes of a paramount importance.
This is the darkness differentiated in its depth that gives to the single figures and groups a texture elusive and rich. They form the light pattern on it.

This pattern effect of plastic forms surging into light from the darkness of the background is worked out in the most intricate manner on the walls of the projecting, portico-like side-cell. Above polygonal pilasters in pot-basis supporting a tympanon arch above animal capitals on the one façade and above less elaborate rectilinear pilasters supporting on capitals a tympanon on the adjacent side, and on the wall to its left proper a scene of forest life is carved with mango trees, rocks, waterfall and animals. Every single form is worked out by itself in bold relief. The forms are so densely set that the entire wall is dissolved into a deep and rough texture. Even the figure of a bird which by its smallness might become inconspicuous, is represented as a clearly visible entity by means of a receptacle, so to say, carved around it of circular or squarish shape. These very elaborate devices make up one of the earliest pure “landscape” scenes of Indian sculpture.

The forest here is rendered in the same way as the jungle grows. One forms next to the other, densely crowded, not allowing any horizon to be seen, any path to be found, an intricate pattern in which the single forms arrange themselves by crowding into every nook and corner. The heavier and more voluminous fall to the ground, the smaller and more slender forms rise up. The density of the pattern worked in high relief, pervaded by the contrast of light and shade, scarcely gives room for any rhythms except a perchance the rigorous discipline of densely set figures in superimposed rows; it is of the same type as the method of crowding with figures the reliefs of the Sanchi gateways.

Whatever the actual chronology of these undated caves may be, an inner process is at work, akin, nay parallel, to the changes that took place in the evolution of the reliefs from Barhut, through Mahābodhi, to Sanchi. These three stages are represented in Orissa by the work on the Mañcapuri, on the Ananta and Rāni-Gumpha.

Guardian figures are carved at the side of the cells of the Rāni-Gumpha or in front of the verandah pillars. Such guardian figures are to be seen on the Bhāja Vihāra rendered in a somewhat different idiom and in an earlier fashion. The figures from the Rāni-Gumpha represent most varied types in body and dress. The treatment, however, remains one
and the same. It is a modelling with naturalistic aim, elaborating
the anatomy in a broadly summarizing manner. The standing posture,
though generally easy,—except the one figure clad with dhoti only,
occupying the uttermost panel of the upper storey, left wing, betrays
determination. The faces are damaged beyond recognition but from
the minutely variegated physique and costume it appears as if these high
reliefs were meant to be portraits. The tall figure, wearing a staff
in the right hand, is reminiscent in its slenderness of the Southern type
as may be seen in the figure of the worshipping prince from the Jag-
gayapeta relief; remarkable again is the mighty bodily bulk of all the
figures in the upper storey; specially striking is the man, clad in
Northern style, girded with a sword and wearing high boots. Just
as the Sūrya composition of the Ananta-Gumphā tympanon may be
traced via Mahābodhi to Mathurā, so also is the costume of this
figure to be met with among the Indo-Scythian statues from Mathurā.

Of greatest artistic value, however, amongst all the early Orissan
reliefs, is the frieze decorating the upper storey, main wing of the
Rāni-Gumphā. It begins with the frenzied onrush of a youthful male
figure, carrying a tray with floral offerings in the left and a full blown
lotus in the right. Its impetuous movement is a direct descendant
of that of the flying Gauḍharva, Mañcapuri. The hovering of the
Ananta-Gumphā flight has sunk into oblivion. Moreover, the move-
ment which in the first storey amounted to a gliding just above
the surface of the earth, now seems to emerge from it; the left foot
is still half-covered by it; it is no longer a movement from above
downward, nor a hovering in mid-air, nor a gliding above the surface,
but a frenzied gesture of freedom; uttered with the conviction of
one who masters the decorative side of every experience. The following
relief on the other side of the tympanon shows three elephants next to a
prelude of a rocky landscape with cave and animals. Nothing could afford
a stronger contrast to the perfectly decorative, two-dimensioned manner
in which the figure with the offering was treated than this bold model-
ing, as impetuous in its realism and voluminous depth as the other is
accomplished in width and complete organization of the surface. The
daring oversecting, the mastery of mass, the agitation of light and
shade and the one superb sweep by which the mighty bodies are
composed into a circle have nothing in early Indian sculpture to
compare with. The following scenes are more lyrical in their treat-
ment, more bent towards the decorative, so that the animated figures,
carved in a high, yet sparingly modelled, relief become displayed lucidly over a flat background. The trend of art represented by the bulk of Barhut reliefs is still going strong. But a greater individual animation, a more dissected rhythm, a tougher sense of modelling are characteristic features. The modelling especially is conspicuous; the figures appear as if made of blown glass, so smooth is the texture of their rounded surface. This softness, however, is counteracted again by crisp movements, imparted to imbs, weapons, etc. The ambiguous character of the frieze may best be judged by comparing the elephant group with the group of girls surrounding a seated woman. Whatever has been depth there is surface here: volume is displaced by linear flow and calm surface, boldness by playfulness, altogether a perfect artistry, a last climax of a development. Its mannerism, its being oversure of itself, may be seen in such forms as offered by the back-view of the musicians where anatomy and movement are mastered and distorted to make a pattern and nothing more.

The reliefs on the Jaya-Vijaya cave may be considered a second rate side-issue of the work on the Rāni-Gumphā. The worship of the tree scene, however, deserves notice, inasmuch as it contains the clearest formulation of the spatial conceptions of early Indian sculpture, widely made use of at the days of Barhut, matured into completion in Mahābodhi and in this special example. One of the female guardian figures betrays in the slimmness of her body and by the easy grace of her posture that selfsame affinity with southern Sāivite type that suggested itself already in view of the male standing figure of the Rāni-Gumphā (side wing, lower storey).

One of the latest excavations, the Ganesa-Gumphā, gives in the reliefs of its frieze a somewhat slipshod and abbreviated, though a more mature, version to the same scenes that figured with such ingenuous variety on the frieze of the upper story of the Rāni-Gumphā. From the style of the carvings the reliefs of the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves, compared with the reliefs on the Buddhist railings in Bihar and Central India, cover a period of one and a half century approximately. The Maṅchāpuri relief and those of the Ganesa-Gumphā mark the beginning and end of this continuity.

19. RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY OF THE CAVES

Rightly presuming that the bas-reliefs in the Ananta-Gumphā, the Rāni-Gumphā and such other caves on the hills of Udayagiri
and Khāṇḍagiri were not an independent local development in Orissa, Sir John Marshall finds reasons to maintain that in the depth of the reliefs and the plastic treatment of the figures, these show a development posterior to that of the sculptured reliefs on the Barhut stonering, and that judged by the relative inferiority and superiority of workmanship in the reliefs of different caves, these appear to reveal a successive chronology of the Orissan art. Dr. Stella Kramrisch agreeing with Sir John Marshall in many of his main points, goes so far as to regard the bulk of the Orissan cave-reliefs as standing midway in some of their essential features between the sculptures on the stonering at Barhut and those at Buddha-Gayā. She inclines to think that the evolutionary process of plastic art in the Orissan caves took about a century and a half from its commencement to produce all the works that we find there.

So far as their conclusions with reference to the development of plastic art in the reliefs themselves go, we may have nothing to gainsay. Our difficulty is whether at all their conclusions as to the relative chronology of the reliefs are valid so far as to decide the relative chronology of the caves themselves.

The real point at issue is whether the arch-bands with their wealth of reliefs treating of various subjects and adorning the entrances of the Ananta-Gumphā and such other caves were at all there when the caves were excavated by King Khāravela and his compatriots. The point gains in significance as we find that the Hāthi-Gumphā and other old Brāhma inscriptions allude to the architectural details, but not at all to any sculptured reliefs. And from the architectural point of view, the inferior workmanship and the superior workmanship as arguments respectively for the priority and the posteriority of the caves cannot bear scrutiny. It is evident from descriptions in the Hāthi-Gumphā inscription itself that workmanship displayed in the costly works of art and architecture done by King Khāravela in the fourteenth year of his reign was far superior to that displayed in the 117 caves jointly excavated by King Khāravela and others in his thirteenth regnal year on the Kumārt hill for providing the resident Jain saints and recluses with suitable resting places. In one case, King Khāravela started with the distinct object of producing certain monumental works of art and architecture, and in the other, he started with the distinct object of comfortably housing the resident Jain saints and recluses.
The differences in style and workmanship may as well be accounted for by the differences in the tradition, training and skill of the artists or craftsmen employed. To prove that the caves with superior style and technique of art in their reliefs were chronologically posterior to those without reliefs, as well as to those with inferior style and technique of art in their reliefs, it is necessary, first of all, to establish that any of the caves now found with highly ornamented reliefs was not counted among the 118 caves excavated in the thirteenth and fourteenth years of Khāravela’s reign.

We have no evidence, as yet, to prove that. The inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri caves standing next in point of chronology to the old Brāhmi inscriptions are a few Sanskrit inscriptions, including one incised by King Udyota-Kesi in the 7th century A.D. or even at a later period. King Udyota-Kesi’s inscription, as we have seen, records the installation of the images of 24 Tīrthaṅkaras in three of the caves on the Khaṇḍagiri hill which are known as Navamuni, Durgā and Hanumān, and the re-excavation of an old tank. None of these mediaeval inscriptions alludes to the excavation of a new cave. On the other hand, the installation of the images of 24 Tīrthaṅkaras by King Udyota-Kesi and that of the images of nine sages, Durgā and Hanumān by the Hindus thereafter indicate a process of successive superaddition of stone-figures.
# LIST OF INSCRIPTIONAL WORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-akhadamsasa, VII.</td>
<td>Utarāpadha-rājāno, I.13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aga-mahisānā, II.</td>
<td>upanānnyam, I.13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apiqa, I.13.</td>
<td>upādayati, I.15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acitayitā, I.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-achariyam, I.13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ajoyā (joyā), V, VII, XII.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aṭhatiṣayā, I.10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aṭhame, I.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-adhvasakarp, I.15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-adhipatinā, I.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-adhipatino, I.11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-adhivasanaṇ, I.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-anugaha, I.7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anubhavapito, I.16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aneka, I.15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nnekanī, I.7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anupato (?), I.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-apayato, I.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-apatihaṇa, I.16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhisitamanato, I.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhisito, I.7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-abhisekam, I.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhutaṇ, I.13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arakatapuraṇa (āhatapuvaṇa ?) I.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arhata-nissāya, I.15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arahanta, II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arhato, I.14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arhilamāttamaṇ, I.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-avādātena, I.11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-assa, asaṇ, I.13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asaka (Asika ?), I.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asi, I.8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ekādasame, I.12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etinām, I.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-evu, I.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ai</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ārṇasa, III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airena, I.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-oghātiṇaṇ, I. 6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ka</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kāpma-paddaṇa, I.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṃkasa, VI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kādāra, I.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadaṃpa (Kudepa ?), III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapa-rukha, I.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kara, I.7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalānāni, I.16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipag-cakavanato, II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipag-nagari, I.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipag-punarajya, I.12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipag-punarajyanaṇ, I.5, I.11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipag-rajaniṇavaṇaṇ, I.10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipag-rajavatsanaṇ, I.11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipag, I.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipagāgatāya, I.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipagādhīpatinā, I.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipagādhipatino, III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāya-nisidhyāya, I.14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kārako, I.16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kārayati, I.2, I.10, I.15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kārāpanāhi, I.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kārāpayaṇi, I.8, I.11, I.15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kārāptanaṇ, I.14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kārapeti, I.12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kārītaṇ, II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāreti, I.19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kālingāśaṁap, II.
klīṣapayati, I.4.
-kliṣā, I.1.
kliṣā, I.1.
kumāra-kliṣā, I.1.
Kumārā-pavate, I.14.
kumāra, IV.
Kusumasa, XIII.
-kūṭena, I.5.
kothā, VL
kothējeyā, V, VII, XII.

Kha

khanāpayati, I.6.
Khāravela, I.14, I.16.
-Khāravelasa, II.
-Khāravelena, I.1.
Khīpāya, VI.
Khomarājā, I.16.

Ga

Gāṅgāyaṁ, I.13.
Gāṇḍhāra-viśva, I.4.
gaja, I.1.
gabhīra, I.2.
gabhe, I.16.
gahapattkānāṁ, I.9.
gita, I.4.
guṇa, I.1, I.16.
guna-cako, I.16.
gopura, I.2.
gopurānī, I.13.
Goradhatīrīpa, I.9.

Gha

-ghātāni, I.8.
-gharavāsīnaṁ, I.9.
-ghātāpayitaṁ, I.9.

Ca

cā, I.2 foll.
cakā, I.16.
cakavatino, I.11.
cake, I.14.
cako, I.16.
catara, I.13.
catara, I.15.
catuvāsa, I.1.
cavuthe, I.6.
Cūkāṇaṁsa, V, VII.
ccu-yahī, I.15.
Cēca-rājāvamsa, I.1.
cetiyāni, I.15.
cēdāni I.6.

Cha

chaṭhe, I.7.
-chatā, I.5, I.8.

Ja

janetup, I.13.
-jānapadaṁ, I.7.
Jināśaṁap, I.13.
jeṣa (ajeṣa ?), V, VII, XII.

Sa

-nātihi, I.14.

Ta

-tadāga-pādiyo, I.2.
tatiya, I.11.
tatiye, I.1, I.4.
tato, I.1.
tathā, I.5.
Tthasulīya, I.6.
tāpasa, I.15.
tāṣite, I.5.
tīryaṁ, I.15.
tiṣasa-sāla, I.6.
tiṣāsa, I.10.
tiṣāhi, I.2.
turaṁga, I.8.
terasame, I.14.
terasa-vasa-sala-katarpa, I.12.

Tha

-thambhāni, I.15.
thambhe, I.15.

Da

dampāṁ, I.3.
dampa (dapa ?), I.4.
dabhaṁ, I.12.
dadāti, I.9.
dasaṁe, I.11.
disaṁ, I.3.
disaṁpa, I.15.
dutiya, I.3.
devāyatana, I.16.

Dha

-dhaja, I.8.
dhamakūṭena, I.5.
Dhamarājā, I.16.
dhamena, I.5.
dharo, I.16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>Ba</th>
<th>Bha</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Ya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nava-vasāṇi, I.1.</td>
<td>paṭṭhāpayaṭi, I.3.</td>
<td>mahāvijaya, I.16.</td>
<td>-mahisīni, II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-pasḍaudanaṇ, II.</td>
<td>-mahāvyākramaṇa, I.1.</td>
<td>-mahāvyākramaṇa, I.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pāḍāmulikasa, XIV.</td>
<td>-mahāvyākramaṇa, I.1.</td>
<td>-mahāvyākramaṇa, I.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pasāto (pasādo ?) VII.</td>
<td>-mahāvyākramaṇa, I.1.</td>
<td>-mahāvyākramaṇa, I.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pāśādamp, I.10.</td>
<td>-pāśādo (pāśādo), V, VI.</td>
<td>-pāśādo (pāśādo), V, VI.</td>
<td>-pāśādo (pāśādo), V, VI.</td>
<td>-pāśādo (pāśādo), V, VI.</td>
<td>-pāśādo (pāśādo), V, VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit Word</td>
<td>Page References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savūyāna</td>
<td>I. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sahasāni</td>
<td>I. 9, I. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sahasāhi</td>
<td>I. 1, I. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sahasēhi</td>
<td>I. 2, I. 6, I. 8, I. 9, I. 10, I. 11, I. 13, I. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sātakampiṣṭa</td>
<td>I. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāpatēye</td>
<td>I. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāsitamp</td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sidhāṇam</td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siri</td>
<td>I. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siri-kadāra</td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sīri-Khāravelaśa</td>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sīri-Khāravelena</td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sīrīnā</td>
<td>I. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sīrīno (sirīno)</td>
<td>III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sīlā-thampbhāni</td>
<td>I. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sīlāhi</td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sīharāṇi</td>
<td>I. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sītala</td>
<td>I. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sīhāsa</td>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūtehī</td>
<td>I. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunampto</td>
<td>I. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supavata</td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūbhā-lakhaṇa</td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūliya</td>
<td>I. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sena-vāhana</td>
<td>I. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sena-vāhana</td>
<td>I. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hathī</td>
<td>I. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hathlāṃ</td>
<td>I. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hathisa-pasaṃp</td>
<td>I. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haya</td>
<td>I. 3, I. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kita</td>
<td>I. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abhuta-acharya, a description of certain elephants and horses from the land of the Vāsuki, pp. 224, 291.
Acharya, P. K., pp. 293, 298.
Aira (Ahira), a king of Utkala, pp. 183-5.
airu, a royal style, p. 262.
Ajagara-Gumphā, name of a cave on the Udayagiri, p. 295.
Akar, pp. 295, 298.
Alaka (Mula) one of the Andhra territories, p. 212.
Alakāpuri, name of a cave on the Udayagiri, pp. 295-7.
Aniga, a country conquered by Khāravela, p. 231.
Ananta-Gumphā, name of a cave on the Khapdagiri, pp. 295-6.
anā acijitā, pp. 216-7.
appu-dabhasā, a description of Pithu-jaga, pp. 197, 217.
aparāla, as presents from the king of Pāṇḍya, p. 292.
apathaka-caka-rāhana-bala, an epithet of Khāravela, p. 293.
Arahaṃta (Arihaṭṭa), a Jain designation, pp. 292-3.
Arkatapura (?), a city identified with Aroot, pp. 205-6.
Asaka (Asika), a city identified, pp. 212-6.
Asoka, his Kaliṅga province compared with Khāravela’s Kaliṅga kingdom, pp. 192-3, 302; prohibition of sacrificial slaughter, p. 251; Kaliṅga War, pp. 254 foll.; population of Kaliṅga in his time, p. 256; attitude towards former kings, p. 258; religious policy and idea of toleration, pp. 264 foll.; conquest of Kaliṅga as a landmark in the history and civilization of Kaliṅga, pp. 279-89, 302-3; compilation of the Kāthavatthu during his reign, p. 284; ideal of conquest by dhamma, p. 286; work of art on the Dhauli rock, p. 303.
Aṣṭāhasena, maternal uncle of King Bahaṣṭimita and king of Ahichattra, p. 278; his inscriptions, pp. 147, 161.
Bagchi, P.C., p. 224.
Bahaṣṭimita (Bṛhaspatimitra), king of Madagha and contemporary of Khāravela identified, pp. 273-4.
bāhanā, p. 262.
Banerji, R.D., pp. 151, 160, 166, 248, 326.
Barābar hills, its different names, pp. 226-7.
Bāriyā, a place or personal name, p. 248.
Beal, Samuel, p. 225.
Beglar, J. D., p. 225.
Bhet-Gumphā (Jambosvara), name of a cave on the Udayagiri, p. 295.
Bhandarkar, D.R., pp. 204, 211, 224.
Bhojaka, pp. 210-1.
Bhūti, a town-judge of Kaliṅga and donor of a cave on the Udayagiri, p. 248.
Bindusāra as a Brāhmaṇa-bhatta, p. 260.
Brahmanittra, a king of the neo-Mitra dynasty (?), pp. 278-9.
Bṛhaspatimitra identified by Jayaswal with Pugyanittra, p. 274.
Bṛhasvāmitra, father of Queen Yasamīta, p. 274.
caka-rāhana-bala, an epithet of Khāravela, p. 293.
Caldwell, p. 206.
cakasati, a royal epithet, p. 232.
caturāntaka-rākaṇa-guṇa-upeta, an epithet of Khāravela, pp. 231-2.
cca-yathī, p. 303.
Cetarajavāsa-radhana, an epithet of Khāravela, pp. 233-5.
cetiyaṇi, shrines, p. 303.
Chakravarty, Niranjan Prasad, p. 149.
Chanda, Ramaprasad, pp. 150, 180-1.
Chatterji, S. K., pp. 164, 249, 267.
Chicaco, p. 201.
Chois, pp. 205-6.
Chōta-Hāthigumphā, name of a cave on the Udayagiri, p. 295.
Coomaraswamy, p. 141.
Cowell, p. 248.
Cunningham, Alexander, pp. 206, 229.
Dakṣhiṇāpatha as distinguished from Uttarāpatha, p. 218.
dampa (dapa), pp. 264-5.
Dantagura-Palouna, old capital of Kaliṅga, p. 198.
Deb, Harit Krishna, p. 143.
Dhanabhūti, donor of Barhut gateways, p. 277.
Dubreuil, p. 228.
Dutt, B.B., p. 289.
Durgā-Gumphā, name of a cave on the Khapdagiri, p. 295.
ekṣapadimagga, p. 212.
Fleet, p. 144.
Francis, p. 241.
gaja, a division of Indian army, p. 252.
gahapatayo, p. 262.
Ganagā as a northern boundary of Anga-Magadha, p. 221.
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ganana, an art mastered by Khārvela, pp. 241 foll.
Ganesa-Gumpha, name of a cave on the Udayagiri, p. 296.
Ganguly, Manomohan, pp. 217, 220, 294-5.
gharuvari, p. 262.
Girivraja, old capital of Magadha, p. 224.
goparathi, pp. 287-90.
Goradghari, a place or personal name, pp. 223-7.
guta-cakā, an epithet of Khārvela, p. 178.
Hunuman-Gumpha, name of a cave on the Khandagiri, p. 297.
Haridas-Gumpha, another name of Pāvana-Gumpha, p. 296.
Hathi-Gumpha, name of a cave on the Udayagiri, p. 296.
Hathisāha (Hathissha), father-in-law of Khārvela, p. 249.
katha-madda, p. 243.
Kapa, a division of the Indian army, p. 252.
Himavanta region as distinguished from Uttarāpatha and Dakkhināpatha, pp. 219-20.
Ipdagimita, a king of the neo-Mitra dynasty (?), p. 278.
Indarāja, an epithet of Khārvela, p. 250.
Indrajī, Bhagawalal, p. 144.
īśā, Hindu sages, p. 262.
Isigil, one of the five hills round Rājagāna, pp. 104-5, 225.
Jackson, V. H., p. 224.
Jaya-Vijaya, name of a cave on the Udayagiri, p. 297.
Jayaswal, K. P., his explanation of the symbols, p. 142; fire corrected readings, pp. 154-6; Sanskrit Stōkas from an old Oriya MS, pp. 183-7; notes on Māṣikas, Kṛṣṇapayṣa and Strīrājya, pp. 207 foll.; readings and renderings of Khārvela's 5th year's record, pp. 222-3; identification of Goradghari, pp. 225-8; explanation of pariṣa-gaṇa, p. 235; explanation of leka-rūpa-gaṇand-cavahāra-śidhi, pp. 244-5; inference about population of Khārvela, p. 256; opinion about Khārvela's date, pp. 274 foll.
Kadamba (Kudega), a king of Kalīgā and donor of a cave on the Udayagiri, p. 293; relationship with Khārvela, p. 247; significance of his name, p. 267; seventh bank of Meghavāhana line, p. 239.
Kalīgā, kingdom of Khārvela, pp. 189-90; its different capitals, p. 201; three divisions, p. 203; contiguity to Assaka, pp. 212-5.
Kalīgā-oakavati, an epithet of Khārvela, p. 232.
Kalīgā-naga, a capital of Khārvela, pp. 195 foll.; proximity to the Tanaṣall road, pp. 202-5; plan, picturesqueess and internal life, pp. 287 foll.
Kamma, donor of the cells of a cave on the Udayagiri, p. 247.
kata-saṇāna, p. 262.
Khalaṭika-pavata, old name of Barābār hills, p. 225.
Khapāgala-pavata, p. 193.
Khārvela, contents and importance of his inscription, pp. 175 foll.; king of the lord of Kalīgā, pp. 231-2; significance of his name, p. 297; nobility of origin, pp. 233-5; dignity of bodily form, p. 293; education, pp. 240-6; family members, relations and officers, pp. 246-9; state elephant, pp. 249-50; wealth, pp. 250-2; army, pp. 252-6; administrative method, pp. 256-9; religion and religious policy, pp. 259 foll.; place in history, pp. 268 foll.; date, pp. 272 foll.; city of Kalīgā, pp. 287 foll.; other works of art and architecture, pp. 292 foll.
Khīṣa, a female donor of the verandah of a cave on the Udayagiri, p. 247.
Kramrisch, Steila, pp. 305 foll.
Kośala, a division of Khārvela's Kaliṅga kingdom, p. 203.
Koṭhājyā, p. 298.
Kumārā, an epithet of Vajukha-Varikha, p. 247.
Kusuma, donor of caves on Khaḍagiri, p. 248.
L(ā)lāka, an epiteth of King Hathiśa, p. 249.
Lekha, an art learnt by Khārvela, pp. 241 foll.
Leṣa (cave), 117 caves on the Kumārī hill, p. 292; one special cave, p. 292; why all are not inscribed, p. 293; system of counting, pp. 293-4; fate of missing caves, p. 294; modern names, pp. 294 foll.; component parts, p. 300; technical significance, p. 301; purposes, pp. 301-2.
Léri, Sylvain, pp. 196-7.
Law, N. N., pp. 237, 251.
Nāḍer, H., pp. 164, 224.
Madhurā (Mathurā), identified, pp. 219 foll.
maddiya-kriḍā, p. 264.
Magadha, country, p. 234.
Magadha-Khetta, p. 228.
Magadha-pura, pp. 218, 225.
Magadha-rāja, p. 229.
Magadha-raṣṭa, p. 234.
Māmānda, an official designation or personal name, p. 248.
māmāmagga from Benares to Cetiyā-raṭhā, p. 234.
Māmāmeṣhavāhana, an epithet of Khārvela and Kadampa, pp. 249-50.
Māmāpadma Nanda, third king of the Nanda dynasty, pp. 279 foll.
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