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FOREWORD

Dr. K. Gopalachari’s book comprises the results of the research he carried on in this department in the years 1934-36. The subject of his study, The Early History of the Andhra Country, is well known in its outline but is full of many little problems in epigraphy and archaeology that need elucidation. Dr. Gopalachari’s thesis does not claim in any way to revolutionise our interpretation of the history of the period; its value consists in a large number of detailed suggestions confirming results now generally accepted by stronger arguments or bringing forward fresh points of view. Parts of the thesis may be found therefore highly technical and possibly of little interest to the general reader; but there is much in the thesis not merely in the selection of facts but also in their elucidation and presentation that I hope will be recognised to be of permanent value to all historians of India.

I have great pleasure in tendering on behalf of Dr. Gopalachari and myself our sincere thanks to the Syndicate of the University of Madras for their sanctioning the inclusion of the work in the Departmental series.

University Buildings,
Triplicane, Madras,
15th Sept. 1941.

K. A. N.
PREFACE

This book represents my work as a research scholar in the Department of Indian History in the University of Madras from 1934 to 1936. It is an attempt to present a connected history of the Andhras and the Andhra country from the earliest times to the advent of the Eastern Chalukyas. The Viṣṇukūṇḍins had to be brought into the picture as they close the epoch. A full account of the dynasty would have involved a study of the many contemporary dynasties and increased the bulk of the volume. So the last chapter is a compromise, a treatment of the skirts and fringes of the subject.

The first five chapters traverse a field covered long ago by great scholars like Prof. Rapson, R. G. Bhandarkar and Bhagawanlal Indraji and unruffled by startling discoveries. This has saved me from pioneering work; but I have had the difficult task of challenging great names and accepted conclusions. An independent study of inscriptions and monuments in situ has necessitated my doing so in some cases. Palaeography and the discovery of a few coins like the Apīlaka coin and the silver coin of Vāsiṭhiputa Satakani have enabled me to reconstruct Andhra and Kṣatrapa chronology on less insecure foundations and question Rapson's identification of Pulimāvi with the son-in-law of Rudradāman. The much neglected social, economic and cultural conditions of the period, upon which a flood of light is thrown by inscriptions and Buddhist remains, have been dealt with at length. One of the conclusions which should not be lost sight of is that the Sātavāhanas were Andhras but began their political career in Western Deccan.

The second period in Andhra history beginning with the Ikṣvākus, one of many short-lived dynasties, is a comparatively unexplored field. The evidence is also scanty. I have built up the chronological scheme with the help of palaeography. A fuller chapter on the Ikṣvākus than anything written before, the date of the Brhatphalāyanas, Kandara and Vaingejakya genealogy and chronology are some of the contributions to the subject. D. C. Sircar's monograph on The Successors of the Sātavāhanas in Eastern Deccan was published while I was writing my thesis. I am
indebted to him only for the Viṣṇukunda genealogy, but even here I have modified his conclusions with the help of palaeography.

The Akola hoard of Satavahana coins discovered in 1939 does not necessitate a modification or abandonment of the conclusions reached in the thesis.

Some of the epigraphical notes in the thesis have been published in Vol. XXIV No. 6 of Epigraphia Indica.

My task of reading the Allūru inscription has been greatly facilitated by the article of Rao Bahadur C. R. Krishnamacharlu waiting for publication in the Epigraphia Indica. The manuscript was with me when I was reading the inscription. Readings like ‘ailasa’ and ‘vadālābhikaro’, to mention only a few and the translations of a few words I owe to the article. I am indebted to Prof. V. V. Mirashi of Nagpur for promptly supplying me a copy of the photograph of the coins of the Akola hoard mentioned above as also his readings.

Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has more than guided me in my work. Discussions with him have led me to new lines of approach and new conclusions. Apart from specific suggestions, I owe to him in no small measure the habit of minute attention to details and of exactitude.

K. G.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Epigraphia Indica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Epigraphia Carnatica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Indian Antiquary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Journal Asiatique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASWI</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of Western India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSI</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of Southern India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>Cave Temples of Western India—Burgess and Indraji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAS</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBBRAS</td>
<td>Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBOB</td>
<td>Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASB</td>
<td>Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS of B</td>
<td>Year-Book of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAI</td>
<td>Coins of Ancient India, Cunningham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>Coins of Southern India, Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDMG</td>
<td>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Catalogue of the Indian Coins in the British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARE</td>
<td>Annual Report on Epigraphy (Madras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASR</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Bombay Gazetteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRI</td>
<td>Annals of the Bhandarkar Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>Sacred Books of the East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABIA</td>
<td>Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. BH</td>
<td>Mahabharata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHQ</td>
<td>Indian Historical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSW</td>
<td>Tree and Serpent Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGI</td>
<td>Ancient Geography of India, Cunningham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS</td>
<td>Gaekwad's Oriental Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Matsya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vā</td>
<td>Vāyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bṛd</td>
<td>Brahmāṇḍa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇu</td>
<td>Viṣṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERE</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOR</td>
<td>Journal of Oriental Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Gupta Inscriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The following pages represent an attempt to trace the fortunes, political, social and religious, of the Andhras, a people whose hoary antiquity is attested by pieces of evidence, literary, epigraphic and numismatic. The period covered is that from the earliest times to the advent of the Eastern Calukyas. Politically, socially and culturally the Dravidian Andhras (condemned sons of Visvamitra) proved a tremendous success. Once their empire extended from sea to sea. The Amaravati art is the most eloquent testimony to the cultural achievements of the race. The activities, maritime and colonial, of the people read like romance. No ancient tribe has on record such a unique achievement in all branches.

Andhras as a people are mentioned as early as the fifth century B.C. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa speaks of them as the exiled sons of Visvamitra, as non-Aryans evidently. The Jātakas speak of an Andhakapura and Andhra country. The inscriptions of Asoka mention Andhras along with Pulindas as border peoples. The Saptasatakam speaks of Pulindas. The Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa speak of Andhras along with Cōlas, Ceras and Pāṇḍyas. The Purāṇas speak of the Andhrajātiyas. They enjoyed the same political status as Kāmbojas, Yavanas, and Gāndhāras in the north. It will thus be seen that the earliest references to the Andhra are to people or tribe and not to their country. The reference to their country occurs first in the Mayidavōl inscription of Śiva-Skandavarman (4th century) in which Dhamiṇaṅkāṭaka is spoken of as the headquarters of the Pallava province Andhāpatha (Andhrāpatha). It is therefore clear that the country derived its name from the people, an instance with many parallels in Indian History. The

1. VII, 8.
Andhra city, ibid., I, 12.
Andhakas, ibid., V. pp. 10 and 138.
3. RE, XIII.
5. M. Bh., Sabhāparvan, XXXI; Rāmāyaṇa, iv, 41.
H.A.—1
name Andhradesa found in literature is also evidence in the same direction. In the 5th and 6th centuries, the Pallava province conquered from the Vaṅguyakas, came to be called Veṅgolāstra. It is very probable that during the Vaṅguyaka period Andhradesa got the name Veṅgideśa, or Veṅginādu, or Veṅgimandalam by which it was commonly known during the period of the Eastern Cālukyas. The Andhras are spoken of as Vaḍugar (Tamil), and their country Vaḍugavali (northerners and the country of the northerners). But the name Andhra lived through all these changes. Andhra people are spoken of in the Chezarla inscription of Kandara’s grandson. The inscriptions of the Maukhari kings Īśvaravarman and Īśānavarman speak of Anāhrāhipati. An inscription of the Vākāṭaka king Harisena speaks of his conquest of the Kaliṅga and Andhra countries. An inscription of the 14th century speaks of the Anāhradeśa.

To-day, Anāhradeśa is a linguistic and cultural unity. It may be noted, that from the earliest times the Andhras were an entity, ethnical and cultural. Megasthenes says that the Andhras were a separate race. The Bhaṭṭiprōlū alphabet, the Veṅgī alphabet as Burnell would call it, and the Telugu-Canarese script were evolved in the Anāhradeśa. And the Kṛṣṇā Prākrīt of our period, of which we know something, has peculiarities which we do not find elsewhere. To-day the Andhras speak Telugu and during the Middle Ages their country was known as Teliṅgāṇa.

The extent of the Anāhradeśa of our period is not however easy of determination. As Asoka’s inscriptions speak of the Andhras and the Kaliṅga country, and as under Khāravela Kaliṅga was a first-rate power, the Anāhradeśa of our study was in the north limited by Kaliṅga. Since Ptolemys’ Maisālia and Periplus’ Masalia refer to the Andhra country, the remark that Masalia extended far into the interior, shows that not only the seaboard between the Godāvari and the Kṛṣṇā, but also a considerable area in the interior was included in the Anāhradeśa. In the south, Anāhradeśa did not extend far beyond the northern part of the modern Nellore District. For the Mayidavolu Anādhāpatha

7. Māṅgaḷūr grant, IA, Vol. V.
Haraha Inscription, El., XIV, 120.
9. JRAS, 1914, p. 137.
11. See Chap. II.
which refers to the region around Dhamañakaṭaka was limited by Karmarāśtra. No doubt under the Sātavāhanas the Andhra Empire extended from sea to sea, and from the Central Provinces in the north to Cuddalore in the south and Mysore in the southwest. An inscription of Caḍa Sāti is found in Koḍavali near Pīṭhāpuram; and some of the dynasties that succeeded the Sātavāhanas would seem to have annexed parts of Kaliṅga if only for a time. In the Śrīraṅgam plates dated A.D. 1358 it is said that the Tiliṅga country is bounded in the north by Kanyākubja, on the west by Mahārāṣṭra, on the east by Kaliṅga, on the south by Pāṇḍyaka. The description of the Andhradeśa is certainly reminiscent of the old empire of the Sātavāhanas. But the Andhradeśa of our period is clearly only the territory bounded on the north by Kaliṅga, on the south by the southern part of the Nellore Dt., and extending from the coast far into the mainland in the west.

12. Chapter on Kings of the Brhatphalāyana gotra.
13. Coins of Pulumāvi II bearing the device of ship with masts are found on the Coromandel Coast as far south as Cuddalore.
14. Paścāt purastādapi yasya deśau Khyātāu Mahārāṣṭra-Kaliṅga- Samjñāu
   Avāgudak Pāṇḍyaka-Kanyakubjau deśas sa tatrāsti Tiliṅganāmā ||
CHAPTER II

ORIGINS OF SĀTAVĀHANA POWER

Materials for a study of Sātavāhana history

It is some decades since some Prākṛt inscriptions in Brāhmī characters of a line of kings called Sātavahānas in lithic records and in literature, and Andhras (Andhrajātiyāḥ) in the Purāṇic genealogies, were discovered. The first publication of their western inscriptions goes back to volume VII of the J.B.B.R.A.S. Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar was the first to translate them in his ‘Notices’ published in the Transactions of the London Congress of Orientalists (1874) pp. 306 ff. Bühler and Bhagvanlal Indrajī improved upon Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar's readings and interpretations; in 1906 the French savant, Emile Senart, gave not merely a modest gloss in the wake of his predecessors' learned interpretations but a scholarly edition of the inscriptions. The five short but important Sātavāhana records from the eastern Deccan have been edited by Bühler, Burgess, Sten Konow and Sukthankar. Thanks to exceptionally skilled numismatists like General Cunningham, F. W. Thomas, Prof. Rapson, Bhagvanlal Indrajī and the Rev. H. R. Scott, we have as much information as could be extracted from the Sātavāhana and Kṣatrapa coins. The Purāṇic material has been carefully studied and diligently collected by F. E. Pargiter in his “Dynasties of the Kali Age”, though his conclusions on the history of Purāṇa literature have been questioned often.

Still it is true to say that the historian's task is made difficult by the paucity of material. A great part of the Sātavāhana dominions remains unexplored. Recently the archaeological department of Hyderabad have begun excavations at Paithān. Only a hoard of Sātavāhana coins has come to light so far. Twenty-four

1. ASWI, Vols. IV and V.
2. BG, Vol. XVI.
3. EI, Vols. VII and VIII.
5. ASSI, Vol. I, pp. 61, 100.
inscriptions (some of which are very short) for a line of 30 kings, who held sway over the greater part of the peninsula for more than three hundred years, are a disappointing number. A long historical night envelopes kings Nos. 4 to 228 in the Purānic list. Prior to the discovery of the Jogalthembi hoard, we had no coins which could with certainty be attributed to Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi. The Purāṇas do not tell us much. Neither does the Bṛhatkathā which, according to tradition, was written in the court of a Sātavāhana king, nor the Saptāsatakam, an anthology of erotic verses attributed to Hāla (Sātakaṇi), nor even Lilāvati, a Prākṛt work,9 the theme of which is the military transactions of Hāla's reign, offer many peep-holes into the dark period. In short, the historian has still to call to aid his imagination to forge some of the missing links. His enterprise even now is not unlike that of adding piece by piece to the ends of the two arms of a cantilever bridge intended to meet at the centre; the ends of the two structures are still, for all we know, facing each other in the air. Until they have met and been firmly and finally riveted they cannot offer a safe passage.

The old theory

Scholars who were assiduously collecting every scrap of information on the Sātavāhana period found that the names gleaned from inscriptions and coins as well as their order agreed with those in the Purānic genealogies; and they straightaway identified the Sātavāhanas of the epigraphic and numismatic records with the Andhras of the Purāṇas. The home of the Andhras was the next question to be tackled. The early references10 to the Andhras and their country enabled them to fix the habitat of this people in the country, the heart of which roughly comprised the present Godāvari, Kṛṣṇa and Guntūr districts. Scholars like Prof. Rapson, V. A. Smith and Dr. Bhandarkar found no difficulty in building on these postulates the theory of an eastern origin of Sātavāhana power, i.e., in the Andhradeśa;11 while V. A. Smith located the Sātavāhana capital at Śrī-Kākulaṇ, Dr. Bhandarkar saw it in Dhaṁna-kaṭaka.12

8. Recently, however, a copper coin of siva Siri-Āpilaka No. 8 in the Matsya list has been discovered in the Central Provinces.
10. Vide supra.
11. ZDMG, 1902 p. 657; CIC, Andhras, and Western Ksatrapas, etc., xvi and xvii.
12. Vide infra.
Epigraphic, numismatic and literary evidence against it

A careful revaluation of the materials, epigraphic, numismatic and literary, would throw in high relief the objections to the orthodox theory of the expansion of Sātavāhana power from the Kṛṣṇa-Godāvari valleys to western Deccan. It is of course hard to break the cake of old theories. Except for a dissentient note here and there\(^{13}\) nothing was done to disprove the old theory till the year 1922 when Sukthankar took up the question.\(^{14}\) His spirited attack on the old theory, only marred by an erroneous theory of the original habitat of the Sātavāhanas and the absence of a sound constructive side, does not seem to have gained the approval of later writers.

An inscription over a relievō figure, mentioning the founder of the dynasty (Rāya Simuka), an inscription of the reign of Kaṇha (Kṛṣṇa), his brother, and an inscription of queen Nāyanikā, the widow of Siri-Sātakaṇi, son of Simuka, come from Nānehgāṭ and Nasik in the western Deccan. The Amarāvati Stūpa has yielded many inscriptions some of which, on palaeographical grounds, can be ascribed to the 3rd century B.C.,\(^{15}\) some others to the 2nd or 1st century B.C.,\(^{16}\) and still others to the 1st century A.D.\(^{17}\) The silence of these inscriptions about not only Simuka, Kaṇha and Siri-Sātakaṇi I, but also other early Sātavāhanas, put by the side of the mention of two Sātavāhana kings of the 2nd century A.D. in two inscriptions,\(^{18}\) tells its own simple story. One would expect the long record of queen Nāyanikā recording the numerous sacrifices performed during the minority of her son to be very near the capital and not in a place on the farthest limits of the empire, which would be the case if the theory of an eastern capital is correct. It may be noted that Nānehgāṭ is only 120 miles, as the crow flies, from Pratiṣṭhāna, the capital according to tradition, of the early Sātavāhanas.\(^{19}\) The Bhaṭṭi-

\(^{13}\) IA, 1913, pp. 281 ff.
\(^{14}\) ABORI, ii, pp. 21 ff.
\(^{15}\) EI, Vol. XV, Some Unpublished Amarāvati Inscriptions, Nos. 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 19; and ASSI, Vol. I, No. 4, p. 101.
\(^{16}\) EI, Vol. XV, ibid., 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18.
\(^{17}\) Ibid., Nos. 25, 29, 33, 36, 40, 42, 43 and 44.
\(^{18}\) ASSI, Vol. I, p. 100, No. 1 and p. 61, No. 2.
\(^{19}\) Nānehgāṭ (Ghāṭghār) is a pass in the Western Ghats which was in the direct line of communication from inland market-towns like Pratiṣṭhāna and Tagara to the western ports like Kalyān, Barygaza, etc.
prôlu inscriptions, ‘probably only a few decades later than Asoka’s edicts’, mention a king Khubirako and his father Śa—

Andhradesa would, therefore, seem to have been ruled by a different line in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. A coin from the Andhradesa bearing the legends ( — — ) B (i) ra or ( — — ) Vira is corroborative evidence pointing in the same direction.

True, inscriptions of kings Nos. 4 to 22 are not found either in the western Deccan or in the Andhradesa. Gotamiputa Síri-Sátañci’s three inscriptions come from Násik and Kárlá. The Násik record of Gotami Balasiri recounting her son’s political achievements, and describing his empire, makes no reference to the Andhradesa.

Only records engraved during the reigns of Vásîthiputá sámi Síri-Pûlumâvi, son of Gotamiputa Síri-Sátañci, and some of his successors, i.e., during the latter half of the second century and the first quarter of the third century A.D., come from the Andhradesa and Kálinça. Of the 24 records of these kings, 8 come from Násik, 5 from Kánhéri, three from Kárlá, one from Bhilsá, two from Náneghât (besides there are 5 short ones over relievo figures), one from Myâkâdóni, one from Cinna Ganjam, two from Amarâvati and one from Kóñavali.

The Hâtighumphá inscription of Khâravela, king of Kálinça and a contemporary of the third or fifth king in the Sátváhána line, throws some welcome light on the question. In the inscription Khâravela is said to have destroyed the city of Pithumnda in the eleventh year.

In the next line an expedition against the kings of Uttarápatha in the twelfth year is spoken of. We must, therefore, look for the city elsewhere than in the North. The East is likewise excluded for the sea lies on that side. Since the destruction of Pithumnda and the breaking up of ‘the confederacy of the T(r) amira (Damira or Tamil) countries of 113 years’ are spoken of in the same breath and achieved in the same year, the South has greater claims than the West. Sylvain Lévi has shown that the

22. Scholars like Dr. Bhañdarkar have made attempts to identify some mountains and countries mentioned in that record with those in the eastern Deccan. Prof. Rapson is of opinion that the record only mentions Gotamiputa’s conquests. For a discussion of these views, vide infra.
24. EI, Vol. XX, pp. 71-89.
Pitundra of Ptolemy is a Greek transliteration of the Indian Pithuṇḍa. He says:—“Ptolemy places Pitundra in the hinterland, between the mouths of the Maisolos and the Manadas, or in other words, between the deltas of the Godāvari and Mahānadi, at an equal distance from both. We must, therefore, look for the site of the city between Chicacole and Kalingapatam, if Ptolemy’s information approaches to the truth.” We cannot very much rely on Ptolemy’s information here, as he has erred in placing to the southeast of the mouth of the Maisolos a great peninsula which, however, existed only in his imagination. We have, moreover, to say with Yule that Maisolos is the Kṛṣṇā and not the Godāvari as Lassen and Sylvain Lévi would have it. Ptolemy places a Kantakossula near (latitude 134°30' longitude 11°40') and a Koddura not far away from (latitude 135° longitude 11°30') the mouth of the Maisolos (latitude 134° longitude 11°40'). Koddura has been identified with the modern Gūḍūr in the Bandar taluq of the Kṛṣṇā district. Kantakossula is the Kaṇṭakasila of a Nāgārjunikonḍa inscription of the time of the Ikṣvāku Virapurisadata, and Koddura is the Kūḍūra of an Amarāvati inscription of the second century A.D. They were, therefore, nearer to the Kṛṣṇā than to the Godāvari. It is possible to get a better clue. Ptolemy places Koroungkala (identified with the modern Warangal) in longitude 15° and more in the interior than Pitundra. Warangal is placed 3°20' degrees and Pitundra ¾th of a degree north of the mouth of the Maisolos (11°40'). Warangal is in the Godāvari-Kṛṣṇā region (south of the Godāvari). Pitundra has, therefore, to be sought for in the Andhradesa and not in Khāravela’s Kaliṅga. The reference to the destruction of Pithuṇḍa along with the reference to the breaking up of the confederacy of Tamil powers is corroborative evidence in the same direction. In such a case the destruction of Pithuṇḍa (probably then, as in Ptolemy’s days, the metro-

26. IA, LV, pp. 146-47.
30. EL, XX, p. 22, Ins., F. t.I.S.
33. The fact that the destruction of the city is spoken of along with his wars with the northern and southern powers makes it least probable that the city was within the kingdom of Kaliṅga.
polis of the Andhra country) by Khāravela would have evoked immediate and tremendous hostilities (or would have been a result of such hostilities) between him and his Sātavāhana contemporary, if really the early Sātavāhanas had been ruling over the Andhradesa. If such a conflict with 'the Lord of the Deccan' had taken place, Khāravela would not have failed to make mention of it in an inscription which speaks of his wars with the northern kings, southern confederacies and western powers. The silence of the Hāthigumpha inscription on this matter is, therefore, conclusive proof that the early Sātavāhanas were not ruling over the land of their birth in the third and second centuries B.C.

The association of the early Sātavāhanas with the Mahārājhis, a class of officers who are mentioned in the western cave inscriptions only, is another piece of evidence that supports our conclusion. Queen Nāyanikā, wife of Siri-Sātakani the third king of the dynasty, is the daughter of the Mahārājhi Tranakayiro of the Āngiya family.

Numismatics tells the same story. The earliest known coins of the dynasty are two pieces, one of copper and the other of lead, bearing the legend 'Siri-Sātasa.' Considering the angular ta, the absence of the mātrā over ra and the early form of sa, Rapson attributes these coins to Siri-Sātakani of the Nāneghāṭ inscriptions. But the nailed heads of the sa of the copper coin make its attribution to a later king, perhaps No. 5 in the Matsya list, reasonable. These coins were picked up in western India with which they are connected by their Malwa fabric, i.e., the Ujjain symbol, the standing man, the representation of a river with fishes swimming in it, which reminds us of the representation of

34. In line 11 (EI, Vol. XX, p. 79) K. P. Jayaswal reads 'eva rāja nīvesitam Pithunādaṁ' for 'pūva rāja etc.,' his earlier reading. (Pithunāda built by a former king). While the upper and lower limbs of the usual a of the inscription are not connected with each other, in the letter read as a, they are connected with each other even if the crease on the stone can be taken to represent the lower curve. The curve taken as the upper limb is usually big. The letter may, therefore, be more correctly read as pū.

35. It is also highly improbable that the Andhradesa escaped the widely thrown net of Khāravela's expeditions.

36. CIC, Andhras and Western Ksatrapas, &c., p. 1.

37. The copper coin differs from the lead coin also in the representation of a man standing.

H.A.—2
river Bīna on the coins of Erān. From western India came 8 coins bearing the legends (partly or fully) ‘Raño Sātakaṁniṣa.’ The alphabetical characters of the legends seem to be later than those of the Sāta coins, but the elongated instead of the squat and rounded form of ta on all the three coins, makes a very long interval impossible.

Prof. Rapson brings into the list of early Sātavāhana coins, three coins coming from the Āndhradeśa; according to him two of them bear the legends ‘(Rā) ṇo (— — ) Vīra’ and one, the legend [ (gha) ] Sadasa. The former are exceptionally large sinha coins “found in a deserted site at the village of Chittala, in the Yernagudem Talook of the Godāvari District.” V. A. Smith attributed them provisionally to Siri-Yaṇa Sātakaṇi (second century A.D.). True, the incomplete and indistinct nature of the legends makes it impossible for us to rely on their palaeography for their date, but according to Rapson, their early date seems to be indicated by the fact that they are struck on one side only. We do not possess sinha coins of Siri-Yaṇa. It is doubtful whether these coins were issued by any member of the Sātavāhana dynasty. We have come across neither Sātavāhana names ending in ‘vīra’ or ‘bīra,’ nor such unusually big Sātavāhana coins. The letter read as vi may well be read as b (i) or b (e). ‘Vīra’ or ‘bīra’ strongly reminds us of king Khubiraka of the Bhaṭṭiprōlu inscriptions. Significantly enough he is there called the head of the Sinha group (Siḥagotihīya pāmukho). On the coins the term ‘raño’ comes after the personal name. It does not do so on other coins while in the Bhaṭṭiprōlu inscriptions ‘rājā’ comes after Khubirako. The striker of these coins might presumably have belonged to this line of kings of the Āndhradeśa. But the distance between Bhaṭṭi-

38. Cunningham, CAI, p. 100.
40. Sir Walter Elliot, CSI, p. 23 n.
41. ZDMG, 1903, p. 625.
42. On the other hand, Lion coins of Vāsiṭhīputa sāmi Siri-Pulumāvā and Mādhariputa Sakasena, have been picked up in the Āndhradeśa. A small signet of lapis lazuli discovered among the Buddhist remains of Amarāvati has on it the representation of a lion with open mouth and raised left fore-leg together with the legend ‘bhūṣasa’ written in Brāhmi characters of the 3rd century B.C. The lion would, therefore, seem to have been of Buddhist origin.—ASR, 1905-06, p. 166.
prōlu and the findspot of the coin casts some doubt on this identification.

On the strength of the early form of da and the incomplete legend read as [ (gha) ] Sadasa, Rapson attributes the third coin to Meghasvāti (Megha Sātakarni), ninth in the Matsya list (2nd or 1st century B.C.).\(^{45}\) As the coin contains neither the full legends nor the upper part of the first letter, we cannot be quite sure of Prof. Rapson’s reading. The letter read as gha by Rapson might very well be read as na; what appears as a vertical to the proper right is a scratch (compared to the central vertical), and does not start from the end of the horizontal. We might reconstruct the legend thus: \((Ra)n(o) Sadasa.\(^{46}\) In inscriptions Sada alternates with Sāta; and Sāta, Sāti and Sađa (?) are abbreviations of Sātakarni (the Sanskrit form corresponding to it is Sātakarni). The striker of this coin might therefore have been any one of the numerous Sātakarniś in the Purānic list. So far as epigraphical evidence alone is concerned, the coin may be ascribed to a period as late as the first century A.D., for da open to the left occurs in some of the inscriptions of Uśavadāta and some epigraphs from Amaraṇatī which, on palaeographical considerations, have been assigned to the first century B.C. or A.D.\(^{47}\)

It will do well to bear in mind the remark of Bühler that “the contemporaneous employment of more advanced types and of more archaic ones ………will have to be explained………by a desire to select archaic and monumental forms for epigraphic purposes and a failure to completely carry out this intention.”\(^{48}\) The type is not that of a horse as Rapson would describe it in the Catalogue,\(^{49}\) but that of a bull whose hump and horns are visible. Coins of the bull type tentatively attributed by Rapson to the Sātavāhana dynasty, come from western India, especially from

---

\(^{45}\) According to V. A. Smith, Saṅgha is No. 9 and Meghasvāti No. 16 in the Matsya list (ZDMG, 1902, p. 659). The coin would seem to belong to an early period in the history of the dynasty since the form of the aksara da is that found in the Nāneghāt inscription and in the Nāśik inscription of Kṛṣṇa Rāja: “So far as the evidence from epigraphy is concerned, this coin might well be assigned to the first or second century B.C.” Rapson, op. cit., lxxvii.

\(^{46}\) In the Nāneghāt inscription of Catarapana Sātakarni we have raṇo for raṇo. Lüders op. cit., No. 1120.

\(^{47}\) Nos. 36, 37, 38 and 49 in EI, Vol. XV, plate facing p. 272.

\(^{48}\) IA. xxxiii, Appendix, Ind. Palæ. p. 43.

Ujjain and Erān. The Sada coin is a square piece bearing the impress of a round die. Cunningham notes that some square coins with impressions made from round dies come from Ujjain and Erān. It is hazardous to conclude on the provenance of a single coin that the early Sātavāhanas ruled over the Andhradesa. It is very probable that a coin of a Sātavāhana king of the first century B.C. or A.D. found its way from his dominions in the western Deccan into the Andhradesa in the wake of commerce.

The next group of coins found in the Andhradesa belong to Saka Sada (Sāda?); the name is an abbreviated and corrupted form of Sakasena Sātakaṇi. Sometimes in the inscriptions, for want of space or other reasons, titles and names are shortened. Metronymics appear on some coins whilst in others of the same kings they do not. So Sakasena Sātakaṇi can be identified with Māḍhariputa Sakasena Sātakaṇi of the Kanheri inscriptions. As the Andhradesa is not mentioned in the long record of Gotamī Balasiri and as no coin or inscription of Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi has been found in the Andhradesa, it is highly improbable that Māḍhariputa Sakasena preceded the former as Rapson would have it. Dr. Bhandarkar would place Māḍhariputa Sakasena late in the Sātavāhana series. Rapson remarks:—"In the inscription (of Māḍhariputa Sakasena) . . . . . . the later form seems to

50. Ibid., pp. 54-56.
52. At Gudivāda and Amarāvati; Rapson, op. cit., pp. 10-12.
53. Some coins of Nahapāna (JBBRAS, XXIII, pp. 13 ff.), coins of Čaḍa Sātakaṇi and the lead coins attributed to Siri-Sātakaṇi of the Nāneghāṭ inscriptions are instances.
54. Rapson, op. cit., pp. 20-21, 30-33, 38-42.
55. Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajī identified him with siva Siri-Sātakaṇi, successor of Pujumāvī. He was probably led to it by his reading Sirisena for Sakasena. This reading is incorrect. (JBBRAS, VII, p. 407). Rapson remarks that (op. cit., Intro. xxv) for Saka-Sāta "no identification with a similar name occurring on other coins or in inscriptions (of the Sātavāhanas) can be suggested." If Prof. Rapson and Dr. Bhandarkar (EHD, 3rd ed. p. 61) have embarked on an ocean of conjectures and doubtfully identified Saka Sada of the coins with Māḍhariputa Sakasena of the Kanheri inscriptions or tried to read the third letter as na (Rapson, op. cit., p. 11, No. 38), it is because they did not look upon Saka Sada as an abbreviated form.
56. Vide infra.
57. Op cit., Intro. xxviii.
occur in the name while the earlier form is seen in other words." It will be shown below that the alphabet of these inscriptions resembles that of a Kaññéri inscription of Siri-Yañà. Moreover, the rather peculiar name Sakasena reminds us of the matrimonial alliance contracted with the Śakas by a successor of Vāsiṭhīputa sāmi Siri-Puljamāvi. Names ending in sena are borne by the Western Kṣatrapas of the line of Caṣṭana. We might not, therefore, be grudged the conjecture that the peculiar name is a result of that matrimonial alliance. Finally even according to Rapson's assumption, the earliest king who ruled over the Andhradēṣa on numismatic evidence would be No. 21 in the Sātavāhana series!

While discussing the inscriptions on the reverse of three coins of Siri-Yañà from Aparānta, Kathiawar and Baroda, Rapson remarks that the reverse inscription is substantially the same as the obverse inscription, but in a different dialect and written in a variety of the Brāhmī alphabet which has not been found elsewhere and which approaches most nearly to that of the Bhaṭṭiprōḷu inscriptions. "It seems reasonable to suppose, then," he concludes, "that the two varieties of alphabet used in the Kistna District were associated with the use of two different dialects (1) . . . . . . the 'Leṇaprākṛt' of Prof. Pischel, . . . . . . and (2) a local Prākṛt, perhaps containing Dravidian elements, peculiar to the Kistna District. Traces of this latter dialect are probably to be seen in certain Andhra names, such as Haku—Sakti; Hala—Śāta, &c.; and its occurrence like that of the alphabet associated with it, on coins of Śri-Yajña struck in Western India must, no doubt, be regarded as a reminiscence of the old home of the race in the Telugu country, . . . . . .". So far as the alphabetical peculiarities are concerned, it seems that we now have a nearer analogy than the Bhaṭṭiprōḷu inscriptions, to the characters on the Siri-Yañà coins. And this analogy is furnished by the inscription on the coin of (Hi)ru Hātakaṇi found in Sopāra and now to be seen in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. And this coin is clearly modelled on Kṣatrapa coinage. The peculiarities exhibited in individual letters like ha and sa by these coins would thus appear to be a develop-

59. ASWI, V, No. 15.
60. The Bhaṭṭiprōḷu sa has its tail turned to the left and not to the right as on the coins of Siri-Yañà and Vāsiṭhīputa Sātakaṇi; the ha of the coins bears very little resemblance to the Bhaṭṭiprōḷu ha.
ment that took place in western India, a development which does not seem to stand in any necessary or direct relation to the Bhaṭṭiprōlū alphabet. The dialectical peculiarities exhibited by the legends of Siri-Yaṇa's coins are the use of ha for sa, and ša for final sa. The Bhaṭṭiprōlū inscriptions do not offer us a single instance of the use of ha for sa. We cannot, therefore, be sure that we have in names like Haku, Hála (the names of early Sātavāhanas) and Hiru-Hātakaṇi, traces of a dialect peculiar to the Kṛṣṇā district. True in the use of ša for final sa, we seem to have a trace of the Kṛṣṇā dialect, but this occurs only on the coins of Hiru-Hātakaṇi and Siri-Yaṇa (second century A.D.) and not earlier. Considering the distance in time and space between Bhaṭṭiprōlū and the Yaṇa coins, and the parallels we find for all other features shown by these coins in those of the Ksatrapas, we may hesitate to accept the view that the use of ša for final sa is derived from the influence, direct or remote, of an eastern dialect. I am not at present able to offer an explanation of this feature.

Andhradesa is rich in stūpas some of which date back to the third and second century B.C., i.e., the Bhaṭṭiprōlū and Amarāvatī stūpas;63 it is really strange that these stūpas should not have contained coins of the early Sātavāhana kings whilst some of the later stūpas, or old stūpas which were decorated and enlarged in the second century A.D.,64 should have yielded us numerous coins of Vāsiṭhiputa sāmi Siri-Puḷumāvi and his successors, i.e., siva Siri-Sātakaṇi, Caḍa Sātakaṇi, Rudra Sātakarṇi, Siri-Yaṇa Sātakaṇi and Kaṇha Sātakaṇi.65

The most characteristic titles of the Āndhra kings are the metronymics. Metronymics seem to have been purely local. Gotiputa, Gāgiputa and Vāsiṭhiputa (borne by a royal artisan) occur in the Sāṇcī, Barhut and Bhilsā (Malwa) stūpa inscriptions of the second century B.C.66 In the Pītalkhōrā cave inscriptions of the second century B.C. the royal physician Magila bears the title Vachiputa (Vāṣṭiputra).67 Metronymics like those borne by the Sātavāhanas are borne by their feudatories and officers in their inscriptions in the western Deccan.68 In the

63. EI, II, p. 325.
64. Ranson, op. cit., lxxi.
67. Ibid., Nos. 1189, 1191-93.
68. Ibid., Nos. 1088, 1100 and 1146.
numerous inscriptions in the Andhradeśa metronymics occur only in three inscriptions of the second century A.D. In the Nāgārjunikonḍa inscriptions the Iksvākus and the high dignitaries of state under them, like the Mahātalavaras and Mahāsenāpatis, bear metronymics derived from Vedic gotras. It seems, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the Sātavāhanas had nothing to do with the Andhradeśa at first and that the practice of coupling metronymics with personal names became common there after the Sātavāhanas had overrun it; that the practice was not native to the soil is shown by the fact that the successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Andhradeśa, i.e., the kings of the Brhatphalāyana gotra, the Vaiṅgeyakas, the Kandaras and the Viṣṇukūṇḍins, do not assume metronymics.

Many personal names, like alphabets and dialects, are local. The queen of the third king of the dynasty bears a name ending in ‘anika’ (anika), and names ending in ‘añaka’ and ‘añika’ (fem) occur frequently in the western cave inscriptions. The earliest known inscription in the eastern Deccan to mention a name with such an ending is the Amarāvatī inscription dated in the regnal years of Vāsithiputa sami Siri-Puḷumāvi, the first inscription on this side of South India to mention a Sātavāhana king. Such names occur frequently in the Nāgārjunikonḍa inscriptions. Names resembling ‘Vedisiri’ and ‘Bhāya...’ of the Nāñeghāṭ inscriptions occur in the Kuḍā and Mahāḍ cave inscriptions; a name beginning in Bhaya (Bhayabhūti) occurs in an unpublished Kārlā inscription. ‘Skanda’ which enters into the composition of the names of some of the early Sātavāhanas occurs in the Kuḍā, Kārlā and Nāsik inscriptions of the first and second centuries A.D. and in the eastern inscriptions only after the reign of Vāsithiputa sami Siri-Puḷumāvi. The Saḍakara of a Kuḍā inscription bears a striking resemblance to the surname Sātakaṇi or Sādakani.

Thus, all available epigraphic and numismatic evidence proves not only that undeniably the centre of gravity of the early Sāta-

69. Ibid., Nos. 1248 and 1271. One of them (Gorṇipītpita) is quite unlike the metronymics borne by the Sātavāhanas, another is the metronymic borne by Puḷumāvi, son of Gotamīpīta Sīrī-Sātakaṇi; a headless statue from the Amarāvatī Sīrup bears the inscription ‘Gōtami nama(o)’.

70. A glance at the long list of names in the Bhaṭṭiprōḷu and the early western cave inscriptions is enough to prove the truth of this statement.

71. Nāyanikā.

72. Lüders, op. cit., Nos. 1050, 1073 and 1091.

73. Ibid., No. 1054.
vāhana power lay in the western Deccan, but also that the early Sātavāhanaas did not rule over the Andhradesa.

Jain literature furnishes corroborative evidence in the same direction. In many versions of the Kālakaza-ṛya-kathā including the Long Anonymous Version, the Kālaka who changed the Paryusāṇa date is said to have gone to Pratiṣṭhāna, the city of Sālivāhana74 and ‘the ornament of the land of Maharāṣṭra.’ The evidence of this work is of course of doubtful value; but it is adduced because it corroborates evidence from other sources. In Jain chronology the changing of the date is put at 993 Vīra era (446 A.D.). The Sātavāhanas as a political power pass out of history in the first quarter of the 3rd century A.D. It seems preferable to accept the account of Yugapradhāna-svarūpa75 according to which it was Kālaka I (died Vīra era 376 or 171 B.C.) who changed the date, Kālaka III coming in to confirm the change 600 years later. Then, the Sātavāhana king mentioned must have been ruling at Paithān during the first half of the second century B.C.76

An old gāthā taken from the Niyyukti (50 B.C.—150 A.D.) and cited in the commentary on the Āvasyaka Sūtra says that Bharukaccha is known for Paithāna Sālavāhana and Nahavāna.77 Bharukaccha, the Barygaza of the Periplus, is modern Broach. Obviously the Nahavāna and Sālavāhana were contemporaries. The Sanskrit commentary on it extracted in the Abhidhāna Rājendra78 makes them contemporaries. The name Nahavāna, corrupted into Naravāha in Jinasena’s Harivamśa Purāṇa, is a variation of Nahapāna.79 The only Nahapāna so far known to history, is Rāja Kṣatrapa Nahapāna of the Kṣaharāta vaṁśa,80 who dispossessed his Sātavāhana contemporary of a part of Maharāṣṭra and Aparānta. The ‘Naravāhas’ of the Harivamśa Purāṇa may imply not the existence of two or more Nahapānas, but Nahapāna and his

75. Ibid., p. 7.
77. JBORS, 1930, p. 290.
78. Ibid., pp. 291-293.
79. For instances of the use of va for pa see Pischel’s Gram. der Prā. Spra., Sec. 144.
80. The Mambanes of the Periplus.
descendants. The old theory that dates in Uṣavadāta’s (governor under Nahapāna) inscription and the Junnār inscription of Ayama, a minister of Nahapāna, must be referred to the Śaka era is to be abandoned in favour of the theory that they are dated either in the regnal years of Nahapāna or in an era starting from the end of the first century B.C. The capital of the Sātavāhanas in the first century A.D. would, therefore, seem to have been Paithān.

The theory of a second eastern capital of the Sātavāhanas also rests upon unsafe foundations. The only source of the assertion made by many writers that the capital of the early Sātavāhanas was Dhaṇṇakatāka, is the conjecture of Dr. Bhandarkar that the compound Dhanakaṭasamanehi in Nasik No. 3 may be taken as Dhanakaṭasāminehi. Obsessed by the unproven and improbable theory of the conjoint rule of Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi and Vāsitṭhiputa Sīri-Pujumāvi, and taking for granted that the donation recorded in the beginning of Nāśik No. 3 is identical with that recorded in Balasiri’s inscription, Dr. Bhandarkar says that Dhanakaṭasāmi [lord of Dhanakaṭa(ka)] is a title of Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi and reads Benākaṭakasāmi of Nāśik No. 4 as Dhanakaṭakasāmi.

In his valuable paper on the Nāśik inscriptions Emile Senart has pointed out the orthographical objection to the identification of Dhanakaṭa with Dhaṇṇakatāka (equivalent to or near modern Dharaṇikoṭ) of the Amarāvatī inscriptions. Considering the general similarity of b and dh, he would read Benākaṭa for Dhanakaṭa. D. R. Bhandarkar, however, does not agree with Senart. He says: What is read as Dhanakaṭa can

82. ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 103, No. 11.
83. Vide infra., EI, Vol. VIII, p. 65, t. 1. 2; dated in the regnal years of Pujumāvi.
84. EHD, p. 30, n. 13; Dhaṇṇakatāka is mentioned in two Amarāvatī inscr. (EI, Vol. XV, Nos. 4 and 5, pp. 262-63) as a market-town (nigama) only. Ptolemy mentions Pitundra (Bk. VII, Chap. I, sec. 93) and not Dhaṇṇakatāka as the capital of the Mäisōlia region. The earliest mention of Dhaṇṇakatāka as the headquarters of a district is in the Mayidavolu plates; also ASSI, Vol. I, No. 53, Dhaṇṇakatāka.
85. JRAS, 1926, pp. 644-650.
89. IA, 1913, p. 280, n. 16.
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also be read as Dhaṁnakatā (Dhannakaṭa); and as, in Nāsik inscriptions ū is used instead of ū (compare e.g., ānapayati of the same Nāsik inscription), Dhaṁnakatā can very well be taken to be equivalent to Dhaṁnakata. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar’s view, therefore, still stands incontrovertible. To draw a parallel between the change of na in a Prākṛ word into ūa in its Sanskrit equivalent (ājñāpayati) and the change of ūa into na in different forms of a Prākṛ word is misleading. Moreover, the literary Pāli form, which occurs in the Nāsik inscription also, is ‘ānapayati’ and not ‘ānapayati’. The instance cited by D. R. Bhandarkar is one of the use of ūa for ūa.\textsuperscript{90} There is not one clear instance of ūa used for ūa in Prākṛ. The only instance cited by Pischel is one of the change of ūa into cina, (rañā becomes rācina, rācino and rācini) and this is not relevant to the point at issue.\textsuperscript{91} In the Mayidavolu plates\textsuperscript{92} edited after Pischel’s Prākṛ Grammar was published\textsuperscript{93} we have the word ‘ana’ (anna) the literary Pāli form of which is ‘aṁna’ and no support can be derived from this inscription for Bhandarkar’s position regarding Dhaṁnakata. because the Mayidavolu grant comes much later and from an altogether different area.\textsuperscript{94}

Dhanakaṭasāmi could not have been the title of Gotamiputra Siri-Sātakaṇi, for neither was he reigning when Nāsik Nos. 2 and 3 were incised, nor are the donations recorded in the two inscriptions identical; No. 2 records a non-official grant and No. 3 an official grant.\textsuperscript{95} Finally the reading Dhanakaṭasamiyeḥi must be abandoned for Bühler’s and Senart’s reading Dhanakaṭasamanyeḥi. Thus the title “Lord of Dhanakaṭa” is hypothetical.

V. A. Smith’s and J. Burgess\textsuperscript{96} theory that Śri-Kākuḷam was the capital of the early Sātavāhanas is based on a passage in the Trilīṅgānuśāsanam, translated and quoted by Campbell in his

\textsuperscript{90} We have a parallel in the Nāneghāṭ ins. of Catarapana Sātakaṇi (rānu for raṁo).


\textsuperscript{92} EI, Vol. VI, pp. 84-89.

\textsuperscript{93} The plates were, however, discovered a year before the book was published.

\textsuperscript{94} In Junnar No. 10, (ASWI, Vol. IV, Pl. XLIX) we have Dhaṁnikaseniya not Dhanikaseniya.

\textsuperscript{95} For a detailed discussion of these points, vide infra.

\textsuperscript{96} EHI, 2nd edn. p. 194; ASSI, Vol. I, pp. 3-4. The way in which Śri-Kākuḷam is marked on the map appended to the Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum shows that Rapson favours their view.
Telugu Grammar. The thick fog of legendary matter in the passage will be apparent to any reader. Andhra Viśṇu, son of the first Andhra monarch Sucandra (Simuka of the second century B.C.), is said in the same work to have been a patron of the first Telugu Grammarian Kaṇḍa. We know that Telugu was in the course of formation in the fifth century A.D., from the distinctly Telugu suffix in a Viṣṇukunḍin record. Atharvaṇācārya quotes from the Vālmīki Sūtras on Prākṛt, and it has been shown that the Sūtras were composed by Trivikrama who according to Dr. Hultsch must have lived between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries A.D. The testimony of a writer removed from the early Sātavāhanas by more centuries than we are from him should not have been made the basis of such a categorical statement.

The old theory has another weak link. The attempts of Rapson and V. A. Smith to bring the epigraphic and numismatic evidence in line with the Purānic testimony, have led them to postulate a rapid expansion of the Sātavāhana empire from the lower Godāvari and Kṛṣṇā valleys, as far as Nāsik before the end of Kaṇha’s reign, that is to say, within 20 years. Yet Simuka and Kaṇha in whom the Washington and the Napoleon are combined, are mentioned in very short inscriptions only and no deed whatever of theirs is recorded. If they did in fact engage in wars of extensive conquest, the vast military operations would have necessitated large issues of coins. Not a single coin of Simuka or Kaṇha has been picked up in the western Deccan or in the Andhradeśa. Not even a Candragupta Maurya could have accomplished the feat of liberating a people and building up, in such a short period, a huge and well organised empire, that withstood the shocks from the Sākas for a long period. Such a rapid expansion is not known to any period of South Indian History. Expansion from the plains over the tableland and the mountainous regions presents far greater diffic-

99. Footnote (Introduction viii) “He who speaks irreverently of my Grammar composed by the command of Andhra Vishnoot shall be considered as guilty of irreverence to his priest.”
100. IA, XL, 219ff.
101. Ibid., p. 221: “The time of Trivikrama can be settled only within rather wide limits. He quotes Hemachandra, who lived in the 12th century, and he is quoted in the Rātmāpana of Kumārasvāmin, who belonged to the fifteenth or sixteenth century.”
102. ZDMG, 1902, p. 657.
culties than expansion from the mountainous regions over the plains. With a powerful and jealous neighbour in Kaliṅga, which would seem to have thrown off the Mauryan yoke along with the Sātavāhanas, a westward expansion would well nigh have been impossible. The inventive genius of the historian has not only painted the glories of Simuka and Kaṇha whom inscriptions and literature agree to treat in a singularly unimpressive manner, but also brought about a travesty of justice in so far as the achievements of great conquerors like Gotamiputra Sātakaṇi and some of his predecessors like Sātakaṇi I have been fathered upon dim figures in history.

True, Sātakaṇi I, the third king of the line, is called 'Dakhiṅāpathapati.' But Dakhiṅāpatha is an ambiguous term. In its widest sense it includes the whole of the Peninsula south of the Vindhyas; since a passage in the Vāyu Purāṇa excludes the Narmadā and the Tapti valleys, the term seems to have been used in a narrow sense, then, as now. To go to an earlier work than the Purāṇas, the author of the Periplus (first century A.D.) mentions the market-towns of the Dachinabades separately from the market-towns of Damirica, mistakenly called by him Līmyrike, i.e., the extreme south of the Peninsula including particularly the Cera, Cōla and Pāṇḍya countries. The extreme south is likewise excluded. Since the Maisōlos of Ptolemy is most probably the Kṛṣṇā, and since the Maisōlia of Ptolemy is the Masalia of the Periplus, Masalia would seem to be the name of the lower Kṛṣṇā-Godāvari region, i.e., the Andhradeśa. The author of the Periplus says that this region was studded with centres of trade and industry. Yet all the market-towns (of which Paithān and Tagara identified with modern Junnār are the most important) of the Dachinabades mentioned in the Periplus are in the western Deccan. Thus it is clear that the Dachinabades of the Periplus excludes the extreme east and south of the peninsula.

103. Lüders, op. cit., Nos. 1112 and 1114.
104. ASWI, Vol. V, p. 60, Pl. LI.
107. Vide supra.
108. Schoff, op. cit., Sec. 62.
109. Ibid., Sec. 51, 52, and 53.
110. Suzerainty over the whole of the Peninsula is therefore to be ruled out.
Even those who have propounded the theory of western origin of Sātavāhana power have failed to correlate properly the Purānic with epigraphic and numismatic evidence. Relying upon a passage in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which speaks of the Andhras as living on the fringes of Aryan civilisation, Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Ayyangar places the Andhras in the Vindhyan regions. But we do not know the exact limits of Aryan civilisation in those days. It has been proved beyond doubt that the ancient home of the Andhras then as now was the lower valleys of the Godāvari and the Krṣṇā. His theory of western origins of Sātavāhana power, not accompanied by arguments, looks like a shot in the air.

Sukthankar cuts the Gordian knot by challenging the Andhra affinities of the Sātavāhanas. According to him in the whole range of epigraphic records, the Sātavāhanas are nowhere called Andhras. The passages from Greek authors which mention the Andhra country and people contain no reference to the Sātavāhanas while those in which certain Sātavāhana kings are mentioned have nothing to say about the Andhras. The hopeless confusion of the Purāṇas makes their evidence worthless.

All these objections would vanish if the available pieces of evidence are properly weighed. Sukthankar treats ‘Andhrabhṛtya’ as a Tatpurusa compound (Servants of the Andhras) ‘having regard to the parallel phrase Sṛṇgabhṛtya applied to the Kanvas.’ The Purānic words ‘Andhrajātiyāḥ’ and ‘Kānvāyanāṁs tato bhṛtyāḥ Suśarmāṇāḥ prasahya taṁ’ (Matsya) exclude the grammatical construction adopted by Sukthankar. The compound should, therefore, be treated as a Karmadhāraya one, in which case it would mean ‘Andhra Servants.’ Then the Sātavāhanas could have been Andhras and Andhrabhṛtyas. Sātavāhana is a family or a dynastic name while Andhra is a tribal name (Andhrajāti). In an inscription we have the expression Sātavāhana kuḷaṁ, in Prākṛt

111. Vide supra.
112. IA, 1913, pp. 28 ff.
114. Some of the Purāṇas call these kings Andhras; others call them Andhrabhṛtyas, and there are others that call them by both names. The majority of the Purāṇas distinguish between Andhras and Andhrabhṛtyas, and state that the Andhrabhṛtyas succeeded the Andhras. Ibid., p. 29.
'kula' essentially means 'family.' The term 'jāti' on the other hand means 'caste or tribe.' That the terms Sātavāhana and Āndhra are not identical is shown by the fact that in the grants of Pallava Śiva-Skandavarman Sātāhanirattha (Sātavāhānirattha) and Āndhāpatha (Āndhrāpatha) are the names given to two provinces. No wonder then that the inscriptions which give the dynastic name considered the mention of the tribal name superfluous. In the Pallava Kadamba and Cālukya records the dynastic appellation only is given and if literary evidence should throw some light upon their tribal connections no one would challenge them by saying that such connections are unknown to epigraphic records. As for the Greek writers, Megasthenes does not mention the dynastic name of the Magadhan, Kaliṅgan, and Āndhra kings. Ptolemy mentions Polemaios (Vāsiṁhīputa sami Siri-Puḷumāvi of the records) of Paithān, but does not give us his dynastic name. Are we to hold that he did not belong to the Sātavāhana kula?

It will not do to ignore the Purānic testimony to the extent to which Sukthankar has done. No doubt the Purāṇas have to answer charges of defective chronology, incomplete lists of kings, corruption in names and different readings of the same passage in different manuscripts. Most of these defects are a result not of ignorance of facts on the part of Purāṇic writers but of misreading of manuscripts and bad copying; Pargiter thinks that the corruption in names must have occurred in the Sanskritization of Prākṛt names. The earliest Purāṇa, the Bhaviṣya, from which the Matsya, Vāyu, Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu derive their account, Sanskritized earlier metrical accounts in literary Prākṛt; the dynastic portion terminates with the downfall of the Āndhras and the rise

116. In the Mahāvamsa, Dhanmapadam, the Five Jātakas and Kuddhakapatha, it is used in this sense only. In the Taḷagunḍa ins. of Kākushavarma, (El., Vol. VIII p. 32, t. 1. 3), Kadambakula signifies the Kadamba family.

117. The Hira-Haḍagalli and the Mayidavōlu plates.

118. In Uṣavadāta’s Nāsik and Kārlā inscrr. Nahapāna is called a Kṣahārāta, and we know from Nāsik No. 2 that Kṣahārāta is a family name, (Khaṅgharātvasa). In a Kaṅhēri ins. (Lüders, op. cit., No. 1021) Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman’s daughter is said to have belonged to the Kārdhamaka race or family. From literary and other sources we know that Nahapāna and Rudradāman belonged to the Pahlava and Śaka tribes.

119. Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, pp. 97 ff. It must be noted, however, that Pargiter’s conclusions have often been challenged by Keiik, Kirfel, and other writers.
of their servants. The Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata carry the narrative to the rise of the Guptas, but are silent about the whirlwind campaigns of Samudragupta. Pargiter notes\(^\text{120}\) that between 325-340 A.D. the accounts were revised twice. The Purāṇas were, therefore, redacted at a time when the Sātavāhana dominion in South India was a thing of the immediate past. Pargiter has shown that there is an indication that a compilation was begun in the latter part of the second century A.D. in Sīri-Yaṇa’s reign, for five manuscripts of the Matsya, of which three appear to be independent,\(^\text{121}\) speak of him as reigning in his ninth or tenth year. The nearness of the Purāṇas to the Sātavāhanas makes their testimony about their tribal affinities unquestionable.\(^\text{122}\)

Having cut himself from the old moorings of Purānic testimony, Mr. Sukthankar seeks to locate the habitat of the Sātavāhanas in the modern Bellary District. The only source of his assertion is the terms ‘Sātavāhāni-hāra’ and ‘Sātāhāni-rattha’ (Sātavāhani-rattha) occurring in inscriptions coming from the small compass of the Bellary District.\(^\text{123}\) On the analogy of inhabitants lending their names to countries, he looks upon Sātavāhāni-hāra corresponding to the modern Bellary District and perhaps its neighbourhood as the original habitat of the Sātavāhanas.

\(^{120}\) Ibid., pp. xiii, g 23.
\(^{121}\) Ibid., p. 42, n. 8.
\(^{122}\) While Sukthankar accuses the Purāṇas of calling Andhrabhṛtyas (servants of the Andhras) Andhras, Ray Chaudhuri suggests that the name Andhra “probably came to be applied to the kings in later times when they lost their northern and western possessions and became purely, an Andhra power governing the territory at the mouth of the river Krishṇā” (Pol. His. of India, p. 280). Sātavāhana rule over the Andhradesa lasted for three quarters of a century. Sāmi Sīri-Yaṇa, No. 27 in the Matsya list, ruled over the western Deccan. The Sātavāhanas would seem to have become a purely eastern power only a few decades before their fall. It has been shown that a compilation of the Purāṇas was begun in Sīri-Yaṇa’s reign, at a time when the Sātavāhanas were a western as well as an eastern power.
\(^{123}\) The Myākadonī inscription and the Hira-Haḍagāḷḷī plates. Myākadonī is a village in the Adoni taluk of the Bellary Dt.

Hemacandra gives Sālāhana and Sālavāhana as variations of Sātavāhana (Pischel, op. cit.). True, viṣaya (Hira-Haḍagāḷḷī plates) and rāṣṭra (Cōlarat-ṭha) denote sometimes a kingdom. But in the Uruvupaḷḷī grant Munḍarāṣṭra is referred to as a viṣaya (IA, Vol. V, p. 51 t. II. 17, 28). The Kūḍūrahāra of the Kōṇḍamudi grant is called Kudrāhāra-viṣaya in the Vaiṅgeyaka grants and Kudrāra-viṣaya in some Eastern Cālukya grants. Therefore Sātavāhana ‘ḥāra,’ Pallava ‘rāṣṭra’ and Vaiṅgeyaka ‘viṣaya’ would denote the same territorial division—not bigger than a modern district.
If Sātavāhani-hāra was the starting point of Sātavāhana power, why are not inscriptions of the early Sātavāhanas found in this territory? Worse still, only an inscription of the last king of the line is found here; and Sukthankar bases his conclusions on the provenance of inscriptions! He gives instances of provinces getting their names from their early inhabitants. But the term in question is an instance of a dynasty lending its name to a part of the kingdom and not of a people lending their name to the whole kingdom.

We are prepared to say with Mr. Sukthankar that the province must have been so called on account of “some intimate connection” between the land and the dynasty. A tentative solution may be proposed that under the later Sātavāhanas, a town in Sātavāhani-hāra became the seat of their capital which would have been shifted to the east after the conquest of their western territories by the Western Kṣatrapas. True, during the reign of the last king, the province is under a Mahāsenāpati. Instances of the headquarters of a district lending its name to the district are numerous, e.g., Govadhana, Govadhanahāra (Lüders, List No. 1124); Kūdūra, Kūdūrahāra (No. 1328); Pātiṭhāna and Pātiṭhānapatha (No. 988) and Dhaññakaṭaka and the kingdom of To-na-kie-tse-kia which may be considered as the Chinese representative of Dhaññakaṭaka. In the Tālaṅguṇḍa inscription of Kakusthavaran, the capital of the Pallavas is called Pallavapuri. Kandarapura at which Mahārāja Damodaravaran of the Ananda gotra is said to have ruled must have received its name from that prince Kandara, who is mentioned as an ancestor of Attivarman. The Anandas and the Pallavas are not far removed from the Sātavāhanas. The capital of the Sātavāhanas might have been called Sātavāhanapura or Sātavāhanipura and the district in which it was situated, Sātavāhani-hāra; the Pallavas might have continued the name.

124. The Myākadoni inscription of Puḷumāvi.
125. “The learned Parimellalagar is inclined to make Cōla the name, like the Paṇḍya and Cēra, of a ruling family or clan of immemorial antiquity and renown.” The Cōlas, Vol. I, p. 24. Cōlamandalam would then be an instance of a territorial designation formed on a dynastic name. It is not, however, an instance of a part of a kingdom getting its name from the dynasty to the exclusion of the other parts.
126. The Myākadoni inscription of Puḷumāvi.
129. Excavations of the type conducted at Nāgārjunikonda may bring to
Now the Purānic, epigraphic and numismatic evidence can be correlated in a way different from those so far considered. The term Āndrabhritya, ‘Āndhra Servant’ gives the clue. Will the facts of Sātavāhana history make it improbable that the Sātavāhanas, undoubtedly Āndhras by tribal connections, were high officers of state under the Mauryas like the Kanvas, called the servants of the Śūngas? True, the Āndhra territory while acknowledging Mauryan suzerainty enjoyed some independence unlike the ‘King’s Dominions.’ This semi-independence need not have been a bar to the Āndhras (of the ruling family) accepting offices under the suzerain. In Asoka’s edicts, Yavanas are politically classed with the Āndhras;¹³⁰ and we find a Yavana serving as governor under Asoka.¹³¹

It may still seem impossible to ascertain how these ‘Servant Āndhras’ of the eastern Deccan drifted into the western Deccan. Asoka’s edicts and the Gīnār inscription of Rudrādana form links in the chain of evidence, and suggest that the Mauryan dominion in South India was the medium through which this drift took place. In Asoka’s edicts the Yavanas are placed with the Gāndhāras and Kāmbojas in the north-west, and still Surāśṭra was governed by a Yavana king for Asoka. Indian History offers us many clear instances of dynastic drifts like the Mauryas of Konkan, the Guptas or Guttas of Guttal and the Cōlas of Renāṇḍu. In the reign of Pulakesīn II “in the Konkanas, the watery stores of the pools which were the Mauryas were quickly ejected by the great wave which was Caṇḍadaṇḍa, who acted at his command.”¹³² A prince, Dhavaḷa, of the Maurya lineage is mentioned in the Kanasa inscription of A.D. 738-739, in the Kotah State, Rajaputana.¹³³ In an inscription of Vāghli in the Khandesh District dated S. 991, princes of the Maurya clan, the original home of which is said to have been the city of Valabhi in Surāśṭra, are mentioned.¹³⁴ The Guttas of the twelfth century A.D. with their capital at Guttavolal, which may be safely identified with the modern Guttal in the Karaji taluq of the Dharwar District (where all their records are found),

light the remains of the capital in the Bellary Dt. or its neighbourhood. In the Adoni taluq there is a village called Sātanuru.

¹³⁰ RE. XIII.
¹³¹ The Gīnār ins. of Rudrādana, EI, VIII, p. 45, t. 1. 3.
¹³² The Aiḥole inscription of Pulakesīn II, IA, VIII, p 244.
¹³³ Ibid., XIX, p. 56.

H.A.—4
trace their descent to Candragupta through a Vikramāditya who is specified as a king of Ujjain. The earliest Telugu records (eighth century A.D.) from the Cuddapah District including the Mālēpādu plates of Puṇyakumāra, have brought to light a line of kings claiming Cōla descent, who had however their dominion in Pallava territory.135 The Vēlūrpalayaṇ plates give us the clue;136 there the Pallava Simhavishnu is said to have "seized the country of the Cōlae embellished by the daughter of Kaveru whose ornaments are the forests of the paddy (fields) and where (are found) brilliant groves of areca." When the power of the Cōlae fell to a low ebb and Simhavishnu's sway extended over the Cōla country, the scions of the eclipsed Cōla dynasty must have sought service under their conqueror and so moved up north.137 Epigraphical records from the Maddaguri taluq of the Tumkur District refer to a certain Dhanamjaya Eriga, a Cōleg. The Cōlae of the Tumkur District may have been of a common stock with the Cōlae of Rennādu among whom we have a Dhanamjayavarman.138 The drift of the Mauryas from Magadha to Konkan, Khandesh and Rajputana, and of the Guptas (Guttas) from the north to Guttal may be explained in the same manner. Even as late as the sixteenth century, Cōlae chiefs with traditionary descent from Karikāla are found as viceroys under Vijayanagara rulers.139 The instances so far cited support the theory that in the days of tribulation and rather obscure existence under their Mauryan suzerains, scions of the royal family in the Andhradesa might have passed into the service of the Mauryan kings and so have gone to the western Deccan as viceroys, thereby getting the Purānic appellation Andhrabhṛtya. A fragment of Rock Edict VIII discovered at Supāra140 makes it certain that a part of the western Deccan was included in the 'King's Dominions.' When the strong arm of Asoka disappeared, their shrewd and more fortunate descendants would have found themselves in a position to strike a blow in their own interest, not in the land of their birth which was far away, but in the land of

137. The names of the first two princes mentioned in the Mālēpādu plates, Nandivarman and his son Simhavishnu, bear striking resemblance to some names in Pallava genealogy.
138. 380 of 1904.
139. ARE, 1909, p. 112.
140. CII, Vol. I.
their adoption. It is possible that in some such manner Simuka, an Āndhra, might have started the political power of the dynasty. But at present we have no evidence in favour of this conjecture.

For all that we know, the ancestors of the Sātavāhanas of the western Deccan might not have belonged to any royal family in the Āndhradesa. They might have been nobles or fortune hunters who readily passed into the service of the Mauryan suzerains and so moved up to western Deccan.

If the Jain legends which mention Paithān as the capital of the first Sātavāhana king may be believed, it would seem to be the starting-point of the Sātavāhana power. The close association of the Sātavāhanas with Mahārathis (matrimonial alliance) and the office of Mahāratha show the extent to which Simuka enlisted the support of the powerful Raṭhikas of the west. This reminds one of the Cuṭu-Pallava matrimonial alliance which would seem to have, in the same measure, contributed to Pallava ascendancy in the south (later Pallava inscriptions mention a Cuṭa-Pallava as the founder of the dynasty). If the Purānic ‘bhṛtyāḥ’ and ‘sa-jātiyāḥ’ are correct, it would seem that Simuka was also helped by a number of faithful Āndhras who like his ancestors had moved up to the western Deccan. The early Sātavāhanas seem to have been engaged in the first instance in the conquest of Mahārāṣṭra north and south, Malwa and the modern Central Provinces.
CHAPTER III

THE EARLY SĀṬAVĀHANAS

The Starting point

Relying upon the supposed date in the Maurya era in the Hāṭhigumpha inscription of Khāravela,¹ and looking upon Khāravela as the third member of the Cedi dynasty of Kālīṅga² like Sri-Sātakaṇi of the Sāṭavāhana dynasty, Rapson would place the beginnings of the dynasty (170 B.C. + 41, i.e., Simuka 23, Kanha 18) somewhere between 220 and 211 B.C.³ The chronological arrangements adopted here would place Simuka 384 years⁴ before 150 A.D., i.e. 234 B.C. Though an edict later than Rock Edict VIII dated in the tenth year of Asoka⁵ has not been found in western Deccan,⁶ it is improbable that Asoka’s reign witnessed a break-up of the empire; and Asoka’s death would seem to have taken place somewhere between 236 and 232 B.C.⁷ The same conclusion can be arrived at in another way. As Pargiter has pointed out,⁸ the

1. Messrs. R. D. Banerji and K. P. Jayaswal remark: (EI, Vol. XX, p. 74) “It has been proved by repeated examinations of the rock that there is no date in the Maurya era . . . . as supposed by Bhagwanlal, Indraji and ourselves formerly.” The inscription reads “Muriya Kāla vohinan ca coyatthi Aṁga-zAītika (m) turiyam upādayati” ‘causes to be completed the 11 Angas of the 64 letters which had become lost (or fragmentary) with the time of the Mauryas.’

2. Vyāḍharājā and Kṣemarājā like Bhikṣurājā are epithets applied to King Khāravela, and not the names of his father and grandfather respectively as suggested by Rapson. (CIC, Andhras and Western Kṣatrapas etc., xviii). The text has ‘Khemarājā sa Vyāḍharājā sa Bhikṣurājā sa Dharmaṇājā pasamīt(o) Sunat(o) anubhavato kalānāñi . . . rūjasī Vasūkula vinisrito maha-vijaye Rājā Khāravela (i)ri’ EI, Vol. XX, p. 80.


4. It would be shown below that Śivavakanda of the Purāṇas (No. 26 in the list) was the king defeated by Rudradāman twice before 150 A.D.

5. 10th year after his coronation.

6. A fragment found at Sopāra.

7. The Purāṇic statements would place an interval of 49 years between the successions of Candragupta and Asoka. According to V. A. Smith’s scheme of chronology, Candragupta began to reign in 322-21 B.C. So Asoka would have ascended the throne in 272 B.C., he is said to have ruled for 36 years and been anointed 4 years after his accession.

8. The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 37.
Purānic total of the individual reigns (of the Sātavāhana kings) excluding 24-a, is only 442½ years even if we take the longest periods, where there is a difference. But the whole duration is said to have been 460 in the Matsya, though it is given as 411 in Vāyu. The addition of Sātakarni mentioned in e Vāyu only would increase its total to 440. It would therefore appear, that the total 442½ years has much to be said in its favour. The end of the Sātavāhana dynasty cannot be placed earlier than 207 A.D., and 442½ years before 207 A.D. would give us the same 234 B.C.

**Founder of the dynasty: Simuka**

As the Purāṇas speak of ‘Simuka Sātavāhana Sirimato’ as simply ‘Śiśuka ṇdhrāh sa jātiyāh’ before the coup d’etat, and as

9. The Sātavāhanas ruled for 55 years after 150 A.D.

10. The Purāṇas place the Sātavāhanas after the Kāṇvas, i.e., (Mauryas 139, Śungas 112 and Kāṇvas 45) 25 B.C. The Purāṇas treat contemporary dynasties as successive. They say that 18 Śakas (Western Kṣatrapas) came after the Sātavāhanas. Some of the Western Kṣatrapas of the Cātaṇa line were certainly contemporaries of the later Sātavāhanas as inscriptions, coins and Ptolemy’s statement would show. It is not possible under the Purānic scheme to place Gautamiputra Sātakarni and Pulumāvi who certainly preceded Rudradāman of the Girnār inscription of 150 A.D., after that date; for does not Ptolemy call Cātaṇa the grandfather of Rudradāman, a contemporary of Pulumāvi?

In the memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 1, *Dates of Votive Inscriptions from Sānci*, R. P. Chanda argues on palaeographical grounds that the earliest votive inscriptions are later than Asoka’s and Heliodorus’ inscriptions by a century, and that the Siri-Sātakani inscription belongs to the later group, which he assigns to the period between 75 and 20 B.C. He identifies the Siri-Sātakani of the Sānci inscription with No. 6 in the line. No. 6 in the line, according to the chronological scheme adopted here, belongs to the years between 180 and 130 B.C. There is no reason why he should not be one of the numerous Sātakarnis found in the Purānic lists after No. 6.

A comparative study of the palaeography of the Nānegrāth and Bhilsā inscriptions enables us to reject the view of Bühler that the Sātakarnis of the two inscriptions are identical. Bhilsā va with the shorter neck and rounded body, the more ornate Bhilsā i sign, the less angular va with the vertical at the centre and the da with the more rounded back than the Nānegrāth inscription, stamp the Bhilsā inscription as one later than the Nānegrāth inscription.

The Bhilsā Tope inscription under reference is carved on the bas-relief of a torana in the middle of the upper architrave of the South Gateway. It records the donation of a Vasiṣṭhiputra Ananda, the foreman of the artisans of Siri-Sātakani. The plates published in the JBOSR, 1917, make it clear that Vasiṣṭhiputra is the metronymic not of the king but of the artisan. For Rapson’s view, op. cit., xlvii.
‘Rājā Simuka’ after it, it is certain that he was the founder of the dynasty. But as his brother Kanha is also said to have belonged to the Sātavāhana kula, Simuka could not have given the name of the dynasty. Then who gave the name to the dynasty? The question cannot at present be satisfactorily answered.

The meaning of ‘Sātavāhana’ is as obscure as those of ‘Cālu-kya,’ ‘Pallava’ and ‘Vākāṭaka.’ For one thing the name is not Sātavāhana as Rapson would have it. Jinaprabhasūri, a Jain monk of the fourteenth century A.D., derives the word thus: ‘Sanoterdānārthatvat lokaiḥ Sātavāhana iti vypadeśam lamhbitah,’ i.e. people call him Sātavāhana, because (the verb) ‘sanoti’ signifies ‘to give’ and hence one by whom were given (sātāni) conveyances (vāhanāni) was called Sātavāhana. Another derivation of the name is given in the Kathāsaritasāgara which explains it as meaning ‘he who rode a yakṣa named Sāta (in the form of a lion).’ These fanciful explanations show that the origin of the term was forgotten long before the fourteenth century. Recently M. Przyluski has given us an equally fanciful explanation.

12. The Purāṇas give various readings: Matsya generally ‘Śīṅuka’; d Mt. Śīṅudraḥ; e Mt. Śīṅuka; e Vāyu Cismako; Viṣṇu Śīṅraka; j Viṣ. Sudhra. According to Pargiter (op. cit., p. 38, n. 17), Simuka was misread ‘Śisuka’ and Sanskritized ‘Śīṅuka’; and Śisuka cannot be Sanskrit Śrimukha (one with a glorious face as Bhagvanalal and Bühler proposed (ASWI, Vol. V, p. 69). Sans. ‘Śī’ is invariably represented in Prakṛt by ‘siri.’ In the relievo inscription at Nāṇeghāṭ itself, Simuka bears the honorific prefix ‘Śirimato.’ ‘Śīva’ enters into the composition of some Sātavāhana names and is used as an honorific prefix even by early Sātavāhanas. However, palaeography prevents us from subscribing to Burgess’ view that “Sivamaka (of an Amarāvatī inscription) might possibly be the same as Simuka of the Nāṇeghāṭ inscription No. 3.” (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 62, n. 2).
13. Sātavāhana with the dental s occurs in Bāña’s verse, Hemacandra’s works and Somadeva’s Kathāsaritasāgara. However, Vātsyāyana in his Kāmasūtra spells the word with palatal sibilant ś. The words as given by Bhandarkar are (EHD, p. 69, n. 7) ‘Karṣetāya Kuntalāḥ Sātakarniḥ Sātavaḥanō Mahādevinī Mahayavatim (jagdhāna’). Dr. Fleet remarks (JRAS, 1916, p. 818 n. 3); “It is, however not possible that Vātsyāyana himself can have used the palatal sibilant in these two names.” As will be shown below, Sātakarni with the palatal sibilant ś is a mistake for Sātakarni with the dental s. It then becomes easier to suppose that Sātavāhana with the palatal sibilant ś is a similar error in spelling.
According to him Sādaṁ, sadāṁ and sādāṁ in Munda languages mean 'horse,' vāhana is a Sanskritization of han or hapan meaning 'son.' Sātavāhana is rendered 'son of horse.' The explanation given is, that princes born of the magical union between the chief queen and the sacrificial horse (during the performance of the Aśvamedha) would have come to be called 'sons of the horse.' It is not possible here to traverse the grounds, highly speculative, on which Przyluski seeks to trace pre-Dravidian influences in post-Aryan society and institutions in India. We must be content with the observation that, according to the learned philologist's explanation every kṣatriya prince, whose father had performed the Aśvamedha would be a Sātavāhana or Sātahapan. Yet history knows of only one dynasty that went by that name. It is possible to consider 'Sāta' as the past participle of San, to obtain, to gain; Sātavāhana would then mean one who obtained a 'vāhana', perhaps one who by his deeds secured a high position in Mauryan military service; and the Sātavāhanas were according to the Purāṇas 'Servant Andhras.' The Śilappadikāram refers to Purambanaiyān vālkōttam and Pāsaṇḍa Sāttan (ix, ll. 12 and 15). The commentaries explain Purambanaiyān by Māsāttan and Sātavāhanan; I do not think that these references to the village deity, the guardian of the boundary of the village, and to his proficiency in the heretical lore, have any place in the elucidation of the dynastic name of the Sātavāhanas. For one thing Aṭiyārkkunallār, the commentator, is only as old as Jinaprabhasūri. The spelling in 'Sātā' is another argument.17

The wife of Sātakaṇi I was versed in and performed numerous sacrifices and worshipped Vāsudeva, Kṛṣṇa and Saṁkarṣaṇa. Gotamiputa Sīr-Sātakaṇi's mother led the life of a royal rṣi. The former prides himself over 'having stopped the contamination of the four castes.' A later Sātavāhana king bears the name Yaṇa Sātakaṇi.

All Purāṇas are agreed that he ruled for 23 years. According to Jain legend the first king, Sātavāhana by name (evidently Simuka), built Jaina temples and cetiyas. But in the closing years of his reign he became a wicked king and was dethroned and killed.18

17. The reference to Sāttan in Śilappadikāram was pointed out to me by Mr. V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar; but I am unable to follow his interpretation for which see Jayanti Ramayya Pantulu Commemoration Volume, pp. 156-8.
Simuka was succeeded by his brother Kaṇha. In his time the Sātavāhana kingdom extended as far west as Nāsik if not farther. Evidence of the modelling of Sātavāhana administration on Mauryan lines is furnished by the Nāsik inscription of his time, which mentions the construction of a cave by a Mahāmātra in charge of the śramaṇas or monks (at Nāsik)—Mahāmātras are a class of officials mentioned in the Asokan inscriptions. The cave is the earliest excavation in the series, and stands far below the other caves. The cells on three sides are decorated with cetiya arches at the top of the openings. Of the four pillars that support the roof of the verandah, two are half-pillars and the others are square at the top and bottom, and octagonal in the middle. They have no capital.

According to Rapson, Kaṇha would have reigned for 18 years. Matsya has generally āṣṭādaśa. But some Mss. of Vāyu read āsmāddasa. Pargiter has pointed out in the introduction that where there are two readings, one āsmāddasa and another āṣṭādaśa, abdāndaśa would reconcile these different readings.

Siri-Sātakaṇi I

On epigraphic as well as literary (Purānic) evidence, the third king of the line is Siri-Sātakaṇi—according to Rapson the Siri-Sāta of the coins, the husband of Nāyanikā, the daughter of Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro. According to Rapson it is not possible to reconcile the Purānic statement that Sātakarni I was the son of Krṣṇa, the brother of Simuka, with the evidence supplied by the

19. The Mt., Vā., Bṛ., Bhāg. and Vṣ. are agreed in calling him the brother of Simuka. According to Rapson this fact fully explains the absence of his name in the Nāneghāṭ relievo inscriptions (op. cit., p. xix).
20. Pl. IV, No. 4.
23. In a Nāsik inscription (El, Vol. VIII, p. 88), Viṣṇudatā, daughter of Saka Agnivarman calls herself a Śakanikā. In the Poona plates of Prabhāvatigupta (El, Vol. XV, p. 41, t. 11. 7 and 8), Kuberasāgā, wife of Candragupta, is said to have belonged to the Nāga tribe. On these analogies the name Nāganikā may indicate the tribe to which she belonged. The Nāga alliance is partially preserved in the Jain legends which make Sātavāhana the son of a Brahman girl and Śeṣa, the king of serpents. (JBBRAS, Vol. X, p. 132).
relievo figures of Simuka, Siri-Sātakaṇi, and the latter's family. The relievo inscriptions mention Rāya Simuka, then Siri-Sātakaṇi and his wife, then a Kumāra Bhāya..., then Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro, evidently the father of the queen, then Kumāras Hakusiri and Sātavāhana. Most of the relievo figures are almost lost, only the legs being partially visible; the rest are completely lost leaving only the space. As will be seen presently, the space for two figures between those of Nāyanikā and Kumāra Bhāya..., was filled by the figures of Vedisiri and Kumāra Satisiri. Then Kaṇha has no place in the relievos.

Other results which Bühler and Rapson have arrived at by a comparative study of the relievo figures and the sacrificial inscription of Nāyanikā at Nāṇeghāt are that queen Nāyanikā was the mother of Vedisiri and Satisiri, and that she governed the kingdom during the minority of Vedisiri. According to them the Kumāra Hakusiri of the relievos is the Satisirimat of the inscription. True, in the Dravidian Prakṛti of the Sātavāhana epigraphs ha sometimes takes the place of sa, e.g. Harihga=Saṅgha; Hiru-Hātakani=Siri-Sātakaṇi, Ḥāla=Sāta. But nowhere is ku or ka used for ti. Moreover one would expect Hakuhiru rather than Hakusiri. This seems also to dispose of Bühler's identification of Satisiri with Hakusiri. Further, Kumāra Sati has 'sirimato' and not 'siri' suffixed to his name. As Kumāras Bhāya..., and Sātavāhana are not mentioned in the sacrificial inscription; and as between the representations of Kumāra Bhāya..., and Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro two statues and their inscriptions have disappeared. Nāyanikā would seem to have had more than two sons; it would seem that Vedisiri and Satisiri were represented in the relievo figures now lost and that the sacrificial inscription, which mentions only two princes (neither of whom is the eldest son, i.e. Kumāra Bhāya), is posterior to the relievo figures and the inscriptions over them.

25. Rapson: op. cit., xx, n. 3.
26. Lüders, List Nos. 1210, 1271, 1272, 1281, etc.
27. Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee assures me that the change of 'Sati' into 'Haku' is not possible.
29. Bühler would identify the latter with Vedisiri ASWI, Vol. V, p. 68; but Rapson is more cautious, op. cit., xlvi.
H.A.—5
Sātakarni: Meaning

Many a prince in the Sātavāhana line bore the name Sātakarni, sometimes along with a metronymic and another name, and sometimes without one or both of them:—Siri-Sātakarni I, Cakora Sātakarni, Mrgendra Sātakarni, Gautamiputra Śrī-Yajjia Sātakarni.

Whilst Rapson’s view that sometimes Sātakarni was used generally is correct, the example given by him, i.e., the Gīrṇār inscription where Sātakarni must mean Puḷumāvi is, as we shall see, rather unfortunate. Better examples are Śivamakā Sātakani called simply Sātakarni in the Gīrṇār inscription, and perhaps the Siri-Sātakani of some coins closely allied to Siri-Yāṇa’s coins by type and fabric, as all the successors and immediate predecessors of the latter bear personal names. The Sātakani of the Nāṇeghat relief would seem to have borne a personal name ending in ‘siri.’ Sātakani was sometimes abbreviated into Sāta, Sāṭi, Saḍa (Sada?) and Sātaka. Sadakana of the Chitaldoorg coins is a Prākṛt form of Satakarna.

The meaning of the term is, however, not settled. Rapson did not attempt to elucidate it. The Purānic forms Sātakarni, Śatakarni, Svātikarni, Svāti, Svātivarna and Śāntikarni show how little the Purānic writers understood the meaning of the word Sātakarni in Prākṛt. Prof. Jean Przyluski’s suggestion that kani

33. Rapson, op. cit.
34. ASWI, Vol. V, No. 24, Kaṇhēri Inscriptions. According to Rapson, Sadakana and Sātaka may be forms of Sātakānaṁ (op. cit., lxxii). As Sāta is an abbreviation of Sātakarni or Sātakani, as the Banavasi inscription of Hāritiputra Viṣṇukaṇa-Cuṭukulananda Sātakarni (IA, 1885, p. 331) and the Malavalli inscription of a Kadamba king (EC, Vol. VII, p. 252 and Pl.) make it clear that more than one prince in the Cuṭu line bore the name Sātakarni, Sātaka as a form of Sātakani is more probable.
35. ‘Sadakana’ occurs in a clay tablet from Candravalli which was exhibited at the Eighth Oriental Conference at Mysore (1935). The reading is mine. The tablet bears the Triśūla emblem in the centre.
36. The Purānic Svāti is possibly a mis-Sanskritization of Sāti, which, like Sāta, is an abbreviation of Sātakarni. Krishna Sastri remarks: “...the name-ending svātikarnā is more likely to have been the origin of the later Sātakarni than the fanciful sāta-karṇa (the hundred-eared).” (EI, Vol. XVIII, pp. 317-18).
is derived from the Munḍa kon meaning 'son', and that Sāta is the Munḍa 'Sādām' meaning horse, is ingenious, but not convincing. Long ago Mr. Coomaraswamy proposed to identify the Nūṟṟuvar Kannar of the Tamil Epic, Silappadikārāin, with a Sātvāhana Sātakarṇi. Since then the Pandits have sought to derive Sātakarṇi from Sātakarṇa (Sātakarṇasya putraḥ Sātakarṇiḥ). So far as we know Simuka, the father of Sātakarṇi I, did not bear either the name Sātakarṇi. In all the Sanskrit inscriptions in which the term occurs we have Sātakarṇi and not Sātakarṇi. True the Purāṇas spell the word sometimes with Ś and sometimes with S. Vātsyāyana in his Kāmasūtra gives the from Sātakarṇa. But the evidence of the inscriptions which belong to the third and fourth centuries A.D. is conclusive. The meaning given by the Tamil annotator cannot therefore be readily accepted. Sāta cannot be connected with Sāṭan for the reasons stated above. Sātakarṇi would be the name of a descendant of Sātakarṇa. Sātakarṇa is as curious a name as Kumbhakarna, Lambodara and Jātikarṇa. If we read the name as Sātakarṇa it may mean one with 'a sharp ear'.

It is not true to say that Sātakarṇi is only the dynastic name of both Sātvāhana and Cuṭu families. It was also borne by ministers and ordinary persons. In a Kuḍā inscription a minister bears the name Hāla=Sāta, a contraction for Sātakarṇi. In Nāsik No. 3, the preparation of the plates or the cloth or the palm leaves is attributed to a 'takaṇi,' and the lacuna could have contained one letter only. So (Sā) takaṇi is most probable.

37. Pp. 540-41. He figures as a close ally of Seṅguṭṭuvan; he is here represented as being prepared to secure for Seṅguṭṭuvan, a stone from the Himalayas, out of which was to be carved a figure of Pattini.
38. (a) Dakṣināpathapatēs Sātakarner dvir api . . . . ."—the Girnār inscription of Rudradāman, El, Vol. VIII, p. 44. 1. 12.
(b) " . . . . prēśubhīs-Sātakarṇy-ādibhis . . . . ."—the Tālaguṇḍa inscription of Kākusthavarmā, El, Vol. VIII, p. 33. 1. 14.
(c) "Vāśīśṭhiputrasya Sātakarṇisyā"—Kanheri inscription of the daughter of Mahākṣatrapa Rudra, ASWI, Vol. V, p. 78, Pl. LI.
39. Vīde supra.
40. Vedic Index, q.v.
41. Ranson: op. cit., Index, V, p. 264.
42. CII, No. 18, p. 15.
43. Pace Senart who says (El, Vol. VIII, p. 70): "It is most improbable that we should have to read Sātakaṇinā, and it would indeed be extremely puzzling if this royal name were borne by a simple engraver."
Sātakaṇi's Imperial Position

The long record at Nāṇeghāṭ incised during the minority of Vedisiri by the regent Nāyanikā mentions a number of sacrifices performed. Among those mentioned are the Aśvamedha, Rāja-sūya, Agnīadhaya. Anvārainbhanīya, Gavāmayana, Bhagaladaśa-rātra, Aptyāyā, Āṅgirasāmayana, Gārgatirirātra, Āṅgirasatri-rātra, Chandogapavamānatirirātra, Trayodaśarātra, Daśarātra, and some others as the lacunae would show.

Bühler supposes that these sacrifices were all performed by Nāyanikā though he admits that “according to the Sāstras, women are not allowed to offer Śrauta sacrifices and that those who perform such sacrifices for them (sṛiyājaka) are severely blamed; yet that seems hardly probable for in the sentence which ends with yañehi yītham, ‘the sacrifices were offered,’ we have the impersonal passive construction and the genitive rāyasa, ‘of the king’ ....” Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar objects: 44 “It is inconceivable that Nāganikā, even as queen-regent, celebrated it (the Aśvamedha) of her own accord and to indicate her paramount sovereignty. ....... as Nāganikā’s husband Sātakarni has been styled apratihatacakra, it is proper and natural to suppose that it was he who celebrated the sacrifice twice. What appears to be the case is that Sātakarni it must be, who carried out the sacrifices referred to in the epigraph, and as all sacrifices are performed by Yajamānas along with their consorts, Nāganikā has been associated with him.” The fact that Nāganikā’s husband is called vīra, sūra, Dakhnā (patha) pa (ti), and apratihatacakra, and the words ‘rāyasa .... (ya) nihi yītham’ support Bhandarkar’s conclusions. After ‘caritabrahmacāriyāya dikavratasumdaṇya yaṇa huta.....’, ‘vano’ appears, and after ‘vano’ there is a stop. It is therefore probable that Nāyanikā’s part is only the description of the sacrifices performed by her husband, and we know that the record was incised after the death of Siri-Sātakani I. The epithets dhamadasa, kāmadasa, varadasa, putradasa, if they apply to Siri-Sātakani, would be another piece of argument in favour of our conclusion.45

44. IA, Vol. XLVII, p. 72, n. 11.
45. Bühler’s reading ‘a(n)āgavaraṇadayaṇiṇiya’ is uncertain. Neither the a nor the na is certain. The epithets ‘putradasa varadasa’ etc., cannot apply to Vedisiri as his name is in a compound with mātuṣya. Nor can they apply to Satīsirin-matasa, as they are too far removed from it.
It would then be that Siri-Sātakaṇi I was a powerful monarch and that most of the sacrifices were performed by him to commemorate the expansion of his empire of which we have evidence from the coins. The Nānēghāṭ record is then the funeral oration of a disconsolate wife.

Sātakaṇi I—Khāravela Synchronism?

According to the Hāthīgumpha inscription, Khāravela, in his second year, sent an army to the west disregarding Sātakaṇiṇi. The army reached the Kanhabepā river and struck terror into the Mūsika capital or city. K. P. Jayaswal and R. D. Banerji have shown that the Hāthīgumpha inscription mentions a Yavana king Dimita who was forced by Khāravela’s victorious invasion of Northern India to retreat to Mathurā. As he could only be Demetrius I, who on his coins wears the head-dress made of elephant’s skin, and who would have come to the throne about 190 B.C., king Khāravela’s reign would on this synchronism fall in the second and third decades of the second century B.C. Sātakaṇi I would, according to the chronological scheme adopted here, have reigned between 200 and 190 B.C. As Sātakaṇi II would have come to throne in 172 B.C. the synchronism of Khāravela and Sātakaṇi II is as probable as that of Khāravela and Sātakaṇi I.

Hakusiri

An inscription on one of the pillars of the Cetiya cave at Nāsik mentions Mahā-Hakusiri and his grand-daughter Bhaṭapālīka, daughter of the royal officer (amaca) Arahalaya and wife of the royal officer Agiyatanaṇaka. The early type (i.e. in low relief) of the decoration of the façade, the simple lotus-shaped capitals of the pillars, and the proximity of the cave to that excavated in the reign of king Kānha, stamp it as a very early excavation in the series. Senart has pointed out that “if this Mahāhakusiri is the same as Kumāra Hakasiri at Nānāghāṭ, two generations would not be too much to explain the difference in the forms of letters which exists between our epigraph and the Nānāghāṭ inscription.” Bühler assigns the inscription to a very early period and supposes that the

47. EI, Vol. VIII, p. 92.
change in the characters of its alphabet is due not only to time, but
to the development of the ‘Malwa and Upper India style.’ The
fact that the grand-daughter of Mahā-Hakusiri is the daughter of
one royal officer and wife of another makes it highly probable that
the Hakusiri of this inscription belonged to the royal family and
was therefore the Kumāra Hakusiri of the Nāneghât relievos. But
since he does not bear the title of Rājan which Sātavāhana kings
invariably do, we cannot subscribe to the view of Rapson and
Bühler that the Hakusiri of our inscription ascended the throne.

Satisiri

Satisiri mentioned as a son of Nāyanikā in the sacrificial inscrip-
tion was probably represented in the relievos between Kumāra
Bhāya..........., and Mahāraṭṭhī Tranakayiro and therefore before
Hakusiri. Rapson and Bühler think that he may be the Sakti
Kumāra of the Jain legends.49 It has been shown above that he
cannot be identified with Kumāra Hakusiri. In the e Vāyu and
Matsya lists the successor of Sātakanī I is Pūrṇotsantu (Pūrṇot-
saṅga or Pūrṇotsarga also in Mt.). As Sāti and Sāta (abbrevia-
tions of Sātakanī) were incorrectly Sanskritized into Sāntikarna or
Sātakarṇa, ‘Santu’ may likewise be an incorrect Sanskritization of
Sāti, (San. Śakti); in that case Satisirimato of the Nāneghât
inscription would be the Pūrṇotsantu of e Vāyu.

Skandastambhī

This king, the sixth in the list, is mentioned only in some ver-
sions of the Matysa Purāṇa.50 As will be shown below two or
three kings have to be added to the Purānic list; and the number of
kings is nowhere mentioned to have been more than thirty.51 Pro-
bably some of the names in the first half of the list have to be
deleted as imaginary names mentioned to bring up the total to
thirty. Skandastambhī’s existence may therefore be reasonably
doubted.

Sātakanī II

If the Purānic chronology may be trusted Sātakanī II ruled
for 56 years,—the longest reign in the annals of the dynasty. From
Western India come certain square coins (potin and copper) bear-

49. ASWI, Vol. V, p. 62, n. 1; Rapson: op. cit., xx,
51. Ibid., p. 36.
ing partially the legends Raño Sātakamnisa; some bear the device of the springing lion, others that of an elephant with upraised trunk. According to Rapson they bear a close resemblance in size, shape and types to the coins of Erān (East Malwa). He cites the authority of Cunningham according to whom while the coins of Ujjain are invariably round pieces, those of Bēśnagar (according to him the capital of East Malwa) and Erān are nearly all square. The double line border with the fish and swastika symbols are strikingly similar to the device supposed to represent the river Bīna on the coins of Erān. The Sātakaṇī of these coins would therefore seem to have ruled over East Malwa. West Malwa, as the Siri-Sāta coins show, had already passed into Sātavāhana hands in the reign of Sātakaṇī I.

The Sātakaṇī of the coins would seem to have been earlier than Āpilaka, eighth in the Purānic lists. And so he must be No. 6 of the Purānic lists. The angular ta of the Sātakaṇī coins brings them near the Nānēghāt inscriptions. But too much reliance cannot be placed on the results arrived at by a comparison of coin legends and stone inscriptions. In the Sātakaṇī coin the ka has no nail-head, and has a longer horizontal member than the ka of the Apilaka coin. East Malwa which, according to Kālidāsa’s Mālavikāgīmitra, was ruled by Agnimitra from Vidiśā would therefore seem to have come under Sātavāhana rule during the reign of Sātakaṇī II, some time between 180 and 130 B.C.

According to Rapson the coins may be those of Gautamiputra or some earlier Sātakarni, and the Bhilsa inscription that of the time of Vāsiṭhīputa Vilvivāyakura, predecessor of Gautamiputra Sātakarni. But the early forms of ka, da and ra in the Bhilsa Tope inscription place it long before Gotamiputa Sātakaṇī’s time. The Vilvivāyakuras do not belong to the Sātavāhana line (at least the main line). Moreover, Rapson’s conjecture that Vāsiṭhīputa applies to the king is not supported by the plate.

Āpilaka

The authenticity of the Purānic lists which mention Āpilaka as the 8th king has been proved by a large copper coin of this

52. Rapson: op. cit., Pl. I, Nos. 5 to 12.
53. CAI, p. 95.
54. Rapson: op. cit., xcii.
55. Op cit., xcvi.
56. Ibid., xxvii, n. 2.
57. Bühler’s Tables III.
58. Vide supra.
king from the Central Provinces.\textsuperscript{59} Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit reads the legend as 'vānō siva-siri-Āpilakasa.' The legend, I think, should be read as 'vānō siva sīrīsa-Āpilakasa,'\textsuperscript{60} the i sign is represented by two short strokes one vertical and the other horizontal attached to the right arm of pa. The coin bears the device of an elephant goad. What is above the elephant may be nandipada. Dikshit remarks "on numismatic grounds the place of this

59. The coin which belongs to the Mahā-Kośāl Society was exhibited at the Annual Exhibition of the Asiatic Society of Bengal by Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, Director-General of Archaeology, who has been kind enough to furnish me with an excellent photograph of the coin (Pl. I, No. 2). About coin No. 3 in his catalogue of coins in the British Museum Pl. I xciv Rapson says: "It is inscribed with Brāhmī characters which are apparently of the same period, (i.e., Sātaṃkūḷīs') but which are too fragmentary to allow of any satisfactory reading. All that can be said is that the name of the king seems to have begun with Aja— or Aji—. No form occurring in the Purānic lists suggests any very probable identification, though it is possible that the curious name Āpitaka or Āpitavā which appears early in these lists . . . may be a corruption of the name of this king." It is no longer possible to hold with Rapson that Āpitaka is a Purānic corruption of a name beginning with Aja or Aji. We have a silver coin from Mathurā with the legends Ajadeva, and bearing the same symbols as our coin, i.e., the swastika with ma attached to each of the four arms, man standing, and representation of a river with fish swimming in it. On palaeographical evidence this coin belongs to the same period as No. 3 in Rapson's Catalogue.—(Mathurā is the findspot of many Śungha coins), and resembles in type and symbols the silver coin of Śumitra, identified with Śumitra of the Harsacarita, a Śungha prince in whose kingdom Malwa might have been included. (JBORS, 1934, Pl. facing p. 5, No. 2 and the following).

It might be remarked that both the Śatavahana and the Śungha coins from Mathurā bear the same symbols. Rapson thinks that the Ajacoin (lead) is clearly connected by type with the potin coins of Sṛi-Sāta. Only future research can show whether the Śatavahanas were indebted to the Śunghas or vice versa, or whether both were indebted to a particular locality for these symbols.

60. From the numerous forms of the name in the Purānas, Pargiter long ago chose Āpilaka of e Vāyu—op. cit., p. 39, n. 45. See Plate IX, No. 3.

This is an instance of an honorific prefix having a case ending in Śatavahana inscriptions and coins; the only other instance is afforded by the legends on a coin attributed conjecturally by Rapson to Pulumāvī II (G. P. 3, Pl. op. cit.), which should be read in the following order: 'samīsa s(i)tr(i) (———).’ The combination of sa and ā in sā is also curious, the only parallels for this being Śvadattābhiraputrasya and Abhirāṣya-eśvarasenasya. But these occur in a Sanskrit inscription while the legends on our coin are in Prākrit.
ruler is more with the later kings of this dynasty than with the earlier ones as indicated in the Purāṇas. But the blank reverse of the coin certainly attests its early age. The early forms of sa and ra which are only slightly developed forms of those of the Sīri-Sāta coins, and the primitive i sign (a short curve) stamp the coin as an early one in the series. No doubt the elephant is better executed but this is not without a parallel; the lion on Sātakaṇi II's coins is better executed than that on Sākasena's coins.

His reign: Extent of his kingdom

The coin, like the inscriptions, bears witness to a growing empire. In his time the Sātavahana power would seem to have extended as far north-east as the modern Central Provinces. It is hazardous to build too much on the provenance of a single coin. It is even significant that Sātakaṇi I and II struck potin coins, and potin coins are found “exclusively in the Chanda District of the Central Provinces.” The Purāṇas are agreed that Āpīlaka ruled for 12 years (daśa dve or dvādaśa) and that he was the son of Lambodara.

Hāla

From Āpīlaka to Hāla (8th and 17th in the Purānic lists respectively), we have a period of absolute darkness, and the Purānic Sātavahana kings between them are to us mere names. But it is probable that fresh evidence like the Āpīlaka coin may not only confirm the order in the Purānic list but also open a vista into the period.

Hāla: Meaning of the name

The king is mentioned by his name in the Purāṇas, the Saptātakam, Līlāvatī, Abhidhānacintāmaṇi, and Desināmamālā. In the last two works mentioned, Hemacandra considers Hāla as a variation of Sālāhāna and Sātavāhana. In the Gāthāsaptāṭati the

63. The Sanskrit form as given in the Purāṇas is the same as the Prākṛt form on the coins.
   Like sāmī Sīri-Pulumāvi, Āpīlaka does not bear the name Sātakaṇi. Unlike other Sātavāhana kings he has the prefix 'siva' in addition to 'siri' (Śiva=auspicious).
64. Abhidhānacintāmaṇi, V. 712. 
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king under mention is called Hāla, and Sātavāhana. Rājaśekhara also calls him Hāla and Sātavāhana. Hemacandra gives Kuntala and Cauricinda as synonyms of Hāla. But we know from the Purāṇas that Kuntala and Hāla are the names of two different kings. On coins and inscriptions Sātakaṇi is abbreviated into Sāta, Sāti, Sada and Sātaka. No instance of the abbreviation of Sātavāhana is to be found. Hāla cannot then be a variation of Sātavāhana. It can therefore be considered as a variation of Sātakaṇi only. Sāta and Sāti are contractions of Sātakaṇi. The form Hātakaṇi occurs on coins; and la is sometimes used for ta. Sātakaṇi as a personal name is borne by many a king in the line.

The reign of Hāla introduces us to an epoch of literary activity. From inscriptions we know that the official language under the Sātavāhanas was Prākṛt. The works attributed to or to the time of Hāla show that the Sātavāhanas encouraged the use of Prākṛt in literature. In this respect they played a part opposite to the part played by the Kṣatrapas. Only in the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta at Nāsik and Kārlā do we have a mixture of Sanskrit. The Sātavāhana son-in-law got some Sanskrit from his father-in-law, and his wife uses Sanskrit in her inscription at Kanheri. But the official records of Gotamiputra and his son Puḷumāvi II at Nāsik and Kārlā are in pure Prākṛt.

Gāthāsaptāsāti (700 verses in seven chapters), an anthology of erotic verses in Āryā metre and in Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṛt is said to have been compiled by Hāla. Hāla evidently worked on the basis of an earlier anthology by a certain Kavivatsala and unified and embellished it considerably, retaining the names of the original composers in some cases, and adding other verses of his own. The work must have undergone several changes at other hands in subsequent times as its numerous recensions testify. But there is no doubt that its kernel dates from the first or second century A.D. and that it shows the previous existence of a considerable body of lyrical literature in Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṛt. In the maṅgala or introductory verse adoration is paid to Paśupati or Śiva. Although the verses are said to have been composed by Hāla alone, the commentator’s notes men-

65. Deśānāmanālā, 8, 66.
66. Ibid., ii, 36, iii, 7.
67. It is however to be noted that the Nāneghat record is not in pure Prākṛt as is often imagined. It is in mixed dialect, e.g., prajapatino (1.1), apratihatacakrasa (1.2), bhāriya, (1.4), and caritabrahmacāriya.
tion the following poets as contributors to the work: Bodissa, Culluha, Amaraja, Kumārila, Makarandasesa and Śrīrāja. Verses from this work are quoted in Dhanika’s commentary on the Daśarūpaka, in the Sarasvatī Kanṭhābharaṇa and in the Kāvyaprakāśa. Bāna evidently refers to this work when he says “Sātavāhana made an immortal refined treasure (kośa) of song adorned with fine expressions of character like jewels.” Merutuṅga in his Prabandhacintāmaṇi tells us of Sātavāhana of Pratiṣṭhāna who devoted himself to collecting the compositions of all great poets and wise men; he bought four gathās for forty million gold pieces and had a book made which was a kośa of the gathās that he had collected.

Events of his reign

Lilāvati throws some light on the events of Hāla’s reign. A theme in the work is the military exploits of Hāla’s Commander-in-chief Vijayanaṃda in Ceylon on behalf of his master. The king of the Śrīṅgala dvipa by name Silamegha had a daughter by name Lilāvati by his gāndharva wife Saraśrī. She lived near Sapta Godāvarī Bhimam which is identified with modern Drākṣārāma. After his military exploits Vijayanaṃda camped with his troops at Sapta Godāvarī Bhimam, and came to learn all about Lilāvati. After his return to the capital, he narrates the whole story to his king. Hāla then proceeds to the place, kills the demon Bhīṣaṇa and marries Lilāvati. After visiting the residence of her father the count returned to Pratiṣṭhāna in Svabhukti viṣaya.

70. Harṣascarita, Trans. by Cowell and Thomas, p. 2.
CHAPTER IV

THE LATER SĀTAVĀHANAS

(a) Gotamīputa Sīri-Sātakaṇi

(i) Metronymics:—Gotamīputa Sīri-Sātakaṇi is the first known Sātavāhana king to bear a metronymic.\(^1\) If Sātakaṇi of the Sānchi inscription is a king later than the sixth in the Purānic lists the early Sātavāhanas would not seem to have borne metronymics. Nearly all the successors of Gotamīputa Sīri-Sātakaṇi, known to us through lithic records, bear metronymics.\(^2\) It may be noted at the outset that the Sātavāhana metronymics, like those in many primitive communities, were apparently an institution for regulation of marriages and not for descent of property, for the kingdom was, as is shown elsewhere, transmitted in the male line.\(^3\)

The Sātavāhana metronymics are derived from Vedic gotras. Gotamīputa means the son of Gotamī or of a lady belonging to the Gotama gotra.\(^4\) Vāsiṭhiputa means the son of a Vāsiṭhi. Mādhāriputa means the son of a Mādhari.\(^5\) It has not been pointedly emphasized by scholars, that the Sātavāhanas and their successors in eastern Deccan, the Ikṣvākus, bear metronymics derived from only the three Vedic gotras mentioned above. The Ikṣvāku records offer an explanation for this curious feature. The institution of cross-cousin marriages especially with the father’s sister’s daughter was the cause. Occasionally a wife might be taken from a new

---

1. After the materials for a discussion of the views of Bühler and Cunningham had been collected and presented by me, D. R. Bhandarkar’s criticism of the old theory appeared in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXII, pp. 30 ff. I have made use of a few of his ideas.

2. The exceptions are Rājaṇ Sivamaka Sada of an Amarāvati inscription and Puṣumāvi of the Myākadoni inscription.


5. The Sātavāhanas bear a personal name, or a surname, or both, along with the metronymics: Gotamīputa Sīri-Sātakaṇi, Vāsiṭhiputa Cāda Sātakaṇi, Gotamīputa Sīri-Yaṇa, etc. We cannot accept Prof. Bhandarkar’s remark that he knows of no instance where the metronymic alone without the personal name is mentioned. In some Andher Stūpa inscriptions (Lüders, List, Nos. 680, 681, 682 and 683) Vāchiputa and Gotiputa occur unaccompanied by a personal name.
family, e.g., Vāsiṣṭhiputra Śrī-Sātakarṇi married the daughter of a Mahārāja of Ujjain, evidently a Western Kṣatrapa.

It is interesting to note that the feudatories and the successors of the Sātavāhanas in eastern Deccan also bear metronymics. An inscription at Kārlā belonging to the first century B.C. mentions a Mahāraṭhi Gotiputra. A Mahābhōja of the first century A.D. bears the metronymic Kocīputa. A Mahāraṭhi of the second century A.D. bears the metronymic Vāsiṣṭhiputa while his father bears the metronymic Kosikīputa. Ābhīra Īśvarasena of a Nāśik inscription bears the metronymic Māḍharīputa. The Ikṣvākus bear the Sātavāhana metronymics.

Even as early as Vedic times people bear metronymics like Kauśikīputra, Kautṣīputra, Ālambāpīputra, and Vaiyagrahapadīputra. Pāli canonical literature calls Ajātasattu a Vedehiputta. But it is from Malwa that we get a good crop of metronymics. Two inscriptions from Sāṇcī Stūpa III and an inscription from Satdhāra Stūpa II mention a saint Sāriputa. In another Sāṇcī inscription an artisan under a Sātakani is called Vāsiṣṭhiputa. In two inscriptions from the same place a Mogalīputra (Maudgalyāputra) and a Kosikīputa, both of whom are Buddhist saints, are mentioned. In a Barhut inscription of the second century B.C. a Vāsiṣṭhiputa Velāmitā is mentioned. In another inscription, which begins with 'Sugānaṁ rāje. . . .' a king is called Gotiputa. But his father and son bear the Vedic gotra metronymics Gāgīputa and Vātśiputa. A Bēnsagar inscription reveals a Kāśiputa (Kāsikīputra or Kāśīputra) Bhāgabhadrā, perhaps a ruler of Ujjain in the time of Antalkidas. It is also worthy of note that some Pītalāhrā cave inscriptions of the third century B.C. mention a royal physician by

10. Vedic Index, Keith and Macdonell, q. v.
11. Barhut Inscriptions, Barua and Sinha, p. 2. Vaidehi means 'one who belonged to Videha.'
12. Lüders, List, Nos. 665 and 667.
13. Ibid., No. 346.
14. As has been suggested by Bühler Gotiputra is Sanskrit Gauptiputra, 'son of a lady of the Gupta race or clan.' Dr. Bhandarkar has suggested that Kotiputa of a Sonari Stupa II inscription (Lüders, No. 158) may be derived from 'Kota' the name of a ruling family whose coins have been found round about Delhi and in the eastern Punjab (EI, Vol. XXII, p. 35).
name Vachiputa (Vatsiputra) Magila. In the case of Malwa metronymics we are thus able to trace three classes of metronymics derived from (a) locality (b) race or clan (c) Vedic gotras; and these seem to be used as indifferently as Satavahanas and non-Satavahanas metronymics are used among Maharathis of western Deccan.

How did the institution of metronymics enter into the Satavahanas family? As metronymics are borne by the later Satavahanas and not by the early Satavahanas, surely it is not the result of the change of father-kin into mother-kin. To go further we have only circumstantial evidence to depend upon. Like the early Satavahanas the early Maharathis bear no metronymics. Later Maharathis and later Satavahanas bear them, and the Maharathis and the Satavahanas were matrimonially connected. The Mahatalavaras who are feudatory nobles under the Iksvaku and are matrimonially connected with the latter, bear Iksvaku metronymics. The Iksvaku, originally servants of the Satavahanas, certainly got their metronymics from the Satavahanas, for do they not bear the Satavahana metronymics and are not metronymics quite foreign to the Andhradesa? The Abhira servants of the Satavahanas also bear metronymics. From these facts two conclusions emerge. The feudatory nobles under the Satavahanas bear Satavahana metronymics and the Satavahanas and the Iksvaku are matrimonially connected with their feudatories and with one another. In the case of the Maharathis it is not clear whether they gave it to the royal family, or got it from them; for, the first Maharahti to bear a metronymic would on palaeographical evidence have to be assigned to the first century B.C. But, in other cases it is clear that the Satavahanas transmitted their metronymics through the channel of marriage as the Iksvaku records unequivocally show. The question then arises,

15. CTI, Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7; Pl. xlv.
16. "Whereas a system of father-kin once established is perfectly stable never exchanged for mother-kin, the system of mother-kin is on the other hand unstable being constantly liable to be exchanged for father-kin." Frazier, Totemism and Exogamy, Vol. IV, p. 31.
17. Naneughat Inscriptions.
18. The dynasties that succeeded the Iksvaku in the Andhradesa do not know metronymics.
20. It has not been noted that while in many cases metronymics and the father's name are mentioned (personal name or gotra name), e.g., in the Barhut inscription referred to above, in all the later Satavahana records,
could they not have got metronymics through the same channel? It has been shown, that the inscriptions of an early period in the Paithân region and in East and West Malwa, mention metronymics. West Malwa came under Sâtavâhana sway in the first decades of the second century B.C., and East Malwa some time between 175 and 125 B.C. It may be that marriages between the Sâtavâhana and Kûṣatriya noble families, more probably in Malwa, gave these metronymics to the Sâtavâhanas.

Bühler held that “the usage of calling sons after their mothers was caused not by polyandria as some Sanskritists have suggested but by the prevalence of polygamy, and it survives among the Rajputs to the present day” and that the surnames of the Sâtavâhana queens which are derived from Vedic gotras and which form the metronymics borne by their children were originally the gotras of the Purohitas of the royal or noble families, from which the queens were descended and kings were affiliated to them for religious reasons as the Śrautasūtras indicate.

The title ‘ekabahânaśa’ applied to Gotamiputra Siri-Sâtakaṇi and the adoption of metronymics derived from Vedic gotras need not mean that the Sâtavâhanas were Brahmans. D. R. Bhandarkar objects to Senart’s translation of ‘ekabahânaśa’ as ‘the unique Brähmana,’ and adopts that of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, i.e., ‘ekabrahmanyaśya,’ ‘the only protector of Brahmans’ and the epithet ‘ekabrahmanyaśya’ applied to Viravarma on the Pîkira grant and to Mâdhavavarma in his Polamûru grant makes Bhandarkar’s interpretation more acceptable. There is, however, no difficulty in looking upon even ‘ekabrahmanyaśya’ as an eulogistic expression. That the Sâtavâhanas were Kûṣatriyas is shown by the fact that Gotami Balasîri styles herself as one who fully worked out the ideal of Râjaśî’s wife. According to the Viśṇu Purâṇa, there are three kinds of rṣis, Devarṣis, ‘sages who are demigods also,’ Brah-

the father’s name is not mentioned at all. In Nâsik No. 2 Vâsiṭhiputa Pulunâvi refers to his father in the expression pitupatiyo (t.1.11) but does not mention his name. In the early Sâtavâhana records, the father is mentioned, e.g., Nâneghâṭ inscription and the Nâsik inscription of the grand-daughter of Mahâ-Hakusiri. In the Nâgârjunâkonḍa inscriptions, ladies usually mention their mothers, brothers and nephews. Only twice is the father’s name mentioned (Inscriptions, H & L.)

22. Ibid., p. 60 t. 1. 10.
maṛśis, 'sages who are sons of Brahmins' and Rājarśis, 'Kṣatriya princes who have adopted a life of devotion.' If the Sātavāhanas were Brahmins it would be difficult to explain the absence of gotra name in their early records especially in the Naṇēghāt record which gives an account of the sacrifices performed by a Sātavāhana king and queen.  

It may be pointed out that this theory is contradicted by the expression 'khatiya dapa madanasā' applied to Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi in Nāsik No. 2 itself. According to Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar 'Khatiya' (Kṣatriya) refers not to the Kṣatriya caste but to a tribe, the Xathroi of Arrian, placed on the confluence of the Chenab and the Indus, and the Kṣatriyas of Kauṭilya, Manu Smṛti and Ptolemy. In his Gīrṇār inscription Rudradāman refers to the reinstatement of deposed kings and the defeats he inflicted on the contemporary Sātakaṇi. If these were the descendants of feudatories of Naḥapāna dethroned by Gautamiputra, might not 'khatiya' of the Nāsik record refer to the Kṣatriya princes deposed by Gautamiputra?

The results of the foregoing discussion may be summarised as follows:—The Sātavāhanas were Kṣatriyas and bore the gotras of their mothers. They got this institution of tracing descent by mothers through intermarriages with Kṣatriya families in certain localities. The system was one for the regulation of marriages and not for descent of property. The system of cross-cousin marriages explains the occurrence of only a few gotra names along with the Sātavāhana names.

26. In some recensions of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Śūdra heads the list of Andhra kings, instead of Simuka; this is obviously a mistake, for the numerous sacrifices performed by Sātakaṇi preclude us from looking upon Sātavāhanas as Śūdras, for according to Manu, the Veda is never to be read in the presence of a Śūdra (iv, 99) and for him no sacrifice is to be performed (iii, 78).

Brahmins also bear metronymicms. The Buddhist teacher Vasubandhu, the son of a Brahman of the Kauśika family, was named Bi-lu-ci Vetsa. Bi-lu-ci was his mother's name and 'vetsa' signifies 'son' (IA, Vol. IV, p. 143). Two inscriptions from Māḷavalli (Lüders, List Nos. 1195 and 1196) mention Kosikiputa Siri-Nāgadatta of the Kondāmāna family and of the Kauṇḍinya gotra and Hārītiputa Kondāmāna of the Kauṇḍinya gotra. In a Nāsik record (Lüders, List, No. 1131), a Brahman is called a Vārāhīputra.
(ii) Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi and the Kṣaharātas

In Nāsik No. 2 Gotamiputa is spoken of as the destroyer of the Śakas, Yavanas and Pahlavas and as the exterminator of the ‘Khalcharāta-vasa’. The Jogalthembi hoard has brought to light numerous coins of Kṣaharāta Nahapāna, of which have been restruck by Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi. Nāsik No. 4 and Kārlā No. 19 show him as engaged in conquests. The Sātavāhana records at Nāsik and Kārlā show that the Nāsik and Poona Districts, Ākara, Avanti, Kukura, Suraṭha and Anūpa countries, which, on epigraphical and numismatic evidence, would seem to have been included in Nahapāna’s kingdom, were conquered by Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi.

Kṣaharāta inroads into Sātavāhana dominions

According to tradition preserved in the Kālakācārya Kathānaka, the Śaka invasion of Western India and Ujjain took place some years before the Vikrama era. After some time the Śakas are said to have been driven from Ujjain by Vikramāditya, only to return in 78 A.D. The identification of the Śakas of the Kālaka legends with the Kṣaharātas is rendered difficult by the fact that while the son-in-law of Nahapāna is called a Śaka, Nahapāna and Bhūmaka are nowhere so called. Says Rapson, “It is possible that the Kṣaharātas may have been Pahlavas and the family of Caṇṭana Śakas.” But that they were “of foreign, i.e. non-Indian nationality is certain.” In later Indian tradition they might have figured as Śakas, much like the Kuśāṇas. But it is highly improbable that the Kṣaharātas are included in the 18 Śakas figuring in the Purāṇas as the successors of the Āndhra Sātavāhanas; these eighteen Śaka rulers are doubtless the kings of the Caṇṭana line who ruled up to the time when the earliest Matsya account was closed according to Pargiter, C. 255 A.D.

27. Chaharada, Chaharata, Khaharāta, Khakharāta are various Prākrit forms of Kṣaharāta.
29. CII, Vol. II, xxvi, xxvii. Says Sten Konow, “I cannot see the slightest reason for discrediting this account as is usually done.”
31. Ibid.
32. Vide infra.
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Bhūmaka

The earliest known member of the dynasty of Naḥapāṇa is Kṣatrapa Bhūmaka, known to us from coins only. According to Rapson, considerations of type and fabric of coins and of the nature of the coin legends leave no room for doubting that Bhūmaka preceded Naḥapāṇa. There is, however, no evidence to show the relationship between them. But the forms of Brāhmī and Kāroṣṭhi letters on their coins make a long interval impossible. According to Bhagavanlal Indrajit, the fact that Naḥapāṇa’s coins are found in ‘the costing regions of Gujerat, Kathiawad and sometimes in Mālwā’ proves the Kṣaharāta conquest of Mālwā from the Sātavāhanas and the establishment of Kṣaharāta power in western India. One coin of Bhūmaka comes from Puṣkhar near Ajmer.33

Naḥapāṇa

On coins he bears the title rājā, and in inscriptions those of Kṣatrapa and Mahākṣatrapa. The inscriptions of his time, his coins and his titles prove the extension of Kṣaharāta power over fresh territory34 including north Mahārāṣṭra, the heart of the Sātavāhana empire. The Sātavāhana power must have been confined to the territory around and to the east of Paithān. We do not know how far Naḥapāṇa succeeded in the south, though it seems probable that portions of southern Mahārāṣṭra passed under his sway and had to be reconquered by Gautamiputra. The Periplus has preserved something of the Kṣaharāta-Sātavāhana struggle in the statements, that the Kingdom of Mambanēs35 (Nambanus—Naḥapāṇa) began with Ariake and that the Greek ships coming into the Sātavāhana port of Kalyān were diverted to Barygaza.36

34. Vide supra.
35. JRAS, 1916, pp. 836-37. Kennedy says, “the MS is so illegible that it is impossible to restore his (the ruler of Ariake’s) name with any confidence. It has been read as Mambaros, Mambaros, and Mambanos. Fabricius says that only the final letters (Barou) are certain. Boyer proposed to read Mambanos, and in an essay full of learning and acuteness identified him with Naḥapāṇa ……….” (JA, July-Aug. 1897, pp. 120-51) Kennedy thinks that like Pandion and Kerebotros the name of the ruler of Ariake may be a general designation. But Sandanes (Sundara) and Saraganes (Sātakārṇi) are personal names. Dr. Fleet has shown how Naḥapāṇa could have been misread into Mambanes (JRAS, 1907, p. 1043 n. 2).
(iii) Comparative Chronology of Gotamiputa Satakani and Nahapana

Prof. Rapson refers the dates in Nahapana's inscriptions (years 41, 42, 45 and 46) to the Saka era (78 A.D.). According to him the evidence of Nahapana's coins restruck by Gotamiputa Siri-Satakani, Naisik No. 2 and Naisik No. 4 issued from a victorious camp, and the ascertained date (S. 72) of Rudradaman show that Gotamiputa was the conqueror of Nahapana. "... it would seem improbable that Nahapana's reign could have extended much beyond the last recorded year 46=124 A.D. Gautamiputra's conquest of Nahapana seems undoubtedly... to have taken place in the 18th year of his reign. We therefore have the equation:--Gautamiputra's year 18=124 A.D., or 124 A.D.+x. On this synchronism, on the recorded regnal dates in the inscription of other Andhra sovereigns, and on the known date 72=150 A.D. of Rudradaman as Mahakshatrapa rests at present the whole foundation of the later Andhra chronology." 37

Cunningham proposed to refer the dates in Usavadata's and Ayama's inscriptions to the Vikrama era; Rapson objects to it and quotes, "the empirical remark" of Kielhorn that "in the majority of the Saka dates the term year is rendered by varsha" and that in "the inscription of the Western Ksatrapas.... the word for 'year' everywhere is varsha ...." 38

It may be noted here that the unit figure in Karla No. 19 read as 8, by Rapson has been read as 4 by Buhler. Senart thinks that it may be any number between 4 and 9. 39 A study of the inscription from the stone itself and of an impression of it taken by me, shows that 7 is more probable than any other figure. No doubt it would then be a later form of the symbol for seven. But it is certainly not 8 as assumed by Rapson or 4 as read by Buhler since it is quite unlike the symbols for 8 and 4. 40 This would show that Gautamiputra's conquests were accomplished at least in part in or before the year 17.

Since Rapson wrote, the Andhau inscriptions of Cashtana and Rudradaman's time (year 52) have been studied and edited by

40. The symbol for 4 appears in the same inscription.
scholars like D. R. Bhandarkar and R. D. Banerji. The Andhau inscriptions shatter the theory of the Gotamiputa-Nahapāna synchronism. Scholars are not agreed as to whether the inscriptions should be referred to the joint reign of Caśṭana and Rudradāman, or the reign of Rudradāman. In all the four inscriptions we have: 'Raño Caśṭanasa Ysāmotika-putrasa, raño Rudradāmasa Jayadāmasa putrasa vasa 52...’ Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar originally thought that pautrasya (which the construction would not allow us to insert) had been omitted. But later he states that “Mr. R. C. Majumdar of the Calcutta University has kindly offered the suggestion that the date had better be referred to the conjoint reign of Caśṭana and Rudradāman,” R. D. Banerji objects: “Apart from the possibility of such an event in India, nobody having ever thought or tried to prove conjoint reigns of two monarchs except Messrs Bhandarkar, there is sufficient evidence in the Andhau inscriptions themselves to prove that the author of the record was quite ignorant as to the exact relationship between Chāshtana and Rudradāman... the Andhau inscriptions are the only records known which mention Chāshtana or Rudradāman as Rājās and not as Mahā-Kṣatrapas, The only possible explanation of this is that in a remote place like Andhau on the Rann of Cutch the people were not aware of the new titles of the new dynasty of rulers, titles on which Rudradāman set great store......The cause of the absence of any word or phrase indicating the relationship between Chāshtana and Rudradāman now becomes clear.” There is many a weak link in this argument. In the genealogical portion in all other inscriptions of the Western Kṣatrapas of the Caśṭana line, the great-grandfather is mentioned first, then the grandfather, then the father and then the son. In the Andhau inscription the names of Caśṭana and Rudradāman precede those of their fathers. One cannot believe that the people of Cutch who knew the relationship between Ysāmotika who does not seem to have been even a Kṣatrapa and Caśṭana did not know the relationship between the latter and Jayadāman. On his coins Nahapāna is known as ‘rājan’ only. Does it mean that the people were ignorant of his titles of Kṣatrapa and Mahā-Kṣatrapa which he bears in the inscriptions of his son-in-law and minister? The objection to the joint rule of Caśṭana and Rudradāman does not seem to be well taken; for as Rapson has observed: “Among the later Western Kṣatrapas we find

43. EI, Vol. XVI, pp. 22-23.
the father and son ruling concurrently as Mahākṣatrapa and Kṣatrapa." This would explain why Jayadāman bears only the title of Kṣatrapa.44

If then Caśṭana was a Mahākṣatrapa in the year 52 (130 A.D.) with Rudradāman as Kṣatrapa, he must have been a Mahākṣatrapa during the reign of his son Jayadāman as Kṣatrapa. As on the testimony of the coins Caśṭana was a Kṣatrapa for some time, if Nahapāna’s dates are referred to the Śaka era, a three years’ interval between Nahapāna and Caśṭana is the utmost that can be postulated. Even taking for granted that Nahapāna was defeated in year 46 itself (124-25 A.D.), we are led to the paradoxical conclusion that a year after the rootiong out of Khakharāta race and the destruction of the Śakas, Pahlavas and Yavanas, Caśṭana was on the scene avenging Śaka defeat.45 The Nāsik record of Balasirī which mentions in such glorious terms Gotamiputra’s conquests of Anūpa, Ākara, Avanti, Suraṭha, Kukura, Asaka and Mulaka would become a record of a fleeting conquest. Was then the ‘Sātavāhanakulayasa-pratiṣṭhāpana’ referred to in an inscription incised 25 years after the event such a shortlived glory?46 Ptolemy’s (139 A.D.) statement that Ozēne was the capital of Tiastanes (Caśṭana), and the Andhau inscriptions which show that Cutch was in possession of Caśṭana and Rudradāman in 130 A.D., are clear proofs of the re-establishment of Śaka power in the lands between Mālvā and Cutch at least.47 It has been pointed out by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri

44. Rapson’s view that between the reigns of Caśṭana and Rudradāman there was an interval during which there was no Mahākṣatrapa and that this may have been the result of a defeat, is no doubt partly based upon the fact that Jayadāman bears only the title of Kṣatrapa.

45. The theory by Bühler in JRAS 1890 that Nahapāna and Caśṭana were contemporaries was abandoned by him later. ASWI, Vols. IV and V.

46. Says Rapson, op cit., xxxvii: “Rudradāman’s conquest took place c. 150 A.D., and before the 19th year of Puluṃāvi. The inscription of Balasirī seems to be a record of glory which has only recently passed away.”

47. R. D. Banerji (JRAS, 1917, pp. 286-87) not only holds with Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar (JBBRAS, Vol. XXIII, pp. 68-9) that Rudradāman had conquered all the dominions mentioned in the Gīrnār prāṣasti before Ś. 52, but also says that it would not have been possible for Rudradāman to conquer Aparānta (N. Konkan) without conquering north Mahārāṣṭra (Nāsik and Poona districts). We cannot subscribe to these views. The former lacks conclusive proof. The identification of Mulaka and Asmaka with N. Mahārāṣṭra, and the absence of their mention in the Gīrnār prāṣasti are conclusive arguments against the latter.
that there is nothing in the inscriptions of Pułumāvi's time to show that his dominions had shrunk so much in their area as the Andhau and Girnār inscriptions would show. The silver coin of Vāsiṭhiputa [Hi]ru Hāṭakaṇि (or ni), (Siri-Sātakaṇि) which like similar coins of Siri-Yañā would seem to have been current in Aparānta, and the Kanheri inscription of Rudradāman's daughter, prove that Aparānta was held by the son-in-law of Rudradāman, a successor of Pułumāvi.

The chronological scheme of Rapson requires that Vāsiṭhiputa sāmī Siri-Pułumāvi should be the son-in-law of Rudradāman and the Sātakaṇi of the Girnār inscription twice defeated in fair fight by him. I was fortunate enough to trace in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, a silver coin of Vāsiṭhiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi; this closely imitates as regards type, size and weight the silver coinage of the Western Kṣatrapas. And we have the Kanheri inscription of Vasiṣṭhiputra Sātakaṇi's queen, the daughter of Mahākṣatrapa Rudra(dāman). These make it difficult for us to identify a king who, on coins and in inscriptions, is called Sātakaṇi, with Pułumāvi who does not bear the surname Sātakaṇi either in inscriptions or on coins. He must therefore be a successor of Pułumāvi. In the Purānic lists Śivaśārī, the Vasiṣṭhiputa siva Siri-Sātakaṇi of the coins, figures as the successor of Pułumāvi (perhaps his brother). As 'siva' and 'sirī' are honorific prefixes, no insuperable difficulty is involved in the identification of Vasiṣṭhiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi with Vasiṣṭhiputa siva Siri-Sātakaṇi. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has rightly pointed out that it is improbable that Pułumāvi, who according to Ptolemy was a contemporary of Caṣṭana, married the latter's great grand-daughter.

The Sātakaṇi of the Girnār inscription

As Rudradāman is said to have defeated Sātakaṇi not distantly related to him sambandhāvidūrayā (ratayā), the Girnār Sātakaṇi is to be sought for in one of the successors of siva Siri-Sātakaṇi, not far removed from the latter in point of time. In the Purānic lists Śivaskanda Sātakaṇi (the Sivamaka Sada of an Amaṅravati inscription) and Siri-Yañā figure as his successors. The difficulty in identifying the Girnār Sātakaṇi with Siri-Yañā is that Pułumāvi would then have to be placed between 86 and 110 A.D., while the contemporaneity of Caṣṭana and Pułumāvi mentioned by Ptolemy would bring Pułumāvi to 130 A.D. at least. So the Girnār Sātakaṇi must be Sivamaka (Śivaskanda) Sātakaṇi, probably a brother or nephew of śiva Śiri-Sātakaṇi. Working
backwards with the ascertained regnal periods of these Satavahana kings we get the following scheme of chronology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King's Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gotamiputra Satakani</td>
<td>82–106 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasišṭhiputra Pulumāvi</td>
<td>107–131 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiva Śrī-Satakarni</td>
<td>132–145 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivamaka Śada</td>
<td>146–153 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It now becomes still more impossible to place Nahapāna between 119 and 124 A.D.

Then how are the dates in the inscriptions of Nahapāna’s son-in-law and minister to be interpreted? In 1908 R.D. Banerji revived a point made by Prof. Bhandarkar years before that Uṣavadāta’s inscriptions are palaeographically earlier than that of Śodāsa of the year 72, and added, ‘it is extremely probable that as Nahapāna is prior to Śodāsa the dates in his inscriptions refer to the era in which the dates in the inscriptions of the Northern satraps are dated.’ Subsequently he refers these dates to the regnal years of Nahapāna. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has lately revived Cunningham’s theory that Nahapāna’s dates must be referred to the Vikrama era. His arguments are as follows:

The letters of Uṣavadāta’s inscriptions resemble those of the inscription of the Northern Satrap Śodāsa and Bühler admits that in the former southern peculiarities are wanting. The discus, arrow and thunderbolt on the coins of Nahapāna and Bhūmaka remind us (as V.A. Smith has pointed out) of the coins of Hāgana and Hāgāmāśa, the Northern Satraps. In EI. Vol. XIV, Dr. Sten Konow has referred the year in Śodāsa’s record to the Vikrama era. Rev. H. R. Scott has observed that the letters on the coins of Nahapāna belong to the near middle of the period from 350 B.C. to 350 A.D. “... the state of Kharosthi on Nahapāna’s coins... seems now to secure for him a place distinctly earlier than Caṇṭana.” The Uṣavadāta bha, va, and sa, a and ka with longer verticals than those of Śodāsa a and ka, the more angular ja, da with better curved back and the ornate i sign, show that Uṣavadāta alphabet was later than Śodāsa alphabet. Conclusions based on similarity of alphabets and the northern affinities of Nahapāna’s family cannot be final; as Sten Konow has observed, “We do not know for certain in which era the Śodāsa inscription of Sam 72 is dated. I do not think it can be the same as

48. IA, Vol. XXXVII, p. 43.
in the Taxila plate of Saññ 78. I think that Patika, who issued that
record, is identical with the Mahakshatrapa Padika of the Mathurā
city which mentions Suḍāsa, i.e., Sūḍāsa as Kshatrapa." A
comparison of coin legends with stone inscriptions cannot yield safe
conclusions. The palaeography of the Andhau inscriptions renders an
interval of more than 160 years between the Girnār inscription and
the inscription of Uśavadā, as Prof. Nilakanta Sastri would postu-
late, too long. Noteworthy are the form of a ka ra and pa which ap-
proach those of Uśavadā alphabet. The state of Khaрослī on
Caṣṭana's coins does not point to a long interval between them, for,
as on Nahapāna's coins, and on the silver coins struck by Caṣṭana as
Kṣatrapa, Khaрослī is used to transliterate the Brāhmī legends in
full. It is only on coins struck by Caṣṭana as Mahāksatrapa that
Khaрослī shows decline—it is used only for the genitive of the king's
name. This fact points to a rapid decline of Khaрослī rather than to
a long interval.51

The development of the Brāhmī alphabet in the Nāsik and
Poona districts in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. makes a long in-
terval between Nahapāna and Gautamiputra highly improbable.
According to Bühler there is a striking similarity between the al-
phabet of the Nāsik inscriptions of Gautamiputra Sātakaṇi and
Uśavadā.52 Prof. Nilakanta Sastri rejoins 'it is a similarity which
is only to be expected if the area of their location had been ruled
by the Khakharātas for some time before Gautamiputra recovered
it for the Sātavāhanas.'53 The Nāsik alphabet of Puḷumāvi's time
especially ca, ja, da, na, and na, (with a slightly curved base), ta,
bha, ya, ha (with a notch at the left), which is more developed
than the alphabet of Gotamiputra Sātakaṇi's inscriptions, deprives
this argument of its force. The Nāsik inscriptions of Gotamiputa
Siri-Yaṇa Sātakaṇi only three generations later than those of
Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi show letters of the ornate type. The Kārālā
inscription attributed to Gotamiputa Sātakaṇi is not only engraved
immediately below that of Uśavadā, but also shows only slightly
developed forms over those of Uśavadā's inscription (e.g., ta, pa,
bhi, va, ra and ma). In the inscriptions of the time of Puḷumāvi

51. According to Rapson on the copper coins of Nahapāna, only the name
Nahapāna in Brāhmī legend can be deciphered. "It is uncertain whether
or not this was accompanied by an inscription in Khaрослī characters." Op.
cit., cix.
53. JRAS, 1926, p. 652.
the ornamental type has appeared. The quick and distinct development from Gotamiputa to Puḷumāvi of the alphabets at Kārlā and Nāsik does not allow us to place a long interval between Nahapāna and Gotamiputa.

The Jogalthembi coins of Nahapāna, more than two-thirds of which are restruck by Gotamiputa, point to the same conclusion. If Gotamiputa defeated a remote successor of Nahapāna, we would have found in the hoard, coins of Nahapāna’s successors restruck by Gotamiputa. The coins of Bhūmaka show, that among the Kṣaharātas other princes than Nahapāna, if they existed, would have struck coins; and there is more point in restricking the coins of the vanquished ruler rather than those of a remote predecessor of his.

The village of Karajaka which is granted by Gotamiputa to the monks of the Kārlā caves is surely the Karajaka granted to them previously by Uṣavadāta. Nāsik No. 4 records the grant of a field in western Kakhādi, a field which was held by Uṣavadāta. Bühler and Bhagwanlal Indraji look upon ajakālakiyam in the phrase ‘ya khetam ajakālakiyam Usabhadatena bhūtam’ as a Prākṛt form of ajakāla (Sansk. adyakāla) and translate ‘the field which has been possessed by Rṣabhadatta up to the present time.’ Senart looks upon it as the name of the field.

Lüders’ No. 795 where Ajakālaka is the name of Yakṣa makes Senart’s suggestion extremely probable. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri denies that the Uṣavadāta of No. 4, the possessor of a single field, was the Uṣavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāna. But it is not impossible that Uṣavadāta held all the fields in the village and that Gotamiputa gave one field to the monks retaining the rest for himself.

56. It is, however, risky to look upon Uṣavadāta as a rare name, and identify all the Uṣavadātas of epigraphic records with the son-in-law of Nahapāna. ‘Datta’ as a name ending is very common and ‘Rṣabha’ often enters into the composition of names (EI, vol. XVI, p. 24; Lüders, List, Nos. 56, 69a). A Sālārwädi inscription (Sālārwädi is near Kārlā) mentions Uṣabhānaka native of Dhenukākata.

An inscription in a pillar of the Kārlā Cetiya cave records the donation of a pillar by Mitadevanaka, son of Uṣavadāta from Dhenukākata. According to Senart, the ‘mita’ in the name of the donor and that of Rṣabhadatta’s wife (i.e., Daksamitra) supplies “a link which may perhaps connect

H.A.—8
The guiding points in the determination of Kṣaharāṭa chronology are the short-lived reigns of Nos. 18, 19, 20 and 21 in the Pūrāṇic lists of the Andhras (44-54 A.D.) and reference to Mambanes in the Periplus; the kingdom of Mambanes (corrected by Schoff into Nambanus and identified with Nahapāṇa) is said to have begun with Ariake, which according to Lassen would represent the territory on either side of the gulf of Cambay. Scholars like K. P. Jayaswal have challenged this identification. But as Nahapāṇa is known to have ruled over Surāṣṭra and as the seaboard of the kingdom of Mambanes was, according to the Periplus, Surastrenea, and as the capital of Nambanus, viz., ‘Minnagara’ also shows Scythian or Śaka associations (Min=Scythian) this identification is highly probable, and Schoff has shown that a consideration of the authorities Roman, Parthian and Arabian fully supports 60 A.D. for the Periplus, and Nahapāṇa would seem to have been ruling 22 years before the accession of Gautamiputra Śrī-Sātakarna.

The question whether Nahapāṇa’s dates should be referred to an era or to his regnal years, is not then so important as it might be if we had no independent grounds to fix his date. The old view that it is dangerous to assume the existence of eras other than the Vikrama and Śaka eras is not accepted by Dr. Sten Konow. The years may then refer to an era which started somewhere in the closing years of the first century B.C., or in the beginning of the first century A.D. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has admirably met Rapson’s objection to referring the ‘vasa dates’ to any other than the Śaka era. He says, “......it must be noted that there are very few dates in these records, and even among these few, we are unable to trace any consistency in the manner of dating. An important inscription at Nasik is undated; only the year and month is mentioned in another, though the day of the month is also added elsewhere in the same inscription. The use of varsha for year does not seem to have been so rare in early dates that are not in the Śaka era.”

R. D. Banerji’s view that these dates must be referred to the regnal years of Nahapāṇa is supported by them.” The absence of the usual epithets applied to Nahapāṇa’s son-in-law makes the Uṣāvadāta of this inscription a different person. The pillar inscription and the Cetiya cave would seem to belong to the first century B.C.

57. JBORS, 1932, p. 9.
the numerous coins of Nahapāna and by the tradition preserved in the *Paṭṭāvali Gāthas* and Jinasena’s *Harivamśa* which assign a period 40 and 42 years respectively to Naravāhana (a corruption of Nahapāna).  

Rapson makes Nahapāna a feudatory of the Kuśānas, on the strength of the mention, in a Nāsik inscription of Uṣavadāta, of suvarṇa which according to him must refer to the gold currency of the Kuśānas “which we must suppose to have been current or prevalent in Nahapāna’s kingdom.” But suvarṇa as a coin was prevalent in India as early as the Vedic times; the suvarṇa under reference need not necessarily refer to the gold currency of the Kuśānas.

Prof. Bhandarkar has advanced another argument for connecting Nahapāna with the Kuśānas. To him the Kuśaṇa of Nāsik No. 12, “appears to have been (the name) given to the silver coinage of Nahapāna, because he issued it for his overlord who must have been known as Kuśaṇa i.e., Kushana.” He continues “Was there any Kushana king who was also known by the mere name Kushana? Certainly this must be the Kushana sovereign referred to in the Taxila scroll inscription of the year 136. I have elsewhere shown that he can be no other than Kujula Kadphises, or Kadphises I as he is also known.” Apart from the objections to kuśaṇa being a form of Kuśaṇa or Guśaṇa, the sense of the passage does not admit of Bhandarkar’s interpretation. In line 2 cvirika and kuśaṇamūla are mentioned together as the purpose for which the money was invested in a guild. In line 3 we have ‘cvirika-sahasrāni be 2000 ye paṭīke sate eto mama leṇe vasavathāna bhi-khunam visāya ekikasa cvirika bārasaka, yā sahasra prayutāni pāyuna-paṭīke sate ato kuśaṇamūla.’ But though the evidence cited for Kuśaṇa overlordship over Nahapāna cannot be relied upon, the chronological scheme adopted here makes Kuśaṇa overlordship not improbable (Kujula Kadphises 50-75 A.D.).

---

60. Rapson remarks (Op. cit., cx): “Pandit Bhagvānlāl Indrāji supposed that the portraits of the Nahapāna on the silver coins indicated a very long reign; but now that a vast number of specimens are available for comparison, it is clear that no such conclusion can be safely drawn from these representations of the king’s head. They cannot possibly have been portraits, in the true sense of the word, of any single individual.”

61. CIC, *Andhras and Western Ksatrapas*, clxxv.


63. IA, *Vol. XLVII*, p. 76.
(iv) Gotamiputa Sātakāni cannot be identified with Gotamiputa Vilīvāyakura of the coins

A number of lead and copper coins from Kolhāpur have revealed to us the names of 3 princes: on the evidence of restruck coins, the order would be as follows:

Vāsiṭṭhiputa Vilīvāyakura
Māḍhariputa Sivalakura
Gotamiputa Vilīvāyakura.

The current theories about these princes are far from being satisfactory. Says Rapson, Vilīvāyakura and Sivalakura "are probably local titles in the dialect of the district of Kolhapur . . . . The question remains whether these peculiar titles are to be regarded as the designations of members of the imperial Andhra Dynasty or of viceroys governing the district of Kolhapur. Although the question cannot be decided with certainty, the former view is perhaps the more probable, since there is some evidence to show that Andhra monarchs were known by different titles in the different divisions of their empire (cf. sup. § 48, 50)." Long ago Sir R. G. Bhandarkar said that Vilīvāyakura and Sivalakura are names of the feudatories whilst the metronymics are those of their suzerains. The metronymics attached to the names of Mahāraṭhis are not those of their suzerains—the Sātavāhanas. The father of a Mahāraṭhi who dates his inscription in the regnal years of Vāsiṭṭhiputa sāmi Sirī-Puḷumāvi, bears a metronymic not borne by the Sātavāhanas viz., Kosikiputa. 'Kura' as a name appears in Bhaṭṭiprōlū. Sivala as the name of a queen occurs in one of Barhut inscriptions, and at Amarāvati we come across an upāsikā Sivalā. La is a common ending in names, e.g., Bhadila, Bhāyila, Dronāla, Sivakhadila, Buddhila, Sarpila, and Rudrila. Vilavanakā is the name of a village. Regarding Ptolemy's mention of Puḷumāvi of Paṭānā and Baleokuros of Hippokura (identified by R. G. Bhandarkar with Vilīvāyakura), Rapson remarks that his Sirī-Puḷumāvi and Vilīvāyakura might be one and the same person. "A foreigner might be excused for not knowing, that in our own country, the Prince

64. lxxxvii-lxxxviii.
67. Cunningham, Stūpa of Bharhut p. 131; Lüders, List, No. 1268.
68. Lüders, List, Nos. 125a, 149a, 1124, 1247, 1292 and 1054.
69. EI, Vol. XV, pp. 41 and 43.
of Wales, the Earl of Chester and the Duke of Cornwall were the same person." But Ptolemy mentions the capital 'Hippokura' (a 'kura' ending in the name of the capital too!), which has been identified by Bhagwanlal Indraji with the modern Goḍabandar. To accuse a contemporary of ignorance we require strong proofs. In seeking to identify these princes with the Sātavāhana rulers Rapson places too much reliance on metronymics, yet we know that the Sātavāhana and Ikṣvāku metronymics were borne by their feudatories, the Mahāraṭhis and the Mahātalavaras. Rapson's identification upsets the order of Gotamīputa Sātakani and Vāsiṭhīputa Puḷumāvi among the Vilivāyakuras; and Māḍharīputa Sivalakura has no place between Gotamīputa Sātakani and Puḷumāvi in the Purānic lists. Prof. Rapson himself points out that the Ujjain symbol which is employed by all the later Sātavāhanas on all their coins is not found on the Kolhāpur coins and that the 'bow and arrow' on these coins is nowhere found on the Sātavāhana coins. To a certain extent the type (the tree within railing) and size of these coins (lead) resemble those of the Cūṭu and Mahāraṭhi coins.

The pieces of evidence which make it probable that they were feudatories of the Sātavāhanas are that one of the Vilivāyakuras was a contemporary of Puḷumāvi, that Gotamīputa's dominions extended as far south as Vaijayantī and that they used Sātavāhana metronymics. The title 'rājan' does not prevent them from having been feudatories, for Nahapāna, who was undoubtedly a feudatory, bears the title 'rājan'.

(v) Gotamīputa's empire

To return to Gotamīputa, he would seem to have wrested from the Kṣaharātas not only the ancestral dominions, but something more. The epithet 'Sātavāhana-kula-yasa-patithāpana-kara' applied to him is no idle boast, for before his reign, the Sātavāhana power would seem to have suffered considerable loss of territories. According to Rapson, the countries which are mentioned in Nāsik No. 2 as having been under his sway, "in no way represent the extent of his empire," "The names themselves are those of the kingdoms which had submitted to Gautamīputra". Rapson is evidently thinking of the Andhradesā. Not all the conquered kingdoms would seem to have been mentioned, e.g., S. Mahārāṣṭra as far south

as Vaijayantī (Nāṣik No. 4 speaks of the Vejayanti army as 'senāye Vejayamtiye'). Even so the extent of his kingdom is indicated by the mountains of which he is said to have been the lord—the western and eastern portions of the Vindhya range (Vijīha and Pāricāta), the Satpura hills extending through the middle of Berar nearly into west Bengal (Achavata), the northern and southern portions of the Western Ghāṣ (Sahya and Malaya respectively). There is then no epigraphic evidence to show that Gautamiputra's sway extended over the Andhradeśa.\(^{73}\) The reference to his chargers having drunk the waters of three oceans need not necessarily mean that his kingdom extended from the Arabian Sea to the Bay of Bengal.\(^{74}\) The most important countries mentioned are Asaka, Mulaka\(^{75}\) (Northern Mahārāṣṭra) Asika, Kukura (Eastern

\(^{73}\) A life-size statue of a person, in the Madras Museum Amarāvati collections, holding a lotus in the left hand, bears the inscription Gotami nama (ōṭ). From the dress we can infer that it is not a statue of the Buddha. Even supposing that the inscription records an adoration to Gotami, the mother of Gotamiputra Śrī-Sātakāni, it is possible that during the reign of Vāsithipūtā sāmi Śrī-Pulumāvi (when the Amarāvati Śtuāpa underwent alterations and perhaps enlargement) a statue of Gotamiputra Śrī-Sātakāni was set up; and from Nāṣik No. 2 (in which both grandson and grandmother have eulogised Gotamiputra Śrī-Sātakāni) we know that Gotami Balasirī was living in the 19th year of her grandson's reign.

\(^{74}\) In Bāna's Harṣacarita (Trans. Cowell and Thomas) the Sātavahana contemporary of Bhikkhu Nāgārjuna is styled "lord of the three oceans" (p. 252).

\(^{75}\) In the Sona-Nanda Jātaka (Fausboll, Vol. V, pp. 317, 24; and 318, 6), Assaka and Avanti are mentioned together (Assakāvamīt; Assakāvamīt ti Assaka raṭṭham va Avantiraṭṭham va etc.). For the precise identification of Assaka (Sansk. Āsmaka not Āvaka). Pāṇini mentions Āsmaka iv, i, 173) and Mulaka a clue comes from an unexpected quarter. Verse 1011 of the Sutta Nipāta (Alakassa Paṭīṭhahāna purimāni) mentions Paṭīṭhahana of Alaka and verse 977 mentions Alakā as a country in the neighbourhood of Assaka (Asaka), a country on the banks of the Godāvari. (So Assakassa visaye Alakassa samāsane vasi Godavirikāle uñce na ca phalena ca). But in three manuscripts (a MS in the Phayre collection in the India Office Library, a Burmese MS in the Royal Asiatic Society, London, and a MS in the Mandalay Collection of the India Office Library) it reads as Mulaka or Mulaka. Mulaka is made more probable by the following facts. Assaka and Mulaka are mentioned together in the Nāṣik No. 2. According to the Purāṇas Mulaka was the son of Āsmaka of the Ikṣvākū line. (Wilson, Viṃśa Purāṇa, p. 382). Paṭīṭhahana is modern Paithān on the banks of the Godāvari; as Assaka is said to have included Godāvari there is no doubt that N. Mahārāṣṭra, at least the Nāṣik district and the territory around Paithān, is to be identified with Assaka and Mulaka; see also IA, Vol. XLVII, p. 150 f.n.)
Rajputana) Ákara (East Malwa), Avanti (West Malwa), Suratha (Surastra), Anupa (a district in the upper Narmada), Vidarbha ("the western part of modern Berar and the valley country west of that") and Aparanta (N. Konkan).

(b) Pułumāvi II.

Gotamiputa was succeeded by his son Pułumāvi who according to the inscriptions would seem to have ruled for 24 years at least. The Puranas assign him a period of 28 years. Since they assign only 21 years to Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi who from inscriptions is known to have ruled for 24 years, it is probable that the Puranic total 49 has to be divided between them as 25 and 24 or 24 and 25.

Messrs R.G. and D.R. Bhandarkars’ theory of the conjoint rule of Gotamiputa Siri-Sātakaṇi and Pułumāvi

The theory of the conjoint rule of Pułumāvi and his father, which was proposed by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar long ago, did not find a single supporter. As it has been restated by Prof. Bhandarkar as late as 1914 and 1918, a discussion is necessary. Accordingly to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar the Puranic discrepancy in the matter of the duration of the Sātavahana dynasty (Mt. 460 years, Va. 411 years and Viṣṇu 300 years) is to be explained “by supposing that the longer period is made up by putting together the reigns of all the princes belonging to the several branches of the Andhrabhṛtya dynasty”. According to V. A. Smith this discrepancy arises on account of some of the Puranas omitting the Śuṅga and Kanva years (112 + 45) or the latter from the Sātavahana total. The other arguments of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar repeated by Prof. Bhandarkar are:

---

76. Pargiter: Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, p. 335.
77. For a detailed discussion of these names BG, Vol. XVI; El, Vol. VIII; Rapson: op. cit., and Bhandarkar’s EHD.
78. His name is spelt as Pułumāvi on coins and in Nāsik Nos. 3 and 20 and Kārlā No. 20; as Pułumāyi in Nāsik Nos. 1 and 2 and Kārlā No. 20; and as Pułumai in Nāsik No. 25. Pułumāvi would seem to be the right form to start from. Rapson thinks that Pułumāyi like Viḷḷvāyakura is a name whose meaning is not clear.
79. JBBRAS, Vol. XXXIII, Epigraphic Notes and Questions; IA, 1918, Dekhan of the Sātavāhana period.
81. ZDMG, 1902, p. 6.
(a) In Nāsik No. 2 dated in the 19th year of Pułumāvi II, Gotami Balasiri is called Mahārājamātā and Mahārājajapatimahi. This statement would be pointless if she were not both at one and the same time.

(b) Gotamiputa is called 'Dhanakaṭasāmi' (Dhānyakaṭakasvāmi) in No. 3 and Pułumāvi ruled at Paithān. It has been shown elsewhere that Dhanakaṭasamaniehi refers to Dhanakaṭa monks or samaṇas and that Dhanakaṭa cannot be a form of Dhamānakaṭaka. In No. 4 Gotamiputa is called 'Benākaṭakasāmi.' Every queen is the mother of a king and grandmother of a king. In the Nāṇeghāṭ record Sātakaṇi I is eulogised and yet he was dead when the record was incised. In the inscription Pułumāvi makes over the merit of the gift to his father in the expression 'pitupatiyo.' Such an application of merit can be made only in favour of a deceased person. As Prof. Nilakanta Sastri has asked, why should not the queen who refers to her son as one living (jīvasutāya) in No. 5 dated in the 24th year of Gotamiputa refer to him so in No. 2? According to M. Dubreuil the inscription is the funeral oration of a disconsolate mother.

(c) If it was a fact that Gautamiputra was dead when the cave temple was dedicated and Pułumāvi alone was reigning, we should expect to find the exploits of the latter also celebrated in the inscription, but there is not a word in praise of him. It is improbable that a king who had been dead for nineteen years should be highly extolled in the inscription and the reigning king altogether passed over in silence. It will be shown below that the cave with all its cells was planned even during the reign of Gotamiputa, but executed only in part. Balasiri completed the cave later and made it equal to the cave of Uṣavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāna, whose dynasty Gotamiputa had extirpated; then the train of thought suggested to a mother explains this puzzling fact.

The arguments adduced by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar are:

1. Since Pułumāvi is a contemporary of Caṭana, who died before year 52 (130 A.D.) and since the dates in the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta and Ayama are to be referred to the Śaka era, we should postulate a theory of conjoint rule if we are not to run into

82. Chap. II.
84. JRAS, 1926, The Later Sātavāhanas and the Śakas.
85. Nāsik No. 2.
chronological absurdities or impossibilities. Bhandarkar himself has admitted that Caśtana was living when the Andhau inscriptions were incised; it has been shown above that the inscriptions of Nahapāna's reign must belong to a time before 100 A.D.

2. If cave No. 3 was granted in the 19th year of Puḷumāvi's reign, and if in the year 24 his father Gautamiputra speaks of it as his own gift, is not the conclusion irresistible that Gautamiputra was living when the cave in question was made over to the Buddhist monks, i.e., in Puḷumāvi's 19th regnal year, and that the year 24 of the other inscription although it records a donation of Gautamiputra must be referred not to his, but to Puḷumāvi's reign? No. 2 dated in the 19th year of Puḷumāvi records a non-official or private grant by the queen, while No. 5 (dated in the 24th year) like No. 4 is an official grant. What stamp No. 4 and No. 5 as official records are the order of the king to the officer in charge of the district where the object of the grant lay, and the mention of the formalities connected with the grant, i.e., oral order, drafting, preparation of the charter, preservation in the archives of the State and delivery. Nāsik No. 2, where neither the order of the king nor the formalities connected with grants are mentioned, is then a non-official record. The grant of the cave and lands by Gotamiputa mentioned in Nos. 4 and 5 must be different from the grant of the same cave by Balasirī. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri has admirably pointed out that all official grants open with the order of the reigning king and end by giving the date, while in all private records (at Nāsik and Kārlā) the date is mention-ed at the beginning. He concludes that Nos. 4 and 5 must therefore be referred to Gotamiputa's reign. 86

But how can one cave be granted by two persons at different times? The statement that Balasirī made the cave equal to the mansion in Kailāsa and the plan of the cave give us the clue. Gotamiputa who emulates Uṣavadaṭa in his grant of lands to the Nāsik and Kārlā Buddhist monks would certainly have planned a cave as beautiful, perhaps more beautiful than Uṣavadaṭa's cave (and in general appearance and arrangement the Queen's cave resembles that of Uṣavadaṭa). According to Prof. Nilakanta Sastri, the raised verandah with a bench at the left end and two cells, one at the right and the other at the left end, show that the verandah with its two cells and the bench was a self-sufficient unit and was

86. Op. cit., p. 650. It may be pointed out that in private records of the Ikṣvāku period the date comes at the end.
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completed in or before the 18th year of Gotamiputa. The 18 cells in the interior, the verandah pillars, the frieze and the ornamentation over the doorway were executed by Balasiri, and the whole cave donated in the 19th year of Puṣumāvi. An examination of the projection before the verandah however makes it highly probable that the verandah of the original cave stood there.

If Gotamiputa and Puṣumāvi ruled conjointly, we would have found at least one inscription mentioning them together (the Andhau inscriptions mention Caṣṭana and Rudradāman) as ruling conjointly, and Prof. Nilakanta Sastrī has pointed out that Nāhpāna's coins restructured by Gautamiputra are sufficient 'to shatter' Bhandarkar's theory. His inscriptions and coins leave no doubt that during his reign Sātavāhana power was at its height.

**His dominions**

There is nothing in Nāsik No. 2 to indicate that Puṣumāvi had lost any part of his father's dominions before the 19th year of his reign. (125 A.D.). The Amarāvati inscription of his time and the find of his coins at Guḍivāda and Amarāvati, in the Godāvarī district and on the Coromandel coast, show that his sway extended over the Andhradeśa, and further south. The Andhau inscriptions prove that the Sākhas had, between 125 and 130 A.D., taken advantage of the preoccupation of the Sātavāhana empire elsewhere to recover some of their lost possessions.

(c) **Siva Siri-Sātakaṇi**

The Purāṇas mention siva Siri-Sātakaṇi as the successor of Puṣumāvi. He is certainly to be identified with the Vāsiṭṭhiputa siva Siri-Sātakaṇi of the coins from Andhradeśa. As has been shown above he is the Vāsiṭṭhiputra Śrī-Sātakarṇi of the Kanheri inscription and therefore the son-in-law of Rudradāman. He must also be identified with the Vāsiṭṭhiputa Catarapana Siri-Sātakaṇi of the Nāneghāt inscription. According to Prof. Rapson it is impossible to determine whether this king Vāsiṭṭhiputra Catarapana Sātakarṇi is a member of the dynasty otherwise unknown, or whether he should be identified with one of the three kings who

88. According to R. D. Banerji and Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, all the lost possessions had been recovered by the year 52.
89. Pargiter, op. cit., 71 f.n. 18.
about this time bear the same metronymic on their coins'. In this latter case, if the length of the reigns is correctly given by the Mātysa Purāṇa, he can only be identified with Puḷumāvi; and 'Catārapana' or 'phaṇa' must be regarded as a local title, somewhat of the same character, perhaps, as 'Vijīvāyakura'. It may be suggested tentatively that Catārapa like Chatrapa can be a form of Kṣatrapa on the analogy of Prākrta Cula instead of Chula, for Sans. Kṣudra and Cāṃtamula for Chāṃtamūla (Sansk. Kṣāntamūla). Catārapa would be a form of Chataraṇa (Kṣatrapa); sometimes the 'āṇaka' ending in names is shortened into 'ana,' e.g., Viramṇaka (Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription F.). Catārapaṇa would be a form of Catārapaṇa. The name Chataraṇa (Kṣatrapaṇa) now becomes intelligible. It could only have been borne by the son-in-law of Rudradāman. A silver coin bearing the legends Vāsiṭhīputasa and the Head of the King on the obverse and the legends (......) Hātakaṇiṣa Ārakh (.....)* is to be attributed to the son-in-law of Rudradāman, as it is modelled on Kṣatrapa coinage. If the title may be restored as Ārakhita, it is possible to connect it conjecturally with Kṣatrapa. This makes the identification of Vāsiṭhīputa Catārapaṇa Sātakaṇi with the son-in-law of Rudradāman probable. The coin legends exhibit a variety of the Brāhmī alphabet in association with the Prākrta usually found in inscriptions and on coins. This fact explains the Dravidian 'āṇaka' ending in the name Catārapaṇa.

(d) Sivamaka Sada (Sātakaṇi)

After sīva Sīrūtākaṇi the Purāṇas with great unanimity place a Sivaskanda. An Amarāvatī inscription which is later than Puḷumāvi's time mentions a Sivamaka Sada. As the palaeography of the inscription would give Sivamaka a place corresponding to

91. Bhagwanal Indraji was correct in his estimate of the period to which the inscriptive characters belong (second century A.D.).
93. There is also a trace of sa; vide supra for other details of this coin. Pl. I No. II.
94. The use of two varieties of Brāhmī alphabet and two different dialects on coins is perhaps an imitation of the use of Brāhmī, Kharoṣṭhī and Greek on the coins of the Western Kṣatrapas.
   The peculiar ha according to Rapson approaches the Bhaṭṭīprouḍa ha. It is perhaps the Kharoṣṭhī ha inverted; it may even be connected with the cursive ha on the Kṣatrapa coins.
95. Vide supra.
the Śivaśrī of the Purāṇas, we have to take it that by some process which is not now traceable Sivamaka was transformed by the Purānic writers into Śivaśrī, and Rapson is inclined to identify him with the Śivaśrī of the Purāṇas. Sivamaka as the name of Sātavāhana is quite probable. In Kuṭā No. 6, Sivama as a personal name occurs, and in the Sātavāhana official records Śiva often enters into the composition of the names of officials under them. Ka as a suffix to personal names is also common in the records of the Sātavāhana period, e.g., Sivaka, Saghaka.

(e) Mādhariputa Sakasena Sātakanī

But for the find of coins bearing the legends Saka Sada (Sakasena Sātakaṇi, (vide supra), the inclusion of his name in the list

96. Dhanama in Nāšik No. 25 (EI, Vol. VIII), is another instance of a name with a ma suffix. For the Kuṭā inscription see ASWI, Vol. IV.
97. Lüders, List, Nos. 1177 and 1189.
98. This king bears the title 'sāmi.' Though Gotamiputra Siri-Sātakanī bears the title Benākaṭakasāmi his son Pulumāvi is the first among the later Sātavāhanas to bear the honorific prefix 'sāmi' in addition to the usual 'siri.' Pulumāvi's successors Mādhariputa Sakasena, Siri-Yaṇa Sātakanī and Caṇḍa Sāti bear it. In the Chinna Ganjam inscription Siri-Yaṇa bears the titles of 'araka' and 'siri.' Therefore 'araka' would seem to be a prefix identical in meaning with 'sāmi' (lord). Since Nahaṇa and his successors, princes of the Caṇḍa line, regularly bear the title 'svāmin,' it may be asked whether the later Sātavāhanas did not borrow the prefix 'sāmi' from the Kṣattrapas. Since in a Deotek inscription a 'sāmi' (lord, king) addresses his official (amaca) at Cikambari, we have to cry halt to such a conjecture. The eye copy of the inscription compared with the stampage of the inscription recently prepared by Prof. Mirashi, and exhibited at the Oriental Conference at Mysore (1935) furnishes the following reading:
1. Sāmi aṁṇapayati Cikambari-sa sa
2. hanainto banḍhamanto va tasaśratan kururādheva
3. Amacaṁa la-namnaga
4. Dato lego (kho) he pa l di 4 badho

(The eye copy is in Cunningham's CII, vol. I, old series, p. 102 and Pl. XV)

In the paper read before the Conference (Proceedings pp. 613-22) the Professor called it an Aṣokan inscription. But the later forms of ta ca, and da (in dato), ye, and the angular pa, make it difficult for us to subscribe to the Professor's views. Cunningham was nearer the truth when he opined that the inscription was not earlier than the first century B.C. The inscription would seem to be a Sātavāhana inscription for the following reasons:

In the first century B.C. and even earlier the Sātavāhanas were in possession of East and West Mālwa. The inscription is dated in the Sātavāhana fashion by the seasons and fortnights. It also begins like the later
of our kings would have been rendered difficult, for do not his metronymic and personal name draw him nearer to Mādhariputra Īśvarasena, the Ābhira? Even so he cannot be identified with any of the kings of the Purānic lists; we have to depend on the palaeography of the two Kaṅhëri inscriptions of his time. Their alphabet so closely approaches the alphabet of Siri-Yaṅa at Kaṅhëri that it is probable that one closely succeeded the other. But we are not in a position to determine who preceded whom. Whilst the looped ta (II. 10, 12 and 13), and the rounded va (as opposed to the triangular va in No. 14), and the more cursive ha in No. 15 stamp it as later than No. 14, the other letters stamp Sakasena’s inscription (No. 14) as earlier than Siri-Yaṅa’s (No. 15). No. 14 which was incised on the 10th day of the 5th fortnight of the rainy season on the 8th year of the king, records the excavation of a cave by a merchant and householder, the son of Veṅhunuṃdi an inhabitant of Kalyāṇa along with his father, brother and mother (Bodhisamā). The other inscription (No. 19) records the excavation of a cave by Hālanikā, wife of the donor in the previous inscription.

Like Siri-Yaṅa, Mādhariputa Sakasena Sātakaṇi ruled over both western and eastern Deccan. This fact also places him before Caṇḍa Sātakaṇi who would seem to have ruled over only the eastern Deccan. His coins bearing the lion device have been picked up in the Kṛṣṇā-Godāvari districts. The ‘sena’ ending in his name makes it probable that he was a son of siva Siri-Sātakaṇi, the son-in-law of Rudradāman.

(f) Gotamiṇḍu Siri-Yaṅa Sātakaṇi

His relationship to siva Siri-Sātakaṇi and Sivamaka Sada cannot be ascertained. Formerly Bhagwanlal interpreted the reverse legends on his silver coins in such a way as to make him the son of Catarapana.99 Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar interprets it so as to make him the father of Catarapana.100 "But there can be no doubt that

Sātavāhana inscriptions. The formalities connected with the grant are also Sātavāhana (dato, lego and bodho). To add to these there is the title ‘sāml.’ It is noteworthy that Mādhariputra Sakasena has only the prefix ‘sāmi,’ the usual prefix ‘siri’ being absent. For this reason Bhagwanlal would read ‘siri’ for ‘saka’ in the inscriptions. But the second letter is only ka. What looks like i sign over the first letter in Burgess’ impression may be only an accidental stroke. The omission of ‘siri’ may be likened to the omission of ‘sāmi’ in some of the inscriptions of Pulumāvi II.

100. JBBRAS, Vol. XXIII, p. 66.
this reading and interpretation are incorrect. The rest of the rev.
legend agrees word for word with obv. legend; but all that can be
said about the doubtful word, which was read as ‘Caturapaṇasa’,
is that it was one of five or six syllables, the last two only of which
are legible with certainty, and that it was probably the equiva-
lent to the first word of the obv. legend—Raṇo.”

His inscriptions at Kaṇhēri, Nāsik, Chinna Ganjam, his silver
coins of Sopāra fabric, his numerous coins from Kṛṣṇā and Godā-
vari districts, his potin coins from the Chanda district (Central
Provinces), clearly show that he not only maintained the
eastern possession but also wrested from the Western Kṣatrapas
Aparānta and North Mahārāṣṭra.

The Chinna Ganjam inscription dated in the 27th year of his
reign shows that the Purāṇas are probably correct in assigning
him a reign of 29 years.

In the Harṣacarita Bāṇa refers to a mendicant by name
Nāgārjuna who was brought to Hell by the nāgas; he begged for
(a wreath of pearls) from the snake King as a gift and received
it. When he went out of Hell he gave it to a king, his friend, i.e.,
Sātavāhana, “the lord of the three oceans.” Cowell and Thomas
say that the latter therefore ruled over Jambudvīpa, Plakṣadvīpa
and Sāmaldvīpa. The Nāsik record of Balasirī makes it clear
that the three oceans or seas are the seas to the west, east and
south of the South Indian Peninsula. Hiuen Tsang refers to
Nāgārjuna P’usa, a contemporary of the king styled Sha-to-p’o-ha
or Leading Light (Yin-Leng). The latter quarried for him a
monastery on the mountain Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li, 300 li to the south-
west of the capital of South Kośala. His date is variously given
as 700, 500 and 400 years after the death of the Buddha. Says
Watters, “the names of the kings Kanishka and Kilika, of Vasu-
mitra, Asvaghosha, Kātyāyaniputra, Dharmagupta, and Rāhula-
badra occur in the writings ascribed to Nāgārjuna, and we may
with some probability assign him to the third century A.D.” (we
may say even to the end of the second century A.D.). Since the
probable date of Nāgārjuna coincides with that of Siri-Yaṇa and

101. Rapson op. cit., xci.
102. If Mādhārīputa Sakasena came between Siri-Yaṇa and Sivamaka
Sada, the credit for recovering the Aparānta would go to him.
103. p. 252 f.n. 1.
104. Watters, On Yuan Chwang, ii, p. 204.
since Siri-Yaṇa would seem to have been the last great Śātavāhana king to rule over eastern and western Deccan, he may be the Śātavāhana contemporary of the P'usa Nāgarjuna. Mādhaviputa Sakasena has equally good claims.

(g) Vāsiṭhīputa Caḍa Sāti

Prof. Rapson identifies Vāsiṭhīputa Siri-Caḍa Sāti of some coins from the Godāvari and Kṛṣṇā districts with the Skandavāti of the Purāṇas on the score that he is closely connected with Puḷumāvi, II by the type of his coins and metronymics;¹⁰⁵ according to the same scholar Caḍa Sāti of some lead coins is probably the Caṇḍāśri who occupies the last place but one in the dynastic lists in the Purāṇas. It has been shown that Śivaskanda Sātakarṇī of the Purāṇas is the Śivamaka Sada of the Amarāvatī inscription. ‘Caḍa’ is a variant of ‘Caḍa’ much like ‘Ruda’ and ‘Ruḍa’.¹⁰⁶ The Kodavolu inscription dated in the regnal years of Vāsiṭhīputa Caḍa Sāti makes two Caḍa Sātis improbable.¹⁰⁷ If the Purāṇic account can be relied upon, the Ābhīras would seem to have risen to power in North Mahārāṣṭra 15 years before the rise of the Ikṣvākus, i.e., about 193 A.D. This makes it probable that the western dominions of the Śātavāhanas were lost during his reign. His Kodavolu inscription shows that during his reign Kaliṅga or a part of it came under Śātavāhana sway.

(h) Puḷumāvi III

An inscription from Myākadonī (in the Bellary district) recording the construction of a tank by a certain householder, resident in the village of Vepuraka¹⁰⁸ under Gāmika Kumāradatta, in the S[ā]tavāhāni-hāra under Mahāsenāpati Kharīndanāga, is

¹⁰⁶. Rapson: op. cit., p. 46.
¹⁰⁷. The inscription records a donation by an officer (amaça) and is dated in the second year of Caḍa Sāti, the Caṇḍāśri of the Purāṇas. What is read as ‘amaça bhūṁiśā’ by Sten Konow should be read as ‘amaça bhūṁikhaśa’. Bhūmika is perhaps the name of the amaça.
¹⁰⁸. Vepuraka may be tentatively identified with Virāpuram in the Adoni Taluq. Vepārīla in the Haḍagaḷḷi taluq and Virāpuram in the Haḍagaḷḷi and Rayadurg taluqs have good claims to be identified with Vepuraka inasmuch as Haḍagaḷḷi would also seem to have been included in the Śātavāhāni-hāra or Śātāhāni raṭṭha. The Chilla(le)rekakodumka of the Hira-Haḍagaḷḷi inscription of Sīva-Skandavarman is perhaps Chillalakadonna in the Adoni taluq.
dated in the 8th year of a Siri-Pulumāvi of the Sātavāhana family (raño Sātavāhananāmi s[ir]i-Pulumāvi). Mr. V. S. Sukthankar who has edited the inscription has identified Siri-Pulumāvi with Vasiṣṭhiputa sāmi Siri-Pulumāvi, son of Gotamiputa Siritākara. The absence of the metronymic and the honorific prefix 'sāmi' which are always borne by the son of Gotamiputa Siritākara, and the alphabet of the Myākadoni inscription, which approaches that of the Nāgārjunakonda and Jagayyapēṭa inscriptions, make it highly probable that the Pulumāvi of this inscription is the last of the Sātavāhana in the Purānic lists.

True, the Purāṇas assign him a period of 7 years. But this fact presents no insuperable difficulty. Gotamiputa Siritākara ruled for 21 years according to the Purāṇas. Yet we know from epigraphic evidence that he ruled for at least 24 years! Vasiṣṭhiputa Catarapana Siritākara ruled for at least 13 years; yet the Purāṇas assign him a period of 7 years only!

Since all Purānic lists stop with Pulumāvi it is highly probable that he is the last representative of the great dynasty.

110. Following V. A. Smith, Sukthankar makes out four Pulumāvis in the Purānic dynastic lists (Nos. 15, 24, 26 and 30 in the Matsya List). In fact the Purāṇas mention only three Pulumāvis. The line 'Śivaśrī vai Pulomā tu saptaiva bhavitā nṛpal' must be translated as: "after Pulumāvi Śivaśrī will be king seven years" and not as "Śivaśrī Pulumāvi will be king 7 years" if we accept the reading 'Pulumāt tu' (Pargiter, Puran Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 71, f.n. 18).
CHAPTER V

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS IN THE SATAVĀHANA EMPIRE

Royal Succession

The Sātavāhana polity conformed to the rule laid down in the Śāstras; its keystone was the sovereign. Monarchy was hereditary. Though the Sātavāhanas bore metronymics, though they do not mention their fathers in their inscriptions, succession was always reckoned in the male line.¹ The expression ‘kulapurisa-paraparāgata’ in which the term ‘purisa’ implies, according to Senart, ‘descent by males’, is corroborative evidence in the same direction.² Generally the eldest sons inherited the crown. It is remarkable that though polygamy seems to have been the rule, we have no evidence, either in the lithic records or in the Purāṇas, of disputed successions.³ During the minority of the Crown-Prince, especially in times of stress, succession passed on to the brother of the late king. Kaṁha Sātavāhana, brother of Simuka,⁴ the founder of the dynasty, would seem to have come to the throne during the minority of the latter’s son. Sometimes the Queen-mother assisted by her father acted as the regent and according to Bühler performed some sacrifices⁵ like kings.

The King

The King was the commander in war and led his armies personally to the battle-field. The detailed instructions issued to amacas (amātyas, governors of provinces)⁶ bear testimony to the

1. The Purāṇa texts and Nāśik No. 3 make this clear; also among the Mahārathis bearing metronymics, titles and office pass from father to son (Lüders, List, No. 1100).
3. Vide supra.
4. All princes are called Kumāras. The Pallava practice of calling the Crown-Prince Yuva Mahārāja and of associating him in the administration of the country is unknown to this period.
5. Kṛṣṇo bhṛtā yavīyāmstu aṣṭādaśa bhavisyati.
6. But it has been shown above that the sacrifices mentioned in the Naṅeṅghāṭ inscription were performed by Sīri-Sātakaṇi.
7. Kārīṇa No. 19, EI, Vol. VII.
effective control exercised by the king over officers in every part of the empire; and kings were not merely content with issuing orders. They took the necessary steps for realising their intentions. It is no wonder that in a simple administrative machinery as the Sātavāhana one, the king was powerful both in theory and practice.

But the king was no capricious Sultan. As the guardian of the social and religious order, his “fearless hand” was to be “wet by the water poured out to impart fearlessness.” He was to prevent “the contamination of the four castes.” The true father of his people, he should “sympathise with the weal and woes of his citizens” and “never employ taxes except in conformity with justice”.

He was to be the “furtherer of the homesteads of the low as well as of the twice-born.”8 He should properly “devise time and place for the triple object of human activity.” A king educated in these precepts among a moralising people would have been more than human if he had escaped the obsession of this conception of his duties. Moreover he was aided by ministers some of whom were confidential ministers (viśvāsyamātīya).

It has been shown that Dr. Bhandarkar’s theory of dual monarchy is unproven and improbable.9 But sometimes kings associated their mothers with them in the administration of their country. Nāšik No. 510 (dated in the 24th year) is a joint order of Gotami Balasiri and her son Gotamiputra Sīri-Sātakaṇi, to the officer in charge of the Govadhanahāra. Prof. Rapson attributes this arrangement to the failing health of the King. It might have been so. It might also be, that the absence of the Queen-mother’s name in Nāšik No. 4 (dated in the 18th year) is to be attributed to the fact that it was issued from a military camp in Govadhanahāra,11 whilst the other was issued from the capital. If so, the arrangement might have been due to reasons other than ill-health. A Kañhēri inscription speaks of a confidential minister who executed certain works, and of the queen

9. Vide, supra.
10. EI, Vol. VIII.
11. According to Senart, the genitive Govadhanasa is better construed with skandhāvārāt than with Benākaṭaka. “The sequence of words would then appear somewhat less regular; but the presence of another genitive, senāye Vejayantiṣya, may have caused Govadhanasa to be placed after khaṇḍhāvārā.”
of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Śrī-Sātakarni. Unfortunately the inscription is mutilated and the missing words may show us the part she played in the government of the empire.\footnote{\textit{ASWI}, Vol. V.}

\section*{Feudatories}

(a) \textit{Petty Princes}.—The administration of the empire was carried on by the agency of ordinary officials, and feudatories, \textit{i.e.}, petty princes, the \textit{Mahāraṭhis} and the \textit{Mahābhhojas}. Kolhāpur and the district around it would seem to have been governed by a line of princes with Dravidian associations (2nd cen. A.D.). That they were feudatories of the Sātavāhanas is made clear by the following facts:—Ptolemy places one of these princes in the time of Vāsiṣṭhiputa sāmi Sirī-Puḷumāvi; their coins are found at Kolhāpur. Gotamīputa Sirī-Sātakaṇi’s empire included lands as far south as Vaijayanti, and Kolhāpur is north of Vaijayanti; these princes bear Sātavāhana metronymics. Like the Kṣatrapas of the Khakharāta and Caṇṭana line they bear the title of rājan. Rājan Cūṭukaṇḍānaṁda and Rājan Muḍānaṁda of the coins from Kārwār in North Kanara according to Rapson belong to the same period as the \textit{Mahāraṭhi} of the Chitaldoorg coins (lxxxvi), a period long before that of the Cūṭu kings of inscriptions (lxxxv). From the fact that Rapson has included these coins in the catalogue, it may be inferred that he considers them as feudatories of the Sātavāhanas.

(b) \textit{Mahāraṭhis} and \textit{Mahābhhojas}.—Rapson and Senart consider the derivation of the term \textit{Mahāraṭhi} uncertain.\footnote{\textit{ASWI}, Vol. VII, p. 49.} The analogous titles, \textit{Mahāsāmanta}, \textit{Mahāsenāpati}, \textit{Mahādaṇḍanāyaka}, leave no doubt that the prefix \textit{mahā} denotes an officer of higher rank. The word\footnote{\textit{ASWI}, Vol. V.} ‘raṭhi’ connects it with the Raṭṭhika of Asoka’s and
Khāravela’s inscriptions; what is more striking, the Mahārāthi
are as much associated with the Mahābhōjas as the Raṭṭhikas with
the Bhojas (Bhojakas).

The Mahāraṭhi and Mahābhōja inscriptions are in western India;
and the Raṭṭhikas and Bhojas of Asoka’s inscriptions are to be
sought for in western India.

Asoka’s inscriptions mention the Raṭṭhikas and the Bhojas in
the plural along with border peoples like the Āndhras, the Pulindas,
Kāmbojas and the Yavanas. These terms would therefore
seem to refer to tribes or peoples. Raṭṭhika (Rāṣṭrika) means
“ruler” or “governor of a province.” In the Aṅguttara Nikāya,
Raṭṭhika implies a hereditary office. The Raṭṭhikas and Bhojaka-
s of the Hāthigumpha inscription would seem to be local chiefs,
since, when referring to Khāravela’s conquest of them, it mentions
the smashing of their coronets, helmets, umbrellas, etc.—insignia
of a ruler. According to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Mahā-

15. The Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravela (El, Vol. XX, p. 79 l. 6);
in Asoka’s edicts the Raṭṭhikas are not mentioned with the Bhojas, but
the Petenikas are mentioned with the Raṭṭhikas in R.E.V. and with the Bhojas
in R. E. XIII; see also Beṣā No. 2, CTI; and Kanheri Nos. 15, 24, 29.
ASWI, Vol. V. The proximity of the Thāna and Kolābā Districts, which
would seem to have been held by the Mahābhōjas, to Poona and the surround-
ing districts, held by the Mahāraṭhis, should also be noted.

16. Unlike the Āndhras and the Pulindas, the Raṭṭhikas, Bhojas and
Petenikas are called “the western borderers” (R.E.V. Gīrṇār, t. 1. 5; Sāh.
t. 1. 12).

17. The Paṇcakāśīmapaṭā in the Nivarana-Vagga mentions as Mahānāma
Kulaputtas, appointed Kings, Pettanika-Raṭṭhikas, Senāpatis, Gāmagāmanikas
and Pūgagāmanikas. D. R. Bhandarkar is of opinion that ‘Pettanika,’
which is explained in the commentary (Indices, Vol. VI) as ‘Pitarā dattam
sāpateyam buṣjati,’ is an adjective qualifying Raṭṭhika. Pettanika-Raṭṭ-
thika therefore means ‘hereditary Raṭṭhika.’ Yadawā which separates Sena-
pati from Gāmagāmanika and the latter from Pūgagāmanka does not sepa-
rate Raṭṭhika from Pettanika. This is the only argument in favour of his
view though he does not mention it. He is also of opinion that Raṭṭhika-
Pitinikeṣu and Bhoja-Pitinikeṣu of Asoka’s inscriptions also mean ‘among
hereditary Raṭṭhikas’ and ‘among hereditary Bhojas.’ The parallel cases of
Āṅgada-Pulideṣu and Yona-Gaṇḍhāra-Kāmbojeyeṣu make such an explana-
tion improbable; and in Sāh V., we have Rastikānāṁ Pitinikānam.

18. These coupled with the fact that in Asoka’s inscriptions Pitinika is
the regular form makes the identity of the Pitinika of Asoka’s inscriptions
with the Pettanika of Aṅguttara Nikāya problematical.

19. Lüders translates ‘sava Raṭṭhika-Bhojakä’ as ‘of the Provincial and
local chiefs’.
bhārata, the term Bhoja denotes a prince. In a Mahād inscription a Kāṇabhoja (Kāṇabhoja) is called a Kumāra, a title applied to princes (CTI, No. I.). If 'bhojaka' of the Hira-Haḍagallī plates can be taken to mean "free holder" it can by a stretching of the meaning, imply a local ruler or chief. In the Mahāvaṃśa, it means 'village headman.' It is probable that these titles have a geographical or ethnical meaning. For all that we know, it may be that the ethnical meaning started from the official title.

The important place assigned to Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro father of Nāyanikā, wife of Sātakaṇi I, (2nd century B.C.), a place just below that of the Crown-Prince and above that of the two younger princes may give the clue to the origin of the title. In the days of their service under Mauryan suzerains, the predecessors of Sātakaṇi I must have been in a close alliance with the powerful Raṭlikas of the west, a source of strength for them; they would have enlisted Raṭhika help in their coup d'etat. The coup d'etat being successful, the Raṭhikas would have been given a higher title and status, but they had to exchange Mauryan suzerainty for the Sātavāhana. The silken bond of marriage which made and unmade empires in Mediæval Europe must have been forged to strengthen Sātavāhana imperialistic position.

Śānti Parvan, chapter LXVIII, ś. 54:
Rājā bhojo virāt saivrāt
kṣatriya bhūpatirṇpah ||
yā ebhiḥ stūyate sabdaḥ
kastam nārečitumahatḥ ||

21. In the Ait. Bräh. one who is installed on the throne for the sake of enjoyment (bhojyāya) alone is called a Bhoja.

22. Bühler's (ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 60, n. 3) restoration of the word before Mahāraṭhi (in the long inscription) as '[bā]lāya' is open to question. General usage requires that [bā]lāya which again should be considered as a mistake for bālikāya, should follow Mahāraṭhino. According to Prof. Rapson (JRAS 1903, p. 238; and op. cit., xx) the Chitaldroog Mahāraṭhi coins make the restoration of the word as '(Ka)lāya' probable. Then the long record does not show the Mahāraṭhi's relations with the royal family. Even so, the Mahāraṭhi of the long record is identical with Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro of the reliëvos, which show him in the company of two kings, one queen and three princes, apparently in the order of precedence after one of them and before the other three. He could not have been a brother of Sātakaṇi I, for he is not called a Kumāra. He could not have been a minister only, for ministers have no place in the royal family. The laudatory epithets used by the Queen towards the Mahāraṭhi following closely those used towards her husband, could only represent an outburst of filial love.
The titles of Mahābhōja and Mahābhōjī might have had a similar origin. But since they occur in the Kuḍā or Beḍsā inscriptions which yield no date or point of contact with any known dynasty, it is not easy to determine the period at which they came into existence. That they existed under the Čuṭus is certain.23 As the ornamental alphabet of the Mahābhōja inscriptions at Kuḍā24 is found also in the approximately datable inscriptions of Vāsiṭhīpura Siri-Puḷumāvi or his time,25 and of the minister of the Queen of his successor Vāsiṭhīpura Siri-Sātakani, it may be ascribed to the second century A.D. True, local influences may have played their own part. Two Mahābhōja inscriptions from Kuḍā26 do not exhibit the ornamental variety and are earlier than Kuḍā Nos. 1 and 9. The primitive form of the dental da (open to the left), and the ornamental treatment of medial I and U signs, of the lower end of the verticals of ka and ra and the upper end of the verticals of ha and la and finally the rounded bottom of ma and la, stamp No. 19 as very early in the series. No. 17 with its somewhat angular ma and cursive da, which occurs in later inscriptions represents a transition to the ornamental alphabet. An interval of two generations between the alphabet of No. 19 and the ornamental alphabet may, therefore, be safely postulated. The office and title of Mahābhōja, then, came into existence not later than the 1st half of the first century A.D.

Nature of the titles: Mahābhōja

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa gives the meaning 'great prince' to Mahābhōja.27 Since no Mahābhōja inscription is dated in the fashion in which kings' inscriptions are generally dated, it is certain that they were not independent rulers;28 and it is very difficult to separate the title from the feudatory titles Mahāraṭhi and Mahāsāmanta. Like all feudatory titles, the title Mahābhōja is also a

23. Lüders, List, Nos. 1021 and 1186.
24. CTI, Nos. 1 and 9.
26. CTI, Nos. 17 and 19.
27. Petersburg Dict. (q. v).
28. A title originally applied to princes can become a feudatory title. The title Mahāraṭhi, which in the Gupta inscriptions is associated with the feudatory titles, Mahāsāmanta, Mahāpratihāra, Mahāsenāpati and Mahā-dandaṇāyaka, is an instance to the point (CII, Vol. III, pp. 252, 289, 290, and 296, n.).
hereditary one and became fixed in a few families or clans. That the Mahābhōjas were feudatories of the Sātvāhanas is proved by the fact that there could not have been a rival power in the western Deccan in the first century A.D. (Kuḍā where most of the Mahābhōja inscriptions are found is only 150 miles from Kārlā which was certainly included in the Sātvāhana empire), which could have claimed their allegiance; they are moreover related to the Mahārathās (feudatories of the Sātvāhanas) by family ties and were the feudatories of the Cūṭus who succeeded the Sātvāhanas in northern Mysore and parts of the western Deccan.

29. Kuḍā, Nos. 1 and 9, CTI.
30. Mamdvā and Sādkara(kera). What is read as Sādakara (in Kuḍā No. 19) may well be read as Sādakera. When we remember that in the same inscription as well as in Kuḍā No. 9, CTI, the ā and e signs are very short strokes (e.g. Vijayānikāya and lēna) and that sometimes the sign for ā is the o sign—mālakārasa Kuḍā, No. 16 (CTI), we may treat what appears as a nail head over ka in Sādakara as the sign for medial e. Considering the ja in Sādakera and Sādagera (the mas. form of Sādageri in Kuḍā Nos. 1 and 9, CTI) and the use of ga for ka (the Sopāraka of Nos. 988 and 1095 is called Sopāraga in No. 995 Lüders, List, one may equate Sādakera with Sādagera. A lady of the Sādagera family bears the name Vijayā. The daughter of Sādakara Sudainasana bears the name Vijayanikā, a variant of Vijayā. Do not these names also suggest the idea that they belonged to the same family circle? Pandit Bhagavanlal Indrajji remarks (CTI p. 15): "Vijayanikā is apparently the same as the Vijayā of Nos. 1 and 9: the epithets Mahābhōya and Sādakara applied to her father here (No. 19) corresponding with the feminine forms Mahābhōji and Sādageri applied to Vijayā". But it has been pointed out already that Kuḍā No. 19 is separated from Kuḍā Nos. 1 and 9 by at least two generations.

According to the same scholar, Mamdvā may designate either the gotra name Māṇḍavya or the title Māṇḍapa 'lord of a town called Māṇḍapa.' Says he:—"This latter seems to be the preferable explanation as Māṇḍapa is the name for towns all over India, and three small villages called Māṇḍād or Māṇḍādh i.e., probably Mandapagādh lie close to Kuḍā". (p. 4). But the use of the dental d in Māṇḍavānam and Mamdvā renders either explanation problematical. Moreover 'Māṇḍavāsāmisā' and not 'Māṇḍavāsa' can mean 'lord of the town of Māṇḍava'. If Mamdvā should designate the country, the cognate inscription would lead us to expect Māṇḍavākasa. In only one inscription have we Kāliaiisasa for Kāliaiakasa (Lüders, List No. 1179), but it is easily understood as a scribal error. The occurrence of 'Māṇḍavana' (Māṇḍavānām) in Kuḍā No. 14 CTI, coupled with the fact that in several instances (Junnar Nos. 5 and 6, the Jangli Guṇḍu inscription of Pujumāvi and the Pallava and Kaddinbas inscriptions) the proper name of a person is preceded by the name of the title or family to which he belongs in the genitive plural, makes it certain that 'Mamdvā' is a family name.

31. Lüders, List, Nos. 1021 and 1186.
It has been generally supposed, that the title Mahābhōja is exactly co-ordinate with that of Mahāraṭhi. But the Mahābhōjas seem to have enjoyed more independence than the Mahāraṭhis, for unlike the Kārlā Mahāraṭhi inscription, no Mahābhōja inscription is dated in the regnal years of a Sātavāhana king; a Kuḍā inscription comes very near to being dated in the years of a Mahābhōja (Mahābhōja Maṇḍave Kochipute Vēlidate). Whereas Senart has said that title Mahāraṭhi cannot imply a title of nobility superior to that of Mahābhōja, we can on the strength of the evidence cited here go further and say that the title Mahābhōja was superior to that of Mahāraṭhi.

Mahābhōji

Like the title Mahāraṭhi, Mahābhōja became a title applied even to women. The title Mahābhōji is borne only by the wives of Mahābhōjas and not by the daughters also as Bhagwanlal thought. In Kuḍā Nos. 1 and 9 (CTI) Mahābhōji Saḍageri Vijaya is mentioned along with her son Mahābhōja Khandapālīta to the exclusion of her husband’s name; this may go to show that, like some of the Sātavāhana queens, the Mahābhōjis sometimes shared political power with their sons. There is so far no evidence to show that a Mahāraṭhini ever enjoyed such a position or influence.

Mahāraṭhis

What stamp the Mahāraṭhis as feudatories are the fact that they were hereditary governors of provinces, and the rank and

32. CTI, No. 23.
33. Senart says (El, Vol. VII, p. 50, n. 4):—“in this instance (Beḍā No. 2 CTI) Maṇḍavi precedes Mahāraṭhini. Seeing that Mahābhōja always precedes either attribute when connected with it, this position does not seem to indicate that Mahāraṭhi could imply a title of superior nobility, and consequently still less that it could designate a very high dignity.” But it is a correct view based on wrong premises. Not much can be based upon Mahābhōja preceding Mahāraṭhi as it is Mahābhōja-Bālikā that precedes Mahāraṭhini, and in a Banavāsi inscription, (Lüders, List No. 1186) Mahābhūvia (Mahābhōji) precedes Mahāraṭja. As for Maṇḍava the donor in Beḍā No. 2 (daughter of a Mahābhōja and a Mahāraṭhini) might have combined the Mahābhōja practice of mentioning the family name after the feudatory title with the Mahāraṭhi practice of mentioning it before the feudatory title (Kārlā No. 14, El, Vol. VII).
34. The daughters of Mahābhōjas are, however, referred to as Mahābhōja-bālikās. Mahābhūvia in a Banavāsi inscription is either a mistake or a variant of Mahābhōji.
35. “...whatever the derivation of the term may have been,” says Prof. Rapson (JRAS, 1903, p. 300) “such an expression as Okhaṭajīyānaṁ Maḥāraṭhi (Kārlā No. 14) shows conclusively that it denoted the governor over
power enjoyed by them, a rank and power far superior to those of ordinary governors or amacas in charge of districts. Whilst amacas make grants of lands and villages to religious bodies under the explicit commands of the sovereign (the detailed instructions issued to them by kings would seem to have left no room for their discretion), the Mahāraṭhi, like a feudal vassal, grants villages with the fiscal immunities attached to them, in his own name. That they were feudatories of the Sātavāhanas is shown, as was pointed out by Bühler, by Kārlā No. 14, which is dated in the regnal years of Vāsiṭṭhãputa Siri-Puḷumāvi. It is not, however, known whether they had the right of waging war with one another. But their semi-independence is shown by the absence of any reference to their suzerains in their inscriptions (except Kārlā No. 14). The Chitaldoorg Mahāraṭhi coins make it very probable, that during

a part of the kingdom." Senart has shown (EI, Vol. VII, p. 50) reasons for abandoning this construction and making Ohkalakiyānām depend upon Somadevena; it would then denote not the people over which the Mahāraṭhi ruled, but the tribe or family to which he belonged.

Senart further says:—"the occurrence of the feminine Mahāraṭhini in Bēḍsā No. 2 also indicates rather that the term does not imply the actual office of governor of a district or province, but an honorific or nobiliary title." But in a Nāsik inscription of Siri-Yaṇa Sātakaṭi's reign (No. 24, EI, Vol. VIII) the wife of a Mahāsaṇṭapati is known by her husband's title. From the Janḍli Guṇḍu inscription of Puḷumāvi II's reign, we learn that a Mahāsaṇṭapati ruled over an āhāra much in the same way as an amaca. Modern instances of finding appellations for women in the official titles of their husbands are afforded by Viceroy, Pūṭtin and Gandāsāmi. That Mahāraṭhis governed is shown by Kārlā No. 14, where a Mahāraṭhi grants on his account a village with its taxes and by the Chitaldoorg coins bearing the legends Sadukana Kaḷalāya Mahāraṭhisa. If Mahāraṭhi is not an official title, we are led to the paradoxical conclusion that the feudatories are known in their coins and official grants by their nobiliary titles, whilst the official titles (given for even minor officers, Nāsik Nos. 4 and 5) are the only ones we miss here. Etymologically too, the term, which Senart himself admits presupposes a Sanskrit form Māhāraṭātrīn implies an office (vide supra).

36. Kārlā No. 14. We owe to Senart a proper explanation of the terms sakarukaro and sadeyameyo which Bühler and Bagwanlal translate as 'this gift is in order to keep the Valūraka caves in repair'. Senart splits sakarukaro into 'kara' and 'ukara,' the exact equivalent of which appears at the head of customary formulas which begin generally with sōdrāṅga sōparikara. According to him while kara is known in the sense of dues payable to government, the meaning of uparikara is as unsettled as that of sōdrāṅga. But upari means 'above' and uparikara may be taken to mean taxes over and above the ordinary ones. The adjective Sadeyameyo is etymologically translated as 'what is taken (in money) and what has to be measured (meyya = to be measured, ādeya = to be taken).

H.A.—11
the second century A.D. the Mahāraṭhis were contributing their share to the dismemberment of the Sātavāhana empire.37

Like many feudatory titles, that of Mahāraṭhi had purely a local significance. The Mahāraṭhi and Mahāraṭhinī inscriptions are found in northern Mysore and the Thāna and Kolabā districts of the Bombay presidency. The expressions okhala kīyanāmī Mahāraṭhi, Sadakana Kaḷalāya Mahāraṭhi, and Aṅgīya kulavadhana Mahāraṭhi suggest the idea that the title was restricted to a few families or tribes.38 Senart says:—"It may be noted that to .......... Mahāraṭhi Agimitraṇaka corresponds a Mahāraṭhi Mitadeva in No. 14; that this Mitadeva is a Kausikīputra, like Vishnudatta at Bhājā (No. 2); and lastly that the Mahāraṭhinī Sāmaḍinī at Bēḍsā (No. 2) was married to an Āpadevaṇaka. Do not these different names look as if they were connected with each other in such a way as to suggest the idea that they may have belonged to the same circle of families or relations?" Much cannot be built on similarity in names, especially when they are very common. Names like Mitabhūti and Mitadeva occur very often in the western cave inscriptions. Surely the bhayata Mitabhūti of the Kanhēri inscription (Lüders, List, No. 1012) has nothing to do with the Mitadeva of No. 1187 and both have nothing to do with the Mitadevaṇaka of No. 1097.

The Nāneghāṭ and Kanhēri inscriptions show that the Mahāraṭhis had marriage relations with the ruling family much in the same way as the Mahātalavaras of the Ikṣvāku period. Professor Rapson remarks:39 "That they were .... closely connected with the Andhra kings by family or by caste seems to be shown, as Panḍit Bhagwānlāl observed, by the use of metronymics which they have in common with them." But metronymics are not peculiar to a caste or family. They are borne by Brahmins,40 artisans,41 and even Buddhists, monks and laymen.42 Unlike the Sātavāhanas, Mahāraṭhis sometimes bear metronymics not derived from Vedic gotra names, and give their father's name also.

It must however be noted that unlike the inscriptions of feudatories of later times, the Mahāraṭhi and Mahābhoja inscriptions are

37. E.I., Vol. VIII, Pt. III.
38. Kārlā, No. 14; Chitaldroog Mahāraṭhi coins; Nāneghāṭ inscription of queen Nāyanīkā.
39. JRAS, 1903, p. 299.
40. Lüders List, Nos. 1195 and 1196.
41. Ibid., No. 346.
42. Ibid., Nos. 657; 661; 662; 663; 664; 665; 667; and 1271.
as short as the votive inscriptions of ordinary persons. We miss in them the laudatory epithets applied to feudatories of a later time.

Mahāsenāpati

Another dignitary in the empire was the Mahāsenāpati, next in rank above the Senāpati. The first known epigraphic record to mention a Mahāsenāpati is the Nāsik inscription of the 22nd year of Vasiṣṭhiputa sāmi Sri-Pulumāvi. In the records of his successors the title is mentioned twice and in Ikṣvāku records often. It may, therefore, be presumed, that the title is not as old as that of Mahārāṭhi. Its origin is perhaps to be sought in the rapid expansion of the empire from sea to sea in the second century A.D.

The Mahāsenāpati of the Sātavāhana period have non-military duties; but this confusion of functions though it may seem curious to moderns was a common feature in Indian polity. In Nāsik No. 3, the drafting of the royal order is attributed to a Mahāsenāpati. (Mahāsenāpatinā Medhunena Nokhadāśātara(ne)na chatho). While editing the inscriptions Senart remarks—"As to the Mahāsēnāpati, the proper name alone seems obliterated or doubtful; but the lacuna may have contained something else than his name. Other inscriptions do not attribute to the Sēnāpati the menial work of drafting, but perpetuate his name as that of a high officer entrusted with this charge at the end of the grant; see e.g. Dr. Fleet’s Guptā Inscr. Nos. 55 and 56. In a still higher degree the title of Mahāsēnāpati, which comes very near to that of Mahārāja....seems to place the person who is honoured with it above any such mean task. This is why I suspect that the obliterated letters, if exactly known, would let his part appear in a different light." No doubt in cognate inscriptions (Nāsik Nos. 4 and 5) the drafting of the royal order is attributed to minor officials.

But here the third case ending in Mahāsenāpatinā precludes any chance of his lekhaka’s name having been on the stone. A close examination of the stone renders ‘Nokhadāśātara(ne)na’ probable; and in western inscriptions ‘dāsa’ often enters into the composition of names. The Hira-Hadagalli plates mention a Rahasādhikata,

43. The office of Senāpati (Commander of forces) would seem to have been coeval with the beginnings of Indian polity itself. We hear of it in the Vedas (Vedic Index Senāni) the Jātakas, the Arthaśāstra, and the Purāṇas; and an inscription from Ayodhyā (EI, Vol. XX, p. 57) shows that Pusyamitra was a Senāpati under the last of the Mauryas.

44. EI, Vol. VIII, p. 70.
the Khoh copper plate of Mahārāja Hastin a Mahāśāndhivigrahika and most of the Valabhi grants of the sixth century A.D. a Śāndhivigrahika, as writers of charters. The title Śāndhivigrahika is sometimes used in connection with that of Mahādanḍanāyaka which is associated with the great feudatory titles of Mahāsenāpati, Mahārāja, Mahāpratihāra and Mahāsāmanta. Mahāśāndhivigrahika would seem to be an officer equal in rank, if not superior to Mahāsenāpati. In the case of such high officials the mean task of drafting would have been done by clerks under them. What would be a conjecture is raised to a certainty by the expression sayam chato in the Konḍamudi plates. The task of reducing royal writs to writing was a responsible one; the dangers attendant upon a careless drafting and the large number of orders to be drafted might have necessitated a lekha department under a responsible officer.

The Mahāsenāpati of the Jaṅgli Günḍu inscription of the time of the last king of the Sātavāhana line, is, like the amaca, in charge of only an āhāra. As late as the reign of Caḍa Sātakaṇi, the eastern provinces, divided into āhāras, would seem to have been under amacas. It is, therefore, probable that in the days of the Śaka attacks and the dismemberment of the empire, the outlying or vulnerable parts were put under Mahāsenāpatis who would naturally have seized the opportunity to gain feudatory rank and power. Jaṅgli Günḍu is midway between the

46. IA, Vols. IV, etc.
47. CII, Vol. III.
48. Vide infra.
49. The Arthaśāstra says that only persons possessed of ministerial qualifications, acquainted with one kind of customs, smart in composition, good in legible writing and sharp in reading should be appointed as rājajalipikaras (chap. IX; Bk. I).

Sometimes Dūtakas carried the orders to local officers whose duty it was then to have the charters drawn up and delivered (Nāsik No. 5, op. cit., CII, Vol. III, p. 100, n.)

51. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar holds that Mahāsenāpati of Nāsik No. 21, is a feudatory on the ground that Aṅguttara Nikāya mentions Senāpati along with kings, hereditary Raṭṭhikas and heads of villages. But the office of Mahāsenāpati was a generic one, and the three Mahāsenāpatis of the Sātavāhana inscriptions appear in three different capacities. So an inference based on such argument cannot be conclusive.

V. S. Sukthankar remarks (EI, Vol. XIV, p. 155); "The relation in which the mahāsenāpati and the gumika stand to the janapada and the gāma
Myākadoni and Chinnakaḍabūru, villages in the Bellary District which along with parts of northern Mysore and Kanara would have represented the southern limits of the Sātavāhana empire in the second century A.D. It is also probable that Sātavāhanīhāra was exposed to Cuṭu and Mahāraṭhi attacks. That, under the Ikṣvākus, the title had become a feudatory one is certain.

These feudatory titles seem to have not only survived the Sātavāhana rule in the Deccan but spread as far south as Mysore. We hear of a Mahāraṭhi in the Chitaldoorg District, who struck coins in his name and of a Mahāraṭhinī in Kaṇheri and Banavāśi inscriptions of the line of Hāritiputa Cuṭukulānanda Sātakani. The same inscriptions show the Cuṭuś intimately connected with the Mahābhōjas and Mahāraṭhis. It may be that the Cuṭuś (who succeeded the Sātavāhanas in the south and in parts of the western dominions), themselves started as Mahāraṭhis or Mahābhōjas. But unlike the title of Mahāsenāpati, these titles do not seem to have spread to the Āndhra dominions of the Sātavāhanas; much less did they become Mahāsāmanta.52

...is not explicitly mentioned. But, considering the position of these persons, one might hazard the guess that these...were feudal lords of the lands, holding them in the form of jāgiras." For reasons given below, what is read as Gumiṅka is to be read as Gāmika; and this considerably weakens the force of his arguments.

D. C. Sircar (Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Eastern Deccan, p. 15) says that under the Sātavāhanas, the Mahāsenāpati were feudatory chieftains in charge of rāṣtras. We do not know upon what evidence this statement rests.

52. It is tempting to connect the Bhōjaka and Mahābhōja of our inscriptions with the bhogika and the Mahābhogika of the later records. In the Gupta inscriptions the son of a Bhogika is in charge of the drafting of the order or charter. (Fleet GI, pp. 100, 105, 109, 120, etc.). In the inscriptions of the Gūjāra Buddharāja (Kalacūri Sāṅvat 361 EI, Vol. VI, p. 298), Dadda II, Prasāntarāga (Kalacūri Sāṅvat 380 and 385 respectively, IA, Vol. XIII, pp. 82-88) and Jayabhaṭṭa III (IA, Vol. V; p. 110); the Bhogikas are mentioned after Rājas, Sāmantas and before Viṣayapatīs and Rāṣṭrādhikārikas. What is interesting, both Bhogika and Bhōja literally mean ‘one who enjoys’. Both refer to rulers of districts also. (Bhogika may also be connected to Bhogapati, i.e., a governor or officer in charge of revenue). According to the lexicographer Hemacandra, both Bhogika and Bhōjaka mean ‘village headman.’ But the fact that the Mahābhōjas are not referred to in any inscription after the second century A.D., the long interval that separates the Mahābhogikas from the Mahābhōjas and the technical nature of the titles, make any connection between them problematical.
_Officials and administrative divisions_

Barring the districts enjoyed by the feudatories, the empire was divided into _āhāras_ (including the Andhra province), e.g. Sopārahāra, Govadhanahāra, Māmālāhāra and Sātavahanahāra. An _āhāra_ would represent the same territorial division as the _rāṣṭra_ of Pallava records, the _viṣaya_ of the records of kings of the Sālāṅkāyana _gotra_, and the modern district. Can we draw from the compound _araṭhasamvināyileam_, which is translated by Senart as 'exempt from the magistrate of the district or of the _Rāṣṭrin_,' the inference that some divisions of the Sātavāhana empire were called _rāṣṭras_? Such technical expressions are often, conventional and in not one of the inscriptions of the Sātavāhana period is a territorial division called _rāṣṭra_. _Āhāras_ were under governors called _amacas_ (Sanskrit, _amātya_ who were non-hereditary officers. Quinquennial transfer was in force. Each _āhāra_ presumably received its name from the headquarters of the governor (nagara); Kūdūra (the Kōdura of Ptolemy) is known to us from an Amarāvati inscription of the second century A.D. and yet we hear of Kūdūrahāra only in a copper-plate grant of the third century A.D.

In a Kanērī inscription, which, on palaeographical grounds, can be ascribed to the time of Siri-Yaṅa Sātakani, we have the expressions _Paṭiṭhāṇe_ and _Rājatalāka-Paṭiṭhāṇapate_. Could we translate the latter as "the village of Rājataḍāka (King's Tank) in the Paṭiṭhāṇa division"? If Rajatalāka is a mistake for 'Rajatalēke' it would mean "in Rājataḍāka in the Paṭiṭhāṇa division." The analagous expression Āndhāpata (Āndhrapatha) in the Mayidavolû plates, which is synonymous with Āndhraraṭtha, makes it

53. Kanērī No. 5, Vol. IV.
54. Nāsīk No. 3, EI, Vol. VIII.
55. Kārlī No. 19, EI, Vol. VII.
57. Vide supra.
58. Nāsīk Nos. 3, 4, and 5, EI; Vol. VIII. Also VII; p. 68.
59. The _amaca_ of the Kōdavolū inscription of Čaḍa Sāṭi and the _rāja-maca_ of Kūḍā No. 18 (CTT), might have been governors of _āhāras_. Sometimes, however, treasurers and officers in charge of the drafting of charters bear the same title (Nāsīk Nos. 4 and 19).
60. Lüders, _List_, No. 1295.
62. No. 5 ASWI, Vol. V; Compare No. 4.
63. Lüders leaves the expression untranslated.
highly probable that ‘patha’ literally ‘path or road’ is synonymous with āhāra (district);64 may be the district of Paithāna which contained the seat of the king and was perhaps under the direct control of the king, was distinguished from the other divisions in this way.65

The next division below that of āhāra is gāma (grāma). From the Saptaśatakanī of Hāla we learn that the officer in charge of a village was called Gāmika (Grāmika). In the Jaṅgli Guṇḍu inscription of Puḷumāvi we come across a Gāmika.66

The other functionaries known to us are the Mahatarakas, Mahā-āryakas,67 Bhāṇḍāgārikas,68 Herāṇikas,69 Mahāmātas

64. It has been shown that the Pallava raṭṭha is synonymous with āhāra.
65. In the Alina copper plates of Śilāditya VII (year 447) we have the expression Śrī Khetakārē Uppalāhēta pathake Mahile (?lā)balī n(a)magrāmaḥ. Pathaka which Dr. Fleet (CII, Vol. III, p. 173, n.) connects with pathin or patha represents here a territorial division between āhāra and grāma.
66. V. S. Sukthankar would read it as ‘Gumikasa’ (Gauṁikasya=of the Captain) which, according to him, would agree with the Mahāśenapatisa of the preceding line. True in the Hira-Haḍāgāḷi plates, coming from the same district, Gumikas are mentioned. But since, the officer over a gāma (grāma) is mentioned and as the u sign is not visible on the plates, it is safer to read it as ‘G(ā)mika.’
67, 68 & 69. Mahataraka means the Great Chamberlain. Hemacandra in the Deśikoṣa (i. 16), gives aiṇa in the sense of an official, e.g., the lord of a village. Etymology would therefore seem to be unsafe guide in the interpretation of official terms. As regards the Mahā-āryaka mentioned in Nāsik No. 3, Senart says (EI, Vol. VIII; p. 68: ‘...the part the monks are playing in the first sentence seems to point to the name being that of a religious personage. Even admitting that the title araka given to Yaṇasirī-Sātakani (Sīrī-Yaṇa Sātakani) by an inscription (Ep. Ind. Vol. I, p. 96) be really=āryaka, that would in no way prevent this epithet, which is commonly used with reference to Buddhist monks, being applied to some religious functionary. I am the more inclined to think so, because I find the similar title Chūḷa-ārya conferred on the Ārṣa Buddhakakshita; who is styled Arhat (Burgess’ Buddhist Stūpas of Amaranavati, Plate lix. No. 39, p. 104).’
He also compares this title to that of Mahāsāmiya in Nāsik No. 4. But Mahā-ār̥ya is used in the singular, while the title of Mahāsāmiya is used in the plural. The latter is perhaps an instance of pluralis majestatis, in which case it would not point to a college of religious functionaries. Mahāt-araka (Sans. Mahat-ār̥yaka), an official title, is mentioned in the Chinna Ganjam inscription of Sīrī-Yaṇa Sātakani, and the way in which our Mahā-ār̥yaka is connected with the village of Samalipada (‘This village of Sāmalipada... by the Mahā-ār̥yaka, you (amaça), must deliver to be owned by the Bhikṣus, of the school of the Bhadāyaniya), seems to point to a secular official, one in charge of a
(Mahāmātras) in charge of Buddhist monks, the Nibandhakāras or officers in charge of the registration of documents (the Aṣapaṭalikas of later times), the Pratiharās, the Dūtakas who carried royal orders, and the Amacas in charge of drafting royal orders. From a Nāsik inscription of Uṣavadāta we learn that every town had a records office.

**APPENDIX A**

**The Allūru Inscription**

One of the notable discoveries of the Epigraphy Department in the year 1924 was that of a Brāhmī inscription on a fragment of a marble pillar at Allūru, a village in the Nandigama taluq of the Kṛṣṇā district. The pillar under reference must originally have belonged to the Buddhist Stūpa which stands at about two furlongs to the west of the village. The Epigraphy Report for the year ending with March 31, 1924 contains a photograph of a facsimile of the inscription and a short note on it. It was subsequently edited by Dr. R. Shamasasya in the Calcutta Review for the year 1925. His reading misses the truth in many a place.

...
My reading of the inscription is as follows: The beginning line or lines of the inscription are lost.

1. (ai) lasa Maḍa (vi)sa ca ...........
2. sa rāmo vihāro deyadhama parica.....
3. nigala-simāya Vetarakuḍo Na(ga)....
4. ti Khetasārasa Pāpikala simāya...
5. nivatanāni rāja datini. Caraṭhe Macha..
6. (pa)da-simāya batisa nivatanāni Rā..
7. (c)erapura-simāya ca (tu) visa-nivatanāni..
8. ḍalasa gāvina pacasatāni (co) yathi balīva (da)
9. sakadani pesa-rupāni dāsi-dāsasa catā 1 (isa)..
10. kubhi kaḍāhasa catari lohiyo be kaḍ(ā)hāni (kasa)...
11. (sa) bhāyanām catāri vādālavikāro karodiyo (yo)
12. (na)ka-dīvikāyo ca Ataragiriya pica-pake taḷāka(ni)
13. kāhāpanāna ca purāṇaṃ sahasam akhayani v(i)
14. esā mahātalavara deya-dhama paricāko
15. ata Pedatarapase bāpana-nivatanāni
16. eta sabhāriyasa saputakasa sanatukasa
17. Ayirāna Puvaselīyāna nīgāyasa ....

The rest of the inscription is lost. It mentions the gifts made by many, including a king, who perhaps out of modesty omits his name, a unique feature in our records. The first two lines speak of an Aila (Āira, or Ārya) Maḍavi. Then comes the gift of something within the limits of Vetarakuḍa. Next is mentioned the gift of a beautiful vihāra, perhaps by the side of the Stūpa, of some nivatanas of land within the limits of Pāpikala (for the identification of Pāpikala, see the chapter on the Ikṣvākus). Then come the gifts of 32 nivatanas of land within the limits of Machappada in the raṭha of Ca, and 24 nivatanas of land within the limits of the town of Rā- cerpura, 500 cows, 64 bullock carts, 40 servants some cauldrons, especially two brass cauldrons, 4 bronze vessels, some hand lamps of the vādala fish shape, some Yonaka lamps, a tank in the vicinity of Ataragiri, and one thousand purāṇa kāhāpanas as a permanent endowment; 52 nivatanas of land were the gifts of a Mahātalavara along with his wife, son and grandson. All these gifts were for the (acceptance of) the school of the Pubbaseliyas....

The use of a peculiar form of ai which comes close to the Vaṭṭeluttu ai is noteworthy. I am indebted for this reading to Mr. K. N. Diksit. It is clear that in this record the Mahātalavara is playing a more important role than even the king.

H.A.—12
As D. C. Sircar has also pointed out what was read by Dr. Shama Sastry jayadhama is only deyadhama (l. 2). What has been read as caradhama is undoubtedly Caraṭhe Ma-pada (l. 5). What is read as Sanasa kata (made by Sana) King of the Ayis (Ayirānam is interpreted as King of the Ayis), is only sanatu kasa (with his grandson) (l. 16) and Ayirānam refers to the school of Pubbaseliyas mentioned in the same inscription.
CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS

I. SOCIAL CONDITIONS

The Bhaṭṭiprōḷu, Amarāvatī and western cave inscriptions give us an insight into the social organisation of the Deccan from the second century B.C. to third century A.D., and from the Amarāvatī sculptures we get a vivid picture of life in the Andhradeśa. The fourfold division of society—the caste system—prevailed. We hear of Uṣavatā's charities and gifts to numerous Brahmans. Gotami-putta Siri-Sātakaṇi boasts of having prevented the contamination of the four castes and of having been the true supporter of Brahmans. Yet one of his descendants took his wife from the Śaka satrapal family and the Śakas were looked upon as degraded Kṣatriyas. It is doubtful whether Buddhism toned down the caste system even to the extent to which these foreign elements in society did. At Kuḍā an upāsaka Ayitilu calls himself Bāṇumhāna. ¹ His wife is called Bāṇimā. Mahādevāṇaka of a Kārā inscription who would seem to be Ayitilu's son bears the title of gahata (Sansk. grha). In the śārman ending in the names of Buddhists, monks and laymen, we have probably one of the Brahmanical vestiges in the Buddhist communities.² Kṣatriyas would sometimes seem to have followed the profession of the Vaiśya caste. In a Kāshārī inscription Gajasena and Gajami (ta), the Khātiya brothers, follow the profession of vānijakas.³ Unfortunately the lacunae before khātiyasa, makes the meaning of the word not quite certain. The sub-castes met with in inscriptions are those of the hālaka or hālika⁴ (ploughman), mūrdhaka (according to the Śabdaratna

2. ASWI, Vol. IV, Junnar No. 19, p. 96; Lüders, List, Nos. 1101 and 1102. However śārman ending in names does not always indicate Brahmanical origin. In an Amarāvatī inscription a vāniya (belonging to the Vaiśya caste probably) bears the name Bodhisarman (TSW 1873, p. 261, No. 8). See also Fleet CII, Vol. III, p. 11, n.
4. Lüders is in doubt as to whether hālika in No. 1084, is only a personal name, or a variation of hālaka. An Amarāvatī inscription (EI, Vol. XV; Some Unpublished Amarāvatī Inscriptions, No. 56), makes it certain that hālika is not a personal name. Wherefore it must be identical with hālaka.
Petersburg Dict. s.v.) a branch of the Kṣatriyas, and *golika* (herdsman).  

*Foreign Elements in Hindu and Buddhist Society*

(i) *Yavanas.*—Yona or Yavana is an Indian form of the word Ionian. In literature Yavana refers to all kinds of foreigners or *Mlecchas.* At the present day the term Yona is applied by the Sinhalese to the ‘Moormen’ or Arabs some of whose families have been settled in Ceylon for centuries. It is however more than probable that Yavana of our inscriptions denotes the Greeks. For, the Yonas of Asoka’s inscriptions placed with the Kâmboja’s and the Gândhâras in the north-west are certainly the Greek element that Alexander’s invasion and Seleucus’ empire left in the north-western India; as our inscriptions mention Šakas and Yavanas, a confusion between Šakas and Yavanas is ruled out; as the term Yavana occurs in the inscriptions of the foreigners also, it is improbable that they did not clearly state their racial affinities.

We do not know how and when these Yavanas entered western Deccan. According to the *Mahâvâjïsa*, some 250 years after the *Nirvâna* of the Buddha, the Yona priest Dhammarakhita was sent to Aparânta as a missionary, while the priest Mahârakhita was sent to the Yona country. This shows that there was already in western Deccan a large element of foreign—Yavana—population. Yavana Tuṣâśâpa was governor of Surâśtra under Asoka. According to Strabo, Menander, the Greek prince, penetrated into ‘Isamus’ (Jumna) and subdued Patalene (the Indus delta) and Saraostes (Surâśtra). This statement is corroborated by the curious observation of the author of the *Periplus* that the coins of Apollodorus and Menander were current in his time at Barygaza. Of a crowd of Yavanas in western India thoroughly Indianised we hear in the inscriptions at Kârlâ. A Sâñci inscription mentions a Yavana.

---

5. ASWI, Vol. IV, Junnar No. 2 pp. 92 ff.
9 & 10. Sten Konow is of opinion, that the ‘Yavana’ of the Kârlâ inscriptions wherever it is followed by a name in the genitive plural, is a personal name. Lüders looks upon Yona in No. 547 also as a personal name. There are weighty considerations to be brought forward against this view. Firstly it is improbable that many persons bore the same name Yavana. The ethnic Yavana denoted to the Indian a foreigner whom he looked upon as a de-
As these inscriptions are incised on the Cetiya cave pillars, they are as old as the cave itself. The palaeography of the oldest Kārlā inscriptions would support a first century B.C. date for the Cetiya cave. It is possible then, that the Yavanas entered the graded Kṣatriya; it is therefore improbable that Indians bore ‘Yavana’ as a personal name. Much less could a Yavana have done so.

While Sten Konow looks upon the names in the plural found along with the word ‘Yavana’ as a family or corporation name, Senart looks upon them as personal names in the genitive plural. Senart looks upon the genitive plural in Sinhadhayānaṁ in Kārlā No. 7 (El, Vol. VII), as a personal name in the plural (pluralis majestatis), and following him M. Swarup Vats has treated the other names in the genitive plural in the other Yavana inscriptions as personal names. In all the Kārlā epigraphs and in the Yavana epigraphs at Junnar (CTI Nos. 5 and 33), the personal name is in the singular while the family name is in the plural—’Oklakakṣyānāṁ Mahāraṣṭraṇaṁ Kosikaputas Maitdevasa.’ (Kārlā No. 14 El, Vol. VII), ‘Yavanasa Irlasa Gātānāṁ’ and ‘Yavanasa Cītasa Gātānāṁ’ (Junnar, Nos. 5 and 8; ASWI; Vol. IV, pp. 93 and 94). It is therefore, not proper to consider Čandānaṁ (Junnar) Cūlayakhānāṁ, Dhamadhayānaṁ, Vitasavihatānaṁ, Sinhadhayānaṁ and Yasavadbhanānaṁ (Kārlā) as personal names. The Junnar inscription under reference is assigned by Dr. Burgess to the first century B.C. on palaeographical grounds, and it is the period of the Kārla Cetiya cave. In the Śaṅcī Yavana inscription we miss the personal name—’Setapatiyasa Yonasa dānāṁ.’ In Lüderitz, Nos. 82 and 1035 the personal names of the donors are omitted though their gotras are mentioned. While editing the Śaṅcī inscriptions, Dr. Bühlert remarks (El, Vol. II, p. 94): ‘Peculiar and noteworthy are the names of monks and nuns, which like Kāboja, Prāṭīṭhāna, Chirātī, and perhaps also Oṇi, consist of adjectives derived from the names of countries, towns and races. In these cases it would seem that the real name of the donors has been lost out.’

Senart translates the compound ‘Dhamma-Yavana’ in Kārlā No. 10 in the same way as Bühlert did viz., ‘of Dhamma, a Yavana.’ He adds: “......the simple name of Dhamma applied to a Buddhist surprises me......I feel tempted to take Dhamma......in a specifically Buddhist sense, and to understand by dhanmanigama ‘a member of the guild of Buddhist merchants’; compare nīgamasabha at Nāsik (No. 12, I. 4). On this analogy Dhamma-Yavana would be the ‘community of the Buddhist Yavanas’ or rather a Buddhist Yavana who has modestly omitted his personal name” (El, Vol. VII, p. 56). Lüderitz considers Dhamma-Yavana as the name. But in a Nāgājīnjōnda inscription Dhamma occurs as a personal name (El, Vol. XX, Ins. J). Dhaṁmila, a name of very common occurrence, is only Dhaṁma with the la suffix. Names Cetiya and Saggi are of the Dhaṁma class. Nor is the compound a source of difficulty. In the Nāsik inscription of the time of Abhirā-Īśvarasena we have the compound Śivadattabhāraptasraya; the analogy is not, however, very close, since a compound is necessary in the latter case and since the one inscription is in Pāraṇī and the other in Sanskrit. In an Amarāvati inscription (El, Vol. XV, No. 11) we have Sa[m]ghalasamanasa; Sa[m]ghala cannot be anything else than a
Sātavāhana dominions in the wake of Śaka conquest. The Yavanas who are credited with donations at Kārlā are: one of the Simhadhaya family, one of the Yasavadhana family, one of the Dhamadha-ya family, and one by name Dhama.

As all the Kārlā Yavanas except one, profess to be natives of Dhenukākaṭa, this place would seem to have contained a Yavana settlement. As most of the donors in the Kārlā inscriptions, come from Dhenukākaṭa, and as the place name occurs frequently in Kārlā epigraphs and once in an inscription at Śailārwāḍi, a place very near Kārlā, it has to be sought for in the vicinity of Kārlā. It would therefore seem to have been included in Māmālāhāra.

A point that deserves mention is that these Yavanas besides embracing Buddhism adopted thoroughly Hindu personal and family names. They use Prākṛt in their inscriptions and it is not unreasonable to infer that they adopted Hindu manners and customs. This is no wonder since even a casual visitor to Ujjain from the kingdom of Antalkidas became a Bhāgavata. So completely did the Yavanas merge into Hindu society that Indian Buddhists had no scruples whatsoever in joining with these foreigners in making donations. The Kārlā Cetiya cave was a result of such a joint effort.

(ii) Śakas.—Like the Yavanas, the Śakas too merged into Hindu society. The Śaka son-in-law of Nahapāna bears the Indian name Uṣavadāta (Sans. Ṛśabhadatta), while his father bears the un-Indian name Dinika. Another Śaka bears the name Agnivar-
man, and his daughter that of Viṣṇudattā. A fourth bears the name Vudhika (Sansk. Vṛddhika).\textsuperscript{15} If Nahapāna was a Pahlava, even Pahlavas would seem to have followed the example of Yavanas and Śakas, for Nahapāna’s daughter bears the Indian name Dakṣamitrā.

Unlike our Yavanas all of whom are Buddhists, Śakas embraced both Brahmanism and Buddhism. Kuḍā inscriptions mention a Brahman upāsaka named Ayitilu, and according to Senart, it is a foreign name corrupted and curiously reminding us of Azilizes.\textsuperscript{16} Śaka Uṣavadātā’s charities to Brahmans and Brahman institutions stamp him as a staunch adherent of the Brahmanical religion. We are told that he gave money and tīrtha on the river Bārṇāsā and also 300,000 cows and 16 villages to Brahmans. He bathed at the Pokuṣara tanks and gave the Brahmans 3000 cows and a village. He also gave eight wives to Brahmans and fed thousands of them all the year round. The Carakas also received something at his hands. In a Nāsik inscription, however Uṣavadāta says that “inspired by true religion, in the Trirāśī hills at Govardhana” he caused a cave\textsuperscript{17} to be made. Says Senart: “I dare not decide if this phrase (dharmaṭmanā) implies an express conversion to Buddhism, or only puts a first gift in favour of Buddhism in contrast with the previous grants which were inspired by Brāhmaṇical feelings. I do not think the wording allows us to settle this shade of meaning. On the strength of this explanation I propose in N. 18 to take dhammaṭmanā in a similar way. I believe the reading ’manā, not ’mano, is certain, and the manner in which the construction is interrupted after the preceding genitives confirms the impression that dharmaṭmanā is intentionally put forward, in order to dwell on the fact of a change having taken place in the religious belief or inclination of the donor Indrāṇidatta,” (a Śaka). If reliance could be placed upon names, Indrāṇidatta’s father and son would both seem to have been Buddhists. As three years after the foundation of his Nāsik cave Uṣavadāta makes donations to Brahmans, his change of faith is extremely improbable.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15} In No. 26, EI, Vol. VIII we have Śakasa Dāmacikasa lekhakasa Vudhikasa Viṣṇudata-putasa Daśapuravātavātasa. As the donor’s race and father’s name are mentioned Dāmacika is the name of his native town. Senart, however, does not agree with Bhagwanlal who looks upon it as a corruption of Damascus.

\textsuperscript{16} EI, Vol. VII, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{17} Govardhana Trirāśīsu parvateṣu dharmatmanā idam leṇam kāritam, EI, Vol. VIII, p. 78, No. 10.

\textsuperscript{18} The cave was consecrated in the year 42.
Viṣṇudattā, the daughter of Śaka Indrāgnidatta, was an upāsikā. As Dr. Bhandarkar observes: "These Śaka kings (Western Kṣatrapas) had thus become so thoroughly Hinduised that another Hindu royal dynasty (the Sātavāhana) had no scruples whatever, social or religious, in entering into matrimonial relationship with them."²⁹

We do not hear of the Śakas and Yavanas in the Sātavāhana dominions in the western Deccan after the second century A.D. The epithet Saka-Yavana-Palhava-nisūdanasa applied to Gotami-pūta Siri-Sātakaṇi seems to be no mere boast; evidently he drove out these foreigners from his newly rebuilt empire—the Śakas were only to return in the wake of Rudradāman's conquest for a short time.

**Yavanas and Śakas in Eastern Deccan**

Of Yavanas in the eastern Deccan we hear nothing; it is however certain that Graeco-Roman influences played a great part in the fashioning of the Amarāvatī tope, and as will be shown below the inscription from Allūru²⁰ is another piece of evidence for Greek influence. Of the Śakas we hear something, An Amarāvatī inscription of the second century A.D., mentions a Saka-giri (not (Ś)akagiri as read by Chanda, or Pi(Si?) giri as read by F. W. Thomas).²¹ Another mentions a ‘........ratika Nekhavana,’ and Nekhavana curiously reminds us of the Persian name Nahapāna.²² More Śakas would seem to have entered eastern Deccan in the wake of the marriage of Virapurisadāta with the daughter of a Western Kṣatrapa. A Nāgārjunikoṇḍa epigraph²³ mentions a Śaka Moda,²⁴ and his Buddhist sister Budhi. Among the sculptures excavated by Mr. Longhurst at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa there are two showing a warrior in Scythian dress.

**Family**

At Amarāvatī not only father and mother, but also sons and daughters, sons-in-law and daughters-in-law, and brothers and

---

20. Vide infra.
22. Ibid., No. 54.
24. Sanskrit moda means 'joy.' This is an instance of an Indian name borne by a Śaka.
sisters, are associated with the donor. The wife has a place above the brothers and sisters, the son enjoys precedence over the daughter and the daughter over the daughter-in-law. At Kăñhēri and Nāsik the donor is mentioned with all his blood relations, and so high was the social sense in the Buddhist world that the donor shared the merit of his donations with all his fellow beings.  

Could we infer from what we have stated above that the joint-family system was in vogue?  

Could Amarāvatī No. 38, which speaks of Khadā and ‘his daughter-in-law in her house’ show that it was at the time going to pieces or had done so?

Women

Women occupied a prominent position in society. The idea of woman being the chattel of her lord with no rights and privileges which make life worth living, was quite alien to the period. In the western cave and Amarāvatī inscriptions we come across a bevy of ladies making sometimes very costly donations. A great number of the exquisitely sculptured rail pillars, torāṇas and stūpa slabs at Amarāvatī were donated by ladies. Of the nearly 145 epigraphs from Amarāvatī 72, out of the 30 at Kuḍā 13, out of the 29 from Nāsik 16, either record gifts by ladies or gifts in which the ladies are associated. The Cetiya āgharas at Nāsik and Kuḍā were founded by ladies. Women joined hands with men in the construction of the Cetiya cave at Kārlā, ‘the most excellent (?) mansion in Jambudvīpa.’ The base to the right of the central door carved with rail pattern, and a similar piece on the left were the gifts of two nuns. A belt of rail pattern on the inner face of the gallery was also a bhīkṣukhuni’s gift. The remaining pillar on the open screen in front of the verandah was the gift of a housewife. These instances unmistakably show that ladies were allowed to possess property of their own. At Nāsik, a Śaṅkā lady (Viṣṇudattā) gives to the Saṅgha of Nāsik more than 3500 kāṛṣāpaṇas. Ladies even

26. The word saparivāra in the Nāsik Kāñhēri and Junnar epigraphs is translated by Senart as ‘with his (or her) next.’ He remarks (EI, Vol. VIII, p. 77): “It is, I think, too precise to translate saparivāra by ‘with his family’………... Parivāra may, together with the family or even excluding it, apply to companions of the donor, fellow-workers or caste-partners.” In Junnar No. 7 (ASWI, Vol. IV) the donor associates with him his son in the merit of his donations and in No. 9 his parivāra. As it is probable that in both cases he has associated with him the same kind of persons, parivāra would refer to members of the family only. In Kāñhēri No. 18, (ASWI, Vol. IV), we have bitiyikāya ca sahā parivāra and in No. 27 sarvasva ca kulasya, 

H.A.—13
got the titles of their husbands e.g., Mahābhōjī, Mahārāthīṇī, Bhojiki, Kuṭumbīṇī, Gahīṇī, Vaṇijīṇī etc. In the Amrāvatī sculptures we often come across ladies, worshipping Buddhist emblems, taking part in assemblies, playing on instruments, enjoying music and dance and entertaining guests along with their husbands. In one of the panels of an outer rail pillar,27 we find depicted a disputation between a chief and another, and the audience consists mostly of women who are represented as taking keen interest in what is going on. In some panels they are represented as watching processions. Widows were to shun ornaments and to be bent on self-control and restraint and penance.28

On dress and ornaments, the Amarāvatī stones, and the figures cut in the western caves, furnish ample information. Except in some minor details, the dress and ornaments in vogue on both sides of the Deccan are the same. The most striking item of the dress of ladies and men is the head-dress as in the Indus valley. The former have their hair divided in front and running down to a knot at the back. Hung on the knot is a cord of twisted cloth or hair drawn in two or four rows. Sometimes we come across two strings in four rows ending in tassels. Some ladies have their hair done in a pointed knot sideways.29 In some the knot is done near the forehead with a string of beads. In western Deccan ladies sometimes cover their heads with a piece of cloth.30 Sometimes a thick cloth runs round their head. At Kuṭā a lady wears a long cap of conical shape. Perhaps it is the coiffure done to that shape. Generally a string or strings of beads adorn the forehead and the knots. Men wore high head-dress. The general custom was to have hair knotted in front and covered to a great extent by twisted cloth running down. The knot was adorned in front by a horse-shoe-shaped or caitya-arch-shaped ornament. Some Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa men wear knots unadorned by ornaments. Lay disciples and even servants have hair done in knots. In one of the Amarāvatī sculptures a groom has let the hair run down and secured it by bands at three places. One of the male figures in the façade of the Caitya cave at Kaṇḫēri has a very low turban fully ornamented, the ornaments even hiding the knot of hair on the left.

27. ASSI, Vol. I, Pl. XI, Fig. 2.
30. The Kārlā Caitya cave figures.
Women are as scantily dressed as men, and sometimes even more so. Twisted cloth running in two or three rows below the waist and knotted at the right, the ends, however, hanging from the knots, and sometimes also four or five strings of beads held together by a clasp, constituted the main part of their dress. Men wear an undercloth. There is only one instance among our sculptures of a woman covering her breasts. Laymen and monks and perhaps others also had also a loin cloth, part of which was thrown over their shoulders. The cloth worn by Brahmans covers them down to their knees. Some men have twisted cloth thrown over their shoulders. At Amaravati and Nāgārjunikonda we also come across men in breeches and long tunic—perhaps Śakas.  

Men and women alike wore ornaments. Heavy rings, sometimes two in each ear, sometimes rows of beads joined together, constituted their ear ornament. Even kings wore ear ornaments. The representations of Vāsiṣṭhiputa Siri-Satākani and Siri-Yaṅa Sātakaṇi on their silver coins show us well-punched ears. Both men and women wore bracelets and bangles with this difference, that sometimes women wore bracelets covering the whole of the upper arm, and bangles running up to the elbow. Men did not wear anklets while all women had them. Sometimes the anklets are heavy rings, two for each leg, while in other cases each is a spiral of many columns. Both men and women, even servants, wore necklaces—strings of beads and of medallions. The noses of women were unadorned as it seems to have been at the Indus Valley. In this connection it is interesting to note a description of some of the Bhaṭṭiprōḷu remains given by Rea in his *South Indian Buddhist Antiquities*. They are coral beads, beryl-drops, yellow crystal beads, amethyst beads, double hollow beads, garnet, trinacrias, pierced pearls, coiled gold rings and gold flowers of varying sizes.

**Luxuries**

Jugs, jars, and vessels of attractive shapes, chairs, tables, stools and cots seem to have been used by many. Whilst kings, great

32. In this connection it is interesting to note the head-dress worn by Sātavāhanas kings as represented on their coins. Siri-Yaṅa’s head-dress consists of a strap on the forehead and from the temple locks of combined hair fall over the strap. Behind the head hangs a string knotted at the end, probably a braided lock of hair. Vāsiṣṭhiputa Siri-Satakan is represented with short curly hair.
33. For the solitary exception see TSW, 1868, Pl. No. LXII.
chiefs, and nobles rode fully caparisoned elephants and horses ordinary men used double-bullock carts much like those that are in use at the present day. It is also surprising that the elephant goad represented on the Amarāvati marbles and on the coin of Apilaka from central India are like those in use at the present day.

Names

Whilst Bhaṭṭiprōlu personal names are most of them not met with elsewhere,34 those of Amarāvati and Nāgarjunikonda are met with in the western caves. A few names like Samanadāsa, Samuda, Sāmaka, Reta, and Utara, which are common to Bhaṭṭiprōlu, Amarāvati, Nāgarjunikonda, and the western cave inscriptions are to be attributed to Buddhism and the commercial intercourse.35 Names of frequent occurrence are Siva, Sivakkha, Sivaguta, Sivadatta, Venhu, Cada, Sagha, Kaṇha, Buddha, Buddhakhrkhta, Buddhi, Sidhatha, Ananda, Damila,36 Dhanima etc., and names into the composition of which Nāga, Khada, and Sāti enter. Names of rare occurrence are Camunā, Campa, Campurā, Vicita, Khumbha, Dusaka, Ukati etc., (Amarāvati) and Mādavi (Allūru), Jebubhūti, Ahila,37 Kuḷīra Sayitī, Lachinikā, Juvārínikā, Apirenuka etc. in the western caves. Sometimes the names of places and objects of worship are borne by persons e.g., Caitya,38 Himala, and so on.39 As at Amarāvati and Nāgarjunikonda, culā and maḥā are prefixed to names in western Deccan. The usual suffixes are la, ka, ra, ma, maka, and da. Da is however only used for la e.g., Māmāḍa headquarters of Māmālähāra.40 On this analogy Sāmada, Harīghaḍa and Kāndada in an Amarāvati inscription are only Syāmala, Harīghala, and

34. They are Banava, Odāla, Apakara, (in an Amarāvati inscription of the second or the first century B.C., the name Apakū occurs. El, Vol. XV, No. 9, p. 264), Alīnaka, Ghālaka, Būha, Ghakhā, Cagha, (probably a form of Sagha), Chadikogha, etc. These are to all appearance un-Āryan names.
35. Vide infra.
36. Lüders renders Damila as Draviḍa, (List No. 1243). As la suffix to names is common in our epigraphs, e.g., Sapa-Sapila, Budha-Budhila, Pusa-Pusila. Dama is the name to start from. Sanskrit and Prākrit dama means 'patience'.
37. As Ahī means 'serpent' and la is a suffix, Ahila is identical with Sapila.
38. ASWI, Vol. IV, Junnar, No. 17, p. 95.
Kāṃdālā. The common name endings are anaka,41 mita, bhūti, deva, ralchita, etc. Some names are borne by ladies and men e.g., Kaṇha, Dhaṇṣma, Nāga, Sātimita, Sulasadatta, Buddhī, Sivapālīta, Sivadatta, and Sapīla. In Kuḍā No. 6, the sons of Sivama bear the names Sulasadatta, Sivapālīta, Sivadatta, and Sappila. His four daughters bear the same names.42 The practice of naming the grandsons after the grand-fathers was very common and it is noteworthy that ladies sometimes bear the names of their husband’s masters.43

Place Names

Many of the places mentioned in the western cave inscriptions can be identified. Govadhana (Govardhana), the headquarters of Govardhanāhāra, is the large modern village of Govardhan-Gaṅgāpur six miles west of Nāśik. Kāpura, the headquarters of Kāpurāhāra mentioned as a place where Uṣavadāta bestowed gifts on Brahmans, is, according to Bhandarkar, the Kāpura mentioned as the name of both the district and the headquarters on a copper-plate grant of the Traikūṭaka king Dharasena found at Pārdī in the Surat collectorate.44 Kāpura thus appears to correspond to the modern Surat district and was situated between the Sopārāga and Bharukaccha districts. It is possible that Kāpurāhāra and Kāpura are contraction for Kekāpurāhāra and Kekāpura mentioned also in an inscription of Uṣavadāta.45 Dāhanukānagara of Uṣavadāta’s inscriptions is the modern Dāhanu in Ṭhāṇa zillā. It would therefore seem to have derived its name from the river Dāhanukā, also mentioned in an inscription of Uṣavadāta.46 The various villages mentioned as having been situated in the Govadhanāhāra are Dhambhikagāma in the Nāśik subdivision, or a suburb of Nāśik, Piṣāji-

41. Burgess is of opinion that the explanation of the names Kapanānaka and Agiyatanaka (Nāśik No. 4, ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 99) is doubtful. As ‘anaka’ is a common name ending, kapana Sanskrit krpana is what we have to consider. Rapson thinks that Agiyatanaka is perhaps Sanskrit Āṇika-trātā the saviour of the Āṇgas (CIC, Andhras and Western Kṣatrāpas, etc.; xxii). It is more probable that ‘anaka’ is here as elsewhere a name ending, and Agiyata is a Prākrit form and condensation of Āṇiyatā Sanskrit Āṇika-trātā.

42. ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 85. However one son is called Sapīla, whilst the daughter bears the name Sapū.

43. Kuḍā, No. 9, CTI.

44. IA, Vol. XLVII, p. 78.

45. Lüders, List, No. 1135.

padaka on the south-west side of mount Tiranhu (Trirasi mi), and Sudisana on the southern road in the Govardhana district. The other places mentioned in Nasik inscriptions are Chakalepa, Pinditakavada, Suvaramukha, Ramatirtha near Soparaga, Cecini, Sacred, Anugami and Da Sapura. As regards Da Sapura mentioned in the inscriptions of Usavadata and Sakaka Vudhika, Senart says: “I see no means of choosing between the Da Sapura in Rajputana (Bühler), that in Malwa (Bhagwanlal), or others which might be added, as Mandaor, etc. In No. 26 we see that some Sakas dwelt in that place; this is at least a hint that it ought to be searched for towards the north.” D. R. Bhandarkar prefers Mandaor since Usavadata’s inscriptions mention places in the

47. Nasik, Nos. 12 and 20, EI, Vol. VIII.
48. As regards the two villages Senart remarks (EI, Vol. VIII, p. 65): “Bühler seems to entertain no doubt as to the identity of the village named here with that mentioned at the beginning of the following inscription. It is certain that the date of the donation mentioned there is exactly the same as in the present epigraph, and that this donation is made in favour of the same sect of Bhadayaniyas. It is above all evident from the place it occupies, and from the fact that the following text has been compressed in order that it might be inscribed here, that that place has been chosen intentionally. It must, however, be stated that the village called here Pisajipadaka, i.e., I suppose Piṣāchipadaka, gets in the following epigraph the name of Sudisana, and that the description is not identical in both texts, Pisajipadaka being located at the S. W. of Tiranhpavata, and Sudisana at the south of the Govadhanahara. The two may after all be the same; but the difference in the name and description deserves to be noted, especially because a perfect agreement would naturally be expected. Further N. 3 brings in the Śrāmanas from Dhanakata, who are not mentioned in connection with the donation which N. 2 records. It is therefore impossible to affirm that the beginning of N. 3 refers to the present donation; nor is it absolutely impossible that the king should have consented on the same day to a double donation, although it would, in that case, be difficult to understand why he should not have combined the mention of both.” It has already been shown that there can be no connection between No. 3 and No. 2 as one records an official grant while the other records a non-official grant. Even the grant of the village of Sudisana was an official grant as the recording of it in the archives of the state is implied in the words ‘Sud……na gāmasa ca Sudavanā vinibadhakārehi anatā’ (1.14). The non-mention of the previous donation in a separate inscription is of course inexplicable under the circumstances.

49. “Chhakalepa or Chhāgalepa, a village or a town, a region or clan; has not yet been identified…” (EI, Vol. VIII, p. 90). Lüders, List, Nos. 214, 477, 547, 626 and 937, make a place name more probable. On the analogy of Pārvatiya, Chākalepaka is more probable.

50. EI, Vol. VIII, p. 79.
pradaksīna order—Bharukacha, Dašapura, Govardhana, and Sopārāga. As Ujjain which was for some time the Śaka capital was included in Nahapāna’s kingdom, the choice is between Mandasor near Ujjain and Dašapura in Malwa.

The places mentioned in the Junnar inscriptions which from the context of the inscriptions would seem to have been near the caves are Puvānadagāma, Konācika Vādālikā, the village of Mahāveja, the village of Seuraka. Kapcītā would seem to be the name of the locality in which the cave containing the Junnar inscription No. 15 is situated.51 Mānaṃukāḍa is the Mānmōḍī hill.

As regards Māmāḍa and Māmālāhāra52 mentioned in Kārlā inscription Burgess remarks: “The name Māmāla is evidently the ancient form of the modern Māval (Māul): the change of medial ma to va is common in Marāṭhi; Māval being still the name of the tract along the Sāhyādri or Ghāṭ range, fully corresponds with the position of the ancient Māmāla. We have thus another proof that the lapse of two thousand years has not changed much the geographical names of Western India and its territorial divisions.”53 Vāluraka mentioned as village in Māmālāhāra designates, according to Burgess and Senart, the modern village of Kārlā a few miles from the caves. It is probable that Vīhārāgaon which the caves overlook designates Vāluraka.

The places mentioned in the eastern inscriptions are however difficult of identification. Velagiri mentioned in the Jagayyapēṭa inscriptions would designate the modern village of Jagayyapēṭa, probably deriving its name from the hill on which the ruins of Stūpa complex stand. Toḍatūra of the same inscriptions was situated in the Kammākaraṭha. Mahākaṃḍurūra would seem to have been outside Kammākaraṭha as unlike Toḍatūra it is not stated to be in the Kammākaraṭha.54 The places mentioned at Amarāvati are Hiralūra, Kevurura, Kudūra, Turulūra,55 Devaparavana, Mahava (i)-nasa (e) la, Mahemkhānāja, Narasa (se) la, Maindara and Rājagiri. The last mentioned would seem to be identical with Rāyasela; Virapura of the same inscriptions may be the Viripara of the Mayidavōlu

53. ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 113, n. 4.
54. The situation Kammākaraṭha has been discussed in the chapter on the Ikṣvākus.
plates. As Chadaka is mentioned twice at Amaravati, and as Chadapavata is mentioned once in a Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription, they must not be far away from Amaravati and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. A feature to be noted is the _ura_ and _sela_ ending in names. Amongst divisions may be mentioned Toînpuki (?) district, Caraṭha and Aya-Sakasaṭhi in which Suvarṇamukha was.

**Military Arrangements**

An Amaravati inscription of the third century B.C., speaks of a _Senāgopā_ Mudukutala. In later times _Mahāsenāpatis_ would sometimes seem to have been in charge of armies. The traditional fourfold division of the army mentioned in the Hāṭhīgumphā inscription of Khāravela, obtained in the Sātavāhana dominions. An Amaravati rail pillar shows vividly the art of war and military organization of these times. Cities were well defended with high walls, ramparts and gates. Walls and gateways were often built of brick and mortar and the gateways were surmounted by _toranās_ as at Sāncī. In battle the foot soldiers armed with round shields, and short swords, with a band round their abdomen intended to protect them from the enemy’s spears, led the army. The infantry was flanked by the cavalry and elephants and the rear was brought up by bowmen. Soldiers used sometimes long spears. The battle-axe is little different from that used in mediaeval and modern times. Mallets also were used. While the cavalrymen and elephant drivers have turbans, the foot-soldiers have no turban. Does this indicate a higher status enjoyed by the cavalrymen and elephantmen?

**II. Economic Conditions**

**Foreign Trade: Seaports: Eastern Ports**

The eastern and western ports in the Sātavāhana empire were throbbing with trade, though the former were not either as many or as important as the latter. To take the eastern Deccan first, Ptolemy notes that Kantakossyla (Kaṇṭakasela of epigraphic records), Koddūra (modern Gūḍūr in the Bandar taluq of the Kṛṣṇā district), and Allosyagne were ports in the Maisūlia region which, according to the author of the _Periplus_, ‘stretched a great way along

---

56. Lüders, _List_, No. 1339.
   Lüders looks upon it as the name of a committee.
58. Lüders, _List_, No. 1303, and EJ, Vol. XX, Nāgārjunikoṇḍa Inscriptions, F.
the coast before the inland country'.

59. North of Allosygne was Apheterion, the starting-point of ships bound for Golden Chryse, i.e., Farther India, the Malay Peninsula and the Archipelago. A stūpa pillar fragment bearing an inscription of the time of Siri-Yaṅa Satakaṇi was found at Chinna Ganjam (Repalle taluq, Guntur district) near the sea-shore. A fragment of a stūpa pillar was also found at Kollitippa a few miles to the north of Chinna Ganjam. In the vicinity of Chinna Ganjam, Rea found the remains of three stūpas. As Jouveau-Dubreuil has pointed out, an inscription dated Śaka 1166 mentions Mōṭupalāla as a port, and Mōṭupalāla is only three miles to the north-east of Chinna Ganjam. It is therefore highly probable that Mōṭupalāla or its vicinity contained a port or ports through which a part of the trade of the Maisōlia region flowed. And the Maisōlia region was also located between two great navigable rivers. Lower down the Maisōlia region also, there would seem to have been ports though their names have not been preserved. Coins bearing the device of ship with masts and the legends, 'sāmi Pu (lumā) visa' and coins with sīna device bearing the legends, 'sāminsa s (i)r (i)' have been picked up on the Coromandel Coast between Madras and Cuddalore. Rapson remarks: "The maritime traffic to which the type 'a Ship,' whether on Andhra, Pallava or Kurumbar coins, bears witness, is also attested by the large numbers of Roman coins which are found on the Coromandel Coast." Regarding the migration of the Hindu colonists to the Far East in the first century of the Christian era and later, Prof. Nilakanta Sastri remarks "...it seems... probable that the movement towards the East was the work of the entire coastal tract on the eastern coast of the modern Presidency of Madras, and that the Andhra Country in general, and the Kingdom of Vēngi with it, had a good share in this movement." Krom re-

59. The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, ed. Schoff, Sec. 62.


61. The inscription mentions the remission of taxes on articles of export and import at the harbour of Mōṭupalāla alias Bisuyuyakondapatiṇa. Nos. 601 and 602 mention a concession given to merchants at sea.

62. Regarding the coin G. P. 3, Pl. CIC, Andhras and Western Kṣatra-pas etc., Rapson reads '— (—) Pu (—) '. Says he (p. 24): "The restoration īu seems possible, but by no means certain." The two obliterated letters before pu are sa and ma. After īu there are traces of ma. We have then 'sāmi-Pu(ū)sa' (sa)র. Regarding G. P. 2, Pl. V. Rapson reads sara[—-] (X) Samisa. The more plausible way of reading the legends is Samisa Sīri—."

63. Telugu Academy Silver Jubilee Volume (English Sec.) p. 11.

H.A.—14
marks: “We understand from Vogel’s study, that the history of the Pallava princes first attains prominence at a time which must be considerably later than the first setting out of the Hindus towards the east; direct connection between the data here and those from the other side is not thus to be expected.” Again: “What we know of the history the Pallavas concerns the later fortunes of a land which must have served as the starting-point for the trade voyages of the Hindus towards the East; they do not relate to that period when such expeditions had their beginning. We are thus at a time much earlier than Sivaskandavarman, and it is wholly uncertain if the dynasty or the kingdom of the Pallavas in general can be taken to a time earlier than the fourth century; and none can guarantee that the Pallava script was begun by the Pallavas or during their rule and had not received earlier the characteristic traits which distinguish it from other scripts. . . . We must leave open the possibility that the ‘Pallava’ script was brought to foreign lands not from the Pallava kingdom itself but from a kingdom which preceded it in the same locality.”

Western Ports

According to the author of the Periplus Barygaza, the Bharukacha of a Junnar inscription and modern Broach, and at his time a Saka port, was the northern-most port in the Dachinabades. Its imports and exports so graphically described by him are: Italian, Laodician and Arabian wine, copper, tin, lead, coral, topaz, fine and rough cloth, storax, sweet clover, flint, glass, realgar, antimony; gold and silver coin, “on which there is a profit when exchanged for the money of the country,” and small quantities of ointments. For the use of the Saka Satraps were brought very costly vessels of silver, fine wines, beautiful maidens of the harem, thin clothing of the finest weaves, and the choicest ointments. The exports were spikenard, costus, bdellium, ivory, agate, cornelian, lyctium, silk cloth, mallow cloth, long pepper; and “such other things as are brought from the various market-towns.” He adds: “Those bound for this market-town from Egypt make the voyage favourably about the month of July, that is Epiphi.” The inland commer-

64. Ibid., pp. 10-11.
65. No. 19, ASWI, Vol. IV. It records the foundation of a two-celled cave by the brothers Buddhmita and Buddharkhita (Buddhist) of the Lankaudiyas, and sons of Asasama (Asvasarman), the Bharukachas.
cial entrepots from which streams of trade flowed to Barygaza are Ozene, Paethan and Tagara. To quote the author of the Periplus: “There are brought down to Barygaza from these places by waggons and through great tracts without roads, from Paethana carnelian in great quantity and, from Tagara much common cloth, all kinds of muslins and mallow cloth, and other merchandise brought there locally from the regions along the sea-coast.”

Tagara has been identified by Dr. Fleet with modern Tër or Thair. The question arises, why

69. JRAS, 1901, pp. 537 ff.

Bhagwanlal Indraji identified Tagara with modern Junnar, IA, Vol. XIII, p. 366. Fleet has identified it with Tër on the following grounds: Tër or Thair represents a variation of Tagara which is mentioned under that name in two Silahara records (EI., Vol. III, pp. 267 and 273, II. 43-44, and CTI, pp. 102-103, II. 26-27); the author of the Periplus says that Tagara is nine days’ journey from Paithān. As Paithān is twenty days’ journey from Broach, and Tër is half as distant from Paithān as Paitān is from Broach, there can be no objection to the identification; modern Tër is as big a town as Paithān.

Fleet continues (p. 548): “A study of the maps has shown me the former existence of an early trading route, of which well-marked traces still remain, from the east coast through Golconda or Haidarābād, Tër and Paitān, to Broach……. There were two starting-points. One was Masulipatam, on the coast, in the northern part of the Kistna district; and the road from this place took, not only the local traffic from the coast districts, on the north of the Kṛṣṇā but also the sea-borne traffic from the far east. The other starting point was probably Vinukonda, inland, in the southern part of the same district, which would serve admirably as a collecting centre for the local products of the sea-side country on the south of Kṛṣṇā.

The roads from these two places joined each other at a point about twenty-six miles towards the east-by-south from Haidarābād, or perhaps at a point about twenty-three miles further in the same direction. And from that point the single road ran in the most natural manner, through easy country via Haidarābād, Kālyānī, Tër, Paithan and Daulatabād, to ‘Chandore’ and Mārkaṇḍa in the west of the Nāsīk district. And only there, in the Western Ghauts …….. commenced the real difficulties of the journey…….”

According to the author of the Periplus most of the seaport towns, especially Barygaza, were connected with inland market-towns like Paethana, and Tagara by great tracts without roads; and waggons drawn by bullocks could do only twenty miles a day. This might have been the case. But the difficult nature of the country described has to be taken into account. Nāsīk official records speak of roads. We have the benefactions of the nāsīk at Barhut of Vaijayantī at Kārlā, of Bharukaccha and Kālyān at Junnar, of Sopāra at Nānēghāt and Kārlā. Ugavādāta’s constant and wide pilgrimages in the north-western parts are well-known. It is therefore
should goods from Tagara and Paethan be sent to a distant port like Barygaza, in preference to the ports of Kalyan and Sopara which were less distant. Was it because as the author of the Periplus himself says the Sakas had closed the port (Sattavahana port) of Kalyan? According to the author of the Periplus again from Ozene were brought to Barygaza all things needed for foreign trade,—agate, cornelian, Indian muslins, mallow cloth, and much ordinary cloth.

Below Barygaza stood the Sattavahana port of Sopara, the Soupara of Ptolemy, the Supara of the Periplus, the Soupara or Suparaga of epigraphic records and modern Sopara, a few miles to the north of Bombay. Of the two Kanhiri records which mention the place, one mentions a jeweller and the other a merchant from Sopara. The Sagarapaloganas (?) of a Kanhiri inscription70 are probably the sea-faring traders at Kalyan or Sopara.

Sopara would seem to have been a port of great antiquity. It is mentioned as Suparapattana in the Mahavansa.71 The early Buddhist story of Puramaitra speaks of Soupara as a great seaport and the residence of a king Purma, a very prosperous merchant of the city, who had made several successful voyages in the great ocean. The Buddha is said to have visited the town and preached his law to two Naga kings there. Puramaitra Yaniputra built a vihara to the Buddha.72 There are at Sopara even to-day the remains of Buddhist Stupa.73 Jaina literature and the Ramayana also mention Sopara.74

The greatest port in Sattavahana western Deccan was Kalyan, on the eastern shore of the Bombay harbour, the Kaliana of inscriptions and the Calliense of the Periplus.75 Of the two Junnar inscriptions mentioning Kalyan, one records gifts by a trader and the other gifts by a goldsmith, from Kalyan. Of the seven inscriptions at

probable that the less mountainous country was covered with roads whilst in the mountainous regions only great tracts without roads were found possible.

70. ASWI, Vol. V, No. 23.
71. VI, 1. 46. The Mahavansa is not older than the fifth century A.D. But it embodies earlier tradition.
73. Antiquities of Sopara, by Bhagwanlal Indraji, pp. 4 ff.
74. Ibid.
75. The various forms in inscriptions are Kaliana, Junnar Nos. 11 and 13, ASWI, Vol. IV; Kalyana, Kanheri No. 15; Kaliana, Kanheri No. 5; Kaliana, Kanheri No. 18; Kalyana, Kanheri No. 25; ASWI, Vol. V. These are Prakrit variations of Kalyana meaning 'blest'.

Kaṅhēri mentioning the port, four record gifts by merchants or their sons, and two record gifts by artisans (goldsmith and blacksmith). It is clear that Kalyān was a prosperous trading and industrial centre. This is also known from the fact that the Śakas captured it with a view to destroy the resources of their enemies, the Sātavāhānas. Of the three dated inscriptions at Kaṅhēri two are dated in regnal years of Mādhāripūta Sakasena and one in the regnal years of Siri-Yāna Sātakaṇi (after 160 A.D.). Could we infer that as the port was closed by the Śakas in the closing years of the first century A.D. it was not functioning as a port when Ptolemy wrote, and that it regained its old position in the reigns of Māḍharipūta Sakaṇa and Siri-Yāna? As late as the sixth century A.D. Cosmas Indicopleustes found it one of the five chief marts of western India and the capital of the powerful Cāḷukya kings with a trade in brass, blackwood logs, and articles of clothing.

The other ports mentioned by the author of the Perīplus and Ptolemy and identified with places in the Sātavāhana western Deccan are: Mandagora (Mandaragirī) identified with Bānkot at the mouth of the Sāvitrī river, and now a fishing village of no importance; Palaepatmae (Ptolemy's Balipatna) probably modern Dābhola; Melizagara (Malayagirī) placed by McCrindle and Müller at the modern Jaigarh, formerly a port of importance but now little more than a fishing village, and by Schoff at the modern Rājpūr near which the Kuḍā caves are situated; Simylla (the Symulla of Ptolemy, the Chimulo of Yuan Chwang and the Cemula of two Kaṅhēri inscriptions),76 certainly modern Chāul about twenty-five miles south of the Bombay harbour; Hippokura,77 which Campbell would identify with Ghoregaon in Kolāba; and Byzantion identified with Vijayadurga the south entrance of the Vāghotan river.78

Market-towns in the interior: Western Deccan

The market-towns in the interior besides Paithān and Tagara were Junnar,79 Karahākaṇa,80 Nāsik,81 Govardhana,82 and Vejayantī.83

76. Lüders, List, Nos. 996 and 1033.
77. Hippokura is not mentioned in the Perīplus. It is however different from the capital of Bāleokuros mentioned by Ptolemy. The latter is an inland town.
78. IA, Vol. XIII, p. 327.
79, 80, 81, 82 & 83. The inscriptions at Junnar refer to a town near the caves, and Junnar is situated in a pass in the Western Ghāṭs, which is on
Eastern Deccan

The market towns in the eastern Deccan would seem to have been not as many or as important as those in the western Deccan. Even as early as the third or the second century B.C., Dhaññakañaka was a market-town. In some Amarāvati inscriptions Kevurūra, Vijayapura and Nārasala (sela?) are mentioned as the residence of merchants. Lüders, No. 1261 mentions a seṭhipamukha and a member of a guild of merchants from Cadden.

Merchants

Merchants are generally all called vanija or negama. A member of a guild of merchants is known as nigama; the alderman of the guild is called seṭhin (Sans. śreṣṭhin). Sathavāha (Sans. Sārtha- vāha) means ‘caravan trader’. The wife of a vanija is called vaniyinī, and the wife of a sathavāha, a sātakavāhinī.

the line of communication through the Nāneghat pass to the ports in the west. Moreover in the Junnar caves a number of senis or guilds are mentioned. The traveller’s rest house at Nāneghat shows undoubtedly that much trade flowed through it. A Sopāraga executed a cistern at Nāneghat hill (Lüders, List, No. 1119) called the Satagara mountain in another inscription. ((JBBRAS, Vol. XV, pp. 513 ff). (80) Modern Karākh 70 miles from Mahā. It is mentioned as a nigama in a Barhut inscription (Cunningham, Stūpa of Barhut, p. 13, No. 16); it is mentioned also in a Kuḍā inscription as the residence of an ironmonger (ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 87, No. 18). (81) A Bēḍā inscription speaks of a seṭhi from Nāsim (ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 89 No. 1). (82) An inscription of Uṣavadāsa mentions a number of guilds, and the guildhall (nigamasabha) at Govadhana (Nāsim No. 12, EI, Vol. VIII). (83) Vide supra.

84. The inscription (No. 1261) runs as follows: “Cadakicēsa seṭhipamukha (bha)-daniga (ma)sā sūci dāna.” Lüders translates it as follows: “the gift of a rail bar by the pious town Chadakica.” On the analogy of Junnar No. 4 (ASWI, Vol. IV) where Virasenaka is a personal name and dhāmmanigama has therefore to be interpreted as ‘the member of Buddhist guild of merchants’ as pointed out by Senart, bhadānigama has to be interpreted as ‘members of a Buddhist guild merchant.’ Chadakicēsa would then mean ‘native of Chadaka’ and seṭhipamukha prominent among the seṭhis’. Instances of the omission of the personal name in votive inscriptions are not wanting.

85. In Lüders, List, No. 987, both vaniṣaka and negama are used in such a way as to show that they had identical meaning.

86. Ibid., No. 30.
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS

In our epigraphs merchants bear the title of gahapati, gahata (Sansk. grhasta) being a title applied to Brahmans who had passed the pupil or the Brahmacarya stage. According to Senart the use of gahapati (Sansk. grhapatī) in Nāsik No. 6 “favours the opinion I have formerly stated, and which I must maintain against the doubts that have been raised by a learned opponent (Fick, Sociale Gliederung zu Buddha’s Zeit, p. 164), viz. that grhapatī is, in the Buddhist language, specially restricted to people of various castes, who are included in the large class of Vaiśyas.” In the Saptāśataśānaśa we have references to the philandering of the gahapati with a girl of the hālīka class; a Śailārvaṇḍi inscription mentions a hālākiya (cultivator) kuṭubīka Uṣabaṇḍaka whose son is called gahapati. In Kaṅhēri No. 15 and Nāsik No. 6, the wives of negamas are called kuṭumbinīs. Therefore kuṭumbinī and gahapati are identical titles applied to persons of the cultivator class also. In Nāsik Nos. 11 and 13, the wife of Rṣabhadatta styles herself kuṭumbinī. Does this show that the word also meant wife, or does it show that the Kṣatriyas also styled themselves as kuṭubin and kuṭubinī? Later on kuṭubin came to mean ‘cultivator.’ A point against Senart’s conclusion is that in the Ama-ravati inscriptions many a gahapati and merchant is mentioned, yet we have only one instance of the father of a vāṇīya bearing the title of gahapati, but even here the latter is not styled a vāṇīya. In the western cave inscriptions too, not all the merchants bear the title of gahapati.

Coins and Trade

If the state of trade, internal and external, can be judged by the coinage i.e., by the variety and number of coins used or issued, it would appear that western Deccan throbbed most with trade and industry during the period of the early Sātavāhanas (third and second centuries B.C.), and during the first period of Kṣatrapa occupation (first century). The Nāneghāṭ inscription of queen Nāyanikā describes the daksīṇas given on the occasion of the various sacrifices performed by the queen and her husband Siri-Sātakaṇi I. They are 1700 cows and 10 elephants, 11000 cows, 1000 horses, 17

87. Ibid., 1091.
88. II, 7, vi, 100.
89. CTI, No. 1, p. 38.
91. Does it indicate that she was a laic?
silver pots and 14000 kārṣāpanaś, one horse chariot, 30002 cows, silver ornaments and dresses, 1100 cows on three occasions, 1000 cows on four occasions, 40001 kārṣāpanaś on three occasions, 12 golden.........?, and 14000 (?) kārṣāpanaś etc. As for the first period of Kṣatrapa occupation, do we not possess a hoard of Nahapāna’s silver coins? Does not Usavadāta endow large sums of money, viz., 70,000 kārṣāpanaś and 3000 kārṣāpanaś? The vast trade of the period is also indicated by the other charities of Usavadāta. Some may be inclined to look upon them as the results of oppressive taxation or successful wars.

We have not a single Sātavāhana coin of the period from the first century B.C. to the reign of Gotamiputa Sīrī-Śatakaṇi (end of the first century A.D.). Even the latter only restruck the coins of Nahapāna unless it be that some copper coins attributed by Rapson doubtfully to him, were struck by him. Even among the coins of the later Sātavāhanas from western India, we have more coins from the Chanda district (Central Provinces), than from Mahārāṣṭra, and Aparānta.

Eastern Deccan where lead coinage predominates over copper and where not even a single silver coin has been picked up, would seem to have entered upon an epoch of great commercial and industrial activity during the reign of Pulumāvi II, an activity which reached its culminating point in the reign of Śiri-Yañā. Pulumāvi issued $\frac{1}{6}$; $\frac{1}{4}$; $\frac{3}{8}$; $\frac{1}{2}$; $\frac{1}{8}$; $\frac{3}{4}$; $\frac{7}{8}$; 1, kārṣāpanaś. The reign of Śiri-Yañā not only saw the issue of a large number of coins which an empire from sea to sea demanded, but a correspondingly larger issue in the Andhradeśa than in the western Deccan. In addition to coins of the denominations already mentioned 1½, and

92. Rapson has pointed out that the kārṣāpanaś of this inscription, as well as those of Kānheri No. 15 (ASWI, Vol. V) and Nāsik inscriptions of Usavadāta, are silver kārṣāpanaś. CIC, Andhras and Western Kṣatrapas, etc., clxxxiii, n. 1. The ratio was 35 kārṣāpanaś to one Suvanra.

93. Nāsik Nos. 10, 12 and 14a, El, Vol. VIII.

94. The Allūru inscription which is a composite record of gifts, mentions an investment of 1000 kārṣāpanaś as permanent endowment. As this is mentioned along with a gift of 53, 32, and 24 nivartanaś of land and 500 cows, 64 bullock carts, some Greek lamps and a tank, it is all but certain that only silver kārṣāpanaś are meant. It must be noted that this is the only inscription where a kārṣāpana is called puraṇa or old coin.

95. 1/16 is more probable than 1/12, as the other denominations follow the division into 16, and as an inscription at Nāgārjunikondā mentions dināri-māṣakas. Māṣaka is the weight five ratis and 16 māṣakas=1 kārṣa,
1¾, kārṣāpaṇas were issued, an indication of increased trade. Māḍhariputa Sakasena’s and Caḍha Sāti’s reigns did not witness such varied and large issues. The large lead and potin coins from Kolhāpur, also attest a busy trade in the south-western part of the empire which was left under feudatories.

**Industrial and Commercial Organization**

The inscriptions introduce us to various classes of workers—dharmikas (corn-dealers), mālākāras (florists), kolikas (weavers), tilapiṣakas (oilpressers), odayantrikas (fabricators of hydraulic engines), kāsākāras (braziers), tesakāras (polishers), kamāras (iron-workers), lōhavāṇīyas (iron-mongers), kularikas (potters?), avesanis (artisans), and lekhalakas (writers) some of whom were in the service of kings and Mahābhhojas, Cāṇmakāras (leather-workers), gadhikas (perfumers), suvanākāras (goldsmiths), maṇi kāras (jewellers), mithikas (stonemasons), selavadhakins (stonemasons), and vadhakis (carpenters). Workers connected with buildings are nāyakamisās, kaḍhikakas, and mahākaṭakas. Among these workers only gadhikas, kammakāras, avesanis and lekhalakas, are mentioned in epigraphs from the eastern Deccan.

Most of these craftsmen were as well-to-do as the craftsmen of the Middle Ages. Their artistic taste was something unsurpassed. It is to their munificence that we owe some of the Buddhist monuments of our period.

---

96. It is here necessary to bear in mind the remark of Rapson that: "... it is important to insist on the fact that any supposed uniformity in the weight-standards of the ancient coins of India appears on examination to be quite illusory. It is impossible to read the various passages quoted from Sanskrit authors in the Vācaspatya Dictionary, s.v. 'kāṛṣa,' without realising that the diversity of weights may have been very considerable. This diversity seems certainly also to be proved by the actual specimens, many of which cannot, in the present state of our knowledge, be satisfactorily assigned to any particular denomination." (op. cit., lxxxii).

97. "For kularika at least I see nothing better than Bühler's conjecture, taking it to be, kulāla = 'a potter'." Senert, EI, Vol. VIII, p. 89.

98. According to Bühler, kaḍhikaka may be the Gujarati kaḍhiyo=brick-layer.

99. A gadhika has lavished all his art on an Amarāvati pillar (TSW, 1868 Pl. LXXXIX).

100. Mugudāsa, a fisherman (dāsa), excavates a cave at Nāsik (Nāsik Nos. 8 and 9, EI, Vol. VIII). As the donation of one cave is mentioned in two epigraphs Senart thinks that the word lenā in No. 9, points no more to the verandah but "to the cell which the same donor Mugudāsa, must have
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Some and perhaps most of the crafts and trades mentioned above were organized into guilds. We hear of a Dhamānikaseṇī, a Kāsākāraseni, and a Tesakāraseni in Junnar inscriptions; Kolikani-kāyasenī at Govardhana; of a Kūlarikaseṇī, a Tilapiṣakaseṇī, and an Odayantrikaseṇī we hear in an inscription from Nāsik. Each guild had an alderman called seṭhin (śreṣṭhin). Guilds had their office in the town-hall or nigamasabhā. Uṣavadāta’s investment in guilds were read (srāvita), and registered in the nigamasabhā.

Permanent endowments, especially in favour of religious institutions were sometimes invested in fields, and sometimes in these guilds. Since Uṣavadāta invests some of his religious charities in guilds, does it mean that the guilds were looked upon as very stable organizations, as stable, if not more so than the government?

In India the rate of interest is stated monthly. Some of our western cave inscriptions show conformity to this method. A Junnar inscription mentions investment of money in two guilds at the rate of paṇadukakā maṣa in one guild and at the rate of paṇ maṣa in the other. Uṣavadāta invested two thousand kāṛṣaṇas in one weaver’s guild at Govardhana, at the rate of pratika per cent (12% per annum), and 1000 kāṛṣaṇas in another weaver’s guild at the same place at ¾ pratika per cent (9%). But the normal rate of interest would seem to have been 12 per cent per annum. Guilds were, like the goldsmiths of the Middle ages in Europe, bankers receiving deposits and lending out money.

Land

In the Sātavāhana empire, as in India at all times, agriculture was the main industry. Western and eastern inscriptions record added to his cave. This interpretation seems the more tempting as the second donation has for its object, to supply with clothes the pavažīta, i.e., the monk residing in the cell. But in our epigraphs there is not a single instance of the confusion between leṇa and ovaṇaka; and the money for clothes is to be applied to the monk or monks living in the cave. It is possible that while making another donation for monks, the previous donation was recapitulated.

101. Lüders translates seṭhin as ‘banker’.
102. A Bhāṭṭiprōḷu inscription mentions a negama (guild), and a number of persons, the members of the guilds. (EI, Vol. II, No. VIII d.)
103. Akḥayanīci. We do not hear of permanent endowments in the Amartañji, Jagayyapēta and Nāgārjunikondā inscriptions. The Allūru inscription however mentions it.
104. Manu, VIII, v. 141.
gifts of villages and fields (for cultivation and plantation of trees) to monastic institutions. The king had what in the Middle Ages was called the royal domain. The king did not expropriate the lands of the subjects but bought them, even when whole villages were granted to monastic institutions.

Sometimes the field was possessed by more than one person; the share of each person in the field was specified in fractions of a pāṇa. A Kanhaeri inscription mentions the owner of an ādhapāṇa-khetā.

Land was subject to more than one tax. Salt was a royal monopoly.

III. Religion

Buddhism in Eastern Deccan

The stūpas at Allurū, Gummadidurru, Ghaṇṭaśālā, Bhaṭṭiprōḷu, Ghulivāḍa, and Göli, and the Amaravati sculptures and epigraphs give us in their own way the history of Buddhism in Āṇḍhradeśa from the second century B.C. to the third century A.D. Much credence may not be placed in the story that the Buddha miraculously visited the Āṇḍhradeśa. As Āṇḍhradeśa is not mentioned among the countries to which monks were sent by Tissa after the Third Council and as the Bhaṭṭiprōḷu inscriptions show that even before 200 B.C. Āṇḍhradeśa had become a stronghold of Buddhism, it is very probable that it embraced Buddhism long before the time of the Third Council and the reign of Asoka. It is also probable that Buddhism spread more quickly among the non-Aryan Āṇḍhra tribes than in Aryan societies. A feature of Bhaṭṭiprōḷu Buddhism is the worship of the relics of the Buddha (sarīra) placed in crystal caskets which were in turn placed in stone caskets. The faithful in each village organised themselves into groups e.g. Śīhagoṭhī, Aya-Sakasaṭhigoṭhī etc.

The objects of worship at Amarāvatī are the stūpas, small and big, the sacred tree with the empty throne, the footprints (pāḍuka) of the great teacher on a stool in front of the throne, the trīśūla

110. EI, Vol. VIII, Nāsik Nos. 3, 4, and 5.
113. The footmarks of the Buddha have been objects of worship among
emblem,114 the Dhanimacakka on a pillar with an empty throne before it, relics of the Buddha and great teachers, Sothikapataś (sans. Svastikapattaś),115 the Buddha or Nāga Rājā with the snake hoods above his head, life size statues of the Buddha, and the Buddha preaching. These objects of worship are often found in the open and sometimes in the midst of a hall with caitya arches and rail pattern bands.116 To these objects of worship offerings of cloth, flowers and liquids, brought in vessels of attractive shapes were made by the rich and the poor, young and old, men and women. Pilgrimages to Buddhist centres would seem to have been the order of the day. Men and women are represented in sculptures as being in ecstatic devotion. The common way of worshipping is kneeling before the object with joined hands. Sometimes it is falling flat on the ground.

The Nāga cult in Buddhism is also noteworthy. Serpents are represented as entwining stūpas. Nāgas and Nāga Rājās and their wives are represented as worshipping the stūpa and hearing the sermons of the master. Both at Amarāvati and Nāgārjunakonda, the Buddha is represented as seated on Nāgās with their hoods just above his head. As there is no halo behind these figures, and as Nāgas are sometimes represented on stūpa slabs, in the place of the Buddha preaching, as the figures under mention have turbans and

his followers from very early times. "And special representations of it supposed to have been left by the Buddha himself as that on Adam's Peak in Ceylon were objects of pilgrimage. And the legends that enumerate the thirty-two marks of personal beauty or superiority ascribed to the Buddha, specially mention two beautiful brilliant wheels (cakra) with a thousand rays on the soles of his feet." But though the essential feature in the representation of this footprint called caraṇa-nīyāsa or Śākyan-carana is the cakra on the middle of the sole, there were almost always others also and in the eastern peninsula they have been multiplied largely. The Saṭṭaśatakaṁ speaks of the worship of the feet of the Buddha (g. 308).

114. Regarding the triśūla emblem and the pillar supporting it Burgess says (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 30): "The sides of the pillar supporting the triśūla are always represented as in flames, and, as Mr. Fergusson has remarked, this seems to be the counterpart of the Agni-liṅga of Śiva." An examination of the sculptures shows clearly that what is taken to represent flames, is only a representation of twisted cloth, much like that worn by men round their waist and hanging from the top of the pillar. In one of the sculptures (TSW, 1865 Pl. LVIII, No. 2) offerings of cloth to the tree is represented.

115. In the Bhaṭṭiprōlu Stūpa 24 silver coins arranged in the Svastika shape were found along with other relics. (Rea, South Indian Buddhist Antiquities, Pl. IV, p. 12).

no upper cloth, it is probable that they are Nāga Rājjas. One is
tempted to identify them with Nāgārjuna, but the snake cult was so
widely prevalent in these parts that such an interpretation must re-
main doubtful until fresh evidence turns up. As we shall see, any
supposed connection between Nāgārjuna P'usa and the Andhradeśa
of the second century A.D., is open to doubt.

Western Deccan

The earliest Buddhist remains from western Deccan come from
Pitalkhorā and Kolhāpur. The former has yielded us a number of
caves and epigraphs which palaeographically belong to the third
century B.C., and which record the gifts of Buddhists from Paithān
and other places. (The most prominent among the donors is a
royal physician). The Kolhāpur Stūpa has yielded a stone box
and relic casket on the square lid of which is cut in pure Maurya
characters (earlier than the Pitalkhorā inscription), the inscription:

_Banḥasa dānaṁ
Dhamayutena kāritaṁ._

In one of his former births the Buddha is said to have gone to
Suppāra, in Aparānta or north Koṅkan, at the request of Pūrṇa, the
son of a slave girl, who had risen to be one of the chief merchants of
Suppāra; then a Brahman and some widows got relics over which
they built a Stūpa.

Bhagwanlal Indraji has excavated the remains of a Stūpa at
Sopāra. According to the _Mahāvaṁśa_ and a Nāgārjunikoṇḍa ins-
cription, Aparānta was converted by a missionary Dhammarakhita,
a Yavana sent by Tissa after the Third Council. Pitalkhorā and
Kolhāpur show that Buddhism had made rapid strides in western
Deccan even before the Third Council. Next in age to Pitalkhorā
come Nāsik, Bhājā, and Będā. The Kārlā Cāitya cave belongs to
the first century B.C. It is however the first and second centuries
A.D. that constitute the glorious epoch of Buddhism in the western
Deccan. Kings patronised various sects. Rival powers vied with
each other in scooping vihāras or caves at Nāsik, and in making
grants of villages, lands, and money to monks spending the _vassa_
in such caves. _Mahābhhojas, Mahārāṭhis_, ministers, and minor officials,
merchants, craftsmen and ladies of all rank and denominations, vied
with one another in making donations to the order. Monks and
nuns vied with laymen in donating caves, cisterns, _cāityas_, stūpa-
marbles and permanent endowments.117 They readily joined with

117. Kaphēri Nos. 17 and 21, ASWI, Vol. V.
laymen in such enterprises. No less than six monks and nuns joined hands with Yavanas and laymen from Vejayanti, Nasik, etc., in constructing the Kārlā Cetiyaḥghara. Were these expenses met from the savings effected out of the cloth money and the kuśānamūla given to them? Did enterprising monks who were enjoined to beg for alms only, go about collecting money for such pious works? Whatever might have been the case, the possession of money by monks and nuns was evidence of relaxation of the rigid rules of the Order. The Buddhist monuments at Kuḍā, Mahāṭ, Kol, Bhājā, Bēḍsā, Kārlā, Junnar, Nasik, and Kaṇhēri are such donations. A Kaṇhēri inscription mentions the construction of a Cetiyaḥghara, upathāṇasālā (hall of reception), three cells in the Abālikāvihāra at Kalyāṇ, a Cetiyaḥghara and thirteen cells at some vihāra at Pati-thāṇa, a kuṭi (temple), and a koḍhi (hall) at Rājatalāka in Paithāṇapatha, and a saṅghārama at the vihāra at Sadasevājū (?) 118

Sects: Buddhist Sects in Western Deccan

Our epigraphs introduce us to a number of sects. The Bhadāyaniyas were the most favoured at Nasik and at Kaṇhēri. Dhammottariyas flourished at Sopāra and in the town near the Junnar caves. The Mahāśāṅghikas had their stronghold at Kārlā and its vicinity. Both Bhadāyaniya and Dhammottariya are subdivisions of the Theravāda school. In two Junnar inscriptions we have Sidha-gaṇēṣu Aparājītesu and Apaṇītesu gaṇe.119 Apaṇītesu is evidently a mistake of the scribe or the engraver for Aparājītesu. Siddha-gaṇa denotes a holy assembly. Another Junnar inscription120 mentions a gaṇicārya. As in our inscriptions teachers are generally mentioned with reference to sects,121 gaṇa of the inscriptions under reference also refers to a school or sect. The Aparājīta sect is not mentioned in the books.

It does not however mean that only one sect flourished at a place or in a group of caves. Caitikas flourished at Nasik, and Uśavādāta's inscriptions show that monks of different sects kept the vassa in the same cave. We know that Mahiśāsakas, Bahusutiyas, Aparmahāvīnaselīyās and Ceylonese monks and nuns lived in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa valley. A preacher of the Dhammottariya sect donates

118. Lüders, List, No. 988.
120. No. 17.
a pillar of the Kārlā Cetiyaṅghara which would seem to have been the property of the Mahāsāṃghikas.

Unlike Gotamīputa Siri-Satakanī and Puḷumāvi II, Uṣavadāta patronised all the sects. At Kārlā and Nāsik, the benefits of his donations are assigned to ascetics of every denomination or residence, who could be brought to take their abode in the caves at Kārlā and Nāsik, along with their resident hosts, during the vassa.122 Another foreigner donates a navagabha maṇḍapa at Kārlā to the Sāṅgha as the special property of the Mahāsāṃghikas. Senart remarks that this grant seems “to stipulate that gifts attributed to particular sects should be meant for monks of every origin and of every denomination without distinction; compare No. 13, 1.4”123. On the other hand Gotamīputa Siri-Satakanī’s donation at Kārlā is ‘for the support of the sect of the Mahāsāṃghikas of the mendicant friars dwelling here in (these) caves of Valūraka. . . .’ Balasiri’s cave at Nāsik was for the acceptance of the Bhadāyaniyas. The official grants of land or village recorded in Nāsik Nos. 3, 4, and 5, were in favour of the same sect.

Eastern Deccan

The Amarāvati epigraphs mention some sects that flourished during the Sātavāhana period. The earliest among them would seem to be that of Caityavaiṇḍa (Caityavada), or Cetika, or Ceti-kiya, which is mentioned in four epigraphs. This is the only sect mentioned both in eastern and western inscriptions. Since an Ama-rāvati epigraph speaks of Cetikas at Rājagiri, and as the commentary on the Kathāvatthu mentions Rājagirika as one of the Āndhaka sects, it is probable that this sect was an offshoot of the Cetika nīkāya, Whilst the Pubbasela (mentioned in the Allūru inscription), and Avarasela schools, (Āndhaka schools), are known to the commentator on the Kathāvatthu, the Mahāvinasela (not to speak of its later offshoot Aparamahāvinasela) and Ayira-Utayipabhāha nīkāyas124

122. Eto mama leṇe vasatānāṁ cātudisasā bhikkhusaṅghasa mukhāhāro bhaviṣati, Nāsik No. 10. Sāṅghasa cātudisasā ye imasmiṁ leṇe vasatānāṁ bhaviṣati cīvarika, No. 12, EI, Vol. VIII.
124. Utayipabhāha is perhaps Sans. Uttara Prabhāsa. Prabhāsa is the name of a place of pilgrimage in western Deccan. (Nāsik, No. 10, EI, Vol. VIII) Most of the schools that took their rise in the Āndhradeśa, derive their names from places, presumably places where the sects in question took their origin. ‘Ayira’ or ‘āira’ (Sans. Ārya) is at Allūru, Amarāvati, and Nāgārjunīkonda
are not so known. The latter group was therefore later than the commentary on the Kathāvatthu. But the epigraphs which mention them cannot, however, be ascribed to a period later than the second half of the second century A.D. The Mahācāitya at Amaravati was dedicated to the Caitikas. As another but smaller Stūpa in the same place was dedicated to the Utabhāhis they were perhaps an offshoot of the Caitikas. Rājagiri would also seem to have been a stronghold of the Caitikas. Each sect had its Mahānava-kaṇṇamas and Navakaṇṇamas, monks some of whom were sthaviras, mahāsthaviras and bhaddantas.125

Monks and Nuns

Monks are called bhikkhus, pavajitas, samaṇas, and pemaṇḍapāṭikas. Nuns are called samaṇikās, pavajitikās, and bhikkhunīs. It is no wonder that the flourishing Buddhist communities in western and eastern Deccan abounded in great teachers. In western Deccan, mahāsthaviras, sthaviras, bhānakas, and tevījas (sans. Travidyās = those who know the Tripiṭaka; also adopted by the Buddhists as an epithet of arhats)126 trod the land, enlightening the faithful on the law of the master. In eastern Deccan, monks, nuns and laymen flocked to teachers versed in the Vinaya and Dhamma (Dhammakathikas) and had bhāṇa under them. Even nuns were teachers (upajhiyā-

a title prefixed to the Saṅgha in general. While in the western cave inscription 'āya', 'āyya', and 'āyira' (ārya) is a title prefixed to the names of Buddhist arhats, teachers, monks and nuns.

125. Navakaṇṇama is a religious building dedicated by some lay member to the Saṅgha. The superintendent of such work is Navakaṇṇika. The Cullavagga VI, 5—Vinayapitakaśaś gives us with the following information. "If the buildings were for the Bhikkhus, then a Bhikkhu, if for the Bhikkhuṇis then a Bhikkhuṇi, was appointed to superintend the works in order to ensure the buildings being in accordance with the rules of the Order as to size, form, and object of the various apartments." (ed. Oldenberg, Trans. SBE, Vol. XX, pp. 189 ff n.). But a Nāgarjunikonda epigraph states that a Cetiya was erected for the theris of Ceylon, in the Nāgarjunikonda valley, and yet the superintendents were not theris, but three monks, theras Ĉaudāmukha, Dhaṁmanandī and Nāga. The Navakaṇṇikas for the Caiyta Cave at Kanherī were the theras, bhaddantas, Acala, Gañala, Vijayaśīna, Bo (dhika), and Dhaṁmapāla. Along with these Navakaṇṇikas is mentioned as Uparakhaṭa, a monk, whose function, however, is not clear. As sometimes ka is used for kha the Uparaka of an Amaravati inscription (Vol. XV, No. 33, p. 269) may be identical with Uparakhaṭa. The Kanherī inscription cited above mentions along with Navakaṇṇikas a Samāpita—a layman the son of a merchant.

126. Rhys Davids, Buddhist Sūtras, p. 162.
yini), and had scores of female pupils (atevasini) under them. Some monks and nuns were persons who had led the life of grīhasthas. Monks and nuns were recruited from the lowest classes also.127

The monks spent the rainy season (kept their vassa) in the caves scooped out on prominent rocks or in monasteries built by the faithful.128 The remaining part of the year was spent in religious tours. That is why most of the Buddhist monuments were erected in trade centres like Dhamānakāṭaka, Kalyāṇ, Paithān and Nashik, and at Kārlā, and Junnar which are situated in the passes leading from Koṅkan to the Ghāts. The caves at Kaṅhērī, which is near the sea and the sea-port of Kalyāṇ, and Kudā, Mahād, and Chiplun situated on creeks, show that monks and nuns travelled by sea also.

Monks and nuns lived in caves called leṇas (Sans. layana) or vihāras. Vihāras cut out of rock, open with a verandah; inside is a hall surrounded on three sides by rows of cells, each with a stone bench for the monks to sleep on. Structural vihāras were also built on the same plan. Attached to the vihāra or as parts of it are bhojanamāṭapa or bhojanacatusālā (refectory), upathānasālā (hall of reception), saghārāma,129 pāṇiyapodhīs, and sānapodhīs. The bhojanamāṭapa at Junnar130 is an open hall 19 feet wide by 14½ feet deep and 8 feet high, with a bench round the three inner walls; the upathānasālā at Kārlā is a hall 21 feet wide by 11 feet deep and seven feet high, and is the upper story of a vihāra 24 feet wide by 22 feet deep and 7½ feet high, with ten cells four in the back and three on each side, but half of them in an unfinished state. The vihāra hall is sometimes called kōḍhi. Thānaka would also seem to be another name for vihāra, as the cave in which the inscription containing the former word is incised bears a close resemblance to the small vihāra at Bhājā. The Buddhist temples attached to vihāras are called Cetiyaṅgaras or Selagharas, or Cetiyaṅkōḍhis. Cetiyaṅgaras are of two main types, both dāgoba shrines. One is the flat-roofed vihāra—like cave with a dāgoba shrine at the back and with cells on the sides or in front of the hall. The other is

128. In Kaṅhērī No. 18, ASWI, Vol. V the vassa is said to have been kept in summer.
129. Lüders translates saghārāma No. 988 as ‘monastery’; but in the inscription (ASWI, Vol. V, No. 6, p. 77) it is spoken as part of a vihāra. Arāma means ‘garden’ and saghārāma means ‘the garden around the monastery’.
H.A.—16
vault-roofed, has horse-shoe shaped windows over the entrance and has an interior consisting of a nave and side aisles with a small circular Stūpa at the inner circular end, the object or centre of cult. To the former class belong those at Mahād, Kuḍā, and Junnar. In a Cetiya at Mahād the dāgoba is in half relief. At Kuḍā the abacus of the capital of the Cetiya just touches the roof and the cell has a stone bench or bed. At Junnar the Cetiya stands a dāgoba of the same style as at Bēdsā. The next step was to pierce the rock over the verandah with an arched window. The dāgoba shrines at Bhājā, Bēdsā, Kārlā, Nāsik, Kōḍāne, and Kaṅheri, some of them belonging to a period considerably anterior to the Christian era, are of the latter type. One on the Mānmōḍi hill (Junnar) is of this type. But those at Nāsik, Kōḍāne, Bhājā, and Bēdsā, have no screen in front, though at Bēdsā the returns of the rock at each side of the façade of the Caiyiya cave favour the idea that something in the front was intended. Burgess remarks: "Judging from the examples at Bēdsā Kārlē, and Kaṅheri, it seems as if the great windows in the original wooden structures from which these Caiyiya caves were copied were always covered by a screen in front, which partially hid them while it protected them from the weather."\(^{131}\)

**Brahmanical Religion**

Brahmanism was also in a flourishing condition. Most of the Sātavāhana kings were followers of the Brahmanical religion. The third king of the line performed a number of Vedic sacrifices and named one of his sons Vedisiri.\(^{132}\) In the Saptasatākain an anthology of erotic verses attributed to Hāla, adoration is paid to Śiva.\(^{133}\) Later Sātavāhanas were also followers of the Brahmanical religion. Gotamiputra Siri-Satākāṇī was not the only supporter of the Brahmanes. He was not only learned in the traditional lore, but emulated epic heroes like Rāma, Keśava, Arjuna, Bhīmasena, and Purāṇic figures like Nābhāga, Nahuṣa, Janamejaya, Sagara, Yayāti, and Ambariṣa. Since Gotami speaks of Kailāsa, were she and her son devotees of Śiva? Another king bears the name Yaña.

---

132. The minister to whom the daughter of prince Hakusiri was given would seem to have been a Buddhist, as he bears the name Arahalaya, and as his daughter excavates the only Caiyiya at Nāsik, (Nāsik, No. 19, EI, Vol. VIII).
133. First and last verses.
Uśavadāta’s inscription\textsuperscript{134} speaks of Carakas, a special category of ascetics at Ramatīrtha in Sopārāga, Suvarṇamukha, Govardhana and Pīṇḍitakāvāda. Uśavadāta’s inscriptions however, show that Brahmanism was more flourishing outside Sātavāhana dominions, viz., in Gujerat, Kathiawad, Rajaputana, and Ujjain; all his Brahmanical austerities are located in them.\textsuperscript{135}

The Nāṇeghāṭ record begins with adoration to Dharma, Samkarṣaṇa, Vāsudeva, Indra, the Sun and the Moon, the guardians of the four quarters of the world viz., Vāsava, Kubera, Varuṇa and Yama. The Saptaśatakam mentions wooden images of Indra which were worshipped.\textsuperscript{136} Worship of Kṛṣṇa is indicated by the names like Govardhana, Kṛṣṇa, and Gopāla. In the Saptaśatakam we find the Kṛṣṇa legends fully developed. Here Kṛṣṇa is called Madhumathana\textsuperscript{137} and Dāmōdara. Gōpis and Yaśodā are also mentioned.\textsuperscript{138} We also hear of the jealousy of shepherdesses against Rādhā.\textsuperscript{139}

Names like Sivapālita, Sivakhadila, Sivadatta, Kumāra etc., point to a worship of Siva, and Skanda. The Saptaśatakam furnishes us interesting data in this direction. In the opening and closing verses Paśupati and Gaurī are adored. Temples of Gaurī are mentioned in gāthā 172. Śiva is also called Paramatādhipa (Prākṛt. Paramahahīvam) in gāthā 440. Kāpālinī or ash covered and skull-bearing women ascetics are also mentioned.\textsuperscript{140} Ganeśa is mentioned as Gaṇādhipati.\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{134} Nāsik, No. 12, El, Vol. VIII.
\textsuperscript{135} According to the Mahābhārata, a forest near Sopāra was in times of yore, the scene of austerities and sacrifices performed by kings. It also contained the holy shrines of Vasu, of the Marutgasas, of Aśvini, Vaivasvat, Aditya, Kubera, Indra, Viṣṇu, etc. (Vanaparvan, Chapter CXVIII).
\textsuperscript{136} Saccam cia kaṭṭhamao
    Suraṇahā, jena ālādhitē |
    Hatthehi kamaladalako
    Malehi cikko na palaivi ||
    Weber, Das Saptacatakam des Hāla, p. 470, g. 864.
\textsuperscript{137} Op. cit., p. 323, g. 657.
\textsuperscript{138} Ajja vi vālo Dāmo-
    aro tī ia jampe jasoae |
    Kanhamuḥapesiaccam
    nihaun hasiam Vaavahūhīm || g. 112.
\textsuperscript{139} Weber, op. cit., p. 31, g. 89.
\textsuperscript{140} Gāthā, 408.
\textsuperscript{141} Gāthās 403, 372.
Names like Vīṇhupālita, Vēṇhu, and Lachinikā point in the same way to the worship of Viṣṇu. In the *Saptaśatakaṁ*, Hari or Trivikrama is said to be superior to other gods. Birth of Lakṣmi from the ocean of milk is also mentioned.\textsuperscript{142}

In conclusion it may be noted that one of the interesting religious data supplied by *Saptaśatakaṁ* is the *vrata* of fire and water.\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{142} Gāthās 411 and 388 respectively.

\textsuperscript{143} Gāthā, 185.
CHAPTER VII

THE IKŚVĀKUS—THIRD CENTURY A.D.

The Purānic label for the Ikśvāku kings

The Ikśvākus of the Nāgārjunikonda and Jaggayarapetā records are none other than the Purānic Śrīpārvatīyas, i.e., the dynasty whose capital or home or kingdom lay in the Śrīparvata region, also called Āndhras of the lineage of the servants (bhṛtyāḥ) of the Āndhra Sātavāhanas. This identification which Mr. K. P. Jayaswal was the first to suggest is supported by the following pieces of evidence:—The Nāgārjunikonda epigraphs make it clear that during the period under review ‘Śrīparvata’ signified not any particular hill on the Nāgārjunikonda site or ‘Śrīsailam’ but the whole range of Nallamalai hills of which the hills surrounding the Nāgārjunikonda plateau and the ‘Śrīsailam’ peak are offshoots.

1. a, c Mt. The rest ‘Śrīparvatīya,’ Pargiter, Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 46, n. 30.
4. In the early Mt, Vā, Bd. and Vs. accounts.
5. JBORS, 1933, Parts I and II, p. 171.
6. These were not worked out by Mr. K. P. Jayaswal.
8. In the Nāgārjunikonda ins. giri is the word for ‘peaks’ and ‘hillocks’ (Cula-Dhārmagiri is certainly the hillock now called Nāharāllabodū on which the apsidal shrine built by Bodhisiri stands. Ins. F.). So ‘Śrīparvata’ of the same inscription cannot refer to a peak or hillock but to a whole range. The later Śrīparvata in the Kurnool District makes it improbable that the hills surrounding the Nāgārjunikonda site monopolised that name.

Scholars like Burgess and Dr. J. Ph. Vogel take seriously the Tibetan tradition preserved by Tāranātha that Nāgārjuna, the expounder of the Mādhymika philosophy (second century A.D.), lived at Śrīparvata. Whilst they are agreed in identifying it with Hiuen-Tsang’s Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li where a Sātavāhana is said to have quarried a monastery for Nāgārjuna, Burgess identifies them both with ‘Śrīsailam’ in the Kurnool District, and Dr. J. Ph. Vogel and the Epigraphy Department with Nāharāllabodū or Nāgārjunikonda, a lofty hill overlooking the Krṣṇā at the northern end of the plateau. The Chinese pilgrim places Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li in Daḵṣiṇā Kōsala in a place 300 li (50 miles) to the south-west of its H.A.—17
No dynasty other than the Ikṣvāku could have ruled over the Kṛṣṇā-Guntur region immediately after the Sātavāhanas. The ornate alphabet, with long verticals, of the Ikṣvāku records shows only slightly developed forms over those of the Chinna Ganjam inscription of Siri-Yaṅa Śātakaṇi and the Jangli Gaṅḍu inscription of Puḷumāvi III (probably the last of the Sātavāhanas). That the Ikṣvākus were once ‘bhṛtyas’ of the Sātavāhanas is shown by the Sātavāhana metrynomics and prefixes to the names which they bear capital. While speaking of To-na-kie-tse-kia (Dhānyakaṭaka where the Nāgārjunikonda plateau would have lain) he speaks of neither Nāgārjuna nor his monastery. To identify Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li of the Daśaṅa-Kosala, which is placed by Huien Tsang 1200 li to the north of To-no-kie-tse-kia, with ‘Śrī-parvata’ in the Guntur and Kurnool Districts is to go too wide of the mark. General Cunningham has identified Daśaṅa-Kosala with the province of Vidarbha, modern Berar, and its capital with modern Nagpur AGI, p. 595. This agrees with the Tibetan tradition that Nāgārjuna was a native of Vidarbha (Wassiljeu, Appendix to Tāranātha, pp. 301, 303). The Tibetan tradition that Nāgārjuna surrounded the Stūpa at Daṇḍyakaṭaka (the Amaravatī Stūpa) with a railing is supported by none of the extant Amaravatī rail inscriptions of the second and third centuries A.D. N. Dutta has pointed out (IHQ, Vol. VII, p. 639) that the Gauḍavyāha, a work of about the third century A.D., speaks of Dānyaśaka as a great city of Daśaṅa-patana and a seat of Mañjuśrī, who lived in an extensive forest and converted a large number of Nāgas and inhabitants of the place, but refers neither to Nāgārjuna nor to Śrīparvata.

A Jaggayyaṇa inscription which, on palaeographical grounds, should be ascribed to the seventh century A.D., mentions Candraprabha, his teacher Jayaprabha and the latter’s teacher Nāgārjuna (Nāgārjunācārya, ASSI, Vol. I, p. 112. Pl. LXIII). The Sādhanaṇamālā mentions a tantric Nāgārjuna, one of the 84 Mahāsiddhas, who came after Sarha. B. Bhattacharya places the former in the seventh century A.D. (Sādhanaṇamālā, Vol. II, Intro. xliv-xlvi, Gaeckwad’s Oriental Series, XLI). The tradition preserved in the Pag-bsam-ljon-bsan (p. 86) is that, according to the account of the 84 Mahāsiddhas, one Nāgārjuna was born at Kahara, a part of Kānci, and educated at Nālandā, where he practised the siddhis and visualised the goddess Tārā. He came to Śrīparvata, (IHQ, Vol. VII, p. 637). Tāranātha also mentions him (ibid., 638, n. 1). While there is thus evidence, literary and epigraphic, for connecting the second Nāgārjuna with Śrīparvata, there is at present no evidence which allows us to associate the first Nāgārjuna with Nāgārjunikonda.

“The Mātṣya Purāṇa speaks of a family of Śrī-Parvatiṣṭha Andhras, which may refer to a petty dynasty either at Śrī-Ṣailam itself or across the river at Chandaguptapatnam in the vicinity.” ASSI, Vol. I, p. 7.

According to Prof. Rapson, “they were probably the Cutus, who rose to power in the western and southern districts after the reign of Śrī-Yajña.” CIC, Andhras and Western Kṣatrapas, Intro. lxix. But the identification suggested here makes Rapson’s conjecture wrong.
(e.g., siri and sāmi); and it will be shown below that they were Mahātalavaras under the Sātavāhanas. Names into the composition of which 'Skanda' enters and the 'anaka' ending in names also point to Sātavāhana influence. The Ikṣvāku capital Vijayapurī is, in inscription F, stated to have been situated to the west of the Lesser Dhammagiri (Nāharāḷlabōḍu mound).

The find of nearly 148 lead coins of the Sātavāhana period at Nāgārjunikonda—they are now in the Calcutta Museum and are said to be much corroded—indisputably shows that the kingdom of the Ikṣvākus or at least a part of it was included in the Sātavāhana empire. Whilst then, the south-western parts of the Sātavāhana empire fell to the Čuṭus, and the western parts to the Śakas, Abhīras and Gardahillias, the eastern parts passed into the hands of the Ikṣvākus.

**Duration of the dynasty**

According to the Purāṇas, there were seven kings in the dynasty. But epigraphy has disclosed the names of only three. As regards the duration of the dynasty, the Purānic account is far from being clear. The Matsya which gives us the oldest version has 'dvi paṁcāsatam,' which, according to Pargiter, may mean 52 or 100. The Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa accounts, which according to him are corrupted, give 'dve ca śatam.' However, c Vāyu which next to the Matsya gives us the oldest version has 'dve ardha

11. "Siripavate Vijayapuriya pūva-dīsā-bhāge vihāre Cula-Dhammagirīyaṇa cetiya-gharano..." at Siripavata (the Nāgārjunikonda site with the hills which form parts of the range which went by that name), a cetiya on the Cula-Dhammagiri standing to the east of Vijayapurī. In the central part of the valley which is now marked by cultivation and which is certainly to the north-west of the Nāharāḷlabōḍu, Mr. Longhurst discovered a palace site (ASR, 1928-29, p. 104). From the elaborate ornamentation and the curious semi-classical objects portrayed on some of the pillars, it would seem that they once supported the roof of some royal palace. The pillar set up in memory of Sīrī-Citamulā lay buried in the north-western part of the valley, not far from the river. Moreover, several ruined manḍapas or pavilions mark the site of the ancient city. Finally, the plateau shut in by hills on which there are remains of fortifications offered an ideal site for a capital. The Vijayapura of the Amarāvatī Inscription (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 85, No. 30, Pl. LVIII) is perhaps identical with the Vijayapurī of our inscription.
12. ASR; 1928-29; p. 103.
śata' which is undoubtedly 52. This conclusion is arrived at in another way. The earliest Mātsya account which mentions the seven ŚṛiṆārvaṭiya Andhras ends with the mention of Kilakila kings; even the Vākāṭaka Vindhyāṣakti is not mentioned in this recension. The synchronism between Vākāṭaka Rudrasena II and Devagupta (Candragupta II 380-419) 13 would place Vindhyāṣakti between 260 and 285 A.D. 14 The earliest Mātsya account was, therefore, closed before 260 A.D. 15 The Sātavāhanas could not have disappeared from the political stage before 205 A.D. The Ikṣvākus, their successors, could, therefore, have ruled for only 52 and not 100 years. We know from inscriptions that Śri-Virapurisadata and Ehuvula Cāṁtamūla divided between themselves at least 31 years. A reign of 15 years may be assigned to Śri-Cāṁtamūla, 'the Unobstructed,' who is credited with many sacrifices and dānas and who seems to have lived to middle age. 16 The short reigns of the last four kings would be evidence of the troubled times. 17

Home of the Ikṣvākus

Dr. Sten Konow seeks their home in the western Deccan. 18 The sources of his suggestion are the 'anaka' suffix to personal names in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and western cave inscriptions and the possibility of explaining some terms in the former through Kanarese. According to him, 'Khandā' is Kanarese 'Kanda' meaning 'child.' 'Caliki-remmanaka' is probably Kanarese 'Calikiranaṇa' 'moon.' "It also strikes me that Kanarese karrambu means 'envy.'" "The h for s also points to Kanarese." We may point out, however, that 'Khandā' is a Prākrit form of 'Skanda.' 'Karumbudhina' is a contraction for 'Karumbudhinaka' 19 and 'karum' in Tamil means 'black' (adj.), and 'anaka'

15. Pargiter arrives at the result in another way. Op. cit., Intro. xxv, Sec. 44.
17. Dr. J. Ph. Vogel says (El, Vol. XX, p. 6): "Dr. Bühler's assumption, based on palaeographical evidence that Śri-Virapurisadata flourished in the third century of our era, may be accepted as probably correct." The identification suggested and the chronology worked out above definitely place the Ikṣvākus in the first half of the third century A.D.
19. Virāṇṇa in Inscription F. is a contraction for Virampaka.
is a name ending; and names like Ehuvuľa, Ađavi-Căhătisiri and Damila-Kanha betray Tamil influence. Since in an Amarāvatī inscription of the time of Vāsiṭṭhiputa sāmi Siri-Puḷumāvi, an ordinary person bears a name with 'aṇaka' suffix, the western influences shown by the Nāgārjunikanḍa inscriptions are best considered as the result of Sātavāhana rule over the eastern Deccan and have no significance for the question of Ikṣvāku origins.

According to Bühler and Prof. Rapson the southern Ikṣvākus were Rajputs of northern descent—a dynastic drift of which we have instances like the Mauryas of Konkaṇ, the Guttas of Guttal and the Cōlas of Rēnāṇḍu. According to the Vāyu Purāṇa, Ikṣvāku, the progenitor of the Solar race, was the eldest among the nine sons of Manu; he ruled from Ayodhya and had a hundred sons of whom Vikukṣi was the eldest and successor; of the other sons fifty were entrusted with small states in the north and 48 in the south. According to the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Kośala (southern) was founded by Kuśa who ruled from Kośasthali. The foundation of Aśmaka and Mulaka on the upper Gaṇavari is ascribed to princes of Ikṣvāku descent. The Ikṣvāku drift into the Andhradeśa must have taken place very early for them to have merged in the Andhra tribe, for according to the Purāṇas the Ikṣvākus were Andhras. A Kanarese work entitled Dharmāṃṛta affords evidence of an early drift. In the time of the 12th Tīrthaṅkara Vasupūya (third or second century B.C.), Ikṣvāku Yaśodhara of Ānag carved a kingdom for himself in the Vēṅgi country, to use the later designation of the heart of the Andhradeśa, and founded the town of Pratipālapura identified by Mr. M. S. Sarma with Bhaṭṭiprōlu.

20. Vide supra, p. 66; Lüders' List No. 1248.
22. Chap. 88, 8 ff.
24. In a paper on Jainism in South India read before the Archaeological Society of South India.

Scholars like Burgess (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 111) and Caldwell (Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages, p. 115) look upon the Ikṣvāku descent claimed by the southern princes as an idle boast. Writes Caldwell: "The Aryan immigrants to the South appear to have been generally Brahmanical priests and instructors rather than Kshatriya soldiers; and the kings of the Pāṇḍyas, Cholas, Kāḷṅgas and other Dravidians appear to have been simply Dravidian chieftains whom their Brahmanical preceptors and spiritual directors... taught to imitate and emulate the grandeur and cultivated taste of the Solar, Lunar and Agnikula races of kings." What, however, invests the claim of the Ikṣvākus with authenticity is that while
Rise of the Ikṣvākus

The Allūrū Brāhmi inscription (Allūrū is a village in the Nandi-gāma taluq of the Krṣṇā District) discovered a decade ago throws welcome light on the rise of the Ikṣvākus to power. The āyaka-pillar inscriptions from Jaggayyapēta prove beyond doubt that the Nandi-gāma taluq or part of it was included in the Ikṣvāku kingdom. The Allūrū inscription which, on palaeographical grounds, is slightly earlier than the Amarāvati inscription of Vāsiṭhiputa sāmi Siri-Pulumāvi, mentions a Mahātalavara and a king. As the

the Gaṅgas (EC, Vol. VII, Sh. Nos. 4 and 64) and the Cōlas (EI, Vol. XVIII; p. 26 and Kalihattupparani) trace their descent from Ikṣvāku, they did not assume Ikṣvāku as their dynastic name.

27. The epigraph does not give us either the name of the king or that of the Mahātalavara. In the Calcutta Review for July 1925 Dr. Shamasasrty edited this inscription. According to him, II. 16-17 refer to Sana king of the Ayis; II. 16-17 of the inscription however read:

kahapanana(ṁ) ca pura(ne)ka saksam akhayani(vi) esa Mahātalaverasa deya-dhama paricāka ati utarapase bāpama-nivatarāni eta sa-bhāriyasa sa-putakasa sanātukasa ayirana(ṁ) Pervaslistyāna nigaṇāya .

The third letter in sanātukasa read as sa is clearly tu; a mention of the grandsons of the Mahātalavara (and not of the name of a king), after the mention of the wife and sons, is what is to be expected.

In the ARE, 1923-24, it was stated that “palaeographically it (the inscription) may be assigned to about the second century A.D. Most of the characters resemble those of the inscription of Siri-Yaṇa Sātakani, while others are like those of Sātakani I and Uśavadata.” The Chinnā Ganjam inscription of the time of Siri-Yaṇa written in the ornate alphabet of the Nāgarjunikonda epigraphs, is admittedly later than the Allūrū inscriptions. A comparison with the Amarāvati inscriptions would have served the purpose far better; the early square characters of the Allūrū type are to be found in some of the Amarāvati inscriptions which, belonging as they do to the various periods between the second century B.C. and third century A.D., (the Nāgarjunikonda alphabet is to be found in Nos. 36 and 42, ASSI, Vol. I, pp. 91 and 104, Pls. LVIII, LIX; and EI, Vol. XV, Nos. 27 and 54), enable us to trace clearly the evolution of the Brāhmi alphabet in the Krṣṇā valley. The Allūrū characters resemble clearly those of No. 16 (ASSI, Vol. I, page 63 and Pl. XLIV, ta, ya, sa, ja, ma, ha, a, ka, da and lo). True, the Allūrū na, ta, a, da and ka somewhat resemble those in the inscription of the time of Pulumāvi II, but the i and u signs in the former inscription as in Nos. 16 and 18, and the rounded form of pa are certainly earlier than those of Pulumāvi’s time. It might be argued that No. 16 is on a coping stone and must, therefore, belong to the reign of Vāsiṭhiputa sāmi Siri-Pulumāvi when the railing was
title and office of Mahātalavara combined with those of Mahāsenāpati and Mahādaṇḍanāyaka was a feature of the Ikṣvāku period, and as the Ikṣvākus like the Mahārathis were matrimonially connected with the Sātavāhanas, they were, like the Mahārathis, feudatories under them. The feudal title often met with in the Andhradesa is Mahātalavara. We would be justified in concluding that the ancestors of the Ikṣvākus were Mahātalavaras under the Sātavāhanas. After their fall Siri-Cāṇṭamula²⁸ founded his dynasty much in the same way as the Mahārathhi Cūṭus in the southwestern parts and the Ābbhīras in the western parts.

The founder of the line—Siri-Cāṇṭamula 'The Unobstructed' ²⁹

Whilst Vāsiṭhīpūta Siri-Cāṇṭamula is extolled by his sisters, his father is not even mentioned in their inscriptions.³⁰ Cāṇṭamula

enlarged and new stūpa slabs set up. No. 52 is on a coping stone of the outer railing, but in early square characters. An inscription of the reign of Sivamaka Sada (kaṇi) which is palaeographically later than that of Vāsiṭhīpūta sāmi Siri-Puljumāvi, is also on an outer rail coping stone. It would, therefore, seem that alterations in or additions to the railings of the Stūpa (Mahācetiya) were made from time to time.

28. Cāṇṭamula in A2, A3, A4, C1, C2, C3, D4, and X; Cālā is clear in E, G, and H.

Cāṇṭa is clear in C4, G2, G3, L, M, etc. Dr. J. Ph. Vogel thinks that probably Cāṇṭa is the correct form. The dictum of Senart that when the anusvāra is found in some cases and absent in others, it is certain that the scribe or engraver omitted it by mistake makes it certain that Cāṇṭamula is the correct form.

Prākrty Cāṇṭamula has been Sanskritized by D. C. Sircar and K. P. Jayaswal as Śāntamula and by Dr. Vogel as Kṣāntamula. Cula which in the Nāgarjunikoṇḍa inscriptions is opposed to Mahā is certainly Sanskrit Kṣudra—small. On this analogy Cāṇṭa would be Kṣānta only. In the inscription under reference āṣa becomes sa and not ca. (See Childers Pali-Eng. Dict., culla).


30. On the other hand he is mentioned by his daughter Aḍāvi-Cāṇṭisiri.

Among Ikṣvākus there is a preference for names beginning with cāṇṭa. A sister of Siri-Cāṇṭamula is called Cāṇṭisiri. His grandson is called Ehuvaḷa Siri-Cāṇṭamula.

Cula-Cāṇṭisiri of the Kulahaka family would seem to have been a descendant of an Ikṣvāku princess married into the Kulahaka family; as the office of the Mahātalavara would seem to have been hereditary in the Kulahaka family as in the Dhanaka and Pūkiya families, as Cula Cāṇṭisiriṇikā is herself married to a Mahātalavara and as the Ikṣvākus are matrimonially connected with the Mahātalavaras such a conjecture has strong support.
mūla would therefore seem to have been the founder of the line.\textsuperscript{31} That he possessed sovereign powers is indicated by the title ‘Mahāraja’\textsuperscript{32} attached to his name, and fittingly enough his sisters, mother and consorts erected a pillar and perhaps a stūpa also in his honour.\textsuperscript{33} But we have no lithic record of his reign. All that we know about him is furnished by the memorial pillar and by the inscriptions of the reigns of his son and grandson.

**His reign**

In a passage which occurs in most of the inscriptions, Śiri-Caṁtamūla is credited with the performance of Agniṣṭoma, Agnihotra, Aśvamedha, and Vājapeya sacrifices. Whilst Jyotir-Agniṣṭoma is the simplest of Soma liturgies and Agnihotra a modest Havir-Yajña, Vājapeya was a complex rite at the end of which the performer sat upon the throne and was hailed ‘Samrāṭ’—‘emperor’. The fact that only three south Indian princes of the early period are said to have performed it (Śiri-Sātakaṇi I, Pallava Śīva-Skandavarmā and Śiri-Caṁtamūla) shows how powerful Śiri-Caṁtamūla must have been. In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa\textsuperscript{34} and Kātyāyana’s Śrauta-sūtra\textsuperscript{35} it is said that by offering Rājasūya one becomes a

\textsuperscript{31} The Memorial Pillar Inscriptions (EI, Vol. XXI, L.) shows that Śiri-Caṁtamūla’s father indulged in a plurality of wives (mātāhi) unless indeed it be that the term is an honorific plural employed by the daughters of his only wife. But even a plurality of wives does not indicate the father’s kingly position, for even nobles and high dignitaries of state would have followed the example set up by kings, as their metronymics would show.

\textsuperscript{32} Caṁtamūla is referred to as Rājan in the Memorial Pillar Inscription. K. P. Jayaswal’s contention that the title of Mahārāja applied to Śiri-Caṁtamūla indicates his feudatory position whilst the title of Rājan applied to Śiri-Virapurisadata shows that the royal position was assumed by the latter cannot therefore be upheld. In the Ikṣvāku records the titles Rājan and Mahārāja are indifferently used. Śiri-Virapurisadata bears the title of Rājan in most of the inscriptions and Mahārāja in inscriptions G and H. (EI, Vol. XX). Ehuvaḷa Śiri-Caṁtamūla is styled Mahārāja in G and Rājan in G2 and G3.

\textsuperscript{33} Though the inscription records the setting up of the pillar only, the dome with the railing, having cetiya-arches over the gates, in the first panel might be a representation of a stūpa erected in his honour. However Śṭūpa No. 9 near which the pillar lay buried, contained only the bones of an ox, deer and hare along with a broken doll’s head made of red pottery. ASR, 1929–30, p. 149.

\textsuperscript{34} V, 1.1.13.

\textsuperscript{35} XV, 1.1.2.
Rājan, and by offering the Vājapeya a Samrāt. According to them the office of ‘Rājan’ is the lower and that of ‘Samrāt’ the higher. The passage in the inscription also credits Siri-Cāṃtamūla with gifts of lumps of gold, ploughs of land\textsuperscript{36} and cows and oxen. Dr. J. Ph. Vogel looks upon the passage as conventional.\textsuperscript{37} But in the fifth panel of the memorial pillar Siri-Cāṃtamūla is represented as standing in plain attire, bareheaded, wearing sandals and holding a staff in his hands. But for the parasol over his head he would look an ordinary person. By his side is an attendant holding a vessel containing libation water. Before him are five Brahmans;\textsuperscript{38} one of them who is very young is stretching his right hand to receive a gift from the king. On the ground is seen a heap of round pieces of uncoined metal.\textsuperscript{39} Here is undoubtedly a representation of the gift of crores of ‘hiraṁa’ (hiraṁnapindas or uncoined gold pieces of a definite weight) with which Siri-Cāṃtamūla is credited.\textsuperscript{40}

**His personality, sisters and queens**

Of the representation of the Sātavāhanas or kings of their bhṛtya lines on stone, we have only two clear instances. One is that of king Simuka, his son Siri-Sātakaṇi I and the latter’s family, the other is that of Siri-Cāṃtamūla on the memorial pillar. In all the four panels he is represented as a corpulent person. In the second and third panels he wears a low cap. The fourth panel shows him riding the state elephant fully caparisoned, with the attendant seated behind him holding a parasol over his head. He is followed by five or six marching attendants, one of whom is a dwarf.

\textsuperscript{36} ‘go-satasahasa-hala-satasahasa padāyisa.’ Regarding the various kinds of measure of land called ‘plough’ see Kullūka on Manu VII, 119.

\textsuperscript{37} EI, Vol. XX, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{38} Dr. Vogel calls them monks. (EI, Vol. XXI, p. 63). According to Mr. Hirananda Sastri they are royal ladies and officials; the young person is prince Virapurisadata. ASR, 1929-30, pp. 165, 166.

\textsuperscript{39} Unlike coins they are thick globules.

\textsuperscript{40} D. C. Sircar would see in the compound ‘aneka-hiraṇa-koṭi-go-satasahasa’ a reference to some of the mahādānas. Probably the gift of cows or oxen and gold pieces was made on the occasion of sacrifices. It is noteworthy that in the last panel Siri-Cāṃtamūla with his hair cut and carrying a staff is like a performer of Agniṣṭoma. What appears to be thrown over his shoulders is perhaps the skin of an antelope. Barnett, Antiquities of India, p. 162.
Unlike his father and son who indulged in many wives, Sri-Cāmṭamūla had only two queens. In the panels he is represented as sitting with two queens. In the inscription where his ‘mahādevis’ are mentioned we have ‘subhatarikāhi ca Sarasikāya, Kusumalatāya.’ ‘Subhataraikāhi’ is a mistake for ‘Subhaṭarikāhi’ (Sansk. Svabhāṭarikābhīhi)—‘by his own ladies’ or wives. Thus in the inscription also only two queens are mentioned.

Hammasirinikā and Cāmṭisiri are the sisters of Sri-Cāmṭamūla. The former would seem to have died before the twentieth year of Sri-Virapurisadata and the latter between his eighteenth and twentieth regnal years. Unlike Sri-Cāmṭamūla, a staunch follower of the Brahmanical religion, the two sisters were ardent Buddhists (lay disciples), and it is to the latter’s munificence that we owe some of the most important monuments in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa plateau.41

**Conclusion**

Since the portrait representation of Cāmṭamūla shows us a middle-aged person, he would seem to have died at middle age; this is made very probable by the fact that his mother and step-mothers (mātāhi) lived up to the twentieth year of his son’s reign. No Buddhist monument in the valley can be definitely attributed to his reign. He was, like some of the Western Cāḷukya kings, a protégé of Mahāśena, ‘the Virūpakhapati’ (‘lord of Virūpākṣa hosts’).42 Until fresh evidence turns up, his attitude towards Buddhism and the Buddhist activities of the royal ladies must remain unknown. Since daughter, sister, grand-daughter and daughter-in-law are all anxious to state their relationship to him, Sri-Cāmṭamūla was evidently looked upon as the most famous in the line.43

41. Cāmṭisiri who was born of a Vāsiṭhi, was married to a Mahāsenāpati, Mahātalavara Vāsiṭhiputa Khaṇḍasiri of the Pūkīya clan. Such an endogamous marriage seems peculiar. As the Mahātalavaras borrowed metonymies from their kings it is no wonder they did not look upon the former as an institution for regulating marriages.
42. EI, vol. XX, p. 6.

"From the expression Virūpakhapati-Mahāsena-parigahitaśa, which is applied to Chāmṭamūla, it may perhaps be concluded that he was a votary of the god Mahāśena or Skanda, ‘the lord of the Virūpakhas’. The term Virūpakha (=Skt. Virūpākha) seems to be used here to indicate the hosts of which Skanda is the lord and leader.”

"The word Virūpakha (Skt. Virūpākha), indicating a class of snakes, occurs in an ancient snake-charm. Vinaya Pitakam . . . ." ibid.
Mādhārīputa Siri-Virapurisadata was not as great as his father Siri-Cāṃtamūla. Even so his reign marks a glorious epoch in the history of Buddhism in the Kṛṣṇā valley. Probably one or two matrimonial alliances of far-reaching importance were contracted during his reign.

Alliance with the powerful house of Caṣṭana

Like their masters the Sātavāhanas, the Ikṣvākus also contracted matrimonial alliance with the Śaka dynasty of Ujjain. An āyaka pillar epigraph dated in the sixth year of Siri-Virapurisadata records the donation of a pillar and 170 dināri-māsakas45 by Mahādevī Rudradhara-Bhaṭṭārikā, an 'Ujenika Mahārājabālikā.' Now that we know the names of the two queens of Siri-Cāṃtamūla it is

44. Bühler, (IA, vol. XI, p. 257) and following him Burgess (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 111) take both 'sirī' and 'vīra' as honorific prefixes. Bühler's argument is that a name like 'Virapurīsada' would compel us to assume the existence of a deity called 'Virapurūṣa' which hitherto is not known. (datta=given by, Pūruṣa=Vṛṣṇi). Names like Virāmnikā and Virānna (inscription F) make 'vīra' part of a personal name. When two or more honorific prefixes adorn a name, they always precede 'sirī'; i.e., what immediately follows 'sirī' is the personal name, e.g., Siva Siri-Āpillaka, Siva Siri-Sātakani. Lüders, op. cit., No. 1127.

45. D. C. Sircar would attribute the presence of dināri-māsakas to Śaka matrimonial alliance. Dr. Vogel would attribute it to the vast seaborne trade between the Kṛṣṇā-Godāvāri region and the West through the emporiums of Kantakossylla, Paḷūra, Koddūra, etc. Dr. J. Ph. Vogel's theory is supported by the following facts:—The find of Roman coins of the period from 68-217 A.D. (JRAS, 1904, pp. 599 ff.), at Vinukonda in the Guntur district and in the Nellore and Cuddapah districts; the mention of a 'vadālabhikara(ra) yonaka dīvikayo' (a Greek lamp resembling the 'vadāla' fish in shape) in the Allūru inscription (A lamp of the fish shape has been found at Pong Tuk. It might have gone there direct from Europe or Asia-Minor or the eastern coast of South India, ABIA, 1927, Pl. 8); and the Graeco-Roman influences discernible in the Amarāvatī sculptures of the middle of the second century A.D. As Gotamiputra Siri-Yaṅga Sātakani and Vāsithiputa Siri-Sātakani struck silver in imitation of Kṣatrapa coinage with the Head of the King (the Kṣatrapas derived the obverse of their coins, i.e., Head of King from the denarius brought into India by way of commerce, Rapson, op. cit., cvii and cix), it is not improbable that the denarius was introduced in the wake of Sātavāhana conquest of the eastern Deccan. The relic casket from Stūpa No. 6, has yielded two coin-like medallions of thin gold 5½ inch in diameter, each embossed with a head which makes the impression of being meant for a portrait (ASR, 1929-30, Pl. 37).
not possible to consider her as his queen; she would therefore appear to have been a queen of Virapurisadata. As she is said to have donated money for the building of the Mahācetiya while the work was going on, the matrimonial alliance must have been contracted before the sixth year of Siri-Virapurisadata’s reign, possibly even during the reign of his father. As Ozěe is mentioned by Ptolemy as the capital of Tiastanes (Caštana) and as ‘Rudra’ often enters into the personal names of Western Kṣatrapas of the Caštana line who style themselves Rājan, Dr. Vogel’s conjecture that Rudradhara-Bhaṭṭārikā belonged to the house of Caštana is very sound. As Siri-Virapurisadata’s reign would fall in the second and third decades of the third century A.D. she might have been a daughter of any one of the following Western Kṣatrapas:—Rudrasena I (Ś. 122-44), Rudrasimha I (son of Rudradāman), Prthivisenā (son of Rudrasena I), Saṅghadāman and Dāmasena (Ś. 144-58), sons of Rudrasimha I. The alliance would have gained Kṣatrapa recognition for the new dynasty.

Other queens

Other queens of Siri-Virapurisadata were Chaṭhisirī and Bapisiṇikā, daughters of Haṁmasirī, and Bhaṭṭīdevā, the daughter of Cāṁtisirīnikā. The marriage between the king and Bhaṭṭīdevā would have taken place between the sixth and fifteenth

46. Unlike the other queens of Virapurisadata, Rudradharabhaṭṭārikā does not state her relationship to him.
47. The year in which the Mahācetiya was consecrated.
49. Rudrasena III is styled Mahārāja on some coins of Mahākṣatrapa Sinhasena. Rapson, op. cit., p. 190.
50. Dr. Vogel reads ‘Ujanika Mahārabālikā’ but the a sign over ja is partially visible (the Prākrit form of Ujjan is Ujjeni or Ujjenni). The learned doctor’s correction of ‘Mahārabālikā’ into ‘Mahārajabālikā’ is certainly warranted by the sense of the passage and the numerous mistakes of the scribe or the engraver to be found in the Nāgarjunikonda inscriptions.
51. This alliance accounts for the sculpture of a Śāka warrior on one of the Nāgarjunikonda pillars (ABIA, 1927, Pl. VI), and for the donations by a Śāka girl (EI, vol. XX, p. 37).
52. This is clear in G3, EI. vol. XXI, Pl.
52a. Bhaṭṭīdevā does not however expressly call herself a daughter of Cāṁtisirīnikā. It can only be inferred from the facts that both of them were Vāśthis, and that Cāṁtisirī calls Siri-Virapurisadata, ‘her own son-in-law’ (apaco jāmāṭuka) in some inscriptions (E, MI, etc.)
years\(^{53}\) of his reign. As Bhaṭṭideva’s son ascended the throne not long after the twentieth year of Siri-Virapurisadata’s reign, the marriage must have taken place soon after the sixth year.\(^ {54}\)

**Alliance with the Cuṭus**

Another power of importance in south-western India of the third century A.D. was the Cuṭu whose kingdom extended as far north as Kāṅhēri and as far east as Anantapur. The political sense of the Ikṣvākus that dictated an alliance with the Western Kṣatrapas also dictated an alliance with the Cuṭus. An inscription dated in the eleventh year of Ebuvula Siri-Cāṁtamula records the benefactions of Mahādevī Kodabalisiri,\(^ {55}\) daughter of Siri-Virapurisadata, half sister (bhaginī, not sodarā bhaginī) of the king and wife of a Vanavāsaka-Mahārāja.\(^ {56}\) Scholars are agreed that Banavāśi

---

53. Dr. J. Ph. Vogel is of opinion that the marriage took place between the 6th and 18th year. But inscriptions M1 to M5 (EI, Vol. XXI) dated in the 15th year mention Siri-Virapurisadata as the son-in-law of Cāṁtisiri; the latter calls herself his aunt (pituca) in an inscription of the sixth year of his reign.

54. The significance of the Ikṣvāku system of marriages has been discussed along with metronymics (vide supra).

55. Ins. H, EI, Vol. XX.

56. Both forms Vanavāsa or Vanavāsī occur in the Nāgarjunikonda inscriptions (H and F). Vanavāsakas or Vanavāsins are mentioned in the Mahābhārata (6,366) as a people dwelling in South India. The Mahāvamisa mentions the conversion of Vanavāsi by Rakkhita (Chap. XII, p. 84, evidently the kingdom).

The ka suffix indicates the place to which the king belonged, i.e., his capital or his kingdom e.g. Kantaksolaka—‘inhabitant of Kantaksola’ (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 106); and Nāsikaka—‘inhabitant of Nāsik,’ (EI, Vol. VIII; Nos. 20 and 22). The compound ‘Ujanika-Mahāra (ja)balikā’ makes it more probable that the capital is referred to here. We may also note the forms ‘Vaṅgeyaka Hastivarma’ and ‘Kāṅgeyaka Viṣṇugopa’ which occur in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta (CII, Vol. III, p. 3 t. 1. 4).

Dr. Vogel places modern Banavāsi, which represents the remains of the old town, in the Shimoga Dt. of the Mysore State (EI, Vol. XX, p. 8). It is, however, in the Sirsi taluq of the North Kanara Dt. (Bombay Presidency) (Survey map 48 F/14; Imperial Gazetteer of India, New Series, Vol. VII).

Dr. Bühlert has quoted St. Petersburg Dictionary to the effect that Valijayantī occurs both in Brahmanical and Jain books as the name of a town in the coast of the Konkan, and has suggested that it is the seaport Byzantion of the Greeks. (CTI, p. 28, n.). The identity of Valijayantī with Banavāsi is however established by the following points: Jayantī as the name of Banavāsi occurs in many records notably in an inscription at Banavāsi itself at the temple of Madhukēśvara which records that the stone cot of Madhukēśvara
Vanavasi, or Vanavasa is another name for Vaijayanti (Prakrt, Vejayanti). The Malavalli pillar inscription of a Cutu Sataka mentions Vaijayanti as his capital. Since Kanheri, which, as late as the reign of Sri-Yana, was in the Satavahana empire, came into the possession of the Cutus, and since neither the Banavasi nor the Malavalli inscriptions can be ascribed to a period later than the third century A.D., it is certain that the Cutus rose to power in the third century on the ruins of Satavahana power. The Cutus bear the title of 'Maharaja'.

The Buddhist monuments of his reign

The central royal Buddhist figure in the reign is Cāṁtisiri. To this donatrix, the 'mahādānapatini', the 'velāmika dāna paṭibhāga vṛchiniṇna dhāra padāyini' goes the credit of having given an impetus to the beautification of the Nagārjunikonda valley, which bids fair to prove of more interest than Amaravati. She would even seem to have been responsible for the Buddhist leanings of Rudrāhara-Bhattārika, Čaṭhisiri Culla-Cāṁtisirinikā and Bapisirinikā. The most important foundation of Cāṁtisiri was the 'Mahācetiya', enshrining the 'dhātu' of the Great Teacher, consecrated in the town of Jayanti (IA, Vol. IV, p. 207, No. 8), and this god who was the family deity of the Kadambas of Hanagal is always called in their records Madhukesaśvara of Jayanti.

Senart remarks (EI, Vol. VII, p. 49): "In addition to the instances quoted by Dr. Burgess, where Jayantī seems to represent Banavasi, one might perhaps ask if in the Banavasi inscription the letter which has been read sa or saṁ before jayaṭakasa (1.2) might not be a ve, in which case the sculptor Damāraka would be designated as a native of Vaijayanti." The letter is clearly sa and nothing else.

\[58\] Lüders' List, No. 1021.
\[61\] C3, EI, Vol. XX, p. 16, t. II. 8 and 9.
\[62\] The reason for her choice of this site must have been its vicinity to the capital.

\[63\] They want to attain Nirvāṇa. B4, B5, C2, and C4.

\[64\] Whilst Dr. Vogel thinks that Cāṁtisiri built the Mahācetiya, Mr. Hirananda Sastri maintains (ASR, 1928-29) that she only rebuilt or enlarged an older stūpa. The latter view rests upon the following arguments, some of them not expressly stated:—The Amaravati, Ghanṭasālā and Jaggayyapēta Stūpas, which on epigraphical evidence belong to a period much earlier than the second century A.D., were enlarged, and āyaka platforms were added to them during the second century A.D. If the Stūpa was built by Cāṁtisiri, the inscriptions would have told us how the relics of the Teacher which the
sixth year of Siri-Virapurisadata. The Stūpa which is fifty feet in
diameter, is in the shape of a wheel, with spokes, hub, tyre and all
complete.65 Cāṁtisiri was aided in the undertaking by other Bud-

Stūpa is said to enshrine were obtained; whilst the terms ‘patiḥapita’ and
thāpita’ are used, with reference to the erection of ‘āyaka-khaṁbhas,’ ‘cetiya-
gharas’ and ‘sela-manḍavas,’ ‘samuthāpiya’ and ‘nīthāpiya’ are used with
reference to the Mahācetiya (B5 and C1). Dr. Vogel cites the authority of
the Mahāvaṁsa (EI, Vol. XX, p. 30) to show that ‘nīthāpiya’ means completed.
In inscription C1, the Mahācetiya is called ‘navakaṁnam’; the ‘navakaṁ-
mūka’ is said to have been the Reverend Ananda, who knew the Majjhima
and Dīgha Nikāyas by heart. According to the Vinaya Piṭaka (SBE, XX,
pp. 189 ff) a ‘navakaṁnam’ is ‘a religious edifice’ erected by a lay member
(upāsikā or upāsaka) for the Sāṁgha.

Whilst the fact that the outer drum and the interior of the Mahācetiya
are built of bricks of the same size negatives the theory of enlargement, the
fact that it is built of bricks of the same size as those used for the apsidal
temples built during the Ikṣvāku period (20"x10"x3") and other Buddhist
monuments in the valley, and the fact that the relic caskets in the Nāgārjunikonda stūpas are all nearly alike, prove Dr. Vogel’s theory. If the Mahācetiya
is older than the Ikṣvāku period, we would have found older epigraphs and
sculptures of which no traces remain; no doubt if the pot containing the silver
relic casket found in one of the northern chambers of the Stūpa had been in-
tact, it might have given us an inscription and proved beyond doubt the age
of the Stūpa. (The relic consists of a fragment of bone of the size of a
pea found inside a tiny round gold box ¾" in diameter. This with a few
gold flowers, pearls and garnets was placed in the silver casket shaped like a
stūpa. The latter was, however, found corroded and broken to pieces).

Vogel translates “nāmo Bhagavato ...... saṁjña saṁbudhassa dhātu-
vara parighitasas Mahācetiya” into “adoration to the Blessed one the supreme
Buddha absorbed by the best of elements at the Mahācetiya.............”
Dr. Hirananda Sastri links dhātuvaraparighita with Mahācetiya and
thinks that the Mahācetiya was protected by the corporeal remains of the
Buddha. I am wholly unable to accept this as we cannot link the genitive
parighitasas with the locative Mahācetiya (EI, Vol. XX, p. 29 note 1). The
interpretation proposed by Vogel on the authority of M. L. de la Vallé
Poussin for the difficult phrase dhātuvaraparighita is quite acceptable.
Mahācetiya commences a fresh sentence and must be linked up with āyaka-
khaṁbo thāpita.

While stūpas of less importance at Nāgārjunikonda (Stūpa No. 6 and
Stūpa No. 9 especially) were decorated with carved marble slabs and coping
stones, the Mahācetiya would seem to have been executed in simple style
like the stūpas of Ceylon. As will be shown below, there was active commu-
nication between Ceylon and the Nāgārjunikonda valley.

The remains of the Mahācetiya are the drum fifty feet in diameter,
and twenty feet high at the centre, the āyaka platforms, āyaka-khaṁbhas,
some of them in fragments, the foundations of the enclosure wall and the
gateways.

65. According to Mr. Longhurst, all the Āndhradeśa stūpas are built in
dhist and non-Buddhist royal ladies and private individuals.  

Mahādevi Rudradhara-Bhaṭṭārikā donated money and an āyaka pillar.  

Aḍavī-Cāṁtisirī, Caṇṭhisirī, Bapisirinīkā and Cula-Cāṁtisirinikā of the Kulahaka family, each contributed an 'āyaka-khaṁbha.' A slab and a coping stone were donated by a Chadakapavatica and his wife Padumavāṁi together with their sons and daughters. However, nine āyaka-pillars or more were set up by Cāṁtisirī.

The practice of erecting vihāras and cetiyaghāras or apsidal temples by the side of stūpas was followed in the Nāgarjunikonda valley also. Close to the Mahācetiya on the eastern side is an apsidal temple; an inscription incised on the marble floor of the shrine in two lines records its foundation by Cāṁtisirī in the eighteenth year of Virapurisadata's reign 'for the sake of his victory and longevity of life.' To the east of the apsidal temple are fragments of thirty-six pillars, some of them just rising out of the ground, pillars which must have supported the roof of a maṇḍapa. Fragments of pottery and stone sculptures and funeral urns were found. The style of these sculptures bears a strong resemblance to those of the Buddha in the Chetiya and Cetiyaghāra.

this style (IA, Vol. 61, p. 188). But the Jaggayyapēta Stūpa was formed of earth in layers about two feet thick over each of which was laid a close flooring of very large bricks closely fitted together (ASSI, Vol. I, p. 108).

66. EI, Vol. XX, p. 25, Inscriptions I and J.

67. The meaning of 'āyaka' is not settled. Some would connect it with 'āyako', 'ayaka' (āryaka) meaning 'venerable or worshipful'. In our epigraphs we have 'āyaka' not 'ayaka'; 'āyaka' is used as a noun; and the fact that āyaka pillars bear inscriptions (EI, Vol. XX, H; Vol. XXI, G2, G3) little favours the theory that they were objects of worship. Āyaka is rendered by Lüders and Burgess as 'entrance'. Dr. Vogel objects to this rendering on the ground that in the Nāgarjunikonda and Amaravati inscriptions, the word for entrance or gate is 'dāra' (F. EI, Vol. XX; ASSI, Vol. I, No. 44). An inscription on a coping-stone (ASSI, Vol. I, Pl. XLVIII; fig. 4) of a Cetiya platform has 'utarāyake paṭo dāna' (ibid., p. 93). Another inscription (No. 47, p. 86) on an āyaka-pillar (Pl. XLV, No. 1), records the gift of a 'Cetiya-khaṁbha' (āyaka-pillar) at the 'dakhināyaka' (dakhināyaka not dakhināyaka as Burgess has read it). But in No. 15 Pl. Ivi we have 'utarāyake unisa dānam.' Since the inscription is on an outer rail coping, 'āyaka' here means 'gateway.' Pali 'eyo' means 'entrance'. Thus in the Amaravati inscription 'āyaka' is used to denote 'something at the entrance,' as well as projections facing entrances. It would, therefore, seem that the projections received that name from the fact that they faced entrances or 'gateways.'

68. 'Cetiya-ghara'. It seems that 'ghara' was restricted to halls used for worship, e.g., 'sela-ghara' Kārīla No. 1, (EI, Vol. VII; Cetiya-ghara Kuḍā Nos. 15 and 23 (CTI), Nāsik Nos. 18 and 19 (EI, Vol. VIII).

69. Plate VI, Nos. 2 and 3.

70. apano jām(ā) tukasa raño M(ā)ṭhariputasa-Ikh(ā) kunam Siri-Virāpurisadataā āyu-vadhānikē vējayike, (EI, Vol. XX, E.).
ments of inscriptions on those pillars put together, record the foundation of a pillared-hall surrounded by a cloister (cātusālaparigahitam) and its consecration in the eighth fortnight of the rainy season of the fifteenth year of the reign.

A private donatrix who emulated Cāmāsiri was the lay disciple Bodhisiri, daughter of the householder Revata and Budhamnikā, belonging to Govagāma and niece of the treasurer (Koṭhāgārika) Bhada (Sanskrit Bhadra). The foundations attributed to her are two ‘Cetiya-gharas’—(one on the Lesser Dhammagiri by the side of a vihāra as the special property of the theris (nuns) of Ceylon, and another at Kulaha-vihāra, a shrine for the Bodhi-tree (i.e.,


72. As Bodhisiri dedicates her apsidal-temple to the theris of Ceylon, she was probably a native of Ceylon. N. Dutt identifies Govagama with Gonagāmaka, mentioned as a port in Ceylon in the Mahāvaṃsa (IHQ. Vol. VII, p. 653, n. 2).

73. The vihāra referred to still stands on the Naharāllābōdu mound.

74. Dr. Vogel's translation of ' (bha)daṁta (rā)jācariyānāṁ Kasmira-Gaṇḍhāra - Cīna-Cilāta-Tosali-Avarāṁta - Vaṅga-Vanavāsi-Yavana-Da (mila) (Pa)lura-Tambapanni-dīpa paś(a)dakānam theriyānām Tāmbapa(m)akānam-suparigāhe . . . . . . . . Cetiya-gharanāṁ kārtitam' (F, t. I. 1) as “Caitya-shrine erected for the acceptance of the fraternities of Ceylon who have converted Kasmira etc.” is not satisfactory. Not even the Mahāvaṃsa does credit Ceylonese monks with the conversion of various countries. Keeping in mind the analogy of the Kārla and Nāsik inscriptions (Kārla Nos. 19 and 20, Nāsik Nos. 2, 3 and 4; also El Vol. I, p. 240), we might translate thus;—“Caitya shrine erected for the venerable teachers who converted Kasmira etc., . . . . . . . . . . for the special acceptance of (as the special property) of the theris of Ceylon.” This agrees with the account of the Ceylonese chronicles (the Dipavāsitsa and Mahāvaṃsa) that Ceylon, Kasmira, Gaṇḍhāra, Mahīśamandala, Vanavāsa, Aparāntaka Mahārāṣṭra Himālaya and Suvannabhāmi, were converted by monks sent from India by Moggaliṣṭa Tissa. Ceylon is said to have been converted by Asoka’s son Mahinda (Mahāvaṃsa Chap. XIII, pp. 88 ff). The inscription “Moggaliṣṭasā” on relic caskets from Anurādhā and Sāṇica stūpas makes Moggaliṣṭa Tissa a historical personality (Lüders’ Nos. 664, and 682).

In a learned paper in the Indian Historical Quarterly (Vol. VII, pp. 651 ff) N. Dutt has objected to Vogel’s translation of paśidadakānam as ‘who converted.’ According to Dutt as ‘paśāda’ in the Mahāvaṃsa means ‘serene joy,’ paśidadakānam ‘of those who brought serene joy.’ But the account of the conversion of countries given in the Mahāvaṃsa makes Vogel’s translation acceptable (Childers, paśāda).

75. Vide supra.

H.A.—19
a railing around it) at the Sīhāla-vihāra, a manḍava pillar at the Mahāvihāra, a hall for religious practice at Devagiri, a tank, verandah and manḍava at Puvasela, a stone manḍava at the eastern gate of the Mahācetiya at Kaṇṭakasela, three cells at Hirunṭhuva, seven cells at Papilā a stone manḍava at Puphagiri, and a stone manḍava at the vihāra.

Ehuvuḷa Cāṁtamūla

The son of Māḍhariputa Śri-Vīrapurisadata by Vāsīthi Bhaṭṭidevā was Ehuvuḷa Cāṁtamūla, the last known king of the dynasty. That he ruled for at least eleven years is shown by the inscription of his half-sister Kodabalisiri (H).

76. On the analogy of Kulaha-vihāra, Sīhāla-vihāra would mean the vihāra built by the Ceylonese monks or nuns or laymen. Perhaps a branch of the Bodhi-tree at Ceylon was planted at Nāgārjunikonda.
77. Could it be the mound to the north-west of, and not far away from the Cula-Dhaṁmagiri? On this mound are the remains of a stūpa and sela manḍava; the latter consists of a series of four cells on each of the north-east and west sides and a pillared hall 30' 6" x 30' in the south with an open court situated between the pillared hall and the stūpa. The roof of the hall rested on sixteen pillars; all of them with the exception of two at the south-east and south-west ends have fallen down. (Plate V Nos. 1 and 4 ASR 1926-27, pp. 158-59).
78. Could this be the Mahā-vihāra (lit. Great monastery) to which the 'Mahācetiya' is said to have been attached (B5).
79. According to Hiuen-Tsang it stood to the east of the capital of Tōn-kie-tsê-kia (Dhānyakaṭaka). It gave its name to a Buddhist school.
80. The name occurs in an Amarāvati inscription (ASSI, Vol. 1, Pl. ixi; No. 54); Burgess and Lüders have read it as Kaṭakasola. But the anuvāra is clear on the plate. An inscription from Peddāvēgi mentions Kaṭakasala (MER, 1926-27 No. 219). It is certainly the port Kontakossyl which is mentioned by Ptolemy (Bk. VII, Chap. 1, Sec. 14) and placed by him just north of the mouth of the Kṛṣṇā and which transliterates Kaṭaṅkaśāla (the spear of thorns) the Sanskrit form of Kaṭakasala. The name is preserved in the modern Ghaṭaśāla, a village thirteen miles to the west of Masulipatam and the sea. There is a Cetiya in the village (Rea, South Ind. Bud. Antiquities, pp 4 ff), and on the southern boundary of the village there is a mound named Polimēradibba on which loose bricks appear. Surely these are traces of Buddhist buildings (Ibid., p. 42). But no trace of the sela-manḍava at the eastern gate of the Mahācetiya is available.
81. Papilā is perhaps identical with the Pāpikala of the Allūru inscription.
82. H. t. lI. 3 and 10, Ehuvula; G2 t. 1. 8, Ehuvula; G3 Ehuvuḷa. Only in G3 is e turned sideways. K. P. Jayaswal agrees with Hirananda Sastri
Buddhist monuments of his reign

The second year of his reign witnessed the completion of a monastery called 'Devi-vihāra', provided with everything by queen (Devi or Mahādevī) Bhaṭṭidevā for the grace and acceptance of the masters of the Bahuṣutiya sect. This monastery, with a roofless maṇḍapa, stands at the north-east foot of Nāgārjunikonda on the Iṭikarāḷabōdu where stand also a sūpa (No. 5) and two apsidal temples. Inscriptions G-2, G-3, are borne by the āyaka-khanībhas belonging to Stūpa No. 5. Perhaps Bhaṭṭidevā built the stūpa and apsidal temples, in addition to the Devī-vihāra, thereby emulating her mother. In the eleventh year Kodabalisiri consecrated to the masters of the Mahiśāsaka school a monastery and a cetiya. The cetiya is probably Stūpa No. 6 on the top of the hill above the monastery. The latter, which is on the Koṭṭampalagu mound a few furlongs to the north of Nāgārjunikonda, and commands a fine view of the Kṛṣṇā, has a pillared hall or pavilion in the centre with a row of twenty cells all round. The hall is sixty-one feet square and provided with a flat wooden roof supported by thirty-six lofty marble pillars. Stūpa No. 6 has yielded a number of sculptured beams, two small medallions, a silver relic

in reading 'Bahuvala'. Says he:—"In the plate G, the letter b is misformed, but the full form is seen in H, where it occurs twice and is clearly the four-cornered b" (JBORS, 1933, p. 173, n. 1). The so-called ba has no resemblance whatsoever with the four-cornered ba occurring in these inscriptions. It certainly resembles the Jaggayyapēta e (ASSI, Vol. I, Pl. LII; t. 1. 5).

Like Pulumāvi it is a Dravidian word and both are difficult of interpretation. 'Ehu' of the name may be Tamil Ehu 'steel', a very old Tamil word. This is another instance of a religious foundation named after its founder. Here the monastery receives the latter part of the queen's name.

Structural apsidal temples of the very early centuries A.D., are very rare in India. Barring those at Nāgārjunikonda, one has been discovered at Sānchi, two at Taxila, and one at Sārnāth.

Dr. Vogel reads imaṁ khaniyam vihāra ca and explains khaniya by a resort to 'khaṇu pillar' (Childers, Pali-Eng. Dict. khaṇu). What is read as ni is certainly ti, for unlike the loop in na the loop in ta ends in a downward curve. The word is clearly cetiyam. At Nāgārjunikonda cetiyas and vihāras are found together.

Pls. VI, 4; VII, 1, 2, 3 and 4, VIII, 1 and 2.

ASR, 1928-30, Pl. 37 d and c, one is embossed with the head of a Greek male figure and the other with the head of an Indian lady. They are not king and queen as they do not wear crowns.
casket much like the one found in the Mahācetiya and bone relics.\textsuperscript{90}

The monuments which would seem to belong to the Ikṣvāku period, but which cannot be assigned to any reign definitely, are two cetiyas (Nos. 3 and 4) and a vihāra\textsuperscript{91} on the hill to the north-west of and near the Nāharāḷlaboḍu, the vihāra on the Nāharāḷlaboḍu and Stūpas Nos. 5, 7, 8 and 9.

\textbf{Buddhism of the period}

Like the Amarāvatī inscriptions the Nāgarjunaṇkonda inscriptions introduce us to a number of Buddhist schools; the Mahisāsakas, an offshoot of the original Sthaviravādas; the Bahusutiyas, a sub-division of the Gokulikas who belonged to the Mahāsāṃghikas, the original schismatics;\textsuperscript{92} the Puvaseliyas (offshoot of the Mahāsāṃghikas) who find place in Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the Kathāvatthu, along with Avaraseliyas, Siddhathikas and Rājagiriyas, are called Andhakas, i.e. schools that took their rise in the Andhradesa,\textsuperscript{93} and the Avaramahāvinaseliyas, who were patronised by Cāṁtimisiri. According to Dr. Vogel ‘Avarasela’ is perhaps the abbreviated form of ‘Aparamahāvinasela’ of our inscriptions.\textsuperscript{94} Since a ‘Mahāvinasela’ school is mentioned in an Amarāvatī inscription,\textsuperscript{95} since we meet with ‘Puvasela’ and not ‘Puvamahāvinasela’ in a Nāgarjunakonda (Inscription F.) and the Allūru inscriptions, Dr. Vogel’s suggestion cannot be accepted. A fragmentary inscription from Amarāvatī has ‘liyānam’ and before it space for four or five letters (Mahāvinase?). The teacher belonging to this school is referred to as “Mahāvinayadhara”\textsuperscript{96} (versed in the Great Vinaya). Can Mahāvinasela be a form of Mahāvinayasela, the elision of ya being not uncommon? Like Puvaseliya and Aparaseliya, Pva-

\textsuperscript{90} Dr. Vogel thinks that the eastern side of the stupa is the most important one. But the relic caskets from the Mahācetiya and Stūpa No. 6 were found in chambers on the north-eastern side.

\textsuperscript{91} Vide supra.

\textsuperscript{92} Walleser, Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus, pp. 6 and 21.


\textsuperscript{94} Edited by Mrs. Rhys Davids, p. 104. Avarasasela is also mentioned by Hieu-Tsang as a hill which stood near the capital Dhānyakataka (Ibid.).

\textsuperscript{95} El. Vol. XXI, M2, 1. 5, M3, 1. 6; Vol. XX. E. 1. 5.

\textsuperscript{96} ASSI, Vol. I., p. 165, Pl. LX, No. 49; Mahava(vi)nasela is mentioned as a place-name in Pl. Iviii No. 35, (Ibid.).

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., p. 102.
mahāvinaseliya and Aparamahavinaseliya schools might also have arisen. It is well to remember the remark of Rhys Davids:—

"As the so called sects were tendencies of opinion, the number of them was constantly changing." Dr. Vogel takes Ayīra-Haṁgha (C1, C2) to be the name of a school. In his paper, entitled 'Notes on the Nāgarjunikonda Inscriptions,' N. Dutt contends that 'Ayīra-Haṁghānām' is another form of 'Mahāsaṁghikānām'.

But 'Āirā-Utayipabhāhinām' in an Amarāvatī inscription, 'Āryamahā-saṁghikānām Lokottaravādinām Madhya desikānām pathena Vinayapiṭakasya, Mahāvastuyeśī, 'Ayīranāṁ Puvaseliyānāṁ' in the Allūru inscription, prove that Ayīra (Ārya) is not used even with reference to sects in the sense of 'mahā' but only in the sense of 'venerable.' 'Ayīra-Haṁgha', like 'Catudisa Sagha' of the Nāsik and Kārlā inscriptions, would, therefore, mean the venerable Saṁgha.

Cāmmisiri's wish that the families to which she belonged and the whole world might attain happiness in both the worlds, reminds us of the Mahāyānist who places the attainment of Bodhi knowledge and liberation from worldly miseries of all creatures, before his own.

According to Hiuen-Tsang monks studying the 'Great Vehicle' lived in the Āndhradesa. Nāgarjunikonda sculptures also show the Mahāyānist tendencies at work (worship of large Buddha figures, one of which was found in the large square chamber at the north-west end of the monastery on the mound to the north-west of the Nāhārāllabōdu; three others were found at site No. 4). Where, among all the Hinayāna schools mentioned, does Mahāyānism come in? The answer is given by Mrs. Rhys Davids:—"The extension of the Mahāyānist school was and is of a very vague and fluid kind. Those to whom it applied formed no close corporation." Mr. Rhys Davids compares the relation of the Mahāyāna to Hinayāna schools with that of the various Roman and Greek Catholic schools to those of the early Christians.
Ceylon and Nāgārjunikonda

Ceylon and Ceylonese Buddhism were in touch with Nāgārjunikonda. Āryadeva, a disciple of Nāgārjuna (3rd century A.D.), was a native of Ceylon, but spent the greater part of his life in India. The pot containing his relics has been found in the Guntur District. The Thēris of Ceylon would seem to have lived in the Nāgārjunikonda valley, for the apsidal temple on the Nāharāḷlabōdu is dedicated to them. A vihāra built by a Ceylonese Buddhist is also mentioned (Sīhāla-vihāra, inscription F.). Probably the trade routes from the eastern ports and the Mahācetiya enshrining the Jdhātu of the Great Teacher attracted these pilgrims to eastern Deccan.

Buddhist Canonical Books Mentioned

A point of interest is the mention of the Dīgha and Majhima sections of the Sutta Piṭaka and of the five Mātukas. The Mātukas are the condensed contents especially of the philosophical parts of the Canonical books in the Abhidhamma. On the authority of Burnouf’s translation of the Saddharmo Pundarīka, Childers says that it means also the list of Vinaya precepts omitting all the explanations and other details.

Administration: Administrative divisions

The biggest administrative division was the rāṣṭra, a division identical with the Sātavāhana āhāra. But the rāṣṭra division was known to the pre-Iksvāku period in the Andhradesa. The Allūru and Amārāvati inscriptions mention rāhas. The division below the rāṣṭra was gāma.

105. Vide infra.
106. ‘Dīgha-Majhima-pānca-Mātuka-osaka (desaka) vācakānaṁ ācariyaṁ nāṁ Ayīra-Haṅghānaṁ aṁ (nt) tevasikena Dīgha-Majhima-Nikāya-dharena bhaja(da)nt Anadena’ (C1, C2). Pali-English Dict. q. v. māsīkā.
108. According to Burgess adhithana may be the name of a town or may mean capital. After adhithane we have a lacuna with traces of four letters and after it vathavasa. The lacuna would then seem to have contained the name of a town.
109. The villages mentioned in the Iksvāku records are Panḍāmga at which masters of the venerable Sāṅgha are said to have resided, Govagāma, Naḍatūra in Kammākaraṭha, Mahākāmḍurūra and Velagiri,
The official titles known to us are those of Mahāsenāpati, Mahātalavara, Mahādaṇḍanāyaka and Koṭhāgārika. A feature of the Ikṣvāku period is the bearing of two or more titles by the same person. Vāsiṭhiputa Kāṁdasiri, Vāsiṭhiputa Mahā-Kaṁdasiri and Vinhusiri of the Pūkiya family and Vāsiṭhiputa Khamdacali-kiremmanaṇaka of the Hiraṇṇaka family, bore the titles of Mahāsenāpati and Mahātalavara; the son-in-law of Siri-Cāṁtamūla bears the titles of Mahāsenāpati, Mahātalavara, and Mahādaṇḍanāyaka; perhaps this indicates a higher position than that of the other Mahātalavaras, which he enjoyed in virtue of his being the son-in-law of the king.

Official Titles: Mahāsenāpati

Vogel looks upon Mahāsenāpati as a nobiliary title on the score that the Sātavāhana Mahāsenāpati was in charge of rāṣṭras. It is highly improbable that high dignitaries are known in their inscriptions by their nobiliary titles only. In the Jangli Guṇḍu inscription a Mahāsenāpati in charge of an āhāra is mentioned along with a Gāmika, an official. A Mahāsenāpati with non-military duties was possible in an age of confusion of titles and duties. In all the records of the Ikṣvāku period the title Mahāsenāpati precedes that of Mahātalavara and except in one instance the wives of Mahātalavara-Mahāsenāpati-Mahādaṇḍanāyakas bear the title of Mahātalavari only. Could this indicate that the title of Mahāsenāpati was superior to that of Mahātalavara?

109. Since Koṭhāgāra means 'storehouse'; Prākṛt Koṭhagarika is best construed as 'keeper of royal stores.' See also Lüders' No. 937, Koṭhagala.

110. In the Cinna Gaṇjam inscription of the time Siri-Yaša Sātakani we have Mahatarakasa Mahā-e---' The latter is perhaps the mutilated form of Mahāsenāpatiṣa; in that case the combination of two or more titles in the same person is not peculiar to the Ikṣvāku period.

111. According to Vogel Mahā-Kaṁdasiri of C5 is identical with Kaṁdasiri the husband of Caṁtisirinikā C3. He however considers the lady mentioned in C5 as a co-wife of Kaṁdasiri, for while Caṁtisirinikā mentions Kharinda-sāgarāmnaka as her son, the other lady mentions Mahāsenāpati-Mahātalavara-Vinhusiri as her son, and both C3 and C5 were incised on the same day. In our epigraphs 'Mahā' and 'Cula' are used to distinguish a younger from an elder person, that is when they both bear the same name, e.g., Caṁtisirinikā and Cula-Caṁtisirinikā (B4, C5); Damila-Kaṇha and Cula-Kaṇha (Lüders' No. 1243). On the analogy of these names Mahā-Kaṁdasiri is either an elder brother, or some senior member of the Pūkiya family.

112. B2, EI, Vol. XX.
Mahātalavara

In his note on the Nāgarjunikonda inscriptions Vogel says\(^{112a}\) "The curious term Mahātalavara which is also met with in other inscriptions of Southern India must likewise denote a high dignitary, whose exact function, however, is not clear. The second member of the compound is not a Sanskrit word, but seems to be a term borrowed from some Dravidian language." As 'mahā' is a prefix denoting a higher title, 'talavara' is the term to be explained. Says Vogel: "We must leave this question to the decision of students of South Indian Languages. Can the word have any connection with Tamil talavāy (=a general), Tamil talaiyāri (=a village watchman) or Canarese talavara, talavāra (=a watchman, a beadle)?" Since Canarese talavara (=a watchman) very nearly corresponds to our Talavara, since Tamil talaiyāri also means watchman, talavara and talaiyāri are the words with which Talavara should be connected.\(^{113}\) The title of Mahāsenāpati born by Mahātalavaras may also exclude Tamil talavāy (commander). Talaiyāri as Tamil form of Talavara or Talavara as a Prākṛt variation of talaiyāri is phonetically possible.\(^{114}\)

Since Talavaras are mentioned in the Kalpasūtra with eighteen gaṇavarājas, Vogel looks upon Talavara as military title. But the Subodhikā, a commentary on the Kalpasūtra, shows that it was an official title.\(^{115}\) The Mahātalavaras would seem to have been viceroys. As has been suggested above, the office of Mahātalavara was a Sātavāhana one derived from the local office of Talavara much in the same way as the offices of Mahābhoja and Mahāraṇṭhi were from those of Bhoja and Raṭhika.\(^{116}\)

\(^{112a}\) EI, Vol. XX, p. 6.


\(^{114}\) Pischel, op. cit., Sec. 254.

\(^{115}\) Talavarah tuṣṭa-bhūpāla-pradatta-patta baṇḍha vibhūṣitā Rājasthāniyāḥ. This passage has been quoted by Vogel himself.

\(^{116}\) On the evidence of the Allūr inscription we may say that during the Sātavāhana period the title of Mahātalavara is not found in combination with those of Mahāsenāpati and Mahātalavara. On this score even the Ramareṇḍippalle inscription which mentions a Mahātalavara would also belong to the Sātavāhana period.
“...It penetrated also into Northern India, for there can be little doubt that it is identical with the mysterious word taravara which coupled with mahāpratihārā (=“a great chamberlain”) is found in the legend of one of the clay sealings excavated by the late Dr. Bloch at Basār, the site of ancient Vaiśāli. This document belongs to the Gupta period. It was suggested by Dr. Bloch that the word tarika, which occurs in the lists of officials in mediaeval copper-plate charters, may quite well be a corrupted form of taravara.”116a These instances show that the office of Talavara survived the Ikṣvāku period. The Konḍamūḍi plates mention a Mahātalavara-Mahādanḍanāyaka. Besides the instances cited by Vogel we have the Deo-Baraṇārk inscription of Jivitagupta II of Magadha, which mentions a Talavāţaka;117 the Kudopali plates of Mahābhavagupta, assigned by Keilhorn to the first half of the twelfth century A.D.,118 mention a Talavārgin; and the Kaţak plates of Mahāśīvagupta mention a Talahi (?)ta,119 and in an inscription of the Kalacūri king, Rāyamūrāri Sovideva (A.D. 1173), the son of the governor of Ehur is called Talavāra Cāmdeynāyaka.120

Mahādanḍanāyaka

The title Mahādanḍanāyaka is unknown to the Sātavāhana period. As āṇḍa means ‘rod’ as well as ‘army’ (āṇḍa-ṇiti=administration of justice), the title can be explained as judicial or military. Since Mahāsenāpati was in origin a military title Mahādanḍanāyaka would be a judicial one. All these titles were hereditary and sometimes more than one son inherited the father’s titles.

Other Conclusions

The few glimpses that the Ikṣvāku records and sculptures afford into the social life of the period have been discussed in the chapter entitled ‘Social, Economic and Religious Conditions’, as it represents a continuity with the conditions in the Sātavāhana period and in many aspects presents no break with the past. According to Vogel seaborne trade was “no doubt also largely responsible for

120. EI, Vol. XII, p. 335.
H.A.—20
the flourishing state of Buddhism in this part of India. The devotees of the Good Law were largely recruited from the commercial classes and it was their wealth which enabled not only the merchants themselves, but also their royal masters, to raise monuments of such magnificence as the great stūpa of Amarāvati." The remains of an ancient quay discovered by Longhurst on the right bank of the Kṛṣṇā near the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa plateau,121 and the emporiums of Kaṇṭakossyla and Allōsygne would seem to be evidence of a vast seaborne trade with Ceylon, Farther India, and the West. This trade was perhaps responsible for the gifts of crores of gold with which Sīri-Cāṃtamūla is credited. But the Buddhist monuments of the Ikṣvāku period were almost all of them constructed neither by merchants nor by their royal masters. All of them were, except the foundations attributed to Bodhisiri and a slab donated by Cada-kapavatica, set up by royal ladies. It is then seen that Nāgārjunikoṇḍa cannot by itself prove that the flourishing Buddhism was a result of flourishing trade. It must also be noted that Nāgārjunikoṇḍa does not introduce us to such a glorious epoch of Buddhism as Amarāvati, Gummaḍidurru, Allūru and Kaṇṭakasela, for we do not find at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa such a crowd of Buddhist devotees as at Amarāvati. Evidently the rise of the Brahmanical dynasties was silently undermining Buddhism from the beginning.

Of the Ikṣvāku currency we know nothing except that the denarii were current. Not a single Ikṣvāku coin has been picked up. As the Sātavāhanas made large issues of lead and copper coins which are discovered in heaps in the Kṛṣṇā, Godāvari and Guntur districts even to-day, especially at Nāgarjunikoṇḍa, it is possible that the Ikṣvākus did not find it necessary to issue new coins.

121. IA, 1932, p. 188.
KINGS OF THE BRHATPHALĀYANA GOTRA

The material for a study of the dynasties that succeeded to the political heritage of the Sātavāhanas in the Andhradeśa and in the areas south of the Kṛṣṇā as far as Pālār is scanty. Of the kings of the Brhatphalāyana gotra, we have but a single copper-plate grant (the Koṇḍamudi plates of Mahārāja Jayavarman).

Chronology.

The chronology of the period is far from being satisfactorily settled. While editing the grant just mentioned Dr. Hultsch says2:—"The alphabet of his (Jayavarman’s) inscription shows that he must have lived in the same period as the Pallava king Śiva-Skandavarman who issued the Mayidavōlu plates.” This view has been followed generally by other writers on South Indian History. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil not only follows Dr. Hultsch but even says that the unknown predecessor of Śiva-Skandavarman Pallava ruled between 225-250 A.D.3 A fuller knowledge of the Ikṣvāku dynasty than was possible before the discovery of the Nāgārjunikōṇḍa inscriptions has led Prof. Dubreuil to change his views. He now places the Ikṣvākus in the third century A.D. and shifts the early Pallavas to the fourth; but even here he maintains that Mahārāja Jayavarman and Yuvamahārāja Śiva-Skandavarman were

1. Brhatphalāyana as a gotra name is not to be found in other records. But the phrase Brhatphalāyana-sa-gotra occurring in the Koṇḍamudi plates of Jayavarman leaves no doubt on the point. In these plates as well as in the records of the kings who are said to have belonged to the Sālaṅkāyana and Ananda gotras we miss the dynastic names. This recalls to our mind some of the Sātavahana inscriptions and coins where we have metronymics derived from Vedic gotra names, but miss the dynastic name. In the total absence of their dynastic names scholars have labelled the former group of kings as ‘the Brhatphalāyanas, the Sālaṅkāyanas and the Anandas.’ It is like calling the Pallavas and the Kadambas as the Bhāradvājas and the Mānavyas respectively. We would avoid the confusion between the dynastic and gotra names if we call these kings ‘kings of Brhatphalāyana gotra,’ ‘kings of the Sālaṅkāyana gotra’ and so on.

2. EI, Vol. VI, p. 316.

contemporaries. Dr. K. R. Subramaniyam has also followed Dr. Hultzsch. He would make the Ikṣvākus, Jayavarman and the Pallavas contemporary powers and give them a third century date.

A comparative study of the alphabet of the Koṇḍamudi and the Mayidavolu plates throws some doubt over the contemporaneity postulated by Dr. Hultzsch. No doubt the alphabets of the two grants have some common characteristics. Both exhibit a cursive writing. Both have the peculiar e which according to Dr. Hultzsch resembles the archaic Tamil sā, the ma with a loop at the bottom, and the semicircle or triangle open at the top, replaced by a rudimentary vertical to which is attached on the left a curved stroke. Sometimes the curved stroke does not touch the vertical as in ‘Yuvamahārāja,’ ‘bāmhadeyam’ and ‘vitaraṇa’ (Mayidavolu ll. 1, 12 and 13 respectively); and in ‘Mahēsvara’, ‘Jayavammo’ and ‘anhe’ (Koṇḍamudi ll. 3, 5 and 7 respectively). The sa consists of two curves one below the other but not connected still. Besides these common features mentioned by Dr. Hultzsch there are others like the peculiar forms of ku, ke, ha, la, and na. These common peculiarities are evidently to be explained by the fact that the records come from one and the same area, from adjoining taluqs in the Guntur District.


The Mayidavolu plates are written in the same alphabet as the plates of Jayavarman—Ibid.

5. “At the time of his (Śiva-Skandavarman’s) rule, about the middle of the third century A.D., the Brhatphalāyanas ruled what was later known as the kingdom of Veṅgi (Vēṅgi) and the Ikṣvākus were in possession of the Andhra country stretching from about Śri Śailam northward and extending indefinitely into Dakshina Kosala and along the coast north of the Godāvarī.” Buddhist Remains in Andhra and Andhra History, p. 78.

While writing this chapter I got D. C. Sircar’s monograph entitled The Successors of the Sātavāhanas in the Eastern Deccan. He has also followed the old view.


7. It is interesting to note that the cursive ha which agrees with the northern Gupta form (Bühler, Tables IV, 39) occurs in the Jaggayyapeṭa inscriptions of the time of the Ikṣvāku king Virapurisadata, but does not occur in the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions of his reign. It occurs in a Kārā inscription El. Vol. XXIV, p. 282 and Pl. XVI l. 3). The peculiar ha on some of the coins of Gotamiputra Śrī-Yaṭa Śātakarni was probably developed out of this ha.

8. Mayidavolu is a village near Narasaranpet, the headquarters of the taluq of that name, and Koṇḍamudi is a village in the Tenali taluq. It is only to be expected that alphabets vary not according to dynasties but according to localities, and in establishing any comparative system of palaeo-
By the side of these common characteristics stand out certain differences in the Mayidavolu grant which seem to indicate a further stage of development from the Koṇḍamudi alphabet. Says Dr. Hultsch: "The group jā (Koṇḍamudi plates II. 5, 11 and 34) has a different shape, the vowel-mark being attached on the right, and not at the top of the letter as in the Mayidavolu plates (II. 18 and 24). The n (or ñ) is identical in shape with the lingual d but the dental d is represented by a separate character while in the Mayidavolu plates no distinction is made between all the four letters." The other differences which are more important for settling the relative chronology of the two dynasties and which have not been pointed out by Dr. Hultsch are as follows:

(a) Whilst the Mayidavolu sa consists of two equal curves, the upper curve of the Koṇḍamudi sa is bigger than the lower one and resembles the upper curve of sə in all other inscriptions. This fact and the peculiarity common to the Mayidavolu sa and the Koṇḍamudi sa which has been noted above make it probable that the latter represents a transition to the former. Whilst the two curves of the Mayidavolu sa, which are more developed than those of the Koṇḍamudi sa, end in strong hooks on the left, the curves of the latter have no such finish.

(b) The broad-backed na of the two grants differs from the na of the Hira-Haḍagallī and the Gunapadeya grants, which has
graphy we must select territorial rather than dynastic names. The highly cursive writing of the Hira-Haḍagallī grant shows in its ductus a certain relationship to the Jangli Gunda (in the Bellary District) inscription of Sīri-Pulumāvi, the last of the Sātavāhanas. The similarity between Gotamiputa Sīri-Sātakaṇji's and Uṇavatara's Nāsik and Kārla inscriptions is explained by the area of their location. (JRAS, 1926, p. 625). The differences between the Mayidavolu and the Hira-Haḍagallī grants of Śiva-Skandavarman Pallava must be explained by the same principle. The peculiar ma, sa, ha, la, na, and e are not to be found in the Hira-Haḍagallī grant. The Udayagiri cave inscription of Candragupta II of the year 82 (G. Era) is the box-headed variety of the Central Indian alphabet. The Sānci inscription of the same king is in the character of the southern alphabets (CII, Vol. III, p. 4). Instances of this kind can be multiplied.

9. na does not occur in the Koṇḍamudi plates.

10. It may be argued that this greater absence of differentiation in the Mayidavolu plates may indicate an earlier period. But differentiation does not always represent a later stage of development. The looped ta and na are later forms of the na with the horizontal or curved base and the ta with the semicircle at the bottom, and yet there is less difference (sometimes no difference) between the former than between the latter.
a strongly curved base line, the beginnings of which we see in the Gīrnār praśasti of Rudradāman and in some Kuṣāṇa inscriptions. The Mayidavōlū na is more broad-backed than that of the Kōṇḍamūḍī plates and this fact certainly points to a later period.

(c) Whilst the e of both the grants has a form not met with elsewhere the Mayidavōlū e is more cursive and ends in stronger hooks than the Kōṇḍamūḍī e.

(d) Whilst the verticals of both the Kōṇḍamūḍī and the Mayidavōlū la are bent to the left, they have longer tails and smaller bodies than those of some of the Amarāvati inscriptions of the first and second centuries A.D. The body is smaller in the Mayidavōlū than in the Kōṇḍamūḍī grant. This development can be traced further. In the western script of the sixth and seventh centuries the body becomes smaller and the tail correspondingly longer. True in the la of the grant of Cārudevi (later than the Mayidavōlū grant) the body is more prominent than in the Mayidavōlū la, but even so the former registers a development over the latter in the enormous tail which is a feature of the la of the Eastern Cāḷukya and later Pallava charters.

Again the Kōṇḍamūḍī la has not the angular or slightly curved base of the Mayidavōlū la. However the la in ‘alonakādaķaṃ’ resembles the Mayidavōlū la (angular base) but even here the upper vertical is not bent to the left as in Mayidavōlū and the medial o sign over it is an earlier form of that found in the Mayidavōlū plates. The vertical of the Kōṇḍamūḍī la does not continue the curve of the body but starts from the middle of its right arm so that even careful epigraphists like Dr. Hultsch cannot distinguish between la and gi. In line 42 Dr. Hultsch reads ‘tagivareṇa’ for ‘talavareṇa,’ and Dr. Vogel thinks that the former is a mistake.

12. Ibid., V.
13. ASSI, I. Nos. 8, 16, 32 and 44.
14. The Cārudevi grant was mistakenly called a grant of Nandivarman of the Śalaṅkāyana gotra by Dr. Fleet in IA, Vol. V, p. 176. However, he corrected himself in Vol. IX. Since writing these lines I find that D. C. Sircar has also noticed the mistake, vide infra.
15. la with the curved base occurs in ll. 13, 15 and 22 while la with the angular base is found in ll. 2 and 6.
17. Vide infra.
of the scribe for the latter. This error arises from the rudimentary form of the Koṇḍamuḍī la.

(e) The curved horizontal member of the Mayidavōlu ka like that of the Cārudevī grant is surely later than the straight line of the Koṇḍamuḍī ka.

(f) The ba of the Koṇḍamuḍī grant with the notch in the left vertical which does not, except in a few cases, show a serif at the upper end (ll. 4, 10, 37 and 38) and is slightly open on the left at the top is less cursive than the closed ba of the Mayidavōlu and the Cārudevī grants. The Koṇḍamuḍī pa in its narrow and curved base is an obviously earlier form.

(g) The letter ya shows practically the same features of development from the Koṇḍamuḍī to Mayidavōlu as the letter pa.

(h) The vertical member of the Mayidavōlu a like that of the Cārudevī grant is longer than that of the Koṇḍamuḍī a. The lower end of the vertical of the former shows sometimes a bend and sometimes a reascent to the left. The reascent is more pronounced in the Cārudevī than in the Mayidavōlu grant; in the later Pallava charters there is a reascent to about half the length of the vertical. The curves at the base of the verticals of the Koṇḍamuḍī a are rudimentary, as those in Uśavadāta's inscriptions from Kārlā. The upper and lower limbs of the two Pallava grants under reference are connected to the middle of the vertical by a straight line; in the Koṇḍamuḍī grant they are represented by a wavy line connected to the top of the vertical by a slanting stroke. While the vertical and left upper limb have nail heads which in the Cārudevī grant are turned into small curves attached to the top of the vertical (ll. 8 and 10), the Koṇḍamuḍī one has no such nailhead or curve. The general appearance of the Koṇḍamuḍī a is altogether more primitive.

(i) The medial ā, i and o signs of the Mayidavōlu plates show a more developed form than those of the Koṇḍamuḍī plates. While in the Koṇḍamuḍī plates the sign expressing the length of the vowel in ā is a short stroke attached to the middle of the vertical (ll. 6 and 9), in the Mayidavōlu plates it is a curve (line 4.) which becomes stronger in the Cārudevī plates. (ll. 6, 8, 10 and 16). Even where the strokes are attached to the top of the letter those in the

19. ll. 6, 8 and 9.
20. Bühler, Tables VII, i, xx and xxii.
Mayidavolu plates end in better curves and have longer tails (as in the Cārudevi grant) than those of the Koṇḍamudi plates. In the latter the medial i sign is a semi-circle; in the other two it approaches the closed circle. The medial o sign in the Mayidavolu lo (line 13) is a wavy line while in Koṇḍamudi (line 32) it is a horizontal stroke. Even where it is a horizontal line over the letter, the tail on the right is longer in the Mayidavolu than in the Koṇḍamudi grant. In the Cārudevi grant it is longer still.

Scholars are agreed that the Cārudevi grant is later than the Mayidavolu grant. The line of development is therefore from the Koṇḍamudi to the Mayidavolu grant, and then on to the Cārudevi grant. Even where the Mayidavolu alphabet does not approach the Cārudevi alphabet, it shows more developed forms than those of the Koṇḍamudi plates.

The Mayidavolu plates were issued by Yuvanahārāja Śiva-Skandavarman during the reign of his father (Bappa). The palaeography of the plates makes it therefore highly probable that Jayavarman reigned at least a generation before the predecessor of Śiva-Skandavarman.

The general facts of history point to the same conclusion. It may be presumed that the find place of the Koṇḍamudi grant (Tenali taluq) is not far from the object of the grant. Then Jayavarman's sway would have extended over lands south of the Kṛṣṇā. The alphabetical peculiarities common to the Mayidavolu

21. The orthography of the grants furnishes corroborative evidence. Whilst the writer of the Koṇḍamudi plates follows the practice of the Sātavāhana inscriptions where every double consonant is expressed by a single letter (the exceptions are 'baṁhadeyam' and 'Jayavaṁmo'), the writer of the Mayidavolu plates adopts the etymological spelling in 'paṭṭika', 'datta', 'sa-gotto' and 'kārāpejja'. In the Hira-Hāḍagallī grant the etymological spelling of the Pandit is more pronounced than in the other two. The orthography of the Cārudevi grant is in accordance with that of literary Pāṇḍī. Dr. Hultsch himself remarks (El, Vol. VIII, p. 144. n. 5) that in this respect the two grants of Śiva-Skandavarman occupy an intermediate position between the Sātavāhana inscriptions and the Cārudevi grant.

22. supra, p. 152.

23. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil sees in the Kūḍāra and the Kūḍārahāra, according to him roughly correspoding to the modern Bandar taluq of the Kṛṣṇā District, the capital and the kingdom respectively of Mahārāja Jayavarman. The Prof. has narrowed down too much the kingdom of Jayavarman. Scholars like Dr. Hultsch and Kielhorn (El, Vol. VI, p. 318; Vol. IV, p. 34; Vol. V, p. 123) are agreed that the Kudrārahāra of the Koṇḍamudi plates is the same as the Kudrārahāra viṣaya of some of the Sālaṅkāyana
and the Königamudi grants are corroborative evidence in the same direction.  

Whilst the Mayidavolu grant of Yuvamahārāja Śiva-Skandavarman proves that the Guntur District or part of it was included in the Pallava division of Arādhipata, the Čārudevī grant shows that the Guntur region continued to be part of the Pallava Dominions during the reigns of Dharmmamahārājādhirāja Śiva-Skandavarman and his immediate successors Skandavarman and Yuvamahārāja Buddhavarman.

inscriptions and the Gudrāhāra, Gudravāra and Gudrāra viśaya of the Eastern Čālukya grants. In a Kākatiya inscription on the right door-pillar of the Bhimēśvara temple at Guḍivāḍa (593 of 1893), Guḍivāḍa is said to have belonged to the district of Gudrāra. Dr. Hultsch has identified Kūḍūra with Guḍivāḍa, the headquarters of the taluq of the same name in the Kṛṣṇa District. A grant of Mahārāja Nandivarman Śālaṉkāyana from the Kollair Lake in the Kaikalur taluq of the Kṛṣṇa District makes it probable that the latter was also included in the Kūḍūrahāra or Kudrāhāra viśaya of the grant. Thus the Kūḍūrahāra of Jayavarman’s time included besides the Bandar taluq the territory as far west as Guḍivāḍa, as far north as the Kollair Lake and as far south as the northern part of the Guntur District. Besides, in the Sātavāhana and Śālaṉkāyana records āhara (or hāra) and viśaya denote a division of the kingdom, not the whole kingdom. Kūḍūra mentioned in the Königamudi grant is spoken of as the headquarters of the governor of the district, and as a ‘viśayakhaṁḍāvāra’ i.e., royal headquarters in camp. According to Hemacandra (Desikōsa q.v.) it may also signify a capital. In Nāsik No. 4 (inscription of Gotamiputra Śri-Sātakāni) which the inscription under reference resembles in phraseology, a ‘viśayakhaṁḍāvāra’ in Govadhanahāra is mentioned. The capital of Gotami-puta Śri-Sātakāni was Paithan, far away from Govadhan or Govadhanahāra.

24. Pāṁtēra, the village mentioned in the grant as baṁkadeya, can be identified with Pottūru in the Guntur taluq. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil identifies it with Pandurru in the Bandar taluq of the Kṛṣṇa District (Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 85).

25. ’Virirpara’ the village situated in the Āṁḍhāpat(h)a and the object of Śiva-Skandavarman’s grant is certainly the Viṁpēru mentioned in the Kopparam plates of Pulakesin II (El, Vol. XVIII, p. 258) and perhaps the modern Vippilappu in the Narasaraopet taluq of the Guntur District.

26. Śiva siri-Āpilaka, siva Śri-Sātakāni, śiva Skanda Sātakarni; the prince called Khaṁda-nāga in a Kāröhi inscription (ASWI, Vol. V, p. 86) is called siva-Khamda-nāga-siri in a Banavasi inscription (IA, Vol. XIV, p. 331). These instances of the use of ‘śiva’ in the inscriptions and on the coins of the second century B.C. and second century A.D., make it highly probable that ‘śiva’ in the expression Śiva-Skandavarman is an honorific prefix and that therefore Śiva-Skandavarman and Skandavarman are identical. Sometimes ‘śiva’ enters into the composition of names, e.g., Sivamaka.

H.A.—21
It is thus clear that the reign of Jayavarman in the same region must be placed before that of Yuvamahārāja Śiva-Skandavarman.

The rise of the dynasty

The rise of the dynasty of Mahārāja Jayavarman is shrouded in mystery. Even so, the Ikṣvāku records from Nāgārjunikonda and Jaggayapēta make a tentative suggestion possible. The cursive writing of the Koṇḍamudi grant obviously places it after the Ikṣvāku inscriptions. It has been shown above that the Ikṣvākus ruled not only north and south of the Kṛṣṇā, but as far east as the delta of the Kṛṣṇā; then their dominions must have included at least a part of what was later on the kingdom of Jayavarman. The continuance of the Ikṣvāku offices of Mahātalavara and Mahādanḍanāyaka under Jayavarman is another link in the chain of evidence that suggests that Jayavarman or his predecessors had a large share in weakening the power of the Ikṣvākus.27

As in the case of the Pallavas we are in the dark as to the founder of the dynasty. The Koṇḍamudi plates do not mention the father of Jayavarman even in the Pallava or Śālaṅkāyana fashion, i.e., under the form Bappa.28 But could Jayavarman have carved out a kingdom for himself out of the debris of the Ikṣvāku kingdom, built up an administrative machinery, earned the title of Mahārāja29 and entered upon a career of further conquests30 within the short span of ten years?31 Obviously Jayavarman's dynasty rose to power before Jayavarman came on the scene.

The Capital of Jayavarman

It has been shown that Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil's and Dr. Hultzsch's view that Kūdūra was the capital is untenable.

27. Sircar boldly attempts to carry Jayavarman's dynasty to the second century B.C. He says:—"If we ..........accept the reading Pithuḍa in a passage in the Háthigumphā inscription (l. 11) of Khāravela and the interpretation that King Khāravela of Kaliṅga besieged the city of Pithuḍa, it is not impossible to think that the Brhatphalāyanas were ruling at Pithuḍa=Pitunda as early as the time of Khāravela (second or first century B.C.)", op. cit. p. 38.
28. Like Pallava kings Jayavarman assumes Brahmanical gotra, has a name ending in 'varman' and does not bear a metronymic.
29. He is called a Mahārāja on the seal and a Rāja in the plates.
30. The source of this assertion is the term 'Vijayakhanaḍśvāra' (Koṇḍamudi l. 1).
31. The Koṇḍamudi plates were issued in the tenth year of his reign.
D. C. Sircar would locate it in Pityendra,32 mentioned by Ptolemy as the metropolis of the Maisôlia region.33 But Ptolemy places it in the interior of the Maisôlia region and there is no evidence to show that Jayavarman's dominions extended beyond the modern Gudivada taluq in the west. Ptolemy wrote in the middle of the second century A.D., and the Ikṣvākus of the third century A.D. had their capital in Vijayapurī. Nothing compels us to look upon Pityendra as the established capital of every dynasty that ruled over the Andhradeśa. Under the Pallavas who would seem to have succeeded Jayavarman in the Guntur region Dhamñākaḍa (ka) is the headquarters of the Andhra province and the town is as old as Pityendra if not older.34 Dhamñakaṭaka has equally good claims to be considered as Jayavarman's capital.35

Administrative Organisation

The kingdom was mapped out into districts called āhāras as under the Sātavāhanaśas, each under an executive officer called Vāpataṁ. The Sanskrit word corresponding to Vāpataṁ is Vyāpta.' Prta is the past participle of pr; with the prefix vyā it means 'busied with or engaged.' Viyapata in the sense of 'engaged' occurs in the Edicts of Asoka.36 The Kāśikā, a commentary (probably seventh century A.D.) on Pāṇini by Vāmana and Jayāditya, equates Vyāpta with the Āyuṅta of Pāṇini (II, 3, 40). The latter term (Pāli ayutto) means 'superintendent or agent.' It occurs in the Cāruvedī grant and with the ka affix in later inscriptions.37 In the Damodarpur inscription of Budha-gupta (fifth century A.D.), it is said that Koṭivarsha viṣaya was administered by the Āyuṅtaka Saṇḍaka. Vyāpta and Āyuṅta were therefore officers in charge of districts much the same as the amacas of the Sātavāhana records and the Viṣayapatīs of later inscriptions. The office of Vāpataṁ is met with in the Koṇḍamuḍi, the Mayidavolu and the Cāruvedī grants only.38

32. The Pithuṇḍa of the Hāthigumpha inscription of king Khăravela.
34. It is mentioned in two Amarāvati inscriptions of the second century B.C. (EI, Vol. XV, "Some Unpublished Amarāvati Inscriptions").
35. McCrindle (IA, XIII, p. 370) would go to the length of identifying Pityendra with Dhamñakaṭaka. But the fact that the former is placed by Ptolemy north of the Maisôlos (the Kṛṣṇā) is against such an identification.
37. EI, Vol. XI, p. 175, t. l. 17; XII, p. 154; t. l. 60.
38. Dr. Hultzsch corrects 'viya' of the Cāruvedī grant to 'viya' and
Another, perhaps higher, dignitary in the kingdom bore the titles of Mahātalavara and Mahādanḍanāyaka. These titles stand out in the Ikṣvāku period as prominently as those of Mahābhōja and Mahāraṭhi in the Sātavāhana period and Jayavarman’s dynasty is obviously indebted to the Ikṣvākus for these titles.

It may be puzzling that a Mahātalavara Mahādanḍanāyaka, probably a feudatory like the Ikṣvāku Mahātalavara and Mahādanḍanāyaka and the Sātavāhana Mahāraṭhi is entrusted with the task of preparing the plates, a task ordinarily entrusted to minor officers in the Sātavāhana stone records, where also engraving does not mean the preparation of the stone, but that of the copper-plates or palm-leaves. Like the Mahāsenāpati of Nāsik No. 3 and the Rahasādhiṣṭata of the Hira-Haḍagallī plates who are said to have been entrusted with the drafting of the charter and who, as has been shown above, would have only supervised the drafting, the Mahātalavara under mention was perhaps in charge of the department for the preparation and custody of the charters. In the same grant the king is said to have drawn up the protocol (sayān chato) which can only mean that a lekhaka drafted it under the immediate supervision of the king, for the king is also said to have issued the order by word of mouth (avīyena ānataṁ).

restores ‘viya(pataṁ).’ The occurrence of ‘viyapata’ and ‘vapata’ in Asokan edicts (vapata: Shah. V: and viyapata: Man V makes ‘viyapatam’ another Prakṛt form of ‘vapataṁ’. In the edicts ‘viyapata’ occurs more often than ‘vapata’ or ‘vapata’.

39. Dr. Hultsch who edited the Konḍamudi plates long before the Nāgārjunikonda, Allāru, and Rāmāreḍipalle inscriptions were discovered read ‘Mahātāgamivarena’ and conjecturally translated it as ‘the best of the Mahātāga family.’ The peculiar form of la in ‘Bṛhatphalāyasya’ (I. 4) i.e., the vertical starting from the right arm of the curve leaves no doubt that the letter read as gi is to be read as la. In his edition of the Nāgārjunikonda inscriptions Dr. Vogel and following him other writers have merely remarked that ‘Mahātāgamivarena’ is a mistake of the scribe or engraver for ‘Mahātalavarena’.

40. The Konḍamudi plates II 36 and 37; Nāsik Nos. 3, 4 and 5. EI, Vol. VIII.


42. Following Senart who derives the word from ‘kṣan’ (to cut) Dr. Hultsch translates chato by ‘signed’. He says (EI, Vol. VI, p. 319): “The king’s signature may have been affixed to the original document, which was deposited in the royal secretariat, and from which the copper-plates were copied.” This leads us to the paradoxical conclusion that the operation i.e., the drafting of the charter which is not wanting in the cognate inscriptions (especially the later Sātavāhana inscriptions which the inscription
Whilst grants of villages to religious bodies or Brahmins is a feature of every reign, the similarities of Jayavarman’s grant to the later Sātavāhana grants, which show the extent to which Sātavāhana administrative traditions were carried on to the period of their successors in the Andhradeśa, invest it with special interest. The immunities expressly attached to the baṇhadeya in Jayavarman’s grant are the same as those conferred on the bhikhuhala in the Sātavāhana charter. The operations or formalities connected with the grants are in both cases verbal order, drafting, preservation of the record in the archives of the state, engraving, and delivery. The parihiṣṭas mentioned in and the operations connected with the Mayidavolu grant are different. More striking is the similarity in the wording. Dr. Hultzsch remarks... the language and phraseology of the inscription (Koḻamuḍi) are so similar to the Nāsik inscriptions of Gautamiputra Sātakaṇṭhi (Nos. 4 and 5) and Vāsishṭhiputra Pulumāyi (No. 3) that Jayavarman’s date cannot have been very distant from that of those two Andhra kings.” This statement which implies Jayavarman’s indebtedness to the Sātavāhanas for his political lessons was made long before the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa remains were brought to light. It has already been shown that some of the political institutions of Jayavarman’s dynasty were inherited from the Ikṣvākus. Since the Ikṣvākus took up the thread where the Sātavāhanas left it, it is not improbable that Jaya-

under reference closely resembles in phraseology) is the only stage of which there is no trace in this inscription.

43. Kārlā and Nāsik inscriptions of Gotamiputra Śrī-sātakaṇṭhi and Vāsīthi-putta sāmi Śrī-Pulumāvi.

44. The Koḻamuḍi grant opens in the same manner as Nāsik No. 4 (EI, Vol. VIII). The parihiṣṭas are expressed by the terms apāpesaṁ, anoma saṁ, alonakhaḍaṁ, araṇhasaṁvinayiṁ and savaṇaṭaparīhāriṁ. The instructions to officials are also couched in the same language: compare the Koḻamuḍi grant “etamsi tam gāma Pāṭāra baṁmhaḍeyam kāṭuna oyaśpehi”, “etasa casa gāmasa Pāṇṭūrasa baṁmhaḍeyam kāṭuna pariḥāre vitarāma” and “etehi nam pariḥārehi pariḥārāhi etam casim gāma[ṁ] Pāṭṭūraṁ baṁmhaḍeyaman kāṭuna etha nibhaṁḍhaḥpehi” with Kārlā No. 19 “etasa (tu) gāma Karajake bhikkuhala deya (oya) pēpehi” “etasa casa gāmasa Karajake bhikkuhala-pariḥāre vitarāma” and “etehi na pariḥārehi pariḥarāḥ et. casa gāma Karajake bhikkuhala-pariḥāre ca etha nibhaṁḍhaḥpehi”. The formalities connected with the grants are expressed in the same terms. This is all the more interesting since the formulae of immunities were variable.

varman is indebted immediately to the Ikṣvākus. No copper-plate grant of the Ikṣvākus and the later Sātavāhanas has been found in the Andhradeśa (the western cave inscriptions of Gotamīputa Sātakaṇi and Vāsiṣṭhiputa Pulumāvi are merely copies of inscriptions engraved on paṭṭikā, i.e., copper plates or palm leaves or cloth). It is, however, highly improbable that the former who outshone the latter in their zeal for the Brahmanical religion, and who were as tolerant of the Buddhist religion as the later Sātavāhanas, did not make grants of lands to Brahmans and Buddhists; in such a case the phraseology of the Sātavāhana grants would have been kept up by them and transmitted to their political successors.46

46. The disappearance of the charters or paṭṭikā, of which the cave inscriptions of Gotamīputa Śrī-Śatarkaṇi and Vāsiṣṭhiputa Pulumāvi's time are copies is to be attributed to the fact that they were written not on copper-plates but on perishable materials—cloth and palm-leaves.
CHAPTER IX
THE VAINGEYAKAS

Śālaṅkāyana—A Gotra and Not A Dynastic Name

While editing the Ellore plates of Devavarman¹ Dr. Hultsch remarked that Devavarman and his successors might be designated the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārājas of Veṅgipura. He has been followed by other scholars. Says K. V. Lakshmana Rao: “The earliest of the dynasties of kings that Epigraphy has disclosed to us as having ruled at Veṅgī in the Krishna district² is that of the Śālaṅkāyanas”.³ Says D. C. Sircar: “It is therefore not quite impossible that the Bull banner of the Śālaṅkāyana kings was connected with the name of their family.”⁴

Śālaṅkāyana is a gotra and not a dynastic name. The Pallava Vākaṭaka and Kadamba charters which give the kula and gotra names make the distinction between them clear. The Vaṅgeyaka grants also make a distinction between kula and gotra names.⁵ In all the records ‘Śālaṅkāyana’ occurs in the singular (Śālaṅkāyana, Śālaṅkāyanaḥ). In the Sātavāhana, Pallava,⁶ and Vākaṭaka records the dynastic name is always in the plural, while the gotra name is in the singular;⁷ and the alphabet and phraseology of the early Pallava Sanskrit charters bear a striking resemblance to those of the charters of the kings of Śālaṅkāyana gotra. In the

---

2. Now West Godāvari District.
4. JI. of the Dept. of Letters, Calcutta, Vol. XXVI, p. 70: In some Sanskrit Lexicons Nandi is called Śālaṅkāyana vide infra.
5. ‘asmat kula gotra dharmā yaśobhī-vyddhyarthaṁ.’
7. In the Kadamba charters the dynastic and gotra names of kings are in the plural.

Sometimes 'vaṁśa', 'jāti' and 'kula' names occur in the singular e.g. 'kṣaharāṭasa Nahapānasā' (Nāsik No. 10 EI, Vol. VIII, 'Khaṭhārāta' is referred to as a 'vaṁśa' name in Nāsik No. 2); Abhirasya Iśvarasenaśya,” (Abhīra is a tribal name); 'Ikhākusa' (Nāgārjunikondo Inscritions). But our records do not resemble these in any respect. Sometimes ‘Ikhāku(ku)lasa’ or ‘Ikhākunaṁ’ occurs.
records of Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavaran, Mahārāja Śimhavaran and Mahārāja Kumāravīṣṇu, the family name immediately precedes the personal name whilst the gotra name is separated from the latter by laudatory epithets. In the Ellore grant of Devavarman Śalaṅkāyana, Śalaṅkāyana is separated from his name by the epithet assamedhayājino. It may be argued that the ‘sa-gotra’ which is added to the gotra names of the donors in the Vaiṅgeyaka grants themselves is not added to Śalaṅkāyana. But the remarkable similarity in the phraseology of these grants and the fact that sometimes gotra names occur without the suffix sa-gotra knocks the bottom out of this argument. It would seem that in spite of the reference to their kula, the kings of the Śalaṅkāyana gotra, like Jayavarman of the Bṛhatphalāyana gotra bore no dynastic name; they were probably upstarts without any renowned ancestors, real or eponymic.

While editing the Kollair plates Dr. Fleet remarked that the Śalaṅkāyanas were descendants of Viśvāmitra and of lunar extraction; he added “Perhaps these are the ‘Solankis’ of Col. Tod, who are included in the catalogue of the thirty-six royal races, and who for a long time ruled over ‘Anhilvādpattana’ in Gujarāt.” Elsewhere, he speaks of Śalaṅkāyana as a gotra name. However, he did not refer to the Pravarakāṇḍas, nor did he emphasise the difference between Śalaṅkāyana, son of Viśvāmitra and Śalaṅkāyana. Four gotra ḍhis bear the name Śalaṅkāyana.

Śalaṅkāyana not the name of a tribe

The attempts of some scholars to see in Śalaṅkāyana the name of a people, becoming subsequently the name of a dynasty also, is wasted effort. Dr. Rayachaudhuri has identified the ‘Salakēnoi’

8. ‘Maudgalya-sagotrasya’ The Kanteru plates of Nandivarman, I.
9. ‘Bhāraddāyaśa’ (The Āruvedvi grant); ‘Bhāraddāyo’ (The Hirahadagallī grant); ‘Bhāradvājāḥ’ (The Pīkira and Cendalūr plates); ‘Kāśyapāya’
10. In the Kōmari plates of Cauḍavaran and the Chicacoale plates of Nandaprabaḥjanavarman (EI, Vol. IV, pp. 142 ff, and IA, Vol. XIII, pp. 48 ff) we miss the dynastic and the gotra names. We miss the dynastic name, in all but three Śatavāhana records.
12. Ibid., p. 102. There is a Śalaṅkāyana gotra which has the pravaras Viśvāmitra, Kātya, and Atkila.
13. Sircar, op. cit., p. 70.
of Ptolemy with the ‘Śālaṅkāyanas’ of Veṅgi. D. C. Sircar accepts this identification and adds: “It has been noticed that the terms Śālaṅkāya and Śālaṅkāyanaka (country of the Śālaṅkāyanas) are mentioned in the Gaṅapātha of Pāṇini. It is certain that the Śālaṅkāyanas (Greek Salakēnoi) ruled over the Veṅgi region as early as the time of Ptolemy (c. 140 A.D.).” He would further consider Benagouron as a mistake for Bengaouron which would represent Veṅgipura. Having regard to the fact that in Ptolemy’s Book the न sound is not suppressed e.g. Gaṅgaridai (Book VII, Chapter 1, Section 81) and Periṅkarei (Section 89), Salakēnoi can be rendered Śalakana and not Śālaṅkāya. The Salakēnoi are placed north of the river Manadas which is almost certainly the Mahānadi, the great river of Orissa, far north of the Andhraśeśa of literature. Kings of the Śālaṅkāya gotra ruled over the heart of the Andhraśeśa and the suggestion of some scholars that they ruled over Kaliṅga and Magadha (!) lacks proof; and Ptolemy’s description of the eastern part of the peninsula is not as much vitiated by errors as that of the western and southern parts. The Śālaṅkāyanaka of Pāṇini does not mean ‘the Country of the Śālaṅkāyanas’; it is the adjectival form of Śālaṅkāyana which belongs to the Rājanyādi class. Names like Athenogouron make it highly improbable that Benagouron is a mistake for Bengaouron. Benagouron would correspond to Beṅānagara; and as several Beṇas are known, and the Benagouron of Ptolemy is on the banks of a river, a Beṅānagara is not impossible. The Benagouron of Ptolemy is not called a metropolis, while Veṅgipura was certainly the capital of the kings of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra.

Śālaṅkāyana of the inscriptions has nothing to do with the bull banner of the Vaṅgeyakas.

According to the Trikāṇḍaśeṣa and the Medinikōsa, Śālaṅkāyana also means Nandin, the vehicle of Śiva. It is interesting

17. The letters might have been transposed in copying.
18. Vide infra.
19. A Beṅākṣaṇaka is known from Nālīk No. 4, EI, Vol. VIII.
20. Mahākālo mahābhīmo, mahākāya vṛṣṇakaḥ dvāḥ sthastu nandī-śālaṅkāyanastāṇḍavatālikāḥ (Trikāṇḍaśeṣa śl. 49).

H.A.—22
to note that the crest of the kings of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra is the bull.\textsuperscript{21} Since Śālaṅkāyana of our inscriptions is a gotra name, the heraldic device cannot be connected with either the gotra or the dynastic name but must be explained on other grounds. Neither the bull banner of Pallavas nor the boar banner of the Cālukyas had anything to do with their dynastic names. Jayavarmman of Bṛhatphalāyana gotra was a worshipper of Mahāsena, and on the seal of his plates we have a representation of the trident of Śiva.\textsuperscript{22} Some coins of Wima Kadhphises bear the representation of Śiva with the combined trident and battle-axe, and the legends ‘Mahā-rājasa-Rājādirājasa sarvaloga Īśvarasa-Mahīśvarasa Wima-Kathphisasa’. On some others we have a representation of Śiva and his vehicle.\textsuperscript{23} In the Mandasor pillar inscription of Yaśodharman there is a reference to Nandi as an emblem on Śiva’s banner.\textsuperscript{24} On the seals of the grants of paramamāheśvaras like Dharasena II\textsuperscript{25} the Maukhari Svaravarman, the Gaṅga Indravarman\textsuperscript{26} and the Gaṅga Devendravarman\textsuperscript{27} we have a representation of the bull. The bull badge of the Vaṅgeyakas is therefore almost certainly connected with their sectarian leanings. Once adopted by paramamāheśvaras like Devavarman it was continued by even paramabhāgavatas like the Nandivarmans.\textsuperscript{28}

**The Dynastic name adopted here is ‘Vaṅgeyaka’**

Since, as has been shown, the only name occurring in the records of these kings is a gotra name, we would avoid a confusion

\textsuperscript{21} Of the five grants of these kings the seals of the Kollair and Peddagēvi plates are much defaced. On the seal of the Kanteru grants of Nandivarman I (No. 2 of 1924-25) and of Skandavarman a couchant bull facing left with its hump is clearly visible. (However the horns and in the latter the legs are not visible). The plates are now in the Government Museum Madras. The device on the seal of the Eilloro plates was thought by Mr. Venkayya to be that of ‘some quadruped, perhaps a tiger.’ An examination of the seal shows the body of a bull, facing left, much the same as that on the seal of the Kanteru grant of Skandavarman. The hump is partially visible.

\textsuperscript{22} EII, Vol. VI, p. 315.


\textsuperscript{24} CII, Vol. III, p. 146.

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., p. 164.

\textsuperscript{26} IA, Vol. XIII, pp. 119-20.

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., pp. 273 ff.

\textsuperscript{28} We may liken this to the Śaivite names borne by the paramabhāgavatas, Kumāragupta and Skandagupta and the Nandivarmans referred to above.
between gotra and dynastic names, if we cease to call them Śālaṅkāyana and tentatively gave them another dynastic name. Fortunately, the Allahabad prāṣasti of Samudragupta calls Hastivarman of this line a Vaiṅgeyaka. As kings of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra are the earliest known ones who ruled from Veṅgipura, their dynasty may be styled Vaiṅgeyaka.  

**Origins of the Dynasty**

A thick veil is drawn over the origins of the dynasty. It has, however, been shown that D. C. Sircar’s theory of the existence of the dynasty as early as the time of Ptolemy, and perhaps of Pāṇini, lacks proof. The passing away of the great Sātavāhana power would have given a tremendous fillip to the disintegrating forces already at work during its decline. Whilst the southern part of the empire came under the Pallavas, the south-western parts of the empire under the Cutūs and after them the Kadambas, the Andhra-deśa fell under less powerful and more short-lived dynasties. In less than four and half centuries it saw the Ikṣvākus, the kings of the Brhatphalāyana gotra, the Vaiṅgeyakas, the Kandaras and the Viṅnikundins, rise and fall in quick succession. Since the later kings of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra were in possession of Kudrāhāra which is identical with the Kūḍūrahāra of Jayavarman’s plates, it is certain that the former rose to power at the expense of the rulers of the Brhatphalāyana gotra. The general opinion of scholars is that the Vaiṅgeyaka did not rise at the expense of the Pallava. It is argued that the starting-point of Vaiṅgeyaka power was Veṅgi identified with Peddavēgi, near Ellore in the West Godāvari district, and therefore north of the river Kṛṣṇā. There is no evidence to show that the Pallavas ever crossed the Kṛṣṇā. Even so the Mayidavōlu plates show that Dhamañakaṭaka (modern Dharanikot) and the Guntur and Narasaraopet taluqs were reached by the Pallava arm; as this part of the Guntur district came under the Vaiṅgeyakas later on, it is highly probable that the latter rose to prominence at the expense of the former also.

29. We do not know whether Vaiṅgeyaka refers to the kingdom of Veṅgi or the city of Veṅgi. In the same inscription some kings are known by the name of their country e.g. Daśavāṭraka Kubera and others by the name of their capital e.g. Kāṇceyaka Viṅjugopa.


31. All the Prākṛt and Sanskrit grants of the early Pallavas have been found south of the Kṛṣṇā, in the Guntur, Nellore and Bellary Districts.
**Devavarman**: He was not the first king of the line

The earliest known member of the dynasty is Devavarman.\(^\text{32}\) But the expression *bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pādabhakta* in his Ellore grant\(^\text{33}\) makes it certain that his father (*bappa*) was an independent ruler, for *bhaṭṭāraka* of the Vaiṅgeyaka and Pallava grants, like *paramabhaṭṭāraka* of the Gupta and Valabhi records, is a title applied to independent kings.\(^\text{34}\) The old view that Devavarman is the first king must needs be given up and the origins of the dynasty traced to the first quarter of the fourth century A.D.

32. Like the other Vaiṅgeyakas Devavarman has the honorific prefixes ‘śri’ and ‘vijaya’. Dr. Fleet (IA, Vol. V, p. 175) and Dr. Hultzsch (EI, Vol. IV, p. 143) considered ‘vijaya’ as an integral part of personal names. Later on Dr. Hultzsch somewhat modified his view by putting a hyphen between ‘vijaya’ and the name proper. (EI, Vol. IX, p. 58). Even here, he spells ‘vijaya’ before ‘Veṅgipurā’ and ‘saṇīvacchara’ with small *v* and that before personal names with capital *V*. In the expressions ‘vijaya saṇīvacchara’, ‘vijaya rājya saṇīvacchara’, ‘śri vijaya Veṅgipurā’ which occur in the Vaiṅgeyaka grants ‘vijaya’ is certainly, an honorific prefix like ‘śri’ ‘śrīmad’ ‘śiva’, ‘jaya’ (Bhandarkar *List* No. 1528) and ‘deva’ (Allan, *Catalogue of Indian Coins, Gupta Dynasties, Index*). The Kaṇcipurā of the Mayādīvālu and Hira-Haḍagaḷḷi grants is called ‘vijaya Kaṇcipurā’ in later records. In the Kadambara grants we have ‘śri vijaya Palāṣika’ and ‘vijaya Vaijanyantipurā’. True these prefixes sometimes enter into the composition of names e.g. Jayavarman and Devavarman. What makes it certain that in the Vaiṅgeyaka charters ‘vijaya’ like ‘śri’ is an honorific prefix, is the fact that Nandivarman II calls himself simply ‘śrī-Nandivarman’ in the Peddavēgī plates and śrī vijaya-Nandivarman in the Kollār plates.

33. This expression occurs in all the Vaiṅgeyaka grants.

34. ‘Bhaṭṭāraka’ is a title applied to gods and priests (CII, Vol. III, Nos. 28 and 46 and Lüders’ *List*, Nos. 43 and 1076). In a Nāsik inscription of Uṣavadāta (EI, Vol. VIII, No. 10) ‘Rājan Kṣatrapa Nahapāna’ is styled ‘bhaṭṭāraka’ (bhaṭṭāraka). That it was a title applied to Pallava Mañjarījas is shown by the Uruvupalli grant where it is coupled with the title of Mañjarīja (bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-Mañjarīja-pāda-bhaktah). Dr. Fleet has pointed out that in the Gupta and Valabhi records ‘bhaṭṭāraka’ and ‘paramabhaṭṭāraka’ are titles applied to paramount sovereigns (op. cit., p. 17 and n. 1); that ‘bhaṭṭāraka’ in the expression under reference is a title applied to kings is evident from the fact that in Pallava grants of the same period (which resemble the Vaiṅgeyaga grants in many respects) it is applied to Mañjarījas.

No term is so difficult of explanation and yet occurs over all parts of India as the term ‘bappa’ in the expressions ‘bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pāda-bhaktah’ (in the Pallava, Vaiṅgeyaka and some early Kalinga grants, EI, Vol. IV, pp. 142ff., Vol. XII, pp. 4ff., Vol. XXI, pp. 24ff.), ‘bappa-pādānu dhyātah’ and ‘bappa-pādāparīṣṭita’ (in, inscriptions from Nepal and in the copper
But was the predecessor of Hastivarman

Before the Peddavēgi plates were discovered Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao considered Devavarman as the successor of Hastivarman of the posthumous pillar inscription of Samudragupta, whom he rightly conjectured to have been a king of the Šālaṅkāyana gotra. Even with the Peddavēgi plates (No. 3 of 1924-25) before him, Mr. M. S. Sarma considered Devavarman as the son of Hastivarman and as the elder brother of Nandivarman I. The mistaken notion that a Prākṛt grant of Nandivarman I existed in Sir Walter Elliot’s facsimiles was partly responsible for this view. It was

plate grants of the Cālukya dynasty—JBBRAS, Vol. XVI, pp. 3, 4 and 5), and ‘parama-bhaṭṭāraka-Mahārājādhīrāja-parameśvara-śrī-bappa-pādānudhyātah’ (in the Valabhi grants). Dr. Fleet’s theory (CII, Vol. III, p. 186 n.) is that since in the Valabhi grants (we may add in the Uruvupalli grant too) ‘bappa’ is connected with the paramount titles of Mahārāja, Mahārājādhīrāja, Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Paramēśvara, since ajjaka, (Pali ayyaka, see Pischel, Gram. Der Pra. Spra. Sec. 252) in the expression ‘ajjaka-pādānudhyātah’ applied to Dharasena IV (JBBRAS, Vol. X, p. 79 and IA, Vol. I, p. 16), is the old Prākṛt form of the modern Canarese ‘ajja’ and Marāṭhi ‘aja, ‘bappa’, suggests itself at once as the old Prākṛt form of the modern ‘bāp, ‘father’; (We may add of the Canarese ‘bappa’ ‘father’).

But while ‘ajjaka’ is certainly a Prākṛt word, ‘bappa’ meaning father cannot be traced. Pāli ‘bappa’ (Sansk. bāspa) means ‘tear’, since the founder of the Mewar dynasty is called ‘bappa’ in one inscription (Prākṛt and Sanskrit Inscriptions from Kathiavara. pp. 88-89) and ‘bāspa’ in another (ibid., pp. 75, 78), ‘bappa’ of our inscriptions also seem to be the Prākṛt form of ‘bāspa’. What then is the meaning of ‘bappa’? A way out of the difficulty is suggested by the personal names Bapisiri (Bappisiri) and Bāpaka (Bappaka, see Pischel, op. cit., sec. 305) which occur in inscriptions of the second century A.D. (Lüders’ List, No. 1213 and EI, Vol. XVI, p. 233). In Nāgārjuni-kōṇḍa inscriptions a royal lady bears the name Bapisirinikā. In the Hira-Hadagalli grant a predecessor, probably the father of Pallava Śiva-Skandavarman, is called Bappasāmī. This is a personal name for the following reasons:—in later inscriptions Bappavāmin is a personal name, (EI, Vol. XIX, pp. 247 and 249, Vol. XI, p. 19). Bapisiri is the feminine form of Bappasiri and ‘sirī’ like ‘sāmin’ is a suffix. In the Hira-Hadagalli inscription itself Bappa is the name of a donee. It is then reasonable to suppose that an early member of the dynasty of the Pallavas or the Vaṅgeyakas, perhaps a founder, bore the name Bappavāmin or Bappa. His son or descendants may have referred to him in the expression ‘bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pādabhaktah.’ Subsequently the practice of referring to father and the unwillingness to change an old expression might have resulted in the same expression being kept with ‘bappa’, however, referring to or meaning ‘father’. This conjecture is made probable by the fact that in Marāṭhi ‘bāp’ means ‘father’.

35. ARE, 1924-25, II 2.
argued “that the assignment of the kings Vijaya Devavarman, Vijaya Nandivarman and Yuvarāja Buddhavarman of the Prākṛt grants, to a period subsequent to Samudragupta whose inscription is in classical Sanskrit is not tenable.” Here is indeed a weak argument for the correct view. In the Peddavēgi plates which probably trace the descent in one line from Hastivarman to Nandivarman II, Devavarman’s name is not found and therefore Devavarman must be placed either before Hastivarman or after Nandivarman II. Devavarman’s inscription is in literary Prākṛt and as Dr. Hultsch has noticed, in one respect the language is more archaic than that of literary Prākṛt, i.e., single consonants between vowels remain unchanged. The inscriptions of Nandivarman II (the Kol- lair and Peddavēgi plates) are in Sanskrit; since it is an accepted view that in official grants Sanskrit replaced Prākṛt, Devavarman cannot be placed after Nandivarman II. The palaeography of the plates under reference furnishes corroborative evidence. The general appearance of the Ellore plates is more primitive than that of the plates of Nandivarman II. The Ellore subscript va (t. ll. 8, 9, 14) which resembles the Konḍamudi and Mayidavōlu va, the tha with the dot in the centre which, in later inscriptions, is replaced by a short stroke in the centre or a curve attached to the left, and the sa are prominent instances.

**Date of Devavarman**

Since Devavarman’s inscription is dated in his regnal year (13th year) it is not easy to fix his date. The lower limit is the date of Samudragupta’s southern campaign; in the Allahabad inscription Hastivarman Vaiṅgeyaka, who came after Devavarman, figures as one of the kings of the Dakṣiṇāpatha ‘captured and liberated’ by that Indian Napoleon during his ‘digvijaya,’ and all that we can say at present is that Samudragupta’s digvijaya took place before 380 A.D. The upper limit is arrived at thus:—The Sāta- vāhanas passed away about 200 A.D. According to the Purāṇas, the Ikṣvākus who succeeded them in the Krṣṇā-Guntur region, ruled for fifty-two years. A period of twenty-five years may be allowed to Jayavarman’s dynasty that succeeded to the political heritage of the Ikṣvākus in parts of the Krṣṇā-Guntur region. It has been already shown that at least a generation separates Jayavarman from Bappasāmi, a predecessor (probably the father) of

37. Allan, Catalogue of Indian Coins, Gupta Dynasties, xx, xxxi, xxxii,
Pallava Śiva-Skandavarman. It has also been noted that the Śiva-
Skandavarman of the Mayidavōlu grant is in all probability the
Vijaya-Skandavarman of the Čārudevi grant. Calculating on the
basis of the usually accepted rate of twenty-five years for a Hindu
generation, we arrive at 340 as the approximate date of the Čāru-
devi grant.\textsuperscript{38} The language, orthography and the Sanskrit verses
of the Čārudevi and Ellore grants would favour the same period for
both.\textsuperscript{39} But the phraseology of the Ellore grant which came to be
widely accepted later on (especially in the Pallava grants) favours
a slightly later period for it.\textsuperscript{40}

\textit{Events of his reign}

Sometime before the thirteenth year of his reign Devavarman
performed the \textit{Aśvamedha}; for he styles himself ‘\textit{Assamedhayājī.’}
Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao disposes of this epithet as a vain boast
that minor dynasties indulged in to emulate the Guptas;
examples being the Cedis, the Vākāṭakas, the Kadambas,
the Śaṅkāyanaś, and others. The Nāṇēghāṅ sacrificial
inscription (2nd century B.C.) enumerates the numerous
sacrifices performed by an early Andhra ruler and goes
into details about the \textit{dakṣiṇas} offered. It states that a second
horse-sacrifice was performed.\textsuperscript{41} The Viṣṇukunḍin king Mādhavar-

\textsuperscript{38} The date of the grant is lost.
\textsuperscript{39} Both are in literary Prākrit. In both the etymological spelling of the
Pandit is adopted. In both grants every side of the plates is numbered.
Palaeographically the two grants are apart. There is on the other hand
much resemblance between the archaic Telugu-Canarese script of the
Vaṅgeyaka grants and the \textit{granthā} script of the Pallava charters of the
4th or 5th centuries. (The few points of difference have been
noted by Bühler in his \textit{Ind. Pal.} pp. 70-71, Sec. 31). The Ellore grant is the
only Prākrit inscription where the letter \textit{ṅ} occurs (Veṅgi and Śaṅkāyana).
In other Prākrit inscriptions including the Čārudevi grant it is represented
by the \textit{anuvāra} (the letter occurs in early, mixed dialect inscriptions
Lüders' \textit{List}, Nos. 64a, 129, 130, 131, 133, etc.); and in Prākrit \textit{ṅ} sound is sometimes retained. (See Pischel op. cit., Sec. 381, 386, etc.). This fact also
favours a later date for the Ellore grant.

\textsuperscript{40} The 13th year of Devavarman would then be somewhere between
360-370 A.D. On palaeographical grounds, Dr. Burnell refers Nandivarman II
to about the fourth century A.D. (\textit{S. Ind. Pal.}, p. 14, n. 2) and Dr. Fleet
quotes him approvingly (\textit{IA}, Vol. V, p. 176). Bühler leaves the question un-
settled (\textit{Ind. Pal.}, p. 65, Sec. 29A). Since Devavarman is removed from
Nandivarman II by at least four generations, the chronological arrangement
proposed by Dr. Burnell cannot fit into known facts.

\textsuperscript{41} ‘\textit{Asamedho bitiyo (yi) tho’}—II B, t. l. 1.
man I is said to have performed eleven Aśvamedhas. The Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena is credited with the performance of four Aśvamedhas.\textsuperscript{42} The number of sacrifices mentioned makes the theory of boast untenable. The Ikṣvāku king Cāṁtamūla is credited with the performance of Agnihotra, Agniṣṭoma, Vājapeya and Aśvamedha. Pallava Śiva-Skandavarmān is also styled an Assamedhayājī. The Aśvamedha was performed either before a king set out on a campaign of conquest (digvijaya) or in celebration of conquests. It involved an assertion of power and a display of political authority. There is no reason why the king of a small kingdom should not have celebrated his conquests and asserted his authority over the various parts of his kingdom in this manner. Economically too, the Aśvamedha was not impossible for a petty prince. If 'Assamedhayājī' were a mere boast, every king could have styled himself an 'Assamedhayājī.' Among the Ikṣvākus only Cāṁtamūla, among the early Pallavas only Śiva-Skandavarmān, and among the Vaṅgēyakas only Devavarman, bear this title.

Much less can this title be traced to a Gupta source. It is borrowed from the Ikṣvākus and the Pallavas. The titles applied to Samudragupta are 'Aśvamedhaparākramaḥ' on some coins attributed to him, and 'Aśvamedhāhartā' in the inscriptions of his successors.\textsuperscript{43}

The only other event of his reign of which we have record is that in the thirteenth year of his reign, he granted 20 nivartanas of land to Gaṅaśārman of the Babhura (?)\textsuperscript{44} gotra and house sites for the Brahman, his tenants and doorkeepers.

\textsuperscript{42} CII, Vol. III, No. 55.

\textsuperscript{43} Mr. Divekar is of opinion (ABI, Vol. VII, pp. 164-65) that, since the Allahabad inscription of Samudragupta does not make mention of the Aśvamedha performed by him, he performed it after the Allahabad inscription was engraved.

In many cases, the Guptas seem to have been the borrowers. The earliest known inscription in which the expressions 'paramamāheśvara' (paramabhāgavata is a similar expression) and 'vijayasaṁvatsara' occur, is that of Devavarman.

\textsuperscript{44} Dr. Hultzsch read this word as 'Ba(bhura). Prof. Keilhorn suggested that it might be meant for 'Babhru'. Considering the facts that the inscription presents archaic and modern forms of some letters (compare va in ll. 1, 6 and 7 with va in ll. 8 and 14; and bh in l. 9 with bhu in l. 10 and bha in l. 18), and that the u sign in ku in the word 'Kuravaka' (Kollair plates) is not represented by a short curve attached to the right of the vertical but by a modification of the reascent of the vertical to the left, 'Babhura.' (Sanskrit
Extent of his kingdom

Whilst it is certain that Mahäräja Devavarman ruled over a small territory around Vëngi, we do not know whether Kudrähära of the later Vaiṅgeyaka grants was included in his kingdom or not. If Prof. Kielhorn’s identification of Kuräla (Allahabad pillar inscription) with the Kollair Lake\textsuperscript{45} can be accepted, the Kollair region (excluding modern Ellore) with probably Kuräla as its capital\textsuperscript{46} was ruled over by a separate line of kings, one of whom was Maṅṭaräja, a contemporary of Hastivarman.\textsuperscript{47}

Importance of Devavarman’s Grant

Devavarman’s grant is the most interesting of the Vaiṅgeyaka grants. It is the earliest known inscription in which occur the expressions ‘paramamäheśvara’ and ‘bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pāda-bhaktah,’ which are of frequent occurrence in later records all over India. It is the first record in this side of India to abandon the Sätavähana method of dating (by the fortnight of one of the three seasons of the year, i.e., gämhānapakha, vāsānapakha and heman-tānapakha) for that of dating by the month and tithi.\textsuperscript{48} This method of dating is followed in the early Kaliṅga Sanskrit charters, in the inscriptions of the Pallavas, the Guptas, the Vākāṭakas and the Kadaṁbas.\textsuperscript{49}

Bābhru, i.e., Bābhrra gotra) is the proper reading. (EI, Vol. IX, p. 59, n. 7).

\textsuperscript{45} According to Prof. Kielhorn (EI, Vol. VI, p. 3, n. 3) ‘jalam Kaunälaṁ’ of the Alliōle inscriptions can only mean the ‘Kollair Lake’ as the description of the water given in the poem would be applicable to it even at the present day and as Kolanu of the later inscriptions is a corruption of Kunäla. Kunäla and Kuräla of the Allahabad pillar inscription are identical, because the former is mentioned just before and the latter after Piṣṭāpuram. Could it be that Kuräla changed into Kunäla in less than three centuries much in the same way as the latter changed into Kolanu in inscriptions of the eleventh century?

\textsuperscript{46} In the Chellūr plates of the reign of the Eastern Cāḷukya Kulottuṅga Coḍa II (Ś. 1056) we are told that in the midst of a great lake in the Vëngi-mañḍala (the Kollair Lake) there is a town named Sarasipūrī.

\textsuperscript{47} Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta.

\textsuperscript{48} The Western Kṣatrapa records are dated by the month and tithi of the year, but the expression ‘vijayasauṁvatāsara’ does not occur in them.

\textsuperscript{49} The exceptions are the Devagiri plates of Kadamba Mṛgesavarman (IA, Vol. VII, p. 37), the Dūdia plates of Vākāṭaka Pravarasena (EI, Vol. III, p. 260), the Halsi plates of the reign of Kadamba Ravivarma (IA, Vol. VI, p. 28), the Orṅgōōdu plates of Skandavarman II (EI, Vol. XV, p. 249), the H.A.–23
Hastivarman

The chronological arrangement proposed above not only makes the identity of Hastivarman of the Peddvēgi plates with the Hastivarman of the Allahābad pillar inscription of Samudragupta certain, but also makes it probable that he was the immediate successor of Devavarman. Much cannot be made of the epithet ‘samarāvāptavijayīna’ applied to him, as the credit for having won many battles is taken by every prince and as similar epithets are indifferently applied even in the case of sovereigns not far removed from one another. But it is certain that the whirlwind campaign of Samudragupta, perhaps because of its transient nature in the south, did not interrupt the fortunes of the Vaiṅgeyakas, and Hastivarman must have resumed his normal course, when the brief disturbance of Samudragupta’s inroad passed away.

Nandivarman I: A misconception about him

The son and successor of Hastivarman was Nandivarman I; in the Peddvēgi plates he is credited with many gifts. An oversight has vitiated all theories about Vaiṅgeyaka genealogy. While editing the Kollair plates of Nandivarman II Dr. Fleet remarked—

“In Sir Walter Elliot’s facsimiles I have another copper plate inscription of Vijayanandivarman and his Yuvamahāraja, whose name seems to be Vijayatungavarmā or Vijayabuddhavarmā;………..

the characters are, in fact, so rude and indistinct, that I doubt whether a transcription of it can be made. The language, ……..seems to be Prākṛt or Pāli, as the first line commences ‘(Sva)sti-śrīvijayanandivarmma-mahārajassa,………..’” Subsequently Dr. Fleet gave a transcript of the inscription and observed

Hira-Haḍagallī and Mayidavōlu plates of Śiva-Skandavarman I and all the Viṅgukundin inscriptions except the Rāmatirtham plates. In these, the Sātavāhana method of dating is followed.

50. It is curious that in Sewell’s Historical Inscriptions of South India (1932), Hastivarman of Veṇgi is called a Pallava Viceroy.

51. The epithets applied to Skandavarman in the Uruvapalli grant are applied to his son, Viravarman in the Pikira grant. Epithets like ‘pratāpapanaśa rājamanḍalasya’ and ‘abhyaṁcitā sakta śiddhi sampannasasya’ are applied to Yuvamahāraja Viṅgugopavarman’s father in the former grant and to his grandfather in the latter. Instances can be multiplied.


'Vijayabuddhavarmā is said to be a Pallava and of the Bhāraṭṭāyaṇa or Bhāradvāja gotra. There is, therefore, no genealogical connection between the Vijayabuddhavarmā of this grant, and Vijayanandivarman of the Veṅgi grant at Vol. V, p. 175, who was of the Śālaṅka-yana gotra.' We might add, the father of Buddhavarman is Skandavarma. This grant, now called the British Museum plates of Cārudève, has been edited by Dr. Hultsch in the pages of *Epigraphia Indica.* This correction has been overlooked by almost all scholars. Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil identified Nandivarman of 'Elliot's unpublished Prākṛt grant' with Nandivarman of the Kollair plates! K. V. Lakshmana Rao, while repeating the mistake, placed 'Vijayanandivarman' and 'Vijayabuddhavarman' after Devavarman and before Caṇḍavarman. With the Peddavēgi plates before them the Epigraphy Department identified 'Vijayanandivarman' of 'Elliot's unpublished Prākṛt grant' with Nandivarman I of the Peddavēgi plates and made Buddhavarman the elder brother of Caṇḍavarman. If only Dr. Fleet's correction had been noted, all these mistakes could have been avoided.55

**Nandivarman of the Kanteru grant is probably Nandivarman I**

While editing the Kanteru grants,56 K. V. Lakshmana Rao identified Nandivarman of one of them57 with Nandivarman II (known to us from the Kollair and Peddavēgi plates). He has been followed by D. C. Sircar and others. This view cannot, however, be upheld. In both the grants Nandivarman II calls himself the eldest son of Caṇḍavarman,58 Nandivarman of the Kanteru grant is not so called. True in two grants,59 Kadamba Mrgeśavarma is called the eldest son of Sāntivarma, and in one, as simply the son of Sāntivarma.60 Even so, Nandivarman of the Kanteru grant is not even called the son of Caṇḍavarman; and when we consider the remarkable similarity in the phraseology of the Vaingeyaka grants, this omission is all the more significant. In both

55. D. C. Sircar also has pointed out this error. *(Successors of the Sāta-vāhanas in the Eastern Deccan, pp. 57–58)*.
57. No. 2 of 1924–25.
58. 'Mahārāja Caṇḍavarmanas-sūnurjyeṣṭḥah' Kollair plates. 'Mahārāja Caṇḍavarmanah puto jyeṣṭhah'—Peddavēgi plates.
60. IA, Vol. VI, pp. 25–27.
the grants of Nandivarman II, a ‘Mūlakura bhojaka’ is mentioned as the ājñāpīti. The Kanteru plates do not mention any ājñāpīti.

The palaeography of the plates also supports our view. In the Kanteru grant of Nandivarman the left half of the horizontal member of ka is looped. This feature is not to be found in any other Vaiṅgeyaka grant. Whilst in the Peddavēgi and Kollair plates the reascent to the left of the verticals a, ka and ra and the u sign in lu, yu, nu and mu, is up to half the length of the vertical and sometimes more, in the Kanteru plates, the reascent is much less. This makes their attribution to Nandivarman I’s time possible.

Extent of his kingdom

If the conclusion tentatively proposed here can stand, Kudrāhāra viṣaya was included in Nandivarman I’s kingdom. The extent of this province is not, however, easy of determination. In the ARE of 1924-25, Kuravata (there read as Kurāvāta) was identified with Kurāḍa in the Guḍivāḍa taluq and Lakumari (there read as Lekumāri) with Lokamuḍi in the Kaikalar taluq. This would make the Kṛṣṇā the southern boundary of the kingdom. Since Kanteru, six miles north of Guntur, is the findspot of two Vaiṅgeyaka grants, since Cittapura can be identified with Cintalapūḍi in the Tenali taluq, it is highly probable that a part of the modern Guntur District was included in Kudrāhāra, as in the time of Jayavarman. What would be a conjecture is raised to a certainty by the term ‘Vēṅgorāstra’ of the Māṅgalūr grant of Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavaranma issued from Daṣanapura (tentatively identified with modern Darsi by Mr. Venkayya). ‘Vēṅ-

61. Kollair and Peddavēgi grants.
62. We might be in a position to discuss the question more satisfactorily if the plate containing the injunctions to officers and the date had not been missing.
63. Especially in II. 1 and 2.
64. An examination of the seal reveals five letters by the side of and above the bull (not below the bull as K. V. Lakshmana Rao thought—JAHRS, Vol. V, Pt. i, p. 22). They appear to be ma, ha and ra, na (or no) and śri. Between the third and fourth letter there is space for two or three letters. However, the first three letters are bigger than the other two. According to K. V. Lakshmana Rao, there are only two letters “one of which appears to be ra and another ma.”
65. The inscription records the grant of 12 niśārānas of land in Kuravata village in the Kudrāhāra viṣaya to Svāmicandra of the Maudgalya gotra.
gorāstra’ is probably a scribal error for ‘Veṅgirāstra,’ for in all records we have Vengidesa or Vengimanḍalam. Māṅgaḷūr may be identified with Maṅgaḷagiri in the Guntur taluq. Only a part of the Vaṅgeyaka kingdom conquered by the Pallavas could have been so named. No Pallava inscription speaks of the conquest of Veṅgi and the grants of Simhavarman, his father Viṅgugopavarman, and his grandfather Skandavarman (fourth and fifth centuries), have been found south of the Kṛṣṇā. That part of the Vaṅgeyaka kingdom which was conquered by the Pallavas must have lain south of the Kṛṣṇā.

**Caṇḍavarman**

Caṇḍavarman was the son and successor of Nandivarman I.66 While editing the Kōmarti plates of Caṇḍavarman of Kaliṅga (Kalingādhipati), Dr. Hultsch remarked that considering the similarity in names, the expression ‘bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pāda-bhaktah’ and the close resemblance between the alphabets of the two grants “the father of Vijayanandivarman may have been identical with the Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman who issued the Kōmarti plates. At any rate, the two Caṇḍavarmans must have belonged to the same period.” An examination of the seal, which, according to Sir W. Elliot, is defaced, would probably show if it reads Pitribhaktah and if, consequently, the plates of Vijayanandivarman may be assigned with certainty to the same dynasty as the Kōmarti and Chicacole plates.”67 Adopting this suggestion (i.e., that the Vaṅgeyakas ruled over Kaliṅga) Kielhorn classed the Kollair grant as a North Indian inscription.68 D. R. Bhandarkar who has recently revised and enlarged Kielhorn’s list has not availed himself of the fresh evidence available.69

In fairness to Dr. Hultsch it must be stated that he was aware that the phraseology of the Kōmarti plates resembles that of the copper-plates of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga and much more closely70 that of the Chicacole plates of Nandaprabhaṅjanavarman. Moreover

66. The Peddavēgli plates. ‘Caṇḍa’ means ‘wrathful, violent, fearful’; probably here is a reference to the fearful form of Bhairava (Śiva).
67. Ganjam District.
68. EI, Vol. IV, p. 143.
69. Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 686.
70. EI, Vols. XIX-XXI, No. 1908.
71. IA, Vol. XIII, pp. 49 ff. and Pl.
when he wrote, only one Vaiṅgeyaka grant was known. He could have however withdrawn his statement when he edited the Ellore grant of Devavarman, but did not do so. The phraseology of the Kōmarti grant is totally different from that of the Vaiṅgeyaka grants which exhibit a remarkable similarity among themselves. Caṇḍavarman of the Kōmarti plates is styled 'Kaliṅgādhipati' and issued the charter from Simhapura identified with the modern Singupuram between modern Chicacole and Narasannapeta; all the Vaiṅgeyaka grants were issued from Vēṅgipura, and in none of the six Vaiṅgeyaka kings known to us is the ruler called 'Kaliṅgādhipati'. It is not stated that Caṇḍavarman, the 'Kaliṅgādhipati', belonged to the Śālaṅkāyana gotra and was a devotee of 'Citrarhasvāmi'! No conclusion can be based upon the expression 'bappa-bhaftāraka-pāda-bhaktaḥ' as it was used by various dynasties. Similarity in names (in the case of the dynasties of the eastern Deccan between the third and sixth centuries) proves nothing. Caṇḍavarman might have been as much a name common to the Vaiṅgeyaka and Kaliṅga dynasties, as Hastivarman was to Gaṅga Vaiṅgeyaka and Kandara dynasties and as Skandavarman and Nandivarman were to the Pallava and Vaiṅgeyaka dynasties.

The epithet 'pratēpopanata sāmantaḥ' applied to Caṇḍavarman in the Peddavēgi plates would seem to be conventional.

Nandivarman II

Nandivarman II is referred to as the eldest son of Caṇḍavarman; the latter, then, would seem to have had two or more sons. Of the events of Nandivarman's reign nothing is known except that he granted the village of Vide (de)tūrapallikā in Kudrāhāra to

72. Pallava and Kaliṅga dynasties. Also vide supra.
73. Caṇḍa often enters into the composition of personal names. Caṇḍamahāśena (EI, Vol. XXI, p. 178), Caṇḍaketu, Caṇḍavikrama, Caṇḍasthāha; Caṇḍaprabha, etc.
74. Dr. Hultsch has not noted the difference between the alphabets of the Kollair and Kōmarti grants. The thick dots or nail-heads at the top and bottom of letters in the latter grant are not so prominent in the former. The Kōmarti va lacks the notch of the Vaiṅgeyaka va.
75. The practice of naming the grandson after the grandfather was not only prevalent among the Ikhākus, the Guptas, the Vākṣākṣas, the Pallavas and the Viṣṇukundins but was sanctioned in books. (EI, Vol. XX, p. 6, n. 2).
76. Dr. Fleet read it as Vidēnūrapallikā. The reasons for adopting the reading given here are stated below.
157 Brahmans of various gotras and caraṇas living in the excellent Kuravaka agrahāra in the 7th year, and 10 nivartanas of land in Arutora, 10 in Munḍūru, 6 in Čeṣceruva and 6 in Karumburān- ceruva as ‘devahalam’ to Viṣṇugṛhasvāmin (God in the Viṣṇu temple), lord of the three worlds, in the tenth year.

Skandavarman

It is no easy to settle Skandavarman’s place in Viṇgeyaka genealogy; those who identify Nandivarman of the Kaneru grant (No. 2 of 1924-25) with Nandivarman II consider Skandavarman of the Kaneru grant (No. 1 of 1924-25) as his brother. The sources of this assertion are the epithet ‘sūnurjyeṣṭhaḥ’ applied to Nandivarman II and the common findspot of the two grants. But it has been shown above that Nandivarman of No. 2 of 1924-25, is probably Nandivarman I. Since Skandavarman and Nandivarman grant lands to persons belonging to the same gotra, probably father and son, and since the two grants come from the same place, Skandavarman might have been a brother and successor of Nandivarman I, omitted in the genealogical list much in the same way as Devavarman in the Rāmatīrtham plates and Vikramendraravarman I in the Īpūr plates set II. Palaeographically no objection can be taken to this view.\(^{77}\)

Contemporary Powers

The theory that the Vaiṅgeyakas were somehow related to the Pallavas of the early Sanskrit charters (i.e., Skandavarman, I Viravarman, Skandavarman II, Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavavarman, Sīnhavarman etc.) and hence were left unmolested by the latter who were more powerful, lacks adéquate proof. Similarity in the names or the bull banner (adopted by both the dynasties) cannot prove matrimonial or family ties. ‘Skanda’ enters into the composition of not only Vaiṅgeyaka and Pallava, but also Sātavāhana and Cuṭu names. Nandivarman, a name of frequent occurrence in Vaiṅgeyaka genealogy, occurs in Pallava genealogy only during and after the sixth century A.D. (i.e., after the Vaiṅgeyakas had passed away). The bull crest of both dynasties has a sectarian, not

---

\(^{77}\) Since a part of the Vaiṅgeyaka kingdom, probably the whole of it south of the Kṛṣṇā, would seem to come under Pallava sway during or before the time of Sīnhavarman (middle of the fifth century), it is probable that Skandavarman preceded Nandivarman II who has to be placed in the last quarter of the 5th century A.D.
dynastic, significance. Since we do not know how Samudragupta's invasion affected the Pallava, we cannot build much upon the fact of the Vaiṅgeyakas not being molested by the Pallavas. Even supposing that the latter were as strong as ever, political and geographical reasons might have prevented them from crossing the Kṛṣṇā to attack Veṅgi. It has also been shown that during the decline of Vaiṅgeyaka power, the Pallava sliced off a part of the kingdom—i.e., the territory south of the Kṛṣṇā. This thrust must have been one of the causes of its downfall.

Kalinga of the same period would seem to have been ruled by powerful kings. The three kings who, on palaeographical grounds, have been assigned to this period are Caṇḍavarman of the Kōmarti plates, Nandaprabhaṅjanavarman of the Chicacole plates and Mahārāja Umavarman of the Brhatprosthā grant. One more Kaliṅgādhipati of the same period, who, however, would seem to have belonged to another line, is Vāsiṣṭhiputra Mahārāja Śri-Śaktivarman.

Section II.

GOVERNMENT, RELIGION AND SOCIAL LIFE

Administrative Units

The land-grants incidentally throw some light on the administrative system. The kingdom was divided into viṣayas. Whilst it is certain that the territory around the capital was not included in the Kudrāhāra-viṣaya, we do not know how it was called. It has been shown above that āhāra, raṭṭha and viṣaya denote the same territorial division, not more in extent than a modern district. Below the viṣaya was grāma and below that pallikā or pallika-grāma (a hamlet). No division between viṣaya and grāma is mentioned.

78. Vide supra.
79. EI, Vol. XII, pp. 4 ff.
80. Ibid., pp. 1 ff.
81. The Ellore and Peddavēgi grants in which the inhabitants of Elūr (modern Ellore) and Prāḷūra (Paloura, Ptolemy) respectively are addressed, do not mention Kudrāhāra-viṣaya. The Kollair plates prove that the Kollair region was included in the Kudrāhāra-viṣaya.
Officers

Each ‘viṣaya’ was under an officer called Viṣayapati. The Dēśādhipati of the Peddavēgi and Kollair plates would seem to be but the same officer under another name. True, under the Eastern Cālukyas, ‘deśa’ denoted a kingdom of which ‘viṣayas’ were divisions. However, in the Uruvupallli grant, Munḍarāṣṭra is also called a ‘viṣaya.’ Like ‘viṣaya’ and ‘rāṣṭra,’ ‘deśa’ sometimes denotes a kingdom and sometimes a province. Cannot, therefore, ‘viṣaya’ and ‘deśa’ in the same inscription denote the same territorial division? Since the Vaiṅgeyaka kingdom would seem to have comprised only two viṣayas, a higher division than a ‘viṣaya’ is impossible. Other officers (but subordinate to the Viṣayapati) whose functions cannot be adequately defined are the Āyuktakas, Niyuktas, Niyogas, Rājapuruṣas, and Vallabhas. Rājapuruṣas (lit. royal agents) are probably the same as the Śāsanasaṃcārins of the early Pallava charters. According to Hemacandra, ‘Vallabha’ means ‘Adhyakṣa.’ As, according to the lexicographer Jaṭādhara, ‘Vallabha’ is a synonym of ‘Aśvarakṣa’ and as ‘Vallabhas’ are distinguished from ‘Go-vallabhas’, ‘Vallabha’ of our records may mean either ‘keepers of horses’ or ‘keepers of cows’.

Offices Borrowed

The writing of the Peddavēgi plates as that of the Hira-Haḍa-galli grant is attributed to a Rahasyādhiṅkṛta (confidential minister). This title would seem to have been borrowed from the Pallavas as also Vallabha. The practice of making bhojakas (freeholders) executors of grants is also a Pallava practice.

82. C.P. No. 1 of 1924-25.
83. Their kingdom was called Venigideśa; and some of their grants (IA, Vol. VIII, p. 76; Vol. XIII, pp. 213 ff.) record grants made in the Pennāṭavāḍi, Gudrāvāra and Pāgunavara viṣayas.
84. IA, Vol. V. pp. 50 ff., t. II. 17 and 28.
86. The Pulises of Asoka’s inscriptions (Pillar Edicts) are royal agents whom all officers are asked to obey. Sometimes the word denotes ordinary persons (subjects).

The Vallabhas are mentioned along with the Rājapuruṣas in our inscription and with the Śāsanasaṃcārins in the Pīkīra, Māṅgāḷūr and Uruvupalli grants.

87. We owe this suggestion to D. C. Sircar, op. cit., p. 79, n.1. Dr. Hultsch translates Vallabha as ‘favourite’.

H.A.—24
'Mutuda' would seem to be the headman of a village. The reading and meaning of the word are not settled. Burnell read it as Munyada. Dr. Fleet was of opinion that for Munyada as a common name no meaning could be found and that Munyada as a proper name was out of place. Reading it as Mutyada he corrected it to Amatyadi. While editing the Ellore Prakrt grant of Devavarman, Dr. Hultzsch read it as Muluda and remarked:—

"The plates of Vijaya-Nandivarman seem to read, ... Munuda; but the apparent nu in the middle of this word may be in reality the obliterated lu." But la has always a short curve attached to right end of its back (the Nagårjunikonḍa inscriptions and the Māṅgalur and Chikkullu plates). What is read as la has no such curve. K. V. Lakshmana Rao reads it as Munuda.

The word which occurs in 4 out of the 5 grants can have only one reading. In the Peddavégi, Kollair and Kanteru plates, the reascent in the u sign in 'nu' is to the left of the vertical, whilst in the letter read as nu, the reascent is to the right as in bhun or bhū. The letter can only be tu. That the last letter of the word is da and not da is shown by No. 2 of 1924-25, where the back of da has a notch at the right and whilst that of da lacks it. Mutuda being the correct reading Dr. Hultzsch's reading in the Ellore grant must be abandoned in favour of Mududa, which would be the Prakrt form of Mutuda.

Though the Prakrt and Sanskrit forms are known, they cannot be traced in dictionaries. Even so, the meaning of the word can be ascertained. Munḍa and Mutālik in Hindi mean 'headman'. In Telugu, Mutṭha denotes subdivisions of districts. Mutalpaṭṭa in Malayalam denotes the office of the headman of the low caste termed Chagon. In the Ed̐ eru plates of Vijayaḍitya II, (789-843 A.D. according to Dr. Fleet's calculations) we have the expressions Kanderu (a)di visaye va (nd)rupite (y)u-nāma grānasya Kuṭaka-pramukhān Kuṭumbinas-sarvān ittham ājñāpayati. These are similar to 'Elura Mududa-pamukho gāmo (gāmeyakā) bhānitavvo.'

92. In the Kollair plates the t in the syllable tu has no loop. But both ta with the loop and ta without the loop are used (t. ll. 5, 10.).
Dr. Fleet has shown that ‘Kūṭa’ has the meaning among others ‘highest, the most excellent, first’ derived no doubt from its meanings of any prominence, a peak or a summit of a mountain. In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ‘Kūṭa’ is used in the sense of chief. Kūṭaka is a variant of Kūṭa. It is highly probable that the Muđudās (Sanskrit Mutuda) addressed in the same manner are also heads of villages.

The Citrarathasvāmi Cult

The tutelary deity of the Vaiṇgeyakas was Citrarathasvāmi (‘bhagavat Citrarathasvāmi pādānudhyātāḥ’). Sanskrit Lexicons give Citraratha as the name of the sun, the vāhana of Agni and some princes. K. V. Lakshmana Rao thinks that Citrarathasvāmin is the Sun-God. While editing the Elore plates of Devavarman, Dr. Hultsch referred to the existence of a mound “which, on a visit to Pedda-Vēgi in 1902, was shown to me by the villagers as the site of the ancient temple of Citrarathasvāmin, the family deity of the Sālānākāyana Mahārājas.” In the Khoh copper plate inscription of Mahārāja Sarvanātha, a shrine of Āditya is spoken of. Ancient temples of the sun exist at Asmarka, Gwalior, Deo-Baraṅkār and Indore. In the Archaeological Survey of India Cunningham has noted an image of the sun at Shahpur, two feet and ten inches high, holding a lotus in each hand, with, on each side, a small standing figure, that on the right being armed with a club. That Sun-worship could have existed along with the worship of Śiva or Viṣṇu is shown by Nirmand copper-plate grant of Mahāsāmanīta Mahārāja Samudrasena. Here the divine Tripurāntaka is called Mihireshvara. According to Dr. Fleet, the occurrence of the word ‘Mihiha’ (the Sun) as the first component of the God’s name seems to indicate that in this particular case, some form or other of solar worship was combined with Śaiva rites. It is, therefore, possible that the Vaiṇgeyakas some of whom had Śaiva and others

95. 2, 9, 19.
97. In many Eastern Cālukya grants we have ‘visaye sarvāneva Rāstra-kūṭapramukha Kuṭumābha itthām ānāpayati’ and ‘rāstrakūṭa’ is a technical title meaning chief of a district.
98. That of the Eastern Gaṅgas was Gokarnasvāmin, i.e., Śiva.
99. Peters, Dict, q. v.
100. CII, Vol. III, No. 28.
Vaiṣṇava leanings were at the same time worshippers of the Sun-God also.

But on the analogy of the compounds Gokarṇāsvāmi, (i.e., the God worshipped in Gokarna), Śrīparvatasvāmi (i.e., the god worshipped in Śrīparvata in the Viṣṇukūṇḍin inscriptions), cannot Citrarathasvāmi mean the god worshipped in Citraratha? We do not know of any place called Citraratha.100 Nor do the Pallava records throw any light on this question.

Religion

The sectarian leanings of different kings are different; some were paramamāheśvaras, others paramabhāgavatas. It has been shown that during the Sātavāhana rule Saivism was in a flourishing condition. Some of the Ikṣvāku kings and their feudatories had Śaiva leanings. Jayavarman of the Brhatphalāyana gotra was a worshipper of Maheśvara. The earliest known king of the Vaingeyaka line is a paramamāheśvara. Like the early Pallava kings the later Vaingeyakas are styled paramabhāgavatas, i.e., worshippers of Viṣṇu. Perhaps Pallava influence is to be seen in this change.101

100. Citrarathā (M.BH. 6, 341; V. P. 184) is the name of a river.
101. Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao is of opinion that paramabhāgavata need not necessarily mean 'worshipper of Viṣṇu'. He quotes Patañjali to show that followers of Śiva were also called 'Śiva bhāgavata'. We may add in some inscriptions 'bhagavat' designates Śambhu (Gadhwa stone inscription of Candragupta II, CII, Vol. III). Paramabhāgavata of the contemporary Pallava inscriptions cannot mean 'worshipper of Bhagavat Śiva' for at least one among them would in that case have styled himself paramamāheśvara. What proves conclusively that paramabhāgavata of our inscriptions means 'a worshipper of Viṣṇu' is No. 38 in CII, Vol. III, in which Dharasena I and his younger brother Dronasiniha are styled paramamāheśvaras, while their younger brother Dhruva II is called a paramabhāgavata. The Peddavēgi plates of Nandivarman II (a paramabhāgavata) mention grant of lands to a Viṣṇugrhasvāmin, i.e., the god inhabiting Viṣṇugrha (Viṣṇu).
CHAPTER X

THE KANDARAS

Dynamic Appellation

Kings of this dynasty of whom three are known are said to have belonged to the 'Ānanda gotra.'¹ According to Dr. Hultzsch they may be designated as 'kings of the family of the Ānanda.'² Other scholars have labelled them simply as "the Ānandas" or "the Ānanda kings of Guntur." We may once more emphasise that confusion between gotra and dynastic names must be avoided. The expression 'Kandara-nrpatikula-samudbhūta,'³ applied to Attivarman, a distant successor of Kandara, shows that the latter was the first king of the dynasty who gave his name to it.⁴ Hence these kings had better be styled 'the Kandaras.'

Kandara: Meaning

Dr. Fleet considered 'Kandara' a variation of Kṛṣṇa.⁵ The Prākṛt forms of Kṛṣṇa are Kaṇha (M; AMg; JM; S) and Kasana (M and S) and Kasina (AMg; J.M). The Dravidian form is Kaṇha. The variations of Kṛṣṇa found in the Raṭṭa and Yādava records are Kanhara, Kanhāra, Kandhara and Kandhāra.⁶ An argument against Dr. Fleet's view is that Kandara nowhere occurs as a variation of Kṛṣṇa. In a Rāṣṭrakūṭa record from Kyāsanūr in the Hāngal Taluq of the Dharwar District, Lionel Barnett has read 'Kandara-vallabha' and equated it with 'Kannara-vallabha' of the other Rāṣṭrakūṭa records, some of which are published in the same volume.⁷ In these records there is very little difference between

1. (a) Ānanda-karāṇanda-mahārṣi-ma(hā) gotra-viyadamala-sakala-tu (hi) nakirnasya . . . . Kandarājasya . . . .', 155 of 1899.
   (b) Ā(na)nda-sa-gotrasya . . . . Dāmodaravarmano'—EI, Vol. XVII, p. 329, t. II. 2 and 3.
   (c) 'Ānanda-mahārṣivahsa-samudbhūtena . . . . rājñā Attivarmanā',
IA, Vol. IX, pp. 102 and 103, t. II. 1 and 5.
3. The Gōranṭha Plates, t. II. 2 and 3.
4. Ikṣvāku, Pallava, and Gupta are some of the kings who gave their names to their dynasties.
6. BG., ibid., p. 526.
nna and nda. Considering the fact that all the records including the Kyāsanūr ones give 'Kannara-vallabha' only, what is read as 'Kandara-vallabha' is probably 'Kannara-vallabha'.

'Kanda' is a Prākṛt and 'Kandan' a Dravidian form of Skanda. 8 'Kanda' might have become 'Kandara' much in the same way as 'Kaŋha' became 'Kanharma.' A fine Śiva temple at Khajuraho erected during the tenth century is called Kandariya Mahādeo. Kings Kandara and Attivarman were worshippers of Śiva. An objection to this view is that in all the Sātavāhana, early Pallava and Kandara records, the Prākṛt form is Khanda.

In Sanskrit and Prākṛt 'Kandara' means 'cave,' 'elephant goad.' As some kings style themselves 'elephant goad to their enemies,' Sanskrit or Prākṛt 'Kandara' as a name is not improbable.

King Kandara: His Date

The founder of the dynasty was Kandara. Since the Allahabad posthumous pillar inscription which speaks of Samudragupta's encounter with the Vaiṅgeyaka Hastivarman and Kāṅceyaka Viṣṇugopa, does not mention king Kandara, whose kingdom lay between the Vaiṅgeyaka and Pallava kingdoms, it may be inferred that the Kandaras rose to power after his southern campaign. Palaeography lends support to this view.

For the determination of Kandara's date, the palaeography of the Chezarla inscription of his grandson supplies positive evidence. On the back of the slab bearing this inscription there is record of Mahendravikrama or Mahendravarman I.9 To all seeming the writing of the two inscriptions is almost contemporaneous. The letters exhibit close agreement even in some details; but a careful examination reveals certain developed forms in Mahendravikrama's inscription. Only one pa and a few ha-s of the record of Kandara's grandson reveal notches at the bottom while all the pa-s and ha-s of the other have notches. The more or less angular la with the notch at the bottom in Mahārāja Mahendravikrama's inscription is to be found only in a few places in the other; and in Chezarla we

8. Tam. Lexicon, S. V. Kandan.
9. In the Mattavīldāsa Prāhasana, p. 3, the son of Śrīnivāsa (i.e., Mahendravarman) is referred to as Mahendravikrama. Mahendravarman II mentioned only by the Kūram plates is not so known. The confusion between the Pallava Mahendravikrama of the Chezarla inscription, and the Viṣṇukunḍin Vikramendravarman of the Rāmatīrtham plates which some scholars have made must be avoided; the Mahendravikrama of the Chezarla inscription belongs to the Bhāradvāja gotra.
find also the triangular va of the Nāgarjunikoṇḍa inscriptions and the British Museum plates of Cārudevi. We may then postulate an interval of thirty to thirty-five years between the two inscriptions. Since Mahendravikrama's reign would fall in the first decades of the seventh century, the Chezarla inscription of king Kandara's grandson may be assigned to the third quarter and king Kandara to the first quarter of the sixth century.10

In the Avantisundarikathā of which we have, thanks to the efforts of Rāmakṛṣṇa Kavi, a fuller text than before, it is said that the wife of Kandareśa (lord of Kandara) who was wounded in battle (with the Pallavas evidently) sent a number of war elephants to a Pallava King, there called a Magadha king.

Rise of the Dynasty

It is now possible to picture to ourselves the circumstances favouring the rise of the dynasty. The Pallavas who were in possession of parts of the Guntur District in the reign of Sīnhavarman in the early part of the fifth century were later on hard pressed by the Kadambas in the south-west and Cōlas in the south. The bitter rivalry between the Pallavas and the Kadambas under Mayūraśarman continued long. Mrgeśavarman, a successor of Kākusthavarman, was 'a destroying fire to the Pallavas',11 and Ravivarman uprooted Caṇḍadaṇḍa, lord of Kāṇci. The Anaji inscription12 states that Kṛṣṇavarman I's armies were totally defeated in a battle with those of a Pallava king. From the fact that the early Pallava charters are issued from Palakkaḍa and Daśanapura, and from the fact that Kāṇci is mentioned only in the Cendalur inscription of Kumāraviṣṇu, scholars like Venkayya have concluded a Cōla occupation of Tonḍaimanḍalam.13 In the country just north of the Kṛṣṇā, the Vaiṅgeyaka power had yielded or was yielding place to the dynasty of the Viṣṇukūṇḍins. Kandara took advantage of this political turmoil to found a new dynasty. The Viṣṇukūṇḍin and the Pallava perhaps saw in the new kingdom a buffer state and so connived at the coup. But the Kandara was too near the Pallava to avoid conflicts later on.14 One wonders whether the monkey

10. It is not possible to agree with the view expressed in the ARE, 1919-20, p. 95, that "by its early type of Pallava-Grantha character alone the inscription must be referred to about the third century A.D." The Report assigns Dāmodaravarman to the fourth century A.D.
14. Vide supra.
device on the banners of Kandara and of the Kadambas may be
taken to prove an alliance between them.\textsuperscript{15}

Kandara set about strengthening his dynasty by means of a
Pallava matrimonial alliance. The Chezarla inscription of Kan-
dara's grandson who bears the titles of 'Satsabhāmalla' and 'Raṇa)
mahāmalla',\textsuperscript{16} introduces us to his father who bears the title of
'Prthiṣīyuvārajā'\textsuperscript{17} and his mother, a daughter of king Kandara of
the Ananda gotra.

In the Chezarla inscription of his grandson, Kandara is said to
have been lord of two provinces or kingdoms and of the best city
Kandarapura. He is said to have engaged in sharp battles with the
Andhras near the banks of the river Kṛṣṇā and brought about the
widowhood of many an Andhra woman.\textsuperscript{18} His enemy was perhaps
the Viṣṇukūḍin. Like the Viṣṇukūḍin Mādhavavarman II, he
bears the title 'lord of the Trikūṭaparvata'\textsuperscript{19} Dr. Hultzsch's view that
Trikūṭa (Trikaśmi of the Nāṣik inscription) in Bombay and Malaya
(in the western Ghāṭs), of which Mādhavavarman claims to be lord,
were at a safe distance from his dominions, must, it would appear,
be abandoned. Any three-peaked hill might have been called

\textsuperscript{15} Rice, Mysore and Coorg from inscriptions, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{16} Appendix, ii. 30, 33-4.
\textsuperscript{17} I owe the suggestion that Yuvarājaḥ in this inscription is the genitive
singular of Yuvarāja to Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. While editing the
Koppam plates of Pulakēśin II, Dr. Hultzsch wrongly considers Prthiṣīyuvāra-
rajāḥ as in the nominative singular. As the sense of the passage requires a
genitive singular, he corrects it into Prthiṣīyuvārajaysa.

The reasons for calling this a Pallava inscription are the following:—
The birudas 'Satsabhāmalla' and 'Raṇa mahāmalla' are essentially
Pallava. Till the advent of the Eastern Cālukyas, the office of Yuvarajā or
Yuvarāja was essentially a Pallava institution on this side of South India.
In a Dharmarājarathra inscription we have similar birudas e.g., Bhuvanabhā-
janāḥ and Prthiṣīvaśa (El, Vol. X, pp. 5, 6; Nos. 1, 3, 7 etc.). The practice of
mentioning the birudas to the exclusion of personal names would also seem to
be a Pallava practice. True Prthiṣīyuvārajā and Prthiṣīvallabha-Yuvarāja
are titles borne by Viṣṇuvardhana in the Koppam and Satārā grants
respectively (IA, Vol. XIX, p. 309). Prthiṣīvārajā is according to
Dr. Hultzsch a form of Prthiṣīyuvārajā (El, Vol. XVIII, p. 258). And
birudas into which 'Raṇa' enters are also borne by Kiritivarman I, and
Mangalesa (BG, Vol. I, ii, pp. 345-7). But the Chezarla inscription cannot
be brought to the beginning of the seventh century A.D.

\textsuperscript{18} Could this mean that king Kandara did not belong to the Andhra
tribe? 'Prathitān-Prthiṣīyuvārajah' applied to Kandara's son-in-law might
be corrected into 'Prathitān-andhra-Prthiṣīyuvārajah'.
\textsuperscript{19} El, Vol. XVII, p. 388, t.1.5.
Trikūṭaparvata. But the association of Malaya with it forces us to look for both in the west. A Vākāṭaka inscription gives us the clue. Verse 18 in it records that Kuntala, Avanti, Kaliṅga, Kosala, Trikūṭa, Lāṭa and Andhra were subjugated by one of the later Vākāṭakas. At that time the Viṣṇukūṇḍins were an Andhra power. Such defeats would have been repaid and these victories would have provided the Viṣṇukūṇḍins the occasion for taking over the Vākāṭaka titles and glories.

Extent of his kingdom

The extent of Kandara's kingdom is not altogether easy of determination. Dhānyakaṭaka was in possession of his son-in-law, a Pallava. Chezarla, where the inscription of Kandara's grandson (by his daughter) and of Mahendravarman I are found, is in the Narasaraopet taluq of the Guntur District. Dāmodaravarman's grant comes from the Ongole taluk and Attivarman's from the Guntur taluq. The kingdom of Kandara would, therefore, seem to have comprised at the most the Guntur, Tenali and Ongole taluqs of the Guntur District.

Dāmodaravarman: His place in the Kandara genealogy

Dāmodaravarman came after king Kandara, for the Maṭṭepāḍ grant of the former is issued from 'Kandarapura' and the Chezarla inscription of Kandara's grandson, which refers to Kandara as 'the lord of the best of cities, Kandarapura' makes it certain that Kandara gave his name to the capital. As Dāmodravarman's father is credited with many Gosahasra and Hiranāyagarbha mahādānas, and as Kandara is not credited with them either in the inscription of his grandson, where he is extolled in a lengthy passage, or in the inscription of his distant successor, Attivarman, Dāmodaravarman could not have been a son of king Kandara.

His date

Since the grant of Dāmodaravarman gives us neither dates nor names and facts tending to establish definite synchronisms with

21. Kaṁgūra mentioned in the grant, which Dr. Hultsch was unable to identify, may be identified with Kandulūru, six miles to the east of Maṭṭepāḍ, the findspot of the grant.
22. Other instances of kings giving their names to their capitals are, 'Pravarapura' from which Pravarasena II's edict is addressed, Kandharapura, the city of Keśa-Kandhara, etc. (CII, Vol. III, p. 236 and BG, I Pt. ii, p. 556).

H.A.—25
kings whose dates are known, palaeography is our only guide in the determination of his date. Dr. Hultsch has only remarked that the alphabet is of an early southern type. 23 We can say that it resembles the alphabets of the later Vaṅgīyaka grants and of the Pikira and Māṅgalur grants of Simhavaran. Since Pikira is said to have been included in the Muṅḍarāstra which has to be sought for in the Nellore District 24 and since Maṭṭepāḍ, the findspot of Dāmodaravarman’s grant, is in the Ongole taluq, once part of the Nellore District, a comparison between the alphabet of the Pikira and Maṭṭepāḍ grants is more apt. Striking is the resemblance between the la, va, ya, ba, na, da, and tu of the two grants. The close resemblance between the ja, bha, dbha and li of the Maṭṭepāḍ and Māṅgalur grants is also noteworthy. The thick dots or nail heads at the top of letters, especially over ga, a feature common to the two Pallava grants under reference, are to be found in the first few lines of the Maṭṭepāḍ grant. The Upadhmāṇīya occurs in all the grants. 25 It may be argued that the Maṭṭepāḍ ᾶ and ʂa differ from the Pikira ones as they have bars instead of curves. But the former are not quite unknown to the Pallava grants of the same period. 26 The Maṭṭepāḍ numerical symbols for 1 and 2 are more primitive than those in the two Pallava grants, but as two symbols for one are used in the Maṭṭepāḍ grant, and as the Māṅgaḷur symbol for four is slightly different from the Pikira one, much reliance cannot be placed on numerical symbols; nor can archaic forms be the main factor in the determination of dates. ʂaka 380 of the colophon of the Jaina work Lokavibhāga would seem to correspond to the twenty-second regnal year of Simhavaran, king of Kānci, mentioned in the text. According to Krishna Sastri the astronomical details given in the Omgūḍu grant of Simhavaran II, 27 do not fit into this date, and Simhavaran of the Jaina work must be Simhavaran I; and the Pikira grant belongs to Simhavaran II. On these pieces of evidence, Dāmodaravarman would

24. Muṅḍarāstra is identical with Muṅḍainādu of some Nellore inscriptions (N. 19, 31 and 121) and Kāṇḍukūra which, according to the Uruvupalli grant, was included in the Muṅḍarāstra is perhaps identical with Kandukūr (IA, Vol. XXXVII, p. 283, n).
25. Dr. Hultsch has not noted the fact that in the Maṭṭepāḍ grant as in the Pikira and Māṅgalur grants, final m is once represented by small m (El, Vol. XVII, Pl. v, t. 1. 15).
26. Māṅgalur grant, IA, Vol. V, pp. 154 ff, Pl. v-b, l. 3; vi-a; II. 1 and 3.
have to be assigned to the first quarter of the sixth century A.D. But as he was not the son and immediate successor of Kandara, he cannot be placed earlier than 550 A.D.

Dr. Hultsch assigns Dāmodaravarman to a period earlier than that of Attivarman partly on the strength of the Prākṛt portion of the former’s grant. D. C. Sircar rejoins, Attivarman is a Dravidian form of Hastivarman through the Prākṛt form Hathivarman. These arguments would compel us to place Dāmodaravarman’s inscription sometime before the Pallava Sanskrit charters of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., which, for reasons stated above, would be impossible. Instances of Prākṛt forms lingering in the records of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., can be cited. The Buddhist leanings of the king can also explain this mixture of Sanskrit and Prākṛt.

Attivarman

According to D. C. Sircar, Attivarman is the father of Dāmodaravarman. The only source of this assertion is the expression ‘Aneka-go-sahasra-aneka-hiranyagarbhodhavodbhavasya’ applied to the latter in his grant. He has rightly pointed out that

28. “It may be inferred from the Prākṛt forms used that it could not be far away in point of time from the Prākṛt plates of the early Pallava kings of the third or fourth centuries of the Christian era”, ARE, 1919-20, p. 75. EI, Vol. XVII, p. 328.
30. According to D. C. Sircar, Dr. Hultsch’s statement that the inscriptions is partly in Prākṛt is a ‘misrepresentation.’ But Dr. Hultsch correctly states the position when he says that the personal and most of the gotra names of donees are in Prākṛt and that the Prākṛt ‘sānvaucchāraś’ occurs in the Sanskrit portion while the Sanskrit amāo occurs in the Prākṛt portion. For Prākṛt forms lingering in Sanskrit records see Viṣṇukundin records generally.
31. Dr. Hultsch looks upon Attivarman as a Prākṛt or Dravidian form of Hastivarman. Since in Prākṛt, the initial ha is nowhere softened into a, Attivarman cannot be another form of Hathivarman. Neither in Telugu nor in Canarese can ‘Atti’ meaning ‘elephant’ be found. That ‘Atti’ is sometimes a Dravidian form of ‘Hasti’ is made certain by the Shōllinghar inscription of Parântaka (EI, Vol. IV, pp. 221 ff.) where the Western Gaṅga Prthivipati II is called Hastimalla (the name of the elephant of Indra) in the Sanskrit portion, and Attimallan in the Tamil portion. Even now ‘Atti’ in Tamil means ‘elephant’. For names and surnames into the composition of which ‘Atti’ enters, see also BG. I, ii, p. 507; SI, Vol. III, No. 60, p. 121; Vol. I No. 74, p. 105; EI, Vol. XVI, p. 37; EI, Vol. VII, pp. 195, 196.
33. T. II, 2, 3.
Dr. Hultsch’s translation of this as well as the expressions ‘Aprameya-Hiranyakarbhaprasavena’34, ‘Hiranyakarbhaprasūta’35, and ‘Hiranyakarbhahasambhūta’36 as ‘producer of many Hiranyakarbhas’ is defective, as the past participles prasūta and sambhūta can enter into Pañcamī Tatpurusa and not Śašṭhī Tatpurusa compounds. He has correctly translated them as ‘born of the Hiranyakarbhā.’ The theory underlying the performance of the Hiranyakarbhā mahādāna is that the performer is born of the golden womb, etc.—perhaps in the same way as Brahsmā.37

But where he brings this translation to bear upon the problem of Kandara genealogy one cannot agree with him. According to him it is not ‘quite impossible’ that Attivaraman who is credited with the performance of the Hiranyakarbhā in the Gōraṇṭlā plates is the father of Dāmodravarman who is said to have been ‘born of one born of the Hiranyakarbhā and a performer of the Gosahasra.’ He dismisses the palaeographical difficulty cheaply when he makes the gratuitous assumption that the difference in time between the Maṭṭepāḍ and Gōraṇṭlā plates is so short, and that it is difficult to determine which of them is the earlier.

(a) The grantha alphabet of the Gōraṇṭlā plates is decidedly later than that of the Maṭṭepāḍ grant, because in them the ra, ka

34. The Gōraṇṭlā inscription IA, Vol. IX, p. 102, t. 1. 3.
37. The Hiranyakarbhā jar is of the shape of a lotus; it is provided with a pedestal, golden stalk of lotus and a golden thread round its navel.

During the performance of the mahādāna the performer enters the precincts of the altar where the Hiranyakarbhā is placed, holding the images of Dharmāraja and Brahsmā in both hands, and takes five deep breaths after placing his head between his ankles. The Brahmins versed in the Vedas perform the Garbhāddāna, Puṇṇasavaṇa and Śimanta ceremonies of the Hiranyakarbhā and later on the rites following the birth of a child. Finally the performer addresses Viṣṇu thus:—

“O, the best among gods, before I came out of my mother’s womb, Now that I am born of your womb, mine is a divya deha.”

Moreover, udbhava (adj.) which occurs in the expression ‘Aneka-Hiranyakarbhodhavodbhavasya’ is mainly used in the sense of ‘birth’ or ‘coming from’—e.g. Rāstrakūṭavamsodbhava, Sāilodbhava, etc. As has been pointed out by Sircar, ‘Hiranyakarbhodhavodbhavasya’ in the sense of ‘performer of Hiranyakarbhā’ is awkward in a prose composition and the Buddhist Dāmodaravarman would not have performed Brahmanical rites like ‘Gosahasra’ and ‘Hiranyakarbhā,’
and the subscribed व consist of two vertical lines of nearly equal
length; in the Pitkira, Māṅgalūr and Uruvapalli grants and even
in the Chezarla inscription of Mahendravarman I, it is considera-
bly shorter. In the Kailāsanātha inscriptions the reascent is to the
full length of the vertical.

(b) Ja with the upper arm converted into a loop is on the line
of development to the Kūram ja which exhibits the head of the
modern Tamil ja. The Chezarla inscription has the archaic ja.

(c) The cursive ha and pa with the notch at the bottom occur
in the Dharmarājaratha inscription. The Chezarla ha and pa with
modest notches are earlier.

(d) The Gōraṇṭla a with a hook at the end of the lower arm
is like the Kailāsanātha a and is more developed than that of
Mahendravarman’s inscriptions. But the treatment of the vertical
in Kailāsanātha a stamps it as later than the Gōraṇṭla a.39

(e) The hook at the right end of the body curve of the
Gōraṇṭla da is absent in Dharmarājaratha, but present in the
Kailāsanātha da. The latter is, however, more developed than the
Gōraṇṭla one.

(f) bha with two equal curves resembles the Dharmarājaratha
bha.

(g) The Kailāsanātha na is more cursive and developed than
the Gōraṇṭla na.

(h) The Gōraṇṭla na is more cursive than the Dharmarāja-
ratha na. The development of na is from Sinhavaranm’s inscrip-
tion where it has a long stem to Dharmarājaratha and Chezarla
forms and then on to that of the Gōraṇṭla inscription where it
is very short.

According to Bühler,40 the Gōraṇṭla alphabet went out of use
before the date of the Kūram plates of Narasinhavarman’s grand-

---

38. The reascent in r l. 3 (paricāreṇa) and in u in the syllable ju l. 6, is
to the full length of the vertical.

Dr. Fleet compared the alphabet of the grant with that of the frag-
mentary inscription at Badāmi incised, according to his researches, by Pallava
Narasinhavarman I during his expedition against the Cārukya Pulakesin II.
However, only the notched pa, ha, ma, la and na exhibit any resemblance to
the letters of the Gōraṇṭla plates.

t. II. 1, 2, etc.
son Paramesvaravarman, which exhibit letters of a much different type. It is thus seen that in many respects, the Goraṭṭa alphabet stands between the Chezarla and Dharmarājarātha writing on the one hand and the Kailāsanātha writing on the other. Dr. Hultsch has pointed out that the majority of the epigraphs on the monolith now styled Dharmarājarātha resemble those of Mahendravādi and Śyamaṅgalam, assigned by him to Mahendravarman I (first quarter of the seventh century). The earliest date for Attivarman would, therefore, be the second quarter of the seventh century.

Sircar's assumption that only one prince in the line could have performed the Hiranyakaranga mahādāna enjoined by the Sacred Books on kings and wealthy men of the realm, is a gratuitous one. In the Śrīśailam plates of Virupākṣa, Harihara, son of Bukka, is said to have performed the 16 mahādānas.42 In the Udayaṁbākam grant of Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya43 (S. 1450) both Kṛṣṇadeva Rāya and his father are credited with the ṣodasa mahādānas. In the Vellāṅguḍi plates of Venkaṭapati Deva Mahārāya I (S. 1520),44 both Vira-Bhūpati and his son Kṛṣṇa-Bhūpati are credited with the same. Nor can the numbering of both sides of the Maṭṭēpāḍ plates attest the posteriority of Dāmodaravarman to Attivarman. The plates of Devavarman and Nandivarman are numbered in the Maṭṭēpāḍ fashion, whilst those of Nandivarman II and Skandavarman are numbered by plates. Yet the latter came after the former.

It is thus seen that Attivarman's reign falls in the second and third quarters of the seventh century. Dāmodaravarman who on palaeographical grounds has to be ascribed to the middle of the sixth century could not have been a successor of Attivarman.

His Grant

Attivarman's Goraṭṭa plates, which bear no date, record the grant of the village of Āntukkuṭra (according to Dr. Hultsch probably Gani Atukuru to the west of Bezwada) and the grant of land called 'Aṣṭāṣatapatṭi45 in the village of Tānthikontha or Tānrikonra (which according to Dr. Hultsch is the modern Tādikonda, ten miles to the north of Guntur and to the south of the Kṛṣṇa as

44. EI, Vol. XVI, p. 298 ff.
45. 'Tānthikontha (or Tānrikonra) grāme caturddiśain-aṣṭaṣatapatṭi kṣetrān'; IA, Vol. IX, p. 103. It may mean 108 paṭṭis.
stated in the inscription itself)\textsuperscript{46} to a Brahman named Koṭṭiśarman who was versed in Rg, Yajus and Sāma Vedas and the Apastamba Śūtra.

Most of the epithets applied to Attivarman in his grant would seem to be conventional. Such are, ‘anuparata-dharmma-kriyā-para’, ‘sura-guru saḍṛśa-buddhiḥ’, ‘sundara-suṣṭa-pēṣala-jana paricāra.’ But epithets like ‘Hiranyaagarbhaprasava’, ‘pratāpopanata-sakala-sāmanta-manḍala’, and ‘samyak-prajā-pālanopārij-jitakirtti’ would seem to have facts behind them.

**Attivarman’s status**

Whilst Dāmodaravarman and the Pallava kings of the period bear the tittle of Mahārāja, Attivarman is styled Rājan. Could this fact indicate a feudatory position? We know that a part of the Guntur district was under Pallava rule in the time of Kandara and Attivarman. But the expression pratāpopanata-sakala-sāmanta-manḍala applied to Attivarman, and the fact that Mahendravarman I is styled rājan in some inscriptions\textsuperscript{47} and also the absence of any evidence of Pallava rule over the Guntur taluq,\textsuperscript{48} make it highly probable that Attivarman was an independent monarch.\textsuperscript{49}

**Religion and Social Life**

The available grants of the Kandaras do not give us any direct insight into the administrative organisation. It may be sur-

\textsuperscript{46} Dr. Fleet read it as Tānthikontha and Dr. Hultsch’s reading is not as certain as it has been assumed. In the Ipūr and Chikkulla plates ra has two cross strokes. In the Peddavēgi plates of the Eastern Cālukyā Jayasimha I, (EI, Vol. XIX, p. 261) and the Kōṇḍanaṅgūru plates of Indravarman, (EI, Vol. XVIII, pp. 1. ff.) letters similar to that under reference occur. In the former it differs from the next letter ra in so far as it has not the latter’s notches. The word has been read as ‘Kantheruvāṭi’ which has been identified with the Kāṇḍēru of the Eastern Cālukya inscriptions. In the latter grant, the subscript ra has assumed its modern form, and is different from the letter above, though Dr. Hultsch read them as ṛṛa. No doubt in all these grants the subscript tha is open to the right and tha has a dot in the middle. Even so, in a grant of the Eastern Cālukya Viṣṇuvardhana IV or V (IA, Vol. XIII, p. 186) and perhaps in the Peddavēgi plates of Jayasimha I, tha with the short stroke occurs.

\textsuperscript{47} EI, Vol. VI, p. 320, t. II. 1 and 2.

\textsuperscript{48} Chezarla where the inscription of Mahendravarman exists is in the Narasaraopet taluq of the Guntur District.

\textsuperscript{49} Attivarman claims to be as powerful as Mahendra (Mahendrasamavikrama). Is there a veiled reference to Mahendravikrama or Mahendravarman I (EI, Vol. IV, p. 153)?
mised that the traditions of the past were continued. Pallava influence might have played its part. However, we know something about the religion of these kings and their subjects. Unlike the Pallavas with whom they were matrimonially connected and who were 'paramabhāgavatās,' the Kandara kings, with the exception of Dāmodaravarman, were protégés of Sambhu Śiva.\(^{50}\) Their family deity was the God in the Vaiṁkeśvara temple.\(^{51}\) Thus the Kandaras continued the Śaiva traditions of the Ikṣvākus, the kings of the Brhatphalāyana gotra and some of the Vaiṁgeyakas. If the names of donees can be relied upon as an index to the state of prevailing religions, Śaivism would seem to have had a strong hold over the Kandara kingdom.\(^{52}\)

But Buddhism was too firmly rooted in the land of the Bhaṭṭi-prōlu, Amarāvatī and Nāgarjunikonda and Ghaṇṭaśālā stūpas for monasteries to be completely eradicated even by four centuries of Brahmanical rule. Dāmodaravarman was a Buddhist (Samyak-saṁbuddhasya-pādānudhyatāḥ), and the Prākṛt of his grant might be an evidence of his Hinayānist leanings. In his day the toleration which the Brahmanical Sātvāhana and Ikṣvāku kings had shown towards Buddhism was returned by Buddhism to Brahmanism. Like Brahmanical kings, Dāmodaravarman makes grants of lands to Brahmans.

Scattered epigraphic and literary evidence attests the lingering of Buddhism in the Andhradeśa for a long time after it ceased to be the dominant religion. Amarāvatī has given us not only Buddhist inscriptions of the third and fourth centuries A.D.\(^{53}\) but also an inscription in early Telugu characters from which we learn that a Simhavarman, son of Nandivarman, on his return from an expedition, came to Dhānyakaṭaka and became a lay worshipper of the Buddha and made donations.\(^{54}\) An inscription on the base of a pillar bearing the sculpture of a standing figure of the Buddha, in

\(^{50}\) Śambhoś-carana-kamala-rajah-pavitrikṛtē, IA, Vol. IX, the Goraṭṭla plates.

\(^{51}\) The anuvāra over va is clear. Dr. Fleet was not sure of it (IA, Vol. IX, p. 103, n.). Only, as in other places, in the same inscription (ll. 4, 6, etc.) it is not exactly over the letter, but slightly to the right of it.

\(^{52}\) Names like 'Ruddajja', 'Nandijja', 'Khandajja', 'Kumārajja' and 'Devajja.'

\(^{53}\) ASSI, Vol. I, p. 106, No. 51 and Pl. LIXI, No. 4; for an unpublished Amarāvatī inscription of the third century A.D., see Pl. III.

\(^{54}\) SII, Vol. I. No. 32.
Rāmareḍḍipalle in the Nandigāma taluq, Kṛṣṇā District, mentions the setting up of an image of the Buddha by the īrmanāyaka Rāhula, the disciple of Ācārya (Mā)deva who was again the disciple of Ācārya Maudgalyāyana. According to Hiuen-Tsang, though Buddhism was on the wane, there were in the Veṅgideśa twenty and odd monasteries with three thousand brethren. In the kingdom of T'e-na-ka-che-ka (Dhānyakaṭaka) there was a crowd of Buddhist monasteries but most of them deserted, about twenty being in use with one thousand brethren mostly adherents of the Mahāsāṅghika system. The play entitled 'Mattavilāsa Prahasana' shows that Buddhist bhikkhus and their vihāras and caityas existed in Kānci in the seventh century, whatever might have been the demoralisation that had set in.

About the social life of the period we do not know anything except that the Brahmanical civilisation had once more gained ground. A point deserving mention here is the 'ārya' ending in the names of the donees of the Maṭṭepāḍ grant. Such name endings are found only in grants coming from the territory immediately south of the Kṛṣṇā (the Koṇḍamudi, the Mayidavolu, the Hīra-Haḍagalli, the Kanteru (Nandivarman I) and the Maṭṭepāḍ grants. 'Ārya' (venerable) as an honorific prefix to the names of Buddhist or Jain teachers and saints occurs in inscriptions all over India. It is used as an honorific title in the Hāthisimha inscription of Khāravela. 'Ārya' as initial part of personal names occurs in a Junnar inscription (Ayama) and in a Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription (Ayakoṭusiri and Ayasiri, names of royal ladies). The celebrated disciple of Nāgārjuna, who spent a great part of his life in the Andhradeśa, is Āryadeva. But the earliest inscription to exhibit names with 'ārya' ending is the Koṇḍamudi grant of Jayavarman, where all donees have names ending in 'aja'. The same

55. 218 of 1926-27.
57. Ibid., pp. 214-215.
58. 'Aira mahārāja Khāravela'; an Aya-Sakasathī is mentioned in a Bhaṭṭiprōṇu inscription as the name of a group (gaśṭhi).
59. ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 103, No. 11.
60. Ins. L. EI, Vol. XXI.
61. The epigraph on a relic pot from the Guntur District, which has been ably read and interpreted by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri (JOR, IX-13, 96, ff.) states that it contains the ashes of Āyamaṇi identified by the Professor with Āryadeva.

H.A.—28
is the case with the Mayidavolu and Maṭṭepāḍ grants. 62 'Ajja' is another form of Prākrit 'ayya' (Sanskrit ārya). 63 'Ārya' started as an honorific prefix and became a name ending much in the same way as 'siri.' 64

APPENDIX B

155 of 1899

1. Sri siddhiśvarāya
2. Kālissara sāraviraketoḥ sva śakti śātita
3. śāttra kari vara ghatā samkṣaṭa Dhānyakaṭa raṇa
4. saptakoṭeḥ prathitān (dhra*) prthiṇiyuvaraṇāḥ ā-
5. nanda karānanda mahārṣi mahāgotra viyadamala-
6. sakala tu (hi) na kiraṇasya samavagāḥdāndhasundari
7. candanānjalaka lokāmalā parimoṣaṇa pa-
8. rīcaya kṛtāparādha vai (pu) lya sitetarabe (nṇā)
9. nāthasya Trikūṭaparvavata pate (r*) golāṅgūla vija-
10. yaketanasya hallisaka paṭu paṭaha rava s(a)la ( ?
11. ma (tya or sya) ṇadyogasya Kandara-puravara-janapada-
dvitayā-
12. dhīpateḥ Kandararājasya priyasutāyāmavanitala-
13. nτava (t) yām mahādevyām saṇḍatās-satguros-tasyāspa
   (n) da-
14. madhi (sthe) ya guṇamadhitihitāṇhannalamkurvā (ṇaḥ)
   sujātaḥ
15. sujanamanāḥ śravaṇasukhacarita-bhājano janodita
16. sakalayaśoviseṣaḥ roṣasthila vṛttta-jānu-karaḥ
17. Karibhaḷa viśasta śāttra śarīra sakalamālamanḍa-
18. na bhāvyamāna pareta kaṇṭāgūṇo guṇonnata virodi
19. parajān (au) gha nivāraṇo vāraṇottamamale balonnatasya-
20. .... (ma) kusumake (tu) rabalājana manaḥ pramathan-
   patura-
21. ...gu...rabhilaṣita phalapradānakṛtmati-rahimagi-
22. ririvā...vilanghanīya mahima-gurus-salila nidhira

62. Ajja of the Hira-Ḥadagallī and Maṭṭepāḍ grants is the etymological spelling of the Pandit; 'aja' is the cave inscription form of 'ajja.'
63. Pischel. op. cit., Secc. 236 and 252.
64. It is used as a prefix in 'Rāya Simuka Sātavāhana sirimato' (Nāneghāṭ relievo figure inscription) and as a part of names in 'Vedisiri' 'Hakusiri' 'Balasiri' (Nāsik No. 2) 'Bodhisiri,' 'Bapisiri' etc. (Amaravati and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions).
23. gādha gāmbhīrya dhairyāślāgī sagaruḍa-muraripu-sanāthaśașanaḥ
24. paramasamṛddha pallījanapadađhipati-raribala-jayamatiḥ
25. sama (ra*) samaya samunnata gṛddhrādhyāsita-ketanaḥ pratiṃṭa-
26. pa vanitāśrutipathā-śrotrābharaṇa gauravaṇai phalya...
27. .pasāmu...mu...ta (ra) vārināsaghoṇaṇaśamaraṇa-ptaṭahara (va*) śravanaḥ dviguṇa maghaguṇa guṇa-
saγaraṇa-
29. . . . . (vijaya) sajayānuraktānurāga gururabhīṣṭuta
30. guṇavāsassakalakalā viśārada sa (t) saha-mallah
31. (svaku) la salīla nidhi samabhivarddhana tuhinakaranara tilaka
32. . . .duṣṭanigrahograviṣaghātaḥ śiṣṭaparipālana
33. . . .prasanna nṛpavara guṇatulya kāntiḥ śrīnā śrī (ra-
34. na) mahā (mallah) sakta...tva (to) nvayasya prthujaya-
balā-
35. yurārogyābhilaṣitārtha siddhaye punaratratirtha-
36. . . . .rvvannata samamahimānasya...bhila
37. . . . .bhūmi bahu devatāyatanāni sthira
38. . . . .ardhātvarvaparīhāra sampa...grāmā
39. . . . .maya...ra...vrśabhagana
40. . . . . . . saklasādhanānēm godha
41. . . . . . . . saha....
42. . . . . . . . .pārvatīpara...ru
43. . . . . . . . .manekavi...nu
44. . . . . . . . .rājitarajata (kapālapāli)
45. . . . . . . . .ka...ghaṇṭākamsatāla chatra
46. . . . . . . . .nise...hāṭabhā...devopakara
47. . . . . . . . .sampradāyā manvantaraḥbhīrāmabhī
guṇa
30. . . . . . . . .pratyanasobitām
CHAPTER XI

THE VISNUKUNDINS

The Visṇukundin is the last of the many minor dynasties that ruled over the destinies of the Andhra Country since the disappearance of the Sātavāhana. Whilst writers have emphasised the fact that it was contemporary with the Pallavas in the south, the Kaliṅga dynasties of the fifth and the sixth centuries A.D., the Vākāṭakas, the Maukharis and the Guptas, they do not say that immediately south of the Visṇukundin kingdom lay the Kandara kingdom. The chronological scheme adopted here makes the Kandaras the contemporaries of the Visṇukundins, and the Visṇukundin-Vākāṭaka matrimonial alliance was perhaps a political one intended as an offset to Kandara-Pallava matrimonial alliance. The fortunes of the Visṇukundins were bound up with the fortunes of the dynasties of the north and their sphere of action lay in the north, especially, in Kaliṅga. It is with the Maukharis, the Vākāṭakas and kings of Kaliṅga, that the Visṇukundins waged a series of wars that finally left them exhausted before the flood of Cālukyan invasion came upon them.

Of this dynasty we have five records. That this dynasty rose on the ruins of the Vaiṅgeyaka dynasty is made clear by the fact that the Chikkulla plates were issued from Lendulūra, modern Deṇḍalūru. Peddavēgi, the site of the capital of the Vaiṅgeyakas, is only five miles to the north of Lendulūra. And in both places there are ruins of a large of Śiva temples and extensive mounds. True some records were issued from other places, Īpūr II from (Ama)rapura, Īpūr I from vijayaskandhāvāra Kuḍāvāda. But as both Kuḍāvāda and Amarapura are called vāsaka, the former also was a temporary residence.

The Rāmatīrtham plates were issued from Puranisaṅgama, a vāsaka. Some scholars think that the Visṇukundins were a northern dynasty. They connect Trivara from which Mādhava-varman I took his wife with Tewar in the Central provinces and Trīkūṭa with Trirāṣmi and Malaya with the Western Ghāts. They also point to the northern wars of the Visṇukundins as furnishing evidence in the same direction. Amarapura cannot be identified with distant Amroati in the Central provinces. Nor can it be identified with Amarāvatī as even as late as the sixth century the
latter is known as Dhānyakaṭaka—Chezarla Inscription. No one has pitched upon Pallava wars with the Western Cālukyas and Ikṣvāku matrimonial connections with the house of Ujjain as evidence of their northern origin. Kielhorn looks upon Vinukonḍa as the survival of the dynastic name\(^1\) and this looks quite probable. Viṣṇukunḍin > Viṣṇukonḍin > Vinukonḍa. Kuṇḍi really means ‘one who comes from the fire-pit.’ But the fact that their family deity was the Śrīparvatasvāmi, may go some way to prove their southern or Andhra origin. But even this piece of evidence should not be pressed too far. Viṣṇukunḍin used in the plural is, like Vākāṭaka and Ikṣvāku, a family name. Some writers look upon it as a gotra name. They say that the Vākāṭakas with whom the Viṣṇukundins had matrimonial connections belonged to the Viṣṇuvṛddha gotra. Viṣṇu also is a recognised gotra. But they admit that the Viṣṇukunḍin is not to be traced in the gotra and pravara kāṇḍas. Moreover we have the plural and not the singular.

It is, however, possible to build some history on the name. The kings of the line though devoted to the God at Śrīparvata (Mallikārjuna) would, as their family name indicates, have been worshippers of Viṣṇu, and the names borne by these kings also lends support to this view. Not one king in the line among those known till now bears a Śaivite name. One wonders if the Śrīparvatasvāmi of the Viṣṇukundins was a Vaiṣṇavaite deity, otherwise as yet unknown, of the Śrīparvata of the Nāgarjunikonḍa inscriptions.\(^2\) Current local tradition, it may be noted, associates the hill with the Rāma cycle of stories. Mādhabavarmar and Govindavarmar, names which occur in the lists, the latter twice, are indications of the Viṣṇu worship in the family, before, if not after, they rose to power. The first king of the line so far known is not called a Śrīparvatasvāmi-padānudhyāta. Did the dynasty begin a Vaiṣṇavaite revival? According to Dr. Hultsch the seal of Īpūr I “is divided by a cross-line into

---

1. El. Vol. IV, pp. 194-95: “The name Vishṇukunḍin has not, so far as I know, been met with in other epigraphical records. Considering the locality where these plates come from, as well as the facts that the writer’s vernacular was Telugu and that, the donor worshipped the lord of Śrīparvata, which I take to be the sacred Śrīśaila in the Kārnāl district, I believe that the word survives in Vinukonḍa, the name of a hill-fort and town in the Kistna district, about 60 miles east of Śrīśaila and 50 miles south of the river Krishnā, and that this Vinukonḍa, which is reported to be a place of great antiquity, was really the capital of the Vishṇukunḍins.”

2. See Ch. VII.
two sections. The lower bears in relief the legend Mādhavavarma in two lines. Above the line seems to be a figure of Lakṣmī or a Svastika on a pedestal, flanked by two lamp-stands, and surmounted by the sun (?) and the crescent of the moon."3 Says Sircar:4 "As on the seals attached to Chikkulla and the Rāmatīrtham plates, the figure of a lion is clearly visible, it may not be impossible that the obliterated part above the line contained the figure of a lion which was possibly the crest of the Viṣṇukunḍins." But the symbol is not the svastika as the arms are not equal in length, nor is there any trace of a lion or Lakṣmī. It is a symbol much like that found on the coins of the Cūṭus in the Anantapur District. True, the seal of the Chikkulla plates bears in relief on a slightly counter-struck surface a well-executed lion, which stands to the proper right raises the right fore-paw, opens the mouth and apparently has a double tail.5 The Rāmatīrtham plates seal "shows the faint figure of an advancing lion or tiger (facing the proper right), with its fore-paw raised, neck erect, mouth wide-open and the tail raised above the back, so as to end in a loop."6 The lion device was perhaps Buddhist in origin. The lion motif at Amarāvati is sufficient evidence.

Viṣṇukunḍin Genealogy

The genealogy of the dynasty was a mess before Sircar came in to point out a patent error made by Dr. Hultzsch and Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao. Identifying Mādhavavarman of Ḡopūr I with the Mādhavavarmans of the Rāmatīrtham and the Chikkulla plates Hultzsch constructed the following genealogy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ḡopūr</th>
<th>Rāmatīrtham</th>
<th>Chikkulla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mādhavavarman</td>
<td>Mādhavavarman</td>
<td>Mādhavavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vikramendra</td>
<td>Vikramendravarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indravarman</td>
<td>Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vikramendravarman II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. EI, Vol. XII, p. 133.
But Hultzsch went wrong in making the Mādhavavarman of Īpūr II the grandfather of Mādhavavarman of the Chikkulla plates. Accepting Hultzsch’s view regarding the position Mādhavavarman of Īpūr II in Viṣṇukundin genealogy, and obsessed by the theory that Mādhavavarman of Polamūru plates whose grant is renewed by the Eastern Cālukya king Jayasiṁha I must be late in the series, and also by the theory that succession was in one line, Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao and others have built up a fantastic genealogy.

Hultzsch’s genealogy is vitiated by one mistake. When he stopped with Īpūr I his genealogy was correct. When he came to Īpūr II he was confronted by the palaeographical difficulty. “The inscription records the grant of a village, the name of which is doubtful, by Mādhavavarman (II)……His father was Devavarman (I.5), and his grandfather the Mahārāja Mādhavavarman (I)……As the alphabet of this inscription seems to be of an earlier type than that of the preceding one, and as grandsons are frequently named after their grandfather, I consider it not impossible that Mādhavavarman II was the grandfather of Govindavarman’s son Mādhavavarman, who would then have to be designated Mādhavavarman III.” Hultzsch’s theory has been exploded by the Polamūru grant which mentions a Vikramahendra and not Mādhavavarman as the grandfather of Mādhavavarman and father of Govindavarman. As

Sircar has pointed out, Hultsch and others have made three Mādhavavarmans out of two. Mādhavavarman of the Chikkulla, Rāmatīrtham and İpūr I and Polamūru plates is one Mādhavavarman. In the İpūr I plates he is called ‘Trivarana-gara-bhavana-gata-
uyati-hṛdaya-nandanaḥ,’ ‘agniṣṭoma sahasra-yājī,’ and ‘Hiranya-
garbhaprasūtaḥ,’ and in the Polamūru plates ‘Trivarana-gara-bha-
vana-gata-yuvati-jana-vihaṁaṇa-ratiḥ,’ ‘kratu-sahasra-yājī’ and
‘Hiranya-garbhaprasūtaḥ.’ In both he is also called ‘ekādaś-Āsva-
medhāvabhṛta-snāna-vigata-jagad-enaskah’ (Polamūru) and ‘ekā-
daś-Āsvamedhāvabhṛtha-vidhūta-jagatkalmaṣah’ (İpūr I). So the Mādhavavarman of the Polamūru plates is identical with the Mādhavavarman of İpūr I. Mādhavavarman of the Rāmatīrtham and Chikkulla and İpūr I plates is identical, as Hultsch himself had admitted. If Mādhavavarman, father of Devavarman of İpūr II, is Mādhavavarman Janāśraya, son of Govindavarman, the genealogy falls in to the following mould:

```
Vikramahendra
     
Govindavarman
     
Mādhavavarman Janāśraya (I)
     
Mañcyaṇṇa-bhaṭṭāraka
          
Devavarman
          
Vikramendravarman I
          
Mādhavavarman II Indrabhaṭṭārakavaran
          
Vikramendravarman II
```

Vikramendravarman I would seem to have had another son as Indrabhaṭṭārakavaran is called the eldest son of the former. Mañcyaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka, associated with his father Mādhavavarman as ājñā of İpūr I, dated in the 37th year of Mādhavavarman, would seem to have been the eldest son of the latter.

It now behoves us to remove the palaeographical difficulty. It is highly improbable that that Mādhavavarman issued the İpūr II plates as king. In the plates he is not called a Mahārāja or Rāja.

9. In the Chikkulla plates Indrabhaṭṭārakavaran is called Mahārāja and in the Rāmatīrtham plates Rāja.
In all the other plates of the Viṣṇukundins the reigning king is called Rāja or Mahārāja. In Ipur II Devavarman, the father of Mādhavavarman, is also not known by regal titles. True, in our records the predecessors of the reigning king are sometimes mentioned without regal titles. Devavarman is also known as one who displayed matchless and well-known valour in attacking warriors. It is therefore probable that he fell in battle in one of the ceaseless wars waged by his father. Ipur II was issued at the command of Viṣṇukūṇ (q) yadhirāja. We know from the Godāvari plates of Prthivimūla that adhirāja means overlord. The inscription is dated in the 47th year. We know from the Polamūru plates that Mādhavavarman reigned for forty years. Such a long reign as forty-seven years for Mādhavavarman, son of Devavarman, is improbable in view of the fact that he was succeeded by his uncle, himself having died childless. It is therefore very probable that the edict was issued by Mādhavavarman the younger, who had been put in charge of the kingdom by his grandfather when the latter was away busy with his wars with Kalinga. The Polamūru plates show that in the 40th year of his reign Mādhavavarman Janāśraya crossed the Godāvari with a view to conquer the eastern region. Ipur I plates of the 37th year of Mādhavavarman Janāśraya record the grant of the village of Vilembali in the district of Guddādi to the Brahman Agniśarman of the Vatsa gotra. Ipur II refers to the two donees Agniśarman and Indraśarman. The words preceding Agniśarmendra (śarma) bhī (ā)m are obliterated, and Hultsch has not read them. One donee seems thus to be common

10. 'Śri-Vikramendravarmanasah', Chikkulla plates, t. l. 10.'Śri-Vikramahendrasa', Polamūru plates, l. 4.Śri-Govindavarmanasah', ibid., l. 6.
11. Kṣatriyāvashandrapravart (t)ita apratimavikī ṣ (vā) taparakramasya.
12. Viṣṇukūṇ (q) yadhirājadhyānodatta.
13. The numerical symbols were read as (4)7 by Hultsch. Says he: "The first figure of the year in the date portion of the .. inscription (l. 13), is injured and uncertain" (p. 338). Sircar reads it as 10. But as the upper part of the symbol is clearly the upper part of the symbol for four Hultsch's conjectural reading is correct.
   The curves considered by Sircar are merely scratches far below the line.
14. Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao and others read the symbol as 48. But as in Ipur II even the symbols for 47 are the symbols for 4 and 7, and not one symbol, and as there is not a single instance of the combination of two symbols in one, such a reading has to be abandoned. What is taken as a ligature for 8 is only the flourish of the lower part of the vertical of the symbol for 40.
H.A.—27
to both the grants. It would therefore seem that Īpur II is also
dated in the reign Mādhavavarman Janāśraya of eleven Aśvamedhas
fame. In that case Īpur I is prior to Īpur II only by ten
years. And there are not insuperable palaeographical objections
to placing Īpur II ten years after Īpur I. Firstly though both the
records were found in the possession of Brindāvanam Gopālācharlu
at the village of Īpur in the Tenali Taluq of the Guntur district,
they do not seem to have belonged to the same locality. The first
set records the grant of the village of Vilembali in the Guddādi
viśaya, by the king from his camp at Kuḍāvāḍa. Guddādi viśaya is
the Guddavādi viśaya to which Drākṣārāma and Chellūr in the
Godāvari district belonged. The name of the viśaya which contain-
ed the second grant is obliterated.

The alphabet of II has those thick dots and that bold writing
which characterise the grant of Dāmodaravarman and of some of
the kings of Kaliṅga. Hultzsch says that the alphabet of Īpur II
reminds us of the British Museum plates of Cārudēvi. But the com-
parison between the carelessly written Cārudēvi grant and this
grant is not happy. While speaking of Īpur I Hultzsch said that
“The alphabet is of an earlier southern type than that of the two
other published grants of the Viśṇukuntāda family. The secondary
forms of i and i are not always clearly distinguished; in
"kuṇḍinām—(l. 1) i looks like i, and in bhagavacchāri-
parvutā (l. 1), śrī Govinda (l. 3), and—mahi—(l. 4), i
looks like i.” But in Īpur II the distinction between
i and i is clear e.g., i in āgniśṭoma (l. 2), priyaputraḥ (l. 5),
and i in Śrī-Devavarmanah and Śriparvataswāmi (II. 5 and 6); the
o sign is as developed as that in I grant-agniṣṭoma (l. 2). The
tail of Īpur II la is as developed as that of I la. Īpur II șa is in no
way more developed than the Īpur I șa. On the other hand na of
the former has a larger bottom than that of the latter and in this
respect it resembles the Maṭṭepāḍ na. Ji in I.2 Īpur II is more
developed than ji in I 1.7. Ta without the loop occurs in I also
(l.13). Pa-s in both have looped bottoms. II ta and na resemble
the Maṭṭepāḍ ones. No doubt the reascent of the vertical of ra
and ka is not as pronounced in II as in I. But the subscript in kra
has a better flourish in II than I; e.g., parākramasya I, 1.1; II,
1.5. Much of the difference between the two alphabets is due to
the fact that Īpur II alphabet is of an angular and bolder type
while the alphabet of I is slanting and small. Moreover the affili-

15. EI, Vol. XII, pp. 4 ff., pp. 2 ff.
ations of the alphabets of II are with the Maṭṭepāḍ grant whilst the alphabet of I is closely related to the grants found in the northern parts (e.g., the grant of Nandaprabhaṇjanavaran).

The foregoing arguments, some of them positive and others negative, prove that there are no insuperable difficulties in putting Ḡpūr II as later than Ḡpūr I. And the arguments adduced above also show that Ḡpūr II belongs to the reign to which Ḡpūr I belongs and that the interval between the two is only ten years. Ḡpūr II, in other words, is a grant of the grandson dated in the reign of his grandfather.

We may in passing note the patent objections to the genealogical scheme built by Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao and others. They have identified the Vikramahendra of the Polamūru plates with the Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla plates. It may be pointed out that Vikramahendra of the Polamūru plates is not even as names go the same as the Vikramendra of the Chikkulla grant. Vikramendravarman II’s grandfather is also known as Vikramendra. To place the Ḡpūr and Polamūru grants after the Chikkulla and Rāmatiratham grants is palaeographically impossible. Since two Mādhavavarmanes have been made three K. V. Lakshmana Rao wonders why Aśvamedhas should have been the monopoly of Mādhavavarmanes!

The chronology of the Viṣṇukundin dynasty can now be settled within reasonable limits. While editing the Polamūru plates, Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao pointed out that the grant recorded in these plates was renewed by Jayasimha I whose date is known. Both grants were found buried in the same village, one by the side of the other. The Polamūru plates say that when Mādhavavarman had set out on an eastern expedition and crossed the Godāvari, he made an agrahāra of the village of Pulombūra on the Dalīyavāyi river and of four nivartanas of land at the southern extremity of Mayindavāṭaki, and granted it to Śivaśarman of the Gautama gotra resident of Kunrūra in the Karmarāṣṭra. The grant of Jayasimha I who began to rule from 633 A.D., records that in his fifth year (638) he granted the village of Pulombūra in the Gudda-vādi viṣaya to Rudraśarman son of Śivaśarman and grandson of Dāmaśarman. In Mādhavavarman’s grant it is Śivaśarman son of Dāmaśarman that gets the same village. So it is clear that the Polamūru grant of Mādhavavarman is separated from the grant of

Jayasimha by at least one generation. The Polamuru grant of Mādhavaavarman is dated in the 40th year of Mādhavaavarman. If, as is stated in the grant of Jayasimha, Rudraśarman was the owner of the agrahāra before he was dispossessed of it, the interval may be greater, say 35 to 45 years. So Mādhavaavarman’s reign falls between 553-593, the period of Dāmodaravarman and Attivarman (Kandara). The day on which the grant was made was Phalguni Pūrṇimā on which lunar eclipse occurred. And the chronology worked out in this chapter makes 593 a possible date for the Polamuru grant.

Mādhavaavarman’s period is then between 553-593 or more. Vikramendravarman, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, Vikramendravarman II might each be assigned a period of 25 years, and the end of the dynasty brought to the latter part of the seventh century A.D., a generation after the advent of the Eastern Cāḷukyas.
ADDITIONAL NOTE TO CHAPTERS III AND IV

In a monograph entitled 'Reconstruction of Andhra Chronology' in the pages of the J.A.S.B.¹ Mr. G. Bose has drawn revolutionary conclusions from equally revolutionary assumptions and interpretations. He has handled the Puranic material shrewdly. But his reconstructed chronology breaks down at every step.

To him the Puranic evidence is everything and the epigraphic one is utterly futile. The Puranic chronological data if properly assessed would give 3101 (Kali)—2700 = 401 B.C. as the date of Nanda’s coronation. The Puranas place the end of the Andhra dynasty 838 years after the advent of the Nandas. The lower limit is therefore 437 A.D. The dynastic total gives us 21 B.C. as the starting point. This is corroborated by the legend that the first Śālivāhana killed Vikramādiya who is supposed by Mr. G. Bose to be the author of the Vikrama Era. A Kanheri inscription² and the Girnār inscription prove that Pulumāvi was the son-in-law of Rudradāman. Pulumāvi’s date is near 150 A.D.; Gautamiputra is known from Nāsik records to be his father. As the starting-point is 21 B.C., Gautamiputra and Pulumāvi must be Nos. 6 and 7 in the Puranic lists, and not Nos. 23 and 24 as supposed till now, for 21 B.C.—the regnal, years of the first five kings would take us to 74 A.D. and Nos. 6 and 7 reigned for 74 years up to 148 A.D. Gautamiputra and Pulumāvi of the records have been identified so far with Nos. 23 and 24 on the slender and often false guide of identity of names. ‘The name Gautamiputra is not an exclusive one and might be applied in conjunction with siri-Sātakaṇi to more than one Andhra king. It is on such a weak foundation that the whole structure of modern Andhra chronology has been built up.’ No. 7 is called Lambodara, but it is a sobriquet and there is nothing against the supposition that his personal name was Pulumāvi. ‘Of course the regnal periods of Lambodara (18 years) and Pulumāvi (24 years) do not tally.’ The same is the case with Sīrī-Yaṇa³ who is assigned in the Puranas 19 years while the inscriptions show that he reigned for at least 27 years. The Yue-gnai

2. Lüders’ List, No. 994.
3. Some Puranas assign him 29 years.
of Kiapili of 408 A.D. identified by Wilson with Siri-Yaṇa supports these conclusions. All these Mr. G. Bose calls a four-fold point of contact.

What is claimed to be a four-fold point of contact is really the Purāṇic evidence with other pieces of evidence twisted to fall in line with it. It has been shown in an earlier chapter that Puḷumāvi could not have been the son-in-law of Rudradāman and that the Sātakaṇi of the Gīrṇār record also cannot be the son-in-law of Rudradāman, but a later king.

The early Sātavāhanas do not bear metronymics. Even the Bhilsa inscription of the time of an early Sātakaṇi gives only the metronymic of the avesaṇi Ānanda. Kings after No. 22 almost invariably bear metronymics.

Puḷumāvi is a peculiar name and has been given on all the coins and inscriptions of the kings bearing it. Even when the title Navanarasāmi is given\(^4\) the personal name is not omitted. The name Puḷumāvi occurs thrice in the Purāṇic lists. It is hard to believe that the great Gautamiḍпутra is not mentioned in the Purāṇas by his only non-surname while the only Gautamiḍputra is an insignificant Gautamiḍputra Viḷīvāyākura. Gautamiḍputra and Puḷumāvi are juxtaposed only lower in the list. The Āpīlaka coin, and the coins of Vijaya and Skanda belonging to the Akola hoard, make an attack on Purāṇic names extremely dangerous.

Epigraphic evidence of the weightiest kind shatters Mr. Bose's conclusions. The interval between Gautamiḍputra and Siri-Yaṇa of 320 years and that between Puḷumāvi and Siri-Yaṇa of 265 years are too long. That between Gautamiḍputra and Kaṃha of 53 years is too short. Fortunately we have at Nāsik a stream of inscriptions belonging to different reigns—of Kaṃha's time, of Hakusiri's grand-daughter, of Gautamiḍputra and Puḷumāvi, and of Siri-Yaṇa's time. Nāsik palaeography is therefore a weighty and accurate evidence. The inscription of Kaṃha's time\(^5\) with its da open to the left, rounded va, ka with a short vertical, narrow-bottomed ha; angular ta and short strokes and curves for u and i signs, is very early in the series. It is more related to the Aśokan inscriptions. Fifty-three years are not sufficient for the development of these early forms into a, ka and ra with long verticals curved ornamen-

5. No. 2 in the Purāṇic lists. EI, Vol. VIII, Pl. VI.
tally at the lower end, *va* with angular bottom and very ornamental *i* and *u* signs. Hakusiri’s grand-daughter’s inscription, conclusively proves that even two generations after Kanha had not changed materially the *da* open to the left and the rounded bottom of *ya* and *pa*; *la* and *ha* and *i* and *u* signs are still primitive. Only *sa*, *ka* and *ra* are slightly developed. The development is so slight and the older forms are so pronounced, that the wonder is not that there is change, but it is so slight. Nāsik Nos. 2 (Puḷumāvi) and 24 (Siri-Yañā) are palaeographically so closely related that we cannot postulate more than a two-generation interval without committing a great error. The treatment of the verticals of *ṭa*, *ra* and *kṣa*, and the angular *pa* are the same in both. The close resemblance of the *a*-s *sa*-s, *da*-s, *ha*-s and the *i* signs of the two inscriptions deserve notice. Palaeography though not a safe guide in fixing narrow margins, is a safe and sure criterion in fixing or disproving long intervals, and it will not do to brush it aside as Bose does.

Mr. Bose’s scheme makes meaningless Gotami Balasiri’s remark that her son inherited ‘from a long line of ancestors the privilege of kingly music.’ His suggestion that it refers to the predecessors of Simuka as governors under the Kāṇvas is a desperate guess. Therefore the orthodox theory rests on a much more secure basis than mere identity of names, on the rock of epigraphic evidence.

Other conclusions of Mr. Bose are that Gautamiputra was the founder of the Śaka era, that Siri-Yañā is the king of the Nāneghañ record and that Puḷumāvi was a viceroy under his father. To him Balasiri’s inscription when considered along with the Purāṇic account and the Śālivāhana tradition ‘throws unexpected light on the origin of the Śaka era’. Khakharāta is perhaps the Prākrit form of Śakarāṭ. Tradition points to Śalivāhana the enemy of Vikramāditya as Śakendra, Śakaditya and Śaka. If we suppose a confusion between Nos. 1 and 6, we can look upon the victories recorded in No. 2 as the starting point of an era. Once this theory is admitted ‘it will be seen that there is no alternative but to recognise that the Western Satraps, who dated in the Śaka era, were tributaries to the Andhras’ and the ‘evidence in favour of the Andhra origin of the Śaka era is fairly conclusive.’

6. Nāsik Nos. 4 and 5, EI, Vol. VIII, Pl. II.
This is only the revival of an old theory. If the Junnar inscription of Ayama, minister of Nahapāna, is dated in the Śaka era we are led to the absurd suggestion that Nahapāna died long before 78+46=124 A.D., (that is in 78 A.D., the year of hostilities between Gautamiputra and Nahapāna as worked out by Mr. Bose), but that a person called himself his minister even long after his death. In Western Kṣatrapa inscriptions the words are vasa or varṣa and the name of the month, whereas in the Sātavāhana inscriptions they are savachara and pakha. It is also curious that an era started by Gautamiputra is not used either by himself or what is more important by his son and successors. Would the Western Kṣatrapas have continued with religious fervour to use on their coins and in their inscriptions an era which started with their defeat—a constant reminder of their fall and chains? And that too, long after the Sātavāhana glories had passed away like a forgotten dream? Mr. Bose's theory narrows down to nothing the interval between the Prākṛt records of Nahapāna's line (years 45 and 46) and the Sanskrit record of year 52. It is all the more significant that the daughter of Rudradāman and a Sātavāhana queen uses Sanskrit. The more plausible suggestion is that it started with a revival of Śaka power after the crushing blow it had received at the hands of Gautamiputra. In cognate records kha is the Prākṛtic form for kṣa or sa or sa in Sanskrit, e.g. Khandapālī, Khatiya. The question of the Śaka era is a knotty one, but Mr. Bose's conjecture based on his interpretation of tradition will certainly not fit into known historical facts.

The Gīrnār record says that Rudradāman was the lord (pati) of Ākara, Avanti, Anūpa, Ānarta, Surāṣṭra, Svabhra, Maru, Kaccha, Kukura, Aparāṁta, etc. In No. 2 Kukura, Suraṭha, Aparāṁta, Anūpa, Ākara and Avanti of which Gautamiputra was the lord (rājā) are mentioned just before Saka-Yavana-Pahlava nisūdanasa and Khakharātavasa niravasesa karasa. These leave no doubt about the contest between the two powers and all theory of the appointment of Rudradāman and Caṣṭana by Gautamiputra is shattered by the words 'and other territories gained by his own valour'.

The view that Uṣavadāta was governor under Gautamiputra is blasted by the Nāsik and Kārlā records. The mention of the Veja-
yantī army, the non-mention of the purchase from Uṣavadāta of the land granted, though he is mentioned as the previous owner of the land and the official nature of the records make the theory of conquest, transfer and utter destruction of Khakharāta power doubly certain. The Kārlā inscriptions Nos. 13 and 19 record the grant of the same village of Karajaka by Uṣavadāta and a Sātavāhana king, almost certainly Gautamīputra, and the entry of it in the state archives. What else can this signify except a change of government?

The author’s remarks about Siri-Yaṇa are the most startling. He looks upon Gautamīputra Śrī-Yajña as the restricker of Nahapāna’s coins long after they were issued. The comparison with the Vīḷvāyakura practice is unhappy as in the latter case no conquest is involved. If his theory is correct, we should find the personal name ‘Yaṇa’ which we find invariably on his numerous coins and his inscriptions. On the restruck coins, on the other hand, we have only Gotamīputasa Śrī-Śatakāṇisa.

The Nāneghāṭ record is ascribed to Siri-Yaṇa. The argument is as follows: the names Satisiri (which he Sanskritizes as Šuktaśrī on the supposition that Prakṛtic form is a corruption) and Vedisiri of the princess of the Nāneghāṭ record are in conformity with the name Siri-Yaṇa; the worn out name of the king in the inscription ends with ‘sirī,’ wherefore it must be Yaṇasiri. Vedic rites in the place of Buddhistic ceremonies were likely to have been inaugurated by the royal personages on the re-establishment on the throne of the Sātavāhana sub-clan, which occurred at the time of Siri-Yaṇa. The placing of the relievo figure of Śīṣuka, the first Sātavāhana, the founder of the dynasty, along with those of the other members of Siri-Yaṇa’s family was to emphasize the fact that the Sātavāhana sub-clan was re-established; Vedasiri is to be identified with Cada Sāti read as Vada Sāti on coins, and Vada Sāti or Cada Sāti is next to Siri-Yaṇa in the Purānic lists. The conservatism of State engravers as also the presence of other inscriptions near at hand, which served as epigraphic models to them, would
explain the old form of the Nāmeghaṭ script' (italics mine). The author of the remark that mere names are false guides in identifications hangs all his conclusions on the slender name Yaña, which could have been borne by any king as sacrifices were not the monopoly of one king. 'Sati' is a variant of 'Sata' which is a contraction for Sātakaṇi. If every Vedisiri must be the son of Siri-Yaña then all Skanda-Sātakaṇis must be looked upon as sons of Puranic Sivasiri. On Siri-Yaña's coins and inscriptions 'siri' is only a prefix. It is only the Purāṇas which give Yajñaśrī. 'Siri' as a name ending does not occur in any of the later inscriptions and coins or in the so-called early inscriptions of Gautamiputra and Pulumāvi. If Vedic rites were performed by one who revived the glories of the dynasty, there is greater reason to believe that an early member of the dynasty performed them to announce and assert the new glories. The author has obviously misunderstood the purport of the Nāsik and Kārlā grants. They do not show Buddhist leanings of the kings, but were mere political acts intended to win the support of or at least reconcile the Buddhist monks to the new regime. The inscription of Caḍa Sāti disposes of any attempt to read the name as Vada Sāti which again cannot be equated with Vedisiri. The identification of the 29th king with Vedisiri is more than fantastic. The utter flouting of palaeographic evidence is thoroughly unscientific. Wherefrom Bose gets his idea of the conservatism of state engravers of our period, we do not know. There are no other inscriptions at Nāneghaṭ to serve as models other than the long sacrificial record and the relieve inscriptions. The Nāneghaṭ record of a later king Catarapana Sātakaṇi shows later forms only. It is a far cry from the Nāneghaṭ script which is a little more developed than the Aśokan to the Siri-Yaña alphabets which are as developed as those of the Ikṣvākus.

It remains to speak of the theory of viceroyalty of Pulumāvi of Nāsik, Nos. 2 and 3 under Gautamiputra. "The epithets and titles (in Nāsik No. 2) leave no room for the doubt that Gautamiputra was the paramount lord and Vasiṣṭhiputra had a subordinate position. Under these circumstances one would naturally expect the inscription to be dated in the regnal years of the paramount

12. P. 107, §. 181.
13. EI, Vol. XVI.
14. JBRRAS, Vol. XIII.
king but it is not so. The most plausible explanation is that Balasiri had been living with her grandson who was a provincial ruler under his father.” It is Bhandarkar’s theory of conjoint rule walking in new clothes. The expressions, pitupatiyo applied to father and mahadeviya ayakaya sevakamo piyakamo ca, leaves no doubt that the grand-mother was living and the father was not when the inscription was incised. Nasis No. 3 is issued in the same way as No. 4. Navarasaami reminds us of Benaakaatakasami. The amaca at Govadhana is addressed in both; both have the prefix siri; in both the regnal years of the kings concerned are given. In what way No. 3 can be construed to be the order of a Viceroy and the other that of a King of Kings one fails to understand. Moreover, if Govadhana was in Pulumavi’s province one would expect Gautamiputra in No. 4 to issue the order through Pulumavi. The regnal years of Pulumavi given in Nos. 2 and 3 are enough to shatter Mr. Bose’s theory though he glosses over this fact. In all cognate records the year of the reigning king is given. The epithets lavished upon Gautamiputra are explained by the motherly feelings towards the dead son and by his grand exploits (‘the funeral oration of a disconsolate mother’). Nothing can be made out of raja applied to Pulumavi and rajaraja applied to his father as both are called maharajas towards the end. Moreover Pulumavi is also styled [Dakhina] pathesararo, a title which is not viceregal. Gautamiputra is also called raja in No. 4 and 5.

One minor conclusion may also be studied. Nasis No. 5 is said to be a joint order of Gautamiputra and his queen Jivasuta. As according to Indian custom as long as the mother-in-law is living the daughter-in-law would not find any prominent mention anywhere, Gotami Balasiri must have died between 97 and 100 A.D.

Since No. 2 is the record of Pulumavi’s reign Gotami Balasiri outlived her glorious son. The theory of the vicerealty of Pulumavi having been disproved, how can the so-called Jivasuta call herself rajasmatat ; as Pulumavi is a Vasishtiputa one would expect to find the gotra name of the queen. To Mr. Bose the translation ‘one whose son is living’ is absurd, because it is a joint-order of Gautamiputra and a mahadevi. But the association of a lady in the govern-

15. El, Vol. VIII.
16. According to Senart Dakhina is ‘a conjecture although more than a probable one.’ Between the two creases there are traces of a letter. It cannot however be read as da though it is tempting to do so.
ment shows the failing health or more probably the illness of the king and under such circumstances, 'kings's mother whose son is living' is neither absurd nor superfluous. Nāsik No. 2 speaks of him as aviparamātu susūsaka.¹⁷

Mr. G. Bose's monograph in short contains nothing new, and must be considered unsatisfactory in every way as an attempt to reinterpret the familiar data.
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| Gahapati | 88n., 111. |
| Gaṅgata | 111. |
| Gaṅhin | 98. |
| Gaṅdhihāra | 1, 92. |
| Gaṅmikā | 83n., 87. |
| Gaṅādhhipati | 123. |
| Gaṅḍavyūḥa | 126n. |
| Gaṅgaridai | 165. |
| Gani Atukūru | 194. |
| Gardabhiśa | 127. |
| Gāthāsaptasati | 41, 42. |
| Gīmānapakha | 173. |
| Gīmrā prāṣasti | 53n., 56, 154. |
| Gokarnasvāmī | 183, 184. |
| Golden Chryse | 105. |
| Goliśa | 92. |
| Goraṇṭla inscription | 193. |
| Govindaśi | 44n., 45. |
| Govadhana (Govardhana) | 24, 101, 102, 103, 109, 110, 114, 123, 215. |
| Govadhanaḥāra | 24, 74, 101, 102n., 157n. |
| Govagāmā | 141, 146n., 215. |
| Go-Vallabhas | 181. |
| Govindavarman (Viṣṇukundin) | 202, 203, 204. |
| Great Dhārmagiri | 142. |
| Guḍḍādī viṣaya | 206. |
| Guḍḍavadī viṣaya | 206. |
| Guḍráhāra (= Guḍra) | 157n. |
| Guḍrāvāra viṣaya (= Kūḍūrāhāra) | 181n. |
| Gumika | 84n., 87n. |
| Gunapadeya grant | 153. |

**H**

| Hagāna | 55. |
| Hagāmāsa | 55. |
| Hākūṣiri (see Mahā-Hākūṣiri) | 33, 37, 38, 122n. |
| Hāla (= Sātakāna) | 5, 13, 14, 33, 35, 41ff., 87, 122. |
| Hālaka (Hālikā) | 91. |
| Hālakiya | 111. |
| Haṁmasi | 136. |
| Haṁmasirinikā | 134. |
| Harisaṇa | 2. |
| Harivānā, | 59. |
| Harivānā Parāśa | 16. |
| Haṛṣa-carita | 40n., 43n., 62n., 70. |
| Haṣṭimalla (see Athimallan) | 191n. |
| Haṣṭin, Mahārāja | 84. |
| Haṣṭivarman of Vengi | 167, 169, 170, 173, 174, 186. |
| Haṭhigumpha inscription | 7, 9, 28, 37, 75n., 76, 104, 158n., 159n. |
| Hemacandra | 19n., 23n., 30n., 41, 87n. |
| Hemantānapakha | 173. |
Kâmbojas, 1, 76, 92.
Karâdasirî, 127n., 147.
Karâgura, 189n.
Karânakâra, 113.
Karimâkarâta, 103, 146n.
Kânabhoa, 77.
Kanda or Kandân, 186.
Kandaras, 185ff.
Kandara (meaning), 185.
Kandara (King), 24, 186.
Kandarapura, 24, 188, 189.
Kandara-Vallabha, 185.
Kandhara, Kandhara, 185.
Kandharapura, 189n.
Kandulûra, 189n.
Kanâ (Sâtavâhana), 6, 14, 19, 20, 28, 30, 32ff, 37, 73, 210, 211.
Kanhâbepâ, 37.
Kanîhara, Kanîhara, 185, 186.
Kanâtakasela (Sans. Kanâtakasela), 8, 104, 142, 150.
Kantakosyilâ, 8, 104, 135n., 142n., 150.
Kanva, 19.
Kâñvas, 21, 25, 29n., 211.
Kâpâlîmi, 123.
Kapanâñaka, 101n.
Kapîcitâ, 103.
Kâpûra, 101.
Kâpurâhâra, 101.
Karahâkañâ, 109.
Karajaka, 57, 161n., 213.
Kâranañjugha, 145n.
Kârikâla, 26.
Karmarâgastra, 3, 207.
Kârâpâna, 97, 112, 113, 114.
Karumbudhâna, 128.
Karùmburânceru, 179.
Kâsâkâras, 113.
Kâsâkârasñi, 114.
Kâsitâ, 159.
Kanâtakasela (see Kanâtakasela, Kanta-
kosyila, 142n.
Kâthârasitâgara, 30.
Kâthâvatthu, 119, 120, 144.
Kâtyâyana, 132.
Kâtuilâ, 48.
Kâvyaprakâsa, 43.
Kekâpura, 101.
Kekâpurâhâra, 101.
Kevurûra, 103, 110.
Khadà, 97.
Khakharâta (Kshaharâta race), 53, 56, 163n., 211.
Khanâdakâlirâmanâlakâ, 127n., 147.
Khanâdâna, 71.
Khanâdanâga-siri, 157n.
Khanâdâsâgaramâlakâ, 147n.
Khanâdasirî Vasîthâpûta, 134n.
Khâravela, 2, 7, 8, 9, 23, 37, 75n., 76, 104.
INDEX

Khubiraka, 7, 10.
Kilakila Kings, 128.
Koëlpüta, 45.
Kodabalisirî, 137, 142, 143.
Koddura (Küdûra), 8, 86, 104, 135n.
Koṭih, 119, 121.
Kolanu, 173n.
Kolikas, 113.
Kolikanaúgyaseñî, 114.
Kollitippa, 105.
Konnâika, 103.
Kondamãna Háritiputa, 48n.
Kondamudi plates, 84, 86n., 151ff., 170, 197.
Koppâram plates of Pulakesîn II, 157n., 188n.
Koðasthalî, 129.
Kosigiputa, 45, 60.
Koṭhâgârika (Sansk. Kośthâgârika), 141, 147.
Kotivarça vissaya, 159.
Koṭṭiśârman, 195.
Krânavarman I, 187.
Kshaharâta, 16.
Kuberañâga, 32n.
Kudavâda, 200, 206.
Kuddhakæpæta, 22n.
Kudrära vissaya, 23n.
Kûdûra, 8, 24, 85, 103, 156n., 157n., 158.
Kûdûrahâra, 23n., 24, 86, 158n., 157n., 187.
Kuñjula Kadphises, 59.
Kukura, 49, 53, 62.
Kulaha family, 131n.
Kulañâ-ñâñhâra, 141, 142n.
Kularikas, 113.
Kularikasenâ, 114.
Kumárañâtta, 71.
Kumârawisñu, 164, 187.
Kumbhakarna, 35.
Kûñnâla, 173n.
Kûnûrã, 207.
Kûrâla, 173.
Kûräm plates, 193.
Kuravaka agrahâra, 179.
Kuravastra, 176.
Kûsa, 129.
Kûsâna, 49, 59.
Kuṣâna, 59.
Kuṣânamûla, 118.
Kûta, 182, 183.
Kûti, 118.
Kûṭumûbika (= Kuðubika), 111.
Kûṭumûbini, 98, 111.

L

Lakumari, 176.
Lambodara, 35, 41, 209.
Lekhaka, 83, 113, 160.
Lençûlûra (=-Dençalûru), 200.
Lilâvati, 5, 41, 43.
Lilâvatî, 43.
Limyrike, 29.
Lohûvâñyag, 113.
Lokâvibhâga, 190.

M

Madavi, 89, 100.
Mâdhavavarman I (Visṇukundin), 47, 171, 201ff.
Mâdhavavarman II (Visṇukundin), 188, 204, 205.
Madhucēvora, 137n.
Madhumathana, 123.
Magila Vachiputa, 14, 46.
Maha-Hakusiri (= Hakusiri), 37, 38, 47n.
Mâha-áryaka, 87.
Mahâbhârata, 1, 76, 123n.
Mahâbhogika, 85n.
Mahâbhova, 75ff., 82, 85, 113, 117, 148, 160.
Mahâbhôjî, 78, 80, 98.
Mahâcetiya, 136.
Mahâdanâñyag, 75, 76n., 84, 131, 147, 149ff, 160.
Mahâdanapatisî, 138.
(Ma)hâdeva, 197.
Mahâ-Hakusiri, 37, 38, 47n.
Mahâkârmûdra, 103.
Mahâkâtaka, 113.
Mahâmâta (Mahâmâtra), 32, 87, 88.
Mahânadi, 165.
Mahânavakarma, 120.
Mahâpratihâra, 78n., 84, 149.
Mahârakhtî, 92.
Mahârathî, 9, 27, 46ff., 60, 61, 73n., 75ff., 80, 81, 82, 85, 117, 131, 148, 160.
Mahârathî Cutus, 131.
Mahârathîni, 80, 81n., 82, 85, 98.
Mahâsâmanata, 75, 78, 84, 85.
Mahâsâmphika School, 118, 119, 144.
Mahâsândhîvâgraha, 84.
Mahâsena, 134, 166.
Mahâsenâpati, 15, 24, 71, 75, 78n., 81n., 83ff., 85, 104, 131, 134n., 147, 160.
Mahâsthâvîras, 129.
Mahâtalavaras, 15, 46, 61, 82, 89, 127, 130, 131, 134n., 147, 148ff.
Mahâtaraka, 87.
Mahâvañsa, 22n., 77, 92, 108, 117, 141n.
Mahāvāstu, 145.
Mahāveja, 103.
Mahāvihāra, 142.
Mahāvinasela, 103, 119, 144n.
Mahāvinaselliya, 145.
Mahāvinayavindhara, 144.
Manipravīhanī, 145.
Mahemkhānāja, 103.
Mahendravādhi inscription, 194.
Mahendravarman I, 186, 195n.
Mahendravarman II, 186n.
Mahinda, 141n.
Mahisāsaka (=Mahiśasaka), sect., 118, 143, 144.
Maissola, 2, 17n, 104, 105, 159.
Maissolos, 8, 20.
Majjhima Nikāya, 139n., 145.
Mālidhāra, 113.
Mālidhārīkāgniśtrā, 39.
Māmāda (Māmāla), 100, 103.
Mamālāhāra, 86, 94, 100, 103.
Mambanes (=Nahapāna), 16n., 50, 58.
Mandara, 103.
Mandagora, 109.
Mānemukāda, 103.
Mandasor, 103.
Mangalagiri, 177.
Māngiūr grani, 2n., 163n., 190, 193.
Mānikāra, 113.
Māñjuśrī, 126n.
Māntrāra, 173.
Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, 63n.
Matsya Purāṇa, 29, 49, 67, 128n., 127, 128.
Mattavilāsa Prahasana, 186n., 197.
Māštepi Grant, 190, 197, 198.
Mātukalas, 146.
Maudgalīyayana (Śāraya), 197.
Mayurāra, 187.
Mediniśkośa, 165.
Megasthenes, 2, 22.
Meghasvāti, 11.
Melizagara, 109.
Menander, 92.
Metronymics, 44ff.
Mihireśvara, 183.
Milinda, 94n.
Mitadevanaka, 57n.
Mithākis, 113.
Moda, 96.
Mōtupalle, 105.
Mrōghendra Sātakarni, 34.
Mrghesvarman, 187.
Mudanamida Rājas, 75.
Mudukutala (Senāgapta), 104.
Mugdāsas, 113n.
Mulaka, 53, 62, 129.
Mūlakura bhojaka, 176.
Munḍa, 182.
Mundarāṣṭra, 23n., 181, 190.
Mundūr, 179.
Mūrdraka, 91.
Mūsika, 37.
Mutilik, 182.
Mūtalpattā, 183.
Mūṭha, 182.
Mutuda (Prākṛt Mududa), 182.
Myakadoni (or Jañjīr Guṇḍu inscription), 7, 23n, 24n., 44n., 71, 72, 79n., 84, 85, 87, 126, 153n.

N
Nāgadatta Kosikipputa, 48n.
Nāganikā (=Nāyanikā), 32n.
Nāgārjuna, 62n., 70, 71, 117, 125n., 126n., 146.
Nāgārjunikonda, 125ff.
Nambanes (=Mambanes), 50, 58.
Nandaprabhājanavarman, 164n., 177, 180, 207.
Nandivarman I, 154n., 157n., 166n., 169, 174, 175, 177.
Nandivarman II, 168n., 170, 171n., 174, 178, 179, 184n.
Nārasala (sela?), 103, 110.
Navakaśa, 120.
Navakaśamam, 139n.
Navanarasimha, 210, 215.
Nāyakamīśa, 113.
Nāyanikā, 6, 9, 15n., 32, 33, 36, 77, 111.
Negama, 110, 114n.
Nibandhakāra (Nibandhakāra), 88.
Nigamasahhāra, 110n., 114.
Nīyogas, 181.
Nīyuktas, 181.
Nīyukti, 16.
Nūṟṟuvar Kannar, 35.

O
Odayantrikas, 113.
Odayantrikaseni, 114.

P
Paethan (=Paithān), 107, 108.
Pāgunavara viṣaya, 181n.
Pahlava, 95.
Paithān, 4, 16, 17, 20, 22, 27, 47, 50, 60, 62n., 64, 107n., 109, 117, 121, 157n.
Paithāna, 24, 86, 87.
Paithānapatthā, 24, 118.
Palaepatmae, 109.
Palakkada, 187.
INDEX

17, 22, 24n., 29n., 34, 40n., 41n., 42, 44n., 47n., 54, 55, 56, 60, 61., 62n., 63ff., 68n., 69n., 72, 75, 78, 81, 82, 112, 119, 129, 130, 131n., 161, 162, 209, 210, 211, 214, 215.

Pulumāvi III, 24n., 71, 72, 87, 126, 153n.
Pulumāvi (meaning), 143n.
Puppagiri, 142.
Purāninsāgama, 200.
Puṇṇamaṭalā Yāṇiputra, 108.
Puṅdrasena, 13n.
Puṅnotsantu, 38.
Puṣkar, 50.
Puvamahāvīnaselā, 144.
Puvānasāgama, 109.

R

Rahula, 197.
Rājagiri, 103, 119.
Rājagiriya, 144.
Rājajalipikaras, 84n.
Rājapurūsas, 181.
Rājaśekhara, 42.
Rājatadāka, 86.
Rājatalīka, 86, 118.
Rakkhiha, 137n.
Rāmatīrtha, 102.
Rāmāyana, 1, 108.
(Raṇa)mahāmalla, 187.
Rāstrādhikārakas, 85n.
Rāstrakūta, 183n.
Rathika (Rathika), 27, 75, 76, 77, 84n., 148.
Ratnāpana, 19n.
Ravivarman, 187.
Rudradhara Bhaṭṭārkalā, 135, 136, 138, 140.
Rudrasārman, 207.
Rudra Sātakarni, 14.
Rudrasena II, 128.

S

Śabdaratna, 91.
Sadakana Kalālāya Mahārāthi, 81n., 82.
Saṭakara, 15, 79n.
Sadasevājī, 118.
Saddharma Pundarika, 146.
Sadēyameyō, 81n.
Śādhanaṃdālā, 126n.
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Sāgarapaloganas, 108.
Sagharāma, 121.
Saka era, 211.
Saka-giri, 96.
Sakarukaro, 81n.
Sakarāt, 211.
Sakas, 94ff., 109.
Sakasena Mādhariputa, 10n., 12, 68ff., 109, 113.
Sākha, 102.
Salakenoi, 164, 165.
Sālānakīyana gotra, 151, 154, 163ff.
Sāmalipada, 87n.
Sāmanta, 85n.
Sānapita, 120n.
Sambhu, 184n.
Sānḍhīgirahika, 84.
Samrāt, 132, 133.
Samudrasena Mahāsāmanta Mahā-
rāja, 183.
Sānapoḍhīs, 121.
Sāṅgaha, 11n.
Sapā, 101n.
Sarpa, 101n.
Saptasatakam, 1, 5, 41, 87, 111, 116n., 122, 123, 124.
Sarasipuri, 173n.
Sarasīr, 43.
Saravati Kṣatībharaṇa, 43.
Sarvanātha Mahārāja, 183.
Sarvarvarman Maukhari, 166.
Sāthasceshinī, 181.
Sāthāhani-raththa, 23, 71n.
Sātakani Sīra I, 6, 9, 12n., 20, 28, 28n.,
31, 32ff., 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40n., 41, 64, 75n., 77, 91, 96, 111, 130, 132, 133.
Sātakani II, 37, 38, 41.
Sātakani (Sātakarni) Sīva Sīri, 14,
34, 55, 66, 69, 135n.
Sātakani Vāsāthiputa, 13n., 45, 54, 66,
75, 78, 99, 135n.
Sātakarna, 34.
Sātakarni (meaning), 34ff.
Sātānu, 25.
Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa, 132.
Sātvāhana, 30ff., 170.
Sātvānaspura, 24.
Sātvāhani-hāra, 23, 24, 71, 85, 86.
Sātvādha, 110.
Sātvādhātihā, 110.
Satisiri, 33, 38, 213.
Satsabhāmailla, 188.
Sattan, 31, 35.
Sela-ghara, 140n.
Sela-mandava, 139n.
Selavadhakien, 113.
Seleucus, 92.
Senāgopa, 104.
Śeṅgutṭuvan, 35n.
Seṣṭhin, 110, 114.
Seṣṭhipmukha, 110.
Seuraka, 103.
Shā-ṭo-pō-ha, 70.
Siddhāthikas, 144.
Śīhagoṭhi, 115.
Śīhala-vihāra, 142, 146.
Śilamegha, 43.
Śilappadikāram, 31, 35.
Śīnḥavarman Pallava, 190.
Śīnḥavarman II, 164, 190.
Śīnḥavīṇu, 26.
Śimuka, 6, 19, 20, 27, 28, 29ff., 35, 48n.,
73, 133, 211.
Śimyila, 109.
Śiripavata, 127n.
Śīṣuka (=Śimuka), 30n., 213.
Śivalakura Mādhariputa, 60, 61.
Śivamaka Śada (Sātakani), 30n., 34,
44n., 54, 55, 67ff., 131n., 157n.
Śivāśarmā, 207.
Śivakṣāṇa (Śivamaka Śada), 28n.,
54, 67.
Śiva-Skandavarman, 1, 22, 71n., 106,
132, 151, 152n., 153n., 156, 157,
158-171, 172, 174n.
Śiyamāngalam, 194.
Śkanda Sātakarni, 210.
Śkandāsvatī, 71.
Śkandastambha, 38.
Śkandavarman, 166n., 171, 179.
Śodāsa, 55, 56.
Śodrāņa, 81n.
Śopāra (=Soupara, Sopāraka), 108,
117, 118.
Śopāraka (Sopāraka), 79n., 101, 102,
103, 108, 123.
Śopārahāra, 86.
Śopariṇa, 81n.
Śōthikapataś, 116.
Śravaṇa Śrīma, 47, 132.
Śrī-Kākulaṇī, 5, 18.
Śṛṅgala dviṣa, 43.
Śṛīparvata, 125, 126n.
Śṛīparvatavāmi, 184, 201.
Śṛipārvatī, 125, 126n., 128.
Śṛirangai plates, 3.
Śṛiśailam, 125, 126n.
Śhaviras, 120.
Śhavirāvdas, 144.
Śubodhikā, 148.
Śudisana, 102.
Śupāra (Sopāra, Supāra), 26, 117.
Śuraśṭra, 58, 92.
Śuratha (Surāstra), 49, 53, 63.
Śutta-Piṭaka, 146.
Śuṇamākara, 88n., 113.
Śuvarna, 59, 112n.
Śuvarnamukha, 102, 104, 123.
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T
Telaiyārī, 148.
Telavāra, 148.
Telavargi, 149.
Telavātsaka, 149.
Telavāvyā, 148.
Telāyārikam, 148n.
Tāntīkona (Tānīkona), 194, 195n.
Tāranātha, 125n., 126n.
Taravāra, 149.
Telīngāna, 2.
Tēr (=Thair), 107.
Tēsavārās, 113.
Tēsavärasenī, 114.
Tēvījās, 120.
Tēnāka, 121.
Tiśatas, 53, 136.
Tilapakasakas, 113.
Tilapakasensēni, 114.
Tirānu (= Trirāsini), 95, 102, 189.
Tirānuvāpata, 102n.
Tissa Moggaliputta, 141n.
Toṭālūra, 103.
Tomuku district, 104.
Ton-nā-kle-tse-śina, 24, 126n., 142n., 144n., 197.
Tōṇdaiśaṃālaṁ, 187.
Tranakayiro Mahaśāraṁ, 9, 32, 33, 38, 77.
Trīkāṇḍāshēṣa, 165.
Trīkūṭā (=Trirāsini), 200.
Trīkūṭaparvata (Trirāsini), 189.
Trīlingāsūṛaśanām, 18.
Tripīta, 120.
Tripūrāntaka, 183.
Trivikrama, 19.
Turūḷu, 103.
Tūsāspha Yavana, 92.

U
Umavarma, 180.
Uparakara, 81n.
Upathānaśāla, 118, 121.
Usābhānaka, 57n., 111.
Usāvadāta, 11, 17, 22n., 42, 49n., 51, 55, 56, 57, 58n., 59, 64, 65, 88, 91; 94; 95; 101; 102; 107n., 110n., 112, 114, 119, 123, 130n., 153n., 212, 213.
Uttiyābhaḥhīs, 120.
Uttarapatha, 7.

V
Vācaspātya, 113n.
Vadaliṅkā, 103.
Vadhalcti, 113.
Vadugar, 2.
Vadugavali, 2.
H.A.—30
Vaiśjayanti, 61, 62, 75, 107n., 137n., 138.
Vaiśjayantipura, 168n.
Vaimgeyakas, 163ff.
Vallabhā, 181.
Vāṃśikī Śatras, 19.
Vāluraka, 103, 109.
Vānāvaśaka Mahārāsā, 137.
Vānāvaśa (=Vānāvaśa), 137n.
Vānījaka (=Vanija), 91, 110n.
Vānījika, 98, 110.
Vānapatii, 159.
Vārahaputra, 48n.
Vas, 117, 118, 121.
Vāṣṭiputa, 45, 46.
Vāyū Puruṣa, 20, 22, 23, 29, 30n., 32, 38, 127, 129.
Vedaśiri, 213.
Vedisiri, 15, 33, 36, 122, 213, 214.
Veiṣayanti, 62, 109, 118.
Veḷāmīta Vāṣṭiputta, 45.
Veḷagiri, 103.
Veṅkt, 2, 105, 129, 165, 167, 173, 175, 177, 180.
Veṅgidesa, 2, 177, 181n., 197.
Veṅgimandalaṁ, 2, 173n., 177.
Veṅginādu, 2.
Veṅgipura, 163, 165, 167, 168n., 17.
Veṅgirācchitra, 177.
Veṅgorācchitra, 2, 176.
Vepuraka, 71.
Vetarakaṭā, 89.
Vidarba, 63, 126n.
Vide (de)tūrapallika, 178.
Vihāragaona, 103.
Vijaya, 79n.
Vijayanikā, 79n.
Vijayakhaṁdāvāra, 157n.
Vijayananāṁda, 43.
Vijayapura, 110, 127n.
Vijayapuru, 127, 159.
Vikramāditya, 49, 209.
Vikramahendra, 207.
Vikramendra, 207.
Vikramendraravaman I, 179, 186n., 207.
Vikramendraravaman II, 207, 208.
Vilembali, 205, 206.
Villivāyakura Gotamiputra, 60.
Villivāyakura Vāṣṭiputra, 39, 60.
Vinayapāknī, 130n., 134n.
Vinadhyaśakti, 128.
Vinhusiri, 147.
Vinukonche, 107n., 201.
Vippaḷa (Virparu), 157n.
Viramīna, 67, 128n., 135n.
Viramīnaka, 67, 128n.
Virapura, 103.
Virapurasadāta Mahārāṣṭraputra, 8, 96, 128ff., 132n., 133n., 134, 135ff.
Viraravarna, 47, 174n.
Viripara, 103, 157n.
Virpara (=Viripara), 157n.
Virūpakhapati, 134.
Virūpakhapati, 85n., 159, 181.
Viṣṇudattī, 32n., 95, 96, 97.
Viṣṇukaḍa Cūṭukulānanda Sātakarnī, 34n.
Viṣṇukunda (d)adhikāra, 205.
Viṣṇugopavarmān Yuvamahārāja, 164, 179, 179.
Viṣṇugṛhasāmin, 179, 184n.
Viṣṇukundīna, 188, 200ff.
Viṣṇu Purāṇa, 22, 23, 48n., 62n., 129.
Viṣṇupata, 159, 180n.
Vudhika, 95, 102.

Wima Kadphises, 166.

X

Xathroi, 48.

Y

Yaña Sātakani Śiri (Sams. Śri-Yajña Sātakarnī), 10, 13, 14, 23, 31; 34; 44n., 54, 56, 69, 70, 71, 81n., 86, 87n., 99, 105, 109, 112, 122, 126, 130n., 135n., 138, 152n., 209, 211, 214.
Yaśodharman, 166.
Yavana (Yona), 1, 76, 92ff., 94.
Yāsmotika, 52.
Yue-gnai (Śri-Yaña), 209.
Yugopradhāna-svarūpa, 16.
ILLUSTRATIONS

Plates II, IV-2 and VIII-1 are reproduced with the kind permission of Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, Director-General of Archaeology of India.
(1) A new inscription from the Caiyana Cave—Kārlā

(2) A silver coin of Vāsiśtiputa Siri-Sātakani—enlarged 2½ times.
Remains of the reliefo figures and the inscriptions above them
—Nāneghāt cave.
(1) Nāgārjunikonda Valley

(2) Remains of the vihāra on the Nāharāḷlabōdu mound
(1) Remains of the mandapa east of the Mahācaitya founded in the fifteenth year of Virapurisādāta.

(2) A coin of Siva Siri-Āpilaka
(1) Monastery on a mound (Great Dhammagiri) to the N.W. of Nāharāllābōdu

(2) The Mahācetiya—Nāgārjunikonḍa.
(3) The Mahācetiya—Nāgārjunikonda.

(4) Another view of the monastery on the mound N. W. of Nāhārāllabōdu
(1) Sculptured beams from Stupa No. 6—Nāgarjunikonda.

(2) Sculptured beams from Stupa No. 6—Nāgarjunikonda
(3) Apsidal temple by the side of the Mahācetiya—Nāgārjunikonda

(4) Another view of same
Stupa slabs from Stupa No. 6—Nagarjunakonda.

Fragment of a statue of the Buddha—Nagarjunakonda.
(1) The Nāneghāṭ cave in which the long sacrificial inscription is incised.

(2) Kārlā Cetiya Cave; X marks the new inscription.
(1) Sinhastambha—Kārlā Cetiya cave.

(2) Sculptures at the entrance to the Cetiya cave—Kārlā.
(1) Three-storeyed vihāra—Kārlā

(2) Mahāyānist sculptures in cave No. 24—Nāsik
(1) Medals and medallions on a pillar in the Queen's Cave—Nāsik.

(2) Queen's Cave—Nāsik
(1) Cave of the time of Kanha Sātavāhana—Nāsik

(2) Cetiya Cave—Nāsik.