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PREFACE

The early history of Peninsular India beyond the great barrier of mountain and forest that separates the vast Indo-Gangetic plain from the valleys of the Godavari, Krishna and the Kaveri has been dealt with by many scholars, notably Fleet, Rice, Bhandarkar and Debreuil. But the paucity of data stood in the way of an adequate treatment of the period that intervened between the disintegration of the Sātavāhana monarchy and the rise of the Imperial Calukyas. The three odd centuries that separated the last great Sātavāhana from the first Pulakesin has been regarded by Smith as a "Blank in history." As early as 1895, Sir R. G. Bhandarkar observed that for some three centuries after the extinction of the Andhra (i.e. Sātavāhana) dynasty "we have no specific information about the dynasties that ruled over the country (i.e. the Deccan)." Smith observed in 1924, "It is still true to say that practically the political history of the Deccan begins in the middle of the sixth century with the rise of the Chalukya dynasty" (E Hist. Ind., 4th ed., p. 440). My aim has been to bridge the gulf between the Sātavāhana and the Calukya periods. The plan and purpose of the present volume have been explained in the Introduction, and little more need be said by way of a Preface. It will be seen that the author deals with the successors of the Sātavāhanas, who held sway in the vast region of the Deccan, mainly inhabited by the Telugu and Kanarese speaking peoples, before the foundation of the Calukya empire. It is contemplated to publish another volume which will be concerned with the dynasties that rose on the ruins of the Sātavāhana empire in the north.

In the present volume, I have tried to develop some of the views expressed in my monographs and papers previously published. Results of most recent investigations
have been incorporated in the Addenda et Corrigenda. My thanks are due to Dr. S. P. Mookerjee, the illustrious Vice-Chancellor of Calcutta University (1934-38), and to Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri, Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University. The encouragement of Dr. Mookerjee and the valuable suggestions of Prof. Raychaudhuri have been of great help to me in writing the following pages. My acknowledgments are also due to Mr. J. Chakravorti, Registrar, Calcutta University, and to Mr. D. Ganguli, Superintendent of the Calcutta University Press.

Calcutta University,
20th December, 1938.

D. C. Sircar
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country, that is to say, beyond the Telugu-speaking area. In the western part, the Cuṭṭu Śātakarni branch of the Śātavāhana dynasty is known to have ruled over the country which had Banavāst (in the North Kanara district) for its capital, that is to say, over the northern part of the modern Kannarese-speaking area.

The Andhra people and their country are mentioned many times in literature; but history of the Andhra region, based on epigraphic evidence, only begins from the third century B.C., i.e., the time of the Maurya emperor Aśoka. At the time of Aśoka, Lower Deccan formed a part of the Maurya empire and the Maurya frontier certainly extended in the south as far as the Pennar river near Nellore, as only the Tamil kingdoms of the Ceras, Colas and the Pāṇḍyas have been distinguished as pramanita (border state) from the vijita (dominions) of the king, and as Aśokan inscriptions have been found on rocks as far south as the Chitaldrug district of Mysore. The Andhras are mentioned in the thirteenth Rock Edict of Aśoka in the list of subordinate peoples that lived in the dominions (ādha rāja-visayaṁthi) of the king. After the strength of the Maurya empire had waned, the people of Andhradeśa appears to have assumed independence.

A king named Kubiraka (=Kubera) has been mentioned in two inscriptions discovered at Bhattiprolu in the Repalle taluka of the Guntur district (Lüders, List, Nos. 1335, 1338). According to Bühler (J.R.A.S., 1892, p. 602), the Bhattiprolu inscriptions belong to the period immediately following that of Aśoka, i.e., to about 200 B.C. It is therefore possible that king Kubiraka fought successfully with the weak successors of Aśoka who died sometime before 230 B.C., and liberated the Andhra country from the Maurya yoke. Unfortunately we know next to nothing about this king.

In Mahābhārata, Kubera is called the "calf" of the Pūrṇa-panā (the Yakṣa), attendant of Kubera (Hopkins, Epic Mythology, p. 148).
Epigraphy is silent as regards the Andhra country for a long time after Kubiraka. Only about the second century of the Christian era we find the country occupied by kings belonging to the family known in epigraphy as the Sātavāhana. A number of coins and inscriptions of the Later Sātavāhanas has been discovered in the Andhra region. The most powerful among them were Vasiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi and Gautamiputra Yajña Satakarni. The date of these kings is a disputed question; but two points seem certain in this respect. (1) King Vasiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi could not be far removed in time from (but was possibly for some time a contemporary of) the Śaka Satrap Rudradāman who is known to have ruled from c. 130 to c. 150 A.D. The mention of Baithana (Baithana in the Aurangabad district) as the capital of Siriptolemaios (siript-Pulumāvi, contemporary of Tiastēnes = Caṣṭana who for some time ruled conjointly with his grandson Rudradāman) by Ptolemy (c. 140 A.D.) is also very important in ascertaining the date of Vasiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi in about the middle of the second century A.D. (2) According to the evidence of palaeography, there could not have been a great interval between the reign of Pulumāvi and that of Yajña. The suggestion of Krishnasastri that the second year of Candra Sāti (a successor of Yajña) is equivalent to A.D. 210 is also important in this connection. It is therefore very probably certain that Yajña ended his rule not long after A.D. 200, and Yajña was the last great king of his dynasty (see infra, Sections I and III of the chapter on the Pallavas).

The local ruling families of South-Eastern Deccan either ruling as subordinate rulers or governors, such as the Sālaṅkāyanas, Bṛhatphalāyanas, Pallavas and the Ikṣvakus who remained loyal to the Śatavāhanas at the time of Pulumāvi and Yajña Satakarni appear to have gradually raised their head and supplanted the weak successors of Yajña. From
palaeographic consideration it appears that the Ikśvākus were the first to grow powerful in the Kistna-Guntur region and to throw off Sātavāhana suzerainty about the third decade of the third century. The performance of Āsvamedha, Vājapeya and other Vedic sacrifices by the Ikśvāku king Cāṃtamūla I clearly shows that the Ikśvākus were no longer feudatory to the Sātavāhanas who were therefore ousted from the Kistna-Guntur area before the time of this king. The successors of the Ikśvākus in the sovereignty of this area appear to have been the Brhatphalāyanas and the Pallavas. The Pallavas became very powerful about the end of the third and beginning of the fourth century. The earliest Pallava epigraphs which appear to belong to the first half of the fourth century show that the Pallavas were at the time master of Andhrāpatha as well as the Bellary region. Pallava headquarters in the Andhra country at the time of Śivaskandavarman, a performer of Āsvamedha and other sacrifices, were at Dhamāñakada (Dbānyaakaṭaka). Their supremacy in Andhradeśa appears to have broken down owing to the rise of the Śalaṅkāyanas of Veṅgi (W. Godavari district) and the Ānandas of Kandarapura (Guntur district). Devavarman, the Śalaṅkāyana performer of the Āsvamedha sacrifice, possibly reigned not long after Pallava Śivaskandavarman. The evidence of the Kanteru plates proves that the Later Śalaṅkāyanas became master of much of the territories that were once under the Ikśvākus, Brhatphalāyanas and the Pallavas. After the collapse of the Śalaṅkāyana power, the Visnukundins gradually became master of the whole of Andhradeśa. When the Calukyas established themselves at Piṣṭapura in the beginning of the seventh century, the Visnukundins appear to have struggled hard with them for existence. But gradually their power collapsed and the country passed to the possession of the Calukyas.

It must not however be thought that these dynasties appeared one after another on the political stage of the
Andhra country. The Śālaṅkāyanas, as we shall see, were most probably in possession of the district round Veṅgi even in the age of Ptolemy (c. 140), when the Śatavāhanas were apparently the suzerain of Andhra-deśa. The Greek geographer possibly also refers to the capital of the Bṛhat-phalāyanas in the present Masulipatam area. Excepting the Viṣṇukūrṇīs, all the earlier dynasties that reigned in South-Eastern Deccan after the Śatavāhanas seem to have ruled more or less contemporaneously.

In Part I of the present volume, I have given an account of the Ikṣvākus, Bṛhatphalāyanas, Ṭanandas, Śālaṅkāyanas and the Viṣṇukūrṇīs. I have also dealt with the Pallavas who were for some time the supreme power in Andhra-deśa.

In Part II of this volume, I have tried to give an account of the dynasties that succeeded the Śatavāhanas in the western part of Lower Deccan. From the breakdown of the Cūtu Śātakarni power up to the rise of the Caṅkayas, the principal ruling dynasty in South-Western Deccan was that of the Kadambas. I have not included in this account the history of the Gaṅgas and the Bāṇas who ruled from places far to the south of the country ruled by the Śatavāhanas. I have included however the Kekayas who ruled in the northern part of Mysore, which most probably formed a part of the later Śatavahana dominions. Since my account is limited in circa 200-650 A.D., I have not discussed a few minor feudatory families (e.g., the Sendrakas) whose early history is wrapped up in obscurity.

In placing this work before students of Indian history, I humbly request them to consider the new points I have been able to light upon in these pages. I have tried to establish a relation between the two known Ṭananda kings on the basis of the passage hirmaṇagairbh-odbhac-odbhava of the Mattepad plates. I have also tried to settle the genealogy and chronology of the Śālaṅkāyanas and the Viṣṇukūrṇīs, in which, as
I have shown, mistakes have been made permanent by previous writers. The theory of the existence of a king called Sana in the Kistna district in the second or third century A.D. has been discussed and found to be untenable. The date of Pallava Sivaskandavarman has been fixed on the basis of the gradual development of inscriptional Prakrit in early South Indian inscriptions. In dealing with the [Early] Pallavas and the [Early] Kadambas, I have tried not to be led astray from the terra firma of solid facts by that eagerness for theorising which is so common among certain recent writers on the early history of those dynasties. The real significance of the passage hiranyagarbha-odbhava has been correctly pointed out. In interpreting terms like āyukta, vallabha, hastikāśa, vyāpyaḥ adhikāra-purusa and others, I have spared no pains to utilise epigraphic as well as lexicographic and classical literature to the full. I have also made full use of the Epic, Purānic and Smṛti literature in explaining passages like avasita-viridha-dīcya, hiranyagarbha and others.
PART I

EASTERN DISTRICTS
CHAPTER I
THE IKŚVĀKUS

I

THE SOUTHERN IKŚVĀKUS.

Some Prakrit 
inscriptions of the Ikśvākus of Eastern Deccan have been discovered at Jaggayyapetta in the Nandi-
gram taluka of the Kistna district (Ind. Ant., XI, p. 257 ff.), and at Nagarjunikonda in the Palnad taluka
of the Guntur district (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 1 ff.) of the Madras Presidency. Formerly, Burgess expressed the
opinion that these inscriptions belong to about the 3rd or 4th century A.D. "but are probably earlier." Bühler
and, following him, Vogel who has recently edited the Nagarjunikonda inscriptions ascribe the Ikśvāku records to
the 3rd century of the Christian era. Like all early Prakrit inscriptions, the Nagarjunikonda and Jaggayyapetta
records of the Ikśvākus express compound consonants with single letters. This characteristic shows that these records
are earlier than the Early Pallava grants which express double or conjunct consonants by more than one letter and appear to
belong to about the first quarter of the 4th century A.D. (see my views in Ind. Cult., I, p. 498 ff.; Journ. Ind. Hist.,
XIII, p. 297 ff.; and infra). The Ikśvāku inscriptions, therefore, almost certainly belong to about the middle and
second half of the 3rd century A.D. (vide infra).

1 Regarding the language of the Nagarjunikonda records, Stan Konow observes
(Ep. Ind., XX, p. 26), "We are faced with a normalised semi-literary Prakrit, used
by people whose home-tongue was Dravidian, and probably Kannada. If I am right,
we should a priori be inclined to infer that the Ikśvākus had come to the Kistna
country from the West."
Ikṣvāku as the name of a king possibly occurs once in the Rgveda (X. 60.4). The word there may, however, be also taken as an epithet of the name of another person, Asamāṭi, whom the Jāminiyabrāhmaṇa (III. 167), Bṛhaddevatā (VII. 35 ff.), etc., take to be an Ikṣvāku prince. Ikṣvāku in the Atharvaveda (XIV. 39.9) seems to be regarded as an ancient hero. According to Macdonell and Keith (Ved. Ind., s.v.) the Ikṣvākus were originally a branch of the Puru family. Zimmer places them (Alt. Leben, pp. 104, 130) on the Upper Indus; the Vedic Index, however, thinks that the Ikṣvākus may well have been somewhat further east even in the Vedic period. Later Ikṣvākus are connected chiefly with Ayodhyā, the capital of the Kośala janapada. We have long lists of Ikṣvāku kings in the Purāṇas and the epics. But we do not know of any relation between the Ikṣvākus of Ayodhyā and the Ikṣvākus of the Madras Presidency. Were the Southern Ikṣvākus a branch of the famous Ikṣvāku family of Northern India, which migrated and eventually carved out a principality in Eastern Deccan?

It is possible that the epithet ikhāku-rāja-pravara-risi-satapahava-camsa-sambhava, applied to Lord Buddha in an inscription of the Southern Ikṣvāku king Virapurisadata, refers to a claim of the king to belong to the same family as the Lord who, according to traditions, belonged to the famous Ikṣvāku family of Kośala (Majjhima-Nikāya, II. 124). It is also interesting to note that the Southern Ikṣvākus were matrimonially related to the Southern Kekayas, as indeed, according to the Rāmāyana, the Ikṣvākus of Ayodhyā were to the Kekayas of Girivrajā in the Punjab. But, in considering the question of the relation between the Northern and the Southern Ikṣvākus, we have also to remember the views of Caldwell regarding the nature of the Aryanisation.

1 Cf. also Saka-rupa-pratishchanam varaṁ yassam = ca sakrire, tasmād = ikṣvāku-samāpār = te bhūṁ tākyā = iti smeṭāḥ (Avaghoṣa, Saundaranandakārya, I. 29).
of South India. "The Aryan immigrants to the South," he says, "appear to have been Brahmanical priests and instructors, rather than Kshatriya soldiers, and the kings of the Pândyas, Cholas, Kalingas, and other Dravidians, appear to have been chiefly Dravidian chieftains whom their Brahmanical preceptors and spiritual directors digni-
fi ed with Aryan titles, and taught to imitate and emulate the grandeur and cultivated tastes of the Solar, Lunar and the Agnikula races of kings" (Comp. Gramm., 2nd ed., Intro., p. 115). This view is certainly correct in some cases. As we know, the Hadis of Mymensingh (Bengal), a tribe closely allied to the Garos, have, only the other day, been allowed to wear uparita and to bear the ancient and illustrious name of the Hailhaya Íśatriyas. It is therefore not easy to determine whether the Southern Ikşvākus were actually Aryan immigrants from the north (which is not impossible) or a Hinduised aboriginal family of rulers who appropriated the name of the most glorious royal family of ancient India. The question is, moreover, a little further

1 It is to be noticed that at present the population of Eastern and Southern India is generally divided into four but only into two nāgaras, viz., Brāhmaṇa and Śūdra. In Eastern India the latter, however, now come on use when obdly likes to remain a Śūdra. For a list of aboriginal tribes claiming the status of Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya, see Census of India, 1931, Vol. V (Bengal and Sikkim) Pt. I. pp. 66-27. It, however, the Ágaria are Ugra-Kṣatriya, the Bāgdis are Vṛṇg-Kṣatriya, the Namāh Śūdras are Namō Brāhmaṇa and the Nāpila are Nāl (or Scvity) Brāhmaṇa, as we have it there in the list, may not the Musulmans, Christians and the Japanese (or Javanese) as well claim to be called Musulma-Kṣatriya, Kliṣṭa (or Kṛṣṇa)-Kṣatriya and Yavana-Brahmaṇa respectively?

2 The extension of the name of "Kūlā," where the Ikşvākus ruled, over the modern Raigarh-Bilaspur-Sambalpur region in the Dakṣiṇāpatha (cf. kālakāla-mahendra mentioned as a dakṣiṇāpatha-piṣā in the Allahabad pillar inscription) and the tradition recounting the establishment of Kūla, son of the Ikşvāku hero Bōma, at Kukkavati to the south of the Vindhyas and the Kava (Rāghavaśāstra, XVI. 31) probably go to prove a southerly course of Ikşvāku expansion. According to the Vāyu Purāṇa (99, 100), Kūla ruled over Kōla with his capital at Kukasthali or Kukavati built upon the Vindhyas precipice. It may also be noticed that the southern kingdoms of Āśana and Malaka (or the Godāvarī) were traditionally known to have been founded by two Ikşvāku princes named Āśana and Malaka (Vāyu Pur., 88, 177-80). The history of the Ikşvāku...
complicated by the points brought to our notice by Przyłuski in an interesting paper in the Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique, 1926, p. 83.\footnote{An English translation of this paper is to be found in P. C. Bagchi's Pre-Aryan and Pre-Draconian in India, Calcutta University, 1929.}

The Sanskrit word ḍvāku means "gourd." It is interesting that some Austro-Asiatic peoples call themselves issue either of a gourd or a melon, of which every seed gave birth to a man (Bonifacy, Cours d'ethnographie indo-chinois, p. 45; Cochbrame, The Shanis, I, p. 120). This myth seems to have passed into Indian tradition, in which Sumati, queen of king Sagara of Ayodhya (to whom 60,000 sons were promised), gave birth to a gourd, and from that gourd came out 60,000 children (Rām., I, 38; Mahābhā., III, 106; Bhāg. Pur., IX, 88). The Austro-Asiatic myth of gourd-ancestor seems to have been transmitted in the legends of Sumati and Ikṣvāku who have been placed at Ayodhya. But as is often the case in Indian literature, it appears that, in the second case, the authors have modified the myth for

Kekayas, Mālavas, Śibis, Guttas, Mauryas and the Atmakas and stories of the sons of Visvāmitra, and of Hāma, Vijaya, the sage Bāvari and others may all be very important in dealing with the Aryanisation of Southern India. But while we have reliable evidence of the migration of the Mālavas (= Malay of the Greeks; on the lower valley of the Rāi in Alexander's time) and the Śibis (= Sobi of the Greeks; in Alexander's time in the Shukot region of the Jiang district, Punjab), and also of the Mauryas and the Guttas, from north to south—there is no satisfactory evidence as regards the migration of the other families or tribes. The mention of the Mālayas (= Mālavas) as living in the vicinity of Poiskāra (near Ajmere) in an inscription ofRARADĀTā (Ind. Ant., 1918, p. 10), the find of coins with legend Mālaranāśi jayāḥ in the southern part of the Jaipur State (Rapson, Indian Coins, \(\text{\textsection}\) 81; and the name of the modern province of Mālāvā, prove conclusively the southerly course of the Mālavas. As regards the Śibis, we may, however, challenge the authority of the tradition recorded in the Dājakmañjarī (Madhya, Ch. VI) about their settlement on the Kāvari and their connection with the greater Cūna as is claimed in the Udavendrāma plates (S. I, 11, 11, p. 392); but the discovery of their coins at Negari leaves no doubt that the Śibi tribe marched at least as far south as the Chitorgarh district of Rajputana. It can hardly be doubted that the Mauryas of Konkan and the Guttas (= Guttas) of Guttala were branches respectively of the famous imperial dynasties of those names that ruled at Pātaliptu. The cases of the other tribes or families however, though not impossible, cannot be proved at the present state of our knowledge.
the sake of ennobling it. The epic poets could not be pleased with the idea that a gourd had given birth to a glorious dynasty. Ikṣvāku, which properly means a gourd in Sanskrit, appears, therefore, to have been personified as a hero, son of Vaivasvata Manu (Rām., I. 70, vs. 20-21; Mahābhārata, I, 75, vs. 31-40) or of Sage Gautama (Rockhill, Life of the Buddha, pp. 10-11). In a story of the Dul-va, analysed by Rockhill, attempt has been made to explain the name Ikṣvāku by the fact that the children of the sage Gautama were found in a field of sugarcane (iṣku).

If we think, now, that the Ikṣvākus were originally an Aryan tribe, this Austro-Asiatic influence possibly shows that they were closely connected with the aborigines of the country, wherein there was a strong Austro-Asiatic element, and consequently shared some of their beliefs and traditions. Relation, matrimonial and otherwise, of Aryan ruling families with the aborigines is frequently illustrated in the epic and the Purānic literature. That the Aryan families which migrated to South India had to accept some aboriginal customs is also clear from the fact that very early authorities on smṛti had to acknowledge and distinguish between the Aryan customs of Northern and those of Southern India. Baudhāyana, who lived long before Christ¹ and is a very great authority, speaks in his Dharmasūtra (I, ii, 1-4) of mātulq-pitrvesvar-dulhitr-gamanā (i.e., sexual relation with daughters of mother’s brother and father’s sister) as an established custom in the South. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Ikṣvāku king Vīrapurisadatta had, among others, three queens who were the daughters of his father’s sisters.²

¹ According to Bihlar (Ind. Stud., No. III, p. 18 ff.) the date of the Śūtras of Baudhāyana is the sixth century B.C. Keith however thinks that they are of a somewhat later date (Comm. Hist. Ind., I, p. 140, note 9).

² Instances of marriage with the daughter of one’s maternal uncle may be found in the history of the Rāṣṭrakūta kings of the Deccan. Rāṣṭrakūta II married Laksānī, daughter of his vādula Rāṣṭraviraha Sañkaragaṇa; Rāṣṭrakūta Indra III also married Vījāmba,
It has been suggested that the capital of the Southern Ikṣvākus was probably at Dhānyakaṭaka and that "the remains of Nagarjunikonda can possibly represent the ancient capital of Dhaññakaṭaka which archaeologists have sought both at Dharaniṅkoṭa near Amarāvatī and at Bezvāḍa." But the remains seem to represent a city called Vijayapurī.

It must be noticed that the country, which according to the evidence of the Nagarjunikonda and Jaggayyapetta inscriptions appears to have belonged to the Ikṣvākus in about the middle of the 3rd century A.D., is known to have belonged to the Sātavāhanas in the 2nd century. After the decline of the Ikṣvākus, this region passed into the hands of the Pallavas of Kaṇcī. The Mayidavolu (Guntur district) Prakrit grant (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 86) of the Pallava Yuvamahārāja Sivaskandavarman, records an order of the Yuvamahārāja to the vāpata (vyāprta, i.e., governor) of Dhamañakada (Dhānyakaṭaka) to execute the grant of a village called Viripāra situated in the Andhāpatha (Andhrāpatha). Another Prakrit grant of the same age belonging to the reign of the Pallava king vijaya-Skandavarman was discovered in the Guntur district. According to Prof. Dubreuil, king vijaya-Skandavarman of this inscription is the same as the Yuvamahārāja Sivaskandavarman of the Mayidavolu grant. Whatever the identification be worth (vide infra), it is clear that the Ikṣvākus were ousted from the Kistna-Guntur region by the Pallavas of Kaṇcī.

We cannot neglect to mention in this connection the rise of the Brhatphalāyanas in the district round Masulipatam. It is, however, certain that the weak successors of the great Cāṃtamūla and his son Viraprisadata were finally swept away by the Pallavas of Kaṇcī at about the end of the 3rd century A.D. But it is quite possible that the rise of the daughter of his mātā Ammapāḷivera (Anāpara) of the Kalacuri family (H. N. History of the Rashtrakutas, pp. 77-80). The custom is prevalent in the Deccan even at the present time.
Bṛhatphalāyanas had a large share in weakening the power of the Ikṣvākus.

An inscription of about the 5th century A.D. (Ep. Carnat., XI, p. 142), discovered at Anaji in the Davanegere taluka of the Chitaldrug district (Mysore), speaks of a Kekaya prince, named Sivanandavarman who claims, for his family, matrimonial connection with the saintly kings of the Ikṣvāku line. *Cf.* parama-māheśvarah mātā-pitr-pādabhaktah ātreya-gotraḥ soma-carmā-odbhavah ikṣvākukhir=api rājārṣhibhiḥ kṛt-āvāha-vivāhanāṁ kekayānāṁ kule jātah sivanandavarmā. This fact possibly goes to show that the Ikṣvāku dynasty lingered long as a ruling power, though unimportant in comparison with the neighbouring royal families.
Genealogical Table of the Ikṣvākus.

Mahārāja: Cāṃtamūla I,
c. 233 - c. 240 A.D.; + Mādhari

Mahātālāvara, Mahādānapatīrī Cāṃtisāiri + Mahārenā
petī, Mahātālāvara Khampāsāiri of the Pēklya family

Haṃmasāiri

Rājā [Mahārāja] Virāpurisādata,
c. 240 - c. 266 A.D.; + Mahādevi Bhaṭṭidēvi; + Rudradharm-bhaṭṭa-
rihā, daughter of the king of Ujjain; + daughter of Cāṃtisāiri;
+ Bāpsāiri, daughter of Haṃmasāiri; + Chaṭhisāri, daughter of
Haṃmasāiri

Mahātālāvara Aūjāvi-
Cāṃtisāiri + Mahārenā
petī, Mahādānapatīrī
pata Khampāsāri
khampāsāri of the
Dhanaka family.

Daughter +
King Virāpurisā
data.

Khampāsāgarasp-
ṣaka.

Bāpsāiri + King
Virāpurisādata

Chaṭhisāri +
Virāpurisādata

Rājā [Mahārāja]
Khurūla Cāṃtamūla II,
c. 265 - c. 276 A.D.

Kodabalisāiri + Mahā-
rāja of Bansvāsaka.
II

Cântamûla I.1

Only three kings of the Ikṣvāku family of Eastern Deccan are so far known. The first of them is Mahārāja Vāsiṣṭhiputra Cântamûla. We have not yet any inscription of the time of this king. But from the epithets applied to his name in the inscriptions of his son and grandson, he appears to have been a very great and powerful monarch.

Vâsiṣṭhiputra Ikṣvāku Cântamûla is credited with the performance of the agnihotra, agniṣṭoma, vâjapeya and aśvamedha sacrifices. It must be noted that the Vâjapeya and Aśvamedha sacrifices could be performed only by very powerful kings. According to the Satapatha-Brâhmāna (V. 1, 1, 13)2 the performance of the former bestowed on the performer a superior kind of kingship called sâmrâjya, while

---

1 Possibly Sanskrit Sântamûla. In this connection may be noticed the change of ñ into c in the name of two kings of the Kulama family of Goa. The name Śêṣthu or Śaṣṭhadeva has in those cases the Prakrit forms Caṭṭa, Caṭṭala, Caṭṭaya and Ceṭṭaya (Bomb. Gaz., I, Pt. II, p. 567). Sten Konow for this reason is inclined to take Cântamûla as a Prakrit form of Sanskrit Kântamûla (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 26). It must also be remembered that Tamil, a typical Dravidian language, has no letter in its alphabet corresponding to the ñ of Sanskrit, and that Sanskrit ñ is generally represented in Tamil by ç; e.g., Sanskrit puṇa = Tamil pên; S. çatra = T. çattara; S. asukha = T. cattakam; etc. This is due possibly to the fact that Sanskrit ñ is represented in Prakrit by ç which again is almost identical in sound with Dravidian c. Cf. Kuḷâcarma for Kuḷâcarman in the Ulayendram grant of Nandivarman Pallava (Ep. Ind., III, p. 142). Sometimes ñ is represented by çh in Prakrit, e.g., S. Šasa = Pali shuña. The word Šasa has sometimes been mentioned in Indian literature, e.g., in the Gârgâmbhidha, as Caka (J.B.O.R.S. XIV, p. 48). Dr. Barnett however suggests to me that the name Cântamûla is derived from some unknown Dravidian word and has no connection with Sanskrit.

2 Cf. rája cau râjâsûyën-çêṭhâ bhunati, samâdhi- râjâsûyën-åcâyam hi raja- naraṇya sâmrâjyaṁ, kâmaçetu cau rája samâdhi bhunati (Pāli, Br., V. 1, 1, 13); see also Raychaudhuri, Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., 2nd ed., p. 103, and Appendix below.
the Rājaśāya conferred merely the ordinary royal dignity called rājya. According to the Āpastamba Śrauta-sūtra (XX, i. 1), only the sārceabhāuma kings (rājā) could perform the Aśvamedha sacrifice. King Cāṁtamūla, therefore, could not have been a weak ruler, subordinate to some Sātavāhana emperor. The celebration of Aśvamedha by the Ikṣvāku king possibly shows his success against a Sātavāhana overlord. Cāṁtamūla is also said to have been a giver of crores of gold, thousands of cows (or bullocks) and thousands of ploughs. The king was evidently a Brahmanical Hindu. The deity he was devoted to is mentioned as vīrūpākṣa-pati-mahāsenā. It may be noted that the Kadambas and the Calukyas also referred to their families, in their inscriptions, as mahāsenā-parigṛhita. Mahāsenā (Skanda), in the Ikṣvāku inscriptions, has been called vīrūpākṣa-pati, "lord of the Vīrūpākṣa." Vogel takes the term vīrūpākṣa in the sense of the hosts of which Skanda is the lord or leader. The word indicates a class of snakes in a snake-charm, in the Vīnaśapatika (ed. Oldenberg, II, p. 110). Vīrūpākṣa is an ordinary epithet applied to Rākṣasas and other spirits in Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana. (Hopkins, Epic Mythology, p. 30.)

King Cāṁtamūla had at least two sisters. One of them named Cāṁtasiri (or Cāṁtisiri = Śāntisiri or Śantiśāri ?) was given in marriage to Vāsiśṭhiputra Khamdasirī or Kanda (Skandaśāri) of the Pūkiya family. Khandasirī has been called

---

1. See my note in Ind. Calcutta, 1, p. 311 ff., and Appendix below; also Bavechaudhurī, op. cit., pp. 118-06 and 120-10.

2. It is possible that his epithet aneka-hirāyagā-ṛṣṭi-go-sātrahasta-hala-sātrahastapadāya refers to the fact that the king performed many times several of the sixteen mahādānus, such as Hirāyagārtha, Hirāyakāma-bhuma, Hirāyāgra, Hiravāra, Giravāra, and Pānakākāla, enumerated in the Purāṇas.

3. An inscription discovered at Ramindipali, in the Sundārgrama taluka of the Katihar district mentions the Mahābhārata of the Pūkiyas. It has been suggested (An. Rep. 8. Ind. Ep., 1925-27, p. 74) that the Pūkiyas may be identical with the Pūkiyas.
Mahāsenāpati and Mahātalavara, and his wife, the Ikṣväku princess Cāmāsiri, Mahātalavara and Mahādānapati. The term mahāsenāpati ("great chief of the army," i.e., general) denoted feudatory chieftains in charge of the rāstras (districts) at the time of the Sātavāhanas; the same meaning seems to be applicable in the present case also. Vogel is, therefore, inclined to render the term by "duke." Mahātalavaras are mentioned in early Jain works along with the eighteen gaṇa-rājas. So, this word must also be taken as a title of nobility (cf. Kalpasūtra, ed. Jacob, 61, ll. 21-25). A Sanskrit commentary on the Kalpasūtra, called Subodhikā, by Vinayavijaya (Nirmalsagar Press ed., leaf 60, lines 6-7) explains the term talavara as tuṣṭa-bhūpala-pradatta-patta-bandha-vibhasita-rājasthāniya. In the Punjab there is a subdivision of the Khetris (Kṣatriyas) called the Tālwār (Ep Ind., XX, p. 7, n. 1). Vogel suggests a connection of the word talavara with Tamil talavāy (general), talaiyāri (village-watchman) or Kanarese talavara, talavara (watchman, beadle). It seems from the Subodhikā and these inscriptions that the Mahātalavaras were provincial governors or subordinate rulers. I, therefore, think that the word is connected with Tamil talaivan, which means a king, ruler or governor (Tamil Lexicon, pub. Madras University, s.v.). The word, which is originally Dravidian, evidently penetrated into North India also. In addition to the instance of the Tālwārs of the Punjab, it may be said that it is obviously identical with the mysterious word taravara, which along with the word mahāpratihāra (great chamberlain) is found on a clay sealing excavated by Bloch at Basarh (Arch. Surv. Rep., 1903-04, p. 108, Pl. XL. 6). Talāra, evidently the same as talavara, is mentioned in the Chirwa

1 Sometimes the Mahāsenāpatis were also called Mahārāja; cf. Mahārāja's Mahāsenāpati Purāṇa of the Wali clay seal (Bhandarkar, List, No. 1869) which belongs to the first half of the sixth century A.D. See also the Bijaygarh inscription (Corpus Ins. Ind., II, p. 290) which mentions a Yaudhaya Mahārāja Mahāsenāpati.
inscription (A.D. 1273) of Guhila Samarasingha of Mewar. According to this epigraph, one Kśema was made talāra of Citrakūta by Jaitrasimha, and after him one Madana was made talāra of the same place by the Pradhana Rājasimha (Bhandarkar, List, No. 579).

At least two children—a son and a daughter—were born to Cāṃtisiri. The name of her son was Khamdāsaģaraṃṇaka 1 (Skanda-sāgara ?). We do not know her daughter’s name; but she is known to have been married to her cousin, king Virapurisadata. In an inscription of Nagarjunikonda, Virapurisadata has been called Cāṃtisiri’s apano jāmātuka, i.e., own son-in-law.

Another uterine sister of king Cāṃtamūla was Hemmasiri (Harmyaśī? ?) who had two daughters, Bapisirinikā (Vāpiśī ?) and Chaṭhisiri (Ṣaṭhisī ?). Both Bapisiri and Chaṭhisiri were given in marriage to their cousin, Virapurisadata, son and successor of king Cāṃtamūla I.

Two children of king Cāṃtamūla are known from inscriptions. One of them is his son from Māḍhālari (Māṭhālari), named Virapurisadata, who succeeded him on the throne. The other is his daughter, Mahātalavarī Aḍavī-Cāḷasiri. 2 The princess was given in marriage to the Mahāsenāpati, Mahādaṇḍanāyaka Khamdavisākhaṃṇaka (Skandavisākha ?) who belonged to the family of the Dhanakas. Both the sister and the brother appear to have been staunch Buddhists,

1 Sian Kono says (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 25), "... the suffix ṣaṅka in Viṣākhaṃṇaka, Sāgaraṃṇaka formed from Viṣāka, Sāgara, respectively. This same suffix is frequent in names from the Bombay Presidency; cf. Lüders, Nos. 988, 993, 1000, 1018, 1029, 1033 (Kanheri), 1063, 1064, 1065 (Kuñjā), 1088, 1091, 1097 (Kārli), 1109, 1111 (Bedse), 1141 (Nālk), 1171 (Junnar). It evidently belongs to a dialect with a Dravidian, perhaps Kamarāse, substratum. The b for s also points to Kamarāse. Moreover, some of the names seem to find their explanation in Kamarāse. Thus kanda means ‘child’ in Kamarāse, and canda ‘cold.’ Chaṭhisāṅkaṃṇaka probably in Chaṭhisāṅka = ‘Moon’.” But the last name, excluding the suffix, is Cāḷikiraṃṇa.

2 The word aḍavī, the meaning of which is not known, was prefixed to the name of this princess evidently in order to distinguish her from her namesakes.
whereas their father was a performer of Vedic sacrifices like agnihotra, agniṣṭoma, vājapeya and aśvamedha.

In one of the Nagarjunikonda inscriptions dated in the 6th regnal year of Virapurisadata, we have a record of the benefactions of one Mahāsenāpatinī Cula(kṣudra)-Cāṃtiśiri-rinikā (i.e., Cāṃtiśiri the younger) who was married to the Mahāsenāpati, Mahātalavara, Vāsiṣṭhīputra Khamdacali-kiremmavaṇaka of the Hiranyaka family. The name of the Mahāsenāpatinī seems to indicate that she was an Ikṣvāku princess; but she is explicitly called kulahakānāṁ bālika, i.e., a girl born in the family of the Kulahakas. She therefore appears to me to have been the daughter of an Ikṣvāku princess married to a Kulahaka chief.
III

VIRAPURISADATA (VIRAPURUSADATTA).¹

King Cāṁtamūla I, as we have already said, was succeeded on the Ikṣvāku throne by his son Virapurisadata. We have a number of inscriptions dated in the regnal years of this king. His inscriptions have been found at the Buddhist sites of Nagarjunikonda and Jaggayyapetta. The records begin with an adoration to Bhagavān Samyaksambuddha, i.e., Lord Buddha.

Inscriptions appear to tell us of five queens of king Virapurisadata. Two of them were Bapisiri and Chaṭхиisiri, daughters of the king’s aunt (father’s sister) Hammasiri. We have already seen that Baudhāyana sanctions marriage with daughters of maternal uncles and paternal aunts for the inhabitants of the South. A daughter of his other aunt Cāṁtisiri was also a queen of the king. Another queen appears to have been the Mahādevi Rudradharabhatṭārikā, who has been described in the inscriptions as Ujanikāmahārabalikā. Vogel is inclined to correct the passage as Ujanikā-mahārajabalikā. This may not be impossible, as in the Nagarjunikonda inscriptions there are signs of careless engraving. Vogel then identifies Ujanikā with the famous city of Ujjayinī (Prakrit Ujeni), mentioned by the Greek geographer Ptolemy (Geography, VII, i, §63) as Ozēnē and as the capital of Tiastēnes (Caṭana). The name of queen Rudradhā and those of the kings of Caṭana’s line, such as

¹ Bähler took Purisadata as name of the king and śri-vira (śrī-vira) as an adjective (Ind. Ant., XI, p. 257) on the ground that there is no deity named Virapurussa and that therefore, as a name, Virapurusa-datta makes no sense. Sometimes, however, such adjectives are known to form an integral part of the proper name. Note, for instance, the name of Virāra-jendra, the Cela king, who ruled from A.D. 1063 to 1070 (Bewali, Lief, pp. 81 and 449-50).
Rudradāman (I and II), Rudrasena (I, II and III) and Rudrasimha (I, II, III and IV) may also indicate the possibility of Vogel’s theory. Though there is no name like Rudradhara (of whom the queen might have been supposed to have been a sister or a daughter) in the genealogy of the Sakas of Ujjain, two kings having names beginning with Rudra reigned in the third century A.D.


It is not altogether impossible that the Ikṣvāku queen was related to one of these kings. It may be noted in this connection that a Nagarjunikonda inscription records the pious gift of a Saka girl, which fact possibly shows that the Ikṣvākus were friendly towards the Sakas. The currency of dināri-māṣakas in their kingdom seems also to indicate their relation with the north. The dināra, according to numismatists, was a gold coin weighing about 124 grains, first struck by the Kuśāna kings (of whom Cašṭana is generally supposed to have been a feudatory) in the first century A.D. in imitation of the Roman gold denarius (Bhandarkar, Carmichael Lectures, 1921, p. 181).

In an inscription of Ehuvula Cāṃtamulā II, son and successor of Virapurisadata, the name of the reigning king’s mother is mentioned as Mahādevī Bhaṭīdevā. She appears, therefore, to have been another queen of Virapurisadata.

Besides the son Ehuvula Cāṃtamulā, king Virapurisadata is known to have had a daughter named Kodabalisiri who is said to have been the Mahādevi (queen) of the Vana-vāsaka-mahārāja. Vanavāsaka-mahārāja appears to mean the king of Banavāsī, now in the North Kanara district of the Bombay Presidency. Banavāsī is known to have been the
capital of the Cuṭu Śatakarnīs and afterwards of the Kadambas. Scholars think that the Kadambas began to rule at Banavāsi about the middle of the fourth century A.D. (Anc. Hist. Dec., p. 95; Kadambakula, p. 18; also infra.)

We should also note in this connection that the Chandravalli Prakrit record of the earliest Kadamba king Mayūrasarman (Mys. Arch. Surv., AR, 1929, p. 50) which expresses compound consonants by more than one letter is obviously later than the time of the issuers of the Nagarjunikonda and Jaggayapetta records. It is therefore not impossible that a Cuṭu-Śatakarni king of Banavasi was the husband of the Ikṣvāku princess Kodabalisiri, daughter of Virapurisadāta whose inscriptions have been ascribed to the third century A.D. Matrimonial alliance with the powerful houses of Ujjain and Banavāsi certainly strengthened the Ikṣvākus at the time of this monarch.

King Māṭhariputtra Virapurisadāta ruled at least for more than nineteen years. We have inscriptions dated in the 6th, 14th, 15th, 18th and the 20th year of his reign. The following are some important inscriptions discovered at Nagarjunikonda and dated in his sixth regnal year:

I. Record of the erection of a pillar at the Mahācetiya of Lord Buddha by Cāṃtāsiri, who was the uterine sister of king Vāsiṣṭhiputtra Cāṃtamūla 1, aunt (pituchā, i.e., father’s sister) of king Māṭhariputtra Virapurisadāta, wife of the Pūktya chief Vāsiṣṭhiputtra Khamdasiri and mother of Khamdasaśāgaramnaka. The act is said to have been done "for the attainment of welfare and happiness by all the world."

II. Record of the erection of a stone-pillar by Bāpi-
sirinikā, daughter of Hammāsiri (sister of king Cāṃtamūla 1), and wife of king Virapurisadāta. The pillar was erected with regard to the queen’s mother Hammāsiri, and for the sake of attaining the bliss of nireṇa for herself; it also
records the completion of extensions of the Mahâcetiya,¹ for the benefit of the Masters of the Aparamahâvâsinaseliya sect, by Reverend Ånanda who knew the Dîgha-nikâya and the Majjhima-nikâya by heart and was a disciple of the Masters of the Ayira-hamgha (ârya-samgha). The Masters of the ârya-samgha are said to have been resident at Patmapâgâma and to have been preachers and preceptors of the Dîgha-nikâya, Majjhima-nikâya and the five Mâtukas.

The Dîgha-nikâya and the Majjhima-nikâya are celebrated Pâli Buddhist works. The way, however, in which the Masters of these Nikâyas are mentioned in the Nagarjunikonda inscriptions is different from that in which they are generally referred to in the Buddhist literature. It has, therefore, been conjectured by Dr. N. Dutt (Ind. Hist. Quart., VII, p. 642) that possibly the inscriptions were concerned with a Buddhist sect that was not exactly the Theravâda (the Pâli) School, but had a literature and tradition very similar to that School. Dr. Dutt further suggests that the word mâtuka (Pâli mâtikâ, Sanskrit mâtakâ) may be taken to be both the Vinaya and Abhidharma Pîtakas; but that the specification of the number in paûca-mâtuka indicates that here the Vinaya-pîtaka is meant. It must be noted that five of the principal Buddhist Schools, viz., Theravâda, Mahâsâsaka, Haimavata, Sarvâstivâda and Mahâsamghika had their Vinaya Pîtaka in five divisions (Przyluski, Le Concile de Râjaqrâha, p. 353 ff.).

The Aparamahâvâsinaseliyas (Aparamahâvanaśailiyas)² have been taken to be the same as the Aparaśailiyas whose

¹ Dr. N. Dutt says that the "period mentioned here (i.e., the time of the Ikshvâku Inscriptions, the 3rd or 4th century) relates to the subsidiary structures of the main stûpa. The stûpa itself—the Mahâcetiya—must be assigned to an earlier period." (Ind. Hist. Quart., VII, p. 634). Vogel, however, translates mûhaputrapûnam anâm nivâram (lit. repairs) mahâcetiyanam khañchhâ ca (kapita ti, ti "this pious work (i.e., marakâma), the Mahâcetiya, was completed and the pillars were erected" (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 17). Vogel has recently edited some additional Ikshvâku inscriptions discovered at Nagarjunikonda in Ep. Ind., XXI, p. 61 ff.

² An Amaravâti Buddhist pillar inscription (Lüders, List. No. 1295) mentions one Åcariya Sâriputa, inhabitant of Mahâvanâsala (viz. "seta").
place has been referred to by Yuan Chwang as A-fa-lo-s.
(Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels*, II, p. 214). Dr. D. suggests (op. cit., pp. 648-49) that the Masters of the *Ajañagha* are to be identified with the Mahāsaṃghikas and that "the whole Buddhist establishment at Nagarjunikonda belonged to the Mahāsaṃghikas." It is, however, difficult to accept the latter suggestion in view of the fact that an inscription of the site dated in the 11th year of king Ehuvela Cāntamūla II records the dedication of a vihāra to the Masters of the Mahāśākāsa sect (*Ep Ind.*, XX, p. 24: imam khaniyam vihāro ca acariyānām mahisāsakānām suparigaha catudisam samgham udisāya sara-satānam hita-sukhātham ṭhapitam).

III. Record of the erection of a pillar in the Mahācetiya by Mahātalavari Ādavi-Cāntasiri who was the daughter of king Cāntamūla I, sister of king Virapurisadatta and wife of the Dhanaka chief Khamdavisākhamañaka. The act is said to have been done with regard for both the houses to which she belonged and for the attainment of welfare and happiness by herself in both the worlds.

IV. Record of the erection of a stone pillar in the Mahācetiya by Mahāsenāpatini Cula-Cāntisirinikā (Kṣudra-Sāntiṣri), daughter of the Kulahakas and wife of the Hiraṃañaka (Hiranyaka) chief, Khamdacalikiremmanañaka.

V. Record of the erection of a *staila-stambha* by Mahādevī Rudradhara-bhaṭṭārikā who was the daughter of the king of Ujjain and evidently the queen of Virapurisadatta, for the attainment by herself of welfare and happiness and the wealth of Nirvāna,—and also of the construction of a shrine and receipt of the gift of 170 *dināri-māsakas* by Mahātalavari Cāntisiri (sister of king Cāntamūla I) who belonged, by marriage, to the family of the Pūkhiyas. The mention of the *dināri-māsakas* (=1/6 of a *dināra* in weight-
or value? \textit{cf.} \textit{fanam}),¹ in an inscription found at Nagarjunikonda in the Guntur district of the Madras Presidency, is very interesting. As already stated, it is generally held that \textit{dināra} is the Indian designation of some Kuśāna coins which were imitated from the Roman \textit{denarius}. Again, the early Western Saka Satraps, according to many scholars, were subordinate to the great Kuśāna kings. As, then, the Ikṣvākus appear to have been matrimonially connected with the kings of Ujjain, it is not impossible that the Kuśāna coin-designation passed into the Ikṣvāku kingdom through the country of the Sakas.

VI. Record of the erection of a pillar by the Mahādevī Chaṭthisirī, daughter of king Cāṃtamūla’s sister Haṃmasirinīkā and wife of king Virapurisadata, for the purpose of attaining Nirvāṇa.

VII. Record of the erection of a stone-pillar by a Mahātalavari, whose name is not mentioned, but who is said to have been the wife of the Mahāsenāpati, Mahātalavara Vāsiṣṭhiputra Mahā-Kāṃdāsirī (Mahā-Skandaśrī) of the Pūkiya family and the mother of the Mahāsenāpati Mahātalavara Vēphansirī (Viṣṇusirī). Vogel thinks it possible that the Vāsiṣṭhiputra Mahā-Kāṃdāsirī is identical with the Pūkiya chief K[h]āṃdāsirī, who is mentioned in some inscriptions as the husband of king Cāṃtamūla’s sister Cāṃtisirī, mother of Khamda-sāgaramṇaka. This identification makes Cāṃtisirī, mother of Khamda-sāgaramṇaka, a co-wife of the unknown Mahātalavari who was the mother of Vēphansirī. It however seems to me that Mahā-Kāṃdāsirī was a uterine elder brother of K[h]āṃdāsirī. \textit{(Cf.} the names Mahā-Cāṃdamukha and Cula (kṣudra)-Cāṃdamukha and of Mahā-Mūla and Cula-Mūla in inscription F of Nagarjunikonda).

¹ Māyaka was the \(\frac{1}{16}\) part of the standard Sazarma. May dināra-māyaka be \(\frac{1}{16}\) of a dināra (about 124 gr.) in weight (or value)? It is interesting to note that some gold \textit{fanams} are found to be 7.7 gr. in weight (see Smith, \textit{Catalogue}, p. 315, Pl. XXX. 7).
SUCCESSORS OF THE SĀTAVĀHANAS

The Nagarjunikonda inscription dated in the 14th year of king Virapurisadata is very important. It records the building of a cetiya-ghara (caitya-grha), "with a flooring of slabs, with a caitya and provided with all the necessaries" in the Cula-dharmagiri-vihāra on the Śriparvata, to the east of Vijayapuri, by a lay-member Bodhisiri (Bodhiśīri), wife of Buddhīnaka and daughter of Revata of Govagāma, for the acceptance (suparigāhe) of the Therīs specially of Tambaṇḍana (Sanskrit: Tāmrarāṇi or ˈnā; Greek: Tapprobane, i.e., Ceylon) and other Therīs who are said to have "caused serenity and happiness" (paśādaka) to the people of, that is, who belonged to, Kasmira, Gaṇḍhāra, Cina, Gilāta, Tosali, Avaramta, Vamga, Vanavasī, Yavana (?), Dāmila (?), Pula ( אולי) and Tambaṇḍana-dīpa. It appears that these Therīs (female ascetics) of Ceylon and other countries used to visit this region for purposes of pilgrimage. Many of the countries mentioned in this connection can be easily identified.

(i) Kāśmīra is the famous country of North-western India still known under its ancient name. The boundary of the country, however, was not the same in all ages.

(ii) The kingdom of Gaṇḍhāra, according to the Rāmāyana (VII, 113.11; 114.11), lay sindhore = ubhayatah pārśve (on both sides of the Indus). We know from the Epics and the Purāṇas that the great cities of Takṣasała

---

1 Dr. N. Dutt in a learned paper in Ind. Hist. Quart. (VII, p. 693 ff.) has objected to Dr. Vogel's translation of the term paśādaka as "one who converts." According to him the word refers to the saintly lives of the āryas, that bring joy and peace to the people of their countries. Mr. D. L. Barna (Ind. Cult., I, p. 110) takes the word therigāna as an adjective of therigānapa, and interprets it as "the teacher represented by the Therās, exponent of Theravāda."

2 It is interesting to note that according to some gāthās of the Mahābhārata, XXIX, verse 30 ff., the leading Therās were representatives of towns and countries like Kāśī, Vesālī, Kosāli, Ujjēṇa, Pulpapura, Vasūra, Vaiśāryapura, and Kāśmīra. We see that the Mahābhārata list mentions Kāśmīra, Vasūra and the Yona or Yavana country which are also included in the Nagarjunikonda list (Ind. Cult., I, p. 111).
and Puṣkalāvati belonged to the Gandhāra kingdom. The ruins of the ancient city of Takṣaśīla are situated immediately to the east of Saraikala, a railway junction twenty miles to the north-west of Rawalpindi in the Punjab. Puṣkalāvati (Prakrit: Puṅkalaoti; Greek: Peukelaotis) has now been correctly identified with modern Prang and Charsadda on the Swat river, seventeen miles to the north-west of Peshawar (Schoff, *Periplus*, pp. 183-84). The *janapada* of Gandhāra appears to have included the Rawalpindi district of the Punjab and the Peshawar district of the North-West Frontier Province.

(iii) and (iv) Cina and Cilāta (Kirāta) were names of the countries inhabited by Mongoloid peoples and situated to the east and north-east of India (as regards the latter, cf. the Purānic statement, e.g., in Vāyu, 45, 82, puruḥ kirātā yasyaṁante pāścime gavanās tathō). According to the *Mahābhārata* (V. 19.15), Bhagadatta, king of Prāgjyotisa or Assam, marshalled the Cinas and Kirātas in the great battle of Kurukṣetra. The name Cina is famous in Sanskrit literature. It originated most probably from the name of the Tsin dynasty which ruled in China from B.C. 255 to 202.1 Cilāta is the same as Sanskrit Kirāta and Greek Kirradai (C. *Periplus*, § 62, Ptolemy, VII, 2.2), Kirradia (Ptolemy, VII. 2.16) or Tiladai (ib., VII. 2.15). In the *Milindapañha* there are two passages which mention a number of places that were used to be visited by merchants for purposes of trade. In both these lists we have the mention of Cina-Cilāta. The printed text of the *Milindapañha*, however, reads Cina-vilāta; but Sylvain Lévi (*Etudes Asiatique*, II, p. 24) has rightly contended that Vilāta is an error for Cilāta. The peoples of these countries are described by the *Periplus* as a 1 race of

---

1 Considering the early use of the word, in Sanskrit it seems impossible that the name was derived from that of the Later Tains who ruled in A.D. 963-100 and 106-945 (D.C. Bouger, *Short History of China*, p. 377 ff.).
men with flattened nose, very savage," and by Ptolemy as dwarfs with flat face and white skin.

(v) The city of Tosala or Tosali is to be identified with modern Dhauli (Puri district, Orissa), where a set of the Fourteen Rock Edicts of Aśoka has been found. The name Dhauli appears to have sprung from Tosali through the intermediate forms Tohali and Dhoali. In literature, the country of Tosala is always associated with (South) Kosala (modern Raipur, Bilaspur and Sambalpur districts). Some mediaeval inscriptions (Ep. Ind., IX, p. 286; XV, p. 2) mention Uttara-Tosala and Daksīṇa-Tosala. The country is to be identified with the Puri district, and parts of the adjoining districts, of Orissa.

The city is generally taken to be the same as the Tosalei metropolis which was, according to the Geography of Ptolemy, situated in trans-Gangetic India. Vogel may be right in identifying it with Dosara of Ptolemy and Dosarene of the Periplus.

(vi) Avarāmāta (Aparānta) is now generally identified with Northern Konkan. It had its capital at Śūrpāraka, modern Sopārā in the Thana district of the Bombay Presidency.

(vii) Vogel appears to be wrong when he says that "Vānga is the ancient name of Bengal." It seems to me impossible that the whole of the modern Presidency of Bengal was meant by the term Vānga in the third century A.D. The country of Vānga may be identified with Central and Eastern Bengal, along with a part of Southern Bengal (Ray Chaudhuri, *Indian Antiquities*, p. 184 ff.).

(viii) The country of Vanavāsī (Bom. Gaz., I, ii, p. 278, n. 2) appears to be the same as modern (North) Kanara. The capital is to be identified with the modern town of Banavāsī in the North Kanara district of the Bombay Presidency. Vogel seems to be wrong in identifying it with "Banavāsī, a village or small town in the Shimoga district of the Mysore state" (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 8).
(ix) The exact situation of the Yavana country (that is, the country inhabited by the Yavanas or Yaunas, the Greeks) is not yet known. It is not certain whether Yavana means here the ancient dominions of the Greek emperors of Syria, or the land of the Yonas referred to in the third Rock Edict of Asoka, or the Far Eastern Yavana country (Northern Annam), or any settlement of the Greco-Romans somewhere in South India. According to the Mahābhārata (XII. 207. 43), we know, the country of the Yaunas lay in the Uttarāpatha. The city of Alasanda, mentioned in the Mahāvaṃsa, has been identified by Geiger with Alexandria founded by Alexander the Great near Kabul (Geiger, Mahāvaṃsa, p. 194). According to the Milinda-paṇho, the Indo-Greek king Menander (Milinda) was born at Kalasigāma in the dīpa of Alasanda or Alexandria (Trenckner, Milindapaṇho, pp. 82-83). The capital where Menander ruled was at Sākala, modern Sialkot in the Punjab. The Indian Yavana country may possibly be the same as Alasanda of the Indian literature, which appears to have been somewhere about modern N.W.F.P. and Afghanistan.

(xi) The reading of the names Damila and Palura is not quite certain. Damila, however, can be no other than the country of the Tamil people. Palura, if the reading be accepted, may be identified with Ptolemy's Paloura (Geography, VII. i, § 16), which has been taken to be the Dravidian form of the name of the famous city, Dantapura, the ancient capital of Kaliṅga. Cf. Pal (tooth) + ār (city) = Danta (tooth) + pura (city). But we cannot be definite on this point. First because the reading is doubtful; secondly, the connection of the name with Dantapura is-

1 In connection with Sahadeva's ṣīvījaña in the south, the Mahābhārata (I, 31, 71-72) mentions a "city of the Yavanas" together with the countries of the Pāṇḍyas, Keralas, Kaliṅgas and others. The Milindapaṇho list mentions Yona, Parama-yona and Alasanda; one of the two Yonas may be identical with Yavana (Northern Annam) mentioned in the Nāgaraśāyana along with Campā (Southern Annam) and Kamboja (Cambodia). See H. C. Majumdar, Suvratapācita, pp. 35, 135.
conjectural; and thirdly, Dantapura is known to have been a city, while all the names in our list appear to designate countries or provinces. The site of Dantapura has not been definitely identified. We have reference to the Dantapuravāsaka in the Purle plates of the Gaṅga king Indravarman (6th century A.D.), edited in Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 361, where it has been suggested that the name survives in that of the fort of Dantavaktra near Chicacole in the Ganjam district of the Madras Presidency. The Jirjingi copper-plate grant of Indravarman was also issued from Dantapura. Oldham identifies Paloura with a village called Pālūra, about six miles north-east of Ganjam (J. B. O. R. S., XXII, p. 1 ff.).

Śrīparvata (= Nagarjunikonda, according to many), where the Cula-dhammagiri-vihāra was built, does not appear to be the same as the Śrīśaila in the Kurnool district of the Madras Presidency. Vijayapuri (the Ikṣvāku capital, according to some) which was situated to the west of Śrīparvata was possibly the city "once situated in the valley of Nagārjunikonda."

The same upāsīkā Bodhisiri here claims also the construction of a chaitya-shrine at the Kulaha-vihāra, a shrine for the Bodhi-tree at the Sihala-vihāra, one cell at the Great Dhammagiri, a mandapa-pillar at the Mahāvihāra, a hall for religious practices at Devagiri, a tank, a veranda and a mandapa at Puvasela, a stone-mandapa at the eastern gate of the great Caitya at Kaṇṭakasola or sela, three cells at Hirumūṭhuva, seven cells at Papilā, and a stone-mandapa at Pughagiri.

The localities mentioned in this connection cannot all be satisfactorily identified. The name of the Kulaha-vihāra reminds us of the Kulahaka family which, as we have suggested above, was probably maternally connected with the Ikṣvākus. The Sihala (Sīmhala, i.e., Ceylon)-vihāra appears to have been a convent "founded either by a Sin-

---

1 An Amaravati inscription (Lüders, No. 1295) mentions Vijayapura.
halese, or more probably, for the accommodation of Sin-
halese monks." This Sihala-vihāra contained a shrine for
the Bodhi-tree (Bodhiṣṭṭha-prāṣāda). It is interesting to
note that the Bodhi-tree is a necessary adjunct of the
Ceylonese vihāras even at the present time. Puvasela
(Pūrvasaila) is mentioned by Yuan Chhwang as Fu-p'ō-shi-lo,
where resided a Buddhist sect known as the Pūrvasailiyas.
The Pūrvasailiyas ācāryas have been referred to in a frag-
mentary pillar inscription discovered at Alluru in the
Nandigram taluka of the Kistna district. Kaṇṭakasela has
been rightly taken to be the same as the emporium
Kaṇṭakassula mentioned by Ptolemy (Geography, VII, i, 15)
immediately after the river Maisōlos (the Krishna) in the
land called Maisōlia (Masulipatam). Kaṇṭakassula has been
identified with the town of Ghaṇṭaśāla which lies between
the village of Guduru and the mouth of the Krishna (cf.
Ptolemy's location : Mouth of the river Maisōlos..............
......Kaṇṭakassula, a mart............Kodoura (loc. cit.). ¹ Mr.
Rea discovered (South Indian Antiquities, p. 132) at this place
the remains of a stūpa which, he thought, date from the
beginning of the Christian era. The remains almost
certainly belong to the Great Cāitya mentioned in these in-
scriptions. Puṇḍragiri is probably the same as Puṇḍragiri in

The Nagarjunikonda inscription, dated in the 18th year
of king Virapurisadata, records the building of "a stone-
hall, surrounded by a cloister and provided with every
necessary at the foot of the Mahācetiya" for the acceptance
of the Aparamahāvinaseliyas, by the Mahātalavari Cāṃtisiri,
sister of king Cāṃtanumula I, wife of the Pākiya chief
Vāsiṣṭhiputra Khamdasiri and mother of Khamdasāgaram-
ṇaka, desiring the longevity, strength and victory of her

¹ An Amaravati inscription (Lādiera, No. 1000) mentions Kaṇṭakasola, evidently
the same as Kaṇṭakasela.
own son-in-law (apono jāmāṭuka), king Māthāraputra Virapurisadata, and for the attainment of hita and sukha in both the worlds by herself. As we have said above, it is to be noted that an inscription of the 6th year of king Virapurisadata calls Cāntisiri the king's pituchā (father's sister); here, however, the king is represented as the son-in-law of the lady. Vogel therefore thinks that Virapurisadata married his cousin, a daughter of his aunt Cāntisiri, between the 6th and 18th years of his reign.

A carved pillar was erected in the 20th year of Virapurisadata's reign in memory of his dead (saga-gata) father by the latter's sisters, mothers and consorts. Some figures in the reliefs carved on the pillars have been taken to represent king Cāntamūla I (Ep. Ind., XXI, pp. 63-64).

The Jaggayyapetta inscriptions are dated in the 20th year of king Virapurisadata. The royal genealogy is not given in these inscriptions. They record the erection of five āyaka-thāmbhas (entrance-pillars) at the eastern gate of the Mahācetiya of Lord Buddha, by the manufacturer (avesani) Sudatha (Siddhārtha) resident of the village of Mahā-Kāḍurura and son of the manufacturer Nakacada (Nagacandra) of Nadatūra in the Kamaka-rātha. Kamaka-rātha seems to be the same as the Karmarāṣṭra of later inscriptions. As for the suffix -ka, we may notice the passages ujanikā-mahārāja-bālikā and conarāsaka-mahārāja, etc., of the Nagarjunikonda inscriptions. Karmarāṣṭra has been identified with the northern part of Nellore and southern part of Guntur district.
IV

EHUVELA CÄMTAMÜLA II.

King Mätharîputra Virapurisadatta was succeeded by his son Ehuvela Cämtamüla, born of queen Väsiśthi Bhäti-devä. It is interesting to note that the custom of naming a grandson after his grandfather was prevalent among the Southern Ikṣväkuśas, as it was in many other ruling dynasties of ancient India. It has been noticed by Dr. Hirananda Sastri (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 6, n. 2) that this custom is sanctioned by Patañjali’s Mahäbhäsya (I. i. 1) where we have tripuräśānukam nāmakrtam kuryāt; Kniyāṭa on this passage has pitä tasya ye trayah puruṣās = tän = anukāyaty = abhīdhatte.

Several inscriptions of king Väsiśthiputra Ehuvela Cämtamüla II have been discovered, some at Nagarjunikonda and one at an adjacent place called Kottampalugu. The Nagarjunikonda inscriptions, dated in the 2nd regnal year of the king, record the establishment of a vihāra by the Mahädevi Bhäti-devä, daughter-in-law of king Väsiśthiputra Cämtamüla I, wife of king Mätharîputra Virapurisadatta and mother of king Väsiśthiputra Ehuvela Cämtamüla II, for the acāryas of the Bahusuttiya sect. The Bahusuttiyas were a branch of the Mahāsāṃghikas.

The Kottampalugu inscription, dated in the 11th regnal year of king Ehuvela Cämtamüla II, records the construction of a vihāra by Kodabalisiri, Mahädevī of the Maharāja of Vanaväsaka, grand-daughter of king Cämtamüla I, daughter
of king Virapurisadatta and sister of king Ehuwula Caṃṭamūla II, for the acceptance of the ācāryas of the Mahiśāsaka sect. The Ikṣvāku princess Kodabalisiri, as we have noticed above, was possibly the queen of a Cuṭu-Sātakarni king of Banavasi. The Buddhist sect of the Mahiśāsakas is mentioned also in other early inscriptions. A samgharāma is known to have been built for the Mahiśāsaka ācāryas somewhere in the Punjab, when the Hūṇa king Toramāna was ruling (Ep. Ind., I, p. 239).
V

IMPORTANCE OF THE IKŚVĀKU PERIOD.

The Ikśvāku inscriptions discovered at Jaggayapetta in the Kistna district and Nagarjunikonda in the Guntur district are of great importance for the history of Buddhism.

Dr. Dutt thinks (Ind. Hist. Quart., V, p. 794) that the site of Nagarjunikonda was a famous resort of Buddhism in the early years of the Christian era and, probably, also an early centre of Mahāyāna. "Just as Bodh-Gayā grew up on the bank of the Nerañjarā as a very early centre of Hinayāna and a place of pilgrimage for the early Buddhists, so also did Amarāvatī (extending to Jaggayapetta) and Nagarjunikonda on the bank of the Krṣṇā (including the tributary Paler) as a flourishing centre of proto-Mahāyāna in the pre-Christian and the early Christian era and a place of pilgrimage for the later Buddhists." The construction of the Amarāvatī stūpa, with its enlargements, decorations and railings, is placed between circa 2nd century B.C. and 2nd century A.D. (Burgess, Arch. Surv. South. Ind., pp. 122-23), while that of the stūpas of Jaggayapetta and Nagarjunikonda has been placed in or before the 3rd or 4th century A.D. (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 2; Ind. Hist. Quart., VII, p. 634).

The stūpas of Amarāvatī appear to have been built at the time of Sātavāhana suzerainty. That the later Sātavāhanas, who were possibly Brahmanist in faith, showed great favour towards the Buddhists is known to all readers of the Sātavāhana inscriptions. They appear to have had strong Buddhist leaning, if some of them were not
actually Buddhist themselves. The successors of the later Sātavāhanas, the early Ikṣvākus, were however staunch followers of the Brahmanical faith. Vāsiśṭhiputra Cāṃṭa-
mūla I, as we have seen, has been credited with the per-
formance of the agnihotra, agniṣṭoma, vājapeya and aśvamedha sacrifices. Evidently Buddhism suffered during
the reign of this king.

With the accession of Māṭhariputra Virapurisadatta on
the Ikṣvāku throne, a new era began with the Buddhists of
the Kistna-Guntur region. The great stūpas of Jaggyya-
petta and Nagarjunikonda were built, repaired or extended,
and Buddhist Thertis were coming for pilgrimage from all
the Buddhist countries of the world to this centre of
Buddhism. The mention of Sihala-vibhāra and of the
dedication of a cetiyaghāra specially to the Theris of Ceylon
points to the good relation that must have existed between
the Buddhist communities of the Ikṣvāku country and their
co-religionists of the Island of Ceylon. Thus we see,
Buddhism was in its heyday at the time of the later
Ikṣvākus.

The existence of such relations among the Buddhist
communities of the different countries can be accounted for
from the sea-trade which was carried on between the ports
of Ceylon and other countries on the one hand and those
situated on the mouths of the Krishna and the Godavari on
the other. Kanṭakasela, the great emporium on the bank
of the Krishna, appears to have played a large part in
this international trade. Dr. Vogel seems to be right in
thinking that this trade was largely responsible for the
flourishing state of Buddhism in this part of India (Ep.
Ind., XX, p. 10).

The collapse of Buddhism in the lower Krishna valley
appears to have begun with the decline of the Ikṣvāku power.
As a cause of this collapse, Vogel refers to the "rising
of the powerful dynasties devoted to Brahmanism like the
Pallava in the South and the Chāluksya in the west." It must however also be added that the immediate successors of the Ikṣvākus in the rule of Andhradeśa were all staunch Brahmanist. After the decline of the Ikṣvākus, we know, the Kistna-Guntur region passed to the Bṛhat-phalāyanas and the Pallavas. Both of these dynasties were Brahmanical Hindu, and the latter claimed to have performed the aśvamedha sacrifice which is evidently a sign of aggressive Hinduism. Bṛhatphalāyana Jayavarman, as we shall see, was a devotee of Lord Maheśvara. The Pallava king Śiva-kandavarman is known to have performed not only the Brahmanical sacrifices, Aśvamedha and Agniṣṭoma, but also the Vājapeya (Ep. Ind., I, p. 2). The significant boast of the early Pallava princes of having been Dharma-mahārāja and Kaliyugadoṣ-āvasanna-dharmmodharanamo-nitya-sannaddha undoubtedly refers to the fact that they were determined to purify their Brahmanical faith from the influence of heretical doctrines like Buddhism. Not a single king of the Sālaṅkāyana and Viśṇukundin lines is as yet known to have Buddhist leaning. On the contrary, we have a Sālaṅkāyana king who performed one Aśvamedha sacrifice and a Viśṇukundin king who performed no less than eleven Aśvamedhas and thousand Agniṣṭomas. The decline of Buddhism in the Andhra country is also evidenced by the account of the celebrated Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang who visited An-to-lo (Andhra) and To-nakie-tse-kia (Dhānyakaṭaka) or Ta-An-to-lo (Mahāndhra) in 639 A.D. and resided at the capital of the latter for "many months" (see An. Rep. S. Ind. Ep., 1913-14, p. 36). Nevertheless Buddhism did not die away all at once. The Buddhist faith of the Ananda king of Guntur, who appears to have ruled about the end of the 4th century or the beginning of the 5th, clearly shows that Buddhism lingered in the Andhra country, although the glory it enjoyed at the time of the later Sātavāhanas and the Ikṣvākus
was long a thing of the past. Later traces of Buddhism in the Amaravati region are found in the Amaravati pillar inscription (S. Ind. Ins., I, pp. 26-27) of the Pallava chief Surphavarman (c. A.D. 1100), probably a vassal of Kulottunga Cola I (Sewell, List, p. 90), and another Amaravati pillar inscription of Koṭa Keta II, from which we know that "Buddhist worship at the old stūpa was still maintained and Keta II gave grants in its support" (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 146; Sewell, op. cit., s. v. A.D. 1182). Another inscription records the grant of a lamp to the Buddhist stūpa of Amaravati, made by Bayyalā, daughter of the Nātavāḍi chief Rudra. This also shows that Buddhist worship was maintained in the Andhra country as late as A.D. 1234 (Sewell, op. cit., p. 141).
CHAPTER II.
THE BṛHATPHALĀYANAS.

I

JAYAVAMMA (=JAYAVARMAN).

A copper-plate grant of a rāja (muhārāju, according to the legend of the seal attached to the plates) named Jayavarma, who belonged to the Bṛhatphalāyana gotra, was discovered at Kondameudi in the Tenali taluka of the Kistna district (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 315).1 No other king of this family is as yet known from inscriptions or other sources.

As regards the date of king Jayavarman, Hultzsch says (loc. cit.): "The alphabet of his inscription shows that he must have lived in the same period as the Pallava king Sivaskandavarman who issued the Mayidavolu plates. Further, the language and phraseology of the inscription are so similar to the Nasik inscriptions of Gautamiputra Satakarnī (Nos. 4 and 5) and Vasiṣṭhiputra Pulumāyi (No. 3) that Jayavarman's date cannot have been very distant from that of those two Andhra kings. The archaic Sanskrit alphabet of the seal of the new plates is corroborative evidence in the same direction." King Jayavarman Bṛhatphalāyana may be placed about the closing years of the third and the beginning of the fourth century A. D.

1 According to Sewell (List, p. 17), "it is just possible that it [i.e., the name Jayavarman] may have been a name assumed by Bappa i.e., father of Pallava Sivaskandavarman." The suggestion however is utterly untenable in view of the fact that Jayavarman of the Kondameudi plates belonged to the Bṛhatphalāyana gotra while the Pallavas are known to have belonged to the Bṛhadāyā's gotra. See my note in Jour. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VIII, p. 109.
The grant was issued in the 10th year of Jayavarman's reign from the viṣaya-skandhārā (victorious camp) of Kadūra (modern Guduru, 4 miles north-west of Masulipatam) which seems to be the same as Koddoura, mentioned in the Geography of Ptolemy (VII, i, 15) as a place in Maisōlia (Masulipatam).¹

The Kondamudi plates record an order of king Jayavarman, who has been described as mahessara-pāda-parigahita and was, therefore, evidently a devotee of Śiva (Mahēśvara), to the vāpata (vyāptra) at Kadūra to execute the grant of a Brahmadeya (religious gift to Brähmanas) made by the king. Vyāptra, according to Hemachandra, is the same as niyogin, āykta and karmasacica (cf. niyogi karmasacive āykoto vyāptra = ca sah). A vyāptra was therefore an executive officer. The Brahmadeya was made of the village of Pāmrora (Pandura in the Bandar or Masulipatam taluka according to Dubreuil) in Kudūralāra, i.e., the āhāra or district of Kudūra (cf. Sātavāhani-hāra in the Myakadoni inscription of Pulumāvi, Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 154). It is therefore apparent that the vyāptra was in charge of the Kudūra district and held his office at the chief town of the same name.

Scholars think that Kudūralāra of the Kondamudi grant is the same as the Kudrāhāra-viṣaya of the Sālaṅkāyanas inscriptions and Gudrāhāra, Gudrāvāra and Gudrāra of later inscriptions. The identification may not be impossible. It is, in that case, necessary to think that Kudūrahāra which originally meant "the āhāra of Kudūra" gradually came to be used as a place-name itself; because Kudrāhāra (not Kudūra) was the name of the viṣaya (province) at the time of the Sālaṅkāyanas.² According to Dubreuil this province

¹ The town of Kudūra is also mentioned in an inscription of Amarkavati (see Lüders, Liz, No. 1205).
² Compare Khetaka āhāra and Khetakabhāra viṣaya (Bomb., Gaz., Vol. 1, Pt. ii, p. 582).
comprised roughly the present Bandar (Masulipatam) taluka. This region, occupied once by the Brhatphalāyanas, was, as we shall see later on, in the possession of the Sālahkāyanas of Veṅgi in the 5th century A. D.

The recipients of the Brahmadeya were the following Brahmans:—Gotama-gota-jāyāpara¹ Savagataja (Sarvaguptārya), Savigija of the Tānava (Tānavya) gotra; Goginaja and Bhavammaja of the Kodina (Kauṇḍinya) gotra; Rudavṛṇhija (Rudraviṣṇuvārya) of the Bhāradāya (Bhāradvāja) gotra, Rudaghosaja (Rudraghoṣārya) of the Opaṃmava (Aupamanyava gotra); Īsaratataja (Īsvaradattārya) of the Kāṃkhāyaṇa (Kāṃkhāyaṇa) gotra; and Khamdarudaja (Skandarudārya) of the Kosika (Kauṣika) gotra. The affix -aṃ (=-ārya) added to the names of these Brāhmaṇas survives even to the present time in Madras names like Veṅkayya (Veṅkārya), Rāmayya (Rāmārya), etc., and in the surname Ayyar (=-Ārya).

The parihāras (immunities) granted are interesting to note. They are apācesa, anomasā, alonakhādaka, arāthasaviniyika, etc. Apācesa is evidently the same as abhatapra-cesa (exemption from the entrance of an army) of other South Indian inscriptions. Military authorities generally called upon the villagers to meet their demands; this fact is proved by a record of Mahāsāmāntādhipati Santivarman of Banavarṣi. Good governments therefore tried to minimise the exactions of the soldiers by preventing them from entering the villages. Śukra (V. 84) says that soldiers should encamp outside a village and should not enter villages except on official business. Anomasā has been taken to mean "exemption from being meddled with." The third parihāra, viz., alonakhādaka, made the village free from being dug for salt. The salt-mines of the country

¹ The word jāyāpara, according to Sanskrit lexicons, means kāmakā, which meaning does not seem to be applicable here. Holzsch thinks that the passage possibly means a "ghrastha belonging to the Gautama-gotra." (Kp. Ind., VI, p. 315).
were evidently property of the king. The term arathasvarinayika has been translated by Senart as “not to be interfered by the District Police.”

The grant was executed by the mahālagicara, mahādaṇḍanāyaka (field-marshall?) Bhapabhanavam. Mahālagicara,

1 A learned discussion on the subject of parakārae by Senart is to be found in Ep. Ind., VII, pp. 65–6. “The cognate inscriptions have no doubt as to the privileges which were expressly mentioned here: we have to restore anumass a eloṣuḥādaṇya arathamurivinayikā a samajātapārthārikāsy. The translation is less certain than the reading. Regarding apāreṣa, in Sanskrit apāreṣa may, it is sufficient to refer to Dr. Fleet’s Gupta Inscriptions, p. 88, note. Anumass a represents anumroṣṭraṃ; its certain equivalent in later terminology, namely, samastānapātapārthārikāṃ, has not been spoken of in this case (ibid., p. 171, note) seems to imply that the royal officers were prohibited from taking possession of anything belonging to the village. For eloṣuḥādaṇya the later inscriptions offer several equivalents avelanakṣaṇapārthālikā (Böhl er, p. 101) are already quoted (Dr. Fleet’s No. 55, I. 28, and No. 56), eloṣ吗ṣuḥādaṇyaḥ, in line 32 of the plates of Sivasundaravarman (Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 6) and sahaḥādaṇyaḥ in line 17 of the plates of Govindaśrī (ibid., Vol. IV, p. 106). These words are far from clear; but if we remember the fact that the production of salt is a royal monopoly (Böhl er, Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 2, note) and the details quoted by Bhagwanlal (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XVI, p. 506, p. 179) regarding the manner of digging the soil for salt which prevailed in the very region of our inscriptions, it seems to me that the explanation proposed by Bhagwanlal, viz., avelanakṣaṇapārthālikā with the Prakrit softening of t into ṭ, is quite satisfactory. The object of this immunity would thus be to deny to the representatives of the king the right of digging pits for extracting salt.

2 The next term seems to be written in our inscriptiona arathamurivinayika or jāvinayika; but line 19 of the grant of Sivasundaravarman (Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 6) distinctly reads arathamurivinayikām. In stating that this spelling excluded his earlier explanation, Böhl er did not suggest another instead of it. I do not know any parallel expression which clears up this one finally. The word seems to represent arathasvarinayika; but etymology alone is an unsafe guide in the interpretation of technical terms. Vineti is only used in a moral sense. Could we think of translating it as exempted from the police, the magistrate of the district (rāṣṭraṃ: compare Dr. Fleet’s Gupta Inscriptions, p. 92, note), or of the rāṣṭrin? This would remind us of those grants in which, on the other hand, it is stated that the right of punishing thefts and offences is reserved by the king, or of those in which the right to punish the ten offenses (śataparrakṣaḥ: see, e.g., the Alina plates, I. 67, in Dr. Fleet’s Gupta Inscriptions, p. 179, and the Dec-Varanakṣ Upasū, inscription, I. 17 (ibid., p. 217) is transferred to the donee. At least I have nothing more plausible to suggest. It is well known that the different formulas of immunities were variable and always incomplete. And it is not to be wondered at that they should be summed up in a comprehensive and general expression like aroṣajātapārthārika. Elsewhere the texts are more precise in stating that there are eighteen kinds of immunities. It will be enough to quote the inscriptions of the Pallavas, and notably that of Sivasundaravarman, which reads aṭṭhaśratapārthārikā (Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 6)."
according to Vogel, is a mistake for Mahātālavara which occurs so many times in the inscriptions of the Ikṣvākus (see above). Possibly it was the custom for an official to write down the oral order of the king (ariyena ānalaṁ). The grant is said to have been signed by the king himself (sayam chato).

The seal attached to the Kondamudi plates has, in the centre, a trident in relief (the handle of which seems to end in an arrow), a bow (?), the crescent of the moon and an indistinct symbol of roughly triangular shape. Round the margin of the seal runs a Sanskrit legend in archaic characters which differ totally from those employed on the plates (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 315). This difference is possibly due to the fact that the seals were kept ready in the king's record office and were attached to the plates when the latter were prepared. Hultsch appears to suggest that the seal is much older than the plates. The Sanskrit legend however seems to show that the seal cannot be placed much earlier than 300 A.D.
II.

CAPITAL OF THE BHATPHALĀYANAS.¹

The only copper-plate grant of the Bhaṭṭa-phalāyana dynasty, belonging to king Jayavaṃśa (= Jayavarman) Bhaṭṭa-phalāyana, was discovered, as we have already seen, at Kondamudi a place in the Tenali taluka of the Kistna district (Ep. Ind., VI., p. 315). We have also seen that the grant was issued in the 10th regnal year of Jayavāṃśa from viṭṭa-khaṇḍhāvarā naṅgarā Kadurālo, i.e. from the viṭṭa-khaṇḍhāvarā at the city of Kadurā. It is for this reason that scholars have taken Kadurā (modern Guduru near Masulipatam) to be the capital where the Bhaṭṭa-phalāyanas ruled. Prof. Dubreuil, as for instance, writes: “The Kondamudi plates (Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 315) are dated in the 10th year of king Jayavarman of the Bhaṭṭa-phalāyanas, who reigned at Kadurā;” and again: “the town of Kadurā, which was the capital of Jayavarman in the III century of the Christian era, is but the modern village of Guduru which is 4 miles west-north-west of Masulipatam and 6 miles from Ghandiśāla…….” (Anc. Hist. Dec., pp. 84-85). The Professor has rightly identified the place with Koddoura in the country of Maśolīa (Masulipatam), mentioned in the Geography of Ptolemy.

It is, however, interesting to note that Koddoura 136° 11° 20’ has been mentioned not as a metropolis, but as an ordinary place in Maśolīa (Geog., VII, i, 15) by Ptolemy who is believed to have written his Geography about the middle of the 2nd century A.D. The archaic

¹ My paper on the capital of the Bhaṭṭa-phalāyanas was originally published in Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VII, pp. 120-1. There however Jayavarman was placed a little earlier.
characters used on the seal of the Kondamudi grant and its phraseological connection with the grants of Gautamiputra Satakarni and Vasisthputra Pulumavi, as well as its language and script, assign the grant to about 300 A.D. Should we then believe that the Brhatphalayanas became a ruling power just after the decline of the Satavahanas in the early years of the 3rd century A.D. and established themselves at Kudura (Kodoura) from where they issued charters as early as the end of the third or the beginning of the 4th century? It is, however, far more natural to think that they were originally a local ruling power under the suzerainty of the Satavahanas and gradually rose to prominence during and after the latter's decline.

The city of Kudura has been called a vijaya-skandhavedara in the Kondamudi grant. The word skandhavedara generally means "a camp;" but according to the lexicographer Hemacandra it may also signify "a metropolis." While on expedition, oriental kings are known to have held court in camps. The use of the term skandhavedara in the sense of a metropolis is most probably due to such a practice. Skandhavedara (as sometimes also possibly the term vāsaka) appears to mean a temporary residence, and therefore a temporary capital, of a king. It is, therefore,

---

1 For the court of the Mughals, see General History of the Mogul Empire (extracted from Memoirs of M. Mahonoki) by F. F. Cotes (Baingabali Edn.), p. 335f. "As Fisapur was at the time of writing these Memoirs the theatre of war against the Scythians removed his court and armies thither."—p. 313. Cf. also "During these years (i.e., the years of Asiatic campaign) Alexander's camp was his court and capital, the political centre of his empire—a vast city, rolling along over mountain and river through Central Asia."—J. B. Bury, History of Greece for Beginners, 1920, p. 422.

2 It is interesting in this connection to refer to Yuan Chao's account of the capital of Mahārāṣṭra (Mr-ho-la-chan) under Pulakeshin II (Pu-lo-ki-shen) of the Western Calukya dynasty (Deol. Bed. Records of the Western World, 11, p. 368; also his Life of Heen Tsiang, p. 146). From the inscriptions of the Calukyas and their irrevocate enemy, the Pallavas, there can be no doubt that the capital of Pulakeshin II was at Vaiśākha, modern Bādāmi in the Bijapur district of the Bombay Presidency. Now,
very doubtful whether the *vijaya skandhāvara* of king Jayavarman Brhatphalāyana could be the permanent capital of the Brhatphalāyanas.

The town of Kudūra, which was the political centre of Kudūrahāra, *i.e.*, the Kudūra district, has been identified, as we have already seen, with a village in the Bandar or Masulipatam taluka. The find of the plates at Kondamudi appears to prove that this region was a part of the Brhatphalāyana kingdom in about 300 A.D. The capital of the Brhatphalāyanas seems therefore not to have been very far from the Masulipatam region.

In this connection it is very interesting to note that Ptolemy makes mention of the *metropolis of Pitundra* (135° 12′) in the country of the people called Maisōloī (*Geog., VII. i., § 93*). In *op. cit.*, § 79, the Maisōloī are placed near the country of the Salakēnōi (*Sālaṇkāyanasa* of Vengi) and in § 15 their country has been called Maisōlia (Masulipatam). Their metropolis, Pitundra, has been identified by Sylvain Lévi with Pibunda of the *Uttarādhīyāyana* and Pithunda of the Hathigumpha inscription of king Khārvela (*Ind. Ant., 1926, p. 145*). We have seen that the Brhatphalāyanas ruled over the Masulipatam region, which is to be identified with Maisōlia of Ptolemy. Pitunda the capital of Maisōlia in the time of Ptolemy (middle of the 2nd century) appears therefore almost certainly to have been the capital of the family of Jayavarman Brhatpha-

---

the surroundings of Bādāmi, as scholars have noticed, do not answer to the description given by the Chinese pilgrim, and its distance from Broach (135 miles) is altogether incommensurate with the distance of 1030 li (about 167 miles) as specified by Yuen Chwang. Scholars therefore now generally agree with the view of Fleet that the town in question is Nashik, about 123 miles to the south-east of Broach. Fleet seems to be right when he suggests: "We have therefore to look for some subordinate but important town, far to the north of Bādāmi, which was mistakenly spoken of as the capital by Hsien Tshiang; most probably because it was the basis of the operations against Harshvardhana of Kanauj, and because in connection with these operations, Pulikæsi II happened to be there at the time" (*Bemb. Gt., I, Fii., p. 335*).
lāyana, ruler of the Masulipatam region in the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the 4th century.

If we now accept the reading Pithumḍa in a passage of the Hathigumpha inscription (line 11) of Khāravela and the interpretation that king Khāravela of Kālāṅga besieged the city of Pithumḍa, it is not impossible to think that the Brhatphalāyanas were ruling at Pithunda = Pitunda as early as the time of Khāravela (2nd or 1st century B.C.).
CHAPTER III.
THE ĀNANDAS.

I

HIRANYAÇARĪHA.¹

As the word Hiranyagarbha has some bearing on the question of the genealogy of kings whom we call the Ānandas, we shall deal with this term first.

According to Sanskrit Lexicons, the word Hiranyagarbha has two principal meanings. First, it is a well-known epithet of Lord Brahman; secondly, it is the name of one of the sōdasā-mahādāna, i.e., the sixteen Great Gifts which are enumerated and explained in books like the Matsya-Purāṇa, Hemādri’s Vṛatakhaṇḍa and Ballālasena’s Dānisāgara. The sixteen Mahādānas are dāna (offering) of the following things:—

1. Tulāpurusa
2. Hiranyagarbha
3. Brahmāṇḍa
4. Kalpa-pādapa
5. Gosahasra
6. Hiranyakāmadhenu
7. Hiranyāśva
8. Pañcalāṅgala
9. Dharā
10. Hiranyāśvaratha
11. Hemahastiratha
12. Viṣṇucakra
13. Kalpalata
14. Saptasāgara
15. Ratnadhenu
16. Mahābhūtaghāta

These names are more or less of a technical character. They have been explained in full details in the Mahādānacarita.

¹ This paper was published in J.B.A.S., October, 1934, p. 720 ff. A paper explaining the term “hiranyagarbha” was previously published in Bhāratīrṣya (Bengali), Bhādra, 1340 B. S., p. 363 f.
section of the Dānasāgara, Chapter V of the Vratakhandā and Chapter 247 ff. of the Matsya-Purāṇa.

The word Hiranyagarbha occurs several times in the inscriptions of some South Indian kings. In the Gorantla inscription (Ind. Ant., IX, p. 102 f.), king Attivarman is called aprameya-hiranyagarbha-prasava, which phrase was translated by Fleet, the editor of the Gorantla inscription, as "who is the posterity of the ineradicable (god) Hiranyagarbha," i.e., Brahma. In the Mahakuta pillar inscription of the Calukya king Maṅgaleśa (ibid., XIX, p. 9 ff.) we have the passage hiranyagarbha-sanbhūṭa. Here also Fleet who edited the inscription translated the phrase as "who was descended from (the god) Hiranyagarbha (Brahman)." It must be noticed that only particular kings have been connected with Hiranyagarbha in the inscriptions of their respective families. If Fleet's interpretation is correct we should have found other kings of the family—wherein one king has been called Hiranyagarbha-sanbhūṭa—with titles of the same signification. Moreover, when we notice that in the Mahakuta pillar inscription, this epithet is given only to Pulakesin I, and not to Jayasimha the first king mentioned, nor to Maṅgaleśa the reigning monarch, there remains no doubt that Fleet's theory is unjustifiable. I therefore hold with Hultsch that the word Hiranyagarbha, in these inscriptions, signifies the second of the sixteen Mahādānas or Great Gifts.

While editing the Mattpad plates of Dāmodarvarman (Ep. Ind., XVII, p. 328 ff.), Hultsch remarked: "A similar feat is ascribed to king Attivarman—in another copper-plate grant from the Guntur district, where I translate the epithet aprameya-Hiranyagarbha-prasarena by 'who is a producer of (i.e., who has performed) innumerable Hiranyagarbhas.'" Hultsch, here, evidently takes the passage hiranyagarbha-prasara as a case of the Ṣaṣṭha-tutpuraṇa compound to mean "prasara (origin, producer) of the
Hiranyagarbha." But he was in difficulty with the word Hiranyagarbha-prasūta which occurs in the Ipur grant (No. 1) of the Viṣṇukunda king Mādhavavarman I (ibid, p. 335 f.). As prasūta is an adjective, it cannot make a case of the Śaṣṭhi-tatpuruṣa compound. Hultsch, therefore, had to correct the passage as Hiranyagarbha-prasūti, i.e., prasūti (origin, producer) of the Hiranyagarbha (ibid, p. 336, note 7). But when we notice that the epithet Hiranyagarbha-prasūta also occurs in the Polamuru plates of the same Viṣṇukunda king (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VI, p. 17 ff.), and further that the Mahakuta pillar inscription has Hiranyagarbha-sambhūta, there can be no doubt that Hultsch is wrong in taking the passage Hiranyagarbha-prasava as a case of the Śaṣṭhi-tatpuruṣa compound. The words Hiranyagarbha-prasūta and Hiranyagarbha-sambhūta are certainly examples of the Pañcamī-tatpuruṣa compound and mean "born of the Hiranyagarbha." The word Hiranyagarbha-prasava must also mean the same thing. I therefore take it as a case of the Bahuvarīha compound to mean "one whose prasava (origin, producer, progenitor) is the Hiranyagarbha." But how can a king be born of the Hiranyagarbha which we have taken to signify the second of the sixteen Mahādānas?

In the performance of the Hiranyagarbha-mahādāna ceremony, the thing to be given away to the Brahmanas is a Hiranyagarbha, literally, "a golden womb." Hiranyagarbha here signifies a golden kunda, three cubits in height. Cf.

brāhmānapīṇaṁ pañcamī-tapanaṁ maṁśam subham
dvārāṣaṭṭhayāṁ-anugul-oçchāyāṁ hema-pankoja-garbhaṇaṁ.

To discuss in detail all the functions of the ceremony is not necessary for our purpose. The quotations, which are all from the 249th Chapter of the Matsya-Purāṇa, will sufficiently clear the point.
After due arcanā, the performer of the Mahādāna ceremony is to utter a mantra in adoration to Lord Hirañyagarbha (here, Lord Viṣṇu), two lines of which run:

bhūr-loka-pramukhā lokās = tava gurbhe vyavasthitāḥ
brahmādhyas = tathā devā namās = te viṣṇa-dhārīne.

Thereafter the performer enters into the hirañyagarbha, i.e., the golden kunda, and the priests perform the ceremonies of garbhādhāna, pumsavanā and simantonnayanā of the "golden womb," as they would do in the case of an ordinary pregnant woman. Cf.

evaṁ = ānāmya tan-madhyam = āvisy = āmbha udān-
mukhāḥ
muṣṭibhyāṁ parisamgrhyā dharmarāja-caturmukhau
jānumadhye śīraḥ kṛte āsthaḥ śāśv-pāṇacakam
garbhadhānām pumāvanān simantonnayanā tathā
kurya = hirañyagarbhasya tatas = te deva-puṅgavāḥ.

Then the performer is taken out of the "golden womb," and the jāta-karma and other necessary functions are performed by the priests, as if the performer is a newly born child. After that, the performer is to utter another mantra, wherein occur the following significant lines:

mātr = āham janitaḥ pūrvam martya-dharmā sur-ottama
 tvād-garbha-sambhavād = eṣa dīyeṣa-deho bhavamy = āham.

"O the best of gods, previously I was given birth to by my mother (and) was martya-dharmā (one having the qualities of an earthly creature). (But) now owing to my (re-) birth from your womb, I become dīyeṣa-deha (one having celestial body)."
That the performer of the Hiranyagarbha-mahādāna was thought to be "born of the Hiranyagarbha, i.e., golden womb," is also clear from the next mantra to be uttered by the priests:

\[ \text{adya-jātasya te = 'ngāni abhiṣekṣyāmahe vayam.} \]

After the ceremony is over, the priests receive the gift of that golden womb together with many other things.
II

Genealogy of the Ananda Kings. 2

Two kings of the Ananda family are known from their inscriptions. They are Attivarman of the Gorantla plates (Ind. Ant., IX, p. 102 f.) and Dāmodarvarman of the Mattepad plates (Ep. Ind., XVII, p. 327 f.). We have already dealt with the reference to the word Hiranyagarbha in the Gorantla inscription and with its different interpretations. Hultzach rightly says: "When editing the Gorantla plates of Attivarman, my late lamented friend Fleet believed this king (scil. Attivarman) to have been a Pallava—chiefly because he interpreted the epithet aprameya-Hiranyagarbha-prasārṇa by 'who is the posterity of the inscrutable (god) Hiranyagarbha.' As I have shown above, the rendering is inadmissible in the light of the corresponding epithet used in the fresh plates, and Fleet himself had since withdrawn his original opinion in his Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, second edition, 3 p. 334 " (Ep. Ind., XVII. 328). In the Gorantla inscription, Attivarman has been called kandaranrpati-kula-samudbhūta, "sprung from the family of king Kandara"; the family (kula), in its turn, is called ananda-mahārṣi-vamśa-samudbhūta, "sprung from the


2. "And now that we know more about the early history and Purānic genealogy of the Pallava, it is difficult to adapt these details to their accounts, though Attivarman does, like the Pallava, claim to belong to the posterity of the god Hiranyagarbha, i.e., Brahman. On the other hand, the name Kandara—and doubtless Kandara also—is a variant of Krishna; and this suggests that we may possibly have here an early Śaṅktraṭika record." (Fleet's Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts in Bomb. Gaz., I, Part II, p. 324).
lineage of the great sage Ananda." On the other hand, the Matṭepad plates were issued from vijaya-Kandara-pura, "victorious city (founded by) king Kandara." Dāmodaravarman is, here, said to have belonged to the Anandagotra. Both the Gorantla and Matṭepad grants were discovered in the Guntur district of the Madras Presidency. While editing the Matṭepad plates, Hultzsch, on these grounds, suggested that the three kings Kandara, Attivarman and Dāmodaravarman belonged to the same family and that they may be styled "the Ananda kings of Guntur."

The palaeography of the Gorantla and Matṭepad records suggests that the rule of king Attivarman and that of king Dāmodaravarman were not separated by a great interval. Considering the facts that the characters of the Gorantla inscription resemble, in some respects, those of the Ikṣvāku inscriptions of Nagarjunikonda (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 1 ff.) and that both Nagarjunikonda, the find-spot of some Ikṣvāku inscriptions, and Kanteru, that of some Śaṅkāyana inscriptions are localities of the Guntur district, it seems to me that the Ananda kings, whose inscriptions are also found in the same district, began to grow powerful about the middle of the 4th century A.D., when the power of the Pallava successors of the Ikṣvākus was gradually

---

1 Vennasākṣa in his Report for 1900, pp. 5 and 35, refers to a much defaced Sanskrit inscription mentioning the daughter of king Kandara of the Anandagotra, at Chesarla to the west of Guntur. Kandara, Kandhara, Kandiara, Kanhara, Kanhara and Kannara are Prakrit variants of the Sanskrit name Kṛṣṇa (Bomb. Gaz., 1, Pt. II, p. 410, note 1). Some inscriptions of the Raṣṭas of Sondaṭṭi style the Raṣṭakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III as Kandhāra-pravarar-dāhitara, supreme lord of Kandhārapura, the best of towns (ibid., pp. 419, 550 and note 6); and 384, note 6). This fact appears to have led Fleet to suggest a Raṣṭakūṭa connection of Attivarman (ibid., 396). But as suggested by the same scholar (ibid., 384, note 4) the name of Kandhārapura "may possibly have been invented from an imaginary Kṛṣṇapura, derived from some passage similar to that in which the Eastern Chalukya King Guṇaka Viṣṇupādiya III is said to have effected the burning of the city of Kṛṣṇapura (Kṛṣṇapura-dāhaka, see Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, p. 102, n. 6)."
GENEALOGY OF THE ANANDA KINGS

declining in the Andhra country. The Nagarjunikonda inscriptions have been assigned to the 3rd century A.D. and, as I shall show below, the Kanteru plates are to be ascribed to the 5th century A.D. KingsAttivarman and Dāmodaravarman may, therefore, be conjecturally placed about the second half of the 4th century of the Christian era.

But which of the two kings of the Ananda family came earlier? According to Hultzsch, the characters of the Gorantla inscription are more developed than those of the Mattepad grant which is besides partly written in Prakrit; "consequently Dāmodaravarman must have been one of the predecessors of Attivarman" (Ep. Indl., XVII, p. 328).

As regards the first point, viz., that the characters of the Gorantla inscription are more developed, I must say that when two epigraphs belong to the same period it is extremely difficult to determine as to which of them is the earlier. In our section on the Viṣṇukundin genealogy below, we shall show that the Viṣṇukundin king Madhavavarman II of the Ipur grant (No. 2) was suggested by Hultzsch, on palaeographical grounds, to have been the grandfather of Madhavavarman (I) of the Ipur grant (No. 1). We shall also show there that the former was actually not the grandfather, but the grandson, of the latter.¹ Since the handwritings of two different scribes of even the same age may be quite dissimilar, I do not think it impossible that the difference in time between the execution of the Mattepad and that of the Gorantla grant is short and that Dāmodaravarman of the Mattepad grant was a successor of Attivarman on the throne of Kandarapura.²

¹ See also my paper on the genealogy of the Viṣṇukundins in Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, p. 378 ff.
² Cf. "Not only the plates of the Pallava but also those of the Gahgas and the Kadambas prove that the alphabets differ much according to the scribes, who have engraved the plates; and the documents of the same reign do not sometimes resemble one another." (Asn. Hist. Doc., pp. 66-68.)
As regards the second point, viz., that the Mattepad grant is partly written in Prakrit, I am afraid, it is a misrepresentation. In fact, the Mattepad plates are, like the Gorantla plates, written in Sanskrit; but it is true that the names of the Brāhmaṇa recipients of the king's gift are written in Prakrit, e.g., Kassava-Kumārājja (Sanskrit: Kāśyapa-Kumārārya), etc. We must notice, however, that the Gorantla inscription also exhibits the same peculiarity. I think it even more significant that the name of the king is here Attivarman and not Hastivarman. Atti is a Dravidic form of Sanskrit hastin, through the literary Prakrit from hatthi. Names like Attivarman, Kumārajja, etc., only prove that both these grants were issued in a time when the replacement of Prakrit by Sanskrit in South Indian epigraphy was nearly, but not fully, complete.

There are, besides, two other points in support of our suggestion. Firstly, in the Gorantla inscription, the kundara-ṛṣṭi-kula has been called bhagavato vakesvarādhīvāsinas=tribhuvana-kartuh sambhoś=carana-kumala-rajaḥ-pavitrikṛta, which appears to suggest that Sambhu (Siva) was the family deity of the Ananda kings and that they were Śaivas. On the other hand, Dāmodaravarman is called in his inscription bhagavataḥ saṃyaksambuddhasya pāḍānudhyāta, which clearly shows that he was a Buddhist. If the Ananda kings prior to Attivarman were Śaivas, Dāmodaravarman who was a Buddhist would appear to have come after Attivarman. Secondly, the inscribed faces of the Mattepad plates of Dāmodaravarman are "numbered consecutively like the pages of a modern book." This fact also

---

1 With the name of Attivarman may be compared that of Attrimallā, a feudatory of the Cola king Rājaśēkhara (S.Ind.Ins., 1, No. 74). Attrimallā was also the surname of Kṛṣṇa II Ṭhāṅkārīya. Compare also Attivarman in Kielhorn's List, No. 1070; and "Attrimallā or Attrarasa, born at Narapaguna in the Andhra country" in Bamb. Gac., I, Pt. II, p. 507
seems to suggest that Dāmodaravarman came after Ativarman.

But, what was the relationship between these two kings of the Ānanda family, who, we think, were not far removed from each other in time?

In this connection, I like to draw the attention of readers to the epithet abandhyav-gosahasr-āneka-hiranyagarbh-odbhav-odbhava applied to the name of king Dāmodaravarman in the Mattepad plates. This epithet has been translated by Hultzsch as “who is the origin of the production (i.e., who has caused the performance) of many Hiranyagarbhas and of (gifts of) thousand pregnant cows.” This translation is defective for several reasons.

We have seen that Hultzsch has wrongly interpreted the passage hiranyagarbha-prasava as the “producer of the Hiranyagarbha.” As we have shown, it should mean “one whose producer is the Hiranyagarbha.” The corresponding passage of the Mattepad plates is hiranyagarbh-odbhava, which means exactly the same thing. Hultzsch says: “he (scil. Dāmodaravarman) boasts of having performed certain Brahmanical rites, viz., Gosahasra and Hiranyagarbha (l. 2 f.).” But it seems to me hardly tenable that Dāmodaravarman who was professedly a Buddhist performed these rites which are professedly Brahmanical. Besides, if Hultzsch’s interpretation is right, why did the composer use hiranyagarbh-odbhav-odbhava and not hiranyagarbh-odbhava which is the naturally expected form? The use of hiranyagarbh-odbhav-odbhava in the sense of “performer of the Hiranyagarbha” seems to me highly awkward in an ordinary prose composition. The natural meaning of the phrase hiranyagarbh-odbhav-odbhava is “one whose udbhava (producer, father) is Hiranyagarbh-odbhava (i.e., performer of the Hiranyagarbha-mahādāna).”

As regards abandhya-gosahasra, I do not think that the word abandhya ever means “pregnant.” Abandhya, i.e.,
not-barren, which also means *amogha-phal-odaya* (producer of unfailing good and prosperity) according to the Sanskrit lexicon *Rājanirghanta*, seems to refer not to *go* as Hultzsch has taken it, but to the Gosahasra, the fifth of the sixteen Mahādānas of the *Purāṇas*. The whole phrase *abandhyagosahasr-āneka-hiranya-garbh-odbhav-odbhava*, then, means "one whose *udbhava* (i.e., father) is Abandhyagosahasra (i.e., performer of a Gosahasra producing unfailing success) and Aneka-hiranyagarbh-odbhava (i.e., performer of many Hiranyagarbhas).

Now, who is this Abandhyagosahasra-Aneka-hiranyagarbh-odbhava, the *udbhava* (father) of king Dāmodaravarman? Curiously enough, in the Gorantla inscription, Attivarmar is called *aprameya-hiranyagarbha-prasava*, which is obviously the same as *aneka-hiranyagarbha-odbhava*. I therefore do not think it quite impossible that it is king Attivarmar who was the father of king Dāmodaravarman of the Mattepad plates. It may however be argued that the Mattepad plates credit the father of king Dāmodaravarman with the performance of a Gosahasra as well; but there is no reference to this Mahādāna in Attivarmar’s own Gorantla grant. The Gosahasra mahādāna may have been performed by Attivarmar after the execution of the Gorantla grant. It may also be a case of the *Argumentum ex Silentio*. 
III

ATTIVARMAN (=HASTIVARMAN).

As we have seen, the Ānanda king Attivarman was a devotee of Sambhu (Siva) and performed “many” Hiranyagarbhas. The performance of such a costly mahādāna as the Hiranyagarbha for more than once (and probably also of a Gosahasra) seems to show that he was a rich and powerful prince. His epithet pratāp-opanata-sakala-sāmanta-manḍala suggests that there were other ruling chiefs who acknowledged his suzerainty. His inscription tells us that he acquired fame in ruling his subjects with justice.

The Gorantla inscription records the gift of eight hundred pattiś (pieces) of land in the village of Tāṇḍikonaḍa on the southern bank of the Kṛṣṇabennā (i.e., the Krishna; see infra, and Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 334 n) river and also of the village of Antukkura, to a Brāhmaṇa named Koṭṭiśarman, who belonged to the Kāśyapa-gotra. The name of the village, read now as Tāṇḍikonaḍa by Hultzsch, was originally read by Fleet as Tanthikontha (Ep. Ind., VII, p. 328). The village has been identified by Hultzsch with the modern Tāṇḍikonda, ten miles to the north of Guntur and to the south of the Krishna. Antukkura, according to him, is probably modern Gani-Ātkuru to the west of Bezwāḍa. The recipient Koṭṭiśarman has been described as knowing the Āpastamba-sūtra and also the three Vedas, viz., Rk, Yajas and Sāman.

The seal of king Attivarman attached to the Gorantla plates is circular. “The emblem on it is probably some god, sitting cross-legged on an altar, but it is anything but clear, even in the original” (Ind. Ant., IX, p. 102). The figure is sunk in the flat surface of the seal, instead of being raised in relief on a counter-sunk surface as is usually the case.
IV

DĀMODARAVARMAN.

We have already said much about this king. The Mattepad grant was issued on the 13th day of the bright half of Kārttika in the 2nd regnal year of the king. It records the grant of the village of Kampūra with all parīhāras, to a number of Brāhmaṇas. Parīhāra, i.e., "immunity, privilege, exemption from taxes," is mentioned in Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra (Shamasastry’s 2nd ed., p. 73). The parīhāras are sometimes stated to be of eighteen kinds, but are very often referred to as sarvajāta-parīhāra (immunities of all kinds). For some of them see pages 43-44 above. The Mattepad grant was issued from the victorious city of Kandarapura which was possibly the capital of the kings of the Ānanda line. The recipients of the grant were the following: Ruddajja (Rudrārya), Nandijja (Nandyārya), Khandajja (Skundārya), Bhavajja (Bhavārya), Agnijja (Agnyārya), Sīrijja (Sṛyārya), Savarajja (Sabarārya) and Virajja (Vṛārya) of the Kopaṇinna (Kauṭindya)-gotra, Dāmajja (Dāmārya), Kumārajja (Kumārārya), Veṇujja (Viṣṇvārya), Devajja (Devārya) Nandijja and Dīnajja (Dīnārya) of the Kassava (Kāśyapa)-gotra and Bhaddajja (Bhadrārya) of the Āgastīgotra.

The seal of Dāmodaravarmān attached to the Mattepad plates is oval and is said to be much worn. It bears in relief, according to Hultzsch, the figure of a "seated bull" facing the proper right.

We do not know who succeeded Dāmodaravarmān on the throne of Kandarapura. The end of the Ānanda dynasty is wrapped up in obscurity. They were possibly subdued or supplanted by the Sālankāyanaś in the 5th century A.D.
CHAPTER IV.
THE SÁLANKĀYANAS.

I

GENEALOGY OF THE SÁLANKĀYANAS.¹

While editing the Kolleru (Kollair) grant of the Sálankāyana Mahārāja Nandivarman, son of Caṇḍavarman, in *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. V, p. 175 ff. (Sanskrit and Old-Canarese Inscriptions: No. XVIII), Fleet remarked: "In Sir W. Elliot's facsimiles I have [found] another copper-plate inscription of Vijayanandivarmanā and his Yuvamahārāja, whose name seems to be Vijayatuṅgavarmā or Vijayabudhavarmā." He appended the following note to the name of the Yuvamahārāja: "The original has, l. 3, 'Vijayabundagavarmassā,' and in the margin, a little above the line, there is the character 'dāha'—differing not much from 'ṅga' as there written—apparently intended to be introduced somewhere in the line as a correction." Now, as we shall presently see, this statement regarding the inscription is really wrong and was subsequently corrected by Fleet himself. But, unfortunately, the blunder has become parmanent in later writings on the Sálankāyana genealogy.

*En passant*, I may draw the attention of readers to the names of these kings generally accepted and used by scholars. The names can hardly be Vijayanandivarman, Vijayabuddhavarman and the like.

¹ My paper on the Sálankāyana genealogy was originally published in *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, IX, p. 308 ff.
The Śālaṅkāyana inscriptions are stated to be issued from Śrī-vijaya-veṅgipura, Vijaya-veṅgipura or Vijaya-veṅgi. The Kadamba grants are generally issued from Śrī-vijaya-vaijayanṭi, Śrī-vijaya-triparvata and Śrī-vijaya-palāśikā. The Mattepad plates of Dāmodaravārman (Ep. Ind., XVII, p. 327 ff.) were issued from Vijaya-kandarapura. We have also references to Śrī-vijaya-kāñcipurā, Śrī-vijaya-palakkada and Śrī-vijaya-daśanapura in some of the Pallava inscriptions (Ep. Ind., III, p. 142 ff., and I, p. 297; Ind. Ant., V, p. 50 ff., p. 154 ff.). There can be no doubt that the names of the places are Veṅgipura, Kāñcipurā, Vaijyanṭi, Palāśikā, etc., and that viṣaya or śrī-viṣaya has been prefixed to them simply for the sake of glorification. I have no doubt that the name of the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja of the Kollair grant is similarly Nandivarman, and not Śrī-viṣaya-or Vijaya-nandivarman, as is generally taken to be. Vijaya and Śrī-viṣaya, in such cases, mean viṣaya-yukta and Śrī-viṣaya-yukta respectively. When prefixed to proper names, they make examples of the Tātpuruṣa compound of the Śākapārthivādī class. The word jaya is also used in this way. As for instance. Karmānta (modern [Bad] Kāntā near Comilla) has been mentioned as jaya-Karmānta-vāsaka in the Asheadpur plate of Devakhadga (Bhandarkar, List, No. 1588). It must also be noticed that in the Pedavegi and Kanteru (No. 2) grants the reigning Śālaṅkāyana-king is simply called Nandivarman. Note also that the Pallava king Skandavarman II in his own Omgođu (No. 1) grant (Ep. Ind., XV, p. 246) calls himself Śrī-viṣaya-Skandavarman, while in the Uruvupalli grant of his son Viṣnugopavarman (Ind. Ant., V, p. 50) and in the Omgođu (No. 2), Pikir (ibid., XV, p. 246; VIII, p. 159) and Mangalur (Ind. Ant., V, p. 154) grants of his grandson ŚimHAVARMAN he is simply called Skandavarman.

1 See the Kadamba grants edited by Fleet in Ind. Ant., VI and VII.

† Cf. teṣām śrī-viṣaya = vāna sarāśrangha bhanteśa : Mahābhā., 1, 68, 24.
To come to our point. The first scholar who accepted the wrong information of Fleet and added thereto something of his own, seems to be Prof. Dubreuil, the author of *Ancient History of the Deccan* (Pondicherry, 1920). Before he wrote, a Prakrit copper-plate inscription of another Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Devavarman, had been discovered near Ellore. It was edited by Hultsch in *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, p. 56 ff. In *Ancient History of the Deccan*, Dubreuil therefore speaks of four Śālaṅkāyana monarchs, viz.,

1. Devavarman of the Ellore plates,
2. Candaivarman, and his son
3. Nandivarman of the Kollair plates,
4. Buddhavarman, son of (3) Nandivarman mentioned in the facsimile referred to by Fleet. As regards Buddhavarman, Dubreuil has quoted the passage of Fleet, and remarked: "This name is probably Buddhavarman, for in the margin, there is the character dha" (*Anc. Hist. Dec.*, p. 89). Evidently the Professor goes a step further. I do not know from which authority he learnt that the letter in the margin is dha and not ddda, as is attested by Fleet.

The mistake was next repeated by K. V. Lakshmana Rao who edited the two copper-plate grants discovered at Kanteru, one belonging to the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Nandivarman and the other to the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Skandavarman. Like Dubreuil, Lakshmana Rao has quoted the same passage of Fleet and has taken "Vijaya Buddhavarman" as a king belonging to the Śālaṅkāyana dynasty (*Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc.*, Vol. V, p. 26). It is to be noted that Fleet hesitatingly proposed an alternative of two names, viz., Tuṅgavarman and Buddhavarman, with a

---

1 *Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc.*, V, p. 26 ff.; the plates appear to have been originally edited by the same scholar in *Journal of the Andhra Academy or Andhra Sāhitya-Parishat-Patrikhā*, Vol. XI, p. 113 ff.
slight inclination towards the latter; then Dubreuil showed favour for the name Buddhavarman; and now Lakshmana Rao takes Buddhavarman as an established name in the genealogy of the Śālāṅkāyana.

Next we come to R. Subba Rao, who has edited the Peddavegi copper-plates of the Śālāṅkāyana Mahārāja Nandivarman II (*ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 92 ff.). He refers to five inscriptions belonging to the Śālāṅkāyana kings. "Of these a Prakrit inscription which was discovered by Mr. (? Sir Walter) Elliot remains unpublished; but two kings (?) mentioned in it are known to us as Vijayanandivarman Yuvamahārāja (?) and Vijayabuddhavarman. The late Mr. Lakshmana Rao edited in *Andhra Sāhitya-Parishat-Patrika*, Vol. XI, two Śālāṅkāyana inscriptions discovered in Kanteru near Guntur and these belong to Nandivarman and Skandavarman. Another Śālāṅkāyana inscription discovered in Kālair lake and (sic.) which belongs to Vijaya Nandivarman, eldest son of Chandavarman, was published in *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. V, by Mr. Elliot (? Dr. Fleet). A Prakrit inscription discovered at Ellore which belongs to Vijaya Devavarman was published in *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. IX " (*ibid.*, p. 93). By this time, everything is complete.¹

I am afraid, these scholars have not carefully read all the inscriptions edited by Fleet in his well-known "Sanskrit and Old-Canarese Inscriptions" series. It is however wrong to say that "a Prakrit inscription which was discovered by Mr. Elliot remains unpublished." It was actually published by Fleet in *Ind. Ant.*, IX, p. 100 ff. (Sans. Old-Can. Ins., No. LXXIV). "This is the grant

of Vijayabuddhavarmā," he says there, "of which I have spoken at Vol. V, p. 175. I now give the text from the original plates which belong to Sir Walter Elliot."

Fleet's reading of the grant is as follows:

L. 1. Siddha Sirivijayakhandavamman-mahārājassamavachchhara.........
L. 2. Yuvamahārājassabhāraṭṭayaṇa Pallavā- 
L. 3. nam Sirivijayabuddhavarmassadevi.......... 
L. 4. kujana vihā (?) rudēvī Kadā (?) viya.......... 

No argument is necessary to prove that the inscription belongs to the Pallavas and refers to the king Skandavarman and the Crown-prince Buddhavarman, and that it has nothing to do with the Sālāṅkāyanas. Fleet was himself conscious of what he said before, and remarked (ibid., p. 101): "And Vijayabuddhavarmā is said to be a Pallava, and of the Bhrārāṭṭayaṇa gotra. There is therefore, no genealogical connection between the Vijayabuddhavarmā of this grant and the Vijayanandivarman of the Vengi grant at Vol. V, p. 175, who was of the Sālāṅkāyanas gotra." Fleet, however, could not translate the inscription, as it is written in Prakrit. It has later been carefully edited by Hultsch in Ep. Ind., VIII (p. 143 ff., "British Museum Plates of Chārūdevī" with "Plates of Vijaya-Skandavarman and Vijaya-Buddhavarman"). The first plate has been thus deciphered and translated by Hultsch:

Siddha//

L. 1. Siri-Vijaya-Khandava[m]ma-mahārājassamavachchhara[ā]......[*]
L. 2. Yuvamahārājassabhāraddāyassapallavā-
L. 3. nam Si[ri]-vijaya-Buddhavarmassadevī[Bu-]
ddhi......
L. 4. kura-janavi Chārūdevī ka[ḍake]viya......[*]
"Success! The years (of the reign) of the glorious Mahārāja Vijaya-Skandavarman, Chārūdēvi, the queen of the Yuvalahārāja, the Bhāradvāja, the glorious Vijaya-Buddhavarman (of the family) of the Pallavas (and) mother of [Buddhyan]kara, (addresses the following order) [to the official at] Ka[taka]."

There can, then, be no question of a Buddhavarman in the genealogy of the Śālankāyanas.

The following kings are so far known from inscriptions to have belonged to the Śalaṅkāyana dynasty:

1. Ellore Prakrit grant (i) Devavarman.
2. Kollair grant (i) Cāṇḍavarman;
   (ii) Nandivarman, the eldest son of Cāṇḍavarman.
3. Peddavegi grant (i) Hastivarman;
   (ii) Nandivarman I, son of Hastivarman;
   (iii) Cāṇḍavarman, son of Nandivarman I;
   (iv) Nandivarman II, eldest son of Cāṇḍavarman.
4. Kanteru grant (No. 1) (i) Skandavarman.
5. Kanteru grant (No. 2) (i) Nandivarman.

There can be no doubt that Nandivarman of the Kollair grant is identical with Nandivarman II of the Peddavegi grant, since both of them are described in the inscriptions as "the eldest son of Cāṇḍavarman." It is however not quite clear whether Nandivarman of the Kanteru grant (No. 2) is identical with either of the two Nandivarmanas of the Peddavegi plates or he is a third king different from them. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to identify him with Nandivarman II of the Peddavegi grant. Both in the Kollair and the Peddavegi grants Nandivarman II is called
bhagavac-citrarathascāmi-pād-anudhyāto bappa-bhattaraka-
pāda-bhaktah parama-bhāgavataś-śālanākyana. It is interesting to note that exactly the same epithets have been applied to Nandivarman also in the plates discovered at Kanteru. It must moreover be noted that the king has the epithet parama-bhāgavata in all these three inscriptions and that no other Śālanākyana king is as yet known to have used this epithet. It appears, then, almost certain that Nandivarman of the Kanteru plates is also, like the king of the same name of the Kollāir grant, identical with Nandivarman II of the Peddavegi plates. There is unfortunately nothing from which we can determine the precise relationship that existed between Devavarman or Skandavarman on the one hand and the line of the remaining four kings on the other.

As the Ellore grant is written in Prakrit, there can hardly be any doubt that king Devavarman ruled before Skandavarman and Nandivarman II who used Sanskrit in their inscriptions. The character of the Peddavegi plates of Nandivarman II appear to be slightly more developed than that used in the Ellore plates of Devavarman. Devavarman, therefore, may be placed before Hastivarman who appears to have been succeeded regularly by his son, grandson and great-grandson. Considering the facts that the inscriptions of Nandivarman II are to be palaeographically assigned to about the middle of the 5th century A.D., and that he was preceded by three kings of his line, it seems probable that Skandavarman of the Kanteru grant came after Nandivarman II. We however do not know whether Devavarman was the immediate predecessor of Hastivarman or Skandavarman the immediate successor.

---

1 Devavarman seems to have ruled about 220-45 A.D. (see below). He therefore may have been the immediate predecessor (father?) of Hastivarman. See my paper in Ind. Coll., I, pp. 499-502.
of Nandivarman II. The genealogical tree then stands thus:

Devavarman

Hastivarman

Nandivarman

Caṇḍavarman

Nandivarman II

Skandavarman

It may be noticed here that this Śālankāyana Hastivarman of the Peddavegi plates can hardly be any other than the vaṅgeyaka-Hastivarman, mentioned in the famous Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta. The main arguments in favour of this assertion are the following:

(i) The Śālankāyana line is the only dynasty which can be properly called vaṅgeyaka (belonging to Vengi), as all the grants of the Śālankāyana kings are issued from Vengipura. No other early dynasty is known to have had its headquarters at the city of Vengi.

1 Some scholars have suggested that Skandavarman might have been the younger brother of Nandivarman II (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., V, p. 27). The conspicuous mention in Nandivarman II's inscriptions of his being the eldest son of Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman may suggest that the king had a rival in one of his younger brothers. We however do not as yet definitely know whether this younger brother could be Skandavarman of the Kautara grant No. 1.


3 It may be noted that a Sanskrit grant belonging to the Pallava Dharma-Mahārāja Simhavarman (Ind. Ant., V p. 154) refers to Venggōrastra. Simhavarman is there said to have granted a village in the Venggōrastra. The grant was issued
(ii) The Sālāṅkāyanas ruled according to Dubreuil, "between 350 and 450 A.D." (op. cit., p. 87); and Burnell thought that the Kollair grant of Nandivarman may be palaeographically assigned to the 4th century A.D. (South Indian Palaeography, p. 14, n. 2). It is therefore generally accepted that the Sālāṅkāyanas ruled contemporaneously with the early Guptas (320-467 A.D.).

As regards the date proposed by Dubreuil, it may be said that the Sālāṅkāyanas certainly began to rule long before 350 A.D. Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri (Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., 3rd ed., p. 341, n. 1) has rightly identified the Sālāṅkāyanas with the Salakêanoi mentioned in the Geography of Ptolemy (about 140 A.D.). Ptolemy says: "Beyond the Muisôloî (cf. Masulipatam) are the Salakêanoi near the Arouasia mountains, with the following cities: Bēnagouron

from Daśanapura, which had been identified by Venkayya with modern Daṣai in the Nellore district (Ind. Ant., 1906, p. 283). "None of these places Tambrāpa, Palakka, Daśanapura or Menmātura (from where some Sanskrit charters of the Pallavas were issued) has been identified definitely, although a suggestion has been made by the late Mr. Venkayya that they are to be looked for in the vicinity of the region comprised by the modern Nellore district" (R. Gopal, Pallavaśa of Kanchi, p. 28). Prof. Dubreuil also places the Daśanapura region in the Nellore and Guntur districts (Anc. Hist. Des., p. 69). The Veṇgi country, we know, lay "between the Krishna and the Godavari." If this Veṇgorṣṭra refers to the country of Veṇgi, it may be assumed that, at the time of Sīnhavarman Pallava, the southern fringe of this country was under the possession of the Pallavas. There is however, as yet no evidence to prove that the capital city of Veṇgi was ever occupied by the Pallavas. We must also note that even the grandfather of this Sīnhavarman used Sanskrit in his inscription (cf. Gomāt plates of Sīnaḍavarman II; Ep. Ind., XV, p. 246 ff.). It is generally accepted that Sanskrit was introduced in Southern inscriptions in the 4th century A.D. Sīnhavarman therefore came some time after the reign of Sānuḍragupta. See infra.

It may however be conjectured that, with the extension of the Veṇgi kingdom under the Sālāṅkāyanas, the name Veṇgi also extended over Andhradesa, as far south as Karṇāṭaśa (northern part of Nellore and southern part of Guntur). Veṇgorṣṭra in the possession of the Pallavas is, then, to be conjectured to have been originally the southernmost part of the Sālāṅkāya kingdom. There is however no evidence to prove that the Pallavas were in possession of the city of Veṇgi.
140° 24' ; Kastra 138° 19' 30' ; Magaris 137° 30' 18° 20' (Geography, VII, i, § 70). Bénagouron, the premier city of the Salakênoi, appears to me to be a mistake for Bêngaouron (Beŋapura) which is no other than the well-known Vêŋipura (cf. Vêŋgorâstra of the Mangalur grant).

As regards the conjecture of Burnell, I may simply point out that, if we compare the characters of the Kollair plates (Ind. Ant., V, p. 175 and Pls.) with those of the inscriptions of the early Eastern Calukyas and of the Viṣṇukundins, it becomes impossible for us to accept such an early date for the Kollair grant. I have no hesitation in asserting that palaeography has nothing to say against the ascription of the inscriptions of Nandivarman II to the middle of the 5th century A.D. It is then quite possible that his great-grandfather Hastivarman ruled about a century earlier and was a contemporary of Samudragupta (circa 330 to 375 A.D.).

(iii) Lastly, excepting this Śalaṅkāyana Hastivarman we do not know of any other king, who ruled at Vêŋi, whose name was Hastivarman and who can any how be placed in the middle of the 4th century A.D. which is the time of Samudragupta.

Accepting the contemporaneity of Samudragupta and Śalaṅkāyana Hastivarman (c. 350 A.D.), we may draw the following approximate chronological chart of the Śalaṅkāyana Mahārājas.

---


2 See, e.g., the Polamuru plates of Mādhavarvarman I (I) who cannot be much earlier than Jayasimha I (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VI, p. 17, Pls.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devavarman</td>
<td>c. 320-345 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastivarman</td>
<td>c. 345-370 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandivarman I</td>
<td>c. 370-395 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candavarman</td>
<td>c. 395-420 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandivarman II</td>
<td>c. 420-445 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
<td>c. 445-470 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ *As. Rep. S. Ind. Ep.*, 1926-27, p. 74 notices the following tree of Śālaṅkāyana genealogy proposed by M. Somasekhara Sarma.

```
# Genealogy of the Śālaṅkāyana Clan

**Hastivarman A.D. 350 (Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta)**

- **Vijaya-Devarman**
  - A.D. 375 (Elliot grant)

- **Nandivarman**
  - A.D. 400 (Elliot's unpublished grant)
    - **Vijaya-Nandivarman**
      - A.D. 425 (Elliot's unpublished grant)
        - **Yuvanabhārāja Vijaya-Buddhavarman**
          - A.D. 450 A.D.
            - **Capdavarman**
              - A.D. 450 A.D.
                - **Vijaya-Nandivarman II**
                  - (Kolleru and Kanteru grants)

- **Vijaya-Skandavarman**
  - (Kanteru grant)
```

We have tried to prove the following points: (1) Devavarman probably ruled earlier than Hastivarman and therefore may not have been the latter's son; (2) there was no Śālaṅkāyana inscription in Elliot's collection and there was no prince named Buddhavarman in the Śālaṅkāyana family; (3) the relation between Skandavarman and Capdavarman is not definitely known.
CANDAVARMAN, LORD OF KALINGA

In his latest work, *Historical Inscriptions of Southern India* (1932), p. 18, s.v. A.D. 340, the late Mr. Sewell has thus remarked on the Komartli grant: "About the fourth century A.D. A set of plates from Komartli in Ganjam, dated in the sixth regnal year of the Sālaṅkāyana chief Chaṇḍavarman." The late Dr. K. P. Jayaswal in his work, *History of India* (1933), even goes so far as to suggest that the Sālaṅkāyanas ruled not only in Kalinga but belonged originally also to Magadha (pp. 127-28). Sewell and Jayaswal here evidently follow the views of Hultzsch who, while editing the Komartli plates in *Ep. Ind.*, IV, p. 142 ff., was inclined to identify king Caṇḍavarman mentioned in this inscription with the Sālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman, father of Nandivarman II. Kielhorn, who entered the Kolleru inscription of Nandivarman II Sālaṅkāyana in his List of Inscriptions of Northern India (*Ep. Ind.*, V, App., No. 686) was obviously of the same opinion.* Prof. Dubreuil remains silent about the suggestion of Hultzsch, who discusses the Komartli grant (*Anc. Hist. Dec.*, p. 94), though he does not take up the suggestion of Hultzsch. We may not accept the identification, but such great authorities in South Indian epigraphy as Hultzsch and Kielhorn cannot be passed over in silence. Moreover, a discussion on this

---

1 My note on Caṇḍavarman of the Komartli Plates was originally published in *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, X, p. 780 ff.

2 Following Kielhorn, D. R. Bhandarkar has also entered the Sālaṅkāyana inscriptions in his List of Inscriptions of Northern India (*Ep. Ind.*, XX-XXIII, App., Nos. 2087-91).
point has now become indispensable after some scholars have accepted the old suggestion made by Hultzsch and supported by Kielhorn.

Regarding the Komarti plates, Hultzsch says that "a connection may be established with the plates (i.e., the Kollair plates) of the Sālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Vijayanandivarman, who (1) like Candavarman, professes to have been devoted to the feet of the lord, (his) father (bappa-bhāṭṭāraka-pāda-bhakta), and who (2) was the eldest son of Mahārāja Chandavarman. The close resemblance between the alphabets of the plates of Vijayanandivarman and of the Komarti plates suggests that Chandavarman, the father of Vijayanandivarman, may have been identical with the Mahārāja Chandavarman who issued the Komarti plates."

I agree with Hultzsch that the characters of the Komarti plates resemble closely those of the plates of Nandivarman II Śalaṅkāyana, and that, therefore, "the two Chandavarman must have belonged to the same period." But it is difficult to go beyond that. There are some serious points against the identification of the issuer of the Komarti plates with the Śalaṅkāyana Mahārāja Candavarman.

The Komarti plates were found near Narasannapeta in the Ganjam district. The grant was issued from vijaya-Simhapura which has been identified with modern Singhupuram between Chicacole and Narasannapeta. On the other hand, all the known Śalaṅkāyana grants were issued from Vengipura which has been identified with Peddavegi near Ellore in the Godavari district and

---

1 The name of Simhapura, the capital of the dynasty to which Candavarman belonged, and the names ending in -varman appear to support a conjecture that these Varman of Kalinga originally came from the Simhapura-rāja (Yuan Chwang's "kingdom of Sung-he-pu-lo)", Ball, Sāyi-kī, I, pp. 143-4) in the Punjab. The Lakshamanadi inscription of about the "end of the 5th century" refers to twelve princes of Simhapura, whose names and -varman (Sp. Ind., I, p. 12 S.). This Simhapura in the Punjab seems to have been mentioned in the Mahābhārata, II, 20, 20, in connection with Arjuna's victories in the Northern countries.
which appears to have been the chief city of the Śaṅkāyanas as early as the time of Ptolemy.

It must be noted that Caṇḍavarman of the Komarti grant calls himself Kaliṅgādhipati (lord of Kaliṅga); but no Śaṅkāyana Mahārāja so far known claims mastery over the Kaliṅga country. The issuers of all the Śaṅkāyana grants invariably call themselves Śaṅkāyana and also Bhagavac-citralathasvāmi-pād-ānudhyāta, i.e., favoured by the feet of lord Citralathasvāmin who must have been the family deity of the Śaṅkāyanas. It must also be noticed that both these distinctive epithets are conspicuous by their absence in the Komarti grant.

Besides, the phraseology of the Komarti grant seems to be different from that of the known Śaṅkāyana inscriptions. Two points at least deserve notice in this connection. First, the king of the Komarti grant calls himself Śrimahārāja(ā)-Caṇḍavarmanā, while all the issuers of the Śaṅkāyana grants invariably call themselves Mahārāja-āri-so-and-so. Secondly, the phrase ā-sahasrāmsū-śāśi-tārakā-pratistha used as an adjective of agrahāra, and the idea conveyed by it, are unknown to the phraseology of the known Śaṅkāyana inscriptions which, we should note, are marked by a striking similarity of language among themselves.

Such being the case, we must take the issuer of the Komarti plates as belonging to a separate dynasty, until further evidence is forthcoming. It seems probable that the dynasty to which Caṇḍavarman of the Komarti grant belongs ruled over the Kaliṅga country (or the major part of it) with its capital at Simhapura, when the Śaṅkāyanas

---

1 For this new interpretation of the word anudhyāta, see infra.
2 Prof. Dubois has rightly separated the two dynasties in his Anc. Hist. Des., pp. 99 and 99. Another record issued from svāja-Simhapura in the fourth year of evidently the same Kaliṅg-ādhipati Caṇḍavarman has been recently discovered (Arch. Surv. Ind., A.R., 1934-35, p. 64).
ruled over the country to the west of the Kalinga region with their capital at Vengi-pura. The country of the Šalankayana was the heart of what is called Andhradeśa in Sanskrit literature. In the inscriptions of the Eastern Calukyas, it has been designated Vengimaṇḍalā, Vengṛatrā, Vengimaṭh and the like. Probably the country was called "the Vengi kingdom" even in the Šalankayana period.

Another king of the dynasty of Simhapura seems to have been the issuer of the Brihatprostha grant (issued from vijaya-Sihapura, i.e., Simhapura), edited by Hultsch in Ep. Ind., XII, p. 4 ff. The name of the king who issued this grant has been taken to be Umavarman. According to Hultsch, "both the alphabet and the phraseology of the grant closely resemble those of the Komarti plates of Mahārāja Chandavarman. This king may have belonged to the same family as the Mahārāj-omavarman.....For both kings issued their edicts from Simhapura (or Sihapura) and bore the epithets 'lord of Kalinga' and 'devoted to the feet of (his) father.'"

The characters of the Komarti grant closely resemble those of another inscription, the Chicaole grant of Nanda-Prabhanjanavarman. The two phraseological peculiarities

1 Ep. Ind., XII, p. 4, Hultsch is not quite accurate in the last point: Chandavarman is called Rappa-bhavarske-pāda-bhakta, while Umavarman is called Rappa-pāda-bhakta in the inscription. The Tekhail record issued from vijaya-Vardhamānapura seems to be dated in the ninth year of this king Umavarman (Jour. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VI, p. 33 i.). I do not think that the Tekhail grant belongs to a different king. A third record of Umavarman is the Dhavalapeta grant issued from Sunagura (ibid., pp. X.: 143-44).

2 Ind. Ind., XIII, p. 48 i. The name so long taken by scholars as Nanda-prabhanjanavarman probably signifies Prabhanjanavarman of the Nanda family. For a reference to the Nanda or Nandodhava dynasty in the Kalinga region, see the Tāmil plates of the Nanda Vīlāsantīna-Dhruvānanda of the year 223 (J. B. O. R. S., XIV, p. 90 ff.). The date if referred to the Harṣa era would correspond to A. D. 699. These Nandas or Nandodhavas appear to have claimed descent from the mighty Nanda who ruled at Patalepura before the Mauryas. It may be interesting in this connection to note that a certain Nandarāja is referred to in the famous Harihara inscription of Kāravela, king of Kalinga (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 79 f., lines 6 and 10). If the king may be identified with Prabhanjanavarman, "the son of the Vasīstha family," we are to believe that he was connected with the Vasīthas on his mother’s side.
of the Komartī grant noticed above are present in the Chicacole grant. We may therefore agree with Hultzach when he says, "The phraseology of the grant resembles that of the copper-plate grants of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga, but still much more closely with that of the Chicacole plates of Nandaprabhaṅjanavarman. Another point in which the last mentioned plates agree with the Komartī plates is that in both of them the title Kalingādhipati, i.e., 'lord (of the country) of Kaliṅga' is applied to the reigning prince. There remains a third point which proves that Chaṇḍavarman and Nandaprabhaṅjanavarman must have belonged to the same dynasty. An examination of the original seal of the Chicacole plates, which Mr. Thurstorn, Superintendent of the Madras Museum, kindly sent me at my request, revealed the fact that the legend on the seal is Pī[ṭri-bhakta], just as on the seal of the Komartī plates."1 The Chicacole grant was, however, not issued from Simhapura or Siṅhapura, but from viṇaya-Śaṅapalliṅka-vāsaka, "the residence or palace (or camp?) at the victorious Śaṅapalliṅka." It is not clear whether Śaṅapalliṅka was the capital of the Kalingādhipati Nanda-Prabhaṅjanavarman; but the explicit mention of the term vāsaka (residence, dwelling) probably suggests that it was not the permanent capital of his family.2

The Koroshandra plates (Ep. Ind., XXI, p. 28 ff.) of the same age record the grant of a village called Tampoyaka in Karasōḍaka-Paṅcāli by a Mahārāja named Viśākhavarman. It is known from the Chicacole grant of Indra-varman (Ind. Ant., XIII, p. 122 ff.) that this Karasōḍaka-Paṅcāli formed a part of the Kaliṅga country. G. Raniadas therefore thinks that Viśākhavarman was a Kalingādhipati like Chaṇḍavarman and Umavarman (Ep. Ind., XXI, p. 24).

1 Ep. Ind., IV, p. 143.
2 The term vāsaka and the similar term saṅghāsāra, sometimes appear to mean "the temporary residence (therefore, the temporary capital) of a king." See supra.
The grant however was issued from Śrīpura which has been identified with Siripuram in the Vizagapatam district.

On palaeographic grounds, these kings should be assigned to about the time of Nandivarman II Śālāṅkāyana, i.e., about the 5th century A.D. It is, therefore, impossible to agree with the late Prof. R. D. Banerji when he writes, “We do not know anything of the history of Kālīṅga and Orissa after the fall of the dynasty of Khāravela (2nd century B.C according to the Professor) till the rise of the Śailodbhavas in the 7th century A.D.”

It is difficult to determine whether this line of the kings of Kālīṅga was ruling at the time of the southern expedition of Samudragupta (c. 350 A.D.). It is, however, interesting to note that the Allahabad pillar inscription does not refer to any king of Kālīṅga, nor of Simhapura, Sārapalliṅa and Śrīpura. The states mentioned there, that may be conjecturally assigned to the Kālīṅga region, are Kurāḷa, Koṭṭūra, Piṭṭapura, Erāṇḍapalla, Avamukta and Devarāṣṭra. Of these Piṭṭapura has been definitely identified with Piṭṭhapuram in the Godavari district. That it was the seat of a Government in the beginning of the 7th century A.D., is proved by the passage piṭṭam piṭṭapuraṁ yena in the Aihole inscription of Pulakesin II. We have got an inscription of a Kālīṅga-ādhipati Vāsīśṭhiputra Saktivarman of the Māṭhara family (?) who granted from Piṭṭapura the village of Rākaluva in the Kālīṅga-viṣaya (Ep. Ind., XII, p. 1 ff.). Rākaluva has been identified with Rāgolu, the findspot of the copper-plates, near Chicacole in the Ganjam district. The characters of the inscription seem to resemble those of the Vengi and Simhapura inscriptions, and may, therefore, be assigned

---

1 Prof. Dubrueil places them a little later, loc. cit.
3 Ep. Ind., VI, p. 4 ff.
to about the 5th century A.D. But the phraseology is remarkably different from that of the inscriptions of the Simhapura line. It therefore may be conjectured that Saktivarman belonged to a separate line or branch line, that of Piṣṭapura, which was probably supplanted by the Calukyas in the beginning of the 7th century A.D. The epithet kalingādhipati seems to suggest that the claim of kalingādhipatisva of one of the two rival lines of Piṣṭapura and Simhapura was, at one time, challenged by the other.\(^1\)

Another grant (Arch. Surv. Ind., A.R., 1934-35, pp. 64-65) mentions a Kalingādhipati named Anantavarman whose adhiṣṭhāna (capital) was Piṣṭapura and who was the son of Prabhaṇjanavarman, “the moon of the Vasiṣṭha family,” and the grandson of Gūṇavarman, lord of Devarāṣṭra (mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription and in the Kasimkota grant of Cālukya-Bhīma I and identified with the Yellamanchili area of the Vizagapatam district).\(^2\)

The names of the other states mentioned above cannot be satisfactorily identified. It does not appear quite unreasonable to think that after the downfall of the Cetā dynasty to which the great Khāravela belonged, Kaliṅgā became split up into a number of petty principalities and that the same state continued as late as the time of Samudragupta’s invasion. The history of Kaliṅgā about the 5th century A.D. was possibly marked by the rivalry between the royal houses of Piṣṭapura and Simhapura for the supreme authority over Kaliṅgā. The line of

---

\(^1\) A recently discovered grant is known to have been issued from viṣṇug-
Siṅghapura in the 98th year of a lord of Kaliṅgā named Ananta-saktivarman, who belonged to the Māthara family (Arch. Surv. Ind., A.R., 1934-35, p. 65). He was possibly identical with Saktivarman or was one of the latter’s immediate successors. Deśikapatiśālikṛtya, talavara Arjunadatta of this grant may be the same as Amātya Arjunadatta of the grant of Saktivarman.

\(^2\) Besides these “lords of Kaliṅgā,” there is reference in the Sarabhaṇavarman
pūṇa’s (Rām. Ind., XIII p. 321), to an unnamed “lord of Cikura.” This “lord of Cikura,” according to Prof. Dubrueil, was “probably a king of Kaliṅgā but only a simple feudatory” (Anc. Hist. Dec., p. 94).
Simhapura was possibly overthrown by the Gāngas about the of the 6th century A.D.¹

In conclusion let me refer summarily to the four grants of the kings of Sarabhapura (Bhandarkar's List, Nos. 1878-1881). These grants are assigned to the 8th century A.D., but may be a little earlier. The above four inscriptions, all issued from Sarabhapura, have been found in C.P.; but, according to Sten Konow (Ep. Ind., XIII, p. 108), Sarabhapura may probably be identical with the modern village of Sarabhavaram, in the Chodavaram division, ten miles east from the bank of the Godavari and twenty miles from Rajahmundry. L. P. Pandeya has described (Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, p. 595) a corn belonging to the Sarabhapura kings whom he takes to be feudatories of the Pāṇḍava kings of Kosala. If the identification of Sten Konow is correct we have another royal family in the Kaliṅga country, the earlier members of which family may have ruled about the end of the 6th century.

¹ Curiously enough we find a line of kings, with names ending in -varman ruling over parts of Eastern and Southern Bengal in about the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D. The ancestors of these "Varman"—as they style themselves—on their inscriptions—are said to have once occupied Simhapura. Cf. varmanena 'tigabhrasvarano dakhatah dīghāsau bhujau bhikkuto bhajāh simhapuranam gahām—iṣa vṛgyāndrām, kasa—bāndharā; Belva grant of Bhavavarman (Ep. Ind., XII, p. 37), son of Sāmavarman, grandson of Jātavarman and great-grandson of Vajravarman. The Bengal Varman, like the Varman of the Lakkhamandala inscription, trace their descent from Yuddh. Evidently they claim connection with the Yudhas (cf. kasa—bāndharā; in the passage quoted above). It is possible that a second branch of the Punjab Varman migrated into Bengal. It may also be conjectured that the Varman of Kaliṅga when they were displaced from Simhapura (by the Eastern Gāṅgas ?), marched towards the east and carved out a principality somewhere in South or South-East Bengal. They appear to have supplanted the Candra dynasty of Eastern Bengal possibly after it was shaken by the defeat of "Goriadendra of Vajrālādas," inflicted by that Indian Napoleon, Gaṅgākumāra Balendra Cela I, in about 1029 A.D.
III

THE TERM ŚALANKĀYANA AND THE RELIGION OF THE ŚALANKĀYANAS.

The word Śalankāyana, according to the Sanskrit lexicons Trikāndāsena and Medinī, means Nandin, the famous attendant or vāhana of Śiva. It is interesting to note that the figure of a bull (i.e., Nandin) is found on the seals of the Śalankāyana kings, whose copper-plate grants have so far been discovered (vide infra). It is therefore not quite impossible that the Bull crest (and banner ?) of the Śalankāyana kings was connected with the name of their family.

Fleet, while editing the Kollair plates, suggested that the term Śalankāyana signifies the Śalankāyana-gotra. Though the Śalankāyana kings are never called Śalankāyana-sagotra according to the fashion in which gotras are referred to in early South Indian inscriptions, the theory of Fleet cannot be dismissed as impossible. There are, however, more than one gotra of the name of Śalankāyana, and it is not possible to find out to which one of these gotras our kings belonged. There is one gotra called Śalankāyana which belongs to the Viśvāmitra section and has the pravaras Viśvāmitra, Kātya and Ātkila. But the word Śalāṃkāyana used in the Ellore grant of Devavarman seems to be the Prakrit form of Śalankāyana which is the spelling used in all the other grants of the family. There are however four gotras named Śalankāyana. The first of them belongs to the Bhṛgu section and has the pravaras Bhārgava, Vaitahavya and Śāvedasa. The second belongs to the Bharadvāja section and has the pravaras
Angirasa, Barhaspatya, Bharadvaja, Sainya and Gargya. The third belongs to the Visvamitra section and has the pravaras Vaisvamitra, Daivarata and Audala; the fourth also belongs to the Visvamitra section, but has the pravaras Vaisvamitra, Salkankayana and Kausika (see P. C. Rao, Gatra-nibandha-kadambam, Mysore).

We know very little of the early history of the Salkankayanas. It has been supposed (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., V, p. 23) that the terms Salkankayana and Salkankayanaka (country of the Salkankayanas) are mentioned in the Ganapatha of Panini. It is however certain that the Salkankayanas (Greek: Salakénoi) ruled over the Vengi region as early as the time of Ptolemy (c. 140 A. D.).

We have already said above that the seals of the Salkankayana kings bear the figure of a bull which is probably to be identified with Nandin. This fact and names like Nandivarman (one whose protector is Nandin) and Skandavarman (one whose protector is Skanda, son of Siva) in the family possibly show that the family religion of the Salkankayanas was Saivism. It must also be noticed that all the Salkankayana kings, in their inscriptions, call themselves Bhagavac-citararthasvami-pad-anudhyata, i.e., favoured by the feet of Lord Citrarathasvamin. Citrarathasvamin is evidently the name of the family deity of the Salkankayana Maharajas of Vengi which, as already noticed, has been identified with the village of Peddavegi near Ellore in the Godavari district. In this connection we must notice what Hultzsch said (Ep. Ind., IX, p. 51): "The correctness of this identification is confirmed by the existence of a mound which on a visit to Pedda-Vegi in 1902 was shown to me by the villagers as the site of the ancient temple of Citrarathasvamin, the family deity of the Salkankayana Maharajas."

The word Citraratha according to Sanskrit lexicons means the Sun. K. V. Lakshmmana Rao therefore suggest-
ed that Citrarathasvāmin mentioned in the Śālāṇkāyana inscriptions was the Sun-god. It however appears to me that, as the family religion of the Śālāṇkāyanas was in all probability Śaivism, Citrarathasvāmin might possibly be a form of Lord Siva.

It must be noticed here that while in the inscriptions king Devavarman has been called parama-māhessara, king Nandivarman II is called parama-bhāgavata. K. V. Lakshmmana Rao, who believes that the religion of the Śālāṇkāyanas was Śaivism, says (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., V., p. 25): "Because this epithet (scil. parama-māheśvara) was changed into that of parama-bhāgavata by the successors of this king (scil. Devavarman), we need not infer that the later Śālāṇkāyanas changed their Śaiva faith and became Vaiśpavas. Bhāgavata did not necessarily mean in those days a worshipper of Viṣṇu, and the followers of Śiva also were called Bhāgavatas. We have the authority of the venerable Patañjali (on Pāṇini V. 2. 1) for the usage of the word Śiva-Bhāgavata."

It is difficult to agree with Lakshmmana Rao. In all the three inscriptions of Nandivarman II, the king is unanimously called parama-bhāgavata, which in its general sense suggests that the king was a devotee of Bhagavān Viṣṇu. It must be noticed that no other Śālāṇkāyana king is as yet known to have used this epithet. Moreover, we know from the Peddavegi plates that Nandivarman II granted no less than 32 nivartanas of land (95.2 acres according to Kauṭilya whose nivartana = 2.975 acres; but 23.4 acres according to a Commentator whose nivartana = 7.43 acre; see infra) in order to make a decahala for the god Viṣṇugṛha-svāmin, the lord of the three worlds. This decahala was cultivated by the local evaṇopālakas and the produce was evidently received by the authorities of the Viṣṇu-grha (temple of Viṣṇu). The word decahala appears to mean "ploughable lands, dedicated
for the enjoyment of a god." Cf. vraja-palakanam krtum devahalan = krtvā; see below, pp. 114-95. This Viṣṇu-grha-svāmin (literally, lord of the temple of Viṣṇu) was evidently a form (vigraha) of Lord Viṣṇu. Dedication of lands in honour of Viṣṇugrha-svāmin and the epithet parama-bhāgacara together leave hardly any doubt that the Śālaṅkāyana king Nandivarman II was a Vaiṣpava.
IV

Devavamma (=Devavarman).

In the Ellore grant, the Śalaṅkāyana king Devavarman has been called a devotee of Maheśvara. He is also credited with the performance of an ṛṣamedha sacrifice (assamedha-yājī). He therefore seems to have been a prince of considerable importance. The performance of the Aśvamedha by Devavarman Śalaṅkāyana seems to speak of his success against the Pallavas who are known to have obtained possession of Andhrāpatha with its head-quarters at Dhamānikaḍa.

In this connection it is necessary to discuss the view of K. V. Lakshmana Rao (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., V, p. 24), who thus remarked on the epithet aśvamedha-yājī (performer of the horse-sacrifice) applied to Śalaṅkāyana Devavarman in the Ellore Prakrit plates: "I am of opinion that the boast of Aśvamedha (horse-sacrifice) started with the Imperial Guptas, and the contagion spread to the minor dynasties like the Chedis (?Traikūṭakas), the Vākāṭakas, the Kadambas, the Śalaṅkāyanas and others. The proximity in the time of Vijaya Devavarman to Samudra Gupta's South Indian triumphal march, in my opinion explains the insertion of the word assamedha-yājīna (1.5) in the grant of Vijaya Deva. He must have seen some of the Imperial grants with similar titles and coolly imitated them." My theory, however, is exactly opposite to what has been propounded by Lakshmana Rao.

The first point to notice here is that there is no reference to any titles like aśvamedha-yājī in the Gupta records. If, however, we take that the epithet of Devavarman is an
imitation of cīr-otsann-āśvamedh-āhartā found in the Gupta inscriptions, we are to think that the Sālankāyana king lived to see the records of Samudragupta’s successors, because we do not get the epithet in his own inscriptions.

But we have already shown that this Sālankāyana Devavarman is probably earlier than Samudragupta’s contemporary Hastivarman of Vengi and, therefore, ruled before the Gupta emperor’s southern expedition. As king Devavarman appears to have ruled in the first half of the 4th century A.D.,¹ it may be that the idea of performing the horse-sacrifice was borrowed not by the Sālankāyanas from the Guptas, but by the Guptas from the Sālankāyanas.

Whatever the value of this suggestion may be, I have no doubt that Samudragupta got the inspiration of performing the aśvamedha from his connection with Southern India which may rightly be called the land of Vedic customs. Even at the present time, South India represents Vedic rituals more truly and fanatically than Northern India. So we may think it was also in ancient times. In comparison with the number and variety of Vedic sacrifices performed by early South Indian rulers, like the Sātvāhana king² referred to in the Namaghata inscription No. 1 (Arch. Surr. W. Ind., V, p. 60 ff.), the Ikṣvāku king Vāsiṣṭhiputra Cāntamūla I, the Vākṣṭaka king Pravarasena I and the Pallava king Sivaskandavarman,³ the one aśvamedha

¹ He cannot be earlier than A.D. 300. Unlike the Sātvāhana and Ikṣvāku inscriptions, and like works in literary Prakrit, his grant in almost all cases expresses compound consonants by more than one letter and contains the usual imprecatory verses in Sanskrit. On linguistic grounds his reign is to be placed a little later than the accession of Sivaskandavarman (c. 300 A.D.), i.e., about 320-345. See my note in Ind. Cult., I, pp. 498-502, and below.

² This Sātvāhana king who has been taken to be the same as Sātaruci, husband of Nāgani, must have ruled before the Christian era.

³ Like all early Prakrit inscriptions, the Ikṣvāku records generally express compound consonants by single letters. This fact seems to show that the Ikṣvāku kings are earlier than the Pallava king Sivaskandavarman whose grants in most cases express compound consonants by more than one letter and have passages in them written in Sanskrit, and the legend on whose seal is also written in Sanskrit. As the Ikṣvākus seem to have
performed by Gājāyana-Sarvatāta (c. 250 B.C.; Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, p. 795), the two by Puṣyamitra (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 57) and the two 1 performed by the Gupta kings Samudragupta and Kumāragupta I, are ridiculously insignificant. So, the South might well have been teacher of the North in this respect.

By the bye it may be said that the view of Lakshmana Rao with reference to the aśvamedha of the Vākāṭakas is also untenable. The Vākāṭakas do not appear to have been inspired by the example set by Samudragupta. The Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena I who claims to have performed four aśvamedhas, along with agniṣṭoma, āptoryāma, ukthya, śoḍaśi, atirātra, bhṛhaspatisava and sādyaskra (Corp. Ins. Ind., III, p. 97), appears to be earlier than Samudragupta. We know that Prabhāvatīguptā, granddaughter of Samudragupta, was given in marriage to the Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II, who was grandson’s grandson of Pravarasena I. A chronological chart is given for easy reference.

Vākāṭaka

Pravarasena I

Gautamiputra

Rudrasena I

Prthivisena I

Gupta

Candragupta I (acc. 320 A.D.)

Samudragupta (c. 330-375)

Rudrasena II married Prabhāvatīguptā
daughter of Candragupta II (c. 375-414).

succeeded the Śatavāhanas about the end of the first quarter of the third century. Sivakandavarman can hardly be placed earlier than A.D. 300; but he seems to have ruled before Kāḷśrapako Vaṭapagopa who came in conflict with Samudragupta about the middle of the 4th century. See below.

1 Allan, Catalogue, pp. 68-69. The official Gupta records do not credit Samudragupta with the performance of many aśvamedhas. In the Poona plates of Prabhāvatīguptā, however, he is called onek-āśvamedha-pati (performer of many horse-sacrifices). The boast seems to be unfounded. First, if Samudragupta performed more than one aśvamedha, his successors would have emphatically mentioned it in their official
It therefore appears that Rudrasena I Vākṣṭaka was a contemporary of Samudragupta's father Candragupta I who began to reign in 320 A.D. It is not impossible that the beginning of the reign of Pravarasena I, grandfather of Rudrasena I, fell in the ninth or tenth decade of the 3rd century A.D. So, if any was the borrower, it was the Guptas, and not the Vākṣṭakas. Pravarasena I could, however, have got the inspiration from his relatives, the Bhāraviśvas, who have been credited with the performance of ten āśvamedha sacrifices.

Records. The Gupta kings after Samudragupta cannot be called reserved with reference to boas. As has been noticed by Prof. Raychaudhuri (Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., 3rd ed., p. 314), even the epithet sir-astama-āśvamedhā-karīta, applied by them to Samudragupta, is an exaggeration. Secondly, there appear to be some mistakes in the grante of Prabhāvatī (J.A.S.B., N. S., XX, p. 53; Ep. Ind., XV, p. 41). Here Ghaṭotkacca has been called the ādi-rāja (first king) of the Gupta family, while the official Gupta records begin the line from Mahārāja Guptas. The passage gupt-ādi-rāja-mahārāja-триgītākacca (Ep. Ind., XV, p. 41) has, however, been translated by Masroor Pathak and Dikshit as “Ghaṭotkacca, who had Guptas as the first.” That the word gupt-ādirāja is an instance of the bhūṭa-tattvapaṇa compound, and not of the Bahuvarī, is clear from the Rāddhāpur plates (J.A.S.B., N. S., XX, p. 59), where we have guptānusā-ādirāja, which only means “the first king of the Guptas.” Thirdly, in these inscriptions, Candragupta I has the simple title Mahārāja, while in the records of his successors he is always styled Mahārājādhirāja; even Samudragupta is called Mahārāja in the Rāddhāpur plates. Fourthly, some attributes such as sarva-rāj-accattā, applied to Samudragupta in the Gupta records are here applied to Candragupta II. These appear to prove that references to the Guptas in the Vākṣṭaka records were not very carefully drawn.

Moreover, as has been noticed by Andrzej Gawronski (Festschrift, Ernest Windisch, 1914, p. 170) and Diveskar (Anm. Bhāuṣūl. Or. Res. In., VII pp. 164-65), Samudragupta performed the āśvamedha late in life, i.e., after the engraving of the Allahabad pillar inscription which does not make mention of any such sacrifice. It is, therefore, doubtful whether Samudragupta had time to perform āshva āśvamedha.

1 “The first year of the Gupta era, which continued in use for several centuries, and in countries widely separated, ran from February 26, A.D. 330, to March 13, 321; of which dates the former may be taken as that of the coronation of Chandragupta I” (Smith, R. Hist. Ind., 4th ed., p. 296). Recently attempts have been made by several scholars to prove that the Gupta era started in A.D. 320, 322 or B.C. 57. The theories are however not convincing. See Ind. Cult., III, p. 47 ff.

2 Corp. Ins. Ind., III, p. 96. That this Pravarasena I was earlier than Samudragupta can also be proved from the evidence of the Purāṇas. The Purāṇas which do not mention any Gupta king by name and which limit Gupta rule within the area—amagyaṃ prapāṇaṃ ca rākṣita-maṇḍhāyaṃ tathā (Vāṣā, ch. 99,
The Ellore plates, dated on the 10th day of the dark fortnight of Pausa in the 13th year of Devavarman and issued from Vengipura, record the gift of 20 nirartanas of land in Elura (Ellore in the Godavari district) to the Brahmana Ganaśarman of the Babhura (Babhru) gotra. The Brahmana was also given a house-site for himself and others for his addhiya-manussas ("men who receive half the crop"); addhika of the Hirahadagalli grant; Sanskrit ādāhika; cf. Mitakṣarā on Yaţñavalkya, I, 166) and dvārgas (doorkeepers). He was exempted from all taxes, and protection of the immunities was ordered by the king.

The exact meaning of Muluda in the passage ellure muluda-pamukhā gāmo bhānitarco (villagers of Elura headed by Muluda should be informed) is not clear. The same word evidently occurs in some other Sāḷāṅkāyana inscriptions, where it has been differently read as mutyada, manuda, etc. The word, which seems to be mutuda or mutuda on some plates, possibly means "the head of a village." Fleet's interpretation of mutyada (Ind. Ant., V. p. 176) as "ministers and others" (mantri + ādi) is certainly untenable.

The seal of king Devavarman attached to the Ellore plates is, according to Hultzsch, "all but obliterated; but a faint trace of some quadruped—perhaps a tiger—can be seen" (Ep. Ind., IX. p. 57). The figure is, in all probability, that of a bull, which is found on the seals of the other two Sāḷāṅkāyana kings.

verse 3631, not only mention Vindhyāsakti and his son Pravīra (doubtless, Pravarama I), but also refer to the performance of some rājapeya (according to one MS. rājavesha is ascribed by the latter). Cf.

vindhyāsakti-sutai = c = ṣe Pravīra nāme vṛttaśā
bhokṣpti ca samāh gaṅgaṃ pūrṇa Kālamanokān = ca vai
vajrapiṣṭa rājapayai = ca sāntēsa-vām-dakṣinaḥ


HASTIVARMAN, NANDIVARMAN I AND CANDAVARMAN.

As we have seen, the names of the Śālankāyana kings Hastivarman and Nandivarman I are found only in the Peddavegi plates of Nandivarman II. The name of Canda- varman is found in the Peddavegi and Kollair plates. Since we have no grants issued by any of these three kings, very little is so far known about them.

In the Peddavegi plates Mahārāja Hastivarman is called aneka-samar-ārāpta-vijaya (one who attained victory in many battles). It may be noticed here that the Allahabad pillar inscription, which refers to the conflict between Samudragupta and king Hastivarman of Vengi, speaks of the different natures of the North Indian and South Indian expeditions of the Gupta monarch. While he is said to have "uprooted" the kings of Āryāvarta, he is said to have followed a policy of "capture and liberation" with regard to the kings of Daksināpatha. It is therefore certain that the Gupta emperor was not so lucky as regards his southern expedition, and it may not be impossible that the reference to the victory in aneka-samara of the Śālankāyana king includes also his samara with Samudragupta.

The epithet pratāp-opanata-sāmanta applied to king Candavarman may suggest that he was not quite a petty chief, and that some subordinate rulers acknowledged his suzerainty.
VI

NANDIVARMAN II.

The Sālāṅkāyana king Caṇḍavarman was succeeded on the throne by his eldest son (sūnur=jyaistha) Nandivarman II. As we have seen, this king has been called paramabhāgavata in all his inscriptions. Evidently he was a Vaiṣṇava and gave up the traditional Saivism of the Sālāṅkāyana kings.

Three copper-plate grants of this king have so far been discovered. They were all issued from Venāipura.

I. The Kanteru plates (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., V. p. 21) record a notice of the king to the Mutuda and the villagers of Kuruvāda in the Kudrāhāra-visāya. It is notified hereby that twelve nicartanas of land in the said village were granted, for the increase of the king's dharma, yasah, kula and gotra, to a Brāhmaṇa named Svāmidatta who belonged to the Maudgalya gotra.

The Kudrāhāra-visāya, which is possibly the same as Kudūrāhara of the Kondaludi plates of Jayavarman, has been identified, as we have said above, with "the country adjoining the modern town of Masulipatam (Bandar)" (Anc. Hist. Dec., p. 85). This region was formerly occupied by the Brhatphalāyanas.

The seal attached to the Kanteru plates has, in relief, the figure of a bull in couching position (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., V, p. 21).

II. The Kollair plates (Ind. Ant., V, p. 176), issued on the 8th day of the dark fortnight of Pauṣa in the 7th regnal year, record another notice of the king to the

---

Mutuda and villagers of Videmupallikā-grāma, situated in the same Kudrāhāra-visāya (Ep. Ind., IX. p. 58 n). The village is hereby granted to 157 Brāhmanas of different gotras, who were then resident at the agrahāra of Kuravaka-Śrīvara. The village was to be treated with immunities from all taxation, and the immunities were to be preserved by the desa-dhipatis, āyuktakas, vallabhas and rājapuruṣas. This inscription is important as it furnishes us with a sidelong into the Śālāṅkāyana administrative system. From the official designations mentioned with reference to the protection of the puriḥāras, it appears that the Śālāṅkāyana kingdom was divided into several desas (provinces), which were governed by the desa-dhipatis. Āyuktas are mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta as "restoring the wealth of the various kings, conquered by the strength of his arm" (Corp. Ins. Ind., III. p. 14). An āyukta is mentioned as a visayapati (head of a province or district) in an inscription of Būdhagupta (Ep. Ind., XV. p. 138). According to the lexicographer Hemacandra an āyukta is the same as the nīyogin, karma-saciva (cf. karmasacīvamatisacīva; Ep. Ind., VIII. p. 44) and evāpirta. We know from the Kondamudi plates (above, p. 42) that a evāpirta was in charge of an āhāra (district). It therefore seems that the term āyukta also signifies ruler of a district. The term vallabha, according to Amara, means adhyakṣa, which has been explained by the commentator as gav-adhyakṣa (see Subda-kalpadruma, s.v.). Vallabha therefore appears to be the same as go-dhyakṣa (superintendent of cows) mentioned in Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra.1 The rāja-puruṣas (royal agents) are also found

---

1 It must however be noticed in this connection that the Hircalagalli grant of Pallava Śravakanivarman (Ep. Ind., I. p. 82 ff.) makes mention of vallara and go-vallara in the same passage and evidently makes a distinction between the two terms. According to Sanskrit lexicons, vallara means goa, a cowherd. But the other word go-vallara certainly means a cowherd and appears to be the same as vallara and vallabha of Sanskrit lexicons. What is then the meaning of the term
Successors of the Satavahanas

mentioned in the Arthasastra (see Samasastry’s ed., pp. 59, 75). They appear to be the same as the pulisus of the inscriptions of Asoka (e.g., in Separate Kalinga R.E. No. 1).

The ajāupti or executor of the grant was the Bhojaka of Mulaku. The term bhojaka (lit. enjoyer) has been taken to mean “free-holder.” The Bhojakas appear to have been like the Jagirdars of the Muslim period. Bhoja, according to the Mahabharata, means persons who were not entitled to use the title “king” (Arjuna bhoja-sabdāṃ tvam tatā prāpyasi sāncayāḥ; Ādi., 84, 22). According to the Aitareya-Brahmana (VII, 32; VIII, 6, 12, 14, 16-17), bhojā was the title of South Indian kings. The term bhojaka, in a degraded sense, may therefore, mean a jagirdār or a protected chief. In some inscriptions, the Bhojakas are mentioned along with the Raṣṭrikas (probably the same as the Desadhipatis), e.g., rathika-bhojaka in the Hatihgumpa inscription of Khāravela.

III. The Peddavegi plates (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., I. p. 92) issued on the first day of the bright fortnight of Śrāvaṇa in the 10th year of the reign of king Nandivarman II, eldest son of Candravarman, grandson of Nandivarman I, and great-grandson of Hastivarman, record a notice of the king to the mutuda (or mutuda) and the villagers of Pralura-grāma. The king is said to have hereby granted a deva-hala to Viṣṇu-grha-svāmin, lord of the three worlds. Deva-hala is evidently the same as devabhoga-hala of the passage devabhogahala-varjyaṇi which is so common in the Pallava grants and has been translated

callaka in the Hirakadagali grant? Curiously enough, the word callaka according to the lexigrapher Jatadhara is a synonym of evra-rakha, i.e., keeper of horses. The passage callaka (callakha of Jatadhara-poetlala of the Hirakadagali grant) therefore appears to mean “the keepers of horses and the keepers of cows.” See below.

1) Fleet’s translation (Ind. Ant., V, p. 177) of the passage tatrā ajāuptiḥ tatrā unakha bhojakaḥ as “the command confers the enjoyment of the original royal dīka there” should now be given up.
by Hultsch as "with the exception of cultivated lands enjoyed by temples." (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 165). Fleet translated (Ind. Ant., V, p. 157 and note) the same passage as "with the exception of the plough of the possession of the god," and remarked, "The meaning would seem to be that the grant did not carry with it the right to some cultivated land in the same village which had already been given to the village-god." A similar word is bhikku-hala (bhikṣu-hala, i.e., cultivated land offered to the Buddhist monks) which occurs in the Naik cave inscription No. 3 and a Karle cave inscription, and has been ably explained by Senart (Ep. Ind., VII, p. 66). These technical words signified religious donations along with certain privileges (parīhāras). The deva-hala granted by Nandivarman II was to be cultivated by the vraja-pālakas (herdsmen) and comprised 10 nivarṇanas of land at Arutora, 10 nivarṇanas at Mundūra-grāma, 6 nivarṇanas at Ceṅceruva-grāma and 6 nivarṇanas at Camburānceruva. Mundūra and Kambarānceruva have been identified respectively with Mundūru and Kommera in the Ellore taluka of the Kistna district. Ceṅceruva is probably the same as Cincināḍa in the Narasapura taluka and Arutora may be identified with Allidodhī in the Gudivāda taluka of the same district (An. Rep. S. Ind. Ep., 1926-27, p. 74).

The deśādhipatis, āyuktkas, callabhas and rājanpurusas were ordered to protect the grant. The executor of the grant was the Bhojaka of Mulakūra, possibly the same as that of the Kollār plates. The grant was written by a rahasyādikerta (Privy Councillor; cf. mata-sacira of the Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman; Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 44 ff., line 17), whose name was Kāṭikūrī.
VII

SKANDAVARMAN.

Only one inscription of king Skandavarman has so far been discovered. It is the Kanteru grant, issued from Vengi and dated on the full-moon day of Vaisākha in the 1st year of the king's reign. It records a royal notice to the villagers of Kudhumāra-Cinnapura. It is hereby declared that the said village was granted to Sivārya of the Mandgalya gotra, a resident of Lekumāri-grāma. This grāma has been identified with Lokamudi in the Kaikalur taluka of the Kistna district. All the officers including the āyuktakas and the viṣayapatis were ordered to make it immune from all taxations (saeva-niyoga-niyukt-āyotaku-visayapatimaśraḥ sā palikap pari-hartaṇya). The mention of the viṣayapati in this connection possibly shows that the deśas or provinces of the Śālankāyana kingdom were further subdivided into viṣayas (districts), each of which was under a viṣayapati. The āyuktakas appear to have ruled the subdivisions (āhāras ?) of the viṣayas.

We do not definitely know whether Kudhumāra is the same as Kudrahāra and whether Kudhumāra-Cinnapura means "Cinnapura in Kudhumāra." Cinnapura has been identified with the present village of Cinnapuram in the Bandar taluka (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., V, pp. 25-26).

According to Lakshmana Rao there is the figure of a bull on the seal of Skandavarman, attached to the Kanteru plates.

2 Ibid., p. 78.
CHAPTER V.

THE VIŚNUKUṆḌINS.

I

GENEALOGY OF THE VIŚNUKUṆḌINS.¹

The history of the Viśnukuṇḍins has been touched by scholars like Kielhorn, Hultzsch and many others. The author of the present work holds an altogether different view as regards the genealogy and chronology of the dynasty. The question of genealogy shall be discussed in the present and that of chronology in the next section.

The first known inscription of the Viśnukuṇḍins is the Chikkulla plates edited by Kielhorn in *Ep. Ind.*, IV, p. 193 ff. These plates give us the following line of kings:

1. Mahārāja Mādhavavarman; his son
2. Vikramendravarman (I); his son
3. Mahārāja Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman; his eldest son
4. Mahārāja Vikramendravarman (II); (10th year).

Then come the Ramatirtham plates, edited by Hultzsch in *Ep. Ind.*, XII, p. 133 ff. Here we have the following line:

1. Mahārāja Mādhavavarman; his son
2. Rājā Vikramendra; his son
3. Rājā Indravarman; (27th year).

There can hardly be any doubt that Rājā Indravarman of the Ramatirtham plates is identical with Mahārāja Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman of the Chikkulla plates.

¹ My paper on the Viśnukuṇḍin genealogy was originally published in *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, IX, p. 273 ff.
Next we have two sets of copper-plate grants belonging to this dynasty, which were found at a place called Ipur in the Tenali taluka of the Guntur district. They were edited by Hultzsch in *Ep. Ind.*, XVII. In the first set of these plates (*ibid.*, p. 334), we have the following line:

1. Mahārāja Govindavarman; his son
2. Mahārāja Mādhavavarman (37th year); his son

Hultzsch, on grounds of palaeography, identified Mādhavavarman of the first set of the Ipur plates with the king of the same name in the Ramatirtham and Chikkulla plates. It can be easily shown that later writers, who have disapproved of this identification as unwarranted, are themselves wrong. The epithets applied to the name of this king, as found in the Chikkulla, Ramatirtham and Ipur (set I) plates, clearly establish the identity. Let us here quote the corresponding passages of the three inscriptions.


3. Ipur plates (set I):—Smṛti-mati-bala-satva(ttva)-
dhairyya-vīrya-vinaya-sampannah  sakala-mahīmandala-
manujapati-pratipūjita-sāsanaḥ(ōnas =)  trivara-nagara-
bhavana-gata-yuvati-hṛdaya-nandanaḥ  sva-[na]ya-bala-vijita-
sakala-sāmant-ātula-bala-vinaya-naya-niyam-āśa (ttva)-
sampannah sakala-jagad-avanipati-pratipūjita-sāsanaḥ(ōno =)
agniṣṭoma-sahasra-yājī-ḥūr[ ra]yyagrabha-prasūta(h) ekādaś-
āśvamedh-āvabhrtha-vidhūta-jagat-kalmaṣaḥ  susti(sthi)ra-
karma-mahāraja-śrī-mādhavavarmanā.

When we remember the fact that no other Viṣṇukundin
king is as yet known to have performed a single sacrifice
of any kind except the one named Mādhavavarman, and
when we note further the unique numbers—ELEVEN āśva-
medhas and THOUSAND agniṣṭomas (kratus), testified to by
all the above three inscriptions, there remains no doubt as
regards the correctness of the identification originally
proposed by Hultsch.

The second set of the Ipur plates (Ep. Ind., XVII,
p. 334) gives us the following line of kings:—

1. Mahāraja Mādhavavarman (I); his son
2. Devavarman; his son
3. Mādhavavarman (II); (17th ? year).

As regards Mādhavavarman (II), the issuer of this set of
the Ipur plates, Hultsch says: “As the alphabet of the
inscription seems to be of an earlier type than that of the
preceding one (scil. Ipur plates: set I), 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.” A considera-
tion of the evidence of the two sets of the Ipur plates render
this theory untenable. It is to be noted that Mādhava-
varman (I), the grandfather of the issuer of the Ipur plates
(set II) is described in that inscription as ekādaś-āśvamedh-
āvaḥīrth-āvadhāta-jugat-kalmaṣasya = āgniṣṭomamasahāsrayājīno = 'neka sāmanta-makuṭa-kūṭa-maṇi-khacita-čaraṇa-yugala-kamalasya mahārājasya śrī-mādhavavarmanal. We request our readers to compare this passage with the corresponding passage quoted above from the Ipur plates (set I). Can there be any doubt whatsoever about the identity of this Mādhavavarman (I) with the king of the same name of the Ipur plates (set I), and also of the Chikkulla and the Ramatirtham plates? It is highly improbable that two kings of the same name and dynasty and of the same period performed exactly equal numbers—ELEVEN and THOUSAND—of sacrifices, such as the āsvamedha and the agniṣṭoma. We, therefore, think it perfectly justifiable to identify the king named Mādhavavarman, who has been credited with the performance of eleven āsvamedhas and thousand agniṣṭomas (kratus) in all the different Viṣṇukumḍin inscriptions.

Moreover, the theory of Hultzsch that Mādhavavarman (whom he is inclined to designate Mādhavavarman III), son of Govindavarman of the Ipur plates (set I), is the grandson of Mādhavavarman II of the Ipur plates (set II), has now been disproved by the discovery of the Polamuru plates wherein Mādhavavarman, son of Govindavarman, is represented as the grandson of Vikramahendra, and not of a king entitled Mādhavavarman.

The Polamuru plates, edited¹ in the Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VI, p. 17ff., give us the following line of kings:

1. Vikramahendra; his son
2. Govindavarman; his son

That this Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru plates can be no other than the famous performer of eleven āsvamedhas and thousand agniṣṭomas is proved by his significant epithets: — atula - bala - parākr ama - yaśo - dāna - vinaya - sampanno daśāsata - sakala - dharaṇītala - narapatir = avisata - vividha - divyaś = trivaranagara-bhavana-gata-parame y u vati - ānāvi ḍara na-ratir = anna(na)nyā-nṛpatisādhārana-dāna - māna - dayā - dama - dhrīti - mati - ksānti - sōriy (saury) - āudārya - gāmbhi(bhi)ryya - prabhṛty-aneka - guṇa - sampaj - janīta - ra yan - samutthita - bhūmāṇḍala - vyāpi - vipula - yaṣoḥ (śāh) kratu - suhāsra-yājī hiranyagarbha-prasūta(h) ekādaś-āsvamedha - ācavrthrtha-sūna - vigata - jagad - enaskāh sarvabhiṣita-pari - raksana - cuṇçuh(r =) vidva[*d]dvija-guru - vydha - tapasvijan - āśrayo mahārāja - śrī - mādhavavarma.¹

It appears, however, that Mādhavavarman and Govinda - varman have respectively been called Janāśraya and Vikramāśraya in this inscription, and it may be argued that they are not identical with the kings of the same names of the Ipur plates (set I). But this doubt is unjustifiable in view of the fact that Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru plates is not only called son of Govinda-avarman and credited with the performance of eleven āsvamedhas and thousand agniṣṭomas, but is also called hiranyagarbha-prasūta and trivaranagara- bhavana-gata-parama-yuvatijana - viharāṇa - rati (trivara - nagara-bhavana-gata-yeucati-hṛdaya - nandana in the Ipur plates), which epithets we find only in his own Ipur plates (set I). There can therefore be no doubt that the Ipur plates (set I) and the Polamuru plates were issued by one and the same person.

successors,\(^1\) who have identified Mādhavavarman II of the Ipur plates (set II), with the king of the same name of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates, and Vikramahendra of the Polamuru plates with Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla plates. We have noticed that only one king of the Viṣṇukundin family may be believed to have performed sacrifices, and, though there seems to be a little exaggeration in the inscription of one of his successors, in all the inscriptions of the dynasty, that king—Mādhavavarman (I), son of Govindavarman and father of Devavarman and Vikramendravarman I—has been credited with the performance of eleven aśvamedhas and thousand agniṣṭomas (krutus). As is also noted above, we think it almost impossible that there can be more than one Mādhavavarman, performer of eleven aśvamedhas and thousand agniṣṭomas, in the same family and the same period. But if we accept the above identifications we have three Mādhavavarmans—I, II and III—all of whom were performers of eleven aśvamedhas and thousand agniṣṭomas!\(^2\) Moreover, the identification of Mādhavavarman II of the Ipur plates (set II), with

\(^1\) Sewell, following E. V. Lakshmam Rao, has given the following genealogy of the Viṣṇukundin kings in his List (1902), p. 494:

1. Mādhava I, c. A.D. 557-582.
2. Devavarman, c. 582-607.
3. Mādhava II, c. 607-444. (Ipur grant No. 2)
4. Vikramendra I, c. 444-469.
5. Indrabhūṭāraka, c. 469-496. (Ramatirtham grant)
6. Vikramendra II, c. 496-521. (Chikkulla grant)
8. Mādhava III, ‘Janāśraya,’ 546—(? 610. (Polamuru grant and Ipur grant No. 1)
9. Manghaṇa-bhūṭāraka (? 710—\(^2\)

The absurd nature of this chronology is proved by the fact that about the middle of the 4th century not the Viṣṇukundins but the Śaṅkukāyas were ruling over the Vṛṣali region. See my note in Quart. Journ. Myth. Soc., XXV, pp. 299-301.

\(^2\) See note 1 above. Curiously, a recent writer on the subject (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., X, p. 195) thinks it to be "not a strong argument."
his namesake of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates is, in my opinion, next to impossible. In the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates, we have the significant epithets of the great Madhavavarman, crediting him with the performance of eleven aśvamedhas and thousand agniṣṭomas; but these epithets are conspicuous by their absence in the Ipur plates (set II) in connection with the name of Madhavavarman II. The date of the plates, which is not fully legible but which appears to me to be year 17, has been read by Hultsch as the 47th year of the king. Is it possible that a king, who performed among other sacrifices eleven aśvamedhas and thousand agniṣṭomas, did not perform a single one of them before the 47th (if my reading is correct, 17th) year of his reign or forgot to refer to such glorious performances in his own inscription? It may also be significant that Madhavavarman II has no royal title even in his own Ipur plates (set II). Moreover, the identification becomes utterly untenable when we notice that those significant epithets regarding the performance of 11 aśvamedhas and 1,000 agniṣṭomas have been attached in this inscription to the name of his grandfather Madhavavarman I. We therefore hold that there were only two, and not three, Madhavavarmans among the known kings of the Viṣṇukundin family and that the first of them, who was the grandfather of the second, performed a good many sacrifices including eleven aśvamedhas and thousand agniṣṭomas.

As regards the second identification, nothing need be said after our identification of Madhavavarman I, the great performer of sacrifices. But it must be noticed that the name is written in the inscription as Vikramahendra which may be the engraver's mistake for Vikramamahendra. If, however, we take it as a slip for Vikramendra, the king should be designated Vikramendra I, there being two other Vikramendras in the family.
The following is the genealogical arrangement of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin princes according to our theory:—

Vikramahendra (Vikramendra I ?)

Mahārāja Govindavarman Vikramāśraya

Mahārāja Mādhavavarman I Janaśraya (Ipur plates: set I, year 37; Polamuru plates, year 0 ?)

—

Devavarman [Rājā] Vikramendravarman I (II ?) Mançyanābhāṭṭāraka

Mādhavavarman II [Mahārāja] Rājā Indrabhaṭṭāraka-varman

(Ipur plates: set II, year 17 ?)

(Ramatirtham plates, year 27)

Mahārāja Vikramendravarman II (III ?)

(Chikkulla plates, year 10)

1 There is only one numerical symbol on the plate. In Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VI (p. 17 fl., line 41), it has been deciphered as 48. It looks like a ligature of the symbol for 40 and that for 8; but as far as I know, there was no method known in ancient India by which a number like 48 could be expressed by one numerical symbol only. The symbol possibly signifies 40 (or 70 ?). It may however also be suggested that 8 was put below 40 for want of space to the right of the latter.
II

CHRONOLOGY OF THE Viṣṇukūṇḍins.\(^{1}\)

We have already dealt with the genealogy of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin kings. Here we shall discuss the order of succession of the kings of this family and the period to which they are to be assigned.

The first known king of the dynasty is, as we have seen, Vikramahendra. Though he has been given no royal title in the Polamuru grant of his grandson Mādhavavarman I, his epithets viṣṇukūṇḍināṃ = apratihata-sāsana and svapratāp-ōpanata-sāmanta-manujapati-mandala seem to prove that he was a king and had some feudatories under him. His son Govinda Varman Vikramāśraya has been called Mahārāja in the Ipur plates (set I) of his son Mādhavavarman I.

Mādhavavarman I Janāśraya, the greatest of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin kings, appears to have had at least three sons, viz., Devavarman, Maṇcyāṇa-bhaṭṭāraka,\(^{2}\) and Vikramendravarman I (born of a Vākāṭa, i.e., Vākāṭaka princess). Of these we know almost nothing about Maṇcyāṇa. Of the other two, viz., Devavarman and Vikramendravarman I, it

\(^{1}\) My paper on the Viṣṇukūṇḍin chronology was originally published in Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, pp. 957-60.

\(^{2}\) Maṇcyāṇa as a personal name is known to have been used in the Kannarese country in the 12th century A.D. As Prof. Raychaudhuri points out to me, Maṇcyāṇa was the name of a minister of Biljala or Vijjana, the Kalacurya king of Kalyāṇa (r. 1145-1167 A.D.). This minister was a rival of the king’s other minister Basava (Bṛṣabha), the famous founder of the Vīrāvira or Līḍaṅkya sect (J. B. B. A. S., VIII, pp. 78, 88, 128; and Bomb. Gaz., I, pt. II, p. 47). Among minor instances, we may take Maṇcyāṇa, a Bṛahmana mentioned as receiving some gifts of land in an inscription of the Yādava king Śīṅghapa (r. 1210-1247 A.D.) dated in Saka sam. 1173 (C. P. No. 4 of 1925-26).
is known that their sons became kings. We have the Ipur plates (set II) of Devavarman's son Mādhavavarman II (see infra) and the Ramatirtham plates of Vikramendravarman (I)'s son Indravarman. Should we then suppose that after the death of Mādhavavarman I the Viṣṇukundin kingdom was split up into two divisions, ruled separately by his two sons, Devavarman and Vikramendravarman I? It however seems to me risky to suggest division of kingdom whenever we find two sons of a king or their descendants ruling. It may not be unreasonable to think that there was no such division of kingdom after the death of Mādhavavarman I.

Mādhavavarman I possibly died at a very old age. The date of the Polamuru grant of this king seems to be year 40 or, if K. V. Lakshmana Rao's reading is correct, year 48. It seems, therefore, not impossible that the elder children of Mādhavavarman I died before their father's death. In view of the fact that Devavarman, in the Ipur plates (set II) of his son Mādhavavarman II, has the only epithet kṣatriya-vāsakanda-pravarttiḥ-apratima-vikhyāta-parākrama, which can by no means suggest his accession to the throne, it appears that this son of Mādhavavarman I did not rule, but predeceased his father. Now, we are to determine whether Mādhavavarman I was succeeded by his son Vikramendravarman I or by his grandson Mādhavavarman II.

According to the Ipur plates (set I), Mādhavavarman I granted the village of Bilembali in the Guddādi-viṣaya to Agniśarman, a Brāhmaṇa of the Vatsa gotra. In the Ipur plates (set II), we notice the grant of a village, the name of which seems to me to be Murotukaliki, by Mādhavavarman II to two Brāhmaṇas named Agniśarman and Indraśarman. It is not impossible that Agniśarman of the first set is identical with his namesake who was one of the two recipients of the second set of the Ipur plates. In view of the above fact,
and also the fact that Devavarman, who seems to have predeceased his father, was possibly an elder brother of Vikramendravarman I, Madhavavarman II appears to have succeeded his grandfather on the throne (see infra). The date of his Ipur plates (set II) has been read by Hultsch as [40]7, but he says: "The first figure of the year in the date portion is injured and uncertain" (Ep. Ind., XVII, p. 336). The figure in question, however, seems to be 10 and, consequently, the date may be read as year 17.

Madhavavarman II was possibly succeeded by his uncle Vikramendravarman I who appears to have been considerably aged at the time of his accession. We have as yet no copper-plate grant issued by this king. The duration of his rule cannot be determined. But if we grant a reign-period of about 25 years to each of the Visnukundin kings a consideration of the regnal dates of the known kings of the family, seems to suggest not a very long reign-period of this king. "His reign was probably short" (Dubreuil, Anc. Hist. Dec., p. 91).

The succession from Vikramendravarman I to Vikramendravarman II appears to be regularly from father to son. All these kings have royal titles in the inscriptions. We, however, cannot be definite as regards the number of Visnukundin kings that ruled before Vikramahendra and after Vikramendravarman II.

We have now to consider the time of the Visnukundin kings. Fortunately for us, the date of Madhavavarman I can be determined with a certain degree of precision.

The Polamuru plates of Madhavavarman I record the grant of the village of Puloburu in the Guddavadi visaya by the king in his 40th (or 48th) year as an agrahara to Sivasarman, a scholar of the Taittiriya school, belonging to the Gautama gotra, resident of Kunjura in Kamarashtra, son of Damasaran and grandson of Rudrasarman. Next, we are to notice the contents of the Polamuru plates of the
Eastern Calukya king Jayasimha I (Ep. Ind., XIX, p. 254 ff), who began to rule from c. 633 A.D. These plates record the gift of the village of Pulobūra in the Guddavādi-vaśaya in the 5th year (15th year, according to An. Rep. S. Ind. Ep., 1914, p. 10) of the king's reign to Rudraśarman, a scholar of the Taittirīya school, belonging to the Gautama gotra, resident of Asanapura-sthāna, son of Sivaśarman and grandson of Damaśarman. There can be no doubt that Pulobūra of the former inscription is identical with Pulobūra of the latter, and that the village is to be identified with modern Polamuru (find-spot of both the inscriptions) near the Anaparti Railway station in the Godavari district. There can also be no doubt that Sivaśarman (son of Damaśarman), recipient of the grant of Mādhavavarman I, was the father of Rudraśarman (son of Sivaśarman and grandson of Damaśarman), the recipient of the grant of Jayasimha I. In the latter grant, Rudraśarman is expressly called pūrv-āgrahārika, "the former owner of the agrahāra." Now, how many years intervened between the date of the first grant and that of the second, that is to say, between the 40th (or 48th) year of Mādhavavarman I and the 5th year of Jayasimha I?

In considering this question, we are to note the following points. Agrahāras were generally granted to Brahmānas when they returned from the gurukula after finishing studies, in order to help them in settling themselves as grhasthas. It may therefore be conjectured that Sivaśarman received Polamuru at about the age of 25 or 30 when king

---

1 Agrahāra means gurukulād-śvetta-brahmacarīya devo hāstādi. See Tārṅaṇātha’s Vācaspatya, s. v.

2 According to Manus (III. 1-2), a Brahmaśarin should study the Vedas (three Vedas, two Vedas or one Veda) in the gurugruha for thirty-six years or for half or one-fourth of that period, and should then enter the grhasthāram. The same authority however also says (IX. 94) that a man of thirty years of age should marry a girl of twelve and a man of twenty-four a girl of eight. Kullāka Bhaṭṭa.
Madhavavarman was in the 40th (48th according to some) year of his reign. The king thus appears to have been old at the time of granting this agrahāra to the Brāhmaṇa youth. Sivaśarman, however, certainly died before the date of the grant of Jayasimha I. The epithet pura-āgrahārika applied to the name of his son in Jayasimha (I)'s grant possibly goes to show that Rudrasarman, as successor of his father, enjoyed the agrahāra for some time before the 5th year of Jayasimha I, i.e., before c. 637 A.D. The most interesting point in this connection, however, is that Rudrasarman in Jayasimha (I)'s grant is called "resident of the town of Asanapura." He is expected to have resided at Kuṇḍāra in Karnarāstra, the original place of his father or at Polamuru, the agrahāra granted to his father by king Madhavavarman I. When we remember this change in residence and when we further see that Jayasimha I, at the time of the execution of the Polamuru grant, was stationed in a camp, viṣaya-skandhācāra, it appears that in the early years of his reign, Jayasimha I led an expedition to the Viṣṇukundins country and encamped in the Guddavādi-viṣaya, somewhere near Polamuru; that constant fights were going on between the forces of the Calukyas and those of the Viṣṇukundins; and that Rudrasarman, the āgrahārika of Polamuru, had to flee to the town of Asanapura (near Draksharama in the Godavari district) in this troubled period, but came after some time, when Jayasimha I was temporarily or permanently master of the whole of

on this verse has: etac ca yugya-lāta-pradāśānam-param sa te vigum-artham; "prāya vaitātā kālāṃ yādita-reda bhavati. Trikhyā-ṛgakha ca kampā raghar-yuna yugya-eti; yadita-reda-cā-opakarāyukto gṛhasth-āramanyu prati sa vilambet-eśti sudhara-yugya-arthaḥ. A story of the Chhandogya Upanisat (VI, 1-3) says that Svetaketu went to his guru at the age of twelve and returned home after finishing all the (three?) Vedas at the age of twenty-four.

1 The Nidāna grant of Jayasimha I was issued from his vālaka at Asanapura (Ip. Ind., XVIII, p. 56). The grandfather of the donor of a grant of Viṣṇuvaridhuna II is also known to have resided at Asanapura (Ind. Ant., VII, p. 192).
the Guddavadi-visaya or a considerable part of it. Considering all these points, I think it not impossible that the difference between the time of the two Polamuru grants was about half a century.

Then, the 40th (or 48th) year of Mādhavavarman I may be c. 637 A. D. (date of Jayasimha’s grant) minus 50, that is, c. 587 A. D. Mādhavavarman I therefore seems to have

1 The mastery of two different powers over two different parts of one district does not appear to be impossible. The Candra (cf. the Rampal grant of Śrīcandra; Inscriptions of Benga1, III, No. 1) and the Varman (cf. Belava grant of Bhujavaran; idem, No. 3), kings of South-Eastern Bengal granted lands in the Pupdrabhukti, which has been presumably taken to be the same as the famous Pupdravardhanabhukti. But it seems impossible that the Cundras and Varmans were ever master of the Kotipura or Dinaspur region of the Pupdravardhanabhukti. I therefore think that in the age of the later Pālas, the bhuḍi of Pupdravardhana was divided between the kings of Gauda and the kings of South-Eastern Bengal. The slight change in the name of the bhuḍi probably goes to confirm this suggestion.

2 The difference between the time of the execution of these two grants may possibly be greater and, consequently, Mādhavavarman I might have ascended the Vīśvākṣādī throne a little earlier. But I do not want to go far beyond the estimate of Mr. Subba Rao who suggests that the period may be about 40 years. This suggestion, however, seems to be invalidated by another suggestion of his. He takes Hastikōsa and Vīra-kōsa, who were the executors of the grant of Jayasimha I, as personal names. We must notice here that the executors of the grant of Mādhavavarman I were also Hastikōsa and Vīra-kōsa. If we think that these two persons were officers in charge of the Guddavadi-visaya, under Mādhavavarman I and also under Jayasimha I, the intervening period between the grants of the two kings should possibly be shorter than 40 years. We must however note in this connection that there were a Hastikōsa and a Vīra-kōsa in the Tālapākṣa-visaya, who were ordered by king Pṛthivimalla of the Godavari plates (J. B. E. R. A. S., XVI, p. 144 ff.) to protect an agna on the same visaya. Fleet, the editor of the Godavari plates, may be right when he says, “I do not know of any other mention of these two officials, who evidently kept the purses and made disbursements on account of respectively the establishment of elephants and heroes who were to be rewarded for deeds of valor.” The epithet mukhāṭra-yaśha applied to Hastikōsa-Vīra-kōsa in the Polamuru grant of Mādhavavarman I, seems to show that they were Mukhāṭra of the Military Department. It may also be that the epithet mukhāṭra goes with Hastikōsa and yaśha with Vīra-kōsa. The word mukhāṭra, according to Medini, means hastipāl-dhīpa (head of the elephant-drivers or riders; cf. vulgo-mūsthift). The word yaśha generally means “a soldier.” Hastikōsa and Vīra-kōsa have been taken to be “officers in command of the elephant force and the infantry” in An. Rep. S. Ind. Ep., 1914, p. 85.
ruled from about the end of the first half to about the end of the second half of the sixth century.

In connection with the period of Mādhavavarman I, we must also notice the passage of the Polamuru inscription, which records a grant made by the king when he was crossing the river Godāvari with a view to conquering the eastern region and another passage which refers to a lunar eclipse in the Phālguni-Paurnamāśi (i.e., the full-moon day of the month of Phālguna) as the occasion of the grant. The connection of Mādhavavarman I with the "eastern region" seems to indicate that he was possibly the andhrādhipati (lord of the Andhra country) who was defeated by the Mankhari king Iśānavarman according to the Haraha inscription of Vikrama Sam 611, i.e., A.D. 544 (vide infra). This synchronism also places Mādhavavarman I Viṣṇukundin in the middle of the 6th century A.D.

We have just noticed that the village of Pulobūru was granted on the occasion of a lunar eclipse in the Phālguni Pūrṇimā. In the second half of the sixth century, lunar eclipses occurred in the above tithi on the following dates:

(1) 11th February, 556 A.D.
(2) 2nd March, 565 A.D.
(3) 21st February, 574 A.D.
(4) 11th February, 575 A.D.
(5) 21st February, 593 A.D.
(6) 10th February, 594 A.D.

Of these dates, years 593 and 594 may be tacitly rejected as they appear to be too late. But it is impossible at the present state of our knowledge to ascertain on which of the other four dates the grant was issued. If, however, we presume that the date of the Polamuru grant falls on any of these four dates and if further the reading of the date be accepted as 40, Mādhavavarman I Viṣṇukundin certainly
began to reign sometime between 516 and 535 A.D. The approximate chronology of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin kings, then may be taken as follows:

1. Rise of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin power in the 5th century A.D.  
2. Vikramāhendra (Vikramendra I ?) c. 500-520 A.D.  
3. Govindaavarman  c. 520-535 A.D.  
4. Mādhavavarman I c. 535-585 A.D.  
5. Mādhavavarman II c. 585-615 A.D.  
6. Vikramendravarman I (II ?) c. 615-625 A.D.  
7. Indra[bhattāraka]varman c. 625-655 A.D.  
8. Vikramendravarman II (III ?) c. 655-670 A.D.  
9. End of the dynasty possibly about the end of the 7th or somewhere in the 8th century A.D.

The period assigned to Indravarman, viz., circa 625-655 A.D., is, I think, supported by some views expressed by

1 Mādhavavarman I married a Vākāṭaka princess and his descendants are represented as boasting of the Vākāṭaka connection. His date does not, therefore, seem to be far removed from the glorious age of the Vākāṭakas, viz., the 5th century A.D. Smith places this relative of the Vākāṭakas in about 500 A.D. (J.R.A.S., 1914, p. 139). It is true that Mādhavavarman I is to be placed between the 5th century, the glorious period of the Vākāṭakas, and the 7th century, the age of Jayasimha I Eastern Gaurya. It therefore seems probable that the reign of Mādhavavarman I began in the first half of the 6th century A.D.

2 It may be tempting to connect the Viṣṇukūṇḍins with the Viṃuktiśa-Cujukulānanda Śatakarni kings, whose inscriptions (see Lüders, List Nos. 1021, 1186 and 1195) and coins (Rapson, Catalogue, p. 59) have been discovered. Viṃuktiśa may possibly be taken to be the same as Viṃuktiśa, i.e., Viṃuktiśa which gives the name of the family whence our kings belonged. But a serious objection that can be raised in this connection is that the Cujukulānanda Śatakarnis who claimed to have belonged to the Mānasya-grāha or metronymics, like Harīśaputra, along with their names like the Śatakarnas-Śatakarni. The practice of using such metronymics and also of mentioning the grāha is found, though in a modified way, in the inscriptions of the Kaudubas and the Gauryavas; but it is conspicuous by its absence in the inscriptions of the Viṣṇukūṇḍins. There is therefore no evidence at present to connect the Viṣṇukūṇḍins with the ancient Śatakarni kings.

3 According to Kielhorn, the Chikkulla plates (Ep. Ind., IV, p. 193) should be palaeographically assigned to the 7th or 8th century A.D. For the 50 years allotted to Mādhavavarman II, see infra.
Fleet in *J.B.B.R.A.S.*, XVI, p. 116. While editing the Godavari plates of Prthivimūla, Fleet said: "The Adhirāja ¹ Indra, at whose request the grant was made, is mentioned as having fought in company with other chiefs who united to overthrow a certain Indrabhaṭṭāraka. Taking into consideration the locality (the Godavari district) from which the grant comes, and its approximate period as indicated by the palaeographical standard of the characters and the use of numerical symbols in the date, there can be no doubt that Indrabhaṭṭāraka is the Eastern Chalukya of that name, the younger brother of Jayasimha I." According to many of the Eastern Calukya grants, however, this Indrabhaṭṭāraka did not reign at all, though some grants assign a reign period of only 7 days to him. It is therefore highly improbable that Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Godavari grant of Prthivimūla was identical with the Eastern Calukya of that name. Kielhorn rightly suggested that the reference to Indravarman Viśnukundin's fights with many *caturdantas* in the Chikkulla grant supports his identification with Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Godavari plates (Ep. Ind., IV, p. 195 note). *Caturdanta* is properly the epithet of Indra's Airāvata, the elephant of the east. We are therefore justified in accepting the identification of Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Godavari plates with the Viśnukundin king Indravarman or Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.

Fleet further remarked: "And the figurative expression that the Adhirāja Indra, mounted upon the elephant *supratīka* of the north-east quarter, overthrew the elephant *kumuda* of the south-east or southern quarter, shows that this attack upon the Eastern Chalukyas was made from

¹ The word adhirāj, according to the *Mahābhārata*, means the same thing as *samrat* and *ekavacana* (Sādakalpadruma, s.v.). In later inscriptions however, it is known to have denoted subordinate rulers. The Bhūd inscription of Čakravarta Prthividesa II mentions his feudatory adhirāja Kumārapāla (Bhandārkar's List, No. 341). An adhirāja Bhōja is mentioned in the *Rājatarangini*, V, verse 151.
the north-east of their kingdom of Veṅgi." The inscription of the Ganga king Indrarvarman referred to by Fleet are dated in the 128th and 146th year of the Ganga era, which "seems to have commenced in A. D. 496" (Ep. Ind., XX, App., p. 201, n. 1; Ind. Ant., LXI, p. 237 f.).\(^1\) The above Ganga inscriptions were, therefore, issued in circa 624 and 642 A.D. Consequently, the Ganga king Indrarvarman was a contemporary of the Viṣṇukundin Indrabhāṭṭāraka-varman (circa 625-655 A.D.).

As regards the possession of Veṅgi by the Eastern Calukyas in the middle of the seventh century A.D., it may be said that there is no conclusive proof of that supposition. From the Aihole inscription (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 4 ff.), we learn that Pulakesin II reduced the strong fortress of Piṣṭapura, which is the modern Piṭṭapuram (Piṭhapuram) in the Godavari district, near the seacoast, about 80 miles to the north-east of Peddavegi; and he caused the leader of the Pallavas to shelter himself behind the ramparts of Kāñci, modern Conjeeveram about 40 miles to the south-west of Madras. Fleet says: "Probably during the campaign which included the conquest of Piṭṭapuram and which must have taken place at this time (i.e., A.D. 616 or 617), the Veṅgi country was made a part of the Chālukya dominions; and the reference to the Pallavas immediately after the mention of Piṣṭapura, has been understood as indicating that it was from their possession that Veṅgi was taken" (Ind. Ant., XX, p. 94 f.). After the publication of the Viṣṇukundin copper-plate grants, however, the theory of the Pallava occupation of Veṅgi in the beginning of the 7th century A.D. may be tacitly given up. Since Lendulūra, for some time the residence (vāsaka) of a Viṣṇukundin king, has been undisputedly identified with

---

\(^1\) Dr. R. C. Majumdar has recently suggested that the beginning of the Ganga era falls between 550 and 557 A.D. (Ind. Cult., IV, p. 171 ff.). Unfortunately, he has totally ignored the astronomical side of the question.
Dēḍalūru, a village on the ruins of the ancient city of Vēṅģī. 5 miles north-east of Ellorė in the Godavari district, it is certain that the Vēṅģī country passed from the hands of the Sālankāyanas to the possession of the Viṣṇukūṇḍins.

It is interesting to notice a passage in the Aihole inscription dated in 634-35 A.D. (Ep. Ind., VI, loc. cit.) which describes Pulakesīn (II)’s southern campaign. Verse 28 of that famous inscription speaks of a piece of water, which appears to contain some islands that were occupied by Pulakesīn’s forces. This piece of water has been called the Kaṁāḷa water or the water (or lake) of Kunāḷa. The position of this Kunāḷa is indicated by the sequence of events recorded in the inscription. Verse 26 tells us that Pulakesīn II subdued the Kālingas and the Kośalas and then, according to the following verse, took the fortress of Pīṭhapura. After that is recorded the occupation of Kunāḷa (verse 28); this again is followed, in the next verse, by Pulakesīn’s victory over the Pallava king near Kāṇcipurā. Verse 29 describes the Calukya king as crossing the river Kāverī, after which is described his contact with the Colas, Keralas and the Pāṇḍyās (verse 31). Kielhōrn seems therefore perfectly reasonable when he says (ibid, pp. 2-3). “Pulakesīn’s march of conquest therefore is from the north to the south, along the east coast of Southern India; and the localities mentioned follow each other in regular succession from the north to the south. This in my opinion shows that ‘the water of Kunāḷa’ can only be the well-known Kollūrī lake, which is south of Pīṭhapuram, between the rivers Gōdāvari and Kṛshṇā. To that lake the description of ‘the water of Kunāḷa’ given in the poem would be applicable even at the present day, and we know from other inscriptions that the lake contained at least one fortified island, which more than once has been the object of attack.” Since the ruins of Vēṅģī and Dēḍalūru lie in the
vicinity of the Kolleru lake there can now hardly be any doubt that the ‘water of Kunāla’ (i.e., the Kolleru or Kollair lake) was, at the time of Pulakesin (II)’s invasion, in the possession of the Viṣṇukundīns and that the battle of Kunāla was fought between the Calukya king and a Viṣṇukundin ruler who was most probably either Madhavavarman II or Vikramendravarman I, both of whom were weak successors of the great Madhavavarman I.

The theory now generally accepted is that Vēngī was conquered by Pulakesin II, during his campaign in the south-eastern region. There is, as I have already said, no conclusive evidence in support of this theory. In the records of the early Eastern Calukya kings there is no reference to the occupation of Vēngī at all. The first use of the name of Vēngī is in the inscriptions of the time of Amma I (918-925 A.D.) which call Vijayaditya II (c. 794-842 A.D.) vēngēśa, and in the inscriptions of the time of Calukya Bhima II (934-945 A.D.), which contain the first explicit statement that the territory over which Kubja-Viṣṇuvardhana and his successors ruled was the Vēngī country (Ind. Ant., XX, p. 94). Both Amma I and Calukya Bhima II reigned in the tenth century A.D.; the evidence of their inscriptions as to the Calukya occupation of Vēngī in the 7th century can, therefore, be reasonably doubted. The fact seems to be that the Viṣṇukundīns of Vēngī, from the time of the Calukya possession of Piṣṭapura, became weaker and weaker, and their country was gradually annexed to the waxing empire of the Eastern Calukyas. The formal annexation which took place possibly after the extinction of the Viṣṇukundīns end of the 7th or (somewhere in the 8th century A.D. ?) seems to have been completed long before the tenth century A.D., i.e., the time of Amma I and Calukya Bhima II, when the Eastern Calukyas claimed that they were master of the Vēngī country from the very beginning of their history. There appears therefore no
strong grounds against our theory that the Viṣṇukūṇḍins, though shorn of their past glory, were ruling for sometime at Veṅgi, contemporaneously with the Eastern Calukyas, who ruled first probably from Piśṭapura,\(^1\) next from Veṅgi\(^2\) and then from Rājamahendrī.\(^3\)

We have to notice two other points before we conclude this section. Smith in his *Early History of India*, 4th ed., p. 441, says: "In the east he (scil. Pulakesīn II) made himself master of Veṅgi, between the Krīshṇā and the Godāvari, and established his brother Kubja Vishnuvardhāna there as viceroy in A.D. 611 with his capital at the stronghold of Piśṭapura, now Piṭhapuram in the Godavari district." Smith, here, professes to rely on the Kopparam plates of Pulakesīn II, edited by Lakshmīnara Rao in *Ann. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst.*, IV, p. 43 ff. These plates, which are full of textual mistakes, seem to record

---

\(^1\) It is to be noted that the Timmāṇapuram grant of Viṣṇuvardhāna I Viṣama-siddhī was issued from the rāṣṭra (literally, residence) of Piśṭapura. We have suggested above that possibly the term rāṣṭra, like the term śramaṇhāra, signifies temporary (or sometimes secondary) capital of a king. It is well known that Pulakesīn II crushed the power of the king of Piśṭapura (piśṭapura-ṛṣṭha) and established his brother Kubja-Viṣṇu-vardhāna on the throne of that place. At the time of Viṣṇuvardhāna therefore Piśṭapura could reasonably be looked upon as the rāṣṭra or śramaṇhāra of this king.

\(^2\) The Veṅgi-ṭa (lord of Veṅgi) antagonists of the Rājaṛākūṭas appear to have been the Eastern Calukya kings (see *Bomb. Gaz.*, I, Pt. II, p. 199). The earliest reference to a king of Veṅgi in the Rāṣṭraṇī records appears to be that in an inscription dated 770 A.D. (*Ep. Ind.*, VI, p. 206). The Eastern Calukyas therefore seem to have occupied Veṅgi before the 9th century A.D. possibly before the second half of the 8th century, the time of Viṣṇupalīya II and his father.

\(^3\) According to Sewell (*Ind. Ant.*, XX, p. 94, note 6) there are two traditions regarding the origin of the name of Rājaṃahendrī (modern Rājamahendry) or Rājamaḥendrapura. The first of these traditions connects the name with a Calukya king named "Viṣṇuvardhāna Mahendrī." This Viṣṇuvardhāna Mahendrī is apparently the Eastern Calukya king Ammu II (A.D. 942-979) who had the epithet Rājaṃahendrī and the surname Viṣṇupadhāna VI (ibid., p. 270). Fels (*ibid.*, pp. 93-94), however, takes the founder of, or the first Eastern Calukya king at, Rājamahendrapura to be Ammu I (918-929 A.D.), who no doubt had the epithet Rājamahendrī, but whose surname was Viṣṇuvardhāna (VI) and not Viṣṇupadhāna.
the grant of some lands in Karmarāṣṭra (northern part of Nellore and southern part of Guntur) by one Prthivi-Duvārāja in the presence of Pulakeśin II. The grant is dated in the pravardhamāna-vijaya-rāja-saṃvatsara 21. Hultzsch while editing these plates in Ep. Ind., XVIII, has shown that the inscription belongs to the 21st regnal year of Pulakeśin II, i.e., to about A.D. 629-30 and that Prthivi-Duvārāja is to be identified with his younger brother Kubja-Viṣṇuvardhana, who is styled Prthivi-vallabha-Viṣṇuvardhana, Yuvarāja in the Satara grant (Ind. Ant., XIX. p. 309). The word duvarāja is a Dravidian tadbhava of Sanskrit yuvarāja. Cf. Akalankat-utvarāyak = Sanskrit akalanka-yuvarāja in the Amber ins.; Ep. Ind., IV, p. 180, and Tuvarākan = yuvarāja in the Kusakudi ins.; S. Ind. Ins., II, No. 73.¹ Lakshmana Rao, however, thought that Duvarāja of this inscription is to be identified with Dbruvarāja of the Goa plates, and that the year 21 of his reign falls in A.D. 611.

But even if we accept 611 A.D. to be the date when Pulakeśin II invaded Karmarāṣṭra and defeated the Viṣṇukūndin king, does it follow that Pulakeśin II conquered the whole of the kingdom of the Viṣṇukūndins? Does the defeat of a king always lead to the loss of his entire territory? Pulakeśin II is known to have defeated the Pallava king, penetrated through the whole of the Pallava territory and crossed the Kāveri; but was the Pallava power weakened? Again, in 642 A.D., the Pallava king Narasimhavarman defeated and killed Pulakeśin II and

¹ It is also interesting to note in this connection the name of the third king of the Calakya line of Kalāṅkī. In many of the inscriptions it is given as Daśavarman, but it is also written (e.g., in the Kauṭuma grant; Ind. Ant., XVI, p. 16) as Yaśovarman. Fleet while noticing the point remarked, "The reason for the variation there is not apparent" (Bomb. Gaz., I, pt. II, p. 431). It seems to me that Daśavarman is an extended form of Daśavarman which is but the same as Yaśovarman.
took Vatapi, the Calukya capital; but did the Calukya power permanently collapse? Did not the power of the Calukyas exist even during the period of Rastakuta usurpation? ¹

Then again according to Bilhana (Vikramāṅkadeva-carita, Intro., p. 44; Ind. Ant., V, p. 323) the Calukya emperor Vikramāditya VI of Kalyani marched on and occupied Kanci, the capital of the Colas (i.e., the Eastern Calukyas), and amused himself there for sometime before returning to his capital. "It is doubtless this campaign that led to there being so many inscriptions, referring themselves to the reign of Vikramāditya VI, at Draksharama and other places in the Telugu country, outside the ordinary limits of the Western Chalukya kingdom" (Bomb. Gaz., I, pt. II, p. 453, note 1.). But does this fact prove that Kanci and the Telugu country were permanently occupied by the Calukyas of Kalyani? Temporary success like this is possibly also shown in the grant of two villages near Talakad, the Gaṅga capital in Mysore, by the Kadamba king Ravivarman (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 146; Sewell, List, s. v. C. A.D. 500; Moraes, Kadambakula, p. 48).

To commemorate even the temporary occupation of part of a country, Indian kings appear to have used to grant there lands to Brāhmaṇas (see Manusamhitā, VII, verses 201-02), and generally, this sort of grants was acknowledged by other kings who followed the donor in the rule of that locality.² It may, therefore, be not altogether impossible that Pulakeśin II penetrated as far as Kamarastra, where the reigning Viṣṇukundin king was defeated, and the Calukya king felt himself justified in granting lands in

¹ Vide the Calukya genealogy as given, e.g., in the Kauthera grant (Ind. Ant., XVI, p. 15). See also Bomb. Gaz., I, pt. II, p. 370 ff.

² Cf. sau-dattam para-dattam ca ye karete varunāharanam, etc., quoted in the copper-plate grants.
the district of which he thought himself to be master for the time being at least. 1

If these suggestions be accepted, there is then no difficulty as regards the discovery of Calukya grants, giving lands in places which were originally under the Viṣṇukūṇḍins. We however do not argue that all the Eastern Calukya kings who granted lands in the country once occupied by the Viṣṇukūṇḍins were temporary possessors of the land. It seems reasonable to believe that the Viṣṇukūṇḍin country gradually, not long after the invasion of Pulakesin II, merged into the Eastern Calukya empire and gradually the Viṣṇukūṇḍins lost all their territories excepting the small district round their capital city of Veṅgi. The existence of Viṣṇukūṇḍin rule at Veṅgi in the 7th century may be compared with that of the Kadamba rule at Vaijayantī even in the glorious age of the early Calukyas of Bādāmi.

The next point is regarding the find-spot of the Ramatirtham plates of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin king Indravarman. The plates were found at a place near Vizianagram in the Vizagapatam district of the Madras Presidency. They record the grant of a village in the Plākiraśtra, which was evidently situated in the Vizagapatam district (Anc. Hist. Dec., p. 91). On the evidence of the find of these plates, it may be suggested that the Vizianagram region was included in the Viṣṇukūṇḍin kingdom, that is to say, the Viṣṇukūṇḍin boundary extended as far as the borders of

1 It is also possible that the time of Pulakesin (II.)'s expedition, the Karmaśāstra was occupied not by the Viṣṇukūṇḍins (but by a branch of the Pallavas?). In A.D. 639 the celebrated Chinese pilgrim Yuán Ch'wang visited the kingdom of An-to-lo (i.e., Andhra), which was a small district only 3,000 li (about 4,500 miles) in circuit. The capital was at Ping-kii-lo, which seems to be a mistake for Ping-ki-pu-lo, i.e., Veṅgisura. The southern part of the Andhra country formed a separate kingdom called To-na-kii-taš-ki (Dhānyaśakata?) or Ta-An-to-lo (Mahāndra) with its capital possibly at Bezwāda, where the pilgrim resided for "many months". See Cunningham, Anc. Geog. Ind., ed. 1934, pp. 600 ff., 608 ff. and 647.
the Ganjam district. 1 In view of the fact that there were the royal house of Piṣṭapura, the houses of the Varmans of Simhapura, Vardhamānapura, Sunagara, Śrīpura and Sārapallika and also of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅganagara whose era probably started from 496 A.D., permanent Viṣṇukūṇḍin occupation of the Vizianagram region seems to be highly improbable. The truth might have been that in retaliation to the raids of Pulakeśin II and Jayasimha I, Indravarman Viṣṇukūṇḍin invaded the Calukya country and penetrated as far as the Plakirāṣṭra, where he made grants of land, as did Pulakeśin II in Karmarāṣṭra, Jayasimha I in Guddavādi and Gudrāhāra, and Vikramāditya VI in the Telugu country. The Plakirāṣṭra or Vizagapatam district seems to have been under the Eastern Calukyas as early as the 18th year of Viṣṇuvardhana I. His Chipurupalle plates (Ind. Ant., XX, p. 15), dated in that year, were found in the Vizagapatam district. They evidently refer to the Plakiviṣaya, doubtfully read as Pūkiviṣaya by Burnell and fleet. This Plakiviṣaya is evidently the same as Plakirāṣṭra of the Ramatirtham plates of Indravarman.

We have seen that the Godavari grant of Prthivīmūla refers to a coalition of kings against Indrabhāṭṭāra-varman, who has been identified with the Viṣṇukūṇḍin king of that name. It seems to me that when Indravarman Viṣṇukūṇḍin defeated the Eastern Calukya forces and penetrated far into their country, Jayasimha I, who seems to have been the Eastern Calukya contemporary of Indravarman, formed an alliance with several other kings, one

---

1 See, e.g., Quart. Journ. Myth. Soc., XXV, p. 80. Kielhorn entered the Chikalka grant of Viṣṇukūṇḍin Vikramendra-varman II in his List of Inscriptions of Northern India (Ep. Ind., V. App., No. 697). Following Kielhorn, D. R. Bhandarkar has also entered the Viṣṇukūṇḍin inscriptions in his List of Inscriptions of Northern India (Ep. Ind., XX-III, App., Nos. 1117 and 3269-90). The Salākkayas and Viṣṇukūṇḍin records must properly be entered into a List of South Indian Inscriptions, as these were local dynasties ruling over the Andhra country in the south.
of whom was Adhirāja Indra, identified by Fleet with the Gaṅga king Indravarman. The combined forces of these allied kings possibly defeated the Viṣṇukundin king and compelled him to return and shelter himself behind the ramparts of his capital, the city of Veṅgi.
III

VIKRAMAHENDRA (VIKRAMENDRA I?) AND GOVINDAVARMAN VIKRAMĀŚRAYA.

As we have already noticed, king Vikramahendra is mentioned only in the Polamuru grant of his grandson Mādhavavarman I. He is there described as favoured by (i.e., as a devotee of) Lord Śrīparvatasvāmin and is said to have subdued the feudatory chiefs by his own valour. The Lord Śrīparvatasvāmin is referred to in all the inscriptions of the Viṣṇukundin family and may, therefore, be taken to have been the family-deity of the Viṣṇukundins. Śrīparvata may be identified with Śrīśaila in the Kurnool district of the Madras Presidency.¹ The original home of the Viṣṇukundin family may, therefore, be supposed to have been not very far from Śrīśaila. Kielhorn (Ep. Ind., IV, 193) suggested a connection of the name of the family with that of the hill-fort and town of Viṣṇukonda in the Kistna district, about 60 miles east of Śrīśaila and 50 miles south of the Krishna river. Viṣṇukonda, according to Kielhorn, was possibly the early home of the Viṣṇukundins.

The son and successor of Vikramahendra was Govinda-\harmā. His surname Vikramāśraya and the epithet anekasamara-saṁghattra-vijayin possibly show that he was a king of considerable importance. He is said to have been obeyed by all the feudatory chiefs.

¹ Excepting the grant of Mādhavavarman II, which applies the epithet bhagavatocā śrīparvatasvāmin-pūd-anudāyata to the name of the issuer himself, all other Viṣṇukundin records apply the epithet to the first king (a predecessor of the issuer) with whose name the general-ginial part of the inscriptions begin. In the records therefore king Vikramendravarman I and his son and grandson are not themselves called ‘favoured by i.e., devotee of Lord Śrīparvata-svāmin.’ The celebrated temple of goddess Siva, called Malīkārjuna, is situated on the northern plateau of the Nallamalai hills. Many Western Calukya grants have been found in the Kurnool district which region appears to have passed to the Western Calukyas before the middle of the 7th century.
IV

MĀDHAVAVARMAN I JANŚRAYA.

Mādhavavarman I Janśraya appears to have been the greatest of the Viśnukundin kings.¹ The performance of 11 aśvamedhas, 1,000 agnistomas and some other rites including the Hiraṇyagarbha proves that he was a prince of power and resources. In very early times the aśvamedha was evidently performed by kings desirous of offspring (see Apte, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v. aśva). According to the Rāmāyaṇa (I, viii, 2), king Daśaratha performed this sacrifice for progeny (sūt-arthi vājimeḥnena kim=aṛthaṁ na yajāmy=aham). Kings are also known to have performed aśvamedha for purifying themselves from sin. According to Viṣṇu, aśvamedhena śudhyanti mahāpātakinas tv=iṁe (Sabdakalpadruma-pariśiṣṭa, s.v. aśvamedha). Yudṛiṣṭhira in the Mahābhārata (XIV, ii) is said to have performed the horse-sacrifice with a view to purifying himself. But, as we have already noticed, it was performed only by a king who was a conqueror and a king of kings. Keith has rightly pointed out that the Aśvamedha “is an old and famous rite, which kings alone can bring to increase their realms” (Rel. Phil. Fed. Up., p. 343). The Baudhāyaṇa Śr. Sūt. (XV, i)

Lakshmana Rao (Journ. Dept. Let., XI, pp. 55-53) refers to several traditions that have grown on the glorious name of Mādhavavarman. A 13th century inscription in the Malleśvaravāmā temple at Bezwāḍa gives an one date about Mādhavavarman, king of Bezwāḍa in Saka 517 (11), who punished his own son with death for killing a poor woman’s son. A Bezwāḍa pillar inscription of the 16th century claims for a general of Kṛṣṇadevara of Viṣṇaṅgara descent from Mādhava-varman of Bezwāḍa. A poem called Śrihṛṣīṇaparājanka (c. 1440 A.D.) speaks of the migration into Telengana of four Rajput tribes under the leadership of one Mādhavavarman in Saka 514. This Mādhavavarman is claimed to be the ancestor of the family of the Maharāṇa of Vizianagram in the Vizagapatam district. The caste called Rāṣṭra or Rāṣṭra in the Telugu country also claims Mādhavavarman as progenitor.
Taittiriya Br. (III, 8, 9, 4; V, 4, 12, 3), Āpastamba Śr. Sūt. (XX, I, i) and many other early texts prove beyond doubt that a feudatory ruler could not perform the aśvamedha. A point of great interest, however, is that Mādhavavarman I claims to have performed as many as eleven aśvamedhas, while successful conquerors like Samudragupta and Puṣyamitra are known to have performed only one or two aśvamedhas. Of course, from the description of the sacrifice given in the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata, it appears that some aśvamedhic practices of the Vedic age may have been slightly modified in the epic period; but it is impossible to think that it became so easy as to be performed by even a king of the feudatory rank. It must be noticed that some Vedic kings are known to have performed a great number of aśvamedhas. Thus Bharata, son of Duṣyanta, according to a gāthā quoted in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (XIII, iii, 5, 11; Weber's edition, p. 994), performed as many as one hundred and thirty-three horse-sacrifices on the banks of the Gāṅgā and the Yamuna (aṣṭāsaptatīṁ bharato dausyantir = yamunāṁ = anu gāṅgāyām vytraghnc = 'badhnāt pānca- pāṇcāśatam hayaṁ = iti). According to another gāthā (loc. cit., 13), Bharata performed more than a thousand aśvamedhas after conquering the whole earth (paṁahsahasrāṁ = indrayaṁ = aśvamedhin = ya = āharad = vijitya prthivīṁ sarvām = iti). The epics and Purāṇas however knew of traditions regarding some early kings trying to perform a hundred aśvamedhas, which would lead the performer to the attainment of the seat of Indra who is, therefore, represented as trying to prevent the hundredth sacrifice (see Vāmana-Purāṇa, Ch. 78; Raḵha, III, 38-66; Bhāgavata Purāṇa, IV, 16, 24; 17, 4; etc.). May it be that the Vedic aśvamedha was less pompous than the epic aśvamedha. and that the aśvamedhas performed by South Indian kings were of the Vedic type?

1. See Keith, Black Yajur, pp. cxxii-iv and Appendix below.
We have already noticed that the Deccan performs Vedic rites more fanatically than Northern India. See also my views in *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, XIII, p. 40.

Mādhavavarman I married a girl of the Vākāṭaka family of Northern Deccan, and thus made his power secure in that direction.¹ According to V. A. Smith (J. R. A. S., 1914, p. 137) the Vākāṭaka father-in-law of Mādhavavarman Viṣṇukūṇḍin was king Hariśeṇa who claims to have conquered the Andhra and Kalinga countries. It is also believed that Mādhavavarman succeeded in getting the possession of the Veṇgi country by virtue of this Vākāṭaka alliance (Sewell, *List.*, a.v. A. D. 500). This suggestion is however untenable in view of the fact that Mādhavavarman I, though he was the greatest king, was not the first king of his dynasty, he being at least preceded by his father Govinda-varman and grandfather Vikramahendra. The Polamuru grant calls him *daśasata-sakala-dharanītala-narapati* ² and credits him with an expedition for the conquest of the eastern region.

It must be noticed in this connection that, in the Haraha inscription dated A. D. 554, the Maukhari king Iśānavarman claims victory over an *Andhr-ādhipati*. There can hardly be any doubt that this *Andhr-ādhipati* was a Viṣṇukūṇḍin king. Prof. Raychaudhuri (Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., 2nd ed., p. 370) has taken this Andhra king to be Mādhava-varman of the Polamuru plates who according to this grant "crossed the river Godāvari with a desire to conquer the

---

¹ Dr. D. C. Ganguly writes in *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, VIII, p. 26: "Mādhavavarman I was the founder of this dynasty. His mother was a princess of the Vākāṭaka family." According to the Chikkulla plates (Ep. Ind., IV, p. 190), however, the Vākāṭaka princess was the mother of Vikramendravarman I, son of Mādhavavarman I. Cf. Viṣṇukūṇḍin-vākāṭa-rāgā-sadvrajanmucchā-grahendravarman, etc. As we have shown, Mādhavavarman I was not the founder or the first king of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin dynasty.

² Mr. M. Somaskhara Sarma suggests to me that the epithet may possibly be translated as "lord of the Veṇgi Ten Thousand."
eastern region." This identification suits well the chronology we have accepted in these pages. It may not be impossible that the eastern expedition of Mādhavavarman I was undertaken in retaliation to his previous unsuccessful struggle with the Maukharis. This supposition is supported by the fact that a victory over the Andhras is alluded to in the Jaunpur Inscription of Iśvaravarman, father of Iśānavarman Maukhari (Corp. Ins. Ind., III, p. 230).

In the Polamuru grant, Mādhavavarman I has been called avasita-vividha-divya (line 8). This passage has been left out in the translation of Mr. Subba Rao who has edited the inscription in Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VI, p. 17 ff. The passage, however, appears to me very important in connection with the administration of justice in the Andhra country at the time of the Viṣṇukundins. Here is a clear evidence of the prevalence of the system of trial by ordeals in the Viṣṇukundin kingdom. The word divya, here, certainly means "ordeal" and vividha-divya "various (forms of) ordeals." The verb avas-a has, among others, the meanings "to accomplish," "to know" and "to destroy." The passage avasita-vividha-divya may, therefore, mean, one "who has accomplished the various (forms of) ordeals," or "who has known (how to use) the various (forms of) ordeals," or "who has destroyed (i.e., abolished) the various forms of ordeals." We have seen that this Mādhavavarman I Viṣṇukundin performed eleven Aśvamedhas and a thousand agniṣṭomās (kr atus). It must be noticed in this connection that no one except a fanatic can be expected to perform an aśvamedha sacrifice and expose his wives to such indecent and obnoxious practices as are necessary in the performance of this sacrifice. As for instance, the mahiṣi of the performer of the aśvamedha is required to lie down beside the sacrificial horse and to put the horse's penis into her own private parts (cf. mahiṣi svayam = ev = aśva-śiśnam = akyṣya sva-yonau sthāpayati—Mahādhara on Sukla-yajus,
XXXII, 18-25; and aścasya śīśnām mahaśya = upasthenaṇḥhatte; Satapathabrihman, XLI, iv, 2). Mādhavavārman I, performer of eleven aśvamedhas, thus appears to have been one of the most orthodox Hindu kings of ancient India. It is, therefore, doubtful whether we can expect from him such a great reform as the abolition of the deep-rooted system of trial by ordeals, which is sanctioned by ancient law-givers and which was in use in our country as late as the end of the 15th century and possibly still later. The last meaning is, therefore, less probable. The divyas or ordeals, which were used in ancient Indian courts in order to ascertain the truth of a statement, has been enumerated as nine in the Divyatattva of Bṛhaspati. They were ordeal (1) by balance, (2) by fire, (3) by water, (4) by poison, (5) by "image-washed" water, (6) by rice, (7) by the hot māṣaka, (8) by spear-head, and (9) by images. Cf.

dhato = gniṇu = udakaṇ = c = aśva viṣam koṣaś = ca pañcamam 
śaṣṭhaṃ = ca tāṇḍulāḥ proktam saptamam taptam māṣakam 
aṣṭaman phālam = ily = uktam navamam dharmajam śṛṇīm.


In both the Ipur and Polamuru grants the king is said to have been the delilter of the damsel residing

1 In the Chikkula grant of his great-grand-son, he is credited with a number of sacrifices among which is mentioned parusamedha. If this tradition is to be believed, Mādhavavārman I must have been an abominable fanatic.

2 Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VII, p. 195 ff. Trial by ordeals is used to settle up disputes among some aboriginal tribes of the Andhra region even at the present day. Mr. G. T. H. Bracken, Chief Secretary to the Madras Government, in course of his address at the "Wi der Parts of India" to the Rotary Club on March 9, 1934, said, "In disputes over land, the custom (in the East Godavari Agency) is to make the parties to the dispute walk round the land, and he who walks the whole way round continually and eats some of the earth is declared to be the owner" (from Report in the Amrita Bazar Patrika, Calcutta). This system of trial was prevalent in the Marathi country even at the time of the Peshwas, that is to say, as late as the 19th century A.D. (see S. N. Sen, Administrative History of the Marathas, 2nd ed., p. 363 ff.)
in the houses of Trivaranagara. Trivaranagara appears to mean "the city of king Trivara." A king named Trivara has been mentioned in the Konnedda grant (Ep. Ind., XIX, p. 267) of the Sailoddhava king Dharmarāja, as having formed an alliance with a certain king named Mādhava and fought against Dharmarāja. It is possible that king Trivara of the Konnedda inscription is the same as that mentioned in the grants of Mādhavavarman I Viṣṇukundin. Mādhavavarman I however does not appear to have lived at the time of Sailoddhava Dharmarāja and therefore can hardly be identical with Mādhava who fought against the Sailoddhava monarch. A king named Tivara is found in the line of the Pāṇḍavas of Kośala, who had their capital at Śrīpura (see the Rajmim and Baloda grants, Corp. Ins. Ind., III, p. 291 ff.; Ep. Ind., VII, p 10 ff.). The charters and seals of Mahāśiva Tīvararāja of Śrīpura are in the box-headed character. According to some scholars, the boxheaded characters were in use in the 5th and 6th centuries of the Christian era (Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, p. 596). Fleet and Kielhorn, however, think that the inscriptions of Tivara of Kośala are not earlier than 700 A.D. (Indische Palaeographie, p. 63, note 20). According to Bühler (ibid, p. 63), the Central Indian or "box-headed" type is found fully developed "in einer Inschrift Samudragupta's aus Eran und einer Chandragupta's II. aus Udayagiri, den kupferfaseln der Könige von Sarabhapura, den Inschriften der Vākāṭaka; der des Tivara von Kośala und in zwei frühen Kadamba-Inschriften." The Gupta, Vākāṭaka and Kadamba records are definitely known to be earlier than 700 A.D. The same may be the case with the inscriptions of Tivara

1 I am indebted for this suggestion to Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri. Lakshmana Rao identifies it with Tewar in the Jhalawar district and considers it to have been the place of Mādhavavarman I's father-in-law (Journ. Dept. Let., XI, pp. 34, 39). The passage in question however seems to suggest his hostile relations with Trivaranagara rather than his marriage with a girl of that place.
of Kośala. It must be noticed in this connection that Fleet's and Kielhorn's view that the Vākāṭaka records date from the 7th century A.D. (ibid., note 19) has now been conclusively disproved.

The performance of Vedic sacrifices and the epithet parama-brahmanya (highly hospitable to the Brāhmaṇas) clearly show that Mādhuavarman I was a staunch follower of the Brahmanical faith.

1. The Ipur plates (set I) were issued on the 15th day of the 7th fortnight of summer in the 37th year of the king, from the camp of Kuḍavāda (vijaya-skandhavārat kuḍavāda-cāsakāt). They record a notice to the inhabitants of Vilembali in the Guḍḍādi-viṣaya. The village was granted by the king to a Brāhmaṇa named Agniśarman belonging to the Vatsa gotra, and all royal officers were ordered to protect it and make it immune from taxation. The executor of the grant was the king's beloved son, Prince Maṇeyaṇa. The village of Vilembali and the Guḍḍādi-viṣaya have not been satisfactorily identified. Guḍḍādi may be the same as Guḍḍavādi-viṣaya, i.e., the present Rāmachandrapur taluka. It is possibly not the same as the Guḍrāhāra-viṣaya which is the district round Gudivāḍa in the Kistna district.

The seal of king Mādhuavarman I attached to the plates is circular and somewhat worn. It is divided by a cross-line into two sections. The lower section bears in relief Śrī-Mādhuavarmanā in two lines. Hultzsch thought that the upper section bears the figure of Lakṣṇī or seastika on a pedestal, flanked by two lamp-stands and possibly surmounted by the sun and crescent of the moon (Ep. Ind., XVII, p. 334). As on the seals attached to the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates the figure of a lion is clearly visible, it may not be impossible that the obliterated part

1 The old form of dating in the Vīpukñāṭa records is probably due to local custom of the original home of the dynasty. See infra.
above the line contained the figure of a lion which was possibly the crest of the Viṣṇukundins.

II. The Polamuru grant was issued by the king when he set out on the eastern expedition and was crossing the Godāvari. By it the mahattaras and adhikāra-puruṣas were informed that the king made an agrahāra of the village of Pulobūrī on the Daliyavāvi river and of four nirvartanas of land at the southern extremity of Mayindavātaki, and granted it to the Gantama gotra Brāhmaṇa Sivaśarman, resident of Kuṇḍūra in Karmarāṣṭra. As Polamuru (Pulobūrī of the inscription) is a village in the Ramchandrapur taluka of the Godavari district, the present taluka may be roughly identified with the Guddavādi-viṣaya in which the village is said to have been situated. Mayindavātaki has been identified with Mahendravāda adjacent to Polamuru, and Daliyavāvi with the small stream Tulyabhāga now turned into a drainage canal. Kuṇḍūra may be the same as Kōṇḍūru in the Sattanepalle taluka or Peda-Kōṇḍūru in the Taṇuku taluka of the Guntur district. As we have already seen, the village of Polamuru was re-granted to the recipient’s son by the Eastern Calukya king Jayasimha I who probably conquered the region from the Viṣṇukundins.

In the Sanskrit lexicon Trikāṇḍaśeṣa, mahattara has been called the same as grāma-kūta, “the head of a village” (cf. rāṣṭra-kūta “head of a rāṣṭra,” an official designation in the Calukya inscriptions). Evidently, affairs in villages were controlled by them. The word adhikāra-puruṣa appears to mean “a puruṣa (agent) having an adhikāra (a post),” i.e., a government official cf. na nisprayoga-nam = adhikāravantah prabhubhir = āhūyante : Mudrā-rākṣasa, Act III. The mention of the mahattaras along with

1 The language and orthography of this record are bad, and the characters are rude and late. The authenticity of the grant therefore may not be quite certain. But we are not definite, as sometimes we also get copies of older records. See also our notes a p. 57 and notes above.
"government officials" possibly shows that the former were not salaried officers of the government. The executors of the grant were the Hastikośa and Virakośa, which terms have already been discussed.

"It is believed that the seal (of the Polamuru plates) contains the figure of a lion, the crest of the Viṣṇukundins, and probably also the name of the royal donor" (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VI, p. 17).

1 Cf. the case of grāmika in Manu, VII, 119-19; also below.
V

MADHAVAVARMAN II.

Madhavavarman II was the son of Devavarman and grandson of Madhavavarman I. Only one copper-plate grant of this king has been discovered. It was found at Ipur, a village in the Tenali taluka of the Guntur district. The grant appears to have been issued on the 7th day of the 7th paksi of varSHA in the 17th (47th according to Hultsch) regnal year,1 from Amarapura which may probably be identified with the modern Amaravati.

Madhavavarman II has been described in this inscription as trikuta-malay-adhipati, "lord of Trikuta and Malaya." We do not know of any other Malaya except the famous Malaya mountain, generally identified with the southernmost part of the Western Ghats. Trikuta is placed by Kâlidâsa (Raghu., IV, 58-59) in the Aparânta, i.e., Northern Konkan. It is, however, difficult at the present state of our knowledge to justify Madhavavarman II's claim to be in possession of those countries. The epithet may show that the ViSHukundin king came into hostile relations with Trikuta and Malaya. He may have joined the armies of some powerful king who invaded those regions.2 Mr. B. V. Krishna Rao appears to suggest that Madhavavarman II was Viceroy at a place called Trikuta-malaya which he is inclined to identify with Kotappakonda near Narasaraopeta (Bharati (Telugu), 1930, p. 414; Journ.

1 It has recently been suggested in a paper read at the ninth session of the All-India Oriental Conference (1937) that the grant was issued in the reign of Madhavavarman I.

2 The Vaiśhāka kings Narendraśāna and Hariśena are said to have conquered Malaya and Trikuta respectively (Bhandarkar's List, Nos. 1700, 1712). But they appear to be considerably earlier than Vișukundin Madhavavarman II.
Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., X, p. 191). This is a happy suggestion; but I could not examine his arguments in favour of the identification.

The plates record the grant of a village, the name of which seems to be Murotukaliki, to two Brāhmaṇas named Agniśarman and Indraśarman. In connection with the sāsan-ājña, reference is made to the attention paid by the viṣṇukundya-adhirāja who may be Mādhavavarman II. If, however, it may be believed that Mādhavavarman II was a viceroy under his grandfather, this adhirāja should of course signify Mādhavavarman I.

The seal attached to the Ipur plates (set II), is circular and much worn. It is divided by a cross-line into two sections like the seal of the Ipur grant (No. 1). In the lower section the legend Śrī-Mādhava(varmmā) in two lines is very faintly visible, while the symbols in the upper section cannot be made out at all (Ep. Ind., XVII, p. 338).
VI

VIKRAMENDRAVARMAN I (II?).

The next king appears to have been Vikramendravarman I, son of Madhavavarman I. No inscription of this king has been discovered. The most interesting point about the king is that, in the Chikkulla plates of his grandson, he is called *visnu-kundia-vakata-vamsa-dvay-alamkrtaja-nm*. Vakata is evidently the same as Vakata, which was the most glorious dynasty ruling in Northern Deccan in the 5th century of the Christian era. The relation of Vikramendravarman I with the Vakatakas is also referred to in the Ramatirtham plates of his son, where he is called *ubhaya-vamsa-alamkarabha-ta* (who is the ornament of both the dynasties).

"The Vakatakas were the neighbours of the Kadambas and the Vakata kingdom extended up to the modern town of Kurnool on the banks of the Krishnâ. We know that the famous temple of Sri Sailam or Sri Parvata is in the Kurnool district, and a story, as related in the *Sthalamahatmya* of the place, says that the princess Chandrâvati, a daughter of the Gupta king Chandragupta, conceived a passion for the God on the Srisaila hill and began offering every day a garland of jasmine (*mallika*) flowers to him* (Report on Epigraphy for 1914-1915, Part II, 91).

"In fact, we shall see that this dynasty (scil. that of the Visnukundins) had for its tutelary deity the God of Sri Parvata and that the first (?) king of this dynasty Madhavavarman married a Visnukundin (Vakata) princess. I think there can be no doubt that this princess was the
daughter or grand-daughter of queen Prabhāvatī," the daughter of king Candraṣūpta II and wife of the Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena (see Dubreuil, Anc. Hist. Dec., pp. 73-74). According to Vincent Smith (J.R.A.S., 1914, p. 137) the mother of Viṣṇukundin Vikramendravarman I was the daughter of the Vākāṭaka king Hariśena who claimed to have conquered the countries of Andhra and Kaliṅga.
VII

INDRAVARMAN.

The son and successor of Vikramendravarman I was Indravarman, to whom belong the plates discovered at a place called Ramatirtham in the vicinity of Vizianagaram. The king has been described as parama-māheśvara (staunch devotee of Maheśvara, i.e., Śiva) and aneka-caturddanta-samara-śata-sahasra-samghaṭṭa-viśayī. The significance of the latter epithet may be understood from what has been already discussed above. It refers to the king’s struggle with his eastern or north-eastern neighbours. In the Chikulla grant he is said to have made some ghaṭikās, which mean establishments (probably founded in most cases by kings) for holy and learned men. Ghaṭikā is mentioned in the Talgunda inscription of Śaṅtilavarman and the Kasakudi grant of Nandivarman. It is the same as Brahmāpurī of other records (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 26). In the same grant, Indravarman is also called parameśvara and bhrūbhaṅga-kara-vinirāṭa-samagra-dāyāda. It is suggested that the latter epithet refers to his success against the viceregal line of Trikūṭamalaya (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., X, p. 191).

The Ramatirtham plates (Ep. Ind., XII, p. 133) which were issued from the Puranisaṅgamavāsaka (which possibly means the camp at the confluence of the river Puranī) on the 7th tilhi of the bright half of Jyaiṣṭha in the 27th year of king Indravarman record the grant of the village of Peruvāṭaka in Plakirāṭra as an agrahāra to a tattīrīyaka Brāhmaṇa named Nagnaśarman who belonged to the Manḍira gotra.
The *agrahāra* was exempted from the burden of all taxes and the peasants assembled at Peruvāṭaka were ordered to give to the Brāhmaṇa the customary share of the produce of the *agrahāra* and to perform regularly all duties, such as conveying message, etc. The future owners of the country are also requested not to confiscate but to protect the *agrahāra*. The king himself was the executor of the grant. The nature of the grant appears to support our view that king Indravarman granted the *agrahāra*, while leading an expedition against his eastern enemies. Plakirāṣṭra, as we have already noticed, is the present Vizianagaram region. It is mentioned as Plakiviṣaya and Paḷakiviṣaya in the inscriptions of Calukya Viṣṇuvardhana I (*Ep. Ind.*, IX, p. 317).

The seal attached to the Ramatirtham plates shows the faint figure of an advancing lion facing the proper right, with its left forepaw raised, neck erect, mouth wide open, and the tail raised above the back and ended in a loop.
VIII

VIKRAMENDRAVARMAN II (III ?).

Indravarman was succeeded by his eldest son, Vikramendravarman II. A copper-plate grant (Ep. Ind., IV, p. 193) of this king was discovered at Chikkulla in the Tuni sub-division of the Godavari district. It was issued on the 5th day of the 8th māsapakṣa of grīṣma (?) in the 10th year of the king, from the Lendulūravāsaka which has been identified by Ramayya with modern Dendalūru near Ellore.

King Vikramendravarman II, who was a paramamāheśvara like his father, hereby dedicated a village called Regonraṇa to Somagirisvaranātha in honour of the matted-haired, three-eyed God, the Lord of the three worlds. Somagirisvaranātha appears to have been the name applied to a linga established in a temple at Lendulūra.

The village of Regonraṇa is said to have been situated to the south of the village of Rāvireva on the bank of the Krṣṇaveṇṇa (Krīṣṇa) in Natṛpaṭi which appears to be the name of a district.

The seal of Vikramendravarman II attached to the Chikkulla plates "bears in relief on a slightly countersunk surface a well-executed lion, which stands to the proper right, raises the right forepaw, opens the mouth and apparently has a double tail" (loc. cit.). It, however, seems to me that the tail of the lion is not double as Kielhorn takes it to be, but is only raised above the back so as to end in a loop. Compare the figure of the lion on the Ramatirtham plates of Indravarman.

1 "Krishṇaveṇṇa, or more usually Krīṣṇaveṇṇa or Krīṣṇaṃveṇṇa, was the ancient epigraphic name of the Krīṣṇa, evidently taken from its confluence at Badgam-Mähuli, three miles east of Sātīra, with the Yeppā or Veppā, one of its most important feeders" (Boml. Gaz., I, ii, p. 331 n.). See p. 61 above.
CHAPTER VI

THE EARLY PALLAVAS.

I

EARLY HISTORY OF THE KANTI REGION.

The earliest reference to Kāncipuram (Conjeeverman in the Chingleput district of the Madras Presidency) seems to be that in the Mahābhāṣya (iv, 2 second āhnikā) of the great grammarian Patañjali whose "date, B. C. 150, may now be relied upon" (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 140). Patañjali is now generally taken to have been a contemporary of the first Śunga king, Puśyamitra, who reigned from circa 185 to 149 B. C. according to Smith (E. Hist. Ind., 4th ed., p. 208 ff.). The mention of Kāncipuram in the Mahābhāṣya goes to show that Kānci became a place of importance as early as the beginning of the second century B. C. It is however not certain whether Kānci was of political or commercial importance in the age of the Mahābhāṣya.

If traditions recorded by the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang are to be believed, Kānci rose to prominence even earlier than the age of the Mahābhāṣya. This Chinese pilgrim tells us that he noticed a stūpa about hundred feet high, built by king Aśoka in the city of Kānci (Beal, Bud. Rec., West. World, II, p. 230). In this connection we may also note the mention of Aśoka or Aśokavarmana as one of the early Pallava kings in the mythical portion of the later Pallava inscriptions. Hultzsch appears to be right in taking this Aśoka or Aśokavarmana as "a modification of the ancient Maurya king Aśoka." The claim of having this great Maurya emperor as predecessor is to be found also in the Rājatarāṅgini, the traditional history of Kashmir (i, 102-06). Though the genealogy of Aśoka given in the

1 The paper was originally published in Journ. Ind. Hist., Vol. XIV, pp. 140-07.
Kashmir chronicle does not tally with the Maurya genealogy found in the Purāṇas, the description of the Kashmir king named Aśoka "who had freed from sins and had embraced the doctrine of Jīna (i.e., Buddha), covered Suśkaletra and Vitastāra with numerous stūpas," clearly shows that he is no other than the great king of Pāṭaliputra. The inclusion of Maurya Aśoka in the traditional Pallava genealogy is therefore not impossible.

If however we take the find-spots of Aśokan inscriptions so far discovered in the far south as establishing the southernmost boundary of the Maurya empire in Aśoka’s time, it would appear that the Kañcē region lay outside that empire. Nevertheless, if traditions recorded in early Tamil works are to be believed, the Maurya frontier at the time of Candragupta, grandfather of Aśoka, possibly extended far to the south of Kañcē. "We have seen that in the south the Maurya power, at one time, had probably penetrated as far as the Podiyil hill in the Tinnevelly district. In the time of Aśoka, the Maurya frontier had receded probably to the Pennar river near Nellore, as the Tamil kingdoms are referred to as prachamata or border states and are clearly distinguished from the imperial dominions (vijīta or rāja-visaya) which stretched only as far south as the Chitaldrug district of Mysore" (Raychaudhuri, Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., 2nd ed., p. 195). If then the Kañcē region was once under the Mauryas, it may not be altogether impossible that owing to the commercial importance of its position Kañcē attracted the notice of a Maurya emperor or a viceroy of the southernmost Maurya province, who assigned this Sanskritised name to a Dravidian original like Kacci (Kaccippeddu) or Kaṇjī.

1 Romb. Cor., I, ii, p. 318, note. At the time of Aśoka, the southernmost Maurya province had its headquarters at Suvanagiri which has been identified by Baltuch with Banakagiri in the Naraśa’s dominions to the south of Maski (Corp. Ins. Ind., I, p. xxxviiii).
The exhaustive list of countries, mentioned in Gautamī Balaśrī’s inscription, over which Gautamiputra Sātakarni is said to have ruled, does not mention any district of the far south. This fact, along with the conspicuous absence of inscriptions and coins of Gautamiputra Sātakarni in the Andhra region possibly goes to show that the country was outside the kingdom of this Sātavāhana king. It must however be noticed that Gautamiputra Sātakarni has been described in that famous Nasik Cave inscription as Lord of the Vindhya, Rkṣavat, Pāriyātra, Sahya, Kṛṣṇagiri (Kanheri), possibly Śrīśaila (maha-siri-ṭana = Martya-sri or Śrī-śutana?), Mahendra, Malaya, Setagiri and Cakora mountains. Malaya and Mahendra, quite well-known in Sanskrit literature, have been identified respectively with the Western Ghats (to the south of the Nilgiri) and the Eastern Ghats. If there is in the list really the name of Śrīśaila, it is to be found in the Kurnool district of the Madras Presidency. Cakora has been mentioned along with Śrīśaila in the Purāṇas. It is therefore possible that Gautamiputra Sātakarni claimed a sort of suzerainty over the whole of southern India. Since there is no mention of the Himalaya, the list of mountains in Gautamiputra’s kingdom does not appear to be altogether conventional. Another important point in this connection is the king’s epithet tri-samuda-toya-pitā-vāhana which says that his war-horses drank water from the three seas. We are to notice that the inscription does not refer to the conventional caṭah-samudra, but only to tri-samudra (three seas) which evidently signifies the Western (Arabian) sea, Eastern sea (Bay of Bengal) and Southern sea (Indian Ocean). The traditional southern expedition of Maurya Candragupta and the southern expeditions of the Calukyas of Bādami and Kalyani, of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mālkiśa and later of Śivāji and Hangar Ali show that it was almost a custom with great Deccan kings to lead expeditions to the far south. Is it impossible that
Gautamiputra Satakarni's vague claim of suzerainty over the whole of Southern India originated from such a southern expedition? 1

The Amaravati inscription of Vasiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi (Arch. Surv. S. Ind., I, p. 100; pl. LVI, No. 1), Amaravati inscription of siri-Sivamaka-Sada (ibid, p. 61, pl. LVI, No. 2), Chinna inscription of Gautamiputra Yaśa Satakarni (Ep. Ind., I, p. 95), Kodavali inscription of Vasiṣṭhiputra Čanda Sata (ibid; XVIII, p. 316 ff.) and the Myakadoni inscription of Pulumāvi (ibid, XIV, p. 155) however clearly show that the successors of Gautamiputra Satakarni certainly ruled in the Andhra region. This southerly extension of the Sātavāhana power may have been due to the rise of the house of Caṭana who seems to have established himself at Ujjayini and to have been a contemporary of the Greek geographer Ptolemy (c. 140 A.D.) and of the Sātavāhana king Vasiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi, son of Gautamiputra Satakarni. We know from the Junagadh inscription (ibid, VIII, p. 44 ff.) that Caṭana's grandson Rudradāman (c. 130-150 A.D.), who for some time ruled conjointly with his grandfather, 2 was reigning over some of the countries that were formerly under the possession of Gautamiputra Satakarni.

The occupation of Andhradesa and the adjoining districts by the later Sātavāhanas is also proved by numismatic evidence. According to Rapson (Catalogue, p. lxxi) the Sātavāhana coins found in the Kistna-Godavari region "fall into two classes distinguished from each other both by their type and their fabric." In the district of the first fabric,

1 A Nasik inscription possibly refers to a southern expedition led by Gautamiputra Satakarni who seems to have once encamped at Vaijayanath Vaijayanti; which was later the capital of the Cuṭa Satakarnis and after them of the Kadambas has been identified with modern Banavasi in the North Kanara district of the Bombay Presidency (see infra).

2 Raychaudhuri, op cit., p. 317 ff.
coins of the following five kings have been found (ibid, lxxii):

1. Vāsiṣṭhiputra śrī-Pulkamāvi,
2. Vāsiṣṭhiputra Śivārī Šātakarni,
3. Vāsiṣṭhiputra śrī-Candra Šāti,
4. Gautamiputra śrī-Yajña Šātakarni, and
5. śrī-Rudra Šātakarni.

In the district of the second fabric are found coins struck by the following three kings (ibid, p. lxxiv):

1. śrī-Candra Šāti,
2. Gautamiputra śrī-Yajña Šātakarni, and
3. śrī-Rudra Šātakarni.

Some lead coins found in the Anantapur and Cuddapah districts have been taken by Rapseon to have belonged to some feudatories of the Šātavāhana kings (ibid, pp. lxx-xi). This suggestion appears to be supported by the following facts. Firstly, in the Chitaldurg district has been found a coin of one Sadakana (Šātakarni) Kalalāya Mahāraṭhi who was most probably a feudatory of the great Šātavāhanas; secondly, the Myakadoni (Bellary district) inscription of Pulkamāvi shows that the Bellary region was called the Janapada (district) of Šātavāhanihāra, and that it was under the rule of a governor (mahāsenāpati) whose name was Skandanaśa. This fact seems to show that the southern districts of the Šātavāhana kingdom were ruled by military chiefs.

From what has been said above it is perfectly clear that the dominions of the later Šātavāhanas extended as far as the borders of the district round Kāṇči. We shall now consider the question whether Kāṇči could have formed a part of the Šātavāhana kingdom.

There is no epigraphic evidence to prove that the Šātavāhana kings ruled over Kāṇči; but certain lead coins with
"ship with two masts" on one side and the Ujjain symbol on the other have been discovered on the Coromandel coast between Madras and Cuddalore. "That they belong to the Andhra (Sātavāhana) dynasty seems certain from the Ujjain symbol which forms their reverse type, and from such traces as remains of the coin-legend. On the solitary specimen on which these traces admit of any probable restoration the inscription appears to be intended for Siri-Pu[llamã] visa (No. 95, p. 22; pl. V)." Of course, mere discovery of some coins of a certain dynasty in a certain area may not prove that that particular area was under the direct control of the rulers of that dynasty. But this distinct type of ship-coins found exclusively in the Coromandel coast possibly supports the view that at least the issuer (or issuers) of the ship-coins had some sort of political supremacy over the coastal region. But who ruled the coast-country during the time of the later Sātavāhana who most probably issued the ship-coins?

According to some scholars, "The coast-region in which these coins are found was in the third century B.C. inhabited by the Colas; but before the middle of the second century A.D. it seems to have passed into the power of the Pallavas who were thus contemporary with the later Andhras (i.e., Sātavāhanas)." This view however can be proved to be unwarranted on the evidence of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea and the Geography of Ptolemy.

We may not expect to get the name of Kāñcipurā in the Periplus as this work does not attempt to give an exhaustive list of cities and towns of the countries about which it speaks. The Kāñcī region was possibly not a separate political unit in the age of this work (c. 80 A.D.). The Periplus says: "§ 59. From Komari (mod. Kumārikā) towards the south (actually toward NNE) this region extends to Kolkhi

1 Rapson, op. cit., pp. ix-xii.
2 Ibid., p. ixxii.
(Karkai on the Tāmrapārṇī in the Tinnevelly district; Smith, op. cit., p. 469)...........; and it belongs to the Pandian kingdom. Beyond Kolkhi there follows another district called the Coast country (=Coromandel or Cola-mandala coast), which lies on a bay, and has a region inland called Argrava (=Uragapura = mod. Uraiyur near Tanjore)...........§ 60. Among the market-towns of these countries and the harbours where the ships put in from Damirika and from the north, the most important are, in order as they lie, first Kamara, then Poduka, then Sopotma; in which there are ships of the country coasting along the shore as far as Damirika; and other very large made of single logs bound together called Sangara; but those which make the voyage to Khryse and to the Ganges are called Kōlandia and are very large.” We do not definitely know whether any of these three ports mentioned by the Periplus belonged to the district of Kānci, but the fact that the Periplus after referring to the Coast country refers to Masalia (=district round Masulipatam) possibly suggests that the borders of the Coast country touched, in the age of the Periplus, those of the district round Masulipatam. This suggestion, it should be noticed, is in accord with the tradition which says that “the Chola country (Cholamandalam) was bounded on the north by the Pennar and on the south by the southern Vellarn river; or, in other words, it extended along the eastern coast from Nellore to Puddukottai, where it abutted on the Pāṇḍya territory” (Smith, op. cit., p. 480).

In the Geography of Ptolemy (c. 140 A.D.) who gives a fairly exhaustive list of countries, cities and important places, we do not find the name of Kānci; but the district of Kānci can be satisfactorily identified from Ptolemy’s map of India. The order of the position of countries in the east coast has been thus given in Ptolemy’s Geography, VII, i:

1. Country of the Pandiones (=Pāṇḍyas) with its
capital at Modoura (=Madura) 123° 16' 20', ruled by Pandion (§89);
2. District of Batoi (§90) with its metropolis at Nisamma 125° 10' 10° 30' (§12);
3. Coast of the Soringo (=Colas) with its capital at Orthoura 130° 16' 20', ruled by Sornagos (§91);
4. Arouarnoi with its capital at Malanga 130° 13', ruled by Basaronagos (§92); and
5. District of the Maisoloi (called Maisolia in §15, and Masalia in the Periplus) with its metropolis at Pitunda 135° 18' (§93).

It is clear from the situation of the above countries that on the way from the district of Masulipatam to the Pandyia country, i.e., to the south of the former, lay first the country of Arouarnoi, then the coast of the Soringoi, and then Batoi. This "coast of the Soringoi" is evidently the same as the "Coast country" of the Periplus which seems to represent the Cola-manda of Sanskrit literature. Its capital Orthoura appears therefore to be the same as Argaru of the Periplus and Uravpur (=Uragapura) of the present day. But what about this Arouarnoi which has not been mentioned in the Periplus, but has been placed between the Cola-manda and Masulipatam by Ptolemy? In this connection it is interesting to note what Dr. S. K. Aiyangar says about the countries of this coast. "The east coast region, however, beginning with the river Vellar flowing across the state of Pudukottah now and emptying..."
itself into the Bay of Bengal which marked the orthodox southern boundary of the Cholas, constituted the Cholamandalam which actually extended northwards therefrom to as far as the river South Pennar where began the division known as Aruvanadu which extended northwards along the coast almost as far as the Northern Pennar" (R. Gopalan, Pallavas of Kanchi, p. xi-ii). There can hardly be any doubt that this Aruvanadu between the northern and southern Pennars is the Arouarnoi of Ptolemy's Geography. This Arouarnoi is practically the same as the Kanci-mandala, i.e., the district round Kanci.1 It must however be noticed that the capital of this district, at the time of Ptolemy, was at Malanga which appears from Ptolemy's map to have been far to the north of Kanci.

It now appears that the Cola-mandala or the Cola coast which at the time of the Periplus was possibly bounded by the Pandyya country in the south and the "Masuli district" in the north was divided into two kingdoms in the age of Ptolemy (c. 140 A.D.). What is more interesting is that at the time of the Greek geographer, the Cola-mandala proper was being ruled by a king named Sornaga, while Aruvanadu, the northern part of the former Cola kingdom, was under the rule of a king named Basaro-naga. We cannot be definite whether these two names really represent Indian names like Sura-naga (or Surya-naga) and Vajra-naga or Varsha-naga; but there can be no doubt that at Ptolemy's time the Cola kingdom as well as the district round Kanci was ruled by princes who belonged to the family of the Nagas. The existence of the Nagas in the Coromandel coast seems to be further supported by the existence of the

1 "The surrounding territory was known as the Dravida country, and also as the Kanci-mandala or province of Kanci, and as the Tenja, Tenali, Tenjira, Tenjira, and Tenjaka-mandala, rākṣaṇa, sīhaṇa, or nāga. And Kanci itself was sometimes called Tenjirapurai, as the capital of the territory under the latter name" (Bomb, Gor., I, ii, p. 319).
city called Uraga-pura in the Pāṇḍya country and another of the same name in the Cola country. Uraga, as we all know, is the same as Nāga. It is however difficult to ascertain whether the "inland region called Argara (=Uraga-pura)" was being ruled by the Nāgas (=Uragas) in the age of the Periplus; nevertheless the name supports a conjecture that in or before that period a place in the heart of the Cola country was under the Nāgas.¹

In this connection we should also notice the Buddhist traditions of Ceylon and Siam which speak of a Nāga country on the coast near the "Diamond Sands," to the south of Dantapura, between the mouth of the Ganges and Ceylon (Cunningham, Anc. Geog. Ind., ed. 1924, pp. 611-12). This country has been called Majerika. We do not know whether Majerika is the same as Masulika (Masulipatam) or a district named after the Manjhira branch of the Godavari or it is Ptolemy's Arouarnoi where the Nāga king Basaronaṅga once ruled. But the traditions seem to support the existence of a Nāga country on the eastern coast. Much value of the traditions is however vitiated by the fact that the epochs to which the two traditions refer are irreconcilable. The Ceylonese tradition gives the date as B.C. 157, while the Siamese tradition gives A.D. 310-313. If we believe the latter tradition (and also in the fact that the tradition refers to the Nāgas of the Coromandel coast), the Pallavas would appear to have risen to prominence after A.D. 313. This however seems to be improbable.

Before the middle of the second century therefore not the Pallavas but the Nāgas were ruling the coast country.

As scholars generally take Ptolemy's Siriptolemaios (sīri-Pulumāvi), ruler of Baithāna (Paithān in the Aurang-

¹ It may alternatively be suggested that Uragapura is really a Sanskritised form of the Tamil name Uṟaiyūr (literary, "city of greatness"). We must however notice that as early as the beginning of the Christian era the locality (or localities) was known to foreigners not as Uṟaiyūr, but as Uragapura (cf. Argara).
abad district) to be the same as Vāsiṣṭhīputra śri-Pulumāvi, son of Gautamiputra Sātakarni, we see that Basaro-nāga, ruler of the Kānci region, and Sōr-nāga, ruler of the Cola-
mandala, reigned contemporaneously with this Sātavāhana king who possibly was the first to establish Sātavāhana power in the Andhra country (Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.,
2nd ed., p. 313). It may not be altogether impossible that the successors of Basaro-nāga acknowledged the suzerainty of the powerful successors of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi, such
as the great Gautamiputra Yajña Sātakarni. It should be noticed here that Pulumāvi of the ship-coins appears to be the same as the king of the Myakadoni inscription, who
was probably a successor of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi and was the last king of the direct Sātavahāna line.

1 Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi has been called "lord of Dakṣiṇāpatha" in the Nāstik inscription of year 19. In line 12 of the Junagadh inscription (Ep. Ind., VIII,
p. 44 ff.) the Saka king Rudradāman (c. 130-150 A.D.) mentions his Sātavahana contemporary (Pulumāvi) as "Sātakarni, lord of Dakṣiṇāpatha." The epithet
however seems to have nothing to do with the inclusion of Andhradesa in the Sātavahana Kingdom (see p. 1 above).
Scholars are now generally of opinion that the Pallavas were not indigenous to the Kāñcī region. Thus Dr. S. K. Aiyangar says, "The Pallavas seem nevertheless to have been foreign to the locality as far as our evidence takes us at present" (op. cit., p. x). The question is now: When did the Pallavas attain political supremacy in the Kāñcī region?

We have already seen that about the middle of the second century A.D., when Ptolemy is known to have written his Geography, the above region was being ruled by the Nāgas. The Pallavas therefore did not rule as a recognised political power in the same locality before the middle of the second century of the Christian era. They are however believed to have risen to prominence certainly before the middle of the fourth century A.D. which is the time of Samudragupta’s Allahabad pillar inscription. This record, as we all know, mentions a certain Kāñceyaka Viṣṇugopa with whom the Gupta king (c. 330-75 A.D.) came into conflict during his South Indian campaign. This "Viṣṇu-gopa, ruler of Kāñcī" has been unanimously taken to have belonged to the Pallava family.

To about the same period should be assigned the Mayidakvolu (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 84) and Hirahadagalli (ibid, I, p. 2) grants of the Pallava ruler Sivaskandavarman, and the British Museum grant (ibid, VIII, p. 145) dated in the reign of a Pallava king named Vijaya-Skandavarman. These grants are written in Prakrit and are unanimously taken to be the earliest available epigraphic records of the Pallavas.
There is however difference of opinion regarding the date of these epigraphs. But, as we shall show in the next section, they appear to belong to the first half of the fourth century A.D. The Pallavas therefore seem to have attained political supremacy in the Kāñcī region after the middle of the second but before the beginning of the fourth century of the Christian era. Now, the next question would be: Who were the Pallavas, and how did they succeed in obtaining mastery over the Kāñcī region from the hands of the Nāgas?

It is almost certain that the Pallavas originally were executive officers under the Sātavāhana kings. They were most probably in charge of the government of districts with titles like Mahārathī and Mahāsenāpati, i.e., governor. There is inscriptional evidence to prove that the Sātavāhana kings took their officers from the families of the Guptas and Nāgas. A Nasik inscription mentions an officer named Siva-gupta, and the Karle inscriptions refer to Gupta and Sivaskanda-Gupta (Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., 2nd ed., p. 332).

We have already seen that a Nāga chief named Skanda-nāga was ruling the Bellary district during the reign of Pulumāvi who was possibly the last Sātavāhana king of the main line. The Pallavas may have been officers like the Guptas and Nāgas.

But, who were the Pallavas? Were they identical with the people called Pahlava or Palhava in inscriptions and literature? Some scholars are in favour of the identification. Their

---

1 Aiyangar, op. cit., p. xv; Sewell, Hist. n, v, c. 225 A.D.
2 See H. Krishnaswami, Ep. Ind., XV, p. 246. "The origin of the Pallavas has been obscure. A suggestion has been thrown out by Mr. Venkayya that they may have been connected with the Pahlava, mentioned in the Mahābharata and the Purāṇas and there classified as foreigners outside the pale of Aryan society (Arch. Surv. Rep., for 1916-17, p. 217 f.). It is true that here the Pallavas are no classified with the Sakas, Yavanas and other foreign tribes; nevertheless the possibility of their being a class that originated from an intermingling of the Brāhmaṇas with the indigenous Dravidian tribes is not altogether precluded. This presumption is confirmed partly..."
arguments may be summed up as follows. The Pallavas, i.e., the Parthians, are known from inscriptions and coins to have been ruling in North-Western India, in the beginning of the Christian era. At the time of the Periplus, "Parthian princes [who] were constantly driving each other out," were occupying the valley of the Indus. This people possibly pushed a little down to the south when they came into conflict with the Sātavāhana king Gautamiputra Sātakarni who is called "subduer of the Sakas, Yavanas and the Pallavas." Indeed, from the Junagad inscription of Rudradāman we learn that a Pahlava governor named Suviśākha, son of Kulaipa, was ruling the district of Anartha and Surāṣṭra under that great Saka king. If, as it seems to be, the territory of the Pallavas lay not far off from the Sātavāhana kingdom, if they really came into conflict with the Sātavāhanas at the time of Gautamiputra Sātakarni, if the Pallavas accepted offices in the government of neighbouring kings, and if the Sātavāhana government accepted services of persons belonging to the neighbouring tribes, there is nothing impossible in the suggestion that the Pallavas were employed by the Sātavāhana kings and eventually carved out a principality in the south of the Sātavāhana kingdom after the decline of the latter.

Curious statement made in the Bāyakaṭa copper plates (above, Vol. V, p. 53) that Avatathman, the Brahmana founder of the race, married a Naga woman and had by her a son called Skandāshīva. Other copper-plates (e.g., S. I. I., Vol. II, p. 358, vv. 16 & 17) which relate a similar story mention the name of Skandāshīva the son of the eponymous king Pallava, after whom the family came to be called Pallava. Hence it appears almost probable that the Pallavas like the Kadambas of Banaspati (Iy. Kau. Durt., p. 336 and I. 3), the Nolambas of Mysore (Rice's Mysore and Coorg, p. 30), the Malayas of Ondhvardi (Ondhadi in the Vizagapatam district) were the products of Brahman-Parthian inter-connections with the races, as the stories related of their origin indicate. The Pallavas are referred to in an early Kadamba record of the 6th century A.D. (Talgundir VIII, p. 32) as Kshatriyas, and their earliest Vedic sacrifices are performed after the Aryan kings of old."

Modern Devaraja. In the Mahābhāraṭa (XIV, 22, 50) referred to both as Anartaṇi and Devarāj.
We however think that there are very strong grounds against the identification of the Pallavas with the people called Palhava (i.e., the Parthians). If the people who were called Palhava or Pahlava at the time of Gautamiputra Satakarni and Rudradaman, that is to say, during the first half of the second century A.D., is the same as the Pallavas whom we find stationed at Kānci at about the end of the third century, how are we to explain the fact that the latter have never been called Palhava either in the records of their own or in the records and works that refer to them? It is improbable that within the short period of about 150 years a tribe had utterly forgotten its original name, so much so that not even for once did its members use that name in the whole course of their history, though Indian literature in all succeeding ages has recognised a tribe named Palhava, sometimes even side by side with Pallava.

Another important point in this connection is that, in the Hirahadagalli grant, the earliest known Pallava king Sivaskandavarman, who appears to have ruled in the first quarter of the fourth century A.D., is reported to have performed the Āsvamedha sacrifice. There is no evidence that kings belonging to foreign dynasties or tribes like the Saka, Kuśāna, Gūrjara, Hūṇa and others ever performed the Horse-sacrifice, even when they were Hinduised. It seems highly improbable that a foreigner would be very favourable to the obnoxious practices followed during the course of this sacrifice. Unless an immigrant tribe hopelessly forgets itself and imbibes utter orthodoxy of Hinduism, it seems impossible for its members to be able to expose their wives to such indelicate practices as are necessary in performing the Horse-sacrifice.¹ The

¹ I am indebted for this suggestion to Prof. H.C. details about the Āsvamedha sacrifice, see Sūrya-Sūtra, Mahābhārata’s commentary thereon. For the

earliest known Pallava king seems to go against the theory of foreign origin of the Pallavas.

The next important point is that the family of the Pallavas is known even from the earliest record to have belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra. This Bhāradvāja gotra of the Pallavas can hardly be imitated from the gotra of any earlier dynasty that ruled in the Deccan. The Śaṭa-vahanas of the main line, whose records the early Pallavas imitated in drawing theirs, did never specifically mention their own gotra. The Viṅhukaḍa Cuṭu-Śatakarnis however called themselves Māṇavya-gotra-Hārīti-putra. This title was imitated by the Kadambas who succeeded the Cuṭu-Śatakarnis in the Kuntala country. The Calukyas who appear to have originally been provincial governors under the early Kadambas (or probably under the Vākāṭakas), got the title in their turn along with the sovereignty of the Kanarese country. Since the Pallavas do not use metronymics like their predecessors and since their Bhāradvāja gotra cannot be reasonably proved to have been imitated from any preceding ruling dynasty of the Deccan, it seems possible that they were originally Brāhmanical Hindus of the Bhāradvāja gotra and therefore belonged to Northern India.
Panini (IV. i. 117) seems to say that the Śuṅgas belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra. From the Purāṇas we know that the Śuṅgas succeeded the Mauryas on the throne of Magadha, and the Mālavikāgniṃitra informs us that a secondary capital of the Śuṅgas was at Vidiśā (mod. Besnagar near Bhilsa in the Jubbulpure district). Is it altogether impossible that the Pallavas really were a branch of the Śuṅgas of Vidiśā, who gradually pushed to the south, took services under the Satavāhanas and eventually carved out a principality in the Kāśeś region? Whatever the value of this suggestion may be, the fact that the Pallavas never try to connect themselves with the solar and lunar dynasties, famous in Indian legends, at least seems to show that they belonged originally to a Brāhmaṇa family of Northern India. If a Brāhmaṇa family rises to royal dignity, it cannot quite naturally look back for past glory to the Śūrya and Candra vamsās which were Kṣatriya dynasties. They can however claim connection with Bhāradvāja Drona, the great epic king of Northern Pañcāla, who was a Brāhmaṇa by birth, but took the profession of the Kṣatriyas. Cf. the case of the Sena kings of Bengal, who refer to themselves in their inscriptions as Brāhma-kṣatriya.

"The Purānic genealogy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas makes its first appearance in the Sādgli grant (Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, p. 247). The pretended historical genealogy of the Western Gaṅgas may have been concocted a little earlier, but was more probably devised about A.D. 950 (Ep. Ind., Vol. III, p. 82). The Gōta Purānic genealogy is apparently first met with in the Kaṇṭahala-Purana (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 329), which was composed in the reign of the Eastern Gaṅga king Kulaṭunga Cholādaṇa I, A.D. 1003-1119. And the Purānic genealogy of the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kalinga-nagara is first presented in a record of A.D. 1063 (Ibid., Vol. XVIII, p. 165). The Purānic genealogy of the Pallavas is the latest such pedigree that has as yet come to light, and possibly the discovery of an unknown record at the latter fashion which became so general."

1 It may be noted that the early Gaṅgas claimed to have belonged to the Kāśyapīya gotra. Thus they claim connection with the famous Kāśyapa royal line that succeeded the Śuṅgas. We however do not know whether the claim could be an imitation, nor do we know whether the family-name Gaṅga has anything to do with the famous North Indian river called Gaṅga.
But, how did the Pallavas occupy the Kāñcī region which was once under the Nāgas? This question is difficult to answer, as we know nothing definitely about the Pallava kings who ruled before Śivaskandavarman, or his father whose name is as yet unknown. Indeed, later Pallava inscriptions, such as the Kasakudi plates of Nandivarman-Pallavamalla (S. Ind. Ins., II, p. 342), the Velurahāniyam plates of Nandivarman III (ibid., p. 508) and the Vayalur pillar inscription of Rājasimha (Ep. Ind., XVIII, p. 150), have mentioned the names of some early Pallava kings otherwise unknown and have traced the Pallava pedigree from Lord Brahman, through his descendants, Āṅgiras, Bhṛhaspati, Sāmyu, Bhāradvāja, Drona, Aśvatthāma, Pallava and Aśoka (or Aśokavarman). There can be no question about the unhistoricity of this part of the genealogy. It is obviously fabricated on the basis of the name of the gotra of the Pallava family. We know that the Pallavas belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra which has the pravara, Bhāradvāja, Āṅgiras and Bhṛhaspatya. Pallava is evidently the eponym, while Aśokavarman "can scarcely be considered a historical person, but appears to be a modification of the ancient Maurya king Aśoka."

It must be noted that the order and form of names mentioned after Aśokavarman in the traditional part of the Pallava genealogy are not uniform in the different inscriptions. Hultzsch therefore remarked on this part of the Kasakudi grant (S. Ind. Ins., II, p. 343), "It must rather be concluded that, at the time of Nandivarman, nothing was known of the predecessors of Simhavishnu but the names of some of them, and that the order of their...

1 According to Eavell (Lit., p. 37), "Bappa," i.e., the father of Śivasahadeva-varman, was a name assumed by Jayavarman of the Kondanadu grant. This theory is untenable in view of the fact that Jayavarman belonged to the Bhṛhatpallavaya gotra, but the Pallavas are known to have belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra. See my note in Janaňa, Andhra Hist. Sec. Soc., VIII, p. 165, and above, p. 41.
succession and their relation to each other and to the subsequent line of Simhavishnu, were then entirely forgotten. This part of the Pallava genealogy may be compared with the mythical genealogy of the Calukyas about which Fleet says, "For the above account (scil. Calukya genealogy before Pulikesin I), a certain amount of foundation may be derived from the fact that from the time of Pulikesin II onwards, the Western Chalukyas were constantly at war with the Pallavas, who were their most powerful and inveterate foes, coupled with a tradition of the later Kadambas that the founder of the Kadamba family was a certain Trinetra or Trilochana. But in other respects, the account is a farrago of vague legends and Puranic myths of no authority" (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii. pp. 341-42). It is therefore difficult to believe that the traditional portion of the Pallava genealogy is much useful for the purpose of authentic history. Nevertheless it is tempting to make a few suggestions.

(i) Verse 6 of the Valurpalaiyam inscription says that Virakūra, son of Cūtapallava, obtained the insignia of royalty along with the hand of a Nāga princess (cf. phanindra-sutagyā sah = āgrandī = nāja-ciknam = akhilam). We have seen above that the Nāgas were ruling over the Kānci region before the rise of the Pallavas in that locality; it is therefore not impossible that Virakūra married the heiress of the last Nāga king of Malanga and thus became the first Pallava king of the district round Kānci. Some very late inscriptions (of about the 11th century) mention a king named Trilocana as the earliest illustrious ancestor of

1 Many scholars think that the Cūta-Silakarpa of Kumara were Nāgas and that the father-in-law of Pallava Virakūra belonged to the family of these Cūta-Nāgas. Since we have tried to prove Nāga occupation of the Kānci region just before the rise of the Pallavas, the above suggestion seems to be more plausible. Jayaswal (op. cit., p. 189) is inclined to identify the Nāga relations of the Pallavas with the Bhūrakara (possibly Nāga) of Central India. His arguments however are not convincing.
Rise of the Pallavas. He is also called Trinetr, Trinayana, Mukkanti-Pallava and Mukkanti-Kâduvetti (Butterworth, Nellore Inscriptions, I, p. 389, II, p. 671; cf. Ep. Ind., XI, p. 349). He is described as having, like Siva, a third eye on the forehead and is believed by some scholars to have been a historical person who was the founder of the Telugu-Pallavas and who ruled over some part of the Telugu country (An. Rep. S. Ind. Ep., 1916, p. 138; Iyenger, History of the Tamils, pp. 364, 384). The historicity of this Trilocana-Pallava is impossible in view of the facts that a similar Trilocana is said to have been the progenitor of the Kadambas in some Kadamba inscriptions of about the same period (Ep. Cârn., VII, Sk. 236) and that all early Pallava records deny the possibility of the existence of any such early king named Trilocana-Pallava. Many scholars have now discarded this Trilocana as purely mythical. "The name Trilocana seems to have passed from the Kadamba inscriptions of the west to the Pallava inscriptions of the east" (Moraes, Kadamba-kula, p. 8, note).

(ii) The name of the father of Virakurca who was possibly the first king of the family was Cûta-Pallava. May Pallava, the name of the dynasty, have anything to do with the second syllable of the name of the first Pallava king's father?

Is the name Cûta-pallava (i.e., twig of the mango tree) eponymous like the name Pallava? I have elsewhere suggested (Ind. Coll., IV, p. 118 ff; also below) that the names Kadamba and Pallava are possibly of totemistic origin. Tree names, like Kadamba, of tribes and families, many of which are totemistic, are quite common in India. Where, on the other hand, we find that a sept of the Marulas is called Chirka (mushroom), Tebber, Gour and Sene is called Sama, etc. (p. 108) and that a totemistic section is called Sera, the plate of grass (p. 123), we find the possibility of having originated a totemistic significance in connection with living. This is evidently a corruption of the
A successor of Virakurca was Skandaśigya who came into conflict with a king named Satyasena (verse 7). Was this Satyasena in any way connected with the Pālakkaka Ugrasena of the Allahabad pillar inscription, who possibly ruled at Palakkada (sometimes a seat of Pallava government) in the Nellore region?

Another successor of Virakurca was Kumāraviṣṇu (verse 8) who is credited with the seizure of Kānci (gṛhita-kāncinagara). Does it mean that the Pallavas first ruled at Malanga, the Nāga capital, which possibly lay somewhere to the north of Kānci and that Kumāraviṣṇu was the first Pallava king to have his capital at Kānci? Had the Colas, then, become again master of their country and occupied the Nāga territory as far as the city of Kānci? The mention of Kumāraviṣṇu and Buddhavarman together, however, makes it very probable that this Kumāraviṣṇu is to be identified with Kumāraviṣṇu I of the Chendalur grant.  

A successor of Kumāraviṣṇu was Buddhavarman, who, is called submarine fire to the sea that was the Cola army (cola-sainp-ārṇaca-vādar-āgni). Does it signify the continuation of the war with the Colas, which we have supposed to have begun in the reign of Kumāraviṣṇu?

---

1 If this identification be accepted, the other suggestion is because k is capital of the Pallavas long before the time of Kum. case gṛhita-kāncinagara would possibly mean recovering Kānci occupation of the Colas.
III

DATE OF SIVASKANDAVARMAN

The Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants of Sivaskandavarman and the British Museum grant dated in the reign of king vijaya-Skandavarman are the earliest available records of the Pallavas. They are written in Prakrit, while the later epigraphs of the early Pallavas are in Sanskrit. We have already noticed that there is a controversy over the date of these records and, therefore, of the Pallava rulers named Sivaskandavarman and Skandavarman to whom they belong. Fleet thought that these kings should be placed after the Pallava king Viṣṇugopa mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 319). According to this scholar therefore the two Pallava kings reigned about the last quarter of the 4th century A.D. Prof. Durbeuil (Anc. His. Dec., p. 70), on the other hand, assigns Sivaskandavarman, whom he identifies with vijaya-Skandavarman, to about A.D. 250-75, i.e., about the third quarter of the third century. It is now generally believed that the king or kings mentioned in the Prakrit grants of the Pallavas ruled before the time of Viṣṇugopa, ruler of Kāñci, mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription (Krishnasastri, Ep. Ind., XV, p. 243; Jayaswal, History of India, p. 181). Here I am going to show that Sivaskandavarman probably reigned in the first quarter of the 4th century and that vijaya-Skandavarman of the British Museum grant was possibly a different king who seems to have reigned a little later than Sivaskandavarman.

Ptolemy who wrote his geography about A.D. 140, mentions (VII, i, §63 and §82) Tiastēnes (=Caṇṭana),

¹ My paper on the date of Pallava Sivaskandavarman was first published in Journ. Ind. Hist., XIII, p. 792 f.; the question was previously discussed in my paper, Date of Vallanaśana Devarman, in Ind. Cult., I, p. 498 f.
SUCCESSORS OF THE SATAVAHANAS

ruler of Ozēnē (Ujjayinī), and Siriptolemaios (=siri-Pulumāyi or Sīmāvi), ruler of Baithāna (Paiṭha in the Aurangabad district), as his contemporaries. The Andau inscriptions, issued in the joint-reign of Caśṭana and his grandson Rudradāman, are dated in the year 52 which must be referred to the Śaka era and would correspond to A.D. 130 (Raychaudhuri, Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., 2nd ed., p. 307 ff). Caśṭana’s contemporary Pulumāvi who has been identified with Vāsiṣṭhiputra śrī-Pulumāvi, son of Gautamīputra Sātakarnī (ibid, p. 313), must also have ruled about the same time.

According to the Matsya Purāṇa, which is the only work that gives a fuller list of the Sātavahana kings and seems therefore to be more authentic as regards Sātavahana chronology than the other Purāṇas, the following Sātavahana kings ruled after Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi (see Rapson, Catalogue, p. lxvii):

1. Śivaśrī [Sātakarnī] ... 7 years.
2. Śivaskanda Sātakarnī ... 7 years.
3. Yajñāśrī Sātakarnī ... 29 years.¹
4. Vijaya ... 6 years.
5. Candaśrī [Sātakarnī] ... 10 years.²

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Pulomā[vi]</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 years.³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59 years.

66 years.

¹ The real name of this king is Yajñā (not Yajñāśrī) Sātakarnī (see my note in J.R.A.S., July, 1934, p. 550). He is called siri-Yajñā-Sātakarnī in inscriptions and coins, and siri is no doubt an honorific. The Chūna inscription is dated in his twenty-seventh year (Ep. Ind., I, p. 95). The Purāṇic tradition ascribing a reign-period of twenty-nine years to him therefore seems to be true.
² The real name of the Purāṇic Candaśrī appears to have been Čanda (or Candra) Sātakarnī. He is never called Candrasrī or Candaśrī in inscriptions and coins.
³ The Myakadoni inscription (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 153) of Pulumāvi is dated in his eighth regnal year. He therefore appears to have ruled for more than seven years.
The only inscription of Pulomā or Pulumāvi, the last king of the list, has been discovered at Myakadoni in the Bellary district (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 153). We therefore cannot be definite as regards his rule over Andhradesa proper. But the Amaravati inscriptions of Vasiśṭhiputra Pulumāvi and Sivamaka Sada (= Sivaskanda Sātakarni?), the Chinna (Kistna district) inscription of Yajña Sātakarni and the Kodavali (Godavari district) inscription of Caḍā Sāṭi (Caṇḍaśri or Candrasri Sātakarni) leave no doubt that at least the Sātavāhana kings of the list, who ruled before Pulumāvi of the Myakadoni grant, were rulers of the Andhra country (Arch. Surv. S. Ind., Vol. I, pp. 61 and 100; Ep. Ind., I, p. 95; XVIII, p. 316). As Vasiśṭhiputra Pulumāvi, son of Gautamiputra Sātakarni, is known to have ruled in the second quarter of the second century, it appears that the Andhra country was under the Sātavāhana yoke at least up to the beginning of the third century A.D.

According to Krishnasastri (Ep. Ind., XVIII, p. 318) the second year of Caḍā Sāṭi is equivalent to A.D. 210. We may therefore arrange approximately the chronology of the above kings as follows:

1. Sivaśri Sātakarni ... circa A.D. 160-166.
2. Sivaskanda Sātakarni ... circa A.D. 167-173.
4. Vijaya ... circa A.D. 203-208.

According to the Matsya Purāṇa, Vasiśṭhiputra Pulumāvi ruled for twenty-eight years. He therefore seems to have ruled from about A.D. 132 to 159. This date,

1 From a different point of view, Rapson has also come to practically the same conclusion. The last known date of Nahapāna, the records of whose reign, according to many scholars, are dated in the Saka era, is Saka 86-124 A.D.; his reign could not have extended much beyond that date. Gautamiputra Sātakarni’s success over Nahapāna almost certainly took place in the eighteenth year of his reign (cf. Nasik Ins., Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 71; Karle Ins.; ibid., VII, p. 60). The
though approximate, corroborates the fact that Vāsiṣṭhiputra śrī-Pulumāvi was a contemporary of the Greek geographer Ptolemy who wrote his book about 140 A.D., and of the Saka ruler Caṇḍana who is known to have reigned in A.D. 130.

The Iksvākus who succeeded the Sātavāhanas in the rule of the Kistna-Guntur region (i.e., the Andhra country) must therefore have risen to prominence not before the time of Caṇḍa (śrī) Sātakarni. The sovereignty of the Iksvākus over Andhradeśa thus appears to have begun from about the end of the first quarter of the third century A.D. Vāsiṣṭhiputra Čāntamūla I, the first known Iksvāku king, should be placed after the time of Caṇḍa (śrī). He could not have been a feudatory of the Sātavāhanas, as he is said to be a performer of the Aśvamedha and Vājapeya sacrifices. We have already seen that according to the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa (V, 1.1.13), the performance of the Vājapeya bestows on the performer a superior kind of kingship called sāmrāya, while Kieth has rightly pointed out that the Aśvamedha "is an old and famous rite, which kings alone can bring to increase their realms" (Rel. Phil. Ved. Upaniṣ., p. 343). It is perfectly clear from statements contained in the Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra (XV, 1), Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra (XX, i, 1), quoted in the eighteenth year of Guntamiputra, is therefore A.D. 121 or 121+ x. Guntamiputra Sātakarni thus seems to have ascended the throne in A.D. 106 or 106+ x. The latest inscriptive date of this king is year 24, which would correspond to A.D. 130 or 130+ x. His son Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi appears to have lost much of his territories to the Saka ruler Rudradāman before Pulumāvi's 19th regnal year and before Saka 52 (A.D. 130), which is the date of Rudradāman's Junagadh inscription. According to Rapson therefore the accession of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi took place in about A.D. (130—19—) 131. See Rapson, op. cit., pp. xxvi—xxvii, xxx, xxxvi—xxviii. The chronology we have proposed here would place Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi approximately in A.D. 130—139 and Guntamiputra Sātakarni, who seems to have ruled for about 24 years, in A.D. 107—131.

1 The Iksvāku records have been discovered at Jaggayapaṭa in the Nandigram-taluśa of the Kistna district (Ind. Ant. XI, p. 257) and at Nagarjunikonda in the Pampa taluśa of the Guntur district (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 1 ff.; XXI, p. 61 ff.).

2 Cf. vājā vai vājasaṃgaṇevsūtraḥ bhavati, samākāyāh vājasaṃgā viśvam hi vājaṃ param vājasaṃgāh kāmṇapeta vai vajā samārođh bhavitaḥ, etc.
Sadbakalpadruma-Pariśīṣṭa, s.v.) and the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa (III, viii, 9, 4; V, iv, 12, 3) that a feudatory ruler could never perform the Aśvamedha sacrifice. The Horse-sacrifice celebrated by Cāntamūla I, therefore, appears to suggest his success against his Sātavāhana overlords.

We do not know for how many years the Ikṣvāku king Vāsiṣṭhīputra Cāntamūla I ruled over the Andhra country. It is however known from the Jagajjapeta records that his son, Virapurisadata, reigned at least up to his twentieth year, while according to the Kottampalugu record, Ehungula Cāntamūla II, successor of Virapurisadata and the last known king of the dynasty, ruled at least up to his eleventh year. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that these three Ikṣvāku kings together ruled for about more than half a century. The end of the reign of Cāntamūla II thus appears to have fallen in the fourth quarter of the third century A.D.

According to the evidence of the Mayidavolu grant, dated in the reign of Sivaskandavarman’s father, Andhrāpatha (i.e., the Andhra country) with its headquarters at Dhamna-kaḍa (Dhānyakataka) passed from the Ikṣvākus to the possession of the Pallavas. Pallava Sivaskandavarman, who was like Cāntamūla I a performer of the great Vaiṣṇava and Aśvamedha sacrifices, was preceded in the suzerainty of Andhrāpatha at least by his father who must have ruled the country after Ehungula Cāntamūla II. Sivaskandavarman therefore can hardly be placed earlier than A.D. 300. His title [Dharma-] Mahārājādhirāja, which, in North India, the Guptas imitated from the Kuśānas at the beginning of the fourth century also points to this direction. This view, moreover, can be confirmed by an altogether different line of argument.

1 See Kist, Black Yejas, pp. cxxii-cxiv; and my notes in Ind. Cult., I, p. 311, II, p. 269, III, p. 376, IV, p. 272. See moreover the Appendix where in the whole question has been discussed.

2 The Aśvamedha performed by Sivaskandavarman seems to suggest his success against the Ikṣvākus and other neighbouring powers.
There is some linguistic difference between the grants of Sivaskandavarman and the records of the Ikṣvāku kings. Like the Śatavāhana grants and other early Prakrit inscriptions, the Ikṣvāku records (excepting a record of the last known King; *Ep. Ind.*, XXI, p. 62) express compound-consonants by single letters. The Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants of Sivaskandavarman, on the other hand, express them, in many cases, by two letters. Though the grants of Sivaskandavarman are in Prakrit, the legend on the seals of both the grants are written in Sanskrit. The Hirahadagalli grant, moreover, ends in a *maṅgala* which is also written in Sanskrit. This linguistic difference between the epigraphs of the known Ikṣvāku kings and those of Sivaskandavarman (one of whose grants is dated in the reign of his father) clearly points to the fact that there was an interval between the reign of the former and that of the latter. Consequently, Sivaskandavarman could not have ruled much earlier than the beginning of the fourth century A.D. He cannot however be placed later than Kānceyaka Viṣṇugopa who came into conflict with Samudragupta about the middle of that century. We have shown that Pallava Sivaskandavarman ruled earlier than Śālaṅkāyana Devavarman who was a predecessor of Śālaṅkāyana Hastivarman, the Vaiṅgeyaka contemporary of Samudragupta (see *above*, *Ind. Cult.*, I, p. 493 ff.; also *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, IX, p. 212 and *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, XIII, p. 37). He therefore appears to have reigned about the first quarter of the fourth century.

We have already shown that the word *vijaya*, in names like *vijaya*-Skandavarman, is not an integral part of the name, but is a simple honorific.1 The name of the Pallava king mentioned in the British Museum grant therefore is Skandavarman. Some scholars think that the word *śiva* in the name of Śiva-skandavarman, is also an honorific.

---

1 *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, IX, p. 208; also *above*. 
like *vijaya* in the other names and that the Pallava prince *śiva*-Skandavarman of the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants is identical with king *vijaya*-Skandavarman of the British Museum grant. The absence of any king named Sivaskandavarman and the existence of many Skandavarmans in the traditional list of early Pallava kings, and also the use of the word *śiva*, in the Kadamba inscriptions, as an honorific in names like *vijaya-śiva*-Māndhātra-varman, *vijaya-śiva*-Mrgeśa-varman and *vijaya-śiva*-Kṛṣṇa-varman (II), may be taken as proofs in support of this theory. It must however be noticed that there is not even a single instance where the word *śiva* is singly used as an honorific. It may be argued that *śiva* in the names of Sivaskandanāgaṇī of the Banavasi inscription (Lüders, List, No. 1124) and Sivaskandavarman of the Malavalli inscription (*ibid*, No. 1196) is only an honorific compounded with the names. These persons belonged to royal families. But Sivaskandagupta is the name of an ordinary person in the Karle inscription No. 19 (*ibid*, No. 1105) and Sivaskandila (*Sivaskandanāga?*) is that of an ordinary officer in a Nasik inscription of Pulumāvi (*ibid*, No. 1124). Since honorifics are not known to have been used by ordinary persons, it is clear that Sivaskandavarman was certainly not an improper name in ancient India. The name of Sivaskanda Sātakarṇi in the Purānic list of the Andhra (Satavāhana) kings, where no other king's name is mentioned with an honorific, is also in support of this suggestion. The name of the Brāhmaṇa Bhavaskandatrāta in the Chendalur grant is also to be noticed in this connection. Since the traditional list of early Pallava kings is of very doubtful authority, we can hardly make out anything from the non-mention of Sivaskandavarman in it. The identification of Sivaskandavarman of the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants with Skandavarman of the British Museum grant is therefore extremely doubtful.
As the British Museum grant is also written in Prakrit, a linguistic consideration may be useful in ascertaining its date. This grant expresses double-consonants, in all cases, by more than one letter, and generally follows the spelling accepted in literary Prakrit. It has moreover the usual imprecatory verses in Sanskrit. There can therefore be hardly any doubt that the British Museum grant is later than the grants of Sivaskandavarman. Skandavarman seems to have been a successor of Sivaskandavarman.

Such linguistic considerations have led us to believe that the Pallava kings of the Prakrit records, Śālanākāyana Devavarman of the Ellore grant, Kadamba Mayūraśarman of the Chandravalli inscription (Mys. Arc. Surv., A. R., 1929, p. 50), the Kadamba king of the Malavalli record (Ep. Curn., VII, Sk., No. 264), Viṁhukaḍḍa Sātakarni of another Malavalli record (ibid., No. 263)¹ and Brhatphalāyana Jayavarman of the Kondamudi grant² may all be placed roughly between about the beginning and the middle of the fourth century.

¹ Linguistic consideration seems to suggest that the Banavasi inscription (Ind. Ant., XIV, p. 381) belonged to an earlier Viṁhukaḍḍa Sātakarni.

² The difference in palaeography between the Kondamudi plates and the seal attached to them may be taken to suggest that Jayavarman ruled a little earlier than the time suggested by the linguistic standard of the Kondamudi grant. But as has already been noticed, the legend on the seal which is in Sanskrit cannot be much earlier than 500 A.D.
IV

EARLY PALLAVA GENEALOGY FROM INSCRIPTIONS OF THE NELLORE-GUNTUR REGION

Some Sanskrit records of the Early Pallavas have been found in the Nellore and Guntur districts, which at one time formed the Northern part of the kingdom of Kānci. The Pallava genealogy constructed from these records cannot be quite easily and satisfactorily assimilated into the traditional list of early Pallava kings found in later records. The Pallava kings mentioned in these northern inscriptions, moreover, can scarcely be identified without difficulty with the Pallava princes mentioned in the inscriptions of the rulers of Kānci. Whether they ruled over Kānci proper is also not definitely known. It is therefore convenient to discuss the Early Pallavas of the northern records separately.

The Omgodu grant, No. 1 (Ep. Ind., XV, p. 246), issued from the sthāna or city of Tambrāpa in the 33rd year of king Skandavarman, furnishes us with the following list of kings:

1. Mahārāja Kumāraviṣṇu; his son
2. Mahārāja Skandavarman (I); his son
3. Vīravarman; his son
4. Mahārāja Śrī-cījaya-Skandavarman (II).

Next we come to the Uruvupalli grant (Ind. Ant., V, p. 50) of prince Viṣṇugopavarman, issued from the sthāna of Palakkada, in the 11th year of Mahārāja Simhavarman. Here we get the following names:

1. Mahārāja Skandavarman (I); his son
2. Mahārāja Vīravarman; his son
3. Mahārāja Skandavarman (II); his son
4. Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman.
There can be no doubt that prince Viṣṇugopavarman, issuer of the Uruvupalli grant, was the son of king Skandavarman II who issued the Omgodu grant No. 1. There is however difference of opinion as regards the identification of king Simhavarman in whose reign the grant of the prince was issued. According to Fleet, Mahārāja Simhavarman was possibly an elder brother of the Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopa. According to Hultzsch however king Simhavarman of the Uruvupalli grant is the same as Viṣṇugopa's son Simhavarman who issued the Omgodu (No. 2), Pikira and Mangalur grants. The term Yuvarāja or Yuvamahārāja which is prefixed to Viṣṇugopa not only in his Uruvupalli grant, but in the two grants of his son Simhavarman, suggests that he never ascended the throne, but that the succession passed from his father Skandavarman II to his son Simhavarman. The reason of this need not have been premature death. If it is assumed that Viṣṇugopa declined to take up the reins of government or was prevented from doing so by some other reason unknown he may well have been alive during the reign of his son Simhavarman to whose eleventh year I would assign—ティघवात as an Indian philosopher will say—the Uruvupalli grant (Ep. Ind., VIII, pp. 160-61).

Three inscriptions of Viṣṇugopa's son Simhavarman have as yet been discovered. They are the Omgodu (No. 2) grant issued in his fourth year from a vijaya-skandhāvāra (Ep. Ind., XV, 246), the Pikira grant issued in his fifth year from the vijaya-skandhāvāra of Memātura-vāsaka (ibid., VIII, p. 159 ff.) and the Mangalur grant issued in his eighth year from Daśanapura (Ind. Ant., V, p. 154). They give us the following genealogical list:

1. Mahārāja Viravarman; his son
2. Mahārāja Skandavarman (II); his son
3. Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopa; his son
4. Dharma-mahārāja 1 Simhavarman.

Next we come to the fragmentary Darsi record (Ep. Ind., I, p. 397). The only information we get from this inscription is that it was issued from the adhiṣṭhāna (city or capital) of Dasanapurā by the great-grandson of a Pallava king named Virakorçavārman. The form virakore (cf. Virakorçavārman of later grants) shows considerable Prakrit influence which proves that the grant belongs to the period immediately following the age of the Prakrit grants. We have already noticed that the Prakrit records of the Pallavas are not written in the early inscriptional Prakrit and that they have in them passages and verses couched in Sanskrit. It must also be noticed that the Omgodu grant (No. 1) of king Skandavarman II is dated in his 33rd regnal year, on the 18th tiṣṭī of the third fortnight of Hemanta. This is an old form of dating used in almost all Prakrit inscriptions. Like the Darsi grant, therefore, the Omgodu grant (No. 1) also seems to have belonged to the same period, i.e., the early Sanskrit period. Sanskrit grants showing considerable Prakrit influence appear to me not much later than the beginning of the fifth century A.D. They may be roughly placed between the middle of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century.2

1 Other South Indian kings (e.g., the Kadamba kings Megavārman and Ravi-
varman) also used the title Dharmamahārāja. According to Fleet (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 283, note 9), the title means "a Mahārāja by, or in respect of, religion," and may be rendered by "a pious or religious Mahārāja"; but what it actually denotes is "a Mahārāja who, at the particular time of the record, was engaged in an act of religion (dharma)." Some kings are called Dharmamahārājadhirajā; cf. Pallava Sivakandavarman; the Kadamba king of the Malavalli record; Ganga Nālīgara-Kuṇugisthāvarna-Peramanji and his successors (op. cit., p. 363, note 8). The epithet Dharmamahārāja, as Prof. Raychaudhuri suggests to me, seems to have been connected with the peculiar boast of these kings to be hālāyugam-dos-avannama-dharm-oḍhiraṇa-nipram-
naṭādha.

2 For dates expressed in the old fashion in the Viṣṇukunḍin records, see above; and for the two Kadamba grants, see below.
It is possible that the great-grandson of Virakocavarman, who issued the Darsi grant, was a predecessor of king Skandavarman II. Consequently, Virakocavarman, great-grandfather of the issuer of the Darsi grant, was probably a predecessor of Kumāraviṣṇu, great-grandfather of the issuer of the Omgodu grant (No. 1).

We have now to consider the seventh and last of the Sanskrit grants so far discovered in the Nellore-Guntur region. It is the Narasaraopet record (commonly called the Chura grant), issued from the camp at Pālotkata (=Palakkaḍa) during the reign of vijaya-Viṣṇugopavarman (II), son of Simhavarman, grandson of Mahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman (I) and great-grandson of Kandavarman (i.e., Skandavarman). See Ṭr. Rep. S. Ind. Ep., 1914, pp. 10 and 82. The grant is not dated; its language is Sanskrit and the alphabet used is Telugu. It registers the king’s grant of the village of Curā in the Karmarāṣṭra to a Brāhmaṇa named Casamiśarman who belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra and was an inhabitant of Kunḍur.¹

The fact that the first three names of the Narasaraopet list, viz., (1) Kandavarman (i.e., Skandavarman), (2) Viṣṇugopavarman (I) and (3) Simhavarman, are found exactly in the same order in the Omgodu (No. 2), Pikira and Mangalur grants of Simhavarman makes it almost certain that Viṣṇugopavarman II of the Narasaraopet grant was a son and successor of the issuer of the above three grants. Two points however have been advanced (ibid, 82) against the possibility of this identification. First, it has been said that the characters in which the Narasaraopet record is engraved are comparatively more modern than those used in the grants of Simhavarman. Secondly, it is argued that in the Uruvupalli, Omgodu (No. 2), Pikira and Mangalur grants,

¹ The same as the native village of Srinakarman, recipient of the Polamuru grant of Viṣṇukundu Mādhavavarman I; see Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, p.289, and above.
the son of Skandavarman and father of Simhavaran has been mentioned as a Yuvarāja or Yuvamahārāja, while in the Narasaraopet grant Viṣṇugopavaran I is called a Mahārāja. It has therefore been observed that Viṣṇugopavaran II of the Narasaraopet grant “must be a later king and very probably one of the missing group immediately preceding the line of Simhavaran and Simhavishnu whose history is pretty certain” (loc. cit.). The grant has been assigned to the beginning of the 7th century A.D.

In connection with the first point however we should notice the fact that the characters used in the Omgodu grant (No. 2) of Simhavaran, son of Viṣṇugopavaran (I), are remarkably similar to those of the Narasaraopet grant of Viṣṇugopavaran II. Krishnasastri therefore thought that the Omgodu grant (No. 2) “must have been a copy of a grant of the 5th-6th century A.D., put into writing in the seventh century, though no direct evidence, external or internal, is to be found on this point from the wording of the grant itself. The numerous mistakes made by the engraver may possibly point to this conclusion” (Ep. Ind., XV, p. 252). If the Omgodu grant (No. 2) is believed to have been an early record copied about the beginning of the 7th century A.D., what is the objection if we think that the Narasaraopet grant was also an early inscription likewise copied about the same time?

As for the second point, it may be said that the epithet Mahārāja applied to Viṣṇugopavaran I in the Narasaraopet grant, which should properly be Yuvamahārāja, may be a mistake due to the engraver’s inattention. The possibility of such a mistake becomes greater, if we believe that the Narasaraopet record is an early grant copied years after like the Omgodu grant No. 2, about the beginning of the 7th century A.D.

From the seven Sanskrit copper-plate grants, therefore, the following genealogical list of the early Pallava kings may
be prepared:

1. Mahārāja Virakoravarman (Darsi grant); his successor (?)

2. Mahārāja Kumāraviṣṇu; his son
3. Mahārāja Skandavarman (I); his son
4. Mahārāja Viravarman; his son
5. Mahārāja Skandavarman (II); issued the Omgodu grant No. 1 in his 33rd year; his son

5a. Mahārāja Simhavarman (I ?); he is according to Fleet the Pallava king referred to in the Uruvupalli grant; his existence however is doubtful;

5b. Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman (I); issued the Uruvupalli grant; did not rule as Mahārāja; seems to have been wrongly called Mahārāja in the Narasaraopet grant; his son

6. Mahārāja Simhavarman (II ?); issued the Omgodu No. 2, Pikira and Mangalur grants respectively in his 4th, 5th and 8th years; his son

7. Mahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman (II); issued the Narasaraopet grant.
V

Genealogy and Chronology of the Early Pallavas of Kāṇcī

We do not know whether the Pallava kings discussed in the last section ruled over the whole of the kingdom of Kāṇcī. It is however probable that some one of the princes of the Pallava house of Kāṇcī, who was originally made a viceroy of the northern part of the Pallava kingdom by the king of Kāṇcī, carved out a separate principality in that part independent of his overlord. If this suggestion is to be believed, the kings of the main line of the Pallavas appear to have been ruling at Kāṇcī side by side with the branch line that was ruling in the Northern part of the old Kāṇcī kingdom. Here we shall try to see what we know about the history of Kāṇcī after the time of the Pallava kings of the Prakrit grants.

We have seen that Kāṇcī was under a Pallava king about the fourth quarter of the third century A.D. That king was succeeded by his son Sivaskandavarman who ruled about the first quarter of the fourth century A.D. He may have been succeeded by a king named Skandavarman. In the British Museum grant of the time of Skandavarman, there is mention of the Pallava Yuvamahārāja Buddhavarman and of the Yuvamahārāja’s son whose name has been doubtfully read as Buddhyanaka. It is not known whether this king ruled at Kāṇcī and whether the crown-prince Buddhavarman and his son ever ascended the throne.

In an attempt to fix the date of the Early Pallava kings of Kāṇcī, we are fortunate to have at least three points wherein we can stand with confidence.
The first of these points is supplied by the Jain work, Lokavibhāga (Mys. Arch. Surv., A.R., 1909 & 1910), where the precise date of the completion of the work is given as the 22nd year of Simhavarman, lord of the Pallavas, and as 80 beyond 300 years of the Śaka era. The 22nd year of a Pallava king named Simhavarman therefore comes to be equivalent to Śaka 380, i.e., A.D. 458. According to S. Jha the date given in the Lokavibhāga corresponds to the 1st of March, 458; but according to Fleet to the 25th August, 458. Any way, the 22nd year of the Pallava king Simhavarman corresponds to A.D. 458. He therefore began to reign in (458 − 21 =) A.D. 436-37 (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 334).

The second point of importance is furnished by the Pennkonda plates of the Ganga king Mādhava (ibid, p. 331 ff.) which, according to Fleet, are to be assigned, on palaeographical grounds, to about A.D. 475. It may be noticed here that the characters of this epigraph are remarkably similar to that of the epigraphs of the Śālanakāyana king Nandivarman II (e.g., the Peddavegi grant; Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., I, p. 92ff.) whom I have placed about the middle of the fifth century A.D. (above, p. 73; Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, 208ff.). The Pennkonda grant was issued by the Gaṅga king Mādhava-Simhavarman, son of Āyyavarman, grandson of Mādhava and great-grandson of Konkanivarman. But the greatest point of historical importance in this inscription is that it tells us of Mādhava-Simhavarman being installed on the throne by the Pallava king Skandavarman and his father Āyyavarman being installed by the Pallava king Simhavarman. We have seen that Fleet ascribes the Pennkonda plates to circa 475 A.D. It is therefore almost certain that the Pallava king Simhavarman who installed Āyyavarman, father of the Gaṅga king Mādhava-Simhavarman of the Pennkonda plates, is identical with the Pallava king Sim-
havarman who, according to the Lokavibhāga, began to rule in A.D. 436-37.

(iii) The third point of importance is supplied by the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta, which refers to the Gupta king's conflict with a certain Kāñcēyaka Viṣṇugopa. This "Viṣṇugopa of Kāñci" has been taken by all scholars to have belonged to the family of the Pallavas. Samudragupta is believed to have reigned from circa 330 to 375 A.D. This dating appears possible from the facts that his father Candragupta I began to rule in A.D. 320 \(^1\) and that the earliest date of his son Candragupta II, according to the Mathura inscription (Ep. Ind., XXI, p. 1 ff.), is (Gupta 61 + 320 =) 381 A.D. Since it is proved from the Prakrit records that the Pallavas were master of the kingdom of Kāñci during the first half of the fourth century A.D., it is almost certain that Kāñcēyaka Viṣṇugopa of the Allahabad pillar inscription was a Pallava king who ruled in the middle of that century which is the time of Samudragupta's South Indian campaign.

Let us now see whether these three Pallava kings—Simhavarman, Skandavarman and Viṣṇugopa, whose date is fairly correct—can be found in the epigraphs of the Pallavas themselves. The evidence of the Pennukonda plates recording the installation of two consecutive Gaṅga kings—Āyyavarman, and his son Mādhava-Simhavarman who seems to have been named after his father's overlord—by the Pallava kings, Simhavarman and Skandavarman, renders it most likely that the Pallava king Simhavarman was the father and immediate predecessor of Skandavarman. It is very interesting in this connection to note that the Udayendiram grant (No 1) of Nandivarman (Ep. Ind., III, p. 142) issued from Kāñcēpura, is the only known Pallava

\(^1\) Smith, E. Hist. Ind., 4th ed., p. 296; above, p. 89 n.
record, where in we find a Pallava king named Śīṅghavarman (Simhavarman) succeeded by his son Skandavarman. The genealogy given in this record is:

1. Skandavarman (I) ; his son
2. Śīṅghavarman ; his son
3. Skandavarman (II) ; his son

These four kings are mentioned exactly in the same order in the Vayalur grant of Rājasimha (ibid, XVIII, p.150; see Nos. 41-44), though the relation of one with the others is not specified there. We are therefore inclined to identify the Pallava king Simhavarman of the Lokavibhāga and the Penukonda plates and Skandavarman of the latter, with respectively the second and the third king of the above list.

Beside the Udayendiram grant, there is another Sanskrit grant belonging to the early Pallava rulers of Kāñcī. This is the Chendalur grant of Kumāraviṣṇu II (ibid, VIII, p.233ff.) issued from Kāñcīpura in the king's second regnal year. The grant supplies us with the following line of kings:

1. Mahārāja Skandavarman ; his son
2. Mahārāja Kumāraviṣṇu (I) ; his son
3. Mahārāja Buddhavarman ; his son
4. Mahārāja Kumāraviṣṇu (II) ; 2nd year.

According to Hultsch (ibid, p.334), "The alphabet of the Chendalur plates is more archaic than those of the Kūram and Kāśakudi plates, but resembles those of the Pīkira, Māṅgalūr and Uruvupalli grants, from which it differs chiefly in the omission of horizontal strokes at the top of letters. But a point which stamp it as more modern is the fact that ṛ, ḳ, and subscribed u consist of two vertical lines of nearly equal length, while in the Pīkira,
Mangalur and Urvupalli grants the left line is still considerably shorter. Hence we may conclude that the four Pallava kings of the Chendalur plates ruled in the interval between Simhavarman (of the Omgodu No. 2, Pikira and Mangalur grants) and Simhavishnu (father of Mahendravarman I, acc. circa 600 A.D.)." 

We have already seen that Simhavarman, the second of the four kings mentioned in the Udayendiram grant, ruled from A.D. 436-37 to not earlier than A.D. 458. Thus his father Skandavarman I appears to have ruled at Kānēi about the first quarter of the fifth century, and his grandson Nandivarman seems to have ended his rule about the beginning of the sixth century A.D. The accession of Mahendravarman I to the throne of Kānēi is supposed to have taken place about the end of the same century, owing to his being an older contemporary of the Western Calukya king Pulakesin II (A.D. 609-642). Mahendravarman I was preceded by his father Simhavishnu and grandfather Simhavarman (see verses 10-11 of the Velurpalaiyam grant; S. Ind. Ins., Vol. II, p. 363). Between Nandivarman, the issuer of the Udayendiram grant, who seems to have ruled up to the beginning of the sixth century and Simhavarman, grandfather of Mahendravarman I, the Vayalur record places three kings named (1) Simhavarman, (2) Simhavarman and (3) Viṣṇugopa. The Vayalur grant thus places five kings between Nandivarman and Mahendravarman I, i.e., in the sixth century A.D. roughly. Since the rule of five kings covering about a century does not appear impossible, since the existence of four earlier kings (Nos. 41-44 of the Vayalur list) has been proved by the Udayendiram grant and since it is possible that the Greater Pallavas of the line of Mahendravarman I did not forget even their immediate predecessors, the three kings (Nos. 45-47), placed by the Vayalur record between Nandivarman and Mahendravarman’s grandfather may be
historical persons, though we have as yet no corroborative proof of their existence. We therefore think that the four kings of Kāñci mentioned in the Chendalur grant ruled before the kings of the Udayendiram grant. The kings of the Chendalur record however appear to have ruled after Viṣṇugopa who came into conflict with Samudragupta in the middle of the fourth century A.D. We have already seen that, in the first half of the fourth century, Kāñci was occupied by the Pallava kings who issued the Prakrit charters.

There are references to some Pallava rulers in the inscriptions of the Kadambas. An epigraph of the Kadamba king Ravivarman (Ind. Ant., VI, p. 29) mentions Caṇḍaṇa, the lord of Kāñci, who was defeated by the Kadamba monarch. Caṇḍaṇa is evidently not the name but a biruda of the Pallava ruler of Kāñci who fought with Ravivarman. He cannot be satisfactorily identified with any king of the traditional list of early Pallava kings. His contemporary, the Kadamba king Ravivarman appears to have ruled about the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century (500-537 A.D. according to Dubreuil, op. cit., p. 95). The Anaji inscription (Ep. Carn., XI, p. 142) mentions a Pallava king whose name has been read as Naṇakkāsa and who was possibly a contemporary of the Kadamba king Kṛṣṇavarman I who ruled about the middle of the fifth century. But the reading of the name Naṇakkāsa is doubtful. Another Pallava king named Sāntivara [varman, i.e., Sāntivarman] has been mentioned in the Hebbata plates (Mys. Arch. Surv., A.R., 1925, p. 98) of the Kadamba king Viṣṇuvarman. This Pallava king is supposed by some (see infra) to be also

---

1 Cf. Ugradaṇḍa, a biruda of Pallava Paramēravarman I, c. 655-80 A.D.
2 In Journ. Ind. Hist., XIII, p. 19 note, it has been suggested that the reading of the passage would be roṇ-deva-kṛṣṇa viṣṇuṁ. If this reading is to be accepted, the name of the Pallava king referred to in the Anaji inscription is not as yet known.
mentioned in the Birur plates (Ep. Carn., VI, p. 91). But he cannot be satisfactorily identified with any of the Pallava kings known from the traditional list. It must also be noticed that excepting Candalanda none of these kings is expressly said to have ruled at Kânci.

We thus come to know of the following early Pallava kings who appear to have ruled at Kânci before the rise of the Greater Pallavas of Mahendravarman’s line:

1. Father of Sivaskandavarman; about the end of the third century A.D., his son.

2. Sivaskandavarman; about the beginning of the fourth century; issued the Prakrit grants discovered at Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli.

3. Skandavarman; the British Museum grant was issued in his reign; he is not definitely known to have ruled at Kânci; he may have been an early member of the branch line of the Nellore-Guntur region.

4. Viṣṇugopa; came into conflict with Samudragupta (circa 330-375 A.D.) about the middle of the fourth century A.D.

5. Skandavarman; his son.

6. Kumāraviśṇu I; his son.

¹ May this Kumāraviśṇu I be identical with Kumāraviśṇu, great-grandfather of the issuer of the Ongodu grant No. 19? The first difficulty in this identification is that Kumāraviśṇu of the Ongodu (No. 1) grant has been called a performer of the Aśvamedha sacrifice, while the Chandulur grant does not credit Kumāraviśṇu I with any such distinction. It is also striking that only in the grants of the descendants of Kumāraviśṇu of the Ongodu (No. 1) grant the Pallava family is called “purified by the Aśvamedha.” The above tentative identification is therefore extremely doubtful. Another difficulty is that while according to the Chandulur grant Kumāraviśṇu I was succeeded by his son Buddhavarman and grandson Kumāraviśṇu II, according to the Ongodu grant (No. 19) Kumāraviśṇu was succeeded by his son Skandavarman I, grandson Viravarman and great-grandson Skandavarman II. But in this connection we
7. Buddhabarman; his son

8. Kumararaviṣṇu II; issued the Chendalur grant.

9. Skandavarman (I); his son

10. Simhavarman; he ascended the throne in A.D. 436-37 and ruled at least up to A.D. 458; his son

11. Skandavarman (II); his son

12. Nandivarman; issued the Udayendiram grant.

13. Candadāṇḍa, who came into conflict with the Kadamba king Ravivarman about the first quarter of the sixth century. Candadāṇḍa may have been the birada of No. 12 or possibly one of his three successors mentioned in the Vayalar grant (Nos. 45-47).

14. Simhavarman;¹ his son

15. Simhaviṣṇu; his son

16. Mahendraravarman I; ascended the throne about A.D. 600.

---

¹ It is doubtful whether Simhavarman, grandfather of Mahendraravarman I, ruled at Kaṇkie.
VI

SIVASKANDAVARMAN AND SKANDAVARMAN.

The earliest known Pallava king is Sivaskandavarman who issued the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants. In the latter grant Sivaskandavarman refers to his father as Mahārāja-bappasāmi. Bühler (Ep. Ind., I, p. 8, note 15) and following him many other scholars think that Bappa is probably the name of Sivaskandavarman's father; and in this connection Fleet's article in Ind. Ant., XV, p. 272, is referred to. Bappa of course may signify a personal name as we find this name in the list of recipients of the gift recorded in the Hirahadagalli grant itself. We must however remember that in many early copper-plate grants including some belonging to the Pallavas, the kings called themselves bappabhāttāraka-pāda-bhakta, "devoted to the feet of the lord, the father." The word bappa there means "father" and cannot be a personal name, as the fathers of those kings are definitely known to have borne names having no connection with the word bappa. It must also be noted that the traditional lists of early Pallava kings do not mention any name

1 In connection with the title Mahārāja of Sivaskandavarman's father, it should be noticed that Sivaskandavarman himself is called gana-balhrāja in the Mayidavolu grant. He assumed however the more dignified title Dharma-Mahārāja when he became king. At the present state of our knowledge, it is not possible to determine what relations Sivaskandavarman had with Northern India and how this North Indian title was adopted by him. The celebration of the Aśvamedha possibly suggests that Sivaskandavarman added new territories to the kingdom that was left by his father.

2 Cf. Bappa, the name of the progenitor of the Chalukyas of Mewar, and also the name Bappārman in the Berar grant of Kadamba Viruvvarman (Ep. Carn., VI, p. 81) and Bappavāmin in the Nīthunpur grant of Bāskaravarman (Kāmarūpa-stāvandī, p. 21).
even slightly resembling Bappa. Bappa therefore cannot be taken as the name of Sivaskandavarman's father without further evidence.

At the time of Sivaskandavarman the Pallava kingdom of Kāñcī certainly included the Andhra country in the north and the Bellary district in the north-west. From the Penukonda plates of the Gaṅga king Mādhava we know that about the middle of the fifth century the Gaṅgas of Mysore acknowledged the suzerainty of the Pallavas of Kāñcī. It is possible that this region was under the Pallavas as early as the time of Sivaskandavarman who was the most powerful king among the early Pallavas. This suggestion seems to be supported by the Talgunda inscription according to which the early Kadambas of Banavāsī (a place to the west of Mysore) also acknowledged Pallava supremacy. Mayūrasaṁgarman, the first king of the Kadamba family, is there said to have been installed by the Pallava king of Kāñcī. According to the Talgunda inscription (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 31 ff.) Mayūrasaṁgarman received the paṭtabandha-saṅgārājā as well as the land between the western sea and the Prehāra from the Pallava king of Kāñcī (cf. saṁśrītas = tādā

---

1 According to the Talgunda inscription of Kadamba Sāntivarman, Mayūrasaṁgarman went to Kāñcī for studying the Vedas. There he took part in the paṭtabandha-kalavana, became enraged at the treatment he received there, and then, having trained himself to warlike exercises, easily overpowered the Pallava frontier guards and established himself at Śripavata (in the Kurnool district). The Pallava king took the field against him; but being unable to subdue him, installed him as king over the territory extending from the Western Ocean (Arabian sea) to the Prehāra (river?). But what is the meaning of a śravasamātha-kalana? According to the lexicon Trīkāṇḍaleśa, the word samātha means :brahat, i.e., sacrifice (cf. samathā samāpattika-carana = ca niṣa-viṣṭrāgaṇaḥ, verse 753). May then the word aśravasamātha mean Horse-sacrifice? See Jour. Ind. Hist., XII, p. 354 ff. If this explanation is acceptable, it would appear that the quarrel of Mayūrasaṁgarman with the Pallavas arose in connection with an Aśvamedha sacrifice. Among the Early Pallavas only Sivaskandavarman and Kunāravarṇa of the Onigala (No. 1) grant are known to have performed the Horse-sacrifice. Mayūrasaṁgarman was possibly a contemporary of one of these kings. The discovery of Sivaskandavarman's grant at Hirahadagalli in the borders of Kuntala appears to settle the question. It is possible that at the time of Sivaskandavarman the Pallava kingdom extended up to the Arabian sea in the west. See infra.
mahipālān = ārādhya yuddhyesa vikramaḥ pṛāpa pāṭṭabandaḥ-
sampūjāṃ karapallavaḥ pallacaśā = dhiṃtaṃ, bhānguraṁni-
calgitair = uṣṭya-ad-aparānaś-āmbhāh-kṛtāvedhiṁ prefārān-
tāṃ = ananyā-saṅcaranaś-samayaś-sthitāṁ bhūmim = eva ca).
This Mayūrasarman cannot be placed long after Sivaskandava-
varman. We have seen that Sivaskandavarman ruled in
the beginning of the fourth century, while scholars place
Mayūrasarman about the middle of the same century
the Prakrit language of the Chandravalli inscription of
Mayūrasarman (Mys. Arch. Surv., A.R., 1929, p. 50) shows
that this Kadamba king ruled a little later than the
accession of Sivaskandavarman. The use of ฑ (1.1) and
the numerous double consonants like mm (1, 1), tr, ll
(1, 2), sth, nd (1, 3), etc., appears to prove that the
Chandravalli inscription was engraved some time after the
execution of the Mayidavolu and Hiradamagali grants of
Sivaskandavarman. He can therefore be rightly placed
about the middle of the fourth century. A.D.

I. The Mayidavolu grant was issued from Kāmēpura
by the Pallava Yuvalahārāja Sivakhandavarma (=Siva-
skandavarman) on the fifth lunar day of the sixth fortnight
of summer in the tenth year of the reigning Pallava king
who was almost certainly the father of the Yuvalahārāja,
but whose name is not mentioned in the grant. By this
grant the Pallava crown-prince, for the increase of his
victory, religious merit and strength, offered with libation
of water, the village of Viripāra situated in the Andhāpata
(=Andhrāpatha) to two Brāhmaṇas, Puvakeṭuṭa and
Gonamdiya, who belonged to the Agniveṣya gotra. The
executor of the grant was Sivaskandavarman himself, and
the order was accordingly sent to the vāpata (vyāpta), i.e.,
governor, of Dhamākaka (Dhāṇyakaṭaka). Dhamākaka
which has been identified by different scholars with
Dharanikota, Amarāvati, Bezwāḍa and Nāgārjunikonda, was
evidently the headquarters of the Andhra province incorporated in the Pallava kingdom. To the village of Viripāra were granted all the immunities enjoyed by the Brahmadeyas. The word brahmadeya therefore means not only "a deya (grant) to Brāhmaṇas," but like the technical terms brahmatrā, devatā, devasāt, etc., signifies a religious donation which implied certain immunities. Of the immunities or parīhāras, the following only are specified in the Mayidavolu grant:—(1) a-lona-khādaka, (2) a-raṭṭha-saṃvinayika, (3) a-paramparā-balivadha, (4) a-bhada-pavesa, and (5) a-kūra-esalaka-vināsi-khatā-samūsa.

A-lona-khādaka is, as already noticed, Sanskrit a-lavana-khātaka; by this immunity the grantor gave up the royal right of digging salt in the village granted. About the next parīhāra Senart says (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 68), "The word seems to represent arāśṭrasmevinayika, but etymology alone is an unsafe guide in the interpretation of technical terms. Vineti is only used in a moral sense. Could we think of translating 'exempted from' the police, the magistrate of the district (rāśṭra; compare Dr. Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, p. 32 note), or of a rāśṭrin?" This would remind us of those grants in which, on the other hand, it is stated that the right to punish the 'ten offences' (sadasāparādha; see, e.g., the Alina plates; 1.67 in Dr. Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, p. 179 and the Deo-Barahārk inscription, 1.17; ibid., p. 217) is transferred to the donor." A-paramparā-balivadha has been called a-paramparā-balivadda-gahana in the Hirahadagalli grant and has been translated by Bühler as "free from the taking of the oxen in succession." This parīhāra seems to

1 According to Kaṭhāya's Arthasastra (Samasastra's 2nd ed., p. 47), "those who perform sacrifices (yajñasya), spiritual guides (āgīpta), priests (puruṣa) and those learned in the Vedas (brahmadāna) shall be granted Brahmadeya lands yielding sufficient produce (bhārata-dānaka) and exempted from taxes and fines (a dāṇḍa-kara)." Brahmadeya is also mentioned when Kaṭhāya says (II, 30) that the dāṇḍa (rod) of 8 cubits (192. séguisa) in length was used in measuring Brahmadeya and Arithaya lands.
suggest that the villagers had to supply bullocks for the bullock-carts used by royal officers when the latter went on tour through the country. _A-bhada-paśesa_, as we have already noticed, implies that no troops would enter the village of Viripāra and cause disturbances. Battles therefore could not be fought on the fields of this village. The next _parihāra_ is very important. According to Hultzsch, _kūra_ means "boiled rice" and _colaka_ (collaka of the Hirahadagallī grant) is the same as _cullaki_, i.e., pot. The word _vināsi_ has not as yet been explained. Possibly it means "fuel." The words _khata_ and _samvāsa_, respectively, mean "cot" and "dwelling." This _parihāra_ then implies exemption from the obligation of supplying boiled rice, water-pots, _vināsi_, cots and dwellings to the officers who visited the place. In this connection it is interesting to note the views of Manu (VII, 115-119). According to this law-giver, the king must appoint a headman called _grāmika_ over each village, a _daśin_ or _daśa_ over each unit of ten villages, a _pimśat-iśa_ or each unit of twenty villages, a _sat-iśa_ over each unit of hundred villages and a _sahasr-ādhīpati_ over each unit of thousand villages. As remuneration, the head of thousand villages should enjoy a city, that of hundred villages a village, that of twenty villages five _kutas_ of land, that of ten villages one _kula_ (_kulyavāpa_ = Bengali _kurobā_, i.e., Bighā?) of land, but

\[ \text{\text{yāni vṛja-pradeyāni pratyahāmi grāma-vāsibhiḥ,}} \\
\text{anna-pān-endhan-ādini grāmikas} = \text{tān} = \text{uvāpniyāt.} \]

"The headman of the village should get all of what is daily payable by the villagers to the king in the shape of food _\text{(anna)}, drink _\text{(pāna)}, fuel and other things \text{(indhan-ādi).}" By the above _parihāra_ then the village would appear to have been exempted from its dues to the _grāmika_. But _khata_ (cot) and _samvāsa_ (dwelling) should possibly have been required by officers who came to the village on
tour, the grāmika being probably more or less a settled inhabitant of the village. In connection with this parihāra we must also refer to line 8 of the Kudgere grant of Kamsamba Māndhātryvarman (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 12) where the immunity is mentioned as a-khaṭvā-vās-audana, "exempt from (the duty of providing) cattle, abodes and boiled rice."

The villagers of Virīpāra and the royal officials are asked to exempt the village and to cause it to be exempted with all the above parihāras. It is also said that one who would transgress the royal edict and would give or cause to be given any trouble or annoyance to the donees, on him the royal authority should inflict bodily punishment.

The ends of the ring that holds the plates together are secure in an elliptical seal which bears in relief "an animal couchant and facing the proper right—apparently a bull," as it has a hump on its back—and below it the legend siva(udavarmanah ?) in an alphabet which appears to be slightly different from "that of the inscription" (ibid., p. 84). The seals seem to have been kept ready in the record-office and were attached to a set of copper-plates when the latter was prepared.

At the beginning of the Mayidavolu grant, there is the word dithām, i.e., "has been seen," exactly as on the last plate of the Hirahadagalli grant. This possibly refers to

---

1 A Tamil record of A.D. 1407 refers to revenue in rice (sakala-bhakt-adāga), and another of 1240 mentions "all the revenue in paddy excluding tolls, and the small tax for the village police and including the three handfuls of paddy; the rice in Kārttika"; etc. (8. Ind. Ins., I, pp. 82, 89).

2 The crest of the Pallavas was a bull (ṭabba lāṭchana), evidently intended for Nandin the servant and carrier of Śiva. The bull appears on the seals of Pallava copperplate grants, sometimes recumbent and sometimes standing. The banner of the Pallavas was the khaṭvāga-shrāja; i.e., banner bearing the representation of a club with a skull at its tip. Sometimes the bull is described as the banner of the Pallavas. Śiva seems to have been the family god of the dynasty. (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 819 and note).
a practice of examining the grants after the copying of the plates from a set kept in the king’s record-office.

II. Hirabadagalli is a place near the western border of the Bellary district of the Madras Presidency. The copper-plate grant discovered there was issued from Kāmčipura on the fifth day of the sixth fortnight of rainy season in the 8th year of the Pallava Dharma-mahārājādhirāja Sivaskandavarman who is said to have belonged to the Bhārādvāja gotra and is credited with the performance of the Aṇuṣṭoma, Vājapeya and Aṣvamedha sacrifices. As we have already suggested, the celebration of Aṣvamedha by Sivaskandavarman seems to speak of the success of the Pallavas against the Ikṣvākus and other neighbouring powers. By this record the king granted a garden situated in the southern boundary of a village called Cillarekakoḍumka as a pariḥāra, i.e., an honorific grant (see Manusamhitā, VII, 201). Two nicarmanas of land were also granted in a village called Āpiṭṭi, one for a threshing floor and the other for a house, along with four Addhikās and two Koliṅkās. The grant was made in favour of a number of Brāhmanas, the chief among whom was Aṅgūrana (=Agniśarmārya). Addhikā (=ārdhika), according to Bühler, is "a labourer receiving half the produce." It has been referred to in the Ellore grant of Śaluniṅkayana Devavarman as addhiya-manussa (see also Mitakṣara on Yājñavalkya, I.166). Koliṅkā, as Bühler says (Ep. Ind., I, p. 9, note), "corresponds to Sanskrit Kauṅkāḥ and may mean 'weavers.' But it is also possible to think of the well-known tribe of the Koliṅs who are slaves."

The village of Cillarekakoḍumka, as also possibly Āpiṭṭi, was situated in the Sātāhāni-raṭṭha (Sātavāhanīya-rāṣṭra) which is evidently the same as Sātavāhanī-hāra mentioned in the Myakadoni inscription of Pulumāvi (ibid, XIV, p. 153) and corresponds roughly to the present Bellary district. The garden of Cillarekakoḍumka is said to have been
originally granted by Sivaskandavarman's father. This part of the old Sātavāhana empire was therefore occupied by the Pallavas as early as the time of that king, that is to say, before circa 300 A.D.

The following officials, employed in the different parts of the viśaya, have been mentioned in connection with the observance of immunities: (1) Rājakumāra, (2) Senāpati, (3) Raṭṭhika, (4) Māḍavika, (5) Desādhikata, (6) Gāmāgāmabhjojaka, (7) Vallava, (8) Govallava, (9) Amaces, (10) Ārakhādikata, (11) Gumika, (12) Tūṭhika and (13) Neyika. Along with these are also mentioned (14) the Samcarantakas and (15) the Bhadamanusas who might be sent by the king to the villages in order to execute any commission (ahma-pesana-payautta). Rājakumāra seems to refer to princes who possibly acted as viceroys of the king. Senāpati is obviously "leader of the army." The word raṭṭhika is equivalent to Sanskrit rāṣṭrika, i.e., governor of a rāṣṭra. As regards the next term, Bühler says (ibid, I, p. 7, note), "I consider the correction māḍavika as certain and take the word maṇḍaba or maṇḍapa, from which it has been derived, in the sense of modern maṇḍari, 'custom-house.'" Leumann however thinks that māḍavika is the same as maṇḍāṃbika, i.e., "chief of a maṇḍāṃba district," and Raychaudhuri translates it as "burgomaster." Desādhikata (=desādhikṛta) is "ruler of a deśa." Gāmāgāmabhjojaka has been translated by Bühler as "freeholders of various villages." This meaning of the word bhojaka is supported by its use in line 8 of the Hirahadagalli grant itself where the donees are called cillarekakoḍumka-bhojaka. In justifying the form gāmāgāmabhjojaka, Fausböll points out that repetitions of the same word with a lengthening of the final vowel of the first are commonly used in Pali in order to indicate vipā (loc. cit., p. 7, note). According to Amara, the word vallava means gopa which is obviously the same as go-vallava of this inscription. Vallava there-
fore seems to be the same as vallabha which is so common
in early South Indian inscriptions and is according to
Jātādhara, the same as aśva-rakṣa (keeper of horses).
Bühler has translated the two terms as "herdsmen"
and "cowherds" respectively. Amacca is evidently the
same as Sanskrit amātya, "minister." Leumann thinks
that ārakṣādhihikata (=ārakṣādhihikṛta) means "employed
as a guard." Bühler however read the word as
ārṇādhihikata and translated it as "foresters." Gumika
(=gāumlīka) is evidently "head of a gūlma (outpost of
soldiers)." According to Manu (VII, V, 114), a king
must place a gūlma in the centre of two, three, five or
hundred villages in order to protect his kingdom (see also
Manu, VII, 190; and Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 155). According
to Bühler, Tūthika may be connected with Prakrit tūha,
"tirtha," and possibly means "overseer of fords or of
bathing places." With neyika may be compared the
word naiyyyoka of the Uruvupalli grant, which Fleet changed
to niyukta (Ind. Ant., V, p. 52). Bühler thinks that
naiyyyoka is a mistake for naiyika, which would exactly
correspond to neyika, and that both the terms are corrup-
tions of Sanskrit nāyaka, which is commonly pronounced
nāieka and seems to mean a military officer of the rank of
corporal or sergeant (Ep. Ind., I, p. 8, note 13). It
however seems to me that neither Fleet nor Bühler is
justified in the interpretation of neyika. Naiyyyoka of the
Uruvupalli grant is evidently a mistake for naiyogika
which word we find in the Chendalur grant of Kumāravīṣṇu
II (ibid., VIII, p. 233). The word is derived from nīyoga
and is evidently the same as niyogin which, according to
Homachandra, is synonymous with karmasacira, āyukta
and vyāptra. A vyāptra is known from the Kondamudi
grant to have been ruler of an āhāra and an āyukta is
mentioned in an inscription of Budhagupta as a viṣaya-
patti (ibid., XV, p. 139). Naiyogika (or niyogin) may there-
fore be supposed to have been the ruler of some territorial division. The sañcarantakas are "spies" (see Manu, VII. 122) and the bhaña-manusyas are "soldiers."

The grant is said to have been confirmed by libation of water (udakādīm)¹ and made valid as long as the moon and stars endure (a-caṇḍa-tāraṇālika kātunam). All the eighteen kinds of parihras were granted. The inhabitants of the viṣaya, specially those of Āpiṭṭhi and Cillaśekeṣumka, were ordered to observe the parihras and to see that they were observed by others. The king says, "Now, if anybody, knowing this, proud of being a favourite of the king, should cause or cause to be caused a smaller obstacle to the donees, him, forsooth, we shall restrain by punishment. And further I pray both the future great warriors of our Pallava race who may rule within a period exceeding one hundred thousand years, as well as kings differing from us in descent, saying unto them: 'To him among you blessings, who in his time makes the people act according to the rule written above. But he who acts contrary to it shall be the lowest of men loaded with the guilt of the five mortal sins.'

Of the eighteen kinds of parihras the grant specifies the following: (1) a-kūra-collaka-vinesi-khattā-cāsa, (2) a-dudha-dadhi-gahana, (3) a-sattā-sunvinayika (4) a-loṇagula-cchobha, (5) a-kura-veṭṭhi-komjula, (6) a-parampara-balivadda-gahana, (7) a-tāna-hattā-gahana, and (8) a-haritaka-sāka-pupha-gahana. The first parihrā has already been explained in connection with the Maitavolu grant. The next parihrā, viz., a-dudha-dadhi-gahana, made the village free from the obligation of supplying sweet and sour milk, and appears to fall under the category of pāna, daily payable by the villagers to the grāmika (see

¹ As regards this custom, cf. Agni Purāṇa, ch. 399. 49-50:—
durgasya nāme gṛhmīyāḥ = dādām = iti tathā vadeat,
sevāpa dādūtaitaka kaste dāne viśhīr = ayaṇas emritab.
Manu quoted above). A-rāṭṭha-saṃcvinayika has been explained. A-loṇa-gula-cchobha (a-lovana-guda-kṣobha) has been translated by Bühler as "free from troubles about salt and sugar." That digging pits for extracting salt was a royal monopoly is known from a number of inscriptions which refer to pariḥāras like a-loṇa-khādaka (a-lovana-khātaka), a-lovana-kreṇi-khanaka (Corp. Ins. Ind., III, line 28, No. 55, and No. 56) and sa-loha-lovan-ākara (Ep. Ind., IV, p. 101). The word guḍa, mentioned along with loṇa, shows that the manufacture of sugar was also a royal monopoly. The following immunity exempted the village from the obligation of supplying grass and wood (cf. indhana in the passage quoted from Manu). The last pariḥāra of the list seems to signify exemption from the (occasional) supply of myrobalan, vegetables and flowers. Bühler says (ibid., I, p. 8, note 28), "Milk, grass, fire-wood, vegetables and so forth had to be furnished gratis by the villagers to royal officers and their servants. The custom still prevails in many native states" (see also Manu quoted above).

The grant was executed by the king himself and the plates were prepared in the handwriting of his privy-councillor (rahasyaādikṛta) Bhāṭṭisamma who was the bhōjaka (i.e., ināmdar) of Kolivāla.

The Hirahadagalli plates are held together by a ring to which an almost circular and somewhat battered seal, about an inch in diameter, is attached. The emblem on the seal is an animal facing the proper right, which, according to Bühler, may be intended for a deer or a horse.\(^1\) Below the emblem stands the word Śivaskanda-Varmanah, the last three letters of which are defaced and doubtful. It is certain that the legend on the seal was written in Sanskrit like the maṅgala at the end of the

\(^1\) The animal is most probably a bull which was the crest of the Pallavas (see Bimb. Gar., I, ii, p. 319, note 9).
inscription which reads svasti ga-brähmana-lakhaka-väcaka-
śrotbhya(b) iti. This along with the fact that the
Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants sometimes express
compound consonants by more than one letter shows that
these two grants were executed at a time when Sanskrit had
already made its way in the field of South Indian epigraphy.

III. The British Museum plates appear to have been
originally found at Kondakur in the Guntur district of the
Madras Presidency. They were issued in the reign of siri-
vijaya-Khandavamma (=Skandavarman). We have already
discussed about the identification of Sivaskandavarman of
the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants and Skandavarman
of the British Museum grant and have shown that the identi-
fication is extremely doubtful.

The donor of the grant is Cārudevī, wife (devī) of the
Pallava Yuvamahārāja Buddhavarman and mother of a
prince whose name has been conjecturally read by Hultsch
as Buddhayankura. The relation of Mahārāja Skandavarman
and Yuvamahārāja Buddhavarman is not specified in the
grant. There is no evidence that this prince, who seems
to have been a provincial governor,¹ ascended the throne.
Skandavarman is not known to have ruled at Kāñci. It is
possible that he was an early member of the Pallava house
of the Nellore-Guntur region and was an ancestor of
Skandavarman II of the Ompodu grant (No. 1). He may
possibly be identified with king No. 29 (or No. 32 ?) of the
Vayalur list (see Appendix below).

By this grant Cārudevī seems to have addressed the
villagers and officials at Kadaka (Kataka) to the effect that
a certain field to be ploughed by Ātuka on the western side
of the drinking well below the rāja-taḍāga, containing four
nivarmanas of land, had been given by her highness for the

¹ Buddhavarman may not be the king of the same name mentioned in the
Chendalur grant. Buddhavarman of the Chendalur grant seems to be of later date.
increase of her highness’s life and power, to the god Nārāyaṇa of the Kuli-mahātaraka temple at Dālura. This Kuli-mahātaraka-devakula appears to signify a temple established by a Mahattara named Kuli. The villagers and officials were asked to exempt the field with all immunities and to cause it to be exempted. The executor of the grant was Rohanigutta (Rohinigupta).

The most interesting feature of the grant is that though it is written in Prakrit, it contains two unprecatory verses (buhubhir=vasudhā dattā etc.) which are in Sanskrit and are so common in the Sanskrit copper-plate grants. This fact and the fact that the grant expresses compound consonants, in all cases, with more than one letter, appear to suggest that the British Museum grant is slightly later than the grants of Sivaskandavarman.

The seal of Skandavarman attached to the British Museum grant bears a standing animal which faces the proper right and looks like a deer, but must be meant for a bull, the crest of the Pallavas (cf. Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 319, note 5), and, over the back of the bull, a few indistinct symbols which may be taken for the sun, a crescent, and perhaps one or more stars (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 144).
CHENDALUR GRANT OF KUMĀRAVĪṢṆU II

The Chendalur grant was issued from vijaya-Kāncīpurā on the fifth titthi of the bright half of Kārttika in the 2nd regnal year of the Pallava king Kumāraviṣṇu II, who was the son of Mahārāja Buddhavarman, grandson of Mahārāja Kumāraviṣṇu I and great-grandson of Mahārāja Skandavarman. Kumāraviṣṇu I and his son Buddhavarman have possibly been mentioned in the Velurpalaiyam record (see above, p. 160). Like Skandavarman II (of the Uruvupalli, Omgodu No. 2, and Pikira grants), Kumāraviṣṇu I has been described as the fifth loka-pāla. In the Mahābhārata (see Hopkins, Epic Mythology, p. 149) and the Nanaghat cave inscription (Lüders, List, No. 1112) the gods Yama, Varuṇa, Kubera and Vāsava are called the four loka-pālas or guardians of the world. The description of a king as the fifth loka-pāla means to say that he was a protector of the earth like those four gods. In classical literature (e.g., Rāghu, II, 16) a king is called madhyama-loka-pāla, "protector of the middle world (i.e., the earth)." In this connection it is interesting to note the description of Samudraguṭa as "equal to (the gods) Dhanada (=Kubera), Varuṇa, Indra (=Vāsava who is however different from Indra in the Nanaghat record) and Antaka (=Yama); see Corp. Ins. Ind., III, pp. 14n., 250.3

Like many other Pallava rulers, Kumāraviṣṇu II calls himself kaliṇiga-dos-āvasanna-dharm-oddharna-nitya-sannaddha. This epithet is also used by Viṣṇugopavaranman and Simhavarman, and Nandivarman of the Udayendiram grant. The Pallava kings thus appear to have boasted of being called "Defender of Faith;" and the epithet possibly refers to the fact that they were determined to purify their

3 Sometimes the quarter-guardians are said to be eight. According to Amara, the dik-pātas are Indra (east), Vābu (south-east), Piṭṛpāti, i.e., Yama (south), Nāryā (south-west), Varuṇa (west), Mārī (north-west), Kubera (north) and Jā (north-east).
Brahmanical faith which was influenced by heretical doctrines like Buddhism at the time of the later Sātavāhanas and the Ikṣvākus. Kumāravīṣṇu II has some epithets in common with Viṣṇugopa and the Ikṣvākus. Kumāravīṣṇu II has some epithets in common with Viṣṇugopavarma and the Uruvupalli grant. Like Viṣṇugopa and his son Simhavarma, he is called bhagavat-pād-anudhyāta and parama-bhagavata, and like the records of those two princes the Chendalur grant begins with the adoration jītaṁ bhagavatā. He was evidently a Vaiṣṇava in faith.

The record is an order to the villagers of Cendalūra in the Karmākarāstra and to all the naiyogikas and vallabhas employed there. Chendalur, the find-spot of the inscription, is a place in the Ongole taluka of the Nellore district. Hultzsch has corrected Karmākarāstra as Karmārāstra known from several inscriptions. The form Karmākarāstra seems to be the same as Kamakaratha mentioned in a Nagarjunakonda inscription.

The word naiyogika is derived from niyoga and is evidently the same as niyogin which appears to mean "governor of a district" (cf. niyogī karmasacīva āyukto vyāptas = ca sah, Hemacandra). Vallabha means either the king’s favourites or keepers of the royal cattle.

It is said that there were eight hundred patṭikās (pieces) of khās land (rāja-vastu bhuvā sthitam) in the village of Cendalūra, and that by this grant the king offered 432 patṭikās out of that land as a Brahmadeya (brahmadeya-maryādaya) to a Brāhmaṇa named Bhavaskandatrāta 1 who belonged to the Kuṇḍinya gotra and the Chāndogya sūtra. The lands given did not include what was previously granted for the enjoyment of gods (devabhoga-hala-varjjan). The grant was executed with a hope for the increase of

---

1 According to Yama (quoted in Sadashivapadama, s. v. bhrāma (cf. bhrāma devai = ca vipasaṣa suranh trāta ca bhāhṣajaḥ, etc.), Bhavaskandatrāta can not be the proper name of a Brāhmaṇa.
the king's longevity, strength, victory and wealth, in accordance with the hala-nyāya (laws regarding the hulas, like devahala, bhikṣuhala, etc.) and was made immune with all the parīhāras.

The villagers and officers were ordered to observe the immunities and to see that others observed them. People who would violate this order have been threatened with physical punishment. The charter ends with the maṅgala: go-brāhmāna (sic) nandatu, svasty=astu praśābhyaḥ, which reminds us of a similar maṅgala at the end of the Hira-hadagallī grant of Sivaskandavarman.

The word paṭṭikā ordinarily means "a piece of cloth;" on analogy, it seems to mean "a piece of land." We do not know whether paṭṭikā here signifies a particular land-measure like the nivartana. The land is said to have been situated in the Kavacakāra-bhoga of the Karmmākarāstra. Bhoga is evidently the same as bhukti of North Indian inscriptions. It signifies a territorial unit like "district." Cf. Pallava-bhoga (Kāñco?) mentioned in the Mahāvamsa (Ind. Cult., I, p. 111).
The Udayendiram grant was issued from Kāncipuram on the fifth *tithi* of the bright half of Vaiśākhā possibly in the first year of the Pallava king Nandivarman, son of Skandavarman II, grandson of Simhavarman and great-grandson of Skandavarman I. Like the issuers of other early Pallava charters, Nandivarman is called *kaliyuga-dos-ācasannadharm-oddha-raṇa-nitya-sannaddha*. His epithets *bhagavatpād-anudhyāta* and *parama-bhāgavata* together with the fact that his grant begins with the adoration *jitam bhāgavatā*, show that he was a Vaiṣṇava like Viṣṇugopa, Simhavarman and Kumāravīṣṇu II.

Udayendiram, the find-spot of Nandivarman’s grant, is a place in the North Arcot district. The grant is full of textual mistakes; the characters moreover do not belong to the early Pallava period. According to Kielhorn (*Ep. Ind.*, III, p. 143), the grant is to be palaeographically assigned to about A.D. 680; according to Fleet however it was fabricated about 935 A.D. (*Bomb. Gaz.*, I, ii, p. 321 n.) But the facts that the four kings mentioned in it are given exactly in the same order in the Vayalur record and that the style and phraseology of the grant are very similar to those of the early Pallava records, seem to prove that the grant was copied, though by an incompetent scribe, from an early genuine record.

By this grant, the Pallava king Nandivarman offered four pieces of *āraṇya* land at Kāncēvāyil-grama in Adeyāra-rāṣṭra, according to *pūrva-bhoga-maryūḍā*, to a Brāhmaṇa named Kulacarman (=Kulaśarman) who was an
inhabitant of Kāncivāyil and belonged to the Kauśika gotra, Pravacana sūtra and Taittirīya carana. The lands were granted in accordance with Brahmadeya-maryāda, with all the immunities but with the exception of devabhoj-hāla, for the increase of the king's longevity, strength, victory and wealth. It is said that the four pieces of forest-land in Kāncivāyil-grāma are to be made immune with all the parihaaras and that anyone who would violate the order should be physically punished.

The seal of Nandivarman attached to the Udayendiram grant is circular. It contains in bas-relief the figure of a standing bull facing the proper left. There is a much worn and illegible inscription at the margin ((loc. cit.).
IX

OMGODU GRANT (NO. 1) OF SKANDAVARMAN II

In the Omgodu grant (No. 1) of Skandavarman II, the reigning king's great-grandfather, Kumāraviśuṇu, has been called aśvamedha-yāji, i.e., performer of the Horse-sacrifice. He was therefore a great king who was possibly a successor of Virakoreavarman of the Darsi plate.

Kumāraviśuṇu was succeeded by his son Skandavarman I who is mentioned in the Omgodu (No. 1) and Uruvnpalli grants. He is said to have been a parama-brahmāṇya; but his most significant epithet seems to be sva-vīry-ādhiqata-rājya, which means to say that he obtained the kingdom by his own valour. His father was a powerful king who performed the great aśvamedha sacrifice. The significance of this epithet, as I have already pointed out, may be that after the death of Kumāraviśuṇu, Skandavarman I quarrelled with his brother who was probably Kumāraviśuṇu's successor at Kānci, and carved out a separate principality in the northern part of the Pallava kingdom. Kumāraviśuṇu's successor at Kānci was possibly Buddhavarman mentioned in the Chandalur grant. We cannot however be definite as regards this suggestion, as the identification of this Kumāraviśuṇu with Kumāraviśuṇu I of the Chandalur grant is very doubtful.

The son and successor of Skandavarman I was Vīravarman who has been called "the sole hero in the world" in all the inscriptions. He was possibly a warrior of considerable importance. According to Krishnasastri (Ep. Ind., XV, p. 249), this Vīravarman is to be identified with Virakoreavarman of the Darsi plate. Darsi, identified by
some scholars with Daśanapura, is a place in the Podili division of the Nellore district. Only the first plate of the Darsai grant has been discovered; it was edited by Hultzsch in *Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 357. The grant was issued from the adhīṣṭhāna of the victorious Daśanapura by a Pallava king whose name and genealogy cannot be known until the missing plates of the grant are found. Only the name of Vīrakoravarman, the great-grandfather of the issuer, is known. The Sanskrit form of the word is Vīrakūrca which is found in the Vayalar and Velurpalaiyam records. The use of this Prakritised name appears to show that the grant was issued at a time when Prakrit was still lingering in the field of South-Indian epigraphy. The identification of this king with Vīravarman however seems to me doubtful, since these two distinct forms (viz., Vīrakūrca and Vīravarman) are found as names of different kings in the Vayalar list of early Pallava kings. Vīrakorca of the Darsai plate may be the same as (the second) Vīrakūrca of the Vayalar list.

Vīravarman was succeeded by his son who is called śrī-vijaya-Skandavarman in his own Omgodu grant (No. I), but simply Skandavarman in the inscriptions of his descendants. He has some epithets in common with Kumāravīṣṇu I of the Chendalur grant and also with Skandavarman II of the Udavendiram grant. Like Kumāravīṣṇu I of the Chendalur grant he is described as the fifth loka-pāla. Though he is not called parama-bhāgavata, his epithet bhagavat-bhakti-sudhāvī-sambhāvita-sarca-kalyāṇa in the grants of his grandson shows that he was a Vaiṣṇava.

The Omgodu grant (No. I) was issued from the victorious city of Tambrāpa in the 33rd regnal year of Skandavarman II, on the thirteenth tithi of the third Hemanta-paṣa. This form of dating resembles that used in the early Prakrit grants and is remarkably different from the form of dating used in the Sanskrit grants of the Pallavas. It therefore shows that Skandavarman II ruled
not long after the kings of the Prakrit charters. We have already shown that some parts of the Mayidavolu, Hirahadagalli and British Museum grants are written in Sanskrit and that the issuers of those grants could not have ruled long before the kings who issued the Sanskrit grants. We have also suggested that the Sanskrit grants showing considerable Prakrit influence may roughly be placed in the period between the middle of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century A.D.

By this grant the king made a Brahmadeya of the village of Omgodu in the Karmarashtra, and offered the same with the exception of the devabhoqa-hala, in a form of sattvika-dana, to a dvi-veda and suka-parya Brahmana named Golaśarman of the Kāśyapa gotra. The Karmarashtra in which Omgodu was situated has been taken to be the same as Kamma-pādu of later Telugu inscriptions and has been identified with the northern part of Nellore and southern part of Guntur. According to Krishnasastri (Ep. Ind., XV, p. 254), Omgodu may be the same as modern Ongole, the head quarters of the Ongole taluka of the Guntur district. Of the boundaries of Omgodu given in the Omgodu grant (No. 2) of Simhavarman, Koḍikinmay be identical with modern Koṇiki near Ongole and Penukaparpu may be the same as Pinukkiparu mentioned as the family name of certain Brähmanas who were recipients of a village called Tandantottam near Kumbakonam (S. Ind. Ins., II, pp. 519, 532).

1 The early form of the date used by the Vīṣṇukumāra appears to be due to conservatism inherited from their original home. It should however be noticed that two grants of the Kadamba kings Mṛgavarmā and Ravivarman who ruled about the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 6th century are dated in the old fashion. One is dated in the 4th year of Mṛgavarmā on the full-moon day of the 8th fortnight of Vargha (Ind. Ant., VII, pp. 37-38), and the other in the 11th year of Ravivarman on the 10th tithi of the 6th fortnight of Hemanta (ibid., VI, p. 38). This old way of expressing dates in such a late period appears to be due to Jain influence. See below.
The seal of Skandavarman II attached to the Omgodu grant (No. 1) is almost circular. It is totally worn away, and has no trace of any symbols, "though it may be presumed to have had on it originally the recumbent bull, as in the case of other Pallava grants" (Ep. Ind., XV, p. 249).
CROWN-PRINCE VIŚṆUGOPA AND DHARMAMAHĀRAJA SIMHAVARMAN

Viśṇugopa or Viśṇugopavarman, son of Skandavarman II, did not ascend the throne. His Uruvupalli grant was issued in the 11th year of the reign of Mahārāja Simhavarman. As we have already seen, Fleet thought that this Simhavarman was an elder brother of the Yuvamahārāja (or Yuvarāja) Viśṇugopavarman. Hultzsch, however, suggests that he is no other than Viśṇugopa's son who issued the Omgodu (No. 2), Pikira and Mangalur grants. According to the latter view therefore the Pallava throne passed from Skandavarman II directly to his grandson Simhavarman.

In the Uruvupalli grant Viśṇugopavarman calls himself praṇa-samraṇjana-paripāla-odgya-satata-satra-vrata-dīkṣita and rājarṣi-guṇa-sarva-sandoha-vijigīṣu, which he could not have said if he was not a ruler of subjects. As a crown-prince he was possibly in charge of a district of the Pallava kingdom. The district of which he was the governor probably had its head quarters at Palakkāda from where the Uruvupalli grant was issued. As we have already noted, both Viśṇugopa and his son Simhavarman are called parama-bhagavata in the inscriptions, all of which begins with the adoration: jītaṁ bhagavata. They were evidently Vaishnava. In this connection, the name Viśṇugopa and the dedication of 200 nirvartanas of land (595 acres according to Kauṭilya, but 148.6 acres according to his commentator; see below) to the god Viṣṇuhāra may also be noted.
In all the inscriptions of Viṣṇugopa and Simhavarman, the Pallavas have been credited with the performance of many aśvamedhas or many kratus and this evidently refers to the aśvamedha performed by their ancestor Kumāraviṣṇu. So far we know only of two Pallava kings who performed the Horse-sacrifice. The first of them is Sivaskandavarman of the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants, and the second is Kumāraviṣṇu, grandfather of Skandavarman II who issued the Omgodu grant (No. 1). The former is also credited with the performance of the Agniṣṭoma and Vaijapeya sacrifices.

In the Omgodu grant (No. 2) of Simhavarman, the Pallavas have been referred to as vallabha which is evidently the same as śri-vallabha of the Mangalur grant. It is interesting to note that titles like śri-vallabha, prthibhi-vallabha, etc., were adopted by the Calukya kings of Bādami. We do not know whether the Calukyas appropriated the title of the Pallavas. It is however certain that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings who succeeded the Calukyas in the sovereignty of the Deccan appropriated these titles and were therefore known as vallabha-rāja. Arabic travelers of the 9th and 10th centuries mention a powerful

1 The Calukya antagonist of Pallava Narasipphavarman has been called Vallabha-rāja (śatā bahulu vallabha-rāja, etc., of the Udayendram grant, No. 2; Ind. Ant., VIII, p. 273). In the Samangadhi inscription (ibid., XI, p. 111), the Calukya contemporary of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga (II) has been called Vallabha. In the Yavur and Miraj grants (ibid., VIII, pp. 12-14), the Calukyas themselves refer to the greatness of their family as vallabhāraśa-lukṣmi. These are only a few of the examples. Prof. Raychaudhuri points out to me that the fuller form of the epithet is śri-prthibhi-vallabha which possibly suggests that these Viṣṇava kings claimed to have incarnations of Viṣṇu who is the vallabha of both Śri and Prthivi. There seems to be an analogy between these kings' upholding Dharma from the Kaliyuga-doṣa and Viṣṇu's upholding Prthivi from the Pralaya in his Varāha incarnation. The figures of two queens with each of the two Pallava kings engraved on the portals of the Adi-Varāha cave (identified by Krishnasastri with Mahendravarman I and his son Narasipphavarman-Simhavarṇa, but by T. G. Arasamathan with Simhayogin and his son Mahendravarman I, see South Indian Portraits, p. 11 ff.) appear to represent symbolically Śri and Prthivi (see my note in Ind. Cult., II, pp. 131-32).
dynasty of the Balharās who ruled at Mānkīr. According to R. G. Bhandarkar (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 200), Balharā is an Arabic corruption of Vallabhārajā and the Balharās of Mānkīr are no other than the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānyakheta.¹

I. The Uruvupalli grant of Viṣṇugopavarman was issued from the glorious and victorious sthāna of Palakkadā. By this grant, the Dharma-yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopavarman, who belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra and the Pallava family, issued an information about his donation to the villagers of Uruvupalli (situated in Muṇḍarāṣṭra) and an order to all the āyuktakas and naiyyokas, and the ṛaṇa-vallabhās and saṅcarantakas, who had to make the following gift of the crown-prince immune with all the parihāras. The grant was in the form of 200 nivratanas of lands which were made a devabhoga to be enjoyed by the god Viṣṇuhāra whose temple called Viṣṇuhāra-devakula was built by the senāpati Viṣṇuvarman at a place called Kaṇḍukūra (or Kaṇḍukūra). The object of the grant was the increase of longevity and strength of the donor. It is warned that any one who would transgress the order would be liable to physical punishment. The plates are said to have been given in the 11th year of Simhavarma-mahārāja, on the tenth day of the dark half of Pauṣa.

Āyuktaka which, as we have already seen, is synonymous with nīyoqin, kārma-sacīca and viyapaṭṭa, seems to mean "governor of a district." The passage asmin viṣaye sarve-āyuktakāḥ possibly shows that there were several āyuktakas employed in a single viṣaya. The word naiyyoka is evidently the same as naiygika of the Chendalur grant which is derived from

¹ "Vallabhārajā should, by the rules of Prakrit or Vernacular pronunciation, become Vallabha-rāj or Ballabha-rāj. The last is the same as the Balharā of the arcbe" (loc. cit., also p. 287 f.).
niyoga (office, employment) and seems to mean "governor." The word raja-vallabha may signify favourites or subordinates of the Pallava king. It may also possibly refer to keepers of the royal horses or cows.\(^1\) Sañcarantaka has already been explained. It is the same as sañcāra of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra. For the appointment of spies in the king's own state to report to him about the conduct of his officials and subjects, see Manusamhitā, VII, 122.

The word devabhoga has been shown to be the same as devatā, devaśāt, devadeya and devadāya, and signifies "religious donation to a god." In numerous South Indian grants reference is made to the fact that the land is granted with the exception of lands previously given away as devabhogahala. The word devahala has been used in the same sense in the Peddavegi grant of Nandivarman II Śālankāyana (above, pp. 94-95).

The village of Uruvupalli in the Munḍarāśtra has not yet been satisfactorily identified. The boundary of the field granted is however clearly stated in the charter. The southern and eastern sides of the field were bounded by the river Suprayoga (or Suprayogā). At the northern extremity was a large tamarind tree in the hills; and the western side was bounded by the villages of Konḍamuruvūdu, Keṇḍukūra and Kararupūra.

According to Fleet (Ind. Ant., V, p. 5), "The seal connecting the plates bears the representation of what seems to be a dog, but in native opinion a lion." The figure is possibly that of a bull.

II. The Omgodu grant (No. 2) was issued from an unnamed skandhāvūra on the fifth tithi of the bright half of Vaisākha in the fourth regnal year of Simhavarman, son of Viṣṇugopa. By this record, the king granted the village of Omgodu (previously granted by his grandfather to a Brāh-

\(^1\) Cf. vallana in the Pikira and Hirahadagallī grants, and vallabha in the Chenda-lur and Mangalur grants.
maṇa named Golaśarman of the Kaśyapa gotra) to a Brāhmaṇa named Devaśarman who was an inhabitant of Konaḍura and belonged to the Kaśyapa gotra. Devaśarman was possibly a relative and heir of Golaśarman. The village of Konaḍura seems to be the same as the native village of Sivaśarman, recipient of the Polamuru grant of Viṣṇukanṭhin Mādhavarman I, and of Casamiśarman, recipient of the Narasaraopet grant of Pallava Viṣṇugopavarman II. The identification of Omgodu in Karmarāstra has already been discussed.

The grant is here referred to as pūrva-bhoga-vicarjita, which seems to be the same as devabhoga-hala-varja of other grants. It was endowed with all the parihāras, and is said to have been copied from the oral order of the Bhaṭṭāraka, i.e., the king himself. According to Krishnasastri (Ep. Ind., XV, p. 252), the characters of this grant are of a later period than that used in Simhavarman’s other grants. He is therefore inclined to think that the grant was copied from an original record about the beginning of the 7th century A.D.

In line 22 of the grant, reference is made to an eclipse being the occasion of the grant. It is however contradicted by the details of the date, viz., 5th lunar day of the bright half of Vaiśākha (ll. 31-32). Krishnasastri however tried to reconcile the two particulars by supposing “that the grant which was actually made on the new moon day of Chaitra, a possible day for the nearest solar eclipse, was engraved on the copper-plates five days after, i.e., on the 5th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha” (ibid, p. 253).3

1 As regards the importance of eclipses with reference to donation, see Garuda Purāṇa, Pūrva-Khaṇḍa, Ch. 31, 29:—
   agne viśeṣa c = aina grakapo candra-vitagāpo,
   emakrānta-ādiśa kālep dattam bhavati c = akṣayam.

2 According to Fleet (J.R.A.S., 1915, p. 473), Simhavarman, son of Viṣṇugopa, is to be identified with the king of the same name who is known from the Lokanāthāya
III. The Pikira grant of Simhavarman was issued from the glorious and victorious camp at the king's residence at Menmâtura in his 5th regnal year on the third tilth of the bright half of Aśvayuja with a hope for the increase of his longevity, strength and victory. The copper-plates were discovered at Nelalur in the Ongole taluka of the Guntur district.

By this record, the villagers of Pikira in Munda-rāstrā, as well as the adhyakṣas, vallavas and sāsana-sancaṁrins, stationed in the rāstra, were informed of the king's gift of the above village, endowed with all the immunities (but with the exception of lands previously granted for the enjoyment of gods) to a Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa named Vilāṣaṅkarman who belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra. The king says here that, as the village of Pikira has been made a Brahmadeya, it should be made immune with all purīhāras by the king's officials who would also see that they be observed by others. Any one transgressing this order is warned to be liable to physical punishment. The word adhyakṣa means a "superintendent" or a "ruler" (Apte, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v.; Gitā, IX, 10; Kumārasambhava, VI, 17). Vallava means gopa according to Amara; other Pallava inscriptions (e.g., the Chendalur and Mangalur grants) have callabha, which means qhotaka-akṣaka according to Jaṭādhara (see Sabdakalpadruma, s.v., pālaka). According to Amara however vallabha means adhyakṣa which has been explained by a commentator as gaṇ-aḍhyakṣa (ibid., s.v.). Vallabha is generally taken to signify favourites of the king. Sāsana-sancaṁrin may be the same as Sāsana-hara, i.e., messenger; it may also be identical with Saṅcarantaka of other inscriptions.

to have ascended the throne in A.D. 436-37. In A.D. (436-37 + 5 =) 440-40 however there was no solar eclipse on the newmoon day of Caḷitra.

1 Being connected with callava (cowherd), may adhyakṣa signify gaṇ-aḍhyakṣa?
The seal of Simhavarman attached to the Pikira grant is very much worn, but bears in relief, on a counter-sunk surface, an animal (bull?) with mouth open and face to the proper left. It is represented as seated on a horizontal line that is in relief. It closely resembles the animal represented on the seal attached to the Urvupalli grant. The tail and fore-legs of the animal are not seen (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 160).

IV. The Mangalur grant was issued from Daśanaspura (identified with Darsi in the Nellore district), on the fifth titthi of the bright half of Caitra in the 8th year of Simhavarman’s reign with the hope of increasing his longevity, strength and victory.

By this record, the king granted the village of Maṅgādūr or Maṅgalur in Vengorāstra as a Brahmadesya to the following Brāhmanas:—(1) Āpastambhya Rudrāśarman of the Ātreya gotra, (2) Āpastambhya Türkkasarman of the Vātsyāyana gotra, (3) Āpastambhya Dāmaśarman of the Kauśika gotra, (4) Āpastambhya Yajñāśarman of the Bhāradvāja gotra, (5) Āpastambhya Bhavakotigupta1 of the Parāśara gotra, and (6) Vajasaneyi Bharṭrāśarman, (7) Audamedha, (8) Chandoga, (9) Sivadatta, and (10) Hairanyakesa Śaṣṭhi-kumāra of the Gautama gotra.

The villagers of Maṅgādūr as well as the adhyakṣas, vallabhas and Śāsana-saṅcārins were informed of the donation which was endowed with all the immunities, but was with the exception of the devabhoga-hala. The villagers and officials were ordered to observe the immunities themselves and to see also that others observed them. Transgressers of the order were liable to physical punishment.

Vengorāstra seems to be the district of Vengī which lies between the rivers Krishna and Godavari. This district was

1 According to sāṭhitas quoted in the Uduṭhattra and Sraddhattra (see Śodakaṇḍaśrama, s.v. gupta and various names ending in the word gupta, properly belong to the Vaiśyas (cf. gupto-dūr-dmukhaḥ nāme prāśeṣaṁ antaṁ-viśeṣaṁ).
in the possession of the Śālāṅkāyanas as early as the time of Ptolemy (140 A.D.); but they became independent only after the downfall of the Śātavāhanas. At the time of Simhavarman, the southern fringe of the district may have been occupied by the Pallavas. It is however possible that the name Vēngī extended over some parts of the country to the south of the Krishna at the time of the Śālāṅkāyanas.¹ Mangadār was possibly situated in the southern fringe of the ancient kingdom of the Śālāṅkāyanas.

¹ From the ninth century Vēngī appears to have signified the kingdom of the Eastern Calukyas. The Telugu Mahābhārata (Aḍi, 1, 5) of the middle of the eleventh century refers to Rājahmundry in the Vēngī country (Journ. Dept. Let., XI, p. 31).
PART II

WESTERN DISTRICTS
CHAPTER I
EARLY KADAMBAS: MAYURASARMAN’S LINE

I
EARLY HISTORY OF THE KUNTALA REGION

The Kuntala country seems to have comprised the southernmost districts of the Bombay Presidency and the northern part of Mysore.¹ In a wider sense Kuntala possibly signified the whole of the Kanarese speaking area of Bombay, Madras and Mysore with the exception perhaps of the coast region. The position of the country is indicated by the fact that it was washed by the river Kṣuṇavarna (Ind. Ant., 1879, p. 18) and included Kurgod in the Bellary district (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 265), Gangavadi in south Mysore (Ep. Carn., IV, Hunsur 137), Nargund in the Dharwar district (Ind. Ant., 1888, p. 47), Taragal in the Kothapur state (ibid, p. 98), Terdal in the Sangli state in South Bombay (ibid, 1883, p. 14) and Kuntalanagara (Nubattur in the north-west of Mysore).² From about the middle of the fourth century up to about the middle of the seventh, when the country was finally made a province of the Calukya empire, Kuntala or Karṇāṭa³ is known to have been ruled by princes who belonged to the Kadamba family.

¹ Cf. a record of A.D. 1011 in Ep. Carn., VIII, Sb. 262: “In the centre of that middle world is the golden mountain to the south of which is the Bhūrata land in which like the curds of the lady earth shines the Kuntala country to which an ornament (with various natural beauties) is Banavāśa.” Some other inscriptions also prove that Kuntala was the district round Banavāśa. In the traditional lists of countries and peoples in the epics, Purāṇas and works like the Bṛhatasparityaḥ however Kuntala and Banavāśa are sometimes mentioned separately.

² I am indebted for some references to Prof. Raychaudhuri. See Bomb. Gaz., 1, ii, p. 553.

³ Kuntala and Karṇāṭa are used as synonymous in the Viḍvamādīsāvyatā by Bhiṣama. Viḍvamādīya VI has been called both kuntal-ana (or kantu-la-ana) and kauṣi-ana (IX, 41-42). Valīyantci, identified with Banavāśa, has been described as a tilaka (that is to say, the capital) of the Karṇāṭa country in the Birur grant of Viṣṇuvar-
Some inscriptions of the Nagarakhanda Kadambas (J. B. B. R. A. S., IX, pp. 245, 285; Ep. Carn., VII, Sk. 225, etc.) say that the Kadamba family originated from the Nandas who ruled over Kuntala and the adjoining districts of the Deccan. But these inscriptions belong to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and very little importance can be put to the traditions recorded in them. It is however not quite impossible that the mighty Nandas held sway over considerable portions of the Deccan. Reference to the wealth of the Nandas in a Tamil poem (Aiyangar, Beg. S. Ind. Hist., p. 80) and the existence of a city called Nander or Nau-Nand-Dehra on the Godavari (Raychaudhuri, Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., 2nd ed., p. 142) may be supposed to support the above conjecture.

In the Sravana-Belgola inscriptions (Ep. Carn., VIII, Sb. 1, 17, 54, 40, 108; III, Sr. 147, 148, etc.), there is a story of the migration of Chandragupta Maurya in Mysore in company of the Jain teacher Bhadrabahu. An inscription in the Sorab taluka (ibid., VIII, Sb. 263) says that Nagara-

man (Ep. Carn., VI, p. 91). Karphata therefore signified the same territory as Kuntala or the country of which Kuntala formed a part. In the traditional lists however they are sometimes separately mentioned. Karphata has been taken to have been derived from a Dravidian original like kar-nadu=kan-nadu (black country) or kar-nadu (great country); cf. Mahâ-tâstra. Kuntala seems also to have been Sanskritised from an original like Karphata. The separate mention of Kuntala, Karphata, Banavasi, Mahishaka (cf. Mahisâ-vijaya in a Kalamba grant), etc., in some of the traditional lists may possibly refer to the fact that these names originally signified separate geographical units shutting on one another. Sometimes however one of them may have formed the part of another; cf. the case of Takraliphi which is mentioned in literature as an independent state, as a part of Sambha and also as a part of Vaṅga; also the case of Taxila (Raychaudhuri, Indian Antiquities, p. 186 f.)

With the rise of Kanarese powers like the Calukyas and the Bâjârâkâlas, the name Karphata (sometimes also the name Kuntala) extended over a large part of western and southern Deccan. In the Kaliyugattu-purâṇi, the Calukyas have been described as Kuntalas, "lords of Kuntala" (see Tamil Lexicon, Mad. Univ., n. t.). An inscription of Haribara II, dated in Saka 1667 (I. Ind., Ins., I, p. 158, verses 25-26) says that Vijayanagar (modern Hampi) belonged to the Kuntala vijaya of the Karphata country.

1 An inscription says that the nine Nandas, the Gupta family, and the Maurya kings ruled over the land of Kuntala; then the Rañj, then the Calukyas, then Kalaçourya Bijjala, and then Hoyala-Vira-Ballala II (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 284, note).
khandā "was protected by the wise Candragupta, an abode of the usages of eminent Kṣatriyas." This record however belongs to the fourteenth century, and none attaches much importance to it. But these traditions, taken together with references to the Vamba-Mōriyar (Maurya upstarts) advancing as far south as the Podiyil Hill in the Tinnevelly district, may possibly be taken to suggest that the Maurya successors of the Nandas were master of considerable portions of Lower Deccan and the Far South. The above traditions are in a way confirmed by the discovery of the inscriptions of Aśoka at Siddāpur, Jatinga-Rameswar and Brahmagiri in the Chitaldrug district of Mysore. This goes to show that at least the greater part of the Kuntala country was within the dominions of the Mauryas at the time of Aśoka. According to a tradition recorded in the Mahāvamsa (XII, 41) and the Dīpavamsa (VIII, 10), the Buddhist teacher Rakkhita was deputed to Banavāsī (the capital of Kuntala or the district round the city) in the third century B.C. shortly after the Great Council held at Pāṭaliputra in the eighteenth year of Aśoka. Some scholars think that Kongkin-na-pu-lo visited by the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang is to be identified with the capital of the Kuntala country. If this identification is to be accepted, we have possibly another tradition regarding the Maurya occupation of Kuntala. Yuan Chwang says that there was to the south-west of the city a stūpa, said to have been built by Aśoka on the spot where Srutavisatikōṣi made miraculous exhibitions and had many converts (Watters, On Yuan Chwang's Travels, II, pp. 237-38; Beal, Bud. Rec. W. World, II, pp. 253-55).\(^1\)

We know very little of the Kuntala country for a long time after Aśoka. The Sātavāhana king Gautamipura Sāta-

\(^1\) The reference to an officer designated rajjuka in the Malavalli grant of Viṣṇukerita Cukkulānanda Sātakaripā possibly suggests that the Kuntala country was once ruled by the Mauryas. The rajjukas (= rajākas) are many times referred to in the inscriptions of Aśoka.
konomía, who ruled about the first quarter of the second century and claimed a sort of suzerainty over the whole of Dakṣinapatha, possibly had some connections with Vacayanti (Banavasi),¹ the capital of ancient Kuntala or Karnata. The claim of Gautamiputra’s lordship over the Malaya mountain (the southern part of the Western Ghats) may be a vague one; but the Nasik inscription (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 71) of his eighteenth regnal year records an order of the Sātavāhana king when he was in “the camp of victory of the army at (or, of) Vacayanti.” This record was issued through the Amālya Sivagupta who was, according to Rapson (Catalogue, p. Iviii), apparently Gautamiputra’s minister at Banavasi. Rapson further identifies this Sivagupta with Sivaskandagupta mentioned in a Karle inscription of the same Sātavāhana king (i.e. cit.; Ep. Ind., VII, p. 64). There is as yet no further proof to make us definite as regards the occupation of Kuntala by the main line of the Sātavāhanas.

According to the Purāṇas, the Andhra (i.e., Sātavāhana) dynasty had five different branches (cf. andhrānāṃ samāthitaḥ paṇca teṣāṁ vamśāḥ samāḥ punah; Vāyu, 99, 358). Indeed one branch of the Sātavāhanas, generally called the Cūṭa-Sātakarni family, is known from inscriptions, coins and literary references to have ruled at Vacayanti (Banavasi) in the Kuntala country before the Kadambas.

The Matsya list of the Andhra (=Sātavāhana) kings gives the name of Kuntala-Sātakarni. A commentator of Vatsyayana’s Kāmasūtra clearly explains the term kuntala in the name Kuntala-Sātakarni-Sātavāhana as kuntala-visaye

¹ As shown by Fleet (Bumb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 278-79 note), the identification of Vacayanti with Banavasi is sufficiently established by two points. Firstly, a name of Banavasi is known to have been Jayanti (see, e.g., Ind. Ant., IV, p. 207), which is very similar to Vacayanti. Secondly, a Calukya record (ibid., XIX, p. 102) of A.D 998 mentions the Esevalol district as situated in the north-east quarter in the vicinity of Vacayanti, while other records prove that Esevalol was the name of the district round Hāndal which is just to the north-east of Banavasi. The city seems to have been mentioned in the Geography of Ptolemy as Banusai.
jatavat lat-samakhyah. A Sātavāhana king of Kuntala is mentioned in the Kātyāyanimāṃsa as having ordered the exclusive use of Prakrit in his harem. Prof. Raychaudhuri (op. cit., p. 260) is inclined to identify this king with the celebrated Hala, sometimes credited with the authorship of the Gāthasaptasati. According to this scholar, the Matsya-Purāṇa which gives thirty names in the list of the Andhra or Sātavāhana kings mentions not only the kings of the main line, but includes also the kings of the branch that ruled in Kuntala.

Inscriptions discovered in the western and south-western districts of the Sātavāhana empire, that is to say, in Aparānta (cf. Kanheri, Arch. Surv. W. Ind., V., p. 86) and in Kuntala (cf. Banavasi; Ind. Ant., 1885, p. 331) including the north of Mysore (cf. Malavalli, Shimoga district, Ep. Carn., VII, p. 251) testify to the existence of a line of the Sātavāhanas called the Cūṭakula which was in possession of South-Western Deccan before the conquest of Banavasi by the Kadambas. The relation of the Cūṭa-Satukanis with the Satakarnis of the main line is quite uncertain. But Rapson thinks that, as the Cūṭus were intimately connected with the Mahārathis and Mahābhujas, it is probable that the branch of Kuntala was originally subordinate to the main line of the Sātavāhanas and that it shook off the yoke when the power of the imperial line began to decline after the death of Yajña Satakarni (op. cit., pp. xxi-ii, xlii).

A doubtful passage of the Devagiri grant (Ind. Ant., VII, p. 35), which seems to imply a connection of the Kadambas with the Nāgas possibly suggests that the Kuntala country was originally ruled by the Nāgas. These Nāgas however may be identical with the Cūṭa-Satakarnis who according to many scholars belonged to the Nāga dynasty. That the Cūṭa family had Nāga connections is clear from the Kanheri inscription which mentions Nāgamūlanikā.
mother of Skandānāga Sātaka and daughter of Viśnukaḍa Čuṭu-kulānanda Sātakarnī (Rapson, op. cit., p. liii).

The following records of the Čuṭu-Sātakarnīs are said to have so far been discovered:

I. Kanheri inscription of Hāritiputra Viśnukaḍa Čuṭu-kulānanda Sātakarnī (Rapson, loc. cit.). As the name of the king could not be read, this record was formerly attributed to the reign of Vāsiśṭhiputra Pulumāvi. The donor mentioned in this inscription is Nāgamālaniṇī who was the wife of a Mahāraṭhi, the daughter of a Mahābhoji and of the great king, and the mother of Skandānāga-Sātaka. Rapson has no doubt that she is to be identified with the donor of the Banavasi inscription in which she is said to have been the daughter of king Hāritiputra Viśnukaḍa Čuṭu-kulānanda Sātakarnī whose name must have originally stood also in the Kanheri inscription.

II. Banavasi inscription of the twelfth year of Hāritiputra Viśnukaḍa Čuṭu-kulānanda Sātakarnī (Rapson, op. cit., pp. liii–iv). According to Bühler’s interpretation of the record (Ind. Ant., XIV, p. 334) the king had a daughter named Sivaskandanāgaśrī who made the grant of a nāga,¹ a tank and a vihāra (monastery) on the first lunar day of the seventh fortnight of Hemanta. With respect to these gifts amaco (amūtya, i.e., minister) Khada Sāti (Skanda Sāti) was the Superintendent of work (kamaṇṭika). The Nāga was made by Naṭaka (Nartaka), the pupil of ācārya Idamoraka (Indramayūra) of Samjñayanti. According to the Mahābhārata (II, 31, 70) Samjñayanti was situated near Karahāṭa which may be the same as modern Karhāḍ. Samjñayanti

¹ "In Southern India, reared stone-images of the Nāga are set up to this day, often at the entrance of a town or village, for public adoration; and ceremonial offerings are made to the living cobra. Groups of Nāga-kala (snake-stones) are to be found in almost every village, heaped up in a corner of the court-yard of a Siva temple or placed under the shade of a venerable Pipal (Ficus Religiosa) or a Maruca (Melia Azadirachta) tree." (An. Rep. S. Ind. Ep., 1918-19, p. 25 and plates).
may possibly be identified with Vaijayanti or Banavasi which was also called Jayanti. The Mahabharata mentions the city of Sampjayanti in connection with Sahadeva’s digevjaya in the south, along with the Pandyas, Keralas and Dravidas.

Rapson, on the other hand, thinks that the proper name of the donor is not mentioned in the inscription, but she is said to have been the daughter of the great king and to have been associated in the donation with Prince Sivaskandanagastrī. He further suggests that the donor is styled Mahābhōji or, it is possible, that the passage mahābhuciyā mahārājubālikāya may be taken to mean "of the daughter of the Mahābhōji and of the great king." If the latter interpretation be accepted, the epithets—except mahāraṭhini—would be the same as in the Kanheri inscription. Rapson has little doubt that the prince Sivaskandanagastrī of this inscription is identical with Skandanaga-Sataka of the other inscription. Thus, according to him the donors mentioned in the Kanheri and Bana-vasi inscriptions must be one and the same person, viz., the daughter of king Viṣṇukadā Cuṭu-kulānanda Satakarni. He further identifies this Sivaskandanagastrī = Skandanaga-Sataka with king Sivaskandavarman mentioned in the Malavalli record (Ep. Carn., VII, p. 252) of an early unknown Kadamba king, and says that the prince subsequently came to the throne of Vaijayanti as the heir of his maternal grandfather and was possibly the last reigning member of the Cuṭu dynasty. The identification of the slightly similar names, viz., Sivaskandanagastrī, Skandanaga-Sataka and Sivaskandavarman, however, cannot be accepted as certain.

III. The Malavalli inscription of the first regnal year of Mānavya-sagotra Hāritippetra Viṣṇukadā Cuṭukulānanda Satakarni (Ep. Carn., VII, p. 251). The inscription records the grant of a village. The king is here called rāja of the city of Vaijayanti. The inscription is followed on
the same pillar by an early Kadamba record which mentions Mānavya-sagotra Hāritīputra Vaijayanti-pati Sivaskandavarman as a previous ruler of the locality. If judged by the standard of palaeography, the second record, according to Bühler (Ind. Ant., XXV, p. 28), cannot be much later than the first. In this connection, it is also noticed that the famous Talgunda inscription of the Kadamba king Sāntivarman refers to Sātakarni (very probably a king of the Cuțu family) and other kings having worshipped in a Siva temple at Sthānakundura (Talgunda). It has therefore been suggested that the Kuntala country passed into the possession of the Kadambas directly from the hands of the Cuțu Sātakarnīs (Rapson, op. cit., p. iv), and the following genealogy of the Cuțu dynasty has been drawn from the above records:

(1) Vaijayantipurā-ruja Mānavya-sagotra Hāritīputra Cutukulānanda Sātakarnī (Kanheri, Banavasi and Malavalli records) + Mahābhoji

Mahārathī + Nāgamūlanika.

(2) Vaijayantī-pati Mānavya-sagotra Hāritīputra Śivas- skandavarman (Malavalli record).

We have already said that the identification Śivaskandana- nāgaśri = Skandanāga-Sātaka = Sivaskandavarman is not quite happy. It has moreover been pointed out (see above, p. 168, note 2) that, on linguistic consideration, the Malavalli record of year 1 appears to be later than the Banavasi record of year 12. The language of the Banavasi inscription resembles that of the records of the Sātavāhanas and Ikṣvākus; the language of the Malavalli inscription is, on the other hand, very similar to that of the grants of Pallava Śivaskandavarman. I therefore think that the Banavasi and Malavalli records belong to two different
Viṣṇukāda Cuṭukulānanda Sātakarnī. This suggestion is also supported by the palaeographical standard of the Banavasi inscription. According to Bühler (Ind. Ant., XIV, p. 331 ff.), the record is to be placed about the end of the first or the beginning of the second century.

From the fact that, according to the evidence of the Talgunda record, Mayūrāsarman, the first king of the Kadamba family, received the paṭṭabandha-sampūja along with the country from the Prehāra (river?) up to the western (Arabian) sea from the Pallava kings of Kānci, it appears that for a time the Kuntala country passed into the possession of the Pallavas. This may have taken place about the time of the great Sivaskandavarman and his father whose direct rule is known to have extended as far as the Andhrāpatha (i.e., the Andhra country with its capital at Dhamūṇakaḍā = Dhānyakaṭaka) in the north and the Sātāhaniraṭṭha (i.e., the Bellary district) in the northwest. We have also shown (see above, pp. 168, 184) that a comparison of the language of the Malavalli record with that of the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants would place the rule of Mayūrāsarman, the progenitor of the Kadambas, not long after the accession of Sivaskandavarman about the beginning of the fourth century. Since the language of the Malavalli record of Viṣṇukāda Cuṭukulānanda Sātakarnī who, as we have suggested, appears to have been different from the earlier Viṣṇukāda Cuṭukulānanda Sātakarnī of the Banavasi inscription, closely resembles the language of the Chandravalli record of Mayūrāsarman and the Malavalli grant which seems to belong either to the same king or to his immediate successor, and does not appear to be earlier than the grants of Sivaskandavarman, I think it not impossible that the later members of the Cuṭu dynasty of Kuntala acknowledged the suzerainty of the powerful early Pallava rulers of Kānci.
No coins have as yet been attributed to any of the Cūṭu kings known from inscriptions. Some large lead coins from Kārvar bearing the title cūṭu-kul-ānandā in the legend are doubtfully assigned to an earlier feudatory member of the Cūṭu family (Rapson, op. cit., p. xliii). The reading hārīti as a portion of the legend on some lead coins found in the Anantapur and Cuddapah districts (loc. cit.) is not quite certain and therefore does not justify in the present state of our knowledge the attribution of those coins to any of the Cūṭu kings.

Besides the coins bearing the legend raño cūṭu-kul-ānandā, there are other coins discovered from the Kārvar district with the legend raño mud-ānandā. The expressions cūṭu-kul-ānanda and mud-ānanda have been thought to signify respectively "Joy of the family" of the Cūṭus" and "Joy of the Mūṇḍas." These titles resemble in character that of the Mahaṛathī Aṅgika-kula-vardhana, "the cherisher of the race of Aṅga." They have been taken to be dynastic. According to Rapson, these may be designations attached to particular localities or titles derived from the home or race of the rulers. Cūṭu evidently signifies the Cūṭu-Sātakarni family. The Mūṇḍas are frequently mentioned in Sanskrit literature. The Viṣṇu-Purāṇa (IV, 24, 14) speaks of thirteen Mūṇḍa kings who ruled after the Andhras, (i.e., Sātavāhanas). "It is perhaps, more probable that the kings bearing these titles were members of two families of feudatories in the early period of the dynasty, and that, at a later period, on the decline of the empire, one of these families gained the sovereign power in the western and southern provinces, while the eastern provinces remained in the possession of the Sātavāhana family." (Rapson, op. cit., p. xxiii).

1 In place of ḍuṇā of the inscriptions, Rapson reads šoṇḍa on the coins and translates the term as "city" (op. cit., p. lxxxiv).
II

ORIGIN OF THE KADAMBAS

In almost all Kadamba inscriptions the Kadambas claim to have belonged to the Mānavya gotra and call themselves Hāritiputra. The designation Mānavyagotra-Hāritiputra was evidently borrowed from the Cūṭu Śātakarnis who ruled over Kuntala before the rise of the Kadambas. From the Banavasi grant of the eighth year of Mrgeśavarman’s reign (Ind. Ant., VII, pp. 35-36) the Kadambas seem to have actually belonged to the Āṅgirasa gotra. This suggestion is possibly supported by the fact that they are called try-ārṣavartma (see verse 3 of the Tālgunda inscription; Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 31 ff.) which seems to refer to the three pravaras of the Āṅgirasa gotra, viz., Āṅgirasa, Vāsiṣṭha and Bārhapatya (Sabdakalpadruma, s.v. pravara).

According to a very late inscription belonging to the Kadambas of Hangal (Ep. Carn., VII, Sk. 117), the Kadamba family originated from the three-eyed and four-armed Kadamba. This Kadamba is said to have sprung into being under a Kadamba tree from a drop of sweat that fell on the ground from the forehead of Śiva. Kadamba’s son was Mayūravarman who conquered the earth by the power of his sword and invincible armour. Another inscription (ibid, XI, Dg. 35) says that Mayūravarman himself was born under an auspicious Kadama tree, with an eye

---

1 This paper was originally published in Ind. Cult., IV, p. 118 ff.
2 As sons of Manu, all men may claim the Mānavya gotra. A Calukya grant says,
3 Srāyambhava: Manu’s son was Mānavya, from whom came all those who belonged to the Mānavya gotra (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 339). Mānavya’s son was Harita; his son was Pañcaśikhi-Hārīti.
4 Did the Kadambas claim connection with the Āṅgirasa Hāritas who are said to have descended, through Ikṣvāku, from Manu? (See Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 317, note).
on his forehead. He is there described as the son of Rudra and the earth. His family became famous as Kadamba owing to the fact that he grew up in the shade of a Kadamba tree. An inscription of A.D. 1077 (ibid., VIII, Sb. 262) gives still more interesting details. There Mayuravarman seems to have been described as the son of the famous Ananda-jina-vratindra’s sister ¹ and as born under the famous Kadamba tree, and to have had the other name Trilocana. A kingdom having been procured for him from the Sasanadevi and a forest being cleared and formed into a country for that prince, a crown composed of peacock’s feathers was placed on his head. From this crown, the prince obtained the name Mayuravarman.

These mythical accounts do not differ materially from those recorded in the inscriptions of the Later Kadambas of Goa. Some of the Halsi and Degamve grants (e.g., ibid, VII, Sk. 236) attribute the origin of the Kadamba family to the three-eyed and four-armed Jayanta otherwise named Trilocana-Kadamba. This Jayanta is said to have sprung from a drop of sweat that fell on the ground near the roots of a Kadamba tree, from the forehead of Siva when the god killed Tripura after a hard fight.

An inscription of the same period belonging to the Later Kadambas of Nagarakhanda (J.B.B.R.A.S., IX, pp. 245, 272, 285) gives a slightly different story. It says that king Nanda worshipped Siva for many days with the desire of getting a son. One day some Kadamba flowers suddenly fell down from the sky and a heavenly voice assured him of his getting two brilliant sons in the near future. Thus according to this tradition, the Kadambas claimed relation with the famous Nanda kings of Pataliputra. Some other late Kadamba grants also attribute a northern origin to the

¹ Here is possibly a reference to the claim of having been related with the Ananda kings of Kanurapotra. For the Anandas, see above, p. 10 ff.; also my note in J. R. A. S., October, 1934, p. 757 ff.
Kadambas. The Kargudari record of the Hangal Kadambas asserts that Mayūravarman came from the Himalayan regions and brought from Ahicchatra eighteen Brāhmaṇas whom he established in Kuntala (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, pp. 560-561). According to another record (Ep. Ind., XVI, pp. 354, 360) Mayūravarman is said to have established his power on the summits of the Himavat mountain.

All these traditions are of little historical value. All they may indicate is that the progenitor of the Kadamba family was named Mayūra and that the family-name had an accidental connection with the Kadamba tree. In connection with the tradition regarding the three-eyed Trilocana-Kadamba, it is interesting to note that there are similar accounts of a mythical Trilocana-Pallava in later Pallava inscriptions. This three-eyed Pallava is said to have brought some Brāhmaṇas from Ahicchatra and to have settled them to the east of Śrīparvata where he made seventy agrahāras (An. Rep. S. Ind.-Ep., 1908, pp. 82-38). Later Kadamba inscriptions, as we have noticed, attribute this Brāhmaṇa emigration to Mayūravarman. These facts seem to show that the mythical traditions about the two Pallava and Kadamba Trilocanas had a common origin, though they possibly depended on the development of each other (Moraes, Kadambakula, p. 8 note). As has already been suggested, the evidence of the Mysore records of the twelfth century stating that the Nanda king ruled over Kuntala (Rice, Mysore and Coorg, p. 3), the reference to the wealth of the Nandas in a Tamil poem and the existence of a city called Nau Nand-Dehra in the South may suggest that the Nanda dominions embraced considerable portions of Southern India. In the present state of our knowledge however it is not possible to prove a genealogical connection

1 Another record says (Bomb. Gaz., p. 561) that Mukappa-Kadamba (the three-eyed Kadambas) brought 19,000 Brāhmaṇas of 33 gotras from Ahicchatra and established them at the Siddapagāhāpura (i.e., Tālgunda).
between the Nandas and the Kadambas. Moreover, the Kadambas, as we shall presently see, were originally Brāhmanaśas, while the Nandas are known from the Purānas to have been Kṣatriyas with an admixture of Śūdra blood.

It is clear that all the later traditions connected with the origin of the name Kadamba developed on a reference in a much earlier Kadamba record. It is the Talgunda inscription of king Sāntivarman who ruled about the middle of the fifth century, that is to say, about a century after the establishment of the Kadamba power in Kuntala by Mayūra about the middle of the fourth century A.D. This inscription records (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 31) that the Kadambas were so named owing to their tending a Kadamba tree that grew near their house (cf. ....... grha-samīpa-samrūdha-vakaśat-kadamb-aika-padapam, tad-upacāravat tad-āsyatārah sānāmya-sādharmyam = asya tat prācērtē sāturīthya-viprāṇam prācūryatās tad viśēṣānam), and that they belonged to the deiva-kula (Brāhmaṇa family). In this Kadamba-kula was born a person named Mayūraśarman, the best of the Brāhmaṇas (cf. evam = agate kadamba-kule śrīmān = bhṛvēva dvijottamaḥ nāmato mayūrasārm = eti).

There seems to be nothing very strange and unbelievable in this simple account. The statement that the Kadambas were Brāhmaṇas is also supported by the evidence of the earliest Kadamba record, the Chandravalli inscription of Mayūra (Mys. Arch. Surv., A.R., 1929, p. 50). In this inscription, the name of the Kadamba king has been given as Mayūra-śarman, and not as Mayūra-varman which form we find only in the inscriptions of the Later Kadambas. Since śarman was used with the names of Brāhmaṇas and varman with that of Kṣatriyas (cf. śarma-vad = brāhmaṇasya syāt, Manu, II, 32; śarmā devaś = ca viprasya varmā trātā ca bhū-bhujah, etc., Yama quoted in Subdakalpadruma, s.v. śarmā), the progenitor of the Kadamba family was a Brāhmaṇa according
to the earliest known Kadamba record, and there is no reason to doubt the truth of the statement. It is not impossible that the Kadambas were originally Brāhmaṇas who migrated from Northern India like many other South Indian royal families, took service under the Sātavāhanas and eventually carved out a principality in the Kuntala country.\footnote{Had the Kadambas some sort of relation with the Nīpa (=Kadamba) family which ruled, according to a tradition recorded by Kālidāsa (Raghu, VI, verses 45-51), over the district round Mathurā? G. M. Marsden says (Kadambakula, p. 10. “The very name of the family suggests that they (i.e., the Kadambas) were the natives of the South. For the Kadamba tree is common only in the Deccan.” It is however a misrepresentation. The Kadamba tree is largely found also in other parts of India.} That they later gave themselves as Kṣatriya is proved by the fact that not only the names of the succeeding kings ended in *varman*, but Mayūraśarman was himself made Mayūravarman in all later records of the family. Their case may be compared with that of the Sena kings of Bengal who styled themselves as Brahma-Kṣatriya which possibly means “Brāhmaṇa first and Kṣatriya afterwards,” that is to say, “Brāhmaṇa by birth and Kṣatriya by profession.”

It is interesting in this connection to note that, like the Kadambas, there were and still are many tribes and families in India, named after particular trees. The Sākyas were a branch of the Ikṣvāku family and were so called owing to their connection with the Śaka tree (cf. *śaka-vṛkṣa-pratichiṭ Damā ṣaṃ yasmāṁ ca cakrīre, tasmād = Ikṣvāku-caṃśyas = te bhūvi śākyāḥ prakṛtilāḥ; Saundaranandakāvya, 1, 24). Coins of a tribe or family called Odumbara have been discovered in the Pathankot region (Kangra and Hosypur districts according to Smith, Catalogue, pp. 160-61) and have been assigned to *circa* 100 B.C. (Rapson, Indian Coins, p. 11). Odumbara (Sanskrit *Aduṇḍbara*) appears to be connected with the Udumbara or fig tree. A tribe named Arjunāyana has been mentioned Varāhamihira’s *Bṛhatsamhitā* (XIV, 25) and the Allahabad pillar
pillar inscription of Samudragupta (circa 350 A.D.). Many coins belonging to this tribe have also been discovered (Indian Coins, p. 11). These Arjunäyanas seem to have been called after the Arjuna tree. The name of the Sibi tribe may also be connected with Śivi or the birch tree.

Some coins bearing the legend vatasvaka are assigned to about B.C. 200 (ibid., p. 14). Bühler has explained the legend as denoting the Vaṭa (fig. tree) branch of the Aśvaka tribe (Ind. Stud., III, p. 46). It is interesting in this connection to notice that even at the present time the Lari Goālās of Chbota-Nagpur, the Gorāits, Kharwars, the Kumhārs of Lohardaga, Mundas, Nāgesars, Orāons, Pans and many other tribes have septs or sections amongst them named after the famous Indian tree Vaṭa (Ficus Indica). (See H. H. Risley, Tribes and Castes of Bengal, II, 1892, pp. 51, 55, 77, 78, 86, 103, 111, 113, 115, etc.) A consideration of modern tribal names seems to suggest that the above tree-names had originally some sort of totemistic significance.

We have already mentioned several Indian tribes and castes bearing the name Vaṭa. There are many such tribes and castes in India, which go by the names of particular trees. Tribal septs are named after the Dumur (fig. tree), bamboo, Palm tree, Jari tree, Mahua tree, Baherwar tree, Kussum tree, Karma tree and many other trees (Riseley, op. cit., pp. 61, 78, 87, 96, 97, 103, 105, etc.). Some of these are actually totems, while others appear to have lost their original totemistic significance.

1 Totemistic ideas appear to be gradually changed with time. Among the present day Santals, only traces of their primitive totemism are to be found. None of these appear to be associated with the idea of culture-heroes as amongst the Amer-indians. The folklore shows indeed some stories centering round the plants (betal-palm, Panjsum tree, Sábai grass) and animals (tiger, jackal, leopard, crab). Besides these, some of the clans' names centre round industrial objects and articles of usefulness, such as shāri, earthen vessel, etc. These would be more in line with a belief in objects possessing mana and venerated as such and gradually getting
ORIGIN OF THE KADAMBAS

It however cannot be proved in the present state of our knowledge whether the Kadambas and the other tribes and families with tree-names were totemistic in the true sense of the term. In this connection it is interesting to note what has been said about the totemism prevalent among the present-day Santals who must originally have been a totemic people. "Totemism in the truest form is not present amongst the Santals. The Santals of our days do not believe in the actual descent of a clan from its totem, and the few legends of the Santals about the origin of some of their clans do not point to any belief in the descent of men from their totems. All that they indicate is that the totem animal and plant had some accidental connection with the birth of the ancestor of the clan. As for example, the sept Pāuriā is called after the pigeon and Chore after the lizard; and the story is that on the occasion of a famous tribal hunting party the members of these two septs failed to kill anything but pigeons and lizards; so they were called by the names of these animals." It is interesting also to note that according to the Talgunda inscription and many other later Kadamba records the Kadamba tree "had some accidental connection with the birth" of the family of Mayūrasārman, the ancestor of the Kadambas, exactly as the pigeon and lizard in the family traditions of the two Santal septs called Pāuriā (pigeon) and Chore (lizard).

-associated with exogamous sub-divisions which might have had a hand in the invention or diffusion of these useful objects. There is no seasonal, recurring ceremonial round these objects meant for the preservation or propagation of animals or plants venerated as ancestors as in Australia. There is indeed some taboo to the use by the particular sub-clan of the plant and animal venerated as its ancestor. The animal and plant thus venerated are taboo to the clans; none can hunt it, nor can they partake of its flesh. But for the observation of this taboo, the Santals are in no sense plant and animal worshippers" (R. C. Biswas, *Primitice Religion, etc., of the Santals; Journ. Dept. Lat., XXVI, p. 6).

1 Ibid, pp. 57-58.
III


The following genealogy of the Early Kadambas is established by the Talgunda inscription of Śántivarman and the numerous records of his son, grandson and great-grandson (see Ind. Ant., VI, p. 22):

```
Mayūrasarman
   ↓
Kangavarman
   ↓
Bhagiratha

Raghu
   ↓
Kākustha or Kākusthavaran
   ↓
Śántivarman or Śántivara-varan
   ↓
Mrgeśa, Mrgeśvara, Mrgeśavarman or Mrgeśavarvarman
   ↓
Ravi or Ravivarman
   ↓
Sivaratha
   ↓
Bhānuvarman

Harivarman
```

In connection with the discussion on the date of Pallava Sivaskandavarman (above, pp. 161-68; also Journ. Ind. Hist., XII, p. 297 ff.), I have tried to prove that Sivaskandavarman ruled in the first quarter of the fourth century A.D. I have also suggested that a comparison of the language of the Chandravalli record
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(Mys. Arch. Surv., A.R., 1929, p. 50) with that of the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants would place the reign of Kadamba Mayūrasarman only a little later than the accession of Sivaskandavarman. The use of ə (l.1) and the numerous double-consonants like mma (l.1), tr, ll (l.2), sth, ud (l.3), etc., appear to prove that the Chandravalli record was engraved after, but not long after, the execution of the grants of Sivaskandavarman. I therefore think that scholars (see Anc. Hist. Dec., p. 95 f.; Kadambakula, chart opp. p. 15) are justified in placing Mayūrasarman about the middle of the fourth century A.D. We may not therefore be far from the mark if we suppose that the date of Mayūra's accession lies somewhere between A.D. 320 and 350.

According to the evidence of the Talgunda inscription (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 31 ff.) of the Kadamba king named Sāntivarman, this Mayūrasarman was followed on the Kadamba throne by his son Kangavarman, grandson Bhagiratha and great-grandson Raghu; Raghu was succeeded by his brother whose name was Kākusthavarman. Supposing that Mayūrasarman's reign began about the middle of the fourth century and that the reign-periods of the four predecessors of Kākusthavarman (viz., Mayūrasarman, Kangavarman, Bhagiratha and Raghu) together covered about a century, we arrive at about the middle of the fifth century for the period of Kākustha.

The Halsi grant (Ind. Ant., VI, p. 23) of Kākusthavarman, the Yuvārāja (crown-prince) of the Kadambas, was issued in the eighthieth year. Fleet says (Bomb. Gaz.,

1 According to the Talgunda inscription, Mayūrasarman received the pahūpandha-vīrapāja as well as the land between the Western sea and the Panchātra from the Pallava kings of Kañci. We have already suggested that this may have taken place about the time of the great Sivaskandavarman and his father who were possibly ancestors of the whole land bounded by the Arabian sea in the west. See above, p. 184 n.

2 In Ind. Ant., XIV, p. 13, it has been suggested to be the eightieth year from the conquest of the Nāgas by Kṛṇavarman (I), who however cannot be 80 years earlier than Kākusthavarman.
I, ii, p. 291), "The year purports by strict translation to be his own eighthith year. But it cannot be the eighthith year of his Yucaraja-ship; and, even if such a style of dating were usual, it can hardly be even the eighthith year of his life. It must therefore be the eighthith year from the Pattabandha of his ancestor Mayurasarman, which is mentioned in the Talgunda inscription." The beginning of Kākustha's reign thus falls more than eighty years after Mayurasarman's accession (somewhere between circa 320 and 350 A.D.). The record issued when Kākusthavarman was a Yuvaraja thus seems to have been inscribed some time between circa 400 and 430 A.D.¹

Kākusthavarman was succeeded by his son Sāntivarman during whose reign the Talgunda record was engraved. Mrgeśavarman was the son and successor of Sāntivarman. Thus the two reigns of Kākusthavarman and of Sāntivarman intervened between the date of the Halsi grant when Kākustha was a Yuvaraja (some time between A.D. 400 and 430) and the date of Mrgeśavarman's accession. But since we do not know the precise date of Mayurasarman's accession and the exact reign-periods of Kākusthavarman and Sāntivarman, it is difficult to conjecture any definite date for the accession of Mrgeśavarman. It is however almost certain that Mrgeśa's rule did not begin earlier than A.D. 415.

Mrgeśavarman's last known date is year 8. He was succeeded by his son Ravivarman whose last known inscriptive date is year 35. Ravivarman's son and successor was Harivarman whose Sangoli grant (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 165 ff.) was dated in the eighth year of his reign. The date of this record is calculated to be either Tuesday, the

¹ Prof. Raychaudhuri suggests to me that, since this is the only instance of an era being used in the Kalasam records and since Kākusha is known to have had relations with the Guptas, the year 80 may possibly refer to the Gupta era. The suggestion suits our chronology, as the date then falls in 400 A.D.
22nd September, 526, or Thursday, the 21st September, 545 A.D. So Harivarman ascended the Kadamba throne either in 519-520 or in 538-539. Since Ravivarman's reign of about 35 years intervened between the end of Mrgeśavarman's rule and the beginning of Harivarman's reign, Mrgeśavarman does not appear to have ended his rule before \(538-35\) = 503 A.D. Thus we see that the reign of Mrgeśavarman fell in the period between A.D. 415 and 503.

Now, the Banavasi grant (Ind. Ant., VII, pp. 35-36) of Mrgeśavarman gives a verifiable date. This record is said to have been dated in \(rājyasya tṛợye varghe pauṣe samvatsare kārttikamāsa-bahula-pakṣe dasāmeyān=tīkhau uttara-bhādra-pada-nakṣatre\). The date is therefore Pauṣa year; month of Kārttika; Bahula or the dark fortnight; tenth lunar day; and Uttha-bhādrapada nakṣatra. This date fell in the third regnal year of Mrgeśavarman. It must first be observed that Bahula is here apparently a mistake for Šukla. The lunar mansion called Uttha-bhādrapada may have chance to occur on the tenth lunar day only of the bright half, and not of the dark half, of the month of Kārttika. We are therefore to find out a Pauṣa year in the period between A.D. 415 and 503, in which the lunar mansion Uttha-bhādrapada occurred on the tenth tithi of the bright half of Kārttiika.

Between A.D. 415 and 503, Pauṣa years, counted according to the twelve-year cycle of Jupiter, occurred in A.D. 425, 437, 448, 460, 472, 484 and 496; but calculations show that the lunar mansion Uttha-bhādrapada occurred in Kārttiika-Šukla-daśamī only in A.D. 437 and in 472. On October 24, A.D. 437, Sukla-daśamī continued till 2-5 A.M. in the night; and Uttha-bhādrapada nakṣatra began about

---

1 Mr. K. N. Dikshit, who has edited the Sangoli grant (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 165 f.) rightly prefers the second date, viz., A.D. 538.
12-15 P.M. in the day. On October 27, A.D. 472, Sukladaśāmī continued till 8-57 P.M. in the night and Uttarabhādrapada began about 2-31 P.M. in the day. It therefore appears that Mrgeśavarman ascended the Kadamba throne either in A.D. 434-435 or 469-470.¹

Scholars (see Anc. Hist. Dec., pp. 95-96; Kadambakula, chart opp. p. 15) generally place Mrgeśavarman's accession in circa 475 A.D. We would therefore prefer the second alternative, viz., 469-70 A.D.

In this connection we should also note that a Halsi grant (Ind. Ant., VI, p. 24) of king Mrgeśavarman is dated on the full-moon day of Kāṛttika in his eighth regnal year which was a Vaiśākha samvatsara. We have already seen that the tenth tīthī of the bright half of Kāṛttika of his third year fell in the Pauṣa samvatsara. This fact seems to show that the same lunar day of Kāṛttika in the next Vaiśākha samvatsara fell in his seventh regnal year. Are we to suppose that the eighth year of Mrgeśavarman's reign began in between the Sukla-daśāmī and the full-moon day of Kāṛttika? Mrgeśavarman would then appear to have ascended the throne on a day between these two tīthīs.

There were several branches² of the Early Kadambas, the most important of them—besides the direct line of

¹ I am indebted for some calculations to Mr. D. N. Mukherji, B.Sc., of the Daulatpur College (Kholna district, Bengal). The calculations are on the heliacal rising system as followed by Dikshiti in Pleni's Gupta Inscriptions (Corp. Ins. Ind., III). After the publication of my paper on this subject (Journ. Ind. Hist., XIV, p. 341), I have noticed that in a footnote at page 338 of his List, the late Mr. Sewell said, "Mrgeśavarman may have come to the throne in A.D. 471. For an inscription of his third year bears a date in A.D. 473, given as in the year Pauṣa, which, in the twelve year cycle—Kilaka," Sewell appears to have calculated the Pauṣa years according to the mean motions of Jupiter.

² It will be seen that the lines of Māṇḍhāśīvarman and Krṣṇavarman I. and a few other lines one of them being that to which king Māṇḍhāśīvarman belonged, ruled more or less simultaneously over different parts of the Kadamba country. The reference to Calukya. Kṛttivarman's victory over the kādaṃba-kādaṃba-kadambaśaka (combined army of a confederacy of Kadamba princes?) is interesting to note in this connection. Buddhadatta, the celebrated author of the Vīmānapersiṣheka, is said to have flourished at Uragapura (modern Upaiyur near Tanjore) about the fifth century
Mayūraśarman—being the line of Kṛṣṇavarman I. Since the exact relation of these branch lines with the main line, that is to say, with the line of Mayūraśarman, is not as yet definitely and unquestionably settled, I think it wiser to deal with them separately.

A.D. In the nāgamaṇa of that work, he says that he resided in the cīvara of Vephusāsa at Bhūtamaṅgala-on-Kaverī in the Colarājha and composed the book when the country was being ruled by Acutavikrama who was a kaḷamba-kula māndana. The śiṅka says that the Cola-rāja Acutavikrama who was kaḷamba-kula-cuṇḍa-pāta was ruling the Cola-rājha. It has been suggested that king Acutavikrama belonged to the Kālāmbha family (see Ind. Cult., I, pp. 71-74). Some scholars think that he was a Kalabhra. The suggestion that the Cola country was ruled by a Kālāmbha or Kalabhra king about the fifth century however cannot be accepted without further evidence. Kaḷamba-kula māndana, i.e., delight of the Kaḷamba-Kālāmbha (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 335, note 2) or Kālāmbha family, may suggest that Acutavikrama’s mother was a Kālāmbha princess. In this connection it is interesting to note that a Pallava king (Pallava-raja) named Gopāleśvara has been described in the Haldipur grant (Ep. Ind., XXI, p. 173 ff.) as kaṅkṣya-cuṇḍa-vahana which has been taken to indicate that Gopāleśvara was connected with the Kālāṃkṣya on his mother’s side. Calukya Jayasimha III is described in the records of the family as being born in the Pallava lineage (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 335), and Fleet suggests that his mother was a Pallava princess. Fleet also suggested (ibid., p. 319) that Satyārāya-Dhruvaśa-Indravarman, “an ornament of the Kāla-maṅga-Bapṭa-vatī”, was a son of Calukya Māṅgulēśa and was connected with the Bapṭa or Bapṭa familia on his mother’s side. It is also not impossible that the Kāmbhoja-vatī-nilaka Rājyaśkī of the Irka grant is the same as king Rājyaśkī of the Pāla dynasty, whose mother was a Kāmbhoja princess. See my note in Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., X, p. 227 f.
IV

MAYURASARMAN

We have seen that according to the Talgunda inscription the Kadambas belonged to a Brähmana family devoted to the study of the Vedas. There the family has been described as tryāra-vartma, hārīti-putra and mānavya-gotra. In this family of dvijas was born an illustrious and learned Brähmana named Mayurāsarman who went with his preceptor Virasimha to Kāncipuram, the Pallava capital, in order to prosecute his Vedic studies. There Mayurāsarman was drawn in a quarrel with the Pallavas, and considering the illtreatment he received a dishonour to the Brähmanas, "he unseathed a flaming sword eager to conquer the world." He then easily defeated the frontier guards of the Pallava kings (antāh-pālān palla-v-endrānān) and established himself in a dense forest near Śriparvata. His power gradually increased, and he levied tributes from the Bhad-Bānas and other kings. At length a compromise

1 Kielhorn thinks that udra-patthi is the same as udra-roha, "a horseman" (Śr. Ind., VIII, p. 26). May the passage udra-patthi kala-kama suggest that the quarrel of Mayurāsarman was in connection with a horse-sacrifice (see above, p. 164, note). Among the Early Pallavas Śivaskandavarmaṇ and Kumāravijaya of the Ongodu (no. 1) grant are the only kings known to have performed the Advamedha. This fact also appears to suggest that Mayurāsarman lived about the time of the great Śivaskandavarmaṇ who is known to have held sway over the greater portion of Lower Deccan. Kumāravijaya seems to have ruled about the end of the fourth century.

2 The plural number in palla-v-endrā-pā, etc., suggests that the quarrel of Mayurāsarman was not limited within the reign-period of a single Pallava king of Kāñci, but continued in the succeeding reigns. Antaḥ-pālā (Warden of the Marches) is mentioned in Kautīya's Arthasastra (Sāmasatry's ed., pp. 20, 247). The salary of an Antaḥ-pālā was equal to that of a Kumāra, Paurava-yavahārīka, Rājatpala and of a member of the Mantri-parīcat.

3 Bhad-Bāna appears to mean the great Bāna or the greater house of the Bānas. Cf. Perumbārpāṭṭi in Tamil.
was brought in, and Mayūrasarman accepted service under
the Pallava kings of Kānci, from whom he received the paṭṭabandha-sampūjā, that is to say, the status of a subordinate ruler, as well as the territory extending from the Aparāñava (Western or Arabian Sea) and the Prebhāra (river?) with a specification that no other chief would enter
into it. The eightieth year of an unknown era by which the Halsi grant of Kākusthavarman (Ind. Ant., VI, p. 23) is dated,
is supposed by some scholars to have begun from this time.

Mayūrasarman is said in the Talgunda inscription (v. 20)
to have entered into the service of the Pallava kings and to
have pleased them by acts of bravery in battles. He seems to
have become a daṇḍanayaka (field-marshall) of the Pallava king
of Kānci. This view is further supported by verse 3 of the
same inscription in which the Kadamba family is called the
great lineage of leaders of armies (kadamba-senāḥ-bhrad-
anvayā), as well as by verse 22 in which Mayūrasarman is
said to have been favoured 2 and anointed Senāpati (general)
by Śādāmanā and the Mothers. 3 (śādāmanāḥ yam-abhiśiktā-

1 The word senāḥ means "leader of an army" (see Gitā, X, 21; Kāmanda,
II, 81). It is also a name of Kārtikeya, the divine general (Rāmāya, II, 37). It may
also be suggested that Mayūrasarman was famous as Senāni or Senāpati like Puyam-
mitra Šūga (Mālavikāgnimitra, Act V).

2 The word anuṣṭhātaka is generally taken to be in the active use to mean "medit-
tating on." In the passage in question the verb anāṣṭha is evidently used in the
passive to mean "to favour,"" to bless." That the word anuṣṭhātaka should be taken in
the passive to mean "favoured" is also proved by passages like mahāsena-māṇḍya-
uṣṭhāt-ahhiśikta in which the other word abhiśiktā is used in the passive. Note also
a similar passage of the Calkyya grants which says that the family "acquired an
 uninterrupted continuity of prosperity through the favour and protection of Kārtikeya." (Bomb.
Gov., I, 11, p. 337). The common phrase hauṣa-bhaṭṭāra-pada-ānuṣṭhātaka means
"favoured (or, blessed) by the feet of the (or, the noble) lord, the father."

3 The Calkyyas are described in their grants as "who have been nourished by
the seven Mothers who are the seven mothers of mankind." The Mothers are
personified energies of the principal deities. They are generally seven (sometimes eight
or sixteen) in number, e.g., Brahma (or Brahmā), Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vasupāli,
Varāhi (sometimes Nārāyaṇī), Indrāṇī (Aindrī or Māheśtrī), and Čalānḍrī, who
attend on Śiva (or Śakta) casually on his son Skanda (Māheśtrī or Śādāmanā). The list of
eight Mothers omits Māheśtrī but includes Čapūlī and Čarikā. They were probably
connected with the six Kṛṣṇikās (Pleiades) who are said to become mothers to Skanda.
vān=anudhyāya-senāpatiṃ mātrbhiḥ saha). In this connection it is interesting to note that in almost all the Kadamba records the family has been described as anudhyāya (favoured) by Śvāmi-Mahāśena (Sañānana) and the Mothers. It must also be noticed in this connection that the Sīra grant (Ep. Ind., XVI, p. 264) of Raviśvarman describes the king as Kadamba-mahāsenāpati-pratima.

A very late inscription found at Talgundu (Ep. Carn., VII, Sk. 178) says that Mayūraśarman (or Mayūravarman as there written) performed no less than eighteen horse-sacrifices. G. M. Moraes says, "It may safely be maintained that he really performed one, or perhaps a few more which thus formed a historical foundation for the exaggerated version of the later records." The suggestion is however untenable in view of the fact that Mayūraśarman is never credited with the performance of any sacrifice not only in his own Chandraṭi record but also in the inscriptions of his immediate successors. The Kadamba family is said to have been rendered pure by the bath of the Āsvamedha only after the time of Kṛṣṇavarman I who is the only Kadamba ruler known to have performed the horse-sacrifice.

The Chandraṭi inscription of Mayūraśarman (Mys. Arch. Surr., A. R., 1929, p. 50) records the construction of a tank by the king who belonged to the Kadamba family and conquered the Trekūṭa, Ābhīra, Pallava, Pāriyātrika, Šakasthāna, Sayindaka, Puṇāṭa and Mokari. This record

by nursing him who formed six months to suckle them simultaneously (cf. Skanda's names, Kṛtitkṛsa, Sañānana, Saṃmātṛa, etc.). See Bumb, Gaz., 1, ii, p. 337 and note.

1 The passage has been taken by some to mean that Mayūraśarman was anointed by Sañāanana after he meditated on the Sañāpati (i.e., Sañāanana?). This interpretation is certainly untenable. The verb in anudhyāya (after favouring), which has here its subject in Sañāanana and its object in yam, is the same as in anudhyāya (favoured) in passages like mahāśena-mātray-anudhyāya-ābhīrakā (favoured and anointed by Mahāśena and the Mothers) occurring in many Kadamba records.

2 Mahāsenāpati evidently signifies Skanda; cf. his names Mahāśena and Sañāpati.
is engraved on a boulder at the entrance of the Bhairavesvara temple at Chandravalli in the Chitaldrug district of Mysore, and is so obliterated that it is difficult to be definite as regards the reading of some of the names mentioned in connection with Mayurasarman’s conquests.

I. Trekuṭa appears to signify the Traikūṭakas who probably received their name from the Trikūṭa mountain in Aparānta, mentioned by Kālidāsa (Raghu, IV, verses 58-59). An inscription (Arch. Surv. W. Ind., p. 124f) of the Vākṣṭaka king Hariṣena (circa 500-520) refers to the kingdom of Trikūṭa. The copper-plate grants of the Traikūṭaka kings are all discovered in the neighbourhood of Surat and Kanheri (Bhandarkar, List, Nos. 1199, 1200, 1202, etc.). The Kanheri grant of the year 245 (A.D. 493-94) of the augmenting sovereignty of the Traikūṭakas refers to a monastery at Kṛṣṇagiri (Kanheri) itself. The Pardi inscription of Dahrasena is dated in year 207 (A.D. 455-56). The date of the Surat inscription of Vyāghrasena is the Traikūṭaka year 232 (A.D. 479-80). The evidence of the Traikūṭaka inscriptions thus shows that the family ruled in Southern Gujarat and the Koṅkan about the second half of the fifth century. It is possible that the Traikūṭakas ruled in the same place also about the time of Mayurasarman. The era used in the Traikūṭaka inscriptions is said to be the same as the Kalacuri or Cedi era which begins from A.D. 248-49 (Rapson, op. cit., pp. clx-xlxi; Bomb. Gaz., I. ii, p. 294.)

Traikūṭaka coins have been discovered not only in Southern Gujarat and the Koṅkan, but also in the Marāṭha country on the other side of the Ghatas. Bhagwanlal Indraji noticed a Traikūṭaka coin mentioning the Paramavaiṣṇava Mahārāja Rudragaṇa (sena), son of Mahārāja Indradatta (Bomb. Gaz., I. ii, p. 295 n.). The fact that the Traikūṭaka coin-types are very closely imitated from the Western Kṣatrapa coins shows that they were intended for
circulation in districts where the Western Kṣatrapa coins had become familiar to the people. "Local conservatism in regard to coin-types is a marked characteristic of Indian numismatics" (Rapson, loc. cit.). It is therefore clear that the country of the Traikūṭakas was originally a part of the dominions of the Śaka kings of Ujjain. According to the Ajanta inscription (Arch. Surv. W. Ind., IV, p. 138 ff.) the Trikūṭa country was conquered by the Vākāṭaka king Hariśena who appears to have ruled about the beginning of the sixth century A.D.

II. The earliest mention of the Ābhīras seems to be that in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya, I, 252 (Ind. Ant., XLVII, p. 36). There they are associated with the Śudras. According to a verse of the Mahābhārata, these two tribes lived near the place where the Sarasvatī lost itself into the sands (cf. IX, 37, 1: śudr-ābhīrān prati dveṣād = yatra naṣṭa sarasvatī). In another place however the epic places the Ābhīras in Aparānta (II, 51). The country of the Ābhīras has been mentioned as Abiria in the Periplus and as Abēría in the Geography of Ptolemy. According to the Greek geographer (Geog., VII, i, § 55), the land about the mouth of the Indus was generally called Indo-Scythia which consisted of three countries, viz., Patalānē (Indus delta), Abēría (Ābhīra country) and Surastrēnē (Kathiawar).

The Purāṇas (e.g., Vayu, 99, v. 359) mention the Ābhīras who ruled after the Andhras (Sātavāhanas). An Ābhīra chief named Rudrabhūti is known to have served as general of a Śaka king of Ujjain. The Gundā inscription of Śaka 103 (A.D. 181), belonging to the reign of Rudrāsimha I, records the digging of a tank by the Ābhīra general Rudrabhūti. It is also known that for a time the Śaka Satraps of Western India were shadowed by an Ābhīra king named Madhariputra Tāvarasena, son of Śivadatta. The Nasik inscription (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 88) of this king records the investment of 1,500 kārṣāpaṇās in the trade-guilds
of Govardhana (Nasik) for the purpose of providing medicines
to the monks dwelling in the monastery on the Trirâsmi
mountain.Coins of a Mahâkṣatrapa named Íśvaradatta
have been found in Kathiawar. These are silver coins
of the same style and type as the coins of the Saka Kṣatrapas.
Íśvaradatta dates his coins in the regnal year and not in the
Saka era like the Western Kṣatrapas. According to Bhag-
wanlal Indrají, Íśvaradatta was probably an Ábhíra connect-
ed with the dynasty of Íśvarasena of the Nasik inscription,
and it was Íśvaradatta who founded the Traikûṭaka era
of A.D. 248-49. Rapson however has no doubt that
Íśvaradatta reigned between A.D. 236 and 239, that is to
say, about ten years before the establishment of the
Traikûṭaka era. It is not possible to determine whether
the Ábhíras and the Traikûṭakas belonged to the same
dynasty or race. It may however be said that the two
groups of kings ruled over substantially the same territory
and had a similar formation of names, which facts possibly
suggest some sort of relation that may have existed between
the Ábhíras and the Traikûṭakas (Rapson, loc. cit.).

III. We have already discussed the question of Mayûra-
sîarmas quarrel with the Pallavas of Kâñcî. About the
beginning of the fourth century, the Pallavas appear to have
held sway not only over Andhrâpâtha and Sâtâhanirattâ
(Bellary district) in the north and the north-west, but
possibly also over the Kuntala country in the west.

IV. Pâriyátrika seems to signify the people dwelling on
the Pâriyâtra mountain, which may be identified with the
Aravelly Range and the Western Vindhyas. According to

1 The Nasik district "may have passed immediately into the power of these
Ábhíras, either during the reign or after the reign of Sri-Yajña, or it may have first been
held by the Čūru family of the Sâtakargha, the ' other Andhras ' or ' Andhra-bhîtyas '
('servants of the Andhras') of the Parâsas, who undoubtedly were in possession of the
neighbouring maritime province of Aparâsana." (Rapson, op. cit., p. cxixiv).

2 Bhandarkar places the rule of Mahâkṣatrapa Íśvaradatta between 188 and
190 A.D.
the Purānas (Vāyu, 45, 97-98; Markandeya, 57, 19-20), rivers like the Mahī, Carmanvati (Chambal), Barnāsā (Banās), Siprā and Vetravati have their origin in the Pariyātra or Pāripātra.

V. Sakasthāna is the country of the Šakas. It has been mentioned by the author of the Periplus (§ 38) as Scythia which was situated in the Lower Indus valley and was under the rule of Parthian chiefs, engaged in unceasing internecine strife. As has already been noticed, the Indian Šaka country is described in the Geography (VII, i, § 55) of Ptolemy as Indo-Scythia which included Patalêné, Abēria and Surastrêné. At the time of Mayūrašarma (middle of the fourth century A.D.), Sakasthāna seems to have signified the kingdom of the Šaka kings of Ujjain. The line of the Šakas of Ujjain was founded by Caštana (a contemporary of the Greek geographer Ptolemy) in the first half of the second century. The Šakas continued their rule in that locality up to the beginning of the fifth century when Chandragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty of Magadha conquered Mālwā from Šaka Rudrasima III (Rapson, Catalogue, p. cxli ff.; Allan, Catalogue, p. xxxviii f.).

VI. Sayindaka has been suggested to be the same as the country of the Sendrakas. The Sendrakas are known to be of Nāga origin and their country is generally identified with the Nāyarkhaṇḍa or Nāgaraṇkhaṇḍa division of the Banavāsī province, which possibly formed a part of the present Shimoga district of Mysore. The Sendraka-viṣaya is known to have been included in the dominions of the Kadamba king Kṛṣṇavarman II. The Bennur grant (Ep. Carn., V, p. 594) of Kṛṣṇavarman II records the gift of a village called Palmāṇḍi which was in the Sendraka-viṣaya. A Sendraka chief named Bhāmusakti seems to have been a feudatory of the Kadamba king Harivarman (see the Halsi grant of the eighth year of Harivarman's reign; Ind. Ant., VI, p. 31). After the fall of the Kadambas the Sendrakas transferred their allegiance to the Calukyas of Bāḍāmi, who succeeded
the Kadambas in the rule of the Kuntala region. A record of Pulakesin I (Ind. Ant., VII, p. 211 ff.), who was the first great emperor of the Calukya dynasty, mentions the Sendraka rāja Rundranila Goṇḍa, his son Sivāra and grandson Sāmiyāra who ruled the Kuhunḍi-viṣaya (Belgaum district) with its headquarters at Alaktaka-nagari. The Chiplun grant (Ep. Ind., III, p. 50 ff.) says that the Sendraka prince Śrī-vallabha Senānanda-rāja was the maternal uncle of Pulakesin II. An inscription (J.B.B.R.A.S., XVI, pp. 228-29) of the tenth year of Vikramāditya I mentions the Sendraka chief Devāsakti who appears to have been his feudatory. According to the evidence of the Balagami record (Ind. Ant., XIX, p. 142; Ep. Carn., VIII, Sk. 154), the Sendraka Mahārāja Pogilli, a feudatory of Calukya Vinayāditya I, ruled over the Nāyarkhorṇa division which had a village called Jedugūr, identified by Fleet with Jedda in the Sorab taluka of the Shimoga district. The crest of the family of Pogilli was the elephant (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 192). In connection with a certain Satyāśraya (Pulakesin II?) a Lakshmesvar inscription mentions the Sendra (i.e., Sendraka) king Durgāsakti, son of Kumāraśakti and grandson of Vijayaśakti.

VII. Pūṇāṭa has been taken to be the same as modern Punnāḍu in the southern part of Mysore. Ptolemy seems to have mentioned it (Geog., VII, i, § 86) as Pounnata where beryls were found. The country or district of Punnāṭa was adorned by the rivers Kāveri and Kapiri. The capital of this ancient kingdom was Kūrtipura (Kittūr) on the Kapiri (Kabban) river in the Heggaḍedevanakōṭe taluka. The Komāralingam and Māmballī plates (Ind. Ant., XII, p. 13; Mys. Arch. Surv., A.R., 1917, pp. 40-41) belonging to early

1 Records like the Bagunra (Nonsari district) grant (Ind. Ant., XVIII, pp. 506-67) of the Sendraka prince Pythivavallabha-Nikumbhallasakti, son of Adityaśakti and grandson of Bhānuśakti, dated in the year 400 (Cedi era? = 653 A.D.), show that the Sendrakas were granted jāgir in Southern Gujarāt after the country was conquered by the Calukyas. Alakhtakanagari = Lattalur of Bājrakīṭa records ?
Punnāṭa rulers speak of the kings named Viṣṇudāsa, Rāṣṭravarman, Nāgadatta, Bhujaga (son-in-law of Gāṅga Mādhava-Simhavarman?), Skandavarman and Ravidatta, who belonged to the Tāmrakāśyapa kula. According to the Gāṅga records, Gāṅga Avinīta, father of Durvinīta, married the daughter of Skandavarman, king of Punnāṭa. Gāṅga Durvinīta is known to have had a very long reign which covered more than forty years and, as we shall see, the Gāṅga king probably helped his daughter’s son, Cälukya Vikramāditya I, in securing the throne of Bādāmi about 654 A.D. The Punnāṭa king Skandavarman, Durvinīta’s mother’s father, must therefore have reigned in the second half of the sixth century. Some of the Gāṅga records assert that the Punnāṭa country formed a part of Durvinīta’s kingdom. The country may have passed to Durvinīta as the heir of his maternal grandfather.¹

VIII. Mokari has been taken to signify the Maukhari of Eastern and Northern India. Inscriptions of the Maukhari kings have been discovered in the Jaumpur and Bara-Banki districts of U. P, and in the Gaya district of Bihar (Bhandarkar, op. cit., Nos. 10, 1601-1605; Corp. Ins. Ind., III, Intro. p. 14). The Haraha inscription (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 115) of Maukhari Īśānavarman is dated in Vikrama 611 (A.D. 544). About the sixth century a line of the Maukhari is known to have established themselves in the Kanauj region. Maukhari Grahavarman of this line married the sister of the illustrious Harṣavardhana (A.D. 606-647) of the Puṣyabhūti family of Thāneswar. The Chandravalli record however seems to refer to the Maukhari of Rajputana. Three inscribed yūpas (Kṛta year 205 = A.D. 288) of a feudatory Maukhari family have been found at Baḍvā in the Kotah state (Ep. Ind., XXIII, p. 42 ff.).

¹ Dr. R. A. Salašee has written a paper on the kingdom of Punnāṭa in Ind. Cult., III (October, 1936), p. 301 ff. His chronology is however based on the theories that Mayūravarman ruled about the middle of the third century, and that Gāṅga Durvinīta reigned in the last quarter of the fifth century, which I consider to be inadmissible. Dobrovolny's chronology is more reasonable (Anc. Hist. Dec., pp. 107-9).
It is interesting in this connection to note that the tentative reading of the Chandravalli record does not speak of the Bānas who are, according to the evidence of the Talgunda record of Sāntivarman, known to have been harassed by Mayūrasarman. The Bānas were a very ancient ruling family in the Chittoor and North Arcot districts. According to Hultzsch (S. Ind. Ins., III, p. 89) the capital of the Bāna dynasty seems to have been Tiruvallam which had the other name Vānapuram and belonged to the district of Perumbānappādi (the country of the Great Bāna). Tiruvallam is 40 miles west by north of Conjeevaram. On the evidence of the Penukonda Plates (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 331), it may be suggested that about the middle of the fifth century A.D., the Pallava kings Simbavarman and Skandavarman installed the Ganga feudatories Ayyavarman and his son Mādhaya-Simbavarman for the purpose of crushing the Bānas who had possibly become unruly. The early history of the Bānas is wrapped up in obscurity. The earliest rulers of the family, whose time is known, are Vikramāditya-Bali-Indra who was a vassal of Calukya Vijayāditya (A.D. 696-733), and Vikramāditya who governed the country, "West of the Telugu Road," as a vassal of Pallava Nandivarman II (A.D. 717-79). See Hultzsch, Ep. Ind., XVII, p. 3 ff., Sewell, List, p. 328.

According to Dr. M. H. Krishna (Mys. Arch. Surv., A.R., 1929, p. 56), the Chandravalli inscription is to be assigned to circa 258 A.D. He suggests that the rise of Mayūra is to be placed between A.D. 250 and 260. All his arguments are however based on an untenable view regarding the date of Pallava Sivaskandavarman whom he places about the end of the first half of the third century A.D. It appears that Dr. Krishna too is inclined to place Mayūrasarman only a little later than Sivaskandavarman. Pallava Sivaskandavarman, as I have already shown, ruled in the first quarter of the fourth century. Mayūrasarman,
the language of whose Chandravalli record is a little more developed than that of the grants of Sivaskandavarman, should therefore be placed not earlier than the first quarter of the fourth century A.D.

The Malavalli inscription (Ep. Carn., VII, Sk. 264) possibly also belongs to king Mayūrasarman. Here however the issuer of the grant is simply said to have been kadam-bānām rājā (king of the Kadambas) and vaijayanti-dhamma-mahārājādhiraṇā (Dharma-Mahārājādhiraṇā of Vaijayanti or Banavasi); but the name of the king is not mentioned. Nevertheless, as the Prakrit language of the record is later than that of the grants of Sivaskandavarman, the issuer of the Malavalli grant must have been either Mayūrasarman himself or his immediate successor.

The grant was executed in the fourth year of the king's reign, on the second lunar day of the first fortnight of autumn, under the first asterism Rohini. The grant was in the form of a Bahma-diṣṭa (Brahma-deya) which was meant for the enjoyment (deva-bhoga) of the god Malapaḍideva. It consisted of a number of villages which are said to have been previously granted by king Mānavyagotra Hāritisṛuta Śiva-

1 Titles like Mahārājādhiraṇā were derived from Rājādhiraṇā, etc., of the Scytho-Kuśānas. They were first used in Northern India by the Guptas who were the political successors of the Kuśānas in the sovereignty of Aryavarta. In Southern India, the title Dharma-Mahārājādhiraṇā first appears in the Hirahadagalli grant of Pallava Sivaskandavarman. No other early Pallava king is known to have used the title. Sivaskandavarman himself has been called Jang-mahārājā in the Mayilavelu grant. The early Gaṅga kings call themselves Dharma-Mahārājā. Since no early Kadamba king is known to have been called Dharma-Mahārājādhiraṇā, may it be supposed that this title of the Kadamba king of the Malavalli record was an imitation of the title of Pallava Sivaskandavarman who, as we have suggested, was possibly suzerain of the Kuntala region in the first quarter of the fourth century? May it be further suggested that the name of Mānavyagotra Hāritisṛuta Vaijayanti-pati Sivaskandavarman who seems to have been the immediate predecessor of Mayūrasarman was after that of Pallava Sivaskandavarman, just like the name of the Gaṅga king Mādhava-Sūphavarman was imitated from that of his father's overlord, king Sūphavarman (A.D. 480-495) of Kāścī?
skandavarman, lord of Vaijyanti. The Brahmadeya was granted for a second time, with all the purihaaras including abhaṭa-pracēsa, to a Brāhmaṇa named Kauśikīputra Nāgadatta of the Komūnya (Kauṭūṃhya) gotra, who is said to have been an ornament of the Konḍamāna-kula. The necessity of granting for a second time is said to have been the fact that the ownership of the estate was abandoned. The villages granted were Sōmaṭṭi, Koṅginagara, Marīyasā, Karpēndūla, Para-Muceṇḍi, Kunda-Muceṇḍi, Kappennalā, Kunda-Tapuka, Velāki, Vegūra, Koṇa-Tapuka, Ekkaṭṭhāhāra and Sahalā. The king’s oral order seems to have been written down by Viśvakarman and engraved on the stone-column by Nāgadatta who is possibly not the same as the donee.

The grant begins with an adoration to Malapalideva and ends with the maṅgala: jayati lokanātha[h] nandaṇstu go-brāhmaṇa[h] : siddhir=astu ; śrīr=astu. This Sanskrit maṅgala at the end of a Prakrit grant reminds us of a similar maṅgala at the end of the Hiraḥadagallī Prakrit grant of Śivaskandavarman. Many of the Sanskrit grants of Mayūraṣarman’s successors also end with similar maṅgalas.

The above inscription is engraved on a pillar in front of the Kalleśavara temple at Malavalli in the Shikarpur taluka as a continuation of, as has already been noticed, an inscription dated in the first year of Mānasyagotra Hāritiputra Vinhukaṭṭa Cūṭukulānanda Śatākarni, king of Vijā-

---

1 It has been suggested (e.g., in Lādors, Lect. No. 1090; Journ. Ind. Hist., XII, p. 301) that Śivaskanda-varman was the name of the Kadamba king who issued the Malavalli grant. The composition of the record however clearly shows that the theory is untenable: cf. saujaganti-dharma-mahārājaḥdiṛaṇa patikuta-sanjñhayinacandrave kadambaraṇaṇa rāja svaḥkṣaḍavasrayā mānavagottrena hāritiputtena saujaganti-putrānai paroṣaddat=eti, etc. It must be noticed that the word [kadamberāṇaṇa] rāja with all its epithets preceding it is in the first case-ending, while svaḥkṣaḍa
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yanti (Banavasi). This grant also begins with an adoration to the god Malapalideva for whose enjoyment a Devabhoga was granted in the king’s first regnal year on the first lunar day of the second fortnight of summer. The Devabhoga was in the form of a Bahmadijja (Brahmadeya) of the grāmahāra (group of villages?) of Sahalāṭavī which was granted to Takiṇḍiputra Kōṇḍamāna who has been called Ḥāritīputra and is said to have belonged to the Kauṇḍinya gotra, with all the parihāras like abhatapraśa and others.

It must be noticed that the Malavallī record of the Kādamba king also mentions Sahalā (cf. the grāmahāra of Sahalāṭavī of the present grant) and there the donee is one who belonged to the family of this Kōṇḍamāna (kōṇḍamanakula-tīlaka). Since the linguistic and palaeographical standards of the two Malavalli records agree in placing them very near each other in time, I think it possible that the Kōṇḍamānakula-tīlaka Kauṣīkīputra Nāgadatta of the Kauṇḍinya gotra (donee of the Kādamba grant) was the son of Takiṇḍiputra-Hāritīputra Kōṇḍamāna of the Kauṇḍinya gotra (donee of the Cuṭu Śātakarnī grant). We should however notice the facts that in the Kādamba record the twelve villages including Sahalā are said to have been previously granted by a Vaijayanti-pati named Śivaskandavarman and that the ownership of the estate is said to have been abandoned. It may be supposed that Sahalā was granted by Vinhukadda Cuṭukulānanda Śātakarnī, while the eleven other villages were granted by Śivaskandavarman who was possibly the former’s immediate successor. It is however possible to suggest that the grāmahāra of Sahalāṭavī consisted of the twelve villages mentioned. In the terminology of later inscriptions it would be like “the Sahalā Twelve” or “the Sahalā-mahāgrāma.” The cause of abandoning the

1 See, e.g., Nāgudāraya, vol. V, verse 134, in which Nala, son of Virasena, has been described as virasena-gaṇa-gupa.
ownership of the estate by the heir of Kouḍamana seems to have been the political troubles caused by the rise of Mayūrasarman. The case appears to be the same as that suggested in connection with Śivaśarman who received the village of Polamuru from Mādhavavarman I Viṣṇukundin, and with his son Rudraśarman who fled to Asanapura during the Calukya invasions and received back his father's agrahāra from Jayasimha I Eastern Calukya when the latter was established in the Guddavādi viśaya (see above, p. 107 ff.).

The order of king Viñhukadja Cuṭikulānanda Sātakarni for the execution of the Malavalli grant is said to have been given to a Rajjuka whose name was possibly Mahābhava. Rajjuka (from raiju) has been taken to be the same as a class of officials described by Megasthenes (McCrindle, Ancient India, pp. 53-54). These officials are said to have measured the land, collected taxes, superintended rivers and the occupations connected with land, enjoyed the power of rewarding and punishing, inspected sluices, constructed roads and carried out other works of public utility. Some of these have been described as the functions of the Rajjuka or Rajju-gāhaka-amacca in the Kurudhamma-Jātaka. From the inscriptions of Aśoka we know that the Rājukas (i.e., Rajjukas) were appointed over many hundred thousands of men and were placed in direct charge of the jānapada jana; they therefore seem to have been the highest district officers (see Bhandarkar, Aśoka, 2nd ed., pp. 59-60). The Rajjukas were possibly employed in this region when Kuntala formed a part of the Maurya empire. The existence of such an official in South-Western Deccan about the beginning of the fourth century shows that the official machinery of the Maurya age was still functioning in Southern India (see Raychaudhuri, op. cit., p. 321).
KAŚGAVARMAN, BHAGĪRATHA AND RAGHU

According to the Talgunda inscription, Mayūraśarman was succeeded by his son Kaṅgavarman. In the Satara treasure trove four Kadamba coins have been found to bear the legend skandha which Moraes takes to be a mistake for kānga (op. cit., p. 382). The suggestion however is doubtful. Another writer suggests (see Journ. Ind. Hist., XII, p. 361) that Skanda was the real name of the son of Mayūraśarman and that he was the same as Sivaskandavarman of the Malavalli record. We have already shown (above, pp. 166-67) that the identification of the names Sivaskanda and Skanda is not quite happy. It has also been proved that Sivaskandavarman of the Malavalli record did not belong to the Kadamba family, but was possibly a scion of the Cutu Sātakarnī dynasty of Kuntala.

The same Talgunda inscription says that Kaṅgavarman was succeeded on the Kadamba throne by his son Bhagīratha. The coins in the cabinet of the Indian Historical Research Institute (St. Xavier’s College, Bombay) with the representation of lions and the word śrī and with the legend bhāgi in Hale-Kannada characters have been taken to be the issues of this king (Kadambakula, p. 382). But the Kadamba coins (even if the Early Kadambas issued coins) have not yet been studied, and we are not definite if these coins can be assigned to the Kadambas.

Rev. Heras has pointed out (J.B.O.R.S., XII, p. 458 ff.) that the story of Kālidāsa being sent as an embassy of Vikramāditya (possibly Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty) to the court of the king of Kuntala is referred to in
the Śṛigāraprakāśa of Bhoja and possibly also in the Aucityacakacaracā of Kṣemendra (not of Hemacandra; see Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, p. 200). He suggests that this Kuntala king was Bhagiratha and that Kālidāsa was sent in order to contract a matrimonial alliance that has been referred to in a passage of the Tālgunda inscription which says that Kākusthavarman, son of Bhagiratha, married his daughters in the families of the Guptas and other kings. The theory of Rev. Heras however seems to me to be based on a tissue of assumptions. As has already been pointed out by N. Lakshminarayana Rao (Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, p. 199), in the passage of the Tālgunda record, king Kākusthavarman, and not his father Bhagiratha, has been credited with the family alliance. We have already suggested that Kākusthavarman appears to have ruled in the first half of the fifth century A.D. He was therefore contemporary of the Gupta king Kumāragupta I (circa 415-455 A.D.), the successor of Candragupta II (circa 375-415 A.D.). It is possible that a son or a grandson of any of these Guptas kings was the son-in-law of Kadamba Kākusthavarman.¹

¹ Dr. S. K. Aiyangar (The Vākāṭakas and their place in Indian History, p. 41 ff.) and apparently following him, Mr. N. Lakshminarayana Rao (Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, p. 200) think that the king of Kuntala to whom Candragupta II is supposed to have sent an embassy was a king of the Vākāṭaka dynasty. It is pointed out that the Bhāratavacana (An Bhand. Or. Rev. Inst., V, p. 46) mentions the author of the well known Prakrit poem Setuvandana as a Kuntalasa, while Bapa in the Haracarita (Intro., verse 14) tells us that the poem was composed by Pravarasena, who has been identified with Pravarasena II of the Vākāṭaka dynasty. According to them, the Vākāṭakas were also known as "Lords of Kuntala." The theory is however untenable in view of the fact that the country of Kuntala has been described as a separate political unit in the records of the Vākāṭakas themselves. According to the Bālaghat plates (Rā. Ind., IX, p. 260 ff.), Narendrakesa, son of Pravarasena II, was married to Aśhika-Bhaṭṭākārī who was the daughter of the lord of Kuntala. The Ajanta inscription (Arch. Surv. W. Ind., IV, p. 188 ff.) says that the Vākāṭaka king Jyathivisnus, father (?) grandfather) of Pravarasena II, conquered the lord of Kuntala. That the Kuntala country did not form a part of the Vākāṭaka dominions is also proved by the fact that according to the same inscription, Hariṣena who was the last great king of the Vākāṭaka dynasty claims to have conquered Kuntala once again. Of course, the Kadambas of Kuntala may, for some time, have
Bhagiratha was succeeded by his son, king Raghu. Nothing important is known about his reign except the fact that his younger brother Kākusthavarman was a Yuvarajā during his reign and was possibly in charge of the district round Pālāśikā (modern Halsi).

- acknowledged the suzerainty of the Vākāṭakas; but that would hardly justify Pravarasena II being called kundala. Moreover, the Puraṇas (e.g., Viṣṇu, 90, 365-66) describe the Vākāṭakas as rādīśekha (belonging to Vindśā), and the Vākāṭaka grants show that the Vākāṭakas ruled from the Vidarbha region in northern Deccan (see Bhandarkar, Hist. [Nos. 1703-13]).

The mention of a Vākāṭaka king as "Lord of Kuntala" in the Bhāratacarita only shows that its author lived in or referred to a period when the name Kuntala extended over the greater part of Western and Southern India, e.g., in the age of the Calukyas who have been described as Kuntaler, "Lords of Kuntala," in the Kaliṅgaśatapatī (see above, p. 215, note 3). The Early Calukyas may be supposed to have been political successors of the Vākāṭakas in the Deccan.
VI

KAKUSTHAVARMAN AND SANTIVARMAN

Raghu was succeeded by his younger brother Kākusthavarmān who was possibly ruling the Paḷāśikā division of the Kadamba kingdom as a governor during his elder brother's reign. Only one inscription of Kākusthavarmān has so far been discovered.

The grant of Kākusthavarmān (Ind. Ant., VI, p. 23) begins with the word namah, and a verse which says, "Victorious is the holy Jinendra who abounds in good qualities and is renowned as being extremely compassionate, and the banner of whose tenderness which comforts the three worlds is lifted up on high." Some of the grants of Mrgeśavarmān and Rāvivarman begin with the same verse.

The grant was issued from Paḷāśikā (modern Halsi on the road to Nandigarh in the Bidi taluka of the Belgaum district) in the eighth year of Kākusthavarmān, the Yuvarāja of the Kadambas, who claimed to have enjoyed the general good wish of the subjects. We have already seen that the date of Kākusthavarmān's grant is supposed to "be the eightieth year from the patta-bandha of his ancestor Mayūraśarman, which is mentioned in the Talgunda inscription." But since there is no proof that the Kadambas had any era like that, it may not be unreasonable that the date should be referred to the era of the Gupta with whom Kākusthā was maternally related.

1 The correct form of the name would be Kākutthavarmān (literally, one whose shield, i.e., protector, is Kākuttha, i.e., Rāmacandra). In the Kadamba grants however the name of the king is invariably spelt Kākusthavarmān.

2 Jaya tāhagāna jinendra guṇarandraḥ prathita-parama-kāraṇikāḥ, Tālaśākāri dayā-patāḥ - śukritā yasas.
By this grant a field called Badovara-kṣetra in the village called Kheta-graṇa, which belonged to the holy Arhats who are said to be the refuge of the created beings and the saviours of the three worlds, was given to the general Śrutakirti as a reward for saving the prince. It is said that the confiscators of the field, belonging to the king’s own family or of any other dynasty, would be guilty of the paśca-mahāpātaka. According to the Jains, the five great sins are destruction of life, lying, stealing, unchastity and immoderate desire. The grant ends with the usual imprecatory verses and the adoration: namo namo; āsabhāya namah. Āsabha is the first Arhat and the first of the twenty-four Jain tīrthaṅkaras (sanctified teachers) of the present age.

As we have already seen, the Talgunda inscription says that king Kākusthavarman “by means of his rays which were his daughters caused to expand the splendid lotus-groups which were the royal families of the Guptas and others.” In this connection it is interesting to note that, in the Balaghat plates (Ep. Ind., IX, p. 270 f.), the Vākāṭaka king Prthivisena II is said to have been the son of Narendrasena by the Mahādevi Ajjhitabhaṭṭārikā who was the daughter of the lord of Kuntala. The Vākāṭaka prince Narendrasena was grandson of Prabhavatigupta, daughter of Candragupta II. Dubreuil thinks (Anc. Hist. Dec., p. 100) that Vākāṭaka Narendrasena, great-grandson of Candragupta II, was the son-in-law of Kākusthavarman and that the Talgunda record refers to this indirect relation of the Kadambas with the Guptas. If this suggestion is to be believed Ajjhitabhaṭṭārikā was a daughter of Kākusthavarman. It is however also possible that another daughter of Kākustha was actually given in marriage to a Gupta prince of Pāṭaliputra, who was possibly a son or grandson of Candragupta II or Kumāragupta I.

There is a lithic record in box-headed characters (Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R. 1911, pp. 33, 35) on the right jamb
of the doorway of the Pranaveśvara temple at Talgunda, which speaks of a certain Kākustha of the Bhaṭārī dynasty and of his mother Lākṣmī who is said to have been born in the Kadamba family. Since Kākusthavarman is known to have had several daughters and since grandsons are sometimes seen to bear the names of the maternal grand-fathers (cf. E. Calukya names Rājarāja and Rājenāra), it is possible that Lākṣmī, the mother of the Bhaṭārī chief Kākustha, was another daughter of the Kadamba king Kākusthavarman. Thus Kākusthavarman appears to have been matrimonially related to the Guptas, Vākātakas and the Bhaṭāris.

The son of Kākusthavarman was king Sāntivarman. The famous Talgunda inscription was engraved at the time of this ruler. The Talgunda inscription begins with an adoration to Śiva and a verse eulogising the god. It records the construction of a tank in the premises of a siddhālaya (temple) of lord Bhava (i.e., Śiva) by Kākusthavarman. It is also said that the siddhālaya was formerly abhyarcita (worshipped at) by Sātakarni (possibly a king of the Cuțu family) and others. The record ends with the following maṅgala: 

\[ \text{nandatu sarva-samant-ågato = 'yam = adhivasah; svasti praja-bhyaḥ.} \]

It is sometimes supposed that the Talgunda record was engraved by Sāntivarman when he was a governor of Stbānakundūra (Talgunda) during the reign of his father. But passages like 

\[ \text{gṛheśu yasya lakṣmy-āṅgana dhirimati sucirām ca reto, yam...sāmanta-cūḍā-moṇayah prānemuh, etc., show that king Kākusthavarman was dead at the} \]

---

1 The epithet bhaṭārī nagja-tilaka, applied to the chief named Kākustha, may also suggest that the name of the chief's father was Bhaṭārī. See above, p. 260 and note. The record speaks of one Pañapati devoted to lord Pañapati, i.e., Śiva. Kākustha is said to have been chief among the ten Maṇḍalikas and had the control of Śalā. He is also said to have pleased his master, the Śeśa. The record also refers to the residence of Stbānakurjapura-tirtha which may be the same as Stbānakundūra or Talgunda. The record has been assigned palaeographically to about the middle of the fifth century.

time when the Talgunda inscription was engraved. The record moreover speaks of the rule (śāsana) of king (nrpati) Sāntivarman who has been described as paṭṭa-traya-ārpana-virājita-cāru-mūrti which means to say that the king wore three diadems or crowns (paṭṭa; see Raghu, XVIII, v. 44), that is to say, had three kingdoms in his possession. It is not clear whether he received the three paṭṭas from his father or from a Pallava over-lord (Pallavendra Sāntivara of the Hebbata grant?) like his ancestor Mayūrasarman.

It is interesting in this connection to note that the Birur grant (Ep. Carn., VI, p. 91) records the gift of a village in the Sindhuthayā-rāstra, made by the Kadamba Dharma-Mahārāja Viṣṇuvarman with the permission of (anuṣaṇa) his jyeṣṭhapitā Śāntivarman-dharmamahārāja who has been described as vaijayanti-tilaka-samagra-karna-tābhūcara-bharat. If this Śāntivarman is to be identified with the son of Kākusthavarman, one of the latter’s three paṭṭas seems to refer to the kingdom of his feudatory Viṣṇuvarman. Another paṭṭa possibly refers to the Vaijayanti (Bananvasi) division of the Karnāta country, which appears to have been under the direct rule of Śāntivarman.

If the above identification is to be accepted (see infra), we see that the Kadamba king Kṛṣṇavarman I (father of Viṣṇuvarman) who celebrated the Aśvamedha, and was a very powerful ruler and possibly had the whole of Karnāta (consisting of three kingdoms?) under him, was a son of Kākusthavarman and a younger brother of Śāntivarman who was the jyeṣṭha-pitā¹ (father’s elder brother) of Viṣṇuvarman. We also see that Kṛṣṇavarman I who was presumably dead when his son

¹ The word jyeṣṭha-pitā is synonymous with jyeṣṭha-tate and pūrṇa-jyeṣṭha, "a father’s eldest brother." See the Mira grant of Jayasimha II (Ind. Ant., VIII, p. 172, l. 4), and Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 30 n.
Viṣṇuvarman was Dharma-Mahārāja under his jyeṣṭha-pīṭa ruled before his elder brother Śaṅtivarman. It will be seen below that the great Kṛṣṇavarma was defeated and probably killed in a battle with the Pallavas. May this fact suggest that, after the death of Kṛṣṇavarma who usurped the throne, the rightful heir of Kākusthavarma got the possession of the entire Karnāṭaka country with the help of the Pallavas who defeated the usurper? 1 It is also to be noted that according to the Hebbata grant Viṣṇuvarman himself is also known to have been anointed by a Pallava king.

An inscription in front of the Durgi temple at Jambehalli in the Sorab taluka (Ep. Carn., VIII, Sb. 44) has been attributed by Moraes to the Kadamba king Śaṅtivarman, son of Kākusthavarma. This record was written by Kannaya, the minister for peace and war. According to it, when Śaṅtivarman-arasa was ruling the [Banavasi] Twelve Thousand, Kannaya built two temples and made a tank; having come and seen them, the king granted a mattal of riceoland to the priest of the temples. The inscription however is in the Kannada language and bears the date Saka 894 (A.D. 972). There is therefore no reason to believe that it belongs to the Kadamba king Śaṅtivarman who ruled about the middle of the fifth century. Śaṅtivarman-arasa of the Jambehalli record obviously belonged to a vice-regal family that ruled Banavasi under the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas. 2 The fact that the date of the inscription falls about the decline of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa power in A.D. 973, possibly explains why the name of the overlord is not mentioned in the record.

1 It may be also suggested that Kākusthā was a feudatory of Pallava Śaṅtivarman and named his son after his overlord. The circumstance Kṛṣṇavarman became independent. He was succeeded by his elder brother, but the Pallavas supported his son. These suggestions are however only speculative.

2 Was he identical with Śaṅtivarman of the Raita family of Saundatti, who ruled in Northern Kuntala in 960?
Sāntivarman appears to have been succeeded by his son Mrgeśavarman whose last known date is year eight of his reign. The king was matrimoniaally connected with the Kekayas whose dominions appear to have comprised the present Chitaldurg district in north-eastern Mysore. An inscription (Mys. Arch. Rep., 1911, pp. 33, 35) on the left jamb of the doorway of the Prapaveśvara temple at Talgunda describes queen Prabhāvatī, dear wife of Mrgeśavarman-Dharmamahārāja and mother of Ravivarman-Dharmamahārāja, as kaikeya-mahākula-prasūtā. The inscription obviously recorded a grant made by Prabhāvatī; but only the beginning of the record survives.

The following inscriptions of Mrgeśavarman’s time have been discovered: —

I. The Banavasi grant (Ind. Ant., VII, pp. 35-36) begins with practically the same verse ¹ as is found at the end of the Devagiri plates of Yuvarāja Devavarman, son of Kṛṣṇavarman I. It is in adoration of the Arhat, the lord of the three worlds.

The grant was issued under the asterism Uttarabhādra-pada on the tenth lunar day of the Bauhula (sic: Sukla)-pakṣa of Karttika in Mrgeśavarman’s third regnal year which was a Pauṣa samvatsara, when the king was at Vaijayanāti. We have already tried to show that the date corresponds to October 24, A.D. 437, and to October 27, A.D. 472, of which the latter appears to be the actual date of Mrgeśavarman’s grant.

In this record Mrgeśavarman is called the son of Sāntivarman and born in the family of Kākustha. Another

¹ Joyati = arhaṃ = trilokānāḥ sarve-bhūte-hīte ratnāḥ.
Rāg-ādy-arihāra = ‘nantu = ‘nantu-sūna  śro = śivarcāḥ.
important point is that it describes the Kadambas not only as Mānavya-sagotra but also as Āṅgirasa which appears to show that the family actually belonged to the Āṅgirasa gotra.

The grant records the gift of some black-soil lands (kṛṣṇabhūmi-kṣetra), forty nirvartanas by the royal measure, in the village called Brhat-Paralūra to the divine supreme Arhat whose feet are rubbed by the tiara of the lord of gods, for the purpose of the glory of sweeping out the temple, anointing the idol with ghee, performing worship and repairing anything that may be broken (sammārjan-opalepan-ābhyaarcana-bhagnasamskāra-mahima). These forty nirvartanas of land lay within the western boundary of the village. A field, four nirvartanas by the ordinary measure (kṣetra-nirvartana), was also granted along with one nirvartana outside the Caityālaya for the purpose of decorating the idol with flowers, and one nirvartana that was the measure of the aṅgana (court-yard) of the devakula.

The grant quotes the usual imprecatory verses and refers to the unresumable character of lands that have been given with libations of water, enjoyed by three generations and have been preserved by good people.

The paṭṭikā (grant) is said to have been written by Dāmakirti-Bhojaka.

II. Another Banavasi grant (Ind. Ant., VII, pp. 37-38) of śri-cijaya-śiva-Mṛgesavarman was issued on the full-moon day of the eighth fortnight of Varsā (rainy season) in the fourth year of the king who was residing at Vaijayanti. The form of dating refers to a primitive division of the year into three seasons of eight fortnights each. Traces of this primitive division are to be found in the ancient

1 K. B. Pachak on the strength of this form of the name identified (Ind. Ant., XIV, p. 15), Mṛgesavarman with Mahārāja Sivakumāra who is mentioned by Rāja-chandra in his introductory remarks on the Prākṛtusāra, as having for his preceptor the well-known dyāra Padmanandi-Kuḍjakunda. The identification is fantastic.
Indian custom of performing *cāturmāṣya* (four-monthly) sacrifices at the beginning of each season on the full-moon days of the months of Phālguna, Āśādha and Kārttika. In connection with the above date of Mrgeśavarman's record it is interesting to note that an inscription of his son Ravivarman is dated on the tenth lunar day of the sixth fortnight of Hemanta (winter). It is also to be noted that both of these grants record some gifts made in favour of Jain ascetics. It is therefore almost certain that the ancient form of dating in these cases was due to Jain influence. To the ascetics of ancient times the year seems to have been divided into three seasons, *viz.* *grīma*, *varṣā* and *hemanta*, each of which was subdivided into eight fortnights.

In this record the *vamsās* of the king's father and mother are said to have been pure. Mrgeśa himself is described as learned in various śāstras and skilled in exercises like riding. He is also said to have fought in many battles and acquired much wealth by the power of his arms. He was a giver of cows, lands, gold, clothes, food and many other things.

By this grant, *śrī-viśaya-śiva*-Mrgeśavarman, the Dharma-mahārāja of the Kadambas, made a gift of the village called Kālavanāga. The village was divided into three equal portions, the first of which was given to the holy Arhat and great Jinendra residing in the Purva-mahac-chālā; the second portion was granted for the enjoyment of a *samgha* (sect) of the Svetapāta (*i.e.*, Svetambara Jain) Mahāśraṇaṇaś, and the third for the enjoyment of a *samgha* of the Nirgrantha (*i.e.*, Digambara Jain) Mahāśraṇaṇaś. Future kings are requested to protect the grant according to the *devabhoga-sāmaya* in order to provide money for *deva-bhāga*, *dhānya*, *deva-pūjā*, *vali*, *caru*, *deva-karma-kara* and *bhāguna-kriyā-pravartana*. The record ends with the usual verses.

1 See Bhandarkar's List, No. 2085 and note.
The charter was written by a senapati named Naravara. The seal attached to the plates is indistinct, but seems to bear the device of the sitting or standing figure of a god or man. According to Fleet, the figure may be meant for a Jinendra. This suggestion however cannot be accepted until it is definitely proved that Mrgeśavarman was a Jain.

III. In the Hire-Sakuna grant (Ep. Corn., VIII, p. 12) the king has been called Mṛgeśavaravarman and the son of Kākustha’s dear son. It was issued on the full-moon day of Vaiśakha in the eighth regnal year of the king when he was residing at Vaijayanti.

The grant records the gift of a village called Kadalakālāni and some vastuka-ksetra (house-site) along with Perddalā to a Brāhmaṇa named Kratusomaśarman who seems to have belonged to the Gautama gotra. In connection with the boundary of the lands are mentioned Virajā which seems to have been a river, a field called Karvveli, a river called Veṇṇa, Palavakkeni, Kadaīkūra, Kādakorasa and a confluence of rivers (Virajā and Veṇṇa ?). The bhujakas or free-holders of the locality were informed of the king’s grant (desa-grāma-grāmabhojakānām śṛcita- śrācanam kṛtvā). The village was granted all the pahīrās and was made a-bhāṭa-pravesā. The record ends with the usual verses.

The legend on the seal attached to the Hire-Sakuna plates reads śri-mṛgeśavarvarmanah.

IV. The adoration with which the Halsi grant (Ind. Ant., VI, p. 24) of Mṛgeśavarman’s eighth regnal year begins is the same as that at the beginning of Kākusthavarman’s grant. In this record the king has been called a dharma-vijaya and has been described as the dear eldest son of Sāntivaravarman and the grandson of Kākusthavarman. He is also called the uprooter of the Gaṅgas. (tuṅga-gaṅga-kul-otsādi) and the very fire of destruction to the Pallavas.
Indian custom of performing cāturmāsya (four-monthly) sacrifices at the beginning of each season on the full-moon days of the months of Phalgunā, Aśādha and Kārttika. In connection with the above date of Mrgeśavarmaṇa's record it is interesting to note that an inscription of his son Ravivarman is dated on the tenth lunar day of the sixth fortnight of Hemanta (winter). It is also to be noted that both of these grants record some gifts made in favour of Jain ascetics. It is therefore almost certain that the ancient form of dating in these cases was due to Jain influence. To the ascetics of ancient times the year seems to have been divided into three seasons, viz., grīśma, varṣā and hemanta, each of which was subdivided into eight fortnights.

In this record the vamsas of the king's father and mother are said to have been pure. Mrgeśa himself is described as learned in various śāstras and skilled in exercises like riding. He is also said to have fought in many battles and acquired much wealth by the power of his arms. He was a giver of cows, lands, gold, clothes, food and many other things.

By this grant, ārī-vijaya-śiva-Mrgeśavarman, the Dharma-mahārāja of the Kadambas, made a gift of the village called Kālavaṅgā. The village was divided into three equal portions, the first of which was given to the holy Arbat and great Jinendra residing in the Purva-mahac-chālā; the second portion was granted for the enjoyment of a sanga (sect) of the Svetapāṭa (i.e., Svetāmbara Jain) Mahāśramaṇas, and the third for the enjoyment of a sanga of the Nirgrantha (i.e., Digambara Jain) Mahāśramaṇas. Future kings are requested to protect the grant according to the devabhoja-sāmaya in order to provide money for deva-bhāya, dhānya, deva-pājá, vai, caru, deva-karma-kara and bhagavān-kriyā-pravartana. The record ends with the usual verses.

1 See Bhandarkar's List, No. 2083 and note.
The charter was written by a senapati named Naravara. The seal attached to the plates is indistinct, but seems to bear the device of the sitting or standing figure of a god or man. According to Fleet, the figure may be meant for a Jīnendra. This suggestion however cannot be accepted until it is definitely proved that Mrgeśavarmāṇ was a Jain.

III. In the Hire-Sakuna grant (Ep. Carn., VIII, p. 12) the king has been called Mrgeśavārvarman and the son of Kākūsthā's dear son. It was issued on the full-moon day of Vaiśākha in the eighth regnal year of the king when he was residing at Vaijayantī.

The grant records the gift of a village called Kadaḷakaḷani and some vāstukakaśtra (house-site) along with Perddalā to a Brāhmaṇa named Kratusomaśarman who seems to have belonged to the Gautama gotra. In connection with the boundary of the lands are mentioned Virajā which seems to have been a river, a field called Karvvelli, a river called Veṇṇa, Palavakkeni, Kadaḷikūra, Kadakorasa and a confluence of rivers (Virajā and Veṇṇa?). The bhōjakas or free-holders of the locality were informed of the king's grant (dea-grāma-grāma bhōjakānāṁ śrāvitaśrāvanaṁ kṛtvā). The village was granted all the pariḥāras and was made a-bhaṭa-praveśa. The record ends with the usual verses.

The legend on the seal attached to the Hire-Sakuna plates reads śrī-mrgeśavārvarmanah.

IV. The adoration with which the Halsi grant (Ind. Ant., VI, p. 24) of Mrgeśavarman's eighth regnal year begins is the same as that at the beginnig of Kākūsthavaran's grant. In this record the king has been called a dharmavijayī and has been described as the dear eldest son of Santivaravarman and the grandson of Kākūsthavaran. He is also called the uprooter of the Gaṅgas (tuṅga-gaṅga-kul-otsādī) and the very fire of destruction to the Pallavas.
(pallava-pralay-ānalā). We have seen that Mrgeśa possibly began to rule in A.D. 470. His Gaṅga contemporary therefore seems to have been either Āyyavarman who was installed by the Pallava king Simhavarman (436-37 to circa 458 A.D.) of Kañcē or probably Āyyavarman’s son Mādhava-Simhavarman whose Penukonda plates have been assigned by Fleet to circa 475 A.D. Mrgeśa’s Pallava contemporary was probably king Skandavarman, the son of Simhavarman and the overlord of the Gaṅga king Mādhava-Simhavarman (see above, p. 176). The reference to the Pallava overlords together with their Gaṅga feudatories appears to prove that Mrgeśavarman had to fight hard with his eastern neighbours.

While residing at the city of Vaijayantī, the king, through devotion for his father who was dead, caused to be built a jīnālaya at the city of Paḷāśikā and gave to the holy Arhats thirty-three nīcārtanās of land between the river Māṭrasarit and the sacred confluence of rivers (Māṭrasarit and Īṇinī ?) called the Īṇinī-samgāma. The grant was made for the benefit of the Yāpaniyas, Nirgranthas and the Kūrcakas who were apparently sects of Jain ascetics. Nirgrantha is the same as the Digambara sect. The word gāpanīya seems to signify “those who go away,” i.e., the mendicants who are going away and not staying.

The date of the grant is given as the full-moon day of the month of Kārttika in the king’s eighth regnal year which was a Vaiśākha samvatsara. We have already seen that the tenth titi of the bright half of Kārttika of his third year fell in the Pauṣa samvatsara. This fact seems to show

---

1 Mr. Moraca suggests (op. cit., pp. 32-33) that Yuvamahārāja Vīṇugopa was possibly the Pallava contemporary of Mrgeśavarman. He takes the title Yuvamahārāja as signifying Vīṇugopa’s subordinate position to the Kadamba king. Yuvamahārāja however means a crown-prince and never signifies a feudatory ruler. Pallava Vīṇugopa could not have been the crown-prince, i.e., heir, of Kadamba Mrgeśavarman.
that the same lunar day of the next Vaisāka samvatsara fell in his seventh regnal year. We are possibly to suppose that the eighth year of Mrgeśa's reign began in between the sukla-daśamī and the full-moon day of Kārttika. The king then would appear to have ascended the throne on a day between those two tithis.

The executor (ājñapti) of the grant was a Bhojaka named Dāmakūri; all other functions were performed by the Āyuktaka Jiyanta. According to Fleet, Bhojaka is the name of a class of officiating priests in Jain temples. It is however generally taken in the sense of free-holder (ināmdār) which seems to be better. It may be noticed that a person named Srutakūri who has been called a senāpati (general) in the grant of Kākusthavarnman has been mentioned as Bhoja Srutakūri in an undated Halsi grant of Ravivarman. Āyuktaka generally means the governor of a district. Jiyanta who has been called sarvasya-ānuṣṭhāla was probably entrusted with the construction of the Jinalaya.

The grant ends with the usual imprecatory verses and the maṅgala: siddhir = astu.

V. The Hitnabhebagilu grant (Ep. Carn., IV, p. 130; Hs. 18) of śri-cīlaya-cīna-Mrgeśavarman begins not with the usual adoration to Jinendra, but with a verse adoring lord Brahman. It must be noted in this connection that this grant was made in favour not of any Jain institution but of a Brāhmaṇa, described as an āṭhavānika and veda-vedāṅga-vit. Are we to suppose that Kṛtivara, the writer of the present record, was a Brahmanical Hindu worshipper of Brahman, while the grants showing considerable Jain influence were written by devout Jain officials of the king? It is known that Mrgeśavarman and Ravivarman

1 Jayati sar-āsaro-mahṛta-praṣṭhitā-
manī-kīrṇa-vhočita-cārpa-yugaḥ;
doṇṣa-kamōṇda-hastāḥ,
padma-prca-arṣa brahma.
favoured Jainism; but it is not definitely known whether they were Jains themselves. While in this record the king is called dharmajña like Yudhishṭhira, satyacādi like Pratardana and brahmanyā like Viṣṇu, his Banavasi grant, as we have already seen, describes the supreme Arhat as having his feet rubbed by the tiara of Indra. It is thus difficult in the present state of our knowledge to form a definite idea about the religion of Mrgeśavarman.

The Hitnæhebbagilu grant was issued on the tenth lunar day of the bright half of Mārgaśīrhas when the king was residing at Vaijayanti. Mrgeśavarman is described as a giver of cows, lands, villages, gold and other things (go-sahasra-nava-kṣetrahala-dhanī?-grāma-hirany-ādī).

The grant records the gift of a village called Kiñcīrilli to a Brāhmaṇa named Sarvasvāmin, son of Piṅgalasvāmin who belonged to the Aupagahaṇi gotra. It was made in accordance with the law of the Brahmadeyas, with libations of water and daksīna. The village was granted the pahāras called abhaṭa-praveśa and antahkara-viṣṭika which we find referred to in the Kudger grant of Māndhātṛvarman (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 12). It is also said to have been exempted from paṅgotkota the meaning of which is not quite clear.

Some verses quoted at the end of the record are said to be the words of Bhīṣma and Rāma. The pāṭṭika was written by Kṛttivara.
VIII

Ravivarman

Mrgeśavarman was succeeded by his son Ravivarman who ruled at least up to the thirty-fifth year of his reign. This king is known to have annexed the Palaśika division of the Karṇaṭa country to his dominions which probably comprised the Vaijayantī and Ucçaśrūṅgī divisions only. A Halsi gaṇṭ of his son’s fourth regnal year (Ind. Ant., VI, pp. 30-31) suggests that the Ucçaśrūṅgī division was governed by Ravi’s younger (?) brother Sivaratha. Another Halsi grant of Ravivarman describes how the king killed Viśṇuvarman (son of the usurper Krṣṇavarman I), defeated the latter’s Pallava allies and established himself at Palaśika. A damaged stone inscription (Ep. Carn., VIII, p. 167) discovered at Kavadi in the Sorab taluka mentions a queen along with the name of Ravivarman, son of Mrgeśa. The record is written in four lines of verse; the first few letters of the lines however could not be deciphered. The epigraph has been taken to imply that at the death of Ravivarman one of his queens burnt herself with him as a sāti. The following records of Ravivarman’s time have so far been discovered.

I. The Nilambur grant (Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 146 ff.) of Ravivarma-Dharmamahārāja was issued when the king was at Vaijayantī. In this record the Kadamba family has been described as purified by the avabhrtha-snāna of the Aśvamedha sacrifice. As we shall see, the only performer of the Aśvamedha among the Early Kadambas was Krṣṇavarman I whose descendants generally refer to the celebration of the sacrifice in their grants. The Nilambur grant
bears the only instance in which the Aśvamedha of the usurper is referred to in a record of a king of the main line.

By this record the king granted on the full-moon day of Kārttika, for the increase of his own religious merit, a palli called Multagī which was to the east of a grāma called Kṛṣṇapāsāni in the viṣaya of Mogalūr. The grant was made in favour of a Yajurvediya Brāhmaṇa named Govindasvāmin who belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra. Another place called Malkāvu was also given along with Multagi. Multagī is mentioned in the Merkera plates of the Gaṅga king Kongoṇi-Mahādhirāja as the eastern boundary of a village called Badaneguppe which was granted to the Jīnālaya of Talavananagara. Talavanapura and Talavananagara were the Sanskrit forms of Tālekōḍ or Talakōḍ, the Gaṅga capital, which still exists under the name of Talakōḍ, on the left bank of the river Kāverī about 28 miles to the southeast of Mysore (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 299). Badaneguppe is five or six miles south of Talakōḍ on the other side of the river. Mogalūr is supposed to be the same as Mugūr or Muḷḷūr which is also near Talakōḍ. The grant of two villages so near the Gaṅga capital proves the success of Ravivarman against the Gaṅgas. We have already seen that according to the evidence of a Halai grant the Gaṅgas were ‘uprooted’ by the father of Ravivarman before the eighth year of his reign. It is interesting in this connection to note that the Gaṅgas were friendly towards the junior line of Kṛṣṇavarman I. The Gaṅga king Mādhava-Mahādhirāja is known to have married a granddaughter of Viṣṇuvarman who, as we shall see, was killed by Ravivarman before the eleventh year of Ravi’s reign. Gaṅga Avinīta-Koṅkani, son of Mādhava, has been described in the Gaṅga records as the beloved sister’s son of Kṛṣṇavarman, evidently Kṛṣṇavarman II, grandson of Viṣṇuvarman (see infra).

The grant is said to have been made with gold and with libations of water. All the pariḥāras were granted.
Those who might confiscate the lands are said to be committing the *pāñca-mahā-pātalaka*, while those who would protect the grant are said to be acquiring religious merit. The record ends with the imprecatory verses and with the *māṅgala*: svasty=astu go-brāhmaṇevabhyah, prajakhyo maṅgalam.

II. The Halsi grant (*Ind. Ant.*, VI, p. 28) of Rāja Bhānuvarman is dated on the tenth lunar day of the sixth fortnight of Hemanta in the eleventh year of the reign of his elder brother Ravivarman-Dharmamahārāja. The record begins with the usual adoration to Jinendra-guṇarundra and traces the royal genealogy from Kākusthavaran.

By this grant a piece of land, fifteen *nivartanas* by the royal measure, in the field called Kardamapaṭi in Palāśikā was assigned in a copper charter and was given to the Jinas by the Bhojaka Pāṇḍara who was a worshipper of the supreme Arhat. Pāṇḍara is said to have acquired the favour of Rāja Bhānuvarman, younger brother of Mahārāja Ravivarman. The *paṭṭi* seems to be the same as *paṭṭi* or *paṭṭikā* which as we have seen (above, p. 198) probably means a piece of land.

The lands were given free from the gleaning tax and all other burdens (*uṇcha-kara-bhar-ādi-vivarjita*) in order that the ceremony of ablution might always be performed without fail on days of the full-moon.

Fleet suggested (*Ind. Ant.*, VI, p. 29n) that Bhānuvarman may have ruled conjointly with his elder brother Ravi. The fact that the prince is simply styled Bhānuvarma-rāja while his elder brother has been called Dharma-mahārāja renders this theory untenable. Bhānuvarman seems to have been the governor of Palāśikā under king Ravivarman.

The grant ends with the usual imprecatory verses. The seal attached to the plates is indistinct.

III. The Sirsi grant (*Ep. Ind.*, XVI, p. 264) of Ravivarman's thirty-fifth year was issued when the king was at
Vaijayantı. Ravivarman, the Dharma-mahārāja of the Kadambas, is said to have been kadamba-mahāsenāpati-pratima\(^1\) and atyanta-pitr-bhakta. The grant records the gift of four nivartanas of land at Sāregrāma to the temple of Mahādeva (mahādev-ayatanā) that belonged to the desāmātya named Nilakaṃṭha who was the king’s priya-vaidya (favourite physician). The grant was made on the fifth lunar day of the bright half of Kārttika in the thirty-fifth year of Ravivarman’s reign. The land is said to have been in a field called Bandupakropi which lay between two tanks called Badvāre-tadāga and Dāsa-tadāga. The record mentions a Brāhmaṇa named Bharadvājārya who belonged to the Kāsyapa gotra and was possibly also called Svāmi-pāśupata. He seems to have been the chief priest of the temple of Mahādeva.

IV. The undated Halsi grant (Ind. Ant., VI, pp. 25-26) which begins with the usual adoration to Jinendra-guṇarūnda records an interesting history of a family that was favoured by Kākusthavarman and his descendants. It says that in former time the Bhoja named Śrutakīrti who acquired great favour of the Kadamba king Kākusthavarman enjoyed the village of Kheṭa. We have seen that Kākusthavarman granted a field called Bādovara in the village of Kheṭa to the senāpati Śrutakīrti for saving him. When Śrutakīrti died, Kākustha’s son Sāntivarman was ruling the country. Then the village was again granted to the mother of Dāmakīrti (son of Śrutakīrti?) by Sāntivarman’s son Mṛgośavarman for the sake of piety and in accordance with the direction of his father. The eldest son of Dāmakīrti was the pratihāra (door-keeper) Jayakīrti whose family is said to have been established in the world by an ācārya (or the ācāryas) called Bandhuṣēna. In order to increase his good fortune, fame and family and for the sake of religious merit, Jayakīrti,

\(^1\) See above, p. 910n.
through the favour of king Ravi, gave the village of Purukheṭaka (i.e., larger Kheṭa or Kheṭaka) to the mother of his own father.

The grant further records that the lord Ravi established his ordinance at the great city of Palaśikā that Jinendra's glory, the festival of which used to last for eight days, should be celebrated regularly every year on the full-moon day of Kārttika from the revenues of that village; that the learned men who were ascetics of the Yāpaniya sect and the chief amongst whom was Kumāradatta should, according to justice, enjoy all the material substance of that greatness during the four months of the rainy season; and that the worship of Jinendra should be perpetually performed by the pious countrymen and citizens.

The record says, "That (land, etc.)—which has been conveyed by copper-charters under some ordinances accepted by previous kings—should be preserved by the king not inattentive to religion, having pondered over the misfortunes of being born again and again," and quotes the usual imprecatory verses. It also says that the grant which is bestowed with libations of water, is enjoyed by three generations, is preserved by good people and the grants which have been made by former kings are not resumed.

The record ends with the adoration namo = namah and says, "Wheresoever the worship of Jinendra is kept up there is increase of the country; and the cities are free from fear; and the lords of those countries acquire strength."

V. Another undated Halsi grant (Ind. Ant., VI, pp. 29-30) of Ravivarman records that the king granted four nivartanas of land to Jinendra. The actual donor of the land seems to have been Śrīkīrti, brother of Dāmakīrti; the object of the grant was the increase of the religious merit of Dāmakīrti's mother. There are the usual imprecatory verses at the end of the record.
The most interesting point in the record is that it describes Ravivarman as established at Palāśikā after conquering the whole world, killing Viśṇuvarman and other kings and uprooting Caṇḍadanda, the lord of Kānci. The descendants of the usurper were hostile to the kings of the main line. Viśṇuvarman however seems to have had to accept for some time the suzerainty of Sāntivarman. We have seen that, according to the Halsi grant of the eighth year of Mrgeśavarman, the king while residing at Vaijayantī built a Jinaśāya at the city of Palāśika and gave to the holy Arhat thirty-three nivartanas of land between the Mātrṣarit and the Iaṅgiṇī confluence. It possibly shows that Viśṇuvarman ruled at Palāśikā as a vassal of the Vaijayantī kings at least up to the eighth year of Mrgeśavarman’s reign. The reference to his fight with Ravivarman shows that, possibly after the death of Mrgeśa, Viśṇuvarman rebelled against the authority of the main line. The mention of the defeat and death of Viśṇuvarman in connection with the establishment of Ravivarman at Palāśikā seems to suggest that the former was a king of the Palāśikā division of the Karnāta country. We have already seen that Ravi’s

1 Srī-viśṇu-varma-prabhāṣita nāvadatrān
niḥatya jītaḥ pṛthivīṃ samastām;
Uttarāśa kāś-aśravā-caṇḍadandaṃ
palāśikāyāṃ samvarasthitamś caḥ.

M. Govind Pai says (Journ. Ind. Hist., XIII, pp. 29-33): "...when after the death of Kṛṣṇavarman I, his son Viṣṇuvarman ascended the Kadamba throne, his cousin-brother (?) Ravivarman of the senior branch fought with him and defeated him and his Pālava ally Caṇḍadanda, seized the Kadamba crown and enthroned himself as king. As a consequence, Viṣṇuvarman was obliged to remove his court to a place called Kujālūr (whence he issued his Habbata grant)...." The verse however clearly says that Viṣṇuvarman was killed and could not therefore have removed to Kujālūr after the battle. As has already been pointed out, Viṣṇuvarman was possibly the king of the Palāśikā division and not of the whole Kadamba country.

2 It may also be suggested that Viṣṇuvarman originally ruled at the city of Kujālūr whence his Habbata grant was issued and that he occupied Palāśikā when he rebelled against his overlords of the Vaijayantī house.
younger brother Bhānuvarman was ruling at Palāśikā in the eleventh year of his elder brother's reign. The death of Viṣṇuvarman therefore seems to have occurred before the eleventh year of Ravi. Since Ravi appears to have ascended the throne earlier than A.D. 503, the date of Viṣṇuvarman's death appears to have fallen in the ninth or tenth decade of the fifth century.

As we have already suggested (above, p. 182) Caṇḍadāṇḍa, described as the lord of Kāñcī, may have been a biruda of Pallava Nandivarman (issuer of the Udayendiram grant) or of one of his successors. Since the twenty-second year of Nandivarman's grandfather Śīṃhavarman is known from the Lokavibhāga to have fallen in A.D. 458, the above suggestion does not appear improbable.

The seal attached to the plates is said to have the device of a dog.
Harivarman

Ravivarman was succeeded by his son Harivarman who is the last known king of the main line. According to a late record (Ep. Carn., VIII, Nr. 35, p. 134) an early Sāntara chief, named Tyāgi-Sāntara, married the daughter of a Kadamba king, named Harivarman. This Kadamba Harivarman seems to be no other than the son of Ravivarman. Harivarman possibly began to reign in A.D. 538. About this time the Calukyas under Pulakesin I became the greatest political power in Western Deccan and the Kadambas of Kuntala began to decline. It is not known whether Harivarman was a contemporary of Pulakesin I. The Calukya king however seems to have come into conflict with the Kadambas in connection with the Aśvamedha which he performed. Calukya Kṛtvivarman I, son and successor of Pulakesin I, has actually been said to have defeated the king of Vaijayantī in the Mahakuta pillar inscription of Maṅgalesa (Ind. Ant., XIX, p. 16 ff.). In the Aihole inscription (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 4 ff.) of Pulakesin II, Kṛtvivarman I has been described as the very night of destruction to the Nalas, Mauryas and Kadambas. A reference

1 According to Bilhaḍa (Vikramāditya vamsacarita, 2, 64), the Calukya conquest in the southern region at first extended as far as Nāgerakhāta which is known to have formed a part of the Kadamba country. The Calukyas are generally believed to have been a foreign tribe who entered India along with the Hūṇas. The different forms of the name of the family are Calkya, Calikya, Calukya, Calkiki, Calukiha and Calki. The Calukya family of Anbilsāda is commonly known as Solaki or Solaiki. Prof. Bayenshuri (op. cit., p. 370 f.) is inclined to connect them with the Sālikas (evidently the same as the Śālikha family of Orissa) of the Harsha inscription. Dr. P. C. Bagchi connects the Calukyas with the Scythians who, according to him, are mentioned as Sālika or Cālika in the Purāṇas and who spoke the Cālika Paśā. See his excellent article on Śālika, Cālika and Cālika Pāśā in Journ. Dept. Let., XXI. In that case however we have to explain the Kanarese-looking original of the name Pulakesin and the celebration of Aśvamedha by the first great king of the family. Possibly they entered India centuries before the time of Pulakesin I,
to _kadamba-kadamba-kadambaka_ in the Aihole record appears to suggest that Kirtivarma I had to fight with the combined army of a confederacy of Kadamba kings. It will be seen below that in the sixth century there were other ruling branches of the Kadamba family than the lines of Sāntivarman and Kṛṣṇavarman I. In several grants, Kirtivarman I is described as "establishing the banner of his pure fame in the territories of the hostile kings of Vanavāsi and other (cities) that had been invaded by his prowess" (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 346). After the death of Maṅgaleśa, there was a general renunciation of allegiance by the subordinate peoples, and Pulakesin II had to reduce Banavāsi once again (ibid., p. 350). In the Lakshmeswar inscription (Ind. Ant., VII, p. 111), Calukya Vikramāditya I is said to have defeated the Kadambas. The Bennur grant (Ep. Carn., V, p. 594) of Kṛṣṇavarman II, grandson of the ill-fated Viṣṇuvarma who was defeated and killed by Ravivarman before the eleventh year of his reign, describes Kṛṣṇavarman II as set out on an expedition against Vaijayantī (vaijayanti-vijaya-yāstrām = _abhiprasthita_). In the nineteenth year of Kṛṣṇavarman (II)’s reign however we find the king stationed at Vaijayantī (cf. Sirsi grant; Ep. Ind., XVI, p. 268). It is not impossible that Kṛṣṇavarman II defeated Harivarman and occupied the throne of Vaijayantī before the nineteenth year of his reign.

The following grants of king Harivarman have so far been discovered: —

1. The Halsi grant (Ind. Ant., VI, pp. 30-31) of Harivarman was issued in the fourth year of his reign on the thirteenth lunar day of the bright half of Phālguna. It says that, at Uccāṣṇī, the king, at the advice of his father’s brother (pitṛya), named Sivaratha, gave such a promise as gladdened the heart of all people. In accordance with that promise, he made Candrakṣānta the principal dacee and
gave to the possession of the *sangha* (sect) of Vārīṣeṇācārya of the Kūrcakas the village of Vasuntavātaka in the viṣaya, called Siddikundūra, with all the *parihāras*. The grant was made for the purpose of providing annually, at the great eight days’ sacrifice, the perpetual anointing with clarified butter (*car-āpalepana-kṛīṇ-ārtham*) for the temple of the Arhat; whatever might remain over after that was to be devoted to the purpose of feeding the whole sect (or all sects; cf. *sava-sangha-bhojanāya*). The temple of the Arhat is said to have been built at Palāśikā by Mrgeśa, son of the general Sinha who belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra.

The grant quotes the usual imprecatory verses and ends with a verse saying, "May the practice of sitting in abstract meditation which is the doctrine of the Arhat Vardhamāna and by which is effected even in the present age the destruction of the sins of worldly existence, flourish." It further adds an adoration to Vardhamāna, the last and the most celebrated of the Arhats of this age.

The seal attached to the plates is said to bear the legend śrī-harivarman.

II. The grants of the early Kadambas generally begin with the word *svasti* or *siddhan*. The Halsi grants of king Harivarman (*Ind. Ant.*, VI, pp. 31-32; also pp. 30-31) however have both of these words at the beginning. The present grant was issued in the fifth year of Harivarman’s reign when the king seems to have been residing at the *adhiṣṭhāna* of Palāśikā. The word *adhiṣṭhāna* generally means a city; sometimes it also signifies the capital of a king. Palāśikā was possibly a secondary capital of the kings

1 In *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, XII, p. 358, it has been suggested that Siddikundūra is to be identified with Siddhakedāra in Triparvata, mentioned in the Devagiri grant of Yuvarṣaja Devavarman. Since however Siddhakedāra was presumably the name of a field (or village; *kedara* means ‘field’) and Siddikundūra was that of a viṣaya, the identification is doubtful.

2 Sinha may have been the general of Mrgeśavarman and named his son after his master.
of Vaijayanti from the time of Viṣṇuvarman’s death and the annexation of the Paḷāśikā division by Ravivarman.

The grant records the gift of a village, called Maraḍa, for the use of the holy people (sādhu-jan-opayog-ārthaṃ) and for the purpose of pūjā-saṃskāra of a Caityālaya. The Caityālaya is said to have been the property of a sect of Śramaṇas, called Ahariṣṭi (ahariṣṭi-samāheya-saṅgh-āncava- vastu). The Head of the Caityālaya was possibly the ācārya Dharmanandin. The word śramaṇa signifies a Buddhist or a Jain religious mendicant or ascetic. The favour shown by Harivarman and his forefathers to the Jains suggests that this Caityālaya was a Jain temple. Jain adorations and maṅgalas are however absent in this record. Was it written by a non-Jain?

The grant is said to have been made at the request of a Rājā, named Bhānuśakti, who belonged to the Sendraka family. The Sendraka chief Bhānuśakti who appears to have been the ruler of the Paḷāśikā division was evidently a feudatory of Harivarman.

Like other grants of the family, the record ends with some imprecatory verse. The seal attached to the plates bears the legend śrī-harivarmanā which is preceded and followed by svastika.

III. The Sangoli grant (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 165) of Harivarman begins with a verse 1 adoring lord Sambhu, and the king is expressly said to have been a paraṃ-māheśvara (devout worshipper of Maheśvara). We have seen that, like many of the grants of Kākusthavarman, Mṛgeśavarman and Ravivarman, the composition of the Halsi grant (No. 1) of Harivarman exhibits remarkable influence of Jainism. That Kākusthavarman and Sāntivarman were also favourable to Saivism as they were to Jainism is proved by the Talgunda

1 Jagati dhruva-bāl enaṃ saṃbhā-mukta-maṇḍanaḥ,
Asādhyā-nikhanaṃ = saṃbhūr = eiśetūḥ = jagatāṃ pathā.
inscription. If it is not supposed that Harivarman became a parama-māheśvara after the date of his Halsāi records, it may possibly be suggested that the early Kadambas of the main line were Śaivas who were exceptionally tolerant towards Jainism. It is clear that many officials of the Kadamba kings were Jains; it is also known that a general, named Śrutakirti, who was evidently a Jain, once saved the life of Kākusthavarman.

The grant was issued when the king was at Vaijayantī. The date of the record is given as the Viṣuṇa or Viṣuva day on the Amāvāśya of Aśvayuja in the eighth year of Harivarman’s reign. It has been found to correspond with Tuesday, September 22, A.D. 526 and with Thursday, September 21, A.D. 545. Mr. K. N. Dikshit who edited the Sangoli grant rightly prefers the second date. Kadamba Harivarman thus appears to have ascended the throne about A.D. 538.

The grant records the gift of a village, called Tedāva, with the pravibhāgas (literally, divisions; sic. parihāras?), dakṣīṇa and libations of water. The recipients were Sivaśarman, Prajāpatiśarman, Dhātṛśarman, Nandiśarman and Dharmāśarman of the Kaimbala gotra; Vaikuṇṭhaśarman, Vasuśarman, Nagaśarman and Maṇḍanaśarman of the Kālāśa gotra; Viṣṇuśarman, Prajāpatiśarman and Pitrśarman of the Garga gotra; Kumāraśarman, Tvaṣṭṛśarman, Skandaśarman and Varuṇaśarman of the Kotsa gotra; Yaśośarman, Āryaśarman, Paśuṇaśarman and Mitraśarman of the Śrīviṣṭha gotra; Vanaśarman of the Cauliya gotra; Prajāpatiśarman of the Valandata gotra; and Kumāraśarman of the Kāṣyapa gotra.

The grant ends with the usual verses and the māṅgala: siddhir-astu; namo hari-hara-hiranyagarbhebhyah; svasti

1 The late tradition saying that Mayūravarman (i.e., Mayūraśarman) was born of a drop of sweat that fell on the ground from the forehead of Śiva is to be noticed in this connection.
praśābhyaḥ. The adoration to the Hindu Trinity (viz., Hari, Hara, and Hiranyagarbha, i.e., Brahman) in a record wherein the king has been described as a devotee of Maheśvara seems to suggest that Harivarman was a Brahmanical Hindu with sense of exceptional religious toleration.
CHAPTER II

EARLY KADAMBAS: KRŚṆAヴァRNAM’S LINE

I

KRŚṆAヴァRNAM I

The Bennur grant (Ep. Curn., V, p. 594) was issued by a Kadamba Dharmamahārāja, named Krśṇavarman II, who claims to have been the son of Simhavarman, grandson of Viśṇudāsa and great-grandson of Rājarāja Krśṇavarman I. Krśṇavarman II has been described in this record as belonging to the Kadamba family which was rendered pure by the avabṛhṛtha bath taken during at the end of an Aśvamedha sacrifice. Viśṇudāsa, grandfather of Krśṇavarman II, calls himself Viśṇuvarma-Dharma-mahārāja and the son of the aśvamedha-gājin (performer of the Horse-sacrifice) Dharmamahārāja Krśṇavarman I in his own Birur grant (ibid, VI, p. 91). According to the Devagiri grant (Ind. Ant., VII, p. 33), Yuvarāja Devavarman, dear son (priyana-tanaya) of the aśvamedha-gājin Dharmamahārāja Krśṇavarman I, appears to have been in charge of the Tripāravata division of the Kadamba kingdom. From the Tagare plates (Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R., 1918, p. 35) of the Kadamba Mahārāja Bhogivarman, which describes the Kadamba family as sanctified by the celebration of Aśvamedha, we get the names of the following descendants of Krśṇavarman II—his son Ajavarman, grandson Mahārāja Bhogivarman and great-grandson Viśṇuvarman (II). From the evidence of the above inscriptions therefore the following genealogy of the

1 This chapter was originally published in Jour. Ind. Hist., XV, pp. 301-19.
Early Kadambas is drawn:

Kršṇavarman I,
performer of Aśvamedha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viṣṇudāsa or Viṣṇuvarman I</th>
<th>Devavarman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kršṇavarman II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajavarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhogivarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇuvarman II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exact relation of this line of kings with the line of Mayūraśarman is not yet established beyond doubt. We have seen that, according to the Birur grant, the Kadamba Dharmamahārāja Viṣṇuvarman I, son of Kršṇavarman I, is said to have granted a village, called Kataṭtaka, in the Sindhu-thayā-rāśtra, with the permission of (anujñāpya) his jyeṣṭha-pitā (father’s elder brother) Śāntivarma-Dharmamahārāja. Śāntivarma has been described as rāṇa-rabhasa-pravarttad-aśṭādaśa-mandapikā-mandita-caiyanti-tī lākṣa-samagra-karnāṭa-bhūvarga-bharta. We have also seen that, according to a Halai grant of Ravivarman, that king is known to have killed king Viṣṇuvarman, extirpated the latter’s Pallava ally, Candalanda and established himself at Palāśikā which was

1 From the cases of Bhānuvarman and Bhānasakti, we have seen that the governors of divisions of the Kadamba kingdom were called Bājā. In the Birur grant however both Śāntivarman and Viṣṇuvarman are called Dharmamahārāja. There may have been a difference in the position of Viṣṇuvarman with that of governors like Bhānuvarman and Bhānasakti. He was possibly a subordinate king. In this connection, it is interesting to note that, in the Pennakonda plates (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 331 ff.) of circa 475 A.D., the Pallava overlord has been mentioned as Skanda-varma-Mahārāja, while his Gaṅga feudatory has been called Mādhava-Mahākārāja.
possibly the headquarters of Viśṇuvarman’s kingdom. Since Viśṇuvarman was killed in the early years of Ravivarman’s reign, it is not unnatural to suppose that the former’s *jyeṣṭha-pitā* Śāntivarman, mentioned in the Birur grant of the third regnal year, is no other than Ravivarman’s grand-father Śāntivarman, son of Kākusthavarman.

The above identification has, however, been challenged by a recent writer on the subject, who points out that Viśṇuvarman has been called *sāntivara-mahārāja-pallacendrābhisikta* (installed by the Pallava king Sāntivara-mahārāja) in the Hebba grant and suggests that Śāntivarman, *jyeṣṭha-pitā* of Viśṇuvarman, is to be identified with this Pallava king, named Sāntivara (i.e., Śāntivarman). See M. Govind Pai, *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, XIII, p. 21.

The suggestion is ingenious; but there are difficulties in the way of accepting it as true without further evidence. Śāntivarman has been called the *jyeṣṭha-pitā* (father’s elder brother) of Viśṇuvarman. Though terms of relation were possibly rather loosely used in ancient times as they are now, this epithet would ordinarily suggest that Śāntivarman belonged to the Kadamba family. The suggestion that “not only one’s father’s elder brother..........is called as *jyeṣṭha-pitr*, but the husband of one’s mother’s elder sister is also called as such” can hardly be accepted without definite proof. Moreover, the *jyeṣṭha-pitā* of Viśṇuvarman is described as “lord of the lands of the entire Karnāṭa country adorned with (the capital) Vaijayantī.” This is hardly applicable to a Pallava king who presumably had his own kingdom outside the Karnāṭa-deśa. It is not impossible that the Kadamba kings prior to Kṛṣṇavaran I were feudatories to the Pallavas; but the above passage seems to suggest something more than mere suzerainty, and a theory that the whole of Karnāṭa, i.e., the entire Kadamba country, was, about the middle of the fifth century A. D., ruled by a Pallava king, named
Sāntivara, cannot be accepted as certain without conclusive evidence. It must also be noticed that no king, named Sāntivara, is as yet known to have belonged to the powerful Pallava houses of Kāñci and of the Nellore-Guntur region. In the present state of our knowledge, therefore, it is better to take the Dharmamahārāja Sāntivarman, jyeṣṭha-pitā of Viṣṇuvarman I, to be the same as the son of Kākusthavarman and grandfather of Viṣṇuvarman’s later contemporary Ravivarman. Kṛṣṇavarman I, father of Viṣṇuvarman I, would thus appear to have been a son of Kākusthavarman and a younger brother of Sāntivarman. Since Kṛṣṇavarman I seems to have been dead at the time when his son was ruling as a feudatory Dharmamahārāja under his elder brother Sāntivarman, he possibly usurped the throne of Kākusthavarman and ruled before Sāntivarman. The fact that Sāntivarman, elder brother of Kṛṣṇavarman I, has been described not as the eldest son, but as a priya-tanaya (favourite son) or priya-hita-tanaya (favourite and beloved son) of Kākusthavarman (see Ind., Ant., VI, pp. 24, 28) suggests that the eldest brother of Sāntivarman and Kṛṣṇavarman I, died and that his death was the cause of a struggle for the throne among the younger brothers of whom Kṛṣṇavarman I came out eventually victorious.

We have seen that Viṣṇuvarman I, son of Kṛṣṇavarman I, was installed on the throne by a Pallava king, named Sāntivara. The cause of this seems to be the fact that though Viṣṇuvarman was the eldest son and the rightful heir to the

---

1 Eldest sons are generally specified in the Kaṇḍamā grants. A Halai grant (Ind. Ant., VI, p. 29) of Mṛgēśavarman says, "tṛī kākustha-narendrapa ānurāh dhūmar īyām āmarāh, tṛī-sāntivarmanāḥ ātī jādja rāja-aśeṣa-bhūmāh; ātī priyā-jyeṣṭha-tanāyāḥ tṛī-mṛgēśa-narāhāhiḥ. Another Halai grant ibid., p. 29 of Ravivarman says, "tṛīmātrī kākustha-rāja-priyā-hita-tanāyāḥ sāntivarman-śeṣam-ādāh, tātāyā aṣṭā ca jyeṣṭha-svāhā prabhū-priyā-puṇāḥ tṛī-mṛgēśa-nar-ādāh. It will be seen that while Mṛgēśavarman is described as the eldest son of Sāntivarman, the latter is described as a favourite son only."
throne of Kṛṣṇavarman I, he was a neglected son of his father. According to the Devagiri grant, Devavarman, who was the priya-tanaya (favourite son) of Kṛṣṇavarman I, was made the Yuvarāja (crown-prince, i.e., heir) in preference to his eldest brother Viṣṇuvarman. It may be conjectured that Viṣṇuvarman, after receiving this ill-treatment from his father, removed to the court of the Pallava king Sāntivara in despair. We have seen that Viṣṇuvarman probably ruled at Pālaśikā when he was killed by Ravivarman. It is possible that he received that territory with the help of the Pallavas who, as we shall see, defeated and probably killed his father Kṛṣṇavarman I. He appears, however, to have transferred his allegiance to his jyestha-pitā Sāntivarman, son of Kākusthavarman, who possibly became the king of Vaijayantī after the defeat and death of his younger brother Kṛṣṇavarman I.¹

Mr. G. M. Moraes says (op. cit., p. 29) that during the reign of Sāntivarman, his younger brother Kṛṣṇavarman I, "had been ruling in the capacity of viceroy over the southern provinces of the empire. For the Birur plates of Vishnuvarma, while describing Sāntivarma, the grand-uncle (father’s elder brother) of Vishnuvarma, as 'the master of the entire Karnāṭa region of the earth,' clearly specify that his younger brother Krishṇavarma 'was sovereign of the southern region.' Now the same plates record a grant made by Vishnuvarma during his father Krishṇavarma’s life. This grant was nevertheless made 'with the permission of Sāntivarma-Dharmamahārāja.' This evidently shows that the donor as well as Krishṇavarma, the father of the

¹ It may be conjectured that Kṛṣṇavarman I was a king of the Tripavara division of the Karnāṭa country, while Viṣṇuvarman, hostile to his father, was a king of Pālaśikā under the Kālamba house of Vaijayantī. If such was the case, the celebration of Āśamedha by Kṛṣṇavarman I, described as the dākṣipātha-sāvamati-cara-pati, becomes quite meaningless. Moreover, that conjecture does not explain how Kṛṣṇa-varman I could be a viceroy of Sāntivarman.
donor, occupied a subordinate position under Śāntivarman." Moraes further thinks that, after the death of Śāntivarman, Kṛṣṇavarman I broke up relations with his nephew Mrgeśavarman and became the founder of a southern branch of the Kadamba family, which ruled from Tripuravata (ibid, pp. 30-31). None of the above statements however stands to reason.

The evidence of the Birur grant has been taken to prove that Kṛṣṇavarman I was a viceroy of the southern districts of the Kadamba empire under Śāntivarman. Three points are however to be noticed in this connection. Firstly, in the same grant Kṛṣṇavarman I has been called aśvamedha-gājīn (performer of the Horse-sacrifice). I have shown (see above, pp. 17 f.; 124 ff.; also Appendix below) from the evidence of the sāstras and inscriptions that "a subordinate king could never perform the Aśvamedha sacrifice." Kṛṣṇavarman I therefore could not be a feudatory or a viceroy of Śāntivarman, but was certainly an independent king himself. Secondly, the same grant calls him daksināpatha-vasumati-vasu-pati (lord of the riches of the land of Daksināpaththa) which clearly shows that Kṛṣṇavarman I claimed a sort of suzerainty over the whole of the Deccan. The word daksināpatha of the grant cannot be taken to mean the southern part of the Kadamba kingdom. "Lord of Daksināpaththa" seems to have been the hereditary title of the great Sātavahana kings. As we have already noticed, Satakarni, husband of Nāganika, is called daksināpathapati, Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi has been called Daksinā-patha-eśvara, and the Sātavahana, contemporary of the Śaka Satrap Rudradāman, is called Daksināpatha-pati Satakarni. The significance of the claim of Kadamba Kṛṣṇavarman I to have been "lord of the riches of the land of Daksināpaththa" is possibly to be found in his performance of the Aśvamedha which cannot be celebrated without
digvijaya (loc. cit.). In this connection, we should also notice that in the Devagiri grant Kṛṣṇavarman I has been called ek-ātapatra (possessor of the sole umbrella), which, as Mr. Moraes himself suggests (op. cit., p. 39 note), "is indicative of the universal sovereignty." This epithet at least shows that he was an independent ruler of some importance. It is also to be noticed that he has been called Rājarāja in the Bennur grant of his great-grandson Kṛṣṇavarman II. The third important point in this connection is that the grant recorded in the Birur plates could hardly be "made by Viṣṇuvarma during his father Kṛṣṇavarma's life," as Mr. Moraes would let us believe. The donor of the Birur grant was sri-Viṣṇuvarma-Dharmamahārāja, eldest son of Kṛṣṇavarma-Dharmamahārāja. Since Viṣṇuvarman has been called Dharmamahārāja, he was obviously a crowned king at the time of issuing the Birur grant. Kṛṣṇavarman I could not have been reigning then as the overlord of his son, because Viṣṇuvarman is reported to have granted lands with the permission of his jyeṣṭha-pīṭa Sāntivarman. It therefore appears that Kṛṣṇavarman I died before the end of Sāntivarman's rule and could not therefore have been the founder of a southern branch of the Kadamba family after the death of Sāntivarman. It is most likely, as has been suggested above, that he died before the beginning of Sāntivarman's rule. There is nothing in the Birur grant to prove that Kṛṣṇavarman I was a viceroy of Sāntivarman; it is, on the other hand, certain that he was a great and independent king who performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice.

Mr. Moraes thinks that the Devagiri grant was issued when Kṛṣṇavarman I "set up as an independent sovereign;" and that the Birur grant was issued some time earlier when he was still a viceroy of Sāntivarman (op. cit., pp. 30-31). This view too is untenable. The Devagiri grant (Ind. Ant., VII, p. 34) was issued by Devavarma-Yuvarāja, dear son
of Dharmamahārāja Kṛṣṇavarman I. It is clear that this grant was issued during the reign of Kṛṣṇavarman I himself. The Birur grant (Ep. Carn., VI, p. 91) was issued, as we have seen, by the Kadamba Dharmamahārāja Viṣṇuvarman, who presumably ruled after his father Kṛṣṇavarma-Dharmamahārāja.

Only one record of the time of Kṛṣṇavarman I has so far been discovered. It is the grant of Yuvarāja Devavarman found at Devagiri in the Karajgi taluka of the Dharwar district. Kṛṣṇavarman I appears to have appointed the crown-prince governor of the Triparvata division of the Kadamba kingdom, which probably comprised parts of the present district of Darwar in the Bombay Presidency. The Triparvata division seems to have formed the northern part of the Karnāta country.

The Devagiri grant was issued by Yuvarāja Devavarman, dear son of Kṛṣṇavarman I Dharmamahārāja who celebrated the Aśvamedha sacrifice, probably when the Yuvarāja was at the city of śrī-vijaya-Tripparvata. By this record, a piece of land called Siddhakedāra in the Triparvata division was granted to the Yāpaniya saṃgha (or saṃghas) for the purpose of the glory of repairing anything that may be broken (bhagna-saṃskāra) in and of the performance of worship at the Caityālaya of the holy Arhat. It is also recorded that Devavarman granted the lands to the Arhat Jaina. The record ends with the benediction, “Victorious is the Arhat, the lord of the three worlds, the maker of the good of all people, the destroyer of passion and other enemies, the eternal one, the lord having eternal knowledge.”

1 A recent writer thinks that Siddhakedāra (in Triparvata) is the same as Suddikundūra mentioned in the Halāt grant of the fourth year of Harivarman. Since Suddikundūra was the name of a vijaya, the identification is doubtful.

2 Jaitya = mukhyam = trikadeśaḥ sarve-bhūta-hitakkarah
Bṛg-ādy-ari-bhūraḥ = nunto = nunto-jañna-dṛṣy = tecarāḥ.
In this record Kṛṣṇavarman I, father of the Yuvarāja, has been called samar-ārjita-vipul-aśvarya and rāja-viśeṣa-ratna. The epithet ek-ātapatra shows that Kṛṣṇavarman I claimed to have been a paramount sovereign. The king is also called nāgajān = ākramya dāy-anubhāta which has been explained as "who enjoyed a heritage that was not to be attained by persons of Nāga descent," or as "who enjoyed his heritage after attacking some chieftains of Nāga descent." The reading of the passage is however doubtful and the interpretation cannot therefore be taken as perfectly established. The former interpretation would suggest the Nāgas to have been the Cuṭu-Sātakarnis, but the latter would possibly suggest the Sendrakas of Nāgarakhandā.

There is an oval and worn out seal attached to the plates. It has the devise of some animal standing towards the proper right but with its head turned round to the left. There is also the figure of a god or a man leaning against it or sitting on it. The animal may be meant for a horse or bullock, but Fleet suggests that it may also be a deer with horns.

According to the evidence of the Bannahalli plates (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 16) of Kṛṣṇavarman II, Kṛṣṇavarman I married a girl of the Kekaya family which, as we have seen, probably ruled in the modern Chitaldrug district of Mysore. His eldest son Viṣṇuvarman was born of this Kekaya princess.¹

¹ For the Nāga connection of the Cuṭu-Sātakarnis, see above, 158 n. In the Lakšmesvar inscription (Ind. Ant., VII, p. 110), the Sendrakas are described as belonging to the Bhuṣageendra lineage.

² Govinda Pai thinks (Journ. Ind. Hist., XII, p. 301 ff.) that Devavarman was the son of Kṛṣṇavarman II. He wrongly takes Devavarman to be the eldest son of his father simply because he was the Yuvarāja. There are however numerous instances in history to show that a favourite younger son was sometimes made heir to the throne in preference to the neglected eldest son. The suggestion moreover is untenable in view of the fact that the Devagiri grant describes the father of Devavarman as the performer of the Āśvamedha which undoubtedly refers to Kṛṣṇavarman I. Kṛṣṇavarman I
A stone-inscription of a Kekaya chief, named Śivananda
varman, has been discovered at Anaji in the Davenegere taluka
of the Chitaldrug district. According to this record, Śiva
nandavarman, after the loss of his country and the defeat of
Kṛṣṇarāja’s army in the tumultuous battle that took place
between Nanakkāsa (?) Pallava-rāja and Kṛṣṇavarma-rāja,
with a tranquillized heart, lay on a bed of darbha and became
desirous of going to heaven. Possibly he burnt himself to
death. We have seen that Kadamba Kṛṣṇavarman I was
matronially connected with the Kekayas. This fact and
the palaeographical standard of the Anaji record support the
identification of this Kṛṣṇarāja or Kṛṣṇavarma-rāja with
Kadamba Kṛṣṇavarman I. Some scholars think that Śiva
nandavarman was a son of Kṛṣṇavarman I and was possibly
identical with Devavarman. The suggestion, however, is
untenable in view of the fact that Śivanandavarman is des-
cribed as belonging to the Ātreya gotra and to the Kekaya
family which was a Soma-vaṃśa. The Kadamba family, on
the other hand, was of the Mānavya or Āṅgirasa gotra and
was never connected with the lunar race.

Śivanandavarman may have been a relative and feudatory
of Kṛṣṇavarman I. The relation of the kṣaya (loss, ruin)
of his own country with the defeat of Kṛṣṇarāja’s army and
of his becoming praśamita-hṛdaya and desirous of going to
heaven, however, is not quite clear. Praśamita-hṛdaya
(having one’s heart tranquillized) has been wrongly taken
by previous writers in the sense that the defeat of Kṛṣṇavar-
man broke the heart of Śivanandavarman (see infra). Kṛṣṇa-
varman I possibly died in this encounter with the Pallavas
or was dethroned as a result of this defeat.

never performed any Horse-sacrifice. The Sīrār Annal (Ep. Ind., XVI, p. 288) of
Kṛṣṇavarman II, which describes him as belonging to the Kadamba family, that was
araṇmohāśākṣikā (having taken the bath, i.e., immersed pure, by the araṇhābhṛtha bath
at the end of a Horse-sacrifice) never suggests that Kṛṣṇavarman II was installed during
an Āśramadha.
II

VIṣṇuVARMAN I

Viṣṇuvarman was the son of king Kṛṣṇavarman I by a princess of the Kekaya family. He has been described as kaikeya-sutāyāṁ = utpanna in the Bannahalli grant of his grandson Kṛṣṇavarman II. We have seen that though he was the eldest son of his father, one of his younger brothers, by name Devavarman who was the favourite son of Kṛṣṇavarman I, was made Yuvarāja in preference to him. As a consequence, he appears to have left his father’s kingdom and taken shelter in the court of a Pallava king, named Śāntivara. According to the Hebbata grant of Viṣṇuvarman he was anointed by the Pallava king Śāntivara-mahārāja. If the identification of his ījeśṭha-pitā Śāntivarman, mentioned in the Birur grant, with the son of Kākusthavarman is to be believed, he seems to have transferred his allegiance to the kings of Vaijayanti. Before the eleventh year of Ravivarman however he appears to have rebelled against the authority of his overlords and, as a result, was killed by Ravivarman, grandson of Śāntivarman. The Palaśikā division, over which he seems to have ruled, was annexed by the victor and the victor’s brother Bhānuvarman was made the governor of that division.

Only two grants of the time of Viṣṇuvarman have so far been discovered.

The Birur grant (Ep. Carn., VI, p. 91) of Viṣṇuvarman begins with a verse in adoration to the Hindu trinity—Hara, Nārāyana, and Brahman. The Kadamba Dharmamahārāja Viṣṇuvarman is here called the eldest son of Dharmamahā-

1 Hara-nārāyaṇa-brāhma-trīṣṇaḥga-namāṁ = eṣaṁ
śūla-sahā-āśeṣaṁ-udgaha-bhava-bhāṣita-pāṇaṁ.
rāja Krṣṇavarman I who has been described as "lord of the riches of the land of Dakṣināpatha" and as "performer of the Horse-sacrifice." As we have already suggested Krṣṇavarman I seems to have claimed a sort of suzerainty over the whole of the Deccan. Such a vague claim may have originated from his performance of the Aśvamedha which could not be celebrated without dig-vijaya. The epithet vikāśita-sac-chatr-āvatamśa applied to him in this record possibly means the same thing as his epithet śaśi-sadṛś-aik-ātapatra in the Devagiri grant of his favourite younger son Devavarman. He is also described as parama-brahmanya-śaranya and is said to have acquired fame in battles.

The grant was made on the fifth lunar day of the bright half of Phālguna in the third year of the king's reign. By it the king made, with libations of water and daksinā, a gift of a village, called Katiṭṭaka, in the Sindhu-thaya-rāṣṭra, along with the boundary of the road to Nandapada, the bridge on the river called Karṇesaka, the Cesāpali (lands?) and a field measuring two hundred nivartas (i.e., nivartanas). The recipients of the grant were eighty-five Brāhmānas, among whom were—Bhava, Kolana, Śiva, Yajña and Sarva of the Kurukutsa gotra; Meruśarman and Somaśarman of the Hārīta gotra; Bhava, Hara and others of the Kaṇḍapa gotra; Deva of the Kṛtya gotra; Yuvu and Ukti of the Vāsiśṭha gotra; Pandha, Yajña, Nāga and Bhṛta of the Vatsya gotra; Bhava and Soma of the Kauśika gotra; Bhūtiśarman of the Kauṇḍinya gotra; Bhṛta of the Purukutsa gotra; and Bhūtiśarman of the Bhāradvāja gotra. The word ārya is suffixed to the names excepting those which end in the word śarman. This fact shows that Ārya (the same as modern Ayyar) and Sarman became cognomens in the South as early as the time of this record.

The tāmra-sāsana was endowed with the pārihāras, called attemara-viṭṭika (sic. antahkura-viṣṭika) and abhidha-pradesa (sic. abhaṭa-pravesa), which have already been explained.
The most important point in the record, however, is that the grant is said to have been made after getting the permission of (anunāpya) Viṣṇuvarman’s ārya-pitā Sāntivarman who was the lord of the entire Karnātadesa with its capital at Vaijayantī. It is generally held that this Sāntivarman is to be identified with the Kadamba king of that name, who was the son of Kākusthavarman and father of Mṛgēśarvarman. A recent writer on the subject however thinks that this king is to be identified with the Pallava king Sāntivara who, according to the Hebbata grant, installed Viṣṇuvarman. As we have already admitted, it is difficult, until further evidence is forthcoming, to be definite as regards the relation of the line of Kṛṣṇavarman I with the Early Kadambas of Mayūraśarman’s line. We have also seen that in the present state of our knowledge it is better to take king Sāntivarman of the Birur grant to be the same as the Kadamba king who was the son of Kākusthavarman. Kṛṣṇavarman I was possibly a son of Kākusthavarman and a younger brother of Sāntivarman.

Any one who would cause disturbances to the donees is said to be committing the sins of brahma-stri-go-mātr-pitr-ācārya-bhrāt-vadhā, guru-dāra-yamana and vaṁś-otsādana. The grant also quotes the usual verses referring to pānca-mahāpātaka, etc.

The Hebbata grant (Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R., 1925, p. 98) begins with the auspicious word svasti and a verse in the anuṣṭubh metre adoring Viṣṇu and beginning with the words jītaṁ bhagavatā.³ In this record, Viṣṇuvarma-Mahārāja has been called a parama-brahmānya and an expert in all the sāstras and kalas; cf. his epithets gāndharea-hastiśīkṣā-dhanurveṣu vatsarāj-ENDR-ārjuna-samena śabd-ārtha-nyāya-ciduṣā in the Bannahalli grant of his grandson (infra).

³ Jītaṁ bhagavatā tena viṣṇunā guruṁ caukṣuṣi.
Sris = svastyān-bhātī đeśa = ca nābhī padma jītaṁ mahāḥ.
He is also described as the jyeṣṭha-priya-tanaya of the aśvamedha-yājin Kṛṣṇavarma-Mahārāja and as installed by Sāntivara-Mahārāja-Pallavendra. We have seen that Kṛṣṇavarma I made his younger son Devavarman the Yuvarāja in preference to his eldest son Viṣṇuvarman who could not therefore have been a priya-tanaya of his father. The mention of Viṣṇuvarman as the "dear son" of Kṛṣṇavarma I in the Hebbatā grant of the fifth year of the former may therefore be taken as an erroneous exaggeration.¹

The grant was issued on the full-moon day of Kārttika in the fifth regnal year of Viṣṇuvarman when the king was residing at the adhiṣṭhāna (city or capital) of Kūḍalūr. We do not definitely know whether he occupied Palāšikā when he rebelled against the house of Vaijanyāti.

By this grant the king made an agrahāra of the village called Herbbata in the Sāṭtipalli-Jāripāta (division) of the Mahiṣa-viṣaya and offered it with dakṣinā and libations of water, in accordance with the brahmadeya-nyāya, to a Yajurvediya Brāhmaṇa belonging to the Badīra family (or clan) and the Gautama gotra. The name of the Mahiṣa-viṣaya (cf. Māhiṣika in the Purāṇic lists) is evidently the source from which the present Mysore (= Mahiṣūr) has derived its name. The agrahāra was made free from danda (fine), viśṭi (unpaid labour) and kara (tax).

The record ends with a reference to the five great sins, but does not quote the imprecatory verses.

¹ It may be conjectured that Viṣṇuvarman became his father's favourite son after the death of Yuvarāja Devavarman. But this does not explain the celebration of Aśvamedha by Kṛṣṇavarma and the installation of Viṣṇuvarman by a Pallava king.
III

KRŚŅA VARMAN II

The son of Viṣṇu Varman I was Śimhavarman who has been described as Mahārāja of the Kadambas (or a Mahārāja belonging to the Kadamba family) in the Bannahalli plates of his son Kṛṣṇa Varman II. We do not know where Śimhavarman became king after the death of his father and the annexation of his paternal kingdom, i.e., the Palāśikā division, by Rāvivarman. No record of his time has as yet come to light.

Śimhavarman's son was Kṛṣṇa Varman II who was a powerful king. We do not definitely know where he originally ruled. An inscription recording his gift of a village in the Sendraka-viṣaya (the Nāgarakhaṇḍa region forming parts of the present Shimoga district of Mysore) appears to suggest that his rule was at first limited in that part of the Kadamba kingdom. He is known to have led a successful expedition against Vaijayanṛti and to have conquered the Vaijayanṛti division ultimately. It is not certain whether he took Vaijayanṛti from Harivarman or from a member of another junior line of the Early Kadambas, which is known to have occupied Vaijayanṛti temporarily.

Three records of the time of Kṛṣṇa Varman II have so far been discovered.

I. The Bennur (Belur hobli) copper-plate grant (Ep. Carn., V, p. 504) of the Kadamba Dharma-mahārāja Kṛṣṇa Varman II begins with the Vaiṣṇavite adoration svasti jitam bhagavatā which is in consonance with the verse speaking of the glory of lord Hari at the beginning of the Bannahalli grant of the same king.
The adoration is followed by three verses which say that King Kṛṣṇavarman II was the son of Simhavarman, grand-son of Viṣṇudāsa and great-grandson of Rājarāja Kṛṣṇavarman I who, like King Yudhiṣṭhira of old, gave perpetually food to thousands of Brāhmaṇas. Kṛṣṇavarman II is said to have made the Brahmottara (brahmātrā ?) again and again (śāvuḷ-brahmottarama kurvan). In this record the Kadamba family is described as "rendered pure by the avabhīṣṭha bath of the Áśvamedha." This undoubtedly refers to the Horse-sacrifice celebrated by the reigning king's great-grandfather Kṛṣṇavarman I.

The most important point in the Bennur record is that the grant is said to have been made by the king when he had already set out on a military expedition against Vaijayantī (vaijayantī-viṣaya-yaṭrām = abhiprasāthita).¹ This shows beyond doubt that at the time when the Bennur grant was issued Kṛṣṇavarman II was not the ruler of that division of the Kadamba kingdom which had its headquarters at Vaijayantī. We have seen that Viṣṇuvarman, grandfather of Kṛṣṇavarman II, was killed by Ravivarman before the eleventh year of Ravi's reign. It is thus clear that the descendants of Sāntivarman and Kṛṣṇavarman I were ruling simultaneously at different parts of the Kadamba country.

The grant records the gift of the rāja-bhāga-daśabandha (the tenth part of the king's share or the tenth part which was the king's share²) and also a piece of land measuring six nīcantanas in a village called Palmaḍī in the Sendrakaviṣaya. Mr. V. R. R. Dikshitar published a paper on the

¹ Some scholars think that Kṛṣṇavarman II led an expedition from Vaijayantī. The passage vaijayantī-viṣaya-yaṭrāṁ clearly shows that this interpretation is untenable.

² Daśabandha has been called the king's share in books on law; e.g., Mann, VIII, verse 107. Kūliṅka in his gloss on this verse says, cādpddhātā sākṣiṃ yuṣm-dān. ādi-ṛṣyaśreṇa tṛipaḥṣo paryayam-pasti sākṣeyam ut vrodh tadā toṛaṇa-kṛpaḥ dāpāṁ eteśaṁ = ṛṇaṁ = uttamārṣaṇaṁ dāpyaḥ, tasya ca ṛṇaṁ daśamāṁ ṛṇaṁ ākṛtaṃ rāṣṭra dāṇḍaṁ ākṛtaṁ dāpyaḥ.
term dasabandha in Journ. Ind. Hist., August, 1934, pp. 174-80. Dikshitar however could not find out any reference to the term in such an early charter as the Bennur grant of Kṛṣṇavarman II. Dasabandha (as also the term pañca-bandha) is a legal expression found in the Arthaśāstra (III, chs. ii, xiii, etc.) and the Smṛtis (e.g., Manu, VIII, verse 107; Viśnunāśvara on Yajnavalkya, II, 171) in connection with some offences punishable with fines. It refers to the tenth part of the sum forming the subject-matter of the suit. In South Indian inscriptions of the medieval period the term occurs in the sense of a tax or an allowance of land or revenue as compensation for excavating a tank, well or channel (Rangacharya, Ins. Mad. Pres., II, Ni. 368,797, etc.). According to H. H. Wilson (A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue terms, etc., London, 1755, p. 127) the Telugu word dasabandham means "a deduction of 1/10th of the revenue on account of compensation for some public work, as the construction of a tank, etc." At the present time, ordinarily the enjoyers of the dasabandham rights are to undertake due repairs of irrigational works.

The grant was made by śrīmad-dharma-mahārāja-vijayaśiva-Kṛṣṇavarman II on the first lunar day called pratipad in the bright fortnight of Pausa when the king was before (a liṅga or an idol of) Mahādeva in the great temple of the village called Īṅgūṇa. It is interesting to note that, though possibly a Vaiśṇava Kṛṣṇavarman II was praying to Mahādeva (Śiva) for success in his expedition against Vaijayantī. The present grant resembles in nature a grant of the Viṣṇukunḍin king Madehavarman I who is known to have made the gift of a village when he set out on an expedition against the eastern countries (above, p. 131 ff.) The recipient of the grant of Kṛṣṇavarman II was a Brāhmaṇa, named Bhavasvāmin, who belonged to the Harīta gotra and is described as a Paiṅga. He was skilled in the performance of sacrifices and was well-versed in the
Chandoga. Paṅga-Bhavasvarmin seems to have been the priest of the said temple of Mahādeva.

The gift of a village in the Sendraka-viṣaya (parts of the present Shimoga district) suggests that the district formed a part of the kingdom of Kṛṣṇavarman II. We have seen that the Sendraka rāja Bhānuśakti was a governor under Harivarman. If this fact may be taken to suggest that the country of the Sendrakas was a part of Harivarman’s kingdom, it may be supposed that Kṛṣṇavarman II took the Sendraka-viṣaya from, and led the Vaijayantī expedition against Harivarman.

The grant ends with the usual verses and the adoration nama viṣṇave.

II. The Bannahalli grant (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 16) of king Kṛṣṇavarman II begins with the maṅgalaḥ om svasti and a verse¹ in adoration to lord Hari. The grant was issued in the seventh year of the king’s reign on the fifth lunar day of the waxing (i.e., bright) fortnight of Kārttiika-māsa under the asterism called Jyeṣṭhā. Mahārāja Kṛṣṇavarman II is called the son of Mahārāja Simhavarman, grandson of Mahārāja Viṣṇuvarman and great-grandson of Dharma-mahārāja Kṛṣṇavarman I. Viṣṇuvarman is here said to have been born of a daughter of the Kekayas and to have been skilled in gandharva (music), hasti-sīkṣā (science of elephant-rearing) and dhanur-vidyā (archery) like Vatsarāja, Indra and Arjuna. He is also called well-versed in sabda, artha² and nyāya. Kṛṣṇavarman I has been credited with the performance of Aśvamedha and with victory in many battles. The reigning king Kṛṣṇavarman II has been described as a

¹ Jayaty = adikītha-dāitya-endo-bole-čīna-śimordanaka
Jayat-pravṛtti-ṣamkāra-ṛṣṭi-māyā-dhara harch.

² Sabārthā is sometimes supposed to signify sabda-dātra and artha-dātra; it is however interesting to note that such a phrase is generally applied to a person having literary talent, e.g., Ramsāman and Sāba-Vīraśena; cf. the very similar epithet pada-padārthā-vicāra-buddha-buddha applied to Prajñāpatidhara in the Doopara grant of Vījayasena.
parama-brähmanya and as "one who acquired rājya-śrī by his own power, strength and valour."

The grant records the gift of a village called Kolanallūra in the Vallā́vi-viśaya, with libations of water and with all pariḥāras, to a learned and pious Brāhmaṇa, named Viṣṇu-śarman. The grant was made at the request of Haridatta Śreṣṭhin who belonged to the Tuviyalla gotra-pravara. The Śreṣṭhin is described as rāja-pūjita (honoured by the king). He was a performer of the Gosahara mahādāna.

The charter ends with the verses referring to the usual imprecation, the unresumable character of the grants and the five great sins. The maṅgala at the end of the record svasty=asti go-brähmaneḥbhyah.

III. Another grant (Ep. Ind., XVI, p. 268) of Kṛṣṇavarman II was discovered at Sirsi (Sirsi taluka, North Kanara district). It was issued when the king was at Vaijayantī, which fact shows that the vaijayanti-viśaya-yaṭrā that he undertook sometime before the date of this record was completely successful.

The grant records the gift of Kamakapalli in the Girigadagrama of the Karvanṇāgam-viśaya to a Somayājin Brāhmaṇa, named Somasvāmin, who belonged to the Vārāhi gotra and was well-versed in the Rigveda. Karvanṇāgam has been supposed to be the modern Karūr in Sirsi. The village Girigadha has been identified with modern Girigadde in the same taluka.

In the Sirsi grant Kṛṣṇavarman II has been described as "obtainer of rāja-śrī as a result of victory in many battles" and as "belonging to the Kadamba family......which took the sacred bath at the end of an Aśvamedha sacrifice." It is strange that some recent writers have taken the passage aśvamedha-abhisiktānām......kadambānām śrī-kṛṣṇavarmanamahārāja to mean that Kṛṣṇavarman II was anointed during a Horse-sacrifice. The passage undoubtedly means the same thing as aśvamedha-srūṇa-pavitrikṛt-ātmanām
kadambānām (Bennur grant of Kṛṣṇavarman II) and other similar expressions in the records of the successors of Kṛṣṇavarman I. The descendants of the Pallava aśvamedhin Kumāraviṃśu use a similar expression, e.g., yathāvad-āhṛt-aśvamedhānām pallaevānām. The Sirsi grant of Kṛṣṇavarman II certainly refers, as his other grants unquestionably do, to the Aśvamedha performed by his great-grandfather Kṛṣṇavarman I. There is absolutely no proof to show that Kṛṣṇavarman II himself performed the Horse-sacrifice. The idea of a king’s or prince’s rājya-ābhīśeka during the Aśvamedha is fantastic. If moreover he performed any horse-sacrifice, why do the Baninahalli and Bennur grants refer to the Aśvamedha of his great-grandfather and not of his own? In case an Aśvamedha was performed by Kṛṣṇavarman II before the time when the Sirsi grant was issued, he himself must have been described as aśvamedha-pājīn like his great-grandfather. No performer of the Aśvamedha is as yet known to have vaguely claimed to belong simply to an Aśvamedha-performing family. It must also be noted that he is not credited with the performance of Aśvamedha in the Tagare grant of his grandson. That the passage aśvamedh-ābhīśika (applied to the Kadamba family) does not mean Kṛṣṇavarman’s being “installed during Aśvamedha” is proved beyond doubt by the Gaṅga records which refer to the Kadamba family as aśvamedh-āvabhrth-ābhīśika (ābhīśika by the āvabhrthha bath of a series of Aśvamedhas).

It is interesting to note that in many of the early Gaṅga records, Avinīta-Koṅgani-Mahādhirāja, son of Mādhava-Mahādhirāja, has been called kṛṣṇavarna-mahādhirājasya priya-bhāgineya (dear sister’s son of Kṛṣṇavarma-Mahādhirāja). This Kṛṣṇavarma-Mahādhirāja has been described as śrī-mat-kadamba-kula-gagana-gabhasti-mālin (son in the firmament of the illustrious Kadamba family). There is however difference of opinion as regards the identification
of this Kadamba king, named Krṣṇavarman, mentioned in the Gaṅga records. Mr. K. N. Dikshit and some other scholars (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 166, n. 2; Ind. Hist. Quart., IX, p. 197) think that he is to be identified with the aśvamedha-gājīn Krṣṇavarman I, while others are of opinion that he should be identified with the aśvamedhin’s great-grandson Krṣṇavarman II. It is believed that “there are no clues in the records to enable one to ascertain who this Krṣṇavarma was, whether he was the first king of that name or his great-grandson” (Kadambakula, p. 55). The Gaṅga records however clearly show that Krṣṇavarma-Mahādhīrāja, maternal uncle of the Gaṅga king-Aviniṭa-Koṅgaṇi-Mahādhīrāja, was not Kadamba Krṣṇavarman I who was a performer of Aśvamedha, but his great-grandson Krṣṇavarman II who never celebrated any Horse-sacrifice. The Kadamba relative of the Gaṅgas is sometimes described in the Gaṅga records (see, e.g., the Merkera, Nagamangala, Javali and Kadagattur plates, Ind. Ant., I, p. 312; II, p. 155; Ep. Carn., VI, p. 151; etc.) as śṛi-mat-kadamba-kula-gagana-gabhasti-mālīn. In some Gaṅga records (see, e.g., Mallohalli and Bangalore Museum plates, Ind. Ant., V, p. 133; Ep. Carn., IX, p. 33; etc.), however, he is also described more fully as avicchinn (or avical)-aśvamedh-ārabhrīh-ābhīṣikta-śṛi-mat-kadamba-kula-gagana-gabhasti-mālīn (sun in the firmament of the illustrious Kadamba family which was wet owing to its taking the sacred bath in continuous Horse-sacrifices). The king has not been called a performer of Aśvamedha, but is said to have belonged to the Kadamba family in which Aśvamedha was celebrated. Since he is not described as an aśvamedha-gājīn, he cannot be the same as Krṣṇavarman I who has that epithet in the Devagiri, Birur and Bannahalli grants of his descendants. The fact that the epithet of the relative of the Gaṅgas saying that he belonged to the Kadamba family which was aśvamedh-
ābhiṣikta is essentially the same as that of Kṛṣṇavarman II in the Sirsi grant (cf. aśvamedh-ābhiṣiktānāṁ.... kadambānāṁ śri kṛṣṇavarma-mahārāja) and in the Bennur grant (cf. aśvamedh-ācābhrītha-svāna-pavitrikriyatmanāṁ kadambānāṁ.... dharma-mahārāja-vijaya-sīna-kṛṣṇavarma) shows beyond doubt that he should be identified with Kadamba Kṛṣṇavarman II and not with the latter's great-grandfather Kṛṣṇavarman I. It must also be noticed that Kṛṣṇavarman I was the only performer of the Horse-sacrifice among the early Kadambas and that no Kadamba king is known to have celebrated the sacrifice before his time. Only a successor of this king therefore can properly be called "belonging to the Kadamba family in which the Aśvamedha was performed." It may further be noticed that many of the grants of the successors of Sāntivarman refers to the Kadamba family as svāmi-mahāsena-mārg-yaṇ-āṇudhyāt-ābhiṣikta. We do not know whether there is a covert allusion to the acābhrītha of an Aśvamedha in this passage. The corresponding passage in the Sirsi grant of Kṛṣṇavarman II, which simply adds the word aśvamedha between the words ānuḍhyāta and ābhiṣikta, is practically the same.

The identification of the maternal uncle of Avinīta-Koṅgani-Mahādhīrāja with Kadamba Kṛṣṇavarman II seems to be supported also by the chronology of the Early Gaṅgas. Gaṅga Durvinita, Koṅganīvṛddha son of Avinīta-Koṅgani, probably lived up to the middle of the seventh century. There is a record (Ep. Carn., VIII, Nr. 35, p. 135) which speaks of a matrimonial relation between the Gaṅgas and the Calukyas.

A very late inscription found at Tālgunda (Ep. Carn., VII, Sk. 178) says that Mayūravarman (i.e., Mayūravarman) performed no less than eighteen Aśvamedhas. We have already seen that this late tradition is to be discarded as entirely unhistorical (ibid., p. 40; Journ. Ind. Hist., XII, p. 40, note; An. Hamb. Gr. Rev. Inst., XVI, p. 163, note). The plurality of Aśvamedhas claimed for the Kadambas in the passages of the Gaṅga records is evidently an unhistorical exaggeration. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the "one" Aśvamedha performed by Samudragupta is referred to as "many" Aśvamedhas in the records of his Vakālaka relatives.
of Bādāmi. "Seizing in the field of battle Kāduvetti who was celebrated as a Rāvana to the earth," it says, "and setting up his (own) daughter's son, he became formidable in the world in the hereditary kingdom of Jayasimha-vallabha; what a terror was this might of arm of Durvinita!" Kāduvetti is the Dravidian expression for Pallava and Vallabha was the title of the Calukya kings of Bādāmi. Jayasimha-vallabha is therefore the same as the grandfather of Pulakesin I (circa 550-66) and the first historical figure with which the Calukyas begin their genealogy. Calukya Jayasimha has been called Vallabhendra and Vallabha in the Malakuta and Aihole inscriptions respectively (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 342). It has been suggested (Triveni, I, pp. 112-20; Kadambakula, pp. 55-56) that the Gaṅga king Durvinita was the father-in-law of Pulakesin II who was defeated and killed by Pallava Narasimhavarman I about A.D. 642 and that it was the Gaṅga king who restored his grandson Vikramāditya I, third son of Pulakesin II, to the throne about 654. The suggestion seems probable.

If however the above suggestion be accepted, Gaṅga Durvinita who possibly had a very long reign appears to have lived as late as A.D. 654. As Durvinita's reign is thus known to have ended in the second half of the seventh century, it is reasonable to suppose that his father Avinītā-Kongani could not have ruled

1 In the same inscription, there is reference to a Kāduvetti of the warlike Kāṭci and his Pallava-umbrella.

2 Dubreuil places Durvinita in 908-50 A.D. (Anv. Hist. Dec., p. 100). Durvinita's last known inscriptions date is year 48 Parinchesa I of the Aśvatitasandarikathā śātra seems to speak of the Pallava king Simhavishnu of Kāṭci, Narendra Vīgavardhana of the Nālik region, and Durvinita (possibly the Gaṅga king, son of Avinītā) as contemporaries. Pallava Simhavishnu appears to be the same as Narasimhavarman I Simhavishnu son of Mahendravarman I who ruled about the second quarter of the seventh century. Narendra Vīgavardhana may be the same as Rukhra-Vīgavardhana, brother of Pulakesin II (609-12 A.D.), who might have been a governor of the Nālik region for some time before he was established at Pujapura.
earlier than the second half of the sixth century. Kṛṣṇa-
varman, the maternal uncle of Avinīta-Koṅgaṇi (second half
of the sixth century), thus appears to have lived about the
middle of the sixth century and certainly not much earlier.
We have seen that Viśṇuvarman who saw the latest years
of Śaṅtivarman and the early years of Rāvivarman was
killed before Ravi's eleventh year about the ninth or tenth
decade of the fifth century. Since Śaṅtivarman ruled
before A.D. 170 which is possibly the date of his son
Mṛgeśa's accession, Kṛṣṇaṭarman I must be placed about
the middle of the fifth century. As Viśṇuvarman seems
to have ended his rule about the end of that century, his
grandson Kṛṣṇaṭarman II must reasonably be placed about
the middle of the next century.
IV

BHOGIVARMAN

The son of Krṣṇavarman II was Ajavarman. No record of Ajavarman's time has as yet been discovered. We do not know whether he ascended the throne at all. The Tagare plates of his son Bhogivarman (Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R., 1918, p. 35) do not call him Mahārāja. Mahārāja Bhogivarman's rule appears to have fallen in the second half of the sixth century. It was the time of Calukya ascendancy in Mahārāṣṭra and Kuntala. The relation of Bhogivarman with the powerful Early Calukyas of Bādāmi cannot be determined until further evidence is forthcoming. Possibly the political existence of the dynasty of Krṣṇavarman I ended with Bhogivarman. His son Viṣṇuvarman II (who is not mentioned as a Yuvarāja in the Tagare record) does not appear to have ascended the throne.

The Tagare grant of Mahārāja Bhogivarman begins with the word svasti and a verse¹ in adoration to lord Viṣṇu. In this record the Kadamba family is mentioned as rendered pure by the acābhṛtha bath taken at the end of the Aśvamedha which evidently refers to the sacrifice performed by the donor's ancestor Krṣṇavarman I. Bhogivarma-[Ma]hārāja, dear son of Ajavarman and grandson of Krṣṇavarman-[Ma]hārāja II (not the performer of Aśvamedha), is said to have acquired a large kingdom by the power of his own arms. He is also said to have defeated many enemies. The claim may be an exaggerated one; but it proves at least that Bhogivarman had to fight with enemies.

¹ Jayaṁy—ambuja-gelagāḥ pātir—viṣṇu—sanātanah (?)
Varāha-ropaṇa dharmam yo-dodhāra ṣuca-kṛṣṇa.
The grant was made at the request of the king's son, named Viṣṇuvarman. It is not dated. It records the gift of a pallī called Kīrū-Kūḍalūr to a pious Brāhmaṇa, named Bhūtāśarman, who belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra. Kīrū-Kūḍalūr-pallī, which reminds us the name of the Kūḍalūr-adhiṣṭhāna whence the Hebbata grant of Viṣṇuvarman was issued, is said to have been one of the twenty-four pallis of the mahā-grāma called Tagare situated in the Tagare viṣaya. Tagare has been found to be a place in the Belur taluka.

It is said that the protector of the grant would enjoy the phala of an Āśvamedha sacrifice, but the confiscator would be loaded with the five great sins. The record quotes two verses (bāhubhir = vasudhā dattā, etc., and svamā dātum; sumahac = chakyam, etc.) as spoken by Manu.

The grant ends with a few lines written in the Kannada language, which say that the pallī was granted with the exemption from the thirty-two imports, and seems to mention the additional grant of a house in the northern street. "The second and the fourth lines on the third plate appear to be a subsequent addition by a later hand. They tell us that Poriyadgal granted Kīḻtivūr to Viṇṉar, as also an equal share below the tank of Kīrū-Kūḍalūr" (ibid., pp. 40-41).
CHAPTER III
EARLY KADAMBAS: MISCELLANEOUS LINES

I

KUMARAVARMAN AND MANDHATA

Another line of the Early Kadambas, the exact relation of which with the lines of Mayuraśarman and Kṛṣṇavarma I is not definitely settled, is known from inscriptions to have ruled in the Kadamba country and for sometime even at Vaijayanti. Only two inscriptions of this line have so far been discovered. They belong to a Kadamba king, named Māndhāta-rāja (evidently a mistake for Māndhāṭrāja), or Māndhāṭrvarman.1 In the Kudgere plates (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 12) the king is called sīr-vijaya-sīra-Māndhāṭrvarman and is said to have resided at Vaijayanti. In the Shimoga plates (Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R., 1911, p. 32) of the same king however the issuer’s name is given as Māndhāta-rāja and he is called the son of Mahārāja Kumaravarmar. The explicit

1 Māndhāṭrvarman of the Kudgere grant has been thought to be different from Māndhāṭa-rāja of the Shimoga grant and the reign of the former had been placed before that of Kṛṣṇavarma I on the grounds that the names of the donors are not exactly the same, that the Kudgere grant begins with the word siddhayam like the Malavalli and Talgunda records and that it does not mention the Kadamba family as being rendered pure by the Aśvamedha of Kṛṣṇavarma I. See Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R., 1911, p. 35; Journ. Ind. Hist., XIII, p. 241. It must be noticed that the Birur grant of Vīṣṇuvarman begins with siddhayam. Both the Halṣī grants of Harivarman begin with the expression siddhayam evasti. Are we to suppose that these princes lived before Kṛṣṇavarma I? Again, the performance of the Aśvamedha by Kṛṣṇavarma I is not mentioned in any of the three grants of Harivarman. Does it prove that Harivarman lived before the reign of Kṛṣṇavarma I? Māndhāṭa-rāja is most probably a copyist’s mistake for Māndhāṭrāja. Cf. Kṛṣṇavarma rāja and Kṛṣṇarāja in the Anaji record of Sīvanandavarman; Kirtivarman and Kirtirāja of the Calalkya records; Vaiṣṇavavarman and Vaiṣṇavarāja of the Kaira grant, etc. For palaeography, see above, p. 57, n. 2.
statement that the king belonged to the Kadamba family which was sanctified by the Horse-sacrifice (cf. aśvamedhā-pavitrikṛtānvayānāṁ...kadambānāṁ) clearly shows that the Kadamba king, named Māndhātā or Māndhātryavarnam, ruled after the celebration of the Aśvamedha by Krṣṇavarman I who was the only performer of the Horse-sacrifice among the Early Kadambas. We do not know where Mahārāja Kumāravarman ruled. His son Māndhātryavarnam however is known to have reigned at Vaijayantī from where he issued the Kudgere grant in the second year of his reign. In the present state of our knowledge it is difficult to place Māndhātryavarnam’s reign in the period between the time of Sāntivarman and that of Harivarman. It is possible that Māndhātā became the lord of Vaijayantī for some time in the period when the Kadamba country was in a state of chaos owing to the repeated attacks of the Early Calukyas of Bāḍāmi. He may have conquered Vaijayantī from Harivarman or from Krṣṇavarman II or one of the latter’s successors.

A set of copper-plates (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 12) belonging to the Kadamba king, named Māndhātryavarnam, was discovered at Kudgere in the Shimoga district. The grant was issued on the full-moon day of Vaiśākha in the second regnal year of the king who has been called Śri-viśaya-śīva-Māndhātryavarnam. The king issued the charter when he was residing at Vaijayantī. The grant records the gift of a kedāra (field, land), twenty nicarlanas by the royal measure, of the hala (plough-land) called Modekaraṇī within the border of Koḷāla-grāma which has been identified with modern Koḷala in the Tiplur taluka of the Tumkur district of Mysore. It was made with dakṣiṇā and with libations of water, and was exempted from the duty of providing cots, abode and boiled rice (a-khatva-vās-audana), from the ingress of soldiers, and from internal taxes and unpaid labour (antahkara-viṣṭika). The parihāra
called a-khatvā-vās-audana has been discussed in connection with the Mayidavolu and Hirahadagalli grants (above, p. 187 f.). It is practically the same as a-kūra-collaka-
vṃśi-khatā-[sany]vāsa mentioned in the grants of Pallava Sivaskandavarman. In this connection, it is interesting to note that according to Manu (VII, verse 119) "the headman of the village should get all of what is daily payable by the villagers to the king in the shape of anna (food), pāṇa (drink), indhāna (fuel) and other things." In connection with antah-kara (internal revenue), a reference to puravāyam (external revenue) in an inscription (S. Ind. Ins., III, No. 61) is interesting to note.

The recipient of the grant was a taittīrya-sabrahmacārin, named Devasarman, who belonged to the Kaṇḍinya gotra. The record ends with the usual verses and says that the paṭṭika was written by the Rahasyādhikṛta Dāmodaradatta. The official designation rahasyādhikṛta is found in other early inscriptions like the Hirahadagalli grant of Sivaskandavarman and the Peddavegi grant of Śaṅkāyana Nandivarman II.

The Shimoga plates were issued on the twelfth lunar day of the bright half of Karttika in the fifth regnal year of Māndhāta-rāja when the king was residing at vijay-Occhrṇgī, that is to say, at the city of Uccāśṛngī. Uccāśṛngī has been identified with Uchchāngidurga situated about three miles to the east of Molkālmuru in the Doḍḍari taluka of the Chitaldrug district, Mysore (Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R., 1910-11, p. 31; Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 285 n). We have seen that in the fourth year of king Harivarman’s reign, his pitṛṛya (father’s, i.e., Ravivarman’s, brother) Sivaraththa was probably in charge of the Uccāśṛngī division of the Kadamba country. It is however not known whether the Vaijayantī and Uccāśṛngī divisions were both taken by Māndhāta directly from Harivarman. Uccangī was the capital of the Nolambavāḍi 32,000 province (Bellary district
KUMĀRAVARMAN AND MĀNDHĀTĀ

and parts of Mysore) under the Pāṇḍyās and probably under the Pallavas before them. The Pallavas acquired the province when they conquered Bādāmi and temporarily overthrew the Calukyas. It was occupied by the Pāṇḍyās about the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. According to a Haribhar record of 1170-71, Kādamba Mahāmaṇḍa-leśvara Ketarasa had the hereditary title “lord of Uccangigiri” (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 564).

The Shimoga grant (Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R., 1911, p. 32) begins with the adoration: svasti: jītaṁ bhagavata. The record speaks of the Kādamba family as rendered pure by the sacred bath of the Horse-sacrifice which obviously refers to the Aśvamedha celebrated by Kṛṣṇavarman I. Māndhātārāja, son of Kumāravarma-Mahārāja, has been described as a successful warrior.

By this grant the Kādamba king made a gift of six nivarlanas of land along with some materials for building a house (gṛha-vastu) in the village of Kaggi as well as some lands in the village, called Pālgaṁi, to a learned and pious Brāhmaṇa, named Triyamabakavāmin, of the Atreya gotra. The passage pālgalini-grāmasya = āucaṁ = catuṣpati-kṣetram is not quite clear. Kaggigramā has been identified with the village of the same name, situated about ten miles to the south of Channagiri in the taluka of the same name (ibid, p. 35).

The grant ends with the usual imprecatory verses and the benediction: siddhir = astu.

1 The passage gṛha-vastuṇā cāṛddhaṁ has been explained as “together with a house and necessaries” (Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R., 1911, p. 35).
II

MADHUVARMAN AND ĐAIMODARA

Two other names of kings belonging to the Early Kadamba family are known from inscriptions. They are Madhuvarmman of the record found at Tadagani in the Udagani hobli of the Shikarpur taluka (Ep. Carn., VII, Sk. 66) and Đaimodara of the lithic record discovered at Konnur in the Belgaum district (Ind. Ant., XXI, p. 96). Their exact relation with the three lines of Early Kadamba kings already discussed cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge.

The Tadagani inscription which according to Rice belongs to circa 500 A.D. was issued by a Kadamba prince whose name has been written as maduvarmma. Maduvarmma is generally taken to be a mistake for Madhuvarmma. Mr. Govind Pai points out (Journ. Ind. Hist., XIII, pp. 25-26) that the name Madhuvarmman or Madhuvarmman bears no good sense. He is therefore inclined to change the reading śrī-maduvarmma as śrī-madhuvarmma which he further corrects as śrī-madh-đećavarmma. The word saṃgha written in the Devagiri grant as saṅga, and names like Madurā for Madhurā, Attivarman for Hastivarman, etc., suggest that the correction Madhuvarmman is not impossible. It may also be pointed out that many names in the early history of India do not bear any good sense. The names Dattavarman and Jalavarman of the Lakhamandal inscription (Bhandarkar, List, No. 1790) and Jātavarman of the Belava grant (ibid, No. 1714) may be cited as examples. Since the Sanskrit word madhu means "water," the names Madhuvarmman and Jalavarman would mean the same thing.
As has been suggested to me by Dr. Barnett, Madhuvaman may moreover be an abbreviated form of names like Madhuripavaran. The correction Devavarman may not be quite absurd, but it cannot be accepted without further evidence. Palaeography moreover seems to go against the suggestion of Govind Pai that this king ruled before Krśnavarman I. He thinks that Madhuvaman, whom he calls Devavarman, was the father of Krśnavarman I simply on the ground that the Tadagani record does not refer to the Aśvamedha of Krśnavarman I. We have seen that, excepting the Nilambur grant of Ravivarman, none of the records of Mrgeśavarman, Ravivarman and Harivarman refers to the Aśvamedha of the usurper.

As the Tadagani epigraph is damaged, the inscription could not be fully deciphered. It seems to record the gift of some lands in the villages called Satomahila-grāma and Ketakapāda to a Brāhmaṇa, named Nārāyanaśarman, who belonged to the Gautama gotra. The record ends with the usual verses. At the top of the stone there is an unfinished final verse along with the name of one Soma who seems to have belonged to the Kāśyapa gotra. The connection of this person with the grant of Madhuvaman is not known. It is also unknown to us whether Madhuvaman was a Rāja, Mahārāja or Yuvārāja of the Kadambas. The letters between the passages kadambānām and śrī-madhuvarmīś could not be deciphered. His position among the Early Kadamba princes is therefore bound to remain uncertain until further evidence is forthcoming.

The name of urpa Dāmodara, born in the family of the Kadambas, is found in a verse inscribed on a rock near Konnur, at the falls of the Ghaṭāprabha in the Belgaum district. The inscription is in the so-called box-headed characters and is probably not later than the beginning of the sixth century A.D. It has been noticed however that above the verse the name śrī-Dāmodara is twice inscribed
on the same rock, once in the usual box-headed characters and once in the characters used in the records of the Early Calukyas. Does this fact suggest that Dāmodara lived in the period when the northern part of the ancient Kadamba kingdom was already occupied by the Calukyas? Is it possible that Dāmodara was a feudatory or viceroy of a king of the Early Calukya family which was established about the middle of the sixth century at Bādāmi in the Bijapur district of the Bombay Presidency? It is however impossible to be definite on this point in the present state of our knowledge. Govind Pai presumes (Journ. Ind. Hist., XIII, p. 32) that Dāmodara was the son of Harivarman. The suggestion is absolutely without any ground.
CHAPTER IV
THE KEKAYAS

I

SIVANANDAVARMAN

According to the Purānas (Matsya, 48, 10-20; Vāyu, 99, 12-23), the Kekayas, Madras and Usinaras were branches of the family of Anu, son of Yayāti. The Ann tribe is frequently mentioned in the Ṛgveda (I, 108, 8; VII, 10, 5). A hymn of the Ṛgveda (VIII, 74) seems to suggest that the Anus lived in the central Punjab, not far from the river Paruṣpī. It is interesting to note that the same territory is afterwards found to be in the possession of the Kekayas and the Madras (see Raychaudhuri, Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind., 2nd ed., pp. 36-37; Law, Ancient Indian Tribes, II, p. 49 f.).

The Kekaya tribe is known from early literature to have dwelt in the modern Punjab between the country of Gandhāra which lay on both sides of the Indus, and the river Vipāśa (Beas). According to the Rāmāyana (II, 68, 19-22; VII, 113-14), the Kekaya territory lay beyond the Vipāśa and was adjacent to the Gandharva (i.e., Gandhāra) viṣaya. The name of the capital of the Kekaya country is not mentioned in the Vedic texts; the Rāmāyana (II, 67, 7; 68, 22) however tells us that the capital of the Kekayas was at Rājagrha or Girivraja. This Rājagrha-Girivraja has been identified with modern Girjak or Jalalpur on the Jhelum. Another Rājagrha-Girivraja is known to have been the ancient capital of Magadha. This city has been identified with Rājgir situated in Bihar between Pāṭnā and Gayā. In order to distinguish between the eastern and

1 My paper on the Southern Kekayas was published in Ind. Cult., IV, p. 516 ff.
western Rājagrha-Girivrajās, the eastern city was sometimes
called " Rājagrha of the Magadhās" (S.B.E., XIII, p.
150). A third Rājagrha is mentioned by Yuan Chwang
(Beal, Si-yu-ki, I, p. 44) as a city of Po-lo, i.e., Balkh.
Jain writers mention a Kekaya city called Setaviya and say
that one-half of the Kekaya kingdom was Aryan (Ind. Ant.,

The Chândogya Upaniṣat (V, I, 5) tells a story about
Āsvapati, king of Kekaya, who realised the supreme truth
and is reported to have once said, "In my janapada, there
is no thief, no villain, no drunkard, no Brāhmaṇa who does
not maintain and consecrate sacred fire in his house, no
illiterate person, no adulterer and therefore no adulteress."
According to the Satapatha-brāhmaṇa (X, 6, 1,2) and
Chândogya Upaniṣat (loc. cit., et seq.), Āsvapati, a con-
temporary of king Janaka of Videha, instructed a number
of Brāhmaṇas. It is known from the Rāmāyaṇa that
Daśaratha, the Ikṣvāku king of Ayodhyā, married a Kekaya
princess by whom he got a son, named Bharata. It may
not be quite impossible that Āsvapati was the name of a
family of Kekaya kings and not the name of any particular
ruler of Kekaya. A similar instance seems to be found in
the name of the ancient Brahmaddattas of Kāśi. That
Brahmaddatta was the name of a family and not that of a
particular king has already been proved (Bhandarkar,
Carmichael Lectures, 1918, p. 56 ; Raychaudhuri, op. cit.,
pp. 45-46). It is interesting to note that a traditional
king (father of the celebrated Sāvitrī) of the Madras who
dwelt near the Kekaya country, on the western bank of the
river Irāvatī (Mahābhārata, VIII, 44, 17), was also named
Āsvapati. We do not know whether he actually belonged
to the family of the Kekaya kings.

Inscriptions prove the existence of a ruling dynasty
called Kekaya or Kaikeya in the Chitaldrug district of
Mysore. It has been supposed that the Kekayas migrated
to the south like the Ikṣvākus, Sibis and other north Indian tribes or families. The southern Kekayas are known to have belonged to the Ātreya gotra and the Soma-vamśa (lunar race). We have seen that, according to the Purāṇas, the Kekayas belonged to the family of Anu, son of the celebrated Yayāti. According to the Mahābhārata (I, 95, 7), Yayāti was a king of the lunar race. Yayāti, son of Nābuṣa, is mentioned in early texts like theṚgveda (I, 31, 17; X, 63, 1). The Kekayas who belonged to the family of Yayāti-Nābuṣya’s son, therefore, could rightly claim to have belonged to the Soma-vamśa. According to the Purāṇas (e.g., Vāyu, 26, 18-20), Soma (i.e., moon) was born of Anasuyā by Atri, one of the principal gotrakāris. The praecaras of the Ātreya gotra are Atri, Ātreya and Satātapa. The Kekayas who claimed to have belonged to the family of Anu should properly belong either to the Atri or to the Ātreya gotra.

According to the Rāmāyana tradition, the Kekayas of Girivraja were matrimonially connected with the Ikṣvākus of Ayodhyā. It is interesting to note that the family of the southern Kekayas has also been described as ikṣvākubhir =api ṛajarsibhiḥ krt-avāha-cīvāha.¹ This fact goes to show that the princes and princesses of the southern Kekaya family were married in the house of the Ikṣvākus. This Ikṣvāku family however seems to be the same as that to which the great kings Cāntamūla I, his son Virapurisadatta and grandson Bhuvula Cāntamūla II belonged. These kings ruled in the Kistna-Guntur region of the Madras Presidency in the second, third and fourth quarters of the third century and are known to have had matrimonial relations with the kings of Ujjayinī and of Banavāsi. The reference to the Ikṣvāku rājārṣis in a Kekaya record of about the middle of the fifth

¹ Ācāha means son’s marriage, while śīvāha means the marriage of a daughter. These two terms occur in Rock Edict IX of Aśoka. See Dīpamārka, I, 90; Jātaka, I, 492, 2; IV, 316, 5; VI, 71, 92; also Cowell’s translation of Jātaka, V, p. 148, note 1.
century seems to suggest that the dynasty did not come to an end with the conquest of Andhrapatha by the Pallavas of Kāñci about the end of the third century. For the Ikṣvākus, see above, p. 9 ff.

Besides the Kekaya record discovered at Anaji in the Davanegere taluka of the Chitraldrug district, there are other inscriptions which prove the existence of the Kekayas in the Mysore region about the middle of the fifth century and possibly also in the eighth. In the Bannahalli grant (Ep. Ind., VI, p. 16) of Kadamba Kṛṣṇavarman II, the king’s grandfather Viṣṇuvarman, eldest son of Kṛṣṇavarman I, has been described as *kaikēya-sutāyāṃ = utpanna*. As we have seen, Kṛṣṇavarman I who married in the family of the Kekayas possibly ruled about the middle of the fifth century. In another Kadamba record (Mys. Arch. Surv., A. R., 1911, pp. 33, 35), Queen Prabhāvatī, wife of Mrgeśavarman-Dharmamahārāja and mother of Ravivarman-Dharmamahārāja, has been described as *kaikēya-mahākula-prasūtā*. We have seen that Kadamba Mrgeśavarman possibly began to rule in A.D. 470. The Kekayas are known to have had matrimonial relations not only with the Ikṣvākus and the Kadambas, but also with the Pallavas. A Pallava chief designated Vikramāditya-Satyāśraya-Prthivīvallabha-Pallavarāja-Gopāladeva who was the son of Caṇḍamahāsena and the lord of Payvegundūpura has been described as *kaikēya-vamś-odbhav-oddhata-puruṣa* in the Haldipur plates (Ep. Ind., XXI, p. 173 ff.) which have been palaeographically assigned to the eighth century A. D. The passage *kaikēya-vamś-odbhava* has been taken to indicate that Pallava Gopāladeva was connected with the Kekaya or Kaikeya family probably on his mother’s side.

The Anaji stone inscription (Ep. Carn., XI, p. 142) belongs to a Kekaya chief, named Sivanandavarman, who is described as belonging to the Kekaya family, Soma race and Ātreya gotra. He was a *parama-māheśvara* and was devoted to his parents, and his family was connected
maturemonially with the saintly kings of the Ikṣvāku family. The record refers to the loss of Sivanandavarman’s own country and to a tumultuous battle fought between Naṇakkaśa (?) Pallavarāja and Krṣṇavarmanarāja, and says that after the defeat of Krṣṇarāja’s army, the Kekaya chief, with a sense of relief in his heart, made up his mind, lay on a bed of *dārba* grass and being unwilling to enjoy worldly pleasures became desirous of going to heaven. Sivanandavarman is then said to have approached that position which is desired by all valiant men, and thereby spread the prosperity of his own family to last as long as the moon and the stars endure. Even after going near that position, he performed some meritorious deeds with the idea that a man dwells in heaven so long as his glory is remembered on the earth. The stone appears to have been engraved after the death of Sivanandavarman.

The inscription has been differently interpreted. Some scholars think (see Sewell, List, p. 352) that Sivanandavarman was a son of Kadamba Krṣṇavarman I and that he turned an ascetic. The first part of the theory is impossible in view of the fact that Sivanandavarman has been described as belonging not to the Kadamba family of the Mānava or Āṅgirasa gotra, but to the Kekaya family which belonged to the Soma vamśa and the Ātreya gotra. The second part of the theory is also rendered

1 Sivanandavarmanas uṣa-deśasya kṛṣya naṇakāsus (?) pallavarāja-krṣṇavarmanarājasya samāre tumulini (?) pravṛttte krṣṇarāja-swēyena bhagya pradamitā-hṛdaya- saṅkalpit-saṅkalpah hṛta dārba-kṛṣyaḥ pravir ṯa abhigauradārmatam caiva-kālēsvasthāpyaṁ kṛtīṁ abhāyam truśi smṛti-śūkta śūgana-gaṇanaḥ (?) manava-yāṃ bhogavirākṣa-manār-avarg-āṅgopī-kṛt-ekṣyaḥ indra-dāka-rukhām abhāyaya. In place of the passage kṛṣya naṇakāsus, Govind Pai is inclined to read kṛṣyena-śīlārīnaṁ. If this suggestion is accepted, the name of the Pallava antagonist of Krṣṇavarman I is not yet known.

2 ācārya-tārakam ātmano saptaśa paṇama-bīsanī vitarvanam virya drṣya vikrama pratapādē ca sahaḥ kṛṣya-harma-parasparam śāhā-vishaya-vicēṣṭhāḥ. Ācārya-pārakram abhāmatam abhāpataḥ.

3 Abhigaman-ātī saha-vamśa-sthākā-puruṣa-harmaṇāya dukto Tārakāḥ yanatūla vicitrati tārumāṇaṁ kālōm puruṣoḥ dīri nisamati pramudita-hṛdaya iti.
untenable by the fact that he is said to have attained the position which is desired by all valiant warriors, to have prepared a bed of darbha and to have become desirous of going to heaven. It seems to me that Sivanandavarman became seriously wounded in the battle fought between the Pallava king and king Kṛṣṇavarman and, apprehending death, lay on a bed of darbha. It may be noticed that the words avahāra and avaharaṇa (cf. the verb in abhyava-
ḥārayamāna) signify “cessation of fight” or “removing from the battle-field to the camp.” The desire of Sivanandavarman to go to heaven and to attain eternal fame may suggest that he burnt himself to death.

It has been suggested by previous writers that Sivanandavarman’s heart was broken at the defeat of Kṛṣṇarāja’s army. The passage prasamita-hṛdaya however seems to suggest that the Kekaya chief’s mind was relieved of anxiety at the disastrous defeat of Kṛṣṇarāja who has been identified with the Kadamba king Kṛṣṇavarman I. This fact appears to prove that, in the battle referred to, Sivanandavarman fought against Kṛṣṇavarman I. We have seen that though Viṣṇuvarman I, born of the Kekaya princess, was the eldest son of Kṛṣṇavarman I, his claim to the throne was laid aside and one of his younger brothers, named Devavarman, who was the favourite son of his father, was made Yuvarāja, i.e., heir to the throne. The fact that Viṣṇuvarman was installed by a Pallava king possibly suggests that he left his father’s court and removed to the court of a Pallava king. It is interesting to note that the battle referred to in the Anaji record was fought between Kṛṣṇavarman I and the Pallavas. It is possible that Sivananda, the Kekaya relative (maternal grandfather or uncle?) of Viṣṇuvarman, fought in the battle for the Pallava allies of Viṣṇuvarman and against Kṛṣṇavarman I. Otherwise Sivananda being prasamita-hṛdaya at the defeat of Kṛṣṇarāja’s army seems to become meaningless.
APPENDIX
I

YAVANA AND PARASIIKA

In an interesting paper on the question of Zoroastrian influence on early Buddhism in Dr. Modi Memorial Volume (Bombay, 1930), Dr. E. J. Thomas has offered some suggestions regarding the interpretation of the term Yavana in Indian inscriptions and literature. It is generally believed that Yavana originally signified the Greeks, but later it was used to mean all foreigners. Dr. Thomas however thinks it to be "an unnecessary assumption that the term must have first meant 'Greek' to the Indians" (p. 282) and takes it to be unlikely "that Indians could have distinguished the Yavanas from the Persians as specially Greek." "It is more probable," he says, "that they learnt the name from the Yavana forces with whom they came in contact, and that they applied the name to all foreigners whose military power was represented by these Yavanas, that is, to the Persians generally" (pp. 282-83). As a sequel to these views of his, Dr. Thomas has been constrained to think that Antiyoka (=Antiokhus II Theos of Syria) has been called Yona-rāja (i.e., Yavana king) in the second and thirteenth Rock Edicts of Asoka, because he was "the chief ruler of what remained of the ancient Persian empire" (p. 282). Dr. Thomas thus seems to think that the word Yavana, from the earliest times, meant "foreigner," and not "Greek" specially, and that the Indians never distinguished the

1 This paper was originally published in Journ. Ind. Hist., XIV, pp. 84-88.
Yavanas from the Persians. There is however evidence to show that neither of these two suggestions is justifiable.  

As regards the first point, we must note that the Persian or any other foreign tribe is never known to have been called Yavana in the early literature and records of India. It is, on the other hand, definitely known from a number of instances that the term Yavana denoted the Greeks. Amityoka's being called Yona-rāja may be explained away, as he was "the chief ruler of what remained of the ancient Persian empire." But that Yavana meant "Greek" is perfectly established by the evidence furnished by the Mahāvamsa, Milinda-pañha and the Besnagar pillar inscription of Heliodorus.

Some gāthās of the Mahāvamsa (XXIX, verse 30 ff.) give a list of countries and cities among which we get Yonanagam-Alasanda (i.e., Alexandria, the city of the Yavanas). Alasanda has been identified with Alexandria, founded by Alexander the Great near Kabul (op. cit., Geiger's ed., p. 194). Alasanda = Alexandria can hardly be a Persian town. According to the Milinda-pañha, Milinda who has been identified with the celebrated Indo-Greek king Menander was born at Kalasigama in the dipa of Alasanda.

---

1 Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar holds (Ind. Cult. I, pp. 16-17, 619 ff.) that "in early times Yavana always denoted the Greeks, but from the second century A.D. onwards, it seems to have been used to denote the Persians." As we shall see, this theory is equally untenable. For the evidence of the Baghavatī and the Junagadh inscription, see below. The reference to the Yavanas in the seventh century work Harṣa-carita in connection with Kakevasa, son of Siṃhagha, proves nothing.

2 It may be argued that since Tushaspa, who was Akka's governor in Surāṣṭra, had a Persian name, but has been called Yavana-rāja in the Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman (circa A.D. 130-50), the word Yavana in this case means a Persian. Names however can hardly be taken as proof of nationality. Pāṇandara, the name assumed by a great Kusāna king about the end of the second century A.D., is an Indian name, but the Kusāna king's family was not certainly indigenous to India. Many early Indian inscriptions, moreover, mention Yavanas bearing Hindu names, e.g., Yavana Čande (= Candra) in Lāḍedā, List, No. 1156.

3 Alasanda thus seems not to have been merely a city. Dipa (cf. Dvārā) appears to mean a district between two rivers.
This Milinda-Menander is said to have had his capital at Sāgara, modern Sialkot in the Punjab (I, 9: jambudīpe sāgālanāgarāṃ milindo nāṃg rāja ahosi). Again in another passage, this Sāgalaranagara is said to have belonged to the Yavanas (I, 2: atthi Yonakānāṁ nānaputabhedanāṃ sāgalanāma nāma nagaram). Next we should note that the Besnagar pillar inscription mentions a Yona-dāta (i.e., Yavana envoy), named Heliodor (Heliodorus), son of Diya (Dion), who was an inhabitant of Takhasila (Takṣaśilā, modern Taxila) and was sent by Mahārāja Aṃṭalikita (Antialkidas) to the court of the Śungha king Kautsiputra (probably Kosiputa, not Kāśiputa) Bhāgabhadra (Rapson, Ancient India, p. 157) who ruled about the middle of the second century B.C. (Smith, E. Hist. Ind., 4th ed., p. 238, note). The Greek names of the Yona-dāta and his father as well as of the king who sent him leave no doubt that the word Yona (=Yavana) was used to mean the Greeks. Aṃṭalikita of the inscription is evidently the Indo-Greek king, named Antialkidas, whose coins with both Greek and Indian legends, have been discovered in the Punjab (Smith; Catalogue, pp. 15-16). The possible reference to Yavanarāja Dīmita and his identification with Demetrius may also be noticed (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 84, n. 31).

There is moreover evidence to show that the term Yavana was borrowed by the Indians directly from their Persian neighbours. The Persians became acquainted with the Greeks chiefly through the Ionian colonists whom they called Yauna (=Ionian). This term occurs in the inscriptions of Darius in a wider sense to signify the Greeks or people of Greek origin generally. The Persian word Yauna was borrowed by the Indians. The Mahābhārata (XII, 207, 43), for example, has:

_Uttarāpatha-janmānāḥ kīrtayisyāmi tān = api,
Yauna-kāmboja-gandhārāḥ kīrātā barbaraḥ saha._
Yavana is only a Sanskritised form of Yauna of which the real Prakrit form is Yona. If the Indians learnt the use of the word from the Persians, it is hardly reasonable to suppose that they used it in an entirely different sense. It is possible that from the time of the Persian occupation of North-Western India (i.e., from the sixth century B.C.) and probably from still earlier times, the people of that part of India had commercial relations with Persia. It may therefore be suggested that Indian merchants who visited the bazaars of Persia for purposes of merchandise came into contact with Greek merchants and called them Yavana in imitation of the people of that country.

As regards the second supposition of Dr. Thomas, it may be said that, in early Indian literature and records, the Yavanas are not only distinguished from other foreign tribes, but are mentioned side by side also with the Pāraśikas, i.e., the Persians. The Nasik inscription of Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi's nineteenth year mentions the Yavanas along with the Sakas and the Palhavas who are said to have been routed by the Sātavāhana king Gautamiputra Śatakarni (circa 107-31 A.D.). The Rāmāyana (I, 54, 21) distinguishes the Yavanas from other foreign tribes in passages like śakān = yavana-miśritān (i.e., Sakas who had the Yavanas with them). In the Purāṇas (e.g., Vāyu, 46, 105-21, see also 88, 122), the following foreign

1 Arrian says (Chinneck's ed., p. 309) that "the district west of the river Indus as far as the river Cophen is inhabited by the Astacencians and the Ausracencians, Indian tribes. These were in ancient times subject to the Assyrians, afterwards to the Medes, and finally they submitted to the Persians and paid tribute to Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, as ruler of their land." Scholars like Ludwig, Hillebrandt, and Weber think that the Persians were known to the Indians as Parthas as early as the time of the Rigveda. See Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, I, pp. 504-05 (paru) and pp. 521-22 (pārthava); see also Camb. Hist. Ind., Vol. I, p. 322 and notes.

2 There seems to have been political relations as well. Indian soldiers in the Persian army are known to have fought on Greek soil, while the Greeks too fought for the Persians in India (Smith, E. Hist. Ind., 4th ed., p. 40).
tribes are said to have belonged to the Udīcya country: (1) Yavana, (2) Śaka, (3) Darada, (4) Tuṣāra and (5) Pallava. According to the Mahābhārata (V, 19), the Kāmboja king Sudākṣiṇa marshalled Yavana and Śaka forces at the great battle of Kurukṣetra. In works like the Mahābhārata (VI, 9), moreover, the Yavanas (Greeks) and the Pārāśikas (Persians) are separately mentioned as peoples living in the Udīcya-deśa. Cf.

\[ yavanāś = cīna-kāmbojā darunā mleccha-jātayāh, \\
\text{sakṣṛdgrahāḥ kulaṭṭhāś = ca ū nanā pārāśikaiḥ saha.} \]

Rapson says (Ancient India, p. 86) that the word Yavana denoted the Greeks "in the Indian literature and inscriptions of the last three centuries before and the first two centuries after the Christian era." The latest extremity however must be pushed at least up to the age of Kālidāsa who is generally supposed to have lived in the 4th century A.D. and to that of Viśākhadatta who lived still later. It is generally believed that, while describing Raghu's victorious campaign in the western countries, Kālidāsa identifies the Yavanas with the Pārāśikas. This belief is based on a wrong interpretation of verses 60-64 of Kālidāsa's Rāghuvamśa, Canto IV, where, as a matter of fact, the poet clearly distinguishes the country of the Pāraśikas from that of the Yavanas. In verse 60, Raghu is said to have started from the Aparānta (Northern Koūkaṇ) and to have gone by the sthala-vartma (land-route) to conquer the Pāraśikas. The king had a strong navy and could have easily sailed from the Aparānta coast to the Persian shore. Why, then, did he go by the land-route? The answer is to be found in the next verse wherein we are told that Raghu was jealous, as it were, of the merry-making of the Yavana girls. The host of Raghu's army is here very happily

\[ ^1 \text{ Cf. verse 36, which describes Raghu's fight with the Vaṇga.} \]
compared with a-kāla-jalad-odaya. Verse 61 thus clearly suggests that in going to Persia from the Northern Konkan, Raghu had to cross the country of the Yavanas with whom he had no mind to fight. Just as clouds temporarily prevent the lotuses from enjoying the sun, Raghu with his large army passed through the Yavana country frightening the Yavana girls and causing temporary cessation of their merry-making. The case of the Yavana girls may be compared with that of the Kerala women who were running this way and that way in extreme fright when, starting from the Pândya country, Raghu was marching through Kerala with a view to conquering the Aparānta.

In the passage asti tāvaschaka-yavana-kirīta-kāmboja-pārasika-bāhlika-prabhṛtiḥ of the Mudrārākṣasa, Act II, Visākhadatta also distinguishes the Yavanas from the Pārasikas.

1 Cf. verses 53 and 64, which describe Raghu’s march through Utkala and Kerala without fighting with the inhabitants of those countries. It may be supposed that these countries were ruled not by independent kings but by feudatory rulers.

2 I am indebted for the suggestion to Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri. Raghu did not fight with the Yavanas, but was going through their country to fight with the Pārasikas who lived further west (cf. pārāṣeṣṭha in verse 62). But the very appearance of his large army in the Yavana country was sufficient to cause terror in the hearts of the inhabitants. The poet says that Raghu could have avoided this, but as he wanted jealously, as it were, to put a stop to the merry-making of the Yavanas, he purposely preferred the land-route. In interpreting verses 53-65 of the Haykhaṇḍa. IV, V, Venkayya also separated the Yavanas from the Pārasikas. For his interpretation, see Arch. Sscr. Ind., A. R., 1903-07, p. 318, note 1. See also Bühler, Indian Inscriptions and the Antiquity of Indian Artificial Poetry (p. 40) in Ind. Ant., 1913.

3 I am indebted for this reference to Prof. Raychaudhuri. In the Brahmaṇḍa (XIV, 17-18), Vartakamhira mentions the Pārasikas along with the Śāltras, Yavanas, Ambaṭṭhas, Kṣambojas and Sindhussaviras. It is not impossible that Pārasava here signifies the Persians. Vākpatri (8th century A.D.), author of Gaṇḍa-rāhu, mentions the Pārasikas in the list of peoples conquered by his master and hero, Yudhvarman of Kasaq (Bühler, loc. cit.).
Evidence thus shows that the Yavanas were generally distinguished from the Persians and other foreign tribes by the Indians in ancient times even as late as the sixth century A.D. and that therefore the Persians and Yavanas were not identical.
Alluru Inscription

In the year 1924, Mr. N. Lakshminarayana Rao discovered at Alluru (Nandigrama taluka of the Kistna district), five miles from Yerrupalem, on the Bezwada-Hyderabad Railway line, an old Brāhmī inscription and the remains of an old Buddhist stāpa, at about two furlongs to the west of the village. A facsimile of the inscription (No. 331 of 1924), along with a short note on it, was published in the *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy* for the year ending 31st March, 1924. The inscription was afterwards edited by Dr. R. Shamasastry in the *Calcutta Review* for July, 1925. According to the transcript published in the *Review* the epigraph refers to jayadhāma (line 2), and cāradhāma (line 5), and to Sana, king of the Ayis (lines 16-17), who is supposed to have been the grantor of some gifts. The *Report* rightly says that the inscription may be palaeographically assigned to the 2nd century A.D. If, then, Dr. Shamasastry's reading and interpretation be correct, a king called Sana ruled over some parts, at least, of the Kistna district about that period, i.e., some time before the age of Jayavarman Brhatphalāyana.

It will, however, be seen from the facsimile that the transcript published in the *Calcutta Review* is faulty in many places, and that the words read as jayadhama and cāradhama there, are clearly degadhama (pious gift) and cā-ra-tho-ma respectively. Here, however, we shall only examine the passage where the name of the king has been read.

The Alluru inscription is very important from the palaeographical point of view. Though it is a fragment, all the letters that have been preserved are perfectly legible; and an interesting point is that in lines 7 and 13 we have a peculiar form—[\[\]J]. This figure has been taken to be so in both the *Report* and the *Review*. 
According to the Report, the inscription records the gift of "a certain Mahātalavara accompanied by his wife, son and daughter-in-law." Evidently the Report reads in line 16: *sabhāryasa saputakasa sanasakasa* and finds in the last word a Prakrit corruption of the Sanskrit word *snusā* (daughter-in-law). In the transcript of the Calcutta Review, the last word of the passage has been read as *sanasa kāta* (made by Sana). The letter after *ka* is certainly *sa*; but the letter after *sana* is that interesting figure we have referred to above.

I have no doubt that the letter which has been read as *sa*, is anything but that. The letter *sa* occurs many times in the inscription and in all cases the right side of the letter is prolonged upward to about the same height as that of the left side—[ınd]. It is clear that this form of *sa*, with the right side considerably raised upward, has been purposely used by the scribe to avoid a confusion between this letter and the *sa*-like form already referred to which occurs twice in the inscription. There can hardly be any doubt that the *sa*-like form is to be read as *tu*. It is certainly the original form from which the forms ṣ (= *tu*), ṣ (= *tu*), etc., of later inscriptions were developed. I, therefore, read line 16 of the Alluru inscription as *eta sabhāryasa saputakasa sanatukasa*. In the last word, then we get *napły* (grandson) and not *snusā* (daughter-in-law), and the word really means "accompanied by (his) grandson" and not "accompanied by his daughter-in-law." From what has been said, it is clear that there is not the slightest reference to any person named *Sana* in line 16 of the Alluru inscription. As regards the passage *agirāna* (line 17), interpreted as "the-

1 In such a case, however, the passage is required to have been *sa-sanasa*, like *sa-patakasa* and *sa-bhārīya*.

2 It must be noted that in the line 7, where also this form of *sa* occurs, the word has been read in the Calcutta Review as *sasutra* and has been translated as "twenty-six." I do not know how the word *sasutra* means "twenty-six." The word is certainly *sāstra*, that is, twenty-four.
king of the Ayis," it may be left out without any serious consideration. The line (line 17) ayirāṇa pūraṣaṇiyanā māṇyaṣasya should certainly be ṛyaśaṁya pūrvaśaṇiyanāṁ māṇyaṣasya in Sanskrit. Cf. ayirahamāgha=Sanskrit āryava- 

saṁgha in the Nagarjunikonda inscriptions.

Though it does not mention the name of any king, the Allurru inscription is important to the student of the history of South Indian Buddhism. It records the gift of lands and some other things to the nākāya of the pūrvaśaṇiya āryas. Pūrvaśāla or Pūrvaśīlā has been mentioned by the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang as Fu-p'o-shih-lo (Watters, On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India, II, 214), and in the inscription F. of Nagarjunikonda as Purasela (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 22). The grantor of the gifts is a certain Mahātalavara which word, as we have already seen, occurs several times in the Nagarjunikonda inscriptions and probably means "a governor." The gifts appear to be in the shape of some nivartanas of land, cows (gāvi), bullocks and carts (balivadhah- 
sakaṭa), men-servants and women-servants (dāsi-dāsa), lamps (divikāya), pams (kubhi-katāha), iron-vessels (lohiyo=Sanskrit lohikā), vessels made of bell-metal (kasasa bhāyana), etc., etc. There are also references to the dedication of a laṭāka (pond), of kārsaṇas and of an akṣaya-nīvi (permanent endowment) of a thousand purānas (purana-sahasa).

1 According to Kantīya's Arthasastra, II, 20, one nivartana appears to have been 240 × 240 square cubits (2.975 acres). According to a commentator of the Arthasastra, however, it was 120 × 120 square cubits (1.436 acre) only. Whereas the danda (rod) is equal to 8 cubits according to Kantīya, it is equal only to 4 cubits according to the commentator. It may be conjectured that the measuring rod was 8 cubits long in some parts of ancient India, while in other parts it was only 4 cubits long. Measuring rods are not uniform in all the provinces or districts of India even at the present day. Note also that a Bombay highā (3925 sq. yds.) is equal to about 21 Bengal highās (1 Bengal highā=4000 sq. yds.) at the present time. The longer rod may also have been used for special measurements (see above, p. 186 n.).

For danda=6 ft. (4 cubits), see Fleet's note at p. 541 of the English translation of the Arthasastra (1st ed.), by Shamasatry.

2 The passage is ráddālākāraka[ro]jya p[arṇ]aśaṁya-dvīkāya. Some time ago, Mr. K. N. Dikshit informed me that it has been explained as "lamps of the shape of the mouth of a ráddā fish, manufactured by the Yavanás."
III

PEDDAVEGI GRANT OF NANDIVARMAN II

The Peddavegi plates appear to be in an excellent state of preservation. All the characters are perfectly legible. These plates were edited in Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., I, p. 92 ff. My reading is based on the excellent plates published there.

Text.

1st Plate: 2nd Side

L. 1. Svasti [||*] Vijaya-Vengipurān-naika-¹
damar-āvāpta-vijayino²
L. 2. I. Hastivarmanmaha-rājasya praputraḥ³ vividha-
dharma-
L. 3. pradhānasya Nandivarmanmaha-rājasya pautraḥ

2nd Plate: 1st Side

L. 4. pratāp-apanata-sāmantasyā⁴ Caṇḍavarmanmaha-rāja⁵-
L. 5. II. sya putro jyeṣṭhah⁶ bhagavac-Citrarathasvāmi-
pād-ānudhyāto bappa-bhaṭṭaraka-pāda-bhaktah

2nd Plate: 2nd Side

L. 7. parama-bhāgavataś-Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja-⁷
gri⁸-Nandi-

¹ Read "d = aneka.
² Read "aṇapta.
³ Read "trō.
⁴ Read "cya.
⁵ Read "rāja.
⁶ Read "gho.
⁷ Read "Māhā".
⁸ Read "éri."
8. varmmā. Prālura-grāme Mutuḍa-sahitān = gra-
9. kān = samajñāpayati \* [\*\*] Asti \* asmad-
dharmma-yaśo-‘bhi-

3rd Plate: 1st Side

10. vrddhy-arthan = triloka-nāthasya Viṣṇugṛhasvā-
11. mina[h] Aru-\*
11. III. tore vraja-palakānam kraṣṭum devahalan = kṛtvā\*
12. asmābbhir = bhumi-nivarttanāni daśa X tath =

3rd Plate: 2nd Side

13. Munḍūra-grāme bhumi-nivarttanāni daśa X Cēnceru-
14. va-grāme bhumi-nivarttanāni saṭ VI tath =a-
15. va Kamburāńceruve bhumi-nivarttanāni saṭ VI

4th Plate: 1st Side

16. dettañi \* [\*\*] Tad = avagamyā desādhipaty-
17. āyuktaka-valla-
18. bha-rājapurus-ādibhiḥ = pariharttavyāni |
18. Pravardhamāṇa-vijaya-rājya-sampvatsarasya da-

4th Plate: 2nd Side

19. masya X Srāvana-māsa-śukla-pakṣasya Pratipa-
20. di paṭṭikā dattā [\*\*\*] Ājñāptir \* = Mulakūra-
21. bhojaka[h\*\*]

L. 21. Lākhituṁ rahasyādhikṛtena Kāṭikūrīnā [\*\*\*]

---

1. Read śāmā\*.
2. Asti is superfluous.
3. Read "mo = "pu".
4. Read kṛtvā = āsmā\*.
5. Read ājñāpti.
6. Read jattāñi.
APPENDIX—PEDDAVEGI GRANT

5th Plate: 1st Side

L. 22. Bahubhirv = vasudhā dattā bahubhiś = c = anupālitā [1*]

L. 23. V. Yasya yasya yada bhūmi tasya tasya tadā phalam 2 [||*]

L. 24. Saṣṭi-varṣa-sahasrāṇi svarge kṛḍati bhūmiduh [||]

5th Plate: 2nd Side

L. 25. Akṣeptā c = ābhimantā ca tāny = eva narake vased = itih. 3 [||]

1 Read bhūmis =
2 Read phalam.
3 Read itih.
IV

Polamuru Grant of Mādhavavarman I

The Polamuru grant of Mādhavavarman I was edited by R. Subba Rao in Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VI, p. 17 f. But his reading does not seem to me quite accurate in all places. Mr. Subba Rao, moreover, did not notice the numerous mistakes in the composition of the record. His translation is also not satisfactory. The passage viṣṇukoṇḍināṁ = appratiḥata-śāsana has been translated as "whose edicts pass unchallenged with the name of Vishnukundī," daśaśata-sakala-dharaṇītala-narapatir = avasita-vividha-divya as "who subdued the kings of the whole earth of ten hundred villages," parama-brahmaṇya as "who is the best Brāhmaṇ," taittirīyaka-sabrahmachāri as "who is the true Brahmachāri of the Taittirika branch," etc., etc. It may also be pointed out that Ll. 29-34 have been translated as "The executors of this grant are Hastikōsa and Virakōsa who are great warriors and whose duty it is to protect the grant." I fail to find any connection between Ll. 29-34 and Mr. Subba Rao's translation.

My reading is based on the facsimile published along with Mr. Subba Rao's paper in Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VI.

Text:

1st Plate : 2nd Side

L. 1. Svasti [||*] Bhagavat-śriparvatavāmi-pād-anu-
dhyātasya Viṣṇu[ndinā]m = appra-

1. Read: Bhagavat-Chri*.
APPENDIX—POLAMURU GRANT I

L. 2. tihata-sásanasya sva-pratá-papanata-sámanta-mañjapati-mandala[sva]

L. 3. I. virahita-ripu-śaṅg-vargasya vidh ī-īndu-pavitra-trivargasya vibudha-pati-sā[ddhya?]-

L. 4. śara-virā-vibhava-bala-parákramasya śrī-Vikramahendrasya śūno aneka-

L. 5. samara-[saṃ]ghaṭṭa-vijayma[ḥ]para-narapati-ma[ku]ṭa-īnīn-mayukh ś śvadāt-ca-

L. 6. [ra*] na-yugāsya Vikramāśrayasya śrī-Govinda-varmanah priya-tanayah ś atula-


2nd Plate : 1st Side

L. 8. patir = avasi[ta-vi]vidha-divyas = Trivaranagara-bhavana-gata-yuvati ś-jana-vi-

L. 9. harana-ratir = annanya ś-nṛpati-sadhārasa-dāna-māna-daya-dama ś śṛhti-

L. 10. mati-kṣānti-kānti-sauriy ś-audāryya-gābhīryya ś prabhṛty-ānka-gūṇa-sampa-

L. 11. j-jaṇita-raya-samutthita-bhūmandala-vyāpi-vipula-yaśoh ś śkratu-sa-

1 Read "vīḍhāyāya".
2 Read "āvaya" and "vīra". Dhāyas is not clear and the idea seems to be awkwardly expressed.
3 Read "spa.
4 Read "nīra = ane".
5 Read "ānī".
6 Read "pūr = tula".
7 Read "sāmpanno.
8 Subba Rao reads "ṛṣṭi.
9 Read "ṣvāmaya.
10 Subba Rao reads "dharma.
11 Read "āṇgya.
12 Read "gābhīrya.
13 Read "yāśāh".
SUCCESSORS OF THE SATAVAHANAS

L. 12. hasra-yājī Hiranyagarbha-prasūtaḥ ekādāś-Āśva-
medhi-āvabhṛthā-sīnāna-vi-
gata-jagad-enaskāḥ sarva-bhūta-parirakṣāna-cu-
icuh vidva-dvija guru-vri.

L. 14. ddha-tapasvi-jan-āśrayo mahārājah śrī-Mādhava-
varmā [\(\text{\textbullet}\) Api ca niyam = au-

2nd Plate : 2nd Side

L. 15. sānasam sattvam kaiśavam kā[nti]m = aindā-
vim udvahann = urubhā[h] bhāti vikrama-
āda.

L. 16. pta-bhūri-bhūḥ apy = asau mahītala-nṛpati-bhā-
skarāh [\(\text{\textbullet}\) Parama-brahmanyo

L. 17. mātā-pitrā 16-pād-anudyātāḥ 11 Janāśraya-mahārā-
jaḥ 12 Guḍḍāvadi 13-viṣa-

L. 18. II. yye 14 viṣaya-mahāttarān 12 = adhikāra-puruṣām
= ca 16 imam = arttham = ā[jnā]pa-

L. 19. yatya = asti 17 vidī[ta]m = astu vo yath = āśmā-
bhū[h] 18 Guḍḍāvādi-vi[sa] ye Da[h]ya-

1 Omit visarga.
2 Subba Rao reads evaṇaḥ.
3 Read "\(\text{\textbullet}\) evam-\(\text{\textbullet}\) dvārām.
4 Read ev.
5 Read vagam.
6 Read "\(\text{\textbullet}\) vām-\(\text{\textbullet}\) dvārām.
7 Read urubhā-hūṭi vikram-ārupa.
8 Read "bhūṛ = app = manu.
9 Subba Rao reads arpativ.
10 Read pīṭā.
11 Read "dhyaṇa.
12 Read "rāṇa.
14 Read viṣaya.
15 Read mahatta-\(\text{\textbullet}\).
16 Subba Rao reads "ṣamīca. Read "\(\text{\textbullet}\) = \(\text{\textbullet}\) = āṇa-\(\text{\textbullet}\).
17 Asti is superfluous.
18 Read "bhūṛ = Guḍḍa", See above, note 12.
L. 20. vavī-tūre Pulo[bū]ru-nāma-grāmah 1 Mayindavaṭ-taki-daksinata-sī-
L. 21. mānte catu 2-nivarttanaḥ = ca kṣetram yugapat pra[ttam] prāg-di-jigishayā prasthi-

3rd Plate : 1st Side

L. 22. tah Gooāva[r]m = atitaraṇ 4 veda-vedamga-
vido Rudrasā[rm]no naptre 4 sva-pitu-
L. 23. r = adhika-guṇ-adhyasi-tanoh 4 Dāmasārmmanah
putrāya Sivasārmmane Gauta-
L. 24. ma-sagotrāya Karumarāṣṭra-Kunḻura-vāstavyā-
yya Taittiirika *-sabra[hma]cāriṇe
L. 25. veda-catuṣṭaya samāmnāt-avadāt-ānanāya sva-kar-
mm-anu 5.
L. 26. sthāna-parāya phālgunyām 8 pauṛṇamasaya 8 somarāhu-sagraha-nimi[tte]
L. 27. Janāśraya-datyā 10 sarva-kara-parihāren = āgrahā-
L. 28. thā bhavadbhīr = anyaiś = ca dharm-adhiṣṭata 10

1 The third letter in the name of the village is not clear. An. Rep. S. Int. Ep.,
1914, p. 10, reads the name as Puliqhārin. In the grant of Jaya-dipeh 1, the name
in Pulubānna. Read "grāma = Mayā".
2 Read daksīna-samānta cau-r-nīca 5.
3 Read prāg-di-jigishayā, prasthitah and saradḥiḥ. Subha Rāo reads tāram.
4 Subha Rāo reads naptre.
5 Read "dhāśita-tanor = Dāma".
6 Read Taittiirika.
7 Read hāṃ-a-nām 11.
8 Subha Rāo reads phālgunya.
9 Read pauṛṇamasāya.
10 Read "dāttā. Subha Rāo reads dāttā 7.
11 Read "bārti".
12 Read "kṛṣṇa".
13 Read "kṛṣṇa".
14 Read pālanīya.
3rd Plate : 2nd Side

L. 29. ś-cid = vād bénéficā karāniyā [ ||* ] AŚnaptir = itra 1 Hastikōṣa-Virakoṣan [ ||* ] Mahā-
mātra-yodhayos = teṣām 2 śreyah kirtir = idam 3 mahat 4 [ ||* ] Ye-
na 5 lobhena lumpanti svapākās = teṣu 6 jāyate 7
[ ||* ] A[nyālya-
L. 31. samakāle tu sthātavyam śaktitah purā [ ||* ] Upeksati
L. 32. punary = yatra 8 nara[ke] sa [ni]mājati [ ||* ]
Ity = evam = ubhaya-
ganau sthikṛtyā 9 paripālayet [ ||* ] Atra Vyāsa-gītā 10 [ślokāḥ].

4th Plate : 1st Side

L. 33. [Ba]hubhir = va[śu]dhā dattā : bahubhiś = ca =
anupā[li]-
L. 34. tā[ ||* ] Yasya yasya yadā bhūmis = tasya tasya

tadā phalam 11 [ ||* ] Sva-da-
L. 35. tā 12 para-dattām = va 13 yo hareti 14 vasun-
dhāram 15 [ ||* ] Saṣṭhi-vā[ṛi]sa 16 sahasrā-

1 Read *tir = utra.
2 Read *x = tayā.
3 Read īgam.
4 Read mājati.
5 Read ca.
6 Read tu.
7 Read jāyante, though it does not suit the line, which seems to be in the
anupāli metre.
8 Read go = 'tra.
9 Read rekhṛtya. But the meaning of the passage is not clear.
10 Read Vyāsa-gītāḥ.
11 Read phalam.
12 Read sva-dattām.
13 Read *dattām ca.
14 Read hareti.
15 Read *rām.
16 Read saṣṭi-cūra.
L. 38. \( \text{ni viṣṭhayāṇ=} \text{jāyate kṛmi [ h ][*] Saṣṭhi} \text{, varṣa-sahasrāṇi} \)

L. 39. \( \text{svarge modatī bhūmidhī [ [ *] Ākṣettā [ c= anumanta ca tāny eva naka } \text{va-} \)

L. 40. \( \text{se[t] [||*] Na viṣa } \text{viṣam=ity=āhuh } \text{brahma-svam } \text{viṣam=uceyate [||*]} \)
\( \text{Viṣam= e-} \)

L. 41. \( \text{kāki[nam] ha[n]t]i brahma-svam pu[tra]- } \text{pautrikam } \text{[||*] Vijaya-rājya-samvat- } \text{sare[40] } \)

\(^1\) See note 16 at p. 338.
\(^2\) Read Ākṣettā.
\(^3\) Read saṣṭhi.
\(^4\) Read viṣaṣ.
\(^5\) Read "hūr=bra".
\(^6\) Read "hūm.
\(^7\) The upper part of the symbol looks like 40, and the lower part like 8. See above, p. 104, note.
POLAMURU GRANT OF JAYASIMHA I

These Plates have been edited in Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., IV, p. 72 ff. and in Ep. Ind., XIX, p. 254 ff. My transcript is prepared from the facsimile published in the former.

Text

L. 1. Svasti \[|\] Sri-vijaya-skandhāvārāt\(^1\) māty-
gana-parirakṣitānām Mānava-sagotrānām

L. 2. I. Hārītī-putrānām\(^2\) Aśvamedha-yājīnām Calu-
kyānām kula-jala nidhi-

L. 3. samutpanna-rāja-ratnasya sakala-bhuvana-
manḍala-manḍita-kīrttilā\(^3\) śrī-

L. 4. Kirttvarammanah pautrah\(^4\) aneka-samara-
samghatā vijayina[h] para-nara-

L. 5. pati-makuta-maṇi-mayūkha-vadāta-carana-
yugalasya śrī-Viśṇuvardhana-

L. 6. mahārājasya priya-tanayah pravardhamāna-
pratāp-ōpanata-samasta-

2nd Plate: 1st Side

L. 7. s[ā]manta-ma[ṇ]ḍalaḥ sva-bāhu-bala-par-
[ākram-o] pārijita-sa[kala]-yaśo-

L. 8. vibhāsita-dig-antarāḥ sva-śakti-traya-triśūl-
āvabhinna-para-narapati-

\(^1\) Read "rāṇa = mātya".

\(^2\) Read "nām = Aśrāna".

\(^3\) Better read kīrtitelā.

\(^4\) Read "ten = neka,"
L. 9. sakala-bala-cetanaḥ ¹ Brhaspatir = iva nayajño
Manur = iva vinaya-
L. 10. jñāṅ ² Yudhiṣṭhira iva dharma-parāyaṇaḥ
Arjuna-vad = aparā-nara-
L. 11. patibhir = anabhilaṃghita-pauruṣyaḥ, ³ aneka-
sāstrārttha-tattvajñānaḥ para-
L. 12. ma-brahmanyā ⁴ maiti-pitṛ-pād-ānudhyātah
Sri-Pridhivi-Jayasingha ⁵-va-

2nd Plate: 2nd Side

L. 13. labha-mahārājaḥ ⁶ Guddavādi ⁷-viṣaye viṣaya-
mahatta [rāṇ = adhi] kāra-pu-
L. 14. ruṣāms = ca ⁸ imam = artham = ajñāpayaty =
asti ⁹ viditum = astu vo yath = āsamābhī ¹¹
L. 15. II. Guddavādi-viṣaye Pulobūmra-nnāma ¹²-grā-
maḥ ¹³ veda-vedāṁga-
L. 16. vidō Dāmaśarmanaṁ paunrāya sva-pitur =
adhika-guna-gan-ādhi-
L. 17. vāsasya Śivaśarmanaṁ putrāya Taittirika
śabrahmacāriṇe ¹⁴ veda-
L. 18. dvay-ālamlkṛta-śārīrāya ¹⁵ Gautama-sagotrāya
sva [ka] rnm ¹⁷ = a [nuṣṭhāna]-
parāya pūrvv-āgrāhārika ¹-Rudrasaṃmaṇe ²
   = Asanapura-sthāna-vastavyāya
L. 20. śrī-Sarvvasiddhi-datyā ³ sarvva-kara-paribhāreṇ
   = āgrāhārikiṣṭya samprattah [||*]
L. 21. Tathā bhavadbhir-ānyaiś = ca dharmmadhi-
   śata ⁴-buddhibhiḥ paripālanīyā [[*]
L. 22. Na kaiś = cid = vādhā karaṇīyā [||*] Ājnāpt-
   tir = atra Hastikośa-Virakośa ⁶ [[||*] Byā-⁶-
L. 23. sa-gitāh Bahubhīrv-vasudhā dattā bahu-
   bhiś = c = ānupālītā [[*] Yasya yasya.
L. 24. yadā bhūmiś = tasya tasya tadā phalam = iti
   [||*] Sāmi||5 | gi 8 | ñi 3

¹ Read pūrvva-āgra⁴.
² Read "sa = 'sana".
³ Read dattiś.
⁴ Read dharmmadhitayita⁵.
⁵ Read "kośa".
⁶ Read Vyāsa. The word itokāḥ seems to be left out after gitāḥ.
⁷ The date was originally read in An. Rep. S. Ind. Ep., 1914, p. 10, as year
   [I]5, [ēu] di 6 (Sunday). Subba Rao reads same ⁴, which is certainly wrong. M. S.
   with Mr. Sarma except in the case of the last figure, which appears to me to be
certainly 3. Cf. the symbol for 3 in l. 30 of the Polamuru grant of Mādhavarman I.
Cf. also Bühler’s Indische Paläographie, Tafel IX, col. viii. The date thus appears
to be expressed in the old fashion. See above, p. 150 n.
VI

IMPORTANCE OF THE ĀŚVAMEDHA

In a note in *Ind. Cult.*, I, pp. 114-115, it has been suggested that since Mādhavavarman I Viśṇuṇḍin and Pravarasena I Vākāṭaka have been called simply Mahārāja (not Mahārājādhirāja) in the inscriptions, they are to be taken as petty feudatory chiefs even though they performed the Āśvamedha. In support of this theory, Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar says that “even a feudatory chieftain can perform a horse-sacrifice” (ibid., p. 115) and that the Āśvamedha “may or may not be preceded by a dig-vijaya” (p. 116). These theories however are not only against the evidence of the Śruti literature, but also go against the evidence of the inscriptions of these kings.

In inscriptions, Pravarasena I has been called samrāṭ which never signifies a subordinate chieftain (cf., samrāṭ[jo] vākāṭakānām mahārāja-śri-Pravarasenasya, etc., in the Balaghat plates; *Ep. Ind.*, IX, p. 270, l. 4; also the Channmak plates; *Corp. Ins. Ind.*, III, p. 235). That Mādhavavarman I was not incapable of dig-vijaya is proved by a reference to his expedition for conquering the eastern countries in the Polamaru grant (*Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc.*, VI, p. 17; *above*, p. 131). Mahārājādhirāja, based on rājātirāja, etc., of the Scytho-Kuśānas, was in early times not very often

1 A critic of my views has tried to explain the passage samrāṭ[jo] vākāṭakānām “as mere overlord of the Vākāṭakas” (*Ind. Cult.*, I, p. 701). There is however a number of instances (e.g., in the early Pallava and Kidanha grants) which prove beyond doubt that vākāṭakānām here means “of (i.e., belonging to) the Vākāṭaka family.” Another critic takes (ibid., II, pp. 54-55) samrāṭ vākāṭakānām to be one word in composition and points out that the passage has been used only in connection with the name of Pravarasena I which fact, he thinks, shows that the Vākāṭakas lost their original imperial position after the time of that king. This interpretation however supports our view that Pravarasena I Vākāṭaka was a samrāṭ. The Dūda plates (*Ep. Ind.*, III, p. 260 and n. 7), it should be noted, read samrāṭah which, according to Kielborn, is apparently a mistake for samrāṭah.
used in South India. The Kadamba king Kṛṣṇavarman I who performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice ruled over the Kuntala country about the middle of the 5th century A.D. In inscriptions, he is simply styled Dharma-Mahārāja—not Dharma-Mahārājādhirāja like Pallava Śivaskandavarman and others. The Devagiri grant (Ind. Ant., VII, p. 34) however calls him ek-ātapatra, “possessor of the sole umbrella,” which, as scholars have suggested (Moraes, Kadambakula, p. 39 n), “is indicative of universal sovereignty.” A subordinate king can hardly be called ekātapatra. The Birur grant (Ep. Carn., VI, p. 91) moreover calls him daksināpatha-vasumati-vasupati, “lord of the riches of the land of Daksināpatha,” which “clearly shows that Kṛṣṇavarman I claimed a sort of suzerainty over the whole of the Deccan.” See above, p. 222, and Journ. Ind. Hist., XV, p. 305; also my paper on Kadamba Kṛṣṇavarman I in An. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst., XVI, p. 160 ff.

Note also that the Malavalli record (Ep. Carn., VII, Sk. 264) describes an Early Kadamba king as kadambānam rājā, but also as vajayanti-dhamma-mahārājādhirāja. The Penukonda plates (Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 331) mention the Gaṅga feudatory named Madhava-Mahādhirāja and his Pallava overlord Skandavarman-Mahārāja. For Mahārāja Varahāsimha, general of Rājā Aparajīta, see the Nagda record (ibid., IV, p. 31).

Keith has pointed out that the Aśvamedha “is an old and famous rite, which kings alone can bring, to increase their realms” (Rel. Phil. Ved. Upanis., p. 343). The Baudhāyana Srauta Sūtra (XV, 1) says that a king victorious and of all the land should perform this sacrifice. According to the Taittiriya Br. (III, 8. 9. 4), “he is poured aside who being weak offers the Aśvamedha,” and again (V, 4. 12. 3), “it is essentially, like the fire offering, an utsaṇa-yajña, a sacrifice of great extent and elaboration.” See Keith, Black Yajus, pp. cxxxii-iv. According to the Āpastamba Srauta S,
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(XX, 1.1), a universal (sārcaḥaua) king can perform the Aśvamedha, but not (u = āpi) an un-universal (a-sārvabhauma) king. It is clear from these statements that a subordinate ruler could never celebrate the Aśvamedha. A performer of the Aśvamedha may not have been a ruler of the earth from North Pole to South Pole or of India from the Himalaya to the Kumārikā; but he must have been an independent ruler of a considerable portion of India.

An essential feature of the Aśvamedha, besides the actual slaying of the horse, is that about the completion of the performance, at the bidding of the Ādhyātya "a lute-player, a Rājanya, sings to the lute three Gāthās, verses, made by himself which refer to victories in battle connected with the sacrifice" (Keith, Rel. Phil. Ved. Upanis., p. 344). Further, "As revealed in the later texts, the sacrifice is essentially one of the princely greatness. The steed for a year roams under guardianship of a hundred princes, a hundred nobles with swords, a hundred sons of heralds and charioteers bearing quivers and arrows, and a hundred sons of attendants and charioteers bearing staves" (Sat. Br., XIII, 4. 2, 5; Baudh. Sr. S., XV, 1). See Black Yajus, loc. cit. To manage these requirements is simply impossible for a subordinate chief.

Moreover, that the progress of the Aśvamedha was sometimes impeded when other kings challenged one's authority to perform the sacrifice, is not only proved from the early cases referred to in Sat. Br. (XIII, 5. 3. 21-22) and

1 See Sahadakalpadruma-pariṣṭṭa (Hitabadi Office, Calcutta). e. v. Aśvamedha,

2 In place of u = āpi there is an alternate reading api, which is a later interpolation according to Keith (Black Yajus, p. cxvii). The interpolation seems to show that sārcaḥaua (not master of all the land) kings could also perform the Aśvamedha. The word sārcaḥaua however never means a feudatory. The alternative reading only shows that in later times kings who were powerful but who did not claim to be rulers of the earth (i.e., the major portion of the country) did also perform the Aśvamedha. It must however be noticed that the alternate reading goes against all the old texts quoted above.
Mahābhāra. (XIV, 74-84), but is also proved by a tradition recorded in such a late work as Kālidāsa’s Mālavikāgnimitra (Act V). It is stated that Puşyamitra Śungra’s sacrificial horse was let loose to roam for a year at its own will under the guardianship of his grandson Vasumitra who was attended by a hundred princes and brought the horse back after defeating the Yavanas as the horse perchance reached the southern bank of the Sindhu (i.e., the Indus) and was captured by the Yavana horsemen. That the Aśvamedha could not be performed without some sort of dig-vijaya is further conclusively proved by an eighth century inscription of the Pallavas. The Udāyendrāram grant No. 2 (Ind. Ant., VIII, p. 273) records that Udāyacandra, general of Nandivarma-Pallavamalla, defeated the Niśāda king Prthivīvyāghra who was accompanying an aśvamedha-turāṅgama, i.e., horse let loose in connection with a horse-sacrifice. This instance proves beyond doubt that the essential features of the Aśvamedha hardly changed even as late as the 8th century A.D. The famous poet Bhavabhūti who flourished in the same century also recognizes the above characteristic when he refers to the sacrifice as aśvamedha iti viśvājayīnāṃ kṣatriyāṇāṃ = urjasvalaḥ sarva-kṣatriya- paribhāci mahān = utkaraṇa-niśkarṣah (Uttaracarita, Act IV). ¹

Al-Bīrūnī (first half of the eleventh century A.D.) also says, "certain of them (i.e., sacrifices) can only be performed by the greatest of their kings. So, e.g., the Aśvamedha." (Sachau, Al-Bīrūnī’s India, II, p. 139).

Dr. Bhandarkar thinks (Ind. Cult., I, p. 116) that the number of performances of the Aśvamedha could be increased by simply multiplying the amount of daksīṇā payable to the Brāhmans. This view is however based on a wrong inter-

¹ I am indebted for this and for some other references to Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri. That the Aśvamedha did not lose its original and essential significance in later times is also proved by the Valṣyanath Temple inscription which refers to Aśvamedha as sātā samad-dāntar-aśvāṁśaḥ puro ṣaṁvedh-adga-mahābhūtānām.
pretation of the following verse of the Mahābhārata (XIV, 88. 14):

\[ \text{evam} = \text{atra mahārāja daṛśiṇāṁ tri-guṇāṁ kuru,} \]
\[ \text{trītvaṁ vrajatu te rājan brāhmaṇā hy = atra kāraṇam.} \]

The verse obviously implies that, according to a Brahmanical theory, the merit accruing from the celebration of the Aśvamedha, and not the Aśvamedha itself, could be tripled if the performer offered three-fold daṛśiṇā to the Brāhmaṇas.¹

In *Ind. Cult.*, II, pp. 140-141, Mr. J. C. Ghosh has quoted the Harivamśa to show that feudatory rulers could also perform the Aśvamedha. Vasudeva, father of Kṛṣṇa, lived at Gokula on Mount Govardhana in the vicinity of Mathurā; he was engaged in cattle-rearing and was a kara-dāyaka to Kamsa, the king of Mathurā (Harivamśa, I, VI, 1162-61). After the fall of Kamsa, the family of Vasudeva removed to Dwārakā. In Kṛṣṇa’s conversation with Indra there is an incidental reference which says that while in Dwārakā Vasudeva performed an Aśvamedha (*ibid.*, CL, 8574).²

It will be seen that Mr. Ghosh’s contention is clearly beside the mark. The question at issue is whether Vasudeva was a feudatory of the Mathurā kings at the time of celebrating the sacrifice after he was established in Dwārakā. There is absolutely no proof to show that he was. We do not know whether the Dwārakā region ever submitted to the kings of Mathurā. It must also be noted that the evidence of traditions recorded in works like the Harivamśa should always

¹ Another supporter of Dr. Bhandarkar’s theory says (*Ind. Cult.*, I, p. 837 n.), “The Aśvamedha certainly had a great imperial significance in the old days. But in the period under review it must have lost that importance. Other wise it would not have been repeated so often.” It may however be pointed out that the Aśvamedha is known to “have been repeated” many times even “in the old days.” Cf., e.g., Bharata Dasyavati’s 131 Aśvamedhas in *Sat. Sr.*, XIII, 3, 3, 11; also *Journ. Ind. Hist.*, XIII, p. 40 and above, p. 125.

be taken with a grain of salt. Haricāṃśa is obviously written for the exaltation and glorification of the family (pāṃśa) of Hari (i.e., Kṛṣṇa-Varṣudeva) and like similar treatises in honour of other religious heroes is not free from extravaganzas incident to a pronounced theological bias. The critical historian can hardly hope for sober history in such texts. On the contrary the probability is that the parent of the hero of the tale has been given more than his due. In the New Testament the saviour of the Christians is described as the son not of a mortal man but of God, and in the Saundarananda (II, verses 32, 39, etc.), etc., glories of the mightiest rulers are put on the head of a petty Sākya chief named Sudhodana.

Mr. Ghosh moreover does not appear to take the evidence of the Haricāṃśa as a whole. While describing the Ā śvamedha that was attempted by Janamejaya, Haricāṃśa itself (Baṅgabāṣṭ ed., Bhaviṣyaparva, 2) makes it clear that the horse-sacrifice could not be celebrated by a petty chief. When the Sarpa-yajña was finished, Janamejaya collected materials for the celebration of an Ā śvamedha. Then he invited the ṛteiks, purukitas and acāryas, and said, "I am desirous of celebrating a horse-sacrifice. Do ye dedicate the horse" (verses 5 and 6). Knowing however that the king’s sacrifice would not be successful, the omniscient Vyāsa warned him not to begin the Ā śvamedha. The sage said, "The Śruti lays down that the Kṣatriyas should celebrate the Ā śvamedha, the foremost of sacrifices. On account of the greatness of it, Vāsava will violate your sacrifice" (verse 28). "O slayer of enemies," the sage added, "as long as the world will last, Kṣatriyas will not

1 Ya kṣeṣe-hām rājiṣṭhena hāgam-vārijṇipātāh-iti.
2 Āśvamedhaḥ kṛṣṇa-vaśavatāḥ kṣatriyāyam pāriṣiṣṭah, tena bhūrema ṛte-yajñam vāsavo bhṛtyogiyati.

That the Ā śvamedha could be performed by great kings only is also proved by the fact that Vāsava (= Indra) is always represented as jealous of its performance. The Haricāṃśa describes how he endeavoured to spoil the Ā śvamedha of Janamejaya.
be able to collect materials for your horse-sacrifice" (v. 35). The king became very sad and said, "Console me by saying that the Aśvamedha will again be undertaken by kings" (v. 58). To this Vyāsa replied, "As energy counteracted by another lives in it, so (the knowledge of) the Aśvamedha, although stopped, will exist in the gods and Brahmans. There will be one Senānī, a Audhīśa, a Dvija and a descendant of Kaśyapa, who will revive the Aśvamedha in the Kali age" (v. 39-40). Could this great sacrifice, of which the Harivaṃśa speaks in so high terms, be performed by a petty feudatory chief?

Mr. Ghosh further points out (Ind. Cult., III, p. 547 f.) that Sewai Jai Singh of Amber (1699-1744 A.D.), though he was a feudatory of the Mughal Emperors Farrukhsīyar (1712-19) and Muhammad Shāh (1719-48), according to Todd (Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, 2nd ed., Madras, 1873, pp. 328-32), performed a horse-sacrifice and that therefore subordinate rulers could perform (Bhasya-pratipada, 5). Note also what Viśāyana says to the king: "O king, thou hast celebrated three hundred sacrifices; Viśāvra therefore cannot forgive thee any longer." (tref-paṇja-lata-paṇjamāṇa cādovasa = tvam na moryate. V. a., 5, 24). In this connection note what Bharadvaka himself says in another occasion (Ep. Ind., XIX. App., p. 2, n. 5). "As Indra is represented as being suspicious of Gorinda Gupta's power, the latter seems to have been a supreme ruler." See the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, Ch. 76, in which the significance of the Aśvamedha and the cause of Indra's unfavourable attitude are clearly described; also Rāgū, III, 38-66; Bhāgavata Purāṇa, IV, 46, 24; etc.

1 Tṛṇā vṛtiṃ kruṇāṇāḥ = e = aice cādvedāḥ paṇaṇaṇa, kṣatriyā n = dharøyasti piṇḍad = bhāmic = dharoyasti.
2 Yady = asti = paṇvar = arṣṭhir = yajñasya = āśvamedha maṇu.
3 The reference is generally thought to be to Puyamitra Śūṅga. But that is doubtful, as the Śūṅgas were Bhāradvājas and not Kaśyapas. On the strength of this verse and another in the Mālavikāngānītra, Raychaudhari suggests (Ind. Cult., III, p. 738 ff.; IV, p. 563 ff.) that Puyamitra was possibly not a Śūṅga but a Bimbhaka. The unanimous evidence of the Purāṇas, however, may be set aside only on evidence of a more positive character. Bimbhaka or Bimbhika appears to have been a predecessor of Puyamitra. Ghosh thinks that the Śūṅgas were dṛgāṇaṇayaṇa, i.e., both Bhāradvāja and Kaśyapa.

4 Uṣpata-paṇja devaṃ bhrāmaṇasya = upapatayate, tejasv vyāhṛtahaḥ tejas = tejas = et = dvatioṣayate; audhīśaḥ bhavatī kāti = cet senāni kāṣyapa devaḥ, avacchedāṃ kāliṣuṇaḥ punah pratygāhariṣyati.
the Aśvamedha. In my opinion, however, if Sewai Jaysingh performed any horse-sacrifice he must have become virtually independent before its celebration. In a paper on this subject in *Ind. Cult.*, III, p. 376 ff, I suggested that Sewai Jaysingh may not actually have celebrated any Aśvamedha and pointed out that he was certainly not a vassal of the Mughal emperors of Dehli during the later years of his reign. I quoted the words of Todd himself: 'Among the vanities of the founder of Ambér, it is said that he intended to get up the ceremony of the Aśwamédha yúga or "sacrifice of the horse" a rite which his research into the traditions of his nation must have informed him had he entailed destruction on all who had attempted it, from the days of Janameja the Pándu, to Jaichand the last Rajpoot monarch of Canauj' (op. cit., p. 339). It was pointed out that Todd only speaks of probabilities—'it is said,' 'he intended to,' etc. It is moreover a known fact now that Todd who wrote early in the nineteenth century and had scarcely any means of testing the authenticity of bardic tales is not accurate in his details. The very passage quoted above from Todd shows that the celebrated author made at least three statements which are not borne out by authentic history. Firstly, he calls Sewai Jaysingh 'the founder of Ambér.' This is wrong; because Jaysingh was the founder of Jaypur or Jaynagar, and not of Amber. Secondly, he mentions Gāhadavāla Jayaccandra as 'the last Rajpoot monarch of Canauj.' It is, however, now definitely known that the last Gāhadavāla king of Canauj was not Jayaccandra, but his son Hariścandra who, as is known from the Machhlishahr and Belkara inscriptions, ruled as a Parama-bhattaraka-Maharājādhirāja-Paramesvara at least up to Sampvat 1257 = A.D. 1200 (*J. A. S. B.*, 1911, pp. 763-65). Thirdly, he credits Gāhadavāla Jayaccandra with the celebration of an Aśvamedha like the Pándava king Janamejaya. No historian has ever suggested that Jayaccandra performed
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any horse-sacrifice. He is never credited with the Aśvamedha in any of the numerous Gāhadvāla records, nor in any other work that refers to him. Bardic traditions however report that Jayaccandra performed a Rājasūya-yajña along with the svayamvara of his daughter, the celebrated Samyogita. I therefore suggested that Todd may have confused the Rājasūya and Aśvamedha sacrifices. This suggestion has however been recently controverted by Mr. P. K. Gode (Journ. Ind. Hist., XV., 364 ff.; Poona Orientalist, II, p. 166 ff.; Mimāṃsā Prakāsh, II, p. 43 ff.) who points out that MSS. of Sadāśiva-Daśaputra’s Aćārasmiṭi-candrikā, Kṛṣṇa-kavi’s Iśvarvilāśa, Vrajanātha’s Padyataraṅgini, Viśveśvara’s Pratāpārka and Hariścandra’s Dharmasamgraha refer to the Aśvamedha performed by Sewai Jaysingh. I have read Cantos IV and V of the Iśvarvilāśa as quoted by Mr. Gode in Mimāṃsā Prakāś and admit that the evidence is genuine.

Now the point is whether Sewai Jaysingh performed the Aśvamedha as a vassal of the Mughal emperors. It is admitted by all writers on Mughal history that within less than twenty years after the death of Aurangzib in 1707 the actual possessions of the so-called emperors of Dehli became limited within the district round the walls of their capital; and that after the invasion of Nadir Shāh in 1739 no power of the emperors was left in Rajputana. We need not go into details. It will suffice to refer to Sir Jadunath Sarkar who says, ‘The invasion of Nadir Shāh dealt such a shattering blow to the empire of Dehli that after it the imperial authority was totally eliminated from Rajputana in all but the name. The Rajput princes were left entirely to themselves . . . . . (Fall of the Mughal Empire, p. 279). It is interesting in this connection to note that Todd himself takes the celebration of the sacrifice as a ‘virtual assumption of universal supremacy’ (op. cit., p. 339). He also says, ‘. . . . . amidst revolution, the
destruction of the empire, and the meteoric rise of the Mahrattas, he (i.e., Jayasinh) not only steered through the dangers, but elevated Ambér above all the principalities around . . . . . (op. cit., p. 381).

That Sewai Jayasinh defied imperial authority even before 1739 is proved by the following facts. In the war of succession that followed the death of Aurangzib, he attached himself to prince Bīdar Bakht, son of Ajam Shāh, and declared him successor of Aurangzib. For this opposition, Ambér was sequestered and an imperial governor sent to take its possession; but Jayasinh entered his states sword in hand, drove out the imperial garrisons and formed a league with Ajitsingh of Marwar for their mutual preservation (Todd, op. cit., p. 328). That he had independent political relations with neighbouring states is also proved by the fact that he did 'dispossess the Birgoorj of Deoti and Rajore which were added to his dominions; they embraced all the tract now called Macherri' (op. cit., pp. 337-38).

The only proof of Sewai Jayasinh's vassalage to the Dehli emperors is that, according to traditions, he was successively the governor of Agra and Mālwa and was made governor of Mālwa a second time in 1732 under Muhammad Shāh. We must however note in this connection that the great Marāṭha leader, the Peshwā, snatched away the provinces of Gujarāt and Mālwa from Muhammad Shāh who issued a farman bestowing the nāīb subahdārī on the Peshwā.¹ The Marāṭha leader replied that 'though the chauth of the whole of Hindustān was his due, he would be satisfied with the above two subhas' (Sarkar, op. cit., p. 277). Will any student of Marāṭha history believe that the great Peshwā, formally the nāīb subahdār of Muhammad Shāh, was a feudatory of the rois faindants of Dehli? Again, the so-called Mughal emperors occupied the throne of

¹ It is interesting to note that the emperor of Dehli conferred (June 19, 1722) the dignified title Rajadhīrāja on Sewai Jayasinh (Poona Orientalist, II, p. 168).
Dehli as late as A.D. 1858 when Bahádur Sháh II (1837-1858) was deposed, and the East India Company pretended to rule in the name of the Mughal emperors. Would it justify us to suppose that Governors-General of the East India Company were feudatory to the puppet emperors of Dehli?

In my opinion therefore the suggestions that Sewai Jaysingh of Amber performed a horse-sacrifice as a feudatory of the Mughal emperors and that therefore the Ásvamedha could be celebrated by a feudatory chief are inadmissible.¹

¹ Jaysingh may have performed the Ásvamedha after 1739 and before 1744. There is however a tradition current at Jaipur which refers to an invitation for an Ásvamedha received by Nágojibhāṣṭha from Sewai Jaysingh (Mimánsa Prakāsha, II, p. 43). Even if this tradition be genuine, I think that the sacrifice should be styled not as one celebrated by a feudatory of the Mughals, but as one performed by a virtually independent king. The Śruti verses quoted by Mevasr, J. C. Ghosh and A. Ghosh (Ind. Cult., III, pp. 760 f.; 768 f.) prove nothing (see my note, ibid., IV, p. 272 f.).
VII

DIVYAS


According to scholars like Bühler and Jolly (Camb. Hist. Ind., I, p. 283; S.B.E., XXV, p. cii; Recht und Sitte, p. 145), it is possible that all the nine forms of ordeal mentioned in later Smṛti literature existed in India from the earliest times. This implication evidently takes its stand on some doubtful early references and on the solitary example of a form of the phala-dīya in the Chāṇḍogya Upaniṣat (VI, 16, 1-2) and the recognition of the daica (divine) proofs in the Āpastamba Dharmasūtra (II, 11, 3;
Some scholars, e.g., Hopkins, Stenzler, Schlagintweit and Kaegi, on the other hand, believe that fire and water ordeals were first used and then came the elaborate trials by balance and other ordeals, till eventually there were nine formal ordeals (Camb. Hist. Ind., 1, p. 283; Z.D.M.G., IX, p. 661, etc.). The latter view seems to be more probable.

The earliest reference to trial by ordeal in India is to be found in the Chāndogya Upaniṣat (loc. cit.) where it is said that a man accused of theft takes in his hand a heated axe and is proved guilty if it burns him, but is acquitted if it does not. The above Upaniṣat seems to have been composed in a country to the South of Gandhāra (modern Rawalpindi and Peshawar districts) and in a place between the Indus and the Jumna (see op. cit., VI, 14, 1-2; VI, 10, 1). The reference to the axe-ordeal in it shows that this form of the phala-divya was used in that country when the Upaniṣat was composed about 550 B.C. (see Camb. Hist. Ind., I., pp. 116 and 112). There is however no proof to show that this ordeal was used in the different parts of India from such an early date as the sixth century B.C.

More important seems to be the recognition of the daiva or divine\(^2\) form of proof by the Āpastamba Dharma-sūtra

\(^1\) Āpastamba—"*In doubtful cases they shall give their decision after having ascertained the truth by inference, ordeal and the like means*" (S.B.E., II, p. 168). Trial by ordeals are said to have been referred to in early works like the Paññavaṇḍa-Bṛahmaṇa. Goldner thought that the ordeal by red-hot axe is referred to even in the Rigveda and Griffith discovered in another passage of it references to the fire and water ordeals. According to Weber, the Satapatha-Bṛahmaṇa makes mention of the balance ordeal. Macdonell and Keith however do not agree with any of these scholars. Scholars like Schlagintweit, Weber, Ludwig and Zimmer think that the fire ordeal is mentioned in the Atharva-veda; but Bloomfield and Whitney have disproved this theory. The system of trial by ordeals may or may not have been referred to in the early Vedic literature; but the practice seems to have been not unknown in India even in the early Vedic period (see Vedic Index, I., pp. 317-18, 264-65). A full-blended system universally used was, however, most probably unknown.

\(^2\) Cf. Nārada—"*Proof is said to be of two kinds, human and divine. Human proof consists of documentary and oral evidence. By divine proof is
which is a book on law. It must be noted that no other early text on criminal law prescribes trial by ordeal for the person accused. According to Bühler (S.B.E., II, 2nd ed., p. xiv), the Sūtras of Āpastamba are to be assigned to a date not later than the third century B.C., but may be placed 150 or 200 years earlier. Āpastamba’s however is a general recognition; none of the ordeals has been defined in the Sūtras. The chief subject discussed by him under this head are assault, adultery and theft. It is interesting to note in this connection that Kauṭilya, supposed to be the author of the celebrated Arthaśāstra, does not recognise the application of ordeals in connection with civil or criminal procedure. According to the Purāṇas, Mudrārākṣas, Mahāvacāsa and Āryamaṇjuśrīmulākalpa, Kauṭilya lived about the time of Candragupta Maurya in the 4th century B.C. He is therefore generally supposed to have been more or less of the same age as Āpastamba and to have had in his purview the administration of the Mauryas whose kingdom embraced almost the whole of India. These facts may not be sufficient to justify us in assuming that Kauṭilya is earlier than Āpastamba, but they may suggest that the

1 See, however, Smith, E., Hist. Ind., 4th ed., p. 161: “I have pointed out that its contents describe the state of things as existing immediately before the establishment of the Maurya empire, while Mr. Samasatry suggests that it may refer back even to the pre-Buddhist age. The book seems to be based on much more ancient treaties now lost and a good deal of it must have been archaic in Maurya times.” I do not agree with Johnson and Jolly (see J.R.A.S., 1929, p. 77 ff.) who think that Kauṭilya, Cāṇakya or Vaisākha was a fictitious figure. The testimony of the Purāṇas and other works (though not contemporaneous) regarding Kauṭilya’s connection with Candragupta Maurya may be disregarded only on definite negative evidence. Absence of reference to Kauṭilya in the works of classical writers and in early works like the Milindapañha is not definite proof. Kauṭilya appears to have been the founder of a new school of Political Philosophy, and the Arthaśāstra may be the work of this school.
system of trial by ordeal was not much popular and was not universally used in India about the fourth century B.C., which is generally supposed to be the time of Kauṭilya and Āpastamba. The general reference to daiva trial by Āpastamba possibly shows that the system of applying ordeals, known to him and used in his time and place, was not elaborate like that illustrated by later law-givers, but was rudimentary like that recognised in the Manusamhitā.

In view of the fact that the law-givers lived in different ages and in different parts of this vast country, we cannot expect unanimity in their views regarding trial by ordeal. It is interesting to note that the word divya originally meant an "oath," that is, a form of invoking the Supreme Being to prove the truth of an allegation; but later it was generally understood to mean "trial by ordeal," that is, a form appealing to the direct interposition of divine power. In connection with the development of the system of trial by ordeals, it is also interesting to note that while the system is unknown to the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, it is seen sprouted in the codes of Āpastamba and Manu, a little developed at the time of Yājñavalkya and Nārada, and fully grown at the age of the Mitakṣarā of Vijnānesvara and the Dīgarattra of Brhaspati. According to Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra, II, i), "Self-assertion (svayamcāda) on the part of

Many of its views may be ascribed to Kauṭilya; but the book, in its present form, is certainly post-Christian. The reference to Cina (derived from the name of the Tsin dynasty) proves that the Arthaśāstra cannot be earlier than the later half of the 3rd cent. B.C. The language and structure of the text and reference to the system of dating in terms of regnal year, month, fortnight and day (III, VI) prove that the work cannot be much earlier than the 2nd cent. A.D., which is the time of Rudradaman's Junagadh inscription. The present Arthaśāstra may be placed in the 1st or 2nd cent. A.D. The suggestion that works like the Arthaśāstra present an ideal rather than the real state of society can only be partially true. The Arthaśāstra could hardly avoid referring to trial by ordeals, had the system been popular in the locality where Kauṭilya's school developed. For an interesting paper on the date of the Arthaśāstra by Mr A. N. Rose, see Ind. Cult., IV, p. 435 ff.; see also my paper Popularisation of Classical Sanskrit and the Age of Sanskrit Dramas, read at the Indian History Congress, Allahabad (1935).
either of the litigant parties has been found faulty; examination (anuyoga), honesty (ârjava), evidence (hetu) and oath (âpattha)—these alone enable a man to win his cause." It appears that the system of trial by ordeal did not fully develop and was not popular at the time and locality of the author (or authors) of the Arthaśāstra. This fact possibly goes to show that Kantilaya cannot be placed—as is the view of some scholars¹—in the 3rd century A.D. i.e., almost about the time of Yajñavalkya.²

The simple âpatha of the Arthaśāstra is seen developed at the age of the Manusāṁhitā, i.e., about the 1st century A.D. or the 1st century B.C. (Camb. Hist. Ind., I, p. 279).³ According to Manu, a Brāhmaṇa—in order to justify the truth of his statement—should be compelled to swear by a declaration of truth; a Kṣatriya by his vāhana (horse, elephant, etc.), a vaiśya by his cattle, seed-corn and gold, and a Śūdra by all sins. Alternatively, a Śūdra may be put to fire, drowned into water or compelled to touch separately the heads of his sons and wives and swear; in these cases, the man who is not burnt by fire or quickly drowned by water and whose sons and wives (heads of whom were touched in swearing) do not fall ill within a short time, is to be considered as true regarding his statement (see Manusāṁhitā, VIII, verses 113-15). Manu therefore seems to have known only three forms of ordeals; the last

² Cf. Camb. Hist. Ind., I, p. 383: "As the Sūtras do not notice ordeals except for a general recognition of them as 'divine' proofs on the part of the late Apastamba, and as the later writers Yajñavalkya and Nārada describe five ordeals adding the plain, knife, scales and poison, it is reasonable to conclude that Manu stands, in time as well as description, midway between the two sets of authors and is the first to describe ordeals already known and practised."
³ Later writers on law have prescribed âpatha for minor and dieya for crimes. Cf.  

dhruva mañvānu-paṭtbhāṇa = en putra-duṣṭa-viśāmaka e tu ṣapathāḥ prabhā maṇavā ṣaṃsla haṭyāga  
evānye = abhilāpe ca dieyaṁ tu viśāhman  
(Sadāskatpadama, 8, 7, âpatha)
form of which however is not mentioned as a legal divya in the works of the later law-givers.¹

In the age of the Code of Yājñavalkya who possibly lived in Mithilā about the 4th century A.D. (Gamb. Hist. Ind., I, p. 279), the system of trial by ordeals became more developed. According to this law-giver "Balance, fire, water, poison and Kośa—these are the ordeals used here for the proof of innocence, when the accusations are heavy and when the accuser offers to hazard a mulet (in case he should fail); or one party may be tried by ordeal if he likes, the other then must risk an amercement; but the trial may take place even without any wager if the crime committed be injurious to the king... Balance for women, children, old men, the blind, the lame, Brahmānas and the sick; but for the Śūdra, fire or water or seven yavas of poison. Unless the loss of the accuser amounts to a thousand pieces of silver, he must not be tried by the spear-head, nor by poison, nor by balance; but if the offence be against the king or if the crime is heinous, he must acquit himself by one of these trials in all cases" (Yājñavalkya-samhitā, II, 95-99). Yājñavalkya thus appears to have known six forms of the ordeals, viz., (1) Balance, (2) Fire, (3) Water, (4) Poison, (5) Kośa and (6) Spear-head.

The existence of trial by ordeals in Indian courts in the 7th century A.D., i.e., some time after Yājñavalkya, is

¹ This form of ordeal seems to have been largely used in Bengal. It can be faintly traced in the alternations of rustic girls of Bengal even at the present time. Swearing before the learned Brahmānas is also mentioned by al-Bīrūnī (Sachau, op. cit., II, pp. 128-30). On one occasion a man is known to have taken an oath on the feet of the Marātaka king Śambha Chāttrapati. "Then Bhikṣuji Hariśāla said that the Marātaka’s feet were the UPSIDE to him and that he would take an oath on his feet. According to the word in the aforesaid manja, he undertook to him and that Kamastu was a Thārañā (Mīrān) peasant. Within a day or two of this oath, Bhikṣuji Gaikwāji got Cholera; he had to be carried back to the village on the back of a bullock and there he died after a month in consequence of that false oath taken on his behalf."
evidenced by the accounts left by Yuan Chwang who travelled in India from 629 to 645 A.D. Ordeals by water, fire, weighment or poison are said to have been much esteemed as efficient instruments for the ascertainment of truth, and are described with approval by the Chinese pilgrim (Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, I, p. 172). The six principal ordeals, viz., poison, water, image-water, balance, hot-coin and spear-head, are also described by the celebrated Mahomedan savant, al-Bīrūnī, who wrote his book on India in the second quarter of the eleventh century (Sachau, *Alberūnī’s India*, II, pp. 158-60).

The fully developed form of the system of trial by ordeals, however, can be found in the works of later writers on law, such as Bṛhaspati, Vijñāneśvara and others. According to the *Dieyatattva* (XIX, 4) of Bṛhaspati who seems to have lived about the 7th century A.D. (*Comb. Hist. Ind.*, I, p. 280), there are nine different forms of ordeals. They are:

*Dhaṭo = gnir = udakāṇ = c = oira viṣāṁ kośaś = ca pañcamam*

*Saśṭhaṇ = ca taṇḍulāḥ proktam saplamam ṭopāta-māṣakam*

*Aṣṭamāṇ phālam = ity = uktam navamam dharmajāṁ smṛtam*

I. *Dhaṭa-dīvyā* or *Tulā-dīvyā*, i.e., Ordeal by Balance.

The beam having been previously adjusted, the cord fixed and the scales made perfectly even, the accused person and a Brāhmaṇa judge (*prādṛśivāka*) fast a whole day. Then, after the accused has been propitiated with homa and deities have been worshipped, the person is weighed. When he is taken out of the scale, the *prādṛśivāka* prostrates before the balance, pronounces some mantras and having written the substance of the accusation on a lipipatra, binds it on the head of the accused. After reciting some more mantras, the judge puts the man again on the
scale. If he weighs more than before, he is guilty; if less, innocent; and if exactly the same, he is held partially guilty. In case of doubt, the accused must be weighed again; but if any part of the balance—though well fixed—breaks down, it will be considered as proving his guilt (Sabdakalpadruma, s.v. tula).

II. Agni-diveya, i.e., Ordeal by Fire.

In performing the fire-ordeal, an excavation nine cubits long, two spans broad and one span deep is made in the ground and filled with a fire of Pippala wood. Into this fire the accused person must walk bare-footed; if his feet are unburnt he is innocent, otherwise guilty (As. Res., I, p. 390).

III. Jala-diveya or Ordeal by Water.

In the water-ordeal, the accused should be caused to stand in a depth of water sufficient to reach his navel; but care should be taken that no ravenous animal be in it and that it is not moved by much air. A Brāhmaṇa is then directed to go into the water with a staff in his hand, and a soldier shoots three arrows on dry ground from a cane bow. A man is then despatched to bring the arrows that has been shot farthest, and, after he has taken it up, another man is also ordered to run from the edge of the water. At this moment, the person accused is ordered to grasp the foot or the staff of the Brāhmaṇa who stands by him in the water, and immediately to dive into it. He must remain under water till the two men who were sent to fetch the arrows return. If he raises his body or head above the

1 Al-Biruni says (op. cit., p. 159), "In case he has spoken the truth, he now weighs more than the first time." We are not definite whether this is wrong or is based upon a local practice. Yuan Chwang also says, "The accused is weighed against a stone; and if the latter is lighter the charge is false, if otherwise it is true."
surface of the water before the arrows are brought back, his guilt is proved (ibid., pp. 390-91). The water ordeal is mentioned in the Padmāvatyavadvāna of the Bodhisattvācārānaka-palatā (S. N. Sen, op. cit., p. 573).

IV. Viṣa-dīvya or Ordeal by Poison.

The poison-ordeal was performed in two different ways:

(a) After the hōma is performed, and the accused person is bathed, 2½ ratis or 7 grains of viṣanāga (a poisonous root) or of śankhyā (i.e., white arsenic) are mixed with 6 māsas or 64 ratis of clarified butter which the accused should take from the hands of a Brāhmaṇa. If the poison is visibly effective, the man is condemned; if not, absolved.

(b) A hooded snake, called nāga, is thrown into an earthen pot into which is also dropped a ring, seal or coin. The accused person is then ordered to take it out with his hand. If the serpent does not bite him, he is proved innocent; otherwise, he is pronounced guilty (As. Res., I, p. 391).

Yuan Chwang seems to refer to a third variety of this ordeal when he says, "The poison ordeal requires that the right hind leg of a ram be cut off, and according to the portion assigned to the accused to eat, poisons are put into the leg, and if the man is innocent he survives, and if not the poison takes effect" (Watters, loc. cit.).

---

1 Trial by ordeal existed also in ancient Babylonia as is evidenced by the Code of Hammurabi which, according to Hall (Ancient History of the Near East, 7th ed., p. 211), was promulgated from circa 2123 to 2050 B.C. The Code which seems to have been based on ancient Semitic laws takes cognizance of a form of the water-ordeal. It was used when a man was accused of sorcery and a woman of adultery without sufficient evidence. In both cases the accused were to leap into the river, and their innocence was established if they came out alive (see Comb. Anc. Hist., I, xiv).

2 Hindi: Saṅkhya; Bengali: ṣaṅkhyā. According to al-Biruni (op. cit., p. 329) the kshā (poison) which the accused person was invited to drink was called brahmaṇa. This may be a mistransliteration for Viṣa-nāga.
V. Kośa-dīvya or Ordeal by "Image-Washed" Water.

The Kośa-dīvya is performed in the following way. The accused person is made to drink three draughts of water into which images of the sun, the Devī and other deities have been washed for the purpose. If the man has any sickness or indisposition within 14 days after taking the draughts, his crime is considered to be proved (ibid., p. 391). Al-Bīrūnī says (op. cit., p. 159) that the accused is taken to the temple of the most venerated idol of the town or realm and that the priests pour water over the idol of the town and give it to the accused to drink. The accused, according to him, vomits blood, in case he is guilty.

VI. Tāṇḍula-dīvya or Ordeal by Rice.¹

The rice-ordeal is generally applied to persons suspected of theft. Some dry rice is weighed with the Śālagram or some mantras are recited over it, and the suspected persons are severally asked to chew a quantity of it. As soon as it is done, they are ordered to throw it on some leaves of the Pippala tree or some bhūrjapatha (bark of a tree from Nepāl or Kāśmīr). The man from whose mouth rice comes dry or stained with blood, is pronounced guilty and the rest innocent (ibid., pp. 391-92). For two cases of the Tāṇḍula-dīvya, the first in connection with payment of money and the second with reference to a boundary question, see Rice, Mysore and Coorg, etc., p. 177.

VII. Taptamāsaka-dīvya or Ordeal by the Hot Māsaka Coin.

In performing this ordeal, the appointed ground is cleared and rubbed with cowdung. The next day at sunrise, after the worship of Gaṇeśa and other deities is done, the prājāpataka, having recited some mantras, places a round

¹ Cf. Cāl-poṛ of rural Bengal.
pan of gold, silver, copper, iron or clay, with a diameter of 12 inches and depth of 3 inches, and throws into it one seer or 80 sicca weight of clarified butter or oil of sesameum. After this, a māsaka coin is thrown into the pan, or alternatively a ring of gold or silver or iron is cleaned and cast into the oil which some Brāhmaṇas proceed to heat. When the thing in the pan is very hot, they throw a fresh leaf of Pippala or Bilva into it; if the leaf is burnt, the thing is taken to be sufficiently hot. Then after reciting a mantra, the prādevivāka orders the accused person to take the coin or ring out of the pan. If he can do this without his fingers being burnt or blistered, he is considered not-guilty; otherwise guilty (As. Res., I, p. 392; see also Pitāmaha quoted in the Mitākṣarā on Yājñavalkya, II, 113, and Alberuni's India, II, pp. 159-60). For cases of this ordeal in records of A.D. 1580 and 1677, see S. N. Sen, loc. cit.

VIII. Phala-dīya or Ordeal by Spear-Head.

In performing the phala-dīya, the Brāhmaṇas, after due worship of Ganeśa, draw nine circles on the ground with cowdung at intervals of 12 inches, each of which circles should have 12 inches as diameter except the ninth which may be smaller or bigger than the rest. Then the homa is performed, gods are worshipped and some mantras are recited. The accused person then performs ablutions and, wearing wet clothes and facing towards the east, stands in the first circle with his hands on his girdle. After this, the prādevivāka and the Brāhmaṇas order him to rub some unhusked rice between his palms which they carefully inspect.

---

1 Twenty palas of ghee and oil, according to Pitāmaha.
2 Even in the 13th century A.D. the real trial in England was by the ordeal of water, failing to get through which the accused was condemned. The English water ordeal was however more akin to the tāpā māsaka dīya of the ancient Indian Penal Code. "The accused had to dip his hand into boiling water and take out a stone from the bottom of the vessel. The hand was then tied up for a time (usually seven days), and if, when the bandages were taken off, it was found to be healed, the man was held acquitted" (Warner & Marten, Groundwork of British History, p. 70).
If any scar of a former wound, mole or any other mark appears on his palms, they stain it with a dye, so that it may be distinguished from any new mark after trial. The accused is then ordered to hold both his hands open and close together. Having, then, put into his hands seven leaves of the trembling tree or Pippala, seven of the Saum or jand, seven blades of the Darbha grass, a little barley moistened with curd and a few flowers, they tie the leaves on the hands with seven threads of raw cotton. Some mantras are then recited by the Brāhmaṇas who next write a statement of the case and the point in issue on a palmyra leaf together with the appointed mantra, and tie the leaf on the head of the accused person. Then they heat an iron-ball or a spear-head, weighing about five pounds, and throw it into water; they heat it again, and again cool it in the same way. The third time they heat the iron till it is red-hot. Next, the Brāhmaṇas, after reciting the mantras, take the red-hot iron with tongs and place it in the hands of the accused who is standing in the first circle. He must then gradually step from circle to circle, his feet being constantly in one of them. After reaching the eighth circle, he must throw the iron in the ninth to burn some grass which must be left there for that purpose. He is thereafter ordered to rub some unhusked rice between both his palms; if, on examination, any mark of burning appears on either of the palms, he is considered guilty; if no such marks appear, his innocence is proved (As. Res., I, p. 392). For a case of grasping a red-hot iron in a record of 1300 A.D., in the presence of the god Hoysalesvara, see S. N. Sen, loc. cit.; see also Alberâni’s India, II, p. 160.

IX. Dharmaja- or Dharm-ādharma-divya, i.e., Ordeal by (the images of) Dharma and Adharma.

In performing the image-ordeal (or Dharm-ādharma ordeal), two processes may be followed.
(a) An image named Dharma is made of silver, and another called Adharma of clay or iron. Both of these images are thrown into a big earthen jar. If the accused can bring the image of Dharma out of the jar after thrusting his hand into it, he is considered innocent; but if he brings out the image of Adharma, he is condemned.

(b) An image is drawn on a piece of white cloth and another on a piece of black cloth. The first is called Dharma and the second Adharma. These are severally rolled up in cowdung and thrown into a large jar, without being overseen by the accused. The accused is then ordered to bring out one of those rolls. If he brings out the figure on white cloth, he is acquitted; if that on the black cloth, convicted (ibid., p. 392; see also Pitamaha quoted in Mitakšara on Yajñavalkya, II, 113).

Certain months and days are specified for the different species of ordeals. There are also other injunctions in the Smṛti literature; but the law-givers are not unanimous on these points. It is not necessary to notice these in detail. We simply quote a passage from 'Ali Ibrahim Khan (op. cit., p. 393), where we find the tradition based on Vijñānesvara's Mitakšara and followed in the Benares region about the end of the eighteenth century.

"Agrahāyana, Pauṣa, Māgha, Phālguna, Śrāvana and Bhādra for that of fire; Āśvina, Kārttika, Jyaiśtha and Ashadh for that by water; Pauṣa, Magha and Phālguna for that by poison; and regularly there should be no water ordeal on the Āṣṭami or eighth, Caturdaśi or fourteenth day of the new or full moon, in the intercalary month, in the

1 Lead or iron, according to Pitamahā.
2 According to Pitamahā, "A Dharma in white and an Adharma in black are to be drawn either on the bhūrja or cloth."
3 Cowdung or clay, according to Pitamahā.
4 We use our method of transliteration.
month of Bhādra, on Śanaścara or Saturday, and on Maṅgala or Tuesday; but whenever a magistrate decides that there shall be an ordeal, the regular appointment of months and days need not be regarded.

"The Mitākṣara contains also the following distinctions. In cases of theft or fraud to the amount of a hundred gold mohurs, the trial by poison is proper; if eighty mohurs be stolen, the suspected person may be tried by fire; if forty, by the balance; if from thirty to ten, by the image-water; if two only, by rice."

As has been already noticed, differences in the views of different law-givers appear to us to be due to differences in their time and place. A few instances will possibly enable our readers to understand the point clearly.

(a) One of the most glaring instances of such differences may be seen in the views of Bṛhaspati on the eighth form of the nine divyas, namely, the phala-divya. According to Bṛhaspati, "A piece of iron, eight aṅgulis in length, four aṅgulis in breadth and weighing twelve palas, is called a phala; when the phala is red-hot (agmi-varṇa), the thief (here, stealer of a cow) must once lay it with the tongue; if (the tongue) is not burnt, he is held innocent; if otherwise, convicted." The passage go-caurasya pradāta-vyāṁ tapta-phāl-avalehanam = iti smṛtir = iti maithilāḥ (Sabdakulpadruma, s.v. phālam) possibly goes to show that this form of the phala-divya was very popular in North Bihar and that Bṛhaspati lived not very far from the Mithilā region. This form of the ordeal seems to have been unknown in South India. The licking form of the phala-divya is mentioned by Yuan Chwang (Watters, loc. cit.), who however describes it as a fire-ordeal.

1 Difference in the practice of the phala-divya is also evidenced by the Chāndogya-Upaniṣat where the thing to be heated is said to have been a paraśu.
(b) A local variety of the third ordeal, namely jaladiya, has been thus noticed by 'Ali Ibrāhīm Khān: "In the villages near Benares, it is the practice for the person, who is to be tried by this kind of ordeal, to stand in water up to his navel, and then holding the foot of a Brāhmaṇa, to dive under it as long as a man can walk fifty paces very gently. If, before the man has walked thus far, the accused rise above the water, he is condemned; if not, acquitted" (op. cit., p. 393).

Al-Bīrūnī possibly refers to a slightly different custom when he says (op. cit., p. 159), "They bring the man to a deep and rapidly flowing river, or to a deep well with much water. . . . . Then five men take him between them and throw him into the water. If he has spoken the truth, he will not drown and die."

According to Yuan Chwang (Watters, op. cit., p. 172), the accused was put in one sack and a stone in another, then the two sacks were connected and thrown into a deep stream; if the sack containing the stone floated and the other sank, the man's guilt was proved.

A different form of the jala-diyya was prevalent in the Marāṭhā country. "The parties and the Pandhars were sent to a sacred river like the Krishna, or better, to a sangama of special sanctity like the Krishna-Venā Saṅgama. There, at an auspicious moment, the Pandhars stood on the bank after their bath in the sacred stream, the defendant and the plaintiff still remaining standing in the river. Either the Patel or some other trustworthy man there present was then ordered to draw the rightful party from the water and pass a conscientious verdict" (Sen, op. cit., p. 365).

(c) Another glaring instance is in connection with the question whether ordeals should be applied to women. According to Nārada, who seems to have lived in Nepal about the 5th century A.D. (Camb. Hist. Ind., I, p. 280), women cannot be tried by ordeals (strīnāca na bhaved = dieyam). But
another law-giver, Śūlapāṇi, says that this prohibition refers to `divyasm' other than the tula-divyam, and we have already seen that Yajñavalkya prescribes trial by the balance ordeal for women. There is also a view that in connection with a quarrel between a man and a woman, the latter should undergo ordeals (sabdakalpadruma, s. v. parikṣā).

The application of ordeals to women appears to be supported by the Rāmāyanic story of Śītā undergoing the fire-ordeal in order to prove that her chastity was not violated by Rāvaṇa during her confinement in Laṅkā, and also by some epigraphic references. Some records (e.g., Ind. Ant., XIX, p. 248) say that Canduladevi (Candrike or Candrikadevi), wife of Lakṣmideva I (c. A.D. 1209), the Raṭṭa king of Saurāṭti, "attained victory over a number of serpents in an earthen water-jar"; the allusion here is certainly to the queen having undergone trial by the poison-ordeal (Bomb. Gaz., I, ii, p. 556 and note 5).

It is evidenced by some old Bengali works that, in Bengal also, the purity of wives was sometimes examined by ordeals. Thus, Khullanā, heroine of Kavikaṇkaṇ Mukundarām's Candikāvya (about Śaka 1499=A.D. 1577) is reported to have undergone successfully four ordeals, the first three of which are in reality the water, poison and spearhead ordeals (see D. C. Sen, Bangabhāṣā-o-Sāhitya, 4th ed., p. 371). It is also stated that Khullanā was put into a jata-qrha made specially for the purpose of testing her chastity, and then it was set fire to. This form of the fire-ordeal is however unknown to the Śruti literature. But the description of the Candikāvya seems to be more or less conventional. It is therefore not certain whether these ordeals were actually prevalent in Bengal in the second half of the sixteenth century A.D. Behulā (Sanskrit: Vipulā), the famous heroine of the Manasa-mangal story, is also said to have proved her purity by undergoing with success several of the ordeals (Praeśā, Kārttiḳ, 1333 B.S., p. 67).
From the above references we see that the prevalence of the system of trial by ordeals is not only proved by the Smṛti literature, but can also be proved from references to the practice in inscriptions and other writings. For inscriptive references, we refer our readers to *Ep. Ind.*, XIII, p. 294; XV, p. 394; and *Bomb. Gaz.*, I, ii, pp. 556 and note 5, 571 and note 3. Here we quote three instances of trial by ordeal, one from an inscription and two from the paper of 'Ali Ibrāhīm Khān who claims to have been an eye-witness of the trials:

I. In the Kaliyuga year 4289 (A.D. 1188) and the 15th year of the Goa Kadamba king Vira-Jayakesīdeva III " on Sunday, the eighth day of the bright fortnight of Āṣādha in presence of the fortunate prime-minister, Īśvarāya Daṇḍanāyaka, Śivasakti, the ācārya (priest) of the god Śri-Kalleśvaradeva of the well called Attibāvi at Kittūr, and Kalyāṇasakti, the ācārya of the original local deity of that place (Mūlasthānadeva), opened a subject of dispute, the former asserting that a plot of ground in that place, called Ālakolanakeyi, had from of old belonged to Kalleśvaradeva, while the latter claimed it for the original local deity (Mūlasthānadeva).

"The agreement that they both of their own free-will entered into at the presence of the same Īśvara Daṇḍanāyaka was this: Śivasakti said, 'Whereas this plot of ground (called) Ālakolanakeyi belonged of old to Kalleśvaradeva, Devarāśi, the father of Kalyāṇasakti, unauthorisedly brought it under cultivation under the Cande state and had a grant written in his own favour; and I am now prepared to undergo the phāla-dīvya in support of my statement that it had belonged from ancient times to Kalleśvaradeva.' (On the other hand), the argument of Kalyāṇasakti under oath with the sacred symbols on his head was, if the Cande Samstāna gave this plot of ground (called) Ālakolanakeyi to my father Devarāśi and to myself on behalf of the original
local deity (Mūlasthānadeva), it has not been unauthorisedly brought under cultivation.'

"Īśvara Dāṇḍanāyaka then said, 'Go both of you before the assemblage of the bankers of the village of Degāve, which has been granted in perpetuity to Brāhmanas; and on their assenting to this, on Sunday, the seventh day of the dark fortnight of Āśadhā in the same year, in the presence of all the bankers of the agrahāra village Degāve and in front of the temple of Mallikārjunadeva of that place, Sivaśakti, undergoing the ordeal of phāla-dīvya, made oath that the piece of land (called) Ālakolaṅkakeyi belonged of old to the god Kallesvara of Attibāvi; while Kalyānaśakti, taking the sacred symbols on his head (or standing on his head!), declared that it was the property of the original local deity (Mūlasthānadeva). After this, on Monday, the eighth day of the same dark fortnight, all the bankers of the agrahāra village Degāve having convened themselves in the assembly-ball and having examined the hand of Sivaśakti, decided that he had won his cause, and that Kalyānaśakti who had taken the sacred symbols on his head had lost it, and that the plot of ground called Ālakolaṅkakeyi belongs to the god Kallesvara of Attibāvi, and gave a certificate of success to Sivaśakti" (Kittūr inscription, J.B.B.R.A.S., IX, pp. 307-09).

II. "In the year of the Messiah 1783, a man was tried by the hot-ball (phāla-dīvya) at Benares in the presence of me, 'Ali Ibrāhīm Khān, on the following occasion. A man had accused one Saṅkar of larceny, who pleaded that he was not guilty; as the theft could not be proved by legal evidence, the trial by the fire-ordeal was tendered to the appellee and accepted by him. This well-wisher of mankind advised the learned magistrates and Pāṇdits to prevent the decision of a question by a mode not conformable to the practice of the Company's Government, and recommended an oath by the water of the Ganges and the leaves of the
tulasī in a little vessel of brass (copper?) or by the book Harivamśa, or by the stone Śālagrām, or by the hallowed ponds or basins, all which oaths are used in Benares. When the parties obstinately refused to try the issue by any one of the modes recommended and insisted on a trial by the hot-ball, the magistrates and Paṇḍits of the court were ordered to gratify their wishes and, setting aside those forms of trial in which there could be only a distant fear of death or loss of property as the just punishment of perjury by the sure yet slow judgment of heaven, to perform the ceremony of ordeal agreeably to the Dharmaśāstra: but it was not till after mature deliberation for four months that a regular mandate was issued for trial by the red-hot ball; and this was at length granted for four reasons: first, because there was no other way of condemning or absolving the person accused; secondly, because both parties were Hindus and this mode of trial was specially appointed in the Dharmaśāstra by the ancient law-givers; thirdly, because this ordeal was practised in the dominions of the Hindu Rājāś; and fourthly, because it might be useful to inquire how it was possible for the heat of fire to be resisted and for the hand that held it to avoid being burned. An order was accordingly sent to the Paṇḍits of the courts and of Benares to this effect: Since the parties accusing and accused are both Hindus and will not consent to any trial

1 A case of the same ordeal (described as aagu-dīpa according to the system of Narada) has been quoted by Prof. S. N. Sen (op. cit., pp. 577-78) from a Marāṭhi document "On Wednesday, my hands were bandaged. The next day, the aforesaid Paṇḍit sat . . . . on the banks of the Godāvari, opened the bandage of my hands in the presence of the god and had them rubbed with rice . . . . . . The signs on the two hands were all marked, and one iron-ball, 50 pālas or 168 tolaś, 2 māgus, was duly weighed and thrice heated in fire. They bound a bhūga-patra on my forehead, placed seven aśvathā leaves on my hands and bound them with thread. Then they placed the ball on my head and ordered me to walk over seven circles and drop the ball in the eighth . . . . dropped the ball on some grains which had been kept in the appointed place and the grains took fire . . . . . . ," etc. The accused person in this case came out successful through the ordeal.
but that by the hot-ball, let the ordeal desired be duly performed in the manner prescribed by the Mitākṣarā or Commentary on Yājñavalkya.

"When preparations were made for the trial, this well-wisher to mankind, attended by all the learned professors, by the officers of the court, the sipāhis of Captain Hogan's battalion and many inhabitants of Benares, went to the place prepared, and endeavoured to dissuade the appelloe from requiring the accused to be tried by fire, adding, 'if his hand be not burned, you shall certainly be imprisoned.' The accuser, not deterred by this menace, persisted in demanding the trial. The ceremony, therefore, was thus conducted before me, 'Ali Ibrāhīm Khān.

"The Pandita of the court and the city, having worshipped the god of knowledge and presented their oblation of clarified butter to the fire, formed nine circles of cow-dung on the ground; and, having bathed the appellee in the Ganges, brought him with his clothes wet; when, to remove all suspicion of deceit, they washed his hands with pure water: then, having written a statement of the case and the words of the mantra on a palmyra leaf, they tied it on his head; and into his hands, which they opened and joined together, seven leaves of Pippala, seven of Jend, seven blades of the darbha grass, a few flowers and some barley moistened with curd, which they fastened with raw white cotton. After this they made the iron-ball red-hot and, taking it up with tongs, placed it in his hands. He walked with it, step by step, the space of three gaz and a half through each of the seven intermediate rings, and threw the ball into the ninth where it burned the grass that had been left in it. He next, to prove his veracity, rubbed some rice in the husk between his hands, which were afterwards examined and were so far from being burned that not even a blister was raised on either of them. Since it is the nature of fire to burn, the officers of the court and the people
of Benares, nearly five hundred of whom attended the ceremony, were astonished at the event; and this well-wisher to mankind was perfectly amazed. It occurred to his weak apprehension that probably the fresh leaves and other things which, as it has been mentioned, were placed in the hands of the accused, had prevented their being burned; besides that the time was but short between his taking the ball and throwing it down; yet it is positively declared in the Dharmaśāstra and in the written opinion of the most respectable Pandits that the hand of a man who speaks truth cannot be burned; and 'Ali Ibrahim Kān certainly saw with his own eyes, as many others also saw with theirs, that the hands of the appellee in this case were unhurt by the fire. He was consequently discharged. But that men might in future be deterred from demanding the trial by ordeal, the appellor was committed for a week. After all, if such a trial could be seen once or twice by several intelligent men acquainted with natural philosophy, they might be able to assign the true reason why a man's hand may be burned in some cases and not in others" 1 (As. Res., I,
pp. 395-98). For another instance of the phala-divya, see B. V. Bhat, op. cit., p. 44.

III. "A Brāhmaṇa named Rśīśvara Bhaṭṭa accused one Rāmdayāl, a linen-painter, of having stolen his goods. Rāmdayāl pleaded not guilty; and after much altercation, consented to be tried, as it had been proposed, by the vessel of oil (taptā-māṣaka-dīvya). This well-wisher to mankind advised the Pāṇḍits of the court to prevent, if possible, that mode of trial; but since the parties insisted on it, an ordeal of hot oil, according to the Śāstra, was awarded for the same reasons which prevailed in regard to the trial by the ball. The Pāṇḍits who assisted in the ceremony were Bhiṣma Bhaṭṭa, Nāṇā Pāṭbak, Manirām Bhaṭṭa, Śiva, Anantarām Bhaṭṭa, Kṛpārām, Viṣṇubhari, Kṛṣṇacandra, Rāmendra, Govindarām, Harikṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa and Kālidās; the three last were Pāṇḍits of the court. When Ganeśa had been worshipped and the homa presented according to the Śāstra, they sent for this well-wisher to mankind who, attended by the two Dāroghās of the Divāni and Pāṇj-dārī courts, the Kotvāl of the town, the officers of the court and most of the inhabitants of Benares, went to the place of trial, where he laboured to dissuade Rāmdayāl and his father from submitting to the ordeal; and apprised them that, if the hands of the accused should be burned, he would be compelled to pay the value of the goods stolen, and his character would be disgraced in every company. Rāmdayāl would not desist; he thrust his hand into the vessel and was burned.¹ The opinion of the Pāṇḍits was then taken, and they were unanimous that by the burning of his hand, his guilt was established and he was bound to pay Rśīśvara Bhaṭṭa the price of what he had stolen; but if the sum exceeded five hundred ashrafis, his hand must be cut off

¹ The boldness and persistence possibly show that poor Rāmdayāl was actually innocent.
by an express law of the Śāstra; and a mulet also must be imposed on him according to his circumstances.

"The chief magistrate, therefore, caused Rāmdayāl to pay Rśisvāra seven hundred rupees in return for the goods which had been stolen; but as amerceements in such cases are usual at the courts of judicature at Benares, the mulet was remitted, and the prisoner was discharged.

"The record of this conviction was transmitted to Calcutta in the year of Messiah 1783; and in the month of April, 1784, the Governor-General, Imād-ud-daulah Jelādat Jang Bahādur, having seen the preceding account of trials by ordeals, put many questions concerning the meaning of Sanskrit words, and the cases: here reported, to which he received respectful answers . . . . . . ." (ibid., pp. 399-400).

The judgment of a case of the tapta-māsaka ordeal (described as agni-dīveya) has been quoted by Prof. S. N. Sen, op. cit., pp. 366-67: "You were then sent with Rājaśri Āpāji Hanumant Subhedār and Bāḷāji Dādāji and Baghoji Rant, officers from the Huzur and the District, to Pali for the performance of an agni-dīveya. The qot of that place assembled in the temple and they lighted a fire and heated ghee and oil mixed in customary proportion. You bathed and after a declaration of your right, took two pieces of metal from the heated liquid in the presence of all. Then your hand was bandaged and sealed. The next day the aforesaid parties were brought to the Huzur by the Kārkun of the District officer. On the third day, in the presence of the Majalasi, the bandage was taken off and the seals broken. On your hand were found only the marks that formerly existed there. Nothing more, nothing less; you passed the ordeal successfully."

---

1 The same as Warren Hastings, Governor of Bengal, 1772-74, Governor-General, 1774-85.
VIII

VAYALUR LIST OF EARLY PALLAVA KINGS

We have already said that the traditional list of early Pallava kings given in some late records is, in our opinion, not much valuable for the purpose of authentic history. All recent writers on Pallava history however have put much faith in the genealogical list given in the Vayalur grant of Rājasimha. The late Mr. H. Krishnasastri said, "It looks, therefore, as if the authors of the Kāśakudī, Udayendiram and Velurpālaiyam plates, all of which are admittedly later than the Vayalur record, but not much later, drew these stray names for airing their knowledge of early Pallava chronology purely from memory and were not always correct" (Ep. Ind., XVIII, p. 147). But this scholar and many others think the Vayalur list historically valuable. There are however reasons to believe that the earlier names of this list are all legendary and unhistorical and that the rest of the list has in it not only the names of a single branch of the Pallava family.

The following is the list of the Pallavas given in the Vayalur record:

1. Brahmaṇa.
2. Aṅgira.
4. Śaityu.
5. Bharadvāja.
6. Droṇa.
7. Aśvattihamana.
8. Pallava.
12. Suryavarman.

1 Nos. 1-6 are also mentioned in the Kurum (S. Ind. Ins., I, p. 144 ff.), Udayendiram No. 2 (Ind. Ant., VIII, p. 373) and Velurpalaiyam plates (S. Ind. Ins., II, p. 598). These names are evidently legendary.

2 Aśoka is mentioned in the Kasakudī (S. Ind. Ins., II, p. 342) and Velurpalaiyam plates. In the latter inscription he is called Aśokavarman. According to Hultzsch, the name is a modification of Aśoka, the great Maurya king of Pārāśarpitam.
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13. Viṣṇugopa (I).
15. Kalinda.
17. Ripumalla.
18. Vimala.
20. Kālabhartā.¹
22. Viṣṇukūra (I).²
23. Candravarman.
24. Karāla.
25. Viṣṇugopa (II).
26. Skandamūla.
27. Kānagopa.
28. Viṣṇukūra (II).³
29. Skandavarman (I).
32. Skandavarman (II).
33. Kumāravīṣṇu (II).⁴
34. Buddhavarman (II)
35. Skandavarman (III).
36. Viṣṇugopa (III).⁵
37. Viṣṇudāsa.
38. Skandavarman (IV).
39. Simhavarman (I).
40. Viṣṇavarman.
41. Skandavarman (V).
42. Simhavarman (II).⁶
43. Skandavarman (VI).
44. Nandivarman.⁷
45. Simhavarman (III).
46. Simhavarman (IV).
47. Viṣṇugopa (IV).
48. Simhavarman (V).
49. Simhavīṣṇu.
50. Mahendravarman.⁸ etc., etc., etc.,

¹ There is no proof that Nos. 10-30 were historical persons.
² He was possibly the first king of the family.
³ The Velupalamayam record appears to identify Viṣṇukūra I (No. 23) with Viṣṇukūra II (No. 24). This fact possibly shows that Nrs. 23-27 are unhistorical. May Viṣṇukūra (II) be identical with Viṣṇukūravāman of the Darai plate?
⁴ This Kumāravīṣṇu II issued the Chandalur grant.
⁵ This Viṣṇugopa may have been the contemporary of Samudragupta. On paleographical grounds however the contemporary of Samudragupta (circa 330-78) cannot be placed after the issuer of the Chandalur grant.
⁶ Possibly the king mentioned in the Penukonda plates of about A.D. 473. According to the Lohapātha, he ruled from 436 to about 458 A.D. (Sp. Ind., XIV. p. 321 ff.). Names 40-42 are found consecutively in the genealogy of the Pallavas of the Nellore-Guntur region; see Nos. 4-6 at page 174 above.
⁷ He possibly issued the Udayendiram grant No. 1.
⁸ He ascended the throne about 600 A.D.
IX

KĀVYA STYLE IN INSCRIPTIONS OF THE SUCCESSORS OF THE SĀTAVĀHANAS

G. Bühler in his famous article entitled The Indian Inscriptions and the Antiquity of Indian Artificial Poetry (translated from German in Ind. Ant., XLII, 1913) has proved the existence of a Kāvya literature in Sanskrit and Prakrit during the first five centuries of the Christian era and showed that a great period of literature following the style of the poetic school of Vidarbha (Berar) lies before the middle of the fourth century A.D. The poetic citations in the Mahābhāṣya (Ind. Ant., XIV, p. 326 ff.) by Patañjali (generally placed in the second century B.C., but is probably later), exhibiting metres characteristic of artificial poetry, such as Mālāti, Pramitākṣarā, Praharṣiṇī and Vasantaṭilakā and many verses in the Anuṣṭubbh agree fully as regards contents and the mode of expression, with the court Kāvyas.1 The Buddhacarita (translated into Chinese between 414 and 421 A.D.) by Aśvaghōsa, said to have been a contemporary of Kaniṣka, also shows a marvellous development of the Kāvya style. The description of the literary capacity of a Saka prince named Rudradāman (c. 130-150 A.D.) in the Junagadh record as sphaṭa-laghumadhura-citra-kānta-sabda-samayodar-ālāṃkṛta-gadya-padya [*kāvya-vidhāna-pravīṇa] which marvellously agrees with the principles of the Vaidarbhi style explained by Daṇḍin (Kāvyādarsa, I, 41-42) and Bharata (Nāṭyaśāstra, Ch. XVI), and the prose style of the Junagadh record (150 A.D.) itself and the Nasik inscription of the time of Rudradāman’s

1 It is interesting to note that the famous Nanaghat inscription of Nāgānīkā, which is placed in the 1st or 2nd cent. B.C., uses the figurative expression sagara-girivira-vālagaṇa-pāthāvīga-pāthama-eva, etc.
Sātavāhana contemporary Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi show, according to Bühler (p. 34 note), that "in the second century, there had been many superior and more elaborate compositions; because the author of the Girnar (i.e., Junāgadh) inscription was only an obscure provincial writer and the author of the Nasik inscription was only a court poet of the Andhira (i.e., Sātavāhana) king." Bühler has in this connection examined from Corp. Ins. Ind., III, some eighteen inscriptions, which are partly or wholly metrical and of definitely known date, including the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta described as a Kāvya by its author Hariśena, the Junagadh inscription of Gupta years 136-38 (456-58 A.D.) described as a Grantha and the Mandasor inscription of Mālava year 529 (473-74 A.D.) described as a Praśasti by its author Vatsabhāṭṭi. The dates of the records examined fall in the period between 350 and 550 A.D. From the great number of similar inscriptions of the period, Bühler suggested that in the above period "the use of the Kāvya style in inscriptions, especially in longer ones, was in vogue and, from this very circumstance, it follows that court poetry was Jefferson cultivated in India."

It should be noticed that in considering the question Bühler did not take into account the inscriptions of the Vākāṭakas and other successors of the Sātavāhanas. The reason seems to be that early writers like Bühler and Kielhorn did not think the records of many of these dynasties, e.g., the Vākāṭaka records, to be earlier than the middle of the sixth century A.D. It was therefore easy for Bühler to remark (p. 34 note), "It is however very questionable whether the poetic art had reached in southern India that degree of development which it had reached at the special centres of intellectual life in Northern India." But evidence shows that Bühler's doubts are unjustified. It is true that the Prakrit language, which gradually died out from North Indian inscriptions as early as the beginning of the second
century A.D., lingered on in the records of Southern India as late as the beginning of the fourth century. It is also true that many of the southern inscriptions are written in a matter-of-fact style. But that the Kāvya style was cultivated in Southern India is perfectly established by a number of South Indian inscriptions, especially those belonging to the family of the Kadambas. The poetic genius of the authors of the Junagadh and Nasik inscriptions was certainly inherited by their successors in the Vākāṭaka and Kadamba courts and, patronised by the Calukyas, found in Raviṅkīrti, rival of Bhāravi and Kālidāsa.

The Vākāṭakas ruled over the greater part of the Deccan before the rise of the Calukyas about the middle of the sixth century. All the Vākāṭaka grants are therefore to be assigned to a period anterior to 550 A.D. Most of their records are however written in elegant Sanskrit prose; but the prose style is not so much artificial as that of the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta. Bühler has rightly remarked, "It was a familiar custom in the fifth century to glorify the erection of temples and other edifices, by means of such occasional composition." The Vākāṭaka records, it should be noted, are ordinary land grants and cannot therefore claim to have been written in the style of Praśastis, Granthis or (Gadya-) Kāvyas. But the prose style of the Vākāṭaka records is as much artificial as that of the contemporary ordinary land grants belonging to the Guptas. We know that Daṇḍin defines the ojo-guna as samāsa-bhūya-stva and describes it as the very life of artificial prose (ojaḥ samāsa-bhūya-stvaḥ = etad = gadyasya jīvitaḥ; Kāvyādārka, I, 70). This ojak is characteristic of the prose style of the Vākāṭaka records. The Chammak, Dudia and other records describe the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena I in a phrase containing no less than thirty-six syllables. The Bhāraśiva relatives of the Vākāṭakas are described in several inscriptions as anśa-bhāru-sanniveśita-sivaling-odvahana-siva-supari-
tuṣṭa-samutpādita-rājavamsānāṃ
parākram-ādhigata-bhāgi-
ṛathy-amala-jala-mūrdh-ābhiśiktānām
daś-āśvamedh-āva-
bhrtha-snānānām
(33 + 21 + 11 syllables).
The plurality of adjectival phrases, reference to epic characters in
passages like yudhiṣṭhira-ṛttī and the length of sentences in
these records exhibit the artificial nature of the style. It
should also be noted that verses are sometimes found in the
prose inscriptions of the Vākāṭakas. The seal of the Dudia
plates of Prabhāvatīgupta, for example, has the following
verse in anuṣṭubh metre and Vaidarbhi style:

Vākāṭaka-lalāmasya krama-prāpta-nṛpa-śriyāh,
Jananyā yuvarājasya sāsanāṃ ripuśāsanam.

The figures of speech exhibited by this verse are Anu-
prāsa and Yamaka. Records like the Ajanta inscription of
the Vākāṭaka king Hariṣena are wholly metrical and show
that the poetic genius of the Vākāṭaka court poets was of
no mean order. This record is fragmentary; but the
existing pādas show that many metres characteristic of
artificial poetry were used by the poet. Pādas like purandar-
opendra-sama-prabhāvaḥ
svabhāvu-viry-ārjita-sarve-lokaḥ;
pravarasenaḥ prthu-pīna-vakṣāḥ saroruh-ākṣāḥ kṣapit-āri-pak-
ṣāḥ; etc.; and the only existing complete verse ¹

Ari-narendra-mauli-vinyasta-mani-kirāṇa-śīlha-
kram-āmbujāḥ,
Pravarasenes = tasya putro = 'bhūd = vikaśan-narendivar-
ekṣanaḥ

prove that the author of the Ajanta record tried to show his
skill in the Kāvyā style. Repetition of the hard sound kṣa in

¹ Kielhorn is inclined to describe the metre of this verse as a species of mātrā-
samaka; but Dr. Venkatasubbiah takes it to be a variety of gīthā (see Ind. Cult., V, p.
114). This metre with slight variation is found in lines 1-2 of the Tusam inscription
(Corp. Ins. Ind., III, p. 270), verses 1-24 of the Tālgunda record and at p. 4 of the
Bower M88. In the 5th-7th centuries the metre seems to have been in use in different
parts of India.
the line pravarasena, etc., shows that the poet preferred the Gaudīya-riti of poetry to the Vaidarbhī.¹

The earliest records of the successors of the Sātavāhanas in Lower Deccan are written in Prākrit prose. That the influence of the Sātavāhana court poets was still working on their successors in South Indian courts is proved by the artificial style exhibited by some of the Iksvāku records discovered at Nagarjunikonda. The artificial nature of the style of the Iksvāku court poets is shown not only by the ojo-guna and the length of sentences in the Iksvāku inscriptions, but also by the mode of glorifying the Buddha and the reigning king’s ancestor with a large number of epithets, some of which exhibit figures of speech characteristic of the Kāvya style. Most of the Nagarjunikonda records begin with an adoration to Lord Buddha—namo bhagavato deva-rāja-sakatasa supabudha-bodhino savamūnno save-sat-ānukampakasa jita-rāga-dosa-moha-vipamutasa mahāgaṇi-casabha-gandhabhathisa sammasabudhasa dhatucara-parīgahitasa. In one of these records, the adoration is—namo bhagavato ikhā-ku-rāja-pravara-risi-sata-pabhava-vamsa-bhacasa deva-manusa-sava-sata-hita-sukha-maga-desikasa jita-kāma-kodha-bhayaharisa-tarisa-moha-dovasa dapita-māra-dapa-māṇa-pasanamakasa dasabala-mahabalasa aṭhamagata-magadhamacaka-pavatakasa caika-lakkha-sukumāra-sujāta-caranasa taruna-divasa-kara-pabhasa sarada-sasi-sama-daranasa sava-loka-cita-mahitasa budhhasa (4+20+19+19+18+9+14+16+11+12+10 syllables). At least the figurative expressions taruna-divasakara-pabha and sarada-sasi-sama-daranasa are conceived quite in the Kāvya style. But such is not only the case with the adoration; the earlier king, Caṇḍamulā I, is generally glorified in his son’s and grandson’s records as virūpākha-

¹ Development of the Kāvya style in the Vākāṭaka period is also evidenced by the existence of a Prākrit poem entitled Setubandha described by Bapa in his Harṇacarita as composed by Pravarasena who has been identified with the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena II.

The early Sanskrit records of South-Eastern Deccan are written in prose. They are not composed on special occasions like erection of temples or other edifices and are not to be classed with Gadyakāvyas. But that the writers of these records were not unfamiliar with the artificial style of Sanskrit prose is proved by the ojo-guna of the records. Reference may be made to the description of Mādhavavarman I in the records of the Viṣṇukundin family. The Chikkulla grant describes him with seven epithets, the longest having no less than fifty-five syllables. The longest epithet describing Mādhavavarman I in the Ramatirtham plates contains as many as forty-nine syllables. It is however better to refer to the Ipur and Polamuru grants of Mādhavavarman I himself who ruled in circa 535-85 A.D.


pariraksana-cuñcūr = vidvad-dvija-guru-vṛddha-tapasvi-janāśra-yo mahārājaḥ śrī-mādhavacarman (19+16+25+60+7+8+20+11+15+4+6 syllables).

The Early Kadambas who succeeded the Čuṭu Śātakarnis in South-Western Deccan in the first half of the 4th century were subdued by the Early Calukyas about the middle of the sixth when the latter established themselves at Badami. Excepting the Talgunda inscription of Śaṅtivarman, however, no other early record of the Kadambas can be said to have been composed on special occasions like the inscriptions examined by Bühler. Nevertheless, the small Kadamba records, many of which are wholly or partly metrical, contain in them verses which are specimens of excellent poetry. We give below a collection of the namaskār verses from different records of the Early Kadambas and the reader will see that they would make a maṅgalācaraṇa suitable to any work of the best writers of Sanskrit poetry.

Jayati bhagavān jinendra guṇarundrah prathita-parama-kārunakah,
Trailoky-āsvāsah dāya-patāk-occhritā yasya.
Jayaty = arhams = trilokesah sarva-bhūta-hitamkaraḥ,
Rāg-ādy-ari-haro = ’nanto = ’nanta-jañāna-dyā-isvarah.
Jayati sur-āsura-makua-pranihita-manī-kirāṇa-khaṅgita-
carana-yugah,
Dauda-kamandalu-hastah padma-pravar-āsano brahmā.
Jayaty = udriktā-dāitya-endra-bala-virya-cimardanaḥ,
Jagat-pravṛtti-saṁhāra-sṛṣṭi-māyādhaḥ hariḥ.
Jitāṁ bhagavatā tona vīṣṇunā yasya vakṣasī,
Śrīh smayan bhāti devaś = ca nābhi-padme pitāmah.
Jayaty = ambuja-gehāyāḥ patir = vīṣṇuh samātanah,
Varāha-rūpeṇa dharāṁ yo dadhārā yuga-kṣaye.
Jayati viśvadeva-samghata-nicīt-aika-mūrtih sanātanaḥ,
Sthānur = indu-raśmi-vieckhrīta-dyuti-maj-jaṭa-mukuta-
manḍanāh

Jayati dhruva-bāl-endu-jaṭa-mukuta-manḍanāh,
Asādhyā-nidhanāḥ sambhur = viśveśo jagatām patiḥ.
Hara-nārāyana-brahma-tritayāya namah sadā,
Śūla-cakr-ākṣasūṭr-odgha-bhava-bhāsīta-pānīne.

The first of these verses written in the Āryā metre occurs
in several inscriptions, the earliest belonging to the time
when Kākusthavarman was a yuvarāja about the beginning
of the fifth century.

When we find such beautiful lines as the following in a
small and quite ordinary grant like the Halsi grant of
Mrgeśavarman’s eighth year we cannot but think that the
Kadamba court poet was a consummate artist:

Kadamba-kula-satketor = hetoh pūry-aika-sampadām,
Śrī-kākustha-narendrasya sānur = bhānur = iv = āparah,
Śrī-sāntivaravarm = eti rājā rājiva-locaṇāḥ,
Khal = eva vaṇit = ākṛtā yena lakṣmīr = devad-grhāt.
Tat-priya-jyeṣṭha-tanayāḥ śrī-mṛgeśa-narādhīpah,
Lok-aika-dharma-vijayī devā-saṃanta-pūjitah
Matvā dānaṃ daridrāṇām mahāpalam = it = eva yah,
Svayaṃ bhaya-daridro = ’pi śatrubhyo = ’dān = mahād-
bhayam.

Tuṅga-gāṅga-kul-otsādi pallaṇa-pralay-ānalah, etc.

To illustrate how the writer of an ordinary small land
grant brings in epic characters, we may refer to the Bennur
grant of Kṛṣṇavarman II.

Yathā yudhiśthirasya = eva sālāyaṃ yasya santalam,
Brāhmaṇāṇāṃ sahusrāṇi samaśnātī yathāsukham.
Sa rājā rājā-rājasya pranaptā kṛṣṇavarmanah,
Pauṭrah śrī-viśnudāsasya putrah śrī-simhavarmanah,
Saśvad-brahmottaram kurvan prajās = ca paripālayan,
Mahi-vinihatāmitraḥ kṛṣṇo jayaṭu kṛṣṇavat.
In this connection we should also note that the Bannahalli grant of the same king describes his grandfather Viśṇuvarman as gandharva-hastiśikśa-dhanurvedēṣu vatsara-jendr-ārjuna-sama and sābd-ārtha-nyāya-vidvat. We are here to notice not only the reference to epic and historical characters like Vatsarāja, Indra and Arjuna, but also to the fact that Kadamba Viśṇuvarman claimed to have been skilled in gandharva (music), sābda (grammar, or the science of words), artha (their vācya, i.e., expressed, lakṣya, i.e., indicated, and nyāga, i.e., suggested import) and nyāya (logical method). It is interesting that the poet (kavi) Śāba-Virasena, the sacīva of Candragupta II, describes himself in the Udayagiri cave inscription as skilled in sābda, artha, and nyāya (cf. kautsah sāba iti khyāto viṛasenaḥ kul-ākhyayā, sābd-ārtha-nyāya-lokajñaḥ kaviḥ pātaliputraḥ). Cf. also, the epithet pada-pādārtha-vicāra-suddhabuddhi applied to Umāpati Dhrāra, court-poet of Laksmanasena, in the Deopara grant of Vijayasena. Evidently Kadamba Viśṇuvarman claimed to have been a musician and poet like Samudragupta and his court encouraged artists like that of the Gupta king and of the Saka king Rudradāman.

The metrical portions of Early Kadamba records generally contain fine verses written in the Vaidarbhī style. As it is not possible to quote all of them we satisfy ourselves only with two verses in the Upajāti metre from a little charter of the time of Ravivarman:

Sri-viṣṇuvarma-prabhṛtīn = narendrān
nihatya jītvā prthivīṃ samastām,
Utsādyā kānc-īśvara-candadaṇḍān
palāśikāyām samavasthitāḥ sah.
Raviḥ kadamb-oru-kul-āmbarasya
gunāṃśubhir = vyāpya jagat samastam,
Mānena catvāri nivartanaṇi
dadau jinendrāya mahīṃ mahendraḥ.
The only Early Kadamba inscription that was composed on a special subject is the Talgunda record of Sāntivarman. It describes how a tank was constructed by Kākusthavarman, father of Sāntivarman, for a temple of Śiva. It is written in verse. Verse 34 of the record says that a poet named Kubja was responsible for the composition of the Kāvyā which the author himself inscribed on stone. The poet cannot be ranked with the best writers of Sanskrit poetry; but his literary talent was not of a mean order. Kubja’s Kāvyā is written in 34 verses which exhibit such metres as Puspitāgrā, Indravajrā, Vasantatilaka, Mandākranṭā, Sārdulavikrīdita and Pracita (a varecity of Daṇḍaka). The first 24 verses are however composed in a metre rarely found in classical Sanskrit works. Kielhorn has fully described it in Ep. Ind., VIII, p. 26 ff (see above, p. 382 note). We give here an analysis of the Talgunda inscription.

The inscription may be conveniently divided into four parts; Part I deals with maṅgalacaraṇa and nāmaskāra; Part II with the early history and glories of the family to which the hero of the performance belongs; Part III with the description of the hero and his performance, and Part IV with conclusion and benediction.

Part I. The record begins with the auspicious word siddham and a verse in adoration to Sthānu, i.e., Śiva. The nāmaskāra is then extended to learned Brāhmaṇas well-versed in the Rk, Yajus and Śāma Vedas.

Part II. Kākusthavarman, the hero of the performance, is introduced, as well as the family to which he belonged. The story how the family was named Kadamba owing to its early members tending a Kadamba tree with care. The birth of Mayūraśarman, the founder of the Kadamba family, and his exploits. His quarrel with the Pallava king of Kāñci and victorious campaigns against the Pallavas and Bhad-Baṇas. His installation by the king of Kāñci on the
throne of the kingdom lying between the Prehāra and the Western Ocean. Description of his abhiṣeka by Śaḍānana and the Mothers. His son Kaṅgavarman, grandson Bhagiratha and great-grandson Raghu.

Part III. Description to Raghu’s brother and successor Kākusthavarman, the hero of the performance. The prosperity of the Kadamba kingdom during his reign. His daughters married to princes of the Gupta and other royal families. How his feudatories obeyed him. How he constructed a taḍāka in the siddhālaya of Bhagavān Bhava, i.e., Siva, which had been occasionally visited by such ancient kings as Sātakarni.

Part IV. Adoration to the Bhagavān, i.e., Siva, residing at Sthānakundūra, i.e., Talgunda in the kingdom of king Sāntivarman who wore three diadems. Benediction—Happiness for the dwelling (i.e., the temple) and prosperity for the subjects.¹

¹ There is another way of looking at the question of the development of Kavya style. Epigraphic evidence does not prove that the style developed much earlier than the first or second century A.D. As regards classical Sanskrit (Sanākhyta, the reformed or refined language), it owes its development and popularisation to schools of grammarians like Pāṇini. It was however not popular in North India before the 2nd cent. and in South India before the 4th cent. A.D., as Prakrit was still the language of the records of kings and the common people. The story of a Sātavāhana king’s ignorance of Sanskrit which led the grammarian Saravavarman i.e., write the famous Kalpastra or Kalpapāharaṇa shows that even cultured people did not understand Sanskrit. In my paper, Popularisation of Classical Sanskrit and the Age of Sanskrit Dramas, read at the Indian History Congress, Allahabad (1938), I have tried to prove that the cradle of sanākhyta was the north-western part of India and that no work in Classical Sanskrit and developed Kavya style (especially, dramas which are meant for the common people) can be given a date before the Christian era. It is interesting that Sanskrit was at first favoured by foreign immigrants who came through N.W. India to which Pāṇini (inhabitant of Sālāśūra in Gandhāra) belonged. It is also interesting that the earliest known classical author, Āśvaghosa, is connected with Kuṇḍa’s court at Purṇeṣapura (—Peshawar).
# CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES OF DYNASTIES

## [A]

### A.D. 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Later Sātavāhanas</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gautamīputra Śātakarnī</td>
<td>c. 107-131 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāví</td>
<td>c. 132-159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivaśri Śātakarnī</td>
<td>c. 160-166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivaskanda Śātakarnī</td>
<td>c. 167-173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautamīputra Yajñā Śātakarnī</td>
<td>c. 174-202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajaya</td>
<td>c. 203-208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canda Śātakarnī</td>
<td>c. 209-218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulumāví</td>
<td>c. 219-225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.D. 210

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iksvākus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Century A.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cāṇṭamūla I (2nd quarter of 3rd century).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virapurisadatta (3rd quarter of 3rd century).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehuvals Cāṇṭamūla II (4th quarter of 3rd century).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Early Pallavas of Kaści

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. 300 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father of Sivaskandavarman (4th quarter of 3rd century).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivaskandavarman (1st quarter of 4th century).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 350 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśṇugopa (Conflict with Samudragupta, about the middle of the fourth century).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX—CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D. 436-58</th>
<th>c. 436-460 A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāraviṣṇu (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhavarman</td>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāraviṣṇu (II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
<td>Nandivarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
<td>Viṣṇugopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
<td>Simhaviṣṇu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. A.D. 620</th>
<th>c. 600-680 A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahendravarman (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**B**

*Early Pulivas of the Nellore-Guntur regio*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virakoravarman</td>
<td>Kumāraviṣṇu</td>
<td>Skandavarman (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitravarman</td>
<td>Skandavarman (II)</td>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**C**

*Byṣṭaphalāyanas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 300</td>
<td>Jayavarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Ānandās*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 400</td>
<td>Kandara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attivarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dāmodaravarman (about the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sālaṅkāyanas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 350 A.D.</th>
<th></th>
<th>c. 320-345 A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devavarman</td>
<td>Hastivarman</td>
<td>c. 345-370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nandivarman (I)</td>
<td>c. 370-395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caṇḍavarman</td>
<td>c. 395-420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nandivarman (II)</td>
<td>c. 420-445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skandavarman</td>
<td>c. 445-470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vignukundás

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vikramahendra (Vikramendra I ?) c. 500-520 A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Govindavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māḍhavarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Māḍhavarman II (II?) c. 585-615] 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikramendravarman I (II?) c. 615-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indravarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikramendravarman II (III?) c. 655-670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 If it is believed that Māḍhavarman II issued his charter as his grandfather's viceroy, his reign should be omitted and the succeeding reigns closed up.

### Early Kadambas of Mayūraśarman's Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. 340 A.D.</th>
<th></th>
<th>c. 405-35 A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayūraśarman</td>
<td>Kaṅgavarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhagiratha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raghu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kākusthavarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sāntivarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472 A.D.</td>
<td>Mrgeśavarman</td>
<td>c. 470-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545 A.D.</td>
<td>Ravivarman</td>
<td>c. 490-538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harivarman</td>
<td>c. 538-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Early Kadambas of Kṛṣṇavarman's Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 450 A.D.</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇavarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 490 A.D.</td>
<td>Viśṇuvarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simhavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 530 A.D.</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇavarman II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ajāvarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhogivarmman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Early Kadambas: Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About the middle of 6th cent. A.D.</td>
<td>Madhuvarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dāmodara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kekayas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 450 A.D.</td>
<td>Sīvanandavarman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

P. 5, l. 22. Read—between two Ananda-kings.

P. 9, ll. 2-3, 12, etc. Read—Jaggayyaapeta ; Read—Nandigama. L. 20. Omit—middle and.

P. 16. Read—Cāṃtāmula I (second quarter of the third century A.D.) ; Virapurisadatta (third quarter of the third century) ; Ehuvala Cāṃtāmula II (fourth quarter of the third century).

P. 20, l. 15. Omit—(Vāpīśī́ (?). Note—As Vogel suggests, the name may be connected with names like Bappiśā. L. 25. Note—It is significant that epithets like virāpākihaṇati-mahāśena-parṇabhaṇa are applied to Cāṃtāmula I and not to his son and grandson.


P. 24, l. 21. Read—dated on the 10th day of the 6th fortnight of varṣā.

P. 25, ll. 18-19. Note—Mātuka has been supposed to be the same as the Nikāyas, corresponding to the maitrīsthāna (māṭrīsthāna, i.e., matrices) of the Jains (Ind. Cult., I, p. 107 ff. ; Law, Mahāvira, p. 50).


P. 29, l. 33. Read—the word in Indian literature. Add—The word cinapāṭha is mentioned in the Pāli Buddhist works, Āpadāṇa and Mūlinda-paśho, and also in the Canonical book called Buddhavamsa (p. 60), supposed to be a work of the 1st
cent. B.C. See Ind. Cult., IV, p. 381. It is also mentioned in Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra.

P. 32, l. 10. Add—Dantapura is mentioned in some other Gaṅga records, e.g., a grant of Madhukāmārpaṇa (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VIII, p. 181). Sometimes the name is written Dantipura. L. 16. Note—The Nallamalai range seems to have been known by the general name Śrīparvata.

P. 33, l. 25. Read—dated on the 5th day of the 6th fortnight of winter (hemanta).

P. 34, l. 15. Read—dated on the 10th day of the 8th fortnight of varṣā. L. 28. Add—A fragmentary pillar inscription dated in the 6th year of Virapurisadata has been discovered at Ramireddipalle not far from the Jaggayapeta site.

P. 35. Note—The name Ehevula may be compared with names like Hamgamavula-Dēvana of a 7th century Dārsṇa record (A.R.S.I.E., 1933-34, p. 41).

P. 42, l. 1. Read—issued on the 1st day of the 1st fortnight of hemanta.

P. 45, l. 4. Note—According to Hemacandra’s Deśināmanālā, avam means uktam which signifies “speech.”

P. 55, l. 2. Read—their own copper-plate grants. L. 3, etc.

Read—Dāmodaravarman.

P. 56, l. 37. Add—Mr. V. S. Ramachandramurti has recently written a note on the inscription in the Kapoteśvara temple at Chezaria (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., XI, p. 43 ff.). A tentative reading of the record has been published in S. Ind. Ins., VI, No. 594. The record belongs to Satsabhāmalla whose mother was the Mahādevi Avantālāntavatī (?), dear daughter of Kandararājā. King Kandara is said to have belonged to the mahāgotra of the great sage Ānanda. He was the lord of “the Black Beṇṇā” (i.e., Kṛṣṇa or Krishna) in which the Andhra girls used to take their bath, of the Trikūta parvata, of the city called Kandarapura, and also of two janapadas (janapada-dvītaya). Mr. B. V. Krishna Rao thinks that this Trikūta parvata is mentioned in the Ipur grant of Viśnukumārin Mādhavavaranm II as Trikūṭa-malaya, and identifies it with
Koṭappakoṇḍa near Kāvūr. One of Kandara’s two janaṇapadas may have been the district round the Trikūṭa hill and the other the district round Kandarapura (not yet identified). The banner of king Kandara is said to bear the representation of Golāṅgula (a species of monkey). As sometimes the banner and crest of a dynasty are found to be the same, it may not be impossible that the seals attached to the Gorantia and Mattepad plates bear the representation of a monkey. Prince Satsabhāmallā, daughter’s son of king Kandara, appears to have been called Prthivi-yuvarāja, and is possibly also credited with victory in some battles at Dhānyakaṭa. The first case-ending in the epithet prthīni-yuvarāja and the epithet kāliśvarasāraviraketu (which is no doubt different from Kandara’s epithet golāṅgula-vījaya-ketana) possibly suggest that the epithets in lines 2-4 of the record belong to Satsabhāmallā and not to his maternal grandfather Kandara. The seal of Satsabhāmallā’s family bore the representation of Muraripu (Viṣṇu) on Garuda and its ketana or banner had the figure of a seated vulture (grūdrā). May Kāliśvarasāravira be the name of the egraha whose figure was the crest of Satsabhāmallā’s family?

P. 58, l. 19. Note—May Vakeśvara be a mistake for Tryambakeśvara? Li. 24-25. Note—According to Coomaraswamy (History of Indian and Indonesian Art, p. 77), the Kapoteśvara temple (4th century A.D.) at Chezaria in the Kistna district is “a structural caitya-hall originally Buddhist and later connected to Hindu usage.” May it have been built by Dāmodaravarman, the only known Buddhist king of the locality, who ruled about the close of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th century?

P. 63, l. 29. Read—supplanted by the Pallavas.

P. 78, l. 25. Note—Some scholars think that the grant contains a date in year 138 which should be referred to the Gupta era (Bhandarkar, List, No. 2036), while others think that it is dated in the king’s 7th regnal year. The reading and suggestion of the former are very doubtful.

P. 80, l. 10. Note—This is the Kindeppa grant published by Mr. M. Narasimham in Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., VIII, p. 150. The Siripuram grant of the same king (issued from
Devapura, possibly the chief town of Devarāṣṭra, was also published by the same scholar in Bhārati (Telugu), September, 1931. The suggestion that the Siripuram grant is dated in year 8 of the Śaka era cannot be accepted. L. 17. Add—The Tandivada-plates (Journ. Or. Res., IX, p. 188 ff.) issued from Piṣṭapura in the 46th year of Prthivi-mahārāja, son of Vikramendra and grandson of Mahārāja Raṇadurjaya, have been ascribed to the first half of the 7th century. The kings mentioned in this record appear to have ruled after the kings of the other records already discussed. Prthivi-mahārāja may have been the king of Piṣṭapura overthrown by Pulakeśin II.

P. 81, l. 2. Read—beginning of the 6th century. L. 14. Read—takes to have been.

P. 89, l. 39. Add—Note that a record of Harijara, an Assam king of the 9th cent., is dated in Gupta 510 (Ind. Cult. V, 114).

P. 112, l. 40. Add—Dr. R. C. Majumdar suggests that the struggle between Indravarman and the Gaṅga king Indra should be placed before the Calukya conquest of Piṣṭapura (Outline of the History of Kaliṅga [offprint], p. 33). I do not think it absolutely necessary; but the suggestion may be reconciled with our chronology if we think that Mādhavavarman II did not rule (see above, p. 133 ff.) and give Vikramendravarman I a shorter reign. In that case, Indravarman may be placed in c. 487-517. His Gaṅga contemporary would then be an earlier Indravarman who reigned in Gaṅga years 87 and 91.

Add.—A word about Fleet’s chronology of the Eastern Calukyas, which we have accepted in this work. Fleet thinks that Kubja-Viṣṇuvardhana’s reign began, as his brother’s viceroy, in 615 (Ind. Ant., XX, p. 12). But his date 688 as the first year of Calukya-Bhima I has now been proved wrong by the Attili grant (O. P. No. 14 of 1917-18) which gives the king’s coronation date on Monday, April 17, 892. According to the Chendur grant (Ep. Ind., VII, p. 236 f.) there was a lunar eclipse in Vaisākhapūrṇimā in Maṅgiyuvarāja’s 2nd year which, according to Fleet, falls in 672-73. Actually however there was no lunar eclipse in that tithi between the years 666 and 682. It is therefore not impossible that the beginning of Viṣṇuvardhana’s reign was
a few years later than 615. Mr. M. S. Sarma thinks that he began to rule "Veṇgi" in 633 (Journ. Or. Res., IX, p. 17 ff.), while Mr. B. V. Krishna Rao thinks it to be 624 (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., IX, iv, p. 1 ff.). Historical arguments in support of both the theories are however weak. Both the scholars rely on the doubtful evidence of the Kopparam grant (above, pp. 117-18). Krishna Rao follows Lakshmmana Rao and thinks that Pulakesin II conquered "Veṇgi" in 611; Sarma follows Hultzsch and takes 632 as the date of the conquest. In my opinion the former theory is improbable and the latter is just possible. But Pulakesin had to fight with two generations of Pallava kings and no doubt led several expeditions to the east coast country. There is no guarantee that the date of the conquest coincided with that of the grant. If however Fleet's epoch is wrong, one of these dates should be examined astronomically, because according to the Chipurupele grant there was a lunar eclipse in Śrāvana-pūrṇimā in Kubja-Viṣṇuvardhana's 18th year, and after 632 (date of the grant according to Fleet) the nearest lunar eclipse on that titki were in 641 and 650. In my opinion, the latter date is too late, as it would make a very long difference between the dates of the Polamuru grants of Mādhavavarman I and of Jayasimha I. Moreover, the astronomical details in the Chendulur grant of Maṅgiyuvāraṇa supports Krishna Rao's theory, not Sarma's. The Musinikonda grant, we should notice, is supposed to support Sarma. It gives the chronogram date read as svādita (ta = 4, da = 8, ta = 6), i.e., Saka 684 = 762 A.D. as following in Viṣṇuvardhana(III)'s reign (A. R. S. Ind. Ep., 1917, p. 116; for the chronogram system, Burnell, S. Ind. Pal., p. 76). Viṣṇuvardhana III ruled in 709-46 (Fleet), or 719-55 (Krishna Rao) or 727-63 (Sarma). But since ta, da, ḍha, and da may be confused in early mediæval Telugu script, Fleet and Krishna Rao may read svādīta and svādhīta respectively to suit their theories. da being = 3 and ḍha = 4. Another difficulty is with the Teralā grant (No. 80 of 1939-30) giving the date in the Saka year Babudhānya and Kārttika-śukla-pañcami on Sunday (A.D. 789 or 859) as falling in the 5th year of a Viṣṇuvardhana (III or IV), which does not suit any of
the three theories. Year 5 may be a wrong reading. The problem cannot be solved in the present state of our knowledge; but of the three dates 615, 624 and 633, the possibility of 624 as the first year of Kubja-Viṣṇuvarṇahān’s rule at Piṣṭapura seems to be just a little more than the other two.

P. 114, l. 36. Add—The Chicacole grant of Indravarman (Bhandarkar, List, No. 1474) dated in year 128 of the Gaṅga era refers to a lunar eclipse in Mārgaśīrṣa-paūrṇamāśī. According to Dr. Majumdar’s theory, this year falls in 678-85 A.D. But there was no lunar eclipse in Mārgaśīrṣa-paūrṇamāśī in the period between 673 and 680 A.D.

P. 116, l. 30. Read—end of the 7th or somewhere.

P. 117, l. 4. Note—Not Veṇgi, but Bezwāḍa, however, seems to have been the capital at the time.

P. 124, l. 31. Add—In this connection, it is also interesting to note that in Telugu works like Śomadēvarājyaṇ (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., III, p. 113) the Kākatiyās are represented as descendants of a certain Mādhavavarman of the lunar race.


P. 139, l. 5. Note—As generally believed, this Mādhava may have been Dharmarāja’s younger brother. Ll. 6-8. Note—The suggestion is possible if Trivara had a long reign and if Sailodhāva Dharmarāja may be placed about the middle of the seventh century. Scholars like R. D. Banerji and D. R. Bhandarkar are inclined to identify Sainyabhīta-Mādhava-varman II (son of Ayaśobhīta, son of Sainyabhīta-Mādhava-varman I) of the Gānjam (Gupta year 300 = A.D. 320) and Khurda grants with Sainyabhīta II-Mādhava-varman-Srinivāsa (son of Ayaśobhīta, born in the family of Sainyabhīta I) of the Buguda and Parikud grants. Some scholars however point out that the latter grants should be placed centuries later on (doubtful) grounds of palaeography and on the strength of the passage tasya-āpi vaṁśe with reference to the relation between Sainyabhīta I and his successor.
Ayaśōbhita (R. C. Majumdar, Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., X, p. 1 ff.). But the striking resemblance in the genealogy furnished by both sets of the records cannot be explained away. Sailodbhava Ayaśōbhita may have been an adopted son of Sainyabhitā I. We cannot therefore be definite on this point until further evidence is forthcoming. If Sainyabhitā-Mādhavavarman II-Srinivāsa reigned in 620 A.D., his grandson may be placed in the middle of the seventh century. Dr. Bhandarkar’s contention that the Kondedda and Puri grants of Dharmarāja are dated in Gupta year 312 = 632 A.D. (List, Nos. 2040 and 2041) is however clearly wrong; because the Parikud grant of his father Ayaśōbhita-Madhyamarāja (ibid, No. 1675) shows that the intervening reign covered more than 25 years. L. 12 ff.

Note.—In Ep. Ind., XXII, p. 19 ff., Prof. V. V. Mirashi accepts my Viṣṇukundin chronology, and believes that Tivara of Kośala reigned in 530-50 A.D. L. 35. Add.—Cf. the passage referring to the kaumāra-keli of Lakṣmanasena with the females of Kalinga in the Madhainagar grant (Ins. Beng., III, p. 111); also “who fulfilled the ardent wishes of the Gaṇda women, etc., applied to Yuvarāja Keyūravarṣa in the Bilhari inscription (Ray, Dynastic History, II, p. 760).

P. 134, l. 3. Note.—The god on the hill at Koṭappakonda (near Kāvūr in the Narasaraopet taluka of the Guntur district) is called Trikōṭīśvara in inscriptions. Mr. Krishna Rao suggests that Trikōṭīśvara = Trikāṭāśvara, lord of the Trikūṭa hill, and that Trikūṭa-malaya = Trikūτa hill, malai (the Dravidian original of malaya) meaning “a hill.” See Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., XI, p. 45. The suggestion does not appear improbably. The acceptance of this theory would necessitate the omission of the reign of Mādhavavarman II from the table at p. 112 above.

P. 140, l. 4 ff.—I now believe that Patañjali is much later than the Saṅga king, and iha puyamitram yājyāmaha, etc., of the Mahābhāṣya are merely “ stock instances.”

P. 176, l. 15.—The evidence of the Penukonda grant is supported by that of the Pura grant (Mys. Arch. Surv., A.R., 1930, p. 259).
Read—Paramesvaravarman I c. 670-90, according to Dubreuil.

Read—yuddheśu.

Note.—According to Manu (XI, 35), the five great sins are brahma-hatyā surī-pānaṃ steyam guṇa-vyagāgamah, mahānti pātakīny aduh samisargaḥ ca api taḥ saha. Kullūka says that steyam brāhmaṇa-sucarna-haranaḥ, guru-pitā, and samisarga is for one year only. The Mahabhā. (XIII, 130, 38) also gives a list of five great sins in the śloka, brahmahā ca aiva goghaṇaḥ ca parādāra ratad ca yah, aśraddhādānast ca naraḥ striyaṃ yasa ca opaṇavati.

Add—The next parihāra means exemption from taxes, forced labour, and kṣajala the meaning of which is not known. A-paramparā-balivadha-gahanā has already been explained.

Read—were to be.

Read—Arabic.

Add—Another copper-plate grant of Simhavarman dated in the month of Śrāvaṇa of his tenth year has been discovered in Nellore Dist. (An.Rep.S Ind.Ep., 1934-35, p. 30). Simhavarman, son of Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopa, grandson of Skandavarman and great-grandson of Viravarman, granted with the object of securing long life, strength of arm and victory a village called Viḷavaṭṭi in Muddarāstra to a Brahmāṇa named Viṣṇuśrīman who belonged to the Gautama gotra and Chandoga śākhā. The seal bears a couchant bull facing the proper left with another figure (said to look like an anchor or boat) above it.

Add—Dr. N. Venkataramanayya has recently suggested (Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., X, p. 89 ff.) that Karnaṭa = Kanna viṣaya or Kannādu, the original home of the Sātavāhanas at the foot of the Śrīśaila. According to him, Kanna = Karṇa, an abbreviated form of Sātakarṇa, i.e., Sātakarni. He thinks that the kingdom of the Sātakarnīs became known as Karnāta from the name of their original home and became afterwards restricted to the western part of their kingdom where their rule lingered for a longer period than elsewhere. The suggestion
may not be unreasonable, and the name Kanna may have actually been derived from that of the Kanna viśaya. But as there is no early evidence to support the theory, it is impossible to be definite on this point in the present state of our knowledge. The equation Kanna=Sātakarnī and the suggestion that the original home of the Sātavāhanas was at the foot of the Śrīśaila cannot be conclusive until further evidence is forthcoming.


P. 230, ll. 8, 23. Read—fīg tree.

P. 254, l. 5. Add—Verse 13 of the Davangere grant (Mys. Arch.Surr., 1933, p. 116) is supposed to suggest that Kundaṅgiri or Miligundaṅgiri was Raghu’s capital. But the verse seems to mean that a hill-fort called Milikoṇḍa (near Asandi?) repulsed an attack of Raghu, but was conquered by Ravi.


P. 262, l. 10. Read—due to. L. 33. Read—and to provide.

P. 267, l. 6. Read—Halsi grant.

P. 269, l. 13. Read—A pāṭi or piece.

P. 273, l. 16. Add—A record of Bavarvarman dated on a certain bright fortnight day of Madhu (Caitra) in the king’s 34th year has been discovered by a lawyer of Davangere (Mys. Arch.Surr., 1933, p. 100 ff). It begins with Siddhāyaḥ, and a verse (Prabhāśīṇi metre) in adoration to Sarvajña-Sarvalakanaṭha which possibly means Śiva. The record is interesting as the verses describing the king are composed in a developed Kāvyya style. It records a grant of lands for (the continuation of) worship at a Siddhāyatana or Śaiva temple possibly at Asandi (identified with a village of the same name in Kadur taluka near Ajjampur), and for the prosperity of the saṅgha (ascetics belonging to the temple?), at the instigation of Haridatta who may be the śreṣṭhin of that name mentioned in the Bannahalli grant. The lands granted were at Asandi, and at Kōra-maṅgā near the boundary-stone (upālaka) of a bridge. One niṅartana (by royal measure) of granted land was in a field near the bridge to the south of Asandi. The king granted, before his Sāmantas, also one niṅartana at Samanā (sic. samaya= 
extremity?) of the bridge and three nicartanas (by royal measure) at Vēṭikauṭa. The localities mentioned may have been in the vicinity of Asandī. The identification of Kōramaṅgā with Koramaṅgalā 8 miles from Hassan and 40 miles away is doubtful.

P. 277, l. 21. Read—verses.
P. 280, l. 7. Omit—during.
P. 285, l. 30. Read—Sātavāhana contemporary.
P. 316, l. 6. Read—Darangere.
P. 325, l. 16. Read—4th-5th centuries.

P. 353, l. 13. Read—received in 1714 A.D.
P. 358, l. 20. Read—drowned in.
P. 367, l. 33. Read—wherein.
P. 382, l. 30. Read—to be the Gitika variety of the Miśragaṇa metre. L. 31. Read—115.
P. 391, Read—c. 400 A.D.—Dāmodaravarman.
P. 398, l. 30. Read—proved wrong.
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Elīora 90
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Famam 37
Farrukhāya 249
Fire Ordeal 361ff.
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Gājāyana Sarvatāla 88
Gāmāgama-bhojaka 190ff.
Gagsarāman 90
Gandhāra 281, 313, 325
Gautama (science) 297
Gandharvā-viśaya 313
Gādga dy, 61 n., 121, 156n., 176ff., 246., 260ff., 299ff.
Gādga era 114n., 400
Gādga vādī 215
Gautamāuitra 3, 41, 42ff., 153, 162ff.
Gautamāyaka 319
Ghatikā 137
Ghatokka 80n., 311
Girigadgadgana 328
Girirajjya 365
Giriraja 313ff.
Godāvari R. 111, 115ff., 121, 140, 211ff., 327
Golāngula 337
Golāsarma 293, 299
Gondanidha 186
Gopala Rāndranita 245
Gopāladeva 336
Gorenta grant 35ff., 61
Gosahara mahādāna 16n., 50, 59ff., 238
Gotra Agasti 82
Gotra Agnivrajya 185
Gotra Khanda 56, 296
Gotra Kāğırasa 285, 351, 359
Gotra Kṛṣṇa 211, 293, 300, 319ff.
Gotra Kṣatriya 249
Gotra Kṛṣṇa 211, 293, 300, 319ff.
Gotra Kṛṣṇa 211, 293, 300, 319ff.
Gotra Kṛṣṇa 211, 293, 300, 319ff.
Gotra Kṛṣṇa 211, 293, 300, 319ff.
Gotra Kṛṣṇa 211, 293, 300, 319ff.
Gotra Kṛṣṇa 211, 293, 300, 319ff.
Gotra Kṛṣṇa 211, 293, 300, 319ff.
Gotra Kṛṣṇa 211, 293, 300, 319ff.
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Hadis 11
Hairanyakaśa 211
Hala 367
Hala 319
Hala-nyāga 128
Halai grant of Bhānavarma 26ff.
Halai grant of Maṅgalavarman 350ff.
Halai grant I of Harivarman 27ff.
Halai grant II of Harivarman 27ff.
Halai grant I of Raviharvarman 27ff.
Halai grant II of Raviharvarman 27ff.
Harpasāri (Harpasāri) 30, 22, 24, 27
Hira (Śiva) 278ff., 230
Hari (Viṣṇu) 278ff., 234
Haridatta Stējeling 288, 403
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Saktivarman 70f.
Sākya 229
Sālakāyana dy. 30f., 39, 42, 63ff., 82ff., 103cf., 121f., 212, 281, 294
Sālakāyanaika 83
Sālakānī 71
Sa-Joła-lacem-Škuru 193
Sambhū (Sīval 53, 81
Sāmiyāra 245
Sanjāyantu 221f.
Sanečkja, Refined Language 339f.
Sanmarga 70, 73, 79f., 80ff., 91, 126
161, 177f., 151, 180, 301f.
Sanmukha-buddha 22f, 65
Sānu 320
Saṅcāra 203
Saṅcārakalpa 183, 202, 207f., 210
Sangara 146
Sāgara, Saugha 262, 276
SangūTRA 277f.
Satkaragāta Ṛgavigrūha 130.
Sāntalī, Sāntalī 120
Sāntivara-Pallava 258, 282ff., 290, 299f.
Sāntivarman, some as Kadamba Sānti
varman 263
Sāntivarman, some as Pallava Sānti
varman 180
Sāntivarman Kadamba 157, 164n., 238, 247,
285f., 297, 371, 277, 281f., 290, 292,
296f.
Sāntivarman-arasa 259
Sarabhapura 61, 120
Sarabhavarana 81
Sārapalikā 76f., 121
Sarvavali R. 242
Sarvagāma 270
Sārmā 201
Sārvā 291
Sarvājñā, sarvājñakānātha (Sīval) 408
Sarvanidhi Jayaśrīma 1 342
Sarvanūma 266
Sarvaśța Gāyāma 88
Sāsana-devi 266
Sāpanāhara 210
Sāsanasaucūrum 260f.
Sājaśa, Saśādeva 17n.
Śaśālikumāra 211
Śaśāmi-raśha 169, 243
Śātakārī 162, 357, 402f.
Śātakārī Cate 217, 248f.
Śātakārī I 37n.
Śātakārī Goutamiputra 3, 41, 143f., 153f.,
163f., 217f., 324
Śātavāhana 31f., 41, 37f., 47f, 87f., 112f.,
142f., 143f., 150, 152f., 218f., 292f.,
299f., 300, 402
Śātavahānāsāra 144, 189
Śaṭ 367
Śatamatilagāma 311
Śatamatilamalla 306f.
Śāṭipallī-Jāripā 290
Śatyasaṇa 168
Śātyāraṇya Dhruvarāja 357n.
Śātyāraṇya Gopāla 316
Śātyāraṇya Pulakṣin I 245
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Skandavarman Pallava of British Museum grant 14, 67ff., 181ff., 181, 182ff., 194ff.
Skandavarman I of Nellore-Guntur region 169ff., 201
Skandavarman II of Nellore-Guntur region 81, 109ff., 201ff., 403
Skandavarman I of Udaiyadurum grant 176ff., 193
Skandavarman II Udaiyadurum & Penukonda grants 178ff., 182, 247, 264
Skandavarman of Chendalur grant 123, 181
Skandavarman of Purna grant 246
Skandavarman Sālākkāgama 63ff., 68ff., 96
Skandhākāra 42, 46ff., 100, 117ff., 170, 248
Spears-Heard Ordeal 354ff.
Pherolhum State 374n.
Srimanga 277
Śrīkṛṣṇa 271
Sripattā 23, 32, 105, 238, 396
Sripattā-sāvītī 123, 304
Sripura in Raṇagā 70, 121
Sripura in Kollā 120
Śrīśānta 123, 133, 141, 402ff.
Śrī-pallubha, Śrī-pithiṣṭa-pallubha 260n., 245
Śrī-nējaga, Śrī-nējaga-sāvītī 64, 261ff., 356ff., 307
Srukapāla 236, 255, 270, 273
Solutvīmāsikāto 317
Śtānakundara 257
Śtānakunja-pratirathra 257n.
Śvāṃidūta 99
Śvāmī-Pāśupata 270
Svetapātā 302
Śoḍaśī 58, 96
Śoma 311
Somagiri-varanāthā 109
Somāppāṭī 249
Somāsarman 291
Somāśāmin 396
Somavājra 313
Somayāja 298
Sopatama 146
Soringi, Cēla 147
Soramā, Suraṇā, Suśrāṇāgā 147f.
Suddikundura-visaya 276
Sudra 249
Sungara 121
Suṅga dy. 156
Supratāna 113
Supravajna R. 208
Suriṣṭha 158
Suranttara 242, 244
Sūrāśra 30
Suvāraṇīgiri 141n.
Suvīṭākha 183

T

Ta-An-to-lo 199
Tālagani inscription 319ff.
Ta-ure grant 304ff.
Tagare-nabīgrāma 205
INDEX

Tagore-visaya 305
Talitiriya School 167, 137, 300, 216
Takhtipadra 350
Taksasila 261ff., 219n., 323
Talagunda inscription 3887
Tajahad, Tekkah 119, 288
Talavanagara, Talavanagura 299
Talavara 197
Talupaka visaya 110n.
Taiwar 19
Tampurap-sathana 169
Tampcyaka 78
Tampuskippyakul 246
Tamuampli. 240n.
Tamraparva, Tamraparsh 28
Tamraparshini R. 140ff.
Tandivada inscription 3.84
Tampala-diyva 126, 363
Tanjikamala 61
Taparajaksa-divya 123, 363f.
Tapaka 240
Talavara, Talarda 197
Turagad 215
Tewar 122n.
Tisatana, Cestana 3, 23
Tiruvalliam 247
Tirvra 129
Tosak-kickakia, Dhanyakajaka, 128n.
Todja, Todja, Tondira, Todpaka 146n.
Tosai, Tosai 28, 31
Tolemism 169n., 280n., 231
Trayaksha dy. 241ff.
Trayaksha era 241, 243
Trayaka, Trayaksha 241ff.
Trivaka-malaya 133, 390, 401
Triveda Mf. 133, 341
Trilokana Kadamba 128, 220f.
Trilokana Pallava 128, 217
Tripavata 278n., 284n., 297
Tri-simdhu 144
Trivra 129
Trivaranagara 129, 335
Trivambakasavmin 300
Tin dy. 29
Tapal-divya 399f.
Tulabhagni 131
Turakkalsarnan 211
Tithika 190f.
Tupara 325
Tusapaka 328
Tyaagi–Santara 274

U

Uccagidurga 305
Uccagiri 305
Ucasten 278, 308f.
Udaka-divya 126f.
Udoyasendra 346
Udoyendiram grant 199f.
Udghya 325
Ugrasena 160
Ujanika, Ujijan 22
Ujjain 27, 143, 162, 315
Ujjain symbol 145
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Ukchyka 88
Ukti 291
Umnapatidhara 297n., 346
Umavarman 77f.
Umaha-kara–dhara 290
Uragapura 148ff., 286n.
Ursjir 148ff.
Urvasiapalli 298
Urvasiapalli grant 207f.

Vaidya 270
Vairupathasarman 378
Vallaka-sapvatsara 346, 304f.
Vallapara 127, 190, 295
Vallapava 17, 21, 39ff., 99, 104ff., 190, 296
Vajaranaga, Varanagam 148
Vavarvarman 81n.
Vallare 93, 95, 211
Vallabha, Vallabhavrjya, Vallabhendra 306f., 302
Vallabha 190f., 210
Vallav-visaya 288
Vapraka 217
Vamsarman 218
Vanavasa, Vanavar, Banavasi 221f., 28, 96, 35, 376, 393
Vanaga 98, 30, 395
Vanangaidesa 81n.
Vambo-Mixyar 217
Vargha (Vigga) 206n.
Vardhamana 276
Vardhamansura 121
Varippahkrya 278
Varman dy. 70m., 81n., 110f., 121
Varna (sudra) 190
Varnasarman 278
Vasaka 78, 117n.
Vasava (god) 196
Vasishthipatra 9, 17f., 21ff., 33, 41, 79, 148ff., 169ff., 209
Vasudeva 247
Vasudeva Kayapa 328n.
Vasumatsrajaka 276
Vasumarman 278
Vela tr. 285
Vatapi 119
Vayalar inscription 877f.
Veegiya 249
Veliak 249
Velluru R. 146
Vena R. 130n.
Vengi, Vengipura 5, 7ff., 73, 87, 83, 90ff., 97, 115ff., 120n., 211f., 383
Vengi Country 144f., 150n.
Vengorajya 70n., 311f.
Vephadasa 337n.
Vephusiri 27
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Vennâ R. 263
Veičiužâ 403
Vetuvavst R. 244
Vidarbha 354n.
Videnskapeligvörðun 93
Vidūs 95fn., 256
Vijaya 63ff.
Vijeyâ (Sākērâvha) 163
Vijeyâditiyâ (Bādāmi) 947
Vijeyâditiyâ II (Veñgi) 110n.
Vijeyâditiyâ-mahendra, same as Anuvas I 117n.
Vijeyâpur 14, 28, 32
Vijeyanagar 216n.
Vijeyâsâco 396
Vikramadityâ 216
Vikramadityâ-Bâne 247
Vikramadityâ-Bali-Indra 247
Vikramadityâ I Calukya (Bādāmi) 245f., 275, 309
Vikramadityâ VI Calukya (Kalâpi) 110, 216n.
Vikramadityâ Chandragupta II 252
Vikramadityâ Gupâladeva 316
Vikramahendra 100ff., 101ff., 112, 123, 126, 336
Vikramâditya 104, 112, 123, 333
Vikramendra-Vijeyâpare 293
Vikromendrâsarma I 97, 101ff., 112, 136n., 188n., 395
Vikramendrâsarma II 121n., 139
Vikramâdityâ 395
Vikramapati 130
Vikramadityâ 125
Vindhyâ 114, 243
Vindhyâsâkâ 90n.
Vipihukâ-Ciâcunâkânanda-Sâtkârâ 1 I. 112n., 113, 168n., 217fn., 226ff., 249f.
Vijgar 395
Vijyâgadha 129
Viraâ 395
Vircokara 171f., 231
Vrindâvnâwara 156n.
Vrinda 11fn., 329, 342
Vrûcikâ 159f.
Vṛtadâsâ, Vṛtadâsâdatta 10, 15, 16, 2ff., 38, 163, 315, 399f.
Vrâsma 387
Vrânavâpa 238
Vrânavâman 160ff., 201f., 403
Vrîghara 185f., 188
Vrîgâkhu, Vrîgâkha 19
Vîcâ-divyâ 128, 392
Vîlâkhâvarâman 78
Vîgâs 42, 96, 109, 193, 207, 293
Vîgâsa-priti 93, 96, 194
Vîgu (god) 81f., 206n.
Vîguḍāsâ of Purnâtâ 246
Vîguḍâsâ, same as Kadamba Vîguḍâvarman I 230f., 235
Vîguḍâvarâ I, Kâstegakis of Allahabad Pillar inscription 82n., 152ff., 161ff., 177f., 184
Vîguḍâvarâman I Yonemachârâja 160ff., 191, 203f., 403
Vîguḍâvarâman II 172ff.
Vîguḍâvrasâmin 84f., 94, 322
Vîguḍâvrasâ 395
Vîguḍâvrasâ, VIgadôka 112n.
Vîguḍâvrasâ, same as Garga (?) 295
Vîguḍâvrasâman 403
Vîguḍâvrasâhâma I Kubâ 116f., 121, 133
Vîguḍâvrasâhâma III 399
Vîguḍâvarman I 150, 217f., 258f., 307f., 373f., 399f., 398 ff., 400f., 303, 316, 318, 393, 397
Vîguḍâvarman II 399f., 395
Vija 395
Vîjâapa 278
Vîjâvarâman 349
Vîjâvhasana 341
Vîpûra: Vîpûra 12, 186, 191
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Water Order 311f.

Y

Yâdveda ls. 31n.
Yajña Karukutâs 291
Yajna Pâthâ 291
Yajnavarman 211
Yajnavâtra 3, 140f., 150, 153f., 210, 213
Yama (god) 195
Yâparâya sect 254, 271, 287
Yoslarâman 278
Yoslarâman 116n.
Yoslâsha 10n.
Youna 322f.
Youna 323f.
Youna 399f.
Younâ 129
Younâ 399f.
Younâ, Yonemachârâja 118, 160ff., 175, 183, 185, 194, 258f., 303f., 303n., 316n.
Youna 399