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PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

In this second edition of the "Early History of the Dekkan," I have embodied the results of fresh researches published by others and myself within the last ten years. Some of my own have, however, been laid before the public now for the first time in this book.

R. G. B.

Poona, 10th January, 1895.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

After finishing his book on "Vaiśṇavism, Śaivism and minor religious systems" in the Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research, my revered father very much wanted to bring out a revised edition of his "Early History of the Dekkan." But multifarious engagements and continued ill-health prevented him from carrying it out. He asked me in his last wishes to bring out a third edition with notes and indicated what important records had been published since the last edition. I do not know how long I would have been unable to carry out this sacred task. But Chuckervertty, Chatterjee & Co., who are to India what Trübner & Co. are to Europe, of their own motion made proposals to me for the publication of the book; and the result is that this new edition with Notes is now before the scholarly public long before I expected it. It is true that much new material has been available since the publication of the second edition. But the main conclusions of the book from the period of the Early Chālukyās onwards have remained unshaken, and whatever changes are now required in reconstructing the history of the earlier period have been pointed out in the Notes.

The additional notes of the present (third) edition have been given at the end, and the text and notes of the second edition have been kept intact in the body of the book. It has not, however, been found possible to adhere to the pagination of the second edition. To facilitate reference, the paging of the second edition is given in bold type in square brackets in the body of the book.

D. R. Bhandarkar.
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CORRECTIONS

Page 38, line 7 from bottom, for Vasishṭiputra read Vāsishṭiputra

" 67 " 5 " " Guṇāḍhya " Guṇāḍhya
" 95 " 9 " " Traikāṭaka " Traikāṭaka
" 96 " 9 " top " Gurjara " Gājara
" 99 " 19 " " Āshāḍha " Āshāḍha
" 100 " 23 " " Paṭṭadakal, here as elsewhere. Paṭṭadakal

" 104 Is. 6 & 2 " " Brahmaṇism " Brahmaṇism
" " line 7 " " in the Southern " in Southern
" 106 " 4 " " Yadu " Yadu
" 111 " 18 " " Paithan, here as elsewhere. " Paithan

" 117 " 13 " " Śilāhāra " Śilāhāra
" 130 " 12 " " Kālanjara " Kālanjara
" 150 " 13 " " Gaddaka, here as elsewhere. Gaddaka

" 180 " 13 " bottom " Singhaṇa " Singhaṇa
" 184 " 15 " " Sāktimuktavali " Sāktimuktavali
" 185 " 14 " " Sukt-, here as " Sukt-
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ADDITIONS AND FURTHER CORRECTIONS.

P. 62, footnote 1, add at the end, Karhāḍ plates recently put into my possession and not yet published.

P. 63, line 35, after Wardhā, here as well as everywhere henceforward except in l. 14, p. 75, and add Karhāḍ and make the necessary grammatical changes.

P. 67, line 30, after death, add The Karhāḍ charter represents the fire of his prowess to have burnt the Chālukya race.

P. 73, line 23, after months, add In the Bhadan grant the latter is represented to have reigned for a year.

P. 75, lines 6 and 7, for the sentence ending with dominions, substitute He expelled the prince Rachchhyāmalla from the throne of the Gaṅga country and placed on it a person of the name of Būtuga, or Būtayya which name has been Sanskritized into Bhūtārya; and destroyed the Pallavas to whose race the Dantiga killed by him probably belonged.

P. 75, line 20, at the end add The Karhāḍ charter was issued in 880 Saka, i.e., 18 years after the Wardhā grant. It contains two stanzas more about Krishṇa III. than the latter; and these must in consequence be regarded as alluding to events which occurred between Saka 862 and 880. As stated therein, to consolidate his power Krishṇa deprived some of his feudatories of their principalities, and granted them to others who were meritorious; some were separated from each other and others joined together. “With the idea of conquering the south, he uprooted the Chola race, placed the territory ruled over by it under his own dependents, made the kings of the Chera, Pāṇḍya, and other countries along with Sinhala or Ceylon his tributaries, and erected a triumphal column at Re(ā)meśvara.” In an inscription at Atakūr in the Maisur territory, dated 872 Saka, Krishṇarāja is represented to have

1 Published by Prof. Kielhorn, Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III., p. 271.
fought with the Chola prince Rājāditya and killed him. In this last act he was assisted by Bātuga, his Gaṅga feudatory mentioned above, and Gūtuga was rewarded for his services by being granted additional territory. In a village in the Chingleput district of the Madras Presidency, which must have formed a part of the ancient kingdom of the Pallavas, there are two inscriptions dated in the seventeenth and nineteenth years of the reign of Kannaradeva, i.e. Krishṇadeva, in which he is spoken of as the conqueror of Kachchi or Kāṇchipuram the capital of the Pallavas and Taṇjai identified with Tanjor (Taṇjavūr or Taṇjāpura) which was the capital of the Chola princes. Another inscription at Vellore is dated in the twenty-sixth year of his reign; and there are two more containing his name in South Arcot which was probably included in the Chola kingdom. These facts bear out the statement in the Karhâd grant of his having uprooted the Chola race and held the country by placing it under his dependents, and another in this and the Wardhā grant that the Pallavas were destroyed by him. This latter event, however, took place before Śaka 862 the date of the Wardhā grant, while the conquest of the Chola prince came on later. By the Karhâd charter which was issued on Wednesday the 13th of the dark half of Phālguṇa when 880 years had elapsed since the time of the Śaka king, the cyclic year being Kālayukta, Krishṇa granted,—while encamped at Melpāṭi with his victorious army for the purpose of apportioning the southern provinces among his dependents, taking charge of all the possessions of Areleśvara, and constructing temples to be dedicated to certain gods,—the village of Kaṅkrin in the district of Karahāṭaka to the great Śaiva ascetic Gaganāśiva, who was the pupil of Īśānaśiva and was conversant with the Sivasiddhântas or sacred books of the Śaiva sect, for the benefit of the whole group of ascetics. It would appear from this that Saivism flourished about the district of Karhâd at this period.

P. 78, to the dates under Kṛishṇa III. add 872, 880.

---
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INTRODUCTORY

INDIA has no written history. Nothing was known till within recent times of the political condition of the country, the dynasties that ruled over the different provinces which composed it, and the great religious and social revolutions that it went through. The historical curiosity of the people was satisfied by legends. What we find of a historical nature in the literature of the country before the arrival of the Mahomedans comes to very little.

I. We have a chronicle of Kaśmir called the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, in which, however, there is a good deal which is not supported by contemporary evidence. Now and then, a bountiful prince or minister found a poet to sing his glories; and the works thus composed, contain a good deal of historical information, though, of course, an undue praise of the patron and his ancestors is to be expected. But a few such works only have hitherto been discovered; and the oldest of them gives an account of a prince who lived in the first half of the seventh century. The literature of the Jainas of the Śvetāmbara sect contains accounts mostly of the later princes of Gujārāt and other noted personages. There are also similar accounts of the princes of Rājaputra. In the beginning or at the end of some Sanskrit works the names of the princes under whose patronage or in whose reign they were composed, are given; and
Introduction. Sometimes we find a long genealogy of the family to which the particular prince belonged, with some short observation with reference to each of his ancestors. Lastly, the Purāṇas contain genealogies of the most powerful royal families which ascend to a higher antiquity than the works noticed hitherto.

II. But the information to be gathered from all these sources is extremely meagre; and there are many provinces on the history of which they do not throw any light. And the facts mentioned in them cannot be systematically arranged, or even chronologically connected, except with the assistance of other sources of information to which we shall now proceed. The invasion of Alexander the Great brought the Greeks in contact with the Hindus; and his successors in Syria kept up an intercourse with the Indian emperors for a long time. The notices of Indian persons and events contained in the writings of the Greeks, when compared with the statements occurring in the Purāṇas, admit, in some cases, of an easy identification; and from the known dates of the corresponding Greek persons or events, we are able to determine those of the Indian persons or events. In this manner the date of the foundation of the Maurya dynasty by Chandragupta has been determined to be about 322 B.C., and a good many other dates in Indian history have been ascertained. The writings of Chinese authors also throw a great deal of light on some periods of Indian history. Buddhism was introduced into China in the first century of the Christian era; and from time to time men from that country came to India as pilgrims; and some Indian Buddhists also must have found their way to China. The Chinese pilgrims wrote accounts of what they saw and did in India, and these works, which have come down to us, are
very valuable for the elucidation of Indian history. The Chinese possessed a perfect system of chronology, and the dates of the pilgrimages are useful for the purposes of the Indian antiquarian. Valuable accounts of India written by the Arabic visitors to the country in the Middle Ages have also become available.

III. Another very important source, and fuller than any hitherto noticed, consists of inscriptions. Some of these are cut on stones or rocks, and others engraved on copper plates. These last are in all cases charters conveying grants of land made mostly by princes or chiefs to religious persons or to temples and monasteries. A great many of these are dated in one of the current eras. It is usual in these charters to give the pedigree of the grantor. The names of his ancestors together with some of their famous deeds are mentioned. As the authors who composed the grants cannot be expected to be impartial in their account of the reigning monarch, much of what they say about him cannot be accepted as historically true. And even in the case of his ancestors, the vague praise that we often find, must be regarded simply as meaningless. But when they are represented to have done a specific deed, such as the conquest of Harshavardhana by Pulakesi II. of the early Chalukya dynasty, it must be accepted as historical; and when we have other sources available, we find the account confirmed, as Hwhan Thsang does that of Pulakeshi’s exploit. Even in the case of the reigning monarch, the specific deeds such as wars with neighbouring princes, which are mentioned, may be accepted as historical; though, however, legitimate doubts may be entertained as regards the reported results.

The stone-inscriptions are intended to comme-
morate the dedication of a temple or monastery or any part thereof, and of works of public utility such as tanks and wells, and sometimes grants of land also. A good many of these benefactions are by private individuals; but not seldom the name of the king, in whose reign the dedication was made, is given together with the year of his reign, as well as the date in the current era. When it is a royal benefaction that is commemorated, we have a longer account of the reigning prince, and sometimes of his ancestors.

The great pioneer in the deciphering and interpretation of inscriptions was James Prinsep; but no great progress was made after him, in this branch of antiquarian work, till the establishment of the "Indian Antiquary" and the institution of the Archaological Survey. These gave a strong impetus to it, and many scholars entered into the field with zeal. Twenty years ago, it would have been impossible to write the following pages.

IV. I must not omit to mention old coins as a valuable source of information as to the names of the successive monarchs of a dynasty, and sometimes their dates. A study of these too has led to very important results.

The materials for the history of the development of Indian thought and of changes in the social condition are the whole literature itself. But this is an independent inquiry with which we are not here directly concerned; and the conclusions arrived at are applicable to the whole Hindu race, and not to any particular province. I have consulted general literature only in discussing points concerning the Aryan settlement of the Dekkan. The materials used in the preparation of the other sections, which
fall under each of the four classes noticed above, are as follows:

I.—Bilhana's Vikramâṅkacharita, Introduction to the Vratakhaṇḍa, Introduction to Jahlaṇa's anthology, the Purânic genealogies; and scattered notices in the Kathâsaritsâgara, Hâla's Saptaśati, Vâtsyâyâna's Kâmasûtra, Kavirahasya, Digambara Jaina works—such as the Hari-vâraṇâ, the Uttara Purâṇa, the Yaśastilaka, the Praśnottararatnamâlîkâ &c.—Vijñâneśvara's Mitâksharâ, the Abhilahshitârthâchintâmaṇî, the Basava Purâṇâ, the Lekha-pañchâshikâ, the Sâbdârṇavachandrikâ, the Jñâneśvari, and a few others.

II.—Ptolemy's geography, the Periplus, Hwhan Thsang's Itinerary.

III.—Inscriptions in the cave-temples of Western India; Rudradâman's inscription at Junâgaḍ; stone inscriptions in the Southern Maratha Country; copper-plate charters of the early Châlukyas, the Râshtrakûtas, and other dynasties, of which we have now a large number.

IV.—Coins of the Sâtavâhanas found at Kolhâpur and in the lower Godâvari district.

Since the political history of the Dekkan before the advent of Mahomedans was entirely unknown before, and the difficulty of ascertaining facts is very great, my object has been to collect as many of them as possible. The absence of proportion in the space allotted to important and unimportant events due to this circumstance, will, it is hoped, be excused. This does not pretend to be a literary production, but merely a congeries of facts.
SECTION I.

ETYMOLOGY OF THE WORD "DEKKAN" AND ITS DENOTATION.

[1] The word "Dakkhan" represents the vernacular pronunciation of the Sanskrit word Dakshīṇa, meaning "southern," used to designate the portion of the Indian Peninsula lying to the south of the Narmadā. The name more usually met with in Sanskrit works and elsewhere is Dakshīṇapatha or "the Southern Region." That this name was in ordinary use in ancient times is shown by the fact that the author of the Periplus calls that portion of the country Dakhinabades. In the vernacular or Prākrit speech of the time, the Sanskrit Dakshīṇapatha must have become Dakhīnipadha or Dakhipavadha by the usual rules, and the Greek writer must have derived his name from this popular pronunciation. The shorter form of the name also must have been in use, since in the beginning of the fifth century of the Christian era, Fah-Hian, the Chinese traveller, was told at Benares that there was a country to the south called Ta-Thsin, which word corresponds to the Sanskrit Dakshīṇa.

Dakshīṇapatha or Dakshīṇa was the name of the whole peninsula to the south of the Narmadā. Among the countries enumerated in the Mārkaṇḍeya, Vāyu, and Mātsya Purāṇas as comprised in Dakshīṇapatha

---

[1] Indicates page 1 of the original edition.
1 Indian Antiquary, VIII. 143.
2 Travels of Fah-Hian by S. Beal, 139.
3 Chap. 57 Verse 45, Edition Bibliotheca Indica. The reading of the second line, however, is wrong. It ought to be, Pāṇḍyās cha Keralās chaiva Cholāḥ Kulyās tathaiva cha, as it is in the manuscript I have consulted.
4 Chap. 45 Verse 124, Edition Bibliotheca Indica.
Section I.

are those of the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, and Keralas, which were situated in the extreme south of the peninsula, and correspond to the modern provinces of Tanjor, Madura, and Malabar. In the Mahābhārata, however, Sahadeva, the youngest of the Pāṇḍu princes, is represented in his career of conquest to have gone to Dakshiṇāpatha after having conquered the king of the Pāṇḍyas. This would show that the country of the Pāṇḍyas was not included in Dakshiṇāpatha. Again, the rivers Godāvari and others springing from the Sahyādri are spoken of in the Vāyu Purāṇa as rivers of Dakshiṇāpatha, while the Narmadā and the Tāpī are not so styled; whence it would seem that the valleys of those rivers were not included in Dakshiṇāpatha. The word thus appears not to have been always used in the same sense. In modern times it is the name of the country between the Narmadā on the north and a variable line along the course of the Krīshṇā to the south, exclusive of the provinces lying to the extreme east. It is thus almost identical [2] with the country called Mahārāṣṭra or the region in which the Marāṭhī language is spoken, the narrow strip of land between the Western Ghāats and the sea being excluded. A still narrower definition is that which excludes from this tract the valleys of the Narmadā and the Tāpī; and to this extent we have seen that there is authority for it in the Vāyu Purāṇa. Thus the word Dekkan expresses the country watered by the upper Godāvari and that lying between that river and the Krīshṇā. The name Mahārāṣṭra also seems at one time to have been restricted to this tract. For that country is, in the Purāṇas and other works,

6 Sahāparvan, Chap. 31 Verse 17, Bombay Edition.
7 Chap. 45 Verse 104, Ed. Bib. Ind.
8 See the chapters of the three Purāṇas referred to in the notes on page 1.
distinguished on the one hand from Aparânta or Northern Konkan, and from the regions on either side of the Narmadâ and the Tâpi inhabited by the Pulîndas and Sabaras, as well as from Vidarbha on the other. In a comparatively modern work entitled Ratnakośa, 9 Mahârâshṭra, Vaidarbha, Tâpi-taṭa-ḍesa and Narmadâ-taṭa-ḍesa (i.e., the countries on either side of those rivers), and the Konkan are spoken of as distinct from each other. The Dekkan or Mahârâshṭra in this the narrowest sense of the word forms the subject of the present notice.

9 Prof. Aufrecht's Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, 352.
SECTION II.

SETTLEMENT OF THE ĀRYAS IN THE DEKKAN.

[3] It is now a recognised fact that the Āryas who came to India were at first confined to eastern Afghanistan and the Panjāb. Thence they emigrated to the east and for a time the easternmost province occupied by them was Brāhmāvarta or their holy land, lying between the rivers Sarasvati the modern Sarasuti, and Drisadvati,¹ a stream in the vicinity, that is, the country about Thanesar. There the system of castes and orders and the sacrificial religion seem to have been fully developed. Thence they spread to the east and the south, and gradually occupied the whole country between the Hīmālaya and the Vindhyā. This last mountain range must for a long time have formed the southern boundary of their settlements. For the name Āryāvarta or the region occupied by the Āryas, as explained by Manu² and even by Patañjali,³ the author of the Mahābhāshya on Pāṇini's grammar, signified exclusively the part of the country situated between those mountain ranges. The Vindhyā, which by its height seemed to obstruct the passage of the sun, was impassable to them. The name Pāriyātra was given to the more northern and western portion of the range from which the rivers Chambal and Bētvā take their rise, probably because it was situated on the boundary of their Vātrak or range of communication. After a while, however, the sage Agastya, in poetical

¹ Manu, II, 17.
² Manu, II, 23.
³ Patañjali's Mahābhāshya under Pāṇini, II, 4, 10.
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language, bade the mountain not to grow high, that is, crossed it and established an Āśrama or hermitage to the south and thus led the way to other settlements. The first or oldest Āryan province in the southern country must have been the Vidarbhas or the Berârs. For in the Râmâyâna when Sugrîva the monkey-king sends his followers to the different quarters in search of Râma’s wife Sîtâ and Râvana her ravisher, he directs them to go among other southern countries to Vidarbhas, Richîkas, and Mahishakas, and also to Dāṇḍakâraṇyâ (the forest of Dāṇḍakâ) and the river Godâvâri. This shows that while the country about the Godâvâri, that is, the Dekkan or Mahârâshâtra in the narrowest sense of the terms, was a forest, Vidarbha was an inhabited country. In the Mahâbhdrata also Agastya is represented to have given a girl that he produced by his miraculous powers to the king of Vidarbha, and after she had grown to be a woman demanded her of the king in marriage. In the Râmâyâna, Râma is represented to have lived for a long time in Dâṇḍakâraṇyâ, at a place called Pañchavaṭi situated on the banks of the Godâvâri about two yojanas from the hermitage of Agastya. That this Dâṇḍakâraṇyâ was the modern Mahârâshâtra is shown by the fact stated above, that it was watered by the river Godâvâri, and by several others. According to the Hindu ritual it is necessary when beginning any religious ceremony to pronounce the name of the country in which it is performed. The Brâhmans in Mahârâshâtra do not utter the name Mahârâshâtra but Dâṇḍakâraṇyâ with the word deśa or “country” attached to it. In the introduction to

---

4 Râmâyana, IV. Chap. 41, Bombay Edition.
6 Râmâyana, III. 13, 13 Bom. Ed.
Section II. Pāñchavaṭi.

Hemâdrî's Vratakhaṇḍa, a work written more than six hundred years ago, Devagiri, the modern Daulatbâd, is spoken of as situated in a district on the confines of Daṇḍakârâṇya. Nâsik claims to be the Pâñchavaṭi where Râma lived. But the poet could hardly be expected to have brought his hero from the Vindhya to such a remote westerly place as Nâsik. The river Godâvari must, from the description occurring in the Râmâyana as well as in Bhavabhûti's Uttara Râmâcharita, have been wide at Râma's Pâñchavaṭi. It could hardly have been so at Nâsik, which is very near its source. On the other hand, "the region about the northern part of the Sahyâdri through which flowed the river Godâvari and in which Govardhana was situated" is in the Purâṇas represented as "the most charming on earth; and there, to please Râma, the sage Bhâradvâja caused heavenly trees and herbs to spring up for his wife's enjoyment, and thus a lovely garden came into existence." In the Mârkaṇḍeya, Govardhana is spoken of as a town; but the Vâyu and the Mâtsya seem to mean it to be a mountain. This Govardhana must, from the given position, be the same as the village of that name near Nâsik; and thus the three Purâṇas must be understood as supporting the identification of Pâñchavaṭi with Nâsik.

But though Mahârâshâṭra was the last country occupied by the Indian Āryas, their subjugation of it was no less thorough than that of all the northern

7 Mârkaṇḍeya, Chap. 57 Verses 34-35; Vâyu, Chap. 45 Verses 112-114; and Mâtsya, Chap. 112 Verses 37-39. The passage, however, is corrupt. The three Purâṇas evidently derive their reading from the same original, but the text has been greatly corrupted. The most ancient version of it seems to be that in the Vâyu.
countries. Here, as there, they drove some of the aborigines to the fastnesses of mountains and jungles, and incorporated the rest into their own society. The present Marāṭhi language is as much an offshoot of the Sanskrit as the other languages of Northern India. The ancient representatives of these dialects—the Mahārāṣṭrī, the Sauraseni, and the Māgadhi, as well as an earlier form of speech, the Pāli—show extensive corruptions of Sanskrit sounds, reducible however to a few general laws. These cannot be accounted for by the natural operation of the causes which bring about the decay of a language spoken throughout its history by the same race. For, this operation is slow and must be in continuance for a very long time in order to produce the wide-going phonetic changes which we observe in those Prākrit dialects, as they are called. This long-continued process must at the same time give rise to a great many changes in other respects. Such, [5] however, we do not find in those dialects, and they do not in those respects show a very wide departure from the Sanskrit. The extensive corruptions of Sanskrit sounds, therefore, must be accounted for by the supposition that the language had to be spoken by races whose original tongue it was not. Those alien races could not properly pronounce the Sanskrit words used by the conquering Āryas; and thus the Prākrit forms of Sanskrit words represent their pronunciation of them. A few sounds unknown to Sanskrit as well as some words not traceable to that language are also found in the Prākrīts, and these point to the same conclusion. It thus appears that the Indian Āryas in their progress through the country came in contact with alien races, which were incorporated with their society and learnt their language, at the same time that they preserved some of their original words and
phonetic peculiarities. This was the state of things in the north down to the Marâthâ country. But farther south and on the eastern coast, though they penetrated there and communicated their own civilization to the aboriginal races inhabiting those parts, they were not able to incorporate them thoroughly into their own society and to root out their languages and their peculiar civilization. On the contrary, the Åryas had to learn the languages of those races and to adopt a portion at least of their civilization. Thus the Kanarese, the Telugu, the Tamil, and the other languages now spoken in Southern India are not derived from the Sanskrit but belong altogether to a different stock, and hence it is also that southern art is so different from the northern. The reason why the result of the Åryan irruption was so different in Southern India from what it was in the north appears to be that when the Åryas penetrated to the south there existed already well-organized communities and kingdoms. In the passage in the Râmâyana, referred to above, the monkey-soldiers are directed to go to the countries of the Andhras (Telugu people), the Pândyâs, the Cholas, and the Kerals, in the south; and are told that they will there see the gate of the city of the Pândyâs adorned with gold and jewels. And these races, their country, and their kings are alluded to in other Sanskrit works, as will be noticed hereafter. In the north, however, at the time of the Åryan invasion, the condition of the country must have been similar to that of Dañḍakårâñya, which is represented in the Râmâyana as a forest infested by Râkshasas or wild tribes who disturbed the religious rites of the Brâhmaṇ sages. And

---

8 These points I have developed in my Lectures on Sanskrit and the Prâkrit languages derived from it; Jour. Rom. B. R. A. S. Vol. XVI. pp. 290-91.
throughout the older portion of Sanskrit literature, which is to be referred to the times when the Āryas were gradually progressing from the Panjāb, the wild tribes they met with are spoken of under the name of Dasyus, Rākshasas, and others.
[6] SECTION III.

APPROXIMATE DATE OF THE ĀRYAN SETTLEMENT IN THE DEKKAN AND NOTICES OF SOUTHERN INDIA IN ANCIENT INDIAN LITERATURE AND INSCRIPTIONS.

We will now endeavour to determine approximately the period when the Āryas settled in Daṇḍakāraṇyā, and trace the relations between the civilized Āryan community of the north and the southern country at different periods of Sanskrit literature and at well-known dates in Indian history. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, which is anterior to the whole of the so-called classical Sanskrit literature, the sage Viśvāmitra is represented to have condemned by a curse the progeny of fifty of his sons to "live on the borders" of the Āryan settlements, and these, it is said, "were the Andhras, Puṇḍras, Śabaras, Pulindas, and Mūtibas, and the descendants of Viśvāmitra formed a large portion of the Dasyus."¹

Of these the first four are spoken of as people living in the south, the Puṇḍras in the Rāmāyaṇa, and the other three in the Purāṇas.² From the later literature, the Pulindas and Śabaras appear to have been wild tribes living about the Vindhya.³ Ptolemy places the former along the Narmadā. The Andhras, who in these days are identified with the Telugu people, lived about the mouth of the Godāvari or perhaps farther to the north. If these were the posi-

¹ Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII. 18. Pulindas are omitted in the corresponding passage in the Śāukhāyana Sūtra.
² See the passages above referred to.
³ In his Kādambarī Rāma places the Śabaras in the forest on the Vindhya range.
tions of the tribes in the time of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, the Indian Āryas must at that time have been acquainted with the whole country to the north of the Vindhya and a portion to the south-east of that range.

Pāṇini in his Sūtras or grammatical rules shows an extensive knowledge of the geography of India. Of the places and rivers mentioned by him a good many exist in the Panjāb and Afghanistan; but the names of countries situated in the eastern portion of Northern India also occur in the Sūtras. The countries farthest to the south mentioned by him are Kachchha (IV. 2, 133), Avantī (IV. 1, 176), Kosala (IV. 1, 171), Kāraśa (IV. 1, 178)⁴ [7] and Kālininga (IV. 1, 178).⁵ The first is the same as the modern country

---

⁴ This name does not occur in the Sūtra, but is the second in the list or Gaṇa beginning with Bharga. As regards the words occurring in these Gaṇas, I have on a previous occasion expressed my opinion that though it is not safe to attribute a whole Gaṇa to Pāṇini (and in several cases we have clear indications that some of the words were inserted in later times), still the first three words might without mistake be taken to be his. This was objected to by Professor Weber. But as my reasons were, as I thought, obvious, I did not think it necessary to defend my view. I may, however, here state that since Pāṇini refers to these Gaṇas in his Sūtras by using the first word in the list with daḥ, equivalent to “and others,” added to it, and since he uses the plural of the noun so formed, and the plural of a noun cannot be used unless three individuals at least of the class are meant, it is proper that we should understand him to be thinking of the first and two words at least more. This observation is meant to be applicable generally. In the present case, however, the expression Bhargadā is a derivative of the compound, and the plural is not actually used, though it is clearly implied.

⁵ In the so-called Pāṇiniya Śikṣā the expression Saurāśṭrikā nāri or “a woman of Saurāśṭra” occurs. But this should by no means be regarded as showing that Pāṇini
of that name, Avantī is the district about Ujjayinī, and Kaliṅga corresponds to the modern Northern Circars. Kosala, Kariśa, and Avantī are mentioned in the Purāṇas as countries situated on the back of the Vindhya. In the Ratnāvalī, a dramatic play, Kosala is also placed near that mountain range. Supposing that the non-occurrence of the name of any country farther south in Pāṇini’s work is due to his not having known it, a circumstance which, looking to the many names of places in the north that he gives, appears very probable, the conclusion follows that in his time the Āryas were confined to the north of the Vindhya, but did proceed or communicate with the northernmost portion of the eastern coast, not by crossing that range, but avoiding it by taking an easterly course.

Kātyāyana, however, the object of whose aphorisms called Vārtikas is to explain and supplement Pāṇini, shows an acquaintance with southern nations. Pāṇini gives rules for the formation of derivatives for the names of tribes of warriors which are at the same time the names of the countries inhabited by them, in the sense of “one sprung from an individual belonging to that tribe,” and also, it must be understood, in the sense of “king of the country.” Thus a man sprung from an individual of the tribe of the

was acquainted with Surāśṭra. The Pāṇinīya Śikṣā cannot be the work of Pāṇini; for the author of that treatise begins by stating that he is going to explain Śikṣā according to the views of Pāṇini and ends with a few verses in praise of the great grammarian. Besides, the author notices the Prākrit dialects to which there is no allusion whatever in Pāṇini’s great work and writes in verse. Grammatical treatises in verse are later than those in the form of Sūtras. The Pāṇinīya Śikṣā therefore must have been composed long after Pāṇini.

6 See the passages cited above.
Pañchâlas, or the king of the country Pañchâlas, is to be called Pañchâla; a descendant of a Sâlva, or the king of the country of the Sâlvas, is to be called Sâlveya, &c. Kâtyâyana notices here an omission; the name Pâṇḍya is not explained by Pâṇini. Kâtyâyana therefore adds, "one sprung from an individual of the tribe of the Pâṇḍus or the king of their country, should be called a Pâṇḍya." 7 Similarly, Pâṇini tells us that in either of these senses no termination should be appended to the word Kambojas, which was the name of a non-Āryan people in the north-west, nor should any of its vowels be changed; but that the word Kamboja itself means "one sprung from an individual of the Kamboja tribe, or the king of the country of the Kambojas." 8 Kâtyâyana says that in this rule, the expression "and others" should be added to the word Kambojas; for the rule applies also to the names "Cholas and others," that is, persons sprung from an individual of the Chola and other tribes, and the kings of the Chola and other countries should be called by the names "Chola and others." Similarly, Pâṇini tells us that the countries Kumudvat, Naḍvat, and Vetasvat are so called because they contain Kumudas or water-lilies, [8] Naḍas or reeds, and Vetas or canes, respectively. 9 Kâtyâyana adds, "Mahishmat is so called because it contains Mahishas or buffaloes."

Now Mahishmat appears to be the same southern country which in the Purâṇas is associated with Mahârâşṭra and is called Mahishakas. Mâhishmatî on the banks of the Narmadâ was probably its capital. Here we may, I think, argue, as Professor Goldstucker has done in many similar cases, that had

---

7 Pâṇḍor dyaṇ, which is a Vârtika on Pâṇ. IV. 1, 168.
8 Pâṇ. IV. 1, 175.
9 Pâṇ. IV. 2, 87.
HISTORY OF

Section III. Pāṇini known the Pāṇḍyās, Cholas, and Mahishmat, he would not have omitted the names from his rules, considering how careful a grammarian he was. Very likely, then, he did not know them, and this supposition is strengthened by the fact alluded to above that the name of no other southern country occurs in his Sūtras. Thus then the Āryas of the north were not familiar with the southern countries and tribes in the time of Pāṇini, but were so in the time of Kātyāyana. The latter author also mentions a town of the name of Nāsikya,¹⁰ which is very likely the same as our modern Nāsik.

Patañjali shows an intimate acquaintance with the south. As a grammarian he thinks it his duty to notice the lingual usages in the south, and tells us that in Dakshipāpatha the word Sarasī is used to denote large lakes.¹¹ He mentions Māhīshmatī,¹² Vaidarbha,¹³ Kāṇchīpura,¹⁴ the modern Conjeeveram, and Kerala¹⁵ or Malabar. Patañjali's date, B.C. 150, may now be relied upon. That author notices variant readings of Kātyāyana's Vārtikas as found in the texts used by the schools of the Bhāradvājīyas, Saunāgas, and others. Some of these might be considered as emendations of the Vārtikas, though Patañjali's introduction of them by the verb pañhanti, "they read," is an indication that he regarded them as different readings. A sufficiently long time therefore must have elapsed between Kātyāyana and Patañjali to give rise to these variants or emendations. I am therefore inclined to accept the popular

¹⁰ In a Vārtika on Pāṇ. VI. 1, 63.
¹¹ Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇ. I. 1, 19.
¹² On Pāṇ. III. 1, 26.
¹³ IV. 1, fourth Āhnika.
¹⁴ IV. 3, second Āhnika.
¹⁵ IV. 1, fourth Āhnika.
tradition which refers Kātyāyana to the time of the Nandas who preceded the Mauryas, and to assign to him the first half of the fourth century before Christ. In this manner the interval between Kātyāyana and Patañjali was about two hundred years. Now, Professor Goldstucker has shown from an examination of the Vārtikas that certain grammatical forms are not noticed by Pāṇini but are taught by Kātyāyana, and concludes that they did not exist in the language in Pāṇini’s time. I have followed up the argument in my lectures “On the Sanskrit and Prākrit languages,”¹⁶ and given from the Vārtikas several ordinary instances of such forms. From these one of two conclusions only is possible, viz., either that Pāṇini was a very careless and ignorant grammarian, or that the forms did not exist in the language in his time. The first is of course inadmissible; wherefore the second must be accepted. I have also [9] shown from a passage in the introduction to Patañjali’s Mahābhāshya, that verbal forms such as those of the perfect which are taught by Pāṇini as found in the Bhāṣā or current language, not the Chhāndasa or obsolete language, had gone out of use in the time of Kātyāyana and Patañjali, and participles had come to be used instead.¹⁷ Professor Goldstucker has also given a list of words used by Pāṇini in his Sūtras in a sense which became obsolete in the time of Kātyāyana, and shown what portion of Sanskrit literature did not probably exist in Pāṇini’s time but was known to Kātyāyana, and in one case comes to the not unjustifiable conclusion that the time that elapsed between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana was so great that certain literary works which either did not exist in Pāṇini’s time or were not old to him came to be

---

considered by Kâtyâyana to be as old as those which were old to Pâñini. No less an interval of time than about three centuries can account for all these circumstances. Pâñini, therefore, must have flourished in the beginning of the seventh century before the Christian era, if not earlier still; and against this conclusion I believe no argument has been or can be brought, except a vague prejudice. And now to our point, the Indian Āryas had thus no knowledge of Southern India previous to the seventh century before Christ; they had gone as far as the Northern Circars by the eastern route, but no farther; and the countries directly to the south of the Vindhya they were not familiar with. About that time, however, they must have begun to penetrate still further, since they had already settled in or had communication with the countries on the northern skirts of the Vindhya and Kâlîṅga, and first settled in Vidarbhâ or Berâr, approaching it still, it would appear, by the eastern route; but in the course of some time more they crossed the Vindhya and settled in Daṇḍakâraṇyâ along the banks of the Godâvari, that is, in Mahârâshâtra or the Dekkan. Before B.C. 350 they had become familiar with the whole country down to Tanjor and Madura.

A chronological conclusion based on the occurrence of certain words or names in the great epics is not likely to be so safe. Though a Mahâbhârata existed before Pâñini and Âśvalâyana, it is highly questionable whether our present text is the same as that which existed in their times. On the contrary, the probability is that the work has been added to from time to time; and the text itself has undergone such corruption that no one can be positively certain that a particular word was not foisted into it in comparatively modern times. The text of the
Rāmāyana also has become corrupt, though additions do not seem to have been made to it. Still the Bengali resension of the poem like the Bengali rescensions of more recent works does contain additions. The text prevalent in this part of the country and in the south is more reliable; and though innumerable differences of reading exist in the different manuscripts even on this side still there is hardly any material difference. But [10] the date of the Rāmāyana is uncertain; the present Hindu belief based on the Purāṇas is that Rāma’s incarnation is older than Kṛṣṇa’s, and consequently the Rāmāyana older than the Mahābhārata; but it is not a little curious that while there is an allusion to Vāsudeva and Arjuna and to Yudhishṭhira in Pāṇini, and Patañjali frequently brings in Mahābhārata characters in his illustrations and examples, there is not one allusion to Rāma or his brothers or their father Daśaratha in the works of those grammarians. Even a much later author, Amarasimha the lexicographer, in his list of the synonyms of Vishnu, gives a good many names derived from the Kṛṣṇa incarnation; but the name of Rāma, the son of Daśaratha, does not occur, though Rāma or Balabhadra, the brother of Kṛṣṇa, is mentioned. Still, whatever chronological value may be attached to the circumstance, the occurrence of the names of places in the Dekkan contained in those epics I have already to some extent noticed. Sahadeva is represented to have subdued the Pāṇḍyas, Dravidas, Udras, Keralas, and Andhras,16 and also to have visited Kishkindha, which was probably situated somewhere near Hampi, the site of the Pampa lake or river, where Rāma met Sugrīva the monkey chief, though the country Kaishkindha is

---

16 Sābhap, Chap. 31.
Section III. placed by the Purânas among those near the Vindhya. He went also to Sûrparaka, the modern Supârâ near Bassein, Dañdaka, the same as Dañdakârañya but not mentioned as a forest, Karahâtkâra the modern Karhâda on the confluence of the Krîshnâ and the Koinâ, and to others. The countries mentioned in the passage in the Râmâyana, alluded to above, as lying to the south are Utkala, probably the modern Ganjam, Kâlînga, Daśârâha, Avantî, Vidarbha, and others. The district near Bhilsâ must have been called Dašârâha in ancient times; for its capital was Vidiśâ, which was situated, as stated by Kâlidâsa in the Meghadûta, on the Vetravati or Betvâ, and is thus to be identified with the modern Bhilsâ. All these are thus in the vicinity of the Vindhya or nearly in the same line with it farther east. But between these and the southernmost countries of the Cholas, Pândyas, and Keralas, the Râmâyana mentions no other place or country but Dañdakârañya. This condition of the country, as observed before, is to be considered as previous to the Aryan settlements in the Dekkan, while that represented by the Mahâbhârata in the place indicated seems subsequent; and herein we may see a reason for believing that the Râmâyana is the older of the two epics. The name Mahârâşhtra does not occur in either of them.

In the middle of the third century before Christ, Aśoka, the great king of the Maurya dynasty reigning at Pâtaliputra in Magadha, speaks in the fifth Edict of his rock-inscriptions, which are found at Girnâr in Kâthiâvâd on the west, Dhauli in Katak and Jaugañ in Ganjam on the eastern coast, at Khalsî in the Himâlaya, Shahbâz-garhi in Afghanistan, and Mansehra on the northern frontier of the Panjab, of his having sent ministers of religion [11] to the Râṣṭikas.
and the Petenikas and to the Aparântas. The last of which we know best is Northern Konkan, the capital of which was Sûrparaka. Petenikas is not unlikely the same as Paithânakas, i.e., the people or country about Paithâna on the Gâvâri. The vernacular pronunciation of the name of the city, which in Sanskrit is Pratishthâna, was in those days, as it now is, Peithâna or Paithâna, for both the author of the Periplus and Ptolemy call it Paithana or Baithana. The Râṣṭikas, or, according to the Manschra version, Raṭrakas, corresponding to the Sanskrit Râshṭrikas, were very likely the people of Mahârâšṭra, for a tribe of the name of Raṭas has from the remotest times held political supremacy in the Dekkan. One branch of it assumed the name of Râshtrakûtas and governed the country before the Châlukyas acquired power. It re-established itself after about three centuries, but had to yield to the Châlukyas again after some time. In later times, chieftains of the name of Raṭas governed Sugandhavarti or Saundatti in the Belgaum district. In the thirteenth Edict in which the countries where Aśoka’s moral edicts were respected are enumerated, the Petenikas are associated with Bhojas instead of Râṣṭikas. Bhojas,

19 व नामनेपरंतरं: is the Sanskrit of the original Prâkrit. It might be translated as “and also those other called Aparântas,” i.e. also that other country called Aparânta. If we take it in this way, Aparânta is clearly Northern Konkan; for that is the name of that part of the country found in Sanskrit and Pâli Literature from the remotest times. In the Mahâvaishnâsa and Dipavaishnâsa quoted below, Mahârâšṭra is associated with Aparântaka. It is possible to translate it as “and also other western countries” as M. Senart does. But the word “other” certainly refers to Raṣṭika-Petenikâdnâm and not to the preceding Youam Kambojam &c., as he takes it so as to make these last also western countries. (Inscriptions of Aśoka, Vol. II., p. 84.)
we know, ruled over the country of Vidarbha or Berar and also in other parts of the Dekkan. In the inscriptions in the caves at Kuḍā the name "Mahābhoja" or Great Bhoja occurs several times, and once in an inscription at Beṛsā. Just as the Bhojas called themselves Mahābhojas, the Rāṣṭrīkas, Raṭṭis, Raṭṭhis, or Raṭṭhas called themselves Mahāraṇṭhis or Mahāraṇṭhas, as will be shown below, and thus the country in which they lived came to be called Mahāraṇṭha, the Sanskrit of which is Mahāraṇḍha. In the second and the thirteenth edicts, the countries of the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, Ketala-ptras (Chera or Kerala), and the Andhras and Pulindas are mentioned. Thus about a hundred years before Patānjali, the whole of the southern peninsula up to Cape Comorin was in direct communication with the north, and the Dekkan or Mahāraṇḍha had regular kingdoms governed by Raṭṭas and Bhojas.

In the Mahāvaṁśo, a Ceylonese chronicle which was written in the third quarter of the fifth century of the Christian era, and in the Dīpavaṁśo, which is much older, the Buddhist saint Moggaliputto, who conducted the proceedings of the third convocation said to [12] have been held in the time of Aśoka, is represented to have sent missionaries to Mahāraṇṭha, Aparāntaka, and Vanavāśi. Whether the name Mahāraṇṭha or Mahāraṇḍha had come into use in the

20 In the Daśakumāra-charita, the family of Bhojas has been represented as having held sway over the Vidarbha country for a long time.
21 Kuḍā inscriptions Nos. 1, 9, 17, 19, 23, and Beṛsā No. 2; Arch. Surv. of West. Ind., No. 10.
22 Mahāvaṁśo, Turnour's Ed., pp. 71 and 72, and Dīpavaṁśo, Oldenberg's Ed., p. 54. The latter however omits Vanavāśi.
time of Aśoka does not appear clear from this, but that it was used in the early centuries of the Christian era admits of little doubt. In some inscriptions in the cave-temples at Bhâjâ, Beṣâ and Kârli which are to be referred to the second century, the male donors are called Mahâraṭhi and the female Mahâraṭhini, which names, as observed before, correspond to Mahâbhâhoja and Mahâbhâhojî and signify the great Raṭhi (man and woman). Similarly, in the large cave at Nânâghâṭ a Mahâraṭhi hero is mentioned. Of the old Prâkrits the principal one was called Mahârâśhti, because we are told it was the language of Mahârâśṭra. We have a poem in this dialect entitled Setubandha attributed to Kâlidâsa and mentioned by Daṇḍin, and a collection of amorous verses attributed to Śâlivâhana. It is the language of Prâkrit verses put into the mouths of women in Sanskrit dramatic plays. Its grammar we have in Vararuchi's Prâkrit Prakâśa; but the date of this author is uncertain, though there is reason to believe that he was one of the nine gems of the court of Vikramaṇḍitya and was thus a contemporary of Varâhamihira and Kâlidâsa. Though the date of

---

23 Arch. Surv. of West. Ind. No. 10; Bhâjâ No. 2; Beṣâ No. 2; Kârli Nos. 2 and 14. Paṇḍit Bhagavânâlî appears to me clearly wrong here in taking Mahâraṭhi to be equal to the Sk. Mahâraṭhi and translating it as "a great warrior," for in Beṣâ No. 2, a woman is called Mahâraṭhini where the word certainly cannot mean a great warrior, and to interpret it as "the wife or daughter of a great warrior" is simply begging the question. Mahâraṭhi appears clearly to be the name of a tribe and is the same as our modern Marâṭhâ. It will appear from this inscription that there were intermarriages between the Mahâbhâhojas and the Mahâraṭhis, for the lady mentioned in this inscription was the daughter of a Mahâbhâhoja and a Mahâraṭhini or the wife of a Mahâraṭhi.
Section III. Kālidāsa has not yet been satisfactorily determined, still he is mentioned as a poet of great merit in the first half of the seventh century by Bāṇa in his Harshacharita in the north, and in an inscription at Aihole dated 556 Śaka in the south. A hundred years is not too long a period to allow for the spread of his fame throughout the country, perhaps it is too short. Kālidāsa may therefore be referred to that period of Śanskrit literature in which the nine gems flourished, and which has been placed by Dr. Kern in the first half of the sixth century. The Mahārāṣhṭrī dialect, therefore, in which Kālidāsa wrote the Setubandha and the Prākrit verses in his plays, must have undergone a course of cultivation for about two or three centuries earlier and been called by that name, since it has been known by no other in the whole literature. Varāhamihira also, who lived in the beginning of the sixth century, speaks of Mahārāṣṭra as a southern country; and in the Aihole inscription alluded to above Mahārāṣṭra is mentioned as comprising three countries and ninety-nine thousand villages. Hwan Thsang, the Chinese traveller, calls the country ruled over by the Chālukyas in the second quarter of the seventh century, Moholocha, which has been properly identified with Mahārāṣṭra. The occurrence of the name of Mahārāṣṭra in the Purāṇas has already been noticed.

26 Ed. of Vārāhamihira, Preface, p. 20.
Political History of the Dekkan or Mahārāṣṭra

—Analysis of the Historical Inscriptions

In the Cave-Temples of Western India.

No clue to the political history of Mahārāṣṭra in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era is now available. The Purāṇas contain lists of kings and dynasties whose chronology has been to some extent determined by their known connection with the successors of Alexander the Great; but clear traces of their occupation of the south have not yet been found. Chandragupta, who founded the Maurya dynasty in about B.C. 320, ruled over Northern India as far as Kāṭhiāvāḍ, and his grandson Aśoka, who reigned from B.C. 263 to B.C. 229, retained possession of the province. The rock-extensions of the latter, which were evidently planted in the countries which owned his sway, show that his empire extended to Kaliṅga or the Northern Circars in the east and Kāṭhiāvāḍ in the west. But stray edicts have been discovered farther south; a fragment of the eighth being found at Supārā and three minor ones on the northern frontier of Mysore. In the second rock-edict he speaks of his own dominions as "the conquered countries" and mentions Chola, Pāṇḍya, Ketalaputta, and Saliyaputta down to Tambapanni or Ceylon as outlying provinces. These therefore did not own his sway. But in the fifth edict he mentions the Rāṣṭikas, Petenikas and Aparāntas and a few more provinces as those for the benefit of which he appointed religious ministers.

Section IV.

Extent of the dominions of Chandragupta and Aśoka.

1 See inscription of Rudradāman; Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 260, line 8.
Section IV. If these were as much a part of his dominions as the many others which are not named, there is no reason why they should be named. Again he includes most of these in the thirteenth edict among countries which received his moral teaching, along with Chola, Pāṇḍya and others, and the territories ruled over by Antiochus and four other Greek princes. It would thus appear that though the countries of the Rāṣṭikas, Bhojas, Petenikas, and Aparāntas were not outlying provinces like those of the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, and Ketalaputtas, they enjoyed a sort of semi-independence; and only owned allegiance to him as suzerain. The appearance of fragments of his inscriptions at Supārā and on the confines of Mysor is to be accounted for by this fact, or by the supposition that his dominions extended up to Supārā on the western coast and along a strip in the centre of the peninsula to Mysor, leaving the western countries of the Rāṣṭikas, the Bhojas, and Petenikas, and the southern coast in a state of semi-independence. And there is some positive evidence to that effect. Vidarbha, the country of the Bhojas, must have existed as a separate kingdom about that time. For in the dramatic play of Mālavikāgnimitra, the political events narrated in which may be accepted as historical, Agnimitra the son of Pushyamitra, the first king of the Suṅga dynasty, who reigned in [15] the second and third quarters of the second century before Christ, is represented to have reigned at Vidiśā, which I have before identified with Bhilsā, probably as his father's viceroy. He had made proposals of marriage with Mālavikā to her brother Mādhayasena, the cousin of Yajñasena, king of Vidarbha. Between these cousins there was a quarrel as regards the succession to the throne. When Mādhayasena was
secretly on his way to Vidiśā, the general of Yajñāsenā, posted on the frontier of the kingdom, captured him. His counsellor Sumati and Mālavikā escaped, but Mādhavasena was kept in custody. Thereupon Agnimitra demanded of Yajñāsenā the surrender of Mādhavasena. Yajñāsenā promised to give him up on condition that his wife's brother, who was the counsellor of the last Maurya king and had been imprisoned by Agnimitra or his father Pushyamitra, should be released. This enraged Agnimitra, who thereupon sent an army against Yajñāsenā and vanquished him. Mādhavasena was released, and the country of Vidarbha was divided between the two cousins, each ruling over each side of the river Varadā.

Paithan also must have been the capital of a kingdom about the time. In the inscriptions in the caves at Pitalkhorā near Chālisgāthā, which from the forms of the characters in which they are engraved must be referred to the second century before Christ, the religious benefactions of merchants from Pratishthāna are recorded, as well as those of the physician to the king and of his son and daughter.² The king referred to must be the ruler of Pratishthāna or Paithan. No more particular information is available. On the history of the early centuries of the Christian era and the first century previous, however, the inscriptions in the cave-temples on the top of the Sahyādri throw a good deal of light. I will here bring together the information deducible from them, noticing the inscriptions in the chronological order clearly determined by the forms of the characters.

An inscription³ in a small cave at Nāsik mentions

---

Section IV.

that the cave was scooped out by the lieutenant at Nasik of King Krishñā of the Sātavāhana race. In a cave at Nānāghāṭ there is another, which is much mutilated and the purport of which consequently is not quite clear. In that same cave figures of persons are carved on the front wall, and the following names are inscribed over them: 1, Rāyā Simuka Sātavāhana, i.e., king Simuka Sātavāhana; 2, Devī Nāyanikāya rāño cha Siri Sātakanino, i.e., of queen Nāyanikā and king Srl Sātakarni; 3, Kumāro Bhāyā, i.e., prince Bhāyā; 4, Mahārāṣṭhīgānakayi, i.e., the heroic Marāṭha leader or the hero of the Marāṭha tribe; 5, Kumāro Haku Siri, i.e., prince Haku Srl; 6, Kumāro Sātavāhana, i.e., prince Sātavāhana. Of these the second who has been mentioned along with his queen must have been the reigning prince, the first was an earlier king of the same [16] dynasty, the fourth was a local Marāṭha warrior, and the rest were young princes of the Sātavāhana dynasty.

In another Nasik cave there are four inscriptions. In the first we are told that the cave was caused to be constructed on mount Trirāṣmi in Govardhana or the Nasik District by the benevolent Ushavadāta, the son-in-law of king Kshaharāta Naha-pāna and son of Dīṅka. Ushavadāta gave away three hundred thousand cows; constructed flights of steps on the river Bāṛṇāśāyā; assigned sixteen villages to gods and Brāhmaṇs; fed a hundred thousand Brāhmaṇs every year; got eight Brāhmaṇs at Prabhāsa or Somanāth Paṭṭān married at his own expense; constructed quadrangles, houses, and halting places at Bharukachchha or Bharoch, Daśapura in Mālvā, Govardhana, and Sarpāraga, the modern Supārā near Bassein; made gardens and sank wells and tanks; placed ferry boats over the
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Ibâ, Pûrâdâ, Damaṇâ, Tâpî, Karabepâ, and Dâhanukâ, which were rivers along the coast between Thâņâ and Surat; constructed rest-houses and endowed places for the distribution of water to travellers on both sides of these rivers; and founded certain benefactions in the village of Nâanaṅgola, for the Charâpas and Parishads (Vedic schools of Brâhmans) in Pîṇḍitakâvaḍa, Govardhana, Suvarṇamukha, Sîrpaṇâga, and Râmânîrtha. One year in the rainy season he marched at the command of his lord to the relief of the chief of a tribe of Kshatriyas called Uttamabhadrâs, who had been attacked and besieged by the Mâlayas. At the sound of his martial music the Mâlayas fled away, and they were made the subjects of the Uttamabhadrâs. Thence he went to Posârâṇi and there performed ablutions and gave three thousand cows and a village.  

In the second inscription Ushavâdâta is spoken of as having, in the year 42, dedicated the cave monastery for the use of the Buddhist mendicant priests coming to it from the four quarters. He deposited with a guild of weavers residing in Govardhana a sum of two thousand Kârshâpaṇas at an annual interest of one hundred Kârshâpaṇas. Out of this interest he directed that a garment should annually be given to each of the twenty priests residing during the rains in his cave monastery. With another guild he deposited one thousand Kârshâpaṇas, the interest on which was seventy-five Kârshâpaṇas. Out of this other things (Kuśâna) were to be provided for the priests. The carrying out of these directions was secured by their being declared in the corporation of the town of Govardhana and
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---

inscribed on the door of the monastery. In the years 41 and 40 he gave away a large sum of money for gods and Brāhmaṇs. The third inscription, which is a short one, mentions that the apartment on which it is engraved was the religious benefaction of Ushavaddāta’s wife Dakhamitrā. The fourth is greatly mutilated but sufficient remains to show that that also records similar gifts of Ushavaddāta’s. In the cave-temple of Kārli there is an inscription [17] in which Ushavaddāta is represented to have granted the village of Karajika for the support of the mendicant priests in the cave monastery of Valuraka, as the hill or the country about it seems to have been called at the time. There also is given an account of his charities similar to that in the first of his Nasik inscriptions. In an inscription at Junnar, Ayama, the minister of the lord Nahapana the great Kshattrapa, is mentioned as having caused a tank to be dug and a hall to be constructed. The minister appears to have been a Brāhmaṇ, since he is spoken of as belonging to the Vatsa Gotra.

Next in order come the inscriptions in which certain kings of the names of Gotamiputra Satakarni and Pułumāyi are mentioned. In the longest of the four occurring in the cave-temple at one extremity of the hill at Nasik, we are told that in the nineteenth year of the reign of king Pułumāyi, the son of Vāsiṣṭhi, the cave was caused to be constructed and dedicated for the use of Buddhist mendicants of the

5 Nos. 18 and 16, Ibid, which together form one inscription.
6 First part of No. 16, Ibid.
7 No. 14 Ibid.
8 No. 13, Kārli Inscriptions—Arch. Surv., W. Ind., No. 10.
9 No. 25, Junnar Inscriptions, Ibid.
Bhadra-yanīya sect by Gotami, the mother of king Sātakarṇī Gotamiputra. She is there called "the mother of the great king and the grandmother of the great king." Gotamiputra is spoken of as king of kings and ruler of Aśīka, Aśmaka, Mūjaka,10 Surāśhtra, Kukura, Aparānta, Anūpa, Vidarbha and Ākarāvanti.11 He was the lord of the mountains Vindhyāvat, Pāriyātra, Sahya, Kṛishṇagiri, Malaya, Mahendra, Śrēṣṭhagiri, and Chakora. His orders were obeyed by a large circle of kings, and his feet were adored by them. His beasts of burden drank the waters of the three seas. He protected all who sought an asylum with him, and regarded the happiness and misery of his subjects as his own. He paid equal attention to the three objects of human pursuit, viz., duty, worldly prosperity, and the satisfaction of desires, appointing certain times and places for each. He was the abode of learning, the support of good men, the home of glory, the source of good manners, the only person of skill, the only archer, the only hero, the only protector of Brāhmaṇas. He conferred upon Brāhmaṇas the means of increasing their race, and stemmed the progress of the confusion of castes. His exploits rivalled those of Rāma, Keśava, Arjuna, and Bhūmasena, and his prowess was equal to that of Nabhāga, Nahusha, Janamejaya, Sagara, Yayāti, Rāma, and Ambaraśa. He was

10 Aśmaka and Maulika are mentioned among the southern countries in the Purāṇas.
11 Surāśhtra is Southern Kāṭhīavād, Kukura, a portion of Rājputāna, and Aparānta, Northern Kukkan. Anūpa is mentioned in the Purāṇas as a country situated in the vicinity of the Vindhyas. It was the country on the upper Narmadā with Mānihismati as its capital, according to the Raghuvanaśa. Ākarāvanti must be the eastern portion of Mālvā.
descended from a long line of kings. He vanquished the host of his enemies in innumerable battles, quelled the boast and pride of Kshatriyas, destroyed the Sakas, Yavanas, and Pahlavas, left no trace or remnant of the race of Khagărâta, and re-established the glory of the Satavâhana family. In the last line of the inscription mention [18] is made of the grant of a village for the support of the establishment in the cave-temple.\footnote{12}

In a later inscription engraved in smaller characters below this, Vâsishtâ putra Śrî Pulumâvi, the lord of Navanara, issues orders to his lieutenant in Govardhana, Sarvâkshadalâna. He calls his attention to the fact that the village granted by the "lord of Dhanakaṭa"\footnote{15} (Gotamiputra) in accordance with the above, was not liked by the Bhadrâyanîyas, and therefore assigns another to them by this charter.

On the wall to the left of the verandah of the cave is another inscription. It purports to be an order or notice issued from the camp of the victorious


\footnote{15} Pâñcit Bhagvânâl and Dr. Bûhler, whose transcripts and translations of the Nâsik inscriptions were published about ten years after mine, read the expression thus understood by me as धनकत्समवेदः for the Sanskrit धनकत्समवेदः: But what the Śramaṇas or Buddhist priests of Dhanakaṭa, which was situated hundreds of miles away on the lower Krishnâ, could have to do with the matter of the granting of a village near Nâsik to the Bhadrâyanîya mendicants of the place it is impossible to conceive. The expression must, I think, be taken as धनकसमवेदः for the Sanskrit धनकसमवेदः; or धनकसमवेदः corresponding to समवेदः in the first part of No. 25, the Sanskrit of which is समवेदः: The form समवेदः must have come into use on the analogy of such forms as अभयवेदः for अभयम्; and राजवेदः for राजम्:}
army of Govardhana, by Gotamiputra Sâtakarñî, lord of Dhanakaṭaka, to Viṣṇupālita, his lieutenant in Govardhana, informing him that the king has granted a field measuring 200 Nivartanas, which was up to that time in the possession of one Ushabhadāta, for the benefit of recluses. The charter here engraved is represented to have been originally issued in the year 18, that is, in the year preceding that in which the cave-temple was completed and dedicated. Below this is inscribed another charter issued in the form of an order to Śramaka, the governor of Govardhana, by the queen of Gotamiputra Sâtakarñî, who is also called the royal mother. She therein speaks of a field granted before, probably the one conveyed by the above charter, and says that it measures one hundred Nivartanas, and she assigns another hundred by this charter out of a field belonging to the crown which was her patrimony. It appears that two hundred Nivartanas were granted by the first charter, but probably it turned out that the field measured one hundred only; hence she now makes it up by granting another hundred out of another field. The date of this grant is 24, i.e., it was made six years after the first.\(^{14}\)

Besides these, there are two inscriptions at Nāsik recording the benefactions of private individuals, dated in the second and seventh years of the reign of Siri (Śrī) Puḷumāyi, and two in the cave at Kārli,\(^{16}\) dated in the seventh and twenty-fourth years of his reign.

Since Gotami is spoken of as the mother of a king and the grandmother of a king, and the wife of

---


\(^{15}\) Nos. 3 and 27, *Ibid.*

\(^{16}\) Nos. 14 and 20, Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10.
Section IV. and queens mentioned in the inscriptions in Gotame’s cave.

her son Gotamîputra Sâtakarnî is [19] represented as the mother of a king, and since the only other king besides Sâtakarnî mentioned in these inscriptions is Pujumâyi, it appears that this last was the grandson and son respectively of these two ladies. He was therefore the son and his mother Vâsishthî the wife of Gotamîputra Sâtakarnî. Sâtakarnî issued the charter contained in the second inscription in the year 18, which must be the eighteenth year of Pujumâyi’s reign, since dates referring to his reign only are found at Nasîk and Kårli and not to that of Gotamîputra. Even the date of the large inscription noticed above in which Gotamîputra’s great deeds are recorded is referred to Pujumâyi’s reign. And the grant of the village alluded to in that inscription and the one below appears to have been made by Gotamîputra, since he is spoken of as “the lord of Dhanakaṭaka,” though the portion of the rock containing the words that would have rendered the sense clear has been cut away. Gotamî is spoken of as dedicating the cave in the present tense, whereas it must be understood she was alive at the time. The father and the son appear thus to have reigned at the same time, the son on this side of the country since the inscriptions are dated in his reign, and the father at Dhanakaṭaka, which has been identified with Dharaṇikoṭ in the Guntur district of the Madras Presidency. And this is confirmed by the fact, mentioned above, of Gotamî’s having been called the mother of the great king and the grandmother of the great king. This statement would be pointless if she were not both at one and the same time.17

17 Dr. Bühler (Arch. Surv. of West. Ind., Vol. IV., p. 110) supposes me to have rested my conclusion as regards this point on this statement alone, and calls it a mistake.
Since the charter of the year 24, intended as supplementary to that of 18, was issued by Vāsishṭhī, while the first was issued by her husband, it appears probable that Gotamiputra had died in the interval and Vāsishṭhī reigned as regent at the capital, while Puḷumāyi continued to govern the Dekkan or Mahārāṣṭra. The years given in the charter must be those of Puḷumāyi, since even the large inscription is dated in the nineteenth year of his reign. These kings belonged to the Śatavāhana dynasty.

The names of other kings, apparently of the same dynasty, are found in other inscriptions. In one of the caves at Kāñheri near [20] Thanā, a grant is recorded in the eighth year of the reign of Maḍhārī-

But he will find my other reasons also stated in the remarks at the end of my article in the Transactions of the Oriental Congress of 1874. And even this statement has a very high corroborative value. For, if the object of the writer was to represent Gotami’s “special claim” to honour, that is better served by supposing that her son and grandson were great kings at one and the same time. Every queen belonging to a dynasty in power is the mother of a king and grandmother of a king; and there is nothing special in the fact if the son and the grandson bore the title at different times. If the son was dead, no object is gained as regards this point by saying she was the mother of that son that is not gained by saying she was the grandmother of a living great king. And if it was a fact that Gotamiputra was dead when the cave-temple was dedicated and Puḷumāyi alone was reigning, we should expect to find the exploits of the latter also celebrated in the inscription, but there is not a word in praise of him. If Puḷumāyi became king only after Gotamiputra, the latter must have died nineteen years before the dedication of the temple, and it certainly is not what one acquainted with the manner and motive of Hindu inscription-writers would expect that a king who had been dead for nineteen years should be highly extolled in the inscription and the reigning king altogether passed over in silence.
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putra Śakasena. In two other inscriptions at the same place the name of the reigning prince is given as Gotamiputra Śrī Yaññā Śātakāriṇī (Gotamiputra Śrī Yajñā Śātakārṇi). In one of these the year that is given is not legible, but still appears to be the sixteenth of his reign. There is one inscription at Nāsik which is dated in the seventh year of that king. Paṇḍit Bhagvānlāl has brought to light the name of another prince. There is according to him an inscription on the Nānāghāṭ in which is recorded the dedication of a cistern of water in the thirteenth year of Vāsiṭṭhiputa Chatarapana Śātakāni.

A large number of coins of copper and lead were discovered a few years ago, buried in what appears to have once been a Buddhist stūpa at Kolhāpur. Another hoard had been found some time previous in about the same locality. The legends on those coins are in characters the forms of which greatly

---

18 No. 19, Jour. B. B. R. A. A. S., Vol. VI. and Vol. XII., p. 409. In the first copy the name is clearly Sakasenasa, but in the second, which is Paṇḍit Bhagvānlāl’s rubbing, something like an effaced mark for the vowel i appears above the first two consonants. The Paṇḍit, therefore, reads the name as Sirisenasa for Sirisenasya, but the k is distinct even in his copy. Siṅśi cannot mean anything, wherefore it appears that the indistinct marks which do not occur in the first copy are due to some flaw in the rock, and do not represent the vowel i. Dr. Bhāũ Dājī also read the name as Sakasenasa. But the copy of the inscription given in Plate II. Vol. V. of the Archaeological Survey of Western India and marked No. 14 leaves no doubt whatever on the point. The name there is distinctly Sakasenasa. Further confirmation if necessary will be found later on. It is therefore clearly a mistake to call the king Sirisenā.

19 Nos. 4 and 44, Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. VI.

resemble those in the cave inscriptions above noticed. They are as follows:

Raṇño Vāsiṭṭhiputasa Vijivāyakurasa.
Raṇño Gotampiiputasa Vijivāyakurasa.
Raṇño Maṭharīputasa Sevalakurasa.

Here we have the same names as before; but the words Vijivāyakurasa and Sevalakurasa have not yet been interpreted by any student of Indian antiquities. On a former occasion I put forth a conjecture that they were the names of the viceroys of those kings appointed to govern the country about Kolhāpur. For, coins of two of these princes and of a few others belonging to the same dynasty are found near Dharaṇikoṭ in the Cantur District about the site of Dhanakaṭaka, the old capital. The legends on these do not contain those words, and the coins are of a different type from those found at Kolhāpur. These last, therefore, it appeared to me, were struck on this side of the country, and consequently bore the names of the viceroy under whose authority they were issued. The truth of this conjecture I will demonstrate further on. It will be seen from what is to be stated hereafter that the Vāsiṭṭhiputa of these coins who had Vijivāyakura for his viceroy can be no other than Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāyi.

[21] The Gotampiiputa must be Gotampiiputra Yajña Śātakaṛṇi of the inscriptions; for the father of Pulumāyi did not reign on this side of the country, as none of the inscriptions are dated in his

---

21 Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XIII., p. 305, and Vol. XIV., p. 153-54. There are in my possession coins of lead of the same size as those figured here, and a good many smaller ones in which I find the same legends as those given above. They also were found at Kolhāpur. Some of the smaller ones appear to be of bronze.
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regain though his exploits are described in the Nāsik Caves. Maḍhārṣiputra must have come after Gotamiputra and not after Vāsiṭhiputa, as is maintained by some scholars; for his viceroy was a different person from that of the other two. The fact that these two had the same viceroy shows that one of them immediately succeeded the other. Another prince with a different viceroy could not come between them. In the stūpa dug out at Supārā, Paṇḍit Bhagavānlāl found a silver coin in a copper casket. On the obverse of the coin, which bears a well-shaped head of the king, we have the legend Raṅño Gotamiputasa Śiri Yañña Sātakanisa, which means "[this coin is] of the king Gotamiputra Śri Yajña Sātakarṇī." This therefore is the prince in whose name the coin was issued. There is another legend on the reverse which though some of the letters are not distinct appears to be Gotamiputa-Kumāru-Yañña - Sātakani-Chaturpanasa the sense of which is "[this coin is] of Chaturpana Yañña Sātakani, prince of Gotamiputa." The coin was thus like the Kolhāpur coins issued in the names

\[\text{The nether portions of the letters chaturpanasa only are impressed on the coin so that the reading is somewhat doubtful; but panasa is distinct enough. Paṇḍit Bhagavānlāl puts Chaturpanasa at the beginning of the legend and reads Chaturpanasa Gotamiputa Kumāru Yañña Sātakani which he translates "Yajña Sātakarṇī, son of Gotamiputra, and prince of Chaturpana;" and states his belief that Chaturpana was the name of Yajña Śri's father. But to connect Kumāru, which forms a part of a compound with the genitive, Chaturpanasa, is grammatically not allowable; while the genitive which is always required to show whose coin it is, is wanting. Hence Chaturpanasa is the last word and the whole is a compound, Kumāru is probably a mistake for Kumāra and Yañña Sātakani is the father's name placed before Chaturpanasa to show that he was his son. (Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XV., pp. 305-6.)}\]
of two persons; of whom Vajña Śri Sātakarṇi was the reigning sovereign, as his name appears round the bust, and Chaturapana who was his son represented him as viceroy in the province in which the coin was issued, and which from the shape and get-up of the coin appears to have been once ruled over by the Kshatrapas of Ujjayinī or Kāṭhīwāḍ.

There is an inscription at Kāṅheri which is in a mutilated condition, but which with the help of Mr. West’s eye copy and an impression given in one of Dr. Burgess’ Reports has been partially restored by Dr. Bühler. Therein is made the dedication of a water cistern by Sateraka who was the confidential counsellor of the Queen of Vāsisṭhīputra Sātakarṇī, who belonged to the family of the Karīdamakas and was the daughter of a Mahākshatrapa whose name is obliterated. The opening letters of the second line have also been effaced, but what we might expect to find there is the name of her son, after we have had those of her husband, family, and father. From the letters in West’s copy which look like Sakarāja one might think the son meant was Sakaṣena; still the conjecture is somewhat hazardous. The name of this Vāsisṭhī [22] putra is Sātakarṇī, wherefore he was not Pujumāyi, but very likely Chatushparrṇa (Chatarapana) Sātakarṇī.

Thus then, from these inscriptions and coins we arrive at the names of the following kings arranged

---

24 Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. VI. and Archæol. S. of W.I., Vol. V., Inscription No. 11; also p. 78 of the latter. There would be nothing improbable in it if we here read the name of Sākasena. For this name and that of his mother Maḍhari point to a connection with the Sakas whose representatives the Kshatrapas were, and this connection is unfolded in this inscription.
Section IV. in the chronological order indicated by the forms of the characters used and by other circumstances:

Krishñarâja.
Sâtakarñi.
Kshaharâta Nahapâna and his son-in-law Ushavadâta.
Gotamiputra Sâtakarñi.
Vâsishtîputra Puṣumâyi.
Gotamiputra Śrî Yajña Sâtakarñi.
Vasishtîputra Chatushparna (Chaturapana or Chatarapana) Sâtakarñi.
Maḍhariputra Sâkasena.

Besides these, we have the name of Simuka Sâtavâhana, a king that reigned earlier than the second in the above list. We shall hereafter assign to him his proper place.
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[23] SECTION V.

NATIVE AND FOREIGN PRINCES MENTIONED IN THE INSCRIPTIONS.—IDENTIFICATION OF THE FORMER WITH THE ANDHRABHṛITYAS OF THE PURĀNAS.

The first thing that will strike one on looking at the list given at the end of the last section, is that the name Kṣaharāta Nahapāna is not Indian but foreign. The title Kṣhatrapa or Mahākṣhatrapa also used in the case of that king, is not Indian, though it is the Sanskritised form of a foreign one, very likely the Persian Satrap. From the statement in the inscription of Gotamiputra that he destroyed the Sākas, Yavanas, and Pahlavas, it appears that the country was at that time very much exposed to the inroads of these foreigners. Yavanas were the Bactrian Greeks, but Kṣaharāta Nahapāna does not look a Greek name. He must, therefore, have been either a Saka or Pahlava. Again, we are told that Gotamiputra left no remnant of the race of Khagārāta or Khakhārāta which name seems to be the same as Kṣaharāta or Khaḥarāta as it is spelled in the Kārli and Junnar inscriptions. It follows, therefore, that the Sākas or Pahlavas made themselves masters of the country some time between the second king in the above list and Gotamiputra Sātakarṇi, and that they were driven out by Gotamiputra who, by thus recovering the provinces lost to his dynasty, re-established, as stated in the inscription, the glory of the Sātavāhana race to which he belonged. All the other kings named above belonged to that dynasty.

Now, in the Purāṇas we have lists of kings and dynasties that ruled over the country. The earliest dynasty with which we are here concerned is the

Section V. Nahapāna, a Saka.
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Maurya founded by Chandragupta in B.C. 320, as determined by his relations with Seleucus, one of the generals and successors of Alexander the Great. It ruled over Northern India for 137 years according to the Purâṇas, and the last king Bhrâdratha was murdered by his general Pushyamitra or Pushpamitra, who founded the Śuṅga dynasty. This was in power for 112 years and was succeeded by the Kâṇva family which ruled for forty-five years. The Kâṇvas were overthrown by Sîraka, Sindhuka, or Sisuka, as he is variously named, who founded what the Purâṇas call the dynasty of the Andhrabhṛtyas, that is, Andhras who were once servants or dependents. The second king of this dynasty was Krīshṇa according to all, the third was Śâtakarṇi or Śrîsâtakarṇi according to the Vāyu or Vishṇu, while the Bhâgavata corrupts the name slightly to Sântakarṇa. The Mâtsya interposes three more kings between Krīshṇa and Śâtakarṇi, while the Vishṇu has another Śâtakarṇi to correspond with that of the Mâtsya. Gotamiputra is the thirteenth prince according to the Vāyu, fifteenth according to the Bhâgavata, seventeenth according to the Vishṇu, and twenty-second according to the Mâtsya. Pulimat, Purimat or Pulomat was his successor [24] according to the Vishṇu, the Bhâgavata, or the Mâtsya. These are so many misselections for the Puḷumâyi of our inscriptions and coins. The Vāyu omits his name altogether. His successor was Śiva Śrī according to the Vishṇu and the Mâtsya, while the Bhâgavata calls him Vedaśīras, and the Vāyu does not notice him. Yajña Śrī occurs in all, being placed after Sivaskandha, the successor of Śiva Śrī, by all except the Vāyu, which assigns to him the next place after Gotamiputra.

Thus then, the names occurring in the inscriptions and on the coins as well as the order sufficiently
agree with those given in the Purāṇas under the Andrabhritya dynasty to justify us in believing that the kings mentioned in both are the same. There is, however, no trace of Chatushpārṇa Sātakarṇi unless we are to identify him with Chaṇḍaśrī Sātakarṇi. The name Maḍhariputra Saksena also does not occur in the Purāṇas; and he appears to have belonged to a branch of the dynasty. We shall hereafter assign to him his place in the list. Simuka, whose name occurs in the Nānāghat inscription, and who, as I have already observed, was an earlier occupant of the throne than the reigning prince Sātakarṇi the third in the Purānic list, must be the same as Śiśuka, the founder of the dynasty. For the Devanāgari ma is often so carelessly written as to look like sa; hence the true Simuka was corrupted to Sisuka, Śisuka, or Śiśuka, in the course of time. The Sindhuka of the Vāyu and the Sipraka of the Viṣṇu are further corruptions. This identification is rendered probable also by the consideration that he who caused the cave to be constructed, and the statues of himself and the younger princes to be carved, might, to give dignity to his race, be expected to get the founder of the dynasty also represented there, especially as he was removed only one degree from him. In this manner the Andhrabhritya dynasty of the Purāṇas is the same as the Sātavāhana dynasty of the inscriptions.
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CHRONOLOGY OF THE ANDHRABHṚTYAS OR SĀTAVĀHANAS.

Section VI. The next question we have to consider is as regards the dates of these princes. In my paper on the Nāsik cave inscriptions¹, I have accepted A.D. 319 as the date of Gotamiśuta's accession, arrived at by taking B.C. 315 as the year in which Chandragupta founded the dynasty of the Mauryas at Pātaliputra, and 664 years to have elapsed between him and Gotamiśuta, since the periods assigned in the Purāṇas to that dynasty and the subsequent ones, and the durations of the reigns of the Andhrabhṛtya princes who proceeded Gotamiśuta according to the Māṭṣya when added, give 664. The "race of Khagārāta," which Gotamiśuta is, as observed before, represented in one of the Nāsik inscriptions to have exterminated, I identified with the dynasty of the Kshatrapas whose coins are found in Kāthiāvāḍ, as well as a few inscriptions, since Kṣaharāta or Khagārāta was also a Kshatrapa and had been placed at the head of the dynasty by previous writers. The latest date on the coins of those princes then known was 250, which referred to the Śaka era, is A.D. 328. This comes so close to Gotamiśuta's A.D. 319, that the two seemed to corroborate each other. But there are several objections to this view, some of which occurred to me even then. The inscriptions and coins of the Kshatrapa dynasty concur in carrying the genealogy backward to Chasṭana and no further, and as yet nothing has turned up to show that any connection existed...

¹ Trans. Or. Congr., 1874.
between him and Nahapâna. (2)—If the Kshatrapa or Satrap dynasty held sway over Mahârâshtra for about three hundred years as it did over Kâthiâvâd, we might reasonably expect to find in that country inscriptions or coins of most of the princes, but a few coins of the later ones only have been discovered in a village near Karâdhi² and no inscription whatever. (3)—Rudradâman in his Junâgaḍ inscription calls a Satakarni, 'lord of Dakshinapatha', which he would not have done if he had been the ruler of even a part of the Dekkan. (4)—And the dates occurring on some Satrap coins recently discovered are said to be 300 and 304³ which referred to the Śaka era A.D. 378 and 382, that is, the Satraps were in power even long after A.D. 340, which is the date of Gotamiputra's death according to the Purânic accounts. For these reasons it would appear that the "race" of Khagârâta or Nahapâna which Gotamiputra put an end to and which ruled over this country before him, could not have been the dynasty of the Satraps. (5)—Besides, according to my former view, the interval between Nahapâna and Gotamiputra is about 200 years; but the difference in form between the characters in Ushavadâta's and Gotamiputra's inscriptions is not great enough for that period. Hence the two princes must be brought closer together.

[26] From the Greek geographer Ptolemy we learn that in his time the country inland from the western coast was divided into two divisions of which the northern was governed by Siro Polemios whose capital was Paithân, and the southern by Baleocuros who lived in Hippocura. Siro Polemios is evidently

the same name as the Siri Pułumāvi or Pułumāyi of the inscriptions corresponding to the Pulomat, or Pułimat of the Puranās. But there were two kings who bore that name, one the son of Gotamīputra, mentioned in the inscriptions, and another an earlier prince of the Andhrabhṛitya dynasty. This last does not appear to have been a prince of any note; therefore very likely the former is the one spoken of by Ptolemy. But the question is almost settled by the mention of Baleocuros as the Governor of the southern provinces. We have seen that in the legends on the Kollhāpur coins the name Viṭhavāyakura is associated with that of Pułumāyi and of Gotamīputra. Viṭhavāyakura is the same as Baleocura, and I have already stated that the reason why his name, in my opinion, occurs along with those of the two princes of the Sattāvāhana dynasty, and on Kollhāpur coins alone, while it does not occur on those found in the lower Godāvari districts, is that he was the viceroy of those princes ruling over the country about Kollhāpur. This country answers to the southern division mentioned by the Greek geographer as being governed by Baleocuros. The Siro Polemios therefore of Ptolemy is the same as the Pułumāyi of the inscriptions and coins.

Ptolemy died in A.D. 163, and is said to have written his work after A.D. 151. Pułumāyi, therefore, must have been on the throne some time before this last date. We will now proceed to reconcile this date with those mentioned in the inscriptions, and to determine more particularly the date of Pułumāyi's accession. Some of Ushāvadāta's benefactions were founded in the years 40, 41 and 42, and the latest date connected with Nahapāna is that in the inscription of his minister Ayama at Junnar, viz., 46. These dates should, I think, be referred to the Šaka
era. For, we have seen that before the time of Gotamiputra, the country was subject to the inroads of Sakas and other foreign tribes, and the Scythians who are identified with the Sakas had, according to the Greek geographers, established a kingdom in Sind and even in Rājputānā. The era known by the name of the Saka and referred to in all the early copper-plate grants as the era of the Saka king or kings must have been established by the most powerful of the Saka invaders, for the first time

4 Prof. Oldenberg thinks Kanishka to be the founder of the era; but this view is, I think, untenable. (1)—A dynasty of three kings only cannot perpetuate an era. The dynasty of the Guptas composed of seven kings was in power for more than a hundred and fifty years, but their era died a natural death in the course of a few centuries. (2)—The characters in Kanishka’s inscriptions, especially the ya as conjoined with a preceding consonant, are later than those we find in the first century. One has simply to compare Inscription No. 1 in Plate XIII. of the third volume of General Cunningham’s Arch. Reports with No. 4 to see the great difference in the forms of the letters in the times of the earliest Kshatrapas and of Kanishka. The former belongs to the time of the Kshatrapa Śodāsa and the letters are almost like those we find in Ushavadāta’s inscriptions at Nāsik; while those in the latter, which is dated in the ninth year of Kanishka, are considerably later; and both the inscriptions exist in Mathurā. (3)—There is no ground to believe that Kanishka reigned over Gujarāt and Mahārāṣṭra, but the Saka era began to be used very early, especially in the last country. (4)—The Guptas whose gold coinage is a close imitation of that of the Indo-Scythian dynasty, came to power in A.D. 319; while the last of the three kings Kanishka, Hushka, and Vāsudeva must, if the reign of the first began in A.D. 78, have ceased to reign about A.D. 178, i.e., about 100 years after the foundation of the dynasty. And the latest date of Vāsudeva is 89. If so, an interval of 140 years must have elapsed between the last of the Indo-Scythian kings and the first Gupta; but the close resemblance in the coinage necessitates the supposition
Section VI. [27] obtained a permanent footing in the country, and Nahapâna and Chashṭana⁵ or his father must have been his Satraps appointed to rule over Western India, and Mâlvâ. On this supposition the latest date of Nahapâna must correspond to A.D. 124. Gotamîputra or Puḷumâyi therefore must have acquired possession of this country after that year. The earliest date of Puḷumâyi occurring in the inscriptions is the second year of his reign; and since the inscription could not have borne that date if Nahapâna or his successors had been in power, it is clear that Puḷumâyi began to reign after the overthrow of the latter. Now, we also learn from Ptolemy that Tiastenes reigned at Ozene about the time when he wrote, and was therefore a contemporary of Puḷumâyi. Tiastenes has, I think, been reasonably identified with Chashṭana. But accord-

that it was much shorter. Albiruni's statement that the initial date of the Gupta era was 241 Śaka, i.e., 319 A.D., has been pronounced unreliable by some antiquarians. As to this point and the era of the Satrap dates, see Appendix A.

⁵ Professor Oldenberg considers Chashṭana to be a Satrap appointed by Gotamîputra, a supposition which is unwarrantable, since a prince like Gotamîputra whose aim was to expel and destroy foreigners cannot be expected to appoint a foreigner, as Chashṭana's name indicates he was, to be a viceroy, and to use a foreign title; and we have seen that Balezuros, who was a viceroy of that monarch or of his son, does not use that title. Rudradâman, the grandson of Chashṭana, appointed, as we sec from his Junâgâd inscription, a Pahlava of the name of Suvishâkha, who was the son of Kulaipa, to govern Surâshṭra and Anarta. This circumstance confirms what we gather from other sources, namely, that this was a dynasty of princes of a foreign origin, who had adopted Hindu manners and even names, had in some cases entered into marriage alliance with native royal families, and were domiciled in the country.
ing to the Junâgaḍ inscription noticed above, Chashṭana’s grandson Rudradâman was the reigning prince in the year 72, which, taking the era to be the Saka, is 150 A.D. Chashṭana and Puḷumâyi therefore could not have been contemporaries in 150 A.D. Ptolemy’s account must, in consequence, refer to a period much earlier, i.e. to about the year 132 A.D., since about eighteen or twenty years at least must be supposed to have elapsed between the date of his information when Chashṭana was on the throne and the year 150 A.D. when his grandson was in possession of it, his son Jayadîman having occupied it for some time in the interval. Again, in the nineteenth year of Puḷumâyi, Gotamiputra was in possession, according to the large inscription at Nâsik, of a good many of those provinces which, according to the Junâgaḍ inscription, were conquered and ruled over by Rudradâman. The date 72 in the inscription seems to refer to the sweeping away by a storm and excessive rain of the dyke on one side of the lake therein mentioned and not to the cutting of the inscription on the rock. So that it is doubtful whether Rudradâman had conquered those [28] provinces before 72 or did so after 72 and before the incision of the inscription. Supposing he conquered them before 72, the nineteenth year of Puḷumâyi must correspond at least to the second or third year before A.D. 150, that is, Puḷumâyi must have begun to reign, at the latest, about the year A.D. 130. And even if we understand him to have conquered them after 72, Puḷumâyi’s accession cannot be placed much later, for the interval between Chashṭana who was Puḷumâyi’s contemporary and his grandson Rudradâman who was reigning in 150 A.D. will be considerably shortened. Nahapâna or his successor must thus have been overthrown by
Section VI. Gotamiputra or Pułumâyi about five or six years at the most after his latest recorded date, viz. A.D. 124.

The history of the relations of these princes appears to be this. Nahapâna was a Satrap ruling over Mahârâśtrâ. His capital was probably Junnar since the inscriptions at the place show the town to have been in a flourishing condition about that time, and we have a record there of the gift of his minister. He must have died soon after 46 Šaka or A.D. 124. Gotamiputra and Pułumâyi came from the south-east to regain the provinces lost to their family, overthrew Nahapâna’s successor, whoever he was, killed all his heirs, and re-established their power over this side of the country. This appears to be what is meant by Gotamiputra’s having been represented in the Nâsk inscription to have “left no remnant of the race of Khagîrata,” and to have “regained the prestige of his family.” Châshṭâna founded or belonged to another dynasty of Satraps which reigned at Ujjayinî. In the Junâgaḍ inscription, men of all castes are represented to have gone to Rudradâman and chosen him their lord for their protection; and he is spoken of as having re-established the kingdom that had been lost, himself assumed the title of the Great

6 The expression is सूचनार्थ यथागृहस्य रूपाः पति के इतिः. Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 160, 1, 9.

7 In Paṇḍit Bhagavânâlâ’s transcript in Vol. VII., Ind. Ant., the reading is नाप्त्राधवत्सायामि. But in a foot-note Dr. Bühler says that the correct reading may be राजस्य for राजन. In Dr. Bhânu Dâji’s copy of the inscription the स्य is distinct, p. 128, Vol. VII., Jour. B. B. R. A. S. Bhânu Dâji and Paṇḍit Bhagavânâlâ translate this expression by “obtained glory of great exploits by the re-establishment of deposed kings,” (p. 20, Vol. VII., Jour. B. B. R. A. S.), and “he who has restored to their thrones
Kshatrapa, conquered Akarāvantī, Anūpa, Surāśṭra, Aparānta and other provinces which, as we have seen, were owned by Gotamiputra, and some more; and as having twice subdued Śātakarni, the lord of Dakshināpatha, but still not destroyed him in consequence of his connection with him not being remote and acquired a good name on that account. The meaning of all this appears to me to be this. Gotamiputra Śātakarni, after having destroyed Nahapâna or his successor, turned his arms against another dynasty of foreigners that was ruling at Ujjayini. Or the Kshatrapa sovereign of Ujjayini, Chashṭana, or very probably his son Jayādāman, having observed the growing power of Gotamiputra or Pulumāyi who had put an end to a kindred family of rulers, and desirous of preventing his further growth, must have attacked him. A fact such as this must be the basis of the popular stories about a king of Ujjayini having attacked Śāliyāhana at Paithan and been defeated by him. Śāliyāhana is but deposed kings." (p. 260 a, Vol. VII., Ind. Ant.). If राज were the reading, this translation would of course be correct, but with राज it is far-fetched. There is nothing here to show that the lost rājya or kingdom re-established by Rudradāman was any other person’s than his own. So that, it looks natural to understand him to have re-established (his own) lost kingdom.

The reading is संव्यासिलिस्य. It is allowable to insert त and take it as संव्यासिलिस्य. But the sense of the word, which is “remoteness,” will not suit the context; as he could not have “acquired a good name,” i.e., been esteemed by people for not destroying the Lord of the Dekkan on account of the remoteness of the connection. Remoteness or distance of the country would compel one to let his enemy alone, and there could be no virtue in it. The therefore in the word must have crept in through mistake; wherefore the true reading must be संव्यासिलिस्य.
another mode of pronouncing Śatavāhana; and Puḻumāyi or Gotamīputra was a Śatavāhana. The ruler of Ujjayini was defeated and pursued by the victorious Gotamīputra into his own dominions, when the latter subjugated Avanti, Anūpa, Surūshṭra and Aparānta, and dethroned Jayadāman. For a time he and his successors held sway over the territories owned by Chashṭana, but subsequently Rudradāman collected a band of followers, the same as those that are represented in the inscription as having chosen him their lord, and driving away the Śatavāhanas, regained his lost kingdom and got himself crowned as Mahākṣatrapa. But as appears from the Supārā coin of Yajña Śrī which bears such striking resemblance to the Kṣatrapa coins and is so unlike the Kolhāpur coins of that monarch, large or small, and from the fact that his son Chaturapana was his viceroy or representative, the Śatavāhanas retained possession of a part at least of the Kṣatrapa territories up to the time of Yajña Śrī. They even entered into blood relationship with the Kṣatrapas, as we learn from the Kānheri inscription, which speaks of the wife of Vāśishṭhīputra Sātakarṇī being the daughter of a Mahākṣatrapa. But Rudradāman pursued his victories and according to his Junāgaḍ inscription twice conquered Sātakarṇī the lord of Dakshināpatha, but did not destroy him, and acquired a good name by his forbearance towards one whose connection with him was not remote. Thus the lord of Dakshināpatha that he conquered was Yajña Śrī Sātakarṇī. He could not have been his son Chaturapana; for the expression “non-remoteness of the connection” suits the former better than the latter, as Chaturapana’s wife was the daughter of a

9 Hemachandra’s Prākrit Grammar,
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Mahâkshatrapa, perhaps his own and the connection with him was positively close. The re-acquisition of his lost kingdom by Rudradâman took place after the nineteenth year of Pujumâyi's reign, that is, after about A.D. 149. It is in this way alone that the scraps of information derived from the Greek writers and gathered from inscriptions, coins, and popular legends, as well as the dates, can be made to harmonize with each other.

But the date thus assigned to Gotamîputra is not consistent with that derived from the Mâtsya Purâna. Our next endeavour, therefore, should be to ascertain whether none of the Purânas agrees sufficiently with the conclusion arrived at, and, if any does, to account for the [30] great discrepancy between it and the Mâtsya and others. That there is very little agreement among them as regards the Andhrabhrtiya dynasty, I have already indicated above. The genesis of our Purânic literature seems to be this. Certain versified accounts of certain things, purporting to be narrated by a bard to Rishis assembled together at a sacrificial session, were handed down orally from generation to generation; and these were after some time committed to writing. The later Purânas, devoted to the exaltation of a particular deity and to the inculcation of certain doctrines, derived their accounts of these things from the earliest written Purânas and not from the oral tradition. Of the works of this class which I am going to compare for our present purpose, the oldest appears to me to be the Vâyu, and next to it the Mâtsya. The Vishnu is later, and the Bhâgavata, the latest. The text of the old Purânas gradually became corrupt, and the authors of the later ones were in some cases misled by their incorrect readings.
Section VI. into putting forth statements at variance with the original account. Now the four Purāṇas just mentioned contain general statements about the several dynasties, giving the number of princes belonging to each and its duration in years, and also mention the names of those princes more particularly; while the Vāyu and the Mātsya give in addition the number of years for which each reigned. Often there is a discrepancy between the general and the particular statements. The duration assigned by them all to the Maurya dynasty, founded by Chandragupta whose date as determined by his relations with the successors of Alexander the Great is justly characterised by Professor MaxMüller as the sheet-anchor of Indian chronology, is 137 years. The number of reigning princes given by the Vāyu is nine, and by the rest, ten; but the names actually enumerated in the Vishnu only are ten, while the Vāyu and the Bhāgavata give nine, and the Mātsya, only four. The total of the years assigned to each prince by the Vāyu is 133 years; so that it is not unlikely that a short reign of four years may have dropped out from the text of that Purāṇa. Thus the general statement about ten princes and 137 years seems to be corroborated, and it appears pretty clear that the text of the Mātsya has in this case undergone a good deal of corruption. Thus, if with Dr. Kern we take B.C. 322 as the date of the foundation of the Maurya dynasty, its overthrow and the foundation of the next or the Śuṅga family must have occurred in the year B.C. 185. The Śuṅgas are generally stated in all the Purāṇas to have been ten and to have reigned for 112 years, though the expression used in the Bhāgavata is not “112 years,” but “more than a hundred years.” In the actual
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enumeration, the Mātsya omits two, and the Bhāgavata, one; and the total of the years assigned to each prince in the Vāyu exceeds 112. There is evidently some mistake here; but if we take the general statement to be the correct tradition handed down, the dynasty became extinct in B.C. 73. The dynasty next mentioned is that of the Kāñervas or Kānvāyanas. There were four princes of this line, and they reigned for forty-five years, though the Bhāgavata, through a mistake to be explained hereafter, makes the period to be 345 years. They were [31] followed by the Andhrabhṛtyas. But here, there is a statement in the Vāyu and the Mātsya, the like of which does not occur in the account of the other dynasties. The founder of the Andhrabhṛtyas, Sindhuka, according to the first Purāṇa, and Śiśuka, according to the other, is said to have uprooted not only the Kāñvas, but "whatever was left of the power of the Suṅgas."\textsuperscript{10} And the Kāñvas are pointedly spoken of as Suṅgabhṛtyas or "servants of the Suṅgas."\textsuperscript{11} It, therefore, appears likely that when the princes of the Suṅga family became weak, the Kāñvas usurped the whole power and ruled like the Peshwas in modern times, not uprooting the dynasty of their masters but reducing them to the character of nominal sovereigns; and this supposition is strengthened by the fact that like the Peshwas

\textsuperscript{10} काणवश्या मनो तस्क भुवन: सुमध्यां पस्सन्त तम्। \ पुराणो चेव गच्चे ये चतुर्यो च यहा॥ \ सिन्धुको \ सप्ताशितीय: प्राप्तातीमं \ वसुपरामः॥

"A servant of the race of the Andhras having destroyed Suṣarman of the Kāña family with main force and whatever will have been left of the power of the Suṅgas, will obtain possession of the earth." The statement in the Mātsya is similar.

\textsuperscript{11} चितार: \ युक्तवस्तिः \ नुपा: \ काणवश्या \ विश्वः। 

Vāyu.
they were Brāhmaṇs and not Kṣatriyas. Thus then these dynasties reigned contemporaneously, and hence the 112 years that tradition assigns to the Śuṅgas includes the 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas. The Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas, therefore, were uprooted, and the family of the Andhrabhṛityas came to power in B.C. 73. In a general way, the number of princes belonging to this line is given as thirty in the Vāyu, the Vishṇu, and the Bhāgavata, and twenty-nine in the Mātsya; and the total duration is stated to be 411 years in the first, 456 in the second and the third, and 460 in the fourth. The disagreement here is not great, wherefore the tradition as to thirty princes and about 456 years may be accepted as correct. But the discrepancy between this general statement and the more particular accounts that follow, as well as the disagreement between the several Purāṇas in this last, is very great. This will be apparent from the following table:

[32] Thus, the Vāyu has seventeen princes and 272 years and a half; and the Mātsya, thirty and 448 and a half. The Vishṇu gives twenty-four names and the Bhāgavata, twenty-two. This last Purāṇa has in many cases corrupted the names and con-founded Hāla with the Arishṭakarman of the Vishṇu, whom it names Anishṭakarman Hāleya. It also omits the fifth prince of the Vishṇu Purāṇa. The details given in the Mātsya come very close to the general tradition and thus confirm it. Should we then attribute the very great discrepancy between these details and those of the Vāyu to the corruption of the text of the latter? Two or three names might drop away in this manner, but the omission of thirteen names and the reduction of the total duration by 176 years must I think be accounted for in
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhāgavata.</th>
<th>Names.</th>
<th>Duration of reign in years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name not given; but mentioned as a Vṛiśhila or Śōdra.</td>
<td>Krishna.</td>
<td>20 or 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śātaka.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Śātakaṇṭi.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purṇaṇa.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śātakaṇṭi.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambodara.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnu.</td>
<td>Names.</td>
<td>Duration of reign in years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śripaka.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krishna.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śātakaṇṭi.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vāyu.</th>
<th>Duration of reign in years</th>
<th>Mātsya.</th>
<th>Duration of reign in years</th>
<th>Vishnū.</th>
<th>Duration of reign in years</th>
<th>Bhāgavata.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Names</td>
<td></td>
<td>Names</td>
<td></td>
<td>Names</td>
<td></td>
<td>Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aplāva</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Apītaka</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ivilaka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hivilaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meghasvāti</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Meghasvāti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Svāti</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skandavāti</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrigendras vātikarṇa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuntalasvāti</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Svātikarṇa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulomāvi</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patimāvi</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patumat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemikrishṇa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aṁśatkarman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anishtakarman Hāleya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hāla</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hāla</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talakā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saptaka or Manda-laka</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mandulaka</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pattalaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purikashena</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Purindrasena</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pravillasena</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purψabhiru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātakarṇi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sundara Svātikarṇa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sundara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakora Sātakarṇi</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Chakora Svātikarṇa</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Chakora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivasvāti</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sivasvāti</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sivasvāti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gantāmputra</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gantāmputra</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gomatāputra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulomat</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pulimāt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purimān (mat.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sivasāti</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sivasātri</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medaśīras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sivaskandha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sivaskandha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yajñāsṛī Sātakarṇi</td>
<td>29, 9</td>
<td>Yajñāsṛī</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yajñāsṛī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajñāsṛī Sātakarṇi</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vijaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijaya</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vijaya</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vijaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daṇḍāsṛī Sātakarṇi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chandaśṛī Sātakarṇi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chandraśṛī</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chandravijñā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulomavi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pulomavit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pulomārchi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sulomadhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some other way. Besides the tradition about 456 years, there is a statement in the Vāyu Purāṇa, in a verse below, to the effect that the "Andhras will have possession of the earth for three hundred years," which seems to point to another. That such a tradition existed is indicated by the mistake in the Bhāgavata by which the Kāṇvas are assigned three hundred and forty-five years. The original account, which the author of this Purāṇa must have [33] seen, probably assigned forty-five years to the Kāṇvas and three hundred to the next or Andhrabhṛtya dynasty. But since that dynasty was also assigned another duration, viz. 456 years, he connected the "the three hundred" with the preceding, and gave 345 years to the Kāṇvāyana family. Now, the manner in which the two traditions are to be reconciled is by supposing that the longer period is made up by putting together the reigns of all the princes belonging to the several branches of the Andhrabhṛtya dynasty. That the younger princes often reigned at Paiṭhaṇ and the elderly ones at Dhanakataka appears clear when we compare the inscriptions with the statement in Ptolemy. When the throne at the principal seat became vacant, the Paiṭhaṇ princes succeeded. But some probably died before their elders and never became kings of Dhanakataka. From an inscription found at Banavasi by Dr. Burgess it would appear that another branch of that dynasty ruled over Kānarā. The period of three hundred years and the seventeen names given in the Vāyu Purāṇa refer probably to the main branch. The Mātsya seems to me to put together the princes of all the branches, and thus makes them out to be thirty. The total of the years
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Two traditions about the duration of the Andhrabhṛtya dynasty—456 and 360 years.

The lower period refers to the main branch of the family.
Section VI. assigned to the several reigns in the Vāyu is 272\%\%, and if we should suppose one or two reigns lasting for about twenty-eight years to have dropped out by the corruption of the text, it would become 300\%. Thus then the Vāyu and the Mātsya Purāṇas each give a correct account, but of different things. The Vishṇu, which gives twenty-four princes, is not entitled to so much credit as the Vāyu. It is a later work and the author's purpose being sectarian, he probably did not care so much for the accuracy of his details, and hence omitted even the duration of each reign. The Bhāgavata is still more careless, as has already been shown.

If then we take the account in the Vāyu Purāṇa to refer to the main branch of the dynasty and consequently generally correct, the period that intervened between the rise of the Śatavāhanas or Andhrabhṛityas and the end of the reign of Śivasvāti is 206 years.\textsuperscript{13} The dynasty must, as we have seen, have been founded in B.C. 73, wherefore the end of Śivasvāti's reign and the accession of Gotamilputra must be placed in A.D. 133. We have seen that Puljumāya, whose capital was Paiṭhaṇ according to Ptolemy, and who from the inscriptions appears to have been king of this part of the country and to have reigned contemporaneously with his father, must have begun to reign at Paiṭhaṇ about 130 A.D. The father and the son drove the foreigners from the Dekkan, and the son was established as the ruler of the regained provinces, Gotamilputra expecting to succeed to the throne at the original seat of the family. Gotamilputra reigned for twenty-one years according to the Purāṇas, wherefore he must have died in 154 A.D. He was alive, as stated before, in

\textsuperscript{13} By adding up the numbers in the table.
the eighteenth year of Pułumāyi, i. e. in 148, and also in the nineteenth when the cave temple was dedicated, and not alive in the twenty-fourth, i. e. in 154, according to the two inscriptions [34] mentioned before. Ptolemy's mention of Pułumāyi I have already referred to about the year 132; so that, the date deduced from this source, and those derived from Gotamiputra's and Pułumāyi's inscriptions at Nāsik and Rudradāman's at Junāgaḍ on the supposition that the era used in this last is the Śaka, as well as those derived from the Purāṇas may thus be shown to be consistent with each other. The dates of all the princes whose names we find in the inscriptions may therefore be thus arranged:

Simuka began to reign in B.C. 73 and ceased in B.C. 50. Krishna began in B.C. 50 and ceased in B.C. 40.
Śāta Karṇa (third in the Vāyu P.) began in B.C. 40 and ceased in A.D. 16.
Nahapāna Kshahrāta.
Gotamiputra began in A.D. 133 and ceased in A.D. 154.

If the twenty-eight years assigned to Pułumāyi in the Mātsya Purāṇa are to be reckoned from the year of Gotamiputra's death, he must be considered to have begun to reign at Dhanakaṭaka in A.D. 154, and to have ceased in A.D. 182. He reigned at Paithan from A.D. 130 to A.D. 154, that is, for about twenty-four years, and we have seen that the latest year of his reign recorded in the inscriptions at Nāsik and Kārli is the twenty-fourth. Altogether then his reign lasted for fifty-two years. But if the twenty-eight include the twenty-four for which he ruled at Paithan, he must have died in 158. This supposition looks very probable. He was succeeded by Śivaśrī, whose coin found in the Tailaṅgaṇa districts has been described by Mr. Thomas in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. IX., p. 64. He appears to have been Pułumāyi's successors.
brother, since he also is styled on the coin Vāsiṭhīputa, i.e., Vāsiṣṭhīputra, or the son of Vāsiṣṭhī. He had a reign of seven years and must have died in A.D. 165. Sivaskanda was the next king, to whom also seven years have been assigned. There is no trace of these two princes on this side of the country; while the name of the next, Yajña Śrī, occurs frequently as we have seen in inscriptions and coins. He appears to have been Puḷumāyi’s immediate successor at Paiṭhaṇ. His full name was Gōtamīputra Yajña Śrī Sātakarṇi, and he is, as observed before, the Gōtamīputra of the Kolhāpur coins. Some copies of the Māṃṣya assign him twenty-nine years, others nine, and twenty, and the Vāyu, twenty-nine; while the Bhāmaṇḍa allows him nineteen. Probably he reigned in Māhārāṣṭra for eighteen or nineteen years, since the sixteenth year of his reign is his latest recorded date, and for twenty-nine years at Dhanakaṭaka since, according to our supposition, the Vāyu Purāṇa gives an account of the Dhanakaṭaka branch and his coins are found in Tailaṅgaṇa. And this is confirmed by what we have already said. Puḷumāyi reigned at Dhanakaṭaka for four years and his two successors for fourteen. All this while, i.e., for eighteen years, Yajña Śrī was ruler of Māhārāṣṭra. He must thus have ceased to reign in the last country in about A.D. 172 and died in about A.D. 202. The next three reigns lasted, according to the Vāyu, for sixteen years. No trace of any of these has yet been found on this side of the country; but coins of Chandra Śrī are found near the original seat of government, and two of these are described by Mr. Thomas in the paper mentioned above. Thus the [35] latest Andhrabharīṭya date is A.D. 218. Maḍhāρīṣṭrapuṭa Sakasena of the Kānheri inscription, the same
as the Maḏhariputa of the Kolhāpur coins, has been identified with Śiva Śrī, the successor of Puḷumāyi, by Paṇḍit Bhagvānlāl, and I also at one time concurred with him. But the identification is not, I think, tenable. He was probably led to it by his reading Sirīsenā for Sakasena; but I have shown that the reading is incorrect. Mr. Thomas has described a specimen of eleven coins found at Amrāvatī near Dharaṇīkoṭ, the legend on which he reads as Sakasakasa, but it is not unlikely Sakasenasa, "of Sakasena." Besides, Maḏhariputra Sakasena could not have been the immediate successor of Puḷumāyi for a reason which I have already given. One of the Kolhāpur coins figured by Paṇḍit Bhagvānlāl Indraji bears the names of both Gotamiputra and Maḏhariputra, showing that the piece originally bearing the name of one of them was re-stamped with the name of the other. Mr. Thomas thinks that it was originally Maḏhariputa’s coin. I think it was Gotamiputra’s; for, if we see the other figured coins we shall find that they are so stamped as to leave some space between the rim and the legend. This in the present case is utilized and the name of Maḏhariputa stamped close to the rim, which shows that the thing was done later. Maḏhariputra Sakasena, therefore, must have been a successor of Gotamiputra Yajñā Śrī Śātakarṇi. But, as we have seen, none of his three Purāṇic successors bore the name, and the name Sakasena is one which has nothing like it on the long list of the Andhrabhṛtīyas. Still that king must have reigned at Dhanakaṭaka also if my surmise that Mr. Thomas’ Sakasaka is the same as Sakasena is correct. In the same manner, as observed before, Chatushpurṇa Śātakarṇi’s name Chaturapana does not appear in the Purāṇas. But the Purāṇās
Section VI. cannot be expected to give accurate information on these points. In the Mātysya Purāṇa another Andhra dynasty of "seven princes sprung from the servants of the original Andhrabhṛtya family will," it is said, "come into power after that family becomes extinct." The Vāyu has got a similar verse the reading of which, however, is corrupt; but it appears that this new dynasty is there meant to be spoken of as having sprung from the Andhrabhṛtya family itself and must have constituted a separate branch cut off from the main line. And we can very well understand from the points already made out how such a branch could have constituted itself after Yajña Śrī's ceasing to reign. Vāsishtṛputra Sātakarni whom I have identified with Chaturapana married a Kṣatrapa lady. The Kṣatrapas, as I have before observed, were foreigners, most probably Śakas who had become Hindus. Maḍhārīputra was not unlikely the son of that lady. And thus he and his father Chaturapana formed, from the very fact of this marriage, a distinct line of princes. Chaturapana appears to have succeeded Yajña Śrī; and Maḍhārīputra to have reigned after Chaturapana. The durations of these reigns cannot be made out, but the latest date of the former is the thirteenth year of his reign, which probably corresponds to 185 A.D. and of the latter the eighth. The dates of the later Sātavāhanas are therefore these:

In Mahārāṣṭra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puṣṇamāyi</td>
<td>A.D. 130–A.D. 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yajña Śrī</td>
<td>A.D. 154–A.D. 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatushparka or Chaturapana</td>
<td>A.D. 172—was reigning in A.D. 185.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maḍhārīputra</td>
<td>About A.D. 190—was reigning in about A.D. 197.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Puḷumāyi ... ... ... A.D. 154—A.D. 158.
Sīva Śrī ... ... ... A.D. 158—A.D. 165.
Śivaskanda ... ... ... A.D. 165—A.D. 172.
Vajñā Śrī ... ... ... A.D. 172—A.D. 202.
Vijaya ... ... ... A.D. 202—A.D. 208.
Chandra Śrī ... ... ... A.D. 208—A.D. 211.
Pulomavi ... ... ... A.D. 211—A.D. 218.

Thus then, the Andhrabhṛityas or Śatavāhanas ruled over the Dekkan from B.C. 73 to about A.D. 218, i.e., for about three centuries. For some time, however, they were dispossessed of the country by foreigners who belonged to the Śaka tribe. How long these were in power it is difficult to determine. If the Śaka era was established by the foreign conqueror after his subjugation of the country, and if his Satrap Nahapāna or his successor was overthrown by Gotamiputra or Puḷumāyi, six or seven years after Nahapāna's latest date, viz. 46, the foreigners held possession of this country only for about fifty-three years.
SECTION VII.

POLITICAL AND LITERARY TRADITIONS ABOUT THE SÂTAVÂHANAS OR SÂLIVÂHANAS.

Section VII. The period during which the Sâtavâhanas or Andhrabhṛityas ruled over Mahârâshṭra must have been a prosperous one in the history of the country. Hence several traditions with regard to different kings of this dynasty have been preserved. But that Sâlivâhana or Sâtavâhana was a family name has been forgotten, and different princes of the dynasty have been confounded and identified. Thus Hemachandra in his Deśikosa gives Sâlivâhana, Sâlana, Hâla, and Kuntala as the names of one individual; but we see from the list given above that the last two were borne by different princes, and both of them were Sâlivâhanas. In his grammar he gives Sâlivâhana as a Prākrit corruption of Sâtavâhana. In modern times the Saka era is called the Sâlivâhana era or an era founded by Sâlivâhana. When it began to be attributed to him it is difficult to determine precisely. All the copper-plate grants up to the eleventh century speak of the era as Sâkanrîpakâla, i.e., the era of the Saka king, or Sâkakâla, i.e., the era of the Saka, and in an inscription at Bâdâmi it is stated to be the era beginning from “the coronation of the Saka king.” Subsequently, the simple expression “Sâke, in the year of the Saka,” was used, and thereafter Sâke or “in the Saka.” The word Sâka thus came to be understood as equivalent to “an era” generally, the original sense being forgotten. And since the era had to be connected with some great king it was associated with the name of Sâlivâhana whom tradition had represented to be
THE DEKKAN

such a king; and thus we now use the expression Śālivāhana Śaka, which etymologically can have no sense and is made up of the names of two royal families. The current legend makes Śālivāhana the son of a Brāhmaṇ girl who was a sojourner at Paiṭhan and lived with her two brothers in the house of a potter. On one occasion she went to the Godāvari to bathe, when Śesha, the king of serpents, becoming enamoured of her, transformed himself into a man and embraced her. In due course she gave birth to Śālivāhana, who was brought up in the house of the potter. Some time after, king Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī, to whom a certain deity had revealed that he was destined to die at the hands of the son of a girl of two years, sent about his Vēṭāla or king of Ghosts to find out if there was such a child anywhere. The Vēṭāla saw Śālivāhana playing with his girlish mother and informed Vikramāditya. Thereupon he invaded Paiṭhan with a large army, but Śālivāhana infused life into clay figures of horses, elephants, and men, by means of a charm communicated to him by his father, the king of serpents, encountered [38] Vikramāditya, and defeated him. This descent of a king of Ujjayin on Paiṭhan I have already alluded to and endeavoured to explain. The Śālivāhana referred to in this tradition appears to be Puḷumāyi who in conjunction with his father freed the country from the Sakas and fought with Chashṭana or Jayadāman and Rudradāman whose capital appears to have been Ujjayinī. It was in consequence of some faint reminiscence of Puḷumāyi Śālivāhana's relations with the

---

1 The story about the girl and her serpent-lover is in the Kathāsaritsāgara mentioned with reference to Guṇādhya who was the son of the girl. Sātavāhana’s origin is given differently.
Sakas and their Satrap kings that his name was attached to the era first used by his adversaries.

There are also several literary traditions connected with the name of Sâtavâhana or Sâlivâhana. A work of the name of Brihatkathâ written in that form of the Prâkrit which is called the Paisâchî or the language of goblins is mentioned by Dañçin in his work the Kâvyâdarśa. Somadeva, the author of the Kathâsaritsâgara, and Kshemendra, the author of another Brihatkathâ, profess to have derived their stories from this Paisâchî Brihatkathâ. The stories comprised in this are said to have been communicated to Guṇâḍhya, who for some time had been minister to Sâtavâhana, by a ghost of the name of Kâñabhûti. They were written in blood and arranged in seven books. Guṇâḍhya offered them to king Sâtavâhana, but he refused to receive such a ghastly work written in blood and in the language of goblins, whereupon Guṇâḍhya burnt six of them. Some time after, king Sâtavâhana having been informed of the charming nature of those stories went to Guṇâḍhya and asked for them. But the last or seventh book alone remained, and this the king obtained from his pupils with his permission.

It is narrated in the Kathâsaritsâgara that while Sâtavâhana was, on one occasion, bathing with his wives in a tank in a pleasure-garden, he threw water at one of them. As she was tired, she told the king not to besprinkle her with water, using the words modakaih paritâqaya mâm. The king not understanding that the first word was composed of two, mā “do not” and udakaih “with waters,” but taking it to be one word meaning “pieces of sweetmeat,” caused sweetmeat to be brought and began to throw.

2 Sūtamaśayīs Prāśhastutâthāvâdâjâvabâs.
3 Kathâsaritsâgara, II. 8.
pieces at the queen. Thereupon she laughed and told the king that he did not know the phonetic rules of Sanskrit, and that while she meant to tell him not to besprinkle her with water, he had understood her to say that she wanted him to throw pieces of sweetmeat at her. There was no occasion for sweetmeat at the place, and this ought to have led the king to the true sense; but he was not. Thereupon the king was ashamed of his own ignorance while his queen was so learned, and became disconsolate. Gunnadhya and Sarvavarman, who were his ministers, were informed of the cause; and the former promised to teach him grammar in six years, though it was a study of twelve. Sarvavarman, however, offered to teach the subject in six months, and his offer was accepted; but as it was not possible to do so, Sarvavarman propitiated the god Kàrtikeya or Skanda by his [39] self-mortifications, and the god communicated to him the first Sûtra of a new grammar Siddho Varnasamâmnâyah. Thereupon Sarvavarman repeated the other Sûtras, when Kàrtikeya said that if he had not been so hasty and allowed him to repeat the whole, the new grammar would have become superior to Pañini’s; but since it could not be so now, it would be a small treatise—Kàtantra, and would also be called Kàlápaka after the tail of his peacock. This new grammar Sarvavarman taught to the king.4 The same story is told by Tarânatha in his “History of Buddhism,”5 but he makes the name of the king to be Udayana, and of Sarvavarman, Saptavarman; while the competitor of Sarvavarman is represented by him to be Vararuchi instead of Gunnadhya. But Udayana is represented as a king reigning in Southern India and Sàtavâhana in the form of

---

4 Kathâsaritsâgara, VI. 108 & ff.
5 Schiefner’s Translation, p. 73 & ff.
Section VII. Šântivâhana is also mentioned in connection with the story as a southern king in whose dominions Vara-ruchi lived. As Udayana frequently figures in Buddhistic stories, the southern prince Šâtavâhana is confounded with him, and this seems to be indicated by the fact that this Udayana is represented to have ruled over a country in the south, though the usual Udayana is a northern prince. It will thus appear that the Kâtantra grammar was composed by Sarvavarman at the request of a prince of the Šata-vâhana family. And this same thing appears to be alluded to even by Hwan Thsang when he says in connection with the shortening of the originally large work on grammar by Pâñini and others, "lately a Brâhmaṇ of South India, at the request of a king of South India, reduced them further to 2,500 ślokas. This work is widely spread, and used throughout all the frontier provinces, but the well-read scholars of India do not follow it as their guide in practice." 6

There is a work written in the old Mahârâshâtri dialect called Saptâsati, which is of the nature of an anthology consisting of Gâthâs or stanzas in the Āryâ metre, mostly on love matters. The author of this is in the third verse mentioned as Hâla, and ordinarily he is spoken of as Šâlivâhana. Bâṇa speaks of it in a verse in the introduction to his Harshacharita as "an imperishable and refined repository of good sayings composed by Šâlivâhana." Verses from it are quoted in Dhanika’s commentary on the Daśarûpaka, in the Sarasvati Kaṇṭhâbharaṇa, and in the Kâvyaprakâśa. There is, it will be observed, in the list of the Andhrabhârîtya princes, one of the name of Hâla, who probably was either the author of the work or to whom it was dedicated by a court-poet.

6 Life of Hwan Thsang, Beal’s Trans., p. 122.
THE DEKKAN

From these traditions we may, I think, safely conclude that literature flourished under the rule of the Andhrabhṛityas, and that the Prākrits or spoken languages, especially the Mahārāṣṭrī, were probably for the first time used for literary purposes. In Vatsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra or Institutes of Love, Kuntala Śatakarni Śatavāhana is spoken of as having killed Malayavati, who is called [40] Mahādevī, and consequently must have been his chief queen, by means of a pair of scissors in connection with certain amorous sports. The name Kuntala occurs in the list given in the Mātasya Purāṇa.

---

7 कत्वा कुंतला: शान्तवा: शान्तवा: महादेवी: महादेवी: महादेवी: शान्तवाह्: शान्तवाह्: [क्रमां]
Prof. Aufrecht’s quotation in the Oxf. Cat., p. 217 b., does not contain the name महादेवी, and he supplies महिकावी from the preceding clause; but a Gaṇikā or courtezan cannot be called Mahādevī.
DURING this period the religion of Buddha was in a flourishing condition. Princes and chiefs calling themselves Mahâbhojas and Mahâraṭṭhis, merchants (Naigamas), goldsmiths (Suvarṇapākāras), carpenters (Vardhakas), corn-dealers (Dhânyakaśreṇis) druggists (Gândhikas), and ordinary householders (Grihasthas) caused at their expense temples and monasteries to be excavated out of the solid rock for the use of the followers of that religion. It has been mentioned that in the first part of this period the country was exposed to the inroads of foreign tribes, such as Yavanas or Bactrian Greeks, Sakas, and Pahlavas. These afterwards settled in the country and adopted the Buddhist religion. For, among the donors and benefactors whose names are recorded in the cave inscriptions, there are a good many Sakas and Yavanas. But some and especially the Sakas seem to have adopted Brâhmaṇism. The Buddhist temples were provided with chaityas or tombs in imitation of those in which some relic of Buddha was buried, and these were objects of worship. The monasteries contained cells intended as residences for Bhikshus or mendicant priests. These travelled over the country during the year and spent the four rainy months at one of these monastic establishments. In the month of Śrāvāṇa the monks held the ceremony of robing, at which the old clothes were thrown away and new ones worn. To provide these for them, charitable persons deposited, as we have seen,
sums of money with certain guilds with directions that out of the interest new robes should be purchased and given to the priests. Villages were assigned by kings and their officers for the support of these religious establishments. The mendicant priests often travelled by sea; and hence at the head of several of the creeks in the Konkan we have cave monasteries intended as Dharmaśālās or rest-houses for them. We have such caves at Chipūṇ, Mahāḍ, and Kuḍem situated respectively on the Dābhol, the Bāṅkoṭ, and the Rājpurī creeks. For those who landed at the head of the Bombay harbour or at Ghoḍbandar, there were the Kānheri caves.

Brāhmaṇism also flourished side by side with Buddhism. In the inscription at Nāsik in which Ushavadāṭa dedicates the cave monastery excavated at his expense for the use of the itinerant "priests of the four quarters," he speaks, as we have seen, of his many charities to Brāhmaṇs. The same notions as regards these matters prevailed then as now. Ushavadāṭa fed a hundred thousand Brāhmaṇs as the Mahārāj Sindia did about thirty years ago. It was considered highly meritorious to get Brāhmaṇs married at one’s expense then as now. Gotami putra also, in the same inscription which records a benefaction in favour of the Buddhists, is spoken of as the only protector of Brāhmaṇs, and as having like Ushavadāṭa [42] put them in the way of increasing their race. Kings and princes thus appear to have patronized the followers of both the religions, and in none of the inscriptions is there an indication of an open hostility between them.

Trade and commerce must also have been in a flourishing condition during this early period. Ships from the western countries came, according to the author of the Periplus, to Barugaza or Bharu-
Section VIII. Kachchha, the modern Bharoch; and the merchandise brought by them was thence carried to the inland countries. Onyx stone in large quantities from Paithan, and ordinary cottons, muslins, mallow-coloured cottons, and other articles of local production from Tagara, were carried in waggons to Barugaza and thence exported to the west. Paithan is placed by the author of the Periplus at the distance of twenty days' journey to the south of Barugaza, and is spoken of as the greatest city in Dakhinabades or Dakshipâpatha, and Tagara, ten days' east of Paithan.¹ This town has not yet been identified. Its name does not occur in any of the cave inscriptions, but it is mentioned in a copper-plate grant of the first half of the seventh century; and princes of a dynasty known by the name of Sihâhâra call themselves "sovereigns of Tagara, the best of towns," in all their grants. Some have identified it with Devagiri and others with Junnar, but in both cases its bearing from Paithan as given by the Greek geographers has not been taken into account. I have elsewhere discussed the question, and have proposed Dhârur in the Nizâm's territory as the site of the ancient city. The other sea-port towns mentioned in the Periplus are Souppara, the modern Supârem or Supârâ near Bassein and the Sorparaka of the inscriptions and the Purânas, where interesting Buddhist relics were dug out by Mr. Campbell and Paṇḍit Bhagvânlâî; Kalliena, the modern Kalyâñ, which must have been a place of great commercial importance since a good many of the donors whose names are inscribed in the caves at Kânheri and some mentioned in the caves at

¹ Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., pp. 143, 144.
Junnar were merchants residing in Kalyāṇa; Semulla identified with Chembur by some and with Chaul by others; Mandagora, very likely the same as the modern Māṇḍāḍ, originally Mandagaḍa, situated on the Rājapuri creek near Kuḍenih where we have the caves; Palaipatma, which probably was the same as Pāl which is near Mahāḍ; Melizēgar, the second part of the name of which can at once be recognized as Jayagaḍ and which must be identified with that place whatever the first part Meli may mean; Buzantion, and others. Buzantion is probably the Vaijayanti of the inscriptions, but with what modern town it is to be identified it is difficult to say. Vaijayanti is mentioned in the Kadamba copperplates translated by Mr. Telang, and was most probably some place in North Kānara. [43] In a grant of the Vijayanagar dynasty, Mādhava, the great counsellor of king Harihara, is represented to have been appointed viceroy of Jayantipura. He then conquered Goa and seems to have made that his capital. Jayantipura is said to be another name for Banavāṣi. In the Sabhāparvan of the Mahābhārata, Banavāṣi is spoken of as if it were the name of a country, and immediately after it, Jayanti is mentioned as a town. If then Jayanti and Vaijayanti were two forms of the same name, Vaijayanti was probably the modern Banavāṣi, or perhaps in consideration of the facts that the name of

3 See the inscriptions in Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. VI., and in Arch. Surv., W. India, No. 10.
4 Kārī No. 7, Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10.
7 Chap. XXXI, vv. 69 and 70, Bom. Ed. The Vanavāsinḥ at the end of v. 69 refers to the town or country of Banavāṣi and ought properly to appear as Vanavāṣikān. In the Purāṇas, too, Vanavāṣikālī is given as the name of a people.
Section VIII. Vaijayanti occurs in an inscription at Kârli and also that the Greek geographers in mentioning the places of note on the coast could not have run at once from Jayagaḍ to the southern limit of North Kânarâ, Vaijayanti may be identified with Vijayadurg. But these objections are not of very great weight.

It is not possible to ascertain the names of all the towns in the inland country that were in a flourishing condition during the time we have been speaking of. Besides Paiṭhaṇ and Tagara there was Nâsik, which is mentioned in an inscription in one of the caves at the place and also at Beḍsâ. The district about the town was called Govardhana. Junnar was another flourishing town, as is attested by the number of cave-temples at the place. But what its name was we do not know. The name Junnar, Junanara, Jûrjanagara, or Jîrjanagara, which means the old town, must have been given to it after it had lost its importance. I have already expressed my belief that it was the capital of Nahapâna. Puḷumâyi, who overthrew the dynasty of Nahapâna, is in one of the Nâsik inscriptions styled "lord of Navanara," meant probably for Navanagara or the new town. That he reigned at Paiṭhaṇ we know from Ptolemy, and also from the many traditions about Sâlivâhana which locate the person or persons bearing that name at that city. The Navanara, then, of the inscription was probably another name given to the town when Puḷumâyi re-established his dynasty, and, in contrast with it, Nahapâna's capital was called the "Old Town." Or perhaps Puḷumâyi windened the old town of Paiṭhaṇ and called the new extension Navanara. What town existed near the group of caves at Kârli and the adjoining places, we do not know. But the place spoken of in connection with the monastic establishment is in an inscription
named Valuraka,7 and the district in which it was situated is called Mâmalâhâra,8 or the district of Mâmalâ, the modern Mâval. Further south there was the town of Karahâṭaka, the modern Karhâd, which is mentioned in an inscription at Kuḍâm9 and also in the Mahâbhârata.10 Kolhâpur also must have been a flourishing town in those days, since a Buddhistic stūpa containing the coins [44] we have already noticed and other remains of antiquity have been found there. The old name of the place is unknown. Either Karhâd or Kolhâpur must be the Hippocura of Ptolemy in which he locates Bâleocuros whom we have identified with the Viśivâyakura of the Kolhâpur coins.

Persons engaged in trade and commerce probably acquired large fortunes. The great chaitya cave at Kârli was caused to be constructed by a Śeth (Śreshṭhin) of Vaijayantibrata and in other places also, especially at Kânheri, their gifts were costly. There were in those days guilds of trades such as those of weavers, druggists, corn-dealers, oil-manufacturers, &c. Their organization seems to have been complete and effective, since, as already mentioned, they received permanent deposits of money and paid interest on them from generation to generation. Self-government by means of such guilds and village communities has always formed an important factor of the political administration of the country. A nigamasabhâ or town-corporation is also mentioned in one of Ushavâdâ’s Nāsik inscriptions, which shows that something like municipal institutions existed in those early days. It is also worthy of

8 Ibid. No. 19.
9 No. 20, Kuḍâ Caves. Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10.
10 In the place above referred to.
remark that the yearly interest on the 2000 karshapanas deposited by Ushavadāta was 100 karshapanas, and in another case that on 1000 and 75 showing that the rate of interest was not so high as it has been in recent times, but varied from five to seven and a half per cent. per annum. If the rate of interest depends on the degree of security and bears an inverse ratio to the efficiency of government, it appears that the country was well governed notwithstanding political revolutions. To this result the efficient local organization spoken of above, which no changes of dynasties ever affected, must no doubt have contributed in a large measure.

Communication between the several provinces does not appear to have been very difficult. Benefactions of persons residing in Vaijayantī or Banavāśi, and Śorparaka or Supārā, are recorded in the cave at Kārli; of a Nāsik merchant at Beṛsā; of some inhabitants of Bharukachchha and Kalyāṇ at Junnar; of natives of Northern India and Dāttāmitrī, which I have elsewhere shown was situated in Lower Sindh, at Nāsik; and of an iron-monger of Karahākaḍa or Karhāḍ at Kuḍelī. On the other hand, gifts of natives of Nāsik and Karhāḍ are recorded on the stūpa at Bharhut which lies midway between Jabalpur and Allahābād. Unless there were frequent communications between these places, it is not possible that the natives of one should make religious endowments at another.

11 Cunningham’s Stupa of Bharhut, pp. 131, 135, 136, 138, 139.
THE DEKKAN

[45] SECTION IX.


For about three centuries after the extinction of the Andhrabhīrītyas, we have no specific information about the dynasties that ruled over the country. The Mātsya and the Vāyu, as observed before, place seven princes of a branch of the Andhrabhīrītyas after them, and I have given reasons to believe that the Maḍhariputra of the inscription and the coins referred to before was one of them. This branch seems to have been in possession of the whole extent of the country that was ruled over by their predecessors. If the fact, noticed before, of some coins of the later Kshatrapa kings being found in a village near Karhāḍ is to be regarded as evidence of their sway over this country and not to be attributed merely to commercial intercourse, the Kshatrapa dynasty also must be considered to have obtained possession of a portion at least of the Dekkan after the Śatavāhanas. The earliest of these princes is Vijaya Sāha¹ (or Sena) whose date is 144² which, if the era is that of the Śaka kings, corresponds to A.D. 222, while the latest date we have assigned to the Śatavāhanas is about A.D. 218. The last of the princes whose coins are found near Karhāḍ is Viśva Sāha (Sena), one of whose coins has the date 214 and another 224, corresponding to A.D. 292 and A.D. 302.³ About this time princes of

² Ibid. p. 28 (No. 10).
³ Ibid. No. 15.
the race of Ābhīras or cowherds must have come into power. Ten of them are mentioned in the Purāṇas. In the Nāsik caves there is an inscription dated in the ninth year of Vīrasena Ābhīra, the son of Damari and of Śivadatta Ābhīra. The characters in the inscription, though they do not differ much from those in the inscriptions of the later Andhra-bhrītya kings, must be regarded as more modern. The language is Sanskrit, which I regard as an indication of a later era. When the popular dialect became different from the Pāli, or the Pāli became less sacred, the people fell back upon the original Sanskrit for such purposes as those of recording religious gifts; and thus in all the later grants we find the Sanskrit used, while, from the times of Aśoka to the extinction of the Andhrabhṛityas, the language used was mostly the Pāli, or, to speak more accurately, one or more of the Prākṛits of the period. The Ābhīras were in power for sixty-seven years according to the Vāyu Purāṇa. Many other dynasties are mentioned in the Purāṇas as having ruled over the country. But the information given there is much more confused than in the case of the previous families. It appears that the dynasties that ruled over different parts of India at the same time are put together and confused with those that succeeded each other, so that it is not possible without extraneous assistance to determine their chronological relations.

[46] We have seen from the cave inscriptions that from remote times tribes of Kshatriyas calling themselves Bhojas and Raṭṭhis or Rāṣṭrikas were predominant in the country. In the northern part of the Dekkan or Mahārāṣṭra these called them-

---

selves "the Great Raṭṭhis or Mahāraṭṭhis, the ancient Marāṭhás," but in other places the name in use must have been Raṭṭhis or Raṭṭhas, since we know of more modern chiefs in the Southern Marāṭhâ Country who called themselves by that name. Some of the Raṭṭha tribes must have formed themselves into a family or group (kūṭa) and called themselves Raṭṭhakūḍa, and later on Rāṭhoḍa, the Sanskrit original of which is Rāṣṭrakūṭa. Or the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family was so called because it was the main branch of the race of the Raṭṭhas that had spread over the whole country. These native chiefs that ruled over the country must have been held in subjection by the Andhrabhṛṣṭyas during the continuance of their power, and also by the later Kṣatrapas. But after the dynasties became extinct they must have resumed their independence. The Ābhīras held sway for some time and over a part of the country only; for the tradition of Gauḷi or cowherd rulers which very probably refers to them is confined to the Nāsik and Khāndeś districts. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas probably rose to power about the same time as the Ābhīras. Hence in the inscriptions on the Miraj plates and the Yevur tablet first brought to light by Mr. Wathen and Sir Walter Elliot, respectively, it is stated that Jayśīṃha, the founder of the Chālukya dynasty in the Dekkan, established himself in the country after having vanquished Indra, the son of Kṛṣṇa of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family. The Chālukya dynasty was, as will hereafter be seen, founded in the beginning of the sixth century of the Christian era. From about the end of the third to the beginning of the

---

sixth century, therefore, the Dekkan was ruled over by princes of the Rāshṭrakūṭa family.

Traikūṭakas. An inscription on copper-plates found in the chaitya of one of the caves at Kānheri is dated in the 245th year of a dynasty, which, if the word has been correctly lithographed, is called Strakūṭaka. But the published copy of the inscription was made in the time of Dr. Bird and the plates themselves are not now available for re-examination. This Strakūṭaka, may be a mislection for Rāshṭrakūṭa. But it is not unlikely Traikūṭaka, as the late Paṇḍit Bhagvānlāl contended. He has published a copper-plate charter issued from the camp of the victorious army of Traikūṭakas by a prince of the name of Darhasena in the year 207. Traikūṭaka was thus probably the name of a race and the prince belonged to it. And the Kānheri inscription would show that this dynasty had an era of its own. From the form of the characters in the inscription, it appears that it was engraved in the latter part of the fifth century of the Christian era; so that the Traikūṭaka dynasty was founded about the middle of the third century, i.e., after the extinction of the Sātavāhanas. But further information about the dynasty is not available; and we do not know over what extent of country it ruled. But since the epoch of the era appears to be the same as that of the era used by the kings of Chedi, possibly the race of the Haihayas or Kalachuris which ruled over that province rose to power about 249 A.D. and held sway over a part of the Dekkan including the western coast up to the country of Lāṭ. They were

---

6 Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol., V., p. 16, of the copies of the Kānheri inscription.

afterwards driven away by some other race and had to confine themselves to Chedi. The resemblance between the names Tripura the capital of the dynasty and Trikūṭa is perhaps not fortuitous.
HISTORY OF

[48] SECTION X.

THE EARLY CHÂLUKYAS.

Section X.

We will next proceed to an account of the princes who belonged to the dynasty called Chalikya, Chalukya, or Châlukya.¹ A large number of inscriptions on copper-plates and stone tablets have amply elucidated the history of this dynasty. The legendary origin of this family is thus given by

¹ Dr. Fleet draws a distinction between Chalukya and Châlukya and asserts that "this last form belongs only to the restored dynasty commencing with Taila II" and that "it does not occur in any of the genuine early inscriptions." But it does belong to the earlier dynasty also, and is found in genuine early inscriptions. The best way to determine the point whether the first syllable was च or च is to refer to verses containing the name, the metre of which will show the quantity unmistakably. The inscriptions of the earlier dynasty are in prose; we must therefore refer to the versified grants of the Râshrâkâta which speak of the dynasty supplied by them. In the Râdhapuru grant of Govinda III. (Ind. ant., Vol. VI, p. 65), we have चतुर्वर्षकुञ्जाकृतम् &c., in verse 3. In the Navasâri grant edited by me (Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XVIII., p. 257), we have चाणुकाकनायां वस्म: समशक्त लक्षण: &c. In three of the five grants of the eastern branch of the early dynasty edited by Dr. Hultsch we have चाणुकारानी कुञ्जम (South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I., pp. 44, 47 & 57). The form चाणुक is also frequently used. The distinction between च and च and the difference in sense in consequence of the lengthening of the vowel which Dr. Fleet points out have place in the pure Sanskrit of Pâñini and of the Brâhmaṇas; but there is no room for them in names that came into use in the Prâkrit period long after Sanskrit became a dead language. Chalukya was some vernacular name which was Sanskritized into the various forms we actually find.
Bilhaṇa, the author of the Vikramāṇkadevacharita, or life of Vikramāditya a prince of the later or restored Chālukya line. On one occasion when Brahmadeva was engaged in his morning devotions, Indra came up to him and complained of the sinfulness of the world in which no man performed the sacrificial rites or gave oblations to the gods. Brahmadeva looked at his chuluka or the hand hollowed for the reception of water in the course of his devotional exercise, and from it sprang a mighty warrior who became the progenitor of the Chālukya race. Some time after, two great heroes of the name of Hārita and Mānavya were born in the family and they raised it to very great distinction. The original seat of the dynasty was Ayodhyā, and in the course of time a branch of it established itself in the south.

As stated in the opening lines of all the copper-plate grants of this family, the Chālukyas belonged to the Gotra or race of Mānavya and were the descendants of Hāriti. They were under the guardianship of the Seven Mothers and were led to prosperity by the god Kārtikeya. They obtained from Nārāyaṇa a standard with a boar represented on it, and fighting under that standard they subjugated all kings. The Yevur tablet and the Miraj plates, referred to above, agree with Bilhaṇa in representing Ayodhyā as the original seat of the family. But since these were almost contemporaneous with the poet, all the three represent only the tradition that was current in the eleventh century. The first prince who raised the family to distinction in the south was Jayasimha, the first prince.
sovereignty of the country. After him reigned Raṇarāga, who was a prince of great valour and had a stately and gigantic person. He was succeeded by his son Pulakesi, who performed a great Aśvamedha or horse-sacrifice and attended equally to the concerns of this world and the next. He made Vātāpipura, which has been identified with Bādāmi in the Kalāḍi district, his capital. He appears to have been the first great prince of the family; for, in all the subsequent grants the genealogy begins with him. His full title was Satyāśraya Śrī Pulakesi Vallabha Mahārāja. Of these words, Vallabha appears to be the title of all princes of this dynasty. In some cases, Vallabha had Prīthvī prefixed to it, so that the expression meant “the Lover or Husband of the Earth.” Satyāśraya or “the Support of Truth” was inherited by some of the later princes. Pulakesi’s son Kṛṭivarman succeeded to the throne after him. He subjugated a family of princes of the name of Nalas; but over what province it ruled we do not know. He also subdued the Mauryas, who, from a statement in an inscription at Aiholē² upon which this account is principally based, seem to have been chiefs of northern Konkan, and reduced also the Kadambas of Banavāśi in North Kānara.

Kṛṭivarman had three sons at least, who were all young when he died. His brother Maṅgalīśa therefore came to the throne after him. Maṅgalīśa vanquished the Kalachuris, a family of princes ruling over the country of Chedi, the capital of which was Tripura or Tēvur near Jabalpur. Buddha son of Śaṅkaragāna, whom he is represented in one grant³ to have conquered and put to flight must

---

² Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 247
have been a Kalachuri prince, as the name Śaṅhkaragaṇa frequently occurs in the genealogy of the dynasty. Maṅgalīśa is said to have carried his arms to both the eastern and the western seas. On the coast of the latter he conquered what is called Revatīdvipa, or the Island of Revati. A copper-plate grant by a governor of this island was found near Goa, from which it would appear that Revati was very probably the old name of Reḍī situated a few miles to the south of Vengurlem. In an inscription in a cave-temple at Bāḍāmi, it is stated that the temple was caused to be excavated by Maṅgalīśa. He there placed an idol of Vishṇu, and on the occasion of its consecration granted a village, out of the revenues of which a ceremony called Nārāyaṇabali was to be performed and sixteen Brāhmaṇs to be fed every day, and the residue to be devoted to the maintenance of recluses. This inscription is dated in the twelfth year of some reign when 500 years of the Śaka era had elapsed. The reign in the [50] twelfth year of which the cave-temple was consecrated is taken to be the reign of Maṅgalīśa. On this supposition Maṅgalīśa began to reign in 489 Śaka; but I have elsewhere brought forward what I consider to be very strong arguments to show that Maṅgalīśa could not have come to the throne so early as that, and the only criticism that I have seen on my observations seems to me to be very unsatisfactory and serves only to confirm my statement. The reign referred to, therefore, is that

---

5 Revati should, according to the usual rules, be corrupted to Revāṭi or Re-a-ḍī and then to Reḍī.
6 Ind. Ant., Vol. III., p. 305.
Section IX. of Kirtivarman, and if its twelfth year fell in 500 Śaka, Kirtivarman must have come to the throne in 489 Śaka corresponding to A.D. 567. In that inscription Maṅgaliṣa assigns all the good fruits of his charities to his brother in the presence of the gods Āditya and Agni and of the assembled crowd of men, and claims to himself only the fruit arising from serving his brother faithfully. In the copperplate grant of the governor of Revati, referred to above, Śaka 532 is mentioned as the twentieth year of the reign of a prince who, from the titles given there and from the fact that Maṅgaliṣa had about that period conquered the island, must have belonged to the Chālukya family. He could not have been Kirtivarman, for the island was not conquered in his time, neither could he be the successor of Maṅgaliṣa who, as I shall presently state, got possession of the throne in 533 Śaka. He must therefore have been Maṅgaliṣa himself, and if Śaka 532 was the twentieth year of his reign, he must have begun to reign in 513 Śaka.9 Kirtivarman

9 See also the arguments used by me in the paper referred to above. In a recently published article Dr. Fleet places the accession of Maṅgaliṣa in 521 Śaka current, being led to it by the occurrence in an inscription of that prince of the words राज्य पञ्चब्री कावः प्रसंवामे सिद्धार्थ. I have carefully examined the facsimile of the inscription given in the article; and am satisfied that this is by no means the correct reading. राज्य and प्रसंवामे are the only words that are certain and perhaps the word शी also. But पञ्चम is highly doubtful; the letter which Dr. Fleet reads श is exactly like that which he reads च; and there is some vacant space after च and श in which something like another letter appears. Similarly the श of सिद्धार्थ is hardly visible as an independent letter, and the next two letters are also doubtful. Besides in no other inscription of the early Chālukyas does the cyclic year appear. (See Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX., p. 9 and ff.)
thus reigned from 489 Śaka or A.D. 567 to 513 Śaka or A.D. 591, that is, for twenty-four years.

In the latter years of his reign Maṅgaliśa seems to have been engaged in intrigues to keep his brother’s son Pulakesī off from the succession and to place his own son on the throne. But Pulakesī, who had grown to be a prince of remarkable abilities, baffled all his intrigues, and by the use of energy and counsel he neutralized all the advantage that Maṅgaliśa had by the actual possession of power, and in the attempt to secure the throne for his son, Maṅgaliśa lost his own life and his kingdom.

Pulakesī, the son of Kṛṣṇavarman, succeeded. Pulakesī II. His full title was Satyāśraya Śrī Pṛthvī-Vallabha Mahārāja. From a copper-plate grant executed in the third year of his reign and in 535 Śaka, he appears to have come to the throne in 533 Śaka or A.D. 611. After Maṅgaliśa’s death, the enemies whom his valour had kept in subjection rose on all sides. A prince of the name of Appāyika and another named Govinda who very probably belonged to the Rāṣṭrakūta race, since that name occurs frequently in the genealogy of that family, attacked the new Chālukya king. The former, who had horses from the northern seas in his army, fled away in fear when opposed by the powerful forces of Pulakesī, and the latter surrendered to him and becoming his ally was received into favour and rewarded. He then turned his arms against the Kadambas, attacked Banavāsi, their capital, and reduced it. The prince of the Gaṅga family which

10 *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 73.
11 *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VIII., p. 242, line 8 of the inscription. From the words cha, ekena and aparena it is clear that two persons are here meant. But Dr. Fleet in his translation makes both of them one, which is a mistake; and the translation, I must say, is unintelligible.
ruled over the Chera\textsuperscript{12} country situated about the modern province of Mulsur, and the head of the Alupa\textsuperscript{13} race which probably held the province of Malabar, became his allies. He then sent his forces against the Mauryas of the Konkan, who were vanquished without any difficulty. With a fleet of hundreds of ships he attacked Puri,\textsuperscript{14} which was the mistress of the western sea, and reduced it. The kings of Lāṭa, Mālava, and Gūrjara were conquered and became his dependents. About this time, there was a powerful monarch in Northern India whose name was Harshavardhana. He was king of Kanōj, but in the course of time made himself the paramount sovereign of the north. He then endeavoured to extend his power to the south of the Narmada, but was opposed by Pulakesi, who killed many of his elephants and defeated his army. Thenceforward, Pulakesi received or assumed the title of Parameśvara or lord paramount. This achievement was by the later kings of the dynasty considered the most important, and that alone is mentioned in their copper-plate grants in the description of Pulakesi II. Pulakesi appears to have kept a strong force on the banks of the Narmada to guard the frontiers. Thus, by his policy as well as valour, he became the supreme lord of the three countries called Mahārāṣṭrakas containing ninety-nine thousand villages. The kings of Kosala and


\textsuperscript{13} The name of the royal family seems to be preserved in the name of the modern town of Alupai on the Malabar Coast.

\textsuperscript{14} The town is called the Lakshimi of the Western Ocean. It was probably the capital of the Maurya king of the Konkan and afterwards of the Śilāhāras.
Kaliṅga\textsuperscript{15} trembled at his approach and surrendered to him. After some time he marched with a large army against the king of Kāṇchiḷpurā or Conjeeveram and laid siege to the town. He then crossed the Kāverī and invaded the country of the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, and the Keralas. But these appear to have become his allies. After having in this manner established his supremacy throughout the south, he entered his capital and reigned in peace. The date of the inscription from which the greater \[52\] portion of this narrative is taken is 556 Śaka, corresponding to A.D. 634, so that Pulakeśi’s career of conquest had closed before A.D. 634.

It was in the reign of this king that Hwan Thsang, the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim, visited India. In the course of his travels through the country he visited Mahārāṣṭra, which he calls Mo-ho-la-cha. He saw Pulakeśi, whom he thus describes: “He is of the race of Tsa-la-li (Kshatriyas); his name is Pu-lo-ki-she; his ideas are large and profound and he extends widely his sympathy and benefactions. His subjects serve him with perfect self-devotion.”\textsuperscript{16}

About Pulakeśi’s having withstood the power of Harshavardhana which we have before mentioned on the authority of inscriptions, Hwan Thsang speaks in these words: “At present the great king Śīlāditya (Harshavardhana) carries his victorious arms from the east to the west; he subdues distant peoples and makes the neighbouring nations fear him; but the people of this kingdom alone have not submitted. Although he be often at the head of all the troops of the five Indies, though he has summoned the bravest generals of all the kingdoms,

\textsuperscript{15} For the position of these countries, see Sec. III. para. 2.

\textsuperscript{16} ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 290.
and though he has marched himself to punish them, he has not yet been able to vanquish their opposition. From this we may judge of their warlike habits and manners." The Chinese traveller visited Mahârâshṭra about the year A.D. 639, that is, five years after the inscription referred to above was incised. The kingdom, according to him, was six thousand li (1200 miles) in circuit and the capital was thirty li, and towards the west was situated near a large river. The soil, climate, and the character and general condition of the people of Mahârâshṭra are thus described by him: "The soil is rich and fertile and produces abundance of grain. The climate is warm. The manners are simple and honest. The natives are tall and haughty and supercilious in character. Whoever does them a service may count on their gratitude, but he that offends them will not escape their revenge. If any one insult them they will risk their lives to wipe out that affront. If one apply to them in difficulty they will forget to care for themselves in order to flee to his assistance. When they have an injury to avenge they never fail to give warning to their enemy; after which each puts on his cuirass and grasps his spear in his hand. In battle they pursue the fugitives but do not slay those who give themselves up. When a general has lost a battle, instead of punishing him corporally, they make him wear women's clothes, and by that force him to sacrifice his own life. The state maintains a body of dauntless champions to the number of several hundreds. Each time they prepare for combat they drink wine to intoxicate them, and then one of these men, spear in hand, will defy ten thousand enemies. If they kill a man met upon the road the law does not punish them. When-

17 Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 291
ever the army commences a campaign these braves
march in the van to the sound of the drum. Besides,
they intoxicate many hundreds of naturally fierce
elephants. At the time of their coming to [53] blows they drink also strong liquor. They
run in a body trampling everything under their feet.
No enemy can stand before them. The king, proud
of possessing these men and elephants, despises and
slights the neighbouring kingdoms.”

Pulakesi II. appears undoubtedly to have been
the greatest prince of this dynasty; and his fame
reached even foreign countries. He is represented
in an Arabic work to have sent an embassy to
Chosroes II., king of Persia, who reigned from A.D.
591 to A.D. 628, in the thirty-sixth year of that
prince’s reign, and must have received one from
him, either before or after. 18 During his reign the
power of the Châlukyas was established over a very
large extent of country. His younger brother Vishnu-
vardhana, otherwise called Vishamasiddhi,
seems to have for some time been appointed to rule
over the Sâtârâ and Paṇḍharapur districts, since a
copper-plate inscription of his found at Sâtârâ
records the grant of a village situated on the
southern bank of the Bhîmâ. 19 Vishnuvardhana
afterwards obtained the province of Veṅgi between
the lower Kṛishnâ and the Godâvari, where he
founded another flourishing branch of the Châlukya
dynasty. Pulakesi’s second brother Jayasimhas must Jayasimha,
have been his brother’s viceroy in the district about
Nâsik. For, in a copper-plate grant found in the
Ikatpuri tâluka of the district, Nâgavardhana, the
son of Jayasimha, assigns the village of Balegrâma,
which has been identified with the modern Belgâm
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Tarhâjâ about twelve miles to the north-east of Igatpuri, for the worship of the god Kâpâlikeśvara. The district in which the village was situated is in the grant called Goparâshṭra. Similarly, Pulakesî’s eldest son Chandrâditya ruled over the province which contained the Sâvantvâdî district. In a copper-plate grant, Vijayabhaṭṭârikâ, the queen of Chandrâditya, who is styled Prithivivallabha and Mahârâja or great king, assigns to certain Brâhmaṇs a field along with the adjoining Khaijana (modern Khâjaṇâ) or marshy land in the village of Kochareni situated on the coast about seven miles to the north of Veṅgurlem. In another grant found at Nerur, she assigns a field in the fifth year of svârâjya or “one’s own reign.” Now the reign referred to by this expression must be her husband’s, so spoken of to distinguish it from that of his brother Vikramâditya, the second son of Pulakesî, who succeeded his father at the chief seat of government. Chandrâditya was a king, as the titles above given show, and it is proper that his crowned queen should speak of his reign as svârâjya or her reign. It is not necessary that charities such as those recorded in these grants should, like political offices or rights, be conferred by the reigning prince alone. The religious merit arising from them is sought [54] by women as much as by men; and hence a woman like Vijayabhaṭṭârikâ might, during the lifetime of her husband, give a field. The fact of her doing so does not necessitate the supposition that she was a ruler or a regent when she made these grants, as has been thought. She was simply the crowned

20 Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. II., p. 4, first translated by Bâla Śâstri and then by me (Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XIV.), and last of all by Dr. Fleet (Ind. Ant., Vol. IX., p. 123).
queen of a reigning monarch at that time. Another son of Pulakesi named Adityavarman seems to have ruled over the district near the confluence of the Krishnâ and the Tuṅgabhadrâ, as a copper-plate grant of his issued in the first year of his reign was found in the Karnul District. An undated grant of Pulakesi found at Chiplun in Southern Konkan has recently been published. In it he sanctions the grant of the village of Amravâtaka made by his maternal uncle Srivallabha Senânandarâja "the ornament" of the Sendraka race. This appears to be a family of minor chiefs with whom the Châlukyas were connected. A similar grant was made by the next king at the request of the Sendraka chief Devasakti. Inscriptions of Sendrakas are found in Gujarât also, where probably they went when the power of the Châlukyas was established in that province. The name Sendraka is probably preserved in the modern Marâthâ name Sinde.

Pulakesi was succeeded by his second son Vikramâditya. In the grants he is called Pulakesi’s priyatanâya or favourite son; so that it appears that Pulakesi had arranged that Vikramâditya should succeed him at the principal seat of government, and had assigned an outlying province to his eldest son Chandrâditya. At the beginning of this reign as of the previous ones there was a disturbance; but it did not come from the princes or chiefs more to the north who seem to have now been permanently humbled, but from the far south. The Pallava king of Kânchi or Conjeveram and the rulers of the

---

Section X.

Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, and the Keralas threw off the yoke which Pulakesi had but loosely placed over them, and rebelled. Vikramāditya, who was a man of abilities and daring adventure, broke the power of the Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, and Keralas. He defeated the Pallava king, captured his capital Kâñcchi, and compelled him, who had never before humbled himself before anybody, to do him homage. On the back of his horse Chitrakaṇṭha and sword in hand he is said to have repelled all the enemies that attacked him. In this manner he acquired again the whole of the dominions ruled over by his father, and became the paramount sovereign of the country "between the three seas." 24

During the reign of Vikramāditya I. a branch of the Châlukya dynasty was founded in southern Gujarât or the country called Lâṭa in ancient times. Vikramāditya seems to have assigned that province to a younger brother named Jayasimhavarman Dharâśraya, [55] who thus was another son of Pulakesi II. 25 Śryâśraya Śilâditya son of Jayasimha made a grant of land while residing at Navasârî in the year 421, 26 and another in 443 while encamped at Kusumâśvara with his victorious army. 27 In both of these Śryâśraya is called Yuvarâja or prince-regent and not a king. Another son of Jayasimha named Vinayâditya Yuddhamalla Jayâśraya Maṅgalarâja issued a similar charter in the Saka year 653. 28 Pulakesi, who represents himself as the

26 Ibid. pp. 2 & 3.
27 Transactions VII. Or. Congr., p. 226.
younger brother of Jayāśraya Maṅgalarasarāja and as meditating on his feet, granted a village in the year 490. Both are styled kings. From all this it appears that Jayasiṁhavarman though made sovereign of southern Gujarāt did not rule over the province himself but made his son Śrīyāśraya his regent. He held that position for more than twenty-two years; and does not appear to have become king in his own right, as he is not mentioned in Pulakesī’s grant. Pulakesī, however, seems from his date to be his younger brother. Śrīyāśraya died before his father; Jayāśraya succeeded the latter as king and he was succeeded by Pulakesī. The dates 421, 443, and 490, the era of which is not given, would if referred to the Gupta era be equivalent to 739, 761, and 808 of the Christian era respectively; while Jayāśraya’s 653 Śaka is 731 A.D. But Vinayāditya the sovereign of the main branch who is mentioned in the grant of 443 died about 697 A.D.; and Jayasiṁha whose Yuvarāja was Śrīyāśraya will have to be supposed to have lived to 761 A.D. i.e., 81 years after the death of his brother Vikramāditya; while the interval between Pulakesī and his immediate predecessor Jayāśraya will become 77 years, as Śaka 653 of the latter corresponds to 731 A.D. The Gupta era will, therefore, not do; and we must with the late Paṇḍit Bhagvānlāl refer the dates to the Traikūtaka era of the use of which we have at least two instances. Thus Śrīyāśraya’s dates will be 670 and 692 A.D., of Jayāśraya 731 A.D. and of Pulakesī 739 A.D., and there will be no incongruity. But the original dates themselves 421 and 490 show the distance of time between Śrīyāśraya and Pulakesī to be 69 years; and if we take the later
date of the former it will be reduced to 47 years. Even this is too much and the only way to account for it is by supposing that the two youngest sons of Jayasimha Dharāśraya were born of a young wife married when he was advanced in years. In Pulakeśi's grant it is stated that he vanquished an army of Tājikas which had destroyed the Saindhava,\textsuperscript{31} Kachchhella,\textsuperscript{32} Saurāshṭra, Chāvoṭaka,\textsuperscript{33} Maurya,\textsuperscript{34} Gurjara\textsuperscript{35} and other kings, and on its way to Dakshināpatha to conquer the southern kings had come to Navasārī to reduce that country first. Thereupon Valla [56] bhanarendra, who must have been Vijayāditya or Vikramāditya II. the reigning sovereign of the main branch, conferred upon him the titles of "Pillar of Dakshināpatha" (Dakshināpathasādhāra), "Ornament of the family of Chaluka" (Chalukakulālaṃkāra), "Beloved of the earth" (Prithivīvallabha), the "Repeller of the unpellelable" (Anivartakaniṃvartayitri) and "Support of men in the world" (Avanijanāśraya). As "Tājika" is a name applied to Arabs, from which the name "Tajika" of a branch of astrology borrowed in the first instance from the Arabs is derived, the allusion in this grant is to an Arab invasion. And we have a mention of such invasions between the years 711 A.D. and 750 A.D. by Mahammad Kasim and his successors.\textsuperscript{36} Navasārī was the capital of the Chālukyas of Lāṭa or southern Gujarāt.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} King of Sindh.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Very likely king of Kachchha.
\item \textsuperscript{33} King of Anahilpattan of the Chāpotkaṭa race.
\item \textsuperscript{34} King of the Maurya race; probably ruled over some part of the Konkan and the coast of southern Gujarāt.
\item \textsuperscript{35} King of the Gurjara race; ruled over the Broach District.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Elphinstone's Hist. of India.
\end{itemize}
THE DEKKAN

A copper-plate grant of the Gujarât Châlukyas found at Kherâ and translated by Prof. Dowson contains the names of three princes, viz., Jayasimharâja, Buddhavarmarâja, and Vijayarâja. Scholars and antiquarians have understood the first of these to be the same as Jayasimha the founder of the Châlukya dynasty of the Dekkan. But I think the prince meant is Jayasimhhavarman, the brother of Vikramâditya I. and founder of the Gujarât branch of the dynasty; for nothing has hitherto been discovered connecting the early Châlukya princes with Gujarât. The grant, however, appears to me to be a forgery. The Buddhavarman mentioned in it, if he existed at all, must have been another son of Jayasimha-varman, besides the two spoken of above, and he and his son Vijayarâja must have ruled over another part of Gujarât. If the grant is to be regarded as genuine, the date 394 will have to be referred to the Gupta era.

After Vikramâditya I, his son Vinayâditya came to the throne. One of his grants is dated Śaka 611, which was the tenth year of his reign, another in 613 Śaka and in the eleventh year, and a third in 616 Śaka and the fourteenth year. There is also an inscription of his on a stone tablet, the date occurr-

38 My reasons are these:—(1) Its style is unlike that of the Châlukya grants. (2) It does not contain the usual invocation to the Boar incarnation. (3) It simply gives the three regulation names, i.e., so many as are prescribed, in the legal treatises. (4) There is a uniform mode of naming the three princes, by adding the suffix râja, a mode not to be met with in the genuine Châlukya grants. (5) None of the three princes has a title or Biruda as all Châlukya princes from Pulakeśi I. downwards had.
39 Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 86.
40 Ibid., pp. 89, 92.
ing in which is 608 Śaka and the seventh year of his reign. From these it appears that Vinayāditya came to the throne in 602 Śaka corresponding to A.D. 680, in which year his father Vikramāditya must have ceased to reign. His latest is A.D. 694, but his reign terminated in A.D. 696 as is seen from his son’s grants referred to below. During his father’s lifetime, Vinayāditya assisted him in his wars with the southern kings and won his love by destroying the forces of the Pallava king and of the other three, i.e., Chola, Pāṇḍya, and Kerala, and tranquillizing the country. Between the eleventh and fourteenth years of his reign (A.D. 692—A.D. 695) he succeeded in making the Pallavas, [57] Kajambhiras, Keralas, Haihayas, Vilas, Mālavas, Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, and others as steadfast allies of the Chālukya crown as the Gaṅga family of Chera and the Alupas whose loyalty was for the first time secured by Pulakeśi II. The kings of Kāvera, or Kerala as it is read in some of the grants, of the Pārasikas, who were probably the Syrians settled on the coast of Malabar, and of Siṃhala were made tributaries. He also seems, like his grandfather, to have fought with and defeated some paramount sovereign of Northern India whose name is not given, and to have acquired all the insignia of paramountcy, such as a certain standard called Pālidhvaja, the drum called Dhakkā, and others. These events must have taken place after 616 Śaka, since they are not mentioned in his grant of that year, but in those of his successors.

41 Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 112.
42 This fact is not mentioned in the grant of the eleventh year of his reign (Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 89), while it does occur in that of the fourteenth year (p. 92) and in those of his successors.
chief of the name of Mahārāja Pogilli of the Sendraka family was a feudatory of his in the south about Maisur. 44

Vinayāditya was succeeded by his son Vijayāditya. He appears to have assisted his grandfather in his campaigns against the southern kings and his father in the expedition into the north. At one time he was captured by his enemies, though they had been defeated and were retreating. Notwithstanding he was in their custody he succeeded in averting anarchy and disturbance in his own country, and when he got off, established his power everywhere and bore all the insignia of supreme sovereignty. There is an inscription at Bādāmi in which it is stated that during his reign, idols of Brahmā, Vishnu, and Maheśvara were put up at Vatāpipura in Śaka 621 and the third year of his reign. One of his grants was issued in Śaka 622 on the full-moon day of Āśhaḍha and in the fourth year of his reign, another in Śaka 627 and in the tenth year, and a third in Śaka 651 on the full-moon day of Phālguṇa and in the thirty-fourth year of his reign. 45 On a comparison of all these dates it follows that his reign began in 618 Śaka after the full-moon day of Āśhaḍha corresponding to A.D. 696. The first two of these grants, and another which bears no date, were found at Nerur in the Sāvantvāḍī state. 46 Vijayāditya had a long reign of thirty-six years.

After Vijayāditya, his son Vikramāditya II. ascended the throne. A grant of his, engraved on a stone tablet, is dated in 656 Śaka and in the second

year of his reign, wherefore he must have come to the throne in 655 Šaka or A.D. 733. Soon after his coronation he had to turn his arms against his hereditary enemy the Pallava king. The name of the prince who reigned at the Pallava capital at this time was Nandipotavarman. Vikramāditya marched against him in haste and encountered him in the Tudāka country. Nandipotavarman was defeated and had to fly away from the battle-field. [58] The Chālukya king got a good deal of spoil in the shape of large quantities of rubies, elephants, and instruments of martial music. He then entered the city of Kānci, but did not destroy it. In that city he gave a good deal of money to Brāhmaṇs and to the poor and helpless, and restored to the temples of Rājasimhaśvara and other gods the gold which, it appears, had been taken away by some previous king. He then fought with the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Keralas, and the Kaḷabhras, and reduced them. Vikramāditya married two sisters belonging to the family of the Haihayas. The elder of these was called Lokamahādevī and she built a temple of Śiva under the name of Lokesvara, at Paṭṭādaḍal in the Kalāḏgi district. The younger’s name was Trailokyamahādevī, and she built another in the vicinity dedicated to the same god under the name of Trailokyasvara. The latter was the mother of Kirtivarman the next king. Vikramāditya reigned for fourteen years.

His son Kirtivarman II. began to reign in 669 Šaka or A.D. 747, since a grant of his, made in the

eleventh year of his reign, bears the date 679 Śaka.\footnote{Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 27.} He assisted his father in his wars with the Pallavas. On one occasion he marched against the Pallava king with his father’s permission. The ruler of Kāṇchi, too weak to face him in the battle-field, took refuge in a fortress. His power was broken by the Chālukya king, who returned to his country with a large spoil. During the reign of this prince the Chālukyas were deprived of their power in Mahārāṣṭra, and the sovereignty of the country passed from their hands into those of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princes. The main branch of the dynasty became extinct; but it had several minor offshoots, and one of these in the person of Tailapa succeeded in the course of time in regaining supreme power. From this time forward, therefore, we do not meet with any copper-plate grants issued by the Chālukyas; but Rāṣṭrakūṭa plates belonging to this intervening period are met with from Rādhanpur in Northern Gujarāt to Sāmangaḍ near Kolhāpur and Nāgpur in the Central Provinces. The grant of Kirtivarman II., from which the above account of that prince is taken, does not allude to the fact of his disgrace, but he must have lost possession of the greater portion of his kingdom before Śaka 679, the date of the grant. The name of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa monarch who first humbled the Chālukyas was Dantidurga, and the work begun by him was completed by his successor Kṛishṇa. In a copper-plate grant of the former found at Sāmangaḍ he is spoken of as having become paramount sovereign after having vanquished Vallabha.\footnote{Journ. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. II., p. 375.} The date occurring in the grant is 675 Śaka. Before that time, therefore, the Chālukyas must have lost
their hold over Mahārāṣṭra. In the Yevur tablet and the Miraj plates the Chālukyas are spoken of as having lost sovereign power in the reign of Kirtivarman II. We will therefore here close our account of the early Chālukyas.

[59] During the period occupied by the reigns of these early Chālukya princes, the Jaina religion comes into prominence. Raviṅkṛtī, the Jaina who composed the Aiḥole inscription and represents himself as a poet, was patronized by Pulakesī II. Vijayāditya gave a village for the maintenance of a Jaina temple to Udayadevapaṇḍita or Niravadyapaṇḍita, the house pupil of Śrīpūjyapāda, who belonged to the Devagaṇa sect of the Mūlasaṃgha, i.e. of the Digambara Jainas. Niravadyapaṇḍita is spoken of as a spiritual adviser of Vijayāditya’s father, i.e. Vinayāditya. Vikramāditya II. repaired a Jaina temple and gave a grant in connection with it to a learned Jaina of the name of Vijayapaṇḍita, who is represented to have silenced his opponents in argument and is styled the only disputant. But Jainism in those days, as at present, probably flourished in the Southern Marāṭhā Country only. If the Pūjyapāda who was the preceptor of Niravadyapaṇḍita was the famous grammarian of that name, he must have flourished some time before 618 Śaka, the date of Vinayāditya’s death, i.e. about 600 Śaka or 678 A.D. All that is known about Pūjyapāda and his relations to other Digambara writers is not inconsistent with this date. But another date two hundred years earlier has also been assigned to Pūjyapāda.

No inscription has yet come to light showing any close relations between the Buddhists and the

52 Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 112.
53 Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., p. 197.
Chāluṣ̱y̪a princes. But that the religion did prevail, and that there were many Buddhist temples and monasteries, is shown by the account given by Hwann Thsang. Still there is little question that it was in a condition of decline. With the decline of Buddhism came the revival of Brāhmaṇaism and especially of the sacrificial religion. The prevalence of the religion of Buddha had brought sacrifices into discredit; but we now see them rising into importance. Pulakesi I. is mentioned in all the inscriptions in which his name occurs as having performed a great many sacrifices and even the Aśvamedha. I have elsewhere remarked that the names of most of the famous Brāhmaṇical writers on sacrificial rites have the title of Svāmin attached to them; and that it was in use at a certain period, and was given only to those conversant with the sacrificial lore. The period of the early Chāluṣ̱yas appears to be that period. Amongst the Brāhmaṇ grantees of these princes we have Nandīsvāmin, Lohasvāmin, and Bhallasvāmin; Dāsasvāmin the son of Jannasvāmin and grandson of Revāsvāmin-Dīkṣita; Devasvāmin, Karkasvāmin, Vajñasvāmin, Nāgammasvāmin, another Devasvāmin, Gargasvāmin, Rudrasvāmin, Prabhākarasvāmin, Keśavasvāmin, &c. There are others whose names have not this title attached to them. Among these names there are three borne by the great commentators on sacrificial sūtras and rites, viz. Karkasvāmin, Devasvāmin, and Keśavasvāmin. [60] Though it would be hazardous to assume that these writers were

54 Report on MSS. for 1884, pp. 31, 32.
55 Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 77.
56 Ind. Ant., Vol. IX., 128.
57 Ind. Ant., Vol. IX., p. 131.
Section X. exactly the persons who are mentioned in the grants
with those names, still it admits of no reasonable
doubt that they are to be referred to the period when
the Châlukyas reigned in Mahârâshtra; and probably
flourished in the Dekkan or the Telugu and Kanaresé
countries. For the revival of Brahmañism was
carried on vigorously in the Southern India. The
ritual of the sacrifices must during the previous
centuries have become confused, and it was the great
object of these writers to settle it by the interpreta-
tion of the works of the old Rishis.

And the Purânic side of Brahmañism also
received a great development during this period.
Temples in honour of the Purânic triad, Brahmâ,
Vishñu, and Maheśvara with a variety of names
were constructed in many places. The worship of
Siva in his terrific form seems also to have prevailed,
as the Nâsik grant of Nâgavardhana assigning a
certain village to the worship of Kâpâlikeśvara, or
the god wearing a garland of skulls, would show.
Cave architecture came to be used for the purposes
of the Purânic religion about the time of the early
princes of the dynasty, as we see from the cave-
temple at Bâdâmî dedicated to the worship of Vishñu
by Maṅgalîśâ. The Châlukyas, like their prede-
cessors in previous times, were tolerant towards all
religions.
[61] Genealogy of the early Châlukyas.

1. JAYASIMHA.

2. RANARAGA.

3. PULAKEŞI I.—Satyâśraya Śrî Pulakeśi Vallabha.

4. KÎRTIVARMAN I., Śaka 489—513 or A.D. 567—591.

5. MANGALIŚA, Śaka 513—532 or A.D. 591—610.

6. PULAKEŞI II.—Satyâśraya Śrî Prithvi-valabha, began to reign in Śaka 532 or A.D. 610, was on the throne in Śaka 556 or A.D. 634, and seen by Hwan Thsang in A.D. 639.

Vishnuvardhana, founded the eastern Châlukya dynasty.

Nâgavar-dhana.


8. VINAYÂDIṬYA, Śaka 602—619 or A.D. 680—697.

9. VIJAYÂDIṬYA, Śaka 618—655 or A.D. 696—733.

10. VIKRAMĂDIṬYA II., Śaka 655—669 or A.D. 733—747.

II. KÎRTIVARMAN II., Śaka 660 or A.D. 747, deprived of supreme sovereignty by Dantidurga before Śaka 675 or A.D. 753.
[62] SECTION XI.

THE RĀSHṬRAKŪTAS.

The Rāśṭrakūtas are represented to have belonged to the race of Vādū.¹ According to the Wardhā plates they were members of the Sātyaki branch of the race; and were the direct descendants of a prince of the name of Raṭṭa. He had a son of the name of Rāshṭrakūṭa after whom the family was so called. These are clearly imaginary persons; and as remarked before, the Rāshṭrakūṭa family was in all likelihood the main branch of the race of Kshatriyas named Raṭṭhas who gave their name to the country of Mahārāṣṭra, and were found in it even in the times of Aśoka the Maurya. The Rāshṭrakūtas were the real native rulers of the country and were sometimes eclipsed by enterprising princes of foreign origin, such as the Sātavāhanas and the Chālukyas who established themselves in the Dekkan and exercised supreme sovereignty, but were never extirpated. The earliest prince of the dynasty mentioned in the grants hitherto discovered is Govinda I. But in an inscription in the rock-cut temple of the Daśāvatāras at Elurā the names of two earlier ones, Dantivarman and Indrarāja, occur.² The latter was Govinda’s father and the former his grandfather. Govinda I. was probably the prince of that name who in Raviṅkirti’s inscription at Aihole is spoken of as having attacked the Chālukya king Pulakesī II. and to have afterwards become his ally.

² Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10, pp. 92—96.
Govinda was succeeded by his son Karka, during whose reign the Brâhmaṇs performed many sacrifices and who seems to have patronized the old Vedic religion. After him his son Indrarâja came to the throne. Indrarâja married a girl who belonged to the Châlukya family, though on her mother's side she was connected with the lunar race, probably that of the Râshtrakûtas themselves. From this union sprang Dantidurga, who became king after his father. With a handful of soldiers Dantidurga defeated the army of Kârṇâta, which hitherto had achieved very great glory by vanquishing the forces of the kings of Kâñchî, the Keralas, Cholas, and Pâñḍyas, and of Śrîharsha, the lord paramount of Northern India, and Vajraṭa; and thus conquered Vallabha or the last Châlukya king Kârtivarman II. with ease. He thus acquired paramount sovereignty in the south. He also subdued the kings of Kâñchî, Kaliṅga, Kosala, Śrî-Śaila, Mâlava, Lâṭ, and [63] Ṭaṅka. At Ujjayint he gave large quantities of gold and jewels in charity. A grant of Dantidurga found at Sâmangaḍ in the Kolhâpur district bears the date 675 of the Śaka era, corresponding to A.D. 753.

Dantidurga died childless according to a grant found at Karlā, and his paternal uncle Kârṇârâja succeeded to the throne. Another grant found at

---

3 The army of Kârṇâta was thus the army of the Châlukyas.
4 Sâmangaḍ grant, p. 375, Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. II.
5 This must have been the country about Śrî-Śaila which contains the celebrated shrine of Mallikârjuna and which is situated on the lower Kûṣâna in the Karnul district, Madras Presidency.
6 Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10. loc. cit.
7 Referred to above.
8 Jour. R. A. S., Vol. III.
Baroda\(^9\) omits the name of Dantidurga, since the object of the writer was simply to give the pedigree of the reigning monarch, with reference to whom Dantidurga was but a collateral, and not to give the names of all the previous kings. In that grant Krīshṇarāja is spoken of as having “rooted out” a prince belonging to the same family with himself who had taken to evil ways and to have himself assumed the task of governing for the “benefit of his race.” The prince dethroned or destroyed by Krīshṇarāja could not have been Dantidurga, as has been supposed by some writers, since he was a powerful monarch who for the first time acquired supreme sovereignty for his family. In a grant found at Kāvī, and another found in the Navasārī district, Krīshṇa is represented to have succeeded to the throne after Dantidurga’s death.\(^10\) The prince whom he set aside, therefore, must either have been a son of Dantidurga or some other person with a better claim to the throne than himself. The statement of the Kādra plate that Dantidurga died childless may be discredited as being made two hundred years after the occurrence.

Krīshṇarāja, otherwise called Śubhatuṅga and also Akālavarsa, carried on the work of Dantidurga and reduced the Chālukyas to complete subjection. In two of the grants\(^11\) he is spoken of “as having with the aid of gods in the form of his counsellors or followers churned the ocean of the Chālukya race which had been resorted to by mountains in the


shape of kings afraid of their wings or power being destroyed—an ocean that was inaccessible to others, —and drawn out from it the Lakshmi of paramount sovereignty. He is said to have defeated Rāhappa who was proud of his own power and prowess, and afterwards assumed the ensigns of supreme sovereignty. Who this person was we have not the means of determining. In the Wardhā plates he is represented to have constructed many temples of Śiva, [64] which resembled the Kailāsa mountain. In the Baroda grant it is stated that Kṛishṇarāja “caused to be constructed a temple of wonderful form on the mountain at Elāpura. When the gods moving in their aerial cars saw it they were struck with wonder and constantly thought much over the matter saying to themselves, ‘This temple of Śiva is self-existent; for such beauty is not to be found in a work of art.’ Even the architect who constructed it was struck with wonder, saying when his heart misgave him as regards making another similar attempt, ‘Wonderful! I do not know how it was that I could construct it.’ King Kṛishṇa with his own hands again decorated Sambhū (Śiva) placed in that temple, by means of gold, rubies,

12 The legend is that in early times mountains had wings, and as they did considerable mischief by their use, Indra set about cutting them. The mountains thereupon took refuge in the sea. The story originated from the double sense which the word parvata bears in the Vedas. It denotes "a mountain" and "a cloud" also. Indra was the god who prevented the clouds from flying from place to place, and compelled them to discharge their freight on the earth for the benefit of his human worshippers.

13 Vishṇu churned the ocean with the aid of the gods and drew out Lakshmi from it, whom he married.


15 Loc. cit.
and other precious jewels, though he had already been decorated by the wonderful artificial ornaments of the stream of the Gaṅgā, the moon, and the deadly poison.” The ending pura in the names of towns, when it undergoes a change at all, is invariably changed to ur, as in Sihur for Sinhapura, Indur for Indrapura, Sirur for Sripura, &c. The Elāpura of the inscription, therefore, is Elur; and the temple described in the grant in such terms must be one of those excavated on the hills at the place, perhaps the temple of Kailāsa itself. Thus it appears that it was Kṛishṇarāja that caused the Kailāsa to be constructed, and the date assigned to

16 Dr. Bühler in his paper in Vol. VI., Ind. Ant., simply states that the “grant (Baroda) connects him (Kṛishṇarāja) with the hill at Eliapur, where he seems to have built a fort and a splendid temple of Śiva.” He has not identified Eliapura and did not perceive the important significance of this and the next two stanzas. He, however, suspected that one of the verses was badly deciphered. That this and the following verses are somewhat badly deciphered there is no doubt; but the translation in the Bengal Asiatic Society’s Journal is far worse and Dr. Bühler was misled by it. Dr. Fleet has published a revised translation (Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 162), but as regards this passage it certainly is no improvement on the first. He also once spoke of “a hill fort” (Ind. Ant., Vol. XI., p. 124), and now thinks Eliapura is in the passage meant to be represented as Kṛishṇarāja’s “encampments.” He identifies Eliapura with Yellapur in the North Kānārā districts. But the manner in which the temple is described according to my translation and also the obvious derivation of Elur from Eliapura, and Elurā from Eliapuraka, leave little doubt that a rock-cut temple at Elurā is meant to be spoken of; and actually the existence of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscription in one of the temples confirms my conclusion. That my translation is correct and appropriate, I have shown in an article published in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII., p. 228, where the reader will find the point fully discussed.
it by Drs. Fergusson and Burgess simply on architectural grounds is verified. Kṛishṇarāja must have reigned in the last quarter of the seventh century of the Śaka era, i.e., between 753 and 775 A.D.

Kṛishṇarāja was succeeded by his son Govinda Ii. Nothing particular is recorded of him in the grants, except, of course, the general praise which is accorded to every prince, however weak and inglorious. It however appears from the Vaṇi-Diṇḍori and Rādhanpur grants that he was superseded by his younger brother [65] Dhruva, and the grants endeavour to palliate his crime in having thus usurped the throne. The Wardhā grant states that he gave himself up to sensual pleasures, and left the cares of the kingdom to his younger brother Nirupama; and thus allowed the sovereignty to drop away from his hands. But subsequently he seems from the Paṭhan grant to have endeavoured to regain his power with the assistance of the neighbouring princes, when Dhruva vanquished him in a battle and formally assumed the insignia of supreme sovereignty. At the end of a Purāṇa entitled Harivaṁśa of the Digambara Jinas, it is stated that the work was composed by Jinasena in the Śaka year 705 while Vallabha the son of Kṛishṇa was ruling over the south. Govinda II. is in the Kāvi and Paṭhan grants called Vallabha, while one of the names of Dhruva, the second son of Kṛishṇa I., was Kalivallabha. Govinda II., therefore, must be the

17 The name of this prince is omitted in the Vaṇi-Diṇḍori and Rādhanpur grants, for the same reason apparently as that for which Dantidurga’s is omitted in the Baroda grant; but he is alluded to when they state that Dhruva or Nirupama set aside his elder brother.

prince alluded to, and he appears thus to have been on the throne in the Saka year 705, or A.D. 783.\textsuperscript{19}

Dhruva was an able and warlike prince. His other names were Nirupama or the "Matchless," Kalivallabha, and Dhārāvarsha. He humbled the Pallava king of Kāṇchi and obtained from him a tribute of elephants. He detained in custody the prince of the Gaṅgā family, which ruled over the Chera country. He also carried his arms into the north against the king of the Vatsas, whose capital must have been Kauṇāmbī the modern Kosam near Allahabad, and who had grown haughty by his conquest of a king of the Gauda country. He drove the Vatsa prince into the impassable desert of Mārvāḍ and carried away the two state umbrellas which he had won from the Gauda king.\textsuperscript{20} The Jaina Harivamsa represents a Vatsa prince as ruling over the west in Saka 705. He must have been the same as that vanquished by Nirupama. According to the Navasaṅgl grant Nirupama took away the umbrella of the king of Kosala also; and in the Wardhā plates he is represented as having three white umbrellas. A stone inscription at Paṭṭadakal was incised in the reign of Nirupama. There he is styled Dhārāvarsha and Kalivallabha.\textsuperscript{21} The last name occurs also in the Wardhā grant and the first in that found at Paṭṭhan. This prince does not

\textsuperscript{19} मानवा द्वितीय समस्ती दिनेश राजवर्षो देनेशाम्।
पूर्वी वीरतदवनामणि तदे विराहित (वि) राजस्यपरि
मीयौ (२७) बाषाधिनश्च (ल) अवयुते श्रीमें वराण्यपतिः।

Rājendralal's Skr. MSS., Vol. VI., p. 80, and MSS. in the Deccan College collections.
\textsuperscript{20} Vaṇi-Dīndori and Rādhaṇapur plates.
\textsuperscript{21} Ind. Ant., Vol. XI., p. 125.
appear to have reigned long, as his brother was on
the throne in Śaka 705 and his son in Śaka 716, the
year in which the Paśān charter was issued.

Dhruya Nirupama was succeeded by his son
Govinda III. The Rādhānapur and Vani-Diṇḍori
grants were issued by him in the Śaka year 730
corresponding to A.D. 868 while he was at [66]
Mayūrakhaṇḍī. This place has been identified with
a hill-fort in the Nasik territory of the name of
Morkhaṇḍ. Whether Mayūrakhaṇḍī was the capital
of the dynasty in the time of this king cannot be
satisfactorily determined. Govinda III. was certainly
one of the greatest of the Rāṣṭrākūṭa princes, and
the statement in his grant that during his time the
Rāṣṭrākūṭas became invincible, as the Yādavas of
Pūrāṇic history did when under the guidance of
Krishṇa, appears credible. Seeing he had grown
up to be a brave prince his father proposed to
abdicate the throne in his favour; but he declined,
expressing himself perfectly satisfied with his
position as Yuvarāja or prince-regent. When after
his father’s death he ascended the throne, twelve
kings united their forces and rose against him,

---

22 The Saṁvatsara or cyclic year given in the first is
Śarvaśī, the current Śaka year corresponding to which was
730, while in the second it is Vyaya corresponding to 729
current. As regards the exact signification to be attached to
these dates, see Appendix B.

23 The Kāvi grant, however, states that the father did
raise him to the supreme sovereignty which his enemies
were endeavouring to deprive his family of, i.e., when he
found the enemies of his family too powerful for him, he
raised his son to the throne and assigned to him the task
of suppressing them. Ind. Ant., Vol. V., p. 147, v. 27. The
reading, however, is somewhat corrupt. The enemies spoken
of here must be those twelve whom he is represented to
have vanquished in the other grants.
Section XI. desirous of striking an effectual blow at the power of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. But alone and unassisted, he by his personal valour suddenly inflicted a crushing defeat on them and broke the confederacy. He released the Gaṅga prince of Chera, who had been kept in custody by his father; but no sooner did he go back to his native country than he put himself into an attitude of hostility. But Govinda III. immediately vanquished him, and threw him into captivity again. Subsequently he marched against the Gūrjara king, who fled away at his approach. Thence he proceeded to Mālvā, the king of which country knowing himself to be unable to resist his power surrendered to him. After receiving his obeisance he directed his march to the Vindhyas. When Mārāśarva, the ruler of the adjoining country, who had been watching his movements, heard from his spies that Govinda’s army had encamped on the slopes of that mountain, he went up to him, and throwing himself at his feet presented to him his most highly valued heirlooms which no other prince had ever got before. On this occasion Govinda spent the rainy season at a place called Śrībhavana, which has not been identified. When the rains were over, he marched with his army to the Tuṅgabhadrā, where he stayed for a short time, and brought the Pallava king of Kāṇchi under a more complete subjection than before. Thence he sent a message to the king of Veṇgi, or the country between the lower Kṛishṇā and the Godāvari, who probably belonged to the eastern Chālukya dynasty, and he came and attended on him as if he were his servant. This grand victorious march to the north and the south must have taken place before Saka 726 or A.D.

24 Vaṇi-Dinḍorī and Rādhanpur plates.
804. For in a copper-plate grant bearing that date found in the Kânarese country, it is stated that when the king (Govinda III.) "having conquered Dantiga who ruled over Kânchî, had come to levy tribute, and when his encampments were on the banks of the Tûṅgabhadrâ," he allotted some lands to one Sivadhârî at a holy place named Râmeśvara. 25 His expeditions against the neighbouring princes must have been undertaken after [67] Saka 716 past, or 794 A.D., since the Paîṭhan charter which was issued in that year makes no mention of them.

Govinda III. thus acquired a large extent of territory and established his supremacy over a number of kings. He appears to have become the paramount sovereign of the whole country from Mâlvâ in the north to Kânchîpura in the south, and to have under his immediate sway the country between the Narmadâ and the Tûṅgabhadrâ. The Vâṇi-Dîṇḍorî plates convey a village situated in the Nâsik district, while those found in the Kânarese country assign some land near the Tûṅgabhadrâ.  

The province of Lâṭa, situated between the Mahî and the lower Tâpî, was assigned by him to his brother Indra, 26 who became the founder of another branch of the dynasty. Govinda III., as stated in the Baroda grant, made and unmade kings. His secondary names as found in his own grants were Prabhûtavarsha or "Raining profusely," Prîthvî-vallabha or "the Lover of the Earth," and Śrî-Vallabha. Others will be noticed below. The Baroda grant was issued by Karka, the son of

26 Kâvi plate, Ind. Ant., Vol. V., p. 147, v. 29; Baroda grant, Jour. Beng. A. S., Vol. VIII., p. 296, v. 21, in which बद्रा ought to be बहिर as in the Kâvi.
Govinda's brother Indra, the king of Lāṭa, in Śaka 734 or A.D. 812, and the Kāvl grant by Govinda the younger brother of Karka, in Śaka 749 or A.D. 827. We need not notice these princes further, since they belong more to the history of Gujarāt than of the Dekkan.

In several of the grants belonging to this dynasty, the son and successor of Nirupama is stated to be Jagattuṅga. Now, since Govinda III. was one of the greatest princes of this dynasty, it is impossible that he should have been passed over by the writers of these grants. Jagattuṅga, the son of Nirupama, must, therefore, be Govinda himself and no other. After his death his son Amoghavarsha, whose proper name appears to have been Sarva,27 came to the throne. He seems to have marched against the Chālukyas of Vėngi and put several of the princes to death.28 In the Navasāl grant Amoghavarsha is spoken of simply as Vallabha and is styled Rājarāja or king of kings and also Vira-Nārāyaṇa. This last title is justified by the poetic writer of the grant by saying that as the God Nārāyaṇa brought out the earth which was immersed in the ocean, so did Vallabha bring the goddess of sovereignty out of the ocean in the shape of the Chālukyas in which it had sunk. He is also represented to have "burnt" Chālukyas. These also must be allusions to Amoghavarsha’s wars with the Chālukyas of Vėngi; and he probably conquered some territory belonging to them. In the Karḍā grant the city of Mānyakheṭa is spoken of as being in a very flourishing condition in his time. There is little question that it was his capital; but whether

27 Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 183, i. 25.
28 Sāṅgali plates. But the reading is somewhat corrupt.
it was he who founded it and made it the capital of the dynasty cannot be clearly made out from that grant, as the reading given by Mr. Wathen is corrupt. But the Wardhâ plates are clear on the point. In them the successor of Jagattuṅga is called Nripa-
tuṅga; and he is represented to have founded the city of Mānyakheśa, which "put the [68] city of the gods" to shame. Mānyakheśa has been properly identified with Mālkhed in the Nizam's territory. In the Kâneri caves there are three inscriptions, in which the reigning paramount sovereign is represented to be Amoghavarsha. In one of them Pulâṅakti of the Šilâhâra family, and in the other two his son, Kapardin, are mentioned as his dependents ruling over Konkan, which province had been assigned to them by Amoghavarsha. The dates occurring in the last two are Śaka 775 and 799.\textsuperscript{29} An inscription at Sirur in the Dhârvaḍ district published by Dr. Fleet is dated Śaka 788, vyaya, which is represented as the fifty-second year of the reign of Amoghavarsha;\textsuperscript{30} so that the year 799 Śaka of the Kâneri inscription must have been the sixty-third of his reign. The cyclic year vyaya corresponds to the Śaka year 788 past and 789 current. This prince appears thus to have begun to reign in Śaka 737 past. In a historical appendix at the end of a Jainâ work entitled Uttarapurâṇa, or the latter

\textsuperscript{29} Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. VI., West's copies Nos. 15 and 42; Vol. XIII., p. 11; and Prof. Kielhorn's paper, Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII., p. 133. The cyclic year given with 775 is Prajâpâti, the current Śaka year corresponding to which, however, was 774. Prof. Kielhorn has recently calculated the true Śaka from the day of the week and fortnight and found it to be 773 expired, i.e., 774 current.

\textsuperscript{30} Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 216.
Section XI. Half of the Mahâpurâṇa, by Guṇabhadra, Amoghavarsha is represented to have been a devoted worshipper of a holy Jaina saint named Jinasena, who was the preceptor of Guṇabhadra, and wrote the Ādipurâṇa or the first part of the same work. 31 Jinasena himself at the end of his poem the Pârśvâbhyaṣṭi gives expression to a wish that Amoghavarsha may reign for a long time. An important work on the philosophy of the Digambara Jainas entitled Jayadhaivalâ is represented at the end to have been composed when 759 years of the Śaka king had elapsed, in the reign of Amoghavarsha. In the introductory portion of a Jaina mathematical work entitled Sārasângraha by Virâchârya, Amoghavarsha is highly praised for his power and his virtues, and is spoken of as a follower of the Jaina doctrine (Syâdvâda). 32 He is mentioned there also by his other name Nripatunga. The authorship of a small tract consisting of questions and answers on moral subjects, entitled Praśnottara-ratnamâlikâ, which has

31 Several copies of this Purâṇa have been purchased by me for Government. The stanza in which Amoghavarsha is alluded to is this:

यश नाष्मन्तांवज्जिताविसर्गाराजानिविम्बनवायामभीकारणः।
सन्तानां समस्यास्वर्तविपत्तिः पूर्वस्यर्वैवर्त
संवेदिार्जनिसतसुप्रकाशगतार्दी जनानुमकल्ल।

"The king Amoghavarsha remembered himself to have been purified that day when the lustre of the gems was heightened in consequence of his diadem becoming reddish by the dust-pollen of [Jinasena's] foot-lotuses appearing in the stream [of waterlike lustre] flowing from the collection of the brilliant rays of his nails,—enough—that prosperous Jinasena with the worshipful and revered feet is the blessing of the world."

32 This and the two preceding references I owe to the kindness of Mr. K. B. Pathak.
been claimed for Śaṅkarāchārya and one Śaṅkara-
guru by the Brāhmaṇs, and for Vimala by the
Svetāmbaras, is attributed [69] to king Amoghav-
varsha by the Digambara Jainas. At the end of the
Digambara copies occurs a stanza, in which it is
stated that Amoghavarsha composed the Ratnamālikā
after he had abdicated the throne in consequence of
the growth of the ascetic spirit\textsuperscript{33} in him. There is
another Amoghavarsha in the dynasty who is
represented as being of a thoughtful and religious
temper. But he reigned for a short time and does
not appear to have had any connection with the
Jainas. There is a translation of the work in the
Thibetan language, and there, too, the tract is
attributed to Amoghavarsha, who is represented as
a great king. The Thibetan translation of the name
has been retranslated, however, into Amoghodaya by
Schiefner; but if he had known the Digambara
tradition, he would have put it as Amoghavarsha.\textsuperscript{34}
From all this it appears that of all the Rāshṭrakūṭa
princes, Amoghavarsha was the greatest patron of
the Digambara Jainas; and the statement that he
adopted the Jaina faith seems to be true.

Amoghavarsha’s son and successor was Akāla-
varsha. He married the daughter of Kokkala, king
of Chedi, who belonged to the Haihaya race, and
by her had a son named Jagattunga. Akālavarsa’s
proper name was Kṛishṇa as is evident from the
Navasārī grant and also from the Wardhā and the
Kardā plates. He is the Kṛishṇarāja during whose

\textsuperscript{33} See my Report on the search for Sanskrit MSS. for
1883-84; Notes, &c., p. ii. The stanza is

\begin{verse}

विवेकाभव्यस्राजीयः राजेश्वरसम रत्नालिकाः
रघुतामीघर्रवेंच्च चुतिष्वाः सर्वस्याः क्रिष्णकृतिः: \textsuperscript{210}
\end{verse}

Section XI. reign a tributary chief of the name of Prithvirâma made a grant of land to a Jaina temple which he had caused to be constructed in the Śaka year 797 at Saundatti.\textsuperscript{35} Another Jaina temple was built by a Vaiśya or Bania named Chikûrya during his reign in Śaka 824 at Mulgunda in the Dhârvâḍ district, and in the inscription which records this fact he is styled Kṛishṇa Vallabha.\textsuperscript{36} Kṛishṇa or Akâlavarsha appears to have been a powerful prince. He is represented as having frightened the Gûrjara, humbled the pride of the Lâta, taught humility to the Gauḍas, deprived the people on the sea-coast of their repose, and exacted obedience from the Andhra, Kalinga, Gâṅga, and Magadha.\textsuperscript{37}

In the reign of this prince the Jaina Purâṇa noticed above was consecrated in Śaka 820, the cyclic year being Pingala,\textsuperscript{38} by Lokasena [70] the

\textsuperscript{35} Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. X., p. 200. The cyclic year mentioned is Manmatha, which corresponds to Śaka 797 past.

\textsuperscript{36} Ib., p. 192. The cyclic year is Dundabhi, which fell in 825 current.


\textsuperscript{38} "Victorious in the world is this holy Purâṇa, the essence of the Sâstras which was finished and worshipped by the best among respectable [men] in the year Pingala that brings about great prosperity and confers happiness on
pupil of Guṇabhadra, who was the author of the second part. In the historical appendix, "the lofty elephants of Akālavārsha" are represented "to have drunk the waters of the Ganges rendered fragrant by being mixed with the humour flowing from their temples, and, as if not having their thirst quenched, to have resorted to the Kaumāra forest (in the extreme south), which was full of sandal trees set in gentle motion by the breezes blowing over the sea waves, and into the shade of which the rays of the sun did not penetrate." 39 The date 833 Śaka has also been assigned to Akālavārsha. 40 It will have been seen that an inscription at Saundatti represents Krishparāja to have been the reigning prince in Śaka 797, while one in the Kānheri caves speaks of his father Amoghavarṣa as being on the throne two years later, i.e., in 799. This discrepancy must be due to the fact mentioned in the Ratnamālikā that the latter had abdicated the throne in his old age. The real reigning prince therefore in Śaka 797 and 799 must have been Akālavārsha his son; but the writer of the Kānheri inscription must in the latter year have put in Amoghavarṣa's name, as he was not dead, and his having abdicated had probably no significance in his eyes.

Akālavārsha's son was Jagattuṅga. But he did Jagattuṅga.

Section XI.

all mankind, at the end of the year measured by 820 of the era of the Śaka king * * * , while that king Akālavārsha, all of whose enemies were destroyed and whose fame was pure (or who acquired religious merit and fame) was protecting the whole earth." The cyclic year Piṅgala corresponded to 820 Śaka current.

39 यथीशुमसतत्वमेव विजयमद्यात्कोष्टिविनिः संवाहसस्वाधि:-
हराय वाच जमलिः कटु मूः पीलायणवचन्तुः:।
कौमारे वनयापन वनसपायपुण्यरंगाविनिः:-
मंदार्धीत्रलक्षान्नकरणाय समाधिहितम्।

not ascend the throne as appears from the fact that his name is not mentioned in the list of kings given in the Khârepâtañ grant, after Akâlavarsha, but that of Indra, who is spoken of as Akâlavarsha’s grandson, while Jagattuñga is mentioned in another connection below. And in the Navasârî grant Indra is represented as “meditating on the feet” of Akâlavarsha, and not of Jagattuñga though he was his father, which shows that he was the immediate successor of Akâlavarsha. But the Wardhâ grant is explicit. It tells us that Jagattuñga had a beautiful person, and that he died without having [71] ascended the throne. Jagattuñga married Lakshmi, the daughter of his maternal uncle, the son of Kokkala, who is called Rañavigraha in the Sângali and Navasârî grants, and Sâhkaragaña in the Karðâ plates. But it will be presently shown that the Karðâ plates contain many mistakes and are the source of a good deal of confusion in the history of this dynasty. From this union sprang Indra, who succeeded his grandfather. His title was Nityavarsha according to the Navasârî grant; and his son Govinda IV. is in the Sângali grant spoken of as “meditating on the feet” of Nityavarsha, which also shows that that was Indra’s title. Nityavarsha is the donor in the Navasârî grant. He is represented as residing at his capital Mânyakheña, but to have on the occasion gone to Kurundaka, identified with the modern Kañoda on the banks of the Tâpi, for his Pañtabandhotsava. This must have been the festival in honour of his coronation. At Kurundaka he granted that and many other villages, and restored four hundred more which had once been given in charity but had been resumed by former kings. He also gave away twenty lacs of Drammas in charity
after having weighed himself against gold. The village conveyed by the Navasārī grant is Tenna situated in the Lāṭ country. It has been identified with Tenā in the Navasārī division of the Baroda State. The grant was issued in Saka 836; so that Indra appears to have come to the throne in that year. Another set of copper-plates found in the Navasārī district records the grant of the village of Gumra identified with the modern Bagumra by the same prince. The grant was issued at the same time as the other, and the contents mutatis mutandis are exactly the same. From these grants of villages in the Navasārī district which must have formed a part of the old country of Lāṭa, and from the statement in the Wardhā plates that Krishṇa or Akālavarsha humbled the pride of the Lāṭa prince, it appears that the main branch of the Rāshṭrakūṭas reigning at Mānyakheṭa must have in Akālavarsha’s time supplanted or reduced to a humble position the dynasty of their kinsmen in Gujarāt, which had been founded in the time of Jagattunga or Govinda III. Indra was the reigning monarch in Saka 838, the cyclic year being Dhātu, as appears from an inscription published by Dr. Fleet.

As regards the next king there is some confusion in the Karḍā plates. The Sāṅgālī grant, however, is clear. Indra married a lady from the Haihaya family of Chedi again. Her name was Vijāṁbā; and she was the daughter of Aṅgaṇadeva, the son of Arjuna, who was the eldest son of Kokkala, men-

---

43 Dr. Fleet in his revised transcript and translation of the Sāṅgālī grant calls her Dvijāṁbā, but in the facsimile given by him the name is distinctly Vijāṁbā in both the places where it occurs. The Sanskrit of Vijāṁbā is Vidyāṁbā. Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 250.
tioned above. By her Indra had a son named Govinda, who is the last king noticed in the Sāṅgali grant, since it was issued by him. But according to the Khārepāṭaṇ grant, Govinda was the younger brother of a prince named [72] Amoghavarsha.44 The immediate successor of Indra, therefore, was Amoghavarsha, and after him his younger brother Govinda came to the throne. And this is confirmed by the Kardā plates also. Amoghavarsha and Govinda are there meant to be mentioned as the two sons of Ambā, who is the same as the Vijāmbā of the Sāṅgali plate. But in the text of the grantGovinda and Ambā form one compound, so that the translators of the grant call the lady Govindāmbā, which certainly is an unique or an absurd name. Thus they drop king Govinda altogether.45 But the

44 Dr. Fleet in his genealogical table at p. 109, Vol. XI., Ind. Ant., speaks of Govinda’s brother as unnamed. But he is named Amoghavarsha in the Khārepāṭaṇ grant, and also in that of Karḍā, if properly understood.

45 The 14th stanza, the latter part of which I have construed as in the text, is

\[ \text{चेष्टः मांतुललक्षरमः कालायामासुक्लवतप्रेक्षा।} \\
\text{वीमानवीघ्वं कोविन्धा वाहिकामाय।} \]

Now the first line of this is, as it stands, out of place and must contain some mistakes. For, (1) it contains, in substance, a repetition of what we have in the first line of stanza 12, and (2) if it is read here as it is, we shall have to make Ambā a wife of Jagattuṅga along with Lakṣmī, who has been represented as his wife in stanza 12, and understand her to be Lakṣmī’s sister, the father of both being Sakharaṅgaṇa. But Ambā or Vijāmbā is in the Sāṅgali grant clearly spoken of as the daughter of Aṅgaṅadeva, the son of Arjunā, who was the brother of Raṇavigraha, the father of Lakṣmī; that is, Ambā was the daughter of Lakṣmī’s first cousin. She is also distinctly represented as the wife of Indra and the mother of Govinda IV. Again, if we take the lines as they are, the result will be that the Kardā grant makes no mention of Indra’s wife Vijāmbā and
Wardhā grant is explicit on the point. From it we learn that Amoghavarsha was the elder brother of Govinda, but that he died immediately after his father, as if “out of love for him,” and then Govinda came to the throne. The Sāṅgali grant of Govinda IV., as he must be called, does not mention Amoghavarsha by name; but states that “though Govinda had the power, he did not act with any reprehensible cruelty towards his elder brother, and did not render himself infamous by incest, or assume the nature of a devil by casting aside considerations of purity and impurity, but became Sāhasāṅka by his matchless enterprise and liberality.” What this of his sons Amoghavarsha and Govinda IV., the latter of whom reigned, as we shall see, for at least fifteen years. Such an omission is not likely. Then, again, the Sāṅgall grant makes no allusion whatever to Jagatitūṅga’s marriage with a lady of the name of Govindāmbā. And the second line चैमानमोचयां गोविन्दाम्बत्/ बालनाथायां looks as if the intention of the writer of it was set forth the names of the two sons of Indra, Amoghavarsha and Govinda, and of their mother Ambā or Vijāmbā. And it seems to me that the following stanza, in which the liberality of a monarch has been praised refers to Govinda IV., who, as noticed in the text below, was called Suvarṇavartsha by people, because he “rained down gold.” The name of that prince, therefore, must occur in the verse immediately previous. The first line must, it is clear to me, have crept in through mistake. If it were not read here, the second would be applicable to the king mentioned immediately before, i.e., Indra, and the whole would be consistent with the information derived from the Sāṅgall grant. The emendation I make in the second line is to read न को for को and then Ambā would be released from her incongruous association with Govinda, and the whole would be consistent and intelligible. There must be other mistakes also in the Karñā grant. Very probably a verse or two are omitted here, as also after the next stanza, where Kṛṣṇarāja is abruptly introduced and spoken of parenthetically.
statement exactly means it is difficult to say. But probably Govinda was believed to have encompassed his brother’s death, and the other accusations referred to were whispered against him; and this is [73] intended as a defence. The Khârepâtaṇ and Wardhâ grants agree in representing Govinda as a prince addicted to sensual pleasures. The former says that he was “the abode of the dramatic sentiment of love and was always surrounded by crowds of beautiful women,” and the latter that he was “the source of the sportive pleasures of Love, his mind was enchained by the eyes of women, he displeased all men by his vicious courses, and his health being undermined, he met with an untimely death.” The words used have double senses from which it would appear that the affairs of the state also fell into confusion and hastened his destruction. But the Sâṅgali grant which was issued by him has of course nothing but praise for him. Govinda’s other names were Prabhûtavarsha and Suvarṇavarsha (raining gold) and probably Sâhâsaṅka also. The grant was issued in Śaka 855, or A.D. 933, in the Vijaya 46 year of the cycle, while he was at his capital Mânyakheṭa. Govinda IV. was on the throne in Śaka 841, as appears from an inscription published by Dr. Fleet, in which under the name of Prabhûtavarsha he is represented as the reigning sovereign. 47 The inscription, however, is dated 840 Śaka; but from the cyclic year Pramâthin, which is also given,

46 The current Śaka year was 856.
47 Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 222. Dr. Fleet, however, identifies this Prabhûtavarsha with Jagattuṅga the son of Akâlavarsa or Kriśña II., and father of Nityavarsha. But as we have seen Nityavarsha was on the throne in Śaka 836 and 838, wherefore his father could not have been the reigning prince in Śaka 840 or 841. Besides, as I have shown, Jagattuṅga did not ascend the throne at all.
it must be understood that the year meant is 841 Section XI, Saka. It will appear from this that Indra or Nityavarsha, who succeeded his grandfather in Saka 836, had a very short reign, and his eldest son, Amogha-varsha, could have been on the throne only for a few months. Govinda IV. like Amogha-varsha I. was at war with the Chàlukyas of Veñgi. Another inscription represents Govinda IV. as the reigning monarch in Saka 851.

From the Khàrepàṭaṇ plates it appears that Govinda IV. was succeeded by his paternal uncle Baddiga, the second son of Jagattuṅga. He is represented to have been a virtuous prince, serene like a sage. He was succeeded by his son Kṛishṇarāja, and after his death his younger brother Khoṭīka became king. The Karāḍa grant is somewhat confusing here, but when properly understood it is perfectly consistent with that of Khàrepàṭaṇ. It states: "When the elder brother Kṛishṇarājadeva went to heaven, Khoṭīgadeva, who was begotten by the king Amogha-varsha on Kandakadevi, the daughter of Yuvarāja, became king." Here the expression "elder brother" must be taken as related to Khoṭīgadeva and not to the preceding king, whoever he may have been. Khoṭīka therefore was, even according to the Karāḍa grant, the younger brother

---

50 चन्द्रपदक्षिणीयन् प्राचीन हृदयभित्ति न च तिरि भानिति दौर्भक्षयाचरकवः
युंगराजेन्द्रृवितिर्वेदकथेष्वामोदसंयुगस्रवःस्पर-
आन्ति क्षितियिनी श्रयविश्वुद्रवविश्वासः || 14 ||
51 For, the clause containing that expression is dependent on the principal sentence, which is in the next or 16th stanza and the subject of which is Khoṭīgadeva. See the passage in the last note.
Section XI.

of Krishṇarāja. But he is represented to have been the son of Amoghavarsha, while Krishṇarāja is spoken of in the Kharepāṭaṇ plates as the son of Baddiga. In an inscription at Sāloṭgi, Krishṇarāja, the son of Amoghavarsha, is represented to have been reigning at Mānyakheṭa in 867 Śaka, that is, twelve years after the Sāngali grant of Govinda IV. was issued. He must have been the same prince as that mentioned in the grants we have been examining. For the Krīṣṇa of these was the second king after Govinda IV. His father Baddiga, who was Govinda’s uncle, must have been an old man when he succeeded, and consequently must have reigned for a very short time. Hence his son Krīṣṇa came to be king within twelve years after Govinda’s grant; and there is no other Krīṣṇa mentioned in the grants who is likely to have been on the throne in 867 Śaka. If, then, the Krīṣṇa of the grants is the same as the Krīṣṇa of the Sāloṭgi inscription, here we have evidence that his father’s name was Amoghavarsha; so that the Baddiga of the Kharepāṭaṇ plates was the same as the Amoghavarsha of the Karḍā plates. Krishnaṇarāja and Khoṭika were thus brothers, and it would appear from the wording of the statement in the Karḍā plates that they were the sons of the same father but of different mothers.53

52 Ind. Ant., Vol. I., p. 205, et seq. The cyclic year given is Plavaṅga, which followed next after Śaka 869 and the current year corresponding to which was 870. According to another system, which however was rarely used in Southern India, it was Plavaṅga in a part of the year 867 Śaka expired.

53 Dr. Fleet, following Mr. Wathen’s translation, makes Krīṣṇa, whom he calls Krīṣṇa III., the elder brother of Amoghavarsha and thus a son of Jagattuṅga. But in the Kharepāṭaṇ grant he is distinctly represented as the son of Baddiga who was the son of Jagattuṅga, and in the
And these points have been placed beyond the possibility of doubt by the Wardhā grant. After Govinda's death, we are told, the feudatory chiefs entreated Amoghavarsha the son of Jagattunga, who

Wardhā plates as the son of Amoghavarsha, the son of Amoghavarsha, the son of Jagattunga, and was thus a grandson of Jagattunga. He is also represented as Khoṭika's elder brother. I have shown in the text that the expression "elder brother," occurring in the Kardā grant, should by the rules of construction be taken as referring to Khoṭṭiga and in this way that grant becomes perfectly consistent with that of Khārepātaṇ. The Amoghavarsha who was the son of Jagattunga is that spoken of in the sixteenth stanza of the Kardā grant, and was different from the one mentioned in the fourteenth, who was the son of Indra and nephew of that Amoghavarsha, as I have shown above. Dr. Fleet brings in another Krishṇa and makes him the younger brother of Khoṭika, and identifies him with Nirupama (see the text below) and with the Krishṇa whose dates range from Śaka 867 to 878. What his authority is I do not know. But the Khārepātaṇ grant mentions one Krishṇa only, the elder brother of Khoṭika and son of Baddiga. The Kardā also mentions one only, and as to his relation with the other princes, I have shown that that grant agrees with the Khārepātaṇ plates. The Krishṇa whose dates range from 867 to 878 is to be identified with the elder brother of Khoṭika and is not to be considered a different prince unalluded to in the grants. Nirupama, the younger brother of Khoṭika, is not and cannot have been this Krishṇa, because his elder brother and the elder brother of Khoṭiga was called Krishṇa, and he too could not have been called by the same name. Nirupama does not appear to have been a reigning prince, for in the Kardā plates he is only parenthetically introduced as the father of Kakka, who was a reigning prince; and in the Khārepātaṇ grant he is not mentioned at all by name, but Kakkala is said to be the son of the brother of Khoṭika. Krishṇa, on the other hand, was on the throne from 867 to 878 Śaka according to the stone inscriptions. Again if Khoṭika was the elder brother of this Nirupama-Krishṇa it is impossible that he should be reigning in 893 Śaka, while Krishṇa should be
was [75] "first among the wise" and the "best of serene sages", to assume the reins of power. He was assisted in the government by his son Kṛishṇa, who though but a crown-prince wielded very great power. The enemies who transgressed his commands were punished; he put to death Dantiga and Bappuka who had grown insolent. He thoroughly subdued the Gāṅga prince; and planted what appears to be a colony of the Āryas in his dominions. Hearing of the ease with which he captured the strongholds in the south, the Gūrjara prince, who was preparing to take the fortresses of Kālanjara and Chitrakūṭa in the

on the throne from 867 to 878 Śaka, that is, before his elder brother. Kṛishṇa, therefore, was the elder of the two as stated in the Khārepātan grant, and Khoṭika the younger. Dr. Fleet, however, being under the belief that this last was the elder brother, gives the following explanation of the discrepancy in the dates:—"Koṭṭiga or Khoṭīga left no issue, and this explains why the date of his inscription now published is considerably later than the dates obtained for Kṛishṇa IV.; viz., there being no probability of Koṭṭiga leaving any issue, first his younger brother Kṛishṇa IV. was joined with him in the government and then the latter's son Kakka III."—(Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 255). This supposition is not supported by any circumstance; on the contrary it is utterly discountenanced by the inscriptions of Kṛishṇa which represent him to be the "Supreme king of great kings," (Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 258) and to have been reigning at the time at Mānya-kheṭa and governing the kingdom (Ind. Ant., Vol. I., p. 210). Otherwise, they would have spoken of him as Yuvarāja. Thus there were not two Kṛishṇas but only one. He was the son of Baddiga or Amoghavarsha, not his brother. His earliest date is that of the Wardhā grant, i.e., 862 Śaka and the latest 88r that of the Yaśastilaka. He was the same monarch as that spoken of in the Saḷoṭi and other stone inscriptions bearing the dates 867, 873, and 878 Śaka. Khoṭīga was his younger brother, and Nirupama the youngest.
north, had to give up the enterprize. All feudatory chiefs between the eastern and the western oceans and between the Himālaya and Sinhala (Ceylon) paid obeisance to him. After he had thus rendered the power of his family firm, his father died, and he ascended the throne. The Wardhā plates announce the grant of a village to the north-west of Nāgpur near the modern Mohagaon made by Kṛishṇarāja, who is also called Akālavārsha, in the name of his brother Jagattuṅga to a Brāhmaṇ of the Kāṇva school of the White Yajurveda on the 5th of the dark half of Vaiśākha in Śaka 862, corresponding to 940 A.D., the cyclic year being Śārvari. This prince is called Śri-Vallabha also in the grant.

Kṛishṇarāja was the reigning monarch in Śaka 873 and 878. At the end of a Jaina work called Yaśastilaka by Somadeva it is stated that it was finished on the 13th of Chaitra when 881 years of the era of the Śaka king had elapsed, the cyclic year being Siddhārthīn, during the reign of a feudatory of Kṛishṇarājadēva. Kṛishṇarājadēva is spoken of as reigning gloriously, having subdued the Pāṇḍyas, Sinhala, the Cholas, the Cheras and others. Khoṭika, his brother, was on the throne in Śaka 893 Prajāpāti.

Khoṭika was succeeded, according to the Khārepāṭaṇa grant, by Kakkala, the son of his brother. The name of this brother was Nirupama according to the Karḍā grant. Kakkala is said to have been a brave soldier; but he was conquered in battle by Tailapa, who belonged to the Chāḷukya race, and thus the sovereignty of the Dekkan passed

Section XI.

55 Prof. Peterson's Report, loc. cit.
from the hands of the Rāshṭракūṭas once more [76] into those of the Chālukyas. The Kārḍā grant, which was made in the reign of Kakkala, is dated Saka 894 or A.D. 972. And another inscription represents him as being on the throne in 896 current,57 the cyclic year being Śrīmukha. But in this year or Saka 895 past Tailapa attained sovereign powers.58 The Rāshṭракūṭas were thus supreme masters of this country from about A.D. 748 to A.D. 973, that is, for nearly two hundred and twenty-five years.

That the princes of this race were very powerful there can be little doubt. The rock-cut temples at Elurā still attest their power and magnificence. Under them the worship of the Purānic gods rose into much greater importance than before. The days when kings and princes got temples and monasteries cut out of the solid rock for the use of the followers of Gotama Buddha had gone by, never to return. Instead of them we have during this period temples excavated or constructed on a more magnificent scale and dedicated to the worship of Śiva and Viṣṇu. Several of the grants of these Rāshṭ rakūṭa princes praise their bounty and mention their having constructed temples. Still, as the Kānheri inscriptions of the reign of Amoghavarsha I. show, Buddhism had its votaries and benefactors, though the religion had evidently sunk into unimportance. Jainism, on the other hand, retained the prominence it had acquired during the Chālukya period, or even made greater progress. Amoghavarsha was, as we have seen, a great patron of it, and was perhaps a convert to it; and some of the minor chiefs and the lower castes,

58 The cyclic year mentioned along with the first of these two dates in Aṅgiras the current Saka year corresponding to which was 895.
especially the traders, were its devoted adherents. The form of Jainism that prevailed in the country was mostly that professed by the Digambara sect. A good many of the extant Digambara works were, as we have seen, composed during this period.

It is remarkable that, unlike the grants of the early Chalukya princes, those of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas contain accounts in verse of the ancestors of the grantor, and most of the verses are of the nature of those we find in the ordinary artificial poems in Sanskrit literature, possessing the same merits and faults. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas, therefore, must have been patrons of learning, and probably had poets in their service. One of the three Krishṇas belonging to the dynasty is the hero of an artificial poem by Halāyudha entitled the Kavirahasya, the purpose of which is to explain the distinction as regards sense and conjugational peculiarities between roots having the same external form. He is spoken of as the paramount sovereign of Dakshināpatha. Prof. Westergaard, however, thought [77] him to be the Krishṇarāya of the Vijayanagar dynasty who reigned in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. But in the Kavirahasya he is spoken of in one place as “having sprung from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa race,” and is in another called “the ornament of the lunar

...

59 जल्ल्यमस्मद्यिनिंद्रायापने द्रष्टिपदे। केताक मति ज्ञाती राजा सामाध्याविद्वीचित:।

“In Dakshināpatha, which is rendered holy by the light of the sage Agastya, there was a king of the name of Krishṇarāya who was crowned as a paramount sovereign.”

60 नास्तयोग्धानमहाब्दन्त ब्रह्म वो प्रमोदिनः। कालं तुधारति ज्ञाता राजाः राजकृत्यायांविद्यम।।

“Who will equal in strength that lord of the world sprung from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa race, who by his power bears an incomparable burden.”
race," which description is of course not applicable to the Vijayanagar prince.

Arabic travellers of the tenth century mention a powerful dynasty of the name of Balharās who ruled at a place called Mān kir. The name of the city would show that the Rāshtrakūṭas, whose capital was Mānyakhetā or Mānkhed, were meant. But Balharā, the name of the dynasty, has not been identified with any that might be considered to be applicable to the Rāshtrakūṭas. But to me the identification does not appear difficult. The Rāshtrakūṭas appear clearly to have assumed the title of Vallabha which was used by their predecessors the Chālukyas. We have seen that Govinda II. is called Vallabha in two grants, Amoghavarsha I. in a third, and Krishṇa III. in a fourth. In an inscription on a stone tablet at Lakshmesvar, Govinda III. is called Śri-Vallabha, while in the Rādhanpur plates he is spoken of as Vallabha-narendra. In the Sāngalī and Kardā grants also the reigning king is styled Vallabha-narendra, while in other inscriptions we find the title Pṛthivīvallabha alone used. Now Vallabha-narendra means "the king Vallabha," and is the same as Vallabharāja, the words rāja (n) and narendra both denoting "a king". Vallabha-rāja should by the rules of Prākrit or vernacular pronunciation, become Vallaha-rāy, Ballaha-rāy, or Balhaarāy. This last is the same as the Balharā of the Arabs.

61 Ṣaṅgaḥ svaṇiḥ vṛṣṇiḥ svaṁvṛṣṇinbhūṣaṇaḥ:
"That ornament of the lunar race extracts the juice of Soma in sacrifices."
62 Ind. Ant., Vol. XI., p. 156.
The genealogy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas is shown in the following table:

1. Dantivarman.
2. Indra I.
3. Govinda I.
4. Karka I.
5. Indra II.
6. Dantidurga.
8. Govinda II.
9. Dhruva, Nirupama, or Dhurāvarsha.
10. Govinda III. Jagatruṇga I.
11. Sarva Nripatunga or Amoghavarsha I.
12. Krishna II. or Akālavarsha.
13. Indra III. or Nityavarsha.
14. Amoghavarsha II.
15. Govinda IV.
16. Baddha or Amoghavarsha III.
17. Krishna III. or Akālavarsha.
19. Kakka, Karka II, or Amoghavarsha IV.

(a) The names of those who were supreme sovereign in the Dekkan are printed in capitals.
(b) The names of those who were kings before the attainment of supreme power are printed in small letters.
(c) The order of succession is represented by the numbers.
(d) The names of those who did not ascend the throne at all, have been printed in Italics.
Section XII.

We left the history of the kings of the Chālukya race at Kirtivarman II. Between him and Tailapa, who wrested the supreme sovereignty of the Dekkan from Kakkala, the last of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings, the Miraj copperplate grant and the Yevur tablet place six kings. Kirtivarman ascended the throne in Śaka 669 and was reigning in 679, before which time he had been reduced to the condition of a minor chief; and Tailapa regained sovereign power in 895 Śaka. 1 We have thus seven princes only between 669 and 895, i.e., for 226 years. This gives an average reign of 32 years to each, which is far too much. This was the darkest period in the history of the Chālukya dynasty, and probably no correct account of the succession was kept. Where the dynasty reigned and what the extent of its power was, cannot be satisfactorily determined in the absence of the usual contemporary evidence, viz., inscriptions. There must have been several branches of the Chālukya family, and it is even a question whether Tailapa sprang from the main branch. I am inclined to believe that he belonged to quite a collateral and unimportant branch, and that the main branch became extinct. For, the princes of the earlier dynasty always traced their descent to Hārīti and spoke of themselves as belonging to the Mānava race; while these later Chālukyas traced their pedigree to Satyāśraya only, and those two names do not occur in their inscriptions except in the Miraj grant and its copies, where an effort is made to begin at the beginning. But evidently the writer of that grant had not sufficient materials at his command, since, as above stated, he

places six princes only between Kṛtivarman II. and Tailapa. There is little question that there was no continuity of tradition. The titles Jagadekamalla, Tribhuvanamalla, &c., which the later Chālukyas assumed mark them off distinctively from princes of the earlier dynasty, who had none like them. In a copper-plate grant dated Śaka 735 found in Maisur a Chālukya prince of the name of Vimalāditya, the son of Yaśovarman and grandson of Balavarman, is mentioned. To ward off the evil influence of Saturn from Vimalāditya, a village was granted to a Jaina sage on behalf of a Jaina temple by Govinda III., the Rāshṭrakūṭa king, at the request of Chākirāja of the Gaṅga family, the maternal uncle of Vimalāditya. These three Chālukya names do not occur in the usual genealogy of the family. This therefore appears to have been an independent branch. Another independent offshoot ruled over a province called Jola, a portion of which at least is included in the modern district of Dhārvāḍ. In the Kanarese Bhārata [80] written in 863 Śaka by a Jaina poet of the name of Pampa, Arikesarin belonging to this branch, is mentioned by the poet as his patron. The genealogy there given is as follows:

Yuddhamalla

Arikesarin

Narasimha

Dugdhamalla

Baddiga

Yuddhamalla

Narasimha

Arikesarin

2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 11.
Section XII.

Chālukya prince mentioned in a Vedāntic work.

At the end of a work entitled Saṁkshepaśārīraka, the author Sarvajñātman, the pupil of Suresvara, who himself was a pupil of the great Saṁkarāchārya, states that he composed it while "the prosperous king of the Kshatriya race, the Āditya (sun) of the race of Manu whose orders were never disobeyed, was ruling over the earth." This description would apply with propriety to such a king as Ādityavarman, Vikramāditya I., Vinayāditya, Vijayāditya, or Vikramāditya II. of the early Chālukya dynasty, since they were very powerful princes and were "Ādityas of the race of Manu." For the Mānavya race to which they belonged may be understood as "the race of Manu." But Saṁkarāchārya is said to have lived between Saka 710 and 742, wherefore his grand-pupil must have flourished about the year 800 of that era, while Vikramāditya II., the latest of the four, ceased to reign in 669 Saka. Supposing then that the date assigned to Saṁkarāchārya is correct, the king meant by Sarvajñātman must be one of those placed by the Miraj grant between Kirtivarman II. and Tailapa. He may be Vikramāditya, the third prince after Kirtivarman II., but if the description is considered hardly applicable to a minor chief, Saṁkarāchārya's date must be pushed backwards so as to place the pupil of his pupil in the reign of one of the five princes of the early Chālukya dynasty mentioned above.

3 श्रीदेवशालिक्षरामण्डलयः संपर्कः पुराणग्रंथः श्रवणं सर्वं प्राप्तिः स्मवेत्: संपर्कः प्राप्तिः।
श्रवणं सर्वं प्राप्तिः एव वर्गायन सिद्धि राजपत्याय वैपे।
श्रीदेवशालिक्षरामण्डलयः श्रवणं पुराणग्रंथः स्मवेत्: संपर्कः प्राप्तिः।

The Devaśāra spoken of in the first line is Suresvara, the pupil of Saṁkarāchārya.

4 See the genealogy at the end of this Section.
Tailapa seems to have carried his arms into the country of the Cholas and humbled the king of Chedi. He despatched an expedition into Gujarât, under a general of the name of Bárapa, against Mālarâja, the founder of the Châlukya dynasty of Anahilapattana, [81] who for some time was hard pressed; but according to the Gujarât chroniclers the general was eventually defeated with slaughter. Someśvara, the author of the Kirtikaumudi, speaks of Bárapa as the general of the lord of Lâta, from which it would appear that Tailapa was in possession of that country. Tailapa invaded Mâlvâ also, which at this time was governed by Muñja, the uncle of the celebrated Bhoja. Muñja, instead of strictly confining himself to the defensive, took the offensive, and, against the counsels of his aged minister Rudrâditya, crossed the Godâvari with a large army. He was encountered by Tailapa, who inflicted a crushing defeat on him and took him prisoner. At first Muñja was treated with consideration by his captor; but an attempt to effect his escape having been detected, he was subjected to indignities, made to beg from door to door, and finally beheaded. This event is alluded to in one of Tailapa’s inscriptions. Tailapa reigned for twenty-four years. One of his feudatory chiefs granted a piece of land to a Jaina temple that he had constructed at

---

5 Ind. Ant., Vol. V., p. 17.
6 Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 15.
7 Râsa Mâlû, Chap. IV., p. 38, new Ed.
8 Kirtikaumudi, II. 3.
9 Merutunga’s Bhojaprabandha and Bhojacharitra by Râjavallabha.
HISTORY OF

Section XII. Saundatti in the Belgaum district, in the year 902 Saka or A.D. 980.

Satyāśraya. Tailapa married Jākabbā, the daughter of the last Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, and had by her two sons, whose names were Satyāśraya and Daśavarman. The former succeeded him in 919 Saka or A.D. 997. Nothing particular is mentioned of him in any of the inscriptions. The Kharepāṭan grant, which we have so often referred to, was issued in his reign in Saka 930 by a dependent chief of the Silahāra family which ruled over southern Konkan.

Satyāśraya died without issue and was succeeded by Vikramāditya I, the son of his younger brother Daśavarman by his wife Bhagavatī. The earliest of his inscriptions is dated Saka 930, which is also the latest date of his predecessor. He therefore succeeded to the throne in that year, i.e., in 1008 A.D., and appears to have reigned for only a short time. He was succeeded by his brother Jayasimha or Jagadekamalla, who in an inscription dated 941 Saka, i.e., 1019 A.D., is represented to have put to flight or broken the confederacy of Mālava and is styled “the moon of the lotus which was King Bhoja,” that is, one who humbled him. He is also spoken of as having beaten the Cholas and the Cheras. The Miraj grant was executed by him five years later, i.e., in Saka 946, when “after having subdued the

---

15 I call him Vikramāditya I. and not Vikramāditya V., as others do, because I would keep the two dynasties distinct for the reasons given in the text above. I shall call Vikramāditya Tribhuvanamalla, Vikramāditya II, and so on.
powerful Chola, the lord of the Dramila country, and taken away everything belonging to the ruler of the seven Konkans, he had encamped with his victorious army at [82] Kolhápur in the course of a march to the northern countries to vanquish them."\textsuperscript{18} The latest date of this prince is Šaka 962.\textsuperscript{19}

Jayasimha ceased to reign in 962 Šaka, or 1040 Somaśvara or Āhavamalla. A.D., and was succeeded by his son Somaśvara I., who assumed the titles of Āhavamalla and Trailokya-
malla. As usual with the Chālukya princes the first enemy he had to turn his arms against was the king of the Cholás.\textsuperscript{20} He is then represented by Bilhana to have marched against Dhârâ, the capital of Bhoja, and captured it. Bhoja was compelled to abandon the city. These hostilities with the king of Mâlva seem to have been inherited by this king and his predecessor from Tailapa, who had caused Muñja to be put to death. Bhoja was but a boy when this event took place. It is narrated in the Bhojacaritarā that after he had come of age and begun to administer the affairs of his kingdom, on one occasion a dramatic play representing the fate of Muñja was acted before him, and thereupon he resolved to avenge his uncle's death. He invaded the Dekkan with a large army, captured Tailapa, subjected him to the same indignities to which Muñja had been subjected by

\textsuperscript{18} Loc. cit. Dramila is another form of Dravida. There is some mistake here in the original. The letters are चंद्रमिलाधिपति. Dr. Fleet takes चं as one word and चंद्रमिलाधिपति as another, but चं cannot be construed and Chandramila is unknown. The first word must be चंच, a mistake for some such word as चंच, "down," "below," and the second Dvamṛḍhīpatim.

\textsuperscript{19} Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX., p. 164.

him, and finally executed him. 21 Bhoja, who ruled over Mālvā for about fifty-three years, was but a minor when Muñja died. Muñja was on the throne in 994 A.D., 22 while Tailapa died or ceased to reign in 997 A.D. He must therefore have been slain by the latter between 994 and 997 A.D., and Tailapa did not survive Muñja for a sufficiently long time to allow of Bhoja’s attaining majority and fighting with him. Hence Bhoja could not have wreaked vengeance on Tailapa. But the wars of Jayasimhha and Someśvara I. with him show that the tradition recorded in the Bhojacharitra must have been correct to this extent, that to avenge his uncle’s death the king of Mālvā formed a confederacy with some neighbouring princes and attacked the dominions of the Chālukyas. Perhaps he captured Vikramāditya I., of whom we know so little, and put him to death. It was probably on that account that Jayasimhha took arms against him and broke the confederacy, as represented in the inscription dated 941 Śaka.

After some time Someśvara attacked Chedi or Dāhala, the capital of which was Tevur or Tripura, and deposed or slew Karṇa. 23 King Bhoja must have died before this event; for, just about the time of his death, Karṇa had formed a confederacy with Bhīmadeva I. of Gujarāt with a view to attack Mālvā from two sides, and sacked Dhārā after his death. 24 Bilhaṇa next represents the Chālukya prince to have marched against the countries on the sea-coast, [83] probably the western. These he conquered, and

21 Bhojācharitra, I., 50-56.  
23 Bilhana’s Vikr., I., 102-103.  
24 Meratūṅga’s Bhojaprabandha; Rāsa Mālā, VI., p. 69, new Ed.
having erected a triumphal column there, proceeded by the sea-shore to the extremity of the peninsula. In his progress through that part of the country the king of the Dravidas or Cholas attacked him, but was defeated. Someśvara thereupon proceeded to his capital Kāṇchi, which he captured, and the Chola king had to flee away to save his life. Ṭhavamalla’s operations against Bhoja and the Cholas are alluded to in an inscription, and he is also represented to have fought with the king of Kānya-kubja or Kanoj and compelled him to betake himself to the caverns of mountains for safety.

Ṭhavamalla or Someśvara founded the city of Kalyāṇa and made it his capital. Billhaṇa mentions the fact, and the name of the city does not occur in any inscription of a date earlier than 975 Šaka, when Someśvara was reigning. In the course of time three sons were born to Ṭhavamalla, the eldest of whom was named Someśvara, the second Vikramāditya, and the third Jayasimha. The ablest of these was Vikramāditya, and Ṭhavamalla intended to raise him to the dignity of Yuvrāja or prince-regent in supersession of his elder brother; but

27 Billhaṇa’s Vikr. Ch., II., I. The natural construction appears to be to take पराः “most excellent” as an attributive adjective, not predicative, and take चक्कार as the predicate. The sense then will be: “He made (founded) the most excellent city named Kalyāṇa.”
28 See Dr. Fleet’s remarks on the point, Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 105. The word Kalyāṇa occurring in the Salotgi inscription (Ind. Ant., Vol. I., p. 210), is also, like that in Kṛti-varman’s grant, to be taken in the sense of “good,” “benefit,” “beneficial,” and not as the name of a town as Mr. Pāṇḍit and Dr. Bühler have done.
29 Billhaṇa’s Vikr. Ch., II., 57-58 and 85; III., I, 25.
Bilhana tells us he declined the honour.\textsuperscript{30} Somesvara therefore was installed as prince-regent, but the real work was done by Vikramaditya, who was invariably employed by his father to fight his battles. The first thing he did was to march as usual against the Cholas, whose king was defeated and deprived of his kingdom. The king of Malvâ, who had been driven from his country by somebody whose name is not given, sought Vikramaditya’s assistance. That prince put down his enemies and placed him on the throne.\textsuperscript{31} Vikramaditya is said to have invaded the Gauḍa country or Bengal and Kâmarûpa or Assam.\textsuperscript{32} In the more detailed description of his career of conquest, Bilhana tells us, he first marched against the Kerals, whom he conquered.\textsuperscript{33} The king of Sihhala submitted to him at his approach;\textsuperscript{34} then he took the city of Gaṅgakunḍa and proceeded to the country of the Cholas, the prince of which fled and took refuge in the caverns of mountains. Vikramaditya then entered Kâñchi and plundered it; and thence directed his march to Veṇgi, and to Chakrakoṭa.\textsuperscript{35}

While Vikramaditya was so employed, Áhavamalla was seized with a strong fever. When he observed his end approaching, he caused himself to be taken to the banks of the Tungabhadrā. He [84] bathed in the waters of the river and gave away a great deal of gold in charity. Then entering the river again, he proceeded until the water reached his neck, and, in the din caused by the waves and a number of musical instruments, drowned himself.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{30} Ib., III., 26-32, 35-41, and 48-51.
\textsuperscript{31} Ib., III., 55-67.
\textsuperscript{32} Ib., III., 74.
\textsuperscript{33} Ib., IV., 2, 18.
\textsuperscript{34} Ib., IV., 20.
\textsuperscript{35} Ib., IV., 21-30. For the situation of Veṇgi, see supra, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{36} Bilhana’s Vikr. Ch., IV., 46-68. This mode of death is known by the name of Jalasamādhi.
This event must have taken place in Śaka 991, corresponding to 1069 A.D. 37 Āhavamalla, according to Bilhaṇa, performed a great many sacrifices and was very liberal to men of learning. 38 On account of his virtues, poets made him the hero of the tales, poems, and dramas composed by them. 39

Someśvara, the eldest son of Āhavamalla, having been prince-regent, ascended the throne as a matter of course, and assumed the title of Bhuvanaikamalla. Vikramāditya received intelligence of his father's death while returning from Veṇgi. He hastened to the capital and was received with affection by his brother. Vikramāditya made over to him all the spoils he had won in the course of his conquests, and for some time there was a good understanding between the brothers. But Someśvara was a weak and tyrannical prince. He oppressed his subjects and lost their affection. He would not be guided by the counsels of wiser and better men; and the kingdom of Kuntala lost a good deal of its importance and influence. Vikramāditya, unable to control his brother and suspecting his intentions towards himself, left the capital with his younger brother Jayasimha and a large army. 40 Someśvara II. sent his forces after him, but they were defeated by Vikramāditya with great slaughter. 41 The prince then proceeded to the banks of the Tuṅgabhadra, and, after some time, directed his march towards the country of the Cholas. On the way he stopped at Banavāsi, where he enjoyed himself for some time, and then started for the country of Malaya. 

38 Bilhaṇa's Vikr. Ch., I., 97-99; IV., 52.
39 Ib., I., 88.
40 Ib., IV., 88-119; V., I.
41 Ib., V., 5-8.
keṣi is represented to have submitted to Vikramāditya and "given him more wealth than he desired, and thus to have rendered lasting the smile on the face of the Konkan ladies." Jayakesi appears thus to have been king of the Konkan, and was the same as the first king of that name, who in the copper-plate grants of the Goa Kadambas, published by Dr. Fleet, is spoken of as having entered into an alliance with the Chālukya and Chola kings and made Gopakapattana or Goa his capital. Vikramāditya or Tribhuvanamalla in after-life gave his daughter Mallalamaḥadvē in marriage to his grandson, who also was called Jayakesi; and this circumstance is mentioned in all the three grants, since the connection with the paramount sovereign of the Dekkan raised the dignity of the family. The king of the Alupas also rendered his obeisance to the Chālukya prince, who showed him marks of favour. He then subjugated the Keralas or people of Malabār, and turned towards the country of the Dravīḍas or Cholas. Being informed of this, the Chola prince sent a herald with proposals of peace, offering his daughter in marriage to Vikramāditya. These were accepted by the latter, and at the solicitations of the Chola he fell back on the Tuṅgabhadrā, where the prince arrived with his daughter and concluded an alliance.

Some time after, the king of the Cholas died and there was a revolution in the kingdom. When the Chālukya prince heard of this he immediately proceeded to Kāṇchi, and placing the son of his father-in-law on the throne, remained there for a month to

---

42 Ibid., V., 10, 18-25.
44 See supra, p. 88, note 13.
45 Bilhana's Vikr. Ch., V. 26-29, 46, 56, 60, 73, 79-89.
suppress his enemies and render his position secure. A short time after his return to the Tuṅgabhadrâ, however, Râjiga, the king of Veṇgi, observing that the nobility of the Chola prince were disaffected, seized the opportunity, and, having deposed him, usurped the sovereignty of the country. To embarrass Vikramâdityya and prevent his descent on Kâñchi, Râjiga incited his brother Someśvara II. to attack him from behind. Vikramâdityya, however, marched on, and, by the time he came in sight of the Draviḍa forces, Someśvara overtook him in his rear. He had a very large army, which was well equipped. 46 Bilhaṇa, who is, of course, anxious to show his patron to be guiltless in this fratricidal war, represents him to be deeply afflicted when he saw that his brother had made common cause with his enemy, and to have endeavoured to dissuade him from the course on which he had embarked. Someśvara made a show of yielding to his brother's postulations, seeking however in the meanwhile for a favourable opportunity to strike a decisive blow. 47 But Vikramâdityya finally resolved to give a fight to the armies of both. Then a bloody battle ensued, Vikramâdityya proved victorious, the new king of the Draviḍas fled, and Someśvara was taken prisoner. The Châlukya prince then returned to the Tuṅgabhadrâ, and after some hesitation dethroned Someśvara and had himself crowned king. To his younger brother Jayasimha he assigned the province of Banavâst. 48 These events took place in the cyclic year Nala, Śaka 998, or A.D. 1076. 49

46 Ib., VI., 7-54.
47 Ib., VI., 56-61.
48 Ib., VI., 90-93, 98-99.
49 Jour. R. A. S., Vol. IV., p. 4; Ind. Ant., Vol. VIII., p. 189. The current Śaka year was 999. Dr. Fleet thinks
Section XII.

Reign of Vikramāditya II.

Vikramāditya II. then entered Kalyāṇa and had a long and upon the whole a peaceful reign of fifty years. He assumed the title of Tribhuvanamalla, and is known by the names of Kalivikrama and Parmādirāya also. He abolished the Śaka era and established his own; but it fell into disuse not long after his death. Some time after his accession, he went to Karahata or Karhād and married the daughter of the Śilāhāra king who reigned at the place. Her name was Chandralekhā and she was a woman of rare beauty. Bilhaṇa represents her to have held a svayamvara where a great many kings assembled, out of whom she chose the Chālukya prince and placed the nuptial wreath round his neck. Whether the svayamvara was real, or imagined by the poet to give himself an opportunity for the display of his poetic and descriptive powers, it is not possible to decide. Chandralekhā is spoken of in the inscriptions as Chandraladevi, and many other wives of Tribhuvanamalla are mentioned besides her. The revenues of certain villages were assigned to them for their private expenses.

that the festival of his Paṭṭabandha or coronation, grants on account of which are recorded as made on the 5th day of the bright half of Phālguna in the Nala year, in an inscription at Vaḍageri, was the annual festival. But this is a mere assumption. One would expect in such a case the word vārshikotsava. The utsava or festival spoken of must be that which followed the ceremony. The date in this inscription refers to the grant, and does not, in my opinion, show at all the day on which the coronation ceremony took place. All we can gather from this inscription and that at Aralēsvara is that the Nala Sotivatsara was the first year of his reign.

51 Jour. R. A. S., Vol. IV., p. 15, and Bilhaṇa’s Vikr. Ch., VIII.—XI.
Some years after, Vikrama's brother Jayasimha, who had been appointed his viceroy at Banavasi, began to meditate treason against him. He extorted a great deal of money from his subjects, entered into an alliance with the Dravida king and other chiefs, and even endeavoured to foment sedition and treachery among Vikramaditya's troops. When the king heard of this, he made several attempts to dissuade his brother from his evil course, but they were of no avail; and in a short time Jayasimha came with his numerous allies and his large army and encamped on the banks of the Krishnâ. He plundered and burned the surrounding villages and took many prisoners, and considered success so certain that he sent insulting messages to Vikrama.52 The king then marched against him at the head of his forces. As he approached the river he was harassed by the enemy's skirmishers, but driving them away he encamped on the banks.53 He surveyed his brother's army and found it to be very large and strong. Then a battle ensued. At first the elephants of the enemy advanced and spread confusion in the ranks of Vikrama. All his elephants, horses, and men turned backwards; but with remarkable bravery the king rushed forward on the back of his maddened elephant, dealing heavy blows right and left. The elephants of the enemy were driven back and the king killed a great many of his soldiers. The army was defeated and Jayasimha and his followers fled away. Vikrama did not pursue the enemy, but took the elephants, horses, women, and baggage left on the battle-field, and returned to his capital. After a time Jayasimha was caught skulking in a forest and brought to Vikramâ-

52 Bilhana's Vikr. Ch., XIV., i-13, 18, 49-56.
53 ib., XIV., 57, 70, 71.
ditya, who, however, is represented to have pardoned him.\textsuperscript{54}

In the latter part of Vikrama's reign his dominions were invaded by a prince of the Hoysala branch of the Yâdava family reigning at Dvârasamudra, the modern Haâlebid in Maisur; and with him were associated the kings of the Pâṇḍya country, Goa, and Konkan. This Hoysala prince must have been Vishnuvardhana, the younger brother of Ballâla and the grandson of Vinayâditya, who first brought the dynasty into prominence. For in the inscription of Vira Ballâla, the grandson of Vishnuvardhana, at Gaddaka, Vishnuvardhana is represented to have overrun the whole country between his capital \textsuperscript{[87]} and Belvoâla and washed his horses with the waters of the Kârshna-Veâna. It is also stated that "he was again and again reminded by his servants of the honour done to him by the king Paramardideva (Vikramâditya), who said, 'Know the Hoysala alone among all princes to be unconquerable.' \textsuperscript{55} Vikramâditya despatched against these enemies a dependent chief of the name of Acha or Achagi, whose territory lay to the south. Acha, who was "a very lion in war and shining like the hot-rayed sun, sounding his war-cry, pursued and prevailed against Poysala, took Gove, put to flight Lakshma in war, valorously followed after Pâṇḍya, dispersed at all times the Malapas, and seized upon the Konkan."\textsuperscript{56} Acha must have fought several other battles for his

\textsuperscript{54} Ib., XV., 23, 41-42, 55-71, 85-87.

\textsuperscript{55} Ind. Ant., Vol. II., p. 300. Dr. Fleet's translation of this verse is incorrect. The words are to be thus collocated:

\textsuperscript{56} Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XI., p. 244. Poysala and Hoysala are one and the same word.
master; for he is represented to have made "the kings of Kaliṅga, Vaṅga, Maru, Gūrjara, Māḷava, Chera, and Chola (subject) to his sovereign." Vikramāditya himself had to take the field against the Chola prince, who had grown insubordinate. He was defeated and fled, and the king returned to his capital. Vikramāditya II. constructed a large temple of Viśṇu and had a tank dug in front of it. In the vicinity he founded a town which was called Vikramapura. He governed his subjects well and they were happy under his rule. The security they enjoyed was so great that, according to Bīlhana, "they did not care to close the doors of their houses at night, and instead of thieves the rays of the moon entered through the window openings." He was very liberal and bountiful to the poor and "gave the sixteen great gifts at each holy conjuncture." That he was a patron of learning is shown by the fact of a Kāśmirian Pañḍit like Bīlhana, who travelled over the whole of India in quest of support, having been raised by him to the dignity of Vidyāpati or chief Pañḍit. Vijñāneśvara, the author of the Mitaksharā, which is at present acknowledged over a large part of India, and especially in the Marāṭhā country, as the chief authority on matters of civil and religious law, flourished in the reign of Vikramāditya and lived at Kalyāṇa. At the end of most manuscripts of that work there occur three stanzas, which may be translated as follows:

57 Ib., p. 269.
58 Bīlhana's Vikr. Ch., XVII., 43-68.
60 Bīlhana's Vikr. Ch., XVII., 6, 36-37.
"On the surface of the earth, there was not, there is not, and there will be not, a town like Kalyāṇa; never was a monarch like the prosperous Vikramārka seen or heard of; and—what more?—Vijñānesvara, the Paṇḍit, does not bear comparison with any other [88] (person). May this triad which is like a celestial creeper exist to the end of the Kalpa!

"May the Lord of wisdom live as long as the

Dr. Bühler's reading of the last two lines is विनयानी वरप्पलितो भजने फिं चाष्ठिदीपणां कल्लो विहरात विश्वेत्तिकाकल्ली तदेष्य तयम्। The Doctor connects कल्लो with फिं चाष्ठिदीपणां and translates "nothing else that exists in this Kalpa bears comparison with the learned Vijñānesvara." To mean "nothing else," फिं चाष्ठिदीपणां must be किं बाणभूत; and in this construction पिंचली, the nominative, has no verb, बाणभूत being taken as the nominative to the verb भजने. Again, it will not do to say "nothing that exists in this Kalpa bears comparison," &c., for one-half of this Kalpa only has passed away; the other half still remains, and what it will produce but has not yet produced cannot be spoken of as बाणभूत or "existing in the Kalpa." The only proper reading with a slight alteration is that of the Bombay lithographed edition, which he has given in a footnote and which is विनयानीवरप्पलितोसामायमकालोनसीमातिकाकल्लो निविनयानीवरप्पलितोसामायमकालो निविनयानीवरप्पलितोसामायमकालो निविनयानीवरप्पलितोसामायमकालो। Instead of बाण, there must be चाष्ठिदीपणां here. And this is the reading of a manuscript of the Mitakṣarā, dated Saṅvat 1535 and Śaka 1401, purchased by me about ten years ago for the Bombay Government. The reading is to be translated as in the text.

Like the celestial creeper, in so far as the trial satisfies all desires.

Dr. Bühler reads सन विनयानीवरप्पलितो and construes it as a vocative. The vocative does not look natural here. The Bombay lithographed edition and my manuscript have विनयानीवरप्पलितो the nominative. Instead of सन the former has तयम् and the latter तयम्. I have adopted this last. The author has here taken the name Vijñānesvara in its etymological sense and given to विनयानी or "knowledge" the
sun and moon endure,—he who produces words which distil honey and than which nothing is more wonderful to the learned, gives wealth exceeding their wishes to a multitude of suppliants,\textsuperscript{65} contemplates the form of the subjugator of Mura, and has conquered the enemies that are born with the body.

"May the lord Vikramāditya protect this whole earth as long as the moon and the stars endure,—he whose feet are refulgent with the lustre of the crest jewels of prostrate kings from the bridge, which is the heap of the glory of the best scion of the Raghu race, to the lord of mountains, and from the Western Ocean, the waves\textsuperscript{66} of which surge heavily with the nimble shoals of fishes, to the Eastern Ocean."

Though Sanskrit authors often indulge in hyperbolic expressions without sufficient basis and as mere conventionalities, still the \[89\] language and manner of these stanzas do show a really enthusiastic admiration in the mind of the writer for the city, its ruler, and the great Paṇḍit, who from the fact of the liberality attributed to him appears to have enjoyed the favour of the king and perhaps held object तथा or "truth," the whole meaning "the lord of the knowledge of truth."

\textsuperscript{65} Dr. Bühler's reading here is द्वाराव्यामातिषयवुज्ञायामधी\
साधारणतावेग: Here पच्छिमतावेग cannot make any sense; it ought to be पच्छिमतावेग, which the lithographed edition and my manuscript have. The latter reads the whole line thus:—

d्वाराव्यामातिषयवुज्ञायामधी\
(तथा)वेग[\:]. There is another वेग after this, which is redundant.

\textsuperscript{66} The reading of the epithet of the "Western Ocean" is corrupt in all the three. I would improve that of the lithographed edition, which is चतुर्वासिककृतिसुमकिरसिंहसंग्राम to चतुर्वासिककृतिसुमकिरसिंहसंग्राम and of my manuscript to तुक्रुत्वनलसिंहसंग्राम. The root रिक्त is used in connection with waves (see B. & R.'s Lexicon \textit{sub voce}).
Section XII. a high office. From this and from the description given by Bilhana, as well as from Vikramāditya's inscriptions, of which we have about two hundred, it appears to be an undoubted fact that he was the greatest prince of this later Chāluksya dynasty, and that during his reign the country enjoyed happiness and prosperity.

Vikramāditya II. was succeeded in Śaka 1048 and in the cyclic year Parābhava (A.D. 1127) by his son Someśvara III., who assumed the title of Bhūloka-malla.\(^{67}\) He had a short reign of about 11 years. He is represented to have “placed his feet on the heads of the kings of Andhra, Dravīḍa, Magadha, Nepāla; and to have been landed by all learned men.”\(^{68}\) This last praise does not seem to be undeserved; for we have a work in Sanskrit written by Someśvara entitled Mānasollāsa or Abhilashītārtha-Chintāmani, in which a great deal of information on a variety of subjects is given. The book is divided into five parts. In the first are given the causes which lead to the acquisition of a kingdom; in the second, those that enable one to retain it after he has acquired it; in the third, the kinds of enjoyment which are open to a king after he has rendered his power firm; in the fourth, the modes of diversion which give mental pleasure; and in the fifth, sports or amusements. Each of these consists of twenty kinds. In the first are included such virtues as shunning lies, refraining from injury to others, continence, generosity, affability, faith in the gods, feeding and supporting the poor and helpless, friends and adherents, &c. Under the second head are described what are called the seven āṅgas, i.e., the ideal king,

---

\(^{67}\) Jour. R. A. S., Vol. IV., p. 15. The current Śaka year corresponding to Parābhava was 1049.

his ministers including the priest and the astrologer, the treasury and the way of replenishing it, the army, &c. The enjoyments are—a beautiful palace, bathing, anointing, rich clothing, ornaments, &c. The diversions are—military practice, horsemanship, training elephants, wrestling, cockfights, bringing up of dogs, poetry, music, dancing, and others. The last class comprises sports in gardens and fields, or on mountains and sandbanks, games, enjoyment of the company of women, &c. In connection with these subjects there are few branches of learning or art in Sanskrit the main principles of which are not stated. We have polity, astronomy, astrology, dialectics, rhetoric, poetry, music, painting, architecture, medicine, training of horses, elephants, and dogs, &c. The king does appear to have been a man of learning, and it was on that account that he received the title of Sarvakṣṇabhūpa or the "all-knowing king." In the Mānasollāsa, in connection with the preparation of an almanac, the day used as an epoch from which to calculate the positions of certain heavenly bodies is stated as "Friday, the beginning of the month of Chaitra, [90] one thousand and fifty-one years of Śaka having elapsed, the year of the cycle being Saumya, while the king Soma, the ornament of the Chālukya [race], who was the very sage Agastya to the ocean of the essences of all the Śāstras, and whose enemies were destroyed, was ruling over the sea-begirt earth. This work, there-

69 Ib., pp. 259 and 268.
70 That is, he drank the essences of all the Śāstras or sciences as the sage Agastya drank the whole ocean.

71 एकपयामदशिकि सहस्र शरदी गते।
शक्य सोमपानि सति चालुक्यसमये॥
Section XII. fore, was written in the fourth year after his accession.

Someśvara III. or Bhūlokamalla was succeeded in the cyclic year Kālayukti, Saka 1060 or A.D. 1138, by his son Jagadekamalla. Nothing particular is recorded of him. He reigned for 12 years and was succeeded by his brother Tailapa II., Nurmaḍī Taila or Trailokya-malla, in Saka 1072, Pramoda Sāhivatsara. During these two reigns the power of the Chālukyas rapidly declined, and some of the feudatory chiefs became powerful and arrogant. The opportunity was seized by a dependent chief named Vijjala or Vijjaṇa of the Kalachuri race, who held the office of Daḍanāyaka or minister of war under Tailapa. He conceived the design of usurping the throne of his master, and endeavoured to secure the sympathies and co-operation of some of the powerful

The Siddhārtha Sāhivatsara is mentioned as the second of his reign, wherefore the preceding Kālayukti (Saka 1060) must have been the first. The current Saka year was 1061. Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 141. There are several inscriptions in which the name of Jagadekamalla occurs, but it is difficult to make out whether they belong to the reign of this king or Jayasiṃha-Jagadekamalla, since the cyclic year only is given in them. Sometimes the year of the king’s reign is also given, but that even does not help in settling the point. For Jayasiṃha began to reign in Saka 940, just 120 years or two complete cycles of 60 years each before Jagadekamalla II., and consequently the cyclic years and the years of their reigns are the same.

For the Yuvra Sāhivatsara was the sixth of his reign and it fell next after Saka 1077. In Pramoda, 1073 was the current Saka year and 1072 years had expired; Pāli, Sans. and old Can. Ins. No. 181.
and semi-independent chiefs. Vijayârka, the Mahâ-
maṇḍalesvâra of Kolhâpur, was one of those who
assisted him, and Prolârâja of the Kâkateya dynasty
of Tailaṅgaṇa, who is represented to have fought
with Tailapa, did so probably to advance the same
cause. He kept his master Tailapa under complete
subjection till Saka 1079 or A.D. 1157, when Tailapa
left Kalyâna and fled to Annigeri in the Dhârvâd dis-
trict, which now became the capital of his kingdom
greatly reduced in extent. There is an inscription
dated Saka 1079, in Vijjaṇa’s name, the cyclic
[91] year being Isvâra; and the next Sâhâvatsara,
Bahudhânya, is spoken of as the second year of his
reign. He does not however seem to have assumed
the titles of supreme sovereignty till Saka 1084, when
he marched against Tailapa II., who was at Annigeri,
and proclaimed himself an independent monarch.
Tailapa seems then to have gone further south and
established himself at Banavâsî. The latest year
of his reign mentioned in the inscriptions is the
fifteenth, the Sâhâvatsara or cyclic year being
Pârthîva, which was current next after Saka 1087.

For some time there was an interruption in the
Châlukya power, and the Kalachuris seem to have
held possession of the whole territory of that dynasty.
But internal dissensions consequent on the rise of the
Lîṅgâyata creed and the assassination of Vijjaṇa con-
siderably weakened the power of the Kalachuris, and

74 Grant of Bhoja II. of Kolhâpur, Trans. Bomb. Lit.
Soc., Vol. III. See Section XVI.
75 He is said to have captured Tailapa and let him off
through his devotion for him. He probably owed some
allegiance to the Châlukya sovereign. Ins. of Rudradeva,
76 P. S. & O. C. Ins. Nos. 219 and 182.
78 P. S. & O. C. Ins. No. 140.
Section XII. about the Śaka year 1104 Someśvara, the son of Nurmaḍī Taila, succeeded in wresting a considerable portion of the hereditary dominions of his family, and established himself at Annigeri. He owed his restoration to power to the valour and devoted attachment of a feudatory of his family named Brahma or Bomma, who fought several battles with the enemies of his master and is said to have conquered sixty elephants by means of a single one. Bomma is represented in an inscription at Annigeri dated Śaka 1106 to have destroyed the Kalachuris and restored the Chālukyas to the throne. But a short time after, the Yādavas of the south rose under Vīra Ballāla and of the north under Bhīllama. They both fought with Bomma; but success at first attended the arms of Vīra Ballāla, who subdued the Chālukya general and put an end to the power of the dynasty. We lose trace of Vīra Soma or Someśvara IV. after Śaka 1111.

The Chālukya family must have thrown out several branches of petty chiefs. One such has been brought to light by a copper-plate grant dated Śaka 1182, Raudra Saṅhvatsara, which was in the possession of the Khot of Teravaṇ, a village in the Rājāpur tāluka of the Ratnāgiri district. The donor Keśava Mahājana was the minister of a Mahāmaṇḍalesvara or chief of the name of Kāṁvadeva, one of whose titles was "the sun that blows open the lotus bud in the shape of the Chālukya race." He is also called Kalyāṇapurasvarādhīśvara or "lord of Kalyāṇa the

81 Ind. Ant., Vol. II., p. 300, ll. 29-30.
THE DEKKAN

best of cities,” which like several such titles of other chiefs simply shows that he belonged to the family that once reigned with glory at Kalyāṇa. The village conveyed by the grant was Teravāṭaka, identified with Teravaṇ itself, from which it would appear that Kāṁvadeva was chief of that part of Konkan. There is an inscription in the temple of Ambābāi at Kolhāpur in which is recorded the grant of a village by Somadeva who belonged to the Chālukya family and reigned at Saṅgameśvara, which is twelve kos to the north-east of Ratnāgiri. Somadeva was the son of Vetugideva and the father of the last was Karnadeva. Probably the Kāṁvadeva of the Teravaṇ grant belonged to this branch of the family. There are still Marāṭhā families of the name of Chaḷke reduced to poverty in the Saṅgameśvara Tāluka or in the vicinity.

---

83 See infra, Section XVI.
Section XIII.

The earliest mention of a family of this name that we have is in connection with Maṅgalsā of the early Chālukya dynasty. Vinayāditya is represented in one of his inscriptions to have subdued the Haihayas and Vikramāditya II. married, as we have seen, two girls who were sisters belonging to the family. The later Rāṣṭrakūṭa princes were also connected by marriage with the Haihayas. This family known also by the name of Kalachuri or Kulachuri ruled over Chedi or the country about Jabalpur. The Kalachuris of Kalyāṇa must have been an offshoot of this family. One of the titles used by Vijjaṇa was Kālājaraṇavaravārādhīśvara "or Lord of the best city of Kālaṇjara." Kālaṇjara was a stronghold belonging to the rulers of Chedi and was probably their capital, though Tripura, the modern Tevir, is also known to have been the principal seat of the family. The title, therefore, connects the Kalyāṇa branch of the Kalachuris with the Chedi family. This branch was founded by Kṛishṇa, who in the Belgaum grant is spoken of as "another Kṛishṇa," the incarnation of Viṣṇu, and as "having done wonderful deeds even during his boyhood." He was succeeded by his son Jogama, and Jogama by his son Paramardin. Paramardin was the father of Vijjaṇa. Vijjaṇa before his usurpation called

1 Supra, Section X.
2 See grant published in Arch. Surv. West. Ind., No. 10.
4 Bilhaṇa's Vikr. Ch., XVIII., p. 93. Karna seems to be represented here to have conquered Kālaṇjara.
himself only a Mahâmaṇḍaleśvara or minor chief, and is first mentioned as a feudatory of Jagadekamalla, the successor of Somesvara III. The manner in which he drove away Taila III. from Kalyâna, and having raised himself to the supreme power in the state gradually assumed the titles of a paramount sovereign, has already been described. But soon after, a religious revolution took place at Kalyâna, and Vijjaña and his family succumbed to it.

The principal leader of that revolution was a person of the name of Basava. A work in Kanarese entitled Basava Purâna gives an account of Basava; but it is full of marvellous stories and relates the wonderful miracles wrought by him. The principal incidents, however, may be relied on as historical. On the other hand there is another work entitled Vijjarâyacharita, written by a Jaina, which gives an account of the events from the opposite side, since the attacks of the Liṅgâyatas were chiefly directed against the Jainas, and these were their enemies.

Basava was the son of a Brâhmaṇ named Mâdi-
raja, who lived at Bâgevâdi in the Kalâdgi district. Bâladeva, the prime minister of Vijjaña, was his maternal uncle and gave him his daughter in marriage. After Bâladeva’s death the king appointed Basava his prime minister as being closely related to Bâladeva. The Jainas, however, state that Basava had a beautiful sister named Padmâvatî, of whom the king became enamoured and whom he either married or made his mistress; and it was on that account that he was raised to that office and

---

6 P. S. & O. C. Ins. No. 119.
became a man of influence. There must be some truth in this story; for the Basava Purâna narrates that the king gave his younger sister Nîlalochanâ in marriage to Basava, which looks as if it were a counter-story devised to throw discredit on the other which was so derogatory to Basava. Basava had another sister named Nâgalâmibikâ, who had a son named Chenna-Basava or Basava the younger. In concert with him Basava began to propound a new doctrine and a new mode of worshipping Siva, in which the Linga and the Nandin or bull were prominent. He speedily got a large number of followers, and ordained a great many priests, who were called Jaṅgamas. Basava had charge of the king’s treasury, and out of it he spent large amounts in supporting and entertaining these Jaṅgamas, who led a profligate life. Vijjaṅa had another minister named Manîchaṇṇa, who was the enemy of Basava, and informed the king of his rival’s embezzlements. In the course of time Vijjaṅa was completely alienated from Vasava and endeavoured to apprehend him. But he made his escape with a number of followers, whereupon the king sent some men in pursuit. These were easily dispersed by Basava, and then Vijjaṅa advanced in person. But a large number of followers now joined Basava, and the king was defeated and had to submit to his minister. Basava was allowed to return to Kalyâna and reinstated in his office.

There was, however, no possibility of a complete reconciliation, and after some time the leader of the new sect conceived the design of putting the king to death. The circumstances that immediately led to

11 Ib., pp. 78 & 89.
the deed and the manner in which it was perpetrated are thus stated in the Basava Purâṇa.

At Kalyâṇa there were two pious Liṅga-yatas named Halleyaga and Madhuveyya, who were the devout adherents of their master Basava. Vijjaṇa, listening to the calumnious accusations of their enemies, caused their eyes to be put out. All the disciples of Basava were highly indignant at this cruel treatment of these holy men, and assembled in their master's house. Basava ordered Jagaddeva to murder the king, pronounced a curse on Kalyâṇa, and left the town. Jagaddeva hesitated for a moment, but his mother spurred him on, and with two companions, Mallaya and Bommaya, went straight to the palace of the king; and rushing through the throng of courtiers, counsellors, and princes, they drew their poignards and stabbed Vijjaṇa. Thence they went into the streets, and brandishing their weapons proclaimed the reason of their perpetrating the deed. Then arose dissensions in the city, men fought with men, horses with horses, and elephants with elephants; the race of Vijjaṇa was extinct, Kalyâṇa was a heap of ruins, and the curse pronounced [95] by Basava was verified. Basava went in haste to his favourite shrine of Saṅgameśvara, situated on the confluence of the Malaprabhâ with the Kṛishṇa, and there in compliance with his prayers the god absorbed him in his body.13

The account given by the Jainas is different. Jaina account. Vijjaṇa had gone on an expedition to Kolhâpur to reduce the Śilâhâra chief Bhoja II. to subjection. In the course of his march back to the capital he encamped at a certain place on the banks of the Bhimâ, and, while reposing in his tent, Basava sent...
to him a Jaṅgama disguised as a Jaina with a poisoned fruit. Vijjaṇa, who is said to have been a Jaina himself, unsuspectingly took the fruit from the hands of the seeming Jaina priest; and as soon as he smelled it, he became senseless. His son Immadi Vijjaṇa and others hastened to the spot, but to no purpose. Vijjaṇa, however, somewhat recovered his senses for a short while; and knowing who it was that had sent the poisoned fruit, enjoined his son to put Basava to death. Immadi Vijjaṇa gave orders that Basava should be arrested and all Jaṅgamas, wherever found, executed.\textsuperscript{14} On hearing of this, Basava fled; and being pursued went to the Malabar coast and took refuge at a place called Ulavi.\textsuperscript{15} The town was closely invested and Basava in despair threw himself into a well and died, while his wife Nilāṃbā put an end to her existence by drinking poison. When Vijjaṇa's son was pacified, Chenna-Basava surrendered all his uncle's property to him and was admitted into favour.\textsuperscript{16} He now became the sole leader of the Liṅgāyatas; but, even before, his position was in some respects superior to that of Basava. The religious portion of the movement was under his sole direction, and it was he who shaped the creed of the sect. In him the Praṇava or sacred syllable Om is said to have become incarnate to teach the doctrines of the Vira Śaiva faith to Basava,\textsuperscript{17} and, according to the Chenna-Basava Purāṇa, "Chenna-Basava was Śiva; Basava, Vṛishabha (or Śiva's bull, the Nandin); Bijnala, the door-keeper; Kalyāṇa, Kailāsa; (and) Śiva worshippers (or

\textsuperscript{14} Wilson's Mackenzie MSS., p. 320.  
\textsuperscript{15} Jour. R. A. S., Vol. IV., p. 22.  
\textsuperscript{16} Wilson's Mackenzie MSS., p. 320.  
\textsuperscript{17} Ib., p. 311.
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Liṅgāyatas), the Śiva host (or the troops of Śiva's attendants.)"  

Vijjana's death took place in Saka 1089 (1090 current), or A.D. 1167. He was succeeded by his son Soma, who is also called Sovideva or Someśvara. The Belgaum copper-plate charter was issued by him on the twelfth of the bright half of Kārttika in Saka 1096, the cyclic year being Jaya, to confirm the grant of land to fourteen Brāhmaṇs and the god Someśvara made by one of his queens named Bāvaladevi. The king had given her his consent to make the grant as a reward for a beautiful song that she sang on an occasion when the most influential persons belonging to his own and other kingdoms had gathered together in his audience-hall. Soma reigned till Saka 1100 and was followed by his brother Saṅkama, whose Saṅkama inscriptions come down to the cyclic year Subhakṛit. In an [96] inscription at Bālagām the cyclic year Vikārin (S. 1101) is called the third of his reign, while in another at the same place the same year is spoken of as the fifth. In other inscriptions we have two names Saṅkama and Āhavamalla and the cyclic years Sārvarin (S. 1102) and Plava (S. 1103) are represented as the third year of his or their reign, which is possible, and Subhakṛit (S. 1104) as the eighth. About Saka 1104 the Chālukya prince Someśvara IV. wrested some of the provinces of his ancestral dominions from the Kalachuris, and the rest must have been conquered by the Northern Yādavas; so that about this time the Kalachuri dynasty became extinct.

20 Ib. No. 189.
21 Ib. Nos. 190, 192 and 193.
During the period occupied by the later Châlukya dynasty and the Kalachuris (Śaka 895-1110 or A.D. 973-1188), the old state of things as regards the religious and social condition of the country may be said to have finally disappeared and the new ushered in. First, we have in this period what might be considered the last traces of Buddhism. In the reign of Tribhuvanamalla or Vikramâditya II., in the cyclic year Yuvan, and the nineteenth of his era (Śaka 1017), sixteen merchants of the Vaiśya caste constructed a Buddhistic vihâra or monastery and temple at Dharmavolal, the modern Dambal in the Dharvâd district and assigned for its support and for the maintenance of another vihâra at Lokkigundî, the modern Lakkundi, a field and a certain amount of money to be raised by voluntary taxation. In Śaka 1032 the Sîlahâra chief of Kolhâpur constructed a large tank and placed on its margin an idol of Buddha along with those of Śiva and Arhat, and assigned lands for their support. Jainism ceased in this period to be the conquering religion that it was, and about the end received an effectual check by the rise of the Liṅgâyata sect. This new creed spread widely among the trading classes, which before were the chief supporters of Jainism. There is a tradition in some parts of the country that some of the existing temples contained Jaina idols at one time and that afterwards they were thrown out and Brâhmaṇic ones placed instead. This points to a change of feeling with reference to Jainism, the origin of which must be referred to this period.

22 Ind. Ant., Vol. X., p. 185.
23 Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. XIII., p. 4, and infra, Section XVI.
The worship of the Purānic gods flourished; and as in the times of the early Chālukyas the old sacrificial rites were reduced to a system, so during this period the endeavours of the Brāhmaṇs and their adherents were for the first time directed towards reducing the civil and the ordinary religious law to a system, or towards its codification, as it might be called. The texts or precepts on the subject were scattered in a great many Smṛitis and Purāṇas; and often there were apparent inconsistencies and the law was doubtful. Nibandhas or digests, of which we have now so many, began to be written in this period, but the form which they first took, and which even now is one of the recognized forms, was that of commentaries on Smṛitis. Bhoja of Dhāra, who belongs to the first part of this [97] period, must have written a treatise on the subject, since under the name of Dhāreśvara he is referred to by Vijñāneśvara in his work. He was followed by Vijñāneśvara, who, as we have seen, lived at Kalyāṇa in the reign of Vikramāditya II. Aparārka, another commentator on Yājñavalkya, who calls his work a nibandha on the Dharmasastra or institutes of Yājñavalkya, was a prince of the Silāhāra family of northern Konkan and was on the throne in Śaka 1109 (A.D. 1187) and in the cyclic year Parābhava. Or, if he was the earlier prince of that name, he must have flourished about fifty years before. This movement was continued in the next or thirteenth century by Hemādri, and by Sāyaṇa in the fourteenth.

Section XIII. Genealogy of the Chalukya family between Vijayaditya and Tailapa as given in the Miraj grant of Jayasimha dated Saka 946.

Vijayaditya.

- Another son.
- Kirtivarman.
- Tailapa.
- Vikramaditya.
  - Ayyana, married the daughter of Krishna.
  - Vikramaditya, married Bhintadevi, the daughter of Lakshmana, king of Chedi.
  - Tailapa.

- Vikramaditya II.
- Kirtivarman II.
Genealogy of the later Chalukyas.

1. TAILAPA I. (Saka 895-919. A.D. 973-997.)

2. SATYÂŚRAYA, Irivibhujaṅga. (Saka 919-930. A.D. 997-1008.)

3. VIKRAMÂDIṬYA I. (Saka 930-940. A.D. 1008-1018.)

4. JAYÂŚIMHA, Jagadekamalla I. (Saka 940-962. A.D. 1018-1040.)

5. SOMEMÂVARA I., Áhavamalla; Trailokyamalla I. (Saka 962-991. A.D. 1040-1069.)

6. SOMEMÂVARA II., Bhuvanaikamalla. (Saka 991-998. A.D. 1069-1076.)

7. VIKRAMÂDIṬYA II., Tribhuvanamalla. (Saka 998-1048. A.D. 1076-1126.)

8. SOMEMÂVARA III., Bhûlokamalla. (Saka 1048-1060. A.D. 1126-1138.)

9. JAGADEKAMALLA II. (Saka 1060-1072. A.D. 1138-1150.)

10. TAILAPA II., Nurmadi Taila, Trailokyamalla II. (Saka 1074-1087 ? A.D. 1150-1165.)

11. SOMEMÂVARA IV. (Saka 1104-1111 ? A.D. 1182-1189.)
Section XIV.

The genealogy of the Vādavas is given in the introduction to the Vratakhāṇḍa attributed to or composed by Hemādri who was a minister of Mahādeva, one of the later princes of the dynasty. Some of the manuscripts of the work, however, do not contain it, and in others it begins with Bhillama, as it was he who acquired supreme power and raised the dynasty to importance. Others again contain an account of the family from the very beginning, the first person mentioned being the Moon who was churned out of the milky ocean. From the Moon the genealogy is carried down through all the Purāṇic or legendary ancestors to Mahādeva. But it is not difficult from the account itself to determine where the legend ends and history begins. Besides, the names of most of the historical predecessors of Bhillama agree with those occurring in the copper-plate grant translated by Paṇḍit Bhagvānlāl Indraji.\(^1\) He considered the Vādava dynasty mentioned in his grant to be different from that of Devagiri and called it "A New Vādava Dynasty," as, of course, in the absence of the information I now publish, he was justified in doing. But it is now perfectly clear that the princes mentioned in the grant were the ancestors of the Devagiri Vādavas. The following early history of the family is based on the account given in the Vratakhaṇḍa\(^2\) and on the grant published by the Paṇḍit.

---

\(^1\) Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., p. 119 et seq.

\(^2\) The edition of the Vratakhaṇḍa in the Bibliotheca Indica contains neither of these two very valuable and im-
The latter, however, brings down the genealogy only to [99] Seuṇachandra II. who was on the throne in 991 Śaka or 1069 A.D., and omits the names of some of the intermediate princes. Two other grants by princes of this dynasty found at Samigamner and

important Praśastis. I have therefore had recourse to manuscripts. There is one manuscript only in the Government collections deposited in the Library of the Dekkan College and that is No. 234 of Collection A of 1881-82 which was made by me. It contains the shorter Praśasti beginning with the reign of Bhillama. There is another copy in the collection belonging to the old Sanskrit College of Poona, which contains the longer Praśasti. Unfortunately, however, the third and fourth leaves of the manuscript are missing; and the second ends with Parammadeva the successor of Seuṇachandra II., while the fifth begins with some of the last stanzas of the introduction referring to Hemādri and his works. The valuable portion therefore was in leaves 3 and 4; but that is irretrievably lost. I therefore endeavoured to procure copies from the private collections in the city of Poona and obtained one from Khāṣgivāle’s library. It contains the shorter Praśasti only. My learned friend Gaṅgādhar Śastri Dātār procured another. In it the two, the shorter one and the longer, are jumbled together. There are in the commencement the first seventeen stanzas of the shorter, and then the longer one begins; and after that is over, we have the remaining stanzas of the shorter. This is the only manuscript of the four now before me which contains the whole of the longer Praśasti, and the information it gives about the later princes of the dynasty known to us from the inscriptions is also valuable and new, but the manuscript is extremely incorrect. I therefore caused a search for other copies to be made at Nasik, Kolhāpur, and Ahmedabad; but none was available at those places. I give the two Praśastis in Appendix C. [Since the first edition was published I have obtained and purchased another copy of the Vartakhaṇḍa for the Government collections. The introductory portion here is more correctly written, and I have used it in revising this section and the Praśasti in Appendix C.]
Section XIV. Kalas-Budruk of earlier dates have been recently published, and these also have been compared.

Subâhu who belonged to the Yâdava race was a universal sovereign. He had four sons among whom he divided the whole earth ruled over by him. The second son Drîdhaprahâra became king in the south or Dekkan. The Yâdavas, it is stated, were at first lords of Mathurâ; then from the time of Krîshna they became sovereigns of Dvâravatî or Dvârakâ; and came to be rulers of the south from the time of the son of Subâhu, viz., Drîdhaprahâra. His capital was Sûrîgara according to the Vratakhaṇḍa, while from the grant it appears to have been a town of the name of Chandrâdityapûra, which may have been the modern Châándor in the Nâsik district. He had a son of the name of Seuṇachandra who succeeded to the throne. The country over which he ruled was called Seuṇadesa after him, and he appears to have founded a town also of the name of Seuṇapura. Seuṇadesa was the name of the region extending from Nâsik to Devagiri, the modern Daulatâbâd, since later on we are told that Devagiri was situated in Seuṇadesa and that this latter was situated on the confines of Daṇḍakâranya. This name seems to be preserved in the modern Khânâdes. In a foot-note on

3 Mr. Cousen’s impression of the first of these grants was seen by me before it was published by Prof. Kielhorn in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. II., p. 212 et seq., and its contents embodied in the copy of this work revised for this second edition. I have, however, since availed myself of one or two points made out by Prof. Kielhorn and not noticed by me. The second grant is published in Ind. Ant., Vol. XVII., p. 120, et seq.

4 He is called Drîdhaprahâri (nom. sing.) in the MSS.; stanza 20, Appendix C. I.

5 Stanza 22, Appendix C. I.

6 Stanza 19, Appendix C. II.
the opening page of the Khândev Volume, the Editor of the "Bombay Gazetteer" observes that the name of the country was older than Musalman times, and it was afterwards changed by them to suit the title of Khân given to the Fâruki kings by Ahmed I. of Gujarât. Seûnadeśa, therefore, was very likely the original name and it was changed to Khândev, which name soon came into general use on account of its close resemblance in sound to Seûnadeśa. The country however extended farther southwards than the present district of Khândev, since it included Devagiri or Daulatâbâd, and probably it did not include the portion north of the Tâpf.

Seûnachandra's son Dhâdiyappa became king after him and he was succeeded by his son Bhillama. After Bhillama, his son Srîrâja according to the grants, or Râjugi according to the other authority, came to the throne, and he was succeeded by his son Vaddiga or Vâdugi. Vaddiga is in the Samgamner grant represented as a follower of Krîshnapâraja who was probably Krîshnâ III. of the Râshtrâkûta dynasty, and to have married Voddiyavâ,

7 Called Dhâdiyasa in the MSS.; Appendix C. I., stanza 23.

8 Ibid. Pandit Bhagvânlâl translates the words arvâk tasya (see note 10 below) occurring in the Yâdava grant as "before him," and placing Vaddiga before Srîrâja, conjectures that he was Bhillama's son and that Srîrâja his uncle deposed him and usurped the throne; (Ind. Ant., Vol. XII., pp. 125a and 128b). But arvâk tasya can never mean "before him," and must mean "after him," and hence the conjectures are groundless. I have never seen a preceding prince mentioned in the grants after his successor, with such an introductory expression as "before him so and so became king." By the occurrence of the word जहानियाँ in stanza 23, line 2, Appendix C. I., it appears Râjagi was the son of Bhillama I.
Section XIV. daughter of a [100] prince of the name of Dhorappa. Then came Dhâdiyasa,\(^9\) who was the son of Vâdugi according to the Vratakhaṇḍa. Two of the grants omit his name, probably because he was only a collateral and not an ancestor of the grantor in the direct line, and the third has a line or two missing here. Dhâdiyasa was succeeded by Bhillama, who was the son of Vaddiga or Vâdugi and consequently his brother.\(^10\) Bhillama married according to the grants

\(^9\) Appendix C. I. stanza 24. If he had been mentioned in the grant, he would probably have been called Dhâdiyappa.

\(^10\) Ibid. Paññë Bhagvânâlâl omits this prince though he is mentioned in his grant. The last two lines of the fourth stanza in this are:

\[\text{भार्वालस समुख भुततबहरि, शौकंद्रिगंधर्य नुः;}\\\text{तत्ताःशौकंद्रिगंधर्यचित्तिपति: प्रवचनमामवत्} \parallel\]

The Paññë translates this: "Before him was the illustrious king Vaddiga, a Hari on earth; and therefore he was exactly like the illustrious good Bhillama in his actions." I have already remarked that instead of "before him," we should have "after him" here. The word तत्ताः is translated by "therefore." "Wherefore?" I would ask. No reason is given in the first of these lines for his being exactly like Bhillama; and therefore, it will not do to translate तत्ताः by "therefore." Again, the Paññë’s interpretation of प्रवचनाः as "exactly like in actions" is far-fetched and unnatural. The thing is, the genitive or ablative चित्तिपति: cannot be connected with any word in the line, and is therefore one of the innumerable mistakes which we have in this grant and most of which have been pointed out by the Paññë himself. What is wanted here is the nominative चित्तिपति: for चित्तिपति: and then the whole is appropriate, and तत्ताः will have its proper sense of "after him," or "from him." The correct translation then is "After him was a king of the name of Vaddiga the prosperous, who was a Hari on earth, and after him or of him (i.e. Vaddiga) came the prosperous, great Bhillama in whom Virtue became
Lakshmi or Lachchiyavvā,¹¹ the daughter of Jhañjha, who was probably the Śilahāra prince of Šhānā of that name. Lachchiyavvā sprang on her mother’s side from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family, and through her son became “the upholder of the race of Yadu;”¹²

incarnate.” In this way we have here another king Bhillama, as mentioned in the Praśasti in the Vratakhaṇḍa in the passage cited above.

¹¹ This lady, according to my translation, becomes the wife of Bhillama, who is the king mentioned immediately before, and not of his father Vaddiga as the Pañḍit makes out.

¹² Here there is another difficulty arising from a mistake in the grant which Pañḍit Bhagvānlāl has in my opinion not succeeded in solving; and he bases upon that mistake conjectures which are rather too far-reaching (p. 123a, Ind. Ant., Vol. XII.). The stanza is:—

भाषा व च मंत्रवाजत्रनव श्रीविद्यवाहिनि
बधवानविवित्रसंमुखा राष्ट्रकुटानवि
वा जात्वा नववानवायस्रवी वदन्याधिरः
सतानीवतराजः भारतभारतायः तत्: III

The Pañḍit’s translation is:—“Whose wife was the daughter of king Jhañjha Lasthiyavvā by name, possessed of the (three) good qualities of virtue, liberality, and hospitality, who was of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa race, as being adopted (by them) at the time of the rule of the young prince (during his minority) and who therefore by reason of bearing the burden of the kingdoms, with its seven aṅgas, was an object of reverence to the three kingdoms.”

I agree with the Pañḍit in reading श्री before राष्ट्रकुटानवित and taking राष्ट्रव as राज्यव, and, generally, in his translation of the first two and the fourth lines. But the translation of the third line, that is, the portion italicised in the above, is very objectionable. The Pañḍit reads राज from नाथ and says that the व in वदन्यां ought to be long for the metre, but would make no sense. Now, in seeking the true solution of the difficulty here, we must bear in mind that in the fourth line the lady is spoken of as “an object of reverence to the three kingdoms.” Which are the three
Section XIV.

so that she was connected with three ruling dynasties and flourishing kingdoms. The Srāngamner grant appears to have been issued by this Bhillama in the Śaka year 922, i.e. 1000 A.D., and the prince mentioned in [101] the grant as having struck a blow against the power of Muñja and rendered the sovereign authority of Raṇaraṅgabhiṣma firm seems also to be he himself. Raṇaraṅgabhiṣma was probably

kings? First evidently, that of Jhañjha, her father, who is spoken of in the first line; and secondly that of the Rāshtrakūṭaś from whose race she is spoken of as having sprung in the second line. Now, we must expect some allusion to the third kingdom in the third line. The third kingdom was clearly that of the Yādavas into whose family she had been married. I, therefore, read वर्णनया for वर्णनया and thus the difficulty about the metre is removed, the त becoming prosodically long in consequence of the following त. In the same manner I think वाल्नाच is a mistake for वाल्नाम. The word जात the writer must have taken from his vernacular and considered it a Sanskrit word; or probably not knowing Sanskrit well, he must have formed it from the root जात on the analogy of सात from मह, नात from मह, मात from मृत &c. Or वाल्नाच may be considered as a mistake for वाल्नाम, the sense being the same, viz. "birth of a child." The compound वर्णनाचारिता is to be dissolved as चारित: वर्णन: यथा। चारित being made the second member according to Pāṇini II. 2, 37. Or, the line may be read as यथा यात्रा नवयोक्ताः प्रत्येकम् वर्णनाचारिताम्, the dot over या being omitted by mistake, and यात्रा written as आत्रा in consequence of the usual confusion between य and य. The translation of the line, therefore, is "who became the Upholder of the race of Yadu on the occasion of the birth of a new child," i.e. through her child she became the Upholder of the Yādava race. In this manner the supposition of her being adopted by the Rāshtrakūṭaś during the young prince's minority becomes groundless. She must have belonged to the Rāshtrakūṭa race on her mother's side.
THE DEKKAN

Tailapa, and thus it follows that the Vādava prince Bhillama II. assisted Tailapa in his war with Muñja which we have already noticed. Vaddiga was a follower of Krishpa III. of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family, whose latest known date is 881 Śaka, and Bhillama II. of Tailapa. The date 922 Śaka of Bhillama's grant is consistent with these facts. The Vādavas appear thus to have transferred their allegiance from the old to the new dynasty of paramount sovereigns as soon as it rose to power. The next king was Vesugi called in Paṇḍit Bhagvānīlāl's grant Tesuka, which is a mistake or misreading for Vesuka or Vesuga. He married Nāyaladevi, the daughter of Gogi, who is styled a feudatory of the Chāluksya family, and was perhaps the same as the successor of the Thānā prince Jhāṇīja. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas must have been overthrown by the Chāluksyas about the end of Jhāṇīja's reign, and thus his successor became a feudatory of the Chāluksyas.

[102] The Vratakhaṇḍa places Arjuna after Vesugi, but the two grants omit his name; and perhaps the former mentions Arjuna not as a Vādava prince, but Arjuna the Pāṇḍava, meaning to compare Vesugi with him and his enemies to Bhishma. The next king was Bhillama who according to the Kalas-Budruk grant was Vesugi's son. He married Hammā, the daughter of Jayasimha and sister of Āhavamalla, the Chāluksya emperor, under whose standard he

13 Stanza 24, Appendix C. I.
14 The expression नासुकान्यमयमयककीक in the grant admits of being taken in the manner I have done, being a mistake for मयमयक. The Paṇḍit understands Gogirāja as belonging to the Chāluksya race. I consider my interpretation to be more probable.
15 Stanza 24, Appendix C. I.
16 Stanza 26, Ibid.
Section XIV. fough several battles. The Kalas-Budruk charter was issued by this prince in 948 Saka. The cyclic year being Krodhana, 948 Saka must have been the current year, corresponding to 1025 A.D. Panḍit Bhagvānīlāl’s grant then proceeds at once to the donor, the reigning prince Seuṇa, who is spoken of in general terms as “having sprung from the race” of the last-mentioned king, and is represented to have defeated several kings and freed his kingdom from enemies after “the death of Bhillama.” This Bhillama was his immediate predecessor, but he was a different person from the brother-in-law of Åhavamalla, since Seuṇa, is spoken of not as the son of the latter or any such near relation but simply as “having sprung from his race.” The Vratakhaṇḍa supplies the names of the intermediate princes. The elder Bhillama was succeeded by Vādugi, his son, “whose praise was sung by poets in melodious words.” After him Vesugi became king, but how he was related to Vādugi we are not told. He humbled a number of subordinate chiefs who had grown troublesome. Then came Bhillama, and after him Seuṇa who issued the charter translated by Panḍit Bhagvānīlāl. What relationship the last three princes bore to each other is not stated. Seuṇa is represented to have saved Paramardideva, that is, Vikramāditya II., who is styled the “luminary of the Chālukya family” from a coalition of his enemies, and to have placed him on the throne of Kalyāṇa. This appears to be a reference to the coalition between the Veṅgi prince and Vikramāditya’s brother Someśvara. The Vādava

17 This appears to me to be the general sense of stanza 8 and not that he fought with Åhavamalla as Panḍit Bhagvānīlāl understands. I need not discuss the matter in detail.
18 Stanza 26, Appendix C. I. 19 Stanza 27, Ibid.
20 Stanza 28, Ib. 21 Stanza 29, Ib.
prince Seuṇa was thus a close ally of the Châlukya monarch and their dates also are consistent with the fact. Seuṇachandra’s grant is dated Śaka 991 Saumya Saṁhvatsara, while Vikramâditya II. got possession of the Châlukya throne in Śaka 998 Nala. The grant mentions the relations of previous Yâdava princes to the Châlukyas of Kalyâna, while the important service rendered by Seuṇachandra to Vikramâditya is not recorded, and he is spoken of only in general terms as having vanquished “all kings.” This itself shows that in all likelihood the fact mentioned in the Vratakhaṇḍa of Seuṇachandra’s having delivered that prince from his enemies and placed him on the throne took place after Śaka 991, and we know it as a matter of fact that Vikramâditya became king in Śaka 998.

[103] Seuṇachandra was succeeded by Paramma-deva who was probably his son, and after him came Simharâja or “King Simha,” whose full name was Siûghaṇa and who appears to have been his brother. He is said to have brought an elephant of the name of Karpûratilaka from Lañjîpura and thus did a piece of service to Paramardin, who appears to be Vikramâditya II. of the Châlukya dynasty. He was succeeded by his son Mallugi, who took a town of the name of Parṇakheṭa from his enemies, and while residing there carried away by force the troop of elephants belonging to the king of Utkala or Orissa. Then followed his son Amaragâṅgeya whose name is mentioned in a copper-plate grant issued in the reign of a subsequent king. After him came

22 Stanzas 30 and 31, Appendix C. I.
23 Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV., p. 315.
24 Stanz 32, Appendix C. I.
25 Stanzas 33 and 34, Ibid.
26 Stanz 35, Ibid.
Section XIV. Govindarāja who was probably his son. Govindarāja was succeeded by Amaramallagi, a son of Mallugi, and he by Kāliya Ballāja. This prince was in all likelihood the son of Amaramallagi, though it is not expressly stated. Ballāja's sons were set aside and the sovereignty of the Yādava family fell into the hands of his uncle Bhillama, who was possessed of superior abilities. Bhillama being represented as the uncle of Ballāja must have been another son of Mallugi, and he is so spoken of in the grant referred to above. He got possession of the throne after two of his brothers and their sons, wherefore he must have been a very old man at the time. Hence it is that he reigned only for a short time, having come to the throne in Saka 1109 and died in 1113. It was this Bhillama who acquired for his family the empire that was ruled over by the Chālukyas.

Paṇḍit Bhagvānīlāl has published a stone-inscrip-

28 Stanzas 35-37, Appendix C. I.
29 In an inscription at Gadag published by Dr. Kielhorn (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III., p. 219) Bhillama is represented as the son of Karna, who is said to be a brother of Arava-
gāngeya. In the many inscriptions of the Yādava dynasty and in the Praśastis given in several books the name Karna does not occur even once. The Gadag inscription makes Mallugi the son of Seṇapadeva, while in the Vratakhaṇḍa and the Paṭhan plates he is represented as the son of Singhaṇa, who according to the former authority was one of the successors of Seṇapachandra and was probably his younger son. The inscription is here opposed to two authorities which agree with each other. Hence this must be a mistake; and that makes it probable that the other is also a mistake. These suppositions are strengthened by the fact that the composer of the Gadag inscription does not mention a single particular fact with reference to any one of the princes, thus showing that he had no accurate know-
ledge of them. Such a merely conventional description is characteristic of a forged charter. I am, for these reasons, inclined to think that the Gadag grant published by Dr. Kielhorn is a forgery.
tion existing in a ruined temple at Añijaneri near Nāsik, in which a chief of the Yādava family, named Seuṇadeva, is represented to have made some grant in the Saka year 1063 to a Jaina temple. From the account given above, it will be seen that there were two princes only of the name of Seuṇa in the Yādava family, and that the later of the two was an ally of Vikramāditya II., and consequently reigned about the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century of the Saka [104] era. The Seuṇadeva of the Añijaneri inscription therefore cannot be this individual, and no other prince of that name is mentioned in the Vratakalpaṇḍa. Besides Seuṇadeva calls himself pointedly a Mahāsāmanta or chief only; while about 1063 Saka, when the Chālukya power had begun to decline, it does not appear likely that the Yādava of Seuṇadesā should give themselves such an inferior title. It therefore appears to me that the Seuṇadeva of Añijaneri belonged to a minor branch of the Yādava family dependent on the main branch, and that the branch ruled over a small district of which Añijaneri was the chief city.

The number of princes who reigned from Dṛḍhaphrāhāra to Bhillama V. inclusive is 22. There are in the list a good many who belonged to the same generation as their predecessors and consequently these twenty-two do not represent so many different generations. Allowing, therefore, the usual average, in such cases of 18 years to each reign, the period that must have elapsed between the accession of Dṛḍhaphrāhāra and the death of Bhillama V. is 396 years. The dynasty, therefore, was founded about

31 The correct year has been shown to be 1064 Saka by Prof. Kielhorn, Ind. Ant., Vol. XX., p. 422.
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Section XIV. 717 Saka or 795 A.D., that is, about the time of Govind III. of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa race. Possibly considering that Vaddiga I. was contemporary of Kṛishṇa III., one might say that the dynasty was founded in the latter part of the reign of Amoghavarsha I.

Genealogy of the early Yādavas or the Yādavas of Seuṇadeśa.

Drīḍhaprahāra.

Seuṇachandra I.

Drāḍḍiyappa I.

Bhillama I.

Rājagi or Śrīrāja.

Vāṅguli or Vaddiga I.

Drāḍḍiyappa II. Bhillama II. Saka 922.

Vesugi I.

Bhillama III. Saka 948.

Vāṅguli II.

Vesugi II.*

Bhillama IV.*

Seuṇchandra II.* Saka 991 or A.D. 1069.

Parammādeva.

Sīṅghaṇa.

Mallugi.

Amaragāṁgeya. Amaramallagi. Bhillama V. or I. died Saka 1113 or A.D. 1191.

Govindarāja. Ballāla.

* The relations of those whose names are marked with an asterisk to their predecessors are not clearly stated.
[105] SECTION XV.

THE YÁDAVAS OF DEVAGIRI.

Later History.

We have seen that the Hoysaḷa Yádavas of Hālebid in Maṅṣur were becoming powerful in the time of Tribhuvanamalla or Vikramāditya II. and aspiring to the supreme sovereignty of the Dekkan, and Vishṇuvardhana, the reigning prince of the family at that period, actually invaded the Chāḷukya territory and encamped on the banks of the Kṛishṇā-Veṇā. But those times were not favourable for the realization of their ambitious projects. The Chāḷukya prince was a man of great ability, the power of the family was firmly established over the country, its resources were large, and the dependent chiefs and noblemen were obedient. But the state of things had now changed. Weaker princes had succeeded, the Chāḷukya power had been broken by their dependents the Kalachuris, and these in their turn had succumbed to the internal troubles and dissensions consequent on the rise of the Liṅgāya sect. At this time the occupant of the Hoysaḷa throne was Vīra Ballāḷa, the grandson of Vishṇuvardhana. He Vīra Ballāḷa. fought with Brāhma or Bomma, the general of the last Chāḷukya prince Somesvara IV., and putting down his elephants by means of his horses defeated him and acquired the provinces which the general had won back from Vijjaṇa.¹

The Yádavas of the north were not slow to take advantage of the unsettled condition of the country to extend their power and territory. Mallugi seems to have been engaged in a war with Vijjaṇa. A

¹ Ind. Ant., Vol. II., p. 300.
person of the name of Dâdâ was commander of his
troops of elephants and is represented to have gained
some advantages over the army of the Kalachuri
prince. He had four sons of the names of Mahâdhara,
Jahla, Sâmba, and Gaûgâdharâ. Of these Mahâdhara
succeeded his father and is spoken of as having
defeated the forces of Vijjaâ. But the acquisition
of the empire of the Châlukyas was [106] completed
by Mallugi’s son Bhillama. He captured a town of
the name of Srivardhana from a king who is called
Antala, vanquished in battle the king of Pratyandaka,
put to death the ruler of Maûgalaveshâ, (Maûgal-
veûhheî), of the name of Villaûa, and having obtained
the sovereignty of Kalyâ, put to death the lord of
Hosala who was probably the Hoysala Yâdava
Narasirha, the father of Vira Ballâja. The com-
mander of his elephants was Jahla, the brother of
Mahâdhara, and he is represented to have rendered
Bhillama’s power firm. He led a maddened elephant
skilfully into the army of the Gûrjara king, struck
terror into the heart of Malla, frightened the forces

2 Introduction to Jahlân’s Sûktimuktavali, now brought
to notice for the first time:

The full introduction will be published elsewhere.

3 Appendix C. I., stanza 38. Maûgalveûhheî is near
Pandharpur. It was probably the capital of a minor chief.
of Mallugi, and put an end to the victorious career of Munja and Anna. When in this manner Bhillama made himself master of the whole country to the north of the Krishnâ, he founded the city of Devagiri and having got himself crowned, made that city his capital. This took place about the Saka year 1109.

Bhillama then endeavoured to extend his territory farther southwards, but he was opposed by Vira Ballâla, who, as we have seen, had been pushing his conquests northwards. It was a contest for the possession of an empire and was consequently arduous and determined. Several battles took place between the two rivals, and eventually a decisive engagement was fought at Lokkiguñḍi, now Lakkuñḍi, in the Dhârvâd District, in which Jaitrasinhha, who is compared to "the right arm of Bhillama" and must have been his son, was defeated and Vira Ballâla became sovereign of Kuntala. The inscription in which this is recorded bears the date Saka 1114 or A.D. 1192; and Vira Ballâla who made the grant recorded in it was at that time encamped with his victorious army at Lokkiguñḍi, from which

---


विजय विजयन गाते सुरक्षों महीपरेः

निलाय निलाय बही राजस्त चयतिक्षितसानम् ॥ १२ ॥

पूर्ववर्षसारको वर्णविषमेवतितुमेव दैन।

भगदनवीरेन्मच्छु दुही; लेखको नीति: ॥ १२ ॥

सः: पशुविकोषबृतभिषिक्षितखावली नेहुजि—

सुमुख: पितकोविकमितिभुवननामा किल राजस्त:।

घो: नूपररक्षको विहारसृंखूरवर्षाकोके

देहाकारी सुराविक्रमस्य विष विष न तस्वीर्जितम् ॥ १२ ॥

The Mallugi mentioned here must have been one of the enemies of Bhillama. He probably belonged to a minor branch of the Yâdava family.

5 Appendix C. I., st. 39.

6 Ind Ant., Vol. II., p. 300.
it would appear that the battle had taken place but a short time before. The northern Yādavas had to put off the conquest of Kuntala or the Southern Marāthā Country for a generation.

Jaitrapāla. Bhillumā was succeeded in 1113 Śaka by his son Jaitrapāla or Jaitugi. He took an active part in his father's battles. "He assumed [107] the sacrificial vow on the holy ground of the battle-field and throwing a great many kings into the fire of his prowess by means of the ladles of his weapons, performed a human sacrifice by immolating a victim in the shape of the fierce Rudra, the lord of the Tailaṅgas, and vanquished the three worlds." This same fact is alluded to in the Paṭhaṇ grant, in which Jaitugi is represented to have killed the king of the Trikaliṅgas in battle. He is there spoken of also as having released Gaṇapati from prison and to have placed him on the throne. The Rudra therefore whom he is thus represented to have killed on the field of battle must have been the Rudradeva of the Kākatiya dynasty whose inscription we have at Anamkōḍ near Woraṅgal, and the Gaṇapati, his nephew who was probably placed in confinement by Rudradeva. In other places also his war with the king of the Andhras or Tailaṅgas and his having

7 Appendix C. I., st. 47. Just as the fruit of a horse sacrifice is the conquest of the whole world, the fruit of a man-sacrifice is supposed here to be the conquest of the three worlds. Jaitrapāla performed metaphorically such a sacrifice; and that is considered to be the reason, as it were, of his having obtained victories everywhere, i.e. in the usual hyperbolic language, of his having succeeded in vanquishing the three worlds.

8 Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV., p. 316.

9 Ind. Ant., Vol. XXI., p. 197.
raised Gaṇapati to the throne are alluded\textsuperscript{10} to, and he is represented to have deprived the Andhra ladies of the happiness arising from having their husbands living.\textsuperscript{11} Lakshmîdhara, the son of the celebrated mathematician and astronomer Bhâskarâcharya, was in the service of Jaitrapâla and was placed by him at the head of all learned Paṇḍits. He knew the Vedas and was versed in the Tarkasastra and Mîmâṃsâ.\textsuperscript{12}

Jaitrapâla's son and successor was Siṅghâna, under whom the power and territory of the family greatly increased. He ascended the throne in 1132 Saka.\textsuperscript{13} He defeated a king of the name of Jajjalla and brought away his elephants. He deprived a monarch named Kakkûla of his sovereignty, destroyed Arjuna who was probably the sovereign of Mâlvâ, and made Bhoja a prisoner. Janârdana, the son of Gaṅgâdhara, who was Jahla's brother, is said to have taught Siṅghâna the art of managing elephants which enabled him to vanquish Arjuna.\textsuperscript{14} He had succeeded to the office of commander of elephants held by Jahla and after him by Gaṅgâdhara. "King Lakshmi-

\textsuperscript{12} I\.b. p. 415.
\textsuperscript{13} Jour. R. A. S., Vol. IV., p. 5.
\textsuperscript{14} Intr. Jahi. Sukt. —

\begin{verbatim}
पशुपशुरेश्वरः भास्करः शाखरा वाक्षीरोपः।
एकाकशवत्वे आलस्युषिणयमुखाश्च। ॥ १५ ॥
तथामय्यक्रमसमुन्नमसस्री जनादिनाः। वर्तवाधिनीव। ॥ १६ ॥
समुदकावश्यकेषु सुभवेऽवसाय सपन्धितं शिवमेर्षेर्दतेत। ॥ १७ ॥
हिंदुप्रचारादिति कश्चिं गान्धर्वं तदःतुम। ॥ १८ ॥
मयावत्मकसर्वं समुच्छुदमुदयत। ॥ २० ॥
\end{verbatim}
Section XV. the possession of Ballâla was taken. All this was but a child's play to King Siṅghaṇa. Jajjalla must have been a prince belonging to the eastern branch of the Chedi dynasty that ruled over the province of Chhattisgarh, for that name occurs in the genealogy of that dynasty. The name Kakkâla I would identify with Kokkala which was borne by some princes of the western branch of the family, the capital of which was Tripura or Tevrur. The kings of Mathurâ and Kâśi were killed by him in battle, and Hammîra was vanquished by but a boy-general of Siṅghaṇa. In an inscription also at Tilivâlî in the Dhârvâd District, he is represented to have defeated Jajalladeva, conquered Ballâla the Hoysala king, subdued Bhoja of Panhâlâ, and humbled the sovereign of Mâlava. He is also spoken of as "the goad of the elephant in the shape of the Gûrjara king." We have an inscription of his at Gaddaka dated 1135 Saka, which shows that Vira Ballâla must have been deprived of the southern part of the country before that time. Siṅghaṇa is represented as reigning at his capital Devagiri.

The Bhoja of Panhâlâ spoken of above was a prince of the Śilâhâra dynasty, and after his defeat the Kolhâpur kingdom appears to have been annexed by the Yâdavas to their dominions. They put an end to this branch of the family as later on they did

15 Appendix C. I., st. 43 and 44. Ind. Ant., Vol. XIV., p. 316.
16 General Cunningham's Arch. Reports, Vol. XVII., pp. 75, 76 and 79.
21 Major Graham's Report, Ins., No. 10.
to another which ruled over Northern Konkan. From this time forward the Kolhapur inscriptions contain the names of the Yàdava princes with those of the governors appointed by them to rule over the district. An inscription of Siṅghana at Khedrāpur in that district records the grant of a village to the temple of Koppeśvara in the year 1136 Saka.

Siṅghana seems to have invaded Gujarāt several times. In an inscription at Ämbēn a Brāhmaṇ chief of the name of Kholesvara of the Mudgala Gotra is spoken of as a very brave general in the service of the Yàdava sovereign. He humbled the pride of the Gûrjara prince, crushed the Mālava, destroyed the race of the king of the Ābhītras, and being like "wild fire to the enemies" of his master, left nothing for Siṅghana to be anxious about. His son Râma succeeded him, and a large expedition under his command was again sent to Gujarāt. Râma advanced up to the Narmadâ, where a battle was fought, in which he slew numbers of Gûrjara soldiers, but he himself lost his life. 22 From this it would appear that Gujarāt was invaded by Siṅghana on two occasions at least, if not more; and this is borne out by what we find stated in the authorities [109] for the history of Gujarāt. Somadeva, the author of the Kirtti-kaumudi, which gives an account of the minister Vastupāla and his masters the princes of the Vāghelā branch of the Chālukya family, describes an invasion of Gujarāt by Siṅghana in the time of Lavaṇaprasāda and his son Vīradhavāla. "The capital of Gujarāt trembled with fear when the advance of Siṅghana's army was reported. Being afraid of this foreign invasion no one among the subjects of the Gûrjara king began the construction of a new house or stored grain, and the minds of all

---

were restless. Neglecting to secure the grain in their fields they showed a particular solicitude to procure carts, and as the army of the enemy approached nearer and nearer, the people with their fears greatly excited removed farther and farther. When Lavaṇapraśāda heard of the rapid advance of the innumerable host of the Yādava prince, he knit his brow in anger; and though he had but a small army, proceeded with it to meet that of the enemy, which was vastly superior. When the forces of Siṁghaṇa arrived on the banks of the Tāpf he rapidly advanced to the Mahi. Seeing, on the one hand, the vast army of the enemy and, on the other, the indomitable prowess of the Chālukya force, the people were full of doubt and could not foresee the result. The enemy burnt villages on their way, and the volume of smoke that rose up in the air showed the position of their camp to the terrified people and enabled them to direct their movements accordingly. The Yādavas overran the country about Bharoch while the plentiful crops were still standing in the fields; but the king of Gujārāt did not consider them unconquerable.23 In the meanwhile, however, four kings of Mārvāḍ rose against Lavaṇapraśāda and his son Vīradhavala, and the chiefs of Godhrā and Lāṭa, who had united their forces with theirs, abandoned them and joined the Mārvāḍ princes. In these circumstances Lavaṇapraśāda suddenly stopped his march and turned backwards.24 The Yādava army, however, did not, according to Someśvara, advance farther; but he gives no reason whatever, observing only that “deer do not follow a lion’s path even when he has left it.”25 But if the invasion spread such terror over the country as Someśvara

23 Kirttikaśāstra IV., stanzas 43-53.
24 Lb., st. 55-60.
25 Lb., st. 63.
himself represents, and the army of Siṅghaṇa was so large, it is impossible to conceive how it could have ceased to advance when the Gūrjara prince retreated, unless he had agreed to pay a tribute or satisfied the Yādava commander in some other way. In a manuscript discovered some years ago of a work containing forms of letters, deeds, patents, &c., there is a specimen of a treaty with the names of Siṅghaṇa and Lavaṇaprasāda as parties to it, from which it appears that a treaty of that nature must actually have been concluded between them.\textsuperscript{26} The result of the expedi-
tion, [110] therefore, was that Lavaṇaprasāda had to submit and conclude a treaty of alliance with Siṅghaṇa.

This invasion of Gujarāt must have been one of the earlier ones alluded to in the Āṃbeś inscription, and Kholeśvara himself must have been the commander of the Yādava army on the occasion. For Lavaṇaprasāda is said to have declared himself independent of his original master Bhima II. of Anahilapattana about the year 1276 Vikrama,27 corresponding to 1141 Śaka, which was about the ninth or tenth year of Siṅghaṇa’s reign, and the work in which the treaty mentioned above occurs was composed in 1288 Vikrama, i.e. 1153 Śaka. But the expedition under the command of Rāma, the son of Kholeśvara, must have been sent a short time before

"On this day the 15th Sudi of Vaiśākha, in the year Sārvat 1288, in the Camp of Victory, [a treaty] between the paramount king of kings, the prosperous Siṁhaṇa and the Mahāmanḍalesvara Rāṇaka, the prosperous Lāvanyaprasāda Siṁhaṇa whose patrimony is paramount sovereignty, and the Mahāmanḍalesvara Rāṇa the prosperous Lāvanyaprasāda should according to former usage confine themselves, each to his own country; neither should invade the country of the other."

The treaty then provides that when either of them is taken up by an enemy, the armies of both should march to his release; that if a prince from either country ran away into the other with some valuable things, he should not be allowed quarter, &c. Now, it is extremely unlikely that the author of the work should introduce these persons in his form unless he had seen or heard of such a treaty between them. Siṁhaṇa is but another form of Siṅghaṇa, and he is spoken of as a paramount sovereign. The treaty, it will be seen, was concluded in the “victorious camp,” which is a clear reference to the invasion described by Someśvara.

In रक्षितं we have, I think, the vernacular root रक्ष “to remain,” “to live.” For further details see my Report on the search for manuscripts during 1882-83, pp. 39 and 225. 27 Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 190.
Šaka 1160, the date of the Ambeṣh inscription. For Rāma's son is represented to have been a minor under the guardianship of that chief's sister Lakṣhipi, who governed the principality in the name of the boy. Rāma, therefore, had not died so many years before Šaka 1160 as to allow of his boy having attained his majority by that time. On the occasion of this expedition Visaladeva, the son of Viradhavala, was the sovereign of Gujarāt. For in an inscription of his he boasts [111] of his having been "the submarine fire that dried up the ocean of Śinghaṇa's army," and he must have succeeded his father about the year 1292 Vikrama corresponding to Šaka 1157, though he obtained possession of the throne at Anahilapattana in Vikrama 1302, corresponding to Šaka 1167 and 1246 A.D. The foundation of his boast was probably the fact of Rāma's having been killed in the battle. What the ultimate result was, however, the inscription does not inform us.

Śinghaṇa appointed one Bīcha or Bīcha, the son of Chikka and younger brother of Malla, to be governor of the southern provinces and his viceroy there. He fought with his master's enemies in the south as Kholeśvara did in the north and kept them in check. Bīchaṇa is represented to have humbled the Raṭṭas who were petty feudatories in the Southern Marāṭha Country, the Kadambas of Konkan, i.e. of Goa, the Guttas sprung from the ancient Guptas, who held a principality in the south, the Pāṇḍyas, the Hoysalas, and the chiefs of other southern provinces, and to have erected a triumphant

---

28 Ind. Ant., Vol. VI. pp. 191 and 212.
29 Viradhavala, it is said, died not long before Vastupāla. The death of the latter took place in Vikrama 1297. Vastupāla was minister to Visaladeva also for some time. We might, therefore, refer the accession of the latter to Vikrama 1292. Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 190.
column on the banks of the Kâveri.\(^\text{30}\) The date of the grant in which all this is recorded is Šaka 1160 or A.D. 1238.

It thus appears that the Yâdava empire became in the time of Sîṅghaṇa as extensive as that ruled over by the ablest monarchs of the preceding dynasties. The full title of a paramount sovereign are given to Sîṅghaṇa in his inscriptions, such as “the support of the whole world,” “the lover of the earth (Prithvivallabhā),” and “king of kings.” Since Kṛishṇa, the eighth incarnation of Vishṇu, is represented in the Purânas to have belonged to the Yâdava family, the princes of Devagiri called themselves Vishṇuvanaḥśodbhava;\(^\text{31}\) and as Kṛishṇa and his immediate descendants reigned at Dvârakā, they assumed the title of Dvâravatipuravaranādhiśvara, “the supreme lord of Dvâravatī, the best of cities.”\(^\text{32}\) In the reign of Sîṅghaṇa as well as of his two predecessors the office of chief secretary or Śrīkaraṇādhipa, which in a subsequent reign was conferred on Hemâdri, was held by a man of the name of Soḍhala. He was the son of Bhâskara, a native of Kaśmir who had settled in the Dekkan. Soḍhala’s son Sarrângadhara wrote in this reign a treatise on music entitled Saṅgīttaratnâkara which is extant.\(^\text{33}\) There is a com-

---


\(^\text{31}\) i.e. “of the race of Vishṇu.”


\(^\text{33}\) Then follows one verse in praise of Sîṅghaṇa, and two in praise of Soḍhala in which he is represented to have pleased Sîṅghaṇa by his merits and to have conferred benefits on all through the wealth and influence thus acquired; and then we have...
Section XV.

mentary [112] on this work attributed to a king of the name of Śīṅga who is represented as a paramount sovereign of the Andhra circle. This Śīṅga appears in all likelihood to be Śīṅghaṇa; and the commentary was either written by him or dedicated to him by a dependant, as is often the case. 34 Chāṅgadeva, the grandson of Bhāskarāchārya and son of Lakshmīdhara, was chief astrologer to Śīṅghaṇa; and also Anantadeva, the grandson of Bhāskarāchārya's brother Śrīpati and son of Gaṇapati. Chāṅgadeva founded a Maṭha or college for the study of his grand-father's Siddhântaśiromani and other works at Pāṭhā in the Châlisgaṁh division of the Khândes district, and Anantadeva built a temple at a village in the same division and dedicated it to Bhavâṇi on the 1st of Chaitra in the Śaka year 1144 expired. 35 Śīṅghaṇa's son was Jaitugi or Jaitrapāla, who "was the abode of all arts, and was thus the very moon in opposition, full of all the digits, that had come down to the earth, to protect it. He was death to hostile kings and firm in unequal fights." 36 But if he protected the earth at all he must have done so during the lifetime of his father as Yuvarâja, for the latest date of Śīṅghaṇa is Śaka 1169, and in a copper-plate inscription of his grandson and Jaitugi's son Kṛishṇa, Śaka 1175, Pramâḍi-Samvatsara, is stated to be the seventh of his reign, so that Kṛishṇa began

34 My Report on MSS. for 1882-83, pp. 37, 38 and 222.
36 Appendix C. II., st. 7.
Section XV. to reign in Śaka 1169 corresponding to 1247 A.D.\textsuperscript{37}

And in the longer of the two historical introductions to the Vratakhāṇḍa, Jaitugi is not mentioned at all. After Siṅghaṇa, we are told that his grandsons Krīṣṇa and Mahādeva came to the throne, of whom the elder Krīṣṇa reigned first.\textsuperscript{38} Krīṣṇa's Prākrit name was Kanhāra, Kanhara, or Kandhāra. He is represented to have been the terror of the kings of Mālava, Gujarāt, and Konkan, to have "established the king of Teluṅga," and to have been the sovereign of the country of the Chola king.\textsuperscript{39} In the Vratakhāṇḍa also he is said to have destroyed the army of Vīsala, who we know was sovereign of Gujarāt at this time and who had been at war with Siṅghaṇa, and, in general terms, to have "conquered a great many enemies in bloody battles in which numbers of horses and elephants were engaged, reduced some to captivity and compelled others to seek refuge in forests, and, having thus finished the work of vanquishing the series of earthly kings, to have marched to the heavenly world to conquer Indra."\textsuperscript{40} Lakṣh-

\[113\] mīdeva, son of Janārdana, is represented by his wise counsels to have helped Krīṣṇa to consolidate his power and to have by his sword subdued his enemies.\textsuperscript{41} Krīṣṇa performed a great many sacrifices

\textsuperscript{38} Appendix C. I., st. 45.
\textsuperscript{40} That is, "left this world," "died," Appendix C. II., st. 11.
\textsuperscript{41} Intr. Jahi. Sakt. : —

\begin{quote}

विनियमकरस्या: सुरुद्दासांनां चित्रानांगानीणां—
सब्रायामध्येकम्: समवन्याप्रिक्षादिविना सुवी:।
महास्मृतिश्रेष्ठापितामिष्टानृविविष्कृतप्रत्यकम्
राज्यं जनन्धिपेतिरिक्तम् दलं स्वरं श्रीवभाषा ॥ २१ ॥
भगवतं द्वं स्वचारिनीशचित्रिताक्रियाः ।
पिता सिद्धवश्चरस्य श्रीभक्तभक्तरावैस् ॥ २२ ॥
\end{quote}
and thus "brought fresh strength to the Vedic ceremonial religion which in the course of time had lost its hold over the people." In a copper-plate grant dated Saka 1171, found in the Belgaum Tâluka, Malla or Malliseṭṭi is spoken of as the elder brother of Bîcha or Bîchaṇa, the viceroy of Siṅghaṇa in the south, and was himself governor of the province of Kuhuṇḍi. He lived at Mudugala, probably the modern Mudgala, and gave, by the consent of Krîshṇa, his sovereign, lands in the village of Bāgevâḍi to thirty-two Brâhmaṇs of different Gotras. Among the family names of these it is interesting to observe some borne by modern Mahârâshṭra Brâhmaṇs, such as Paḷaṇârthaṇâ and Ghaisâsa, prevalent among Chitpâvanas, and Ghâlisâsa, Ghâlisa, and Pâ ṇhaka, among Deśasthas. The name Trîvâḍi also occurs; but there is no trace of it among Marâṭhâ Brâhmaṇs, while it is borne by Brâhmaṇs in Gujarât and Upper Hindustan. In another grant, Chaunḍa the son of Bîchaṇa, who succeeded to the office and title of his father, is represented to have personally solicited king Krîshṇa at Devagîri to permit him to grant the village mentioned therein. Jahlaṇa, son of Lakṣmîdeva who had succeeded his father, assisted Krîshṇa diligently by his counsels in conjunction with his younger brother. He was commander of the troops of elephants and as such fought with Krîshṇa's enemies. He compiled an anthology of select verses from Sanskrit poets, called Sûktimuktâvali, which is
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Section XV. extant. The Vedântakalpataru, which is a commentary on Vâchaspatimiśra’s Bhâmati [114] which itself is a commentary on Śaṅkarāchārya’s Vedântasûtrabhâshya, was written by Amalânanda in the reign of Kṛishṇa.45

Kṛishṇa was succeeded by his brother Mahâdeva in 1182 Saka or 1260 A. D. ‘‘He was a tempestuous wind that blew away the heap of cotton in the shape of the king of the Tailaṅga country, the prowess of his arm was like a thunderbolt that shattered the mountain in the shape of the pride of the swaggering Gûrjara, he destroyed the king of Konkan with ease, and reduced the arrogant sovereigns of Kanṭâta and Lâṭa to mockery.’’46 The Gûrjara here mentioned must be Visaladeva noticed above, as Mahâdeva is represented in the Paithâp grant to have vanquished him;47 and the king of Kanṭâta was probably a Hoysaḷa Yâdava of Hajebid. ‘‘King Mahâdeva never killed a woman, a child, or one who submitted to him; knowing this and being greatly afraid of him, the Andhras placed a woman on the throne;

---

44 Intr. Jahl. Sukt.: —


46 Appendix C. I., st. 48, and II., st. 13.

and the king of Mālava also for the same reason installed a child in his position, and forthwith renouncing all his possessions practised false penance for a long time. He took away in battle the elephants and the five musical instruments of the ruler of Tailangana, but left the ruler Rudramā as he refrained from killing a woman.\textsuperscript{48} In a work on Poetics called Pratāparudrīya by Vidyānatha there occurs a specimen of a dramatic play in which Gaṇapati of the Kākatiya dynasty, the same prince who is represented in the Paithanī grant to have been released from confinement by Jaitugi, is mentioned as having left his throne to his daughter, whom, however, he called his son and named Rudra, and who is spoken of as “a king” and not queen. She adopted Pratāparudra, the son of her daughter, as her heir. This, therefore, was the woman spoken of above as Rudramā and as having been placed on the throne by the Andhras.\textsuperscript{49} “Soma, the lord of Konkan, though skilled in swimming in the sea, was together with his forces drowned in the rivers formed by the humour trickling from the temples of Mahādeva’s maddened elephants.” “Mahādeva deprived Someśvara of his kingdom and his life.\textsuperscript{50} We have seen that Kṛishṇa fought with the king of Konkan, but it appears he did not subjugate the country thoroughly. His successor Mahādeva, however, again invaded it with an army consisting of a large number of elephants. [115] Soma or

\textsuperscript{48} Appendix C. I., st. 52, and II., st. 14 and 15.

\textsuperscript{49} एवानसत्। चन्द्रा सद्धीश्वरस्मादाह्ले निरहुः प्रतापरुद्रियते सनमक्ष्मिनः नृत्यशाखायेव।

\textsuperscript{50} Appendix C. I., st. 49, 50, and II., st. 17.

Conquest of Northern Konkan.
Section XV. Someśvara was completely defeated on land and his power broken, whereupon he appears to have betaken himself to his ships. There somehow he met with his death, probably by being drowned, for it is said that "even the sea did not protect him" and that "he betook himself to the submarine fire," thinking the fire of Mahâdeva's prowess to be more unbearable. Konkan was thereupon annexed to the territories of the Yâdavas. Hence it is that the country was governed by a viceroy appointed by the Devagiri king during the time of Mahâdeva's successor, as we find from the Thanâ plates published by Mr. Wathen. The Someśvara whom Mahâdeva subdued belonged to the Silâhâra dynasty of Thanâ that had been ruling over that part of Konkan for a considerable period. He is the last prince of the dynasty whose inscriptions are found in the district, and his dates are Śaka 1171 and 1182. Mahâdeva like his predecessors reigned at Devagiri, which is represented as the capital of the dynasty to which he belonged and as situated in the country called Seuṇa on the borders of Daṇḍakârâṇya. "It was the abode of the essence of the beauty of the three worlds and its houses rivalled the peaks of the mountain tenanted by gods, and the Seuṇa country deserved all the sweet and ornamental epithets that might be applied to it." At Paṇḍharpur there is an inscription dated 1192 Śaka, Pramoda Śaṅvat-sara, in which Mahâdeva is represented to have

51 Appendix C. I., st. 40.
52 Ib. I., st. 51, and II., st. 28.
55 Appendix C. II., st. 19 and 20. "The mountain tenanted by gods" may be the Himâlaya or Meru. In this epithet there is a reference to the etymology of Devagiri which means "a mountain of or having gods."
been reigning at the time. He is there called Praudha-pratapa Chakravartin, or "Paramount sovereign possessing great valour." The inscription records the performance of an Aptyrayama sacrifice by a Brâhmaṇ chief of the name of Keśava belonging to the Kaśyapa Gotra.

The immediate successor of Mahâdeva was Âmapâ, who appears to have been his son; but the sovereign power was soon wrested from his hands by the rightful heir Râmachandra, son of Krîshṇa, who ascended the throne in 1193 Saka or 1271 A.D. He is called Râmadeva or Râmarâja also. In the Thânâ copper-plate grants he is spoken of as "a lion to the proud elephant in the shape of the lord of Mâlava," from which it would appear that he was at war with that country. He is also called "the elephant that tore up by the root the tree in the shape of the Tailânga king." This must be an allusion to his wars with Pratâparudra the successor of Rudramâ, which are mentioned in the work noticed above. Several other epithets occur in the grants; but they are given as mere birudas or titles which were inherited by Râmachandra from his predecessors, and do not point to any specific events in his reign. His inscriptions are found as far to the south as the confines of Maisur, so that the empire [116] he ruled over was as large as it ever was.

There is in the Dekkan College Library a manuscript of the Amarakośa written in Konkan on Tâla leaves during his reign in the year 4308 of the Kaliyuga corresponding to Šaka 1219 and A.D. 1297. His viceroy in Konkan in Šaka 1212 was a Brâhmaṇa named Krîshṇa belonging to the Bhâradvâja Gotra, whose grandfather Padmanâbha first acquired royal

---

favour and rose into importance in the reign of Siṅghaṇa. One of the Ṭhānā grants was issued by him, and the other dated 1194 Śaka by Achyuta Nāyaka, who was also a Brāhmaṇ and who appears to have been a petty chief and held some office which is not stated. Where he resided is also not clear. By the Paiṭhaṇ copper-plate charter, which was issued in Śaka 1193, Rāmachandra assigned three villages to fifty-seven Brāhmaṇs on conditions some of which are rather interesting. The Brāhmaṇs and their descendants were to live in those villages, not to mortgage the land, allow no prostitutes to settle there, prevent gambling, use no weapons, and spend their time in doing good deeds.57

Hemādri, the celebrated author, principally of works on Dharmaśāstra, flourished during the reigns of Mahādeva and Rāmachandra and was minister to both. In the introduction to his works on Dharmaśāstra he is called Mahādeva’s Śrīkaraṇādhipa or Śrīkaraṇāprabhu. In the Ṭhānā copper-plate of 1194 Śaka also, he is said to have taken upon himself the ādhīpatya or controllership of all karaṇa. This office seems to have been that of chief secretary or one who wrote and issued all orders on behalf of his master and kept the state record. Hemādri is also called Mantrin or counsellor generally. In his other works and in the Ṭhānā plate Rāmarāja instead of Mahādeva is represented as his master. Mahādeva’s genealogy and his own are given at the beginning of his works on Dharma. Sometimes the former begins with Siṅghaṇa, sometimes with Bhillama, while in the Dānakhaṇḍa the exploits of Mahādeva alone are enumerated. The description of the several princes is often couched in general

terms and consists of nothing but eulogy. But the Vratakhaṇḍa, which was the first work composed by Hemādri, contains, as we have seen, a very valuable account of the dynasty from the very beginning, and by far the greater portion of it is undoubtedly historical.

Hemādri was a Brāhmaṇ of the Vatsa Gotra. His father’s name was Kāmadeva, grandfather’s, Vāsudeva, and great-grandfather’s, Vāmana. He is described in terms of extravagant praise; and the historical truth that may be gleaned from it appears to be this. Hemādri was very liberal to Brāhmaṇs and fed numbers of them every day. He was a man of learning himself, and learned men found a generous patron in him. He is represented to be religious and pious, and at the same time very brave. He evidently possessed a great deal of influence. Whether the voluminous works attributed to him were really written by him may well be questioned; but the [117] idea at least of reducing the religious practices and observances that had descended from times immemorial to a system must certainly have been his, and must have been carried out under his supervision.

His great work is called the Chaturvarga Chintāmaṇi, which is divided into four parts, viz., (1) Vratakhaṇḍa, containing an exposition of the religious fasts and observances; (2) Dānakhaṇḍa, in which the several gifts to which great religious importance is attached are explained; (3) Tirthakhaṇḍa, which treats of pilgrimages to holy places; and (4) Mokṣakhaṇḍa, in which the way to final deliverance is set forth. There is a fifth Khaṇḍa or part which is called Pariṣeshakhaṇḍa or appendix, which contains voluminous treatises on (1) the deities

58 Pariṣeshakhaṇḍa, Ed. Bib. Ind., pp. 4-5.
Section XV. that should be worshipped, (2) on Śrāddhas or offerings to the manes, (3) on the determination of the proper times and seasons for the performance of religious rites, and (4) on Prāyāśchītta or atonement. All these works are replete with a great deal of information and innumerable quotations. They are held in great estimation, and future writers on the same subjects draw largely from them. A commentary called Āyurvedārasādyana on a medical treatise by Vāgbhaṭa and another on Bopadeva’s Muktāphala, a work expounding Vaishṇava doctrines, are also attributed to him.

This Bopadeva was one of Hemāḍri’s protegées and the author of the work mentioned above and another entitled Harililā, which contains an abstract of the Bhāgavata. Both of these were written at the request of Hemāḍri as the author himself tells us. Bopadeva was the son of a physician named Keśava and the pupil of Dhaneṣa. His father as well as a teacher lived at a place called Sārtha situated on the banks of the Varadā. Bopadeva, therefore, was a native of Berār. Bopadeva, the author of a treatise on grammar called Mūgḍhabodha, appears to be the same person as this, since the names of the father and the teacher there mentioned are the same as those we find in these works. A few medical treatises also, written by Bopadeva, have come down to us.

Hemāḍri has not yet been forgotten in the Marāṭhā country. He is popularly known by the name of Hemāḍpant and old temples throughout the

59 विन्यासलिखिता विषयज्ञानसमुदाय इसाधरितवर्षिनिय सुमानमयावर्तनी विभव बुद्धिमत्यादि निशुल्किती भविष्यवादियो मलिनंतरिकार्यी Dr. Rājendralal’s notices of Skr. MSS., Vol. II., pp. 48 and 200.
country of a certain structure are attributed to him. He is said to have introduced the moḍī or the current form of writing and is believed to have brought it from Laṅkā or Ceylon. As chief secretary he had to superintend the writing of official papers and records, and it is possible he may have introduced some improvements in the mode of writing.

The great Marāṭhā sādhu or saint Jñānesvara or Dnyānesvara as his name is ordinarily pronounced, flourished during the reign of [118] Rāmacandra. At the end of his Marāṭhī commentary on the Bhagavadgītā he tells us: “In the Kali age, in the country of Mahārāṣṭra and on the southern bank of the Godāvari, there is a sacred place five kos in circuit, the holiest in the three worlds, where exists Mahālaya, who is the thread that sustains the life of the world. There, king Rāmacandra, a scion of the Yadu race and the abode of all arts, dispenses justice, and there a vernacular garb was prepared for the Gītā by Jñānadeva, the son of Nivruttinātha, sprung from the family of Mahēśā.”

The date of the completion of the work is given as Śaka 1212 or A.D. 1290, when we know Rāmacandra was on the throne.

Rāmacandra was the last of the independent Hindu sovereigns of the Dekkan. The Mussalmans

Conquest of the country by the Mussalmans.
Section XV. had been firmly established at Delhi for about a century, and though they had not yet turned their attention to the Dekkan it was not possible they should refrain from doing so for a long time. Alla-ud-din Khilijji, the nephew of the reigning king, who had been appointed governor of Karra, was a person of a bold and adventurous spirit. In the year 1294 A.D. or Saka 1216 he collected a small army of 8000 men and marched straight to the south till he reached Ellichpur, and then suddenly turning to the west appeared in a short time before Devagiri. The king never expected such an attack and was consequently unprepared to resist it. According to one account he was even absent from his capital. He hastily collected about 4000 troops, and threw himself between the city and invading army. But being aware he could not hold out for a long time, he took measures for provisioning the fort and retired into it. The city was then taken by the Mahomedans and plundered, and the fort was closely invested. Alla-ud-din had taken care to spread a report that his troops were but the advanced guard of the army of the king which was on its way to the Dekkan. Râmachandra, therefore, despairing of a successful resistance, began to treat for peace. Alla-ud-din, who was conscious of his own weakness, received his proposals with gladness and agreed to raise the siege and retire on condition of receiving from the king a large quantity of gold. In the meantime, Râmachandra’s son Śaṅkara collected a large army and was marching to the relief of the fort, when Alla-ud-din left about a thousand men to continue the siege and proceeded [119] with the rest to a short distance from the town and gave battle to Śaṅkara’s forces. The Hindus were numerically superior and forced the Mahomedans to fall back;
but the detachment left to observe the movements of the garrison joined them at this time, and Śaṅkara’s followers thinking it to be the main army that was on its way from Delhi were seized with a panic, and a confusion ensued which resulted in the complete defeat of the Hindus.

Rāmacandra or Rāmadeva then continued the negotiations, but Alla-ud-din raised his demands. The Hindu king’s allies were preparing to march to his assistance, but in the meanwhile Rāmacandra discovered that the sacks of grain that had been hastily thrown into the fort really contained salt; and since the provisions had been well nigh exhausted he was anxious to hasten the conclusion of peace. It was therefore agreed that he should pay to Alla-ud-din “600 maunds of pearls, two of jewels, 1000 of silver, 4000 pieces of silk, and other precious things,” cede Ellichpur and its dependencies, and send an annual tribute to Delhi. On the receipt of the valuable treasure given to him by the Devagiri prince Alla-ud-din retired.

Some time after, Alla-ud-din assassinated his aged uncle and usurped the throne. King Rāmacandra did not send the tribute for several years, and to punish him the Delhi monarch despatched an expedition of 30,000 horse under the command of Malik Kafur, a slave who had risen high in his favour. Malik Kafur accomplished the long and difficult march “over stones and hills without drawing rein,” and arrived at Devagiri in March 1307 A.D., or about end of Śaka 1228. A fight ensued in which the Hindus were defeated and Rāmadeva was taken prisoner.⁶¹ According to another account, Malik

⁶¹ Elliot’s History of India, Vol. III., p. 77.
Kafur came laying waste the country about Devagiri, and the Hindu king observing the futility of resistance surrendered himself. Râmachandra was sent to Delhi, where he was detained for six months and afterwards released with all honour. Thenceforward he sent the tribute regularly and remained faithful to the Mahomedans. In Śaka 1231 or A.D. 1309, Malik Kafur was again sent to the Dekkan to subdue Tailângaṇa. On the way he stopped at Devagiri, where he was hospitably entertained by the king.

Râmadeva died this year and was succeeded by his son Śaṅkara. He discontinued sending the annual tribute to Delhi and Malik Kafur was again sent to the Dekkan in Śaka 1234 or A.D. 1312 to reduce him to submission. He put Śaṅkara to death, laid waste his kingdom, and fixed his residence at Devagiri.

In the latter years of Alla-ud-din his nobles, disgusted with the overwhelming influence which Malik Kafur had acquired over him, revolted. In the meantime Alla-ud-din died and was succeeded by his third son Mubarak. The opportunity was seized [120] by Harapâla, the son-in-law of Râmachandra, who raised an insurrection and drove away some of the Mahomedan governors. In 1240 Śaka or A.D. 1318 Mubarak marched to the Dekkan in person to suppress the revolt. He took Harapâla prisoner and inhumanly flayed him alive.

Thus ended the last Hindu or Marâṭhâ monarchy of the Dekkan, and the country became a province of the Mahomedan empire.
Genealogy of the later Yādavas or the Yādavas of Devagiri. Section XV.

Mallugi.

1. Bhillama
   (Śaka 1109-1113 or A.D. 1187-1191.)

2. Jaitrapāla or Jaitugi.
   (Śaka 1113-1132 or A.D. 1191-1210.)

3. Singhana
   (Śaka 1132-1169 or A.D. 1210-1247.)

Jaitrapāla or Jaitugi.

4. Krishna, Kanhāra or Kandhāra.
   (Śaka 1169-1182 or A.D. 1247-1260.)

5. Mahādeva
   (Śaka 1182-1193 or A.D. 1260-1271.)

6. Rāmāchandra or Rāmadeva.
   (Śaka 1193-1231 or A.D. 1271-1309.)

7. Šāmkara (Śaka 1231-1234 or A.D. 1309-1312.)

Brother-in-law, Harapāla, killed in Śaka 1240 or A.D. 1318.
[121] SECTION XVI.

THE SILĀHĀRAS OF KOLHĀPUR.

Section XVI. Three distinct families of chiefs or minor princes with the name of Silāra or Silāhāra ruled over different parts of the country. They all traced their origin to Jīmuṭavāhāna the son of Jīmuṭaketu, who was the king of a certain class of demigods called Vidyādharas, and who saved the life of a serpent named Saṅkhachūḍa by offering himself as a victim to Garuḍa in his place.\(^1\) One of the titles borne by the princes of all the three families was Tagarasa-varādhīśvara or “lords of Tagara, the best of cities,” which fact has a historical significance. We have seen that Kāṁhadeva, the donor of the Rājāpur grant who was a Chālukya, called himself Kalyāṇa-puravarādhīśvara, and one of the titles of the later Kadambas after they had been reduced to vassalage and of the rulers of Goa was Banavāśi-puravarādhīśvara. As these titles signify that the bearers of them belonged to the families that once held supreme power at Kalyāṇa and Banavāśi, so does Tagarasa-puravarādhīśvara show that the Silāhāras who bore the title belonged to a family that once possessed supreme sovereignty and reigned at Tagara. In one Silāhāra grant it is expressly stated that “the race known by the name of Silāhāra was that of the kings who were masters of Tagara.”\(^2\)

As mentioned in a former section, Tagara was a famous town in the early centuries of the Christian

\(^1\) This story has been dramatized in the Sanskrit play Nāgānanda attributed to Śrī-Harsha.

\(^2\) Grant translated by Dr. Taylor and published in the Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay, Vol. III.
era and retained its importance till a very late period, but unfortunately the town has not yet been identified, nor have we found any trace of the Silahara kingdom with Tagara as its capital. Perhaps it existed between the close of the Andhrabhṛtya period and the foundation of the Chālukya power.

The three Silahara dynasties of Mahāmanḍalesvaras or dependent princes which we have been considering were founded in the times of the Rāshtrakūṭas. One of them ruled over Northern Konkan, which was composed of fourteen hundred villages, the chief of them being Puri, which probably was at one time the capital of the province. As represented in an inscription at Kānheri noticed before, Konkan was assigned to Pullasakti by Amoghavarsha a few years before Śaka 775. Another Silahara family established itself in Southern Konkan. The founder or first chief named Saṇaphulla enjoying the favour of Kṛishṇarāja acquired the territory between the sea-coast and the Sahya range.3 There were three Rāshtrakūṭa princes of the name of Kṛishṇarāja but the one meant here must be the first prince of that name who reigned in the last quarter of the seventh century of the Śaka era [122] or between 753 and 775 A.D.4 The genealogy

3 Kharepāṭan plates, Jour. B. B. R. A. S., Vol. I., p. 217. The name of the first chief is read "Jhallaphulla" by Bāl Gangādhara Śastri; but the first letter looks like ज though there is some difference. That difference, however, brings it nearer to स. The letter which was read by him as स is clearly ज. For देशसंभावनी I find देशसंभावनी on the plates.

4 From Saṇaphulla the first chief to Raṭṭa the last three are ten generations. Somehow each succeeding chief in this line happens to be the son of the preceding. Though in a line of princes some of whom bear to others the relation of brother or uncle, the average duration of each reign is
Section XVI.

of this dynasty is given in the Khârepâtan grant, the last prince mentioned in which was on the throne in Śaka 930 while the Châlukya king Satyârâaya was reigning. The capital must have been situated somewhere near Khârepâtan.

The third Silahâra family the history of which falls within the scope of this paper ruled over the districts of Kolhâpur, Miraj, and Karhâd, and in later times Southern Konkan was added to its territory. This dynasty was the latest of the three and was founded about the time of the downfall of the Râshtrakûta empire, as will be hereafter shown. The first prince of the family was Jatiga, who was succeeded by his son Nâyimma or Nâyivarman.

from 19 to 21 years; the average duration of a generation is always much longer, and varies from 26 to 28 years. One can verify this by taking any line of princes or chiefs in the world. Raṭṭa was on the throne in Śaka 930, and supposing him to have begun to reign about that time, nine generations or about $27 \times 9$ years must have passed away from the date of the foundation of the family to Śaka 930. Subtracting $27 \times 9 = 243$ from 930, we have Śaka 687 as the approximate date of Saṇapûlûla. If we take the average to be 26, we shall have 696 as the date. In either case we are brought to the reign of Krishnâ I. The dates of Krishnâ II. range from Śaka 797 to 833 and of Krishnâ III. from Śaka 862 to 88r, and therefore neither of these will do. Even if we take the other average of a reign in the present case and subtract $19 \times 9 = 171$ from 930, we get Śaka 759, which will not take us to the reign of Krishnâ II. whose earliest date is Śaka 797. The Khârepâtan family therefore was the oldest of the three, and was founded in the reign of Krishnâ I.

Bâl Sâstrî read the name of the last chief in the grant as Râhu; but the second syllable of the name is certainly not य the form of which in the grant itself is different. It looks exactly like the य in the word परमसारक and यात्रालालिक which occur elsewhere in the grant.
THE DEKKAN

Nāyimma was followed by his son Chandrarāja, and Chandrarāja by his son Jatiga, who is called "the lion of the hill-fortress of Panhāḷā." Jatiga's son and successor was Gōnika, otherwise called Gōnkāla or Gokalla. He is represented to have been the ruler of the districts of Karahāṭa-Kunḍi and Mairiṇija and to have harassed Konkan. He had three brothers named Gūvala, Kirtirāja, and Chandrāditya, of whom the first at least appears to have succeeded him. Then followed Mārasimha the son of Gōnika, whose grant first published by Wathen is dated Saka 980. He is represented to have constructed temples; and to have been reigning at his capital, the fort of Khīligi, which probably was another name of Panhāḷā in the Kolhāpur districts. Mārasimha was succeeded by his son Gūvala and he by his brother Bhoja I. Bhoja’s two brothers Ballāla and Gaṇḍarāditya governed the principality after him in succession.

An inscription at Kolhāpur mentions another brother named Gaṇgadeva and the order in which the brothers are spoken of is Gūvala [123] Gaṇga, Ballāla, Bhoja, and Gaṇḍarāditya. But the grants of Gaṇḍarāditya and Bhoja II. agree in representing Bhoja as the elder and Ballāla as the younger brother, and in omitting Gaṇga.

Of all these brothers the youngest Gaṇḍarāditya seems to have been the most famous. He is the

---


6 Mārasimha’s grant. Kunḍi or Kuhunḍi was some part of the Belgaum district, as stated before. Mairiṇija is Miraj.

7 Inscription No. 4, Major Graham’s Report.
Section XVI. donor, as indicated above, in the grant published by Paṇḍit Bhagvānlāl Indraji, and in others recorded on stone at Kolhāpur and in the districts. His dates are Śaka 1032, 1040, 1058. He ruled over the country of Mirīñja along with the seven Khollas and over Konkan, which thus seems to have been subjugated by the Kolhāpur Śilāhāras before 1032. Probably it was added to their dominions in the time of Goṇka or soon after. From the grant of Bhoja II. it appears that the part of Konkan ruled over by the Dekkan Śilāhāras was the same as that which was in the possession of the family mentioned in the Khārepāṭaṇ grant, wherefore it follows that the Śilāhāras of southern Konkan were uprooted by their kinsmen of the Kolhāpur districts. Gaṇḍarāditya fed a hundred thousand Brāhmans at Prayāga. This must be the place of that name which is situated near Kolhāpur; and not the modern Allahābād. He built a Jaina temple at Ājareṁ, a village in the Kolhāpur districts, and constructed a large tank, called after him Gaṇḍasamudra or "the sea of Gaṇḍa," at Irukuṇḍi in the Miraj district, and on its margin placed idols of Īśvara or Śiva, Buddha, and Arhat (Jina), for the maintenance of each of which he assigned a piece of land. Several other charities of his, in which the Jainas also had their share, are mentioned, and his bountiful nature as well as good

8 In loc. cit.
9 Bhagvānlāl’s plates, and Inscriptions Nos. 1, 2, and 3. Major Graham’s Report. The Śaka in Bhagvānlāl’s grant and No. 1 of Major Graham’s inscriptions is the same, i.e. 1032, though in the translation of the latter it is erroneously given as 1037, but the cyclic years are different. As to this see Appendix B.
10 For the village granted is Kaśeḷ, which is near Jaitāpur and Khārepāṭaṇ.
and just government are extolled. He first resided at a place called Tiravâḍa and afterwards at Valavāṭa, which has been identified with the present Valavdem.

Gaṇḍarāḍīṭya was succeeded by his son Vijayārka, who was on the throne in Śaka 1065 and 1073. He restored the chiefs of the territory about Thānā to their principality which they had lost, and replaced the princes of Goa on the throne and fortified their position which had become shaky. He assisted Vijjāna in his revolt against his masters, the Châlukyas of Kalyāṇa, and enabled him to acquire supreme sovereignty. This event, as we have seen, took place about 1079 Śaka.

[124] After Vijayārka, his son Bhoja II. became Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara and reigned in the fort of Panhâḷā. His dates are Śaka 1101, 1109, 1112, 1113, 1114, and 1127. He granted the village of Kāṣeḷi in Konkan near Khârepâṭu on the application of his son Gaṇḍarāḍīṭya for feeding Brahmans regularly, and gave lands for Hindu and Jaina

---

12 His grant in loc. cit.
13 Bhagvânâlā's plates and Major Graham's Ins. No. 2.
14 Ins. Nos. 4 and 5, Major Graham's Report.
15 Grant of Bhoja II. in loc. cit.
16 In the transcript of the inscription in Vol. IV. Trans. Lit. Soc. Bom. we have Vikshaṇa for Vijjâna. There is no question this must be a mistake of the reader of the inscription or of the engraver. For the Kalachuri usurper at Kalyâna is called both Vijjâla or Vijjâna in his inscriptions, and there was none who about the date of Vijayārka obtained the position of a Chakrabartin or paramount sovereign, as stated in the inscription.
17 Major Graham's Ins. Nos. 6, 7, 8, the grant, and Ind. Ant., Vol. X., p. 76, note.
18 There are, however, some mistakes here in the transcript of the grant and the sense is not clear, though it appears pretty certain that it was the village that was granted and not a field in it or anything else, from the fact that the boundaries of the village are given.
temples in other places also. Two of the grantees in one case at Kolhāpur are called Karahāṭakas, which shows that the caste of Karhāḍe Brāhmans had come to be recognized in those days; and two others bore the family name of Ghaisāsa, which is now found among Chitpāvan Brāhmans.19 In the reign of Bhoja II, a Jaina Pañḍit of the name of Somadeva composed in Śaka 1127 a commentary entitled Sabdārṇavachandrika20 on Pûjyapāda’s Sanskrit Grammar. The Kolhāpur chiefs enjoyed a sort of semi-independence. Vijāṇa, the new sovereign at Kalyāṇa, however, endeavoured probably to establish his authority over Bhoja. But that chief was not content to be his feudatory, and to reduce him to subjection Vijāṇa marched against Kolhāpur a little before his assassination in Śaka 1089.21 On the establishment of the power of the Devagiri Vādavas, Bhoja seems similarly to have assumed independence; but Siṅghaṇa subdued him completely, and annexed the principality to the Vādava empire.22

The number of generations from Jatiga, the founder of the dynasty, to Gaṇḍarāditya is seven. The latest date of the latter is Śaka 1058 and the earliest of his successor Vijayārka is 1065; so that if we suppose Gaṇḍarāditya to have died in 1060 and allow about 27 years to each generation, we shall arrive at Śaka 871 as the approximate date of the foundation of the family. At that time the reigning Rāṣṭrakūṭa sovereign was Kṛishṇa III., the uncle of Kakkala the last prince.

One of the many titles used by the Śilāhāras was

19 Ins. No. 8, Major Graham’s Report.
20 Ind. Ant., Vol. X., p. 76, note. The manuscript here mentioned is in the Dekkan College library and I have seen in it the colophon given in the note.
21 Vijalarāya Charitra in Wilson’s Mackenzie MSS. p. 320.
22 Sec. XV.
Srīman-Mahālakṣmi-labāha-vara-prasāda, i.e. "one who has obtained the favour of a boon from the glorious Mahālakṣmi." Mahālakṣmi was thus their tutelary deity, and they were clearly the followers of the Purānic and Vedic religion; but they patronized both Brāhmaṇs and Jainaś alike; and their impartiality is strikingly displayed by the fact noticed above of Gaṇḍarāditya’s having placed an idol of Buddha, whose religion had well nigh become extinct, along with those of the gods worshipped by the other two sects, on the margin of the tank dug by him.

There are at the present day many Marāṭhā families of the name of Selārā reduced to poverty, and the name Selāravāḍī of a station [126] on the railway from Khaṇḍālā to Poona is also, I believe, to be traced to the family name of the sovereigns of Tagara.

---

Genealogy of the Silāhāras of Kolhāpur.

Jatiga I.
   Nāyimma.
   Chandrarāja.
   Jatiga II.


Mārasimha, Šaka 980 or A.D. 1058.

Gūvala II. Bhoja I. Ballāja, Gaṇḍarāditya, Šaka 1032, 1040, 1058, or A.D. 1110, 1118, 1136.

Vijayārka, Šaka 1065, 1073, or A.D. 1143, 1151.

Bhoja II, Šaka 1101, 1109, 1112, 1113, 1114, 1127, or A.D. 1179, 1187, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1205.
APPENDIX A.

Note on the Gupta Era.

Appendix A. In order to render the chronologies of the different dynasties that ruled over western and northern India in the early centuries of the Christian era mutually consistent, it is necessary to discuss the initial date of the Gupta era. Alibiruni, who accompanied Mahmud of Ghizni in his invasion of Gujarat in the early part of the eleventh century, states that that era was posterior to the Saka by 241 years, and that it was the epoch of the extermination of the Guptas. He mentions another era named after Balaba, the initial date of which was the same as that of the Guptas.

Now in some of the inscriptions of the Gupta kings and their dependent chiefs the dates are referred to Guptakāla or the Gupta era, wherefore Alibiruni's statement that it was the epoch of their extermination cannot be true. This error is regarded as throwing discredit on his other statement, viz., that the era was posterior to the Saka by 241 years. But it has nothing whatever to do with it. Alibiruni must have derived his knowledge of the initial date from contemporary evidence, since the era of the Guptas was, as stated by him, one of those ordinarily used in the country in his time, and as his statements regarding the initial dates of the Vikrama and the Saka eras are true, so must that with reference to the Gupta era be true. On the other hand, his information as regards the event which the Gupta era memorialized must have been based upon the tradition current among the Hindu astronomers of the day, who were his informants. Such traditions are often erroneous, as has been proved in many a case.
Albiruni was also informed that the Śaka era was the epoch of the defeat of the Śaka king by Vikramāditya. This was the tradition as to its origin among Indian astronomers, though it has now given place to another. For Soḍhala in his commentary on Bhāskarāchārya’s Karanakutūhala, a manuscript of which more than four hundred years old exists in the collection made by me for Government during 1882-83, tells us that “the epoch when Vikramāditya killed Miechchhas of the name of Śakas is ordinarily known as the Śaka era.” But we know that in Maṅgaliśa’s inscription at Bādāmi it is spoken of as the era of the “coronation of the Śaka king”, that Ravikīrti in the inscription at Aihole describes it as the era of the Śaka kings and that it is similarly represented in many other places. Albiruni’s error therefore as regards the origin of the Gupta era no more invalidates his statement as to its initial date than his error about the origin of the Śaka era does his statement about the initial date of that era. The only reasonable course for us under the circumstances is to reject the statement as to the era being an epoch of the extermination of the Guptas and accept that about the initial date of the era. But some antiquarians reject both these statements and accept what simply hangs on them and what must fall with them, viz., that the Guptas were exterminated in Śaka 242, and make elaborate endeavours to find an earlier initial date for the era. If the inscriptions show that the era was not posthumous but contemporaneous, we should rather believe that the Guptas rose to power in Śaka 242, assigning its due value to the statement of Albiruni, which must have been based on contemporary evidence, that the era began in that year. But if instead of that we declare that they cease to reign in Śaka 242, we in
Appendix A. effect reject contemporary evidence and accept a mere tradition which in so far as it represents the era to be posthumous has been proved to be erroneous.

Again, Albiruni’s statement that the initial date of the Gupta era and of the Valabhi era was the same seems to some not “at all probable.” To [127] my mind the improbability is not so great as to render valueless what clearly is contemporary evidence. We all know that the date occurring in a grant of one of the sons of the founder of the dynasty is 207, and we have a large number of grants of subsequent kings with dates posterior to this and in harmony with it. So that it is clear that these dates cannot refer to an era dating from the foundation of the dynasty. Such a long time as 207 years cannot be considered to have elapsed between the father who founded the dynasty and his son, even supposing him to have been a posthumous son. The dates, therefore, are understood to refer to the Gupta era. What, then, could have been the Valabhi era, if it was never used by the Valabhi princes during the 275 years or thereabouts of the existence of their dynasty? An era cannot receive the name of a certain line of princes unless used by those princes, at least on a few occasions, and enforced. The era used by the Valabhi princes must be the Valabhi era. One certainly would expect that it should be so. The only supposition, therefore, on which the whole becomes intelligible is that the era introduced by the Valabhis in Surāshtra and used by them was called the Valabhi era by their subjects, and not one dating from the foundation of the dynasty; for such a one, we see, was not used by the Valabhi princes themselves. The era introduced and used by the Valabhis was
that of the Guptas, whose dependents they were in the beginning, and hence Albiruni’s statement that the initial date of the Gupta and Valabhê eras was the same is true. From an inscription at Somanâth discovered by Colonel Tod, we gather that Saka 242 was the first year of the Valabhê era. Hence, therefore, the initial date of the Gupta era was 242 Saka, as stated by Albiruni.

The question in this way is, I think, plain enough. Still since astronomical calculations have been resorted to to prove the incorrectness of the date given by Albiruni and to arrive at an earlier one so as to place the extinction of the Gupta dynasty in Saka 242, it is necessary to go into the question further. The following tests may be used and have been used to determine the correctness of a proposed initial date:

1. The date of Budha Gupta’s pillar inscription at Eran, which is Thursday, the 12th of Ashâqha, in the Gupta year 165.
2. Râjâ Hastin’s inscription dated 156 Gupta, the year of the 12-year cycle of Jupiter being Mahâvaiśâka.
3. Râjâ Hastin’s inscription dated 173 Gupta, the year of the 12-year cycle being Mahâsvayuja.
4. Râjâ Hastin’s inscription dated 191 Gupta, the year of the 12-year cycle being Mahâchaitra.
5. Râjâ Saûkhshobha’s inscription dated 209 Gupta, the year of the 12-year cycle being Mahâsvayuja.
6. An eclipse of the sun mentioned in the Morvi copper-plate grant dated 5th Phâlguna Sudi 585 of the Gupta era.

Before applying these tests to the initial date given by Albiruni, it must be premised that according to the Arabic author the Gupta era was 241
Appendix A. years posterior to the Šaka. To convert a Šaka date into a Valabhi date, or which is the same thing, into a Gupta date, he tells us to deduct from it the cube of 6 and the square of 5, that is, 241. And proceeding to give actual instances, he says 953 Šaka corresponds to 712 Valabhi or Gupta. We have thus to add 241 to a Gupta date to arrive at the corresponding Šaka date. Again, as I shall show in Appendix B, in inscriptions the numerical date indicates, in a large number of instances, the number of years of an era that have elapsed, that is, the past year and in about a third of the instances, the current year. The year of the cycle, however, whenever it occurs, is as a rule the current year, though in rare cases that also is the past year. If, therefore, a past Gupta year is to be converted into [128] the current Šaka year, we shall have to add 242 to the former; while if both are current or both past, the difference between them is only 241.

Now, as to the first of the above tests, Gupta 165 + 241 = 406 Šaka. If Alбирuni is correct, the 12th Āshādha Sudi of this year should be a Thursday. I asked my friend Professor Keru Lakṣhmaṇ Chhatre to make the calculation for me, and he tells me that it was a Thursday. Since our astronomical methods are based on the past Šaka year, and even our present Šaka year 1805 really represents, as I shall show in the next Appendix, the years that have elapsed, the current year being really 1806, Gupta 165 was a past year, as well as Šaka 406. Hence only 241 has to be added. Šaka 406 corresponds to 484 A.D. General Cunningham takes the Gupta 165 to correspond to 483 A.D., adding 240 + 78 = 318 to it, and of course arrives at the result that "the 12th day of Āshādha Sudi was a Friday instead of a Thursday." If, however, he had added
241 + 78 = 319 and taken 484 A.D. to correspond to Gupta 165, he would have arrived at the correct result.

Then as to the dates in years of the 12-year cycle, General Cunningham himself has placed before us the means of verifying them. In the tables published by him in Volume X. of the Archæological Reports, the cyclic year corresponding to the current Christian year is given, and if we subtract 78 from the number representing the year, we shall arrive at the current Śaka year. Now, if we take the Gupta figured dates to represent the years that had elapsed before the cyclic year commenced, (and this way of marking the dates is, as remarked above, the one we usually find), then 173 Gupta, the third date in the above, corresponds to 414 Śaka past and 415 current, 241 being added in the first case, and 242 in the second. If we add 78 to 415 we shall get the current Christian year, which is 493. Now in General Cunningham’s tables we do find the year Mahāśvayūja given as corresponding to 493 A.D. In the same way, 191 Gupta past + 242 = 433 Śaka current, + 78 = 511 A.D. current. In the tables we find 511 put down under Mahāchaitra. Similarly 209 Gupta past + 242 = 451 Śaka current, + 78 = 529 A.D. current which was Mahāśvayūja.

Now, as to the first of the dates in the 12-year cycle, 156 Gupta + 242 + 78 is equal to 476 A.D., which however is Mahāchaitra instead of Mahāvaiśākha. Here there is a discrepancy of one year; but such discrepancies do sometimes occur even in Śaka dates and the years of the 60-years’ cycle given along with them, and some of them will be noticed in the note forming the next Appendix. They are probably due to the fact that the frequent use of the past or expired year and also of the
Appendix A. The current year led sometimes the past year to be mistaken for the current year, just as we now mistake the year 1805 Baha for the current year, though it really is the completed or past year. Thus the completed year 157 must, in the case before us, have come to be mistaken by the writer of the inscription for the current year, and he thought 156 to be the past year and thus gave that instead of 157. Now 157 Gupta + 242 + 78 = 477 A.D., which is Mahā-vaisākhā, according to the tables.

[129] The eclipse mentioned in the Morvi plate occurred, according to my friend Professor Keru Lakshman, on the 30th of Vaisākhā, Baha 827. The Gupta year given in the plate is 585. If 827 is in the astronomical calculation the current year, it must correspond to 585 Gupta past; for 585 + 242 = 827. It is by no means necessary to suppose that the eclipse occurred on the new-moon day immediately previous to the 5th of Phālguna Sudi mentioned in the grant. For it is perfectly possible that the actual religious ceremony with reference to the grant was made in Vaisākhā and the deed executed in Phālguna.

* Though by using General Cunningham’s table, I arrive at the desired result in three cases, still I now find that his current Christian year is derived by adding 78 to the past Baha, while I have added 79; i.e., the cyclic year given in the dates is true not of the Gupta year in the date as a past year but of the Gupta year + 1 as a past year. And the third date 173 Gupta is a correction of General Cunningham’s, the actual date in the inscription being 165. I have, however, allowed the paragraphs to remain, as I am by no means quite satisfied that the question of these cyclic dates is settled beyond dispute (1894).

† There was an eclipse also in Baha 826 the new-moon day of Kārttika; so that Gupta 585 past + 241 = 826 Baha. This is evidently the eclipse mentioned in the grant and not that mentioned in the text. On the whole question
I have thus shown that Albiruni’s initial date for the Gupta era stands all these tests. It may even be said that it stands them better than 167 A.D. and 190 A.D. proposed by General Cunningham and Sir E. Clive Bayley respectively. But I am loath to decide such questions simply on astronomical grounds; for there are several very confusing elements involved, and a modern astronomer cannot know them all and make allowance for them.

It now remains to notice the last point relied on by the opponents of Albiruni. The date on a copper-plate grant by the last Śilāditya of Valabhi hitherto known is 447. This Śilāditya is also styled Dhrūbhaṭa in the grant and has been identified with the Tu-lu-v[a-po-tou] or Dhruvabhaṭa of Hwan Thsang who visited Valabhi in 640 A.D. The date 447 is understood as referring to the Gupta era, and, 319 being added it, corresponds to 766 A.D. It has therefore been argued that an earlier initial date must be assigned to the Gupta era so as to bring this Śilāditya or Dhrūbhaṭa nearer to the date of Hwan Thsang’s visit. But the identification of the last Śilāditya with Hwan Thsang’s Dhruvabhaṭa cannot stand. In the Si-yu-ki the Chinese writer does not speak of a king but of kings, and says they were nephews of Śilāditya of Mālvā and the younger of them named Dhruvabhaṭa was son-in-law to the son of Harshavardhana. If they were nephews of the king of Mālvā they were brothers and both of them kings. Now, the predecessor of the last Śilāditya of Valabhi was his father, and among the kings of Valabhi we do not find brothers reigning in succession at this period. There were two brothers who occupied the throne before this period, one of them

Appendix A. being named Dharasena and the other Dhruvasena. They were the sons of Kharagraha, and the younger of them was the father and predecessor of Dharasena IV. This younger brother or Dhruvasena must have been Hwan Thsang’s Dhruvabhaṭa. Nothing important is involved in the suffix Bhaṭa. It was a mere title or honorific termination as Pant and Rāv are among us the Marāṭhās. Sena, Sinha, and Bhaṭa were the Valabhi honorific endings and they could be used promiscuously. The king spoken of in the plates as Dhruvasena may have been called Dhruvabhaṭa by ordinary people, from whom Hwan Thsang must have got the name. Now, a copper-plate grant of Dhruvasena bears the date 510, and the earliest date of his successor Dharasena IV. is 326. The first corresponds to 629 A.D. (310 + 241 + 78 = 629), and the second to 645 (326 + 241 + 78 = 645). It is quite possible, therefore, that Dhruvasena was on the throne in 640 A.D. at the time when Hwan Thsang visited Valabhi.

[130] The initial date mentioned by Albiruni is thus consistent with everything with which it has been thought to be not consistent. I have shown that the statement of the Arabic writer is in itself entitled to our confidence, being based, as it must have been, on contemporary evidence, as his statements about the Śaka and Vikrama eras were. I will now show that the date mentioned by him is alone consistent with the information we possess as regards the relations of the several dynasties that ruled over Gujarāt and Kāṭhiāwāḍ in the early centuries of the Christian era, and the dates proposed by General Cunningham and Sir E. Clive Bayley are not. We know that the Guptas succeeded the Satraps, and the Valabhis were at first dependents of the Guptas and afterwards attained independence.
Chandragupta II. must have been the Gupta prince who overthrew the Satraps, since he is the first prince of that dynasty whose silver coins are a close imitation of those of the Satraps. The latest date of that monarch is 93. This corresponds to 260 A.D. and 283 A.D. on the supposition that the Gupta era took its start in 167 A.D. and 190 A.D. respectively. Now, the latest date of the Satrap dynasty is 304. If the era to which it refers is the Śaka, it corresponds to 382 A.D., that is, we shall have to suppose one of the princes of the dynasty to have reigned about a hundred years after the dynasty had been put an end to by Chandragupta II. The Śaka era will therefore not do. Supposing the Satrap dates refer to the Vikrama era, 304 corresponds to 48 A.D., which of course is consistent with Chandragupta’s date 260 A.D. or 283 A.D. If then the Satrap dates refer to the era of Vikrama, Rudradāman’s 72 must correspond to 16 A.D. Rudradāman’s grandfather Chashṭana will have to be placed about B.C. 4. But Ptolemy, writing after 150 A.D., tells us that Ujjainī was ruled over about the time when he wrote by Tiastenes, who has been very reasonably identified with Chashṭana. Ptolemy’s information cannot certainly be 150 years old. It has, however, been argued that Ptolemy does not state that Tiastenes reigned about the time when he lived, and that he and Siro Polemios were contemporaries. For, he gives the information in the form of two short notes, “Ozone, the royal residence of Tiastenes,” and “Baiṭhana, the royal residence of Siro Polemios.” Such notes it is possible that one should write even if the princes reigned several hundred years before him, as a modern geographer may mention Berlin as “the capital of Frederick the Great,” or Ghizni as “the capital of Mahmud.” As to this I have to observe
that the analogy does not hold good. A modern geographer and his readers are very well acquainted with past history, while neither Ptolemy nor those for whom he wrote could have known the past history of India. A modern geographer knows which of the princes that ruled over a certain country in past times was the ablest or most powerful, and selects him out of a number and mentions his name in connection with a certain place. It is extremely improbable or almost impossible that Ptolemy should have known many Indian princes who reigned before he lived, along with their achievements, and should have chosen the ablest of them for being mentioned. And, as a matter of fact, we know that one at least of the rulers mentioned by him could be a person of no importance. For Baleocuros who according to him held power in Hippocura was, as we have seen, but a Viceroy or dependent of Pulumāyi and Gotamiputra Vajña Srl, since as Viljavayakura his name occurs along with those of the two princes on the Kōlhapur coins. Again, Ptolemy must have derived his information from merchants carrying on trade with India and these from the natives of the country. And we know that natives of India care very little for past history and [131] soon forget their kings. Hence the information derived by the merchants cannot have reference to princes who reigned long before the time of Ptolemy. It is possible that Indians may remember a celebrated prince for a century or two. But, as stated above, one of the rulers mentioned by Ptolemy was but a dependent sovereign and could not have been a man of note. The only other supposition that our opponents may resort to, is that Ptolemy’s statements were based on those of previous geographers whose contemporaries the princes mentioned by him
were. No ground whatever has however been adduced in support of such a supposition. In the Periplus which was written before Ptolemy, Paithana and Ozene are mentioned, but Polemios and Tiastenes are not. On the contrary, the author of that work says that Ozene was "formerly the capital wherein the king resided." If Tiastenes lived before him, and Ptolemy's mention of the former was due to his having been a prince of note like Frederick the Great and Mahmud of Ghizni in modern times, we should expect the author of the Periplus to have noticed him, especially when he does allude to the kings of Ozene. Tiastenes, Polemios and Baleocuros must thus have reigned about the time of Ptolemy. The last two were, we know, contemporaries, and so also must the third have been.

In this manner the Vikrama era will not do for the Satrap dates. Besides, no trace whatever has hitherto been discovered of the use of that era in the early centuries of Christ. Since, then, the use of no other era at the time has been well authenticated, the Satraps must be supposed to have employed the Saka era. The circumstances of the country at that period render, as I have shown, the establishment of this era by the Sakas who ruled over the country in every way probable. The latest Satrap date will thus correspond to 382 A.D., and Chandragupta, the conqueror of the Satraps, can be rendered posterior to this only by taking 242 Saka current or 319-320 A.D. as the first current year of the Gupta era; for his 93 past will then correspond to 412-413 A.D. And in this way Rudradāman's 72 will correspond to 150 A.D.; and Chashtana's date will be about 130 A.D., i.e. anterior to the date of Ptolemy's geography by about 25 years.
Appendix A. Thus, then, the evidence in favour of Albruni's initial date for the Gupta era appears to me to be simply overwhelming.
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[132] APPENDIX B.

Note on the Saka dates and the years of the Bārhaspatya cycle, occurring in the Inscriptions.

There are certain difficulties with reference to the Saka dates and the cyclic years or Samvatsaras occurring in the inscriptions which require to be cleared up. The current Saka year (A.D. 1883-84) in the Bombay Presidency is 1805, and the year of the sixty years' cycle, Subhânu. In the southern provinces and the Madras Presidency the current Saka year is 1806, the cyclic year being the same. The first question, then, is, "Do the dates in the inscriptions conform to the Bombay reckoning or the Madras reckoning?" and the next, "What is the cause of this difference of a year?"* We have also to consider whether the Saka dates in the inscriptions represent the number of years that have expired before the event recorded in them or the current year in which the event took place.

* It will be obvious to any careful reader that the manner in which the question here proposed for solution is stated, is based upon the ordinary view that Saka 1805 was the current year in 1883-84. I have no right to assume in the beginning of my inquiry that the ordinary view is mistaken, and it would be unscientific to do so. But having stated the question in that manner, I come at the end of my inquiry to the conclusion that the ordinary view is incorrect, and that 1805 Saka was not current in 1883-84 A.D. but past, and that the Madras way of understanding the matter alone is correct. In the previous note also I have stated that "we now mistake the year 1805 Saka for the current year" (in 1883-84); so that there is no possibility whatever of anybody misunderstanding my meaning.
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Mr. Robert Sewell of the Madras Civil Service gives in the first column of the Chronological Tables compiled by him the number of the Śaka years that have expired before the beginning of the cyclic year set against it in the same line in the third column. The current Śaka year corresponding to that cyclic year is the one given in the next line in the first column. Thus against Śaka 855, the date of the Sāngali grant of Govind IV. of the Rāshṭrakūṭa dynasty, we have in the third column the cyclic year Vijaya which shows that 855 years of the Śaka era had expired before the Vijaya year began, while the current Śaka year corresponding to Vijaya was that given in the next line, viz. 856. Mr. Sewell follows the Madras reckoning. If we interpret the tables according to the Bombay mode, the Śaka year appearing in the first column will be the current year corresponding to the cyclic year in the same line in the third column, while the number in the line immediately above will represent the years that have expired before the beginning of that cyclic year. Thus against 1805, the current Śaka year on this side of the country, we have in the third column the current cyclic year Subhānu, while 1804 in the line above shows the number of years that have expired. By comparing the Śaka dates and cyclic years occurring in the inscriptions with those in the tables we shall be able to determine the points raised above.

In the analysis of Pāli, Sanskrit, and old Kānarese inscriptions published by Dr. Fleet and Dr. Burgess there are 97 cases in which the Śaka date as well as the cyclic year are distinctly given. On comparing these with the tables I observe that in 58 out of these the given Śaka date occurs in the same line with the cyclic year mentioned in the inscription. These are:
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Thus in inscription No. 20, the date given is 1200, and the cyclic year the Bahudhānya, both of which occur in the same line set against each other in the tables.

In 28 cases the Saka date given in the inscription occurs in the tables in the line below that in which the given cyclic year occurs. These are:

Nos. 19, 22, 26, 33, 34, 47, 72, 89, 91, 95, 96 (first part), 96 (second part), 100, 110, 111, 112, 118 (first part), 118 (second part), 146, 151, 194, 227, 230 (second part), 231, 234, 236, 237, 281.

In No. 19, for instance, the Saka date is 1184 and the cyclic year Durmati. In the tables, Durmati occurs in the upper line set against 1183, and 1184 is in the line below, and Dundubhi is the year marked against it.

Now on the supposition that the inscriptions conform to the Madras reckoning, in the first 58 cases the Saka date represents the number of Saka years that had expired before the current cyclic year of the inscription and in 28 it shows the current year of that era. If we suppose the Bombay reckoning to have been in use, the dates in the first 58 cases will represent the current year and those in the next 28, the future year and not the past. But since it is almost absurd to suppose that the immediately next year should be stated in the inscriptions, it follows that the Madras mode of reckoning was the one in use. The objection, however, may be obviated by supposing that these 28 cases conform
Appendix B. to the Madras reckoning and give the current year, while the first 58 follow the Bombay mode. But this supposition is not reasonable or probable, since these groups are not confined to particular provinces, and often one of the former exists in the same district or even place with one of the latter. We thus see that though in the majority of cases the inscriptions give the past Śaka year, there is a large number in which the current year is given and not the past.

I have also compared other dates with the tables, and the result I give below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saka date</th>
<th>Cyclic year</th>
<th>What the Saka date represents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>Subhānu</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Sarvajit</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>Piṅgala</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td>Dandubhi</td>
<td>Years elapsed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>Vijaya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Aṅgirās</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>Srimukha</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>Kīlaka</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>946</td>
<td>Raktākshi</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>Vilambhi</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>Vikṛiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>Virodhin</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Vilambhi</td>
<td>Years elapsed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td>Dandubhi</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Saumya</td>
<td>Years elapsed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saka date</th>
<th>Cyclic year</th>
<th>What the Saka date represents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>Vilambin</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>Sādhāraṇa</td>
<td>Years elapsed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113</td>
<td>Virodhin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114</td>
<td>Paridhāvin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
<td>Śrīmukha</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1182</td>
<td>Raudra</td>
<td>Years elapsed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1192</td>
<td>Pramoda</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1194</td>
<td>Āngiras</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>Virodhin</td>
<td>Current year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of these 24 dates, eight give the current year and the rest the years that had expired, the proportion being the same as in the other case, viz. 1 to 2. In all cases in which the cyclic year is given it is possible to determine whether the date represents the current or past year, but not in others. The inscriptions of the early Chālukyas do not give it, and hence the exact date remains doubtful.

Now the Bombay mode of reckoning, which is one year behind that prevalent in Madras, is, I believe, due to a mistake. We have seen it was more usual in recording a date to mark the years that had expired than the current year. A word expressive of that sense such as gateshu, "having elapsed," was used after the number, and another such as pravartamāne, "being current," was used in connection with the name of the cyclic year. These words were, for brevity's sake, afterwards dropped; and in the course of time the sense, to express which
they were used, was also forgotten, and the number came to be regarded as denoting the current year. So that what we do on this side of the country is that we use the past or expired year without knowing that it is the past year. And there are in the inscriptions instances of mistakes due to the circumstance that the real past year came to be regarded as the current year. Thus in No. 86 of the Pāli, Sanskrit, and old Kānarese inscriptions, Śaka 911 is given along with the cyclic year Vikrīti. Now, according to the tables, the number of years that had expired before Vikrīti was 912 and the current year was 913. This discrepancy is to be explained by the supposition that Śaka 912 which represented the years that had expired came to be thought of as the current year, just as we, on this side of the country, consider 1805 as the current year now, though it indicates the past year, and the writer of the inscription wishing to give the years that had expired before his current year, put them as 911. The same is the case with Nos. 27, 67, 115, 130, 224, and 284, the Śaka dates in which are 1444, 1084, 1430, 1453, 1114, and 1128, respectively, and are two years behind the current year as determined by the cyclic years given along with them. In some cases the Śaka dates are in advance of the Samvatsara or cyclic year by one year. Thus in the Vaṇi-Dipḍori grant of Govinda III. the Śaka date is 730 and the Samvatsara Vyaya, and in the Kānheri inscription of Amoghavarsha we have Śaka 775 and the Prajāpati Samvatsara. [135] Now the Śaka years immediately preceding Vyaya and Prajāpati were 728 and 773, while the current years were 729 and 774 respectively. This difference might be accounted for on the supposition that the current years 729 and 774 were from the usual custom understood to be
past years and the writers of the documents desirous of giving the current years added 1 and put them down as 730 and 775. The date in No. 79 of Pāli, Sanskrit, and old Kānarese inscriptions is three years behind the current Sārvatṛṣa, and that in No. 228, four years; No. 221 has 1113 for 1121; and No. 246, 1492 for 1485. These must be considered to be mistakes.

The Śaka dates given in the preceding pages represent in most cases the years that had expired before the particular occurrences mentioned. Thus "in 855" means after 855 years of the Śaka era had expired.
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[136] APPENDIX C.

Introduction to Hemâdri’s Vrata-Khaṇḍa.

Appendix C.

In the critical notes D. represents the MS. in the Dekkan College Library, No. 234 of A. 188r-82; D 2, another recently added to the collection; S. the MS. belonging to the old Sanskrit College, No. 657; Kh. the MS. belonging to Khâsgivâle, and G. the MS. procured by Gangâdhar Śâstri Dâtûr. See Section XIV., first page, note 2.

* These two stanzas exist only in a mutilated form in S. and D 2, but they occur fully in D. and Kh. which contain the shorter Praśasti. In G., which contains both the Praśastis mixed together, they occur at the head of the shorter one, so that they appear to belong to the latter rather than to the other.

1 सङ्ग for भङ्ग D. Kh. 2 न: for न: D. Kh.

Râjapraśasti I.

1 जीवारसलंभतादेंसर्वविभासंवसंभवनाः
2 सुभाषितंपुष्कलंजयंरशीष्टंवेंद्रविश्वतः

1 जीवाल ० S. जीवन ० G. २ द्राक्ष ० S. तुष्क ० G.
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[138]

[General Chapters.]

1. दिव्याराज सत; श्रीगणेशप्रेमसिन्नो महात:।
2. लत: कुष्ट्यो राजा गुप्तकीय: क्षमामृत: ॥ १२॥
3. विद्वानुषोहिद सालिसुभाषाके क्षाराजमानसः॥
4. विद्वानुषोहिद शर्राम्ब: प्रतिचव रसि शिरसा: ॥ ११॥
5. बसुणाय शवर्भीजशतापी जीवकाधातु।
6. बसुणाय भौराका राजाने देवसुनिदुष्यम् ॥ १४॥
7. श्यायेन्द्रवेदिपूरुष: शिरसा पाउतात फू शर:।
8. तस्िीपि राजा नसुण्डवासासी वो बिश्वानुषोहिद ईंत॰ाम्बती। ॥ १४॥
9. हन्दाहलाराकाझालामसालामालासालासालासालवी कुताही।
10. वासीदमुसाधा्वासादायमाय अनुता सुधारिः ॥ १५॥

1. दिव्याराज: D 3. २ नाम for राजा G. १ सलिली D 2.
4. अवनसी G.S. १ So both MSS., also D 2. But there must be a mistake. The name of शुरा's son शीर्षक is disguised as राजा. Perhaps the reading is शुरारी. ५ सुरा सुधारि: S. पुरारि: D 2. ६ फला for एस D 2. ७ दिव्याराज: S.; G. totally incorrect and there is a lacuna. D 2. has वर्ष; for वर्ष of 8. ९. The Purānic genealogy ends here. Subāhun, however, is there called Suchāru १० द्राक्षणसत D 2.
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1. राजसुनिकाः D 2. 2 स बांधवि S. सूचारुः G. 3 This is the reading of S., D 2 and G. probably for धायियस. But the name according to Pañdit Bhagvânlal’s grant was धायियस. 4 S. and G. have a wrongad unintelligible reading here. 5 पाव S. पावः G. for पाव 6 The visarga is dropped in S. and G. 7 धायियस D 2. 8 S. G. have बिंदित: भिन्स 9 नामतो D 2.
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1. परमार्जिन: तत्त्व सुमुख दिष्टमित्रकन्यास्थियै।
2. प(प्रारंभ) कक्षानेत्र वर्षा चरण ग्रहण क्रियाप्रक्रिया।
3. तथ्यावर्णम् मन्निदेशात्।
4. तथ्यावर्णस्वर्ण सुपद्धव वर्षाविनिविनिकृष्टी स राजा॥९॥
5. ब्राह्मणराजीकृत आङ्गेय वाक्यात्मक ग्रामम्।
6. स नरेन्द्रतम पुष्पमालकीर्तिरसिद्धिं।
7. सकादेशमित्रां मुन्नामित्रांमित्र:।
8. उद्भवत् जम्भारिकाप्रदेशः स्थितम्।
9. वासाय तद्य: यथिरसाधिं।
10. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।
11. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।
12. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।
13. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।
14. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।
15. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।
16. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।
17. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।
18. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।
19. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।
20. वधा: विनामक्षिप्तमः निपुणः रिपु:।

1 प्रवत्तिः प्रणाली S.G. २। Here S. ends, and the following is based on G. and D 2, of which the former is, as I have already observed, an extremely incorrect manuscript. 1 प्रारंभ G. 1 संहि: संहित G. 1। This word in G. must be some mistake as it has no significance here. D 2. has सुभाषु which also is a mistake. 1 निदित: for निदित्त: G. 2 G. has सुभाषु G. सुभाषु in G. 8. चारण D 2. 10 सुभाषु D 2. 11 जोःप्र् D 2. 12 स D 2. for य रुग्वाल पृष्ठस्मात् for रुग्वाल G
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1 ज्ञानविविधीपालपालितमुखः सर्वांगवर्धनः यः;

2 वैदिकं इत्य सन्धीपतर्वेचित्रते सावलिका विषाणम् ॥ ४७ ॥

क्षणः मन्तरां द्रवति प्रतीती जाती ततः हि वर्णपति दीर्घे ।

तत्त्वस्य पूर्वप्रथमः पुराणाः क्षणिकविष्णुसतति पोषुम् ॥ ४९ ॥

विनायकाचि विनायकसिंचमुखं द्रव्यदिकाणामें

छ्वीमुकितमुक्तयज्ञसमे निर्वृष्टमुक्तसिनम्

विनायकसंज्ञालककुलक्षिता संभवसाधोनिनि ।

6 चौथः: कालविवाहविवाहविवाहातः धर्मपिं साधापितः ॥ ४५ ॥

[141] ततः: जाथे राजायमातः जाथोऽवास्वस्तः परेष्कुण्ड दिति समाधि तेजः: सिद्धार्थः।

4 पविताता सूक्ते: समज्ञवि ज्ञातत्वसम्बन्धः सुचिंद्रः: सीताप्रांकुशकालप्राणस्तिनः ॥ ४० ॥

4 निर्लक्षितिप्रसल्लिपिग्रहणप्रकृतिका

सचौं ज्ञानार्थविगतः भाइपहोपायितम् ॥

छ्वीमुकितमुक्तचित्तिपतिः: क्षणिकवाटोऽक्षणोऽ

चौथायतवाहिनक्ष: स इति मन्त्रां: सर्वं विभौते ॥ ५५ ॥

वी मोर्यदेशार्थः: प्रतापो अधाप नाथे सत्तमदस्सः।

7 साधु जनमं चात्माविविधिस्मितस्मितस्मितायिष्ट ज्ञात राजाम् ॥ ५५ ॥

1 साधु is omitted in the MSS. since it is followed by another साधु, and the copyists mistook the one for the other. The compound is to be dissolved as अजाति जिल्लग्रहणः.

2 ज्ञानिकां महोऽवस्था यथा स ज्ञावितर्फः. ५ शृग्भुष्णीला"

D 2. 6 सदम्मुस्सः: which is also the reading of D. 2, as an epithet of Mahûdeva, involves censure instead of praise.

The correct form of the word is, probably, मद्यमः. ज्ञावितर्फः in which case it would be an epithet of Bhojadeva. 4 After this follow stanzas 14 and 19 of the next Praśasti in D 2.
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Rājakrpaśasti II.

1. यदीपन्यवधिः वर्ग सौतानिक तदाच्छन्नुसरितम्। नाम: समुद्रपन्यधिः सम्मह सम्मो: ग्रह ज्योत्ि! च ॥ ५० ॥
2. यदात्तसुबन्धः वा जगत जगतं संयोगं रित्ववर्षः 
3. श्रेयं व रश्वं जाश्रयं वायनस्यात्य विजयाः।
4. ज्ञातित्ववर्षश्चादनमि योगाविनोभासम्।
5. यमकं दश्यं जाश्रयं वायनस्यात्य विजयाः।
6. बन्धुशेषं व रश्वशेषं जाश्रयं वायनस्यात्य विजयाः।
7. ज्ञातित्ववर्षश्चादनमि योगाविनोभासम्।
8. रश्वशेषं व बन्धुशेषं जाश्रयं वायनस्यात्य विजयाः।

[142] नामाभिमतावेदश्चादनमिवैधिविनोभासम्।
1. वषोपसारस्य दश्यान्तिविनोभासम्।
2. वषोपसारस्य दश्यान्तिविनोभासम्।
3. वषोपसारस्य दश्यान्तिविनोभासम्।
4. वषोपसारस्य दश्यान्तिविनोभासम्।
5. वषोपसारस्य दश्यान्तिविनोभासम्।
6. वषोपसारस्य दश्यान्तिविनोभासम्।
7. वषोपसारस्य दश्यान्तिविनोभासम्।
8. वषोपसारस्य दश्यान्तिविनोभासम्।

1 २ गुणक Kh. २ चंद्रमां: D. & Kh. चंद्रभाष्टि G. १ बार्या गत: Kh.
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चय प्रमाणपतिः अन्तः विचरण नीलकम्बितिधारिणम्।
विनित्वम् शास्त्रस्तु हृद्यमयं भुवन शास्त्राद्वम्: प्रामाण्यम्। रूपम्।

tे

शेषस्य नितिनिपातसब्धिं निवधारणे परमकार्यालयो
गणना तु ज्ञात्वपर्यं तत्त्वमाङ्: द्विकृतदीपिकाः।

शेषोमूलतविषयकविनिपत्ति: करीविलायतेषत्रतः
वीतीपालनविचः स व दसाद्वम: कर्म वषयते। रूपम्।

tे

क्षण प्रयोगमोष्ठपाटायानं हुन न न प्रभावनस्यम् न जातं।

प्रत् विनिभिष्य तत्त्वमित्तीर्थाये: पुरुषी विनिधिता शुपले। रूपम्।

रत एन दि मालवेण्ये: विग्रहमेव लघं व क्षेत्रम्।

खण्डावाः निर्माण सप्त कपूरवेन्ये चिन्तन प्रस्तुत। रूपम्।

विशमकरकाः: मलवो यथा पाठार भुगदिनमे महामातातीतीमाम्।
प्रयोगकर्तराल्लालस्मातीकारणी
 भव श्राक्षस्तीमतं मन्त्रसुभाष्यत। रूपम्।

[143] यद्योषय्यक्षोपश्चैवविविधातः विद्यातत्त्वातः

सोः समुद्रग्रहश्लीलीण समवेन सि भो: संकुञ्ज, बीमा। रूपम्।

यत्तत्त्वातीती चिन्तामृत्तमानस्तत्त्वरिज्ज्ञाति कु: प्रायमी।

पिरं विनिभिष्य योजनावेषे सुमिष्ठे वाक्यस्मात: । रूपम्।

4 सार्वभाष्य हृ. & गृ. हृ. प्राचीन हृ. चौथे हृ. गृ. । चंद्रालिकासी
क्ष. & गृ. हृ. लाटो हृ. चौथे हृ. गृ. । दर्शी विनिभिष्याती
विनिभिष्यार्थे: ख्री. विनिभिष्यालृ. दीपिका
5 खिस्मण्डिनी: हृ. दि न प्रभावत्त तपश्यति हृ. 2 प्रयोः: हृ. ।
10 सोः: हृ. 11 ओरस्त्रन: पुरोगितिः तु: प्रायमी द. 13 बासे हृ.
2 सेवलाखा: D. सेवलाखा: Kh. The middle letter of the name in G. looks somewhat like ः, but there is little question that the copyist had ः before him and made it appear like ः by producing the nether curve and making its end touch the knot of ः. 4 घरालुः D. 4 घर for घर D 2.
NOTES

ADDITIONS AND FURTHER CORRECTIONS

BY PROF. D. R. BHANDARKAR, M.A., PH.D.


Pp. 4-5. For Aryan immigration into the Dekkan, see D. R. Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, p. 2 & ff.


P. 23. The inscriptions of Asoka found at Supārā and on the northern frontier of Mysore were not "stray edicts". At Supārā the whole set of his Fourteen Rock Edicts must have been engraved, of which only a fragment of Edict VIII has now been preserved. As regards his inscriptions on the frontier of Mysore, they are three separate copies of his Minor Rock Edicts and speak of a prince of the blood royal as being placed in charge of that frontier province (D. R. Bhandarkar, *Asoka*, pp. 254-255, p. 258 & pp. 26–28). Since the *Early History of the Deccan* was published, another recension has been discovered at Maski in Nizam's territory.

P. 24. For a revised transcript and interpretation of the Nānāghaṭ inscriptions, see Bühler *Arch. Surv. West. Ind.*, Vol. V. p. 60 & ff. For the history deducible from them, see D. R. Bhandarkar, *Ind. Ant.*, 1918, pp. 71-72.


Pp. 34-35. For the different views about the family of the princes who issued the coins found at Kolhāpur, see *Ind. Ant.*, 1920, p. 31 & ff.

P. 36 & n. 23. For the correct reading and interpretation of the coin, see E. J. Rapson, *Jour. R. As. Soc.*, 1905, p. 797 & ff.

P. 42 & ff. For the Kshatrapa rule in the Dekkan and the restoration of the Sātavāhana empire set forth in Section VI., read also D. R. Bhandarkar’s *Dekkan of the Sātavāhana* in *Ind. Ant.*, 1918, pp. 69-78 and 149-156; and H. C. Ray Chaudhuri’s *Political History of Ancient India*, p. 305 & ff.


P. 57 & ff. As to the Purāṇa texts relating to the Andhrabhṛitya dynasty, see F. E. Pargiter’s *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 35 & ff. For comments on the texts, see V. A. Smith and S. M. Edwards’ *Early History of India*, p. 230 & ff.
P. 64. In respect of the time when Śālivāhana-Saka came into vogue, see J. F. Fleet, Ind. Ant., Vol. XII. p. 214 ff.

P. 68. For another view of the authorship and date of the Saptaśati, see A. Weber’s Ueber das Saptaçatakam des Hāla, pp. 2–4.

P. 70 & ff. For a further account of the religious, social and economic condition of Mahārāṣṭra, see D. R. Bhandarkar, Ind. Ant., 1919, p. 77 & ff.

Pp. 77–81. One powerful dynasty, that ruled over Mahārāṣṭra between the extinction of the Andhrabhṛtyas and the rise of the Chālukyas, is Kaṭachchūri, known later as Kalachuri. Three copper-plate grants of this family are known: (1) the Ābhōṇā Plates of Saṅkaragaṇa dated K. 347 and published by K. B. Pathak, Ep. Ind., Vol. IX. pp. 297-298; (2) the Vaḍnēr Plates of Buddhāraja, dated K. 360 and published by V. R. Gupte Ibid., Vol. XII. p. 33 ff; and (3) the Sarsavṇī Plates of the same king, dated K. 361 and published by F. Kielhorn, Ibid., Vol. VI. pp. 297-299. It is this Buddhāraja who was defeated by the Western Chālukya prince Maṅgalaraja (Maṅgalesa) and is referred to in pp. 84-85 of the Early History of the Dekkan. The capital of this dynasty, however, was Māhishmati (Ind. Ant., 1911, p. 20; Arch. Surv. Ind., An. Rep., 1913-14, p. 214).

Pp. 82–104. For the epigraphic records connected with the Early Chālukyas of Badāmi, see Nos. 1–52 of F. Kielhorn’s List of Inscriptions of Southern India (Ep. Ind., Vol. VII. Appendix). Some of the inscriptions of this dynasty published thereafter are:

(1) Lakshmeshwar (Dhārwār Dist., Bombay Presidency) Pillar Inscription of the Yuvarāja Vikramāditya granting some constitution to the


P. 96. For a more detailed history of the Arab invasion see p. 20 & ff. of *the Gurjara-Pratihāras* by R. C. Majumdar, in *Jour. Dept. Letters* (Cal. Univ.), Vol. X.

P. 106 ff. For epigraphic records connected with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānyakheṭa, see Nos. 53—107 of F. Kielhorn’s *List of Inscriptions of Southern India*. Some of the inscriptions published thereafter are:


Mentions his son Prabhūtāṅga Govinda (II.).


(4) Ś. 701.—Dhulia (East Khandesh Dist., Bombay Presidency) spurious (?) Plates of Suvarpa-varsha Pratāpāśīla Karkarāja, son of Dhrūvarāja,
younger brother of Prabhūtavarsha (-Govinda II.) to whose reign it refers itself.

(5) S. 715.—Daulatabad (Nizam’s State) Plates of Samarāvaloka Śaṅkaragāṇa, son of Nanna, who was brother of Kṛishṇarāja (I) and son of Karkarāja. Charter issued with the consent of Kalīvalabha-Narendradeva (Dhruva-Nirupama). Ed. by D. R. Bhandarkar, Ep. Ind., Vol. IX. p. 195.


(13) Kyāsanūr (Dhārwar Dist., Bombay Presi-
dency) Inscription of the time of Nityavarsha-
Amoghavarsha who is the same as Nityavarsha-

P. 112 & n. 19. For a detailed discussion and 
historical importance of the passage from the Jaina 
and ff.

P. 136. For the epigraphic records connected 
with the Later Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi, see Nos. 140-274 
of F. Kielhorn's *List of Inscriptions of Southern 
India*. Some of the inscriptions of this dynasty pub-
lished thereafter are:

1. Ś. 929.—Hoṭṭūr (Dhārwar Dist., Bombay Pre-
sidency) Inscription of the time of Akalaṅkācharita-
īrvabeḍaṅga Chālukya Satyāśraya. Ed. by L. D. 

2. Ś. 393.—Sudi (Dhārwar Dist., Bombay Presi-
dency) Inscription of the time of Tribhuvanamalladeva, 
*i.e.* Chālukya Vikramāditya V. Ed. by L. D. 

3. Ś. 933.—Ālur (Dhārwar Dist., Bombay Presi-
dency) Inscription of the time of Tribhuvanamallā-
Vol. XVI. p. 27 ff.

4. Ś. 950.—Kuḷenūr (Dhārwar Dist., Bombay 
Presidency) Inscription of the time of Jagadekamalla-

5. Ś. 963.—Sīrūr (Dhārwar Dist., Bombay Presi-
dency) Inscription of the time of Jagadekamalla *i.e.* 
XV. pp. 334-335.

6. Lakshmeshwar (Dhārwar Dist., Bombay Presi-
dency) Inscription of the time of Jagadekamalla II. 


(16) S. 975.—Mulgund (Dhārwār Dist., Bombay


(18) Ś. 988.—Hoṭṭūr (Dhārwār Dist., Bombay Presidency) Inscription of the time of Trailokyamalla-Ahavamalla (Someśvara I.) and Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Jemarasa. Ed. by L. D. Barnett, Ep. Ind., Vol. XVI. p. 82.


(20) Ś. 966 and 1067.—Hūli (Belgaum Dist., Bombay Presidency) Inscription of the time of Ahavamalla (Someśvara I.) and Jagadekamalla (II.). Ed. by L. D. Barnett, Ep. Ind., Vol. XVIII. pp. 172-3.


Of the 38th year of his reign.

(33) Gadag (Dhārwār Dist., Bombay Presidency) Inscription of the time of the Chālukya Vikramādiṭya

Of the 23rd year of his reign.


Of the 27th year of his reign.


Of the 7th year of his reign.


Of the 29th year of his reign.

(41) Ś. 1029.—Huli (Belgaum Dist., Bombay Presidency) Inscription of the time of Tribhuvana-


Of the 32nd year of his reign.


P. 160 & ff. For the epigraphic records connected with the Kalachuris of Kalyāṇa, see Nos. 275-300 of F. Kielhorn's List of Inscriptions of Southern India. Some of the inscriptions of this dynasty published thereafter are:
THE KALACHURIS.


P. 205 & n. 60. Jnana-deva was a descendant (suta) in the pupil’s line, that is, really a disciple of Nivruttinatha. At the conclusion of his work he says that Nivruttinatha was a pupil of Gahininatha and that the latter was a pupil of Gorakshanatha who himself was a pupil of Matsyendranatha. If Jnana-deva’s date was Saka 1212 (=1290 A.D.), Gorakshanatha has to be placed about the beginning of the 13th century A.D.
Early History of the Deccan.