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ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Page 8, para. 7, l. 1.—For Kharōṣṭhī read Kharōṣṭhī.
12, f. n. 1.—For Deotēk read Deotēk.
13, para. 1, l. 16.—For Āptōryāma read Āptōryāma.
16, f. n. 3.—For Ranabhañja read Ranabhañja.
23, para. 4, l. 6.—For Rājarāja read Rājarāja.
24, f. n. 8.—For Eliśaimoγa read Eliśaimoγa.
25, l. 2.—For Silavati read Silavati.
27, text l. 3.—For [Vā]jilaikaṇḍīṣuramudaiya read [Vā]jilaikaṇḍīṣuramudaiya.
35, para. 5, l. 2.—For Tanjai read Tañjai.
37, f. n. 16, l. 4.—For Chatuṛvėdiṃaṅgalam read Chatuṛvėdiṃaṅgalam.
39, para. 2, l. 18.—For has to be connected read have to be connected.
46, f. n. 1, l. 4.—For Irda read Irda.
53, l. 24.—For Duduia read Dudia.
57, para. 2, l. 1.—For dip-thongs read diphthongs.
65, text l. 11.—For karaṁpura read karaṁpura.
66, text l. 11.—For naṇavāṭīmaṇḍūry read naṇavāṭīmaṇḍūry.
70, text l. 46.—For ṛḥaṁ read ṛṛḥaṁ.
73, text l. 12.—For karaṁpura read karaṁpura.
74, text l. 24.—For aṣṭāṅgaḥ read aṣṭāṅgaḥ.
75, text l. 41.—For karaṁpura read karaṁpura.
79, text l. 14.—For devadāya read devadāya.
81, text l. 26.—For navaṁ read navaṁ.
90, para. 3, l. 4.—For first fortnight and read first fortnight of the month of Rishabha and.
90, para. 4, l. 3.—For a new read anew.
95, para. 1, l. 1.—For Vaṭiyari read Vaṭiyari.
95, para. 2, l. 11.—For Śīgaṇṇa read Śīgaṇṇa.
108, end of para. 1.—Add the following:

"On re-examining the inked impressions of the Rewa stone inscription of Kārṇa of the Chāṇḍi year 800, I find that the second of the two missing akṣaras before nāṁvā in l. 31 is ra. The name of the cyclic year was, therefore, Khara. This corroborates my reading of the date of this inscription. For the cyclic year corresponding to the expired Chāṇḍi year 800 (A. D. 1048-49) was Khara according to the Northern lunisolar system." (V. V. M.)

110, l. 7.—For Mālawā read Mālawā.
120, para. 2, l. 1.—For Pendraṁbandh read Pendraṁbandh.
120, para. 2, l. 1.—For Vol. XXII read Vol. XXIII.
133, para. 1, l. 2.—For characters read charters. (B. C. C.)
140, para. 1, l. 2.—For Uruvupalli plates of Sūnhabarman read Uruvupalli grant of Sūnhabarman.
154, para. 3, l. 8.—For Udaiyaṇ Kūṭiḍuvaṇ read Udaiyaṇ Kūṭiḍuvaṇ.
154, para. 3, l. 21.—For 'on which varagu' read 'on which elī, varagu'.
154, para. 4, l. 2.—For and borne crops read and had borne crops,
Page 162, l. 28.—For friendly relation read friendly relations.

168, text l. 1.—For Pā-malar-ṭiruv[am] read Pāmalar-ṭiru[am].

175, text l. 37.—For māmāyā read Māmāyā.

176, para. 3, l. 1.—For Kaira read Kairī.

176, para. 3, l. 1.—For Sāṭkhaḍa read Sāṭkhaḍā.

179, para. 5, l. 13.—For Valabhi read Valabhi.

184, para. 4, l. 7.—For Velungagupta read Velungagoguṇa.

191, para. 1, l. 4.

185, f. n. 2.—For No. 453 of 1906 read No. 543 of 1906.

185, f. n. 8.—For Arakatavēmulu read Arakatavēmulu.

188, para. 1, l. 11.—For Kibbenahal[ṃ] read Aralaguppe.8

189 f. n.s. 1, 2 and 4.—For No. 309 of 1923 read No. 309 of 1922 and for No. 310 of 1923 read No. 310 of 1922.

211, para. 5, l. 5.—For thier read their.

213, f. n. 6, l. 4.—For Chāmpaner read Chāmpāner.

213, f. n. 7, l. 5.—For goddess read goddess.

214, para. 1, l. 1.—For Muslim historians and read Muslim historians (and).

215, f. n. 7, l. 1.—For tā-ṭeṇāṣya read tā-ṭeṇāṣya.

217, f. n. 4, l. 2.—For verse 21 read verse 22.

218, para. 5.—[In this para. Dr. Sankalia describes Jayadēva as the lord of Bāgūla and seems to hold the view that by Bāgūla the name of a country is indicated. But by the form Bāgūla a race or clan of Rāṭhaṣṭras seems to be referred to. The origin of the name Bāgula and its application to a race or clan are explained in Rāṣṭrāṭhadhvanśamahākīvyā of Rudrakavi (1596 A.D.) vide Canto II vv. 27 ff. (M. V. R.).]

218, para. 6, l. 2.—For Śaka 1401 read Śaka 1410.

224, text l. 9.—For ṇaṭṭha read ṇaṭṭha.

225, f. n. 1.—For puṭagāṃ read puṭagāṃ.

233, text l. 15.—For viṣhaya-ṭaḥpahāṅgāḥ read viṣhaya-ṭaḥpahāṅgāḥ.

239, f. n. 10.—For Mahāraṇa-suva-mukhi-ṭapṣyaḥ read Mahāraṇa-suva-mukhi-ṭapṣyaḥ.

242, corrected text l. 1.—For अत्रेयाः read अत्रेयाः.

249, para. 1, l. 3.—For Kaubīḍharikā read Kaubīḍharikā.

256, l. 8 from bottom.

257, para. 3, l. 2.—For Dharanikāṭṭha read Dharanikāṭṭha.

259, l. 3-4.

261, para. 2, l. 10.—For gotra read gotra.

263, f. n. 7, l. 2.—For Bālora read Bālora.

264, text l. 2.—For viṇiṣṭhaḥ स तीस सम्बद्ध read viṇiṣṭhaḥ स तीस सम्बद्ध.

279, para. 1, l. 4.—For pillar by the wife read pillar by Reti, the wife.

285, f. n. 4, verse l. 1.—For ंतसरास read मंतसरास.

286, f. n. 4, verse l. 3.—For श्रवस read श्रवस.

286, f. n. 4, verse l. 11.—For श्रवस read श्रवस.

288, f. n. 5, verse l. 1.—For śāṇḍa read śāṇḍa.

299, f. n. 2.—For Uruvupallī plates read Uruvupallī grant.

332, f. n. 7, l. 1.—For at the first instance read in the first instance.

315, Text l. 6.—For संस्क्रीत read सं.
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EPIGRAPHIA INDICA.

VOLUME XXIV.

No. 1.—THE BAJAUR CASKET OF THE REIGN OF MENANDER.

BY N. G. MAJUMDAR, M.A., INDIAN MUSEUM, CALCUTTA.

The inscriptions edited here occur on a steatite casket which comes from Shinkot in Bajaur territory. The place is about twenty miles to the north-west of the confluence of the Panj kora and Swat rivers, beyond the borders of the North-West Frontier Province, where the casket was discovered by some tribal people while digging the foundations of a new fort. The territory of Bajaur, representing a part of the ancient province of Udyana, is practically an unexplored country, and the present find is therefore of unusual interest. The only other mentionable object discovered in this region is the seal of Theodamas which was first published by Serart. The steatite casket is said to have encased a casket of silver, which in turn contained a gold reliquary and some ashes; but the silver and gold articles are no longer traceable. The outer casket together with some fragments of its lid has been recovered through the efforts of Mian Afzal Shah, son of Khan Bahadur Mian Rahim Shah, C.I.E., of Ziarat Kaku Sahib in Peshawar District. At the request of Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, Director General of Archaeology in India, Mian Afzal Shah has very generously presented the casket to the Archaeological Department and it has been lent for exhibition to the Indian Museum, Archaeological Section, Calcutta. I am deeply obliged to Rao Bahadur Dikshit for having permitted me to edit the inscriptions and also for the help I have received from him in manifold ways.

The casket is a flat, bowl-shaped vessel of dark steatite having a flanged base all round, 1-3" in width. The diameter of the casket at the mouth is 8-8" and at the base 11-3" and the diameter of the lid is also, 11-3". The depth of the bowl is 1-9", and the casket including the lid measures 3-3" in height. Excepting a few indented lines in the form of concentric rings encircling the casket and its lid at six different places, it bears no other decoration.

The characters appearing on the casket are Kharoshthi, as may be expected in the locality from which it comes. The inscriptions are engraved along the rim of the lid (A), around its centre (A1 and C) and on its inner face (A2), also in the concave portion of the casket (B and D) and on its back (B). The longest one of the inscriptions is marked D, the lines of which are disposed of in the form of a spiral, as in the case of the Relic Casket of the year 393 from Charsadda. As only a few fragments of the lid have been recovered it has not been possible to restore the entire text of Inscriptions A, A1, A2 and C. The rest of the inscriptions, however, have been completely made out, as the bowl of the casket, although slightly cracked, is in a fair state of preservation.

The engraving of letters has not been carried out in the same uniform style throughout, and from this point of view the inscriptions may be classified under two distinct groups. In A, A1, A2 and B the letters are formed by bold and deeply incised strokes, while in C, D and E the

2 See pp. 8 ff. below.
writing is shallow, the letters are comparatively small and the strokes in many places no better than superficial scratches. A similar example of superficial engraving of Kharoshthi letters is afforded by the Charsadda Casket inscription of the year 303.

The grouping of inscriptions as suggested above can be justified also on grounds of palaeography. Inscriptions A-B have in all the instances a with a rounded head, but in C-E it shows definitely an acute angle. In the former inscriptions a has a long sweep in its top curve, resembling the letter in the Shabazgarh and Manshree Edicts of Aśoka. In the latter inscriptions this curve has taken an angular or hook-like appearance, akin to the type occurring in the inscriptions of the Kusān period. Significant also are the varying shapes of the letter a which in A-B is generally of the closed type as in the Asokan inscriptions and Indo-Greek coins, while in C-E it shows in all cases a definite gap at the upper left side of the crowning loop, although in the majority of examples its lower vertical slightly extends upward, beyond the point where it meets the loop. The latter feature is characteristic of the a as found in the inscriptions of the Saṅga period, while the upward extension of the vertical is absent in the letter occurring in the Kusān inscriptions.1 While, therefore, Inscriptions C-E are referable to the period of the Saṅga Satraps of Taxila and Mathurā, Inscriptions A-B must be referred to a somewhat earlier date. This date is suggested by Inscription A which refers itself to the reign of Mahārāja Minḍra, i.e., the Greek King Menander, who ruled sometime in the 2nd century B.C. To the same date must also be assigned Inscriptions A1, A2 and B which exhibit palaeographic features identical with those of Inscription A. The difference in age between the two sets of inscriptions was probably a little more than fifty years, so that we may suppose that the additional inscriptions C, D and E were engraved sometime in the 1st century B.C.

Apart from the evidence of palaeography and the technique of engraving, there is another point in favour of the assumption that some of the inscriptions were incised at a later date. The position of Inscriptions A1 and C on the casket shows that A1 existed already when C was engraved. Had it not been so the engraver of C would have commenced his writing from a point further to the right. Similarly, Inscription B must have existed prior to D; otherwise there would be no need for the engraver of D to leave so much space between lines 1 and 2, just where Inscription B occurs on the casket. This spacing was evidently intended to avoid overlapping of the inscriptions.

The language of the inscriptions is the North-Western variety of Prakrit as in the post-Asokan Kharoshthi documents. Linguistically, the earlier group of inscriptions on the casket cannot be differentiated altogether from the later group; the only mentionable difference is in the case of the word Śākyamuni which is rendered as Śākumāni in Inscription A2. The word appears in this form in the Taxila plate of Patika, Mathurā Lion Capital inscriptions and the Tirath Foot-print inscription.2 It occurs also in a Jaulā inscription which, according to Konov, is a copy of an older record.3 In the Kurram and Wardak Vase inscriptions4 the name is Sanskritized as Śākyamuni. It is spelled, however, as Śākumāni5 in Inscription D. Such a difference in the spelling of the all-important word denoting the Buddha's name cannot be without significance and must be attributed to the circumstance that Inscription D was composed by a different man at a date later than Inscription A2. Other points concerning the language will be noted where each individual text is discussed.

3 Ibid., p. 97, No. 12.
4 Ibid., pp. 155 and 170.
5 The letter mu in A2 is also of an earlier form as compared with that in D.
The question arises why these two sets of inscriptions were engraved on one and the same casket, but at two different dates. This can be answered after we have considered the purpose of the inscriptions and also analysed their individual contents. The earlier portion of the record represented by A, A₁, A₂ and B refers to the establishment or consecration of the corporeal relic of the Buddha in the reign of Mahārāja Minādra, on the 14th day of the month of Kārttika of a certain year which is lost. The donor of the casket was a person named Viyakamitra. The later portion of the record represented by Inscriptions C-D also refers to the establishment of the corporeal relic of the Buddha, and of the bowl, but by a person named Vijayamitra, on the 25th day of Vaśākha of the 5th regnal year. Inscription E of this later group mentions the name of the scribe Viśūpila. Further details of the inscriptions will be clear from our analysis of the contents as given below.

A.—This inscription must have opened with a mention of the year of consecration of the casket. The portion specifying the year is lost. So also is the concluding portion of the text which probably contained a reference to sarīra after the word prāṇa-samāda. As mentioned already, the inscription refers itself to the reign of King Menander whose name is spelt here as Minādra, allied to the Pāli form Milinda. The Pāli text Milindapañha, or ‘The Questions of King Menander’, contains a number of imaginary dialogues between this king and the Buddhist sage Nāgasena. The king’s name appears as Menādra on his coins, while on a relief from Gandhāra the name of its donor, who is also a Menander, is spelt as Miṇḍa. ¹ In the present record the title maharāja occurs after the name of the king. Similar instances are found also on some of his coins, the Kharoṣṭhī legend on which reads as: Menādras maharājasa tratarasa.² The word katvasa is equivalent to Sanskrit Kārtikasya. The change of r into t occurs also in the Prākrit of Asokan inscriptions. The day of the month of Kārttika is expressed as 4 4 4 1 1, i.e., 14. This notation is rather unusual, since the customary way to express the number 14 would be to write 10 4. The third digit, viz., 4, which is engraved below the line, appears to have been added later.³

The words prāṇa-samāda, i.e., prāṇa-samāṭa, which occur twice, in A and in A₁, seem to have been used in reference to the sarīra, i.e., the corporeal relic of the Buddha. The Buddhist conception regarding his corporeal relic is thus explained in the Mahāvamsa:⁴ “If we behold the relics we behold the Conqueror” i.e., the Buddha. Regarding the deposit of his relics in the Thūpārāma-chetiya in Ceylon the Buddha is supposed to have observed: “If my pure relics, filling a dona-measure, are laid ..., they shall take the form of the Buddha, and rising and floating in the air, they shall take their place after having wrought the miracle of the double appearances.”⁵ Thus in regard to the relic consecrated in the Thūpārāma-chetiya it is stated that when it was brought to the place on the back of an elephant and was being watched by the people from every side, it “rose up in the air from the elephant’s back, and floating in the air plain to view, at the height of seven tālas, throwing the people into amazement, it wrought that miracle of the double appearances, that caused the hair (of the beholders) to stand on end, even as (did) the Buddha under the Gāndhāra-tree”.⁶ In view of such powers attributed to

³ The second symbol for 1 is longer than the first. A similar example occurs in the Fatejhāng inscription of the year 69 (C. I. I., Vol. II, Pt. I, Plate IV, 1).
⁵ Ibid., p. 129.
⁶ Ibid., pp. 119-120.
the corporal relic of the Buddha the significance of the expression, prāṇa-sametā, i.e., ‘endowed with life’, becomes clear. The relic was no doubt looked upon as a living organism, as animated as the body of the Buddha before Nirvāṇa. As in the Mahāvamsa, the donor here also must have been actuated by the same belief: “By these relics of his body the Master of the World, being already passed into nibbāṇa, truly bestowed salvation and bliss in abundance on mankind.”

A1.—The text here consists of remnants of two letters followed by a ta. Traces of a horizontal line are discernible in the first two, which enable us to restore the word as thavita, the complete word being pratīthavita, i.e., ‘established’. This must have reference to the deposit of the relic in a stūpa.

A2.—There are wide gaps here between the words which were probably four in all and arranged in a circle. The first and the last are clear, viz., prāṇa-someda-Sakamunisa. Before Sakamunisa there is just a trace of the letter t or r. If it is t, as is more likely, we are perhaps justified in restoring the missing word here as bhavavato. The entire inscription would then read: prāṇa-someda sārira bhavavato Sakamunisa, i.e., ‘the corporal relic of the bhavavat Śākyamuni, which is full of life’.

B.—There is no difficulty about the reading of B which runs as Vijakamitra apraḍaca-raja. It should be noted here that the two dental sibilants are of the later semi-open type, although technically speaking the inscription should be assigned to the date of Inscription A, that is the reign of King Menander. As our analysis shows, in the earlier group the closed type of s predominates, while in the later group the predominant form is of the semi-open variety. The first part of the name Vijakamitra may represent Viryaka, or Vijjaka which appears as a personal name in later times. The title apraḍaca-raja perhaps corresponds to a-praḥyag-raja, i.e., ‘one who has no royal adversary.’ It may be compared with such phrases qualifying the king’s name as apadihata on the Indo-Greek coins and apratiṭhata-chaka on those of the Indo-Parthian king Gondophernes. The genitive case ending in Vijakamitra, which has no complementary word after it, shows that here the word dana has to be supplied, that is to say a gift of Vijakamitra is to be understood. Similar examples are well known from early Indian inscriptions. The gift was no doubt the casket itself containing the relics. Vijakamitra, who must have been a vassal chief under King Menander on the North-Western Frontier of India, is not known from any other sources.

C.—It records the name of Vijayamitra in the first line. The second line reads as pate pradithavide; the word pate no doubt stands for pātra, i.e., the bowl, referring to the steatite casket. How much of the inscription is missing cannot be guessed from the fragmentary condition of the lid.

D.—This is the principal record that was engraved subsequent to A-B. The opening words ime sārira are familiar to us from other Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, but there is no analogy elsewhere of what follows. The words palugha-bhutad correspond to Pāli palugha-bhūtā, meaning ‘which has broken or has been shattered.’ The words following, na sakare atrī, may be taken to represent na satkāře ādrita. The verbal form sariṣṭi(r)i may correspond to Sanskrit śīrṣatē, Pāli sarati from the root āri, meaning, ‘to be worn out, to decay’, etc. The subscript r stroke in the last

---

1 Geiger’s Mahāvamsa (Translation, P. T. S.) p. 121
2 The additional stroke at the foot of the letter s in Vijakamitra cannot be explained.
3 Pāli-English Dictionary (P. T. S.), s. v. palugha.
4 Cf. the expressions pājñāsa adāra ‘worshipped with zeal’ and sakkāra-phāna, ‘place of worship’ used in reference to the Buddha’s relic. Geiger, Mahāvamsa (Text), 31. 29 and 31. 62.
letter is superfluous but might have a phonetic significance. It appears several times in this inscription in places where it is not at all expected, e.g., in grīṇayat(r)i, Veś(r)akha(r)asa, paṁchavat(r)aye, prati(r)ihavat(r)e and bhag(r)avarā. Similar examples frequently occur in the Mathurā Lion Capital Inscriptions.¹ The word kalad(r)e may stand for kālataḥ, 'in course of time,' and iṣadho for śraddhā, 'venerated.' The word piṇḍodayakaye would correspond to piṇḍ-ādekaṭāḥ, i.e., 'with alms and water,' and pītri grīṇayat(r)i would correspond to pītri grāhaya, i.e., 'makes the ancestors or manes accept,' or 'propitiates the ancestors.' The inscription means to say that since the relic was damaged, it was no longer zealously worshiped. In course of time it had begun to decay and was not venerated, and the distribution of alms and water for the propitiation of the dead ancestors was no longer taking place. It is further stated that even the receptacle of the sarīra (lasa ye patre) was apomna, i.e., apomuktaḥ or 'abandoned.' The offering of piṇḍodakā to the ancestors was no doubt the usual practice even among the Buddhist laity. The regular offering of peta-
dakkhinā, i.e., 'gifts to dead ancestors,' is enjoined in the Aṅguttara-Nikāya as one of the principal duties of a house-holder.² Offerings to pubha-petas are referred to also in the Milinda-
pañcāḥ and in the Petavattu.⁴ In the present case the idea probably is that these offerings used to take place so long as the corporeal relic together with the casket which contained it was de-
posited in a stūpa in an undisturbed condition. But subsequently before Inscription D was written, the relic and the casket had become desecrated and unfit for worship. The inscrip-
tion goes on to say that in the fifth (regnal) year the same relic was established (in a stūpa) by Vijayamitra,⁶ who has the title apruca-raja like his predecessor Viya\n kamintra of Inscrip-
tion B. Vijayamitra appears to have belonged to the same family and to have re-con-
secrated the relic, a record of which he was naturally anxious to perpetuate on the casket itself. A similar example of the re-establishment of a corporeal relic of the Buddha occurs in the Taxila copper-plate of Patika (aprutṣṭhavat bhagavata Śakunijisa sariram pratiḥaveti).

E.—Finally, on the back of the casket is recorded the fact that the writing (that is of C and D) was carried out by one Viśpila. The word apraṇkutena qualifying Viśpila corresponds to śaṇkritena, i.e., aśaṃkritena, 'who was ordered.' It refers of course to his having executed the work under the orders of Vijayamitra. In Central Asian Kharoṣṭhī documents an anusvāra is often substituted for a long vowel, e.g., in vinīcayamīni for viṇīpāyāmi. In these documents aṣa regularly stands for ājña.⁸ In the Shahbazgarhi recension of Asoka's edicts jn is rendered by the lingual ȝ, as in literary Prakrit.⁹ The compound ep in Viśpila represents Sanskrit sv. A similar name Veśpasi occurs in the Māṇikīlā inscription¹⁰ of the reign of Kanishka.

From Inscription D of Vijayamitra we can understand why the two sets of inscriptions came to be incised on one and the same casket at two different dates. The relic casket was con-
secrated twice: the original consecration was done by Viyakamitra in the time of King Menander and the re-consecration was carried out later by Vijayamitra, who, as the title shows, must have been a descendant of Viyakamitra. Inscription A, which gives the date, the 14th day

⁴ Ed. by Minayeff, e.g., I. 4, I. 5.
⁵ The year no doubt refers to the reign of Vijayamitra.
⁶ Kharoṣṭh Inscriptions, p. 250, No. 663 and p. 300.
of Kırttika of some year, refers no doubt to the original consecration, while the 25th day of Vaiśākha of the fifth (regnal) year mentioned in Inscription D represents the date on which the re-consecration took place. Both the months Kırttika and Vaiśākha are auspicious from the Buddhist point of view. As pointed out by Fleet, the Sarvāstivādins held that the Buddha attained Parinirvāna in the month of Kırttika. On the other hand, according to the Ceylonese tradition, the event happened in the month of Vaiśākha. The former view, which is based on a statement of Yuan Chwang, perhaps represents an earlier tradition. In any case it would be quite natural for a Buddhist to consecrate the corporeal relics of the Great Master on the anniversary of his demise.

As mentioned already, Vijayamitra must have been a ruling prince under Menander. The latter, who belonged to the house of Euthydemus, had his capital at Sākala as stated in the Milinda-panha. Sākala is said to have been situated in the country of the Yonakas and is usually identified with Siākot in the Punjab between the rivers Chenab and Ravi. According to the Milinda-panha Menander was born in Alasanda, identified with the district of Alexandria-under-the-Caucasus between the Panjshir and the Kabul rivers. From the finds of his coins, which are distributed over a very large area, from the Kabul Valley to the United Provinces, there remains no doubt that his empire was an extensive one. According to some scholars the passage in the Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali regarding the siege of Sāketa (in the United Provinces) and Madhyamikā (in Rājputāna) by a Yavana king refers to an invasion of Menander. The discovery of the present record in Bajaur proves conclusively that it was included within his territory and was under the governorship of Vijayamitra, who, as the name shows, must have been a prince of local origin.

As regards Vijayamitra, Rao Bahadur Dikshit has kindly drawn my attention to a number of coins discovered in the Śaka-Palhava City of Sirkap in Taxila during the excavations of 1931. These are rectangular copper pieces bearing the legend Vijayamitra, written in Brāhmī on one side and Kharoṣṭhī on the other, along with the svastika, tri-ratna, hill and other symbols. The Brāhmī legend, which is the clearer of the two, shows characters of the 1st century B.C. There is another coin in the British Museum ascribed to 'Vijayamitra's son' (Cunningham, Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd series, Vol. X, 1890, p. 127; and Whitehead, Catalogue of Coins in the Panjab Museum, Vol. I, p. 168 and Pl. XVII, iii). It is an imitation of the Indo-Parthian type (King on horse-back and standing deity), the Kharoṣṭhī legend on which reads Vijayamitra (ṣa) apacha. The lower portions of the letters apacha are cut away. It is probable that these are the remains of the legend apacha-raja. This coin, however, must be attributed to the middle of the first century A.D.

Vijayamitra of the Taxila coins may be identified with Vijayamitra of the present casket. His connection with the North-West Frontier is thus independently attested by numismatic

---

3. In the Buddhavamsa (P. T. S.), p. 68, v. 8, the bowl relic (pātra) of the Buddha is supposed to have been deposited at a place called Vajrāś. This name might be identical with Bajaur and it is not impossible that the author of the text had actually heard of the story of the consecration of a bowl or relic casket like the present one in a stūpa in that country. Its capital might have been Vajraśvātī 'in Uttarapātha' mentioned in the Boddhisattvavamsa-balapatha (B. C. Law, Geographical Essays, 1937, Vol. I, p. 46).
4. Along with the coins of Vijayamitra was found a rectangular, bilingual copper piece of an identical type, which belongs to a king named Viśvāsa. The Brāhmī characters of this coin also are assignable to the first century B.C. This king should be identified with *Kuśa Viśvāsa* who is known from a round copper coin in the British Museum (Allan, Catalogue of Coins of Ancient India, 1936, p. 138), found by Cunningham in the Northern Punjab beyond Lahore.
a. Relic Casket from Bajaur.

b. The same showing Inscription E on back.
Part of lid showing Inscription A 2 on the inner face.

Part of lid showing Inscriptions A, A 1 and C.

Scale: one-half.
THE BAJAUR CASKET OF THE REIGN OF MENANDER—(II).

Inside view showing Inscriptions B and D.
evidence. The British Museum coin must belong to a later prince, most probably of the same dynasty, as appears from the continuity of the epithet *apacha-(raja)*.

**TEXT.**

**A. Rim of Lid.**

*Minadrasi* maharajasa *Katia divasa 4 4 1 1 pra[na]-[sa]me[da].....

1. Centre of Lid.

2. (prati)thavi[ta]

3. Centre of Lid.

**A*. Inner face of Lid.

praṇa-same[da]...............[to] *Śakamunisa* 2

**B. Inside of Casket.**

*Viyaκamitra* apracha-rajasa

**C. Centre of Lid.**

1 Viyaκa[mit]ra ............

2 pate pradithavide

**D. Inside of Casket.**

1 Ime śarim paluga-bhud(r)ao* na sakara atrita [*] sa śariat(r)ij kalad(r)ena śadbro na pinḍoyaka-

kṛti griṇayat(rji) [*]

2 tasa ye patre aprumua [*] vashaye pariṣṭhamaye 4 1 Veś(r)akhrасa masasa
divasa-pariṣṭhamaye[r]yе iyo

3 prat(r)ithavit(rje) *Viyaκamitra* apracha-rajena Bhag(r)avatu *Śakamunisa* sama-
sa[mi]buddhāsa* śarīra [*]

**E. Back of Casket.**

*Viyaπilena* aṇaṇikatena likhit(r)e [*]

**TRANSLATION.**

**A.**

On the 14th day of Kāttika, in the (reign) of *Mahāraja Minandra*, (in the year . . . .), (the corporeal relic of the Buddha), which is endowed with life.....

1. . . . has been established.

**A*. (The corporeal relic) of *Śakamuni* (i.e., Śākyamuni), which is endowed with life . . . . .

**B.**

(The gift) of *Viyaκamitra*, 'who has no king as his adversary'.

---

1 There is a scratch looking like the *e* stroke in *a*, which seems to have been due to a flaw in the stone.
2 For a proposed restoration see above p. 4.
3 The superfluous *r* stroke has been put within brackets in every case.
4 The word *sambudhasa* is quite clear in the original.
C.

Vijayamitra ....... the bowl has been established.

D.

This corporeal relic having been broken is not held in worship with zeal. It is decaying in course of time, (and) is not honoured; (and here) by the offering of alms and water ancestors are no longer propitiated; (and) the receptacle of that (relic) has been cast aside. (Now) in the fifth year and on the twenty-fifth day of the month of Vaisākha, this has been established by Vijayamitra, 'who has no king as his adversary',—(namely) the corporeal relic of the lord Śakimuni (i.e., Śākyamuni), the one who is truly enlightened.

E.

Written by Viśpila under orders.

No. 2.—INSCRIPTIONS ON TWO RELIC-CASKETS FROM CHARSAĐDA.

BY N. G. MAJUMDAR, M.A., INDIAN MUSEUM, CALCUTTA.

The two caskets (marked respectively I and II) on which the subjoined inscriptions are engraved were acquired by Mr. Dilwar Khan, Curator, Peshāwar Museum in April, 1935, from a man of Charṣadda in Peshāwar District. The latter had discovered them some time ago in an ancient mound called Kula-dheri near Charṣadda, while removing earth for the manure for his fields. The contents of the caskets are however lost, and from the vague reports that reached Mr. Khan he was not able to ascertain the exact nature of the deposits. In May, 1935, the caskets were sent for examination to the Director General of Archaeology in India who kindly placed them at my disposal for study and permitted me to edit the inscriptions in the Epigraphia Indica.

The caskets are of blue schist and on the whole well preserved, each bearing a Kharoṣṭhi inscription. The letters, which are made by superficial scratches, often show irregular shapes, due partly to careless engraving, but to a greater extent to the cursive nature of the script itself. The letters being extremely shallow it has not been possible to take estampages. The accompanying plates are based on photographs taken of the caskets in the Indian Museum, Calcutta.

1.—Inscription of the year 303 on Relic-Casket I.

The casket on which this inscription is engraved has a diameter of 9·1" and is 1·5" high, with a circular cavity in the centre 7" deep. The writing is disposed of throughout in circular lines according to the shape of the casket. It begins on the rim and is continued inside, covering the base of the hollow, from where again it is carried on to the outer face of the wall of the casket.

The characters are Kharoṣṭhi of the Kushān period. Some remarks are called for regarding the forms of individual letters. The letter ṭ in praḍīṭhaveti and rakataya is distinguished from r by the shortness of its stem. In thūbo the letter b is angular and does not present the top curve. Similar examples of b occur also in the Jauliā inscriptions 1 and in the Loriyān Tangai inscription 2 of the year 318. The sign for letter ṭ in saṅgharamu which more resembles a b is rather unusual, although the reading is certain. The ligature read as ts in saṅbata (i.e., saṁbāsara) is exactly similar to the sign occurring in the Pājā inscription. 3 Sten Konow prefers to read it as ṭi which

2 Ibid., Pl. XXI, 1.
3 Ibid., Pl. XIII, 1.
he finds also in the Kharāṣṭrī documents from Chinese Turkestau. But this reading has not been generally accepted. The letter y in this inscription is in most cases distinguished from ē by the curvilinear slanting stroke it shows on the left-hand side; also the head of y is more or less conical while that of ē is rectangular. In one instance at least (prachā-Budhaṇa maga) there is a slanting top bar added to the two uprights of y.

The language is a form of Prakrit as found generally in the Indian Kharāṣṭrī inscriptions of the Kushān period. The word etako in the expression etak-eta-mite corresponds to Pāli ettaka, meaning 'so much' (cf. Prakrit ettia, ettiga and ettika). The same form etaka is well known from the Asokan inscriptions. In rakaraṇa, which stands for arakaraṇa, a is elided as a result of euphony. The verbal form sthapareṇa represents Sanskrit sthāpayaman (cf. Pāli thapāpet). The use of nominative singular for accusative singular in thuva (thubako) is irregular, (for which cf. dhrama for dhromam in Aśoka's Rock-edict XII at Shahbazgarhi.) Attention may be drawn to a dialectic peculiarity which the language of this inscription bears in common with that of the Kharāṣṭrī Dhammapada as preserved in the Dutreuil de Rhins Manuscript. This is the u termination in sa parapu (sanghārīma) that has its parallels in such forms as muqo for muqo, dhama for dhammain and so on of the Dhammapada. The Dutreuil de Rhins Ms. has been referred by Senart to the second century A. D., but probably is of a somewhat later age. It may be suggested that the Charssada casket inscription also belongs to this period. The words se yena may be taken to represent tad yad-ita, meaning 'as follows'. The three letters following yena I read as navga (navaka, a Buddhist novice). In Saravaraṇa we have evidently an example of the locative singular with -aśi.

The inscription records the consecration of a reliquary or casket (dona, i.e., drōna) in a place called Saravaraṇa. Another place Avasaśraṇa is also mentioned in the locative case (Avasaśram) in connection with the donation. The former was probably the name of the particular locality where the gift was made and the latter that of the town of which it formed part. The casket is stated to have been deposited by the 'novice' Vesu, who for this purpose also erected a stūpa and a sanghārīma.

The concluding portion of the inscription mentions a personage named Avakhajhada to whom honour (puja) is shown. He is described as khatraṣa (khatrapa), and also as grama-śami (grāma-śāmi), i.e., 'the lord of villages,' serving under a mahaṇa (mahaṇa), that is, an independent ruler. The town Avaśraṇa must have been included within the jurisdiction of Avakhajhada. The inscription is dated in the year 303 of an era which is not specified. Probably it should be referred to the same reckoning to which the year 318 of the Loryān Tanga inscription must be attributed. If referred to the Malava era of 58 B. c. the year 303 corresponds to A. D. 245, a date that agrees well with the language and paleography of the inscription.

I now place below the text and translation of the record. It should be noted, however, that my transcript of the portion following the date, which occurs on the rim of the casket, is not entirely free from doubt. But at present I am unable to offer a better reading.

1 Kharāṣṭrī Inscriptions, Part III, Oxford 1929, p. 314.
2 Pāli-English Dictionary (P. T. S.), s. v.
3 Senart, Journal Asiatique, 1897; also revised edition by Barua and Mitra, Prakrit Dhammapada, Calcutta University, 1921.
4 Pāli-English Dictionary (P. T. S.), s. v. saraka.
5 Drōna is a vessel or measure of capacity; cf. donahātucched in Childers, Pāli-English Dictionary, from the Mahāvana. The expression sattadaṇsā dhātām, i.e., 'seven drōnas full of relics,' occurs in Mahāvihāra, 31.22.
6 This is the special sense in which dona is used in the present inscription.
7 The official title gōmasāmiko is mentioned in the Miliṇadevaṇho (Roy. As. Soc. reprint), p. 147, l, 12.
TEXT.

On rim.

Sabatsa 111 100 111 [**] etak-eta-mite tu dona[1] sthapapema [**] se yema naviga Vesa Šaravaraṇaṇaś [ṣa]-thub[o]² saṅgharamu pradīthaveti

On inner side, outer circle.

Avasārami mada-pidu puya[e*] sarva-Buddhaṇa puyaṇ sa-

On inner side, inner circle.

rva-Prach[ga*]-Buddhaṇa puyaṇ sarva-rahaṇaṇa puya[e*]

Along outer face of wall.

putra-darasa puyaṇ mitra-nadi-salohitaṇa puya[e*] maharayasa grammasambisa³

Avakhajhadasa puyaṇ Chhatravasa

TRANSLATION.

The year 303. And in such and such (year) as here specified a reliquary is caused to be consecrated by us. Thus the 'novice' Vesa, establishes a saṅgharāma, together with a stūpa, at Šaravaraṇa in Avasāraṇa,⁴ in honour of parents, in honour of all Buddhas, in honour of all Pratyēka-Buddhas, in honour of all Arhats, in honour of wife and son (or sons), in honour of friends, kinsmen and blood-relations, and in honour of the Mahārāja's village-lord, the Satrap Avakhajhada.

2.—Inscription on Relic-Casket II.

This casket is 2-9" in diameter, 1-1" in height and its central cavity is '6" in depth. It bears only one line of inscription in Kharoṣṭhī characters, engraved along the outer side. The letters are formed by shallow incision as on Casket I. As regards the forms of individual letters, the only point to note is that the letter y in puyaṇ has the top bar as in ā. The two caskets are similar in shape and execution and paleographically there is no difference between this and the foregoing record.

The inscription records the deposit of a corporeal relic (ṣārīra) by a person named Trami.

TEXT.

Tramisa daṇamau[khe*] ime ṣārīra prasthevida Buddhaṇa puyaṇ

TRANSLATION.

The gift of Trami. This corporeal relic is deposited in honour of the Buddhas.

---

[1] The letter sa was omitted at first and added later above the line.
[2] At first the letter ha was engraved, which was later changed to o.
[3] The first sa has an additional flourish below, which may have been an attempt to write au.
Inscriptions on two relic-caskets from Charasadda.

Casket I (rim and inner side).

Casket II.

N. P. Chakravarti.
Casket I (Outer side).

a.

b.

c.
No. 3.—PAUNI STONE INSCRIPTION OF THE BHARA KING BHAGADATTA.

BY PROF. V. V. MIRASHI, M.A., NAGPUR.

Pauni is an old town situated on the right bank of the Wainganga about thirty-two miles south of Bhandara, the headquarters of the Bhandara District of the Central Provinces. The ancient name of the town is said to be Padmavati. The town is surrounded on three sides by a moat and a mud-wall, covered in some places with stone battlements, and on the fourth by the river Wainganga. A mound on the south, outside the moat, which was dug some years ago for building a temple, is said to have yielded a stone-box containing some relics and small images, but none of them can now be traced. The present inscription was brought to my notice by Mr. Ichchhappuri Goswami, a retired teacher of Pauni, while I was halting with some friends for a short time at the place on our way to see the inscribed slab at Deotek, in October 1935. The slab on which the present inscription is incised is now lying in a pit two or three furlongs to the west of the main gate of the town. We were told that it was originally lying flat on the ground, but some years ago some persons dug under it in search of treasure which they thought was buried under it. They made a large pit, in which the slab is lying now with one end of it stuck into the ground. We could not then take out the massive slab, but we were informed that the underground end of it contained no inscribed letters. At a short distance from the place we found a mound, which, being situated in the midst of a plain, appeared to be artificial.

As already stated, the present inscription is incised on a massive slab. The inscribed portion measures 3' 1" by 4", and consists of a single line containing fifteen aksharas. The size of letters varies from 2" to 3½". They were deeply incised, but parts of them have now become worn, being exposed to weather for several centuries. For instance, the lower portion of the vertical of ṛa and the upper one of ya in ra+yasa and the middle horizontal stroke of j in pā+juga− have left only faint traces. Some other letters, again, like d in Bhagadatta, pa and the medial i of pāṭi show partial effacement. The characters belong to the early Brāhmi alphabet. They exhibit an admixture of earlier and later signs. The medial long i of i in pāṭi, for instance, occurs exactly in this form in a Ginnar rock-edict of Asoka, but in other respects the letters show a marked development over the Asokan alphabet. The broadened forms of bh, g and t, the form of s in which the right prong of its fork is raised to the same height as the left one, the angular p with a shortened left limb and the sign for the medial u in ju—all these denote a later age. The letters are not, however, so broad or angular as those of the Kushan inscriptions, nor even as those of the Nāsk inscription of Ushavadā. I would, therefore, refer the inscription to the beginning of the Christian era. The language is early Prakrit. Double consonants are entirely absent. There is also no elision of inter-vocalic murmutes except in ra+yasa where we have ya+kruti. In pā+juga− (for Sanskrit pāduka) we see two changes: the substitution of the palatal j for the dental d, cf. the Sauraseni chitihi for tiṣṭhihi, and the softening of k into g, cf. mugha for mukha in No. 1217 of Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions.

The object of the inscription is to record the dedication of a slab with foot-prints (pā+juga−pāṭi) by Bhagadatta (Bhagadatta) king of the Bhāra ( clan). The slab on which the inscription

1 The akshara cannot be read as dā, for the existing vertical stroke is too long to be the upper portion of d. Compare the form of the letter in Bhagadatta. I, therefore, read it as rā, its lower portion, being effaced like the vertical of the next akshara ya. In the present record there are several instances of partial effacement of letters owing to exposure to weather.

2 See Table II, IX, 18 in Bühhler's Indische Palaeographie.
is incised contains, however, no carving of foot-prints, which suggests that it was put up at a shrine where a slab with foot-prints was installed. If this conjecture is correct, the adjoining mound may contain ruins of that shrine. We have an analogous instance in the Deo\-tek slab, the later of the two inscriptions on which was intended to record the construction of a temple (dharma\-stha\-na\-nā) at Chikambari, near Deo\-tek, by Rudrasena I, a Vākṣṭaka king. The word dānam which usually occurs in connection with the dedication of foot-print slabs\(^1\) is again missing in the present record. Its absence can, however, be accounted for on the ground that the present inscription is not a votive tablet recording the gift of a private individual such as would have necessitated the use of the word dānam. Bhagadatta, as became his royal position, must have erected a magnificent shrine over the foot-print slab. It must have, therefore, been thought unnecessary to record that it was a gift made by him. It was sufficient to mention his name in connection with it. The wording of the Vākṣṭaka inscription on the Deo\-tek slab,\(^2\) which is similar, would also support this conjecture.

We are not told whose foot-prints were carved on the slab, the dedication of which is recorded in the present inscription. Prima facie they must have been those of the Buddha. But we must not forget that it was also the custom to install slabs with foot-prints of Hindu deities. We have, for instance, in the Paṭṭan plate of the Vākṣṭaka King Pravarasena II, and the Podjagad stone inscription\(^3\) of the Nala king Bhagadatta, clear evidence of the worship of the foot-prints (pādi-\-mūla) of Vishnu. It is true that these inscriptions belong to a later age, but the custom they evidence may go back to earlier times.\(^4\) The question as to whose foot-prints are referred to in the present inscription cannot, therefore, be definitely answered in the absence of further proof. But the Prākrit language of the dedicatory inscription, the general prevalence of the custom of dedicating slabs with the foot-prints of the Buddha in the period to which the present inscription can be referred on paleographic grounds and above all, the discovery of a relic stone-box in a mound at Pauni, to which a reference has already been made, point to the conclusion that the foot-prints were probably intended to symbolize the Buddha.

Another question, which presents itself in connection with the inscription is whether the Bhāra clan to which Bhagadatta belonged, was identical with the Bhārasāivas whose glorious achievements are recorded in Vākṣṭaka inscriptions. The identification prima facie may appear unlikely; for the Bhārasāivas, as their name signifies, were devotees of Siva. In Vākṣṭaka inscriptions their royal family is said to have been created by Siva who was pleased by their carrying the Siva-Nāga on their shoulders. On the other hand Bhagadatta the king of the Bhāra clan was

---

1 See my article 'New Light On Deo\-tek Inscriptions' (Proceedings and Transactions of the Eighth Oriental Conference, pp. 613 ff.).

2 See Nos. 1206, 1217, 1219, 1225 and 1286 in Lüders' List of Brahmi Inscriptions.

3 Compare the wording of the Vākṣṭaka inscription [Vākṣṭaka\-n*]मान[अ*]निद va\-sadhāna\-r[श] यहानात्म with that of the present record रामावरम साकारम पावलायती.

4 Above, Vol. XXIII, pp. 85 ff. The words रामावरम साकारम पावलायती ... ... in the Rāhilapura plates of Pravarasena II indicate that the shrine at Rāmagiri (modern Rāmāk near Nāgpūr) also contained foot-print of Vishnu. Cf. also Kālidāsa's Meghadūta (v. 12) वनात: पुष्पवट्टिमित्रिनिमेण रघुनाथ विश्वेषः रामावरम साकारम पावलायती.

5 [Ibid., Vol. XXI, p. 156.]

6 [In this connection attention may be drawn to Prof. Bhandarkar's remarks in J. Ind., Vol. XXII, pp. 202f.—Ed.]
probably a Buddhist as shown above. Besides, according to the researches of the late Dr. Jayaswal 1 the Bhāraśivas, who belonged to the Nāgavahāra, had their home in the North. It was only when they were pressed by the Kusāna that they migrated to the Central Provinces, where they ruled for half a century before the expansion of their power in the North. It would, therefore, seem that the Bhāras mentioned in the present record were different from those that became known in later history as Bhāraśivas.

Such a conclusion does not, however, appear to be convincing; for, the possibility of the Bhāra clan changing its religion in later times is not altogether excluded. When the Bhāras became staunch devotees of Śiva, whose liṅga they always carried like modern Vīra-Saivas (Lingāyats), they may have become known by the name of Bhāra-Śivas. It is not again definitely proved that the Bhāraśivas belonged to North India. Dr. Jayaswal's theory that there was a confedera of Nāga states under the leadership of the Bhāraśivas rests on a slender basis. For, though it is known from epigraphic records that there were several Nāga families ruling in North India before the rise of the Guptas, they are nowhere distinctly said to have been united under the leadership of the Bhāraśivas. From the Vākāṭaka inscriptions in which alone the name and achievements of the Bhāraśivas are specifically mentioned we know, of course, that they were crowned with the water of the Ganges which they obtained by their valor and performed ten Āṣvamedhikas, but this description itself suggests that they were a southern power that successfully raided the North for obtaining the water of the Ganges3 for their coronation. As for their ten Āṣvamedhikas, they appear to have been performed in the South4; for, it is only the southern Andhra, Pallava, Ikshvāku, Vākāṭaka and Vishnukonda kings that are known to have performed several Vedic sacrifices such as the Agniśṭoma, Vājapeya, Āṣvamedha, Āptorya, Ukthya, etc., in the early centuries of the Christian era. It may again be noted that in the Gupta records Samudragupta is said to have revived the Āṣvamedha sacrifice which had long been in abeyance,5 evidently in North India. If the ten Āṣvamedhikas of the Bhāraśivas had been performed in the North, the palpable falsehood of such a boast would not have escaped notice even in a prakāasti. The relationship of the Bhāraśivas and the Vākāṭakas also suggests that the former had, like the latter, their home in the South. That the Vākāṭakas were by origin a southern power can be easily shown. All their early inscriptions6 are found to the south of the Narmadā. From the Purāṇas we learn that Vindhyāśakti and Pravīrā, who has been rightly identified with Pravarāśaṅka I, ruled from two capitals Purikā and Chanakā. The latter has not been satisfactorily identified, but from the Hariyavasika7 we learn that Purikā was situated at the foot of the Rākshavat (modern Sātpurā) mountain. Again the phraseology of the formal part of the Vākāṭaka grants bears a striking resemblance to that of

---

1 History of India 150 A.D. to 350 A. D., pp. 16, 29, 40, etc.
2 In this connection attention may be drawn to the somewhat analogous instance of Gangai-konda Rājendra Chola I.
3 The statement in the Vākāṭaka inscriptions does not substantiate Jayaswal's view that the Āṣvamedhikas were celebrated on the bank of the Ganges (See History of India, etc., p. 5). The wording in the Vākāṭaka grants.
4 See Bājera Stone Inscription of Kamārā Gupta, C. I. L. Vol. III, pp. 42ff. A similar statement may have occurred in the Mahārāṇa fragmentary stone inscription as shown by Fleet, ibid., p. 27.
5 The inscriptions at Nachnā and Ganja of a feudatory of the Vākāṭakas has been referred on paleographic grounds to the reign of Prithvirāśaṅka II, by Prof. Dubreuil and Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit. I have corroborated this view elsewhere. (Above, Vol. XXIII, pp. 172 f.).
6 See History of India, etc., p. 16 n. 3.
7 Hariyavasika, Vīshnu Purāṇa, adhyāya 38, v. v. 31-22. Jayaswal identifies Purikā with Hebbangābād in the Central Provinces, History of India, etc., p. 40.
the early Pallava records and this is no matter for surprise, since an inscription of a Vākātaka householder has been discovered on a pillar at Amaravati in the Āndra country. It may again be noted that the earliest Vākātaka inscription known so far was discovered at Deotēk which lies only about twenty miles south-east of Pauni. The proximity of that inscription to the present one accords well with the close relationship which we know from epigraphic records to have existed between the Bhāraśivas and the Vākātakas. It seems probable, therefore, that the Bhāras mentioned in the present inscription belonged to the same clan which came to be known in later times as Bhāraśivas when its members became staunch followers of Śaivism.

**TRANSCRIPT.**

भाराक्षस भगदत्तक पाविकावत्रो

Remarks.

(1) The dots over ḍha and ṭu and the curve on pa are due to faults in the stone. Similarly the curve which seems to join the two lower limbs of ta, thus making the letter look like ṭu is due to an accidental depression in the stone. (2) The right limb of pa appears to be lengthened by an accidental scratch. Near the top of the left vertical of po in paṭi there is a round hole in the surface of the stone, which in some stampages makes the letter the appearance of pa. Similarly the horizontal scratch near the top of its right hand curve which makes the letter look like ḍha is unintentional.

**TRANSLATION.**

A slab with foot-prints of (i.e., dedicated by) Bhagadatta (Bhagadatta), the king of the Bhāras.

The usual technical name for a slab with foot-prints is paduka-paṭa (Sanskrit padvā-ṛpaṭa). See Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, No. 1217. For padvā (Sanskrit padvā) the variants padaka and padāka are also met with in Amaravati inscriptions. The paṭi-paṭa of the present inscription corresponds to Sanskrit paduka-paṭi. In an inscription at Nāgarjunikonda we have paṭi-paṭa, evidently in the sense of foot-prints on a slab, which Dr. Vogel traces to Sanskrit prati-padā. But the latter word nowhere conveys that sense. It must evidently be taken to correspond to Sanskrit paṭi-paṭa (foot-prints on a slab). In paṭi-paṭa, where one would expect paṭi-paṭa there is a dental letter used for the corresponding linguistic as in anuṭhitam for anuṭhita in another inscription (No. H. 1. 14) at Nāgarjunikonda.

---

1 In this connection attention may be drawn to the following points of similarity: (1) Like the Pallava grants Vākātaka plates begin with drīṣṭam. (2) In the beginning of both there is an enumeration of the Veda sacrifices performed by the donor or his ancestor. (3) There is a close similarity in their phrasing. Compare, for instance, the following Prākrit expressions in the formal parts of Pallava grants (above, Vol. I, pp. 5-6 and Vol. VI, p. 87) with their Sanskrit counterparts noticed in the Vākātaka grants (above, Vol. XXII, p. 173) viz., apśuṣa kula-gotasa dhām-āyu-balav-śadhanikē with dharmam-āyu-bala-vijay-aścaryga-vircarīdhāya; a-dīkha-dādhi-gahayam and a-kartīka-cukka-pukka-gahayam with a-paṇa-khara-sanādhaḥ; a-lava-guṇa-caloḍhāya with a-lavaya-līna-kriṇi-khandakah; apōtāpā-śalivāda-gahayam with apātāpā-śālaviścārya, etc. Notice also the close similarity between amba-śanopa-ppayute samucharantaka-bhava-napāsaṇa with anugā-pandakū samudhyakāra-nipēja-nipākā and a-śacā-karītikā-kalupat-ūdhiṣṭam bhājaka-chāṭhāraṇa; and also between sojan-āṇtakā and a-śūja sojanam (contrary to the construction I have proposed, above, Vol. XXII, p. 174). The drafterman of the Vākātaka records has evidently borrowed some expressions from the Pallava grants as the writer of the latter had done from earlier Stīravāhana inscriptions. (See Naṇik inscriptions Nos. 3 and 4 and Karle inscription No. 19.)


3 From the original stone and ink-impressions.

4 Above, Vol. XX, p. 37.
No. 4.—THE JURADA GRANT OF NETTABHANJADEVA.

BY C. R. KRISHNAMACHARLU, B.A., MADRAS.

The subjoined inscription was first brought to light in December 1927 when a resident of Phulsara, a village in the Athagaḍa taluk of the Ganjam District, while digging for the foundations of a kitchen-room for the Svapaṇeśvara temple at the neighbouring hamlet of Deula-Pedi, discovered a pot containing two sets of copper-plates, each containing three plates strung together on a ring of the same metal. The plates were subsequently preserved in the local temple of Chandrakeshvara. They were obtained on loan from their owner Sjt. Madhava Patro by Pandit Gopabandhu Vidyabhushana, a teacher of the Raja’s Sanskrit College at Paralakmedi and published by him in the monthly journal called Vaiśya-Vāṇi of the same district. Mr. Satyanarayana Rajaguru subsequently examined the two sets and published an article on them giving only the text of one of them under the caption: ‘The Phulsara copper-plate grant of Kirtirajadeva’. Subsequently Sri Lakshminarayana Harichandan Jagadeb, Rajah of Tekkali, edited the present grant giving the text in a rather indifferent manner. This article is not accompanied by any facsimiles and thus provides no basis for verifying either his transcript or his conclusions. I, therefore, requested the Collector of Vizagapatam to secure both the sets for my examination. At his instance the Deputy Tahsildar of Kodala, Ganjam District, forwarded the two sets to me in December 1934. They have been included and reviewed in the Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy for the year ending 31st March 1935, as Nos. 15 and 16 of Appendix A. The purpose of the present article is mainly to deal with the latter. My reading of the inscription is based on an examination of the original plates and their ink-impressions which have been prepared in my office. As there are also some inaccuracies in the readings of the other grant published by Mr. Rajaguru (No. 15 of App. A), I shall deal with it in a separate article.

The set under review consists of three plates measuring 6” by 2⅞” with slightly raised rims. A thin copper ring, about 3⅛” in diameter, holding the plates together, passes through a ring-hole of about 1½” in diameter at the left hand margin. The ends of the ring are pressed together loosely into the tubular bottom of a circular seal 1½” in diameter. On the surface of the seal is carved in high relief the figure of an amṛta-kalasha which Sri Jagadeb takes to be a pūrṇa-kumbha. The plates with the ring and the seal weigh 79 tolas.

The paleography and orthography of the plates do not call for any special remarks. Mistakes in the latter are corrected in the foot-notes accompanying the text. The following points may, however, be observed: s is used for ś as in sākṣha and salda in line 4, etc., kusalinā (l. 8), sṛi for śrī (ll. 4, 6 and 7), etc. and s for ś in sūmaśta, in l. 9. V is employed instead of b as in yuṣhka in l. 6; pratīvaddha in l. 8. The inscription employs the forms āṃrā (l. 11) and tāṃrā (ll. 19 and 34) for Skt. āṃra and tāṃra. The consonant following r is generally doubled as in earlier inscriptions, e.g., varjita (l. 11), arka (l. 13), etc. The use of the form paurṇavāḍi (probably colloquial) for paurṇamāstī in l. 19 and of śripi for śripati (twice in l. 21) deserves notice.

The inscription belongs to the king Mahāṇandaleśvara Nettabhāṇjadeva (not Netribhāṇjadeva as has hitherto been read by several scholars) and registers the gift, by the king, of the
village Jurāḍa in Gāḍa-viśaya, which was a subdivision of Khiṅjali-maṇḍala to Pātra śrī-
Vā[ppa]mna, who was the son of Bhaṭṭa Guhēvara and grandson of Bhaṭṭa Śantōsha of the
Viśvāmitra-gātra, the Kanya-bākhā and the Yajur-veda and who was an immigrant from Gaṅga-
vāḍī. The donee is undoubtedly identical with Vāppa, the donee of the grant of Kṛitiirajaḍēva,
which mentions him, however, without the title Pātra. The latter grant refers also to the tryuṛ-
shtīga-pravara and the paṇchāśāśa-gaṇyapravara of the donee which are omitted in our grant.
The identity of the donee suggests that Nēṭṭhabhaṇjaḍēva and Kṛitiirajaḍēva were either contemporaries ruling over adjacent principalities or one of them succeeded the other to the throne of the same principality.²

The king’s genealogy is given thus:—

Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Nēṭṭhabhaṇjaḍēva (I)

Baṣṣabhaṇjaḍēva

Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Nēṭṭhabhaṇjaḍēva (II) (king) m. Śantōsha-Maḍhavi

Rāyaḥbaṇja (Yvavāja)

The king is described as a paraṇa-vaiśhova and appropriately enough the grant commences with an invocation to god Nārāyaṇa, who is stated to be the family deity (kula-dēvatā) of the Bhaṇja kings.³ He is also mentioned in very respectful terms by the addition of the honorific suffix pāḍā to his name, which is also the case with Kṛitiiraja of the other grant. The charter was issued from Kumāraṇa and was addressed to the sūmanta (corrupt form of sāmantas), sāma-
vāsii (corrupt form of sāmacikas or sāmacikas) and all the residents of the concerned country (or district). Sāmantas must refer to the feudal lord of the territory and sāmacikas to his councillors. The gift was made with the knowledge and cognizance (śparijñāna) of the chief queen (maṇḍādevi) śrī-Santōsha-Maḍhavi, the crown-prince (yvvarāja) śrī-Rāyaḥbaṇja, the minister (pātra) śrī-Yaśā-
dhara, the aśaṇpala śrī-Ajāṇanda, the praṭihāra śrī-Bhāvila and the vāgvi śrī-Rāyaḥkāvā. The inscription was engraved on the copper (plates) by the merchant (vaṇik) Malaka or Kamalaka. The two expressions rājya-pralaya rupya and kaṇṭhāpala-muṇḍa-mola-rupya are not intelligible. They probably refer to the amount of silver coins meant to be paid (annually) into the royal treasury and to the local (police) officers respectively. The symbol or ligature following the expression rupya is perhaps meant as an abbreviation for rupya.⁴

The record is not dated but the occasion of the gift was Phāligna full-moon, and lunar eclipse (sāma-grehaṇa), which fact alone is not helpful for determining the exact period of the inscription.

The king Nēṭṭhabhaṇja of the present inscription evidently belongs to a later period, as evidenced by its paleography which resembles closely that of the Antirigam⁵ plates of Yaśabhaṇjaḍēva

---

¹ In Kṛitiiraja’s grant Śantōsha is styled Bhāṭṭapaṭha.
³ Other Bhaṇja kings of the Vaishapura persuasion are mentioned in Bhandarkar’s List of Northern Inscriptions, Nos. 1491 (Śatrabhaṇja), 1492 (Ranabhaṇja) and 1493 (Rāyaḥbaṇja Raṭabhaṇja).
⁴ [See p. 20 n. 1 below.—Ed.]
⁵ Above, Vol. XVIII, p. 209.
and the Antirgam plates of Jayabhāṣajñadēva. He undoubtedly comes of the Vaishnava branch of the Bhaṅgas who were mostly lords of the Kṛṣṇajali- or Udbhaya-Kṛṣṇajali-mayādala and issued the earlier grants from Dhrītipura. A close study of the genealogy of the family would suggest that Nṛṣṭabhaṅja alias Kālaṇjakālaṇa of Nos. 1497 to 1499 of Bhandarkar’s List, who was the son of Raṇabhāṅja and grandson of Śatrubhaṅja is identical with Nṛṣṭaṅja I of our grant. Nṛṣṭaṅja, son of Vidyādharabhaṅjadēva, the donor of the Dasaśāla grant (called also Chakradharpur plates, see J. B. O. R. S., Vol. VI, p. 266) is styled Mahāraṇa and parāma-vaiṣṇava. The latter epithet might suggest a possible identity of Nṛṣṭaṅja I of our plates (who calls himself, a parāma-vaiṣṇava but only a Mahāmaṇḍalēvaṇa) with Nṛṣṭaṅja of Bhandarkar’s List, No. 1502. But the title Mahāraṇa borne by the latter precludes this identity.

In attempting a satisfactory genealogy of the several kings of the family the chief factor to be borne in mind is that the various branches had a special lāṅkhana or seal, viz., a lion in certain cases, a bull in others and a kalāśa in still others. We may therefore tentatively look upon the kings of the present record as belonging to a junior branch on account of the absence of sovereign titles. The expression Mata-mayūra-bhūya, etc., occurring in the eulogy of the kings of our grant seems very strongly to connect the origin of the Mayūra-Bhaṅga family with this branch. I shall, under the circumstances, suggest the following tentative genealogy for the present and await future discoveries for its confirmation.

---

**Mahāraṇa Raṇabhāṅja**

Digbhaṅjadēva

Śilabhaṅjadēva

**Mahāraṇa Vidyādharabhaṅjadēva alias Amūghakālaṇa** or Avārṣyaśakālaṇa (Bhandarkar’s List, Nos. 1500 and 1601; Ep. Rep. for 1917-18, p. 136).

Mahāraṇa Nṛṣṭabhaṅja alias Kālaṇjakālaṇa; worshipper of Viṣṇu (same List, No. 1502).

---

**Būnaka Śatrubhaṅja** (Bhandarkar’s List, Nos. 1490 and 1491).

**Rāṇaka Raṇabhāṅja** (same List, Nos. 1492 to 1495 and 1505).

Nṛṣṭabhaṅja (same List, Nos. 1497 to 1499) [probably identical with Mahāmaṇḍalēvaṇa Nṛṣṭaṅja I of this grant].

Raṇabhāṅja

Mahāmaṇḍalēvaṇa Nṛṣṭabhaṅjadēva (donor of this grant) m. Santosh-Mudhavi

Rāyaṅaṅja (Yuvrāṇa).

---

1 Above, Vol. XIX, pl. facing p. 44.
2 Vide Bhandarkar’s List, Nos. 1490 to 1495 and 2055.
3 He would appear to be a solitary devotee of Mahāśvara in this branch. It should be noted that his grants were issued from Vaṇjulvaka and not from Dhrītipura. The change in faith might have been caused by some unknown political causes which also must account for the shifting of his capital from the family city Dhrītipura to Vaṇjulvaka. Similar change of faith from Śaivism to Vaiṣṇavism is suggested in the case of Jayabhāṣajñadēva of the Antirgam plates (see above, Vol. XIX, p. 43, text, verse 3).
Though I had tentatively suggested in my Report for 1934-35 the identity of Mahāmaṇḍalivāna Nēṭṭabhaṇja I of the present inscription with Nēṭṭabhaṇja alias Kalyāṇakalaśa of the above table, on further consideration of the reasons given above, I herein suggest the alternative identity shown in the above table.

The reading ‘Nēṭṭibaṇja’ has till recently been adopted in almost all publications dealing with this dynasty. In the Ganjām plates the reading is clearly Nēṭṭa- and not Nēṭṭibhaṇja as wrongly adopted. That the second letter in the name is not tṛi (cf. tṛi in pīṭṛi of line 11 of the grant) but is ṭta will be clear from a comparison of this letter with ṭṭa in bhaṭṭa of line 24 of the grant. Thus in all cases it will be seen that the original reads only Nēṭṭa. Even in the imperfect lithograph of the Gumsur plates of Nēṭṭabhaṇja the reading ‘Nēṭṭibhaṇja’ cannot strictly be justified. In his article on the ‘Two Bhaṇja grants from Dasapalla,’ Mr. Binoytosh Bhattacharya, however, suggests that the king’s name might be Nēṭṭabhaṇja or Nēṭṭabhaṇja. But he is not definite. Dr. Bhandarkar, in his List of Northern Inscriptions adopts the several forms indiscriminately. But from a close study of all the concerned grants it will be seen that Nēṭṭabhaṇja is the correct name and not Nēṭṭibhaṇja or Nēṭṭabhaṇja. Pandit Binayak Misra, however, read the name correctly.

The names of the akṣapataṇā and pratiḥāra respectively read as Ājñā and Bhāvīṇa by Sri Jagadeb must be correctly read as Ājñānda and Bāvīlāla.

Kumārapura, the place from which the charter was issued, must be identical with the village of that name in the Berhampur taluk of the Ganjām District. Khinjali-muṇḍala is already known from other records of this dynasty. Gada-vaiḥaya in which the gift-village Jurādā was situated is evidently identical with the Khinjaliya-Gada-vaiḥaya of the Antirgam plates of Jayabhaṇjadēva. Jurādā may be identical with Janaḍa, a Zamindari village in the Kodola taluk of the Ganjām District.

TEXT.

First Plate.

1 Siddham[*][*] Yaṣmāḥ=ehakra-gad-āzuśaṅkha-dhanavahā Śrīvatsa-tārkśhāv-apil[16]dyōntē

2 Ditiadhināṭha[17]-vanitā-vaidhavya-dikshā-kṛitaḥ [*] sō-yaṁ bhakta-janā[y]a[*] mokṣha-

3 Šri-Bhaṇja-vaiṭd-ādhihāvan pāyād=vaḥ kula-dēvatā pratidinam Nārāyaṇābhūbhujah]


ābhinnadīta

---

2 See above, Vol. XVIII, plate facing p. 292.
4 J. O. R. S., Vol. VI, p. 266.
5 Nos. 1497 to 1499 and 1502.
7 Above, Vol. XIX, p. 42.
8 It is also possible that Surada, the head-quarters of a taluk of that name in the Ganjām District represents the Jurādā of the inscription.
9 Expressed by a symbol.
10 Dāḍā unnecessary.
11 Read dīṣṭanit Dīṣṭi-ādhi.
AN INSCRIBED BRICK FROM NALANDA OF THE YEAR 197.

(From a photograph).
THE JURADA GRANT OF NETTABHANJADEVA.

The text is in an sanskrit language. The content is a grant from Nettabhanjadeva, dated 5th century CE, mentioning the grant of a portion of land to one of his vassals. The grant is written in a traditional sanskrit script and contains a list of names, titles, and places. The text is divided into three plates, each with a different set of details.

The first plate mentions the grantee and the grantor, with the grantor's name being last. The grant includes land in various regions and is accompanied by a benediction.

The second plate contains a list of names and titles, possibly referring to the grantor's vassals or attendants. It also contains a prayer or blessing.

The third plate lists the declarant and witnesses to the grant, along with their names and titles.

*The s-sign is indicated more like the one for r; cf. also gu in l. 18 below.*

*We may have to read Váguli- Vargulika of the Ganjâm plates of Vidyâdharabhañâja.—Ed.*

*Darāja unnecessary.*
No. 5.—AN INSCRIBED BRICK FROM NALANDA OF THE YEAR 197.

BY A. GHOSH, M.A., PATNA.

The brick containing the present inscription was found in 1936-37 from the cere of a votive stūpa attached to the Main Stūpa of Nalanda (Site No. 3). It was recovered in fragments which have been pieced together, but a portion of the upper right corner of the brick is missing. The size of the complete brick is 18" × 10" × 4".

The inscription is on one side of the brick and runs to 15 lines. The letters were evidently engraved with a stylus when the brick was still wet, so that the clay thus displaced adhered to the surface of the brick and hardened when the brick was burnt. Palaeographically, the inscription may be referred to the sixth century A.D. The letters are in the cursive style and present much the same features as the other brick inscriptions of Nalanda, two of which have already been published by Dr. N. P. Chakravarti. Some points of difference, however, may be noted here. The vowel i (l. 14) does not consist of three dots, but of two dots placed one above the other and of a third member resembling the letter d. The triangle representing e (ll. 7 and 13) has its apex pointed to the left. The letter k shows the earlier unlooped form when it is an independent member; but both looped and unlooped forms occur indiscriminately when the letter is the second member of a ligature, e.g. 1. 9, where svaṅga occurs twice. Y is tripartite with an additional curve to the left hanging downwards, but occasionally, e.g. aya in 1. 13, the curve turns inwards, thus producing the more common form. An important feature is that, unlike those of the published brick, both śk and s of the present record are of the looped variety, which since Hoernle's time has come to be known as the eastern variety.¹

As regards orthography, the use of anusvāra for the final n in bhāgavān (l. 2), āsmai (l. 4), etc., and the doubling of m in dharmā (l. 3 et passim) may be noted. Rules of sandhi have not been regularly observed. Two punctuation marks are found, the first consisting of a short horizontal line (ll. 4, 9, and 13) and the other of two vertical lines (ll. 8 and 15).

¹ [Reading seems to be -preṣṇyaṇa reṇṇa. The symbol after 'reṇṇa' in this line and the next appears to represent a numerical sign and may have to be read as 70.—Ed.]
² There is a symbol between the two pairs of danda.
³ This might also be emended as Vasīk-Kamalakāna.
⁴ Above, Vol. XXI, pp. 194 ff.
⁵ Hoernle, Bover Manuscript, pp. xxvii ff.; Ind. Ant., Vol. XXI, pp. 30 ff. For criticism see Altekar J. B. O. R. S., Vol. XIV, pp. 405 ff.; D. R. Bhandarkar, above, Vol. XXI, pp. 1 ff. A very early example of looped s occurs in a Saheth-Maeth brick inscription containing the word paurikagyā (An. Rep. A. & I., 1910-11, pl. xii(a)). The roundish shape of p and s shows the priority of the inscription to the angular development of the Kushāṇa period.
A unique interest is attached to the inscription in view of the fact that it is dated in the year 197, which its paleography allows to be referred only to the Gupta era, thus bringing its date to A.D. 516-17. This fact leads to some important conclusions about the date of the main Stūpa at Nalanda. In its present form the monument is the result of seven successive accumulations, each integument being placed upon the ruins of the earlier one, with the result that each time the size of the Stūpa greatly increased both horizontally and vertically. The stūpa of the fifth period, with its four corner-towers and eastern façade decorated with rows of niches containing well-modelled stucco figures of Buddha and the Bodhisattvas was more carefully constructed, or, at any rate, is better preserved now, than any other. The votive stūpa from the core of which the present record has been found belonged to this period of the Stūpa and was subsequently covered up by the eastern outer wall of the sixth period. It appears, therefore, that we can now ascribe the fifth period of the Stūpa occupation to circa A.D. 500 with much greater certainty than was possible with the help of the images mentioned above.

The inscription gives the text of the Nidānakūśa or the Pratītyasamutpadā-stūra together with the nirodha portion, called here the āchaya and apachaya of dharma. Except the two bricks published by Dr. Chakravarti, which give the stūra together with its vihaṇγa, every brick inscription of Nalanda gives either this stūra (with or without the nirodha) or the famous creed yā dharma, etc., which no doubt refers to this stūra. One brick recovered in two pieces (Site No. 3, Reg. Nos. 250 and 236) repeats the stūra and nirodha thrice; each time the stūtra finishes with the sentence iyam mithyā-prakṛtiṃ saṁskṛta-vavini ti and the nirodha with iyam saṁyak-prakṛti-asamskrīta-vyākramatiṇī. The same votive stūpa which yielded the present record contained another brick (Reg. No. 275B), elliptical in shape, rather carelessly inscribed with five lines of the text of the stūra. For some reason or other the record was never completed.

The following text is transcribed from the original which is now preserved in the Nalanda Museum:

TEXT:

1. Namasyaṃ! Īvam-mayā śrutam-ēkaśma-sa-samayaḥ Bhagavāni(ḥ)-chhrāvastyaḥ viharati [ema] [Jñāvane Anōtha].

1 For illustrations see As. Rep. A. S. I., 1925-26, pl. xlix; 1926-27, pl. vii and viii.
2 These images are referred to the 7th or 8th century A.D., An. Rep. A. S. I., 1925-26, p. 105.
3 This all-important stūra occurs in many Pāli and Sanskrit Buddhist texts. For references see Chakravarti, loc. cit., p. 195, n. 2.
5 This portion of the text is lost.
6 Same as the text of B published by Dr. Chakravarti. The correction to bhikṣhu-m-anmanayate now appears to be better than bhikṣhām-anmanayate, as the letter mā could not have been inadvertently left out in both cases.
7 The lacuna may be filled up as dharmaṃ-sūn vō bhikṣhava āchayaḥ cha dēśa.
8 There is no doubt that the word is in the plural.
vēdanā-pratyayā trishā trishā-pratyayam upādānāḥ [u]pā[r][dā]na-pratyayō bhavah bhava-pratyayā jātiḥ jāti-pratyayā
ds. 7 jjarit-maraṇa-sōka-parideva-duḥkha-daunma[nasy-ō]pāyāsāḥ [sam]bhavanti [*]. Ēvam-
asya kēvalasya mahatō duḥkha*].
ds. 8 [skandhā]yāya samudrayō bhavati [**] Ayam-uchyate dharmmāṇam-ācayāḥ [***] Dharmmā-
ṇam-apachayāḥ [katamaḥ] Yad-ut-āsmin*]
ds. 9 sat-īda(dam) na bhavaty-asva nīrōdhād-idaṁ nīrubhayāt | Yad-ut-[ā]vidyā-nīrōdhā-
[t-sa]bhakā-nīrōdhā saṁskāra-[nīrōdhā-vijñāna-nīrōdhah]*]
ds. 10 vijñāna-nīrōdhān-nāma-rūpa-nīrōdhah nāma-rūpa-nīrōdhah [ch-ehha(t-sha)]l-āyatana-
nīrōdhah shad-āyatana-[nīrōdhāt-sparsa-ni*[r]ōdhā]
ds. 11 aparā-nīrōdhād-vēdanā-nīrōdhah vēdanā-[u]nīrōdhāt-trishā-[n]īrōdhah trishā-nīrōdhād-
upādāna-nīrōdhah upādāna-nīrōdhah bhava-
ds. 12 nīrōdhah bhava-nīrōdhāj-jāti-nīrōdhah jāti-nīrōdhāj-jāra-maraṇa-sōka-parideva-duḥkha-
daunmasy-ōpāyāsāḥ
nds. 13 nīrubhayāt ēvam-asva kēvalasya* mahatō duḥkha-ska[nḍhasya] nīrōdhō bhavati [*] Ayam-uchyate [dharmmāṇam-apachayāḥ *] Dharmmāṇam vō bhikshava
nds. 14 ācayān cha désayishyān-apachayān ch-ēti iti [mē] yad-uktam-[i]dam-ē[gu]t* pratyukt-
tān [*] Idam-svāchād-Bhagavān-ātta-
ds. 15 manasastē cha bhikshāvō Bhagavatō bhāsītam-abhyanandan sa 100 90 7 Māgha di
20 5.

No. 6.—SENDAMANGALAM INSCRIPTION OF MANAVAVALAPPURUMAL; 5TH YEAR.

BY V. VENKATA SURBA AIYAR, B.A., MADRAS.

The subjoined inscription1 is engraved on the south base of the maṇḍapa in front of the central shrine in the Āpatsahāyēśvara temple at Sendamangalam2 in the Tiruvannamalai taluk of the South Arcot District. Though exposed to weather, the record is in a fairly good state of preservation.

It is engraved in the Tamil language and script of the 13th century A.D. with a slight admixture of Grantha letters at the beginning and end. In incising the record, certain scribe’s mistakes have crept in and these have been corrected in the text given below. The text of the record has been published in South-Indian Inscriptions.3

The orthography of the inscription does not call for any special remark. The word vāṅgai (l. 3) requires some explanation. In the Tamil classical work Purapporul veyyāmalai of Ayyan Āritaṅgar, vāṅgai forms the subject matter of one of the twenty-one divisions in the chapter Vaṅgai-ppaṇḍalam. It is there explained as referring to the act of sending in advance, at an auspicious moment, the sword of a king who intends to march against his enemies. This is described under

1 This portion of the text is lost.
2 Read jāra.
3 Between in and so intervenes the ks of the ligature skī of the previous line.
4 These three letters had originally been dropped out by the scribe, who subsequently corrected the omission by putting a cross above the letter shad and inscribing the necessary letters below the line, slightly to the left of tri.
5 No. 73 of 1903 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
6 This village must be distinguished from the village of the same name in the Tirukāyilur taluk of the same
   district.
7 Vol. VIII, No. 339.
the name vāṇilaikanda in the Tolkāppiyam. The historical implications of this word and its bearing on our inscription will be discussed in the sequel.

The present inscription is dated in the 5th year of Sakalabhuwanachakravarttigal Māṇavāḷap-perumāḷ and it registers a gift, by this chief, of the village Mōgāṟ Māṟagara, as a tax-free tirumuttukāṇgi, for conducting the service called ḇīśaiṅōṅg-saṇḍi newly instituted by him, for celebrating a festival in the month of Puraṭṭadi (September-October) and for burning ten perpetual lamps in the temple of the god Vāṇilaikandaśuram-usāṭiyā-Nāyaṉār set up by him at Śendamāṅgalam after converting it into a military camp.

The importance of this record to South Indian history has not so far been recognised. It is the only record, so far known, issued by Māṇavāḷap-perumāḷ under this name as an independent chief. Who this chief was and what his position was in South India, when he assumed independence and how long he continued to be in power are points which have not been satisfactorily explained till now. An attempt is now made to elucidate them.

For this enquiry, the present record gives a good start by stating that Māṇavāḷap-perumāḷ garrisoned his forces at Śendamāṅgalam and thus made it an important centre. From the Tiruvēndipuram inscription and the records of Jatāvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I (A.D. 1291-71) commencing with the words ‘pūnalar valar’, etc., we know that this place was the stronghold of the later Pallava chief Kōppenrūḷ-gadēva II. A record from Vṛppidāḥchalām in the South Arcot District mentions our chief in the 28th year of Kulōṭṭiṅga-Chōḷa III. It further states that he was a native of Kūḍal in Kīḷamāṭ-nādu, a sub-division of Tirmaṇaippāḍi in Mēṟkā-nādu which was a sub-division of Vīrūḍhākhaḷāṭiyākara-valanādu.

This inscription gives Māṇavāḷap-perumāḷ the following titles:

1. āḷaiśāṅmōṅg Maṇavāḷap-perumāḷ,
2. Vāṇilaikanda-perumāḷ, and
3. Rājarājak-Kaṭavacakrāṭ.

The first name indicates that āḷaiśāṅmōṅg was the father of Maṇavāḷap-perumāḷ. This would explain why Māṇavāḷap-perumāḷ instituted a service called āḷaiśāṅmōṅg-saṇḍi. The god Vāṇilaikandaśuram-usāṭiyā-Nāyaṉār consecrated by Māṇavāḷap-perumāḷ at Śendamāṅgalam must have been so called after the second name. In this case it may be said that Māṇavāḷap-perumāḷ of our inscription is identical with Vāṇilaikanda-perumāḷ. The third appellation was probably assumed about the 28th year of Kulōṭṭiṅga-Chōḷa III after the name of the crown-prince Rājarājak.

This chief also figures in a record of the 29th year of Kulōṭṭiṅga-Chōḷa III at Tirvadi as donor with the additional title Aṭṭalakulōṭtumāṇ. Further it may be inferred that he had also the title ‘Aḷagiyap-Pallava’, because the deity in the Perumāḷ temple at Tiruvēndaiṉallūr constructed by his wife was named Aḷagiyap-Pallava-Vināṭgar-Emberumāṇ. It will thus be clear that Maṇavāḷap-perumāḷ aḷḷaś Vāṇilaikanda-perumāḷ was a Kūḍal chief belonging to Kūḍal in Tirmaṇaippāḍi, that his capital was Śendamāṅgalam and that he was a subordinate of the Chōḷa king Kulōṭṭiṅga-Chōḷa III about the latter’s 29th year, i.e., A.D. 1207.

---

2. Pūtai-adīṭhīram, Puṭṭaiṇaiṅiyal, stāra 68.
6. Aṭṭalakulōṭtumāṇ would indicate his connection with the Malaiyamāḷ chiefs. Aṭṭalakulōṭthumāṇ was also a title of the Rādhārāṇāṭa king Kāṇaparādeva (No. 281 of 1936-37 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection).
7. No. 484 of 1921 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
No regular genealogy of the Kājava chiefs in the Tamil country has so far been attempted, but from a few records available, a tentative one can be drawn up, at least for a period of a century and half commencing from the second half of the 12th century A.D.

Two litic records from Vriddhāchalam and Tiruveniainallūr which contain the same text furnish the following genealogy except No. (6):

\[(e)\]

(1) Vajandandār *alias* Kājavārāyar.

(2) Ātkoḷiyār *alias* Kājavārāyar (A.D. 1158).\(^4\)

(3) Ėjisaimōgen Kājavārāyaṇa, who conquered the four quarters (A.D. 1182).

(4) Āraṇārāyaṇaṇ Kachchiyāraṇa *alias* Kājavārāyaṇa.\(^8\)

(5) Āḷappirandāṇa Viraśēkhara *alias* Kājavārāyaṇa, who destroyed Kājad belonging to Kaṅkatakamāraṇyan and Adiyāmāndu.\(^7\)

(6) Ėjisaimōgen *alias* Jananātha Kachchiyāraṇa (A.D. 1184).

Three other records give the following genealogies:

\[(b)\]

Kājad (Ėjisaimōgen) Āḷappirandāṇa *alias* Kājavārāyar.

Pallavāṇḍār *alias* Kājavārāyar or Virar Viraṇ Kājavārāyar, 'Conqueror of Tondaimoṇḍalum'.

\[(c)\]

(Ėjisaimōgen) Maṇavāḷaṉ-phemul.

Kājavārāyar.

\(^1\) [A genealogy of these chiefs has been given by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri on p. 161 of Vol. II of *The Āḷḷa* which was issued after this article was sent to the press.—Ed.]

\(^2\) No. 74 of 1918 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.

\(^3\) No. 463 of 1921, *ibid.*

\(^4\) No. 486 of 1921, *ibid.*

\(^5\) No. 423 of 1921, *ibid.*

\(^6\) Nos. 224 of 1919 and 467 of 1921, *ibid.*

\(^7\) *S. I. I.*, Vol. VIII, No. 121.

\(^8\) Nos. 413 of 1909 and 137 of 1906 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection; also *S. I. I.*, Vol. III, No. 44. Ėjisaimōgen No. (6) was another son of Āraṇārāyaṇaṇ Kachchiyāraṇa.

\(^9\) No. 296 of 1912 and 178 of 1921 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
One point connecting the four sets given above is that all the members belonged to Kōdal. Pallavāṇḍar aśiś Kāṉavarāyavar mentioned in the second set is said to have been the son of Kōdal Eḻiṣaimōgan Āḷappipandān in two inscriptions from Tirukkaḷukkuṟṟaṁ and Atti. There are two persons with the name Eḻiṣaimōgan in the first set given above, one the elder brother of Aṟaṇāṟṟiṇa who flourished about A.D. 1152 and the other, his son who figures in inscriptions of about A.D. 1184. Considering the proximity of the latter date to the period of Rājarāya III, the Eḻiṣaimōgan mentioned in that year seems to have been the father of Pallavāṇḍar mentioned in the Atti record. The conquest of Tōṇḍaiṃṇadālam claimed by Pallavāṇḍar could not have been an independent achievement, for then he would have issued records in his own name in this region; it, therefore, seems probable that this conquest was undertaken on behalf of his overlord Kulottungu-Chōḷa III. But since Conjeeveram, the capital of Tōṇḍaiṃṇadālam was under the Chōḷas in the time of Kulottungu-Chōḷa I, Vikrama-Chōḷa, Rājarāya II and Rājaṉadāla Rājā, we must presume that it must have been lost to the Chōḷas during the later portion of the reign of Rājaṉadāla II or during the beginning of the reign of Kulottungu-Chōḷa III, for the latter says, in a record19 of his 19th year, that he entered Kachi in the ground of the king of the North. The conquest of Kachchi is definitely included in his record from Tiruṅkoil,10 dated in the 24th year. Just as another feudatory chief of Kulottungu-Chōḷa III, viz., Ammaiyaṉa aśiś Rājāya Śāmbuvārāyaṉ styled himself the conqueror of the Pāṇḍya country for assisting the Chōḷa king in his Pāṇḍya war, Pallavāṇḍar must have called himself the conqueror of Tōṇḍaiṃṇadālam for a similar help rendered to his overlord in the Tōṇḍaiṃṇadālam region.

The third genealogy noted above helps us further in the identification of Pallavāṇḍar. It has been pointed out that Maṉavāḷaṉ-perumāḷ, a native of Kōdal in Kīḻanūṟ-nādu, was a subordinate of Kulottungu-Chōḷa III about the latter’s 28th or 29th year, i.e., 1206 A.D. He was called Alagiyā-Pallavaṉ and had also the name Vāṇilaikanperumāḷ. Since the word vāṇilaṉ refers to the despatch of arms in advance of an invading army, evidently under a trusted officer, the name Vāṇilaikanperumāḷ assumed by this chief would indicate his service to his overlord. Since Maṉavāḷaṉ-perumāḷ (i.e. Alagiyā-Pallavāṉ), was an important Kāṉava chief under Kulottungu-Chōḷa III till about the latter’s 35th year, we may identify him with Pallavāṇḍar the conqueror of Tōṇḍaiṃṇadālam of the second set. This identification receives further support

---

1 No. 202 of 1906, ibid.
2 No. 157 of 1922-33, ibid.
3 No. 296 of 1912, ibid.
4 Nos. 166 and 170 of 1906, ibid.
5 No. 413 of 1906, ibid.
7 Ibid., Vol. III, No. 80.
8 Ibid., Vol. IV, No. 822.
9 Ibid., No. 820.
10 Ibid., Vol. III, p. 217; also No. 164 of Pudukkottai Inscriptions dated in the 31st year of Tribhuvanavilādaṅga, i.e., Kulottungu-Chōḷa III.
11 No. 2 of 1905 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
12 Nos. 167 and 176 of 1918, ibid.
15 Nos. 69 of 1910 and 487 of 1921 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
from the fact that Pallavāñḍar, like Maṇavāḷap-perumāḷ, is said to have been the son of Kūḍal Ėliśāmōgaṇ Āḷappirandāṇ.¹

We have seen that Maṇavāḷap-perumāḷ of the third set was known as Āḷagiya-Pallavaṇ and since Kūṭperuṇjiṅgadēva was also called Āḷagiya-Pallavaṇ, the identification of Maṇavāḷap-perumāḷ and Pallavaṇḍar, the conqueror of Tōṇḍaimaṇḍalam, with Jiyamahipati of the fourth set is easily established. The whole genealogy can, therefore, be tentatively given thus:

(1) Vaḷanṭaṅḍar alias Kāḍavāryar.

(2) Āṭkollīyār alias Kāḍavāryar (A. D. 1158).

(3) Ėliśāmōgaṇ Kāḍavāryaṇ, who conquered the four quarters¹¹ (A. D. 1152).

(4) Āṇānāriyaṇaṇ Kachchiyāryaṇ alias Kāḍavāryaṇ of Kūḍal¹² (A. D. 1180).

(5) Kūḍal Āḷappirandāṇ Vīrāṭkhaḷa alias Kāḍavāryaṇ, who destroyed Kūḍal belonging to Kaṅkatakamāṇaṇ and the country of Adigaimāṇ.¹³ (A. D. 1186).

(6) Ėliśāmōgaṇ alias Janaṇāṭha Kachchiyāryaṇ¹⁴ (A. D. 1184).

(7) Pallavāñḍar alias Kāḍavāryar, who conquered of Tōṇḍaimaṇḍalam, also known as Ėliśāmōgaṇ Maṇavāḷap-perumāḷ,

Vāṇasiṅga-perumāḷ, Āḷagiya-Pallavaṇ, Jiyamahipati, Kūṭperuṇjiṅga I (highest regnal year so far known is 11 probably corresponding to A. D. 1243).

(8) Kūṭperuṇjiṅga II (access. A. D. 1243).

Maṇavāḷap-perumāḷ, whom we have identified with Jiyamahipati of the Tripurāntakam inscription, was a subordinate under Kūḷōṭtuṅga-Chōḷa III till about A.D. 1211.² He strengthened his position in the country and gradually made Śēndamaṅgalam in the South Arcot District his capital, garrisoned it with forces and declared his independence by issuing records in his own name. The Chōḷa king Rājarāja III was captured and imprisoned in this place and was released only when the Hoysaḷa forces marched against this city threatening destruction. An unpublished record from Villiyamūr in the French territory near Pondicherry, dated in the 6th year of Kūṭperuṇjiṅgadēva II, refers to an audit of temple accounts from the 37th year of Trībhuvanaṇvīrādēva, i.e.,

¹ No. 187 of 1932-33, ibid. The name Ėliśāmōgaṇ Maṇavāḷap-perumāḷ means Maṇavāḷap-perumāḷ, son of Ėliśāmōgaṇ.
² Nos. 423 of 1921; 160 and 170 of 1908 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
³ Nos. 391 and 487 of 1921, ibid.
⁴ No. 463 of 1921. It cannot be stated definitely which of the two brothers Nos. (3) and (6) was the elder.
⁵ No. 415 of 1908, ibid.
⁶ No. 299 of 1912.
⁸ No. 262 of 1905 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
⁹ No. 63 of 1919, ibid.
Kulottuunga-Cholâ III to the 11th year of Alâ'îyârîh Kôpperunîjadêvâ (I).¹ Probably 11 was the last regnal year of Kôpperunîjadêvâ I, i.e., Mañâvaîap-perumâl, because we know that he made an attempt to supplant the Chôla power by imprisoning Râjâîja III at Sêndamaâgâlâm in A.D. 1232 and that Kôpperunîjadêvâ II came to the throne in A.D. 1243.² He was a quasi independent chief roughly from the 37th year of Kulottuunga-Cholâ III to A.D. 1292 when he assumed the role of an independent ruler and continued to be in power till the accession of his son in A.D. 1243. He assumed the title "Sakalabhuva-chakravarta-tîgâl" which was exclusively adopted in inscriptions by his son Kôpperunîjadêvâ II. Some of his records are found at Vâlion, Chidambaram and Tiruvanantamalâi. Mañâvaîap-perumâl, the sIgnatory to the present record, may be identified with the chief himself in whose regime this inscription was issued.

Of the geographical names occurring in the record, Sêndamaâgâlâm is identical with the village of the same name where the present inscription is found. Geôilâm is the river that rises in the Kallakurichi taluk of the South Arcôt District and flows into the Bay of Bengal under the ruined bastions of Fort St. David near Cuddalore in the same district.

TEXT.

1 Svasti² śrî² [¹] 'Sakalabhuva-chakrâ[vattigâ] śrî²-Mañâvaîap-perumâl.-Udaiyâr[kku]
2 yâgo aîchâvâdu Sêndamaâgâlattu ārûm paṭâivâtu aś[ê]*du U[daîyâr]
4 [g-]ëllaiâkkku unâtâta nañjai puñjai ulîţâta payiru marrum oppâpañtta aîñîtâyamum unîtpadâ tirunâmâstu-kâñî iâîyîyîyâga tandêm[*î] i$pâ\.d[ikkku Chandirâdîtâvâr sêllâ iyûr nâng-ellaîîyîyîlum natta[î]tilu[m]* tiruchekîla-tâpana[m]-

¹ This is No. 186 of 1936-37 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection. The relevant portion of the record reads:—
1. Svasti śrî [¹] Sakalabhuva-chakravarta-vattiga śrî Avânâjâppândâr Kôpperunîjadêvâkkku yâgo aî-
2. pâvadu * * * * mpparduvattattu-kâpîsâlîya śîvappirañâma-
3. * * * * * * * * * * * * * * tîm tâțkku:lju:na pariâvadu[*î] in-nâyańâr koyîl Tirubuvanâtva-devâkkku muppatêtêvadu mulâd Alâ'îyârîh Kôpperunîjadêvâkkku padippravâ-
4. du vârâ i-koyîl niki nîlî kâsûm nêllâm âdûm mûdam ârûdhu Tâyâ-y梅西daâtu Udaiyâr Peruman-
5. gâlâm udiyâr Udaiyâ-udaiya-
6. pîrmâlįyâ Kâdîvetîtâjâ kaçakkku kêttu * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

This record confirms the view expressed in the Madras Epigraphical Report as early as 1906 as to the existence of two chiefs of the name Kôpperunîjadêvâ. But Mr. S. R. Balasubrahmanyam has laboured in vain to refute this theory in the Journal of the Madras University, Vol. IX, No. 3, pp. 293ff.

³ Engraved in Grantha.

¹ The letters Sakalabhuva are in Grantha.
² The length of â is indicated, unnecessarily, by a secondary sign. It is possible that the letter â was intended to be engraved.
TRANSLATION.

Lines 1-4: Hail! Prosperity! In the fifth year of our reign, the Sapkalabhuvanaacha-chakkaravattigal, the prosperous Manavilam-Perumal-Udaiyar, made the village Sendamaagalam, a military camp, installed therein god Vinilaikanidisuram-Udaiya-Nayaqar, and, for conducting in this shrine, the service called Ehsaimoogan-sandi (which we have) instituted to this god, for celebrating the Purattadi festival, and for maintaining ten sacred perpetual lamps, endowed, as a tax-free tirunattukkai, (lands) within the four boundaries of the village Moganar Maraqar situated to the north of the river Goelilam and to the west of the kurukkal-vati (pathway marked by kurukkal trees), together with all the wet and dry crops and other incomes.

Lines 4-6: Let the stones bearing the emblem of the sacred trident be fixed in the four boundaries of this village (including) dwelling sites, and (the deed) engraved on stone and copper, so that (the gift) may continue in this wise: (as long as) the moon and the sun (last). This (is) the signature (of) Manavilam-Perumal.

This shall be under the protection of all Mahesvaras.

No. 7.—REGULATIONS OF THE SABHA FROM TWO UTTARAMALLUR INSCRIPTIONS.

By K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyar, B.A., Coimbatore.

The early inscriptions of Uttaramallur in the Chingleput District are found to start from the time of the Pallava king Dantivarman and cover the reigns of this king and of his successors, viz., Nandivarman, Nripatuenga, Kampavarman and Aparajita and of the Chola kings Parantaka I and Rajakeshavarman Aditya who is reported to have captured the Pallava country and extended his dominions into Tongaimaadalam after defeating and killing its last king Aparajita. The sabha of the place is referred to in almost all the inscriptions of these kings. And as six records earlier than the time of Parantaka I, viz., one of Dantivarman, one of Nripatuenga, two of the Chola kings, and of the Pallava king Parameswaravarman II.

No less than 13 epigraphs belong to Kampavarman's reign. They range in date from the 6th to the 26th years of his reign. Ibid., Nos. 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, and 360.

A grant made in the 14th year of a Rajamkirtiyan did Prazja, referred to in No. 350.

Ibid., No. 360, dated in the 9th year of his reign.

Ibid., No. 346.
three of Kampavarman and one of Rājakēsirivarman—make specific mention of Committees, there is certainty that the sabhā and its committees were functioning in the place during the reigns of at least six kings prior to the accession of Pāṇāntaka I in A.D. 907, in whose 12th and 14th years of reign the regulations relating to the constitution of committees (published in the Archaeological Survey Report for 1904-05, pp. 131 ff.), came to be inscribed. By any modest computation the existence of the sabhā of Uttaramallūr and its committees through which it performed its various functions may be taken to at least a hundred and fifty years prior to the said promulgation of the regulations regarding the constitution of the committees. In all fairness, therefore, it may be said that there must have been some kind of regulation to guide the people in their elections and the sabhā in discharging its onerous duties during this long period of 150 years, though at this distant date, we are left entirely in the dark as to what that regulation was. And this is just our position in the case of sabhās of all other places also where, according to information supplied by inscriptions, that constitutional body and its committees were functioning. We have every reason to think that the fundamental principles of the working of the sabhā as well as other regularly constituted bodies must have been the same, though in details, there might have been some variations suited to the time, place, experience and attainments of the people. It is here enough for our purpose to note that the sabhā and some of the committees were in existence at Uttaramallūr long before the publicity given in Pāṇāntaka’s time of the committee regulations.

The two inscriptions edited below are engraved on the south wall of the Vaikuṇṭha-Perumāl temple at Uttaramallūr and they register regulations made by the sabhā (village assembly) of the place, one of the time of the Chola king Pāṇāntaka I, relating to settlement of boundaries, and the other dated in the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūta king Krishna III, regarding the procedure to be observed in the recovery of fines imposed by the assembly. The texts of these records in Tamil are published in South-Indian Inscriptions (Texts).  

A. Inscription of Dantivarman (circa A.D. 782) detailing Boundary Settlement Regulation.

The first of these inscriptions was copied in 1898. Only five lines of this record are published in the South-Indian Inscriptions (Texts) with the remark that the rest of the inscription is not traceable. To judge only from the penal clauses occurring at the end of the inscription the regulation which it registers seems to be a very important one. It is unfortunate that the epigraph is not fully available but what is missing does not appear to be much.

The inscription under notice is dated in the 21st year of the reign of the Pallava king Dantivarman, and may, therefore, be assigned to the last quarter of the 8th century A.D. According to my scheme of chronology the date would be A.D. 782.

The record is engraved in the Tamil language and alphabet. A few Grantha letters are however used, viz., svasti ɪʀɪ, Dantivikra, rma, sabhai, vyavasthai, bhū in bhūmi and sā in sāmantra in line 1; sā and nta in sāmantra and bhū in bhūmi in lines 2 and 3; sāmantra in line 4; and gra and ddhyastha in line 5. The use of the word agampaṭi meaning ‘within’ is worthy of note. It

---

1 Ibid., Nos. 294, 348 and 369.
2 Ibid., No. 360.
4 No. 61 of 1898 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
5 Above, Vol. XX, p. 50.
stands for \textit{agatu} or \textit{village} and its antonym would be \textit{purantin}. Both \textit{purantin} and \textit{ujjála} (same as \textit{agampadi}) are used in Tanjore inscriptions in the sense of an outer and inner quarter of a village. The phrase \textit{milgata-rail} may be construed to mean ‘if one returns to redeem’. The proper form of the initial part is \textit{miitka}.

The wording of the inscription is not quite satisfactory. There is first the indifferent use of the singular and plural, e.g., \textit{bhāmīyatiya kuśiga} (l. 1), \textit{kuśigaravum} (l. 2), \textit{pūrṇālatār} (l. 2), \textit{bāmīyatiyar} (l. 2), \textit{civa} (l. 2) and \textit{caiva} (l. 3). Secondly \textit{Ur} and \textit{Sabhā} are used to denote the same body: and this is plain by the employment of the first personal termination \textit{mam} in \textit{Sabhāyōn} (l. 1) and \textit{Urōmēy} (l. 2). Coupled with these, there is the difficulty of making out the sense implied by the term \textit{Sāmantu-sēy}, which though for all appearance is Tamil, is hardly met with in any Tamil work or Lexicon. For the just appreciation of the regulation contained in this epigraph, a correct interpretation of this obsolete phrase is essential and to this we shall give our attention. The initial part of the compound \textit{Sāmantu-sēy} suggests that it is a partial Tamil rendering of a Sanskrit original. If this is so, it is easy to say that the Sanskrit form of \textit{Sāmantu-sēy} must be \textit{Sāmanta-karaṇa}. In this, the ordinary meaning of \textit{Sāmanta}, viz., ‘a chief or lord’ will hardly suit, applied as it is in connection with a land transaction. The word \textit{Sāmanta} occurs in \textit{dharmaśāstras} in connection with settlements of disputed lands and villages, and in connection with transfers of properties. Manu says that witnesses in cases of boundary disputes must be examined in the presence of the contending parties and the \textit{Grāmīya-kula}; and the settlement thus made must be recorded in writing with the names of the witnesses entered.\textsuperscript{a} \textit{Grāmīya-kula} is explained by Kullāka-Bhaṭṭa as \textit{grāmīka-jana-samāhāra} which may be taken to mean the assembly of the village. Brihaspati declares that witnesses in cases of boundary disputes are to furnish evidence as to how the lands in question were acquired, their extent, the period of their enjoyment, their names and nature.\textsuperscript{b} In connection with the settlement of boundaries of fields, wells, tanks, gardens situated in a single village, with which our inscription is concerned, Manu rules:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Kṣetra-kūpa-taḍāgānām-ārāmāsāyā ghṛhaśaya cha}
\textbf{Sāmanta-pratyayō jñeyāḥ sīmā-sētā-vinīrṇyaḥ । ।}
\end{quote}

It is noteworthy that the testimony of the \textit{Sāmanjas} determined the boundaries; and there is no doubt that the \textit{Sāmanjas} were well acquainted with them. In cases where there is doubt or suspicion as regards boundaries of villages owing to the removal or absence of boundary marks, evidences of witnesses, says Manu, must be considered primarily the deciding factor; and in the absence of such witnesses, adds \textit{Yājñavalkya, Sāmanjas}, the residents of adjoining villages,—four, eight or ten—may fix the boundaries.\textsuperscript{c} Manu limits the number of \textit{Sāmanjas} to four and says that the settlement must be made in the presence of the king (\textit{rāja-saṃnidhau}). The word \textit{Sāmanta}, it may be noted, is explained in the Manvartha-muktaśāri thus: \textit{chatur-dīsan samantād-bhavāḥ sāmantaḥ.} The \textit{Mitāksharā} also gives the derivation \textit{samantād-bhavāḥ sāmantaḥ}.\textsuperscript{d}

\textsuperscript{1} The difficulty of this promiscuous use of singular and plural may be got over to some extent by replacing \textit{are-are} and \textit{are-are} for \textit{away and away}.\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Manuśmrī} (Nirvayasaṅgara ed.), ch. VIII, v. 254.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Ibid.}, vv. 255 and 261.
\textsuperscript{4} This is cited in the commentary of \textit{Mitāksharā} under v. 152 of ch. II of \textit{Yājñavalkyaśārī} (Nirvayasaṅgara ed. pp. 233 f.).
\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Manuśmrī}, ch. VIII, v. 262.
\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Yājñavalkyaśārī} (Nirvayasaṅgara ed.), \textit{Vṛtadārādhyāya}, v. 152.
\textsuperscript{7} See the commentary under v. 258 of ch. VIII.
tārīkha dike-hantara-grām-ādayas-ta cha pratishman vyavanhīṭaḥ. According to Kātyāyana ‘grāma’ here means “the Sāmantas of the village.” The same authority has

Sāṁsaktas-tu Sāmantar-tat-sāṁsaktas-tath-ottarāḥ
sāṁsaktas-sakta-sāṁsaktāḥ padmakāraḥ prakīrtitaḥ ||

Sāmanta-bhydāl, i.e., the action of the Sāmantas, to which our inscription refers, is actually found described in the text of Yājñavalkya thus:—

Simnō vivādē kshētrasya sāmantāḥ sthavīrādayaḥ
* * * * *
nayēyur-stē simānāṁ sthal-āṅgāra-tuṣha-drumalḥ
sētu-valmika-nimm-āṣthi-aisyā-addyair-upalakshitaṁ ||

and as such, we may take the phrase to mean the “settlement or marking out of boundaries of lands, villages, etc., made in the presence of the village assembly, by witnesses, Sāmantas (i.e., neighbouring land owners) and others”. The text of Yājñavalkya and the note of Vījñānēśvara cited above show that in respect of every boundary line there used to be appointed or nominated some persons styled Sāmantas on account of their being owners of adjacent fields, who had an intimate knowledge of all boundary marks set up in the line whether they be hidden from or open to public view; and whenever any disputes arose, these Sāmantas were requisitioned to give evidence and to determine the boundaries in accordance with such original marks. It is not unlikely that the Sāmantas were furnished in writing with a detailed description of boundary marks, such as are found in the Tiruvāḷangādu, Leiden and other grants.

It is said that in cases where no Sāmantas or Maulas are available to give evidence as to the boundaries in dispute, the evidence of others have to be sought. By Maulas are meant the lineal

1 Vyavahārīdhāgya, commentary on v. 151.
2 Vījñānēśvara quotes the verse.
3 Grāmō grāmesya sāmantāḥ kṣetram kshētrasya kṛttaṁ āryaṁ
ghrānaṁ ghrayaṁ niyabhitaṁ sāmantā-paraṁ rāṣṭraṁ hi aṁ
and notes grāmādī-sabdaṁ tat-sthāḥ paurūṣhāh lokahāsitaṁ. (Nirayaganās ed. of Yājñavalkyamrit, p. 232)
4 Vyavahārīdhāgya, vv. 154-5.
5 The following verses of Manu name most of the objects used as boundary marks and these are found in many of the land grants:—
Simā-vārikahāṁ-cha kurvita nyāgrōdh-aśvattha-kīṃsakhān
āśmālla-sāla-tālāṁ-cha kṣaṇīnaḥ-cha nīva-śaśa pūdṛpān
Gulmān-vāṇīṁ-cha vividhāṇa-chhaṁtvallā sthalāṁ-cha
śaṅkā-kujuka-ghumāṁ-cha yathā śimā na nasyati
Tadāgānār-udapānāṁ vāpyaḥ naśrayaḥ-cha
śimā-sandhiśu kārāyita āvā-āyataniḥ-cha Ch. VIII, vv. 245-248,
Upachchhāmnāṁ ch-āunyaṁ Śimā-līgāṁ kārayet
Śimā-jñānā nṛpiṇān viśkaḥ nityam koṭā viparītyayam
Aśāmā-śthiṁ gośālāṁ-āvāḥ bhāṣā-kaṁpāliṁ
kālīhaṁ-īṇaḥ kṣaṇa-Āṅgāra-ārkara-vaṁśa-vāṇikā-śātāḥ
Yāni cha-aiyaṁ-prakārāṁ kādāhyaṁ-nā bhākahaṁ
śimā-saundhiśi śimāṁ-āpakhānāṁ kārayet
Ibid., vv. 249-232.
6 These are stated by Manu to be:—
Vyāḍhaṁ-śaukākānaṁ-gopāṁ-kaśṭān-vedākātkān
vyālaṁ-āśvaṁ-vaṁsativitrit-tanyānāṁ cha vanagōcharān
Ibid., v. 260.
descendants of such persons as had been originally Sāmantas but had since emigrated from the
place. Regarding them the following text of Kātyāyana may be noted—
Nishpādyamānaṁ yair-dṛṣṭaṁ tat-kāryaṁ tad-guṇ-ānvitaṁ
vṛddhā vā yadi v-āvṛddhās-ś tu vṛddhāḥ prakīrtiṣṭāḥ ||
Yē tatra pūrvaṁ sāmantāḥ paśchād-śeśantaraṇāṁ gataḥ ||
tan-mūlātvaṁ-tu ś tu mañcā śrīśah śī parīktiṣṭāḥ ||
Upāśāvānaṁ-samihhīgā-śrīh-khyāṇāḥ-śeśāhnaṁtāh ||
uddharanta punar-yaśmād-uddhiṣṭāṁ-taṁ saṁrūtāṁ ||

We shall now note how the instructions contained in the dharmakāśtras had been faithfully
carried out in practice as evidenced by epigraphical records.

We learn from inscriptions that in several corners of lands it was usual to set up stones bearing
different marks such as puḷḷaṇi (Skt. haṁsa-pāda), i.e., the mark of interlineation, āṣa, i.e.,
a trident, chakra, i.e., the discus, plough (mēlī or chitra-mēlī), especially when the lands or any
portion thereof had to be sold, assigned or otherwise dealt with.1 The planting of stones or other
distinguishing marks is expressly stated to be one of the observances to precede the actual drawing
up of deeds of sale, gift, or assignment and it was used to be done in the presence of many
people, the chief among them being the assembly of the village. Invariably in all cases of grants
of lands or villages made by kings, we find a royal order issued to the assemblies of the division
in which the gift property was situated and the villages under it requiring them (1) to go round
the boundaries accompanying a she-elephant, (2) to point out clearly the boundaries and mark
them with stone and milk-bush and (3) to draw up and give the deed of gift to the donee. The
faithful carrying out of the above order, as we find it described in numerous inscriptions, with
such minute details that are intended to avoid future troubles, shows clearly the rules followed
in all cases of transfers of property. Besides, the village assemblies made the necessary changes
in the revenue registers through the village karanaṭṭaṁ or naṁhastha. The point that calls for
special attention is that even when the king made a grant, the cognition of it by the village as-
sembly was considered essential. Secondly, it is seen that due publicity was given to the grant
by the members of the assembly not only of the village in which the property lay but also of all
surrounding villages, walking round the boundaries and attesting the document drawn up. The
third essential was the pointing out of the boundaries and marking them with stones and milk-
bush in the presence of assemblies of that and all the surrounding villages. This shows that the
cognition by the neighbours was considered essential for the transfer and gift. The long
description of the boundaries indicate that there must have been persons whose duty was to be
acquainted with the boundary marks of the lands in the village, to point them out when required
and to plant fresh ones in missing places; and this presupposes the maintenance of registers to
guide them. In fact we learn from the Larger Leiden plates that in the ceremony of walking
round the boundaries of the village of Ānaimāṅgalam, preceding its grant to the Buddhist vihāra
at Negapatam, two persons of the village went with the procession, and one of them, a vellāja
rode on the back of an elephant and pointed out the various boundaries; and that the assemblies
of no less than 27 villages which lay next to the one that was granted, took part in the settle-
mment of the boundaries.2 From the Kāṭakṣuṇḍi plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla we learn
that the person who actually pointed out the boundaries in the ceremony of kariṇī-śrāmanam
was called viṇava.3 Evavāṇa, viṇava and vakṣheleśā are synonyms of viṇava. In the case of

1 See Nos. 496, 518 and 1290 of S. J. I. (Texts), Vol. V.
3 The words used here (S. J. I., Vol. II, 110 f.) are nāṭṭu-viṇavaṁ ṭoliya ēllai pōy padāgai vaṭṭaṁvehdu
kailaṁ-kajiiyam nāṭṭikkoṭutadarkku.
the grant registered in the Tiruvālandāgu plates, the assemblies of 3 villages that adjoined the gift property took part in settling the boundaries and recording them. Sometimes even Divisional assemblies took part in determining boundaries and getting them marked by stones and the planting of milk-bush. The whole procedure described in these charters, viz., the gathering together of the neighbours, walking through the boundaries, marking them with stones and milk-bush inclusive of drawing up a schedule of boundaries and attesting it may be said to be Sāmanta-seyda or Sāmanta-karaṇa in the case of big villages. We have already stated that in the case of lands situated within a single village, the testimony of the owners of the neighbouring lands given in the presence of the village assembly of the place and recorded in writing was considered to be a final settlement of boundaries. It may be of interest to note here that the procedure recorded in inscriptions and noticed above is quite in accordance with the injunction laid in a text of dharmasūtra relating to the formalities to be observed in the transfers of immovable properties.

Sva-grāma-jñāti-sāmanta-dāyād-ānumatēna cha
hirany-ōdaka-dāneśa saqdhīr-gachchhati mēdīṁ

It seems that grāma here means 'the village assembly' and Sāmanta 'the neighbouring land owners'. The Miśīkharā which cites the above text adds 'Grām-ānumatiḥ eyavahāra-prakāšan-ārtham-ev-āpekṣayatē', and 'Sāmant-ānumatīs-tu simā-vipraipati-nirāst邋', thus making it clear that the assent of both the grāma and the Sāmantas was necessary, the one for giving due publicity and the other for the removal of all doubts and trouble regarding boundaries. The use of the word Sāmanta is particularly worthy of note and also its connection with simā. It seems pretty certain that by Sāmantas are meant only the neighbouring land owners.

Having made clear what is meant by bhūmikku sāmanta-seyya, and shown also how it was observed in land grants registered in copper plates and stone inscriptions, we may note the further interesting information which our inscription furnishes. It tells us:—

(i) that settlement of boundaries of lands used to be taken up by village assemblies on applications made by owners of lands;
(ii) that the party applying for it had to pay a fee in gold when the settlement was made;
(iii) that this fee, if not paid by the party, was to be met by the village assembly (sabhā or úr);
(iv) that the fee became a charge on the land and was recoverable by the sale of such portions as would cover it;
(v) that the sale effected in this connection was subject to confirmation only on the expiry of the third year, within which period the defaulting land-owner was given the option of redeeming his land by paying the amount justly adjudged to be due; this amount perhaps included the original fee plus such other charges as would have been incurred in bringing about the sale of the land: hence the use of the phrase "niyāyutī kolla-udaiyā ponellāṁ" instead of 'sāmanta-seyya vanda pop';
(vi) that after the expiry of the third year the sale is to be ratified and the proceeds utilized for the benefit of the village tank; and

2 We read in S. I. I., Vol. II, p. 386 "ippamūr nāṭai-kūttī nīla-nadappittu=kkallua=kaṇhiya[m] nāṭī " "sāmancī-cheycitu=kkuduttāṅg".
(vii) that if any (future) member directed the return of the land, acting contrary to this (the last-mentioned clause), he was to be treated as a traitor to the village and his entire property sold and the amount realised formed into a fund for the improvement of the said tank.

Here it may be noted that the Sabhā looked on the transgression of its regulation by its own members and its officials as more heinous than that of the owner of the land in his failure to pay the fee. The offending member was treated as grāma-kāntaka and was ordered to be deprived of his immoveable property. The power which the assembly expressly provided itself with to punish any future member that might transgress the regulation herein made, and which is contained in the last clause, it may be observed, is made in conformity with the ancient rule of practice noticed in the text of Kātyāyana "mukhya-dāyunē samāhast vṛtā udhikāryaḥ". To provide against the contingency of the assembly’s inability to punish such members, some inscriptions go further and insert a clause to the effect that the transgressing member or members could be taken before the dharmasūtra, i.e., the Royal Court, or the then reigning king (mṝḷ-kṛ) by certain persons empowered on that behalf and be made to pay a fixed fine or what the empowered persons may deem fit and that, after the payment of such fines, the members and the assembly may be enforced to observe the terms of the assembly regulation. Insertion of such clauses is done in accordance with the laws pertaining to bodies as laid down in the dharmaśāstras. The punishment to be meted out to the madhyastha, who carried out the order of the offending member, is expressed in the phrase "vetṭippōga iduvadāgavam". Though vetṭippōga may denote capital punishment, I think it may simply mean 'dismissal from office', for this phrase, in common parlance, implies 'striking off or cancelling'. Even in Sanskrit, it may be noted, the lexicographers give prāśana, parāśana, nishūdana and nihūsana as the equivalents of the synonymous term vadha.

TEXT.

1 Svasti śri [\*\*] Dantivikramaparmam[\*\*]luku yāndu irubattongrāvadu nā] nṝru irubattu iraṇḍu Uttaramāru-chaturvedimāṅgalatu sabhaiyōm ṣeyda vyavasthai [\*\*] Emm-ār bhūmi-udaiya kuṇḍāl bhūmi sāmantu-ṣeyga eṇru vandaiya epperpaṭṭaṇa-

2 vum [sāmantu]-ṭeyya vanyā bhūmiy-udaiyaṁ maṅ-ṇiṅru pōṇ-ιθādīr bhūnkkur sāmantu . . m pōṇ-ida-māṭṭāda cuji palaṇām nirkkamāṭṭādu pōṇamaiyil āṁrāmāy pōṇ-ιθṭu avan bhūmiyil . . pōṇukku vēṇḍum-ajavu emm-ār Vaiyiram-

3 ga-tatākkattukku bhūmiy-āga sāmantu-ṣeyda viru-kuḍḍuttu manjagatta kalīle ējutva veṭṭuvadāgavum [\*\*] iiparīṣy Vaiyiramāga-tatākkattukku viru bhūmi mū-yaṇḍin agampaṭi udaiyāṅ milga-varil niyāyattāl

4 koḷa-udaiya pōṇ vēḷām koṇḍu viṭṭa-kuḍḍuppadāgavum [\*\*] mṝru saṅvatāramum kalindāl i-bhūmiy-i-Vaiyiramāga-tatākkattukku aṇ-ṭevrā atuvaḍāgavum [\*\*] iiparī-ṇḍrī āraṇgulmil jāḷpāippap-par-ularagil avan bhūmiyam Vaiyiramāga[Vaiyiramāga]-tatākkattukku mudaḷāga viru atuvaḍāgavum [\*\*] ivaṇ grāmaṇaṇṇak-avāṇāgavum [\*\*] iḍu jāḷpāippa-koṭa maddhyasthaṇ-udanāyil avanai veṭṭippōga iduvadāgavum [\*\*] i-pparīsų ṣeyda jāḷpaippapāy\*\n
1 Manusmṛiti, ch. VIII, v. 41. Ako Behaapati, Māksyine-naḥa samāhāritāc cītanvātā yudā bhadṛ, tādā vichārayat tīja avadharmā udāyapāke-cho tūn i

2 The rest of the inscription is not traceable.
TRANSLATION.

Hail! Prosperity! In the twenty-first year and one hundred and twenty-second day of (the reign of) Dantivikramavarman, we, (the members of) the Sabha of Uttaramēruchaturvēdimangalam made this regulation (vyavastha):

Whereas all classes of ryots who own lands in our village had come up to have the boundaries of their lands settled, (śāmantri-sēyga) and when the boundaries had been settled, several of the owners had left (the village) without coming forward and paying the amount of gold due (i.e., incurred on their behalf), and whereas we, (the members of) the ċūr (i.e., the village assembly), had to pay the gold, it had been ruled that (in such cases), we should sell so much extent of the (defaulters') land as would be required to cover the (amount of) gold (expended by us), and give (the land) to the Vayiramēga-taṭāka of our village, determining the boundaries of the portions sold, and have (the transaction) engraved on stone in the maṇḍapa (of the temple); that, if any owner of the lands, sold in this manner to the Vayiramēga-taṭāka, should come within three years to redeem the land, it should be returned to him, on receiving from him (the amount of) gold justly adjudged to be due; that after the expiry of three years, the lands should remain permanently sold to the Vayiramēga-taṭāka, (i.e., the sale effected before should be confirmed); that, in contravention of this if there should be any (member) that order the return of the land (after three years), his lands should also be sold and given to the said Vayiramēga-taṭāka as its fund; and he (i.e., the member) should be treated as a traitor to the village (grāmA-kayātaka); and that if any madhyastha carried out such an order of returning the land after three years, he should be removed from office.

B.—Inscription of Kannaradēva (A.D. 964) detailing Fine-recovery Regulation.

The second inscription1 is in a fairly good state of preservation. It contains nine lines of writing very neatly executed without many flaws of grammar, language or idiom.

The inscription is mainly in the Tamil language and alphabet. A few Granthā letters are, however, found used in writing words of Sanskrit origin. They are Seasti Śri (I. 1), chaturvēc or satuvēc (II. 1 and 9), sabbai (II. 1, 3 to 6, and 8), mahāsabhai (I. 2), jūṣṭā and ryavastai (1. 2), grāma-kārāya (II. 2 f., 5 and 6 f.), purṣha (I. 4), madhyastha (II. 4, 9), ngāya (I. 8) and Śivādāsa and Vādīra (I. 9). The word dāṇḍa is sometimes written in Tamil (II. 5, 6, 7) and sometimes with the initial letter alone in Granthā.

The date of the inscription is the 25th year of the reign of Kannaradēva who took Kachchi, i.e., Conjeevaram and Tanjai or Tanjore, both of which places were, at the time of the record, important cities belonging to the Chōḷas. The identity of this Kannaradēva with the Raṣhṭrākūta king Krīṣṇa III is fairly well established. His rule lasted from A.D. 939 to 966-967,2 and the 25th year of his reign, to which the subjoined inscription belongs, must correspond to A.D. 964.

The opening sentence of the inscription states that the Peruvikri-Mahāsabhā of Uttaramēruchaturvēdimangalam, assembled during day time, in the terri of the pēranbalam of their village, and (agreeing) among themselves (厂区-cheydai), made the regulation ryavasthai, which forms the subject matter of the record. Before noticing the clauses of the regulation, it is necessary to say a few words on the terms employed in this introductory sentence and what they lead us to infer.

---

1 It was copied in 1898 and registered as No. 77 of the Appendix to the An. Rep. on Epigraphy, Madras, for that year. The text of it in Tamil is given in S. I. I. (Texts), Vol. VI, p. 168, No. 362.
The words Sabha, Mahasabha and Perunthu-Mahasabha occur in a large number of inscriptions of the Tamil country and denote the class of assemblies that were functioning there, and not a few of these epigraphs mention by name the persons that composed them. Judging from their names alone, which have prefixed to them, the yatra to which they belonged such as Bhradivaj, Kasyapa, Harita, Vatsa, etc., and the suffixes Kramavida, Somaia, Vaivrepayaji, Sarvakratu-Vajapayayaji, Shaadanga Vida, Bhata, Bhatasomaia, Dividividi, Dividivi, Chaturdividi, etc., it may be said that the members that took part in the deliberations of these organizations were Brahmanas. This fact proves that the qualifications for membership to the Sabha, laid down in the two Uttararamallur inscriptions published in the Archaeological Survey Report, and a few other records of a similar nature, were strictly observed all the time that the Sabha lasted. That this class of assemblies had under them several offices and services which were open to other castes of people is quite evident from the numerous inscriptions that register the transactions made by them; and the varied nature of their activities also required their enlistment. In spite of the presence of the people of other castes for carrying out the duties undertaken by the assemblies, there is nothing to doubt that the deliberative body was purely Brahmanical in this case. Similarly also the examination of the transactions of the assembly of the Yr recorded in a number of epigraphs shows that the deliberative body of that institution was purely non-Brahmanical though in the execution of its functions Brhamans may have been employed for some of the offices and services. The duties discharged by both the classes of organisations were in most cases identical.

It seems that the locality and the occupation of the people determined the class of organisation that functioned in the place. A point that is worthy of note in our inscription is that the Perunthu-Mahasabha referred to in the first person in the headline is later on spoken of as Sabha and Mahasabha. The Sabha is explained in Manavathamukval as grantha-vaar-adau niyatajana-samrutha-sthamam—the place of meeting of the assembly of a village or town.

The statement that the assembly met together generally during day time finds an echo in other epigraphs as well and is suggestive of the fact that, if occasion required it, the body could also meet during nights. It is interesting to find this suggestion proved by an inscription dated in the 40th year of the reign of Parantaka I. discovered at Kuru which states that the Sabha of the place met together during night in the kuda of the Tiruvaypadi temple in the village. Unfortunately the inscription is so badly damaged that we are not able to understand clearly from what remains of it, the occasion that necessitated the convening of the body in the night. If the fragment in the same script published as a footnote to the inscription is connected with the record in question, this much may be gathered that the misbehaviour of an Accountant of the organization in making wrongful entries in the books which led the assembly to the payment of unnecessary taxes on lands that were lying waste, was the occasion for their meeting in the night. The assembly seems to have decided in this case that no member should render to, or receive from, the guilty accountant any kind of help and that if any one acted contrary to this decision he should be taken by the Sadhadhamantal before the dharmasana and a penalty of 108 kayam of gold be obtained from him. Two other inscriptions, one of the time of Rajendra I and the other

---

3 [For a different view see above, Vol. XXXII, p. 206.—Ed.]
5 Ibid., Vol. VII, No. 35.
6 Ibid., p. 15.
7 No. 180 of 1919 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
dated in the reign of Kulottunga-Chola I, also bear evidence on the practice of holding night sessions of assemblies. The former speaks of a settlement made that nobody except the residiitary Vellalas of Vakira should levy or pay any kind of dues within the village and that those who do so will be considereed to have transgressed the Law. The latter speaks of an alteration of classification of land.

About the meeting-place of the assembly we may also say a word. This inscription states that the assembly met in the terri in front of the perambalam of the village. Though the word terri generally means a platform close to the front wall of a house on one or both sides of the entrance, it seems to stand here for a hall. Attached to temples there were put up in ancient times several kinds of halls and pavilions, large and small, befitting the accommodation available and they were perhaps according to their shape and form, variously called kudam or chitra-kudam, chaturdala, or chaturkala, ambalam or perambalam, and maqadapam. Besides these, there were also spacious paved courtyards (tirumurram), covered enclosures running all round the main structure (tiruvellattukotti), as well as sabbha or tiruvolakka-mandapa and brahmathana, in most of which places the assemblies used to hold their meetings. The Tamil Nighantu makes ambalam, maqadapam, podi, podu and sabbhai synonymous, and equates terri-ambalam with chitrakudam (chitra-kuta). Sometimes the members also assembled under trees and water sheds. Ambalam or perambalam as well as chaturdala are described in inscriptions as forming part of or being built in front of a brahmathana.

The body framing the regulation is called in the first instance by the term Perunakri-Mahasabha (I. 1). It is subsequently referred to once by the term Mahasabha (I. 2), and several times by the term Sabha (II. 3 to 6 and 8). That all these three terms denoted one and the same body is made certain by the terms having the first personal termination om. Though it would thus appear that there was no distinction in the use of the three terms as found in this inscription, yet the qualifying terms mah and perunakri cannot but be said to carry with them some kind of

1 No. 186 of 1919 of the same Collection.
2 The Tamil Saduragarti gives as synonyms for terri both chitrakudam and tigal.
4 Ibid., Vol. IV, No. 549.
5 Ibid., Vol. VII, No. 440, 1, 17.
11 Ibid., No. 1034.
12 Ibid., No. 1034.
13 Ibid., No. 1034.
14 See v. 49 of Idappayargudi.
15 In No. 57 of S. I. I., Vol. VI the assembly is said to have met under the mango tree in front of the Vishnu temple at Manarugudi, and in No. 500 of Vol. VII under a pongai tree.
differentiation and this is clear from a study of numerous inscriptions some of which speak exclusively of the Sabha, while others refer to the Mukhasabha and Paruikuri-Mahasabha. The term Sabha is used in inscriptions to mean the administrative assembly of a class of villages known as brahmadyugas. The Larger Leiden Plates mention as many as nine brahmadyuga villages and their assemblies and without any exception these assemblies are called by the term Sabha. As found in every association or corporate body in the present day, the ordinary meetings of the Sabha, held to dispose of matters of routine nature, seem to have consisted of a limited number of members; and that when subjects of wider interest came up for discussion and disposal, a larger collection of members was considered necessary and that such a larger gathering—still confined to the members alone—was termed Mahasabha. Besides these two classes of meetings of the assembly, which were confined to the members, there appear to have been other extraordinary gatherings in which were present not only the members but also the people of the village including the young and the old (sa-bala-criddhara). These facts could easily be gleaned from the large number of inscriptions which record the transactions of the village assemblies (Sabha). It is further learnt from these epigraphs that notice or intimation of assembly-meetings used to be given by some special signal which, it might be said, was well understood at the time both by the people and the members. The blowing of trumpets was one such device (kalam údi or úd-vachchuk). Sometimes the inscriptions use the phrase dharmi údi or eludi or dharmi isydu in place of kalam-udi. Though we cannot be certain about the interpretation of this phrase, there is no doubt that it must have reference to the proclamation of the meetings of the village assemblies. The use of the word eludi (writing) in some places and údi (blowing) in others, with the object dharmi, seems to show that the announcement of a coming gathering of the assembly was sometimes made by the blowing of an instrument and sometimes by the issue of a written notification. Dharmi seems to be connected with dharma, and to have reference to the transaction of the assembly. At any rate, it is certain that there was an individual whose duty it was to announce the meetings of the assemblies by either of the methods noted above. In this connection it is worth pointing out some specific references to such an official. An inscription of the Chola king Parakasivarman (probably, Uttama-Chola), dated in the 16th year of his reign, found at Tirukkalavur states that the great men of the Mulapparvai of the village received money from the temple and sold it to, free of taxes, some lands of theirs which were termed "eigai sabhai-kuttuvai-nilam" and "eigai iraydu mavin" and in doing so they also state that the lands were previously tax-free. Here the phrases "eigai-sabhai-kuttuvai-nilam" and "eigai iraydu mavin" show that the village assemblies sometimes set apart some of their own lands for the maintenance of the person whose duty it was to announce the meetings of the assemblies. The Madras Museum Plates of Uttama-Chola refer to an official designated ghoshhi-seydain which is but another form of "sabhai-kuttuvai" and this is used immediately after parishai-nayamnair. Here we are informed that a provision of one tani and one padakku of rice was made for the ghoshhi-seydain, i.e., the conveners of the parishat (assembly). An inscription of Rajaraja I. of A.D. 1061 states that the members of the village assembly were called together by the blowing of a trumpet and that the herald was entitled to get daily 2 ñõãmu from the village. The Uttaramallur election regulations show that the convening of the meeting

---

3 "Trav. Arch. Rep. for 1926, pp. 41 and 49; and No. 156 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection for 1919.
7 Ibid., p. 271, text-line 106.
8 An. Rep. on Epigraphy, Madras, for 1919, p. 95, para. 15.
was done through a madhyastha. The clause relating to it runs thus: Vāriyānāʾcheppuṇányārāi aparāṇān-kavijāṇādu acuṇāi (singular for acuṇalāi) oṣūcud-āgārum | iṣuṇgal ofjīnda anvātaram uddu vāriyālguṇām pāṇśirandu sēriyul dhanaṇkriyāna-dadakkuṇām vāriyare madhyastharāi bhūtē kari-kūtē kṣuṇpāṇyāram meaning “when any transgression is noticed among the members functioning in the committees, such persons shall be removed and after these have vacated, the members of the committee superintending the dispensing of justice in the twelve chēris shall cause the madhyastha to have a meeting of the assembly convened and fresh persons chosen (in their places)”. It thus appears that at the direction of the madhyastha the herald announced the meeting.

The phrase enmiyar-cheyda vyavasthā “the regulation made among ourselves” may be taken, as the words indicate, that the regulation concerned only the members of the assembly and not others; that is to say, it determined or fixed the duty of a certain section of the assembly on the one hand and the general assembly on the other with regard to the realisation of fines. As the terms of the regulation show, there is absolutely no doubt that the regulation was brought about to define the course of action to be followed by the members in collecting fines. But we may point out that there are a few instances in inscriptions, which record regulations and transactions of a similar nature, where we find the use of the very phrase enmiyar-cheyda with the addition of the word ottu or iṣaṇdu (meaning agreeing) inserted after enmiyar and before seyda. It may be that the word ottu or iṣaṇdu has to be taken as being understood in our inscription also as in the others. In this case, it would mean that the regulation was passed unanimously by the members of the assembly.

Three other words that are used in this inscription are worthy of note. They are adikkilingār, vāriyam and perumakkaḷ. Adikkilingār literally means “those that stand at the feet”. This is a rare Tamil expression for ‘servants or attendants’. It is worth pointing out that the Tamil classical work Puranāṇī uses the word adiyṟūṟai and the commentator has rendered it into adikkil. The employment of the word vāriyam in the two Uttaramallūr inscriptions that record the election regulations leave no doubt as to its sense being ‘a body of men chosen to form a committee’. As such, I think it must be connected with the Sanskrit root vṛi ‘to choose’. In this connection it may also be noted that the Sanskrit word vṛ̥ ṭa means multitude. More interesting is the etymology of the word perumakkaḷ. The Sanskrit word pravukkaḥ assumes the form panukkah in Pāli, and occurs as paramukkhā in a number of cave inscriptions of the pre-Christian centuries found in Ceylon. In a few of these inscriptions we also find it so employed as to denote the title of persons who, in all probability, were members of corporate bodies. As such, one can easily recognise this word for the Tamil perumakku (pl. perumakkal) used in hundreds of inscriptions of the Tamil country along with the words sabbhā, nāḍu or vāriyam to denote the members of the respective bodies. Thus then the pravukkhās mentioned in Sanskrit charters, perumakkal used in Tamil inscriptions, panukkan of Pāli, and paramukkhā found in Ceylon epigraphs, have the same bearing and indicate the title of persons connected with the assemblies of villages and divisions of countries (vishaya, rāṣṭra or nāḍu). With the word pravukkaḥ has to be connected the forms perumān or perumānār and emperumān or emperumānār (which are used with or without the suffix adigal corresponding to the Sanskrit pāḍāḥ) to denote persons of rank, kings and gods. The form ma-paramukkaḥ, used in Ceylon epigraphs as referring to the king, would even suggest that the Tamil prefix ma or nam in em perumānār or nam perumānār is the same as ma (for Skt. me or mamo) in maparamukkaḥ and it is worthy of note that they all indicate the first personal pronoun. In this connection, it is worth remembering that the dharmakāstras, in referring to heads or chiefs of

corporate bodies, employ the word mukhya as in mukhyais-saḥa samāhārāṁ viṣamvaśīdō yado bhaveti in Bṛhaspāti,1 and mukhya-daṇḍanī samāhārā-śiva aśānīkaṇṭa.2

The present inscription tells us (1) that the Mahānātha had the power to form committees by appointing the members thereof (vāriyappuramakkal); this, it may be noted, is quite in accordance with what is recorded in the Uttaramallur inscriptions, regarding the election of members to the committees; (2) that the officials adikkil-nilpā, madhyasthas and pañci-kāppār were carrying out the behests of the assembly and (3) that all these persons as well as individual members taking part in the discussions of the assembly could be fined (whenever they misbehaved) by the assembly as a whole.

The subject of the regulation is to determine the method of collecting and realising the fine imposed by the Sabha on the three classes of persons noticed in the previous paragraph and on the duskhas. The regulation provides that the great men elected annually for carrying out the business of the village (nēva-aruṇā graṇa-kārayam kṣayam perumakkal) should obtain from the assembly the fines that had been paid.

The Uttaramallur constitution does not mention separately a group or committee for conducting the graṇa-kāraya for each year. But it does mention a committee called samētsara-vāriyappuramakkal the members of which, as the name of the committee indicates, must have been chosen each year; and it is not unlikely that the body was in charge of the graṇa-kāraya. Like tōttavāriyam śri-vāriyam, etc., graṇa-kāraya indicates the chief function of this body and samētsara-vāraya indicates the tenure of office. Both the tenure of office and the function of this body are brought out in the name samētsara-graṇa-kārayam ituttukira kiṭṭa-ppermakkal, used in an inscription of the 4th year of Kulōttunga-Chōla.3

Though the graṇa-kāraya-perumakkal are clearly made responsible for obtaining the fines, the regulation gives them no independent action in the matter of this collection as it explicitly states that the collection must be effected only by or through the Sabha. It will be perceived that there is an element of easy and successful realisation in thus leaving the responsibility of collecting the fines with the Sabha that imposed them. At the same time the arrangement must have contributed to the disposal, without delay, of the cases in which fines had been imposed and must have prevented further complications and fresh actions that would sometimes have arisen had the collection been left in other hands than those that imposed them. The regulation provides at the end that, if the graṇa-kāraya-perumakkal fail to act in the said manner regarding the realisation of the fines, the Sabha could levy on, and get from, each one of the graṇa-kāraya-perumakkal a fine of 124 kāram (of gold), and see also to the non-recurrence of such a predicament in the future. Here again, it may be observed that the Sabha had the power to fine the graṇa-kāraya-perumakkal, just as they could the duskhas, as well as the members of the several committees (vāriyam) and the (public) servants carrying out their orders.

The employment of the word duskha in this inscription calls to mind the use of the phrase ‘duskha keṭta viśhitar (or viśīshitar) vartāttikāśudāya (or vartākhīppadāya)’ in the two famous Uttaramallur inscriptions embodying the rules to be followed in the election of members to village committees.4 Though all institutions like the Sabha, meant for the maintenance of dharma (law

2 See Veṣṇamsṛta (Jivānanda Vidyāsagar’s Edn.), p. 428.
and order), must have the above object as their aim, it is worth noting that Manu defines śiśṭa (among Brāhmans) in the following terms⁴:

Dharmena-udhigato yais-tu Vēdaḥ sa-paribhrinhanah

tē śiśṭa bhrāmaṇa jāyeyah śrutipratyaksha-hētavah

and that Kullikā-Bhaṭṭa gives the following gloss on it:—

Brahmachary-ādy-ukta-dharmaṇa yair-aṅga-mimāṁsā-dharmaśāstra-purāṇ-ādy-upabhrinhitō

Vēdō-ūḍhigatas-tē Bhrāmaṇaḥ śrutēḥ pratyakshikaranaḥ hētavah,

yē śrutēṁ pāṭhitvā tad-arthaṁ-upadhiṁahi tē śiśṭa vijñeyah

Indeed the few inscriptions⁵ that lay down the requisite qualifications for membership to the Sabha, an institution that was functioning only in Brahminical villages, and the titles expressive of the attainments of the members that actually graced the Sabha at different times and at different places such as Bhaṭṭa, Shadangavīd, Kramavīd, Sōmayājīn, Vājapeyavājīn, Chaturvedīn, Trīvēdīn, etc., show that the above was actually observed and that only śiśṭas were elected as members.

This inscription bears at the end the signature of the madhyastha Śivadāsa Maṅgalādityaṇa, who is said to have written the document at the bidding of the Sabha. Almost all transactions of assemblies are generally committed to writing by persons bearing one or the other of the official designations madhyastha, karaṇatāṁ, karaṇatāṁ-madhyastha, etc., who affixed their signatures to the written document and in doing so they sometimes stated that, being present in the assembly and having been directed by the Sabha-Tīrūvaṁi or the members, they executed the task.⁶ It may perhaps be of interest to note that in ancient times there were karaṇatāṁ and madhyastha appointed not only for the village assembly but also for every village, temple, dīvīya assembly and guild of merchants: and it was one among them that was employed by the respective bodies to perform for them the duty of the scribe or secretary.⁷ In the inscriptions of the Malayālam country, the term madhyastha figures in the form Poduvaṁ which is but a rendering of the Sanskrit word.

**TEXT.**

1 Svasti Śri [?[[*] Kachchiyun-Taṅjaiyun-kōṇda (Kaṅjaradēvarkkku) yāṇḍu 25-vadu

Uttaramēru-chatu[r*]vēdimegalattu-pperunkuri-sabhāyōn emm-ūr-ppēr-amba-

latu

2 munbǐ-tērįyīśa pagar-kūdyi-irundu emmir-chēyda vyaavastaivy-avadvu [?[[*] na[lj[*]in-ūr

mahā-sabhāiyomāl dandippunndā dushtargal daṇḍam-īṭṭana ullaṇa daṇḍam⁶ avv-av-

āṇḍu grāma-

---

⁴ Manusmṛti, Ch. XII, v. 109.

⁵ See the qualifications mentioned in (1) the two Uttara-mālam inscriptions, (2) the Maṅge inscription (above, Vol. XXII, pp. 9-10) and others: Mantra-brāhmaṇam cullam ődvartin-aṅgavanai, Vēdīnīdīnī dīvīnīdīnī kārgatūlum nippag-ENNappizirupūrpaṇai of (1); Mantra-brāhmaṇam cullam suvaṇărūgī truppaṇai of (2); Mantra-brāhmaṇam cullāryā vīrāśeṣeṇaṅgam saṁkāraṅgam-coltuvāṅgan: Nos. 240 and 241 of 1922.

⁶ Above, Vol. XX, p. 237.

⁷ No. 286 of S. I. I. (Text)., Vol. VI makes the madhyastha of a gaṭṭha subject to the orders of the Sabha. For references to ar-madhyastha see Nos. 537 and 547 of S. I. I., IV. V., 289 of Vol. VI, and Nos. 41 of Vol. VIII: the ar-madhyastha wrote the inscription No. 289 of Vol. VI at the command of the Sabha. Nāju-madhyastha figures in No. 489, and madhyastha of a Chaturvedimagalam in No. 518, 1102 and 1049 of Vol. V and in No. 189 of Vol. VI.

⁸ Here and in line 5, daṇḍam ἵτα ullaṇa stands for daṇḍam ἵτ-ullaṇa.

⁹ After daṇḍam, the word ἵτα is omitted to be engraved: See line 5 where it is supplied.
3 kāryaṁaṁ(ñ-če)yrum perumakkale sabhaiyōmaį-kkoṇḍu tirvār-āgavum [[*]] tirkkā-māṬṭa
dana sabhaiyōmaį-yo konḍu daṇḍaṅga-iruttu-kkuḍḍappār-āgavum[[*]] sabhaiyil[[*]-nirṛu
sabba-māṛṛam pēśi-ppa-
4 qitā tani-pursharaṇiyum[ sabhaiyōm paṇiyāl śeyda vāriya-pperumakkalaiyum adikkl-
nirppāraiyum madhyasthargalaiyum padi-kāppārgalaiyum ulliṭṭa sabhai-ppaṇi-śe-
5 ydār eppēppetṭāraṇiyum-daṇḍam-iṭṭana uljana daṇḍam-iṭṭa av[ν-*)v-av-āṇḍuga] grāma-
kāryaṁ-če(y*)yrum perumakkalėy sabhaiyōmaį-kkoṇḍu tirvār-āgavu-
6 m [[*] tirv-urādana sabhaiyōmaį-yo konḍu daṇḍam iruttu kuḍḍappār-āgavum [[*] i-ppariśu
śeyārāgil daṇḍam-iṭṭa av[ν*)v-av-āṇḍuga] grāma-
7 kāryaṁ-če(y*)dārai moy-vēru-vagai 124-ñ-če-ydu-kāpan-daṇḍam-yda-pperuvār-āgavum
[[*] i-ddaṇḍappattu ivv-a-
8 nyāyam vārmaį-tṭirrutta-kkuḍḍappōmaṇoṁ Uttaramēru-śa(cha)tu[r*]vvedimaṅgalattu
sabhaiyōm [[*]] idu sabhai[yr]ār-
9 paṇikka eludicen madhyasthan Śivadāsaṇ Maṅgalādityanēn [[*]]

TRANSLATION.

Hail! Prosperity! In the 25th year of (the reign of) Kannaradēva, who took Kachchi
(Conjeevaram) and Taṇḍai (Tanjore), we, (the members of the) Perukuri-Mahāsabba, having
assembled during day-time, in the terī (i.e., raised platform) in front of the big hall of our village,
made the following vyavasthā (regulation), agreeing among ourselves:

The great men conducting the business of the village for each year shall alone collect, through
us (i.e., the Perukuri-Mahāsabba), the fines that have been paid out of the fines imposed on the
guilty by us (i.e., the members of the) Mahāsabba. Such fines as are not realised, they (i.e., the
great men conducting the business of the village for the year) shall get only through us (i.e., the
Perukuri-Mahāsabba) and pay.

Further, the fines that have been paid by every kind of persons engaged in carrying out the
transactions of the Sabba,—including individual members that are present in the assembly (Sabba),
partaking in the assembly-discussions (sabba-māṛṛam) and giving their opinions; the great men
of the Committees (Vāriya-pperumakkal) that have been formed by an order of us (comprising
the Sabba; those that stand at our feet (i.e., the servants of the assembly), the madhyasthas and
those that watch our village,—the great men conducting the business of the village of the year in
which (these) fines have been levied, shall collect them, through us (i.e., the assembly of) the Sabba:
such fines as have not been realised (in these cases also), they (i.e., the great men conducting the
annual business of the village) shall get only through us and pay.

Failing to act in this wise, the great men conducting the business of the village for the year
in which the fines are levied shall individually be liable to a penalty of 124 current kānum.
Imposing this penalty (on them), we, the Sabba of Uttaramēru-chatuvēdimāṅgalam, shall see that
the miscarriage does not recur.

Being ordered by the members of the assembly, I, the madhyastha Śivadāsaṇ Maṅgalādityan, wrote this (vyavasthā).

1 Read perukasamiyam.
2 Delete ū.
No. 8.—NOTES ON THE IRDA COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF KING NAYAPALADEVA.

By Jogendra Chandra Ghosh.

Mr. N. G. Majumdar has published the above grant in the Epigraphia Indica (Vol. XXII, pp. 150-9). It is very important, inasmuch as it throws interesting light into the political and other conditions of Bengal, in the tenth century.

The charter discloses the names of three kings and a queen, viz., Paramasauagata-Mahārājādhīrāja-Paramēśvara-Paramabhaṭṭāraka Rājayapaladeva, his queen Bhāgyadevi, their son king Nārāyaṇapaladēva, and his younger brother Paramēśvara-Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Mahārājādhīrāja Nayapalā, the donor. It records the grant to a Brāhman, of some land in the Dānajhuktimandala of the Vardhamāna-bhakti. It was issued from the capital of Priyaṅgu, founded by the king Rājyapala. The bhakti of Vardhamāna is in Uttara-Rādhā and the capital of Priyaṅgu, we shall see, lay in Dākshina-Rādhā, in Bengal. So it is clear that this family of the Pālas ruled in Rādhā.

Mr. Majumdar thinks that these kings belonged to a Kambujā dynasty, and were different from the Pālas of Bengal. But there exist some very striking similarities between the two dynasties, which can hardly be explained away as mere accidents. Both of them were Buddhists, and have used the Buddhist Dharmachakra device in their seals. And both have got the dynastic name of Pāla. These are not all. Like Rājyapala of the present grant, there was a Rājyapala among the Pālas of Bengal. Both had a queen named Bhāgyadevi, and both were styled Paramasauagata and Mahārājādhīrāja. Both the Rājyapalas were great temple-builders. Verse 7 of the Rāgarha, Aṅgāchhī and Manahali charters of the descendants of the Rājyapala of Bengal describe him as having constructed many temples with lofty halls. The opening verse of the present plate also says that Priyaṅgu, the capital, where flourished Rājyapala, was decorated with temples reaching up to the distant firmament. We shall presently see that the times of both also coincide.

All these raised a great suspicion in our mind, whether Mr. Majumdar has arrived at the right conclusion. In fact the similarities are so very overwhelming that even Mr. Majumdar was inclined to identify the two Rājyapalas as one. But the epithet of the Rājyapala of the present plate, Kambsjā-vaśa-tilakah, as read by him, stood in his way. Our suspicion led us to examine this reading very carefully. The first word Kambsjā is all right, but the reading of vaśa-tilakah seems doubtful. What has been read as va seems to us to be nothing but dha. If this is conceded, the next syllable cannot be ni, for dhanī is meaningless. It cannot be a mistake for dvamaṇa, as that will spoil the metre. Of the next word tilakah, ti and the visarga attached to the last syllable are there, but the two syllables after ti are altogether lost. Mr. Majumdar says that he has found the right hand flourish of k before the visarga, in the original, but we find no indication of it, in the facsimile. We read the epithet as Kambsjā-Dhanī-atiparāh, i.e. an

1 The Bengali monthly Bhāratavarsha, śravāṇa and Āśwa B. S. 1344, pp. 268 ff. and 648-50.
5 He has since modified his opinion. (Modern Review, September, 1937, pp. 323 ff.)
6 I am inclined to think that the letter after Kambsjā should be read as su though at first sight it appears like dha. So far as I can see, it has only a triangular top as in certain other cases (e.g. ta in śrāvāṇa in l. 13 and ka in śrāvāṇa in l. 14) instead of the ordinary top stroke, while in dha no top stroke is found. The next conjunct letter I would prefer to read as sa following Mr. Majumdar and would point out that in conjunct letters the subscript sa is clearly represented everywhere in this inscription. The next two signs that are visible are ti in l. 5 and only the visarga in l. 6.—Ed.]
inveterate foe (stiparāḥ) of Kambūja and Dhaṅgu. If our reading be correct, the chief difficulty of identifying the two Rājyapālas vanishes at once.

Now who could have been this Dhaṅgu, an inveterate foe of this Rājyapāla of Rādha? We think that he is no other than the king Dhaṅga of the Chandellās. The Bengali tendency of changing a-endings of personal names into u, such as Rāma to Rāmu, Vaṅka to Vaṅku, etc., seems to be responsible for the slight change in the name of Dhaṅgu. This identification of Dhaṅgu with the king Dhaṅga is not based on the similarity of names only. It is supported by the historical evidence also. This king of the Chandellās, in his Ksahjurāho inscription of V. S. 1059 (1002 A.D.) boasts of having thrown into prison the wives of the kings of Kāśchī, Andhra, Rādhā and Aṅga. This shows that he had, among others, invaded the kingdom of Rādha. We have already seen that Rājyapāla of the present plate was ruling in Rādha. So it is very natural for him to declare Dhaṅga as an inveterate foe of his. But were both Rājyapālas contemporaries of Dhaṅga? Mr. Majumdar on palaeographical grounds assigned this charter of Nayapāla to the latter part of the tenth century. Rājyapāla was succeeded by his son Nārāyanaapāla, who again was succeeded by his younger brother Nayapāla. So Rājyapāla can be assumed to have ruled in the first part of the tenth century. But what was the time of Dhaṅga? The latest known inscription of this king is the one of V. S. 1059 (A. D. 1002) mentioned above. It is stated therein that he lived over hundred years. So he was born sometime about A. D. 900. It is clear from this evidence that Dhaṅga and Rājyapāla of the present inscription were contemporaries.

It now remains to be seen that the other Rājyapāla, father of Gopāladēva II., also flourished in the first part of the tenth century. We have shown elsewhere that king Mahipāla I. ascended the throne in A. D. 981. His father Vigrahapāla II. ruled at least 26 years, and his grandfather Kṣitigarbha ruled at least 8 years. So the commencement of the latter's reign cannot be later than A. D. 942. The recently published Jājilpāra charter of Gopāladēva II. was issued in the sixth year of his reign, on the 11th day of the bright half (i.e. ēkāṇā ēkādaśi) of Pausa, on the occasion of Utpaṣṭāya-karaṇā. The only date, nearer to A. D. 942 satisfying the above data, is A. D. 931. So his first year must be A. D. 925. This should, in the ordinary circumstances, be also the last year of his father Rājyapāla's reign. Rājyapāla ruled at least 24 years. So the period of his reign also falls in the first part of the tenth century, and, therefore, he was contemporaneous with the other Rājyapāla and Dhaṅga.

Now the difficult question arises that if the two Rājyapālas were identical, why Dhaṅga calls him the king of Rādha only, and not of Gauda and Magadha? A very satisfactory solution of this is possible. The known dates of the Pratiḥāra Mahendrapāla I. are 898-907 A. D.* His inscriptions of the years 4 and 19 have been found in the Patna District, of 8 and 9 in the Gayā District, and of 5 in Pāthāpur in the Rājshahi District of Bengal. These show that Rājyapāla was ousted from Gauda and Magadha. The Digha-Dhauuli (Saran district) inscription of V. S. 956 shows that he lost Tirhabhūti also. From these circumstances, R. D. Banerji rightly came to the conclusion that Rājyapāla must have succeeded to a very small principality, either in Rādha or in Vaṅga. This plate fully corroborates his view, which was considered at the time no better.

---

4 J. R. A. S., 1910, pp. 150-51; The Pilas of Bengal, p. 65.  
5 Ind. Ant., Vol. XLVII, p. 110.  
7 The Pilas of Bengal, p. 63.
than a mere surmise. This Pratihāra occupation of the Pāla dominions does not appear to have lasted long. It must have come to an end with the death of Mahāndrapāla I. It appears from the Bargāon (Patna District) inscription of the time of Rājyapāla that he must have recovered at least Magadha on or before the 24th year of his reign. This clearly explains why Rādha has been mentioned as a separate entity by Dhaṅga. After Rādha, Dhaṅga names Aṅgā, which shows that Aṅgā also was an independent country at the time. He makes no mention of Magadhā, which country he must have had to pass through, to return to his kingdom. This probably shows that he was friendly with the Pratihāras, who occupied that province.

The two Rājyapālas being one, he had at least three sons, viz., Nārāyaṇapāla, Nayapāla and Gōpāla II. Both the first and the third claim to have succeeded their father directly. Both the statements may be true, if we take that Rājyapāla divided his kingdom between Nārāyaṇapāla and Gōpāla, giving Rādha to the former, and Magadha to the latter to rule independently. About the other provinces we have no information if they were recovered in the life-time of Rājyapāla. The Jājilpārā inscription shows that Gōpāla was in possession of Gauḍa, at least in the sixth year of his reign. An inscription of the first year of his reign has been discovered in Bargāon. Another solution may be that Gōpāla usurped the throne of Nayapāla. As this was not a peaceful succession, he did not mention the names of his brothers. It is not likely that Gōpāla’s throne was usurped by either of his brothers. If at all, it must have been for a time only, for we find that he was succeeded by his son, Vīgrahapāla II. We are in favour of the first view, for that explains why Nayapāla traces his descent from Rājyapāla, and not from Gōpāla, the founder of the dynasty. Rādha, no doubt, was a feudatory state under the Pālas, but it was Rājyapāla who raised it to an independent kingdom and built its capital there. So he was the founder, and Nayapāla, inheriting that kingdom only, traces his descent from Rājyapāla. Gōpāla II, who inherited Magadha, a country ruled by his forefathers directly, names his forefathers from Gōpāla I, like others of the main line.

We think, we have been able to solve satisfactorily all doubts that could be raised against the identification of the two Rājyapālas as one. Now we shall devote our attention to find out, if we can, who this Kambōja, another inveterate foe of Rājyapāla, was. We have seen that the Pratihāras conquered all the important provinces of his forefathers. So who could have been more inveterate enemy than these Pratihāras? Nay, they were hereditary enemies of the Pāla dynasty from the time of Dharmapāla. We find also that Rājyapāla came into direct conflict with them when he reconquered Magadha, on or before the 24th year of his reign. Can these Pratihāras be the Kambōjas? Let us see. Kambōja, according to Pāṇini, meant a king or a Kshatriya of the country of Kambōja. Now where was this Kambōja country? According to the earlier authorities, it was in the north-west of India. But some later works as the Mārkaṇḍeśa-Purāṇa and the Brīhatsaṁhitā place a Kambōja country in the south-west, along with Sindhu, Sauvira and Anārta. Garuda-Purāṇa, a still later work, mentions it side by side with Lāṭa, in the south-west. This Kambōja might be the same as the Stambha-tirtha about the Narbada, mentioned in the Kūrma-Purāṇa, and the modern Cambay, on the gulf of that name. It might have derived its name from this Stambha or Kambha-tirtha. It, no doubt, formed part of the Pratihāra empire. According to some authorities, the Pratihāras were Gurjaras. We find this Kambōja

---

2 Mr. Majumdar entertains the last view (Modern Review, September 1937). It appears from the Tirumalai inscription that a Pāla king of the name of Dharmapāla ruled in Daṇḍabhukti till the reign of Mahipāla I. He was probably a grandson of Nayapāla of this plate. So the question of usurpation on either side does not arise.
3 Mārkaṇḍeśa-P., ch. 58, v. 30; Brīhatsaṁhitā, ch. 14, v. 17.
was also in Gujarāt. It may be that these Pratihāras coming to live in Kambōja of Gujarāt, before they rose into power, came to be known as Kambōja. It is for this reason, we think, they have been styled as 'Kambōja' in the present plate. It must be noted here that the Pratihāras came into contact with the Pālas long before they became established in Kanauj.

Now having said all that we have to say in justification of our differed reading, let us turn our attention to what geographical information we can gather from this plate, about Rādha in the tenth century. The golden rampart walls of the city of Priyaṅgu have been described as resplendent as fire (v. 3). This leads us: to think that they were built of the red laterite stone. So the capital must have been at a place, where or in the vicinity of which, these stones abound. The district of Midnapur, in Dakṣiṇa-Rādha, lies on the border of the Balasore District, from where the plate has been obtained. It contains laterite soil, and some forts are still to be found here built of laterite stone. It is not, therefore, unlikely that the seat of the kingdom was here. There are two places in this district, which come nearer to the name of Priyaṅgu. One is thānā Pingla, and the other is the village of Pingbani, in thānā Garbeta, with ancient remains. The latter seems more likely. The soil here is lateriferous.

The donated village of Bhṛhat-Chattīvanī is described as adjoining to Kaṇṭhi, Samāsā and Bādakhaṇḍa, within the Dāṇḍha-bhūkti-maṇḍala, belonging to the Vardhamāna-bhūkti (Uttara-Rādha). Mr. Majumdar identifies this village with Chhatina, near Belyabera and Nayabashan, on the Suvarṇarākha. It is probably in thānā Gopiballabhpur. There is a village named Chhatina, in thānā Salbani. Besides, there are three villages of the name of Chhatina, in thānā Daspur. The donated village is said to have contained salt-mines (karaṇa-śākara), which probably means that some part of it was a saline tract, where salt used to be manufactured. This discloses the contiguity to sea-coast. Salt is still manufactured in the district. Kaṇṭhi may be the modern Contai, which is on the sea-coast. There are, however, two villages of the name Kanchik in thānā Danton, and Kanthi in thānā Gopiballabhpur. As we find both Chhatina and Kanthi in thānā Gopiballabhpur, lying on the western part of the district, Chhatina suggested by Mr. Majumdar may be the donated village. The existence of madhuka trees in the donated land also supports this view, as they grow in the western part of the district. But this village must have extended up to the sea-coast of Balasore, along the Suvarṇarākha, for we have already seen that a portion of it was a saline tract. This also shows that the village was a very big one, which the prefix Bhṛhat also suggests.

Chhatina is the name of a Jungle Mahal. We do not know, if the donated village Chhatina has anything to do with the name of this Jungle Mahal. Belyabera or Belaiberia is also a Jungle estate, owned by a family of Phraharāja Chaudhuri of the Midnapur District. The plate belongs to a Phraharāja Chaudhuri of Irdā, in the neighbouring district of Balasore. It is possible that both belonged to the same family, with their original home in Chhatina. It is not known how the plate was acquired by the present owner. It may be that the Phraharāja family was in some way connected with the donee, or it might have been found somewhere within their Zamindari.

We do not know anything about the origin of the name of Dāṇḍha-bhūkti. It seems that originally a village of the name of Dāṇḍha was the headquarters of the bhūkti, which ultimately gave this name to it. There are two names connected with the word Dāṇḍha, in the Midnapur District: (1) A village of the name of Bhāṣadaṇḍha in thānā Sabang. It is the seat of the Madhyaśāhāri Brāhmaṇa of the district. This might be the original village of Dāṇḍha. (2) A temple of Śiva,
named Dandaśvara, in Karnagarh, six miles to the north of the Midnapur town, with remains of a fort and several temples. Daṇḍa, though originally a bhūkta, is found as a manḍala under the Varādhamaṇa-bhūkta in the present plate, and also as a kingdom under a king named Dharmapāla, in the Tirumalai inscription of the first quarter of the eleventh century. This Dharmapāla might be a descendant of Nāyapāla of the present grant. If so, this Pāla dynasty of Rādhā continued for about a century and a quarter at least.

Narayanagarh is a village in the sādāor sub-division of the Midnapur District, containing the remains of a ruined fort, and some very fine old tanks. The Raj family of this place is said to have had possession of it from the time of the great Pāla kings of Bengal. It is not unlikely that Nārāyaṇapāla of this plate founded it.

The present charter is also of great interest as depicting the religious condition of Rādhā, in the tenth century. The Pāla kings of Bengal were well-known Buddhists. But they were not antagonistic to Brahmanism. All their charters record grants to Brāhmaṇas, which bespeaks their liberality to Brāhmaṇas and regard for Brahmanism. Their grants are sealed with the Buddhist Dharmachakra-mudrā and begin with praises to the Buddha. With the exception of the three earliest and the present one, all were granted in the name of the Buddhābhaṭāraka. The present king spoke of his father as a Paramasaṅgata and sealed the plate with the dynamic Dharmachakra device. But unlike others, he has begun it with salutation to the Brahmanic god Śiva and granted it in the name of that god. This clearly shows how the Buddhist population was being slowly and gradually merged into Brahmanism. The elder brother of this prince, the king Nārāyaṇapāla, is described as a devotee of Vāsudeva. This conversion of the royal family of Rādhā reflects no little credit on the Brāhmaṇas of Rādhā.

In conclusion, we would like to make some remarks about the reading of the date of the plate. Mr. Majumdar read it as "Sanev 13 Kārttika-dina 2". He found no other numeral sign after 2. Dr. Chakravarti, the Government Epigraphist, however, notices two digits and reads them as "18". We too find two signs, but read them as "8u 91". It appears that the engraver through mistake was repeating the preceding syllable ni, but found out his mistake before he could finish and rectified it, by clumsily converting it to su, indicating sukta. The subscript u of su here is comparable to subscript u of su of the word sukraṇaḥ (I. 47). The date of issue of the charter, therefore, is the same as the date of the actual gift.

No. 9.—SIRIPURAM PLATES OF ANANTAVARMAN, LORD OF KALINGA.

By G. V. Srinivasarao, B.A., Madras.

These plates were secured for examination by the Superintendent for Epigraphy from Mr. Manda Narasimham Pantulu of Arasavilli, teacher, Board High School at Chincote in the Vizagapatam District. They are stated to have been discovered while digging a tank at Siripuram, a village near Chincote. They have since been purchased by the Government Museum, Madras. Mr. Narasimham has published the inscription on the plates in the Telugu Monthly Journal Bhārati for September 1931, and has also reviewed its contents in Vol. VIII of the Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society (p. 153), but the interpretation of the record by him leaves much to be desired. It is now re-edited here from ink-impressions of the plates kindly supplied


[I am not convinced of the correctness of the reading suggested here and have no reason to change my views about the date.—Ed.]
to me by the Superintendent for Epigraphy. In his article in this Journal the Srungavarapukōta Plates of the same king, Dr. R. C. Mazumdar has also considered this inscription.

The grant should have consisted of three oblong copper plates of which the last is now missing. They measure 6½ in length and 24½ in breadth, and have their rims slightly raised all round to protect the writing which is incised on the inner side of the first plate and on both sides of the second. They are strung together by a ring about 4½ in diameter which passes through a hole about 1½ in diameter near the proper right margin of the plates. The ends of this ring are soldered into the bottom of an oval seal of which the rim bears on one side a slight projection. The surface of the seal which measures 1½ by 1¾ is completely worn out, so that the emblem or legend that should have been engraved thereon is lost, but judging from the seal of the Srungavarapukōta Plates, we may suppose that it should have contained the figure in relief of a conch. The two plates with the ring and the seal weigh 70 tolas.

The alphabet of the inscription belongs to the same type as that of the Komartli Plates of Chandavarman and the Chiccōcule Plates of Nanda-Prabha Janavarman. It bears a close resemblance to the writing in the Rāmatirtha Plates of the Vīshnukūdina king Indravarman who has been assigned to the second quarter of the 6th century A.D., and, except for one or two letters which look slightly more developed, to that of the Jirjīgi Plates of the Eastern Gaṅga king Indravarman dated in the 39th year of the Gaṅga era. It also shows a general likeness to the characters of the Pīkāra grant of the Pavaibha king Simhavarman, son of Yuvamahārāja Vīshṇugopa. This Simhavarman has been placed by Prof. J. Dubreuil in the beginning of the 6th century A.D.

The language of the grant is simple Sanskrit and similar in style to that adopted in the Brhatprāṣṭha grant of Umavarman, the Komartli Plates of Chandavarman and the Kōrōhaṇḍa Plates of Vīshkhavarman.

The orthography of the inscription calls for a few remarks. Except in the case of the two words vinirgata and a-chandr-ārka-kala in 1.15, the consonants are invariably doubled after the rēpha. Other consonants are also doubled, incorrectly in such words as samppadasya (1.3), dākkhiny-ūśēha (1.6), Toṣāparasamāvadā (11. 8 & 9), tēbhya eva saa idānim (1.10), and vidhīvasampradattā (1.16), and in place of the anusvāra in the words sappannō (1.6) and savatsavrē (1.13). Anusvāra is used in place of the nasal consonant n in the expressions mām-mahārāja (1.5) and veśēn kutumbinā (1.9); and both anusvāra and nasal are used together in Annivatarmā (1.8) and vinirgatamā-cha (1.15). Uparāṇīya is used in place of the visarga in the words bhūḥ prajā (1.7) and paravānāḥ pariśiṣṭiyā (1.14) and redundantly in the case of the words karaṇa prada (1.10), dānāh-pratigṛha (1.11), kālaḥ-pratishtham (1.15) and vachanah-prēṣha (1.17). The final t is found in vihṛat (1.2).

The grant was issued in the year MahĀśvayuja, on the day of full moon in the month of Māgha. This method of dating the record in the Twelve-Year Cycle of Jupiter, according to which the year commences on the day when Jupiter, after its conjunction with the Sun, rises heliacally at mean sunrise in a particular nakṣatra after which it is named, is said to have been in vogue to a limited extent only in the 5th and 6th centuries of the Christian era, and found used

---

1 Above, Vol. XXIII, pp. 56 ff.
2 Above, Vol. IV, p. 144.
3 Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII, p. 49.
4 Above, Vol. XII, p. 134.
8 Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 58.
9 Above, Vol. XII, p. 5.
10 Ibid., Vol. IV, pp. 142 ff.
so far only in a few inscriptions ranging between A.D. 475 and 528. In the Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy for 1931-32, Mr. C. R. Krishnamacharlu taking the Gaṅga Era to start with A.D. 493 assigns the Achyutapuram Plates of Indravarman² dated in the 87th year of the era to A.D. 580, and assuming the present record to be about half a century anterior to it gives it the provisional date A.D. 528-9 which was the year in which the Mahāśvayuja occurred. It may be stated, however, that the years A.D. 516 and, before that, A.D. 504 are equally possible for the record.

The inscription registers an order of king Anantavarman issued from Dēvapura confirming the grant of the village Tōntāpura as a tax-free agrahāra to be enjoyed by eight (1) members of the Ātraṇa-gōtra who were already in possession of it and were paying tax hitherto thereon, after separating it from the sub-division known as Kharapuri-madamba⁴ to which it had belonged and also from the bigger division Pattana-bhōga.⁵

Anantavarman is called the Lord of Kaliṅga possessed of many virtues and a great Māheśvara. He is stated to have been the son of Mahārāja Prabhajana(Prabhāṇa)varman and the grandson of Mahārāja Guṇavarman who is described as the Full Moon in the great and spotless (firmament viṣṇ., the) Vāsishṭha (family). This epithet is however applied to Prabhāṇa-varman in the Srugāvarapukṭa Plates, while Guṇavarman is styled the Lord of Dēvārāṣṭra and is credited with victories in many battles. Anantavarman is said to have acquired the Earth by the strength of his own arms.

Other kings of this region who also called themselves Kaliṅgādhīpati were Śaktivarman, Umavarman,Chaṇḍavarman and Nanda-Prabhāṇa-varman. Another king of the same region, who might have been a Kaliṅgādhīpati though he does not specifically style himself as such was Viśākhavarman who issued the Kōrōshaṇḍa grant¹⁰ mentioned above, from Śripura.¹¹ Four new copper-plate grants of the Kaliṅga kings have been found recently and are reviewed in the Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy for 1934-35. Of these one is the Srugāvarapukṭa Plates mentioned above, of king Anantavarman of our grant. The others are the Tiritthaṇa grant of Chaṇḍavarman¹² issued from Śringapura, in which the king calls himself a Kaliṅgādhīpati, the Tekkali Plates of Umavarman¹³ issued from Vardhamānapura¹⁴, and the Madras Museum.

³ This seems to be borne out by the writing in the Ārīrīgī Plates dated in the 39th year of the Gaṅga Era, which, as stated above, bears similarity to the alphabet of the present grant.
⁴ Madamba is thus defined in Śrīvatavatamānākura, Kālōka 6, Taranga 1, verse 14: Yuktam-śekhāṣa-prānāir-
madamba-parikśittam.
⁵ Cf. Vānkhāra-bhōga of the Ārīrīgī Plates (J. A. H. R. S., Vol. III, p. 51) and Mahēndra-bhōga of the Dāvaṭapēṭa Plates (J. A. H. R. S., Vol. X., p. 144). The name of the division is evidently derived from Pattana which is perhaps an abbreviated form of Kaliṅga-Pattana (Kaliṅgapatam) a sea-coast town about 20 miles from Chīcōla. The ancient Kaliṅga capital Kaliṅga-nagara mentioned in the Hāthigumpha inscription of Keralavēla has been identified with this town (above, Vol. XX, pp. 77).
⁶ Above, Vol. XII, pp. 1 ff.
⁷ Ibid., pp. 4 ff.
⁸ Ibid., Vol. IV, pp. 142 ff.
¹⁰ Above, Vol. XXI, pp. 23 ff.
¹¹ This has been identified with Śripuram in the Palkonda taluk of the Vizagapatam District. It is possible that it may refer to Śripuram the find-spot of the plates under publication.
¹² C. P. No. 12 of 1934-35.
¹³ C. P. No. 13 of 1934-35. In the As. Rep. for this year these two kings have been taken to be different from their namesakes who issued the Kōmarti plates and the Bṛhatprāṇiṣṭha grant.
¹⁴ This has been identified with Vādamana in the Palkonda taluk of the Vizagapatam District (As. Rep. on South Indian Epigraphy, 1934-35, Part II. para. 2).
Plates of Ananta-Śaktivarman, issued from Śrīnghapura. The Dhavalapēṭa copper-plates of Umavarman issued from 'Sunagara' complete the list of these kings.

From the provenance of all these records and the places mentioned therein, it may be surmised that their territory extended in the north to the southern portion of the Ganjam District and in the south to the northern portion of the Godavari District. It is not, however, possible to state whether it was held intact throughout their rule by this line of kings. The plates of king Ananta-Śaktivarman record the gift of a village in Barāha (Varāha) vartanī division to two Brāhmans. This division which should have comprised portions of the present Vizagapatam District round about Chicacoale is mentioned in the Narasīngapalli Plates of the Eastern Gaṅga king Hastivarman dated in the Gaṅga year 79 as having been included in his territory. Sometime later, Pishaṭapura situated in the southern portion of their territory had passed into the hands of a certain Pritihivī-Mahārāja, probably a subordinate chief under the Vīşṇupūdra, who issued his Tāṃḍivāḍa grant from that place, and then to the Chālukyas under Pulikēśa II. It may therefore be concluded that this dynasty of kings calling themselves Kaliṅgādhipati should have disappeared before the close of the 6th century A.D. The lower limit may of course be taken to be the middle of the 4th century A.D., when Śamudragupta invaded the south and subjugated along with others Mahēndra of Pishaṭapura and Kubera of Dēvarāṣṭra.

The relationship of the several kings mentioned above to one another is still obscure, the information contained in their grants being too meagre to throw any light on this point. Similarity in the alphabet or phraseology employed in their different grants, in the epithets applied to the kings and in names of officers occurring in them is our only guide in attempting any genealogy or chronology of these kings, but it seems to be unsafe to make any suggestions on this slender basis.

Of the places mentioned in the record, Dēvāpurā from where the king issued his grant, may be identified with one of the two Zamindari villages—one named Dēvāḍa in the Shrīgavarapukōṭa taluk and the other named Dēvāḍi in the Chicacoale taluk. Tōṇṭāpara, the village granted, perhaps has its representative in the modern Zamindari village Tōṭāḍa in the Chicacoale taluk. It is not possible to identify Kharapuri after which the sub-division was named.

TEXT.

First Plate.

1 Īrī Sanskrit [*] Vijaya-Dēvapūra-Vāsishṭha-vipul-āmala-sakala-chandramaś
2 *vibhū-ḥa-hiranya-gō-sahaer-ādy-anēka-dāna-dharm-aḥbhīrasaya sakti-tray-ō-
3 panata-rājya-samppadasya śūtrātāmala śāraṇa-chandra-chandrik-āvadāt-ōru-
4 yāṣaśa[*] śiṛṣṭaś Mahārāja-Guṇavarmmanapāśiyaśmājanmanō-nēka-guṇa-gaṇ-ā-

---

1 C. P. No. 24 of 1934-35.
4 Above, Vol. XXIII, p. 63.
5 Ibid., pp. 88 ff.
6 Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 11.
7 C. P. No. 1 of 1931-32.
8 Expressed by a symbol.
9 Read bhṛnt-bhū-hiranaya. The letter aṇa of hiranyas is written in smaller size below the line, evidently as a correction of an omission indicated by a small cross above.
10 Read saṁpūdrāḥ.
11 Read atyaṇḍ-āmala.
12 Read śṛṣṭaś.
TRANSLATION.

Öm. Hail! From the victorious (city of) Dēvapura, the glorious Anantavarman, lord of Kaliṅga, who is endowed with wisdom, refinement and truthfulness, with purity of life and good conduct, liberality and magnanimity, and with courtesy, heroism and strength; who has acquired the earth by the strength of his own arms; who is (ever) devoted to the welfare of (his) subjects; who is a devout worshipper of Mahēśvara; and who meditates on the feet of (his) parents; who is the son of the glorious Mahārāja Prabhājana-varman richly adorned with a multitude of (good) qualities, the son of the glorious Mahārāja Guṇavarman who was a Full Moon in the broad and spotless (firmament vic. the family of) Vāśishṭha, who took great delight in the performance of the several kinds of gifts like the earth, gold and a thousand cows, who secured the...
prosperity of his kingdom with the threefold regal power and who possessed great fame which was as pure as the light of the exceedingly clear autumnal moon,

(thus) commands (all) the farmers assembled in Tōṇṭāpara: This (village which) has been already an agrahāra enjoying the privileges (applicable to the group of villages included) in Kharapuri-madamba and paying tax (hitherto), is now given by Us with (due) rites preceded by (libations of) water for the increase of (Our) merit, longevity and fame, on the day of full moon in the month of Māgha in the year Mah-Āsvayuja, to the same Brāhmaṇas, eight share-holders in number (!) of the Atri-gōtra and charapa, who are engaged in performing and helping others to perform sacrifices, in study and in teaching, and in making and receiving gifts,—after having completely exempted (the village) from all kinds of taxes and having made it separate from the Kharapuri-madamba (sub-division) and the Pattana-bhōga (division !), and conferred it as an agrahāra to last as long as the moon and the sun.

Having understood this (it becomes that you) should bring the yield of the village (to these Brāhmaṇas), and with all (due) respect carry out the behests issued (by them). (This) command (should be respected) by the kings who are to come in future as well, in protecting this meritorious gift.

No. 10.—INDORE PLATES OF PRAVARASENA II.

BY SUSHIL K. BOSE, M.A., CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY.

The plates which are edited here were in the possession of Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, who kindly placed them at my disposal for the present purpose. They were originally in the possession of the late Wamanrao Islampurkar Śāstri of the Indore State along with the grants of Mahāraja Svāmīdāsa and Mahāraja Bhuluṣa edited by Dr. R. C. Majumdar in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XV, pp. 286 ff.

These are three well preserved copper-plates each of which measures 7" long by 3½" broad. They are quite smooth and their edges not mired or fashioned thicker. About 2" distant from the middle of the proper right margin each plate has a hole about 1/8" in diameter, obviously for a ring with which the plates were strung. Originally, the grant consisted of four plates. The first plate together with the ring and the seal is now missing. From a comparison with the other grants of the same king it would appear that roughly about seven lines of writing are lost. The first plate, therefore, as one would expect, was inscribed on one side only. The first and the second of the remaining three plates that we now possess, that is to say, the second and the third of the original grant, are inscribed on both the sides while the last one is written on one side only. The writing throughout is in an excellent state of preservation. The size of the letters is about 1/4". The characters belong to the southern class of alphabet and are fine specimens of the 'box-headed' variety of the Central Indian script, which is well illustrated in the copper plates of the kings of Sarabhapura as well as in those of Trivaradēva, king of Mahā-Kōśala1. The script resembles closely that of the Duida and Siwani plates, as also of the recently published Tirōḍi2 plates of Mahāraja Pravarasena II.

From the standpoint of paleography these plates have some peculiarities which are worthy of note. As in the Siwani plates, the letter ṇ in this grant occurs in two distinct forms. One is the usual type of this alphabet and the other consists of a square and is more archaic. It seems that the scribe was familiar with both and had freely used the two forms, though the usual type

occurs in larger number. For the former type see Kōbidārikā (l. 12), balivarudda (l. 21), and piboti (l. 33) and for the latter see brāhmaṇairā (l. 27) and bāhula (l. 33). Both the lingual ṯ and the
dental Ṗ occur in different varieties. As regards the dental ṗ, it may be noted that, though
different forms are discernible, the larger number is of the looped type; see for instance, ṗ in
Rudrasenasya sūn[ā*] (l. 1). For a different kind of ṗ see Rudrasena (l. 6). Likewise,
differences exist in the types of ṯ; see for instance, Prūhitivishēṣasya and Chakrapāṇī (l. 5), and
guṇa (l. 3). A very peculiar form of the letter occurs in pāviṛiṣa (l. 4). The ṗ of Gōḍāryāya
(l. 15) is also worthy of note. The letter ṯ, in general, has a much smaller rectangle than that of
ḍh, even then they could hardly be distinguished in many places, but for the context; see ṯ in
prabhava (l. 39) and compare it with ṭha in chandrāditya (l. 24). Of the ligatures the two
forms ina and nta deserve special notice. Referring to his tables (plate vii, 43, X) Bühler says,
"We meet repeatedly with the looped ṭa and the na without the loop." The ligature to which
he has referred has been taken by him to be nta. But exactly the same ligature occurs in this
place where the reading is clearly ina (sajña-chittana, l. 28 for saṃchittana). By mistake the scribe
put the ṭ first and then the subscript na. So Bühler’s reading of the same ligature as nta cannot
stand. We have a clear example of nta in aryanta (l. 2), santāna (l. 4) and santikās (l. 9).
Incidentally it may be noted here that the subscript ṭ in the first of these words shows some peculiarity.
The letter ḍh is of the usual square type except, however, in Yudhiṣṭhirā (l. 4), where it is definitely
roundish in shape. Similarly the letter ṭ which is generally of an angular character, has one exception
in ājñāpayītavāsya[ā*] (l. 10) where it is round. As regards the letter ṯ, it might be noted that
the real box-headed type, which is met with in the Siwāni plates, does not occur in this inscription.
There is, however, a single instance where the box-headed ṭ appears here, in āyur-ṭala (l. 11),
if it is not to be read as ṭala for-ṭala. With regard to this particular letter ṭ our inscription
tallies well with the Tiḍṉī, Chammak and Duddus plates of the same king. Lastly we might note
that ā is denoted in different ways. Usually a slanting stroke attached to the head of the consonant
indicates the medial ā; see Vākaṭakaśānantē (l. 8). For a different way of indicating it see kāṇīya
(l. 24).

The language is Sanskrit and except the usual imprecatory verse, ascribed to Vyāsa, in the
fourth plate, the inscription is in prose. The composition is not at all satisfactory and shows
that the writer’s knowledge of Sanskrit left much to be desired. As regards orthography the
most prominent features are: (1) the use of upadhūravya in ll. 25, 31 and 33; (2) frequent non-
observance of the rules of external sandhi; (3) carelessness in the writing of ā (medial), ṇ and ṇ;
(4) the doubling of ṯ after anusvāra as in para-dattām vē (l. 32); (5) the doubling of consonant
after r as in mārga (l. 8), etc., and (6) the interchange between ri and ri in some cases, e.g., in Prūhitī
(l. 5) and kṛiṣībhī[ā*] (l. 25). The inscription contains several words whose meaning and grammar
are not clear. It seems that the official who was entrusted with the drawing up of the record
was responsible for these solecisms. Some of the mistakes, however, are no doubt due to the
inadvertence of the engraver.

The inscription is one of the Vākaṭaka Mahārāja Pravarasēna II and is dated (l. 33) the
fifth lunar day of the dark half of the month of Vaisākha in the twenty-third year
(of his reign). Its object is to record the grant of a village (l. 12)¹. The situation of the village
is described as being to the north of Ārāmaka, east of Kōbidārikā, south of Kōṣambaka and
west of Aṇājaṇavāṭaka (ll. 12-14). The donors are said to be (ll. 15-17) Gōḍāryya, son of
Vāsākhāryya of the Vāja-Kusīka gotra and resident of Ārāmaka, his son Manorāthāryya, Gōvāryya,
Dēvāryya, Bāppāryya, Kūmārāryya and Dṛṇāryya. It has been noted (l. 20) that half of the

² [From the details given it is not clear whether the object granted is a village.—Ed.]
village was purchased by a merchant named Chandra from the Brahmins. Beyond this our inscription furnishes no such information as has not already been supplied by the Dudia plates written in the same year as this record as well as by the Chammak and Siwani plates which were issued in the eighteenth year of the reign of this Mahārāja Pravarasena II. But the similarity of the Tirodi plates with the present record is striking. Both these grants were issued in the same year and their language is also very much similar. As a matter of fact some of the terms and words in this inscription can be properly understood only when compared with the Tirodi plates. Mistakes due to the engraver are very numerous in this inscription and many of them have been corrected with the help of the Tirodi plates.

Like his other inscriptions the present one also supplies us with the stereotyped genealogy of Pravarasena II. But the first plate being lost the genealogy from Gautamiputra only survives. After the genealogy the details of the grant are given. The inscription ends with the date and the name of the writer.

In one point our inscription offers information which makes it of great interest to students of administrative history. Unlike the other plates of the Vākāṭaka kings this record was written by one Kṛṣṭadāva who styles himself as Rajuka. This is the first time we meet with the term Rajuka in so late a period. Rajuka is primarily a term to indicate an officer whose undoubted existence in the 3rd century B.C. is proved by the inscriptions of Aśoka. Until the middle of the second century A.D. South India at least kept up the use of this official. The reference to Mahāmārāja, Rajjuka and Saṅghārīma indicates that the old tradition was kept up in Southern India. When the Vākāṭakas came to the forefront, on the decline of the Kusāṇa, they probably made an endeavour to revive the old institutions. The Gupas, who were mainly a North-Indian power, were greatly influenced by the Kusāṇas and adopted many foreign features in their administrative machinery. The Vākāṭakas were more in the south and so could retain the earlier official terms. For this reason we find that in most of the records of this Vākāṭaka king occur certain revenue terms which have not been found in any other copper-plate and of which no satisfactory explanation can yet be offered. It is clear from the record that the Rajuka was still an officer mainly concerned with land and revenue. It is strange that in no other records of this period do we meet with this term. The reason seems to be that though all land transactions were negotiated under his jurisdiction, only in very important cases the Rajuka himself used to participate, the rest being done by subordinate officers. The date of the record being given in regnal years cannot be verified. None of the places mentioned in this inscription can be identified.

TEXT.

Second Plate; First Side.

1 dājuḥbhrasasvā. Gautamiputrasasya patrasya Vākāṭaka[ā]jānāmaḥ-tāra(m)ā-ra(e)śaṇasvaṣa sūn[ā]r[4]

2 atyanta-ma(m)āhērvarasya saty-arjjava-kārura(ṇ)ya-lauryya-vikrama-naya-vinaya-mahātmya-

3 dhimavu[4]-pātragatadhaktiv-r-śharmavijayita-manōaimamaly-ādi-śuṇya-samudātasya


2 From the original plates.
3 Read dhimavu.
5 vṛttēr-Vākāṭakānā[m*]-mahārāja-āri-Pri(Pri)thihiśēṇasya sūna(nō)ḥ bhagavatē-Chakrā-
pāṣē(ḥ*)  
6 prasād-lōpārjita-āri-samudāyasāya Vākāṭakānā[m*]-mahārāja-āri-Rudrasēṇā-

Second Plate ; Second Side. 
7 sva sūnōḥ[*] mahārājadhirāja-āri-Śrī-Dēvagupta-sūtāyā[ūn*] Prabhāvatīguptāyām-utpanna-
8 sva Vākāṭakānām-mahārāja-āri-Pravaraśēṇasya vahanā[ḥ t*] Gēpuraka-mārggē asma-
9 t-santikāś-sarvyāddhyaśka-nīyogā-nīyuktāḥ ājñāsāmchāri-kulaputra-ādhiriktāḥ bhātō-
10 bhū-ohhātrāś-cha vyushita-pūrvva-mayt-ājñay-ājñāpayitavyāḥ[ḥ*] Viditam-asu vañ-
11 yav-ch-āsmbhūr-śatmanō dhṛdharm-āyur-bhala-śvāryya-vivṛiddhiyā[ḥ*] īti-āmutra-hi-
t-ārtthānī  
12 vaijyikē dharmma-sthānē Ārāmakāsya uttara-pārśe Vēkūdārikāyā[ḥ*] pūrvva-
13 pārśe māla datām-īti?:—

Third Plate ; First Side. 
14 Kōśambakṣaya[ḥ*] dakhina-prājya[ḥ*] Aṇjanavājirakṣaya aparā-pārśe Viśākhēryya-vātaka-
saya [Ārāmakv[ṛ] stavyā-Vaij-Kausika-sugōtra-Viśākhēryya-puṭtā-Gōḍjā-
16 Bāppārīyāya[ḥ*] cha Kumārēryya[ḥ*] Drōaṇēryya[ḥ*] cha pā[r]vva-dattā iti kṛtvā 
17 yatō-śma[sma[bhīḥ]] hitchēya-sāsana-nibandham[ṃ-kritas] apūrvva-dattā(ītyā) udaka-pūrvvam[ṃ*] 
atishidāḥ[ḥ*]  
18 uchitā[ḥ*] jā-ah-sāya pūrvva-tāj-ānumata[ṃ*] Chāturvyādyā-grāma-maravāyād-parihā[ṃ*] 
vita. 
19 rāmaḥ[*] Atra vātā(ṭa) k-ārddhāni vānijaka-Chaṁdrēṇa kraya-kritanā brāhma[nēbhīḥ] Bhagavat-pada[ṃ*]  

Third Plate ; Second Side. 
20 Tad-yathā a-kara-dāyi a-bhāṣa-chehhatra-prāvēṣāya a-pāraṁpara-tō(ṛghu)-bhīvā-padā[ḥ*] 
21 a-pushpa-kṣihi(kṣihi)[rā-sa[m*] dōhāḥ a-chāra(r-a)īsana-čhamā(r-m-a)ngāraḥ[ḥ*] a-lavanā-kiṭiva-
22 (nna)-krēṇi-khanakā[ḥ*]

1 The formation of medial s in ds is noteworthy. It consists of an a-nātri on the top and an ā-ānītra added to the lower-left side of ds. 
2 Read vantsiṣ-a as in other Vākāṭaka records. 
3 Read bhūtās. 
4 Read viśātilī-pūreṣa as in the Siwari and Chammak plates. 
5 Read yav[ṛ]. 
6 Read dharm-āyur-bhāt-āśātāya-svārāṭkap. 
7 Read maga dattōnāti. [These six syllables seem to be out of place here, and their sense is not clear.—Ed.] 
8 It is tempting to identify this place with the village of Köśambakṣaya mentioned in the Tirōḍi plates of the same king. 
9 [From the impression it can be read as Bāppārīyāya.—Ed.] 
10 The reading may be nibhadha-kritah.—Ed.] 
11 Read -mavyāḥ-paṁhari as in the Tirōḍi plates. 
12 I am indebted to the Editor for this reading. 
13 Read a-sahā-śekhārā-prāvēṣaḥ; the word śekhāra seems to be somehow connected with the term đāṭa of other inscriptions.
23 sarvva-viśiśṭi-parihāra-parihri(hri)taḥ sa-tidhis=s-ōpatisṭhiḥ
    sa-kliṣṭ(kli)pt-ōpakliṣṭ(kli)-ptaḥ.
24 ā-chandr-āditya-kūliyaḥ putra-pautr-ānuvāmi bhunjata[ṁ*] na kēnasch[īd*]
25 vyāghātana[१] kartavyās=sarvva-kriyābhīṣ sa[ṁ*]rakhitavyāḥ-parivardhayitavyāḥ-
    cha[ī*] yaśe=ch=Ā.
26 smach-chhāsasam-agani(ṣa)yamāṇa(ṇaḥ) svalpām-api paribādhatkū(ṇ=ku)ryāt=kāra-
    ghina vā[५]
27 tasya brāhmaṇair-vvēvī(ḍi)tasya sa-daṇḍa-migraham kurvyāmaḥ(ma !) Asmi ś=cha[४] dharm-
    m[A]dhi.

Fourth plate; First Side.

28 kamaṇīṣ atit-āṇēka-rāj-ātatt(tta) saṇchitā(ṇa)na-paripālana[ṛt*] krita-puṇya-ānukī(kl)-
29 rttana-parihār-ārthā(ṇ* ) na kirttayāmaḥ sankalp-ābhīṣyōdhaḥ-parākrama(m-ō)pajā
    (jj) tān-vatiḥ(rrta)-
30 ghatā(ṁañā)ṇ-ājñāpayamāḥ śyayati-kāla-prabhavāḥ(ṇ)ta[१९] gauravād-bhavishād[१२]=
    vijāna-
31 payāmāḥ [१८] Vyāsa-gita-ś=āttra ślokāḥ śramāṇikartavyāḥ [१२] Sva-dattā[ṁ*]
32 paraddatt(ārṇ* ) vṛṇ(ārṇ) yā harēśa vasundharā[ṃ* ] gavā[ṛṇ] śata-sahaerasya hantu-
33 ṣ=pibati[१५] dushkritīmar(ṇ)ma[१४] [११] śaṅvateśar trayovinśē Vaiśākha-bāhula-paṃchamyān [१*]
34 Ajñā svayam [२] RAJUK-koṭṭadēvīna likhitam [२*]

No. 11.—JAGANNATHARAYA TEMPLE INSCRIPTIONS ATUDAIPUR.

BY SAMSKRITI PT. AKSHAYA KERSTY VYĀŚ, M.A., UDAIPUR.

The inscriptions under consideration are fixed on both the sides of the passage leading into the Subhā-maṇḍapā of the Jagannāthārāya temple at Udaipur. They are in a fair state of preservation but the engraved letters have been filled up with lime in course of the annual repairs to the temple. At places, the original engraving itself is very shallow. Although Rai Bahadur Gaurishankar Ojha has utilized these inscriptions in writing his history of Rajputana (Rājputānā

[2] [What has been taken as the sign for medial i here is perhaps a mere scratch. Moreover, the form of the subscript character in this syllable differs much from that of the subscript i in kīmā in the previous line. In view of these considerations it seems probable that we have in this inscription the correct reading sa-kṛiṣṭat.]
[1°] Read asmrīčāca [The asmrāra meant for emmā seems to have been placed on ṣa. —Ed.]
[1°] The Śivani and Tirōḍī plates have also dharmamāhāyvāṇe while the Channak, Duddia and Riddhapur plates have dharmam-ādama-karaṇe.
[1°] Read ṣhīgṣaḥ; the Riddhapur plates have ṣdḥīgṣa and the Duddia plates ṣiddhīgṣa.
[1°] Read ṣivānāu.
[1°] The stop is indicated by a horizontal stroke.
[1°] Instead of pibati generally the word karoti occurs in this imprecatory verse.
kā Itihāsa) they still remain unpublished, and I edit them here at the instance of Dr. N. P. Chakravarti, Government Epigraphist for India.

These inscriptions are engraved on four big slabs of black stone, which we shall call, from left to right on both sides, A, B, C, and D respectively, for the sake of convenience. A measures 2' 6" broad by 3' 2" high, B 2' 10" by 2' 10", C 2' 6" by 3' 0" and D 3' 2" by 3' 2", and contain sixty, forty-six, fifty-seven and forty-nine lines of writing respectively. It may be pointed out that D is made up of as many as ten pieces of stone of different size, shape and variety, and seems to have been engraved after fixation. The writing appears to have been done by different hands as is chiefly perceptible from the upper part of D. Carelessness in engraving is particularly visible in the lower part of D.

The characters are Nāgari in their modern form and the medial vowels (particularly the dipthongs) which are joined to the consonants are throughout represented by kīrā-mātrās, the only example of the use of prāṣṭha-mātrā being in dēsvā (l. 25, A). The forms of y and p are often indistinguishable, not only when the former is joined to a preceding consonant, but also when it occurs independently.

As regards orthography we find that in many cases b has been distinguished from v, while in some cases b has been used for v as in kābāca-chh(chchh)ētā (l. 11, A). Chh is used in place of chhh throughout with a few exceptions particularly noticed in C. T is almost everywhere reduplicated after a preceding r. The sign for aṣavaṇḍa has been employed only twice in vaivarīkhya-śīvīmanānau (ll. 16-17, C) and in désva-khilé (l. 17, D).

The language of the inscriptions is Sanskrit except the sentence Śrī Jagannātharāja pāṇa padharāya at the end of C which is in the dialect of Mewār. The verses contain many paronymous words and thus many of them convey two senses. Considering the length of the inscriptions, the historical information they contain is very meagre. The poet has spared no pains in trying to please his patron, the ruling prince, and his work is meant to be more a literary study than history. The composition is, on the whole, free from errors, most of the mistakes appearing in the records being due to the engraver. The first line of each slab is in prose wherein five or six gods and goddesses have been adored. In addition to this, portions of ll. 3 in B, 50-51 and 56-57 in C and 2 and 47-48 in D are in prose. The rest of the epigraphs is in verse.

Before considering the actual contents of the records, let us determine whether all the four slabs contain one single inscription or more than one. From the intended plan of writing and the method of presenting the subject-matter, it will appear that three inscriptions have been incised on these four slabs. A and B together form what may rightly be called the Jagatsinha inscription, for the numbering of the verses in B is in continuation of that in A and the subject-matter also is connected with Jagatsinha. C and D on the other hand, appear to be two different inscriptions with independently numbered verses, intended by the author to pertain to Rājasinha and the temple of Jagannāthāryā respectively. That D, although intended to look like an independent epigraph, is but a supplement to A and B is evidenced by a close study of its contents; all these three together, therefore, should properly be regarded to form one inscription. The main object of the inscription engraved on these three slabs is to record the installation of the image of Jagannāthāryā in the temple by Mahārāṣa Jagatsinha, on Thursday, the 15th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha (Mādhava) in V. S. 1709 (l. 18, D).

1 An imperfect and uncertain transcript of the records was first printed in the Vīra-vināḍa (Part II, pp. 384-86).
2 Below the line containing the last verse in A, there are three more lines given to the description of the masons, where the verses are separately numbered. The same procedure of numbering the concluding verses separately is followed in the other slabs also.
Now we may consider the nature and the date of the fourth slab which we have called C. It may be pointed out that this slab, as a matter of fact, contains an inscription of the opening years of the reign of Rājasimha, the son of Jagatsimha, and has no date of its own. Its object is to record the erection of the four small corner-temples outside the main shrine. That the temple was to be one of the Vīshnū-Pañchāyatana type seems to have originally been contemplated by Jagatsimha himself, an indication of which we find in v. 48 of A and v. 12 of D. It is not improbable that the actual work of erecting these smaller temples was set afoot by this ruler but could not be completed by the time of the installation of the Jagannātharāya image when Jagatsimha was alive, and was brought to completion later on by his son Rājasimha. It is not, however, certain when this epigraph was fixed in the temple. The date given at the end, viz., “Thursday, the 15th of the bright half of the second Vaiśākha in the Vikrama year 1706,” is really the date of the installation of Jagannātharāya as explicitly mentioned beyond it in a sentence in Mewār tongue; and the purpose of mentioning it here can only be to show that the epigraph, although belonging to a later period, was to be taken in continuation of the earlier event of installation. It may be noticed here that the year 1708 recorded at the end of this slab as the year of the installation is at variance with that given in l. 18 of D, which is 1709. This can only be explained by regarding the former as Śrīvairavī (as is the custom prevailing in the Udaipur State even now) which would be equivalent to Caustrāṭa 1709, for it was only in the latter year that there was a second Vaiśākha with Thursday on the 15th of its bright half.1 Rai Bahadur Ojha has accepted this date given at the end of C as the date of all the four slabs which in his opinion contain one single inscription. But as I have already pointed out, this could not have been the date of the slab C, although it may have been that of the remaining three. The date of C cannot be earlier than the 13th of the dark fortnight of Margāśirsha of V. S. 1710, when Rājasimha is stated to have given eighty maidens (in marriage) which is the latest date found in this slab (v. 28). It is possible that the record was put up soon after that date. It may, however, be noted that the authorship of both these inscriptions goes to one and the same person.

With regard to the contents of A we find that it opens with three invocatory and benedictory verses in praise of Kṛṣṇa-dāna, Bhava and Durga; in the fourth verse the poet declares his intention of producing what he calls the Jagatsimha Prasasti. Then he attempts at giving a genealogy, chiefly of the Rāṇās of Mewār, which begins from Rāma, the celebrated hero of the Rāmāyaṇa from whom the rulers of Mewār claim their descent. In the family of Rāma were born Vijayaabhūpa and his son Padmāditya. The latter went towards the south leaving his ancestral capital Ayodhya. Later on in that family was born Bāpa who had the title of Rāval and who was a native of South India and thence called to rule over Mewār. Then in his family were born: Rāhappā (bearing the title of Rāpū for the first time), Narapati, Dīnakara, Jāskarakṣa, Nāgarāla, Pūrāpāla, Prthvimalla, Bhuvanasiṃha, Bhismasiṃha, Jayasiṃha, Lakṣhmanasiṃha, Aṣāi, Humira, Kābētrasiriṃha, Lakṣhasiṃha, Mokala, KunbhaKarṇa, Rājamalla, Sāga (Sāgā), Udaya, Pratipasiṃha, Amarasiriṃha, Karṇasiṃha and Jagatsiṃha.

It may be noticed here that Vijayaabhūpa and Padmāditya here mentioned are also included in the big list of princes, beginning with Sumitra and ending with Bāpa, given in cantos II and III of the Rāja-praśasti of V. S. 1732 (= A. D. 1675). As this list seems to be based on bardic accounts with no chronological truth, Pandit Ojha has rejected it as unauthentic.2

Bāpa indeed is a historical figure but his description as given here clearly seems to be based on the legendary stories prevalent among people even to-day, according to which his family came

---

1 Bhāmapuri Inscriptions, pp. 114-54.
to Mewār from Surāṣṭra and Valabhi. Col. Tod has closely followed this tradition in his work, but Rai Bahadur Ojha is of opinion that the family of Rāṇā had no connection whatsoever with South India, and has discussed in details the invalidity of the legends.

The names of the Rāṇās as given here next are to be met with in some other records also—such as the Ekalīṅga-mārāṭya, the Rāja-prakāṣati, etc., with certain variations. The only point of importance worthy of note with regard to these princes is that till before the time of Hammūra they were the rulers of the small estate of Sesodā and were contemporary to the princes of the Rāval branch of the family ruling over Chitor. It is a mistake to take them as having ruled over Mewār with Chitor as their capital in direct succession to the Rāvals, as has been done chiefly in the chronicles of the bards, which have in their turn been relied upon by most of the inscriptions. It is from the Ekalīṅga-mārāṭya first of all that we learn of the division of this family into two branches in the reign of Rāval Rāṇaśimhā or Karṇaśimhā at the beginning of the twelfth century of the Vikrama era. The first of the Rāṇās to govern the territory of Mewār as a whole was Hammūra who regained his ancestral citadel of Chitor in about A.D. 1326 from the Muhammadans by establishing matrimonial alliance with Mādeō Sonagarā to whom was entrusted the famous fort by Khizr Khān, the son of Ali-ud-din Khalji.

The list of the Rāṇās which is given here is almost in chronological succession except the omission of Ajayasisṁha after Lakshmaṇasimhā and of Ratnasimhā, Vikramāditya and Banabirā after Sāṅgā. Lakshmaṇasimhā’s successor as here recorded is Arasi, his eldest son, but in truth he never succeeded his father, for he together with his father had died in the dreadful sack of Chitor in A.D. 1303. His younger brother Ajayasisṁha, who somehow escaped from the battle-field, became the next Rāṇā. He was afterwards succeeded by his nephew Hammūra, the son of Arasi.

The description of these princes found here is more poetical than historical. Kumbhakarna is first of all said to have built the fort of Kumbhalgarh.

Record of some tangible historical value is, however, found first in connection with Sāṅgā. He is described to have conquered the Sultāns of Mālāwā and Gujarāt, although the author has confused their names with relation to both these countries. Here we find a reference to the victory of Rāṇā Sāṅgā over Mahamūd Khalji II of Mālāwā when the latter attacked Bhimakarna, the viceroy of Mēdinī Rāi at Gāgrūn in A.H. 923 (= A.D. 1519). The intelligence of this attack of Mahamūd having reached Sāṅgā, he at once led a large army against him on account of his friendship with Mēdinī Rāi, and a dreadful battle was fought in which, after great bloodshed, the Muhammadan army was utterly defeated and Mahamūd, receiving several wounds, ultimately became a prisoner in the hands of the Rāṇā. The latter took his royal prisoner to Chitor, treated him with utmost care and after three months’ nominal captivity, honourably sent him back to Mānjū.

The other reference is to Rāṇā Sāṅgā’s victory over Muzaffar Shāh II, the Sultān of Gujarāt, with whose army he had to fight more than once. The cause of one of his fights with Muzaffar was his partiality for Rāi Mal, the legitimate heir to the state of Idar, whose rights were usurped during his minority by his uncle Bhimā whom the governor of Gujarāt favoured. When Bhimā

---

3 Ibid. pp. 446-7.
5 According to the text (v. 38, A) Maudharā (Muzaffar II) was the governor of the fort of Māṇḍāvā (Māṇḍā or Mālāwā) and Mahamūndā Khaṇā (Mahamūd, Khalji II) that of Gujarāt. The poet has here evidently confused both these names and the positions they held.
7 Bayley, loc. cit., p. 284.
died, his son Bhāra Mal (Bihār Mal, according to Bayley) ascended the throne of Idar, but with the help of Rāṇā Sāṅgā, Rāi Mal ousted him and took possession of the land of Idar. This led the Sultān to send Nizām-ul-mulk, the jāgirdār of Ahmadnagar, for driving Rāi Mal out of Idar and re-establishing Bhāra Mal. A series of skirmishes followed and Rāi Mal tactfully faced the royal forces, sometimes victorious and sometimes incurring defeat. The state of Idar was ultimately entrusted to one Malik Husain Bahmani entitled as Nizām-ul-mulk, who was a foreigner and was a man of stern temperament. People were not satisfied with him and wished him to be dismissed from office. One day in A.H. 926 (1520) he rebuked Rāṇā Sāṅgā using very improper words for his patronage of Rāi Mal. The news of this insult having reached his ears through a bard, Sāṅgā at once started with an army of 40,000 cavalry to avenge himself. Nizām-ul-mulk fled and took shelter in the fort of Ahmadnagar, but Sāṅgā persistently followed him and the former was ultimately defeated in a battle with a great loss of life and property. The town of Ahmadnagar was sacked and that of Bāsalnagar plundered. Rāṇā Sāṅgā, thus successfully avenging the insult and firmly establishing Rāi Mal on the throne of Idar, went back to Chitor.

Sāṅgā had to face the Sultān of Gujarāt, Muzaffar II, a second time also when the latter himself took the initiative to avenge Sāṅgā’s recent ravages wrought in the country of Gujarāt. In A.H. 927 (1520) he despatched two large armies, one under Malik Aliāz, the governor of the district of Sōrāth and the other under Kiwām-ul-mulk to attack the Rāṇā. Both these armies reached Māndasor through Dungarpur and Bānswārā, laying waste the countries through which they passed. Rāṇā Sāṅgā, having heard of this, himself set off with a considerable army and encamped at the village of Nadṣā, twelve kās distant from Māndasor. Mahāmūd Khaljī of Mālāwī too, came to join the Gujarāt forces under Malik Aliāz, probably to avail himself of the good occasion of taking vengeance for his previous defeat at the hands of Sāṅgā. All these enormous armies assembled, but this time no genuine warfare could take place and Malik Aliāz agreed to make peace with the Rāṇā, the reason for which is attributed by the Muslim historians to the ill feeling entertained against him by Kiwām-ul-mulk and other amirs which broke down the unity of their aim. But the argument of Rai Bahadur Ojhā to the effect that Malik Aliāz had to make peace after having been actually defeated by Rāṇā Sāṅgā seems to be quite sound.

The next important historical information that we derive from A is with regard to the result and the time of commencement of the well-known battle of Haldighāthi where Rāṇā Pratāpa and the imperial army of Akbar under the command of Mānasimha fought a desperate battle. According to the account of this battle given by Bādāyūnī who was present in the battle-field, the victory was achieved by the royal forces and Rāṇā Pratāpa was defeated; while the present inscription records the retreat of the Muhammadan army, evidently when defeated by Pratāpa in the field of battle. Thus, each of the conflicting parties claims victory for itself and makes it difficult to arrive at the truth. Rāṇā Pratāpa, as a matter of fact, was insignificant as compared to the mighty Emperor Akbar, who had already annexed much of the fertile portion of the former’s territory to his own empire, and it is possible that this powerful ruler might have achieved material victory. But to quote Rai Bahadur Ojhā, the unfailing zeal, the pride, the dauntless bravery and the sense of perfect freedom which Rāṇā Pratāpa faithfully cherished—particularly at the time when everywhere around him was leading to disappointment—and which caused a sense of terror in the hearts of his enemies, and also the sudden vicissitudes in which he cast the great Imperial

---

1 Bayley, loc. cit., p. 264.
2 Ibid.
6 Bayley, loc. cit., pp. 269-70.
7 Ibid., p. 274.
army often and often, all these go to assign the real conquest to him. As regards the time when the battle actually began, what we find from the Akbar-nama of Abul-Fazl is that it commenced after the first prahara (eighth part) of the day, while the epigraph under consideration clearly speaks of it as having begun early in the morning (pragō, v. 41, A). The time as recorded here seems to be probable for, it was mid-summer of V. S. 1653 (=A.D. 1676) when this celebrated battle took place, and it would be impossible to indulge in fighting at about mid-day.

The next historical information to be met with here pertains to Karnasimha, grandson of Pratapa and son of Amarasimha, who is said to have burnt the town of Sirorîja (Sironj) which was like the heart of the lord of Delhi. Karnasimha really could not have done this rebellious deed after being enthroned as the Râja of Mewar, for then he was bound to the terms of the treaty which his father made with the Mughal emperor Jahângir. This, therefore, was an exploit of Karnasimha when he was only a crown-prince and his father was in regular warfare with the emperor. This event was contemporaneous with the period in which Jahângir, himself coming ever up to Ajmer, had whence sent his son, prince Khurram with large forces to attack Mewar and reduce the Râna. That Sironj was a town in Mâlwa and was an object of Karnasimha’s wrath, together with another town named Dhindhêra is, however, known from v. 5, canto V of the Râja-prasasti. It may be noted here that almost all Persian chronicles are silent on this point.

Karnasimha was succeeded by his virtuous son Jagatsimha to whose reign this inscription belongs. It is customary in Mewar to seat the next Râna on the throne in an informal manner, the very day on which the death of his immediate predecessor takes place. This being so, Jagatsimha’s informal accession took place in the month of Phalguna of the Vikrama year 1684 (=A.D. 1637) on the day of his father’s demise. But his coronation, with all its pomp and splendour, was celebrated on the fifth of the bright half of Vaishakha of V. S. 1684 as recorded in the present inscription (v. 49, A). Now if this year be regarded as Chaitrâdi as usual, the date of Jagatsimha’s coronation would fall before that of his father’s death. It is therefore evident that the year is to be regarded as Shravanâdi which would be Chaitrâdi 1685. Thus, Jagatsimha’s coronation took place on the fifth of the bright half of Vaishakha in V. S. 1685 (=Monday, 28th April, A.D. 1688). The only political event of his reign recorded here is the sending of his minister with a big army to subjugate his contemporary ruler of Dungarpur, Punjaja, better known as Râval Punjâ (v. 54, A). This officer, having defeated Punjâ who fled to the hills, completely ravaged the city of Dungarpur by plundering and setting fire to it. The cause of this inroad was that the rulers of Dungarpur had ceased to acknowledge the supremacy of the Rânas of Udaipur since the time of Pratâpasimha and had submitted themselves to the imperial throne of Delhi, an act which the Rânas of Udaipur were naturally disposed to resent. Jagatsimha, at last, avenged the disregard which the Râvals of Dungarpur had shown towards him and his predecessors. The name of the minister to whom was entrusted the subjugation of Punjâ is, however, not known from this record. But the event is recorded with more clarity in vv. 18-19, canto V of the Râja-prasasti, where the name of the minister occurs as Aksara (Aksahayarâja).

Turning our attention to the contents of B we find that it is a mere continuation of A, vividly describing Râna Jagatsimha’s pilgrimage to the Mûndhârî-fûrthka, the holy seat of the God Oûkânâûthea, and mentioning his acts of munificence which formed the most outstanding
character of his personality. In consultation with his family priest Rāmarūja, he, at the beginning of V. S. 1704, set out of the city in a big procession, for his projected pilgrimage to Oṅkāranātha in the Central Provinces. That day he halted on the bank of the Udayasāgara, a big artificial lake six miles east of Udaipur, constructed by Rāṇā Udasāsīnha in the period between A.D. 1559 and 1564, and passed the night in his own palace there. Thence he directed his camp on the following auspicious day towards Avantikā (Ujjain), the abode of the God Mahākāla. Having bathed in the holy Sīrpa and having visited Avantikā disregarding her ruler, he reached his destination, the bank of the Narmada with the sittha of Mandalā in the neighbourhood. His most distinguished deed of piety here, among others, was his weighing against gold on the occasion of the solar eclipse which fell on the fifteenth of the dark half of Jyāṣṭha in V. S. 1704 (=A.D. 1647, Tuesday the 22nd June), and distributing the precious metal among the people (v. 85). He erected a Tula-stambha there to commemorate this event, which even now stands there. An inscription dated in V. S. 1704, the 15th of the bright half of Āśādha (=A.D. 1647, Tuesday the 6th July), located outside the Oṅkāranātha temple, also records this pilgrimage and the allied charities of Jagatsainha. While returning he seems to have entered into some quarrel with the then viceroy of Mālwā as indicated by the text (l. 36, B). We know that by this time Mālwā had been annexed to the kingdom of Delhi and was governed by the viceroys deputed by the Moghul emperors. The name of this particular governor of Mālwā with whom Rāṇā Jagatsainha had an imbroglio is, however, not known.

Jagatsainha performed the charity of a very costly Kālpa-uriksha on the third of the bright half of Bhādrapada of V. S. 1706 (=A.D. 1648, Saturday the 26th August), the anniversary of his birthday. It had five branches below which were placed the images of the gods of the Hindu Trinity together with that of Ratnapati (the Cupid), which was the fourth. On his birthday anniversary in V. S. 1707 (=A.D. 1650), he performed the Supta-sāgara charity. On the same auspicious day of V. S. 1708 (=A.D. 1651) he gave in charity a Vīrava-chakra of (gold) replica of the globe of earth. He also gratified many Brāhmaṇas of Kāśi (Benares) with presents of gold.

In D which is but a sequel to A and B, the poet chiefly describes in detail the beauty and grandeur of the Jagannāthāraya temple erected by Rāṇā Jagatsainha. The only important event here recorded is the installation of the image of Jagannāthāraya in the temple, which was stylized as such by Jagatsainha after his own name. It took place on Thursday, the fifteenth of the bright half of Vaiśākha (Mādhava) in the Vikrama year 1709. As it was Thursday on the 15th of the bright half of the second Vaiśākha in that year, the date corresponds to A.D. 1652, Thursday the 13th May. Rāṇā Jagatsainha gave charities of a golden horse, a Kālpa-lotā of gold, a thousand cows, five fertile villages together with pieces of cloth, raw food and jewels.

1 The first known predecessor of Rāmarūja was one Sarasala, a Pallivāla Brāhmaṇa of Sānderāo in Marwar. He came to Mewar in the reign of Rāṇā Rāhappā who made him his priest as desired by the ascetic under whose treatment the Rāṇā is said to have been cured of his disease of leprosy (Rāj. Itikā, Fasc. I, p. 510). His present descendant is Amarālāl and is called bāṇa-purūṣa or a high priest.
3 Ibid., Fasc. II, p. 839. [The date given in this record is Saṅvat 1704, Tuesday in the dark half of Āśādha, Ravi-purūṣa and corresponds to Tuesday, 22nd June, A.D. 1647 when there was a solar eclipse. Therefore Šuchi in v. 85, B has to be taken as meaning the month of Āśaghā and the month as Pūrīmaṇa. —Ed.]
4 The sense here seems to be the same as indicated in v. 76, i.e., he did not pay any heed to the ruler of Mālwā through whose territory he passed. The context does not appear to indicate any conflict with the viceroy at Mālwā. —Ed.
5 A full description of this and such other charities is to be met with in the Purūṣas such as the Līgūra, Matoga, Padma, etc.
on this occasion to the Brāhmaṇas. He used to perform such charities every year in company of his brothers Garbadāsa and Śatrusimha and his sons Rājasimha and Arisimha.

He built a palace called Jagamandira with a beautiful garden attached to it, in the lake at Udaipur. The erection of this palace was first started by Karnaśimha, his father, but was brought to completion by him and called after his own name. He also built the Mūhanamandira in Karnaśagara, which is a part of the lake at Udaipur. This palace was styled after his natural son Mōhanasimha. The eight carved Tulā-sambhas that are to be seen on the left, inside the Bādi-Pōla gate, the main entrance to the palaces at Udaipur, appear from this epigraph to have been raised by this ruler to commemorate the tulā ceremonies (l. 28, D) which he performed annually for some time. He also constructed Būpa-sāgara, an artificial lake in the vicinity of Āhād. The author has, in course of his description, also touched upon the palaces built by his father Karnasimha and grandfather Amarasilimha. He, again, briefly mentions the temple of Śrī Ekaliṅga jī and a keli-mandira built there by Jatatesimha, the temple of the goddess Rāṭhāśenā on the top of a hill in the neighbourhood of Ekliṅgi, the Udaya-sāgara, the goddess Ambikā in the village of Jawar and the silver mines there. The temple of Ekaliṅga jī is here believed to have been built by Mōkala, but we know from the Śrīṅgi-pāli inscription that it was only the rampart round its site that was built by this prince and not the temple itself.

With regard to C it has already been stated that it is an independent epigraph belonging to the early years of the reign of Rājasimha, the son of Jatatesimha, and was fixed in the temple at a later date. As an independent inscription it opens with the genealogy of the Rūpas of Mewār very little beyond whose names has been mentioned here. It begins with Bāpā and ends with Rājasimha, the intervening princes being the same as mentioned in A.

Rājasimha’s coronation took place on the second day of the dark half of Phālguna in V. S. 1709 (A. D. 1652, Monday the 1st March), although he informally ascended the throne, as usual, on the fourth day of the dark half of Kārttika (Wednesday the 24th November) of the same year, the date of his father’s demise. Soon after his informal accession he went to Ekliṅgi on the fifth day of the bright half of Mārgaśirṣa and weighed himself against gold and jewels. This weighing of the body against jewels is recorded by Rai Bahadur Ojha to be the only example of its kind ever recorded in the whole of India. Another fragmentary inscription recording Rājasimha’s weighing against jewels at Ekliṅgi was found there by Ojha which is now preserved in the Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur. When he was only a crown-prince, he weighed himself against gold on the 15th day of the bright half of Vaiśākhā in V. S. 1705 (A. D. 1648, Thursday the 27th April) at the holy site of Śukara-kaḥtrā on the bank of the Ganges. In the Vikrama year 1707 (A. D. 1650) he, as a crown-prince, built a palace for himself near the lake, which was decorated with fine paintings. No trace of this kaumāra-saundha or prince’s palace is visible now for, on that very site was erected the modern Sambhū-nivāsa palace by Mahārāṇa Sambhusimha (A. D. 1861-74). The only remnant of the former is a small old building nearby, called kunvarpadon ki chhatri. On the thirteenth day of the dark fortnight of Mārgaśirṣa in V. S. 1710 (A. D. 1653, Thursday the 22nd December), he gave away eighty maidens in marriage. He also set up a lovely garden and erected a beautiful palace which is now identified with the Sabarata-vilasa (Sarvarat-vilasa), situated in the south-east corner of the city. He brought to completion the erection of the four small temples dedicated to Śiva, Gānapati, Śrīya and Śakti situated outside the main Jagannāthahrāya temple. The inscription under description

3 Above, Vol. XXIII, pp. 231-2.  
4 Ibid., n. 2.
mainly stands to record the erection of these four temples which were not apparently ready at the time of the consecration of the main shrine.

The poet who composed these epigraphs and his family, the masons who built the temple of Jagannāthārāya also called here Rāṇā-śreṇa, and the overseer under whose superintendence it was erected, find mention in the concluding lines of these records. We know from them that the name of the poet was Lakṣhmīnātha, better known as Bāṇu Bhaṭṭa. He was a Tailāṅga Brāhmaṇa and the designation of his lineage was Kaṭhaṅḍī after his original home in the village of that name. His genealogical tree for eight generations from these epigraphs is as follows:

Bhāskara, his son Mādhava, his son Rāmachandra, his son Sarvēśvara, his son Lakṣhmīnātha, his son Rāmacandra, his son Krishṇabhāṭṭa, his son Lakṣhmīnātha or Bāṇu, the author.

From B we find that the author's great-grandfather Lakṣhmīnātha was a contemporary of Rāṇā Udayasimha as well as of Amarasiṃha, his grandson, both of whom bestowed upon him, as a token of favour, the villages named Bhravāḍā and Holi respectively. Krishṇabhāṭṭa the father of the author, received a costly horse named Ṇignāraja from Mahārāṇa Jagatasiṃha which was exchanged by the prince for Rs. 4,000. On his birth-day anniversary, the third of the bright half of Bhādrapada in V. S. 1706 (= A.D. 1649, Thursday the 13th September), Rāṇā Jagatasiṃha performed the "golden earth" charity and donated the village named Bhāṁśadā near Chitor, to the same person. On the same day of V. S. 1709 (= A.D. 1652, Friday the 10th September), he performed the charity of Rātna-dhenu. He also gave to Madhusūdana Šarmā a piece of land measuring two ikṣu in the village of Ṣadā (Aghāsapura or Āṣapura of inscriptions) bordering on the city of Udaipur. The recipient of this land also appears to belong to the family of our poet and seems to be the father of Rāpaṭhāṣa Pāṭhaṭa, the author of the Rājapurāṇa, who also was a Tailāṅga Brāhmaṇa and belonged to the same lineage, Kaṭhaṅḍī.

The masons who erected the temple of Jagannāthārāya were Sūtraḍāra Mukunda (Mukunda) and his younger brother Bhūḍhara, sons of Bhāna or Bhāna and grandsons of Rāṇā. They belonged to the family of the masons known as Bhāṅgāra or Bhāṅgāra. Rāṇā Jagatasiṃha gave a gold and a silver yard to Mukunda and Bhūḍhara respectively, in appreciation of their work, and a village named Dēvadāna (modern Dēvāda) in the vicinity of Chitor. The inscription on C was engraved by Vā<Bā>gāḥa, son of Mukunda.

The superintendent or the overseer in charge of the construction of the temple was one Arjuna, Panḍhori by caste, whose family designation was Gughāvata. The names of his father and grand father were Kalā and Ačhala respectively.

It may be pointed out here that according to Rai Bahadur Ojhā, the author of these inscriptions was Krishṇabhāṭṭa, but as we have already seen, his son Bāṇu, otherwise known as Lakṣhmīnātha was the real author. Similarly, he regards Bhāṇa and his elder son Mukunda to be the chief masons who erected the temple, but in reality Mukunda and his younger brother Bhūḍhara were the chief architects. He also reads the name of Arjuna's father as Kamala, which is
distinctly Kālā. This may be due to his reliance on the imperfect transcript of the records alluded to by me on p. 67, n. 1, above.

Lastly, a word regarding the geographical places mentioned in the inscriptions will not be out of place. In 1. 16 of B, Rāṇa Jagatśinīha and his company are described to have bathed in the confluence of Rśvī and Kāverī. This is not possible for Kāverī is in far south. The villages of Bhairīsaḍā and Dēvādaha are known from the very text to be near Chitor, and those of Bhūravāḍā and Hōli are in Rājanagar and Girvā districts respectively.

TEXT:

A.

1 "... śīmāmaṇḍapatyā nāma: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā nāma: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā nāma: ...

2 "... gṛṇaputraṃ śīmaṃśīmaṇḍapatyā dīraṇa kāraṇa: ... tathāpi śīmaṃśīmaṇḍapatyā: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā: ...

3 "... śīmaṃśīmaṇḍapatyā: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā: ...

4 "... śīmaṃśīmaṇḍapatyā: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā: ...

5 "... śīmaṃśīmaṇḍapatyā: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā: ...

6 "... śīmaṃśīmaṇḍapatyā: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā: ... śīkṣāśīmaṇḍapatyā: ...

---

1 [The places where Jagatśinīha bathed is apparently the confluence of two rivers not far from the temple of Oṁkārapī, one of which is the Narmaṇḍ and the other locally known as the Kāverī.—Ed.]
2 Transcribed from the original slabs and compared with the impressions.
3 Occasionally lines begin and end with one or two daśas which are superfluous.
4 In this inscription the half verse has often been indicated by two daśas instead of one.
5 Metro: Upanīta.
6 Metro: Anuśāsāna.
7 Metro: Pārśāvāśa.
8 Metro: Gītī.
7 \\n   \text{त्रिया} गृहतिः \text{जनन}\\n   \text{वृत्तिः सप्तगम्यकर्मिष्ट} \text{[वा]ऽपूर्वं तं किल दारि}-\\n   \text{पालव} (\text{यम}) \text{॥}\\n8  \text{राज्य प्रदाता} पुरुषं \text{ले} \text{बलवत्स्वाकारदेखकालिंग} \text{॥}\\n   \text{तनः}\\n   \text{प्रश्निः} \text{नृपस्वामिः हस्तम्} \text{दुन्दजत} \text{॥}\\n9  \text{च} \text{भुवि} \text{राज्यविति} \text{॥}\\n   \text{राजस्यरणिणि} \text{नस्य} \text{वृत्ति} \text{राणेश्व} \text{प्रचारणे}\\n   \text{प्रत्युत्तोष्णः} (\text{वस्म}) \text{॥}\\n   \text{रणणे} \text{ि} \text{त्याने} \text{लिङ्गमित्रो} \text{राज्यो} (\text{वस्म}) \text{ि} \text{॥}\\n10  \text{तुर्भू} \text{वर्जनाथ} \text{श्रद्धाः} \text{॥}\\n   \text{वर्जने} \text{वर्जनायदयकार} \text{रणे} \text{श्रद्धेषु} \text{भृगुप्त} \text{विन} \text{॥}\\n   \text{राणमवर्जनः} \text{पुष्करमुखीं} \text{भृगुस्तुरकरण} \text{नरवर्तवः} \text{॥}\\n11  \text{समुरुतीयिः ततः} \text{वियज्ञकारपन्याय सुनिधनम्} \text{॥} °\text{राणारिकोधिपः}\\n   \text{सक्षमते} \text{सेव याः} \text{॥}\\n   \text{काय्यम् संगतयाह्य न स्वदं} \text{काय्यमुसूदः} \text{॥} °\text{भृगुप्तः}\\n12  \text{कार्यमुखजनकारमितिः} \text{पशुः} \text{॥}\\n   \text{परं} \text{कचु(कचु)} \text{तत} \text{न राज्यापि} \text{भोग-}\\n   \text{वतुः} \text{॥} °\text{नागपालभवपूर्वी} \text{विष्णु सुज्ज्वलकः} \text{॥} \text{दिम्मा(द्र)गृहिण्यनागाणां}\\n   \text{पालनायक्षानः} \text{॥} °\text{चर्ये}\\n13  \text{चारणाः पानाः} \text{पूर्णम्} \text{पालूमुक्षम्} \text{॥} \text{वनाथचारिकारपा} \text{श्रवणातन्त्राकारपी} \text{विलेच्छ} (\text{विलेच्छ}) \text{ि} \text{भृगुपुराम्}\\n14  \text{शिष्यम् संगते} \text{थे} \text{पद्धति} \text{॥} \text{कदाचिं} \text{समकालं भविः} \text{नवयते} \text{थ} \text{वधाप्रा} \text{पाय} \text{प्रकाशमेवमिस्व न(न)एतासुकाराकारकत्वेन जात} \text{॥} °\text{यज्ञे} \text{क्रीयये} \text{ि} \text{तत} \text{सिः} \text{॥}\\n15  \text{क्रियाविवेचनः} \text{जयसिः} \text{चमाधयः} \text{॥} \text{कर्माचारकेलः} \text{रजः} \text{संज्ञाजये} \text{थे} \text{॥} °\text{क्षरमालाः} \text{ि} \text{वर्जने} \text{ि} \text{भृगुपुराम्} \text{॥} °\text{अधिसिधिः} \text{ि} \text{गते} \text{वनविधिः} \text{केशगति} \text{ि} \text{सेवः} \text{परे} \text{शुद्धिबिन्दः} \text{श्रव्यनिद-}
16 ई: कैचिन्ही रावणः। देवनाथ नवीन सिद्धपुष्पः। तवेत् श्रवणंह्यप्राभ्रेष्मणः। एव किमभूमीः। स सामान्यः। ॥२१॥  धा(च)कारवाची समवा विषयः।

17 शारीन्द्र यथौचिं यथसः। गुणादिभ्यमित्वात्। महान्। राजा तत्वोदयसौति। विन्दः। ॥२२॥ हर्कारवाची किल कौपवजी सा सेवकी(च)जाति। खलु मौर्यवाचा। ॥ प्रवेशः ॥

18 मेति भ्रोमादमा व(च)सुर सुराजा जगतीकारमणिः। ॥२४॥ पवतोन्द्रवतापि खस्तुने विश्रमितः। श्रवणः। ॥ कैसेरु मेंदानः। यथेतरं शंकसबधरमेवत्। ॥२५॥ प्रेक्षा (च) सेवकी(च)प।

19 निर्माणादि गुत्य वल्लभोरुप्यं विद्वाय विषिदकल्य दिनासानाम् वेदाशिको भृस्मोऽद्यः। ॥ चलला तात्वंवीर्यः जीविकानाम् रेवभूमिः। कृष्ण जीवित श्वास्त्रानि ता्

20 नि ददया जिन न विजुष्ठो दद्ये। ॥२६॥ प्रव्यर्थः। ईश्वरं विसंघानी मा विषयम् वपवाहि दद्ये। ॥२७॥ मां धर्मस्य सतादेव मूर्त्यं लघुसंगमिति। जिन' ददयं वाधावूः। ॥२८॥

21 पुत्रसम्यवसामानः दुर्गो दलैव एढात्। वल्लभोरुप्यं संज्ञानं श्रवणेऽस्म्ययं (यम) ॥२९॥  युस्मः। ॥ मकारवाची विख्याति विश्वलकारवाची शिशो दुर्गायाः। ॥

22 शाश्वानामनि मेहति बानतीत्रान्दूरस्यकविकालामभूमि। ॥२३॥१० व्रीक्षमोभमित सृष्टिमयि श्रीकमकाणिः तुद्य। गायणां घोरात्मस्यदग्निः सहाद्वा।

23 चिन्नश्रवणिः। भौम च श्रुतिसारसारि। विपुराणी भृत्यं निनयाय चर्यं नीच। चिन्त तदिशत्थित वल्लुष्मयामूः प्रमाणः। चन्दाकास्ताम्य(ताम) ॥३०॥ कांतं कर्तं जगान्तुः। यथावसानं।

1. नाम: सीर्दिलालक्रिष्ट्या।
2. नाम: उपजाति।
3. नाम: उपद्रववर्त्ता।
4. नाम: अनुशंकुः।
5. नाम: अयस्त्रेव।
6. नाम: धर्मस्य सतादेव।
7. नाम: आस्त्रात्रान्ति।
8. नाम: वार्तालाम्बिक।
9. नाम: तदृशत्थित।
10. नाम: वल्लुष्मयामूः प्रामाण्याः। चन्दाकास्ताम्य(ताम)।

* This word seems to have been used here to show that the preceding two verses have got the unity of description, and not that they form one grammatical sentence.
* This mark of punctuation is unnecessary.
24. विचि. "नावनामात्रा भूवालिा चोक(च्छ)सुध्दर्मण(नम)। 11। हिए (हिए) देवीमुत्तर शीतलावचलेतमिति। छेखश पाकोझ: किमि जड़ लहस्त(क्र) न किए दैऽ। 12। मिरो।

25. देवा न रच्चा: सुरपस्मर्वत: कुमारिमें पृतीहार रच्चा था कुंभराजा चरित्रभव विश्वामपवर्तकलेत्तुसे। सकारात्मक सक्षापमक दिनमहूऽपतिरातीकावश्य नीया।

26. न केिन दिन त्योविहृष्ट कोवत(व)नष्टि कोवितियं कुंम: 13। चुखाश्रेण- (च्छ) भक्तपुष्पाभिवर्धिणि प्राभविन्धिणोकैकुंम्बराजुपामतवस्तुसंस्कृ।

27. हथ्य सुध्दर्मण(नम)। कालीकालिकात्म प्रतिपदचलि कुमरेचे निधायो विभाविण वैषमचारण प्रिसाधकलशुकुनी जीवयामय वेदि: 14। नेत्रे सीने च कुमं प्र.

28. दक्षद्वयुगे पादूकानि वामांचि संहि सच्चे प्रकृति गुरुस्मनकस्म वामम संगर्भज्ञानम्। छेखण हूऽहि कर्ण शुभि वरदंंदन दुरवमनं ग्राहकं पद्मनावान्नारेत् अगः।

29. नि जयति को राजमथुम सुह्म: 15। सर्वपि सितं सुखिनो महविषि न गारिमासून च्ययनुभाष:। सिद्धान्तमस्तिं धोषियौवैन: परस्त्वभोग्यविदुहामा।

30. तत्तान 16। भूताना: कहाँपुचिणि नागम नापत्रन महपीत्य भूति। कवरम्य वर्त्तर राजमथुपस्म सिति चार्धकामि रति च 17। सीति वागमहीपिति: कसत।

31. श् योमंधक्याध्यायसुद्धाम् यवनेष्ठर सुधर्मं द(व)थ्याम(ह)सरकलम्भप:। द(व)-थ्याम(ह)यथा समद्वशानमलुमूं चोक(च्छ)विवुषी श्वरव जितव मद्यमुरस्ततमन: क्षीवीमि।

32. विचि०भवतं 18। से श्रेय: पवित्रस्वतं ज्ञामकवरि: चिरित(तिसि)। 19। न किं कीनकरो भूवाप्राथाधीतिभवत(तम) 20। सदौत्विनी आश्चर्य प्रतापी लकें च कहो। अयतानकर्षणं।

2. In connection with kusāka (the jar), ochala-chētan should be taken to mean earth or clay, for potters generally dig it out for their purpose from the interior (heart) of mounds; and for that very reason it is also cool (Aītāna).
6. The word iti is superfluous considering the metre.
7. To make it historically correct, we may arrange this verse as श्रेय श्रेयाः।
8. Metro: Śrīvatiśekṣita.
9. The word Aksaraka may also represent Aksaraka for the implied sense.
33 ते न संयोगऽक न चाष्मा। [[१८]]°४५° हला करे खुदायां ख्यात(व)ज्ञानो प्रतापविनुः समुपागते प्रणुः सा खड्किता। मानवति हिन्दुस्मुः। संकोचयती चौरण पुराज्जुः° ॥६३°° वाति मन्विनः। ।

34 अनुस्यान विषुद्वा समाख्या। व्रीमिति वज्रत: किन्। भूमो समस्येवस्मेव। धुमस्ता संकुक्क(च्च)क्ष्मामाय स्राव करे हला ॥५८°° वदा चालापा: अरणिण: प्रतितेष्टि यस्त सर्व करण सिं। ।

35 चति पदे सूदेव। यं खुश्चिन्हं नरपालसस्योपहि भुजते दृढ्या व(व)शोकतः। (लम) ॥४५°° जानो भूमारुद्धट्टायस्वागुस्कपक्षायविज्ञमभेना। अथोहाती सदा। सोहद्र द्विजः। ।

36 कुलस्यागी: पालयन(य)स्त्रीसहसि। जाना: श्रीमधुसुबद्धांज देश वनदी वागवाय चार्मच्छुन्ति(कित्व)ला ख्यासुनंदाधितिकः। चन्द्रित नुवान: निः विवृत्ति लोकोत्तरीण:° ॥४५°° राजायोजः। ।

37 श्रीकिशोर: स्थानिकः। चिन्तितकुञ्जतिकः। वास्यार्य। [च]हरिणो वर्णवायामस्में वृत्तिक वाकयान। सख(क्र)नामं निरोधः(प्रम)°। निला दण्डा सिरेणः। विक्षितः। समस्येः करा।।

38 छा: [च]मस्ता: प्रतिरियविशसुमुहुम्बित्तानुपूणाः। ॥४५°° वधभशनवादुवा। यत्यदांति मृदु। भूण्या। सुकमस्या सुकमस्या। लुधिति। ॥ शुक्लमधुसुबद्धारितागाच यं भूपसिंहं। चार्मरेवी(च)ज्ञः। ।

39 य[न]° ॥४५°° चार्मच्छुन्ति कार्याण्यांवितिकः। (तिक)सामिधः। प्रसुः। संविधीप: स्मृतिनारायणसुभुतम्। सुबीत्तिर इङ्गारण। ॥४५°° भाषा(वाद)नूः। चौमो बालिचारी। जलमाता। विभाजः। ।

40 ° पु[ज्ञः]: [च]हरिणो विन्यासः। पंचवेदमय:। प्रसुः। ॥४५°° वर्ष वैद्यास्ताक्षरितविद्वर्ती। सावधे शुभावे पंचवं राजविश्रेणां करण्यति। गुप्त:। श्रीमालासमुपुः।। देः। ।

41 वा: [समु]शृद्धिस्या। द्वारवेद दुःखया। पामरभाषानाग्नानोति। विशालमृती। द्वारतरस्यं नैव। शेष:। कुऽतोः° ॥४५°° समभागो विसहवृङ्गो शिरस्समविवक्। ।

¹ Metre: Anuvakta.
² This verse is cited by Rai Bahadur Ojha. (Raj. Hist., Fasc. II, p. 753, n. 1)
³ Metre: Upajati.
⁴ Cha was included first which was afterwards turned into ba.
⁵ Metre: Sraghara.
⁶ The medial s was first engraved short which was made long afterwards.
42 सिन्धुः सुजनमिषिनन्दनां निन्ज्याश्निनीकां (क) ।
43 तद्व(क) तद्विन्ना सुन्दरानां श्रीपन्नानमां (म) ॥ ॥
44 निन्ज्याश्निनीकां वगवान निन्ज्याश्निनीकां (स) ॥
45 चन्द्र(क) चन्द्रिकानं सुलभान्तिङ्गमिव (त) ॥
46 चन्द्र(क) चन्द्रिकानं सुलभान्तिङ्गमिव (त) ॥
47 चन्द्र(क) चन्द्रिकानं सुलभान्तिङ्गमिव (त) ॥
48 चन्द्र(क) चन्द्रिकानं सुलभान्तिङ्गमिव (त) ॥
49 चन्द्र(क) चन्द्रिकानं सुलभान्तिङ्गमिव (त) ॥
50 पि द्र(क) ॥ कर्तव्यास्थ्री मृतां कर्तव्यास्थ्री मृतां (व) ॥

---

1. Metro: Śrīpālā.
2. Sukhā-pāla is a kind of palanquin, having obtained which Śrīva is stated to have no desire for any other conveyances.
4. The meditā was first engraved short which was made long afterwards.
5. The anuvāda is very faint.
6. This verse is quoted by Rāi Bahadur Ojha. (Rāj. iïkb, Fasc. II, p. 833, n. 1)
51 [०]: स्तूपम् भृषा॥ विफलं तदवैशा शिर् शिरकृतमिभिः मिः चति धृवं दधि ॥ ५१॥ मूर्ति पद्मले व्यक्तियों मस्तिताया बिरकामालकासं देवीमूर्तविण्यः-

52 रसि च [२०]। भोजिनाः: सवेती॥ श्रीप्राणो श्रीरहु स्तुतिसंशिषित: स्नोतका: 'प्रीतिपथ प्रभृमा तब्रीसीलिनो शमरघनमैनस्तायाम् भि शान्ति: ॥ ५२॥ स्वासिष्टयाः: वखम।

53 मांदराट्स:। गृहनिर्वानशुद्धेऽसि: संलयं श्रवणनुदानविव (ब) लघु भामिक-लघुनाहो (क्षण)॥ वेदि: कलाशिने देव जिनकरकिणी रोहवतीदेव मध्ये प्रकर्मबृह॥

54 कोषिनां वयस्ति नवमवं वेष्टन्न वारिणी। ॥ ५४॥ विद्यासान् दश वेद्या मेव- दर्शनात जात वस्तु जातिः: शिपं नंब्रुण निर्यितकोषिनो विचिन घाता कर्त-(तम)।

55 इत्य चिन्तयता चिरं नृपाजलिकं पुने: पश्चात्त इव इवत तत्वेव जनमालभाषकौषधिमित्र (चिक) दा ज्ञाते ॥ ५५॥। चक्रप्रेमाकेशालविव वु (उ) धिष्ठयो शुपुताविव- स्तम्भात्ता लान्याहेः।

56 यु साधि इव सदस्य कविव कोषपुर्णप्रतिव: (ब)। संधा। भाजो रसेन लिजापि- साधियो साधियो साधियो साधियो साधियो: सुचिकारविव चतुरिश्चिम जीयः: शतावः: ॥ ५६॥।। लूकारण कुर्कराजेन-

57 करा [२०]। या: इव कीर्तनं सूर्याः: सुविश तेषी कारिणे कस्तन ने क्षेत्रः। ऐं भोजोदसंविचियो जनांस्विचिय तत्तत्वयुता: इवके कारणाम् वशः- वस्त्रेन का: वा सुतिस्स्वतो (तम) ॥ ५७॥।।

58 संगोग:। मांदराजातसम्प्रविकल्पोऽ:। चुर्जाधा दो भाणा नति:। श्रीसुकं (चु) दो वस्त्रः। बहुतस्य वित्ती।: यामान्य: ग्राम:। पदती हतिपुनिनी कर्जीविज्ञिनहूँप्रेत्वी।

1 This word has been repeated by mistake and has to be omitted.
2 Metre: Upanātī of Vaitālīga and Aspoonkhandasāla.
3 Read 'ramadina.
4 Pra is incoined over an engraved śrua.
5 Metre: Sragdhārā.
6 Read 'dambhāhādi' sota. The word vamārpa is used here in the sense of 'milky way'.
7 Metre: Sādālāvartina.
8 Read 'jursi'. A narrow medial i is also to be seen joined to vi.
89 सी[वर्णरोगी (का)] कारण इह क्षात्रियाण (म) पदिति। राजाय श्रीमद्भण्डकाकामिति 
संक्षेपित हुए (म)। नामावधार करें। श्रीमद्भण्डकाकामिति। तथाया श्रीमद्भण्डकाकामिति। 
हुए (तं)। [१६२८]

B.

1 श्रीमणे श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न। श्रीमणे श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न। 
हुए (म)। श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न। तथा श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न।

2 चर राजाय श्रीमणे श्री (म) व मायत (र) तीर्थशासनं। तथे कदां लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न्। 
श्रीमणे श्री (म) व मायत (र) तीर्थशासनं। तथे कदां लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न्। 
हुए (म)। श्रीमणे श्री (म) व मायत (र) तीर्थशासनं। तथे कदां लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न्।

3 श्रीमणे श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न। तथा श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न। 
हुए (म)। श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न। तथा श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न।

4 नास्तदव्यान्मा नास्तदव्यान्मा नास्तदव्यान्मा। उवाच श्रीमणे श्री (म) व मायत (र) 
अवश्य। श्रीमणे श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न। तथा श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न।

5 नास्तदव्यान्मा नास्तदव्यान्मा नास्तदव्यान्मा। उवाच श्रीमणे श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पন्न। 
हुए (म)। श्रीमणे श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न। तथा श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न।

6 श्री का चन्द्रभण्डकाकामिति ग्रंथ दु:ख। श्रीमणे श्री (म) व मायत (र) तीर्थशासनं। 
हुए (म)। श्रीमणे श्री (म) व मायत (र) तीर्थशासनं। तथा कदां लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न।

7 श्रीमणे श्री (ग) व लक्षणार्थकालोत्पन्न। 

---

1 Metre: Śrṣṭā.  
2 Read Chitrā (कित्तर) व च प्रथम.  
3 Read Śrī.  
4 Metre: Ugrā.  
5 Two letters, i.e., saṃgha are to be seen engraved here, but are cancelled.  
6 Space for one letter is left blank between these two syllables.  
7 A cancelled sati is to be seen engraved before stī.  
8 Either dissolve veṣā or (amodā) dattā, or regard rāja as the instrumental singular of the base rāja.  
9 Metre: Śrṣṭā.  
10 The saṃgha sign is faintly visible.
8 व:व(व) पुरुषोत्तर नवपहा चव हय: संवीयाति निषिध:(प:)
1189. वार्षिक: कुनीके: निषिधमधः यस्य महुःना;
809. पद्मातिरत्नाति चवः सुनिवः वयः
820. पद्मातिरत्नाति चवः सुनिवः वयः
821. पद्मातिरत्नाति चवः सुनिवः वयः
821. पद्मातिरत्नाति चवः सुनिवः वयः

9 व:व(व) नवपहा चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः

10 व:व(व) पुरुषोत्तर नवपहा चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः

11 व:व(व) पुरुषोत्तर नवपहा चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः

12 व:व(व) पुरुषोत्तर नवपहा चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः

13 व:व(व) पुरुषोत्तर नवपहा चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः

14 व:व(व) पुरुषोत्तर नवपहा चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः

15 व:व(व) पुरुषोत्तर नवपहा चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः

16 व:व(व) पुरुषोत्तर नवपहा चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः
821: चवः सुनिवः वयः

1 वर्ण: विनोढ़िति।
2 वर्ण: विनोढ़िति।
3 वर्ण: विनोढ़िति।
4 वर्ण: विनोढ़िति।
5 वर्ण: विनोढ़िति।

The syllable seems to be engraved over an erasure.

1 Metropolitan: Śaṅkulaśāsana.
2 Metropolitan: Śrāvṇaḥ.
3 Metropolitan: śūnikaḥ.
4 Metropolitan: Upanātipātha.
5 The syllable is engraved over the line.
17 जन कान्तसमग्यः ॥ ८१॥। अधात दाराद्विभुतिःप्रभारितत्वा भाषा ॥ जलतापमोहम्-
पावानान्तःसिद्धान्तमोहन्यायः ॥ ८१॥। समानी : सुभाजनानिन्यानसुभि:
18 स्वते ॥ समानी : सुभोजितां हिवारविविधसिद्धिः (सम) ॥ ८१॥। चतुर्भुजायुगविना-
वामि स्वेतःसिद्धिः ॥ महाराजायुगबिंदुः कांचनय तुला वधातु ॥ ८१॥।
19 चर श्रृवङ्गदुलासाय (सम) ॥ महाराजायुगबिंदुः कांचनय तुला वधातु ॥ ८१॥।
धिरायुगप्रतिनामादतु ॥ स्वराजकोषान्तरारुप धियातु धिरायुगपुषुपुर्वी
विलयां खः
20 यद्यमात् ॥ नेवे पूर्वार्थक तेन समानी भूतता दृष्टः पुनः प्रिया भूतता
पलावानगण्येण चतुर्भुजायुगाधियोगः ॥ ८८॥। वैभवार्धते भूवेष्टिनेहि दु:खः
कुलेन्द्र तथा ॥
21 च्यः चारा वारा मायो हिवारविनिपु पुरा खर्चाः सिद्धिः (सम) ॥ वैनिसां च मयं
रूप [नाम] ॥ द्रोः साधारणयु छोटानी (वै) इसामसयुवी विनयत चीरायुगिंशः
प्रसः ॥ ८५॥। महासानी (वै) महागमम्
22 श्वहेतुमार्गमार्ग यद्याधियम् ॥ स्नातिकिर्ति तात सुषुक न क्षुड्डाकालः (क्ष) न ॥
कार्याय (वम) ॥ ८५॥। जगविंश तहसर चित्तान्त्वविद्यात् चित्तान्त्वविद्यातव चि
क तेन चित्तान्त्वविद्यात् चित्तान्त्वविद्यात् चित्तान्त्वविद्यात् चित्तान्त्वविद्यात्
समः
23 ॥ ८५॥। श्वहेतुमार्गमार्ग चतुर्भुजायुगविनाय विनायक ॥ सर्व लाभायिि गाम्बेकालः (क्ष) 
सिद्धांताय मार्गायाम ॥ ८५॥। न हि चापावनसीत न परायामार्गायामः
कार्यायिि न गुणाद्विद्व (वै) न
24 श्वहेतुमार्गमार्ग यद्याधियम् ॥ ८५॥। कामार्गसद्वयमार्गमार्ग विनायकः [१०] श्वेतमार्गः
समायु जगसिद्धिः महीपितः ॥ ८५॥। जगविंश तहसर चित्तान्त्वविद्यातव
25 श्वहेतुमार्गमार्ग यद्याधियम् ॥ ८५॥। कामार्गसद्वयमार्गमार्ग विनायकः [१०] श्वेतमार्गः
समायु जगसिद्धिः महीपितः ॥ ८५॥। तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी
तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी
तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी
तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी
तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी
तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी
तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी
तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी
तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी
तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी
तपायामी तपायामी तपायामी

1 Metro: Amantaupakh.
2 Metro: Upagita.
3 The syllable seems to be engraved over an erasure. 4 Metro: Pramāṇita.
5 First sin was engraved which was then corrected into sīma.
6 Metro: Sārāsālvārdhita.
7 Metro: Gṛihāṇa.
8 The expression means Śaṅkha Jyēṣṭha-mañḍaya Amā Amā-śīthi (the fifteenth of the dark fortnight of Jyēṣṭha), on which day Jagatāśrīthā actually ascended the scales; and it also means śaṅkha gṛihāṇa mantra ramātā lakṣātin, (the wealth of summer) in correspondence with Kanyā-sampat (the wealth of the sixth sign of the zodiac) of the first pāda. [See p. 62, n. 3 above.—Ed.]
26 भृगोऽदित(तः) || देवा नागा समुःज्ञेत्। व्रुधा समापि || भृगु लामकर्मणीया सामाधिक्रिया सिता भृगु लामकर्मणीय महावर्तिनी || मैत्रीकुपोषये

27 कृष्णांश्वत्वः लक्ष्यमं सेवयस्य || न्यायमं भवेऽववता च | श्रियम् || देवोऽति || देवोऽति समापि || भृगु लामकर्मणीय महावर्तिनी || मैत्रीकुपोषये

28 तिः बृहिपतिः निनाथा यदंतकलिका विवाहा || भृगु लामकर्मणीय महावर्तिनी विवाहा || भृगु लामकर्मणीय महावर्तिनी विवाहा || भृगु लामकर्मणीय महावर्तिनी विवाहा || भृगु लामकर्मणीय महावर्तिनी विवाहा || भृगु लामकर्मणीय महावर्तिनी विवाहा ||

29 तागड़ेः || दिवंगतस्वयंवरोपास्यं बलीकर्ता रूढः सुभृति चापते विवशया || भृगु लामकर्मणीय महावर्तिनी विवाहा ||

30 मर्मरेश्वरेण कपिलाधिपति के पा(प्र)पित(तम) [१०] त्यात्मनुभितपापांगकुमरिः सम्मद्ध सूत्रात्तिशायाः वस्मुः महावर्तिः || भृगु लामकर्मणीय महावर्तिनी विवाहा ||

31 तत्तथे स्वर्ण देशे ब्राह्मणेव देशायो विवशयनुवत व्रुधा अनन्ये किं देशे || 

32 ततः सुरवर्णमानवलोकीयाः करारमिश्रवाय पवल || संप्रदाय स्वर्ण भवेऽववता चर्मे || सुः महावर्तिस्वाधीने ||

33 स्य क्रिकेनुः परिवर्तमन्त्राम | पाथोजस्यमेकैः भवेऽववता चर्मे || संप्रदायः भवेऽववता चर्मे || संप्रदायः भवेऽववता चर्मे ||

---

1 Metre: Anwahpah.
2 The syllable is engraved over the line.
3 Metre: Sindhojikritah.
4 Metre: Indraveşvära.
5 Read *man-ahā.
6 There is an erased vertical line before *drā.
7 Metre: Upajātī.
8 This syllable seems to be engraved over an erasure.
34 मृत्युः। "दल(ठ)" सुबीशम सुभाषिताय गा वर्णोऽयाय वसविवारी:[[१०]]
1०६१। रेगुंगोळोळ भर्ग्म गवाधानसनादिका(कम) [१०] विष्णुरावत देवो भूप
स्त्रीक्ष्याता सहस्रहूः। १०४०। देवः वितियन साधारणित(स)धर्मजान भू-
35 पिंढवतस्त्वादिवर्त्य म्भयाकथणुः। मार्गः पि छांभुक्त: तन्बोंसपंस्यैनन्यसपातातिन्नुः
प्रमदेश संजयः। १०४५। गाम्यसत्यसुखी पवित्रमध्ये गातः देवी विजयाराय
सुवर्णः। वर्षान्य कन्हकरी रसमेका
36 संतनविद्वा संविदा च पारीः। १०४६। तथा जियः सुदीनः। चिन्तीडः समाय
शब्दाचार्याधिकारीक्षमः। "दला(ठ)" गता सुमुखः चिलः। समागाञ्जः पुरो इन्द्रे-
संप्रदातः, सहायः। १०४७। माता प्राणामिव चित्राङ्ग, इक्षुमिव ची.
37 पीखरा नामवैद्यग्रीषम कम्बलवा। गणने[१०] देवी(ठ) देवी(ठ) यान चालान(नम)। देवी
बामुणि युः। प्रतिव्रत जातो। महाशाक्ते, काला बच(च)रंगितः। चम। सुरवते
राजार्तिकांसे। पुमानः। १०४८। चर्च विजयाक्षुकाभिनविविन्ते।
38 न्यः स्वार्धः ब्रह्मचर्य कार्यां नयनः। सुवादुभारवः परिपालनाधिकारः
सत्काराय विद्यायां कलयति भूवि यो। स्मृतमेडी
शुगोलः वीर्यः मसहे देवः तदुः
39 मुलाणान(न) हिराकान्तावपैः। मौलिकः शाक्तिकायाय सक्षात्तमतुः। चेतु(च)समाय
शब्दांविभागः। सुगुणकुषावर्दिग्निगृहीतमोहसूक्तकः। वंचागः। १०४९। चर्चा
कृष्णसिप विष्णुसदस्य रतिपति। खाना
40 तिता गो नाचे। सोयं स्वाक्षः सृष्टिश्चित्रतवत्तीति। महाकालिकस्तारः। वा(वा)-
शाचिरे(क)सर्विचिरे। समुद्रितयुः। वेंडमारे लीलीयां प्रायः प्रायः वज्राः
केशवहस्तिनः सर्वविश्वायः। १०५०।[१०] खाना
41 वालसुण्त्वाध(ह) जानः। कल्पतुः। श्रासी। समकालिकचारसामग्री वि(च) समग्रः
देवः। १०५१। भागामसहासपवनेनादिरोहडः। सर्वशास्त्रस्तिक्षानीनायः।
कंडी(क)कीति। १०५२। वृषिद्रोहः। १०५३।}

1 Metro : Upajāti.
2 Metro : Vasumatiabā.
3 Read īdāntātāh.
4 Metro : Indrāvajra.
5 Read "prabhadāh.
6 There is a cancelled anuvāra over vpa.
7 Read "śālāhāri.
8 Metro : Anuṣṭhūḥ.
9 Metro : Sūgata.
10 Va is engraved below the line.
11 Metro : śāndisūkṣmaśānta.
12 Metro : Śrūpāhārā.
13 Metro : Upajita.
42 याको वि सुरवाक्षः । दस्तोमृता यामो श्रीजीनामायायमरसिंमयः।।१२८५॥
लक्ष्मीनायकचं तथास्मः । क्रमानु तबोवर् । पदांस्य जगमन्त्र संगराजाः
हर्षः क्रमं (सम) । १२५५॥ चतुःसदुभी यक्ष्यं दलवा (खचा) हस्-

dhaaraśvaḥ विवाहः। महामायासंगराज:। समो नान्तिका कुटोधिकः।।१०॥
वर्गः प्रास्त्यार्यं चुनाविनिपत्त राजाः तातिश्रिखरी श्रुवे जिप्पिष्ठे निजे नुप-
जगमन्त्र: । कष्टाय निधि: । दलाः (खचा) कार्यकृतः दिनः सजान-

dhaaraśvaḥ विवाहः। यामः क्रमानु वायथः सर्वनाथिपि: । श्रीमेम्माते देशी॥
१२७५॥ श्रापः श्रीजीमजसिंमयः। महासंगराजः। प्रदानार्थार्थां क्रमानु विनिपतः शर्वः (सम)
१२५५॥ एको लक्ष्मीसागरः।

45 तद्विपुरपित: भुवारीन भृगोऽभृगः रीतः रीतिहारः। दुरसुरसतहः या
वििबियः। महायः। क्रमानु श्रीमयः। यामः श्रीमहिम सामसामार्थितार्थः
दलवा (खचा) परऽसिंमयः विनिपते ऐश्रमजनानविवशः।

46 १२७५॥ क्रमानुदोभुवावे जगमन्त्रसिंमयः।। भारतराजितीश्वरः समाह (द्रथ) तूः
समाप्ता॥ १२०५॥ गणान्तः सुनोऽवे जगमन्त्र:। चमापितः।। भारतराज-
िीश्वरः विश्रचनः (च) देशी प्रभुः। १२७५॥

1 || श्रीमहिमानेत्री नमः ।। श्रीहाथारामायायीसेवादात ।। श्रीमक्षिणीप्रसादात ।।
श्रीविवशकर्मणि नमः।। श्रीसरसः नमः।।

2 || श्रीमहिमानेत्री नमः ।। श्रीहाथारामायायीसेवादात ।। श्रीमक्षिणीप्रसादात ।।
श्रीविवशकर्मणि नमः।। श्रीसरसः नमः।।

The fourth pada is short by one syllable instant.
1 Metro: śūnāḥ. The word which was at first omitted is written below the line.
2 The stroke on the ellipse of ha is absent.
3 The locative has been used instead of the dative.
4 This word which was at first omitted is written below the line.
5 This slab should rightly follow B. It may be noted here again that it is composed of ten different pieces
of stone and is very carelessly engraved. Many of the letters are either obliterated or are not properly engraved.
6 The medial a seems to have been engraved later on, and hence is indicated by a very small stroke narrowly
drawn.
7 The medial a is not joined to the top-line.
8 The medial a is not joined to the top-line.
9 The word which was at first omitted is written below the line.
10 Vārān śvra is ungrammatical. It is used here for cāruna cāruna.
11 The medial a is inverted.
3 का चिन्हसिद्धिता दक्षामनि ॥१३॥ यथापि देवा ॥ भृवि वार्णनाः सुहुः कहुः १ गङ्गा: कुते एव मानवा: तथा क्रमाका विनयोगिता वर्णाः श्रीकृष्णामदि- बज एव वाजु: ॥१४॥

4 गङ्गेतुतुतु: कालेनभस्म्सा भालिकार्यक: ॥१५॥ काव्यविविल्लम् यथा: सुरसंस्कारिक व रामायणकः ॥ धुधायांत हरि तपस्वित हरसप्ताक हर्षे कंदुः शर्मे श्रीवर्धे (ढाना) महानन्दा श्रीवर्धेन्नम् (त्व) यथीमित्रसम् नाम: ॥

5 निरोधवी ॥१६॥ पुर्ख प्राथ्य तद्वितीयपर्यं श्रीमिदामपर्यं ब्रह्माभुपमेषः (ष) || भृगुवजनन्त्र: किमपददेवन: यदेकामपविद्युर्य ज्ञनी विभोग्यं दशय: ॥ किं राजसे ॥

6 सा: विलिता: ॥१॥ मन्त्रका (काँ) एवै निम्ही श्रुतम् यथे: सुप्राय वर्गामिचारायावत: ॥ भृगुवजनन्त्र: सह सर्वा प्रतितित्र अंगामनेनु (ष) कुर्म देव (ढा) न ॥ पुर्ख प्राथ्य वाह्यावगम् ॥ खिष्ठे१० पटिता फ़ा: ॥

7 दा० विशेष: विषा: ॥१६॥ चातुर्विविल्लमित्रिनिका (ष) जलामाय लघुविन्दु विन्दुविन्दुविन्दु नैव, देव विनियन्त चिन्तिता: क्लावा महामार्गिति (ष) रामे ॥१॥ [र] रामायणवाची कानामित्राची काले काले तनो (ष) निम्ने खिष्ठे भारतीः ॥

8 वं किं प्रतिकृत (ष) वीमविवर्णापत्य: ॥१६॥ श्रीम(ष) हासिनिकीर्णिविन्दुपार्वर्तिकी सहितीय आयामा देव(ष) भाँकी विषवितीवित कर्णापार्व कर्णापार्व (ष) प्रारम्भ जगदीश्वर्य विन्दु भृत मी ॥

9 लाचुरग कर्मकारे ॥१६॥ द्वार वितिन्ता विन्दु त्विन्दु: इव निम्न लक्षणा (ष) निम्ने ॥१॥ खिष्ठे ॥१॥ कर्मिनिकार्यिनिस्मृते जगविहिः ॥ सुधाकरे ॥१॥ यथा युद्धरसमेः न प्रजा तापनविभु ॥१॥०॥४॥९॥

---

1 Metro: Upaśīti.
2 There is an asambara over e which is redundant.
3 Metro: Indravastū. The fourth pada is short by one syllable.
4 This danda is superfluous.
5 This a resembles ya as it naturally does when written hastily.
6 The r over gu is very faint.
7 Metro: Śrāvantu-vatika.
8 The stroke on the ellipt of ka is absent.
9 This omission of viśau gu is grammatical.
10 Read sthīrabh.
11 The syllable seems to be engraved over an erasure.
12 Read saupatī.
13 First an asambara was engraved which was then corrected into the sign for medial e.
14 This danda is furnished with a top-line.
15 Metro: Aumakhyūbh.
10 भृगुरीतवर्षुकालमयिण्याजाधिकारानी स्रावु मण्डलमधून सरसात्सुतुरु पर्युः(दम्) ॥ विकृतितः खगनम(व)कारखुस्य(घ)ना कुन्यू मुदत्तशि विनाथशीन लाभविधि चारिवर्गिः कोऽ

11 पीभवत संक्षिप्तः सदृशवां सञ्जावाडः प्रवचन्त हि: [18] कल्याणू स्थितमिः स्थानोत्सरादृश्यः चित्रणः ॥ मुदोपे विचारी भुजेन नुपत्तिपत्तुष्ठ(च)लतु(ल)चुन्युः ॥६ वातावर्तितमः

12 यत्वा कारिदं राणमुट्टर् समेतिन किंमेव भारोपरान्तः चित्रणः ॥ भुजेने विचारी बुजुन नुपत्तिपत्तुष्ठ(च)लतु(ल)चुन्युः ॥६ वातावर्तितमः

13 यत्वा सरसात्सुतुरु पर्युः(दम्) ॥ संस्कृत द्वार(द्वार) नरपुरुषमणिरण्युण्यु निस्माष्टः प्रशादाय विधायकान्त वसवः इत्यतः मोक्षाजावाडः ||१२||

14 कौनिकः संस्कृत(सम्) ॥ विचारायां द्वार(द्वार) नरपुरुषमणिरण्युण्यु निस्माष्टः प्रशादाय विधायकान्त वसवः इत्यतः मोक्षाजावाडः ||१२||

15 ज्ञातस्वीहो राशः कारिदं च मण्डलमणिरण्युण्यु चारिदं मुदोपे सकलवन्त(त)रच्चपर्: ॥ ज्ञातस्वीहं नुपत्तिपत्तुष्ठ: विद्वितवानवः

16 वा ॥ सो(सो)रचवः खजनवाणिण्यांदजलिनि: (दिपि:) ॥११॥ घर्मोऽनुतुष्ठिनि: (दिपि:) तदनेव विषितमिः अङ्कुः वीरोकां विनाथाय ततः (त्से) सत्स: [सत्]

17 चतिरिचार्यः ॥ सो(सो) दारिद्रः रचयिते चण्डमिण्यां स्वामिपत: चिन्तिता चिन्तिता तदसाबामाने एक्षमेकाधिकान्त चारितः: ||१३||

18 एक्षमेकाधिकान्त चारिताः ॥ सो(सो) दारिद्रः रचयिते चण्डमिण्यां सतुमुखोऽनवसः ॥ निदित्व(दिति) योगसुनिचर्यां ॥४ पवित्र्य सारिसारिब(द)वे: ||१५|| शुभोऽन्यः योगी पूर्णिष्वाय तथा तिथिः

1 Aruṣa here has double entendre, 'red' and the name 'Aruṣa' of the charioteer of the sun. The anger of Jagannatha towards the sun for the latter's having occupied a more exalted position is fancied as Aruṣa approaching the king for refuge when no longer required by the sun, as he (sun) resolved to illuminate the world from the top of the temple only.
2 Metro: Śārdūlaśrīdīna.
3 After ga there are two small hollow squares indicating the erasure of two letters engraved by mistake.
4 There is a horizontal stroke on top of the numeral.
5 Metro: Anuṣṭubh.
6 The mark of punctuation is unnecessary.
7 Āra is represented by three perpendicular strokes only.
8 This dasā is superfluous. Read vasātī: ahō. Metro: Srambarā.
9 First, pā was engraved which was then corrected into tā.
10 This tā is superfluous.
11 Metro: Śikharīśat.
12 The mark of punctuation has a top-line.
13 The number is wrongly repeated.
14 This is a superfluous dasā.
19 गुडारं प्रशिंशा(ख) ी विष्णु पालामानि दहौ प्रभु || विशारारं कालातागा। गौरव ॥ दर्तावनु ॥ १२(१६)॥ तच्च प्रशिंशा(ख) प्रस्त्वरलोक यावचिन्न(च) नं विशार भूपति। || समूर्ति ओजार(ला) नो-  
20 गृद्धोपक्रमं पुनः पुनः सत्रलुकारुकं सनु ॥ १४(१३)॥ प्राकृतेनचतुरुष्यं काल- 
  
21 यथा जनकी विष्णु प्रस्त्वर नार्यों(बी) किरदारं गरिचारिणः कालयु प्रायण लोक- 
  
22 मशरुकास्थुदन चढ़ि लघुत्र ज्ञान। ॥ १५(१५)॥ रक्तलिल्लु(छत्रा) तिमापः धार्यवस् 
  
23 माघे ऊर्जिमायां रायाणीकोरं पुनः सकलुपुरजगभलंकरः प्रस्त्वरलोक ॥ विष्णु 
  
24 सं च दलव(छ) ॥ १५(२१)॥ प्रामाण्य दलव(छ) सहुनाम । यथो धुलो धुलो 
  
25 कौलुकासंपत्रस्तिविकारे । सहीले ॥ पालामानो भुवाकुरेऽ नह नाट 

1 The syllable is engraved over the top-line.  
2 This and the next half verse may be regarded to constitute one single verse.  
3 Read गौरवसारां.  
4 Metro: Anvâlêpakh.  
5 The mark of punctuation has a top-line.  
6 Metro: Ujîfâ.  
7 The medial अ in प्राः is very faint.  
8 Metro: Sârâcāchârî.  
9 त्स is only partly engraved.  
10 Metro: Ujîfâ of Baudhâdërâ and Sâhâpâ.  
11 There is a horizontal stroke on top of the numeral.  
12 The medial त sign is only faintly visible.  
13 Metro: Sârandhârâ.  
14 Metro: Sâlî.  
15 This daṇḍa is superfluous.
26. यापुरा सुतामी चि || तह(च)रव विसूचितः श्वर शति प्रवृत्तिः महानिनोऽन्नतिः किलक्रितिसंवाध्यायचितांते जोवाता चिन्चितः ॥२१(२४)॥¹ पाधयाकान तदां || सभाः
27. मणिमयी श्रावण (भाग) || ढवयुक्तवर्ण चकुः सुरा विश्वामती सुभः ॥२२(२५)॥² लोकः ³ मुद्रयमः संधूसंपीतिः प्राक्षापयतः [ढ] श्वासा (श्रोता) कुन्तुष्ट। अविनयवन्यम् (आ) जर्मा (नाते)
28. वीणीयान् || चाँ येवार्दी विषयः (ह) यमुनकृष्णिः विसुचितः करतवथे लघुपकुलक्षुसणाभावान्यायारः ॥२३(२६)॥³ शौर्यासृंखलाकारितमिदे सौव- [ढ] गुः
29. चीरची मंचज्जाय्याय यशोभी विचुरकी मुहुर्भथायायणात् || तह(च) [ढ] नृत्यकारिणिः हरिधित गुरुनाथकर्मक्रयायामुः शिविरसमागताः: किसुमः समाचित् (चि) का वि-
30. मृति: ॥२४(२७)॥¹ सौर्य मधेनार्यान मुद्रिविष्कर्तारां महेश्वरे विश्वाविश्व- शाय हूँ तलविरिति विपा जलकिंचितमृतम् (सम) [१८] काले हरिमहिसवी वृत्तियमार्थ विन-
31. लानिंद्र: किसय[ह] [का] कर्मस्यानागति लघुि वक्तनि न हरि: कियैः चित्र(स) हस्तः के न: ॥२५(२८)॥⁵ का शोकान्तिमिदरं सुनिश्चितमुक्तार्काण्गरे ॥ कौराकाचित-(चि) कामेरञ्ज विजाळगति खा ⁹
32. नंस कर्णामः: || कठि नेत्रयिता न मात्मति हरिवैरातः कोण सुक्षिं: शेतविच(टा) प्राप्ते विषयवने शीतीश्वर्णविपातः ॥ २६(२८)॥⁶ चायेकिंचितमाक्ष्य- महामायामोहदा
33. भौमाङ्कलेश्वरशतें च लंडरील(सम) [१८] हत(दा) न कौलाम(स) समिति न चितर- (रा) नृत्य[ह] नासिं देवाः स्वामहादुनक्षय(सम) ॥२७(२०)॥¹² तन(चा) ग्यथा- स्वाम [१८]: सर्वे देवदेवमितिमुः ॥ यथायापि

¹ Metro: Sārdalovibhūtī. ² This danda is superfluous. ³ Metro: Annubhūb. ⁴ Read ेके। ⁵ The mark of punctuation has a top-line. ⁶ A long syllable is expected here. ⁷ Metro: Brahabhā. ⁸ The mark of punctuation is unnecessary. ⁹ The medial अ is not joined to the top-line. ¹⁰ There is a horizontal stroke on top of the numeral. ¹¹ The virūma sign here resembles that of the medial अ. ¹² Metro: Upajātī.
34. श्रीम् भूति चकृतन्ति मायमाहामः: "२८(२१)" गिरिति गिरिसिन्तनवां मनवां शिवं भ्रमणकामिकसंग अयु। गिरिसिन्तनाध्यरेवस्तरा|२८(२१)|[३१]"।

35. सत्कांतिमप्य पद्मरविंद्र मञ्जा नो याद कदाचितां | द्वां धियाय स्तुतिसमये देवता। स्वंस्वरं रच्यात: लारकुला। "१५०(३४)" धय: नौमाजस्त्रिः- कारिति मूल:।

36. मंदिरेः (रम्)। तदात्ताहुरुः मलवा वैज्ञान मधुरे संहिते। "११(४६)"। धय हम् कस्पद्येष्वर्णिंविनिष्ठिता| (भाग)। राजामनिस्वादा वंद्या जानिति मूलति हृदे- ज्ञाता। "२५(४६)"। भागश्योदयमारे।

37. चारजने मिरीषारिति प्रायोगी संगीतर सन्तं व्रतः लम्बु| ना धुलख स्वायते। राजासम्बन्धीर्विगति सत्तं मनोकामातुपद्ग्रोहाधारता न चा रेम् ते गभीरीक्षात्स्वामुलः।

38. "१६(२६)"। धय या(११|चतुरवर्णिः| क्ष)। श्राविति कुक्तसागररः (सम्)। धियाय समस्याकालोका मितमि(मन)दूरवमसं सत: | [२०६]"। धय तहददयसागरस्ये धियाय| (काय)। पुण्येष्वरो(य)संहिते| [३७]। संहिते।

39. चकु: "२८(२८)"। धियाय समस्यासागरस्ये धियाय समस्यासागरस्ये। धियाय समस्यासागरस्ये। धियाय समस्यासागरस्ये।

40. गरुद्व(चु)विप्लवः वीर्यास्मात्| (वेन)। श्च। धियाय स्त्रिः विप्लवः श्च। धियाय स्त्रिः विप्लवः। धियाय स्त्रिः विप्लवः। धियाय स्त्रिः विप्लवः।

1. These two syllables are repeated by mistake.
3. Although the number of syllabic instants in the latter half of this verse is complete, there is gati-bhaṅga between the third and the fourth quarters.
4. The mark of punctuation has a top-line.
5. There is a horizontal stroke on top of the numeral.
8. Read na cha-chāpi sarga.
9. According to the Ekalīṅga-mākhānya this Trikūṭāchala is somewhere near Eklīngji.
11. The medial ṛ is not joined to the top line.
12. Read 'sīnhaṁ.
14. The medial ṛ is not completely engraved.
15. Metro: Mañjubhaṅga.
41 सुक्तम न विभिन्निक नै ॥ ॥ ॥ कथा ज्ञानविषय्यम भवे" समां भुजाद देया

42 गँधरव-पातीहारणिः [खा] सः मै(नी) कर्णमयी युभा । जनित

43 रघुवन्त मणिकन्तकरी कणामहाय दुःखादृश्यात श्यामप्राणिकरणरक्ष[वै] सुमार- खिलादिः नै ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ काम गरीव[व] दुसित शुक्लसंहिता ॥ ॥

44 रा ततः [वै] ॥ ॥ वर्गवृत्तं(र)पाण्य जगात्सिद्धोऽयमः(द) नमात्[वै] ॥ ॥ शहादत[न] सिद्धविशिष्टविपञ्चविप...

1. Metre: सौवीकृतितसा।
2. Read dēvōn.
4. This syllable is superfluous.
5. Read anidaṃ.
7. Read tṛṣyā, though the metre will suffer.
8. Read svagābh.
9. This danda is superfluous.
11. There is a dash after ghā.
12. This syllable is only partially engraved.
13. Read chān.
14. No sandhi is observed here.
15. The medial ० is not joined to the top-line.
48 या(पृ)॥ अममद्र इति जन्म(चन्द्र)चन्द्र[सः] कृष्णेऽपि बुधमा स्नाया यज्ञा मार्गः।[२०] युष्मा निज्ययभिवधा कायस्मेतोऽचलस्यायामः॥[१७]॥ तत्कलाकालेष्यमयाकरेऽपि-पुराणेष्यण्डितः(स)भवण्डितः।[१८] कथयाणाः
49 गुणानां कलाभिधान: प्रसावचाच:॥[१२]॥ सिद्धार्थिः दण्डः कर्त्ता(ला)भिरति-केशवमना(न)कुशागः: [१९] स चर्यः(ज)नामिभानानिन्जन: [१०] च चवोषणौ पाठी:॥[२०]॥

C

1 || भुवन्दरानयेः नमः॥ श्रीमुक्कायरायणपादमातृम् || श्रीकुमारिणी[स]दातः।
...
2 || श्रीविष्णुवर्निः नमः॥ श्रीविष्णुवर्निः नमः॥ श्रीविष्णुवर्निः नमः॥ श्रीविष्णुवर्निः नमः॥
3 || गॉट्यालः || संयमसूत्रोऽपुरुणिसहराव नातीवती रावण श्रवणार्यामि॥ ताहस्य राघवार्यामि॥ गॉट्यालः || संयमसूत्रोऽपुरुणिसहराव नातीवती रावण श्रवणार्यामि॥
4 || वज्रार्यामि || श्रवणार्यामि॥ तस्मान प्रतिशालये दिनकरणां वर्षौलय।
5 || नामकलाकालः॥ श्रीपुरुषालमात्र श्रीविष्णुवर्निः जातः।
6 || नामकलाकालः॥ श्रीपुरुषालमात्र श्रीविष्णुवर्निः जातः।
7 || नामकलाकालः॥ श्रीविष्णुवर्निः तद्यथासिद्धान्तोऽपि जातः॥

1 * Metre: अर्यपत्राया.
2 * Read सुदेवमार्ग-साय.
3 * Read याज्यायाम.
4 * Read अय्यापीय.
5 * Read श्रीपुरुषालमात्र.
6 * Read चारोनाच्छाद.
7 * Metro: अनुष्ठान.
8 * With this verse and the next cf. nos. 7 and 11 of A—Ed.
9 * Metro: Indraśrayā.
10 * Metro: पुष्पमात्र.
11 * Metro: Uṣṇī.
12 * The medial a is not joined to the top-line.
13 * Metro: पुष्पमात्र.
14 * The second quarter of this verse is short of one syllable instant.
15 * Read सुदेवमार्ग-साय.
8 नोमरसिंहस्तां नूपः काणिमोहणूः ॥ गुणागदिरस्तोभूतारणाचायिभज्ञगविषः ॥१॥
लगाभिनमहामुनि: कथं चिन्तापणि: समः ॥ विनाविखिदातायः

9 चिन्तनाविखिदातो नूपः ॥११॥ राजा-योगीजोहोच्छायांचुकुः ॥ यथं
हण्डेरा कातार्यभूतसमंदिजस्यन्ति: ॥११॥ वीमानः रामः प्रजायं यवसि
नलःः

10 संवर्षधारु पार्वतः दानी कणीः प्रति प्रकागदियांश्चर्वसुतुङ्गाय्याः(याम) ॥ राजा-
योगीजोहीः चित्रितकुमालकः [हो]जगविशिष्टो जीवंदांश्रतावरणाविपरः

11 श्रीचोराचायिभिवः(याम) ॥१२॥ च निध्वंदरस्तिचित्राविधाननुबुः जागुण्यस डितीया-
स्तिः काणाचायणे सकलसमपनः गृहालिंकः ॥ राज्योहितीस्वरूपः चित्राव-

12 गति सर्वः(क)द्र इतससिद्धांसि साक्षायोविष्टितः(च)लोकः कलालपकलापुराणस्य राजसिद्धः
॥१३॥ च च निध्वानःराजसिद्धिनिर्विदणुते माण्डायींपि शुक्लः पौषायमकालिः
जनाः

13 मणितायः सपुजः राजायामः(शय्याः) ॥ राजा-योगीजोहीः चित्रितपिन्नकः; श्रीमार-
विहंसुः; धाता तन्मवविजयायामपि विशिष्टावत् राजाजीतंतुङ्गाः ॥१४॥
श्री(शय्याः)लेनोम्बयः

14 च प्रभावः सुकुः रोचना निध्वंनारम रचितेन शोचिने स्वातः तुराध्वस्मिनारमसिद्धानाहीः। विश्वः ॥ वर्णालकः राजस्मयुगः लोकदांतः ततोमः राजा-
योगीजोहि

15 भजत भजतः २ संगमः संगवारः ॥१५॥ लक्ष्मीचित्ताधिन विज्ञविनितवृह(क)दरे
कंडकांमाणिगाः पुक्कामिर्ग सम्भवादसु(क)भूताः(क)मूर्तेन(क)वेषः कदापि ॥ श्री-नारायणः

16 न जंकुरणः राजासिद्धः[च] राजाचाचारिणूर्वाविधानकः राजसिद्धाः भजवेः
(घम)॥१६॥ ची निम्नः दायवतः विद्वानः(च)विद्वानः: प्रापविला वैरिष्ट्रा

17 प्रयजमाः समसूचिव गलान्तमाथिया विशिवूः ॥ शिद्यैवेच दस: स(क)यमिबः
सुवं ची सुक्ष्मतयो: किं राजाचाचारिणू लद्वलकारः: कथा

1 Metre : Upaugiti.
2 Metre : Anuvahshubh.
3 The medial a is not joined to the top-line.
4 Metre : Grotaharā.
5 Read "nripa-maśīh.
6 This daṇḍa is superfluous.
18 चैत साक्ष्य(म्य)॥१॥ नता सो हलिन विन्दुरसिरं नौ ककिष्ण डेशिक जिसा दत्तसहन्दको व(व)लरतः सत्यवचन प्रायणः ॥ शूरारुपसतः सदा नपति॥ कौमानगांधुः

19 श्रीक्षणस्वर मद्यको विजयात्त श्रीमानिष्कासमये ॥२॥ राणार्जुनराजसिंह लवनं विमला हृदिकरे(खघ) गंगा सो चैत्राहास्या कथमिथ सत्यं पापसुंतं विचिते ॥

20 मूलानामा मद्यं विविध करतले प्रकरिति प्रासा चेतदिरेखी करतिति उ[स]॥तनं तं नरं रक्षेण(म्य)॥३॥ मः(मम)यनम् मां किल मंदराय दच्छ गच्छर्गितं देवी मनुष्य तरं प्रशा

21 ममजनारंगय तनुं वंदे कपिलिं || भूला भुकलका सनुद्र श्रवण सदनुपवरं- मानुषौ(य) प्रस्तरात नाथे(व)काजस्थववदरका तदन || यानैोधितुः ||२॥

22 हस्ति प्रतापो वाह्यनालः ॥ द्रुतं नेहि वर्णस्वरं जम्बौवनमाधवं ॥२॥ राणार्जु- राजसिंहस्वर राजे भूमिमनहं ॥ वाह्यापमः ॥ सुनो गमनेनकुससा(घ) वातुः ॥२॥

23 राणार्जुराजसिंहस्वर गुणेषु भवानु धूर्वः(वम) ॥ सदानीर्दिरी निम्नवा व(व)निम्प्राणी निपरंत ॥२॥ श्रीमानार्जुनवाचलावनाः ॥ श्रीराजसिंहः प्रतिविसिवः ॥ वर्ष- व्र

24 गाजायनलोकालः प्रकाशमनापकरे जडनं: ॥२॥ भाद्रपदनिरस्वारस सदयूक्तकालस्य प्रमोः ॥ राणार्जुराजसिंहस्य हरिविनति तम्मदा ॥२॥(५) नित्याभिषेक-ह्रासः

25 सदा समितुः कौतिष्ट प्रताेपं सलको नाशो सि सिंहे यथ हिमस्मृतकनकः
     सकतुः ॥ सवालिः कुथुमखे वह सकतः ॥ सक्तः(झ)लिमोनिवारी निम्नः बादरागसिंहः

* Metro : Sradhākurā.
* Read nara-batik.
* Metro : Sāhrāvatsobhita.
* Read Padmā.
* Read loj-jam.
* Metro : Anushkthā.
* Better read ṛgā-kardā.
* Metro : Pujākāra.
26 दौल वायू नवीनी भवानु ॥२६॥ वर्ष वा (वा) वा (वा) । रविधितिमणनयुते भावे । शुजपने पूर्वियां पूर्वकास् । कनकमणिवयि सतुला शुकारये ॥ चेचे गंगातटाये ॥

27 हिष्क्षणमहिति निर्माणमहिपुष्प: कौमारि संविधाय खजनपरनमावृक्षीं धनाधारनु ॥२७॥ भक्तरामणिद्रोहे (अ) मांगिधितसपचे ॥ चेचे दीघामधारे ॥

28 तिरुदूहे कल्य महाभु ॥२८॥ राणाधीराजसिंह अमित भुवि भवनु काश । ह्रज्जातारो दलव (वा) वंशयानानी । कनकमणिव्यातिरिष्ययि । चुक्या ॥ चैसानिल ॥

29 कन्यागज्जुमाणिद: कामावधितिमयक्षुकि नराणें दलवितमसत्सु । सुनिम्नक्ष पाण्तु ॥२९॥ सुनिम्नक्षुवणिद्रोहे (अ) तडागांते सरिः । । राणाधीरा ॥

30 जासिण्यं कौमारि कात्यायनू: ॥ ३०॥ युक्त । स्वनुज्विणिसहि यदि चेचाचित काशिर (काशि) नूम । चक्षुराविद्यापि जलाधि पचम्ब । रचा न तदु ॥

31 वणुवशेषाय कौमारि राणाधीरुतराजसिंह । भवत: प्राणात्मेष (क्ष) लात् ॥३१॥

32 नौम न उपायं यदि ब्राह्मण ॥ । वेद (वेद) राणाधीरुतराजसिंह । वेद (वेद) राणाधीरुतराजसिंह । भवत: कौमारसिंहलाटाय ॥३२॥ मुंडू यथ वर्तित ॥

33 चित्रमिश्रित यति (चि) कल्विकितं तथा न कुमारिसिद्दिरिः कितलखुत्त प्रेचितं ॥ धैरायनेश्विनिलिपिपाणिकस्त्रिरेः (दा) सूक्षमिव (वि) विषमिचारायुय सदा ख्वलं स्विर ॥

34 तमसो पानामवृषं ॥ ॥ ३४॥ राणाधीरुतराजसिंहो । वाणी (वाणी) कामसुखं (वाणी) । वेजुन्मेव च (वाणी) तत्र प्राणात्मात्मनी ॥ ॥ विजीरहं (वि) क्रिष्णय । अनमपुट ।

35 तथेऽभृगु: सोहु हुस्व एव मानकानि गगनालेनकृपी रवि (रवि) ॥ इति चंद्रमाय । चित्त्विचल सुधिरां चित्रितालेनाश (चित्रितालेनाश) । शक्तानां चोपचियतो नून । निवास: ॥ ॥

---

1 स्वार्चानिणीकोलता।
2 स्वार्चालः
3 भाृनाटकीन।  
4 वाटू स्वा-क्रि०-अल्पका।
36 राजा श्रीगांधिकर्तिपरिप्रेमित सबालिंगे ऋषिपते राजशाही राजसिंहविविखित नलाभि पत्रिणा:।। श्रेणियोगणपाः

37 तुष्टं काॅिरिस्तोधमकारीमिदम(साम)।।१६।। राजाश्रीपतिजसलामवते कौशिकटीश्रीरिणी शुभद्युी सीमाविन विधायितत ततः साई महाबिशुका || बलस्त्रामः

38 धित प(प)चिमाचितं यदां जि तत्कमःसः)क्षं इवं स्मर्यमांस(स)क्वापि शिवी-

भाषये नाधसारणा: ॥१२॥ द्रह देवजस्वं(व)र्दं हिमाविन: श्रीविषुमाणि

39 स्माच सुपुष्के स्वयमात्र: श्रीमदपाते चिलर(रस)।। राजाश्रीपतिराजसिंहकालसेिया-

40 जसलंङ्गाया याज्ञवल्क्याये माधवी श्रीरिति निविल्चितां वते न चाले भुवि ॥ नाथस[चा] याममेकामकुरा: यामीमेिग्याभिः प्रायः श्रमस्माणि-

41 [है] जा एषायतामविशयात्।।१५॥१ देवा: सबसैहुाकेवमासा गेहानु जत्वा

42 शाचीपिरे विशिष्टादि विनियोगिना गणेन: ॥ सुवंशते प्रत्यायात तव भुजवलघाौङ्गाकाशकाशश्च

43 द्विवी जतमा गेहानु संज्ञा चिनिँहिजिन्नव: पार्थान्त: कि निलाना: ॥१५॥४

44 पाकुः अविशिष्टा विविधोगिते सुधाया मां चंद्रमहानशिवा संहितेद्वस्त्रि

45 चाकेय चातुः तां किं निमाक(कथ) प्रतिजान जये वारिष्ठ: सामस्त: ॥ सूक्ती

1 Metro: संदृशलोकित्रिता।
2 Read *arjupāṭhā*.
3 Metro: सहितः.
4 Metro: स्थायी.
5 Metro: सैन्यतानिकः.
6 The medial द is not joined to the top-line.
46. मणि: विंग प्रतापीपतम् ॥४५॥ एकं युध संतुः कायमति ब्रह्मव जीवनं: खैरंभ नेरे महीषशृवर्तित दह सुता वारिधिभय: प्रदत्ता:।। तब्धर्घितो तिंदि-

47. गंतानु ब्रजिति च जवतः प्रायः दिशमन्नर्विकी राजाधीराजसिंहचितितपितुनमणी: सत्यतांपीत हृद् ॥४६॥ राजायीराजसिंह लवदुनकुशण:सबरा-

48. पाथ्मूणि गच्छन् चेंढ़ानु सुविणू चर च दह ॥५॥पये खर्णा(का)राज दलाः (वत्र)।। पण्येत्वर(के)वैने कुर्यादिति समविन्य भिया तया रीतरङ्गितंद्रोः खूंड विनं च तवालकं(क)समिः दमतु दातु व-

49. भंडासुः ॥६॥ राजायीराजसिंहोऽपृता चविराजित: ॥ गिर्मुण्डचतुर्यों धीराधारा-वेदात्माकर(क)श्रीमम् ॥६॥ श्रीमद्वासरकुपर्माधयक्षत्योरायासंहनदोवेशीमितवर्मण-

50. [७]भाग्यशुभभवस्वविद्येष्यापापित:।। नायतुर्कुलरामयं(क)तनुजन्त्रकाषभूतांभूताः नायकति: सना(ता)भिम्मुडः भूश(ता)हिंदिय निरंमेला ॥६॥५॥ फल नीम-

51. निष्कलपपालपालिनिलामारामनिद्रीनिराजितचरणाविकर्मणा ॥५॥ जाजिराजसह(स)पाणी- [८] जगालिसंस्कारे पुनः राजायीराजसिंह प्रगसी।

52. ॥ राजायीराजसिंहोऽपृता चर दह ॥[९] यायाखन्ति:।। प्रासादेशित कहाकाराकिरती करत: सुधी:।।५॥ गुप्ताकलिकवृं(से)र्यार्य: पंचेकी [८] कलासुत:।।

53. क्ष पुरुषाभिरकीरेण: ॥६॥२॥ भगराजाराजातनुजवदवस्यव: चूचारी दि सारान [५]पुरशु: योमुक्त(क)दी वस्सम[कला](क)का मूर्तीन्यो हिताय:।। यायाः

54. यास् ॥ प्रदस्तो हर्षपुपिनिवकंरधिग(क)सिंहशृवर्तिती सोवर्षियोऽक्रम(ता) ॥ दह क्षपाल्याको मातरहि [८] ॥ राजायीराजसिंहि(विक)हकारंति संदिर शुभ- (भम) [१०] नाम्मन(भया)मेव करत
The Raṅganātha temple at Śrīraṅgam has been eulogised by several Ājavars in the beautiful hymns of the Nālāyiruprabandham. It was also the place where many eminent āchāryas, including the great Rāmānuja and Maṇavāla-Mahāmuṇi had sojourned.

The subjoined record (A), which is complete and in a good state of preservation, is engraved on three sides of a well-dressed slab of stone set up in front of the Dhanvantari shrine in the fourth prākāra of this temple. The documentary portion of this epigraph consists of one long sentence composed in correct Tamil prose; while here and there a few Sanskrit words, engraved in Grantha characters, add a certain piquancy to the style.

The record does not refer itself to the reign of any king or chieftain, but simply states that it was issued in the régime of a certain Irandakālamēduṭṭa-Perumal aliases Kūḍal Uttamānmbi-Pillai. It is dated in Śaka 1415, corresponding to the cyclic year Pramādi, on a Monday with paṇchami-tīkka of the first fortnight and Pushya-nakshatra. These details give the English equivalent A. D. 1493, May 20, Monday.

The object of the inscription is to register a gift of 2 vēli of land made by Śrīnivāsa aliases Śrīraṅga-Garudāvāhana-Bhaṭṭā, son of Alagiya Maṇavāla-Maṅgalādarāya, (a member) of the bhaṭṭāl-kottu of the temple, who constructed a new the arogaṇaṇi which had been formerly erected by an ancestor of his by name Garudāvāhana-Bhaṭṭa in the time of Pratāpachakravartin and had suffered damage during the same, and installed therein an image of Dhanvantari-Emberumāi. It is stated that this land, which was situated in Pāṇḍamaṅgalam, had been in the enjoyment of the earlier Garudāvāhana-Bhāṭa (and his descendants), having been granted to him as pallaṅku-māṇyan for having composed a prabandham called the Raṅgaṅāhāravai, evidently in praise of god Raṅganātha, and that it was now transferred to the temple for conducting worship to the newly installed image of Dhanvantari and for supplying kudinir-amudu to god Perumāl (Raṅganāthā).

1 Metre: Aanakūṭhā.
2 Read Ramāpalli.
3 Read aṇārāsikā.
4 The sentence means that Vā(Bā)ghā got (the task of) engraving (the epigraph).
5 Such as Tirumānagai-Ājavār, Kulaśekkara, Tonḍaradippodi, Tiruppaṭāḷjavār and all the others except Madhuramaṇavi.
7 Pāṇḍamaṅgalam is a village near Trichinopoly. It is also mentioned in the Śrīraṅgam plates of Dēvarāya II (above, Vol. XVII, p. 111).
8 This work is not extant now, so far as it can be ascertained.
9 Kudinir is the Tamil word for kuṣāṇḍa and is used in this sense in Tamil medical works.
The record is important for Sanskrit literary history, as it helps us to identify this Garudāvahāna of A.D. 1493, with the author of the hagiological kāvya called the Divyasāra-charitaṃ, as will be shown in the sequel, setting aside its traditional attribution to a contemporary of Rāmānuja (12th cent. A.D.), and as it mentions also that the earlier Garudāvahāna-Bhaṭṭa of A.D. 1257 was probably the author of a prabandham named the Raṅgaghoṣhaṇī. Further interest attaches to this epigraph in its reference to the existence of a temple-hospital at Śrīraṅgam and to the erection of a shrine for Dhanvantari, which is not found elsewhere in South India.

The construction of the ārājaśālai referred to in this record is mentioned in an incomplete inscription, engraved on another slab set up near this, and dated in the 3rd year of the Hoysala king Pratapachakravartin Vīra-Rāmanāṭhadēva (corresponding to A.D. 1257). It registers a gift of land by the general Śiṅgadēva Śiṅganaṇa-Dapṭaṇāyaka to a certain Garudāvahāna-Bhaṭṭa for the maintenance of a śāla in the temple. The inscription reads thus:

(B)


. . . . . nāl india-kkākkukκum iru prá]< print missing> varāhān poṇ āyirattatu oru-nūṟu[* i-poṇ āyirattatu oru-nūṟukku uppadiyāl koṇḍa nilattil udayañ-kkoṇḍu vajjya-paḷjarakarkkum aushadhatukkum chandradiyavarai selvāṅga Śrīraṅganāṭhaṇa tandarunjna tirumugappadiyum mahāṇiyogappındaki i-ddhanamam śeyvāḍaṅga niśchayita(ta)țu vaijīyaril enakkum rakshakarāy i-ddhamamam neṇulapadu naḍatīkkonḍu vanda nāyakan-āṇa Garudāvahāna-Bhaṭṭarukku āṇi-gurunjul nilum paḷjarakarāy kaḷaṇikkūṭṭiṭy i-ddhamamam naḍattu Tōḷmāḷaiyaligavārku mu-kkuruṇi ne[1*]iḷum paḷjarakar ēruvarkku tāṇi-ppadakkku . . . . . nikki uḷḷalil nāl oṇrakkum nūṛu kāśil vanda aushadham koṇḍu . . . . .

The Köyioloju, 4 a late Tami\' compilation of about the end of the 18th century, purporting to be a 'chronicle' of the happenings in the Śrīrāmāṅgam temple for several centuries, in which, however, several incidents, historical and otherwise, are found somewhat mixed together in a haphazard sequence, 5 also makes mention of the institution of an ārājaśālai in the temple premises and its subsequent repair after its destruction during the Muhammedan raids. The relevant entries are the following:

(i) A disciple of Yaṭiṭiḍi (Rāmānuja) named Mudaliyāṇḍāṅ having inadvertently added some jambu fruits to the curd-rice offering of god Raṅganāṭha, Rāmānuja 6 detected signs of indisposition in the face of the image and traced its cause to this injudicious offering. He at once ordered some kashāṅga to be administered to the deity and

---

1 There is a village now known as Mummudēśīchār-puppedimāngalantu in the Lalgudi taluk.
2 This compilation, part 1 of which has been published (Ananda Press, 1949), takes the history of the temple to Saka 1301, nearly to the end of the 16th century A.D. Further parts are expected to be published. In several places the contents of the inscriptions are seen to have been correctly incorporated.
3 In cases where Saka dates are also recorded, this jumbling is not harmful; but in cases where the statements are not set off by dates, their chronological sequence is difficult to determine.
arranged for the regular distribution of this decoction to the god every night, through the agency of his **disciple Garuḍavāhana-Pañḍita**.  

(ii) The benefaction of Gaṅgādēvarī Śīṅgaṇaṇ-Daṇḍanāyakkar:—

The ārōgyāśālai and the tirunādaimāḷiyai are the gifts of Gaṅgādēvarī Śīṅgaṇaṇ-Daṇḍanāyakkar, one of the agents (kāriyappēr) of Pratāpachakravartin.  

(iii) The benefaction of Garuḍavāhana-Pañḍita:—

The ārōgyāśālai and the tirunādaimāḷiyai, which had been erected by Gaṅgādēvarī aluṣ Śīṅgaṇaṇ-Daṇḍanāyakkar, agent of Pratāpachakravartin, and which had been a kavakārīya of Uḍaiyavar, having been damaged during the tulukka-vāsam, this shrine, gopura, rampart wall (muḍil), tirunādaimāḷiyai and the frontal muḥappa-muḍapom are the benefactions of Garuḍavāhana-Pañḍita. The title of Garuḍavāhana-Pañḍita is in use for the Superintendents of the ārōgyāśālai from the time of Uḍaiyavar.  

As in the Köyilolgu a Garuḍavāhana-Pañḍita is stated to have been a disciple of Rāmanuja, who lived (according to the traditional chronograms *dhi-laṭhā* and *dharmō naxṭha*) from A. D. 1017 to 1137, it is not possible to identify him with the Garuḍavāhana-Bhaṭṭa, who was installed as superintendent in the sālai in the 3rd year of Vira-Rāmanātha corresponding to A. D. 1237, more than a century later. The incumbent in the hospital figuring in the present record of A. D. 1493, who lived more than two centuries later than the second Garuḍavāhana mentioned above, had also the same surname of Garuḍavāhana attached to his own personal name of Śrīnivāsa. Thus, as attested to by the Köyilolgu also, the cognomen 'Garuḍavāhana-Pañḍita' appears to have been in the nature of a hereditary title assumed by the successive superintendents of the ārōgyāśālai; and so one has to proceed with caution in the matter of identifying persons having this same title.

Now the *Divyasūricharīta*, a Sanskrit hagiography composed in the classic kavya style and dealing with the lives of the Āyārs and Āchāryas (*Divyasūri*) up to Rāmanuja, is known to be the composition of a Garuḍavāhana-Pañḍita; and it has been traditionally ascribed to an alleged disciple of Rāmanuja of that name. This work contains the following colophons, one in prose and the other in verse, at the end of its first sarga:

(i) Iti Kaśyapa-kula-tilakasya Raṅgādhipī-ārōgyāśālīa-vallabhasya Kari-vaidyayu-puranraya-nāmadhayasya Śrīraṅga'-Garuḍavāhana-Pañḍitāsa Śrīnīvāsa-kavēr

kriyau Divyasūricharīta mahākārī prathamas-sargaḥ |

(ii) Yan-nilīṭha bhagirāja-bhoga-sayanō Raṅgēśvarō yat-pitā

Saumyaśrisakha-Maṅgaladhipa-vibhūḥ sarvaśīna-chuḍāmaṇiḥ |

1 The Köyilolgu, p. 43.
2 This name appears to be a misreading of Śīṅgaṇaṇa, given in the records.
3 *Loc. cit.,* p. 12. The inscription uses the word sālai simply, but apparently an ārōgyāśālai or 'hospital' was meant.
4 *Loc. cit.,* p. 120. In both these cases, the dates are not given; but these extracts ascertained refer to the contents of the two records reviewed in this paper.
5 History of Śrīnīvāsaṅamas (T. A. O.), pp. 46 and 47.
7 *Ibid.* In some printed versions the word 'Śrīraṅga' is omitted.
From them we learn that the author of that kavya was called Śrīraṅga-Garudavāhana-Paṇḍita, that his father's name was Saumyārāśaka-Maṅgalādhīpā, his mother was called Bhuvanādhīpā, that he belonged to the Kāśyapa-gōtra, that he bore the title of Kavi-vaidyapurandara, and that he was in charge of the ārāgyaśāla of god Raṅgaṛaṇa. As the donor figuring in the present record (A) is described as the son of Aḷāgiyamāṇavāla-Maṅgalādārya and was called Śrīnīvāsa alias Śrīraṅga-Garudavāhana-Bhaṭṭa, we are enabled to identify him with the author of the Divyāsūrīcharitā. As this inscription does not, however, specify the title of Kavi-vaidyapurandara to the Garudavāhana-Bhaṭṭa mentioned in it (not called a 'Paṇḍita' yet 1) in A.D. 1493, we may perhaps infer that this work, whose composition may have earned for its author the title of 'Kavi' had not been composed yet, and that it may therefore be ascribed to the closing years of the 15th century A.D., i.e., to about A.D. 1500. The hitherto prevailing idea that it was the work of a contemporary of Rāmānuja may now be given up.

1 In an article on the Divyāsūrīcharitā published in the Journal of Indian History, Vol. XIII, pp. 131 et seq., the following alternative verse-culophon is quoted from the Mysore edition of the work:

Śvāmī Raṅgapati-guru Varavārādīśa-cha yaś-yātulō
Vādhilō Varada pīt Varavara-Kahēmēśa-Lakshēmbakhaḥ
Lōkēśa jāmāni tu taṣya Garudāsīvāhana Śrīsēdāḥ
Kāvyā divyātyā Divyāsūrīcharitē sargō-yam-ādir-gatā
t

2 From this we learn that author's tutelary deity was 'Raṅgapati'; his spiritual guru was Varavārādīśa; his maternal uncle (yaś-yātulō) has been taken to be the probable correct reading in place of yaś-yātulō, which does not give a clear meaning was Vādhilē-Varada; his father was vāra-Lakshēmbakhaḥ (Aḷāgiyamāṇavāla) Kahēmēśa (Maṅgalādhīpā) (cf. Saumyārāśaka-Maṅgalādhīpā of the other verse); his mother was Lōkēśa (cf. Bhuvanādhīpā of the other verse); and that his own name was Garudāsīvāhana Śrīsēdāḥ (cf. VaiṣṇavaśāhībhdīŚrīsēdāḥ of the other verse). These details agree with those given in the other colophon; while two additional names are mentioned in this verse. There is therefore no discrepancy in the biographical details furnished in the two colophons.

3 Saumya-śrīsēkha is clearly a Sanskritisation of Aḷāgiya-māṇavāla. Another more popular translation was Rāmāyu-jāmāti. Bhuvanādhīpā appears to be a similar transliteration of a Tamil name, Bhumiyēkōḻi, Uaṇḍuḷajāyō or some equivalent of it.

4 In Suru (17) of this work, the author refers in an impersonal manner to the jambu- and dāthigumām incident which led to the founding of the hospital under an earlier Garudavāhana-Paṇḍita thus:

Rangēśa yattītir-śakād avo-āśīyāv-āddadhīya-nivēyayāmīmāmām,
Śrutvā tān-nilanavāśād vishātīrē ṣrāhārd-yaṭindakā-sa Rangībbhīyam (s. 96)
Rājīty-śparahara-āśīraśa Muśrāna tad-dōsha-prasāmam-adipatayat-kāśyam

Ārōgy-śparadās-mahākāla-śākālaśa śālām śri-Dhāvānḷi-varāhīmām-tadh-chākām (s. 87)

5 It is interesting to note that Mr. B. V. Ramakrishna, M.A., who has examined the problem from a purely literary view-point has also arrived at the same conclusion. (Journal of Indian History, Vol. XIII, p. 186.)

In his History of Śrīraṅgāvata, (Subrahmanya Ayyar Lectures, 1917), p. 56, Mr. Gopinatha Rao, however, identifies this author with the disciple of Rāmānuja and places him before Pumalagēyaśuramalī-ṉair, the author of the Garudaparamparā in Tamil (c. 14th cent. A.D.)

In this connection it may be mentioned that the Uttamaṃbāvandīyaṇprabhāsā (p. 7) states that a Garudavādana-Paṇḍita Śrī-Uttamaṃbāla aliś Kavi-vaidyapurandara Śrīnīvāsa-mahākavi lived in Śaka 995 (= A.D. 1023) and welcomed Rāmānuja on his first arrival at Śrīraṅgām. This statement appears to have been based on the usual tradition which connects one Garudavāhana with Rāmānuja; and the mention of Śrīnīvāsa as his personal name appears to be the result of a promiscuous mixing of different facts. He is enumerated as the 74th in descent from Periyāvār of Kali 48. The list of names of Uttamaṃbāla with their respective ages, as tabulated in this pamphlet, cannot stand a critical examination.
It therefore follows that the three Garudavahanas who figure in the above discussion, were different one from the other:

(i) A Garudavahana-Papdita, traditionally believed to have been a disciple of Ramanauja, who started an Adhyasala under instructions from his guru, for which we have only the authority of the Divyasuricharam and the Kripalaya;

(ii) a second Garudavahana-Bhatta, a contemporary of Vira-Ramanatha in A.D. 1257, who received endowments of land for the hospital from the Hoysala general Sinigana-Danjanayaka, and who was probably the author of a prabandham called the Raiganagashaya; and

(iii) a third Garudavahana-Bhatta of A.D. 1493, the hagiographer-author of the Divyasuricharam, who reconstructed the Adhyasala which had fallen into decay owing to the Muhammadan invasions, and installed therein an image of Dhvantalari-Emberumann.

The historical and other facts contained in these two records may now be examined.

(a) As stated already, record (B) of the time of Vira-Ramanatha states that Sinigana-Danjana, the pradhana of the Hoysala king, partitioned off a portion of the covered corridor (irunadima) to the west of the Edutakai-alagya-Nayanagarapura in the fourth prakara of the Raiganatha temple, and converted it into a hall for conducting a sula (a hospital). He then purchased 16 and odd celi of land in Mummudessala-chaturvedimagalam in Vilana, a subdivision of Pandikulasa-vaalanadu, for 1160 varahapuros and arranged that, from the produce of this fairly extensive block of land, the doctor in charge of the temple-hospital, namely Garudavahana-Bhatta, be paid an allowance of 5 kurusi of paddy per day, his assistant and colleague Tolemalaiyaliyari 3 kurusi of paddy, and two men-attendants (vaidya-paricharakar) 1 tuni and 1 pakkali each, while medicines to the value of 100 kada per day were prepared. As this record is incomplete, it is not possible to know if this outpatient’s dispensary simply ministered to the health-needs of the servants and others of the temple establishment only, or functioned in the more comprehensive sense of a philanthropic institution for the community at large. The famous hospital inscription of Virarajendra (A.D. 1069) at Tirumuukulat in the Conjeevaram taluk of the Chingleput District gives us a fairly detailed idea as to how such an institution worked at that time, and what medicines were prepared and kept in stock for the needs of the students of the Vedic seminary attached to the temple there. The present epigraph does not furnish any such illuminating details, but is, however, of topical interest in that it refers to the existence of a temple-hospital which, in addition perhaps to its usual pharmaceutical activities, also prepared and supplied a kashaya as an offering to god Raiganatha every night, as an item of the temple ritual.

Though the explanation offered for the inclusion of this stomachic in the god’s dietary may at first sight appear far-fetched, it shows with what royal pomp and reverence god Raiganatha was venerated by his devotees and how the daily routine of worship was regulated with such close adherence to meticulous detail.

1 See also note 7 on page 100 below.
2 Sula ordinarily means only a hall, a feeding hall; but as provision was made for a doctor and drugs, an Adhyasala is meant. It is actually referred to as an Adhyasala in record (A).
3 Kadukkasta is the word used in the inscription. It means he who actually carries out a certain duty, and is translated as 'nirvishaka'. In Vidyavachika’s commentary on Tirupparani (Muraasi-nirupan) occurs this sentence: Krishna itukku kadukkasta-dagarum (nirvishetri-valpppan-dagaram) kaduva.
5 The offering of a medicinal decoction to god at night is understood to be in vogue in one or two other temples in South India, at Madura, for instance.
(b) The expression Vaidyuril caikkam rakhakarayi-iddharmamae vedanai-panḍa nadaitikkondu randa nāyakan-āya1 Garudavāhanā-Bhaṭṭar used in the record (B) in referring to the physician, has perhaps to be understood in the sense that something in the nature of a private hospital was already being conducted by Garudavāhanā for a long time and that the Hoysala general Śīggaṇḍa-Daṇḍanāyaka who had personally benefited by this doctor's services made this munificent donation of land to the hospital in token of his gratitude.

(c) A certain Śīggaṇḍa-Daṇḍanāyaka, a general in the army of the Hoysala king Vira-Somēsvāra is stated to have invaded the Tamil country in about A.D. 1240-41, the 25th year of Rājarāja III, for an inscription2 at Vēdārangam in the Tanjore District dated in the 30th year of this Chōla king (A.D. 1246) refers to the effects of this invasion which necessitated the reconsecration of some images in the temple of Kōṇikku-lagar at that place; while a general of the same name figures in a Tiruvanāmalai record3 dated in the 5th year of Rājendra-Chōla III (A.D. 1260). We have no means of determining their identity with the Śīggaṇḍa of record (B). In another record4 from Śemāṭṭur in the Pudukkotah State dated in the 23rd year of Vira-Somēsvāra (A.D. 1256-57), a general described as Mahāperiyapradhāna Śīggaṇḍa-Daṇḍanāyaka, son of Mahāpradēva Śīggaradēva-Daṇḍanāyaka5 is mentioned; and he was probably identical with this Śīggaṇḍa. It is possible that this Śīggaṇḍa was trampled underfoot by the most elephant of Jaṭāvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I, as claimed in a record of his at Śīrāngram,6 and that this event may have happened by A.D. 1261, as the Pāṇḍya king appears to have made his entry into Śīrāngram at about this time.

(d) Rāmānuja is mentioned in the Kōgilōḷuṇgu7 as having been in charge of the Śīrānga temple for over 60 years, and as having regularised the respective duties to be performed by the several groups of temple priests and menials and introduced many salutary reforms in its internal administration. Among the ten sections into which he is stated to have classified the superior service of the temple establishment, the bhattāl-kotu is one; and the duties devolving on the several Brāhmaṇ families which were clubbed together into this administrative classification, consisted mainly of chanting the different Vēdas and of expounding the Māṁśād and the Śīrībhāṣyam8 in the temple. To this bhattāl-kotu Śīrāṅga-Garudavāhana9 of this record belonged; and being the hereditary physician of the temple, it is but proper that he should have repaired the āṅgasālā, installed an image of Dhanvantari in it and arranged for the daily supply of kuḍīnir to god Raṅganātha of the main temple.

(e) As regards the Dhanvantari-Emberumāṇ stated to have been consecrated in A.D. 1493, it is not definite if an already extant shrine was only renovated now. The incomplete record (B) of the time of Rāmānuja does not contain any allusion to it or to the provision of kuḍīnir to god Raṅganātha. The Kōgilōḷuṇgu, however, says that a shrine of this deity which had been in existence even long before the time of Rāmānuja (purāṇa-sidhā) and had become dilapidated, was repaired during his trusteeship of the Śīrāṅga temple and left in charge of his disciple

---

1 Nāyaka in the sense of 'the head' of the hospital.
3 S. I. I. (Texta), Vol. VIII, No. 88. The general is called Mahāpradēhaṇa Maṇḍalikariyanaśaraja Śīggaṇḍa-Daṇḍāyaka.
4 No. 215 of 1914 of the Madras Epigraphical collection.
5 The name Śīggaradeva appears to be a mistake for Śīgadeva.
6 S. I. I., Vol. IV, No. 507. The verse reads:
Ājau Simha-pannuma-daṇḍa Karīṇa daṇḍa-Dhāraṇapataṃ Dhrīṣṭā Saṁhidatā Prāṣamitā-kaśēm-Akhinaṅgō bhūvāḥ
7 Kōgilōḷuṇgu, p. 46 et seq.
8 Loc. cit., p. 47.
9 In another place it is stated that Garudavāhana was included in the Tiruppattiyār class.
Garudavâhana. The correctness of this statement is not now capable of architectural verification, as the present shrine is the result of a somewhat jumbled reassembling made in A.D. 1493 of stones and pillars from older structures.

The shrine of Dhanvantari-Emberumânu or the 'Divine Physician' is quite an appropriate adjunct to a hospital, as he is the patron-deity of the art of healing. Dhanvantari, the father of Indian Medicine, was produced at the 'churning of the Ocean' and came out with a vessel of nectar in his hands. But according to the Bhâgavatapurâna, Dhanvantari was also one of the twenty-two avatâras* of god Vishnu; and appropriately enough he is represented in this shrine as a four-handed image wielding the discus and the conch in the back pair of hands, while one of the frontal pair of hands is in the abhaya pose, and the other carries his special attribute the amrita-kalasa. Shrines to Dhanvantari have not been met with elsewhere in any of the numerous temples of Vishnu in South India, and, as such, this shrine and its deity acquire a special iconographic importance.

(f) Similarly also the image of Eduttakai-alagiya-Nâyanâr or 'the god beauteous with the uplifted hand' referred to here is of iconographic interest, as it furnishes a rare instance in which an image ensconced in the gôpara of a temple gets the status of separate worship. This stucco image of Narasimha represented with one of his arms raised aloft in the act of striking down Hiranyakasipu, forms the central figure facing north in the first tier of the northern gôpara of the fourth prakâra; and a lofty nandajapa erected on a high platform in front of it serves the purpose of a shrine for the image. In Vaiṣṇava hagiologies, Álînâdan or Tirumangaí-Alvâr is stated to have built this gôpara for the god; but the ascription of the image and the gôpara in their present form to such an early date cannot be substantiated by structural or inscriptive evidence. In literary tradition, this deity is said to have nodded his head in appreciation of Kamba's Râmâyana, when that poet expounded it to a literary coterie in the nandajapa in front of this selfsame gôpara; and some verses of that work* eulogising the Narasimha incarnation are believed to have been composed in specific reference to this deity. Be that as it may, this god and the gôpara are described in the Srîraṅgapatstava* of Parâśara-Bhaṭṭa (c. A.D. 1150), the son of Srîvatsaśankâmîśra (Kûrattâlvâr) and the successor of Râmânuja on the pontifical seat at Srîraṅgam. The name Eduttakai-alagiya-Nâyanâr is mentioned in some inscriptions* of the temple—of Virâ-Râmañâtha (c. A.D. 1257), of Jaṭâvarman Śûndara-Pûndâya I (c. A.D. 1269) and of Mâravarman Kulasâkhâra (c. A.D. 1272).

(g) Tyândakâlam-edutta-Perumâl Kuṭâl Chakrâvâjanambi oralias Uttamañambipilas, who was evidently the sole Trustee of the temple at the time of this record, belonged to the Ullamañambi family, several of whose members are said to have wielded great influence with the contemporary kings of the Vijayanagara dynasty, perhaps as trustees of their munificent benefactions to the Srîraṅgam temple. The Kûyilûyânu mentions some of them, such as, Vaḻiyândaimilaiyîtâ-Uttamañambi, his brother Uttamañambi-Chakrâyâvar (Saka 1337), Tirumalañâthâ-Uttamañambi (Saka 1366) and Krîṣâñâya-Uttamañambi (Saka 1409).
This family which belonged to the Pauraviśa community of Brahmans of the Kāśyapagotra, claims to have migrated to Śrīraṅgam from Śrīvilliputṭūr in the Tinnevelly District along with the Vaishnavī saints Periyārā and his daughter Kōdayāṇāl (of the 9th century A.D.). The genealogy of some of its members is given in the Sanskrit work called the Lakshmikēśyam1 and in a pamphlet entitled Uttamaniśvaravimakaprabhāvam.2 Kūdāl Chakravālanambi of the present record was the brother of Krishparāya-Uttamanambi according to the Kōyiloju, but the Lakshmikēśyam states that its author Tirumalainātha had a brother named Kūdāl Śaravāla-Nayīnāl. The Vaisnāsprabhāvam3 noted above mentions that he was Tirumalainātha's son and had the other name of Chiṅga-Krishparāya. This Chakravālanambi is stated to have purchased a few villages on behalf of the temple and to have repaired the Rājamahēndrankiruvāal3 which had also been damaged during the Muhammadan raids.

The title Irandakālam-edutta-Perumāl (he who revived the past) attached to his name does not appear to have been coined after the biruda of any king4 or chieftain, but may, in all probability, have been bestowed on him by the temple in recognition of his meritorious services in having brought it to its former greatness after its desecration by foreigners. Several instances of similar titles, such as Ellai-nilaiyīṭa and Rājakkaḷ-perumāl, etc., said to have been granted by the god himself for such deserving services, have been mentioned in the Kōyiloju.

(b) This record which is dated in Śaka 1415, as noted already, does not mention any ruling king. The date falls in the period following the extinction of the first Vijayanagar dynasty and before the accession of Vīrā-Narasimha of the Tuluva line i.e., during the Sāluva interregnum. In the Kōyiloju5 it is stated that Śāluva Tirumalaīrāja, the local governor of the Tiruchchērāppalli-ārmaī was succeeded by Kōṅēṭīrāja in about Śaka 1393, and the latter who had a partiality for the Siva temple at Jambukēśvaram imposed certain unauthorised taxes on the Śrīraṅgam temple lands and otherwise coerced the Śrīraṅgam people. A deputation headed by a certain Kandāḍai Rāmaṇujāda went to Narasā-Nayaka and appealed to him for relief. Thereupon this general marched against Kōṅēṭīrāja6, killed him in a fight and restored order in the temple administration at Śrīraṅgam7. It is therefore possible that in this period of confusion when the Vijayanagar throne itself was occupied by an usurper and also because the Uttamanambis were themselves recipients of several honours including the ‘Rāyar-mudrai’ from the previous kings8 this inscription as well as a few others of this period which were concerned with simple temple transactions omitted the mention of the Śāluva king’s name and were issued with the simple quotation of Śaka dates.

(c) As regards the vānum (tulukka-vānum of the Kōyiloju) during which the āṅgaiyāḷā had suffered damage, the reference is to the anarchy which followed in the wake of the Muhammadan invasions of South India in the first half of the 14th century A.D.

---

1 Above, Vol. XVIII, p. 139.
2 This pamphlet was compiled and published by S. Narasimhachar in 1912. The reason for the title ‘Kūdāl Śaravāla’ given in this book that the Trustee ripped open his entrails (kūdāl) and measured it out in lieu of the paddy due to the king, is fanciful.
3 Kōyiloju, p. 125.
5 Loc. cit., p. 129.
6 Kōṅēṭīrāja’s records dated in Ś. 1409 and 1412 are found in the Tamil districts (Modras Ep. Rep. for 1912, p. 75).
8 Nos. 87, 92 and 93 of 1936–37 of the Madras Epigraphical collection.
If the Köyiloju’s narrative can be relied on, there were two distinct raids during both of which Śrīnāgam appears to have fallen a victim to the invaders’ rapacity and iconoclastic zeal. It is stated that as a result of the first raid1 the image of Raṅganāthā was absent from the temple for a period of 59½ years, until its restoration in A. D. 1372 by a ‘Chandragiri-prabhu’, thus pointing to A. D. 1310–11 coinciding with Malik Kāfūr’s southern campaign, as the date of its occurrence. The date of the second sack of Śrīnāgam is Śaka 1249, and as this coincides with the date of the southern campaign undertaken in the reign of Muhammad-bin-Tughlak in A. D. 1327–28,2 it has been surmised that the Muhammadan army which was sent out from Warangal passed along this route and raided Śrīnāgam. The Raṅganāthā image which escaped capture by being smuggled out of the temple by Pillai Lōkāchārya4 had, as described in the Köyiloju, an eventful itinerary through several places for over forty years, until it was brought back to Śrīnāgam by Gōpanāraya of Ginge, an officer of the Vijayanagara prince Kampana in Śaka 1293 (=A. D. 1372). The heroic part played by these two persons, prince and officer, in defeating the Muhammadans at Madura and in restoring the Raṅganāthā image to its own habitation, is already known from the Madhuravijayam3 of Gaṇḍāvī and from the two Sanskrit verses engraved on the Dharmarāma’s wall in the second prakāra of the Śrīnāgam temple. Epigraphical references to these incidents are also found in records copied at Kaṇṭaṇūr,3 Tiruppattūr, Tirukkākkiṇu and several other places.

When Śrīnāgam slowly recovered from the effects of the tulukka-vāpaṭam, the work of renovating the fallen gopuras, prakāras walls and mantapas, appears to have been taken in hand in easy stages, and the turn of the aṅgaṅgāla and its annexes the Dhanvantari shrine came when, in Śaka 1415 (=A. D. 1493), Śrīnāga-Garudavahana-Bhaṭṭa, the hereditary Physician of the Śrīnāgam temple and the author-to-be of the Divyastūrīcharitam, came forward to do his little bit in rehabilitating the Śrīnāgam temple to its former state.

(A.)

TEXT.

Front Side.

1 * Svasti Śri [||]Śakā-
2 bdam 1415–n–
3 mēḷ śellā–
4 niṟra Pramādi-sa–

5 nivatsarattu Risha–
6 bha-nāyatru pūr–
7 va-pakshattu pañcha–
8 miyum Sōmavā–

1 Loc. cit., pp. 12 and 103 et. seq. There seems to be some duplication in the Köyiloju’s narrative.
2 These facts are dealt with in Ind. Anti., Vol. XI, p. 138 and in greater detail in S. K. Aiyangar, South India and her Muhammadan Invaders, pp. 113 and 155 ff.
3 South India etc., p. 158.
4 Loc. cit., p. 104. Pillai Lōkāchārya died on the way at Jyṭṭiśkūṭi.
5 Published by G. Harihari Sastrī, Trivandrum.
6 Above, Vol. VI, pp. 322 ff.

There is some slight vagueness in the Köyiloju narrative. The first image was brought back through the help of a ‘Chandragiri-prabhu’, while the second image was restored by Gōpaṭa of Ginge. Apparently both these images were restored on the same occasion, which necessitated the discriminative test applied by the temple washerman for their identification (p. 29). The Sanskrit verses referring to the restoration by Gōpaṭa do not make specific mention of two images, however.

7 No. 162 of 1936–37, No. 119 of 1908 and No. 64 of 1916 of the Madras Epigraphical collection.
8 A vAdaḷalai mark (without the central line) flanked by a Chakra and a Saṇkha are engraved at the top of the inscription.
9 Many of the Sanskrit words are engraved correctly in Grantha letters.
10 The secondary length of the letter is engraved in the next line.
9 ramum perça Pū-
10 satnañl Turveda-
11 agañlirrupati-
12 randakālamedu-
13 tta-Perumāḷ[Ka]-
14 dal Chakrālajanam-
15 da āga Uttamana-
16 mbl-Pillai kāla-
17 tila bāṭāl-
18 kottu Ajaigya-
19 pūlā-Maṅgalā-
20 darāyar putran Śrī-
21 nivāsan āga [Śrī]-
22 raṅga-Garudāva-[Śrī]-
23 hana-Battar kaḻi]-
24 ēkāryan āga Śrī-
25 [Chajtrapushkaranikku

26 mēlpurām-āga mu-
27 ṣṇāl Pratāpa-
28 chakrāvatr*āṭi kālām
29 tuḍaṇgī ivanūlai-
30 ya pūrvāl Ga-
31 ruḍavāhana-Bha[ṭṭa]-
32 r naṭattī-vanda ā-
33 rōgaśālai-
34 vaṅattīle
35 khilam-āgaiyil
36 ippoḍu ā-
37 rōgaśālai-
38 yum ūmaippī-
39 tta Dhanvantari-Em-
40 berumāṇaiyum
41 ēri-aruḷappan-
42 Ṽuṇgaiyil

Back Side.

43 nālōgru-
44 m Perumāḷ
45 kuḍi[n]īmamudu-
46 śeyd-aruḷi-
47 ra kaṭṭalaikk─
48 m Dhanvantari-E-
49 mberumān
50 tiruvāraḥdana-kar-
51 ṃṭalaiikkum naḍa-
52 kāmbadhi munṇā-
53 Garguvala-
54 na-Bhatṭar Perumā-
55 lukkan Raṅgagho-
56 saḷai praba-
57 ndham paṇḍi
58 Perumāḷ tiruvu-
59 ēlam ugantu ti-
60 rukkaivālakram-
61 āga-ppallakkī-mā-
62 Ṽuṇiyam-āga-tt-

63 ruvullam-parṇa
64 tirumugappadiyilī-
65 anubavittu-vā-
66 nda teṇkarai [ti]-
67 tuvīdaiṭṭam Pā-4
68 nīrāniyala-
69 tu Irajavibhā-
70 ṭanṭ nilan śuru-vē-
71 liyum nālau
72 Perumāḷakku
73 vipappān-
74 śeydu Dhanvant-
75 ri-Emberumāṇ-
76 kku tiruvīḍaiṭṭa-
77 māga samapppikai-
78 ūlinda nilam
79 śuru-vēliyum Dha-
80 nvaṇṭari-Emberumā-
81 nukku tiruvāra-
82 dhana-kkaṭṭalaikkum

1 The Tamil letter pā is used instead of bān.
2 The secondary length of the letter lā is engraved in the next line.
3 Correctly 'Chandrapushkariṅī'.
4 The letter lā is engraved in the next line.
5 This should be correctly kuṭiṅṅīr here as well as in line 83 below.
6 The secondary length is in the next line.
7 Tirukkaiyilakam ordinarily means 'offerings distributed to devotees etc.' Here it implies that the land had been granted by the god himself.
8 Rājavibhāṭan was the title of some king, after which the measuring-rod was so named.
9 The letter va is in the next line.
83 kudiñir-amudukku- 85 na-Bhaṭṭar adhi-
84 m Garuḍavāha- 86 śṭhānam-aṅga.  

Third Side.

87 putra  
88 pau-  
89 tra-  
90 param-  
91 parai-  
92 y-aṅga  
93 āchā-  
94 nārākka-  
95 sthāyi  
96 āga na-  
97 datta-[kke]-ka-  
98 dāvād-a-  
99 gavum [*]  
100 inda  
101 dhammat-  
102 tukku  
103 ahita-  
104 m niṇai-  
105 ttavarga-  
106 | Gaṅgi  
107 kkarai-  
108 yil ka-  
109 vila-  
110 yai va-  
111 dhāttavar-  
112 gaḷ pāpā-  
113 tīūṭī pō-  
114 ga-kka-  
115 dāvarga-  
116 1-aṅgu-  
117 m [ ][*] Subha-  
118 [m]-astu [ ][*]  

TRANSLATION.

Hail! Prosperity!

In the (cyclic) year Pramāḍi which was current after Saka 1415, in the month of Rishabhā, on Monday, with pañcama (nti) of the first fortnight and Pushya (naksatra): in the time of Īrandaṇālīm-ṇḍutta-Perumāḷ [Ku]ḍal Chakravālanambi alias Uttaṇānambi-Pillai of the temple of Tiruvanāṅga-Tiruppāti,—

Śrīnīvāsan alias Śrīrāṅga-Garuḍavāhana-Bhaṭṭar, son of Alagiyamaṇavāla-Maṅgalādārāvar of the bhaṭṭāl-kottu, reconstructed the ērōgyaśālāi to the west of the Chandra-pushkariq (tank), which had been conducted in the past by an ancestor of his named Garuḍavāhana-Bhaṭṭar from the time of Pratāpachakravartin and which had become dilapidated during the vāgam, consecrated (the image of) Dhanvantari-Emberumān (therein), and arranged for the service of (supplying) daily kudiñir-offering to Perumāḷ (god Rāγanāṭha) and for worship to Dhanvantari-Emberumān, in the following manner:—

The two vēḷi of Rājavihār-nilāṅ in Pāṇḍamangalam, a tāṟuvuṟaiyattam (village) on the southern bank (of the river Kāverī), which had been in the enjoyment of (the earlier !) Garuḍavāhana-Bhaṭṭa, having been graciously granted to him through the god's tirumugam as pālakkumāṇyam, for (his) having composed the prabandham (called) Rāṇgagōshitaṇi to (i.e., in honour of)

1 Kudiñir is correctly kudiṁir. It was intended for being offered to Perumāḷ (Rāγanāṭha), as specifically mentioned in line 44.
2 Addḥāṅgan means 'under the supervision of'.
3 The letter ka is engraved in the next line.
4 Read ā-chand-ārka.
5 The ai sign is engraved in the previous line.
6 I.e., land, as measured by the Rājavihāraṃ measuring-rod.
7 There is a slight vagueness in the wording, which would also admit of considering the Rāṇgagōshitaṇi as the work of the Garuḍavāhana of A. D. 1493.
8 I.e., land granted for the maintenance of a palanquin for his use, as a special honour.
the god, was on this day made over as śirucidavādānam to Dhanvantari-Emberumāṇ after due initiation¹ to Perumāl (Raṇganāthā). And it was stipulated that this two celi (of land) was to be utilised, as long as the moon and sun last, for providing worship to Dhanvantari-Emberumāṇ and for āṇ̄avā offering (to Perumāl), under the supervision of Garudavāhana-Bhaṭṭa and in his lineal succession of son and grandson.

Those that contemplate evil to this charity shall incur the sin of having killed tawny cows on the banks of the Ganges.

Be it well!

---


By Prof. V. V. Mirashi, M.A., Nagpur.

This inscription was discovered by Dr. N. P. Chakravarti, Government Epigraphist, at Rewāh in 1936. The slab, on which it is inscribed, is now lying in the guard hall of the old palace at Rewāh. It is said to have been previously built into a wall of the Zenana Mahal of the same palace, from where it was removed a few years back and preserved in its present place. I edit the inscription here from two excellent impressions kindly supplied by the Government Epigraphist.

The record is incised on a large slab. The inscribed surface measures 7'-2" in breadth and 3'-11" in height. As shown below, the inscription was originally put up at a temple of Śiva and seems to have been brought over to Rewāh from somewhere else.² The record has suffered considerably on the right and left hand sides and especially in the lower portion comprising lines 23-31, in which in some places only a word here and there can be read with confidence. Even in other parts, where it is better preserved, the mātrās, the anusvāra, the sign for the superscript r on the top of letters and the horizontal stroke in the body of s have in many cases disappeared. The inscription consists of thirty-one lines and falls into two parts which are separated by an ornamental figure in L. 19. Except for the obeisance to Śiva with which it seems to have opened and a few words recording the date at the end, the whole record is in verse. The first part of it, which eulogizes the reigning Kalachuri king Kārna and his ancestors, comprises thirty-three verses. As many as twenty-one of these occur in the Goharwa plates³ of that king. In many cases, therefore, the damaged letters of the present inscription can be easily supplied from the latter record. The second part, comprising verses 34-59, contained a legendary account of the origin of the Kāyastha caste as well as the genealogy of the minister of Kārna, who founded the temple of Śiva at which the present inscription was set up. The mutilation of a considerable portion of the record in this part is very much to be regretted as none of the damaged verses are known to occur anywhere else. We have consequently lost not only an account of the achievements of the minister and his ancestors, but, except in one case, even the names of all of them. Besides, the present record, had it not been so badly mutilated, would have thrown much welcome light on the notions current in the eleventh century A. D. about the caste of the Kāyasthas, which has latterly become a subject of keen controversy. As shown below, the mutilated condition of the present record makes its evidence doubtful.

¹ This means that the formal permission of the god was obtained for the transaction.

² In his report for 1935-36 the Government Epigraphist has conjectured that the slab might have been brought from Gurgi like so many other inscriptions and statues which are now kept in the State Treasury or in the compound of the Prince’s Palace”. (A. S. R. for 1935-36, p. 89.)

The characters belong to the Nāgarī alphabet. The size of letters varies from '8' to '1'. Medial diphthongs have generally been indicated by prishtha-mātras. Kh has attained its fully developed Nāgarī form, see nikāha, l. 8, but s is still without its dot, see e.g. Vanga-bhangā, l. 6; th has developed a vertical at the top, see lathantu, l. 3 and pitka, l. 6; the upper loop of th is closed, see pūṭhā-māshī, l. 16; its subscript form, however, is not now laid on its side, see sthalā, l. 15. The left portion of dh is still undeveloped. The letter is, therefore, distinguished from v which it closely resembles by the absence of the horizontal line at the top and in the case of dhā by a horizontal stroke joining the two verticals, see avaishāvaya-vidhāna, l. 15. The right hand curve of ph is open and is added at the top of its vertical as in phala, l. 3, or a little lower down as in sphāl-, l. 13. The curve of ś is joined to its vertical on the right, see sūṣaṇa-, l. 18; the letter can in many places be distinguished from s only by its round top. Finally, ṣ shows no tail, see mahāti, l. 4.

The language is Sanskrit. As stated above, except for a few words in the beginning and at the end, the whole record is metrically composed. There are fifty-nine verses in all, of which thirty-three fall in the first and the remaining twenty-six in the second part of the record. In its first part our inscription has as many as twenty-one verses in common with the Goharwa plates of Karna, there being only slight variations in their readings here and there as pointed out in the footnotes to the transcribed text. In two cases (vv. 20 and 26) the order of verses in the present inscription differs from that in the Goharwa plates. The verses consequently refer to different kings in these two records; but as they contain mere conventional praise, the change does not affect the historical information. As regards orthography we may note that the consonant following r is doubled in many cases; see e.g. Saṁbhār-jañṭā maṅgalā, l. 2; b is throughout denoted by the sign for v, see vadāḥ-ṛ, l. 1; mura is used for mūr in tāmvarapāṭhāḥ, l. 18. Similarly n is wrongly substituted for amuscūra in pāṇu, l. 21. In evā-pāṇa, l. 11, we have the change of n to ṅ in accordance with Pāṇini's rule VIII, 4, 10.

The record seems to have opened with an obeisance to Śiva. This is followed by three maṅgala-sūkṣas in praise of Śiva, the last of which describes his Ardha-nārīśvara form. After two more verses—one in praise of Brahman and the other in that of poets' speech—begins a description of the ancestors of the reigning king Karna of the Kalachuri dynasty. His pedigree is traced to the moon, but the first historical personage, mentioned after such mythical and legendary heroes as Buddha, Pururavas, Bharata and Haihaya, is Lakṣmana-rāja, who is evidently identical with the homonymous king mentioned as the son and successor of Yuvarājadēva I in the Bihāri stone inscription and the Benares plates of Karna. As I have shown elsewhere, his father Yuvarājadēva I was a contemporary of the Rāṣṭrakūta kings Buddhāgama-Amoghavarsha III and his son Kṛishṇa III and may, therefore, have flourished from circa A.D. 915 to 945. Lakṣmaṇapāraja has thus to be referred to the period A.D. 945-970. In v. 11 of the present inscription which is also found in the Goharwa plates he is described as one 'who was clever in routing the king of Bengal, who defeated the Pāṇḍya, who was adept in despoiling the king of Lāṭa, who vanquished the Gūjara king and whose foot-stool was honoured by the heroes of Kāśmir.' There is no corroboration of Lakṣmaṇapāraja's raid in Bengal and Kashmir, but as regards his victory in Lāṭa or Gujrāt we have the statement in the Bihāri inscription that Lakṣmaṇapāraja, in the course

1 An analogous instance is furnished by the Goharwa plates. The verse Bhābhāra-kshaṇama-drik, etc., employed to describe Yuvarājadēva II in the plates occurs in the eulogy of his grandfather, Yuvarājadēva I, in the Benares plates of Karna.
of his expedition in the west, worshipped the god Sōmēśvarā, evidently Sōmanātha near Verāval in Kāṭhiāwār and dedicated to the deity the effigy of the (Nāga) Kāliya wrought with jewels and gold¹. His invasion of the Pāṇḍya country also seems to be corroborated by a mutilated line² in the contemporary Kāritaḷai inscription which mentions his forces encamped on the bank of the Tāmraparṇī. It seems rather strange that there should be no reference to Lakṣmanarāja’s victory over the Chōlas who, and not the Pāṇḍyas, were supreme in the South in the latter half of the tenth century A. D., and who must have been attacked and defeated by Lakṣmanarāja, before he could press as far south as the Tāmraparṇī in the Pāṇḍya country. We have, therefore, to suppose that the Chōlas had not yet recovered from the attacks of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince Kriṣṇa III and that the Pāṇḍya king was raising his head and trying to re-establish his power with the help of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king when his country was raided by Lakṣmanarāja. The Gūrjara king defeated by him must have been one of the weak successors of Mahāpāla II as pointed out by R. D. Banerji. The same scholar found corroboration of this victory in the statement of the Bihāri inscription that Lakṣmanarāja defeated the lord of Kōśala³. He further identified this prince with his namesake mentioned at the head of the genealogy in the Kahla plates of Sōghadēva⁴ and conjectured that he must have placed one of his sons in charge of the country conquered from the Gūrjaras. But these suppositions do not seem to be correct. Lakṣmanarāja’s victory over the king of Kōśala is mentioned in connection with the despoilment of the lord of Oḍra. The Kōśala appears, therefore, to be Dakṣiṇa Kōśala or Chhattisgarh and the adjoining states. Further, Lakṣmanarāja, who founded the dynasty ruling in the Gōarkhpur District, U. P., must have flourished long before the Lakṣmanarāja of our record; for, Rājaputra, the next prince mentioned in the Kahla plates, who, however, was not his immediate successor, must be referred to cīra A. D. 775, as his third lineal descendant Guṇāmbhōhiḍēvā I was a contemporary of the Pratihāra king Bhōja I (cīra A. D. 836-885). Lakṣmanarāja of the present inscription cannot, therefore, be identified with the homonymous king mentioned in the Kahla plates.

Our inscription next mentions Yuvarājadeva (II) as the son and successor of Lakṣmanarāja. He is evidently the second prince of that name mentioned in the Bihāri stone inscription and the Benares plates of Karna. The name of his elder brother Śaṅkaragaṇa who is known from the afore-mentioned two records as well as from the Kāritaḷai stone inscription⁵ has been omitted here probably because he was a collateral. The description of Yuvarājadeva II and his son and successor Kōkalla II given here is quite conventional.

After Kōkalla II, his son Gāṅgēyadeva came to the throne. Of the four verses devoted to his description in this record, three (viz. vv. 18, 19 and 20) occur in the Goharwa plates, but one of them (v. 20) is employed there to describe his son Karna. Verse 19 which is not known to occur anywhere else describes in a conventional manner Gāṅgēyadeva’s victory near the sea coast. This may refer to his campaign in Orissa which is specifically mentioned in the preceding verse (18).

² Only the lower portions of a few letters in the beginning of this line are preserved. The line has been omitted in Kielhorn’s text. I read the letters as nitarānī dalena || Tāmraparṇī tadē ||.
³ Compare जला राजसदिखारिकावरी वृक्षाकावयोवरे ताब्य भिष्मभक्तमययवर्तिकारापादराविवृतम्। in the Karhaṇḍ plates of Kriṣṇa III (above, Vol. IV, p. 285, v. 35). Perhaps the poet’s intention was to name the peoples living on the borders of India, and the Pāṇḍyas are mentioned here as living in the extreme South.
The latter gives the following description of Gāṇgāyādaśa's achievements—'From him (i.e. Kōkallā II) was (born) Gāṇgāyādaśa who threw into the cage of a prison the king of Kira, who looked radiant with the mass of wealth of (the king of) Aṅga, who was fond of defeating (the king of) Kuntala in a (clever) manner, and who, strong as he was in the action of breaking open the frontals of the best of elephants, made his own arm a pillar of victory on the shore of the (eastern) ocean after vanquishing the (king of) Utkala'. Most of the statements regarding these victories are substantiated by other evidence. We do not of course know if Gāṇgāyādaśa succeeded in actually extending his dominions as far as the Kira country which comprised the territory round Baijnāth in the east of the Kangra District; for, references to victories over the king of the Kira country and even a pun on his name are found in other records, which show that such descriptions were more or less conventional. But Gāṇgāyādaśa had certainly the Doāb under his control. He fixed his residence at the holy city of Prayāga (Allahābād) where he lived to the last. It is not therefore unlikely that he extended his sway in the North-West up to the Kangra valley, on the downfall of the Gürjara-Prathihāra king Trilochanapāla some time after A. D. 1027. His victory over the king of Aṅga seems to be a historical fact; for, from the colophon of a manuscript of the Rāmāyana in the Durbar Library, Nepal, he seems to have established himself in Tirābhiṣkrti as early as A. D. 1019 and this country he must have wrested from the contemporary ruler of Aṅga and Madagha, who was probably Mahīpāla I. It seems that there was another expedition against the king of Magadhā towards the close of Gāṇgāyādaśa's reign. This expedition was led by his son Karna. Tibetan tradition tells us that some time before A. D. 1040, which is the approximate date of Atiśa-Diṇaṅkara's departure for Tibet, there was an invasion of Nayapāla's territory by king Kārṇya of the West, who is obviously none other than the Kalaḥūra Kārṇa. As Gāṇgāyādaśa was ruling till A. D. 1040, this invasion cannot be placed in the reign of Kārṇa himself. It seems to have taken place towards the end of Gāṇgāyādaśa's reign. In that case Kārṇa may have been obliged to patch up a peace with the king of Magadhā as his presence was required elsewhere by the approaching end of Gāṇgāyādaśa. From the description in v. 18 Gāṇgāyādaśa seems to have exacted a heavy tribute from his vanquished adversary.

Gāṇgāyādaśa's victory over the king of Kuntala is also referred to in other records. Both the Khairhā and Jabalpur plates state that 'wishing to run away in haste from him the king of Kuntala ceased to wield his spear'. Kuntala included the Southern Maratha country and
the adjoining Kanerese districts and was at this time under the rule of the Later Chālukyas. The king of Kuntala, over whom Gāngēyādēva is said to have obtained a victory, was probably Jayasimha II, who ruled from about A. D. 1015 to 1042. From the Kulenur inscription it seems that Gāngēyādēva had formed a confederacy with the Paramārā Bhōja and the Chālā Rājendrā I to attack Jayasimha from three sides. Victory does not appear to have always attended the arms of the allies; for, the Kulenur inscription records the defeat of their elephant squadrons by Jayasimha’s cousin Kundarāja and the Balagānwe inscription states that Jayasimha searched out, beset, pursued, ground down and put to flight the confederacy of the Mālavas.

In his war against the king of Utkala (Orissa) Gāngēyādēva was helped by the subordinate branch of the Kalachuri family established at Tumāna. The Amōdā plates of Prithvīdēva I state that Kamalarāja vanquished the king of Utkala and gave his wealth to his lord Gāngēyādēva. The king of Utkala was, it seems, one of the Guptas of Dakshina Kōsala, perhaps Mahā-Siva-gupta-Yayāti who calls himself the lord of Utkala and Trikaliṅga. In one of his grants Yayāti is said to have obtained a victory over the Chaidyas and devastated the Dāhala country. The war seems therefore to have continued for some time and victory sometimes leaned to one side and sometimes to the other. If Gāngēyādēva was ultimately victorious, he may have assumed the title Trikaliṅgadhipati after his success. We know that his son Karna mentions this title in his first grant issued just a year after Gāngēya’s death.

Gāngēyādēva’s son and successor Karna is next eulogized in as many as twelve verses. Of these, six (vls. 22, 24, 26, 30, 31 and 32) were already known from the Goharwa plates. Of the remaining six, three contain a description of his achievements. The importance of the present inscription lies in this that it provides us for the first time with a contemporary record of some of Karna’s victories; for, though two other grants made by the king had already been discovered, they contained mere conventional praise. Our knowledge of his achievements was, therefore, entirely derived from the records of his descendants and his adversaries. Verse 23 states that ‘the ship of the king of the Eastern country, being driven by the storm of unparalleled arrogance, was submerged in the ocean of his (i.e. Karna’s) forces, its joints being rent by (dashing against) the promontories of the mountains of his elephants.’ Stripped of its metaphor, the verse means that Karna achieved a decisive victory over the king of the Eastern country, who lost his life in the fierce fight. Who was this king of the Eastern country? He could scarcely have been a Pāla king, for the kingdom of the Pālas, as shown by their own inscriptions and those of their contemporaries, was restricted to parts of Bihār and North-West Bengal. From the Bherā-Ghāt inscription of Alahanadēva, on the other hand, we learn that when Karna gave full play to his heroism, the Vanga trembled with the Kaliṅga. Karna’s victory seems, therefore, to have been obtained over the king of Vanga or Eastern Bengal. The tenor of the description suggests that the dynasty of the latter was supplanted and his kingdom was either annexed by Karna or placed in charge of his own nominee. As a matter of fact we find the Varmas supplanting the Chandras in Eastern Bengal in the eleventh century A. D. Śrīchandra is the last king of the Chandra dynasty known from inscriptions found in Bengal. The name of one more king, viz. Gōvindachandra, is known from the Tirumalai rock inscription of Rājendra Chōla I, which mentions him.

1 [If Krishna Sastry’s translation of verse 11 of the Khairā plates of Yaśaśkarādēva (above, Vol. XII, p. viii) is correct, the Kuntala king who was the adversary of Gāngēyādēva would be Vīkramāditya (V).—N. L. R.]
2 [It is doubtful if Kundarāja was a scion of the Chālukya family and hence a cousin of Jayasimha II (see Karnatak Historical Review, Vol. II, pp. 37 ff.)—N. L. R.]
4 Ibid., Vol. XIX, p. 79.
6 Ibid., p. 11.
as the ruler of the Vaṅgāla-dēśa. He was defeated in circa A.D. 1021 by Rājendrā I, the illustrious Chōla Emperor (A.D. 1012-44). Either this prince or his successor was on the throne when Karṇa invaded Eastern Bengal. After the overthrow of the Chandra prince, Karṇa seems to have placed Vajravarman in charge of the newly acquired territory and given his daughter Viraśāri to his son Jātavarman to cement the political alliance. The latter seems to have distinguished himself in the Aṅga country in one of the later campaigns of Karṇa. The present inscription which is definitely dated shows that the dynastic revolution must have been effected before A.D. 1048-9 and thus furnishes us with a landmark in the mediaeval history of Bengal.

Verse 25 refers to Karṇa’s conquests in the South. Overrunning the district of Kānchi he thoroughly enjoyed the Southern direction, in which the fortune of the Kuntala was shaken by forcible seizure and the low Pallavas were destroyed, as though covering the hips of a woman he was ravishing her, the beauty of whose hair was marred by forcible seizure and whose tender lower lip was wounded (in kissing).’ The description here is evidently dictated by the poet’s penchant for double entendre. The earliest verse of this type is traditionally ascribed to Mayūra and is taken by some scholars to contain references to Harsha’s expedition in the South. In later times poets composed such verses containing puns on names of countries to flatter their patrons in utter disregard of historical facts. For instance, three such verses, besides the aforementioned one ascribed to Mayūra, have been collected in the Sadubaktikarṣāṃrita of Śrīdharadāsa. It is, therefore, difficult to say how far the description in v. 25 of the present inscription can be taken to be historically true. Besides, the Pallavas, over whom a decisive victory is claimed for Karṇa in the present verse, had long before ceased to be supreme in the South, their kingdom having been annexed by the Chōlas in about A.D. 890. A branch of the Pallavas, no doubt, continued to rule in the Nolambavāḍi 32000 down to the eleventh century A.D., but they had no control over the territory round Kānchi and a victory over them would not have brought much glory to Karṇa’s arms. Besides, Karṇa’s victory over the Pallavas is not referred to in the fairly long lists of his conquests intimated in the records of his descendants. So far as the reference to the Pallavas is concerned, the description in the present verse appears to be more fanciful than real.

The reference to the invasion of the district of Kānchi is perhaps intended to signify the defeat of the Chōlas; for, though the capital of the Chōlas had been removed to Gaṅgāpurī or Gaṅgai-kopāḍachalapuram since its foundation by Rājendrā Chōla I, Sanskrit poets continued to mention Kānchi as the Chōla capital. Karṇa’s victory over a Chōla king is intimated in a verse in the Karanbēl inscription of Jayasīhādēva, R. D. Banerji conjecturally identified the Chōla king defeated by Karṇa with Virarājendrā Rājakēśarivarman, who was reigning between A.D. 1062 and 1067. The reference to the invasion of Kānchi in v. 25 of the present inscription, if historically true, would show that the victory had already been attained in A.D. 1048-9. Karṇa’s adversary must therefore be identified with Rājādhārāja I, the son and successor of Rājendrā Chōla I, who ruled from A.D. 1018 to 1054.
The account of Karṇa's conflict with the king of Kuntala is substantiated by other evidence. As already observed, Kuntala was then under the rule of the Later Chāluksyas. Though the Kalachuris and the Later Chāluksyas sometimes combined, as they did for instance when they overran the Mālava country some time after Bhūja's death, they frequently came into conflict with each other. Bihārapa records that Áhavamalla (Sōmesvara I) utterly destroyed the power of Karṇa, while an Apabhramśa verse mentions Karṇa's victory over the mighty Vikrama, evidently Vikramāditya VI, the son of Sōmesvara I-Áhavamalla. The conflict referred to in the present inscription must have occurred during the earlier part of Áhavamalla's reign when his son Vikramāditya was too young to take the field against Karṇa.

Verse 27 of the present inscription states that "when Karṇa approached (the Gūjrara country), tears mixed with collyrium flowed on the cheeks of Gūjrara women living in the neighbourhood and colour-marks indicative of thier non-widowhood slipped as if it were from their foreheads." This, is, of course, too vague a description to indicate an actual conflict with the king of the Gūjrara country, but, unless it is altogether meaningless, it suggests that Karṇa's relations with the contemporary Gūjrara king were already strained. Later on the two kings seem to have combined for the common objective of crushing out of existence the kingdom of Mālava, but their amiable relations did not last long; for, Hēmachandra records Bhūma's defeat of Karṇa while an Apabhramśa verse gives Karṇa credit for the extermination of mighty Gūjrara forces.

Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar has recently suggested (see his List of Inscriptions of Northern India, p. 231, n. 4) that Karṇa mentioned in this verse is the Chauñukya Karṇa and not Kalachuri Karṇa. He takes the scene in the above verse to he Jayasimha, the son of Bhūja. But the Chauñukya Karṇa was not a contemporary of Jayasimha; for, his father Bhūma was reigning till V. S. 1120 (above, Vol. XXI, p. 172), while Jayasimha was succeeded by Udayāditya some time in V. S. 1116 (see Bhandarkar's List, Nos. 133 and 134). The later references to Jayasimha are either doubtful (see above, Vol. XXII, p. 56, n. 3) or refer to some other Jayasimha, perhaps the Chauñukya Jayasimha (ibid., Vol. XXII, p. 37, n. 8). The Kalachuri Karṇa, on the other hand, was a contemporary of the Paramara Jayasimha. It seems that he invaded Mālava at least twice. The first invasion occurred in circa A. D. 1055 about the time of Bhūja's death. Karṇa and Bhūma attacked Mālava from the east and the west. Jayasimha, the son of Bhūja, was then obliged to seek Sōmesvara-Áhavamalla's help to turn back the invaders (see the Vikramāditya inscription II, 67). Karṇa's second invasion seems to have occurred about five years later. His ally this time was probably Sōmesvara II, the elder son of Vikramāditya VI. Karṇa achieved greater success this time. Jayasimha was probably killed in the battle of Vikramāditya VI. The story of the battle and parts of Mālava annexed to the Chauñukya and Chēlī kingdoms. In the Śādi inscription of Śāka 906, the battle of Mālava is described as a blazing submarine fire to the ocean, that is, the race of the Mālavas. An Apabhramśa verse in the Pingalākara inscription to which Dr. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar drew attention long ago (see his Collected Works, Vol. II, p. 390) clearly says that the Kalachuri Karṇa had by force uprooted the family of the king of Mālava (एक उपर वाला कुल देवसुरवर्धक देवतादास्वरूपंमहं शासिताधीरोति के शुक्लानिरविशालः) such statements could have been made only if Jayasimha being killed in the battle, there was for some time no seion of the royal family on the throne of Mālava. Though the Chauñukya Karṇa also is said to have waged war on the king of Dhārā, he is nowhere credited with eradicating the family of the Mālava king.

2. The Shādi inscription records that during this period the king of Mālava (कुरुक्षेत्र ग्राम सम्पत्ति वास महोदयतः जीवनात्मकः) Nicholas Barker, Collected Works of R. G. Bhandarkar, Vol. II, p. 339.
4. See n. 1 above.
statements show that the two kings must have measured swords before A. D. 1063 at the latest, each side claiming victory over the other. Verse 27 of the present inscription suggests that the battle may have been fought even before A. D. 1048-9.

The object of the present inscription appears to have been to record the construction of a temple of Śiva by a minister of Karna, who belonged to the Kāyastha caste. Verse 34, with which commences the second part of the record, states that the twice-born caste undertook the work of a minister to augment the mantra-śakti (power of good counsel) of kings who are possessed of the other two powers, viz., the utāda-śakti (personal energy) and prabhu-śakti (power derived from their royal position). We next get an account of the origin of the Kāyastha caste. There was a great sage (mun-indra) named Kāchāra who derived his holy birth from the three-eyed god Śiva. He made the town Kulāncha an ornament of three worlds. A person of the fourth caste (turiya-janman) respectfully propitiated him on the bank of the heavenly river (i.e. Ganges). The next verse, which is partly mutilated, seems to describe the boon granted by the sage apparently to the Śūdra who had been serving him, that he would have a son of well-known and righteous deeds, who having his head sanctified by the dust of earthly gods (i.e. Brāhmaṇas) would become almost like the councillor of the lord of heaven (i.e. Brahma). The sage next declared that his caste would thereafter be known by the name of Kāyastha, since he had innumerable merits in his kāya (body). Verse 39, which is only partially preserved, refers to the birth of a son (apparently to the Śūdra) from whom sprang the caste of the Kāyasthas. We next told that in his race were born wise, grateful, virtuous and meritorious diplomats, who gave security from fear to (all) beings. Verse 41 describes a personage of matchless prowess, who was distinguished among the rest as the Kaustabha is among all the gems produced from the milky ocean, but unfortunately his name is lost in the damaged portion. Verse 43 also mentions a person whose name again is illegible, but who was apparently an object of veneration to the illustrious king Lakshmanaṇa as Višnu is to the three worlds. This personage seems to have been eulogized in the next two verses (44 and 45). The preserved portion of v. 46 states that Somaśvara who dedicated himself to the welfare of the people was born from the aforementioned personage. The next verse seems to have described some achievements of his through intelligence and personal prowess. From l. 26 the record has unfortunately been too much mutilated to yield any useful information. We have consequently lost even the names of the descendants of Somaśvara, of whom the last one mentioned in the present inscription seems to have been a minister of Karna. From the description of the white splendour of a temple in v. 54, that it was as it were due to the laughter of Śiva who rejoiced to have such an excellent abode, it seems that it was a temple of Śiva at which the present inscription was put up. This surmise receives confirmation from the statement in v. 58 that the person, who had caused the temple of the 'enemy of Smara' (i.e. Śiva) to be constructed, himself composed the present praśasti. The last verse seems to name him as the great poet Kāchara, but the reading is not free from doubt. The record closes with the date 800 expressed in numerical figures only. This must evidently be referred to the Kālacuri-Chhedi era and corresponds to A. D. 1048-9. In the absence of the necessary details it does not admit of verification.

As already observed, the present inscription, if it had been in a state of good preservation, would have proved valuable for the history of the Kāyastha caste. Even as it is, it clearly shows that the Kāyasthas had crystallized into a caste in the beginning of the eleventh century A. D., but we have still earlier records which unmistakably prove the existence of the caste two centuries.

1 His name ended in kara and may have been Prabhakara.
2 The first two figures of the date are certain. The third also is clear in one of the impressions.
earlier\(^4\). The fanciful derivation of the caste name Kāyastha given here occurs also in the Naishadhiyacharita (Canto XIV, v. 66). The present inscription seems to connect the caste with a sage named Kāchāra. The tendency to trace the origin of royal families to well-known legendary heroes or sages was widely prevalent in the middle ages, but the name of Kāchāra as an eponymous hero occurs nowhere in ancient mythological or legendary literature\(^5\). It would seem, therefore, that an attempt has been made here to give a legendary explanation of the name of the caste which had become current in the eleventh century A. D.\(^6\). From the introductory verse of the second part of the present record, viz. v. 34, the poet’s intention seems to have been to show that the Kāyasthas belonged to the Brāhmaṇa caste. It looks strange, therefore, that he should refer in v. 36 to a Sūdra (turiya-janman) as a Kāyastha and the progenitor of that caste and describe his son as having his head purified by the dust from the feet of earthly gods (i.e. Brāhmaṇas). Owing to the unfortunate mutilation of the lower part of the inscription it is now impossible to say how the Sūdra origin of the caste referred to in vv. 36-38 was reconciled with the claim to Brāhmaṇa-hood which seems to have been made in v. 34\(^4\).

The names of the distinguished members of this Kāyastha family, who seem to have served Kālachuri kings as their ministers, have been lost with the single exception of Sōmēśvara. The latter is eulogized in vv. 46 and 47, as one who had dedicated himself to the welfare of the people and distinguished himself by his prowess as well as by intelligence. The mention of Lākṣaṁancaṇa-rāja’s name in one of the preceding verses suggests the identification of this Sōmēśvara with the homonymous son of Bākamiśrā, who was a minister of Lākṣaṁancaṇa-rāja as stated in the Kārt-talāi stone inscription\(^8\). A careful comparison of the descriptions in the two records would show, however, that the identification cannot be upheld. For, Sōmēśvara of the Kārt-talāi inscription was undoubtedly a Brāhmaṇa, as he is called Bhaṭṭa therein\(^9\) and is said to have belonged to the Bāhāravajjā gōtra\(^7\). From the lengthy description of his accomplishments in that record we learn that he was proficient in various arts, but we do not find therein a single reference to his skill in the use of arms\(^8\). Sōmēśvara of the present inscription, however, was a Kāyastha distinguished as much for personal valour as for intelligence. Besides, he does not seem to have been a contemporary of Lākṣaṁancaṇa-rāja himself, but of his successor; for from vv. 43-46 we learn that he was the son of a person who was honoured by Lākṣaṁancaṇa-rāja. He is not, therefore, likely to have been identical with Sōmēśvara of the Kārt-talāi inscription.

Of the geographical names occurring in the present record Bangāla, Kāśmirā, Kāchī and Himālaya are too well known to need identification. Anōja comprised the country round modern

---

\(^1\) In his article ‘The Nāgar Brāhmaṇa and the Bengal Kāyasthas’ (Ind. Ant., Vol. LXI, p. 48) Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar has drawn attention to the Sañjān plates of Amōgaharsha I (871 A. D.) and the Gurne plates of Jayādityadāva II (870 A. D.) as the earliest records mentioning the Kāyastha caste.

\(^2\) In the Ajayagadhi inscription of Nātra, a minister of the Chandella Būdavarman, the origin of the Kāyasthas is traced to the sage Kāyapa (see J. A. S. B., Vol. VI, p. 882).

\(^3\) Is Kāchāra, like Khachara (Ind. Ant., Vol. XL, p. 31), identical with Khaṇḍar?\(^\star\)

\(^4\) It is, of course, possible to take turiya-janman in the sense of a Brāhmaṇa by dissolving the compound as turiya-janman (gajānman) janman gaj̄a aś, i.e. one who is born for (the performance) of a sacrifice, a Brāhmaṇa. Both the St. Peter’s Latīcōn and the Vācchāpiṣayam give this sense of turiya, citing the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa IX, 2, 3, 11, etc. in support of it. But such an explanation would appear forced; since the word does not bear that sense in classical Sanskrit. Balkūryuda gives turiya-ṣamsa in the sense of a Sūdra. Note also agna-janman (first born) which means a Brāhmaṇa. Besides, the expression ṣaḥ bhūmi-dēva-pada-pānā-pavitra-mault suggests that the son did not belong to the caste of earthly gods or Brāhmaṇas.


\(^6\) Ibid., v. 9.

\(^7\) Ibid., v. 2.

\(^8\) It must, however, be stated that v. 16 of the inscription states that Sōmēśvara’s deeds were praised by lards in the fore-front of the battle-field.
Bhāgalpur and Kira that near Bijnāth in the Kāṅgārā valley. Lāṭa is generally identified with Central and Southern Gujarāt; but may have included some northern territory also. Kuntala has already been shown to be the name of the country under the rule of the Later Chāluksyas. Kulānchā, the town founded by the sage Kāchara is evidently identical with Kōlānchā, Kṛōḍānchā or Kṛōḍāṇjā met with in the epigraphic records ranging in date from the tenth to the twelfth century A.D. which have been discovered in the modern provinces of U. P., Assam, Bihār, Orissa and Mālwa. From the statements in these records the place seems to have been a stronghold of the Brāhmaṇas of the Śaṅditya-gotra, most of whom belonged to the Śālavāda. According to the tradition recorded in the Kula-pāṭikās of the Rāṣṭri and Vārāndri Brāhmaṇas, five ancestors of these Brāhmaṇas came to Bengal from Kōlānchā at the invitation of the king Ačiśā for the performance of a Vedic sacrifice. The present inscription shows that the place was also the home of the Kāyaśasas. In a copper-plate inscription from Assam the village is said to have been situated in Śravastī. Our inscription seems to indicate that it was situated on the Ganges, but its exact location I am unable to fix.

TEXT:

[Metres: Vv. 1, 20, 33 and 54 Śraghṇa; vv. 3, 9, 12, 15, 18, 19, 24, 30 and 31 Śārdūḷavikrīḍita; vv. 4, 43, 50 and 53(1) Āryā; vv. 5, 14, 17, 38, 44, 48, 49, 56 and 57(1) Amahabh; vv. 6, 8, 11, 22, 26, 32, 37, 40, 41, 46, 47, 51, 52 and 59 Vasatāstilaka; v. 7 Pushpitāgī; vv. 10, 13, 16, 23, 25, 29, 34-36, 39, 45(1), 55 and 58 Upajāti; v. 21, Deutavitambita; v. 27, Indravajṛ; v. 28, Mālinī; v. 42 Ruchirā.]

1 . . . . . [*] — — — — — — — — — — से मण्डलोपणप[।] श्र[।]ि [सं] [व] बर्त्त[स] जान्य। भविकरिण अकानक्तीदात्रि। द्वादशीविवर्त(व) दीर्घम् मित्रिकरण। श्रीमणि शरणर्थिष्ठानकोनिर्दिश। वत्सिसर्वसिद्धान्तद्रविद्यान्त्य-मानिव [श्री: ] II[11] य — — कन्यामदरोकारलाख्यार — — — —


1 Above, Vol. VII, pp. 86 &.
2 Mr. J. C. Ghosh mentions six such charters (see Ind. Col., Vol. II, pp. 358-9). To whom I would add the Kahli copper-plate grant of the Kalachuri Śrīhañdeva, above, Vol. VII, pp. 83 ff. In l. 44 Kielhorn doubtfully reads Ākuṇādhya, which should be Kūlānchā (i.e. of Kulānchā). It is noteworthy that the Brāhmaṇa Jāla mentioned therein as being from Kūlānchā belonged, like other Brāhmaṇas of that place, to the Śaṅditya-gotra and the Śālavāda.

3 See Padmanath Bhattacharya, Kāmārātīpa-śāhāndura, p. 155.
4 From inked estampages supplied by the Government Epigraphist for India.
5 There is space for about nineteen akārav in the beginning, of which the first six may have been.
6 Brestan śrīkāla.
9 [भि प्रजाना*] [प्रजानीच्छि] चेनिति व[ै]मानि। तले(चे) परिणावविव योगस(जाँ) निनालंकारमसर्म प्राप्तम् ॥[१६४।।] बाहुमण्डलौ(चे) ब्र(श्र) ब्राप्तरागसर्वसूचितं।

10 [डै।] [कोणस्व।] वेदाकरि करोऽदकुचदन्वारायणारामणा। निनि[चिह्व]योकलम- 

11 [त्रोदरीत्] [किले] वाणीतः। ॥[१८।।।] योक्तुप्रमाणः[इसू] नाविगिर्दुरापराधमसर्व- 

12 [चन्द] दिगा। रेष संकल्पकारत्व। उपयुक्। शुद्धावधारकारवर्ग सुभाषित स 

13 — [परि] देहस्व। ॥ पनः[य] देवस्व व[ड] लाहु(सु) वाणी। मन्या पुर्णविन-राजपत्। ॥[२१।।।] नाप[श्र]। नाप विष्णुप्रतिज्ञानिन्न। वाक्यावृत्तियोगस्मिनयो- 

14 [कः] [शून्य]। [टक्कौचल्लितकुलकृष्ण] [विश्वासनामध्यपक्ष]। प्राप्त मानितकुलकृष्ण। वेन दियमभिं व[ड] बुध। बुधे द्राक्षरम् ॥[२२।।।] "पापा- 

*The Goharwa plates read the second half of the verse as मनि वर्णमुद्रयताधयात्मकम् मया. 
*In the Goharwa plates this verse occurs after मनि नाम विष्णुदेवसेवतः (५. २४ below) and therefore describes Karpa. 
*The Goharwa plates have कृष्णस्मि which Dr. Hultsch proposed to change to कृष भण्डारी. Here the खृष्णस्मि are clear except that the horizontal stroke in the square of the superscript श has been obliterated. 
*Before त्रोदरी। 
*The Goharwa plates read वाणी। 
*In the Goharwa plates this verse is placed before वर्णमुद्रयताधयात्मकम् etc. (५. १६ above) and is, therefore, intended to describe Kōkālatadvad (२).
15 [महुक्कडिकिनिनिर्मितिर रूपमें[षण]] गद्धकल्य साधन-व्य[षण]। मालादैविकविश्वासच: पर्यंतभाषां शब्दिता द्वासन[षण]।
[20][*] चतुर्विंशती[षण] यक्षांशोरत[षण]। यद्यपि[षण] वाचीपत्यान्तः
दत्। चिन्तितसन्य नित्योऽर दल्ल्य[षण]।
16 — — — — — कमेल[षण]। प्रताप[षण]। [28][*] मूर्ख: चक्षुः। महीनेमाणपायाः
मस्थ[षण]। एहसासे चेन वीणकेस्वात: मृगशिवाय भवायः
[षण]। [28][*] नीलीतु प्रमदावियालकिनिना द्राम(षण)। भारारित[षण]
वष(षण) तुषारा भक्षय: कारार[षण]। वानप्रस्थरः
17 [वनावयवादेश[षण]। भिक्षुः]। भिक्षुः]। येन[षण]। चतुर्वासेकुरुः कठोरकताः शुष्क[षण]
[30][*] यायिष्कुशमानोत्तरम्बिताकलापाः निगम्याल्पम: प्राकृतवर्णाचाराः
र्यालस्यसमारः। एतत्ततिममः। पुरुष परिशिशः व(षण)। भावार्थम्
संस्कृतभे। यज्ञाकिनः [षण]।
18 [दिनं]। तिर्याकुर्ता|भूषि|। [षण]। तथा क्रण: नुस्तन(त्त)। आत्म
वर्णाष्ट्यो यद्य जिन जिन जनविन्यासमध्यतमः पदः। उक्तीश्चारणिनि(षण)।
दाताप्रवाहान्तः जातिनित्याचार्याय विवम: [32][*] यावदुच्छ चत्त्री[षण]
[षण]। तिर्याक-रिपुर्णमदित्वुरुषशिवाय [षण]। शूरोक्ता याव[षण]
— — [रिपुर्ण्य]। प्रदक्षण दृष्टी याव[षण]
19 — — — — — — — — — — यावद्यस्तवषेषा[षण]। आवश्यकस्फक्तम: आवश्यक[षण]
स्थानायोत्य भावोत्य पदान्तिति प्र(षण)। भेष्माः। वषा: [षण]। [31][*]ो रा-
उदाहरणक्रममद्याभिन्य[षण]। प्रवृत्तिनायिनिक्षमाय[षण]। [षण]
जिन जिन जिन जिन। प्रवृत्तिनः वर्ततायाः तत्स्वात्मायाः य[षण]
18 [षण]। [षण]। प्रवृत्तिनः वर्ततायाः तत्स्वात्मायाः य[षण]
— — [षण]। प्रवृत्तिनः वर्ततायाः तत्स्वात्मायाः य[षण]
— — [षण]। प्रवृत्तिनः वर्ततायाः तत्स्वात्मायाः य[षण]
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3 The Goharwa plates have वाणमाणमप्रेयर्नायानादात्तैत्व य ये ये ये
प्रनवि प्रनवि
4 भागाभागिन्य
5 Read नार्यानः
6 Read नार्यानः
7 Restore नार्यानः
8 This akshara is superfluous.
26  

27  जगतीपाल

28  

29  

30  

31  प्रकाष्ठेऽन्तः 

1 It would perhaps be better to read नलमः.

* The reading appears to be ाऽ; but it would not suit the metre.
The first conjecture about the epoch of the Kalachuri or Chedi era, which was found used in dating several records in the Central Provinces, was made by Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall who, in his article on the Bherā-Ghāt inscription of Alhaṇḍēvī dated Saṅvat 907 and the Tēwar inscription of the time of Jayasimhadēva dated Saṅvat 928, showed that the unspecified era used in the Kalachuri records might have commenced about A. D. 250. 3 Subsequently in 1878 Sir A. Cunningham announced in the Introduction (p. vi) to his A. S. R., Vol. VII, that he had found among the inscriptions collected by his assistant Beglar in the eastern part of the Central Provinces, two, which were specifically dated in the Chedi Saṅvatasa, and two others in the Kalachuri Saṅvat. He identified the two era’s, ‘as the princes of Chedi were of the Kalachuri branch of the Haidaya tribe’. He also stated that he had examined some eight verifiable dates of the era and had found by calculation that the era began in A. D. 249, the year 250 being the year 1 of the Chedi Saṅvat. The details of these eight dates were given by him together with the corresponding Christian dates in the A. S. R., Vol. IX, p. 111 which showed that only four of them were found to be regular, with the epoch of A. D. 249. But Sir A. Cunningham felt satisfied with the result and stated in his Indian Eras that A. D. 249-0 and A. D. 250-1 was the true starting point of the Chedi era.

Cunningham’s conjecture about the epoch of the era was corroborated by the dates of the Nausāri plates and the odd Kavi plate of the Gurjara king Jayabhaṭa III, which on calculation appeared regular 4 with the epoch of A. D. 249-250. No definite suggestion about the month and the tithi when the era actually commenced was, however, made until Dr. Kielhorn published his article entitled ‘the Epoch of the Kalachuri or Chedi era’ in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVII, pp. 215 ff. In that article Kielhorn showed by an examination of 12 dates of the later Kalachuris and their feudatories and of two dates of the Gurjara king Jayabhaṭa III, that ‘the only equation which yields correct week-days for those Chedi inscriptions in which the week-day is mentioned is Chedi-Saṅvat 0-A. D. 248-249 and Chedi-Saṅvat 1-A. D. 249-250; and that, if we wish to work out the dates by a uniform process we must take the Chedi year to commence with the month Bhāḍrapada, and must, accordingly, start from July 28, A. D. 249-Bhāḍrapada śu. di. 1 of the northern Vikrama year 307, current, as the first day of the first current year of the Chedi era’. In a note Kielhorn remarked that a year beginning with the month Āśvina would suit the dates examined by as well as that beginning with Bhāḍrapada but he preferred the latter because ‘Albērūni does mention a year commencing with the month Bhāḍrapada’. As regards the arrangement of fortnights Kielhorn found that it was the pūrṇimānta one in which the dark half of a month precedes the light half.

Kielhorn’s calculations made on the basis of the epoch of A. D. 248-249 showed that of the fourteen dates examined by him, in none of which the year was qualified either as current or as expired, eleven were found recorded in current years, two in expired years and one in a year, which is to be taken as expired if the Chedi year commenced on Bhāḍrapada śu. di. 1, but as current if it began on Āśvina śu. di. 1. This proportion of current and expired years of the Chedi era was, however, the reverse of what Kielhorn himself found in the case of other eras, such as the Vikrama, Ṣaka and Nēvār eras. It was pointed out by Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar among others that

1 J. A. O. S., Vol. VI (1860), p. 501. The article was presented to the Society on October 26, 1859.
2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII, pp. 76-77. The grantor of the Prince of Wales Museum plates of the (Kalachuris) year 486 (above, Vol. XXIII, pp. 147 ff.) is the same as of the Kavi plate. He should, however, be taken as Jayabhaṭa IV and not as Jayabhaṭa III.
"the Hindus' usual, not invariable, way of expressing a date is not 'in the year so and so' but 'after so many years had elapsed since such and such event had taken place'." The case of the Chédi era, which seemed to be an exception to the general rule, was cited by Fleet in support of his view that the years of the Gupta era, which were not qualified as current or expired, should be taken as current. This controversy about the general practice of the Hindus in dating their records in the middle ages led Kielhorn to revise his conclusion about the epoch of the Chédi era. In his article 'Die Epochen der Chédi-Aera' contributed to the Festgruss an Roth and in another on the Bhera-Ghat inscription of Alhanadévi in the Ep. Ind., Vol. II, pp. 7ff, both of which were published in 1893, he expressed his opinion that in conformity with the common usage observed in the case of other eras, the epoch of the Chédi era should be fixed in such a way that all or at least a majority of the available verifiable dates would be in expired years. He, therefore, proposed A. D. 247-248 as the epoch of the era. As regards the beginning of the Chédi year he drew attention to the following remark in Colebrooke's letter written at Nagpur on the 30th October 1799: "The new year begins here with the light fortnight of Āsvina; but opening in the midst of Durgā's festival, the New Year's day is only celebrated on the 10th lunar day." Kielhorn thought that the Āsvinādi year, which was current down to Colebrooke's time in a part of the country previously included in the Chédi kingdom, might be reminiscent of the Chédi year and, as such a year suited all the twelve Chédi dates known till then, he fixed the 5th September (Āsvina śa. di. 1) A. D. 248 as the first day of the first current year and the 26th August (Āsvina śa. di. 1) A. D. 249 as the first day of the first expired year of the Chédi era. He next showed that all the twelve verifiable Chédi dates in the inscriptions of the Later Kalachuris and their feudatories, which were known till then, were, without exception, in expired years. The two early dates, 456 and 486, of the Naunši and Kávi plates, however, presented difficulties which Kielhorn acknowledged in foot-notes to his List of Northern Inscriptions.

Three more Chédi dates containing the necessary data for verification were subsequently discovered and were calculated by Kielhorn before his death, viz., (1) the Sárñāth fragmentary stone inscription of the time of Karna dated Sa[meva]s[arē] 8]10 Āśvina (Āśvina) sudi 15 Ravaṇa (corresponding, for the expired Kalachuri year 816, to Sunday, the 4th October 1058); (2) Tahan-kapār (first) plate of Pampa-rājā dated Sa[meva]sarē] 965 Bhādrapadā savi 10 Mṛīga-rī[śī]kṣē [Sūma]-[dīnē] (corresponding, for the current Chédi year 965, to Monday, the 12th August A. D. 1213); and (3) Tahan-kapār (second) plate of Pampa-rājā dated Sa[meva]sarē 966... Īsava[sa]sarē[sa]meva]sarē Kārtti[kamāś Čchār-rī[śī]kṣē Ravi-dīnē Sūry-apārāgī (corresponding, for the expired Chédi year 966, to Sunday, the 5th October A. D. 1214). Besides, he found it necessary to change his reading and the corresponding Christian date in the case of one of the previously known twelve Chédi dates, viz., (4) that of the Sheorinārāyana image inscription which he now read as Kalachuri-samet[arē] 898 Āśvina-sudi 7 Sūma-dīnē from a photograph supplied by Dr. (then Mr.) D. R. Bhandarkar and found by calculation to correspond, for the current Chédi year 898, to Monday, the 24th September A. D. 1145.

1 See Collected Works of Sir H. G. Bhandarkar, Vol. III, pp. 388-389. The paper was communicated to the
3 See pp. 53-56.
4 See Life of H. T. Colebrooke by Sir T. E. Colebrookes, p. 163.
7 Above, Vol. IX, pp. 128-130.
8 Ibid., p. 129.
9 Ibid., p. 130.
Kielhorn's final view that the epoch of the Chödi era in A.D. 247-248 was confirmed by these new dates; for while two of them (viz., 1 and 3) might have been taken as current years with the epoch of A.D. 247-248, the other two (viz., 2 and 4) would have appeared irregular according to that epoch. The latter dates again showed that 'Kalachuri years, occasionally and exceptionally, are quoted as current years'.

Since 1893 scholars have generally accepted Kielhorn's conclusion that the Chödi era commenced on Ásvina śū. di. 1 (corresponding to the 5th September) in A.D. 248. Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit alone, differing from Kielhorn, has suggested that the Chödi year might have commenced on the first tithi of the dark fortnight of the pūrṇimānta Ásvina.

Since Kielhorn's time as many as thirteen new dates of the Chödi era have come to light and though they have been calculated and the corresponding Christian dates have, generally, been given by the scholars who have edited the records in which they occur, none has so far comprehensively dealt with them with a view to see how far they support or go against Kielhorn's view regarding the epoch of the Chödi era and the beginning of the Chödi year.

Having recently had to verify all the Chödi dates I have come to the conclusion that the epoch A.D. 247-248 finally fixed by Kielhorn is correct so far as it concerns the later Kalachuri dates; but taking all the dates into consideration I am convinced that with that epoch the Chödi year could not have commenced on Ásvina śū. di. 1 as held by Kielhorn. On the other hand some of the lately discovered dates go to show that the year must have begun on some day between Ásvina śū. di. 18 and Phālguna va. di. 7. And since we do not know of any Hindu year beginning in any of the months from Mārgaśira to Phālguna as current in any of the provinces under the Kalachuri, I think it probable that, like the Southern Vikrama year, the Chödi year also commenced on Kārttika śū. di. 1, especially because the era seems to have originated in Western India, where the Kārttikādi variety was the standard one.

To prove my view I give below nine out of the thirteen lately discovered Chödi dates together with their corresponding Christian dates according to the epoch of A.D. 247-248. These dates are arranged under two heads A,—Dates in expired years and B,—Date in current year. As according to my view the Chödi era commenced on the pūrṇimānta Kārttika śū. di. 1 in

---

* Above, Vol. IX, p. 130.
* See his History of Indian Astronomy (Marathi) (first published in 1896), Second ed. p. 375.
* Ablard mentions a year beginning in Mārgaśira, but from the account he gives of it, it seems to have been current in the north-west of India from Mulasā to Sindh and Kanaq (see Sachau's Tr., Vol. II, pp. 3-9).
* Since this article was sent to the press, the Government Epigraphist has, at my request, sent me stampages of the Makundpur stone inscription dated [K.] 772. The existence of this inscription was known to Kielhorn. He has referred to it twice (Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, p. 85 and above, Vol. I, p. 354), but had no opportunity to examine it.
* The inscription refers itself to the reign of the Kalachuri king Māglāyavēva and is dated Somast 772 Kārttika in di. 12 Phālgunāśada. This date, falling in the month of Kārttika, would have proved invaluable for fixing the later limit for the commencement of the Kalachuri year, but unfortunately the details do not work out satisfactorily. The nearest equivalent is Tuesday the 13th October A.D. 1019 when the twelfth tithi of the dark fortnight of Kārttika ended 11 A. after mean sunrise, i.e., there is a mistake of one day. In A.D. 1020 the tithi fell on Monday and in A.D. 1021 on Friday. So neither of these would be more suitable. If we overlook the mistake of one day, this date would show that the Kalachuri year 772 was a current year and that it could not have commenced later than Kārttika śū. di. 1. If the above supposition is correct, this date and the dates Nos. 5 and 6 given below, p. 121, may be said to furnish the necessary evidence to prove that the Kalachuri era commenced on the pūrṇimānta Kārttika śū. di. 1 in A.D. 248.
* I omit the following four dates for the reason stated in each case: (1) The Gohārāwā plates of Karpājāna, because they mention no year of the Chödi era; (2) the Khairāh Plates of Vaśaṅkara, because the date is found to be irregular; (3) the Ghoti plates of Pratīvīlēva II, because the numerals of the date are evidently incorrect; and (4) the Anōdā plates of Jāñjalladēva (II), because the last figure of the date is uncertain.
A. D. 248 (corresponding to the expired Śaka year 176), to convert a current Chēdi year into an expired Śaka year we have to add 169 when the date falls in the bright fortnight of Kārttika or in any of the months from Mārgaśīra to Phālguna and 170 in all other cases. Similarly, to convert an expired Chēdi year into an expired Śaka year we have to add 170 and 171 respectively in the same circumstances.

A. Dates in Expired Years.¹

1. The Rewah stone inscription of the time of Karṇa (Bhandarkar’s List No. 1226) (from an ink-impression with me) — Samaṇa-sata[ra] 612 śrīmaṇa Karṇa-prakṣiṣa[(ṣa)-]rayakaraṇayā navama-samacaturé Maṅgā-sudi 10 Gura, i.e., the year 812, the ninth year of the administration established by Karṇa, the tenth tithi of the bright fortnight of Māgha, a Thursday. The corresponding Christian date (for the expired Śaka year 812 + 170 = 982) is Thursday the 4th January A. D. 1061 when the tenth tithi of the bright fortnight of Māgha ended 8 h. 10 m. after mean sunrise.

2. The Sheorinārayaṇa plates of Ratnadēva II (Ind. Hist. Quart., Vol. IV, pp. 21ff.) — Samaṇa-sa 878 Bhaḍāra-sudi 5 Gura, i.e., the year 878 the fifth tithi of the bright fortnight of Bhaḍārapa, a Sunday. The corresponding Christian date (for the expired Śaka year 878 + 171 = 1049) is Sunday the 14th August A. D. 1127. On that day the fifth tithi of the bright fortnight of Bhaḍārapa ended 8 h. 30 m. after mean sunrise.

3. The Sakhē plates of Ratnadēva II (above, Vol. XXII, pp. 159ff.) — Ten-ā{s}(ë)ity-adhikāśāya-catevra-lute jātī dinā Gīnavatē Kārttikeya-ānu Rōhini-īkha-samayē rātrē-s-cha yūma-traye Śrīmaṇa-Ratna-narēvarasya sadasi jyōti-vudām-agratā sarva-grāsam-anushā-gō̄h praccadā tiryagā pratiṣṭhānā-sati [v. 19], i.e., the expired Chēdi year 880 Kārttika १ ५, a Thursday with a total eclipse of the moon when she was in the constellation of Rōhini. The corresponding Christian date (for the expired Śaka year 880 + 170 = 1050) is Thursday the 8th November A. D. 1128. The moon was totally eclipsed in the third quarter of the night. The naksatra Rōhini commenced 13 h. 30 m. after mean sunrise on that day.

4. The Amōdā plates (first set) of Prthvividēva II (Ind. Hist. Quart., Vol. I, pp. 409ff.) — 1. 24, Chattē śoma-grahē sattā; 1. 33, Samaṇa 900, i.e., the Year 900 with a lunar eclipse in the month of Chatra. The corresponding Christian date (for the expired Śaka year 900 + 171 = 1071) is Friday the 25th March A. D. 1149. On that day there occurred a lunar eclipse visible at Ratnapur.

5. The Amōdā plates (second set) of Prthvividēva II (Ind. Hist. Quart., Vol. I, pp. 412ff.) — Samaṇa 905 Āśvin(śvina-sudi 6 Bhāumē, i.e., the year 905, the sixth tithi of the bright fortnight of Āśvina, a Tuesday. The corresponding Christian date (for the expired Śaka year 905 + 171 = 1076) is Tuesday, the 14th September A. D. 1154. On that day the sixth tithi of the bright fortnight of Āśvina commenced 15 h. 50 m. after mean sunrise. With the Chēdi year commencing on Āśvina १ ५ in A. D. 248, this date should fall in A. D. 1152 if the Chēdi year is taken as current and in A. D. 1153 if it is taken as expired. But in A. D. 1152 the tithi ended 7 h. 30 m. after mean sunrise on Saturday (the 6th September) and in A. D. 1153 it ended 7 h. after mean sunrise on Friday (the 25th September). In either case it would have to be regarded as irregular.

6. The Jubbulpore Kotwah plates of Jayasitihās (above, Vol. XXI, pp. 91ff.) — Samaṇa 918 Āśvin-sudi puṇamadhyāyaṃ tithiḥ Sa(śa)ni dinē Tripurāṇē śoma-gramāṇē, i.e., the year 918 the fifteenth tithi of the bright fortnight of Āśvina, a Saturday, at Tripuri, a lunar eclipse. The corresponding Christian date (for the expired Śaka year 918 + 171 = 1089) is Saturday, the 30th

¹ For the verification of dates I have used throughout D. B. S. K. Pillai’s indispensable work *An Indian Ephemeris.*
September A. D. 1167. On that day the full-moon tithi ended 13 h. after mean sunrise and there was a lunar eclipse. With the Chedi era commencing on Āśvina sū. di. 1 in A. D. 248, this date should fall in A. D. 1165 if the year is current, and in A. D. 1166 if it is expired. But in A. D. 1165 the tithi fell on Tuesday (the 21st September) and in 1166 it fell on Monday (the 10th October). Again in neither year was there a lunar eclipse on the given tithi.

7. The Rewah plates of the time of Vijayasimha (above, Vol. XIX, pp. 295ff.)—Saṅvāvat 944 Bhadrāpada-sudi 1 Śukrē, i.e., the year 944 the first tithi of the bright fortnight of Bhadrāpada, a Friday. The corresponding Christian date (for the expired Śaka year 944 + 171 = 1115) is Friday, the 30th July A. D. 1193. On that day the first tithi of the bright fortnight of Bhadrāpada ended 22 h. 20 m. after mean sunrise.

8. The Pendarbhand plates of Pratapamalla (above, Vol. XXII, pp. 1ff.)—1. 26, grāmō Makara-samkrāntau dattāh sankaṇa-pūrekaṇḥ; l. 35, Saṅvātaḥ 955 du Pulasada-samācāviśāvi (ta-va)jaya-kotakah [Maṅgala-sudi 10 Maṅgala-dinē]. As it stands, the date is irregular; for in none of the years 1212-1215 was the tenth tithi of the bright fortnight of Maṅgala connected with a Tuesday. If, however, sudi is taken to be a mistake for sūdi it corresponds (for the expired Śaka year 965 + 170 = 1135) regularly to Tuesday the 7th January A. D. 1214. On that day the tenth tithi of the dark fortnight of the pūrṇimānta Maṅgala ended 10 h. 55 m. after mean sunrise. The Makara-samkrānti had taken place about a fortnight earlier on the 25th December, A. D. 1213.

B.—Date in Current Year.

9. The Amōdā plates of Prithvīdeva I (above, Vol. XIX, pp. 78ff.)—7. 27-28, Gha(Phāl)guna-
krīṣhva-saptamī Ravi-dinē; l. 41 Chēd-isu(au)su sam 831, i.e., the year 831 the seventh tithi of the dark fortnight of Phālguna, a Sunday. The corresponding date (for the expired Śaka year 831 + 169 = 1000) is Sunday the 27th January A. D. 1079. On that day the seventh tithi of the dark fortnight of the pūrṇimānta Phālguna ended 7 h. 30 m. after mean sunrise.

A careful examination of these nine dates will show that—

(1) All these dates can be shown to be regular only according to the epoch of A. D. 247-248 finally fixed by Kielhorn; for though the dates 1-8 might also be explained as dates in current years with the epoch of A. D. 248-249, that epoch will not at all do for the date 9. This date, therefore, clearly proves the correctness of the epoch A. D. 247-248. There were only two such dates in current years\(^1\) known to Kielhorn.

(2) The dates 2 and 7 clearly show that with the epoch of A. D. 247-248 the Chedi year must have begun in some month later than Bhadrāpada. There was only one date of this type\(^2\) known to Kielhorn, which rendered his earlier view about the Chedi year commencing in Bhadrāpada impossible when he changed the epoch to A. D. 247-248.

(3) As seen above, an Āśvinādi year with the epoch of A. D. 247-248 will not at all suit the dates 5 and 6. For them a year beginning in some month later than Āśvina is required. Now the date 9 shows that the Chedi year must have commenced before Phālguna va. di. 7. The beginning of the Chedi year must, therefore, lie between Āśvina sū. di. 15 (the tithi of the date 6) and Phālguna va. di. 7 (the tithi of the date 9). Though it is not yet possible to settle this question definitely, I think it probable that the era commenced on Kārttika sū. di. 1 for reasons already stated.

---

1 See above, p. 117, the dates 2 and 4.
2 The date of the Rewah copper-plate inscription of Kṛṣṇavarman, Ind. Ant., Vol. XVII, pp. 219 and 224ff.
(4) Among the nine dates there are only two (viz. the dates 8 and 9)\(^1\) which fall in the dark fortnight. They corroborate Kielhorn’s conclusion that the arrangement of fort nights in the Chedi era was the *pūrṇimānta* one.

(5) The proportion of expired years to current ones is 8 : 1, which is in accordance with that observed in the case of the dates of other eras.

A Kārttikādī year will also suit almost all the dates known to Kielhorn. The only dates that require to be specially considered here are those falling in Āśvina. Only two such dates were known to Kielhorn, viz., (1) the date of the Sārnāth fragmentary stone inscription of the time of Kārnādaśa—Sāvinaca 810 Āśvina-sudi 15 Rauv, the corresponding Christian date being Sunday the 4th October A. D. 1058; and (2) the date of the Sheorinārāyaṇ image inscription—Kalachuri Sāvinaca 898 Āśvina-sudi 7 Sōma-dinē, the corresponding Christian date being Monday the 24th September A. D. 1145. Of these the former presents no difficulty. Only, it will now have to be considered as citing a current year and not an expired one as was supposed by Kielhorn. In regard to the latter it may be noted that its reading has been a matter of controversy for a very long time. Sir R. Jenkins first published it in the *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. XV, p. 505 as Sāvinaca 898 Āśvina-sudi 7 Amukāsapt. Cunningham in his A. S. R., Vol. IX, gave it as in the *Kalachuri Sāvinaca in the year 898, Āśvina-sudi Sāma on p. 86 and as 898 Āśvina-sudi 7, Monday on p. 111. Subsequently in his A. S. R., Vol. XVII, plate XX, he published a photograph of only part of it which reads Kalachuri Sāvinaca 898. He again referred to it in his *Indian Bṛāh* p. 6 where he remarked “A fresh examination has shown the date to be Āśvina su. di. 2 (and not Āśvina su. di. 7)”. Kielhorn at first accepted this last statement of Cunningham and on calculation found that the date corresponded to Monday, the 9th September A. D. 1146, on which day the second *tithi* of the bright fortnight of Āśvina ended 21 h. 54 m. after mean sunrise. As he was then of opinion that the Chedi year was Bhādrapadādī and the era commenced in A. D. 249, he concluded that the year 898 of this date was a current year. Subsequently in his article on the era in the *Festynachte an Roth* he confirmed the aforementioned reading from a facsimile and gave the same corresponding date as before, but as he had then come to the conclusion that the Chedi era commenced on Āśvina su. di. 1 in A. D. 248, he took the year of the date as expired. Dr. (then Mr.) D. R. Bhandarkar next stated in his notice of the inscription in *P. R. A. S. W. C.* (p. 53) for 1903-4 that the inscription was dated 898 Kalachuri era, Monday, the 7th of the bright half of Āśvina. From a photograph of the inscription supplied by him, Kielhorn also finally read the inscription as Kalachuri Sāvinaca 898 Āśvina-sudi 7 Sōma-dinē and stated that it regularly corresponded, for the current Kalachuri year 898, to Monday the 24th September A. D. 1145, when the seventh *tithi* of the bright half of Āśvina ended 20 h. 57 m. after mean sunrise. This date seemed to confirm Kielhorn’s opinion that the Chedi year began in Āśvina, for it showed that the month of Āśvina fell, in any case, in the beginning of that year. But the recent discovery of the dates 5 and 6 noticed above, which show that the Chedi year began in some month later than Āśvina, has rendered the accuracy of the date of the Sheorinārāyaṇ inscription open to question. There is of course no doubt about the reading of the date. I have satisfied myself that the reading finally adopted by Kielhorn is correct; but with that reading the date appears to be irregular; for, with the Chedi year beginning in some month later than Āśvina, the seventh *tithi* of the bright half of Āśvina would, in the current year 898, fall on Saturday (the 14th September 1146) and in the expired Chedi year 898, on Friday (the 3rd October A. D. 1147). In neither case was the *tithi* connected with Monday. The question, therefore, arises whether we should take the Chedi era to be Āśvināḍī on the authority of this date and treat the dates 5 and

\(^1\)[The actual reading in No. 8 is *sudi*.—Ed.]
as irregular or whether on the authority of these latter dates we should take the Chedi year to have commenced in some month later than Áśvina (probably in Kārttika). I choose the latter course not only because a larger number of dates would otherwise appear irregular but also because the evidence on which Kiellhorm relied for taking the Chedi year to be Áśvinādi is, as shown below, questionable. As for the date of the Sheorinārāyaṇ inscription the conjecture may be hazarded that owing to the similarity in the Nāgarī figures 2 and 7 of the twelfth century A. D., the writer or the engraver committed a mistake in recording the tiṇhi and wrote or engraved 7 in place of 2. The confusion in reading the figure of the tiṇhi, which persisted for a long time, shows that such a mistake is not unlikely. The intended date Monday the 2nd tiṇhi of the bright fortnight of Áśvina regularly corresponds, for the current Kārttikādi Chedi year 888, to Monday the 9th September A. D. 1446.

Let us next turn to the evidence on which Kiellhorn relied for his view that the Chedi year commenced on Áśvina śu. di. 1. As stated above he found the following statement in a letter written by Colebrooke at Nāgpur on the 30th October 1799: The new year begins here with the bright fortnight of Áśvina, but opening in the midst of Durgā’s festival, New Year’s Day is only celebrated on the 10th lunar day. Kiellhorn took this usage as reminiscent of the Chedi year, for according to him the country round Nāgpur was previously included in the Chedi kingdom. But Colebrooke’s statement is clearly due to some misunderstanding. He was appointed Resident at the Court of the Bhonsla Rājā of Nāgpur and he stayed at Nāgpur from the 18th March 1799 to the 19th May 1801. The statement referred to by Kiellhorn occurs in the Journal of Occurrences at Nāgpur, which Colebrooke privately kept and from which some extracts have been printed in the Life of Colebrooke by his son Sir T. E. Colebrooke. As the context shows, the statement in question refers to the festival of Durgā which is to this day celebrated with great eclat not only in the Central Provinces but in other parts of India also. In the Mahārāṣṭra the Dassarā or the Vijayā-daśamī, as the 10th day of the festival is called, is celebrated with great pomp and splendour during the Marāṭhā rule, as marking the end of the monsoon and the commencement of the season for military operations. Under the date 30th October 1799, Colebrooke gives in the Journal a graphic description of the Dassarā festival which he attended at the Rājā’s invitation. He seems to have thought that the festival marked the beginning of the new year, but he was clearly mistaken in this. The era current in the country round Nāgpur during the 18th century was the so-called Sālivāhana or Śaka era. That the Śaka year did not then begin in Áśvina even at Nāgpur there can be no possible doubt. Dates of contemporary state papers cannot unfortunately be cited to prove this; for the Bhonslas, like other Marāṭhā chiefs, almost invariably used the Muhammadan year in dating their records. But if proof is needed, it would be furnished by the following date which occurs in two Marāṭhī letters written evidently at Nāgpur by Raghōji II, the Bhonsla Rājā of Nāgpur and by his brother, Khandōji alias Chimpāji Bāpu to record a mutual agreement, viz., Śakē 1701 Vikāri nāma somvatateśātvit Áśvina vakula panichami, Bhrigu-vāsarē. This date corresponds, for the amānta Áśvina, regularly to Friday, the 29th October A. D. 1779. The cyclic year for the Chaitrādi Śaka year 1701 was Vikārī according to the southern luni-solar system. This date clearly shows that the era current in Nāgpur in the time of Colebrooke was the Śaka era, its months were amānta and the year commenced in Chaitra and not in Áśvina.

1 In a note added to the statement the Editor of the Life of Colebrooke remarks: It would appear too from a passage in Niebuhr’s travels that the reckoning in use at Nāgpur was followed in Bombay and Gujerat at the time of the traveller’s visit. The year is said by him to begin with the month of Kārttika, evidently referring to the Autumnal Equinox. The Editor is here evidently confusing the Durgā festival in Áśvina with the Dīwāli festival in Kārttika.

2 See Adikāśaka Patra-vyavahāra (Historical Letters, Marāṭhī, pub. in 1933), pp. 147-48.
Even supposing that in Colebrooke's time the year began at Nagpur in the month of Āsvina it can have no bearing on the question of the commencement of the Chêdi year for the simple reason that the country round Nagpur was probably never under the rule of the Kalachuris. No inscriptions dated in the Chêdi era have been found in the Marathi-speaking districts of the Central Provinces and Berar. These districts which were evidently comprised in the three Mahārāshtras mentioned in the Aihoje inscription of Pulakṣēn II were successively under the Early Chulukyas, the Râshtrakûtas, the Paramâras, the later Chulukyas and the Yâdavas, but never under the Kalachuris of Tripuri or of Ratanpur. In the present Central Provinces the use of that era was confined to the Chhattisgarh and the northern Hindi-speaking districts.

Kielhorn's view that the territory round Nagpur was once included in the Chêdi kingdom was evidently due to his wrong identification of the kings Sinhâpita and Râmacandra mentioned in the Râmântâ Lakshmana temple inscription with the homonymous kings of the Raipur branch of the Kalachuri dynasty. The inscription is fragmentary and has not been edited so far. Kielhorn's knowledge of the kings mentioned in it was derived from a faint rubbing which he obtained from Fleet. My examination of the inscription has convinced me that it belongs to the Yâdava (and not the Kalachuri) dynasty; for 1. 4 of it names the royal family as Yâdava vânsa. The kings Sinhâpita and Râmacandra mentioned in ll. 14 and 19 are evidently the well-known kings of the Yâdava dynasty. That the rule of the Yâdavas extended in the east as far as Lâňji in the Bâlâghât District, about 100 miles north by east of Nagpur, is clear from a fragmentary stone inscription of the dynasty, found at Lâňji, which has now been deposited in the Central Museum, Nagpur.

There is thus not an iota of evidence to prove that the Chêdi era was current in the Nagpur District, nor to show that the Chêdi year commenced in Âsvina. On the other hand the testimony of some of the recently discovered Chêdi dates renders it probable that the Chêdi era commenced on Kârttika śu. di. 1 (the 6th October) in A. D. 248.

---

No. 15.—A DUTCH MEMORIAL SLAB IN INDIA.

BY F. W. STAPEL, LIT. D., UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM.

In 1911, Dr. J. P. H. Vogel, at present professor in the Leiden University, and at that time the officiating Director-General of Archaeology in India, noticed a memorial slab with a Dutch inscription. Some parts of Berar may have been under the Early Kalachuri king Krišnasûrya as a half of his coins was found at Dhamori near Amraoti in Berar, but those coins were used by other dynasties also.

Kielhorn has incidently mentioned this identification at the end of his article on the Khalari stone inscriptions of Haribrahmadeva of the Vikrama year 1470, above, Vol. II, p. 239. He may also have had in mind the fact that the Kalachuri king Karna made his Benares grant (above, Vol. II, pp. 297 ff.) after bathing in the Veṅg. Kielhorn at first identified this river with the Wainganga which flows about 40 miles from Nagpur, but later on he corrected himself (see, above, Vol. IV, p. 122 n.) and took it to be a tributary of the Gangâ which it joins at Allahabad.

The late Rai Bahadur Hiratal also, following Kielhorn, at first thought that the princes mentioned in the Râmântâ Lakshmana temple inscription belonged to the Haïhaya dynasty, but he has not asserted that view in his Inscriptions in C. P. and Berar, p. 3. That these princes were of the Yâdava dynasty is clear also from the fact that the first eight lines of the inscriptions, though much damaged, intimate the victories of these princes over Rudra, Āndira, Chûla and perhaps Gujjarândra also. It is clear that we have here references to the brilliant exploits of the Yâdava kings Jaitugi and Sinâgha. The petty kings of the Raipur branch of the Haïhaya dynasty who ruled in the fifteenth century A. D. did not distinguish themselves in this way.
inscription in the wall of the kachahri (court-house) at Chingleput. He drew the attention of the Government of the province of Madras to it, suggesting at the same time that it should be transferred to the Government Museum in Madras. Evidently this hint was taken, for the stone is now preserved in the aforementioned Museum.

The rectangular stone is well preserved, measures 1·40 m. by 50 c.m. and bears the following inscription in letters 3 c.m. high.

**TEXT.**

1 Onder de Hoek van de Flank, hier naast deser Fortificatie, aangelegd
2 door den heer, Coenraad Pieter Keller, lieutenant-dessave, en
3 ingenieur tot Colombo, ten tyde van Joannes Spits, en Philippus
4 Jacobus Dormieux, als opperhoofd, en secunde: is den eersten steen
5 gelegt, door Catharina Elizabeth Dormieux, dochter van gem:
6 Dormieux, en syn huyvrouw, Elizabeth Maria Mestral d’Meresie,
7 op den 14th May anno 1749.

**TRANSLATION.**

Under the corner of the flank, next to this fortress, built by Mr. Coenraad Pieter Keller, lieutenant-dessave of Colombo, engineer, at the time of Joannes Spits and Philippus Jacobus Dormieux, chief and assistant, the foundation stone was laid by Catharina Elizabeth Dormieux, daughter of the mentioned Dormieux and his wife, Elizabeth Maria Mestral de Meserie, on the 14th of May Anno 1749.

So far nothing was known about its origin, but a recent search in the records of the Netherlands-East-India Company has revealed the following facts:

In 1747 and the following years a fierce struggle was going on in the Carnatic Lowlands among the native authorities. Owing to his advanced age, Nabob Annawardi-chan (Nawab Anwar-ud-din) wanted to hand over his office to his eldest son, Mahometh Mafus-chan (Mahfuz Khan), but a number of vissadars (governors) strongly opposed this wish. The managers of the Netherlands factory at Sadraspatnam (usually called Sadrass for short) situated about 35 miles south of the Madras city, viz., the Under-Merchant Joannes Spits and his assistant or deputy, the book-keeper Philippus Jacobus Dormieux, approached the Netherlands governor of Coromandel, Mr. Librecht-Hooreman, who resided in the castle at Negapatnam, asking his permission to build a fortress in order to be able to protect the Company’s money and merchandise. The request was granted and in 1749 a small garrison was drafted from Negapatnam into Sadrass, consisting of 1 sergeant-major, 2 corporals, 1 constable, 6 musketeers and 12 common soldiers, armed with a number of small guns. At the same time an order was placed for the building of a small fortress, which was erected by an engineer, named Coenraad Pieter Keller, "borrowed" for this purpose from the governor of Ceylon. The building was started in 1749, the memorial slab referred to was placed in it and towards the end of the same year the fortress was completed. A report was forwarded to the High Government in Batavia, who sent a message of thanks and satisfaction to Spits, for his tactful action through which he had succeeded in obtaining permission from the native ruler to build the fortress, and by way of reward promoted him to the rank of Merchant. Keller, however, came in for a rebuke, because he had built the fortress in so grand a style that the cost of it stood the Government in over 10,000 gold pagodas.
The way, in which the memorial slab, placed in the fortress, found its way to Chingleput, is described in pages 356. in the book, written by Jacob Haafner: Reise von Madras naar Ceilion (Voyage from Madras to Ceylon) published in Haerlem in 1806. Haafner had been employed in the Company's office at Sadras since 1779. We get the following information from this work: Jacob Pieter De Neyes was the chief there at the time. In the fortress there was then still a small garrison, not even 20 strong, in charge of a sergeant. Yet this garrison was sufficiently strong to hold it against the Gallouris, a predatory tribe living in the Carnatic jungle. On the 17th of June 1781 De Neyes had a party of all the qualified (higher) officials and their wives at his house, to celebrate a birthday. At the height of the revels the arrival of a British officer was announced. De Neyes asked him to enter and join them. The young officer, however, was the bearer of a very distressing message. The British had received an intimation of a war that had broken out between England and the Dutch Republic. He had been sent by his chief, Captain George Mackay, the Commander of the strong garrison of Chingleput, situated 3 miles north-west of Sadras, who with the whole of his troops had marched to within a mile's distance. Mackay demanded the Dutch fortress and lodge to surrender at discretion. The alarm of the guests may be easily imagined. De Neyes immediately held a meeting and all the persons present realised that it would be useless to offer resistance to the British, who outnumbered them; yet, a surrender at discretion was out of the question. Only if fair conditions of capitulation should be granted, would they open the gates. The assembled company stated their terms: A. the property of the officials and inhabitants should be held in respect; B. fair treatment of the prisoners-of-war should be guaranteed up to the conclusion of peace or the time of their exchange. Haafner being the only one who could speak English well, was sent to Mackay, who, at first, refused stubbornly and scornfully to sign the conditions of capitulation, but in the end proceeded to do so, when the Dutch stuck to their point.

The same evening the British troops marched into the fortress and now that it was in their possession, Mackay did not hold to the conditions he had signed. He had the prisoners taken to Madras without allowing them to take their possessions which they never saw again. Before their departure they witnessed how Mackay blew up the whole of the fortress. Though Haafner does not say anything about the memorial slab, it is obvious that the British troops took it as a trophy with them to Chingleput, where it was noticed in 1911 by Dr. Vogel.

It is common knowledge that in 1784, at the conclusion of peace in Paris, Sadras and the other conquered places, with the exception of the important settlement of Negapatnam, were restored to the Dutch Company.

In conclusion we are able to give the following information about the persons, whose names are stated on the tablet.

Coenraad Pieter Keller born in Steynfeld in Germany, sailed for the Indies as a lenspassaat (non-commissioned officer) on board the Watervliet in 1735. In the same year he entered the Civil Service in Batavia as an assistant and in 1737 was appointed assistant-surveyor in the same town. The High Government decided in 1740 upon sending him to Ceylon as an engineer, with the rank of Under-Merchant. He worked for several years in Colombo and in 1746 was appointed lieutenante-dessaye (dessaye being the title of the Governor of a province in Ceylon). On the 13th of September 1754 he was promoted to the rank of Merchant. Soon afterwards he went to Coromandel, where he took part in building a fortress at Bimlipatnam. In 1766 he got into trouble; the Governor suspended him and afterwards imprisoned him in consequence of an effort made by him to run away. On his trial the public prosecutor demanded that he should be executed, but the Governor not being convinced of his guilt, sent him to Batavia with all the documents bearing on the case. He came up for trial before the Superior Court of Law and finding the charges
against him not proven, his case was dismissed. On the 27th of March 1767 the Government decided to reinstate him in his former rank on the same salary. Soon after that his death must have taken place, because after 1767 his name does not occur any more in the registers of the Company.

Joanne Spies was born in Negapatnam about 1677, and in 1695 he entered the service of the Company as a soldier. Owing to his clever penmanship he obtained a clerkship and after five years he finally entered the Civil Service as an assistant. In succession he occupied the following posts: 1705, book-keeper; 1708, senior clerk in the Negapatnam police-office; 1712, Under-Merchant and Secretary in the same place; 1717, Adilgar (Collector) of the suburbs; 1724, Chief in Palliacatta (Pulcat) and in 1725, Chief in Sadas. This last position he held for more than 26 years. In 1750, on the 12th of June, he was promoted to the rank of Merchant. At that time he was over 70 years old and soon afterwards he died. He was in the employ of the Company on the coast of Coromandel for about 55 years.

Philippus Jacobus Dormieux was born about 1708 in Porto Novo, where his father, who had a large family, was Secretary to the Company. In 1726 Philippus started life as a soldier; was soon given a clerical job, became a provisional assistant in 1728; and assistant in 1732 and a book-keeper in 1737, in which capacity he was employed in Sadas for many years. He, too, was for a long time, about 50 years, in the service of the Company on the coast of Coromandel. He rose to greater heights than Spies, although in the 18th century promotion was slower than in the 17th century. His record of service reads: 1751, Under-Merchant; 1751, Merchant; 1763, Chief in Palliacatta; 1769, titular rank of Chief-Merchant; 1775, substantive rank of Chief-Merchant, Senior Administrator at Negapatnam and Second in the Coromandel Government. As such his name is mentioned for the last time in 1777, when he was about 70 years old. Soon after that his death must have occurred.

The memorial tablet records the name of his wife: Elizabeth Maria Mestral de Meserie, a name, which is not mentioned in the registers of the Company. Very likely she was not a Dutch woman, but probably the daughter of one of the many Frenchmen who lived along the coast at that time. For that matter the Dormieux, too, were supposedly of French origin.

No. 16.—NOTES ON THE NANDAPUR COPPER-PLATE OF THE GUPTA YEAR 169.

BY JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH, CALCUTTA.

The above grant has appeared in the *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 52-56. We congratulate Mr. N. G. Majumdar, the editor of the plate, for his fine critical acumen. Although he has not been able to identify the village of Ambila, from where the charter was issued, nor the village of Jaṅgōyikā, in which lay the donated land, the indication he has given of their locality, has come very true. He, from a study of the nature of the script, the phraseology used in the Baigrama and other contemporary inscriptions discovered in North Bengal, and the standard measuring reed used, came to the conclusion that the land given away must have belonged to North Bengal, although the donors came from Nandapura in the Monghyr District of Bhār.

We find that a village named Ambulia or Ambalia still exists in thānā Rajarampur of the Dinajpur District, in North Bengal. There is also a village named Jaṅgī in thānā Nawāhganj of the same district. Baigrama is also in this thānā. The village of Jaṅgōyikā seems to be a very ancient one. Kauṭilya in the *Arthashastra* speaks of a variety of sandal wood, a variety of

---

1 Village Directory, Dinajpur (1888).
agaru (resin of aloe) and also a kind of tailaparṇika (leaves producing oil such as Eucalyptus) named Đöṅgaka which might have taken this name from its place of origin. The commentator says that all these are the products of Kāmarūpa. We do not know the time of this commentator. He might have flourished in the seventh century, when this part of Bengal was under Kāmarūpa. It is interesting to note that a variety of agaru is named Đöṅgaka, and a variety of tailaparṇika as Aśokagṛūmika. This Đöṅgaka might be the same as the Đōṅgā-grāma in Hima-vachchhikhara, occurring in the Dāmodarpur plate No. 4. The commentator placed Aśoka-grāma also in Kāmarūpa, but we find a village of this name in Thānā Gaṅgarāmpur of the Dinajpur District.

We would now like to make some observations on some of the terms used in the first two lines of the plate. For ready reference, we give below the text and the translation by Mr. Majumdar:

**TEXT.**

1 Svasty-Amv̄i(mb)īla-grām-āgrahārāt-sa-vīvāsam-adhikaraṇām(ṇam) Jaṅgōyikā-grāmē Brāhmaṇ-ōttarān-saṃyavavahā- 2 ry-ādi-kutumvi(mbi)nāh kuśalam-anuvarṇṇya būdhyantit(i) likhantti(ti) cha[*] Vijūśpayati nāh viśhayapati-Chhatramahāh.

**TRANSLATION.**

(Ll. 1-2) Hail! From the (royal) grant (āgrahāra) of Ambīla village, our Head of the District (Viśhayapati) Chhattramahā, with confidence intimates, addresses in writing and informs the Court (Adhikaraṇa), as well as the Brāhmaṇas, the chief officers and others, and also the householders, at the village of Jaṅgōyikā, after having enquired about their well-being:

**Āgrahāra—** This has been translated as ‘(royal) grant’. The word, no doubt, ordinarily conveys this meaning. But it is doubtful if it has been used here in the same sense. Charters are usually issued from some headquarters or camps. There appears no reason why the present charter should be issued from a village of royal grant. In the Mallasārul plate of Vijayāsaṇa, issued in the third year of the reign of Mahārāja Śādiśvara Gopāchandra (c.508 A.D.), we find the designation of an officer as Āgrahārika. In the same plate the grant has been made by addressing several ‘Āgrahāra-mahattaras’ of the neighbourhood. So it seems that Āgrahāra was meant to be the headquarters of a Mahatara, who was also an Āgrahārika, or Āgrahārīn.

Let us see what āgrahāra literally means. It is derived from agra= first or prior and hri= to take. Agra here has to be taken in the sense of agra-bhāṣa, i.e., king’s share, because the king has got the priority or the first charge on the produce of land. Āgrahāra means ‘one who takes or collects king’s share’. The Śukraniti has used the words bhāyakara and bhāgyagruḥi in this sense. Āgrahāra, therefore, means the place of business or headquarters of the Āgrahāra or Āgrahārin.

---

1 Arthādhyāsya, Bk. II, ch. 11.
2 Ibid.
3 Above, Vol. XV, p. 140.
4 Arthādhyāsya (Gangapati Sāstri’s ed.), p. 189.
5 Vīl. Dir., Dinajpur.
7 Śukraniti (Venk. Press), ch. II, vv. 120, 419.
Now we shall try to see how agrahāra came to mean 'a grant made to a Brāhmaṇa.' We have seen that in the Mallasārul grant Agrahārīnaus were Mahattaras also. The title Mahattara implies 'a head-man of a village.' When he performs also the function of 'a revenue-collector,' he is called Agrahārīsa-mahattara.1 Manu says that the king should appoint a head-man for every village, every ten villages and so on. The head-man of one village will get as his remuneration what food and drink the villagers are to pay to the king every day. The head-man of ten villages will get land which requires six bulls to cultivate, and so on.2 Kauṭilya also says that the Adhyakshas or 'Superintendents of departments' should be endowed with land.3 The Śukranīti again says grāmapā Brāhmaṇo gōjīya4 i.e., a Brāhmaṇa should be appointed as the headman or Mahattara of a village. In this way the land granted as maintenance for the Agrahārīsa-mahattaras who were invariably of the Brāhmaṇa caste came to be known as agrahāra.

Sa-vīśāsam—This has been translated as 'in confidence.' No question of confidence comes in here. We think that Dr. Chakravarti, the Government Epigraphist, has rightly raised the point that after agrahārā some officers should be mentioned. We take Vīśaśa to be the designation of some officer. Sa-karaṇān, a word similar to sa-vīśāsam, is found in the Khālmipur plate of Dharmanapālādeva, as yēṣṭha-kāyaṣṭha-mahāmahattara-mahattara-dāsagārik-dāsi-vičhaṣa-yaγaḥ sa-karaṇān, i.e., the District-Officers such as the Jyēṣṭha-Kāyaṣṭha, etc., with their Karayās, i.e., Sub-Departments or the officers constituting their respective Sub-Departments. Here it appears that the Mahattara was an officer higher than the Dāsagārika or the head of ten villages and the Jyēṣṭha-Kāyaṣṭha was the head of the Vīśaṣa-Vyavahārīnus or 'officers of the district,' probably employed in the work of revenue collection. Vīśaśa literally means 'trust,' hence 'any officer in charge of some work of trust.' Here it probably refers to the post of revenue-collector of the Ambila agrahāra.

Let us see if there is any evidence to show that there really existed any post of the name of Vīśaśa. The present-day surnames such as Vīśaśa, Nāgoji, Bhāuḍāri, Bīśi (Vishoyi), Majumdar (correctly Mājmuḍār), Munshi, etc., are nothing but the names of posts, which were held by some forefathers, probably for some generations, of the present holders of these surnames. Arjuna Miśra, the Bengali commentator of the Mahābhārata, says that he wrote the Mōkṣadharmanmārthaṇḍipīkā under orders of the Gauḍēvarac-caṇḍamātirṣimad-Vīśaśa-rāya.5 Again Rāmchandra Guha, the poet of the Aṅdvacnandar-Vataka, says that he was the son of Gauḍēvarac-caṇḍamātir-kavi-paṇḍita-prāptya-Vīśaśa-sthāna(khaṇa)-padavikā.6 We find that both Vīśaśa-rāya and Vīśaśa-khaṇa held high posts under the king of Gauḍa. Rāmchandra clearly states that his father held the post (padavī) of Vīśaśa-khaṇa. Padavī literally means 'a situation, a place,' but surnames after the post-designations have become so very common in Bengal that padavī means 'a surname.' The term again is so very popular that surnames such as Banerji, Ghosh, etc., which are not strictly padavī go by the name of padavī. Vīśaśa-rāya and Vīśaśa-khaṇa seem to be similar to the modern 'Lord Chancellor of the Exchequer.' After this there cannot be any doubt that Vīśaśa in the present plate has been used as the designation of an officer.

1 [Agrahārīsa of the Mallasārul Plate evidently stands for agrahāra and has been formed on the analogy of grāmpā.—Ed.]
3 Ardhākṣetra, Bk. II, ch. 1.
5 Above, Vol. IV, p. 220, text I.47.
Adhikaranaṃ—This has been translated as ‘court’. We think it would be more suitable to say ‘department’ or ‘officers constituting the department’. Court ordinarily carries the sense of ‘a Court of Justice’. Kautilya has used this word in the sense of ‘a department’.

Brāhmaṇottarāṇ—This has been rendered as ‘the Brāhmaṇas and others.’ In the charters of the Sena and the Varman kings of Bengal, we have ‘Brāhmaṇaṇa Brāhmaṇottarāṇ,’ which has been translated by Mr. Majumdar as ‘Brāhmaṇas, and the best or chief among Brāhmaṇas.’ Again in the Rāmapāl copper-plate of Śrīchandra occurs only ‘Brāhmaṇottarāṇ.’ This has also been rendered as ‘the best among Brāhmaṇas.’ We think in the first case ‘Brāhmaṇottarāṇ’ means ‘other than the Brāhmaṇas,’ and in the second case as ‘the Brāhmaṇas and others,’ as has been interpreted in the present case. No other rendering will be suitable to the context.

Saṃvyavahāry-ādi-kutumbināḥ—This has been translated as ‘the chief officers and the householders’. In the Dāmodarpur plate No. 3 a distinction has been made between the adhikaraṇa-grāmika-kutumbināḥ, and the prakṛiti-kutumbināḥ. The first seems to refer to those who by virtue of their position in society held some office, such as mahattāra, etc., while the second are the lay or ordinary householders. In the present plate these householders are not the ordinary householders, but belonged to the first class.

Kuśalam-anuvarrṇya—This has been interpreted as ‘inquiring about the well-being of’. This is the same as ‘kuśalam-uktvā’ of the Dāmodarpur plate mentioned above. It should, we think, be translated as ‘after saying or wishing well-fare’ such as ‘sūhāsam-astu bhavatēm’. Manu ordains that kuśala should be enquired of the Brāhmaṇas only, and not of the other varṇas. Here in the assembly people other than the Brāhmaṇas were also present. So enquiring of kuśala of all would have been against law and etiquette.

No. 17.—SVALPA-VELURA GRANT OF GANGA ANANTAVARMAN.

By B. Ch. Chhabra, M.A., M.O.I., Ph.D. (Lugd.), Ootacamund.

This grant is one of the nine sets of copper-plates which were acquired by Mr. N. G. Majumdar, Superintendent, Archaeological Section, Indian Museum, Calcutta, in the year 1935, and seven of which have already been published. Their exact find-spot is not known, but, as stated above, they were unearthed in a village of the Badakhimedi Estate in the Ganjam District.

The charter consists of three copper plates, each measuring about 7” x 24”. They were strung on a ring, about 3½” in diameter, to which was fixed a seal. This is now badly defaced, but it probably contained the figure of a recumbent bull. The plates together with the ring and the seal weigh 108½ tolas. The first and the last plates are engraved only on the inner face, while the second plate bears writing on both the sides. Their rims are left flat, still the inscription on them is intact. There are altogether thirty lines of writing, each face of the second plate containing eight and the other two seven each.

1 Arthasthātra, Bk. II, ch. IX.
3 Ibid., p. 8.
5 Manusumriti, ch. II, v. 127.
6 Above, Vol. XXIII, pp. 73 ff.; 78 ff.; 141 ff. and 261 ff.
7 Ibid., p. 73.
The characters belong to the northern variety of alphabet, which is generally found in the Gaṅga records. The script of the present inscription resembles to a great extent that of the Vishamagiri plates of Indravarmadeva, and, at the same time, appears to be somewhat more archaic than the latter. It is, however, decidedly much later than that of the Dhanantara plates of Śāmantavarmar. With regard to the formation of individual letters, it may be observed that k, dh, p, m, g, r, t, s and h have two signs each, as found in the following examples: Śvetakāndaka (l. 1); adhishkhā (l. 1) and dhirāja (l. 7); parika (l. 10) and janapa (l. 11); māheśvarī and mātā (l. 6); pralaya (l. 2) and nāyaka (l. 10); dhirāja and parame (l. 7); sakala (l. 1) and kamal (l. 4); nivāsī (l. 3) and sāmanta (l. 5); hēto (l. 2) and nāhe (l. 6). Similarly n is represented by two distinct forms one of which is identical in shape with the same letter in Nāgari, while the other looks like Nāgari e. Both of them may be compared in nivāsīna (l. 3). The same word also illustrates the two ways in which the medial i is expressed. The medial long i is likewise denoted in two ways, cf. īri (l. 3 et passim) and kusāliḥ (l. 8). Attention may be called also to ēri in l. 29 the form of which totally differs from the sign of the same word occurring several times in the rest of the inscription. As to the signs for initial vowels, a is met with in ll. 8, 22, 27, t in ll. 24, 26, 29, and u in ll. 18, 29. Here again, two diverse forms of initial r are seen in iti, appearing twice in l. 29. The sign for final t (ll. 15, 23) is equally noteworthy.

The language of the record is Sanskrit and the composition is in prose, except that five of the customary verses occur in ll. 19-26. Concerning orthography the following points are noticed: (1) In certain cases sandhi rules have been disregarded, as in l. 15. (2) In a few instances the sanshī observed is wrong, as in rājō parama (l. 6). (3) Anuvāra has taken the place of a final m, as in phalāmi (l. 20) and (4) occasionally also of a class nasal, as in Kalīng (l. 6), (5) whereas in some cases it appears redundantly before a nasal, as in Gaṅga (l. 7) and bhavatāmāntād (l. 13). (6) Visarja is sometimes omitted, as in nivāsīna (l. 3), (7) while it is wrongly used in kusāli (l. 8). (8) The letter r preceding r in sakti-traya (l. 4) and in acca (l. 27) is reduplicated. (9) A consonant after r is in most cases doubled, as in Gātharā (l. 3), and (10) left single in others, as in ārka (l. 16). (11) As in many other records of this period, no separate sign for b has been employed in this inscription, it being invariably expressed by the sign for v. The composition of the record also shows a few mistakes such as wrong spellings or incorrect grammar, which have been rectified in the transcribed text.

The document is issued by the illustrious Mahārajādhirāja-Paramēśvara-Paramabhaṭṭāraka Anantavarmadeva from his capital or seat of government (adhishkhāna) Śvetaka. Its object is to record the grant, made by the king himself, of a village called Svalpa-Velora (or Svalpa-Velora), included in the district (vishaya) of Khalakncand, to one Bhāja Nānatsarman belonging to the Vatsa gātra, the Vājasanāya charaṇa, and the Kāyu sākhā (of the white Yajurveda). Mahāsāmanta Aśokadeva acted as the Dītakā for this charter, while it was composed by Mahāsandhibhiṣakha Gōvindaśiva, registered (lāschiśita) by the chief queen (Mahādevī) Vāsabhaṭṭārīkā and engraved by Mahindrabhima. The date of the record, which is given at the end, is the fifth day of the bright half of the month of Phāḷguna in the nineteenth year which, in all probability, refers to the regnal year of the king.

The donor, M. P. P. Anantavarman, belonged to the Early Gaṅga dynasty of Kālinga. One of the conventional attributes attached to his name describes him as ‘one who wields the supreme power over the entire Kālinga (country) conquered by the strength and might of his own arms’, but this in common with a number of other Gaṅga grants has no special significance

2 Ibid., Vol. XV, pp. 275 ff.
here. Although several of the Early Gāṅga kings are known to bear the same name Ananta-
varman, none of them appears to be identical with the grantor of the present charter. Unfortu-
ately there still prevails a good deal of uncertainty with regard to the chronology of the
Early Gāṅga kings, in spite of the fact that the number of their known records, which was
already not a mean one, has during recent years been appreciably augmented by fresh dis-
coversies. From the varied and extensive data available divergent opinions have been formed
in respect of the many vexed problems connected with the history of the Gāṅgas, which it will
serve no useful purpose to repeat here. Hence a brief and relevant discussion may suffice.

It has been supposed that there were at least five collateral branches of the Early Gāṅgas,
ruling over different parts of Kaliaṅga. Even an attempt has been made to fix the genealogy
of each of them. A verse appearing in Vajrahasta’s grants has been cited in support of that.
There is indeed nothing against such a supposition. In fact, there is an additional piece of evi-
dence in its favour. We know that there were various capitals from where the Gāṅga records
have been issued. This diversity of capitals is better explained by accepting the above view
than by assuming, with Mr. T. C. Rath, that the capital was changed from time to time.

Latterly, it has been suggested that one branch of the Early Gāṅgas had Śvētaka as its
capital, whence it ruled over the surrounding territory. It may parenthetically be pointed out
that Mr. M. Somasekhara Sarma asserts that the name of the city has hitherto been ‘wrongly
read as Śvētaka’ but ‘is really Śchētaka’. His assertion is based on his examination of the
four grants then available to him. There is no gainsaying that the forms of conjuncts śva and
ścha are often very similar to and hardly distinguishable from each other in those records, as is
the case in many others for the matter of that. Again, the evidence of the Vishamagiri plates,
as adduced by Mr. Sarma, even substantiates his alleged reading Śchētaka. In spite of all that
the latter does not seem to me acceptable. Considering that the names of the other Gāṅga capi-
tals are purely Sanskrit ones, one would expect in the present instance also a familiar Sanskrit
word as Śvētaka rather than a quasi-Sanskrit term like Śchētaka. This in itself, I admit, is not
a sufficiently cogent argument for the acceptance of the former reading, but, as we shall present-
ly see, it is strengthened by concrete evidence. As remarked above, Mr. Sarma had only four
charters for comparison, whereas we have now six or seven more issued from the self-same capi-
tal city. If the śe of Śvētaka is not clear enough in any of the previously known four grants,
it is absolutely clear in at least three of the latter group. It will be seen that the conjuncts śva
and ścha there have distinct forms. We have, therefore, to treat the reading Śchētaka of the
Vishamagiri plates as a mistake for Śvētaka.

Assuming now that the kings who issued charters from Śvētaka belonged to a separate
branch of the Early Gāṅga rulers, we find that Anantavarman of the present grant is the only
king of that name so far known in that line. The earliest known prince of this family is

---

3 Above, Vol. IV, p. 199; Vol. IX, p. 96; Vol. XXIII, p. 71. The verse runs as follows:
6 Ibid., p. 59 and n. 9.
7 Above, Vol. XXIII, plates facing pp. 80, 262 and 267.
Sāmantavarman, as would appear from his Dhanantara plates, which are not dated but are assigned to the seventh century A.D. on the evidence of their more archaic characters. Two points are noteworthy in this last-mentioned record; firstly Sāmantavarman does not bear any royal title; secondly he is described as saṃ-buṣja-bala-parakram-ukrānta-rakula-Svētak-adhirāja. This latter epithet, we know, occurs in connection with many other Gāṇa kings, with the only difference that there it has Kalīga instead of Svētaka. From the above observation we may conclude that Sāmantavarman must have been a petty chief, ruling over a small territory called Svētaka after the name of the capital city. Incidentally, this last reference further supports the theory of the separateness of the Svētaka branch of the Early Gāṇa kings of Kalīga. As will be seen below, Sāmantavarman later on rose from his humble position to considerable power.

Recently, an important discovery has been made in the shape of a copper plate grant. The charter is likewise issued from Svētaka. It is dated and records the gift of a village, named Phērava, to four Brāhmaṇas. The donor is Mahārāja Sāmantavarman who has been rightly identified with Sāmantavarman of the Dhanantara plates. The identification is vouched mainly by the similarity of the script used in both the records. It may be noticed that in the Phērava grant Sāmantavarman is styled Mahārāja and bears the more common epithet saṃ-buṣja-bala-parakram-ukrānta-Kalīga-adhirāja, whereas in his Dhanantara plates he bears no such title as Mahārāja and his corresponding epithet there contains Svētaka and not Kalīga. This indicates that, during the interval between the times of the issue of his Dhanantara plates and Phērava grant, Sāmantavarman somehow or other managed to have his dominions expanded and thereby to acquire more authority. We have at present no means to ascertain either the exact duration of that interval or the circumstances that led to his success and achievements.

As has already been remarked, the Phērava grant is dated; and that is again a point inviting controversy. The date is expressed only by three numerical symbols which the editor, Mr. Sarma, has read as 185. The first and the last figures have no doubt represent 100 and 5 respectively. The middle one, however, answers neither to 8 nor to 90, as a comparison of it with the known symbols of those numerals will prove. Mr. Sarma’s reading of the date as 185 is thus not warranted. The precise value of the disputed symbol cannot be determined unless we come across the same sign used elsewhere in a Gāṇa record in a date expressed both in words and in numerical symbols. Tentatively, however, I propose to explain the sign under discussion as representing 6, because it closely resembles the symbol for six occurring in the Kōmarti Plates of Chandravarman of Kalīga. The date would thus be the year 165 and not 185. No era has been specified in the record, but the year 165 possibly refers itself to the Gāṅgāya era.

According to Mr. Sarma’s reading of the date as the year 185 of the Gāṅgāya era, Sāmantavarman becomes contemporaneous with Gujārāva’s son Dēvendravarman, a Gāṇa king of Kalīganagara, whose records of the years ranging from 183 to 195 of the same era are known.

---

1 Above, Vol. XV, pp. 275 ff.
3 The date portion has come out more distinct on the plates accompanying Mr. Sarma’s article in Telugu.
4 For the signs of 8 and 90 see above, Vol. XVII, plate facing p. 333, text l. 23; Vol. III, plate facing p. 129, text l. 23, has the symbol for 80, and Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII, plate facing p. 121, text l. 20, has that for 8.
5 Above, Vol. IV, plate facing p. 145, text l. 20. It will be seen that in both the cases the symbol is identical in form with the letter k of the alphabet used, but that in the case of the Kōmarti Plates it has the sign of modali added to it.
6 See Bhandarkar’s List of Inscriptions of Northern India, Nos. 1478, 1479 and 2048; also I. H. Q., Vol. X, p. 301.
Mr. Sarma is inclined to believe that Sāmantavarman's subsequent rise was presumably due to a successful invasion by him on Devendrarvarman's territory. This belief is not tenable in view of the fact that the reading of the date as the year 185 of the Phārava grant is not correct.

Besides Mahārāja Sāmantavarman and M. P. P. Anantavarman, the following are the names of the other Gaṅga rulers of the Śvētaka branch as known from their respective characters: Mahārāja Indrarvarman; 2 Mahārāja Prathītvirman, son of Mahindravarman; 2 M. P. P. Indrarvarman, son of Prathītvirman; 2 Mahārāja Jayavarman; 4 P. M. P. Rāṇaka Dānāravā, son of Prathītvirman; 4 M. P. P. Bhumēndravarman; 4 Rāṇaka Jayavarman; 2 and Mahārāja Indrarvarman. 8 Sufficient data are not yet available for determining the chronology of these kings.

As regards the localities mentioned in the present inscription, no satisfactory identification is forthcoming. Commenting upon Śvētaka, Mr. R. Subbarao says: "It would appear from the Śhalaśpuraṇa that the region round about Śrī-Kūrma was called Śvētaka Pūrṇavaṇya (sic); and probably the donor had his capital at Śrī-Kūrma." 9 Mr. Sarma, on the other hand, identifies Śvētaka with the modern Chakā Zaminḍari in the Sāmpēta taluk of the Gaṅjam District. 10 Khalugukhanda viśaya of the present grant is evidently the same as Khalugukhaṇḍa viśaya occurring in the charters of Bhumēndravarman and Rāṇaka Jayavarman, 11 but it has not yet been identified. The name of the granted village, Svalpa-Velura, suggests that there must have been two villages of the name Velura, one svalpa (small) and the other bṛhat (large). I am unable to offer any plausible identification of either.

Finally we may consider in brief the significance of the designations of some of the officers figuring in this record, as they illustrate in a way the administrative history of India. The list of officials to whom the charter is addressed is headed by Mahāśāṃsana and Śrīsāṃsana. From the context they appear to be some dignitaries rather than 'feudatory chiefs' as the term sāṃsana ordinarily signifies. Moreover, I am inclined to take sīri in the latter term as an integral part of the designation and not as merely an honorific prefix. In the first of these two ranks appears to be superior to the second one. May be they denote 'officers in charge of or posted on the frontiers'. Daṇḍanāyaka 12 is probably the same as Sēnāpati 'army-leader' or 'general'. Daṇḍapāśika

---

2 Ibid., Vol. IV, pp. 198 ff.
3 Ibid., Vol. XXXII, pp. 78 ff.
4 Ibid., pp. 283 ff.
5 Ibid., pp. 267 ff.
6 He is known from a recently discovered copper-plate grant which has not yet been published. As the characters of this record are much earlier in appearance, Mahārāja Indrarvarman of this does not seem to be identical with either of the two rulers of the same name mentioned in the above list.
8 J. O. R., Vol. XI, p. 58. It may be recalled that Mr. Sarma reads śhētaka instead of śvētaka. The latter reading may not upset his identification of the place with Chakāti, śev being equally transmutable into śē through reading or stress. TheBHāṣā forms śē (which actually occurs in one instance, see above, Vol. XXIII, p. 286) and the supposed intermediary forms śē (which occurs in several instances, see above, Vol. XXIII, p. 286). He observes that the term śhētaka can be explained philologically to be the same as the modern Chakāti śē. This view is further borne out by the intervening forms being, śēktaka (through metathesis), Chakāta Chakāta and finally Chakāti śēktaka, in popular parlance." Further on in his essay he also connects Sēkā- or Sēkā-māndala with Śēktaka (op. cit., p. 61).
9 Mr. N. G. Majumdar thinks that Daṇḍanāyaka means 'a judge'. Inscriptions of Bengal, Vol. III, p. 185.
10 The same term has been rendered by R. G. Bāsak as 'magistrate'. Above, Vol. XII, p. 43. The title Mahā-cūmārāyaṇa, which denotes a higher rank than that of Daṇḍanāyaka, appears also in the famous Allābābād pillar inscription of Samudrāṅkura, where Fleet takes it for a military title and discusses its significance in detail. Antiquities of Chamba, Pt. I, p. 123, where he discusses the title Kumārāṇya.
may mean 'an officerentrusted with the punishment of criminals'. The term Antaraṅga is not of frequent occurrence and has been subjected to much discussion. It possibly signifies 'a court physician'. The title Kumaṇḍaṅga has been explained as to denote 'councillor of the crown prince'. No satisfactory explanation of the term Uparika has yet been found, though it is met with in many inscriptions and several scholars have discussed it. The office of Uparika seems to have existed even in very olden days, for we find it defined by so ancient an authority as Bhāsāpati who is quoted by Viśvarūpāchārya in his commentary Bālakṛṣṇa on the Yajñavalkyaṃśayī while commenting on the verse 307 in the Rājadharmaprakaraṇa of this work. The definition runs as follows: avākṣaįyā-vikal-advartī pratāpayō subhaṅgaḥ sumukhydro-kṛiyāpanyo-prapādi dākṣaṅgō dākṣaṅgīya-Uchara-rakṣaṇ-ārtham-adhiṣṭhāna-nīkṣita-viṣeka-kṛid-eparikāḥ sāyād, i.e., 'a man who is resolute, wise, energetic, blissful, personable, generous, vigilant, devout and capable of administering justice in legal disputes should be (appointed as) Uparika in order to maintain impartiality and morality'. The office of an Uparika may thus correspond to that of 'a magistrate'. Viśhayaṅpati and Čandraṅpati are 'district-officer' and 'village-head' respectively. The meaning of the terms Bhāgīn and Bhāgīka is not very clear. They are apparently the same as Bhāgaṅa and Bhāgaṅka, occurring elsewhere. They possibly denote 'collectors of revenue'. Explaining the latter designation Mr. Vaidya writes: 'the collector of the Bhōga, i.e. the state share of the land produce taken in kind, as a rule, one sixth. The term Bhōga is still in use in Kathiawad for the share usually 4th which land-holders receive from land-cultivating tenants'. The chōta, bhōta and vallabhas belong to the inferior staff. The first two have often been rendered as 'irregular soldiers' and 'regular troops' respectively. Prof. Vogel has, however, shown that the office of chōta still exists in the Chamba State where the corrupt form chār is used and it means 'the head of a parvaṇḍa', while bhōta is taken in the sense of 'an official subordinate to the head of a parvaṇḍa'. Vallabhas are mentioned also in Kauṭīlīya's Arthaśāstra where the word is translated as 'courtiers'.

TEXT.

First Plate.

2 r-Mmatheṇdrāchāla-ādhaṅa-nīvāsina[1*] arīmad-Gōkārṇīśvam-bhatāṭāra-kara- 
3 sya charaṇa-kamal-ārādhana-āvāpta-punayā-nya-nichayaṣya[12] śakti-tṛtaya-

[12] The letter i in this juncture appears to be doubled, but in reality it is single; cf. the same in kṛīṇa, l. 17. 
prakārah-ānuraṇijit-aśeṣha-sāṃanta-chakraḥ  svabhava-va(ba)la-parākrama-[ji]-
śa-sakala-Kalih-ādhīrājī(śyā)ḥ  paramamāhēvāraḥ  mātā-pitrī-pād-ānu-
dhyāta(tō)  Gatiṅgī-āmala-kula-tilaka(kī)  mā(ma)hārajādhīrāja-paramēsvara-

Second Plate; First Side.

paramaḥ(bha)ṭa-raja-śri-‘Anantavarmmadēva[h]’  kuśaliḥ  Khalgukhaṇḍa-visha-
yē  Vartatmāna(nān)  bhavisyaśūcha(shyānā-cha)  vrā(brā)maṇa-pūraṇaka(gān)
mā(ma)hāsāmanta-ārisāma-
nta-dānānayaka-dānantāśāk-āntaraṅga-kumārāṃaty-ōparika-vishaya-
pati-grāmapati-bhī(ha)gi-bhūgy-ādi-vishaya-śanapada-śīn-anyānās(nyaḥ)-ṣa cha
cuṣṭha-
bhuṭa-vallabhā-jātiyāh(yān)  yathārāhā  mānayatī-śāsati  cha  viditam-
sūtu  bhavataṁ-śīt-vishaya-samvandha(mbddha).Svalpa-Vēlurō  grāmō-yaḥ
tuk-śī-

m-ōpalaksitō  Vājasana[ya]*-charanaśa Kāyuśa-sākhāya  Vachchhaha(tsa)-gōtrā-
ye  Bhṛgu-vatś  Dairda-vatś  Chyavana-vatś  Jā(Ja)madagni-vatś * pravaraṇā *

Second Plate; Second Side.

bhuṭa-‘Nāṇasaṃrāmanāya’  saīla-dhārā-puraṇāsarēnu-śa-chandrārka-kaḥita-sa-
ma-kālam-akarikṛtya  pratipādātēna  śmābhūr-yaṭaḥ  tūṃva(mra)-śāsana-dārsa-
nāda-dharmma-gauravācha(cha-cha)  na  kēnachit-panicpanthinā  bhavatavyaḥ(vyam)
uktaṁvī-cha  dharmma-śāstra-
sūtu  Va(ba)hubhir-vasudhā  datā(tā)  rājabhis-Śagar-ādibhū[ī]*  yasya  yasya
yan  bhū(bhū)ma-tasya  tasya  tādā  phalam(lam)  [lī]*  Mā  bhū(bhū)d-aphal-

śaṅkā vaḥ para-

Here the anuketa is redundant.

The letter śī here is in fact single, but it looks doubled as compared with the one in ‘ādikāramāṇa’, l. 1, and ‘ārādēva’, l. 4. The form in question may be compared with the same letter in ‘ādikāra’, above Vol. III, pl. facing p. 18, text l. 3.

Here bha is reversed and is engraved upon a partly erased letter which was perhaps śī, while ṣī is differently shaped from that in ‘bhujāraḥ’, l. 3.

Śandhi has not been observed here.

Here visarga is superfluous. Read kuśali.

This ṣouṇa is unnecessary.

There is a superfluous sign after the letter rāhā.

The Vatas gōtra is known to have the following paṭṭa-ārıkṣa-praṭaraṇa: Jamadagni-Uṛva-Apnavāna-Chyava-Bṛigu (see the Gṛhpravaraṃbandhathākamanta (Bombay edition), p. 25). In the present instance, while Apnavāna has obviously been omitted through inadvertence, Uṛva is replaced by Dairda which is not a well-known name. In the case of the dome in the Gaṅgā plates of Jāyavarmmedēva (who likewise belongs to the Vājasena chaṇḍa, the Kāyuśa śākha and the Vatas gōtra), Apnavāna and Uṛva are substituted by Vatas and Dairddā respectively, as he is described to be Vata-vat Dairda-vat Bṛigu-vat Jā(Ja)madagni-vat Chyavana-vat paṭṭa-praṭaraṇa (see Ind. Hist. Quart., Vol. XII, plate facing p. 492, text li. 23-24).

These dausa are unnecessary.

Read bhujā-‘Nāṇasaṃrāmanāṇaḥ.’

Better read -praṭāraṇam-

Read pratiṣṭhitē-

There is a superfluous sign of final t after the syllable ṭab.

Here d is redundant. Read dharmma-
21 datē(tt-ēti) pārthivāh [*] sva-dānāt-phalam-ānantyaṁ para-datta-ānapāla-nah(ēṁ) [2 [*] Sa(ēṁ)saḥ śaṁ(aḥ)-shaṁ(aḥ)]
22 m-varsha-sahasraṁ svargē mōdatā bhu(bhū)midaṁ [*] a(a)kshēptaṁ cha-ānumantā cha tān-yē-
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24 vīṣṭhāyāṁ krimiṁ bhū(bhū)tvā pīṭgībhi[h] [*] saha pachyatē || [4[*] Iti kamala-daṁ-
25 lāṁv(mu)ṁ-va(bi)jīndu-lōlāṁ śrīyam-ānuhpinta yam manushya-ji(ji)vitaṁ-ṁu cha sakalam-i-
26 dam-udāhritaṁ-cha vu(bu)ddhīva na hi purushaṁ[h] [*] para-kīrttayō vilōpya[pyēh] [15[*]] iti
27 du(du)taṁ-তttrā mā(ma)hāṁsāṁanta-śrī(śrī)-Āśvādaraḥ | likhatān-cha mā(ma)hā-
28 sandhīvīgīh(gra)hika-Gōvindadēvēna | laṁ(lā)ścchitaṁ[ti] mā(ma)hādēvyā śrī-Āśvā-
30 Phālaśuddi 5 [18]]

TRANSLATION.

(Lines 1-8) Ōm Hail! From the (capital) city of Svētaka, the illustrious Mahārājādhirāja-
Paramēśvara-Paramabhaṭṭāra Kh Anantaśvaromāṇa, who has a store of religious merit acquired
by worshipping the lotus-like feet of the illustrious lord Gōkarpēvara-bhṛṭāra (i.e., Śiva),
who⁸ is the cause in bringing about the creation, preservation and destruction⁸ (of the universe)
(and) who² resides on the summit of the mount Mahēndra, who⁶ has the entire circle of feudatory
chiefs loyally attached (to himself) through the excellence of his⁸ three-fold power, who⁴ has the
supremacy over the whole Kaliṅga (country) conquered by the strength and force of his⁶
own arms, who⁸ is a devout worshipper of Mahēśvara (i.e., Śiva), who⁶ has meditated on the feet
of his⁸ parents, (and) who¹¹ is an ornament of the pure family of the Gaṅgas, being in good health,

(II. 8-12) duly honours and commands the present as well as the future (officers) of the
district and of the country, headed by the Brāhmaṇas, (namely) Mahāsāṁanta¹⁴ Śrīśāṁanta, Daśa-

¹ Read evamādharam.
² Here the anusvāra is redundant.
³ Sandhi has not been observed here.
⁴ This sāl is engraved over an erasure.
⁵ Read ṛikaya-ṛti
⁶ Read sākṣa. The sign after sākṣa cannot be read as final ṛ, because the form of this letter occurring in
the present inscription is altogether different as may be seen in I. 15 and l. 23. No doubt the sign in question
is to be read as the numeral 1, while the next one is the numerical figure 9.
⁷ This evidently stands for Phālgaṇa.
⁸ This refers to Gōkarpēvara-bhṛṭāra.
⁹ The order in the original is: preservation, creation and destruction. The same is seen also in the other
known Gaṅga records where the phrase in question occurs. The proper order, however, should be as given
in the translation.
¹⁰ This refers to Anantaśvaromāṇa.
¹¹ The three šaṁkī are prabhu-šaṁkī (majesty), mantra-šaṁkī (good counsel) and utāka-šaṁkī (energy).
¹² The significance of this and the following titles has been discussed in the introduction.
nāyaka, Daṇḍapāśika, Antarānā, Kumārāṁyaga, Uparika, Vishayapatik, Grāmopati, Bhāgin
Bhūgin and so forth, as well as others belonging to the class of chātas, bhaṭas and vallabhas in the
district of Khaluguṇḍa (as follows) :

(ll. 12-18) "Be it known to you that this village of Svalpa-Vēlura (or Svalpa-Vēlurō), belong-
ing to this district (of Khaluguṇḍa), (and) marked by (its all the) four boundaries, has been
donated by Us, after making it rent-free, with libations of water to Bhaṭṭa Nāṇaśarman of the
Vājasaṇeṣa charaṇa, the Kānya kākha, the Vataś gōra (and) the Bhāgī-Ūrva-Chyavana-Apna-
vāna-Jamadagni pravara, to last as long as the moon, the sun and the earth (endure); wherefore
seeing the copper charter and out of respect for the dharma no one should become an obstacle
(to it).

(ll. 18-26) "Moreover, it is declared in the dharmaśāstrās : [Here follow five of the customary
verses.]"

(ll. 27-30) The Dūtaka here is the illustrious Mahāsāmaṇa Aśokadēva. And (it) is
written by Mahāsaṃdhikvīraśika Gōvindadēva (and) registered by the illustrious chief queen
Vāsabhāṭṭārika. And (it) is engraved by the illustrious Mahindrabhīma. The year 19,
the 5th day of the bright fortnight of Phalguna.

No. 18.—CHURA GRANT OF PALLAVA VIJAYA-VISHNUGOPAVARMAN.

By C. R. Krishnamacharlu, B.A., Madras.

The grant edited below is engraved on three copper-plates strung on a circular ring bearing
an oval seal. The plates were forwarded to the late Rao Bahadur H. Krishna Sastri, Government
Epigraphist for India, by J. N. Roy, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of Guntur, in 1913 and were reviewed
in the Annual Report on Epigraphy, Madras, for the year 1913-14. Though a set of impressions
was forwarded to Professor Hultzsch in October 1913, no article appears to have been contributed
by him on the record. I am now editing it for the first time here from the original plates re-
cently borrowed for the purpose and from the impressions preserved in my office.

The plates measure 6 inches by 2½ inches each and the ring is ¾ inch in thickness and 3 inches
in diameter. The seal measures approximately 1½ inch by 1 inch. The plates are very much
worn out and slightly damaged also. Some holes are visible in the first and the third plates,
while a portion in the top margin of the first plate is broken. The ring attached to the plates
was not cut when they were first received for examination. The oval seal, into the bottom of
which the ends of the ring are fixed, is slightly broken and on its face bears in relief the figure
of a couchant bull facing the proper right. The first plate is engraved on one side only, while the
second and the third plates are engraved on both the sides. The plates together with the ring and
the seal weigh 31 tolas.

The Revenue Divisional Officer of Narasaraopet, who secured the plates at the first instance,
reported that they were brought to him by Mulla Sheik Mirem of Narasaraopet who said that the
plates were granted to his ancestor (1) one Mulla Abdul Fatel, "as title-deed for some Jāghir in
Daggupādu, a village of the Bapatala taluk". It is probable that the plates were originally dis-
covered in Daggupādu itself or its vicinity, since Lagubāhru (evidently modern Daggupādu)
figures among the boundaries mentioned in the grant.

1 No. 3 of App. A ; vide also page 6, para. 9 and page 82, para. 1.
The inscription is composed in Sanskrit language and the characters belong to the Southern class of alphabets. As remarked by Krishna Sastri, though the record is full of mistakes, it is important enough for supplying information for Pallava genealogy prior to the time of the Sinhavishnu line of Conjeeveram. A few Telugu expressions occurring in the description of the boundaries are noticed below. The mistakes in sandhi, etc., are corrected in foot-notes accompanying the text. The following orthographical peculiarities deserve to be noticed:

The anusvāra is often replaced by the class nasal, which is joined on to the following consonant in a conjunct letter: e.g., *jītam-bhayavañā, (l. 1), Pallaśodāra-dharmo, (l. 16), pāru-śatrava-na bhūmaṇa (l. 31), pāpāṇa bhūmaṇa (l. 32), etc. In this respect this record resembles the Māṅgālī grant of Sinhavaran. The letter ja is often miswritten as jā with the central cross-bar elongated. Consonants following r are doubled in certain places (e.g., bal-ār̥jīt-ār̥jīta, in l. 2, maryādasya in l. 3, varmaṇa in l. 10, 16, etc. and dharmaṇa in l. 8, 16, etc.), but not in others (e.g., niḥkha-viḍhi in l. 3, nivarṇata in l. 25). The word pūrvea is invariably written as pūrvea (l. 19, 28) and utara as uto (l. 22). The following corrupt forms are worthy of notice: Kandavarma (l. 4 l.), roṣe (l. 16 l.), sācharantakā (l. 17 l.), gṛhādāna-thita (l. 24), paumātra (l. 26), etc. The expression naṅyāvika (l. 17) appears to be meant for naṅyāmika derived from niyama and used for naṅyāmika or niyāmika signifying ‘law officers’. The word kshetra is wrongly used in the masculine form (l. 24) and kshetraṇ in kṣetraṇa in l. 25. The upadānāyâya is employed in gataḥ-prakāśaḥ (l. 12-13). The use of the Telugu expressions muru (i.e., the meeting-place of three villages) and mēñitâpa in l. 21 are also noteworthy. Mēñitâpa is perhaps used in the sense of a stepped platform to stack ploughs (mēਵ- modern mēdi). Mudī-ṭaṅka (l. 24) is another mixed expression probably meant to indicate an ancient (mudi) tank.

The inscription records the gift of one hundred and eight vīcārāṇas of land and a house-site with a garden (vī Śītā) in the village of Churō in Kārṇam-rāṣṭra by the Dharma-mahārāja Vijaya-Vishnugo-pārvavarman of the Bhāravāja line and the Pallava family, to the Brāhman Chāsamārman, who was the son of Dvēdaya-Vṛiddha-rāmarman and grand-son of Vishnusarma and was a resident of Kuṇḍāru, who belonged to the Kāśyapa-gotra and was well-versed in the four Vedas, as a brahmānāya, exempting it from all obligations or endowing it with all exemptions (purānār-a-viṣa) on the occasion of the Uttarāyaṇa. The gift was made for the increase of the king’s life, strength and success.

The record commences with salutation to the Bhagavat as in some other early Pallava copper-plates, and this is followed by the name of the place of issue, viz., Vijaya-Palākṣaṭa-adhisāṭhīnā, i.e., the prosperous capital Palāṣṭa. The genealogy of the king is given thus:

Kandavarma (Skandavarma)
Vishnugo-pārvavarman
Singhavaran
Vijaya-Vishnugo-pārvavarman

1 Cl. (1) neyike of the Hīrādajagall plate (above, Vol. I, pp. 5 and 8) and (2) naiyāvika of the Chendalāru plates of Kumāravīhāru II (ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 235).

Comparing this table with the list of succession given in allied Pallava grants, the king would appear to be the son of Simhavarman, who issued the Pikira, Māngadūr and Urvupalli grants and also the Orṅgōḍu grant discovered by me in 1916, although the last is only a copy. Of Vishṇugopavaranman we have no copper-plate grants known so far besides the one under review which again from its paleography clearly appears to be a copy made some time in the beginning of the seventh century A.D. and has, therefore, some value as such. A closer comparison of the letters would reveal great affinity between these and the letters of the Koṇḍanagirū grant of the Eastern Chālukya Indravarman and the Ṡpūru plates of Vishṇupardhana III. It would therefore, be accurate to assign the writing of the present grant to the early part of the seventh century A.D. Vishṇugopavaranman, the donor of the present grant, may be designated Vishṇugopā III of the Pallava dynasty.

We are not in a position to guess the actual political or natural causes for the origin of the copies of grants of this king and his father Simhavarman (i.e., the Orṅgōḍu grant). It is possible that the intrusion of the Eastern Chālukyas into the Karmma-rāṣṭhra in the first quarter of the 7th century under Kubja-Vishṇupardhana was one of the circumstances that contributed to the loss of the original grants and the subsequent issue of their copies which have been left to us.

Krishna Sastri mentions a difficulty in the identification of Mahārāja Vishṇugopavaranman, the grandfather of Vijaya-Vishṇugopavaranman of our grant, with Yuvamahārāja Vishṇugopā of the Māngadūr, Pikira, Urvupalli and Orṅgōḍu grants. But beyond the difference in the title there is no insurmountable difficulty in the understanding of the succession list. We have a similar analogy in the Eastern Chālukya line in the instance of Maṅgi-Yuvanā, always being mentioned as a Yuvanā in the dynastic lists, though we have definite evidence to show that he ruled for 25 years under the royal name or title 'Vijayasiddha'. Moreover, in the light of the present grant, applying to Vishṇugopa the title 'mahārāja', we will have to give up the supposition made by Dr. Hultzsch that the king never ascended the throne.

The title Dharma-mahārāja applied to the early Pallava, Gaṅga and Kadamba kings is somewhat interesting and seems to call for some remarks. The title occurs also in the form Dharma-mahārājaḥdharīhaṇa applied to the early Pallava king Śivakandavarman in his Pūrāṇa. Hirehadagali plates and to the early Kadamba king Śivakadhavarman Hāritiputta in his Pūrāṇa Malavajji pillar inscription. The title was borne also by the early Western Gaṅga king Satyavākya-Koṅgagavaranman. This king is also given the title Dharma-mahārāja in another...
The early Kadamba kings Krišna-varman, his son Visnu-varman, and Ravi-varman also bore the title Dharma-mahārāja. Similarly the early Kadamba king Vijaya Śiva-Mandhāṭrivarman is entitled Dharma-mahārājā. The title Dharma-Yuvamahārāja also occurs in some Pallava inscriptions. Dr. Fleet commenting upon the significance of the title 'Dharma-mahārāja' says that it means a mahārājaṁthrāja by or in respect of religion or by free translation a pious or righteous mahārājaṁthrāja. Aśoka is believed to have borne the surname or title Dharmaṁthrāja. But the titles Dharma-mahārāja, Dharma-mahārāja or Dharma-mahārājaṁthrāja are not known to have been applied either to him or assumed by any other early king in North or South India besides those noted above. They are not known either to the Epics or the Purāṇas which deal with the most pious kings. These titles appear, in my opinion, to have been based upon or evolved from the earlier title Dharma-mahāmāta of the Aśokan inscriptions. These officials, according to the monarch's own statement, were appointed by him for the first time and they were primarily officials in charge of morality. It appears to me that the early Pallava, Ganga and Kadamba kings, having succeeded to the sovereignty of the territories over which Aśoka might have appointed some of his dhamma-mahāmātas (dharma-mahāmātas) assumed the titles dharma-mahārāja or dharma-mahārājaṁthrāja as and when their political circumstances permitted. This explanation seems also to be borne out by the context in which the title occurs in the early Kadamba inscription of Śiva-Mandhāṭrivarman in the form 'Vaijayantyām Dharma-mahārāja', even before the family of the king is introduced. Just as in the Vaijayantyām times vassals or ministers who were originally entitled mahārāja assumed the paramount title mahārāja when they gained sovereignty, so too the successors of the Aśokan Dharma-mahāmātas must have adopted the title Dharma-mahārāja or Dharma-mahārājaṁthrāja when they became independent kings but were willing or even proud to maintain the earlier traditions of their political power and associations with the great Mauryan emperor's time.

The grant was issued from Vijaya-Palākṣṭaṁbhaṁ, i.e., the victorious capital Palākṣṭa. Palakkāda-sthāna was the place of issue of the Uruvapalli plates of Sinhavarman, the father of the present king. Whether we can definitely identify Palākṣṭa with Palakkāda as suggested by Krishna Sastrī and assumed also by Professor Dubreuil is doubtful, though the possibility of the identity is not altogether precluded. Prof. Dubreuil suggested once personally to me that Palakkāda might be identical with the modern village of Peda-Palakalur in the Guntur taluk. It is also possible that Palakur in the Kandukur taluk of the Nellore District might be the ancient Palakkāda or alternatively Palākṣṭa. From the Postal Directory we see that in the vicinity of Kandukur town are villages of the name Pallava, Pallava-Bālagopālapuram and Pallava Bhuvanagirivari-khandrika. These names definitely point to the association of this tract with the Pallavas.

---

1 Above, Vol. XII, p. 50, Text, l. 4.
2 Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 18 and Vol. VIII, pp. 30 and 147.
5 Above, Vol. V, p. 163, l. n. 2.
6 Ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 167.
7 Hultsch, Inscriptions of Aśoka, Gir. V; Kal. V, XII, etc.
8 E.g. Tirumala I.
9 [There is not sufficient evidence to support this view.—Ed.]
12 Pallavas, table on p. 72.
The boundary villages Łagubamru, Pāgahuru and Nāgoḷāmi mentioned in the inscription may be identified respectively with the modern villages Daggupādu, Pāvuluru and Nāgalā, all in the Bapatla taluk of the Guntur District. The gift-village Churā would therefore be the deserted village shown in the New Atlas sheets between Nāgalā and Daggupādu. In the older sheets this is shown as Sāravāripālem. Irādi-mahāpatha cannot be identified. Karmma-rāṣṭra of the inscription is very well known in early Eastern Chālukya inscriptions and in still later epigraphs it is known by the name Kamma-nāṇḍu. But attention may be drawn to the fact that it was still earlier known as Karṇāka-raṭha in the Jaggayyapēta Prakrit inscriptions of the Ikāku king Sīriva Purisada.¹

TEXT.²

First Plate.

1 Jitam-Bhagavatāta[*] ["] Svasti ["] Śrī-vijaya.Palāṭkaṭ-ā[dhishtānā]t²-pa-
2 rama-brahmanāsya svā-bāhu-bal-ārjīt śrījīta-kṣattra-tapā-ni-
3 dhē[r*]-vīdhī-[vjihita-sarvva-marryādasya sthiti-sthī[ta]sya-amitt-ātmanō⁴ ma-
4 hā[rājāsya] pratāp-ōpanata-rājā-mundālasya³ Śrī-Ka³:
5 ndavarnaṇaḥ pra-pautṛṇaḥ siddhi-sa[r*]paṇna(nma)ṣayā vasudhā-tal-aika-vī-
6 rasya 19mahārājasya Śrī-Vas煌gūpav[a*]maṇaḥ pautra[h] dēva-dvi-

Second Plate: First Side.

8 hirayya-blūmy-[ā]di-pradānaiḥ pravṛddhā-dharmma-saṃchayasya
9 prajā-pālana-pakhasyasya¹² lōkapāl[i]n paṃchamasya [lōkapālasya*] satya(ty-ā)tma-
10 nō mahārājasya Śrī-Sīrgha[v[a*]rmmaṇaḥ putra[h] bhagavat¹⁴-bha[kti]-sa-
11 dbhāva-sadbhāvambhājvita-sarvavṛṣa[kalagā]-paṃchama[n]dōga¹⁴ satatā-satata-
12 vrata-dīkṣhitō anēka¹⁴-samara-sahas-avamardhdha¹⁷ labdha-vijaya-yasa¹⁸.
13 ḫ-prakāsa[h*] Kali-yuga-dōṣh-āvasa[n]-dharmm-ōddharanapītya-sannaddhō rāja-
14 rasha[ra]h[ṛ]-gūna[h*] bhagavat-pad-ānudhāy[tō] bappa-bha[t*]tāraka-pāda-bhakta[h*] pā-

¹ Lāduka’s List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, Nos. 1202 to 1204; Hultzsch, above, Vol. IX, p. 50.
² From the original plates and ink-impressions.
³ Read Bhagavat. The last letter looks like ṭa without the top-bar. As it is not small in size it cannot be read as t. It might even be read as ōṁ or Siddham.
⁴ Read vijaya.
⁵ Read ādhishtānā.
⁶ Read śrī-vijaya.
⁷ Read maḥārājasya.
⁸ Read rāja-mundālasya.
⁹ The original shows an accidental and superfluous stroke after Ka.
¹⁰ Read maḥārājasya Śrī-Vas煌gūpa.
¹¹ Read devī-guru-vṛiddh-āpachāyinī. This is the expression adopted in the Uruvupalli grant, while others read vṛiddhāpachāyanī (vide above, Vol. XV, p. 254, text, line 10 and f. n. 8).
¹² Read vṛiddhā-pachāyanī. The traces in the impression seem to give vṛiddha.
¹³ Read dakhagūṇa.
¹⁴ Read bhagavat-bhakta.
¹⁵ Read saṃdōkaḥ.
¹⁶ Read śrī-kṣhitō-nēka.
¹⁷ Read dēvā-sahamarddu.
¹⁸ Read ṭaṣṭaḥ.
Second Plate: Second Side.

15 rama-bha(bhā)gavatō Bhā(bhā)radva(dvājaḥ śrī-nilayāṇā(m)b [ṁ] anēk-Āśvamedhānā(m)n Pa-
16 llavānān-dharma-mahārājāḥ1 śrī-Vijā(ja)-ya-Vishnu-pugoparvamna Karma-stā-
17 te[ē]([ā]kṣa) Churā-nāma-[graṁa]-grāmeyakān-attr-ādhūḥ(dhī)kṣa-sarvve[rvva]-
18 niyāvī(m)i[ā]n[ā]m[ā]-sa-
19 ścharamatākā rājāvalabhasā-ch-ānihpayat[y]-asya grāma(grama)-pachima-
20 taḥ
21 hṛṇugrha-rāma-grāma-ṣaya pu[pu]rvva-simā pu[pu]rvva-taṭākē puruvata-
23 svarita-muṣyurra-kujuva mejītāpaḥ pachimata(tō) Nāgo[ā]mī-gr[ā]-

Third Plate: First Side.

23 dhir[ṛ][ṭ](ta)m
24 ashtot[ṛ][ṛ]tara-satā-nivartta-kahētra[ṁ][ṭa]simā-ēva grāmō madhyama-vaṭā- gr[ā]-ma-
26 [dak]hināṭa(tō) vāṭika-thāṁsa-thīta kahētra[ḥ]19 nivartma-kahētra[n] Kupūjū-
27 r-vv(vv)stavyya [Kā]ṣaya(ya)pā-gōṭēf[ā]ya 18 Vishnu-ārmanma pauvnta Dvēdaya-
28 19 Vṛdha(sa-
30 t[ś] udaka-[ṛ]purvāṇa daitam brahmāṇya-13māyyadaya sarvva-paṛīhāra-

Third Plate: Second Side.

31 r[u]pētō19 āyu[ṛ]-bala-vijā(ja)y-ābhiviṛddhayē[ṛ]ddhayē-simā-sampri(mpra)ṣ[ṛ]tō-
32 yāḥ -[aitad-a]-
33 [smañ[ā]chāsanam(ch-ḥhāsnam) atikramāta sa pāpa[ḥ] śrīram đūḍa[i]m-arthā[ṛ] [ṭ]
34 [Santu-a]-
35 pi ch-āṭr-ānāhā ālōkāḥ [k-]* Bhūmi-dānāt-panr-[d]uṇa(m)n]na-na bhūtan-na bhavi-
36 shyatā-asya(bhaviṣhyati)asya aiva karanāt-pāpa-na bhūtan-na bhaviṣhyati [[[]]
37 Bhū-

1 Read mahārājāś.
2 Read varamāṇa.
3 Read saṅkṣarākās rājanallakhaṇa.
4 The Uruvapalli grant of Sīhavarma the father of the present king, reads saṅkṣarastakāṣa-cha as in our grant. The draft for the latter was perhaps adopted from the former. Saṅkṣaraka must denote 'circuit officers'.
5 Read taṭākāh.
6 Read mahāra[j-]sā.[u]n[ā] or kūḍika.
7 Read -ītās.
8 Read ṣat[i]-kāhētra[ḥ] kahētra[ḥ].
9 Read allāt[a]-dakhināṭarvah grīha-thāṁsa-thīt-kahētra[ḥ].
10 Read vāṭika-thāṁsa-thīt-āla.[u]kā.-
11 Read Vīshnu-ārmandaḥ paurāṇya.
12 Read chatur-ṛvēkṣatōr.
13 Read pūrvam.
14 Read pūrvam.
15 Read upātāṃ.
16 Read ludā.[u]h.
17 This verse occurs with a slight variation in the Pkira grant of Sīhavarma; above, Vol. VIII, p. 192.
The subjoined inscription is engraved on three copper plates strung together on a ring which bears a circular seal fixed on to it. The plates belong to Mr. Gopal Sinha Gudo and they were discovered during casual excavations made at the village of Siroda de Ponda in the Portuguese territory of Goa. They are rectangular in shape and measure about \(5\frac{1}{2}\) by \(1\frac{1}{2}\). The ring passes through a hole near the proper right-hand top corner of the plates and the circular seal attached to it has the relief figure of a swan executed in a conventional style and facing our left.

The plates were first brought to my notice by Mr. Panduranga Pissurulecchar, M.A., Archaeologist to the Portuguese Government of Goa in August 1933, at the suggestion of Mr. G. V. Acharya, Curator of the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. In spite of his best efforts Mr. Pissurulecchar could not obtain a loan of the original plates for my examination but sent me only photographs of the inscribed sides of the plates. The photographs were not quite clear and the ink-impressions which Mr. Pissurulecchar supplied later on were also not distinct and therefore not helpful. However, at his urgent request I furnished Mr. Pissurulecchar, in March 1934, with a short note on the contents of the grant and a tentative transcript of it so far as it could be made out from the photographs. Mr. Pissurulecchar utilised this note and transliteration for a note on the grant published by him in Portuguese language in *O Oriente Português* in 1934. But from the early nature of the grant and its mention of a hitherto unknown dynasty, viz., Gomias, I intended to examine the original plates. With the permission of the Director General of Archaeology in India I visited Nova Goa in July 1934 and verified the text of the grant with reference to the plates, but for want of facilities I could not get good ink-impressions of these. Subsequently attempts were made in January 1937 through the Government of India to obtain a loan of the plates from the Portuguese Government but these were of no avail as their owner was unwilling to part with them. So the illustrations accompanying the present article had to be based on photographs only. A brief note on these plates was recently contributed by me to the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference under the caption 'A New Dynasty of the West Coast.'

The characters of the inscription belong to the archaic variety and from their general shape and style of execution they somewhat resemble the script of the Mayidavolu Plates of the Pallava king Sivakandanavarman¹ and more closely that of the Kondamudi Plates of Jayavarman². There is also a slight resemblance between the characters of this grant and those of the plates of the Pallava kings Vijaya-Skandavaran and Vijaya-Buddhavarman³. All the above charters are written in Prakrit, while the present plates though written in Sanskrit, have some Prakrit ex-

---

pressions interspersed here and there. On this account the inscription may be assigned to the period following the age to which the Prākrit charters of the Pallavas have been ascribed i.e. to the period of the mixed Prākrit charters like the Maṭṭepāḍ Plates of king Dāmōdaravarman². The late Rao Bahadur Krishna Sastrī has, on valid grounds, ascribed these latter to about the 4th century A. D.³, to which period may be assigned the present inscription also.

The following Prākrit forms used in the record may be noticed—aṣṭākṣa (l. 12), and titṭhātī (l. 13). Of orthography the use of the jīhāvālīya in the expression, Kōṭiḥkāyā (l. 3) and of the upadāśāniya in amāyād-punyō (l. 5) and kriyā-parama- (l. 14) deserve to be noticed.

In his article Mr. Pissurlekar states that the emblem on the seal is a peacock. But I have to differ from him and suggest that it is only a swan in a very conventionalised style. It is noteworthy that similar objects in tile or wood are adopted as house-top crosses or gable-ornaments in Nova Goa even at the present day.

The charter is addressed by (king) Dēvarāja of the Gōmins from the prosperous Chandrapura to the future bhogikas, ayuktaśas and sthānayās (l. 2) (ll. 1 and 2). The object of the inscription is to record the gift of tolls, etc. (l) in (the village) Thāṇiyarka-Kōṭiḥkāyā in the country or division of Jiyāyā, to two Brāhmans named Gōvindasvāmin and Indrasvāmin of the Bhārādvāja-gōra, with the income accruing (?) in the village (parivṛttā) and also the income realised on things brought (ānita) into it, evidently articles of merchandise, together with a house-site (griha-sthāna) and pasture-land for cows (go-prachāra) to each (ll. 3 to 7). The charter further enjoins on the proper supply to the donces of the grass from the pastures and of fuel (kāśtha) (ll. 7 and 8).

From the wording of the record it appears as if the king proclaims his ratification or sanction of the above-mentioned gifts made by Prabhū Nāga-Bhōgikāmātya, for the acquisition of his own spiritual salvation (punya) (ll. 4f.)

The executor of the grant (or the royal ratification) is the Savatantriḍāḍikīrīta (Superintendent of all Departments) Amārāvāra, who was a very righteous man (parama-dhārmikā) and one devoted to truth (satya-sanātha) (ll. 14 and 15).

The charter was written or composed (likhitam) by the Bakhyaḍādikīrīta⁴ (Private Secretary) Prabhākara (ll. 15 and 16).

The inscription is dated in the twelfth year of the victorious and prosperous reign of the king, on the twelfth day (dvādaśī) of the dark fortnight of the month of Magha (ll. 17 and 18). At the end comes the invocation of prosperity which partly reminds us of the closing expression in the Hirēḍagallī Plates of the early Pallava king Śiva-Skandavarman⁴.

The king Dēvarāja who is compared to Indra (Dēvarāja) is not known from other sources so far. The family of the Gōmins is also new and may be the one with which the patronymic Gōmāyana is connected.

¹ Above, Vol. XVII, pp. 327 ff.
³ The original reads sthānayadāpy which may be a clerical mistake for grāmy-adāpy cf. grāmika (C. I. I., Vol. III, p. 112n) and grāmikābha (above, Vol. XVII, p. 327). Or it may be a mistake for sthānayās derived from sthāman meaning ‘a seat’ or ‘place’ and denoting the ‘local officials’. This may correspond to the sthānakṣākṣikas of the later inscriptions (cf. above, Vol. III, p. 323) and sthānakṣākṣikas (ibid., Vol. VI, p. 136n).
⁴ For other early instances of this officer being employed to compose copper-plate charters see above, Vol. I, p. 7 and Vol. VI, p. 13.
⁵ Above, Vol. I, page 7, Text l. 32.
The localities mentioned in the inscription are Chandrapura, the town from which the charter was issued, the territorial division Jiyayā (and the village granted) Thānniyarka-Kōṭṭīkayā. It is not possible to identify any of them definitely. Regarding these Mr. Pissurencar informs me that the places are in Goa, chiefly in Salsette. He is not able to identify or explain Jiyayā which evidently indicates some local territorial division but thinks that Salsette may represent it. He thinks that Chandrapura is Chandor of Goa and identifies Thānniyarka-Kōṭṭīkayā with Tanem-Kuttal in Salsette.

**TEXT.**

**First Plate.**

1. ॐ [Svasti] ["] [Śrī-vijaya]-Chandrapurād-Gōmināṁ Dēvarāja-vachanāt
2. bhavishya[d-bhōgik]-āyūtiaka-sthāmy-āda(yō) vaktavyāḥ ["]
3. Jiyayā[ya]su Thānniyarka-Kōṭṭīkayā-parivṛti-
4. tēma ch-ānīthēna2 yan-nispadyate [tat"] Prabhu-Nāga-

**Second Plate; First Side.**

5. Bhōgik-Āmātyabh[tyaṇ]ḥ-puṇy-ōpachayāya Bhāradvāja-sa-
6. gōrāḥ bhyaḥ Gō[va]indasvām-Indrasvambhyārṁ dataṁ griha-sthāna-
7. 2c[cha gō-prachārāv-ātataṁ] || Gō-prachāra-triṇa-kāṣṭh(āṣṭh)-ādīka-
8. 2c[cha [s]u]-pratibh[ā]dhyāyam || Yō-smat-kul-āḥbyantarē-nyō va

**Second Plate; Second Side.**

9. rāga-dvēsha-lōbha-māṁ-ābhibhātō hijāḥṣyāt sat paṇchabhūr-mmāhī-
10. bātakair-upapātakaś-cha sa[m]yuktaḥ syāt || Uktaḥ-cha || Bahūbhī-
11. r-vvasudhā bhuktā rajabhis-Sagar-ādibhūḥ ["] yasya yasya yadā
12. bhūmis-tasya tasya tadā [pha]lam || Shaṭṭhīṁ7 varsha-sahasraṇi
13. svarge tītṭhāḥ(āṣṭh)-aḥ bhūmidaḥ ["] 2c[ā]chhettā ch-ānunmaṇtā cha

**Third Plate.**

14. tān[y]-ēva narākē vṛnjēd-iti || Sārvavatāntādhirhikrītaḥ-parama-
15. dharmikas-satyasandho-marāsvara10 ājjāḥ[pi]ḥ ["] Rahasyādhirhikrī-
16. na Prabhākaraṇa [De]varāja-pratimasyā[11] [De]varājasya-ājñāya likhi-
17. tā [pa]ṭṭikā ["] Vijaya-pravarddhama-rāja-saṁvatsaraḥ dvādaśamē

---

1 From a photograph supplied by Mr. Pissurencar.
2 The spiral at the commencement of the line probably stands for "Śrī"; see above, Vol. XVIII, p. 349, n. 9.
3 Read =ānīthā.
4 Read -Indrasvambhyārṁ.
5 Read -ātataḥ or "prachārasah-ātataḥ.
6 Read piṭukair.
7 Read Śaṭṭhīṁ evaṁ-haṁ-sahasraṁ.
8 Read 2c[ā]chhettā or 2c[ā]chhētā.
9 Read rasūr-iti.
10 The name is Amarāśvara.
11 Read -pratimasyā.
12 The Hirahadagalli plates have the expression Svāsti gō-śāhāmaṇa-lōbha-vāchaka-śāhāmobhyā iti; see n. 5, p. 144.
No. 20. Kosam Inscription of the Reign of Maharaja Vaisravana of the Year 107.

By the late Mr. N. G. Majumdar, M.A., F.R.A.S.B., Calcutta.

This inscription, which is engraved on a small stone pillar, was discovered in January, 1938, near Kosam (ancient Kausambi) in Allahabad District, where I was camping at the time for conducting excavation. It was found lying in the house of a Muhammadan Zemindar named Gulzar in the village of Hasanpur or Hajipur, about a mile and a half to the north-west of the Kosam Pillar. The actual findspot could not, however, be ascertained, although there is little doubt that it came originally from the immediate neighbourhood of the place of discovery. The pillar has now been deposited by me in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, with the consent of the Director General of Archaeology in India.

The pillar, which has four faces, is 3' 9" in height, and measures 8" square at the top with a maximum width of 91/4" at the base. The inscription is engraved on one of the faces, covering a space of about 2" 2" by 7", and the size of the letters generally varies between 4" and 11/4". In all there are 16 lines of writing. The pillar is broken into two halves, one containing lines 1 to 12 and the upper part of line 13 and the other containing the rest of the record. A few letters have partially broken off from the beginning and end of line 1, while some of the letters of line 13 are damaged owing to the crack running through its entire length. But there is no difficulty in restoring almost the entire text.

The characters belong to the Northern class of alphabets, which developed in this region out of such forms as those in the Kosam inscription of Kanishka.\(^1\) Paleographically, the present record appears to belong to the same group as the Gāndhāra inscription of Bhīmasena and the Kosam inscriptions of Bhadrakāla, Śivamāni and Bhīmaravan, the dates of which range between the years 51 and 139 of some unspecified era.\(^2\) The forms of the letters ma, la, sa and ha of this record are closely akin to those appearing in the Gupta inscriptions. It contains also the looped form of a together with the more archaic form of the letter in which it has bent base line. The letter ś is uniformly of the looped type and ṣ is of the form which is usually taken to be characteristic of the Eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet. Judging from paleography the inscription may be assigned to the fourth century A.D.

The language of the inscription is a mixture of Sanskrit and Prākrit. The Prākritic forms occurring in it are: śatimā for śatamā, grīshma for grīshma,\(^3\) etāya puruṣaya for etāyam puruṣa-yām, negamasya for na-gamasya and Sār西洋aka for Sāru西洋akasya. The form puruṣaya is found also in a few other inscriptions discovered in Kosam. The term negama occurs here probably in the sense of 'the merchant' and is similarly used, along with a specification of the domicile of the donor,\(^4\) in the Kanheri inscriptions. As regards orthography, it may be noted that the medial ñ stroke is frequently omitted, e.g. in Badarikāramā (ll. 10-11). Such spelling,

---

\(^1\) See Ind. Hist. Quart., Vol. X, pp. 575-76. A good facsimile of the inscription has not yet been published.

\(^2\) Sahni, Ep. Ind., Vol. XVIII, pp. 158, 160; cf. A. Ghosh, Indian Culture, Calcutta, Vol. I, pp. 715 ff. and Vol. III, pp. 177 ff.; G. Chatterji, The Commemoration Volume, pp. 101 ff. and above, Vol. XXIII, pp. 243 ff. I am informed by Dr. N. P. Chakravarti that a set of inscriptions recently discovered in the Rewah State, which are being edited by him, are dated respectively in the reign of Bhīmasena (year 51), his son Pāthasiri (year 86) and grandson Bhadadēva (year 90). These years, as well as those of the Kosam inscriptions, are perhaps to be referred to the same reckoning.

\(^3\) Both śatimā and grīshma occur in the inscription of Bhīmaravan of the year 130.—Indian Culture, Vol. III, p. 182.

\(^4\) In the present inscription the term Sāru西洋aka, originally denoting 'an inhabitant of Sāru西洋aka', is used as a personal name. Such instances are not rare.
Kosam Inscription of the Reign of Maharaja Vaisravana of the Year 107.
however, should perhaps be regarded as a linguistic feature and not necessarily an orthographic irregularity. Separate signs are used to denote $b$ and $v$, e.g. in *Buddha* in ll. 12 and 15, and the letter $v$ following a superscript $r$ is invariably doubled.

The purpose of the inscription is to record the establishment of an umbrella (t.e. a stone umbrella) in honour of the lord Buddha by the merchant Māgha, son of the merchant Śūrpaṇā (Śūrpaṇā) and grandson of the merchant Svrāṭalaka (i.e., 'one who hailed from Svarštirī'), an inhabitant of Suktimati. The donor is described as a śrāvakā, i.e. a lay hearer. The umbrella was installed within a temple called Pūrvasiddhāyatana in Badarkārama. The small pillar on which the record is engraved probably represents the staff of the umbrella which is missing. The inscription refers itself to the reign of the Mahārāja Vaśravāna and is dated in the year 107, the first day of the 7th fortnight of the summer. The year is expressed in words as well as in symbols.

Mahārāja Vaśravāna, obviously one of the rulers of Kauśāmbī, is known from this inscription for the first time. The year 107, when he was reigning, is referable, judging from the palaeography of the inscription, to the Kalachuri era of 248 A.D. and is thus equivalent to 355-56 A.D. I am unable to identify Suktimati which was probably in the neighbourhood of Kauśāmbī. Badarkārama, where the umbrella was dedicated, is mentioned in the introductory portion of the Tattvā-Jālaka as a locality situated in the vicinity of Kauśāmbī. The first epigraphical reference to this locality occurs in the present inscription. Another arāma adjoining Kauśāmbī was the Ghōshārāma which is well known from Buddhist literature, being the place where the Buddha spent some time during his sojourn in the Vatsa country.

**TEXT.**

2 sāhvatāśrē satp-ottara-śat[-
3 [mē] 100 7 gri[gr]ahma-pakhē sapta-
4 mē 7 divase prathama? [††]
5 etāya puruvaya Sukti-
6 mati-va(va)stavyasya negama-
7 sya Svrāṭalakasya sapta ne[ga]-
8 masya? Śurpaṇā-purū putrō vanit(ō)ja-
9 kāḥ aviruddha-śrā[javakō Māghaḥ
10 Pūrvasiddh[ā]yatana Badari-
11 k[ā]r[ā]mē bhagavatō(tāl) pitāma-

1 [Suktimati or Śuktiśākvaya is mentioned in the Mahābhārata as the Cīḍī capital—see Sorensen, *Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata*, etc., p. 221. In Pāli literature this city is mentioned as Sotthivati-nagara—see Cheta-jālaka (No. 422).—Ed.]
3 There are only traces of the upper portion of the letter $m$ on the stone.
4 This portion is damaged; only traces of the letter $n$ and a part of the subscript $y$ are visible.
5 The left portion of the last letter is damaged.
6 Usually one should expect here the numeral 1 after prathama. If it originally existed it has peeled off.
7 For the reading of the first two letters I am indebted to Dr. N. P. Chakrabarti.
8 The name perhaps represents Śurpaṇā of uncertain meaning.
No. 21.—CUTTACK MUSEUM PLATES OF MADHAVAVARMAN.

BY THE LATE MR. N. G. MAJUMDAR, M.A., F.R.A.S.B., CALCUTTA.

The actual provenance of this copper-plate charter, which is edited here for the first time, is not known. It appears to have been for a long time in the custody of the Mohant of Kendu-pada Math in Cuttack District, Orissa, and was shown in an exhibition held at Banki in the same district in February, 1937. Subsequently it came into the hands of Pandit Artatran Misra, who has now presented it to the Provincial Museum, Cuttack. I take this opportunity of thanking the authorities of the Museum for having placed the record at my disposal for publication.

It consists of three sheets of copper each measuring about 8 7/8 × 4 7/8. They are held together by means of a copper ring, to which is affixed a seal, bearing in relief the figure of a seated bull and below it the legend kri-Sainyabhita-syas, i.e., 'of the illustrious (King) Sainyabhita'. Sainyabhita was the birth of one of the kings of the Sailodhava dynasty of Kōṅgōda. In the present case it refers to Mādhavavarman who, as will be seen below, issued this charter.

---

1 Read Ṛ 수행. 2 It is not clear if the reading should be dūka or dēka. There may have been another letter at the end of the line where the stone has flaked off. Could the word be Dañapala, a name of the Buddha, and the reading intended Dañapala-śākṭabhājana? 3 [Aviruddha I would take in the sense of ‘free (from greed, passion, etc.)’. For an explanation of this term see Mahānādana (ed. P. T. S.), p. 239.—Ed.] 4 The title pitānaka as well as sanyak-sambuddha is applied to Buddha also in a Mathūrī inscription of the reign of Kanishka (Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX, p. 97). Palaeographically it is impossible to refer this inscription to Kanishka I, that is to say the Early Kushān period, as its alphabet shows predominantly Gupā forms. 5 I record with deep regret that Mr. Majumdar had met with his tragic end in his exploration camp at Nai Gaj in the Dīḍhī District of Sīnd before the proof of this article reached me. By his death we have lost a promising scholar and a valuable contributor to the pages of this journal.—Ed.]
Two other grants of his, namely the Bugudā and Puri plates,¹ have already been published. The inscription consists of 46 lines of writing which is engraved on the inner face of the first and third plates and on both the faces of the second or the middle one. Although a few letters are worn out and damaged here and there, the inscription is on the whole in a good state of preservation.

The characters of the inscription are a variety of the Northern alphabet which are hardly distinguishable from those of the Gañjām plates of Mādhavarāja of the Gupta year 300, i.e., A.D. 619–20 and his Khurdā plates.² Its style of writing, so far as reflected in the engraving, is quite dissimilar to that of the Puri plates of Mādhavarāman. In the former letters are formed by continuous lines, while in the latter by sharp and detached strokes. The alphabet of the Puri plates cannot therefore be regarded as quite normal, while in the characters of this record we should recognize the writing typical of Orissa in the first half of the seventh century A.D. In spite of this difference in style of engraving the characters of the two sets of copper-plates do not reveal any material difference in paleography. In this connection it should be noted that the alphabet of the Bugudā plates of Mādhavarāman is definitely of a later type, which Kielhorn thought could not be placed earlier than the tenth century A.D. A contrary view is expressed however by Dr. Basak who has edited the Puri plates. According to him the characters are assignable to the seventh or eighth century A.D., and “mostly resemble those used in the Bugudā plates”.³ Although Kielhorn’s opinion is not acceptable, it must be admitted that there is a marked difference in form between some of the important letters occurring in the Bugudā plates and the two other records. Letters such as य, न, and ल, have a decidedly later appearance in the Bugudā plates. The enigma presented by these plates is to be attributed, however, to a factor not yet taken note of by epigraphists. As pointed out by Kielhorn, the Bugudā plates ‘originally bore another inscription, the letters of which probably were beaten in to make room’ for the inscription which they now bear.⁴ It is possible that the original inscription engraved in the reign of Mādhavarāman was re-engraved on the same plates in a subsequent period for some reason or other, a practice of which there are several well-known examples. The text of the document, as we find it now, presents many inaccuracies and lapses of the scribe, to which due attention has been drawn by Kielhorn. These presumably might have occurred in the process of re-engraving. If this view be accepted, the apparent incongruity in the paleography of the three copper-plate grants of Mādhavarāman could be satisfactorily explained.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit. Excepting a few lines of prose it contains as many as twenty-two verses, seven of which (vv. 2, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16 and 22) are quite new. Of the remaining fifteen verses three are the customary donative ones and twelve occur in other land-grants of the Śaṅgdhava dynasty. Among those that are common notable textual variations appear in vv. 13, 14, 20 and 21 of the present record. In v. 20 the word lakkhita is used in the sense of lakkhaka, which probably has to be taken as an instance of mattavartiya acha.⁵ It is so used also in v. 16 of the Puri plates and in v. 18 of the Bugudā plates.

¹ Above, Vol. VII, Pls. between pp. 100–101, and Vol. XXIII, Pls. between pp. 123–29. The Puri plates are dated in the regnal year of Mādhavarāman which has been doubtfully read as 22 (Basak, above, Vol. XXIII, p. 124). An examination of the original shows that the figures cannot be anything but 13.
³ Above, Vol. XXIII, p. 123.
⁴ I have not had the occasion to examine the original plates which are kept in the Madras Museum. But judging from a set of excellent photos kindly supplied to me by Mr. T. N. Ramachandran I can definitely endorse the opinion expressed by Kielhorn. [I had an occasion of examining the original plates. There are certainly a few traces of an earlier inscription and this also seems to have been a Śaṅgdhava record.—Ed.]
⁵ Mahābhāṣya, under Pāṇini, 3, 4, 67. [The word is probably lakkhita, the nominative singular form of lakkhā.—Ed.]
As regards orthography we should note particularly the following: the same sign is used forṣ and ṣ; consonants following a superscript ō are doubled in the majority of cases; the letter ṭ preceding a subscript ō is often doubled e.g., in āṭayāśiṅṭī, I.30; occasionally a visarga is omitted e.g., bhasiyatāḥ (k) I.27; the sign of avagraha is never used; before ā and ā a guttural nasal is used for anusvāra e.g., in caṇṭhā, I.14 and Jayasimhāna I.44; and final a is changed into anusvāra in visheyā-smin, I.27. Orthographic irregularities and scribal errors have been duly pointed out in the body of the text.

The document opens with the formula om svasti followed by a verse asking for the benediction of the god Śiva in communion with Pārvatī. Verse 2 mentions the Mahāendra mountain and the Eastern Ocean, the two prominent topographical features of Kaliṅga introduced in the next verse (v. 3), which refers to Pulindasena, an inhabitant of this country. He worshipped the god Śvayambhū (v. 4), as a result of which was born out of rocks (v. 5) the victorious king Sālāsālāhava (v. 6). The dynasty was so called after him (v. 7); and in it was born (A)rāpahita (v. 8) whose son was Sainyabhitā (v. 9). In the latter’s lineage was born King (A)yaśābhitā (v. 10). Ayaśābhitā’s son Sainyabhitā (II) issued the present land-grant. Vv. 11-13 give an eulogistic account of the royal donor, which are, however, not of any historical interest. The following verse (v. 14) states that he was called also Mādhavavaran and that he resided in the city of Mādhavapura. It may be noted in passing that Mādhavavaran had an additional title ‘Śrīnicāṇa’, which is mentioned in his Puri and Bugdā plates.1 It is repeated also in the Kūṇḍeṣṭa and Nūriṇā plates of Dharmarāja,2 a later member of the family, but does not occur in the present record.

In vv. 15-16 are addressed the various officers, Brāhmaṇas and others of the Jayapura-vishaya. Then begins the formal part of the grant which is in prose (ll. 29-36). Herein we are told that the village of Tamatajā situated in the Vyāghrapura-bhakti of this vishaya, consisting of twenty-three timpiras of land, was granted by means of this charter to the undermentioned Brāhmaṇas: Skandaḍityasvāmin, Rudrasvāmin, Dādāśvāmin, Vādasvāmin, Mahāendraśvāmin, Khadirāḍityasvāmin, Pradyumnasvāmin, Paṇḍaramāṭrisvāmin, Ādityasvāmin, Yajñasvāmin, Agrasvāmin, Chhāmpasvāmin, Kāyavarasvāmin, Śrīvāmin, Mātrichandrasvāmin, Vīntāḍityasvāmin, Gālāśvāmin, Mādhvasvāmin, Mātrichandrasvāmin (II), Dattasvāmin, Dharmaśvāmin, Vāmadevāsvāmin, Śrīvāmin and Svāmichandrasvāmin. The prose portion conveying this information is followed by three of the customary stanzas (vv. 17-19). Then in v. 20 are mentioned Guhachandra, a rājya and upadhyāya, who served as the dūtaka, and also Upendrasimha, son of Kuṇḍabhogin, who acted as the scribe or draughtsman of the record. This Upendrasimha, son of Kuṇḍabhogin, drafted also the Puri and Bugdā plates. V. 21 speaks of the charter (tāmra-patta) as having been engraved by Skandaḥbhogin and ‘heated’ by Jayasimha. The two other documents mention that they were lāaghita, i.e., ‘endowed with the lāghhana or emblem’ by Jayasimha. This seems to convey the same idea as that suggested by tāpita i.e., ‘heated’ occurring in the present charter. The latter evidently refers to the process of soldering the seal containing the royal emblem to the ring of the plates, which could be done only by means of heating.

Verse 22 of the record states that the king issuing this charter resided in the city of Śrīdhara, evidently the same as Mādhavapura mentioned in v. 14. It further describes him as a friend of the Lōkanātha who had been graciously disposed towards him. By the term lōkanātha we are probably to understand the paramount sovereign to whom Mādhavapura owed allegiance. It

---

1 V. 10 and v. 11 respectively.
is not clear, however, which dynasty at this time held paramount sway over Orissa. The first time that we hear of a Saṅghabhava prince ruling over this part is in the Gaṅgājām plates, dated in the Gupta year 300, i.e., A.D. 619, which mention his overlord Mahārājādhirāja Śaṅkuka, undoubtedly the same king who is described as 'the lord of Gauḍa' in Bāṇa's Harshacharita.

The last line of the charter, immediately after v. 22, specifies the date of the grant the 24th day of Śrāvana of the year 50. As already pointed out, the present record paleographically resembles the Gaṅgājām plates of Mādhavaraṇa of A. D. 619-20. I consider this Mādhavaraṇa and Mādhavavarmn of the present charter to be identical, and would refer the year 50 to the Harsha era of A. D. 606 which makes the date equivalent to A. D. 656.

In the Khurāda and Gaṅgājām plates Mādhava-rahā's father is stated to be Ayaśōbhīta. This is also the name of Mādhavavarmn's father as given in the Purī, Būgūḍ and the present copper-plates. The Khurāda plates mention Ayaśōbhīta's father to be Sainyabhīta, and the king mentioned immediately before Ayaśōbhīta in the dynastic lists in the Būgūḍ, Purī, Parikud and the present grants is also Sainyabhīta, but these records state that Ayaśōbhīta was born 'in the lineage of Sainyabhīta, without specifying further that the relationship between the two was that of father and son. From this circumstance some scholars are disposed to regard Mādhava-rahā and Mādhavavarmn as two distinct persons. But it is significant that the three names Sainyabhīta, Ayaśōbhīta and Mādhava-rahā or Mādhavavarmn occur exactly in this order in all the copper-plates and the presumption is that this Sainyabhīta was really the father of Ayaśōbhīta and that Mādhavavarmn and Mādhava-rahā are identical. It may be added further that both Mādhava-rahā and Mādhavavarmn had the bīruda 'Sainyabhīta'. As regards the possibility of the name Mādhavavarmn appearing as Mādhava-rahā, there are similar instances elsewhere, as in the case of the Chālukya kings Vijayavarmn and Kirttivarmn who in some of their copper-plates are called Vijayavarmn and Kirttirahā respectively. I do not therefore think that the identification of Mādhavavarmn with Mādhava-rahā of the Khurāda and Gaṅgājām plates involves any real difficulty.

Jayapura-viṣhaya may be the same as Jayakāṭaka-viṣhaya of Kōṇgōda-manḍala mentioned in the Dharakota plate of Šubhākara-deva. It may be identified with the present Jeypore estate contiguous to the Gaṅgājām District in Orissa. The rest of the localities mentioned in the grant I am unable to identify.

**TEXT.**

[Metres: Vv. 1, 2, 4, 6, Šārdūlavikrīḍita; vv. 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, Vasantarilaka; vv. 5, 14, 22, Āryā; vv. 7, 15, 16, 18-21, Anushtubh; v. 10, Indravajra; v. 13, Sragdhara.]

**First Plate.**

1 Ōṁ svasti [*] Indōr-dhauta-mṛgāla-tantubhir-iva āṣiṣṭaḥ karaṇaḥ kōmalair-vva(bba)ndha-āśeṣa-āruṇaṁ

2 sphurat-phaṇa-maṇḍara-digdha-prabhāsā-ō(n)ṣubhiḥ [*] Pārvvatī sa-kacha-graha-vyātikaram-vyāvṛitta-vandhaḥ(bandha)·

3 āḷaṁ ḍaṅg-āṁbhaṭ-a-loti-bhinnam-bhmasa-kaṇikaḥ Śambbhōr-aṭaḥ pāntu vaḥ || [*] Prācyā-āṁbhōniddhi-ruddha·


*B. Misra, Orissa under the Bhaumā Kings, p. 21.

* From the original copper-plates.

*Expressed by a symbol.
sāmūr-atulāḥ  pūsha-yād-āli-vṛitaḥ  syandān-nirjhara-vāri-dārīta-dārī-pāta-skhalan-
[ṃ]iavanaḥ (*]

svāna-ṭrastra-patattri-valgu-virutār-aṭūrit-āntar-gūhāḥ  āriṃān-Meṛur-iv-ōdgatah  kula-
girīḥ

khyāṭo  Mahēndraḥ  kṣitau  || [2*] Prāṅ[t]uśur-mmah-śbha-kara-pivara-chāru-vā[b]huḥ  kri-
śū-āśma

saṇēchaya-viḥārāda-viśāla-vakṣāḥ  [*]  rājiva-kōmala-dal-āyata-lochan-āntaḥ  khyāta[h]

Kālīṇga-janaṭāsa  Pulindasēnaḥ  || [3*] Tēn-cēthān guṇin-śpī satva(ttvā)-mahatā  nē-
ēṣṭaṁ bhuvā maṇḍalāṁ

ākṛto  yaḥ  paripālanāya  jagataḥ  kō  nāma  sa  sya(sa)yā)di-śī [4*] pratyādiha-svībh-ūtṣavēṇa
bhagavā

n-ārāgi(dhītaḥ  śāśvataḥ  tach-chhitt-āṅgugaṁ  vidhi-tsur-ādīsad-vaṅchhāh  Swayambhūr-
api  || [4*] Lōka-pratiti-

vā(b)hāyāḥ  śakala-sīḷā-sampūñāḥ-prasūta  iva  [*] dēva-kumār-ānyatamō  [Hara-
nirmāṇāṭ]tato  dṛṣṭaḥ  || [5*]

Sō-py-āścharya-manōbhuv-āḍhipatinī  Śambhūḥ  praśādāt-kshaṇaṁ  bhīt-ōdbhrānta-sa-
visma(ya)-sthi-ti.

Second Plate : Obverse

matā  sambhāvyā  saumyaṁ  vāpuḥ  [*] bhūt-ānanda-karaḥ  kritaś-cha  vijayi  Śailōdbhavaḥ
kṣmāpatiḥ  sāstā  dushpathā-

gāmināḥ  suktīnāṁ  rūp-īva  dharmmaḥ  svayāṁ(yam)  || [6*] Śailōdbhava  iti  khyātaś-tatō
vaḥ(m)śaḥ  suḥśaḥ  kṣita[t]u  [*] utasvā-

tiśaya-sthānam-adbhutaṁ-iv-ādbhutaṁ(tam)  || [7*] Śailōdbhavasya  kulajō-raṇabhita
āśid-yā(yē)n-āsakrit-krita-bhiyāṁ

dvishad-aṅganāṁ  [*]  jyōtsnā-pravō(b)dha-samayō  sva-dhiy-aiva  sārddham-ākam-
pito  nayana-paksha-jalesu

chandraḥ  || [8*] Tasy-ābhāvad-vivu(b)dhapāla-samasya  sūnuḥ  śrī-Sainyabhitā  iti  bhū-
mitapar-gāriyān  [*]

yam-prāpya  nāika-śaṭa-nāga-gaṭha-vighaṭṭa-lav(b)dha-praśāda-viṣayaṁ  mumudē  dharitri
|| [9*] Tasy-āpi-

vaḥ(th)i śaḥ  yath-ārtha-nāma  jāto-yaśōbhita  iti  khyātaḥ  [*] yēna  prādhihō-pi  suḥbhaiś-
charitrāi-

r-mūṣhāḥ  kalaṅkāḥ  Kali-darppaṇasya  || [10*] Jātasa-sa  tasya  tanayas-suśruti  samasta-
simā(ma)nti

ni-nayana-shatpaṇ-punḍarikaḥ  [*] śrī-Sainyabhitā  iti  bhūmipatiṁ-mmah-Śbha-kumbha-
sthāḥtala-dalana-dūrlali-

t-āśi-dhāraḥ  || [11*] Jātēna  yēna  kamalākara-vat-ava-gottṛum-unmītum  dinakrit-ēva  ma-
hodāvayān[*] sāmkhēpta

maṇḍala-ruchaś-cha  gataḥ  praṇāśam-sāu  divishō  graha-gaṇāḥ  iva  yasya  di[p]tyē  || [12*]
Kālēyair-bhūta-dhāttṛi-

patibhir-upachit-āṅkā-pāp-āvataśā-śoḥāḥ  nītā  kath-āpi  pralayaṁ-abhīmatā  kirit-
-akāri  spītāṁ  triptīm  surō(r-au)gha[h]
Second Plate : Reverse.

26 prathāhata-va(ba)lavach-chhattrattra-paksabha yena || [13*] Mādhavapura-vihita-sthitir-amv(ba)-ndū-niruktac-andhastisita-kirttih [*]

27 sa śī-Mādhavamarma ripu-mānā-vighaṭanah kuśal || [14*] Viṣhayaś-smitum(na) Jayapuru vartaṁna-bhaviṣhyataḥ [h] [*]

28 dvija-pārṇyāṇi-rupatā-rājaśahitya-saṁyutak || [15*] Kumāramātyaś-ayuktāth (n) karaṇā-śarīkān-api [18*]

29 tathā janapadaṃ sarvam-arhayaty-ānupāryataḥ || [16*] Viditam-astu bhavatām-śtad-

vija(sha)m-samv(ba)addha-Vyāghrapurā-

30 bhuktau Tamataṇā-grāmaś-chatuḥ-smīni trtra(la)śāvini(śa) sati-timpāra-parimāṇāḥ Skandā-
dityasvāmi-Rudra-

31 svāmi-Daddasvāmi-Vēdasvāmi-Mahiṃḍrasvāmi-Khaḍirādityasvāmi-Pradyumnasvāmi-Pandaramāṭī-

32 svāny-Ādityasvāmi-Yajñasvāni-Agrasvāmi-Chaṁpadasvāmi-Kāya vavasvāmi-Sarevasvāmi-

Māṭi-

33 chandraśvāmi-Veṅṭelādityasvāmi-Gōlasvāmi-Mahiṃḍrasvāmi-Māṭrīchandrasvāmi-Dattasvāmi-

34 Dharmanasvāmi Va[Vā]madēśasvāmi-Śrīsvāmi-Svāmi handrasvāmibhūyō dvijātibhyḥ nātā-
pitṛīt-ātmane[sa]-ca

35 punyabhivipaddhā pustipādātā tadeśaḥ-chhānaṁ-dāraṇād-śakhaṁ yath-ōcitaṁ tām-

vra(mra)-paṭaṁ-dānaṁ

36 datvā(śvā) bhunānānām dharmma-gauravā[n]ē kānachid-vighayaḥ(tē) varitātavam=

api ca Vidyu[ṃ]-vīlaya-

37 tamsām-aṅgasya samayag-lōka-sthitih yaśasi ma(sa)kta-manohīr-uchchhāḥ [18*] śaha
dvijā(śvā) apākriṭ-

Third Plate.

38 mā[ttra]-ratair-bhavadvihir-ddharmma-ānurādham-paścarat-ānāmādirāvyaḥ || [17*] Uktah

cha Manaṅe ddharmma-śastra ||

39 Va(ba)hubbhir-śvasudhā dattā va(ba)hubbhiś-śv-anupālitā [18*] yasya yasya yāti bhūmis=

tasya tasya tadbhālaḥ(śam) || [19*]

40 Api [chā] [Mā] bhūd-aphāla-saśākā vaḥ para-datt-ṣi pārtihvā [19*] sva-dā[nā]t-phaḷam=

ānāntaryā para-dān-ānapa

41 lansāḥ [sa] || [19*] Abhidādhitvā-upāddhyāy[ī] Guhaḥchandras-ttra dūtakaḥ [18*] ēkhit = ē-

42 pēndrasaṅhiḥ-ḥa cha tanayāḥ Kuṇḍabhogināḥ || [20*] Utkirṛṭas-tāma-

43 paṭiō-yaṃ durita-pratiḥāta-krita [20*] Skandabhoginā(śa) samyak

44 Jayati(yeh)na, tāpitaḥ || [21*] Jayati Jayanta-patimaḥ prasabha-samākriṣṭa-

45 ripu-nirpa-śrikaḥ [18*] Śrīdhara-[pō[au]]rāḥ kṣitipō varadikṣita-lōkanātha-

46 sakhaḥ || [22*] Samvat 50 Śrāvaṇa-dina 20 4

No. 22.—TINNEVELLY INSCRIPTION OF MARAVARMAN SUNDARA-PANDYA II.

BY K. V. SUBRAMANYA Aiyar, B.A., COIMBATORE.

The inscription edited below is engraved on the inside of the north wall of the second prakāra

of the Nelliappar temple at Tinnevelly. It was copied by the Epigraphical Department in

1 This pāda is short by one letter. [I see faint traces of the letter ś at the beginning of this pāda.—Ed.]
1894. A text of it is given, in Tamil, in the South-Indian Inscriptions, Volume V, pp. 170-171. On account of the important information which it furnishes, it is taken up here for publication. It may be noted also that no inscription of this kind with the introduction Pū- malar-tiruvum has yet been edited in the pages of this journal.

The record contains 24 lines of writing and is in Tamil, verse and prose. Here and there a few Sanskrit words are found written in Grantha characters. The verse portion is almost free from mistakes; and the few errors of spelling that are found in the record are corrected in foot-notes. The introductory portion is purely eulogistic and calls for no remark.

The only words of lexical interest are mudal (l. 11 and 14), kār (l. 14) and tiramam (l. 15). Of these mudal is used in the sense of ‘yield’ or ‘produce’. This sense is preserved in the usage kaṇṭu-mudal which is current in several places of the Tamil districts. Kār is used to denote the paddy harvested in the kār season, i.e., the months of Āvaṇi and Puraṭṭāśi. The word tiramam is derived from draṇam, ‘a coin.’ The ordinary meaning of pō in Tamil is ‘to go’. In lines 7 and 15, its participle, i.e., pōy is used with Vēdamum Sāstrum meaning ‘learned in the Vēdas and Sāstras’. This use of it is not common in Tamil. We have the use of the word pōy with Vēdamum Sāstrum qualified by porupada in another inscription where the meaning is clearly ‘having learnt, with meaning, the Vēdas and Sāstras’.

The object of the inscription is to register the grant of a brahmaṇḍēya village. In the 8th year and 988th day of the reign of the Pāṇḍya king Māravarman alias Tribhuvanachakravartin Sundara-Pāṇḍiyadēva, when he was seated on Mālavayyaṇ in his palace at Madura on the eastern side of Māḍakkuḷam in Madurōdaya-valanādu, 224 Chaturvedi-Bhāṭtas, versed in the Vēdas and Sāstras and capable of expounding them, approached him and said that Kūḍatūr in Murappu-nādu and the villages comprised in Kīlai-Kūṭalūr—with the exclusion of 4 mā of land forming the paṭṭichekanda (i.e., land granted to Jaina or Buddhist shrines), as well as the old dēvadāna and the lands purchased by Uḍaiyaṇ Kūṭtajjvān alias Villavadaraiyaṇ of Vaṭugūr residing in Kulaśekhara-ppurantar at Paṭṭina-Murudūr in Sūrāṅgudi-nādu and given as dēvadāna to the temple of Ulaguyavanda-Īśvararājaiyaṁ—might be constituted into a new village called Pōsala-Vira-Sōmiśāvat-chaturvedimaṅgalam after the name of the king’s uncle (mānaphi) and given as a brahmaṇḍēya, divided into 244 shares, so that the 224 Chaturvedi-Bhāṭtas mentioned above might have a share each, and 20 shares might be assigned to those that had to do service in the dēvadāna. As regards the assessment of the lands of this new village, it is stated that the king’s uncle had enjoined that the lands should be measured by the rod called Sundara-Pāṇḍiyán-kōl of 24 feet length, the kind of crop raised should be examined, and for such of the lands as had yielded produce, tax should be levied at the following rates, on each mā:—

1) 1/4 kāru for antarāya, vinīyog, ucchhu, kāriyavārhakohi, vētti-pāṭam, paṭchupali, san-dhivighrahappēru and all other payable dues, and three kalam of paddy for kār;
2) half of this rate shall be charged for lands sown in Tulā and crops realised;
3) 2 tiramam (draṇam) shall be paid on lands on which varagu, tīnaippul and iyuvu had been harvested;
4) for paṭilam, the above rates should prevail.

One of the most salient rules framed in early days with regard to land revenue is that the assessment should be charged only on lands that had been cultivated and borne crops, and that the charge should be made after inspecting the crops raised, and determining the extent of cultivation by a measuring rod of fixed length. The land-tax was paid both in kind and in money.

In the case of wet lands on which two crops were generally raised in a year, one in paṣāṇ and the other in kār, the assessment appears to have been paid in two instalments, the first in the month of Chittirai when the paṣāṇ yield was secured, and the second in the month of Aippasi when the kār crop was harvested. The money payment was made to cover a number of small duties. In the present instance, it is stated that қ kāsū covered the duties of antarāṇa, vinjēṇa, achchū, kāriyavāṁścchhī, veḷi-paṭām, paṭchupilī, sandheivāṁraḥapēṇu and all other payable dues. It is learnt from this record that the revenue paid in kind was three kalam of paddy on each mā of land. That this was the prevailing rate is also known from other epigraphs. A Tiruvāţāmarudur inscription states that 5 kalam and 3 kurvaṇi of paddy was the assessment (dēvar-kadāmās) on one mā and three kāya of land. This works out to 3 kalam for each mā. No. 272 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1907 states that for each veḷi, the paddy determined to be given was 60 kalam. This also yields three kalam on each mā, since 20 mā equaled one veḷi. The fractional terms mā (one-twentieth) and kāya (one-eightieth) are still in use in some of the Tamil districts but their extents vary according to localities as do the kalam and veḷi. Therefore, they are not of much value in giving us an idea as to the rate of assessment of lands in ancient times.

One of the medieval Pāṇḍya inscriptions of Tinnevelly states in clear terms that a mā is the extent of a square field measuring 288 feet in length which works out to nearly one acre and 90½ cents. Therefore, the assessment of 3 kalam in paṣāṇ and 3 kalam in kār on such a field, paid in kind, and that too when the crops had been raised, could not have caused much hardship to the land owner. Besides, he had no necessity for immediately converting his produce into money to pay off the land revenue.

The present inscription furnishes an instance of the formation of a new village and the grant of it as a brahmadeyga to a number of Brāhmaṇas. It is stated that the village of Pāḻa-Vira-Somidēvā-chaturvedimāṅgalam in Murappu-nāţu was formed out of the lands which had originally belonged to a number of villages—with the exclusion of a small extent that had been previously endowed to temples. In the constitution of the new village, the donees, it is said, desired that the previous owners (maṇi-udaiyār) of the lands, the old names (palam-peyar) of the villages and their lands, their cultivating ryots (uţūn) and the head of classification (mudal), should be removed; that all the lands should be clubbed into one single village with a single puruṇu; that these lands should be divided into the required number of shares, and that with the right to build houses in the sattam fit for residential purposes, specified in writing, the new village should be granted as a brahmadeyga. There is no doubt that the procedure herein briefly described should have involved considerable labour and work in the actual carrying out. The removal of the previous owners must necessarily have been followed by providing them with other sites or by awarding adequate compensation after ascertaining the correct extent of their lands and their yield. The division of the lands into equal shares and the entry of the changes of classification in the departmental and village registers could not but have taken some time.

3 This is an inscription of the time of Vīkrama-Chōa and the text runs as follows —Tiruvāţāmarudualaiyār.Empty
4 See S. I. I., Vol. V, No. 411, dated in the 5th year of the reign of Māravārman Kulaēkha. The words used are “patiṇēṭṭ-aṭṭ-kōkal padiṇārrukku-paadikāru kōṇadu oru-māvāga” meaning “land measuring sixteen by sixteen of the rod measuring eighteen feet in length being one mā.”
The whole course of action described here may be compared with the procedure that is being adopted at present in the working of the Act for the acquisition of lands for specific purposes. That the owners of the lands, who were dispossessed of their holdings should have been given other lands in exchange, is made plain by a statement in the Tiruvalluvar plates\(^1\), where it is noted that when Pañjaiyaṉ-ūr—which was previously given as a brahmādeya to the members of the assembly (sabhaivaṉ-ūr) of Śrīgaḷantaka-chaturvedīmāṅgalam—was converted into a devādana of the temple of Tiruvalluvar, the sabhaivaṉ-ūr were promised to be given another village in exchange. The same plates may be referred to explain the meaning of the phrase mudal tavirindu occurring in lines 11 and 19. The actual words employed in the Tiruvalluvar plates are: Sāvaivārkkuv brahmādeyamāṇī varaṅigaṟapaṉi • • • • tavirindu vellāṉ-vaṇayil mudalāṉa • • • • Pañjaiyaṉ-ūr in one place,\(^2\) and Pañjaiyaṉ-ūr vēru-mudalāṉy brahmādeyamāṇī varaṅigaṟapaṉi tavirindu vellāṉ-vaṇayil brahmādeyam-iraṅgi in another place,\(^3\) make it plain that brahmādeyam and vellāṉ-vaṇai are two different heads of classification. This sense of the word mudal is not common in modern usage. The other uses of the word mudal in the inscription under publication are found in iv-vēṟu-mudal (ll. 15 and 22) and mudal Virāptoṇ-daṉ-ūr-nellu mukkalam (ll. 14 and 22), the former meaning 'commencing from this year' and the latter 'the yield of three kālam of paddy as measured by the measure Virāptoṇ-daṉ'.

Different views have been expressed in the Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy regarding the identity of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya, whose inscriptions begin with the introduction pū-malar-tiruvum. Remarking on the very inscription under publication, the late Venkayya declared that he must be different from, and later than, the Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya of the Tiruppūvaṉūm grant which has the introduction pū-maruvya-tiruvadandai.\(^4\) This view was at first adopted by the late Krishna Sastri, who, later on, finding the mention of the seat Māḷaṉuvaraiṉ in his records as in those of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I, came to the conclusion that the king with the pū-malar-tiruvum introduction must be the same as the one that had the introduction pū-maruvya-tiruvadandai, i.e., Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. Add to this, it may be noted that some of the signatories that figure in the records of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I figure also in the records of pū-malar-tiruvum. These are reasons sound enough for holding the view expressed by Krishna Sastri. It was accordingly adopted in subsequent Epigraphical Reports and by Swamikkāmmu Pillai in his Indian Ephemeris. In reviewing certain inscriptions of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya with pū-malar-tiruvum introduction and of the Hōyaśa king Vīrā-Sōmēśvara found at Alagārmarai, in the Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy for 1929-30, I pointed out some valid objections to this view and showed that Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya with pū-malar-tiruvum introduction is the second of that name and different from Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. The paragraph alluded to is extracted hereunder as it decides the question once for all:

\(^{11}\) No. 291 (of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1929-30) from Alagārmarai states that, at the request of his māṃsaṉi (i.e., uncle) Hōyaśa Viḷa-Sōmēśvara, the Pāṇḍya king Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya ordered the assignment of the revenue of the village of Tirukkoṭiṉūr in Kēlaḷaṅga-vaḷaṉūṟu to the temple of Tirumaliruṉṉōḷai-ṅṉṟuṟuṉ-vaṉarūṉ- Paramavēṁ in for conducting the Viḷa-Sōmēśvaran-ṭandu instituted in it by the Hōyaśa king. This order was issued in

\(^{1}\) The words used viz., "sāvaivārkkuv brahmādeyamāṇī varaṅigaṟ Pañjaiyaṉ-ūrī talaṉuṟu ur kuḻippadu," may be noted.
\(^{2}\) See text-lines 63-66 on p. 403 of S. I. I., Vol. III.
\(^{3}\) Ibid., p. 402, ll. 10-19.
the 8th year and 988th day (i.e., the 11th year) of the Pāṇḍya king’s reign. From a record of Vira-Sōmēśvara himself found in the same temple, we learn that this service was instituted in the 10th year of his reign, i.e., in A.D. 1243. As such, the grant made to it by Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya in compliance with the Hōyasāla king’s request, must have been a subsequent event. If, as held by Mr. Sastrī, the introduction pū-malar-tiruvum belongs to Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I, who ascended the throne in A.D. 1216, the date of the Aḻagayamalai inscription would fall in A.D. 1227, i.e., 16 years prior to the establishment of the service itself. It is thus evident that inscriptions with the introduction pū-malar-tiruvaum do not belong to Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I, but are clear records of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II whose accession took place in A.D. 1238. In this case, the date of the epigraph under consideration will be A.D. 1249, which is about five years after the institution of the service. Another decisive proof for saying that the records with the introduction pū-malar-tiruvum are not those of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I, is afforded in the omission in them of the conquest of the Chōla country (Sōgāda kōndarūlyā) which is invariably mentioned in inscriptions definitely attributable to him."

The different introductions pū-maruniyā-tirumāṇāndai and pū-malar-tiruvum which do not in any way recount the same historical facts, and the results of calculation of the details of dates furnished in Pāṇḍya inscriptions of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya, having definitely pointed out the existence of two kings bearing the same name, one closely following the other, there is reason for the same officials figuring as signatories in the records of both the kings. The names of seats and halls cannot be made use of to prove the identity of kings, for two kings not far removed from each other in time may occupy them one after the other.

To understand the political situation of the various powers of South India at the time of our record, it is necessary to follow closely the trend of events consequent on the Pāṇḍya civil war and the dynastic connection which existed between them. The outstanding political event of the century commencing with the end of the reign of Māravarman II, is the civil war alluded to above, which, while it lasted, did not confine itself within its own limits, but threw the whole of South India into a restless state and rudely disturbed its peace. Begun at first between two rival parties of the royal house of the Pāṇḍyas, it soon made the heads of all the chief kingdoms to range themselves on a side which seems to have been weak but just, while the other was very strong and derived its support chiefly from the foreign country of Ceylon. It exhausted the resources of the Chōlas, sowed seeds of discontent among their chieftains and turned them into open rebellion and brought about the destruction of the mighty empire which had been built up by the military genius of the members of the revived Chōla line of Vijayālaya and the aid of the victorious standing army which won laurels wherever it was sent. The permanent outpost of the Hōyasālas in the Tamil country was also an offshoot of this war. In about A.D. 1167 two hostile branches of the Pāṇḍya family put forth rival claims to the throne of Madura. At first, the parties were headed by Parākrama-Pāṇḍya and Kulasēkkharā. The Sinhalese chronicle gives indeed a very full description of the help which the Ceylon king Parākramabahu gave to Parākrama-Pāṇḍya and his son Vira-Pāṇḍya, and recounts the many deeds of valor performed by the Sinhalese army. From this very account, which is naturally one-sided, one does not fail to gather that the cause of Kulasēkkharā was espoused by other kings of the mainland, principal among them being the Chōla, whose country was threatened with immediate danger. Inscriptions of Rājādhirāja II tell us that the Chōla supported the cause of

¹ No. 292 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1929-30.
²Mahāvīma (Wijesinha’s transl.), Chs.76 and 77.
Kulaśēkharā.¹ The hostility between the parties of Vira-Pāṇḍya and Kulaśēkharā continued in the reign of Rājādhīrāja's successor Kulōttuṅga III (A.D. 1178-1217). The position was the same. Vira-Pāṇḍya, who was now joined by his son, was supported by the Sinhalese, while Vikrama-Pāṇḍya, probably the son of Kulaśēkharā, applied to and obtained the help of the Chōḷas. The earliest mention of this war in the records of Kulōttuṅga III is dated in the 4th year of his reign,² i.e., in A.D. 1182. It states that the son of Vira-Pāṇḍya was defeated with the allied forces of the Sinhalese, that he was deprived of his kingdom and crown and forced to flee from the field of battle, that his country and crown were taken by the Chōḷa and given to Vikrama-Pāṇḍya, and that a pillar of victory was set up in the Pāṇḍya capital Madura. Later records tell us that Vira-Pāṇḍya, sometime after his first flight, revolted and tried another chance with Kulōttuṅga III but was defeated again at a place called Neṭṭūr.³ The treatment meted out to Vira-Pāṇḍya and his son in this war by the Chōḷa king was anything but satisfactory. The Pāṇḍya queen was made to enter the harem of the Chōḷa and when the Pāṇḍya king himself, along with his ally the Chēra, came, bowed, and sat down at the foot of the Chōḷa throne, the Chōḷa king placed his feet on his head and dismissed him. It is impossible to expect the defeated party to put up with the extreme humiliation and insult meted out to him, for any length of time. Now, if there was a counter-invasion of the Chōḷa country, directed against the very sovereign that behaved in a most remorseless manner in the treatment of a fallen adversary appearing before him with all humility, it would not be difficult to find out who the invader must have been, and what the cause of the invasion was. The invader Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I, who, in the last years of Kulōttuṅga III, did unto him and his son all that had been done to the latter's Pāṇḍya adversary a few years previously, might in all probability be the unnamed son of Vira-Pāṇḍya, who, along with his father, was ignominiously treated by Kulōttuṅga III. In our opinion, it will be extremely unnatural, and impossible to a high degree, that Māravarman Vikrama-Pāṇḍya, a weakling who owed his very being as a monarch to Kulōttuṅga III, or a son of his, would, without any cause, ever rise against the Chōḷa benefactor. Thus, it will be seen that the civil war begun by Parākrama-Pāṇḍya in about A.D. 1167 was pursued by his son Vira-Pāṇḍya, and pushed to a decisive end by Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. The other hostile party counted Kulaśēkharā and his son Māravarman Vikrama-Pāṇḍya and perhaps one other member. In the account of the Pāṇḍyan civil war that has come down to us, both from the Sinhalese source and from South Indian epigraphs, we are able to see very clearly that the side of Parākrama-Pāṇḍya,—represented mostly by Vira-Pāṇḍya, his son, and Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I,—was very resourceful, was of undaunted spirit and performed noble deeds of valour, while that of Kulaśēkharā, represented by himself and Māravarman Vikrama-Pāṇḍya, was weak to a degree and had to be propped up again and again by the Chōḷas.

¹ Four records of Rājādhīrāja II refer to the war of Pāṇḍya succession. They are dated in the 5th, 8th and 12th years of his reign. While the earlier two state that the Chōḷas prevented the Pāṇḍya country from becoming a part of the kingdom of Ceylon by helping Kulaśēkharā with men and money, the two others dated in the 12th year are said to add that Kulaśēkharā turned insincere to the Chōḷa who deposed him and placed Vira-Pāṇḍya on the throne (above, Vol. XXI, p. 196). If this is true the enmity does not seem to have lasted long, for early in the reign of Kulōttuṅga III we find the Chōḷas supporting this party of Pāṇḍyas against the very Vira-Pāṇḍya.

² S. I. I., Vol. VI, No. 436. The date of this inscription is not given at the beginning as usual. It registers an order to the effect that what was granted in the 4th year may be incised on stone, and generally such records are relegated to the dates specified.

Is there anything to suggest or support the view that Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. might be of the line of Kulaśekhara and Māravarman Vikrama-Pāṇḍya ? An inscription of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. refers to Vikrama-Pāṇḍya by the term Periyāṇāyikār and another of Jatāvarman Kulaśekhara refers to the same king by the term Periyadēvar. From these references it has been inferred that both Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. and Jatāvarman Kulaśekhara I. must have been the sons of Māravarman Vikrama-Pāṇḍya, the king that was set up on the Pāṇḍya throne by the Chōla Kulottunga III. The inference, however, lacks support. Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. having ascended the throne in A.D. 1216 and Māravarman Vikrama-Pāṇḍya having been set up as ruler nearly 35 years prior to that date, the latter was certainly a senior member and perhaps also one that immediately preceded Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. and Jatāvarman Kulaśekhara I. As such, it is quite natural that he must be referred to by the term Periyadēvar or Periyāṇāyikār which in English may be rendered ' senior ' in age or office. Periyadēvar with regard to ordinary persons, and Periyadēvar or nāyupār with regard to kings, may be applied to any elderly person, be he father, elder brother or one that preceded. The term does not exclusively mean ' a father '. If the relationship of a father were intended definitely, the inscription would have used the term ayyar and if an elder brother ayyar. To show that the use of Periyadēvar or Periyāṇāyikār is indefinite and that of ayyar and ayyar is definite, the following instances of the employment of the terms in inscriptions may be noted:—

i. An inscription dated in the 3rd year and 81st day of the reign of the later Pallava king Perunējīga refers to gifts of cows made in the 3rd and 4th years of the reign of Periyadēvar to Kulottuṅgan-Tiru-gōśālai. Here Periyadēvar must refer either to Kulottuṅga III in whose time and under whose name the gōśālai must have been formed or to Rājarājē III who was the predecessor of Perunējīga and in whose reign some gift of cows might have been made to the said gōśālai, but certainly not to any relation, not to say father, of Perunējīga. Numerous instances may be cited where Periyadēvar is used to denote the immediate predecessor of a reigning king, who may happen to stand in the relation of ' father ' to the reigning king; but that the term Periyadēvar need not necessarily indicate ' a father ' will be quite evident from the inscription cited above. The use of Periyadēvar with reference to Rājarājē II in an inscription of Rājadhirājē II (above, Vol. XXI, p. 189) will bear out this view.

ii. We have a specific instance in an inscription of Viraraṁdēra which shows that when a reference had to be made to the king's father the term ayyar is used and that when referring to an elder brother ayyar is employed. In this inscription, Rājanēḷa-Chōla I. is called ayyar and Rājaṅdēra-deva is called ayyar. Another inscription of Viraraṁdēra also uses the term ayyar in referring to his father Rājanēḷa-Chōla I.

These references are sufficient to show that the allusion to Māravarman Vikrama-Pāṇḍya as Periyadēvar in the inscriptions of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. and Jatāvarman Kulaśekhara I. does not prove that the latter two were the sons of the former. All that the allusion can indicate is that Māravarman Vikrama-Pāṇḍya was a predecessor, a fact which we know from

---

1 See No. 47 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1926 and No. 83 of the same collection for 1927.
3 Ibid., text-lines 61 and 172.
4 No. 110 of 1903.
the circumstance that Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. ascended the throne in A.D. 1216 and that Kulōttunga III snatched from Vira-Pāṇḍya his crown and kingdom and set up Vikrama-
Pāṇḍya as ruler in or before A.D. 1182. As has been shown already, there are good grounds for holding that Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. must be of the line of Vira-Pāṇḍya and that the cause of his invasion of the Chōḷa country was to pay its king in his own coin. If Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. be not the unnamed son mentioned in the inscriptions of Kulōttunga III, there is a possibility of his being the son of one of the collateral Pāṇḍya kings that took up the cause of Vira-Pāṇḍya in the war against the Chōḷas and had a share of the defeat inflicted by Kulōttunga III or his predecessor Rājādirāja III. For all these considerations, I think the question of the parentage of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya must be regarded as unsettled and must remain open till decisive evidences are forthcoming. The Pāṇḍya invasion was a thorough success. The very Chōḷa emperor, who, not long after his accession, deprived Vira-
Pāṇḍya of his crown and country and put him to flight, defeated him a second time at Neṭṭūr, and finally gave a public audience at the capital of the enemy and placed his feet on the head of the vanquished monarch when he appeared with all humility, bowed and sat down. At the foot of his throne, was now, in his turn, deprived of his crown and country, was forced to run to a forest, his capital cities of Uraiyyūr and Tanjore being set on fire, his country damaged, and finally, when the victor gave a public audience at Ponnamaravati, the Chōḷa was bid to attend it on a promise of being restored. On hearing this, says the inscription, ‘the Chōḷa returned with his wife and presenting his son first, himself remaining behind, prostrated before the victorious lion throne of the conqueror and begged.’ The Pāṇḍya then gave back to the Chōḷa king’s son the crown and an extensive territory. The terms to be abided by the suppliant were embodied in a royal writ bearing the fish-seal which was conferred on him along with the title of Chōḷapati, which he had formerly lost, as well as his old city and crown. Kulōttunga III did not long outlive these disgraceful proceedings, and his son Rājarāja III, adds the record, did not at first mind remaining submissive under the feet of him who formerly gave him his crown, but subsequently refused to obey his commands, denied him tribute and sent a large army against the Pāṇḍya. In dealing with the Timnevelly inscription of Māravarman Sundara-
Pāṇḍya I, I had stated that this second encounter between that Pāṇḍya king and the Chōḷa should have taken place in about A.D. 1222 when the Hoysaḷa Narasimha II marched on Śṛivaṅgam and assumed soon after the title of ‘establisher of the Chōḷa’ which signifies the help rendered by him to the Chōḷa. Siding with the Chōḷa means, in terms of the Pāṇḍyan civil war of which this was one of the issues, espousing the cause of Vikrama-Pāṇḍya’s party against that of Vira-Pāṇḍya, i.e., against Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I, who was then representing it. Narasimha’s voluntary help to the Chōḷa is suggestive of his prior marriage alliance with Rājarāja III, as much as it is suggestive of his own interest in that party of the Pāṇḍyas which was favoured by the Chōḷas all along and with which he had contracted marriage alliance. Here we may note the dynastic connection that existed among the Hoysaḷas, Chōḷas and Pāṇḍyas at the time. The inscription under publication shows that Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II’s contemporary and uncle was the Hoysaḷa king Vira-Sōmēśvara who ascended the throne in A.D. 1233 and reigned till A.D. 1255. That the same Hoysaḷa king stood in the relation of uncle to the Chōḷa Rājendra-Chōḷa III (A.D. 1246-1267) also, is known from the latter’s records. From these it may be gathered that Vira-Sōmēśvara had two sisters one of whom was the mother of

---

1 This title is far inferior to “Tribhuvanachakravartin” which the Chōḷas usually bore, and is indicative of the position Rājarāja was made to hold as a result of the invasion of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I.

2 Above, Vol. XXII, p. 44.

3 S. I. I., Vol. IV, No. 512, where Rājendra-Chōḷa III is called ‘Māma-Sōmēśvara-pratikēlā-bhadānḍa’.
Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II and the other was the queen of the Chōla king Rājarāja III. The following table shows the dynastic connection of the three families:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pāṇḍya</th>
<th>Hoysala</th>
<th>Chōla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narasimha II</td>
<td>Kulottunga III</td>
<td>Rājarāja III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mār. Sundara-Pāṇḍya’s father</td>
<td>m. Daughter</td>
<td>Daughter m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II</td>
<td>Vira-Sōmeśvara</td>
<td>Rājendra-Chōla III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides the above dynastic connection, the titles assumed by the Hoysala kings Narasimha II and Vira-Sōmeśvara and those claimed by the Pallava Perunjiṅga bring out the exact position of the various powers of South India at the time of which we are speaking. It has been noted already that Narasimha II styled himself ‘the establisher of the Chōla’ soon after A.D. 1222 which shows that the political relationship between him and Rājarāja III was one of cordiality. Another of his titles was ‘the uprooter of the Makara kingdom’. The late Prof. Hültzsch was of opinion that this kingdom must be somewhere in the Coimbatore or Salem District. If it could be the same as Magadai, we are to understand that the Hoysala, who sided with the Chōla, was hostile to the king or chieftain of Magadai. Since we know from numerous inscriptions that the chieftains of Magadai called themselves Bāṇa (Vāṇa in Tamil) and since it was to a Bāṇa that Sundara-Pāṇḍya I gave the conquered territory of the Chōlas in the first instance, it is but natural that the ally of the Pāṇḍya must figure as an enemy of Narasimha II. Among other enemies of Narasimha II figuring in inscriptions of A.D. 1222-24, is the Kādava by which is no doubt meant the Pallava Perunjiṅga, who in several records is said to be of the Kāḻha or Kādava family. It goes without saying that the enemies of Narasimha and the Chōlas were the friends and allies of the Pāṇḍya Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. It is quite in consonance with this, and expressive also of the attitude of the Pallava Perunjiṅga, that he styled himself Karna-bhūpa-māna-mardin, Pāṇḍya-maṇḍala-sthāpana-vitruthāra and ‘the rut elephant to the forest, viz., the Chōla’. From all that has been said above, it will be clear that the chief powers of South India were divided into two parties one of which counted in its ranks the Chōla and Hoysala kings with their generals and chiefs supporting the members of the line of Kulāșekhara-Pāṇḍya, and the other had in its file the members of the line of Parākrama-Pāṇḍya and Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I, supported by Pallava and Bāṇa chiefs of the mainland and the Sinhalese forces which last, as will be shortly shown, had come to stay in South India till the final issues of the civil war which brought them there, were settled. Though we do not hear much of this Sinhalese army after Kulottunga had succeeded in putting down Vira-Pāṇḍya and his son, and though it is expressly stated in the historical introduction of Kulottunga’s records that the Sinhalese soldiers had been driven into the sea with their noses cut off, there is clear evidence to show in the Tiruvendipuram inscription of A.D. 1232-3 that among the forces of the Pāṇḍyan ally, the Pallava Perunjiṅga, there were four Sinhalese generals of Parākramabāhu whom the generals of the Hoysala Narasimha II put to death. After the rise of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I, the Pāṇḍyan civil war, though it still lingered, was turned into one chiefly between the Pāṇḍyas and the Chōlas aided by their respective allies. The principal aim of Narasimha II in establishing a capital in the Tamil country just on the border of the Pāṇḍya

---

1 Kielhorn’s Southern List, No. 434.
2 S. I. I., Vol. IV, No. 1342-B.
and Chōja territories with a powerful prince invested with independent authority stationed there seems mainly to support his two sons-in-law, viz. the Chōja Rājarāja III, and the Pāṇḍya who was the father of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II, both of whom were weak, and not fit to combat their powerful enemy Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I, allied as he was with the Pallava Peruṅṭinga and other chiefs and the Sinhalese army. Here we may consider and dispose of two apparently contradictory titles assumed by the Hoysalas Narasimha II and Vira-Sōmēśvara. Narasimha’s claim to the title of a thunderbolt in splitting the rock that was the Pāṇḍya has to be understood with reference to his action against Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. undertaken in support of his son-in-law, the father of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II, while Vira-Sōmēśvara’s title Pāṇḍya-kula-samudāharaṇa with its variant Pāṇḍya-rāja-pratiksṭhā-āchārya has to be construed with reference to his action in successfully piloting his brother-in-law Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II to the Pāṇḍya throne. Thus, it will be seen that both the father and the son, i.e., Narasimha II and Vira-Sōmēśvara, pursued a consistent policy, viz., the lifting up of the family of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II. That Vira-Sōmēśvara should have taken part in Narasimha’s military campaign in the Tamil country undertaken to establish Rājarāja III in his kingdom, when worsted by both Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I and the Pallava Peruṅṭinga is evident from the title Chōlarāja-sthāpana-āchārya which he assumed. The Hoysala general Appaya Daṇḍanāyaka that took a prominent part in the war against Peruṅṭinga is reported in one of the inscriptions of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II to have invaded Kāna-nādu, an ancient subdivision in the Pudukkottai State. It is not unlikely that this invasion was undertaken in aid of the same Hoysala protégé. The existence of inscriptions of Vira-Sōmēśvara in the Pāṇḍya country, the institution of the service called Vira-Sōmēśvaran-śaṇḍi at Alagarmalai in the Madura District, the grant of the village bearing the name Pōśaḷa-Vira-Sōmēdeva-chatur-vādimaṅgalām in Murappu-nādu in the Tinnevelly District and the implicit obedience paid to his behests by the Pāṇḍya king Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II show clearly that that Pāṇḍya king acknowledged his overlordship and maintained friendly relation with him.

The aim of the Hoysala Narasimha II to prop up his two sons-in-law, i.e., the waning Chōja lord Rājarāja III and the father of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II, both of whom much needed his support, was only partially successful. In spite of all the efforts made by himself, his son and generals, the decline of the Chōjas could not in any way be prevented. The very Pallava who was daring enough to capture the Chōja emperor and confine him at Śendamangalam, though defeated by the Hoysalas in several engagements and brought under subjection almost at the end of the reign of Narasimha II, soon assumed regal powers and proclaimed himself king. Vira-Sōmēśvara followed his father’s policy of supporting his Pāṇḍya relation and Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II was crowned in A.D. 1238, and throughout the major portion of his reign, he was keeping watch and ward. So long as Rājarāja III lived, there was no conflict between the Chōjas and the Hoysalas. But, as is apparent from the historical introduction of Rājendra-Chōja’s inscriptions, the Chōja nephew of Vira-Sōmēśvara assumed a different attitude and became an open enemy not only of the Pāṇḍya but also of the friendly Hoysalas. Without counting his own strength and the weakened state of the empire brought on chiefly by the Chōja subordinates
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2 *S. I.,* Vol. IV, No. 421. He is called Pāṇḍya-rāja-pratiksṭhā-āchārya in No. 435.
3 A. R., on Epigraphy, Madras, for 1907, Part II, paragraph 28.
4 See Nos. 291 and 292 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1929 and the record under publication.
6 His Nuggahali inscription states that his army was encamped on the Tāmraparṇī.
7 *S. I.,* Vol. IV, Nos. 611, 612.
who, following the example of Perumkka, shook off their allegiance to the Chola throne and became independent, each in his own region, Rājendra-Chōla III formed a design to chastise all those that formerly despised the family of the Chōlas. He claims to be a very Rāma in destroying the northern part of Lanka (i.e., Ceylon), which, as we have seen, supplied in the past valiant generals who supported that party of the Pāṇḍyas that was opposed to the Chōlas and stood also on the side of Perumkka. Rājendra-Chōla boasts of having killed a Rājarṣī after making him wear a double crown for three years, and of having subdued the Pāṇḍyas and the Kera-
las, of having plundered the country of the former, of having taken the Pāṇḍyan crown, and of placing his feet on his jewelled crown. He claims to be Death to the Karnaṣa kings and states that on his legs, Vira-Somivarā, the wrestler on hill forts, placed the anklet of heroes. Whatever may be the truth of these high claims, this much may be gathered that Rājendra-Chōla made some sporadic attempts to revive the power of the Chōlas. But his effort was past remedy. The reign of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II is important as being the one in which the Pāṇḍyan civil war ended, and as showing how in the final issues of it, the Hoysalas came to play the part which the Chōlas did earlier.

Besides the Chōlas and the Hoysalas, the kings of Koṅgu were also taking up the side of Kulasēkhara-Pāṇḍya and were helping him and his descendants in the fight against the members of the family of Parākrama-Pāṇḍya. Like the Hoysalas, the Koṅgu kings were also connected by marriage with the kings of the Kulasēkhara line. A regular succession of Koṅgu kings are known to us from inscriptions for nearly ten generations which include the period of the Pāṇḍyan war of succession. To show the connection between the two families, we give hereunder five kings of the Koṅgu line who regularly succeeded one another and whose period of rule extended from A.D. 1135 to 1263. These are:

Viraṇārāyaṇa (Uttama-Chōla)—A.D. 1135 to 1149.
Kuliṭṭunāga (Rājakēsari)—A.D. 1149 to 1183.
Vira-Chōla, who ruled the two Koṅgus—A.D. 1183 to 1206.
Viraṇārāyaṇa (Rājakēsari), who ruled the two Koṅgus—A.D. 1206 to 1255.
Vikrama-Chōla—A.D. 1255 to 1263.

One of the inscriptions of the Koṅgu country states that Rājakēsari Kuliṭṭunāga was the grandson of Vira-Chōla. This information is useful in establishing the fact that Viraṇārāyaṇa was the son of Vira-Chōla and the father of Kuliṭṭunāga, for the three kings ruled in succession the Koṅgu country as their dates clearly prove. We learn from a lithic record at Neeruvār that the Koṅgu king Rājakēsariwarman Kuliṭṭunāga-Chōla, on the eve of setting out on an expedition against Madura to capture it for his sister’s son (marumagaṇa) Kulasēkhara-Pāṇḍya, directed the sabhā of the place to make a brahmudēya gift of some lands in Māṇiyamaṅgalam, which had been the camping ground of the king, as a yādṛākṣa to his purākṛta Āḻvar Śrihalidēva. This shows that Kulasēkhara-Pāṇḍya’s father had married the sister of the Koṅgu king Kuliṭṭunāga. The Sinhalese chronicle Mahāvamsa, besides confirming this, supplements the epigraphical account by letting us know that Kuliṭṭunāga had another brother who was ruling over North Koṅgu, for it is stated that Kulasēkhara gathered together the forces of his mother’s brothers who were in Ten-Koṅgu and Vada-Koṅgu. That this cordial relationship between the Koṅgu king and

1 Rājanārāyaṇa Sambuvarāya in A.D. 1245, and Gaṇḍagopāla in A.D. 1249. Somewhere about the same time Yidava Narasimha and Magadasipperumāl.
4 Wijesinha’s Translation, p. 245.
the Pāṇḍyas of the Kulaśekhara line which commenced in the days of Kulaśekhara’s father continued to exist is proved by the presence of Śoḷaṅ Śilamban aśa Viṣṇu-Dīva Maṅkēśvara-Dīva, a sāmanta of the next Koṅgu king Viṣṇu-Chōla in the vicinity of Madura, and the interest taken by him in making gifts to the Mūlaṭhānēśvara temple at Teṅkara, a village 15 miles from Madura, in the 3rd year of the reign of Jaṭāvarman Kulaśekhara with pūṭalū mānaḍandai introduction.¹ This sāmanta continued to live in the reign of Viṣṇu-Chōla’s successor Viṣṇu-Rājendra who, like his predecessor, ruled the two Koṅgu together and who, in the 25th year of his reign corresponding to Śaka 1153 (A.D. 1331) made a gift of land in the Koṅgu country for conducting a festival in the temple at Tirumālirūṇjōlai (i.e., Aḷaṭagamai) in Kīl-Iraṇīyamūṭa-nādu, a subdivision of Pāṇḍī-maṇḍalam.² During Viṣṇu-Rājendra’s reign a further, and this time a double, marriage alliance was brought about between the Koṅgu and Pāṇḍya kings. Viṣṇu-Rājendra, it would appear, had two daughters whom he gave in marriage to Maṅgarvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II and Maṅgarvarman Viṭṭamara-Pāṇḍya, for both of them call Viṣṇu-Chōla—who, to judge merely from the dates of these contemporaries, must be no other than the next Koṅgu Chōla king of that name—their brother-in-law (maṇḍagubāṇa).³ Viṣṇu-Chōla’s presence in the Pāṇḍya country and the influence which he wielded with both the Pāṇḍya relations of his are amply evidenced in inscriptions.⁴ The position held and the part played by the Hoysala Viṣṇu-Sōṁśvara and the Koṅgu Viṣṇu-Chōla in the politics of the Pāṇḍya country seems to have been quite identical. The names of the Pāṇḍya kings who espoused Koṅgu princesses, viz., the two Kulaśekharas and Viṣṇu-Pāṇḍya, strongly suggest that the Koṅgu kings were allied with that party of the Pāṇḍyas who were opposed to the members of the Parākrama line. Be this as it may, there is no doubt that Maṅgarvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II was helped both by his uncle the Hoysala Viṣṇu-Sōṁśvara and by his brother-in-law the Koṅgu Viṣṇu-Chōla.

It may be useful to say a word about the attitude of Maṅgarvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I towards the two Koṅgu contemporaries of his days, one of whom was Viṣṇu-Rājendra the father of Viṣṇu-Chōla and the father-in-law of Maṅgarvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II. The historical preamble of the inscriptions of Maṅgarvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I seems to leave no doubt that he prosecuted a successful war against the two Koṅgu kings and triumphantly returned to his capital with the vanquished kings taken captive in war, and, receiving their homage, dictated to them the terms to be abided by in future and that on pain of death.⁵ The supplicant attitude of the two kings is expressed in unambiguous terms, though the victorious Pāṇḍya is described as being more favourably disposed to the South Koṅgu king. Even here, one cannot but recognise in Maṅgarvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I’s powerful rival and a descendant of Viṣṇu-Pāṇḍya, up in arms against all those that were ranged on the side of Kulaśekhara’s party. The end of the rule of Maṅgarvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I and the accession of Maṅgarvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II helped, as the latter was by the Hoysala and the Koṅgu kings throughout his reign, seem to mark the final part of the third stage of the civil war in the Pāṇḍya country. The following will show at sight the

² No. 106 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1909.
³ No. 135 of the same collection.
⁴ S. I. L., Vol. V, No. 421 and A. R. on S. I. Epigraphy for 1930, Part II, paragraph 12. The inference that the two Pāṇḍya kings must have been brothers is wrong.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Above, Vol. XXII, pp. 42 f.
several stages of the war of Pāṇḍya succession leading up to the accession of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II:

First stage.

Parākrama-Pāṇḍya and Vira-Pāṇḍya supported by the Sinhalese.

Kulaśekhara-Pāṇḍya aided by the Chōja Rājādhīrāja II and the Koṅgu king Rājakēśari Kulottunga and his brother.

Second stage.

Earlier.—Vira-Pāṇḍya and his son supported by the Sinhalese and the Chēra.
Later.—Māravarman Vikrama-Pāṇḍya I . . Chōja Kulottunga III.

Third stage.

Earlier.—Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I and Perunuṅga aided by the Sinhalese.

The Chōja Rājarāja III supported by the Hoysala Narasimha II who also backed up the father of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II.

Later.—Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I . . Hoysala Vira-Somasvara and Koṅgu Vira-rājendra supporting Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II and his father.

There is a peculiarity in the method of dating of the inscriptions of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II. Records belonging to the first four current years of his reign are dated in the ordinary way, as 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th, while those belonging to the years after the completion of the 4th up to the 8th year are dated as 4+1+1st, 4+110th day, etc., giving prominence to the expired 4th year or rather counting fresh years from the end of the fourth. Similarly, the dates of records falling after the expiry of the 8th up to the 11th year are expressed as 8th year and 215th day, 8+1+1st, 8th year and 988th day, etc., thus counting fresh years after the 8th year, while those later than the 11th year are cited as 11+1st, 11+3rd, etc. It looks as if this systematic counting of fresh regnal years after the expiry of the 4th, 8th and 11th years must have been devised to commemorate some important events that marked those fresh years in particular. What those events are is not stated anywhere. Since we know that the accession of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II took place in A.D. 1238-9, the end of his 4th, 8th and 11th years correspond to A.D. 1242-3, 1246-7 and 1249-50. Some important events of these years are known to us. They are respectively the years of accession of Perunuṅga, Rājendra-Chōja III, and Vijaya-Gaṇḍagōpāla. But it will be interesting to know how they were important with reference to Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II and whether there were other important events in his own reign in these years that singled them out for the special treatment they get. It is not, however, contended that the particular events noted above singled out the years in question, i.e., the commencement of 5th, 9th and 12th years.

3 S. I. I., Vol. V, Nos. 400, 446 and 448; and Nos. 209 and 211 of the collection for 1924.
4 No. 560 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1916, No. 35 of the collection for 1924 and No. 524 of the same for 1911.
5 In all cases where two years are given connected by the word 'adīr' the first expresses completed years and the second the current years.
The reign of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II lasted till at least A.D. 1252. There are several inscriptions of his dated in the regnal year 11+1+1st and the details given in one of these\(^1\) take us to A.D. 1251, June 14. But the latest regnal year is furnished in an inscription dated in the 15th year.\(^2\)

The geographical names that occur in the inscription are Kūḍalūr and Kālai-Kūḍalūr in Murappu-nāḍu which together were constituted as a brahmādēya under the name Pōśaḷa-Vīra-Sōmīdeva-chaturvēdimaṅgalam, Muttāḷaṅkūṟuḷchchi alias Rājasingamaṅgalam, Śeṇalūr alias Tiruvaraṅga-chaturvēdimaṅgalam, Tapporunda-āṟu and Sundara-Pāṇḍyan-Tēnnāṟu which formed the boundaries of the new village, and Paṭṭina-Marudūr in Śūraṅkuḷi-nāḍu to which the donor of a dēvaṅkāḷu belonged. Murappu-nāḍu is a village in the Śrīvaikūṭam taluk of the Tinnevelly District, 6 miles east of Palamcottah, and is situated on the right bank of the river Tāmraparṇī.\(^3\)

As the inscriptions in the Vēdanārayaṇa-Perumāḷ temple of this village call the place by the name Sōmīdeva-chaturvēdimaṅgalam or Pōśaḷa-Vīra-Sōmīdeva-chaturvēdimaṅgalam and as it is stated to be a brahmādēya,\(^4\) there is no doubt about its identity with the place mentioned in our inscription as being newly constituted under that name out of the old villages Kūḍalūr and Kālai-Kūḍalūr. The name given to the deity of the temple in its inscriptions, viz., Sōmīdeva-viṇaṅgar-Āḻvār, suggests that it must have come into existence in the time of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II and Vīra-Sōmīdeva and called after the latter king just as the village itself was. Muttāḷaṅkūṟuḻchchi still goes by the same name and is in the same taluk. Paṭṭina-Marudūr and Śūraṅkuḷi are zamindari villages in the Kovilpatti taluk of the same District. Tapporunda-āṟu is the name of the river Tāmraparṇī.

**TEXT**

1 Svasti śrī \([\text{Pā-malār-}}\text{tirum[u]}\) poru-Śeyal-[Jaya]-madandaiyun-tāmarai-kkuvimulai-śeyal-[jaya]-ppuyatt-iṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṛṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṝṇṟṇṟṇṝṇṟṇṝṇṟṇṝṇṝṇṝṇṝṇṇṝṇṝṇṇṝṇṝṇṇṝṇṝṇṇṝṇṝṇṇṝṇṝṇṇṝṇnvarchar[maṇ-riṇji-[kidas]kai-iṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṝṇṟṇṝṇṇṝṇṝṇṇṝṇṝṇṇṝṇตรว]pa veṭṭaṇaiy-uttutta \[maṇ-riṇji-[kidas]kai-iṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṝṇṝṇṇṝṇṝṇṇṝṇṝṇṇrückaiy-


---

1 No. 147 of 1894.
2 Read ma[a]-tiruṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṝṇṝṇṇṝṇなんです-

---

\(\text{No. 147 of 1894.}\)
\(\text{No. 421 of S. I. L., Vol. V.}\)

---

\(\text{SEWELL’S \textit{LIST OF ANTIQUITIES}, Vol. I, p. 312.}\)

---

\(\text{See Nos. 431 to 435 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1906 and the \textit{Annual Report on Epigraphy}, Madras; for 1907, Part II, paragraphs 26 and 27. In the alphabetical list of villages of the Tinnevelly District two villages are noted bearing the names Murappu-nāḍu-Kōyipattu and Murappu-nāḍu-pudurṉāṉam.}\)

---

\(\text{No. 448 of \textit{S. I. L., Vol. V} (No. 156 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1894). For obtaining the correct original of the introductory portion, I have compared the text of this inscription with the readings of two other inscriptions, viz., Nos. 421 and 446 of the same Volume and noted in footnotes the differences. Whenever those numbers occur in subsequent notes they must be taken to refer to \textit{S. I. L., Vol. V}.}\)

---

\(\text{Read \textit{ma[lah]}-Tiruvaram. All the three inscriptions have \textit{r} which is incorrect.}\)

---

\(\text{Read \textit{malar}.}\)

---

\(\text{Śal-
vara is the reading in both 421 and 446. Though \textit{r}la is not incorrect, \textit{sal}-vara is better.}\)
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3 ru-ṣevi mu-mmada-nār-kōṭṭ-A[y]rāvata-mudal
[k*]koṛṛatt-en-dīsai-yaŋai-eruttam-ṛ[ṛ]-kkanḍa nād-emad-en-kkayal kalj-kūrā
Kōśalān-Tuluvān-Kudira[n*-]Kuchcharam Pōsēla[m*] Maga[da]m Poppan[a]m
Punja[a]-Kali[ṇ]-gam-I[a]-Kadja[r]-Gavu[r]-Telugu-[Chōŋa]-China[m*]-mudal

4 vi[di]-mru-pīy[i]-ṭi[a]-va[v]-vē[rā]* vagutta muda-nil[a]-kkilamųyil mū[q]i-pu[nai]-vēndark-
or-ta[ni]-nāyaka[n]-enj-ulag-ṛ-tiru-muḍi [sāj]i[ṃ]-chhef-kōl-scheh-kkorga-ttān-
kkul-ṛ-kq[i]-nlar-kkvar[i]-kq[i]-va[a]-l[a]r vi[sa] mū[ṃ]-k[ad]i-nava-ma[ni]
vi[s]a[m]nā-sa[ṃ]-tt-ṛ-ṇaḥ

5 muḍi šūdiy-u[a]-kula-t[ṛ]ruv-e[a]-[ppa]-agya-ma[l]a[r]*-kara[n]-kuvittu-[ppa][r*]-ttivarr-
mā[ṛ]-ga[y]ar tirapṭu vana[n]-gu[ṃ]-chē[n]i-čē[n]-cēh[ā]-r[i]-mēl[i]-čēh[i]-vanda[v]-i[r]-ni-
ma[n]-mala[r]-[ch]-[ch]- Aynı-kkamala-madukar[i]-ka[m]a[l]a[m]* vand-a-
[n]-anugum-U[la]-gamulud[a]-yārodum vi[ṛ]ṛu-rud-ṛ

6 [i[ya] śrī-kō-Mārpa[ṃ][nr]-a[n]a Tribhuvanachchakrava[r*]-ttig[a]-Śrī-[Sūndra-
Pāṃḍiyad[ṛ]-vaj[a]-kṛ yāndu etṭu nāj [t]ol[ṛ]-yiratt-enpa[t]-etṭigāl Madurō-
dāiya-vālanāṭṭu Māḍakku[la]-kkl-Ma[du]-rai-kkōyil pā[li]-ap[ni]-kkūj[t]-pattu pāli-
pp[la]m[ ]Ma[j]avariya[ni]-e[ṃ]-lu

7 nd-aruḷi irandu Vēdamum [Ś]astramum pōy vyākhyāṭikāḷāy-irukkum chatur-
vvēṭi-Bhaṭṭa[r]-pāṭa pēr iru-nāṟu-[ṛ]-pattu-nāḷ[v]a[r] Šeyya-[t]-ruvavvēṭ[i]-nd[n]-aru[n]-
pad[a] [Vē]damum Šēstr[mu]ṃ pōy vyākhyā-[t]-kāḷāy-irukkum chaturvvēṭi-
Bhaṭṭa[r]-pēr iru-nāṟu-[ṛ]-riru-

8 t[ṛ]-nāḷvarku[ṃ] puṅgu iru-nāṟu-ruvattu-[ العلم dēvadāna-p[a]-ṣey [v]ṛuttī paṅgu irupadum ā[a]-puṅgu iru-nāṟu nā[ṃ]-paṭṭu nāḷ[kkum] [Mu[r]a[p]-nuṭṭu-Kūḍa-
[ṛ]-ru[m]-kḷai-Kūḍal|-uu]-ṭṭa āṛga[lku]-kk[i]-ellai Taṇporunda-ṛṛukku mē-
kum tēng-ellai Mut-

9 tālāṅkuruchchīy-ṛṇa Rāja[simha]maṅgalattu ella[kkum] Sēṇṭār-ruṇa Tiruvu-
raṅga-[chaturvvēṭi]-maṅgalattu ella[kkum] [va]-dakkum mēl-ellai i-Murappa-
nāṭṭu-kkāl-ṛṇ Sundara-[Pāṇḍ[i][ya]-[t]-em[n]rrukku kāḷ[j]-va[j][v]-ellai Taṇporunda-
ṛṛukku-ṭṛ-ṛ-kkum ā[a]-nā

---

1 The reading given in No. 421 is seya which is wrong. It must be seya-ti[va] of which the last syllable is omitted to be engraved. In No. 446 these words are wrongly given as seya-
2 This word is spelt in the same way in No. 421, but No. 446 has kūṇa with two dota after, which are un-
3 The spellings are admissible.
4 Kaduru is omitted in No. 421 but is given in No. 446. Metrically the word is required.
5 Poppa[m] is also the reading in both Nos. 421 and 446. It seems to be the correct form as it furnishes proper mōṇi.
6 The reading in No. 421 is Chōṇ[a] which is evidently wrong.
7 Vēru[ṛ] is the reading in No. 421. Both are identical in meaning and metrically admissible.
8 Read vēndark-
9 The reading given in No. 421 is vida-kad[i] which is an evident mistake. It ought to be bevid-kad[i] or mid[i].
10 Read malar-kkaraṇ-
11 The reading in No. 421 is che[n]ś[ī]yil.
12 Viṣa-malar is the reading in No. 421 which is incorrect.
13 Kamalam-enj-anugum, the reading furnished in No. 421, is better.
14 Read nārvarudāa.


*Read paḷlicchandamum.
*This is the colloquial form of vilaiṭṭu : see l. 22.
*Read nāḷavarku.
*Read nāḷapattu.
*This word occurs in l. 10, above, with the spelling puṇčeyyum.
*Here and in similar places, the particle pāḷ is used in the sense of ' in or near '. To distinguish a particular place from others bearing the same name, it was usual to mention the place near it or in which it was situated and affix to it the particle. The practice is rarely in vogue now.
*The word nēṟṭu occurs in l. 11 also. But the form nēṟṭu is used in eppeyarpatt[iṇa] (ll. 14 and 21) and māṇḍi-pēyarāḷ (ll. 12 and 20). It seems nēṛu denoted ' number of persons ' and pēyar ' the name ' or ' kind '.

TRANSLATION.

(Lines 1-6.) Hail! Prosperity! The goddess Lakshmi (Tira) (that resides in) the beautiful (lotus) flower and the goddess of Victory (attendant) on war, (now) resting on (his) victorious arms (having the semblance of) the lotus-like rounded breast; the goddess on the tongue of Brahmi (Veda) that loves the white-petalled lotus, gracefully approaching (him); the goddess of the wide Earth with (her) bed of hard ground surrounded by the white-billowed (sea), exulting on becoming (his) queen; all creeds, politics and law (luxuriantly) springing up; flags for the festivals of gods being hoisted up in every place; the fire of the dark Kali (age) being extinguished; the fine sacrificial fires accompanied by rare acts performed by saintly Brahmins, rising

---

1 As an adjective qualifying malar, aśa means 'beautiful'.
2 There is some difficulty in explaining the passage tāmarai-kuvi-mulai—jaya-ppaivas-iurappa. Here it would be natural to take tāmarai-kuvi-mulai as a single phrase qualifying jaya-bhaja. If so taken, the meaning would be, as we have adopted in the translation, that both the goddesses Lakshmi and Victory rested on the arms of the king and the arm is likened to what the combination of the three words tāmarai, kuvi and mulai might imply. These words respectively mean 'the lotus', 'well developed or rounded' and 'breast'. Preserving the order of the words the phrase could be rendered into 'lotus-like well developed (or rounded) breast'; and if the order of the words could be altered, for which we do not find any good justification, it would mean 'well shaped breast-like lotus'. Either in this case, or in taking tāmarai and kuvi-mulai as two separate qualifying terms of jaya-bhaja the sense is not much altered. The comparison of mulai to bhaja seems somewhat far-fetched. It is rather difficult to trace in the passage reference to two different parts of the king's body where the two goddesses rested. If the conjunct was combined with the termination of the seventh case it, i.e., ilam could be taken as understood after mulai and ppaivas, it may be possible to say that the king's breast and arm became the resting places of Lakshmi and Victory. That these goddesses would naturally resort to the arm is evident for the arm resembled the lotus which is the residence of one, and is the source of victory also; but the difficulty is the insertion of kuvi-mulai after the word tāmarai.
3 The word tijappu carries the sense 'coming into close touch' or 'enjoy'.
4 Urimai is used in this sense in many inscriptions.
5 On sumaya see above, Vol. XXII, p. 50, foot-note 7 and Additions and Corrections.
up; Śruti and Tamil, exhibiting their ancient greatness;¹ (his) powerful war-disc circumventing the (entire) expanse of earth;² (his) fish (emblem), mounted on the neck³ of the eight powerful and victorious quarter-éléphants that are counted in order from the single-trunked, double-eared and four-tusked Airāvata⁴ with its triple exudation of ichor;⁵ (now) exulting greatly⁶ on finding all the visible countries to be their own; the world praising (him) as the single matchless lord of (all) the kings that are invested with crowns in accordance with the established law and practice,⁷ in order to have their hereditary right⁸ over the different ancient territorial divisions that had been formed, such as Kōsalam, Tuluvam, Kudiram, Kachcharam, Pōšalam, Magadam, Poppalam, Pūndaram, Kaliyāgam, Ijam, Kadāram, Gauḍam, Telīgām, Sōnakam and Chinām; wearing the sacred crown and wielding (his) just sceptre, with Chieftains waving dy-whisks under the shade of his ūnai-parasol;⁹ the glorious king Māravarman alias the illustrious Sundara-Pāṇḍyadēva, the emperor of the three worlds, was pleased to be seated on the lion-throne set with the radiant nine gems, along with his queen Ulagamujuduṇiayar, who was simultaneously invested with a crown, and whose pair of lotus-like feet, being reddened by the rubbing of the gems fastened in the crowns on the heads of the multitudes of royal damselsw bowing before her, as they would before the goddess Lakshmī, with their lotus-like palms held together in worshipping attitude, was flocked to by the lotus-frequenting beetles considering them (i.e., the reddened feet) to be lotuses.

(L. 6.24.) In the eighth year and nine hundred and eighty-eighth day¹⁰ (of his reign) when he was pleased to remain on the reclining seat called Mahāvarāṇa in the hall of the bed-chamber of his palace at Madura on the eastern side of Mādakkuḷam in Madūrōdayavālamadu,¹¹ just as the two hundred and twenty-four persons (entitled) Chaturvedi-Bhāṭṭas, versed in the Vēdas and Ćāstras¹² and capable of expounding (them), had been pleased to declare, that these (i.e., the aforesaid) two hundred and twenty-four persons (entitled) Chaturvedi-Bhāṭṭas, versed in the Vēdas and Ćāstras and capable of expounding them, may be given two hundred and

¹ With Śrutiyaṁ, compare mūrūzai-Tamilam niṟṟimaiyai sīṟṟaṟṟu and mūrūzai-Vēdaṁam niṟṟimaiyai sīṟṟaṟṟu (above, Vol. XXII, p. 45).
² With ṣaṟṟai-pokal-ṉi, etc., compare ṣaṟṟai-pokal-ṉiṟṟu-Itaṟṟiṟṟa-chakkaraiṟṟiṟṟu (ibid., p. 45).
³ Erutuṟṟam means pīdaṟ. Cf. Yāṇai-erutuṟṟam-pāṟṟu-irurn (Canto XXIII, i. 120 of Viḷappadigaram).
⁴ Nāṟ-kōṟu stands for the chatur-antas. The deity of the eastern quarter is Indra and the elephant of this direction is his vehicle Airāvata which is here described as having a single trunk, two ears, three kinds of ichor exudation and four tusks. In the Gódvāri plates of Pithiviniḻa, Chaturdanta, Kumuda and Supraitikka are made to represent the countries lying on the respective directions to which these niṟṟai-pokal belonged. [The context would show that in these plates chaturdanta has to be taken in the sense of chaturanga-sīrko (see above, Vol. XXII, p. 178, fn. 4).—Ed.]
⁵ These are the exudations from the kaṟṟa, kaṟṟaḷa and bēṟṟa.
⁶ If the reading kōtī-kōṟu is adopted, it would mean that the fish expressed its joy.
⁷ The phrase viṇṭi-muṟṟai-tigai may preferably be taken as qualifying muṟṟai-pokal rather than the immediately following sev mrṟai pokal.
⁸ Kiṟṟamai means urimai or headship.
⁹ Made of palm leaves.
¹⁰ This is the actual date when the grant was ordered to be made.
¹¹ The geographical description of Madura here given would fix its position at the place where it now is, for Mādakkuḷam is still to its west. In an inscription of Māravarman Sundara-Pāṇḍyai L. A.D. 1216-38 Madura is called Māḍa-Madurai (above, Vol. XXII, p. 45). The same term Māḍa-Madurai occurs in several places in the ancient Tamil work Viḷappadigaram (Cantos VIII, l. 3; IX, l. 76; XV, l. 112; XXVII, l. 61). It is called also saṇḍur 'ancient city' (ibid., VIII, l. 51; XI, l. 188; XXV, l. 677; XXVII, l. 61 and l. 131), Mā-nagar, apunpati or Mā-Madurai (XI, l. 188; XXV, l. 677) and Māḍa-Kūṭal or Nāṉ-Māḍa-Kūṭal (ibid., XXI, l. 39 and XXIV, pattumadai, 5).
¹² See p. 154, paragraph 2.
twenty-four shares, with twenty (other) shares as viñā for doing service in the dévadāga, making a total of two hundred and forty-four shares, and this purpose Kūṭṭāḷur in Murappu-nādu and the villages comprising Klai-Kūḍāḷur situated within the four boundaries,—the eastern boundary being to the west of the river Taṇ-Porundam, the southern boundary being to the north of the boundary of Mutṭāḷāṅkuruchchī alias Rājaisinhamāṅgalam and of Seṇāḷur alias Tiruvaranga-chaturvedīmāṅgalam, the western boundary being to the east of the channel of this Murappu-nādu named Sundarapandiyan-tennāru, and the northern boundary being to the south of the river Taṇ-Porundam,—consisting of wet lands (nīr-nilam), karuṇākhēy (black-soil land), punchey (dry lands), nattam, garden lands (tāḻam), tanks (kūḷam) and tank-spread (kūḷapparippu), with the exclusion of the pallaichchandams (i.e., lands given for Jain or Buddhist shrines), and pāḷandevadāṟam (i.e., lands assigned for temples) as well as the lands purchased by Udaiyān Kūṭṭāḷuvāṅ alias Villavadaraiyam of Valugur residing in the (street called) Kulaśekharappunteru at Paṭṭina-Marudū in Śūrāṅkudi-nādu and given as dévadāṇa to the (temple of) Ulaguyavandā-Īsvaramudaiyār of this village which consisted of house (maṇṇai), garden and nattam, might be formed into one village and one puraṇu, after removing their previous owners, (their) old names, cultivation and holding, and be given from the year opposite to the first year opposite to the eighth year as brahmadeva in the name of the māṇḍhi (i.e., uncle) as Pōsāḷa-Vira-Sōmillēva-chaturvedīmāṅgalam in Murappu-nādu, with the right to inhabit the nattam, fit for habitation, being entered as shares and house-sites; and the māṇḍhi having told us that in respect of payment of taxes of this village, the lands should be measured by Sundara-Pandiyan-kōl of twenty-four feet length, (the kind of) crop examined, and on lands on which crops had been realised, there should be paid from this year one-fourth kāṭu and three kalam of paddy, as measured by Vīrapandiyan, on each mā of land for kāṭu, towards antarāya and viṇiyōḍha inclusive of achū, kāriya-vārūṭchī, vesti-pāṭṭam, pāṇchupilli, sandhiyaṅgaraippēṟu and all other payable dues, that one-half of this rate should be paid on all lands sown in Tāḷa and crops realised, that two tīram on each mā should be paid on lands on which eḻu, varaṇu, tīṇaippuḷ and iriṅ̄gā had been harvested, that this (same) rate should be fixed for pāṭṭam also, and that this (i.e., the above-mentioned) rate of assessment should be entered in registers; We ordered that for providing the two hundred and twenty-four persons (entitled) Chaturvedi-Bhaṭṭas, versed in the Vēdas and Śāstras and capable of expounding them, with two hundred and twenty-four shares, with twenty other shares as viñā for doing service in the dévadāga, making a total of two hundred and forty-four shares, Kūṭṭāḷur in Murappu-nādu and the villages comprising Klai-Kūḍāḷur, situated within the four boundaries (specified hereunder), viz.,—the east boundary being to the west of the river Taṇ-Porundam, the western boundary being to the east of the channel of this Murappu-nādu called Sundarapandiyan-tennāru, and the northern boundary being to the south of the river Taṇ-Porundam,—consisting of wet lands, karuṇākhēy, punchey, nattam, gardens, tank and tank-spread, with the exclusion of the pallaichchandams and pāḷandevadāṟam, as well as the lands purchased by Udaiyān Kūṭṭāḷuvāṅ alias Villavadaraiyam of Valugur residing in the (street called) Kulaśekharappunteru at Paṭṭina-Murudur in Śūrāṅkudi-nādu and given as dévadāṇa to the (temple of) Ulaguyavandā-Īsvaramudaiyār of this village,—in all, four mā of land as measured by the (red) Sundara-Pandiyan-kōl,—should be formed into one village and one puraṇu after removing their previous owners, their old names, cultivation and holding and be given from this year as brahmadeva in the name of the māṇḍhi as Pōsāḷa-Vira-Sōmillēva-chaturvedīmāṅgalam in Murappu-nādu, with the right to inhabit the nattam, fit for habitation, being entered as shares and house-sites; and that in respect of payment of taxes of this village, the lands
should be measured by Sundara-Pāṇḍyaṇ-kōl of twenty-four feet length, the crops examined, and on lands on which crops had been realised, there shall be paid from this year one-fourth kāśu and three kalum of paddy as measured by (the measure) Viraṇānyāñān on each mā of land during kār, towards antarīgā and saṅgīgā inclusive of achiku, kārīvārāvēkhi, vēti-pāṭam, pāṇīchupilī, saṁkhiṇghrāhappērū and all other payable dues; that one-half of this rate shall be (fixed) on lands sown in Tulā and crops raised; that two tirumam shall be paid on each mā of land on which ejū, varagu, tiraiipupul and iuragū had been harvested, that this same rate shall also be (fixed) for parasam; and that a copy of the entry in the tax-register signed by the varīṭur as well as a copy of our order shall be issued. The king had been (further) pleased to say that on receiving these (copies), the same may be entered on stone and copper so that (the order) may be carried out as long as the moon and the sun last. This is the signature of Uyyanāṇādāvēn Viraṇānyān alias Kurukulattairān of Tādańkai-chitirrū in Tirumalī-nādu. This is the signature of Arayana Viraṇamudittān alias Pallavairaṇ of Saṅkarāpāṇinālīr in Ševoorukkē-nādu.

No. 23.—Komanda Copper-Plates of Nettabhanja.

By Krishna Chandra Panigrahi, M. A.

These copper-plates numbering three were unearthed at the village Komanda in the Naygarh State, Orissa, by a cultivator, while ploughing a paddy-field. Pandit Binayak Misra of the Calcutta University got possession of them and deposited them in the Archaeological Museum at Baripada in the Mayurbhanj State. I am very thankful to Pandit Misra and to Mr. P. Acharya, the State Archaeologist of the Mayurbhanj State, for their kindly allowing me to edit these plates.

Each of the plates roughly measures 6½” x 3½” and is strung to the rest on a circular copper ring, the circumference of which is 11” and which passes through a hole of about ½” in diameter cut in the left margin of each plate. The ends of the ring are secured by a lump of copper containing the seal which seems to bear the figure of an animal with a line of writing running just below it. The figure is damaged beyond recognition and of the letters, only one can be read as ēkka. Judging from the similarity of the text of these plates to that of other plates of Nettabhanja it can be inferred that the seal contained in relief the figure of a couchant lion and the legend Śrī-Nettabhanjajādevaṇa. The plates with the ring and the seal weigh about 100 tolas. The first and the last plates are engraved only on one side, while the second is inscribed on both the sides. There are altogether thirty-seven lines of writing, the first three faces containing nine lines each and the fourth ten lines.

The characters used in this grant closely resemble in form those used in the other plates of Nettabhanja and therefore call for no special remark. The language is Sanskrit, but it contains a number of orthographical errors which will be corrected in their proper places. Only one case may be pointed out here which represents the phonetic peculiarity of the Oriya language: in line 14 ekačārīn has been written for vyacahārin.

1 The entry in the register was to recite the royal order and note the changes made in accordance with it.
2 Varīṭur means ‘maintainers of revenue accounts’.
3 These signatories figure in the inscriptions of Māvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I also (above, Vol. XXII, p. 54).
5 Ibd.
6 [See below p. 175 n. 1—Ed.]
The text opens with two verses invoking Hara. Then it gives out that the grant has been issued from the victorious camp Vañjulvaka by Paramamahēśvaraśri-Neṭṭabhaṇṭādeva sur-named Kalyāṇakalasa. He is described as son of Raṇabhaṇṭajadēva, grandson of Satrubhaṇṭajadēva and great-grandson of Sīlabhaṇṭajadēva. It should be noted here that Rai Bahadur Hiralal misread the name of the donor as Neṭri, though the letters standing for it in the inscription distinctly read as Neṭṭa.

The object of the inscription is to record the grant of the village Karaṇḍa, situated in the estate of Sāradā, to a Brahmin named Stambhadhēva, belonging to the Kaṇva-saṅkha, the Gautama-gotra, the Autathya pravara and the Āṅgirasa anupravara, whose father and grandfather were Durgāsarma and Harṣarasa respectively. The ḍūṭaka of the grant is Bhaṭṭa Sumanagala. It has been written by Sāndhīcigrāhin Āvarāṇa, incised by Akhaṭalīkha Durgādēva and sealed by Māmmā which term seems to be a corruption of mahaṃgāyā or the queen. The names of these officials occur in one of the two Ganjam copper-plate grants of Neṭṭabhaṇṭā and the engraver of the second one is also the same Durgādēva.

The village Karaṇḍa may be identical with Kōmaṇḍa, the find-place of these copper-plates or with Raṇḍa, a village about sixteen miles north of Kōmaṇḍa, and Sāradā may conveniently be identified with Aṛasa about ten miles east of Kōmaṇḍa. All these villages are situated in the Nayāgarh State from which the copper-plates hail. Vañjulvaka from which the present charter has been issued has not yet been identified.

The donor of the present charter and those of the same name of the two Ganjam copper-plate grants and Gumsur.copper-plate grant must be identical in view of the facts that these donors not only issue their charters from the same victorious camp Vañjulvaka, but also give the same genealogical account and the names of some officials as occur in this document. But we are faced with difficulties when we attempt to identify Neṭṭabhaṇṭā of the grant under discussion with the donors of the same name of the Bod (Bauḍha) plates and Daspalla plates, firstly, because in one the genealogical account is omitted and in the other it is quite different and secondly, because the officials mentioned in these grants are entirely different.

Neṭṭabhaṇṭā, unlike other Bhaṇṭa rulers, bears in all his copper-plates hitherto discovered, the only title Paramamahēśvara which refers to his religious creed. His grants also do not contain the traditional account relating to the origin of the Bhaṇṭa as other Bhaṇṭa records do. The official seals used in his charters are also different from those found on other Bhaṇṭa copper-plates. All these characteristics of his grants mark him out from other Bhaṇṭa rulers who issue their charters from Khijagakōṭa or modern Khiching in the Mayurthhan State. He must, therefore, be taken to belong to a different branch of the Bhaṇṭa family. If Satrubhaṇṭa and Raṇabhaṇṭa, represented here as the grandfather and the father of Neṭṭabhaṇṭa, be taken as identical with Satrubhaṇṭa and Raṇabhaṇṭa of the Ṭasapaikera grant, the dominions of this branch of the Bhaṇṭa family must have comprised the tracts both to the north and to the south of the Mahānadi river, because in the Ṭasapaikera grant Raṇabhaṇṭa describes himself as the

2 Ibid., p. 295.
3 Ibid., p. 296.
4 The Archaeological Survey of Mayurthhanj, pp. 146 ff.
6 Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 276 ff.
7 [The engraver in the Daspalla plates, however, seems to be the same Akhaṭalīkha Durgādēva.—Ed.]
lord of the two Khañjas, one of which has been identified with Hijjali in Angula to the north of the Mahanadi and the other with Khijariypara in Bardd to the south of the same river.

As has been shown above, Nébaghañja belongs to a different branch of the Bhañja family. Considerable disagreement prevails among the scholars regarding the origin of this Bhañja family of Orissa. Different interpretations put on the traditional account recorded in some Bhañja copper-plates have led the scholars to arrive at two different views relating to their origin, one connecting it with the Šailodhavas of Orissa and the other with the Imperial Mauryas. Whatever may be the views of the scholars about the origin, the fact that it goes back to high antiquity is proved by the recent archaeological discoveries at Dengaipoai in the Keonjhar State. Among these important discoveries there is a precious fresco-painting representing a war expedition, which contains a line of writing recording the name of a Bhañja ruler. The palaeography of the writing cannot be later than the fourth century A.D. If the dating of the record and the reading Bhañja therein be accepted as correct, we can safely trace back the existence of the Bhañja family at least to the fourth century A.D. Thus it becomes evident that among the known royal families of Orissa, the Bhañja family is only next to the family of Khāravela in point of antiquity.

TEXT.

First Plate.

1 Ōr* svasti [*] Jayati kusumavā(bā)ya-prāṇa-vikshōba-daksha
2 sva-kiraṇa-parivēśah(ah-an)jijita-jirya-āndu-loskhah(kham) tri-bhuvana-bhava-
3-n-ānta[r*]-dyōta-bhāsvat-pradipaṁ kanaka-nikasha-gaurah vibhru* nē-
4 traṁ Harasya {1*} Śeṣa-āher-iva ye phañah pravirānty=udbhāśvar-ē-
5 ndu-tvishah {10} prālāy-āchala-śringa-kūṭa(ta)ya iva tvaṅgantī ye=tu-
6 nmatāḥ | nrit-tāṭī(tō)pa-vihāṭhitā iva bhujā rājantī ye śambhavā-
7 sē ṭa sarvā-āgha-vihāṭhitāh sura-srit-tōy-śrīniyaya[h*] pāntu vah | {2*]u Viṣa-
8 ya-Vaṭjuvakaśt [*] Asti jaya-tri-nilayaḥ prakāṣ(a)ya gūpa-grasta-sārvav-
9 ripu-garvvaḥ | Kalyāṇakālaśa-nāmi rājā nirddha[nta]kāli-kāla-

Second Plate: First Side.

10 shañḥ | {3*]u Bhañj-āmala-kula-tilaka[h*] śrí-Śilābhāñjādevaśya pra[pau]traḥ śrī-
11 Śārabhañjādevaśya napatā śrī-Raṇabhañjādevaśya su[sū]nu[h*] Paramamāhē-

2 Above, Vol. XVIII, p. 290.
5 From ink-impressions and the original.
6 Expressed by a symbol.
7 [This is the correct reading: vikṣipt bhūrangaṇa tad vibhru. It has been wrongly corrected into šelhara, above, Vol. XVIII, pp. 293 and 296.—Ed.]
8 Metro: Maniśi.
9 Read pravirāntasya.
10 Dasda unnecessary.
11 Metro: Śārīrādevīśiṇā.
12 Metro: Ārjā.
Komanda Copper Plates of Nettabhanja.

i.

ii.a.

ii.b.

iii.

Scale: One-half.


13: Hī [(*) Sāraddā-viṣhayā rāja-rājanaka-rājaputra[n]*] viśaya-pati-da-
15: hmaṇ[ā]*] karāṇa-pū(ṛ)gō(ṃ)*] nivāsī-jaṇapada[ṃ]*]c̥ha yathā-ārhaṁ maṇa-
16: yati vō(ṃ)dhaṇyati samādīśāti [cha]*] sarvātāḥ śivam-asmākam-anvya[ḍ]*
17: viditam-astu bhavatāṁ etad-viṣhayaṃ samvandhāṃ(sambaddha]-[1] Kāraṇāḍu-grāma cha[(ā-
18: tu[ḥ]*)kma-parīchhinnō(usahaan)*]smābhīr-mmātā-pitrōr-śtma[na]*]c̥ha puṣy-śva(ṃh)-

Second Plate; Second Side.

21: naptāṛ(ṛ) bhā(bha)ṭṭa-Durgāsarmasya[ṇaḥ] suta(tā)*]ya[*] bhaṭṭa-STambhādeva[ṃy]ya[*]
22: salīla-dhāra-pū(ṛ)p[
23: raḥsarāṇa vidhīnā pratipādītō-smābhīḥ [ (*) a(ā)chandr-ārka-taināṇān(tāraḥ) yāvat
24: a-chattā(ṃa)-bhaṭṭa(aa)-pravāsēṇā sarvā-tā(bhādhā-parihārō)-ākaraṁśe bhuṣi-na
25: dhī-nāmar-harmma-gauravāt nā kēnacād-vyāghītiyānḥ(yam)[*] Asmat-kūla-kramam-sū-
26: dāram-udharabadbhī-panic-ssa dānām-śdām-abhyanumōdaniyam[yam][*] La-
27: kṣhnyās-taṇḍ-Śalīla-vudvubu(bdu)da-chāndalāyā dānānī phalān para-yaś[a(ḥ)*]pari-
28: pālanaḥ-cha [ [1*] u(ṃ)ktae-cha dhamma-śāstre [ [1*] Va(Ba)hubhir-vvasudhā dattā rā-

Third Plate.

28: jmbh[ḥ]*] Sagar-ādibhū[ḥ]*] \( (\) yasya yasya yadā bhu(bhūmis-tasya tasya ta-
29: dā phalān(lam) [ [3*] Mā bhu(bhū)d-aphala-śaṅkā vah para-dattēti pārthivāḥ \( \text{sva-dā-
30: nāt-phalam-śaṁantāṃ para-dattūnupālanāṃ} ] [ [6*] Sva-dattāṃ para-dattām-vā \( (\text{tiṣṭā vā} \) yō
31: kar[ṛ]ta vasundharāṁ(rām)[*] sa viṣhāyaṁ krimir-bhu(bhū)tvā pitribhīḥ saha pachyate | \( [*]\)
32: Shaṣṭhi-varsha-aahārāṇī svargō mōḍāi bhūmīdaḥ \( a(ā)khaṃśē tī ch-ānu-
33: mantā cha sa eva (tāνy-eva) narakaṁ vrajet [ [8*] Iti kamala-dal-śāya(mbu)-vī(ṃ)du-tu-
34: loān śrī-
35: yam-anukīntya manushya-jīvatān-cha sakalam-śdām-(m-ā)dhītān-cha [vṛddhā(bu-
36: ddhā) na
37: hi purūsāh[ḥ] para-kṛttayā vilōpyā(ḥ)[*] [ [9*] svaya[ṃ]-śādāḥ tī rājā ṃ (dū&tak[ō]-
38: tra bhaṭṭa(ṭṭa)-Samāgral(ā)ḥ[*] likhitān-cha sandhīvigrhaṁ śāvarū(jena)[*] utkṛśτaṁ-pañ-
39: cha-ā
40: khaśālikēna Durgāgadevēna \( lāṁchhiṭa[ṃ]* \) māmāyā satī 30+17.

1 [Reading is correctly vānacārīśō.—Ed.]
2 This mark of punctuation is superfluous.
3 Millet: Vanacārīśō.
4 Millet: Ānacārīśō.
5 Millet: Nācārīśō.
6 This name is read as Śvarūja in H. Gajām Plates of Nēṭṭhabhaṅjadhēva, above, Vol. XVIII. 296.
7 I am not certain of the reading of this date.—Ed.
No. 24.—A NOTE ON THE PRINCE OF WALES MUSEUM PLATES OF JAYABHATA (III ?).

By Prof. V. V. Mirashi, M.A., Nagpur.

In his article on "A Grant of the Gurjara King JayabhATA III : [Kalachuri] Year 486," Mr. G. V. Acharya has re-arranged the succession of the Early Gurjara princes. As the subject is of importance for the history of Gujarat, I propose to examine his views in the light of the published records of the dynasty.

Until the publication of the Prince of Wales Museum plates by Mr. Acharya in the aforementioned article, seven records of the Early Gurjaras were known to us. The genealogy together with relevant details about the birudas and religious creeds of the princes as mentioned in each is given below:

| I and II—Kairā Plates³ (K. 380 and 385) |
| Dadda |
| Jayabhata, Vitaraga |
| Dadda-Prašāntarāga (Dinakara-caryya-archcha-rata) |

| III—Sānkhejā Plate⁴ (K. 391) |
| Vitaraga |
| Rapagraha (Dinakara-kirna-dhuparrachana-rata) |

| IV and V—Sānkhejā Plates³ (Two sets of K. 392) |
| Vitaraga |
| Dadda-Prašāntarāga (Dinakara-caryya-archcha-rata) |

| VI—Nausārī Plate⁵ (K. 456) |
| Dadda |
| Jayabhata |
| Dadda-Bhūmāḥīya (Paramamāhīvara) |

| VII—Kāvi Plate⁶ (K. 486) |
| Jayabhata |

In the Kaira plates of K. 380 and 385 and the Sānkhejā plates (two sets) of K. 392 the same draft of the eulogistic portion is used with this difference that in the latter the portion descriptive of the donor’s ancestors is omitted, the name of the donor’s father being known only from the sign-manual at the end. The Sānkhejā plate of K. 391 being the last plate of its set, contains no genealogical portion, but since it mentions that the grant was written with the permission of the illustrious Dadda who is mentioned separately from the donor Rapagraha, we may take the latter to be a brother⁴ and feudatory of Dadda-Prašāntarāga. In the Nausārī plates of K. 456, Jaya bhata

---

1 Above, Vol. XXIII, pp. 147 ff.
2 I omit the odd Sānkhejā plate of K. 346 (above, Vol. II, pp. 19 ff) as it mentions no king. Similarly the Umeq, Bagumā and llao plates of Dadda-Prašāntarāga dated in the Śaka era are also omitted as they are now held to be spurious.
5 Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, pp. 100 ff.
6 Dr. Bhandarkar takes Rapagraha to be another name of Dadda-Prašāntarāga. See his List of Inscriptions of Northern India, p. 161, n. 3. What he proposes to read as Dadda-pād-ānurjāṭā[ā] is really Dadda-pād-ānurjāṭā[ā] which is evidently a mistake for Dadda-pād-ānurjāṭā[ā].
an altogether different draft of the eulogistic portion is met with. It has nothing in common with the extant portion of the fragmentary Kāvi plate of K. 486.

While editing the Nausāri plates Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji showed for the first time that the first Dadda mentioned in them was identical with Dadda-Praśāntarāga on the following grounds. This first Dadda was the great-grandfather of the Jayabhāṣṭa who issued the plates. Taking 455 as the commencement (of the latter’s reign), and calculating backwards at the rate of twenty-five years to a generation, we arrive at 380 as the date of the first Dadda of the Nausāri grant. He is therefore identical with Dadda-Praśāntarāga for whom the two sets of Kairā plates furnish the dates K. 380 and 385. As regards the Jayabhāṣṭa of the fragmentary Kāvi plate of K. 486, Dr. Bhagwanlal identified him with the donor of the Nausāri plates of K. 456, the interval of thirty years not being too long for one reign. Dr. Bhagwanlal thus gave the following genealogy of the Early Gurjara princes:

```
Dadda I
    (circa K. 330)
  /   \
Jayabhāṣṭa I-Vitarāga
    (circa K. 355)
  /   \
Dadda II-Praśāntarāga
    K. 380 and 385
  /   \
Jayabhāṣṭa II
    (circa K. 405)
  /   \
Dadda III-Bāhusahāya
    (circa K. 430)
  /   \
Jayabhāṣṭa III
    K. 456 and 486
```

This genealogical list was later on adopted in the History of Gujarāṭ in the Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part I, p. 114 and has also been included by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar in his List of Inscriptions of Northern India, p. 391. The Prince of Wales Museum plates of Jayabhāṣṭa, dated K. 488, recently edited by Mr. Acharya have, however, slightly affected it. The draft used in these plates closely agrees with that of the Nausāri plates in the eulogy of the first four princes. It carries the genealogy two generations further, mentioning Ahirola as the son and successor of the last Jayabhāṣṭa mentioned in the Nausāri plates and finally Jayabhāṣṭa (IV) the son and successor of Ahirola. The concluding eulogistic portion of the grant is identical with that of the fragmentary Kāvi plate which is also dated in the same year. The donor of the latter grant must
therefore be now called Jayabhāṣa IV and not Jayabhāṣa III. The genealogical list of the Gūrjara princes will, therefore, stand as follows:

Dadda I

Jayabhāṣa I-Vitarāga

Dadda II-Praśāntarāga
K. 380, 385, 391, 392

Jayabhāṣa II

Dadda III-Bāhusāhāya

Jayabhāṣa III
K. 455

Ahrōla

Jayabhāṣa IV
K. 486 (two grants).

Mr. G. V. Acharya, however, has rejected the genealogy proposed by Dr. Bhagwanlal and has instead arranged the succession of these princes as follows:

Dadda I. K. 330, 346

Jayabhāṣa I. K. 355

Dadda II-Bāhusāhāya. K. 380, 385, 392

Jayabhāṣa II. K. 405, 456

Ahrōla

Jayabhāṣa III. K. 486.

It may be noted in this connection that Mr. Acharya nowhere mentions the biruda Praśāntarāga, but as he assigns the dates K. 380, 385 and 392 of Dadda-Praśāntarāga to Dadda-Bāhusāhāya we must suppose that he identifies the two Daddas. The dates K. 330, 355 and 406 assigned by him to Dadda I, Jayabhāṣa I and Jayabhāṣa II are conjectural, as no records of these dates have yet been discovered.

In re-arranging the succession of the Gūrjara princes in this way Mr. Acharya seems to have assumed that the Nausāri and Prince of Wales Museum plates dated respectively K. 456 and 486

1 Above, Vol. XXIII, p. 149.
begin their genealogy with the same prince as the two sets of Kairā plates of Dadda-Praśāntarāga dated K. 380 and 385. But this view is open to several objections:

1. Till now we have not come across a single instance in which a prince of this Early Gurjara dynasty assumed more than one biruda. In fact, as pointed out by Dr. Bhagwanlal, the use of the biruda was the expedient resorted to in order to prevent confusion arising from the use of only two names almost throughout the genealogy. Dadda-Praśāntarāga is not therefore likely to be identical with Dadda-Bāhusahāya.

2. Dadda-Praśāntarāga is described in the Kairā and Sākhāḷa plates as Dinakara-charan-āruchiha-rata-devoted to the worship of the rays of the sun, while Dadda-Bāhusahāya is called, in the Nausāri and Prince of Wales Museum plates, Paramamāhēśvara—a most devout worshipper of Śiva. We have no evidence to hold that Dadda-Praśāntarāga changed his religious creed as we have none to show that he changed his biruda.

3. Dadda-Praśāntarāga whose known dates range from K. 380 to K. 392 may be supposed to have flourished from K. 375 to K. 400. If he is identified with Dadda-Bāhusahāya, his grandfather, viz., the first Dadda mentioned in the Nausāri and Prince of Wales Museum plates, must be referred to the period from K. 325 to K. 350 i.e. from about A. D. 575 to A. D. 600. Now this Dadda is said to have given protection to the lord of Valabhi when the latter was attacked by the Paramēśvara Harsha who is undoubtedly the great Emperor of that name who ruled at Kanauj (A. D. 606-647). Harsha came to the throne when he was a lad of sixteen years. Even if we suppose that his invasion took place towards the end of Dadda’s reign (A. D. 575-600) he could not have been more than ten years of age at the time! It is needless to add that he was not then Paramēśvara (Emperor).

4. In the proposed succession Mr. Acharya is obliged to assign a reign of more than fifty years to Jayabhata II. Such a long reign is improbable, though not impossible.

If on the other hand we identify the first Dadda, the grandfather of Dadda-Bāhusahāya, mentioned in the Nausāri and Prince of Wales Museum plates with Dadda-Praśāntarāga, he becomes a contemporary of Harsha, as his known dates range from K. 380 to K. 392 (i.e. from about A. D. 630 to A. D. 642). Harsha’s invasion of Valabhi during which Dadda gave protection to a Mañukra king must have occurred soon before the Harsha-Pulakāsin war. Dr. Altekar has adduced cogent reasons to date the latter in the period A. D. 630-34. It may, however, be asked why Dadda-Praśāntarāga is silent in all his records about his glorious achievement if he actually gave protection to the ruler of Valabhi against the powerful Emperor of Kanauj. The reason is not difficult to find. In this matter Dadda was evidently acting at the instance of his suzerain, Pulakāsin II. From the Aihole inscription we know that he had submitted to the Chālukya Emperor. He knew full well that single-handed he was not strong enough to defy the lord paramount of North India. He could not have claimed credit for the protection of the Valabhi ruler during the life-time of Pulakāsin II. As a matter of fact, we find this achievement of Dadda II mentioned for the first time in a record of his great-grandson Jayabhata III. His successors had evidently neither fear nor scruples in giving him credit for defying Harsha.

There would thus be no chronological difficulty in accepting the order of succession first proposed by Dr. Bhagwanlal, with, of course, the addition of the two names which have now been brought to light by the publication of the Prince of Wales Museum plates.

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII, p. 73.
2 See e.g. 1. 4 of the Nausāri grant of Jayabhata III (Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII, p. 77).
3 Cf. Smith—Early History of India (Fourth Ed.), p. 349.
No. 25.—GAUTAMI PLATES OF GANGLA INDIRAVARMAN: YEAR 4.

By KUNJA GOVINDA GOSWAMI, M.A., CALCUTTA.

This set of three copper-plates, which are in a good state of preservation, was discovered in 1937 in the village Gautami in the Badakhimdi Estate of the Ganjam District by a villager, while preparing the site for the construction of a house. Mr. Tumul Krishnamurti of Nuapara obtained the plates from the villager and handed them over to Pandit Nilkantha Das, M.L.A. (Central). Mr. Das again gave the plates to Pandit Binayak Misra, Lecturer in Oriya, Calcutta University, and the latter has very kindly made them over to me for publication. I am extremely grateful to Messrs. Das and Misra for thus providing me with an opportunity of editing these plates in the Epigraphia Indica.

These three plates together with the ring and the seal weigh 93 tolas. Each plate measures 6½ inches in length and 4½ inches in breadth. The ring is almost round, and is ½ inch in thickness, with its inner diameter of 3½ inches. The seal is very small and is ¼ inch in diameter. No emblem or legend is any more traceable on it. The plates are strung on the ring passing through the holes which were bored in the middle of the left hand side of each plate. The first and the third plates are inscribed on one side only while the second plate bears writing on both the sides. There are altogether thirty-one lines of writing, the first three sides containing eight lines each and the fourth seven.

The characters belong to the Northern variety showing signs of southern influence at places. Considering its script, the present inscription seems to be one of the early records of the Ganga Kings of Orissa, though not so early as the Dhanantara plates of Simantavarmā* of the same dynasty. It may be pointed out in passing that the name Padmachandra of the engraver of this latter record happens to be identical with that of the engraver of the present charter. It is, however, extremely doubtful whether one and the same person is meant thereby, as the scripts of the two records exhibit so marked a difference in the style of writing that they cannot be taken to have been inscribed by an identical hand; the script of the Dhanantara plates on the whole appears to be earlier than that of the plates under consideration.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit, and the composition is in prose except that two customary verses occur in the concluding portion.

As regards orthography, there are some peculiarities to be noted:—the consonants after r are doubled in some cases while in others there is no such doubling, as in śētār-m.Mahēndrāchala- I. 3, and in chaturdāsē- I. 1-2. Again t followed by r is doubled in sakti-īrāya, I. 7, kṣēttra and gētra, I. 15. The scribe does not make any distinction between the signs for medial short i and long ī. The forms of b and c also are not differentiated; everywhere we find the use of v only for both the letters. In ligatures a class nasal is sometimes used, e.g., śḍdēkā, I. 2 and sometimes represented by anusvaara, e.g., Ganges, I. 5. In certain cases a letter or visarga has been wrongly left out. An anusvaara almost invariably takes the place of a final n, while occasionally it also stands for a final n, as in sa-karāpān, I. 12. In I. 16, the sign obviously meant for vā is used, while I. 16, the sign obviously meant for vā looks more like that for rā. Besides, there are certain other errors which have been duly corrected in the transcribed text.

The first four syllables, containing a name, in I. 17 have been rendered obscure by some scratchings over these letters. It may be the correction made by the original scribe himself or somebody might have tampered with its subsequently.

---

* Referred to above, p. 133, n. 8.
* Above, Vol. XV, pp. 275 ff. and plates.
The inscription records the grant of a piece of land in or near the village Salachani, of the Hemvakamamavma district (vishaya) by the Gaṅga Mahārāja Indravarman, who was a devout worshipper of Śiva, to Brāhmaṇas, Vināyakāsarman and . . . sarman of the Vaiṣāsanāya chaura of the Parāśāra gūra and of the Śakti-Kānya-Vaishālī pravara, for the increase of merit of his father, mother and self. The boundaries of the land are specified in the grant. The engraver is Aksahasālin Padmāchandra. The plates were issued from the victorious residence of Śvetaka on the 3rd day of the bright half of the month Phālguna of the year 4 which evidently refers to the regnal year of the king and not to any era.

Among the known charters of the Gaṅga rulers of Śvetaka only a few mention a date. Thus Svalpa-Velura grant of Gaṅga Anantavarman is dated in the year 19 which has likewise been taken to refer to the king's regnal year. Rājaka Jayavarmanāśa's plates are dated in the year 100 apparently of the Gāṅgāya era, but as these plates are suspected to be spurious, their date is not reliable. Dhanantara plates of Śamantavarman are not dated, but are placed in the seventh century A.D. on palaeographical grounds, which have been borne out by a later discovery: the Phērava grant (held to be) of the same Śamantavarman dated in the year 185 or 165 which in all probability refers itself to the Gāṅgāya era, the initial point of which is supposed to fall in A.D. 497. As already observed, the Gautami plates are palaeographically later than the Dhanantara plates. We may place the former in the eighth century A.D.

As regards the localities mentioned, Śvetaka, according to Mr. Tarini Charan Rath, was perhaps the Country adjoining Kailāga to the west. Some other scholars identify it with Chikiti or Chikātri in the Ganjam District. Mahendrachala probably refers to the hills of this name in the Ganjam District. I am unable to identify the district or vishaya of Hemvakamamavma and the village Salachani, mentioned in the grant.

TEXT:

First Plate.

1 Ṣvasti [1*] Vijaya-Śvetak-ādhisāthānāḍ-bhagavataś-cha-
2 turīḍaṇa-bhuvan-ādhipaḥ[1*] śakalā-śāṅkka-āñkhabrahā-
3 sya sthity-utpatti-pralaya-kāraṇa-hetāḥ[3]*-mMahendr-āchala-si-
4 hāra-nivāsyasya(naḥ) śrī(śrī)-Gokarnaśvāra-svāmina-ś-charaṇa-
5 kamal-ārādhanaṇ-avāpta-punya-nichayō Garīng-a-
6 māla-kul-śāva-[l-āmba]-r-ēndu[3]* sva-bhūva-vag(ah)a-pa-rakram-ākrānta-saka-
7 la-Kailāga-ādhiraś[a]* sakti-tīrāya-prakāshā-anurāṇjīt-āśe-
8 aha-sāmanta[3]* paramamāhēśvaro mātā-patip-pād-ā-

1 [See below, p. 182, n. 1.—Ed.]
2 [The Parāśāra gūra does not have Kaṇva in its threefold pravara which is Parāśāra Śakti-Vaishālīsa. Kaṇva may be the gūra in the present instance.—Ed.]
3 Above, pp. 134 ff. and plate.
4 Ibid., Vol. XXIII, pp. 267 ff. and plate.
5 Ibid., p. 334, n. 1.
9 Above, p. 132.
11 From ink-impressions.
12 The letter ṣ̐ has been engraved below the line.
Second Plate; First Side.

9 nudhyāta(tō) mahāraja-srī(śrī)-Indravarmanmadāväḥ kuśalī(lī) [*]
10 Hēnvakamaṇṭvanavishayē Salachāṇikālī grūmē
11 yathā-kāl-ādhyāsinō vyavahāriṇā[-Sahā.-] sa-ka-
12 raqām(ṇān) sa-daṇḍanāyaṇaka-pramukhāṃ(khān) nivāsi-
13 na(nō) janapadāṃ(ḍān) chāta-bhaṭa-vallabhā-jātināṃ yathā-
14 raḥś[ra] mānayatī viditam-astu bhavatāṃ ēṣaē kha-
15 yōj-khēttra[ra] Vājaśanēya-chaṇāpēbhya ē gōtra-Pārās-
16 ra-Saktīvat Vāsiṃhāvat Kāṇuvat Vīnēya'kaśarman-Nārā-

Second Plate; Second Side.

17 —-[rda]śarmaṇē mātā-pittror-ātmanaḥ cha puṣy-ābhī-
18 vṛdhayē[ś] salilā-dhārā-puraḥ[ḥ] jśaram-ā-chandr-ārka-sa-
19 ma-kālaṭvēna datta[ḥ] [*] pūrva-diśām(ś) tūṇī vālmik-āgṛṇyāṇē
20 taṃka-sī(ṣ)ṁāntaḥ[ḥ] dakaṣhipa-diśām(ś) raṇya[ya] -si(ṣ)ṁānta[ḥ] [*] pa-
21 schīma-diśām(śi) Kōsahvata-taṃka-sī(ṣ)ṁāntaḥ [*] uta(tta)-
22 ra-diśām(śi) Udāya-taṃka-sī(ṣ)ṁāntaḥ ēvān chatur Bah[ḥ]
23 pi dikshu nirdihṣṭa-spaṭhā-si(ṣ)ṁāntaḥ na kēnacih
24 paripāthinē bhavatavyah ē tathā ch-ōktaiṃ dharmā-ṣ[ṛ]

Third Plate.

25 Va(Ba)hubhir-vasudhā datta rājāna[ṇa] 11 Sagarādibhi[ḥ] [*]
26 yasya yasaya yadā bhūmīta(s-tā)ya yasaya tadā phala[m[ṃ] [*] [*]
27 Mā bhū-phala[ḥ]-śaṅkā va[ḥ] [*] 12 paradatē(tta-s)tī pūthi(rthi)va(vāḥ) sva-da-
28 tā(tta-)[phalām-anantya[ṃ] [*] 13 paradatē(tta-[tt]ūpālaṇāṃ(nō) ||
29 dānaḥ murajī[ḥ] 14 chatvāri 14
30 utκi(tki)roṇah akṣahasāli-ṣrī(śrī)-Padmahandrēṇa | saṃvah(vat) 4
31 Phāluṇa[ṇa] 15-sūdī 3

TRANSLATION.

(Lines 1-14) Óm Hail! The illustrious Mahāraja Indravarman, who has acquired a store of virtues by worshipping the lotus feet of the illustrious god, Gōkarnaśāvara, the almighty—who is

1[The name of the village may be read also as Sāhresālā, because the form of v in some cases closely resembles that of ć, as in dćaḥ, l. 9. —Ed.]
2 Read jāṭyānē.
3 Read caṁabhiyānē.
4 Read claraṅgābhāyānē.
5 The letter ṛ is incised almost below the line in smaller size, which shows that it was first omitted and later supplied.
6 Read kālamahāyānē; the preceding portion is not clear.
7 Read vṛddhāyē[ś].
8 Read vṛddhāyē[ś] apagāyānē. [The reading appears to be triśī sūmṣṭikā-apagāyānē which may be corrected as triśī sūmṣṭikā-(or triśī sūmṣṭikā) apagāyānē.—Ed.]
9 Read caṇaṇaḥ.
10 Read caṇaṇaḥ.
11 Read rañjākīḥ.
12 This dukṣa is superfluous.
13 Read caṇaṇāḥ. The meaning of the expression dćaḥ murajā chatvāri is not clear. Muraja generally means a kind of musical instrument such as drum or tambourine. [Muraja may denote a land measure, the area of the donated land being four murajos.—Ed.] There is a symbol between the two dukṣās which looks like Nāgari 6.
the lord of the fourteen worlds, who wears on the forehead the crescent, who is the cause of existence, creation and destruction and who resides on the summit of the hill Mahendra,—he a moon in the sky—namely the spotless race of the Gaṅgas, possessing overlordship of the whole of the Kaliṅga territory by the strength of his arms, endeared to all his vassals by the excellence of his threefold power, a great devotee of Mahēśvara (Śiva) and meditator upon the feet of his father and mother, being well duly advises from the victorious residence of Śvētākṣa, the existing administrative officers together with the accountant, the Dāṇḍaṁyaka and the like, the inhabiting people of the locality, the officials of the rank of Chōta, Bhaja and Vaiṭhabha—at the village of Salachāṇikā in the vishaya or district of Hēmvakamaṇṭāmaṇya:

(Ll. 14-24) "Be it known to you that this piece of land is given along with the offering of water to Venāyakaśārman and . . . śārman of the Vajasaneya charaṇa, Pārīṣaṇa gōtra and Śakti-Vaśishṭha-Kaṇva pravara to continue as long as the sun and the moon exist for the increase of merit of mother, father and self. (It is bounded) on the east by an ant-hill, which is in the shape of a quiver, on the south-east by the tank, on the south by the forest, on the west by the tank called Kāśāṇava and on the north by the tank named Udaya. Thus on all sides it is marked by fixed and clear boundaries. No body should be opposed (to this grant). Thus it is said in the religious scriptures":"—

(Ll. 25-28) Here follow the two verses.

(L. 29) Gift of four murajās.
Incised by the illustrious Akṣhāśālin Padmāchandra; on the 3rd day of the bright half of Phāḷgūna of Saṃvat 4.

No. 26.—THREE INSCRIPTIONS OF VAIDUMBA-MAHĀRAJA GANDATRINETRA.

By R. S. Panchamukhi, M.A., Madras.

The three subjoined inscriptions which are edited here for the first time were copied by the Office of the Assistant Archaeological Superintendent for Epigraphy, Madras, in 1905, 1906 and 1922 respectively and are noticed in the Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy for the respective years. They are called in the sequel A, B and C for the sake of convenience.

A.

The record is engraved on a slab set up in a field west of the village Basinikonda near Madnapalle. The alphabet is Telugu-Kaṇṇaḍa of the 9th century A.D. and resembles the script of the Bāpa and Chōla records of the period secured in the Puṇganur and Cuddapah regions. The language is ancient Kaṇṇaḍa.

The inscription records the death of a hero named Kāre Punnaṇi-mañi in a fight with Nolambi, Daṭṭiga, Rāchamalla, Mayindaṇi and Gunḍige-guḷa who had mustered their forces on the occasion of a raid on the fort of Sōremaṇi made by Mahāraja (i.e., Gandatrinētra) and

[1 See above p. 181, n. 2.—Ed.]
[2 See above p. 182, n. 8.—Ed.]

[As regards akṣhāśālin, we find in Kauṭilya's Arthāśāstra a chapter called "Akṣhāśālini Suvarṇādhyakṣaḥ", The Commentator interprets "akṣhāśālini" as "svuṛma-rāpa-ādi-nirmāṇa-kālaḥāya." [The commentary quoted by R. Shamasnātry in his translation of Kauṭilya's Arthāśāstra (2nd ed., p. 91) runs as follows: Akṣhāśālini svuṛma-ādi-parikrama-āvasthya-svayā gaṇeṣṭhadāya ādi. i.e., "Akṣhāśālini is a name of the chamber in which the artistic work of gold and other metals is carried out."—Ed.] So the term akṣhāśālin here seems to mean 'one who is in charge of the goldsmith's office'. [See also above, Vol. XXIII, p. 76.—Ed.]

Bāparasa, when Vaidumba-Mahārāja Gaṇḍatrinētra was ruling the earth. The chief interest of the record lies in the fact that it furnishes a synchronism which, as shown below, helps in determining the date of the battle and of Gaṇḍatrinētra.

B.

This inscription is engraved on a slab standing near the ruined Śiva temple in the Yenugaramaṇḍi field at Peddattippamudram in the Madanapalle taluk of the Chittoor District. The alphabet is early Telugu-Kannada and resembles that of A. In respect of orthography, it may be noted that the king’s name is written as Kaṇḍatrinētra instead of Gaṇḍatrinētra. The language is Telugu of the archaic type. The nominative singular vaṇu in Chelevenru is a precursor of later vaṇu. The meaning of the expression Yemmakāla is not clear though it appears to have some connection with the Telugu word enmekādu meaning amorous or sportive (vilāsavantuva).

The record belongs to the same Vaidumba king Gaṇḍatrinētra and states that Prabhu Chelevenru distinguished himself in the battle that took place between the Mahārāja and Nojambi at Soremaṇī and died after opposing and piercing the Nojambi army. It adds that the Mahārāja’s servant (mānīru) Muţalamale Dōchayya also had distinguished himself in a sportive way (?). It is not clear why Dōchayya is introduced here. Perhaps Dōchayya and Prabhu Chelevenru both started to oppose the Nojambi army and the latter fell in his attempt to destroy the enemy’s forces.

C.

This record is written on a slab in a field at Veligallu in the Madanapalle taluk of the Chittoor District. The alphabet is early Telugu-Kannada and resembles the one found in the inscriptions of Bānavidyādhara and Chōla Vikramāditya Satyādityar. The shape of f, however, deserves to be noted (ll. 3, 5, 6, etc.). The language of the record is archaic Telugu in lines 1-5 and 14-16 and ancient Kannada in lines 6-14. Orthography and idiom are not uncommon to the period and locality where the inscription is found. Lines 4-5 offer some difficulty in interpretation. The passage has been construed in the following order: — Vaidumba-Mahārāja Chantamāna-Daṇḍi vaṇi in paras vaṇi, Kaṇ[a]-Dēsengarhi un vāṇi edayum vāṇi Gaṇḍatrinētra maṇḍi-devīluml- bodīche, according to which Kōru-Dēsingarhi would be a servant of Chantamāna and an enemy of Gaṇḍatrinētra. Similarly some of the epithets of Chantamāna which are in ancient Kannada are peculiar and archaic in form and do not admit of easy interpretation.

The inscription introduces Gaṇḍatrinētra Vaidumba-Mahārāja as ruling over Rēnāṇḍu-seven-thousand country and states that Kōra Dēsingarhi, after seeing the act (paras vaṇi) of the Mahārāja killing Chantamāna-Daṇḍi in a conflict at Muḍumaduṇu during the fight with Nojambi, struck a blow at or pierced (poḍīche) the generals of Gaṇḍatrinētra who had opposed the king (i.e., Nojamba) who ruled over him. Lines 5-14 extol Chantamāna-Daṇḍi as a great valiant with a string of descriptive epithets. Lines 14-16 refer to Kōra-Dēsinga again and mention visayasaṁśa and birādaya at Velīnagunru (possibly modern Veligallu). The record was written by Śrīkaṇṭhadeva-Āchāyra (Āchārya). Since the grant portion is obscurely worded and badly damaged, the purport of the record is not clear though it appears that Kōra-Dēsinga granted these incomes to Chantamāna’s family in memory of his valour.

From the contents of the records given above, it may be gathered that Vaidumba-Mahārāja Gaṇḍatrinētra fought with a Nojamba king at Soremaṇī in the course of which he killed Chantamāna-Daṇḍi at Muḍumaduṇu. According to A, the combatants that met at Soremaṇī

1 Fide Telugu Dictionary Śādvartaṇakaraṇa, p. 111
2 See Translation below, p. 193.
were the Mahārāja and Bānarasa on the one side, and Nōlamba, Daṇḍiga, Rāchamalla, Mayindaṭi and Gudigēgulja (1) on the other. A Bāngavādi record(1) of Mahābali Bānarasa adds that Permāṇadigal had joined the party of the Mahārāja in a fight with the same enemies at Māṇdāvudā. According to the Chadalla inscription(2) Mahābali-Bānarasa rose against Nōlamba, Rāchamalla and Mayindaṭi on the battle field of Sōremaṭi on behalf of Permāṇadigal. Mayindaṭi’s name is substituted by Mayindiramikirama (Mahēndravikrama) in another inscription of Bāngavādi(3) dated in the 24th year of Vijaya Narasinhavikramavarman. The Sōremaṭi battle which took place during the reign of Gaṇḍatariṇētra must have therefore been of great consequence for the history of the south-eastern Dekkan in this early period. An attempt will be made in the sequel to enquire into the causes that led to the meeting of these powers at Sōremaṭi and to ascertain the probable date when this important event occurred as also the result of this campaign.

Two of the Vaidumbas kings, viz., Manuṣatariṇētra and Gaṇḍatariṇētra, are stated to be ruling over Rēṇāṇḍu-seven-thousand country which, as we know, had been subject to the administration of the Chōlas under Vikramādiya Satyādityanu. The Rēṇāṇḍu country comprised a major part of Cuddapah and Kurnool Districts along the valley of the Kundēru river. The Mālepāḍu stone inscription of the Chōla king Satyāditya states that Siddhi-one-thousand (Siddhaut country) also formed part of the dominions of the Chōlas. Since the inscriptions of these early Chōlas are found in the Proddatur taluk of the Cuddapah District, Madanapalle and Puṅganur taluks of the Chittoor District, besides Gōribidanūr of the Kolar District, Mysore State, it may be surmised that their territory extended almost over the whole of the Cuddapah and Kurnool Districts, part of Chittoor and the north-western portion of the Kolar Districts. This could not have been held by them intact from the beginning of their political career. For Pulināḍu (in Puṅganur) was mainly a Bāṇa district and had been occupied by the Chōlas in the course of their aggressive campaign. Similarly Gōribidanūr which was included originally in the Gaṅga or Nōlamba territory had been wrested from them by the Chōlas in a similar campaign. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas who were engaged in battles with the Gaṅgas, the Eastern Chālukyas and the Pallavas in the 8th and the beginning of the 9th centuries A.D. could not devote their attention to the expansion of their dominion in the south-east of Dekkan, nor could they have done so without subduing the Gaṅgas and the Nōlambas who ruled in the intervening province.

The Bāṇa (or Brhahd-Bāṇas) who were originally settled in the Śrīśaila country in the 4th century A.D. lingered on and continued to rule in the Gooyti province in the 7th-8th centuries A.D. as subordinates of the Chālukyas of Bāḍami. After the decline of the Chālukyas, one branch appears to have slowly moved down to the south and taken service under the Pallava kings, protecting the north-western frontier of the latter’s country. Their inscriptions are found in the

---

2 No. 453 of 1906 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.  
4 Above, Vol. XI, p. 337. No. 342 of 1922 and Ep. Curn., Vol. X, Bāṇapalle 62. In the latter, the Kiradore is mentioned as the limit of Rēṇāṇḍu. This might be the Kundēru river mentioned below.  
5 Ibid., p. 345, Postscript.  
6 E.g., Nos. 466 and 617 of 1906, 307 and 329 of 1922-23, 290 of 1906, 174 of 1931-32, of the Madras Epigraphical Collection; Ep. Curn., Vol. X, Gōribidanūr 69, 72-75, etc.  
7 Nos. 174 and 183 (probably a Chōla record) of 1931-32. The Chōlas could not have occupied this district without an encounter with the Bāṇas.  
8 Tālγūndi Pillar inscription of Kākusthavarmān (above, Vol. VIII, pp. 24 ff.). Perbbāṇavindha is mentioned in an inscription of Śrīvalabha-Mahārāja dhīrāja, from Arakattavēmula in the Cuddapah District (No. 474 of 1906). This Śrīvalabha is most probably Chālukya Vikramādiya I who according to the Gadvāl grant acquired the title of Śrīvalabha after defeating the Pallavas.  
9 Nos. 333 and 343 of 1920 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
North Arcot and Salem Districts as well as in the Kolar and Chittoor Districts. Bāṇagavīdyādhara figures as a subordinate of Pallava Dantivarman and Nandivarman III and prior to him a certain Bāṇarasa who was probably Jayanandivarman or his son Malladēva held a subordinate position under Nandivarman Pallavamalla. Thus the Bāṇas had at this period thrown in their lot with the Pallavas who were waging constant wars with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Gaṅgas in the north and the Pāṇḍyas in the south. In the 9th century A.D. their territory extended far beyond their ancestral home. A record of Dhavaleyarasa of the Mahābalikula dated in Śaka 897 is found at Pottippadū which would show that the northern boundary of their dominions extended up to the Jammalamadugu taluk; in the west, portions of Gōrībidanur, Kōḷār and Mulbagal were included in their province as their inscriptions are found in that area and in the east Kājahasti formed probably the extreme limit of their province. Their original home, however, lay between Kājahasti and Puṅganūr to the north of the Pāḷār which area constituted the Perumhāppāppu of the Tamil inscriptions. This must have comprised the Vaiṣuḍavaḷi-twelve-thousand and Pulinaḷu-sixty. The occupation of the Cuddapah District as far north as Jammalamadugu must have brought them face to face with the Chōḷas of Rāṇaṇḍu. Several Chōḷa records are found in this area, but the king is represented by the general epithet Chōḷa-mahārāja which does not help us in determining the period of the inscription or of the chief mentioned therein. After a rule of over 200 years, the Chōḷa power was probably not strong enough to resist the invasions of the Bāṇas who, as stated above, pushed forward their conquests as far north as Jammalamadugu which was purely a Chōḷa country.

This Bāṇa-Chōḷa conflict must have commenced much earlier. For we find at Chippili a stone record of Pupiyakumāra who in all probability was the donor of the Mālepāḍu plates, and in the same place is discovered an epigraph of sri-Malladēva who appears to have been referred to as Bāṇaraasa in the record. If Malladēva is a Bāṇa chief, he must be identified with the father of Bāṇagavīdyādhara who flourished in the first half of the 9th century A.D. This would show that some time after Pupiyakumāra the Bāṇas must have subjugated the Chōḷas and occupied a portion of their territory. This event must have taken place after the time of Vikramādiya Satyādityaṇu, who ruled over Rāṇaṇḍu-seven-thousand and Siddhi-one-thousand. The Chōḷas were possibly driven to the north towards Cuddapah, Proddatur and Siddhaut, where, too, their rule was not uninterrupted by the Bāṇas as evidenced by the Pottippadū record of Dhavaleyarasa. They probably continued as petty chieftains in a portion of Rāṇaṇḍu awaiting an opportunity to avenge the defeat inflicted on them by the Bāṇas.

The Nolathas who had become the faithful servants of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas by about A.D. 770 and whose territory lay adjacent to that of the Bāṇas could not have remained unaffected by the

2 Huien Tsang (cir. A.D. 643) mentions the Chōḷas as a ruling power in the Cuddapah region. I have shown (above, Vol. XXIII, p. 92) that one branch of the Chōḷas ruled in the Godavari District in the 8th century A.D. and it is likely that another branch ruled simultaneously in the Rāṇaṇḍu country which was ultimately overthrown by the Bāṇas in the 9th century A.D.
3 No. 299 of 1903 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
4 Ibid., No. 301.
5 Recently a record of an early Pupiyakumāra—apparently a Chōḷa—engraved in characters of about the 8th century A.D. has been discovered at Tippalūr in the Kamalaṇpuram taluk of the Cuddapah District. This would show that the Chōḷas were the earliest occupants of Rāṇaṇḍu prior to the Bāṇas and the Vaidumbas.
6 No Chōḷa records of the 9th-century A.D. are found in the Madanapalle region whereas a number of Bāṇa epigraphs exists in that locality.
7 Two Chāllakere inscriptions of Prabhuḷavaraḥa Gōvinda (II) in which Chāḷapoonāra figures as the king's subordinate.
aggressive campaigns of the latter. Polalchôra who was a feudatory of Nitimârâgrenga (Saka 775) invaded Pulinâdu of the Bânas who under Prabhumêrâ Vijayâditya occupied as a counter-measure the Gaṅgarusârâ District of the Nojâmbas. The conflict assumed a serious turn in the time of Mahêndrâ-Nojâhâdhirâja who was determined to establish his power by exterminating the Bâna race and who accordingly sent a force under the command of Kaḍuveṭṭi and Maduva to seize Pulinâdu. It may be noted that Bâna Vijayâditya’s inscriptions are found in a portion of the Kolar Group which comprised the Gaṅgarusârâ District of the Nojâmbas. It is significant to find that the Gaṅga king Râchamalla I had contracted a marriage alliance with the Nojâmba Polalchôra by giving his daughter Jâsibbe to him, so that their dominion in the south might be safeguarded from the attacks of the Pallavas and the Bânas. In one of the Bûdikôte inscriptions, Râchamalla II is stated to have carried an expedition against Kânchi, when Gaṅgarusârâ was under the administration of a Bânarasa who was evidently Prabhumêrâ Vijayâditya. And Mahêndra is described in a Hindupur record to have been ruling the country extending up to Kânchi. These events establish clearly the political hostility between the Gaṅga and the Nojâmba on the one side and the Bâna and the Pallava on the other in the period under review.

We know that the Gaṅga throne passed to the line of Vijayâditya, the younger brother of Śivamâra, in supersession of the latter’s son Yuvarâja Mârasimha and Prithvîpati I. There are reasons to think that Mârasimha died prior to his father, but Prithvîpati I ought to have, when he came of age, succeeded to his father’s kingdom though perhaps he was a minor at the time of Śivamâra’s death. Prithvîpati I’s claim was evidently overlooked by his uncle Vijayâditya who had received the Gaṅga kingdom from his brother only as a trust as Bharata had that of Râma. Prithvîpati had, therefore, out of despair and disappointment, to seek alliance with the opposite party, i.e., the Pallava by taking service under them and giving his daughter Kundavve in marriage to Bânavidyâdharâ, the most powerful Bâna prince who was the servant of Pallava Dantivikramavarman and Nandivarman III. Thus the Bânas and the collateral Gaṅga branch became allies by this marriage under the patronage of the Pallavas who were the inveterate foes of the Râshtrakûtas, the Gaṅgas and the Nojâmbas.

The unsettled political condition in the Rânasâdu country in the 9th century A.D. was favourable for the rise of petty chieftains to power. Some time in the beginning of that century, the Vaidunâbas who hailed probably from Vaidumâvanâlu (Madanapalle taluk) tried to measure their strength with the Chôlas and other powers of the Dekkhan. Their history is not known during the period of Chôla ascendancy. Since at Chippili, the records of Chôla, Bâna and Vaidunâbas

---

4 No. 588 of 1912 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.
5 Mârasimha has issued as Yuvarâja, the Nelamâgala and Aûr copper-plate charters dated respectively in A.D. 797 and A.D. 799. Śivamâra would not have offered the throne to his brother if Mârasimha the heir-apparent had been alive. It may be remarked that the view that these two charters are spurious is no longer tenable, since the script employed in them is perfectly regular for the period and closely resembles the writing of the Maṅga plates of Râshtrakûta Gârvinda (Ep. Carn., Vol. IX, 41). Further, the historical details mentioned in them are now corroborated by several genuine Gaṅga grants such as the Kiḍalu plates of Mârasimha II and the apparently impossible reference in them to the recrowning of Śivamâra by Gârvinda III and Pallava Nandivarman III which took place in about A.D. 813 will have to be explained by supposing that the grants actually made by Mârasimha when his father was in prison were issued after the liberation and re-coronation of Śivamâra in A.D. 813, incorporating the events that had happened in the interval.
6 Rice has suggested that Tûmba in the North Arcot District might be the original habitat of the family.
kings are discovered,¹ that of the Vaiduñhas being paleographically the latest in date, it may be surmised that the Vaiduñhas had not yet attained an independent position in the 8th century A.D. and must have consolidated their power only after Malladeva or Bāgavidyādhara. Accordingly they are found fighting with the Chōlas and the Bāgas at this period from whom they must have wrested Madanapalle and extended their territory on all sides so as to include in it the whole of Rāṇāḍy—a seven-thousand province. Their aggressive policy is noticeable in their records found in the Bāgapalli taluk of the Kolar District which was included in the Nojambha territory. Finally the Chōla Mahārājas appear to have been driven away from their country to a corner in the Gōribidanur taluk of the Kolar District where, too, they had to fight constantly with the Nojambha under Mahāndra.²

From the foregoing brief analysis of the political situation in the south-eastern Dekkan in the latter half of the 9th century A.D., it is apparent that the Vaiduñhas and the Bāgas had by their aggressive campaigns created enemies of the Gaṅga, Nojambha and Chōla kings of the time and were biding an opportunity to give a decisive blow to the three powers. Such an opportunity offered itself in the cause of the Gaṅga Prithvīpata I whose claims to the hereditary throne had been set at naught by Vijayāditya and his son Rāchamallā. Prithvīpata appears to have proclaimed himself king, at least temporarily, with the aid of the Bāgas; for we find him as the reigning sovereign in a few inscriptions of the Punganur taluk which belong to the 9th century A.D. on paleographical grounds.³ But Prithvīpata having been killed in a fight with Pāṇḍya Varaguppa, the struggle seems to have been continued by Nanniya-Gaṅga who, as stated in an inscription of Hirēbidanur⁴, was the son of Prithvīpata of the Gaṅga family. A record at Kibbeṇahalli⁵ in the Tumkur District informs us that Nanniya-Gaṅga, evidently the son of Prithvīpata I, fought with Satyavākya Rāchamallā who must be the second prince of that name. We also learn from an epigraph at Rāyakot (Salem District) that Mahābali Bāparasa invaded Manne on behalf of Gaṅga who could be no other than Nanniya-Gaṅga.⁶ The Bāga chief, presumably Prabhūmēru Vijayāditya, was victorious in the campaign, as some of his inscriptions represent him as ruling over Manne in addition to Vajugavali-twelve-thousand province. It must be in the course of this fight that Nanniya-Gaṅga occupied Talakadu, the capital of the Western Gaṅgas, and proclaimed himself king, with the regal epithet Nītimaṅga as shown by a stone record at Arakalūḍ.⁷ The only Nanniya-Gaṅga known to the Gaṅga genealogy is Būtuga II who was, however, a Satyavākya and not Nītimaṅga. Hence the Nanniya-Gaṅga Nītimaṅga of the Arakalūḍ record must be the son of Prithvīpata only, who must have borne the surname Nītimaṅga as a rightful successor of Satyavākya Rāchamallā whom he had ousted.⁸ It was on this occasion that Rāchamallā II mustered his forces and sought the assistance of

¹ Nos. 298-301 of 1905 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection, see also p. 186, foot-note 4 above.
³ Nos. 326, 334 and 337 of 1912. Pruduvaya-Pjiljuvumpa-Prithvīpata of these inscriptions has to be identified with Prithvīpata I who sacrificed his life for his friend Aparajita in the battle of Sripurambyam with Pāṇḍya Varaguppa, since No. 337 bears an apparent reference to this battle in which the Pāṇḍya was one of the contending parties. See also Madras Epigraphical Report, 1913, part II, p. 92. No. 326 describes Pjiljuvumpa as the younger brother of Durvinta. This Durvinta was evidently different from the son of Avindha who flourished in the 6th century A.D. Yuvarāja Mārāsimha had apparently borne the surname Durvinta.
⁵ Ibid., Vol. XII, Tp. 55.
⁶ S. I. J., Vol. VII, No. 4. The Bāgas are not known to have been the friends of the Western Gaṅgas of the main line at this period.
⁸ The epithets Satyavākya and Nītimaṅga were borne alternately by the Western Gaṅga kings.
his relatives, the Nolamba, who were in open hostility with the Bānas and met on different fronts of battle such as Soremaṭi, Mudumaduvu, Tiruvula, Māndavuda, etc., the Bānas and Pernāṇḍi, i.e., Nanniya Gaṅga who had been joined by the Vaidumbas on account of the common enmity with the Nolamba and the Cholās. Since Satyavākyā Rāchamalla and Nanniya Gaṅga were the rival claimants to the Gaṅga throne at this period, they both appear to have been called Pernāṇḍi in the records of their respective subordinates or allies. Thus Pernāṇḍi of the Kalakṣṭtīr record of Nolamādhavarsa apparently refers to Rāchamalla while that occurring in the Bāna inscriptions such as Baṅgavāḍ, Chadalla and Rāyakōṭa epigraphs mentioned above refers to Nanniya-Gaṅga, the refugee of the Bānas who were instrumental in placing him on the Gaṅga throne at Tālkāḍu. Among the allies that met at Soremaṭi, Rāchamalla was evidently Satyavākyā Rāchamalla II, Nolambhi was Mahēndra and Mayindaṇḍi, who was otherwise known as Mayindiramikkirama, was probably identical with the Cholā king Mayindamachōḷa-Mahārāja who is referred to as king in an inscription at Hiribidanur. Daḍiga was possibly the Daḍiga of Gōribidanur record who figures as an ally of (Nolamba) Mahēndra. It is not impossible that this Daḍiga was Chantamāḷa-Daḍi who, as stated in inscription C below, fought with Gāndātrįṇpute on behalf of Nolambhi. It must be as a preliminary to or in the course of the fateful battle of Soremaṭi that Mahēndra sent under the orders of Pernāṇḍi, i.e., Rāchamalla II, his officers Krāyuveṭṭi and Maduva to seize Tālkāḍu which was now, as stated above, in the hands of Nanniya-Gaṅga and to invade Pulināḍu on the way. This intensive fight finally resulted in glorious victory to Mahēndra. Pulināḍu of the Bānas was captured, the city Pernāṇḍi was burnt, Nanniya-Gaṅga was dethroned and Rāchamalla re-occupied Tālkāḍu. The Bāna who was the principal aggressor in the struggle was routed and finally killed by Mahēndra. In the records of Baragūr and Dharmapurī, Mahēndra is described as ruling the country in peace and quiet after having eradicated the Cholās and other kinsmen and destroyed root and branch the Mahābali race. The latter is dated in Śaka 815 (A.D. 892) by which time the event must have been accomplished. As the event is narrated as a fresh and recent exploit of Mahēndra, the Soremaṭi battle which formed only an item in the long struggle must have taken place a few years before the destruction of the Mahābali race. Since Rāchamalla II issued his Bīlīyūr charter in his 18th year corresponding to Śaka 809 (A.D. 887), it may be presumed that the battle was fought in about A.D. 885.

The battle of Soremaṭi proved fatal to the confederate allies. After Prabhumāru Vijayāditya, the Bānas are thrown into oblivion until the time of Rāshtrakūṭa Kṛishṇa III who

---

1 Nos. 309 and 310 of 1923 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection and inscription C below indicate that these were fought during the same period. The Loṅkūḷas figure here as the enemies of Vaidumbas whereas in an archaic inscription copied recently at Tadānum (Punagārī taluk), a certain Loṅkūḷaditya is represented as administering Sadaṇbu under Vaidumbamaḥārāja. Probably on the eve of the Soremaṭi battle the Loṅkūḷas availed of the general political chaos, rebelled against their masters and fought against them at Soremaṭi (No. 310 of 1923) apparently on behalf of the Nolamba, etc.

2 Inscriptions A and B below; Nos. 543 of 1906 and 310 of 1923 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.

3 Inscription C below.

4 No. 309 of 1923 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.


6 Ibid., Gōribidanur 69.

7 Ibid., Gōribidanur 75.

8 The Nolamba enemy of Gāndātrįṇpute was Mahēndra.


11 Coorg Inscriptions, No. 2. See also Arakalāgūḍ 24 and 26 the former of which mentions Taddayya as an officer of king Nittāṅga Nanniya-Gaṅga while the latter, dated in Rāchamalla’s 19th year (A.D. 888), refers to his death in a fight.
reinstated the last prince of the family, viz., Vikramāditya III in a part of the Chōla territory conquered by him. We find one Saṁbhayya of the Mahābali race as an officer under Iriva-Nolamba in A.D. 961. Nanniya-Gaṅga himself who was left a destitute after the destruction of the Bāgas had to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Nolambas. For he figures as a subordinate of Nanniya Bira-Nolamba in an inscription of Hirehidanūr and fights with the Sāntaras on behalf of his master. The Vaidumbas, could not have maintained their independence for long after A.D. 885. Though the order of succession and chronology of the several Vaidumbas chiefs known to epigraphy cannot be determined for want of sufficient data, their subordination to the Rāṣṭrākūṭas and Nolambas in the 10th century A.D. is gathered from the following evidence: A Kālī inscription of Kṛishṇa III refers to Vaidumbha-Mahārāja Vikramāditya as a governor of Malādu, Vāṅgapāppā, Śivapuranādu and Veṇkuṛakūṭām. A Vaidumbha chief Vikramāditya Rairuvayya is represented as an officer under Iriva-Nolamba in the records of Bowringpet and Chintāmani, the latter of which is dated in A.D. 951. Chandraśekhara or Sandayan was also a subordinate of this Nolamba king. It is possible that he was the son of Tiruvayya mentioned above. His son Tiruvayya II was ruling in the South Arcot District under Kṛishṇa III in A.D. 961-62. In one of the Kāmādikā inscriptions his son Śrikanṭha is mentioned as an officer under the same king in A.D. 965. Prior to A.D. 951, Vikramāditya who ruled in the Chōla country appears to have been driven away from there in consequence of which his son Tiruvayya I had to take shelter under the Nolambas. This event must have taken place some time before the famous battle of Takkōlām in A.D. 948 after which date the Rāṣṭrākūṭa power was acknowledged in the Tamil land at least for some years to come. Since Kṛishṇa’s record of his 5th regnal year (A.D. 944) is found at Siddhalingamadjam in the South Arcot District, it is possible that he conquered the Chōlas soon after his accession to the throne and appointed the Vaidumbha chief Vikramāditya in the newly acquired territory. Not long after, Parāntaka I appears to have recovered the lost province from the Rāṣṭrākūṭas as a result of which the Vaidumbha Vikramāditya or his son Tiruvayya had to retreat to the Nolamba territory and take service under them. Kṛishṇa III, however, not brooking this reverse, led a huge army against the Chōlas in A.D. 947-48 and inflicted a crushing defeat on their king at Takkōlām. Parāntaka I must have repulsed the Rāṣṭrākūṭas from South Arcot within a few years after this event; for he is known to have issued a record in his 48th year (A.D. 955) as far north as Puṅganūr in the Chittoor District. But Kṛishṇa did not keep quiet. He again marched to the south and camped at Mēlpādi on the Pennār in A.D. 959 with the object of distributing his new acquisitions among his trusted servants. Accordingly we find Tiruvayya II as ruling over South Arcot in A.D. 961-62. From an inscription at Pālagiri which refers to an early Vaidumbha Mahārāja under Chalake-Nallāṭa Akālavarṣa Kṛishṇa (III), it may be surmised that the main line of the Vaidumbas con-
continued to hold the Cuddapah District in this period. This is supported by a charter of Vaidumba Mahārāja Bhuvanatrinīṭētra dated in Śaka 898 (A.D. 971) according to which the king was ruling the country from his palace at Pottappi in Pākānāḍu. After the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Vaidunbras were reduced to vassallage by the Chōlas as testified to by a record of Rājārāja I dated in his 14th regnal year (A.D. 928-99) and the Tiruvallal inscription of his 20th year (A.D. 1004-05) in which Nannamaraiyar son of Tukkarai belonging to the Vaidunbra family figures as the governor of Itgallir-nāḍu, in a district in Mahārājāvādi (Cuddapah District). The district of Mahārājāvādi remained in the Chōlas under Rājādhīrāja I also whose officer Rājendrachōla-Brahmanāraya was governing it in Śaka 970 from his capital Vallurū in the Cuddapah District. From the Pālagiri record of Śaka 978 mentioned above, it is learnt that Vaidunbra Mahārāja Kaligetrinīṭētra Bhīma-Mahārāja, son of Madhujaka-Mahārāja did not acknowledge a suzerain power while making the gift which probably indicates that he attempted to declare independence during the troubled period consequent upon the warfare between the Chalukyas and Chōlas in the 11th century A.D. This is the latest known date for the Vaidunbra chiefs and the history of the family in the subsequent period remains to be cleared up by future discoveries.

Of the localities mentioned in the records proper, Sōremaṭi cannot be identified. It must be located in the Nojamba territory adjoining Madanapalle since Vaidunbra and Bāna are stated to have laid siege to it. Mudumaduṇuva which was one of the scenes of the Sōremaṭi battle may be identified with Mudimaṇḍu in the Anantapur District. Velugagungūṭa is modern Veligallu in the Chittoor District where the inscription C was found. Rānagūṭa-seven-thousand comprised a major part of the modern Cuddapah and Kurnool Districts.

**TEXT of A.**

1. Svāstaṁ-anēka-samarāṁ-rs-samighaṭṭan-ū-
2. palobhaṁ-labhhaṁ-jayaṁ-lakṣmiṁ-samālingita-vakshaṁ-
3. staṁ-sthaṁla Gāndatre(triṇētra-srī-B)ayunbra-Mā(Mā)-
4. hārājaṁ puṣṭiṁ-thīvṛ-rājaṁ-gye(yye)
5. Mahārājaruṁ Bāparasamur Sōremaṭi koṭṭheh(koṭṭhe)
6. yit-talli Nojambī Daḍgarm Rācharāvallī[īṁ]
7. Mayindaṁ Gaṇḍigegu[īla] ēne-
8. haru samasta-balaṁ bhigṛ biṭṭo-
9. de go[la]-go[ttu] yit-talivali
10. ......yadoḍe valluṁ[ha]yvar-aṁsū
11. Pāvarā apāqark-Kare Punna-
12. ni-māṇi yirdu blīdan [i[^]

**TRANSLATION:**

(Lines 1-4) Hail! when the illustrious Vaidunbra-Mahārāja Gāndatreṇīṭētra whose breast was embraced by the goddess of victory obtained in several conflicts of battles, was ruling the earth,

---

1 An. Rep. on S. I. Epigraphy for 1935-36, C. P. No. 7. See also No. 323 of 1905 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection bearing the date Śaka 894 which records the coronation of this chief. Recently a record at Animals (Kamalapuram thank, Cuddapah District) has been discovered which is dated in Śaka 898 and belongs to Vaidunbra Iriyaga-Mahārāja.
5 From ink impression.

---

No. 323 of 1935-36.
6 Read inibaru.
(Ll. 5-9) the Mahārāja and Bānarasa having attacked (yuddha-to hit) the fort of Sōremati, Nojarbi, Daḍiga, Rāchamalla, Mayindaqi and Gunḍige-guḷaḷa—all these having camped with all their armies,—offered battle (gola-gotṛa) and destroyed (the enemies), after an attack, (Ll. 10-12) Kāre Punnapi-Māni elder brother of......Pārva..........pierced (the foes) and fell.

TEXT of B.¹

1 Svasti śrī[śrī] [**] Svasty-anēka-samara-saṅga.-²
2 ṭan-śopalahda(bṛha)-jaya-lakshmi-samā.-
3 lingita-vaksha-tala² Kāṇḍatrinē.-⁴
4 tra Vaydumba-Mahārājula-Mu-
5 ṭamale Dōchayya mānisi
6 yemmakāla meresi prabhū-
7 Chelvunru Mā(Ma)hārājulayu
8 Nojombiyu Sōremaṭi
9 kayambuna meresi prabhū
10 Chelvunru Nojombi-vāgū(ṇ)u tā-
11 nki(nki) poḍichī [vīra-lōj]ā..pōye [**]

TRANSLATION.

(Lines 1-3) Usual praśasti of Vaidumbha chiefs,
(Ll. 4-11) Servant(mānisi) Dōchayya of Muṭlamale of Vaidumbha-Mahārāja Gaṅda-

TEXT of C.⁶

1 Svasty-anēka-samara.-saṅgasṭṭan-śopalahda(bṛha)-jaya(ṛa)-la
2 kṣhimm(kṣhimi)-sama(mā)liṅgita-[vo](ṛa)ksaha-stala⁸ Gaṅda-Tre(trinētra [śrī]-Baiy-
dumbā²-Mahā-
3 ra(ṛa)ju Rēṇāṇḍ-śulu-vēḷum(vēḷum)-śluchu(śluchu)m Nojambī-tōli kayyahbu[na] Mudumāduvuṇa
4 pōṭuna Maharaju (Mahāruju) Chantamāna-Daṇqi vadhimchina paṇqi gaṇṭi paḍa(dāl)iṃ-⁵
5 [la]m-boḍiche Kō[ṛa]-Dēśimgambhu(Dēśimgambhu) ċlina rēnikin-edarayna Gaṅda-
Tre(trinētraṇi)
6... raṇa[rṇu] [**] urbbiyol[=.sakalado]orbbane gaṇḍan śrī-Chantaman-entum=ol[p]i[je]-

¹ From ink-impresion.
² Read sathaka.
⁴ Read Gaṅḍa.
² The meaning of this word is not clear. Can Tammakāla be taken as the name of the servant of Dōchayya (Dōchayya-mānisi) ? In this case it would be this Yemmakāla who distinguished himself (in battle) as stated in line 6.
⁸ From ink-impresion.
⁶ Read saṅghaṭṭaṃ.
⁷ Read Vaidumbha.
TRANSLATION.

(Lines 1-5) Hail! When the illustrious Vaidumba-Mahārāja Gaṇḍatrīṇētra (with the usual praṣasti) was ruling over Renāṇḍu-seven-thousand, having seen the act of the Mahārāja killing Chantamāna-Dādi in a conflict (paṭu) at Murumāduva during the fight with Noḷamb, Kōra-Dēśingambru attacked the generals (padāveḷam) of Gaṇḍatrīṇētra, who had opposed the king that ruled over him.

(Li. 6-14) Chantamāna (was) the only hero in the whole earth, a receptacle (ācchany) of goodness (oppu), was more valorous than the sons of Gonti (Kunti), a Suḍraka in prowess (?) (or in possessing a strong army), was the only ācchārya (teacher or master) to one who should steal the front (of battle) after having attacked with great force [lit. raising shouts (dhani) as in deluge (?), who knew (to carry out or stick to) his determination, who would (aspire to) rule and who conferred gifts (upon supplicants). Hence he was the hero among persons of great value, who defeated (lit. threw down) the hero among the chiefs (manava-manneya), destroyed (odd-āl) the biruda of titled persons who would stretch their head, i.e., come forward (?). (peyeyam beḷopa), was the master to the brave favourites who were the lords of the lady that . . . . . of the fallen Bhagadatta. (He) was the ācchārya-puruṣa, who did not appreciate the conduct (lit. method) of those that attacked without losing themselves, twisted down (i.e., killed) those that were back-bites (pamapa), crookedness, and scattered away and mocked at those that obtained reward (muyvam) from (this (?) Nandīdeva), without making gifts, piercing (in battles) and speaking truth.

(Li. 14-16) Therefore Kōra-Dēśinga the income of birāḍa (tax), bounetax (1) (acruval) in the village of Vēngungunṭā and whatever (ent-ayiss) viṣaya-sriika (tax from the district) was available. Whoever comes crookedly to this (gift) . . . . .

Written by Śrīkaṭhadeva-ācchārya(ryya).

1 Read: auṃga. 2 Read: ācchārya. 3 Who this Nandīdeva was cannot be ascertained.
No. 27.—SEVEN BRAHMI INSCRIPTIONS FROM MATHURA AND ITS VICINITY.

BY PROFESSOR H. LÜDERS, BERLIN.

I.—The Mōrā Well Inscription.

Mōrā is a small village 7 miles west of Mathurā City and 2 miles to the north of the road leading from Mathurā to Gōvardhan. In 1882 General Cunningham discovered there a large inscribed slab which formed part of the terrace of an ancient well. In 1908 Dr. Vogel had the slab removed to the Mathurā Museum under supervision of Pandit Radha Krishna. A transcript and a facsimile of the inscription were published by Cunningham, ASR, Vol. XX (1885), p. 49 and Plate V, No. 4. At that time the inscription was already fragmentary, more than half of it having peeled away on the right side, but it has since become much more damaged. It was edited again by Vogel, Cat. Arch. Mus. Mathurā p. 184, No. Q1. His transcript was reprinted, with a photolithograph of the inscription in its present state, by Ramaprasad Chanda, MASI, No. 1 (1919), p. 22, and Plate VI, No. 5, and an attempt to correct the reading of the second line of the inscription was made by the same scholar in MASI, No. 5 (1920), p. 166f. The inscription was carefully engraved in 'archaic' characters and Cunningham's transcript and facsimile are apparently in the main correct. The following text is therefore based on them with such corrections as are warranted by a new impression or suggested by general considerations. In the notes I have stated the readings of the impression, of Cunningham's facsimile, of his transcript and of Vogel's transcript.¹ I think that this rather minute treatment is justified by the importance of the inscription.

TEXT.

1 अ mahākṣatrapasa Rājūvulaṣa putrasa svāmī.............
2 bhagavataḥ Vrīskūnā[m] pañcāhavirāṇāṁ pratimā[h] āśīlaṅdevagri....................
3 ya[a]-To[ṣa(y)āh] sa[la]-āḥ śrīmaat-griha-ātulam-udadhasamadhārā............
4 āreha-deśāṁ sa[la]-āṁ pañchā jvalata iva paramavapuṣā....................

NOTES.

Line 1.

Impression : mahākṣat[r]a[ps]
C.'s transcript : Mahākṣatrapasa Rajūvulaṣa putrāsa Svāmī Vā-(Vi)
Vogel : Mahākṣatrapasa Rājūvulaṣa putra

As regards the same of the mahākṣatrapa Cunningham's facsimile is certainly more trustworthy than his transcript. In the facsimile the pu of putrāsa shows at the top some strokes which might be taken as the sign for au, but as the u-stroke at the bottom of the letter is quite distinct, putrāsa must be considered the correct reading. The last word svāmī is based only on Cunningham's transcript, the facsimile showing only the subscript va. But svāmī is exactly what we should expect. Rājūvula's son was Śoḍāsā, who in the Mathurā inscriptions Nos. 59 and 82 of my List and in the Mathurā pillar inscription edited below is styled svāmī mahākṣatrapa. I have therefore no doubt that Cunningham's transcript is correct as far as svāmī is concerned and that the original reading was svāmis (or possibly svāmi)-mahākṣatrapa.

¹ In Vogel's transcript the portions enclosed within round brackets have been taken from Cunningham's facsimile.

² The numbers of inscriptions quoted in the following pages always refer to my List of Brahmi Inscriptions.
I.—The Mora Well Inscription.

II.—Inscription on the pedestal of a female statue from Mora.

III.—Inscription on a sculptured stone slab from Mathura.

IV.—Inscription on a sculptured stone slab from Mathura.

SCALE: ONE-THIRD.

SCALE: ONE-THIRD.

SCALE: ONE-FIFTH.

SURVEY OF INDIA, CALCUTTA.
VII.—Inscription on a door-punj from Mathura.

V.—Inscription on the pedestal of an image from Ganeshra.

VI.—Inscription on the base of a male figure from Mathura.
Line 2.
Impression: bhagavataṁ Vṛṣaśāsun[a]. . . [cha]
C.'s facsimile: bhagavā Vṛṣṇi nā pančavirāyam pratimā(h) śaiva dev. gṛi
C.'s transcript: Bhagavāta Vṛṣṇiṇa panca Vairānāṁ pratimu Sāula trea-gra
Vogel: Bhagavatā Vṛṣṇiṇa panca Vairānāṁ -pratimā saiva devaragro"

The anuvāra of bhagavatāṁ is perfectly clear in the impression, and so is the ī of Vṛṣṇi-
nāṁ, although it has a peculiar form. The two strokes denoting the long ī are both turned to the
left to avoid their running into the ṣa ṣa hanging down from the first line. Similarly in the next
word pančavirāyam the two limbs of the ī-sign are drawn wide asunder on account of the long-
tailed ō standing in the first line just over the ī. The anuvāra of Vṛṣṇiṇāṁ has not been noted
by Cunningham and is not visible in the impression on account of a fissure in the stone, but
it was no doubt originally engraved. The reading bhagavato Vṛṣṇeḥ proposed by Ramaprasad
Chanda is impossible. Between pratimā, which is quite distinct in the facsimile, and the following
word the intervening space is rather large, and the original reading was apparently pratimāḥ.

A trace of the lower dot of the visarga is even visible in the facsimile. The last word is not quite
distinct in the facsimile, the la lacking the long vertical and the va showing a small appendix at
the bottom which makes it look like va, but as Cunningham in his transcript renders the two
letters as la and va and as the third letter clearly is the same as the third letter of the fourth line,
the reading sailaśevagrī is practically certain, and the word is to be restored to sailaśevagrihe.

Line 3.
Impression: ya. to[shā]yāḥ śaivaś[ris]va
C.'s transcript: Yasto Śāyāḥ Śailam Śri nad graha mātula mudhāsa mudhāra
Vogel: yataśhayā h[asa] (śrimadhgrahamātula muda-dhara)

Cunningham's transcript of the first two words is probably correct, although his reading of
the second and third aksharas cannot be verified completely from the impression. Instead of the
a of sto there is at present little more than a square hole, but traces of the hook to the left of the
letter are visible, and I consider the reading sto as certain. The śa is much damaged and the
sign of the long ā is indistinct, but, as we shall see later on, the length of the vowel is confirmed by
the metre and Cunningham's reading may therefore be taken as correct. The visarga, of which the
lower dot only is indicated in the facsimile, is quite distinct in the impression. The next four words
are perfectly clear in the facsimile. The facsimile has śrimad, but the long ī is visible in the im-
pression. The last words are uncertain. I can give only Cunningham's reading with the second
and third syllables corrected from the facsimile. Udatāḥi would seem to be an obvious emenda-
tion of udatāha, but the word does not fit well into the context.

Line 4.
Impression: ārčadeśāṁ saīlāṁ panča jvalata [i]va po[ramavapusha], but the last five
aksharas are only faintly visible.
C.'s facsimile: ārčadeśāṁ saīlāṁ pachā jvalata iva paramavitapusha
C.'s transcript: Arca deśām Saīlam panca jvalata ieva parama Vapesa
Vogel: arcā dolah saīlāṁ pachajvalata ievā parama vapuska

All readings divergent from the text derived from the impression are faulty.

Too much is lost of the text to fill up conjecturally the gaps. The extant words may be
translated as follows:
TRANSLATION.

(1) Of the son of mahākṣhatrapa Rājyula, svāmin
(2) The images of the holy pañcavirūpā of the Vrīshnis, the stone shrine
(3) Who the magnificent matchless stone house of Tosah
(4) The five objects of adoration made of stone radiant, as it were, with highest beauty

REMARKS.

As remarked already in the notes on the text, it is most probably the svāmin mahākṣhatrapa Sodāsa who was mentioned in the first line, and the record has therefore to be dated in his reign, which perfectly agrees with the paleography of the inscription. I consider it also probable that the words preserved of the first line belong to the date. It will be noticed that there is a marked contrast between the first line and the rest of the inscription as far as the language is concerned. Whereas the first line shows the popular language, the following three lines are apparently in pure Sanskrit. This strange diversity would seem to be best accounted for by assuming that the author of the inscription, even when writing in Sanskrit, for the date used the language customary in the documents of the time.

From the second line it appears that the inscription recorded the setting up of five images representing the holy pañcavirūpā of the Vrīshnis in a stone temple. Pañcavirūpāḥnādly means simply 'of five heroes', which at any rate in correct Sanskrit would be pañcavirūpāṁ virāyam. Pañcavirūpāḥ would rather seem to denote a fixed group or body. In this sense the word occurs in the Daśakumāracharita, where the meeting or the meeting-house used by a gaṇi for her musical performances is called pañcavirūpōgosthā: Kumāramānjarīḥ saśā dāvīyāci Rāgumānjarī nāma pañcavirūpōgosthe samāyakaman anuṣṭhāyati (ed. K. P. Parab, p. 96). In commenting on the passage Kavindrarasavati gives the meaning of the word the Kossāra: tat pañcavirūpōgostham tu yat tu jānupadānam sadaḥ. Pañcavirā, therefore, would seem to be the designation of some administrative body, perhaps equivalent to the modern pañcāyat, but, as far as I am aware, no such body is mentioned in the Epi in connection with the Vrīshnis. When some time ago I was reading the inscription with Dr. Alsford, I asked him if the term might perhaps be found in the Jain scriptures, and he promptly favoured me with the following note:

"In the canonical writings of the Jainas, there occurs what might be called a statistics of the subjects ruled by Kriṣṇa Vāsadeva at Dvārakā. In the first chapter of the Antakaṇḍadaṇī it reads as follows: tathā yaṁ Bāravaṁ nayakar Kauha nāma, Vāsudeva rāgū pariwarā ... se yaṁ tatha Samudddvajyapāmokkhaṁyas dasaśaṁ Dvārakāya, Baladevaṁpokkhaṁ pañcavirān, Pajjumapāmokkhaṁ adhaśītāya kumārakośarīṇ, Sambapāmokkhaṁ saśītāya duddantāśāntayā, Mahāsaigpāmokkhaṁ, chhapawśće balavāyāśāsīyā, Virasaigpāmokkhaṁ evaśāe viraśāsīyā, Ugasaigpāmokkhaṁ saśāyānān rāyāśāsīyā, Rupipaigpāmokkhaṁ saśāyānān deshāśāsīyā, Apanasaigpāmokkhaṁ apanāān gaśiyāśāsīyā, annuvati cha bahuvāṁ idaṁ āyaḥ saḥthāvāhāyaṁ Bāravaṁ nayakar adha-Bharāhāsaṁ ya samātthaṁ āveṣchāyaṁ jaiā vihāyāvāṁ."

For those who are not too familiar with Jaina Prakrit, I add the translation of Barnett:

"In this city of Bāravā dwelt King Vāsadēva, high Kauhē, ... Here he held sway over Samuddavijāya and the rest of the ten Dasāras, over Baladeva and the rest of the five great heroes, over Pajjuna and the rest of the three and a half erores of princes, over Sambē and the

1 Perhaps khamvatāṁ is to be construed with Vrīshnisāṁ.
2 I omit the obscure words adāhāsamaddhāra.
3 The quotation is given also, without stating its source, in Śivarāma's commentary and in the Lāhūdāpīka.
rest of the 60,000 fighting men, over Mahāśena and the rest of the 56,000 mighty men, over Virasena and the rest of the 21,000 warriors, over Uggasena and the rest of the 16,000 kings, over Ruppin and the rest of the 16,000 queens, over Aṃgaśena and the rest of the many thousands of courtesans, and over many kings, princes, barons, [prefects, mayors, bankers, traders, captains,] merchants, and others, over the city of Bāravāli and the whole of the southern half of Bhārāha-viśe.\(^1\)

In the sixteenth chapter of the Nāyādhammakahā, we are told how King Drupada sends a messenger to Dvāravatī and commands him to invite to the veyamāvarī of his daughter Draupadi "Kauhān Vāsudeva, Samuddavijayāpāmokkhe dava Dāśāra. Baladevapāmokkhe pañcha mahāvire . . . . . ." The list which follows agrees verbatim with that of the Antaraśadasā, merely omitting the queens and courtesans, inserting Uggasena between Baladeva and Pajiuna, and inverting the order of Mahāśena and Virasena. A third version found in the Vāghidasā is also practically identical.

There can hardly be an doubt that the Baladevapāmokkhe pañcha mahāvīra included in the canonical list are identical with the holy paśchaviras of the Vrishnis mentioned in the Mūra inscription, but sought for in vain in Brahmanical literature.

The question now arises: who are the other four mahāvīra besides Baladeva? The canonical list, though it does not give us their names, yet furnishes at least some negative clue for their identification, because it clearly excludes from their number several of the most prominent Vrishnis known to Jaina tradition, viz., Kṛishna, the ten Daśāras (including Vāsudeva), Pradyumna, Śambha, Ugrasena, Mahāśena, and Virasena. We must obviously look for four names, other than those just mentioned, which must be equally well known to the Jinas and the Brahmins. Further, considering that Baladeva, the leader of the group, is the eldest son of Vāsudeva, the conjecture is perhaps not too far-fetched that the other four mahāvīra might be looked for among the brothers, or half-brothers, of Baladeva. Now the Jaina Hari-varṇapurāṇa gives a long list of Yādava princes who, under Kṛishna's command, took the field against Jarāsandha; the list is found, in almost identical form, in Jinasena's Hari-varṇapurāṇa (48, 38-74) and in Hemachandra's Trīṣhaṭṭīdala-kāpurusbhakacitra (VIII, 7, 155-193). In this list no less than 47 sons of Vāsudeva are enumerated. This great number is easily accounted for by the fact that Vāsudeva has taken the place of Nārāyana-matadatta in the Jaina version of the Bṛihākathā, the so-called Vāsudeva-sūtra, which forms also part of the Hari-varṇapurāṇa. Just like his Brahmanical counterpart, Vāsudeva during his "kṛiṣṇa" wins 26 consorts, and the Jinas apparently thought fit that with each, or at least most of them, he should beget one or more sons. The list of the Harivānśapurāṇa accordingly distributes the 47 sons among 23 mothers. Under these circumstances, it stands to reason that most of those 47 names are secondary Jain inventions not likely to be met with in Brahmanical literature. As a matter of fact, almost all of them are either purely fantastic or, if they do occur in Brahmanical texts, their bearers are certainly no Vrishnis. The only exceptions to this—apart, of course, from Kṛishna and Baladeva—are four names, viz., Akrūra, Anāḍhjarotī, Ṣāruṇa, and Vidrāratha. These four are well-known Vrishni princes expressly denoted as such in the Mahābhārata.\(^2\)

That the Harivānśapurāṇa list of Vāsudeva's sons should include, besides Kṛishna, Baladeva and neither more nor less than just four younger brothers of his who are recognised as Vrishni princes in the Mahābhārata is no doubt a very remarkable coincidence. It can certainly not be regarded as a cogent evidence, yet I think we may feel justified in assuming that the "five great


\(^2\) Vide Sūryana's Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata.
heroes" of the canonical list, and therefore probably also the "five heroes of the Vishnu" worshipped in the temple at Móra, were Baladeva, Akrūra, Anādrāsth, Sārāpa, and Vidūratha."

In the following lines the stone-house (śailān griham), of course, cannot be anything else but the stone-temple (śailadeva griha) mentioned before, and the śailādēsaśailān panichā must refer to the five images of the Vishnu. I take śailādēsa as a compound of śaila 'adoration' and deśa as used here in the sense that in later literature is conveyed by the synonyms ādāpa, pada, sthāna. The lengthening of the initial a before r followed by a consonant found in śaila seems to be a peculiarity of the Mathurā dialect; compare the frequent spelling ārha, ārhat, ārhaṇa, ārhaṇa in Mathurā inscriptions of the Kushān period and ārthasiddhāye, ārthākshu in the manuscript of the Buddhist dramas dating from the same time. That ārha was used with special reference to the worship of images is shown by the fact that the word in course of time assumed the meaning 'image of a god'; cf. ārghnaśīky-ārha, tūṅgaṇaśīky-ārha, Mahābhāṣya 2.222,18; Mauvyair-hīndugādyār-hār-ārha prakūpyitā, ibid. 2.429,3; ābhayaṁ tiṣṭe-rūpaṁ Śambhu-ār-aṅguṇa bhopala pūnāḥ quoted in the commentary on Mahābhāṣya 138.

In the Kośas ārha is quoted among the words for image (pratimā); Am. 2,10,36; Hal. 1,131, Hem. 1463, An. 2,54; Vaiy. 220,1. Grammatically śailādēsaśailān panichā is acc. plur. agreeing with ājataḥ. The spelling with the anusvāra instead of n is not only quite common in the Central Asian manuscripts of the canon of the Sarvāstivādins, but occurs also in the manuscript of the Buddhist dramas and in the manuscript of the Kalpaśārvāṇaśūśa written in early Gupta script.

Little as is left of the last two lines, the language of this portion of the inscription will strike the reader as being unusual in a donative record. An expression such as ājataṁ ēva paramāsya-pūśā sounds like poetry. Now an examination of the two lines shows that both of them begin like a Bhujanevintihāyika the scheme of which is — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — in the quarter. Even the doubtful word udayaṁsāna-dhāra conforms to it in Cunningham's reading. That this was really the metre in which the two lines were composed can be shown also in a different way. The writing preserved in line 4 which consists of 19 akṣaras fills about 11 1/2. A hemistic of 52 akṣaras would fill about 27, and allowing 3' or 4' for the blank at the beginning and at the end of the line and between the two quarters of the hemistic, we arrive at a total length of 2' 10" or 2' 11" for the writing of one hemistic, which agrees exactly with Dr. Vogel's statement that the width of the slab is 2' 11". It is thus proved that the stanza was engraved in hemistiches. Our inscription is the earliest of this mode of writing verses which prevailed in the ornamental inscriptions on pillars and slabs until about the middle of the fifth century A.D. and occasionally occurs still in later times. As far as I know, it is never found in copper plates, but it was practised

---

1 See Nos. 78; 102; 105; 110 of my List of Brahmi Inscriptions.
2 Bruchstücke buddhistischer Drachen, p. 31. The lengthening bears an analogy to the lengthening of the initial a followed by n in the Mathurā inscriptions; see āđēnai, āđēnaiśi in Nos. 93; 99.
3 Loc. cit. p. 31; ḍhogaṇiḥ, and even ḍrīvyaṁ (for ārāvyaṁ) pūṣaṁ.
4 Bruchstücke der Kalpaśārvāṇaśūśa, p. 40; asūnaḥ, viśvam, paramāsyaśūśaṁśa kā.
5 Cf. Māhārāmū iron pillar inscription of Chandragupta (GL. No. 1); Āśra stone pillar inscription of Samudragupta (GL. No. 32); Allahābad pillar inscription of Samudragupta (GL. No. 32); Udayaṅgi cave inscription of the time of Chandragupta II. (GL. No. 6); Bilsā pillar inscription of the reign of Kumāragupta I. (GL. No. 10); Bihār pillar inscription of the time of Skandagupta (GL. No. 12); Kāhān pillar inscription of the reign of Skandagupta. (GL. No. 15); Barahār Hill cave inscription of Anantavarman (GL. No. 48); Nāgārjuna Hill cave inscriptions of the same (GL. Nos. 49 and 50); Mathurā image inscription of G. 135 (GL. No. 63); some of the Ajanta inscriptions A.S.W.I. Vol. IV, pp. 129 and 138. The earliest inscription showing verses in continuous writing seems to be the Gaṅgādhāra stone inscription of the time of Viśva-varman, probably dated in V. 480 (GL. No. 17). Of the three inscriptions at Mandaśe engraved by Govinda the two copies of the Praṣasti of King Yaśodharman (GL. Nos. 33 and 34) have the verses partitioned off, while the well inscription dated in V. 589 (GL. No. 35) is written in continuous lines.
sometimes also in manuscript writing as proved by a palm-leaf manuscript in Gupta characters unearthed in Eastern Turkestan.

The occurrence of this stanza is of considerable interest for the history of Sanskrit literature. The metre Bhurajyagrirjyabhita is found also in Kumāralaṁ's Kalpanāmanāditiṁka, but our inscription is about 200 years earlier than that work, and if here a most artificial metre such as Bhurajyagrirjyabhita is used for a Sanskrit stanza, it is proved that the Sanskrit Kāvyā poetry was fully developed in the first century B.C.

There is just enough left of the stanza to show that the first hemistich was mainly devoted to the praise of the stone temple where the five images were set up and that the beauty of the images themselves was extolled in the second half of the stanza. From the epithets conferred on the temple, even if they should be slightly overdrawn, we may infer that it was a remarkably fine building, but there is nothing to show that it was exclusively dedicated to the five Vrishnis. It is far more probable that it was a Bhāgavata temple where the five images were established. No trace of this temple has until now turned up at Mōrā. When in 1910 Pandit Radha Krishna examined the site, he found only a number of fragments of very large inscribed bricks from which Dr. Vogel was able to make out the legend: jīvaputāye rajabharyāye Brahmāsvāmita-[dhi]tu Yāmaṇāyāye kārtiṁ. As stated by Dr. Vogel, the characters of that inscription are those of the third or second century B.C., which is the approximate date also of King Bahasatimita who in all probability is identical with the Brahmāsvāmita of the brick legend. The bricks therefore must have belonged to a much earlier building than the stone temple spoken of in the inscription. The emphatic, twice repeated, statement that the temple was built of stone leads one to think that it was destined to replace the older brick building. We shall see later on that it is not impossible that a detached piece of the temple has been preserved at Mathurā in another place.

Although the stone temple has entirely disappeared, I think it very probable that some remnants of the five images have survived on the spot. When visiting the Mōrā site, Dr. Vogel noticed some fragments of stone images consisting of two torsos of standing male statues, the pedestal of a standing image of which only the feet remain, and the pedestal and lower half of a standing female statue. All the images are carved in the round. The two torsos are much alike. Both wear a dhott held to the loins with a girdle and a shawl tied round the legs. The main difference lies in the necklace. One wears a double necklace fastened in front by means of a clasp, the other a heavy single necklace tied in a knot at the back. On the pedestal of the female figure is a fragmentary inscription. The four images were transferred to the Mathurā Museum where they bear the numbers E 20-23.

When Dr. Vogel first announced his discovery, he suggested that the sculptures might be connected with the images mentioned in the inscription. Of course, his conjecture that the male figures represent those of the Pāṇḍava brothers and the female statue is an image of Draupadi is based on the wrong idea that the term pāṇchavirāh in the inscription refers to the Pāṇḍavas, and must be abandoned. The female statue must be left out of consideration altogether, at any rate, at present. We shall see later on in what relation it may possibly stand to the other images and the well inscription. For the rest, Dr. Vogel's suggestion is plausible enough. From the inscription we should expect to find at the site of Mōrā five remarkably fine statues originating from

1 Loc. cit., p. 55.
2 This is the correct reading, not Brāhmaśvāmita, as read by Vogel, ASI. AR. 1911-12 [Part II] (1915), p. 128, Plate LVIII, fig. 18.
3 JIAS. 1911, pp. 131f.; ASI. AR. 1911-12 [Part II] (1915), p. 127f. The two torsos are figured ibid. Plate LVII, fig. 12-15, the one with the double necklace also in Vogel, La Sculpture de Mathurā, Plate XLIII (Ars Asiatica, XV).
the time of Šodāsa and representing Bahadeva and four of his brothers or companions and therefore being probably much alike in appearance. There are actually found at Móra images of three male persons. The torsos of two of them show that they were very similar in attitude and dress and certainly represented not foreigners as, e.g., the three Māj statues, but some Hindu personages. They are, moreover, as far as I can judge from photograph, of superior workmanship and being carved in the round, cannot be ascribed to a later date than the Kushān period, but may be considerably earlier. The identity of the statues and the pañcavīras which thus becomes highly probable, would be finally established, if the fragments had been found in the ruins of the sañac-devavarāka, where, according to the inscription, the pañcavīras were set up. But, as already remarked above, there is no trace whatever of a stone temple. The images were found lying round about the remains of a building constructed of bricks, but I do not think that for this reason the identity of the statues and the pañcavīras is to be given up. There is no positive evidence that the statues were ever set up within that brick enclosure. It can be easily imagined that at the time when the temple was demolished and its materials were carried away, the statues also were cut up and thrown aside. Dr. Vogel himself seems to have changed his mind. He is now inclined to look at the statues as Yākṣa images. In my opinion, they have a better claim to be regarded as the images of the Viṣṇu heroes, although I admit that this view cannot be definitely proved at present.

There is still one point that requires elucidation, viz., the word Toshāya in line 3 of the inscription. I have stated already in the notes on the text that there is no reason to doubt the correctness of the reading. Judging from the context Toshāya can hardly be anything else but the genitive of Toshā dependent on the following gṛham. At first sight one would obviously understand 'the house of Toshā' as a shrine dedicated to a goddess called Toshā, but I am not aware that there ever existed a goddess of that name. Under these circumstances, Toshā can only be taken as the name of the lady who caused the shrine to be built. Just as we find here sañiam gṛham combined with the name of the founder in the genitive case, we have māhārājasya rājātīrājasya dēvapītrasya Hūrāshkasya, vahāre in the Mathurā inscription No. 62 of my List, or dāhārjasya Somatīrasya-deva-pītrasya Bhāgavata-pādopājyasya kundam uparyyā-bhāratasya kundam, eb-aparanom in the Tusān rock inscription (GI. No. 67). Toshā does not sound like an Indian name. It is quite probable that Toshā was of Iranian extraction, and there would be nothing strange about the fact, that she should have erected a Bhāgavata shrine as we know from the Heliodorus inscription at Bēṣānagār that foreigners were adherents of the Bhāgavata religion. We shall probably find the name of Toshā in a different spelling again in the following inscription.

II. — Inscription on the pedestal of a female statue from Móra.

The inscription is incised on the pedestal of a standing female figure which was discovered by Dr. Vogel at Móra together with the remnants of the three statues discussed above. The image is now in the Mathurā Museum. The inscription was edited by Vogel, Cat. Arch. Mus. Mathurā, p. 199, No. E 39. It is figured ASI, AR. 1911-12 [Part II], Plate LVIII, fig. 19.

1 Perhaps this statement has to be modified. Mr. V. S. Agravala writes: "I inspected the Móra sites with Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit in November 1906. . . . Dr. Lüders' remark that there is no positive evidence that the statues were ever set up within the brick enclosure does not seem to be grounded in fact. From actual inspection of the site we found that the images were set up at that very place, since there still exists in situ the stone pedestal in which the images were embedded. Mr. Devi Dayal took a photo of this part of the building and also measured the mortise cut into the stone which once received the image." It is not quite clear from this statement whether the five statues were all embedded in one pedestal and whether the measurement of the mortise can be shown to meet one of the Pañçavīra statues or perhaps that of the Toshā image.

2 Sculpture de Mathurā, p. 116.
TEXT.

1. ... sa[ya(?) kan(?) ka[ya(?) ... [r(?) ... [m(?) ... 
2. ... etasya (?) purvaye Ma[thuri kalvas[? o[ak[?i(?) ... 
3. ... ya To[s[hi] patim[ ... t(?) ... 

NOTES.

(1) Probably to be restored maha[r]a[ya]. (2) Vogel: [H]ue[ish]ka[ya]. The first akshara is distinctly ka. The vowel-sign of the second akshara has disappeared, but the matrika is distinctly na. The sh of shka and the sya are blurred, but certain. (3) Probably to be restored as sanvatsare. (4) Of the seven or eight aksharas following [r], only the lower half of ma is distinct. The akshara before ma seems to have contained a subscript ma, so that the original reading may have been something like grishman[a]. (5) Traces of two aksharas before etasya are still visible, but it is impossible to read them. (6) Vogel: mathurikelavd[ap]. The å-sign is not quite certain, but probable. The dot distinguishing the dental tha from tha is indistinct. The seventh letter is certainly da as read by Vogel, a similar form occurring in one of the Mañj. inscriptions, but there appears to be an å-sign attached to the letter. The reading of the last three aksharas is very uncertain. What Vogel reads as pu consists, as far as I see, of two letters. The first letter looks like an initial o, but in the middle of the vertical line of the letter there is a small horizontal stroke which might suggest to take the letter as au; it is, however, probably only accidental. The second letter, the lower portion of which has disappeared owing to an erosion of the stone, may have been da. The same erosion has destroyed also the body of the last akshara which may have been kha. Possibly one akshara is lost at the end of the line. (7) The last word also has become illegible on account of the peeling off of the stone with the exception of a subscript ta which must have belonged to the third letter of the word. The word is probably to be restored as patistapita; cf. pratistapita in No. 45*, pratistapenti in No. 149. The slanting stroke to the left of the ta seems to have been caused by the erosion of the stone.

REMARKS.

It is impossible to offer a connected translation of the inscription, too much of the text being lost to fill up the gaps even conjecturally.

As the date fills half of the text, the numbers of the year, the month and the day were apparently given in words, not in figures. The king’s name is distinctly Kanishka.

In the third line the only legible words are To[s[hi] patima after which probably patistapita is to be supplied. The meaning of the words may be either that an image was set up by Tośa or that an image of Tośa was set up. If Tośa were taken as the name of the donatrix, the object of the donation would here simply be called patima. However, this would be quite unusual. In no other inscription of this time1 pratima alone is used in this way, No. 68, where the second line ends with Janadis[e]ya pratima, being apparently incomplete. Everywhere the name of the person represented by the statue is added to pratima, sometimes compounded with it (Nos. 13, 23, 29, 37, 50, 51, 118, 121, perhaps also 72), but often in the genitive case (Nos. 18, 24, 26, 34, 43, 45, 45*, 47, 69*, 71, 110; in 74 bhagavato Varidhakamana pratima). Generally the same in the genitive precedes pratima: a different position of the words occurs only in No. 39 (dānām prā-

1 In later times pratima alone occurs occasionally, e.g. in the Matharā inscription of G. 113 edited by Bühlcr, Sp. Ind., Vol. II, p. 210, No. 39.
timā Vadhamanasya), No. 119 (pratimā pratihāpita Vardhamaṇasya) and apparently in No. 68 quoted above. It is therefore not only possible, but even more likely that Toṣāye pratimā means 'the image of Toṣā'. Unfortunately the upper half of the statue is lost, and what remains of it is not sufficient to determine exactly the character of the person represented. All that can be said is that it is a woman as shown by the anklets and that she wears a folded cloth with one end tucked up in the waist-belt and the other slung over the left arm. This seems to have been the costume of a fashionable lady of that time. Exactly the same dress is worn by the female worshippers on a door-jamb in the Mathurā Museum (P2)1; cf. especially the figure in the upper compartment. There is absolutely nothing to show that the statue was meant for a goddess or a Yakṣi or a Nāga woman. Nor do we know of any goddess of the name of Toṣā. Now, considering that the image which according to the inscription probably represents a lady called Toṣā has been found together with the remnants of three statues which probably are mentioned in the well inscription as having been set up in the stone house of Toṣā, we can hardly reject the idea that Toṣā and Toṣāh refer to the same person. The difference in the spelling of the name cannot be regarded as a serious obstacle to the identification as the name appears to be of foreign origin and, moreover, we have even in Sanskrit kūṣma by the side of kūsha, keśha by the side of kōṣa, etc. There can be no doubt that the well inscription is about a century older than the statue inscription; it shows the 'archaic' writing that is found in all other records of the time of Śoḍāsā, whereas the statue inscription is dated in the reign of Kausikā and written in the typical clumsy characters of that period. As Toṣā cannot have set up a statue during the reign of Kausikā, if her shrine was already in existence at the time of Śoḍāsā, the identification of Toṣā and Toṣāh would definitely prove that Toṣāye pratimā means 'the image of Toṣā'. On the other hand, we should be compelled to assume that somebody erected the statue of Toṣā at her shrine about a hundred years after her death. Such a posthumous honouring by one of her descendants would not seem to be impossible, if we remember that probably a statue of Vima Kadphises was set up at Māt some time after his death, but I admit that the evidence for the identity of Toṣā and Toṣāh is not much more than a chain of possibilities or probabilities that requires substantial strengthening before it can be regarded as conclusive.

The second line of the inscription affords no help in this respect. Māthuri kālavāḍā probably means 'the wife of the kālavāḍa of Mathurā', although the formation of the second word is unusual. In analogy to such derivations as sārthavāhī from sārthavāha, we should expect rather kālavāḍi. As will appear from the following two inscriptions, kālavāḍa or kālavāḍa was the title of a high official at Mathurā. Owing to the large lacuna of the text in the beginning of the third line, it is impossible to decide whether Māthuri kālavāḍa refers to the person who erected the statue of Toṣā or to Toṣā herself. Nor can I suggest anything with regard to the meaning of the following three syllables which I have tentatively read adakhi.

III. — Inscription on a sculptured stone-slab from Mathurā.

This inscription is engraved on a sculptured stone-slab from the Kanakā Ṭīlā at Mathurā, now preserved in the Lucknow Provincial Museum. The slab is figured in V. A. Smith's Jain Stūpas at Mathurā (ASI. New Imp. Ser., Vol. XX), Plate XIII. The inscription was edited by Bühler, Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 396, No. 33, and Plate, and commented on ibid. p. 393I. Fleet made it the subject of a learned paper, JRAS. 1905, pp. 635-655, and R. D. Banerji treated it briefly, Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXVII, p. 49.

1 Vogel, Cat. Arch. Mus. Mathurā, p. 173, and Plate IIb; Sculpture de Mathurā, Plate XXIIb.
The inscription which is written in the script preceding that of the Kushān period was read and translated by Bühler as follows:

1. [nā]mo arahato Vardhamānaśya Gotiputrasa Pothayaśaka-
2. kālavājasa
3. . . . . . 1 Kośikiye Śimitrāye śvāgapato pra.i . . . . . . 4

Adoration to the Arhat Vardhamāna! A tablet of homage was set up by Śivamitrā (of) the Kausika (family), (wife) of Gotiputra (Guptiputra), a black serpent for the Pothayas and Śakas.’’

Gotiputra’s epithet was explained by Bühler as referring to his fights with the Pothayas and Śakas, in which he proved to them as destructive as the black cobra is to mankind in general. The Pothayas he identified with the Proshthas, who are mentioned in the Mahābhārata as a nation of Southern India. Fleet, although agreeing with Bühler in the reading and the literal translation of the epithet, tried to show at great length that by the Śakas were meant the Buddhists and by the Pothayas the Digambara Jaines and that Gotiputra, who himself was a Śvetāmbara Jain, was marked in the record as being particularly successful in dispute with adherents of those rival creeds.

Many grave objections may be raised against these interpretations, but I deem it unnecessary to enter into a detailed discussion, as in my opinion they are untenable, or at least highly improbable, already for general reasons. An epithet with the meaning assumed by Bühler and Fleet is against the style of these dedicatory inscriptions, which in a formulary language record facts, but refrain from rhetorical embellishments taken from the language of the Kāyasas. Secondly, although metronymics are sometimes used instead of personal names, especially in the case of Buddhist saints, I consider it extremely unlikely that in an inscription like this one a private individual should have been called simply by his metronymic. It is far more probable that just as in innumerable other cases the metronymic was followed by the personal name, and there is no reason why Pothayaśaka should not be taken as a name formed by compounding the abbreviated form of the asterism Proshthapada and yasas, or rather their Prakrit equivalents, and adding the suffix -ka. Personal names the first member of which is the name of a nakṣatra are very common in the period to which the inscription belongs. Potha itself occurs in Pothaghoṣha in the Mathurā inscription No. 59, Pothadeva in the Sāndhi inscription No. 205 and the hypocoristic form Pothaka in the Sāndhi inscription No. 342. For yasas as the second member of a compound name we have in epigraphical records Kriṣṇaḥyaśa in the Kanihāra inscription No. 8, Dhamayaśa (fem.) in the Sāndhi inscription 410, Śivayaśa (fem.) and Phaguyaśa in the Mathurā inscription No. 100 and Bhadrayāśa in the Mathurā inscription No. 107. As Phagu is a shortened form of Phalq'un and Bhadra an abbreviation of Bhadravatā, the last two names are almost exact counterparts of Pothayaśaka in our inscription.

If we take Pothayaśaka as the name of the husband of Śimitrā, we are driven to the conclusion that the original reading was Pothayaśakasa and that kālavājasa is an independent word characterising Pothayaśaka somehow or other. I think that this is fully confirmed by an examination of the outward appearance of the inscription.

The inscription is damaged both at the beginning and at the end. On the left side a piece of the stone is broken off, which has caused the partial loss of the na in the beginning of the upper line and the complete disappearance of three akṣaras in the beginning of the lower line. Here

---

1. Restore bhārapāya.
2. Read Śivamitrāye.
3. [Bühler: sāgapato (misprint),]
4. Restore pratiṣñāṭapāta.
certainly, as proposed by Bühler, some word like bhāryāye has to be supplied. How much of the text is lost on the right side can be determined from the last word of the last line. There can be no doubt that pra.ś is to be restored as pra(t)ī(thāpto) and that this was the concluding word of the record. The pra stands exactly below the tha of the first line, and as the inscription is very carefully engraved, it may be taken for granted that the tha also was followed by four akāharas, which perfectly agrees with my suggestion that sa has to be supplied after Poṭhayāśaka. There is another point to prove that the text read Poṭhayāśaka(sa bhāryāye). A glance at the inscription will be sufficient to show that originally it consisted of two lines only, and that kālavālāsa has been inserted by an afterthought below Poṭhayāśakasa. The word has been engraved in much smaller characters than the rest of the inscription, the kā being only 1/2" high, the vā only 1/2", whereas the second ka of Kośikiye measures 1 1/2" and the va of Vardhamānasya 3/4". And there is another unmistakable sign that it was incaused after the other two lines had been finished. It will be noticed that the sa is separated by a considerable space from the preceding letter, which can be accounted for only by the wish of the engraver to avoid the contact of the sa with the i-sign of ś standing in the line below.1

1 therefore read and translate the inscription as follows:

**TEXT.**

1 [na]mo arahato Vardhamānasya Gotiputra[a] Poṭhayāśa[ka] (sa)
kālavālāsa
2 (bhāryāye) Kośikiye Śimitrāye āyāgapāto pra(t)ī(thāpto)

**TRANSLATION.**

Adoration to the Arhat Vardhamāna! The tablet of homage has been set up by the Kośiki (Kośiki) Śimitrā, (the wife) of the kālavāla Poṭhayāśaka (Poṣṭhayāśaka), the son of a Goti (Gauḍi).

**REMARKS.**

The exact meaning of kālavāla is not known. The word does not seem to have turned up hitherto in literary sources. Bühler was of opinion that both Śimitrā and her husband were shown by their family names to be of noble or royal descent. But this conclusion goes too far. The use of metonymies was by no means confined to the Khaṣṭriya caste. Fleet, loc. cit. p. 637f., has collected a large number of cases where the names of Brahmans also and sometimes of persons who seem to be neither Brahmans nor Khaṣṭriyas are coupled with the same metonymies that we find in connection with the names of princes and noblemen. So much only is certain that a man who attaches the metonymic to his name is a person of high social standing. From the fact that Gotiputra Poṭhayāśaka is called kālavāla we may infer that the word denoted some dignitary or high official. From our inscription it appears that the title was...

---

1 The photolithograph published in *Ep. Ind.* has been tampered with. Here the upper portion of the i-sign has been joined to the ja and in this form, which has never existed, the ja has been entered on Plate II. XX, 41 of Bühler's *Palaeography.*

2 The etymology of the name is not clear. Bühler's correction to ŚiṣNatā is hazardous and hardly correct. Not can the name be traced back to Śrijātā as Skt. iśri would have to appear as iśri.

3 Kālavāla, of course, cannot be connected with kālayā giála, kālayā (Mahāyā. 186, 109), which denotes a distiller or seller of spirits, the modern kālayar or kālā. Possibly kāla, which in the Kharoshthi documents from Eastern Turkestan occurs frequently as a very high title, is an abbreviation of kālavāla, but it cannot be proved at present. Professor Thomas, *Fasciculi H. Jacobii,* p. 51, thinks that kāla is the same word as kāra in Kujula Kara Kadphises, but this suggestion also is not convincing.
in use already before the time of the Kushānas, and this is confirmed by its occurrence in the inscriptions on the first Stūpa at Sānchi. No. 340 of Bühler’s collection reads Vedasa Datasana kalavāsasa dānam. There is a second copy (No. 339) which differs only in the writing of the first word: Vedasa Datasana kalavāsasa dānam. A third inscription (No. 195) was read by Bühler Datasana kalavāsasa dānam. Bühler identified this inscription with Cunningham’s No. 172 which Cunningham himself, in accordance with his facsimile, transcribed Datasaka kalavāsasa dānam. There can be little doubt that here also the true reading is Datasaka kalavāsasa. The word is found once more in the Vakāla inscription, No. 971 of my List: Koja kalavāsasa. Kalavāda and kalavāda are apparently only defective spellings of kalavāja, and I therefore feel sure that also in the Mora inscription kalavadā is meant for kalavāja. Additional proof is furnished by the next inscription.

IV.—Inscription on a sculptured stone-slab from Mathurā.

The inscription is engraved on a beautifully sculptured slab found at Mathurā and now preserved in the Lucknow Provincial Museum. The slab is figured in V. A. Smith’s Jain Stūpa at Mathurā (ASI. New Imp. Ser. Vol. XX), Plate VIII. The inscription was edited by Bühler, Ep. Ind., Vol. II, p. 200, No. 8, together with a photolithograph from which it appears that the inscription has suffered a good deal since the time when the impression used by Bühler was taken. Judging from the impressions before me it seems that in the second half of the inscription the lower portion of the letters has now almost entirely disappeared. My reading of the text therefore depends to a certain extent on the reproduction in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. II.

TEXT.

namo arahato(1) Mahāvīrasya(2) — Mathurakā . . . . lavālāṣa(3) [sā] . . bhayaye(4) . . varakhyātē(5) āyāgapato(6).

NOTES.

(1) There is a cut to the left of the s which makes it look like sa. (2) Bühler: mahāvīrasya, but the sign of length is attached in the same way as in the sā of the following word. (3) Bühler: Mathurakā . . . . lavālāṣa, which agrees with the photolithograph in the Ep. Ind., whereas in the impression before me lavā is almost illegible and the last sa is strangely distorted. The aksara read da by Bühler shows a distinct hook to the right in the impression and is therefore more probably fa. The two words can safely be restored as Mathurakasa kalavālāṣa. (4) This is Bühler’s reading, and it is evidently correct, although the letters are far less distinct now in the impressions than in the photolithograph. Restore sāhā bhayaye. (5) Bühler: . . . . va . . . . itāye, where i seems to be a misprint for i. The last four aksaras may be called certain. Instead of va the reading ta would be possible according to the impressions, but the photolithograph shows a plain va. The name is probably to be restored as Śivarakhītē. (6) Bühler’s reading, although enclosed in brackets, is quite distinct in the photolithograph and there can be no doubt that it is correct, but the last three aksaras are illegible in the impressions.

TRANSLATION.

Adoration to the Arhat Mahāvīra! The tablet of homage (is the gift) of the kalavāda of Mathurā together with his wife Śivarakhītē (Śivarakhītē).
certainly, as proposed by Bühler, some word like bhāryāye has to be supplied. How much of the text is lost on the right side can be determined from the last word of the last line. There can be no doubt that pra. is to be restored as prah(iḥ)(ṭāpito) and that this was the concluding word of the record. The pra stands exactly below the tha of the first line, and as the inscription is very carefully engraved, it may be taken for granted that the tha also was followed by four akṣaras, which perfectly agrees with my suggestion that sa has to be supplied after Poṭhayāsaka. There is another point to prove that the text read Poṭhayāsaka(sa) bhāryāye). A glance at the inscription will be sufficient to show that originally it consisted of two lines only, and that kālavāla has been inserted by an afterthought below Poṭhayāsaka. The word has been engraved in much smaller characters than the rest of the inscription, the ka being only ⅔ high, the va only ⅓, whereas the second ka of Kośikya measures ⅔ and the va of Vardhamānasa ⅔. And there is another unmistakable sign that it was incised after the other two lines had been finished. It will be noticed that the sa is separated by a considerable space from the preceding letter, which can be accounted for only by the wish of the engraver to avoid the contact of the sa with the i-sign of ti standing in the line below.¹

I therefore read and translate the inscription as follows:

TEXT.

1 (na)mo arahato Vardhamānasya Gotiputrasa Poṭhayāsaka[ka](sa)
2 kālavāla
3 (bhāryāye) Kośikya Śimitrāye āyāgapato pra(t)i(ṭāpito)

TRANSLATION.

Adoration to the Arhat Vardhamāna! The tablet of homage has been set up by the Kośiki (Kośikya) Śimitrā, (the wife) of the kālavāla Poṭhayāsaka (Pośibhayāsaka), the son of a Goti (Gauti).

REMARKS.

The exact meaning of kālavāla is not known. The word does not seem to have turned up hitherto in literary sources. Bühler was of opinion that both Śimitrā and her husband were shown by their family names to be of noble or royal descent. But this conclusion goes too far. The use of metronymics was by no means confined to the Kshatriya caste. Fleet, loc. cit. p. 637ff., has collected a large number of cases where the names of Brahmins also and sometimes of persons who seem to be neither Brahmins nor Kshatriyas are coupled with the same metronymics that we find in connection with the names of princes and noblemen. So much only is certain that a man who attaches the metronymic to his name is a person of high social standing. From the fact that Gotiputra Poṭhayāsaka is called kālavāla we may infer that the word denoted some dignitary or high official. From our inscription it appears that the title was

¹ The photolithograph published in Ep. Ind. has been tampered with. Here the upper portion of the i-sign has been joined to the ja and in this form, which has never existed, the ja has been entered on Plate II. XX, 41 of Bühler's Palaeography.

² The etymology of the name is not clear. Bühler's correction to Śimitrā is hazardous and hardly correct. Nor can the name be traced back to Śrīmitra as Skt. śrī would have to appear as śrī.

³ Kālavāla, of course, cannot be connected with kalāpāla, kalāśā (Makār. 186, 109), which denotes a distiller or seller of spirits, the modern kallār or kālā. Possibly kāla, which in the Kharoshthi documents from Eastern Turkestan occurs frequently as a very high title, is an abbreviation of kālavāla, but it cannot be proved at present. Professor Thomas, Feitschriften H. Jacobo, p. 31, thinks that kāla is the same word as kara in Kujula-Kara Kadphises, but this suggestion also is not convincing.
in use already before the time of the Kushānas, and this is confirmed by its occurrence in the inscriptions on the first Śūpā at Sānchī. No. 340 of Bühler’s collection reads\(^1\) *Vedasa Datasa kalavudasa dānam.* There is a second copy (No. 339) which differs only in the writing of the first word: *Vedasa Datasa kalavudasa dānam.* A third inscription (No. 195) was read by Bühler *Datakalavudasa dānam.* Bühler identified this inscription with Cunningham’s No. 172\(^2\) which Cunningham himself, in accordance with his facsimile, transcribed *Datakulavudasa dānam.* There can be little doubt that here also the true reading is *Datakalavudasa.* The word is found once more in the Vakālā inscription, No. 971 of my List: *Kojavasa kalavudasa.* Kalavudā and *kalavāda* are apparently only defective spellings of *kalavāda,* and I therefore feel sure that also in the Mōrā inscription *kalavāda* is meant for *kalavāda.* Additional proof is furnished by the next inscription.

IV.—Inscription on a sculptured stone-slab from Mathurā.

The inscription is engraved on a beautifully sculptured slab found in the Kankālí Tilā at Mathurā and now preserved in the Lucknow Provincial Museum. The slab is figured in V. A. Smith’s Jain Śūpā at Mathurā (ASI, New Imp. Ser. Vol. XX), Plate VIII. The inscription was edited by Bühler, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II, p. 200, No. 8, together with a photolithograph from which it appears that the inscription has suffered a good deal since the time the impression used by Bühler was taken. Judging from the impressions before me it seems that in the second half of the inscription the lower portion of the letters has now almost entirely disappeared. My reading of the text therefore depends to a certain extent on the reproduction in the *Epigraphia Indica,* Vol. II.

**TEXT.**

namo arahato(\(^1\)) Māhāvirasa(\(^2\)) — Māthuraka . . . lavāsasa(\(^3\)) [sā] . . bhayaye(\(^4\)) . .
vara[khjṭaye(\(^5\)) āyā[gapat[\(^6\)].

**NOTES.**

(1) There is a cut to the left of the *ra* which makes it look like *na.* (2) Bühler: *mahāvirasa,* but the sign of length is attached in the same way as in the *mā* of the following word. (3) Bühler: *Māthuraka . . . lavāsasa,* which agrees with the photolithograph in the *Ep. Ind.*, whereas in the impression before me *lavā* is almost illegible and the last *sa* is strangely distorted. The *akṣara* read *ja* by Bühler shows a distinct hook to the right in the impression and is therefore more probably *la.* The two words can safely be restored as *Māthurakasa kalavāsasa.* (4) This is Bühler’s reading and it is evidently correct, although the letters are far less distinct now in the impressions than in the photolithograph. Restore *sāhā bhayaye.* (5) Bühler: . . . *vṛ . . . itāye,* where *i* seems to be a misprint for *i.* The last four *akṣaras* may be called certain. Instead of *va* the reading *ta* would be possible according to the impressions, but the photolithograph shows a plain *ta.* The name is probably to be restored as *Śivarakhītāye.* (6) Bühler’s reading, although enclosed in brackets, is quite distinct in the photolithograph and there can be no doubt that it is correct, but the last three *akṣaras* are illegible in the impressions.

**TRANSLATION.**

Adoration to the Arhat Mahāvīra! The tablet of homage (is the gift) of the kālavāda of Mathurā together with his wife Śivarakhītā (Śivarakhītā).
REMARKS.

For palaeographical reasons the inscription must be assigned to the period before Kanishka. The fixing of an early date is also supported by the language which is pure Prakrit and further by the fact that the inscription records the setting up of an ayagapata. In the Kushan times the dedication of ayagapatas seems to have gone out of fashion, there being no inscription in Kushan characters on any of the sculptured slabs unearthed at the Kanahali Tilak.

The two words Māthurakaśa kālavājasa, which, though partly restored, may be regarded as perfectly certain, are of special interest, because they give us a hint as to the meaning of the term Māthuri kālavājā used in the Mōra inscription, and at the same time confirm what I have said about the social position of the kālavājā. The donor of the slab would hardly have called himself simply by his title, without adding his personal name, if he had not been an official of very high rank.

V.—Inscription on the pedestal of an image from Gapāshrā.

The inscription is on the pedestal of a standing figure of which only the feet remain. It is incised on the top of the pedestal between the feet. The stone was acquired by Pandit Radha Krishna from a Koli who is said to have obtained it from a Brahmin's house in the village of Gapāshrā, three miles north-west of Mathurā City. It is now in the Mathurā Museum. The inscription was edited by Vogel, Cat. Arch. Mus. Mathurā, p. 122, No. G42.

TEXT.

1 Maha[dat]j[a]n[ayakasya] yamasa-
2 [heka][ya][v][l][a][saka]ya Ulānasya paṭimā

NOTES.

(1) Only the first two aksharas are well preserved, the rest of the word is more or less effaced. Vogel reads maha[n][yanasya], but the reading given above is certain with the exception of the anusvāra. (2) This is Vogel's reading. The first akshara is possibly ya, though the a-stroke would be very short. The lower portion of the he and the ks and the subscript ya have disappeared through the breaking off of the stone. The he is doubtful, and instead of ks we may read na. (3) Vogel: [v]i[ya]ya. The lower portion of vi and the subscript ya are mutilated. There may have been an a-sign attached to the eva, but it is doubtful. The third and fourth aksharas are almost completely effaced, but from the faint traces they can be read with certainty as saka. There seems to have been no i-sign on the top of the eva. (4) Vogel: Ulānasya. The a-sign of ja is quite distinct.

TRANSLATION.

The image of the great general, the yamasa[eka] (and 3) viṣavasaka Ulāna.

REMARKS.

From the inscription it appears that the statue represented the great general Ulāna, who, judging from his name, was certainly a Śaka. Ulāna being formed with the suffix -āna which is common in the Śaka language. What is left of the statue, points into the same direction. The feet are shod with the same waddled boots that are worn by Kanishka in his well-known statue.

1 According to Mr. V. S. Agrawala the word was correctly read by Daya Ram Sahni in the Aasual Report Northern Circle, 1921, p. 3, which is not accessible to me.
As regards Ulāna’s titles, mahādaṇḍanāyaka occurs again in the Mathurā inscription No. 60 of Sānt 74. In my edition of the record1 I read in ll. 6ff. mahādaṇḍanāyakasya Vālānasya, but the true reading appears to be Valānasa, and Valāna and Ulāna being evidently only different spellings of the same name, it is quite possible that the general mentioned in that inscription is identical with the person represented by the statue. The title viśeṣaśaka is found in slightly different spellings in several Mathurā inscriptions of the Kushān period. Nos. 127, 128 and 141 record gifts of the viśeṣaśaka or viśeṣaśaka Vakamihira, No. 1259 a gift of the viśeṣaśaka Aśyala or Suśyala. It will be noticed that the title is only borne by persons who by their names are shown to be of foreign descent. Perhaps the correct form of the title is viśeṣaśaka. In the Diegāvadāna p. 188 it is said of a certain Brāhmaṇa: sa rājā Prasenajitā Kauśālānā hastimādhyasvaparī viśeṣaśakaḥ sthāpitaḥ, but here also viśeṣaśakaḥ is not warranted by the manuscripts which write either viśeṣāśakaḥ or viśeṣaśakaḥ. Yamāraheka, provided the word has been read correctly, would seem to be a foreign title or a local designation, though I cannot suggest anything as to its meaning. But whatever his functions may have been, the title of mahādaṇḍanāyaka certainly shows that Ulāna was a high official, and the present inscription, although it is badly preserved and its original place is not known, is yet of great importance as proving that during the Kushān period not only kings, but also dignitaries of lesser rank were honoured by statues. As shown by the following inscription, the statue of Ulāna is not an isolated case.

VI.—Inscription on the base of a male figure from Mathurā.

The inscription, as stated by Vogel, is incised on the base of a male figure, standing, clad in the Indo-Scythian dress: tunic, trousers and boots. He holds a bunch of lotus-flowers in his right hand and an indistinct object in his left. The head is lost. The image was found in a bāṅkā on the Brindāban road about 1½ miles from Mathurā. It is at present in the Mathurā Museum. The inscription is in a very bad state of preservation, and only the date of the year was read by Vogel, Cat. Arch. Mus. Mathurā, p. 110, No. E25. The statue is figured JRAS, 1911, Plate VIII, fig. 2.

TEXT.

1 sa[vya]sārāḥ 70 2(?) h(e) . . . s(e)(e) prathama(me)
2 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . rṇasya(?) pra(timā)

NOTES.

(1) The ś-sign of rā is pretty distinct. After rā there is a long vertical stroke, apparently caused by a fissure in the stone. (2) The first figure is not quite distinct. Vogel took it to be 40, but it is more probable that it is 70. The second figure is probably 2. (3) The e-sign of h(e) and s(e); if they were originally engraved, are entirely obliterated. The word was certainly meant for hemantamāsa. (4) Before rṇasya about ten akṣaras are illegible.

REMARKS.

Although only one complete word and two numerical signs can be read with tolerable certainty, the inscription, in conjunction with the complementary evidence furnished by the dress of the statue, allows us to affirm that, probably in the year 72 of the Kushān era, in the first month of winter, the statue of a foreigner, whose name ended in rṇa, was set up at Mathurā. The custom of erecting portrait statues seems to have been in vogue among the foreign chiefs at Mathurā.

during the Kushan period. The Mathurā Museum contains no less than six heads of statues wearing the high conical hats which are an essential part of the Scythian dress. In my opinion, these facts give additional weight to the suggestion that the female statue from Mōrā also represents some lady belonging to a clan of the foreign invaders.

VII.—Inscription on a door-jamb from Mathurā.

The inscription is engraved on the side of a carved door-jamb dug out of an old well in the Mathurā Cantonments in 1913 and is now in the Mathurā Museum. The inscription consists of 12 lines, but the first five lines are so much obliterated that only here and there a letter can be made out with more or less certainty. Each line consisted of nine or ten akhaaras, of which four or five on the right side are missing. From an examination of the stone Mr. Ramaprasad Chanda came to the conclusion, which undoubtedly is correct, that the epigraph was originally incised on a square pillar which was afterwards cut lengthwise through the inscribed side, into two halves and turned into door-jambs. The inscription was first noticed in the Annual Progress Report of the Superintendents, Hindu and Buddhist Monuments, Northern Circle, for the year ending 31st March, 1917, p. 104, and edited by Ramaprasad Chanda, MASI. No. 5, pp. 169-173, and Plates XXV and XXVI.

TEXT.

1. [v]...
2. sa[e]ya(1)
3. [vaa](2)
4. [p]...[na] Śiva(3).
6. Vasunā bhaga[va](to Vāsude)- (5).
7. vasya mahāsthāna...
8. laṁ torāṇam ve[dikā cha prati]- (6)
9. śhāhāpito (7) prito [bha][gavān Vāsu]- (8)
10. devaḥ svāmisy[ya] (mahākṣhatra)- (9)
11. pasyā Śodā[sa][iya]. (10)
12. sati[vartayatāṁ(11)

NOTES.

(1) Sasya is distinct, and as we should expect the inscription to begin with the date, the first line is probably to be restored as svāmisyā mahākṣhatrapasyā Śodā. The subscript seen visible in the first line may have belonged to svāmisyā. (2) The second akhaara of this line is sa with an indistinct vowel-sign. The preceding akhaara looks like sa. Considering that probably the date stood in this line, sa, is possibly to be restored as divasa. (3) The reading of the first and third akhaaras of this line is by no means certain. (Prāpavartayā) would be in keeping with the context, but what is visible of the letters can hardly be reconciled with that reading. The fourth akhaara of the line is i followed by an akhaara that probably is a v of the same shape as in devaḥ in l. 10 and sati[vartayatāṁ in l. 12, but it may be ma. (4) The first akhaara is clearly sh and to the right of it below the line there is a distinct pu, so that at first sight one might read shpu. However, there seems to be no connecting line between sh and pu.

1 G 32, Addl. 1232 (from the village of Māṭi), 1019, 1586 (from Pāl Kherā), 1587, 2123. Two of them are figured in Vogel’s Sculpturae de Mathurā, Plate IV; cf. p. 23; 32.
2 This report is not accessible to me.
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and I therefore consider it more probable that ps was at first omitted by mistake and afterwards inserted below the line. As the second akṣhara certainly had a subscript ra and the third akṣhara is va, the reading shapūtrēṇa naturally suggests itself, and although the upper portion of the second akṣhara is very indistinct, the reading would not seem to be impossible. The fourth akṣhara of the line is ka with the ordinary o-sign at the top and another very distinct horizontal line to the left. The next akṣhara is sa. From the reverse of the inscription it appears that of the two strokes visible at the top of the letter the one to the left is accidental, whereas the stroke on the right seems to be the i-sign. Perhaps the two akṣharas are to be read Kadāi and the word to be restored as Kadākipūtraṇa. (5) The missing akṣharas were restored by Chanda. (6) The missing portion of the compound mahāsthāna can hardly be restored with any certainty. At the end of the line I would supply āi. Other possibilities are discussed below. (7) Chanda restores vedikāḥ (which seems to be a misprint for vedikā) pratī, but the additional cha is indispensable. (8) The o-sign of to is distinct, but to must be a mistake for either te or tāni. (9) Chanda wrongly restores bhavata instead of bhagavān. (10) The missing akṣharas were restored by Chanda. (11) Something like aśvastrubhān or aśvastrubhān is to be supplied at the end of the line. (12) Chanda read at first satvasatrubhān and afterwards satvarṣaṭrubhān. The third akṣhara is undoubtedly rā, not rτ, the last akṣhara in tāni, and the reverse of the impression shows clearly that the supposed ā-sign of ye is only a flaw in the stone.

TRANSLATION.

... by Vasi, a gateway of stone (1) and the railing was erected at the... of the great temple of bhagavat Vāsudeva. May bhagavat Vāsudeva, being pleased, promote (the dominion or the life and strength) of svāmin mahākṣhatrapa Śoḍāsa.

REMARKS.

Owing to the extreme uncertainty of the reading, the first five lines of the inscription cannot be translated. As stated above, from the few letters legible in the first two lines it becomes probable that the inscription was dated in the reign of svāmin mahākṣhatrapa Śoḍāsa, and this is borne out not only by paleography, but also by the benediction pronounced on the mahākṣhatrapa in the conclusion. The genealogy of the donor is hopelessly fragmentary. Not a single name can be relied upon, and it is not even quite sure whether the donor's own name was simply Vasi or a compound name ending in -vasi. Only so much seems to be certain that he was not a foreigner, but a Hindu.

The gift consisted of a gateway (torana) and a railing (vedikā) and perhaps a third object the name of which ended in -laṁ. Chanda restored laṁ as chatuṣkālam which is highly improbable as this term never occurs in inscriptions of this time. Possibly laṁ is the rest of devakulam used here in the sense of a small shrine as in the Jain inscription No. 78, or, more probably, laṁ is to be restored as sālāṁ. If the language of the record were quite correct Sanskrit, the predicate would be either pratiṣṭhāpitaṁ or pratiṣṭhāpita. The form actually found in l. 9, (pratī)ṣṭhāpita, is wrong in any case and therefore of no account for the restoration of the subject of the sentence.

The name of the place where the torana and the vedikā are said to have been erected, is mutilated and cannot be restored, especially because it is doubtful whether one or three syllables are lost after mahāsthāna. But whatever the missing syllables may have been, I cannot follow Chanda in taking the term 'the great place of bhagavat Vāsudeva' as meaning a spot that was believed to have been either the birthplace of Krishṇa or the scene of some notable event in his early career.

1 Chanda translates vedikā by 'a square terrace in the middle of the courtyard', but the meaning 'railing' is absolutely certain.
Chanda himself has pointed out that in the Mathurā inscription No. 85 bhagavato nāgaraja
Dadhikarṇa stāme means 'in the temple of the holy lord of the serpents Dadhikarṇa', and I see
no reason why mahāsthāna should not simply denote a large temple or sanctuary also in the
present inscription.

As the pillar, perhaps hundreds of years afterwards, was taken away from the large temple of
Vāsudeva to be turned into the door jamb of another building and ultimately to be thrown
away into a well, all that can be possibly asserted with regard to the place of that temple is that
it stood in Mathurā or somewhere in the environs of the City. The inscription moreover shows
that that temple was, if not erected, at any rate enlarged or embellished during the reign of the
mahākṣatrapa Śoḍāsa by a person, who although being a Hindu, seems to have been a high official
in the service of the mahākṣatrapa1, carrying out the work by order or at the desire of his master,
since the benediction the benefit of the donation is attributed to Śoḍāsa alone. The facts that
we can thus ascertain with regard to the temple of Vāsudeva agree in several respects with what
we can infer from the Mōrā well inscription about the Bhāgavata sanctuary at that place. There
also a temple (devagriha) is said to have been adorned with the images of the paśchaveśas of the
Vrishnis during the reign of Śoḍāsa. If my suggestion that in line 8 of the present inscription
lām is to be restored as sītali should prove correct, this also would be a point of agreement as in
the Mōrā inscription also the temple and the images are expressly stated to be of stone (kaila).
Moreover, as no trace of a stone building has been found at Mōrā, it appears that the temple was
intentionally pulled down at some time and the materials carried away and probably used for
some other purposes. Of course, these coincidences are no conclusive evidence, but considering
everything I think it not improbable that the pillar bearing the present inscription hails from
the Bhāgavata temple at Mōrā.

---

No. 28.—KOSAM INSCRIPTION OF (THE REIGN OF) KANISHKA: THE YEAR 2.

BY KUNJIA GORINDA GOSWAMI, M.A., CALCUTTA.

This inscription is engraved on the pedestal of a big standing figure of a Bōdhisattva, which
was recovered from the ruins of Kosam (ancient Kauśambi). The image is now kept in the
Municipal Museum at Allahabād. In 1934, at the time of a visit to the said museum, I came
across the image and deciphered the important portions of the inscription. As no photograph
or stammpage was available at that time, the inscription was first noticed by me in an issue of the
Calcutta daily paper, the Amrita Bazar Patrika and subsequently a tentative reading with translation
and notes was published in the Calcutta Review, July, 1934, without any facsimile. It has,
however, now been possible for me to make out the full text of the epigraph with the help of a
good photograph and a set of stammpages, very kindly supplied by Mr. N. G. Majumdar, Superinten
tendent, Archeological Section, Indian Museum, Calcutta, which he received from the Government
Epigraphist for India.

The inscription consists of only two lines of writing. The size of the letters varies between
\(\frac{3}{8}\) and \(\frac{1}{2}\). The characters are Brāhmī resembling those of the Sārnāth and the Sahēṣṭh-Mahēṣṭh
image inscriptions of the time of Kanishka. The type may be termed 'early Kusāna' after Dr.
Vogel, who used this expression in reference to the characters of the Sārnāth inscription of
the 3rd year of Kanishka. It forms a transition between the script of the 'Northern Kusāna'2

---

1 According to the inscription No. 82 the treasurer of Śoḍāsa also was a Brāhmī patra.
2 Above, Vol. VIII, p. 175.
epigraphs and that of the later Kushāpas. The middle stroke of ya in pratiṣṭhāpayati is almost equal in length with the side ones. The subscript ya is used here in its full form (e.g. in rājasa). In later Kushāpa inscriptions, this letter, when used in a conjunct is indicated by a cursive form or a loop attached to the left hand side of the central line. The signs for medial ā in rājasya, Buddhāmitrā and trepiṭkā, e in cha(m)kame and o in -sutta are used by horizontal strokes as in the records of earlier period, but e in trepiṭkā and o in bhagavato show a tendency towards the slanting forms to be found in later Kushāpa inscriptions.

The stone is much mutilated and although some letters have disappeared, it is not difficult to fill up the lacunae by means of the clue supplied by associated letters. The first letter ma of the word maḥārājasya in line 1, and the last syllable ti of prati in the same line have entirely been obliterated; a portion of the conjunct letter ṣṭhā of pratiṣṭhāpayati (in lines 1-2) has also been effaced.

The epigraph is dated in the second year of Mahārāja Kaṇishka, the second (month) of Hāmanta (winter), the eighth day, and its purpose is the erection of a Boddhisattva statue by the nun, Buddhāmitrā, well versed in the Tripitaka, at the promenade of the Lord Buddha. So far the records of the 3rd year of Kaṇishka found at Sārnāth were regarded as the earliest epigraphic evidence of his reign, but now we find that the present one is the earliest Brāhmi inscription of Kaṇishka so far discovered.

The language of the inscription is a form of mixed dialect as found generally in the Brāhmi inscriptions of the Kushāpa period. The genitive case-ending in [Maḥārājasya is a regular Sanskrit termination, but sa in Kaṇishkasa and Buddhasa is a Pākṣkrit case-ending.

As I have stated above, the donor of the image is the Buddhist nun Buddhāmitrā. We come across the same name among the donors of the Sārnāth image of the 3rd year of Kaṇishka. This name again occurs on an inscribed Boddhisattva image from Mathurā (now preserved in the Lucknow Museum) of the year 33 of King Huvishka. In all these places she is mentioned as well versed in the Tripitaka, while in the Sārnāth and the Mathurā inscriptions, we are further told that she was a female pupil of the monk Bala, who knew the Tripitaka. It may be reasonably concluded here that Buddhāmitrā of all the records mentioned above, is one and the same person. That she was a very well-known lady appears from the fact that the nun Dhanavati, donor of a Boddhisattva image at Mathurā, introduces herself as the sister's daughter of the Tripitaka Buddhāmitrā.

The style of the image bearing this inscription is that of the Mathurā school as in the case of the two other Boddhisattva images found at Sārnāth and Sravasti. The material used in each case is the red Agra sand stone. More than three decades ago, Dr. Vogel, while explaining the nature of art of the Sārnāth image remarked: "Seemingly this Mathurā school created a Boddhisattva type, specimens of which found thier way to other famous centres of Buddhism." This statement of his finds corroboration also in the present sculpture.

1 Ibid., Vol. II, p. 199, plate facing page 200, No. 2.
2 The script used in the inscription of the 5th year of Kaṇishka's reign is similar to that of the later Kushāpa records. See above, Vol. I, p. 381, No. 1.
4 Above, Vol. VIII, p. 176; D. R. Sahn, Cat. of the Sarnath Museum, pp. 35-36.
6 Above, Vol. VIII, p. 182.
7 D. R. Sahn, Cat. of the Sarnath Museum, No. 8(a), plate VII.
8 Above, Vol. VIII, plate facing p. 181.
9 Ibid., p. 174.
The image is badly damaged. Its head and right arm are broken and lost. The left hand rests on the hip and holds the upper garment, which leaves the right shoulder bare. The folds of the dress are quite prominent. A double girdle tied round the loins keeps in the lower garment which reaches beneath the knees. Five lotus buds tied together, with a full-bloomed flower at the top, are found between the legs. There is another full-bloomed lotus by the side of the left leg of the image. The difference of this sculpture with the one found at Sarnath is that we find lotuses between the two legs in the former case, while in the latter the same place has been occupied by a lion.

TEXT.


TRANSLATION.

In the year 2, of Mahāraja Kanishka, on the 8th day of the 2nd (month) of Hāmanta, (Buddhist) nun Buddhāmitrā, who is well versed in the Tripitaka, sets up (this image of) Bodhisattva at the promenade of the Lord Buddha.

No. 29.—DOHAD STONE INSCRIPTION OF MAHAMUDA (BEGARHA) ; V. S. 1545, SAKA 1410.


This inscription is preserved in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. It is now published for the first time from the stone itself as well as with the help of ink-impressions made available by the courtesy of the Trustees of the said Museum. The editor has also to thank Mr. G. V. Acharya, the Curator of the Archaeological Section, and Mr. R. K. Acharya, for assisting in deciphering a few passages of the inscription. The stone on which it is inscribed measures 3' 3" by 1' 7" and is reported to have come from Dohad, the chief town of the Sub-Division Dohad in the District of the Pānch Mahālī, Bombay Presidency, 77 miles north-east of Baroda. Besides the two vertical cracks across the stone, it is chipped off at several other places, which has made the deciphering difficult. The difficulty is enhanced by the application of vermilion or some other pigment on the stone. The record contains 22 lines of writing, a few letters of the first line and many of the last two lines being completely effaced. The average size of the letters is 1/8.

The inscription is dated in Vikrama 1545, Śaka 1410, Vaisākhā śudi 13 (and perhaps also in the Hija era which might have been mentioned in the first half of line 21, which including the name of the day is now completely chipped off). This corresponds to Thursday, April 24, A.D. 1488 (and to H. 893 Jamādī'āl awwal). With regard to the date it is to be noted that the inscription records Śaka as well as Vikrama era and that this is a feature not only of all the Sanskrit

1 Kern Institute, Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology, Vol. IX (1934), pl. II(b).
2 Mr. A. Ghosh entertained some doubt about my reading of the year 2, and suggested a symbol for 20, before 2 (Ind. Hist. Quart., Vol. X, pp. 575-76); but from the photograph and the stammapa, it is perfectly clear that his assumption is not correct. The writing immediately preceding the figure 2 is not a symbol for 20, but the last portion of the word saṁva[sa](sa) 2. Again the last word of the inscription is cha[m]kame and not pākame as read by Mr. Ghosh. In the stammapa and the photograph cha is quite clear.
inscriptions of Mahmūd’s time found in Gujarāt but also of some other inscriptions of Northern India; whereas inscriptions found in Kāthiāwar, during this period, use only the Vikrama era.

The script is Dēvanāgarī and calls for no remarks.

With regard to orthography also there is nothing particular to note, excepting the frequent use of anusvāra instead of final ī and the doubling of consonants after r in some cases, for example, dhārma (I. 4 and 18) and kārta (I. 8).

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit and with the exception of the introductory invocation and the portion after the stanza 26 the entire composition is in verse.

Unfortunately as the last three lines are badly defaced it is not possible to say with certainty whether the inscription belongs to the reign of Mahmūd Begarhā or whether it is his own, that is, ordered to be inscribed by Mahmūd himself to record his deeds. From the sense that can be gathered from the last lines it appears that the inscription was engraved after the building of the fort of Dadhipadra (Dohad) by Imādalamula (i.e., Imād-ul-mulk), the chief minister of Mahmūd Begarhā, and it incidentally gives the genealogy and the deeds of the Gujarāt Sultāns and particularly those of Mahmūd. It is, however, the first inscription of the reign of Mahmūd Begarhā or of his predecessors that gives some details of the deeds, viz., of the wars won and buildings constructed by Mahmūd and his predecessors.

The inscription opens with an invocation to a goddess, who is said to be residing in Kashmir, after which it mentions one Mudāphara Pātasāhā, who seems to be no other than Muzaffar I of Gujarāt.

The inscription then gives the following genealogy of the Sultāns of Gujarāt: (1) Shāh Mudāphara; (2) his son, Mahammad; (3) in his family, Shāh Ahammad; (4) his son, Shāh Mahammad; (5) in his family, Shāh Mahamūdā.

2 See Bhandarkar, List of Inscriptions of Northern India, Nos. 723 and 1121; 736 and 1126; 737 and 1127; 748 and 1128; 757 and 1129; 773 and 1130; 873 and 1136; 901 and 1138; 967 and 1146.
4 This implies that the orthographv, as regards the use of the era, which was noticed in Kāthiāwar at the end of the 13th century, had disappeared in the subsequent period.
5 For details see below.
6 Other inscriptions published so far are:—Arabic Inscriptions: Revised List, Antiquarian Remains, Bombay Presidency, pp. 309-309-07; one is reported in An. Rep., A. S., I., 1927-28, p. 146; it is said to give the names of the Sultāns of Gujarāt who were associated with the completion of the town of Dohad; two from the Halol gate, Chāmpaner, are published in Ep. Indo-Mus., 1929-30, p. 4. Sanskrit Inscriptions: from Adalja, Rev. List, p. 310; Bāji Hazrā’s Inscription, Rev. List, p. 300; Ind. Ant., Vol. IV, p. 388 and above, Vol. IV, p. 298. Of all the inscriptions—either of the Muslim rulers themselves or of Hindu kings referring to their Muslim overlords—till about A.D. 1500, only one record comes very near to the present one, viz., the Inscription of Sūrānā Ghīr (V. S. 1373) found at Lādh in the Jodhpur State. It is in Sanskrit, in verse and though it emanates from a petty chief in Rajputāna it incidentally gives the genealogy of the Muslim emperors of Delhi, from Sūrānā-Ghīr to Akād-din Khalji. For details see above, Vol. XII, pp. 17-27.
7 Other inscriptions of Mahmūd’s time do not lend us much help in the attempt to identify this goddess. She seems to be Brāhma ātika Sarvāvati, for a Jain writer, Chandraprabhaśiri (A.D. 1278) of Gujarāt, uses identical expression ḍvāna Kāmākṣārīvittā in the section on Hāmachandra (Hāmachandraśīriprabandha), verses 30-40, of his work Prabhāvakas-charita (Ed. Hiranand Sharma, Bombay, 1909) for telling us that Hāmachandra worshipped the goddess Brāhma of Kāmātra and became a Sūrānā-Charitā. The reference may be to the goddess Dāra-Saравati probably of the Sāradā shrine of Kashmir which was well known in India even in the 15th and 16th centuries. See Stein, Kaula’s Chronicle of Kashmir, Vol. II, pp. 279 ff.—Ed.
This differs from the genealogy given by the Muslim historians and also accepted by the authors of the Cambridge History of India in some respects as considered below.

Firishta and the authors of the Mirâd-i-Sikandarî, the Mirâd-Âhmâdî, and of the Arabic History of Gujarât give the following list:

(1) Muzaffar Shâh (Muzaffar I); (2) Ahmad Shâh (Ahmad); (3) his son, Muhammad Shâh (Muhammad); (4) his son, Kutub-ud-din (Qutb-ud-din Ahmad Shâh); (5) Daud (Dâуд) and (6) Mahmûd (Mahmûd I), second son of Muhammad Shâh.

Thus our inscription leaves out Nos. (4) and (5), viz., Kutub-ud-din, son of Muhammad Shâh, and Daud, a brother of the last (No. 3) and an uncle of the former (No. 4). But it does take note of Mahmûd (called by the Muslim historians “Muhammad”)—a name which was bestowed upon Tâtâr Khân by his father Zafar Khân before the latter proceeded to Delhi. This event, however, took place when Zafar Khân was still a governor under the Delhi emperors and not an independent ruler of Gujarât. Our inscription seems to refer to Mahmûd in that capacity when it calls him Mahîpâtî, though it is possible that this title merely recalls the short period of Mahmûd’s sovereignty referred to above. The latter inference is all the more probable because the inscription besides giving him the epithet Mahîpâtî does not credit him with any conquests.

But it is not in our inscription alone that the names Kutub-ud-din and Daud are omitted. They are not found also in two Arabic inscriptions—one of Mahmûd himself and the other from Bâi Harîr’s well. They are missing also in the legends on the silver coins of Mahmûd. Moreover, these inscriptions refer to Muhammad (Tâtâr Khân), son of Muzaffar Shâh, as Muhammad Shâh, implying thereby that he was one of the independent Sultân of Gujarât.

Two other points in the genealogy of the present record are worth noting. (1) Though Ahammada (No. 3) and Mahamida (No. 5) were the sons of Nos. 2 and 4 respectively, they are not explicitly called so as Nos. 2 and 4 are called the sons of Nos. 1 and 3 respectively. They are merely introduced with the words “in the family were born...”. (2) The names of Kutub-ud-din and Daud are omitted from the list. The omission of Daud may be understood because his reign was very brief; moreover, he was not the direct descendant. But Kutub-ud-din was the eldest son of Mahmûd and had a glorious, though brief, reign of about 7 years, and the reason for his omission in the epigraphs cannot be easily explained. It is possible that:  

2 History of the Rise of the Mohomedan Power (Tr. from the Persian by Briggs), Vol. IV, pp. 1 and 9; though on pp. 8-9 Firishta does cite a historian according to whom Muzaffar Shâh himself, before proceeding to Delhi, conferred upon his son the title “Ghias-od-Dowla-od-Deen Mohamed Shâh.”
3 Tr. by Faridî, p. 7; he also says that Zafar Khân had invested Tâtâr Khân with the title of Nâsirudin Muhammad Shâh. But this was before Zafar Khân declared his independence.
4 Briggs, op. cit., p. 9; Faridî, op. cit., p. 9. Bird, op. cit., p. 179 (according to Firishta, Tâtâr Khân imprisoned his father and assumed the title of Muhammed Shâh); Ross, op. cit., p. 904 gives his name as Muhammed Khân, and Tâtâr Khân as his title.
5 These authorities cited in notes above.
6 Briggs, op. cit., p. 9; Faridî, op. cit., p. 9. Bird, op. cit., p. 179 (according to Firishta, Tâtâr Khân im
7 It cannot be that he died in suspicious circumstances, because his father Muhammed also died in similar circumstances (Briggs, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 36), though the Cambridge History of India (Vol. III, p. 301) says that he died of severe illness.
the inclusion of Muhammad I and the omission of Kutub-ud-din and Daud in all the epigraphs—Sanskrit and Arabic—of Mahmūd’s reign may be with a certain motive which we do not know. But it is difficult to believe that all of them derived their information from the same source which was not as exhaustive as those of the historians we know of, because Daud and Kutub-ud-din were the immediate predecessors of Mahmūd and thus not so far removed from him that the family records would forget them. On the contrary the family records are likely to possess much more information about them than outsiders should—and that perhaps accounts for the divergent genealogies of the epigraphs and the historians.

Further historical information we can gather from this record is that Muzzaffar Shāh is called Mudāphara and Nripārākhu. This latter epithet perhaps implies the establishment of the independent kingdom of Gujarāt in A.D. 1396 acquired by that Sultaṇ by severing his allegiance to the Delhi emperors.¹ The capital of this kingdom was Pattana, the ancient Aga-hilapattana of the Chaulukyas of Gujarāt (c. 960-1300 A.D.). His previous conquest over Farhat-ul-Mulk, the disobedient governor of Gujarāt and other kings of the neighbouring provinces,² while still a governor under the Delhi Emperor Muhammad Shāh seems to be referred to by the words nripakulam-akilaru yō veṣṭiywaćdhitathāvah.

Mudāphara’s son Mahamadda is merely called a Mahipati. In absence of any other details this epithet does not mean much, and in reality Mahamadda did not succeed his father, nor many exploits are credited to him by historians, hence the unembellished epithet seems to be justified.

After Mahamadda comes Ahammada. He is said to be born to adorn the earth, and one who was omniscient (and knew) the essence of all religions, worldly things and thoughts. Further, not only did he afflict by his prowess and conquer the lord of Mālava but took his land as well as wealth. History bears out, to some extent, the truth of these words of praise for Ahmad. As to the other praises, Ahmad may well be called an “ornament of the earth” because he was one of the first great Sultaṇs of Gujarāt and consolidated his dominions and founded the city of Ahmadābād, though, strange to say, there is no reference to this city among his achievements, but it is perhaps referred to incidentally in verse 20.

Ahammada was really an eyesore to the King of Mālava, who, we know from the Muslim historians, was Hūshang Shāh. Twice, in 1411 and 1418, he repulsed the invasions of Hūshang on Gujarāt.⁴ Not content with this he himself invaded Mālāv in 1419,⁴ but was only successful in defeating and compelling Hūshang to take refuge in the fort of Māndū. Once again⁴ he invaded Māḷāv in 1422 when Hūshang had gone to raid Orissa, but did not succeed in capturing Māndū. The result of these invasions was not very fruitful. Ahmad could only plunder and devastate the outlying territory of Māḷāv, but not annex it to that of Gujarāt. Epigraphical reference to the seizure of the country of Māḷava,⁷ therefore remains unconfirmed by other historical sources.

¹ For details see C. H. I., Vol. III, pp. 294-95.
² For details see ibid., and Briggs, op. cit., IV, pp. 4-10 and Faridi, op. cit., pp. 5-10; Bird, op. cit., pp. 177.
³ See below n. 7.
⁵ Briggs, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 21-22; Faridi, op. cit., pp. 16-17.
⁷ Expressed by jagrāha tad-dēsa-dhāram cha paśēkāt; but if this expression is dissolved as tad-dēmasa dhānam and not as a Deodac compound: tad-dēsa ca dhāram ca, then it merely means that Ahammada seized the wealth of the country, i.e., plundered the country. For details see Briggs, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 17, 20, 30; Faridi, op. cit., pp. 14, 17, 19, 21; Bird, op. cit., p. 188; C. H. I., Vol. III, pp. 298-99. [See p. 223, n. 3.—Ed.]
It is remarkable that the inscription is silent about some of the other wars of Ahmad, particularly with those of the Ch’hásamá Chief of Girmár, King Nasir of Khándesh, Rájá of Ch’ámpánér whom he made a vassal in 1422, and the Bahá’u’-din Ahmad of the Deccan.

About Ahmad’s son, Mahamnáda, the inscription has not much to say and rightly so. For though he is credited with victories over Rájá Bir of Idar, Ráñá Kumbha of Mewár, and Rájá Gañgádás of Ch’ámpánér, some Muhammadan historians describe him as a coward who turned his back when attacked by Sul‘án Mahmúd of Málwá and as a result of his cowardice was poisoned and killed by his wife at the instigation of some officers. Mahamnáda’s one virtue was that he was exceedingly generous, for which he was called “Karín” by the Muslims.

Immediately after Mahamnáda, we are introduced to Mahamúda, omitting, as mentioned above, his two immediate predecessors. Mahamúda is popularly known as Mahmúd Begarhá (Gurjárí Bégardô). The inscription says that he was noble in warfare and further speaks something of Gyáśaddína, and it is not clear whether it refers to Mahamúda or to some one in his family. If it does refer to Mahamúda then it is surprising to find this title, meaning “the Aid of the Faith” (Ghyáś-ud-din), given to Mahmúd, because the title given to him in his coins and inscriptions is usually Nasir-ud-duniyá Wa-ud-din meaning “Defender of the Faith and the World,” whereas Muhammad II, son of Ahmad I, alone is called by the epithet “Ghyáś-ud-din” in his coin legends.

Unfortunately there are some breaches in the lines dealing with his wars, which make it difficult to identify them in all cases. Verse 8 says something about Mahmúd’s relation with the ‘Lord of the South’ and the Chief of Amána (1) and his subjugation of the earth (1) till the Raivata. The first reference seems to be the help that Mahmúd gave to Nizám Sháh, the King of the Deccan against the two attacks of Mahmúd Khilji of Málwá in 1462 and 1463. The second reference appears to relate to the submission of the King of Párdí, near DAMAN, to Mahmúd in 1464.

The mention of Raivata, that is, Mt. Girmár at Junánagar, has reference, perhaps, to the first invasion of that state by Mahmúd in 1466, when its chief Rao Mánjálik was compelled to pay tribute and to discontinue even the insignia of royalty. The next verse says that Mahmúd conquered that impregnable fort (1) of Junánagar (Jirga) and to commemorate this victory, the mountain Raivata itself was made a pillar of victory. This implies the final conquest of the Juná-
garh fort, and the annexation of Sorath to Gujarāt, in December 1470. Muslim historians further tell us that the King of Gînâr was compelled to surrender. He then accepted Islam, and was given the title of Khân Jahân. At the foot of the hill Mahmūd founded the city of Mustafâbâd, which became one of his capitals and also a favourite residence.

Verses 10-12 tell us that Mahmūd then took Châmpâka (padra ?), i.e., modern Chāmpāner, conquered the fort of Pâvaka, i.e., Pâvâgarh, captured its chief alive and ruled in that city. Here we have an allusion to the principal events in the final conquest of Chāmpāner and its hill fortress Pâvâgarh by Mahmūd. Chāmpāner held a strategic position between Mâlwâ and Gujarāt. Its rulers were Râjputs of the Chauhân clan, and the only Hindu principality near the Gujarāt capital. So whenever the King of Mâlwâ wanted to attack Gujarāt he first instigated the Chief of Chāmpāner, or when the latter felt aggrieved he himself harassed the Gujarāt Sultâns by plundering their territory. Skirmishes and even serious battles had often taken place in the past between these two neighbours, but none of the Sultâns before Mahmūd could conquer Pâvâgarh and subdue its chiefs for long.

Mahmūd was aware of the rebellious deeds of the Chāmpāner chief, who was perhaps Jayasinha, but he did not get a suitable opportunity to attack that kingdom. He got this in 1482 when one of his governors, Malik Sâîha, in charge of the country neighbouring Chāmpāner was killed by Patâî, the Râjâ of that kingdom. Enraged by this action he invaded Chāmpāner, occupied it and built a mosque there. Patâî thereafter took shelter in Pâvâgarh, to which Mahmūd laid siege. This lasted for 21 months and at the end of which the fort was stormed by a strategy. Betrayed by this the Râjputs who were already reduced to their last straits, performed jauhar burning alive the women (to this a reference seems to have been made by the inscription), and marched forth to give an open battle to the Muslims. It is said that all of them were slain, but Râjâ Patâî and a minister named Dungarsi were captured alive. Mahmūd was pleased with their courage and brave defence and after they were cured of their injuries in war, they were asked to embrace Islam. On their refusal to do so Mahmūd imprisoned them, and gave them time to think over his offer. But when they persisted in their resolve not to become Muslims,

---

2 Ibid., pp. 305-06; p. 55; p. 57 and p. 209 (in 1472) respectively.
3 Ibid., pp. 306-07; p. 56; p. 57, p. 209 and pp. 20, 25, 26 respectively.

He was ruling at Pâvâkâdurga (according to the inscription cited in the note above) in V. S. 1535 and was perhaps still the ruler of the place when Mahmūd attacked it. In fact verse 21 of our inscription does speak of one Jayâdeva, and, I believe, these two are identical kings. For their names tally very closely with 'Jey-singh' who according to the authors of the Tābâkh-i-Akhbâr (as cited by Bird, op. cit., p. 212) and Mirât-i-Sikandârî (Faridi, op. cit., p. 59) was the King of Chāmpāner whom Mahmūd defeated. Moreover, the name of his father and forefathers as mentioned in the inscription and by the Muslim historians also tally. Thus:

**Inscription of Jayasinha of V. S. 1535.**

Muhammad Historians.

1. Viradhavala
2. Trimbakâlîhûpa
3. Gangârâjâsvâra

**Muslim Historians.**

1. Vîsingh (Tâbâkh-i-Akhbâr); perhaps contemporary of Ahmad Shâh.
2. Trimbakâdîs (Mirât-i-Sikandârî, pp. 15-17); also contemporary of Ahmad Shâh.
3. Gangâdîs (Mirât-i-Sikandârî, pp. 24 and 30); contemporary of Kuth-ud-din.

Other chroniclers (for instance, Firishta, Briggs, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 66) call him 'Beny Ray'; Faridi, op. cit., pp. 65-67, also calls him 'Rawal Patâî'; Bird, op. cit., p. 212, calls him 'Rawal Toppa'; Bayley, Local Mahamudan Dynasties, Gujarât (1886), p. 211, "Rai Patâî". From this it appears that the chiefs of Châmpâner were known as Râya, as the kings of other Châhamana or Chauhân families were called. 'Patâî' seems to be the contraction, as Watson has rightly said Jud. Ant., Vol. VI, p. 2), of the word 'Pâwâpati' or the lord of Pâwâ.
they were executed at the end of five months. And after that Mahmūd founded the city of Muhammadābād and a fort around it called Jahān panāh.

The purport of verses 13-15 seems to be that Imādālā was appointed to govern (?) (this newly acquired) province.

The next few verses continue to speak of Malika Imādālā, his conquest of Pallidēśa and the construction of a fortress there. A reference to the same fort, built by the orders of Imādālā as well as to the excavation of (two) tanks seems to be contained in verse 19. This Pallidēśa seems to be, as shown below, some part of the Godhrā District and not the famous district of this name in Rājputāna.

Verse 20 speaks of a well, apparently caused to be dug by Imādālā, at Ahammadapura, which probably refers to Ahmadābād and not to Ahmadnagar.

Verse 21 again tells us that Imādālā constructed an excellent fort and an artificial lake [at Champakapura (Chāmpānér)?] with the consent of (?) Mahamūd Shāh. The former perhaps refers to the outer wall and special fortification that Mahmūd ordered to be built round Chāmpānēr.

Verses 22 and 25 mention the lord of Bāgūla, called Jayadēva in v. 22, and the complete destruction of his forces by Imādālā. Verse 23 mentions the conquest of Rāyadurga or 'the fort of the Rāya (king),' probably belonging to the same ruler. Verse 24, however, again speaks of the destruction and capture of a fort. Now, it is not quite clear whether all these verses refer to the same conquest of the Pāvāgarh Chief, whose name was Jayadēva and who is to be identified with the Jayasimhadēva of the Pāvāgarh inscription, or Jayadēva, the lord of Bāgūla, was a person different from the Chief of Pāvāgarh. The only point in favour of accepting the first suggestion is the use of the word digvijaya in v. 23. The victory over Pāvāgarh may have been considered a digvijaya (world-conquest), as it was not accomplished so far by any of the Gujarāt Sultāns; and it was, further, the last Hindu kingdom which had remained independent so far. It cannot be argued that the conquest of Champakapura has once been referred to, and a further detailed reference is not expected as we find the mention of Pāvaka again in v. 25. This question, however, cannot be satisfactorily decided till Bāgūla remains unidentified. It may have been another name of the tract over which the Chāmpānēr Chief ruled possibly due to a confusion with the name of the adjacent territory known as Vagāda or it may be the same as Bāgūlā, which was a petty Rājput State between Gujarāt and the Deccan. There is, however, no reference to a victory over 'Bāgūla' in Muslim chronicles.

Verse 26 which is only partly legible, speaks of the beautiful fort at Dadhipadra, modern Dohad, probably built by Imādālā Mulaka in Saka 1401 and Vikrama 1545. Line 21, however, seems to refer to its repair by Imādālā Malika on a particular day, the details of which are obliterated.

---

2 For details see p. 221 below.
3 For details see p. 219 below.
4 Bombay Govt., Vol. I, Pt. I, p. 227 and Bird, op. cit., p. 212; Bayley, citing Tabakht-i-Abhari, op. cit., p. 210. It is strange that there is no reference to this in Mirāt-i-Sikandārī, which is usually followed by the author of Mirāt-i-Ahmadī; C. H. L., Vol. III, p. 612 and pl. XXV. A note in Bayley, op. cit., p. 212, says that 'this appears to have been an upper citadel; apparently the remains of the upper fort now existing are of Muhammadan construction, and are attributed to Mahmūd Bigarha, who is said to have named the citadel Man Mahal.' See Bombay Govt., Vol. III, p. 190.
5 South and perhaps contiguous to the Pallidēśa (modern Godhrā tālākā) of the inscription. For details see pp. 226-21 below.
Verse 26 seems to give us a totally new information. None of the Muslim historians attributes the construction or repairs to a fort at Dadhpadra (Dohad) to Mahmūd or to any of his friends whose deeds are described at length by the author of the Mirā, i-Sikandarī.1

The inscription, it will be found, records all the important conquests of Mahmūd till about A.D. 1490, the date of the record, but omits Mahmūd’s expeditions to Sind and Jagat (Dwārkā) in A.D. 1472 and 1473 respectively.2

The inscription, in lines 11, 13, 15-17, 20 and 21, refers to the deeds of a person designated as (1) Īmādālā, (2) Īmādālā Malika, (3) "Vīra" Īmādālā, (4) Īmādālā Mulaka, and (5) Īmādālā Malika respectively.

The context in which the first is mentioned is not clear. He seems to have been entrusted with the "protection of a country", probably the newly acquired country of Chāmpāner. The second, Malika Īmādālā, conquered Pallidēsā and built a fort there. The third built a fort at Champakapura; whereas Īmādālā Mulaka, the fourth, made a gift (in connexion with the fort at Dadhipadra). The last, Malika Īmādālā, repaired the same (1) fort in his possession (malikīnī ?). From the context it appears that all these deeds were performed by one and the same person, namely, Īmādālā Mulaka, which are described chronologically in the inscription—from the time of his appointment "to protect a country" to his repairing a fort at Dadhipadra in Śaka 1440.

This Īmādālā Mulaka may be identified with Īmād-ul-Mulk,3 which was a designation for the post resembling premiership. During Mahmūd’s regime there were three such Īmād-ul-Mulka’s: (1) Īmād-ul-Mulk Sha’bān, (2) Īmād-ul-Mulk Hājī Sultānī, and (3) his son Buda. It was the first who helped Mahmūd to fight the conspiracy at the time of his accession to the throne; while Buda must be the person who assisted Mahmūd in his conquest of Chāmpāner, etc., and who built and repaired the fort of Dadhipadra (Dohad), because his father, Hājī Sultānī had died just before the invasion of Chāmpāner.4

The inscription refers to the following places: Ahammadapura, Champakanpadra, Champakapura, Dadhipadra; (the lords of) Gurjara, Mālavaka, Damana and Bāgūla; the forts of Pāvaka and Jirna (1); and the mountain Raivataka.

The context in which Ahammadapura is mentioned is not clear, nevertheless it probably refers to the city of Ahmadābād, founded by Ahmad Shāh on the site of the old city of Asāwal,6 and not to Ahmadnagar, (also built by him), because Mahmūd is not credited with the construction of any building at Ahmadnagar, while at the former city he erected a number of splendid edifices5 and surrounded it with a wall and bastions just after the conquest of Chāmpāner.5

Champakanpadra or Champakapura is the modern Chāmpāner, the ancient splendour of which is vividly described by historians.19 There are still some ruins of the buildings constructed

---

1 See Faridi, op. cit., pp. 70-88; Bayley, op. cit., pp. 238 ff. This historian, however, mentions another Īmād-ul-Mulk Malik ‘Ata who built ‘Ata pūrah, “one of the most beautiful of the suburbs of Ahmadābād.” But as Dadhipadra is to be definitely identified with Dohad this information does not help us much.
3 According to the kind suggestion of my friend, Mr. Gyani, of the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay.
6 Ibd., p. 300.
7 Bird, op. cit., p. 100.
9 Cf. Briggs, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 70, “at this period”.
by Mahmūd at Chāmpāner. Of these—the walls of the citadel, its bastions and gateways, custom house, mosques and tombs—the finest is the Ḫāmī Masjid.¹

Dadhīpadra is identified with Dohad, and literally means a village (padra) on the Dadhi. The latter may be identified with the river Dadhīmati, on which Dohad now stands.² Dadhipadra is also mentioned in the inscriptions³ of Jayasimha and Kumārapāla found at Dohad.

Our inscription settles the question regarding the construction of the fort at Dohad, which was left vague by the Muslim historians. The author of the Mirāt-i-Ahmadī, for instance, says at one place⁴ that Ahmad Shāh built a fort in the market town of Dahmod, among the mountains; while at another place⁵ the construction of the fortifications at Dohad is credited to Muzaffar II. But it appears from the account of the author of the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī that Dahmod and Dohad refer to one and the same place and that the fort at Dohad was built by Ahmad I⁶ while the same was repaired by Muzaffar on his way to Mālwā in about 1514.⁷ From the context in which the fort at Dadhipadra occurs in our inscription it appears that a fort was already there⁸ (perhaps built by Ahmad I as shown above), but it was in ruins and was subsequently repaired⁹ in the reign of Mahmūd I by Malika Imādāla.

As I have mentioned before, the country of Bāgāla may be the same as Buglana mentioned by Firisha¹⁰ or Baghāna by Abūl Fazl and others.¹¹ According to the former, it was a district contiguous to Surat; according to the latter, it was a mountainous, well-peopled country between Surat and Nandhar. These descriptions correspond to one of the subdivisions of the modern Nāsīk District¹² known as Bagāna. Muslim historians tell us that the chiefs of this place belonged to a Rāshtrakūṭa family, perhaps identical with that of the Rāthōrs of Kanānjī¹³; and that their hereditary title was Bahārjī—which may be the same as Basurah, a family name of the ruling house of Kanānjī, according to Masudi.¹⁴ They also mention that the country had seven forts, two of which, viz., Mulher and Sāler, were places of unusual strength.¹⁵

From very early times Bāgāna was a half-way house between the Deccan and the Gujarāt coast. At the end of the 13th century it had given protection to its overlord Karna, the last Hindu ruler of Gujarāt. Later it was always a bone of contention between the Sultāns of Gujarāt.

¹ For description of this and other buildings see Arch. Surv. West. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 41 and pls. LVI, LVIII, LXI and XIV; and C. H. I., Vol. III, pp. 612-13 and pl. XXV.
² Mythologically the town was called Duddhipuranagara after the temple of Duddhāvara Mahādeva on the banks of the river Dadhīmati. The latter was so named in honour of the sage Daddhī who lived there. As shown above Dadhipadra is the most natural etymology of the name; Duddhipuranagara seems to be a later attempt to show the antiquity of the Śiva temple at the place.
⁴ Bird, op. cit., p. 190.
⁵ Ibid., p. 222.
⁶ Faridi, op. cit., p. 17. Cf. "fortified a bāhāna at Dohad, which was among the hills".
⁷ Ibid., p. 96.
⁸ Cf. Duddhipadra rakturbhur dhvayagata vati in l. 19.
⁹ Cf. udharēa in l. 21.
¹³ Maṣāiru-l-inārā (Memoirs of the Nobles) cited in Bird, op. cit., p. 122. But its other statement that the Zaminār held the ... country for four hundred years is doubtful.
¹⁵ Many of them exist even now; cf. ibid., p. 400: "Most of the ridges are crowned by perpendicular ledges of rock, and the tops of many are fortified, the chief being Sāler in Baroda territory in the extreme west, and Mulher about 10 miles east of Sāler."
and those of the Deccan, now owned by the former and now by the latter, and at times independent. Our inscription seems to refer to its one of such conquests by the Sultāns of Gujarāt (before it was subdued in about 1487 by the brothers Malik Wagi and Malīk Ashraf, the governors of Dau-łatābād), which is not mentioned by Muslim historians.

The context in which Pallidēśa is mentioned (l. 13) is not clear. It appears, however, that a fort was built there by Imādāla. Now there is a place called Pāli in the Godhrā tālukā, which seems to preserve the name of the ancient Pailidēśa. The reason for identifying with this Pāli and not with the famous place and district of that name in Rājputānā is that the context favours it. In conquering Chāmpānēr Mahāmūd must have conquered the territory now comprised by the modern Godhrā tālukā, (then known as Pallidēśa), while no conquests are credited to Mahāmūd in Rājputānā, unless it be the proposed invasion of Sanchor and of Jalo in Mārwār, entrusted to Imād-oool-Moolk and Kīnsur Khān with a view to levying tribute "on the rājās of Juwara and Aboogur." But it is doubtful if this invasion took place at all. Godhrā, on the contrary, is known as a separate province under Mahāmūd. Its governor was Kowam-oool-Moolk. However, the reference to the building of a fort in this country cannot be explained at present.

The Pāvakadurga (l. 9) is to be identified with the hill fort of Pāvāgarh "about 25 miles south of Godhrā and by road 29 miles east of Baroda," in the Pānch Mahāls District of the Bombay Presidency. It is also called by this name in an inscription of its rulers mentioned above.

Before Mahāmūd, Ahmād Shāh and his son Mahāmād Shāh had attempted to take this fort but had failed. After a protracted siege Mahāmūd succeeded in storming and forcing open its gates in November 1484. It is said that on gaining possession of the hill Mahāmūd strengthened the defences of the upper and lower forts and built there a city called Mahāmūdābād which was known as Mahāmūdābād Chāmpānēr. Our inscription perhaps refers to these deeds of Mahāmūd by merely saying that he ruled in that city.

Jirnādurga is not to be identified with the modern Junāgarh, but it is to be identified with one of the forts at the place mentioned by the Muhammadan historians and also noticed in other epigraphs. According to these, in the 15th century there were two forts and a city. The latter was presumably called Girinagara as it was in the past—in the 2nd and 8th centuries A.D. respectively. The fort within the city, on the outskirts of the Dāmodar Ghat and on the rising slope of the Girnār (or the mountain Raivata), was known as Jirnādurga or

---

2 In Jodhpur State, see Bājpūtīna Gazetteer, (Imp. Gaz. of India, Provincial Series), p. 203. Hēmachandra mentions one Pallidēśa in his Dvīkāra māhākāra, msra XX, v. 33. But, probably this too, is identical with the country of that name in Rājputānā.
4 Briggs, op. cit., p. 62.
6 See above p. 217, notes 3 and 4.
7 For a plan of the hill and the fort of Pāvāgarh, see Bomb. Gaz., Vol. III, p. 196.
9 Bird, op. cit., p. 212.
10 See Faridi, op. cit., p. 52 and p. 64; Bird, op. cit., p. 208.
11 Cf. Briggs, (Firishta), op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 32-33, "Mahmood Shah......towards the country of Gīrนāl, the capital of which bears the same name."
12 Inscription of Rudraḍāman, above, Vol. VIII, p. 45.
Jhinjharakāṭa⁵ or Joona garh⁸—presumably the modern Uparkot.⁴ Evidently it was a fortified palace, or a citadel, like the fortresses of the Mughals, probably built under the Čhūjāsāmā kings of Gīrṇār. The second fort was situated higher up the mountain⁶ of which no traces now remain. The transference of the name Girinagar to the mountain (suppressing the latter's ancient names Raivata and Īrjaya) and that of the citadel Jirnadhura to the city—now known as Jamāgarh—probably took place after the 15th century.

Raivatakā seems to be another name for the mountain Gīrṇār. In one of the inscriptions found from the place the mountain is called Īrjayaṭ.⁷ Both of these names, however, are mentioned in the inscription of Skandagupta.⁸ Fleet identified Raivataka with one⁹ of the two hills of Gīrṇār and not with Gīrṇār proper.¹⁰ After this no epigraphical references are found, so far, till about 1300 A.D. Henceforward the inscriptions seem to identify Raivata with Īrjayaṭa.¹¹ In early times therefore Raivata and Īrjayaṭa might have been names of two different hills at Gīrṇār, but in later times they came to be regarded as identical.¹² The Raivataka in the present inscription therefore seems to refer to the hill on which there are temples, etc., and which is now known as Gīrṇār.

TEXT:

[Metres: vv. 1, 10, 26 Āryā; vv. 3, 11, 12, 16-18, 20, 22, 23 Anushṭupūḥ; vv. 5, 6 Indrasūryā; vv. 4, 13, 14, 15, 25 Upajjāṭā; v. 2 Sṛgdrāhā; vv. 7-9, 19, 21, 24 Sārūvācikriḍita.]

I...²²... तीष्ठते । वर्षं जमगति विभा [ढ़] — ¹⁶ व मातका गुड़ामाती(नाम) ॥ ॥ च चादी

1 । ॥... तोऽगुः ॥... घरसियो घ्रापुषलमात्[ः]... प्रमयुमे... ।

²⁴ This is 'stylistically Hindu', probably of the 13-14th century or even of an earlier period. See Arch. Surv. West. India, Vol. II, p. 94.
²⁵ Cf. Firishta (Briggs, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 53), "on a mountain...the strongest fortress...".
²⁶ Inscription of Rudradhama, above, Vol. VIII, p. 42.
²⁸ Ibid., p. 64, n. 1, "The hill opposite to Īrjayaṭ or Gīrṇār"; whereas in the Bomb. Gaz., Vol. VIII, pp. 441-42, it is said that Rąvatāchāl is the name of the hill immediately over the Rāvata Kund (and also the Dāmodar Kund): that the hill was so called after Hājk Rāvata, who, after marrying his daughter Rāvati to Bāladeva, brother of Kṛṣṇa, came and resided at Gīrṇār from Dwārakā. Bhāskarā. Purāṇa, skanda X, adhyāya 52, mentions part of this story. There Rāvata is called the 'lord of Anarta.' But it does not say that Rāvata went to Gīrṇār and stayed there.
²⁹ Perhaps after the Girnathra Madhāma. See Ind. Ant., Vol. VI, p. 239.
³⁰ From Gujarāt. Otherwise Raivata is mentioned in the Jaunpur-stone Inscription of Īśvaravarman,
³² See Ins. No. 14 found in the temple of Nāmīmātha, Rev. List, Ant., Rem., Bom., Préc., p. 355, and Chorwaid Ins. of Malladēva, op. cit., p. 250. In an inscription of a Māmālalka king both of these are mentioned but it is not clear whether they are the same or different. See op. cit., pp. 347-48.
³³ Cf. Bomb. Gaz., Vol. VIII, p. 441, "The Jains sometimes incorrectly apply the name Rāvadāchāl to the Gīrṇār."
³⁴ Probably there was a symbol at the beginning.
³⁵ The top loop of ० and the stroke of ु are faintly visible on the impression; the word preceding, it may have been 'mūnta.'
³⁶ Read Kāmsūṃ.
³⁷ Should be Śākā. The scribe has used the correct form in line 3.
³⁸ [The previous two syllables may have contained some such verbal form as vālatayā.—Ed.]
³⁹ Only the ै of ू is now left.
2 [ष्ठ] कद्दः [ण] त्रिमाण(ण) शौर्यदार्शे छूप्पकत्वमनिल(ण) यो विजिलाचितः[ण]स्तोः।
पायतु त्रिपलम्बिनि प्रत्येकप्रणायः स्रोतानि रक्षितश्चतिमणि मानिर्भुपाल--
मोरिर्भुसुक्तभाष्यं बीरविख्यातम्।

3 [सिन्दु] [१[१] २[२] त्रिमाण बीरोद्वक्त शाहिलमुर्दार्पस्य प्रमुः।
तत्पत्रान बीरविख्यातः स्वर्यविद्वादिप्रज्ञानि।[१[०] २[०] सर्वप्रान्ये सर्वप्रान्ये।
प्राप्तः प्रतापसंतापितभाष्यम्। बीरः सदा श्रीमद्विपादेशी।

4 राजा मोहनमदमंडलया।[१[०] २[२] यस सर्वभावविधारसाधस्वेष्याः युद्धे युद्धे।
जिवः सदास दलविका दिनः तद्भजनः च पावतः।[१[०] २[२] तमाणस्य नभूमिपरः।

5 रः। सदा श्रीमद्विपादेशी । द्वारा ज्ञाजन्यजन्यातापरिष्ठितः यथा प्रभावः।
विहितः पुष्पिका(आम) [१[०] २[२] श्रीमद्विपादेशी। यथा विहितः पुष्पिका।

6 ने जालोनि बाध्यवाणि। यथा राज्यदिविकः [क] स्व प्रदः।
दशानिः वे कश्चिं विक्राक्षम्बपि च जितवान्य। गामायायाय गुरुः। [१[०] २[२] राज्य दिव्य निःजन।

7 ने दातात्याः[या] द्वितिः। पवादह(ह) विषादिकपि स्वस्तः संमुच्छते।
[नती वै] द्वारायायायाय नान्याय सकालें देख्यं सम्म भूपपरिवार श्रीमद्विपादेशी।

विधिकम् [स कर्तवः] सूप(प) स्वमित्वाः। जिल्ला पृष्ठाचित्य स्वमित्वाः। 

1 The reading is doubtful.
2 The r stroke should be on the following letter vi. Read m.asir-विष।
3 The reading is almost clearly sad-vātma dhanaḥ ca.—Ed.
4 These three letters are obliterated. [Reading seems to be suṇ-guṇair-वर्त्रा.—Ed.]
5 Intended readings may be dānaḥ and Guraṃ.—Ed.
6 The samāśraḥ over sa is superfluous; it may be a flaw in the stone.
7 [Probably we have to restore sa—diśpat[९] suṇ-nāgarā suśākhyā cha jīvāḥ.—Ed.]
8 The reading seems to be correctly tattatānta.—Ed.
9 The letters read suṇa suṇāga, which yields no sense. [Reading seems to be Jīvasaṃavijñāna
punā(ah).—Ed.]
9 चारक चुप्पितस्वायतं पवर्त्त (तम) [I*]8[II*] चंपक —— पञ्चात्र सं —— वैरिकुककुझल[.] किला पावक[ढुम्ब] पिशा रहं प्रतापपान्विन् (तम) [I*]10[II*] महासरधीयापला पान्विन पवर्त्त। प्रविष्ट्य क्यालित.

10 [ढुम्ब] लिहितं पवर्त्त [I*]11[II*] जोवंत तयपितं बन्धुः दुष्प्या नीला महाका-वल। चारक तत्वुर्यान महासनधीयाकर[.] [I*]12[II*] शाला शुभ[.] कर्मोभिषुद्धदर्शिते कुलीन नुपवणजाल। सुख्यं चारकाः।

11 रयांत्रकं महोकम् म सेवकत[भोज्योत्कामिन्द्रानि] [I*]13[II*] पवर्त्त [म] सेवक [म]-कर्मोभिषुद्धदर्शिते कार्यं कर्तव्यं विषयं चा। —— —— सदासिद्धर्षु चारकाः—

12 मृत्युनीचु पुष्पिकः (सह) (न) —— — महासरधीयापला:। सत्वस्य या संबंधात? नाम्तः तन्नु —— चारकोत्ति: [I*]14[II*] तत्प्राचाय संवल संबंध। —— महोकसिद्धीतो

13 महार्षिः प्रतापवाने(न) गोर(री) विश्वाम:[.] पुष्पंकर्ममिति [I*]15[II*] महासनधी-पालस्वाप्राकृततापावन [I] दानवीरत्वं जीवाधिकर्मवर्गमाद्यं [I*] 16[II*] जनानिज्ञानी च गुणी पुष्पायम—

14 तिष्ठता दूरकाल्यात् रायं दुर्मिलं चारक वेम [I*]17[II*] (सेवक) [र्वाणी] —— —— चारक [सोपल] महोभिषुद्धदर्शिते पुष्पं पुष्पासिद्धवध वर्ष्यो च चारकाः

15 च महोकसिद्धी निष्ठावतं सोयं गोर रायस्तार्माणि हस्ती पिकुली चारात्मकम् (म) [I*]18[II*] प्रतापवानं तक्षं: कृपोद्वृत्तो विचारात। अग्निविन्दानिन् योगामिश्रितविधिभन्न्द् [I*]19[II*] य[.] ची—

1 It may be paliya or podphoa; the former is improbable because place names with the ending pali are not met with in later Gujarati inscriptions, though in this very inscription. Palli occurs as a complete name of a place, and as will be mentioned in a note on it. Pallidiva is also mentioned by Hemachandra in his Desavatara-bhaya. Even in the case of earlier inscriptions, a few cases that are available are limited to the Traikūṭaka, Rādhakūta, Valabhi and Western Chaulukya inscriptions. [The reading, however, appears to be Champaka-purāya.---Ed.]
2 The sense is not clear and the reading is doubtful.
3 A superfine awarana is seen over म of मान।
4 On the impression the reading looks like ṛṣa.---Ed.
5 (Reading seems to be —) कृपो [सम] प्रति सागरांताः [पा] [पा].---Ed.
6 The reading according to Dr. Chhabra is Tāremāḥ = jātā = जितेजाश्व = तो भक्त(क) किलानु। (स्त्री) प्रा-पत्तार्थम् (विषये) विषधोः [प] पुष्यविकारणो।
7 (The correct reading is sallim for kalpana.---Ed.)
8 The sense is not clear as a few letters of this line are illegible. [Reading may be kṣastra-deśyang = addārāna.---Ed.]
The following set of two copper plates was discovered about forty years ago by Dewan Seth Brij Mohon Dass, a leading banker of Bhopal, while digging the foundations of his house in Chowk Bazar, Bhopal, at the time of its re-erection and is in his possession at present. The plates are stated to have been found at a depth of about 20 feet, laid one above the other and nailed to the

---

No. 30.—BHOPAL PLATES OF THE MAHAKUMARA HARICHAMDRADEVA.

BY N. P. CHAKRAVARTI, M.A., PH.D., OOTACAMUND.

[Probable to be restored as pujagam.—Ed.]

Letters effaced.

Sense not clear.

[Reading seems to be tasmui krip-athakir=datu.—Ed.]

There appears a cipher between 134 and 5 which is perhaps a scratch in the stone itself.

The zero before 10 is superfluous.

All these letters are effaced; probably they contained the date in the Hijra era.

Should be *m=ūddhakārti.

The construction of this sentence beginning with * and ending with vañtari is identical with the relative clause in the Gujarāṭī language. The letters * and * in pāli look like the modern Gujarāṭī letters. The sentence seems to contain a curse, as in many Sīhāra and Yādava inscriptions, to the effect that he who would tamper with the fort (pudā), would be a witch (vañtari) or afflicted by a vañtari, etc.
ground. Nothing can therefore be said as to the place where they originally came from. Mr. M. Hamid, the Superintendent of Archaeology, Bhopal State, very kindly sent me a set of excellent enlarged photographs of the plates to whom I also owe the details of the measurement, etc., of the plates and also of their discovery. Mr. Hamid himself published an exhaustive note on the record in the Hindusthan Times, in its issue of 31st January, 1937. The charter is now edited here with the permission of Mr. Hamid and the consent of the owner of the plates which the former was good enough to get for me.

The plates are 11\(\frac{3}{4}\) long by 7\(\frac{1}{4}\) broad each, with a thickness of about \(\frac{1}{4}\) at the edges which are fashioned thicker than the inscribed surfaces. The first plate weighs 3 lbs. but the weight of the second plate is only 2 lbs. Each plate has two holes for the passing of two rings with which they were originally held. Both the rings and the seal which was probably attached to one of them, are now missing. The Plates are inscribed on one side only, the obverse of the first and the reverse of the second plate being left blank. The first leaf contains 21 lines of writing and the second only 20. The second plate has the figure of a Garuda, kneeling and facing right, engraved in the middle between lines 8 and 14. The plates are well preserved. A portion at the end of the last line of the first plate was left unmarked. The commencement of the second plate which apparently contained the gōtra of one of the donors is also illegible. It is doubtful if this portion also was at all engraved. With the exception of this the text of the whole record can be made out with certainty.

The characters are Nāgarī as prevalent in Central India and found in the records of the Paramāra rulers of Māla. In a few places su can hardly be distinguished from cha, e.g., -lava-chalam-(l. 13). The final consonant has been indicated by a short slanting stroke at the bottom of the letters concerned, e.g., tām (l. 1), ādīn (l. 8), pūrīn (l. 11) and -ītē (l. 30). The language is Sanskrit and with the exception of two invocatory verses in ll. 1-3 and seven customary benedictory and imprecatory verses in ll. 15-16, 32-33 and 39-40 the rest of the record is in prose. In respect of orthography the following points may be noted: (1) b has been denoted by the sign for v throughout; e.g., 'svadā' (l. 5), sanāuddha (l. 7), vīkhanā (l. 8), etc.; (2) while s has been used for š in many places, e.g., sīrset (ll. 1-2), Parameśvara (ll. 3, 4), prasasta (ll. 5, 6), etc., š has been wrongly used for s only once in kṣaptamā (l. 34); (3) though consonants in conjunction with a subscript ā have never been doubled, those in conjunction with a superscript ū have very often been doubled, e.g., 'svāmava (ll. 3, 4, 5), chaturādana (l. 9), pūrṇimaṃsā, suveśa, parevani (l. 10), bhartavā (l. 37), etc., the exceptions being samabhārya (l. 11), Gartēvara (l. 17), pūrēvā (l. 35), etc.; (4) anuvāra has often been used in place of the nasal of the same class, e.g., aindarāva (l. 1), -ānkuva, tančantu, kalpāṇita (l. 2), panča (l. 5), manidāla, chandrā (l. 7), etc. In a few places the signs of anuvāra and visarga and even whole syllables have been dropped, evidently due to the fault of the engraver. The writing, however, has on the whole been executed carefully. All the errors occurring in the text have been corrected by me either in the body of the text or in the footnotes accompanying it. Often a mark has been put by the scribe at the end of a line where the last word could not be fitted into it and had to be continued in the next, apparently to draw attention to the continuity.

As in the case of many Paramāra records, the present inscription opens with the phrases 'Om saṁasti and Śrīr-īśvaradeva which are followed by two verses in praise of Śiva. It then introduces the donor, the Mahākumāra Harichandradēva, who had obtained the privilege of the five great sounds (saṁadhigata-paṁcha-maheśvara) and who had acquired the victorious sovereignty through the favour of (prasād-āśritya-vījaya-ābhīṣyte) the Mahākumāra Trailōkyavarmanmaṇḍevas who had also obtained the privilege of the five great sounds. The latter is said
to have meditated on the feet of the Paramābhāṭṭaraṇakā-Mahārājādhārīja-Paramāśara, the illustrious Yaśōvarmmadēva, who meditated on the feet of the P. M. P., the illustrious Nara-
varmmadēva (ll. 3-7).

The object of the record is the grant by Harichandradēva of the village Dādārapadra,
belonging to Vikhūlapadra-twelve and situated in the Mahādvāḍāsaka-maṇḍala (I. 7). The
village which was given with its suburbs on the east and the south (pārvecca-dakṣiṇa-tala-devay-
dēta) was divided into 16 shares and given to 19 Brahmins, whose names and gōtras along with
names of their fathers are given in the record. Of these donees, a list of whom is given in the table
below, 13 received one share each and 6 half a share each. Two of the donees were related as
father and son (Nos. 4 and 8) and the following as brothers: Nos. 3 and 11, 5 and 7, 6 and 12,
and 14 and 16. The last two donees mentioned in the list were only pupils (sātukā).

The date of the record is given in words in ll. 9-10 as śrīmad-Vikrama-kāl-ānta-chaturdasi(ś)-
dhika-dvādaśa-su taj-āna[1]\
Cākāpati-jaanta-vartari Kārtikeya-sūdi pūrṇimāśaḥ saṃhitā-somag-
hana-sarva-grāma-pārvan, i.e., on the full moon day of Kārtikeya of the Vikrama year 1214,
on the occasion of a complete eclipse of the moon. It regularly corresponds to Saturday, the 19th
October, A. D. 1157 when there was a lunar eclipse. The grant was made by the ruler with the
usual ceremonies after bathing in the river Vetravati and in presence of the god Bhāilasvāmin.

If Mukhyādēsā is a proper name, he was the Dātaka of the grant. The record concludes with
the sign-manual of the Mahākumāra Harichandradēva.

Of the rulers mentioned in the inscription, the P. M. P. Naravarmmadēva and the P. M. P.
Yaśōvarmmadēva are the well known Paramāra rulers of Mālā. For Naravarmmadēva we
have the latest date as V. S. 1190 in Ratnasūri’s Life of Ammasvāmin.3 That he died in the same
year is certain, as we find his son Yaśōvarman making a grant on V. S. 1191 Kārtikeya sudi 8 on
the occasion of the death anniversary of his father.4 For Yaśōvarman we have the latest date
as V. S. 1190 if the reading of the date of the Jhālmūtān inscription3 is correct and if the record
belongs to the time of this ruler.

The next two chiefs mentioned in the record under consideration, i.e., Trailokyavarman and
Harichandra undoubtedly belong to that branch of the Paramāras who call themselves Mahā-
kumāras in their inscriptions. The earliest ruler known in this family is the Mahākumāra Lakshm-
īvarman. In V. S. 1200 we find him confirming a grant made in V. S. 1191 by the M. P. Yaśōvar-
madēva, on the anniversary of the death of the latter’s father Naravarman. Lakshmīvarman
confirmed this grant “for the merit of (his) illustrious father” (śrīmat-pātri-kriyāthān)5 which
shows that he was undoubtedly a son of Yaśōvarman. We shall discuss later what might have
been the reason for re-issuing the grant after a lapse of nearly nine years. According to the Bhopāl
plates6 of his grandson Udayavarman, dated V. S. 1236, Lakshmīvarman obtained his kingship
through the favour of his sword which he held (!) in his own hand (niya-kara-kṛita(dhṛita) kara-
tāta-prasād-śrīpa-niṣṭd-ādhāpita). The Pipālānagar plates7 of Harichandra (V. S. 1236 and 1238),
the son of Lakshmīvarman, state that the former obtained his rulership through the favour of the
last mentioned ruler (tasmā-prasād-kāta-prabāth prasādāt-avāpta-niṣṭd-ādhāpita), namely, the
P. M. P. Jayavarmanadēva, the son of the Paramāra Yaśōvarmadēva of Mālā. In connection with
the history of these Mahākumāras, Dr. D. C. Ganguly observes:8 “According to the Pipālānagar

1 Dhar State Gazetteer, p. 159.
5 Ibid., Vol. XVI, pp. 294 f. and pl.
grant, Hariścandra obtained his dominion through the favour of Jayavarman. The Bhopol grant, on the other hand, expressly states that Hariścandra’s father, Lakṣmīvarman, made himself master of a principality by the force of his sword when the reign of Jayavarman had come to an end. It evidently follows from these two statements that Lakṣmīvarman and his son Hariścandra ruled over separate territories. This finds strong corroboration in the fact that Udayavarman, the son of Hariścandra, is described by the Bhopol grant as succeeding to the throne of Lakṣmīvarman without the intervention of Hariścandra, who again excludes his father Lakṣmīvarman—in the Piplānagar grant—as a ruler preceding him. A critical survey of the epigraphic records will show that all these are deliberate representations and not accidental omissions. Following the same argument are we to hold that Trailokyavarman and Hariścandra of the present record held sway over a third principality—a view which would only make the complication in the history of this branch more complicated? But the state of affairs is not so bad as it is made to look. If Yaśośvarman was still ruling in V. S. 1199 it is almost certain that Jayavarman’s rule could not have come to an end before V. S. 1200 when Lakṣmīvarman was already a Mahākumāra. In fact Dr. Ganguly’s conclusion is based on a wrong interpretation of the Bhopol plates. They do not mention that Lakṣmīvarman became ruler by the force of his arms when the reign of Jayavarman had come to an end. The phrase Jayavarmanmadē varājya yujati in l. 5 of the Bhopol plates has no connection whatsoever with Lakṣmīvarmanmadē. It qualifies only the concluding portion of the whole sentence Udayavarmanmadē vijay-ādayi in l. 8. There is, moreover, nothing in the Bhopol plates to prove that Udayavarman succeeded to the throne of Lakṣmīvarman without the intervention of Hariścandra, nor do the Piplānagar plates show that Lakṣmīvarman is excluded as a ruler preceding Hariścandra. We know that inscriptions do not always give a full genealogy of the ruler to whose reign they refer themselves but may mention the names of one or two or even none of his predecessors.

The real difficulty that presents itself in our record is to establish the identity of the Mahākumārara Hariśchandradēva and the Mahākumāra Trailokyavarmanadēva. In my opinion Hariścandra can be no other than Hariśchandra, the son of Lakṣmīvarman. It is, however, more difficult to determine the place of Trailokyavarman in the genealogy of these chiefs. That he belonged to the same line is certain from the titles he is given in the inscription. If he is not identical with Lakṣmīvarman, which seems unlikely, he could only be another son or a brother of Lakṣmīvarman, probably the latter. It is not impossible that when Lakṣmīvarman died, Hariścandra was very young and his uncle Trailokyavarman acted as the regent during his minority. Trailokyavarman, though only the regent, wielded the full power of a chief and is therefore given all the titles connected with the princes of this line. Had he been a son of Lakṣmīvarman, his name should have been mentioned in some other records of this family. As the Mahākumārara were subordinates of the Paramāra rulers of Mālwa they had to obtain the formal sanction of their overlords at the time of succession. Probably Hariśchandra took up the reins of government not long before V. S. 1214, the date of the present grant, and that is why he mentions Trailokyavarman as his predecessor from whom he received the kingdom and to whom he was grateful for managing affairs during his minority. But when he issued his other grant in 1235, when Trailokyavarman was probably dead, he mentioned only the name of his sovereign ruler, viz., Jayavarman, as the one through whose favour he got his kingdom and Trailokyavarman being a collateral, his name was omitted from this and all the later inscriptions of this family.

Now to understand properly the political situation as revealed by the inscriptions of the Paramāra Mahākumārara, it will be necessary to consider the history of the Paramāras of Mālwa from

---

1 History of the Paramāra Dynasty, pp. 179-81. See also Ind. Ant., Vol. LXI, p. 212.
Jayavarman down to Vindhyavarmman. According to the Pipliānagarī (V. S. 1267) and the two sets of Bhopālī plates (V. S. 1270 and 1272) of Arjunavarman, Yaśōvarman was succeeded by his son Ajayavarman, while in the (incomplete) Plates of Jayavarman, the Pipliānagarī Plates of the Mahākumāra Harišchandra (V. S. 1235 and 1236) and the Bhopāl Plates of the Mahākumāra Udayavarman (V. S. 1256), Yaśōvarman is stated to have been succeeded by Jayavarman. From the information supplied by these records Kielhorn came to the following conclusion: "Yaśōvarman had three sons, Jayavarman, Ajayavarman, and Lakshmīvarman; and he was in the first instance succeeded by Jayavarman. Soon after his succession (and certainly some time between Vikrama 1192 and 1200), Jayavarman was dethroned by Ajayavarman, who and whose successors then became the main branch of the Paramāra family in Mālava, and continued to style themselves Mahārājas. The third brother, Lakshmīvarman, however, did not submit to Ajayavarman; and, as stated in E (i.e., the Bhopāl grant of Udayavarman), he succeeded by force of arms in appropriating a portion of Mālava, which he and his son and grandson de facto ruled over as independent chiefs. At the same time, Lakshmīvarman and, after him, his son and successor Hariśchandra looked upon Jayavarman, though deposed, as the rightful sovereign of Mālava, and, in my opinion, it is for this reason that Hariśchandra, in the grant D. (i.e., the Pipliānagarī plates), professes to rule by the favour of that prince, and that both Lakshmīvarman and Hariśchandra claim for themselves no higher title than that of Mahākumāra, a title which was handed down to, and adopted by, even Lakshmīvarman’s grandson Udayavarman." Though there is nothing definite to show that Kielhorn is wrong in his assumption, I prefer to agree with Dr. Ganguly that Jayavarman and Ajayavarman mentioned in the above inscriptions are identical. The later inscriptions, probably those issued after the re-occupation of Dhārá, call him Ajayavarman while the earlier inscriptions mention him as Jayavarman. Prof. Hall’s theory that ‘Lakshmīvarman sat on the throne with his sire’ and was thus the eldest son of Yaśōvarman cannot be substantiated. When Yaśōvarman died, Jayavarman as his eldest son must have succeeded to the throne of Mālava. Sometime before his death Yaśōvarman might have placed Lakshmīvarman in charge of a small principality which the latter ruled under the title of a Mahākumāra or, he might have wrested a part of the Paramāra empire which passed into the hands of enemies and established himself as the ruler. In any case, as he adopted a feudatory title he seems to have ruled only as a subordinate of the main branch. The boast of Lakshmīvarman that he obtained his sovereignty by force of arms as found in his Ujjain Plate is, however, not altogether an empty one as borne out by inscriptions. We find from the Bāndā Plate of the Chandēla Madanavarmanadēva that this ruler made a gift in V. S. 1190 when he was encamped near Bhailasavāmin. As I have shown below, this place was in the Mahādvāsaaka-mahādāla mentioned in our grant. What led this Chandēla ruler to encamp at the place cannot be ascertained. But it is not unlikely that he was, at this period, leading a campaign against the Mālava ruler and encroached upon the Paramāra territories soon after. Probably we find a confirmation of this in the verse 11 of the Mau stone inscription of Madanavarman, which says that ‘the ruler of Mālava, full of arrogance, was quickly exterminated’ by this ruler. This Mālava ruler was possibly Yaśōvarman himself. But that the Chandēlas

5 Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI, pp. 254 ff. and pl.
6 Ibid., Vol. XIX, p. 348.
7 History of the Paramāra Dynasty, p. 181.
9 Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI, p. 208 and pl.
could not keep this part under them for long is clear from the inscription of Lakshmûvarman of V. S. 1290. It appears that the Mahâdevâsaka-maâjala, adjacent to Bhâllasvâmin passed out of the hands of the Paramâra rulers temporarily and was re-conquered by Lakshmûvarman sometime before V. S. 1290 and this necessitated the re-issuing of the grant of 1191 of his father. That Lakshmûvarman also could not keep this maâjala in his hands for long is certain. An inscription dated V. S. 1229 of the reign of the Chaulukya Ajayapâladëva records the gift of Lûnapâsâka, an officer of the king at Udayapura which was included in the Bhâllasvâmi-Mahâdevâsaka-maâjala. According to this inscription this part of the country was acquired by the Chaulukya ruler by his own prowess. Probably it passed under the Chaulukyas even a little earlier during the reign of Kumârapâla. A fragmentary inscription of this ruler, in which the date has been restored by Kielhorn as V. S. 1220, has been found at Udayapur, which calls him Avantinâtha.

Though the Paramâras lost most of their territory in Mâlwa to the Chaulukyas, the Mahâkumâra branch still retained at least the southern portion of their principality, as their grants issued in V. S. 1235 and 1256 show. It is, however, possible to deduce from the grant of Udayavarman of V. S. 1250 that Vindhyavarman did not yet succeed in regaining the lost possessions of his ancestors, as the expression Jayavarmanadâvo-râyâ svatît shows. For, had Vindhyavarman already succeeded in firmly re-establishing himself in Mâlwa, one would expect his name to be mentioned in the record of Udayavarman, unless Kielhorn is right in his assumption that Lakshmûvarman and his successors never accepted the rulers of Mâlwa from Ajayavarman downwards as their sovereign rulers. But as the former always used the same subordinate titles, and as Dêvapâla, the brother of Udayavarman, seems to have succeeded to the Mâlwa throne as a matter of course, it is doubtful if there existed any feud between these two families as suggested by Kielhorn. Aâdhamra in his Dharmârâja states that when the country of Sapâdálaksha was conquered by Bihâbûd-din (Muhammad Ghûrî) he left his native country with his family for Mâlwa where king Vindhyâya was ruling. Muhammad Ghûrî's conquest took place in A. D. 1192, but if my supposition is correct, Aâdhamra does not appear to have moved to Dhârâ for a few years after the Muslim conquest till things really looked bad for him.

Udayavarman for whom we have only one inscription of V. S. 1256, is the last ruler we know of in the Mahâkumâra line. If he is identical with Udayâditya of the Bhopâl inscriptions dated V. S. 1241 (A. D. 1184) and Sâka 1108 (A. D. 1186) respectively, as Dr. Ganguly supposes, he had already a rule of at least 15 years to his credit when the Bhopâl Plates were issued. We also know that his brother Dêvapâla ultimately succeeded to the throne of Mâlwa. As the earliest inscription of Dêvapâla is dated V. S. 1275 and the latest inscription of his predecessor Arjunavarman bears the date V. S. 1272, Dêvapâla probably inherited the Mâlwa throne shortly before V. S. 1276. It is significant that in his Harśanda inscription, though the subordinate title of the Mahâkumâra is replaced by the Imperial one of Paramabhâttâraka-Mahârâjâdâhitâja-Paramâvâra, Dêvapâla still retains a part of his original title, viz., Samastâ-prastâ-opâsamo-adhigota-paśûka-mahâśabda which is missing in all his later records. As we have no record of Udayavarman's successor it may not be unreasonable to suppose that he also had no male heir and his younger brother Dêvapâla first succeeded him as the Mahâkumâra and then ultimately was raised to the throne of Dhârâ when Arjunavarman also died without a male issue, thus uniting both the houses of the Paramâras.

1 Ind. Ant., Vol. XVIII, pp. 347 ff.
2 Ibid., p. 343 and n. 9.
4History of the Paramâra Dynasty, p. 186.
5 The Harshanda Stone Inscription, Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, pp. 310 ff.
Of the localities mentioned in the record Mahādvādaśaka-maṇḍala must have comprised Udayapur and Bhisā in the Gwalior State as far as Raisen (Rājaśayana) to the south in the Bhopāl State. The Udayapur stone inscription of V. S. 1229 calls it the Bhāllasvāmi-Mahādvādaśaka-maṇḍala. Vētravatī is the modern Betwa and the temple of Bhāllasvāmin which was situated on the Betwa, must have given rise to the name of the Bhisā town. According to Dr. Hall, a fragmentary inscription which was originally discovered at Bhisā, but is now no longer traceable, recorded the erection of a temple of the Sun god, under the name of Bhāllēsa on the Vētravatī, by one Vāchāspati, a minister of Rāja Krishṇa, who is probably identical with the Paramāra Vākpatirāja. I cannot identify the other localities mentioned in the record. Mr. Hamid, the Superintendent of Archaeology, Bhopāl State, remarks as follows in his note on this inscription, which has been referred to above: "The temple of Bhāllasvāmin was situated on the banks of the Betwa river at Bhisā in the Gwalior State, 34 miles from Bhopāl and 8 miles from Sānci. The village Dādara padra is in the Bhopāl territory. The name was obviously corrupted into Dharapadra, and later on into Padria, but as there are eleven villages of this name in the various districts of the Bhopāl State, Dādara padra of our inscription was given the name of Padria Raja Dhar to distinguish it from other Padrias."

List of the Brahmin donees of the Bhopāl plates of Harichandra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Āvasathīka Śrīdhara</td>
<td>Agniḥetrika Bhāradvāja</td>
<td>Sāṅkṭiyā</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tripathi Gartēvara</td>
<td>Tripathi Nārṣyaṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drivēda Uddhārāna</td>
<td>Drivēda Kshirasvāmin</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇāṭrīya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot; Yāsōdhavala</td>
<td>&quot; Vatv(a)ka(m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pānī Madhusūdana</td>
<td>Āvasathīka Dēlha</td>
<td>Kāyāpa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drivēda Pālmā</td>
<td>Drivēda Sōlē</td>
<td>Saunaka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pānī Śomadēva</td>
<td>Āvasathīka Dēlha</td>
<td>Kāyāpa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Drivēda Pālpaka</td>
<td>Drivēda Yāsōdhavala</td>
<td>Adavāha</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pānī Raṇapāla</td>
<td>Pānī Dhamadēva</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Drivēda Gargādhara</td>
<td>Drivēda Sōtā</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot; Lakṣumādhara</td>
<td>&quot; Kshirasvāmin</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇāṭrīya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot; Śrīdhara</td>
<td>&quot; Sōlē</td>
<td>Saunaka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Thakura Vāchvehuka</td>
<td>Thakura Viḷ[ḥv]ē</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; Kuladhara</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Śaṅdiyā</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Drivēda Vālbhuka</td>
<td>Drivēda Gōlē</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Ind. Ant., Vol. XIX, p. 352, Text, l. 5.
* Ibid., Vol. XVIII, p. 397.
* P. R. A. S., W. C., 1913-14, p. 60.
* See above, Vol. XIX, p. 239.
* I. t., Pāndūs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Name of the donee</th>
<th>Father's name</th>
<th>Gotra</th>
<th>Share in the village granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Thakura Rāsala</td>
<td>Thakura Kuladhara</td>
<td>Śāṇḍilya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vishnu</td>
<td>Parī Sūdpala</td>
<td>Kāyapa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Āhada, a pupil (vijñak)</td>
<td>Thakura Kūfāja</td>
<td>Kauṇḍinya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mahāga</td>
<td>Vījāpāla</td>
<td>Kāyapa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEXT.**

*First Plate.*

1. Öm² svast[i][*] Śrīr-ajayō-bhyudaya-ś-aḥ | Jayati Vyōmakēśa-sau yaḥ saraggya vi(bi)-bharrti tām | aindav[i[n] si(ś)ra.²

2. sā lekhā[ṛ][n*] jagad-vij-āmkur-ākṛitima(m) | [[*]² Tanvāntu va[ḥ*] Śmarārte[ṛ*]² kalyāṇam-anisah(śaṅ) jatāḥ | kālpānta-samay-ōddāma-taḍi.

3. d-vālāya-pīṅgalāḥ | [[*]² Parambhāṭṭaraka-Mahārājādhirāja-Paramēsava(āva)ra-śri-Nara-varmmadēva-pādaṇu(dhyā).²


7. charādradēvō Mahādvādāsaka-maṇḍalē Vikhilapadra-dvādāsaka-saṅhva(ba)ddhā(ddbha).-Dādarapadra-grāma-nivāsināḥ pratigrāma-mi.


10. rē Kārttiṃē(k)a-sudi pūrṇimāyaṁ saṁjñāya-sōma-grahaṇa-sarvva-grāsā-parvvaṇi Kali-kalūsa-hārini Vētradvāt-vārṇi saṁ-


---

1. From photographs.
2. Expressed by symbol.
3. There is a mark here to show that the word is continued in the next line.
4. Metro Amokānakōtā, a mark of punctuation unnecessary.
5. The omission of vīrṣyā in puras is according to the vārtika: kharparē kari vā vīrṣyā-lōpō vaktavah.
Bhopal Plates of the Mahakumara Harichamdradeva.

14 [n] The hymn recites the praises of the deity in a grandiose manner.

15 [u] The deities are invoked with their various attributes.

16 [d] The deities are praised for their qualities.

17 [r] The deities are invoked with their various attributes.

18 [v] The deities are praised for their qualities.

19 [a] The deities are invoked with their various attributes.

20 [s] The deities are praised for their qualities.

21 [t] The deities are invoked with their various attributes.

Second Plate.

22 [d] The deity is invoked with their various attributes.

23 [s] The deity is invoked with their various attributes.

24 [t] The deity is invoked with their various attributes.

25 [a] The deity is invoked with their various attributes.

26 [s] The deity is invoked with their various attributes.

27 [t] The deity is invoked with their various attributes.

28 [v] The deity is invoked with their various attributes.

29 [d] The deity is invoked with their various attributes.

30 [s] The deity is invoked with their various attributes.

31 [t] The deity is invoked with their various attributes.

---

5 Metric: Vinatulikā.

2 Mark of punctuation unnecessary.

3 There is a mark here to show that the word is continued in the next line.

4 Space for about four letters is left after this.

5 Seven or eight letters, probably specifying the gupta, are completely effaced now.

6 Dāṇḍa unnecessary.

7 Read bhāmaṇaṁ-kṣanaṁ-viśeṣah.

8 Read vātā-arāṇa.

9 There is a dāṇḍa after ś to show that the word is continued on the right side of the rectangle containing the Garuḍa figure.
32 kti-varjaṁ sarvam-amibhyaḥ vrā(brāḥ)manēbhyaḥ samupanētavyam || yada-uta Vā-(Ba)hubhir-vvasudhā bhuh.4
33 kṛtā rajabhīḥ Sagar-ādibhiḥ || yasya yasya yadā bhūmīṣ-tasya tasya tadā phalam(lam) ||
34 Trīyā-ā.4
35 hur-aitāñāṇāi āgvaḥ pṛ[th]vī sarasvatī || ā-ṣa(sa)ptamam punahy-ṛta dōha-vāha-nivēda-
36 naṁ || Sarvavān-śtān- bhāvinaḥ pārthiv-śtūnd niḥ bhūyō bhūyō yāchatē Rāmabhadrā [[*]
37 sāmānyō.4
38 yaṁ dharma-ma-s[er]*-nripaṁ kāle kāle pālanīyō bhavabhīḥ || Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ
39 vā yō harēd-vasuṁ(su)dhā[m*] nripaṁ || na tasya pu
40 nar-āvṛttir-narakāś-Kumbhīpāk[ka]ṭah || [[*] Dēva-vrā(brā)hmanā-dvija*-pradattā bhir-
41 nma hṛtavayaṁ nripa[ṛ]-yē(ya)taḥ[*] kēṁ-āpi saha vēṣy(āy)ēva na
42 gata na chiraṁ sthitāt.4 Iti purātana-muni-prapita-vacana-paripaṭī-śravana-samudbhūta-
43 prabhūta-vivō(ve)k-ōdayēna mātā.4
44 pitṛō-ātmanās-cha punya-yas[ā]-bhuvvidhayaḥ || Iti jñātva parair-bhūpair-asmad-va[ma]s-
45 (ā)-ō🇩bhīvva(vai)l=stāthā || dharmmē-yaṁ-īha nō
46 lōpyō yaiḥ kē(kai)šchit(d)=[dharmama]-čhūntakaḥ || Dū Mukhyādeśāḥ || śivam-asti[1]
47 [Mangala[m] mahā-ārīḥ]
48 Svaḥastō-yarn Mahākumāra-ārī-Harichandrā-dēvasya || Śrī[ḥ]

No. 31.—SASANAKOTA PLATES OF GANGA MADHAVAVARMAN ; 1ST YEAR.

By C. R. Krishnamacharlu, B.A., Madras.

The plates on which the subjoined grant is engraved have been discovered about
4 or 5 years back in the village of Sāsanakōta in the Hindūpur taluk of the Anantapur District.
They were kindly forwarded to me for examination in June 1937 by Khan Bahadur Javed Hussain,
Bar-at-Law, Collector of the district, who obtained them from Mr. K. Gopalakrishnamacharlu of
his office in whose possession they had previously remained for some time. The plates will be
purchased for the Indian Museum, Calcutta, where they will be deposited.

The old village site at Sāsanakōta was subsequently inspected by me in March 1938. Speci-
mens of old pottery and beads and other relics were collected from an extensive mound here. A
preliminary note on these antiquities will appear in due course in the Archaeological Survey Report
of India. The area is full of promise and is expected to be explored by the Archaeological Depart-
ment at an early date.

The set consists of four plates measuring 7" by 2" and about 1/8" in thickness. At the proper
right margin in each plate is a ring-hole of about 4" in diameter through which passes the copper
ring bearing the seal. The ring measures about 2 1/2" in diameter. Its ends are soldered into the
bottom of the seal which is oval and measures 1 1/2" by 1 1/2". On its counter-sunk surface is carved
in relief the figure of a standing elephant facing the proper left. On the top and bottom sides

1 There is a mark here to show that the word is continued in the next line.
2 Metro : āmāṣṭāuk.4
3 Metro : śalini.
4 The word brāhmāṇa in this pāda is superfluous.
5 Danda unnecessary.
6 The left hand stroke of the medial o in sō is joined to the preceding ha.
of the seal are small projections, of which the one at the bottom side looks like a small knob and bears carved on it a spiral, the significance of which is not apparent. The set with the ring and the seal weighs 60 tolas.

The inscription registers the gift of the village Vēpputtoru in Paru-vishaya as a brahmādeya to the Brähman Dharāsarman of the Vatsa-gōtra and Taṭtiţirïya-charaṇa by Mahārāja Mādhavavarmān, son of Kōṅganivarman-Dharma-mahādhīrāja of the Kāṇvāyana-gōtra and the Jāhnavēya-kula.

The record is in Sanskrit prose except for the usual imprecatory verses attributed here to Manu as in the Penukonda plates, given in II. 17 to 23.

The script is an early variety of the Southern class of alphabets and is definitely anterior to that of the Penukonda plates of Mādhavavarmān II (III) of this family discovered in 1914 and published by Mr. Lewis Rice. These plates were then considered to be of special interest as being an admittedly genuine record of the early Gāṅga kings of Gaṅga-vadhī, or Mysore. In subsequent years, i.e., during the last quarter of a century, a number of copper-plate grants purporting to belong to the early kings of this dynasty have come to light, mainly in Mysore, and are reviewed in the Mysore Archaeological Reports. Some of these will be noticed in the sequel. But it deserves to be mentioned here that the present grant is the earliest genuine copper plate document discovered so far not only for king Mādhava I but also for his family.

The script resembles very much that of the Ongōjgrant of the early Pallava king Vijaya-Skandavarmān II, and is more archaic than that of the Penukonda plates referred to above. The letters of our grant are of a more archaic type than those in the records of the Kadamba king Kākusthavarmān whom Dr. Fleet has assigned to a period later than Śaka 360. They closely resemble those of the Narsapur plates of Vijaya-Dēvavarmān, which are in Prākrit prose. Our grant may, therefore, be assigned to a time immediately following the period of Prākrit charters of the Telugu country, i.e., to about the fourth-fifth century A.D. Its characters would appear to be anterior to those of the Pikira grant of Pallava Sinhavarmān. In this connection see also Krishna Sastri's remarks on the period of the Pallava kings Sinhavarmān and his son Skandavarmān, respectively contemporaries of Āryavarmān and Mādhavavarmān II (middle of the 4th century A.D.). The letters of the Penukonda plates are more developed and ornate and seem to bear evident influence of the so-called Pallava-Grantha style on the Gāṅga alphabets. The alphabet of the Kūḍalīrā grant of Mādhavavarmān resembles that of the latter. This grant says explicitly that Āryavarmān and his son Mādhava were crowned respectively by the Pallava kings Sinhavarmān and Vijaya-Skandavarmān. Moreover, as a token of the latter's suzerainty the grant bears, at the top, as preamble, the name of Skandavarmān of the Bhāravēya-gōtra and the Pallava-kula.

The horizontal stroke at the top of several letters is not marked in our grant though a few have it. In this respect our grant resembles the Chendaliṣu plates of Pallava Kumāravishvānu II. It...
must be observed that as in the case of the Āndrā and the early Pallava inscriptions some space is left after every syntactical group in this inscription (see especially lines 1 to 6). This is noticeable to some extent in the Penukonda plates also. The initial vowel ə is written in two forms: one with the length indicated by a curled loop at the bottom of the letter (ātma ə in line 11) and the other with the length indicated by a small hook at the right bottom of a which carries a round loop (ātma in line 14). The medial short i is not a complete loop as in some early grants but is left-open on the left side. In this respect our grant resembles the Uruvupalli grant of Sinvaharman, the Chandelāru plates of Pallava Kumāravishnu II, the Rāguruc the Śaktivarman, the Brihatprākṣāra grant of Umavaran, and the Ūgūru grant of Vijaya-Skandavarman II referred to above. The sikhaṃūliya is used in dukkaras (l. 22) and the upadhanīya in adhikī-ppattai (l. 15). The following mistakes due to oversight in writing may be noticed: dāraṣṇ-ūri for dāruṣṇ-ūri (l. 3), vakrī for vakrī (l. 9) and Manu-ṣoṭa for Manu-ṣiṇā (l. 18).

The anuvāra is replaced by the class nasal of the following consonant in svaṇ-dātūn (l. 21) and likhit-ūjan-ṛma-patitā (l. 24). The employment of a conjunct letter with ə and the following consonant is commonly observed in this as in other early grants; e.g., Jitam-Bhuyavatā (l. 1), svadatām-para (l. 18). The final ə is indicated by a miniature sign for ə in daṇḍāray (l. 13), and pālakṣa (l. 22) as in some early Pallava and other records; but in other places this is indicated in our grant by a small hook at the right-hand lower corner: vamakṣa (l. 18); phalas (l. 21). The letter ə is written in two different ways. In one, the length is marked in the middle on the right side of the letter (elde dāraṣṇ-ūri in l. 3) and in the other by a small hook added to the upper right arm of the letter (varmanā in l. 11, krama-ūdhi in l. 15 and kramaṇi in l. 24). The letter ə is written in two forms, i.e., with a small loop or without it. Both the forms are seen in Padmanābhe (l. 1), while the latter form is distinctly noticeable in suṣana-junapadaśya (l. 3) and jyenha (l. 11), etc. As in the other grants of this period the consonant following ə is doubled.

Since Rice published the Penukonda plates an earlier grant than these came to light in Mysore in the Kuṇḍithiyam plates of the Gaṅga king Krishnavarman-Dharmamahākṣirāja, son of Madhavavarman-Mahākṣirāja and grandson of Kuṇḍanivarman-Dharmamahākṣirāja, who belonged to the Kāṇḍavaṇa-gūra and the Gaṅga-kula. This king, known to Rice from later epigraphs, was presumed by him to be identical with Āryavarman (Tamil Āyyavaran) and Harivarman of other grants with the supposed variant and synonymous name Krishnavarman. It would not generally be justified to assume identities on the mere basis of synonymity in names, because names as names must strictly be applied to the particular individuals to whom they are given. In solving the difficulty we must take into consideration the possible causes for the interference of the Pallavas just about the time of this generation. The Penukonda plates say that the Pallava Sinvaharman crowned Āryavarman according to propriety (yaṭkaraṇam). But Krishnavarman does not admit or lay claim to such a distinction, if it were a distinction at all. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that Krishnavarman of the Beṇḍiṣaḥali plates and the Kuṇḍithiyam grant was a younger brother of Āryavarman who must have, for some unknown reasons, ousted Āryavarman and seized the throne. Āryavarman, thus dispossessed, must have called in the Pallava king Sinvaharman for help with which Krishnavarman must have been dispossessed and the result was that Sinvaharman crowned Āryavarman. A sort of political overlordship having thus been established by the Pallava over the Gaṅga king, the practice of the former crowning the latter is continued even
in the next generation and Skandavarman or Vijaya-Skandavarman crowns Madhavavarman who was surnamed Simhavarman by his father, evidently, as a token of political feudality and personal gratitude also. The fact that Madhava II, son of Aryavarman, claims in the Peunkonja plates to have been led up to his ancestral kingship (sva-cāmśa-krama-īghata-rājya-prāpitā) also suggests the correctness of this view.

Rice alternatively designates the later Madhavavarman as Madhava III on the ground that a comparatively later inscription at Nagar, containing several traditional and mythological statements, designates Konkanivarman also a 'Madhava' and so he calls him Madhava I. Since we have no early epigraphical data designating Konkanivarman as a Madhava we need not confuse issues by creating a Madhava II. It will be clear and precise to consider the latter only as Madhava II and not Madhava III.

Collecting the genealogical information furnished in all the known documents of this family and taking into consideration the probable causes for the Pallava intervention suggested above we may tentatively arrange a revised genealogy as follows:

\[
\text{Konkanivarman} \\
\text{Madhava I} \\
\text{Aryavarman or} \\
\text{Ayyavarman or} \\
\text{Harivarman (Crowned by Pallava Simhavarman)} \\
\text{Madhava II a/s Simhavarman (Crowned by Pallava Skandavarman or Vijaya-Skandavarman)} \\
\text{Vishugopa} \\
\text{Madhava III} \\
\text{Avintha} \\
\text{Durvintha}
\]

The names Arivarman and Harivarman occur only in the spurious or later copper-plates and stone inscriptions of this dynasty (Kielhorn, *Southern List* Nos. 108 ff.). These names must be given up in favour of "Aryavarman" of the earlier plates. Professor Dubreuil makes Harivarman a different person from, and a younger brother of, Aryavarman. But in the light of the Tanjore plates Hari might be the same as Ari and the latter a colloquial or pet form of Arya. Rice's difficulty in allocating to Vishugopa the proper place in the family genealogy is also overcome by adopting the scheme suggested above. His supposition that Vishugopa's name was dropped out by mistake in the Peunkonja plates requires corroboration.

The inscription is dated not with reference to any era but gives the occasion of the grant as *bhūka-pañcha-daśamī* in the month of Phalguna in the first year of the king's reign. In determining the dates of the Peunkonja plates of the present king's grandson Madhava II, Fleet has given A.D. 475 as a very good date for it. Shifting back by two generations of 25 years each our plates will have to be assigned to about A.D. 425, which is not improbable in the light of its paleography which has been fully discussed already.

---

1 The name is given in this form in the Kōdālūr grant of Madhavavarman (*Mys. Arch. Rep.*, 1930, p. 259).
4 Above, Vol. XIV, p. 331.
The localities mentioned in the grant are Paru-vishaya and the village Veliputtu. The former is evidently the same as Parui-vishaya of the Penukonda plates which has been identified by Rice with Pargi, seven miles north of Hindupur in the Anantapur District. The gift village is evidently identical with the modern village Velipumajugur of the Gooty taluk in the same district. The plates must have migrated from Veliputtu to Sasanakota where they were discovered in course of time.

The engraver of the grant was Somaarman. Nothing is stated about his official position or status.

**TEXT.**

### First Plate.

1. Jitam³-Bhaagavata gata-ghana-gagan-abhena Padmanabhena [*!*] árima-
2. j-Jahnaveya-kul-ämala-vyom-avabhasana4-bhakarasya
3. [sva-bhuja-javaja-jaya-jani]ta-sujana-janapadaasya *darañ-ári-gaṣa-

### Second Plate; First Side.

4. vidaran¿-raña-ópalabdha-vrana-bhushapasya Kánvýayana-sagútrasya
5. árimat-Kónganiwarma-dharma-mahádirajasya putrenga pitur-anvag-
6. ta-gunëna sva-bhuja-vrity-ótpatit-avaghihit-ári-ári-yasa[ñ]
7. nánñ-sástraatha11-sad-bhav-ádhigama-prañita-mati-vidháhsya12

### Second Plate; Second Side.

8. viñvat-kavi-káñchana-nikash-ópalah-hútasya12 viñvahutó-py-aná-
9. vaśéhasya niti-sástrasya yathávad-vakkrí14-prayóktri-ku-
10. sañëna samyak-prajà-pálana-mátr-ádhigata-rájya-prayójanëna
11. su-vibhakta-bhakta-bhútiya-janëna áti Mádhavavarmmaná átmahan

---

2. The term tora or dorasa is synonymous with mañjya in Telugu and means a ‘pond.’ It would be interesting to note that Velipumajugur is a very ancient settlement. The adjoining ‘isolated round-topped granite hill crowned with a fortification of post-neolithic date yielded a good harvest of celts and other neolithic artifacts’ (Bruce Foote, Indian Pre-historic and Proto-historic Antiquities, p. 99).
3. From the original plates and from ink-impressions prepared in my office.
4. This symbol is engraved in the margin as in the Penukonda plates and probably stands for Śri or Siddhant.
5. In addition to this the Penukonda plates have the expression Samata in the margin.
6. At the top of ñ is a dot in the original. This is accidental and due to corrosion and need not be mistaken for an aumacma which in this record is always marked at the right top corner of the concerned letter.
7. The Penukonda plates have vma-bhagama.
8. The portion enclosed within the brackets is engraved on an erasure like a palimpsest. The Penukonda plates read ‘bhuja-javaja-jaya-
9. Read durañ-ári,
10. The Penukonda plates have Kokaññi.
11. After this word is a letter like pñ engraved and scored out.
12. Read áciári-yastha.
13. Read vñádsña.
14. Read áciári.
Third Plate: First Side.
12 pravardhdhamana-vipul-sivavryya prathamade savara[th]sar[ha] Phalguna-MA.
13 s[ha]ku-ra-pakh{a} tithau dasan{a}y{a} Vasua-sagar{a}ya Taittiriya.
14 charan{a}ya Dharsarasman{a} atman{a}r{a}yanast Paru-vishaya.
15 V[ap[pu]toru-nama-gramo brahmadeya-kramena-adbh[ha]-pratta[th].

Third Plate: Second Side.
18 gata[th] [*] lokah [*] Sva-dattam-para-dattam va yo harioma vasasadharam [*].
19 shaptih(shti) varsha-sahasrap{a} ghore tamasi varattat [*] Bahu.

Fourth Plate: First Side.
20 bhir-vasudha bhukta rujabhis-sagar-adbh[i][ha][y][a] [*] yasya yasya.
21 yada bhumi-tasya tasya tada phalam [*] Svan-ditum su-maha{ch}-chha.
22 kyan du[ka]kh-anaarya-arpaha-palanam [*] dana{m} va palanam v{eh}ti danach-chhr{at}.  
23 y-ouden[lana[m] [*] Sva-maharaja-mukhi-ajnapaya Soma.

Fourth Plate: Second Side.
24 sarman{a} likhit-ayana-tama-pratik{a} [*].

No. 32.—RANIPUR JHARIAL INSCRIPTIONS.

TMA.

By B. CH. CHHAJTRA, M.A., M.O.L., Ph.D. (LL.D.), Gopacamund.

Ranipur Jharia, a village about 21 miles west of Titilagarh in the Puthi State of Orissa, is famous for its numerous old temples, all of which are now deserted and partly dilapidated. They are built on a rocky surface on one side of a big tank close by. The place was first surveyed as early as 1875 by Mr. J. D. Beglar who has left us a vivid description of the buildings and sculptures found at this site. About seven years later Sir A. Cunningham also visited this village and examined its antiquities. Lastly, in November

1 Read asamsayra.
2 The dome in the Penukoja plates also belongs to the same gatra and charasa.
3 Read Taittiriya. The Penukoja plates also adopt the form Taittiriya.
4 Read atmanah kriyase or atma-nihkriyasa.
5 The Penukoja plates call it Parusi-vishaya. [The same Parusi-vishaya is evidently intended here. The line seems to have dropped a ci by way of haplography.—Ed.]
6 The Penukoja plates read only yasya karta.
7 Read -gudha as in the Penukoja plates. The same three imprecatory verses are cited in the said plates but in a different order.
8 Read adhika.
9 This ha is written below the line.
10 Read Maharesavenamukhi-ajnapayya.
11 The writer of the Penukoja plates was the goldsmith (SAMEPRAH) Apana.
12 Titilagarh is a railway station on the Raipur-Vizagapatam line of the Bengal Nagpur Railway.
13 Cunningham’s A. S. I. Reports, Vol. XIII, pp. 126-127, plates XI-XVI.
14 Ibid., Vol. XVII, pp. 64-65.
1936. I went there, while I was touring in that part of the country, specially in quest of inscriptions. I copied there three epigraphs which form the subject of this article.

A. — Mahādeva Temple Inscription.

This record is engraved on the architrave over the entrance to the sanctuary of a stone temple which is the largest of the whole group and is locally known as Mahādeva temple. It has been noticed by Mr. Beglar according to whom it is the only inscription in the whole of the innumerable temples here. Evidently the other two epigraphs treated of here escaped his notice. Nor has Sir Cunningham noticed them. The inscription under discussion consists of six lines of unequal length, the first four lines measuring more or less five feet each and the last two only one foot. The average size of the letters is 1 1/2 in.

The characters of the inscription belong to the Northern script of about the 10th or 11th century A.D. The language is Sanskrit, but the composition is extremely faulty. Nevertheless the contents are fairly intelligible. No orthographical peculiarity is noticeable, except that the consonant after r is occasionally reduplicated, as in cemugara of l. 1, and that the sign of v is used for both b and v.

Lexically, the usage of the word kirtitam (A. l. 2) as well as of prakāritā (B. l. 4) in the sense of 'built' is of interest. In the latter record the term kirti is employed as a synonym of kirtana, meaning 'a building' or 'a temple'.

The object of the inscription is to record the construction of the temple by an aśokara, named Gaganāśva, an immigrant from Utarn-Terambarghana. It is clear from the inscription that the temple contained images of at least four different deities, namely Śoma, Svāmīn, Siddhāsvara and Lakshmi. The first of these names is obviously a shortened form of Śomāśvaradēva which occurs in l. 1 and refers to Śiva, the principal deity of the temple. Svāmīn is an epithet of Śiva's son Kārttikeya. As regards the name Siddhāsvara, it probably stands here for Siddhārtha, meaning the Buddha, a figure of whom is found sculptured on the jamb of the entrance of the temple in question. The figure of Lakshmi is found over the entrance. From the presence of relics pertaining to different creeds, Beglar concluded 'that the temple was first Vaishnavic, next Buddhist, and finally Saivite.' This conclusion is now disproved by the mention of the aforesaid four deities in the inscription itself, which rather shows that they all were installed simultaneously, and that the seeming diversity was the original character of the temple.

It may be pointed out that the inscription was examined both by Mr. Beglar and by Sir A. Cunningham, but their interpretation of it is open to question. For instance, the appellation Śomāśvaradēva-bhātāraka, occurring in the beginning of the record, has been

---

1 For its Buddhist and Vaishnavic associations compare Mr. Beglar's remarks, loc. cit., p. 130.
2 The significance of this word has been discussed by Prof. R. G. Bhandarkar in Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, pp. 228-229, where he has also cited certain instances of its usage in the given sense both in literature and in inscriptions.
3 The word kirti is found used in the same sense also in the Ghoarākha Buddhist inscription, Ind. Ant., Vol. XVII, p. 309 (also p. 308 and p. 312, n. 30), and Kirti of the Lakhṣa Mandāl prasāti, above Vol. I, p. 14 and p. 15, n. 21.
4 See above, n. 1.
5 Loc. cit., p. 131.
taken by them as referring to a rājā of that name,1 while, as is clear from the context, it refers in reality to Śiva, the main deity of the shrine.

The only information we get from the inscription regarding Gaganasāvīva ācārya is that he hailed from Uttara-Terambagriha. In this connection Dr. N. P. Chakravarti has kindly directed my attention to the Mattamayūra school of Śiva ascetics, suggesting thereby that Gaganasāvīva might have been one of them, as the names of some of them likewise end in śiva. This argument receives further support from the identification of Uttara-Terambagriha with Terambhi as proposed below. Terambhi, it may be pointed out, is known from the Rāṇōd inscription to be the seat of an earlier Śiva saint of the Mattamayūra line, whose name is not given but who is styled Terambhipāla, i.e., the protector of Terambhi.2

The saints of the Mattamayūra sect are known to have founded temples, tanks and monasteries at various places, being highly honoured and favoured with munificent gifts by certain Kalachuri rulers.3 The Rāṇōd inscription itself belongs to one such sage, called Vyomaśīva, who is stated to have restored to Raṇipadra4 its past glory5 and beautified the mātha there by building in its vicinity a magnificent tank, a temple, a garden and shrines with images of Śiva, Umā, Nāṭyēśvara and Vināyaka.6 Of all these, prominence is given to the tank, the construction of which forms the main object of the record and which is glorified in no less than twenty verses (vv. 45-64). The line of disciples given in this record is as follows:5 Kadambaguhī-thivāsin, Śānkhamatihik-adhipati, Terambhipāla, Āmardakātirtha-nātha, Purandara, Kacchāsvīva, Sādāsvīva, Hridayēśa and Vyomaśīva. Of these Purandara is described to have founded two māthas, one at Mattamayūra and the other at Raṇipadra. The latter place, it is narrated, was subsequently graced by Sādāsvīva by doing penance there, while still later, as has already been stated, its grandeur was revived and enhanced by Vyomaśīva. From the numerous laudatory verses in praise of Vyomaśīva we gather that he was an ascetic of a very high order and a profound scholar, well-versed in the Śiva-vidhāntas as well as in the Nyāya, Vaiśēshika, Mimāṃsā and Śaṅkhya āsttras, equally proficient in the Lōkāyata, Baudhā and Jaina doctrines, who could easily silence his opponents in a debate, so much so that he is related to be a second omniscient Śāṅkara (i.e., Śiva) incarnate.7

Now, considering that Vyomaśīva, so far as the meaning of the word is concerned, is the same as Gaganasāvīva, one feels suspicious whether the two names refer to one and the same person. And this suspicion is heightened by the fact that Vyomaśīva is variously mentioned in the Rāṇōd inscription by such equivalent appellations as Gaganēśa (v. 39), Vyomaśambhu (v. 41), Vyomēśa (v. 50) and Gaganasāśimauili (v. 65). The same will be found in the case of certain other sages. Thus, for example, Hridayēśa of the Rāṇōd inscription

---

1 The Secretary to the Cabinet, Pāṭa State, has kindly placed at my disposal copies of certain manuscripts by the late Mr. Manbodh Sahu, a resident of that State. One of them contains a transcript of the present inscription, with some notes regarding its contents. I find most of the text read by Mr. Sahu to be correct, except that he has, after the Oriya fashion, used 5 for 6 in his transliteration. As regards the contents of the record, while his explanation of it improves little upon that given by Mr. Beglar and Sir Cunningham, he follows them in regarding Sōmeśvaradēva as referring to a royal personage.


4 R. D. Banerji wrongly gives it as Raṇipadra.


6 Ibid., p. 359, vv. 43, 44.

7 For a fuller list and a more detailed account the reader is referred to R. D. Banerji's monograph, loc. cit.

8 Compare especially the verses 36-39 of the Rāṇōd inscription.
is called Hṛdayaśīva in the Bilhari inscription. It is clear from this that with regard to the names of the Mattamayūra sages it was the sense of the word and not the word itself that mattered, so that any synonymous term could be substituted for a personal name, be it though merely to conform to metrical requirements. In view of these considerations, one would naturally conclude that Vyōmaśīva and Gaganāśīva are, in all probability, but two different names of one and the same person. This conclusion is favoured also by the likelihood of Tērambi being identical with Uttara-Tērambaṛagriha. There is yet another point which would lend support to the identification of Vyōmaśīva with Gaganāśīva, and that is the name Raṇipatra. Has this name anything to do with Raṇipur Jharjāl? Referring to the deserted temples at this latter place, Mr. Beglar points out that they are traditionally ascribed to a Rani, but her name has been forgotten. But one may as well ask: Can it not be that we have a replica of Raṇipatra itself in Raṇipur Jharjāl, with its name, tank, temples and all, owing their origin to one and the same personage, viz., Vyōmaśīva or Gaganāśīva?

However plausible the above argument may appear, the whole question has to be left undecided in the absence of more convincing evidence. The verbal likeness between Raṇipatra and Raṇipur may be as accidental as may the similarity between Vyōmaśīva and Gaganāśīva be fortuitous. And when we consider how ill compares the faulty and clumsy construction of the present brief record with the chaste and ornate composition of the copious inscription from Raṇōḍ, the former depicting Gaganāśīva as a mediocre abbot and the latter representing Vyōmaśīva as a great celebrity among the learned and the holy, the possibility of the two being identical becomes remoter still. There is, however, no such obstacle in accepting Tērambi being the same as Uttara-Tērambaṛagriha and Gaganāśīva being connected with the Mattamayūra sect of Šāiva saints.

As regards the location of the places referred to above, Raṇipatra has been taken to be Raṇōḍ itself, an old decayed town in the state of Gwālior, about half way between Jhānsī and Guna. Tērambi, it is suggested, may be identified with Terahi, which is five miles to the south-east of Raṇōḍ, and which seems also to represent the Uttara-Tērambaṛagriha of the inscription under discussion, unless, as a partial phonetic resemblance between the names would suggest, it be identified with the modern Tarbhā, an important mart in the Sonepur State, lying on the borders of the Pāṇḍa State, some sixty-five miles north-east of Raṇipur Jharjāl, which seems less probable.

\[\text{TEXT}\]
TRANSLATION.

Om. Obeisance to Śiva! The āchārya (or siddhāchārya?) named Gaganāsvīma, an immigrant from the glorious Uttarā-Terāmbhagagrīha, (who has been) favoured with a boon by the Supreme Master, the Lord, the illustrious god Sōmaśvara, has built this (holy) place which combines in itself the merit of all the holy places, is beneficial for the people, and is sacred, containing (the images of the four gods) namely Sōma, Svāmin, Siddhēśvara and Lakshmi as the fourth. This holy place delivers (one) of all sins, if (one) bathes (here). O Śrī-Sōmaśvarānātha! Gaganāsvīma, being ever full of devotion, bows at your pair of feet. O Śāṅkara! you bestow salvation (on your devotee), if (he) is in bondage. You are able even to put (one) into bondage, (if one) is freed. What is not possible through penance? ....the lord of the universe, you give bondage or liberation. But Gagan alone (is?) this lord Śiva.

B.—Kēnduvalli Temple Inscription.

At a little distance in front of the Mahādēva temple described above, there is another, called Kēnduvalli temple, which is much smaller in size. The face of the rock on which

1 Sandhī has not been observed here.
2 Between pu and agn traces are visible of a cancelled letter which seems to have been a sa.
3 The reading is probably Śrāmi, only the subscript n is not clear.
4 The usage of this absolute gerund for a conditional clause is unusual.
5 This is equivalent to śrī-Sōmaśvaradēva.
6 This can also be read as sthānāpi.
7 From here onwards the sense is not very clear to me.
8 These names have been discussed in the introduction.
9 See above, n. 4.
10 See above, n. 7.
it stands is carved with figures of nava-graha. The present short inscription is engraved to the left of these carvings. Owing to the exposure, both the drawings and the epigraph are badly weather-worn and can be made out only with difficulty.

The inscription consists of four short lines, each about a foot and a quarter in length, comprising one stanza in the Amishṭubh metre; thus every line containing one quarter of the verse.

The characters are similar to those of the record A already dealt with. The inscription can thus be assigned roughly to the 10th century A.D., which would also be the date of the temple the erection of which is recorded in it.

The language is Sanskrit, practically without any mistakes. In point of orthography the use of $s$ for $i$ in saddhō (I. 1) may be noted. The significance of the words kīrti- and prakāśi has been discussed above.

The record simply informs us that one Dēvānanda, son of Jōgēśvara, has raised this shrine in honour of Krishṇa, by which evidently the present Kânduvalli temple itself is meant. It cannot be ascertained from the inscription whether the name Kânduvalli is the same as was originally given to the shrine or whether it came to be attached to it later on. It is, however, only from this epigraph that we learn that the shrine was dedicated to Krishṇa, as the monument itself in its present condition is totally bereft of its original contents. As is evidenced by this as well as by the previous record, the temples of Rānipur Jharīal were devoted to various deities. It must, therefore, have been a place of pilgrimage for Hindu devotees of all persuasions.

No information is given regarding Dēvānanda and his father Jōgēśvara so as to determine whether the builder of this Krishṇa temple was also an āchārya or simply a layman.

TEXT.¹

1  jōgēśvarah  s (ṣ)ro
2  dēvānandē
dhūt  i
3  tēn  kṣēpārāś
4  kōtiśiṣa  prakāśi

TRANSLATION.

Jōgēśvara (had) a son, well-known as Dēvānanda. This temple is constructed by him in honour of Krishṇa.

C.—Rākhasa-parvata Inscription.

This inscription is cut on the top of a rocky elevation known as Rākhasa-parvata, lying opposite the Kânduvalli temple at a short distance. The inscription is accompanied on the left by a line-drawing, representing a pair of human footprints enclosed within a rayed circle. The engraving of both the drawing and the writing is shallow.

¹ See above p. 240.
² From ink-impressions.
³ Strictly speaking, it ought to have been Dēvānanda ṭi, but sandhi has been made through the exigency of the metre. Or, the name Dēvānanda is used here avibhaṅka, i.e., without the case-termination.
The writing consists of three very small lines, each about eight inches long, comprising half a śloka. The characters appear to be somewhat later in date than those of the previous two records, but belong to the same type. The language is Sanskrit. The purport of the record is the consecration of the foot-marks (at the instance of a siddhāchārya?) which are engraved near by, though the text is rather obscure. The nimbus around the foot-impresses denotes the holiness of the person to whom they belong, but there is nothing to show whether the person is a god or a saint.

TEXT.¹

1 ओँ प्र[लित्ता]यमि-
2 ते प[व]िति-
3 चार्य वाचित[!]*

TRANSLATION.

Om. Siddhāchārya has declared this footprint to be consecrated.

No. 33.—ALLAHABAD MUNICIPAL MUSEUM YUPA INSCRIPTION.

BY PROF. A. S. ALTEKAR, M.A., D.LITT., BENARES HINDU UNIVERSITY.

While on a visit to Allahābād, Rai Bahadur Braj Mohan Vyas, B.A., LL.B., the devoted founder and maker of the Allahābād Municipal Museum, showed me an inscribed fragmentary stone pillar, which had been acquired for the museum some months ago. This interesting monument hailed from the neighbourhood of Kosam, ancient Kauśāmbī, in Allahābād District, which was a well-known and flourishing city in ancient India. Rai Bahadur Vyas kindly supplied to me an ink-impression of the inscription on the pillar, after I had read it from the original, and requested me to edit it in the Epigraphia Indica. I am doing so accordingly.

The inscription has been inscribed on a stone pillar, which, in its original form, was obviously intended to be a yūpas. The pillar has been sadly mutilated; only one of its facets along with a small part of the adjoining one on its left, has been recovered. To judge from the angles of these facets, it is clear that the pillar was originally an octagonal one. It thus resembled the main shafts of the yūpas at Isāpur, Bājdva and Bījaygadh. For further information about the size, nature and significance of sacrificial pillars, I may refer the reader to my paper on 'Three Maikhari Inscriptions on Yūpas, Kṛita year 295' published ante, Vol. XXIII, pp. 42 ff.

As in the case of the Isāpur yūpa, the inscription on this pillar also has been engraved in horizontal lines. In this respect it differs from the rather inconvenient arrangement to be seen on the yūpas at Nāndsā, Bājdva and Bījaygadh, where the records have been inscribed in long vertical lines to be read from the top to the bottom or vice versa.² The extant portion of the inscription extends over 16 lines. From its concluding sentence, 'May Mahēśvara, thus honoured, be pleased over and over again', it is clear that the record ends with the last words of the present last line.

¹ From ink-impressions.
² Expressed by a symbol.
³ There are two records on the pillar of Nāndsā containing practically the identical text. One of these is written in vertical and the other in horizontal lines.—Ed.]
It may be recalled that the Isāpur yūpa record also ends similarly, ‘May the fires be pleased’. We may therefore confidently conclude that our record did not run into any lower line over a facet which has been destroyed.

The general arrangement of the record and the purport of the lines preserved make it further certain that the present first line was preceded by two earlier ones, which referred to the first two sacrifices in the Saptā-Sōna-saṁsthā. This point will be further explained later.

The portion of the inscription that has been inscribed on the completely preserved facet of the pillar and also over a small fraction of the facet on its left, makes it clear that each facet was intended to have one quartrain of the Anusṭūbha metre. It is thus clear that at least the metrical part of the record was inscribed over the four out of the eight facets of the yūpa. The same probably was the arrangement in the case of the last five lines, which are in prose.

The characters of the inscription, which has been engraved very carefully and beautifully, belong to about the 2nd century of the Christian era. The form of the letters na, na, la, and sa makes it quite clear that the record is much earlier than the Gupta period. It would be instructive to compare its facsimile with those of the Isāpur, Nāndśa and Bādīyā yūpas, erected respectively in the 24th year of emperor Vāsiśthaka, and 282nd and 296th year of the Krīta, i.e., Vikrama era. Unlike in any of the above dated records, in our epigraph, the forms of the medial short and long i are denoted by one and two curvilinear lines respectively, placed over the top of the letter; the later practice of using for this purpose curves turning to the left and right, which we see in Isāpur, Nāndśa and Bādīyā records, is not known to our epigraph. The central stroke of sa is still slanting downwards; this is an archaic characteristic and is not to be seen in any of the above records. Na and va have only a slight bend in the base line; the former has not yet developed a hook, and the latter shows no tendency to develop any curve at the top. The central bar of ka is still a straight line; it has not become curved as at Nāndśa and Bādīyā. The vertical of la has not yet developed a curve at the top as at Bādīyā. Ya shows no loop in the left limb as at Nāndśa and Bādīyā. The letter da still retains its archaic form and opens to the left as in the inscriptions of Ushavadāta and Rudradāman. Paleography would therefore show that this yūpa inscription is earlier than the yūpa records, referred to above; we may, therefore, with fair certainty, place it in the first part of the 2nd century A.D., if not even a little earlier.

The language of the record is Sanskrit, but there are the following mistakes in it. Chekh in uückhritak or supuückhritak has been throughout represented by chkh; see ll. 1, 2, 7. In l. 7 "vimsēr has been wrongly spelt as "vimśē. In l. 10 dāveca is a mistake for dattē-aiwe. At the end of the l. 13, there is a sandhi mistake; instead of taśmimnī-er-āhāni the record reads taśmīmnī-er-āhāni. The last five lines of the record are in prose, but its first II lines are in verse, the metre being Anusṭūbha. The same probably was the case with the first two lines of the record that have now been lost.

Orthography calls for a few remarks only. An anussāra is indicated by a dot above the letter; it is not changed to the nasal of the class of the letter following; see ll. 6, 8. Va has been changed into bu in the word Kaubidārkī, l. 12. Consonants are not doubled when they are conjoined with a preceding r; cf. [chatu]rthik, l. 2, "r-bhōktāraṇam, l. 16. The rules of sandhi are usually observed; "dhih khurakā" (l. 15) is the only exception. There are no punctuation marks at the end of sentences or verses. At the end of l. 15, there is a small horizontal stroke which was perhaps intended to be a punctuation mark. The verses are numbered at the end. There is a separate numbering for the verses in sections A and B of the record.

1 [See p. 249, n. 3 below.—Ed.]
Symbols for all the numerals from 1 to 9 appear in the record. They are similar to those found in the Nāsik and Kushāna inscriptions of the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D.

As regards the date, it is clear from l. 7 that the record was inscribed in the 23rd regnal year of a certain king. But as his name is not preserved in the extant part of the inscription, we cannot utilise this information for determining its date. Palaeographical evidence therefore affords the only clue; it points to the early part of the 2nd century A.D. as the probable date of the record, as shown already above.

Though the inscription is very fragmentary, its main purpose can be ascertained fairly satisfactorily. It divides itself into three parts, part A consisting of ll. 1-7, part B of ll. 8-11, and part C of ll. 12-16. Part A commemorates the erection of as many as seven yūpas in connection with the performance of seven Śoma sacrifices, technically known as Sapta-Śoma-sanāṭhā. The sacrificer was almost certainly Śīvadatta, who was a very trusted minister of a certain king, whose name has been lost. That he performed the various sacrifices comprised in the group of seven Śoma sacrifices becomes clear from the fact that only seven sacrifices are mentioned, and that—to judge from the wording in ll. 3 and 5—they have been counted from Agnishtoma. Line 5 further shows that the 5th sacrifice in the series was Vājapēyā. Such actually is the case with the sacrifices in Sapta-Śoma-sanāṭhā. For the sacrifices included in this group are Agnishtoma, Agnishtoma, Uktihya, Śōdasa, Vājapēyā, Atiśītra and Apāryyāma, and they are to be performed in the stated order.1

In the Vedic age the Śoma sacrifice was very common and its most popular form was Agnishtoma, so called because the last of its twelve chants was called Agnishtoma-Śūman. The other six sacrifices included in the Sapta-Śoma-sanāṭhā, enumerated in the preceding paragraph, differ from Agnishtoma only in minor details. This group of seven Śoma sacrifices seems to have been very popular when the Vedic religion was in ascendancy, for one Dharmasūtra writer has elevated them to the status of the sanāṭhā.2 It is clear that the idea was that these sacrifices should be performed by every household as regularly as the sacraments like the upanayana and antyeksha. As a matter of fact we sometimes find even the Grihya sacrifices, which were very numerous, being artificially grouped into a sapta-pakavyajña-sanāṭhā on the analogy of the sapta-Śomayajñā-sanāṭhā.3 This would show how great was the importance that was attached to the seven Śoma sacrifices of this group. It is, however, interesting to note that the present is the first case of our having discovered any yūpa referring to their performance. The Bījayagadha yūpa and the yūpas of king Mālavarmān of Borneo do not mention the name of the sacrifice in connection with which they were erected.4 The Isāpur yūpa commemorates the celebration of a Devadāsa-rātra sacrifice, and the Nandā yūpa of the Shāhṣṭi-rātra, as would appear from the preliminary note published about its inscription by Mr. Haldar.5 Each of the three Baiḍā yūpa inscriptions that have so far been published, refers to the Triśītra sacrifice and another from the place, which is published below, commemorates an Apāryyāma sacrifice. The present record is, therefore the first one published so far that refers to the celebration of all the seven sacrifices included in the famous Sapta-Śomayajñā-sanāṭhā.

---

1 Kātipāyana-Sramasūtra, X, 9, 27. In the enumeration of these sacrifices as given in Gauṭama-Dharmasūtra, Uktihya, Agnishtoma, Śōdasa and Atiśītra occupy the 2nd, 6th, 3rd and 4th position respectively.
2 Gauṭama-Dharmasūtra.
3 Bāhuśāyana-Grihyasūtra, 1, 1, 1.
4 [In one of the inscriptions of Mālavarmān, Bahuśuvrāṣaka has been taken by Kern as a synonym of Bahuśuvraṣaka, a Śoma sacrifice.—Ed.]
5 Ind. Ant., 1929, p. 33. [The sacrifice mentioned in this record is Ṛṣa-Shaṣṭi-rātra.—Ed.]
Section A of the record, consisting of ll. 1-7, refers to the erection of seven pillars in connection with the seven Šōma sacrifices referred to above. The first line of the record, which has been numbered 3 at its end, begins with a fragmentary letter which was clearly t, and which is followed by yē yūpā u[ṃ]*[ṣ]ikhitabh. It is clear that we have to restore the first word as ātiṣyā and that the line refers to the erection of the third yūpā in connection with the third sacrifice of Šōma group; viz., the Ulṣṭhya. Of the first word in ll. 2, which has been numbered 4 at the end, only two letters *rhas-tu have been preserved. It is however clear that we have to restore the word as chasthrathas-tu and the line thus refers to the erection of the fourth resplendent yūpā. The next line in the inscription, which is numbered 5, refers to the fifth one from Agnīśhōma; as the sacrifices in the Sa[p]ta-Śōmatya-rātanathā were numbered from Agnīśhōma, its first member, the line refers to the erection of the fifth yūpā in connection with the Vājarāya sacrifice, which is the fifth one in the series. The next line, which contains the verse numbered 6 in the record, refers to the sixth one from the first sacrifice. Obviously when complete, it described the erection of the sixth yūpā in connection with the Aṭṭāra sacrifice, which is the 6th member in the Šōma group. The next line, containing the verse 7, refers to the seventh yūpā from Agnīśhōma, and obviously must have referred to the Aṭṭārāya sacrifice, which was the last one in the Sa[p]ta-Śōma-rātanathā group. It would now become clear from this that the original record contained two more lines in the beginning, which have been now completely lost and which must have referred to the erection of two yūpas in connection with Agnīśhōma and Aṭṭārāya sacrifices, which were the first and second member respectively in the series of seven Šōma sacrifices.

Though not originally included in the group of Šōma sacrifices by the earlier Śāṁhitās, the 5th sacrifice in this series, the Vājarāya, soon assumed very great importance, and became associated with royal coronation. The 6th line of our record [prathā]mād-yaṣāt puñchamā Vāja-rāya[hitab] refers to something connected with this sacrifice, as its concluding adjective would show. As the record is fragmentary, we cannot be sure about the purport of this line. It is, however, permissible to conjecture that the line referred once more to the yūpā of the Vājarāya sacrifice, and that it is identical with the one we have discovered. It would appear that though seven yūpas were duly set up by the sacrificer, he decided to select the yūpā of Vājarāya sacrifice for the honour of bearing the inscription, commemorating the performance of the seven Šōma sacrifices. Other yūpas were probably merely erected but not inscribed. We can now understand how only one of the sacrificial pillars found at Isāpur bears an inscription. When several yūpas were erected in connection with a sacrificial sātra, it was customary to inscribe the relevant inscription on only one of them. The yūpas at Bādyā are all inscribed, because they refer to sacrifices performed, no doubt on the same day, but by different sacrificers. Each sacrificer was anxious to commemorate his sacrifice separately.

The 7th line of the record stated the time of the performance of these sacrifices. The date was given not in any era but in the reignal year of a king. Unfortunately for history, the name of this potentate has been lost. The only restoration possible of the first crucial word in the line is [trayā]-śīṁśe; the first fragmentary letter may possibly be taken as pā, but it can give no word for a numeral in combination with śīṁśe following. On the other hand it could very well have been a part of the letter yē. In that case the word can be restored as trayāśīṁśe(vin)ī, as pointed out above. The record therefore was undoubtedly dated in the 23rd year of a king, whose name has now been lost.

Section B of the record, consisting of ll. 8-11, is again in Anushṭubh metre. It was intended to give us information about the honorarium paid to the Brāhmaṇas, who officiated at these sacrifices. It is almost certain from these lines that the sacrificer was not the king, but a minister of his.
His name Sivadatta appears in 1.8 and he is probably once more referred to in 1.11 as 'a friend of the king', the form rājamitraḥ being probably a mistake for rājamerataḥ. The first word of 1.8 can certainly be restored as grūmaḥ. The line, therefore, mentioned a village given to the minister Sivadatta, obviously by the king. In 1.9 the word grūma occurs as an object of a sentence and 1.10 refers to the payment of dakshiṇa. It would therefore appear that a village, which had been originally given by the king to his minister Sivadatta, was subsequently transferred by him as dakshiṇa to the priests, who officiated in his sacrificial session. Each Soma sacrifice required 16 priests; if different sets of priests had officiated at each of the seven Soma sacrifices performed by Sivadatta, the total number of persons entitled for the sacrificial fee would have been 112. Though an entire village was thus alienated, each donee probably received only 1/112th part of its revenues. The total dakshiṇa, which Sivadatta had to pay on the occasion, undoubtedly constituted a big amount, and it will incidentally remind us of the oft-repeated observation that the Vedic sacrifices represented the religion of rich aristocracy and were beyond the means of ordinary individuals.

Section C of the record, consisting of 1.12-16, is in prose and these lines have not been numbered. As the lines are fragmentary, their purport can only be conjectured. Line 12 describes the homage paid to Kaubidariṣṭa and the first part of 1.13 refers to some merit available in this and the next life. Kōvidāra is the name of a tree, favourite to Śiva like Bilva. It would appear that Śiva was the tutelary deity of the minister Sivadatta and these lines refer to the planting of a Kōvidāra grove, Kaubidariṣṭa [vaiṣṇava], apparently in the garden of a Śiva temple, and the homage paid to it on the occasion. The merit of this religious act was probably described in the greater part of the next line, i.e., 1.13.

1.14-16, along with the last six letters of 1.13, refer to another gift made on the same day. The last line (l. 16) expresses the hope that Mahēśvara, thus honoured, may be pleased over and over again. It would therefore appear that the donee of this second gift was a Śiva temple. L. 15 states that wandering mendicants should be supplied with food. It would appear that this temple of Śiva had a satra attached to it, and that a portion of the donation was reserved for the expenses connected with it. Epigraphs of later days refer to several such satras maintained by temple authorities, where poor men, wandering mendicants and students were offered free food. L. 14 and a portion of l. 15 describe the gift given. The extant portion of the inscription does not specifically describe the object of this gift, but to judge from the expression sarva-jita-bhōgyam and abhritra-pravesam, it is obvious that the gift made was of a village. Whether the donor was the king or his minister Sivadatta we do not know; probably it was the latter.

Though the record is very fragmentary, we can thus ascertain its purport almost completely. The loss of the name of the king, whom Sivadatta was serving as a minister, is, however, an irreparable historical loss. Had his name been preserved, we would probably have been able to date the record and get some welcome information about the contemporary history.

The contents of the record, as made out above, would show that it is a very interesting epigraph. It not only refers to the erection of as many as seven yāpas in connection with the

---

1 [Probably we have to take Rājamitra here as a proper name as the case termination indicates.—Ed.]
2 [We cannot determine if the whole of this portion is in prose. The opening portion of L. 13 appears to be in Awasthī metre, while the last line decidedly conforms to Vaisnavakṣa metre.—Ed.]
3 [In the copper-inscription this is given as विकारिता स्वादिशविनिः स्वादिशविनिः: विष.]
4 I am indebted to Pandit Chinmowati Shastri, Vice-Principal, Oriental College, Benares Hindu University, for drawing my attention to this line. [Kōvidariṣṭa and Kōsambara, apparently as place names, occur in the Indore Plates of Pravarāsena II (above, p. 50).—Ed.]
performance of the seven Śoma sacrifices, but also records a donation made on the same day, and probably by the same donor and of the same value, to a temple of Siva. The record thus shows how in the everyday life of the second century Hindu community, Vedic and Paurānic religions were harmoniously blended together. The concluding portion of the Īśapur āpā inscription is "Priyānt ām-Agnaya[ḥ], and it is quite appropriate in a record describing a Vedic sacrifice. In our epigraph, however, the concluding sentence expresses the hope that Siva may be pleased. Of course this is probably due to the last recorded donation being in favour of a Siva temple. It would however also attest to the growing hold of the Paurānic religion even on the minds of those who were taking an active part in the revival of the Vedic religion.

**TEXT.**

A

1 [ढलौऽ]गो घुप अक्षितः [र*-] [र*-] [र*-]
2 [चोऽ]खूऽ निवासमुष्टी समुखि: [र*-] [र*-] [र*-]
3 [तोऽ]ताम विश्वनिष्ठामात्र परमपर [र*-] [र*-] [र*-]
4 [तोऽ]नवैन पदल्लु प्रमातं ती: [र*-] [र*-] [र*-]
5 [चान-]आन्ध्रमध्यक्षांसम्पूर्ण: [र*-] [र*-] [र*-]
6 [प्रय-]मायिकात्यमः वाजपेयिक: [र*-] [र*-] [र*-]
7 [चोऽ]वीरिनव घुप: समुखि: [र*-] [र*-] [र*-]

B

8 [चोऽ]म विवदलय मंथिणि [र*-] [र*-]
9 [चोऽ]चवई चामं रक्षी महामन: [र*-] [र*-]

---

1 From the original and ink-impression.
2 A part of the letter र can be seen in the ink-impression.
3 Read nekhrasitis.
4 Read ठ. The upper horizontal line in the symbol for ठ has been destroyed.
5 For the restoration proposed, see the introduction.
6 Read samsukhkhrasitah.
7 The first letter ट of this line appears to have the mark of a medial s above it in the ink-impression. It is, however, merely a trace in the stone, caused when the pillar was mutilated. There is no clear sign of medial s also on the second letter. This letter ट is, however, the 8th one in an Anushṭubh quatrain and should therefore be a long one. The reading and restoration ठस्त seems to be very probable. Compare [人格] at the beginning of the next line.
8 For the restoration proposed, see the introduction.
9 Read shantibhah.
10 The subscript क्र of this conjunct has penetrated into the lower line.
11 The right portion of the circle of त्स can be seen in the ink-impression.
12 The first fragmentary letter of this line can also be read as ग, but when joined to the word रितम् following, it cannot combine into any suitable word. It must therefore be taken to be the right hand portion of ग; त्रितम्बिक: is then the only restoration possible.
13 Read रितम्.
14 Read samsukhkhrasitah.
15 A comparison of the remnant of this letter with the letter ग in the next line shows that it could have been nothing else than ग in the undamaged condition.
16 This restoration is rendered probable by the word mastript occurring in the preceding line.
No. 34.—FOURTH MAUKHARI YUPA INSCRIPTION FROM BADVA.

BY PROF. A. S. ALTEKAR, M.A., LL.B., D.LITT., BENARES HINDU UNIVERSITY.

While editing my paper on "Three Maukhari Inscriptions on Yūpas: Kṛita year 295", I had observed that a fourth sacrificial pillar should have originally existed in the locality. I had thought that a Sāti stone, existing not far from the locality and bearing the letters yujō in the characters of about the 3rd century A.D., was probably a fragment of the fourth pillar. Dr. Mathuralal Sharma, the State Historian, Kotah, however, now reports to me that a fourth yūpa, complete in every respect, was discovered in another part of the same village. It bears a general resemblance to the three yūpas already discovered, whose photographs were published along with my paper on the inscriptions engraved upon them. The new yūpa also

---

1. The letter preceding tin had a medial i mark which can be seen in the impression. It is, however, not possible to restore the word.
2. Read datta-tesa.
3. Read -dakātītresam.
4. The first broken letter was obviously ti; compare it with the form of this letter in ll. 7, 8, 12, 14, etc. The restoration yasasi is therefore very probable, the metrical irregularity not being a serious one. [The proposed restoration is doubtful. According to the rules of proseody the two syllables preceding as in this case should ordinarily be long. In fact there seems to be a sign of medial i attached to the seventh syllable of this pada.—Ed.]
5. The letters phalak are preceded by a fragmentary letter, which looks like yi. Phalak obviously must have formed the concluding part of a compound, but it is difficult to restore it with confidence.
6. Read tassmam-va-hani.
7. Read haram. The word may have been agraharam.
8. Village grants usually use the word bhaja in this connection; here its original Sanskrit form has been preferred.
9. This restoration is conjectural, but it is rendered highly probable by the word chakrakāśī following.
10. Read -dhibhī-chakrakāśī.
11. This step is indicated by a horizontal stroke. It cannot stand for the numeral 1 here as it does in l. 8.
12. A greater part of the letter as is visible in the impression.
bears an inscription written, as on the other yūpa in this locality, in a long vertical line. Dr. Mathuralal has kindly sent me an ink impression of the record with a request to edit it in the Epigraphia Indica: I am doing so accordingly.

As in the case of other sacrificial pillars at Baḍvā, the surface of this pillar also is not properly dressed. Some of the letters of the record have not therefore come out well in engraving. The mason was also not very careful in his work. Thus in qa of gava (l. 2), he has engraved a third slanting stroke; nu in Dhanurāta (l. 1) has been tucked on to its preceding letter and the engraving of sya and sva is throughout very shabby. The characters of the record show a close resemblance to those on the other sacrificial pillars from this village, already published: Though the record is not dated, on palaeographical grounds it can well be placed with confidence in the third century A.D., to which period the other Maukhari records of the locality belong.

The language of the record is Sanskrit. Unlike the other yūpa records at Baḍvā, this inscription is composed in poetry. It consists only of a single verse in Anushṭubh metre. The record, though short, contains several mistakes, which will be indicated in the foot-notes.

The purport of the record is to announce that the pillar upon which it has been engraved, is a yūpa erected in Aptyāyāma sacrifice performed by Dhanurāta, son of Hastin, of the Maukhari clan, and that a sacrificial fee of one thousand cows was paid on the occasion to the officiating Brahmans. Unlike other yūpa records at Baḍvā, this record does not bear any date at its beginning. The name of the sacrificer Dhanurāta, one protected by his bow, and of his father Hastin, 'Elephant', would suggest that the family was of the Kshatriya stock. Neither the sacrificer nor his father bears any feudatory or military titles like Sāmita or Śenāpati. It may be that the family of Hastin had not yet risen high in the military or administrative hierarchy like that of Bala, who was a Mahāsena or a commander-in-chief in 239 A.D. Or, it may be that in the short space of a single Anushṭubh verse, this information could not be imparted by the versifier. The former seems to have been the probable alternative; had Dhanurāta or his father acquired any feudatory or military rank, the versifier would certainly have been ordered to compose a second verse, announcing this distinction. Another facet of the pillar could have been utilised for this purpose, as has been done in the case of the yūpa of Balasinha from this locality.

The Baḍvā yūpa records would show that there were several Maukhari families settled in the locality during the 3rd century A.D. They were probably the scions of one and the same stock. Records discovered so far do not establish any blood relationship between the families of Bala and Hastin, apart from the suggestion conveyed by their surnames. All the Maukhari families were following the military profession and some of them like that of Bala had risen very high in military hierarchy. Probably several villages, if not Tahsils, in modern Kotah state in the vicinity of Baḍvā and Kotah were assigned to them as military jūgirs.

The sacrifice performed by Dhanurāta was Aptyāyāma. It is a variety of the one day Soma sacrifice, but occupied, like the Atirātra sacrifice, a whole day and extended through the next night. It marks a further elaboration of the Atirātra sacrifice, inasmuch as it added four extra stōtras and sastras to it at the end. It forms the last member of the famous group of seven Soma sacrifices, technically known as Saśta-Soma-saśthā. For further information on this point see my paper on 'Allahābad Municipal Museum Yūpa inscription', ante, pp. 245 ff.

1 Keith: The Veda of the Black Tajus School, introduction, p. CXVII.
TEXT.¹

Mākharēr-Hasti²-puttrasya Dhanuttratasya dhīmataḥ [ * ]
Aptōryṛy[ājmaṇ[aḥ] kratōḥ yūpah sahasrō gava-dakshinā [ * ]

TRANSLATION.

This is the yūpa of the Aptōryāma sacrifice performed by the wise Dhanuttrāta, son of Hastin, of the Maukharī clan; an honorarium of a thousand cows (was given on the occasion).

No. 35.—KOSAM INSCRIPTION OF BHADRAMAGHA'S REIGN: THE YEAR 81.

BY KRISHNA DEVA, M.A.

This inscription which is engraved on a large slab of sand-stone, was discovered early in December 1937 in the course of an exploration of the ancient site of Kosam and its neighbourhood in the district of Allahābād by Mr. N. G. Majumdar, Superintendent, Archaeological Section, Indian Museum, Calcutta. It was dug out, 2 ft. below surface, from the western bank of an old dried up canal, once draining into the Jumna, near the village Nauhā, nearly 1 mile north-west of the well-known Kosam Pillar. I am grateful to Mr. Majumdar for kindly supplying me with an emstapage of the inscription and providing me with facilities for editing it.

The epigraph is in an excellent state of preservation. The writing, which is neatly incised in two lines, covers a space of 2' 6" × 4' and is engraved braidwise at one end of the huge rectangular slab, measuring 7' in length, 2' 9" in width and 6" in thickness. The size of the letters varies in length from 1" to 2".

The characters of the inscription belong to the Brāhmi alphabet of the later Kushāna period. The majority of the letters used are Kushāna while a few like m and  are show advanced forms which are rare in the Kushāna documents but are of common occurrence in the Gupta records. The inscription, however, bears a close resemblance to the Mathurā pedestal inscription of the year 14 of Kanishka³ with which it also agrees in the use of m, k and s (e.g. maharajasya, l. 1) of the so-called eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet. The signs used for representing the medial vowels— and  by horizontal side strokes (e.g. asana-patā, l. 2; savatsārē, l. 1), i by a curve to left on top of the consonant (e.g. divaś, l. 1),  by a U-shaped sign at the top of the letter (e.g. dviniya, l. 1) and ri by a line, slanting from the lower right extremity of the consonant towards left (e.g. grishma, l. 1)—as well as the forms of the letters n and u with curved base-lines (e.g. asana-patā and śriniya, l. 2),  and  with rounded tops (e.g. grishma-pakṣē, l. 1; śriniya, l. 2), gh, j, p and v with flat angular forms (e.g. Bhadramaghaṣya, maharajasya, pakṣē and savatsūrē, l. 1) and the initial ā with the bar denoting its length attached lower down (e.g. asana-patā, l. 2)—are typical of the Kushāna writing. The forms of g, t, bh and  show the pre-Gupta type inasmuch as in each case their verticals are of the same length. Similarly noteworthy is the letter sh with unlooped form and archaic round base. Incidentally we may also notice some peculiarities which are evidently due to the engraver's carelessness; the middle horizontal bar of the first sa in savatsārē (l. 1) is missing.

¹ From an ink impression.
² Read Hasti.
³ Owing to the carelessness of the mason, the three letters in dhanutra have been all joined together.
⁴ Read śriniya.
⁵ Read sahasra-gava-dakshinā.
⁶ Above, Vol. XIX, pp. 98 ff.
and the base line of na in āsana-pattā (l. 2) has on either side been bent so low that it is difficult to distinguish it from ta; compare ēkasāte (l. 1) for the latter.

The language of the inscription is the usual mixed dialect of the Kushāṇa documents. The form grishma for grīṣma is noteworthy. As regards the expressions maharajajasa (l. 1) and śha-
pata (l. 2) we are not sure whether the shortening of the long vowels in these is due to a mistake in spelling or to Prakritism. The plural form in āsana-pattā (l. 2) has a parallel in āyūga-pattā, occurring in one of the Mathurā inscriptions.¹

The object of the inscription is to record the installation of āsana-pattas, i.e. seats by a guild of stone-masons in the year 81, second fortnight of the summer and fifth day, during the reign of Mahārāja Bhadrāmagha. Judging from its shape and enormous size, its well-dressed smooth surface and the position occupied by the inscribed portion, we may safely conclude that the slab itself is being adhered to as one of the āsana-pattas. It is interesting to note that two more inscriptions from Kosam, referring to the year 87 of Bhadrāmagha,² are incised on slabs, similarly labelled as āsana-pattas. One of the latter epigraphs explicitly states that the āsana-patta was set up at a tank. The fact that the present inscription has been unearthed from the bank of what looks like an ancient canal confirms that it was customary at the time to set up āsana-pattas at the bathing ghats. The inscription furnishes the earliest known date for the reign of Mahārāja Bhadrāmagha, viz., the year 81. So far only two dates, years 86 and 87, were known for the reign of this king. The inscription, therefore, shows that Mahārāja Bhadrāmagha had a reign extending over at least seven years.

The record testifies to the existence of a guild of stone-masons in the Kosam region during the early centuries of the Christian era. It is interesting to note in this connection that within two hundred yards of the find spot of the inscription there is a sandstone quarry, popularly known as Pāṭlār Kān, with remains of ancient workings visible on the spot. It is not improbable that this quarry supplied the stone-masons with requisite material for practising their craft.

There is a striking family-likeness in point of script, language, style and the peculiar method of dating, giving in order the year, number of fortnight in the season and the day, between this and a series of dated records, coming from the Kosam region. That these inscriptions together with the present one are dated in a continuous, though unfortunately unspecified, reckoning, ranging from the year 52 to the year 130, seems probable. The inscriptions are as follows:

1. Girja inscription of Mahārāja Bhīmaśeṇa—year 82.*
2. Kosam inscription of Mahārāja Bhadrāmagha—year 81.*
4-5. Two Kosam inscriptions of Mahārāja Bhadrāmagha—year 87.*
6. Kosam inscription of Mahārāja Śivasagha—year lost.*
8. Kosam inscription of Mahārāja Bhīmaśvarman—year 130.*

¹ Jha Commencement Volume, pp. 101 ff.; above, Vol. XXIV, pp. 54 ff.
² The present inscription.
³ Above, Vol. XVIII, p. 120, No. III.
⁴ See above, pp. 146 ff.
The question of the attribution of the above to a known era bristles with difficulties. Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni who edited Nos. 3 and 6 was inclined to refer them to the Gupta era. Dr. Jayaswal, on the other hand, followed General Cunningham who refers No. 1 to the pre-Gupta period and definitely held that these are to be assigned to the Chêdi era of 248 A. D. This is supported by Mr. Amalananda Ghosh who refers Nos. 8 to the same reckoning. The editor of Nos. 4-5, however, thinks that these might be attributed to the era of either 78 A. D. or 129 A. D.

Now as the whole controversy mainly hinges on paleographical evidence, it is worth while to examine the exact relationship of the script of our inscriptions to that of the Kushâna records on the one hand and the Gupta on the other. No. 1 of our list, which bears the earliest date, is paleographically earlier than the remaining Kosam inscriptions and is, in fact, hardly distinguishable from the general body of the imperial Kushâna documents except for the use of m and h of the Eastern variety of the Gupta alphabet which links it with the Kosam series. It is to be noted that it shows the archaic unlooped type of the dental sibilant which is invariably replaced by the looped type in all the Kosam records save the last, namely No. 8, where both forms appear side by side. At the other extreme is No. 7 of our list, which though not the latest in date, nevertheless, closely approaches the Allahâbâd inscription of Samudragupta in its comparatively mature and cursive style of writing, in the use of pronounced top-strokes and in the representation of some of the individual letters like n with a loop, j with the bent vertical, p with an acute angle, s, d, dh, y and t, besides m, h and s which are common with the majority of the Kosam records. While noting the likenesses we should also not ignore the points of disagreement between the two which go to show that No. 7 is not exactly as advanced as and consequently slightly earlier than the Allahâbâd pillar inscription. To illustrate, while the former uses the older forms of t, y, s, and dh with equal verticals, in the latter usually the right limb of each of these is longer than the corresponding left; the letter sh in the former is of the archaic unlooped variety while the latter contains the more advanced looped type; n in the latter is invariably indicated by its cursive looped or unlooped form while the former always shows the Kushâna form of the letter with the curved line; the medial i in the former as in all the earlier records is represented by a curved stroke at the top of the consonant while in the latter the left limb of the curve is occasionally lengthened below the top line, a feature characteristic of the Gupta script. It will thus be seen that whereas No. 1 appears to be not much posterior to the latest records belonging to the Great Kushânas, No. 7 is perhaps not far removed in time from the Allahâbâd inscription. Within the limit set by these two may be placed the remaining Kosam records including the present one, which bear affinity to the Gupta characters in the case of a handful of signs and to the Kushâna in that of a larger number but whose general ductus of hand shows greater maturity than is evident in the Kushâna, without approximating the Gupta in cursive style. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to assume that the Kosam records, which, as already observed above, present striking family-likeness one to the other, belong to the period of transition between the Kushâna and the Gupta and may roughly be assigned sometime from the third century to the first half of the fourth century A. D.

This is strikingly corroborated by the stratigraphical evidence of the Bhita sealings of Bhima-sena and Sivamagha, which were discovered little above the Kushâna level. The remarkable
palaeographical similarity between these and the Kosam records has led Dr. Jayaswal to convincingly identify Rāja Vāsishthiputra Bhīmaśēna, and Mahārāja Gautamiputra Śivamagha of the sealings with Mahārāja Bhīmaśēna and Mahārāja Śivamagha of Nos. 1 and 6, respectively. The transitional character of the language employed in the Kosam records also points in the same direction. It reveals an unmistakable tendency towards progressive Sanskritisation without altogether eliminating the Prākrit forms and expressions. Lastly, there is no evidence to show that the peculiar method of dating uniformly adopted in the Kosam records was continued in Northern India in the Gupta period. Even in the Kushāna period its use seems to have been limited. From the foregoing considerations it seems unlikely that our inscriptions should refer themselves to either the Śaka or the Gupta era, as one becomes too early and the other too late. We will, therefore, be not far from right if we provisionally assign our inscriptions to the Chōdi era of 248 A.D., which strikes a golden mean between the two extremes. Referred to this reckoning the dates on the Kosam series will be equivalent to 300-378 A.D., and that on the present epigraph to 329 A.D. In this connection the possibility of our having to reckon with a local era, current in the Kosam region, as suggested by Mr. Amalananda Ghosh, cannot be overlooked. The final solution of the problem, however, is possible only on the discovery of fresh evidence of a more decisive character.

TEXT.

1 Maharajasa śrī-Bhadramaghaśya savatsarē 80 1 grīshma-pakṣa
   dvitiya(yād) 2 divasē pāñcamaī 5.
2 āstāyē puruvayē Katsa-pastharika-brōniyā āsana-paṭṭā sthapata.

TRANSLATION.

In the year eighty—one, 81, (in the reign) of the Mahārāja, the illustrious Bhadramagha in the second, 2, fortnight of the summer, on the fifth, 5, day; on (the date specified as) above the slabs were set up by the guild of the stone-masons of Katsa.

NO. 36.—DHARANIKOTA DHARMACHAKRA PILLAR INSCRIPTION.

BY P. SEKHADRI SASTRI, GUNTUR.

It has been my privilege to recover within the last two years three inscribed marble pillars at Dharanikōta in the Guntur District on the information supplied by a local resident. Subsequently I brought them to the notice of the authorities of the Archaeological Department, who have got them removed to Amarāvatī where other antiquities of the place are preserved. I edit below one of the three epigraphs at the instance of Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, Director General of Archaeology in India, while the remaining two are dealt with by some other scholars.

The shaft or pillar on which the subjoined inscription is engraved is square at its base and hexagonal above. The base is decorated with some carvings, representing a casket and a floral design in the centre, a hooded Nāga on the left and a railing with a sun-window on the right.

1 [It may be mentioned here that a recently discovered inscription at Bandhogarh in the Rewah State belonging to year 51 of the reign of Mahārāja Bhīmaśēna styles this ruler as Vāsishṭipūta—a fact which makes the identification certain.—Ed.]

3 Indian Culture, Vol. I, No. 4, p. 716.
4 Read grīshma-pakṣa.
5 Read  stlōpitaṃ.
The pillar is called in the inscription Dhamachakra-dhāja (Skt. Dharmachakra-dhvaja) from which it is evident that it originally had a sculptural device of the Dharmachakra on its top. Several Dharmachakra pillars of this type have already been discovered at the ancient site of Amaravati. From a sculptured slab representing a āṭṭapā we get some idea of the position which such posts used to occupy. There are two very elaborately curved Dharmachakra columns shown flanking an entrance to the āṭṭapā.²

Unfortunately, a part of the present pillar is broken off at the top and is missing. As a result thereof a considerable portion of the inscription has been lost to us in the beginning which evidently contained the name of the ruler of the locality as well as the date of the record. Some details of the donor's description are also lost in the missing portion. Besides, a few letters in L. 4 have been obliterated and cannot be restored. The rest of the epigraph, though blurred at places, can be made out fairly.

The alphabet is Brāhmī of about the second century A.D., and resembles that found in many an early inscription from Amaravati. The language is Prākrit of the same type as is used in most of the Amaravati records.

The object of the inscription is to record the erection of the Dharmachakra-dhvaja at the eastern gate of the Mahāvihāra at Dhanakāṭa, the modern Dharanikōta. The Mahāvihāra is stated to have been in possession of the Buddhist Pārśvaśāliya school, about whom we shall discuss more below.

The name of the donor or the individual who set up the pillar has apparently been omitted in the record. He is, however, stated to be son of Viśakaḍa (1) and described as an Agalokaka Atapora minister³. As to whose minister he was is not explicit. Nor is the reading of his father's name Viśakaḍa free from doubt. The epithet preceding this name must have referred to the donor, as is obvious from its case-termination in the instrumental. Before this occurs the name Khadānāga (Skandaṇāga). This person is said to be a householder (kopaṭika, Skt. kautūṣṭika), but his relation with the donor cannot be ascertained owing to the gap. The meanings of the terms Agalokaka and Atapora are not clear. As both of them are attributes of the donor, they probably refer to his original home and to his place of residence respectively unless they have been used in some technical sense.

Atapora, as already remarked, perhaps indicates the donor's place of residence. A similar instance is furnished by a short votive inscription from Sānci, which calls the donor there Adhaporika.² This term has been explained as 'inhabitant of Adhapura', while the Sanskrit equivalent for Adhapura has been suggested to be Ardhapura. The place has, however, not been identified.

---

¹ Cf. Burgess, The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggyopapeta, Pl. XXXII, 2; Pl. XXXVIII, 1; Pl. XL, 3, 4; etc.
² Ibid., Pl. I, the frontispiece. Compare also E. B. Havell's A Study of Indo-Aryan Civilisation, p. 61, Pl. XII, fig. A.
³ The same place is mentioned under its variant names such as Dhanāṇākāṭa, Dhanāṇākāṭa and Dhanaṇākāṭa in other inscriptions of about the same period; see Lüder's List of Brahmi Inscriptions, Nos. 1205, 1225 and 1271; above, Vol. XV, pp. 262–263, Nos. 4 and 5. See also N. L. Dey's Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India, s.a. Dharakāṭaka, where it is stated to be a corruption of Sudhānākāṭa. Huien Tsang mentions T'o-na-kir-te-hia (Dhanakāṭaka) as the name of a country (Sui-yu, transl. by S. Beal, Vol. II, p. 221 fl.). T. Waterer (On Yma Chwang's Travels in India, Vol. II, p. 216) restores the name to Skt. Dhānattakāṭa on the evidence of the Tibetan rendering of it. In later inscriptions the name of the place is spelt as Dhānattakāṭa and Dhānattakāṭa; see above, Vol. XV, pp. 281–282. Prof. Vogel suggests that 'the remains of Nāgārjunikona can possibly represent the ancient capital of Dhānakāṭaka (above, Vol. XX, p. 9).
⁴ See below p. 259, n. 10.
I would rather restore Adhāporika to Ardhhapouriika and explain it as 'inhabitant of Riddhapura'. This place seems to be identical with the modern Rithpur which is well known to the Indian archaeologist as the provenance of a copper-plate inscription of the Vākṣaṭaka queen Prabhāvatiguptā. It is situated in 21°14' N. and 77°51' E. in the district of Amrohi, Berār, and is reputed to be an old city of importance. It is not unlikely that Atapora of the present record is likewise to be understood as Ardhhapaurā, meaning 'inhabitant of Riddhapura'.

A pillar inscription from Amarāvata reads Chetikiyānā (Skt. Chaityakīyānā) where our inscription has Puraveṣṭīyānā (Skt. Purvaśāyānā). In explaining the import of the former, Burgess has pointed out that the Stūpa belonged to the Chaitya school, otherwise called the school of the Purvaśāyasa, a subdivision of the Mahāśaṅghikas. Mention is made of these ascetics also in a fragmentary Prākrit inscription from Allūrū in the Nandigāma taluk, Kistna District, the last line of which reads as follows: aprīṇā Purvaśeṣṭīya vigāya sa. In the Pāli chronicles of Ceylon the Purvaśāliya and the Aparaśeḷiya are mentioned among the different sub-sects of the Mahāśaṅghika school. Dr. W. Geiger, in his translation of the Mahāvamsa, renders the two terms as 'the first Seliya, the other Seliya,' whereas the words puṇa and aparasa of the original evidently refer to 'east' and 'west' rather than to 'first' and 'other'. In fact, Huien Tsang, while describing the country of Dhanakata, informs us that to the east of the capital bordering on a mountain is a convent called the Purvaśāśaśa and to the west of the city leaning against a mountain is a convent called Aparaśāśaśa. In this connection we may cite Prof. Vogel's following remark: "Perhaps it would be preferable to render the names of these two monasteries by Purvaśāśa and Aparaśāśa, the Sanskrit word for a mountain being inā, whereas the mountain is a stone". It becomes thus clear that the two sects Purvaśāliya and Aparaśāliya were so called after the two congregations of monks, one residing in a monastery on the Eastern Hill and the other dwelling in a convent on the Western Hill. Among the localities mentioned in the Nāgarjuniṣṭhūța inscription referred to above, we come across the name Purvasela which is clearly a Prākrit form corresponding to Sanskrit Purvaśāśa and possibly refers to the very mountain on which the Purvaśāliya monastery was situated. As regards the location of the two mounts, Burgess and Ferguson identified the Amarāvati tope with the Purvaśāli and the Aparaśāli respectively, but their identification has been questioned. There can, however, be little doubt that the situation of the two hills is to be sought in that very neighbourhood.

As has been pointed out above, the record contained a date in the beginning; but its details are mostly lost in the damaged portion. From the preserved letters we gather that it was dated the first day evidently of the sixth fortnight. While the name of the season cannot be restored at all, an attempt has been made with the help of the surviving portions of the words in that connection to read the year conjecturally as panātrisa, i.e., thirty-five. This in all probability referred to the regnal year of the king whose name is again missing. In the Dharmachakra pillar inscriptions:

1 Bhandarkar's List of Inscriptions of Northern India, No. 1706.
2 See Imperial Gazetteer of India, under Ruppur.
4 Ibid., p. 101. See also p. 24 where the name of the school is given as Chaityika and Chaityaśila.
6 Mahāvamsa, V. 12. In the Dipavamsa (V. 54) they are referred to as Purvaśeṭṭhāna.
7 Si-pu-ti, transl. by S. Bell, p. 221.
8 Above, Vol. XX, p. 9.
9 Compare The Life of the Buddha by Rockhill, p. 184. See also G. P. Mahakasekera's Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, s.v. Aparaśeḷiya and Purvaśeṭṭhāna, where it is stated that 'according to the Kathāvatthu commentary they belonged to the Chaitya school'.
cription of Amarāvatī referred to above, while the date portion is completely lost except the only word samakhara, the name of the ruler is fully preserved, and it is the king Vasiṣṭhiputa (Vasiṣṭhiputra) Pulumāvi. Judging from the proximity of the two localities Amarāvatī and Dharanikōta, the resemblance between the scripts of the two records and the high regnal year, it seems very likely that the present record also referred itself to the reign of the very same Andhra king Pulumāvi of the Śrīvira dynasty. The latest known regnal year of this monarch is twenty-four. If the reading panatāṣṭre proposed in the present record be correct, then we have to conclude that Pulumāvi's reign extended over at least thirty-four years. The inscription contains the numerals 1 and 6 in l. 3 and l. 2 respectively.

**TEXT.**

1. chhara

2. pana 6 divasa

3. prathame 1 ka-koṭubikasa

4. Khadānagasa a. 1|kena Agalokakena Virakha...sa

5. putena amāchena

6. Ataporena Dhanakādasa Mahāvihāre puva-dāre pava-

7. jītāna bhikhu-saghasa Puvase[li]yāna nīgāyasa

8. parigahe dhamachaka-dhayo paḍītaxipito savan-loka-

9. satya-hita-sukhāya

---

1. See Rapseon's Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, etc., p. XXXVII.
2. Ibid., p. LXVI, where Purāṇic lists of Andhra kings are given. It will be seen there that No. 15 Pulomāvi, according to the Mateyaparāna, ruled for 38 years and No. 24 Pulomāvi for 28 years.
3. From ink impressions.
4. Restore the word as samakhara (amanatāra). The preceding portion, comprising about eighteen syllables, is lost. It might have contained the name of the king to whose reign the inscription was referred.
5. After pana, the lower part of the third syllable is visible, which is most probably a subscript r, judging from the formation of prā in the beginning of the next line. We may restore this word as panatāṣṭre (panatāstrī). The following letters, which are now missing, obviously contained the name of the season and then probably such words as pahu chhote, as is suggested by the numeral 6 before the word divasa in the end of this line.
6. The syllable preceding la, only a lower portion of which is now preserved, may have been ri. The word however, cannot be restored.
7. The right-hand portion of this letter is effaced. It has been read as initial a, but the curl at its lower end forms almost a circle, and as such it differs from that found in a of Agalokā l. 4 and Ataporena l. 6.
8. The reading of this name is doubtful. The letter ra shows on its top something like a hook opening to the left. If that is meant to be the sign for medial t, we have to read the syllable as ri and not as ra. Moreover, the left hand portion of this letter is effaced, making it difficult to ascertain whether the intervening letter is joined with as or whether it stands indepenently. The latter is most probably the case, as the word is required to be in the genitive. Thus Virakhaḍasa may have been the intended reading.
9. This partial line of writing was inserted later, as is clear from its position. Obviously, the two words contained herein were first left out by the engraver through oversight, who discovered the omission after having incised the whole record and then did nothing but supply the omitted matter in the manner he has done. The latter reads the record and then did nothing but supply the omitted matter in the manner he has done. The latter in amāchena was imperfectly formed due to the insertion between the narrow space below the downward curl of a in l. 4. Hence it is read as amāchena and not amākheṇa. If we adopt amākheṇa it would be a proper name.
10. The reading is probably Atabereṇa, Atabera being a personal name.
11. There is an ornamental design carried here, which marks the conclusion of the record.
plates the dowager queen describes herself as the mother of Dāmōdaraśēna and Pravaraśēna. It has been suggested that Divākarasēna, when he came of age, assumed the title of Pravaraśēna. In that case the regnal years of Pravaraśēna II would have to be reckoned from his accession as boy-prince. The second grant edited here, which is dated in the eleventh regnal year and was made by Pravaraśēna himself, clearly shows that he is different from Divākarasēna who had not begun to rule independently even in the thirteenth year since his accession. Pravaraśēna evidently succeeded Divākarasēna, but how long the latter continued to reign after the issue of the Poona plates cannot be determined unless fresh records bearing on the point come to light.

As stated above, the second set of plates records the grant of two villages, one of which had already been given by the same king to the same donee by the first set. Why it was found necessary to include the village again in the second grant is not known. Cases of the issue of a fresh charter recording again a previously made gift are indeed not unknown, but in such cases the circumstances which necessitated the issue of a fresh charter such as a foreign invasion or the loss or damage of the earlier charter by fire, etc., are generally specified. No such reasons are given in the present case. In fact both the charters purport to have been granted by the same king and the interval between their dates could not have been more than ten years. This, therefore, raises the question if the second charter, or at least the second plate of it which records the grant of two villages, is a forgery. In favour of such a supposition may be adduced the circumstance that the writing on the second plate of Set B begins and ends with the same words as that on the second plate of Set A, so that the former plate could have been easily substituted for the latter. It may, however, be pointed out that there are no other circumstances suggesting such a forgery. As shown above, both the plates of Set B are smaller in size than those of Set A, so that not one but two plates must have been so substituted. But there was apparently no need to replace the third plate of the first grant. Again, the similar formation of letters and the occurrence of the same orthographical peculiarities and grammatical mistakes in both the records make it highly probable that both the grants were written by the same clerk in the Secretariat of the Vākātakas. The mention of Chitravarman as Sēnāpati in Set B is another point in favour of the genuineness of that set; for from the Chammak plates of Pravaraśēna II we learn that Chitravarman held that office till the 18th year at least of Pravaraśēna II's reign. The second set does not, therefore, appear to be spurious. The reason why it includes the name of a previously donated village seems to be that the Brāhmaṇa donee probably made a request to the king to give him a consolidated charter for the two grants.

---

1 J. P. A. S. B. (N. S.), Vol. XX, pp. 53 ff.
2 According to the late Dr. K. P. Jayaśwal, Pravaraśēna was another name of Dāmōdaraśēna. See his History of India 150-350 A.D., p. 63.
3 J. R. A. S. (1914), pp. 327 ff. In fairness to Vincent Smith who makes this suggestion, it must be said that he thought it more likely that Divākarasēna died young and that Pravaraśēna was his brother.
4 See e.g. the Barah copper-plate of Bhūjadeva, above, Vol. XIX, p. 18; and the Nidhanpur copper-plates of Bhūkāravarman ibid., Vol. XII, p. 76.
6 [As the difference in size between the two sets of plates is very little it does not seem impossible to me that three out of the four plates, i.e., plates I and II of Set A and plate III of Set B, were meant to form a complete grant of Pravaraśēna II. It may be that the grant of two villages in plate II of Set B was found to be wrong on examination and this plate was meant to be replaced by plate II of Set A which was subsequently engraved. This view gains some support from the ornamental work found after ariṣvakah in plate II, Set A, which was apparently engraved with a view to stopping any unauthorised addition in the blank space which could not be utilised by the engraver. But even if this surmise is correct, it is not understood why plate II of Set B was not removed before handing over the charter to the donee unless it is to be assumed that the document for some reason or other did not leave the Secretariat. And as it was not formally issued it was not considered necessary to remove the unwanted plate, or to attach a ring and the royal seal to the document.—Ed.]
As for the localities mentioned in the present grants, Nandivardhana from which the plates of the first set were issued, is probably identical with Nagardhan (also called Nandarshana) near Rāmtek as has already been suggested by Hiralal.1 The place is described as a holy tīrtha in the Sindūragiri-māhātya2 and retained its ancient name down to the time of the Bhonslas3; for it is mentioned in the Sanskrit play Purandaracarita of Krishnadatta, which was staged at Nagpur in the 18th Century.4 As already stated, both the grants edited here were made at the king’s place of religious worship (dharmaśāla), and consequently at the royal capital; for this expression is not found in the Tirōdi plates which, as shown elsewhere, register a grant made at a holy tīrtha outside the capital. It may be noted in this connection that the earlier Poona plates of Prabhāvatigupta also were issued from Nandivardhana. This place was, therefore, the earlier capital of the Vākātakas.5 Later on Pravarsena II removed the seat of his government to Pravarapura which he seems to have founded and named after himself. Several subsequent charters of Pravarsena II granted at the capital were issued from Pravarapura. The earliest of them is the Chammak grant dated in the 18th regnal year. Unfortunately the date of set A is missing. Otherwise it would have enabled us to fix the limits between which the Vākātaka capital was shifted from Nandivardhana to Pravarapura. Mahalla-Lāta or Mahallama-Lāta6 which seems to mean the larger Lāta may be represented by Lāḍki or Ghāṭ Lāḍki in the Morsī tālekā of the Amraoti District, about 18 miles north by west of Bālorā.7 Mahalla-Lāta lay on the road to Sālāpura which may be identical with Sālbarī situated in the midst of hills about 15 miles east of Lāḍki.8 Asi, the chief town of the bhukti (subdivision) in which Mahalla-Lāta was situated, may be identical with Ashţi which lies only 10 miles south-east of Bālorā. Dīrghadra is probably Dighi on the left bank of the Wardhā about 30 miles south of Ashţi. The name of Praverṣvara-shaṇḍviṃśati-vāṭaka which is mentioned in both the grants as the home of the donee seems to indicate that it was the chief village in a group of twenty-six villages. Perhaps it received this name from a shrine of Śiva called Praverṣvara installed by Pravarsena I and named after himself.8 This place as well as Pākke, the headquarters of the rākṣṭra (division) in which Dīrghadra, one of the donated villages, was situated, cannot be traced now.

1 See above, Vol. IX, p. 43.
2 Sindūragiri is another name of the hill near Rāmtek. It was probably the Rāmagiri of Kālidāsa’s Māhā-
dāta. See above, Vol. XXIII, p. 84.
3 Nandivardhana is also mentioned in the Dēoli plates of Krishṇa III. See above, Vol. V, p. 196.
6 This suggestion was first made by me while editing the unfinished Vākātaka plate from Drug; see above, Vol. XXII, p. 209. It is corroborated by the present plates. The Bithpur plates of Bhavatavarman who belonged to the Nāla dynasty were also issued from Nandivardhana, which indicates his temporary occupation of some Vākātaka territory. See loc. cit. p. 210.
7 There is another and smaller village called Lāḍegaon on the left bank of Wardhā, about 20 miles south of Bālorā.
8 Sālbarī is an ancient place containing some old caves and hot springs.
9 Compare the name Vaṅkē-Tummaspa of the first capital of the Kalachuris in Chhattisgarh (Ind. Hist. Quart., Vol. IV, p. 34). It was so called because of the shrine of Vaṅkēśvara which it contained.
TEXT.

Set A.

First Plate.

1  Dr̄iṣṭam [I] śīvam ṣeṣitā [I] na(m)niṇdvēnādīmūnāmāṃśāyaṃṣaṃphoṣḍal).[r]āvaṇāvaiṃyābhikṣaṇam.

2  Sāvyakṣa(m)chaturgy(m)mbhyājitaḥ. vīṣṭhunā śhīcyaḥ sambhūtvāvākāṭkānaṃśāṣṭrayajīvī (r)ppha-ra-

3  sāṃsā ṣunā[.] ṣunāḥ pātālaṃśābhīṣṭaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśābhāsibāṃśaṃśाभासibāṃśaṃśābhासibāṃśaṃśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibā�śābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśābhासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśābhासibांśābhासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासibांśाभासिं्गिनिति-
Two Incomplete Grants of Pravarasena II—(set A).

i.

ii.a.

ii.b.

SCALE: TWO-FIFTHS.

SURVEY OF INDIA, CALCUTTA.
Second Plate; Second Side.

13 वचनात् [1] शेलपुरामारीः शशिभुजसिंहमहादात्तमात्र(सत्र)ः वरेन्द्रमहानिवारीः-

14 काळसिंहायः ῥै[रत्न]रियायः ῥै कारप्रसन्तकाशिकारीः दस: [1*] यतीयांकतं-

(नः)का: सावरः[कता]

15 चन्द्रायांगिन्युः: चन्द्रायांचारिकः कुलपुराविकता भटमावायः विजयपूर्वायाजवाय-

(या)

16 चालवित्तवः: [1*] विनितमय(व) यज्ञवक्षाधिकारमानो यज्ञाधिकारमानो विजयः

17 व(व)हरेय 10 इत्त्राभव विताष्मात्मानुभावः 10 वैजयः विताष्मान चपुरावदायाः-

(श्या)

18 उदकवृत्रतिहः [1*]

Set B.

Second Plate; First Side.

7 सवायांबालकार्याः विश्वनाथमविविधयागाभाम(त्री)विनामनवाल(व)पालवतरभक्तिलकवमे-

8 विजयालमनोनैम(ङ्ग) साहिद्गुणः [1*] समकृतवय वर्षगतमधिविहिमनकोषिदासाः

9 धमसंतानपुराविधः ग्यां: वृक्षदिर्गमात्कारानामाहाराजविधिविविशेषः

10 सुनोम(भृ)दव्यः 10 अग्रथः सरावपावित्तविशिष्य साहराजङ्गभेष्टः

11 सैन्यं सुनोमाहाराजविधिविशिष्य सुनोमाहाराजविधिविशिष्य

12 रम्बा(द)प्रसादप्रतिष्ठानसुधिः 17 वाकानामापूरवज्ञमहामहरः(ह) राजविधिविशेष-

1 Read शेलपुर as in L. 13 of Set B, below.
2 In Set B the name of this village occurs in the form महामात्रामात्र:.
3 Perhaps प्रवर्तकांक्तकान्तात्त्वम् is the correct reading.
4 The mark of punctuation here is superfluous.
5 The subscribed t of tii is not completely incised. Read सहिरायः.

6 Read नावानिन्याः.
7 Read चालशायांगिनः.
8 Read अंकः.
9 The mark of punctuation is superfluous here.
10 An ornamental figure is incised here.
11 As the first plate, like the others of this Set, must have contained six lines, I have numbered the first line on this side as 7.
12 Read नामिनिंदिपिश्च.
13 This visarga is superfluous.
14 Read महाराजः.
15 Read सुनावामधिविशेषः.
16 Read नाभानिविशेषः.
17 The mark of punctuation here is superfluous.
Second Plate; Second Side.

13 नन्दन वचना[मृ]। पाककाल्ट दोगचिंग्रामम अमः[ः]। गैङ्गुलध्याम मधिसुलिटः।

14 समाव्यानां एवं यामहूँ मेवः प्रवर्तक हिंदिविधितवात्कावयः।

15 तेन्नियः कायापसर्गा[मृ]। विखारण न्दनः[शृ]। यतोऽक्ष्यक्तका: समझैः नियोऽगः।

16 नियुक्तः। बावस्सत्वरिकुलस्वाधिकानः। भताकालाव विश्व[शृ]। नी०।

17 पवित्रवा पवित्रसबूतवा देवः[हृ]। धन्यवानवर्षाभिधानो धर्मायुर्वेवसविज्ञयः। धर्मः।

18 मूल विद्वानमकात् अय(शृ)। वेजः। धर्मवानवर्षा उदकपुल्लमिति[०]। १०[१४]

Third Plate; First Side.

19 विविषाणः पुरव्रजाणुसमान्तं घातावृत्तायामकात्वाधितिर्मषेण सत्यशा यकरदािय।

20 जममाल्यम(शृ)। ग्रामविश्वा[शृ]। भागायमोग्यवशा। भुपूवविन्दा संदर्भा[शृ]। भुवारासनव।

21 धारणा[शृ]। पञ्चवाहिनीविन्नुकरे। १०। समतचित्तपरमपरिप्रिण। ११। मनिधि। १७। सीमा।

1. Read डीमुर्दाइ नाम।
2. Read प्रक्षरन्वन्दिनिविधितवात्कावयः।
3. Read फ्रान्सुयः।
4. The engraver at first incised छु and then altered it into छु। Read एक्ष्याहमिने॥
5. Read समाप्तच।
6. Read धन्यवानवर्षाः।
7. The mark of punctuation is superfluous here.
8. Read हैमगिकः।
9. Read धर्मायुर्वेवसविज्ञयः।
10. This should be मनिधि: so as to agree with धारणाः in l. 14 above.
11. Read वेजः। धर्मः।
12. Read फ्रान्सुयः। फितालः।
13. Read वथरमोग्यवशा। In this and some expressions below the writer has blindly copied the masculine form from the usual draft, referring to the donation of one village (धारणा): Here the neuter form is required so as to agree with धारणाः।
14. Read भुपूवविन्नुकाईः।
15. Read धर्मवानवर्षाः।
16. Read धर्मवानवर्षाः।
17. Read मनिधि।
TWO INCOMPLETE GRANTS OF PRAVARASENA II—(SET B).

ii,a.

8
10
12

ii,b.

14
16
18

iii,a.

20
22
24

iii,b.

26
28
22 निषि 1 सक्षिप्तप्रि 2 चवनादिसिद्धालाभः 3 वृद्धावनामिकः 4 स्मृताः (सन).
23 न वैनमिरियालयं 5 चवा 6 संचारवाकियः 7 राजत्वः 8 परिवर्ततः 9 यथा 10 स्मृतः 11.
24 समग्रावर्णनमः स्मृतिप्रि विनाधिकारिष्य या 7 भगव ब्रह्मचरी वैदिकस्थः

Third Plate: Second Side.

25 सदहस्तिप्रि हुः कुश्याम 1 शब्दः 2 धर्मार्दीकं च प्रतीताविकारं वा च समाधिकरणः च 3 न परिवर्ततः.
26 लन (व) कण्ठपुन्यायामेव 4 चुकु तपरिवर्तरावः (व) न कीन्त्यामः 5 आमर्नो 6 चाच सतेयिक प्रभावी.
27 कर्त्त्वो 7 कालकार्यदर्शनः 8 हरेसः 9 व वधुभाराः व 10 वाक्यमां 11 शास्त्रावर्गः.
28 रसि 12 तु क्षुद्रम 13 दिनः 14 वर्षसहस्त्राणि सम्मोदिती भूमिकः 15 शास्त्रावर्गः.
29 तुम्भान 16 व ताम्मिव नरके वसित् 17 व 18 संक्रान एकादशम 19 10 1 कालिका 20 शृष्टिक.
30 योद्धाः 21 18 सन (जा) पती 22 विन्यासाय (म) पि ना 23 लिखिताः तु 24.

1 Read नीपरिवर्ततः.
2 Read सक्षिप्तप्रि.
3 Read क्षिप्तप्रि.
4 Read वृद्धावनामिकः.
5 The subscript कि is not completely incised, so that the whole akṣara appears like मि.
6 Read संचारवाकियः.
7 Read परिवर्ततः कुश्यालाभः.
8 Read राजाविकारः.
9 Read धर्मार्दीकं.
10 Read भरसे.
11 The mark of punctuation here is superfluous.
12 Read प्रिवर्ततः.
13 Read मिरियालयं.
14 Read जयाप्रियः.
15 Read जयाप्रियः.
16 The symbol for 3 is unusual, but there is no doubt about its value, as the हि/हि is mentioned in words.
17 Perhaps मिरिया was intended, but the writer in copying the draft omitted the akṣaras मि by haplography.
18 There is an ornamental mark after this followed by two दस्सरस and a horizontal stroke.
No. 38.—MASULIPATAM PLATES OF AMMARAJA II.

By B. V. Krishna Rao, M.A., B.L., Rajamundry.

This interesting record of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty was first noticed by the late Robert Sewell when it was found lying in the record room of the District Court of Kistna at Masulipatam. It is not known where the plates were originally discovered and how and when they reached the District Court of Kistna. Dr. J. F. Fleet, who examined these plates at the instance of Robert Sewell, described them as follows:

"A set of five copper-plates, each about 1½" long by 5½" broad with a seal which bears the usual Chalukyan Bear, the motto Śrī-Triḥkṣuṇāṇāyukṣa, the moon, the sun, a closed umbrella or an elephant-goad and a floral device. The whole inscription is very much corroded and very difficult to read."

These plates came to be included in the collection of the Assistant Archaeological Superintendent for Epigraphy, Southern Circle, in 1908, and marked as C. P. No. 8 of 1908-9. The late Rao Bahadur H. Krishna Sastri described the plates thus: They consist of five copper-plates (with raised rims) of which the two exposed sides are blank. They are strung on a massive ring whose ends are soldered into the bottom of a circular seal which bears in high relief on a countersunk surface the legend Śrī-Triḥkṣuṇāṇāyukṣa, the standing boar, the elephant-goad, two fly-whisks, the sun and the moon and the lotus flower. The writing on the plates is much worn out and where it is clear the rust has so firmly settled down in the depths of the letters that even the process of allowing the plate to boil in a thick solution of tamarind and salt has not effectively removed it. I now edit this inscription from the ink impressions and photographs supplied to me by Dr. N. P. Chakravarti. The inscription on these plates is written in the Telugu characters of the tenth century. The letters are beautifully engraved; and the plates used for the purpose of the grant are perhaps the largest ever used for the charters of Ammarija II. The writing on the plates is for a greater part not well preserved; particularly on plates ii-b, iii-b, iv-a and iv-b. Some of the characters employed call for a few remarks. Special signs are used for the final a (in māṣa, ll. 9, 15 and 17), but no special sign is employed for the final i, which is, however, denoted by the ordinary sign for ta with the sign of tirūma above it. Initial vowels a and a (ll. 56 and 57), i (ll. 32-34 and 42), ī (l. 60) and ī (l. 17) also appear in the record and they represent the forms of the transitional period. Orthographical mistakes are few and in one or two cases they appear to be due to the scribe. Thus: we find in īṣ̄kṣa (l. 52) the palatal sibilant used for lingual; and in kṣaḍriṣa (l. 47) the palatal sibilant: used for the dental. Signs for both the jiḥvāṃśīya and the upadhvāṃśīya are found in the present record, the former in l. 11 and the latter in l. 38.

The inscription is written in Sanskrit, partly in prose and partly in verse; and there are altogether twenty-one stanzas including the usual imprecatory verses in lines 65-68 at the end. The inscription also contains some archaic Telugu words, e.g., ḍūra (l. 57), pūlura (ll. 58 and 60), pṛṇa-pṛṇi (l. 58) and īṣvāppakṣa (l. 57), the exact meanings of which are not quite clear. These words occur in the description of the boundaries of the village granted.

The inscription consists apparently of two parts; and though it records a charity to the Jaina religion, it opens with an invocation to the god Vishnu, the wielder of the fierce sīrīṣa bow which

---

Footnotes:
1 List of Inscriptions and Sketches of the Dynasties of South India, Vol. II, p. 13; No. 84.
2 Ibid.
protects the three worlds, unlike the Maliyapūndi grant which opens with an invocation to the Jaina religion, being a charity made for the Jaina faith. Lines 2-22 contain the usual prāṣasti and genealogy of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty, beginning with Kubja-Vishnurvardhana, the younger brother of Satyāśraya Vallabhendra down to Vijayāditya-Ammarāja II, the donor of the grant. The genealogical portion does not give us any more historical particulars about the kings that preceded Amma II, than we know from the other records of the family. As usual Jayasimhavallabha I is given a period of 33 years, which Dr. Fleet, however, considered to be incompatible with his adjustment of the reigns of the other kings of the dynasty. 8 I do not think that Dr. Fleet was justified in reducing the period of Jayasimhavallabha I from 33 to 30 years; and his reasons for so doing are not convincing. There is only a single record which gives the king a reign of 30 years while the entire range of the family charters, which number about fifty, are unanimous in giving him a period of 33 years. Dr. Fleet’s calculations and computations are made, as I have shown elsewhere, upon certain misconceptions. The only record that gives 30 years’ reign to the king is the Padasikaluru grant of Ammaraja II, which was composed by Mādhavabhaṭṭa. The scribe who engraved the charter on the plates must have committed an obvious error in omitting the word trāyais before trīṃśatam, for the edict on the Guṇḍūgolana plates of the same king, which was also the composition of the self-same poet Mādhavabhaṭṭa, gives Jayasimhavallabha a reign of 33 years, which is in conformity with the statements of other records. 9 Similarly, Narāṇḍramīgarṣa-Vijayāditya II is stated to have reigned for 40 years in the present inscription; and this length seems to be the correct period as shown by me in my Revised Chronology of the Eastern Chālukya Kings, as against the period of 44 years which was allotted to him in Dr. Fleet’s computation. 8 It is, however, needless to repeat here my reasons for accepting the period of 40 years, which I have stated at length in my Revised Chronology; but I consider it necessary to give a summary of the chronology of the kings as fixed by me—from Kubja Vishnurvardhana to Chālukya Bhima I, for whose coronation we have a recorded date—alongside with Dr. Fleet’s scheme of the Eastern Chalukyan chronology for easy reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order and Names of Kings</th>
<th>Revised Chronology</th>
<th>Dr. Fleet’s Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of reigns (years) and their equivalents in years A.D.</td>
<td>Length of reigns (years) and their equivalents in years A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jayasimhavallabha I</td>
<td>33: 641-673</td>
<td>30: 633-663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indrabhaṭṭāraka</td>
<td>7 days: 673</td>
<td>7 days: 663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kokkili</td>
<td>6 months: 718</td>
<td>6 months: 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Above, Vol. IX, pp. 60 ff.
2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, pp. 10 and 12.
5 Ibid., Vol. XIII, p. 248, text, line 7.
6 Ibid., Vol. XX, pp. 12-13.
Apart from what has been stated already, the above table shows also that Chałukya-Bhima I’s accession could not have taken place in A.D. 888 as stated by Dr. Fleet, for we have a record of the king that gives the date of his coronation as Ś. 814 (expired). (Mōsha) Chaitra ba. devīyā, Śaṭi-dīna, when the moon was in the nakṣatra Maitra (Anurādhā), which has been equated to Monday, 17th April, 892 A.D.¹ Thus the whole scheme of Dr. Fleet’s arrangement falls to the ground.²

Vijayāditya (IV) is given the title Kaliyattigana, “the hero who raised the sins of the Kali Age”. Dr. Fleet who examined those plates read the term as Kaliyattigana. The epithets Kaliyattigana and Kaliyattigana, which occurs in the Iḍṛu plates of Amma I,³ have the same meaning, for aṅka and aṅkakāra are the Telugu-Kannada synonyms of the Sanskrit word gāṇa, which means ‘a hero’, ‘a champion’ or ‘a warrior’. The clue for the correct interpretation of these terms is found in the phrase aṅkakāra-sākṣhā, which occurs in a passage describing Guṇaga- or Guṇaka-Vijayāditya III in the Kaluchumbarra grant of Amma II.⁴

Of the several enemies whom Chałukya Bhima (II) is said to have conquered or killed before he became king according to the other records of the family, only four, namely, Mallapa, his son, Rājamārtanda and the Rāṣṭrakūtas are mentioned in the present charter. The inscription states that king Bhima, the son of Mōḷāṃbā and Kaliyattigana-Vijayāditya, who was endowed with truthfulness, liberality, pride and majesty and all other virtues, conquered in battle Rājamārtanda, defeated the fierce Mallapa and his son, and then, having dispelled the darkness (that overwhelmed the realm), i.e., the Rāṣṭrakūtas, reigned in glory for twelve years. Till now Rājamārtanda has not been satisfactorily identified. Dr. Hultsch has suggested that Rājamārtanda might be the same as Rājamaya,⁵ and the identification may be for the present

² [But it is not impossible that, though he was actually crowned in A.D. 892, his regnal year was counted from the date of his accession which might have taken place some years earlier. This custom was widely prevalent in South India.—N.L.R.]
⁴ Above, Vol. IX, p. 49.
accepted as correct. Rājamārtanda would appear to be one of the foremost opponents of Chālukya-Bhima II, for he is mentioned in the latter's own Kölnennu plates. Rājamārtanda might be a younger brother of Yuddhamalla II or more probably a son of Vikramāśīta II, the younger brother of Kollahigandha or Kalyāntavanka-Vijayāditya IV, who reigned for eleven months after destroying Tāla. If so Rājamārtanda would be a dāyaκa of Chālukya-Bhima II, being his cousin in the same degree. Mallapa and his powerful son may be identified with Yuddhamalla II and his eldest son Adhirāja Bādapa of the Āruṇabāka plates.

Vijayāditya-Ammarāja II is said to have conquered several of his own kinsmen before he became the lord of the country or soon after he had ascended the throne. Verse 6 describes the important event thus: "Having been crowned (as the lord of) the kingdom of Vēṅgi, having conquered his enemy, the rising and powerful Vijayāditya, who had vanquished on numerous battlefields his own adversaries and whose neck was adorned with the fillet (kaṇṭhikādāna) (of the dignity of yuvāroja), having defeated the group of his treacherous kinsmen, by the prowess of his arm (or his rays) and having pleased the goddess Lakshmi (or the lotus) by dispelling the darkness viz. his opponents, the sun of the Kshatriya race shines in all splendour". That Kaṇṭhikā-Bēta or Kaṇṭhikā-Vijayāditya, the son of Ammarāja I, was one of the opponents of king Amma II is not known from any of the records hitherto published. It now appears that Bēta or Kaṇṭhikā-Vijayāditya returned to the country, appeared once more as a claimant to the throne on the death of his father's step-brother, Chālukya-Bhima II, and opposed the accession of the boy king Amma II. Among the other rival claimants whom Amma II had conquered might be the children of Yuddhamalla II, who was driven away into exile by Chālukya-Bhima II. The rest of the passage which describes Ammarāja II (II. 30-35) is merely in panegyric style and does not contain anything historical. The present record is not dated; it does not also mention the occasion on which it was issued.

The second part of the inscription (II. 39-51) opens with a description of a family of feudatory chiefstains, who professed the Jain religion and who flourished during the reigns of Chālukya-Bhima II and his son Ammarāja II. There was born in the great family known as Trigayana-kula, a nobleman called Naravāhana (I.), an officer of the Chālukya kings. He belonged to the gōtra called Grēva; he enjoyed the privilege and honour of sitting on simhāsana or a 'lion seat' like a crowned prince. Prince Naravāhana, like the preceptor of the gods, was a master of the science of Polity. He outshone the glory of Naravāhana, the Regent of the Northern quarter (Kubhā). His eldest son was Meḷaparāja, who was an embodiment of virtues like liberality, pride and praiseworthy conduct. He, therefore, bore the epithet Mānavadēva, 'god amongst men'. He was a worshipper of the lotus feet of the Blessed Lord Jina. His wife was Meṇḍāṁbā, who was a patīvratā (devoted wife) like the epic princess Sītā. She was a fervent follower of the teachings of Lord Jina (Jainacrāta). To them, Meḷaparāja and Meṇḍāṁbā, were born two sons, Bhima or Rāja-Bhima and Naravāhana (II). The former would appear to have been named after Chālukya-Bhima II and the latter after his own grand-father. Both these princes were intelligent and renowned. They were masters of all śāstras and skilled in the use of various weapons. They resembled Rāma and Lakshmana (in personal charm). Bhima
and Arjuna (in might and prowess), Baladeva and Vasudeva (in strength and wisdom), and equalled Nakula and Sahadéva (in valour and bravery) respectively. They were devoted to the Jaina-dharma. They obtained through the favour of Chañukya-Bhima, i.e., Chañukya-Bhima II, the insignia of feudal chiefmanship (śāmanda), namely, the śīra, chātra (parasol), chāma (fly-whisk), peacock's tail, water-jars, horses, and musical instruments like kāhala and others.¹

The inscription then refers (l. 51-54) to a Jaina pontiff (āchārya), the preceptor of the two noblemen Bhima and Naravāhana II. He was the renowned Jayasena, who bore the surname Náthasena and was the disciple of the illustrious Chandrabhesa. Jayasena was a master of all the āstras. He was well versed in the Siddhānta, i.e., Jaina-siddhānta, the doctrines of the Jainas. He was a man of excellent and praiseworthy conduct. He attained proficiency in para-samaya, that is to say, his soul became absorbed in the non-self for the liberation of mankind from bondage. He was honoured by śravakas, kshapaśekus, kshullakas and the ājākakas. For the benefit of the celebrated Jaina pontiff, who was their religious preceptor, Bhima and Naravāhana II, constructed two Jaina temples (Jina-bhavana) at Vijayavātikā; and for that purpose king Ammaraja granted the village of Pedda-Gālīdārī having converted it into a dīvābbhāya and exempted it from all kinds of burdens and taxation.

Some of the names and terms that occur in the inscription are interesting. The family of the two chiefs is called the 'great Trinayana-kula', and their gōra-name appears as Grivya. Both these terms have not been met with before either in the inscriptions of the Eastern Chañukya dynasty or in the literature of the Andhra country. The Trinayana-kula seems to belong to the fourth or Sūdra caste, like the Paṇḍa-kula of the Rṣṣ of Andhradēśa, whose birth-place is said to be the Gaṅgī which spring from the feet of Lord Viṣṇu. The Grivya-gōra, too, is not a Brahmanical gōra, and this fact supports the above conjecture.² Several orders of the Jaina ascetics and lay worshippers are mentioned in the record. The Śravakas, for instance are Jaina laymen; the Kshapaśekus are Jaina yatis (ascetics) who received proper initiation according to the school of the Digambaras. A Jaina kshullaka is one who is a Śravaka of a high order belonging to the tenth degree, the eleventh degree being that of Ailaka. These seem to correspond to the dōsa of the Bhāyavatasa-viśādūya. The next higher order of spiritual stage is that of muni or āchārya. The term ājākā may be a Prakrit form of Sanskrit Āraṇkap, 'a female ascetic', who, according to Jaina doctrines, wears only a white sari.³ The expression para-samaya which occurs in the passage para-samaya-patuk samaśa-kṛsīṣṭha-svittā (l. 53) is apparently used in a highly technical sense here as it rightly belongs to the Jaina philosophical terminology. The Samayavāra of Kundakunda Ācharya, which is a discourse that gives a knowledge of the Highest Soul, explains the terms para-samaya and sva-samaya as follows:

"Know that sva-samaya is the soul which is concentrated in right conduct, belief and knowledge and which is self-absorbed. And para-samaya is the soul which stands in the condition determined by the operation of the Karmic matter or bondage and which is absorbed in the Non-self."

¹ Compare this passage (lines 40-50) with the passage in the Raṇaṣṭhapāḍī grant of Vimaladitya above, Vol. VI, pp. 351, text, line 83: "नीर्विद्यानियित्यायामार्थमसि पि स्त्रयमानमार्थमानि हि विमाननमायित्यायामार्थमसि" etc.

² [No evidence is available to indicate that Bhima and Naravāhana were Sūdras. The statement that they belonged to the Trinayana-kula may only show that they were Śāivas. The Nojamba-Pāllavas are described as born of the Iśvara-cānta (Iśvara-rāja) and the later Pallava chiefs of the Telugu country have the epithet Parama-rāma-bhārata. It is also not certain that Grivya is not a Brahmanical gōra. Griva is known to be the name of a gōrašī.-N. L. R.]

³ I am indebted to Pandit Ajit Prasad, M.A., LL.B. of Lucknow, for the meaning of these terms. [The term is more likely ajaka Skt. āryaka.—Ed.]
The edict states that king Ammarāja II issued the command after having assembled, in the usual manner, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and kṣatruḥkīnas of the district of Velanāḍu and in the immediate presence of several high officials of his government. They are the entire circle of his vassal kings (saṁasta-saṁanta), the antākhāra-mahāmāra, the purāhina, the anātya; the kṛṣṇāja, the sānapati, the kṛikara, the Dharmādhyaśas and the twelve sthān-ādhipatis. In spite of his own faith, like a true Hindu sovereign, king Amma II was tolerant of the other faiths of his kingdom, and particularly of Jainism.

The object of the grant was the gift of the village of Pedda-Gālīḍipāṟṟu, situated apparently in the Velanāḍu-vīshāyana. It is well known in the Andhra country that Velanāḍu was the ancient name of the region that is bounded by the sea on the south-east and south, and the Kṛishṇā river on the north-east and north and which is now covered by the modern tāḷuiks of Rēpallī and Tenāḷi in the Guṇṭūr District. Pedda-Gālīḍipāṟṟu had changed its name during the past nine or ten centuries and is called to-day Pēda-Gādēlavaṟṟu. It is situated in the Tenāḷi tāḷuik, about three miles to the east of the Tsunḍūru railway station. The boundaries of the villages are according to the edict (ll. 57-61) as follows:—On the east: a dāva (probably a mound) in the centre of the tank called Yisupakaṭṭala-cheruvu, on the boundary of the village Maṇḍayāru. On the south-east: (probably) a cluster Bāruvavu-paḍveṇa of silk cotton trees (Eriodendron antirrhoeusum) at the meeting place (maṇḍalakūṭṭa) of the boundaries of the villages, Āḷaparṭi and Chūṇṭāru. On the south: an irrigation tank called Kuṇḍavidi-guṇṭha situated to the north of the ancient village site (prāṇta-parṭi) of Chūṇṭāru. On the south-west: the temple (guṇḍi) of Pōtiyavva or Pōṭi-avva, the anna (village goddess) of Chūṇṭāru. On the west: . . . . . . . . . . . .
On the north-west: a tank called Gāralaguṇṭha on the boundary of the village of Valīvēru. On the north: a marshy swamp (paḍveṇa) (?) belonging to the village of Tapparāḷa.
On the north-east: an irrigation tank called Naḍupani-guṇṭha, at the meeting place of the boundaries (maṇḍalakūṭṭa) of the villages, Kōḍa-Gālīḍipāṟṟu, and Valīvēru. All the above-mentioned localities, viz., Maṇḍayāru, Āḷaparṭi, Chūṇṭāru, Valīvēru, and Kōḍa-Gālīḍipāṟṟu may be easily identified to-day. Āḷaparṭi is known to-day as Āḷapāḍu, and Chūṇṭāru is changed into Chūṇḍāru. Tapparāḷa had apparently gone out of existence and a new village called Parīmi had sprung into existence in that neighbourhood. While all the other village names had not materially changed, the names of Pedda-Gālīḍipāṟṟu and Kōḍa-Gālīḍipāṟṟu alone had altered. And that may be explained by the fact that the hard consonant ka had merely given place to soft consonant do in the pronunciation during the last nine or ten centuries. Kōḍa-Gālīḍipāṟṟu is known to-day both as Kōḍa-Gādēlavaṟṟu and Chīṇa-Gādēlavaṟ্uru, the words Kōḍa and Chīṇa being synonymous. All the villages mentioned above are situated round about Pēda-Gādēlavaṟṟu.

Among the other localities mentioned in the record, Vijayavāṭīkā is clearly identical with the modern town of Bezwāda on the Kṛishṇā river. The site or sites on which the two Jina-bhavanas or Jaina temples once stood cannot be identified; perhaps an extensive exploration of the ancient sites of the locality may help us to discover the spot.

The executor of the charity was the officer known as Kaṭakarāja. From the Maliyāpūndi grant, we know that the office of Kaṭakarāja was held during the reign of Amma II by the General Duggarāja, a descendant of the celebrated Paṇḍaraṇa, the generalissimo of Guṇaga-Vijayāditya III. The engraver of the record was Jayantāchārya.
TEXT.  
First Plate.

1 श्यामकमें बिंतानामां श्यामके स्वेच्छानुपालयवीद्यादृश्यम् । निश्चयास्ध्यायिकम् ।

2 ति स्वामीनारायणीविष्णुभवनिदणु विष्णुतत्त्वलीको: ॥[१५] ॥ सैंस्ति क्रोमतां सकल- ।

3 मनस्मर्दुगाां गारीतिकुशाणां कौशिकवर्षप्रमाणवराज्ञानामात्तत्वपरिपालितानां ।

4 महामिन्द्रपालनानां भगवान्क्रि क्रि समापित महामात्तत्ववराजां स्वस्वमान- ।

5 श्रीमपालनारम्भमिद्वयमानामानवशयधार्मिकवस्तुप्रकाशपालुक्तपबुध्मा चालुक्यानां क- ।

6 कष्टविद्वकविभूषणपति वस्त्रावरणं भाटा कुशलकृत्तिन्द्रपृद्धकान्तावरणी ।

7 वैवेशिकस्वामिपत्रयुज्य । तदाधिक जायसिस्वामिसिंहसम्भवन । तदनद्रेः द्रापनरान्नां मिश्रु- ।

8 व । तमौन्नामलेश्वराराजः पन्धानिषादसु । तन्मुखो जायसिस्वामिद्वय । तदाधिक- ।

9 । कौशिकिप्रभासानु । तस्मि क्षीति भाषा मिश्रुविवेकस्वामिसम्भव सर्वविश्वासम् ॥
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10 ज्योतिन्द्रभवनकोठारम् । तस्मा ज्योतिन्द्रभवनसम्भवनिदण्तम् । नन्दकुमारसरसात[स्यौ] थ- ।

11 वरारोऽपराकंत: । ज्योतिन्द्रभवनम्बुद्धालिखितम् । ज्योतिन्द्रभवनकोठारम् । नन्दकुमारसरसात[स्यौ] थ- ।

12 स्वेच्छायानुपालयवीद्यादृश्यम् । नन्दकुमारसरसात[स्यौ] थ- ।

13 [कस्तो] ज्योतिन्द्रभवनबुद्धालिखितबुद्धालिखितम् । यक्तीविष्णुविवेकावरणिनिदण्तम् ।

14 ॥[१५] ॥ स्वेच्छायानुपालयवीद्यादृश्यम् । ज्योतिन्द्रभवनकोठारम् । नन्दकुमारसरसात[स्यौ] ।

1 From ink-impressions and photographs.
2 Meter: Vasanta-tillābā.
3 Read ढिण्ठाला.
4 Read नानाताभापाप.
5 Read नानाताभापाप.
6 Read नानाताभापाप.
7 Read नानाताभापाप.
8 Meter: Amalājñā. The scribe apparently left out the last two syllables of the fourth quarter or pada of the ślokā.
9 Meter: Stotapākā. 
10 I am unable to make out any sense from the faintly visible letters.
11 Mark of punctuation is unnecessary here.
MASULIPATAM PLATES OF AMMARAJA II.—(I).
(From Photographs).
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22
24
26

iv, b.

56
58
60
62

Seal.

N. P. CHAKRABARTI.
SCALE: ONE-HALF.
SURVEY OF INDIA, CALCUTTA.
15 [चिकिद्] यां ||[४]|| नामुः अविलयतिमणकलियायदिलियाः सामान्
तबतुभाराजसा-
16 [स]वयाणि। तकत्रे विजायादिवं चिन्तकामायाभायपावेश्वरेऽ बालसुधायः
tाल्लरोत्रे
राजग्रान्तेषु-
17 [मे]तेषु च[१] तटुक्कायामणि मित्रामर्द्याः हलवा एकादसमानाः।
विजयादिलो
वेषीयः कल्याणिः- कल्याणिः-
18 गाढीले चैमाः। तथा संति भोवः। तज्ज्ञीराजसमापि परिष्ठोऽ॥ सब-
लागातिमानाद्विष-
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19 जगुषुन्तो राजभाराण्याः। जितोश्यमाणां समुत्सहितं सौभंग[४]हि
ज्ञानकामेऽ। बिनिष्ठी मार्गी-

20 कुटःकवल्लमाणगंहरे अद्यावधः। राजयेन कलामकम्। प्रविष्कार[सुधा] भ्यंत्रवान-
कयम्। ||[८]|| विशे शः-
21 शो:। यदीवां शंतिरिव भिन्तिनद्या यथा देवी मया। संसाधा।
[हेम्य] नागिनाः
[खं]वि पुष्पानः[१]०-
22 क्सग्रः। लोकां नवकल्लोभुमर्दितादिपर्वतः वंगिनायोमार्गः।
राजद्रापार्णाः
[शिरियः] 'भ'-
23 कुटःकवल्लमाणगंहरे। बीमेसा[राजवार्तिकाः] शिनितुसुविज्ञायिलिदिसुधालमः।
[शिरियः] ले
24 प्रज्ञापरिवर्तः। कठिनायादसमयः। बदा। (ह) याद्रोहेकाविपान्य वस्तुकला:। चाचि-
[व] दिवकरे-
25 शो[४] यस्वार्तुक्षत्रशारितिविविष्क्तमाग्निक्रियायतस्यापी भिनाति। [४] यहियस्मातु-
विसर्गं जनसिद्धान्तान्तर्भिषेयं विशे ति
26 चिन्तृन्नेः। राजानं चामत्तायारं सकलसुधाः। राजमोहिको।
वयाणु व पतिष्ठिकोबाः-
27 [ल] क्षयपालोत्सवेण। चो०मयेश्वरापृष्ठ। जगुषुन्ता जनानः [६] राजाप्रचिँडः। [६]
स्वयंतिः पूर्वः।

¹ Read tentatively: स्त्रवश्चतन्त्रमाया। [Reading is trimśad-abda-pramaṇam.—Ed.]
² Mark of punctuation is not necessary here.
³ Read: नामाः। श्रादः।
⁴ This verse and the following four are in सुधार्कार metre.
⁵ [Reading is राजद्रापार्णाः। पर्यायः.—N. L. B.]
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28 नाथा नलनाथपरिवर्तनामस्योऽयोऽग्रोमभिधितरुपस्युन्वतर करिवानी-
29 मद्यगुरु: यथासैः कार्तिकिः शिवराज्यकार द्वयकार तितियोदयोक्तिनु: राजाधराजान- विशालकर्मे नजः
30 यति विजयादित्वदेवाराजः: \[८\] भागम् इ स जगतापितस्मराजो राजमहिंद्रस्यो- गोत्रस्तेन
31 समृद्धोपाकांस्तमेश्वरियोऽकेव वहुरािद्विनिविकिष्ठं विकस्मेतामाकारारः: न भाषण
32 इव निरालामनाभोगुःपद: इ विद्विरभ सुकाराविराजित: इ पितामह इव काम-
33 लास्त: इ विविद्विरभ इव धर्मायच्छुलचारित: इ भारकर इव समस्त-
34 शरणागात्मभूतवाराय: इ सुवर्षाशंकल इव सुवर्षाशंकःगुःवद: इ विविद्विर
35 इव सिंहासनोपास्तितस्मरीवानस्वयज्ञनिराराजार्थारः: इ स सम-
36 सहभुवनायामानोविजयादित्ववाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरपस्य-
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37 भद्राय: इ वेलनाभुविजयनिवासिनो राजकृतामुखानुःस्तिविवस्मामस्य-
38 सामन्ता[र्यत्]तपुरमण्डलायोऽविदेशिनापति स्मारकामालयाचरः
39 बादगकान(न)विकारोमणमाझैः समाजापाण्य सिन्धिस्तामतू बन: \[८\] वीमानुवाच:-
40 दि माःशाद्रिश्चन्दकृकुरादवरवर... चेताभ्रो [९] मात्र हवःसिन्धाःमन्तो इ
41 विविद्विर [न]वेकालनाधारेको [शानाम \[८\] \[८\] शोकस्वयम्भुविविदीविविद्विर इ विद्विद्विर-
42 कर्तर[शस्त्राद्वादृत्तम] इ अवशोमिकश्रातष्टान्: इ प्रकारायते-
43 यशसा \[१०\] यथापनुसरूण गुणानु: \[१०\] मःपराणो गुणभ[भा]वो सुनानी। मानो मानाम-

1 Mark of punctuation is unnecessary here.
2 Read: कार्तिकः.
3 Read भागम्.
4 Read कार.
5 Read शार.
6 The metre of this and the following 5 verses is त्रिपक्तम्.
7 The letter seems to read like पृ for there is a loop-like stroke at the bottom. If this is borne out by the plate, then the name of the chieftain has to be read as यास्व.
8 [ Reading may be गुत्ति. — Ed. ]
MASULIPATAM PLATES OF AMMARAJA II—(II).

(From impressions).

iii. a.

iii. b.

iva.

SCALE: ONE-HALF.

Survey of India, Calcutta.
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44 नवचरिति । सानवरेजी जिन्दरपदप्तः[चचकी] ॥ [१९४] तथा सतो मेषज्ञांवा ॥

45 बृन कन्मचरिता । सत्वरेजी [विजयवरी । सतनामचरिता छलचर्या ॥

[१९५] ताज़ीः

46 [च]ती परिष्ठी । वुडचर्या । सकलाशस्माग्धविवेकी । मौमनरवावहानां

47 मलमण्डिरविव [चोकी] [१९६] शी भोमाजुम्ना(न)हंगी । विजननवावावात्तदेव-

[समा]जी ॥ [न]-

48 कुलस्वदेवतुवी । ती जाती जनसंहर्मनर्विवर्षी ॥[१९७] श्रीमता शंकरेलेश-

[चित्रपतिशाप]-

49 या लक्ष्मानसाल्चर्या । श्रीहरी चंद्रमीन ॥पदविकाल(चा)मर्चस्व [चोकी] ।

50 ——— रिक्षीमुस्तिलिपिपतचयायसाल्चर्यालीको । ताती चालक [चोकी]

51 नैनायकी कालावसपुती ॥[१९८] अनाचार्यों यदयो गुरुक्षी-

52 कलुणविनयसागरपिधिया ॥ शास्त्रीरोजी(न)दसेनो म्यु(स)मुनुनजययेनो मुनिकृष्टिताका ।

53 शंकराचार्यां कृज: परसमयपूर्वः सबूतोक्तः तथापः धाकाण्यां चपाणकसु[ज]-

54 नज्जलांचर्यां[च] कृजानां ॥[१९९] ताती सत्या रामभीमनवासणा(न)भां विज्ञ-वाक्यायां
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55 जिनभवनक्रियानिपदकर्मश्री मध्यामस्वविश्वकारपिन्दे देवभोगो-

56 कल धिमागी लिङ्गप्राधान ग्रामी दत्तः [१०] चक्षुविविहया ॥ पूर्वत: मणकू-
57 विश्वविद्यालय  

58 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

59 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

60 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

61 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

62 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

63 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

64 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

65 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

66 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

67 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

68 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

69 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

70 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

71 यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा  

---

1 See note 0 on the previous page.  
2 Metre: Sstrapar,  
3 The dot denoting the asasvedra on this letter is placed by the scribe at the beginning of the next line.  
4 Reading is यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा—N. L. R.  
5 Read यह सुधारक मेरे पास पहुँचा.  
6 There is an ornamental design after this.
No. 39.—EPIGRAPHIC NOTES.

By Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and K. Gopalachari, M.A., Madras.


Chanda reads: 'Malamavuka...yā Retiyā thahbo', and translates 'This pillar is the gift of..... Reti, an inhabitant of (wife of) Malamavuka'. The letter after ks is clearly ja. The next letter exhibits the outlines of ya, and in No. 12 jāyājā occurs. The inscription may then be read, 'Malamavuka- [jāyājā Reti]yā thahbo' i.e., 'gift of a pillar by the wife of Malamavuka'.


Chanda reads: 'Kānima .. yā Apakuyā [thaj]bo', and adds, 'Two letters after Kānima have been broken off' The Editor suggests 'Perhaps they were bhuja = bhārya.' The first letter, though much mutilated, has the backbone and limbs of ja partially visible. So again the word is jāyājāyā.


Chanda reads: 'chalchuli sa[m]ghārā' and translates '.........to the brotherhood ...........chalchuli'. The cha at the beginning indicates that more than one person donated the object on which the inscription is incised. What is read as chuli should be read as chula; for what is taken as the i mark is nothing but the ornamental vertical of la. See li (No. 41). Chula often occurs in Amaravati inscriptions as part of personal names, and as Saṅgha (also Hanīcha) is also a name of frequent occurrence: '..........cha Chula-saṅghāya' is the correct reading. The translation is '.........and to Chula-saṅgha.'


Chanda reads: 'mahā govalivu bālikāya', and translates 'of the great cowherd's daughter'. What is read as li in govalivu is only la (compare li in bālikāya) and as govaliva gives sense, and what is taken as the u sign is just a crease on the stone, and as the application of Mahā to a govalava (Skt. govalabha), an officer under the king, is more probable than to a cowherd, govalavu would seem to be the correct reading. Meaning 'of the daughter of the Mahā-govalabha'.

The characters resemble those of the inscription of Śivamaka Śatakarni.


What is read as 'Turugāhum' should be read as 'Turulura'; see line 39, Bühler's table III. Turulura is mentioned in another Amaravati inscription (Lüders: List of Brahmi Inscrr., No. 1299).

VI. Prākrit Inscriptions from Nāgarjunakondā (above, Vol. XX, p. 24, Inscription H, text 1.11):

Imān chetiyaṁ vihāro cha.

Dr. J. Ph. Vogel reads 'iman khaniyām vihāro cha', and explains khaniya by Pāli khāya 'pillar' (Childers, Pali-English Dictionary). The explanation is far from satisfactory. In our epigraphy, a pillar, even a vihāra pillar, is called khemīha (Inscrr. F, Bc, C3, etc.). In fact chetiya seems to be the correct reading, only the letter che is rather carelessly engraved. The chetiya referred to is probably stūpa No. 6. In inscriptions from Nāgarjunakondā, a chetiya, chetiya-ghara and vihāra often occur together.

Dr. Vogel has read it as [E]dhisirīya. The letter read doubtfully as e is probably ba and the name B[ō]dhisirī—name met with in these epigraphs. [The first syllable does not look like Bo to me.—Ed.]


Dr. Vogel read the term as 'vasasanayya' in inscr. L, and as 'vasasanayya' in inscr. M3, and treated it as a term of uncertain meaning. In a footnote the Editor has asked, 'can it be vasasatiya?'. The difference between the Nāgārjunikonda ta and na is often fairly clear. Though we are not sure of the ta in inscr. L, in M3 we have surely ta and not na (compare Mahāravasācā- 

yānā, l. 6):—vasasatiya samva 10. The same term occurs in the Chinnag Ganjam inscr. of Gotamiputra siri-Yaśa Śatakarni and the Banavasi inscr. of the time of Haritiputa Vīnukadā- 

Chutukulanānda Śatakarni—vasasatiya samvachhara sat[a]v. . . mām 20+7' in the former, and 'vasasatiya svacchhara 10+2', in the latter. In our epigraphs also vasasatiya occurs before samvachhara.

According to Bühler vasasatiya has the same import as the phrases pravardhamāna-vijaya- 

rājya-samvatsara, vijaya-samvatsara, etc., of the Pallava and Chāluṣya (and Śalāṅkāya) grants. This seems to be ultimately connected with the Vedic ideal of Pāyūma karadaś—kotam.

IX. Lüders' List No. 1078.

The inscription may be read with great probability:—


c. Bhogavatasa gābhob dānaṁ.

The fifth letter in l. 1 is very unlike any other sa in the inscription, and seems to be ṣa, of which the upper part has peeled off. The present reading is based on a careful examination of the estampage in the office of the Archaeological Superintendent at Poona, and the rather unsatisfactory photozincograph in the Cave Temples of W. India (Vol. IV, Plate XLIV) does not contradict it. The inscription may be translated: 'A cell, the gift of Nāda Vaḍhanāya Bhogavata'.'


The first letter of what is read as nesakaresu and restored as vasakaresu is neither na nor en. It is unlike the three na-s in the same inscription; the open base of the letter makes sa equally impossible. Moreover, it is not proper to ignore the e sign over the letter in any emendation of the text. The only possible reading is tesakaresu (the Skt. form is probably tējaskarēṣu, polishers); Jummar Nos. 24, 25 and 29 have similar ta-s. What is read as pāo is pāu and what is read as pō[do] se[me] is clearly pāu māse.

So we have

1 Seniye tesakare[ṣu]

c. pām pānade[ke]

3 kaśiḥkaresu seniya[ye] p[a]ju māse

meaning: "With the guild of tesakaresu, monthly, one and three quarters. With the guild of kaśakāresu, monthly, one quarter". [The derivation of tesakara from Skt. tejaskara is extremely-doubtful.—Ed.]
XI. Lüders' List No. II05; above, Vol. VII, pp. 64 ff. (Karla No. 19, text, l. 5,—year 17.)

The unit figure was read as 4 by Bühlcr and as 8 by Rapson. Senart thinks that it may be any unit number (above, Vol. VII, p. 65). It is certainly not 8 as assumed by Rapson as it is open to the left and not to the right, or 4 as read by Bühlcr as it is quite unlike the symbol for 4 which occurs in the next line. A study of the inscription from the stone and from a fresh impression (reproduced here) shows that 7 is more probable than any other unit figure. The square characters employed in our inscription may account for the angular form of the symbol. It would appear to be a slightly later form, but such late forms are not unknown in the Karla inscriptions; witness symbol for 1 in the last line of this very inscription.

Rapson's historical argument (Coins of the Anurā Dynasty, etc. p. xlix) for the figure being read as 18 is based on the word vijayāsthavatākhe which is now seen to mean not 'from victorious camp' but 'for the sake of victory and prosperity'. (Vide Koudamyūti plates, above, Vol. VI, p. 319, n. 7.)

XII. The Koudamyūti plates of Jayavarman. (Above, Vol. VI, pp. 315 ff., text, l. 42)

Mahātālavareṇa.

It was long before the discovery of the Nāgārjunikōḍa, Allüru and Rāmaredjīpalle inscriptions which mention the office of Mahātālavara that Hultsch read the word as 'Mahātālavareṇa and conjecturally translated it as 'the best of the Mahātāgi family'. In his edition of the Nāgārjunikōḍa inscr. (above, Vol. XX, p. 7, n. 1), Vogel, and following him other writers, have merely remarked that 'Mahātālavareṇa' is a mistake of the scribe or engraver for 'Mahātālavareṇa'. But the peculiar form of la in the word 'Brihatphalāyana' (l. 4) i.e., the vertical starting from the right arm of the curve, leaves no doubt that the letter read as gi by Hultsch has to be read as la and the word is therefore really mahātālavareṇa in l. 42.

XIII. The Kolār plates of Nandivarman II. (Ind. Ant., Vol. V, pp. 175 ff., text, l. 4)

Vidētārapallikā.

Fleet's reading is Videnārapallikā. But in the plates under reference, e.g., lines 1, 3, etc., as also in the Peddavēgi and Kantēru plates, all Śālaṅkāya records, the re-ascent in the a sign in nū is to the left of the vertical, whilst in the letter read as nū in the word under discussion, the re-ascent is to the right as in bhu or bhū. The letter can only be tū. Hence the correct reading seems to be : Vidētārapallikā.


The reading of the word is not settled. Burnell read it as Munyada (S. Ind. Pal., p. 14). Fleet was of opinion that for Munyada as a common name no meaning could be found, and that Munyada as a proper name was out of place (Ind. Ant., Vol. V, p. 176 n). Reading it as 'Munyada' he corrected it to 'Amātyāti'. While editing the Ellore Prakrīt grant of Dēvavarman, Hultsch read it as Munuḍa and remarked:—"The plates of Vijaya-Nandivarman seem to read Munuḍa; but the apparent nu in the middle of this word may in reality be an obliterated lu" (p. 59, n. 4). But la has always a short curve attached to it at the right end of its back (the Nāgārjunikōḍa inscr. and the Mānagāpur and Chikkullā plates). What is read as la has no such curve. K. V. Lakshmmana Rao reads the word in the Sanskrit grants as Munuḍa.

The word, which occurs in 4 of the 5 grants of the Śālaṅkāyanas, can have but one reading. In the Peddavēgi, Kolār and Kantēru plates, the re-ascent in the u sign in the proper nu is to-
the left of the vertical, whilst in the letter read as nu here, as in Vīdatūrapallikā, the re-ascent is to the right. The letter can only be tu. That the last letter is ḍa and not ḍa, is shown by copper-plate No. 2 of 1924-25 (Madras), where the back of ḍa has a notch at the right whilst that of ḍa lacks it. Mutuṣa being the correct Sanskrit reading, Hultsch’s reading must be abandoned in favour of Mūḍaṇa which would be the Prākrit form of Mutuṣa.

XV. The Māttropāḍ plates of Dāmōdaravarman (Above, Vol. XVII, pp. 327 ff., text, II. 2-3).

Anēka-gō-sahasr-ānēka-Hiranyagarbh-ōdbhav-ōdbhavasya.

Hultsch has read the word preceding gō-sahasro as or[vandhyā], and translated: ‘pregnant’. A careful examination of the plates shows that the proper reading of the phrase is as given above. Hultsch’s translation: “(and) who is the origin of the production (i.e., who has caused the performance) of many Hiranyagarbh and of (gifts of) thousands of pregnant cows...” must be amended into: “(and) who is born of one who was the cause (or one who was born) of several Hiranyagarbh and of several gō-sahasras”, meaning that Dāmōdaravarman’s father made these two dānas repeatedly. The play upon the word ūdbhava has special reference to the nature of the Hiranyagarbha and is untranslatable.

XVI. A Karla Chaitya Pillar Inscription.

While all other Chaitya Pillar inscriptions at Karla are incised on octagonal columns having a pot-shaped base, lotus-shaped top, and elephant capital, this inscription is on one of the eight plain octagons in the apse, standing second from the right row. (Marked x on the photograph.) The letters resemble those on the other pillars. But the cursive ha of our inscription, especially the hi in putahi, is peculiar. Mediāl-o is indicated in bho by two short strokes one going up and the other going down from the horizontal. The sign in Ja is attached to the centre of the letter.

The orthography of the inscription calls for very few remarks. In cognate inscriptions be is used for de, e.g., bātīye for deṭīpē (Karla No. 22, ASWI., Vol. IV, p. 113 and Nāsik No. 2 above, Vol. VIII, p. 60), bātīyikā for deṭīyikā (Jumna Nos. 3 and 18 ASWI., Vol. IV, pp. 93 and 95). In one of the Jumna inscriptions (ASWI., Vol. IV, No. 25, pp. 96-7) we have however re. The language is Prākrit.

The personal names, Jebubbhūti, Miṭidāsa and Bhayabhūti are names not met with in other records, though the last one may recall to our mind the Bhāya......of a Nāṇāghat relievo inscription. Dāsa and bhūti enter into the composition of names (Nāsik No. 8, above, Vol. VIII and ASWI., Vol. V, No. 23, pp. 83 ff.).

TEXT.

1 Dhenukākaṭa Miṭidāsa-vejasa
2 thabhō dāsa[ṇ]i sahā bhariyāya Jayamī-
3 tāye(ya) sahā ve puṭṣeji Bhayabhūtīnā
4 Jebubbhūtīnā cha Vasumūṭi[ṇ]a cha.

TRANSLATION.

Gift of a pillar by the physician (vejasa Skt. vādyasa) Miṭidāsa, of Dhenukākaṭa, with his wife Jayamī, two sons Bhayabhūti and Jebubbhūti1 and with Vasumūṭi.2

1 Reading may be Jābe- or Jābubbhūti.—Ed.
2 She was perhaps a daughter.
TWO INSCRIPTIONS FROM KARLA.

XI.
Karla Inscription of the year 17.

XVI.
Karla Chaitya Pillar inscription.

XVI.
Karla Chaitya showing the inscribed pillar.

(From photographs).

N. P. CHAKRAVARTI.

SURVEY OF INDIA, CALCUTTA.
accession extremely doubtful. Probably he was a younger brother of Sarvavarman or else predeceased his father at a young age; at any rate, it is entirely unnecessary to postulate a fraternal war after Isanavarman.

Attempts have been made to identify this Suryavarman with the king of that name mentioned in a Sirpur inscription, in which a Suryavarman figures as a Varman king of Magadha and as the father-in-law of Harshagupta, the nephew of Mahāśiva-Tivara of Southern Kosala. But the Maugharins of the line of Harivarman are nowhere mentioned as a characteristically Magadhan dynasty, their capital being Kanauj. Moreover, a detailed palaeographical examination of the inscriptions of the Kosalan Pāṇḍavas leads us to place Tivara at a date much later than A.D. 554, to which year the Harpā inscription belongs. That, however, is a different matter and need not detain us here.

Regarding the history of Avantivarman next to nothing is known. In the present seals he is styled mahaśivādhivāja, while the Dād-Baramārk inscription calls him paramāśvara. Bāṇa describes him as the ornament of the Maughari race. He seems to have continued the imperial traditions of his family.

The second of the present seals introduces us to the son of Avantivarman, only the first two letters of whose name remain and can be read as Suva... or Sucha... This is a fact which does not readily fit in with the known facts of history. Bāṇa unequivocally states that Grahavarman was the eldest son of Avantivarman, as such he is expected to have come to the throne after Avantivarman. It is usually assumed by historians that when Grahavarman was killed by Devagupta of Malwa, the throne of Kanauj fell vacant and was offered to Harsha, who accepted it after some hesitation. This is perhaps stating the complicated course of events too simply. It is possible that the second son of Avantivarman came to the throne after the murder of Grahavarman as the rightful owner before Harsha occupied it in the name of his sister. It is also possible that Grahavarman was still a prince when he was killed and that some time elapsed between that event and Harsha's occupation of Kanauj, so that on the death of Avantivarman his younger son came to the throne and continued to rule till he was deposed by Harsha. This son, the author of the present seal, might have been the progenitor of the later Maughari dynasty, a scion of which, Bhogavarman, the crest-jewel of the illustrious Varmanas of the Maughari race, married his daughter to a Nepāl king in the eighth century. In short, it seems reasonable to hold that there was a legal heir to the Maughari throne even after the death of Grahavarman; this may explain why Harsha was hesitating to accept the s sceptre of Kanauj.

The text given below is transcribed from the original seals, now in the Archeological Museum at Nālandā.

---

1 Cf. Piše, loc. cit., p. 97.
4 Fleet, loc. cit., p. 213.
5 Harshacharita, p. 141.
6 The reading has been suggested by the Government Epigraphist for India. It is curious that the Mañjuśri-mālā-kalpa mentions a king Suvra after Graha; see Ganapati Sastry's edition (Triv. Skt. Series), p. 623. See also K. P. Jayaswal, An Imperial History of India, p. 27 § 19 (c). Jayaswal corrects the last pada of the verse as Graha-Suvra(ta) (as)pārak which according to the ordinary rules of Amrtaśubha would spoil the metre. As the last visible letter on this seal seems to be a part of u and as there seems to be a sūma sign below it I am tempted to restore the concluding portion as tri-Sukha(suvramayā Maughari).—Ed.
8 Bāṇa is silent as to whether Grahavarman ever came to the throne, unless the word dēva, used in one-place (p. 183), is taken to show his royal position.
TW0 MAUKHARI SEALS FROM NALANDA.

A.

N. P. CHAKRAVARTI.

SURVEY OF INDIA, CALCUTTA.
TEXT.

A.—Seal of Avantivarman (Reg. No. 852).


7. tasya puttras-tat-pād-ā[1]nudhyāta [Indra][1][1]-[bhāṭṭārikā-mahādevyām-utpānṇaḥ para-mahāvarṇō]


B.—Seal of the son of Avantivarman (Reg. No. 855).


2. ṣṭā[1]n[1]-ṛ[1]-[e]-dēvyām-utpānṇaḥ śrī-mahārāj-E[1][1].

3. Upaguptā-bhāṭṭārikā-dēvyām-utpānṇō mahārājādhī[1][1].

4. t-pād-ānuśyāt[1]o Lakshmīvati-bhāṭṭārikā-mahādevyā[1][1].

5. cāravarmanā tasya [pu]ttras-tat-pād-ānuśyātā [Indra]-bhāṭṭa[1][1].

6. [mahārāj-a]-ādhira[1]j-[Śrī]-Avantivarmanā tasya pu[1][1].

7. [vatt]-t-bhāṭṭārikā-mahādevyām-utpānṇaḥ para[1][1].

8. rājā[1]-[dhi]-rāj-a-Śrī-Suva[1][1][1].

No. 41.—SRIRANGAM INSCRIPTION OF ACYUTARAYA: SAKA 1461.

BY A. S. RAMANATHA AYYAR, B.A., MADRAS.

The subjoined inscription is found on the east wall of the second prāśāna in the Baṅganāṭha temple at Śrīraṅgam, the well-known place of pilgrimage in South India, especially sacred to the Vaishnavas. It is dated in the reign of the Vijayanagara king Acyutaraya-Mahārāja in Saka 1461, corresponding to the cyclic year Vikārīn, and contains astronomical details which give the English equivalent A. D. 1539, August 26, Tuesday.

The record which is engraved in Tamil and Grantha characters, contains an introductory portion in Tamil which states that on the occasion of the king's performing a tulabhāra ceremony, his rāja-mahāsthā Oduva Tirumalaśīvī-Ammaqavarqa composed two Sanskrit slōkas and had them engraved in several holy places, Srīraṅgam being one of them, so that the descendants of prince Chikka-Venkiṭādri may rule as emperors (śravabhavaḥ). Then follow the two verses referred to, and the epigraph closes with an epilogic sentence in Tamil.

1. Restored from the Aśīrgaḍa and Nālandā seals of Sarvavarman.

2. Restored from the seal B.

3. Of the existing portion.

4. [Dr. Suck ...— See p. 284, note 6 above.— Ed.]

5. Registered as No. 15 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1938-39.

6. The slōkas refer only to the gift of Aṇandaśī and not to the tulabhāra; and it is possible that both the ceremonies were performed on the same occasion at Hampi.
Several records\textsuperscript{1} copied at different places mention that the senior queen (pattumahishi) of king Achyuta was Varadağēvi-Amman and that the crown-prince Venkatabddri alias Chikkaraya was her son. That the king had another queen named Tirumalānbā was known only from the references in the two Telugu works Vijayavilāsam and Raṅgunāthābhīyudayam,\textsuperscript{2} which also supply the additional information that her sister Murtināmbā was given in marriage to China Chevvappa-Nāyaka, along with the governorship of the Tanjore principality as dowry. The present inscription is important in its furnishing epigraphical confirmation as to the existence of this queen Tirumalāśēvi and in enabling us to identify her with Odūva (or Vōduva) Tirumalāmbā, the composer of the two Sanskrit verses under reference, as also of another verse\textsuperscript{3} commemorating the king’s gift of Svarnamēra to Brāhmans at Hampi in Saka 1455. It is possible that the three verses\textsuperscript{4} recording the king’s celebration of the tulabhāra of pearls at Kāṇchipuram in Saka 1455 in company with his queen Varadāmbikā and prince China-Venkaṭādri, were also her composition.

A Sanskrit champū-kāvyā called the Varadāmbikāpūrīsyyam was written by a certain Tirumalāmbā, who describes herself in its colophon\textsuperscript{5} as ‘the favourite of king Achyuta’. As indicated by its title, the theme of this work is the marriage of Achyuta with Varadāmbikā, the younger sister of the two brothers bearing the name of Tirumala, narrated in the usual conventional style. It may have been composed in the reign of Kīrāṇadēvarāya\textsuperscript{6} himself, and the portions relating to the birth of a son to Achyuta by name Venkaṭādri and the latter’s anointment as Svarāja at the time of his father’s coronation may probably have been added on later by the same author.\textsuperscript{7}

Though of average literary merit, the kāvyā is interesting because of the quasi-historical nature

\textsuperscript{1} She is referred to as a pattumahishi in a record dated in Saka 1463 (Telugu Desamātad Epigraphical Report 1930, p. 253) and in Saka 1464, Subhakrit (No. 330 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection for 1929-30). See also No. 181 of 1922 of Saka 1455.

\textsuperscript{2} S. K. Ayyangar, Sources of Vijayanagar History, pp. 255, 255.

\textsuperscript{3} No. 9 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection for 1904 and No. 708 of 1922.

\textsuperscript{4} These unpublished verses (No. 81 of 1919) may, with advantage, be reproduced here.

\textsuperscript{5} These verses are also found in No. 178 of 1924 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection from Kālaḥasti, now under publication in S. I. 1., Vol. IX.

\textsuperscript{6} Sources of Vijayanagar History, p. 170.

\textsuperscript{7} The coronation of Achyuta took place towards the end of A.D. 1329, when Venkaṭādri was also anointed Svarāja (Achyutarājahbhyudayam). The Varadāmbikāpūrīsyyam states that on seeing the prince adorned with all good qualities, the king made him heir-apparent. So the latter portion may have been supplemented after A.D. 1330.
of its contents and the light it throws on contemporary political and social life. We may infer from it that this poetess Tirumalāmbā was identical with Ōduva Tirumalaidevi-Ammap-avargal (Vōduva Tirumalamanavanam), who, originally a 'Reader' (Ōduva) at the royal court, subsequently rose to the position of a co-queen (rajaθamahishi) herself. It may also be noted that she was one of the galaxy of poetesses, royal and otherwise, who attained to literary fame under the patronage of the Vijayanāgara kings.

The fervent hope expressed in this inscription by Tirumalāmbā that the performance of dānas and the engraving of the commemorative verses in holy places would ensure for Veṅkaṭādri’s descendants the rule of the kingdom as sārvabhuuma, implies that doubts had probably begun to be entertained even at this time, as to whether the prince would be allowed to peacefully succeed his father, if such a contingency arose. The danger that threatened his regal hopes came from two quarters. Towards the end of Achyuta’s reign, his ambitious brothers-in-law Salakam Pedda-Tirumalalarija and China-Tirumalalarija had usurped much power into their hands and, in the event of the king’s death, were even prepared to wrest the kingdom from their helpless nephew, by fair means or foul. Then there was also the party of nobles led by Aliya-Rāmaraya, the son-in-law of the late king Krishnaraya. This astute general, by espousing the cause of Sadāsvarayar on the plea of his being the son of an elder brother of Achyuta, schemed to overthrow the power of the Salakam brothers and concentrate it in his own hands. This struggle for power must have already attained definite shape and proportions at the time of the present record in A. D. 1539, for the co-queen to have voiced her devout prayer. It is, however, unfortunate that the capacity of the younger uncle China-Tirumalalarija proved stronger than the prayer, for he is believed to have strangled his royal nephew in A. D. 1543, when the latter was on the throne only for a few months.

As regards the two verses quoted in this epigraph which are couched in the Śārdulavikrādita metre, it may be mentioned that more than a dozen copies of them exist in all the different scripts of the kingdom, Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Grantha and Nāgarī, and in several places, so far apart as Anjugere in the Bombay Presidency and Śrīraṅgam in the Madras Presidency; but in none of them is there the additional information furnished by the Śrīraṅgam copy. While the Sanskrit verses glorify only the gift of Anandarudhi made by the king in Śaka 1461, the Tamil portion refers to the performance of a tulābāhāra on the same day. This was also probably celebrated in the

1 The information it gives about Nama’s military achievements is particularly useful.
2 This is the spelling adopted in the Kannada version of No. 9 of 1904.
3 See Sources of Vijyanagar History, p. 170, fn. 8 and also p. 11 of Introduction, Parandukvāparisayachampā.
4 Gāntgadhi, the author of the Mathurāśayjagam and the wife of Prince Kampana, was a notable example.
5 There was another named Mōhanāgū, who wrote the Māricēparisayjagam.
6 For a discussion on these points, vide Dr. N. Venkatakrishnayya’s Studies in the History of the Third Vijayanagar Dynasty, pp. 76 et seq.
8 No. 597 of 1929-30 from Handādī (South Kanara), dated in Sukhakṛit, mentions that Venkaṭādrikrīyaya was ruling at Vijayanagara.
9 Hampi (Nos. 27, 28, 39 and 40 of 1889, and No. 1 of 1904); Anantālayanagudi (Nos. 684 and 685 of 1922); Kamalapur (Nos. 17 and 20 of 1904); Haritat (Dīvānapare 24); Nilgund (Holalkere 123); Gadag (B. K. Nos. 7 and 14 of 1926-27); Anjugere (B. K. No. 166 of 1928-29).
Vīṭhālēśvara temple on the bank of the Tuṅgabhadra at Bhāskara-kṣetra (i.e., Hampi), the venue of the Anandaṃdhi-dāna, mentioned in the following Kannāḍa preamble of the Gadag version.\(^1\)


From this it is also clear that Anandaṃdhi is the name of a particular kind of dāna and that it was performed in the temple of Vīṭhālēśvara on the bank of the Tuṅgabhadra at Bhāskara-kṣetra to propitiate god Mādhava and that these laudatory verses were engraved also in the temple of Triyambakakēdeva at Gadag.\(^3\) The inscriptions engraved at Śrīraṅgam and other places must have also been of this nature. According to Hēmādri, who describes this gift in some detail in the Dānakhaṇḍa of his Chaturanga-chintāmanu, the Anandaṃdhi-dāna consists of presenting to learned Brahmans, after some ceremonial preliminaries, pots made of the udumbara wood (audumbaram ghatam) and filled with precious stones and coins of gold, silver or copper. The days prescribed for the performance of this dāna are days in the months of Kārttika, Māgha and Mādhava (Vaisākha), days of Ayana, Vишu, Manvādi and Yugādi, and days of the lunar and solar eclipses; and the merit accruing from this ceremony is said to be longevity, perfect health and imperial sovereignty.\(^4\) It is no wonder therefore that king Aichyuta selected this Ananda-

---

\(^1\) No. 7 of the Bombay-Karnatak Epigraphical Collection for 1926-27.
\(^2\) Compare dvija Dhanadāyam-amōdayam-Mādhavan of the verse.
\(^3\) A similar preamble found in the Āryagore copy states that the verses were engraved in the Amṛtāyāra temple at that place under similar circumstances; while the Āryagore copy has simply the following sentence: — Srimâ-Mahārajâśîrâja-Râjaparamēśvara-Mahârajâ-viṣṇupratâpa-Mahârajâ-krit-Mahâaṇandaṃdhi-pravâma-pûdya-drâyan lākhyat\(^5\).
\(^4\) Bibliothec Indica, No. 31, Chaturanga-chintāmanu, Dānakhaṇḍa, pp. 583-588; and Madras Epigraphical Report for 1929, p. 110.

---

\(^5\) तारामित्रीराजं प्राप्ति प्रतिच्छे \nबिपर्यस्थितेऽदायित्वविनियोगिनाम् \nव: कृपया सीतामुः काराधिवागन्नामान्यायाम् \n
nidhi-dānga for celebration to ensure succession to his son, though unfortunately the actual results completely falsified his expectations.

The final sentence in Tamil states that these verses which were forwarded (varakkūṭi-aruru) by the king (rānas), were arranged to be engraved during the regime (ādhikārattil) of Śrīraṅga-pāpa-Nāyaka, son of Tuluva Veṅgala-Nāyaka and a subordinate (pāḍaṇeṭṭai-paṇṇum) of King Achyuta, who was probably wielding some authority in the Tiruchchirāppalli region. He figures in another record from Śrīraṅgam dated in Saṅke 1460, wherein he is described as the son of Madura (Maruda)-arasa-paṇḍava Tuluva Veṅgala-Nāyaka. In Saṅke 1458, the same officer is stated to have provided for offerings and worship to god Veṅkaṭēśa at Tirupati, for the merit of Achyutarāya-Mahārāya, his queen Varadāji-Asmaṇ and prince Chikka-Venkaṭāri-ūjāiyar.

Śrīraṅga-Nārāyanapriyāṇ, the temple-accountant, has affixed his signature at the end, in attestation of the fact that the inscription was engraved in the temple with his full cognisance. This name or rather title was borne by all the accountants of the Śrīraṅgam temple in succession, having been bestowed, it is said, from the time of Śrīraṅga-Nārāyanā-Jiyar alias Kūra-Nārāyanā-Jiyar, the author of the Suddhaṅkaraṇasam, who flourished in the 13th century A.D. and was connected with the administration of the Śrīraṅganātha temple for a long time.

TEXT.


This implies that Achyutarāya was not present at Śrīraṅgam at the time of the record. As stated in another inscription (No. 16 of the Madras Epigraphical collection for 1938-39), which reads ‘Vijaya-samūravasattu. Āṣhāḍha bhujaa dvādaśi-nāḷ Śrīraṅgattukku eṣṭuṇḍari,’ the king was at Śrīraṅgam on July 18, A.D. 1533.

This was later than the occasion when, according to the Achyutarāyāḥhūdayagam, he stayed here for some time, while his brother-in-law Saiśakam Tirumala had led the expedition down south against the Tiruvadi king.

* No. 91 of 1938-39.
* Kāḻiḷoḷu, p. 72.
* Many of the Sanskrit words in the Tamil portions are engraved in Grantha characters.
* The other copies read Avanandadhīn and Avanandādhīn.
* Some of the other copies read purati.
* The other copies read avas-aṣṭāṭṣaṣṭṣa and this reading has been followed in the translation.
* Read nar.
TRANSLATION.

(Line 1) Be it well! Hail! Prosperity!

In the Śaka year 1461 (expired) corresponding to the (cyclic) year Vikārin, in the month of Bhādrapada, on Tuesday, which was a day of the twelfth tithi of the first fortnight, with Śrāvaṇa-nakshatra—Māhārājādhirāja Rājaparamēśvara śri-Virapratāpa śri-Vīra-Achuyatārya-Mahārāya was pleased to perform the tulabhāra-mahādāna (ceremony). For (i.e., in commemoration of) this, the queen (rajamahātī) of the Mahārāya named Oduva Tirumalaidēvi-Ammaṇavargal was pleased to compose two (Sanskrit) ātakas.

(ii. 2-3) (In the hope that) if this dharmam is conducted well, as long as the moon and the sun, in holy places such as Śrīraṅgam, Chikka-Veṇkatārdviga’s descendants will rule the earth as emperors (sāvabhūmas), this epigraph was thus engraved in the shrine of god Śrīraṅgānātha.

In (the) Śaka (year) counted by chandra (1), rasa (6) and umarēndra (14), in the (cyclic) year Vikārin, on the day of the tithi called dvādaśī, in the increasing fortnight of Bhādrapada, which was a Tuesday with the nakshatra presided over by Viṣṇu (i.e., Śrāvaṇa) king Achyuta by bestowing (gifts of) Anandanidhi made Brāhmans like Dhanada (Kubera) and pleased (god) Mādhava.

Though (themselves) nava (nine), how can the niḥkṣi (of Kubera) attain equality with the Anandanidhi of king Achyuta of renowned valour, which has earned navai (new) celebrity (or eulogy)—for, while the former are surrounded by hosts of demons and are seized by crowds of serpents, the latter is protected by meritorious deeds and is coveted (only) by the assemblage of the good!

Be it well!

(iv. 4) These two verses which were graciously sent by the svāmi (king), were engraved on stone during the regime of Śrīraṅgappa-Nāyaka, son of Tuluva Veṇgaḷa-Nāyaka and a subordinate of Achyutadēva-Mahārāya, in attestation whereof, this is the writing (i.e., signature) of the temple-accountant Śrīraṅga-Nārāyaṇapriyāṃ.

---

1 The word śvāmi is not appropriate, for the verses describe only the Anandanidhi.
2 There is some ambiguity here, for no dharmam was actually made at Śrīraṅgā in this occasion; it appears to be a shortened form of the dharmas-kiśṭipāraśi of the Gāgag and Anuśiras versions.
3 The word ananda-nidhi means inexhaustible treasure; but the more technical Anandanidhi of Hemakārī appears to have been intended.
4 The idea in the first verse is that the Brāhman-recipients of the rich gifts of Ananda-nidhi were made to resemble Dhanada (Kubera), the possessor of the nine niḥkṣis; while the second verse says that king Achyuta’s gifts, however, outvalue Kubera’s niḥkṣis, for specified reasons.
5 A pun on nava=nine and nava=new.
No. 42.—LUCKNOW MUSEUM PLATE OF JAYACHANDRADEVA: V.S. 1237.

By N. P. Chakravarti, M.A., Ph.D., Ootacamund.

The record edited below is found on a single copper-plate now preserved in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow. No information is available as to where it was discovered. According to the information kindly supplied by Rai Bahadur Prayag Dayal, Curator of the Lucknow Museum, it was purchased at Lucknow from Messrs. Mata Prasad Sita Ram of Benares on the 12th October, 1935.

The plate which is inscribed on one side only, measures 1' 7" x 1' 2". Its edges are fashioned thicker and raised into rims for the protection of the writing. In the upper part of the plate there is a hole for the passing of the ring. Both the ring and the seal which was once affixed to the ring, are now missing. The plate contains 38 lines of writing, the letters being about $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ of an inch in height. It weighs about 502½ tolas. A piece in the left hand corner at the bottom of the plate is broken and lost. This has caused damage to the last four lines in each of which five or six letters are lost at the beginning. One letter in l. 13 and two or three letters in ll. 16-17 are also partly damaged. But there is nothing in the plate which cannot be restored from the other known records of the Gāhādavālas of Kānauj to which family the grant belongs.

The characters of the inscription are Nāgarī and the language Sanskrit. There are altogether 26 verses composed in different metres of which one is introductory in praise of Lakshmi and Vishnu found at the commencement of almost all the Gāhādavāla grants, 13 are devoted to the descriptions of the different rulers mentioned in the record and the last twelve are imprecatory and benedictory verses. With the exception of these verses the rest of the record is in prose.

The inscription has been carefully written and in respect of orthography the following points may be noted: (1) $B$ is denoted by the sign for $r$ everywhere except in bahāramur in l. 8, e.g. vahuvallī-varadā (l. 7), -āmēru (l. 8), Vāli (l. 10), vacula (l. 14), etc. (2) Combinations of consonants and nasals have been represented by both anuvāna and a nasal of the same class without any discrimination, e.g. akṣamarṣita and ārambha (l. 1), -Eśāra (l. 4), -ānkita (l. 5), kumbhi, manjalā (l. 6), ārambha (l. 20), etc., as against samānabha (l. 1), Mahāmardita (l. 3), manjalo (l. 3), sāmū (l. 7), Gāvindachandra (l. 8), -ēru (l. 11), mahārā (l. 20), etc. (3) A consonant in conjunction with a subscript $r$ has never been doubled but one following $r$ has very often been doubled, e.g. dōrvarāmaṇu-ārjyālā (l. 4), kirti, varṇa (l. 10), avarṣa (l. 12), etc., the few exceptions being jayārāma, -ārthi (l. 11), virāhara (l. 14), etc. (4) $S$ has been wrongly used for $ś$ in anuṣam (l. 4), satasat (l. 5), vasūd (l. 7), rāṣṭa (l. 8), etc., and $ś$ for $s$ in -ālāśātuḥ (l. 6), āśīrī-pādharṣṭāt (l. 7), tirīksha (l. 8), yadānā (l. 11), saharan (l. 13), etc. (5) Final $s$ is found only in phalam (l. 30), anuṣaṇa being used in other places. (6) For want of sufficient space in a particular line when anusvara being used in other places. (7) For want of sufficient space in a particular line when anusvara being used in other places.

The donor of the grant is the Paramābhāṣāraka-Mahārajadhāma-Mahāveśarāj-Paramāṣekha Avadhālo-Kanauj and Benares, of whom we have already sixteen records dating from V.S. 1226 to V.S. 1245 (A.D. 1170-89). The present record does not contain any new information with the exception of what is imparted by the grant portion. The genealogy of the donor is given in verses 2-12 and once again in ll. 14-18 where the names of the first two members of the family are omitted. The list begins, as in the other

records of this family, with Yaśovigrahā (v. 2) whose son was Mahāchandra (v. 3). The latter’s son was the P. M. P. Chandradēva, who is stated to have acquired the kingdom of Kanyakubja by the prowess of his arm. He is also said to have protected the holy gīthas at Kāśi, Kuśika, Uttarakṣāla and Indrashtāna (i.e., Benares, Kanyakubja, Ayōdhya and probably Indraprastha or Delhi) after he had acquired them, and bestowed to Brahmans his weight in gold in hundreds. His successor was his son the P. M. P. Madanāpāla and his son was the P. M. P. Gōvindachandra who by his creeper-like long arms secured the elephant which was the newly acquired kingdom (v. 8). Commenting on this verse Kiellhorn observed: “Attention may also be drawn to the fact that the sovereignty over Kanyakubja is described as having been newly acquired, even when Gōvindachandra, the grandson of Chandradēva, was reigning.”

But as this verse is found in the Kamauli Plate of V. S. 1171, the earliest known record of this ruler and which is separated by only five years from the last known record of his father Madanāpāla, it is probable that noṣa-rājya in the verse refers to the kingdom to which Gōvindachandra newly succeeded. It was also this ruler who for the first time assumed the birudas aśeṇapati-gajapati-narapati-rājatray-ādhikapati, originally used by the Kalachuri rulers of Tripuri, the use of which was continued by all his successors. It is significant that these epithets appear for the first time in the Bengal Asiatic Society’s plate of V. S. 1177 which records the transfer by Gōvindachandra to one Thakura Vasīthpā of the village Kāraṇḍa in the Antarāla-patalā which was originally granted to the Rāja-guru Rudraśiva by (the Kalachuri) Yaśākṣaraṇa. As these are not found even in the two grants of Gōvindachandra issued in V. S. 1176 it is obvious that shortly before the issue of the grant of V. S. 1177 the Gāhādavāla ruler wrested a part of the Kalachuri kingdom, probably from Yaśākṣaraṇa himself, and to mark the occasion assumed the birudas hitherto used by the Kalachuri kings. Gōvindachandra’s son was the P. M. P. Vijayachandra whose son was the P. M. P. Jayachandra. Vijayachandra is stated to have swept away the affliction of the globe by the streams (of water flowing) from the clouds in shape of the eyes of the wives of Hammīra, the abode of wanton destruction to the earth” (v. 10). There is little doubt that this passage contains a reference to some historical incident not known from other sources. As this event is referred to in the Kamauli Plate of Vijayachandra of V. S. 1224, the earliest record known of this ruler, it must have taken place between this date and V. S. 1211, the last known date of his father Gōvindachandra, i.e. between A. D. 1154 and A. D. 1167. It is, however, difficult to identify definitely this Hammīra. The earliest numismatic reference to this title is found on the coins of Muhammad bin Sām otherwise known as Muhammad Ghūrī, whose invasion of India did not take place till a later period. Probably Hammīra was a popular designation for the Muslim chiefs in India, and therefore Dr. H. C. Ray may not be wrong in identifying Hammīra of these records with Khusrau Malik Tāj-ud-Daulah (1160-1186), the last prince of the Yamnī dynasty, who was noted for his weakness as a ruler and who might have suffered a defeat at the hands of this Gāhādavāla ruler.

1 See Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, p. 8, n. 46.
2 Ibid., p. 6.
3 Above, Vol. IV, p. 102 and n. 3.
4 Viz., the Rāhan Plate of V. S. 1166 (Ind. Ant., Vol. Xviii, pp. 15 ff.).
9 Major Ravielly notes two coins, one of Khusrau Malik and another of his father Khusrau Shāh, but the legends on them give them the titles of Sulṭān and Bābāshāh respectively. See Tabaqūt-i-Nāṣirī, Transl. (Bibli. Ind.), footnote under p. 114.
The date of the record is given both in words and in decimal figures in ll. 22-23 as Sunday, the 7th day of the bright half of Phālguna in the (Vikrama) Samvat 1237, when the sun had entered the Mina (sign of the zodiac) and regularly corresponds to Sunday, the 22nd February, A.D. 1181.

The object of the grant is to record the gift of the village Maridara with Kadāhī in the Dehadūra-pattalā by Jayachandradeva. The recipient of the gift, which was made by the ruler after bathing in the Ganges at Vāraṇasi and performing other ceremonies connected with it, was the Brahmin Paṇḍit Brahmasārman of the Vatsa-gonśa and the five pravara, Bhārgava, Chyavana, Apanavāna, Aurva and Jámadagyna. He was a son of the Paṇḍit Gōtrānanda and grandson of the Paṇḍit Sarvānanda. In l. 27 of the record, among the taxes to be paid to the donor, is found the phrase yomali-kāmali which is found also in some other records of this ruler in a slightly different form. Its meaning, however, is not clear.

The writer of the plate was the Mahākāśyapatalika Thakkura Śrīpati who figures as the writer of most of the copper-plate grants of Jayachandradeva.

I am unable to identify the gift village and the pattalā in which it was situated.

**TEXT.**

[Metres: Vv. 1, 3, 15-23, Anuṣṭubh; vv. 2, 26, Indravajra; vv. 4, 7, 13, Śārdūkavikrīdita; vv. 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 25, Vasantalilaka; v. 9, Druvatilombita; v. 10, Mālinī; v. 14, Srainglehī; v. 24, Śālinī.]

1. Om svasti || Akuṇṭhottaka-vaikunṭha-kaṇṭhapilīha-luḥhat-karaḥ | sam rasabhaḥ surat-ārabhaḥ sa śīyaḥ śrīyasa-s tu vah || [1][*] Āśi(s)d-Aś(Aś)ātudyuti-[vaṁśa-jā]u-kahmā-pāla-[mālaus]

2. divaḥ gataḥ || sākaḥ Vivasvan īva bhūri-dhāmā nāmā Yaśōvigrha ity-udāraḥ || [2][*] Tat-sutō-bhūṁ-Mahi stands charāś-charādhamā-nibham nijāṁ(jam) yēn-āpāraṁ akūpārā-prē-vyaṁ-


5. bhyō yēn-āṅkita vasumaṭi śatasa(sa)s-tulabhūḥ || [5][*] Tasya-ātmajō Madanapāla iti kshitiśrī-ḍhājāmanīr-śvijyayatē nīja-gōtra-chaṇḍraḥ | yasya-ābhishēka-kalāś-ōlāśi(sī)-taḥ payōbhiḥ prakābha-


7. līta-styān-āśi(ṛ)śrī-gadbhūti(sī)taḥ Śeṣaḥ pēśa-vasā(ā)hī-īva khaṇam-amau kroḍē nila-ānanaḥ || [7][*] Tasmād-ajayata niś-āyata-vā(bā)hu-valli-vān(bān)dh-śvaruddha-nava-ṛaya-ga(ja) nārendraḥ sāṁdrāmanīr-

---

1. Probably Kadāhī was a pōraka attached to the village of Mandara.
3. From an impression which I owe to the courtesy of Rai Bahadur Prayag Dalal, the Curator of the Provincial Museum, Lucknow.
4. Expressed by a symbol.
8 ta-drava-muṇhāṃ prabhāvō gavāṃ yō Góvinda-chāndrā iti chaṅḍrā iv-āṃviv(mhur-
rāśi[sa]) ॥ ॥ [8][*]

Na katham-apy-alabhanta raṇa-kahamahā-stis(aḥ)ī hum dikahu gajānā athā vajraṇāḥ[ḥ] ॥ ॥ kahūhua bhāmrn(a)-Abhāramvallabhāḥ(bhu).

9 praśībhājā iha yasya(ya) ghatā-gaṇaḥ ॥ ॥ [9][*] Aparati Vijaya-chāndrā nāma rāma-v[na]

rōbhrāḥ Śrīraṣṭrā-iva bhūḥrīt-pāśka-viṣchhēdā-dakṣaḥḥ ॥ bhūvāna-dalana-hēlā-hēm-

ānyaḥ Hāmm[h]a(ra)-nārī-nayana-jala-1

10 da-hārā-dhauta-bhūlōka-tāpāḥ ॥ ॥ [10][*] Lōkā-trāy-ākramāṇa-kēli-viṣankhalanī prakhyāta-
kṛttvī-kāvī-varṣṣita-vāhīhanī ॥ yasya Trīvikrama-padā-krama-bhānī bhatti prōjā-

(jjhum)bhayānti Vā(Ba)li.

11 rāja-bhāyaṃ yaśasī[ti] ॥ ॥ [11][*] Yaśmin-čhalaty-udadhī-nēmī-mahī-jayārtanāḥ mādyat-

kar-śrīrā guru-bhāra-nipīṇātēvā ॥ ytī Śrīraṣṭrā-paddāḥ sa(a)ṇaḥ-ārīhīnī bhūs-tvaṃg-

taraga-nivāh-ōttāh-rajā-čhalēna ॥ ॥ [12][*]

12 Tasmād-adbhuta-vikramād-atha Jayac[ch*] hārdābhīnāḥ prātīm-ḥūpānam-avati-

ṛupā ērā bhūvan-ōdhhārāya Nārāyaṇaḥ ॥ dvaiḥbhāvavan-apāsya vipraga-ruchēm dhik-

kritya sā(sā)nt-āśa(sa)yēḥ sēvantē yam-udagra-

13 van(bam)adhana-bhaya-dharmā-ārthiḥānā pārthiḥvīh ॥ ॥ [13][*] Gachēhēn-mūrcchhēm-

atuchchēhaṃ nā yaḥ kavalay[at]-ś(cē)-kūrma-prishhībh-hēbhghē-hēprātyāvṛtta-śram-ārī-

māmād-ākeli-ṣaṭa-su(vsa)[sa]-vāyāy[sa] ॥ sāhāram(ram) ॥ utīyogē yasya dhāvā

14 d-dharaśūla-dhūm-nirjirā-saṭa-hāra-hrāya-dāna-dīv-apli-v(a/ba)la(ha)-bhara-galad-

aśairya-mudraḥ paṇhūnāraḥ ॥ ॥ [14][*] Sō-yah samasta-rāja-chākra-samāśvīta-

charanaḥ ॥ ॥ Sa cha Parambahāṣārā-Mahārājā-

15 dhina-yāmā-śvāra-Parāmāṃhēśvār-nīja-bhu-jōpērrīja-sīri(Kānyākuv[bj]-ādhipati-

(tya)-sīri-Chandradēva-paddāḥ jūdhyātā-Parambahāṣārāk-a mahārājādhīra-sīri-

Parāmēśvara-Parāmāṃhēśvāra-sīri Ma-

16 da-napāḷadēva pādānudhyātā - Parambahāṣārāk Mahārājādhīra-sīri - Paramēśvara - Para-

māmāhēśvarāśvāpaṭi-gajapati-narapati-rājatray-ādhipati-vividha-vidyā-vichāra - Vāchas-

pati-

17 sīri-Govindachandradēva pādānudhyātā - Parambahāṣārāk Mahārājādhīra-sīri - Pa-

rāmēśvara - Paramāmāhēśvarāśvāpaṭi-gajapati-narapati-rājatray-ādhipati - vividha-vidyā-

vichāra-Vā

18 chaspati - sīri - Vijayachandradēvote viṣay[ ] Dehadūra-pattavāyaḥ | Kaḍahā-

sahā Māmavā grāmā niśini niśhikā-jañapāhan-upagatām-āpi cha rāja-rājī yavārāj-

vraṭīrī pruṣhita-prasātha-sṃaṭāti-bhānḍāgarikā-hakahapatālika - bhūṣhāg - haimuttikā - āntā-

hūraṃ-dītā kuru-rājarṣaṇā-rasūla-gauḍamādikā-reṇuśhān-ājñāpaya.

20 ti vō(bodh)dayatya-ādikati cha ॥ ॥ Viditaṁ-asti bhavaṁ yathā-opārlikha-grāmaḥ sa-

jālā-sthalaḥ sa-lōha-lavan-ākaraḥ sa-mataya-ākaraḥ sa-gārti-ōshanaḥ sa-gīri-gaṇana-nilai-

nāḥ sa-2


chatur-āghaṣṭa-visu(eu)ddah sva-simā-paryantaḥ śa(s)a[pta]-trim[ma]nsa(s)a[d-adhika-dvā-

dasa(sa)-śa-samvatsāre Phālgunē māsi4

1 There are two dots here to show that the word is continued in the next line.
2 This letter is damaged.
3 There is a mark here to show that the phrase is continued in the next line.
4 There is a superfluous drāṇa here.
23 sukla-pakṣe saaptamyān-tithau Ravi-dīnē aṅkātō-πi samvat 1237 Phālguna-
sudi 7 Ravaun Mina-gate savitari | ady-ēha śrimad-VRāṇasyāṁ Gaṅgāyāṁ snātvā
vidhivan-maṁtra-deva-mū(μ)ni-
24 maunja-bhūta-pitrīgāṁs-tarppayitvā timira-pañḍa-pāṇa-paṁu-mahasam-Uṣṇaṁ-chisham
-ūpsthāy-ō(ō)ṣadhipati-śakala-śekharāṁ samabhyarchchya tri-bhuvana-trātṝ-bhaga-
vatō Vāsudēva-
25 sya pūjāṁ vidhāya prachura-pāyasena haviśā hariḥvjuham hutvā mātā-pitrīr-āṭmanas-
cha punya-yāstḥ bhivṛiddhayē āsvābhīr-gāṅkariṇa-kuṣalatā pūta-karatalā-ōdakā-pūr
vvakam Vatsa-
26 gōtrāya Bhārgava-Chayan-Āpnavan-Aurvyaya-Yā(Ja)madagny-ēti-paṁcha-pravarāya paṁ-
dīta-śri Sarvvananda-paurāya paṁdīta-śri Gōtrānanda-purāya paṁdīta-śri Vr(ṇa)
-hma-sammarṇaś vr(ṇa)ḥmaṇyā chaṃdre-ā-
27ṛk[kaṁ] yāvach-chhāsāniktya pradattā matvā yathādiyamāna-bhāga-bhōga-kara-pravapi-
kara-yamālā-kāmālā-prabhṛtī-niyāntā yamāta-samast-adēyān ajēvībhīṣya dāsya-
28 thēti || || Bhavanti chātra ślokaḥ || Bhūmīṁ yaḥ pratigṛhiṇī ya-ča bhūmīṁ prayā-
chchhati || ubhau tau punya-karmāṇaṇī nityataṁ svarga-gāminau || [15][*] Sātu(śaṁ)-
khaṁ bhadrāśeṣānāṁ chchhatraṁ var-āsva va-
29 ra-brāhanāḥ bhūmi-dānasaayas(aya) chhānāṁ phalam-śat Purauḍārā || [16][*] Shasṭi(p)aṁ-
varsha-sahāśrā(śrā)ṁ svargā vasiṣṭ bhūmidaḥ || ācchheṭṭa cha-anumantā cha tānī-śva
narakā vases || [17][*] Va(ţa)ḥubhir-vra-
30 sudha bhukta rājabhiḥ Sagar-ādibhiḥ || yasya yasya yadā bhūmis-tasya tasya tadā phalam
|| [18][*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yoh harēta vasantharāṁ sa viśhthāyanāṁ kriṁ-
bhūtyā putrī-
31 bhīḥ saha majjati || [19][*] Vāri-hīṁ(e)ḥv-aranyēshu śushka-kōṭarā-vāsināḥ || kṛishpa-
sarpāṁ chā jayante dēva-vra(ṇa)ḥma-sva-hārināḥ || [20][*] Na vishāṁ viśham-īty-ahur-
vrā(ṇa)ḥma-svaṁ višham-uchyate || viṣha-
32 m-eśākālīnaṁ hantī vra(ṇa)ḥma-svaṁ putra-paurūṭkam(kam) || [21][*] Tājāgānāṁ sahaśram-
(srēṇa) Vājāpyā-satēna cha | gavāṁ kōṭi-pradānēna bhūmiḥ-hartē na su(śu)ḥdyati || [22][*]
Asmād-varma(ṇa)ḥ parikśhiṇi yaḥ ka. 1
33 [ś-chin-liṇapatīr-ḥa] 2 vēṭ || tasya-āhaṁ kraṁ-lagno-smi śasanēn na vyaṭkramēṇ(t) || [23][*]
Sarvvan-ētāna(ṇ)-bhāvināḥ pūrtīvā(ṇ)ndrān bhūyō bhūyō yācate Rāmabhadraḥ ||
sāmānaye-yam dha. 2
34 [ṛmma-sētur-liṇpō] 2 pāṁ kālē kālē pālanyō bhavadbhiḥ || [24][*] Vāṭ-ābha-rvibhrmaṇva(ma)
-m-idam vasudh-ādhīpattyām-āpata-mātra-madurā vishay-ōpabbōgah | prānāś-trīṇ-
āgrra-jalā-vinā
purā narēndrār-dānāni dharm-mārtṛ-yaśaṃkṛṣāṇi | nirṛmāya-vānta-pratimāni tāni kō
36 [nāma sādhub puna] 3 pr-ādādita || [26][*] Likhitāṁ ch-ēḍāṁ tāṁ[ra]-paṭṭakam mahākha-
paṭalika-ṭhakkura-śri śrīpāṭabhir-īti
No. 43.—VILAVATTI GRANT OF PALLAVA SIMHAVARMAN.

By C. R. Krishnamacharlu, B.A., Madras

The plates containing the grant were brought to my notice by Mr. K. Ramakoteswara Rao, B.A., B.L., Editor, "Triveni", Madras, and placed by him in my hands for examination in September 1933. He informed me that they had originally been lent to him by Sri (now Hon'ble) Bezswada Gopala Reddi, Minister for Local Self-Government to the Government of Madras. In reply to my enquiry regarding the history of the discovery of the set Sri Reddiga informed me that it was discovered at Vavvēru, a village one and a half miles to the west of his native village Buchchireddipāḷem in the Kōvūr taluk of the Nellore District, Madras Presidency. The plates were originally unearthed by Satyavēlu Rāmī Reddi of the former village some time about the year 1928 while digging pāṭimattī (i.e., earth in the old village-site), at about eight feet below the surface level. Some earthen pots are also reported to have been found along with the plates but as they were broken, they were not preserved. The plates were subsequently purchased by me for the Government Museum, Madras, and are now deposited there.

This inscription has been noticed by me in the Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy for the year 1933-34 as No. 1 of App. A and its contents are briefly reviewed in Part II (p. 30) of the same report.

The set consists of five plates, four of which measure 9 inches while the fifth measures only 8½ inches in length and all of them measure 2½ inches in width. They are held together by a circular ring of the same metal measuring about 3½ inches in diameter, which passes through a ring-hole, measuring ½ inch in diameter, near the left margin of the plates. The ends of the ring are soldered into the bottom of a circular seal measuring roughly one inch in diameter. On its plain surface the seal bears the relief of a couchant bull facing the proper left and seated on a stand which is indicated by a thin horizontal line in relief. Above the bull is a relief carving of a wavy line which may represent the sea, and above it is the figure of what appears to be an anchor. The latter seems to be tied on to what looks like a post on the right hand side.

The first and the last plates are inscribed on one side only, while the rest bear writing on both sides. The ring had been cut and soldered in one place and cut in another place before the plates reached me. There is, however, no report of impressions of the plates having been taken before. The plates with the ring and seal weigh 121 tolas.

The outstanding feature of the document is its elegant execution. The composition is also carefully done observing the rules of sandhi in almost all cases.

The script of the plates closely resembles that of the Uruvupalli grant of the same king. Most of the letters in both the grants are box-headed, which is a somewhat rare feature in South Indian epigraphs. For example this characteristic is not noticed in the Māṅgalur grant of this king wherein the top-strokes (talakatțu) of letters are rather thick but not box-shaped.

In our grant some letters are arrow- or nail-headed as they are sometimes called (e.g., ka, cha, ra, va, and bha, in lines 3 ff.). Another point to be noticed is that while the plates of the Uruvupalli, Māṅgalur and Pikana grants are numbered in numerical figures cut on their proper right

1 I understand that Mr. M. S. Sarma of the Bōrarī Office, Madras, examined the document before he sent them to me at Mr. Ramakoteswara Rao's instance.
A. Vilavatti Grant of Pallava Simhavarman.
   (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIV.)

B. Chura Grant of Pallava Vijaya-Vishnugopavarman.
   (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIV, pp. 137ff.)

C. Pikira Grant of Simhavarman.
   (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, pp. 159ff.)

From photographs.
margins, the plates under examination are not numbered so. A third noteworthy point is that while all the known grants of the king begin with the invocation Jitam Bhagavatā preceded, in two cases (Māngalār and Pikira grants), by a spiral which has been rendered by Hultsch as Omī, our grant commences with the expression Svasti like the two other known Pallava records, viz., the Ōṅgōḍu grant of Vijaya-Skandavarman ⁴ and the Chendalār plates of Kumāravishnu. ⁵

The emblem on the seal of the Uruvupalli grant was originally made out by Dr. Fleet to be a 'dog', ⁶ but from deference to native opinion he later accepted it to be a 'lion'. The illustration accompanying the facsimile of the grant suggests a wild animal like a dog or a wolf, sitting on its four legs and about to pounce. The short tail of the animal precludes its being taken for a lion which must conventionally have a long and curling tail.

The seal of the Māngalār grant ⁴ is not described or depicted but the animal on that of the Pikira grant ⁴ appears from the description given by Venkayya to resemble the one on the seal of the Uruvupalli grant. Unfortunately the Ōṅgōḍu grant carries no seal and consequently the seal of the present set gains importance as being the only well-preserved one of this king known so far. The animal here is clearly a bull, with a prominent hump, seated facing the proper left, and having a pretty heavy dew-lap. Above the bull appears to be what looks like an anchor as already stated or, a boat as assumed by me in my Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy for 1954 (p. 30, para. 4). Attention may be drawn here to a Pallava coin bearing the effigy of a bull on one side and that of a double-masted boat on the other, illustrated by Sir W. Elliot. ⁷

In the seal of the Prakrit charter issued by Vijaya-Buddhavarman's queen Chārūdvī, the animal had been originally taken ⁵ to be a deer but a closer examination would reveal it to be a standing bull facing the proper right, the hump rather indistinct. The view taken by me on the first examination of Fleet's facsimile is confirmed by an examination of the better illustration of the seal which appears in the plate published by Dr. Hultsch. ⁶

A few important orthographical peculiarities may be noticed here. The long ē attached to the consonants is distinguished by an inward curl. While in some other records of this king the word jitam in the invocation Jitam-Bhagavatā is written with a final m conjoined with the succeeding letter bha, here it is incised with an anusvāra as in the Uruvupalli and the Ōṅgōḍu grants. But the conjunct letter is employed in Lōkapālānām-pañcchamaya in I. 6 and in Yejyinm Pallavarānm-Mahārāja in I. 13. The anusvāra is replaced by the class nasal: kṣhētraṇaḥ in I. 14, sāravāṇ-dāyanāṃ in I. 22, paran-dānam in I. 23, ghōran-na in I. 24, etc. Consonants following r are invariably doubled as in all early grants, and as in some other earlier ones the consonants preceding r are also doubled as for example in paṟukramō in I. 10. The forms pādānudhṛṣṭaḥ in I. 11 and sāvṛdhyakṣaḥ in I. 14 may also be noticed. Above all, the employment of the Tamil letter for ło in Vīlavarī (I. 13) is noteworthy and indicates the influence of Tamil on the composer of this grant though it originated in and related to the Telugu country.

The epithet vattā in the expression vattā-grāmēṃśkāḥ (I. 21) meaning the officers of the grouped villages also suggests the influence of Tamil. I understand that in Mahārāṣṭra and Hyderābād the expression vattām-jāghirādar is in vogue.

⁴ Above, Vol. VIII, p. 161, Text.
⁵ Ibid., Vol. XV, pp. 251 f.
⁶ Ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 234.
⁷ Coins of Southern India, Plate I, No. 38.
 ⁹ Above, Vol. VIII, p. 144.
Several wrong forms, evidently due to oversight, are noticeable: e.g., grāma for grāma and grāka for grāšaka in l. 15, sumuhāṃkāpyās for sumuhākāpyās in l. 30 and eavundhārā for eavundhārā in l. 25. The expression kshētram in l. 14 appears to be used in the sense of a ‘department’ or ‘committee’ in charge of the village. We may compare in this connection the expression Oṁgṛūḍa-grāmas-cha vaktayāḥ used in the Oṁgṛūḍa grant of Vijaya-Skandavarman.1

The grant was issued from Vijaya-Padukkar-ādhisṭhāna by Mahārāja śri-Sirimhavarman, son of Yuvarāhāra-śri-Vishnūgopa, grandson of śri-Skandavarman and great grandson of śri-Viravarman, who belonged to the Bhāradvāja-gōtra and the family of the Pallava that had performed several Aśvamēdhā sacrifices. It registers the gift of the village Viḷaḷavati in Munda-rāṣṭra together with its hamlet (sa-grāśakaḥ), with the several taxes (specified below) which were the property of the king, to (the Brāhma) Vishnūsarman of the Gautama-gōtra and the Chhandogya (sākṣa).

The inscription is dated in the tenth year of the king’s increasingly victorious reign (samanāna-vijaya-rājya), on the fifth (tithi) of the bright fortnight of Śrāvaṇa (Śrāvaniṃ). The main interest of the record is in the enumeration of the several taxes which the king was entitled to collect from the village and which are now given away by him. Attention may be drawn in this connection to the eighteen kinds of parihāras (ashtadāśa-śātēśaḥ parihāra) mentioned but not enumerated in the Urvupalli grant. As regards the taxes the king’s command runs thus — whichever taxes are payable in this village by metal-workers and leather-workers (lōha- charmsakāra), the shop-keeping cloth-dealers (āpara-patta-kāra), licensed spies (!) going about in loose masks or garments (pṛīvāraṇchāra), rope-jugglers or dancers (rajjuprathāra), shops (in general) (āpara), Ājīvikas (a class of Jain mendicants), the taxes payable by barbarians and outcasts (nāhala), mukhadharakas (mask-actors), water-diviners (kūpa-darśakas), weavers (tantra-vāya), taxes on gambling (dīyāta), marriage (vivāha) and barbers (nāpita), and the taxes or tithes payable by the artisans enjoying the privileges of sarvaparīkāra (!) and such other taxes that belong to me, have been given to this (Brāhma) as brahmādeya. The officers of the vaṭṭa-grāmas2 shall accordingly do my bidding. Others shall (only) render and cause the dues to be rendered unto the donee. Whoever transgresses this charter of mine, that sinner will undergo corporal punishment.” The order for the gift was issued orally by the king and committed to writing by the Private Secretary (Rahasyādhipita) Achyuta.

---

1 Above, Vol. XV, p. 251, Text, l. 10.
2 These probably represent the begging būḍa-bakkīs who go about in loose and heavy garments.
3 If raujoyu-pratiḥār-āpasa be construed as one compound, it would indicate ‘booths of rope-jugglers or dancers’.
4 Alternatively we might understand this expression to refer to a particular class of self-mortifying devotees known as mukhadhāra-yāsī.
5 Many of the terms in ll. 18-19 are met with here for the first time and are difficult to explain. It appears to me that tax levied for the maintenance of certain offices is indicated in l. 18. Accordingly, I would prefer to take paṭṭālākāra not in the sense of ‘silk-weaver’ but in that of paṭṭālēkha or writer of official documents. Prāvāraṇchāra is probably the same as Saicharanakta of the Urvupalli grant and Saichārṣa of other early records. I am not certain whether raujoyu is to be taken separately or to be compounded with the preceding or succeeding word. Raujoyu and chāra-rajoyu are found in the Arkaśāstra as fiscal terms. Raujukas as an official designation occurs not only in the edicts of Asoka but also in such later records as belonging to the Andhra and Vaiṣākata rulers (see above, p. 54). Āpara-ajīvikas has probably to be taken as one word meaning ‘those who live by shops’, i.e., shopkeepers in general as distinguished from smiths and leather-workers (lōha-charmaka-āpara). Kūpa-darśaka may be ‘an inspector of wells’.—Ed.
6 If vaṭṭa is a Prākrit form of vaṭṭa the expression would mean bhūpa-grāmikāyaḥ, i.e., officers of the subsidiary villages. Cf. also the Telugu expression Oṣṭudāra.
The epithets and eulogies applied in our grant to the several kings are almost the same as those found in the allied grants, viz., the Uruvupalli, Pikira and Ōmgōdū ones with slight interchanges. The phraseology of the Māṅgaḻū grant is quite distinct from that of the other charters of the king, and its author Nēmī seems to have composed it in an almost independent and original style of his own without borrowing from any of the other grants of the family. The practice in the plates appears to have been to apply a particular set of attributes to the particular generation irrespective of the actual king concerned. If we compare the text of the Uruvupalli grant with the rest we find that the same set of epithets is applied in all to the great grandfather, the grandfather, the father of the king and the king of the grant, irrespective of any particular king. Thus, epithets applied to Skandavarman I, the first member in the Uruvupalli grant, are applied to Vīraravarman, the first member in the other grants. But the epithets vasudhā-tal-aika-vīra or prithvi-tal-aika-vīra is applied consistently in all to king Vīraravarman and this one appears to have been particularly his personal attribute. Skandavarman I, his son Vīraravarman and the latter's son Skandavarman II of the Uruvupalli grant are mentioned in the earlier Ōmgōdū grant of Vijaya-Skandavarman II but with quite a different set of attributes. Vīraravarman is not therein called the sole hero of the world. Some other epithets of the later grants are traceable in the earlier Ōmgōdū grant, viz., anēka-samara-labha-vijaya-asah-pratāpa (for prakāśa of later grants) and pratāp-ōpanata-rāja-maṇḍalaḥ, which are applied to Vīraravarman. It therefore appears that the ornate eulogy of the several kings was for the first time composed and brought into use in the reign of Vishṇugōpā and uniformly adopted in all the known grants of his son Śīnhavarman except in the Māṅgaḻū grant as already remarked.

In connection with this and the allied grants there exists what we may call the "Śīnhavarman problem." Dr. Fleet assigned the Uruvupalli plates to Śīnhavarman, a supposed elder brother of Vishṇugōpā and made him Śīnhavarman I of the dynasty. Dr. Hultsch, while editing the Pikira grant of Śīnhavarman, has attempted to solve the difficulty by assuming the non-existence of an elder brother of Vishṇugōpā by name Śīnhavarman and the passing of the succession from Skandavarman II to Śīnhavarman without Vishṇugōpā ever having ascended the throne, on the ground that he is entitled only Yuvārāja or Yuvamahārāja. If Vishṇugōpā did not succeed to the throne there is no meaning in saying that he 'made a gift' as the Uruvupalli charter states. I think there is not much justification for Dr. Hultschhi's supposition. The assumption of the title Yuvārāja or Yuvamahārāja which appears to have been due to some dynastic convention or exigency does not by itself deny accession to Vishṇugōpā as it did not in the case of the Eastern Chāluṣya king Maṅgi-Yuvārāja. The Mayidavolu plates were issued by Yuvamahārāja Śīvaskandavarman. Professor Dubreuil who has made a special study of the Pallava dynasty accepts that Vishṇugōpā did rule, but follows Dr. Fleet in assuming a Śīnhavarman as the elder brother of Vishṇugōpā. Hultsch and Dubreuil are partially right and partially wrong. We need not either suppose with the former that Vishṇugōpā did not ascend the throne or agree with the latter and Dr. Fleet that he had an elder brother named Śīnhavarman. I would suggest that the difficulty can be solved by supposing that the Uruvupalli grant originally made by Vishṇugōpā was, for some reasons not known, formally issued by his son Śīnhavarman.

---

1 In the Uruvupalli and other plates this epithet is applied to Vīraravarman's grandson Vishṇugōpā.
2 In the Uruvupalli plates this epithet is given to Vīraravarman, but in the other grants of Śīnhavarman, to his son Skandavarman II. The eulogies applied to the several generations of kings in the Uruvupalli plates are indifferently applied to the kings figuring in the Chandalār plates of Kumāravishnū II (above, Vol. VIII, p. 233).
4 Above, Vol. VIII, p. 190.
5 See my remarks in the article on the Churā grant of Vijaya-Vishṇugōpavarman, above, p. 139.
6 Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 63.
in the eleventh year of the latter's reign. The Pallava genealogy for this period would therefore stand thus:

Kumāravishṇu I.
   | Skandavarman I.
      | Viravarman s. a. Virakorčavarman.
         | Skandavarman II.
            | Vishṇugopa II.
               | Simhavarman.
                    | Vijaya-Vishṇugopa III.

Dubreuil\(^3\) supposes that Skandavarman of the Chandalūr plates was the father of Kumāravishṇu I of the earlier Ōngōdu grant. On the other hand it would be reasonable to identify him with Skandavarman II, son of Viravarman, and grandson of Skandavarman I, because of the epithets applied to him which are mostly the same as those given to him in the Pīkira and Ōngōdu grants and our present grant, though epithets alone are not sufficient for the identification of kings as the same epithets are applied to different kings, as pointed out by me above. If, however, my identification is correct, we may have, for this period, a tentative genealogy as follows:

Kumāravishṇu I.
   | Skandavarman I.

Kumāravishṇu II.
   | Skandavarman II.
      | Yuvamahārāja Vishṇugopa.
         | Simhavarman.

Buddhavarman

Kumāravishṇu III of the Chandalūr plates.

This arrangement would not only suit Dr. Hultsch's argument about the later nature of the characters of the Chandalūr plates but also we have a clue herein to suppose that the first Kumāravishṇu of these plates was probably named after his grandfather Kumāravishṇu of the earlier Ōngōdu grant. This would also remove the inconsistency in Prof. Dubreuil's scheme which, while suggesting a paleographical resemblance\(^4\) between the Urupupali and the Chandalūr charters, places Kumāravishṇu II of the latter on a collateral plane with Viravarman, the grandfather of Vishṇugopa and the great grandfather (according to Dr. Hultsch) of Simhavarman of the former. With these arguments kept in our view we will have to designate Kumāravishṇu, the donor of the Chandalūr plates as Kumāravishṇu III. His father Buddhavarman is stated in the Vēḻṟpāḷaiyam plates, to have conquered the Chōḷas\(^5\) while his grandfather Kumāravishṇu had.

\(^1\) [The conjecture seems to be rather far-fetched. On the other hand the position of Vishṇugopa seems to have been such that he was not able to issue any document in his own name.—Ed.]

\(^2\) Loc. cit., pp. 60ff.

\(^3\) The genealogical table given on p. 503 of S. I. I., Vol. II, drawn up before the discovery of the Ōngōdu grants, requires modification.

\(^4\) Loc. cit., p. 67.

VILAVATI GRANT OF PALLAVA SIMHAVARMA.

The captured (preferably re-captured) Kāṁchi which had been the Pallava capital in the earlier generations. With sufficient reason are the Chendalūr plates issued from Kāṁchipura and the donee is, very naturally, a native of a village in its vicinity, the name of which though not read by Dr. Hultzsch, may, I think, be safely read as Pulḷalūr and identified with the village of that name situated 9 miles north of Conjeevaram.

Discussing the initial date of Simhavaran Rao Bahadur Krishna Sastri remarks: “If the initial date derived from the Lōkavīhaṇa for Simhavaran II is to be accepted there must have been in A.D. 449, the fourth year of the king, a solar eclipse in the month of Chaitra. This, however, does not happen to be the fact.” I regret, I have to differ from Mr. Sastri and point out that Dr. Schran’s Tables of the Eclipses of the Sun in India record an eclipse on the 17th of May in A.D. 440. The month of Chaitra in certain years overlaps the month of May and definitely such is the case in the years in which there is an Adhika and a Nīja Chaitra month. So it is is quite possible to assume that in the Chaitra of A.D. 449 there was a solar eclipse. Consequently the assumption of A.D. 436 as the initial year for Simhavaran would be fully justifiable. So the date of our grant which is dated in the tenth year of his reign would correspond to A.D. 446.

Mūṇḍa-rāṣṭra is also mentioned in the Uruvupalli and Pithara grants of Simhavaran. It is evident that the later Mūṇḍa-nāḍu or Mūṇḍai-nāḍu of the Nellore Inscriptions. Vijavati, the gift village may possibly be the village Vavvcūru where the plates were discovered or with greater probability it may be the village Vijavlūru, about 12 miles east of it. Both the villages are in the Kōvdr taluk. Paddukkar-ādhisṭhāna from which the charter was issued may be identified with the village Padugupadu about 9 miles south by east of Vavvcūru in the same taluk. This is now a Railway station a little distance from the northern bank of the river Pennār on the Madras-Calcutta line and within a mile from Kōvdr.

TEXT.

First Plate.

1 Svasti[*] Jitam Bhagavatā [*] āri-Vijaya-Paddukkar-ādhisṭhānē parama-brahmanya sva-bā
2 hu-nirjīt-ārjītām kaṭhāra-tapō-nidheḥ vidhi-vihiita-sarvva, māryya-dā-sūrthi-sūrthi-,
3 ay-āniḥ-ātmanō mahārajasya pṛthivī-tal-aika-vīrasya āri-Viravarmmaṇap prapau
4 trasy-ātyuḥchitaś. sakti-siddhi-sampannasya prastāp-ōpanata-rāja-śaṇḍalasya Bhaga-

Second Plate: First Side.

5 vad-bhakti-sad-bhūva-sambhāvita-sarvva-kalyaṇasya-śaṇkā-gō-hiraṇya-bhūmy-ādi-pradānaiḥ]
6 [pravṛttita-dharmma-saṃchayasya] prajā-pālana-dakshasya Lōkapālān-śaṇchamasaya[10]
    mahā-

---

1 The reading Puṭṭukākā given in Nellore Inscriptions, p. 1421d, must be given up.
2 Sewell, List of Antiquities, Vol. I. p. 188.
5 Nellore Inscriptions: — See Nellore 19, 31, 61, 71, 72 and 121. The villages mentioned in connection with this nāḍu would all point to the Kōvdr taluk of the Nellore District in which the present plates were discovered.
6 The southern portion of the Kandukūr taluk also would go into this rāṣṭra.
7 From the original plates and ink-impressions prepared in my office.
8 Read śal-ārjīt-ārjīta- as in other plates.
9 The Uruvupalli and Pithara grants read māryya-dāsya.
10 The Uruvupalli grant has āṣaḥdāsya.
11 The Pithara grant reads prapauṭr̠ō-bhāyuchhiṭa.-
12 Read pravṛṭṭiḍhā as in the Uruvupalli and Pithara grants.
13 Read Lōkapālān-śaṇchamasya after this as in the above-mentioned grants.
tmano mahārājav sa Śrī-Śaṅkara[r*]immanah paurasya déva-dvija-guru-vydhnopaseśvin9 vi
vydhā-vinayasya-aneka-sahgrāma-sahas-śavamaradd-śopalabdhī-vijaya-yaśah-prakāśasya

Second Plate: Second Side.

9 śirupam-ātmano Yuvarājarājasya Śrī-Viśnugopasya putraḥ Kali-yuga-dōṣh-ā
vasannā-dharam-ūdāharaṇe nitya-sannaddhaṁ śripañjī-śaṅkramano rāja[r*]jahi-guña-su
rrva-sandhā-śighiṣura-śighiṣura-śighiṣura-Bhagavat-pādānuddhyāt Śrī-nilayō yathāvad-

Third Plate: First Side.

bhaktah paramabhaṅga-vātī Bhrādvājāḥ svā-vikrama-ākrānta-g[daya]Śrī-nilayō yathāvad-
hūrī-ś.

13 nēk-śavamādā-hyājinām-Pallavānām-mahārājāḥ Śrī-Sṛṅhavarmnā Muṇḍa-ṛaṣṭrē
Vijāvati-

14 grāmē taśya-aiva grāmasya kahītra-cē saṁsvādhyaśkāhāṁ-cē tat-saṅhārīnaḥ-cē
ājñāṇapayati 9 a-

15 va[r]a grāmē sa-grākas-sarvā-parihṛ-ṅpētō dēva-bhūga-hala-varjant-āśmad-āyur-bha-
16 la-vijaya-śhivṛddhaye śamādhānā-vijaya-rājye dāsāmē samvatsarē Śrāvanyāṁ
śukla-pa-

---

1 The Uruvapalli grant reads -āpachāyaśa and the Pikira grant has -āpachāyaśa. The Omgōḍu grant reads āpachāyaśa as in the present one.
2 The Pikira and Omgōḍu grants read aṣṭn-ātimanā. The Uruvapalli grant applies the epithets aṣṭn-ātiman and mākastas to Mahārāja Skandavarman.
3 The Uruvapalli and Pikira grants read dharmā-nitya-sannaddhāsya. The possessive form which has evidently been incorporated from the former into the latter of these grants has been left uncorrected into the nominative, though the appositional expressions putraḥ (l. 10), parākramo (l. 11), etc., are in the latter case: vide above, Vol. VIII, p. 162, text ll. 10 & 11.
4 Read -āyus-nrijīs: as in other grants. The other allied grants make this an attribute of the Pallava and not of this particular king.
5 The Uruvapalli and Pikira grants read -āvemādāhānām while the Omgōḍu grant has -ānēkā-krutāna Suhā-
kutānas (above, Vol. XV, pp. 254 f., text ll. 16 ff.).
6 The Pikira grant has dharma-mahārāja-aṭvā while Omgōḍu has vallabhānām Pallavānām dharmma-mahā-
rāja-aṭvā.
7 The Uruvapalli grant is addressed to the grāmāyakas at the first instance and then to the āyuktuṣa, saṅgātiyas (probably saṅgātyas), rājasūlaḥkās and saṅkharanātiaksos. The Pikira grant is addressed to the grāmāyakas, adhi-
krita-saṁśvādyakas, vallakhās and āśrama-vārāhina, almost as in the Māṅgalār grant.
8 Read grāman sa-grānakas.
9 Dr. Fleet's translation of the expression Viṣhnuvarma-śīhputi-kriṣṭa-Viṣhnuḥāra-deva-kulika-deva-bhōga, etc., in the Uruvapalli grant is inaccurate. The grant is not meant for the family of Viṣhnuḥāra-deva which was founded by Viṣhnuvarman but for the temple (dēvothuḥ) called Viṣhnuḥāra founded by the general of Viṣhnuvar-
man, as a dēva-bhōga. This would thus appear to be one of the early temples of Kandukīr founded in Pallava times. A still earlier temple of Pallava times is that of Bhagavān-Nārāyaṇa mentioned in the Prākrit copper-plate charter of Yuvarasārājas Vijaya-Buddhavarman's queen Chārudēvi dated in the reign of Vijaya-Kandavarman (above, Vol. VIII, p. 145). Dr. Fleet's reading dēva-bhōga in text l. 20 of the Māṅgalār grant (Ind. Ant., Vol. V, p. 156) is only a printer's mistake for deva-bhōga (side his translation, ibid., p. 157). But his reading vasād-bhōga (ibid., p. 156, text l. 23 and p. 157 fn.) is correctly vasād-bhōga. Dr. Fleet stated that the meaning of vasād-bhōga-
samudāyō was rather doubtful. It is possible that it corresponds to the kudintōga-dēvadāna of the Tamil ins-
criptions and perhaps means 'with the tenants' occupancy rights assured.'
Third Plate: Second Side.

17 kuhē pañcharnyārī Gautama-gōtīya Chhandogāya Vishṇuśarmmaṇaḥ dattam(ttaḥ)
[*] yad-asmin-grāmē

18 lōha-charnakeśara-prāśāsana-prāśāsana-rajjau-pratiheśa-āpan-Ajivikake-
raṇī Nāhakā-Mukhadharaka-kūpa-dārāsaka1-tantravāya-dyūta-vivāha-nāpita-dē-
20 y-ādhinā cha sarvva-parihāra-kāru-dēvīni cha yāny-anvāni ch-āśmad-bhāgyāni tāny-asmai

Fourth Plate: First Side.

21 brahmā-dēyikrzya dattāni Vaṭṭa-grāmēyakaḥ [asmad-ājñāṁ*] kuruvvanta-itarē parih[ra*]-
ntu parihārayantu
22 cha[*] yaś-cch-aīta-ad-asmach-chhāsanam-atikrāmēt-sa pāpaḥ ʾsāfran-danām-arhati [[*] Api ch-ā-
23 tr-a[r]shāḥ slōkā bhavanti || O O ||—3 Bhūmi-dānāt-paran-dānam-īha lōkē na vidyatē [[*]
yah praya-
24 cchhati bhūmi[jr*] hi sarvva-kāmān-dadāti saḥ [[*] ʾBrahma-svān [hi*] vishaṁ ghōran-na vishaṁ vishaṁ-uccayatē [[*] vishaṁ-ekākinaḥ

Fourth Plate: Second Side.

25 hanti ʾprahma-svānt putra-ʾbautrikān || Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yō harēta vasundhā-
rānāḥ [[*] gavāṁ śata-
26 sahasrasya hantuḥ [pi]bhati kiliśham [[*] ʾYathā nibhānta-uptaṁ kīrṇāni cha mahi-
27 talē [[*] ēvaṁ kāmā virōhantī bhūmi-dāna-samarjītāḥ[*] || Bahubhir-vvasudhā dattā ba-
28 hubiṣ-eh-anupālītā [[*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmis-tasya tasya tadb phalam ||

Fifth Plate.

29 ʾAsaṁkhīyāni varṣāṇi svargge mōdantī bhūmidāḥ [[*] ʾāksēptā ch-ānumanta cha tāny-eva
30 naraṇā vasēt || Prabhōh ʾsanukh-ājñāptā 12 rahasyādhikritēn-āchyutēna likhitān śasanami]
31 Svastata[ti] || [12] —

1 [See above, p. 298, n. 5.—Ed.]
2 This reading is found in the Pīkara and other grants of the king. The Maydavālū Prākrit plates read sāri-
rūta śasanam kareṣāmo (above, Vol. VI, p. 87, text, I, 24).
3 The Uruvupalli and other grants quote this verse in a different form. The Pīkara grant which cites the
verse reads Bhūmidāna-saman-dānam*.
4 This verse is not quoted in the other grants of the king.
5 Read brahma*.
6 Read -psutrikām.
7 Read vasundhāram.
8 The letter pi looks like bi.
9 This verse does not occur in the other grants of the king.
10 This verse is not quoted in the other grants of the king.
11 Read aśv-mukh*.
12 Invariably all the earlier grants adopt the form ājñāpt while the later ones, like those of the Eastern Chā-
lukyas, have ājñāpti. The former though obsolete seems to be more suitable to the context in the technical sense of
the agency that obtains the command (ājña-āpti) while ājñāpti would strictly refer to the 'agency that
commands'.
13 There is a symbol between these two sets of dasas.
No. 44.—FIRST AND THIRD SLABS OF KUMBHALGARH INSCRIPTION: V. S. 1517.

By Samskritī Pt. Akshaya Keerty Vyās, M.A., Udaipur.

The inscription under description was briefly noticed for the first time by Rai Bahadur Gaurishankar Ojhā in the *Annual Report, Rajputana Museum, Ajmer*, for the year 1925-26. It seems to have originally been engraved on five big slabs of stone of which the fifth or the last slab has not yet been discovered. Of the second slab, only a very small piece has been found containing the words *Deviya-pāṭtiṣā* on the top to ensure its being a part of that slab. Of the remaining three slabs, the fourth one (which is the best preserved of whatever has so far been found of this inscription) has already been published1 by R. R. Halder of the Rajputana Museum, Ajmer. I now take up here, at the instance of Dr. N. P. Chakravarti, Government Epigraphist for India, the first and the third slabs for edition. Both these slabs were discovered only in fragments and are, therefore, in a very damaged condition. All that has till now been discovered is deposited for preservation in the Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur.

The inscription belongs to a temple built by Mahārājā Kumbhakarṇa on the fort of Kumbhalgarh, originally called the Kumbhavāmin temple but now known as that of Māmāđeṇa. The first slab is 3‘ 10" broad by 3‘ 7" high with a margin of about 2‘ on all sides, and contains sixty-eight verses (1-68) with short sentences in prose in fifty lines of writing; and the third slab is 3‘ 1" by 3‘ 6" with a margin of about 1‘ 1" on all sides containing fifty-nine verses (121-179) with some small prose sentences in forty-nine written lines. Unfortunately the slabs are very much damaged and some of the important portions of their contents have altogether been destroyed.

The characters are Nāgari and the medial vowels ē, ai, ō, and au which are joined to the consonants are represented by both śrī- and prishthā-mātrās. The letters are nicely cut and are on the average about two-fifths of an inch.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit and the composition is, on the whole, free from errors. In the first slab, however, we find sandhi not observed in śrī Ekāḷīṇga-prabhū (l. 7) and pralaya-krit-pū (l. 41); and in the third slab in *abhūḥ-śrī-Joīra* (l. 27). In yad-akārī Mākala-aripā (l. 29-30, slab I) the error of syntax is obvious. Besides, there are some other minor mistakes chiefly pertaining to engraving which are noticed in dealing with the text.

Regarding orthography we find that ē and ō are usually distinguished, the exceptions being Vāghāḷīṇa-varṇāṇam (l. 28 and 31, slab I) and *Amṛtāprāsaṇā-*(l. 19 and 20, slab III). The dental sibilant is used for the palatal one in samśpriṣṇīty-api (l. 20) and sad-dhāriya-saurya- (l. 39) of the first and the third slabs respectively. The sound of *sh* is twice represented in the first slab by the sign for *kh*, e.g., in *sarvanṣākhāh (l. 47) and kalukh-ākṣā-y(āś) (l. 50). This seems to be based on the analogy of the representation of the sound of *kh* by the sign for *sh* in many of the inscriptions of this period in Rājputāna. The following other features are also to be noticed the examples for which are here drawn from the first slab only. Anumāṇa is throughout used for nasals. *N* is almost invariably reduplicated after a superscript ē by drawing a horizontal stroke across the body of the letter; other consonants are very often doubled, e.g., *śvarg-a-Prayāga*- (l. 12), *mukti-rjanai*- (l. 13), ṣ-rvairī-udānava- (l. 16), etc., as against muni-varma-r gītā (l. 35), garva-sarvanṣākhāḥ(ā)yāḥ (l. 47), etc. Jihvāmāliya and upadāṇiye are sometimes used and represented by a sign which here resembles the sign for *sh* as in *nritamāya-khalu.*

---

(l. 2), Takshaka-Kali-yuga (l. 6), punyavaiya-parivritam (l. 16), etc. The sign for avagraha is used thrice, only in slab I. in sariot=gy[ih] (l. 14), raja=ny[a (l. 18) and ya[=]vamanah (l. 28).

Before taking up the actual contents of the slabs under consideration, it may be mentioned that the present inscription, the Tower of Victory inscription and the Ekaliṅga-māhātmya have a good number of verses in common. We know for certain that all these three records were composed during the reign of Mahāraja Kumbhakarna and are, therefore, contemporary records. Now the former two, viz., the Tower of Victory inscription and the present record, besides belonging to two different localities far off from each other, have got the same date in all particulars which is Monday, the fifth of the dark fortnight of Mārgaśirsha in Svavat 1517 (=A.D. 1460, Monday the 3rd November). It, therefore, seems improbable that anything from the one may have been borrowed in the other, particularly when we consider the amount of difference found in the plan of writing followed in both of them. The text common in both these records, therefore, seems to have a different source altogether in the Ekaliṅga-māhātmya, the third contemporary record, which seems to have already been compiled borrowing material particularly in its Princes' chapter, from many old inscriptions, viz., the Mahāsati gate inscription¹ at Chitor of the time of Rāval Samarasinhha dated in V. S. 1331 (=A.D. 1274), the Samādhivara temple inscription² of prince Mokala of V. S. 1485 (=A.D. 1428) and others. That the Ekaliṅga-māhātmya was composed prior to the present record as well as the Tower of Victory inscription, and has an air of originality around it is also evidenced by the fact that the division of the Guhāl family in two branches, viz., the Rāval and the Rāṣ, in the reign of Rāval Rasasinhha or Karpasinhha, is first of all found mentioned only in this work where all other inscriptions, contemporary or otherwise, are silent. Although we do not know much about the Tower of Victory inscription at present, for, all other slabs containing it excepting the two, viz., the first³ and the last but one⁴ (which also are in a very mutilated condition) are lost; but so far as the present record is concerned, much of what we find in connection with the genealogy of this dynasty in its three slabs till now discovered, is almost a reproduction of the Rāja-varṇana of the Ekaliṅga-māhātmya. Thus, much of the destroyed portion of the slabs under consideration is restorable from the aforesaid work as well as from records prior and posterior to it, as will be done, wherever possible, in dealing with the text.

Taking up the contents of the first slab we find that it mainly describes in poetical manner some important geographical places of Mewar including lakes, hills, sacred spots, people, etc. It opens with the propitiation of Gaṇeśa, Sarasvati and Ekaliṅga in three short prose sentences. Then begins the Aśṭha Prakaraṇa covering verses 1-14, benedictory and invocatory in nature, in praise of many a deity such as [Lambodara], Gajamukha, Vindhyavāsinī, Ekaliṅga, Pīnākī, Ina and others. The deity of the first verse is, however, difficult to determine due to the initial portion of the verse being destroyed.

Then begin various descriptions the first of which is the description of Trikūṭā. With regard to the method of composition followed, it may be remarked here that the whole of the present inscription is distributed in various varṇanas, the commencement and the termination of each of which is indicated by atha and iti respectively. This Trikūṭa-varṇana covers verses 15-17. Trikūṭa is a range of hills naturally formed into a triangle within which is situated the temple and the town of Ekliṅgaṭī.

¹ Bhāmagar Skt. and Pr. Inscriptions, pp. 74-78.
³ Cunningham, A. S. R., Vol. XXIII, plate XX.
⁴ Ibid., plate XXI.
Vv. 18-19 contain the description of a rivulet called Kuṭilā in inscriptions which rises in the Trikūta hill nearby and flows only in the rainy season. Its description as given here is simply hyperbolic.

In vv. 26-22 we have the description of the goddess Vindhyavāsini whose shrine is situated on the slope of the hill to the north outside the rampart round Ekaliṅgaji’s temple.

In vv. 23-24 the poet describes the god Ekaliṅga. The temple of Ekaliṅgaji is, in popular belief, regarded to have originally been built by Hāpā Rāval, which, having been damaged in course of a few centuries by the Muslim invaders, was repaired by Mahārāṇā Mōkala who also furnished it with a rampart to ensure its protection. Mahārāṇā Kumbhakarpā, the son of Mōkala, is also stated in vv. 239-404 in the fourth slab of this very epigraph, to have done something towards reparation to this ancient shrine. The modern structure of the temple, however, is stated to be the work of Mahārāṇā Rai Mal who laid fresh foundation and erected the new structure.

Vv. 25-28 give the description of a beautiful tank situated to the east, near Ekaliṅgaji’s temple. It is popularly known as Indra-sāgara, but it is here called Indratīrtha-Bhōjasara. The tank is said to have been in existence since the time of Indra who is stated in v. 8 to have meditated on the feet of Ekaliṅga in Kṛita-yuga; but it was given its present shape by forming the dam, etc., by Bhōjabhāpa, one of the early predecessors of the Guhila family, and hence called after his own name.

Then come the descriptions of Kāmadhēṇu (vv. 29-30) and Takshaka (vv. 31-33) who are stated in v. 8 to have attended upon Ekaliṅga in Trēṅga and Deāpara ages respectively. The city of Nāga, i.e., Nāgđā, the ancient capital of Mewār, is here stated to have originally been founded by this lord of the serpents.

Vv. 34-35 describe Dhārēśvara whose temple is situated a few paces off the Ekaliṅgaji temple on the base of the western range of the neighbouring hill in front. This small temple with a reservoir attached to it seems from v. 167 of the third slab of this inscription to have been built by Rāval Samarasimha as a deed of charity.

Next comes the description of Vaidyanātha in vv. 36-37, whose temple must have existed at Ekaliṅgaji at the time. No such monument is now popularly known to exist there.

In vv. 38-40 is described another beautiful tank situated to the south of the town of Ekaliṅgaji, touching the site of the ancient town of Nāgđā, popularly known as Bāghelā Talāv but here simply called Vā/Bā/Bāghālāva. This tank was excavated by prince Mōkala in memory of his brother Rāgasimha.

From here the poet takes us to the fort of Chitor and describes in vv. 41-50 the temple of Sarnā-bhīṣvara which is situated a little way to the south-west of Kumbhā’s great Tower of Victory. This temple was originally built by Bhōjrāṇa, the Paramāra prince of Mālwā, in the eleventh century when Chitor had already become a Paramāra possession in the reign of his uncle Muṇja (Vākpatirāja). It was also called Tribhuvanānāraṇa temple after his title Tribhuvanānāraṇa, and Bhājjasvāmidēva-jagati. The temple having been ruined in course of time was repaired by prince Mōkala in V. S. 1485 (= A.D. 1428) on account of which it is now generally called Mōkala’s temple. The present inscription, however, assigns the renovation of the temple to prince Kumbhā (v. 49), but this fact is not corroborated by any other record. The poet here evidently appears to have confused this monument with the temple of Kumbhasvāmin on the fort which really was built by Kumbhā. Rai Bahadur Ojhā regards this temple as the second

1 Above, Vol. XXI, p. 236.
ancient monument on the fort, the first being that of Kālikā of the seventh or the eighth century, originally dedicated to Śūrya or the Sun god. But in fact, the temple under description is the third ancient monument on the fort, the second being the temple of Kukkutēśvara as will be seen from the next paragraph.

Then we come to the description of Mahā-Lakṣmī in vv. 51-54. The temple of this goddess is now generally known as that of Annapūrṇā, but what is worshipped here is the same original image of Lakṣmī with a lotus flower in her hand and an elephant on each side of her face. This temple was originally built by Mahārāṇā Hammiṇa (A.D. 1326-1364). These verses also contain the description of Kukkutēśvara (Śiva) and Gadādhara (Vishṇu) whose temples are also situated near the Mahā-Lakṣmī temple. The temple of Gadādhara is now generally called as that of Chārabhujā (Chaturbhujā). The three big reservoirs of water, viz., Mātāji kā kuṇḍa, the Kukkeśvara-kuṇḍa and a third one, all in the vicinity of these three temples, are also briefly mentioned here. It may be pointed out that the original temple of Kukkutēśvara and the adjoining reservoir of the same name date as far back as V. S. 811 (=A.D. 755), an inscription of which date recording the erection and the excavation of the temple and the reservoir respectively was found there by Col. Tod. Later on, the reservoir being damaged was repaired by Mahārāṇā Kumbhā.

In vv. 55-57 we find the description of Kumbhasvāmī now popularly known as Kumbhāyāmājī, whose temple was erected on the fort of Chitor by Mahārāṇā Kumbhā in V. S. 1505 (=A.D. 1448) and styled after his own name. The temple was originally dedicated to Varāhā or the Boar incarnation of Vishṇu as mentioned here (v. 56), but nowadays Vishṇu in his ordinary form is here worshipped. The temple Kumbhasvāmī to which belongs the present inscription, is not to be confused with the monument under description, for, the former was erected not at Chitor but at Kumbhalgarh and was later in date. Kumbhā evidently erected two temples dedicated to the same god on both the prominent forts of Mewār.

Vv. 58-68 contain the description of the country of Mēḍapāṭa (Mewār), mentioning in general terms its cities, rivers, hills, lakes, gardens, people, etc.

Lastly is mentioned in prose the date of the inscription which is Monday, the fifth day of the dark half of Mārgāraśha in Sarvott year 1517 and Śaka year 1382, corresponding to A.D. 1460, Monday the third November, taking the month to be Pūrṇimānta. At the end of the first slab we are asked to consult the second slab for further description.

Of the second slab, we are in possession of a very small fragment as already stated, which is of no avail for our present purpose. It can, however, be concluded that it must have contained the description of some other important places of Mewār, for we find the central portions of the initial four lines contained in that fragment to be identical with the initial portion of an independent description of Chitrikūṭa extending over a good number of verses, found in another unpublished inscription from Kumbhalgarh whose first slab is preserved in the Victoria Hall Museum which seems to contain in an abridged form all that is found in the first and the second slabs of the present inscription with the same date. The second slab contained fifty-two verses (69-120).

As to the contents of the third slab we find that it opens with the description of Mahārāṇa sīr-Bāpā which extends over six verses (121-126) on this slab. Vv. 121-122 mention Hārvatārāśī, but much of their text is now lost to us. In v. 122 mention has been made of a person whose surname (apara-ṇāmadhēga) reads in the mutilated text as [śrī] . . . [ya]ku[bja] who appears to be the father of Harītarāśī. What little is, at present, preserved to us of this verse

clearly calls Haritarasi a devendra or the best of devas. We cannot, however, fully believe in it for the date of the present record, as compared to that of the sage under description, is much later; but we can at least believe that at the time of the composition of the record, he was regarded as of Brahmin origin. Rai Bahadur Ojha’s contention that he was an ascetic of the Natha order does not necessarily contradict the present description, for he, born as a devendra or the best of devas, i.e., a Brahmin, might later on have accepted that order.

From v. 123 properly begins the description of Bapah who is there said to be a vipra meditating on the feet of Haritarasi who bestowed upon him the kingdom of Mewar (vv. 124-25), and to have migrated to Mewar from Anandapura. Verse 123 of this slab is also found in Raval Samarsinha’s inscription at Chitor of V. S. 1331 (= A.D. 1274) located in the western wall of the northern gate of the Mahasati enclosure. In the Princely chapter of the Ekalinga-mahatmya we have another verse of the same import composed in a different metre, originally found in the Atapura inscription of Saktikumara of V. S. 1034 (= A.D. 977). The only difference between the two verses is that the former mentions Bapah and the latter Guhadatta in precisely the same terms. Now, in the former record of V. S. 1331, Bapah is mentioned as the Purana-purusha or the progenitor of the family and Guhadatta or Guhila as his son (the same order being followed in almost all other records later to it including the one under consideration); while the latter record of V. S. 1034, which is earlier in date, speaks of Guhadatta as the founder of the family and Bapah as one of his descendants. This shows that already in the thirteenth century people had forgotten what their predecessors knew a few centuries ago about the genealogy of the ruling family. One point, however, viz., these rulers being described as vipra or mahi-deva, is common to both earlier and later records. Guhadatta’s description as mahi-deva in the Atapura inscription referred to above led Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, while editing the record, to conclude that Guhadatta was a Naga Brahmin of Vadnagar in Gujarat and that the Odaipur dynasty had a Brahmanic origin. But instances in inscriptions where the scions of this dynasty are described as Kshattra-kshetra (v. 6 of the same Atapura inscription), Kshatriya-vahana-mahabana-maati (v. 5 of the Spinghi-rishi inscription), etc., are in no way wanting as Rai Bahadur Ojha rightly points out. The use of such terms as vipra or mahi-deva in their connection seems to have some bearing on their habits which they might have acquired through such association as mentioned in certain bardic chronicles, and not on their blood. There are, again, epigraphs of various dynasties in which the ruling princes are described as born in Brahma-Kshatriya-kula which simply hints at their being possessed of both divine and martial virtues, by habit and blood respectively. So also an inscription of the tenth century from Chhatasah in the Jaipur state describes prince Bhartripattra of this very Guhila dynasty as Brahma-Kshatranvita, hinting thereby at the possession of both the virtues mentioned above.

Next is given the account of Raula sri-Guha]datta (vv. 127-33). He is described as the son of Bapah and it was after him that the dynasty came to bear the title Gubala. He, as has already been noticed, was really the founder of the dynasty and thus an early predecessor of Bapah. Nothing remarkable of him is mentioned here except that he had a son Latwiniḍa by name who

---

3 Above, Vol. XXIII, pp. 234 ff.
4 Mahāpota Naiṣṣaṭi’s Kshatika, p. 10.
6 Above, Vol. XII, p. 13-17.
7 Whether Latwiniḍa is a proper name or simply an epithet is also doubtful, yet here it seems to have the plausibility of being the former.
was called as such due to passing his days in enjoyment with ladies of the Lāṭa country. No prince of this name has been found mentioned in any of the inscriptions of the dynasty so far discovered. In A.D. 1869 General Cunningham had found some 2,000 silver coins at Agra\(^1\) bearing the legend Sri Guhila which he attributed to Guhadatta.

Then we have the description of Rūla śri-Sh(Kh)ummaṇa (vv. 134-37). He is said to have weighed himself against gold in company of his wife and children, and given away the precious metal in charity. In vv. 136-37 it is mentioned his far and wide conquest (dīya-jaya) of various countries, viz., Āṭa, Bṛ(Va)śa, Kaliṅga, Trilīṅga (Telugu country), Surāśṭra, Chōḍa, Dravīḍa and Gauḍa. This description is not free from exaggeration, but the martial spirit with which the name of Khummaṇa is associated in Mewār even to this day may point to some truth therein.

It may be mentioned here that the description of the foregoing three princes, viz., Bāpā, Guhadatta and Khummaṇa as found in this record contains no chronological truth.

We now come to the most important and also the original portion of the whole inscription called Rāja-varṇaṇa. At the very outset it is professed that this portion dealing with the genealogy of the ancient rulers of the family, has been prepared after studying many old prāṣṭasis (v. 138). The first thing that draws our attention here is the title Rāja-varṇaṇa which seems to have been borrowed from the Ekaśiṭṭha-māhātmya where a whole chapter extending over 204 verses is called Rāja-varṇaṇa. Although much of this Princes’ chapter of the Eka. māt. is contained in the present record as already mentioned above, this particular portion, at least that preceding the description of Rāval Samaranuṣha, seems to be genuine and prepared with solemn effort. Here we have another proof of the priority of the Eka. māt., for, if it had been posterior to the present record as Rai Bahadur Ojhā thinks\(^2\), that portion of the Rāja-varṇaṇa under consideration which is original, dealing with the ancient rulers of the Guhila family whose chronology was even then regarded doubtful, would have been totally incorporated in the māhātmya being a result of very laborious researches as professed in v. 138 of the present record. On the other hand, it may be assumed that as the genealogy of the early rulers as given in the Eka. māt. was not found to be trustworthy an attempt was made in the record under discussion to make it as authentic as possible.

Now we may take up the contents of this portion. In the family of Guhila was born a prince Bhojā by name. From him were born Mahindrā, Nāga, Bappa and Aparājīta (v. 139).

It may be noted here that the author has already mentioned Bāpā as the very founder of the family but now he takes him as the son of Nāga. Similarly he has described before Guhila or Guhadatta as the son of Bāpā, but here he evidently believes him to be the real progenitor of the family which he calls the Guhila-varṇaṇa. This clearly shows the amount of labour bestowed on the present portion. From the Āṭapura inscription of V. S. 1034 (=A.D. 977) which gives a correct genealogy of the family from Guhila to Saktikumāra, we learn that the son of Nāga or Nāgāditya was Śīla, and from the Kuṇḍāvarśa temple inscription\(^3\) of V. S. 718 (=A.D. 661) we find that the father of Aparājita was Śīla, an inscription of whose reign dated in V. S. 703\(^4\) (=A.D. 646) has been found and is now preserved in the Rajputana Museum, Ajmer. Thus, we find that the term Bāpā or Bappa which is now universally believed to be not a proper name but simply a title, is either here accepted by the author as the title of Śīla, or he may have used it as an independent proper name, but in either case he has been clearly mistaken.

\(^{1}\) A. S. E., Vol. IV, p. 95.
\(^{3}\) Above, Vol. IV, pp. 29-32.
\(^{4}\) Above, Vol. XX, p. 99.
Then came Mahindrä (II) and from him was born Kālabhōjā. After him came in succession Sh(Kh)ummāṇa, Māttatā, Bhattipatī and Allatā (v. 140).

The chronology as mentioned in this verse omits between the last two princes, the names of some five princes, viz., Suvahā, Khummmāṇa (II), Mahāyaka, Khummmāṇa (III) and Bhattipatī (II) mentioned in the inscription of V. S. 1034. This clearly shows that the author did not possess a copy of that inscription at the time of writing this portion. He seems to have studied only some later records such as the Chitor inscription of V. S. 1331, the Rānapura inscription of V. S. 1496, etc., which also he seems not to have studied carefully, for, the names of three princes out of five omitted here are to be found in both these records. It may also be mentioned here that Bāpā as a title is regarded by different scholars as belonging to the first three princes mentioned in this verse. Thus, Kavirāja Shyāmalāsā takes the first prince of the verse, viz., Mahindrā (II)¹, Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, the third prince Khummmāṇa² and Rai Bahadur Ojhā, the second prince Kālabhōjā³, to be Bāpā. Col. Tod, however, with the scanty material he had at his disposal, thought long ago that Bāpā was the title of Śīla⁴.

Then came Naravāhāna and then Sālivāhāna. After him was born Śaktikumāra and from him Aniv(b)pāprasāda. Ambāprasāda had three brothers Nṛivarmā, Anantavarmā and Yaśovarmā by name (vv. 141-42).

What is worthy of note here is the name Anantavarmā which is not found in any other record so far discovered. Likewise, the name of Śuṣīvarmā found in some of the other records is omitted here. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, therefore, is inclined to regard the former as identical with the latter. Ambāprasāda is named Āmpraśāda in the Chitor inscription of V. S. 1331. Similarly Nṛivarmā and Yaśovarmā are called Naravarmā and Kṛttivarmā respectively⁵ in other inscriptions. These three brothers of Ambāprasāda mention above, also seem to have ascended the throne successively as they are mentioned in order of succession in a few other inscriptions.

Then Yōgarāja became the ruler of Mewār whose line did not obtain royalty although he himself fully enjoyed it (v. 143). This important fact of the deprivation of throne from the progeny of Yōgarāja is known from this inscription only and is mentioned nowhere else. Rai Bahadur Ojhā gives the reading of the last quarter of this verse as tach-chhā [nō devān] gatā?, with his own omissions and additions and interprets that the line of this prince came to an end during his own lifetime and the throne thus passed on to Vairatā. He has omitted one syllable in the first word of this quarter which is distinctly visible on the slab as shā(khā). The intention of the Rai Bahadur in omitting the syllable seems to be to regard the first word as masculine plural ending in "nō, presuming that the word might thus mean 'off-shoots of his family', for which he has also inserted visarpa after gatā at the end to make it plural. But the text as visible on the slab, although partially damaged, clearly seems to be tach-chhāś(ḥ)ā nō[ḥhīr(ḥhṛā)yaṁ] gatā (ll. 20-21), which clearly shows that the line of this prince was cut off from the throne evidently due to some internal family feud and the lot finally fell on Vairatā, one of the progeny of Allatā. The word api in the beginning of this verse also emphasises this conclusion, otherwise there is no justification for its use here.

¹ Vīra-cināda, part I, p. 250.
² Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXIX, p. 188.
⁵ See his List of Inscriptions of Northern India, p. 389, n. 1.
⁷ Ibid., p. 443, n. 2.
Thus Vairāṭa ascended the throne after Yōgarāja and was succeeded by Harṣapāla after whom came Vairisimha (v. 144). This prince erected a rampart round Āghāṭa-pattana (v. 145), the modern town of Ahāj near the city of Udaipur, also mentioned in inscriptions as Aghāṭapura or Āṭapura. He had twenty-two meritorious sons of whom one, a narëndra, was the most virtuous (v. 146). Unfortunately we do not find the name of this virtuous narëndra mentioned here who must evidently have succeeded his father Vairisimha. In the Bhērā-gōṭ inscription\(^1\) of the Chōḍi year 907 (=V. S. 1212 and A.D. 1155) and the mount Ābu inscription\(^2\) of V. S. 1342 (=A.D. 1285), the son of Vairisimha and grandson of Harṣapāla is mentioned as Vijayasimha, a copper-plate grant and a stone inscription of whose reign dated in V. S. 1164 and V. S. 1173 respectively have been found\(^3\). Thus it can easily be understood that the prince who is anonymously mentioned here in v. 146 is none else than Vijayasimha, and the author, due to his apparent ignorance, has not mentioned this name. In the Rāṇapura inscription\(^4\) of V. S. 1496, however, the name of Vairisimha's successor is given as Virasimha; and Rai Bahadur Ojhā is inclined to accept him and Vairisimha of v. 147 of the present inscription whom he regards as the son of Vairisimha, as being identical with Vijayasimha of the Bhērā-gōṭ inscription\(^5\). He does not seem to have given due consideration to v. 146 of this slab which mentions Vijayasimha in clear terms as narëndra though omitting his name, as already shown above. The present inscription appears to speak of Vairisimha not as the son of Vairisimha, but as his grandson unless tanmat in v. 147 is meant to refer to Vairisimha which from its position and the construction seems improbable. This fact is overlooked also by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar who professes to have taken the names of princes of this dynasty after Śālavāhaṇa from this record\(^6\). It thus becomes almost settled from this epigraph that Vijayasimha's son was Vairisimha. This is corroborated by a small inscription which I had found engraved on the pedestal of the Harṣapāla image at Padaḍāḍa which mentions Virasimha as the son of Vairisimha. The date of that inscription, however, presents some difficulty. I, therefore, leave this point here for further investigation. For the time being, this portion of the chronology has to be regarded as uncertain.

Thus, we find that Vijayasimha was probably succeeded by Vairasimha and from him was born Arasimha. His throne was occupied by Chōḍa (v. 147). Chōḍa had an elder brother named Vikramakēṣari whose son was Ānasimha (v. 148).

Chōḍa is also called Chōḍasimha in the Rāṇapura inscription and nothing more is known of him and his predecessor from any other epigraph. Vikramakēṣari is here mentioned as the elder brother of Chōḍa, but in the Ābu inscription of V. S. 1342 he is mentioned as the son\(^7\) of Chōḍa which seems to be more probable. Nothing is mentioned here about Ānasimha. The Ēkalinga-māhātmya, however, attributes to his reign the splitting up of the ruling family into two divisions, viz., the Rācal (senior) and the Rāṇa (junior), ruling over Chitor and Sesodā respectively. Although our author has sometimes closely followed the Ēk. mht., he has, however, not borrowed the portion dealing with this division, evidently because his object here was to prepare a chronological list of the princes of the main branch who really governed Mewār as a whole. He, as a matter of fact, is quite cautious in distinguishing the princes of the one branch from those of the other (as

---

\(^6\) List of Inscriptions of Northern India, p. 388, n. 7 and p. 389.
\(^7\) Bhār. Inscre., p. 86.
will be seen later on), which knowledge he appears to have derived from a close study of the Ekālīga-māhātmya.

Ranasingha was succeeded by Kshēmasiringha, the younger brother of Mahānāsiringha who evidently predeceased his father. Then Sāmantasiringha became the ruler of Mewār (v. 149). Nothing beyond the names of these princes is known from the present epigraph.

Sāmantasiringha was succeeded by his brother Kumārasiringha who turned out of Mewār one Kītū who had somehow taken hold of the country (v. 150). He also made Aghāṭapura his own by acquiring the favour of the ruler of Gujarāt.

Kītū whom Kumārasiringha had driven out of Mewār was the third son of Ālhanādeva, the Chaubān ruler of Nāḍōl in Mārwār. He was brave and ambitious and had acquired the dominion of Jālōr from the Paramāras through his own might, and had become an independent prince. He was the founder of the Sonagār branch of the Chaubān race. In the inscriptions and the copperplates of the Chaubāns, his name is mentioned as Kiritipāla but he was better known as Kītū in Rājasthān. He seems to have attacked Mewār and taken hold of it in the reign of Sāmantasiringha, the predecessor of Kumārasiringha, when the former had become weaker owing to being at regular war with the rulers of Gujarāt in order to regain his dominions gone in their possession. When Kumārasiringha succeeded his elder brother Sāmantasiringha, he practically seems to have nothing to govern except the fort of Chitor which the latter seems to have regained from the ruler of Gujarāt through hard struggle. One of the two 'princeships' (ntripate, v. 151) which Kumārasiringha is here stated to have gained was that acquired by expelling Kītū out of Mewār; the other was gained by recovering the ancient capital of Aghāṭapura which still remained in the possession of the rulers of Gujarāt.

Aghāṭapura was lost to Mewār as early as the first half of the eleventh century of the Vikrama era, having been attacked by Vākpatirāja (Muṅja), the Paramāra ruler of Mālwa, in the reign of Saktikumāra, as known from v. 10 of the Hastikund inscription of V.S. 1053 (=A.D. 997). Since then it became a Paramāra dominion along with the famous fort of Chitor which also seems to have been annexed thereto by the same prince, where used to live the celebrated Paramāra prince Bhōja, the son of Sindhurāja and the nephew of Muṅja, who built there the great Tribhuvanamārāyaṇa temple (now popularly known as that of Sāmuddhēvara and Mōkara, so called after his biruda of Tribhuvanamārāyaṇa). This Paramāra dominion of Mewār subsequently passed in the hands of the Chaubānys of Gujarāt in the reign of Jayasimha Siddharāja, who, after a hard struggle extending over a period of twelve years defeated Naravarman and his son Yasōvarman, the Paramāra rulers of Mālwa and brought the Mālwa dominion, including Aghāṭapura and Chitor, under his own control. The rulers of Gujarāt enjoyed an uninterrupted authority over both these important localities of Mewār for a long time, when Sāmantasiringha of Mewār, the elder brother of Kumārasiringha attacked the ruler of Gujarāt who is supposed to be Ajaya-pāla, to regain his lost citadels. There is no explicit mention of this fight in any of the records so far discovered, but we find an indication of it in the Ābu inscription of V.S. 1287 (=A.D. 1230), where the ruler of Gujarāt is stated to have been assisted by Prahlādanādeva, the younger brother of Dhārāvarsha, the Paramāra ruler of Ābu. Through this fight Sāmantasiringha appears to have acquired the fort of Chitor.
from the Chaulukya Ajayapāla, but had been unable to take back Āghāṭapura, which task was ultimately carried out by his younger brother Kumārasimha as mentioned here. He was succeeded by Mahānāsimha (v. 151) who is mentioned in other inscriptions as Mathanasimha.

Mahānāsimha (Mathanasimha) was succeeded by Padmasimha, a prince of great valour whom people even now remember for his manifold merits (v. 152).

Next we come to the description of Rāula śrī-Jayasimha, also called Jaitrasimha. Though a fresh title is given to the portion dealing with this ruler it has to be regarded as a sub-division of the Rāja-varṇa which is still continued. This prince is stated to have governed the four territorial divisions, viz., Chitrakūta, Āghāṭa, Mādāpāta and Vāgāda; and no prince on the surface of the earth is said to have ever thought of humbling his pride (v. 154). He held his court at the capital of Nāgarakara, the modern Nāgā near Ekliṅgaji (v. 155).

Mādāpāta as mentioned here seems to have comprised the rest of Mewār excluding Chitor and Āghāṭapura, both of which are regarded as forming two different divisions. Vāgāda, which is described here as the fourth division, is the country to the south of Mewār, now forming two different states, viz., Čhugarpā and Bānswārā.

Rāula śrī-Tējāsimha (vv. 158-159) is spoken of next. Nothing beyond his name and a poetical description of himself is given here. It may be noted that the portion dealing with this ruler has got a new title and a colophon, and has thus been made an independent description although apparently under Rāja-varṇa. The poet has evidently not been able to maintain a strict uniformity in the classification of his varṇas.

The account of Rāula śrī-Samarasimha, the son of Tējāsimha, which comes next extends over seventeen verses (vv. 160-176). It is worthy of note that the portion covered by these seventeen verses is nothing but a reproduction of the corresponding portion of the Princes’ chapter of the Ekalāṅga-māhāmya, in the same order. It has already been stated by me that the latter had been compiled prior to the composition of the record under consideration, borrowing verses from many old inscriptions and arranging them sometimes without the least discrimination. This being so, the present description of our record (being nothing but a copy from the Ek. māh.) has naturally come to have certain verses (particularly v. 168), which, properly speaking, have no bearing on Samarasimha. Nothing of any historical importance is mentioned here of this prince. Simply his valour, munificence and such other virtues are poetically described. His erection of a small temple dedicated to Śiva called Dhaṅśvara at Ekliṅgaji, however, finds mention in v. 167. The remaining verses of the sub-section, borrowed as they are from other inscriptions through the Ek. māh., are primarily found in connection with the other princes of this line. In v. 176 which is the last dealing with Samarasimha, he is stated to have gone to heaven having appointed Ratnasimha, his son, for protecting the fort of Chitor.

The last ruler recorded on this slab is Mahārajā śrī-Lash(kh)amanasi whose account is continued on the fourth slab. The author here clearly distinguishes Lakhamasi by calling him Mahārajā from the foregoing princes who are styled Rāula, and seems to have critically studied the Ek. māh., particularly the portion dealing with the division of the family. He has here deliberately omitted the description of all the Rāņas found just after that of Rāval Samarasimha in the Ek. māh., and has taken into account only one of them, viz., Lakhamasi who, although not a crowned prince of Mewār just like others of his branch, was conspicuous by his presence with his seven sons, as a gallant defender of the fort when Chitor was sacked by Alā-ud-din Khaljī in A. D. 1303. In v. 177 he is stated to have bravely defended the fort as well as the honour of the family which had been cast in a critical situation when Ratnasimha, the ruling prince, had fled (gata, v. 177) from the field of battle in a cowardly manner (kāpurushāṁvinuktāṁ, v. 177).
This inscription does not speak of Ratnasimha as having bravely fought and died in the battlefield, as Rai Bahadur Ojha thinks. This battle is here stated to have continued for full one year (sāvatsarām, v. 179) before the Muhammadans could capture the fort, while the Muslim historians reduce this period to half its length, i.e., six months. I really could not understand why Rai Bahadur Ojha has omitted the word sāvatsarām in his citation of this verse, which is visible on the slab plainly enough.

Lastly, Sarvat 1547 is given as the date of the inscription. Other particulars of the date are not given on this slab as on others, probably for want of space.

Nothing can be said definitely with regard to the authorship of the inscription until the last (i.e., the fifth) slab is brought to light. Rai Bahadur Ojha is, however, inclined to regard the author of the Tower of Victory inscription, Mahēśa of Dāsāpura (Dāsōrā)-jñāti to be the author of this inscription also, on the ground of the common text found in both these records. But the occurrence of some common text in two records does not necessarily imply the identity of authorship, for some of the verses common in both these records appear to have been borrowed from other ancient epigraphs.

It hardly needs any mention that the present inscription belongs to the reign of Mahārāṇa Kumbhakarṇa of Mewār whose description has been taken up towards the end of the fourth slab and must have been continued on the fifth. Though the main object which the inscription aims at recording, cannot be definitely ascertained till the last slab is discovered, it stands to reason that it recorded the erection of the Kumbhāsvāmin temple at Kumbhalgarh.

TEXT.

First Slab.

पत्नपदिका १

1 ब्रह्म। भक्ति [२५] चावियमप्रसादात् हृदः स्वरस्वतीप्रसादात्। श्री[एक्क]लिग-प्रसादात्। भग [घ]

2 कै[च]लिङ्गनक्षत्राः [सह]पञ्चविधिः [देव]वांगनाई धरी ॥५॥ [लोकी] [र]

1 रा. इति., Fasc. I, p. 484. [Mr. Vyasa's interpretation seems far-fetched. Guti may mean 'having died'.—Ed.]
5 Transcribed from the original stone slabs.
6 A portion of the text now missing on these slabs has been restored from other records. We shall, for the sake of convenience, call them in the footnotes by the following abbreviations: the Chaunukya Kumārapalī inscription of V.S. 1207 at Chitor (above, Vol. II, pp. 422-24)—A; the first slab of the Chitor inscription of V.S. 1331 (Bhāī. Insacr., pp. 74-77 and Cunningham, A. S. R., Vol. XXIII, pl. XXXV)—B; the Samādhīvāra temple inscription of V.S. 1486 (above, Vol. II, pp. 410-21 and Bhaś. Insacr., pp. 96-100)—C; the Princes' chapter of the Ekādiṣa-Māhātmya of the time of Kumbhā (a fragmentary manuscript copy of which I have found in my father Samskriti Vyasa Vinau Ram Sāstrī's collection)—D; the first slab of the Tower of Victory inscription (Cunningham, A. S. R., Vol. XXIII, pl. XX)—E; and the later Ekādiṣa, of the time of prince Bāl Mal (a manuscript copy of which written in V.S. 1754 I have also found in my father's collection)—F.
7 Indicated by a symbol.
8 Metre: Sārādābālākṛṣṭi.


5 श्री देवी श्रीविध्वातिसहिती जयस्ति [4] द्वायदिनयुतिः (भ) [स] [र] रेत तुम कृष । कृष । 

6 वाङ्कि फलप्रदेशः श्रीमाति [7] नेकीलगङ्घः। रक्षेत । स पूर्णपाठानीकरितसंग्रामांकेषु भवणः


9 न: स्वाधित्य प्रशादतु दृश्यती ने नोभक्तं काल [क] काल: [10] विद्या जग्म 'तत:... नामनन्दी दिद्रो प्रशादतमस्मिन: हरावे [14] विद्या का कवर्षा भावः किषु नतु गहिन्त वर्षाक्षरः संविनिभिः किं वा धार्मिकः

---

4 This verse is no. 1 in E.
5 Metro: Vasantaśilpakā.
6 Metro: Prakaraṇī.
7 Text within these brackets is restored from E where the v. is no. 2. Here also the text is much mutilated.
8 Metro: Śikharī.
9 Metro: Giti.
10 Metro: Dādaśaka.
11 Metro: Arādha.
12 Text within these brackets is restored from v. 39, Ch. X of F.
13 Sandhi is not observed here.
14 Metro: Śūrdāsālivārīdītā.
15 Text within these brackets is restored from v. 44, Ch. X of F.
16 The viśaya seems to have been added later on and hence is very faint.
17 Metro: Anumānaḥ.
18 The vertical stroke of the au sign in auā is very faint and seems to be a later addition.
19 Metro: Malini.
10 वा भवित निगम पर किं च रूप तदाम । किं सात्वकर्मचारियों विशुद्धैं न नु[र]त् । पद[डे] यस्ये कश्चि यवक्ष्याः ना दात[छ्या]श्रीः। कर्म वा वदन सतिमता कुमारकान्य राज्यु ॥१२॥ द्वन्द्रो विनाश नो लोकोऽलोको धोती बुधभगी प्रो ॥ विनोदोऽन्तः मनोहारः

11 नो हीनोऽन्तः न नीरदः ॥१४॥ इवाच । प्रकारण च भब्य[चिश्]कृत्यवसान् । शिखरें युप्यमुखंगलपप्पलकुशलयं कालिकास्विनम: सायनः । सुदुर्गुणशुद्धरञ्जिनिः चिन्होऽविलिखितस्वकृत्योऽहाः ज्यैति ॥१४॥ ईदिरार्चितचारस्मिद्

12 रा ईमाससमस्तात तारापि। विश्वासशिविशिवकृतिः न सौभाग्यं किं किः मवपर्यं तस्मिन (मम) ॥१६॥ यव श्रवशशिविरौरः निरन्तरकौण्डकोरस्तुरिविभावरः भाष्यायामभञ्ज: । चिर्च तथा विलोक्यशिलम[ल] चैतन चिन्तुः

13 चले नानायामवताप । दुर्भवतरा सुभासीनेनारायणे ॥१७॥ द्वन्द्रो विचिन्तायन् । चाथ उल्लिखायन् । पातकसमस्तवनामस्मार्कान्तरवरिष्ठ्यायला कृतिः । सुरसरिदिव शिवनुपवत्ततारातितिसुपागता ज्यैति ॥१८॥ कवित्रोऽन्तः मोऽ

---

1 Better read satihis as qualifying āśvabhanah.
2 This verse, strictly speaking, should go to prince Kumbha's description, but being benedictory in nature it seems to have been included in this prakaraṇa. The solution to theiddle contained in this verse appears to be श्रीराम श्रीनाथ सुदर.
3 Metre: Srayādhara.
4 Read sābh. The intentional change of visarga to medial त at the end of both the half-lines of this verse appears to be for the sake of alliteration.
5 The meaning of this verse appears to be as follows:—

भ्रमीन दातृ दैवत्व दैवत्व विद्वत्व विद्वत्व प्रकाहु वा नीरदः। श्री भवानुसरः प्रेक्षा:। द्वन्द्रो बुधभगी प्रो ॥ विनोदोऽन्तः मनोहारः। स्मृतिकारकांक्येकला सन्नात:। प्रियक्ष:। न:। गरिमः।। भद्वी न:। दैवत्व बुधभगी प्रो ॥ विनोदोऽन्तः मनोहारः। स्मृतिकारकांक्येकला सन्नात:। प्रियक्ष:। न:। गरिमः।। भद्वी न:। दैवत्व बुधभगी प्रो ॥ विनोदोऽन्तः मनोहारः। स्मृतिकारकांक्येकला सन्नात:। प्रियक्ष:। न:। गरिमः।। भद्वी न:। दैवत्व बुधभगी प्रो ॥
6 Metre: Anushjukhā.
7 The syllables दातिही। which were at first omitted by mistake are later on engraved above the line in smaller letters.
8 The त over ब seems to have been engraved later on in a very narrow space.
9 Metre: Pranitikshara.
10 Metre: Ratikshatā.
11 The word 'chitra primarily means 'a diamond', but it is here used in the sense of 'white', which it may mean secondarily.
12 Metre: Śārdūlākṣirīdita.
13 Metre: Arya.
14 ना मकरमहीती मधुरगति पत्तीरूर नौरं मातिव[पीनौ बीतविदः]। चाकोः संमतेः
नारिन कुटि[लं सेवनिकते ततो जाता संखे विदिवसरिताः] इत्यः कुटि-
जाता १८। इति कुटिलावर्णिन्॥ बच्य विभवसावर्णिन्॥ संहिगितेऽः
मोः।

15 एतमोनिश्चारसं महः। गृहांजंकान्तिति विंम्भ|वासमुपास्याः। २०। दन्तोलकुकृत-
संतानात्तुतिः। दलितब्धकंतिः। सचिकृतभुवि चास्क्यानी बंधिका
अयत्तिति विंभवासिनी ||२१। धाब्योपरिधः|नुर्धरीयाः महाकुक्क्वाः।

16 सिबिबिश्वासितिहैदुम्पुष्पः। परिसहं सञ्चा|मन्नंगोर्वति। भा|कामयाबः|तुम्बकि|क्षणा
समवहृताभायमुला|न]जन्तामाधिकरिष्ठिः जयति सततं सा विंभवसावतु। २२।
इति विंभवावर्णिन्॥ अय वीरकलिंगवर्णिन्॥ वीरान्ति भद्रपादः

17 परिशिष्टकर् पुष्कर्केत बिक्रेतः चाको धारिताः|शी|श्रग|शः|तत्पसा शंभरविश्वाषू|भुवः।
यथाधारिः प्रसादांधविभावमुला बधिके|शम|निर्याई|भूमिमार|भुजमु
गणमाणवास्तकेत हिति ||२३। कांक्षीभूती विना न भवति न गि.

18 रो राजत राजानं शों संबालकावस्य न वधति न गता|स्विरित|१०|स्विरितीप।
भक्ते|कैक|१०|रू|१०|संतानेवासरिः|प्राप्तोत्तिलकृतेः|प्रमथयपतिरसावाकीलोगावतिः।

19 तीर्थोत्तिलोकरूपन्॥ विरंजते तत्व च पूर्व|शरणेन शरणामेन शरणामेन|रामः।
श्रीभूषणेन|न] शालकृत|मदिरू|मधिह|विधवा यशोसरां|स्तूरकता|तमसः।

12। रक्षागणस्य तु मया विजय संभावतिहृदिः सोक्तारामाभासः। भोकवत्

20 रंगचर्मर्मचर्मवार्तेः बदी|ज्ञान|निध|रा|विश्वाकर्ष्यः। २१। तीर्थवाचूः|मरात्वाबा-
वल|का|मंजरीमनः|हरी|एः। संघासः|शः|राखि न धृतिः भारे कैस्रे
सर्वत्री|भोजास्रेऽके। २३। सर्वत्र सुरुङ्क्षिप्त यतः सर्वत्र विश्वाकर्षि।
21. भूगोलकर्णविश्वासातिः । मणि[विष]व्रतभूत भाषिकर्णविश्वासातिः ॥ भूगोलकर्णविश्वासातिः ॥ भूगोलकर्णविश्वासातिः ॥

22. परिवहन सिद्ध विविधताः । यथा विद्याग्रिनि विचारकर्णविश्वासातिः ॥ भूगोलकर्णविश्वासातिः ॥

23. शिल्पकर्णविश्वासातिः ॥ सि[विष]कर्णविश्वासातिः ॥ कामदृष्टिः ॥ सि[विष]कर्णविश्वासातिः ॥

24. जीवंतालिकाः । नाय[विष]व्रतभूत विविधताः । सि[विष]कर्णविश्वासातिः ॥

25. रेवसौप[विष]व्रतभूतातिः ॥ सि[विष]कर्णविश्वासातिः ॥ नाय[विष]व्रतभूतातिः ॥

26. निरंतर समरस्थतिः ॥ सि[विष]कर्णविश्वासातिः ॥

27. चेलस्थानविश्वासातिः ॥ यथा यथा विविधताः ॥

28. द्विप्रथमस्थानविश्वासातिः ॥ चेलस्थानविश्वासातिः ॥

2. The construction seems to be engraved later on.
5. Metre: Rathoddhata.
30 रूपः सः (रूपः) अद्वितियाँ यज्ञार्थनीयं। उपगमा महासभन्नस्तदा। श्रवणे विज्ञानेचक्रं विकारं। इत्यादित्त्विशेषसारस्वतमेव।

31 मतृलं जयति। ॥६५॥ भवाः। तस्मादगार्भवान्तः। कथा भोमध्याभिश्रवणः। स्त्राः (स्त्राः) नां। शाक्तैतम्याभियमनं: नेत्रानु वा। शास्त्रार्थं कक्षाबिषयं श्रावणे श्रावणं श्रावणं।

32 थासिई शाक्ताविशेषस्वरूपः। म ज्ञाते। समाविशेषः। ॥६९॥ मैली। प्रांड्रो। जलोच्चरः। वारति विरास्तुवैवेदार्थान्तरार्थाः। प्रार्थीलयः। युक्तिः कुरुक्किश्चिति। फलक्तिः। सत्कारानां। (नाम)। व्याकरणे। दार्शनौद्विगितियमस्थितिः। त्वरावाक्षमेव।

33 एवः दियाशिशविन्दुः विमन्दयां द्राकष्माभिन्नस्तदा। सः। ॥६२॥ तत्त्वनु। देवः। सः। (स)। वेंकैवन्यस्त्वारः प्रास्तः। प्रेयक्षतिशृङ्गः। इति। इति। कुवलितुः। हुतं। पुष्कर्ति। माति। वौसा। स्वामिक्षेत्रः। सः। ॥६३॥ यथा। तथा। वीरः। ॥५४॥ पुमानू। मानाभिवेदः।

34 तेनै। श्रावस्त्रभाषणं। न। संपूजयं। [त] यमायं। या। प्रहारेर् गहः। ॥५५॥ प्रत्येदिपिः। ॥५६॥ ते। दर्शनं। प्रकटप्रभावः। वीरेणुक्कालकालक्षमावष्टः। संदर्भानिति। प्रधानस्तिः। वार। वार। प्रवह। मणिकमलं। केवल। समा।

1. मृत्त: MANDAKRANTA.
2. यह Passive Voice Aorist form of the verb in the Active Voice construction of the sentence is grammatically incorrect. It may have been used here for the sake of the metre.
3. मृत्त: MAJUJBHALA.
4. मृत्त: PRAMITAKSHARAS.
5. यह danda being omitted at first was thinly engraved later on.
6. मृत्त: SARDASAVIKRITI.
7. जोड़।
8. इसे it is to be connected with Chitrakam and samadhasatam, and didyad with vikavas.
9. मृत्त: SVAGAKHARA.
10. मृत्त: SAKH.
11. जोड़।
12. इसे it is to be connected with vikavas.
13. मृत्त: UPJASTI.
14. मृत्त: IDRASAOJRA.
35 चिलङ्गः खलु विस्मानाय:। काशो प्रकाशोपि च चिलङ्गः। किमि नह तद्विष [भ*]विहसुः सा॥

36 समख्रम्यस्तायां गुणवर्ध्यां च महामायां विश्वायन:॥

37 माति विचक्रृतामिरात्वे योक्ष्मभुः माति:। प्रामार्ग: निरुजपात्वेष्यच[च]व[च]व[च] (वायवता-)

38 तेल च जनः तुम्हारे कार्य: निर्मित कामः। चिज्ज गहत्तावस्थान: शान्तिपात्वेष्या। वति विचक्रृतेन दिवमपि:।

39 सु भा सतां पतुस्य हः सुजय्यां कोऽ[ग] कविः। निरोधिकः महानुभ: सर:। तेश्वरदित्वः महापालिका माधुर्यः।

40 महामायां वसेति:। यद्य जागर्न्ति य[म]ज्ञवतेः यस्य भावाने: यस्य भावः।

41 प्रवीणविधि ना: कुक्कु(क) च निवर्घान श्वाय:॥

---

* Metre: Upojati.
* Metre: Sardsivikritita.
* Metre: Vasunatilaka.
* This verse is found in l. 23 of A where the first half of it is destroyed.
* Metre: Anubhah.
* Metre: Priti.
* The syllable सः is only partially engraved.
* This verse is no. 70 in C where variance in reading is in samhāna-dāna-raja-. It will be seen that our author has improved the reading.
* The sense is namā bhavāni.
* Sandhi is not observed here.
42 দানেংহকায়ে যে বিভিন্নত্বে বহার দৃষ্টা মূর্তি [হংগীনিতেতার(তাম)। ১৬২-
ধ্রুষাকাৃতিগতিসাধারণীত ভারত যে গোগিনিব্যুৎপত্তি বিশাল ম ভারতানাথী
বরাহাকারণ। ১৬২১ সংবৎ শতি জগন্নাথচৌরাস্তে তিনি সুরাচরবর
যেন।

43 স্বতন্ত্রভাষানিষ্ঠ ফলাদ স্বরাপারাংদিন। এই সাধামাং তু যদা[ঙ্ঠি চিত্তবনে]
স্তন্ত্রকুমিচ্ছত্তারায় কন্যারং প্রথমতারিঘ দৃঢ় দিতে লেংী স্বষ্টত্ব। ১৬২১ চিত্ত প্রথা-
কন্যারং প্রথমতারিঘন। চিত্ত প্রথমতারিঘন। চিত্ত প্রথমতারিঘন। চিত্ত প্রথমতারিঘন।

44 চিত্তবনে পার্শ্বিক্ষত্তি প্রতিষ্ঠিত। স্বরাপারাং জীবিত বিলাসবাদীর চারির প্রতিষ্ঠত
তথ্যে ১৬২৫ তোবরিরুদ্ধজ্ঞানের মনসাপ্রাক্য। পুরো স্থায়ের চারির প্রতিষ্ঠত
সৃষ্টিরুদ্ধজ্ঞান। সারিরুদ্ধজ্ঞান। অ্যামনায়েরুদ্ধজ্ঞান।

45 লোকে জ্ঞানগানাত্মকজ্ঞানচতুর্থনিতিতন জনপদে। চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে ১৬২৫
চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে।

46 বুঝন হস্তী সহকথায় সমায়কল্পন ন। ১৬২৫ যে স্থানে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে চিত্তবনে।

47 স্বেচ্ছাবিকার;[১] ১৬২১ প্রাণবিকিরণারামাজ্ঞাত্তিতে কথার [কাননার্ত
প্রথমত। চিত্রাৰামাজ্ঞাতে কথার [কারার্ত
স্বামী। ১৬২২ যে স্থাপন প্রাণবিকিরণারামাজ্ঞাত।

48 যার প্রতিরুপ প্রতিরুপ মনসাপ্রাক্রিয়া ১৬২০ নাদুড়িকাস্ত্রেরচারির যুব সুব্রাম
চারিহে হিন্দু। কুলোর্বাভাবসংক্ষেপ দেশকার হি ভারত
তথ্যে হিন্দু। ১৬২১ সংস্কার যে স্থান গুরুযাষ্টর(চে)বিদিত। ১৬২২ সংবৎ সংস্কার
প্রমাণ।

---

1 Metro: Sārdālāsvākhāta.
2 There is a superfluous anusātra over ṭe.
3 Metro: Uṣṇajīti.
4 This verse is no. 6 in B.
5 This verse is no. 7 in B where variance in reading is in "marapuri-jī-गारॆ।"
6 This verse is no. 16 in B and belongs to the description of prince Bhūja of the Guhila family.
7 Metro: Rākṣa.
8 This mark of punctuation is incomplete.
9 Read "पुराण।".
10 Metro: Anushṭubh.
11 Metro: Vatsastha.
49 दानद्वृत् बागसंस्कृति: ॥६४२ सुधा धि वसुधा चार समे विश्वकर्ति हाते।

श्योरेषु विश्वेशु ग्रामेक विश्वाधि ॥६३ मानव वाचक गदा प्रमदा: ।

प्रमदा: मदा । केवल केवल प्राया भागसाधारणा न हि ॥६३ दानकलाप-

प्रथित- ।

50 तालासुता जना न होना श्योरापि च च तत्तक्रया: कलुकामय: य[८]योऽ

तुलामारकमत्रृपिति च ॥६३ एकदानाभरणोऽरित्वे ॥ परिकारो त्राकके

कल्पित वैदिकः ॥ संवात १९२[७] वर्य भागे १०५२ प्रवर्तिताय मानव-

मुद्रा वदि ५ सोभि प्रणयित: ॥१॥

Third Slab,

[हरितविरिका ८]

1 चारीत्तथे सिमसिन्ययम्य । नियुक्ति: । तद्विषये । तसद्विषये ।

कलुकामय: य[८]योऽ तुलामारकमत्रृपिति च ॥६३ एकदानाभरणोऽरित्वे ॥

परिकारो त्राकके ॥ संवातु १९२[७] वर्य भागे १०५२ प्रवर्तिताय मानव-

मुद्रा वदि ५ सोभि प्रणयित: ॥

2 विन्दानान्तरहस्ति: [८] ॥[८] ॥ चारीत्तथे मानः ॥ निरः ॥ चारीत्तथे ।

हात: ॥६३२ जीयाधेनुवन्ति: ॥ परिवाला ॥ तद्विषये ।

[वैदिकः ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥

3 [स]क्षेत्ता ॥ [८] ॥ चारीत्तथे चारीत्तथे मानः ॥ निरः ॥ चारीत्तथे ।

हात: ॥ [८] ॥ परिकारो त्राकके ॥ संवातु १९२[७] मन्वान्यादिविन्य निरः ।

4 [विन्दानान्तरहस्ति: [८] ॥ चारीत्तथे ।

हात: ॥ [८] ॥ चारीत्तथे: ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥ परिवाला ॥

1२६[७] [सदैवः] ॥

1* Metre: अनुस्तूहः.
2* There is a superfluous medial इ stroke over this का.
3* Read अयः/यः.
4* Metre: उपज्ञातुः.
5* Due space for these three syllables is left on the slab.
6* Metre: प्रभाताभिनी.
7* Text within these brackets is restored from B where the verse is no. 9.
8* Read अिः/यः.
9* This verse is cited by Rai Bahadur Ojha (Raj. Itike, Fasc. I, p. 380, n. 2).
10* Metre: स्वराज्या.
11* Text within these brackets is restored from B and D where the verse is no. 10 and 20, respectively. The difference in reading in the former is in युन्दा-पुरुषा-युन्दा and in the latter in अपलम अहकीमि and अपना अपिना अपि.
12* First युः was engraved which was afterwards turned into युः.
13* Metre: बन्धुस्वरक्तिः.
14* Text within these brackets is restored from B where the verse is no. 11.
5 (स, तं चिण्कुमोऽधारिः यादायवपुष्यां।) चारीतराज्यसम्राट् वासादवाप्र सयो
नवरा[श]जष्मी(स्मृत)॥१२॥(५) वयो ग्य[व] समयुक्त्व[वष] नीलकण्ठ[प्रव]॥
6 (सदमस्तय][सय]दमवाय तः श्रय॥(१) [वंगो] [राधया]॥(१) [व] [विद्वत्चरिताधामवायसंहद्]॥
[मछली] जयगृही प्राशित्॥१२॥(५) शिल म[णरा]र[न]वीषायपवर् श्रय
पय राजवी[वषु]॥
7 (सव)षेर त् तस्यभावः स सुष्ट्वत[र]हुष्ट्वत्[व] कामभविन्यहस्मस्मस्य वस्तुष्ट्व मधु॥
[विक्रमा]॥(१) यस्तै[व]हि गुप्तलक्षणस्य [प्रसिद्धा श्री]क्रिष्ण[व]गाम
[वषु]राजगृहे जातिः(सम)॥१२॥(५)॥
8 (च)मनहपुरः पूवु गुप्तलर्ता[व]स्वीकार विजना॥(१) स लेव[व] देवः...
[तिरिति]॥
9 (चं संत् यथृविधः[व]मदहिव[फ]विषयपिनि[/न]रम सुभाज(वम)॥[१२॥(५)॥
— — — [व्]॥(१) [व] त्यस्माद् यवरधर्मकर्मक्षितमूलर्युव्य:॥(१) [व] सीरिः[व]रीजः[व]
सन्त[स]पुष्यमित्रवर्[व]॥१२॥(५)॥
10 (सिंह:.)॥१३॥(५) या[व]मदहिव[फ]रितर्यपति[स] [स्वपवमी]॥(१)॥१३॥(५)॥
— — — [व्]॥(१)॥(१) — — — रघु[आ]त्रविश्वनाथ[व]॥(१)॥(१)
— — — [व्]॥(१)॥(१) गुप्तलक्षणवायः॥
11 (यु) वैविश्वा॥(१) स एव [व] गांवी[व]स्वाम्यमभिसति रमाः[व]॥
— — — [व्]॥(१)॥(१) [व] विश्वनाथविश्वस्तरिनि[व]॥(१)॥(१) साथे [व] विनीतिन्तिनि[व]॥
12 (व)मय्यर्यन वातीविनोद श्रय वत्स[व] मुनी॥[१३॥(५)॥[व] राजवी[व]
गुप्तलक्षणम्॥॥(१)॥(१)॥(१)॥(१)॥(१)॥(१)॥(१)॥(१)॥(१)॥(१)॥(१)॥(१)

1 Text within these brackets is restored from B where the verse is no. 11.
2 Metre: Upajati.
3 Text within these brackets is restored from D and E where the verse is no. 30 and 7 respectively.
4 Metre: Vasanatilaka.
5 Text within these brackets is restored from B and D where the verse is no. 13 and 17 respectively. The
difference in reading in the latter is in Sridha-ahatpad.
6 Metre: Anasakti.
7 Better omit the viṃspa and read "raṃga-pratāgata-"
8 Text within these brackets is restored from D, verse no. 18 where the difference in reading is in "Umaṅga-
9 Metre: Malini.
13 दातान्विते; नामः[स्त्राहस्तोपमा]ना। तौरः[विचतचर्यसं] तु*]
चिन्दरविधिसमाधीमेंरविद्याधारे।

14 ॥१३॥ विचारविद्धी सकलं महोत्सतः सिद्धमः[गण्य यात्रि] निविद्धभिग्रिहितरव[जम्ब।]
षु[स्थ*]] भाष्याः[नक्षत्रियारूप] विशेषावकी[ना] न्त्[सुतुङ्केतिसंतोंदो] ॥ १३ ॥

15 वह परं दत्तानां; कारणम्[तं] नद्याँखलांगा गṛ.विद्धितिरम्; पाणिनंतंगा*] [मिनितंगा; \(\text{मिनितंगा} \)]

16 रणस[पत]को दानविका [नेव गौङ्पा]; ॥ १२६॥ प्राणम् नृ - - -
[दम] गृहो दातिवालोकवही कादम्बिन्निदृंतयो नरपररेरी[वाचकोपदे] ॥(१) प्र(पा) वालोपिन न [भुभणार्थः]

17 [विचार] पुष्कर[स्वभवं देवीं] तर्किन्न्य[विख्यातं नर्णती*] ॥ १२६॥ दिव्यालेपी[सुहं कर्म]

18 [सङ्क] ॥(१) चित्ताण्व[न्द्र] नाम[ना] [ना] [तथा व] चक्रण[तु] ॥ १२६॥ ततंत्रं शास्त्रिनं परन्तर
[परा] नश्वर्णेश्वर प्रविशाचित: || १२६॥

19 पाण्ड[दाता] जातिवालोज्ञातोज्ञनचिन्ता: ||(१) षु[स्थ] [स्वाभवो सत्त्व|वीर्य(स)परें|एस] ॥ १० ॥ प(प)-
\\[सूत] ॥ १२६॥ नववाणसंवधध गृहित्वायाः[व] बुधप: [म: ||(१) वर्मा] शास्त्रिकमुमुराय[व] प्रसहतः" ॥ १५५]|

20 [मृतु] दात्तनवर्मिष्टा च याग्यवर्मिष्टा महोपतिः ||(१) [वयो|प्रयो|सार्दू|जन्मी|ता|री|ज] [तदाय] ||(१) ||(१) चपि
राज्येष्म ख्या तत्त्वनं तत्त्वायाः खनो[न] [स्व] [स्व] [स्व] [स्व] [स्व]

1 Text within these brackets is restored from D where the verse is no. 32.
2 Metre: Sūrdāśākrāti.
3 Text within these brackets is restored from D where the verse is no. 33.
4 Metre: Upaçāti.
5 Text within these brackets is restored from D where the verse is no. 34.
6 Read खिलामपाह.
7 खिलामपाह.
8 Metre: Anushṭubh.
9 Either read Mahindra-Nāg-ākoo or Mahindrā Nāg-ākoo.
10 Sandhi is not observed here.
11 Read -pratādakaḥ.
12 Space for one letter between these two syllables seems to have originally been defective on the slab, and
hence not used for engraving.
13 Read रूपोऽ.
21 गता १४४¹ पवादशिस्वतन्त्र वैश्वीकर्ण[व]|रेखः [१] तत: [क्रिया|वि]|सिद्धो [रुप]|शिरी: १४४¹ क्वातितीय|कलो बेचन(म)|दातापत्रने [१] प्राकाराच चतुर्दिश्च च[तुनो|रूप]²-

22 भूमिल: १४४¹ डावितितः सुतात्त्वः वश्वः सथ(ह)|पाल्यः [१] तेवः मध्

23 युष्मी|हैरापुष्प: १४४¹ चालायण्यजः [जः] वृंचविकर्मकिसी [१] तकृती वेण-

24 ना[मा] भूषिपतिवृष्टि जातः १४४² भाता कुम(मा)|रयिङ्गोऽरयिङ्गस्रावः परस(सम) [१] धेरामाकीता|नया|सामायम|कौटू|सर्व वष|त यः [१५०²]

25 [च(वा)|तः [१] येन वपले लके वदु वाचिशिं|सही|वमा [१] नीचा यथा सहासनः १५२² यः सदा शौकेच[सर्वा]|द्विगामी-

26 वीरज|मम्मनदिर(सम) [१] स कृमान्|पवासितामो|मनस्सने समी टप: [१५३³] पर राजलवो|जायसिं|ष्ट्रां|नत|त्रिप्ति|ज्ञाप्तिहन्नालासु|लिपितः पो[हा]|म-प्रतिप[चर्च]

27 तत्तरमुत्त्व[सी]|जैत्यसितो टप: [१] वाचाकारि न [कः]चित्र[समा|भुजा के]-

28 मद्यमा चाराच रेडवार|निक्किलापि वर वागर्त — — [०|व्यक्तांग]—

---
¹ Metre: Anushtubh.
² The first and the second quarters are irregular each having a syllabic instant in excess.
³ Metre: Arya.
⁴ Omit vinayaka and read -sa-sunthukahita-poddama-.
⁵ Metre: Šāradāvākridita.
⁶ Metre: Sraddhabāra.
30 दक्ष दिशा भवं सुवः सुधा नर इतरहि (किं) या ।

31 [निजः नमः] चिरे विच्योति ॥ १५ ॥ पवनायः रावतीतिजसिंहपर्ववर्णरूपम् ॥

32 चंकितरयः: चंकितराखराखरणः ॥

33 यनोः भ[र्द] युरी भृष्टतः ॥ १५ ॥ चतुरात्मातिजसिंहपर्ववर्णरूपम् ॥

34 [ध]चति [धच्छ] भाँवं कुम्भसत्यायः वनारः ॥ निजरामलेनाखायामाय वाजतः।

35 [रेकाकलयः संविनविरियकर्पणाव्य] प्राप(समायाक्षयक्रोधः) ॥ १६ ॥ [हृद्ध चिनिच्यूढः] ॥

2. The metre here seems to be Upagāthi but the exact number of syllables (short and long) is difficult of determination.
3. Read prātiṣṭhā.
4. Text within these brackets is restored from D, verse 52. The difference in reading is in sadā sad-gurus, Tēajasāhika and sansprajātya āśīṣā.
5. The metre here requires a long syllable. Read Tējāśa.
7. Text within these brackets is restored from D, verse 53.
9. Text within these brackets is restored from D, verse 54.
10. Text within these brackets is restored from D, verse 55.
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36 [श्रीभुवनितितिमिश्र जीतिवारः[विश्वा[भूमितिमिश्र भविया[यतीनितिमिश्रितानि]*]
[युक्]मनितांभर ||१५२| चमरनगरलेख विच्छिन्न पुराणम् भविय समरसिंह(४)
शासितुर चोरणाम(४) ||(१) कः
37 [लक्षकाः]का[प्रभुद्रिगिरिका[र्तनांसचित्तिमिश्रितानि]स्तंबम्[भूमि]*][[२१६]२४ जगति
कार्ति न संयत प्रार्थितांध्रास्तान्तितिमिश्रितानि]स्तंबम्[भूमि]*] ||(१) परमिन्ध
पर-
38 [वीक्षेत्री]वीक्षेत्री[सारः]वयन्ति संसर|संसर दानमादिसिमानः[*][[२१६४]४]*
[वाहिनीदावित्तम]*[नाः]दुही वयन्ति वा न वा ||(१) श्रीमक्षमरसिंहेश्वर
सुसंसर संसरदा १९४७ किं वीक्षेत्री समरसिंहः
39 [मरुकी]समरेरैः[को]समरेरैः[विनः]कविकालय[भूमि] । संसर्तामय पुढ़ोरंमिधित
ताणावाही स्थानः*]दलं सपनहवळकालिन ||१५६९ विदुर्धवसचर्च लल्ल तपास
मालुष्ये वीक्षेत्री संसरसिंहिः किं
40 [रं] विश्वनास[को]सिंह परः[व्याघिः]नो || चंद्रश्यामित्यपायितः स्वयम्
वाचिकः कावितो*][को]चंद्रश्यामित्य चिणितिता तथासाबालिनम्[भूमि] ||१५५८
केष्वी कविकालयतुरित सुदः
41 [किं] मनालः कारः]सी वाच[वचना[विन] किंतमितिता तथापाबालिनतथाविना वर्णः; ।
नैवा वर्णनाः*]]०] वि
44 यथा: यथा: सन्[मा]यथा[ण] विवधा: सर्वसीति सर्वीण्ड(तम) [१७०१] [भुगुपतिविव](हृ) चतुर्व्यवहारकारी सुर्युरिपर(ग्रह) [नू]नी(लो)|तिमाराहतुमारी [१] खर श्य सुरीयु प्रेतिनीचितत्तरी शिविरिव स कमु व्यतस्तः
45 लो(र्गो)पकालो[री] [१७२१] यथा वनुण्डिरिष्टालि [विभाति विवर्णमण्ड: सुधारिण्डै। केशविहिपरसिंहमुळा: पार्षद शुभ[प्रलेख] [दीपीत्तिः] [१७३१] योनिीणु पुरोपरिवर्जनार्य-मेलब सरीन्दिबो व्यसनार्थाविश्वाहो[१] विशेषस-
46 सरीपालुष्मृ(ृं)कस्य श्रीसंपवो यथा सुता(प्रस्तावोऽतः) [१७४१] [तथा]स्थाननिर्विरहितमन- तयां नगरिविवश वचृषु रघुनः [१] चन्द्राणु(स) प्रपक्षमित्व जालां खलु महुकरकरः [१७५१] सरस्विने [त]नगर निरुपकम स
47 [चित्त]कुटिलभवनाय [१] महुकर्य[चाघवनाबौव भर्तृपति: खर्जपिरिर्यूः*][१०]
[१७६१] चन्द्राणु(स) हराराणाशोआ(क)समस्वषाहो ॥ चु(छ)माणवरः। खलु लक्षण- मिम्सवविवस्मिः [१२] गते दुस्मवर रक्ष [१] कुजितः
48 [तित] कालपूर्वकालोत्तरा न जातु धौरा: [पुष्याः]पश्चिमीति [१७७१] [किंत्व] मः*|१४ [खा]गुरू(गूरू) रक्षनिरिकरश्चरविश्वाहा सर्वान्स्वशंसिनिखः प्रवलराजान् पालिवा गाजः [१] क्वल्य योवधा योवधिरिवतः
49 राजानास्तिकालाकारोपमेणी लक्षनिसेविर्याराजसहसुलम[च] संगरं संगरणव[र]शरणः [१७८५] इहूं केस्कूराय्यं क्वल्य संगरं संगरनां त्रुपः [१] चित्तकूटाचर्यः रचनः शशाप्तो दितं गयोः [१] [१७९१] से [१५३१] वरः [१५]

1 Metro: Śārdulavikrīḍita.
2 Better omit esvara and read drīḍa-lakṣatra-.
3 Text within these brackets is restored from B and D where the verse is no. 50 and 65 respectively. The difference in reading in the former where it describes prince Āmaraprasāda, is in rāti-lōla-prāgaṣ-čittā-chārī.
4 Metro: Mālinī.
5 Text within these brackets is restored from D, verse 66.
6 Metro: Aṛḍa.
7 Text within these brackets is restored from D, verse 67.
8 Metro: Upājñatī.
9 Text within these brackets is restored from D, verse 68. The verse obviously seems to contain a partial description of some royal damsel. It is indiscriminately fitted in both these records successively, having been borrowed from some other record.
10 Text within these brackets is restored from D, verse 69.
11 Better read Khummāna-rasajōī.
12 Read 'aṣṭasmin.
13 This verse is no. 77 in D.
14 Text within these brackets is restored from D, verse 78.
15 Metro: Sragdhāra.
16 This verse is no. 79 in D.
17 Metro: Anushafr̥ēh.
No. 45.—KAMAN STONE INSCRIPTION.

By Prof. V. V. Mirashi, M.A., NAGPUR.

Kāman, the headquarters of a taksil of the same name in the State of Bharatpur in Rājputāna, is situated in 27° 39' N. and 77° 16' E. about 35 miles North by West from Bharatpur and about 40 miles from Mathurā. There are several derivations given of the place-name. According to one account the old name of the place was Kadambavana from the numerous Kadamba trees found there; another account traces the present name to a mythical Rājā Kāmaśēna, while according to Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajī it is derived from Kāmavān. In the middle of the town there is an old fort which contains a mosque called Chaurāsi Khambā built with materials from Hindu temples. A Sanskrit inscription on one of the pillars built into the inner side of the court-wall of this mosque has been edited by Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajī in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. X, pp. 34 ff. The inscription is undated, but according to the Pandit it can be referred to about the eighth century A.D. It records the building of a temple of Vishnu by a prince of the Sūrasēna dynasty.

The present inscription, which is edited here for the first time, was brought to my notice by Mr. V. S. Agrawala, M.A., Curator of the Curzon Museum of Archaeology, Muttra, who kindly furnished me with two excellent stammpages and a photograph of it. The stone which bears this record is said to have been obtained from a large well situated about half a mile outside Kāman. It is now at Golul in the possession of Śri Vallabha Lalji Maharaj Gosai who very kindly allowed Mr. Agrawala to copy it. Kāman is one of the twelve holy places of the Vraja Mandal and is also one of the headquarters of Śri Vallabha Lalji Maharaj. The same stone contains another record in Persian embossed letters on the reverse side. I feel deeply grateful to the Gosai Maharaj for permission to edit the present record.

The writing covers a space 2' 2' broad by 1' 8½' high. There are twenty-four lines in all, of which the last is only one-third of the rest. The inscription has been very badly mutilated especially in lines 1-12 where only about a dozen aksharas at either end are now legible. Even in the lower half of the record where the writing is better preserved, a few aksharas here and there have been completely damaged, while some others can be read only with patience and perseverance from the faint traces which can still be marked on the back of the impressions. The characters belong to the North Indian alphabet of about the 9th century A.D. They are very beautifully written and skillfully incised, the strokes for medial vowels being ornamentally treated as in the Jhālīpātan inscriptions. Especially noteworthy are the signs for the medial ə and i and the diphthongs. These appear in many

1 Imperial Gazetteer of India, Rājputāna, pp. 338-39.
2 Ind. Ant., Vol. X, p. 34.
3 This record was copied by me in January, 1937, and has been noticed in the An. Rep., A. S. I., for 1936-37. The stone, I was told by the Gosai Maharaj himself, came out of the well which was re-excavated at his instance. A number of broken Hindu images also came out of it some of which were seen placed near the well when I visited Kāman. The inscription seems to have been deliberately damaged, probably by the Muslim invaders. Mr. G. Yazdani has kindly sent me the following translation of the Persian record which is incised on the other side of the stone:

"The well was originally excavated some 50 years ago; but was filled up with stone and earth during the governorship of Muhammad Hājī. As the scarcity of water was causing trouble to people the well was re-excavated in the month of Ramzān 660 H. (A.D. 1271) during the reign of Ghillīkhud-dīn Balban, and the government of Nūrāt Khān, the sīf-holder of Bayānā."

This record is under publication in the Epigraphia Indica Moslemica.—Ed.
cases on the top of letters and their flourishes extend to several letters on the right and left, which, owing to the unsatisfactory preservation of the original, cause not a little confusion in decipherment. Some of the letters such as $j$ and $r$ appear more developed here than in the other inscription from Kāman edited by Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajī. It may again be noted that the signs for the medial $i$ and $i$ in the latter record do not appear wholly over the top of letters as they do in the present one.

The language is Sanskrit. Except for the opening om namah Śiva and the particulars of the dates here and there, the whole inscription appears to have been metrically composed. The verses are not numbered and in the present damaged condition of the record it is not possible to state their total number. The orthography shows the usual peculiarities such as the use of ri for the vowel $rī$ and vice versa (see triśūlyām 1.13 and chaustriśūlyām 1.18), of $v$ for $b$ (as in Kāmalī 1.23), and of $m$ for anusvāra and $nh$ for visarga (see Samvat 1.13 and -āvikalpataṃ-[-pratimāsaṃ] ll. 16-17), unless the latter is meant to be the sign for upadhmāniya.

The present record is of the same type as the Śiyadopī and Āhār inscriptions, being a collective public copy of a number of deeds recording donations and endowments made from time to time in favour of a deity, apparently Śiva, installed in a temple at Kāmalī. The record itself is not dated but its preserved portion contains seven dates of an unspecified era ranging from the year 180 to 299. The month, fortnight and tithi were stated in each case, but some of these particulars have now become illegible in two cases. As the week-day or the nakshatra has not been specified in connection with any of them, the dates do not admit of verification, but the paleography of the record leaves no doubt that they must be referred to the Harsha era. It may be noted in this connection that Kāman is only about 75 miles south-west of Āhār, the stone inscription of which contains several dates of the Harsha era. If we except the date 563 of the Pañjaur inscription, the year 299 mentioned towards the close of the present record is the latest known date of this era. The dates mentioned here thus range from A.D. 786-87 to 905-06.

The unsatisfactory condition of the inscription does not admit of a detailed and connected account of its contents. It falls into two parts which are separated from each other by an ornamental figure in l. 12. The first part, which is almost wholly effaced, probably contained a description of the person who built the temple of Śiva where the present record was evidently put up and of the Śaiva Āchāryas who were successively in charge of it, while the second part registers the deeds recording the donations and endowments made to the deity from time to time.

After the customary obeisance to Śiva, the record seems to have had two verses invoking blessings of that deity. The third line mentions a Brāhmaṇa (Bhatta) named Kakkuka, who lived in a place the name of which appears to be Rōhitaka. He is described as a destroyer of his enemies. The next line speaks of several sons, apparently of this Kakkuka, who attained noble fame by their excellent qualities. The eldest of them whose name appears to be Untaṭa is described in l. 6. The next two lines speak of a temple (mātha), apparently of Śiva, erected by the same person, having realized the transitoriness (of earthly fortune). The following three or four lines (9-12) mentioned some successions of Śaiva ascetics, but unfortunately almost all their names are lost.

2 Ibid., Vol. XIX, pp. 52 ff.
3 There is a similar figure in l. 11 also.
4 One Untaṭa is also mentioned in l. 19.
5 The name of one of them mentioned in l. 10 appears to be Guṇarpāṇī.
The second part of the record which begins in line 12 registers the following documents:

Document No. I (ll. 12-13). This is undated. It records that the Gōshṭikas (members of the Managing Committee) made a permanent endowment of something, which they had acquired, evidently in favour of the deity.

Document No. II (l. 13). This document is dated in the year 22(x) on the third tiḥi of some month, now lost. It records some donation of a merchant named Vajrāta.

Document No. III (ll. 13-17). This is dated in the year 229 on the third tiḥi of the bright fortnight of Māgha. It records the gift of two plots of land situated inside the koṭṭa (fort) by some one whose name occurring in the beginning of line 15 is now missing. The first of these was bounded on the east by the house of one Krishnāka, on the south by a small well and on the west and north by an old royal road. The second plot of land which was situated in the eastern part of the fort was bounded on the east and the south by a royal road and in the other directions (i.e., the west and the north) by the land of the temple (sthāna) and a small habitation. These gifts were made in favour of a deity (probably Śiva) whose name appears to be Kāṃyakāśvara. It is further recorded that a guild of potters living in Kāmyaka, in consideration of a sum of money received in advance, stipulated to pay a permanent cess. Every potter was, without any exception, to pay one paṇa per wheel every month.

Document No. IV (ll. 17-18). This is dated in the year 232 on some tiḥi now lost, in the bright fortnight of Vaiśākha. It records that the guild of gardeners living in Kāmyaka, in consideration of a sum of money paid in advance, stipulated to supply permanently sixty garlands, of which thirty-four were to be delivered at the temple of Vishṇu and the remaining (twenty-six) at the shrine of Chāmuṇḍa.

Document No. V (ll. 19-21). This is dated in the year 233 on the 7th tiḥi of the bright fortnight of Pauṣha. It records that the guild of artisans living in the place (i.e. in Kāmyaka), in consideration of an amount received in advance, made a permanent endowment. Every artisan who worked in the place was to pay one dramma per month.

Document No. VI (ll. 19-21). This is dated in the year 220 on the 5th tiḥi of the bright fortnight of Śrāvāṇa. It registers that a man named Untatā piously denoted three plough-measures of land in his own village, the name of which has not been preserved. The land was previously tilled by the Brāhmaṇas Sāhulla, Jajja and others and was, at the time of the gift, cultivated by one Kuṇāṭāka.

It is further laid down that whatever would be produced in the case of all these permanent endowments should be added to the capital; for such is the law (āśtra) of endowments.

Document No. VII (ll. 21-22). This is dated in the year 180 on the 3rd tiḥi of the bright fortnight of Śrāvāṇa. It records that two āvāris (enclosures), facing the west and situated outside the fort, were donated by a sōmkhika (a worker on conch-shells) named Bhadrā by means of a written deed.

Document No. VIII (ll. 22-24). This is dated in the year 299 on the 2nd tiḥi of the bright fortnight of Phālguna. It records that some drammas were formerly (purū) made over by

---

1. The third figure of the date is illegible.
2. The meaning of this is not clear. Perhaps it is intended to provide that if the amount of the endowment or the property increased in value, the benefit of it was to accrue to the donee.
3. Of the three figures of this date I take the last two as denoting 9, though they are dissimilar. Of the two figures in question the second is the usual one for 9; the first also has the same value in l. 21 of the Jodhpur inscription of Pratīhāra Bāuka (above, Vol. XVIII, plate facing p. 96). In the Chaunukya grant of Trilochanapāla (Ind. Ant., Vol. XII, plates I and II between pp. 202-203) both the signs are used to denote 9.
Bhōjadēva to Pramāṇarāśi, which the latter gave to Chāmudjakā. After his (i.e., Pramāṇarāśi’s) death the ācārya (i.e., Chāmudjakā or Chāmudjakārāśi) seems to have paid the amount to the Goskhikās. The latter purchased two āvarīkās with those drāmas. The rithis or shops in the āvarīkās were situated facing the south in the Kambali-haṭṭa, which seems to mean a part of the town where a cattle-market was held. The rent of these rithis was to be utilised by the Goskhikās in meeting the expenses of white-washing, vermilion and lights for the temples as long as the sun and the moon would endure.

The preserved portion of the inscription does not state the name of the ruling king. If any was mentioned in the introductory part of the record, it has been lost. But Bhōjadēva named towards the close of the record is plainly identical with the well-known Emperor Bhōja I of the Pratihāra dynasty. In the year 299 of the Harsha era (i.e., in A.D. 905-06) Bhōja was dead; for, the Unā plates give Valabhi Sañvat 574 (i.e., about A.D. 993-94) for his son and successor Mahāndrapāla. Bhōja I was himself a devotee of Bhagavati and Vishṇu as is evidenced by his Baraṅghate and the Ādivāhī drāmas. It is therefore interesting to note that he made over a sum of money to a Saiva ācārya for the maintenance of a Saiva temple.

In view of the foregoing identification of Bhōjadēva, it may be asked if Kakkuka described in line 14 is identical with his namesake who is mentioned in the Gwalior prāsasti of Bhōja as the grand-uncle of Bhōja’s grandfather Nāgabhāṣa II. He is no doubt called here Bhāṭa, but that does not per se preclude the identification; for according to the Jōdhpurā and Ghatiyāliā inscriptions the Pratihāras were descended from the Brāhmaṇa Harichandra and an expression in the former record has been taken to refer to the Brāhmaṇa caste of the Pratihāra rulers of Kamuj. The description in 1. 4 that Kakkuka was a destroyer of his foes shows that he was a man of warlike spirit and lends colour to his identification with the aforementioned Pratihāra prince. The damaged condition of the present record, however, makes its evidence doubtful. Besides, the subsequent portion, judging from the few aṣṭharas that are still legible, does not appear to have contained the description of a royal family. I am therefore inclined to think that this Kakkuka did not belong to a royal family. As for the description that he destroyed his foes, it may have been by policy, if not by personal bravery. It is, of course, not unlikely that in that age some members of the priestly caste distinguished themselves on the battlefield, as others preferred the peaceful occupation of a farmer.

There is only one legible place-name, viz., Kāmyaka, in the lower portion of the record, which is evidently identical with Kāman where the inscribed stone was found. It is now clear that its modern name is not derived from Kānumbavana, Kāmaśēna or Kāmavana, but from Kāmyakavana. As stated above, Kāman has still an old fort, which is clearly referred to as kūṭa

1 Kambali means one having a dewlap, a bull.
2 Above, Vol. XIX, pp. 17 f.
3 Ibid., Vol. XVIII, p. 95.
6 Line 4 of the present inscription mentions a place named Rōhītaka. According to the Mahābhārata (Sabhāparvan, 33, 4-5), Rōhītaka, which lay to the west of Delhi, was inhabited by the Mattamayāras. (Rōhītaka, evidently same as Rashītaka of the Rājarājanīśa IV, 11) and the Līkha Māndal prāsasti (above, Vol. I, p. 14), is to be identified with modern Rōhītak, 43 miles N.W. of Delhi. — Ed.]
7 This Kāmyakavana is evidently different from the Kāmyakavana of the Mahābhārata, where the Pāṇḍavas sojourned for a short time during their exile; for, the latter was situated on the bank of the Sarasvatī. See the Mahābhārata, Vaiśampāyana (Bombay recension), adhyāya 6, vv. 1-3. Cunningham has identified it with Kāndā near Kurukshetra. See his A. S. R., Vol. XIV, p. 100.
in ll. 13 and 15 of the present record. The inscription edited by Pandit Bhagwan Lal Indraji was on a pillar of a temple dedicated to Vishnu. The present record, on the other hand, seems to have been put up at a temple of Siva under the name Kamyaksevara, which must have been situated not far from the well outside the fort where the stone was found. There were, besides, two subsidiary shrines dedicated to Vishnu and Champaqda. These temples were evidently placed in charge of Siva dharyas of the Pashupata sect, though the actual management of them was carried out by a committee (Gosikhi) appointed for the purpose. That the Pashupata sect of Sivism was flourishing in the northwest of India in the time of the Pratihara Bhoja I is also shown by the Sirsa inscription1 of his reign, edited by the late Rai Bahadur D. R. Sahni.

Our inscription throws interesting side-light on some transactions of guilds in ancient India. When a donor intended to make a permanent provision for the maintenance of a temple or the supply of materials for the worship of a deity, he either invested the necessary amount in landed property or deposited it with a guild. In the latter case the guild sometimes stipulated to pay perpetually a definite amount or a particular rate of interest on the amount deposited with it. Our inscription shows that the guild sometimes did not pay out of its common fund, but levied a small cess on every member of it working in that particular locality. The inscription mentions three such guilds, viz., those of potters, artisans and gardeners. We find that the members of the last guild were to pay in kind, while those of the first two had to pay a small cess probably because the articles manufactured by them were not regularly required for the use of the temple. We notice again that the guilds comprised all the members of their respective professions; for in two cases our inscription explicitly states that every one who followed the particular profession in Kamyaka was to contribute a fixed amount. We are not told how the investments received by the guilds were utilised. But it would not be wrong to infer that they were expended on some works, religious or secular, such as those enumerated by Brihaspati,2 which were regarded as useful to all the members of the guild. The guilds had evidently the necessary sanctions to secure the timely payment of the cess which they levied on their members. From the Brihaspati-smriti (XVII, 13)3 we learn that they could impose a fine or even exile a member who refused to perform his part of the agreement. Again, both the Arthasastra and the Dharmasastras mention Sri-bala or the army maintained by guilds, which even kings were not loth to use for their conquests4. The guilds could, therefore, be trusted to collect the stipulated amount from their members and pay it regularly to the beneficiary of the endowment.

TEXT.

1 [भो नम्] श्रीवार ।

2 [विष्ट] सूतफण ।

3 वह हसे ।

4 बुताया ककणे भोमसुबे: [विष्ट] पारिरमें ॥

4 Bhartaphaka the founder of the Maitraka dynasty of Valabhi is, for instance, said to have obtained royal fortune with the help inter alia of the Sri-bala.

5 From inked impressions.
2 - पर (?)वाक्यचारकत[दल] - ो नामे 

3 - सुचितमयो .......................... 3राजास[क]षट्को ........................

4 - [रा]होतकेमलय: ककुको[व]विसंहन: 5(रा) .......................... 6घ सु[प]  

5 - [खस्क] य[ब]बहुयुक्तमगुणप्रथ्यातसकोराय: 8 (रा) .......................... 9रका चव ।।

6 - [च्च]हेतु[न] ?]ठो कोड: सामाय[प]षोद[य]: ?] 10 .......................... 9ए 

7 - ना[ख]्या वा वाभिजाय चति जगति विशुद्ध [टा] ध्वनि 11 .......................... 9शवेक 

8 - [ईक]ी मठसिद्द .......................... 12नतू । पव- 

9 - .......................... 12कव्वर[द]  .... .......................... 


11 - गरागिय: 14 । तक्षाक्ष: .......................... 15हरि: साय .......................... 

12 चक्षुसिद्ध  ............ [द्वा]कोसं भव[तु] ताप्षद चयन 16 ।।

1 वेंट: Scapāharā.
2 उसीसर बोन, था राजा दो अक्षार है। यहाँ 30 अक्षार है।
3 यहाँ 11 अक्षार है।
4 वेंट: Amavalkūṭhā.
5 यहाँ 25 अक्षार है।
6 यहाँ 8 अक्षार है।
7 वेंट: Bādūsākavāciti.
8 यहाँ 36 अक्षार है।
9 वेंट: Anuṣṭubh.
10 यहाँ 44 अक्षार है।
11 यहाँ 35 अक्षार है।
12 वेंट: Gītā.
13 यहाँ 17 अक्षार है।
14 वेंट: Rathākālā.
12 ... चिता[वा?] ... नव ... शंसु ... सुत... ॥०॥ कर्ति - या[गोठि]कैधि पुराणिता।।

13 - - [सूत्र?]जबालोपितविका;२ ए ... [सू]मन्न। [२२]॥ .. शुक्लतीर्थ तीर्थस्थीति [र]द्रो[व] व[ट]ो विषक्। सं २२८ व[म]चल्लि व[क]का[का]क्रिेकों।

14 [मन्त्रे प्रा*][व्यंचित] [विखंत *] [श्लेष्ट*]हर्ष [भुवीर] [वि*]बस्थाप्ति अव-[विखंत।] पूर्वं एक्षमाक्षम दलितं तु कृपिता [१*] परिशीतरा-स्वत राजमार्गित्वम्। [[१*] तद्नासू।

15 न न न न न न यथ[तु]र् ना। का*][स]के [स]द्रव्यत्व[व]य मूर्ति*[व]र्ग[व] निव- [दितं [१*] पूव[व]स्वं दिग्दो कह[स]न चतुरादेशिणिं। पुरूषदशशिपदा स्वर राजमार्गित्वान्नावय:। [[१*] दिम्बालो*] खा...।

16 [नभुविीया च] कुटिकापणा [।] [त*]विव [कुष्ठका*][रसं लेखा।] काव्यकाया [१*] उन[म*] मुखमाध्य पद्याज्ञानीविका [॥९] राधाच चक्राकाव्यम्।।

17 [भाष्य] प्रदात्वरः [प*]विल(श)कच तु चक्र[व]१० [२२] [म*] २३२ वन[श]र्षं। १२[मा*] किर्तनानि तथा स्वेता कामके बस्म(न)ग्या। यहींता पुरी: स्वरुऽ प्रदात[व]यन्यानीका | [[१*] देया कृष्णसमालाना।

18 पाठः पतिनित्य [समा।] चतु[सुं]ग[भै]। विष्णुच[सु]ष्यायस्मस्त[वरा।] [[१*] सं २५६ पीष शदि ६ तद्वर[मा]विनय्या लेखा स्थतोनामासिद्धाया। गद-हीला पुरी: स्वरुऽ प्रदाताचार्यनी।

1 A verse of the Anushkālā metre is almost wholly lost here.
2 Metre from here to the end (except for a hemistich in l. 23 below): Anushkālā.
3 Read काव्यम्.
4 The third figure of the date is illegible.
5 There is space for four aksas here and the last aksara looks like su, so the month may be Margaśīrṣa; or it may be Phāṣa if the name of the month formed part of the following verse.
6 The visarpa is omitted here in accordance with the Vṛttika on Pāṇini VIII, 3, 36.
7 The metre requires an additional aksara like shu to be supplied here.
8 Read भाषयिन्यः.
9 Read निवितानि: [१*] प्रति-.
10 Probably प्रतित्वम् is the intended reading.
11 The figure of the tāthā is illegible.
12 This is incorrect for चहया.
13 Read सन्तोमलयान्तः.
19 विका ॥ याँ वैदध कबी सुधित सम्पत्ति स्तन ॥ तैन तु ॥ देवश्रेष्ठकी मामन्तात्त्वम् प्रकटक सर्वदा ॥ धृतकं ॥ सम्भवं दूरका यावा गुरु ॥ सम्भवामानयामि च उन्नाटं झड़या- ।

20 दिल: ॥ श्रेष्ठ भूमिके ॥ श्रेष्ठ हि ॥ या लक्ष्मण विजय- । पदवाकोभुिा याक्ष वाहक विनाशकः ॥ यदि- । 

21 तीर्थाचयन ॥ नोऽविषु ॥ देवत सम्बन्धम् ॥ शाश्वमिति तत् ॥ सम्भवं दूरका यावा २०७ पश्चिमाच्याकाराय संप्रभूतिः ॥ कीठासः शिविन प्र- ।

22 देहन देवी ॥ श्याम काव्यन ॥ पुज वीभोजयते ये द्रव्यसभ्यासतिः ॥ प्रमाणार्थे तैन चासुधाकस्य सैनिकता ॥ तत- ।

23 ते शाश्वाच्यान ॥ देवी ॥ गोदिशेतिय तैन देवीः ॥ कोशाच्याकालयो यब्ज (मधुर संधिवर्धयम) नकालनं ॥ सुधासिद्धांतिपाठौ व्यायामी- ॥

24 श्याम ॥ गोदिशेतिय जनोभावक्येश्वरश्रेष्ठ ॥ [न्द्रा] देवी ॥ दिल: ॥

---

1 Read संस्कृत.  
2 One अक्षर is missing here. Read श्याम.  
3 What look like two असंवेदन on काव्य are probably due to faults in the stone.  
4 Some reading like भूमिकात्मिति is intended here.  
5 Read संस्कृत.  
6 The intended reading may be अभाष्यशान्तिनिः - The medial vowels of sa and yi can be marked on the back of the impression.  
7 This is only a hemistich. Metre: Mātrāsāmakas.  
8 See note 6, p. 335, above.
## INDEX.

By

M. Venkataramayya, M.A.

[The figures refer to pages: n. after a figure refers to footnotes and add. to additions. The following other abbreviations are also used: ca. = capital; ch. = chief; ci. = city; co. = country; com. = composer; C.P. = Copper-plate; crun. = chronicle; di. = district or division; do. = district; dy. = dynasty; E. = Eastern; engr. = engraver; ep. = epithet; f. = female; feud. = feudatory; gen. = general; hist. = historical; ins. = inscription; ins. = inscriptions; k. = king; l. = locality; lit. = literary; l.m. = land-measure; m. = male; min. = minister; mts. = mountain; myth. = mythic or mythological; n. = name; N. = Northern; off. = office or official; q. = queen; rel. = religious; ri. = river; S. = Southern; s.o. = same as; sur. = surname; t.d. = territorial division; te. = temple; tit. = title; v. = village; W. = Western; wk. = work.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a, initial</td>
<td>198 and n., 226-228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a, initial, its euphonic elision in Kushán Prákrit</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā, initial</td>
<td>130, 236, 253, 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā, medial</td>
<td>53, 77 n., 81 n., 82 n., 83 n., 84 n., 85 n., 88 n., 122 n., 146, 211, 253, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-soundings changed into ā, in Bengál</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akhyānu</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhimanyu, epic hero</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiramavallabha, Indra's elephant</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboogur, so.</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ábu, co.</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ábu ins. of V. S. 1287</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ábu ins. of V. S. 1342</td>
<td>61, 219 n., 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ábelum Fuzl, Muslim historian</td>
<td>64, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achala, m.</td>
<td>23 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackalakulóbhārāna, tit., of the Rāshtrakūta</td>
<td>23 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackalakulóbhātam, tit., of the Kádavāraya</td>
<td>23 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch. Maṇavāḷappuram,</td>
<td>23 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ākāraś, 90, 92, 103, 200, 240, 241, 244, 273, 277</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ākāraya-puruṣa,</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ākāya of Dharmo</td>
<td>154, 156, 159, 169, 171, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akshu, tax</td>
<td>298, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achut, Pallava off.</td>
<td>298, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achyutapuram Plates of Indravarman</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achyutapuñjākhyaśyayam, lit. wk.</td>
<td>286 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achyutarāya-Mahārāya, Vīṇapumārapu</td>
<td>283, 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and n., 287, 288 and n.</td>
<td>287 and n., 290 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adalja, l.</td>
<td>213 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādala Vār ānaś</td>
<td>213 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>197, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127, 128</td>
<td>16, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127, 128</td>
<td>294, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 n.</td>
<td>183 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127, 128</td>
<td>173 and n., 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>181, 182, 183 and n., 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>156, 157, 162, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>90, 93 and n., 99, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177, 178</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216, 220</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216, 219 and n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69, 128, 219</td>
<td>27 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 n., 304</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176, 123</td>
<td>273, 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215, 219 and n.</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 n., 220 n.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 n., 220 n.</td>
<td>24, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167, 170 and n.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 18, 19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312, 313</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220, 230</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298, 303</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372 and n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61, 304, 306 n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55, 265 and n., 266</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 and n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 and n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 and n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 and n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 n., 29, 35, 90, 98 n., 154, 285, 287, 289 n.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>INDEX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 n.</td>
<td>Alphabetas—cośfi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 n., 198</td>
<td>Gujarāti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Gupta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149, 253, 255</td>
<td>Gupta, Eastern variety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 and n., 238</td>
<td>Kannada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5 n., 6, 8, 9 n., 10, 104</td>
<td>Kṣarāthī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Kusāṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Mārāṭhī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57, 109</td>
<td>Nāgari.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122, 130, 287, 291, 304</td>
<td>Nāgari, (Central Indian variety).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Nail-headed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130, 140</td>
<td>Northern class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149, 180, 240, 329</td>
<td>Pallava-Grahntha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52, 138</td>
<td>Southern class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Tamil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Telugu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183, 184</td>
<td>Telugu-Kannada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 n.</td>
<td>Âlūr copper plates of Yuvarāja Mārāsimha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93, 92</td>
<td>Âlāra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Âlār Sraballādeva, dona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 and n.</td>
<td>Ânând, s. a. Âmârāpada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>anuvahā, 'minister'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>anûnta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 n.</td>
<td>Âmâralal, priest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55, 61</td>
<td>Âmârasimha-Rāṇa, Mōvâr k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63, 64, 69, 77, 81, 85</td>
<td>14, 256.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 and n., 258, 259, 279</td>
<td>Âmârâvatī, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Âmârâvatī ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Âmârâvatī tope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Âmārākha-trīṭha-nātha, Śrīva ascetic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Âmārāvama, s. a. Intra, god.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144, 145 and n.</td>
<td>Âmārāvama, off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273, 276, 281</td>
<td>omitya, off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Âmârâya-dharma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 and n.</td>
<td>Âmârâya, omiyā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310, 324</td>
<td>Âmârâya, Gahilaka k. of Mōvâr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63, 83</td>
<td>Âmâlka, goddess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126, 127, 128</td>
<td>Âmâlka, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Âmârâya or Âmâlka, s. a. Âmbila, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Âmârâya or Âmâlka, village goddess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273, 278</td>
<td>Âmârâya or Âmâlka, st. Â. Chāltika k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270, 271, 275</td>
<td>Âmârâya II, s. a. Âmârâya II, st. Â. Chāltika k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Âmârâya, Chāltika.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Âmârâya, Chāltika-Âmbilâvansânyâ, Sânântevâryâ, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Âmârâya II, Vījâyâlîya, st. Â. Chāltika k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 275, 276, 278</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 n.</td>
<td>Amōdā plates of Jājâlladēva II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105, 120</td>
<td>Amōdā plates of Prithvīdēva I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Amōdā plates (first set) of Prithvīdēva II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Amōdā plates (second set) of Prithvīdēva II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 n., 17</td>
<td>'Âmōgâkala'â, it. of the Bhuñjâ k., Vidyâ-dharâbhâṣâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 n.</td>
<td>Amrâoti, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258, 263</td>
<td>Amrâoti, st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Amrâprasàdâ, s. a. Amrâprasâdâ, Gahilaka k. of Mōvâr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>amrâtâ-kulâsâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>amrâtâ-kulâsâ, emblem on seal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 n.</td>
<td>Amrâtâvâra, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Ânâvâ, goddess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ânâ, suffix of proper names in Śaka language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197, 198</td>
<td>Ânāḍârâjâ, Prâkâshâ prince.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215, 223</td>
<td>Ânâpâhâpa-tanâ, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ânâimâna, Âmâ, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285 n., 287, 288 and n., 289</td>
<td>Anândanâthâ, gilt, and n., 290 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308, 322, 323</td>
<td>196, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Ânântâ, s. a. Sâhu, servant-lord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 n.</td>
<td>ananda-nâthâ, incorrect for Anândanâthâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234, 238</td>
<td>Ânânapâtâ, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ânânta-Âkâra, Mâlaka k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287 n.</td>
<td>Ânântâtâyanâgudî, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310, 324</td>
<td>Ânântârâvanâ, Gahilaka prince of Mōvâr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130, 131, 133, 135</td>
<td>136 and n., 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49, 51</td>
<td>Ânântârâvanâ, Kalâna k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198 n.</td>
<td>Ânântârâvanâ, Mâukhâri k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ânâpâyâ, Châlîa k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45, 222</td>
<td>Ânârâ, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ânâthâpa, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296, 297</td>
<td>anchor, emblem on seal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259 n.</td>
<td>Ânâkâ, Buddhist school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Ânâkâra-pârîpa, s. a. Sâva, god.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 44, 259 and n., 272, 273</td>
<td>Ânâdra, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 236, 238, 288 n.</td>
<td>Ânâdra, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 n.</td>
<td>Ânâdra, st. Ânâdra et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>äśīk-čârava-châda-vâjâya-vâsah-prâkâpa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Pallava ep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Angâ, st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ângâatarâ-Nâhatâ, Buddhist wk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 n.</td>
<td>Ânâhilwâra, Pattan, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Animals, et.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63, 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150, 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 and n, 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58, 59, 67, 84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311, 632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169, 172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194, 195, 196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 203, 204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79, 69, 84, 272, 277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64, 84, 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229, 230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 n, 189 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231, 232</td>
<td>Āvastikā, tit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td>Avasa, ci.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 n., 237</td>
<td>Avinīta, Gaṅga k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147, 148 and n.</td>
<td>aviruddha, 'free',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 and n., 204, 205, 206, 204</td>
<td>āyagaspata, 'tablet of homage',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71, 288 and a.</td>
<td>Ayana, solstice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130, 151, 152</td>
<td>[A]yaśodhita, Saillōdhava k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58, 65, 292</td>
<td>Ayodhyā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144, 145, 153, 302 n.</td>
<td>āyuktahas, off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ayyaṇa Arātāndar, author,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Ayyappadēva, Nāṇkina ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>ayyar, 'father',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206, 237</td>
<td>Āyavaran, s. a. Āryavarman, Gaṅga k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (Kharoṣṭhī), 52, 53, 57, 147</td>
<td>b, denoted by r,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102, 226</td>
<td>b, used for r,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57, 240, 304, 330</td>
<td>b and r, use of same sign for—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Basaurah, s. a. Baharji, tit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Bābh Bhaṭṭa alias Lakṣhmīnātha, poet and com.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64, 78, 93</td>
<td>Bābh Bhaṭṭa alias Lakṣhmīnātha (son of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Krishnabhaṭṭa, com.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bādakhandā, l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129, 180</td>
<td>Badakhmeni, estate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Bādapa, Adhirāja—E. Chāsukyā k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 n.</td>
<td>badā-purūṭita, ‘high priest’,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 and n., 148</td>
<td>Badariśārya, l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Badāyūni, Muslim historian,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Badigā Amoghavaharā III, Rāshtrakūṭa k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Badī-Prāṇa, gate at Udāipūr,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 n.</td>
<td>Bādakāhāh, tit. and legend on coins,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245, 246, 247, 248, 251, 252</td>
<td>Badvā, vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245, 246, 247, 252, 253</td>
<td>Badvā-yāpra inas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185 n.</td>
<td>Bāgopalle, vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64, 90 and n.</td>
<td>Bāl (Vīghāh, engr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Bāhgaśāhīna, prince of Mewār,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Bāghśāh-Tālāv, tank,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Bāghšīha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Bāglīn, Rajput state,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Bāglīn, Bāgālāna, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218, 219, 220</td>
<td>Bāglīna, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 n.</td>
<td>Bagumā plates of Dadda-Prasāntarāga,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Baharji, tit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Bahastimita, s. a. Brahāvātimita, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Bahmani, dy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Baigāmā inas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 n.</td>
<td>Bāi Harīr’s ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Bāi Harī’s well Arabic ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104, 110</td>
<td>Bājīnāth, ci.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 6 and n.</td>
<td>Bajaur, co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bala, Buddhist monk, 211
Bala, Manibharî ch., 232
Baladeva, Baladeva, Prince, 196, 197, 198, 200
Baladeva, epic hero, 222 n., 272, 277
Balagisvne ins., 105
Balâgâhi, di., 125
Balâkshita, commentary on Tâjînamâlāv-simrâti, 134 and n.
Balatimna, ch., 265
Balî, myth. k., 66, 69, 96, 294
Bâna, Sanakrit author, 151, 283, 284 and n.
Bâna, dy., 161, 183, 184, 185 and n., 186 and n., 187.
Bâna & n., 180, 199, 191, 188 & n., 190, 191, 188
Banabîra, Meru k., 59
Bânapara, Bâna ch., 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 192, 193
Banâsura, myth. k., 317 n.
Banavasi, vi., 250
Bâgavardhâra, Bâna k., 184, 186, 187, 188
Bânda plate of Chandela Madanavarmanmdâra, 229
Banîbhogar, vi., 226 n.
Bâpâ (Vâjûga, co.), 309, 324
Bâgâla, s. u. Bengal, co., 109, 111
Bâgarh Chartier, 43
Bâgarvâdaî Bâga ins., 189
Bâgarvâdaî ins. of the 24th year of Vijaya.
Narasimharavanvarman, 185
Bâgarvâdaî record of Mahâbali Bâparasa, 185
Bâuki, vi., 148
Bânumâri, state, 60, 313
Bâpâ, tit., 310
Bâpâtîla, di., 137, 141
Bâpâ, s. u. Bâpâ-Râval, Gubîla k. of Meru, 309, 322, 323, 324
Bâpâ-bhaṭṭâraka-prabhâkâra, tit., 141
Bâpâ-bhaṭṭâraka-prabhâkâra, Pallava ep., 302
Bâppârîya, dones, 53, 53
Bâpparivasnâna, family, 317
Bârâbar Hill cave ins. of Anantavarman, 198 n.
Bâraghâ, vi., 188
Bârcha (Vârchara) varantâ, 1. d., 50
Bârtha Copper-plate of Bhojâdeva, 262 n., 332
Bhârâval, vi., 196
Bârdâ, forti, 216 n.
Bârgion ins., 45
Bârîyâda, vi., 172
Bâroda, vi., 212
Bâroda, co., 221
Bâroda, ghat, 220 a.
Bâruda, ro., 216 n.
Bhâsinimârâd, vi., 183
Bhâgavata, ca., 124, 125
Bhâdri, state, 174
Bhâdrikâya Griyâvâsâtra, 247 n.
Bâkka, Brahâkura k., 331 n.
Bâyâna, co., 329 n.
bh., used for def., 282
Bâgudā, s. a. Baghāra, sur. of Mâhâdīd
Shâh, Sultan of Gujûrât, 216
Bâhâra, vi., 260, 303 and n.
Badelabera or Beliabora, estate, 46
Bânesâra, vi., 291, 292
Bânesâra plate of Karpa, 102 and n., 103, 123 n.
Bânerjîmâhâlîji plate, 236, 237
Bângal, 46, 48, 44 and n., 102, 108, 106 and n., 109 n.
111, 127, 129, 129 and n., 133, 143 n.
Bângal, North, 126
'Benî Ray', s. a. Jayasimha, ch. of Châmar
pâher, 217 n.
Berhampur, vi., 18
Bemagor, vi., 260
Bôta, Kapthikâ, K. Châlakura prince, 271
Betwa, s. a. Vârnavati, vi., 231
bô, 11, 253, 255, 296
Bhâdcadéva, ch., 146 n.
Bhâdcramagha, Mâhârâja — k. of Kaukânâth, 146, 253, 254, 256
Bhâdrapadâdi, 121
Bhâdrasam, 205
Bhâdrayâna, n., 203
bhâga, kind of income, 295, 293
Bhâgadaga or Bhâgadatta, Bâra k., 11 and n., 12,
17
Bhâgadatta, myth. k., 193
Bhâgadatta, Nalô k., 11, 12
bhâgârâhî, 127
bhâga-prânâgaîs, 'officers of the subsidiary
villages', 298 n.
Bhâgârâhî, 137
Bhâgâpur, di., 110
Bhâgavan-Nârâyaṇâ, god, 302 n.
Bhâgavat, s. a. god Vishnu, 55, 236, 238
Bhâgavat, s. a. the Buddha, 4, 7, 21, 22, 147
Bhâgavat, 138, 141, 195, 200, 204, 208, 210, 210, 217,
301, 302
Bhâgavata religion, 200
Bhâgavata temple at Môrâ, 199, 200, 210
Bhâgavataparâsa, 96, 222 n.
Bhâgavata-amrâgâya, 272
Bhâgavati, goddess, 332
Bhâgîkâ, off., 194
Bhâgîkâ, off., 134, 135, 137
Bhâgârâha, myth. hero, 73
Bhâgârâthi, s. a. the Gandes, vi., 264
Bhâgî, 303
Bhâgaya, 43
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| Białaśrāmi-Mahādvāsāhaka-mandala, t. i. | 230 |
| Białaśrāmi, v. | 227, 231, 232 |
| Białaśrāmī, vi. | 229, 230, 231 |
| Bhālinā, sūr-vadā | 231 |
| Bhamisājā, v. | 64, 66, 77 |
| Bhamikāmāra, m. | 109 |
| Bhandāgīkāra, v. | 294 |
| Bhanja, | 174 |
| Bhanā or Bhāṇā, m. | 64, 71, 83, 89 |
| Bhāndārā, v. | 11 |
| Bhandārī, v. | 128 |
| Bhangārā or Bhangārā, family of howards | 64, 71, 83, 89 |
| Bhāja, dy., 15 m., 16 and s., 17 and s., 18, 19 |
| 173, 174 |
| Bhūnavarāla, architecl | 61 n. |
| Bhāra, cl. | 11, 12, 13, 14 |
| Bhāradvāja, descendent from son of Bhāradvāja | 302 |
| Bhāradvāja, t. i. | 134, 142 |
| Bhāradvāja, m. | 231, 233 |
| Bhārabe-vās, v. | 196, 197 |
| Bhārā Mal (Bhār Mal), ch. of Idras | 80 |
| Bhārāsiva, cl. | 12, 13 and s., 14, 264 |
| Bhārata, smth. k. | 102, 111, 187 |
| Bhārata, epic | 37a. |
| Bhāratpur, State | 329 |
| Bhārtipata, Gahla k. | 308, 301, 324 |
| Bhāsakara-Bhāsaka, Brāhmana | 64, 76, 83, 79 |
| Bhāsakara-kaśṭra | 298 |
| Bhāsakara-varman, k. of Kāmarāja | 262 n., 283 |
| Bhaba, | 55, 134, 135, 137, 182, 183, 295, 296 |
| Bhatākara, Mātṛakā k. | 333 n. |
| Bhatākara, Mātṛakā, v. | 175, 330, 332, 334 |
| Bhāttā-kutta | 90, 95, 99, 100 |
| Bhāsapatra, v. | 56 |
| Bhāṣṭa-Somayajī, v. | 36 |
| Bhaua, dy. | 151 n. |
| Bhāva, sā. Śiva, god | 58, 59, 70, 115 |
| Bhāvanāga, Bhāvanāsī k. | 13 n., 264 |
| Bhāvānt, goddess | 65, 70, 72, 77, 84, 320 |
| Bhāvanāpatt, sā. Śiva, god | 232 |
| Bhāvanāvarman, Nala k. | 263 n. |
| Bhāvālī, m. | 16, 18, 19 |
| Bhāvīpīna, m. | 18 |
| Bhāvinaga, m. | 68 n. |
| Bhāvinagā, s. | 282 |
| Bhāroś-Ghāt ins of Ahaśpadāvī | 105, 116, 117, 311 |
| Bhārava-sūha | 250 |
| Bhībhī, v. | 231 |
| Bhūbhā, t. i. | 205 n. |
| Bhūmī, sā. Śiva, god | 69 |
| Bhūma, Chālukya k. of Gujarāt | 107 and n. |
| Bhūma, ch. of Idras | 50 |
| Bhūma, epic hero | 67, 69, 271, 277 |
| Bhūma, k. of Anakōhād | 107 |
| Bhūma II, s. a. Chālukya-Bhūma II, k. | 270 |
| Chālukya k. | 270 |
| Bhūma or Rāja-Bhūma, m. | 271, 272 and n., 277 |
| Bhūmadurka, fort | 325 |
| Bhūmakara, off | 59 |
| Bhūma Mahārāja, Vaidūrākha ch. | 191 |
| Bhūmasena, ch. | 146 and n. |
| Bhūmasena, Mahārāja, k. of Kauśambī | 254, 255, 256 and n. |
| Bhūmasena, Rājā Vaiśākha-putra, k. of Kaśābhōt | 256 and n. |
| Bhūmasingha, Mevar k. | 58, 66, 84 |
| Bhūmavinārman, Mahārāja, k. of Kauśambī | 146 |
| and n., 254 |
| Bhīshag, off | 294 |
| Bhīsna, s. | 154, 333, 335 |
| Bhūta, v. | 49 and n., 51, 52 |
| Bhūgāduṇā, v. | 154 |
| Bhūgarvarman, later Maukhārī k. | 284 |
| Bhūlapita, off | 134, 144, 145 |
| Bhūjā, k. | 134, 135, 137 |
| Bhūjā, off | 300, 324 |
| Bhūjā, Guhila prince of Mevar | 103, 107, and n., 306, 312 |
| Bhūjā, Paramāra k. | 105, 107, and n., 306, 312 |
| Bhūjā I, Pratihāra k. | 109, 107, and n., 322, 333 |
| Bhūjābhūpā, Guhila k. of Mevar | 306, 317, 321 n. |
| Bhūjādeva, ch. | 282 n. |
| Bhūjādeva, sā. Bhūjā I, Pratihāra k. | 332, 338 |
| Bhūjāsara, tsuk | 308, 317, 318 |
| Bhūjāsāmīdeva-vajagāti, v. | 308 |
| Bhūjāvarman, Chandella k. | 109 n. |
| Bhōnala, dy. | 122, 293 |
| Bhōnṣa Rāja of Nagpur | 122 |
| Bhōpāl plate of Arjunavarman | 220 |
| Bhōpāl plates of Harichand | 221 |
| Bhōpāl plate of Udayavarman | 227, 228, 229, 230 |
| Bhūrīguptā, sā. Paraśurāma, smth. hero | 268 |
| Bhūdhara, m. | 64, 71, 83, 89 |
| Bhūṣikha-patram, v. | 113 |
| Bhūṣkā, t. i. | 43, 46, 47, 100, 153, 261, 263, 294, 295 |
| Bhūluḍa, Mahārāja, k. | 52 |
| Bhānichchhīdāra-vaidūrākha-vyāsa | 263 |
| Bhāmā;yōpālā, s. a. Bhuvanāčhipā, f. | 93 n. |
| Bhūpēndravarman, E. Ganga k. of the | 133 |
| Śeṣṭaka branch | 64, 65, 77 |
| Bhūravājā, v. | 282 |
| Bhūṣikha, suffix of personal name | 93 and n. |
| Bhuvanāčhipā, f. | 58, 66, 84 |
| Bhuvanasiṃha, Mevar k. | 191 |
| Bhuvanātipīṭha, Vaidūrākha ch. | 315 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64 n.</td>
<td>45 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198 n.</td>
<td>111 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 n.</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245, 247</td>
<td>211, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 n., 107</td>
<td>6 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102, 103, 242</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198 n.</td>
<td>198 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 n.</td>
<td>102, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 and n.</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>298 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>150, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97, 176, 178, 193</td>
<td>150, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>211, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C**

<p>| Cambay, L. | 45 |
| Carnatic, co. | 123 |
| Carnatic Lowlands, co. | 124 |
| Casket, emblem on Darwinakura pillar | 256 |
| Catharina Elisabeth Dormieux, f. | 124 |
| Central-Asian Kharoshthi documents | 5 |
| Central-Asian Sarvastivadin manuscripts | 198 |
| Ceylon | 3, 39, 124, 125, 157, 158 n., 153, 258 |
| ch. | 53, 182 n., 212 n., 296 |
| cha, not distinguished from sr. | 226 |
| Chadnala ins. | 183 |
| Chambalana, s. a. Chauhan, clan of Raujps. | 217 n. |
| Chaitlyas, dy. | 105 |
| Chaitika, Buddhist school | 258 |
| Chaitrudi | 58, 61, 122 |
| Chaitypala, Buddhist school | 258 n. |
| Chaitypa, do. | 258 n. |
| Chakra | 98 n. |
| Chakro, ' discuss', emblem on boundary stones | 32 |
| Chakradhara, s. a. Vishnu | 57, 285 |
| Chakradharpur plates of Nettahbaṇḍa, s. a. | 32 |
| Dasapala grant | 17 |
| Chakrapani, s. a. god Vishnu | 55, 264, 295 |
| Chakravāja, myth. mo. | 112, 113 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chhatrasagar, s. v. Dakshina Kosa, co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhatramgaha, off.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhaya, the consort of the sun,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhaya, q. f. Raja Dinakara, k. of Memor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhota Udepur, state,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicasco, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chincalo plates of Nanda-Prabha Johnson,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chidambaram, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikambari, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikati, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikati, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikiti, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikka Venkatadri, Vijayanagara prince, 285, 289,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikka Venkatadri-Udayar, s. a. Venkatadri,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijayanagara prince,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikkalur plates,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimeji Lamania Khandoji, Bhonsla prince of Nagoor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Chevappa Nayaka, governor of Tanjore,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China-Godavaram, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinaka, co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinam, co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China-Tirumalakaya, s. a. Salakam China Tirumalakaya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Venkatadri, s. a. Chikka Venkatadri,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijayanagara prince,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Turkestan, co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chingleput, di.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinnamangai, ins. of Gotambigala, siri-Yaiga Satakarla,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinnaka Krishnapuram, s. a. Koele Saravala Navegar, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintamani, celestial tree of gifts,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintamani, di.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippilli, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitor, ci. and fort, 59, 60, 64 and n., 65, 305, 306, 307, 308, 311, 313, 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitor ins. of V. S. 1331,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chirakkalam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirakkuta, s. q. Chitor, ci. and fort, 69, 70, 72 and n., 77, 88, 307, 313, 319, 320, 325, 326, 327, 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitravarna, Vishnu sasanga, s. q. Chitor, ci. and fort, 261, 262, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittor, di.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choda, co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choda or Chodasimha, k. of Memor,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chodas, dy., 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 35, 38, 96, 108 and n., 109, 106 and n., 138 n., 157, 158 and n., 159, 160 and n., 161, 162, 163, 165, 190 and n., 191, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chodas, dy., 183, 184, 185 and n., 186 and n., 187, 188, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chola, k. of the Chola co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chola-Karnata, Chola ch.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholapatil, tit.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chola-vijaya-sahapam-chakravy, tit. of Hoyala k. Vira Somanatha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholagam, co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholavajju, fiscal term,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholap, s. a. Cholap, dy.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholavud Ins. of Malladewa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholamandal kings of Ginzur, dy.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chola-sangha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choladalu, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholagala, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churakatt, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churakatt of Vują-vishnu-gopavara,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churilu, s. a. Bruli,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintukulamandla Satakari, Andhra-chitya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissary Pieter Keller, Dutch engineer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commander, di.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conqueror, s. a. the Buddha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conqueror, s. a. the Buddha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conta, s. a. Kaoti, vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coromandel,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal, off.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupid,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>246, 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227, 221, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176, 178, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176, 178, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days, lunar:---contd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th (full-moon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark fortnight:---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th (new-moon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of the month:---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of the reign:---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of the seasons:---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd fortnight:---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th fortnight:---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th fortnight:---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd month (?)---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of the week:---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of the Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deacon (Dekan), Ile—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi, ci.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi Emperors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Noyes, s. a. Pieter De Noyes, Dutch officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dengapoli, l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deö-Baraṇyak ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deol plates of Krishna III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deotek ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deotek ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśa, synonymous with ṣeṣa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśa, Dutch lit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deulā-Pedi, hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśabhāga, incorrect for Deśabhāga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśabhāga,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśabhāgakala,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśadā, vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśadā, s. a. Deśadā, vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśadā, 154, 156, 166, 167, 168, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśadvī, vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśapāla, temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśapūpa, s. a. Chandragupta II, Gupta k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśapūpa of Malvā, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśananda, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavāpas, Paramāra k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavāpas, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavāpas, Kushān tit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavātras, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavāsī, Gōma k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavāsī, s. a. Indra, god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavāśy II, Vijayasagar k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavāśy, assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavāyana, dones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavarman, Śālikāya k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśendavarman, E. Gupta k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśavād Bari, State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dā, 53, 130, 135 n., 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dā, 43 and n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dhāmādhāra, s. a. Dharmachakra-dhāra, 237, 259**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dharmārāja, tit. of Maurya k. Aśoka,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dharmārama, 'royal court',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dharmāśāstra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dharmasthāna, 'place of religious worship',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dharmasthānān, 'temple',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmānūhu, s. a. Yudhishthira, epic hero,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmānura,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmavarma's wall,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhūrma, Yuvamahārāja, tit.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhūrni,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhūrnaśākara,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhūrnavasāmin, dones,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhūrnavātstra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhātā, s. a. Brahmap, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhāvalapātā plate of Umatavarman,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhavālayaras, ch.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhēnukakāta, eii,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhūnīhōra, cii,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhūritipura, Bhaṣaja ca.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīgavahāras, Jain sect,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīgabhājīdeva, Bhaṣaja k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dīg-gojara,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dighi, s. a. Dīghadhastra, eii,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dighwa-Dubauli ma,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dīgviṣaya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīlī, s. a. Delhi, ca,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinājpur, dī,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinakara-charaṃaurecchāna, ep. of Early Gurnaja k. Dudda Praśāntarāga,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Dinakara-kiraṃaurecchāna' ep. of Early Gurnaja k. Raapagraha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinakara-Rānā, Mevar k,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipānasūtra, Ceylonese chron,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diphthongs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diphthongs, (in Nāgari) represented by śīra-mātrās,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diphthongs, medii—(in Nāgari),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīghadhastra, eii,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirghārūdy-akṣa, image of god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dīkṣa, weapon of god Vishnu,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divākaraśena, Yuvārajā—Pākāṭaka prince,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divāli, festival,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divaśati, s. a. Indra, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional assemblies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīgārāyaṇa-marāyana, wk,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīvārāsiri, 'Ājvāras and Achāryas',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīvāśārāciṁita, hagiological wk,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīvārcudāna, Buddhist wk,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doab,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dōchayya, Muṣhamañ—m,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dog, emblem on seal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dohad, fort, 212, 213 and n., 218, 219 and n., 220 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dona, s. a. drōṇa, 'reliquary or casket',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donatā,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dopa-measure, measure of capacity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dōṅgaka, variety of resin of aloes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dōṅgaka, vi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dōṅgārāma, s. a. Dōṅgaka, vi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormieux, Dutch family of French origin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormieux, s. a. Philippus Jacobus Dormieux,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch officer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūrva, 'pond',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draupadi, epic princess,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dravidā, cii,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drōṇa, 'vessel or measure of capacity',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drōṅārīya, dones,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug, vi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum, epic k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāva,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūdheśvara Mahādēva, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūdhipurangāra, s. a. Dūdhipadra, ci,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūdā plates,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūggara, gen.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūṅgarṣpur, cii and state,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūṅgarṣi, min. of Rājā Patāl of Chāmpāner,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūṅga, s. a. Pārvati, goddess,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūṅgādēva, engr,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūṅga-Sarasvati, goddess,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūṅgālarman, m.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūṅga festival,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durvinīta, Gān̄ga k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durvinīta, sur. of Yuvarajā Mārasinha, W.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dushita,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūta or dūtaka, off,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutreuil de Rhins Ms,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīvāsadārāsi, 'the twelve signs of the Zodiac',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvāpara-Yuga,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvārakā, ci,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvārakā, co,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvāravatī, ci,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvedā, form of Dvēcāda,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvedāgāmapuram, ci,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvedāya, form of Dvēcāda,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvedāya-Vīrādasārman, m,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dveja, 'Brāhma',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dieja-guru-vīrādasārmanab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvedēda, sit,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvivēcā, ep,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvārkā, s. a. Dvārakā, ci,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 n., 233, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 10, 119, 120, 227, 232, 288 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 and n., 74, 117, 288 and n., 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91, 94, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321, 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61, 66, 70, 72, 77, 78, 81, 82, 84, 85, 304, 305, 306, 313, 314, 315, 317, 318, 322, 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, 24 n., 25, 26 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, 24 n., 25, 26 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, 24 n., 25, 26 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 (odd.), 163, 169, 171, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chedi, 108 (odd.). 116, 117, 118 and n., 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 255, 256, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian, 48, 246, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganga, 39, 49 and n., 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dholaka, 132, 181 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptas, 21, 117, 120, 140, 151, 198 n., 235, 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsha, 151, 330, 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hira, 60, 212, 225 n., 329 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 n., 220, 221 n., 222 n., 237 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258, 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11, 24, 253, 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307, 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287 n., 288, 290 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgājā, ca.</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>149, 151</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>175 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>19 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>63, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>231, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>233 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>45 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>90, 99, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>91, 92, 93 n, 94, 95, 99, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>92, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>44, 45, 128, 151, 309, 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>203, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>203, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>65, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>167, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>27, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>41 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāgānā, ca.</td>
<td>214 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ghiyās-ud-dīn, ‘the Aid of the Faith’, 216
Ghiyāth-ud-Dīn Bālān, Sulṭān, 319 n.
Ghūsh, surnāme, 128
Ghūshītārāma, l., 147
Ghūshīvā Buddhist ins., 240 n.
Ghotāia plates of Prithvīvāla II, 118 n.
Gīntia, co., 98 and n.
Gīntia ins. of Bhāmasena, 146, 254
Gīvārāṇā-Māhātma, w., 222 n.
Girijā, s. o. Pārvatī, goddess, 88, 314
Girijāpāti, s. o. Sāva, god, 320
Girinagara, co., 221, 222
Girirājanāya, s. o. Pārvatī, goddess, 275
Girnāl, s. o. Girnar, co., 221 n.
Girnar, mo., 216, 217, 221, 222 and n.
Gīrma Rock-edict of Aśoka, 11
Girvā, di., 65
Gos, ci., 143, 145
Gōdvārī, di., 50, 186 n.
Gōdvārī plates of Prithvīvāla, 170 n.
Gōdrā, di., 218 and n. 221
Gōharwā plates of Kārādēva, 101, 102 and n.
103, 105, 111 n., 112 n., 113 n., 118 n.
Gōkārpaṇāvara, 181, 182
Gōkārpaṇāvara-bhaṣṭṭāraka, s. o. Sāva, god, 134, 136
and n.
Gokul, vi., 329
gōkuladhikari, off., 284
gō-pēta, ‘offered battle’, 192
Gōlakagāra, 225
Gōlāvāmin, dones., 150, 153
golden-horse, kind of gift, 62, 80
Gōlā, m., 231, 233
Gōṅkāvāyā, patronymic, 144
Gōṁīṣas, dy., 143, 144, 145
Gōṅḍārya, dones., 53, 55
Gondopheres, Indā-Parthian k., 4
Gonti, s. o. Kunti, f., 193
Gooty, di., 185, 238
Gōpāchanḍra, Mahārajādhirāja — 127
gōpā, ‘watchman’, witness, 31 n.
Gōpāla I, Pāla k., 45
Gōpālaḍēva II, do., 44, 45
Gōpalpur, vi., 21 n.
Gōpārāya of Gīntia, c., 95 and n.
Gōpābhālabhpur, vi., 46
Gō-prāchāra, ‘pasture-land for cows’, 144, 145
gōpurā, 92, 96, 98 and n., 98
gōṣṭhara, gift, 80 and n., 282
gōṣṭhā, 159
gōṣṭhī, ‘committee’, 33
Gōṣṭhīkās, ‘Members of the Managing Committee’, 331, 332, 333, 336

Pānchālay-dān, ‘Convener of the pani-
shat’ off., 33
Gotamputa siri-Yaśa Sātakani, Andhra-
k., 280
Gōti, s. o. Gauḍī, meteronymic, 203, 204
Gōlāputra, m., 203, 204
Gōtiputra, meteronymic of Pāthīvākaka,
Gōrāpravara-bhādākāndānā, w., 135 n.
gōtra: —
Adāvā, 231, 233
Ātriya (Ātri), 40, 51 and n., 52
Bhāradrāva, 36, 109, 144, 145, 231, 233, 235,
239, 298, 302
Gautama, 173, 175, 231, 233, 298, 303
Grīvāya, 271, 272 and n., 276
Harita, 36
Kāṇāvāyana, 235, 236, 238
Kāyapa, 36, 92, 97, 138, 142, 231,
232, 233, 261, 265, 266
Kūnḍiāya, 232, 233
Krīṣṇāṭrāya, 231, 233
Māṇivya, 274
Parśara, 181 and n., 182, 183
Sādārya, 110 and n., 231, 232, 233
Sāṅkṛitya, 231, 233
Saunaka, 231, 233
Vājī-Kauśikā, 53, 55
Vatas, 36, 130, 135 and n., 137, 235, 239
and n., 293, 295
Vaiśnavida, 16, 19
Vaiśnavītra, 293, 295
Vēṛānanda, m., 279
vēṛānava, s. o. vēṛalabha, off., 279
vēṛalabha, off., 279
Gōvārdhan, vi., 194
Gōvārīya, dones., 53, 55
Gōvinda, engr., 108 n.
Gōvinda (II), Prabhūtavara, Rādhākṛīṣā,
188 n.
Gōvinda III, Rādhākṛīṣā k., 187 n.
Gōvindaheunda, Gōdāvāra k. of
Kauṇā, 292, 294
Gōvindaheunda, k. of Vāyuṣṭi-dālā, 105-6
Gōvindadeva, kom., 130, 136, 137
Gōvindavāmin, dones., 144, 145
Grahavarman, Maukharī k., 283, 284 and n.
gréka, incorrect for grēka, ‘hamlet’,
298, 302
gréka, ‘village assembly’, 33
gréka-kṛśīka, ‘traitor to the village’, 34, 35
gréka-kṛśī, 35, 40, 41-2
gréka-kṛśī-para, m., 40
Gṛihānam ins., 190
Gṛihānapati, off., 134, 135, 137
Gṛihānam, ‘lord of villages’, off., 9, 10
Gṛihāyaka, 144 n., 292 n.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144 n</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 n</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298, 305 and n.</td>
<td>123 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144, 145</td>
<td>109 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>93 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 and n. 147</td>
<td>231, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253, 254</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 n</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64, 89</td>
<td>146 (Gupta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150, 153</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308, 309, 323</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 19</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308, 309, 323</td>
<td>123 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308, 309, 323, 324</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308, 321 n.</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308, 323</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254, 256</td>
<td>123 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>77, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 n</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270, 273, 274</td>
<td>292, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 n., 334</td>
<td>311, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>287 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49, 50, 51</td>
<td>318, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>283, 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137, 140, 250, 273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146, 198, 222 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246, 250, 250, 283 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68, 102, 103, 107, 111, 113, 116</td>
<td>67, 78, 79, 80, 152, 173, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176, 219, 222</td>
<td>318, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178, 177, 178</td>
<td>283, 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>87, 88, 89, 232, 238 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H**

<p>| h, looped form, in Gupta alphabet | 102, 130, 253, 255 |
| h, substitution of guttural nasal for anusvāra before | 146 |
| ha, | 146 (Gupta) |
| Haasner, s. a. Jacob Haasner, Dutch author | 125 |
| Haarlem, ei | 125 |
| Hāhayā, dy. | 103 n., 123 n., 241 n., 273 |
| Hāhayās of Rāipūr, dy. | 125 n. |
| Hāhayā, myth. k. | 102, 111 |
| Hāhayā, tribe | 116 |
| Hāhayāchakrāvartin, s. a. Kārtavīryārjuna, myth. k. | 111 |
| Hājapūr, s. a. Hasanpur, vi. | 146 |
| Hājī Sultānī, Imād-ul-Mulk under Mahmūd Begarhā | 219 |
| hala, l. m. | 64 and n., 77, 302 |
| hala | 302 |
| Hākūyāda, Sanskrit author | 108 n. |
| Hākhūdhi, place of battle | 60 |
| hālī, l. m. | 336 |
| Hali, s. a. Balarāma, epic hero | 86 |
| Halol gato | 213 n. |
| Hamūgha | 279 |
| Hamnira or Hamnira-Rāṇgh, Mewār k. | 58, 59, 67, 84, 307 |
| Hamnīra, s. a. Khurshād Malik Taq-ud-Daulah, Vānsal k. | 292, 294 |
| Hamnīra, legend on coins of Muhammad bin Sām | 292 |
| Hamnīra, tit | 293 |
| Hāmpī, vi. | 285 n., 286, 287 n., 288 |
| Hāmspāla, r. of Mewār | 311, 325 |
| Handalī, vi. | 287 n. |
| Harā, s. a. Śiva, god | 67, 78, 79, 80, 152, 173, 174 |
| Harākā ins. | 318, 319 |
| Hari, s. a. Vaiśnav, god | 283, 284 |
| Hari, s. a. Vaiśnav, god | 66, 68, 71, 74, 81 |
| Hari, <em>form of Ari</em> | 247 |
| Hari, <em>the sun</em> | 86 |
| Haribrahmdeva, <em>Hathaya-Kalachari k.</em> | 123 n |
| Harichandradvaya, <em>Mahakumara</em> - | | |
| Paramara ch. | 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 234 |
| Harilhar, <em>et</em> | 287 n |
| Harisarma, <em>m</em> | 173, 175 |
| Haricheandra, <em>Brahmana, ancestor of the</em> | 332 |
| Prajñāvaras | | |
| Haricheandra, <em>myth. k.</em> | 276 |
| Haricheandra, <em>Paramara ch.</em> | 227, 228, 229 |
| Haritita, <em>sage</em> | 315 |
| Haritdarāja, <em>Drākṣana sage</em> | 307, 308, 317, 322, 323 |
| Haritit, <em>sage</em> | 274 |
| Haritiputa, <em>Vishvakarma Chutukulānaṃkanda</em> | 250 |
| Sātakampī, <em>Chauta k.</em> | 13 and n |
| Hariprasāda, <em>lit. wk.</em> | 197 |
| Harivinayaka, <em>Jaina wk.</em> | 197 |
| Harivarman, <em>Ganap,</em> | 236, 237 |
| Harivarman, <em>Mukhari k.</em> | 283, 284, 285 |
| Haranada ins. of Dēvapala | 230 and n |
| Harsha, <em>Paramēvarā, k. of Kanauj</em> | 108, 179, 283 and n, 284 |
| Harshacharita, <em>wk.</em> | 151, 233 and n, 284 n |
| Harshagupta, <em>later Gajra k.</em> | 284 |
| Harshagupta-Butṣṭakaka, <em>Mukhari q.</em> | 285 |
| Haanapura, <em>et</em> | 146 |
| Hastikapūrī ins. of V. S. 1053 | 312 |
| Hastin, <em>Mukhari ch.</em> | 252, 253 |
| Hastimahāyata | 207 |
| Hastivarman, <em>K. Ganap,</em> | 50 |
| Hathoe ins. of Māhāra chief Thēpaka | 221 n |
| Hathigumpha ins. of Khāresvēla | 49 n |
| Helliokosins ins. at Bemagar | 200 |
| Hēmchandra, <em>author</em> | 167, 197, 213 n, 221 n, 224 n |
| Hēmchandrastra-prīcabanāhā, <em>wk.</em> | 213 n |
| Hēmndīri, <em>author</em> | 288, 290 n |
| Hēmāntta, <em>et</em> | 211, 212 |
| Hēmāntamās, <em>sage</em> | 207 |
| Hēṃvākamātanvya-Vishaya, <em>t. d.</em> | 181, 182, 183 |
| Hījījali, <em>t. d.</em> | 174 |
| hill, <em>coin-symbol</em> | 6 |
| Himāchala (Himāgiri, Himālaya, Himavan), <em>etc.</em> | 98, 109, 112, 113, 127 |
| Hīndī | 197 |
| Hindu, <em>et</em> | 117, 118, 134 n, 200, 208, 209, 210, 213 n, 217, 218, 220, 222 n, 244, 250, 273, 283 n, 329 and n |
| Hindupur, <em>et</em> | 234, 237 |
| Hindupur record | 187 |
| Hindu Trinity | 82 |
| Hīra-ye | 233 |
| Hīranyagariha, <em>gift</em> | 282 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ina, s. a. the sun, god</td>
<td>88, 305, 316 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Greek coins</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Parthian, dy.,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Parthian coin types,</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indore plates of Pravaraśaṇa II,</td>
<td>249 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra, god</td>
<td>144, 170 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306, 313, 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrabhātākā, E. Chālukya k.</td>
<td>269, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrabhātākā, Maukheri g.,</td>
<td>283, 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indrājala</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indraprastha, s. a. Delhi, ci.</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrasāgara, tanks</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrānāma, co.</td>
<td>292, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indravāmin, dōn,</td>
<td>144, 145 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra-tirtha-Bhōjasara, tank</td>
<td>306, 317, 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrāvarṇamāla, E. Gaṅga k.</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrāvarman, E. Chālukya k</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrāvarman, E. Gaṅga k.</td>
<td>48, 181, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrāvarman, E. Gaṅga k. of the Sētaka branch</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrāvarman, Mahārāja——, E. Gaṅga k. of the Sētaka branch</td>
<td>133 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrāvarman, (son of Prithiviāvarman), E. Gaṅga k. of the Sētaka branch</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrāvarman, Kālanga k.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrāvarman, Vishnuvaśāditra k.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingollār-nāḍu, t. d.</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipiṭkā plates of Vishnuvaśādhana III</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iriṣṭi-mahāpatra</td>
<td>141, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śūgaṇī, ‘tax-free’</td>
<td>27, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iriṣṭi-vihāta, s. a. Rājasvīvihāta, s. of land measuring rod</td>
<td>99 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Iramakālam-ojutta’, tit.</td>
<td>97 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iramakālam-ojutta Abhāya, pāvālāśa, runed of Śrīraṁgam te.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Iramakālam-ojutta-Perumāl’, tit.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iramakālam-ojutta-Perumāl alias Kūḍal</td>
<td>90, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttamam-ambalai, temple off.</td>
<td>90, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iramakālam-ojutta Perumāl Kūḍal Chakravālañambal alias Uttamanambalai, trustees of Śrīraṁgam te.</td>
<td>99, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫrā, vi.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫrā plate</td>
<td>46 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫrāyā-Mahārāja, Vairāma ch.</td>
<td>191 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫrāyā, Nalakā, Nalakā ch.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫrāvāga, kind of crop</td>
<td>154, 188, 189, 171, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫām, s. a. Śiva, god</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫāmavāman, Maukheri k.</td>
<td>283, 284, 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫānūr, vi.</td>
<td>245, 246, 247, 248, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫānūr-Fāga ina.</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫyana-mān,</td>
<td>272 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫyava-varman, Maukheri k.</td>
<td>222 n., 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>233, 235, 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫy, palatal, used for dental d; in early Prākrit.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫy, misspelt as jā</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫānabha, W. Gaṅga princess</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫalpur plates</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫacob Haastor, Dutch author</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫacob Pieter De Nays, Dutch officer</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫagamandira, palace at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫagamāthāra, te.</td>
<td>76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 85, 88, 89 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫagamāthāra, te., 77, 79, 80, 84, 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫagat (Drākā), co.</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫagatunna Finselēti</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫagatunna-Rākha, Manōr k.</td>
<td>57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74 and n.</td>
<td>75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 89 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫagatunna-Rākha, Manōr k.</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫagatunna, s. a. Gaṅge, vi.</td>
<td>357 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫagayyaspāta, vi.</td>
<td>357 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫagayyaspāta Prākrit ins. of Ichākku k.</td>
<td>357 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīvira Purisadatta</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāghir</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāghīrār, off.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jā ṭūra</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāhān Panāḥ, fort</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāhānāvāya-kula</td>
<td>235, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāhānari, s. a. Gaṅge, vi.</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāhānānēya, s. a. Gaṅge, vi.</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāhāna, sect.</td>
<td>154, 171, 190, 197, 209, 268, 269, 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāhāna, sect.</td>
<td>272, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāṁ Sūpa at Mathurā</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jālpur, state</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāltrasinna, s. a. Jayasimha, k. of Manōr</td>
<td>313, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jātagi, Viḍāna k.</td>
<td>123 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jājilalādēva II, k.</td>
<td>118 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jājilāpā Charier of Gōpālādēva II</td>
<td>44, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāsna, Beḍāmāva</td>
<td>331, 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jālor, ci.</td>
<td>221, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jālu, Beḍāmāva</td>
<td>116 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jām,</td>
<td>91, 93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāmā,</td>
<td>282 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jāmāwāram, vi.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāmī Masjīd</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānavaṭhā Kaṭheṭikarayāṇa alias Eṣṭāmōgaṇa, Kāḍavārāya ch.</td>
<td>24, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānapada, off.</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānārada, s. a. Viṣṇu, god</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāngai, vi.</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāngāyika, vi.</td>
<td>126, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jārādā, s. a. Jurādā, vi.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jārāsāndhā, epīk</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāskaṇa, Manōr k.</td>
<td>58, 66, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānaṭā</td>
<td>147 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jātavarman, ch.</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayavarman, Bōnaka —, E. Gāngā k. of the Gāndhāra branch, 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāwar, vi., 63, 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobubhatāti, m., 282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jēhūngir, Mughal emperor, 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jētavāna, 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeyopore, state, 151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jēyasingh, s. a. Jayasimha, ch. of Chāmpānēr, 217 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhārapāta insa, 227, 329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhūnāl, ci., 242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinniharākota, fort, 223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jōhānpurī, 144, 238, 268, 304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinā, Lord —, 271, 277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinā-bhāvana, 'Jina temple', 272, 277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinādāśa, 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinā-nigama, 273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinēśa, Jina author, 197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jirinjī plates of the Eastern Gāndhāra k. Indra- varman, 48, 49 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīrā, fort, 210, 228, 228, 233 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīrā, s. a. Jñāgar, fort, 210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīrankhu, s. n. Arjuna, epic hero, 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīrōpuṭa, 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīyamāhdiṭa, Kāśavārīya ch., 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīyamāhdiṭa, s. a. Kōppṇpiṭa, I., Kāśavārīya ch., 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīyā, dī, 144, 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jā, in Adāka Kharēṭhē, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnes Spīts, Dutch officer, 124, 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jōdhpur insa, of Praśīhā Bāuka, 331 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jōgēvāra, m., 244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jōṅgaka, 127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumbulpore Kottāi plates of Jayaśimha, 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliwar, co., 231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumna, rī, 253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumāgar, or Joonagar, fort, 216, 221, 222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junnar, vi., 280, 282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter, planet, 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter, Twelve-year Cycle of, 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurādā, vi., 16, 18, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyēkha-Kāyakā, off., 128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyōtishkūdi, vi., 98 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**K**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23, 43 and n., 130, 201, 246, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabul, ri., 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāchāra, sage, 108, 109 and n., 110, 113, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāshāvīa, Śāiva acetic, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaksi, s. a. Conjeeveram, et., 23, 33, 41, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāsūṭā, vi., 293 and n., 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāsūṭā, off., 91, 94 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādīnī, dī, 139, 140, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādīnī, kind of tree, 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādīnī-baguh-śālīvasī, Śāiva acetic, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadamhavana, e. a. Kaman, ci...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadham, co...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādaya or Kādayara, dy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādayara, Kādayara, ch...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādevetali, Nalamba gen...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādevetattal alias Udaiyar-perumāli, ch...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāhā, musical instrument...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahaun pillar ins. of the reign of Skandagupta...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahla plates of Sūdhādeva...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalāka...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānakara...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairā plates of Kalachuri year 380...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairā plates of Kalachuri year 383...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaliberka, 'fisherman', witness...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakkuka, Brahman...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kākumāharman, Kākumahā k...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kali...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kali, m...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kala, abo. of Kākalaja, off...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kala, a. a. Kākalaha, lit...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālabhūja, Gahā k. of Mān...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalachuri, dy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalachuri, dy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalachuri, dy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalachuri, dy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalachuri, dy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalachuri of Raipūr, dy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalachuri of Ratanpur, dy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalachuri of Tripuri, dy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalākara...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalákṣuti record of Nalambadiyur...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalākṣuti...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalām...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalām, measure of capacity...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kālam, 'trumpet'...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kālī...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kālī, emblem on seal...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalavāla...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāla-pālah, Kāla-pālah, Kālapal...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāla-pālah, s. a. Kāla-pālah, off...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāla-pālah, s. a. Kāla-pālah, off...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāla-pālah, s. a. Kāla-pālah...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpana...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kali, opa...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālīcāsa...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpātra-strā, s. a. Bhima-Mahārāja...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaidhuntha ch...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālika, te...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinaga, co...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinaga, co...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinaga, co...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinaga, dy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinaga, k. of the Kalinaga co...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinagadhipati, tit...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinagamagara, co...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinagapatam, ci...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184, 192, 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54, 264, 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103, 105, 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 n., 254, 255, 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53, 55, 249 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331, 332, 335, 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257, 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306, 301 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 n., 91, 92 and n., 96 and n., 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramavīd, ep.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krauschechchhi, s. a. Kumāra, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishna, s. a. Krishnavatta, Brāhmaṇa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishna, s. a. Vīṣṇu, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209, 222 n., 244, 318 n., 326-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 35, 102, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77, 78, 83, 89, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubhā-ganṭra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubhābha, s. a. Agastya, supe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumuda, n. of elephant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupālāhū, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kundakunda Āchārya, Jainu teacher, kundām,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kundarāja, Chālukya prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunḍavijaya-gupta, tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kundaswe, W. Gaṇa princess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kundérā, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupāsvarā, tel. ins. of V. S. 718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuñja, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kutasā, <em>one who wields the spear</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntala, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntala, k. of Kuntala co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunti, q. of the epic K. Pāṇḍu,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunvarpadōśi-ki-chhatri, building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kipā-dorikāku, <em>water diviners</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kipā-dorikāku, <em>inspector of wells</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūra, vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāra-Nārāyaṇa Jiya, s. a. Sriranga-Nārāyaṇa Jiya, author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kākattālar, saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūrma-puṇa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurram Vase inas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūrāme, <em>kurate</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūrakhibāra, in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kṛṣṇa, <em>measure of capacity</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūshān, Kūshāng, dy.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūshān ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūshān ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūshāna, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūsika, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutāla, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutub-ud-din (Qutb-ud-din Ahmad Shāh), Sultan of Gujarāth,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūtumbhā,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L**

1, | 53 (Central-Indian Box-headed), 130, 146, 149, 246, 255, 281 |
1, | subscripts, in *box-headed* Central Indian script, 56 a. |
1, | in Telugu-Kannada, 184 |
1, | in Tamil, 297 |
1, | in Persian, 99 a. |
1, | changing to 8. | 273 |
1, | Lād improve, in. | 293 a. |
1, | in Persian, 293 |
1, | 213 a. |

**Languages:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>107 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindī</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayalam</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mewār dialect</td>
<td>118 a, 122, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed dialect (Prākrit and Sanskrit)</td>
<td>57, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriya</td>
<td>211, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahlī</td>
<td>3, 4, 9 a. 21 a. 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakrit and Sanskrit</td>
<td>172, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>61, 322 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>61, 322 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>147 a, 253 and n. 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

languages — contd.
Prākrit. 2, 3 (Āśokan), 5, 9 (Kushān)
and n., 11, 12, 14 n. (Pallava), 139, 141, 143,
144, 146, 196 (Jaina), 198, 203, 206, 211, 235,
256, 258, 261, 267, 272, 279, 290, 281, 282,
297, 298 n., 303 n.
Śaka. 206
Sanskrit. 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 14 and n.,
21 n., 30, 34, 39, 41, 48, 53, 57, 90, 91, 92,
93 n., 97, 98 and n., 102, 106, 109 n., 130, 131,
138, 143, 146, 149, 154, 172, 180, 196, 199,
202, 209, 211, 212, 213 and n., 215, 226, 235,
240, 244, 245, 246, 251 n., 252, 257, 258, 261,
263, 268, 270, 272, 279, 280, 282, 285, 256,
287, 288, 289 n., 290, 291, 304, 329, 330
Sarasvati.
Tamil.
Telugu.
(aarchic) and n., 235, 238 n., 263 (aarchic)
272 n., 286, 297, 298 n., 309
Lāṭjīl, vi. 163, 317
Lāmakā, s. a. Ceylon,
 learns passatt, Dutch off. 125
Lāṭa, ca. 263
Lāṭa, vi. 263
Lāṭvinīḍa, Rāṇa of Mewār,
 its akauru, salt-mines. 308 and n., 323
Leiden plates, the Larger — 31, 32, 38
Lēkhītā, s. a. lēkaka, 140 n.
Lēkktīrī, 261
li, used for the vowel li, 261
li, vowel, substituted by li, 261
Librecht Hooreman, Dutch governor of
Coromandel, lieutenant-governor, Dutch off. 124
Līṅga-parīna, 124, 125
Līṅgāyata, rel. sect. 13
lion, emblem on seal. 17, 172, 297
lōka-charma-kāra, metal and leather
workers. 298, 303
Lōkāṁbha, Hālaya princess and q. of E. 275
Lōkāṇaka, s. Rāja-Bhuma II. 150, 153
Lōkāṇa-kāra, 'paramount sovereign'. 301
Lōkānsā, Jaina wk. 93 n.
Lōkāsā, s. a. Bhuvan-khīpā, 241
Lōkāyata, doctrine. 159 n.
Lōkālōka, Lōkāsā, Lōkāsā complement. 159 n.
Lōkāloka, people. 8, 9
Lōriyān Tāngāi. 230
Lōqāpāsāka, officer and donor. 162
Mahāperigopādakāna, off., 95
Mahāpradhāna, off., 95
Mahārajah, s. a. Mahārāja, tit., 7
Mahārāja, s. a. Vaidyantha k. Gaṇḍatīraṇītra,
183, 184, 185, 191, 192, 193
294
Mahārajaśimha (i. e., Kōpperuṇījīngas) of Kōjāl, Kālavardīga ch., 25
Mahārājaviśālī, t. d., 191
Mahārāṣṭra, co., 122, 297
Mahārāṣṭra, the three—, co., 123
Mahāsāla, tit., 307
mahārāja, tit., 140
mahāśāla, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42
Mahāśāman, off., 130, 133, 135, 136
Mahāśāmanghika, Buddhist school, 288
Mahāśāmanvigrāhika, off., 130, 136, 137
Mahāśāmi gate ins., 305, 308
Mahāśāna, god, 67, 274
Mahāśāna, Vishnui prince, 196, 197
Mahāśānapuṇḍita, Later Gupta k., 283
Mahāśānapuṇḍita, off., 282
Mahāśānapuṇḍita-Yājñīti, Gupta k. of Dakhinā Kōṣala, 105
Mahāśāla-Tvāra, k. of Southern Kōṣala, 284
Mahāśāma, 'great temple', 246, 240, 210
Mahāśāmanvigrāhika, incorrect for Mahāśāmanuvara, 281
Mahāśāmanuvara, off., 281
Mahāśāmanuvara, 'headman of the village', off., 127, 128, 129
Mahāśāmanu, wk., 3 and n., 4 and n., 9 n., 157 n., 163, 238 and n.
Mahāśāmanu, wk., 3 and n., 4 and n., 9 n., 157 n., 163, 238 and n.
Mahāsvāmī of Dhaṇakāja, 257, 259, 260
Mahāsvāmī, s. a. Mahāśāmī, 280
Mahāśāmī, s. a. Mahāśāma, 290
Mahāśāma, Jain teacher, 205
Mahāśāma, Kuhila k. of Maṇavar, 310, 327 n.
Mahāśāma, k. of Maṇavar, 310, 327 n.
Mahāśāma, Kuhila k., 134, 136, 150, 152
Mahāśāma, Kuhila k., 139 & n., 190
Mahāśāma, Pishtapura, k., 50
Mahāśāma-bhāga, t. d., 49 n.
Mahāśāma-chalī, m., 150, 181, 183
Mahāśāma-Nalambaśīri, Nalamba ch., 187, 188
Mahāśānapuṇḍita, Pratīkāra k., 332
Mahāśānapuṇḍita I, do., 44, 45
Mahāśānapuṇḍita, do., 150, 153
Mahāśāma, do., 314
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX.</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahbūs, s. a. Śiva, god</td>
<td>86, 89, 317, 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahēvāra, do</td>
<td>17 n., 51, 75, 136, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245, 249, 251, 261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahēvāra, tit.</td>
<td>49, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahēvāran,</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahfz Khan, Prince of the Carnatic</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīchandra, Gahadavāla k. of Kanauj</td>
<td>292, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīndra (I), Gahalā k. of Mevār</td>
<td>309, 324 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīndra (II), Gahalā k. of Mevār</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīndrabhīma, engr.</td>
<td>130, 136, 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīndravarmān, E. Gahā k. of the Šuṭala branch</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīpāla, Pāla k.</td>
<td>45 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīpāla I, k. of Anga and Majapātha</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīpāla II, Pāla k.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīpāla II, Gahā rāja k.</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīpati, tit. of Mahāmāda, Sultan of Gujarāt</td>
<td>214, 215, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahīśvaraparājāyavam, hist. wk.</td>
<td>287 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmood Shāh, Sultan of Gujarāt</td>
<td>221 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd</td>
<td>219, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd, Sultan of Gujarāt</td>
<td>213 and n., 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd, Sultan of Mālāvā</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd (Mahmūd I), Sultan of Gujarāt</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd I, Sultan of Gujarāt</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūdībād, ci.</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūdībād-Chīmāṇer ci.</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūdībād, Sultan of Gujarāt</td>
<td>213 and n., 218 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd Khaljī II, Sultan of Mālāvā</td>
<td>59 &amp; n., 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd Khaljī, k. of Mālāvā</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahomedian</td>
<td>214 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahometh Mafus-Chan, s. a. Mahfz Khan</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prince of the Carnatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainakā, myth. mo.</td>
<td>82, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Sūpa at Nālandā</td>
<td>20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintraka, dy.</td>
<td>179, 333 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majmūdār or Majmūdār, off.</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makara, co.</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldū, t. d.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malamāvuka, m.</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāvā, s. a. Mālāvā, co.</td>
<td>76, 107 &amp; n., 215, 223, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāvā k. of Mālāvā</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāvās, people</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāvaka, co.</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malavalli pillar ins.</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malavākarīya, n. of royal seat</td>
<td>154, 156, 167, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāvaya, race</td>
<td>170 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldeo Sonagāra, gen.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālēpādu plate</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālēpādu stone ins. of the Chōla k. Satyā-</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāyā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Atār, Governor of Sūrat,</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Imādāla</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Imādāla, s. a. Imād-ul-Mulk</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Asbra, gen.</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Hussain Bahmani, s. a. Nizām-ul-Mulk,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor of Idrās</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Kafür, Muṣlim gen.</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Sūdrā, governor under Sultan Mahmūd</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Gujarāt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Wāgi, gen.</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malikfāpūndi grant of Ammārāja II</td>
<td>269, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallakāvā, ch.</td>
<td>221 n., 222 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallakāvā, Bāya ch.</td>
<td>186, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallapā, s. a. Yuddhamalla, E. Chālukya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prince</td>
<td>270, 271, 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallarāri plaque of Vijayāśena</td>
<td>127, 128 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malliyana Kāršapāi, donor</td>
<td>28 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāwā, fort</td>
<td>59 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāwā, s. a. Mālāwā, co.</td>
<td>59, 60, 61, 62 and n., 107 &amp; n., 110, 215, 216, 217, 220, 226, 227, 228, 230, 234, 286, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māmādīvā, t.</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māmādīvā, 'uncle'</td>
<td>154, 156, 168 and n., 169, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mā-Madurā, s. a. Madura, ci.</td>
<td>170 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Māna-Somēṉvaraparāśikā-kāla-saṇḍha', tit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Chōla k. Kājēndra-Chōla III</td>
<td>160 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māndālīka</td>
<td>222 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māndāra, ri.</td>
<td>293 and n., 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māmāśā, corruption of mahaṃgā or the queen</td>
<td>173, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māmmā, Senkāta author</td>
<td>104 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mā-nagār, s. a. Madura, co.</td>
<td>170 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manahali charter</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maṇḍis, 'house' (?)</td>
<td>168, 169, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mānaśīnā, general of Akbar</td>
<td>60, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mānavaṇḍā, 'god amongst men', ep.</td>
<td>271, 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mānavaṇḍā-śārmanākṣāra</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavāla-mahāmuni, Vaiṣṇava teacher</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavālap-perumal, s. a. Manavālap-Perumal, Kēdvārapūrya ch.</td>
<td>27, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavālap-perumal, Sakuḷabhuvaṇa-kāṛavāvatīrī</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavālap-perumal, Kēdvārapūrya ch.</td>
<td>23, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavālap-perumal alias Īḷīṣaiṁōgaṇa s. a. Kēdvārapūrya I, Kēdvārapūrya ch.</td>
<td>26 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavālap-perumal alias Vaiṣhtakapāla-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perumal, Kēdvārapūrya ch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavālap-perumal, s. a. Alagiyapallavan, Kēdvārapūrya ch.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavālap-perumal, s. a. Jiva-mahāpati</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavālap-perumal (Īḷīṣaiṁōgaṇa), Kēdvārapūrya ch.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavālap-perumal (son of Īḷīṣaiṁōgaṇa), Kēdvārapūrya ch.</td>
<td>26 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavālap-perumal of Keḻal, Kēdvārapūrya ch.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manda, s. a. Sani, planet,</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandákin, celestial tank,</td>
<td>319, 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandakini, s. a. Ganges, vi.</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandala, t. d., 16, 17, 18, 19, 43, 46, 47, 133 n., 153, 164, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapdana, architect-author and builder of the Tower of Victory at Chitor,</td>
<td>64 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapdapa,</td>
<td>37, 96, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandaviga, myth. mo.</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandasor, vi.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandasor ins.</td>
<td>198 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mándová a. a. Málwa, fort.</td>
<td>59 and n., 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mándavuda, vi.</td>
<td>185, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mándayur, vi.</td>
<td>273, 277-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mándhata, myth. k.</td>
<td>62, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mándutí-lerha,</td>
<td>61, 62, 72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mándjá, s. a. Mándava or Málwa, fort.</td>
<td>59 and n., 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mândgaur (Mànggaur) grant of Sinhavarman,</td>
<td>138, 159, 251, 256, 257, 290, 302 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangalaithipa, s. a. Kahumão, m.</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangala-śilpa,</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjú-Yuváraja, E. Cháljukya k.</td>
<td>139, 269, 274, 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjukariká, pool,</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máŋkíša, vi.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máŋkíša inscription of the reign of Kanishka,</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maníš, 'servant',</td>
<td>184, 192 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maniplamangalam, vi.</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjúśrī-nála-balpa, Buddhist wk.</td>
<td>284 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manókha, vi.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Mán Māhès', n. of citadel,</td>
<td>218 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánmárguḍi, vi.</td>
<td>37 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manumara,</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maŋpo, W. Ganga ca,</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maŋpo plates of Ráthasrádya Górvinda III.,</td>
<td>157 n., 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manuṣay,</td>
<td>53, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manóraśhíkārya, donee,</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masāgaram,</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánóśhíra, vi.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánóśhíra Edicts of Alóka,</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantrabálama,</td>
<td>41 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mántra-lāttī, 'power of good counsel',</td>
<td>108, 113, 136 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maṅOSP, 'minister', off.</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu, law-giver, 30, 31 n., 41, 128, 129, 235, 236, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manujjatropésha, Vaidumka k.</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánjúr ins.</td>
<td>41 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu-sūrdi, vi.</td>
<td>30 n., 31 n., 40 n., 128 n., 129 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuvádi,</td>
<td>288 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuvarta-muktaśaivi, wk.</td>
<td>30, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mánvapadañcika, measuring rod, ma-parumāla,</td>
<td>72, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maráth, people,</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marátha, co.</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máravarman II, Pántya k.,</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máravarman Kusákáchara, Pántya k.,</td>
<td>96, 153 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máravarman-Sundara-Pántya, Pántya k.,</td>
<td>156, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máravarman Sundara-Pántya I, Pántya k., 156, 157, 158, 160 and n., 161, 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164, 165, 170 n., 172 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máravarman Sundara-Pántya of the Tirupūramam grant, Pántya k.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máravarman Sundara-Pántya ('púmalak-tiśvram etc., prastiti'), s. a. Máravarman Sundara-Pántya II, Pántya k.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máravarman Sundara-Pántyaśadéva, Pántya k.,</td>
<td>156, 158, 157, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máravarman Vikrama-Pántya, Pántya k., 158, 159, 164, 165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Márṣṣa-śrákal,</td>
<td>94 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>máṛgya, 'beggar',</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mráčchpakam, lit. wk.</td>
<td>267 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mráčchakara-púndro,</td>
<td>45 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moramas, 'sister's son',</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mráwr, vi.</td>
<td>62 n., 221, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msudí, Muslm his torian,</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masulipatam plates of Cháljukya-Bhumá II,</td>
<td>271 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mát, vi.</td>
<td>202, 203 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mát ins.</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mát stánta,</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mátši-kunja, water reservoir,</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mótka,</td>
<td>241, 330, 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathanasinha, s. a. Mahásaminda, k. of Meér,</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá, vi.</td>
<td>2, 5, 10 n., 13 n., 148 n., 194, 199, 200 n., 201 n., 202 n., 205, 206, 207, 208, 211, 253, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá image ins. of G. 135,</td>
<td>198 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá ins.</td>
<td>200, 201 n., 203, 207, 211, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá ins. No. 85,</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá ins. of the Kushán period,</td>
<td>199 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá ins. of the reign of Kanishka,</td>
<td>848 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá ins. of Satrapa,</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá Lion Capital ins.,</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá Lion Capital ins. A-9,</td>
<td>10 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá Museum,</td>
<td>194, 199, 200, 202, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá pedestial ins. of Kanishka,</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá pillar ins.,</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurá school of sculpture,</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mántra,</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mátśchandrasvámî, donee,</td>
<td>150, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mátśchandrasvaráni (II), donee,</td>
<td>150, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matyapuṣṭa,</td>
<td>62 n., 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241, 242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310, 324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144, 282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245, 251, 252, 253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283 and n. 284 and m. 285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148, 174, 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143, 299, 303a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172, 173 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 n. 263 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270, 275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271, 276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138, 142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5, 6 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88, 83, 142, 358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357 n. 32 n. 283 n. 32 n. 323 n. 324 n. 325 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Mettuns:** continued.
  - **Arya:** 84 n., 110, 151, 174 n., 222, 315 n., 316 n., 325 n., 328 n.
  - **Aryaśči:** 276 n.
  - **Auspachchandakasika:** 71 n.
  - **Bhujapavijjyāsūkha:** 198, 199
  - **Dādegana:** 315 n.
  - **Dut Srīla:** 110 n., 293
  - **Gūṭhi:** 65 n., 77 n., 82 n., 83 n., 315 n., 334 n.
  - **Harinī:** 326 n.
  - **Indravajra:** 75 n., 76 n., 84 n., 110, 151, 222, 293, 319 n.
  - **Indrawatikā:** 78 n.
  - **Manjushākṣi:** 82 n., 319 n.
  - **Mālinī:** 110, 174 n., 293, 315 n., 321 n., 323 n.
  - **Mandakrānta:** 326 n., 327 n., 328 n., 334 n.
  - **Mārābana:** 319 n.
  - **Prakasakī:** 335 n.
  - **Pramāṇikā:** 74 n.
  - **Pratīkākṣa:** 316 n., 318 n., 319 n.
  - **Prākāśa:** 318 n., 320 n.
  - **Pushpākṣa:** 110, 175 n.
  - **Ratēdabha:** 67 n., 80 n., 316 n., 317 n., 318 n., 334 n.
  - **Ruchira:** 334 n.
  - **Śāini:** 66 n., 68 n., 80 n., 88 n., 234 n., 235 n., 319 n.
  - **Śūrdalavikāśita:** 67 n., 68 n., 70 n., 71 n., 72 n., 73 n., 74 n., 75 n., 76 n., 77 n., 78 n., 79 n., 80 n., 81 n., 82 n., 83 n., 86 n., 87 n., 88 n., 89 n., 110, 151, 174 n., 222, 227, 288, 293 n., 314 n., 315 n., 316 n., 317 n., 318 n., 319 n.
  - **Śukhajā:** 320 n., 321 n., 322 n., 324 n., 325 n., 326 n., 327 n., 328 n., 334 n.
  - **Śūrdalavikāśita:** 79 n., 315 n., 317 n.
  - **Śūrdalavikāśita (Anuśūkha):** 56 n., 245
  - **Śrīgāra:** 66 n., 68 n., 69 n., 70 n., 71 n., 72 n., 73 n., 74 n., 75 n., 76 n., 77 n., 78 n., 79 n., 80 n., 81 n., 82 n., 83 n., 85 n., 86 n., 87 n., 88 n., 89 n., 90 n., 110, 151, 222 n., 274 n., 275 n., 276 n., 277 n., 278 n., 293 n., 316 n., 317 n., 319 n., 322 n., 324 n., 325 n., 327 n., 328 n., 334 n.
  - **Śrīgāra:** 76 n., 80 n.
  - **Uṛgā:** 84 n.
  - **Uṛgā:** 65 n., 67 n., 68 n., 69 n., 72 n., 73 n., 75 n., 76 n., 78 n., 80 n., 81 n., 82 n., 84 n., 86 n., 110, 114 m., 322, 317 n., 319 n., 320 n., 321 n., 322 n., 323 n., 324 n., 327 n.
  - **Uṛgā:** 80 n.
months:—lunar—contd.
Māgha, 22, 48, 51, 52, 119, 120, 288 and n. 331,
335
Mārgaśīrṣa, 58, 63, 85, 87, 118 and n. 119, 305,
307, 322, 335 n.
Pausha, 44, 333, 335 and n.
Phālguna, 16, 19, 61, 63, 85, 118, 119, 120, 130,
136 and n., 137, 181, 182, 183, 237, 238,
293, 294, 295, 331, 336
Śāvāṇa, 43 n., 151, 153, 286 n., 290, 298, 302, 331,
336
Sāgha (Āsadhā), 62 n., 74
Sāgha (Āsadhā or Jyēśthā), 74 and n.
Vaisākhā, 3, 6, 8, 58, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63,
212, 225, 288 and n., 331, 335
Vaisākhā [drūṣṭ][1], 90
months:—Muhammadan (lunar), Jamādāʾ I awwal, 212
Ramāznān, 329 n.
months:—solar,
Aṣpāṣ, 155
Āvāsī, 154
Chittirai, 155
Mārgaśīrṣa, 94 n.
Mē, 270
Purattādi, 23, 27, 28, 154
Rishabhā, 90, 98, 160
Tai, 27 n.
Tulā, 154, 169, 169, 171, 172
months of seasons:—
2nd of Hēṃanta, 211, 212
months of the year:—
Hēṃantaṃāsā, 297
Mōrā, vi., 194, 198, 199, 200 and n., 200, 208, 210
Mōrā Well ins., 194, 197
Mōrā, vi., 260, 263
Mrigākṣa, n. of horse, 64, 77
Mrīga, nakahatra, 117
mu, in Khaṛākṣhi, 2 n.
muḍ, ‘yield or produce’, 154, 156, 168, 169
muṇ, ‘commencing from’ 150, 168
muṇ, ‘head of classification’, 155, 156, 168
Mudalīyāndān, m., 91
‘muṇ, ‘year’’, 156, 168
Mudāphara, s. a. Muzaffār Shāh II, Sultan of
Gujārāt, 59 n., 68 and n.
Mudāphara, Shāh, s. a. Muzaffār Shāh I, Sultan
of Gujārāt, 213, 214, 215, 222, 223
Mudāphara Pātashāh, s. a. Muzaffār I of Gujārāt,
213
mud, ‘ancient’, 138, 142
Mudīmādugur, vi., 191
mudī-tatka, ‘ancient-tank’, 138, 142
Mudutl(a) (deh), vi., 281, 282
Mudumaduvu, s. a. Mudīmādugur, vi., 191
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad, et c., 184, 189, 191, 192, 193</td>
<td>66 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughal, dy., 62, 82, 222</td>
<td>66 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad I, Sultan of Gujarāt, 215</td>
<td>170 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad II, Sultan of Gujarāt, 215</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammadābad, 215</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammadānā, 59, 60, 91, 97, 98, 122, 146, 218 n., 314</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad bin Sām, s. a. Muḥammad Ghūrī, Sultan</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad-bin-Tughlāk, Mūsīlī k., 98</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad Ghūrī, Sultan, 230, 292</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūḥammad Ḥājī, off., 329 n.</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūḥammad Khān, s. a. Tādūr Khān, Sultan of Gujarāt</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūḥammad Shāh, Dehli Emperor, 215</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūḥammad Shāh (Muḥammad), Sultan of Gujarāt</td>
<td>214 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūḥaṣṣita Naṣīmat, author</td>
<td>308 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musāhuṣ-mandājam</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukanīs or Mukundīs, maṇṇaṇa</td>
<td>64, 71, 83, 89, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mukhāhbarātās, 'mask-actors'</td>
<td>298, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mukhāmādāpar, 37 n.</td>
<td>298 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mukhānāsāqyis, 'class of self-mortifying devotee'</td>
<td>298 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhyādūs, s. of dātāka</td>
<td>227, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhīṣṭāpar, gift</td>
<td>280 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukundpur stone ins. of [Kālchurī] year 722, 118 n.</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musākātāka, witness</td>
<td>31 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūla-parvār, 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūla-thānēvāra, te., 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūlāvarman of Borneo, k., 247 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūlābāg, dī.</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūlhor, fort</td>
<td>220 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūljīsār, Padāya-ta'in-Abāpayās—, scribe</td>
<td>28 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūljan, ci.</td>
<td>118 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūlṣā, incorrect for Mutuṣā, off.</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūmūnīsālā, chaturvedimālaṇ, vi.</td>
<td>37 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūmūnīsālāch-chārupādīmālaṇ, vi.</td>
<td>91, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūmūnīsālamālaṇ, vi.</td>
<td>91, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūṇṭīsānu, t. d.</td>
<td>91, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūṇṭīshātr, t. d.</td>
<td>91, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mūṇṭi</td>
<td>91, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musāndā, 'sage'</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūṇṣā, s. a. Vāṅkatiśāja, Paramāra k. of Mānā</td>
<td>306, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūṇṭu-waṅsā, 'previous owners'</td>
<td>155, 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūṇṣā, off.</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūṇḍā, incorrect for Mutuṣā</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūṇḍā, incorrect for Mutuṣā, off.</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mūnṭi, l. m. (1)</td>
<td>182 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mūnṭi, musical instrument</td>
<td>182 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murappu-nāṇa, t. d.</td>
<td>154, 155, 162, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murappunāṇu-Kūrīpāṭṭu, vi.</td>
<td>166 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murappu-Nāṇa-duṇḍān, vi.</td>
<td>166 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūrānī, s. a. Vīnānī, god</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūrī, s. a. Vīnānī, god</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūrti-māmba, wife of Chinnā Chevappā Nāyaka of Tāpośore</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musketeers, off.</td>
<td>213 n., 216, 217, 230, 306, 314, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim, 213 n., 216, 217, 230, 306, 314, 329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim chronicles</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Emperors of Dehli</td>
<td>213 n., 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim historians, 60, 214, 215, 216, 217 and n.</td>
<td>219, 220, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutafābād, ci.</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutālu-kircihi alias Rājasīnghamālam, ci.</td>
<td>166, 167, 168, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutālāmālī, off. (7)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuṣā, off.</td>
<td>281, 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuṣā, incorrect for Mutuṣā</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūrī, kāṣṭhā, 'meeting place of three villages'</td>
<td>138, 143 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūrī, 'reward'</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūrī, 'meeting place of three boundaries'</td>
<td>273, 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūzafrārī, Sultan of Gujarāt, 220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūzafrī Shāh, s. a. Mūzafrārī, Sultan of Gujarāt, 214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūzafrārī Shāh I, Sultan of Gujarāt, 213, 214 and n.</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūzafrārī Shāh II, Sultan of Gujarāt</td>
<td>59 and n., 60, 68 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N**

n, 2 (Kharōštī), 53 (box-headed), 130, 146 (Gupta), 236, 246, 253, 355, 281, 289, 290

n, final, 20, 266

n, final, changed into anusāra, 150

n, changed to u, 102

n, used for anusāra or m (?), 102

n, in Nāgari, 102

n, 2 (Kharōštī), 53 (box-headed), 147 n. (Gupta), 149, 246, 253, 265

n, lingual, used for j, in Aūkān Kharōštī, 5, 236

nā, 316 n.

nā, bhājākara, 13 n.

Nāja Vaṣṭhaṇāya Bhogavata, donor, 280

Nāḍā, ci., 312

Nāḍī, ci., 312


Nāḍāpī-guṇḍā, tānṭā, 273, 278

Nāya, 103

Nāya, 'people of the serpent-world', 75

Nāya, tribe or clan, 13

Nāya, hooded—, emblem on Dharmachakra pillar, 256

Nāya or Nāgāditya, Gāhī k. of Mewār, 309, 324

and n.
| Page. | Nāga image, | .202 |
| Nāgarbhata II, Pratihāra k., | .332 |
| Nāgarahāda, &c., | .313, 325 |
| Nāgāla, &c., | .141 |
| Nāgānantara, &c., | .318 |
| Nāgāpāla, Mūsār k., | .58, 66, 84 |
| Nagāra, &c., | .237 |
| Nāgārāiya, | .70 |
| Nāgārāma, Brahmāna, caste, | .109 n., 308 |
| Nāgārdhan, s. a. Nandardhan, &c., | .293 |
| Nāgārjuna hill cave ins. of Anantavarmā, | .193 n. |
| Nāgārjunakonda, I., | 14, 237 n., 238, 279, 280, 281 |
| Nāgārjunakonḍa ins., | .281 |
| Nāgārśāna, Buddhist sas, | .3 |
| Nāgāra stātas, | .13 |
| Nāgāra stātas, | .13 |
| Nāgārśa, &c., | .306, 313 |
| Nāgārśāna, s. a. Nāgāra, &c., | .141, 142 |
| Nagpur, &c., | 12 n., 107 n., 117, 122 and n., 123 |
| and n., 260, 263 |
| nāhala, 'barbarians and outcasts', | .293, 303 |
| Nāhuṣa, uthk. k., | .276 |
| Nāi Gaj, &c., | .148 n. |
| natsmatika, off., | .294 |
| Naishaśākyarācharita, lit. wk., | .109 |
| naivāyamika, s. a. naivāyamika, off., | .138 |
| naivāyamika, s. a. naivāyamika, off., | .138, 142 |
| naivāyamika, off., | .138 n., 302 n. |
| naivāyamika, off., | .302 n. |
| nākehatras — | .293 |
| Bāghara (Bhadrapada), | .293 |
| Meitrā, (Ānāndā), | .270 |
| Phugā (Phalguni), | .203 |
| Prēshālapada, | .203 |
| Pūshyn (Pāsam), | .90, 99, 100 |
| Rākṣāṣ, | .119 |
| Tiruvilām (Śravaṇa), | .299, 300 |
| Nakṣatramcharāmaṇi, s. a. Rāvaṇa, | .111 |
| epic hero, | .111 |
| Nakula, epic hero, | .272, 277 |
| Nala, dy. or tribe, | .12, 293 n. |
| Nala, epic hero, | .55, 276 |
| nāla, | .353 |
| Nālandā, l., | .20, 21, 233, 234 |
| Nālandā Main Śīṭā, | .20, 31 |
| Nālandā Soot of Sarvavarman, | .233, 233 n. |
| Nālīkāyaprabhandham, Tamil wk., | .90 |
| Nāma, Chaudāla min., | .109 n. |
| Nāṅgāhāṭi reliero, | .292 |
| Nāṅgāhāṭi sarvanāma, dones, | .120, 135 and n., 137 |
| Nanda-Prabhāsajamavarman, Kalinga k., | .49 |
| Nandapura, &c., | .120 |
| Nanddarbar, &c., | .220 |
| Nandardhan, s. a. Nandivardhana, &c., | .263 |
| Nandigāma, &c., | .258 |
| Nandivardhana, Vā أغāca k., | 261, 263 and, 264 |
| Nandivardhana, Pallava k., | .28 |
| Nandivardhana II, Śālākāyana k., | .281 |
| Nandivardhana III, Pallava k., | .186, 187 and n. |
| Nandivardhana Pallavaranallā, Pallava k., | .32, 188 |
| Nāndā, &c., | .245 and n., 246, 247 |
| Nān-Mājā Kūḍal, s. a. Madura, &c., | .170 n. |
| Nānannakārya, Vaidūkha ch., | .191 |
| Nānissiga Braja-Nolamā, Nolamā ch., | .190 n. |
| Nānissiga Braja-Nolamā, s. a. Ayavaḍāva, Nolamā ch., | .190 n. |
| Nānissiga-Gāntiśīrāga of the Ārkalā record, | .188, 189 n. |
| Nānissiga Gānta, (son of Prithvirāpati) W. Gānta k., | .188, 189, 190 |
| Nānissiga-Gānta, son of W. Gānta k. Būtāga II, | .188 |
| nāpūla, 'barber', | .293, 303 |
| Nāpurī-Gānu, Mūsār k., | .58, 66, 84 |
| Nāpuris, Vijayaśapara gen., | .256 n., 257 n. |
| Nārasaḥyukta, s. a. Achatya, k. of Vijayasapara, | .286 n. |
| Nārasā Nyākṣa, ch., | .97 |
| Nārasaṭṭha, god, | .96 |
| Nārasaṭṭha, Vāsarāya ch., | .163 n. |
| Nārasasuṭṭha II, Vojolaka ch., | .160, 161, 162, 165 |
| Nārasanadhavaśramavarman, Vijaya—, Pallava k., | .185 |
| Nārāṇāgapalle plates of Gāṇga Ġaḍaravarmān, | .50 |
| Nārāvahana, Gukila k. of Mevar, | .310, 324 |
| Nārāvahana, s. a. Kābēra, uthk. k., | .271, 276 |
| Nārāvahana I, prince, | .271, 276 |
| Nārāvahana II, prince, | .271, 271 and n., 277 |
| Nārāvahandatta, legendary hero, | .197 |
| Nārāvadhana, Gukila prince of Mevar, | .310 |
| Nāravarmanadāva, Paramārā k., | .227, 223 |
| Nārarvarman, Paramārā k. of Mālaś, | .312 |
| Nārāyaṇa, god, | .16, 18, 274, 276, 294 |
| Nārāyaṇa, m., | .231, 233 |
| Nārāyaṇagharī, &c., | .47 |
| Nārāyaṇapāla, Pāla k., | .47 |
| Nārāyaṇapāladaiva, Pāla k., | .43, 44, 44 |
| Nārādyā, &c., | .45 |
| nārēṇdra, lit., | .311, 325 |
| Nārāyandramgarāja-Vijayaśīlīya II, E. Chāghākṣa k., | .269 |
| Nārāyaṇa, ri, | 13, 62, 65 n., 73, 74, 75 |
| Nārsapura plates of Vijaya-Dēvavarman, | .235 |
| nasal consonant, used for nasārā, | .138, 238 |
| nasal, use of —, | .180 |
| Nāśik ins. of Ushvadāta, | .11 |
| Nāśik ins., | .14 n., 247 |
INDEX.

Nastr, k. of Khandesh, 216
Nastrubdin Muhammad, ib. of Tattar Khan (son of Zafar Khan), 214 n.
Nastr-ud-dinyya Wa-ud-din, ‘Defender of the faith and the world’, ib., 216
Natha, order of ascetics, 308
Nathaesima, Jaina preceptor, 272, 277
nattam, 165, 168, 169, 171
nattu-madgashta, 41 n.
Natyevara, god, 241
Nauhki, vi., 253
Nausari plates of Jayabhasta III, 116, 117, 176, 177, 178, 179 and n.
nara, ‘nine’ or ‘new’, 290 n.
navigraha, ‘the nine planets’, 73, 79, 244
Nayabashan, ci., 46
Nayadhamakshaka, Jaina Prakrit wk., 197
Nayagar, state, 172, 173
Nayapala, Pala K., 43, 44, 45 and n., 47, 104
edu, nominative singular suffix in Telugu, 184
negos, ‘the merchant’, 146, 147
Negapataam, ci., 32, 124, 125, 129
Nelamangala copper-plates of Yuvaraja
Madrasinha, 187 n.
neeti/du, 288
Nelliappar, te., 163
Nem, com., 290
Nemithaha, god, 222 n.
Neruvur, ci., 163
nesakara, incorrect for tenakara, 289
Nettabhaanja, wrong for Nettabhajja, 18
Nettabhajja, with Vidiyadharsanadhajjadeva, 15, 18
Nettabhajjadeva, Bhaaja k., 175 n.
Nettabhajja, Bhaaja k., 18, 172, 173, 174
Nettabhajja (son of Vidiyadharsanadhajjadeva) Bhaaja k., 17
Nettabhajja alias KalyakaKalanasa, Maharaaja—
Nettabhajja k., 17, 18, 173, 175
Nettabhajjadeva (I), Mahasundarajyavara, Bhaaja k., 16, 17, 18, 19
Nettabhajjadeva II, Bhaaja k., 15, 16 and n., 19
Nettheer, place of battle, 158, 160
nityaka, off., 138 n.
Nidambudira
Nidhanpur Copper-plates of Bhaskaravarman of Assam, 292 n., 293
Niebuhr’s travels, 122 n.
niravataari-vaipapan, off., 94 n.
Nirguna, ci., 287 n.
nir-nilam, ‘wet lands’, 168, 171
nirbahak, off., 94 n.
Nirvaipa of the Buddha, 4

PAGE.

Nimitarga, ep. of W. Gujara kings, 188 and n.
Nimitarga Ereganga, W. Gujara k., 187
Nimitarga NammaGujo, a., 189 n.
Nirakara, l. m., 138, 142
Nirukasa plates of Dharmaraja, 150
nirag-avigata-samanadada, 295
Nirghumaha or Nirghumaha, ‘law officer’, 138
Nirgopa, Nirgopa, off., 14 n., 55, 128, 285, 296
Nirguuta, off., 14 n., 55, 285, 296
Nirvana, k. of the Deccan, 216
Nirud-ul-Mulk, Jajirdar of Ahmadnagar, 60
Nirud-ul-Mulk, tit., 60
Nojamba, dy., 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189 and n., 190, 191, 272 n.
Nojamba, k., 184, 185, 189 n.
Nojambadiyaras, Nojamba k., 189
Nojambavadi, 32,000, b. d., 106
Nojambhi, Nojamba k., 183, 184, 185, 189, 191, 192, 193
Nojambhi, s. a., Mahendra, Nojamba ch., 189
Nova Goa, ci., 143
Nivrethi, s. a. god Narasimha, 96 n.
Nripaprabha, tit. of Muzaffar Shah I of Gujarai, 215
Nripatunasa, Pallava k., 28 and n.
Nritisimha, god, 74
Nrrivarma, Guhila prince of Mewar, 310, 324
uru, nominative singular suffix in Telugu, 184
u, ligature, in Central Indian ‘box-headed’ script, 53
u, 232
Nuapara, ci., 180
Nagghalji ins. of Vira-Somavara, 162 n.
Nunjipayya, Nojamba ch., 190 n.
numerals—
in decimal notation—
0, 90, 108, 115, 225, 336
1, 90, 136 and n., 225, 296, 322, 325, 336
2, 285, 322, 333, 336
3, 225, 296, 322, 333, 336
4, 225
5, 225, 322, 328, 336
6, 90, 296, 322, 328, 335
7, 90, 108, 115, 225, 336
8, 136 and n., 137, 335, 336
numerals—
sign or symbol, 1, 3 and n. (Kharoshti), 7 (Kharoshti), 10 (Kharoshti), 147 n., 175, 247, 250, 256, 260, 267, 281
2, 207, 212 and n., 247, 250, 256, 290
3, 182, 247, 250 and n., 254, 260 and n., 267 and n.,
4, 3 (Kharoshti), 7 (Kharoshti), 153, 182, 247, 250, 251, 284
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign or Symbol</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22, 132, 136, 137, 247, 250, 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>132, 247, 250, 259 and n., 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22, 147, 148, 247, 250, 280, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>132 and n., 212, 247, 250, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>247, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>260, 267, 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22, 153, 212 n., 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 (†)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>20 and n., 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>132 and n., 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>269 (Kharoshthi), 22, 132, 147, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuqor Khan, Off.</td>
<td>329 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāya, System of Hindu philosophy</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**O**

o, initial, in Brāhmī | 201 |
o, medial, 55 n., 211 (Kushāṇa Brāhmī) | 282 |
o, medial, for visarga | 316 n. |
Oṣa-ōṣa, 'destroyed' | 193 |
Oṣdra, co. | 103 |
Oṣora, 'reader' | 287 |
Odura (Vodura)-Tirumalaiedevi Annapoornavargal, q. of K. Achyuta of Vijayanagara | 285, 286, 287, 289, 290 |
Oll, 'order' | 169 |
Olipideya, 'receptacle of goodness' | 192.3 |
Om, represented by spiral sign | 297 |
Oṃgōḍu grant | 139 |
Oṃgōḍu grant of Pallava Vijaya-Sandavarman II | 235, 236, 287, 288, 290, 300 and n., 302 n. |
Oṃkāra, a. a. Śiva | 72, 75 |
Oṃkārāṇātha, do. | 61, 62 |
Oṃkārāvāra, do. | 73, 74 |
Oṃkārī, te. | 65 n. |
Oṃkūḍūr, off. | 286 n. |
Ottam, co. | 103, 105, 110, 148, 149, 161 and n., 172, 174, 180, 215, 239 |

**P**

प, in Tamil | 11, 20a, 37, 130, 235 |
Paṭagam, ci. | 99 n. |
Paṭihrij, 'military camp' | 27 |
Paṭi, measure of capacity | 83, 91, 94, 155 n. |
Paṭi, general | 193 |
Paṭimmukhāra grant of Ammanāraīa II | 269 |

**P**

Pāḍamūka, 'foot-print', 12 and n. | 128 |
Padač, 'office' | 298, 301 |
Paddukkar-ahītthānī, Pallava ca. | 40, 42 |
Paddikāppā, 40, 42 |
Padinist-ōsk-kō, rod measuring 18 feet | 155 n. |
Padmçchandra, engr. | 180, 181, 182, 183 |
Padmādiyā, myth. ancestor of Mamārī, 58, 65 |
Padmanāthā, god | 238 |
Padma-privāna | 62 n. |
Padmanāthā, b. of Mamārī | 313, 325 |
Padmāvatī, old name of Paunti, ci. | 11 |
padraw, 'village' | 220 |
Padri, a. a. Dāḍarapadra, ci. | 231 |
Padrika, Raja Dhar, a. a. Dāḍarapadra, ci. | 231 |
Pāpugōḍu, ci. | 301 |
pāpum, 'swamp' (†) | 268, 273, 278 |
Pāṇganavar grant of Chālukya-Bhima II | 271 n. |
pagudas, coins | 124 |
Pābhurā, a. a. Pāvulūr, ci. | 141, 142 |
Pābhūrā, co. | 44 |
Pābhula, dona | 231, 233 |
Pājā mā | 8 |
Pajomī, Vīra-ji, prince | 196, 197 |
pājapāṭṭi, 'ab ab foot-print' | 11, 14 |
Pākikōṇādu, t.d. | 191 |
Pākkarā-rāṣṭra, t.d. | 261, 263, 266 |
Pākasa of Bengal, dy. | 43, 44a, 45 and n., 46 and n. |
47, 105 |
Pālgirī record | 191 |
Pāliyantar, ci. | 156 and n. |
Pālakkaṇṭha-ethana, Pallava ca. | 140 |
Pālamottah, ci. | 166 |
poṣam-pēgar, 'old names' | 155, 168 |
Pālē, ci. | 186 |
Pālaśadā, ci. | 120 |
Pālakakāta, Pallava ca. | 138, 140 |
Pālakana, dona | 231, 233 |
Pālā, ci. | 221 |
Pālī, ci. | 208 n. |
Pālakā-putram, land tenure | 90, 99, 100 |
Pallava-Balagopālapuram, ci. | 140 |
Pallava-Bhuvanagiri-Khabrhika, ci. | 140 |
Pallava grants | 14 n. |
Pallavāṇḍārā, Kāḍarāṇa ca. | 25 |
Pallavāṇḍārā, 'the Conqueror of Toppaṇaṇḍana-lam', Kāḍarāṇa ca. | 25, 26 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallavānḍār alaśa Kācyavārāyaṇa 'Conqueror of Toṿdajina-mālam', s. a. Ejaśīmogān Maṇavāḷapūrām, Vāṇiśal-Kaṇḍaperumāl, Alavāya-pallavan, Jityaṁbalpāti, s. a. Kotpenteruja, I, Kācyavārāyaṇa ch.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallavānḍār alaśa Kācyavārāyaṇa, s. a. Virar Virar Kācyavārāyan, Kācyavārāyaṇa ch.</td>
<td>24, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallī, n. of place.</td>
<td>224 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallacatā, (Pallacat), Dutch port.</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pallaq-daśikādam, 'hall of the bed-chamber'.</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallēcharanda, 'land granted to Jainas or Buddhist shrines'.</td>
<td>164, 168 and n., 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallikīśa, co., 218 and n., 219, 221 and n., 224 and n.</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pallaśad, 'reclining seat'.</td>
<td>62 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallīvāla Brāhmaṇa, sect.</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palukūr, s. t.</td>
<td>231, 232, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāmāravānaka, dy.</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāmpārāja, Kālaya ch.</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panāra, coin.</td>
<td>331,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panātris, 'thirty-five'.</td>
<td>258, 259 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panava, a musical instrument.</td>
<td>196, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pānichamāhārā,</td>
<td>293, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pānicharaprāvara,</td>
<td>16, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pānichasrasya-ānuprapāvara,</td>
<td>155a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pānichārasya-pratprāvara.</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pānichārāvīra, 'administrative body'.</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pānichāravīra, 194, 195, 196, 197, 199, 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pānichāravīra of the Vrishnis.</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pānichāravīra,</td>
<td>200 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pānichāraptapātā,</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pānīcāyā,</td>
<td>212, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍ Mahālā, di.</td>
<td>64, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍholl, caste.</td>
<td>154, 155, 168, 169, 171, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍjamālakam, et.</td>
<td>90 and n., 99, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍjamālakam, s. c.</td>
<td>150, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍjamālakam, n.</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍjamālakam, χ.</td>
<td>190, 332 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍjamālakam, t. d.</td>
<td>91, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍjamālakam, t. d.</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍjamālakam, t. d.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍy, epic.</td>
<td>25, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍy, dy.</td>
<td>25, 95, 97 n., 103 and n., 154, 155, 165, 157, 158 and n., 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164 and n., 165, 186, 188.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍy, k.</td>
<td>102, 111, 188a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍyakuta-samuddhārma 'tit of Hoysala k.</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira Sōmeśvara,</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍyagama-mandala-sūtra-dhāraṇa 'tit. of Pallava Perumālghu.</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍyajñāna-pratipātha-sādhya', tit. of Hoysala k. Vira-Sōmeśvara,</td>
<td>162 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍya, 'act'.</td>
<td>184, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍyajñāna-pratipātha-sādhya', tit of Hoysala k. Vira-Sōmeśvara,</td>
<td>162 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍyajñāna-pratipātha-sādhya', tit. of Hoysala k. Vira-Sōmeśvara,</td>
<td>162 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍyajñāna-pratipātha-sādhya', tit. of Hoysala k. Vira-Sōmeśvara,</td>
<td>162 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍyajñāna-pratipātha-sādhya', tit. of Hoysala k. Vira-Sōmeśvara,</td>
<td>162 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍyajñāna-pratipātha-sādhya', tit. of Hoysala k. Vira-Sōmeśvara,</td>
<td>162 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍyajñāna-pratipātha-sādhya', tit. of Hoysala k. Vira-Sōmeśvara,</td>
<td>162 and n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pravārēvara, god, 263
Pravārēvara-śudā-viśeṣāvātaka, vi., 261, 263, 265 and n., 266 and n.
Pratira, Vākṣtaka k., 13
Prāyagā, s. a. Allahābad, ci., 104, 237
Prādunyayya, s. a. Prithvivipati I, W. Ganga k., 188 n.
Prince of Wales Museum plates, 176
Prince of Wales Museum plates of Jayabhata dated Kalachuri 490, 116 n., 177, 178, 179
prīśāha-mātās, 57, 102, 224, 317 n.
Prithivivipati, Vākṣtaka k., 55, 264 and n., 265 and n.
Prithivivipati II, 12 n.
Prithviviparman, E. Ganga k. of the Śvētāka branch, 133
Prithvivipati I, Hālaka k., 105, 129
Prithvivipati II, Hālaka k., 118 n.
Prithvimahārāja, Kaṇṭaka k. (1), 50
Prithvivippala, Mahārāja k., 58, 60, 84
Prithvimahā, 170 n.
Prithvivipati I, W. Ganga k., 187, 188 and n.
prithvīśat-āśa-vira, tit., 290, 301
Prithviviparman, E. Ganga k. of the Śvētāka branch, 133
privileged:—
a-bhātā-chakrātā-pravēśā, 55 and n., 266
a-bhūtā-pravēśā, 249, 251
a-chāhāna-śaṃsān-kāyān, 55, 266
a-chāntā-bhātā-pravēśā, 19, 175
a-dātā-buddhi-gaṇeṣa, 14 n.
a-haraṇa-sāla-pupha-gaṇaṣa, 14 n.
a-kara-dāyaṁ, 55, 266
a-karunā, 175
a-lauca-bhīnna-kṛṣṇa-kumarū, 14 n., 55
a-leṣa-gula-chakrāba, 14 n.
a-pāraṇu-pala-bāla-viśa-gaṇa, 14 n.
a-pāraṇu-pala-go-bālivanā, 14 n., 55, 266 and n.
a-puṣpa-kāla-sandhā, 14 n., 55, 266
bhavishya-kara-rūha, 19
nidhi-nēhēnas-abhita, 233
sa-dāntā-guṇa, 55
sa-parī-mahā-, 291
sa-giri-gaṇa-nidhāna, 294
sa-jaya-katāla, 19, 294
sa-kāśa, 56 and n.
sa-kīṣa, 294
sa-māta-sāpa-kīṣa, 294
sa-māta-sāpa-nārāyaṇa-bhāva, 294
sa-māta-nāra-nāra-vatā-sītā-trīya-sāla-bhāva-parṣyanta, 294
INDEX.

Rai Mal, Mahārajan—k. of Udaipur, 305, 314 n.
Rāj Patāl, s. a. Jayasimha, ch. of Champañer, 217 n.
Raiipur, ci., 123 and n., 239 n.
Raism (Rājaśayana), co., 231
Rāvata or Rāvataka, s. a. Girnar, m., 219, 219, 221, 222 and n., 223, 224
Rājā, m., 64, 71, 83
Rājakārya, 199
Rājā-Bhillam II, s. a. Chākṣyakya-Bhillam II, B. Chākṣyakya k., 275
Rājā Bit of Idar, ch., 216
Rājakaruna-prakrava, 314
Rājādhiraśa I, Chōla k., 103, 104
Rājādhiraśa II, do., 25, 157, 158 and n., 159, 165
Rājādhiraśa III, do., 150
Rājādhiraśa, tit., 274, 276, 283 n.
Rājaguru, 292
Rājakṣarī, Kongu k., 163
Rājakṣarī Kulottunga do., 163, 165
Rājakṣarivarman, Chōla k., 29, 36 n.
Rājakṣarivarman Kulottunga-Chōla, Kongu k., 163
Rājākṣarivaly, rupiya, 'rupee', 97
Rājākṣarivaly, tit., 276
Rājamahendrā, ci., 97
Rājamahendrā-irunamal, 285, 287, 289, 290
Rājamallana, Mewār k., 58, 68, 84
Rājamānya, 141
Rājamānta, B. Chākṣyakya prince, 270, 271, 275
Rājamāntapāla, alias Aparājita, Pallava k., 28 n., 270
Rājamayya, ch., 249 and n., 290
Rājamitra, m., 256
Rājā, tit., 175, 241, 294
Rājāgar, di., 65
Rājāgar, 175
Rājān, 175
Rājān, prince, 103, 175
Rājapurama, off., 232
Rājāsañjana, unidentifed k., 163
Rājāraja I, Chōla k., 36 n., 38, 190 n.
Rājāraja II, do., 25, 159
Rājāraja III, do., 25, 25, 26, 37, 95, 159, 160 and n., 161, 162, 165
Rājāraja-Kāḍavārāyaṇa, tit. of Kāḍavārāyaṇa ch.
Manvālap-perumāl, 30
Rājāraja-jānīlā, 36 n.
Rājārajamūr, di., 126
Rājāsakyan, ci., 251
Rājasiddhānta, 'science of polity', 276
Rājasimha, prince of Mewār, 83

Q

Qutb-ud-din Ahmad Shāh, Sultan of Gujarāt, 214

R

8 (Kharāshthi), 130, 296, 330
R, doubling of consonants after—, 15, 53, 57, 102, 130, 138, 150, 180, 213, 226, 236, 240, 261, 291, 297, 304
R, doubling of consonants before—, 150, 180, 261, 297
R, subscript, in Kharāshthi with phonetic significance, 4-5
Rāchamalla I, W. Gahag k., 187, 188
Rāchamalla II, do., 183, 185, 187, 188, 189, 191, 192, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47
Rādhā, co., 66
Rādhā, s. a. Karṇa, epic hero, 110
Rādhā Brāhmaṇas, sect., 196
Rāgamaṭhī, f., 122
Rāghoṭa II, Bhūmala Rāga of Nāgput, 65, 323
Rāgho, epic hero, 76
Rāghanṭha, s. a. Rāma, epic hero, 236
Rāghanṭhābhuyayadāyam, Telugu wk., 12 n.
Rāghupati, s. a. Rāma, epic hero, 236
Rāgūlo plates of Sākta varman, 202 n.
Rāhan plate of V. S. 1166, 58, 62 n., 66, 84
Rāhappā-Rāna, Mewār k., 144, 145, 298, 303
Rāhasyākhāraṇa, 'Private Secretary', off., 50, 60
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rājāsainha, Ūdaiyar k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājāsainha-Rāṇa, Meenā k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājāsainyangamaḷalom oḷḷi Muttalankuruṇcchi, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājāsthānīya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājātaraṅgī, hist. chron.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājāṭirāja, tit.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājāvallabha, off.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājāvallabha, work on architecture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājā-varnana,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājāvibhaṣaṇa, tit. and n. of land-measuring rod,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājendra-Chōla I, Chōla k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājendra-Chōla III, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājēndrachōla-Brahmamārāyar, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājēndrēdeva, Chōla k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājēndrēdeva-pūrāṇam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāj family of Nārāyanagār,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājīva, fiscal term,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājukha, off.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājajyavēṭhāra, 'robe-jugglers or dancers', 298, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājajyāṭhēr-āpara, 'booths of robe-jugglers or dancers',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājā,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājāpata,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājubala, s. a. Rājāvula, Satrap,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājukha, off.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājēpala, Satrap,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājyapala, Pāla k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājyāṛt, Māvahara q.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rākṣasa, sācba,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāma, epic hero,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāma, k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmaḥbhadra, s. a. Rāma, epic hero,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmacandra, Kulahari k. of Raipur,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmacandra, Yādava k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmacandra (son of Lakshminātha), Brāhmaṇa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmacandra (son of Mādhava), Brāhmaṇa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmacandra Guha, author,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmacīrī, s. a. Rāmēṭk,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmanāṭhīdeva, s. a. Housela k. Vīra-Rāmaṇātha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmanuṇa, Vaiṣṇava teacher,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmapāḷ C. P. of Śreṣṭhendranātha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmapāṭī, s. a. Vahpur, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmarāja, priest,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmastaṭham plates of Vāhukupūṭḍa Indra-varman,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāṇāyana, epic,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāṁbaṇī, celestial nymph,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmēśā, s. a. Śiva, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmēśrdipāla ins.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmtimek, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmtimek Lakshmanā temple ins.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmīya-jāmāṭrī, s. a. Aṣājiya-maṇḍapāla, m,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāsā, junior or Sesašā branch of the Guhila family,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāṣā, til.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇalhaṇḍeṇā, Bhaṭṭa k., 16 and n., 17, 19, 173, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇacaita, Bhaṭṭa, author of Raṇa-vraṣṭi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇagdra, Early Gūrjara k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇaka, til.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇaka, Jayavarmanadeva's plates,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇapāla, done,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇapura ins. of V. S. 1495,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇasenā, k. of Mewār,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇasenā, Rāṇa—, Mewār k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇas of Mewār or Ūdaiyūr, dyu.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇapsthūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇapsthūṇḍi-ṛṇagṛha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇapsthūṇḍi-ṛṇagṛha, lit. wk., 90, 91, 94, 99, 100 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇagusā, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇagusā, god, 90, 91, 92, 93 and n., 94, 95, 98, 100 and n., 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāṇi, f,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāṇīkāvala, m.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇipadra, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇipadra, s. for Raṇipadra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇipur Jharila, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇpūl, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇūpi ins.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇo Māṇḍalik, ch. of Gircar,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇala, done,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇēṛ, t., 39, 138, 261, 263, 266, 268, 301 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇēṭhakāṭa, dyu., 102, 103, 23 n., 29, 35, 123, 187 n., 185, 186, 187 and n., 189, 190, 191, 220, 224 n., 270, 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇēṭhakāṭa, 'land-holders' (?),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṅa Mālla, hist. chron.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇatpur, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇṭhāṇā, goddess,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇṭhāṇā of Kanauj, dyu.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇṭipati, or Rattika, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇatādeva II, Kulahari k. of Raṇatpur, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Raṇa-dāṇḍa', gift,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇatapasta, n. of temple,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇatpur, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇasenā, Mewār k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇasenā, prince of Mewār,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇasṭhāla, s. a. Jagannāthārāya k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṇatśrīha, author,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rañasēva, 'a kind of gift',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rāṭra, corrupt form of rākṣra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raushīṭaka, s. a. Rōhitaka, vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāula, tit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāval, senior or Chitar branch of the Gubila family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāval of Dāngarpur, dy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāvalī, tit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāval Puńja, s. a. Puńjarāja, ch. of Dāngarpur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāvī, epic hero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi, ti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravirvarman, Kadānās k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Rāwal Patāt', s. a. Jayasīthha, ch. of Chāmpānér.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Rāval Tuppāt', s. a. Jayasīthha, ch. of Chāmpānér.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāya, tit. of the chiefs of Chāmpānér.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāyabhāṣāja, ḍhāṣa prince.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāyadurgā, fort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāyakōta, ti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāyakōta Bāpū ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāyamalla, s. a. Rājāmallā-Rāṇā, Mevār k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Rāyar-mudrai'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redjīsa of Andhārāśa, dy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reise Van Madras naar Ceilan, (Voyage from Madras to Ceylon), Dutch sek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēnkūdu, t. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēnkūdu-ji-wējū, s. a. Rēnkūdu-seven-thousand, t. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēnkūdu seven thousand, t. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēpalli, dī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>régha, doubling of consonants after—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retī, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēvā, s. a. Narmadā, ri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēvātēśchālī, mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēvātē Kūmār, mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēvātē Rāja, epic prince.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēvātī, epic princess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewah, state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewah C. P. ins. of Kirtīvarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewah plates of the time of Vijayāśīthha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewah stone ins. of the time of Kāraṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ri, substituted by ri, vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ri, used for vowel ri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ri, substituted by ri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ri, used for ri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ri, used for ru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ri and ri, interchanging of—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddhapura, ci.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddhapura plates of Prabhāvatiguptā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūkhāvāt, s. a. Sātpūra, mo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rithpur, s. a. Riddhapura, ci.</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rithpur plates of Bhavattavaran.</td>
<td>263 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rītīkā,</td>
<td>130, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rōhitaka, l.</td>
<td>330, 332 n., 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rōhitaka, vi.</td>
<td>332 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohtak, vi.</td>
<td>332 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudra, Kākāṭya (1) k.</td>
<td>123 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudra, s. a. Śiva, god</td>
<td>70, 81, 82, 88, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrādāman, Satrup,</td>
<td>221 n., 222 n., 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrāśīna I, Mahārāja—, Vālakīlā k., 12, 54, 264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrāśīna II, Mahārāja—, Vālakīlā k., 55, 264, 265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrāśīna, Rāhjavara of the Kalochāri k.</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrāśīna, dones</td>
<td>150, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruksma, or Rukmi, epic prince.</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūpā-sāgara, lake</td>
<td>63, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupāqi, epic queen.</td>
<td>196, 197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s, used for s,</td>
<td>15, 226, 244, 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šabap, Thānā—</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šabara-vālah, s. a. Survarṭaśāhā,</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palace at Udaipur</td>
<td>28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 90, 40, 41 and n., 42, 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šabāhā, post</td>
<td>106 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saba,</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saba-kāttvan, offic.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šabāhā-Ṭiruvadī</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šabāhāyā, ‘members of assembly’</td>
<td>156 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sabāhā-mārgum, ‘assembly discussions’</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacrifices:—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apnaṭhāma</td>
<td>13, 247, 248, 260, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apapūrāma</td>
<td>13, 247 and n., 248, 252, 253, 261, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āvāmačhā,</td>
<td>13 and n., 142, 152, 264, 274, 298, 302 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aṭīṭātra,</td>
<td>247 and n., 248, 252, 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aṭyaṇaṭhāma</td>
<td>247 and n., 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāsakātrāpa</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhuvarana, mūkhyā</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāvāptavāya</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhakāṭhātra</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadaňdhë, a. a. Tezamu, vi,</td>
<td>190 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadar, d.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salihëva, Sáiva nectaiah</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sádávartya, Víyasa-nagara k.</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sádhana, 'army' (?)</td>
<td>54, 264, 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sádunapatanam, a. a. Sádram, ci</td>
<td>124, 125, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sádunátagamihita, w. k.</td>
<td>196 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sádunátagamihita, Támil w. k.</td>
<td>37 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ságara, myth. k.</td>
<td>239, 75, 135, 175, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>234, 239, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ságarakanika, 'family of Ságara'</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáléمحا, epie hero</td>
<td>272, 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáheb-Maheth brick ins.</td>
<td>20 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáheb-Maheth image ins. of the time of</td>
<td>Kanishka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáháru, Brāhmada</td>
<td>321, 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sádóvaghriham, 'stone-temple'</td>
<td>194, 195, 196, 198, 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sálípûra, v.</td>
<td>261, 268, 269, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sálítiyana, a. a. Párvati, goddess</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sálo'bdhava, epynymus k.</td>
<td>150, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sálo'bdhavas, dy.</td>
<td>148, 149 and n., 151, 152, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáiláyánti, Sáilódbhara k.</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáiláyánti, a. a. Mādhavavarman</td>
<td>Sáilódbhara k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáiláyánti, son of (A)rághánti, Sáilódbhara k.</td>
<td>150, 151, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáiva Achatrás,</td>
<td>330, 332, 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáiva-aiśvánavástrás,</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáivánu,</td>
<td>14, 17 n., 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sákunáthaparvabhavtsávamatságil, tit. of Köpper úti</td>
<td>27 and n., 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sála, foreigners or Muhammadans</td>
<td>319, 320, 322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáka, tribe</td>
<td>2, 203, 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sákálo, ca.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sákáman, a. a. Sákámani,</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáka-Pálitha, dy.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáka Satraps of Taxila and Mathura, dy.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáka, myth. demon</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sákétha, ci.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sállúda:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chándága,</td>
<td>298, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Káyva,</td>
<td>16, 19, 130, 135 and n., 137, 173, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>261, 265, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sákinumá, a. a. Sákimuní,</td>
<td>2, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sakthára-thága, 'place of worship'</td>
<td>4 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sálibhájí, a. a. Sálápuram, v.</td>
<td>263 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sákru, a. a. Indra, god</td>
<td>70, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sákti, goddess</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sákti, rihi</td>
<td>181 and n., 182, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáktis, the three</td>
<td>190 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110, 72, 88, 89, 110</td>
<td>176, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151, 152, 273, 315, 317</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>55 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>265, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>16 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331, 336</td>
<td>16, 17, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>62, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198, 197</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135, 133 n., 198, 293</td>
<td>246, 247, 248, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>247, 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127, 129</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 and n.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 n.</td>
<td>213 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 n.</td>
<td>213 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138, 142 and n.</td>
<td>173, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 n., 302 n.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54, 298 n., 302 n.</td>
<td>197, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231, 237</td>
<td>62 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 n.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130, 138</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246, 296</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154, 155, 168, 169</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171, 172</td>
<td>210, 211 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173, 175</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156, 162</td>
<td>117, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58, 59, 60</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 and n.</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>263, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 n., 55, 265, 266, 267, 302 n.</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>6, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 198</td>
<td>299, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283, 284, 285 and n.</td>
<td>150, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64, 76, 83, 89</td>
<td>234, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293, 295</td>
<td>302 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 a</td>
<td>144 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 a</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 a, 17</td>
<td>173, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63, 33</td>
<td>248, 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>188, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>9 a, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92, 93</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>173, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144, 145</td>
<td>216 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131, 133</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīhavārman, sur. of Gaṅga Mādhavārman</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīhavārman I, Pallava k.</td>
<td>139 n., 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīhavārman II, do.</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīhavārshu, do.</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīkṣā, 'horse'</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīmbhāja, s. a. Rāhu, planet</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīmśrī, s. a. Sīmśrī (Sīrnī), f. donor</td>
<td>203, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīn (Sīnāh) co.</td>
<td>45, 118 n., 219, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīndhū, Paramāṇa ch.</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīndhūrāja, Sit,</td>
<td>263 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīndhūrāja-mahāsāmya, lit.'wk.'</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngādeśa, Ḥoyala gen.</td>
<td>95 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngādeva, m.</td>
<td>92 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngādeva śīgaṇa Daṇḍajāyakṣa, Ḥoyala gen.</td>
<td>91, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngājāyanta-ṣahūrvedīdīnagalam, ci.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngāna-Daṇḍajāyaka, Mahāprasādhana Māṇḍukikapīravānīkīrīyam (Śīghu)</td>
<td>95 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngāṇa, s. a. Mahāprasādhana</td>
<td>95 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngāṇa-Daṇḍajāyaka, Ḥoyala gen.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngāṇa-Daṇḍajāyaka, Ḥoyala gen.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngāṇa-Daṇḍajāyaka, Mahāprasādhana</td>
<td>95 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngāṇa-Daṇḍajāyaka, s. a. Sīngādeva-Daṇḍajāyaka, Ḥoyala gen.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngāṇa-Daṇḍajāyaka, s. a. Sīngādeva-Daṇḍajāyaka, Ḥoyala gen.</td>
<td>94, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngāṇa-Daṇḍajāyaka, Ḥoyala gen.</td>
<td>95 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngāṇa-Daṇḍajāyaka, Ḥoyala gen.</td>
<td>95 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngāṇa-Daṇḍajāyaka, Ḥoyala gen.</td>
<td>95 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīngaprabāṇḍu, d. d.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīnāpura, Kaliyga co.</td>
<td>49, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singular and plural, indifferent use of — in Tamil</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīnālā, Ḥoyala gen.</td>
<td>157, 158, 161, 162, 163, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīp, ri.</td>
<td>62, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīpārā, s. a. Sīpāra, ci.</td>
<td>47, 49 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīṇpirām, s. a. Sīṇpirām, ci.</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīṇāvira Purāsāṭa, Iḥāku k.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīrkan, Saka-Pallava ca.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīrma, d. d.</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīroda de Ponda, ri.</td>
<td>57, 50, 61, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīrā, Sūru, ri.</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīrā ins. of the time of Bhōja I</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sītā, epic princess</td>
<td>40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīva, god.</td>
<td>271, 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīvā, s. a. Pārvati, goddess</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīvā, s. a. Bhārata, goddess</td>
<td>41, 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śīvadatta, min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvakāhavan, Hārīputta, Kādambo k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvalīla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvamuhāja, Mahaśēk, k. of Kauśāmbi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvamuhāja, Rāja Śākhāhāputtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvamāka Śākakaruk, Andhara k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīva-Māṇḍhātra-vārman, Kādambo k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvamāra, W. Gaṅga k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvamāra, donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvamātha, donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvamāra, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvamākha, s. a. Śīvamākha, donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvamākha, donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvamūra, commentator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvacakandavarman, Pallava k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvacakandavarman, Yumahāraja — Pallava k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvatathāraṇākara, w. k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvayyaśa, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvani plates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvārāja, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvājānhi ins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śī-yu-k, w. k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīkṣā, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śkandahāṅga, engr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śkandā-līkāyāvarāmin, doner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śkandacupās, Gupta k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śkandamāgā, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śkandavarman, Pallava k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śkandavarman I, Pallava k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śkandavarman II, s. a. Viṣaya-Skandavarman II, Pallava k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śkandavarman, Viṣaya — Pallava k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śmara, s. a. Mānmatha, 'Cupid'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śmaṛāṛātī, s. a. Śiva, god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śmaṛīchandikā, w. k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śēḷā-māṇḍala, s. a. Śēḷāmāṇḍala, t. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śēḷāsa, Satīkṣā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śēḷādeva, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śēḷādeva, Kalācāra k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śēḷā, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śēḷā-Śīkṣā, alias Viṣṇu-Chārla Lāṅkēśvarāvai, Śēḷāmatha of Kōṅga k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śēḷā, s. a. Śēḷāmahāvai, god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śēḷādeva, doner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śēḷāmatha, god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śēḷāmatha, Vaidūmēha ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāla, E. Chākṣuṣa prince,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tālakādju, W. Gāgga ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tala-kāṣṭha, 'top-stroke',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tālguṇḍa pillar ins. of Kākṣuṣhavarnam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumakkaḷa, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmraparāti, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tāmraparāti,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taṭṭaṇḍatōṭam plates of Vijaya-Nandivikramavarnam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taṭṭālivāda grant of Prithvivaharāja,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tānām-Kuttaḷ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taṇḍaḷ, s. a. Tanjore, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanjore, Chōḷa ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanjore ins.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanjore plates,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taṭāporunda-śrī, s. a. Tāmraparāti, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>santrāra, 'weavers',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāpita, 'heated',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapparāḷa, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāruka,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarbā, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaṭṭakaḷa grant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāṭār Kāhān, s. a. Mahamattam (Muhammad),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan of Gujarat,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxila coins of Vijayamitra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxila plate of Patika,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tājaśāntha, Ṛāna Śrī, k. of Mēnūr,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tīgasvarī, 'polisher',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattkali, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattkali plates of Umanvarman,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telingam, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tēppurai, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten-Konka, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torāḥi, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tērāmbaṛīra, Uttara—, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tērāmbē, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tērāmbīpāḷa, Śrīnīvāsa Assetic,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tērāmbīpāḷa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terī, 33, 37 and n., 41, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terī-ambalam, s. a. chittira-kūṭam (cittrakūṭa),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tēmukara, 'artisan' (1),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thā, in Nāgarī,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thā, subscript, in Nāgarī,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakkara Srirampati, ca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakkara Vāsīśtha, donar,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakkara, lit.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thānā, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thānniyarka-Kōṭiṭhikāya, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodamas, Greek ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thēppaka, Maḥāra ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thēppārāma Chetiya in Ceylon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibet, co.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibetan,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiṃpiru, l. m.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiṃippuḷ, 'kind of crop',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timīravāna, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timiṇelī, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timiṇelī ins. of Māgavaranma Sundara-Pāṇḍya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipāllathimagi-Jātaka,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipalpur, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tīra-bhūnti, t. ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiramana, coin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tīrāṭh foot-print ins.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tīrīṭhā grant of Chauḍavaranma,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tīrūḍi plates of Mahārāja Pravaraśāna II,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54, 55 n., 56 a, 261, 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirhas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tīru, s. a. Lakabmi, goddess,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tīrūchirāppalli, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tīrūchirāppaḷi-śrīmal, t. ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirūpūram,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirukkaḷaṭhakkam, 'offerings distributed to.devotees etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirukkalakki, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirukkalāvār, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirukkalakkuṇgam, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirukkōṭtiyār, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirukkoṭil, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirukkoṭil, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumala, Vijayamangaru prince,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumala I, Vijayamangaru k.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumalai ins.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumalaināṭha, ankur,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumalaināṭha-Uttamaṇanambi, trustee of Śrīramgam te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumalai rock ins. of Rājendra-Chōḷa I,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumallāmbā, s. a. Oduva Tirumallamāmbi, poetess,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumallirūḻjāli, s. a. Alajārāmali, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumallirūḻjāli-nigraruḷya-Paramāvāmīn, god,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumallirūḻjāli-nāṇu, t. ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirumāndapam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumangal-Āḷvār, saint,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumagam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumakkōṭi, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumakkipadi, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirumārṇam 'court-yard',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirunādai-āḷiṣṭha,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirunattukkāṇi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirupata, ṛ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruppāṇālāvār, saint,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirupputiṭiḷār, community,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tbody>
</table>

| Page | Uruvupalle (i) grant of the time of Pallava Simhayarman, 139, 140, 141 and n., 142 n., 226, 229, 297, 298 and n., 299 and n., 300, 301 n., 302 n., 303 n. |

| Page | Üvera, riñõ, | 135 n. |
|------| Ubravâdāta, Sotrap | 11, 246 |
|      | Utkala, s. a. Orissa, co. | 104, 105, 112 |
|      | Ustimâ-Châõa, Châõa k. | 38 |
|      | Ustimâ-Châõa, Konâha k. | 163 |
|      | Ustimâsamî, family | 93 n., 96, 97 |
|      | Ustimâmamâs-Chakrâyâr, trustee of Śrîrangam te. | 96 |
|      | Ustimâmamâs-mâs-prabha-nam, wks. | 93 n., 97 |
|      | Utsara-Kôsâla, co. | 292, 293 |
|      | Utsara-mallûr, vi. | 28 and n., 29, 30, 31 and n., 39, 40, 41 n. |
|      | Utsara-mallûr ins. | 40 and 41 n. |
|      | Utsaramâruchâtuvändamângalam, vi. | 34, 35, 41, 42 |
|      | Utsara-pâtha, co. | 6 n. |
|      | Utsara-Râjâha, co. | 43, 45 |
|      | Utsara-Terâmâbagriha, k. | 240, 241, 242, 243 |
|      | Utsarâyaça, | 138, 142 and n. |
|      | Utsrâyana-sankrânti | 44 |
|      | Uyyanârûdâvn Vîrâ-Sôjadëvan alias Kuru-kuttâliyâna, m. | 169, 172 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>20 n., 43 and n., 53 (box-headed), 57, 102, 130, 147, 152 n., 233, 255, 296</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v, not distinguished from c</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v, used for k</td>
<td>15, 102, 130, 160, 180, 226, 240, 291, 330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Page | Vâcchhastri, mills | 231 |
|------| Vâcchhapati, s. a. Bhuvaspati, celestial regent | 294 |
|      | Vâcchhapatya, Sanskrit lexicon | 109 n. |
|      | Vihaçchhuka, done | 231, 233 |
|      | Vadhavati, sect | 98 n. |
INDEX.

Vāḍja-Kongu, co., .............................................. 163
Vajjana, s. a. Vardhamānapura, co., .................. 48 n.
Vāṭhūlavarada, m., ............................................ 93 n.
Vajnagar, c., .................................................. 308
Videgavas-twelve-thousand, t. d., ..................... 186, 188
Vāgāda, co., ................................................... 70, 218
Vāgāga, t.d., .................................................. 313, 325
Vā (Bāg)ha, engr., ........................................... 64, 90, and n.
Vāgāha, clan, .................................................. 304
Vā (Bāg)ghālava, tank, ..................................... 306, 318-9
māsuri, off. (?), ............................................. 16, 19
Vaidymba, dy., ................................................ 184, 185, 186 n., 187, 188, 189
and n., 190, 191 and n., 192 and n.
Vaidymbha-Mahārāja, tit., ................................. 190, 191
Vaidymbha-Mahārāja, tit. of Vaidymbha k.
Gaspatrioptra, ............................................. 184, 191, 192
Vaidymbha-Mahārāja, Vaidymbha ch., .............. 190 n., 190
Vaidymbha Mahārāja Bhuvanatrioptra, Vaidymbha ch., ................................. 191
Vaidymbha-Mahārāja Vikramaśīlita, Vaidymbha ch., ............ 190
Vaidymbhavālī, Vaidymbha ca., ........................ 187
Vaidyamāñika, god, ......................................... 306, 318
Vaiyayantī, ct., ............................................. 115
Vaiyayantī, sigd. ct., ....................................... 82
vaiyya-paricharaka, 'medical attendant', .......... 91, 94
vaiyya, 'doctor', .......................................... 91, 95
Vāsikuthu, ................................................... 80, 293
Vāsikuthaperumāl, tc., .................................. 29
Vailūr, vi., ..................................................... 27
Vairasimha, k. of Mewār, ................................ 311, 325
Vairāta, k. of Mewār, .................................... 310, 311, 325
Vairisimha, k. of Mewār, ................................ 311, 325
Vaiśēkha, system of Hindu philosophy, ........... 241
Vaiśhnavas, sect. ........................................... 18 n., 17, 96, 97, 285
Vaiśhnavism, ............................................... 17 n.
Vaiśravaṇa-Mahārāja, k. of Kauṇābī, ................. 147, 148,
Vaiśrama, legend on Kosam coins, .................. 148
Vaiyiramēghatākām, tank, .............................. 34, 35
Vaiṣajayayāj, cp., ......................................... 36, 41
Vaijārī, s. a. Bajan, vi., .................................. 6 n.
Vaijraha, E. Ganga k., .................................... 131 and n.
Vaijraha, donor ............................................. 331, 335
Vaijraha, donor ............................................. 106
Vaijvarman, c., ............................................. 205
Vaijvati, ca., ................................................. 6 n.
Vaijāti, s. a. Indra, god, ................................ 318
Vakēlā ins. .................................................. 205
Vakamihira, donor ........................................ 207
Vakētaka, dy., ............................................. 12 and n., 13 and n., 14, 53, 54,
55 and n., 256, 260, 261, 262, 263 and n., 264 and
n., 255, 298 n.
Vakētaka insa. ............................................... 12, 13 and n.
Vakētaka plate, ........................................... 14 n.

Vākpatīrka, Paramāra k. of Mālaṇa, .......... 231, 306, 312
Vākūr, vi., ................................................... 47
Vālahi, ca., ............................................... 333 n.
Vālahi, ca., ................................................... 99, 179
Vālahi, dy., ............................................... 224 n.
Vālana, s. a. Ulana, Taka gen., ...................... 207
Valandāyāgar alias Kādavarāya, Kādavarāya ch., .......... 24
Vālūka, donor ............................................. 231, 233
Vajjachēḷuva, s. a. Vēkapura, vi. off., ............... 32
Vālīvēru, vi. ................................................. 273, 278
Valīyadimainalaiyitā, Uttamanaśū, m., .......... 98
valīlahā, off. ............................................. 134, 133, 137, 182, 183, 302 n.
Vālōru, ca., ................................................. 101
Vālōuṛi, vi. .................................................. 154, 168, 171
Vāmādeva, doner ........................................... 150, 153
Vāmādeva, 'palanquin bearer' .......................... 70
Vaiśnāprabhārama, s. a. Uttamanaśvarama-
prabhārama, wk., ....................................... 97
maṭari, 'witch' ................................................ 225 n.
raṇagachāruh, 'forest officer', witness .............. 31 n.
Vāsāgopādī, t. d., ........................................ 190
maṭara .................................................... 90, 97, 99, 100
Vānagā, s. a. Bāgā, dy. .................................. 161
Vaiṣṇavasthapa, ........................................... 113
Vaiṣṇava, s. a. Eastern Bērgāl, co. .................. 44, 105
Vaiṣṇava, k. of the Vaiṣṇavas co. ................... 105
Vaiṣṇava, dāsa, co. ....................................... 106
Vaiṣṇavas, Jaina Prākṛiti wk., ......................... 107
raṇvīri .................................................... 22, 25
Vaiśnavaśāstra-perumāl, Kādavarāya ch., ....... 25, 26
Vaiśnavaśāstra-perumāl, tit. of the Kādavarāya
ch. Maṇavāja-perumāl, ................................... 23
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, s. a. Kēperuṇjāgī I,
Kādavarāya ch., ........................................... 26
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, s. a. Kēperuṇjāgī I,
Kādavarāya ch., ........................................... 26
Vaiśnavaśāstra-perumāl, tit. of the Kādavarāya
ch. Maṇavāja-perumāl, ................................... 23
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, s. a. Kēperuṇjāgī I,
Kādavarāya ch., ........................................... 26
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, tit. of the Kādavarāya
ch. Maṇavāja-perumāl, ................................... 23
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, s. a. Kēperuṇjāgī I,
Kādavarāya ch., ........................................... 26
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, tit. of the Kādavarāya
ch. Maṇavāja-perumāl, ................................... 23
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, s. a. Kēperuṇjāgī I,
Kādavarāya ch., ........................................... 26
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, tit. of the Kādavarāya
ch. Maṇavāja-perumāl, ................................... 23
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, s. a. Kēperuṇjāgī I,
Kādavarāya ch., ........................................... 26
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, tit. of the Kādavarāya
ch. Maṇavāja-perumāl, ................................... 23
Vaiśnavaśāstraperumāl, s. a. Kēperuṇjāgī I,
Kādavarāya ch., ........................................... 26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>varagn, ‘kind of crop’</td>
<td>154, 168, 169, 171, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varagnara, Pándék k.</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varṣa, incarnation of Viṣṇu</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varaṅhā-kā_EMPTY_CHAR</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varāha-pāṇi, coin</td>
<td>91, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varāhavart, t. d.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varāpan, s. a. Benares, ci.</td>
<td>293, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varāṅkha, m.</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varāṅkha, s. a. Alagya Manavāla-Māngalādarāya(dhipa), m.</td>
<td>93 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardhamāna, ca.</td>
<td>43, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardhamāna-ākā, t. d.</td>
<td>43, 46, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardhamāna, Jain teacher</td>
<td>201, 202, 203, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardhamānapura, ca.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vartdrī Brahmānas, sect</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vātika, ‘committee’</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vātikoppperumakkā, ‘members of committees’</td>
<td>40, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vātikūl, ‘maintainers of revenue accounts’</td>
<td>169, 172 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varman kings of Bengal, dy.</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varman, dy.</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varman k. of Magadha</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varman of the Maukhari race, dy.</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vārtikā</td>
<td>232 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāravā, ‘the west’</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāsabhaṭṭārikā, E. Gāṅga g.</td>
<td>130, 136, 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaśatē, incorrect for vaśatē, 302 n.</td>
<td>273, 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaśatē, 302 n.</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaśatē-māryaka, 302 n.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaśatē-kara, incorrect for vaśatē-kara</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣa, 72</td>
<td>Vētē, e. a. Brahma, god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣa, s. a. Indra, god</td>
<td>73, 107 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣa, Kṛishna k.</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣa, family</td>
<td>49, 50, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣa, soga</td>
<td>181 and n., 182, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣṭhitāputra, metronymic of a Kosaṃ k.</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣṭhitāputra, metronymic of the Ānand k. Pulamāvi</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣṭhitāputra, s. a. Vēṣṭhitāputra, metronymic of Ānand k. Pulamāvi</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣṭhitāputra, metronymic of Mahārāja Pulamāvi</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣṭhitāputra, metronymic of Mahārāja Bhulma-sena</td>
<td>256 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣṭhitāputra, metronymic of Mahārāja Bhulma-sena</td>
<td>256 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣṭvīḍyāmaṇa, m.</td>
<td>28 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṣṭvīḍyāmaṇa Nākkan, scriba</td>
<td>28 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭa, donor</td>
<td>208, 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭudēva, epic k.</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭudēva, s. a. Viṣṇu, god</td>
<td>272, 277, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭudēva, s. a. Viṣṇu, god</td>
<td>47, 208, 209, 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭudēva, s. a. Viṣṇu, god</td>
<td>272, 277, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭudēva, s. a. Viṣṇu, god</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭudaṇḍi, Jaina story-book</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭudaṇḍi, s. a. Kṛishna, epic k.</td>
<td>196, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭudaṇḍi, s. a. Kṛishna, epic k.</td>
<td>196, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭumētā, f.</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭumētā, f.</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭumētā, f.</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭurpāli, s. a. Viṣṇu, god</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭurpāli, s. a. Viṣṇu, god</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēṭurpāli, s. a. Viṣṇu, god</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vira-Chōja, 'who ruled the two Koṅgas',
Koṅga k.,... 163
Vira-Chōja Lakākēvara alias Sōja-Sīlam-
haun, Sīmanda of Koṅga k.,... 164
Viraḍavāla, ch. of Chāmpānīr,... 217 n.
'Vira.' Imādīla, Muslim gen.,... 219, 224, 225
Viraṛkha, s. a. Viraṛkha, m.,... 257, 259 and n.
Viraṛkhaṛvarman, s. a. Viraṛvarman,
Pallava k.,... 300
Vira-Rāja, vīra-śiva, 81 n., 268
Viraṇitrīśaya, vīra-śiva, 40 n.
Vira-Narasimha, Vijaya-śivapāda k.,... 97
Viraṇārāyaṇa (Uttama-Chōja), Koṅga k.,... 163
Viraṇārāyaṇya, 'n. of measure of capa-
city,... 156, 168, 169, 171, 172
Vīra-Pāṇḍya, Pāṇḍya k.,... 158 n.
Vīra-Pāṇḍya (son of Paṇḍarāja-Pāṇḍya),
Pāṇḍya k.,... 137, 158 and n., 160, 161, 164, 165
Vīraṇatīṭī, vīraṇatīṭī, 288 and n., 289, 290
Vīraṛjendrā, Chōja k.,... 94, 159
Vīraṛjendrā Rājākāśiśvarman, Chōja k.,... 106
Vīra-Rājendra (Rājākāśi), 'who ruled
the two Koṅgas', Koṅga k.,... 163, 164, 165
Vīra-Rāmanāthādeva, Hoyāla k.,... 91, 92, 94, 95, 96
Vīra Vīraṇā Śāilapāyāvar, Kādanārāya
ch.,... 24
Vīra-Saivās, s. a. Śaiva, n. Śaiva, 13
Vīraśāna, Vīraśīla prince, 196, 197
Vīrāśīla, k. of Mewār, 311
Vīrāśīla, k.,... 257
Vīrāśīla, s. a. Vīrāśīla, m.,... 260
Vīra Śiva-Nārāyaṇa, Hoyāla k.,... 95, 156, 157, 160,
and n., 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166
Vīra Śiva-Nārāyaṇa-śiva, 156, 162
Vīraśīla, Mahākūta prince, 106
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 298, 299 and n., 300, 301
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 57 n., 61 n., 310 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 6 n.
Vīraśīla, s. a. Bṛhadēśa, god, 318
Vīraśīla, s. a. Vīraṇātha, ch. of Chāmpā-
nīr, 217 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 217 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 57 n., 61 n., 310 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 6 n.
Vīraśīla, s. a. Bṛhadēśa, god, 318
Vīraśīla, s. a. Vīraṇātha, ch. of Chāmpā-
nīr, 217 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 217 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 57 n., 61 n., 310 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 6 n.
Vīraśīla, s. a. Bṛhadēśa, god, 318
Vīraśīla, s. a. Vīraṇātha, ch. of Chāmpā-
nīr, 217 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 217 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 57 n., 61 n., 310 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 6 n.
Vīraśīla, s. a. Bṛhadēśa, god, 318
Vīraśīla, s. a. Vīraṇātha, ch. of Chāmpā-
nīr, 217 n.
Vīraśīla, Pallava k.,... 217 n.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yashua, 'Muhammadan'</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yauvñavarā, 'Muhammadan king'</td>
<td>68 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yayati, s. a. Mahā-Sivagupta-Yayāti, Gupta k. of Dakshin-Kōnala</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years of the cycle:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>108 (add.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>206 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>236 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>237 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>238 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>239 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>240 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>241 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>242 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>243 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>244 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>245 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>246 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>248 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>249 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>250 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>251 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>252 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>253 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>254 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>255 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th</td>
<td>256 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>257 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>258 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th</td>
<td>259 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th</td>
<td>260 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years of the reign:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>165, 237, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>201 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>166, 167, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>238 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>240 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>242 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>243 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>244 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- Yashua, 'Muhammadan'.
- Yauvñavarā, 'Muhammadan king'.
- Yayati, s. a. Mahā-Sivagupta-Yayāti, Gupta k. of Dakshin-Kōnala.
- Years of the cycle and years of the reign are listed separately.
- The page numbers indicate the specific year and its corresponding page in the document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of the reign</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36th</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th</td>
<td>26, 27 and n., 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th</td>
<td>155 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th</td>
<td>36, 269, 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th</td>
<td>261 n., 269, 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of the twelve-year Cycle of Jupiter:
- Mahāśvayuṣa, 48

Years of unspecified era:
- 61st, 146 n., 256 n.
- 62nd, 254
- 65th, 3 n.
- 81st, 254, 256
- 86th, 254 and n.
- 86th, 146 n.
- 87th, 146 n.
- 88th, 254 n.
- 90th, 146 n.
- 106th, 147, 148, 254
- 130th, 146 n., 254
- 150th, 146
- 160th, 330, 331, 336
- 180th, 331, 336
- 220th, 331, 336
- 230th, 331, 335
- 232nd, 331, 335
- 233rd, 331, 335
- 237th, 330, 331, 336
- 303rd, 1, 8, 9, 10
- 318th, 9, 9
- 907th, 116
- 928th, 116

Yēnugārātmadī, n. of field, 184, 192 and n.

Yēnugārātma, "to hit", 184

gīvapakṣa, 192

gīvapakṣa, 268

Z

Zafar Khān, s.a., Musafar Shāh I, Sultan of Gujarāt (1), 214 and n.

Zafar-ul-Walī, bi Musafar Wa Ālā, hist. chron., 214 n.

Zir-Baksh, n., 216 n.

Zodiac, signs of the:
- Ahī, "Scorpio", 86
- Dhanu, "Sagittarius", 86
- Kasaṇḍa, "Virgo", 74 and n., 86
- Kumbha, "Aquarius", 86
- Makara, "Capricornus", 86
- Mēsā, "Aries", 86
- Mithun, "Pisces", 86, 293, 295
- Meṣha, "Gemini", 86
- Simha, "Leo", 86
- Tula, "Libra", 74, 86
- Frīshā, "Taurus", 86