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PREFACE

The value of the four inscriptions studied and edited in the following pages for a proper understanding of the later Yaḍava history, particularly of the reign of Śiṅghaṇa, the greatest member of the dynasty, can hardly be overestimated. Two of these epigraphs are edited here with their facsimiles for the first time. The Rāmanārāyaṇa Temple Inscription, though originally published with a photozincograph by G. Bühler, is included here for the sake of completeness, and a perusal will convince anyone that the present edition marks a considerable improvement over Bühler’s. A glance at the monograph will highlight the wealth of historical information enshrined in these records.

The press copy of the work was ready as early as in March 1968, but owing to some circumstances beyond my control it could not see the light of the day earlier. It is reproduced in the following pages without any material change.

It is my pleasant duty to acknowledge gratefully the valuable help that I have received from various quarters in the production of the present work. The idea of editing these inscriptions anew was suggested and the stamps for this purpose were kindly supplied by the late Dr. Moreshwar G. Dikshit, Director of Archaeology, Government of Maharashtra; I remember him on this occasion. I am highly grateful to Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. V.V. Mirashi for checking the readings and offering some useful suggestions. I am greatly indebted to Acharya Dr. Vishva Bandhu, Director, Vishveshvaranand Institute of Sanskrit and Indological Studies, Panjab University, Hoshiarpur, for including the monograph in the Vishveshvaranand Indological Series, and to Dr. K.V. Sarma, Reader in Sanskrit, Vishveshvaranand Institute, for taking keen personal interest in its publication. But for his valuable help it would not have been
possible to see it published so soon. My thanks are due to Shri S.K. Pande, photographer, Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, Nagpur University, for preparing the photographs illustrating the work.
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INTRODUCTION

The stone-slabs bearing the four inscriptions edited hereunder are situated in the village Ambe, also known as Ambe Jogai, in the Bhir District of the Marathwada Division of the Maharashtra State. Three of these inscriptions were published with a Marathi introduction and rendering, but without facsimiles, by G. H. Khare in the Sources of the mediaeval history of the Deccan (Marathi), Vol. I, pp. 55-76. However, as these inscriptions were published only in Marathi, they were not accessible to the generality of historians¹, and as the facsimiles were not published, scholars interested in them were deprived of a means of checking the readings. It was, therefore, generally felt by historians that these records should be published with facsimiles and an exhaustive introduction in English discussing the historical information contained in them. Moreover, since the first publication of these epigraphs more than thirty-five years ago, much new material bearing on the Yadava history has come to light, which has rendered a re-appraisal of these inscriptions imperative. In view of these facts, these records are being edited here afresh from the excellent ink-impressions kindly supplied by the late Moreshwar G. Dikshit, the then Director of Archaeology and Archives, Government of Maharashtra. The remaining fourth inscription was edited with facsimile and an English introduction and translation by G. Bühler in James Burgess’s Report on the antiquities in the Bidar and Aurangabad districts.² But he had left many a lacuna

¹ Except for the late A. S. Altekar (Early history of the Deccan—hereinafter referred to as EHD—Part VIII, Ch. II), no historian has utilised these inscriptions. E.g., H. C. Ray, Dynastic history of Northern India, II, Chs. XIV-XV; A.K. Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat (Bombay, 1956), Ch. IX.

² Archaeological Survey of Western India, (ASWI), Vol. III. Having been known for a long time, this record has been utilised by historians like Bhandarkar, Ray, Altekar and Majumdar.
in his reading of the inscription and quite a few of his readings, besides making no sense, are not borne out by the facsimile published with his article. I am, therefore, editing this inscription also from an estampage kindly placed at my disposal by the late M. G. Dikshit.
A FRAGMENTARY INSCRIPTION OF KHÖLĚŚVARA
FROM AMBE JOGAI

This inscription was first noticed briefly by G. H. Khare. It is cut into a stone-slab built up in the wall of a little shrine to the south of the Mother-in-law's tank on the Māyāmocana-tīrtha situated to the west of the temple of Jogeshwari at Ambe Jogai. Since the proper right portion of the slab is broken away, some letters in the beginning of all the lines are lost, and the lower part of the slab is buried underground, the later portion of the epigraph has also been irretrievably lost. The extant portion of the inscription has twenty lines\(^2\) comprising the first twenty-one verses and the beginning of verse 22 of the Yōgēśvari temple inscription edited below as No. III. Many of these stanzas are also found in the Sakalēśvara temple inscription (No. II). As the latter portion of the inscription is no longer extant, it is not possible to ascertain its object. It is possible that the lost portion might have contained some additional information about Khōlēśvara and that the composer of its formal portion might have been different from those of the other records under study.\(^3\) But all this is but a conjecture.

As stated above, the extant portion of the inscription is literally identical with vv. 1-21 of No. III and, consequently, does not make any new addition to our knowledge of the Yādava history. But a few

1. *Sources of the mediæval history of the Deccan* (hereinafter referred to as *SMHD*), p. 55.

2. Khare, however, states that the portion of the inscription after line 16 is buried. But the set of estampages before me clearly shows 20 lines.

3. Twenty-one stanzas of the extant portion of this epigraph being identical with those of No. III, it appears very likely that both were composed by the same author.
interesting points about it may be noted. The lines in this inscription contained a comparatively smaller number of letters than those in No. III. This is obvious from the fact that whereas in No. III the first twenty-one verses are accommodated in only 19 lines, they cover 20 lines in the present inscription. As in No. III, the stanzas are numbered. The serial numbers of the verses are sometimes flanked by two vertical lines (donças) on either side and sometimes by a single line. In the opening line, the prsthamatras are not used at all, while they are invariably employed in all the subsequent lines. Although the text of the preserved portion of the epigraph is the same as that of No. III, some of the names and words are differently spelt. Thus in verse 2, the name of the reigning Yādava emperor is given as Simhāna as against Siṅghana in No. III.1 In the words gurjāro and jajaratvam in line 4, the letter j is not duplicated as against the corresponding portion of No. III where it is duplicated. The concluding word of verse 3 is clearly spelt as turuskah in the present record in place of turukkah in No. III. In line 6, between murtī and śchitih, there is no visarga in the present inscription as in the corresponding portion of the other record. Many other instances of such minor differences can be cited, but there is no use multiplying them here.

As will be shown in the sequel, the Yogeśvarī temple inscription (No. III) is later than the Sakaleśvara temple inscription (No. II). And, as the extant portion of the present inscription is identical with the corresponding portion of No. III, the two inscriptions appear to be either contemporary with or not far removed from each other in point of time. Therefore, from the chronological point of view, it would have been in the fitness of things to group the present inscription as No. II or III. But as Khare has placed it first in his edition of the inscriptions, that serial number is retained here for convenience of reference.

1. This is the form of the name found in No. II also.
THE SAKALĒŚVARA TEMPLE INSCRIPTION
OF KHŌLĒŚVARA, ŚAKA 1150

The epigraph, as stated above, was first brought to light by G.H. Khare who published it with a Marathi introduction and a free rendering in the *Sources of the mediaeval history of the Deccan* (Marathi), Vol. I, pp. 55-68. The Marathi portion of the inscription was re-edited by M.G. Dikshit first in the *Bharata Itihāsa Saṃsādhaka Māndala Quarterly*, Vol. XXX, Parts 1-2, Suppl., p. 5, and later in the *Marāṭhī Saṃsādhana Patrika*, Vol. IX, Part 1, pp. 23-30. It has been recently dealt with in detail by S.G. Tulpulse in his *Prācīna Marāṭhī kōrīva lēkha*,¹ No. 23, pp. 118-23. It is edited here anew from a fresh stampage which I owe to the kindness of M.G. Dikshit.

The stone-slab bearing this record rests at present against a wall in the garden of Bansilal Marwadi outside the village of Ambe in the Mominabad Taluk of the Bhir District, Maharashtra State. But as indicated by the inscription itself, the slab must have originally belonged to the Sakalēśvara temple which is situated about two miles to the north-west of Ambe. According to Khare’s information, it was brought to its present place by an English army officer. The inscription covers a space measuring 3'9" x 2'6". There are altogether forty-seven lines of writing. As the upper portion of the slab on the right side is broken away, the concluding portion of the first twelve lines is lost, the number of the *akṣaras* thus lost in each line varying from 12 to 2 in a diminishing order. But this loss is not irretrievable as the missing letters can be restored with the help of the Yōgēśvarī temple inscription, also found at the same place. Each line contains forty-seven to fifty-seven *akṣaras* except the last one which has only twenty-five letters. Each *akṣara* covers a space of about \(\frac{1}{2}\)" broad and \(\frac{3}{4}\)" high. Even though a few letters here and there have become illegible owing to the inscription having been exposed to the

---

¹ Poona, 1963.
inclemency of the weather for several centuries, the record is, on the whole, in a fairly good state of preservation.

The characters are of the Nāgari alphabet regular to the period to which the epigraph refers itself. The letters are generally well formed and do not present much difficulty in decipherment. The medial u turns normally to the left, but we have one example where it turns to the right ("dadbhuta"). The pṛṣṭhamātrās are employed throughout the record, though occasionally this rule is not observed as in namō, line 11, yēnā, l 3, likhyata, l 35. Sometimes, in one and the same word, once the pṛṣṭhamātra is used to denote the medial ṣ, while the second medial ē is denoted by a stroke above the letter, as in ṭelumīkā, l 23.1 Normally, the letters are carefully executed and they can be easily distinguished from one another. But often this distinction is not maintained and a confusion is likely to result if one does not take the context into account. For instance, there is not much difference between v and c, as in vicāra, l 11. Sometimes v and b are clearly distinguished, the latter having a notch or a cross-bar in its loop, as in balō, l 4 (notch), and Niṁbadeva, l 16 (cross-bar); in the Marathi portion, b is formed with a complete cross-bar, e.g., āhū, l 35, Āṁbē, l 36; but sometimes this distinction is not clear, cf. vimala and buddhiḥ in l 12. In many a place t, n and bh are similarly formed and, but for the context, cannot be distinguished from one another, cf. svaṁnat, l 11, yēnā, l 3, and bhuyad, l 2. Likewise, s and m have often the same form, as in saṁstām, l 3. In dha, the aṅgāra and the medial sign for a are joined by a horizontal line.2 In writing ṣṇ the second member is added below the first, as in vṛṇṇana, l 17, and raṅṛṇava, l 32.3 Two (sometimes only one) dandaśas are employed as the punctuation mark at the end of verses and verse-halves as also of sentences in the prose portion.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit except for lines 35-41 and 46-47 which are in what the author styles as Mahāraṣṭra-bhāṣā. The Sanskrit portion is partly in verse and partly in prose. The

---

1. Also cf., telunśga, l 4, where the medial ṣ is denoted by a top-stroke, while a pṛṣṭhamātra is employed in writing the medial ṣ.
2. So also in dha and dhau.
3. As will be shown in the sequel, a different method is adopted in No. IV.
stanzas, which are composed in a variety of metres, are beautiful and, from a literary standpoint, are of a considerably high standard. There are altogether twenty-seven verses. The first twenty-three stanzas, which are in the nature of a praśasti, are not numbered, while the remaining four verses following the Marathi portion are numbered independently.  

As regards orthography, the following points may be noted. Both jihvamulīya (l 1) and upadhanāniya (l 2) are sparingly employed. The consonant following r is sometimes duplicated, e.g., sarppa, l 1, kirtti, l 3, muritti, l 6; but this rule is more often violated than followed, e.g., gurjarō and jarjaratvām, l 4, rvisa and rgaṇa, l 6. The subscribed th is formed like ch. An anusvara is invariably employed in place of final m. As noted above, there is a confusion between v and b; in some places, b is used for v, as in bipulam, l 21. It is interesting to note that ri is never used for r, as in so many contemporary records.

The Marathi portion is also important as it furnishes us with a specimen of pre-Jñāneśvara Marathi prose. Although it is styled Mahāraṣṭra-bhāṣa, there is in it a good deal of admixture of Sanskrit, and expressions like nāma grāmō dattāh and tatha Amrapurē, l 36, form part of it. Among other interesting features, mention may be made of u-ending of masculine and neuter nominative singular forms, as in desu, l 36, kamatu, l 39 and 40, sakū, l 45, etc. Interestingly from lexicographical point of view are the words like bailla, ādu, sunka and kamata which are either borrowed or adapted from Kanarese.

Line 45 gives the date as Śaka 1150 (in figures only), the cyclic year being Sarvadhārin. No other details are given. But the date is regular as the cyclic year Sarvadhārin actually fell in expired Śaka 1150 (1151 current), corresponding to A.D. 1228-29. The inscription refers itself to the time of the great Yādava king Śiṅghaṇa and his general Kholēśvara. The object of the epigraph is to record certain grants made by Kholēśvara in favour of the god Sakalēśvara.

1. I.e., 1, 2, 3 and 4 and not 24, 25, 26 and 27.
2. For the linguistic peculiarity, of the Marathi portion, vide S.G. Tulpule, Pracīna Marathi kōrīva lekha, pp. 119-20.
3. For a discussion on these words, see M. G. Dikshit, op. cit., pp. 26-28.
The inscription opens with a benedictory stanza invoking the blessings of the elephant-headed god, *i.e.*, (Gaṇēša). The next two verses enumerate the more important military exploits of the reigning Yādava king Singhaṇa (vv. 2-3). Then follows a detailed description of the personal qualities and military achievements of his general Kholēśvara. This description is partly in verse (vv. 4-23) and partly in prose (ll 24-34). The prose portion gives us a catalogue of the virudas assumed by Kholēśvara, giving us an insight into his conquests and qualities of character. Lines 35-41 give an account of the various grants made by Kholēśvara for the enjoyment (viśēṣa-bhogaya) of the god Sakalēśvara from time to time. Verses 24-26 are of an imprecatory character enumerating the calamities that would befall a sinner who obstructed or revoked the grants. The next verse (27) exhorts the future rulers of his own family as also those of other families to continue the grants. Then follows the date as specified above and the information about the writer and the engraver of the record (ll 45-47) and some auspicious formulas.

The inscription was written by one Rāma, the paṇḍita-in-charge of the Records Office (śrikaraṇa-paṇḍita). The arrangement for engraving it on the stone slab was made by one Nāaikeya, son of Sarēśa (Sarvēśa), a servant (sānūnugū) of Mēdipau and Adhivāṇiya. We are told that the whole record was first written out on a bhurjapatra (bhurju) and then engraved (kaṇḍārili), from the beginning to the end, on the slab. This statement is interesting inasmuch as it gives us information about the mechanical processes involved in the execution of an inscription: first it was written out on bhurjapatra and then

---

1. Called nāmāvali (l 25) or rājāvali (l 33).

2. Tulpulse, (op. cit., p. 122), gives the name of the writer as Śrikaraṇa Paṇḍitasuta; but the relevant reading appears to be paṇḍita Rāmēṇa and not paṇḍita-suśēna as suggested by Tulpulse (pp. 121, 123).

3. Tulpulse describes Sarēśa as the follower or servant of Śri-Svasti, Śri-Mēdipau and Adhivāṇi (p. 121). But this does not appear to be correct. The expression śrī svasti śrī appears to be part of the preceding auspicious formula. This is also supported by another consideration. If we accept Tulpulse’s view, it would be difficult to explain why the honorific śrī is employed only for Svasti and Mēdipau and why Adhivāṇi is excluded from this privilege, while the relationship of all the three to Nāaikeya was the same.
engraved on stone or metal as the case may be. Unfortunately, we have no information about the author.1

The grants made by Khōlēšvara to the Sakalēśvara temple, which are recorded in Marathi, include the following: the village Laghu-Bāūci in Āmradeśa; many sources of income (baumūlika)2 created at the royal residences or military cantonments in every village in the four dēsas, viz., Āmbedēśa, Kējadēśa, Ausadēśa and Udgiri (dēśa); one gold coin and a flower-basket from each of the markets3 and residential wards at Āmrapurā; cautha measures of food grains and 1/4th cowrie shell in lieu of gold4 from each of the four garrisons in the four dēsas, every month, for the maintenance of the free feeding houses (sattras) for the priests; one cowrie to meet the expense of betel leaves for the god; 1/8th (evidently of the produce) from the land, even if it was meant for the cultivation of the puṇḍra variety of cane,5 as a sarva-namasya (tax-free) gift; 3 malās6 near the tank at the village Bīlvapāli and 1 from the unclaimed land near the village; 1 malā in the village Rāhatavāṇḍi;7 1 malā near the temple; another maļā to its east; thus all-told 7 malās; four-stringed flower garland from every flower-vendress in the market; 6 oil-mills for oil, 1 kāmata8 to the south of Āmbe and another to

1. Tulpule thinks that Śrikaraṇa Paṇḍitasuta was the author of the record (op. cit., p. 122). But this does not appear to be correct. Firstly, as we have seen above, the correct reading should be Rāmaṇa. The reading sutēna proposed by Tulpule is grammatically incorrect. Secondly, in epigraphic records a distinction is made between the writer (lekhaka) and the author, the duty of the former being of a mechanical nature, viz., writing the record given to him for the guidance of the scribes. Often he wrote the record on the stone or plate itself. Vide D.C. Sircar, Indian epigraphical glossary (Delhi, 1966), p. 171, under lekha and likhita.

2. From Sanskrit bhumūlika. Dikshit (op. cit., p. 25) reads it as ghaudālika and takes it to mean a tax on horses.

3. Hōtavaṭṭi. As pointed out by Dikshit (ibid.), it may refer to markets held on certain days.

4. I.e., tax in coins. Tulpule (op. cit., p. 120) reads sana (festival) in place of svarṇa.

5. The puṇḍra variety of sugarcane is still grown in Maharashtra.

6. Field where fruit-trees are grown.

7. As suggested by Dikshit (op. cit., p. 26), it may also denote a place where the Persian wheel was employed to draw water.

8. I.e., field cultivated by employing labour.
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its east; 1 cautha for the salt, from the village Sāya; 5 areca nuts on the transaction of every gold coin called asu;\(^1\) 1 āḍu\(^2\) after every asu at Mārivāva; 1 bundle on the sale of dry fodder and grass; on the betel leaves sold by weight or in lump, 25 leaves, while on those sold by auction, 12 leaves;\(^3\) a cess named suṁka on vegetable-vendors and fruits; 1 kāmata each in the villages Cātusa, Āḍasa and Javalagāva; a mala and a field in Sālivāva.\(^4\)

The epigraph affords us a wealth of historical information about the Yādava king Śīṅgaṅa and his generalissimo Khōlēśvara which we may now proceed to study. Śīṅgaṅa, we are told, had destroyed the multitude of all his enemies and his spotless fame had reached the very ends of the quarters. As regards his specific military achievements, it is said that he captured in a moment the whole of the extensive kingdom of Arjuna, which was very prosperous and rich in horses and elephants, and destroyed Dharā, the ornament of the earth, caused the death of Telūṅga, split up the powerful Gurjara, drove Kēśi to such a state of helplessness that he started plucking out his hair, compelled the Hōsala (Hōysala) king, together with his retinue, to take shelter in the water of a pool, drove the Cōḍa to the sea, caused the death of Subhaṅa on the battle-field, repulsed the Gaṅḍa in a play as it were and drove away the Turuṣka to the quarters (vv. 2-3). These two stanzas eulogising the conquests of Śīṅgaṅa are reproduced verbatim in inscriptions I and III edited in these pages.\(^5\)

That Arjuna was defeated by Śīṅgaṅa is known to us from several Yādava records.\(^6\) Fleet was inclined to identify king Arjuna

---

1. For references to asu in Mahānubhāve literature, vide Dikshit, op. cit., p. 27.

2. A copper coin of small value.

3. Tulpule reads 12 in the text, but gives the figure as 10 while giving the rendering of the Marathi portion. Vide Tulpule, op. cit., pp. 123, 121.

4. In dealing with the Marathi portion I have derived great help from the learned writings of Dikshit and Tulpule.

5. These verses, as stated earlier, are partially damaged in the present inscription. They are restored here with the help of No. III.

6. Bahal inscription of Śīṅgaṅa, verse 14, EI, III, p. 113; Madanpur inscription of Kanhara, verse, 10, ibid., XIX, p. 32; Purushottampuri pls. of Rāmacandra, verse 4, ibid., XXV, p. 209; Paithan pls. of Rāmacandra, IA, XIV, p. 314. The Raja-praṇasti of Hēmāḍi's Ṭṛata-khanda (Collected works of Sir R.G. Bhandarkar, III, p. 195, verse 43) avers that Śīṅgaṅa killed king Arjuna.
with Arjunadēva, the Vāghēla chief of Anhilwad. He overcame the chronological incongruity that the Vāghēla Arjunadēva ascended the throne after the reign of Śīṅghaṇa had come to an end by assuming that the former might have held command under his father Visaladēva (A.D. 1243-44 to 1261-62) and so have been a contemporary of Śīṅghaṇa.1 R.G. Bhandarkar, on the other hand, regarded him as identical with Arjunavarmanadēva, the Paramārā king of Mālava.2 The present inscription settles this point beyond doubt as it associates Arjuna with Dhāra, the Paramārā capital, which is said to have been stormed by Śīṅghaṇa. The Uddari stone inscription also describes Śīṅghaṇa as a lion in curbing the pride of the rutting elephant, that is, Arjuna, the king of Mālava.3 That Śīṅghaṇa seized the king of Dhāra is also averred by Hēmārdi.4

The statement that Śīṅghaṇa killed Subhaṭa in the battlefield is important inasmuch as this exploit is not known from any other source so far. This prince may be easily identified with the Paramārā ruler Subhaṭavarman, father of Arjunavarman. It is interesting to note in this connection that in the Mungoli Inscription,5 Śīṅghaṇa's father Jaitugi, is credited with defeating, among others, the king of Mālava, who could be none else than Subhaṭavarman. It is quite likely, therefore, that Śīṅghaṇa may have accompanied his father on his Mālava expedition or that the latter may have entrusted the Mālava campaign to his able son Śīṅghaṇa. We have no means to judge the veracity of the claim that Subhaṭavarman met his doom at the hands of Śīṅghaṇa.

The Tēluṅga (Andhra) contemporary of Śīṅghaṇa was undoubtedly the Kākattyā king Gaṇapatidēva (A.D. 1198-99 to 1261-62). Like our

Though there is no independent evidence in support of this claim, Altekar accepts it as probable (EHD. p. 534). The Sūktimuktāvali of Jalhaṇa (vv. 16-20, cited in ibid., p. 150, fn. 6) states that Sīmha uprooted Arjuna because of the training in the science of elephants (gaja-śika) he had received from Janārdana.

4. Bhandarkar, op. cit., p. 195. v. 44.
5. EI, V, p. 33.
inscription, some other Yādava records also style Śīṅghaṇa as the uprooter of the water-lily that was the head of the Tēlaṅga king. But Mahādēva is also credited with the same achievement. It is doubtful, therefore, if Śīṅghaṇa actually killed the contemporary Kākatiya king whom he had himself released and reinstated on his ancestral throne. It is probable, however, that he participated in the battle in which his father Jaitugi had had killed Gaṅapatī's uncle Rudra or his father Mahādēva. In view of more than one king laying claim to the same achievement it is equally likely that Śīṅghaṇa and Mahādēva inherited this title from Jaitugi.

Śīṅghaṇa sent a number of expeditions against Gujarāt and Lāṭa, and, but for the last one, all of them were crowned with brilliant success. In one of these expeditions aimed against Lāṭa, the Cāhamāṇa ruling chief Simha and his brother Sindhurāja breathed their last and the latter’s son Saṅgrāmasimha, also known as Śaṅkha, was taken prisoner but later released by Śīṅghaṇa, as we learn from the Gujarāt chronicles. The death of the Lāṭa chief Simha in the battlefield is also referred to in the present inscription (ll. 30-31). On another occasion, Śaṅkha besought the help of Śīṅghaṇa in recovering Cambay which Vīrādhabala, son of Lavaṇaprasāda, had forcibly occupied. Simultaneously, the Paramāra king Dēvapīḷa also marched against Gujarāt to help his Cāhamāṇa feudatory in regaining Cambay. The Yādava forces crossed the Tapti and the people were panicky. Lavaṇaprasāda,

5. It is not improbable that Simha belonged to the same Cāhamāṇa family of which six members are known to have ruled over Lāṭa from the Hansot pls. of Bhārtṛvadāḷa, V.S. 813, *EI*, XII. p. 197.
7. The name is given as Sihāḍī in the present inscription.
8. Verse 36 of the next inscription also refers to the beheading of the king of Bhṛgukaccha.
minister and de facto ruler under Bhma II, retrieved the situation through a clever stratagem which split up the members of the confederacy and entered into an alliance with Sinhagana, as we learn from the Lekha-paddhati. As we shall presently see, the defeat of Devapala is also mentioned in our record. On both these occasions, the Yadava forces seem to have been led by the Brhma general Kholesvara. On yet another occasion, however, the Yadava forces, led by Kholesvara’s son Rama, were routed by the Yagheula chief Visaladeva, a fact admitted by the Yadavas themselves.

King Kes, with whom Sinhagana came into conflict, has not been satisfactorily identified so far. In all probability, he is identical with Jayakasin III, the Kadamba king of Goa, who ruled from A.D. 1187-88 to 1215 or 1217. In his war with Jayakasin, Sinhagana seems to have received valuable help from his feudatory Candradeva who is known to have been flourishing in A.D. 1250. In the Tasgaon plates of Yadava Krishna, dated Saka 1172 (A.D. 1250), he is said to have addressed the enemies of the Yadavas variously. He addressed Jayakasin as follows: “O Lord, if you are Jayakasin, the king of the sea, then drive the group of horses.”

The Hsala antagonist of Sinhagana was Ballala II. Shortly after his accession, Sinhagana concentrated his attention on preparing to avenge the disastrous defeat inflicted by the Hsala king Ballala on Bhillama V in the battle of Soratur. By a series of expeditions Sinhagana brought a large portion of the Hsala kingdom comprising Bellary, Anantapur, Chitaldrug and Shimoga districts under his control, and it continued to be governed by the Yadavas throughout the thirteenth century as indicated by a large number of Yadava inscriptions found there.

2. See infra No. IV. For details of Sinhagana’s campaigns against Gujarat, vide Altekar in EHD, pp. 533, 537, 539: The Struggle for Empire, pp. 189-91.
5. EHD, p. 532.
The Cōla contemporaries of Śiṅghana were Kulōttuṅga III (A.D. 1178-1216), Rājarāja III (A.D. 1216-1246) and Rājendra III (A.D. 1246-1279). In the present state of our knowledge, however, there is nothing to substantiate the claim of Śiṅghana to have won a victory over any of the Cōla kings.

His claim to success against the Gauḍa king and the Muslims does not fare better. According to the Patna inscription, a lesser general of Śiṅghana had defeated a Muslim ruler.¹ As suggested by Altekar,² it is not unlikely that in the course of his expeditions in Gujarāt and Malwa, Śiṅghana may have been involved in some border skirmishes with the Muslims.

We may now pass on to the information supplied by our inscription about Śiṅghana’s general (sainyādhipati) Khōḷēśvara, also called Khōḷēśa, (v. 15) and Khōlladēva (v. 9), and styled ‘king’, kṣmāpati (vv. 4, 8). The inscription supplies details about his descent both on his mother’s and father’s side. On his father’s side the descent is traced to the sage Mūdgala who was ever engrossed in meditating on Lord Śiva. On the mother’s side the descent is derived from the sage Kaśyapa. In other words, Mūdgala was his own gōtra, while the gōtra of his mother’s family was Kaśyapa. The descent on both the sides may be given in a tabular form as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On father’s side</th>
<th>On mother’s side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mūdgala</td>
<td>Kaśyapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhādēva</td>
<td>Gövinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śvāmidēva</td>
<td>Vāsudēva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivikrama</td>
<td>Nimbadēva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KHŌΛĒŚVARA

Only vague praise is bestowed upon Khōḷēśvara’s ancestors. The only interesting details that can be gleaned about them are as

---

follows: Bhāideva is said to have performed some sacrifices (v. 6). Svāmideva was a patron of scholars (v. 6). We are told that the whole of the agrahāra\(^1\) of Umbarapaṅktika was sanctified by the birth of Trivikrama (v. 8). This shows that Umbarapaṅktika was probably the home town of Khōleśvara.

Next, as regards his mother’s descent. Gövinda is said to be the foremost among good kings (kalyāṇa-brhadhu, v. 11). Vāsudeva was always absorbed in worshipping Vāsudeva, i.e., he was a Vaiṣṇava (v. 12). Nimbadēva is described as a veritable wish-fulfilling tree to the suppliants and a lion to the elephants that were his enemies (v. 13).

Although Nimbadēva is described as verily the moon to the water-lilies that were the Brāhmaṇas (v. 13), the very tone of the description leaves no room for doubt that Khōleśvara’s mother hailed from a ruling family. As we have already seen, Gövinda is clearly described as a king (brhadhu). On the other hand, Khōleśvara’s ancestors do not seem to have had any pretension to royal power; none of them had either a regal title or a military achievement to his credit. They took pride in performing Vedic sacrifices and enjoying agrahāras. Khōleśvara was probably the first member of the family to exchange the hereditary priestly profession for a military career, and by dint of his own ability, he attained the status of a great general and a feudal chief.

Khōleśvara is naturally described in most glowing terms. Thus, he is said to have been an abode of fame, an adornment of the universe, of sharp, pure intellect, an ocean of nectar that is gentility, a treasure of virtues, terrible in fierce war, sacredness incarnate, risen to a high position by his prowess, endowed with unrivalled valour, foremost among those whose speech was purified by a sense of propriety, character and discretion, another Viśvāmitra as it were, capable to create another set of the three worlds, equal to Agastya in drinking the ocean, viz., all his enemies, successful allround, of handsome form, respected throughout the world, so on and so forth (vv. 4, 8-9).

Besides this general description we also get glimpses of the brilliant military career of Khōleśvara. The Gurjaras, it is said, were destroyed by him with his fierce sword on the other bank of

---

\(^1\) *i.e.*, a rent-free Brāhmaṇa village.
the river Mekalakanyaka (Narmada) and were still crying together with the goblins or jackals (pērava), who had had evidently come there in search of flesh. 1 Khölēśvara is further styled as extirpator of the stalk (i.e., neck) of the lotus-head of the Gurjara king Sihaḍī (Gurjara-vara-Sihaḍī-sirah-kamala-mula-nal-ōśapatanakara, ll 30-31). The Yögēśvari Temple inscription also contains this statement in somewhat different words: Having split up the Gurjaras and cut off the head of the lord of Bhrgukaccha, Khölēśvara planted a column of victory in the sea (v. 36). Sihaḍī is undoubtedly identical with the Cāhamāna chief Simha who was ruling over Lāṭa (central and southern Gujarat) with Bhrgukaccha (modern Broach) as his headquarters. According to some scholars, he is probably identical with Sahajapāla as well as with the unnamed king of Lāṭa mentioned in the Vasanta-vilāsa and the Kīrti-kaumudi (VI. 57). 2 Although Simha is not mentioned by name in the Vasanta-vilāsa and the Kīrti-kaumudi, the Hammīra-mada-mardana informs us that he was a king of Lāṭa. The last-named play further tells us that when Simha’s kingdom was invaded by the Yādava army his Mālava ally (the Paramāra king Dēvapāla) deserted him and, consequently, he was forced to seek the help of Viradhavala, son of Lavanaprasāda, the de facto ruler of the Caulukya kingdom during the reign of Bhima II. The Hammīra-mada-mardana is reticent about the subsequent fate of Simha; but the evidence of our inscription enables us to conclude that Viradhavala probably did not come to the rescue of Simha who had proved his friendship to be untrustworthy by allowing his relations with the neighbouring powers, viz., the Paramāras and the Caulukyas, to be determined by sheer opportunism, and that he lost his life in this encounter with the Yādavas. We learn from the Hammīra-mada-mardana that Simha’s brother Sindhurāja also lost his life at the hands of the Yādavas and that his (Sindhurāja’s) son Śaṅkha was imprisoned. 3 The Yādava forces on this occasion were evidently led by Khölēśvara who, being a resident of Vidarbha, was thoroughly acquainted with the terrain.

A.K. Majumdar identifies the Yādava adversary of Simha with Jaitugi, the father of Śinghaṇa. 4 But in view of the explicit assertion

1. This is the same as verse 25 of the next inscription.
in our inscription that Siṇha (Siṃha) was killed by Khōleśvara who was a general of Siṃhaṇa there can be no doubt that the expedition against Siṃha was sent by Siṃhaṇa under the leadership of Khōleśvara.

A. S. Altekar held the view that the defeat and death of Siṃha took place in c. A.D. 1222 or 1223. But the available evidence merely indicates that the event must have taken place sometime before A.D. 1228, the date of the present inscription. This is in full conformity with the evidence furnished by the Hammāra-mada-mardana, the only work bearing on this question, which was composed sometime between A D. 1220 and 1230. How long before this date the event took place cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge.

In verse 22 Khōleśvara is styled as the destroyer of the king of Bhambhāgiri, while a viruda in line 30 describes him as the forest-fire for setting ablaze the family of the Ābhira king Lakṣmidēva, the lord of Bhambhāgiri. Verse 35 of the next inscription also refers to the destruction by Khōleśvara of the lord of Bhambhādri. He is evidently the same as Lakṣmidhara, the “lion of Rambhāgiri” who, according to Hēmadri, was killed by Siṃhaṇa. The Uddari stone inscription and the Paithan and Purusottamapuri plates of Rāmacandra also refer to this feat which is, however, attributed to Siṃhaṇa. G. H. Khare suggested the identification of Bhambhāgiri with the village of Bhambhorī in the Ahmadnagar District or Rāja’s Bhām near Yeotmal. Mirashi, on the other hand, proposes to identify it with the hill near a ruined old town called Bhāmer, four miles to the south of Nīzampur in the Pimpalner taluka of the West Khandesh District. It lies at the foot of a great fortified hill littered with many ruined gateways, gates, towers and also some old caves locally known as

5. *IA*, XIV.
7. *SMHD*, 1, p. 60.

*Yad. Ins.* 3
'Rāja's houses'. The latter view appears to be more probable. Now, as we have seen above, Hēmaḍri, the Uddari stone inscription and the Paithan and Puruṣottamapuri plates ascribe this achievement to Śīṅghana, whereas our inscription credits Khōlēśvara with this exploit. It is obvious, therefore, that the line of Lakṣmidēva was actually destroyed by Khōlēśvara on behalf of his overlord Śīṅghana.

In line 27 Khōlēśvara is styled as the master of the kingdom of Bhōjadēva, the Paramāra king of Cāhaṁda, while the next inscription (verse 30) avers that the angered Bhōjadēva, king of Cāmhadā or Cāmhadā, who had mustered four-fold forces, was conquered by Khōlēśvara in the battle-field. As suggested by Khare, Cāhaṁda (or Cāmhadā), the headquarters of Paramāra Bhōjadēva, may be Chanda, the principal town of the district of that name in the Vidarbha Division of Maharashatra. In the colophon of a manuscript of the Campū-Rāmāyaṇa it is said to have been composed by one Bhōja, king of Vidarbha. Whether the two Bhōjas were identical cannot be determined. At least there is nothing to suggest that Bhōja, the author of the Campū-Rāmāyaṇa, was a Paramāra king. As the main Paramāra kingdom of Malwa was, at this time, ruled over by Dēvapāla, and not by the illustrious Bhōja, Khare is inclined to hold that Bhōja of our inscription, like Paramāra, was a family, not personal, name of the king and that Bhōja of Chanda had nothing to do with the Paramāra dynasty. But this goes squarely against the evidence of the present inscription which clearly states that Bhōjadēva hailed from the Paramāra line. There is also no doubt that Bhōjadēva in this case was a personal, not family, name. It is interesting to note in this connection that a stone inscription in the Bhadranāga temple at Bhandak, 16 miles north-west of Chanda, records the installation of an image of Nāga Nārāyaṇa and the repairs to the temple in Śaka 1308 by a Paramāra. This shows that a branch of the Paramāra dynasty ruled in this region. It is not unlikely that Bhōja of our inscription belonged

---

2. Both the spellings of the place name, Cāhaṁda and Cāmhadā, appear to have been current. The first spelling is found in the present inscription and the second one in the next inscription.
4. Ibid.
to this dynasty. The Paramāra rule in this region was thus brought to an end, or at least temporarily eclipsed, by Siṅghaṅa's general Khōleśvara.

In lines 27-8 Khōleśvara is described as the very southern wind for subduing the haughtiness of the army of Hēmādi, King of Bāṇakhēṭī. Now, two kings bearing the name Hēmādi are known to us, viz., (i) Hēmāḍidēva of the Nikumbha family known from the undated Patna inscription as ruling in the Chalisgaon region of Khandesh,¹ and (ii) Hēmāḍridēva ruling at Ṭekkali (modern Barsi-Takli, Akola District) in Śaka 1098 (A. D. 1176).² Of these two chiefs of the name Hēmādi, the first was evidently a contemporary of and owed allegiance to Siṅghaṅa, for he is styled as "a lion to the elephants that were the enemies of the illustrious Siṅghaṅadēva."³ Khare has, therefore, indicated the possibility that this Hēmādi may have at first risen in rebellion against Siṅghaṅa early in the latter's reign but was defeated and compelled to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Yādava king by Khōleśvara.⁴ There is nothing inherently improbable in this suggestion.

Mirashi, however, identifies our Hēmādi with the Hēmāḍridēva known from the Barsi-Takli inscription of Śaka 1098.⁵ He prefers to read Parnākhēṭīya in place of Bāṇakhēṭīya⁶ and depending on Hēmādi's statement that the Yādava king Mallugi took a town named Parnākhēṭa from his enemies and, while residing there, carried away by force the elephant force of the Utkala king, holds that Parnākhēṭa captured by Mallugi and the place of that name where Hēmādi, said to have been defeated by Khōleśvara, was ruling must have been situated somewhere to the east of Khandesh, possibly in Vidarbha, and proposes to identify it with Patkhed, about four miles to the south-west of Barsi-Takli. He reconstructs the course of events as follows: Mallugi defeated the father or some elderly relative of Hēmādi of the Barsi-Takli inscription; while he was a mere boy, Hēmādi vanquished Rājula, son of Mallugi, who was advancing on

---

Tekkali with a large army; finally Khōlēśvara defeated him early in the reign of Śingaṇa. There are, however, two main difficulties which come in the way of accepting Mirashi’s view. Firstly, the reading of the place-name in our inscription is clearly Bānakheṭṭi, and not Pānakheṭṭ as suggested by Mirashi. Thus the very basis of the supposed connection between the capture of Pānakheṭṭa by Mallugi and the defeat of Hēmādri at the hands of Khōlēśvara disappears. The other stumbling block is the chronological consideration. In the Barsi-Takli inscription, Hēmādri is said to have vanquished Rājula, son of Mālugi. Even if this Mālugi is regarded as identical with the Yādava king Mallugi, as held by Mirashi, it may be reasonably assumed that his son Rājula must have attacked Hēmādri as his father’s general. Now, the reign of Mallugi came to an end about A. D. 1160, while Śingaṇa, whose general Khōlēśvara is said to have defeated Hēmādri, ascended the throne in A. D. 1210. Thus, there is an interval of about fifty years between the end of Mallugi’s reign and the commencement of Śingaṇa’s, in other words between Hēmādri’s victory over Rājula and his own supposed defeat at the hands of Khōlēśvara. Even otherwise, there is a gap of thirty-four years between the only known date of Hēmādri of the Barsi-Takli inscription and the earliest known date of Śingaṇa. Thus the whole reconstruction appears a priori improbable.

Khōlēśvara is said to have put Rāmapāla to flight (I 28). The name of the country ruled over by Rāmapāla was given in the present inscription, but it has now become quite illegible. However, in the next inscription, which describes him as a very death to his foes, he is said to have been a king of Vārāṇasī (v. 32). From the manner of his description he appears to have been a powerful ruler. He is evidently identical with the Kāśi-pattī (Lord of Kāśi) who, according to the Paṇḍa inscription, was defeated by Śingaṇa. No

1. EI, XXI, pp. 130-31.
2. My reading has been kindly checked by Prof. Mirashi himself.
3. EHD, p. 519.
4. The following points also deserve consideration in the present context: (1) Except phonetic similarity there is nothing to vouch for the identification of Mallugi and Mālugi: (ii) Mallugi is known to have had two sons, Amara-gāṅgaya and Karṇa; Rājula is not known as his son from any other source.
chief of this name ruling over Vārāṇaśī in the time of Śiṅghaṇa is known from any other source. No doubt the Pāla king Rāmapāla had once ruled over Vārāṇaśī, but he was dead some eighty years prior to Śiṅghaṇa's accession. Moreover, Vārāṇaśī was at this time, under Muslim rulers. It was, therefore, suggested by Altekar that after Vārāṇaśī was occupied by the Muslims, the scions of the Hindu family ruling there might have escaped to Madhya Pradesh and carved out small principalities for themselves. They might have styled themselves as lords of Vārāṇaśī and occasionally come into conflict with Śiṅghaṇa. The prāṇastikāra may have given the name of this chief as Rāmapāla as he was aware of the rule of Rāmapāla at Vārāṇaśī at one time. While this explanation fails to carry conviction, no other conjecture on the question need be hazarded and the question must be left open for the present.

In line 29 Khōlēśvara is compared to Rāma in storming Laṅkā that was the inaccessible fort of Toragala. This exploit of Khōlēśvara is also mentioned in the next inscription (v. 34) where the name of the fort is spelt as Toragalla which, we are told, had become unassailable even to arrogant rulers but was reduced by Khōlēśvara in no time. In view of the fact that the fort at Torgal, near Kolhapur, retained its importance even during the period of Muslim rule, its capture was indeed a great achievement of which a seasoned general could justifiably be proud.

Khōlēśvara is further described as a very hatchet to cut off the root that was the head of the powerful Nāgaṇa (l 30). Verse 33 of the following record also states that Khōlēśvara struck off Nāgaṇa's head in battle. This chief is not known from any other source.

Khōlēśvara is also compared to an eagle (vainatēya) in destroying the multitude of snakes, namely the confederacy of Vāvannadeśa (l 29). We know nothing about Vāvannadeśa.

Khōlēśvara also claims some success against the king of Kaliṅga (l 27). But as the reading of the relevant portion of the inscription is rather uncertain, the nature of this exploit cannot be determined.

---

1. Even as the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Yādavas styled themselves as the lords of Laṅgalūra and Dvārakā respectively.
2. EHD, pp. 540-41.
As we shall see presently, Khôlêśvara probably led a campaign against Kôsala or Chhattisgarh region. It is not unlikely that in the course of this campaign he may have come into conflict with the Gaṅgas of Kalinga. Singhaṇa’s Eastern Gaṅga contemporaries were Rājarāja III, Anaṅgabhima III and Narasimha I.¹

A *viruda* in line 31 describes Khôlêśvara as a very storm in destroying the forest that was the haughtiness of Dēvapāla, the powerful king of Dhārā. This Dēvapāla is undoubtedly the same as the Paramāra king of that name who succeeded Arjunavarman about 1217 A. D. Obviously, the traditional hostility between the Paramāras and the Yādavas continued in his reign. With the death of Arjunavarman, the Paramāra power was broken and all his successors were weak. It is quite likely that Khôlêśvara won an easy victory over Dēvapāla. It is likely that as a result of his defeat Dēvapāla lost the Nimad region to Singhaṇa. This is suggested by the discovery of a hoard of twenty-four coins of Singhaṇa in the village Kotha of the Harsud Tehsil, East Nimad District, Madhya Pradesh.² As we have already seen, on another occasion the Cāhamāna chief Śaṅkha induced Singhaṇa and Dēvapāla to make a common cause against Lavaṇaprasāda. The allied forces advanced causing great consternation among the people of Gujarat. But Lavaṇaprasāda saved the situation by employing spies who created dissension between Dēvapāla and Singhaṇa. A treaty of peace was concluded between Singhaṇa and Lavaṇaprasāda about A. D. 1231. It is possible that being angered over the apparent deceit of Dēvapāla, Singhaṇa may have attacked and defeated him. On this occasion the Yādava forces were led by Khôlêśvara, as we learn from the present inscription.

Khôlêśvara is styled as a great Varāha (Boar incarnation) in lifting up the earth and rescuing the army of a southern king who was submerged in the ocean of the armies of the Raṭṭa king Karuvēma (/32). Depending on the analogy of the name Annavēma, Khare opines that Karuvēma must have been one of the Cōla kings of Kāñci.³ But it is difficult to accept this suggestion in view of the

---

fact that Karuvēma is said to have been a Raṭṭa chief, while Annavema and others of his family are never called Raṭṭa. Unfortunately, no king named Karuvēma is known from any other source. But two Raṭṭa lines are known to have been ruling in the Belgaum District of Mysore. One of them ruled from Saundatti and the other ruled over the Kuṇḍi country with Vēṇugrāma (Modern Belgaum) as its capital. Kāṛttavirya IV, the Raṭṭa chief of Vēṇugrāma, is known to have submitted to Siṅghaṇa.¹ The last known member of this family was Lakṣmidēva II and his latest known date is A.D. 1228. Shortly afterwards, the Raṭṭa family was dispossessed of its kingdom which was placed under the charge of Siṅghaṇa’s victorious general Bicaṇa.² Raṭṭapati Karuvēma appears to have belonged to this family. It is also not impossible that Karuvēma was a nickname of either Kāṛttavirya IV or Lakṣmidēva II. In the absence of definite evidence, it is not possible to say anything more about the course of events leading to this conflict.

The recently discovered Ardhapur stone inscription, dated Śaka 1111 (=A. D. 1190), has brought to light another line of Raṭṭa chiefs ruling in the Parbhani region as feudatories of the Yādavas.³ The inscription refers to three generations of the Raṭṭa chiefs and describes last of them, Ballāla, as the ‘stabiliser of the Yādava kings’. Nothing is known about the subsequent history of the family. It is not impossible that Karuvēma of our inscription belonged to this family.

Verse 22 seems to credit Khōleśvara with some victories in Mālava, Vaṅga, Nēpāla, Gurjara, Kōsala, Höysala, Tēluṅga and Cola countries and against Mahāhāmmira also. This stanza is in the form of an address to women of the harems of these kingdoms and states that they (women) had angered Khōleśvara, the destroyer of the king of Bhambhāgiri. We have already seen that Siṅghaṇa’s campaigns against Mālava and Gujarāt were led by his general Khōleśvara. We have also taken note of Siṅghaṇa’s relations with the southern kingdoms, viz., Höysala, Cola and Tēluṅga (Kākatiya). The verse under consideration indicates that Khōleśvara took part in his master’s

---

southern expeditions also. The Vaṅga contemporaries of Śiṅghaṇa were the Śēna kings Viśvarūpaśēna and Keśavavēsa. But it does not seem very likely that Śiṅghaṇa or his general Khōlēśvara actually came into conflict with the Śēna kings of Bengal. His claim to success against Nēpāla also does not appear to rest on facts. But his claim as regards Kōsala or Chhattisgarā, however, seems to be based on more solid achievements. Pratīpamalla, the last known Kalacuri chief of Ratanpur, ruled at least up to A.D. 1218. It is possible that he or his successor was defeated and his kingdom annexed by Śiṅghaṇa. That Śiṅghaṇa and his successors down to the end of the dynasty maintained their hold over Chhattisgarh region is indicated by the discovery of the coins of Śiṅghaṇa in the Raigarh District of Madhya Pradesh\(^1\) and of those of Śiṅghaṇa, Kṛṣṇa, Mahādeva and Rāmacandra at Sonepur in Orissa.\(^2\) The Yādava conquest of South Kōsala was evidently achieved by Khōlēśvara.

From what we have seen, it would appear that the extension of the Yādava power in the north was almost entirely the work of Śiṅghaṇa's able general Khōlēśvara. But the activities of Khōlēśvara were not confined to the north alone. He had some achievements in the south also to his credit. As we have already seen, he subdued a Raṭṭa chief of Mysore and also participated in some other southern campaigns of Śiṅghaṇa. The capture of the fort of Torgal was also due to him. In the light of these facts, the popular notion that Khōlēśvara was in charge only of the northern expeditions of Śiṅghaṇa must be substantially modified. The great encomium showered on him in this as well as in other inscriptions edited in these pages is fully justified by the glory he brought to his master.

But Khōlēśvara was not only a great general. He distinguished himself equally well in peaceful pursuits of life. As the traditional

1. \textit{JNSI}, VIII, pp. 147 ff.
2. \textit{Ibid.}, XV, pp. 126 ff. As pointed out by B.B. Nath (\textit{Ibid.}, p. 129), the discovery at Sonepur of the coins of three successors of Śiṅghaṇa shows the improbability of the occupation of Kōsala by Nasir-ud-Din as suggested by Altekar on the basis of the association of a gold coin of Nasir-ud-Din with those of Śiṅghaṇa found in the Raigarh District (\textit{Ibid.}, VIII, 147 ff). There is also nothing to support Altekar's conjecture that the local Kalacuri rulers of Jabalpur and Tumāṇa were known as Kōkkalla and Jājalla (\textit{EH D}, p. 540). It is more probable, as suggested by D.C. Ganguly, that these were kings ruling in parts of Mysore. \textit{Vide The struggle for empire}, p. 189.
progenitor of his line, sage Mudgala, is stated to have been absorbed in meditating upon Śiva, it may be concluded that Śaivism was his family religion, and the erection by him of the temple of Sakalēśvara (Śiva) at Amrapura (mod. Ambe) is in keeping with this fact. As already stated above, the present inscription originally belonged to this temple, its object being to register certain grants to the temple. But Khōlēśvara practised religious toleration. While Śaivism was his family religion, he probably inherited love for Vaiṣṇavism from his mother, whose ancestor Vāsudēva is said to have kept himself busy worshipping Vāsudēva (Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa). It was probably under his mother's influence that he built a lofty temple of the god Śaṅgadārīn at Acalapura (v. 17), modern Ellichpur, Amraoti District, Maharashtra. It must be mentioned in this connection that there is even now a temple of the god Śaṅgadāra at Ellichpur, and while the temple itself is a modern construction, the image is undoubtedly old and most probably represents the one installed by Khōlēśvara.

Khōlēśvara was a Brāhmaṇa by birth, and though he had given up śāstra for śastra, he solicited the welfare of the Brāhmaṇas. As we have already seen, his father, Trivikrama, was born at the agrahāra village Umbarapaṇktiṇa which, as will be shown below, should be identified with present Amraoti. In all probability, Khōlēśvara was also born at the same Brāhmaṇa village. He himself founded some agrahāras. A great agrahāra named Khōllapūra after himself was created by him on the bank of the river Payōṣṇi. In extent and glory it is said to have resembled Hastināpura (v. 18). Another extensive agrahāra named Vārāṇasi, resorted to by numerous Brāhmaṇas, was founded by him in what was known as Varadāta (v. 19). He had established several agrahāras, free water-sheds (prapās), free feeding houses (sattras) and built temples and step-wells (vāpis) in Varadāta (v. 20). Yet another agrahāra township, an abode of the learned Brāhmaṇas, was founded by him on the river Vaṅjarā, in Amrādēśa (v. 21).

Khōlēśvara was excessively fond of virudhas or titles. Line 25 tells us that he had acquired by the prowess of his own arms a

1. Supra, p. 5.

Yād. ins. 4
multitude of virudas, and lines 25-33 give us what is called a string of names (nāmāvali) or regal titles (rājāvali). Much of the historical information discussed above is afforded by them.

Khōlēśvara seems to have been kind-hearted and endowed with a high moral character. While he was the very staff of Yama in punishing the circle of his foes, he was also a preceptor in the art of reinstating kings who had been dispossessed of their kingdoms, gave shelter to those afraid of their enemies and treated young women of others as his own sisters (ll 25-26).

Next, as regards the localities mentioned in our inscription. As stated above, Acalapura, where Khōlēśvara erected a temple of Šāṅgaḍhārin, is identical with modern Ellichpur in the Amraoti District. It is referred to under the name Acalapura in some early inscriptions. The Khōllapūra agrahāra founded by Khōlladēva and named after himself is modern Kholapur, 16 miles west of Amraoti. The Vārāṇasi agrahāra may be identified with modern Banārsī, a small village a little to the north-west of Amraoti. It is interesting to note in this connection that the surname Banārasē is quite common in this part of Maharashtra. It is quite likely that the surname originated from this agrahāra village. Umbarapaṅktika, the native place of Khōlēśvara, has not been satisfactorily identified so far. In view of the fact that all the three places in this region which were the venues of Khōlēśvara’s pious activities are situated in the present Amraoti District, it may be suggested that Umbarapaṅktika is the same as the chief town of the district. The name is still popularly pronounced as Umaravati. The place is referred to by the name Umbarāvati in the Gōvinda-prabhu-caritra, a Mahānubhāva work of the 13th century A.D. The river Payōṣṇī, on whose bank Khōllapūra was situated, is modern Purna and Kholapur is on its eastern bank. Varadātaṭa, which witnessed the pious works of Khōlēśvara, is Berar, Varadātaṭa being the prototype of the name Berar, as pointed out by Khare.

1. Udumbaramanti, mentioned in the Bhandak plates of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa I, dated Śaka 694, has been identified by K.N. Dikshit with Rani Umraoti in the Yeotmal Taluk, Yeotmal District. Vide Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference, 2nd Session, 1923, p. 626. However, Rani Umraoti is out of question in the present context as all the places in Vidarbha mentioned in the present as well as the next inscription are situated in the Amraoti District.

2. Edited by V.B. Kolte (Malkapur, 1960), 236.

3. SMHD, I, p. 58.
Amrapura (l 36), the headquarters of Khōlēsva ra, is Ambe, the findspot of the inscriptions edited here. But Amrapura is not the original form of the name. It is mentioned as Ambā in the Ambe inscription of Udayāditya, dated A.D. 1144. But even this does not seem to represent the original form of the name. Both these appear to be Sanskritised forms of the original name. Amrapura appears to be the Sanskritised form of Ambā or Ambē, Sarskrt āmra and Marathi āmbā or āmbē being synonymous (= mango). The name Ambā is found in the Marathi portion of the present record itself (l 39). It is mentioned as Ambē (Khōlanāyakāce Āmbe) in the Mahānubhāva work Li lācaritra, composed in c. Śaka 1200. Thus the original name of the place was Āmbā or Ambē, Amrapura being merely an attempt at Sanskritisation. It is also supported by the use of Ambēdāsu (l 36) and Āmradēśā (ll 21, 35) as synonyms. These two names evidently denote the region round Ambe Jogai. The river Vānjarā on which an agrahāra created by Khōlēsva ra was situated is the present Mañjara. The village Laghu-Bāūcī has been identified with one of the villages called Bāochi in the neighbourhood of Ambe. One of these is situated 19 miles west by south from Ambe between Ambe and Kalamb; the other Bāochi is situated 16 miles to the south of Ambe between Ambe and Latur. As pointed out by M. G. Dikshit, the latter village seems to be intended. The adjective laghu was added to the name of the village to indicate its smaller extent as compared to the other Bāochi which may have been known as Bṛhad-Bāūcī. The practice of prefixing bṛhat and laghu to place names is noteworthy. Kējadeśā is the country round present Kej, 22 miles to the west of Ambe, Āusadeśā denoted the region round Ausa, 34 miles to the south of Ambe. Udāgiri has been identified with Udgrī, the headquarters of the Udgrī Taluk, Oosmanabad District, at a distance of 52 miles from Ambe. Saiya may be the same as Sai situated at a distance of about 2½ miles from Laghu Bāūcī. Javalagāva is modern Javalagamva, 7½ miles south-
east of Ambe in the Mominabad Taluk, Bhir District. Cātusa is the same as the village Chat, 33 miles to the south of Ambe. Āḍasa is the modern village of Adas to the west of Ambe. Bilvapāli, Rāhaṭavamdi and Śalivāva cannot be identified.¹

Finally, it must be pointed out that a perusal of the list of localities mentioned in the present inscription will reveal that they were situated in two distinct regions: Amraoti District of Vidarbha and the Bhir and Oosmanabad Districts of the Marathwada Division of Maharashtra. The same may be said about the localities referred to in the next inscription. As stated earlier,² Trivikrama and probably his son Khōleśvara were born at Amraoti. The next epigraph contains a hyperbolic description of Āmrāpura, modern Ambe, which is said to have been Khōleśvara’s headquarters. The closeness of Khōleśvara’s association with Ambe is indicated by the description of Ambe as Khōlanāyaka’s in the Līlācaritra. It would thus follow that Khōleśvara was a native of Vidarbha but afterwards migrated to Marathwada when he was appointed a general and provincial governor with Ambe as the seat of his administration, by his Yādava overlord, as it was more centrally situated.³

TEXT

1. ॥ श्रेयस्थऽ(स्थऽ)मन्त्रंकामयं दन्तसिदूर रक्षतिकरे सभ्रर्कराविभा(वा)लङ्कलसरसो बलत्सरे ॥[सतेऽ हेलालोहित-मोदकायमः ॥]⁴⁻⁵

1. The villages mentioned in the Marathi portion were correctly identified by M. G. Dikshit, ibid., pp. 24-3. Tulipule also follows him. Vide Pracīna Marathi Korīva Lākha, p. 120.
3. There is nothing to support the opinion of Altekar (EHDP, p. 541) that Khōleśvara was a native of Khandesh.
4. Khare has omitted ॐ.
5. Khare औषोस्मतः.
6. “ सर्पाक्रंददलिताः.”
7. “ बलत्सरे.”
8. “ भ्राञ्जते.”
9. Restoration of the missing portion of this, as well as other lines, is based on the next inscription.
2. वनस्पति(द्वाराधमो) स यो मूर्तियोत्सवस्त्रप्रतिविन् विच्छलवाचियो प्रप्तय्यमः [१२] [२] [३] [४] अवस्था यहस्तामस्तब्रजिनिकर(रः) प्रद्रूप्तारामान्त: कुञ्जवैतिन्यः [५]

3. तत्कीतिरूचनः थीतिषणः होशिष्यः ने:ना:नरि हरिमसंपत्तरतिष्कों समस्त: खण्डाशायं प्रायःमयः कुञ्जवस्य दलिता भारा घरम् [६]

4. पक्षः (नामः) [२] [१] [२] [३] तेलनो [७] येन नीतो निधनमतिवितो गृह्यरोऽर्जनर्थः [१०] केषिका: केषकामिनो [११] परिजनसहितो होतसः [१२] पुर्वलाखः चोडः गोर्गः [१३]


6. प्रतापोन्नतिबिमबालकितक्कुञ्जः (स्व) यामनालमः [१८] मुखर्मुखालकित(स्व) महालमः [१६] गृह्यरोऽर्जनर्थः [१०] सोंरणवृत्तारिपुण्यालिनिभूषोऽर्जनर्थः [१७] महत्या युष्मेन्द्रस्त्रातुमात्रमिनिभूषोऽर्जनर्थः [१८]

7. अयते चोड़: दरकारकार्यः [१३] [५] [१२] [१३] हृदर्भणसङ्ग्राहबाधनकाप्रवृत्तः शरमनिवायांशः: हउँशायानवयः [१२] बिविदतः [१३] तपरमत्वसे: ग्याताः [२]

---

1. Khare, शिवः दुःखाग्रामो, 2. Khare, हुक्तश्रद्धान्यमः.
3. Metre, Sārdulavikridita.
4. .. has omitted it.
5. Khare, दीपः.
6. .. हंसस्यः.
7. Metre, Sārdulavikridita.
8. .. तेलनो.
10. .. आर्जनर्थः.
11. .. केषकामिनो.
12. .. सुत (म) देव. As observed above, त and bh are often formed alike. In the next inscription, where also this stanza occurs, the reading is clearly bh.
13. Khare, मुखः (सुतः) कालः. The medial u, which is turned to right, is quite clear.
14. Khare, मुखः (सुतः) कालः.
15. Metre, Srāgāhāra.
17. Khare, चूर्णिनातः.
18. .. चूर्णि निवाचियः.
19. Metre, Sārdulavikridita.
8. तीतवेता जयति लतितकीौत्सर्गगलात्यो मूर्तिः: ॥ [५.१.३]
ब्योमूलयस्य सर्वप्रभुवर्गसदलाधनीवर्गवं विप्रः कृश्वाइः।

9. न(न:) स्त्रीविधानभूमि: ॥ तत्त्वाधिकारसमानदिवसाधारीः
लक्ष्यसाधनाय सम्भवसादिर्शतमसाय तिरुमलयपूजः ॥ जयाम् कः

10. ह्युवः ॥ [६.१.३] ततः श्रीश्रीमूर्तिविस्तारविनिमयः ॥
युवक्वातुवर्षिताः सर्वप्रभुवर्गसदलाधनी: ॥ [७.१.३]

11. [हृद्या]
ब्योमूलयविशिष्टः श्रीके[श्री] कमातिञ्चक्षुचारविचार:-
निमित्तं विद्याश्रिप्रक्षु[न्] [निर्माति इति]

12. बौद्धाट्या शक्तियाः शिलालिंगादिरिजयात् ॥
[६.१.३] श्रीहरिबन्धुः ॥
सबेतः प्राधिकारिविविधितपरस्यः
[ज्ञान:]
[राज: इति]

13. श्य: आयति लतितमूलसिविनिमयात्सर्वसम्बन्धसुनकुत्तमाः
[रोहिल्लुवा-
[जिवाः]
[१०.१.३] श्रीभक्तिवृष्टिसास्य श्रीकामाकांलकुशः

14. तृष्णालोकाः स्वर्गसोः ॥ [१०.१.३] कल्याणः
[ज्ञान:]
[राज: इति]

15. क्षत्रियाः साधनाः रत: ॥
विद्याविविधासः सबेतः
[१२.१.३] ह्युवक्वातुवर्षिताः कल्याणः विद्वानथुतः
[निर्माति]

1. Khare, "कृश्वाइः.
2. Metre, Malini.
3. Metre, Sragdharā.
4. .. Indravajra.
5. Khare takes it as the concluding letter of the last line.
6. .. "नौरा".
7. .. takes all this as forming part of the last line.
8. Metre: Śāradāvīkraṇāda
10. Metre, Malini.
11. Khare, "कृश्वाइः.
12. .. Anugṛhā.
13. .. "नौरा".
14. .. ..
15. Metre, Anugṛhā.
16. Khare, "मूलः".
16. प्राणः। अरिधृतारणात्तो वालुकेर्भतोमोऽसकलपुष्पनिधानं [निवि]वः
    [कैपालिकनि: ॥ [१३ ॥ नृ] ॥ तस्माद्युज्वतो सति शारिकलालाभावः
    लीला[रूपः]

17. वह चंद्राध्य नायितहु (हु) चांपकजस्ताम्बसरामृत् वृक्षं। सतिष्ठी किमहो
    परि[ऩ]त्तर्तः तत् किवचारभाषात्रिशेषं यत्र सुचिर्रिभण्णिष्णित्विवधे क्याति
    सम्भावना

18. ॥ [१४ ॥ नृ] ॥ अन्तःयुत्मुरस्यादविती बासवो यथा ॥ स्वालेशु
    इति विश्वातः स्वस्य विवाकरः ॥ [१५ ॥ नृ] ॥ कि कि तथा
    यसोः[म्] जो विचुवने स्तुत्यविष्ये ॥ महासुरीरूः[न्ये]स्त्रां

19. दानियः करालक्षणमिहताः! कृष्ण्यथो गूँजरा। ॥ वंशार्य्याधिनिष्ठः
    [व्र बहुलकु]कारः ॥ गोरेश्वनन्दनस्तेमेकलक्षणयापति चाहे ॥
    [१६ ॥ नृ] ॥

20. अधि च। यदवकारकालपूर्वः कमकारकारश्च महत्। मंदिरं म[वराकारः]
    रक्षार्यः ब्राह्मणेश्वरिणः ॥ [१७ ॥ नृ] ॥ वोल्लुकिरिरियं नको [यो] प्र[थि]
    [महुः] (समुः) ॥ तीत

21. रे परोष्यथा वि(वि)पुलं त(व)नायदक्षिणापुरुरं (रसः) ॥ [१८ ॥ नृ] ॥
    अवहारि तंत्रवसं विहरिण्य वर्तवते ॥ वाराणसिति विश्वात्समीत्वादाहुपुरीः
    अम्बे (समुः) [१९ ॥ नृ] ॥ कि च बहुरा।

——

1. Metre, Mālini.
2. According to Khare, this is the concluding part of the last line.
3. Khare, "प्रतितुहुः".
4. Khare, "वर्णनः".
5. Metre, Sārdūlavikritā,
6. .. कोलेशु.
7. The intended reading appears to be विस्वातो रिपुवालतिविवाकरः.
8. I owe this suggestion to my friend K.V. Sarma.
10. Khare, गूँजरा।
11. .. ०-कारः.
12. .. सारचः.
13. .. -रक्षे:
14. Metre, Sārdūlavikritā,
15. Metre, Anusūbh.
17. ..
18. Metre, Anusūbh.
19. Khare, कि च बहुरा।
22. वेदालयाम्प्रार्हारा यथः 1 सिद्धाभनेकरः। प्रपादः सत्यामः रः [स्मा] आया[प्र्य]एव वर्धवार्हारः। [२०।२] १० जास्तारो तथा चक्षुं योवर्हार 4 महात् [पु]रः (रस्)। भवेदालयाम्प्रार्हारः।

23. यद रम्यं विमक्ते ५ बंजरात्ते। [१२।१।४] ६ किक्तव ११ बा[(व)केः ८ मालिक बृंगि गूढ़रिङ भूहाम्हंतेरि। ९ नेवालिके। १० मालः: कोतलि चोलि हो [र]लि तथा तेलुकिले।

24. स्त्र:पुरिः २ विबारावती विषांसमयं काकुरः (षो)। १२ भवधूतेयं १२ यज्ञानिर्मिर-मुरुङ्ग: भवन्हुवालोकेवरि। १४ रोपितः। [२९।१।१] १६ वस्येयुः १६ नि।

25. अभिनिर्मिर्निर्मिति (वि) विवदनमुहृद्यं १७ नामावली। १८ विश्वम्बरी: १६ वि विवदन-मुहृद्यं। १८ विवदन्युक्ततम भूलीकसुः (अ) नारायणी। १९ वस्येयुः।

26. लघुस्थितिवेक्षकत्वं पुरायुः (म) हेयानावाचयं। ३० प्रत्येकविवर्तमभन्नेत-धारणामतवाणं परं। ३१ अवशेषविवाहवन्तस्वतन्त्रिवर्नारीयारीया।

27. होवर। चामुद्वेष्वराराजस्वरपरमार्योक्तेवेरा (षो)वर। २८ कालिकाराजराज-भयतमावरोधक। २८ नुपरिस्थियस्वर। २४ ब्राह्मणवेद्य।

1. Khare, यस्य (अ).
4. " घुराः(ण)। 5. Khare निम्नलिङ्गे।
6. Metre, अनुग्य भा। 7. " फ़ि च।
10. " वेणे विके। 11. " तेलुकिले।
14. " यज्ञानिर्मिरमुच्च: पल्य: भक्तिवरोच।
15. Metre, सर्वदलावितरिता। 16. Khare, यस्य।
17. Khare, जरायं पारितविवशनमुस्य।
18. " विं—मंडलीक।
19. " श्राय।
20. " विवितार: शरणय: नवपापानायाचा।
21. " वरमुतियपरनारीस।
22. " वेश्वर।
23. " वरमुतियपरनारीस।
24. " ब्राह्मणवेद्य।
28. मारिमा(वा)हिनीमानवलनविज्ञानिन् II तथा [ष]² कलिहकमवाक्याल- 
कम II सेवक (?)³ देशाविश्वरामयाल-पतायनपरंपरारथुर II⁴.

29. विधानघोष II वाबनदेिवींसिंहसंलकमं गएकुजनिन्दनवतेय II विधम-
तरलरोगों लंकाविभंजनराम II प्रभल—

30. तरनामणियश्र(र.) कंकुड़हाल II राजवंश(श)मां(मा)वाल(वल)न(क)राज-
पितामहं संनाविरोधवा।ूर्तितुराजयकथवेंनेरकल्यणवहनदायाल II मृत्युय—

31. रवरसोहिणि(र.)कमलमूल[न]लोकपालकर II धाराचिपिवस(श)ब-
सुमहलवेंपालमानवलभंजनप्रभुजन II र[ष]पति[क]से[म][म * ]क—

32. २⁴कुरत्रिवदनगुरुगीवी(वर)प्रवलतररणार्यवाविनम्यविज्ञानपुपसनेनपू[द्व] 
समुदरणमहावाराह II विभुजनमोनमानसराज—

33. स II हुंलाायरिविकुंवंचवनरस०१३वशिकोतिवुध[व]विलितविश्वनेत्य[व]११— 
राजवतीविराजमास्तोलसवर्धेेविेविे विज—

34. यते II प्रतापालसंतापतिवित्र विपुलासका II लेखिते नाथी तत्त्वज्ञ 
वस्त्रायसिद्धविभीयम( समु )[आ०]१२॥ * ]१३ II द्व० II इवानी धीमता१४ लोिे—

1. Khare, ॐता(वा)हिनीमानवलनविज्ञानिन. 
2. इ. —— .
3. इ. —— .
4. इ. ॐप्र. 
5. इ. निधान — — — — — — देशीयो. 
6. इ. पो(हो)र(य)वलो. 
7. इ. ॐवरामोरो.

8. Khare reads ka before ra in this line, but the stroke for ka is quite 
clear at the end of the last line.

10. Khare, ॐचेंद्रनमसो.
11. इ. —विरो. 

13. इ. प्रमाणपनमां वाय तिपायुद्वासाका II लेखिते वापितविच वस्त्रायसिद्धविभीयम III इ. इ. 

14. Khare and Tulpule, धीमता,
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35. यद्वरेण सकलेवर्यक्षे विशेषभोगमय यथा यहांमय तथेत महाराष्ट्रभाष्याय लिखयते ||षा|| लघुवाङ्ग-।

36. चौहेनाम थानो बस्। || तथा भा(त्यों)पैः केवलेयुः || तथासुदेवः || उवनिराः ||

37. चौवेसी || वर्णाः एकूः || तथा पु(?)रकः || पुरवः सतः || चौहेनाम रवनक-18 ||

38. 1 || चौवेसी || पथे || वैलन || एकूः सतुलकः || सब्रमस्य || विहलमल्लवस्य तेजः ||

39. पूर्वथा मला 127 तथा पूर्वथा मला 128 एवं 29 मले 7 || हाटी || मल्लिनी प्रति ||


7. Khare has left the first two letters undeciphered. Dikshit reads the first two letters as ghau (?) da but at the same time concedes the possibility of the first aksara being read as bau. Tulpule: बौमलिक।
8. Khare, आन्त्र (अ) पुरे। 9. Khare, द्रवलोकक कुप्पक...।
10. " || तथा पुर || ; Dikshit: मंगापुर || ; Tulpule, तथा परह। ||
11. Dikshit, मुरवांत। 12. Khare, ऑकोम° ; Tulpule: चौवेज।
15. Khare, मायव°। 16. Tulpule, प्रतिपादी।
17. " || वात्सेवः। 18. Khare, — देसी; Tulpule: चौ देसी।
19. " || and Tulpule, पालव। 20. " || and Tulpule, बेल।
21. " || पलसुणः || Tulpule, एका सुणः।
22. " || has left the 6 letters before ड undeciphered.
23. " || and Tulpule, पालव।
24. " || मैं -१ || हरवेंद्रः ; Tulpule: राहुकवः।
25. " || मला || ; Tulpule, मला।
26. According to Khare, it forms the concluding letter of the last line.
27. Khare, मला। 28. Khare, मला।
29. " || पूर्वः। 30. " || हा(द्र)पालो(टॊ)।
II. SAKALEŚVARA TEMPLE INSCRIPTION
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बौतरे ॥ वाणे ॥ बांबांहसणे कामतुऱ ॥ तत्था युवता कामतुऱ ॥ सायप्रविले ॥

40. चा बौतरे ॥ ठासू पाँच चौकली ॥ मोहोबाबोऱ आयुपाठो भादु ॥ काढूऱ गळता देणी ॥ पायणिदेऱ विकलिले पाने (हे) बोललिले ॥ पाने

41. १ २० ह वाणे फरी सूऱ कटूऱ चाटूऱ ॥ आडसी कामतुऱ ॥ सालिबाळी ॥ हुऱऱ सेत १ जवलगवी कामतुऱ ॥ अणुपानां शिवर्थे यो

42. [१] मसा हुऱऱ बस्थ महस्ति ॥ इह [तत्थ] फुलबेंऱ्य: [परश] नरक जेतुऱ ॥ [२४ *] स्वतऱ्य परेतां या हुऱऱ हुऱऱ चापर (राम) ॥ वस्तुत वर्षसिद्धशास्त्रण विे

43. [हळा] आसाते कृमिशऱ ॥ इह [१५ *] बहुभिकंबऱ भुऱऱ राजविश [२०] तराराचंबिश: ॥ यस्य यश्य यथा भूमिन्थय तथऱ तथां फलऱ (लम) ॥ इह [२६ *] महाधाण: परमहोऱ

44. पतिंबाणा चा पायपरेतमसो भुवि भाविभूऱ: ॥ ये पायणिदेऱ मम

1. Khare, झूऱ— ; Tulpule, प्रतिबिसर.
2. ,, आयुऱऱ; Tulpule, श्रावऱऱ.
4. ,, कामह.
5. ,, माय प्रविलोऱ; Tulpule, सोमप्रविलोऱ.
6. ,, — — वा.
7. ,, आयुपण पोफऱ, The remaining part of the line has been left undeciphered by Khare.
8. Tulpule, पाँवी वाणी.
9. Tulpule, वामणिदे.
11. Khare, एहऱ.
13. ,, सालिबाळी.
14. ,, चामह.
15. ,, हुऱऱ.
16. ,, — —
17. Metre, Anupushth.
18. ,, कृमिशऱ.
19. ,, ,,
20. ,, राजविशऱ.
21. ,, ,
यदावां इन्स्पिशन्स फ्रूम अम्बे जोगाई

यथः विषमधिकमसंस्थनं 

45. इह स्वस्ति भो सकुमालवहु । १६५०।। 

46. गं भोधाङ्गी । यथाभवु ॥ भो भो भो भो स्वस्तिभो नवविचीची आधिवाणिवी कानुकु णो नाते पुनः नाते याय कांडार- 

47. पचलो भुजाणुक्षिप्या भिराणि यवा आमुलाभ सेवति कंडारिति । ॥ ओहू।

1. विषार, वसांततिलाका। 2. खारे, ठौ। ठौ।
3. क्षेर, शक।
4. तुल्पुले, सर्वधारिणी।
5. “, लिखिता।
6. खारे, — — ; तुल्पुले, सुतुण।
7. तुल्पुले, गंल।
8. तुल्पुले, आधिवाणिवी।
9. “, नाव।
10. “, द्योगले।
11. “, भुजाणुक्षिप्या।
12. The reading is somewhat doubtful.
13. This is the only word in this line read by 'Khare.
THE YOGEŚVARĪ TEMPLE INSCRIPTION
OF KHŌLEŚVARA

This inscription was first noticed by James Burgess who found it covered with whitewash and otherwise damaged so that parts of it had become illegible. It was first published with an introductory note and free rendering in Marathi, but without facsimile, by G. H. Khare. In view of its historical value it is edited here afresh from estampages kindly made available by M. G. Dikshit. The inscribed slab is built into the western wall of a structure known as Chaubhara at Ambe. The slab measures 2' 8" high by 2' 2½" broad. There are altogether forty-one lines of writing, each line comprising between fifty and sixty letters. The average size of individual letters is about ½" broad by ¼" high. Being exposed to the inclement weather for over seven centuries, some aksaras have become illegible. On the whole, however, the inscription is fairly well-preserved.

The characters belong to the Nāgari alphabet of the thirteenth century A.D. As regards palaeographical features, most of the observations made in connection with the preceding record are equally applicable in the present case also. The following additional remarks may, however, be made. The letters are not so neatly formed as in the previous inscription, probably because the scribe was not quite efficient in his work. The prsthamastras are employed throughout, the solitary exception in a long record of forty-one lines being cakre at the end of l 25. The medial a normally takes the form of a vertical stroke to the right of the letter in question, but in one case (prapta, l 5) a top-stroke is employed for the same purpose. As a rule, the medial u is added at the bottom of a letter, but in one place (mṛtyu, l. 5) it is in the form of a side-stroke (−) attached in the middle of

1: ASWI, III, p. 49.
2: SMHD, I, pp. 68-76.
the akṣara on its proper left. The letter b has a notch in its left limb, there being no example of b with a cross-bar as in the preceding record.

Except for the concluding words referring to the engraving of the record which are in Marathi, the whole inscription is in Sanskrit, and but for the initial salutation to the god Vighnarāja (Gaṇapati), the words api ca in l 25 and kim vahunā in l 27 and the concluding portion giving the names of the writer and the engraver, the whole epigraph is in verses composed in various metres. There are altogether forty-two stanzas.

As for orthography the following points deserve notice. At one place, viz., tribhuvanō, l 34 r is used for ri. Sometimes v is used in place of b, e.g., lamvodara, l 10, pratividhā, l 20, and vice versa, as in sarbāṅga, l 13. Likewise, there is a confusion between s and ś, e.g., subhraīḥ for śubhraīḥ, l 8, sama in place of śama, l 13. Ny is nowhere employed, and even when it is indispensable, the writer has avoided it at the cost of correctness, as in sāmrga in place of sāṅga, l 25. The verses are numbered. Except for the danidas at the end of verse-halves, verses and sentences, no punctuation mark is employed. Even when a word or part thereof has been twice engraved by mistake, no mark is used to cancel the redundant letters as in kanyakanya., l 24.

The record is not dated, but as it refers to the temple of Sakalēśvara, it must be later than the preceding inscription which records the construction of and gifts to the temple. Like the previous record, it belongs to the time of the Yādava king Śiṅghaṇa and his general Khōlēśvara. It aims at recording the construction by Khōlēśvara of a temple dedicated to the goddess Yōgēśvari and the grant of the village Talaini to it.

The inscription commences with the salutation to the god Vighnarāja (Gaṇēśa) in a prose formula and a verse invoking the blessings of the same god (v. 1). This is followed by two stanzas eulogising some of the more important conquests of Śiṅghaṇa (vv. 2-3). We are next introduced to his general Khōlēśvara (v. 4) and his headquarters, Amrapura (modern Ambe), the provenance of the inscription (vv. 5-12). Verses 13-22 furnish an account of his descent on both the sides. Then follows a detailed narrative of Khōlēśvara’s military and cultural achievements (vv. 23-41). The concluding verse (42) gives
us information about the author of the record, followed by the prose portion mentioning the writer and the scribe (l 41).

As we have seen above, the preceding inscription mentions the names only of the writer and the scribe, the name of the author being conspicuous by its absence. We are fortunate in having the name of all the three functionaries in the case of the present epigraph. It was composed by a Brāhmaṇa physician and poet named Mādhava, son of Bhaṭṭa Dhanēśvara of the Viṣṇuṛddha gōtra and the Taittiriya śakha (of the Yajurōḍa). It was written by one Trilōcana and engraved by one Śemā Prabhu. Thus, there were three stages in the preparation of an inscription: composing, writing on the stone or metal for the guidance of the scribe, and engraving.

Although the main object of the inscription is to record the building of and the grant of a village for the temple of Yogēśvara at Ambe, the major portion of the record constitutes a grandiloquent eulogy of Khōleśvara and his master Siṅghana. The same is the case with the preceding inscription. The present epigraph is actually styled praśasti by its author (v. 42).

About half the number of stanzas in this inscription are common to the previous epigraph. Many of them are also found in No. 1. These verses are of inestimable help in restoring the missing portion of the last inscription. However, a comparison of these stanzas will reveal that in a few cases there are differences of isolated words and spellings.

1. See supra, p. 8.
2. It is interesting to note in this connection that the Vakṣṭakas were also Brāhmaṇas of the Viṣṇuṛddha gōtra. The Brāhmaṇas of Taittiriya śakha are found in large numbers in the Deccan and South even now.
3. This may perhaps indicate that the author of both these inscriptions was the same.
4. As stated in connection with Inscription No. 1, the twenty-two verses found in it are identical with the corresponding portion of the present inscription.
5. E.g., vimala-bahula-kṛttir-dhīmatām, l 19, in place of vimala-bahula mīttir-ddāhīmatām, l 15 of the previous inscription.
6. E.g., Gurjarō jarijaratvam, l 3, in place of Gurjarō jarijaratvam, l 4, of the last inscription.
The two stanzas describing Sīŋghaṇa’s conquests and most of those eulogising Khōleśvara’s achievements are also found in the Sakalēśvara temple inscription and their contents have been discussed in connection with it. They need not be repeated here.

The present inscription mentions only one new military exploit of Khōleśvara not known from the last record, viz., that he brought a maddened elephant of Kaliṅga origin from Cakrakōṭa, the ancient capital of the Nāgas ruling in the former Bastar State. In the absence of more evidence on the point it is not possible to ascertain the nature of this exploit.¹

An interesting feature of this inscription is a long, eulogistic account of Āmrāpurā, modern Ambe Jogai, the headquarters of Khōleśvara (vv. 5-15). We are told that it was an ornament of the earth, comprised many janapadas and was adorned by many gardens. The town was an extensive one, its beauty being enhanced by numerous buildings. It was surrounded by a lofty rampart wall (prākāra) and a moat (parikhā) and shone with enormous prosperity. It was beautified by tastefully decorated mansions. Here were situated the temples known as Kēdāreśvara, Ambarēśvara, Māṇikyēśvara and Sakalēśvara adorned with glittering gems, little tinkling bells, tōraṇas and flags fluttering on their tops; they were crowded by a multitude of devotees and penance-observers. There was also a sky-scrapping temple dedicated to the long-bellied god (i.e., Gaṇēśa). Its crossways were incessantly resorted to by multitudes of travellers fatigued by journey. The courtyards of houses were slightly sprinked with saffron-water and houses beautified with decorative designs in various colours (rangamālikās) formed of rows of pearls and rubies. Much of this description is indeed very general and of the varṇaka type intended to suggest the prosperity of the capital. The only piece of historica information relates to the presence of the temples mentioned above. Of these, the construction of and grants to the Sakalēśvara temple form the main purpose of the last inscription.

¹ Khare thought that verse 33 of this record contained reference to Khōleśvara’s victory over a Nāyaka king (SMHD, I, p. 70). But according to our reading of the relevant portion (kyō= ‘pahiya sarvasvaṁ c-śrīnipo vaṁśpakaḥ), there is no mention at all of any Nāyaka king and the verse states in a general manner that Khōleśvara having deprived a ruler of the earth (avankā) of all his belongings made him a protector of the forest (vaṁśpaka), i.e., drove him away to the forest.
From the tenor of its description the temple of Yōgēśvarī built by Khōlēśvara appears to have been an imposing structure. It is said to have resembled the peak of the divine mountain (i.e., Meru), an expression evidently suggestive of its great height. It was adorned with golden kalaśas. Khōlēśvara endowed the temple with beautiful golden ornaments set with a variety of precious stones, and granted the village Talaiṇī to it. The goddess Yōgēśvarī is naturally eulogised very fervently. Thus it is said that her praises were sung by Isā (Śiva), Viṣṇu, Śakra and other gods in wonder-inspiring prose and verse. Her attendant spirit (cara) is represented as dancing in the courtyard of the temple (vv. 38-40). This shows the great popularity of the Mother Goddess cult at Ambe which came to be known as Ambe Jogai in allusion to the goddess Yōgēśvarī. It is noteworthy in this connection that Ambe was a centre of the Yōgini cult even prior to the time of Khōlēśvara. This is indicated by the Ambe inscription of Udayāditya, dated A.D. 1144, which refers to the place as Ambā and states that the vajra-daṇḍa of the Yōginīs may befall one who might obstruct or revoke the grant made by Udayāditya.¹

Other pious acts of Khōlēśvara are also recorded. Those which have already been referred to while dealing with the preceding epigraph need not be repeated here. According to the present inscription, Khōlēśvara excavated a huge tank resembling a river in Dhāraura-dēśa and constructed a temple of Viṣṇu² and enlarged a temple of Vināyaka (v. 41).

As for the localities mentioned in our inscription, Talaiṇī may be identified with the village of Taḷaṇī in the Bhir District.³ But we cannot be sure on this point as the boundaries of the donated village are not mentioned. Dhāraura-dēśa where Khōlēśavara got a tank excavated probably denotes the region round Dhārūr in the Bhir District. It is mentioned under the name Dhāraura-viṣaya in the Dharur plates of Raṣṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III, dated Śaka 722.⁴ Other localities have already been identified in connection with the Sakalēśvara temple inscription.

¹ Vide SMHD, IV, p. 61, text-line 10 : Tulpule, op. cit., p. 36.
² Is it the same as the temple of Śṛṅgadhārin at Acalapura ?
³ The Mahārastra-grama-stūci mentions a village of this name in the Bhir District.
⁴ EI, XXXVI, p. 254, text-line 43.

Yād. Ins. 6
1. ओं नमो विज्ञाराजय। यहांप्रयोगपत्यंकमण्डलगैरस्तुरस्तोबे सर्वं
काव्यविद् ू मूलमण्डलो व(व)तः करे भालते॥ हे लोकोपितः
2. मोहकालवकलः शुंदाप्रमाणे न बो पृथ्वी नवतीौतः प्रतिविनं विध्योगी
विविष्णुतम्य॥११२॥ अर्षत् स्वस्तसमस्तविनिर्विग्रहःप्राप्तता॥
3. नलः कुंवरवेतविषंकीलिकः श्रीसिघणश्रीश्रि॥ वेनाधारि हारीम
संबलातसौरिषीको समस्त कलामण्डल प्राप्यमहाश्रवेशः(क्रु)नरसः
"मलिता भारा
4. धरामृणः(भृ)॥१२॥४ तेनों बो बो नेत्रो विषमः(न)मलिकलो गुर्जरे
अज्जरसः केवः क्षेत्रानोऽपरिजनतस्तः होः पल्लवः॥ चोडः
कोऽपि पयः
5. वे रणभूषि हुमटोौःसृष्टुकालः नृकालःौःपौः क्षेत्रानिररतः। कृतः
इत्या शहः प्राप्तविक्षिणुसतः(क्र्र)॥३॥३ तस्याध्यात्मकधारायंश्चितिः(तिः)
प्राप्तसतायोः(यो)न(न)सः
6. विवहायकिलवकः(व)णाौमलमतिः पुष्पकवमुः(स)हितिः॥ सोज्ज्वमा
सृष्टाहितिमनिविधीमोौः महाभाः (यु)बि वस्तुस्तमित्व(स)निनिवि॥२०
विज्ञाते कृतलेखः॥

7. क्षेत्रपति: ॥ ॥ ॥ यश मंडिर(वाच्य)पुरुषं कोन्त(स)नगरं सूर्यं भुजा। ॥
राजाज्ञानवेशीणं ॥ नासरामराययोभिषि(तमु) ॥ ॥ ॥
यर्व(व)लघुत्व-मस्तरं कविदां शास्त्रोभिषि(तमु)। ॥ उच्चसं(वचं).

8. प्राकाशपरिवारिमंरवमाुर(रमु) ॥ ॥ ॥ सं(सं) क(का)
शरात्चेतजयः। ॥ हस्ता० ॥ रथयतैः ॥ सू(सू) ||
समताधुष्पशीभिः (तमु) || ॥ ॥ ॥
रुपरं (र) प्रमणिरणाः (लक्ष) ||

9. टिकातोरणवंजः: (सं) ॥ ॥ सो(सो)पः ॥ शस्त्रकवरियस्तपतां चोलनैपि
॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ अमताराधकरात्तपोष्यांशां स्वातः ॥ केवारार्धमालिनयस्तकलेखः।

10. सूरालयः: ॥ ॥ || पश्चाति सम्भोजवुच्चविलंबे(सो)दरालयं (पुमु) ॥ ॥
चन्तु (तुष्ट) || पद्मांतं (त) ॥ प्रवेशिनन्दमालिनि (तमु) || ॥
यश कृष्णमन्नियंवंमंदसं(सं)कल्यात्वरा। ॥ दूसरा मः।

11. मल्लकमालिन्यश्वेश्वरिविमालिकः: ॥ ॥ || पश्चाति सम्भासुल-
पंकजाजोदेशुकरः। ॥ निर्य पृथिथवियपृः हृः ||
स्मिरिवधनः। ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥

12. वरस्य राजचंद्रे(विच्छोरणविगुप्तवर्यः ॥ स्वरेश्वरस्य नवशास्त्रः।

1. Metre, सारदालविक्रंडिता.
2. Khare, चौतेमा(न) गर्यं.
3. "पद्माकरण (पूरत)。
5. Khare, यद्य-नन मस्तकः।
6. " "
7. " विचिन्द्ररक्षकत्वमः। -- -- -- -- -- ॥
8. Khare, हस्त (प्र्यं)।
9. " रथयतः:
10. " " चुरुः:
11. Metre, Anuṣṭubh.
12. " " रणघुः।
13. Khare, "वनाः।
14. " " सोषः।
15. Metre, Anuṣṭubh.
17. Khare, "बचोः।
18. Khare, चचुःपैः।
19. " चाटुः(सं)।
20. Metre, Anuṣṭubh.
21. " संव संक्षोध्वरः।
22. " "
23. " " सुदुः।
24. Khare, शुदुःच चेयः हरस्मरवध्वनः।
25. Metre, Anuṣṭubh.
26. " " बंशः।
27. Khare, "साशुः।
विचारचारवादार्थऽदमुखवल्लमिरोः (ि)ः तत्सिद्धिः प्रशस्तिः ॥ ॥ ॥

13. लेकांप्रदर्शः सः (सः) मेक्षणितमाछकोंसबाः (ि)ः मेर्यतिः इस विचित्रपरमतत्तत्त्वोंके उदाहरणों का ज्योति लाइकोंमेहतुमुः कस्तहः ॥ ॥ ॥

14. गोतेकंद्रम धयातिमयतयत्त्वातः (ि)ः ॥ बुधासा सत्व (ि) माता लस्मात्य प्रसादमः कोः ॥ ॥ ॥ बंधुसहाय सर्वभवरसुगुणास्वाध्यक्षका प्रभुः चः [* ] भी भाइचेरः

15. समुखसुमुखसुल्लोत (ि)ः महद्वासः द्विमि इस तत्त्वा महाद्वितीयकोंसिद्धि-विमलद्विलिहव (ि)ः शरस्वतामिदेशः सीमातृत्वाचविविषोंलीलावत्ति विवुधा (ि)ः इन्न (ि)ः क्षमा (ि)ः कल्पबुधः [* ]

16. ॥ ॥ ॥ ततः प्रसादः (ि)ः मानेमयसिद्धि रहिर्विद्वाक (ि)ः गोः यात्तिक विचारः इस युधिकोंदंशसम्प्रकाशकाः सर्वोपरि गोविदो बुधवाः इस ॥ ॥ ॥

17. स्य विचि (ि)ः मेक्षण (ि)ः गोः (ि)ः मुकुन्तः ॥ यात्रावशामतो वस्त्रायः (ि)ः सर्वभवरा महोत्त्वातः ॥ ॥ ॥ कल्यपालस्य बंधुसहायः (ि)ः मूषन्यं भावातः यहः गोविदो नाम लिहटानामः (ि)ः कः

18. लघुमुखसुमुखसुल्लोत (ि)ः ॥ ॥ ॥ गोविदोऽभिमानस्वर भावायां रस्तः इस विचार- विचारवाचियचं (ि)ः इन्न शरीरन्तरायणः ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ गोविदोऽभिमानस्वर भावायां समान रस्तः कल्पबुधः

1. Something like *मेक्षणमिर:*, appears to be the intended reading.

1a. Metre, *Vasantatilaka.*
1b. *क्षमा*, Khare.
16. *Anugubh.*
18. Khare, संप (ि)ः गोः.
19. विमलबुद्धीकौशलधृमतांनमर्गणः अरिकरिगणितः वामवेवामञ्जोतृतकल
gुणविनिधानां विवेकवामिधानः। २२ ।।
तस्माद्विधोत्तरी सती शति(निः) 
कतः॥

20. लालवण्यमुद्रास्वरेण(वष्णुः)॥ चंद्रश्या प्रतिव(प्र)ङ्कज्जमजामप्रतारा सुषुः नूवि ॥
सावित्री किमहो पतिबतरता किवाववांवध्वितौङ्कवें या गुष्ठिरज-
व्यषाणिविदी

21. क्षणितसमभागतः । २२ ॥
तस्माद्विधुवियविविषभिरधरः: क्षेत्रकर(१ः) 
क्षतरुः नीतिवैधारिवचारनिर्मलविधानप्रेरितोजायत ॥ विवेकमिष्ट 
इवापरः॥

22. हिमभुवनीः । निः(निः)महुःभीष्टतथा शस्त्रापस्तथा 
विशालालिरस्तवः 
स्मात: प्रमृष्ठः: क्षणतः ॥ २३।१०) 
प्रजुरः । विमलबुद्धिः भाप्तसर्वव(प्र)सिरितः 
(विः) । विवेकविद्व(प्र)रस्मयः: स ।१८।

23. हजनवस्त्र इवन्यः ॥ जयति 
ललितमृतिः: । विवेकविषयवतकौतिः । 
हिमभुवन- 
हतमानः: क्षेत्रमयवामिधानः। २४।१६) 
कि कि तस्म वासिलम[विः]मुखने 
हवुः महा-

24. सुरिन्दस्मायशाविपः करारक्षणनिहृषतः (ततः)कृजस्यमः 
गृहजरः। ॥ म(प)- 
वा । कर्णनिनिव(य )वशवहल(फुः)का( लका ) ।५धोरश्वनिर्मलस्थमकसन 
कन्य(मेकलकन)कापरत-
25. ते साठ पर अर्धः।॥२५॥२ अपि च।। वद्धाकाराचलपुरे चन्द्रकारस्यमा चू।॥ मनविं मंवराकारं स्कारं चोवांग(चा)चारिणः॥२६॥४ 

लोहपुर(ल्भ)लु(पु)रामिन्ध(प्र)चके

26. योग्मानुसर(म)लु(पु)स्टम(सठ्)॥ तीरे। पवीत्र्या बिपुल त(च)गण्य(प्र)हु(पु)बिल्कुल(सठ)॥२७॥७ द्रष्टां सर्वेंकृ जस्तीर्णः ब(च)रवालस्।॥ वाराणसी(सी)तिलस्वयंतमित्राव(शा)हुणा।॥

27. अय(म)सु(द्)॥ २८॥१२ कि व(च)हुना।॥ ॥ ॥ देवालयायप्रहा गद्य तिलकस्य(स)क्षेत्रः॥ ॥ प्रपा(पा.)तमाणि रघुचिन्द्र(चन)।॥ ॥ वायस्च वरवालात्॥ ॥२८॥१६ ताह्वादेवो येन वितः

28. संग्राममृत्यु॥ मोहद्वारामिन्धः कृष्ठः वनूरंगवल(ल)विवतः।। ॥ ॥ ॥ जानीतो मल्लमातं(म)निगुरुषश्रवकृतम(द्)॥। प्रतिवेशभूतामि(दम)॥॥ विकाह वित्॥

29. विष्णुन।॥ २९॥२३ रामपालो हि कालवालात्ं॥ पराण(ल)। यनपरो॥ येन कृष्णो वाराणसीवरः॥ ॥२९॥४५ छेविं येन सहसा नागणस्य

1. Khare, —रचः।
2. Metre, Sardalavikridita.
4. Khare लोहपुरामिनः
5. Khare, योग्मानुसर(र)मनुमम।
6. तीरे।
7. Metre, Anushtubh.
8. तपालबः.
9. Khare, जस्तीर्णाः
10. वरवालात्ते
11. " श्रावणान्।
12. Metre, Anushtubh.
13. कि व(च)हुना।॥
14. Khare: गन्न(च)हु(म्व)स्ट(पु)स्नेकः।
15. " र(च)म्पानि।
17. " चाहुः।
18. " ।
19. " श्रावणः करणः करणकोटः (चे)।
20. " कृष्णः।
21. According to Khare, this forms part of the next line; but the letter is clear at the end of line 28.
22. Metre, Anushtubh.
23. Khare, "लावणं".
24. " ।
30. तिरोपूहा सर्वस्वं चावनीयो नानायां ।
31. सं निजं कुर्यां तं सुचूं(त) हिष्ठमाबं न न्यायं संहसा भमात्रिसुचूं भूति ।
32. नाथिरोपितं । फिं श्रीयं वर्णनीयं सकलरिपुजननं बदनवहारी-श्योवायि वा किमसह्यायिनमंगतणहूं।
33. वार्षिकाविषमितंविनमलिपीवत्संघियिः त्वमंकेलोवथं कि तु(वह) भुवननमोण सा(सस)रि।
34. बालयम्यं(तम) यथारो[पित] हृदयं(र) मयकलामवयेन भानित-श्रमं(वस)।
35. चालो किररोपतेन नानायां नानायां नानायां नानायां नानायां नानायां नानायां

1. Khare, श्रीतोपूहाय सर्वस्वं चावनीयो च नायकः।
3. Khare, तीर्थस्वव।
4. Khare, ममदेः
6. .. मूलपराः
8. .. कि चालोक्ति रणायः — ——
9. .. — — दित्तमानक्षतनहस्ता संगति सूर्यं
10. Metre, Sārdūlavikṛṣṭita.
11. Khare : गूर्जराण्डर्रोक्तः
12. Khare सत्तिहवः
14. " चनासोः
15. Khare, प्रकरोः
16. " "अति
17. " त्रिमुखवनतनोलसारि
18. Metre, Sragadhyāra.
19. " "स्तुतः
20. Khare, युग्मवं
21. " "व्यातः
22. " " — — — चरमः
23. Metre, Sārdūlavikṛṣṭita.
बद्री देवेश्वर तथा ग्राम तलेयाति च कर (तम्)॥ ॥ ॥ \n37. मधुरपुर: श्रोक्तये तु राजा: स्वतः स्वयं वाणिज्यविशद समरपुरिम: प्रगामि-मिश्रां (माम्)॥ भवया सूत्र इवथानारिरलि चांकसुधोरे? नृशंस (स्य) र्षयः (र्ष)॥
38. कणमधो: भवतु सा तैङ्गे वर: निर्धे (मे)॥ ॥ ॥ प्रासादः रक्षकेनवर्धयरविदा रंचना हरीरो रेदेसे सरिष्णारामस्य व (ि?) विषोल्यो चिनिकरे गुः (ि)॥
39. श्रण (चण) ते (ि) तांक कृतं (तम्न)॥ बिध्योरायण्यं तात (त) च विष्णुस्माधिन वेनातकः (ः)॥ प्रासादः वक्। प्रणणो कुलोपमिलिन सः।। कोलेक्सीयणापुना॥ ॥ ॥ जाविगोष्ठी॥
40. भिवयायणी: [ : : ] कविवरः [ : : ] विमायायोऽव्य रास्तेि विकः (ि) म- लालतः (ि)।। केलिविवुलत: च: प्रासादः रसितः।। शुभः (माम्)॥ पुच्छो महत्तवनेवर्धय समुतो (ते)॥ श्रीवियभूतुर्य॥
41. यो वंशपालत जानया विमलया धीरित्तिर्याय: कृते॥ ॥ ॥ सेम्ब्रा प्रणुता शेषे कायुरिली॥

1. Khare, ——कुलं।
2. Metre, Amusubh।
3. .. यामीग्न।
4. Khare, कमलाम।
5. .. —— दे मे।
6. .. "द्वाणिः प्रगामि निजा (जा)॥
7. .. रावृश्चितरो (रा)॥
8. Metre, Sārdulavikrṣita।
9. .. धारोर।
10. .. "सत्कायमा-ि [—]-विषोल्यो चिनिकरेशु॥
11. "श्रणे (स्य) कृतं। Khare takes all this portion as forming part of line 33।
12. Khare, वेनायकः।
13. Khare, "मिलें।
14. Metre, Sārdulavikrṣita।
15. .. "स्त् (ि)से।
16. Khare, विक्रम सः (ि)कः।।
17. .. प्रणुता।
18. .. "सुप्रक्ष।
19. .. "वद्वस्त।
20. Metre, Sārdulavikrṣita।
21. The reading of this portion is extremely doubtful।
Plate IV. The Rāmanārāyana Temple Inscription of Laksu, Śaka 1162
IV

THE RĀMANĀRĀYĀNA TEMPLE INSCRIPTION

OF LAKŚMĪ, ŚAKA 1162

The inscription was discovered under peculiar circumstances by James Burgess¹ and was first published with a photozincograph, an introductory note and an English translation by G. Bühler.² Later, G. H. Khare made some observations on this inscription and suggested some emendations in Bühler’s reading of the text.³ The Marathi portion of the inscription was re-edited with a facsimile and a few observations by S.G. Tulpule.⁴ Of the four Yādava inscriptions at Ambe edited here, this is the only one known to most of the historians of the Yādavas.⁵ But many of the readings of Bühler are not supported by the facsimile and he has left several lacunae. The historical import of this inscription has also not been fully appreciated. In view of these facts, it is being edited here anew from the excellent impressions kindly placed at my disposal by M.G. Dikshit.

The record is cut into a rectangular slab of black basalt built in the wall on the south side of the east porch of a shrine now known as Khōlēśvara’s Maṭha at Ambe. But, as shown in the sequel, it actually represents the temple of Rāmanārāyāna built by Lakśmī in memory of her brother Rāmadēva, son and successor of Khōlēśvara. The slab bearing the epigraph measures 2’ high by 3’ 3½” broad. The inscription consists of altogether twenty-seven lines of writing besides three short lines in the lower right corner. The first twenty lines and the

1. *ASWI*, III, p. 49.
5. The only historian who has utilised the evidence of the other Ambe inscriptions is Altekar. R.G. Bhandarkar, H.C. Ray and A.K. Majumdar have used only the present inscription.
portion of verse 34 in line 21 have been executed neatly and clearly, while the remaining portion is done negligently. The strokes in the first part are neat, beautiful and proportionate, while those in the second portion are ugly and disproportionate. This makes the task of deciphering it a bit more difficult. The prśhamātras are commonly employed in the first portion, but they are conspicuously absent in the second part. Whereas each line in the first portion contains on an average about 90 akṣaras, that in the second portion has between 55 and 60 letters only. In view of these facts it is probable that these two portions were engraved by two different persons, the second one being done by an unskilled mason.²

The characters are Nāgarī regular for the period to which the inscription belongs. The prśhamātras are common in the first part, though at many places top-strokes fulfil their function. E.g., mrgāṅka-śriyō, l 2, ṣyaśō, l 3, ṣyōṣid, l 4. They are not to be found in the second part. There is one example of the medial ṛ being denoted by a top-stroke, viz., ṣṭhāpana l 7. The letter ḳ is exactly like its modern Nāgarī form; but in one case (kumbhā, l 4) its left limb is without a loop. The letter ṇ is often formed like ṭ, as in nirmala, l 3, kumbhayōnī, l 4, etc. Bh can be clearly distinguished from ṭ; but it has a peculiar form with the lower half of its vertical projecting sometimes to the right and its lower end turned to left, e.g., ābhimata, l 5, āgbhīrya, l 6. We have both the forms of ḍ: with a notch (e.g., ḍbrahma, l 2) or a cross-bar (throughout line 1). Ṣ has sometimes a slanting cross-bar, as in ṣyōṣid, l 4. Ṣ is formed by adding a horizontal cross-bar across ṣ.

The Language is Sanskrit but for the last line and the three short lines in the lower right portion which are in Marathi, Except Om in the opening line, the whole of the Sanskrit portion is in verse, there being altogether forty stanzas in various metres. As regards orthography, the following observations may be made. The consonants

1. Not first 19 lines as stated by Bühler, op. cit., p. 85.

2. As suggested by Bühler, op. cit., p. 85. Khare’s alternative suggestion that the second portion may have been engraved afterwards does not appear to be very cogent, for, in that case, we must suppose that when the inscription was first engraved, its main object, viz., the building of the Rāmanārāyana temple, was not mentioned and that it came to be specified in verse 35, afterwards.
following \( r \) are sometimes reduplicated, as in "mārttaṇḍa\( ^{o} \), l 2, karṇṇam\( ^{o} \), l 14, devacca\( ^{u} \), l 22, and sometimes not, as in "cakravartini, l 3, varṇy\( ^{o} \), l 8, acārya\( ^{o} \), l 8. Sometimes, \( v \) is used in place of \( b \), as in śavda\( ^{o} \), l 12, vr\( \text{ṃ} \)\( \text{ḥ} \), l 9. Similarly, \( ri \) is used for \( r \), as in ritvij\( ^{o} \), l 18. There are some other errors of san\( \text{dh} \)ī also, e.g., \( t \) in place of \( tt \), as in satva\( ^{o} \), l 5, bhūtrivikrama\( ^{o} \), l 6, tatva\( ^{o} \), l 24. Jīva\( \text{ṃ} \)uti\( ^{a} \)ya is commonly used, vide ll 8, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25. Upadhmanīya is employed only once, see l 15. As regards punctuation marks, one or two dāṇḍas are used at the end of verse-halves, verses and sentences in prose.\(^1\) The verses are numbered, the serial number being flar\k\( ^{e} \)ked by one or two dāṇḍas on either side. When a wrong medial sign is engraved by mistake it is cancelled by a cancellation mark attached to its bottom, e.g., "pa\( \text{ṃ} \)kajīnī, l 2, "matīv, l 3, "bhṛta, l 10. Where a letter (or letters) is left out by mistake, it is added in two ways: (1) after inserting kākapāda mark at the appropriate place, the missing letter or letters being given above the line as at present, see l 23 where a kākapāda is inserted between prakāśakha\( ^{o} \) and cittāna and the missing letters, citē, are given above it; (2) the missing letter or letters are given along with the serial number of the relevant line on the top of the slab before the commencement of the record.\(^2\) The latter method is also adopted for making corrections.\(^3\) Turning to the Marathi portion, the use of the abbreviations da for daśamī and kain for kaiḍārī (engraved) is noteworthy.

The date of the inscription is given in Marathi in l 27 as Kārtika śuddha daśamī, Śaka year 1162, the cyclic year being Śarvari. The cyclic year Śarvari fell in the expired Śaka year 1162. The date regularly corresponds to Saturday, the 27th October, 1240 A.D.\(^4\) The inscription refers itself to the reign of Siṅghaṇa when Lakṣmī, the daughter of Khōlēśvara, was looking after the affairs of the principality.

---

1. In many cases a single dāṇḍa is employed after verse-halves and two dāṇḍas at the end of the verses, as at present.

2. There are two examples of this practice, viz., (i) In l 18, v. 10, da was left out between Khōlēśvara\( ^{o} \) and bhṛt; alongwith the serial number of the appropriate line (i.e., 8), it is given at the proper place above line 1. (ii) In l 9, v. 13, the letter na in bhayēna, which was left out, is also similarly given.

3. In odvijānām, l 5, v. 6, n was formed like t; the correct form of the letter alongwith the serial number of the line is given on the top of the slab.

4. L.D. Swamikkannu Pillai, l.c., Vol. IV, p. 82.
on behalf of the son of Rāma, the son and successor of Khōlēśvara. Its object is to record the construction of a temple of Rāmanārāyaṇa by Lakṣmī in the locality called Brahmapuri (probably a Brāhmaṇa settlement) at Ambe.

The inscription begins with benedictive stanzas invoking the elephant-headed god (Gaṇapati) and the goddess of speech (Vāgdēvi, i.e., Sarasvati, vv. 1-2). The next verse describes in a general manner the Yādava emperor Simha (v.3). We are next introduced to the family of the Maudgalā Brāhmaṇas and Khōlēśvara, the son of Trivikrama (vv. 4-9). Then follows an account of the personal excellences and exploits of Khōlēśvara’s son Rāma who died while fighting a battle against the Gurjāras on the other bank of the Narmadā (vv. 10-32, 38-9). Next we come face to face with Khōlēśvara’s daughter, Lakṣmī, who acted as regent for the unnamed son of Rāma, kept herself constantly busy with pious works like the construction of of temples, parks and step-wells and built the temple of Rāmanārāyaṇa in Brahmapuri to serve as a memorial to Rāma (vv. 35-6). Three verses are devoted to the praise of the praśasti (33-4, 40). Verse 37 is of an imprecatory character. Lastly, the Marathi portion specifies the date, grants, the author and the scribe (l 27 and the three short lines).

The epigraph, which is styled praśasti, was composed by one Vāgdēvatābhaṭṭa1 and inscribed on the slab by one Jōiya, son of Rāmēya, a resident of the village Nōvarā.

The grants made by Lakṣmī for the enjoyment of the god (dēva-bhōga) Rāmanārāyaṇa consisted of a village named Bāṇḍhādegaṁvā, two malās (fields where fruit-trees are grown) and three oil-mills.

Turning to the historical information afforded by our record, we find that the Yādava emperor (Yādava-cakravartin) Simha2 is described in very vague terms attributing to him a sole (ekachhatra), long

1. Bühler’s view that the praśasti was composed by the poet Kavirāja, whom he identified with the homonymous author of the Rāghava-pāḍavīya, cannot be accepted, for in l 27 Vāgdēvatābhaṭṭa is clearly described as praśastikarī. This was first hinted at by Shri Khare, SMHD I, p. 78. But his ascription of this view to Burgess is incorrect.

2. Buhler thought that Siṅghaṇa was also known as Siṅhamēḍha. Vide ASWII, III, p. 86. This suggestion was evidently based on a misreading in verse 9 of our inscription. But, as shown below, the correct reading is Siṅhamēḍha, not Siṅhamēḍha as held by Buhler.
reign and success against his proud, powerful enemies. Leaving aside the general description, Khöleśvara is styled as a very eagle in crushing the pride of the serpents that were the Gurjaras, a very lion to the host of the maddened elephants that were the Mālavas, and an axe in destroying the line of the Ābhīra kings (v. 8). We have already discussed these achievements of Khöleśvara at length in connection with an earlier inscription. He was probably succeeded by his son Rāma, also called Rāmachanda and Rāmarāja, as a commander (sainyādhīpatai) of Śiṅghana. He naturally claims the larger portion of the record. But bereft of all hyperbole, the only piece of historical information that we get about him is that once at the command of his master he led a campaign against the Gurjaras; passing through many districts (visayas) he reached and crossed the Narmāda and fought a severe battle with the Gurjaras; initially he seems to have achieved some success, but ultimately he lost his life in the battle. Although nothing is stated about the outcome of the war, there can be no doubt whatever that it ended in a tragedy for the Yādavas.

According to Bühler, the Gujarat expedition led by Rāma probably took place towards the end of the second or in the beginning of the third decade of the thirteenth century A.D. and the Gujarat adversary of Rāma was Rāṇā Viradhavala, the son of Lavaṇaprasāda. This view, however, is not supported by the available evidence. As pointed out by R.G. Bhandarkan, the fact that Rāma’s son was a minor and his (Rāma’s) sister Lakṣmī was acting as a regent on his behalf at the time when the record was put up shows that the battle in which Rāma met with his death could not have been fought long prior

1. Khöleśvara is described as the very staff of Yama, evidently to his enemies, preceptor of the art of giving protection to those seeking shelter and as an acārya in the art of installing (or rather reinstating) kings. Vide v. 9. Virudhas of similar import are said to have been assumed by him in the Sakalēśvara temple inscription, ll 25-26.

2. Sumra, pp.10 ff. The suggestion of Bühler that the Ābhīra chief defeated by Kholeśvara should be identified with Narasimha I, the Ballala-Yādava king of Dwārasamudra (ASWI, III, p. 86), is no longer accepted by historians.


5. ASWI, III, p. 86.

to A.D. 1240, the date of the inscription. That the battle did not take place so early as the end of the second or the beginning of the 3rd decade of the thirteenth century, as suggested by Bühler, is also indicated by the fact that as late as A.D. 1228, Rāma’s father Khoḷēśvara was at the height of his career, as known from his Sakalēśvara temple inscription of that year. Similarly, the Vāghêla chief Visaladēva, and not Vīradhavala, was the Gujarat adversary of Rāma, for Vīradhavala breathed his last and was succeeded by his son Visaladēva as a mahāmanḍalēśvara under the Caulukya king Bhīma II in V.S. 1295 (= A.D. 1237). It is pertinent to note in this connection that in the Kadi grant, dated A.D. 1261, Visaladēva describes himself as ‘the submarine fire that dried up the ocean of Siṅghaṇa’s army’ (Siṅghaṇa--sainya--samudra--sainṭoṣaṇa--vaḍavaṇala). In the Dabhoi inscription also he claims to have successfully fought with the Daksīṇēśvara. It follows from these facts that Rāma’s Gujarat expedition took place sometime between A.D. 1237, the date when Visaladēva succeeded his father Vīradhavala as mahāmanḍalēśvara, and 1240, the date of the inscription under consideration. Visaladēva must have fought this battle on behalf of his nominal overlord, Bhīma II.

Rāma, like his predecessors, was a Śaiva by religion, but his sister Lakṣmī was a devotee of Viṣṇu in his man-lion form. Unfortunately, we know nothing about Rāma’s minor son, not even his name.

Of the localities named in our inscription, Brahmapuri, where the temple of Rāmaṇārāyanā was situated, seems to denote a Brāhmaṇa settlement round what is called Khoḷēśvara’s Maṭha which actually represents the Rāmaṇārāyanā temple built by Lakṣmī. The village Bāṅḍhaḍēgāṁva, which was gifted to this temple, and Novarā, the residence of the scribe, cannot be identified.

---

2. IA, VI, pp. 191, 212.
3. EI, I, pp. 20ff.
5. Verses 35-36.
1. Bühler, "कपाल।
2. Bühler, "दूर्यंगी।
3. " नूषा।
4. " विभ्रस्वा।
5. Metre, Śārdūlavākṛṣṭīta।
6. " भा।
7. Bühler, "खयेरजक।
8. The scribe had first engraved short medial i, but later cancelled it and added the correct medial sign (i.e., ।).
9. Bühler, "शब्द।
10. " read प्रणावार्वंतु but suggested in a footnote that it was meant for प्रणावार्वंतु। However, the stroke for ॥ is quite clear.
11. Bühler, "वृण।
12. Metre : Śārdūlavākṛṣṭīta।
13. " टोस्टनो।
14. Bühler, "दूर्यंग।
15. " left the three letters after ॥ unread. In the second of these letters the scribe had by mistake engraved short medial i, but later corrected it, realising his error.
16. Bühler, "वृहंगारिभ।
4. स्योध्वतनुः प्रकाशः || हिमकरहर्द्वरर्कारणयुक्तपतलवचनकीतिकौः || विद्वानकोः || दे || एकदिशाचिकसुतोभवविव चोरः खोलेश्वरः || सकलप्रमाणमयूक्तः || यः कुमायोधिनिवेद वृत्तसमस्त्वरिवाः

5. जावुराशिमलिङ चुलुऽकारः || दे || चरितकृषिजमंरसीरभाष्यवाच्यमाधवपुपकारकारानाराजस्मना जम्भवि (स्वाम्) || अभिमतवलनाच भौवलाः हेविजानं भियाहिः कुलवली वृत्तिमाहमेषु || ते || त्वमिनी-बाजारहरस्व (च) वानाच यतः

6. हारागीयावानोधिमाग्निक वयोवियूकाय वामुपवलने: संतानः स्नातकः || विद्वते (कर्म) || बोधकशेषमुपस्यात्विबोधिणेन सन्नाविपुपपाचितः || विकससूतो यथेष्ठ खोलेश्वरः || दे || वर्ष्णदुपर्वथपपतमाधवपारतावद्यक्तिमाधामालः

7. मतविद्धुपविपि प्रामाणम् || जूरामीरक्रसततिलसंहः || कुठारो नृपे नामचलनो भविता भवस्यपि न वा खोलेश्वरनामरम् || ते || एष चौद्यमविठ एव शरणाश्रयकरोक्त राजस्मा || वत्कायामीपालिविधावाः

1. Metre : सार्दुलविक्रित्तिना।
2. Bühler : स्नातः || Khare : एकहातः।
3. Metre, Malini।
4. Bühler, खोलेश्वरः।
5. " Vasantaśila।
6. Na, being formed like ṛa, was likely to be mistaken for the latter; the scribe has, therefore, given the correct form of the letter alongwith the serial number of the line (5) on the top of the slab।
7. Metre : Malini।
8. Bühler, खरस्यः।
9. Bühler, अयुक्तः।
10. " संमावः।
11. " चिदवोः।
12. Metre : सार्दुलविक्रित्तिना।
13. " प्रवनाधाररः।
14. Bühler, जूरामीरक्रसततिलसंहः।
15. Metre, सार्दुलविक्रित्तिना।
16. Medial a above the letter।
8. चाम्य एव स्वयं (यम्) ॥ एव इतिविचि यथा वाच्यकाल: श्रीलिङ्गमेवः निष्ठितं
अव्यक्तिमुद्धितं सदृशं। ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
9. निम्नलिखितार्थोऽस्मि। श्रीरक्ष्योऽस्मि। ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
10. योगाधिकारिः निष्ठितं (तम्) ॥ ॥
11. धर्मानलिखितं निष्ठितं (तम्) ॥

1. Bühler, "मस्तिष्कः"
2. Metre, शर्धालविक्रिष्टिः
3. श्रीरक्ष्यम्
4. da, which was left out at the proper place, is given together with
the serial number of the line (i.e., 8) above line 1.
5. Metre, अनुस्पुहः
6. Metre, अनुस्पुहः
7. Bühler, ब्रुमोः
8. ..
9. ..
10. .. न — —. But the stroke for ye is quite clear in his photo-
zincograph, and na, which was left out by the scribe by mistake,
is given above line 1. There is a kakapada between ye and cha to
indicate that a letter (na in this case) is missing here.
11. Bühler did not read this letter.
12. यामिक्रिष्टिः
13. At first the scribe engraved short medial i, but later, realising his
mistake, he cancelled it and added the long medial i, as required.
14. Bühler, ब्रुमोः. Originally, the scribe had engraved a प्रस्थमात्रा,
but cancelled it later and added the a mark.
15. Bühler, ब्रुमोः
16. Bühler, कि न.
17. Metre, शर्धालविक्रिष्टिः
18. .. अनेकवा.
19. .. अनुस्पुहः.

Yad, Ins. 8
11. गृहूम्बलस्तुस्वरूपशु(शु)ण्‌महोरजोिििः। सूर्यः तिरोधाय अगाम राम
हेजोििको नो सहेत्वलेजः॥ १७॥८ रणंतरतित्वंबलस्तुस्वरूपमधुक्करकार-
परिवल्लोिाः। युक्तावपि चोरिघाय विराज रामजलसायी॥१६॥५
चोरिघायेव रामांगपििः।।

12. ब्यञ्जगोिकया तवा॥ तिरस्कुद्धायक्षीपार्वििििशााःकारिि रजोमयो॥ १७॥७
कोयमंडपाल्कुस्बरामीयमहोितः। उल्ललातितिबारासाः(श्व) कालकूट-
छट्राधिः॥ [ **] १५॥९ अरमातीयः वमुस्तातिि रामस्यांगे परोपिि ॥
ब्रह्मातातिि श्रीयमैिि परापिि्।।

13. लच(च्छ)लात॥ १५॥११ अगमन विषयांस्वरस्लयमैःऽवा चोलेिांिििः। अवाप
नायिि रामो योगीि बहुमायता(ताम)॥ १२॥१३ नाम्बा लोल लोलजलारोिि-
पुरिता॥ बनी। रामहस्तचलस्तुमैःताराजलमरियत इ। [ ** ] २१॥१६
अरमाते महोसिि(हा)युगमधुस्तमस्य गुरुरेिे(४): [ ** ]

14. मै(५)शं संग्रलस्तुमैः। रामो यशं इवाबसी॥ २२॥१८ कठोि निक्खपतमुक्ता-
ब्रह्मलस्तुस्तुरिकाधिकायथाप्रायोितिसारोिीरस्तवलयवलयवचनेिी-
विलासः। सोिचको बाविश्वको फलरकललितेनातिि। राजमानो
मुक्तिभोिायिकाया वरं॥

1. Bühler, ओगमाणो।
2. Bühler, ओशुण्‌।
3. Metre, Indrasājra।
4. " रय।
5. " Gīti।
6. " ओशीपाििो।
7. " Anusṭubh।
8. " ओधारास्य।
9. "
10. " अपातीय।
11. "
12. " कणंविषयमाःस्य।
13. "
14. Bühler, ओजालंगपुरिता। Khare, जलेतापुरिता।
15. " ओबलस्तुम।
16. Metre, Anusṭubh।
17. " ओसुंगर-क।
18. "
19. " साक्षा-ग्यत।
15. वः बड़ौँ रामेकः प्रतिष्ठाः । [ ** ] ॥२६ ॥१२ मात्वालवित तमस्तोमाग्नविय पर्नालाविनम [ ** ] विबे इव रागांवैविरिऱ्यो विविहार सः ॥२४ ॥४ लक्ष्मणाळोऽ( चल्ल )लक्ष्मणिर्विरिविरिसंहिलियोऽवुःः ।१५ बौरमात्र्यावरी रामो श्रेयस्वितम्[पुढ़]लतः ॥२५ ॥६ रामवीरकृपणीरा सुरः

16. स्धिः भ्ूषपकरञ्जा ॥ ततः क्षणद्वृढः ध्योऽ तरसि हुंसवालिनी ॥२६ ॥३ उवितः परिलिङ्ग तुम्हः सत्वितिवारणवंतवायः ॥। पवकमलः। ॥लक्ष्मणपुरवर्ध इव बौरवविवः कोऽहि ॥२७ ॥११ चंदङ्गप्रभाजालमलिवप्रवेशः ॥२२ ॥१२ क्षिपरदीजातिविवारिसंगमः

17. श्रव्यस्यवद्धतः । [ ** ] ॥२७ ॥१३ कि मौखः किसु करणं एव किमां तृणीयवः भार्यते बौरितानित ता किन्काद्वितवलो रामः। त कि वृण्यंते ॥१४ वशालाधुक्तितात्नि गूजार्ववमलंडातिनि के ॥वेयरी बौरववषवविविधुपः [ परिः **] वलस्वभवत्तुपको बयः ॥२६ ॥[ ** ] ॥१५ केन्द्रस्यवर्यः

18. चंदङ्गदंलगं लक्ष्मेरवाचलस्ते स्मरणे करवः कुंरणपरे ज्ञायं वराया जावः॥ जानेहः पुनरत्र तत्स्य महतः॥१६ बौरवच्च रामस्य तस्मौ सुपौवसंगरसः

1. Bühler takes it as forming part of the last line, but the letter is clearly visible at the beginning of line 15.
2. Metre, Srasadhara.
4. Anusṭubh.
5. Bühler, लक्ष्मणवर्षोऽल्—वैरित्वमिविवः.
7. Bühler, अन्नी°.
8. ....
9. Bühler, लक्ष्मणवर्षवंतवायः. In a footnote he suggests to read it as लक्ष्मणवर्षवंतवायः.
11. Metre, Aarya.
12. द्रोमांच°.
14. वृण्यंते.
15. सर्थलविक्रियापिता.
16. ..........
19. त्वा विशुद्धानान् ॥ वैक्यं फलमद्भवति (त) श्लोकः ब्रह्मेक (कः) स वैक्यं ब्रह्मा रामः सुः (श्रवणे हस्तिरित्वा) प्राणावटो (होर) धीवरसे ॥ असारे ससारे यो विवित्रेण चतुर्भुजः (सम्भः) ॥ वयुः जीवितवान् रामः क्षत्रियानं विद्यासे ॥

20. रिता जयति श्रीरामकौटिकपलता ॥ युधिष्ठिरः परिमलास्वया बिलुलिति ब्रह्मेवत्तानं ॥ उद्वस्ता प्राणावर कविराजार्णवः नामः प्रसिद्धिः श्रीरामः शुल्लितपयात्सुभागः ॥ सुभाष्याभावं कृपाविकितेष्वा रामायुधः निष्णम् कसारे समसिदः

21. न(स)नितमहित हृतिवृत तमानः (ताम) ॥ याहो श्रेष्ठानुभुती नर-हरिवर्णाङिधोऽसाकास्त्रावतारे लक्ष्मी श्रीरामसूनिरहितस्वराज्यमारे नियुक्तः ॥ प्रास्रावनायापौष्युतिष्कुटपो (र) वरः ॥

22. प्रास्राव श्रीभवर (वि) ॥ विनितसुकरोद्रामनारायणे सा । [I] ॥ देववचनः ॥ तपस्या राज्यविधिः ॥ प्रास्रावकायं वहो लक्ष्मी अस्म-नावायुनामवं ॥ यसे नानाविर्भय (सम) ॥ य-

1. Metre, Sardalavikridita.
2. Bühler, दंगः स पर एव यजः-भुजः - - - रिबद्रो यो दासरः पशुव - - - श्रवणे हस्तिरित्वा
3. Bühler, देववचनः
4. नहोः
5. Metre, Sardalavikridita. For a similar idea see Vaisanakhara, I.25.
23. दृश्ये (?) नरकेरविधितयाब्राह्मणप्राप्तवासार्यबुद्धिररामनाथस्वायत्त्
विदेशे चिनीते। ॥ ॥ ॥

24. निष्क्रियः। ॥ ॥ ॥

25. ज्युताययाने स रामो नववित्वंविवाहप्राप्तपथस्य रामम्। शोभ्याय श्रीस्य श्रीस्य श्रीस्य श्रीस्य श्रीस्य श्रीस्य श्रीस्य श्रीस्य श्रीस्य। ॥ ॥ ॥

26. ॥ ॥ ॥

1. Bühler, नरके स पिप्रुत पद्।
2. Buhler, सुपुरुता — — — पुरु।
3. The last two letters were left out by mistake and after inserting the kākapaṭa mark indicating the place of the missing letters were added above the line.
4. Bühler, विशेषः।
5. Metre, Sārdhāvākriḍita।
6. Metre, Anusṭubh।
7. Bühler, रामो।
8. Bühler, लक्ष्माप्रात्।
9. " कविष्टवचसां।
10. " ततवाचारी।
11. According to Bühler, line 24 ends with रामो and the next line begins with [न], but the stroke for न is quite clear in the facsimile at the end of line 24.
12. Metre, Srāghāra।
13. Bühler, पद्यांगोपायः।
14. Bühler: कविताश्चेष्यु।
15. " केल्या — —।
16. " संगीतरा-धवनियु — —।
17. Last three letters of the last and the first letter of this line were left undeciphered by Bühler.
18. Metre, Srāghāra।
19. Metre, Anusṭubh।
27. स्वस्वित्तः ब्रह्मः लक्षुः १९६२ सावंसरी संवत्सरे । कृतिकः गुरुः व १०
देवमोगः दल्लु प्रापः १ वांवेलाः शाल्ला । मले: २ घाणे ३ वांवेलामुंद्रे
प्रसारितकर्तः ॥

× × × ×

(Three short lines at bottom right)
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Note:—The figures refer to pages and ‘n.’ after a figure to footnotes.
The figures in bold type refer to the text of the inscriptions.

Ābhira, kings, 53, 56
Acalapura, locality, 25, 26, 31, 41n., 46
Aḍasa, locality, 10, 28, 35
Adhivāṇia, 8, 36
Aditi, 31
aḍu, coin, 10, 35
Agaṣṭya, sage, 15, 30, 45
Altekar, A.S., 1n., 11n., 12n., 14, 17, 21, 24n., 28n., 49n.
Amarāgāṇīya, Yādava chief, 20n.
Ambā, locality, 27, 41
Ambā, locality, 27, 35
Aṃbākṣetra, locality, 27n.
Ambarēśvara, temple, 40, 43
Aṃbī, locality, 27
Aṃbēdesu, district, 27, 34
Aṃradēśa, district, 9, 25, 27, 32, 34
Aṃrapūra, locality, 8, 25, 27, 28, 34, 38, 43
Aṃgaḷabhīma III, Eastern Gaṅga king, 22
Annavēma, 22, 23
Arjunavarman, Paramāra king, 10, 11, 22, 29, 42
Arjunadeva, Vaghela king, 11
Arundhati, 31, 45
aṣu, coin, 10, 35
Avasādesa, region, 27, 34
Ballāla II, Hōysala king, 13
Ballāla, Raṭṭa chief, 23
Bāṇakheṭi, locality, 19, 20, 32
bhumulika, 9, 34
Bhāidēva, 14, 15, 30, 44
Bhambhāḍri, locality, 17, 47. Vide Bhambhāgiri below
Bhambhāgiri, locality, 17, 28, 32, 33.
Vide Bhambhāḍri above
Bhandarkar, R.G., 1n., 10n., 11, 12n., 17n., 49n., 53
Bhārgava, 59
Bhartrvaḍgha, Cāhamāna chief, 12n.
Bhillama V, Yādava king, 13
Bhima II, Caulukya king, 13, 16, 54
Bhiṣma, epic hero, 59
Bhōja, king, 18.
Bhōjadēva, Paramāra chief, 18, 32, 46
Bhr̥gukaccha, locality, 12 n., 16, 47
Bīcaṇa, 23
Bilvapali, locality, 28, 34
Brahmapuri, locality, 52, 54, 60
Bührler, G., 1, 49, 50n., 52n., 53, 51, 55-62 n.
Burgess, J., 1, 37, 49, 52n.
Cāhamāna (also Cāmhadā), locality, 18, 32, 46
Cakrakōṭa, locality, 40, 46
Campū-Rāmacāṇa, text, 18
Candra, 14, 31, 45
Candradēva, Kadamba chief, 15
Cāṭusa, locality, 28, 35

63
Cautha, 9, 10, 34
Coja, 10, 29, 42. Vide Coja below.
Cola, 23, 32. Vide Coja above.

Davaūla, Paramāra king, 12, 13, 16, 18
22, 33
Dhanēvara, 39, 48
Dhāra, locality, 10, 11, 29, 33, 42
Dhāraūra-deva, district, 41, 48. See Dhāraūra-visaya below.
Dhāraūra-visaya, district, 41. See Dhāraūra-deva above.
Dikshit, K N., 26n.
Dikshit, M. G., 1, 2, 5, 7n., 10n., 27,
28n., 37, 49
Drōpa, 59
Durvāsas, sage, 44
Dvāракā, locality, 21n.
Dvārasamudra, locality, 53n.
Fleet, J. F., 10, 13n.
Gajendrānana (=Gaṇapati), 55
Gaṇapatidēva, Kākatiya king, 11, 12
Ganguly, D.C., 24n.
Gauḍa, 10, 14, 19, 42
Govinda, 14, 15, 30, 44
Govinda III, Raṇḍ̄akṛta king, 41
Govindaprabhu-caritra, text, 26
Gurjarā, 10, 15, 23, 29, 31, 32, 33, 42,
45, 47, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59
Hamirramadasamardana, text, 12n., 13n.
16, 17
Hara, god, 61
Hastināpura, locality, 25, 31, 46
Hemādi, king of Baṇḍākheṭi, 19, 33
Hemāḍīdeva, Nikumbha chief, 19
Hemāḍrīdeva, king, 18, 19
Hemādri, author, 10n., 11, 17, 18, 19

Hira Lal, 18n.
Hośala (Hōysala), 10, 23, 29, 32, 42
Iṣa, god 41, 48
Jāṁnavī, river, 59, 61
Jātūgī, Yādava king, 24n.
Jālaṇa, author, 11n.
Jānārdana, 11n.
Jāvalagīva, locality, 10, 27, 35
Jayakēśīn III, Kadamba king, 13
Jōiya, 52, 62
Kalindi, river, 59
Kaliṅga, country, 21, 22, 32, 40, 46
Kamalātana, god, 48
kūmata 10, 35
Kanhara, Yādava king, 10n. Vide Kṛṣṇa below.
Karna, Yādava, 20n.
Karna, epic hero, 59
Kārtavirya IV, Raṇṭha chief, 23
Karuveama, Raṇṭha chief, 22, 23, 33
Kaśyapa, sage, 14, 30, 44
Kavrīṛīja, poet, 52n.
Kēḍārēvara, temple, 40, 43
Kējadēsa, district, 27, 34
Kēśavasēna, Śēna king, 24
Kēśī, king, 10, 13, 29, 42
Khare, G. H., 1, 3, 4, 5, 17, 18, 19, 22,
26, 28-36n., 37, 40n., 42-48n., 49, 50n.,
52n., 58n., 60n., 62n.
Khōlanāyaka, 28
Khōlēsa, 14, 31, 58, 60. Vide Khōlēsava and Khōllādeva below.
Khōlēsava, 3, 7, 8, 10, 14-28, 29, 30,
32-34, 36, 38-41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48,
49, 51-54, 56, 57. Vide Khōlēsa above
and Khōllādeva below.
Khōllādeva, 14, 30, 45. See Khōlēsa
and Khōllādeva above.
Khōḷēśvara's Maṭha, 49, 54
Khōḷaḷiṇḍu, agraṅga, 25, 26, 31, 46
Kīrti-kaumudi, text, 12n., 16
Kōkkaḷa, king, 24n.
Kolte, V.B., 26n.
Kōsala, country, 23, 24, 32
Kṛṣṇa I, Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, 26n.
Kṛṣṇa, Yādava king, 13, 24
Kulottuṅga I, III, Cōla king, 14
Kumbhayōni, sage, 56. See Agastya above.

Laṅghū-Bāuci, locality, 9, 27, 34
Lakṣmi, 49 51-53, 60
Lakṣmiḍēva, Ābhira chief, 17, 18, 33
Lakṣmiḍēva II, Raṭṭa chief, 23
Lakṣmiṇidhara, Ābhira chief, 17
Lambodara, god, 43
Laṅkā, country, 21, 33
Laṭṭātalura, locality, 21n.
Lavāṇaprasāda, 12, 16, 22, 53
Lēkha-paddhati, text, 13
LIlācariṭra, text, 27, 28

Mādhava, poet, 39, 48
Madhuripu, god, 48
Mahāēva, Kākatiya king, 12
Mahāēva, Yādava king, 12, 24
Mahāhambīra, 23, 32
Mahārāṣṭra-bhāṣā, 6, 7, 34
Majumdar, A.K., In., 16, 49n.
maṇḍa, 9, 10, 34
Mādāva, country, 1, 23, 32, 56
Mālugi, 20
Mallugi, Yādava chief, 19, 20
Mandara, mountain, 46
Māṇīkyēvāra, temple, 40, 43
Maudgala Brāhmaṇaḥ, 56
Yga, Ins. 9

Mēḍipau, 8, 36
Mēkalakanyakā, river, 31, 45. Vide Narmadā below.
Mēru, mountain, 41
Mīrashi, V.V., 17, 19, 20
Moraes, G.M., 13n.
Mudgala, sage, 14, 25, 30, 44, 56
Murasītī, god, 60

Nāākīya, 8, 36
Nāgaṇa, ruling chief, 21, 33, 46
nāmāvali, 8n., 26, 32
Narāhara, god, 60. Vide Narākēsarīn below.
Narākēsarīn, god, 61. Vide Narāhara above.
Narasimha I, Eastern Cāluṅga king, 22
Narasimha I, Hoysala chief, 53n.
Narmadā, river, 52, 53, 58. Vide Mēkalakanyakā above.
Nasir-ud-Dīn, 24n.
Nath, B.B., 24n.
Nene, H.N., 27n.
Nēpāla, country, 23, 24, 32
Nimbadēva, 14, 15, 31, 45
Nōvārā, locality, 52, 54; 62
Pārṇakhēṣa, locality, 19, 20
Payōṣṭī, river, 25, 26, 31, 46
Pillai, L.D. Swamikannu, 7n., 51n.
Pohanekar, N.S., 23n.
Pratāpa-carita, text, 12n.
Pratāpamalla, Kalacūri king, 24
puṇḍra, a variety of cane, 9
Rāhaṭavāṃḍī, locality, 9, 28, 34
Rāja-pradāsti, text, 10n., 12n.
Rājarāja III, Cōla king, 14
Rājarāja III, Eastern Gaṅga king, 22
rājāvali, 8n., 26, 33
Rājendra III, Cōla king, 14
Rajula, Yaḍava, 19, 20
Rāma, epic hero, 21, 33
Rāma, 8, 36
Rāmacandra, Yaḍava king, 13n., 17, 18, 19n., 24
Rāmadēva, 53, 57
Rāmanārāyana temple, 49, 52, 54, 60 61
Rāmanārāyana Temple Inscription, 49
Rāmapāla, king of Vāraṇasi, 20, 21, 33, 46
Rāmaṇaṇa, 53, 57
Rāmābhāgiri, locality, 17
Rāmēya, 52, 62
Rāy, H.C., 1n., 13n., 14n., 49n., 54n.
Rēvē, river, 60
Rudra, god, 58
Rudra, Kākatiya king, 12

Sagara, king, 35
Sahajapala, king, 16
Sakalēśvara, temple 7, 8, 25, 34, 38, 40, 41, 43, 48
Sakalēśvara Temple Inscription, 5
 Śakra, god, 41, 48
Śgliṅgāvā, locality, 10, 28, 35
Saṅgrāmasīhha, Cāhamāna chief, 12
Saṅkha, Cāhamāna chief, 12, 16, 22
Sarēśa (Sarvēśa), 8, 36
Sarma, K.V., 31n.
Śrāngadhārīn, god, 25, 26, 31, 41, 46
Sarvadhārīn, year, 7, 36

sarvanamasya, 9
Śarvari, year, 51, 62
Śāvitrī, 31, 45
Śāya, locality, 10, 27, 35
Sēmāṇ Prabhu, 39, 48
Sīddhāvara-carita, text, 12n.
SIhađi (Sīhha), Cāhamāna chief, 12, 16, 17, 33
Sīhha, Yaḍava king, 52, 55, 57. Vide Sīhhaṇa and Sīghaṇa below.
Sīhhaṇa, Yaḍava king, 4
Sindhurāja, Cāhamāna chief, 12, 16
Sīghaṇa, Yaḍava king, 4, 7, 8, 10–14, 21–21, 29, 38–40, 42, 52n., 54
śrīkaraṇa-paṇḍita, office, 8, 36
Subhaṭavarman, Paramāra king, 10, 11, 29, 42
Sūktimuktāvali, text, 11n.
śunaka, cess, 10, 35
Śvāmidēva, 14, 15, 30, 44

Taittirīya-śūkha, 39, 48
Talaiṇi, locality, 38, 41, 48
Tēla(u)ṇga, 10, 11, 23, 32, 42
Tōraγaḷa (also Tōraγallā), fort, 21, 33, 47
Trilōcana, 39, 48
Trivikrama 14, 15, 25, 28, 30, 44, 52, 56
Turukka (also Tūruka), Muslims, 10, 29, 42
Udagiri, locality, 27, 34
Udayāditya, 41
Udumbrāmatī, locality, 26n.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umbarapsūktika, locality, 15, 25, 26, 30, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbarāvati, locality, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāgdevatā, goddess, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāgdevatābhaṭṭa, poet, 52, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāgdēti, goddess, 52, 55, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāṅga, country, 23, 24, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāṭjarā, river, 25, 27, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varadānta, region, 25, 26, 31, 32, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vārāṇasi, agrahāra, 25, 26, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vārāṇasi, locality, 20, 21, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasanta-vilāsa, text, 12n., 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāsava, god, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāṣudēva, 14, 15, 25, 30, 31, 44, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāśvannadēśa, country, 21, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vighnārāja, god, 38, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vināyaka, god, 41, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viradhavala. Vāghēla chief, 12, 16, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viramāhēvara, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśaladeva, Vāghēla chief, 11, 13, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśnu, god, 41, 48, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśuvarddha, gōtra, 39, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvāmitra, sage, 15, 30, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvarūpasēna, Sēna king, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vratakhandā, text, 10n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yajurveda, text, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yōgēśvari, goddess, 38, 39, 41, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yōgēśvarī-mahātmya, text, 27n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yōgēśvari Temple Inscription, 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ERRATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>and as the</td>
<td>and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>portion</td>
<td>protn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>repulsed</td>
<td>repnlse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hēmādri</td>
<td>Hēmardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13n.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Khōlēśa</td>
<td>Khlōēśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>had had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>betbeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>[स्माद्र]चु</td>
<td>[स्माद्र]चु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ṣांष्ठती</td>
<td>ṣांष्ठती</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sēmaa</td>
<td>Sēma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39n.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>jaryjaratvam</td>
<td>jaryjaratvam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>sprinkled</td>
<td>sprinked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>सयं:</td>
<td>सयं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>विवशालकृति</td>
<td>विवशालकृति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>सछबो</td>
<td>सछबो</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inscriptions - Ambe Jogai
Ambe Jogai - Inscriptions