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No. 1—NEW DELHI INSCRIPTION OF ASOKA

(1 Plate)

D. C. Sircar, Calcutta

(Received on 28.9.1967)

Sometime ago, the discovery of a new inscription of the Maurya emperor Aśoka\(^1\) (c. 272-232 B.C.) at New Delhi was reported in the newspapers. It is described as engraved on a flat but tilted rock surface of the quartzitic outcrop of the Aravalli in the newly developing Amarpuri Colony to the south of Lajpatnagar. The discovery resulted from clues supplied by Sardar Jang Bahadur Singh who is a building contractor of Delhi. The inscription was identified as an Aśokan epigraph by Shri M. C. Joshi and Shri B. M. Pande of the Archaeological Survey.\(^2\) Dr. G. S. Gai, Chief Epigraphist, copied the record in September, 1966, and was good enough to send me two impressions for editing it in the *Epigraphia Indica*. I am thankful to him for his kindness.

The inscription under study is a version of Aśoka’s Minor Rock Edict I which was so far known from copies discovered at no less than 13 places in different parts of India—(1) Sahasram in the Shahabad District of Bihar, (2) Ahaura in the Mirzapur District of Uttar Pradesh, (3-4) Rupnath in the Jabalpur District and Gujarra in the Datia District of Madhya Pradesh, (5) Bairat in the Jaipur Division of Rajasthan, (6-11) Maski, Gavimath and Palkigundu in the Raichur District, and Siddapura, Jatinga-Ramesvara and Brahmagiri in the Chitradurg (Chitradurga) District of Mysore, and (12-13) Erragudi and Rajula-Mandagiri in the Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh.

The New Delhi version is thus the fourteenth copy of the epigraphic record. Its discovery at New Delhi is interesting because, unlike the Delhi-Siwalik and Delhi-Meerut pillar inscriptions of Aśoka which were brought to Delhi from outside by Sultan Firuz Shah (1351-88 A.D.) of the Tughlaq dynasty, the Minor Rock Edict engraved on rock is in situ. This shows that there was a flourishing city in the vicinity of the inscription during Aśoka’s time and that it was intended for the people of the said city. Considering the tradition about the ancient city of Indraprastha located near Delhi,\(^3\) it appears that the Aśokan inscription under study was meant for the citizens of ancient Indraprastha. The present inscription thus indirectly proves that Indraprastha was one of the flourishing cities during the Maurya age.

---

\(^1\) Macron over e and o has not been used in this paper.

\(^2\) When the present paper was going through the press, an article entitled ‘A Newly Discovered Inscription of Aśoka at Bahapur, Delhi,’ by Joshi and Pande, appeared in *JRAS*, 1967, pp. 96-98 and Plates I-II. They say that the findspot of the inscription is not in the Amarpuri Colony, but lies ‘to the south-east of Delhi in a colony now being developed to the south of Srinivasapur. The inscription is within the village limits of Bahapur.’

\(^3\) Sircar, *Stud. Geog. Ame. Med. Ind.*, pp. 21 (note 2), 92. Indraprastha is located at the site now called Purana Qila.

1 DGA/68
In the present record, the inscribed space is marked by a deeply incised vertical line (about 3 feet in length) at the right hand side, though it is difficult to say whether it was engraved before or after the incision of the edict. The engraving of the letters of the inscription is rather shallow compared to that of the vertical line, and the lines of writing are not at right angle to the said line. The lines of the inscription are again of different length and their beginning and end are by no means uniform. Lines 1-2 and 5 end quite close to the vertical line; but such does not appear to be the case with lines 3-4, etc. The writing covers an area about 2 feet in height and between 2 feet 5 inches and 1 foot 4 inches in width.

There are altogether ten lines of writing in the inscription, the preservation of which is unsatisfactory; some aksharas in most of the lines being totally rubbed out. Needless to say that, like the other versions of the edict, the present epigraph is written in the Early Brāhmī script and the Prakrit language. It has, however, to be noted that the aksharas are not of uniform size and, in some cases, the letters and signs exhibit cursive forms; e.g., va in Devānaṅgiye (line 1); hā in hake (line 2); ca in mañjāvase (line 6); the e-mātrā in te in etena (line 4); la in ṣādhātave (line 7) and udālā (line 8); the i-mātrā in ti in evadhatai (line 10); etc. The back of d is sometimes angular (cf. Devānaṅgiye in line 1 and diyaḍhāyām in line 10) and sometimes roundish. There is no uniformity in the space between any two aksharas; cf. khulakā cha udālā cha palakamantu (line 8) in which there is no extra space between khā and cha and between ṭa and cha while the space between cha and u, between u and ṭā, between cha and pa and between ma and tu is considerably wider than that between any other two aksharas in the record. This lack of uniformity puts us in some difficulty in conjecturing the number of lost aksharas in the damaged sections of the inscription. The orthographical and linguistic peculiarities exhibited by the inscription are also noticed in the other versions of the edict. The language of the edict is usually called the Magadhi dialect of Prakrit speech.

As regards the draft of the inscription, it generally follows the Bairat version of the edict, but exhibits some variations. Interesting is the use of the word hamaye for Sanskrit mañjā, ‘by me’, in line 3 in place of mañjā found in the Bairat version. We know that the Abhaka edicts use the words me, mañjā, mañā, mañā, mañjā, mañjā, mañjā, mañjā, mañjā, etc., in the above sense. The word mañjā seems to be also used in the present version in line 2. In place of sīrī (Sanskrit sīrī) and hoti (Sanskrit bhavat) of the other versions, we have here hoti (line 9) which reminds us of hoti in the Siddapura version. Sanskrit sākya has been made ṣākhe in line 6 and sakhe (ke) in line 7. The word bādhām (lines 2 and 3) for Sanskrit bādhā may be compared to bādhā in the Rupath version of the edict (lines 1 and 2).

The well-known geographical name Jambu-dvīpa occurs in the inscription. In early Indian literature, this name is applied to ‘the earth’ as well as to the land between the sea in the south, east, and west and the Himādhri in the north. In the inscriptions of Abhaka, the name Jambu-dvīpa and the word prīthiyau appear to have been used to indicate the Mauya kingdom.

---

1 Devāna[m]piye ahā [*] Sātilekāni ṣādhaṭṭiyānī
2 vasāni yam hake1 upāsake [*] No cha bāḍhām palakate ma2 [*] Sātileke

---

* See Sirjar, Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature, p. 33.
* From inked impressions.
* Vā had been originally engraved and was somehow changed to ṣā.
* The upper end of the left limb of the letter is slightly curved to the left and seems to end in a dot.
* There appear to be traces of an akshara after this letter. The intended reading may be me or mayā.
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3 savachhale aha hamaye [saṁgha upayatā] bādhīrī cha.

4 palakaṇṭe [*] Etena aṁta[lena] bu-[dipa]si [ye a]m[i][s][ā] dev[e]h[i].


7 svage sakā[*] ālāhetave [*] I[mā]ya a[śṭa]ya iyani sā[va]ne [*]

8 Khudakā cha uḍālā cha palakamaṇṭu [*] . . . [pi] cha [jā]naṇṭu [*]

9 Chilaṣhitike palaka[me] [ho]ṭi [*] E . . [cha aṭhe vipulam pi vaḍhisati]

10 diyadhiyāna pi vaḍhisati [*]

TRANSLATION

The Beloved of the Gods says:

A little more than two years and a half have passed since I have been an Upāsaka (i.e., a lay follower of the Buddha).

But no vigorous exertion [in the cause of Dharma] was made by me [from the time of my initiation].

It is more than a year since I have been devoutly attached to the Saṅgha (i.e. the Buddhist Church), that vigorous exertion has been made [by me].

Those men, who were unmingled with the gods in Jaṁbu-dvīpa during the past age, have been mixed with the gods.

[This is indeed the result of my exertion]. And this [result] is not to be achieved [only] by the people of superior position.

---

1 The intended reading may be upāyata. There is some space between ya and tā and also after tā. It is difficult to say whether a letter was inserted between tā and bā.
2 After this letter, there appear to be traces of two akṣaras which may be ṣa (Sanskrit ˈsra) meaning 'in this matter'. But it is difficult to say whether a word like this was really engraved.
3 The akṣara ṣa must have been engraved here. The space between na and the expected ṣa appears to be considerable.
4 The traces of about two akṣaras after this have probably to be ignored.
5 The damaged words are apparently palakasam asa hi.
6 The damaged word here is phale.
7 The damaged word is no doubt palakasamante. This may have been followed in the original by the words vipulo pi, though there are no clear traces of the letters.
8 The intended reading seems to be saka.
9 The lost akṣaras are apparently aṁti.
10 The damaged word appears to be ṣa.
11 For the meaning of upāyata, etc., see Sircar, Indian Epigraphy, pp. 161 ff.; also Select Inscriptions, 1905, p. 49, note 2, and above, Vol. XXXV, pp. 227 ff.
12 Cf. Select Inscriptions, 1905, p. 49, note 4; also Sircar, Mānki Inscription of Ajañca, p. 27, note 1.
Even a poor man, who is zealous [in the cause of Dharma], is capable of attaining the [great] heaven.

This declaration is for the [following] purpose. Let [both] the big and the small exert themselves [in the cause of Dharma].

And let even the Antas (people of the bordering States) know [about the good results of exertion in the cause of Dharma].

And let exertion [in the cause of Dharma] be everlasting. And this matter (i.e. exertion in the cause of Dharma) among the people will increase enormously; it will increase even to one and half times.
No. 2—TWO GRANTS OF RASHTRAKUTA INDRA III FROM VAJIRKHEDA, SAKA 836

(2 Plates)

V. B. KOLTE, NAGPUR

(Received on 15.5.1967)

These grants, called here A and B for the sake of convenience, were discovered while ploughing his field by Shri Narayanrao Motiram Mali, a farmer at Vajirkheda, a village about four miles to the east of Malegaon in the Nasik District. They were secured by Shri N. A. Rahalkar a teacher at Malegaon who sent one of them (Grant B) to Dr. M. G. Dikshit, Director of Archives and Archaeology, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay, who has very kindly handed it over to me for editing. Grant A in the possession of Shri N. M. Mali was secured for me by Shri R. V. Khairnar, Principal, M. S. G. Arts and Science College, Malegaon through Shri Rahalkar. Shri S. R. Desai, Manager, Government Press, Nagpur, supplied excellent estampages of both the grants. I am indebted to all of them. I am also indebted to Shri N. Lakshminarayanrao, Government Epigraphist for India (Retired) and Dr. V. V. Mirashi for their help and advice. I am editing both the grants here from the original plates.1

Each grant consists of three copper plates, each plate measuring approximately 35 cm in length and 23.75 cm in width and weighing 4 kg. The weight of the seal of Grant A is, together with the ring, about 2 kg 400 g and that of the seal with ring of Grant B is 2 kg 600 g. The total weight of Grant A together with the ring and the seal is 14 kg and 400 g and that of Grant B is 14 kg and 600 g. The plates are strung together in a circular ring about half an inch thick with a diameter of 7.5 cm. The ends of the rings are soldered into the sockets of a square seal of 7 cm a side. When I received the copper plates, the rings were in tact and had not been cut before. The seals bear on a countersunk surface an image of Garuda in relief as the principal figure. He is squatting on a lotus seat; his wings are spread on both sides of his body. He is holding serpents in both hands. The hoods of the serpents are distinctly seen. It seems that he has a sacred thread on his body, but in fact it is a serpent whose hood is held by Garuda in his right hand. What looks like an ornament around his neck may be the coil of another serpent whose hood has been held by him in his left hand. Garuda faces front and has on his proper right the representation of Ganapati in the upper corner, lower down a chauri and below it a lamp. On the proper left in the upper corner is an image of the goddess Durga, riding on a lion. The legs of the lion are distinctly seen though the mouth has been worn out. Down below the lion is a chauri, and a svastika in the lower corner. On each side of the head of Garuda is a circle, which may be representations of the sun and the moon. Below the squatting Garuda is an inscription, a few letters of which are not quite distinct. On the seal of Grant A the letters Śrīman-Nityavarshadēva are quite clear. In the seal of Grant B the second and the third letters can be read as “manat”; and the last five letters can be read as “varshadēvasya”. The inscription on both the seals can therefore be reconstructed as Śrīman-Nityavarshadēvasya. Along the margin of the seals is a border containing various emblems many of which seem to be the weapons of war.

1 These grants have been published by me in the Nagpur University Journal, Vol. XXII, pp. 117-42.

(5)
The edges of the plates of each grant are raised into rims for protecting the inscription, which is engraved on the inner sides of the first and the third plates and on both sides of the second plate. All the sides contain 17 lines each except that the first side of the second plate of Grant A has only 16 lines, while the third plate of Grant B has a few letters engraved at the lower corner on the right. The inscriptions thus run into 67 lines in Grant A and 69 lines in Grant B. Each line has approximately 40 to 42 letters, the size of each letter being 1.25 cm in height. The engraving is very clear and, except for a few mistakes committed by the engraver, it is quite satisfactory.

The characters belong to the Northern class of alphabets. As regards palaeography attention may be drawn to some individual forms of letters. (1) The letter i is found in lines 8, 17, 19 and 26; (2) The form of medial u in lines 55 and 60 is denoted by only a line below the daṇḍa; (3) The sign of medial ṣ is generally a vertical daṇḍa, but in lines 4, 5 etc. it has been denoted by engraving a semicircle at the right end of the headline; (4) For denoting the rōpha a small vertical daṇḍa has been engraved on the headline of the letter; (5) In Grant A we come across two forms of r (cf. r in the word uttarā with ṛ in chutāra in line 59 and also the r in ṛamaṇa and ṛānyāka in line 62); (6) Two forms of kh also are found in Grant A (cf. the kh in lines 3, 15 and 29 with kh in lines 46 and 67); The kh in Grant B is just like the kh in lines 46 and 67 of Grant A and is uniform everywhere; (7) The form of the letter ṣ in the word ṭūcchhāna (line 2 of both the grants) deserves to be noted; (8) The form of v and ṭh is the same except that ṭh has no head-line; (9) Similarly the forms of sh and th are also the same and are likely to be mistaken for the other as in lines 46 and 47 of Grant B.

As regards orthography the following points may be noted. (1) The letter v has been used for b, everywhere; (2) Consonants are generally doubled after r; (3) anuvāra has been used in place of a para-savarṇa in the following words, e.g. kriyāśkṛiti (line 5 of Grant A), aṃchita and kūchana (line 32 of Grant A, and line 31 of Grant B) etc.; (4) In Grant B, s has been used for i in paschima (line 63), veṣiṣyāḥ (line 66); (5) Attention may be invited to the conjunct letter tra which has been engraved as tṛa almost everywhere, in both the grants.

The language of both the inscriptions is Sanākrit and is generally correct. Special attention may be drawn to the forms of the words pūrva, paschima, dakṣīṇa and uttara, in both the grants, which have been used for pūrvaṭaḥ, paschimataḥ, etc. as usually found in other inscriptions. The text of the inscriptions in both the grants is partly in verse and partly in prose. The verses are not numbered. There are 21 verses in the first 36 lines, the remaining portion being in prose except that lines 64-67 of Grant A and lines 67 and 68 of Grant B contain the usual imperative verses. Grant A contains three such verses while Grant B contains only one verse, the others being omitted presumably for want of space. An indirect reference to the omitted verse has been made in Grant B saying, "here the meaning of verses of Kāma (should be read)".

Grant A registers a gift of two villages to a Jain monastery, Amūgha by name, and the site of the monastery itself to the preceptor Vardhamāna. Grant B registers a gift of six villages to the Jain monastery of Uriamma in the city of Vādanāra and the residential monastery itself to a preceptor named Vardhamāna who is evidently identical with his namesake mentioned as the donee in Grant A because both are described as belonging to the prominent Viragaṇa of the Dravida Sangha, a sub-section of the Jain religion, and to the Vīraṇaṇa or Vīraṇāṇa-anuṇaya. Grant A states that this Vardhamāna was the disciple of Lokaḥadra.

1 Grant A gives this name as Chṛṇāṇa or Vīraṇāṇa while Grant B gives Chīraṇāṇa or Vīraṇāṇa. 
The two grants have been issued by the prosperous Nityavarshadēva, the lord of the universe also called Śrivallabha Nārāṇḍrāda, who meditated on the feet of the Śrīmad-Akāśavarshadēva i.e., his grand-father Ḫrisṇa II. Nityavarshadēva or Śrivallabha-Nārāṇḍrāda is the same as the Rāshṭrākūta king Indra III. He had gone to Kurundaka for the Paṭṭabandha festival. On that occasion he ascended the weighing balance and weighed himself against a heap of abundantly lustrous gold and before getting down from the pan he made these grants. He had gone to Kurundaka from his capital Mānayakhēta, where he was more permanently settled and had, on the auspicious occasion of his rājyaabhishēka, restored the various lapsed grants of land to the temples and bestowed other 850 holy villages yielding an income of 31 lakhs. The grants were issued on Friday, when the Naksatra was Mṛgaśīrṣa, the 7th tithi of the bright fortnight of Phālguna of the Yuva-saṁvatsara, in the expired Śaka year 836. According to S. K. Pillai's Indian Ephemeris the date mentioned in the grants is absolutely correct. It corresponds to the 24th February 915 A.D.

Only six copper-plate grants of Indrarāja III have been discovered up to this time, viz., (1) Bagumrā plates¹ (First set), (2) Bagumrā plates² (Second set), (3) Jambgaon plates,³ (4) Chińchani plates⁴ and (5 and 6) the present Vajirkhēda plates A and B. Except No. 4, the remaining five grants have been issued on one and the same date, i.e., on the 7th tula of the bright fortnight of Phālguna of the Yuva-saṁvatsara, in Śaka 836 as mentioned in both the Bagumrā grants. The Jambgaon and Vajirkhēda plates, in addition to the above details, have given the nakshaṭra as Mṛgaśīrṣa and the day as Friday, the former using the word Bṛigu-nandana and the latter Sāukraṇa. The Chińchani plates are dated Śaka 848 (926 A.D.).

Of these six grants, five grantees, which are dated in Śaka 836 have been issued by Indrarāja III from Kurundaka where he had gone for the performance of the paṭṭabandha ceremony after the completion of which he weighed himself in the tula (balance) and made various grants. The Bagumrā and the Jambgaon plates say that he ascended the tula after the completion of the ceremony of paṭṭabandha. The Vajirkhēda plates supply the information that the king ascended the tula for weighing himself against a heap of lustrous gold.

The genealogical draft of both the Bagumrā and Jambgaon plates is generally the same and has been written by Trivikramabhāṣṭa, while the draft of the Vajirkhēda plates is quite different from the above and has been written by Rājaśekhara. Though the draft of the former three grants is generally the same, it cannot be said to be exactly the same. In the genealogical portion of the Bagumrā plates, set No. 1, there are 24 verses while in set No. 2 there are only 23 verses. Verse No. 21 in the former has been omitted in the latter. The Jambgaon plates contain 31 verses, out of which, as pointed out by Dr. Mirashi,⁵ Nos. 12, 17, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 are new. “They contain mere conventional praise and therefore do not add to our historical information”. The present plates have an independent genealogical draft describing the events that took place before the accession of Indrarāja III, not referred to at all in the Bagumrā plates.

The new genealogical draft in the present Vajirkhēda plates does not include the traditional verse invoking the protection of Viṣṇu and Śiva, with which almost all the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records begin. We have instead two opening verses in praise of the doctrine of Jina, probably because the grantees are issued for donating certain villages to Jain monasteries. The second verse occurs as

---

¹ Above, Vol. IX, pp. 24-41.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid., Vol. XXXVI, pp. 223-38.
⁴ Ibid., Vol. XXXII, pp. 45 ff.
⁵ Ibid., p. 224.
a Maṅgala-śloka in the Pramāṇa-saṅgraha of the famous Bhaṭṭa Akalaśka⁴ and has been adopted here, as in many other inscriptions. The first verse has been either composed by the writer of these grants or has been adopted by him from some other work. It is a well-known fact that Aṃoghavarsha and Aklāvarsha (Krīshṇarāja II), the predecessors of Nārendrādēva, were very much influenced by the Jain religion and philosophy. Jinaśāṇa, the author of Āḍipurāṇa and Mahā-virāchārya, the author of Gaṇitaśāraṇaśaṅgraha, describe Aṃoghavarsha as a follower of Jainism.² Aklāvarsha was educated under the supervision of Gaṇachandra, the author of the last five chapters of Āḍipurāṇa.³ Indrārāja III also seems to have been generous towards the Jain religion, but it does not mean that he was a follower of the Jain Dharma. Since the Bagumrā and Jāmbgaon plates have the opening verse invoking the protection of Viṣṇu and Śiva, it is clear that by tradition, he belonged to the Hindu religion.

Verse 3 describes Sōma, i.e., the Moon from whom sprang the Rāṣṭrākūta dynasty, in which, as verse 4 tells us, was born king Yadu. In his family was born the great god Hari, i.e., Śrīkrishṇa (verse 5). In this illustrious family was born king Dantidurqa (verse 6). From verse 7 we learn that after the death of Dantidurqa his paternal uncle Krīshṇarāja became the king and that he had a son Gōvindarāja by name. His younger brother Nirupama became the king. After him his son Jagattuṅgadēva became the ruler of the earth. His son Aṃoghavarsha became the king after him.

It is worth noting that both the Bagumrā and Jāmbgaon plates have omitted the name of Gōvindarāja but the same has been included in verse 7 of the grants under study. But it does not specifically say that he had ascended the throne. Whether Gōvindarāja had actually ascended the throne was a matter of controversy amongst the scholars. It has now been generally accepted on the evidence of the Kajjāwa and Daulatāwād plates that this Gōvindarāja II did actually ascend the throne.⁴ But he had not much interest in the administration. He abandoned himself to a life of ease and pleasure, entrusting the whole administration to the charge of his younger brother Nirupama (Dhruva) who was very ambitious. There was a fight between Gōvinda II and Nirupama (Dhruva) in which Gōvinda was defeated and dethroned.

Verse 8 tells us that Aṃoghavarsha was a fire of destruction to the Chālukyas. We learn from history that during the earlier part of Aṃoghavarsha’s reign there were rebellions and consequent chaos in the Rāṣṭrākūta kingdom. The Eastern Chālukya king Vijayāditya II had attacked, defeated and overthrown the country of the Rāṣṭrākūtas. There was a long-drawn war between them but ultimately Aṃoghavarsha inflicted a signal defeat on the Chālukyas on the battle-field of Viṣṇavalli and offered a royal feast to the God of Death.⁵ The Bagumrā plates inform us that Aṃoghavarsha had raised the glory of the Rāṭṭa sovereignty immersed in the ocean of Chālukyas by destroying them just as a man burns chickpea plants the stacks of which have been pulled out by the root. By using the word stambha with double meaning it has been suggested there that Aṃoghavarsha had devastated the town Stambha which was wrongly identified by D. R. Bhandarkar with Tāmralipta—the modern Tamluk in Midnapur District of Bengal. It was in fact the modern Cumbum in the Kurnool District of Andhra Pradesh which must have been an important city in the possession of the Chālukyas which was devastated by Aṃoghavarsha.

---

¹ *New Indian Antiquity*, Vol. II, pp. 111 ff.—“On the Authorship of a Maṅgala verse in Inscriptions” by Dr. A. N. Upadhye.


³ Ibid., p. 285.


⁵ *Ind. Ant.,* Vol. XII, p. 249.
From verse 8 we further know that Amäghavarsha had a son, Krishnärajá by name. His queen was the daughter of the king of Chelí. Her name has not been mentioned. This relationship, though not referred to in the Bagumra and Jambgaon plates, finds a place in the Sängli and Kardá* plates from which we know that the king of Chelí referred to in this verse was Kökkala and that his daughter was married to Krishnärajá. Their son was Jagattuṅga. Verse 9 describes how the surviving Gürjaras whose bodies were disjoined by the powerful stroke of his sword did not leave even now the fever of fear. If we carefully read verses 8 and 9, it will be clear that this description is of the deadly fight of Jagattuṅga against the Gürjaras. The Bagumra and Jambgaon plates give a graphic account of the bravery of Krishnärajá II in the war waged by him against the Gürjaras. They do not refer in any way to the valor displayed by Jagattuṅga, while the Vajirkhêda plates do not say anything about Krishnärajá’s war against the Gürjaras but they do describe such a war waged by Jagattuṅga as pointed out above. The Gürjaras are undoubtedly the Gürjara-Pratihāras who were ruling at Mahādya or Kānauj in Northern India. Now the question is whether it was Krishnärajá or Jagattuṅga or both who fought against the Gürjara-Pratihāras before the date of the present grant, i.e., Saka 836 (915 A.D.). It may be that both had waged wars against the Gürjaras at different times during the reign of Krishnärajá II. From the Bagumra plates* of Krishná of the Gujarāt branch we definitely know that Krishnärajá II had engaged the Gürjara-Pratihāra army at Ujjain sometime before 838 A.D., and the Kardá grant† would show that his son Jagattuṅga, had undertaken another expedition. The reference in verses 16, 18 and 9 of the Bagumra, Jambgaon and Vajirkhêda plates respectively to the valor of Jagattuṅga would show that he had taken active part in vanquishing the enemies, particularly the Gürjara-Pratihāras as has been recorded in verse 9 of the Vajirkhêda plates.

Lakshmi was the queen of Jagattuṅga. Her pedigree has been described in detail in verses 10 and 11. We are told that there was an illustrious king known by the name of Sahasrārjuna in whose family was born Kökkala, the king of Chelí, who was an ornament of the Haihaya dynasty. To him was born a son named Saunkaraṇa (verse 10), who has been referred to as Saunkuka in verse 11. His wife was the daughter of king Arayamma, the son of Siñhuka, the ornament of the Chāḷukya dynasty. This wife of Saunkaraṇa bore a daughter, Lakshmi, by name, who became the wife of Jagattuṅga.

The Bagumra and Jambgaon plates have also described in detail the pedigree of Lakshmi, the wife of Jagattuṅga wherein Saunkaraṇa or Saunkuka of the present Vajirkhêda plates has been referred to as Raṇavigrha. This lineage of Lakshmi is corroborated by information from the Sängli and Kardá grants. The Sängli plates* also give the name of Lakshmi’s father as Raṇavigrha, while the Kardá grant† mentions him by the name Saunkaraṇa as in the Vajirkhêda plates. There is, therefore, no doubt that Saunkaraṇa and Raṇavigrha are one and the same person. As has been pointed out above, he had another name Saunkuka, which is apparently a short form of Saunkaraṇa. That his wife hailed from the Chāḷukya family is known for the first time from the plates under consideration, though it is not possible to identify Siñhuka and his son Arayamma in the present state of our knowledge.

From the union of Jagattuṅga and Lakshmi was born Indrarāja, the donor of these grants. Verses 13-21 have been devoted to the description of the various qualities and merits of this
Indrarāja, most of which are eulogistic and of conventional type. However, special attention may be drawn to verse 16 which gives some new historical information. It is generally believed that after the death of Jagattunāga the accession of his son Indrarāja was peaceful and without any event, but from this verse we learn that it was not so. This verse tells us that his relations who claimed a share in the patrimony were envious of Indrarāja and therefore could not bear the glowing lustre of him and who themselves were roaming or whirling about by their own faults, had joined together in an adventurous onslaught on the king and ultimately fell a prey to (or were burnt in) the inflamed valour of the king. From verse 17 also we learn that Indrarāja vanquished his enemies and occupied his own throne simultaneously. At the same time he had broken his other enemies also by the mere knitting of his eyebrows and reduced their kingdoms to mere kingdoms of desire (i.e., wishful desires). It was only after this that the earth, like the creeper of desire, fulfilled his wishes.

Verses 18 and 19 describe in glorious terms how his three white umbrellas were shining like his own fame, and how the son of Vinatā, i.e., Guraḍa came to serve on his banner. After these exploits it appears that Indrarāja performed his rājyaabhishēka ceremony, since verse 20, as has been discussed above, describes in eulogistic words his munificent gifts made on the occasion of the rājyaabhishēka ceremony. Verse 21 tells us how he himself became entitled to obeisance from all the kings after having made (restored) all the grants towards the enjoyment of the gods (temples) and Brāhmaṇas.

Thereafter follows the prose portion wherein the various bīrudas of the king, which he had acquired by his various deeds, have been mentioned, giving poetic justification for each of them. They are: Śrīgirivahatūravukhā, Śrīkirtūttāmarayagha, Śrīmanavatūrīṭṭara, Śrīrājāmārtṛapatgā, Śrīvatkāmadarppah, and Śrīvēkramatūrgha. In the following lines thereafter, it has been said that this king Nityavarshadhēva, when he had gone to Kurundaka for his pātṭabandha ceremony donated two villages to the Jain monastery, Amoghavasati by name, at Chandanapūrī (Grant A) and six villages to the Jain monastery, Uriamvavasati (Jēlāmāthinī) by name, in the city of Vādanēra (Grant B).

Special attention may be drawn to the specific references to the rājyaabhishēka and the pātṭabandha ceremonies in lines 46-47 of Grant A and lines 45-46 of Grant B. The Bagumrā and Jāmbgaon plates do not mention the rājyaabhishēka ceremony specifically anywhere, but our Vajirkhēḍa grants do mention it in verse 20 and the lines referred to above, wherein they mention the pātṭabandha ceremony also. Verse 20 of the Vajirkhēḍa grants describes that the munificent gifts on the occasion of the rājyaabhishēka ceremony were made by the king without anger, without delay and without proud and thunderous announcements. Lines 46-49 of Grant A and 45-48 of Grant B would mean that on the occasion of the rājyaabhishēka ceremony, the king, in order to increase the religious merit and the fame, both in this world as well as in the next, of his parents and himself, had restored the grants to the temples which were confiscated or already lapsed and had offered 650 additional villages with an income of 21 lakhs. From his capital Mānyakhēṭa, where he had been more permanently settled, he had gone to Kurundaka for the performance of the pātṭabandha ceremony, on which occasion he is said to have granted two villages according to Grant A and six villages according to Grant B to two Jaina monasteries. This would show that the rājyaabhishēka and pātṭabandha ceremonies are quite distinct and, therefore, should not be confused with each other. The rājyaabhishēka ceremony must have been performed at the capital Mānyakhēṭa sometime before he had gone to Kurundaka for the pātṭabandha ceremony. The date of the pātṭabandha ceremony, which was performed on Friday, the 7th titkī of the bright fortnight in Saka 836 should not therefore be taken as the date of his accession, as has been done by some scholars. The latest known date of Krishna II is Saka 834 (912 A.D.) and, therefore, it may

2 Ibid., p. 99.
safely be inferred that Indrarāja III ascended the throne sometime after Saka 834 and before Saka 836 (915 A.D.).

In this connection attention may be invited to some of the exploits of Indrarāja III described in the Bagumrā and Jāmbgaon grants. His most important victory was the extermination of the Bāna king Vījyāditya II alias Prabhumārū, described in verses Sa jayati bhujadandasaṃśrayasṛṣṭi, etc. and Kṛttakavrindavanoddhāram, etc. occurring in these grants. It is said that Indrarāja III had won this victory when he was Yuvrāja and this invasion must have taken place towards the close of the reign of his grandfather Kṛishṇa II, for it is mentioned in the charters issued by Indra on the occasion of his coronation, i.e., in the very first year of his reign. If it was really so, this important victory should have gone to the credit of Kṛishṇa II and should have been referred to in his grants. But since it has been described in the grants issued by Indrarāja III, this important event must have taken place during his reign as the king and therefore, must go to the credit of Indrarāja III himself. If the distinction between the words rājyādbhisekā and paṭṭabandhotisava is borne in mind this would be quite clear. The Vajirkhēta plates do refer to both these ceremonies specifically and describe the various gifts and grants made by Indrarāja on both the occasions separately.

The donee of both these grants is a Vardhamāna by name. Both belong to the Viṣṇū-yāya-anvaya of the Viragaṇa in the Dravīḍa Saṅgha. The donee Vardhamāna of Grant A is described as a disciple of Lōkabhadrā in the family of Viṣṇu-yāya-anvaya while the donee Vardhamāna of Grant B has been described only as a disciple on the throne of the Viṣṇu-yāya-anvaya. Viṣṇūya can be read as Cīrṇīya also, but it appears to be a mistake of the engraver and there seems to be no doubt that Virmāya and Viṣṇūya refer to one and the same family. So also, in all probability, both Vardhamānas are one and the same person. It seems that he was the preceptor of both the Jaina monasteries, one in Chandaṇāpuri city and the other in Vādanēra, the first being known by the name Amogha and the other Uriāma. I could not find the names of these Jaina monasteries mentioned anywhere.

The followers of Jain religion, on account of difference of opinion in respect of wearing garments, were first divided into three sections, e.g., Digambara, Śvētāmbara and Yāpaniya. Afterwards the Digambara Jains were again subdivided into independent saṅghas. Dravīḍa-saṅgha is one of them. According to Āchārya Dēvasēna, this saṅgha was founded by Vairanandi, the disciple of Pūjyapāda, in 469 A.D. The followers of Dravīḍa-saṅgha stayed in monasteries and temples, received land grants, ploughed farms and subsisted on earnings from them. This is why they were denounced by the puritan Digambara ascetics. The saṅghas acquired its name from the name of the country, where it was established. The saṅgha was further divided into gaṇas, each gana was again divided into anvayas (families). In our records we find a reference to the Viṣṇūya-yāya-anvaya belonging to the Viragaṇa of the Dravīḍa-saṅgha—probably for the first time in the copper-plate records discovered in Maharashtra. I could not trace the names of the Viragaṇa and its Viṣṇūya-yāya-anvaya, neither could I find the names of the preceptors Lōkabhadrā and Vardhamāna. Probably this information is coming to light for the first time and would be valuable to scholars of Jain history, especially of the Dravīḍa-saṅgha.

From our records we can definitely say that the Jain ascetics of the Dravīḍa-saṅgha had migrated and settled in the Nasik district of Maharashtra even before 915 A.D., the date of issue of the grants. They received patronage and donations from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings. The Amogha monastery at Chandaṇāpuri (Grant A) may have been named after king Amoghavarsha from whom it may have received grants formerly. The name of the other monastery at Vādanēra was Uriāma

1 Above, Vol. XXXVI, p. 231,
(Grant B) which is a Kannada name for Jvalamalini, the yakshipi devotee of Tirthakara Chandraprabha. This would show that the followers of Dravida-saanga used to worship the yakshipis also.

The undated Kalvan'a grant issued during the reign of the Malava king Bhoda I would show that the Svetambara Jains had also their monastery at Muktapalli in the Audrahevi vishaya somewhere near Kalvana in the present Nasik District.

The donations of the villages granted to both the monasteries were inclusive of certain taxes usually recovered by the residents and exclusive of certain taxes usually recovered by the government. However, the word achita-bhata-praveda which occurs in Grant A has been omitted in Grant B. This omission may have been through inadvertence. Otherwise it would mean that the police and military warriors had a right to enter the six villages donated according to Grant B and recover articles of amenities and money required by them. But since the villages had been donated to a Jain monastery, this does not seem to be possible. The omission of the word in Grant B must have been therefore, through inadvertence only.

Manivakhata, the capital of the Rashtrakutas has been identified with modern Malkhed in the Gularga District, Mysore State. The place Kurundaka where the king had gone for his patah-banada was identified by R. G. Bhandarkar with Kadoda on the bank of Tapi. A. M. T. Jackson proposed to identify it with Kurundavada and this identification is accepted by D. R. Bhandarkar and A. S. Altekar. Dr. V. V. Mirashi suggests that 'if Kurundaka was situated near Paithan, as appears from the present grant (i.e., Jambgaon plates) it may have been near the confluence of the Pravara and the Guldvari (Pravara-sangama) which is regarded as very holy. In that case, Kurundaka may be represented by Kaigaon near Pravara-sangama.'

The search for Kurundaka near about the findspots of the grants or the donated villages will not be very helpful because all the five grants of Indraraja III have been issued from Kurundaka, while their findspots and the donated villages are spread over in Gujaratt, Marathwada and Nasik Districts. Very often the royal camp where the grants were made is far removed from the villages donated. Kurundaka may not be far away from the capital place Manivakhata. There is a village Kurund in the Basmath Taluk in Parbhani District, in Maharashtra, which is only at a distance of a few miles from Malkhed. It is only three miles away from the bank of the holy river Guldvari. I would propose to identify the modern Kurund with the ancient Kurundaka. The change in the form of the place name Kurundaka to Kurund is natural and phonetically justified. The Jain monasteries at Jinta and other places round about the modern Kurund may also be an additional evidence in support of this identification.

As for the localities mentioned in Grant A, Chandanapuri where the Amogha monastery was situated is the present Chandanapuri on the south bank of the Girna river, about two miles to the south of Malgaon, the headquarters of the taluk of the same name in Nasik District. Maladaha the first donated village in the territorial division Padalabaddha-Sa may be the present Maldha two miles to the south-east of Malgaoon, on the north bank of the Girna and Padalabaddha may be identified with the present Padalada about twelve miles north-east of Maldha. Chinchavalli, which formed its eastern boundary, can be identified with Chinchagavapaha about ten miles to the east of Maldha. The Giriparna river which formed its western and southern boundaries is undoubtedly the present Girna river. The Mahuli-grama on the northern boundary may in all probability be the modern Malgaon.

The second village donated to the monastery was Pariyala, near Sihapuri. It may be identified with Parila now situated in the Vijaipur Taluk of Aurangabad District, which is about

1 Above, Vol. XIX, pp. 71 ff.
2 Ibid., Vol. XXXVI, p. 232.
two miles away on the eastern bank of the Mānyāda river, mentioned as river Maniyādā the western boundary. Shapura may be the modern Sīr about eight miles to the east of Pārala. The village Nimba-grāma which formed the eastern boundary is the present Nīngaon about five miles to the east of Pārala and the northern boundary village Bhaddavalli can be identified with the present Bhādīli which lies about four miles to the north of Pārala.

As regards the localities in Grant B the Vadana town, where the Urianjna Jain monastery was situated, may be identified with the present Vadhner situated on the north bank of the river Mōsam at a distance of about fifteen miles to the north-west of Mālēgaon. The donated villages are: (1) Ruddāna in the territorial division Raṅkāna-24. Its boundaries as given in the grant are Rudragiri to the east and south, the village Vārivāhlā to the west, and river Mōsinī to the north. The river Mōsinī may be identified with the river Mōsam on the bank of which Vadhner, the place of this Jain monastery was situated. Raṅkāna-24, cannot be traced. Ruddāna may be identified with the present Utrān, about ten miles to the north-west of Vadhner. The only difficulty in this identification is that Ruddāna is mentioned as situated on the south bank of Mōsinī, while the village Utrān is on the north bank of the Mōsam. It may be due to the windings and change of the course of the river during a period of about one thousand years. Such change of the course of rivers is found elsewhere too. But there can be no doubt that the villages Ruddāna and Raṅkāna must be somewhere there since, as would be seen below, the third donated village Tuṅgōpī with its boundaries can be identified beyond doubt in the same locality. The village Vārivāhlā said to be to the west and the mountain Rudragiri to the east and south of Ruddāna cannot be traced. Rudragiri may be the name of the mountain at the foot of which the village was situated. (2) The second donated village was Dhamnaūra in the territorial division Chhaṭṭhiyāna-32. Its boundaries were: Antaravalli village to the east, Giriparnī river to the south, Phēnchā-grāma to the west and Talavāja-grāma to the north. Giriparnī is undoubtedly the present Girī river. The northern boundary village Talavāja is the present Talavāja about seven miles south of Vadhner and ten miles to the west of Mālēgaon. The donated village Dhamnaūra may, therefore, be identified with Dhamnara about five miles to the south of Talavāja. It is situated on the northern bank of the river Girī, Chhaṭṭhiyāna, Phēnchā and Antaravalli cannot be traced. (3) The third donated village was Tuṅgōpī in the territorial division Raṅkāna-24. Tuṅgōpī is the present Tuṅgūpī in the Baglan Taluk of the Nasik District on the bank of a small river which may have been known by the name Tuṅgabhadrā, mentioned in the grant as the southern boundary of Tuṅgōpī. The eastern boundary village Daśāhōyvāli may be the present Dashwel, one mile to the east of Tuṅgūpī and the northern boundary village Katarvāli may be identified with the modern Katarwāla, two miles to the north of Tuṅgūpī. The western boundary Sāvinivāda cannot be traced. It may be a small hill, as is suggested from the use of the word vāda which in fact may be pāda. (4) The fourth donated village is Ajjalōpī in the vīghaya (District) of Vatanağara, with Nīla-grāma to the east, Talavāja-grāma to the south, Dōngaragrāma to the west and Mōsinī river to the north. The district place (vīghaya) Vatanağara may be the present Vadhner, on the bank of the Mōsam river which may be the same as the Mōsinī river which formed the northern boundary of Ajjalōpī. Nīla-grāma may be the present Neelagawān on the bank of the Mōsam, and just near Vajirkhēla, the findspop of the grants. The other boundary villages cannot be traced.

Fortunately there is a reference to some of the above places in the Pimpri plates1 of Dharā sarha Dhrurvarāja, dated Śaka 697 (775 A.D.). In those plates a village named Līlā-grāma in Vatanağarika-84 division was donated. Boundaries of Līlā-grāma as mentioned in the plates

---

1 Ibid., Vol. X, pp. 81-89.

1 DGA/88
are: Laghu-dejrapa-khetaka to the east, Talapata-grama to the south, Ajjaloni-grama to the west and the river Mosipyi to the north. The village Ajjaloni of the Pimpadi plates is certainly the same Ajjaloni donated in our grant B. The northern boundary river Mosipyi is the same which formed the northern boundary of Ajjaloni in our grant. Lili-grama which has been identified by G. K. Chandorkar with Nilagavaha is the same as the Nila-grama in our plates. Chandorkar has identified Vatanagarika with Wani in the Nasik District, which does not seem to be correct. It appears to be the same Vatanagara referred to in our present records as a Vishaya (District) in which Ajjaloni was situated. Talapata-grama in the Pimpadi plates is certainly the Talavada-grama in our plates. The real proper name of the eastern boundary village Laghu-dejrapa-khetaka¹ may be Ujrapa-khetaka only. I would identify it with Vajirkheda, the findspot of our grants, which is just two miles to the east of Nilagavaha.

(5) The fifth donated village is Chandbhana in the territorial division Buddapa-12 with the boundary village Aggavalliyana to the east, Amiyar to the south, Kanhainapa village to the west and Vasttara to the north. Chandbhana may be identified with the present Chaunthane, in the Baglan Taluk of the Nasik District, about six miles north west of Satana. Amiyar may be the modern Arama river. Kanhainapa may be the modern Kandhane, about two miles to the west of Chandbhana. Vasttara may be the present Vathar, one mile to the north. The village Aggavalliyana cannot be traced. Buddapa, the chief village of the territorial division may be identified with Uttraph about 15 miles to the north-west of Vastnar.

(6) The sixth donated village is Divara-grama in the territorial division of Udvalaula, which may be identified with the modern Udhurula, about seven miles to the south of the Taluk place Chandavad in Nasik District. Divara-grama may be the present Devargaon about three miles south-west of Udhurula and ten miles to the east of Vastnar in the same Taluk. Pipalavada the boundary village to the east, may be the present Pimpalada about three miles to the east, situated on the bank of the Pimpal river. The southern boundary village Siha-grama cannot be traced. The western boundary Vadali-khatra may be the dry bed of Vadali-rala about one and a half miles to the west of Devargaon. The northern boundary village Bhurka-grama may be identified with the present Bhoyagaon, two miles to the north of Devargaon.

The writer of the panegyric in both the grants is one Rajashekhar. Whether he was the same as the well-known poet Rajaeshekhar, the author of the Kayyamamani, cannot be said with certainty. It may be possible, the approximate period of Rajaeshekhar's life being 855-930 A.D. He was at the royal court of the Gurjara-Pratihara king Mahendrapala who died in about 910 A.D. After him there was chaos in his kingdom. The country was invaded by the Rashtraakuta king Indraja III. Rajaeshekhar is said to have left Kanaaj and stayed with the Kalachuri king Yuvarajadeva who ruled during 910-50 A.D. where he wrote his Vidhakaalabhatkika. It may be that after the victory of Indraaja III over Kanaaj and the temporary exile of king Mahipala, Rajaeshekhar had gone to the royal court of the Rashtraakutas and stayed with Indraja III where he might have composed this panegyric of Indraja III, which has been adopted in the Vajirkheda plates. From there he might have gone to Yuvarajadeva, the king of the Kalachuri dynasty at Trupuri. The close relations between the Rashtraakutas and the Chedis during this period would strengthen this surmise.

¹I would read the place name as Laghu-ujrapa-khetaka instead of Laghu-dejrapa-khetaka. It may be noticed that the letter which has been read by K. B. Pathak as dē has a loop to the left at the lower end, which we do not find in any sign of de in the record. Compare the de in nda (line 6), cde (lines 12 and 22) and sde line 29. The letter can therefore be read only as n.
Grant A

**TEXT**

[Metres: Verse 1 Indravamśa; verse 2, 9, 14, 15, 22, 23 Anushtubh; verses 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 16-21 Sārdūlanikriḍita; verse 6 Vasantaradākī; verses 7, 12, 13 Sṛgdrātā; verse 24 Śūcinī.]

**First Plate**

1 स्वास्ति [1*] विश्व: पुरि मवमोपोमोग(च) रनवेश्राणप्रतिपिन्देवप्रभु [1*] जनसय

2 नेर्दशक्षामु: [11*] श्रीमतराममहोरास्यायादामोगांच्छन्नम्। जीवातिसौंक्व

3 तवशापि निताशुम्भकतिलको रजेति नामोज्य(चच)लम्ब वि (वि) भ्रानो

4 कापि कला कल्कुराहिता गातेव तुसै जनासौद्रे धूर्जितना धूतामृतमयो सोम:

5 रव: प्रमृतिमहूः: कृतांवन्दित-सारत्योन्निति गतवति प्राप्ते च वृद्धि

6 परिः(गी) जातो वर्जूंपतिः: या कृता कुलमातमामभिन्नि पुरवेनिजित्यो नृपान्

7 ते तस्तन्वम् सत्येव मत्वा श्लायतम् पितामहमुवृत्तस्यभितो नाकिमि: [1*]

8 नस्तान्तन्वेव जनम ह्रिरितामरस्यु: साक्षात्तवम् श्रीपति: [1511*] इति

9 ते पृथिविवन्याकुलं वरुकुले कलितरिताप: [1*] निर्मितातिभिभिपमिछुरुः

10 पृथुषमोजनः दत्तरुः: [1611*] जेतु तसम्प्रयते त्रिविदिविव तत:

---

1 From the original and the impressions.
2 Express by a symbol.
11 सीतलूयः समजन तनयस्तय गोविंदराजो(जः) [1*] राजा तस्यानुजोभुजनी- 
स्मापनकति: श्रीगाजूः देव: II1

12 सूरस्तायकनीयोभवविनिमयतिस्मापनकतिस्मापनकतिस्मापनकतिस्मापनकति: [111**] तस्मातीकुपरकरावदायसस्मापनकतिस्मापनकतिस्मापनकतिस्मापनकति: 
कालानुलालता हेले-

13 मे जन्म हिमालुवानियक: श्रीकृष्णराजो न्युः: II(1) राजी तस्य च 
चेदिराजतनया छट्टास्तख्वास्तायिक्ष्वारा जाता भूमि-

14 पतेभ्य(खः) भूष च जगतु हृदस्योरामजय: III[111*] यस्यावाचपि क्रिष्णायापात- 
विलाल्पविक्रमिः: [11*] हृद्वण्या विमुच्यति मूर्ते-

15 रा न भयब्रजम् III[111*] आसोद्र(ब्रा) हृद्वण्यातः स्वरहत्यावृत्तरेराजः: 
क्षाणिशो दशायक्षदर्पधलन: क्यात: 

16 सहस्त्सरजुन: II(1) वेशो तस्य च हृद्वण्यातात्तकश्चेदीश्वर: कोकलो जातस्तय 
सूरस्तादश शंकरगण: शंकाकरो विद्वानं(यामु) [111011*]

17 चालुक्यायणस्मदनष्ठयु पृपति: श्रीसुहुक्ष्यालम्भो राजासीदर्यमम इत्युपपमस्त्स्वालम् 
जायामयु[1(1)
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18 लघमी: श्रीराजभ्राणवारदिव नुता लघमीस्तत: श्रीकेतुलक देवी सा च 
पराकोऽघिनेजगमुमुखी वामानवभ: II [1111*] तस्या-

19 स्त्सालुनो मदन इव हुरे स्कन्दब्रजरकरोविहः त्रिवरोरकर राजेरिव 
विमलयस्योरालिकोहृताश: [1*] धातु: सी-

20 न्यूःस्मून्दिक्षयोरक्रिष्णमानुविहायमतः: पृथ्वया: पुण्यातिरक्तः 
शुक्लातिरिहषेऽभुजिन्दराजो 
नरेश: II[1211*] वे-

21 धा विजानदरपि बिनव(सु) यथार्थि र्थविस्मयवेदपि भूभाराधारपि 
फणपतिरिक्त 
वाचक: श्रीविनयजुध(पयमु 1 क)-

22 न्यूः सन्देशपि नुमि समसमुच(नुमि) व विलक्षा: समम दुधा दुधान्तकल्पे 
मकश्वागणस्यमेवानियाम् II[1311*]

23 न सध्वेगवसोपोहरकर्ष्य कुले विधि: [1*] वसन्मानिति निमुखात्तेन दोषविनच- 
रायम् II[1411*] सूर्यंक्तकराम्मोधिः-

1 The dashas are unnecessary.
2 The final सि is written outside the margin.
24 वेशभूमि (भव) में। विनिरसत्यमूलाना (ला) स्वयं बृहत्ति मही ||[१५०००] तेजो विशिष्टमधुमा: क्रणमयं स्वयं-  
25 व देवस्फुटात्त्वा: सततमणमेण सहस्रा संगम्य सब्रध्माय। व्यालोधकालपकानामधुमान-  
26 कला विदायकामले दायादा: स्वयमेव यथा पतिता दीये पतंगा दव ||[१५१०] आकार्यं सम-  
27 येव शल्युशिरसा येन स्वसिंहासनम् भु (छु) मंगन सहव भंगमपरे नीता: परं विधिः: [१०] तेयां  
28 राज्यमयं कङ्खान्तकपवरोपित (स) कृत्तं राज्ये कल्पतेत्वा कामस्वर यस्याभिमन्दिनी ||[१५२०] मूवारोद-  
29 हन्ते जित: फणत्तिः शक: भिया निंजित: कीति: कान्तदिगंगनरा मल्लिनिता येनालिंक्षबमृताम् ||[१०] फैलो-  
30 क्षेत्रप न विशेषतेष्व सदृशो रज्जेत यस्योच्चकरामात्ति प्रकटोत्तु यथा इव ||[१५३०] निम्नलं नर-  
31 सिज्जता गतवता वशोभुमा विधिः (वां) देवो वितथा सब्रध्मालिहिता वारिस्वरयायायित: [१०] तत्सतेहमु मुखवा-  
32 यज्ञवल्क्यो राजामिन्तिनित्तो रागाधितकांतोज्जव (वज्र) ललन्ध्यं बनतेय:[१०] स्वयम्  
33 मा वा कृष्ण करोदयानं सदृशोपि फलग्राह्यं स्वयमेव वयन्धोनो गर्जित [१०] न कृष्णसहन न कालह-  

Second Plate; Second Side

34 राज्या तीष्मकारं गरितं दाने यथा तथापयतत्वमभविज्ञायात्यंकोलवे ||[१५४०] देवो दाननित्याः स निंजितवै (व) हि:  
35 श्रीकीर्तिनारायण: जित्वा वारिचेश्लां वसुमतीर्थकाष्ठि: पालयस् [१]  
36 विद्वं कृष्ण (वज्जा) नमस्य (स्च) फल सब्रध्ममधुराः समुज्ञा स्वयमसुत्त्वाः  
37 भूपालमीलालालालितवर्णिनिपुनोऽदापः शीर्षायाः शीर्षायाः वादेः वायुग्मयेन श्रीगोऽदि-
भरतात्जनानायकरिमरहितव (ब) दुर्गेश्वराकरिमममहागुणेष्वार्थासिद्धाविवेकोतमानविविवः

धनमवेषः स्वराज्यविश्वार्थामिनिजितशतमलस्योमयवज्नवमुखः: गोदाममूर्मिदानकनक- 

dानान्वकानुन्वादः

निपुरायणः श्रीकृष्णारायणः संत्रासितोऽस्ततः बुधवरुपोऽस्त्रासितसिद्धायतनः: 

श्रीमुनोज्यनेवः । श्वकीः

योद्यविकसितात्सोपि विविर्तजनवदनपुष्पदरकः पराकायकारानस्तत्सः पारिवर्तिवृोः

तुज्ञः श्रीविक्रमतुज्ञः समवत (त) [II°] स च परमभुखरकमहराजा- 

ग्लिराजपरवेशवक्षीमकलमवर्यः

dेवपादन्वस्य (थ) वधर्मभुखरकमहराजायाचिराजरमेब्बर्यश्रीमन्तङ्गवर्येकुपुथ्रीवव्वः: 

श्रीवल्लभगऱ्यश्रीः

कुचली सवंनेव वथावतः (व) ध्यानाकू(कान्) राज्यविविवश्वातिग्रामकू(र)- 

युक्तकालिन्तकारिमहतारादी(वीः) सः

मादश्चतु (व) सचिविद्वः यथा मन्यक्लराजायानीश्वरतरावस्थानेन पाठः (ब)- 

स्थीतसांपादनाय समाः

नविदतुकुशलक्षमपतलेन मया वायाभिषेकस्य मातापियोरामनश्चिनकृतस्यकृत- 

पवित्रमध्यकिमे

वुढ़िये पूर्वकः वातावरणात्ते वेदमोगऱ्यहरायाचिरायता तथापराम्ययकविवितशक्लद्वृत्तसिद्धायस्यसतिः 

सहितानि दे

वभीमारमे नढ़त्वानि पचायम्सामध्यकानि नमस्वानि प्रयस्तता शकुप- 

कारतीतसवेतस्यस्थायः

ठाकुरु पठ्ठिवातुरपु युवस्वतःरः

1 The Bagumra and Jambeson plates use the word प्रमः.
2 This line, beginning with the symbol व, is engraved on the proper left side of the plate.
51 न्यागारफळ्युक्टुदसात्मां शुक्लबरे मृगावरसि नत्वे प्रमूतोव्यः (रुक्म) लकनकलुकुक्ते रामावरपुरि तुलागुरुवः

52 माऊकः तस्मादनुसरतः प्रथमोदकालित्यतः च (रुक्म) लिङ्गसरस्त्योषयां रथमत्योगार्थां वेषगुरु- गुरुवारं खः

53 गुप्तस्वतिसंपादनार्थः च ब्राह्मणपुरिष्ट्यमाल्याभान्नैः अमोधवसतये सोऽही सपरिकरी समूतीपातः

54 प्रत्ययो साधनाविष्टै देशादेशद्वारपारास्वहितो अवासाध्यायो सब्बराजकी- यानामहस्तः

55 प्रभेड़णीयो समस्तोलुप्तिमातहितो (तर्क) वाचनकारणैवसित्वमुज्जानीनी हि प्रामो नमस्यो दलो ॥

56 तत्र तात्त्व्यम: पादावत्वः (रुक्म) चतुराः(श्री) श्री(श्री) चत्तर्गतामलयः प्राम: तस्मात्पूवः: [विं] चवलीः प्राम: दक्षिणा गिरिः

57 फण्डः नहीं। पशुः कतः(तन) एव गिरिरणः नहीं। उत्तर: माहल्लाहः।

58 याल्लाहः। तहस्तुः प्रियं (श्री) ग्रामः दक्षिण: जनपाल्लाहः। पशुः मुणिवाळः

59 नाम नहीं। उत्तर: जादवलिनामः: [II*] एवं यथावसिष्ट(सिन्धु) तस्मात्- राजोपालित्याः

60 दक्षिणाः पूव्वमायाया मुक्कमुख्यमाना यथाविष्कर्तुराधारापालिता

61 सा वस्तिप्रववितसंविशेषवेदोऽगः [श्री] तथावत्त्यलोकमभ्रमविषय: वद्मानगुरुः च नस्परिता।

62 अर्थ चालमध्यमः सामाग्रिकभूमिपरिशिवर्मः(सिन्धु) नुमत्यः: II वस्त्राधारानी लिपिवद्याः

*This name occurs as गिरिरण in grant II.
63 वृत्तमिराचिच्चमादीचिच्चमानं वा कदाचिदनुमोदते स पञ्चमविषपाठकेषु-पालके जययते || उ- 

64 कता च भगवता वेदद्वासेन || पिष्ट वापसहसाणि स्वगं सति मुनिदः ||
[[1*] आच्छद्वता वानुमत्वा च ताष्वेव नर- 

65 के वंद्तु ||[२२॥*] स्वद्वात्परदत्ता या तलादः (श) नाराधिप || महीममहीमां
क्षेत्र दानादश्योनोपाणमु ||[२३॥*] सामा- 

66 व्योम चर्मंसेतुनुपाणि काले काले पालनीयो मध्वेऽ: ||[२*] सम्बन्धतां (तानु) 
मात्रामः [२*] पारिवेशं (द्वारिः) भूमि मृगाया वाचते 

67 रामभवः ||[२४॥*] राजे यावरक्ता प्रशस्तिरियम् || अः श्री || श 

Grant B

TEXT *

Third Plate *

52 वहनेरपनें उरिक्कवसतये सोद्रः। सवरिकरः। समृतोपालपत्यमः। सपाय- 
हिक्षीयादेया मां दशो- 

53 स्वाभाविकप्रसतिहः। सब्रेसारकोपनामहस्तपशग्रासीयामः। समक्ष्मेऽसतिसहिता आचन्त्र- 
क्षेत्रसतिसहितवेष्ठत- 

54 समकालीनाम पद्ध ग्या रमृश्या दत्ता। तत्र ताबाध्यम। रक्षणचतुर्विक्षे। (विश) त्यं तंत्राक्षेत्रहियािमः। तस्मात्मूखः। रक्षित- 

55 रिपाद। दक्षिणः स एव। कथगिरिः। पक्षियम। वारिकालाप्रायम। उत्तरः 
मोसीनी नदी। तथा द्वितीयः। छवियानांदामित्र- 

56 'शा' (श) ||[श*] तांत्रिकांनउर्जियांम। तस्मात्मूखः। अनतरवल्लिप्रायम। दक्षिणा गिरिपणी 
नदी। पक्षियम। फँट्राप्रायम। उत्तरः तल- 

* From the originals and impressions. 
* The first two plates bearing lines, I to 51 contain the same text as in grant A with a little variation at the beginning and the end of each line. 
* After this word a स्वर्गः was first engraved which has been subsequently cancelled.
57 बाणग्राम: तथा तित्र (तु) तीय: राक्षशचतुर्विष्णुशक्तितंतुगोतिस्ताय:। तस्मातः
वाणोदित्तविज्ञान: दक्षिणा

58 तुंगभद्रा नदी। परिचाय: साविंविवाड़ाग्राम: उत्तर: क्षत्रियविज्ञान:। तथा
चतुर्व: वटनगरविवाहान्तगम:<।

59 अज्जलोणीग्राम:। तस्मातःचतुर्व: नीलग्राम: दक्षिण: तलबाड़ग्राम: परिचाय:
घोषराग्राम:

60 उत्तरा मोसिनी नदी। तथा पंचम: गंगादरादशान्तगमसंतुम्हुणास्त्राम
तस्मातःचतुर्व: अगमः

61 विलियाग्राम: दक्षिणा अभियारा नदी परिचाय: कण्ड्हनाग्राम: उत्तर:
वटाराग्राम:।

62 तथा पठ्ठ:। दल्ललकुलक्षितान्तर्गतिधाराग्राम:। तस्मातःचतुर्व: पिपलविज्ञान:
दक्षिणा: सीहाग्राम

63 म: परिचाय (यहConfig.Field) म: बड़ालीक्ष:। उत्तर: भोगराग्राम:। एवं यथा (यहConfig.Field) वस्तिभुत-
चतुर्व:वाहादोपकलक्षितामकवस्थित

64 पूज्येमर्यादा भूमतःमुख्यकाना यथावस्थितचतुर्वादोपिलिकी सा वस्तिभुविविदः
विष्णुकौटी

65 गणवीणाध्यायान्याय्युक्तियाय वद्भामानार्ये समर्पिता।। अथा चारमदमर्यादा
समागामिनिविनिता

66 तिरिमद्द (हे) स्या (कठ्ठे) र्यायानुसारमतय:।। यथायान्तिमिरिपादपान्तोढ़तिरामान्तिकङ्गः
वाणिज्यकानां वा कङ्काला

67 चिदनुमा (यह:) दत्ते संविंमिन्यापातकापापातकार्य लिप्यः।। उज्जै च भगवता
बरासेन।। वनां वनस्थलमः

1 It appears that य was first engraved which has been corrected into य. afterwards.
2 This letter is redundant.
3 DGA/68
68 शि स्वाय कसति मूर्मित: [1] आच्छेदो चातुरमल च तान्येव नरके बतेि। [२२२1*] अन्तव रामस्तोकार्य (कः)। राजशेषरक (कृ)।

69 ५, ता प्रशस्विरियां (यम्)।
No. 3—BANTRA INSCRIPTION OF NRIPAMALLARAJA

(I Plate)

K. V. RAMESH, MYSORE

(Received on 29.6.1967)

The inscription, which is edited here with the kind permission of the Government Epigraphist for India, Mysore, is engraved on two sides of a stone slab set up in the Mahālīṅgēśvara temple in the village of Bantra in Mangalore Taluk, South Kanara District, Mysore State. The record is damaged on the right and left margins resulting in the loss of a few letters, especially in the upper half of the obverse portion. The writing is, otherwise, well preserved. There are twenty-six lines of writing in all, seventeen on the obverse and nine on the reverse sides.

The characters and the language of the inscription belong to the archaic Kannada variety and are comparable to those found in the records from neighbouring areas. The inscription is not dated but could be assigned, on grounds of palaeography, to about the middle of the ninth century A.D. As is usual with such early records from South Kanara, the letters do not all of them fall into one particular palaeographical period, some like y and t showing earlier characteristics and others like l, k and, in some instances, y betraying later developments. Nevertheless, the record does bear comparison, in general, with Kannada records of the said period from the adjacent regions and, in particular, with the inscriptions of the Alupa king Māramma alias Ājuvarasa IV who, in all probability, ruled over South Kanara from about 840 to about 870 A.D.

The epigraph contains a few orthographical errors and peculiarities. Iṣdu (lines 10 and 18) has been written for iṣdu. Ekasta (line 6), vyavaste (line 18), stiti (line 23) and phalam (line 24) for ekasta, vyavaste, stiti and phalam respectively illustrate the influence of Kannada on words borrowed from Sanskrit. The usage of uḍeyār for the more usual uḍeyār in line 14 is interesting. The word pāli (line 19) in the sense of ‘reviling’ or ‘vengeance’ is noteworthy. Of initial vowels, u occurs once (line 24), i thrice (lines 7, 20 and 23), a thrice (lines 16, 24 and 25), e four times (lines 17, 18, 25 and 26) and o twice (lines 9 and 26).

As for the purport of the record, it has been observed in the A.R.Ep., 1930-31 as follows: “Seems to register an agreement regarding the enjoyment of some lands, made in the presence of the king, the Kadamba chief Rācharmālā-Dugarāja, brother of Vīḷarittalīyarasa and Narasingan-Dugarāja and some Perugaḷes”. This statement, however, is not correct, since there is no reference whatsoever to the enjoyment of lands.

The inscription, on the other hand, records a political agreement entered into by four persons, viz. king Nrīpamallarāja, a Kadamba ruler whom the record fails to mention by name, Rācharmālā-Dugarāja, the beloved brother of Vīḷarittalīyarasa and Narasingan-Dugarāja, the son of Balle (or Valle)-uḍeyā. That these four persons were parties to the treaty becomes obvious when we connect māvaram-īṣdu in line 10 with kēyida vyavaste in line 18, the

---

1 This is No. 351 of A.R.Ep., 1930-31.
2 In A.R.Ep. for 1930-31, the record has been assigned to the eighth century.
4 The correct reading is Kadamba.
space in between being devoted to the enumeration of the names of some persons who too were present at the time of the conclusion of the agreement. The treaty itself was to the effect that the parties concerned would, in the times to come, discontinue (†) mutual enmity (page), vengeance (poli) and fights (esage †). Such political agreements become more numerous in the later his- trory of South Kanara. 1

The record commences with the auspicious word svasti and immediately refers to the reign of Nripamallaraja who is eulogised as [raja-kul-anhar-aditya] and satya-taucha-rinay-acharga-sampanna (lines 2-4). The passage immediately following is not happily constructed. It reads sakala-guna-ga[v-šam]krita-Katambha-kul-aabhava sri-prithuvi-raujyad-ul (lines 5-7). This sentence though complete in itself, is defective in that it does not mention by name the Katambha ruler to whose prithuvi-raujya it alludes. Besides, the reference to Nripamallaraja’s reign merely as rājya-vriddhiy-ulle and to the Katambha’s rule as prithuvi-raujyad-ul seems to imply that the latter was the superior of the two.

The name of the king Nripamallaraja is interesting. This name is not met with elsewhere in available records as that of a ruling king or chieftain. Nor has a second record of this ruler been found in South Kanara itself and this, coupled with the silence of the record regarding the dynasty to which he belonged, renders the identification of Nripamallaraja impossible at least for the present. It may, however, be pointed out that Nripamalla is only a variant of Rājamalla, a name by which more than one Western Gaṅga ruler are known to history. 2 It is interesting also to note that the name of Rāchamalla who was also a party to the agreement is also a variant of Rājamalla and Nripamalla and is used as such in Western Gaṅga records. In the present state of our knowledge, however, it is not possible to connect this record with the Western Gaṅgas.

Kadamba as a dynastic name is found written also as Kādamba, Kadamba and, in rare instances, Katamba. Our record contains the family name Katambha which may or may not be connected with the dynasty of the Kadambas.

As has already been pointed out, South Kanara was, during the period to which this record belongs, in all probability under the sway of Māramma alias Ājuvarasa IV. As far as could be judged from this Ālupa ruler’s available records, his reign was a peaceful one. High-sounding titles such as paramēśvara and adhirāja which he assumed 3 reveal that he was the most powerful ruler of South Kanara in his time. It is not improbable, therefore, that Nripamallaraja and the unnamed Katambha ruler were the subordinates of Māramma. As for Rāchamallan-Dugaraja and Narasingan-Dugaraja, 4 it becomes obvious that they were only princes of two minor houses, the former’s elder brother Vilarittalijyaras and the latter’s father Balle-ođeya being alive at the time of the setting up of the record as is proved by the references to them towards the end of this record. In all probability, Nripamallaraja, the Katambha chief, Vilarittalijyaras and Balle-ođeyar were administering adjacent bits of tracts within Ājuvahcëda, i.e., roughly the present district of South Kanara. The absence of any reference to the Ālupa king does not preclude the possibilities suggested above. 5

Among those who were present at the time of the conclusion of the treaty, perhaps as witnesses, was Sādāvarma-marudaga. The exact significance of the term marudaga is difficult to

---

2 It may be pointed out here that Bājamalla Sutjavākya was on the Western Gaṅga throne about this period.
4 Could it be that dugaraja suffixed to the names of Rāchamalla and Narasinga is a corrupt form of gurāja? 7
5 Such political treaties which belong to the Vijayanagara period and to South Kanara do not generally mention the Vijayanagara emperors though South Kanara formed part of the empire.
Reverse

Scale: One-sixth
determine though it may stand for the 'physician' of Śādanura. Mardu, an outdated form in Kannaḍa for modern maddu—medicine is even now employed in Tulu. This marudagaḍ may be the same as Tamil maruttuvargal, 'physicians'. Others present were 'those who arrange for service (like playing instrumental music by turns) in the temple (dēguladul vōlagada pāliyavaṭ), Śrīdhara-paṭṭa, Mēdhāvi-bhaṭṭa, Pureya-kittara (r), Pajujiyaṇa, Viṣ[va?] of Kukke, the kaṇaka (accountant), the uḍēya of Śādanura, Jayārāma-nā...yīga, Aḷṭīya(?I) of Kōṭivallī, Vayasaṇi (?) Śrī-Vikkrama-poyga, Uttama-voyga of Valla, Narasīṅga-voyga and the perggaḍes.

The geographical names mentioned in the record are Śādanura, Kukke, Kōṭivallī, Valla and Vārāṇasi. Of these the last is the famous Vārāṇasi of the north. Kukke is even to this day a second name for Subrahmaṇya, a famous pilgrimage centre in Puttur Taluk, South Kanara District. I am unable to identify the rest of the place-names though they were probably situated around Bantra, the findspot of the present inscription.

Lines 20-23 pronounce a curse upon those who fail to abide by the terms of the treaty while lines 23-24 exhort that he who preserves the aims of the record will have gained the merits of performing the horse-sacrifice. Lines 24-26 refer to Viḷḷaṭṭalīyarasa and Valle-uḍēya but the context in which they are thus referred to is not clear.

TEXT:

Obverse

1 [Svâ]sti [¹] śrīmat
2 [râ̄jja]-kul-āmbar-ādi-
3 [tya]-satya-saucha-vinay-āchāra-
4 [sam]pauṇa-śrī-Śrīpaṭamallaraja-rajya-
5 [vṝ]ddhiy-ula[le sakala-guṇa-ga-
6 [u-alaḥ]Karitā Katambha-kul-oilbha[va śrī-prithuvt-rā-
7 jyāl-a] irvvaruṁ ta[mu]-ekastar-āgi Vi-
8 [laṛit]talīyarasārā priy-ānujan Rāchamallan-dugarāja
9 Balle-uḍēyarā magan Narasīṅga-dugarāja-
10 [n-āgi] nālvaruṁ[ru]m-iḍhu Śādanurā marudaga-
11 ודות-ā dēgula-ul [vō]lagada pāliyava-
12 ruṁ Śrīdhara-paṭṭa[r]uṁ Mēdhāvi-bhaṭṭar[uṁ Pureya-
13 Kittara[r][uṁ Pajujiyaṇar[uṁ Kukke Viṣ[va]ruṁ kaṇakaruṁ ma-
14 [ntippallu?] Śādanur-uḍēyaruṁ Jayarāma-nā .
15 yīgaruṁ Kōṭivallī-Aṭṭiyar[uṁ [Valya [sur]ri[² (?)
16 Śrī-Vikkrama-poygaruṁ Vallada Uttama-voygaruṁ
17 Narasiṅga-[vō]ygaruṁ enebāruṁ perggaḍega[ru]-

¹ From impressions.
² Lost letters have been restored in the text wherever possible.
³ This reading is extremely doubtful.
18 m-i具备 ke[yi]da vyavaste em[u]-
19 [da]¹ pageyun pajiyum-[e]sageyum² -u (I)
20 mu[ndalde?]² intu salisādōn-Vāraṇā[si]
21 sāśi(s)ra-kavileyu konda pātakaṇ-āgi raurava
22 narakad-u] tanna gōtra-sahita pulu-
23 kōti vuttu-ppōn[ar-akku)n] ()[*] I(I) stitiyan-nir[i][si]-
24 donge asvamēdha keyda pa(pha)lam-akke [u]¹
25 embodu Vījarittaliyarasargge [u]
26 koṭu embodu Valle-odeyarargge [l][*]

---
¹ I am not sure of the reading here. I have taken the word emuda to be the equivalent of Tamil emudaliga meaning 'our'.
² sage literally means 'to throw' or 'to engage' and appears to be used here in the sense of 'fight'.
³ This reading is uncertain. But the letters within the brackets do not easily lend themselves to any other reading.
⁴ Here and at the end of the next line one or two letters appear to have been lost.
No. 4—MADURAI INSCRIPTION OF PANDYA CHENDAN, YEAR 59

(1 Plate)

K. G. Krishnan, Mysore

(Received on 4.9.1967)

The slab containing the inscription edited here, with the kind permission of the Government Epigraphist for India, was reported to have been unearthed from the bed of the Vaigai river while digging for water. It was reported to the Superintendent, Southern Circle, Archaeological Survey of India, by Shri V. Arunachalam of the Office of the Collector of Ramanathapuram. Shri K. V. Raman, the Technical Assistant deputed by the Superintendent took a photograph and an impression which were sent to the Government Epigraphist for India. Since the inscription which was found to be very important could not be satisfactorily deciphered from the photograph and the impression, it was copied by me in September 1961. Even while I was copying this inscription I began to suspect that similar inscribed slabs might be lying somewhere along the bed of the river and my search yielded two more inscriptions of which one was an unfinished copy of the inscription edited here.

The inscribed slab measures about 1.2 metres long and 75 cm wide. The inscription is engraved within the space bordered by a rough rectangle drawn on the stone. It is broken at the lower bottom diagonally from the right end of line 11 to the beginning of line 14. In spite of this damage it can be said that not much of the inscription is lost. The total number of lines of the extant text is 14 of which the beginning of the 14th line is just visible.

The epigraph is engraved in Vaṭṭeluttu and Grantha characters of the 7th century and the language is Tamil. Sanskrit expressions used to describe the king are engraved in Grantha with Tamil terminations which are engraved in Vaṭṭeluttu characters. Palaeographically the inscription is interesting. Dots have been used not only over the pure consonants but also on full consonants where the short medial vowels e and o occur. This feature has been noticed also in the case of the Velvikuṇḍu grant of Neduṉjaṉaiyāṉ in Vaṭṭeluttu script and the inscriptions from Śendalai in Tamil script. Some other inscriptions provide instances of the use of the dot over pure consonants only. While the use of dots over pure consonants is well-known, the use of dots over medial short e and o requires some explanation. It may be noted here that this practice is in accordance with ancient Tamil grammar. The Tolkāppiyam Eluttadikāram, has the following to say on this:

Meyyin-iyarkai pulliyodu nilaiyal (śūṭṭira no. 15)
Ekara-Okcaratt-iyarkaiyam-arrē (no. 16).

2 Since the river is dry except during the rainy season, supply of spring water from its bed during other seasons has become a regular trade. Stones are also kept in the water-shade for beating up the clothes. During times of floods the stones go farther down or below the bed and it is one such slab that has yielded the inscription edited here.
3 Ibid., No. B 331. The other inscription (No. B, 332) is in Tamil characters of about the 12th century.
4 Above, Vol. XVII, p. 291. It has been observed there "the pulji (i.e., the dot) is unnecessarily inserted over the vocable e and o and even over the initial vowel letter o". This is not correct. The insertion of a dot is necessary and regular as explained by us in the sequel. The plates provide also instances for the use of dots over these initial vowels (see lines 108, 109, etc.).
5 Ibid., Vol. XIII, pp. 134 ff. The impressions of inscriptions which are not illustrated there show the dots.
6 SII, Vol. III, Nos. 27, 90, 100, 104, 108, etc.
The form of the pure consonant is to appear with a dot, as also the forms of e and o. Thus this inscription proves to be a good example of these rules. The next important feature is the form of the letter y. This letter is formed by a diminutive but convex semicircle being placed on a fully drawn concave semicircle. The next stage of its development can be discerned in the Smaller Sinnamanur plates and the Madras Museum plates where the convex semicircle tends to swing towards the centre bottom or the left end of the bigger concave semicircle. Thus this form of y is the earliest ever met with in Vaṭṭelutti inscriptions. In the only case of medial i the sign is marked by a distinct loop inside the left. A comparison of the palaeography of this inscription with the Tirunādarukhuru inscription and the early Pāṇḍya copper-plates mentioned above indicates that the present record may be placed sometime between these two, about the middle of the seventh century, if not earlier.

This being a very early inscription, in Tamil, of the Pāṇḍya dynasty, some words of grammatical and lexicographical interest may be noted here. Araśū in line 2 is an instance of ādāppōlī for araśu. The use of the word nādāvi in line 7 is noteworthy. The expletive particle ārya is used in line 8. This is also used in the Pāṇḍya charters of the successors of Chēndan. The use of pāṭuttu (lines 9-10) in the sense of ‘having caused to be constructed’ may be noted. Pījar in line 10 is evidently a corruption of peyar and this is not grammatically sanctioned. The expressions cheṅgol-nādāvi in line 7 and kāṟudwuttu in lines 10-11 should be separated as cheṅgol and nādāvi, and kāl and toḷudwuttu respectively. The sandhi has been observed correctly in both the cases.

Regarding the Grantha script it may be observed that it is regular for the period. This duplication is invariably present in the inscriptions of the later period. The fragmentary inscription engraved on another stone discovered at the same place and mentioned above contains only the portion of the text of the present inscription up to the date portion. The preamble which is in Grantha shows a few later features such as the form of y (line 2) in which the diminutive convex semicircle becomes concave and is combined to the left end of the main semicircle and the form of a in āya (line 2) in which one end of the base line has become a loop. This copy of the text appears to have been engraved by a different hand at a later period.

The inscription under study introduces the king Chēndan of the Pāṇḍya dynasty in the preamble (lines 1-8). The style of this passage is reminiscent of the later mãṇiprasādā used so profusely by the Vaishnava commentators of the Nālāyira-divyaprabandham and may be considered to be the earliest specimen of the style. Besides, this passage provides also the earliest instance, in Tamil epigraphy, of the use of poetry anticipating the prasāstis of the later period.

The king is described in the record as follows: He was born in the Pāṇḍya family and adorned it as an effulgent jewel. He subdued kings by his prowess, destroyed wickedness (marana) and augmented goodness (arana). He created many agrahāras and performed numerous mahādānas such as hiranyagarbha, gōṣṭhara and tuḷābhāra and thereby chastised Kali. Lastly he is stated to have established the city of Maṅgalapura and ruled from there. The inscription is dated

1 The letter y in Arīyaśarpya (line 10) and pījar (line 10) shows the later form where the diminutive convex circle tends to swing towards the centre bottom.
2 SII, Vol. III, p. 462, lines 4, 5, 6, etc.; Ind. Ant., Vol. XXII, p. 70, lines 19, 20, etc.
3 SII, Vol. XVII, frontispiece.
4 This word is also used in SII, Vol. IV, No. 133, section j, line 2.
5 Ibid., Vol. III, p. 455, line 106; p. 463, line 23; above, vol. XVII, p. 300, lines 40, 48, 51, etc.
6 It is a matter of opinion whether this also could not be treated as an instance of numarpōlī. For this form pījar see also above, Vol. XVII, p. 302, line 108.
in the fiftieth year in the reign of the king Chêndâ and records the construction of a sluice (madagu) and the excavation of a channel (kāl) from Vaigai by the king and also states that the sluice was named Arikēsariyān. It also refers to the closing of another channel and to some territorial divisions including Paruttikkudi-[nādu] obviously comprising the areas benefited by the new channel. Since the record is damaged at this point, nothing more could be made out.

Chêndâ, the king to whom the record belongs, is no doubt identical with Chêndâ described in the Smaller Sinnamanur plates and the Velvikiudī grant as the father of Arikēsari Māravarman. The name of the sluice Arikēsariyān is reminiscent of Arikēsari, Chêndâ’s son, though there is nothing in the record to suggest that it was named after this prince. The present record does not attribute any cognomen to the king such as Māraṇ or Chaḍaiyaṇ while his father is described only as a Māravarman in the Velvikiudī grant. But the same grant describes Chêndâ as Chaṭiliya Nagavar Chaṇḍōr-Chêndâ. Following the practice in later times, of alternating Māraṇ and Chaḍaiyaṇ between father or predecessor and son or successor among the Pândya kings, we may expect that Chêndâ, the son of Māravarman should be called Chaḍaiyaṇ. An inscription from Malaiyadikkurichichi recently discovered by Shri K. R. Srinivasan is dated in the reign of this Chêndâ and describes him as Māraṇ Chêndâ instead of Māraṇ Chaḍaiyaṇ as the later Pândya inscriptions would have. We are led to surmise that the title Chaṭiliya applied to Chêndâ in the Velvikiudī grant perhaps transformed itself into Chaḍaiyaṇ in the reign of his grandson Chaḍaiyaṇ Rāpadhira as described in the same grant. It may be noted that while both Māraṇ and Chaṭiliya were used for the Pândyas in general in the Sangam classics, Chaḍaiyaṇ came to be used among the Pândya kings in later times and Chaṭiliya ceased to be applied to any particular king of the Pândya dynasty. Jaṭil or Jaṭilavarman and Chaḍaiyaṇ are obviously interconnected.

Tamil literature contains references to more than one Chêndâ. A stanza in the Mutṭollāyiram quoted in one of the commentaries on the Tolkāppiyam refers to a king Chêndâ and describes the conventional love of a maiden towards him in the form of an appeal to the elephant on which the king was riding to walk alongside the window of her house so that she can have a full view of the king. The stanza is:

KoVV[t]alir-ru-ppalaik-kâṟṟap-perun-Chêndâ
vaigalam=rum vayak-kaiṟē kaitolual
kâl-evaraṇṇaik-kaavyārâk-kâṣav-eân-
chaḷēgaṇ-chēra naḍa

Since the Mutṭollāyiram is known to be an anthology of poems containing three sections composed on the three great Tamil kings Chēra, Chēlā and Pândya respectively and since the Chēra and the Chēla dynasties do not claim to have a Chêndâ in their genealogy, Chêndâ of this stanza

---

1 SII, Vol. III, p. 463, line 14 where he is called Jayantavarman, Chêndâ being its Tamil form.
3 It is not known whether Chêndâ’s father also had the name Arikēsari which is not improbable. The Velvikiudī plates refer to him only as Māravarman. Aemānkkānamu occurring in the relevant passages seems to be a title.
5 Pupapāṇāy, verses 19 and 25 for Chaṭiliyaṇ and verses 55.57 for Māraṇ. There is no evidence to consider whether these two cognomens were applied in the Sangam period alternately.
6 Chaḍaiyaṇ as applied to Śiva or to persons professing Saiva religion may have to be derived from Chaḍai or Jaṭil, the matted locks of Śiva. See n. Tamil Lexicon. Chaḍaiyaṇ as applied to Pândya kings could not be justified in each case as Saivaite to the exclusion of Māraṇ, though the Pândyas are known to have god Śiva at Madurai, their capital, as their tutelary deity.
7 Tolkāppiyam, Cholladikaram, sūtra 37, Nachinhārkkkinjiyār’s commentary. The expression kâṟṟap-perun-Chêndâ is given as kumār in the commentary of Mayilainādar and Saṅkaranamaṅgāyār on sūtra 306 of Nagāṇḍū.
is very likely to be identical with Pāṇḍya Chēndan of this inscription. This anthrology is ascribed to the last quarter of the ninth century. The other Chēndans referred to in Tamil literature are: (1) Chēndan (Aruvandal), the chief of Ambar on the banks of the Kavēri. (2) Chēndan, the lord of Tamil, at whose court the work called Chūlamani of Tolâmâlîtēvar was set with the seal of approval. The commentary on a verse in the Pāyiram of this work containing this statement, states that Chēndan was Avanichilâmanâ Mâravarma and this is obviously incorrect. Chēndan was not a Mâravarma but he was the son of Avanichilâmanâ Mâravarma according to the Velvukhi grant. The work being definitely later than the well-known five big epics (Chîippyâdhikâram, etc.) the identity of this Chēndan with the Pâṇḍya king is precluded. (3) Jayanta (the Sanskritic form of Chēndan) referred to in a verse cited in the work called Yâpparasîgala-rîruttu of about the tenth century. He is there stated to be an ally of Chatumuka (Chaturmukha) who was defeated by Saṅgasipâla who is also referred to as Naudi of the Bâpakula. If this Nundi is the same as Nandivarmârman, the first known chief of the Bâpa family removed only by two generations from his descendant Vikramâditya, a junior contemporary of Varagunta of accession in 872 A.D., Jayanta of this poem cannot be identified with Chēndan of our record for, the latter, as already indicated, lived in the first half of the seventh century. (4) Chēndana, the sēnâpati of Tûḻaimânan and the chief of Popparâ who saw the back of the fleeing Siûgalattaraiyân and the Villavan and also captured the white parasol of the former. Thus, none of these four Chēndânâs can be identified with the king of the present record.

Chēndan of the record under study is the first among the Pâṇḍyas, who performed the mahâdânas in so far as the available records show. According to the Velvukhi grant which does not refer to this fact regarding Chēndan, his son Mâravarma Akkâsari and his great grandson Mâravarma Râjasimha are also known to have performed these charities. The most important fact in the description of the king in the present record is the founding of the city of Mângalapurma. The Velvukhi grant also refers to a city Mângalapura where Chadaiyan (Râphidhira in the Sanskrit portion), the grandson of Chēndan is stated to have attacked and destroyed the Mahârathas. The editor of the said plates proposed the identification of Mângalapura with Mangalore in South Karnâra District, Mysore State without assigning any grounds therefor. There is, however, a contemporary copper-plate charter of Pulakesin II from Mâruṭhur dated in the latter's eighth year (616 A.D.) of reign which refers to the visit of an Alka (Âlupa) chief to the royal camp at Kollur from his own capital Mângalapura in spite of the arduous journey and other difficulties. While this Mângalapura

1 History of Tamil Language and Literature by S. Vaiyappuri Pillai, p. 136.
2 Chēndan Dîvâkârum, stanzas at the end of each of the twelve chapters. Ambar Aruvandal of Puṇanâsura (No. 385 composed by Kallâspâr) was evidently a distant ancestor of this Chēndan Aruvandal, the author of Dîvâkârum.
3 Chûlamâni, stanza no. 4 in Pâyiram, U. V. Swaminatha Iyer's Library edition, Adyar. Tâmil Varalâs (p. 176) of Srînivas Pillai quotes a verse from another edition of Chûlamâni, which speaks of Vîjaiyan, a chief of Kâvâli (i.e., Kârvi) during whose regime this work is stated to have been composed. The identity of this chief is obscure. The authenticity of this verse is not attested and the name Kârvi is a late one in history.
4 History of Tamil Language and Literature, p. 163.
5 Yâpparasîgala-rîruttu, Bhavanandam Pillai's edition, p. 197.
6 Prâdîgghan, Yâppiyâl, sūtra 11, commentary. This work on Tamil grammar of about the 11th century was composed by Buddhâmitra, who is also described as the chief of Popparâ (vide, ibid., Pâyiram).
7 See page 23 above.
8 Above, Vol. XVII, p. 301, lines 60 and 85.
9 Ibid., lines 66-67.
10 Copperplate Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh Government Museum, Hyderabad, Vol. I, pp. 11 ff. and plates. Mângalapura has been wrongly identified with Mângalasgiri in Guntur District ignoring the statement in the charter that the Âlupa chief had to travel hard all the way from that city to Kollur identified by the editor with Kollur again in Guntur District. It is not clear how the Âlupa chief will find it difficult to travel from Mângalasgiri to Kollur both in Guntur District which once never have been the territory of the Âlupa.
is no doubt identical with Mangalore which was certainly within the territorial limits of Āḷupa’s dominions (Āḷavakēḍa) the Maṅgalapura of the present record which refers to its foundation and the Maṅgalapura of the Vēḻykuḍi grant which refer to the city as the place where the Mahārathas were attacked and destroyed, may be identical and will have to be located well inside the Paṇḍya dominion, if not on their borders. Maṅgalapura which was founded by Chēndan and which cannot be identified with Maṅgalapuram (i.e., Mangalore) of the Māruṭhīru plates referred to above, was evidently attacked by the Mahārathas in the reign of his grandson Ḍaḷaiyaṇ Raṇadhīra. Besides the Pallavas of the Siṇṇhavishṇu line from Kāṇchi who were frequently at war with the Paṇḍyas, the Chālukyas of Bādami also claim to have either befriended or subdued the Paṇḍyas along with the Chōla and the Kēraḷa. Pulakēsin II is known to have come as far upto the Kāvēri if not crossed it, sometime before 634-35 A.D., as indicated by the Aihole inscription. He is stated to have assured protection for the three Tamil Kings, including the Paṇḍya against the Pallava and this is a clear instance of the maṇḍal theory of political science. His son, Vikramāditya I is known to have camped actually at Uragapura in Chōlaka-vishvaya, i.e., Uraiyyr on the south bank of the Kāvēri in 674 A.D., though the actual circumstances of his camp are not stated. It is not unlikely that the Paṇḍya who was friendly to the Chālukya Pulakēsin II joined the Pallava later on thus inviting the Chālukya king to administer a reprisal. It is, therefore, possible that the second expedition of the Chālukyas in 674 A.D., in the reign of Vikramāditya I provided the occasion for a fight at Maṅgalapuram. There are two places that may answer to the location of this place. One is Tirumaṅgalam in Lalgudi Taluk in Tiruchchirappalli District on the north bank of the Kāvēri and the other a village called Maṅgalam in Sattur Taluk in Ramanathapuram District. There is no contemporary evidence, however, of these places being called Maṅgalapuram. The former is on the route of the march or retreat of the Chālukya army which suffered, after this date, defeat at Peruvāḷanallīr which is nearby. The latter is far into the south. An inscription from Uraiyyr in Madurai District in Tamil characters of the 11th century A.D., dated in the 10th year (c. 950 A.D.) in the reign of Śōlan-talai-kōṇḍa Virapāṇḍya, refers to the palace at Maṅgalapuram which is no doubt identical with Maṅgalapuram of the present record. Another evidence in its support is a reference to a palace of the Paṇḍya king Māvaṁano Sundaraṇaḍya I (acc. 1210 A.D.) at Maṅgalam which is said to be situated in Ḍaḷkuḍi-nāḍu. This is the present record and the two Paṇḍya records cited above attest to the continuity of the place at least

---

1 The Āḷupas claim to have belonged to the Paṇḍya lineage as recorded in the Shiggaon plates of Chālukya Vijayaṇidīya dated Šaka 630 (above, Vol. XXXII, p. 322, line 33). This will have to be treated as, unconnected with the question of the identification of Maṅgalapura. For, Chēndan is never known to have extended his kingdom as far north as to Mangalore. The Paṇḍya lineage of the Āḷupas referred to above is well supported by the names of Āḷupa kings such as Uṭtamāpāṇḍya, Pāṇḍya-vakravṛtti, Virapāṇḍya etc. In later times a Virapāṇḍya of Madurai, the brother of Jālīvarman, Dandapāṇḍya I is known to have been made the ruler of Koṅkaṇaṇidīya (A.R. Ep., 1938-39, pp. 81-82).

2 Above, Vol. VI, p. 6, lines 15-16.


4 Ibid., Vol. XXXII, p. 177.

5 See the Pallavas by Jouveau, Dubrecq, p. 68 where the Mahāratha has been identified with the Chālukya king. Contrariwise, The Paṇḍyan kings, p. 35, note 2. The name is misspelt as Maṅgalapuram and the evidence of the Chālukyan charters is not properly evaluated. But it is suggested that “Arikēsari Māvaṁano, Chēndan’s son could have entered into an alliance with the Pallavas’ enemy on the other side, namely Chālukya Vikramāditya I”. A History of South India, 3rd edition, p. 152.

6 A.R. Ep., 1961-62, No. B 336. The nāḍu in which Maṅgalapuram is situated is not given. The record is considered to be a later copy (see ibid., p. 15).

7 Ibid., 1926, No. 557.

1 DGA/68
down to the reign of Māravarman Sundarapandya I. The name of the nāḍu in which it is situated could be restored as Paruttikkudi or Karunilakkudi-nāḍu. Paruttikkudi-nāḍu which is mentioned in line 12 of the present record covers roughly the area around Tiruchchuliyal and Palli-madai in Arrupukottai Taluk in Ramanathapuram District. There is no place bearing the name Maṅgalam or Maṅgalapuram in this region. Karunilakkudi-nāḍu comprises the area extending roughly from Kunnūr in Śrivilliputtur Taluk to Tiruttangāl in Sāttur Taluk, both the Taluks being in Ramanathapuram District. There is a Maṅgalam in this area in Sāttur Taluk which might have contained the palace referred to above. Therefore, Maṅgalapuram may be identified with Maṅgalam mentioned above. It is difficult to say now whether the Chālukya, if his identification with the Mahārathas is correct, came further south from Kāveri or sent his army far up to this place. In the wake of reconstruction of the events connected with the Chālukya expeditions before 634-35 A.D. and in 674 A.D., it may follow as a natural corollary that the battle at Maṅgalapura in which Raṇadhira is credited with success, against the Mahārathas might have been fought shortly after 674 A.D. This will make the reign of Chēndan, Raṇadhira’s grandfather, fall in the first half of the 7th century, which is well supported also by the palaeography of the present record.

The only other geographically name Paruttikkudi-nāḍu in line 12 has been discussed above.

1 Pāndya-kula-maṇi-prādipan ay prādhīvaraṇa-che-
2 yēḷa[,]vikramaṅgalakśaraśaṇa-adakki maṇi-
3 kṣattī-nīram-perukki[,]agragrahāram pala
4 cheyā-śapāritam-iṣṭi Hiranyagarbha[,]Ga-
5 sahasr-aśaṇārattu mahādānagār
6 kati-kadindu[,]Maṅgalapura-maṇi-ākki vi-
7 sra[nu]dha[ṇ]a-gō-[nāj]āv[ă][,]niṅa Koch-Chē-
8, maṅ Maṅga[ṃ]a[ṃ]b[ād]-āvadu rājya-saṃvatsara-
9 n[-]chellēnį[r]kya Vaigai [chon][-]madagu pa-
10 ūd[ui]-Arikkāriyān-sap-piyār-iṭṭu-kā-dōd-
11 viṭṭu-kā[ṇ]ak[ē][:] tai ūdai aṇṭṭu[16]
12 l-nāḍu Paruttikkudi[į]......
13 kuṭulkkė [ppa],.......
14 .........

1 See above, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 116-17 for the use of the word Maṅgala in a number of titles such as Viramāṅgalapēraiyar, Pāṇḍi-Ampitamāṅgalapēraiyar and Pāṇḍi Pāṅgōmaṅgalapēraiyar of Pāṇḍya officials in the reign of Parāntaka Varaguna I (see n. 768 A.D.). It is not known whether Maṅgalapuram has anything to do with these.
2 SII, Vol. XIV, Nos. 46, 79, 80, 82, 83, 88 and 90.
3 Ibid., Nos. 92, 257 and 258.
4 Shri Arvai S. Doraiswami Pillai in his History of Tamil Literature, Śaiva Literature (p. 6) states that the famous Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwangs has referred to the death of Chēndan, at the time of the former’s sojourn at Kāśē. He has not cited any reference. None of the books on Yuan Chwangs refers to the Pāṇḍya’s death. On the other hand the reference is to the king of Sīnhabāja (see The Life of Hitu-brāhma, p. 139).
5 From impressions.
6 This dāgas is introduced here and in lines upto line 7 in order to indicate the verse form of the passage (see page 28 above).
7 There appears to be a superfluous length sign for a attached to ma, which may be ignored.
8 The meaning of this word is not clear.
9 This looks more like a though it would make no sense either.
10 A medial a sign with a dot above can be seen here. The stone slab is broken diagonally from this point to the beginning of line 14.
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The impressions of the two inscriptions under examination belong to the old collection of the inscriptions preserved in the Office of the Government Epigraphist for India, Mysore. Since the records are important for the history of the Paramara dynasty of Malwa and both of them still remain unpublished they are edited here with the kind permission of the Government Epigraphist for India.

1. Paṭhari Inscription of the time of Jayasimhadēva II, V. S. 1326

The inscription is engraved on a stone slab set up near the eastern bank of the tank at the village Paṭhari, Kurvai Tahsil, Vidisha District, M. P. It was first noticed by F. Kiern in his List of Inscriptions of Northern India from a rubbing supplied to him by E. Hultzsch and later on by D. R. Bhandarkar in his List. It has also been noticed by Shri H. N. Dvivedi in his Abhilēka.

The record occupies a space 29.5 cm x 40 cm. It contains seven lines of writing which is bold and deep. The size of the letters is not uniform and they vary in height from 2 cm to 5 cm. The characters are Nāgari and are regular for the period to which the record belongs. Among the palaeographical features the following are noteworthy: Both the forms of medial sign for ai occur here, one of them indicated by a priśhmātrā and a sīrōmātrā and the other by two sīrō-mātrās as found in Ven (line 1) and Jai (line 3) respectively. So also the earlier form of the medial sign for ao in Gao (line 4) is noteworthy. The language of the inscription is Sanskrit prose. As regards orthography, the following features are noteworthy: Buddha for Buddha in Buddhaśīne (line 1); generally the doubling of consonant after r as for instance varttamānā (line 4) and kīrtti (line 6). The influence of local dialect is noticed in some places e.g. Vaisīsha (line 1), Puśkha for Pushya (line 2) and Jaisēṅgha (line 3).

The inscription commences with a symbol for ṛm, which is joined with the following letter saṃ. This is followed by the date V. S. 1326, Vaiśākha śu. 7, Wednesday and Pushya nakṣatra, corresponding regularly to A. D. 1269, April 10. In lines 2-3, it is stated that when king Jayasimhadēva was [ruling] at Vaiḍōvā-pattana, the record was set up, evidently at Paṭhari, the findspot of the record. The object of the inscription is to record the erection of the kīrtti (i.e. the inscribed slab), after the udāyapaṇa ceremony was performed on the completion of the construction of an orchard by Puś Mahaṅṣaśa, the son of Puś Mahaṅṣaśa who was the son of

---

1 This is A. R. Ep., 1963-64, No. C 2051.
3 Cf. Bhandarkar's List, No. 576.
4 Cf. Guatikūr Rājaśe Abhilēka, No. 127.
5 It seems that the year was Kārttikeya current. It can also be taken as Chaityaśa expired, but there are indications that in this area Southern Vikrama was prevalent during this period. See below p. 35, note 1.
Panāthi Dödē of the Gaudānvaya. The record ends with an auspicious expression and Śrī to be repeated five times.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the king Jayasimhadeva. Though the name of the family to which he belonged has not been recorded, it has been now generally accepted\(^1\) that he was Jayasimha II who was otherwise called Jayavarman and who flourished in the Paramāra family which was ruling over the Malwa region during the period in question.

Only one geographical name Vadovāpattana occurs in the second line and it may be identical with the village Bādhā, situated in the neighbourhood of Paṭhārī, where some inscriptions\(^2\) of the 11th century have been discovered.

TEXT\(^3\)

1 Oṁ\(^4\) [\*\*] Śaṁ 1326 varṣe Vaisā(śa)śa(kha) su 7 Buḍḍha(dha)-dine

2 Puṣaka(śya)-nakshatrap aly(a-dya-śya) Vaḍovā-pattana śamasta-rājya-

3 vall-saḥita Jai(Jaya)śingha(ha)dēva-rājya tasmin kā-

4 lē varitamanē Gaudānvaya Panāthi Dōdē [su]ta-

5 Pain-Mahajanēsha-[su]ta-Pain Raṇasalhēnā

6 Vatikā-udyāpanaṁhē kirtti[h*] sthā[pi*][(t=ū)-

7 yati [\*\*] śubhah bhavata(tu) 5 śrī [\*\*]

2. Udaipur Inscription of the time of Jayasimhadeva III, V.S. 1366

This inscription\(^4\) is engraved on the left pillar of the east porch in the temple of Nilakanṭhēsvara at Udaipur, Basoda Taluk, Vīhitā District, M. P. It was noticed by Kielnhorn\(^5\) who took Jayasimha of this inscription as the fourth ruler of this name flourishing in the dynasty of the Paramāras of Malwa. G. H. Ojha\(^6\) and H. N. Drivedi\(^7\) also expressed the same view. D.R. Bhandarkar,\(^8\) however, considered Jayasimha II and Jayavarman as identical and therefore took Jayasimha of this record as the third and last one. This identity between Jayasimha II and Jayavarman has been further supported by the Mandhāta copper-plate grant edited by Dr. D. C. Sirca.\(^9\) But that there was a Jayasimhā III is not known from any other source except the present inscription.


\(^2\) Cf. Drivedi, Gucçlor Bājya kē Abhāṭkh, Nos. 41 and 49.

\(^3\) From impressions.

\(^4\) Expressed by a symbol.

\(^5\) Kielnhorn reads it as Vā.

\(^6\) Kielnborn and Bhandarkar read it as śya, but the form of the letter is quite clear.


\(^9\) Cf. D. R. Bhandarkar’s List, No. 661, genealogical table, 48, No. 25.

\(^10\) Cf. above, Vol. XXXII, pp. 133 ff. and Plates.
2. Udaipur Inscription of the time of Jayasimhadēva III, V. S. 1366
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The record occupies a space 32 cm × 39 cm. It contains nine lines of writing. Each line consists of about 9 to 11 letters excepting the last one which consists of 7 letters only. The letters vary in size from 2 cm to 5 cm. As a result of the defective engraving the characters cannot be stated as representing the standard palaeography of the time, although it may represent the peculiarity of an individual’s hand and therefore excepting a few letters like , all the others have taken peculiar forms. The language of the record is Sanskrit. As regards orthography the names Jayasimha (lines 3–4) for Jayasimha and Jaitasi (line 6) for Jayatasi, as also the words aṣṭamūnśaśa (line 5) for aṣṭamūnśaśa and prakṣhālayitaśa are interesting.

The inscription commences with the symbol for Siddham or Oh Śrāvaṇa ba. 12 [Friday], which is equivalent to 1310 A.D., July 24. Then the reign of Mahārājādhirāja Jayasimhadēva over Udayapura is mentioned. This statement has been followed by the object of the inscription, which is to record the donation of one-eighth revenue of the total income from the village Hathivasā to the Brāhmaṇa Jaitasi by Thakura Vidyādhara. The last sentence is not clear, but probably some official’s name which seems to be Tha Vaijja (i.e. Vaidya) Śrī-Chandraprabha is recorded as witness.

The importance of this inscription lies in the fact that it mentions a Mahārājādhirāja Jayasimha, who is otherwise unknown and has been taken as the third ruler of this name in the Paramāra dynasty of Malwa. Now, this mention of the reign of Jayasimha III in V. S. 1366 contradicts the accepted view that Malwa was finally included in the Khalji empire in 1305 A.D. The view is based on the details given by the contemporary Muslim historian Amir Khusru, who states that Malwa was invaded by Alaundin Khalji during the reign of Mālhakadēva, whose general Kākadaṇḍa was killed in the battle. Having lost the battle Mālhakadēva took shelter in the fort of Māṅḍu, where he was killed by Alaundin’s general A‘īn-ul-mulk who was led by a secret spy and Māṅḍu was also added to the Government of A‘īn-ul-mulk. Thus the conquest of Malwa was complete in 1305 A.D. But it seems that the conqueror could not keep Malwa under his sway for a long time, as Malwa appears to have regained independence under the leadership of Jayasimha III. The inscription in question points to the affluent state of affairs in Malwa under Jayasimha III in 1310 A.D.

Two names of geographical importance have been mentioned in the inscription. Udayapura given in line 2 is a well known place wherefrom the record itself hails. The village Hathivasā mentioned in line 4 seems to be identical with the village Hatavahā in Basoda Tahsil of Vidisha District and situated in the neighbourhood of Udayapura.

TEXT

1 Ōn Śrāvaṇa bādi 12 [Śukrē]

2 Udayapurē samasta-rājāvali-[sahita] –

The year was Kāṭīkkādi expired. If it is taken as Chaitrādi expired then the equivalent will be 1309 A.D., July 4, but there are some other inscriptions from this and other places in the same region where correct equivalent is found only according to Kāṭīkkādi system. Cf. Ind. Ant. (1889), Vol. XVIII, pp. 344-46 (discussion on date portions) and Bhandarkar’s List Nos. 322, 353, 475, 541, 551 and 623 which indicate that Southern Vikrama should have been prevalent in this region during the time in question.

2 Cf. The Struggle for Empire, p. 72.
4 From ink impressions.
5 Expressed by a symbol.
6 This word is omitted in the text, but the expression is found in the previous inscription and so it can be supplied here. It may also be read as maḷādaṇkī, which is found in the inscription of Dēvapāladeva, V. S. 1289. (cf. Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, p. 83).
3 mahāga(rā)jādhirāja-śrī-Jaya-
4 simghē(ḥa)dēva-rājyē | Hathivasā-
5 grāma-satka asḥtamāṁsaṁ(śaṁ) ṭhakura-
6 Vidyādharēṇa brāhmaṇa-Jaitasi-
7 kritē pādau prashkālītvā¹ uda-
8 kē pradattaṁ(ttam) || [ā[jña*]jutiḷpti] ṭha Vaijja (?)
9 śrī-Chaṇḍraprabha [pra*] ma(mā)ṇa ||²

¹ Read praṇāhākṣyitū.
² This portion of the text is not clear, but it seems that some official is mentioned here.
No. 6—FIVE CHERA INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE KONGU COUNTRY

(3 Plates)

C. R. Srinivasan, Mysore

(Received on 20.1.1967)

Of the five inscriptions edited here with the kind permission of the Government Epigraphist for India, A and B come from Ponnivádi, Dharapuram Taluk, Coimbatore District, C and D from Vežhalur in Coimbatore Taluk and District, while E is from Kirañur, Palani Taluk, Madurai District, all in Madras State.

Inscriptions A, B and C belong to the reign of Kañḍan-Iravi who bears the epithets Chandráditya-kula-tišakaṇ and Sāruva-bhau-man. Inscription A gives him an additional epithet of Satya-vara-tan and B Kañḍa-pa-kalvaṇ. While A and B do not give any date, C quotes the year 24 of his reign. Inscription D belongs to the reign of Kañḍan-Virana-rāyaṇaṇ and it is dated in the 11th regnal year. Here too the king bears the epithets Chandráditya-kula-tišakaṇ and Sāruva-bhau-man. Inscription E belongs to the reign of Iravi-Kañḍan and is dated in his 2nd year. This Ravi-Kañḍan bears no epithets. The epithets of these kings and the provenance of these records along with considerations of palaeography lead us to conclude that all these rulers belonged to the same family and were not far removed in time from one another. Scholars have come to the conclusion that these were Chēras, on the ground that their names resemble those of the known Chēra kings (Stān, Ravi, etc.). It would appear that the names Kañḍan and Iravi were popular among the rulers of this family. The two components of these names consist of the name of the father and the ruler’s own name next. Thus Kañḍan-Iravi and Kañḍan-Virana-rāyaṇaṇ were the sons of Kañḍan. If both Iravi and Virana-rāyaṇaṇ were the sons of the same Kañḍan, Virana-rāyaṇaṇ of D was probably the younger of the two. He might have got the chance to rule during the minority of the heir to his elder brother. The names Kañḍan and Iravi are also found in the plates which were discovered at Nāmakkal and edited as Udāyendra-plates, wherein the genealogy of a Viračhēla, who was a subordinate of a Chēla ruler named Parākṣa-rivarman, is described. But whereas the kings in the present inscriptions claim to be of Chandráditya-kula (i.e. born of a conjunction of both the Solar and Lunar races), the genealogy in the extant portion of the fragmentary Nāmakkal plates is of the Solar family. But it is quite likely that the missing fourth plate gave the grounds on which this epithet is based. It may be that some members of this family had a marriage alliance with the Pāṇḍya family, who claimed lunar descent and that such an important alliance led them to assume this title.

2 Above, Vol. III, pp. 79-82. The second plate which is published gives the genealogy up to Raghunandana and the third plate continues the line as Dāsaratva, Rāma and in the family of Rāma, Mahālāha, Kērala Jagaṭpati(?), Manikuttuvga, Kōti (Kōdai), Ravi, Kañḍa. The genealogy after Kañḍha up to Viračhēla was evidently given in the fourth plate which is lost to us. It is not known whether the epithet Chandráditya-kula, occurring in A, B, C and D above, occurs in the last plate though the ancestry is traced to the Sun. However, Viračhēla, the donor of the copper plate was no doubt a prince of the family and was a feudatory of Pāṇḍakaśri who can be no other than Parākṣa-rivarman, after whose title the donor came to be known as Viračhēla. The gap between Ravi-Kañḍan of inscription E and this Viračhēla cannot however be restored in the present state of our knowledge. Another inscription from Pēḻur (SII, Vol. V, No. 233) refers to Kañḍan Iravi and Iravi Kañḍan. It is not known whether they belong to this family. The identity of Kañḍan-Iravi with the nameakes of our records is not certain.
3 In this connection one may note that some of the Pāṇḍya rulers of this period also described themselves as descended from both the Solar and Lunar families. Cf. A. R. Ep., 1960, p. 15 wherein the king Jāṭilavarman has been designated as a Chandrakānaṇa-gadya.
Inscriptions C and D record that the two pillars on which they are engraved were caused to be set up in the Nakkārar maṇḍapa, obviously the maṇḍapa where these pillars are today. But the maṇḍapa as it is today, as pointed out in the Annual Report, is not in its original form, since there are other pillars bearing later inscriptions. One of them, recording the gift of the pillar on which it is engraved, is dated in the 14th year of king Vikramakīta who was removed from Kaṭṭaṭārāvī and Kaṇḍaṇ-Virāṇāvaiyana by more than a century. This fact suggests that the whole maṇḍapa had been renovated later on.

An inscription from Piramiyam in Dharpuram Taluk, in Vaṭṭeluttu characters of a slightly earlier period, is dated in the 6-9th regnal year of a Vararūna Parāntaka described as Chandrāditya-kulatilaka and Saṁsabhauñamaṇi. There was no doubt a Vararūna Parāntaka in the Pāṇḍya family. But the titles of this ruler coupled with considerations of palaeography and the provenance of this inscription preclude the identification of the ruler of the Piramiyam inscription with his namesake of the Pāṇḍya family. Probably herein we get an inkling into the origin of the epithet Chandrāditya-kulatilaka as this prince might have been named so as his mother was a daughter of the Pāṇḍya king of that name.

A.—PONNIVĀDI INSCRIPTION OF KAṬṭAṬāRĀVī

This inscription in Grantha and Vaṭṭeluttu scripts of the 9th century and Tamil language is engraved on a loose stone which must have formed a balustrade in the Nirmalāvāra temple at Ponnivādi in Dharpuram Taluk, Coimbatore District. This undated inscription refers to the construction of a temple by Kaliyakurivar, a servant (adiyā) of the king, Kaṇḍaṇ-Irāvī. The name of the temple or of the deity is not given in the record. The temple referred to here is evidently the one near which the stone on which the inscription is engraved was found. However, two later records engraved on the rock near inscription B, dated in the 7th (1214-15 A.D.) and 12th (1219-20 A.D.) years in the reign of Virarājendra, who is no doubt identical with the Koṅgu king of that name, refer to the deity of this temple as Nirmanivaram-adiyār and Nirmalāvāra respectively. Both the inscriptions record endowments made by the residents of Nirman in Pongalurknāraṇam. The place which is now called Ponnivādi is evidently the Nirman of the inscriptions cited here and Nirmalāvāra has been, in course of time, changed into Nirmalāvāra as the deity is now called. However, inscription B which belongs to the same king as in A gives the name Nirman (for Nirman-) as part of the boundaries of the land granted. The provenance indicates clearly that the names of the village and the deity would have been Nirman and Nirmalāvāra respectively in the period to which this record is assigned, i.e., the 9th century.

Regarding orthography, the following may be noted. The form of répha in rea in line 3 is peculiar. The letters a of the previous word and sa of the following word are written as a conjunct letter in line 3 of the record. This can be seen in the case of bhavman Satyavatap. The medial vowel sign for i in Kaliyan in line 5 is written not in the Vaṭṭeluttu fashion but by putting it right above the letter as in the Tamil script. Pullis (dots) are marked over the consonants except in the following cases: line 6—the consonant i in the word eduppitta and k in the word tirukkoṭi.

2. Ibid., 1910, No. B 145.
5. Ibid., Nos. B. 272 and 273.
FIVE CHERA INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE KONGU COUNTRY — PLATE I

A. Ponnumudi Inscription of Kavandan-Travai

Scale: One-third
1 Svasi Śri [*] Chandrādi-
2 tya-kula-tilakan-Sā-
3 rvabhaumān-Satyavrata-
4 n-āgiya kōk-Kaṇḍan-Iravi
5 adīyaṇ Kaṇivaṅkaṅkai-
6 yān edupitta tiruk-kōyi-
7 I [*]

B.—PONNIVĀDI INSCRIPTION OF KANḌAN-IRAVI

This inscription* in Tamil script of the 9th century and Tamil language with the usual admixture of Grantha characters is engraved on a rock in front of the Gaṇḍa śrine to the south of the same temple as in A. This records a grant of land in Sēkerinallur (Sēkhanallur) as unṇālīgapp-puram for the maintenance of worship of the god in the unṇālīgai i.e., the central shrine by Maṇiyaṇa, a servant (adī-āl) of the king. The land is said to have been brought under cultivation by the donor himself.

Dots (pullis) are used in all the consonants of the record. N is written with the short ŋ and the sign for length instead of the extension of its downward stroke and ăing is written* as ăina in line 2. The vowels a and ā in the Tamil word adī-āl are in Grantha. The engraver had apparently drawn lines before engraving the record and had also enclosed the sides with vertical lines making up a square and thus had intended to engrave the entire record between the lines. Yet the last two lines could not be accommodated and hence they are out side the square.

TEXT*

1 Svasi Śri [*] Chaṇḍrāti(di)tyak-kula-tilakan Sā-
2 rvabhaumān Kaṇinauiruva(pa)-kaḷvan-Śiṇa kō-
3 k-Kaṇḍan-Iravi adī-ālgā Maṇiyaṇ Śēker[n]-
4 hārt-tān vayaṅkiṇa nilatīr-Palajap-pō-
5 li[y]ir [Ne]g[peṭṭup-pō]ḷyin vajakku Maṇi-
6 yān-vayaṅkkukkup-pōnda kava[r]iṅmekku Nirmiṅ-vā-
7 y[k]al[n] ilakku Sē[k]al[n]t[i]lāṅgkāg[k]kār[k] kavarupēli unṇā-
8 līgaip-puram-āgā aṭṭinen[i]
9 Maṇiyaṇ vaya...*

---

* From impressions.
* Cf. above, Vol. XXXVI, p. 115. This appears to be a general feature of the early Tamil records in Vaṭṭal-uttu characters.
* This letter is in Tamil and is actually written like cāi.
* This letter is unnecessary.
* Read adīya or ălīgya.
* Read Śēṅgaṇiṭṭarkat-tekku ādīkak*.
* Read vayaṅku or vayaṅkkal.
C.—VEILALUR INSCRIPTION OF KANDAN-IRAVI: YEAR 24

This inscription¹ in Tamil script, with an admixture of Grantha, of the 9th century and Tamil language, is engraved on two faces of a pillar in the maṇḍapa in front of the central shrine in the Teppāvar temple at Veilalur, Dharapuram Taluk, Coimbatore District. It is dated in the 24th regnal year of the king Kandān-Irāvi and refers to the gift of the stone pillar, apparently the one on which the inscription is engraved, to the Nakkāṇār maṇḍapa at Veilalur-Tenṇur by Kaṇnai-Kāvan, a resident (or headman) of Māgalur. The king, in this record, bears the title Chandrāditya-kula-tilaka and Sārvabhauma. The name of the place according to the inscription is Veilalur which in course of time has changed into Veilalur. Tenṇur is probably the name of the locality where the temple is situated. The names Tenṇur-Patiyul and Tenṇur-Aṅgā occurring in other inscriptions² copied from this place lend support to this inference. The expression Nakkāṇār-maṇḍapattukku indicates that Nakkāṇār may be the name of a deity.

The form of letter cité is not uniform throughout the record. Traces of influence of Vaṭṭeluttu can be seen from the way in which the sign in line 4 is written. The letters cité of the previous word and cité of the following word in line 3 of the record are written as a conjunct letter.² The Grantha ligature icaid is used throughout the record e.g., Kaṇḍa (line 4), yāṇu (line 6), āṇu (line 8) and maṇḍapa (line 10). The place Māgalur cannot be identified.

**TEXT**

**Face 1**

2. ditya-kula-[ti]laka-
3. n-Sārvabhauma[n-a]-
4. giya śrī-kōk-Kaṇḍa-
5. pp-Iravikkuch=che-
6. lāminrā yāṇu
7. irupattu-nān-
8. gu ivv-āṇu Veḷi-

**Face 2**

9. lārt-Tenṇur-
10. r-Nakkāṇār-maṇḍa-
11. pattukku Ōma-
12. [yintraṇ Māgalā-

¹ A. R. Ep., 1910, No. 148.
² Ibid., Nos. 144 and 149 respectively.
³ See A above.
⁴ From impressions.
⁵ There is an unnecessary medial i sign added to rā.
D.—VELLALUR INSRIPTION OF KANDAN VIRANARAYANAN:
YEAR 11

This inscription1 in Tamil script, with the usual admixture of Grantha, of the 9th
century and Tamil language is engraved on three faces of another pillar in the same
mandapa where inscription C is engraved. The titles occurring in the first three lines are written
in Grantha as in A above. This inscription is dated in the 11th regnal year of the king,
Kandanning Viranarayanan and it records the gift of the stone pillar to the mandapa of Nakkanar
at Vellalur-Tempur by Vaannakkan Murkkann-Chelana and his younger brother Murkkann-Era
for the merit of their father Era-Murkkannar.

Straight lines are drawn at the bottom of the first four lines only in this record by the engraver.

TEXT*

Face 1

1 Svasti Sri [**] Chandrika-
2 ditya-kula-tila-
3 ka [n-Saar]rvvabhman≡ä-
4 giya ari-kok-Ka-
5 ndan-Vira-

Face 2

6 narayana[r]-
7 kuch-chellani-
8 nra yandu padi-
9 ngru ivv-a-
10 ndu Vellur-
11 t-Tempur-Nak-
12 kanar-mandapaatu-
13 kku Vaannakkan
14 Murkkann-Chella-
15 [sr][mr] tambi Murkk[a]n-E

1 A. R. Ep., 1910, No. 147.
* From impressions.
1 DGA/68
E. — KIRANUR INSCRIPTION OF RAVI-KANDAN: YEAR 2

This inscription* in Tamil script of the 9th-10th century and Tamil language is engraved at the door-step of the kitchen in the Vāglāvarasvāmin temple at Kiranur in Palani Taluk, Madurai District. It is incomplete. It quotes the year 2 of the reign of king Iravi(Ravi)-Kandan. Its purport is not known, since the portion recording the grant is lost. The use of dots (pullus) is noteworthy. Straight lines have been drawn between which the text of the inscription is engraved. In quoting the king’s regnal year the inscription uses the expression tiruveluttu (line 3) which is absent in the other dated inscriptions (C and D) edited above. It may be noted that this expression is ordinarily found to be used in the later records of the rulers of this area as tiruveluttu-iffuch-chelāninga. Thus this is the earliest inscription where this expression tiruveluttu-ch-chelāninga is used.

TEXT†

1 Śrī [[*]Kov-Iravl—
2 Kandarkut—
3 triuveluttu—
4 eb-chellāni—
5 ēru yār—
6 du iranṭu a[rru—
7 ppēr. īn—

† See above, Vol. XXX, pp. 102 ff.
‡ From impressions.
† The remaining portion is lost.
No. 7—VARADA INSCRIPTION OF CHAHAMANA SAMANTASIMHA, VIKRAMA 1347

(1 Plate)

C. L. SURI, MYSORE

(Received on 15.9.1967)

The inscription\(^1\) edited below with the kind permission of the Government Epigraphist for India was copied by me at Varāḍā, Sirohi Tahsil and District, Rajasthan, during my collection tour in the beginning of 1963. The marble stone bearing the inscription was found under a tree about half a mile to the north of the village. The record is engraved below the representations, in relief, of the sun and the moon, and a cow with a calf. It consists of 12 lines of writing which covers an area measuring 27.5 cm × 26 cm. The last line begins from the middle of the slab. The record is in a fairly good state of preservation. However, a few letters have been damaged in lines 8 and 9. The last letter at the end of some of the lines is also damaged due to the peeling off of the stone; but they can be restored without any difficulty.

The record is written in Nāgarī characters which are regular for the period in question. The form of medial ฤ in pūjā (line 7) and bhūmi (line 11) is interesting. Medial ฤ and 匜 are indicated by a prishṭhamārā except in rājya (line 3) where a śrīmātā is used to indicate it. Medial ฤ and ฤ are invariably indicated by one prishṭhamārā and one śrīmātā. The central curve of ฤ has almost become a vertical stroke in some places (see Jābali\(^2\) and rājakula, line 2) while the earlier form with the central curve is also found (see vijaya, line 3 and rājakulib, line 10).

The language of the record is Sanskrit and its composition is in prose but for an imprecatory verse at the end. The use of the word dyāyēha for adyaśa and Śāmāṭa for Śāmānta\(^3\) perhaps shows the influence of local pronunciation on the orthography. It may also be noted that ฤ has been distinguished from ฤ (cf. Jābali, line 2 and bahubhik, line 10) and that the consonants following ฤ have not been reduplicated except once in pravarta\(^4\) (line 5). The abbreviated forms mahan\(^5\) (line 4) and Sō\(^6\) (line 8) are found in the record. Of these, mahan\(^5\) is well known and occurs in numerous records of this period. Sō\(^6\) appears to be another form of Sō\(^6\) standing for Śōlaṇki.

The record is dated Vikrama 1347, Chaitra vadi 10, Sunday which regularly corresponds to 1291 A.D., February 25, according to the Kārttikey system.

The inscription refers to the victorious reign of Mahārājakaḷa Śāmāntasīhadēva ruling at Jābālipura. He is no doubt identical with Śāmāntasimha, son and successor of Mahārājakaḷa Chāchignadēva of the Sōngirō or Jalore branch of the Chāhamāṇa family. A number of records of this king has been discovered with dates ranging between V.S. 1339 and 1362.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) This is No. B 449 of A.R. Ep., 1963-64.
\(^2\) For the abbreviation Sō, see Dinkalark, Kathiakad Inscriptions, No. 80.
\(^4\) See Bhandacker’s List, p. 333. Another new record of this king has been found at Pōśitarī in the Sirohi Tahsil. This inscription is considerably damaged, resulting in the loss of its date portion. That the record belongs to the latter part of Śāmāntasimha’s reign is indicated by the mention of his son and successor Rāja Kā[nadēva] (cf. A. R. Ep., 1964-65, No. B 591 and Introduction p. 8).

---

1 DGA/68
The object of the inscription is to record the grant of one arahatti in Vrahāḍā-grāma to provide for the asḥṭāṅkikā worship and offerings in the Mahāvira-chaitiya in the Chaṇḍana-vihāra. This Chaṇḍana-vihāra is mentioned in some inscriptions of the time of Chāchigadēva and was apparently named after king Chaṇḍana of the Jalore branch of the Parāmāras. The grant was made during the administration of the panāchakula consisting of Mahān Kitala and others.

The grant was made for the performance of bālī-pājā which lasted for eight days as evidenced by the expression asḥṭāṅkikā-bālīpājā. It is described as Asḥṭāṅkikā-mahātāvā in the Mount Abu Inscriptions of Tejāhpala and Vastupāla, dated V.S. 1287 (1230 A.D.) and as Asḥṭāṅkikā-mahātāvā in the Jalore inscription, dated V.S. 1331 (1274 A.D.). According to the Mount Abu inscriptions, the celebration of the festival began on the third day of the dark half of Chaitra and ended on the 10th day of the same month. Thus, Chaitra badi 10 of the present inscription seems to have fallen on the last day of the festival when a grant was made in favour of the temple. This would make us believe that the Asḥṭāṅkikā festival was conducted only in the dark fortnight of the month of Chaitra. But that it was not so is shown by the Jalore inscription referred to above. According to that inscription, a grant was made on the occasion of the Asḥṭāṅkikā festival which was conducted on the 11th day of the bright fortnight of Āśvayuja. As the Mount Abu inscription refers to the celebration of this festival on the anniversary of the installation of an image, it would appear that it could be celebrated on all important events connected with a temple or an institution.

The description of the donor is given in lines 8 and 9. A few letters preceding the expression arahatti pradattā in line 9 and following the name of a queen (vājñi) in nominative singular in line 8, appear to read [bhṛjī-ṛāvalā-śamāshyā], the meaning of which is not clear. It is, therefore, difficult to find out who made the above-mentioned grant. However, it is not unlikely that the name of the queen is wrongly given in the nominative case instead of instrumental case. If it was so, as is likely, the grant was made by a queen of Sāmantasimha whose name appears to be Lalatādevī. The word samāshyā in the expression [bhṛjī-ṛāvalā-śamāshyā] may be taken to be a corrupt form of the word samakṣambhā. If it is so, the expression would mean that the grant was made by the queen Lalatādevī in the presence of her brother Rāvala. The present inscription is the only record mentioning the name of a queen of Sāmantasimha. She is stated to be the daughter of Śrī (Śūlaikī) Puḍimāla. The latter seems to have been only a local chief as he is not endowed with any title. The record ends with an imprecatory verse in lines 10-11.

Of the place names mentioned in the record, Jāhālipura is modern Jalore and Vrahāḍā-grāma is evidently the same as village Varāḍā, the findsport of the inscription.

---

1 The word arahattā occurs in some other inscriptions of the period, viz. Barīt (Sirohi District) inscription (above, Vol. XXXVI, p. 38, text line 5 and n. 4) and is the same as Sanskrit aravattā.
3 Above, Vol. VIII, pp. 219 ff.
4 Ibid., Vol. XXXIII, pp. 46 ff. It is mentioned as Asḥṭāṅkikā-pādī in another inscription from Jalore, dated V.S. 1320 (ibid., p. 47).
5 The language of the record, however, seems to indicate that the grant was made in the beginning of the festival.
7 Lalatādevī is the same as Lalatādevī which seems to have been a popular name in the thirteenth century; cf. B. G. C.., Vol. I, Pt. I, pp. 202 and 478-79.
8 The word Rāvala can as well be taken as the title of Lalatādevī's brother whose name is perhaps given in the following three letters, doubtfully read as samāshyā. In that case, the brother of the queen Lalatādevī was the donor.
1. Siddham\(^1\) || Sarbh\(\text{vath}^{1}\) 1347 [Varsh\(\text{e}\) Chaitra-vadi 10 Raj\(\text{vau}\)]

2. dyay\(\text{e}\)\(^2\) ári-Jág\(\text{alipu}\)r\(\text{e}\) m\(\text{hārāj}^{4}\)ku[la].

3. ári-Súmmat\(\text{as}^{6}\)dvā\(-\)ka\(\text{yā}^{7}\)a-vij\(\text{yā}^{7}\)-rā[ya]yā\(\text{yā}\).

4. tan-niyukt\(\text{a}^{8}\)ári-S\(\text{ri}^{8}\)karaṇ\(\text{e}\) ma\(\text{hā}^{10}\)s\(\text{à}^{10}\)ri-[K\(\text{l}^{11}\)]tala-pra-

5. bh\(\text{r}^{11}\)ti-pad\(\text{n}^{12}\)chakula-prat\(\text{ip}\)att\(\text{a}^{12}\) ē\(\text{va}^{13}\)-kāl\(\text{ē}^{13}\) pr\(\text{a}^{14}\)vatt\(\text{ī}^{14}\)rt\(\text{a}^{14}\).

6. m\(\text{ā}^{15}\)n\(\text{ē}^{15}\) ári-Chañ\(\text{d}^{15}\)ans-\(\text{v}^{15}\)i[h\(\text{j}^{15}\)är\(\text{ē}^{15}\) dē\(\text{v}^{15}\)a-ári-Mah\(\text{ē}^{15}\)vī\(\text{ra}^{15}\)-\(\text{c}^{15}\h\)ai-]

7. ty\(\text{ē}^{17}\)āsha\(\text{h}^{17}\)nīkā-bali-p\(\text{ū}^{17}\)jā-nim\(\text{it}^{17}\)taṁ Vr\(\text{a}^{17}\)h\(\text{ā}^{17}\)dā-grā]-

8. m\(\text{ē}^{18}\) S\(\text{ū}^{18}\) [P\(\text{u}^{18}\)d\(\text{ī}^{18}\)m\(\text{ā}^{18}\) - pu\(\text{t}^{18}\)tr-rāj\(\text{i}^{18}\)-ári-La\(\text{l}^{18}\)a(h\(\text{i}^{18}\))]tā[d\(\text{ē}^{18}\)vi]

9. ári-Rā\(\text{v}^{19}\)ala-[\(\text{a}^{19}\)sam\(\text{h}^{19}\)ya]-arah\(\text{ṭ}^{19}\)ṭa[h\(\text{h}^{19}\) 1] pr\(\text{a}^{19}\)d\(\text{at}^{19}\)ta[h\(\text{l}^{19}\)].

10. Be[\(\text{h}^{20}\)a]hīr-vasud\(\text{h}^{20}\) bh\(\text{u}^{20}\)kta rāj\(\text{abh}^{20}\)īh S\(\text{a}^{20}\)gar-ā[di]-

11. bhīh [\(\text{i}^{21}\)]yas\(\text{ya}^{21}\)-y\(\text{a}^{21}\)yā y\(\text{a}^{21}\)dā bhūm\(\text{i}^{21}\)-[h\(\text{h}^{21}\)-]t\(\text{a}^{21}\)ya ta\(\text{ṣ}^{21}\)ya [2a]-

12. dā phala\(\text{m}^{22}\)-[lam]- [1\[1]][*]

---

\(^1\) From impressions.
\(^2\) Expressed by a symbol.
\(^3\) Read ad\(\text{y}^{2}\)gha.
\(^4\) This ja is carelessly engraved and looks like initial u.
\(^5\) Read Sā\(\text{m}^{2}\)akā\(\text{a}^{2}\) sa\(\text{m}^{2}\)had\(\text{ē}^{2}\)va.
\(^6\) The medial ĵ sign is joined with the vertical line running down from lines 4 to 6 in the left hand margin.
\(^7\) The intended reading seems to be bhr\(\text{r}^{2}\)ti-Râ\(\text{v}^{2}\)al\(\text{a}^{2}\)sam\(\text{h}^{2}\)ya.
\(^8\) Skt. ar\(\text{agha}^{2}\)tha.
\(^9\) This line begins from the middle of the slab.
About the end of January 1969, I received from Shri C. Krishna, Deputy Director of Archaeology, Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, Government of Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal, impressions of about ten inscriptions, collected by his department, for examination and publication. This collection contained impressions of two records on the pedestals of two Jaina images kept in the Vidisha Museum. According to Shri Krishna, they were discovered at a village called Durjanpura in Vidisha District of Madhya Pradesh. Though the impressions were not satisfactory, on a careful examination they were found to be very important in throwing fresh light on the history of the Guptas. I, therefore, visited Vidisha Museum in March 1969 and examined the inscriptions in situ and took good impressions and photographs of the same. On enquiry, I was told that three Jaina images, called here A, B and C, which are now kept in the Museum, were found while clearing a field with a bulldozer in the village of Durjanpura, about 3 miles from Besnagar which has yielded the famous Garuda pillar inscription of Heliodorus. By the action of the bulldozer, all the three images have suffered damage, particularly in their faces and sides. While the faces of the images of A and B are completely broken away that of C is partially preserved. While the attendant figures and the right and left-hand portions of the prabhāvali of image B are well preserved, the face of proper left-hand attendant figure of image A is damaged. In C, both the attendant figures and the prabhāvali have disappeared. All the three images are inscribed on their pedestals. While the inscription on A is well-preserved and complete, that on B has suffered damage in the last two lines and on C it is completely effaced, though some words and letters can be traced with difficulty in the first two lines with the help of the texts of the first two records.

A study of the sculptural features and styles of the three Jaina images would show that they all belong to the same group and can be attributed to the Gupta period of about the 4th century A.D. This dating, as would be shown below, is in consonance with the palaeography of the records on them. The prabhāvali is not so much developed and stylised as in the case of the Buddha images at Sanchi which are attributed to the 5th century A.D. The fact that only chakra is represented in the centre of the pedestals of all the three images and not the characteristic lāñchhanas of the respective Tīrthankaras also indicates the early stage in the development of Jaina iconography. The two sets of Chauri-bearers in A and B differ in their dress and in some minor details.

1 A Press Note drawing the attention of the public to the importance of these two inscriptions was released by the Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi, and was published in several Newspapers between 12.3.1969 and 23.3.1969.
2 I am thankful to Shri Krishna for sending me the impressions of the inscriptions and also for his co-operation in this regard. I am also thankful to the authorities of the Vidisha Museum for the facilities provided in copying and studying the inscriptions there and also for photographing the images.
4 See Monuments of Sanchi, ed. by Marshall and Majumdar, Vol. II, Plate LXX.
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THREE INSCRIPTIONS OF RAMAGUPTA—PLATE I
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Image B

(From Photograph)

Inscription on Image B

Scale: Two-sevenths
The inscriptions which do not contain any date are engraved in Gupta characters of about the 4th century A.D. The alphabet closely resembles that of the Sanchi inscription of Chandragupta II dated in the Gupta year 93, and to some extent that of the Eran inscription of Samudragupta. We may compare the individual letters like unsafe, 9, 0, 5, 0, bh, m, y, r, l, 9, 5, and k appearing in inscriptions on A and B which are very similar to those letters in the Sanchi inscription. Letters like y, r, l, and s also resemble those in the Eran inscription of Samudragupta. And the letters m, r, l, s and k are of the so-called southern or western variety of the Gupta alphabet as in the case of the Sanchi inscription. The medial 9 in our records has, however, more flourish than in the Sanchi inscription where it is just a circle on the top of the letter. But such a feature cannot be regarded as a later one since it appears even in earlier records like the Nândâ Yûpa inscriptions of the 3rd century A.D. Thus from the paleographical point of view, the records can be assigned to about the 4th century A.D. and this dating is supported, as shown above, by the stylistic features of the Jaina images containing these records.

In respect of orthography, it may be noted that the consonant following r is doubled in Sarspasaṇa (A) and that the class-nasal is used in the words Chandraprabha (A), Pushpadanta (B) and Chandrakshama (A and B). The language of the three records is Sanskrit.

The two inscriptions on A and B contain 4 lines each and give identical text in the first two lines except the name of the image. The inscription on C also appears to be in 4 lines with a similar draft. While the record on A states that the image of Chandraprabha was made by Mahârajâdhirâja Râmagupta, that on B refers to the making of the image of Pushpadanta by the same ruler. The name of the image in C appears to read Padmaprabha. The record on A further informs us that this act of Râmagupta (viz. the making of the image of Chandraprabha) was done on the advice or at the instance (upâdâsa) of Châlû-kshamaṇa, son of Gûlakâyaṇti and pupil of Ákhyâra Sarppasaṇa-kshamaṇa who was the grand-pupil (i.e. pupil's pupil) of the Jaina teacher who is described as pûnipâtra-Chandraksaham-ákhyâra-kshamaṇa-âramaṇa. This description is also found in the record on B which gives the name as Chandraksaham-ákhyâra instead of Chandraksaham-ákhyâra. The epithet pûni-pâtrika indicates that the Jaina monk was eating with hands. The expression pratiśhyâ meaning grand-pupil or pupil's pupil, as it is used in the record, qualifies the following name Ákhyâra Sarppasaṇa so that we have to take that the latter was the grand-pupil of the former. If, however, it is presumed that the genitive case-ending in the word pratiśhyâ has been omitted by mistake and is supplied by reading the word as pratiśhyâsa, then it would qualify Sarppasaṇa's pupil Châlû-kshamaṇa so that Sarppasaṇa becomes the pupil of Chandraksahamaṇa. In the record on B the name of the person at whose instance the image was made as well as that of his immediate teacher and of parents, if any, are lost in the damaged portion at the end of the record. This portion in the inscription on C is completely effaced and nothing can be made out.

The importance of these records lies in the fact that they refer to Mahârajâdhirâja Râmagupta. From the assumption of the title of Mahârajâdhirâja, Râmagupta must have been an imperial ruler and since the records have been assigned to the 4th century A. D., he must be regarded as an imperial king of the Gupta dynasty holding sway over the Vindhyâ region. If this identity is accepted, then these inscriptions will be of unique importance since they furnish the first epigraphical mention of Râmagupta of the imperial Gupta dynasty of Magadha.

---

2Ibid., pp. 18 ff. and plate.
3Above, Vol. XXVII, pp. 252 ff. and plate.
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The controversy regarding the existence and historicity of Rāmagupta is well known to all the scholars of Indian history and particularly of Gupta history. This controversy has been going on for about half a century, ever since the discovery in 1923 of the portions of the Sanskrit drama called Ďeśichandrauguptam by Viṣākhādatta and it gained fresh momentum after the discovery of some copper coins ascribed to Rāmagupta in 1951 and afterwards.¹

From the evidence of the drama Ďeśichandrauguptam and other literary sources and epigraphic references of later period, scholars have tried to reconstruct the story of Rāmagupta somewhat as follows:—He was the son of Śamudragupta and elder brother of Chandragupta II and succeeded his father to the throne. He was besieged by a Šaka ruler and was placed in such a difficult position that to effect his escape and for the safety of his subjects, he had to agree to surrender his queen Dhrūvadēvi. But his brother Chandragupta could not tolerate this ignominious arrangement and offered to go to the enemy’s camp in the guise of the queen with a view to kill the enemy. He succeeded in this plan and was raised in the estimation of his people as well as that of the queen while the reputation of Rāmagupta suffered which resulted in the enmity between the brothers. Ultimately Chandragupta II murdered Rāmagupta, succeeded to the Guptan throne and married queen Dhrūvadēvi.

This ingenious reconstruction of the story of Rāmagupta was considered by some scholars as incredible and unbelievable. They doubted the existence and historicity of Rāmagupta himself in the absence of any epigraphical records mentioning his name and also of coins prior to their discovery in 1951. Even after the discovery of the copper coins of Rāmagupta, some scholars did not accept his identification with the imperial Gupta king in the absence of any imperial title but took him to be a local ruler in the Vidyāraṇya region. Dr. Sirca has even suggested that the script of the legends on the copper coins of Rāmagupta has to be assigned to the close of the 5th century on palaeographical grounds and thought him to be only a local chief.²

In the midst of these conflicting views, it was considered wise to suspend one’s judgement. In fact Dr. Majumdar and Dr. Altekar said “we must suspend our judgement upon the historical character of Rāmagupta, his fight with the Šakas, and the strange event which deprived him of his throne, life and the natural affection and fidelity of his wife.”³

Under these circumstances, the discovery of three stone inscriptions in the Vidyāraṇya region, two of them clearly mentioning the name of Mahārāja Dhourārya Rāmagupta, is undoubtedly of great significance. As indicated above, the third record also seems to mention this ruler. And, as stated above, they establish the existence and historicity of Rāmagupta as an imperial ruler of the Gupta dynasty. But it must be noted that they do not solve all the other problems connected with the episode of Rāmagupta narrated above till further evidence is made available. The question of identifying the Rāmagupta of the present records with his name-sake of the copper coins has to be left open for the present in view of the difference in their palaeographical features, though such a study is extremely limited in scope because only 3 or 4 letters appear on the coins.⁴

---
³ The Vākaṭaka-Gupta Age, 1946, p. 164.
⁴ My thanks are due to my colleagues Shri P. R. Srinivasan and Dr. K. V. Ramesh for some suggestions.
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TEXT

Inscription on Image A

1 Bhagavatō-ratagah Chandraprabhasya pratīma-vahāh kārita ma-
2 hāra-jādhirāja-śrī-Rāmaguptēna upadeśat-paṇipā-
3 trika-Chandrakshamaśchārīrya-kahamanā-sramaṇa-prāśiṣhya-āchā-
4 ryya Sarppasēna-kahamanā-sishyasya Gālakyaṇtya-satputrasya Chēlī-kahamanasya-ēti

Inscription on Image B

1 Bhagavatō-ratagah Puṣpadantasya pratīma-vahāh kārita ma-
2 hāra-jādhirāja-śrī-Rāmaguptēna upadeśat-paṇipātri-
3 Chandrakshama[ṇaḥchā]rīya-[kahamanā]-sramaṇa-prāśiṣhya
4 ti

Inscription on Image C

2 śrī-[Rāmaguptēma] upadeśat-pā[ni-pātri] 13
3 14
4 14

---

1 From the impressions taken under my eye, pervasion.
2 The two letters kaha and sa are slightly blurred.
3 The formation of this letter as is rather peculiar in as much as the head is curved into a downward stroke.
4 This letter is slightly damaged.
5 Inscription on Image A reads Chandrakshamāśchārīrya.
6 Only a portion of the letter aha is preserved.
7 This line is completely effaced.
8 This record is badly damaged and effaced.
9 Traces of visarga marks can be seen on the impression.
10 Traces of these letters can be seen on the impression.
11 Faint traces of the letters sa and pî can be seen on the impression so that the word can be restored as Rāma-
12 guptēma.
13 The letters in the brackets have been restored with the help of the other records.
14 The remaining letters in this line are completely effaced.
15 The letters in this line are completely effaced.
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No. 9—TWO INSCRIPTIONS FROM TUDUMULADINNE

(I Plate)

S. S. RAMACHANDRA MURTHY, MYSDRE

(Received on 22.12.1966)

The two subjoined inscriptions were copied from Tuđumuladinne, Cuddapah taluk, Cuddapah District, Andhra Pradesh during the year 1938-39 and noticed in the Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy for that year as Nos. 422 and 425. They are now edited here with the kind permission of the Government Epigraphist for India. For convenience's sake No. 422 would be referred to as A and 425 as B in the article.

Inscription A in Telugu which is engraved on a slab now forming the threshold of the eastern entrance into the Kēśava temple in the village, records that the village Turimiljadinne was the agrahārā of Nāchana Sōma given to him as an ekabhōgam by Prauḍhāśāva-mahārāja. It is an undated late epigraph merely recording a past event. Inscription B which is also in Telugu is engraved on the dhvajastambha in front of the same temple states that Pushpāla Pāpāna erected the dhvajastambha for Chennakēśara of Turimjadinne, the agrahāra of Nāchirāju Sōma, in the Saka year 1451, Vīrovita, Asrāha 11, Thursday in the reign of Kṛishṇadēvarāya. The details of the date regularly correspond to 1529 A.D., June 17. As will be shown in the sequel, the mention of Turimjadinne as an agrahāra of Nāchirāju Sōma in this inscription is also a reference to a past event as in the case of the other inscription referred to already.

The main interest of the two inscriptions lies in the fact that they refer to the village Turimjadinne or Turimjadinne as the agrahāra of Nāchana Sōma. Nāchana Sōma or Nāchirāju Sōma referred to in these two records is evidently the Telugu poet who is well known by his works Utara Haričaṇḍasamu and Vasantavilāsaasu of which the former work is available in full while the latter is known to us only by references made to it by later poets.

The earliest reference to Nāchana Sōma is found in two copper plate grants of Bukka I dated in Saka 1266, Tāraṇa (=1344 A.D.),1 wherein he figures as the recipient of the village Peṇchukaladine situated on the banks of the Pīrākin. On this date Bukka I, who is given here the full regal titles, was ruling the kingdom jointly with his brother Harihara.2

Now according to inscription A, Prauḍhāśāva-rāya is said to have granted the village Turimjadinne to Nāchana Sōma. This Prauḍhāśāva-rāya could not have been Dēvarāya II, son of Vijaya alias Bukka III, who ruled between A. D. 1422 and 1446 as he is too far removed from Bukka I. He could have been only Dēvarāya I, who is referred to as Prauḍhāśāva-rāya in an inscription2 dated Saka 1299 and in some local records.3 Dēvarāya I ascended the throne on Friday, Kārttika 10 in the cyclic year Vyaya, i.e., Saka 1328 which corresponded to 5th

---

1 Ep. Carn., Vol. X, Nos. GD 46 and MB 158; Utara Haričaṇḍasamu, pitāka. The chronogram rasaḥ [or ras-āḥra]nayan-pāda for the Saka year quoted in both these records has to be emended as rasaḥ [or ras-ān]nayan-pāda to fit them into the reign of Bukka I. Otherwise as it is, it would yield a date long before the foundation of the Vijayanagara empire.
3 A. B. Epi., 1926, No. 399.

4 Further Sources of Vijayanagara History, Vol. II, Nos. 39, 39 etc.
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November, 1406 A.D. As our inscription is not dated it is also possible that Dēvarāya I made the grant of this village during his viceroyalty in this region under his father Harihara II as evidenced by two inscriptions from the Cuddapah District dated in Saka 1299 and 1319 respectively. Even the earliest date for Dēvarāya I, i.e., Saka 1299 is 33 years later than the date of the Copper Plates of Bukka I referred to above wherein Nāchana Sōma figures. We may, therefore, have to conclude that Nāchana Sōma had a very long span of life or that he had gained royal recognition as a poet quite early in his life.

It is curious that we do not find any reference to Nāchana Sōma in any inscription of Harihara II and Bukka II who ruled between Bukka I and Dēvarāya I.

The gift village Turimijladinē or Turimijladina can be identified with modern Tuḍumuladinne, the findspot of the inscriptions under discussion.

A

TEXT

1 Nāchana Sōmuni "agra-
2 hānaa śakbhō-
3 gaṁ Turimijladinē-
4 nne Prauḍhādēva-ma[hā*].
5 rāyalu iechina
6 dattaṁ* [||*]

B

TEXT

1 Svasti [||*] śri Jayaḥhyu.*
2 dāya Śālivāha–
3 na-Śakha(ka)-varushaṁbu–
4 lu 1451 agunu–
5 ti Virāḍhi Sarvavatsara
6 Āshādha su 11 Gu[||*]
7 Śrīman-mahārājādhi–
8 rāja-rājaparamāśva–
9 ra-śrī-vrāpratāpa-śrī-Kri(Krī)–
10 [shña*]dēva-mahārāyalu

---

2 A. R. Ee., 1926, No. 399.
4 The Peñēnakaladinne grants (GD 60 and MB 158 of Ep. Carn., Vol. X) describe Nāchana Sōma as follows
5 From impressions.
6 *a is engraved above the line.
7 Dattan is engraved in the margin on the left side.
8 The inscription commences in the middle of the slab and is continued on the top from line 14 onwards,
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11 Viṣṇu[sa]nagaramāndu vajra-
12 sidhāvat(hā)sanārdhānaśāi rā-
13 jyam śat(chē)yagānu Ghaṇḍi-
14 kōṭasimalōni Pu-
15 śapagiriprāhita(ta)ṇh Peś-(Pe)
16 nnaku vuttaraṇh Nāchi-
17 rāju Sōmuni agrahā-
18 raṁ Turimālāṇa Cha(Che)nnakā-
19 āvartuni Pushpāla Pāpanā
20 yu[ju ] nilpi[nā] divya-gaṁbhāṁ ||
No. 10—PAUNI PLATES OF PRAVARASENA II

(2 Plates)

V. B. KOLTE, NAGPUR

(Received on 11.4.1968)

These plates were discovered at Pauni (District Bhandara, Maharashtra) by Shri Ramchandra Narayan Wakadiker while digging earth, in the month of March, 1967. They were secured by me through the good offices of Shri W. G. Ghodavadya, Head Master, Vikas High School, Pauni. I am editing them here from the original plates with the kind permission of Dr. M. G. Dikshit, Director of Archives, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay. I am thankful to all these gentlemen. I am also thankful to Mm. Dr. V. V. Mirashi and Shri N. Lakshminarayan Rao, retired Government Epigraphist for India, for their kind suggestions.

The plates are four in number, each measuring 16 cm in length by about 8.7 to 9 cm in width. They are smooth and their edges are neither fashioned thicker nor raised into rims. A few lines on the first plate and the second side of the third plate have been damaged by rust, but the rest of the inscription is in a state of excellent preservation. Towards the left of each plate there is a hole of 1 cm diameter through which the ring passed. The plates when discovered were strung together by a ring along with the seal. It is reported by Shri Wakadiker that he cut the ring for taking out the plates for cleaning through a goldsmith. He has lost the ring. The seal is a flat circular disc of thin copper with a diameter of 7.5 cm. A bolt in the centre of it secures it to a thin band of copper of about 2 cm by which it slides on the ring. The surface of the seal is slightly damaged but the letters of the legend inscribed on it can be read without much difficulty. The weight of the four plates is 1040 gm and that of the seal 90 gm. The first and the fourth plates have been inscribed on one side only while the second and the third plates have been inscribed on both the sides. The whole inscription runs into 42 lines. Most of the letters are clear and deeply incised.

The characters are of the boxheaded variety of the Southern alphabets. The numerical symbols for 30 and 2 appear in line 41. The stroke at the bottom of the box in the letter ch (line 22) has not been engraved. Compare this ch with ch in acharana in line 29. Final consonants have been indicated without boxes at the top of the letters; cf. m (line 42), t (line 31), etc. The engraving in general is without fault. However, the vertical danda and the box at the top of the letter kasa at the end of line 31 have not been engraved. In some lines the signs of punctuation have been engraved at wrong places.

The language is Sanskrit and except for the legend on the seal and the two imprecatory and beneficent verses in lines 37-40 the whole record is in prose. The language is generally correct. The form dattā in line 21 should have been dattāni, since it qualifies the noun vaicitrasāni in line 20. As regards the orthography it may be noted that the consonants following r are generally reduplicated. However, they have not been reduplicated in some cases; cf. prasūdopārjita (line 14), etc. The consonant th preceding y has also been reduplicated in the word bhāgiratthā (line 6).
Like the other grants of the Vākāṭakas, the present record also commences with the word *driśṭam* which means that it was seen and recorded in the offices of the emperor. The grant was issued from *Pravarapura* which obviously must have been the capital of the kingdom. It was issued by *Mahārāja Pravarasena (II)* who was born from the womb of *Prabhavati-guptā*, the daughter of *Mahārājādhiraja Dēvagupta*. His genealogy as recounted here is exactly the same as in his other copper plate grants. The object of the inscription is to record a gift of land measuring fifty *nayuttanas* by the royal measure. It was in exchange of some other land and was located in the holy place *Achalapura* in the *Krishnapālēśāli-kaṭaka*. The donee was one *Durgāravya* of the *Bhājīka-Auspamanyava gōtra*.

The name of the place has been inscribed as Achalapuka which in all probability is a mistake for Achalapura. The difference in the letters *ka* and *ra* is that *ka* has a small horizontal stroke in the middle of the letter, which is absent in *ra*. The engraver of these plates has no doubt engraved the letter *ka* but it may be due to the horizontal stroke which has probably been engraved inadvertently. In this connection it may be worthwhile to point out certain mistakes of commission and omission by the engraver especially with regard to the letter *ka*. In the word *parasara* (line 30) the letters *n* and *a* have been engraved as *ni* and *ka* respectively, may be inadvertently. The letters *kam* in *putrapatra-nugamikam* (line 31) has been engraved without the vertical *daṇḍa*. Similarly, the horizontal stroke in the middle part of the *daṇḍa* in *ra* may have been engraved inadvertently. The word should, therefore, be read as *Achalapurē* instead of *Achalapukē*. If my reading is correct, it may be that this is the first reference to Achalapura in the copper plates discovered so far. It must have been a well known religious place.

The grant was written on the third tithi of the dark fortnight of *Jyēṣṭha* in the 32nd regnal year of Pravarasena II, when Madhappa was serving as the king's commander. The importance of the record lies in the fact that it gives the latest known date for the reign of Pravarasena II. The latest grant issued by him as known hereto was the Pāṇḍhurṇā plates which was issued in his 29th regnal year. The present plates would show that he reigned at least for 32 years. Thus the discovery of the present grant would necessitate readjustment of the period of his reign. It may be noted that Madhappa who was the *śēnāpati* at the time of the issue of this grant was holding the same office at least for the previous three years also since his name is mentioned in the Pāṇḍhurṇā plates.

As for the localities mentioned in the grant *Pravarapura* has been identified with Pavanār (District Wardha). The archaeological finds at Pavanār may lend some support to this theory. But phoneticaly the change of the name *Pravarapura* to Pavanār is not very convincing. *Achalapura* (which in all probability is misspelt or wrongly engraved as *Achalapuka*) may be the present Achalapura (or Ellichpur) in the Amaravati District, Maharasthra. *Krishnapālēśāli* may have been the name of the division (*kaṭaka*) in which Achalapura was situated.

**TEXT**

**First Plate**

1. दृष्ट [I*] प्रवरपुरः अनन्तोपापोधोमोक्षयीकरालिताराजवाजः

2. पेयकुपमितवावपकस्यकस्तुर्वमेघयाजिन[ः]*] व (वि) धणुष्क|सगो|व्र.

---


* From the Impressions.

* The *daṇḍa* of this letter has not been engraved.
Scale: Two-Third
3 स्य स्य भर्माध्वाकार्तकानाः महाराजश्रीप्रवरसेत्यस्य [सूतोः] सूतोः।
4 अत्यन्तस्वाभाविमहामेरवघजातिस्य अंशभारसेनि(चिः)बेघितविन्-
5 वन्द भूमिधनङ्ग्नेवमुखपरितुष्टसम्पुत्तानिदितराजविजयानाः (नाः) स्य राजक-
6 माहित्रभावीमालालगामूद्दके (च्छा)भिलायतानाः (नाः) दशायामेवाभुषाः[भुः]ष-
7 नातानन्तां भारतनि भारतनां महाराजश्रीभवन्नागदीहिन्द्यः।

Second Plate, First Side
8 गोतमी(मी)पुरस्य पुरस्य वादाकार्तकाः (नाः) महाराजश्रीप्रवरसेनाः-
9 स्य सूतोः[*] [अ]त्यन्तमहादेवस्य सत्याच्युक्तकारुपारायणिकम्-
10 नयविनयायामेवत्थिको (ची)मत्र (र्त्व)पागवतृभितित्वथभन्निनित्वत्त्वम्-
11 नोनेन्द्रानादिसुमृणीसपुत्तस्य वर्णस्तातिभवम्-
12 देवलालकोशंमदासासासनाः (स)तानुपपत्तिः युविचित्रात्सूचेन्योः-
13 कालानां महाराजश्रीपुरस्यविसेत्यस्य सूतोः भगवतश्रवः-
14 पाणिः[*] प्रसादोपाधिजः (त)वि (ची)समुद्रस्य वादाकार्तकाः

Second Plate, Second Side
15 महाराजश्रीप्रवरसेत्य सूतोः महाराजश्रीराजश्रीदेवगुः-
16 तत्तुमासा प्रभावतीगुप्तायामुप (स)स्रय शम्भोः[*] प्रसादाद्विति (त)का–
17 तन्वृस्य वादाकार्तकाः (नाः) वरस्तातिभवरमहाराजश्रीप्रवरसेत्यस्य वरस्ताति वचना: [*]
18 कृष्णाणेशवालिकः कः एविकामुः-
19 द्विम क्षमस्यान्यो अचलङ्कुरे (रे) सूमीवित्वतस्तु बहुच ओषषाः-
20 मण्य (न्य)वसस्मीवदुगविद्योऽराजनमानिन्य मूमखिन्तने तानि
21 प्रभाशा (श)तृ दस्ता: तह निवेदनां। यतोरस्मात्तत्त्वकाः

Third Plate, First Side
22 कारस्वबृद्धिघातितियोगनिवुन्ता आश्वास्थवारिकुलपुणाविष्टृता भे–
23 टाँच्छ (वश्च)वाश विमु (भु)नपुःकावयस्यायामपिवत्यः [११]* विदितस्तु व[११]* ये–
24 वेरातमाभिलामत्स्य धममाङ्गविलाजवेशत्वविषुवुप्रयो इगामुः-
25 वैदिक्यंमालानुवहयं वैज्ञानेवः धममाङ्गविलाजवेशत्वविषुवुप्रयो इगामुः-
26 द्वि (र्त्वा) उदकपुष्पमनिसृवः [११]* अवमोचिताः पुर्वेवाराजनुमाताः

1 The superscript is unnecessary.
2 Read बचनाल।
3 Read द्विशानि।
4 The letter कः is redundant.
27 चातुर्वेश्यांगम्यादपिराणार्थः (र्ग) कौतियासत्राथा अकर-
28 दायी भयोष(च्छा)प्रावेष्यः अपारापरगोविलवेहि: घर-

Third Plate, Second Side

29 [ङु*]ण्यर्मः (स) दोहः अवारासनवम्पीजः: अधवणिकित (व्य)धे-
30 हिताक : सत्यविद्यानिरहर्षित : साधित: सोपणिकितः [ङ-]
31 संकल्पोपकल्पः आचार्यादिविकारिणी: पुनःप्रतापमानिः [क]
32 मुनिजनः (तो) न केननिः [ङु]वापातः [ङ*] कर्तव्यः: [स]वेदान्ताम्सरसरहितः
33 त्यः [ङ*], परिवर्तितवेष्वः। विश्वासमोहास्तमगणयमानः [ङ*] स्वल्पामिः
34 परिवारः (श्य) कुर्येरकारिष्यत वा* तस्य ब्राह्मणविद्वाद्य सदर्क निग्रहः
35 कुर्यप्रेम [ङ*] अतिं (सम) वशमोहधिकरण* अति (ती) तापबर, रामधला (त) -

Fourth Plate

36 नप्रीपालनः (न) कुर्युप्यानुकरोतेन परिवारः न कौतियामाः [ङ*]
37 व्यासमृतो (तो) चात्र श्लोको प्रमाणिः (णी) कर्तव्यः। स्वस्तां परस्तां (ता)
38 यो हेतु विभैवः [ङ*] गयः (वा) भतसहः[ङ*]स्य हनुमित्तुः (त्य) [ङ*]*
39 प्रति वर्तसहावि ग्याम भौदित्व भूमिभिः [ङ*] आपित्ता
40 चानुमान्ता कन (च) तान्येव नरके वस्तिदित्वाय (वसेत् [ङ*] इति) इ।
41 संसारी: वार्तिः (चि) शे
42 पर्ये लितित शास्तमाः।

Seal

1: वाकानकनधनस्ते
2: कम्भाकुस्तुपितः [ङ*]
3: रामसः [ङ*] वर्मनसन्ते
4: चानसन रिप्रसामाण (नमः) [ङ*]*

1 Read सक्षरणःकथापूर्वः.
2 Read कौरयेवः.
3 Read ग्रामाधिकरणः.
4 After this there is a stroke which may be ignored.
5 This and the previous two stanzas are in suvakshubha metre.
No. 11—SIROLI INSCRIPTION OF SARVAVARMAN

(I Plate)

G. S. GAI, MYSORE

(Received on 3.10.1967)

The inscription 1 edited below is engraved on the surface of a weather-worn rock located on the left side of the bridle path leading from the village Siröli to the temple of Anasayadévi. Siröli is situated in Chamoli Tehsil and District of Uttar Pradesh and this area is known as Uttararkhand. Siröli is about one mile from the road-side village of Mandhali-chattii which itself is about 10 miles from Gopésvar in Chamoli District. The findspot of the inscription is about a mile from the Anasayadévi temple.

The inscription was copied by me in October 1966 when I was camping at Gopésvar in the course of my official tour in the Uttararkhand area. The existence of the record was made known through a letter written by one Shri Baburam Mishra of Gopésvar and communicated through the Inspector of Schools of that place Shri Govind Narayan Mishra. A copy of this letter was forwarded by the Director General, Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi, to me as well as to the Superintendent Archaeologist, Northern Circle, Agra in June 1966. The latter sent me a photograph of the record in August 1966 but very little could be made out of it due to its unsatisfactory nature except that it was engraved in early characters of about the 6th century A.D. So I wanted to obtain a good set of impressions of this record which could be done only in October 1966.

The inscribed portion covers an area of about 55 cm by 40 cm. The average height of the letters is 3 cm. There are 7 lines of writing in all. The characters belong to the northern class of alphabets of the middle of 6th century A.D. They generally resemble those of the Haraha inscription 2 of the Maukari king Isanavarman; cf., e.g., the letters q, m, r, v, l, etc. The tripartite q is used throughout. These letters also resemble, to some extent, the characters of the Barabar Hill Cave inscription 3 of the Maukari king Anantavarman. But since the present inscription is engraved on the surface of a rock which has suffered from exposure to the weather and also from the flow of water from a spring above, the letters are worn out in some places. However, much of the inscription can be made out without difficulty.

As regards orthography, it may be noted that the consonant following q is doubled. The language of the record is Sanskrit.

The inscription, belongs to Mahāyāñathirāja Paramēśvara Sarvavarman and refers to kshatriya Naravarman as meditating on the feet of Sarvavarman and as the one responsible for the construction of the temple of Mahālaya-Vriddhēsvara. The blood-relationship, if any, between Sarvavarman and Naravarman is not stated and there is no mention of the place where the temple of Mahālaya-Vriddhēsvara was constructed. It is difficult to say if the Anasayadēvi temple, which is the nearest existing temple from the place of the findspot of the record (about one mile), was originally an Īśvara temple representing the one mentioned in the inscription, though the present structure dedicated to the goddess is of a later date.

1 This is noticed as No. 287 of A.R.Ep. for 1966-67.
2 Above, Vol. XIV, pp. 110 ff. and plate.
The object of the inscription is to record the construction of a water-reservoir (pāṇiya-saṅgraha) by Naravarman for the merit of his parents as well as his own. The reservoir must have been somewhere in the vicinity of the inscribed rock and the present spring above might have been connected with it.

The dynasty to which Śarvavarman belonged is not mentioned in the record. But from the date to which the epigraph has been assigned, viz., the middle of the 6th century A.D. and from the imperial title mahāraja-dhirāja assumed by him, we may identify this Śarvavarman with the Maukhari king Śarvavarman who is known to have ruled from circa 576 to 580 A.D.\(^1\) over an extensive region including the present Uttar Pradesh. It is, however, not clear from the present inscription whether Śarvavarman and his subordinate Naravarman mentioned therein held sway over this Uttarākhandā region also or whether Naravarman had gone there on a pilgrimage in the course of which he caused the construction of a water-reservoir for the benefit of other pilgrims as a meritorious deed. We know that the Maukhari king Śarvavarman had a son named Avantivarman.\(^2\) If the suggested identity of Śarvavarman of the record under study with the Maukhari king of that name is accepted and if kshatriya Naravarman mentioned therein as the feudatory of this Śarvavarman was the son of the latter, then we get another son in the person of Naravarman, besides Avantivarman. We must, however, await further discoveries for confirmation or otherwise of this identification.

The importance of the epigraph under study lies in the fact that it is the earliest inscription mentioning a ruling king in the Uttarākhandā region.\(^3\)

**TEXT**

1. Maharaja-nilī-para-
2. mēvara-Sva(Sa)ravavarma-pād-ānuddhyāta-
3. āri-Mahālaya-Vṛiddhēvara-dē[va]-
4. kūla-kārāpaka-kshatriya-Na-
5. ravavarma[nā*] mātā-pitrāh-ātmana-
6. ś-cha puny-āpāyānāya || ayita*-pā*†
7. pānī-nilī-ya-saṅgraha kṛita* ||

---

\(^1\) The Classical Age, p. 76.
\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 68-70.
\(^3\) Some inscriptions engraved in Brāhmī characters ranging from the 2nd to the 5th century A.D. have been found on a rock behind the temple of Baghunāth at Dārāpurāya, at the confluence of Alakānanda and Bhāgirathī rivers (cf. above, Vol. XXX, pp. 133 ff.). They are in the nature of pilgrims’ records, mentioning the names of persons.

\(^4\) From impressions and photographs.

\(^5\) What looks like a double danda here is unnecessary.

\(^6\) The word śeṣa means ‘white’ and we may take it here in the sense of ‘clear’.

\(^7\) This letter is superfluous.

\(^8\) Read -saṅgrahē kārita.
No. 12—SIRPUR INSCRIPTION OF ACHARYA BUDDHAGHOSHA

(1 Plate)

BALCHANDRA JAIN, RAIPUR

(Received on 14.3.1967)

The stone slab bearing the present inscription was found by Dr. M.G. Dikshit in the forest close to the famous Lakshmana temple of Sirpur (ancient Srīpura, capital of Dakshaṇa Kosala), District Raipur, Madhya Pradesh and is now deposited in the M.G.M. Museum, Raipur. The slab measures 45 cm in length and 45 cm in height. The bottom right portion of the stone has broken away causing loss of a considerable part of the inscription. The left and upper parts of the record are also badly damaged.

The inscription consists of 26 lines of writing. It is well written and neatly engraved. The characters are early Nāgarī of the 7th and 8th century A.D. and closely resemble those of the contemporary stone inscriptions discovered at Sirpur. The record employs the initial vowels a in lines 1 and 14, ā in lines 6, 10 and 17, and ē in lines 13 and 17. The medial sign of ē is made sometimes by a pristhamātra (cf. sthitēbhyah in line 17) and sometimes by a īrōmatrā (cf. Tēhām in line 9). The letter b has been indicated by the sign of v as in line 5. Final form of consonant t is seen in line 16.

The language is Sanskrit. The whole record appears to have been written in verse. The stanzas are not numbered. The first and second halves of stanzas are marked by a single and double daṇḍa respectively. The final m at the end of the second and fourth feet of verses has invariably been changed to anusvāra. Before g, the anusvāra has been changed to ā (cf. bhūshitaṅgāḥ in line 6). The inscription is not dated and if it was there at the end, the portion is now broken away.

As stated above, the inscription is broken and badly damaged. Therefore, the subject-matter of the record is not fully understandable. Probably it opens with the praise of Buddha. In verse 3, the name of Āchārya Ratnaghōsha is mentioned. Verses 4 and 5 describe the qualities of Āchārya Jinaghoṣa who was the best among the disciples of Āchārya Ratnaghōsha. In verse 6, we are told that after Jinaghoṣa, Buddhaghōṣa obtained the poet of the Āchārya and that he was the sishya of the former. In verse 7, the pious qualities of Buddhaghōṣa are described. In the next verse, the construction of a Buddhist temple (chaitya) by Āchārya Buddhaghōṣa is recorded. The temple is described in verse 9. Further, in the verses 10 and 11, we are informed that a village named Sārkarañjaka was granted to Āchārya Buddhaghōṣa who was residing in the monastery named Kailāsabhavana (l) of Sirpur. By whom the village in question was granted to the Āchārya is not known as that part of the inscription mentioning the name of the donor has been damaged. The word rājñāh, however, occurs in line 19 but no royal names are legible in the record.

The revenue of the village was arranged to be distributed for certain purposes like expenditure on naisādyā, of white rice, flowers etc. for the daily worship of the Lord and that on the upkeep of the temple.
The name of the composer of the praśasti or that of the engraver is not known, the record being much damaged. The village Śarkarālaka which was granted to the Buddhist Achārya appears to be the same as Guḍaśarkaraka of the Senakapat inscription of the time of Bāḷārjuna and may be identified with Sāṅkrā which is about 13 miles due west of Sirpur.

TEXT*

[Metres: Verse 1 Śrāvadāri; verses 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 Vasantatilakā; verses 7, 9 Śrāvadāvibhījita; verses 3 (?), 10 Āryā; verse 11 Anuśṭubh.]

1 अध्यतिकान्तमोऽक्तविकृति सूतानककर्पकार काव्या निम्मुक्तमुक्त

प्रवचन[म*-]

2 खिलविध्यापि श्रीवरण[1] सर्वस्थिति श्रवणवरणस्वर वरि

3 [II] [III*] -- ्रि - लिङ्गामुनिजन यज्ञ

4 - लिङ्गामुनिजन - [III] शास्त्रगति य वरिष्ठयमुनि

5 तन्त्रोपाध्याया व(ब) मृतुराजाय , . . . . . . . गुण . . . प्रपायविविहरयं

6 ठन[III*] तेशामल वल्लभां वल्लभां वल्लभां। स्वाधीनमास: प्रशासक्षण-

7 कालत्तित्तित्तितीयो य आसन्तान्तर्णिकत्रिशिविराजं जिन्दरोपाठाय: [IV*] [II] घन्तौरिकर्मि

8 तित - सा जननामकान्तामोऽक्तविकृति तमास्तिमस्तविविद्ध:। यम्नकण्ठविनुष्ण-

9 सत्ता -- द्वाराज्ञुवर्क्ष्यसिद्धानि वि - नि तानिः [III*] देवां आवज्जतित-

कुश्यपवर्ग वरणों भान्त्यस्िर्वनि

---

1 Above, Vol. XXXI, pp. 31 ff.
2 From original stone and impressions [This is noticed as No. B. 117 of A.R.Ep. for 1950-57—Ed.].
Scale: Two-Seventh
10 लेक्कुण्डकृष्ण भिन्नमृण्डुखेमा:। आचार्य [वर्ष] पदवी। भूबिबुझ जोप-पादायुक्तम्।(म) कबित् ।

11 ता: ॐ [मन्त्र] तत्वा: ॥ [६११] मन्नामालिकाय — ॐ ॐ। —— (षविच्छावन) मुद्राणं च ॐ — जने ।

12 चतु ॐ —— निर्देशमात्रा:। येरादान ॐ — ॐ — ॐ ते: संसाधि-तेम्मण्डलप्रभोजनेतम्मतोक —

13 सिद्ध ॐ —— ल्यासवन्ता: किंग (यामु) ॥[७११] तेरा ॐ — सदृश एव जग्निमुक्तमय निच्छापित:। सपदि चैत्यव-

14 रो ॐ —। अन्तग्नितासमपरसमन्नीस्मन्नद्वैप्रभातिमिरिनिवर्धूरिनूय:॥[८११] यस्मि—

15 शा ॐ — ऋतिमिनिवहाकर्पङ्ख: ॥ स्फुतं ग्रन्थोदग्राममन्नद्रान्निमिन्नववापुर्णि-तावण्णि:॥

16 तै। —— ॐ नलोच्छल्चविष्णुवधाय — मूलार्थिव व्यासेकालितता गताविकसुवा —

17 विरात — ॐ — [९११] [कैला] समवननामन्वय विहारे स्वेतम्भ एतेभ:। आचार्युबिबुझ धपपावे ——

18 तनं (नमु) ॥[१०१] तो ग्राम: श्राकर्तातककटिं:। प्रदत: शासनस्थित्वा भौज्य ।।[१११]॥

19 राज: श्री ।।।।।।। ग्रामस्थाप्त श्रवीराभिन्नलिङ्ग नवक्षमेण प्रकाशत ।।

20 चार ।।।।।।। विविधदन्दुत्कं संविधातं निवेब शुक्लानां तत्तंतुला[ना] ।।

21 येन। ।।।।।। कुमुमकृतचतुर्य्यर्ष प्रतिक्षालिखानां ।।

22 था ।।।।।।। भागङ्गवेदस्तिविकारका ।।
23 जानि . . . . .  नुमिन लधभगवत्या ग्राम . . . . . .
24 रजत . . . . . . . .
25 ति: फ . . . . . . . . मलं वुढ्रम . . . . . .
26 . . . . . . . . . . . . तां चन स ज मि ती ज?
No. 13—A CHARTER OF KULIKA VIRAPRACHANADAEVA

(1 Plate)

P. R. SHRIVARAN, MYSORE

(Received on 17. 12. 1966)

The copper-plate inscription1 edited below was temporarily in the custody of the authorities of the Orissa State Museum, Bhubaneswar. I secured its impressions when I visited the Museum in December 1964 during my collection tour. The Museum authorities told me that the record was discovered in the village of Chitalpur, Hindal Sub-Division, Dhenkanal District, Orissa by a resident of the village and it belongs to him. They also informed me that there was a proposal to acquire it for the Museum. It is not known if they have done so by now. Shri S. N. Rajaguru who was then working in the Museum told me that he was writing an article on the charter for publication in the Orissa Historical Research Journal, Vol. XII, No. 1. However, in view of the importance of the charter which brings to light for the first time a ruling family of ancient Orissa not known so far from any other source, it is dealt with here in detail.

This is a single plate rectangular in shape with a short rounded-off handle in the centre at the top, a feature which makes it a Shouldered plate. It measures 13 cm by 10.5 cm and has writing on both sides. The rims of the sides have been raised slightly. The plate has, however, suffered from some damage, traces of which are seen in some places on both sides although the writing has not been affected. The engraving is indifferent, on account of which some letters are bold and some are small and yet others are cursive. There are 26 lines of writing of which the obverse has 12 lines while the reverse has 14 lines.

The characters of the inscription belong to the East Indian variety of Nāgarī and may be assigned to about the 11th century. They are similar to those of the records of the Bhañjas of Vaiṣṇovala like the plates2 of Nēṭṭabhañja Thībhuvanakalāsa. Of the initial vowels a (line 1), ē (line 4), u (line 17) and ē (line 12) occur. The medial u is indicated, in most cases, by the stroke employed to indicate ri. That the engraving is indifferent is proved by the use of the sign of visarga to stand for the cīrāsa in a number of places, this being superfluous in a majority of cases and by the engraving of the dot representing the anusāra by the side of a letter (line 11) instead of on top of it. The language of the inscription is corrupt Sanskrit and the text is in prose except for two verses at the end. The language is so corrupt that the errors of spelling and non-observance of sandhi, etc. are numerous. These are, therefore, rectified in the body of the text given below as well as in the foot-notes under it. Among the orthographical features, v is invariably used for ṣ and the consonant following r is doubled (lines 18, 21).

The inscription appears to be dated in the 1st year of the reign of the chief named Virapra-
chandadeva belonging to Kulika-vahana (Kulika-vahana-śubbha)3 and records the grant made by him of the village Vajapatty included in Gokarṇa-vishaya. The donor was the Brahmaṇa

1 This is A.R.E.P., 1964-65, No. A 49.
3 Another family of rulers of ancient Orissa was called Šailodbhava.
Bhaṭaputra Ugranandi, son of Viranandi, grandson of Suvanandi and great-grandson of Ravanandi. He hailed from Bhaṭṭagrāma in Varṇḍri and belonged to one of the families of the Kāśyapas (not mentioned here) with the three pravaraṇas viz. Naidhraya-Kāśyapa or Kāśyapa (omitted in the text), Vachchhāra (i.e. Āvatsāra) and Naidhraya, and to Yajur-vēda. The actual day on which the gift was made is not given although a reference to an auspicious day (puṣya-dīvac) is found in line 14. As stated above, only from this record we know of the existence of this family and also of the ruler. Probably, he was a petty chieftain ruling over a small territory comprising the two divisions, namely the Kūrmmadēva-vishaya and the Gōkarga-vishaya. This is proved by the absence of regal titles prefixed to his name and the presence of the epithet sāmanta. The non-mention of any suzerain in the record is evidently indicative of the fact that during the time when this charter was issued the political conditions in the country were unstable so as to enable such petty chiefs as the issuer of this charter to assume semi-independence. That this was the case in about the first half of the 11th century to which our record belongs on palaeographical grounds, is attested by the records of some of the Sōmavatī kings of Orissa.

Of the geographical names occurring in the inscription, Varṇḍri is known from several other records of royal families of this period from Orissa and is identified with that part of Northern Bengal which included considerable portions of the present Bogra, Dinajpur and Rajshahi Districts. The places like Kūrmmadēva-vishaya, Gōkarga-vishaya, the gift-village Vajapāṭṭi and Bhaṭṭagrāma remain to be identified.

**TEXT**

*Obverse*

1 SiddhamŚ Svasti [**] Avūdi Ś 1 bhujavaba-la-

2 parukramaḥ pratāpāṭha[a]vāpta*-sakala-dīna-ma-

3 ṇḍalaḥ āśha*-sāmanta-vrdtvāliḥ* saka-

4 la-jagataḥ sri-Sainyaprahaṇḍa iti prā-

5 ti(thi)lāḥ paramamāhēvara[h]* Kulika-vamś-ō-

6 dhavha-kula-tilaḥ[ ] Śri-Vi(Vi)prachāndadhēvāḥ

7 kuśalih Ī Kū(Kū)rmmadēvah*-vishaya bhavishaha-hya)-va-

8 rttamā[nā]-niyuktāka-dandaṃ�aś(i)ka-sāmanta-ma-

9 ḫata(tta)raḥ*-sāmavāja-bhēgi-pustapālak-ā-

10 dh[di][n]Ś Gukarāṇa*-vishaya-nivāsiḥ*-janapadāḥ [cha*]

---

1 The Struggle for Empire, pp. 210-11.
2 From impressions.
3 Expressed by a symbol.
4 Read abhā.
5 Read *maṇḍol-āśaka.
6 Read *birudāvalāḥ.
7 This visarga is superfluous.
8 Read Gōkarāṇa.
Scale: Five-Sixth
11 yath-āraham mānayati vō(bō)dhayati samādīṣya(ās)-
12 ti 1 viditam-astu bhavatāṁ(tāṁ) || ētna(ētad)-vishaya-sa-

Reverse

13 [m]ma(mba)ndha(ddha)ḥ Vajapāṭṭhiḥ chā(chā)tu[s*]-si(sī)mā-pra(pa)ryanṭena 1
14 punya(ṇya)-divō(va)sō 1 Varai(rē)ndri-gaḍo(ta)-Bhaṭṭagrāma-vi-
15 nirggata || Bhaṭaputra-Raviṇa(na)ndi-suta[h*]
16 Bhaṭaputra-Suvaya(na)ndi Bhaṭaputra-
17 Vi(Vi)raṇa(na)ndi Bhaṭaputra-Ug[r*]jaṇa(na)ndi
18 tasmaī Vachhāra¹-Naidhruva-Yayu(ju)r-vvēda
19 charaṇaḥ(qāya) sakala-samudāya(yē)na pra-
20 tipadītō-dya² || Rājā(jnāḥ) tāṃva(mra)sā-
21 shas(ṣa)naṁ(nam)[*[a] V(a)hubhir-vvasudhā datā(ttā) rājaḥh[ś*]=
22 Sagar-ādhībhīḥ *[a] yasya yasya yadā
23 bhūmi[h*] tasya tasya tadā phalāṁ(lam) || 1*[a] Sva-da-
24 tāṁ(tāṁ) para-dattāṁ-vā yō harēti(ta) vasundharāṁ(rām) [ *[a]
25 sa vishtāyāniṃ kriṃi-raḥ-rātvā pitṛbhī[ś*]-sahā pa-
26 [chya*]to [*[a*]

¹ The virāma is expressed by a sign for aśvara.
² These dandaś are superfluous.
³ There is here apparently the omission of the word Naidhruva-Kāśypa or Kāśypa, as also the omission of the actual gṛha name of the dome.
⁴ Read Aṇāṭhāya.
⁵ The reading of this aśvara is not certain.
3 DGA/68
The inscription under study, being edited here for the first time, with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore, was found engraved on a slab set up in the inner verandah of the Dhāresvara temple in the village Dhāresvara, Kumta Taluk, North Kanara District, Mysore State. It was noticed in the Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy for 1945-46 as No. 342 of App. B.

The inscription is written in Kannada characters of the second half of the 11th century and the language of the record is also Kannada. The palaeographical and orthographical features of the record do not call for any special remarks. The writing is in a good state of preservation but for the last line.

The inscription is dated Saka 1005, Rudhirodgari, Ashadha su. 5, Sunday. If the weekday is taken as a mistake for Friday, the given details of date would correspond to 1083 A. D., June 23. The epigraph registers a grant of two agras to the deity Dhāresvara by Chaṭṭabarasi, the crowned queen (gaṭṭa-mahādevī) of Hayvaṇṇarasā. The term agrā means, among other things, a measure of food given as alms. This word occurs in the sense of nivedana offerings to the deity in Tamil inscriptions. It may be concluded from this that two specific quantities of food were granted for being offered to the deity. The record further states that the tax (teru) income from five mūḍaś of land called kaṁchina-barada-bhūmi was granted towards the offering of the agras to the god. In present day coastal Mysore, the expression kaṁchina-mūḍa is used to denote an extent of land on which 63 seers of seed can be sown. The expression teru-kāku (teru = to pay; kāku = protection) obviously means that the tax incomes from the gift land were protected i.e. set apart for meeting the expenses of the actual grant recorded. It is, therefore, likely that kaṁchiya-barada-bhūmi of the record under study qualifies the word mūḍa and that the tax incomes from five plots of cultivable land, each of the extent of being sown with one kaṁchina-mūḍa of seeds, was granted in order to provide two agras for the deity Dhāresvara. Lines 8-9 further record that another income from tax was granted to the god Dhāresvara and to the deity Vishnudēva of the same place. No further details regarding this tax-income are given in the inscription. Line 10 stipulates that the grants thus made were to be protected by the village (grāma) and the māḍu. Lines 11-13 contain the usual imprecatory passages in Kannada.

The inscription is important for the regional history of North Kanara. Though the donatrix Chaṭṭabarasi is referred to as the crowned queen of Hayvaṇṇarasā, the latter does not receive in the record any regal titles, barring the honorific śrīnāt, nor is there any reference to his rule over any territory. Yet, with the help of some inscriptions from the North and South Kanara Districts,

1 F. Kittel, Kannada English Dictionary, s.v.
the family to which Hayvaṇṇarasasa belonged and the region which was under his sway can be ascertained.

Two inscriptions from Mūḍabidure, Karkala Taluk, South Kanara District, one belonging to 1430 A.D., and the other undated but assignable to the same period, give a genealogical account of a family of rulers who were avowedly of Sāluva extraction. Of the two inscriptions, the undated one states that the first two rulers in the family were called Sāluva Nāraṇa and Sāluva Nāgaṇa. During the Vijayanagara period, this family held sway over a principality which was known as Nagire-nājya and which comprised parts of the southern extremes of the North and the northern extremes of the South Kanara Districts. Throughout their known history, the rulers of this family were ardent followers of the Jaina faith.

The earliest datable reference to this family occurs in two inscriptions of the reign of Harihara II and belonging to 1398 A.D., and the name of the Nagire ruler figuring in these records is Hayi-varasa. According to the undated record from Mūḍabidure, referred to above, this Hayivarasa was preceded on the throne of Nagire by Māvarasa, Kāma, Hoṣana, a number of other rulers who are not named, and Sāluva Nāgaṇa and Sāluva Nāraṇa. If the family tradition, as recounted in the undated epigraph, goes back to the earliest beginnings of the Nagire family’s history, then Hayvaṇṇarasasa of the Dharāśvara inscription under study, who may be safely assigned to this family on the strength of his name and the provenance of his record, is to be considered as one of the successors of Sāluva Nāraṇa and Sāluva Nāgaṇa of the undated Mūḍabidure inscription.

The assignment of Hayvaṇṇarasasa to the Sāluva ruling house of Nagire is further strengthened by the description of his queen Chaṭṭabarasi as Jina-gandh- odaka-parama-pavitrikrit-ōttam-āṅgeyar which clearly suggests that Hayvaṇṇarasasa and his queen, like the other known members of the Nagire family, were of the Jaina faith.

As pointed out above, the inscription belongs to 1083 A.D., and thus falls within the reign period of Vikramādiyta VI, the Chāluksya emperor of Kalyāṇa. The Goa Kadamba kingdom, which lay to the north of Hayvaṇṇarasasa’s principality, was at that time under the disturbed reign of Gūhallaṛēva III. The explanation for the absence of any reference to a superior authority in the Dharāśvara inscription may have to be found in the antagonism which marked the relationship between Vikramādiyta VI and Kadamba Gūhallaṛēva III.

**TEXT**

1. Svasti [*] Śrīmat Hayvaṇṇarasasa Paṭṭamahādevi Ji.
2. na-gandh-ōdaka-parama-pavitrikrit-ōttam-āṅgeya.

---

2 Ibid., No. 207.
3 Karnaḥak Inscriptions, Vol. I, Nos. 35 and 36.
4 [This suggestion is extremely doubtful.—Ed.]
5 The Kadamba Kuha, p. 188.
6 From inked impressions. On the top of the inscription is a panel in which the figures of 8 warriors in fighting poses, all of them facing right and armed with swords, bows and shields, are sculptured in relief.
7 Another inscription, in similar characters and consisting of two lines, the first line engraved below line 1 and the second engraved below line 2 of the inscription under study, records a grant of a cow (suraṇī) for maintaining 2 perpetual lamps to the deity Dharāśvara by one Jakaśra. It reads:

```
1 Jakaśra bala ra soṣaṇaḥ (bhīśa)
2 meḷa pu (Dhārāśvarī) mādātya (su) ṛīga 2 manādātya ṛīga salu
```

8 In between line 2 of the second inscription and line 3 of the main record is a panel depicting, in the centre, a cow and a calf, facing left, flanked on the left by six male figures, two of them smaller than the rest, and on the right by two female figures.

3 DGA/68
r-appa Chaṭṭabarasyar τu Sakha-varisa\(^1\) 1005 ne-
ya Rūḍhrōdgāri-samvatsarada Asāda\(^1\) su(śu)ddha
parcchami Ādīvara Dhārēsva(śva)rādēvara-
lī māḍid-agrav-eraḍu \([^*\)]\) adarke kaṁcchiya-
barada-bhūmi mūde 5 kaṁ teru
kāhu || Dhārēsvaṅkābhaṁge vit(l)llī-
yā Vishṇudēvargge teru kāhu \([^*\)]\)
id-inisum grāmada nāda rakshe \([^*\)]\)
dharmmavan-alīdaṁ[ge\(^*\)] sāsira kavileya-
n-alīda dōsa \([^*\)]\) ida pāli(li)sidam[ge\(^*\)] sāsira-ka-
vīle [yaṁ] koṭṭa phala || i [du ba] ....\(^a\)

\(^1\) Read Sakhaṣeسا
\(^*\) Read Āṭasāha.
\(^a\) The remaining letters are lost. Probably they contained the name of the writer.
No. 15—TWO CHARTERS OF BHANUSHENA, YEAR 30
(2 Plates)

LATE MORESHWAR G. DIKSHIT, BOMBAY

(Received on 18.4.1968)

In January 1967 Shri P. P. Vaishampayan, a social worker from Nasik, brought to my notice the two copper plate charters edited here, which he had obtained from a copper-smith of Thālnēr, Sirpur Taluk, Dhulia District, Maharashtra. The estampages of these two charters were later prepared under the kind supervision of Dr. G. S. Gai, Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore, in his office. The original plates have since been returned to the owner and I learn that they are now preserved in the Sārvajaniaka Vāchanālaya at Nasik.

Each set consists of three plates with a hole in the centre of the left margin, obviously for the ring to pass through. However, neither the ring nor the seal is now available for either of the sets. For the sake of convenience, the two sets will be referred to hereafter as A and B. Each plate in set A measures 18.5 cm x 7.3 cm and the three plates together weigh 737 gm. Each plate in set B measures 17.5 cm x 9.3 cm and the plates together weigh 562 gm. The rims in all the plates are raised as a result of which the writing has remained in a fair state of preservation. The middle plate in each set is engraved on both sides while the first and third plates bear writing only on the inner sides. Set A consists of 27 lines of writing and set B of 38, the distribution of lines on the written sides being as follows: Set A:—I and II a : 8 lines each; II b : 6 lines; III: 5 lines. Set B: — I and II a: 10 lines each; II b and III: 9 lines each.

The characters employed in both the charters are the western variety of the Southern alphabet and are palaeographically assignable to the 6th-7th century A.D. As in the Ēndrī Berdī plates of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Vibhurāja and the Āṭjanēri plates of Prīthvichandra Bṛgāśakti, certain letters in set A have deeply incised dots at their head. In set B the formation of the letter t (line 1), s (line 23) and the initial vowel e (line 24) is noteworthy. Also in set B, the halanta is indicated by an arc over the letter t (line 31). As regards orthography it may be pointed out that the consonants are doubled when preceded by r and that the rules of sandhi are not observed in several places. The language of both the records is Sanskrit. A few minor errors of language and orthography have crept into the texts of both the records.

Both the records were issued on the 7th day of the bright fortnight of the month of Kārttika in the 30th year, obviously of the reign of the then ruling Kumbhakarna chieftain, Bhānushena. These details of date are insufficient for verification. But, as stated above, the records are to be assigned to the 6th-7th century A. D. on grounds of palaeography.

Barring the details of the grant portion, both the records are identical in their contents. While set A commences with the auspicious word svasti, set B commences with a symbol for Īm followed by svasti. The records then introduce the ruling family of Sthālaka-nagarā which was known by the name of Kumbhakarna. Next is given a succession of five names of the rulers belonging

---

1 [They have been noticed in A. R. Ep. 1966-67 as Nos. A 7 and 8.—Ed.]
3 Ibid., Vol. XXV, pp. 223-38 and plate.
to that family, the fifth one, Bhānushēna, being the ruling chieftain at the time the two charters were issued. The lineal descent, given in the two sets, may be tabulated as follows:

(1) Ādi-mahārāja
    Jayarāja

(2) Mahārāja
    Ādhya-rāja

(3) Mahārāja
    Bhaṭṭāraka-rāja

(4) Mahārāja
    Svāmikarāja

(5) Mahārāja
    Bhānushēna

Since Jayarāja is described as Ādi-mahārāja, he may be taken to have been the progenitor of the family. Nos. 2-4 are described as meditating on the feet of their respective fathers while Bhānushēna is stated to be meditating on the feet of his parents. He is further eulogised as having attained fame in several battles and as parama-bhāgavata.

Then follows the statement that the ruler Bhānushēna communicated his orders (pertainning to the grants recorded in the two charters) to various officials, whose designations are given. They include daṇḍa (police or army officials), bhata (warrior), bhāgika (owner), kunār-āmātya (a minister enjoying the status of a prince), chār-śākharānya (officer in charge of the recovery of stolen goods), chāra (spy) and dūta-prāśānya (officer in charge of sending messengers). This section is followed by the details of the grants including the delineation of the boundaries of the plots of lands thus granted. Three identical imprecatory verses are then engraved in both the sets followed by the statement that the executor (dūtaka) of the grants was Nāgādāra-pratihāra and that the texts were written by Rājyādikṛītī Dīva,² son of Prithvikīva. Then follow the details of the date mentioned above. The records end with the expression Śilagrahasya, which was probably the sign-manual of Bhānushēna.

The object of set A is to record the grant of a plot of land (paṇchāśi)² in the village of Vadrapidhara in the district of Stall-nagara-vishaya-bhōga to the brāhmaṇa Nāgavasu, son of Bhaṭṭāraka, belonging to the Vājirnāya branch of the Yajurvēda and to the Gautama-gōtra, who was a student of the four vēdas. The grant-land was situated to the west of the boundary of Millukājaka, to the north of Vahakoppara, to the east of Mahatar-kaḥētra and to the south of the boundary of Paṇḍakapithāka. The king made the grant for the growth of his parents' and of his own merit and fame and the donee and his descendants were to enjoy the grant in perpetuity.

The object of set B is to record the grant, by the king, for the growth of his parents' and his own merit and fame, of a plot of land, mentioned as parṇīśi (line 13) and paṇchāśa (line 19), situated in the southern fringes of the village of Takkārikhētaka on the banks of the river Būrāvi

¹[See below, p. 69 note 2.—Ed.]
²[The expression paṇchāśa occurs in both the grants while grant B gives the form parṇīśi also in line 13. They may be derived from Sanskrit paṇcāśa, parṇīśi being the Prakrit form and are connected with the terms paṇñasa or paṇñāśa found in Kannada inscriptions. These terms seem to denote a land tenure in which the donee enjoyed fifty per cent of the revenue of the donated land. Cf. D.C. Sarer, Ind. Ep. Glossary, p. 234, s.v. paṇñasa and G.S. Gal, Hist. Grammar of Old Kannada (1946), p. 203, s.v. paṇnasīgar.—Ed.]
in the district of Sthal-lagara-vishaya-bhōga, to the same brāhmaṇā Nāgavaasu. The gift land was situated to the west of Sinhakshētra, to the north and east of the boundaries of Pippari-Manḍalaka and to the south of the well and garden. An ill-constructed passage in lines 23-24 seems to state that the gift-land was situated near the road running from west to east where eight pathways meet. As in set A, here also it is stipulated that the grant was made for the perpetual enjoyment of the donee and his descendants. From set B we further learn that Khandachihāni was the grandfather of the donee, Nāgavaasu.

The importance of the two charters lies in the fact that they reveal for the first time the name of a hitherto unknown ruling family of the 6th-7th century in the Dhulia region, viz., the Kumbhakarṇas and also the name of the five of its members who were endowed with the feudatory title of Mahārāja. The provenance and the probable period of the charters suggest the possibility of Bhāmashāna having served as a subordinate of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi. However, the complete absence of any reference to the sovereign power is difficult to explain in the present state of our knowledge.

Of the geographical names occurring in the two charters, Sthalak-nagara, from which the Kumbhakarṇas hailed, is the same as modern Thājnār, the findspot of the two grants. During the medieval period Thājnār, located on the northern banks of the river Tāpi, was the headquarters of the Farrukk dynasty (1382-1601 A.D.) of Khandesh. The two plots of land gifted to the donee are stated in the records to be situated in the district or division (vishaya-bhōga) of Sthal-nagara. Sthalmagara and Sthalaka-nagara apparently denote one and the same place.

The other place-names occurring in the two charters may be identified as follows:—

Set A: Vadrādhara-grāma, the village in which the gift-land was situated, may be identified with modern Pīlode in Sirpur Taluk, Dhulia District. The village is situated about 7 miles upstream on the banks of the river Tāpi, to the east of Thājnār. Names of the localities around the gift-land, as given in the charter, are too general to be identified with precision.

Set B: It is stated in this grant that the gift-land was situated in Ṭakkārikheṭaka-grāma on the banks of the river Būrāvi. The latter is evidently the same as the well known Būri river, which rises in the Dhulia District and flows eastwards and finally meets the Tāpi. Ṭakkārikheṭaka is represented by modern Ṭākarakhejē situated about 6 miles to the east of Amalner, the headquarters of the Amalner Taluk in Jalgaon District.

Pippari-manḍalaka, a division named after Pippari, represents the region around modern Pimpri, a small village about 4 miles to the south of Dhulia. This village is bounded by the Bori river on its south. The distance between Ṭākarakhejē and Pimpri is about 23 miles. It may therefore be said that the boundary of Pippari-manḍalaka was contiguous to the boundary of the village in which the gift-land was situated.

All the names discussed above are found in Indian Atlas Sheet Nos. 467/4 and 462.

**Set A**

TEXI*

First Plate

1 स्वरित [1*] वधाकनगरकुभारण(भण्ड)तामादिनहाराजश्रीजयराजस्वात

*There is another river called Būrāvi in the Dhulia District which flows through the Sinhkhed Taluk and meets the Tāpi near about Thājnār. But there is no village corresponding to Ṭakkārikheṭaka on the banks of this river. Būrāvi of set B, therefore, is no other than Būri mentioned above.

* From the original plates.
2 पुजः
तत्त्वादनुद्वचालो महाराज्यी आज्ञाराजः तस्य पुजः

3 नृद्वचाल: महाराज्यीमहाराजकर्म: तस्य पुजः

4 महाराज्यीस्वामिकः
(व:) स्वामिकराजमुः अनेकसमः

5 रघुवर्यः मातापितः (तु:) पादानुद्वः
परमभागवतः महा-

6 राजः (व:) कृष्णामः
सत्ववनेव दश्शख्मेंकुर्मिका (तु:) कुमारमायत्थे

7 ठर्णकारभद्रसत्वेतयास्तिकः (तु:) समाजायत्थे

8 बो विदितः यथा मचः (तः)
श्लैनगरविवयमानः

Second Plate, First Side

9 बहुपीर्चारामेव पूव्होतरसीमायः
पञ्चाशा मात्रोः (तः)

10 नाश युष्म (प्व:) यसोभित्रि (व:) ब्रह्मा
अविन्दरकर्मः (व:) वाच्यार्थकः (कः) नामी
पुजः

11 ययी (भो:) क्या स्वालकः
राजाविविद्वारसामान्यायः

12 सत्त्व (मः) वस्त्रद्रादपिरणे
भिन्नारुष्यायः

13 कपुर्भवः पञ्चाशा
दत्तः (तः) आपातानानि
चार्यः: (तः) मल्लकाणकः
सुमा (तः) नयिताया

14 व (व:) परतः
वहकुष्ठारुतातः
महाराजः (कः)

15 त्वकसी (सी) मा (तः) नितायाय
दक्षिणः: (तः) चतुराद्यातानिविवुषः

16 वसुप्रायःः
भूषकांशवशः

Second Plate, Second Side

17 यपालिनिभवस्वभामलदननमस्मिष्टायामस्थुता (हा)

18 नुमन्तः: पालितविचः (तः) उक्तं च महावता
वेदव्यासेन

1 Here and in similar contexts the rules of sandhi are not followed; the text is left uncorrected.
2 The visarga is redundant.
3 The letter srd is redundant.
4 Read हमदेवयेश्वर.
5 Read पालितविचः.
TWO CHARTERS OF BHANUSHENA, YEAR 30—PLATE I

Set A

G. S. Gai

Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXVIII
No. 15] TWO CHARTERS OF BHANUSHENA, YEAR 30

19 व्यासन [1*] वर्धिवर्ग (ि) सहारण स्वर्गी तिष्ठति मूर्तिद: [1*]

20 आश्चर्यता चातुर्मता थ तान्यवेव नरके कसेि:। [112*] बहुभि:-

21 क्ष्युपात सु (ि) ता (क्ता) राधि (ि) मिस्त्रग्राहिदि: [1*] यस्तं यस्तं यदा मूः-

22 मिस्त्रस्तय तस्य तदा फल (ि) [113*] व्र (ि) ममस्थिति वाक्यशेषः। [1*]

Third Plate

23 पुरावेद्वत्तां विज्ञातिमयो वत्ताय (ि) अ युक्ति (ि) विहार [1*] महरी (ि) हि म-

24 हिमता (ि) श्रेष्ठ दानात्रे (ि) योनिपातन (ि) न (ि) [113*] दृष्टकोष नागद: 

25 समाधीहारे: [1*] लिखितचः रायाचितिकः तेषा शि (ि) तथौदेव: 

26 मदेवेन देवेन। [1*] संवच (ि) तस्य तिष्ठति [ि] मे कालिकादुर्गः 

27 अस्ताद्यम् (ि) मय् [ि] श्रीलग्राहः।

SET B

TEXT*4

First Plate

1 ओः [1*] स्वसित ॥ स्वालकनगरकुमकण्णान्ता (ि) मादि [ि] राज [ि] ॥

2 जयराजस्तय पुत्र। [ि] तलादानुदङ्गातो महाराजः ॥

3 श्रीँ (ि) क्षणराजस्तय पुत्रस्तत्पादानुदङ्गातः ॥

4 महाराजश्रीब्रह्मराजस्तय पुत्रस्तत्पादः ॥

5 नुम्माडतमहाराजश्रीस्वामीकराजा (ि) स्वामिकरा [ि] ॥

6 सुत: अनेकपरमज्ञविकास माराणीतः ॥

7 पादानुदङ्गात: परमभागवतः महाराजश्री ॥

8 मानुषेन: सुश्रृव्णब (ि) दण्डमभोजिककः ॥

1 Read व्यासन। इति ॥

2 The word देवेन is redundant. [The intended name seems to be Dēvānadeva. — Ed.]

3 Read विष्ठि।

4 From the original plates.

* The Prasāya is expressed by a symbol.

* The sandhi has not been observed here.
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9 मारामात्वशोरोदरणः कचारमट्टुप्रेते

10 शिषिकावतः दीनः समाजायस्मी (स्व) स्तु वो

Second Plate, First Side

11 विदितः यथा मया स्थलीनगरदिविषयोः

12 गे बुराविद्वेदः मकरारिखत्वेक ग्रामे ग्रामस्य

13 विषीर्मायोः पफ्याः मातापितरोरात्मनः

14 वष्णु पुप्याभोभिचः (वृ) द्वये आचरणाकारण्यवस्थिति

15 क(क)ल (सी) न (ना) पुप्याभोभिचः स्वालक्षणाः[चा]

16 तुष्वा (विं) धानामार्याय गीतमसंगोऽयाय बादिः (जि) स

17 नेयसार्व्याचारी लक्षवीण्युः (भो) नाय भङ्गै

18 शुरुण्यायं तस्य पुजः ना[ग]वसुः ब्राह्मणाय

19 उदकपूवः पवन्वाशा दत्ता [1*] आपातनानि चा

20 स्या: सति [1*] सी (सिं) हस्येत्राद्वारतः

Second Plate, Second Side

21 विप्परितम्[स्तं]स्तुवस्मि (मा) निर्मायः मु (उ) तरतः तस्मेवः

22 विप्परितम्[स्तं]स्तुवस्मि (मा) निर्मायः [2*] पूज्वतः वापि

23 उदानदेण्यत: * अपरप्रववामास्तममय:-

24 मोक्षिता एवं चतुराधातनविदहुः ना[ग]*वसुः

---

1. [Read] पवन्वाशा as in lines 9 and 13 of set A.
2. [Read] मधुसुःरमहापुराणान्—Ed.
3. [Read] नामसुः for नागसुः here as well as in line 24; for this name see set A. lines 12, 15-16.
4. [Read] सिर्या उवः—Ed.
5. [Read] वापीयामस्तममय:-—Ed.
25 ब्राह्मणस्य यतोस्मिद्य्येकर्त्याश्रद्धा भोगपतिः

26 विपश्यपतिः भूमि विद्यमानामिः

27 कव्ये (क्षये) समादा (ही) योनुमस्तत्त्वः पालि (तः) [विः] तथ्याश्च [1] उदात्तः भ-

28 गवता वेदन्याणे व्यासन [1]* परिवर्तेऽ

29 सहस्राणि स्नानं तिष्ठति भूमिदः [1]*

Third Plate

30 आन्तिका (ता) चानुमन्ता च तान्येव नरके व-

31 संतू [1]* वधुभिवेद्याः भुक्ता राजभिस्माग(ग)र(रा)ः

32 विशिष्टः [1]* यस्य यस्य यदा भूमिस्तस्य तस्य त-

33 दा फा लम् [1]* ठ(व) मांस्येव(ति) वाक्यायोः [1] पूववंदता (ताः) विश-

34 जातियो यतायाब्रह्मणूयिथिर [1]* महीमहिमोः

35 श्रेष्ठ दानाधीयो योनुदा (गः) लम् (सम्) [1]* दृष्टकोश नामा-

36 दासप्रतीहारः [1] भिक्षितः राज्याधिकार (क) तेन

37 प्रियः (पु) विवेकदेवपुरे[गः] देवेन देवेनः [1]* संवत्सरे विद्वश-

38 तिमे वर्त (सि) कशुदपः सम्पत्तिम् [1]* शीर्षभ्रम्य [1]*

---

1 Read ठूँडः

2 Read भूमिकानासः

3 The word 'देवेन' is redundant. [See above p. 89 note 2.—Ed.]

4 Read विष्णुसितः तमें

5 There is a sign here which probably stands for श्री.
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No. 16—UTTARESVARA GRANT OF KAKATIYA RUDRANBA, SAKA 1211

(Plates)

K. V. Ramesh and V. S. Subrahmanyam, Mysore

(Received on 6.5.1967)

The impressions of these copper-plates, being edited here with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore, were prepared by our late lamented colleague Shri K. H. V. Sharma from the set in the possession of the late Shri M. Somasekhara Sarma of Waltair. The charter was noticed in the Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy for the year 1961-62 as No. 19 of App. A.

The set consists of seven plates in all and bears writing on 13 of its 14 sides, the second side of the seventh plate alone being unincised. With the help of the inked impressions it is easy to conclude that each plate measures 26.7 cm × 14 cm. At the left centre, 2 cm from the edge, a round hole, 1.8 cm in diameter, has been cut out for passing the ring of the seal. No details regarding the seal are available nor is the weight of the set known. The charter consists of 177 lines of writing in all and the number of lines on each of the 13 sides is as follows: I a and VI b : 15; I b, IV b, VI a and VII : 14; II a and b, III a and b, IV a and V a and b : 13.

The text of the inscription is written in Telugu-Kannada characters of the second half of the 13th century. The palaeography of the record does not call for any remarks.

The language of the grant is Sanskrit, prose and verse and Telugu, prose. As regards orthography, it may be pointed out that the class nasal is generally changed into anusvāra. The consonant immediately following r is uniformly doubled.

The Saka year 1211 is given in lines 27-28 in the form of a chronogram as Sudhākara (1) Vasuñīdharā (1) Nayana (2) Chandramāhā (1). The other details of date given (line 29) in the record are Virōdhi, Phālguna, lunar eclipse. Though the given details of date are insufficient for verification, it may be pointed out that a lunar eclipse occurred on Saturday, the 25th of February, 1290 A.D., and that this, in all probability, was the intended date.

The charter states that when Vīra-Rudranripati was ruling over the Kākata-rājya from the capital city of Orungallu, Rudrādēva obtained the village of Uttarēsvara from Induśekhara of the solar race and granted the same as guru-dakṣiṇā to his preceptor Viddhanācārya who, in his turn, shared out the gift village to a number of brāhmaṇas, retaining a few shares for himself. Lines 148-75, which are in the nature of a post-script state that Viddhanācārya obtained an additional extent of land in the villages of Dāchāpallī and Pulupārī and shared it out to some more brāhmaṇas, again retaining 12 shares for himself.

As for the contents of the record, the inscription commences with the siddham symbol followed by the auspicious word svasti (line 1). The first two stanzas (lines 1-5) pay obeisance to Gaṇapati, the second verse naming the deity as Prāḷēśvara. Verse 3 (lines 5-6) is in praise of Hari (i.e. Vīṣṇu) while the next verse (lines 6-9) is in praise of the crescent moon (chandra-kalā) adorning the head of Śiva. Brahmā, the primal being, the self-born and the creator of all the universe, is praised in verse 5 (lines 9-10).
Verse 6 (lines 10-11) states that of all the countries like Anóga, Vañga, Kaliñga, Anédra, Karnnatta, Magadha, etc., the Añdhra-manúḍála was the most beautiful. In that country flowered hundreds of great cities but unique among them was Orúngallu (verse 7; lines 12-13). The next stanza (verse 8; lines 13-14) states that the city of Orúngallu shone illuminated by the rays from the crescent moon adorning the head of Śiva even during the nights of the dark fortnight. The exact import of verse 9 (lines 14-16) is not clear though the reference is to the immense wealth of the city by virtue of its proximity to the Vindhya mountain.

Verse 10 (lines 16-18) introduces the ruler Víra-Rudrániripati as ruling over the Kákatíya kingdom (Kákatá-rája) from Orúngallu and states that at the feet of the ruler lay innumerable crowns from the heads of enemy kings and that the wish-fulfilling-tree (kála-viśāpa) had gone back to the heavens angered by the unequalled munificence of the ruler.

The next six verses contain an account of four members of a family, belonging to the lunar race. Verse 11 (lines 18-20) states that Víra-Rudra-níripati’s relative, Vishnúvaradhana by name, who distributed wealth among the needy and spread death among his foes, was born in the lunar race. His son was Induśekhara who was an adept in drinking the poison (hálikála) in the form of his enemies, whose fame had spread in all directions and who, in richness, was equal to the Mérú (i.e., golden mountain) (Verse 12; lines 20-21). The next verse (lines 21-23) states that from Induśekhara was born Mahádeva on whose forehead his enemies beheld the third eye.

According to verse 14 (lines 23-24) Lord Śiva (referred to as Induśekhara) himself was born to the fortunate Mahádeva, in the guise of a king and with the name of Induśekhara. Verse 15 (lines 24-26) is damaged in parts and its exact import is not easy to know. It describes the oceans as swelled by the steady flow of the water of ablation resulting from the innumerable gifts given by Induśekhara.

Verse 16 (lines 26-27) states that the learned Rudradéva obtained the village of Uttaréśvara from Induśekhara in order to grant it to his teacher as guru-dakshiná. Verse 17 (lines 27-30) gives the date, discussed above, and states that Rudradéva granted the said village to his guru, with all the accompanying privileges, on that date.

The next four verses are in praise of the gift-village. The sacrificial altars in the court-yards of the temples of Uttaréśvara were crowded by the well-versed in the Rík, Yajus and Sáma Vedas (verse 18; lines 30-32); all the streets in that village, covered as they were by smoke from the sacrificial altars and by men engaged in scholarly disputations day and night, appeared as if they were themselves ever engaged in serious tapas (verse 19; lines 32-33). In that village those who desired to look at the waves on the river Gágangá did so without exertion from the court-yards of their own houses (verse 20; lines 33-35). Gódávari, with lotuses drifting along and moved by the charming waves, had come there as if to develop intimacy with that village (i.e. Uttaréśvara) (verse 21; lines 35-36).

Verse 22 (lines 36-38) states that Rudradéva’s father was Pínyáyácharaya, the foremost among the Sámyagájas. Verse 23 (lines 38-39) states that the sage Vasishṭha himself was born (as Rudradéva) to witness the Kali age and also to remove, out of compassion, the eternal taint on the name of Kali. Verses 24 and 25 (lines 39-42) respectively state that the ‘Mother of all tongues’ (i.e., goddess Sarasvatī) and the goddess of wealth (Mahála-káshmí) had come to live with him.

Verses 26 and 27 (lines 42-47) allude to the munificence of Rudradéva in making gifts to the learned while the next two verses (lines 47-50) speak highly of his deep scholarship. Verse 28

1 Here the Góḍāvari is obviously equated to the Gáṅgá in sanctity.
declares that his works were above improvement and improvements suggested by him (in other’s works) were unquestionable. According to verse 29, the influence of goddess Sarasvati on Rudradēva was noticed in all fields of learning like tarka, tantra-mārgya and in sweet poetry (kavitva).

Verses 30 and 31 (lines 50-52) introduce Viddhana-dīkṣāhita as Rudradēva’s guru and as being instrumental for the latter’s eminence as a scholar. Because of his teacher’s anugraha, Rudradēva is stated to have attained pre-eminence without even undergoing the necessary ordeal of abhyāsa.

Verses 32-36 (lines 52-54) are devoted to the praise of Viddhanāchārya. Verse 32 declares that as long as the rain-cloud (i.e. Viddhanāchārya) was raining words (of knowledge) on the water-basins (i.e. the faces) of his disciples, croopers of eloquence (i.e. knowledge) were constantly growing. According to verse 33, the utterances of Viddhana which were marked by the fragrance of the sandal-wood tree, possessed mādhurya and his wealth, obtained through proper means, was enjoyed by deserving brāhmaṇas. Viddhana was verily like Śiva in human form.

The next verse states that even as an elephant chained to its post delights the onlookers with the constant tinkling of the two bells, Viddhana delighted all by the display of his deep knowledge of the vēdas and vēdānta. According to verse 35, Viddhana, in whose heart dwelt Śiva, with the crescent moon on his head, who had the serpent for his kumādi and who had applied the sacred ash (bhūmaṇa) on his chest, himself appeared to the learned to be the human incarnation of the Lord himself. Verse 36 compares the scholarship of Viddhana with that of Brahmā.

Verses 37-42 (lines 64-74) give the names of Viddhana’s ancestors for three generations. Verse 37 (lines 64-66) refers to the Kapi-muni-kula and the next verse (verse 38: lines 66-67) introduces Rudrāchāryya as belonging to that family and states that Sarasvati, the goddess of learning, indulged in conversations with him. According to verse 39 (lines 68-69) all men who beheld Rudrāchāryya were wont to say in wonder that a jewel of the best qualities had been created by Brahmā.

His successor (i.e. son) was Dēvanāchārya who was the very ocean of good manners (verse 40, lines 69-70). He was followed by Śrīkanṭhāchārya whose skill in the art of scholarly debating is alluded to in verse 41 (lines 70-72). He was the doyen among those skilled in composing sweet poems even as Śiva and Agastya were the foremost among the gods and sages respectively (verse 42, lines 72-74).

His son was Viddhanāchārya whose birth is compared in verse 43 (lines 74-76) to that of Shaṅmukha (i.e. god Subrahmanya) from Śaṅkara (i.e. Śiva), the sun from the Udaya mountain and the moon from the ocean. Verses 44-61 (lines 76-108) are devoted to the description of Viddhana’s greatness, his many acts of piety and charity, his literary composition Pramēya-charchāmpita and to the land grant he made to a number of brāhmaṇas. Of these, verse 44 (lines 76-78) states that Viddhana, whose erudition was felt in all directions, performed in keeping with religious prescriptions, the sacrifice called Sarvatōmukha1 in the town Vāgīśaratnākara. The next verse (lines 78-80) alludes to the great scholarship of Viddhana by saying that men of learning often retired to his gardens and, by pleasing the parrots living there with offerings of fruits, cleared their doubts by putting questions to them and getting the necessary answers. From verses 46-47 (lines 80-83) we learn that Viddhana had excavated a tank christened Śicatirika in the town of Bhimavallabhapuri. Besides, Viddhana also installed an image of the deity Śiva alias Jhānēśvara in that town (verse 48, lines 84-85). The Sōma-yājins were astounded by the agniśṭhōna performed by Viddhana at Bhimavallabhapura (verse 49: lines 85-86). Verses 50-52 (lines 86-93) state that Viddhana was ushered into the royal presence even without his asking and was honoured at first sight by the ruler with offerings and that

---

1 See also line 171 of the text.
Rudra-kumāra-vīra (referred to in verse 52 as Rudra-nripāla-mauli), who looked upon him with devotion as if he was the very incarnation of Śiva, honoured him with gifts of an umbrella (āuspatra) and fan (āndolikā). Verses 53-56 (lines 93-99) contain further tributes to Viddhana's scholarship. He performed religious rites such as agnihōtra, offered worship to god Narakañjara (i.e. Vighnēśvara) and prayers to Śvayambhū and was keen on promoting piety (verse 53). He was a helping hand to others and was skilled in the two mimāṃsās. The teaching of all vidyās and skill in the Vēdas were like sports to him (verses 54-55). He was a paṇḍita in Śaiva ōgamas, yōga, tantrā and mantra, his speech displayed his familiarity with dharma-śāstra and he was greatly devoted to Śiva (verse 56). It may be pointed out here that, in lines 170-73, while recording the supplementary grant, Viddhana, who is referred to as agrahāra-pradāṭy, is stated to have performed the sacrifices known as Agniṣṭōma, Agniṣṭōma, Sarcatōmukha, Vējadēya, Bīhastāsīva, Mahāvata, Aptośyāma and Chāturmāya.

Verses 57-60 (lines 99-107) are in praise of Pramāyacharchārṇīva, a work written by Viddhana. Even ignorant men who listened to that work being read in assemblies were transformed into men of wisdom. Verse 59 (lines 103-05) states that Induśekhara brought out Pramāyacharchārṇīva by churning the ocean of learning with the mantha of Viddhana’s genius and that, as a result, the damsel of fame became attached to the latter even as Lakshmi was to Viṣṇu. Scholars drank the sweetness of Viddhana’s work with the satisfaction of having tasted earthly nectar.

Verse 61 (lines 107-08) states that the great Viddhanāchārya having obtained this (i.e. the village of Uttarāśvara from Rudradēva as guru-dakṣiṇā) made a grant of the same to brahmanas well-versed in the Vēdas and in all the śāstras and ōgamas. Lines 108-18 give the boundaries of the gift village and the language employed is Telugu. Lines 118-37, in Sanskrit, state that Viddhana granted 3 khāris of land each to fortyone brahmanas and retained the remaining lands (ītaret-sarca) for himself.

The names and götras of the 41 donees are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Götra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kumaraśraya-sarvakratuyājin</td>
<td>Hārṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maṇḍūkan-sōmāyājin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tāṁśa-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kēśava-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vaiśnava-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Appana-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Viśvanātha-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Kapi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kāmci-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Viśmadēva-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Srīrauka-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kāmci-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kāmci-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Viśveśvara-gaṭṭasaiti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gōтра</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mārē. bhattōpadhyāya</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kāmadēva-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vallabha-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Talyē-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pōti-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pampaya-sōmayājin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Purāyī-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Annaka-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sūrē-bhattōpadhyāya</td>
<td>Ātreya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sarabha-bhattōpadhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rāli Peddi-bhattōpadhyāya</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Velupula Pōti-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ananta-bhattōpadhyāya</td>
<td>Kumjina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nūṭalna-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Appana-bhattōpadhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Kēśava-bhattōpadhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sūrē-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kāntadēva-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Narasimha-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dēṇḍara-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bēvana-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Kandarpadeva-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Vādhula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sūrē-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Purushottama-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mančhena-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Kāśyapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Ananta-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Dēvana-ghataśāsin</td>
<td>Śātha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sarvadeva-bhattōpadhyāya</td>
<td>Śāmōgīlyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verses 62-67 (lines 138-48) are imprecatory stanzas usually met with in donative records.

The rest of the charter covering a part of the last line (i.e. line 148) of the first side of the sixth plate, the whole of the second side of the sixth plate and the first side of the seventh, is in the nature of recording supplementary grants. Lines 148-49 state that Viddhana obtained an additional extent of land, measuring 30 khāris, in the villages of Dāchapalli and Puluparṇu,
transferred them to the bounds of Uttarāśapura and granted them to *brahmanas*. The names of the donees, the *gōtras* to which they belonged and the quantum of shares given to each, given in lines 149-174, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gōtra</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Viddhana-bhāttōpādhyāya</td>
<td>Hāṛta</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rudra-sūmayājin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prūlē-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Amē-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Purushottama-bhāttōpādhyāya-sūmayājin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prūlē-bhāttōpādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kēśava-bhāttōpādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Venuś</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vallabha-sūmayājin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kamchi-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Narasimha-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Śrīśānta-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Toravi-Yajñēvara</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yajñēvara-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mārē-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jāmē-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Dēvarē-bhāttōpādhyāya</td>
<td>Bhṛadvāja</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rēmanā-bhāttōpādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kūchana-bhāttōpādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maunchi-bhāttōpādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Narasimha-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Purāyi-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sūnṭēvara-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kāmadēva-bhāttōpādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Eṣapōta-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Narasimha-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Viśvēvara-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jānue-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nōukāna-ghaṭaśāsin</td>
<td>Kumūjina</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sūmadē[va]*-bhāttōpādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Viśvēvara-bhāttōpādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gōtra</td>
<td>Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Gumūjina-lohi-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Kusumāna</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dore-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bhumīśvara-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Viśvanātha-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Toṇda-sūmyāji</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Chēnē-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Yajñūśvaropādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nāgadēvā-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Kamakavelli Narasimha-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Narasimha-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Virana-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kamdarppa-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Prāśa-bhaṭṭopādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Māna-bhaṭṭopādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Kore-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Gūrāya-bhaṭṭopādhyāya</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Krapāta-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Garga</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Kēśava-bhaṭṭopādhyāya</td>
<td>Ātrēya</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Sōmanātha-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Jamē-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Annē-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Lōhita</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Kāntana-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Kāmā-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Kauśika</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Māri-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Prēḷē-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Kāśyapa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Kēśava-yajvā</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Nārāyaṇa-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Uttarāśvara-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Saṭṭiṃsa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Jannē-sūntōyaśin</td>
<td>Vādhula</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Śṛṅgata-bhaṭṭopādhyāya</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Purushottanta-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Viśnuprlḍhika</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Kamdarppa-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Poddi-ghaṭaśaśin</td>
<td>Kapi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Gūrā-Bharata</td>
<td>Kapi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gōtra</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Sarvadēva-ghaṭāḍāsin</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Virabhadrā</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Vīdhīhanā-bhaṭṭopādhyāya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Mārkandēsvra-Mahādēva</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Uttarēsvra-Mahādēva</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Janārddana-Vallabha</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lines 174-75 declare that all the incomes from the payments to be made by the eighteen jātis of the village (of Uttarēsvra), including the potters (kuṇbhubhakāra) and oilmen (taṭakāra) and whatever other incomes may thenceforth accrue were also granted to the same brāhmaṇa donees.

Lines 175-76 contain verse 68 which is the usual imprecatory stanza bāhubbhir-varudhā dattā, etc. The charter ends with the invocation Svasti Śri-Dēvya namah followed by two symbols in line 177.

The plates under study are important for the local history of the period to which they belong. They refer themselves to the reign of Vira-Rudranipati. The Kākatiya kingdom was under the sway of Rudrāṇbā alias Rudramadēvi, daughter and successor of Gaṇapati (1199-1262 A.D.) from 1262 to 1296 A.D., and the date of the present grant, 1290 A.D., falls within her reign period. In a number of her inscriptions, Rudrāṇbā is given the masculine name of Rudradēva-mahārāja and, therefore, Vira-Rudra-nipati of the charter under study is to be identified with her.

Verses 11-15 (lines 18-26) give the genealogy of a family of rulers who belonged to the lunar race. The genealogy given is as follows:

Vishṇuvarṇihana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indusēkhaṇa (I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahādēva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indusēkhaṇa (II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these, Vishṇuvarṇihana is referred to as nripa. Indusēkhaṇa (I) was verily Śiva himself, for he was an expert in drinking the bālākala in the form of his enemies. He is referred to as rājasa. His son Mahādēva was a mahāpātī and his enemies were as if burnt by his third eye seen by them in the battlefields. To him was born, in the guise of a nripa, Lord Śiva himself and he was known as Indusēkhaṇa (II).

A few more inscriptions from the West Godavari, Krishna and Nalgonda Districts, Andhra Pradesh, reveal interesting facts about the members of this family. Thus, two inscriptions from Narasāppur, Narasapur Taluk, West Godavari District, one to 1159 A.D. and the other to 1170 A.D., refer themselves respectively to the 24th and 35th years of the reign of Sarvalokānaya

---

2 Ibid., No. B 11.
Vishnupardhana-mahārāja. It is very likely that this ruler is identical with Vishnupardhana mentioned in our grant as the great-grandfather of Induśekhara II. Two other inscriptions, one from Juttiga, Tanuku Taluk, Krishna District and belonging to 1259-60 A.D. and the other from Pālakkollu, Narasapur Taluk, West Godavari District and belonging to 1261-62 A.D. refer themselves to the reign of Chālukya Virabhādra. Of these, the Juttiga inscription states that Virabhadrēśvara was the husband of Rudramadēvi, daughter of Kākatiya Gaṇapati while, according to the Pālakkollu inscription Virabhādra was the grandson of Vishnupardhana and son of Udayāmī. Yet another inscription, also from Pālakkollu and belonging to 1266 A.D., states that Udayāmīkī, the mother of Virabhādra, was the wife of Induśekhara who was the son of Vishnupardhana and that Virabhādra was the husband of Anyamānī. This Induśekhara is, no doubt, identical with Induśekhara I of our record. It may, therefore, be concluded on epigraphical evidence that Virabhādra had two wives namely Kākatiya queen Rudramadēvi and Anyamānī.

An inscription from Kolanupāka, Bhuvanagiri Taluk, Nalgonda District, belonging to 1279 A.D. and to the reign of Kākatiya Rudradēva (i.e. Rudrāmbā) states that Virabhādra of the Chālukya lineage was the husband of Rudradēva (i.e. Rudrāmbā). We further learn from this inscription that Virabhādra had an elder brother named Mahādēva who was married to Lakkāmī by whom he had a son named Induśekhara. Virabhādra's elder brother Mahādēva and the latter's son Induśekhara of the Kolanupāka inscription may be safely identified with Mahādēva and Induśekhara II of our record. The genealogical information derived from the above records may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vishnupardhana</th>
<th>Induśekhara I = Udayāmī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahādēva = Lakkāmī</td>
<td>Virabhādra = Rudrāmbā and Anyamānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Induśekhara II

Line 18 of our grant states that this ruling family belonged to the Paṅkaṭa-bāṃdhava-śrīvata. The well-known Chālukya houses of Bādāmī and Kalyāṇa and the Eastern Chālukyas of Vēṅgī all claimed to belong to the Lunar race. Moreover, we learn from the Pālakkollu inscription of 1266 A.D. and the Kolanupāka inscription of 1279 A.D., both discussed above, that the family in question belonged to the Lunar race. Therefore, though Paṅkaṭa (= lotus)-bāṃḍhava usually indicates the Sun god, in this particular case it will be necessary to equate paṅkaṭa with kumuda and conclude that the record under study also assigns this minor Chālukya family to the Lunar race. It is likely that these chieftains were the scions of the Eastern Chālukya family of Vēṅgī and that they were ruling in parts of the West Godavari, Nalgonda and Krishna Districts as the subordinates of the Kākatiyas of Warangal.

The praise bestowed on Viddhana as a poet and scholar and the reference to his work Pra-
meṣyacharchāmpita are of interest. Viddhana and his work are for the first time brought to light by
the grant under study. From the description of the work in line 100 as sūktimati-vrajaṁ añā
katāḥ, it may be concluded that Pramēṣyacharchāmpita was of a didactic nature, containing subha-
shīitas.

Among the donees of the supplementary grant Virabhadra is mentioned (line 170) as Ārahya-
putra, Viddhana himself being immediately referred to as Ārādhyā. Virabhadra was, in all proba-
bility, the son of Viddhana. The lineage of Viddhana, reduced into tabular form, is as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kapī-muni-kula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rudrāchāryya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dévaṇāchāryya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīkaṇṭhāchāryya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viddhanāchāryya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virabhadra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rudra-kumāra-vīra, mentioned in lines 89-93 as being devoted to Viddhana and as having
conferred royal honours on him is to be identified with Pratāparudra II (1295-1326), the grandson
and successor of Rudrāmbā. He is known to have been made yuvarāja as early as in 1280 A.D.⁵

Iñduśekhara who, according to verse 59 of the present grant, was instrumental in Viddhana
writing his work and from whom the donor Rudradēva obtained Uttarēsvara and granted it to
his guru Viddhana as dakṣiṇā was obviously the poet’s patron. The donor Rudradēva was the son
of Pinnayāchārya.

Among the place names mentioned, the capital city of Orumgallu is the same as Warangal.
Since the exact find-spot of the plates are not known, it is not possible to locate the villages of Uttarēsvara, Dāchapalli, Puluparṇa, Vāgīsaratnākara and Bhīmavallabhapura on a modern map.

TEXT⁶

[Metres: Verses 1, 4, 26 Saṅghadā; verses 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 18-25, 27-32, 34, 38-41, 43,
46, 48, 49, 53-55, 63-66, 68 Anuṣṭubh; verses 7, 50, 59, 67 Vasantaṭīkā; verses 10, 15, 33 Saṅgada-
vikrīditā; verse 11 Indraśpenā; verse 12 Praśastha; verse 17, 35, 36 Prīthvi; verse 37 Pushpi-
tāgrā; verses 42, 44, 51, 52, 57, 59-61 Upajīti; verse 45 Mālinī; verse 47 Rathoddhatā; verse 58
Upendrasajjā; verse 62 Śālīni.]
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1 Ōṁ Svasti ś Pratyāhā-vyūha-rājas-sa bhavatu bhavatāṁ śrīyasē [bhūyasē] — —
2 tvā dhṛitvā karaṁ eh-ōpari visṛjjati tān vyōnmi yasmin-parasmin [maṁda[n] maṁdam
pa — —

¹ A History of South India, p. 212.
² From impressions.
³ Expressed by a symbol.
⁴ DGA/68
3 parisara-saśiṇaṃ prêma-rîṅgais-taramgair-âliṅgya-âliṅgya putram paridadhati sukh-âraññaham-anira
4 bhūdhayas-taṃ [1"] Bālaḥ Prōśvaro nirītyam-âcharan-khêcharai[h"] stutah | bhava-taṃ bhūtaye bhūyā-
5 dā kântaḥ prabho Kari [2"] Harih kāli-kîniḥ pātu viśvam viśvamibhar-ânihitā | yad-damahay bhāti
6 chānḍri-îva kāla kā-îpi kâlaiedy [4"] Śambhōr-âmbhōṇidhinām-anavarata-sam-âlāsa-
7 kīhī chānḍradi sândri-âhavach-chhṛ[rl"]-jagad-avatu Kalā kā-îpi maulau visālē | âliṅgya-
8 hari-atîchagel-jjahuni-kanyakā-ramaṅgair-śrīvīm-ekatra-vāsand-iva bhūsman-ud-
9 tām-âcharadvhīs-âkāravhī || [4"] Puṁse puruṇāya namō-stu tasmai yan-nâbhi-padmā-
10 bhūt-Svayaṁbhuḥ || tasmai-âdīhaye cha namō-stu yasmāt-samastaṁ-ētaj-jagad-âvirātin ||
11 ga-Kalivig-Ādiksa-Ārnavatā-Magadhabhādayay | dēsāḥ sphuranti tatrasaikāh mânōjñām tvā-
12 Tatrā-âlāsanti sataś-pi mahā-nagaryyās-tasām purī sphurati kēvalam-Oṛūṅgalluḥ || ma-
13 dhyē trivāśṭapa-saṅgṛah-sakñhānām-adīyā mura-pramathau-âmubha-lōchanā-iva || [7"] Śaik-
14 bhūbhōḥ Svayaṁ-
15 bhuvō yatra śīrās-chāndra-marṣīchayah | kurvvanti chaḍradh-ōṅdrāh krīṣṇa-pakhē-îpi
16 yāminī || [8"]-Paśya-
17 ni(l) Puruṣūr-dākṣām paṇurukāṭam-iva śrīyān(yam) | bhaktāya-dātum udyuktā yad-[vṛ]tā
18 Vīnicāya-vā
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19 sī [9"] Tasyāṁ-maśa Virārudra-aripatiḥ [pratyarthī]-prīchī-pati-sphūrjād-rat-
20 ma-kīśā-kōti-vilasat-pā-
21 dārayudhā-îvayaḥ | śrīmat Kākata-rājya-[bhā]ra-vahana-prēukhad-bhujā-yikramō ya-
22 sya tyāgam-unīkṣaya Kalpa-vītāpi [krōdhāk] dh-âgād-līvau(yam) || [10"] Tad-bāddhavaḥ
23 pānkaja-bāndhav-ânivāyū
24 jātō uippa-namāni Vīshuvardhanah | yaj-ārththinō yat-paripāthinō mūnāḥ śrīyān
25 labhāntāte sura-saṅgālām-āpi || [11"] Tad-āṭma-jō-bhūt-svāyaṁ-Indusēkharāḥ pratyarthi-
26 hālāhāla.

* The numeral 1, indicating the plate’s number, is engraved by the left side of the ring-hole.
* Read -Oṛūṅgalluḥ for the sake of metre.
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22 diMahādevas-tēna rājñā mahipatiḥ | paśyanti ripavē yuddhō [yasya bhāle] vilōchanam (nam) || [13*] 

23 Tasya bhāgyeṇa kēm-āpi bhagavān-Indusūkharāḥ | śripati-ekhahdramā [yatra] sputraya-adhika-vikra-

24 maḥ || [14*] Yud-dān-anāhu-jhara-pravāha-[vibhavaḥ] pāthōdhayō vārodhitāḥ bhūtō kām-a-

25 pi Kumbha-sanībhava-bhayāj-jātāṁ tyajanto dhruvaśv(yam) || [1*] ā chaṁdramā [viharaḥhir-

26 śührjjat-kucha-kumbhaka-sanībhava-mahā-maitrī-pavitrī-kritāḥ || [15*] Tasmād-śalabha

27 grāmam-Uttarē.- 

28 śvaram-ākhyayā | Rudradēva-sudhir-ddātuṁ guravē guru-dakshināṁ (yam) || [16*] Sudhākā-

29 ram(ṛa)-vasumdhara-nayana-chaṁdramah-śamskhyayā mitēshu Śaka-vatśā

30 rēshy-ahā Virōdhinaḥ Phalguṇē | śaśi-grahāṇa-mam[galē] sa guravē satām-agra-
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32 nir-adatta puram-Uttarēśvaram-āśeṣa-bhūgaiḥ sahā || [17*] Pada-vākya-pramā-

33 ṇa-ṝjai-Rig-Yajųh-Sāma-vēdibhiḥ | spuruṣti bahusō yasyā maudir-āni-

34 gaṇa-vēdikāḥ || [18*] Hōma-dhūmais-sanākirmṇaṁ sāyaṁ prātar-vvihā-

35 ribhiḥ | yat-purī-vīthikāḥ sarvvaḥ kurvanta-iva tapaḥ param(ram) || [19*] Yatra 

36 Gaṅgā-tara-

37 ngāgam-avālōkana-kautukṛṇaṁ(kam) | grih-aṣṭgana-vilōlanām-ayamād-ēva 

38 sidhyati || [20*] Lōla-kalīlōla-hast-āgra-liṅgā-chālita-pamkajā | Gōdāvari

39 yayā purvya sakhyau karttum-iv-āgata || [21*] Yā muhū 

40 Rudradēvasya tasya-ābhuyadaya-kāripō | yat-pitā Pinnay-śchā-

41 ryyas-tīlakah Śōma-yājināṁ (yam) || [22*] Āṭakaḥ kali-yugamā draśtuṁ Yaiṣhthō 

42 muṇi-punagavaḥ | kaluṣh-aika-hatō mā bhūt-Kalkir-īty-anukāmpāyā || [23*] Padma-āla-

43 yām-iv-ālōkya kautukājanan girāṁ (ram) | śrūgāra-bhārantā yasya mukha-

44 padm-āṣray-ābhavat || [24*] Chhaha(Chha)lād-iva Mahālakshmī-udṛṣṭtyā yan-mukha 

45 bhāratām(tim) || ()


1 The numeral 2 indicating the number of the plate is engraved at the left side of the ring-hole.
2 The two doṇḍas engraved at the end of this line are unnecessary.
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gamda-sthala-krita-padam-arohausahaan brihuna-sri-bhanga-ibb-angikritah sa nripatir-a-
pi vaisati nita ev-ata esha | pitros-chitr-opacharyya muhur-api rachi-
ta padajitabhyo-khilabhyo dattaṁ vittaṁ tad-asmin jagati khalu krit Rudradevasa-
eva | [26*] Yad-dana-payasaṁ-oghair-aradbhé pathaśaṁ nidhau | kavi-sukti-anrjugam
kürtti-lakshinuh pradurabhūdva(d-dva)yati(yam) | [27*]. Yat-kriyam chödyam-aniyo nó
pariharttum pra-
galbhaté | yat-kriyé pariharé-pi n-aniyo-chödayitun kahamaḥ | [28*] Tarkké vā tami-
tra-mağgë vā kavety madhurë-tha vā | yatra kutr-āpi vā yasya pra-
galbhë-pi Sarasvatī | [29*] Tasy-āsti Rudradevasya gurur-Viddhana-dikshitaḥ | yasya
āruṇī-
ta-kara-sparśat-tan-mattr-vārdhī-varddhita | [30*] Yad-anugraham-āsūdyā sudhi-
jam-agranir-ahūt | vin-siv-ahyāsa-bhāreṇa Rudradevah krit-lśurah | [31*] Ya-
smin-varshnti vāktyoam Viddhan-āchāryya-tōyade | śishy-ānan-ālavālauh vārdhahnte bhā-
ratī-latāḥ | [32*] Śpaṁdas-chatīdana-saurabhāsya garimā mali-mattali-śriyā yasya nyasya-
ti bi(vi)bhrāmēshu vachasāṁ mādhuryā-dhuryayā padaṁ(dam) | bhogyā yogyā-mahi-
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suparvva-nikarain-yyad-bhūtayō nītayō yaj-jas-sajjana-mauli-Viddhana-sudhi-
ri-jāgarthī mūrttaḥ Śivah | [33*] Vēda-vēdānta-ganājābhyām Viddhan-āchāryya-sindhu-
rāh | lì(vi)hat-ārtthia-kiy-ālānah kēshān vā na maṇi-haraḥ | [34*] Sudhā-
kara-kalā-milan-mukta-maujālalau kalakāli-krit-ōragam-ura-sthili-rachita-bhasma-
pani mahāḥ | nidhāya ĥrīdi tat-paraṁ yam-avalōkya vidvaj-janan-as tad-eva
paramai mahāḥ kim-api manvati mūrttimat | [35*] Chaturmmu-
ka-chatur-mukhi-nagara-sīma-sīmantinī nirantara-pariprathu-mana-vi-
lāsa-panyas-sthali | samullasati yan-mukh-ātimbura-maujālala muṇḍjasāṁ
su sarva-sudhiyān muhu-sphraut Qi Viddhan-ārıyāḥ sudhiḥ | [36*] Kapi-muni-kal-
ma-asti yatra maitrim rachayati paṁkaja-bhū-kurumṇa-mērti jalita-pada-pa-
d-aṛtthia-sāṛtthā-dātri maṁhu-madan-āmbuja-patra- lokham-eva | [37*] Rudr-āchāryyaś-
bhavate-
smi-kamalē Padma-bhūr-iva | bhāshata purataḥ sthitvā yēna sākati Sarasvatī | [38*]
Yam-ālōkya janāḥ sarvē maṇir-ekō gun-ōtkaraiḥ | grathitō Vēdhas-śty-śvam

1 The numeral 3 is engraved at the left side of the ring-hole to indicate the number of the plate.
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69 sangiraneśa-vipasyāḥ || [39*] Tatōḥ-hūḍa-Dēvān-āchāryyaḥ saujanyāṁ-
70 ta-vārddhiḥ | na kādācāḍ-abhūḍ-yasmād-ahī-janīyō halāhalāḥ || [40*] Ya-
71 smā-n-vadati gōśthiḥśu pratīvāditva-adṛṣṭhu | tat-ta[nī]bhir-abhūḍ-dhanyāḥ Śrī-
72 kaṁthāchāryya-kōvīdāḥ || [41*] Kavitvā-mādhurya-dhurāṇḍharāṇīm-ādyōv-
73 bhavaḍ-yō nava-sāstṛa-bhājūṃ(ājām) | [Sūrāḥ?] surāṅgām-iva chaṇḍra-maulīr-mumm-
74 r-mummānām-iva Kūṁbhayōniḥ || [42*] Tatōḥ-hūḍa-Vidhāha-ārōyō yāḥ Śaṁkara-
75 iṇa Shānmukhaḥ | Bhāsvān-iv-ōday-ādṛ-lād-Āmṛtāṅshur-iv-ōdādē-
76 h || [43*] Vāgīśaratnakara-nāmāḥ yah purē vyadhātta (sanyag-vidl)ī Sarvavatōmukhaḥ (kṣem.)]
77 madhyā-sabham yasya vachō-vijrīmhitab(taṁ) můhr-muhu spuruṣjarī sarvачaś-
78 mukhaṁ(kṣem.) || [44*] Yad-upavana-sūkānām kv-āpi lilā-ratānāṁ pariṣāraṁ-upaśa-
79 tāḥ paṁḍitās-tad-vachōbhīḥ | vidadhati niṣa-sāstrē samśay-ōcchhēdām-ēbhyō madhu-
80 ra-phala-visēśhān-ādārād-arppayantaḥ || [45*] Bhīnavallabha puryyārin yah ka-
81 rōṭī sma sarō-vaṇaṁ(ram) | Śiva-tīrttham-iti khyātām yad-aśamb vasudhā-sudhātīṁ(dham) || [46*] Bhi-
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82 mavallabha-puri-vibhūshaṇam yas-tadāgam-adapādayat kahananāt(ī)n(īm)"
83 viśṛṣṭaṁ hi Śiva-tīrtthā-saṁjñāyā visphurantam-iva punya-saṁ[chayaiḥ] || [47*]
84 Śiva[m] Jñānēsvaran-tattra pratishtāpayati sma yah | vastu-dhyōyām-
85 v-āṭmīyaṁ karttuṁ lōchana-gōcharan(ī)n(īm) || [48*] Agniśṭōṇāṁ karōti sma yah purē Bhī-
86 mavallabhe | yathā vismayam-āyānti paśyantah Sōma-yājīnāḥ || [49*] Apra-
87 ṛṭhitīṁ-yam-avantāḥ-kula-pravēśō yasy-aṁśh-āmala-ma[ḥḥ]jāvaḥ-bhā-
88 gya-pūraṁ | yasmā kiritāṁ prathama-dārśanā évā rājñā karppūra-
89 pūga-phala-bhōga-samarppanāṁ cha || [50*] Adatta yasmā svayam-ātapatra-
90 m-āṇḍōlikāṁ Rūḍra-kumāra-vīrah | paryāya-vṛttīṁ pahāya yasmā
91 tēn-ōchitaṁ nishkā-satāṁ cha dattām(ī)n(īm) || [51*] Dévah Svayambhūr-hī yatra bhaktim karōti-asau
92 Rudra-nripāla-maulīḥ | bhṛmē muḥūrttē purushatī purāṇāṁ dhattē-ivaham yō
93 hriyārāvindō || [52*] Agniḥōtra-ādy-anusūṭānām Narakumāra-pūjanām(ī)n(īm)"
94 Svayambhū-
95 vē nāmas-karmā puyāṇām-avalōkanāṁ(ī)n(īm) || [53*] Parasya mahāsā dhyānām-
dharmmani-

1 The numeral 4 is engraved at the left side of the ring-hole, to indicate the number of the plate.
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95  rmmāṇa-kautukaṃ(kam) | par-ōpakāra-tātparyyaṁ mimāṃśa-dvaya-kauśalām(lam) || [54*] 
   Vyākhyā-
96  tum-akhilām vidyām-utkarmātha-pa[ri]rahbhaya[m*] | pada-krama-yutēm(tē) Vēdē-
   naipuṇī-
97  yayā-sūkṣyati | [55*] Šaiv-āgamaḥ-svāpi orthogonal γήγονον gnmεhshθη θαμαθνη tαντριθνη mαθη-
98  sv-apī pañcittō yah | yō dharmma-sāstra-parinēṣṭhitα-vāg-gilēsah Kailāṣa-vāsī ma-
99  hasn-yā-śtā-lampatō yah | [56*] Pramēya-charchch-āmṛīta-nāmadēryah karmāṁrītah
100  yēna kṛitaḥ prābhudhaḥ | ratn-śkarālī sūkti-mañi-vrajēnām Sūryāḥ sudh-
101  ś-ānāna-pañkajānāṃ(nām) || [57*] Pramēya-charchch-āmṛītam-adriyante yād-abdh-
   labdhān su-
102  bhiyāḥ sabhācāu | tad-śva labdhyā jāda-buddhayō-pi bhavanty-abhijñā vija-
103  y-ōtasaśvēnū(nām) || [58*] Nichāya sāraśvata-nāmam varīdhāy-udbōdha-mam-
104  th-āchalal-Induśekharaḥ | yach-chhadmanā vikṣēhya Hariṁ yastah-sriyam Pramēya-ch-
105  rekh-āmṛītaḥ-āhariśālīr(d-īhru)vanu(vam) | [59*] Pramēya-charchch-āmṛītam-apibanti
   yam-nirmitath bhūmī-
106  sudh-āsamaṭtvah(tvam) | sarvē śaivaṃśabūm-it-śtma-niṣṭhāni sudhiśvarāḥ sū-
107  kti-sudhā-muchō-pi | [60*] Sa Viddhan-āchāryya-sudhiśa-maulir-labdhvā tatas-tām-
   avan-
108  sūra bhīyāḥ | adatta Vēda-prathimā-śrīyēpēhīyāḥ samasta-sāstr-āgama-tatva(ttvā)vibhīyāḥ || 
   [61*] A-
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109  aya grāmadya simānāḥ | tūrpunā || Śuraya-battum kōdu | āgniśyānānū 
110  Uttarēśvāra-purum [dījapalī kādam ni muyyama-kutṛra gṛha ṭa dakshi-
111  nataḥ || Uttarēśvāra-puram kādami punu-parti muyyami-kutrum gu-
112  rēla garvun | nairṛ ṛtatah | Uttarēśvārapuram Prēkēṭi polamē kōdu
113  paschimataḥ | Uttarēśvārapuram prēkēṭi polamē gṛha ṭa kōdu | ananta-
114  rataḥ || Uttarēśvārapurum prēkēṭi mukrōmala muyyakṛjulam jammī 
115  vāśavyataḥ | pedda-maṇḍupu nadumu | uttarataḥ | mrota chintū-kō-
116  du | iṣāyataḥ | Gaṅgadevi nāmum | Saṅgam tūrpuna 
117  Gaṅgadevi nāmanu | Saṅgam dakshīmānum mēđi-pūṭa | Saṅgam magu-
118  da nūmbi dakshīmam mūntamī rāgānu mēdīgūḍi Kōdu || Ta ete | Kumārasvāmi-
119  sarvākṣara-yaīmaḥ | Mañchena-somayaśmaḥ | Tōmēga-ghata-
120  śēṣmāḥ | K[ē]śava-ghataśāsinaḥ | Yaṁnārāyaṇa-ghataśāsinaḥ || 
121  [A]ppana-ghataśāsinaḥ || Ēṭt Hāritēḥ | Viśvaṇātha-ghataśāsinaḥ ||

1 The numeral 5 indicating the plate’s number, is engraved at the left side of the ring-hole.
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122 Kaunche-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Vāmadedā-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Śrīrāmga-gañataśāsīnā
dh

123 ॥ | Kaunche-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Īṭe Kapti-gōtrāḥ | Kāmanā-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Viśvēśva

124 ra-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Mārē-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Kāmadēva-gañataśāsīnāḥ |

125 Vallabha-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Talyē-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Pōti-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Pampaya

126 sōmayājināḥ | Purāyi-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Annaka-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Īṭe Bhā
dh

127 radvājāḥ | Sūrē-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Śrābhā-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ |

128 Ātrēyau | Rāli Peddi-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Velupala Po

dh

129 ti-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Gautamau | Anantha-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Nu

dh

130 [ta]nha-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Appana-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Kēsava-bhāṭṭopādhīyā
dh

131 yāḥ | Sūrē-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Kāmadēva-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Narasīhā
dh

132 gañataśāsīnāḥ | Dāmōdana-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Rēvana-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Īṭe Kūṇādīnāḥ |

133 [Kh]ūdarpapi-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Sūrē-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Purushottama-gañataśāsīnāḥ |

134 [Īṭe] Vādhulāḥ | Manūchen-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Aj[a]nata-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Kāśy

er
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135 paun | Dēvana-gañataśāsīnāḥ | Śaitha-gōtrāḥ | Sarvvedāva-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Ša

136 rdīlyāḥ | Prati-dvīja-varēbhīyāḥ | Kārti-traya-parīmitām bhuvām | Ita

137 rat-sarvam-Ārādhya-sarvvakratuyājī-Śrīdēva-sōmayājināmēva |

138 Sāmānyō-yaḥ dharmma-sētur-nripaṇāṁ kālē kālē pálanīyō bhavadbhib |

139 sarvvaṁ-śām-bhūvīnaḥ pārthiv-vindras bhūyō bhūyō yāchatē Rāma

dh

140 bhadraḥ | [62*] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yō harēta vasunidadehām(rām) |

141 shaśṭhim varsha-sabārsāpi viśhthāyāṁ jāyāṁ kṛimīḥ | [63*] Sva-dattā[di*]

142 dvi-guṇan punyāṁ para-datt-ānupālanaṁ(nam) | para-datt-āpahāraṇa sva-da

143 ttām nishphalāṁ bhavēt | [64*] Gām-ekāṁ ratnikāṁ-ekāṁ bhūmeś-apy-ekāṁ

144 hanam-narakam-āpnōti yāvad-a bhūta-samplavaṁ | [65*] Satrūn-āpi kriyō dharmmaṁ

145 pālaniyāḥ prayatntah | [66*] Satrūr-āva hi satriyā-syād-dharmmaṁ satrūr-naха ka

146 svaḥchit | [66*] Mad-varṣaṣajāḥ para-mahipati-varṣaṣajā vā pāpād-apēta-manasō bhī
dh

147 vi bhūṁpālāḥ | tī pālayantu manaḥ dharmmaṁ-imaṁ saṃgrahāḥ tēśaḥ mayā

148 virachit-ōṇjali-rāha mūrdhni | [67*] Pmar-āpi Viḍḍhan-ācaḥyṛṇa | Dāchapallī |

[Pulluparau cha trīṇ]—

1 Para-dattām is redundant.
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149 śat-khāri-mitaṁ kahētraṁ labdhvā tad-ubhayam-Uttarēsapaṁ-ūtarbhāvyavā viprēbhvō dattaṁ [ ]

150 gōṛē [ ] Viddhana-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ s-ārdha-dvi-bhāginaḥ | Rudrē-sōmayājinaḥ | Prōḷē-gathaśāsināḥ |

151 Anū-gathaśāsināḥ | Purushōttama-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyasa-sōmayājinaḥ | Prōḷē-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Kēśa-

152 va-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ dvi-bhāginaḥ | Vennē [pāḍ-ārddha-bhāginaḥ] | Vallabha-sōmayājinaḥ ardhā-bhā-

153 ginaḥ | Kaṁchi-ga[t]a*śūsināḥ | Narasiṁha-gathaśāsināḥ | Śrīrāma-gathaśāsināḥ | Torvi-Yagnē(jnē)

154 śvar[h*] pāḍ-ārddha-bhāgi | Yegnē(Yajñē) śvara-gaṛ‘ ardha-bhāgi | Mārē-gha ardha-bhāgi | Janē-gha pāḍ-ōnābhāgi |

155 Ėṭē Hārītāḥ | Dēvarē-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Reśman-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Kūchā-

156 na-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Maṁčhi-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Narasiṁha-gathaśāsināḥ [ ]

157 Purāyi-ga ardha-bhāgi | Śomēśvara-ga ardha-bhāgi | Kāmadēva-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ [ ]

158 Erōpōta-ga arddha | Narasiṁha-ga s-ārddha | Viśvēśvara-gathaśāsināḥ | Jannē-

159 ghaśāsināḥ[h*] ardhā

160 pāḍhyāyāḥ | Guṇḍimāṁchi-gathaśāsināḥ | Dōṛē-gathaśāsināḥ | Bhūmeśvara-gathaśāsināḥ

161 Viśvauśha-gathaśāsināḥ = Tūtā-sōmayājinaḥ = Cēnē-gathaśāsināḥ = Yajñēśvar-opā-

162 dhīyāyāḥ | Nāgadeśa-gathaśāsināḥ | Kanakāvelli Narasiṁha-ga | Narasiṁha-gathaśāsināḥ | Vīra-

163 na-gathaśāsināḥ arddhi | Karūndarpa-ga arddhi | Prōḷē-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ arddhi | Mānē-ga arddhi |
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164 [Ko]ṛena-ga arddhi | Ėṭē Kūṁdınāḥ | Gōṛaya-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ | Gautamāḥ | Erōpōta-gathaśāsināḥ |

165 Gargāḥ | Kēśava-bhāṭṭopādhīyāyāḥ pāḍ-ōna-bhāginaḥ | Somanāthā-ga arddhi | Jannē-

166 gha arddhi | Ėṭē

166 Ėṭēyāyāḥ | Amē-gathaśāsināḥ | Kāman-ga pāḍau | Ŭtau Lōhitaḥ | Kāman-gathaśāsināḥ | Mārē-gha-

167 taśāsinā | Ŭtau Kauśikāu | Prōḷē-gathaśāsināḥ | Kēśava-jayā | arddhi | Nārāyaṇa gha arddhi | Ėṭē Kuśya-

168 pāṭi | Uttarēśvara-gathaśāsināḥ | Śaṭha-gōṭraḥ | Jannē-sōmayājinaḥ | Vādhūlaḥ | Śrīrāma gha arddhi = Pu-

1 The abbreviation gha stands for ghaśāsinā.
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169 rushottama-gha arddhi | Vishnuvridhī | Kaundarppa-gha pādi | Bhāradvājāḥ | Peddi-gha pād-ōna-bhāgī [ ] Gōma-

170 Bharat-ōrdhī | Sarvadēva-gha arddhī | Ārādhya-putrō Virabhadr-ōrdhī | Śrīmad-ārādhya-Viddha-

171 na-bhaṭṭopādhyāy-Āgniśṭōma-Atyagniśṭōma-Sarvvatōmukha-Vājapēya-Bṛhaspati- 

172 sava-Mahāvrat-Āptōryyāma-Chāturmmāśa-yājinō-grahāra-pradātārō dvādaśa-

173 bhāginaḥ [ ] Ėtē trayāḥ Kai-gōtrāḥ | Märkanidēsvara-mahādēvaḥ paṃcha-bhāgī [ Uttarēśvara-ma-

174 hādēvaḥ tri-bhāgī | Janārddana-vallabhaḥ dvi-bhāgī | Atra cha grāmē kumbhakāra-tailakār-ādy-ashṭāda-

175 śa-jātibhir-yad-dēyaḥ yach-ch-ānyan-navyakaḥ taḥ-sarvam-ēbhya ēva viprēbhyaō 

dattām || Bahubhi-

176 r=vasudhā dattā bahubhi=ch-ānupālitā | yasya yasya yadā bhūmis-tasya tasya tadā phalath (lam) [ ] 68*] 

177 Svasti Śrī-Devyai namaḥ [ ]*

---

1 Better read paṇcā.
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No. 17—A FRAGMENTARY SARADA INSCRIPTION FROM HUND

K. V. RAMANU, MYSORE

(Received on 25.7.1967)

The text of the subjoined inscription has been prepared from three inked estampages and one good photoprint lying in the Office of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore. I am thankful to the Chief Epigraphist for permitting me to edit this inscription, engraved on a marble stone originally from Hund, Attock District, West Pakistan and later deposited in the Archaeological Section of the Indian Museum at Calcutta, in the pages of this journal.

The discovery of this inscription has a long history of more than thirteen decades. The existence of blocks of marble containing inscriptions traced in characters quite unknown to its inhabitants at Hund were first noticed by M. Court who, however, had no opportunity to study the inscriptions. Subsequently, when Captain Burns visited Hund he prepared facsimilies of four inscriptions and made them available to James Prinsep. As early as in 1837 the latter published the defective lithograph and his defective readings in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. VI, pp. 877-79 and plate XLVI. According to Captain Burns the marble slab on which the inscription under study is engraved had found its way into a Moslem building, though originally in a Hindu temple. A follower of the faithful made a mortar of it and hence the round hole, in which the barbarian pounded his massaala, (culinary condiment). The estampages and the photoprint were secured in 1924 by the then Government Epigraphist for India from the Indian Museum, Calcutta.

The inscription, consisting of 13 lines, is fragmentary, only the left half being now available. Even here, the round hole, explained away by Captain Burns, has resulted in the loss of quite a number of letters in lines 7-11. Since most of the text is in metrical composition, it is possible to conclude that the missing right part of the slab is almost exactly of the same size as the available left half. The writing in the available half of the slab covers an area roughly 30×30 cm. Even at the time of the engraving of the record the left top corner of the slab appears to have been cut off as a result of which the first four lines are shorter than the rest by about 13.5 cm. The central hole, referred to above, is about 12 cm in diameter.

The record is written in Sarada characters and Sanskrit language and is to be assigned, on grounds of palaeography, to the second half of the 8th century A.D. While the text is mostly in verse, almost the whole of line 12 and the whole of line 13 are in prose. The inscription is closely related, in date and in contents, to the inscription of Mahārajā Kāmēśvarādēvi, also from Hund. The latter records the construction of a dēvakula and its consecration in 774-75 A.D. and mentions

2 Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 877.
3 Above, Vol. XXII, pp 96-98 and plate.
4 The inscription bears two dates, one in śaṃvat 168 and the other in śaṃvat 169. These aśvatsa are obviously of the Harsha era and 774-75 A.D. as the period to which the inscription belongs is fully borne out by its palaeography.
navakarmapati Jayantaraja, pamphakula Pillaka and kayatha Bhogika. It will be seen below that these three persons figure in our inscription as well.

The following palaeographical features, most of which are also noticed in the inscription of Kamesvaridevi, may be pointed out here. The only difference between the writing of p and v is that in the case of the former the top is open. There is no difference in the writing of v and dh. The imposition of the sign for superscript resha into the main letter and under the top horizontal bar in cases of t (see kirti in line 2) and v (see bhaktir-csyra in line 4, Parvati in line 6, etc.) and the peculiar way of writing rya resulting in the incomplete formation of the main letter v are worthy of note. The sign for medial i is of two types, one curving upwards (eg. sri in line 5) and the other running down to the right (cf. ki in line 2). Final m occurs once in rashtram (line 10). Barring vairijitā in line 4, in no other case is the consonant immediately following r doubled. As regards orthography, the replacement of y by j in samajj (line 7) for samayē is interesting.

It is not possible to make out the purport of the inscription from the available part of the text. All that can be made out from the extant portion is that part of the text was in the form of a prasasti of king (nripati) Anantadeva, to whose reign the inscription in all probability belonged, and that another part of the text was devoted to the praise of two or more individuals belonging to the Kallatha-varna which had risen to the status (padavi) of arînati. Details of date, if given, are lost with the missing half of the slab, but as has been pointed out above, the present epigraph is closely related to the inscription of Kamesvaridevi and, therefore, is not far removed from 774-75 A.D.

As for its contents, the inscription commences with the auspicious word Svasti followed by a symbol (resembling that of the numerical figure for 1) and two daevas. Then follows the first verse (line 1), only the first half of which is now extant. It seems to be in praise of a deity who is hailed as the true master who bestows on the mortals the bliss either of kingship (bhupatiteash) or of renunciation (yatiteash). Lines 2-3 contain verse 2 of which only the first and third quarters are available in full. This verse refers to the kirti (i.e. either fame or the insizational prasasti) as having spread in all the quarters even as the earth is encircled by the oceans and halts the subject of its praise as dexterous in the task of incessantly striking down the growing and formidable might of the Turtshkas. Since the subject of the very next verse is king Anantadeva, it is very likely that the above eulogy is bestowed upon none other than him. Verse 3 (lines 4-5), of which only the second quarter is now wanting, praises king (nripati) Anantadeva as sincere in his devotion to elders (guru-jana), as taking (on) innumerable (occasions) the advice of br-hmanas, as delighting in the company of (men of) knowledge and as sparing no efforts in the task of protecting his subjects (prajā-pilana). The first three quarters (line 5) of verse 4 are lost and the last quarter (line 6) mentions the consort of Pavrati (i.e. Lord Siva). Verse 5 (line 6), of which only the first two quarters are now extant, refers to the (members of the) Kallatha family (vaṃśa) as having risen to the status (padavi) of arînati. The round hole, resulting from massāla grinding, comes into play at this stage and even the available parts of verses 6-12 (lines 7-11) are badly mutilated. Verse 6 (lines 6-7) contains a reference to Sindhurāya in the context of a military expedition (vidhānasamayē). Verse 7 (line 7) appears to refer to a certain Nāgu who is described as a lord or as a powerful man (vidhūḥ). No sense could be made out of the available letters of verses 8 (lines 7-8), 9 (lines 8-9), 10 (lines 9-10) and 11 (lines 10-11). It is, however, likely that these verses are in praise of three individuals (cf. devīgy-pr) in line 11 and the plural number used in the second half of verse 11). Verse 12 (lines 11-12) seems to contain a reference to Anantadeva.
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As stated above, lines 12-13 give the names of three individuals who also figure in the inscription of queen Kāmēśvariđēvi. The latter record helps us in restoring the names of either these three individuals or their fathers wherever they are found incomplete because of the fragmentary nature of our inscription. The three individuals and the names of their fathers are, (1) navakarmapati Jayantarāja, son of Upēndra; (2) the brāhmaṇa Pillaka, son of Virāditya and (3) Kāyastha Bhūgika, son of Vihēnda. In the inscription of Kāmēśvariđēvi, Jayantarāja is described as hailing from Avanti (Avantikā) and as a sūryadevi; Pillaka is referred to as a paśchakula and kāyastha Bhūgika as a sūryadevi. Though the text of the queen’s inscription is clumsily worded, it seems to associate the three persons mentioned above with the construction and consecration of a temple (dēvakula) caused to be built by Kāmēśvariđēvi. It is not unlikely that they had a similar role to play in the inscription under study but, as had been stated earlier, all details in this regard are lost.

Our inscription is of great importance for the early history of the North Western region of the Indian sub-continent. The history of the early Muslim invasions of India, which begins in 643 A.D. with a naval expedition against the port of Debal at the mouth of the Indus, is too well known and needs no detailed repetition here. Unlike in the 12th century A.D. when the Muslim invaders took by storm a Hindu India torn asunder by mutual rivalries and strifes and thus heralded long centuries of Islamic domination almost all over the sub-continent, the early Muslims of the 7th and the following centuries, of Arab and Turkish extraction, found the then Hindu rulers to be more than their match on the battle-fields. A series of battles fought in Sind and elsewhere in the North-West found the Muslims more often on the losing side and from the middle of the 8th century onwards, far from being a successful force of invasion and territorial annexation, they barely succeeded in clinging to parts of Sind and Multan, where the Arab Muslims held a precarious sway, and Gandhāra which had come under the Turkish Muslims. It is known from epigraphical sources that Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa I and his successors as well as Avanijanāśraya Pulakēśin of the Chālukya house of Navasārīkā and Lalitāditya, the ruler of Kashmir, were among the Hindu rulers who claimed to have successfully withstood and repulsed Muslim invasions of about the period of our inscription. The record under study adds one more ruler to this list, viz. Anantadēva-nripati. It is not known if he fought the Turushka forces on his own or was in league with other Hindu rulers of North India. The situation of Hund, the findspot of the inscription, shows that his kingdom bordered on the Muslim holdings of Gandhāra and Multan. The epithet udriktu-Turuska-pushkala-bala-kshēp-aika-dakṣhātan (line 3) does not appear to refer to any particular triumph of Anantadēva over the Muslims but, on the other hand, appears to imply that he had to strive continuously and on a number of occasions to defeat their designs of expanding their territorial possessions at his expense. D. R. Bhandarkar has opined elsewhere that the term Turushka denoted, in the times of our inscription, Muslims of Turkish extraction who had secured a foothold in Gandhāra and that the Arab Muslims of Sind and Multan were known as the Yavanas. This would mean that the Turushka adversaries of Anantadēva were the Turkish Shāhiyas of Gandhāra. But, as pointed out above, our inscription mentions Sindhurājya in the context of a military expedition. It is, therefore, likely that the Yavana-Turushka distinction was not watertight and that the Turushkas whom Anantadēva had to keep in check were the Muslims not only of Gandhāra but of Multan as well.

1 For an account of the trials and tribulations of the early Muslim invaders in India, See ABORI, Vol. X, pp. 25-44; see also The Classical Age, pp. 166-75.
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The relationship, if any, between Anantadéva-nripatí and Mahárají Kámeśvaridévi is not known beyond doubt. The mention of Jayantárajá, Pillaka and Bhégika in both the inscriptions shows that the records belong to one generation and also to one and the same reign. Could it be that they were husband and wife. A study of other inscriptions from Hund may perhaps throw welcome light on this problem.¹

We learn from the inscription of Kámeśvaridévi that navakarmapati Jayantárajá and kágastha Bhégika were súryadevijas. This probably means that they belonged to a professional community other than, and of course, lower than that of the bráhmanas. This is supported by the reference to Pillaka as a bráhma. The designation navakarmapati applied to Jayantárajá implies that he was an architect by profession.

The reference to the Kallathá-vaná as having secured śrímáti-padávi (verse 5; line 6) is interesting. The reference does not appear to be to the community of śrímála-bráhmanas but to the religious profession of a florist (Sanskrit málin-florist) providing flower garlands to the deity. When viewed with reference to the mention of Lord Siva (Párvatí-sakthá) in the previous verse (verse 4; line 6), it appears that the members of the Kallathá family were, by profession, florists who provided garlands to a temple of Siva.

The only geographical name occurring in our inscription is Sindhú-rajá, which, as stated above, denotes the Muslim kingdom spread over the Sind and Multan regions.

TEXT²

[Metres : Verses 1, 4-8, 11-12 Anushthuh ; verses 2-3, 9 Sárdháv ákriñita ; verse 10 Upañáti.]

1 SiddhamŚvastí Bhúpatitvám yatitvám véd yó dádáti niñé[sva]………………… [1*]

2 Kýrtis-távad-iyáth dig-anta-ñihitá na-ambhódi(dhi) viśvám ya[tha] — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — [2*]

3 táh [1*] yén-ôdrikta-Turushká-pushká-balab-khág-áika-dákh-atmaná hā — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — [2*]

4 Bhaktir-vyája-vivarjijáta guru-jáné viprēshva-asamkhyañ va[cha][h*] — vriddhi — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — [3*]

5 sa vivó(bó)dha-Sahgraha-ratir-yatmaigail-praya-pálané ' hanta śrímad-Anantadéva nripatíh-kíndhi [3*] kính na lókó tvā — [3*] ………………………………………

¹ The facsimile of another inscription from Hund, given by James Princep in JASI., Vol. VI, Plate XLVII shows that that inscription also belongs to the same period as the inscriptions of Anantadéva and Kámeśvaridévi. But the eye copy is defective and defies any meaningful reading.

² From inked estampages and a photoprint.

³ Express by symbol.

⁴ Princep reads : yair arádhibhir-éjatá. Only important defects in Princep’s transcripts are listed below.

⁵ Princep reads this line as follows : Kýrtimaparjíñah viñgamé bhúyantaraíh rdayáh.

⁶ Princep reads : pala (trášá) karéśvarmaná.

⁷ Princep reads : Uktisháruśivardhátha.

⁸ This dánda is redundant.

Princep reads : Rájá yah avíndthá.

²² Princep reads : hánarásavarnanéva nripaladhá.
6 dēvō-yaṁ Pārvatī-sakahā || [4*] Yathā-yaṁ Kallaṁhō vamsah(śaḥ) ārīmāli-padarīm

gatah [5*] ta ............................................[[6*] ....................

7 vidhānā-samajēyō" Sindhurājya ... laḥ || [6*] Taṣy-āstī- ti vibhu[r]-Nāgu4........... [7*]
........................ [[7*] ........................

8 svatyā mitir-vinā | ārīma ......... vō-py=atra as[mya]mah || [8*] Saujanyā ○ ○ — ○ —
No. 18—SAKREPAÑA PLATES OF PALLAVA SIMHAVARMAN, YEAR 41

(2 Plates)

G. S. GAI, MYSORE

(Received on 17.1.1969)

The copper-plates containing the inscription edited below were sent to me for examination by Shri T. T. Sharma, Editor of the Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore, in April 1967. He informed me that the plates were unearthed while digging a pit in a village near Sakrepana, the headquarters of the Taluk of the same name in the Chikmagalur District of the Mysore State. I am thankful to Shri Sharma for sending me the plates and enabling me to edit the same in this Journal.

The set consists of five plates, each plate measuring 20 cm by 6.3 cm. Near the left margin of each plate, there is a ring-hole, about 1 cm in diameter, through which passes a copper-ring the ends of which were soldered into the bottom of a circular seal. But nearly half of the seal and a portion of the ring were broken away and lost when the plates were received by me. Hence it is not possible to make out the figure on the surface of the seal which, however, might have been a couchant bull as found in the case of similar seals. The first and the last plates are engraved on the inner sides only while the remaining plates contain writing on both the sides. Each of the written sides contains 4 lines and so there are 32 lines in all. The reverse sides of the second, third and fourth plates respectively contain the numerical figures 2, 3 and 4, on the left margin, indicating the number of the plate in the set. The engraving is bold and neat and the preservation of the writing is excellent, though the rims of the plates are not raised to protect this writing. The five plates together weigh 1420 g while the existing portion of the ring and seal weighs 165 g.

The characters of the grant resemble those of similar charters of what is commonly known as the Pallavas of the Sanskrit charters. They may be compared with those of the Māṅgalūr,1 Pikira2 and Vēsanta3 grants. The Vēsanta grant, however, contains more ornate flourishes on the strokes of the letters and the box-heads (talekatṭu) are more pronounced while the letters of the Māṅgalūr grant are more cursive than those of our grant. They, however, bear closer affinity to the characters of the Pikira grant. Initial a is found in line 4, initial ā in line 27 and initial ē in line 21. The akṣara t is represented with a loop while s is without any loop. Final consonants are written a little below the line in smaller characters: cf. final m in lines 16, 17, 21-22, 25-26 and 30, final t in lines 2 and 28. The sign for upadhmana is found in line 26. As regards orthography, it may be observed that the consonant following r is doubled but rightly not so in the case of sh in line 26. The class-nasal is used instead of anusvāra. The language is

2 Above, Vol. VIII, pp. 150 ff. and plates.
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Sanskrit and the composition is prose except the four benedictory and imprecatory verses. The text is free from errors and the sandhi rules have been observed in most of the cases.

The charter was issued from the victorious camp at Maudgali-taṣa by the Pallava king Simhāvarman who is described as the son of Skandavarman II, the grandson of Viravarman and the great-grandson of Skandavarman I. And its object is to register the gift, made by Simhāvarman, of all the royal enjoyments in the Valvī or Valvili-agrahāra in Sēndraka-rājya to the brahmīns of the same agrahāra. The charter is dated in the king's regnal year 41, tenth day of the dark fortnight of the month of Praushṭhapada (Bhādrapada).

The record is important in many respects. It belongs to that group of charters which is commonly known to the scholars as the Sanskrit charters of the early Pallavas and is an important addition to the series in as much as it throws welcome light on what is called 'the Simhāvarman problem'.

As stated above, the present charter mentions four generations of kings, viz. Skandavarman I, his son Viravarman, his son Skandavarman II and his son Simhāvarman, the ruling king. The first three kings, Skandavarman I—Viravarman—Skandavarman II, are mentioned in the same order in the Ōṅgōḍu-I grant which also gives the name of Kumāravishṇu, the father of Skandavarman I. This grant is, therefore, the earliest of the series known so far. The names of Skandavarman I—Viravarman—Skandavarman II appear in the Uruvupalli and Neṇuṅgarāya grants of Skandavarman II's son Yuvamāhārāja Vīṣṇupōpa but the charters are dated in the 11th and 12th regnal years respectively, of a certain Mahārāja Simhāvarman. The four grants, viz. Ōṅgōḍu-II, Pīkira, Mūṅgaḷur and Vīḷavaṭṭi mention only two names of our charter, viz. Viravarman and his son Skandavarman II, while the charters themselves belong to the reign of king Simhāvarman, mentioned as the son of Yuvamāhārāja Vīṣṇupōpa and the grandson of Skandavarman II. The Vēsanta grant, however, gives the names of the last three kings of our charter viz. Viravarman—Skandavarman II—Simhāvarman in the same order. Thus while the Ōṅgōḍu-I grant mentions the first three kings of our charter, the Vēsanta grant gives the names of the last three kings. But the present record is the only charter discovered so far which gives the names of the four generations starting with Skandavarman I and ending with Simhāvarman, son of Skandavarman II. In other words, though the ruling kings of the present charter and of the Vēsanta grant are identical, the present charter commences the genealogy of the family with an earlier member, viz. Skandavarman I, father and predecessor of Viravarman. It may also be pointed out that while the Vēsanta grant gives the genealogy for only three generations, the remaining grants of the series mention four generations of kings. The genealogies of the different charters discussed here may be shown in the tabulated form for better understanding.

1 Amongst the charters of this class, the following may be listed here: (1) Ōṅgōḍu-I grant of Skandavarman II (above, Vol. XV, pp. 246 ff.); (2) Vēsanta grant of Simhāvarman, son of Skandavarman II (C. P. Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh Govt. Museum, Vol. I (1962), ed. by N. Ramesan, pp. 211 ff.); (3) Uruvupalli grant of Yuvamāhārāja Vīṣṇupōpa issued in the 11th regnal year of Mahārāja Simhāvarman (Ind. Ant., Vol. V, pp. 50 ff.); (4) Neṇuṅgarāya grant of Yuvamāhārāja Vīṣṇupōpa issued in the 12th regnal year of Mahārāja Simhāvarman (Bhārati, Vol. 18 (1941), pp. 263 ff.; A. R. Ep., 1941-42, No. A 2); (5) Ōṅgōḍu-II grant of Simhāvarman, son of Yuvamāhārāja Vīṣṇupōpa (above, Vol. XV, pp. 252 ff.); (6) Pīkira grant of the same king as in No. 5 (above, Vol. VIII, pp. 139 ff.); (7) Mūṅgaḷur grant of the same king as in No. 5 (Ind. Ant., Vol. V, pp. 154 ff.); (8) Vīḷavaṭṭi grant of the same king as in No. 5 (above, Vol. XXIV, pp. 296 ff.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ōmgōju-I</td>
<td>Sakrepatna plates</td>
<td>Vēsanta</td>
<td>Uruvupalli</td>
<td>Neḍuṅgarāya</td>
<td>Ōmgōju-II</td>
<td>Pikira</td>
<td>Māṅgalūr</td>
<td>Vilivati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kumāra-vishṇu

Skanda-vārman I

Viravarman

Skanda-vārman II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman I</td>
<td>Skandavarman I</td>
<td>Skandavarman I</td>
<td>Vīra-vārman</td>
<td>Vīra-vārman</td>
<td>Vīra-vārman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman II</td>
<td>Skandavarman II</td>
<td>Skandavarman II</td>
<td>Yuvamahārāja Vishnugōpa</td>
<td>Yuvamahārāja Vishnugōpa</td>
<td>Yuvamahārāja Vishnugōpa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siṭhāvārman I</td>
<td>Siṭhāvārman I</td>
<td>Siṭhāvārman I</td>
<td>Siṭhāvārman I</td>
<td>Siṭhāvārman I</td>
<td>Siṭhāvārman I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11th regnal year of Mahārāja Siṭhāvārman I)</td>
<td>(12th regnal year of Mahārāja Siṭhāvārman I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above discussion, it may be seen that the Siṣhāvarman mentioned in the Uruvupalli and Neḍuṅgarāya grants may be identified with the Siṣhāvarman of the Vēsanta grant and the present charter under whom Vishṇugōpa was a Yuvarāja or Yuvamahārāja. This would support the surmise made long ago by Fleet that Siṣhāvarman mentioned in the Uruvupalli grant might have been an elder brother of Yuvamahārāja Vishṇugōpa. Thus we get four charters of this Siṣhāvarman, son of Skandavarman II and elder brother of Yuvamahārāja Vishṇugōpa. These are (1) the Uruvupalli grant, dated in his 11th regnal year, (2) Neḍuṅgarāya grant dated in his 12th regnal year, (3) the Vēsanta grant dated in his 19th regnal year and (4) the present Sakrepatṭa plates dated in his 41st regnal year. While the Uruvupalli grant furnishes the earliest known regnal year, viz. 11 for this king, the present Sakrepatṭa plates give the latest regnal year, viz. 41 for him, showing thereby that he ruled for at least 41 years. In the absence of any charter issued in the regnal year of Yuvamahārāja Vishṇugōpa, it appears that he predeceased his elder brother who does not seem to have had any male issue to succeed him and hence the throne passed on to the son of Yuvamahārāja Vishṇugōpa who was also named Siṣhāvarman. For this Siṣhāvarman II, son of Vishṇugōpa, there are four charters, viz. the Ōṅgōḍu-II, Pikira, Māṅgalūr and Viḷavatṭi grants. The Pallava genealogy of the Sānksrit charters of this period would, therefore, stand as follows:

```
Kumā ishnu
|        |
Skandavarman I
|        |
Viravarman
|        |
Skandavarman II
|        |
Siṣhāvarman I
|        |
Yuvamahārāja Vishṇugōpa
|        |
Siṣhāvarman II
```

As already pointed out by the earlier writers, some of the epithets and expressions applied to the earlier members of the family are found associated with other members of the family in the different grants. Thus the epithets sva-bāhu-bal-udṛjjitaḥ, etc. applied in our grant to Skandavarman I are attached to the first king Viravarman in the Pikira grant. Similarly the epithets abhyuucchita-sakti-siddhi-sampannasya, etc. applied to Viravarman in the present grant are associated with his son Skandavarman II in the other grant. It has been pointed out that the ornate eulogy of the several kings as found in the Uruvupalli, Pikira, and Ōṅgōḍu-II grants was for the first time composed and brought into use in the reign of Yuvamahārāja Vishṇugōpa. But in view of the fact that the draft containing this eulogy is found in the present charter of

---

2 Ibid.
3 The draft of the Māṅgalūr grant is different.
Sînhavarmman, the elder brother of Yuvamahârâja Vishungopa and also in view of the fact that both the Uruvupalli and Neâunga rays grants which have a common draft are shown to belong to Sînhavarmman I, it may be stated that the said draft was composed during the reign of this Sînhavarmman I, although the epithets applied to Sînhavarmman in our grant are found applied to Vishungopa in the other two grants. The draft of the Vêsa grant is, however, different from the other grants of the series.

As noted above, the present charter was issued from Maudgali-taâja, i.e. the bank of the river Maudgali and the king made some gifts in Valvili or Valvilli-agrahâra situated in Sêndraka-râjya. It is difficult to identify the river Maudgali as well as the place Valvili or Valvilli. But Sêndraka-râjya, which is mentioned as Sêndraka-vishaya in some of the Kadamba grants, comprised the area round about modern Shimoga District in Mysore State. It is, therefore, clear that Sînhavarmman was ruling over this area at the time of the grant.

Since all the charters of the series mentioned above, except the one under study, came from the Nellore-Guntur region of Andhra Pradesh, some scholars have suggested that the Pallavas of the Sanskrit charters belong to a northern branch of the main Pallavas of Kânchi i.e. Connjeavaram near Madras. The reasons for this suggestion was that none of these Sanskrit charters was issued from Kânchi, except the Udayândiram plates of Nandivarman and the Chendalur plates of Kumâravishnu II, which were considered to be later grants and which were issued from Kânchipuram.

So the Vêsa grant of Sînhavarmman is the first charter of this series to have been issued from Kânchipuram from which evidence the editor of the grant, Shri N. Ramesan, thought that the Pallava kings of the Sanskrit charters ruled from Kânchi or Connjeavaram. As against this, Shri T. G. Aravamuthan has suggested that we have to look for another place Kânchi or Kânchipuram in the Nellore-Guntur region wherefrom not only all the Sanskrit charters of this series but also some of the earlier Prakrit charters of the Pallavas are either issued or register gifts of villages or lands in that area. It is indeed difficult to set aside this suggestion of Shri Aravamuthan unless and until we get positive evidence to prove that the place Kânchi or Kânchipuram mentioned in the Prakrit and Sanskrit charters of the Pallavas referred only to modern Kânchipuram or Connjeavaram near Madras which was undoubtedly the capital of the Pallavas of the Simhavishnu line. But the discovery of the present Sakrepatâja plates may throw some light on this problem. As stated above, this record shows that the Pallava king Sînhavarmman held sway over Sêndraka-râjya i.e. parts of Shimoga District in Mysore State. This area is nearer to Kânchipuram near Madras than to any other Kânchipuram in the Nellore-Guntur region. Hence it is likely that the Kânchipuram from where the Vêsa grant of this ruler was issued might be the famous Kânchi or Connjeavaram.

Only three geographical localities are mentioned in the charter under study, viz. Maudgali river, Sêndraka-râjya and Valvili or Valvilli-agrahâra in it and these have been already discussed above.

---

1 Sirca, Suc. Sat., p. 24a.
2 Ibid., p. 169.
5 While the Udayândiram grant refers to a gift of the village Kânchivyâli, the Chendalur grant register the gift of the village Chendalura in Karârâka-râhâra (loc. Nellore-Guntur region).
6 Arch. Soc. of South India (Silver Jubilee Vol.), 1902, pp. 71, 83-84.
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First Plate

1 Siddham* [*] Jitam-bhagavatā |° Svasti [*] Vijaya-skandhāvārāṇa-Maudgalya-taṭa.
2 vāsakāt parama-brahmaṇyasya svā-bāhu-bal-ārjīt-ārjītra-kāhātra-tapō-
3 nidārāvividhi-vihiṃśa-sarvva-marṣyādasya sthititi-sthitasya-āmīrāta-tmanō
4 mahārāja-ārī-Skandavarmanmaṇaḥ prapautraḥ abhyuchchita-

Second Plate, First Side

5 sakti-siddhi-samvanṇasvaya pratā-pāṇatā-rāja-maṇḍalasya vasudhā-
6 tal-āka-virāṣya mahārāja-ārī-Viravarmanmaṇaḥ pautraḥ deva-dvija-
7 guru-vṛiddha-āpaḥcāvinī vivṛiddha-virāṣya-anēka-gō-hiranya-bhū-
8 my-ādi-pradānāhi pravṛiddha-dharmma-saṃchayasya praja-pālana-dakshasya

Second Plate, Second Side

9 loka-pālaṇām-paṇchamasya loka-pālasya satyātmanō mahā-
10 rāja-ārī-Skandavarmanmaṇaḥ pautraḥ bhagavat-bhakti-sambhāvita-sarvva-
11 kalyāṇaḥ praja-saṁhāraṇa-paripāla-ōdyoga-sata-ta-
12 satra-vraja-dikṣitaḥ nāka-samara-saḥsa-āvasamardda-labdha-viṣa-

Third Plate, First Side

13 ya-yāṣaḥ-prakāṣaḥ kalyoga-dēṣa-āvasanā-dharmma-ōddharaṇa-nitya-
14 sannaddhaḥ rājarshi-guṇa-sarvva-sandōha-vijigishur-ddharmma-vijigishuh
15 bhagavat-pād-ānuddhyātō bappa-bhāṭṭāraka-pāda-bhaktah parama-
16 bhagavatō Bhāradvājaḥ sva-vikram-ākrānt-ānya-nṛpi-ārī-nilayānām

Third Plate, Second Side

17 yathāvad-āhrit-ānēk-āvamōdhānām Pallavanāḥ-dharmma-mahārā-
18 ja-ārī-Simhavarmanmaṇa Sēndraka-rājyē sarvva-naiyōgika-vallabhā-
19 n=vaishayikāḥ=ch=aṅnapayati atr-āṣmāhīs=Sēndraka-rājyē
20 Valvilīy-agrahār nairantaryyōga bhujyamāṇo upari-bhāgama(m-ā)diṅ=kṛtvā

Footnotes:
1 From the impressions prepared in my office.
2 Expressed by a symbol.
3 This punctuation mark is denoted by a horizontal stroke.
4 The small stroke at the bottom which gives an impression that this letter ḫa may also be read as a appears to be due to a scratch on the plate.
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Seal

(From Photograph)
Fourth Plate, First Side

21 yad-yad-rāja-bhūgyan-tat-sarvva-tad-agrahārikēbhya ēva brāhmaṇēbhyaḥ dattam
22 sarvva-parihārās-cēt-ānujñātāḥ tad-avagyama tathā sarvvair-vvartitavyam
23 parihiṛtavyaḥ-ch-ēti [*] Bhūmi-dānat=paran=ān[=]na bhūtan-na bhavishyati [*]
24 tasy-āiva haraṇāḥ-pāpan-na bhūtan-na bhavishyati || 1 ||

Fourth Plate, Second Side

25 Svā-dattām=para-dattāṁ vā yō harēta vasundharām [*] gavāḥ śata-
26 sahasrasya hantuḥ-pibati kilbisham || 2 || Varsha-kōṭṭī-
27 sahasribhi swarggē kriṣṭadi bhūmidhā [*] ākṣhēptā ch-ānu-
28 mantā cha tāvanti narakē vasēt || 3 || Bahubhir-vvasuḍhā dattā

Fifth Plate

29 bahubhīś-ch-ānupālitā [*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmis-tasya tasya
30 tadā phalam || 4 || Pravarddhana-vijaya-rāja-saṅvatsarē
31 ēka-chatvāriṁśe Praushṭhapaṇa-māsa-bahula-pakṣa-daśamyā-
32 n-dattā paṭṭikā [*] svayam-a[n]jñā(jaḥ)ptam-īti [*] gō-brāhmaṇarḥ(ṇa)n-naṃdatu ||
No. 19—RAIBAG INSCRIPTION OF VIKRAMADITYA VI

(I Plate)

K. V. Ramesh, Mysore

(Received on 23-3-1967)

The hero-stone inscription, edited here with the kind permission of the Government Epigraphist for India, Mysore, was found engraved on a stone-slab lying near the library building at Raibag, Raibag Mahal, Belgaum District, Mysore State. The text of the inscription is engraved in four sections. Of these, sections I and II are engraved on the top and middle panels while sections III and IV are written on the upper half of the right and lower half of the left panels respectively. No details are available regarding the sculptures which the inscribed slab must have contained.

There are in all 11 lines of writing, sections I to III consisting of 3 lines each and the last section consisting of 2 lines. The inscription is written in Kannada language and characters which are regular for the period viz., the second half of the 11th century A.D. The palaeographical and orthographical features of the record do not call for any special remarks.

While reporting this inscription in the Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy for the year 1955-56, in which it is registered as No. 155 of Appendix B, the cyclic year has been read as Śukla and its contents are given as follows: "States that Chandarasa, commander of the elephant force, attacked the elephant corps of Bhōja, and having killed several renowned warriors, died on the battle field in the course of an encounter between Mahāmaṇḍalēvara Kāṇāraasa and Maṇḍalika Bhōja. The encounter is said to have taken place when Tribhuvanamalla (i.e. Vikramaditya VI) was returning from his expedition having made Udayin the lord of the quarters, burnt the city of Dhārā and planted a pillar of victory." It will be seen from what follows that the above remarks are not only inaccurate but cover only a portion of the text of the inscription.

The record is of unique importance because it throws welcome light on the history of two imperial powers of the period, the Chāluksyas of Kalyāṇa and the Paramāras of Malwa.

The inscription is dated in the Chāluksya-Vikrama era (without the regnal and the cyclic years1 being specified), Chaitra ba, 7, Sunday. As will be shown below, this date will have to be referred to year I of the era, and that it regularly corresponds to 1077 A.D., March 19, Sunday.

The record commences with the auspicious word svasti and the details of date, mentioned above, are given in line I. Lines 2-3 state that Tribhuvanamalla (i.e. Vikramaditya VI) was returning from an expedition in which he had scattered (the forces of) Udayin, had burnt (the city of) Dhārā and had erected a pillar of victory. Line 4, which appears to have contained one or more epithets of Koṅgājarasa,2 is badly mutilated. Lines 5-9 state that (when Vikramaditya VI was thus returning from his victorious expedition) a fierce encounter ensued between (the forces of) Mahāmaṇḍalēvara Koṅgājarasa and Maṇḍalika Bhōja in which Chauḍarasa, the commander (nāyaka) of (the army of) the former successfully

1 The inscription does not mention the cyclic year Śukla as stated in A. R. Ep., 1955-56, No. B, 155.
2 This name has been read as Kāṇāraasa in the Annual Report mentioned above.
repelled the (onslaught of) the elephant corps of the latter and also accounted for the lives of a number of enemy generals before he himself fell on the battle-field having spread his fame in all the quarters.

The purport of lines 9 to 11 is difficult to understand because line 11 is illegible inspite of the letters being well preserved. These lines seem to record the construction of some structure, probably a memorial to Chalukya, by Kausitikarasa who is given the epithets of bhūvänamākhakāra and Padmaladēviya-nija-gāmīdhāvarana.

As has been pointed out above, Vikramāditya VI is stated, in the record, to be on his way back from his victorious expedition in the course of which he had defeated Udayin, burnt Dharā and erected a pillar of victory. The reference to Dharā helps us to conclude that the expedition was directed against the Paramāra kingdom which had that city as its capital. Udayin, therefore, should be identified with the Paramāra ruler Udayāditya whose known dates range from V. S. 1116 (1059 A.D.) to V. S. 1143 (1086 A.D.) and who is named in the Bālāva inscription of Bhōjava-rman of Eastern Bengal as Udayin.

The military career of Vikramāditya VI, both before and after his accession to the throne in 1076 A.D., is fairly clearly known from his numerous records and from Bihāna’s Vikramānakhadevacharita. According to Bihāna, Vikramāditya VI was once involved in the military conquest of Malwa when he was only a prince and when his father Sōmēvara I was still on the throne. The first half of the verse in question reads:

Sa Mālav-śādahā saraṇaḥ pravishatma-

akaṇṭakā śthāpita sme rājyē ||

This has been taken elsewhere to mean that Sōmēvara I “sent his son, Vikramāditya, a distinguished general, with a large army to help the cause of Jayasūrīha” on whom had fallen the onerous task of regaining the Paramāra throne which had fallen into the hands of Kalachurī Karṇa and Chalukya Bāhu consequent on the death of the famous Bhōja I. “After a hard contest the Chalukya prince succeeded in routing Karṇa and Bāhu and drove them from the land of Malwa, establishing Jayasūrīha once more on his throne”.* It is obvious from this that Prince Vikramāditya had invaded the kingdom of Malwa not as the enemy of the Paramāras but as their saviour. This invasion must have taken place a little before V. S. 1112 (1059 A.D.) to which year the earliest known record of Paramāra Jayasūrīha I belongs.

Vikramāditya VI’s second intrusion into the Malwa territory, this time as an enemy of the Paramāras, had lihterito been inferred from the epithet Dharā-nāthā-māhā-hāya-jvarā-karam as found applied to him in an inscription from Belagāmi, Shikarpur Taluk, Shimoga District, dated in December, 1077 A.D. On the basis of this record, it has been rightly suggested that Vikramāditya VI ‘seems to have led a successful campaign against Malwa, shortly after his accession to the

---

1 Bhandarkar’s List, No. 134.
2 Ibid., No. 150.
4 Vikramānakhadevacharita, Chapter III, verse 67.
5 D. C. Ganguly; History of the Paramāra dynasty, p. 124.
6 Ibid.
7 Bhandarkar’s List, No. 132.
9 D. C. Ganguly, op. cit., p. 137.
throne during the reign of Paramāra Udayāditya. As will be seen below direct evidence in support of this conclusion is provided by the inscription being edited here.

The Beḷaṇagāmi inscription, mentioned above, helps us in solving the problem of dating this inscription. We have stated above that the Chāluṅkya forces, led by Prince Vikramāditya VI, had entered the kingdom of Malwa sometime before 1055 A.D. to assist Paramāra Jayシンītha I. There is no evidence to show that subsequent to 1055 A.D. and until 1069 A.D., in which year Chāluṅkya Sōmēśvara I ended his reign, he undertook any expedition against the Paramāras in which his son Vikramāditya VI could have been associated so as to merit the above mentioned epithet. Between 1069 and 1076 A.D., when Sōmēśvara II was having his troubled reign, Vikramāditya VI was busy in the southern parts of the Chāluṅkya empire warring off attempts on his life by his suspicious brother and trying to consolidate his political standing. During those years he could not have turned his attention towards Malwa. On the other hand, it was Sōmēśvara II who, with Chāluṅkya Karṇa for his ally, invaded Malwa and laid waste the city of Dharā killing the Paramāra ruler Jayシンītha I in battle. It is, therefore, obvious that the epithet Dhārānātha-mahā-bhaya-śara-karanā must have been earned by Vikramāditya VI after his accession in 1076 A.D. but before December, 1077 A.D.

It is in this context that the date of the present inscription is to be examined. This portion (line 1) reads Chāluṅkya-Vikrama-varshada Chaitra ba. 7, Ādi-vāra-aditdu. We may venture to suggest that since the first year of this era was still current at the time of the engraving of the record, the writer did not deem it necessary to mention it. If this is accepted, the given details of date regularly correspond to Sunday, March 19, 1077 A.D., implying thereby that Vikramāditya was on this date, already on his way back from his victorious expedition.

As has been pointed out above, Mahāmandalēśvara Kōnigajärasa is described in our inscription as bhāva-anikakāra (i.e. the 'chief servant' or 'leading hero' in the court or camp of his brother-in-law) and Padmaladeśiga-nījadagnadavāra (i.e. the protector of the fragrance or chastity of Padmaladevi). It may be concluded from this that Kōnigajärasa was the brother of Padmaladevi and that, since the epithet bhāva-anikakāra suggests that Kōnigajärasa's brother-in-law was also his master, she was the queen of Vikramāditya VI himself. Thus, this inscription reveals the name of a hitherto unknown queen of the famous Chāluṅkya emperor. As regards Kōnigajärasa, he may be identified with his namesake who, in an undated inscription from Chachāḍi, Parasagad Taluk, Belgaum District, palaeographically assignable to the 11th-12th century, is men-

---

1 By ignoring the Beḷaṇagāmi inscription and not being aware of the Raibag inscription, Nilakanta Sastrī suggests (The Early History of the Deccan, Parts I-VI, p. 361) that Udayāditya, who followed Jayシンītha in about 1060 A.D., must have made friends with Vikramāditya VI.


3 Fleet refers (Bom. Gaz., Vol. I, part II, p. 452) to an inscription from Yajavalliti, Dharwar District, belonging to 1088-90 A.D. as stating that Vikramāditya VI crossed the Narmada and conquered kings on the other side of the river. This has been taken elsewhere (Jainism in South India, p. 244) to mean that Vikramāditya had once again invaded the Malwa kingdom towards the close of Udayāditya's reign i.e. in about 1087 A.D. (cf. also above, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 181-82). It may be pointed out that the Yajavalliti epigraph does not help us in dating Vikramāditya's invasion and that it makes no specific reference to his triumph over Paramāra Udayāditya. At any rate, the possibility of the Raibag inscription referring to a possible Chāluṅkya invasion of the Paramāra kingdom around 1087 A.D. does not arise because the details of date are irregular not only for that year but for the previous years too. Evidence of another invasion of Malwa by Vikramāditya VI is found in a record from Nimbergi, belonging to 1098 A.D. (See Jainism in South India, pp. 243 ff.). This invasion was carried out in all probability, about the year 1097 A.D. and, since Udayāditya was no longer alive on that date, the episode does not concern us here.
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Scale: One-Third
tioned, along with Mahāmāṇḍalaścara Kannakairarasas as the joint donor of the village Nāgarapāla to the god Bhūgāvara.

It may be safely supposed that Koṅgajarasa had accompanied Vikramāditya VI in his northern expedition. The battle against Mahāśāla Bhōja appears to have been fought in the vicinity of Raibāg, the findspot of the inscription. Raibāg lies exactly to the south of Dhārā and they are separated by a distance of about 400 miles as the crow flies. From north southwards, the two places are separated by the Narmadā, Tāpti, Gōḍāvari, Bhimā and Kṛishṇa rivers.

Bhōja, whose forces the returning Chālukya army encountered, may be identified with his namesake of the Karāḍ Silāhāra family. This identification is supported by an inscription1 of Vikramāditya VI from Malghaṇ, Sindgi Taluk, Bijapur District. Dated in 1100 A.D., this epigraph states that the emperor was camping on the banks of the Bhimārathī while he was proceeding west against Bhōja. The Raibāg and the Malghaṇ inscriptions show that Bhōja was a constant opponent of Vikramāditya VI. It is likely that the expedition, recorded in the Malghaṇ epigraph, failed to bring about the subjugation of Bhōja for, Āchuni II, the Sinda feudatory of Vikramāditya VI, whose known date falls in 1122 A.D., is credited with the repulsion of Bhōja and his forces when they invaded the Chālukya territories.2 The present inscription provides us with the earliest as yet known date for Bhōja. Though Bhōja fought a battle against the Chālukya army when the latter was on its way back from the Malwa country, it is unlikely that he was a subordinate of Paramāra Udāyāditya. It may be that on its return march the imperial army had to pass through the Silāhāra territory and that Bhōja, unwilling to let the encroaching forces go unchallenged, gave them battle.

The only place-name occurring in the inscription is Dhārā, the famous capital city of the Paramāras. It is the same as modern Dhār in Madhya Pradesh.

TEXT

Section I

1 Svasti [*] Śrīmacha-Chāḷḷu(lu)kyā-Vikrama-varshada Chaitra ba 7 Ādīvārad-arhdu

2 āṛīma[t]-Tribhuvanamalladēvam Udayiyam disāpaṭṭan mā-

3 dī Dhāreyam suṭṭu jaya-stambhamām nilisi magulī bappalli [sukha]

Section II

4 [tā] . y[u] . . . . . . . . [āṛīma]-4

5 n-Mahāmāṇḍalaśvā(śva)raṇ Koṅgga[ja]-

6 rasaru[rh] Maṇḍalika Bhō-

Section III

7 janu[rh] [kā]duvalli Koṅgajarasana nāyakaḥ Chaundarasa Bhōjan-āneya-ha(pā)lli-mogama [kī]

1 SII, Vol. XX, No. 64.
3 From impression.
4 The upper halves of letters in this line are broken off.
8 [ṭṭi] palaruṭḥ pesara nāyakaraṁ kōmuś salagi divya-kl[r]ṭṭī amṁ diugu-danti-camṭhbara var-vaydisi
9 sura-lōka prāptam-udā || Bhāvan-amkakāra Padd[m]aladēviya nija-gaṭhā-vaṭaṇa

Section IV

11 za . . . uru eji . . . ko . . .
NO. 20—GORANTLA PLATES OF DEVARAYA I, SAKA 1339

(2 Plates)

S. SUBRAMONIA IYER, MYSORE

(Received on 4. 3. 1967)

The copper plate charter edited here with the kind permission of the Government Epigraphist for India was found with Sri K.A. Nagaraja Rao in Góranṭla, Hindupur Taluk, Anantapur District, Andhra Pradesh.¹ They were photographed and the photographs were sent to the Government Epigraphist for India for examination by the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, South-Eastern Circle, Hyderabad. The set consists of three plates. The first and third plates contain writing only on one side while the second plate is written on both the sides. The photographs reveal that the rims of the sides of the plates were raised for the sake of preservation of letters. Each plate has a hole at the left in a projection from the main plate for the ring to pass through. Excepting the third plate, the other plates are not numbered. Since the plates are not available for examination, details regarding the weight of the plates, the ring and the seal are not known. The writing is in a good state of preservation.

The characters employed in these plates are Nandi-Nāgarī with the exception of the sign manual Śri-Rāmachandrā at the end which is in Kannāda characters. The languages used are Sanskrit and Kannāda. Sanskrit has been employed for the benedictory verses in the beginning, the genealogical account of the dynasty, the grant portion and the imprecatory verses at the end. Kannāda has been used for delineating the boundaries of the donated village. As an orthographical feature, it can be pointed out that instead of ṛ, ṛṣ is used in ruṣeṣvāṛelī in line 28. The way in which au in uṇanaṭya in line 4 has been written is also noteworthy. This letter is written by omitting the serif of a. The form of ḫ in bīṣya (lines 43, 44, 46, 48, etc.) is slightly different from that of l. The first loop tends to touch the central prong. This seems to suggest the origin of the use of ḫ in Nāgarī. The fact that it occurs in the Kannāda passage seems to indicate that the well known preference for ḫ to l in Kannāda has influenced this form.

The record belongs to the reign of Dēvaraya I and it registers the grant of a village Karikhikūṇa by Bukkāmba, the queen of prince Rāmachandrā. It is dated Śaka 1339 given in numerals as well as in the chronogram suau-guṇāṭara-ṝama-chāṇḍra. The other details of the date are Jaya, Tapasya (Phālguna), śu. 5 (ishu), Thursday (Jīva). The Śaka and the cyclic years do not, however, correspond. For, the cyclic year Jaya fell only in Śaka 1336. If Śaka 1336 is the intended year, then the details of date would regularly correspond to 1415 A.D., February 14.²

The inscription begins with a salutation to Gaṇeṣa. The first two verses are in praise of the primeval boar (Prathama-pātri) and Gaṇeṣa respectively. Verse 3 describes the race of Yadu. Verse 4 mentions Bukkāraṣa. Verses 5 and 6 refer to his successor Harihara (II). Verse 7 speaks of Dēvaraya (I) and his prowess is described in verse 8. Verse 9 introduces his son Rāmachandrā. His valour and munificence are praised in verses 10 and 11. Verse 12 states that Rāmachandrā set out with an army on the orders of his father Dēvaraya, to conquer the

¹ This has been registered as A.R. Ep., 1966-67, No. A. 1.
² If the cyclic year Jaya is ignored and Śaka 1339 is accepted as the date of the charter, then it will correspond to 1418 A.D., February 11.
Andhra country (Andhradēvakam-abhisēkāyay). Verse 13 describes his arrival in a forest near Śrīśailam (Śrībhūdar-ūbhyauryam) which is sanctified by the breeze wafting over the river Krishnā (Pāñchagangā). From verse 14 it is known that the prince had a hill-shrine (Śrīgiri-mandira) constructed for Śiva and that he asked his queen Bukkāmbā to grant a village for establishing an agrahāra.

Verse 15 gives the lineage of queen Bukkāmbā. She is stated to belong to the race of the moon (Saśikukulkopāralakshmi) and as being the daughter of Mallājī and Adbhalarāja, who, in turn, is described as the son of Rudradēva. In verse 16 is given the date of the grant and the name of the donated village. It is stated therein that the grant was made in the temple of Mallikārjuna and that the queen gave away the village Kamīchikunṣa as sarvaśamānya with the consent of her lord to the donees and that the village was renamed Bukkā pura after the donatrix. Besides, the right of the donees to the eight-fold enjoyment of the donated village was also granted. Verses 17-25 give the names, gōtras, etc., of the donees. Verse 26 is a benediction on the donated village. Verse 27 refers to the prose-passage that follows wherein the boundaries of the donated village are given in ḍeśa-bhāsī i.e. Kannada. In the Kannada portion it is stated that the boundaries were marked by Pokkaras and the guṇadā-prajayga of the four villages (names not given) surrounding the grant village. In the end, four imprecatory verses are given. The grant is attested by the sign-manual Śrī-Rāmachandri of the prince.

The importance of the record consists in the details it furnishes about prince Rāmachandra and his queen Bukkāmbā. Prince Rāmachandra is already known from a copper-plate grant* where he is described as the Yuvārāja of Udayādī i.e. Udayagiri and as having defeated the Turushka king. It is stated therein that the prince confirmed the grant of a village formerly given by his father Dēvarāya (I) to Chennabhaṭṭa in Śaka 1312 Pramōda (1390 A.D.), when the latter was the viceroy of Udayādī under Harihara (II). The date of confirmation is, however, not given. It seems quite probable that the date of the grant is later than 1306 A.D., the year of accession of Dēvarāya (I).† Rāmachandra is further mentioned in three other inscriptions.‡ We can identify Rāmachandra of the grant under review with his namesake mentioned in the inscriptions referred to above.

The accession of Dēvarāya (I), it is known, marked the beginning of a long and protracted struggle between the Vijayanagara and Kōṇḍavīdu kingdoms. Peda Kōmaṭi Vēma attacked Udayagiri-rājya and captured a large portion of it while Dēvarāya had gone to the capital probably to take part in the struggle for succession after the death of Harihara (II) in 1404 A.D. After his return, Dēvarāya (I) retaliated and not only got back his lost territory, but also made some incursions into the enemy’s territory. But he could not long keep the territory under his sway.¶

Meanwhile, the alliance between Firuz Shah, the Bahmani Sultan and Peda Kōmaṭi Vēma became strong. Kāṭaya Vēma, the chief of Rājamahāndravraram, hemmed in by enemies like the Rēḍḍi chiefs of Kōṇḍavīdu, the Telugu Chōḍjas and the Veḷāmas, sought the aid of Dēvarāya I. He visited Abībalam and seems to have met Dēvarāya I.° Dēvarāya offered aid readily and accordingly sent his troops. War broke out between Kāṭaya Vēma and Annadēva, the Telugu

---

† Contra. Further Sources of the Vijayanagara History, Vol. I, p. 64.
‡ Nell. Ins., Part II, p. 637; A.R.Ep., 1916-17, No. 125; A.R.Ep., 1931-32, No. 317. An inscription at Haje Agrahāra in Kankanhalli Taluk in Bangalore District in Mysore State (Ep. Oasis, Vol. IX, No. 2) refers to one Rāmachandra, the son of Harihara. This prince is not known to us and it is very difficult to identify him with the prince Rāmachandra of our record.
¶ History of the Rēḍḍi Kingdom, p. 191.
° A.R. Ep., 1915, No. 94.
Chōda in about 1415 A.D., and the two were aided respectively by Dēvarāya (I) and Firuz. The details of the struggle and its sequel are described in the Rajahmundry Museum Plates of Anna-
dēva. It is possible to identify, in the light of the facts stated above, the expedition which according to the plates under study Rāmachaṇḍra undertook with the one sent by Dēvarāya (I) to aid Kāṭaya Vema. But it seems more likely that the expedition was sent with the object of subduing the recalcitrant Rājājī chiefs of Koṇḍavikut, who were known to have intruded into the Udayagiri region of the Vijayanagara empire. In this connection, it is noteworthy that Prince Rāmachaṇḍra was the viceroy of Udayagiri under his father Dēvarāya I as late as 1416 A.D.

It is not possible to identify Aubhala Rāja and Rudradēva who are stated to be respectively the father and grand-father of Būkkaṇābā. Till now, Būkkaṇābā as the queen of Rāmachaṇḍra was not known to us and the present record reveals her identity for the first time. The claim is made in our record that Rāmachaṇḍra caused a shrine for Śiva to be constructed at Śrīśālam. This shrine does not appear to be the same as the original shrine at that place, for there are several inscriptions at Śrīśālam which testify to the existence of that temple even prior to the time of Rāmachaṇḍra.  

As stated above, the donees were seven brāhmaṇas. The particulars regarding their Vēdas, Gōtras, etc., are given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of the donee</th>
<th>Father's name</th>
<th>Gōtra</th>
<th>Vēda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Haribhaṭṭa</td>
<td>Nāgapārya</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>Rīk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dēvaṇṇaṭṭha</td>
<td>Chauḍappāḍhyāpaka</td>
<td>Vasishṭha</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Māhiṣibhaṭṭa</td>
<td>Mādhanvabhāṭṭa</td>
<td>Kāśyapa</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gōpināṭha</td>
<td>Narasiṇha</td>
<td>Harita</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dēpaṇṭārādhya</td>
<td>Lakkaṇṭārādhya</td>
<td>Bhāradrāja</td>
<td>Yajus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gāṅgādharabhāṭṭa</td>
<td>Appaṇṇasutva</td>
<td>Agastya</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vishnuḥbhaṭṭa</td>
<td>Appuṇgalārādhya</td>
<td>Āṭrāya</td>
<td>Sāman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is stated that Dēvarāya, the writer of the grant was also given a share of the grant village by the seven donees themselves. I am unable to identify the gift village Kaṃchikunja.

TEXT

[Metres : Verses 1, 2, 5, 18-25, 27-30 Anushṭubh ; verse 3 Āryā ; verses 8, 11, 13 Upaṭṭati ; verses 4, 7, 9, 15, 16, 26 Vasantaritaka ; verse 12 Rāthādhāta ; verses 6, 10, 14 Śārdula-vikrita ; verses 17, 31 Śālin].

First Plate

1 || Śri-Gaṇapatayē namaḥ || Āvyād-vaḥ prathamah pōtrī sarasām-udvahan-Raśām-(sam) | pri-

---

2 A.R. Ep., 1914-15, Nos. 11, 20, 27, 36, etc.
3 From photographs.
2 y-āmga-saṅga-saṃjñāta-sāndra-svēda-odayām-iva || [1*] Vaṃḍāru-sura-kōṭira-maṇi-
raṇjita-pādu-

3 kāṭakaṃ | Vighnaṃdriśvaṇaṃ vaṃḍe vadaṇe vāraṇaṃ maḥaḥ || [2*] Āsti svastimad-
udayē muktaṃnaya-sūti-saṃ-

4 bhavān-mahīmā | annuṣṭati-mūla-nilayeṇaṃ suṇḍa-mahītō Yādīr-Vaṅgīr-vaṇi-śaḥ || [3*] 
Taṣmin-ajāyata

5 niṣ-āyata-kaḍgaḍhārā-śampaṭa-pāṭita-parah-ṣata-vairī-rājāḥ | vaiṣṇe viśeśhaka-vilās-
karin-ya-

6 sēbhiḥ saṃsēbhīta-kaḥṣiti-talaḥ kila Bukkaraṇaḥ || [4*] Āśīd-āśīma-bhūmiśa-mauli-
mālita-śaṣe-

7 nāh | rājā Hariharē nāma Yādu-varūs-ābdhi-chaṭādramāḥ || [5*] Ājya-prājya-haṅ-
saṃśiddha-hutabhag-dhūm-ōḍga-

8 māvīrhanva-bhūyaḥ saurabh-sādhv-saudha-valabhī-vāṭayān-ōdbhāṣini | tat-tan-
maṇṭrā-nīmaṇṭrit-āgata-surā-

9 hamūpurvīkā-pūrītē yēn-ākārīṣhēt-ārīthinē dvīja-ṛipē satrāya Śakr-ādayāḥ || [6*] Āśīd-
āśīma-mahi-

10 mā hima-dhāma-kīrtīē bhīṣṭaḥṛīyāḥ Hariharēn-nripatēs-tanūjaḥ | uddāmā-vāma-
narapāla-kul-ābdhi-

11 mānūṭha-Mamūṭhacchha-ṣṭhira-bhūjo bhuvī Dēvarāyaḥ || [7*] Yasya pratāp-ānal-
jiṛībhahāmaṇa-jvalā-jatūlē bhuvā-

12 aṅutarāle | paraṇaḥ tāmaḥ pṛapad-anupravēṣaḥ pṛatayarthi-prathvīpati-hṛid-darishu || [8*] Taṃsād-udanvata iv-śūndur-

13 dāraṁmaićcā-jaṭaḥ kal-āvali-vilāsā-nilāsā-bhūmiḥ | jaivāṭrikō jayati kīrtti-kalāpa-
chaṇḍaḥcchha-chaṇḍā-ṣṭapa-chchhu-

14 rīta-dīn-nippa-Rāmaraṇḍhraḥ || [9*] Pratyayarthe-khisīhā-nāyaka-praṇayinī-sēk-āgni-
saṁdhukṣaṇē prōṇaṭhā-

15 na-parākrama-prakaraṇe sēnā-prayaṇe-bhītāḥ | janīghāl-ātula-vāji-rāję-vadana-prayatnī-
phōṇ-āval-

16 jaṅbāl-āḍhvanē yasya pāda-pataṇaḥ nṛpiṇāḥ vanaḥ v-āvanaḥ(nam) || [10*] Vadānva-
śaṃ-ṛthi-janāya mā dāl-lakṣhmī-iva kRaṃ-

17 m-eva mām-apā-īti | bhīy-ēva yat-kīrtir-adaravēgā vigāhatē-hūtām kakubhām-
anāmāthaṇaḥ(tam) || [11*] Dēvarāya-jaga-

18 tipatēḥ pituḥ śaśanāt-sa nirṛgāt-sa-saiṇikāḥ | Andhra-dēsam-abhīsēṇayam-mahiṃ-
andhayam-bala-ra-

19 jōbhīr-udgataḥ || [12*] Sa pratāp-apachechhrida-pravēṣaḥ Śrībīhīḍhar-ābhīrṇāṃ-
araṇyaḍēśaṃ(śaṃ) | Pāṭālaṇāgū-

---

* The latter half of the verse is also found in verse 5 of the same record. Ibid.
* This verse is found with slight variations in the same record as verse 7. Ibid.
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21 bhūmīṁ Śivaṁ sāṁtaṁ sādaram-ārirādhayishayā prāṭishṭhipat-sa priyāṁ(yām) ||
Bukkaṁbh-ēti bhūvi śrutāṁ Śāśiку.

22 lākūpāra-lakshmiṁ navāṁ tām-ājijāśpad-agrahāra-vidhayē grāma-pradānaṁ tathā || [14°]
Sā Rudradēva-tanay-Aubha-

23 larājanputrī Bukkāṁbikā tadanu bhartṛi-krit-ābhyanujñā | Mallāi-garbha-kalaś-ārṇava-
rājalakshmiṁ śrī-Rā-

24 māchandra-nṛpamānaśa-rājahastī || [15°] Śākē gatē nava-guṇottara-rāma-chandaṁ 1339 Jīvē Jayābda-śa-Tapasya-si-

25 tēshu-tithyāṁ(thyām) || śrī-Mallākārjuna-grīhēdita Karṇēhikumṭa-grāmale śah-
āśhta-vidha-bhūga-hiraṁ(ra)nyām-dhārath(ram) || [16°] Māṇyē ṛasmi-

26 nālata-Bukkaṁpurī-ākhyē s-āśht-āśvaryē s-āśhta-bhūgo-grahāō | sapt-āsan-yē saṁpradā-
naṁ dhvijendrās-tēṣhāṁ vakṣhē gōtra-sākh-ābhī-

27 dū-ādīna || [17°] Jámadagyo Vatsa-gōjōrī Nāgāpāya-tanābhuvaḥ | Haribhūṭṭo-grim-
āmnayē-dhūṭī s-āṅgā-pada-kramē || [18°] Vaiśeṣṭha-

28 gōtraṁ dūmāṁśa-Chaudappā-ādhyāpak-ātmajāḥ | nāmā Dēvaṇṇa-bhūṭṭo-yam-agr-
āmnayāvid-agrauṭhū || [19°] Kāyana-āṅvayu ṛugvēt-

29 da-vēdi Mādhaṇavbhāṭṭaṁjāḥ Māṇyī-bhāṭṭaḥ śrāutra-hautra-vidyā-sāṁrājya-dikṣitaṁ || [20°]
Harit-āṅvaya-mṛūrdhyanu-Nārāyaṇu-su-

ekaṇ-ārdhya-nauḥdānaṁ [1°]

31 Yajurvid-Dēpāṅgārdhyā yājō-ādhvaṁya-vaḥ-ṭhurya-ṭhīḥ || [22°] Agastyo-gōtraṇā-
Paṁṇa-sutvā-sūnur-udāra-ṭhīḥ | śrī-Gaṅgā-

32 dhara-bhāṭṭ-ākhyō yāhu(ja)hō yajāsārathīḥ || [23°] Ātrēyō-ṇuγaḷ-arādhya-tanayō vinaya-
ākaraḥ | Vishnu-bhāṭṭaḥ Śaṁa-

33 sākhābhūya-saṁsaḷaṁ-kausalcate ||[24°] Asthamas-tu kritāt trāṁśaḥ sv-āṁśābhūyo-
maḥmaṇaṁ | yajvanē Dēvarāyā-

ejukkāṁbhāyā suvīhitaḥ

35 sukṛit-aika-sētuḥ | Bukkāṁpurākhyā uditōdita-bhāgya-bhūmīr-āchārya-bhānu jayatād-
āya-

36 m-agrahāraḥ || [26°] Kalpitā kalpitai-raṅkaiḥ aṁśa tad-dēśa-bhāṣhayā | Likhyatā-
th-agnahāre-smi-

* Read श्री. *
n-sarvamāṇṣa prasiddhayē || [27*] Bukkāpuravadā Kamchikūṭe-Mēnādu adhikāri Pōtārasanuṃ chaugrāmaṇa gavuṇḍu-prage-

gau(lu)m māḍāda śimē vivara | Ilāṇayav-ārabhyav-āgi mettameliya kaṇuveyali kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryaru Bu-

dāpuramda sīmēy-emdu barada kariya-kallu [ * ] Allīnḍaṃ tenkazu kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryaranu barada beṇpachi-

gau(lu) [ * ] Allīnḍaṃ tenkazu kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada beṇpachi-gallu [ * ] Allīnḍaṃ tenkazu kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sū-

ryaranu barada bili(lī)ya-kallu [ * ] Allīnḍaṃ tenkazu kaṭhāri Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada niṭuda bili(lī)ya-ka-
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tenkau kaṭhāri Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada habbu(go)ya biliya-kallu [ * ] Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān uṇika chikku kaṇuve[ya]*]lu

kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada biliya-kallu [ * ] Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān uṇika chikkavu eradu kaṇuve mūra(ra)nuya e-
dala kaṇuve[ya]*]lu kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada kariya-kallu [ * ] Ā halla(la)niṇuḍa tenkau kaṭhāri Chaṇḍra-

Sūryarau barada biliya-kallu [ * ] Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān uṇika kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada biliya-kallu [ * ]

Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān uṇika eradu kaṇuve [ * ] Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān uṇika tenkau kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada kariya-kallu [ * ]

Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān uṇika uṇinge Āgṇayadali halla(la)dojage kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau Bukkāpurasi-
mā-emdu barada kariya-arre(ṛe)gallu [ * ] Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān pāduva Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada kariya-kallu [ * ] Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)-
daṇ pāduva kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada biliya-guṇḍu [ * ] Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān pāduva kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sū-

ryaru barada halla(la)dola(la)gaṇa dāriyūduṇa pāduvaṇa arre(ṛe)gallu [ * ] Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān pāduva halla(la) [ * ] A-
darriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān pāduva kaṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada bili(lī)ya arre(ṛe)gallu [ * ] Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān pāduva kaṭhāri

Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada biliya guṇḍu [ * ] Adarriṁ(ṛiṃ)dān pāduva kaṭhāri Chaṇḍra-Sūryarau barada bili(lī)ya-kallu [ * ] A-
(From Photograph)
54 darri(ri)udam pajuva a urinhe Nairityadalu daririnidam madalu kaathahi-Chandrap-Suryaru Bukkaphu-

55 ra-simaa oshdu barada biliya-gundo [ * ] Adarrir(rii)dam baadaga kaathahi Chandrap-Suryaru barada kariya-gu-

56 ju [ * ] Adarrir(rii)dam baadaga kaathahi-Chandrap-Suryaru barada bili(li)ya-guindo [ * ] Adarrir(rii)dam baadaga kaathahi-Chandrap-

57 Suryaru barada bili(li)ya-kallu [ * ] Adarrir(rii)dam baadaga kaathahi-Chandrap-Suryaru barada bili(li)ya are(re)-

58 gap(ga)llu [ * ] Adarrir(rii)dam baadaga dairiya naajue ere olafe kaathahi-Chandrap-[Su] ryaru baradu naBitte kariya-

59 guindo [ * ] Adarrir(rii)dam baadaga kariya-guindo [ * ] Adarrir(rii)dam baadaga kaathahi Chandrap-Sa(Su)ryaru barada kaathahi-Chan-

60 dra-Suryaru barada1 kariya-guindo [ * ] Adarrir(rii)dam baadaga dairiyanidam madanaya bi-

61 kaathahi-Chandrap-Suryaru barada biliya battha-guindo [ * ] Adarrir(rii)dam baadaga dairiyanidam madanaya bi-

62 li(li)ya-guindo [ * ] Adarrir(rii)dam kaathahi-Chandrap-Suryaru barada kariya-guindo [ * * ] Adarrir(rii)dam baadaga a

Third Plate*

63 urinhe vayavyadali kaathahi-Chandrap-Suryaru Bukkaphura-simaa oshdu barada-bili(li)ya huju-kallu |

64 Adarri(ri)ju(dam) mu(ud)da[na*] kaathahi Chandrap-Suryaru barada biliya-guindo [ * ] Adarri(ri)ju(dam) mu(ud)da[na*] kaathahi-Chandrap-S-

65 ryaru barada bili(li)ya-guindo [ * ] Adarri(ri)ju(dam) mu(ud)da[na*] kaathahi Chandrap-Suryaru barada bili(li)ya-guindo [ * ] Ada-

66 riim(rii)dau(u) mu(mud)da[na*] kaathahi-Chandrap-Suryaru barada biliya guindo [ * ] Adar-

67 ru barada bili(li)ya-guindo [ * ] Adarri(rii)jau mu(ud)da[na*] kaathahi-Chandrap-Suryaru barada biliya arre(re)-kallu [ * * ]

68 Adarri(rii)dau mu(ud)da[na*] kaathahi-Chandrap-Suryaru barada bili(li)ya-monekallu | Adarri(rii)dau mu(ud)da[na*] kaathahi-Chan-

69 dra-Su(ud)ryaru barada biliya-guindo [ * ] Adarri(rii)damu mu(ud)da[na*] kaathahi-Chandrap-

*Suryaru barada biliya arre(re)-

1 The expression Kaathahi Chandrap-Suryaru barada is here redundant.
2 This plate has been numbered as 3.
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70  kallu [*] Adarśīṁ(ṛīṁ)daṁ mūḍa[nā*] kaṭṭhāri-Chaṇḍra-Sūryaru barada bilī(lī)ya arre(re)-kallu || Āk=aīva bhaginī lō-

71  kē sarvāśām-api bhūbhujāṅ(jāṁ) | Na bhūgya na kara-grāhyā vipra-dattā vasundhara || [28*] Dāna-pālanayōr-madhya

72  dānāc=chhrēyō-nupālanam(nam) | Dānāc=svargam-svāpuṇtī pālanād=achyutaṁ padam-(dam) || [29*] Svā-dattāṁ paradattāṁ vā yō da(ḥa)rō-

73  ta vasundharaṁ(rām) | saṣṭīṁ varsha-sahasrāṇi vieḥḥāyāṁ jyā(jā)yato krimiḥ || [30*] Sāmānyō-yathā dharma-sētār-nṛṣipāṇāṁ

74  kāle kāle pālanīō bhavadbhīḥ | Sarvān-ētāṁ-bhāvinaḥ pārthiv-ēndrāṁ bhūyō bhūyō yāchatē Rāmachaṇḍraḥ ||[31*]

75  Śrī-Rāmachaṇḍra¹

¹ In Kannaţa characters.
No. 21—SENA GALAGUDURU INSCRIPTION OF BANA CHANDIYANNA

(K Plate)

K. V. RAMESH, MYSORE

(Received on 15. 4. 1968)

The subjoined inscription, edited here with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist, Mysore, was found engraved on a stone slab set up in front of the Pârvati shrine near the Śiva temple at Senagalaguduru, Tadpatri Taluk, Anantapur District, Andhra Pradesh.

The record consists of 23 lines of writing, the letters being carelessly engraved and of unequal size. Though the preservation of the letters is, for the most part, satisfactory, the written surface of the slab is worn out in the middle as a result of which a few letters in lines 8-13 have become somewhat obliterated.

The inscription is engraved in Telugu-Kannada characters of the 8th-9th century A.D. and the language employed is Kannada which is not free from errors. It has been noticed in the Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy for 1950-51 as No. 197 of Appendix B. A comparative study of the palaeography of this inscription on the one hand and the inscriptions of the Râshtrakûtas of the second half of the eighth and the first half of the ninth centuries on the other shows that it may be roughly assigned to about 800 A.D.

The formation of the letter ba in line 6, as against the forms of the same letter in lines 8, 16, 17 and 19, is interesting from the palaeographical point of view. The following orthographical peculiarities deserve to be noticed:—kulôthava for kulôdṭhava is more or less a persistent mistake in Bâna inscriptions; in śrimatchandiyanna for śrimach-Chandiyanna (line 12), sandhi has not been observed; the change of y to jy in sūrya, for sūrya, (line 14), the writing of the word phala as phala (lines 22-23) and the metathetic form riśiṇyā for hiriyṇa (line 23) are noteworthy; in some cases the palatal ś is found wrongly employed in place of the dental sibilant. Class nasals are found used in all cases and āṃsvāra is employed in the only instance of vaṃśa (line 11).

The record is not dated and the only chronological datum given therein is a solar eclipse on which occasion the grant, recorded in the inscription, was made. The epigraph commences with the auspicious word svasti (line 1) and refers itself to the reign of Chandiyanana (lines 12-13) who is endowed with a part of the usual prâṣasti of the Bânas (lines 1-12). It is then stated that the ruler remitted, on the occasion of a solar eclipse, the income from the levy called ponna-teg to the mahâjanaś of Pepukaparu in lieu of 120 gândhuga of paddy. The imprecatory portion, in Kannada prose, follows in lines 18-23.

The Bâna chief Chandiyanana is known for the first time from the record under study. The earliest epigraphical reference to the ancient Bâna family occurs in the Tâlâgunda inscription of Kadamba Kâkusthavarman (c. 422-47 A.D.) wherein it is stated that the first Kadamba king Mayûraśarman (c. 332-57 A.D.) levied tribute from the Brihad-Bâna. The early rulers of this


2 Above, Vol. VIII, p. 32, verse 15.
family ruled over a tract of land known by the names of Andhrāśpathahpasīchimataḥ kshitiḥ in Sanskrit and Vaṅgauḷi-mērku in Tamil which has been identified with parts of the Ceded Districts, including the district of Anantapur. It has also been suggested that the early rulers of this family served as the subordinates of the Pallavas of Kāñcchi until the region covering the Ceded Districts was conquered and annexed to the Chālukya empire by Pulakēśin II (610-42 A.D.). With their defeat at the hands of the Bāna family retreated from their ancestral domains and set up their sway in the North Arcot region and thus continued their allegiance to the Pallavas. But scions of this family continued their existence as the feudatories of the Chālukyas and, thus, their rule over at least a part of their native kingdom. This was for the first time revealed by the Koṭṭūr inscription of the 4th year (i.e. 699-700 A.D.) of the reign of Chalukya Vijayāditya. This epigraph, in Telugu language, refers to a Bāna chieftain (Vāgarāju), without giving his proper name, as the subordinate of Vijayāditya and as ruling over Vaṅgauḷ-vidhaya and registers a grant of land in the village of Peṅukaparūti.

Koṭṭūr and the findspot of the record under study, viz., Senagalagūrū as also Vaṅgauḷu, the head-quarters of Vaṅgauḷ-vidhaya are all of them in the Tadpatri Taluk. Peṅukaparūti of the Koṭṭūr inscription and Peṅukaparū of the present record denote obviously one and the same village. It has been pointed out above that, on grounds of palaeography, our inscription belongs to about 800 A.D. It is thus clear that Chandiyana was one of the successors of Vāgarāju of the Koṭṭūr inscription and that he was administering the district known as Vaṅgauḷ-vidhaya.

The only place-name occurring in the inscription viz. Peṅukaparū does not find a place on a modern map of the Tadpatri Taluk.

TEXT

1 Svasti [||*] Sakala-
2 jagat-[t]*ray-ābhi-
3 vandita-sur-āsu-
4 r-ādhāśa-Paramesvara-
5 pratihārīkrīta-Mahā-
6 bali-kul-ōbbha/dbha/ya
7 Krishṇa-dhvaja-va ila(rā)-
8 [bi] (ji)ta Vṛishabha-laṅchana
9 Paisācha-pataha-[ni]-
10 [r]ghōshaṇa [Bāṇa-kula-

1 For brief accounts on the early history of the Bānā, see above, Vol. XI, pp. 230-34 and above, Vol. XXX, p. 70.
3 There are two other villages of this name, one situated in Karmāśaṭṭrā and the other in the Gudhahāra-vidhaya mentioned in the copper plate grants of Chalukya Jayasimha II—Above, Vol. XVIII, p. 312 and Ind. Ant. Vol. XXIII, p. 137 respectively.
4 From impressions. On top of the slab is found engraved the figure of what appears to be a bull.
5 Read—kānḍakhana.
11 va[r̥j]̥as-ōnnata [ityādi] [nā]m-ā-
12 nvaya śrīmatchari(gh-Chaṇḍi)diyanna
13 aras-u geyuttu
14 Śūrja(rya)-graḥaṇad-āndu
15 Peṇukaparṇa mahājana-
16 [k]kke ponna-tereya bitṭu
17 nūrirppatu gāṇḍuga ba[ḥājṛta
18 nūrāju(s)a[d[ra][r]a] Idan-ajidavage
19 aśa(s)ra kavīleya kondu Bā-
20 rāṇāsṛ ajiṣa papā²
21 sā(s)rug iđa kā[davage
22 Āśvamōda(du)da phalam-akkū
23 rihiṇya²-garbbhāda phalam-akkū []]
No. 22.—TWO GRANTS OF VINITATUNGA II

(2 Plates)

P. R. SRINIVASAN, MYSORE

(Received on 10. 10. 1968)

The two copper-plate inscriptions edited below belong to the Tuṅga family that ruled over parts of ancient Orissa during the 10th-11th centuries. The rulers of this family seem to have been subordinates of the Bhauma-Karas although Vinitatunga, the issuer of the two charters under study, like another ruler of the family, named Gayādatunga, was semi-independent. Of these inscriptions, which are referred to here as A² and B² for the sake of convenience, the former was discovered only recently at Khargaprasād, Hindol Sub-Division, Dhenkanal District and published in the Orissa Historical Research Journal, Vol. XI, pp. 242 ff. with a facsimile while the latter, discovered at Talcher in the Dhenkanal District has been known for a long time from its text published without facsimile and translation in the Archaeological Survey of Mayurabhanja, Vol. I, pp. 154-57. I secured the impressions of A, which is now deposited in the Orissa State Museum, Bhubaneswar, in December 1964 during my visit to the place in connection with my collection tour. The original plate of B, discovered at Talcher and now preserved in the Patna Museum, was sent by the Curator of the Museum, Dr. P. L. Gupta to Dr. G. S. Gai, the Government Epigraphist for India, sometime in the first quarter of 1965, and it is edited here with the latter's kind permission. Including No. B five copper-plate charters of this family are already known and the discovery of A has increased the number to six. Of these charters three belong to Gayādatunga and three to Vinitatunga including charter A² edited here. Besides, a Rāṇaka Vinitatunga figures as a subordinate chief in both the Talcher plates of the Bhauma-Kara king Śivakara III.

The texts of the two charters under study like those of the other records of this family, are full of orthographical, grammatical and metrical errors. Besides, another defect met with in these two grants is jumbling up of passages. Consequently, a proper understanding of the passages where this has occurred is possible only with some effort. For instance, in charter A, the passage prathita-prithu-yaśas-Tuṅga-vaisād-babhūva should have followed the name Auchihaḍaṇḍa in line 9, but a part of this passage is engraved in line 10. Similarly, the verse (lines 9-10) tasyu-ātmajā-bhūj-jagaty-ekavira[h] śrī-Khadgatungrade[va] tī kshitiṇḍraḥ, engraved in continuation of the name Auchihaḍaṇḍa in line 9, seems to have been introduced here by mistake whereas its proper place seems to be before the expression tasya-āneṣyā in line 13, as required by the context on the analogy of other records of the king who issued the present charter. In

---

² Above, Vol. XXXIV, p. 92.
⁴ Ibid., No. A 2.
⁵ Above, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 93 ff.
⁶ Two grants of Vinitatunga already known are the Bonsai plate (JBOBS, Vol. VI, 1920, pp. 236-40) and the Talcher plate i.e., B, edited here.
⁸ This defect was discovered and the solution was suggested by Dr. G. S. Gai, Government Epigraphist for India, and I am indebted to him for this.
charter B also, likewise, the passage commencing with Kāshapa and ending with ‘kula in line 23 seems to be intended to go after naptri in line 21 like the passage Gautama-gōtriṇā etc. engraved after naptri in line 19.

With the emendations suggested above it will be found that the style of the introductory part of both the records under study is almost identical with that found in the Bonai plate. It is, therefore, evident that the issuer of all the three charters was one and the same ruler viz. Vinitatuṅga. It is, however, to be noted that while he is styled Mahārāja and Rāṣaka in charter B edited here and the Bonai plate, he bears the title Mahārāja only in charter A. According to the former two records this Vinitatuṅga was the son of Khagatuṅga who was a descendant (probably a son) of another Vinitatuṅga, i.e., Vinitatuṅga I. The emended text of charter A, while following the genealogical portion of the other two, also furnishes for the first time the fact that the real name of Vinitatuṅga II was Achchharadhēva. This would show that the name Vinitatuṅga was evidently assumed by the ruler at the time of or after his coronation.

The characters of charter A are similar to those of the Talcher plate No. 1 of Gayādatuṅga while those of charter B are similar to those of the epigraphs of the Bhājjas of Vañjulavaka, especially to those of the plates of Śilākhaṇja Trihuvanakalasa, and are assignable to the end of the 10th or the beginning of the 11th century. In fact, though none of the epigraphs of the Tuṅga family bears any date, charter A, edited here, contains the date viz., Sārvat 161 in the last line, owing to which this charter assumes a unique importance. This date is probably to be referred to the Bhauma-Kara era of 831 A.D., in which case its Christian equivalent would be 992 A.D. The manner of recording the date in this charter alone of his three known records coupled with the omission of the lesser title Rāṣaka from the set of epithets of the king, occurring here, seems to suggest that king Vinitatuṅga II was really semi-independent at the time of the issue of this charter. This fact goes to strengthen the view that for a while during the turn of the 10th century, the family of the Tuṅgas was semi-independent due to the weakness of the Bhauma-Kara authority.

Both the plates under study and the Bonai plate, all of the time of Vinitatuṅga II, as also two of the three charters of Gayādatuṅga, refer, in their introductory portion, to the ruling chief as one who had hailed from the mountain called Mahāparvata described in glowing terms and as one who had arrived at Yamagartta-manḍala from there. This would, doubtless, mean that the family of both Vinitatuṅga II and Gayādatuṅga originated in the mountain Mahāparvata or a place situated on a range of mountains that went by the name. When the meaning is so clear it does not seem necessary to correct the passage Yamagartta-manḍala-gataḥ into Yamagartta-manḍal-āntargatā and to construe the meaning of the passage viśakā Mahāparvata as a “[city on] the hill called Mahāparvata situated in Yamagartta-manḍala”. That this family had originally the association of a mountainous habitation is corroborated by another statement occurring in all the above mentioned five records relating to the description of the ancestor, probably the grandfather, of the issuer of these charters, i.e., Vinitatuṅga I of the three charters of Vinitatuṅga II and Jagatantuṅga of the two charters of Gayādatuṅga. According to this statement both Vinitatuṅga I and Jagatantuṅga hailed from a hill called Rōhitā-giri. It is interesting to note that the description of these two earlier members of the family referred to in the two groups of records, also contains another common factor, viz. that they both belonged to Śaṅḍilya-gōtra. When these particulars are put together there would appear to emerge the fact that Jagatantuṅga and

---

2 Above, Vol. XXXIV, plate between pages 96-97.
3 Ibid., Vol. XXVIII, plate between pages 267-77.
4 Ibid., Vol. XXXIV, p. 92.
5 DGA/69
Vimitattuṅga I were brothers and that their respective grandsons, the issuers of the two groups of records mentioned above, became the rulers of the Yamagartta-maṇḍala. The genealogy of the family as deduced from the above discussion, may be tabulated as follows:

```
Unknown Progenitor
    /\                /
   /   \              /   \
  Jagattuṅga      Vimitattuṅga I
    |               |
    |               |
Salōqattuṅga    Khaḍgattuṅga
    |                |
    |                |
Gayādattuṅga    Vimitattuṅga II
                    (year 161)
```

It has been suggested that Gayādattuṅga may have been named "after his father's overlord who was either Gayāda (i.e., Śāntikara I Lālitaḥāra or "bhāra, known date: year 933-3 c. 924 A.D. or II, i.e., Śāntikara II whose son's Talcher plates are dated in the year 145-c. 976 A.D. and the year 149-c. 980 A.D.) of the Bhauma-Kara dynasty."1 In view of the fact that our charter A of Vimitattuṅga II is dated in the year 161, a date also in all probability of the Bhauma-Kara era, which is later than the period to which Gayādattuṅga possibly belonged, it is not unlikely that the latter ruled earlier than Vimitattuṅga II.

In both the charters under examination, Vimitattuṅga II is stated to have been the lord of the whole Gōḍrama. But charter A supplies a piece of new information namely that the king acquired this lordship by his own prowess. Similarly charter B and the Bonai plate also furnish an additional information relating to the location of Gōḍrama. It is stated there that Gōḍrama was situated in Navakhaṇḍa. In this connection it may be noted that of the three records of Gayādattuṅga only the Talcher plate No. 12 contains the statement that he was lord of the whole Gōḍrama, while this statement is conspicuous by its absence in his other two records, although the reason for this is not known.

A. Khargaprasād Plate, Year 161.

This single plate with writing on both sides, was, as stated above, discovered at Khargaprasād, Hindol Sub-Division, Dhenkanal District. It measures 21.5 cm high and 15.5 cm broad. The sides of the plate are not straight and are slightly curved in. A solid circular seal with a diameter of 6.2 cm is attached to the middle of the top of the plate. The details worked on it in relief are not very clear, but they seem to include the symbols representing the sun and the moon, a single line legend which is not legible, and a couchant deer facing proper right. There are altogether 41 lines of writing of which 26 lines are on the obverse and 15 lines are on the reverse. The writing is fairly well preserved. The weight of the plate is 1265 g.

The characters of the record are similar to those of the Talcher plate No. 1 of Gayādattuṅga as also the features of palaeography. The language is Sanskrit which is corrupt and the text is in prose and verse. Besides a number of orthographical errors which this record shares in common with the other records of this family, it suffers, as stated above, from the defect of some passages in its introductory part being jumbled up and of the omission of a half each of two verses.

The inscription begins with a symbol for siddham followed by the word seṣṭi. The prose passage in lines 1-6 describes in glorious terms a hill called Mahāparvata marked by the Tuṅga

---

1 Above, Vol. XXXIV, p. 92.
2 Ibid., p. 95, text lines 7-8.
3 Ibid., pp. 98 ff.
kings, and states that from it hailed one, apparently the issuer of the charter, who arrived in the Yamagartta-mañḍala. This passage would, therefore, imply that this ruler originated in the hill and ruled over the mañḍala. It would seem that the Mahāpravata hill was not far away from the Yamagartta-mañḍala. The above prose passage is followed in the other records by two verses describing the ruler. But in the present record the incomplete verse 1 praises a certain Achchharadēva. The context in which he is mentioned clearly implies that he was no other than the ruling chief and the issuer of the charter whose coronation name Vinitatunga is mentioned later on in line 17. The portion prathita-prithvya[śāh*] of the passage prathita-prithvyaḥ-Ṭunga-vanisūd-babhūca which is required to complete verse 1, is engraved in line 10. Between the name Achchharadēva and the word prathita is a defective half verse which is found for the first time only in this record describing Ḳhaḍgatuṅga as the son of another. As has been stated above, this half-verse has probably been engraved here by mistake and it should really have come after verse 3 in line 13. Verse 2 (lines 10-12) is also in praise of the ruling chief Achchharadēva alias Vinitatunga.

Verse 3 speaks of Vinitatunga i.e. Vinitatunga I, who belonged to the Śāḍīlya gōtra and to a family which originated in Rōkitā-giri. The half-verse in lines 9-10 was, in all probability, intended to go after this and, if so, it will be seen to state definitely that Ḳhaḍgatuṅga was the son of Vinitatunga, a point which has not been made so clear by the expression tasya-ānityatā occurring in verse 4 of the other records of this ruler. This half-verse, when complete, was perhaps intended to be the first of two verses describing Ḳhaḍgatuṅga, the usual verse 4 occurring in the Bonai plate and charter B dealt with below being the second. However, this half-verse in question appears, for all intents and purposes, to be an unsuccessful attempt at composing a new verse in praise of his patron’s father by the drafter whose work was simply to copy the praśasti from the available records. It also appears that after composing only one half of a verse, the drafter had not only wrongly introduced it in an earlier context than the one where it ought to go, but also tried to tamper with the usual verse 4, by introducing in its first quarter the name of his patron Vinitatunga in place of Ḳhaḍgatuṅga. Thus this passage tasya-ānityatā Vinitatunga has become metrically defective while it was correct in metre with the name Ḳhaḍgatuṅga. Besides, the retention of the expression tasya-ānityatā in the passage would be either redundant or anomalous. Thus it is seen that in trying to interpolate a new passage into the introductory part the drafter has made the confusion worse confounded. In view of the fact that the text of this part of the record is in all other respects similar to the same part of the texts of the other two charters of this ruler, nothing will be lost if the half-verse in question is omitted and the name Vinitatunga is substituted by the name Ḳhaḍgatuṅga. Only by doing so can the confusion that had been imported into this introductory part be removed and the purport of this section made clear. If, however, one attempts to interpret this section without the above-mentioned omission and substitution then not only the problem relating to the syntax of the passages but also the one pertaining to the genealogy of the family becomes insurmountable.

Thus restored, verse 4 would properly fit into the context as it does in the other records of this ruler. Its first half is seen as usual to describe Ḳhaḍgatuṅga while the second half introduces his son whose coronation name is given in the following passage in prose in lines 14-17 as Mahārāja Vinitatunga. He is described here as one who, by his own prowess, had come into the possession of all the Gōndrama, who had obtained the boon from Mahāpravata, meaning

1 Examples of ruling families hailing from hills are not wanting in Indian history as for instance the Vishnu-kūḍjas, and the Śailakaṇhavas.
probably the presiding deity of the hill, in which the Tuṅga family is stated to have had its origin, who was a parama-mahēśvara and who had obtained the paścha-mahā-sabda.

The passage in lines 17-22 contains the statement that the ruler addressed the future officials called Rājanaka, Rājaratna, Mahāsāmanita, Sāmanita and Sāmanavijjikajana as also the local people of the maydala (i.e., Yamagartta), saying that the village Khāmbhāra in Lavantāicha-khaṇḍa-kṣhētra was granted by him by means of a copper-plate charter. Lines 23-25 state that the donee was a certain Bhaja Isana, son of Ananda and grandson of Bhāṣaputra Kusārman, who belonged to the Kāṇya-gotra with three pravāras, who hailed from Pōḍhi and who resided at Kōṭamala. Lines 25-26 state that the grant was made for the increase of the religious merit of the ruler's parents and for his own merit. The usual donor's wish that his gift should last for a long time is expressed by the passage in lines 26-27. Line 27 states that the gift was exempt from the entry of chāta and bhaṇa. Then there follow, in lines 28-40, five of the usual imprescript verses. The engraver is stated to be one Vaniśa (i.e., Vajīk) Duvadāsās (line 40). The date of the record is given at the end (line 41) as 161 expressed by numerical symbols.

Of the geographical names mentioned in the record Mahāparvata has been discussed above and Yamagartta is identical with Jamgadā in Angul or Jomurdi in the former Pallahara State.1 The identification of Khāmbhāra, Lavantāicha-khaṇḍa-kṣhētra, Pōḍhi and Kōṭamala is not certain.

TEXT:

[Metres: Verses 1-2 Srāvādhāra; verses 3-8 Anushṭubh; verse 9 Pushpitaṅgrāṇa.]

Ovverse

1. Śāṭhodhā Svasti[ || ] Āva(ba)dēśḍhata-dvīpa-gaṇḍasthala-galad-a-
2. virāla-mada-malina-madhukar-āvali-[jharī]kriṣṇa(ī)ka-praddhāt-pravudhātē-
3. jaḥ-vipra-varai-Rī(r. Rīk)-Sāma-Yau[jr]*-vēḍa-dhavan(ni)bh[r]*-nīvara-pratikrit[a*-sakalinga-
4. nayadē- anavarata-dvīpa-hā(hu)ta-kutavah-ōdbhūta-dhau(hū)ma-sauḍhay-ōpra(pa)hasita-
5. samast-ariṣhīt-vāvakāt-Mahāparvat-ābhidhāna-parvatōdarindatātī-Tuṅga-
6. narāṇḍr-aṅkit(ki)ta-tanō[h]* Yamaṛgartta-maṇḍakā gata[h | h] Durvār-arāti-mādyad-dvīrada-
7. vara-ghaṭā-kumbha-piṅha-praḥarā*-vīyālagama-muktā-phaśānaka-kakālā-
8. si-dhāra sphurītra(na)ti[ || ] dṛṣṭī-śavbhagna nivāritavatā yasvā grāmē [bhū]manu*

1 Above, Vol. XXXIV, p. 98.
2 From impressions.
3 Expressed by a symbol.
4 Read pravudhātē.
5 Read dhavan-nīvarahāt pavītakrit[a.
6 Read samast-ariṣhīt-vāvakāt.
7 Read pārvalī-fitakrit[a.
8 The word dhāra may be supplied here for the sake of metre (vide, above, Vol. XXXIV, p. 102, note 2).
9 This quarter of the verse should read na dṛṣṭī-śavbhagna nivāritavatā yasvā grāmē bhūmanu (vide, ibid., text lines 8-9 and notes 7-8).
ti kahitū(t)ndrah[1][2] prathita-prithu-ya[śāh][h][h][h][h][ ] [Sa][d]-vīry-āścharya-bhū(bhū)[ ]to
ni(ni)ja-bhūja-mahim-āpā

10 rjitā(t-ā)pu(pu)pjita-śrī[h][h] rājā vānārya-sat(sa)trō satamat-ap(p)ī chalā niechalā

[1-1]
jāvīnisūnika-ākhya[khyō][ ] ru(rū)pa-vi(vi)rya-va(ba)l-āuvitaḥ[1][3] Taśyānāvayō Vi
(Viniṭatungasekha[h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h][h]
Reverse

27 tāsa(sa)nē(ṇa)-graha-nakhatra-tāraka(kāṅ) a-chāta-bhā(bha)ja-pravēṣayō-{vēṣyan}-
28 da(ga)-prama(mā)ṇḍar vāvāt vivakshita[h]1 [[*]] uktañ-cha dharmā-sāstrē [[*]] Va(Ba)-
29 hubhir-vasudhā datā(tā) rājabhī[ṣa]-Sagar-ādibhū[ḥ]2 yasya yasya
30 yadā bhūmīs-tasya tasya tadā phalam(lam) [[*]] Mā bhū[d-a*]phala-
31 sa(sa)yāk v(āḥ) para-data(ṭṭē)ti pārthiva(vaḥ) [[*]] sva-datā(tā)pha[la]m-ānanyam pa-
32 ra-data(ṭṭ-a)nālau(nē) [[*]] 6[*] Śa(Shā)shthiśhiti-varsha-sahasrāqi svargē
33 mōdati(tī) bhūmīda[ḥ]2[ṣa] Sva-datā(tā)[ṁ]ṛ[ṛ] para-[da*a]ta(tāṁ)mva(vā) yō harēdv(a va)su-
34 ndhārā[m[*] sa vī(vi)śhāyā[ṁ*] krimir-bhūtvā pitribh[iṣa*[s*] saha pachyatē [[*]] 7[*]
35 Sarvanvītīn3-bhā(bhā)vina[h]3 pūṁ(pā)[ṛthi*]vēndrān-bhūyō bhūyō yācha-
36 tē Rāma(h)[ḥ*] sāmānyō-yaṁ dharmāma-sūtur-nīpa[ṇṇ]h
37 kālō kālō pālandyō bhavadbhūḥ [[*]] 18[*] Iti kamala-da-
38 lāṃvu(mbu)-vi(bh)ndu-llō(lo)lāṁ ārī(ārī)yamaṁ(ma)nuchintya manushya-ji(ji)-
39 vitān-cha [[*]] sa+kalama-ida(na)[da-m]-udhārīta[i=cha*] vu(bu)[d*]dvā na li pusūhāi-
40 rpa(h pa)ra-k[ki*]rta(rta)yo vī(vi)lōpyā[ḥ]4 9 utkīrṇītaṁ4 vanīka Duvad(ā)sam-
41 sva(ta)[t] 100 60 1 h[5]

B. Talcher Plate

This is a single plate measuring about 23 cm wide and 15 cm high with writing on both sides. Unlike the other charters of this family, the engraving is done breadthwise on this plate. There are altogether 26 lines of writing, each side having 13 lines. The plate has suffered corrosion on both sides and so the writing has been affected in several places especially on the obverse. A circular seal worked like a beautiful full-blown lotus with a diameter of 18 cm is attached to the left. There is a circular design with a diameter of 5 cm in its centre. A figure of a couchant stag facing proper right with its right fore-leg stretched in front is seen here. In front of it is depicted a plant and the stag is shown as biting a bunch of its leaves. Just above the back of the stag are depicted the symbols for the sun and the moon. Below the animal is the legend which reads ōrī-Vīn(i)ṁ tatūngadēvasya in the same characters as those of the record proper. This legend is underlined and below it is a design of a five-petalled flower. The whole device is worked in relief. The plate weighs 950 g.

As has been stated above, the characters of this inscription are similar to those of the records of the Bhaṇjas of Vaṇjulvaka, and so they share the palaeographical features of the latter also. The language is Sanskrit but not so corrupt as that of charter A, discussed above, although the text exhibits nearly all the orthographical peculiarities met with in the other records of this family. A special defect of this charter, which it shares with charter A, is, as stated above, the jumbling up of a passage, not in the introductory part as in the latter, but in the formal part.

The inscription begins with a symbol for siddhaṁ followed by the word svasti. This is follo-

1 The passage from “daga” to vivakshita[h] is probably a mistake for “daka-pramāṇaṇa vivarjitaḥ.
2 The other half of the verse is omitted.
3 Read Sarvēs-śān.
4 Read utkīrṇītaṁ.
5 The symbol for dh is intended to suggest the end of the record.
that one, evidently the donor of the grant, had hailed from the hill i.e., a place situated on it, and had arrived at Yama
gartta-mañ̄ḍala. Then follow four verses of which the first two (lines 5-9) describe the donor hinted at earlier, named Vinitatun
gā. Verse 3 (lines 9-10) speaks of Vinitatunāgā, evidently Vinitatunāgā I. While the first half of verse 4 states that in
Vinitatunāgā I’s family (i.e., probably to him) was born Khāḍgatun
gā, the second half of the verse states that to him (i.e., Khāḍgatun
gā) was born one, apparently the ruling chief Vinitatun
gā II, who is actually mentioned with the usual epithets in lines 12-13. It is interesting to note that he is here stated to be the lord of the eighteen Gondramas.1 This territory is here stated to have lain in Navakhanda, as in the Bonai plate. The epithets of the ruler include Rāṇaka also.

Lines 14-16 contain the passage referring to the ruling chief’s order addressed to the future officials and feudatories of a visayya (name not mentioned) in Yamagartta-mañ̄ḍala. The list of these people includes Rājaṇaka, Rājputra, Mahāśāmantra, Kumārśāmatya, Uparika, Daṇḍa
dśika, Sthānāntarika, Śamanta, Śāmavājika, Prakṛitika, Bhattā, and Vallabha-jātiya. It will be seen that this list contains some more names of officials than those of the list in charter A. The passage in lines 17-18 states that the copper-plate charter is in respect of (the grant of) the village Maddhamanḍa-grāma attached to the above-mentioned visayya. This is followed by the statement that one half of a village, obviously referring to Maddhamanḍa-grāma, was granted to Bhattāputra Naraka. This donee is stated, in lines 18-20, to have hailed from Puṇḍravarddhana and to be a resident of Rōyarā, to belong to the family of Bhattāputra Narakarakhi(kshi)ta, to be the son of Sādhāraṇa and grandson of Balabhadra, and to belong to the Gautama-gōtra with three pravaras. Lines 20-21 contain the statement that one half of a village, apparently implying the other half of the same Maddhamanḍa-grāma, was granted to another donee named Lakhādita (Lakayāditya), who is stated to have hailed from a place called Mrithavastu and to be the son of Ujāla (Ujjvala) and grandson of Balabhadra.

This passage is followed by another (line 22) which states that the gift made by the ruling chief was a joint one (saha-yoga), which indicates that both the donees have to enjoy the gift
village jointly, or that they should share the produce equally among themselves. Coming as this statement does immediately after the expression Balabhadra-napṭre ardha-grāmaḥ, it would give the idea that the donee Lakhādita, whose gōtra and pravaras are not mentioned in his description, was also a grandson of Balabhadra like the donee Naraka figuring earlier. But in line 23 is a passage which says “(for him) who belonged to the Kāśyapa-gōtra, to Vachchhāra
Naidhrava-pravara and to Aṭṭakula”. This passage, as has been stated above, appears to have been engraved here by mistake and it in reality should go after the expression Balabhadra
napṭre in line 21. The transposition of this passage seems warranted not only to complete the particulars relating to the donee Lakhādita but also to know where its original position was, because it has no relevance in its present place. Thus it becomes clear that the donees belonged each to a different gōtra although the names of their grandfathers were identical. It may be noted here that in the case of Lakhādita his place of residence has not been mentioned either by oversight or because he was also a resident of Rōyarā. The word Aṭṭakula occurring in his description seems to be a local variation of Aṣṭakula in which case it might be taken to suggest that Lakhādita was a member of a group called Aṣṭakula.

The gift is stated, in lines 23-25, to have been accompanied by such privileges as khaṭa, patīna, vaditaras-ithāna and gulumaka, and to be exempt from all encumbrances. It is also stated

1 See above, Vol. XXXIV, p. 33 for an explanation of this term.
that it belonged to the category of a-likhani-pravēśita and was given according to the bhūmich- 
chhidra-pidhāna-nayya. The passage in line 25 says that the gift was made for the increase of 
the religious merit of the donor’s parents and of himself. Line 26 contains a usual 
imprecatory verse which is incomplete. Besides this incomplete verse the fact that it should 
have been followed by at least a few more such imprecatory verses, seems to suggest that the 
record is incomplete and the plate containing the rest of the matter is missing.

Of the geographical names occurring in this record, Mahāparvata, Yamagarta-maṇḍala 
and Gondrama have been discussed above. Pundravaradhana has been identified with 
Bengal; Rōyārā is evidently identical with the place of that name, on the borders of the old 
Sonpur State by which a visaya is called in the charter of Śatrubhaṇa.1 The location of 
Maddhamanḍagrama, the gift village and Mrīthāvastu is difficult to identify.

TEXT  
[Metres: verses 1-2 Saṇḍhāra; verses 3-5 Anuṣṭubh.]

Obverse

1 Siddham  Svasti[*]
   Āva(ba)ddh-ōddhata-dvipa-gāṇḍa-sthala-valad-avirala-mada-malinamadhu-
2 kar-āvali-jhanakrub(t-ai)ka-pra[dōṣha-p-[pravu]ṭāya[*]
   vipra-varaiRi(r-R)i-k-Sāma- 
   Yajurvēda-dhvaniḥ-
3 raunuvah-pratikriyā[ta(sakala-janapadā[t]
   anavaratadvīja-hutāvahūta*-dhūmā-samcha-
   yōb(y-o)pra(pa-)
4 hasita-samāstirishā-vāsakāt Mahāparvata-śāhldhāna-parvvat-ōdarindrāt* Tuṅga-ta(n)pi-pē-
5 ndr-āṅki[ta*-]tanē[r] Yajmagarta-maṇḍalan gataḥ [*] Durvvar-ārati-nū(mā)dya[d*-]dvir-
   rada-varavā-ghatā-ku-
6 mbha-pitha-prayāra-vyālagna-mukkā-phala-nikara-karāl-āśi-dhārā sphiuranti(ntl)
7 dhiṣṭvā bhagāṇa uśāratavati grame yasya[*] sa śrīmaṇa-Vinitatuṅga[h*] prathi-
8 ta-pṛthu-yasa(la)-Tuṅga-vanśād-va(ba)bhūva [[1*] Sadvyā-śāharya-bhūtō niṣa-bhujaa-
   mahim-ō
9 pārjita-śri [h*] rāja vāṇārya-śatrōh*12 satatam-apī(pī) chālā nīchālā yasya lakṣmīh [[2*][13
10 Śaṇḍīya-gōtrād-utpaṇa(mō) Rehitā-giri-nirgattāh [[[*] śrī-rāj-Vinitatuṅg-ākhya
11 rūpa-viṣraya-(va)hal-ānuvitaḥ [[3*] Tasya-anvayab[ya] Khadgtatuṅga[h*] śrīmaṇa-ūrjita-
   vikrāmaḥ [[[*] tasya va(ba)bhūva

2 Prun impressions.
3 Expressed by symbol.
4 Read paurudhā-tējō.
5 Read śhvanim-niḥañbānī parivirījita.
6 Read kala-kalpānā-ōdābhūtā.
7 Read samas-ta-rāka.
8 Read garvvalad-adā-indrīti.
9 Read ‘dhāra’ after this word.
10 Read dhiṣṭvā bhagāṇa niyātān-aparatānī yasya maṅgrāma-bhūman,
11 Read śrī for śrīmaṇa for the sake of metre.
12 Read rājātējā-śhānāy-śateṭhā.
13 This is only half of the verse.
14 Read tasmād-bahāca.
12 dharmma[jñā] [dugdh-ā]vīhā[bdhē]r-iva chandramāh || [4*] Para[ma*]māhāśvara-samadhigata-pañchamahā-sadvata[bdv]-nava-

dēva[h*] ku-

Reverse


15 nta-kumārāmātya[ty-ō]parika-ḍaṇḍapāśīka-sthānāntarika-sāmunṭa-sāmavājīka-pra-


grāma[h*] s-ōsa[sha]na[rah] tāṃvra[mbra]-sa[śa]-

18 śa[sa][nē*]na arddha-grāma[h*] bhaṭṭaputra-Narakā(kā)[ya*] datta[h*][ 4*] Pund[ra*]vadha-

19 Narakarakah[kṣiti]-kuṭumva[mba][ka*] h || Sādhāraṇa-suta-Va(Baj)labhadra-naptri(trē) Gautama-gō-

20 triṇḍ tatha-pravara-[Rōyari]-vāstavya(yā)[ya*]|| Mṛthāvastu-vin[ui]rga-bhaṭṭaputra-

21 klādita[tyā][ya*] 4 Ujōla-suta[tyā][ya*] Va(Baj)labhadra-naptri(trē) || arddha-grāma ēka[h*] saha-jō(yō)-

23 gōna Vinitatunγōna pradatōsmabhi dharma-gauravaḥ pari(t)iḥpayaṭi* 

23 Kāṣṭha[ṣa]pa-gōtra(trē)[ya*] Vachchhāra-Naidhr(īhru)pā(va)-pravara(rā)[ya*] aṭṭa-kulā-

(ya*) || Sa-khetta-paṭṭan-ādita-

24 tra-sthān[ya*]-ādi-gulya(ma)ka-savya-piṣṭa-varjāṭ-dōkhandhāvatā bhūmichchhādi-prāpi-

25 ma-nāyaṇēu chandr-ārkha-kṣhti-samakāla(m)īmātā-piṭrō-ātmanalah cha punyā-

(qy-ō)bhuvṛddhayā[ī*]

26 sa-datūm(śām) pa(ra)-datānvā(śām vā) yō hariṇa vasundharān [4*] sa viśhṭhāya[ṛ]h krimir-bhūṭvā pitribhi[h*] sa*[ī*]

1 The corner bit where these two letters were engraved has been broken and missing.
2 This daṇḍa is superfluous.
3 Read trya[ndha]-pravaraγa.
4 This name appears to be the corrupt form of the name Laḥgāditya.
5 Read pradattaṣe sambhāra*.
6 Read pariḍālamyaṃ.
7 Read paṭṭagunadattara-sthaṇa.
8 The remaining letters of this verse may be ha pockyati.
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No. 23.—TWO INSCRIPTIONS OF AJAYAPALADEVA

(1 Plate)

RAMSHARMA, MYSORE

(Received on 27.12.1967)

The inscriptions dealt with below are important as these mention a king Ajayapaladēva ruling over Gwalior in the last quarter of the 12th century. This king is not known from any other source. Since our inscriptions throw a good deal of light on this dark period of the medieval history of the Gwalior region, I avail the opportunity of editing them here with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist, Mysore.

1. Narēsār Image Inscription of V. S. 1249.

This inscription\(^1\) belongs to the old collection of the Chief Epigraphist and was copied from the pedestal of a broken image found at Narēsār village, Morena Taahil and District in Madhya Pradesh. The image is preserved now in the Archaeological Museum located in Gūjarī-Mahal inside the fort at Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh. The inscription was first reported in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Department, Gwalior State, for Samvat 1975 (No. 23), and later it was included by Dvivedi in his Abhilēkha.\(^2\)

The inscription is well engraved and well preserved and occupies a space which measures 10 cm × 74 cm. It contains only two lines of writing. The characters are Nāgari of the period to which the record belongs. The letters vary in size from 2 cm to 3 cm. The letters a and ja in Ajapāla (line 1) and ya in prāyamati (line 2) are interesting. The second letter can be confused with la in Rāvula in the same line. The language is Sanskrit and is not free from mistakes. The visarga has been wrongly added to some words, cf. rājyā (line 1), kāpa (ro)gyatiḥ and prāyamatiḥ (both in line 2). Ajapāladēva (line 1) is a mistake for Ajayapaladēva.

The inscription commences with a symbol for ṭhā or siddhaṃ. Then the date has been recorded as V. S. 1249, Mārgāśirha šu. 2, Sunday, which is equivalent to 1192 A. D., November 8. The object of the inscription is to record the making obviously of the image on the pedestal of which the inscription has been found and obeisance to the same by Rāvula śri-Vāmadēva styled as Dōdhākṣētrapāla during the reign of Ajayapaladēva.

Now, this Rāvula Vāmadēva has been mentioned in some other image inscriptions,\(^3\) also found at Narēsār, as responsible for the making of those images. He seems to be a local chief ruling over the area with his headquarters at Narēsār.

The king Ajayapaladēva of this record is apparently the same as Ajayapaladēva who was ruling over Gwalior in V.S. 1251 as is known from the Gaṅgēlā tank inscription from Gwalior, edited below.

A name of geographical importance is found in the inscription. The exact extent of the area included in Dōdhā-kāshētra as mentioned in line 1, is not known, but probably it included Narēsār and the neighbouring region.

---

\(^1\) This is A. R. Ep., 1961-62, No. C. 1462.
\(^2\) Cf. Gwalior Rājya Kē Abhilēkha, No. 94.
TWO INSCRIPTIONS OF AJAYAPALADEVA

Naredar Image Inscription of V. S. 1249

Left half

Right half

Scale: One-Third
Gwalior Tank Inscription of V. S. 1251

Scale: One-Third
TWO INSCRIPTIONS OF AJAYAPALADEVA

TEXT

1. Siddham² | Samvat 1249 Margasi² sudi 2 Ravi-dinē śri- Ajaya² pāladēva-rājyē²
   [Dōṭhākāhē]tra-pālah | ²

2. Rāvala-śri- Vāmadēna(vah) kāpa(rā)yatiḥ | tathā prāpamatiḥ | ||

2. Gwalior Tank Inscription of V. S. 1251

This inscription² was copied by the Senior Assistant Curator of Gwalior Museum, from the bed of the Gargolā Tank inside the fort at Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh and an impression of the same was later on sent to the Chief Epigraphist by Shri B. C. Jain, Deputy Director of Archaeology and Museums, Madhya Pradesh, along with the impressions of some other records engraved in the bed of the same tank and a note saying, "The impressions are not good as the official did not get sufficient time to copy them properly. The records cannot be copied again for many years because they are now under deep water." From the same impressions the inscription is edited here, with the permission of the Chief Epigraphist.

The record occupies a space measuring about 46 cm x 23 cm. It contains six lines of writing which is well executed. The letters are Nāgari and measure about 2 cm to 4 cm in size. The forms of the letters jā, pa, bha and ya are noteworthy. Two forms of the letter rā are found here, cf. rāja (line 3) and rājyē (line 4). The language of the inscription which is composed in prose and verse, is Śaṅskrit. As regards orthography, the doubling of the letter following the superscript r as in mṛṇmadā (line 1) is noteworthy.

The object of the inscription is recorded in the first two lines. It is stated in eulogistic terms that the king Ajayapaladēva got the tank desilted. Then in the beginning of the third line the symbol for dūh or siddham is given and afterwards the details of the date viz., V. S. 1251, Bhadrapada ba. 15 Wednesday, corresponding regularly to 1194 A. D., August 17, are given. In the last two lines it is stated that Virapāla who was the son of Kesava and who was like the sun to the lotus flowers in the form of the Divirā (i.e. writers) wrote the present inscription at the instance of the king.

The identity of the king Ajayapaladēva is not clear. Though his name has been given twice in the record, nothing has been mentioned about the dynasty to which he belonged. In the genealogy of the Pārihāra rulers who ruled over Gopāchaladurg from V. S. 1186 to V. S. 1289, the name of the present ruler is not found. The rule of the line of Kachchhapaghāta Vajradāman who originally captured the fort from a ruler of the imperial Pārihāra dynasty, is also stated to have extended over this region at least up to V. S. 1212. Afterwards what happened to this line is not definitely known. According to the bardic tale, the last ruler of the Kachchhapaghāta

---

¹ From ink impressions.
² Expressed by a symbol.
³ Read Mārgaśirha.
⁴ The rīsarga is redundant here.
⁵ The danda is redundant.
⁶ This is A. R. Ep., 1965–66, B. 72.
⁷ The expression indicates that he was the chief of the Divirā. For divirā, cf. D. C. Sircar, Indian Epigraphical glossary, p. 99.
⁹ Cf. Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, pp. 36 and 41, v. 6; and Bhandarkar’s List, No. 156.
¹⁰ Cf. Bhandarkar’s List, p. 391, No. 33, No. 11.

1 DGA/69
family was Tejā-Karaṇa otherwise called Dulhā Rāi, the hero of the romantic story of Ḍhālā Māru.1
Tejā-Karaṇa left Gwalior in about 1128 A.D.2 (i.e. 1185 V.S.) in order to marry Māroni, the
dughter of the Daosas ruler after putting his sister’s son Paramāldev or Paramārdidēv who
is stated to be a Parīhāra3 Rajput, in charge of the fort. On the former’s return Paramāldev
did not give back the fort to him and thus founded the Parīhāra line which ruled over
Gwalior for 103 years.4 Besides this bardic account, Cunningham5 noticed an inscription dated
V.S. 1207 in the reign of Parīhāra Rāmdeō and found that in V.S. 1251 Parīhāra Lōhāṅga Deo
was ruling over Gwalior. These things are contradictory to the facts that the Kachchhapaghātas
ruled over Gwalior at least upto V.S. 1212 as noted above and that Ajayapāladeva was ruling
over Gwalior in V.S. 1249 and V.S. 1251 as supported by the present inscriptions. Under the
circumstances it is probable that the two dynasties ruled over Gwalior side by side and that
the Parīhārās were the feudatories of the Kachchhapaghātas. Even according to the
bardic stories noted above they were otherwise related to the Kachchhapaghātas. That the
Kachchhapaghātas of Gwalior have come to be known as the eastern neighbours4 of the Chāha-
māna dynasty of Sambhār during the reign of Prithivirāja III, the dates for whom range between
A.D. 1177 to A.D. 1188, would indicate that the line of Kachchhapaghāta Vajradāman probably
flourished even after Sūrāpāla and his son Anāgappāla. Afterwards Ajayapāla of the present
inscription, though his relationship with the former is not clear, appeared probably in the same
line and shortly after the date of the present inscription, he was succeeded by Rāj Sōlāṅkhapāla7
who was subjugated in A.D. 1196, according to Muslim historians,8 by Kubū-uddin Aibak. Cun-
ningham’s identification9 of Sōlāṅkhapāla with Lōhāṅgadeo of the bardic list of Parīhārās
does not appear to be tenable. That the names of Ajayapāla and Sōlāṅkhapāla end in pāla may also
be a significant fact10 to support that they were born in the Kachchhapaghāta family of Gwalior.

No name of geographical importance occurs in the record. The taḍāga (line 2) which was
described, was obviously the same as the Gaṅgūla tank where the stone bearing the present
inscription has been fixed.

TEXT

[Metres : Verses 1-2 Anuḥṭubh.]

1 Nirmalō-jayapālō-yān bhūpalaḥ kēva[lan] ka[lan]]
2 jānō yasya taḍāgō-pi nirmuktaḥ panīka-saṁī[saṁ]kayā || [1*]
3 Öm11 || Sarīvat 1251 Bhādrapada vadi 15 Budhē mahāraja-
4 śrīmad-Ajayapāladeva-rājyē ||
5 Kēśav-āśīmaraḥ-ga[tra divi]r-śambhōja-bhāsavatā
6 alēkhi Viḍapālēna nrip-ādīśṭena dhīmatā || [2*]

3 Cf. ibid., where he is stated to be either a Parīhāra or Paramāra Rajput.
4 Cf. Cunningham, op. cit., p. 375.
5 Cf. ibid., p. 378.
6 Cf. The Struggle for Empire, p. 109.
7 Cf. ibid., p. 120, where his name is given as Sallakshaṇa.
10 Cf. ibid., p. 373. The local tradition followed by the annalists may not be entirely true but seems to support
that Pāl-ending names which most of the Kachchhapaghāta rulers bore, were considered by them as auspicious
ones for the uplift and glory of their family.
11 From impressions.
12 Expressed by a symbol.
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S. NAGARAJU, MYSORE

(Received on 26.3.1968)

Nimbarga is a fairly big village in the Aland Taluk of the Gulbarga District, Mysore State. It is situated about ten miles south of Aland town, and is about five miles from Gānagāpur, a Railway Station on the Wadi-Sholapur line.

Nimbarga appears to have been a place of importance once, as indicated by the remains of a good number of temples seen in and around the village, and the ruins of a stone fort with a moat around. Two temples, of Mallikārjuna and Iśvaraliśa, are still in a good state of preservation. Both are in the ornate later Chalukyan style and are datable to about the 12th century A.D.

The present inscription was copied by me in the summer of 1960, during an exploratory tour undertaken in search of archaeological antiquities in the Gulbarga District. The inscription is on a large rectangular slab leaning against the western wall, inside the navaranga of the Iśvara-

aliśa temple. The slab is of black schist and is well dressed on the written side. It measures 1.79 x 0.95 metres. At the top of the slab there is a small horizontal raised band and the first line of the inscription, consisting of the invocatory verse, is inscribed on this. Above the band, the slab is cut to the shape of an arch and sculptures in bas-relief consisting of a liṅga flanked by Brahma to the right and Vishṇu to the left, are carved. A portion of the Vishṇu figure is broken. To the right of the figure of Brahma, a bull is shown facing it, and to the left of the Vishṇu figure there is the figure of a cow with a calf. A small dagger is shown in front of the cow. The inscription is neatly carved and well preserved but for a circular patch in the lower middle portion of the slab, where the letters have been effaced.

The inscription is in Kannada script of the 12th century A.D. The language is Kannada except for the invocatory and imprecatory verses which are in Sanskrit. The palaeography of the record is quite regular for the period to which it belongs. However, a noteworthy feature is the use of two types of medial u sign, the usual one with a curved line attached to the right of the consonant (Namastuvṣa, line 1, Kuṭuge, line 2, nudiṃa, line 4, tateṇu, line 13, etc.) and another, which is used sparingly, looking like a slanting hook inserted below the letter (as in kunbbhā, line 13, nūtu, line 16, kujiṃa, line 21, mukura, line 16, etc.). Similarly apart from the usual medial u sign, there is also a solitary case of the employment of the counterpart of the latter type of medial u which looks like a hook with a circle at the upper end in mūreṇa, line 35. Also there are two ways of representing superscript r (i.e. ṛpha). The normal one, shown by a slightly curved line attached to the right top corner of the letter, occurs in many places (cf. stṛgyya, line 31, nirṛmalla line 44). The other type is usually used when the conjunct consonant has the medial vowel i. There, a small semi-circle opening to the right is inserted to indicate r between the letter and the medial i sign (cf. kiritti, lines 14, 22, 23, etc., sparaddhi, line 14, mūrti lines 22 and 44, and karppina, line 47). However, there are many cases where this ṛpha and medial i are indicated separately (cf. kiritti and chakraparvati, line 40, mūrti, line 48, etc.). The form of the letter ri in rishī rishī-pūjya (line 28) is interesting.

* The text of the inscription has been published in the Andhra Pradesh Govt. Arch. Ser. No. 9, p. 76.
The following orthographical features are noteworthy. The consonant following r is doubled in many cases. The letter 转型升级 occurs only once in the record in negalda (line 18), whereas it is substituted by 普通 in other cases (cf. negalda, line 39, 40, etc. negalhe, line 42, negalal, line 39 etc.). The 著作 is used once in antaksa (line 17).

The record is in 耕田 style. There are 63 verses in different metres interspersed with a few short prose passages. The whole record is a good piece of literary composition. The verses describing Kuntala (lines 18-20), Alaridade (lines 20-21) and Nimbarage (lines 24-27) are delightful, with the apt use of 阿 jára like upama and 歌咏.

The record belongs to the 9th regnal year of the Western Chalukya king Bhulokamalla Somesvara and is dated Saka 1057, Ananda, Asah cross, Amavasya, Monday, Pushyana-nakshatra, Vyatipata, on which day there was a solar eclipse called Chudama. Saka 1057 refers to the current year, and the date corresponds to the 23rd July, 1134 A.D. The date is regular but for a slight discrepancy. The eclipse is mentioned as Chudama. Chudama eclipses are those which take place on the week days of the respective planets i.e. the Solar on Sunday and Lunar on Monday. But the day mentioned in the inscription is Monday and not Sunday. Further the nakshatra prevailing is stated as Pushya, which, however, ended at 0.53 on the previous day itself.

The record commences with a general invocation to Siva and the local deity, Abhinava Kalidevavarai (lines 1-3). Then the mythical genealogy of the Chalukyas is given (verse 3-7). It is then stated that a few Chalukya emperors ruled and then the kingdom was snatched away by the Rashtrakutas. Then commences the genealogy of the Western Chalukyas of Kalyapa, from Tailapa, who recovered the kingdom from Rashtrakutas, up to the ruler of the day, Bhulokamalla Somesvara (verses 8-14) and his queen Barmmadavi. Probably the present inscription is the second so far discovered giving the name of this queen. Then, after describing Kuntala and Alarinde, the record lauds (verses 18-20) the chiefs of the Alarinde province, Mallidiva and his brother Gomika, and introduces (verses 24-56) a new line of chieftains of Nimbarage, who ruled as subordinates of Mallidiva and the Chalukya emperor Bhulokamalla. The genealogy of this line of chieftains as given in our epigraph, is as follows:

Narayana
(born in the gotra of the sage Putimasha, who traced his descent from Brahma)

Kesava-dvedi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narasimha</th>
<th>Trivikrama</th>
<th>Bhaskaradiva</th>
<th>Chikkanabbe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prabhu-Rudra</td>
<td>Gövinda</td>
<td>Biyala</td>
<td>m. Baganaabbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakka</td>
<td>Tika</td>
<td>Kalidiva</td>
<td>m. Demala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kacha</td>
<td>Barmmadiva</td>
<td>Gövinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastry quotes an unpublished record, where this queen is stated to have been mentioned. Yadvani (ed.), Early History of the Decans, p. 372.
The account is not very clear about the exact position of certain persons mentioned in the genealogy. Narasīhā, Prabhu-Rudra, Gōvinda and his son Jakka are mentioned as the predecessors of Kācha, and Jakka is mentioned as the brother of Kalīdēva. It is possible that Narasīhā mentioned here is the same as Narasīhā, son of Kēśava-dvēti appearing earlier in the genealogical list. Jakka, who is mentioned as the brother of Kalīdēva, is probably his cousin. Kācha, though mentioned as a son of Kalīdēva, is not included in the description with Gōvinda and Barmmadēva, the other two sons of Kalīdēva. It is difficult to account for this discrepancy. Kācha might have been a descendant of a collateral line of Kalīdēva, with Narasīhā, Prabhu-Rudra, Gōvinda and Jakka as predecessors. He might have occupied the position of nephew on the paternal side of Kalīdēva, by which, according to local usage, he could be termed ‘son’ of the latter. It is also possible that Kācha is the son of Kalīdēva through Dēmaladēvi, by virtue of which his description appears immediately after the description of that lady, and that Gōvinda and Barmmadēva are sons of Kalīdēva through some other wife, and so they are mentioned separately somewhat later. Another possibility is that at the time of the composition of this record Gōvinda and Barmmadēva were too young to be included along with the main persons appearing in the genealogical description. Two others, Mallikārjunā and Gōvinda, appear as brothers-in-law and are connected with the name of Chikkaṇabbe.

It is stated in the record that Nārāyaṇāryya first obtained the village Nimbarage as a grant from Vinayādītya Satīyāraya, and that later on Bīyāla, father of Kalīdēva of the present inscription was bestowed with the title Prabhushakravaartti by Chalukya Vikramāditya (VI).

The purpose of the inscription is to record certain donations made to the temple of Abhinava Kalīdēvēsvaṭa for its upkeep, maintenance of worship and other charitable acts. The temple of Abhinava Kalīdēvēsvaṭa is stated in the inscription to have been built by Kalīdēva. It is probably the same as the present Īvaraṇāga temple at Nimbaraga, where this inscription is found. The donors include the emperor Bhūlokamalā and his queen, who made the donations at the request of his senior general Kālīmaraṇa, Mallidēva, the provincial chief of Alanḍe, Kalīdēva and Kācharasa, the local rulers of Nimbarage, and many merchants and residents of that town. One Dhruvēsvaṇa Parījita, the chief of the Mutt, associated with the Kōṭisāṅkaradēvē temple at Māḍipahalā is praised here, and it is stated that the preceptor of the religious seat of the Abhinava Kalīdēvēsvaṭa temple at any time should be one belonging to the line of disciples of this Dhruvēsvaṇa Parījita. At the end of the record it is ordained that these are also to perform the death ceremonies of Kallarasa, Dēmaladēvi and Dhruvēsvaṇa Parījita according to Vedic rites on proper days.

Kuntalā and Alanḍe are the geographical divisions that find mention in the record. Kuntalā comprised roughly the present Karnātaka region. Alanḍe-viṣaya with its headquarters at Alanḍe often occurs in inscriptions of this period as Alanḍe-thousand. Alanḍe is the same as present Alanḍ, the headquarters of the taluk of the same name. Alanḍe-thousand was

---

1 In Kannada, the word tamaša could be used for indicating both these relationships.
2 In the description of the donations made, the name of Kēcha alone occurs along with that of his father Kalīdēva (line 72).
3 The only king of this name in the Chalukya line is Vinayādītya (681-696 A.D.) of the Chalukyas of Badami.
4 [The inscription states that Kalīdēva constructed the temples of Īśa, Dāna, and Mukunda which were named respectively as Abhinava Kalīdēvēsvaṭa, Udayādītyadēva and Chennakēśavadēva; cf. text lines 59-62. The donations were made to all the three temples.—Ed.]
5 It is possible that this portion, occurring after the usual preceptory verses, was added to the original inscription sometime later. But the gap in time between the two may not be very long as there is no clear difference noticeable between the scripts employed in the two portions.
6 See above, Vol. XXVIII, p. 31.
probably equivalent to the present Aland Taluk. Most of the other places mentioned in the record are in Aland taluk itself. Nimbarage is Nimbara where the inscription is found; Māḍiphaja is Māḍihāl, about 5 miles west of Nimbara where there is a beautiful temple of Śaṅkarāliṅga, which is probably identical with the Kṛtiśāṅkaradēva temple mentioned in this inscription. Maravadige may be Bhairu Madgi, in the Afzalpur taluk, about 8 miles south of Nimbara. Sirivūr may be Hittal Sirūr, about two miles west of Nimbara. Sivarājana-halji and Somnagambē cannot be identified.

TEXT

[Metres: Verse 1, Anuḥṭubā; Verses 2 and 12, Sragdharā; Verses 3-6, 9, 13-15, 17-20, 23-27, 32-36, 38-40, 42-46, 48, 50-54, 56-57, 59, Kaūda; Verses 7-8, 10, 30, Mattēbhavikridita; Verses 11 and 28, Mahāsragdharā; Verses 16, 31, 37, 41, 47, 49, 55, Chastrapakamalā; Verses 21-22, 29, 58, Utปาlamātā.]

1 Oh namaḥ Śivāya || Names=tunā-sīraschuṁbhichi-Chaṅdra-chāmara-chāravē || [*] trai- lōkya-nagar-āraṁbha-mūḷa-staṁbhīya Šaṁbhavē || 1 [/][*]

2 Śrīmad-dēvāḥdiṭevaṇu kuṇḍuge namag-ābhaḥṣ-ārtthamaṇi Viśvalakṣmī-dhāmaṁ kārṇya- dīṇḥ-old-Abhinava-Kalidēvēvaramū dēva-mauḷi-stōma-pravyakta-pād-ārppita-sulalīta-pādam ja-


4 n-ādiya-karttiriv=enisi Bhavan-anumatadiṁ || [4][*] Vanajabhavaṁ Svāyāmibhava-Manu- vam Śvāyāmibhu-yōgi Māṇavyanan-a munipāṁ Ṣarīyantī tan=munipāṁ Ṣarīyantī-mun- yan-a mu-

5 ni paṭeda || [5][*] Janyiṣidīṁ paṁcha-sīkanāṁ munipāṁ Ṣarīyantī kuṇḍuva chuluk-ōdakadoḻ= ghana-bhuja-Śatyāravadēva-nripalakān-emban-orbban-ādi-Chaḷukya || [6][*] Vṛi || Analana-

6 koṭṭ=arunadhvajaṇa Vanaj-a-bhaṇa koṭṭa Vārāha-luṅchechanav-ā-Kauṣaki koṭṭa belgoḍe Kumāraṇa koṭṭa māyūra-piṅchechhānīkā-āṇeche-kuntam-iniit-iniutaṁ kaikoṇḍu lōka-

7 ykan̄maṭaṇar-āḷd̄ar=ssakaḷ-āvaṇt-taḷamunaṁ Chaḷukya-chaṅkrēvarar || [*] [7][*] Va² Alliṇu-balikka saty-ādi-guṇa-gaṇ-āraṇayuṁ samasta-bhuvaṇ-āraṇayuṁ-enisida Chaḷukya-

8 chakravattīgalu rājyaṁ geyye Raṣṭrakūṭar-parabalis bhū-valayamaṇaṁ kaikoṇḍ-ire || Vṛi || Udayaṁ geydṛ-ati-pratāpad-odavīṁ Chaḷukya-vanimal-āṇhbar-āgradoḻ-udvṛttva-virō-

9 dūbh-bhūja-taṁmaṇ koṭṭ-ōḍe Lakṣhmi-vadhu-vadan-ābjaṁ naẏadīndam-uḷḷarale bhās- vāch-chakrāhastaṁ mahāspadarāpaṁ mudadiṁde Tailapa-nripaṁ niyta prachanda prabha || [8][*] Kaṁ || Dhāreyaṁ dā-
No. 24 NIMBARGA INSCRIPTION OF CHALUKYA BHULOKAMALLA, SAKA 1057 139

11 navan-uydaže Mura-ripi tappante Rāṣṭrakūṭa kaiyiyin sthīryam mija-bhujadol- susīthirey-agire tathdu nilisīdham Taila-nripa \[9*] Vṛi || Janapati Tailana sūnu Sattiga-nripiha-agr-ā-

12 tmajam Vikramaṇi ghana-dripyad-bhujan-Ayaṇayya Jayasiṁha mūvarun dhāriṇi- vinutam Śihha-nripājan-aṇgra-taniyam Trajōkyamallā-anikan-ātana putra-
Bhhuvanaika-Vikrama-

13 nripap-ttat-sūnu Sōmeśvara \[10*] Ā Vikрамādityan-ent-ene Vṛi || Nija-khalgam, Viralakshmi-vadana-lujīta-sad-darpaṇam tējāv-āśāgaja-kumbhahālaṅkri(kri)=ālēpita-
suruchhira-sīndhūrama(m-n)ttam-

14 ga-kirtti-dhjaav=ākāś-āgra-gaṅgā-jala-dhavaḷa-ruchi-sparddiy-āyit-erhīnahn viṣva-jagad-
vikhyātan-ādaṁ nripa-nukha-tiḻakaṁ Vira-Permmāṅjīdeva \[11*] Va || Ātana-putra Vṛi || Srimach-Chālukya-chakrēva-

15 ran-akhilā-mahīpāla-māṇiyaka-mauḷi-stōm-ānśu-vrāta-vihṛjītā-pada-kamalāṁ Kunta-
ādhūsān-uydād-vyōma-v,ālagna-bhāsvat-prathita-prīthu-vāsō-vā-

16 lalr-sad-vīṭān-ōḍḍāmaḥ Sōmeśvar-ōrvīvāran-atula-bala-sthāyi-Bhūlōkamalla || \[12*] Kaṁ || Ari-narapāla bisu-nettara nūṭīva nimirda-bhuja - bhujānigana jihvam paribhāvivuvad-i-

17 d-enipudu nirutaṁ Bhūlōkamalla-dēvana khalgam \[13*] Va || Ā chakravarttiya pīryi-arasi || Bhūlōkamalla-dēva-nripālakaṁ-arbdhāṅga-lakṣmi śubha-lakṣaṇe sallī-
antapura-kamala-va-śāya-kaḷaḥanī-

18 se negaḍā Barmmalādevi \[14*] Va || Ā chakravarttiy-āyva Kuntaṇa-viṣhaṇaṣ-entere \[15*] Kaṁ || Dharey-eṣmb-arbhuṣaṅ-ippudu saradh-sarōvara naḍuva karṇika-vol-
Mahādarav-ippud-ā Maṇīda-

19 ra-giriyyiṁ teṅkal-eṣeva Bharata-kahētra \[15*] * Vṛi || Bharata-vasūmdharā-taladō-
ippudu pāṟṟu-jala-pravāhadiṁ parimala-gaṅḍha-baṇḍhura-su-purpa(ṛpa)-van-āṭiyin-
udāṭa-bhāsura-gi-

20 ri-rājvīyin kanaka-ratna-sammanvīta-saṁsthālaṅgāliṁ parimala-gaṅḍhaśāli-maya-bhūtarā-
urjīta-puṇya-Kuntaṇa \[16*] Va || Ā viṣayaḍol-Alamdhī-deśaṇ-ent-ene \[17*] Kaṁ || Tiḷī-goḷaṁī tāvareyīṃ-eṛ-e-mīvīṁ

21 gaṅḍhaśāliyin vividha-kujāvaliyin gīlyįnų-āliyįnų-ēög-esuved-Alahade-nādu nādugal-
arasa || \[17*] Va || Ā maṅḍalā-pati Bhūlōkamalladeva-pāda-padim-ōpajīvīy-ent-ene \[17*] Kaṁ || Pravirāyāt-kī-

22 rttiy-Alahade-veḍaṅgam biruda-ripu-bhayaṅkaran-ātyanta-viḷaṣa-mūrttiy-enisidam-avani-
pati-Mallīdevan-ādaṭha-dēva || \[18*] Kaṁ || Birud-āli vitarangam kaieragānt chalāṁ 
sadilāy-anmu saṅgaḍaṅ-arītam daravaraṇ-enisida

23 nripa-ēḍh doreyappare Mallīdeva-bhūpālakaṇolo || \[19*] Va || Āṭana-ōḍa-vuṭṭiδa || 
Kaṁ || Avidhiyya-ripu-nripālaka-nivāha.-Kṛtāntaṁ dig-anta-parivṛta-saṅkhṛtti-virāji-
mūrttiy-Alahade-veḍaṅgaṁ Gomuk-amaḷa-kī-

24 rttiy-mṛgāṇika || \[20*] Va || Alli Nimbbaragey-eh(y-e)nṭe(nte)ḍade \[17*] Vṛi || Kuntaḷaṁ-
utam-āṅgada-vol-ippudu bhāvisī nōḷpaḷi-mahīkānte-alāhaṇ-deśaṇ-adaṛu-parirājasut-
ippud-eyte sat-kāntiya hōh-

*1 There is a spiral mark after the date.

26 hav-ul-arrâda hoa-mallige lâdari bâle yile kharjûrav-añjûnav-app-arîsânîgâla tâôñîdân-ołpan-âldu vîstârâdi niit.â Nibârâge dëvâprak-êney-âgi tôrugu || [22 |*] Kañh || Bhûkânt-ântana-ma-

27 ni-mukur-âkiñi ni-jâ-vimâla-kirtti-valî-vrîna-bhûlîkam jît-âmar-âdhîpa-lökam Nibârâge dhârege sogayisi tôrkuñ || [23 |*] Int-enisida Nibârâgeya || Kañh || Vanarû-bhav-ânvaya Vîda-nibamûda-jînâ-

28 na-nilayan-âjñâ-rûpañh vinuta-jagat-tritayam vîrta-nidhânâm Pûtîmasa-riñhi rishipûjya || [24 |*] Pûrâ || Vara-Pûtîmasa-gotr-âññara-mitrân-enalke mudânîn-udayam geydanâ parina-


30 vipr-âbharanâ || [26 |*] Kañh || Parama-charitra-va vipr-âbharanar-enal-kêldu Vinaya-Satyârayan-âdaradhi Nârâyaña-bhußatar-âgalâ-bari i bhaktî-purâ-bukadît-idañh || [27 |*] Vri || Mudâdîn Nârâyaña-dvêdiyârâ pa-

31 da-pâyâna-ândrâ karhecchi dân-âpad-ac-hastâm mechchi Sûrya-graha-da-uru-Gôtâvari- tiradôl-sad-vadanâm Châlukya-châkarînudha-pati Vinayâditya-Satyârayanâ râgadî-

32 nu-urrrvî-rajshaka[rth*] Nibârâgeya-œsed-I dhâtry-âllanam-îtta || [28 |*] Va || A vipr-ôttamañh variñâdô || Vri || Aidiya Vâg-vadhû-priyane tâm mudâmînâm Pûtîmasa-gotr-ô-


34 Vri || Parama-brâhmya-charitra-saktyiyan-adahm kâlî[m]hûndu barpp-âgal-àññbaradôl=kappadav-onûdu bappud-îdan-ûrutt-idha-darbhû-âdígal=parîpût-õdakatînbra-pûrûna-kâlañham hastâm-

35 galol-chelvân-âld-ire barppâ-r-dhâreig-intu kautukav-enal sri-Kâsava-dvêdiyâr || [30 |*] A Kâsava-dvêdiyâra vatîsa-vatâravent-enadîje || Vri || Sărâsa- sañhavage parîbhâvise mûr-e-

36 ne Vêdam-alli vîstariyasa sâkhek-ônd-âdol-âgire nûlk-enipante nûlê Nibârâgeya Kâsava-prabhuvin-agrarâj oppuva mûvar-orbba suñdari-sutey-antu nûlku

37 modaliñd-œsedar-vasudhâ-tal-âgrado || [31 |*] Kañh || Narsîrîna Tîri(Tîri)vikramam Bhâskaradiâvam Chikkuñabhey-embd-i nûlvar-pparîva(vî)dyîmînt santânâm sthira-tarav-ene Kâsavâryya-dêvântîg-âdar || [32 |*] Kañh || A vanîñsa-âr-a-

38 ti-vimâla-yaśî-vîjoñitar-âgi negalal-arâvar=gûna-vidyâ-tibhavadinî Trîvikramadîvam bhûdêva-vaññidîn-esedam dhâyeyol || [33 |*] Kañh || Bhûvâjayado-Tîri (Tîri)vikramadêvâna sati Râ-

* There is a spiral mark after the dasâdas.
* There is a spiral mark at the beginning of this line.
39 jikavve śubha-lakṣaṇadol-dēvara-dēvana Gauridēvige saman-enisi negadāl-ati mudadini.da || [34*] || Kaṁ || Bhavekan-enal-Trivikrama-dēvani gaṁ Rājikavvegaṁ guṇa-nioli vidyā-vibhavaṁ negaḻalu dhātrīs-
40 vilasa-kirtti Biyala-ādaṁ tanayaṁ || [35*] || Kaṁ || Odeyaṁ Trī(Tri)bhuvanamallaṁ pōdavi-g-enal-negaḻaṁ Vikramādityaṁ tāṁ kuḍe chakravartti mudadini paṭedanā Prabhu-chakravartti vesa-
41 raṁ Biyala || [36*] || Vṛi || Biyalaṇa kānte sarbla-śubha-lakṣaṇe sallalit-āni gi satya-vāgni yame sudhānāu-bimba-mukhi sajjana-bhāṣaṇe Fārvvti-manāl-priyaṁ scā-bilānte bhāgyavati-
42 y-embha negalṭeva Bāgaṇabbegaṁ naya-vachanaṅgalinī dam-abhivaraṇisut-irppendu dhāṁri-taḷaṁ || [37*] || Va || Avar-aグラjaṁ || Kaṁ || Para-vanitā-putraṁ sačcharitaṁ Kalidēvam-anujan-emēna ta-
43 nage dīyākari-parivṛttan-esedāṁ Śañkara-pada-pañkēja-chaṅçharekkaṁ Tiṅka || [38*] || Va || Ātati-anuja || Kaṁ || Biyalaṅgaṁ kula-vanit-āgréyey-enisida Bāgaṇabbegaṁ janiyisidám naya-
44 vēdāchāra-guṇapriya laksadha-mūrttiy-enisi vibhu Kalidēva || [39*] || Kaṁ || Kōḍadol-tāware gagan-sthalaṅdol-sāsiy-oṣeva teḍadina ogedaṁ nija-nirmāḷa-yaśaṁ eseyē su-pu-
45 traṅkula-dīpak-an-enisi pogaţe dhare Kalidēva || [40*] || Vṛi || Vilasa-kirtti hāl-gaḍalā sinhipi di-g-vanitā-jaṅakke nirmāḷa-charitaṁ visūddha-Manu-mārgeraدادieḥi tattva-
46 Saravatige muttina-hārav-enutte mechchi bichchaliṇḍu dhātri kuḍe Kalidēvam-enudha-yaśah-prabhāvana || [41*] || Kaṁ || Guṇiy-ādaṁ vipra-kul-āgraṇiy-ādaṁ vi-
47 budha-nivaha-rakṣaṇa-chintāmaṇiy-ādaṁ sučachītraṇa kaṇi-y-ādam Biyala-ātmajam Kali-dēva || [42*] || Kaṁ || Husey-illada nuḍi karppina desey-illada kīrtti loḥbhava-
48 nil-basav-illada mūrttiy-enalk-esedāṁ Biyalaṇa tanū-bhavain Kalidēvam || [43*] || Kaṁ || Neladolag-an-ellaramaṁ geḷevaṁ-ṭem mikkan-ītana-einan-enuttaṁ Kalidēvan-emēdu hogaḷal-Kalidēvam negaḻaṁ-1 malī-maṇḍa-
49 [adu] || [44*] || Kaṁ || Miḍa-pujące vipra-āliga paṭed-arththau Biyala-ātmajam Kalidēvam pōḷaṿiyan-ālvāṅg-avanige paṭed-arthṭhav-ad-anyaṛ-arthṭhav-adu paramūrththa || [45*] || Kaṁ || Vāg-bhāmīni-priyaṁ himarug-bhā-
50 ărkładūa-vimhaḷa-vičhakiḷa-vijasat-āri(a)r(ā)r(ā)bhāra-kāṇṭe-parivṛttīa-digit-bhāṣura-kīrttiy-enisidāṁ Kali-dēva || [46*] || Vṛi || Negajda pativrataguṇad-Arunadhāti-emudhiduda-
51 gra-bhāgyadol- Naṅga-tanu-jātey-embudu vivēkado-ādiya-vāṇiy-embud-1 jagam-anurāgā-
52 nna niṃnum-lave Dēmalenāriya sad-guṇapṛthiṇaḥ || [47*] || Kalidēvana pēr-uradol-emāsidā siri-sukavi-nikara-chintāmaṇi Dēmalā-dēvī dhavālisaḍūlujvala-yaśādiḥ-ṛṣeṣeyē
53 sakṣaḷa dig-bhittigala || [48*] || Vṛi || Vinaya-nidhāna-apratīma-rūṇam-anūṇa-charitraṇ-udgha-
   kāṅchana-tanu-varṇan-ujvala-yaśaḥ-pravirājitum(n-a)tyudra-maṇḍana-maṇi-
54 ratnān-ndu Kalidēvana putranān-oldū kūde mēdini mudadiṁde baṇipipuṇa Kāchanarūrjita-satya-vāchana || [49*] || Ā punya-mūrttiya mūr̥ūmu modala gū-

55 trājar || Kaṁ || Vimala-charitrāṇī vidyā-rāmaṇāṁ śrī... [pra]vīrājat-kamaḷa-vana-mitrānti-suddha-manaṁ Narasimhadēvaṁ-i vara-dēva || [50*] || Kaṁ || Suru-

56 ehira-chaṁdr-ābharāṇāṁ vara-sakti-trayan-Umā-priyāṁ vibudha-jan-ōtka-ra-saṁstutyan-

57 dāna-lakāṅa-haṁtāṁ bhāvīse migālādaṁ vaṁśa-āvahateyaṁ-imtu Jakkan-amaragajakakāṁ || [52*] || Kalidēvana-tanayaṁ-nirūrmaḷa-charitar-Bhrmadēvanāṁ dhavala-

58 vanuṁ vasumatiyō || [53*] || Āvaruṁ-eṇe tavag-alla mahī-vatayad-eṇiśi Chikkaṇabbeya modaloḷ-Gōvindā Mallikāryaṇjuna-i vasumati pogaḷe bhāva-mayudam-eṇe-

59 dar || [54*] || Va || Int-ensid-ā mahānubhāvana dharmmas-emit-eṇe || Vṛi || Taḷajā

60 lke māṇiśi susaṅchita-puṇya-dhana-prabhāvamaṁ taḷedavār-āro Niṁbaragey-ūrodeyaṁ Kalidēvanāṁ-āndadi || [55*] || Kaṁ || Dēva-grihaṁ śīkharadā bhūdēva-grihaṁ śatā-sāle-

61 dānangal-Kalidēvanā dharmmaṁgāl-eṣeuvvū-ā-chānḍr-ārka || [56*] || Intu jagāṁ pogaḷe

62 ga-pūjā-nivīdyaṅkaṁ tapōdhana bhōjanakkarāṁ brāhmaṅcura śatā-kaṅḍika-puruṇakkarāṁ1 Svasti samastā-bhuvan-āraṁya śrī-prithivivallabha mahārājaḥi-

63 rāja paramēśvara paramabhaṭṭaṁgaṁ Satyaśrāya-kuḷa-tālaṅkaṁ Chālukyaṁbharapaṁ śrīmād-Bhūlōkamallādēvāra viṭaya-rājya-uttara-ōttar-ābhivṛddhi-pra-

64 vardhamānam-ā-chānḍr-ārka-tāraṁvaṁ saṁvatā Kallyā(ly)apuṇuḍa nevēdinoḷ-sukha-

65 ttēlēnya 1057 neya svasti śrīmāḥ-Chālukya-sarbbajña Bhūlōkamalla-var-

66 māvāra Puṣyav(ṣya)-nakshatra Vyatipāta Chūḍāmaṇi-Sūryya-grahnadāṛhdu Mādiḥalāda Koti-SAṅkara-dēva-āchāryarum1 Kaṁ || Parama-taṇa-śrī-

67 vanītege charitrāṁ Bhāratige matī diśājalaka-sudhridayagge kirttiy-ādudou suruchirama-

68 prakasālanaṁ mādi ḷallaraṭa tana praṭhubhutva Sivarājanahalīya umālī-ṣaḷag-āgī

69 g-āgī dhārā-ṃrahkṣakadāṁ koṭṭau [1] śrīman-mahāpradhānaṁ hirīya-daṇḍanāyakaṁ Kālīmarasara binnapadiṁ śrīmād-Bhūlōkamallādēvarum patta-

1 There is a spiral mark after this.

2 The letter u which had been omitted formerly, is inserted in the lower line, flanked by spirals on either side, between the letters /a and ḷa.
70 mahādeviyarum paramēsvara-dattiy-āgi sarbba-namaśyaṁ mādi haḷljyaṁ mēl-āḷkeyaṁ dēvargge dhāra-pūrbbakaṁ mādi biṭṭar [ ] *ērman-māhāmaṇḍalēvaṁ Mālīditēvaṁ-

71 sara tanuma manneyavolaj-āgi antu trī-bhōg-ābhyantraṁ dēvargge dhāra-pūrbbakadim biṭṭaru mattaṁ Maravādigeya-manneya-geyi kālaṭiya mattar-embhattumāṁ vaṭṭara voinḍumaṁ dēvargge

72 dhāra-pūrbbakaddaṁ biṭṭaru [ ] * mattaṁ Kallarasanun Kāchaṛasanun Nīṭābarageya tamma kēriya holadolage Bānīṭeya-geyyin bāḍaja haḷḷađiṁ mūḍalu kālaṭiya mattar-ayvattumāṁ biṭṭaru [ ] * Huṇuḥ-

73 segoladallī hūvina tōṇṭam mattar-eraṇḍu dēvariṁ paḍuval-amgajijy-endoru Kallarasaṁ tām-anuĉehāyada avatamāṁ gāṇavāyavmaṁ biṭṭaru dēvariṁte ḍikaṁ bhojaṇa-sāleya paḍuvaṇa bīḍyaṁ teṁ-

74 kal-ūṛ-aggoḍe mērey-āgi mūḍaṇa-kēriya va...kēriya prajegalu tāv vaccha Siddhāyada ponqe 5 hoṁbēraṁ hoṅg-okkuḷada lekkadiṇ īḷjamumāṁ dhānyadal-irbbala bhatta-

75 mumāṁ biṭṭaru [*] hirīya kēriya………………….röda dāsāvandhad-olage bānīṭiya bāviyaṁ paḍuvalu biṭṭa tōṇṭam kālaṭiya mattar-ondu [*] Harā-pada-bhaktar-uppa Nagaram Kālīditēvarī-

76 ttaṁ sudhirataraṇ-āgal-amgajijyal-ommanā dhānyam-ad-āvud-ādaṛjanī [*] suruchiram-
äge divigge sOLSad-adṛddhaman-ethpayaṁ maṇōḥaram-ene vilēyaḵk-añkey-omid-ele-
ant-eraṛjanī niraṅṭhara 1 || 58* || Ma-

77 ttaṁ Maravādigeya prajegalu tāv vaccha Siddhāyada ponqe 5 hoṁbēraṁ hoṅg-okkuḷada lekkadiṇ īḷjamumāṁ dhānyadal-irbbala bhattumāṁ ondu gadyaṇa homna kāṇikeymaṁ dēvargge biṭṭaru in-ti vrīṭi-yo-o-

78 lage biyā-gitā-vāda-nrajityakaṁ Bānīṭeya-geyya sthalaṁ-olag-āgi elavada maradiṁ mūḍalu kālaṭiya mattaru 150 uppattu manuṣya(ṣhya) brahmanāra ṣatrakke diṅkhita-geyi kālaṭiya

79 mattaru 50 haḷḷaḍiṁ mūḍalu kālaṭiya mattaru 12 khaṃḍika-puruśakkaṁ Madalēma-
duceriva haḷḷaḍiṁ teṅka kālaṭiya mattaru 30 allīṁ paḍuvalu Kēsava-dēvaruṁ pūjisup-upādhiyāyargge kālaṭi-

80 ya mattaru 12 allīṁ paḍuvalu Štalagaḍuge…... ge kālaṭiya mattaru 16 aravaṇṭageya niṁ-gaṇa brahmanāṁge mattaru 4 samkheyaṁge mattaru 3 Brahmāpurīya [bra]-

81 [hma]...... laḍiya mattaru 3........... llaṁ dēvar-amgabhōga-nivetya-chaṅträpaṁvitrakkan āṭtipādhanaramā graśakakāṁ khaṃḍasphuṭita-jīṛpp-ōḍḍhārakkaṁ Int-śudharmama...-

82 ............ mmadimāṁ pratipālisuvaṁ r(ī) sthānake niṛūpisadavara niyāmaṁ-dappi naḍeį-
avargge dushta-nigraha-siṣṭha-pratipāḷana mā-

83 rppdu māḍad-upēkhaśiḍdavara ta........... Rauravakke galagalan-śīḷavaru r(ī) dharmamāṁ pratipālisadavargge Vāraṇāsīyalūṁ Kurukbēstraduluṁ sāyira kavileyas-
alaṁkā-

84 ra-sahātan dānam geydha phalav-akku.............. d-īha-paraṇad-aṭkhaun-aṭtaṁ pūny-ā-
-spadan-āldiḍaṇaṁ hūljita satt-udayisai Rauravadol-iṅkum-ā-chandre-ārkka 1 || 59* || Śloka3 Bhāhubhir-vvasudhā dhaḍ(a)ttā rā-

1 There is a spiral mark after this.
1 DGA/69
80 jabhis=Sagar=ādibhiḥ(bhiḥ) [ | * ] yasya ya.............[dā] phalaṁt1 [ || 60* || ] Sāmānyo
yaṁ dharmma-sētur-nri(nri)pāṇām kālekāle pālanīyō bhavadbhiḥ [ | * ] sarbān-ētān= bhāginah pāṛthivendraṁ-bhūyō
86 bhūyō yāchatē Rāmaçarṇa[draḥ] [ || 61* || ]........,vā yō harēta vasumādharū-[tū | *]
śahśitr-vvarsha-sahasraṇī viśāṭayaṁ jāyate kṛmīḥ [ || 62* || ] Viśudhy-āṭavaiḥv=
atōyēśhu śuṣka-kōṭara-vāsinaḥ [ | * ]
87 krishṇa-sarppā hi jāyantē dēva-bhūg-āpahāriṇāḥ1 [ || 63* || ] Ā ḫaḷiyya pratibaddhada
keygaḷ-āvuv=emādaṛe Nibbharageya mūḍaṇa nāgara-bāviyinī mūḍalu tūṃṭaṁ mā-
88 rtaṁ(ttar) nālku 4 ā śriim pāḍuvaṇa marāṇjeyinī ḫattiḍa mūḍaln dikshita-geyi
kāla māṭtar-ayivattu 50 ā marāṇjeyinī pāḍuvalu Sīrūrā-sīmeiyin teṅkalu Som-
89 naganbiyā sīmeiyin mūḍalu Kaṁbagana-konājāradinī baḍagaḷu ḫaledore sahitav-āgi
Sella-konājāraṁ māṭtar-embhättu 80 ā marāṇjeyinī mūḍalu Sīrūrā-konājāradinī ba-
90 ḫagalu Asaga-goṅjāraṁ māṭtaru haṁneradu 12 ā marāṇjeyinī mūḍalu sthāḷa-vṛttiya
i(l) vattāriṁ teṅkalu Bāṅṭheya-geyi māṭtar-epatāu 70 I sthānad-āchāryyaru purvvvā-
91 sra(sra)ya-brahmaṇar-āgi Māḍiphalada Śaṅkaradēvara māṭhad-āchāryya Dhruvēvara-
dēvara śīṣya-samānāva-āgala-vērkkum Dhruvēvara-dēvara saudare Kallarassa
Dēmaledēviya
92 tad-dinam-āhalaṅgam vaidika-kriyeyinī māḍuvudu sthānad-āchāryyayar-akke prabhuv=
akk-ārādaḷam-ī vṛī(वṛ)ittiyan-ottey-īḍalum māṛalum dāna geṣyalum sallalu mī-
93 rīdandu daṃḍyaru otteyam hiḍīdarum daṃḍyaru [||*]

---

1 There is a spiral mark after this.
2 This letter is inserted above the line.
No. 25—THANA PLATES OF MUMMUNIRAJA, SAKA 970

(3 Plates)

V. V. MIRASHI, NAGPUR

(Received on 8.11.1968)

These plates were discovered in 1956 while digging the ground between the Church and the District Office at Thanā, the chief town of the Thana District in Maharashtra. They were presented by Mr. M. V. Hegde, M.L.A., to the Director of Archives, Bombay. They are now deposited in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. Dr. P. M. Joshi, Director of Archives, Bombay, sent me photostat copies of the inscription on the plates, from which I edited the grant first in Saṁśādana-muktāvati (Marathi), Part IV, pp. 115 ff., in 1961. I edit it here from the same copies.

The copper plates are five in number, the first and the last being inscribed on the inner side only and the rest on both the sides. The plates measure 12½" in breadth and 10" in height and are held together by a ring which has the usual Silāhāra Garuḍa seal. The plates, the ring and the seal weigh nearly 12½ seers. The inscription is in a good state of preservation, but in lines 63, 66, 91 and 110 a few place-names, personal names and a gotra name have become illegible.

The characters are of the Nāgari alphabet as in other grants of the Early Silāhāras. The letter a has assumed the form of modern Hindi a (see adhyāpī, line 23); bh has not yet developed a tail in its left limb (see sikhara, line 2); the forms of jh, the subscript v in the conjunct ve and the palatal ś are noteworthy (see śrivajamśa, line 12; Karuṇa-line 18; and Śivā, line 3). In stating the grants in dranjas figures are used. The forms of figures 5, 7, 8 and 9 are noteworthy.

The language is Sanskrit and, like other grants of the Early Silāhāras, the present one also is written partly in verse and partly in prose. There are thirty-three verses in all, of which twenty-two occur in the eulogistic portion. The record opens with a verse in praise of Gopānayaka (Gopāpati), which is followed by another invoking the blessings of Śiva. The next fifteen verses which eulogise Jīmūtavahana and the Silāra (Silāhāra) kings born in his family from Kapardin I to Chhittāraja are repeated from the earlier grant of the Silāhāras. The next five verses which describe Chhittāraja and his brothers Nāgarjuna and Mumumūpi are new, but they contain mere conventional praise. The formal part of the grant, except for the details of the donces, villages and lands granted etc., is also repeated from the earlier grants of the family. The grant is written generally in correct Sanskrit. As regards orthography, the dental s is in many cases written for the palatal ṣ and vice versa also in one case (see sikhara, line 2 and śradāna, line 49); v is usually written for b (see durgah-anuvadhik, line 9) and the consonant following r is reduplicated (see parārthē, line 4).

The genealogy of the Silāhāras is given as in other grants of the family. In the family of Jīmūtavahana, the son of Jīmūtaśāstra, who sacrificed his life to save Śākhhchāda from Garuḍa, was born Kapardin (I), the ornament of the Silāra (Silāhāra) family. He was succeeded by the

1 Of these, verses 18 and 19 occur in the description of Arikēsārin in the Thana plates of the king, dated Saka 939.
following kings—his son, Pulasakti; his son Laghu Kapardin (or Kapardin II); his son Vappuvanna; his son Jhanjha, who built as many as twelve temples of Śiva evidently at the sites of the twelve Jyotir-lingas and named them after himself; his brother Gōggrāja; his son Vajjada I; his son Aparājita, who welcomed Gomma, who sought refuge with him, established Aiyapadēva firmly on his throne and gave security from fear to Bhillama, Anuṣa and Mambuva. He assumed the title of Birulaṅka-Bāma. He was succeeded by Vajjada II and the latter by his brother Arikēsarin. He marched with his army to Somaṇātha-pājan, where he offered his conquests to the god Somaśvara as directed by his father. His nephew Chhitujāja succeeded him. He was followed by his younger brothers Nāgarjuna and Mummupirāja, one after the other. The description of most of these princes is conventional and yields no historical information.

The object of the present inscription is to record the grant, by Śilāhāra Mummupirāja, of some villages and lands to learned Brāhmaṇas on the occasion of a lunar eclipse on the fifteenth fortnight of Phālguna in the Śaka year 970, the cyclic year being Sarvadhūrīna. The date corresponds regularly to the 20th February, A.D. 1049, when there was a lunar eclipse and the cyclic year also was Sarvadhūrīna according to the southern scheme. The grant was made for the religious merit of the crowned queen Padmā. The present plates record first the grant of the revenue of the following villages in the Varetikā viṣaya (district) named to the fourteen Brāhmaṇas named below who hailed from Karahāṭaka—Ekāśāla, Būtavali, Vādavali and Asalagṛama and of fields in Umbaravali and one more, the name of which has now become indistinct. The grant was in the form of the stated number of drāmas from the revenue of the villages and fields besides one drāma per house and also a Kumārāgadyāgaka. The names and other particulars of the donees are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Brāhmaṇa</th>
<th>His father's name</th>
<th>Gṛta</th>
<th>Śākhā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita</td>
<td>Tlkapaiya</td>
<td>Jamadagni-Vata</td>
<td>Rgveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rāma Paṇḍita (Brother of No. 1)</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lakshmīdhara Paṇḍita</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gopati Paṇḍita</td>
<td>Rāma Paṇḍita</td>
<td>Jamadagni-Vata</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chakrapāhbigbhāṭṭa</td>
<td>Drūgabhaṭṭa</td>
<td>Kapil</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems that these fourteen donees were living at one place which is not named in the grant. The villages have not, therefore, been assigned to them severally. Their revenue in the form of
The purpose of the grant was to provide for the observance, by these Brāhmaṇas, of their religious duties such as sacrificing for themselves and for others and the study and teaching of the sacred texts, the performance of the pañcha-mahāyajñas and the maintenance of their families.

While stating the boundaries of the villages the following particulars are given: The village Ėkasāla was bounded by the river Ulasa on the east and by the river Pavāhā on the south. The way to (the village) Siyali formed its western boundary. The village Vaḍavali was bounded on the north by the river Pavāhā. The village Ąsalarāma had fields of Vaḍavali and Vikāra on its eastern and northern boundaries. Another donated village, the name of which has now become illegible, had a cow-path of the village Ėkasāla and the river Pavāhā as its eastern and southern boundaries respectively. Other boundaries of the donated villages are also mentioned, but they are not useful for their identifications. But the particulars given above of some boundaries of the donated villages show clearly that all of them were situated near each other and so their revenue and other income could be easily pooled together and distributed among the donees.

Besides, the present plates record the grants of the produce partly in the form of drammas and partly in food-grains from fields in two other sets of villages, not included in the Varējkā vishaya, to certain Brāhmaṇas individually. The villages were situated in the following two vishayas:

(A) Villages in the Abhyantara-śatśashtāśi-vishaya:—
   (i) Mūlanda and (ii) Vēriyalā.

(B) Villages in the Śūrpāraka-śatśashtāśi-vishaya:—
   (i) Bṛihad-Ādānikā (ii) Laghu-Ādānikā (iii) Khānuvaḍā (iv) Pēḍhāla and (v) Vīrāra.

The villages Kādhēvālī-pallikā and Mānēgrāma are mentioned in stating the boundaries of fields in Vēriyalā. The village Khaḍīvaligrāma is mentioned as forming the western boundary of a field in Laghu-Ādānikā and Uppalappallikā as a hamlet of the village Vīrāra. The fields are named generally after the kind of food-grains produced in them such as Khairāgī-khaṭṭā, Vāḍa-khaṭṭā, Nīkura-khaṭṭā, etc. While stating the boundaries of the donated fields in

1 A close examination of the present grant shows that in the case of a few fields only, certain levies of rice are laid down, in addition to the amount in drammas. These fields are as follows: Kāṭṭhāravīṭṭhi-khaṭṭā (lines 99-100); Vāḍa-khaṭṭā (line 106); Nīkura-khaṭṭā (line 111); Vēriyalā-khaṭṭā (line 114); two Pēḍhā-khaṭṭās (line 120) and two Vīrārī-khaṭṭās (line 123). These must evidently have been rice-fields and so, in addition to a certain amount of drammas, a levy in rice-grain is mentioned for being paid to the donees. In other fields other food-grains may have been grown. It is not known whether Kāṭṭhāravīṭṭhi, Vāḍa, Nīkura, Vēriyalā etc., were different kinds of rice grown in these fields. Dr. Dikshit states, on the authority of some residents of Kōkhan, that Pēḍhā, Chōli, Thāpasa, Āsada, etc., are fields of different types (I.O.I., Vol. XII, pp. 273 f). In some cases it is clear that the fields were named after the crops grown in them. See Nāgātāya-khaṭṭā, lines 123-24; Vēriyalā-khaṭṭā, line 124.

The present grant contains some words not met with in Sanskrit dictionaries, e.g., pāḍhāṇa meaning ‘produce in grains’, uṇaś meaning ‘a field producing subsidiary grains’ (cf. rāvakas in Marathi), rāvaka meaning ‘a field’ (cf. căwra in Marathi), etc.}
these villages the following particulars are specified: fields, hills, ukāsa (fields producing subsidiary grains), fruit gardens, trees, rows of boundary-stones (pādāhāra-prīkhalikā), small streams, cow-paths, khajjana (salty land), jāniya-prāpatas (water-falls), salty streams, temples, royal roads, etc.

The produce of the fields in the aforementioned villages in rice-measures and drummas was assigned to the following Vāvaḷaka Brāhmaṇas. They had not all come from Karahāta like those mentioned before, but had migrated from different places as stated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Brāhmaṇa</th>
<th>His father’s name</th>
<th>Original place</th>
<th>Gōtēra</th>
<th>Śāhā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Daddapaiya</td>
<td>Brahmanāyaka</td>
<td>Madhyadēśa</td>
<td>Gārgya</td>
<td>Rigvēda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vāpyaiya</td>
<td>Dhālana-Shaḍangavīd</td>
<td>Karahāta</td>
<td>Vāśishtha</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gōvindaiya</td>
<td>Mahādharaiya</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>Jamadagni-Vatsa</td>
<td>do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Namapaiya</td>
<td>Madhuvaiya</td>
<td>Purī</td>
<td>Bhūradvāja</td>
<td>Gōbhila (Śāmavēda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lōkapaiya</td>
<td>Vāvaḷaiya</td>
<td>Karahāta</td>
<td>Kāšyapa</td>
<td>Rigvēda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While stating the measures of grains, the following are mentioned: mūtaka, khāṇḍikā and kūṭaka. Lines 115-116 state first the quantity of grains in one donation as one mūtaka less by five kūṭakas and later mention the same quantity as follows: 3 khāṇḍikās and 15 mūtakas. This gives the following table of the measures of food-grains:

20 kūṭakas — 1 khāṇḍikā
4 khāṇḍikās — 1 mūtaka

These measures varied from village to village. So to state the intended measure the expression grāma-māṇēna is used. It shows that the intended measure was that current in the particular village. In the case of the measures of Sthānaka (the capital) Kallivana-māṇēna is used, which probably refers to the measures current in Kallivana (modern Kalvan in the Nasik District). In some cases the produce was exempted from excise dues or toll cess.

As for the localities mentioned in the present grant, the Varētikā viṣaya seems to have comprised part of the modern Karjat taluk of the Kolaba District as many of the villages mentioned as situated in it can be satisfactorily identified in the vicinity of the Bhivapuri Road Station of the Central Railway, which lies in the Karjat taluk. The identifications of most of them were first suggested to me by Mr. N. B. Atre, who belongs to that locality. Later, they were identified by Dr. M. G. Dikshit with the aid of large-scale Survey Maps. “Ekasāla is to be identified with a village of the same name, now situated about 1-1/2 miles to the north of the Bhivapuri Road railway station on the Central Railway. About a furlong to the north of this village flows the river Ulhāsa (Glasa of the grant) in the direction indicated in the copper-plate charter. About a mile to the south of Ekasāla lies the village Varjaval, without any change in its old name. A small stream flows in between Ekasāla and Varjaval crossing the railway track near the mile-stone 8E. 57. The stream is evidently the same as the river Pavahā mentioned in the grant. To the south of the
village Vāḍavali there is a small hillock ... and behind it lies the village Bhūṭavali, which is about a mile to the south-west of Vāḍavali ... About a furlong to the north of Bhūṭavali we come across a small hamlet called Āsala, which is indicated by the same name in the charter. About two furlongs still north of Āsala there lies another Vāḍi specified by the name Bēkare, which is evidently the same as Vikarāla mentioned in the copper plates. In this way nearly all the villages mentioned in the first section of the charter can be identified satisfactorily in the vicinity of the railway station Bhivapuri Road within a radius of 5 to 6 miles. The copper-plate grant mentions a village (whose name is effaced in the original) as having a temple of Ghaṭēśvara. In view of the identification of Ėkasāla as above proposed, it seems certain that it is the modern village Ambīvali which lies about a mile to the west of Ėkasāla. The village Umharavali, whose boundaries are not specified in the grant, is probably represented by Umroli, a small village situated about a mile to the south of the Bhivapuri Road railway station. As for Varētiča, after which the Varētiča vishaya was named, Dr. Dikshit would identify it with Variti, which is situated on the Bhivandi-Wāḍē road and lies about 12-1/2 miles to the north of Bhīwandi in the Bhivandi taluk of the Thana District. But it lies far to the north of these places. It is more likely to be identical with Varhaḍi situated near Bhivapuri as suggested by Mr. Atre.

As stated before, the villages in the second part of the present grant were situated in two vishayas viz., Abhyantara-shaṭhahasti and Sūrprakara-shaṭhahasti. The former of these is evidently identical with the Sthānak-Abhyantara-shaṭhahasti vishaya, mentioned in the Bhaṇḍup plates of Chhattisgarh. It was so called because it included the Silahara capital Sthānak (modern Thāṇā) and was afterward included from the Sūrprakara-shaṭhahasti vishaya, which comprised the territory round Sūrprakara, modern Sopāra in the Bassein tahuk. The former comprised the territory between the Thāṇā and Bassein creeks. As for the places mentioned as situated in it, Mūlanda still retains its ancient name and is a station near Thāṇā of the Central Railway. Bōriyali is evidently modern Bōrivali, a station on the Western Railway, which is the chief town of a taluk of the same name in the Thana District. Kādhēvalipalikā is probably Kāṇjivali, 6 miles west of Thāṇā. Mānegrāma is identical with Manōrī near Bōrivali, and Khānuvadā is Khānuvadā, east of the same place. As for the places included in the Sūrprakara-shaṭhahasti, Dr. Dikshit has shown that the two villages Brhad-Adanikā and Laghe-Adanikā are identical with the village Adānā, situated 8-1/2 miles to the east of Virā, which lies about 5 miles north of Sopāra (ancient Sūrprakara). A small stream separates the two parts of the village, which seems to have been known by the names of the Large and Small Adanikās in ancient times. Kāṇjivali lies to the west of Adanikā, and Khānuvadā to the north of it. Virā still retains its ancient name and is a station on the Western Railway. Pēdhāla is identical with Pelhā, about 8 miles N.N.E. of Bassein. Uppalapalikā, a hamlet of Virā, seems to have emerged itself in Virā.2 Some other places mentioned in the present grant are well known. Thus Purī was the ancient capital of the Silhāras. It is identified by some with Rājapuri near Janjirā, but this identification appears doubtful as the place lies far from Sthānaka. It may have been situated not far from Thāṇā. Consens identified it with a site in the middle of the Salsetti island near the village of Mārol.4 He has pointed out that there are vestiges of Hindu temples at the place. This place is central for the territory under the rule of the Silhāras and may, therefore, represent ancient Purī. There is, however, no indisputable proof of it.

1 J.O.I., Vol. XII, p. 266.
2 Varētiča-vishaya is mentioned in the Vāḍavali plates of Aparādiya and probably also in the Thāṇā plates of Arkalasarin.
4 Medieval Temples of the Deccan, p. 81.
1 सिद्धः [%] जयद्वृक्षदश्वः॥ अमते सवर्कायेऽयु पूज्या गणायकः।।
विन्म निपृणसि व: पायादपायादगणः।

2 नायकः [II[111*]] स व: पातु दिवो नित्यं यमोलो भाति जाल्वी।
मुमंसि (विष) सरोदगच्छद्वन्दवकल्लुप।

3 मा [II[211*]] जीमूङकेुतुतन्यो नियतं दयालुक्ष्मीमूंतवहनं दिति निनिगत्यसिद्धः।।
देहं निज तुण्डमिः।

4 बालक्षयसु नरं गौरवं रक्षति स्म कर्त्तमध्यकालुः बंस्क दृष्टः (हम)॥ [II111*]
तस्यान्यं निगदवशु परम्परानुन-रर-।

5 नन्दुत्रत्चुरिततिनमेंवायादपः॥ श्रीसाहसिकः ।। दव साहसिकः कपारी सोल-।
रव्यातिको नृप-।

6 तिथिः (व्यः) मृतुभ [II[111*]] तस्मादभूमः ।। तनये: पुलशक्तिनामा सीमासम: </br> सुगुप्तदिराजेनात्मात:।। निनिघज्यते संगमु-।

7 श्रीजवल्लभिरवर्म्को निकटों जगति राज्याकार येन [II111*] ततोपि सम्भूः सुतो।। नपिन्दोविन्यायमणिः।

8 सि (विष) नः शुभिनिवापरोरिकरिणाः कपारी लघुः।। यदीययशसा जगत्यविवयेन </br> शुक्तीकृते न भाति सु-।

9 रज्जनो मैं शमी (सवी) न दुर्गामुखः (सु) विष: [II[111*]] तस्माद्वचविभूमित-।
पववयामां पवित्रसीताश्चपदमावलं म-।

10 हृदितिकः: श्रीवपव्यवः; मुं।। संग्रामार्गसिरिकरणासिद्धयाः नूतनकठता हठास्वः।।
येन विः।

11 नायका विरचिता विन्दुपाणि दत्तिव: [II[111*]] तस्मात्तत्तमत्रं रजनिकर विवान्दितापायतः।।

1 From photostat copies supplied by Dr. P. M. Joshi. [The illustrations are from the impressions prepared in the Office of the Chief Epigraphist.—Ed.]
2 Expressed by a symbol.
3 Properly श्रीसाहसिक, but changed for the sake of the metre. [श्रीसाहसिक is the intended reading.—Ed.]
12 द्वाय: श्रीभद्रराजो दिवकर इव द्वस्तनिषयोप:। धंशेयों द्रवहारिः विशंधयनिराके—

13 तृतीय मनोध्येण सीपनानीव मने प्रणततन्त्रूतां स्वर्गमार्गोक्तानां (नाम) ॥[८१]* ॠता तत्र तत्ततोज (क्व) रक्ष—

14 सो(शो) राविभकाशीकृताशोकावल्यो व (व) लो व (व) लखलो श्रीमोगिराजोभवत। नियापक्ष्यकमणि

15 प्रवाणं वर्तमानंते भूतवि भीमन्द्रोणपुष्पामुलप्रत्यक्ष्यकी स्वप्नाकिरितं प्रकाशनीयकरिष्ठार्थः। ॥[९१]* तत्त्वातिशयकारिष्ठार्थः—

16 चरितप्रकाशकीसिः युतास्त्र स्वर्णमध्यभावः मर्यदाः च चुक्लाधिपि। इत्येवणुनिर्देशः ( ) लखलो यस्य स—

17 हस्त वर्णादर्पणं राजाघ्रीः स्वर्णमलयात्र वक्ष्यम रतिः चक्रे मुरारिरव ॥[१००]* जयता इव वृहारे: पुराक—

18 रंगिन धामुः। तत: श्रीभाष्टमुः सचिरिन्द्रपराजित:। ॥[११३]* कण्यनस्त्यागः य: साधारस्यवः अः युः—

19 भिंडि:। प्रतापाभिन्नतानां: कालवद्धस्य दिवसः (पामू) ॥[१२२]* शरणागतसामान्ता अपरा अवश्यम जगति रक्ष—

20 ता येन्। स स जयति यथायोऽनमस्तुशरणागत्वक्षणवरे देव:। ॥[१३१]* येन स्वागतमात्य विभिन्ना गोः—

21 मनाव नानाविवचने वनेवचयवेदनानमिचि राज्यु स्तिरः कारितं (तमू)। भिलमामामममममममबूः—

22 स्वितम्भजण्ड दर्तच व वेदनाय तद्यु बीवि (विश) उद्दका (क) राममुण्यःस्यकिश्मानग्यः। ॥[१४७]* श्रीभाष्टमूः—

23 तदनु वजजेदेवनामाः स्वप वाममकमणिन्तत्त्व नयवः। अर्ययाः यस्य चरितानि


* Read भिलमामाममममबूः।
24 जना: समस्तता रोमा(मा)चक्रनिवित्तग्रहलता स्थूलति॥ [१५॥१°] तद्भवत्तव
तत्तत्विषयारूपी जाति: स-
25 तव समस्ती दुःपारातिक्कूललक्षणमहाने दम्मोनिविलीक दशतु। गव्या वैस(श)व एव संियसहिः-
26 तव [ष्टव] च सोमेिवर तस्मादेष पिंणामाय जगदः य: कीलयङ्गताः: इ।[१६॥१°]तत्वतात्तवो बजाहहैयव-
27 सूतुः श्रीसच्चाराजो नूतिवद्वः(व्र)भुवः। सीलारसात्वि(शः) विसु(शु)वानि येन
नीत: परामृितंमुिपलते
28 [१७॥१°] लम्ब(स्व)लकानि कुचकृषितोपकाण्डःस्यहरितालकानि निरंजनानि।
उत्तात्तवोत्तरकालस्यविवि-
29 स्रिस्य योति:पुराणिः परिप्रेषणनस्य चके [१८॥१°] हतारितारोंमें शामसेनेन
कसम्ब(संि)ईलादिवः। व(व्र)हरिगमणप았-
30 पं यस्य कीलतिक्केिति:हिति [२१॥१°] दुःपारातिषु कोषकालमहान: सीमास्य
नारायणो बास्त्रीणु तत्तोमुच-
31 स्मदमधिकराज्य: क्षापि: [१] यस्यामानुस्मुिजित् भुजन(व्र)लो दुःि्मास(श)म्
हिंिप्य निभािशीतव राणमृिगयांसिनि।
32 नी दोहेगक्षेत्रता [२०॥१°] यदसमिनििविः (वि)रामसमितवेशभदानप्रसरतदसिल
शुष्कहर(र्तसो)तस्यो विविजाजोः। अ-
33 रिनगरीरिताहोधामिस्रग्रामिनस्यप्रसरभयांमिशरमिलानायिनिपिनि [२१॥१°]
तदनु
तस्मानम्ह ग्रामिनमागः-
34 स्तीिकृतः: कृततिरुविविभवमुिमुिण: क्षोपालः। विनिद्वनुि यमिनि:वाजिनी-
राजमानैतः व(व्र)लस्-
35 भिन्धिः व(व्र)सीमायाििः चापसन्नक्तु [२२॥१°] अष्ट वक्त्रियुगियोद्योिसा
मिश्रितपुिवचमहापत्त्व(व्र)महासा
36 स्त्रियिक्षितमाप्पुपय[स]धवरसि(वि)लहार्लाइरेिमतवाहििनक्तयासुिमुिमण्डलः।
व्यििविचारः-
37 मसमुद्गातिविन्यासकरणगतमभूमि परमाङ्करामात्त्रज्ञानप्रदर्शिंद्रमर्शचिंद्रम (म्भ) ररसुः
मुण्डकालिककृतविस्मरितस्वरः
38 वंधरस (श्र) रणमतयाचयायस्थितस्मातराजाधिरजयितमहामण्डलेन्द्रवश्चमममुणिने
हेतुरारो निजभुजे
39 पारंतंतेममणिलंक्तमेत् पुरोपुशमतुतंशंगामस (श्र) त्यसमममित्ततस्मास्तकोणमभुव
समनुसारित
40 तरंगस्वतिताभाषामुडुमति महामायत्स्तीरिासे तथा महापाविविहीक्षझिन्दिख्रिवमे
सत्वे (सतप)
41 तत्रसमकाले प्रवर्त्तमाने स च महामण्डलेन्द्र (श्र) रश्त्रीयमुणिनेवेठराजः सत्वनिव
स्वसन (म्भ) ठ्यामान
42 कान्त्यादिति समागमिराजपुरस्मिनपुरोपास्मागमज्ञानाभावाविभागिनिपथ्य
रा-
43 ध्युतिनगररतिनिबिद्धारीकर्तांस्मिनपुरोपास्मागमज्ञनदितिः हृद्यमना
44 नगरपौरितिनिर्देशमपृथ्वीस्च चणितिज्ञात्वकासरासैं: (श्रे. ) संदिशयस्तु व: संविदित
यथा 
45 चला विभूतिः क्षणभिग्य युवनं कृतान्तदलानां जीवित (तमु) । तथापवषमा
पूर्वकालोऽयस्मात
46 ने नूयामहो विकम्याकरि चेंद्रलं (तमु) [२३११५३] तथा चाङ्तल्लीनजरारायणासी-
प्राचुश (थ) प्रास योवन
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47 स्वग्नमातारकामानं (म) माहत्समामागमविभीषणकं कावलीगमम (थम्र) वदसार: संसार: ।
सहजजराम
48 रणसाधारणकं शारीरं पवनचालितममिनीयदलापतंतत्रात्तरते धनात्तमी इति
मत्वा
49 बृहस्तिरकुतु (थ) धर्मा संगृहेक्रतुं दानपल (तमु) [२५४१५३] कृत वेदांमारंहु
तपोत्वम् (थयु) प्रास्ताते। मुनु
50 योश्व ततो ज्योंसति दानमेकं कलों युगे [२४४१५३] न तथा सफला बिधा
न तथा सफलत तथा। यथाज मुनयां

1 This danda is superfluous.
2 Read संघृहेक्रतुं दानपल (थम्र).
51 श्रावीनसेकं कली युगे [२५१] तथा वौक्तं भगवता व्यासेन। अभ्यर्पितं
प्रथम सुवर्णं भूवृज्णवी

52 सुर्यसुगल्ल गावः । लोकवर्यं तेन भवेत्रवर्तं यः कोचं गां च महीं
च देवात् [२६१] आस्फोटयति पिता

53 रः प्रवलेति पितामहः ॥ भूमिदोक्षलुके जातः सः नः संतारविवेति
॥ [२७१]

54 हन मदोब्रह्मा ॥ भूमिदानय पुष्याणि कलं स्वर्गं पुरुषः (स्वर्गं पूर्वः)
॥ [२८१]

55 निश्चननान्यवहादा (था) ये स्वधीयपाटमहाराजीपत्रायायाः । अशोकः मया
शकुनपः
कालातितसः

56 स्व (संब) सरासेपु नवसु सपत्यचिक्षेपु सर्वार्थसंव (संब) सरासेन्तकालुगुः
शुद्धां पंचदश्यां (थयां) यशा (आ) कलोपा

57 सम्ब (संब) तु ६७० फाल्गुनशुद १५ संवातसोमइल्लापवर्णिणि सुतीत्वः सनात्वा
गणानिकः

58 चतुष्कृ (च) हांमये कमलिनीकामुकाय भववते सं (स) ब्रह्म नानाविधि-
कृष्ण (स) मलाध्यामा (म) व्र (थ) देवा (व्र)

59 सकाचुरसुरसुरुः चालोवस्तामिनं भगवनसुमतापतिमभववच्यं वजनवाजनायाध्यनायाः

60 सकाचुरसुरसुरुः चालोवस्तामिनं भगवनसुमतापतिमभववच्यं वजनवाजनायाध्यनायाः

61 दी कर्षाटिविष्णुः जा (ज) मदिनावस्मोत्रम व (व) हुवशाखा (लिनं) महाद्रा (ब्रा) भ्रान्येयो यताना

62 हुवशाखा (ब्रा) हुवान्योतिकयो पाबायायमुत्तं तथेत्त्रा (दुः) तुवर्म (स्व) पणितं
तथेत्त्रा त्रातूलस्मिनचरणमिति

63 ... "विनिमोति ... \" गोवं व (व) हुर (च) शाश्वा (लिनि) कण्ठाकोश (च) वर्मणापाय \..." सुतं

* Four akṣaras have been effaced here. They can be conjecturally restored as कर्षाट।
* The name of the प्रव्र has become illegible.
* The name of केदाराभास्ता's father has become illegible.
64 कर्हादविनिगमंतजामदिनक्तस्योयज व (म) हुः चवशाला (दिनए) नोपतिपूंडीत स्थोराम्बु (म्ब) - पाणिखुसुंत

65 कर्हादविनिगमंतजाज (म) मदिननवसगोगज व (म) हुःचवशाला (दिनए) धार्यकरम्बु माथवम्बु - मुसुत कर卤ट (त) -

66 विनिगमंतामर्यंगुरज व (म) हुःचवशाला (दिनए) सोवर्णवंम्बु सुत नारायणम्बु . . . .

67 विनिगमंत कपिगोगज व (म) हुःचवशाला (दिनए) चक्षुपरिवधु द्रोणम्बुसुत कर -

68 वाटविनिगमंत (त) आकेयगोगज व (म) हुःचवशाला (दिनए) दाउपंयसुत माधव - ज्योतिर्वित (द)

69 कर्हादविनिगमंत (त) आकेयगोगज व (म) हुःचवशाला (दिनए) वाम्भ (म्ब) देवभुट (हर) रितिपसप्पमोहुसुत
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70 कर्हादविनिगमंतकाय (स्थ) पगोगज व (म) हुःचवशाला (दिनए) वाचलय (सं) दाउपंयसुत करहा -

71 टविनिगमंतबर्दाजगोगज व (म) हुःचवशाला (दिनए) दिवाकरें दिसिर्यसुत करहा -

72 टविनिगमंतकाय (स्थ) पगोगज व (म) हुःचवशाला (दिनए) जनाइनभुट (हर) वेदवल - फंकवितुम (त) . . . .

73 कर्हादविनिगमंतजाज (त) चेमगोगज व (म) हुःचवशाला (दिनए) वाम्भ (म्ब) जा तीक्ष्युसुत प्रभृति चतुर्दश - . . .

74 भयो ज्यन्याज्यानाध्याज्यापपाठवनाध्यपक्षमध्यकरणाय व (म) विपेरवेशवेशवेंत्येत्येत्येत्येत्ये - . .

75 यान्युपस्यायंत्व स्ययतिप्रध्यायस्य न प्रभृतिलित्विनारायणप्पंडित तथा दिवाकरेः . . . .

76 यान्यं वंदकेहं हुःचवमितिरेषो वंदकेक विघोय वर्णिकाविवाहान्त्य (तत्व) तित एकालाप्यामो

77 यत्र सिद्धायत्वात्तप्सम पुंचवत्सारिङ्गद्रम्माकानिन द्रम्मान्त चत्वारि गणना (तत्त) स्यातोछ पि द्र ४४५ [१८] य-

---

[1] Here again the name of a place is lost. It may have been कर्हादट.

[2] These दादास are superfluous.
78 स्य चापात्तनानि। प्रवेषत अत्तरधारी सीमा। दक्षिणत: पवहानानि। पश्चिमत: सिवलिपायचैः गो-।

79 नामम्।। उत्तरतोवश्यकदल्ला गोमागळाच। तत्तद्यामीयगुह्यमातथा कुम्भरगिर्यांकः-।

80 स्य।। तत्तद्यामीयाल्पणातीती। भूतवभः चिरागार्थो यह सिद्धासारलांकांम ज्योमिनिसंदिन्न्य द्रम्म-।

81 शतसुदसंकाली प्र २२३ [१] यस्य चापात्तनानि। प्रवेषतो विरकः।। दक्षिणतः पवहः।।

82 पश्चिमतः पवहः एव।। उत्तरतः विरकः एव।। तत्तद्यामीयगुह्यमातथा कुम्भरगिरि-।

83 यणकद्वः।। चौ।। तत्तद्यामीयाल्पणातीती बद्धवलीयामो एव सिद्धालसारलांकांम एकोन-।

84 सत्तावृक्षाक द्रम्मकाण्तसंकाली प्र २६२ [१४] यस्य चापात्तनानि। प्रवेषतो वरक-।

85 मणिरिलवशः।। दक्षिणत उज्जानबोधवलांकोरारिकाः।। पश्चिमतस्य विरकः।। उत्तरतः वद-।

86 हानी।। तत्तद्यामीयगुह्यमातथा कुम्भरगिर्यांकक्षः।। चौ।। तत्तद्यामीयाल्पणाती। भूतवभः चिरागार्थो यह सिद्धासारलांकांम ज्योमिनिसंदिन्न्य द्रम्मः।

87 सत्तावृक्षाक| प्र २५४ [१०] यस्य चापात्तनानि। प्रवेषतो बद्धवलीयामः एव।। विरक-।

88 कः।। दक्षिणतो विरकः एव।। पश्चिमतो वृ(१०११)हुवार्यः।। उत्तरतः विकर-।

89 शास्त्रमें| विरकः।। तत्तद्यामीयगुह्यमातथा कुम्भरगिर्यांकक्षः।। चौ।। तत्तद्यामीयाल्पणाती।

90 न्यायात| ग्रामालेंकम्बिंशक्तिपुरेतन्त्रं एव यह सिद्धालसारलांकांम ज्योमिनि-।

---

1 Read कुमारगिर्यांकक्षः।
2 Read विकर-ः।
3 This danda is superfluous.
4 The preceding name of the village has become illegible.
5 Read—छाब्लामाल्लांकोरारिकाः।
92 श्रद्धमा यत्राक्तोपित 48 [५५] यस्य चाहातानाः। पूवङ्क्त एकतालङ्गामध्ये
गोमाग्ने-।

93 दक्षिण: पवहामनी। पश्चिमः धीरागेशैवदेवसलक्पितपुर्विकाशेः
तथा राजः।

94 मार्गशी | उत्तरतो गोमाग्ना। तपातलश्रीघृंडमास्तः कुम्भराण्डिश्यन्तः

95 || छ || तपातलपितापण्यातिद्वारा(व्र)हराणाण्तपुष्पिन्द्रमिश्रमणां(नो)(म्व)वष्मी
रक्षली-भ्रानीया।

96 हृदाणात्मास्त्रामा यत्राक्तोपित हस्तध्रम ५० || छ || छ ||

97 तथा वरेतिकाविश्वयः(व्र)हस्तावेलकाशः(व्र)हरणेयो वराहो। मध्यदेशविनिमयः

98 ताय गाम्यगोशाय व(व)हुच्छाशिकीने महादा(व्र)हराणात्माय महादा(व्र)
हरणेयः(व्र)हरणेयः।

99 नायकसुताय अभ्यतापरपुष्पी(व्र)पर्यावरस्यात्मित(नःपाति)मूलद्रामाल्यः
व्रतिकोट्टरः।

100 वैद्यक्षेव यस्य सिद्धार्थाविश्वविद्यामास्तः वैद्यदुर्गायणमने पवादाधुरीहोणा साधः

101 मूर्तिकुशः यत्राक्तोपित समुपाल्यमान २० ब्रह्ममुड़ा १।। यस्य चा-

102 चाहातानाः। पूवङ्क्त: त्येवौण्डाश्चै। दक्षिणतो बदुक्रेस्तं वैवस्तकवावः

103 पश्चिमति वौलयेनाक्षरकङ्क्षुंकुष्मी(म्वी)केवः || उत्तरतो विन्दलिक्षेव(म्वी)पस-

104 तक्षेषः || तपातलस्वर्ण्यातिव(व्र)दग्धमोक्षमचेतसमां एव || छ || तथा कर्तारः

105 विविष्ठताय वासिष्ठगोशाय व(व)हुच्छाशिकी व्र(व्र)हराणावप्ययाय व्र(व्र)
हरणाप्रलयः।

106 वद्गविसुताय अभ्यतापरपुष्पी(व्र)विषाणात्मात्मित(नःपाति) वोरियलाप्रामानस्वे
हेः साधः

¹ Read कुमारिकाण्डकः।
² Read विषाणात्मातिः।
³ [The reading is सिक्कनी-……—Ed.]
107 यत्र सिद्धायात्तू, (दृशः) नादन्द्रमास्तर्यत्तद्राग्रामान्ते पलाण्डाकृंहिरीणां पादू (ये) -नर्तकतारिर (रो) मूठका-

108 दच। यग्नकंडोपिः ् द्र 36 श्रीहिंसुका 3।।। [1*] यस्य चाषात्तानि। पूर्वबंतः। खानुवका-

109 क्षेत्रस्तकङ्कासस्त्याः आविष्कारितकाशः। दक्षिणाः। विकंडका। पश्चिमतः।

110 . . . 'ग्रामप्रतिव (ब) दकार्तीसीपलिका। उत्तरस्य। विन दाजिपेयस-

111 लक्षाविकः।। तवात्ज्ञल्या (ल्यो) यनिन्द्रक्षेत्रः यत्र सिद्धायात्तादश द्रमास्तः-
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112 वैत्तिर्ग्रामान्ते पलाण्डाकृंहिरीणां दशकुटपापिकः। नानामूटक्काक्कः। यग्नकंडोपिः ् ० ८

113 श्रीहिंसुका ् ११। कु १० [1*] यस्य चाषात्तानि पूर्वबंतो वानेम्रामः।। दक्षिणाः। गोमार्गः। पश्चिमतः

114 गोपालरः।। उत्तरस्य। तवात्ज्ञल्या।। तवात्ज्ञल्या।। यत्र सिद्धायाप्रये द्रममा-

115 स्तवः ग्रामान्ते पलाण्डाकृंहिरीणां पंच कुटपोनः। मूटक्काक्कः।। यग्नकंडोपिः ् ० ६ श्रीहिः-

116 खंडिका ् ३ कुवः १५ [1*] यस्य चाषात्तानि। पूर्वबंतो विष्णुनारायण-देव सत्कंडवः।। दक्षिण-

117 तो निगुर्जेतः। पश्चिमतः। कुगम्ब्र(मिन्य) कपालः (बु) वसलक्ष्यामः।। उत्तरः। खानुवकस्त्रः।। तवात्त्यलोकः-

118 यस्यप्रतिव (व) दुःखहुन्ह द्रमास्तर्यत्समः।। एव।। ् ० २।। तत्। कर्षात्तिनिर्मितात्य कायः (ध्व) पगोवाय (ब) चुराः-

119 शालिः।। प्रार्ग (ब्रा) हाणासंध्वपेयः। प्रार्ग (ब्रा) हाणारिसवेयपेयसुताय। सू (शु) पपरक-पपट्टाविश्वान्तष्यातः।। पु (ए) बुढ़ा-

* Here the name of the village is effaced.
* This मूठ is superfluous.
* Read पपरक्षिदि पपट्टाविश्वान्तष्यातः पु (ब्रा) बुढ़ा.
120 यथा साधायितानि पूर्वति इ(ए) शायानि
दिशिमार्मायणेयि दिशि।
121 यावदवत्यवस्थात्वा न्यायोद्वस्तत्वा। यिन्यावस्तः युक्तकत्वावस्तः वादिववस्तः
उपरेन च।
122 दक्षिणातो वाक्ष्यत्वः तथा सिंहसितःप्रकः
प्रचमतः पापाण्यः ज्ञातः
तथा निलालमात्राः
123 शायानः। उत्तरातो मधुप्रकः
तथाद्वस्तः(त्यः) तथोद्वस्तः(त्यः)
सः यस्य
चालयः।
124 प्रकः तथा वदेवःप्रकः।
दक्षिणातो राजार्यः।
प्रचमतः पुर्वव्युक्तः
पापाण्यः
उत्तरः
125 तो माधोऽनार्यः।
एवं वेंचलकृत्यसिद्धायादविदिकानिमाम्काः
दम्मत्तते।
दलस्य
126 न पलाण्यात्राः।
सामुःप्रकः।
ब्रह्मक्तोऽपि इ १२२ सिद्धिमूडः
तथेत्तुशुममामः
127 धो गृहःकृत्यवः
तचे(त्त)कोऽतःकृत्यप्रतिवः(व) दम्मत्तमामः
तथेत्तिम्यानः
प्रतिबः पुर्वव्युक्तः
पापाण्यः
उत्तरः
128 चालयः।
पूर्वतिर वाससीतः।
दक्षिणातो जम्बू(मु)वर्दीशः।
प्रचमतः
वक्षविप्रायः।
उद्दनः
129 वक्षविप्रायः
एव तथा पुर्वव्युक्तः।
तथेत्तिम्यानः
प्रतिबः(व) दम्मत्तमामः।
यस्य चालयः।
130 शकः।
दक्षिणातो बेंदरीकाचः।
प्रचमतः
बेंदरीकाचः एव।
उत्तरातो
लक्षुवालिकः।
तथेत्तुशुममामः(त्त)।
131 ब्रह्मक्तः उद्दनात्तरः।
यस्य चालयः।
पूर्वतः एव्यः।
दक्षिणातो
गोम्यः।
प्रचमतः
गोम्यः।
132 उत्तरातो ब(व)स्य।
एवव वेंचलकृत्यसिद्धायात्तरविवाहमामः
बर्हस्तोऽपि इ ५० ।
तथेत्तुशुममामः

a. Read एघारः विद्यामार्मायणेयि दिशः पापाण्यः The following dasa is redundant.
b. Read विदिकानिमाम्काः.
c. Read हिस्याल्यायपातिः.
133 च। तत्त्वादिपालयानपातिः। चालवुर्गऽग्रामान्तविदशंकुसुमोमोलिक्षे।। यस्य चाचातानानि।

134 पूवंतो मधुवंक।। दक्षिणो राजकीयकुमुदोमोलिक्षे। परिचयमः। शारणदौऽक्षेंन। उत्तरसोऽक्षें।

135 वटुक्कस्ताया पूवंमुखन्यत्र।। तथावल्लोतियपिनवतवापोत्रेऽ।। यस्य चाचातानानि।

पूवंतो वटुक्कस्ताया। दक्षिण।  
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136 ज्ञातः कुंमुदोमोलिक्षे। परिचयमः। राजकीयकुमुदोमोलिक्षे। उत्तरः। पूवंमुखन्यत्र। पाणियप्रापऽतस्तथा बोग-  

137 रिकाच।। तथावल्लोतियपिनवतवापोत्रेऽ।। यस्य चाचातानानि। पूवंतो भोगामः।।  

दक्षिणायु भोगामः एव।

138 परिचयमः। शारणदौऽक्षेंन।। उत्तरः। कुंमुदोमोलिक्षे।। तत्त्वादिपालयानपातिः।। यस्य चाचातानानि।

139 पूवंतः। अगारवेदोत्रेऽ।। दक्षिणमः। अनुपदस्त्रेऽ। तथा बरिकाच।। परिचयमः।

स्ताटापाली।। उत्तरस्ताटापाली।  

140 श।। एवं शेषऽन्तुष्टपितांत्यायाधिकारितिः।। करकोक्तिः।। यत्र।  

141 तथा करकोक्तिविनंगतिः।। काशः।। पशुवारः।। बः।। हृद्याविनिन।। श्रा।। श्रा।। श्रा।। श्रा।। श्रा।। श्रा।। सू।।

142 परिक्रमकेत्यहि (ढूः) विपालयानपातिः।। पेडालार्मानंतरष्टिः।। तिः।। वाण्डूषं तथा साहित्यविद्यायमुक्तिः।। नव-  

143 तृष्णमोऽत्र।। यस्य चाचातानानि। पूवंतो भवन्मः।। नीवाधेशे।। दक्षिणायुस्तुनीशे।। उत्तरसोऽक्षें।। परिचयमः।

दक्षिणायुस्तुनीशे।। उत्तरसोऽक्षें।। तत्त्वादिपालयानपातिः।। यस्य चाचातानानि।

पूवंतः।। स्तृ।  

1 Read विपालयानपातिः।
2 Read परिचयमस्ताटापाली।
3 Read शेषऽन्तुष्टपितांत्यायाधिकारिति।
4 Read तिः।। पेडालार्मानंतरष्टिः।। तिः।। वाण्डूषं तथा साहित्यविद्यायमुक्तिः।। नव-  
5 Read तृष्णमोऽत्र।। यस्य चाचातानानि। पूवंतो भवन्मः।। नीवाधेशे।। दक्षिणायुस्तुनीशे।। उ�्तरसोऽक्षें।। परिचयमः।
6 Read परिचयमस्ताटापाली।
7 Read पूवंतो वटुक्कस्ताया।
145 सालसिक्कारकः। दक्षिणतः सत्ताबागकः परिचितः कौशिकोर्णाकैर्मः। उत्तरः लालुपितः। एवं शून्यपानकः।
146 सिद्धायाद्वाराणां गतमें यवत्स (श्र्य) करतीय दृष्ट १०० [१९] तथैतन्यान्द्रक्षत्रित्व (व)-
दूष्टहुम्मास्तः। छ। तथा करः
147 द्वाश्वाहिनिर्वाग धार(व) मदनविथुवाताराय व (व) हृच्छालिशेषे धार(श्र्य) हनुमावतिविन्देणाय
धार(श्र्य) हनुमावतिविन्देणाय सू (श्र्य) परिष्ठकः
148 पञ्च(तुप) ग्धूर (किं) विषयान्त्वेत्रात्तिक्याणामान्त्वेत्रित्वम् देशायाद्वेशः। यथा चाराटनात्तिकः
पूर्वतो राजक्षेत्रेद्याहै। दक्षिणः
149 सालियकैर्मः। परिचितः देशायाद्वेशसङ्कोकः। उत्तरः लोचनाधिकः।
तथैतन्यान्द्रान्त्वेत्रित्वम्
150 हरोपित्तेषः। तथा कणीतः। यथोचाराटनात्तिकः। पूर्वत: पञ्चाविलासकृतकरतः
दलिताविवः। दक्षिणः। राजमानः
151 परिचितः होंगिकोः। उत्तरसंसारिकः। एवं कैश्याधिकाद्वाराणां
शतातः। यत्रांकोतिः। दृष्ट १०० [१९]
152 तथैतन्यात्तिकः। तथमान्त्रित्व (व)-दूष्टहुम्मास्तः। छ। तथा पुर्व(श्र्य) विनविनायकः
भारसायाद्वायुः। गोमिलिस(व) लिङ्केषे। धार(श्र्य)-
153 द्वाश्वाहिनिर्वाग धार(श्र्य) हनुमावतिविन्देणाय सू (श्र्य) परिष्ठकः।
पञ्च(तुप) ग्धूर (किं) विषयान्त्वेत्रात्तिक्याणामान्त्वेत्रित्वम् दलिताविवः
154 द्वारः। यथा चाराटनात्तिकः। पूर्वतो योगमायः। दक्षिणः। चाराटनात्तिकः
कौशिकोर्णाखकः। परिचितः
155 सालावः। उत्तराते राजक्षेत्रेयोकातः। एवं भूम्य (व) सिद्धायाद्वाराणां शतातः।
यत्रांकोतिः। दृष्ट १०० [१९] तथाः
156 तथैतन्यान्त्रित्व (व)-दूष्टहुम्मास्तः। छ। तथा करहृदान्तविनायकः। काश्य (श्र्य) प-
गोत्राय व (व) हृच्छालिशेषे। धार(श्र्य)
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161 संत्य सूचः। उत्तरविविचारः। तथेश्वरानन्तरत्वं आयवायालक्षणं। यस्य चाप्तालाणिः। पूर्वः।

162 तो व(व)हुसः(व)संक्षेपः। दिक्षिणः। पर्वतः। परिचयः। पर्वतः एवः। उत्तरः। शच्चेदीक्षेत्रः। तथादि।

163 हिइवात्वणिति बरीराज्यार्थितविविचारः(व)उपपतिपलिकान्तर्विन्दकृतकङ्क्षेत्रः। यथा चाप्तालाणिः। पूर्वः। राजः।

164 जकीयतालनसंक्षेपः। दिक्षिणः। नायुषतवरलीसक्षणीयप्रयतः। परिचयः। मधुः। उः।

165 तरः: पर्वतसक्षणीयप्रयतः। एवः। क्षेत्रविन्दियाद्रम्भाणी शास्त्रः। अनामः(अ)कार्यः। दूर १०० तथातस्तः(तः)।

166 क्षेत्रार्थितविविचारः(व)हुसः(व)आयवायः। एवः। जातुरापापोपसुङ्क्ति ग्रामस्थचा। वाकाचार। संवृत्तमालिकः।

167 वस्मीमायेन्तः। सातुरूपकाशोबोक्षेत्रः। पूर्वः। देवदात्वः(व)हुसः(व)स्वयः। अवास्तहविवेशः(सष्यः) अनामेशः(सष्यः)। अः।

168 नासे(कः:*): प्रशासितक्षेत्रन समुन्नद्यात्वमालिकान्तर्विन्दकृतस्तथा बिकिष्ठः। बाँधकारदाइतपतः।

1 Read विइवातः। पाति।
2 Read उत्तराचार्यवेदीक्षेत्रः।
3 Read हिइवातः। पाति।
169 युग्मदिवीकाँ तथा खानुवडा उभरे ग्रामवीर्योग्योनं सरकारकुंकुमितवर्ज्ञ
श्रीस्यलके समायात्सिद्धायकः

170 लान्डगुद्दर्मादिकोकणकल्लथनमानने। तङ्गढ़ुमहा/काकाईसरकुषुक्कुलकु मुक्तिसिद्धिता
उदकातिसागरः

171 ग नमस्यवृद्धा परम्या भक्त्या प्रतिपादिता तदैव सान्यवयं(व) -
प्रयोगाकी भुजाता भोजयता कृप्ताः क-

172 ब्रह्म(व)तां वा न केनापि परिप्रथना करणुया यत उक्तमात्पुद्यु(लु) राजन-
महामुनिनिम्। व(व) हृदिष्ठवसुपामु भु -

173 क्ता राजमेः सगरातिमि। यस्य यथा यथा भूमिस्तव्य तस्य तदा
फल(लम)। [३१॥४] तथो दान निरायावं साया -

174 सं द्रीपेणालू(नाम)। अत एववेशः। पालकुलनी(कथा) मौनपालन(तम्)। [३१॥४] द्रव्य(स्व) भूमिभावि।
पालकुलनास्मातो भूयां

175 याचते रामभक्तः।।(१) सामायोऽयं धर्मसंतुष्टं पाण्यं काले काले पात्नीयों
भविः।।[३१॥५] इति भुविष्यनाथ्

176 वधार्यं सामायामभूपूलुलर्मनिण्यं। जातियों पालनघरमविलोभ एव करणुया।
आः। न पुनस्तलोऽ(लित)।।

177 नपापकलमाएकरेण केनापि प्रवर्तितम्(व्यम्)। यस्तवंमयविशिष्टोपि लोभाधाः
निर्मितिकोपलावृक्तमः

178 राज्ञिबाद्विध्यनमानमुनोऽदेतेः। ता स परम्भुमिभापात्करणसः लिटो
सौरवमहारीवरः

179 न्तामिग्न्या(सा) विनाभिकाचरमुत्तं(अ) विप्रवित्।। तथा चौक्व भगवता व्यागेन।
बृहदा परदत्ताय(ताः वा) यो हः

180 रेत कुचछरां(राम्)।। स विष्ठयों कुमिन्धि वा कुमिन्धि। सह पद्धत इत्यपि।।
(पत्रयते ॥ ३२ ॥ इत्यपि ॥) भूष्ये।।मयायं ॥। मढ(उ) शाबा: पर-
181 महापितवंशला या पापाद्वेतमनमी(सो) भूषण भाविभूषण। ये पाल्यते
धम्मेदिमा(सो) समग्र(स्रो) तेन। मया विर-

182 चित्तोऽर्थेऽ शून्यः॥ [१३॥१०] ॥ यथा जैत्यवं तथा जासनदाता
लेखकहस्तेन स्वभावसारोपयति। याः

183 या मतः मम। महामण्डलीद्वरश्रीमनमुमुकिरजदेवस्तु। महामण्डलीद्वरनाम
श्रीमद्विजजदेवराज-

184 सूनोंयंदव शासने विशिष्टः(तम्)॥ विशिष्टः(तं) चैतन्यमा श्रीद्राजानुजया
भाण्डागरसेनप्रभाते

185 श्रीद्राजानुजे भाण्डागरसेनमहाकालबंधवागलेष्यभासनमा(सो)॥ [१०] यद्योनाधि
मविकाले

186 मवः तस्वै प्रामाणयती॥ छ॥ छ॥ श्रीमंतु स्व(सव) मिनः॥ छ॥
शिवमस्तु॥ छ॥

1. Read मम after पाल्यते.
2. This danda is superfluous.
3. Read मविकाले वाः.
The legend on the silver coins of the Śatavāhana king Gautamiputra Yajña-Śatakarni* was read by E. J. Rapson in his Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, Western Ksatras, the Traikutaka Dynasty and the Boddhisatva Dynasty (Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum), London, 1908, p. 46, as follows:

(1) Obverse—in the usual Middle Brāhmī in the normal Epigraphic Prakrit—raṅga Gotami-pataśa sīri-Yajña-Śatakarniya (Sanskrit—rājya Gautamiputrasa śri-Yajña-Śatakarnaye, "the coin of the illustrious Yajña-Śatakarni, the king, the son of Gautami ").

(2) Reverse—in the Middle Drāviḍa-Brāhmī in the Drāviḍa-influenced Prakrit...nasha Gotamiputasha hira-Yajña-Hātakanyaka (Sanskrit,...nasya Gautamiputrasa śri-Yajña-Śatakarnaye, "the coin of the illustrious Yajña-Śatakarni, the son of Gautami,... ").

Rapson quite correctly conjectured that the incomplete word ending in nasha at the beginning of the reverse legend is the translation of the Prakrit word raṅga (Sanskrit rājya 'the king's') in the Southern dialect. In our paper appearing above, Vol. XXXV, pp. 247 ff., we succeeded in deciphering the same word, occurring in the reverse legend on the silver coin of Vāsishthiputra Śatakarni, as arahaṇa, in which arahaṇa was taken by us to stand for Tamil araṇā, 'a king'.

Recently there has been a lot of writings in various periodicals, in which it has been suggested that the akṣaras read by myself (and also by Rapson) as ha and sha should be read as cha and ku, so that the reading of the word should be arachāṇakū and not arahaṇa. I am sorry that I consider this view to be an unwarranted guess.

That the sound ś was modified in Southern Prakrit to h is clearly demonstrated by the name Hakuṣiri (Sanskrit Saṅkṣiri) occurring in the Nāṇīghat inscriptions* of the time of the Early Śatavāhanas. Fortunately, in this case, the akṣara ha has been written in its usual Brāhmī form so that the reading Chakuṣiri is not at all possible. Saṅkṣiri-Hakuṣiri (cf. also Śāṭa-Hāla) quite clearly points to Śatakarni-Hātakani and śri-siri-hiru. It has to be admitted, however, that some later epigraphs of the third and fourth centuries A.D., i.e., the Ikākūṭa inscriptions* from Nāgarjunikonda, represent the name Śāntamāla as Chāntamāla (Chāntamāla). This shows that sometimes ś was replaced by ch. But we prefer to read the letter in question as h because,

---

* We have both the spellings Śatavahana and Śatavahāna and Śatakarni and Śatakarni. I now prefer Śata-vaha and Śatakarni because they appear to be stereotyped patronymics derived from the personal names Satakarnas ('one who could pay attention at a time to hundred reports'; cf. Śatavahāna) and Śatavahana ('one who has hundred chariots or carriers'; cf. Dakaruka, Śatavahana). See The Bharata War and Purānic Genealogies, ed. D. C. Sircar, Calcutta University, 1969, p. 105 note.

* The macron over e and o is not used in this article.


* Cf. Sircar, Select Inscriptions, Vol. I, 1965, p. 191 (No. 9) and plate XXXIII.

* On the reverse legend on Vāsishthiputra Śatakarni's coin the word appears as hira probably standing for hiru-hiru.

* Ibid., pp. 229 ff.
whereas it has no clear resemblance to \( \text{ch} \), the letter very closely resembles a type of \( k \) found in the Jaggayapatana epigraphs of the Ikshvaku king Virapurushadatta, the Kon
damudi plates of the Brihatphalayana king Jayavarman and the Mayidavohu plates of the Pallava crown-prince Sivas
dkandavarman.\(^1\)

That the akṣhara \( \text{sha} \) was used in the local Prakrit as the suffix for the sixth case-ending is
clearly indicated by the Bhaṭṭiprolu inscriptions\(^2\) in which the akṣhara cannot be read as \( \text{ku} \).
In the first place, it is often endowed with vowel-marks as in Samanadāśa=Sanskrit Śrāmanadāśa (once on Casket No. 2, centre, line 11, and again on Casket No. 3, on the upper stone, line 8) and Shīhagotihī=a=Sanskrit Śīhagotithī (Casket No. 2, on the rim of the lower stone). It will be seen
that this precludes the possibility of reading the akṣhara as \( \text{ku} \). Secondly, the akṣhara \( \text{ku} \) is written in
its normal Early Brāhmī form side by side with \( \text{sha} \) in Kurasha (Sanskrit Kurasya, i.e. Kura’s)
occurring both in sections A and B on the rim of the lower stone on the Bhaṭṭiprolu Casket No. 1.
It is difficult to think that the akṣhara \( \text{ku} \) was written by the same scribe in half the number of cases
in one shape and in the rest of the cases in another. Thirdly, attention may be drawn to the fact
that the Sanskrit word Maṇjushā meaning ‘a casket’ has been written as maṇjusam and also as
maṇjuṣa, and that, in this case, the reading \( \text{ku} \) is absurd. This shows that the akṣhara indicating the
sixth case-ending in the legend on the reverse of the silver coins of the Śatavahana kings is
expected to be \( \text{sha} \) and not \( \text{ku} \).

The normal Early Brāhmī form of \( \text{sh} \) is the same as \( p \) with a horizontal stroke attached to the
right side about the middle of the left limb. The lower part of both these letters is curved upwards
towards the right. The Draviḍa-Brāhmī form of \( \text{sh} \) exhibited by the Bhaṭṭiprolu inscriptions,
however, shows the horizontal stroke on both sides of the vertical and has the lower part curved
upwards towards the left and not towards the right as in its normal Early Brāhmī form.
This \( \text{sh} \), therefore, resembles the Early Brāhmī letter \( k \) with its lower part curved towards the left
and then upwards. The peculiarity of the Bhaṭṭiprolu forms of letters like \( gh, m \) and \( l \) explains
the peculiar form of \( \text{sh} \) used in it and does not go against the reading of the letter of the similar
type in the legend on the coins as \( \text{sh} \).

Secondly, the vowel-mark \( u \) is attached to the right in the upper part of the vertical of \( r \) in
the legend on the silver coins of the Śatavahana kings and this shows how the same vowel-sign would
have been attached to \( k \) because both the letters have the same kind of vertical to which the sign
had to be added. This suggests that the letter in question should better be read as \( \text{sha} \) and not as
the akṣhara \( \text{ku} \).

It has also to be remembered that the language of the legend on the coins in question is Prakrit
so that the use of the Dravidian sixth case-ending in it is really uncalled for. Moreover, \( \text{ku} \) is not
the normal suffix for the Dravidian sixth case-ending.

---

1. Ojha, Prāchīṇa Bhāraśīya Līpimālā, Plates XII-XIV.
No. 27—A BRAHMI INSRIPTION FROM PÄLE

(I Plate)

H. D. SANKALIA AND SHOBHANA GOKHALE, POONA

(Received on 29.9.1969)

The discovery of a short Brāhmī inscription\(^1\) in a cave near Pāle in Poona District, Maharashtra, was made known to us by Shri R. C. Bhide, an official of the Poona University. The village is situated about 8 miles away from Kamshet on the main Bombay–Poona Road. The cave is excavated at a height of about 70 m on a hill near Pāle. The cave faces east, and commands a magnificent view. It measures 22 m 75 cm long, 5 m 67 cm broad and 7 m 27 cm high. The ceiling is probably incomplete, as we can distinguish between the finished portion and the unfinished lower portion. Further on the left hand wall of the cave, there is a cell with a bench. The cell measures 1 m 37 cm × 1 m 2 cm × 1 m 21 cm. The inscription is engraved on the same wall, just near the original entrance, almost at eye level, about 2 m from the floor level. Below is a carved out cistern.

The inscription is incised on a specially prepared space which is about 50 cm × 40 cm, the actual engraved space occupying an area of 39 cm × 17 cm. It is in four lines. The letters are bold and deeply cut, their average size being 3 cm. The characters are Brāhmī and in their squat nature and other features they resemble the Nānāghāt inscription. On paleographical grounds the inscription may be assigned to the 1st century B. C. Initial \(a\) occurs in line 1, the triple-dotted initial \(i\) occurs in line 2. The language of the inscription\(^2\) is Prakrit influenced by Sanskrit. The word kātūnatā (Skt. krētā, line 1) is interesting and it may be compared with another absolutive form abhipītātā in the Calcutta-Bairat inscription of Aśoka.\(^3\) The name Idarakhita (line 2) is also of interest, because as far as we know this is the first instance where rakhita is suffixed to the name Ida. The record does not call for any special orthographical remarks.

The inscription records that a certain Bhadayita Idarakhita (Indrarakshita), probably together with some others, caused the cave and a cistern to be excavated. The expression sahā kāhi saha occurring towards the end of the record is difficult to interpret. But our interpretation is based on the analogy of the inscription No. 5\(^4\) in cave No. V from Kuda, which reads tēnaṁ pūḍhi cha sahā... Būdhiya saha.

The importance of the record lies in the expression namō arahantānāṁ which commences the writing. It means "obeisance to arahantas", and it may therefore be taken as maṇḍalāchariya. In no other record of the numerous inscriptions belonging to pre-Christian period from the caves of Western Maharashtra, does this expression find a place. But this invocation occurs in a definitely Jain context in the inscriptions on the avāpaṭas and images from the Jaina stūpa at Mathura datable to the early centuries of the Christian era, and in the inscription of Khāravēla from the Udayagiri cave, Orissa, belonging to the pre-Christian period. Of the two words in

---

\(^1\) This is registered as No. B 74 in A.R.Ep., 1968-69.
\(^2\) We are thankful to Professor M. A. Mehidale for very useful suggestions in preparing this article.
\(^3\) CII, Vol. I (1925), p. 172; see also above, Vol. XXXVI, p. 6, text line 12.
\(^4\) ASWI, Vol. IV, p. 85.
the maṅgalācharaya, arahatānam with its contracted form arahat, occurs invariably in a Jaina context, except probably in one instance viz., the Rājgir Buddhist cave inscription. But even here the record refers only to the worship of the images of Arahat. Thus in an overwhelming majority of cases, the word stands for a Jaina Tirthaṅkarā in the first place, failing that for Jaina monks. Very rarely it refers to the Buddha or Buddhist monks, or to the Buddhists in general. Moreover, arahat suffixed to or preceded by namō could only occur in a Jaina record, devoted to the worship of Jina, and not to the Buddha. For, at this early period, Buddhists did not worship the Buddha in the anthropomorphic form while the Jainas worshipped the Jinas or Tirthaṅkarās in human form. Taking all this evidence, we come to the inescapable conclusion that in the Pāle cave we have the earliest Jaina record in Maharashtra, datable to about the 1st century B.C.

The cave is situated in the hitherto unknown group of hills, and this cannot be the only Jaina cave over here. There must be many more, which need to be searched.

TEXT

1 Namō arahatānam [*]kātunā [ñ]*
2 [bha]* Bhadānta Idarakhitēna lēna[ñ]*
3 kārāpitā[ñ*] pōḍhi cha sāh[ī] kāhi-
4 saha[[ñ*]}

---

* Lüders' List, No. 550.
* From the original engraving and impressions.
* This word might be taken as an absolute form (cf. Sanskrit kriyā), e.g., abhiruddhānā in the Calcutta-Bairat edict of Ašoka (CII, Vol. I, 1925, p. 172).
* The letter seems to have been chipped off at the time of engraving and so the engraver had to incise it a second time.
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No. 28—BRAHMl INSCRIPTIONS FROM PAUNI

(1 Plate)

V. B. Kolte, Nagpur

(Received on 1.11.1969)

Pauni is a small town in Bhandara District (Maharashtra), situated on the right bank of Vainganga. On the 19th March, 1968 I received information from my friend Shri W.G. Ghodvaidya that some sculptures and inscriptions were discovered at Pauni. Before I could visit the place the Nagpur Times of Nagpur published an account of these sculptures and inscriptions as reported by Messrs. Brahmanand Deshpande and S. J. Killeidar from Nagpur Mahavidyalaya, Nagpur, who had visited the place earlier on information received by them from Dr. Meshram at Pauni. I found that the inscriptions were not read. After a few days Shri Ghodvaidya informed me that another stone with large inscriptions was lying in a pit near about those sculptures referred to above. I immediately visited the place for taking estampages of the same, on the basis of which I published an article in the daily Taruna Bharata from Nagpur (7th April, 1968), giving my transcription of those inscriptions. During my visit to the site of these ancient relics I tried to study the stone sculptures and the pillar stones. I could see that they were stones of railing, since they had notches and upright projections. I, therefore, surmised that it must be a site of a Buddhist stupa. I am editing the inscriptions called here as A, B, C and D from the originals and estampages. I am thankful to Dr. S. B. Deo, Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Nagpur University, Nagpur, for supplying me the photographs and a set of estampages taken by the photographer of the Department and also the necessary information and description of the architecture on these stones.

Pauni is a place which is surrounded by a moat and a rampart on three sides, which is now in a dilapidated condition. On the fourth side flows the sacred river Vainganga. As we approach the main gate of the town we find that on both the sides of the gate the rampart is intact. On the right hand side of the approach road is a small tank which is known as Balasamudra. Near the tank there is a mound on which the modern temple of Jagannatha has been constructed. The temple is facing east. On the right hand side of the mound there are a few kilns for which earth is often dug out for laying bricks. It was during such operations that the stone pillars and railings bearing some inscriptions were incidentally discovered. Close to the west of the mound are lying some remains. One of these, bearing inscription A, shows the upright member (thakba) of the stone railing with lenticular notches on one face to accommodate the horizontal bars or suchis of the railing. On the rest of the faces of the octagonal upright are human sculptures in the lower panel and in the upper panel are early Buddhist religious motifs. The physical features and coiffure of the human figures in the lower panel and the absence of the Buddha figures in the upper panels are suggestive of the early date of these relics. The top of the upright has a projection which was accommodated in the notch of the coping stone.

The face of this pillar to the left has in the lower panel a standing female figure holding a chahara in her right hand. She wears triple valayyas with possibly the marginal valayyas having a beaded pattern. Around her waist she has put on a mekhla with multiple beaded strings which

1 The macron over e and o is not used in this article.
keep her lower garment in position. The garment is diaphanous, one end of which has been held by the lady in her left hand. The other end has been bunched down straightway in front. She wears around her neck a series of necklaces (mālās). Her face is charming because of a seductive smile, round outline and plump cheeks so characteristic of the Śunga-Sātavāhana period. She has an elaborately arranged hair style with the bun on her left shoulder. She wears squarish Karṇakūṇḍalas. She is a chānuradhārī typically representative of the Śunga-Sātavāhana period, reminiscent of those from Bharhut and Sanchi. Over her head is a flat band bearing the inscription A. The upper panel has the motif of dharmachakra with eleven spokes, placed on a pillar surrounded possibly by railing. On either side of the dharmachakra are garlands. The whole motif is carved above a miniature railing pattern and is enclosed within the framework of a chaitya arch with triple lunette reminiscent of Barabar caves.

On the adjacent face is a standing figure of a male with folded hands, possibly in devotion. He wears a dhōti over which is tied a roll of cloth, the ends of which fall in front in plaits. The figure wears five vālayas of beaded pattern. On either arm, he wears armlets, with probably beaded pattern and decorative fringes. He wears a necklace of multiple strings with spacerz. In the ears he is shown wearing bulgy earrings. His headdress is elaborate, bunched up, and with an ornamental bun in the form of a rosette bound by a band towards his left.

Overhead is the miniature railing pattern. The upper panel shows a stūpa on a low platform. The dome is semicircular capped by a squarish ārāmi enclosing the triratna motif crowned by the chhatra. On either end of the triratna motif, hang motifs which are essentially vegetal. The whole motif is so arranged that the railing below forms virtually the vedikā of the stūpa.

On the third face of the same upright (thabha) is shown a female figure similar to the one described earlier. She wears a diaphanous dress, a makhālā of multiple beaded strings as also a band around her waist loosely tied and having tassels at each end. Around her neck appear to be a necklace, amulets and pendants, possibly containing the motifs of triratna etc. so common at Bharhut. She wears four vālayas in each hand, the right hand thrown up as if in the act of dancing while the left is let loose. She wears bulboous earrings and her headdress has a series of beadings with a huge bunch at the back. She also wears a forehead pendant. The whole body is supple and has a vivacious warmth of the flesh, which is enhanced by the seductive smile on the face.

The upper panel shows above the miniature vedikā motif, the motif of a tree in railing. There is a chhatra over the tree and from the branches of the tree are shown dangling various types of necklaces as at Bharhut and Sanchi. To the left of the tree near the railing is the standing figure of a male with features similar to the bigger figure in the adjoining lower panel. To the right is a seated figure carrying on its head a container through which emerges a flower.

Adjacent to this upright is another octagonal pillar belonging to the same complex. There are no sculptures on any face at least on the surfaces now above ground. On the three faces of the faceted thabha is carved the inscription B.

Close to the west of the Jagannātha temple is exposed another pillar of variegated standstone, cylindrical in shape and having at one end a rosette in bold relief. On the lengthwise portion of the pillar, there is inscription C on one side and inscription D on the other side.

Let us now turn our attention to the available inscriptions which at present are only four in number. The characters of the inscriptions are Brāhmaṇī. They show palaeographic uniformity. They are fully rounded and there is not much evidence of any angularity and stumpyness of the later period. The roundness of s with a prominent curved loop, the fully rounded form of m,
the well rounded \( v \) and the somewhat semi-circular \( g \) indicate palaeographical similarity with Sanchi and Bharhut and compare favourably with the palaeographical peculiarities characteristic of the second century B.C.

The language is Prakrit and from the data available in our inscriptions it can be said that the forms and case terminations agree with those in the Sanchi and Bharhut inscriptions. However, a few points may be noted here.

(1) The word \( dāna \) appears twice in our records. In inscription D it has been spelt as \( dāna \) instead of \( dāna \) which may be a mistake of the engraver who may have inadvertently omitted the stroke for \( a \). However, this form of the word is found in the donative inscriptions Nos. 6, 19, 28 and 82 of Stūpa No. 1 at Sanchi\(^1\) also. Another form \( dāna \) is also found in inscription No. 3 on the Sanchi Stūpa\(^2\) No. 2.

(2) Another thing worth noting is that the final anuvāra on the letter \( a \) in the word \( dāna \) is missing at both the places in our records. This omission of final anuvāra is found in inscription No. 53 of Stūpa\(^2\) No. I and inscriptions Nos. 6, 8 to 11, 18 and 20 of Stūpa\(^2\) No. II at Sanchi. The final anuvāra is missing in the word \( sūtāna \) also in inscription D of our records.

(3) The genitive termination of the masculine stems ending in \( a \) is \( a \), e.g. \( nāgasa, padaajñīsa \) etc. and that of the feminine stems ending in \( a \) is \( ya \), e.g. \( visamañīya, upaśikāya \). There are other genitive terminations of the feminine stem in \( a \) which are \( ya \) and \( ye \). The termination \( ya \) is found used in inscriptions Nos. 48 and 86 of Stūpa No. 1 at Sanchi\(^3\) and inscriptions Nos. 9 (p. 132), 5 (p. 134) etc. at Bharhut.\(^4\) The termination \( ye \) has been used in inscriptions Nos. 20, 32-33, 36 etc. on Stūpa\(^2\) No. 1 at Sanchi and inscription No. 93 (p. 138) on Stūpa at Bharhut.\(^5\) Forms with these terminations are absent in our records which are only four but they may be found in other records when they are discovered at Pauni.

Inscription A is on the flat band of the sculptured pillar. The length of the band is 18 cm and the width is 5 cm. The height of the letters is approximately from 3 to 4 cms. They are deeply engraved and are in a good condition of preservation. The inscription records a gift by a Nāga. This may in all probability be a personal name only and therefore it may not be justifiable to associate it with a person belonging to Nāga clan which may lead to the conclusion that every person having a personal name with the word Nāga must be from Nāga clan. Dr. Bühler remarks that (names like) “Nāga, Nāgilā, Nāgadatta and so fourth bear witness to the existence of snake worship which was common to the Brahmanists and the heterodox sect”.\(^6\) Such names are likely to have been merely adopted also from the names of disciples of the Buddha, e.g., Nāgasena. The personal name Nāga in our record may not therefore be taken to mean that he belonged to Nāga clan. This Nāga, the donor of the sculpture stone has been described as a Pachamukhāyika which evidently means ‘a person who studied the pacha (Sk. paśca) i.e., the five Nikāyas’. Nikāya is a Sanskrit word which means an assemblage, flock or a group in general. The Buddhist scripture known as Sutta Pātaka has been divided into five groups, each group being named as Nikāya, since it includes a collection of a number of sūtras. The five Nikāyas

\(^1\) Above, Vol. II, pp. 97, 99, 100 and 106.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 111.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 102.
\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 111 and 112.
\(^5\) Ibid., pp. 102 and 106.
\(^6\) Stūpa of Bharhut (A. Cunningham).
\(^8\) Stūpa of Bharhut (A. Cunningham).
\(^9\) Above., Vol. II, p. 95,
are: (1) *Digha Nikāya*, (2) *Majjhima Nikāya*, (3) *Samyutta Nikāya*, (4) *Aṅguttara Nikāya* and (5) *Khuddaka Nikāya*.

The word occurs in one of the donative inscriptions on a rail of the Stūpa at Bharhut⁴ as *panchamukhākāya* and in another inscription (No. 66) on Stūpa No. 1 at Sanchi⁵ as *pachanekayika*. A. Cunningham missed the real meaning of the word which he thought to be merely a place name. Bühler in his article on ‘the Votive Inscriptions from the Sanchi Stūpas’⁶ has correctly translated it as ‘one who knows the five Nikāyas’. As would be seen there are slight differences in the forms of the word at all the three places. The Bharhut inscription has in the beginning the word *pancha*, while the inscriptions at Sanchi and Pauni (our present record) have *pacha* instead, where probably the sign of *anuvāra* on *pa* has been inadvertently omitted or it may also be another form of the word in the Pali of that region. The next word *nekāyika* has been spelt as *nekayika* in the Sanchi inscription and *nekāykā* in the Bharhut inscription.⁷ Both these forms are obviously wrong and may be due to negligent spelling. It is noteworthy that our record gives the correct form.

The observations made by Bühler on this word deserve to be mentioned here. He says: “The title furnishes, therefore, a clear proof of the existence of these divisions of the *Sutta Piṭaka* at the time when the inscription was incised. And this time must be the third century B.C., as the letters of the inscription fully agree with those of Aśoka’s Edicts. The discovery that the five great subdivisions of the *Sutta Piṭaka* existed at so early a period lends some support to the view of those scholars who, like Professor Oldenberg, identify the titles of some of the treatises mentioned in Aśoka’s longer Bairūṭ edict with portions of the Majjhima Nikāya and Aṅguttara Nikāya.”⁸

The frequent use of this title word may suggest that it had acquired the merit of a surname during the period. Barua and Sinha have correctly pointed out that ‘The expression *nikāyā* excepting in the sense of a sect or school or denomination is not found in use among all Buddhists. This naturally leads us to infer that the term *nikāya* in the technical sense of the Buddhist canon was current exclusively in a particular sect namely *Theravāda*. *Paścika*—*nakāyika* would, therefore, mean the follower of the *Theravāda* sect.

Inscription B is inscribed on three sides of an octagonal pillar. On one side, the letters are *pavaññīsaka*, on the other *uttarakasamāṇa* and on the third *dīreṣha*. The whole inscription, therefore, reads as *pavaññīsaka uttarakasamāṇa dīreṣha*. The first two words mean ‘(the gift) of the monk *Uttaraka*’. The third word does not make any sense and therefore presents difficulty. The last letter ‘hi’ may be a case termination for instrumental or ablative. I think that it is better to take it as ablative termination. The word then would mean ‘from Mādira’. Mādira may be a place name (Mādurā?). The whole inscription would, in that case, mean ‘(the gift) of the monk Uttaraka from Mādira (Mādurā).

Inscriptions C and D refer to one and the same person, Visamittā by name. C furnishes her with the title *upāṣikā* i.e. ‘a female lay worshipper’, while D adds a benedictive note to her gift. Both these inscriptions may be incomplete, the preceding parts being lost on the other part of the stone which may be lying buried somewhere near the findspot. However, as it reads, inscription C is in a way complete by itself. But from the two letters preceding the word ‘Visamittā’ in inscription D it is clear that a word or two must have been lost. The letter preceding *vi* is *ya*, which would show that the preceding word may also be an adjective of *Visamittā*. In inscription C,

---

¹ *Stūpa* of Bharhut, p. 142, No. 52.
³ Ibid., p. 93.
⁴ (The Bharhut inscription has been read as *pa[m]ka-nekāyika*—cf. CII, Vol. II, Pl. II, p. 37.—Ed.)
⁵ Ibid.
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the word preceding Visamitā is upāsikāya and, therefore, one would like to presume that in inscription D also the word preceding Visamitā may have been the same, which does not seem to be a fact. The portion of the letter preceding ya has a clear sign of the loop which is found in the letter ya. A horizontal stroke to the right of the top is also clear. There is an indistinct sign visible of the vertical straight line in the ya. The letter therefore may be ya and not kā. The word therefore is certainly not upāsikāya but some other. Attention may be drawn to the last word which reads as sātana where we would expect sātanaṁ. The omission of the final caussaTvā has already been discussed.

The palaeographical, sculptural and architectural considerations assign these relics and inscriptions at Pauni to about the 2nd-1st century B.C. They also give clear proof of an ancient Buddhist settlement at Pauni. The mound where the sculptures and stone pillars have been discovered was dug some years ago for building the modern temple of Jagannātha, and is said to have yielded a stone box containing some relics and small images. In all probability the relics were from the Stūpa which, I presume, must be there. Some forty years back a stone inscription of the Bhāra king Bhagadatta was discovered at Pauni.1 The characters in that inscription belong to the early Brāhmī alphabet. The inscription includes a reference to footprint which Dr. Mirashi thinks 'prima facie' must have been those of the Buddha.2 In 1959 a pillar inscription of Mahā-kathasāpa Rupiama was discovered in the field of Shri Maniram Lanjewar at Pauni.3 At Docteka, which is only about twenty miles east of Pauni, a stone slab with two inscriptions was discovered. One of the inscriptions is engraved lengthwise and belongs to the Asokan period. The other inscription, which is incised breadthwise, belongs to the Vākāṭaka period.4 Year before last a copper-plate grant of the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena II was also discovered at Pauni.5 All this evidence would prove that this part of the District of Bhandara with Pauni as its principal town is very important from the point of the ancient history of this region, and must have been a strong centre of Buddhist settlement and civilization.

TEXTS

Inscription A

Nāgasa पचनकाशिकाः

[Translation: (The gift) of Nāga who has mastered the five Nikāyas.]

Inscription B

पवजितस उतरकस भादिरेः

[Translation: (The gift) of the monk Utaraka from Mādara.]

1 Above Vol. XXIV, p. 11.
2 Ibid., p. 12.
3 Sāthādhāna Mahābām, Part V (Dr. Mirashi), p. 100. [See also, above, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 201 ff.-Ed.]
5 Nagpur University Journal, Vol. XVII, No. 3.
6 From the originals and impressions.
Inscription C

उपासिकाय विसमिताय दान

[Translation: The gift of the female lay worshipper Visamità.]

Inscription D

[या]य विसमिताय द(वा)न मुखाय होतु सबसातान

[Translation: May this gift of Visamità be for the happiness of all beings.]
No. 29—A NOTE ON SOME FRAGMENTARY INSCRIPTIONS FROM NAGARJUNAKONDA

(2 Plates)

H. SARKAR, MADRAS

(Received on 13-6-1969)

Vogel has published a few fragmentary inscriptions discovered from the Mahāvihāra, Site 1, of Nāgarjunakonda.¹ The number of fragments published by him is nineteen; two more pieces related to these inscriptions have recently been noticed by the writer in the collection of fragmentary inscriptions deposited in the Nāgarjunakonda Site Museum. It has been found in an effort to piece them together that these fragments belong at least to seven different epigraphs coming from one and the same site.

Vogel has numbered these nineteen fragments from M1 to M19: the two recently noticed fragments in the Museum collection may therefore be numbered as M20 (Museum accession No. 2947) and M21 (Museum accession No. 2937).

(i) M1 of Vogel consists of eight lines, engraved just below the carved figures of two recumbent lions, turned sideways. There is no doubt that this pillar-fragment, with an average width of 37 cm., represents the first eight lines of an inscription.

(ii) & (iii) M2 and M9 are incised on the opposite sides of the same pillar, which has an average width of 39 cm. In contents the former is very similar to M1.

(iv) M3 appears to be the lower half of another epigraph dated in the fifteenth regnal year of Virapurushadatta. This inscribed pillar, i.e. M3, was found in situ at the Mahāvihāra site, its undressed part going to a depth of 91 cm.

It is evident from differences in the sizes of letters and in the style of writing that these three fragments, viz., M1, M2 and M3, represent three separate records though all of them, including M9, register more or less the same facts and are ascribable to the reign of Virapurushadatta. Thus, the three limestone pillar-fragments contain four different epigraphs which were incised on the rectangular part of the column just below the octagonal middle-portion.

(v) Fragments M4, M5, M10, M16, M18 belong to one and the same epigraph (pl. I). From the point of view of the style of the writing M14 may be taken as a fragment of this inscription. But it has not been included here because of its doubtful character. The restored pillar shows a carving of half lotus medallion on the top and has an average width of about 38 cm. Here also the inscription is recorded just below the octagonal part, separated from the rectangular portion by a half lotus medallion. Traces of fourteen lines are available but originally it must have had seventeen or eighteen lines. M18 and M16 form the first line because of the carving that immediately precedes the inscription. M18 is to be read as mahāśa[ma][pattī]² followed by

² In two fragments.
³ The macron over e and o is not used in this article.
[parśaghitasa of M16; M8 comes next succeeded, after a gap, by M5, M10 and M4 respectively. The reading of the available text of the inscription is as follows:

(Upper half)

1. .......... mahāsenā[pati] [parśaghitasa
2. .......... [asame]dha-yājisa
3. .......... sahasa-ha-la-sat-sahas...
4. .......... [apatihata-sanikapasa Vāsiṣṭhipa[ta]]...
5. .......... [bha]gini maḥāsenāpatiṣa

(Lower half)

1. .................. [Kuṭādasirisa]
2. .................. [-m]ātā Chaṇḍisirī apa[ṇa]
3. .................. [ratiṇa Viśvarup]tasa Ikhākumaṇ...
4. ........ [āyu]-vadhanike viṣaya-veṭayaika...
5. ... na[m]ānāṇāesu-samana [āgat nadi]...[su]kha-nivāṇathanaṇyā bhagavato...
6. .. api cha apana ubhaya-kulasā aṭ[nichita]...[m]ahāchetiya pādamu...[n]
7. nikapaniko parinametana ma...
8. .. parigaha saṇāṇīyaṃ chāṭusāla-parigahitasa...
9. ... paṭiṭhāpatiṣaṃ [S]i[ri] Virapurishadatmasaṃsva 10. 5 va pa 8 di...

(vi) Pillar inscriptions M6, M7, M13, M17, M19 and M20 (new fragment) can also be joined together (pl. 1). M13 comes first followed by M6 on the left and M7 on the right; M17 succeeded by M20 forms the lower half of the extant epigraph. M19 also possibly belongs to this inscription since the size of the letters and the style of writing are very similar to those of the other fragments. All these pertain to the rectangular part of the pillar having a breadth of 40 cm. The full available text of the inscription is as follows:

1. .......... ma...
2. .......... agho[t-a]...
3. .......... [a]neka-hiramū-ko[t]-go...
4. .......... yi...
5. .............
6. .. savathesu apat[ihata-sanikapasa]...
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7  ...  Ikākusa Siri-Charitatamulaśa sa[hodara] [bhagijna
8  ...  [ma]hātalarasā Vāsiśṭhīputa[sa] Ka[ū]darasīsī
data
9  ...  [māhā]talarasī ... Chāitäisiri apano ... .
10  ...  Māṭha[ripuṭasa] [Śi]ri-Virapu[risadasta] sa ... .
11  ...  [ve] jayika apicha apapo ... .
12  [Śi]ri Virapu[risadastasa]

(vii) M12 and M15 are fragments of another inscription (pl. II), the reading of which is as follows:

1  ..........
2  [mahācheti]ya pādamū[le] pa[va]jīi .........
3  ...  sava-sā[dhunāni] mahā[bhi]khu-sani[ghasa] ....
    ...  nikapani[ke] cha parinametuna .... .
5  .......... parighe ........
6  .......... patiśhapi ....
7  .......... va pa 8 ........

Without any doubt the above is the lower half of an inscription. M 11 appears to be a fragment of the same but it cannot be joined with any other piece.

M21 which reads as follows stands as an isolated fragment:

1  ..........
2  ...  aneka-hi[raṇa-kōti] ....
3  .......... yī ..........}

Leaving aside the three doubtful fragments, viz., M11, M14 and M21 (not illustrated), one may definitely see the traces of at least seven epigraphs—more or less same breadth of the pillar-fragments also suggesting that these pillars originally belonged to one māṇḍopā-complex, associated with the Mahāvihāra. Vogel has rightly concluded that the "epigraphical records engraved on the pillars are not identical and do not represent a single text. On the other hand, the preserved portions show recurring passages, which are also found in the āyaka pillar inscriptions belonging to the Mahāchetika and in the first Apsidal Temple Inscription E". In fact, the last-mentioned inscription, from the point of view of wording, comes very close to those from the Mahāvihāra. Further, all of them record the same fact, namely, the foundation of the pillared hall surrounded by four monastic wings or chaturśālā-māṇḍopā by Chāitäisiri, the aunt and mother-in-law of the

1 Not illustrated here. See, Vogel, op. cit., plate facing p. 67.
2 Above, Vol. XXI, pp. 64-65.
reigning monarch. In all likelihood these inscriptions bore the same date i.e., the eighth rainy season of the fifteenth regnal year of Māṭhariputra Virapurnashadatta. Why so many inscriptions registering the same facts were installed there is difficult to ascertain; at the Sarvadeva Temple also, six or seven copies of the same text, dated in the eleventh regnal year of Kuvala Chāntamūla, were affixed on different mandapa pillars.\(^1\)

No. 30—A CHARTER OF AHOM KING SIVASIMHA

(1 Plate)

J. N. Phukan, Gauhati

(Received on 23-9-1967)

The information about the existence of the copper-plate grant edited here was received by me recently from Shri Sarbananda Rajkumar, who was the Additional Deputy Commissioner of Kamrup District, Assam. It appears that he had examined it sometime during 1943-45 and took a pencil rubbing of it. He was kind enough to give me the pencil rubbing for the purpose of deciphering. But it being indistinct in two places, a correct reading was not possible. I then wrote to the owner requesting him to send the original plate to me. Shri Mahendra Bhattcharjee the present owner, of Dekarchuk Village, P.O. Jamuguri, District Darrang, was very kind to send me the plate through the courtesy of Prof. P. K. Sharma, M.Sc., of the Gauhati University.

The language and script of the text are Ahom, a dialect of the Tai language which is spoken in a very wide area in South-East Asia. Basically, it is similar to the Khânti, Phâkiâl, and Xîtoniâ languages of Assam, and the Shan, Lü, and Khūn of Burma, and the Tay of Thailand, although in respect of certain individual characteristics and written script, it differs from them. Historically, Ahom is the oldest of the Tai languages in Assam, but it is now almost ‘extinct’ in the sense of not being used in conversation, while it remains as a sacred language among the Ahom priestly classes.

In respect of language, copper-plate grants of Ahom kings can be categorised into three groups: (1) those in purely Ahom language and script, (2) those in Ahom language and script on one side, and Sanskrit and Assamese languages on the other, and (3) those in Sanskrit and Assamese languages. Charters belonging to the first category are few in number and most of them belong to the earlier period. The present charter, falling in the first category, therefore, has, besides its historical importance, also linguistic importance.

The plate measures about 31.1 cm x 11.2 cm with an extended portion 6.1 cm long in the middle of one side, apparently to serve the purpose of a handle. Both sides of the plate are inscribed. On the obverse there are 9 lines and on the reverse there are 6 lines thus making a total of 15 lines.

The following Ahom equivalents of Assamese proper names, etc. are noteworthy:

Bâk-shi Bhaw-tâ-shâ-ja (Bâgîsh Bhaṭṭâchâryya, lines 2, 4), Khaw-raw-ngi (Kharangi, lines 3, 3-4, 6-7), Raw-khu-nan-tan (Raghunandan, line 7), Ni-jee-ri (Nîjēri, lines 7-8), Raw-mâ-nât

1 Shri Rajkumar in an article entitled “One Copper Plate” in Manideep (an Assamese magazine), December 1964, p. 99 has wrongly assigned it to Châo-phâ Shâ-hum (A.D. 1497-1539). So far no charter of this king has come to light.

2 Hundreds of valuable ancient manuscripts written in this language on different subjects are preserved and are available with the Deodâlî, Mohans and Bîlongs, the three Ahom priestly classes.

3 The earliest known inscription on stone in Ahom language and script is the ‘Snake Pillar’ discovered in 1921 by Mr. O. Callaghan, the then Political Officer in Sadiya, in the bed of the Deopâmî river, a few miles above Sadiya. A translation of this inscription appeared in the Annual Report, Archaeological Survey of India, 1924-25, under the title “Notes on Ahom Stone Pillar”. This pillar is now preserved in the Assam State Museum, Gauhati.

(179)
Ramānāth, line 8), Rī-nilā (Riniā, line 8), Jāi-bah (Jibban, line 9), Joi-ānat (Joyānāth, line 9), and Bhē-dē-li (Bhedeli, line 10).

The record is in two parts; the first part in lines 1-11 contains the main contents viz. the issuing authority, the date, a general description of land and men granted, the occasion of the grant and the name of the Brahmin who received the grant. The second part in lines 12-15 contains the name of the officer who executed the order as well as the names of two scribes. The inclusion of the names of scribes is a special feature of this record. The two parts are separated by a gap of 3.7 cm between lines 11-12.

In respect of calligraphy, the writing in lines 1-13 belongs to one type and the writing in lines 14 and 15 belongs to a different type, the latter representing a mature hand, not without skill and artistic taste. The size of the letters in the second type is comparatively smaller than that of the letters in the first.

Like many other charters of this family this charter does not contain the royal insignia of the Ahom kings. But the name of the issuing king has been very clearly inscribed.

The present charter was issued to one Raghunandana during the reign of the Ahom king, Chāo-phā Shō-tān (Svaragadeva Sivasimha) who ruled Assam during A.D. 1714-44, to fulfill the commitment in respect of a grant made earlier by his father, Chāo-phā Shō-krung (Svaragadeva Rudrasimha, A.D. 1696-1714) to Bāgāshr Bhāṭāchārya, father of Raghunandan.

The record commences with the name Chāo-phā Shō-krung and states that he, in Lāk-nil Tāo-Chānu (A.D. 1697-98), granted two gōts of men or pākis who were under the Kharangi Hātarāti to a certain Brahman named Bāgāshr Bhāṭāchārya of Kalibār. The grant was made on the occasion of the dedication of the Big Tank at Rangpur. The Ahom name for Rangpur,

1 Ahom kings, since their recognition of Hinduism as a royal religion, used to have two names, one Ahom, in accordance with their traditional custom, the other Hindu. Documents, inscriptions, coins and copper-plate charters written in Ahom language, as a rule, contain their Ahom names only.

2 Shri Mahendra Bhattacharyya, the present owner of the plate and a descendant of Bāgāshr Bhāṭāchārya, the donor of the record, informed me that the name was Bhāṭa Bāgāshr. But in a copper-plate charter in Sanskrit and Assamese, granted to the same Bāgāshr by king Rudrasimha in 1621 (A.D. 1699), it was clearly mentioned that Bāgāshr was a title awarded to the said Brahman. This information is from a note (copy) made by Shri Rajkumar from the original.

3 The record begins with the name Lāk-nil, the title of the year, etc. Chānu is the name of the year. The Lāk-nil commences from the 18th of Agrabāyana. For the details of Ahom chronology see Sir Edward Gait’s A History of Assam, Calcutta, 1926, Appendix B. pp. 367-68, and Dr. S. K. Bhuyan’s (ed.) Dīdhibhum Asam Bharatij, Gauhati, D.H.A., 1962. Introduction, pp. xxxiv-xliv. Both Gait and Bhuyan have used the word Lāk-nil instead of Lāk-nil.

4 Under the Ahoms, every able-bodied adult male was enlisted as pāk (or soldier). Three or four paiks formed a gōt. An officer called Bādār in Assamese and Bād-āṣi in Ahom was appointed over every twenty paiks, a Seik (Ahom Ku-pūk) over every hundred paiks and a Ĥāgārikā over every thousand paiks. In a copper-plate charter written in Ahom on one side and Sanskrit and Assamese on the other, issued by Chāo-phā Shō-krung (Bājērāsirmān, A.D. 1751-79), a son of Rudrasimha, the word ku-pūk is employed to mean a gōt of three paiks and the word ku-pūk to mean a single paik.

5 Kaliabar is an area of about 20 sq. miles in the present District of Nagaon, Assam. There is a place known as Nīl-Kaliabar situated in the same area at a distance of 33 miles to the east of Nagaon Town. There is also a tea-garden of the name Kaliabar. Kaliabar was an important administrative centre during the Ahom time. This information was obtained from Prof. P. Hazarika of Kaliabar. Ahom word Tāng-rungāna meaning a kind of black pipal tree, Assamese word Kāliabar means Kali-blackish, bar = black or pipal tree. Kaliabar, therefore, seems to have got its name from the tree.

6 The Big Tank referred to here is, in all probability, the famous Joysagar Tank, 5 miles to the south of the present Siliguri Town. This is the first tank excavated by the Ahom kings at Rangpur, the former capital of the Ahoms. The date given in this place corroborates the date given in other sources regarding the excavation and dedication of the Joysagar Tank. Rai Sahib G. C. Barua, Ahom Buranj (edited and translated with parallel Ahom text, 1930, p. 31; Dr. S. K. Bhuyan (edited), Satāri Asam Buranj (in Assamese), p. 118.
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the medieval capital of Assam was Chê-nun (lines 1-2), (Chê-town, nun-enjoyment, merriment). The Khurangi men, who had been granted to Bagish Bhattâchâryya, appealed. It is not given here as to whom the appeal was made, but from the sentence that follows immediately it appears that the appeal was made through Bhattâchâryya. The next sentence states that Bhattâchâryya's son Raghâ1 informed the king. It is not known from the record whether this happened after the death of Bâgish Bhattâchâryya or during his life-time. It is also not given whether the king who was informed was Châo-phâ Shû-khrung himself or his son, Châo-phâ Shû-tân. But from the passage that follows, it is clear that it was the latter and not the former and it states that in Lâk-ni Kât-sau i.e., in 1714-15 A.D., Châo-phâ Shû-tân, in order to honour his1 late father's word, granted two göts of men of the Nijeri2 estate, in place of Khaw-raw-ngi men to Raghunandan. Their names are given as Ramânâth, Rimù, Hatai, a boy servant, Jiban and Joyânâth. Thus, a total of six men were granted to Raghunandan and they evidently formed two göts. These six persons of the Khat, that is of the Nijeri khat, had been given twenty purâ3 of cultivable rice land by the side of Bîdedi. Bîdedi is a place name but at present it is difficult to locate it. And also a garden at Nàooshâl (Assamese word for boat-building centre; अहोम शेंग रिं रून शु नून).

In obedience to the order of the king the Bar Phukan, a descendant of Cheng-tai-kow gave the land to the pâiks and asked to write down (on copper-plate). During the Ahom rule, Kaliabar was a part of Lower Assam4 which was governed by Bar Phukan, the viceroy of the king. As the land granted by the king was within the jurisdiction of the Bar Phukan it was his duty to make the actual grant. The Ahom title for Bar Phukan is Phu-kanaâng (line 12). Then the names of the two scribes are mentioned. They are Barua of Bar Chum chi-ring family and Katak of the Bar Bâilong family. Barua is a class of high officer, the Ahom word being phu-ke (line 14). Katak means 'messenger' in Assamese, the Ahom word being phu-chou (line 15).

**TEXT**

**Obverse**

1 Ru Lai1 Lâk-ni Tâo-châu Châo-phâ Shû-khun2 kaw hi Nam-khum lung ti Chê-

2 mun le pû-nâi heu ti mân Tun-rung-dâm Bâk-shî Bhaw-tâ-shâ-ja

3 kun mân Rû-ring Khaw-raw-ngi[1] khâ sang3 kun nâi le Khaw-

4 -raw-ngi mài lai âo le pû-nâi luk mân Bâk-shî Bhaw-tâ-shâ-

5 -ja [ | ] Raw-khu4 lai Châo-phâ le Lâk-ni Kât-sau5 Châo-phâ

6 Shû-tân kaw khâm pau mân nû le put mân kun Khaw-raw-

---

1 I was informed by Shri Mahendra Bhattâchâryya that Raghâ or Raghunandan's father was Bhattâ Bagish.
2 Nijeri is a locality in Kaliabar, at present the Kellyden Tea Estate. This information was obtained from Prof. P. Hazarika.
3 One pura is approximately equal to 1-1/3 acres.
4 Wade noted that Assam was divided for the purpose of administration into Lower and Upper Assam. Kaliabar was included in Lower Assam. J. P. Wade, A Geographical sketch of Assam inserted in An Account of Assam (ed.) Benuddhar Sharma, 1927, p. 3.
5 From impressions.
6 Expressed by symbol.
7 Khung is pronounced as khrung.
8 Written in numerals.
9 Assamese ḍh is Ahom ḍh.
10 A khat (a symbol) is placed above k which is superfluous. I have failed to find out the significance of this khat.
7 -ugi heu ti Raw-khu-nau-tan\(^1\) [ ] kun mān jang-nā Ni-joee
8 -ri khā sang\(^2\) khang nām-na [ ] chū khā chām Raw-mā-nāt\(^3\) [ ] Ri-n̄-ā[ ] -
9 Haw-tāi [ ] lik khā noi [ ] Jai-ban [ ] Joi-ā-nāt\(^4\) [ ] khāo ruk kun

Ro\(\text{v\(\text{er\(\text{s}\)}}\)
10 jang-nā pā Bhā-nāt-li heu\(^5\) nā sāu raw[ ] heu shūn shōng-riu ran\(^6\)
11 shū nān lūng\(^7\) vām-na [ ]
12 kham Chāo-phā le luk-lān Cheng-sāi-kau Phu-kan lung doi
13 bāi heu ti shūng nin māi kwa nām-na
14 phu-māi lāi chām phu-ke ryeu Chum-chī-ring lung [ ] -
15 phu-chou Bāi-lang lung khāo sāng\(^8\) kun nām-na [ ] -

\(^1\) Assamese dā is often written tāw in Ahom.
\(^2\) Written in numerals.
\(^3\) Assamese nāṭh. Ahom nāṭ.
\(^4\) Assamese d is often n in Ahom.
\(^5\) This word is engraved slightly above the line.
\(^6\) The kān above n is put just below n for want of space.
No. 31—NOTE ON NAGARJUNIKONDA INSCRIPTION OF 333 A.D.

D. C. Sircar, Calcutta

(Received on 26.6.1969)

The damaged Nagarjunakonda inscription of the time of the Ikshvāku king Ehuvula Śāntamūla, dated in the cyclic year Vijaya² probably corresponding to 333 A.D., refers to a lady who made a dēvacūla (a shrine) and a sthala (in the present case, probably a platform in an area surrounded by a wall) for the god Noḍagāvārasvāmin (possibly a form of Viṣṇu), with the assistance of a few other ladies, and created an āksaya-nīvī (permanent endowment) apparently for the maintenance of the religious establishments in question. In connection with the above endowment, mention is made of the interest accruing to it month by month; and it appears from the partially deciphered writing that the sum of one hundred dināris (probably gold coins) was deposited in four different śreṣṭis or guilds, 70 coins in one of them and 10 in each of the other three. The name of two of the four guilds have been read as pūrṇika-śreṣṭi (guild of the grower or sellers of betel leaves) and āṇuṣpika-śreṣṭi (guild of the confectioners). The concluding sentences state that the embellishment (chitraṇa), apparently of the dēvacūla and sthala, should be done by some agency indicated by the word āsmanā, and that, otherwise, the nigama headed by the Śrēṣṭhin should get it done. While editing the inscription, we suggested² that the embellishment had to be done by the person responsible for the creation of the religious establishments and also that the nigama was probably a board like the Pañḍhāyat which we compared with the board of administrators like that formed by the Nagarārāṣṭhin assisted by the Sārthavāha, Prathama-Kūlika, Prathama-Kāyastha and others or the Chauthia of medieval Rajasthan headed by the Nagar-

¹See above, Vol. XXXV, p. 4. I do not agree with those who have offered other interpretations of the word Vijaya occurring in the inscription.

²[For the view that this record is not dated in the cyclic year Vijaya, see above, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 70-72. —Ed.]

² Ibid., p. 5.

² The Damodarpur copper-plate grants generally mention, at the same time, the reigning Gupta monarch, his viceroy in the province of Pundravarshana (North Bengal), the governor of the Kōṭivāraka District (Dinajpur) who enjoyed the official rank or designation like Kusūrāmātya (officer of the rank of a prince of the royal blood), Ayukta (administrative officer) or Vishayapati (governor of a District). The extant seal of the document bears the legend—Kōṭivārak-uddhikshā-uddhikaravamānya, i.e., [the seal] of the Adhikarana (court and office of non-military administration) of the Adhikarana (city) of Kōṭivāraka (i.e., headquarters of the District of that name), when the business of the Adhikarana-uddhikara is stated to have been conducted or transacted by a body headed (cf. purāṇ) by four persons entitled (1) Nagarārāṣṭhin or Ārpa-Nagarārāṣṭhin, (2) Sārthavāha, (3) Prathama-Kūlika and (4) Prathama-Kāyastha. See Select Inscriptions, 1965, pp. 201, 293, 336-37, 347-48. The Pañḍhāyat plate (ibid., pp. 359 ff.) records an order of the Ayukta (or Ayuktaka) stationed at the provincial capital of Pundravarshana and the Adhikarana-uddhikara headed by the Ārpa-Nagarārāṣṭthin, while the Bagram plate (ibid., p. 350) records the order of the Kusūrāmātya stationed at Pañḍhāyapura and the Adhikarana-uddhikara of the viśaya or district around the city. The Kālaikuri-Sultaṇpur plate (ibid., p. 382) contains an order of the Ayukta stationed at Pūrṇakavāli, the headquarters of a vēli (subdivision), and of the Adhikarana of the vēli. The above instances and the seal of the Damodarpur plate, referred to above, show that the board in question was usually called Adhikarana. While writing earlier on the subject in the Journ. Univ. Gu. Hattiy, Vol. VI 1955, pp. 81 ff., I did not notice that the word purāṇ points to the number of the members of the board to be more than the four mentioned particularly in the text.

70/823/1 DGA

(183)
sēth (Nagarasēththin) assisted by the Paṭēl and Paṭwāri. The first suggestion was based on the use of the word atmanā in the singular. The word atman is, however, used in the sense of self or oneself reflexively for all the three Persons and in the Singular Number and Masculine Gender irrespective of the Number and Gender of the noun to which it refers, so that a more suitable meaning of the passage seems to us now to be that it was the four guilds that were required to do the embellishment of the dēvakula and sthala and that such embellishment included periodical whitewashing, etc. If this interpretation is accepted, it would suggest that the nīgama headed by the Srēṣṭhin had some kind of jurisdiction over the sēpiṣ because, as we have seen, it was requested to compel the sēpiṣ to do the embellishment if it was not done by them of their own accord.

The administrative board headed by the Nagarasēththin assisted by others, which appears to be similar to the Chauhāni headed by the Nagarāth aided by others, seems also to resemble the nīgama (sometimes described as headed by a Srēṣththin) or nīgama-sabhā as mentioned in certain early inscriptions.

In the Sanskrit and Pali lexicons, one of the senses of the word nīgama is given as 'a city or township', but no meaning like 'a guild'. But the words nāgama and nāgama-putra occurring in early inscriptions have been understood in the sense of 'a merchant'. In the Pāśaaddamahasura, moreover, the following senses of nīgama have been recognised—(1) 'a commercial centre or a town inhabited by many tradesmen' (on the authority of the Prakravatāraṇayāsastra, Aupapātikasūtra and Ārādāgasthāsūtra) and 'the community of tradesmen' (on the authority of the Samāvāyāgasthāsūtra). This is analogous to the following secondary meaning of the word nāgara, primarily 'a city or town', as noticed in the early medieval inscriptions of South India—'a guild of merchants, a mercantile town'; 'in Telugu inscriptions, a territorial assembly like the sabhā and ūr; the merchant community in general or the organisation of the merchant community of a town. In some places, the nāgara and ūr carried on their functions side by side. The word is sometimes used to indicate occupational groups like sālevyanagaratnam'.

There are certain seals which belonged to the Srēṣththinīgama or Kulika-nīgama or Srēṣththin-Kulika-nīgama or Srēṣththin-Sārvācāksa-prathama-Kulika-nīgama and it has been suggested that

---

1 The Paśchāya-type board of administration headed by the Nagarasēththin (the chief banker), Sārvācāka (the merchant), Prathama-Kulika (the chief artisan) and Prathama-Kāyaṣṭha (the chief of the scribes) was compared by us with the Rajasthani institution of unpaid magistracy called the Chauhāni, which included the Nagarāth (Nagarāsthin) and his assistants like the Paṭēl (village headman) and Paṭwāri, (the village scribe). The board 'headed by' the Nagarāsthin and others apparently means that it was headed by the Nagarasēththin who was assisted by others. About the Chauhāni, Tod says as follows: "Besides the resident ruler of the district, who was also a judicial functionary, there was........a special officer of the Government in each frontier Thana or garrison post. He united the triple occupation of embodying the quatuor, levying the transit duties and administering justice, in which he was aided at the Chautara or court, by assembling the Chauhānis or assessors of justice. Each town and village has its Chauhāni, the members of which are elected by their fellow citizens, and remain as long as they conduct themselves impartially in disentangling the intricacies of complaints preferred to them. They are the aids to the Nagarasēth or chief magistrate, and hold hereditary office in every large city in Rajasthan. Of this Chauhāni, the Paṭēl (headman) and Paṭwāri (accountant) are generally members............these are the special and fixed council of each town; the general Panchayyat are formed from the respectable population at large and were formerly from all classes of society. The Chautaras or terraces of justice were always established in the Khāliya or crown demesne." See Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, ed. W. Crooke, Vol. I, p. 171; cf. p. 231; also, Vol. II, p. 682. See Journ. Univ. Goa, loc. cit.


4 Ibid. s.v. nagara. The Sēndraka king Bhogasakti is stated to have reconstituted the township of Samagiri along with four other localities and to have given it to the nagara headed by two Srēṣththin. See Sircar, Landlordism and Tenancy in Ancient and Medieval India as revealed by Epigraphical Records, Lucknow, 1969, p. 30.
śrēṣṭi and nigama refer to guilds of two different types, the former consisting of persons belonging to one or more communities, but following the same profession, and the latter incorporating persons following various crafts, or merchants dealing in various commodities.3

The legends, however, really mean 'the nigama headed by a Śrēṣṭhin (banker)', 'the nigama headed by the Kulika (artesian)', 'the nigama headed by the Śrēṣthhin assisted by the Kulika and others', 'the nigama headed by the Śrēṣthhin, aided by the Sārthavāka (trader), the First Kulika (the chief artisan or the head of the Kulika guild)' and others. As indicated above, in these cases, nigama may be interpreted as the nigama-sabha which occurs in a Nasik inscription of 120 A.D.2

The Nasik inscription4 of Śaka 42 (120 A.D.) speaks of the creation of a permanent endowment by depositing 3000 kārshāpyaṇas in the śrēṣṭis or guilds functioning at Gāvārthana and of the deposit of (1) 2000 kārshāpyaṇas (out of the 3000 kārshāpyaṇas) in a weavers' guild at an interest of 1 per cent per month for providing 12 chievavas to each of the 20 monks residing in a particular cave on the Nasik hill, and (2) 1000 kārshāpyaṇas in a second weavers' guild at an interest of 2 per cent per month for the provision of light food for the said monks. The inscription further speaks of a gift of 8000 coconut saplings at the village of Chikhalapadra in the district of Kāpur in favour of the same monks. All these grants are stated to have been declared at the nigama-sabha and written on plates according to the prevailing custom.

There are some interesting points in this record. In the first place, we find that there were at least two weavers' guilds at the city of Gāvārthana, so that even the communities of weavers at a particular locality were not combined into a single guild. Secondly, the creation of the permanent endowment and the gift of the coconut palms (albeit in a different district), in favour of some monks residing in a Nasik cave were declared at the nigama-sabha or the council of the town. This appears to have been done because the nigama-sabha had the power to compel the śrēṣṭi to supply the amounts for the purchase of chievav and light food for the monks if they did not supply them of their own accord.

The nigama-sabha, literally 'the citizens' council' may be an administrative board of the Pañchāyat type. As we have seen, the board of administrators formed by the Nagarāśrēsthin, Sārthavāka, Prathama-Kulika, Prathama-Kāyashta and others, known as the Adhikaraṇa from records like the Damodarpur plates of the Gupta age, was of the same type, the Nagarāśrēsthin probably being its President.

We have also seen above that the governor of a district working side by side with the administrative board headed by the Nagarāśrēsthin often enjoyed the title Kumārāmāy. It is interesting therefore to note that there is an East Indian seal bearing the double impression, viz. (1) Śrēṣthi-Sārthavāka-Kulika-nigama and (2) Kumārāmāy-adhikaraṇa, probably pointing to a transaction involving both the office of the governor of the district and the Pañchāyat-type board of administration.4

---

1 K. K. Thaplyal in JNSI, Vol. XXX, pp. 133 ff. (p. 150 where in line 1 'nigama and śrēṣṭi' should be corrected to 'śrēṣṭi and nigama' according to the author.)
No. 32—A GRANT OF MAHASIVAGUPTA I—YAYATI, YEAR 4

(1 Plate)

P. R. Srinivasan, Mysore

(Received on 13-2-1969)

The copper plate charter1 edited below is deposited in the Orissa State Museum, Bhubaneshwar. Its findspot is not known. I prepared its impressions when I visited Bhubaneshvar in December 1964 during my annual collection tour, with the kind assistance of Shri K.N. Mohapatra, the then Assistant Director of the Museum. The inscription is stated to have been included in the Inscriptions of Orissa, Vol. IV, as No. 26. But in view of its importance for the history of the Soma-vara dynasty of Kalinga, it is dealt with in the following pages in detail. I am thankful to my colleague Shri S. Sankaranarayanan, for his kind help in this work.

The charter consists of three comparatively small copper-plates, each with a ring-hole at its left margin. The ring, with the seal, if any is missing. The sides of the plates are not straight; and one of the plates is damaged slightly at the top and bottom. Each plate measures approximately 20.5 cm long and 14.8 cm broad. The first and the last plates have writing on their inner side while the second plate has writing on both sides. The edges of the plates are raised a little. In spite of this the writing of the plates has suffered from corrosion which is considerable especially on ii-b and iii. However, the passages engraved on the corroded places too can be made out with some effort. The letters are written carefully and deeply. There are altogether 55 lines of writing which is distributed as 14 lines each on i and ii-b, 15 lines on ii-a and 12 lines on iii. The three plates together weigh 1557 g.

The characters are Nagari as obtained in Kalinga in the 10th century and they resemble very much those of the Katak plates of the 1st year of Mahabhadagupta P and those of the Katak plates of the 3rd year of Mahabhavagupta II—Bhalmaratha.2 A significant difference is, however, noticeable in the tops of letters of the present record in which they have solid nail-heads, while the tops of the letters of the other two charters mentioned above are of the scooped-out variety. In palaeography too this record is similar to the above records, and generally the letters are written with care indicating wherever necessary the differences between the letters which have similar forms. Of initial vowels this record employs a (lines 36, 52), a (lines 26, 38, 35, 44, 54), i (lines 28, 47), and u (lines 17, 39, 55). The signs for the medial vowels are normal for the period and region. The final consonants t (line 7), n (line 47) and m (lines 27, 32, 42, 42) occur, but the former two are not distinguishable from the regular letters.

The language of the record is Sanskrit, and the composition which suffers from metrical defects and omission of words, is partly in verse and partly in prose. In regard to orthography, there is very little to be mentioned. As usual v is invariably used for b; the consonant is in most cases doubled after r (e.g., vinirijita, line 9); and occasionally some confusion is seen in writing s for ś, as for instance paramamahesvara for paramamahesvara in line 13.

---

3 Ibid., pp. 356 ff., and plate between pages 356-57.
The record refers itself to the reign of P.M.P. Mahāśīvagupta-Yayāti, son of Mahābhavagupta-Janamājya. This king is given the titles Sūmakululilaka and Trikaliṅgādhīpati. There is no doubt that the donor of our record is identical with Mahāśīvagupta I-Yayāti of the Sūmakululilaka dynasty of Kaliṅga, quite a few of whose inscriptions are already known to us. The date of the record, expressed in words, is regnal year 4, Kārttiqā su. 5. In repeating it, the scribe, instead of engraving the symbol for 4, has engraved two slanting strokes after Sāmat. If the year 4 is correct, then this charter is the earliest of the records known so far of this king. The charter was issued from Vīntapura just as the other known records of this king dated up to his 15th regnal year are.

The inscription begins with the symbol for Siddham. Then follows a prose passage (line 1) stating that the charter was issued from the victorious camp at Vīntapura. Lines 2-4 contain a verse in praise of Vīntapura. Then follow three verses in lines 4-13 in praise of Yayāti, from which it is possible to infer that Yayāti was the son of Janamājya of the lunar race. These verses are hyperbolic in character. Verse 2 is especially so, and an understanding of its meaning is made all the more difficult by its corrupt text. Lines 13-17, in prose, make mention of the fact that P.M.P. Mahāśīvagupta, son of P.M.P. Mahābhavagupta, is enjoying good health. The prose passage in lines 17-20 contain the king’s order addressed to the Brāhmaṇas, Ayukta, Samāharī, Sannidhāri, Niyuktaka, Adhikāri, Dāṇḍapāsika, Chāṭa, Bhāṣa, Pīrānvarātikā, Avarghvajana, Rājaśa, Rājputra, Rājavallāhaka and others of the Gaṇḍīta-viṣhaya. The contents of the order are contained in lines 20-38. They relate to the grant, made by the king, of the village Kudukulōkhaṇḍa-kṣaṭra in the Gaṇḍīta-viṣhaya in Udra-dēsā, as a tax-free gift, attached with the privileges specified and freed from all encumbrances, to Kākō, who was the son of Madhu and grandson of Bhūtputra Dāmōdara. This done is stated to have belonged to Kausika-gōtra with three pravara, to have hailed from Śrāvastī-khaḍiyā-grāma and to be a resident of Yaśakatāka. It is stated that the grant was made for the increase of the fame and religious merit of the king’s parents and of himself.

Lines 28-29 contain the king’s instructions to the above mentioned officials to abide by his order to remit the shares etc., (due to him) from the village evidently to the donee. Then follows the usual request of the king to the future rulers to protect the gift as though it is theirs (lines 29-31). Lines 31-49 contain 14 of the usual imprecatory and beneficent verses. The date of the record discussed above is given as chaturtha-saṁvatārīya-Kārttiqā-sita-pakshapānchami and also partly in figures, and it is stated to be in the victorious reign of P.M.P. Sūmakululilaka Trikaliṅgādhīpati śrimad-Yayātirajadēva (lines 49-53). According to the passage in lines 53-55 it would seem that the record was written by one, whose name is omitted, who was a favourite of Mahākṣapaṭala Śāntināgra and who was known to Mahāśīvagupta I Rājakā Chhohhichhaṭāvvara. But on the analogy of other records one would be tempted to correct abhimatēna into abhidhāmēna and take that Śāntināgra himself was the writer. The engraver of the record was Pannāka. Of these Chhohhichhaṭāvvara, whose name is also spelt as Chhohhichhaṭāvśa, is known from the Kaṭak plates of the 9th year of the same king; Pannāka described as Thakura-Panāka, is known from the Sōnpur plates of the 15th year of this king; and Mahākṣapaṭala Śāntināgra is known from the present record only. That this Śāntināgra was a member.

---

1 Bhandarkar’s List, Nos. 1565-69, where, however, he is called Mahāśīvagupta II, which is not correct. See The Age of the Imperial Kausāu, pp. 146 ff; The Struggle for Empire, pp. 209-10.
2 Bhandarkar’s List, Nos. 1565-67.
4 Bhandarkar’s List, No. 1567.
5 Bhandarkar’s List, No. 1566.
of the Nāga family, like Uchchhavanāga\(^1\) son of Āllavanāga figuring both in the Pāṭāla plates of the 8th year and the Sōmpur plates of the 15th year of this king is noteworthy. For, members of this Nāga family, like those of the Datta family, appear to have been under the continuous employ of the Sōnavanāga kings of Kāḍīṅga.

This charter is **important** in more respects than one. As has been stated above, this is the **earliest** of the records of this ruler so far known. Secondly, the eulogistic description of the place of issue namely Vinitapura shows that this is the earliest known record of this family where Vinitapura figures as the capital of the donor’s kingdom. Thirdly, the situation of the gift-village in the Gānditama-vishaya belonging to Uḍra-dēśa shows that this is the earliest charter known so far, recording a grant of a village in Uḍra-dēśa, although according to the Bhūtanāvar record of Uḍyotakāśarī, Mahābhavagupta I-Janameyajaya, the father and predecessor of the donor of our record, captured the royal fortune of the king of the Uḍra country\(^2\).

Of the geographical names occurring in the inscription, Vinitapura is identified with the modern Binka, and Uḍra-dēśa is the region comprising the modern districts of Puri and Cuttack. Yāṣakaṇaka seems to be identical with modern Cuttack. The other names Gānditama-vishaya, Kuḍulokhaṇḍa-kāhētra and the village Śravasthālokaṇḍiyā-grāma are difficult to identify.

**TEXT**

[Metre: Verses 1-4 Śārdulavikrīḍita; verses 5-8 and 10-15 Anuśṭubh; verse 9 Indravajrā; verse 16 Śūstī and verse 17 Pushyāṅgrā.]

**First Plate.**

1 Siddham\(^4\) [\(\ast\)] Svasti [\(\ast\)] Śrī-Vini(ni)tapūrāta (t) samavāsi(si)ta-śrīmatō vijaya-kaṭakāta(t) [sva-]

2 sty-sātu [\(\ast\)] samasta-satru-nripati-prāravda(bdha)-śvā-vidyā-vyagr-ākāra-vinita-dūrā-nichita Donation of the (tad)-ā-māgra(rga)mā(m=)

3 [dṛ]vratataḥ | dharman-ārth-ekhita-śāstra-nīchita-naya-vyāpā-ārā-praṇā-khyāt-āmātya-[ma]-

4 tād-Vinitapurātō-nvarthā-prasiddh-āhvayāta(t) \(\|\) [\(\ast\)] Sūmādi-svakul-ōdgata-kshitiṃbhu-bhaya jān dēvatva-

5 bhājām-āpi kṣhāmāṭyāḥ-cchātma-manō-bhvānīcchita-pratiṃrāpeṣa-anurūpa-śrīyāḥ | nāgānā-

6 m-atru(t)bhūta-saurānāṣhūka-ākāsmik-ānumra(hā) Yajñātmā prahāna-khaṇās- 

7 māya-ukhītaḥ \(\|\) [\(\ast\)] Prakhyāt-ākhya- Yuddhiṣṭhir-ānvaya-mahā-sēghānḥhasanā-

---

\(^1\) Ibid., No. 1965.
\(^2\) JRAI(9), Vol. XIII, p. 68, text line 3; also see The Age of Imperial Kanauj, p. 147.
\(^3\) From impressions.
\(^4\) Expresse by a symbol.
\(^5\) An explanation for udhāvātma is required here to complete the metre and to bring out the sense of this verse.
\(^6\) This letter kṣhāma is not properly formed.
\(^7\) Read paripṛṣṭa.
\(^8\) Read "anugrahah.
\(^9\) Probably saṁnlakṣitaḥ is intended.
Scale: One-Fourth
8. rōhaṇa-vyāpyā(pā)rāvāsara-āhit-ōtava-manō(nā) lōk-ābhīnandōdayah[*] niḥ-
9. sēsh-āgama-tät[t*]va-vēṭri-vimala-prajñā-vta(ha)-śāla[m*]kṛitaḥ sphūrjjasau(ch-chhau)-
    ryya-vininjīt-ōrjīj-
10. ta-ripu-kamāpāla-vēl-ōdyamaḥ || [3*] Sapta-dvīpa-vibhūshayaṁ kṣhitalaṁ yad...
11. y-ālaṃkṛitaḥ tat-prōta-sthita-Sōmarāja-vibhūtām-dhattē ttamanyāīdyaṁtaḥ 1 |
    dēvaḥ Śrī-Jana-
12. mējayas-tad-adhūnā trā-āvatiṛya savaṁ ta[t*] kuryāṁ-iti yaḥ kṛt-āvataraṇaḥ sa Śrī-
    Yaya-
13. ti-prabhūḥ || [4*] Paramamāhēśva(sva)ra-paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārāja-dhirāja-paramē-
14. [sva]ra-Sōmakulatilaka-Trikālingādhipati-Śrī-Mahābhavagupta-ra-

Second Plate, First side

15. jadēva-pādāmudhyāyī || Paramamāhēśva[sva]*ra-paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārāja-dhirāja-
16. paramēśvara-Sōmakulatilaka-Trikālingādhipati-Śrī-Mahāśivagupta-ra-
17. jadēvaḥ kuśali | Udra-dēśē | Gaṇḍitama-vishaya-Kuḍukulōkhaṇḍa-kṣheṭre
18. tad-vishayāya-vrā(brā)hmaṇān-āyukta-yathākālādhīyāyinaḥ samāhartriḥ(tri)sva(sa)nnidhatṛi-
    ni-
19. yuktak-ādhikārika-dāṇḍapāsi(sī)kā(ka)-chāta-bhāta-pisu(śu)navēṭrīk-āvarōdhajana-rōpaka-ra-
20. japutra-rājavallbh-śīlā(n) samājāpayati(tī) viditam-astu bhavatāṁ(tām) | Yathā-āśmabhī-
21. r-aya[s*] grāmaḥ snidhiḥ sōpanidhiḥ sadaśāparādhaḥ sarvva-vā(bā)-
22. dhā-vivarjītaḥ [sa*]ravīparik-ādāna-sahitāḥ ścha(ch)tuḥ-sīmā-parva-
23. ntaḥ sa(sā)nma-madhukhaḥ sagart-ōsharaḥ sa-jala[a*]-sthala-sahitāḥ dva(a)chāta-bhāta-
    pravēśa(sa)ka-
24. ḫ[ Kausi(sī)ka-gōtrā(tru)-trirshaya[1]-pravaraya Śrāvasthālēkhaṇḍiyā-grāma-vingrīgatā-
25. ya[Yasa(sā)kaṭaka-vāstavyāya Bhāṣaputra-Dāmōdara-napṭre Madhu-sutaṁya | Śrī-Kā-
26. kō-nāmnē sahīla-dhāra-pur FONT-log̃sānaḥ ā-chandra-tārakaka[khšiti-śamakāl-ōpabhū-
27. gārtham mētā-pitrc-ātmanāe-cha punya-yaśō-bhivīddhayē trā(tā)mrā-sāsānē-ākārikri-
28. tya pratipādita ity-agavatya yathā-diyamāna-kara-bhara-hira[ṛya]-bhōga-bhājā-
29. [dikatū] cha dadādbhī bhavādbhī suḥkhēna pratīvaśvam-īti[bhā]-

1 Probably dabā-birāja-śaṅkrītām tat-pauṭra-sthita-somārajā-vibhūtām dhattēśeśa manyaśāynta tat is intended.
2 Read trī-ārahēya.
3 Read trāk-ārkāṁ.
4 After this some space which can accommodate seven or eight letters has been left blank, and the engraving is continued on the next side.
30 vibhiṣaḥcha bhūpatibhir-dattir=iyam-asmadīyā dharmma-gauravāḍ=asmad-anurūḍhāḥ=cha sva-datti-
31 r-v=ānupālanīyā [[*] tathā ch-ōkaṃ dharmma-śaṣtrē [[*] Va(Ba)hubhīr=vvasadha dattā rājabhīḥ Sagar-śa]-
32 dibhiḥ [[*] yasya yasya yaḍā bhūmiḥ tasya tasya tada phalam [[*] 5*] Mā bhūd=aphala-
33 sa(sa)[ākā]
34 vaḥ para-dattēti pā[rthi]vah] a[v]-dattēt=phalam-ānu(ṇa)ntyah para-datt-ānupālanē
[[*] 5*] Ā-
35 sphoṭayanti [pitaraḥ pravalgantī] pitamahāḥ [[*] bhūmi-dātā kulē jātaḥ sa
36 nas-trātā bhavishyatī || [7*] Shashṭiḥ varsha-sahasrāṇi svarggē mōdati bhūmidāḥ(dah)y
[[*] ākhēptā
37 ch-ānumantā cha dva[u] ταυ na[raka-gāminau || [8*] Ag[n]ār-apatyam prathamam su-
38 [vṛnuvaḥ bhūr]−Vaśaphivi Sūrya-sutāḥ=cha gāvaḥ [[*] yah kāchanaḥ-gām cha [ma*]−
39 [hīṃs]-cha
40 [da]dyād=dattēs-trayas=tenā bhavanti lōkāḥ || [9*] Bhūmiḥ yah pratigṛihītā yaḥ=cha
41 bhūmiḥ
42 prayacchhāti [[*] ubhau ta[u] puṇya-karmmāṇaḥ niyata[m*] sa(sva)rgga-gāminau [[10*] Taḍāgā-
43 nāṁ sahasrōṇa vājapēya-sātēna cha [[*] gavāṁ kōṭi-pradānēna bhūmi-harttā na su(ē)u[dhy-
44 ti || [11*] [Harēṭa] hārayād=yaṣu tu manda-vu(bu)dhis=tamō-vrītaḥ [[*] suva(ba)dhdhō
45 Vāruna[h] pāsaī(śa)h]
46 tiryag-yōniḥ sa gachchhati || [12*] Suvarṇam=ekā(kam) gām=ekāṁbhūmēr=apy=
47 arddham=aṅgulam | haran=narakam=āyā-
48 ti yāvad-a-bhūta-samplavam ||[13*] Sva-dattēm=para-dattēmvā(ṭatāṃ vā) yō harēṭa
49 vasundhārāṃ |

Third Plate

44 [sa v]iṣṭhāyāṁ krimir-bhūtvā pitribhis-saha pachayate || [14*] Ādityō Varuṇō Vishṇu=Vra(Bra)hmā Sō-
45 mō Hutāsanaḥ [[*] Śūlapāṇiḥ=cha Bhagavān=abhinandati bhūmidaṁ || [15*] Sāmānyō=
46 yah dharmma-
47 yan dharmma-
48 sētur-nipāṇāṁ(yaṁ) kālē kalē pālanīyō bhavadbhīḥ [[*] sarvāṇa=ētāṁ bhāvināḥ pārti-

1 These words, which were omitted here first, are engraved in diminutive letters, just below sucares and between the letters νεα and δο of the next line.
47 vendrān bhūyō bhūyō yāchatē Rāmabhadrāḥ || [16*] Iti kamala-dalāmvu(mbu)-vi(bi)ndu-lōlam Śrī-

48 yam-anuchintya manushya-jīvitaṁ-ccha ||[*] sakalam-idam-udāhṛitaṁ-ccha vu(bu)dhvā na hi purushaiḥ para-

49 kirttayō villōpyāḥ || [17*] Paramamāhēśva(śva)ra-paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājā-

50 dhīrāja-paramēśva(śva)ra-Somakulatilaka-Trikalāṅgādhipati-

51 śrīmad-Yāti-rājadeva-vijaya-rājyē chaturtha-sāmva(sanha)tsaṛi-

52 ya-Kārttikā-māsa-sita-paksha-paṇḍhapyāṁ ankatoḥ samvat Śrī Kārttikā-

53 sudī 5 [!*] Likhitam-idam tāmra-sā(hā)sana[*] mā(ma)haśāndhivigrahi-rāja-

54 ka-Śrī-Chhehhehhaṭṭāsva(śva)rasyā-vagatōna māhā ātkapataṭa-Śrī-Śanti-

55 nāg-ābhimatōna || Śrī-Pannākōna utkṛṣṭam-idam-iti ||

---

1 Read asṃaut. There are two slightly curved strokes after this, although one would expect here the symbol for a figure 4.
2 Saadā is not observed here.
3 Better read "ābhādānēna."
No. 33—HYDERABAD MUSEUM PLATES OF PRITHIVI-SRI-MULARAJA

(2 Plates)

S. S. Ramachandra Murthy, Mysore

(Received on 31. 8. 1967)

The copper plate grant edited here which is now preserved in the Government of Andhra Pradesh Museum, Hyderabad was obtained from the Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh. No other details regarding its findspot are available. The record has been published by Shri N. Ramesan in "Copper Plate Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh Government Museum, Hyderabad", Volume I, with plates. This has also been copied by the Office of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore. It is now edited here with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist.

This is the second known record of Prithivi-śri-Mūlarāja, the first one being the Godavari plates published by J. F. Fleet. The present record is important as it mentions Rājā Harivarman as the son of Prithivi-śri-Mūlarāja who is referred to as Prithivi-Mūlarāja the son of Mahārāja Prabhākara in the Godavari plates. Thus now the three generations of the family, viz., Prabhākara, Prithivi-śri-Mūla and Harivarman are known to us. The fact that the grant villages mentioned in the Godavari plates and in the present record lay in Tālupāka-vishaya indicates that Prithivi-Mūlarāja's territory centred round that vishaya.

The grant consists of five plates held together by a circular ring with a seal. The first plate is engraved on the inner side only. Except for the third plate, first side, and the fifth plate, second side, all plates contain four lines of writing each. Whereas the third plate, first side, has five lines, the fifth plate, second side has only two lines of writing. Thus the plates contain 35 lines in all.

The language of the record is Sanskrit throughout and the text is in prose and verse. The prose portion comprises long compounds (gajas) as in those of the Vishṇukundin records of Gōvindavarman and Vikramaendrabhaṭṭārakavarman published in the Telugu journal Bhārati. The characters of the record belong to the southern variety prevalent in the Telugu country in the 6th century A.D. and closely resemble those of the above mentioned Vishṇukundin records.

The record opens with a verse in praise of the Muni i.e., the Buddha, who was unconquerable by the army of Māra. The next verse introduces Mūlarāja who is described as one whose great fame earned by the victories in many battles has spread throughout the world. Then the verse passage begins with the invocation svasti and mentions that Prithivi-śri-Mūlarāja issued the order from the capital Guṇapāsāpura. After this, a long description of the king is given in lines 6-14 wherein he is described as the son of Prabhākara-mahārāja, who is said to have acquired merit by worshipping the feet of dēva, dvīja and guru and who adorned all the four quarters

1 Andhra Pradesh Government Archaeological Series, No. 6, pp. 241 ff.
3 JBBRAS, Vol. XVI, pp. 144 ff. and plate.
5 Bhārati, June and July, 1965. Also JIH, Vol. XLIII, pp. 734 ff.
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with fame. It is further stated that Prithivi-sri-Mularaja protected the varnārama-dharma, that he was a victor in many battles involving châturdantas (elephants) and that he was a dharma-vijaya. The king is further described as a para-rama-brahmany and para-madhava. Then follows the order of Prithivi-sri-Mularaja to the elders in the Tālupāka-vishaya headed by the rishtrakūtas to the effect that he had given the village Kaṭṭuchervul, surrounded by the villages Konralaggaṇgru, Pariyaṇgru and Truppāṇgru, to his beloved son Hari-varmaṇgru who had won fame and fortune in many battle fields. In turn Harivarman, with the permission of his father, granted the same village after making it tax-free, to meet the chatushrayyasya of the Bhikshu-saṅgha which was staying in the maha-vihāra constructed by himself at the foot of a hill in Guṇapāraspura, permitting the official navakarṇa-vyāśāṇa-dhikṣita (supervisor of building-renovations) residing in the maha-vihāra itself (obviously to administer the grant). The grant is also intended for the benefit of the bhikṣu-saṅgha coming in future from all the four quarters to the maha-vihāra (either on a visit on pilgrimage or to stay permanently) (āgat-ānāgata-chaturādi-āryavara-bhikṣu-saṅgha) also. Then follows the injunction to all kings to safeguard this (endowment) and it is followed by the usual imprecatory verses. The record concludes with the statement that this grant (issued by Harivarman) from Tāmbraparṇiṣya may stand till the moon and the stars. Tāmbraparṇiṣya obviously refers to Ceylon where from the Tērvadins were known to have come and established themselves in the kingdom of the Iksvākus which came under the rule of Vīṣṇukūḍaṇḍa, their successor. So Tāmbraparṇiṣya might have been a locality or some edifice established by these Tāmbraparṇiṣyas i.e., Ceylonese Buddhists and it was but proper that Harivarman who was stationed there made a grant to the maha-vihāra. 1

The recently discovered Tummalagūḍem copper plate grant of Vīramāndrābhunāraka-vavarman of the Vīṣṇukūḍa family refers to Paramabhaṭṭārikā, who adorned the family of Prithivi-Mularāja and who was the chief queen of Gūṇindarāja of the Vīṣṇukūḍa family. Prithivi-Mularāja’s family is referred to in it as sāmantra-kula. At the end of the same record a certain sri-Mularāja is mentioned as the executor of the record, who, in all probability, is identical with Prithivi-Mularāja. While editing the Godavari Plates of Prithivi-Mularāja, Fleet assigned it to the 7th century A.D. on grounds of palaeography. But in case the king Prithivi-Mularāja of the Godavari plates and his namesake of the Tummalagūḍem plates are identical then it will take the date of Prithivi-Mularāja back to the latest to the third quarter of the 6th century A.D., since the aforesaid Vīramāndrabhaṭṭāraka-vavarman’s record is dated Śaka 488 or 566 A.D., and for this the palaeographical features of this record also would not come in the way. But we must note that, whereas this Prithivi-Mularāja of the Vīṣṇukūḍa record was a sāmantra, Prithivi-Mularāja of the Godavari plates was an independent king, who was powerful enough to have adhirāja Indra as a subordinate ally, who is stated to have defeated Indrabhaṭṭāraka-vavarman. In case these two Prithivi-Mularājas were identical then it will lead us to conclude that Indrabhaṭṭāraka-vavarman, the father of Vīramāndrabhaṭṭāraka-vavarman was a weak ruler, who

---

1 Kielhorn suggests that chātu-ruddanta is an epithet of Indra’s elephant Airāvata, the elephant of the east (above, Vol. IV, p. 196, note 2).
2 The chatushrayyas i.e. the four needs are caṭṭa (clothing), pīṇḍa (food), sāmantra (bed) and bākṣa (medicine).
3 It is interesting to note, in view of the statement at the end of the record that it has been issued from Tāmbraparṇiṣya (line 34), that the term maha-vihāra was applied to the first great monastery at Anuradhapura in Ceylon established by Devanāṃpiya Tissa, and all monasteries were virtually affiliated to the ‘great monastery’, more or less as its branches. However, later on this term was adopted to designate local monasteries. Further the maha-vihāra was a stronghold of the Tērvadins. See History of Buddhists in Ceylon by Walpola Rahula.

Appendix I and pp. 32-33.
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could be defeated by adhirāja Indra, obviously with the support of Prithivi-Mālarāja and that either Indrabhaṭṭārakavaran himself or his son might have later avenged this defeat and reduced Prithivi-Mālarāja to the position of a sāmantā.

Of the geographical names mentioned in the record the village Tālpāka, after which a vishaya was named may be identified with the modern Tātipāka situated in Razole Taluk, East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh. Guṇapāṣapura, the name of the capital, seems to be a Sanskritized one. It is not possible to identify this and the other villages mentioned in the record.

**TEXT**

*First plate, Second side*

1 Siddham *[I]* Jayati Munir-udagra-khyāta-chandr-amśu-jala-prachaya-ruchira-ki-
2 rtti-śrīr-ajēyasya yasya[ | *] jagad-idam-abhishiktan-dakshaṁ-dhobhir-u-
3 chohaṁ kshubhit-salila-nātha-sparśdhibhir-Mmaṁ-sainyaṁ[ || [1 ||] Tek-anu jayati bhū-
4 mna Mularājas-samantād-vitata-ruchira-bhāsval-lōka-vikhyāta-kirtttiḥ | bahu-4*

*Second plate, First side*

5 samara-jay-ōpatt-ōmata-śrīr-ajēyas-svaka-vara-Gun̄a-pāś-ābaddha-
7 guru-charaṇa-samārādhān-ādhigata-nirātisays-punya-nichaya-
8 sva sakala-diū-manḍal-ālakāra-bhūta-yaśasaḥ śri Prabhākara-vikhyāta-

*Second Plate, Second side*

9 mahārājasya sūnur-smātā-pitī-pād-ānuddhyātah ārti-smṛti-vihita-
10 padārtth-āvahōdha-janita-prajā-vēveka-nirvāṅgī-smupāli-
11 t-āśeṣha-varṇa-ārama-dharmaḥ par-anugraha-mātra-prayājana-
12 pratipann-āśvarya-guru-bhāraṁ anēka-chāturddanta-samara-saṁghatṛa-vi-4*

*Third plate, First side*

13 jayī satata-gō-bhūmi-hīranyā-kanyā-pradān-ādibhis-saphal-kṛita-jīvit-ēpa-
14 [yō]gaḥ parama-māhēśvaraḥ parama-brahmanyah dharmaṃ-vijayī śrīmān Pritivī7-śrī-
15 Mularājaḥ Tālpāka-vishayaṁ rāṣṭrakūṭa-grāma-vṛiddha-pranukha-vishaya-

---

1 From the stampsages.
2 Expressed by a symbol.
3 Metre : Māliṅ.
4 This side of the plate is numbered one in the margin.
5 Cf. ivyāya cakṛhṛtrāśrīkāśyam (Raghaṭesuktam, Canto I, verse 7).
6 This side of the plate is numbered two in the margin.
7 Read Prīthītrī.
Third plate, Second side

18 [y-ō]pārjjit-ōṛjjita-yaśō-vibhūti-vistarāya mama priya-tanayāya Harivarman-rajā-
yya Konralaggaru Pariyaparu Trupparu ity-ēśāṁ grāmāṇāṁ maddhya-gataḥ
20 Kaṭṭucheryul-nāma grāmō mayā dattaḥ [||*] Anēna cha mad-anumatēna Hari-
varman-rajēṇa mahā-viḥāra-nivāsinaṁ nava-karma-vyāpār-ādikrītam-anumātya

Fourth plate, First side

22 Guṇapāsapura-giri-taṣa-svā-pratishṭhāpita-mahā-viḥāra-nivāsya-āgat-ānā-
gata-chātur-ddīś-āryya-vara-bhikṣu-saṅgha-chatush-pratyaya-parihōg-ārththa-
n-dattā-saṅvva-parihārēga [||*] Sa sarvār-eva rāja-riśhibhiḥ śrutī-smṛīti-vihi-
ta-sad-āchār-ānuvarātibhiḥ-samyak-paripālanīyaḥ [||*] Bhavanti ch-ātra Ma[n]-gī-

Fourth plate, Second side

26 tā[ḥ*] ślokaḥ [||*] Bahubhir-vvasudhā dattā bahubhir-ch-ānupālītā [ ||*] yasya
27 yasya yadā bhūmīs-tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ (lam) [ ||*] Bhūmi-dānāt-paran-dā-
na[n-na] bhūtan-na bhaviṣhyati[ ||*] tasya-aiva haraṇāt-pāpan-na bhūtan-na bhavi-
shyati [||*] Shashaṭhaṇī varṣa-saḥasārāṇī svarggē tīṣṭhathī bhūmidaḥ [||*] āchehśhētā ch-ānu-
mantā cha tāṃ-eva

Fifth plate, First side

30 narakō vaśēt [ ||*] Yaśe-ch-ātra lōḥh-ēṛhya-śramaṇ-ājñāna-kshudra-parivāra-dōsha-vaśēt
dharmma-va-
31 lōpāya pravarttēta sa imāni pātakāni spriśēt || Nighnatāṁ bhartaṇ-gō-vipra-bā-
32 la-yōḥit-tapasvinah[ ||*] yā gatiś-sā bhavēd-vṛttīṁ harata[h*] śāsam-āṅkitām [||*] Sv-
dattāṁ paran-
33 dattāṁ vā yō ṣaḥaṭa vasumdhāram[*] sa viṣṭhāyāṁ krimibhūtvā² pitribhin-saha pachyatō || *]

Fifth plate, Second side

34 [Saṁ*]diyya Taṁbraṇaprayat śāsana[ū] Harivarmanmaṇṭ[ ] rājāṁ kṛtam-īha śthēya-
35 d-idam-ā-chandra-tāraṇaṁ(kam) || ||*
No. 35—MAINAMATI PLATES OF THE CHANDRA KINGS

( 3 Plates )

D.C. Siroar, Calcutta

( Received on 18-8-69 )

We have had occasion to refer to the contents of certain copper-plate grants of the Chandra kings of South-Eastern Bengal, on the basis of a note by Prof. A. H. Dani of the University of Peshawar which was read at the Aligarh Session of the Indian History Congress in December 1960 and was published in its Proceedings. For the removal of our doubts about the reading and interpretation of the stanzas quoted by Prof. Dani, we were so long eagerly waiting for the publication of the inscriptions with facsimiles. It is a matter of satisfaction to us that three of the said copper-plate grants discovered on the Mainamati hill and belonging to kings Ladhahachandra and Govinda-chandra—two issued by the former and one by the latter—have now been edited by Prof. Dani himself in the Pakistan Archaeology, published by the Department of Archaeology, Government of Pakistan, Karachi, No. 3, 1966, pp. 22-55.

An examination of the facsimiles shows that there are mistakes in Prof. Dani’s reading of the texts and that a few such errors also crept into our discussion of the contents of the records as referred to above. It is unfortunate that the word vaṁśa (spelt vaṁśa), which occurs in three stanzas found in the grants of Ladhahachandra and in one verse in Govinda-chandra’s charter, has in all the cases been read by Prof. Dani as Vaṁga meaning the country of that name, even though it is quite unsuitable to some of the stanzas. Thus what we quoted from Prof. Dani’s note in the description of Trinākyachandra (c. 900-23 A.D.) as Vaṁgasya mukti-maṇḍi, ‘the ornament of the Vaṁga country’, is in reality vaṁśa vaṁśa vaṁśya mukti-maṇḍi, ‘the ornament of the Chandra dynasty’.

There are inaccuracies in the indication of the metres of some of the verses, the most curious amongst them being the mention of the metre of a stanza in Āryā as Vistama-prakta.

Besides mistakes in reading, there are many mistakes of interpretation in Prof. Dani’s translation of the epigraphs. One of the unfortunate errors of this category is noticed in his translation of verse 1 of Ladhahachandra’s grants and verse 2 of the charter of Govinda-chandra. Both the stanzas introduce the Moon-god (Chandra) as “the light sprung from the eye of the sage Atri (Atri-nētṛā)” , a tradition not only noticed in the Purāṇas and numerous epigraphical and literary works, but even supported by such names of the Moon-god as Atrijāta, Atridrigja, Atrinētrakṣa, Atrinētraprasāṭa, Atrinētrabhū, etc., recognised in the lexicons. Unfortunately, Prof. Dani reads Atri-nētṛā as a-Trinētṛā and interprets it both as “not from the three-eyed god (i.e. Śiva) ” and “from the three-eyed god ” through confusion. Indeed, there is no tradition in Indian literature which mentions Chandra as emanating from the god Śiva who is of course said to have made the half-moon an ornament of his head.

---

1 See, e.g., our paper on the Paśchimbhāg plate of Śrīchandra, above, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 289 ff. What has been mentioned in the present paper as East Pakistan is now the independent State of Bangladesh.

2 See below, verse 3 of Ladhahachandra’s grants. Besides other cases in these records (cf. line 11 of No. 3), there are numerous instances of the use of ni for ni in the early medieval records of Eastern India.

3 See ibid., verse 10.
The three charters of the Chandra kings re-edited in these pages were discovered in 1954 in a mound now called Chör Patri Murā (the mound of four copper-plate grants), on the Lāmāi-
Maināmāti range near Comilla in the Tippera District of East Pakistan, the fourth
inscription alluded to in the name belonging to a later king named Viradhāra.daena. Two of the
grants were issued by King Lādāhāchandra (c. 1000-20 A.D.) in the sixth year of his reign, while the
third charter was issued by his son and successor Gōvindachandra (c. 1020-45 A. D.) though its date
is not mentioned.

Each of the three charters are engraved on both sides of a single plate, and a seal is affixed
to its top. It is the usual Dharma(craft) mudra adopted by the Buddhist royal families of Bengal,
such as the Pālas. The shape of the seal is circular though it has a projection above. The legend on
the seals attached to the first and second charters issued by Lādāhāchandra reads śri-Lādāhāchand-
trādēva and that on the seal of the third grant of King Gōvindachandra has śri-Gōvindachandrādēva.
The first record has 62 lines of writing, 31 on each side of the plate. The second epigraph has 30
lines of inscription on the reverse and the third 29 lines each on both obverse and reverse. For
the sake of convenience, the three charters may be alluded to as Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

The palæography of these records resembles that of the other copper-plate inscriptions of
the Chandra kings; but Gōvindachandra's charter exhibits cursive writing, though it is not as
cursive as the charters of the Bētā-Pālupāda image inscription1 incised in the king's twentythird
regnal year. The inscriptions contain a large number of initial vowels—(1) a in lines 24, 52-53 and
55 of No. 1; lines 19 and 23 of No. 2; and lines 45 and 49 of No. 3; (2) i in lines 8, 15, 54 and 59 of
No. 1; lines 22 and 30 of No. 2; and lines 29, 48 and 54 of No. 3; (3) i in lines 9 and 61 of No. 1;
and lines 16 (twice), 27, 52 and 56 of No. 3; (4) i in line 25 of No. 3; (5) u in lines 41, 43 and 58 of No.
1; and line 53 of No. 3; (6) e in lines 4, 28, 41 and 44 of No. 1, and line 29 of No. 3. The medial
form of p in pā occurs once in line 27 of No. 1. The sign of avagraha is noticed in lines 24 and 32
in No. 1; lines 15, 20 and 21 (twice) in No. 2, and lines 40 and 46 of No. 3. The language of
the records is Sanskrit. As regards orthography, the wrong representation of ni as ni and of ni as
ni is interesting. There are many cases of the final m changing to the class nasal; e.g., diśm-tanaḥ
in line 5 of No. 3. In these respects, the present records are similar to the published copper-plate
grants of the Chandra kings.

An interesting fact about the three Maināmāti plates is that they do not adopt any stanza
from the earlier charters of Śrīchandra (c. 925-75 A.D.) who was the grandfather of Lādāhāchandra.
This does not of course mean that there is absolutely no trace of any influence of Śrīchandra's
records on these charters. At least the passage dhasala-chhatra-smitānāṁ śriyāṁ in verse 6 of
Gōvindachandra's grant (No. 3) reminds us of Harīkēla-raja-kakuda-chhatra-smitānāṁ śriyāṁ in
a well-known stanza in the charter of Śrīchandra.2 The expression kautila-bhiru-brādojanī in verse
8 of the same inscription likewise reminds us of kautila-bhiru-bhayaṁ in verse 5 of Śrīchandra's
Pāścimāhāga plate.3 It is also interesting to note that the passage niśīyasyaś-cūtū ānta jāmānāṁ,

---

1 We edited the inscription in Ind. Cult., Vol. VII, pp. 405-16, and assigned the record to the middle of the
eleventh century while Gōvindachandra's reign period was ascribed by us in 1020-45 A. D. N. K. Bhattachari
later published the epigraph, above, Vol. XXVII, pp. 26-27. Gōvindachandra was defeated by the Chōja army
shortly before 1025 A.D. when the Tiranāla inscription was inscribed in the thirteenth regnal year of Rājendra-
chāda. The author of the Subhodīpiya says that his father Bhadrāvana served Vangārava Rāmapāla (c. 1128-
1226 A.D.) and that his grandfather Devagana was the court physician of Gōvindachandra. It has been recently
said that the manuscript of a Buddhist work was copied in Rāmapāla's 33rd regnal year. See Indo-Asian Cultures,
Vol. XVII, p. 91.
3 See above, Vol. XXXVII, p. 301.
which is a Buddhist maṅgala noticed in the first foot of verse 1 of the grant of Gōvindachandra, also occurs in the maṅgala of the Vajrayogini (Dacca District, East Pakistan) tortoise-shell inscriptions. Unfortunately, neither Prof. Dani, who has now edited Gōvindachandra’s grant, nor the late Dr. N. K. Bhattasali, who first published the tortoise-shell epigraphs, was able to read the expression niśīrāṇyāś-āstu, the former making it niśīrāṇyā-āpyu-āstu and the latter śrīyagāyā su*.

Another important fact revealed by these records is that the later members of the Buddhist family of the Chandra were followers of Brāhmaṇical Hinduism or at least had strong Brāhmaṇical leanings. Thus the charters of Laḍahachandra begin with the Vaishnavite maṅgala—Om namō bhagavati Vāsudēvō ya and record grants made in the name of the god Vāsudeva or Viṣṇu (bhogavantō Vāsudēva-bhāttārakam-uddīṣya). The recipient of the gifts was the god Laḍahamādhava-bhāttāraka installed by King Laḍahachandra at Paṭṭikāraka and named after him ‘Mādhava’, being a well-known name of the god Viṣṇu, there cannot be any doubt that Laḍahamādhava was a form of Viṣṇu and that Laḍahachandra was a Viṣṇuva even though he is called paramaṅgata like his ancestors (cf. line 35 of No. 1 and line 6 of No. 2) apparently as a matter of convention. Like a Hindu, Laḍahachandra visited, on pilgrimage, Vārāṇasi which he describes as a place of Śambhu and Čirindā (verses 16-17) and where he took a ceremonial bath in the waters of the Ganges and offered oblations to his ancestors. For the same purpose, the king also visited the confuence of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā, i.e., Prayāga near Allahabad (verse 18), which is a Hindu tīrtha. Of course, about this time, the Buddha was already accepted by the Brāhmaṇical Hindus as an incarnation of Viṣṇu. There is, however, no clear reference to this rapprochement between Hinduism and Buddhism in Laḍahachandra’s records. It is significant that Vārāṇasi, which is one of the four most important places of pilgrimage of the Buddhists because the Buddha preached his doctrine for the first time at the Mrigadāvī (Sarnath) there, is not mentioned as a Buddhist tīrtha. There are again several references in Laḍahachandra’s records to Brāhmaṇical mythology (cf. verses 2, 9-10, 14, 17-18), but none to Buddhist legends.

As regards Gōvindachandra’s grant, it begins with a Buddhist maṅgala stanza and calls the king paramaṅgata, the first of which may be due to the Buddhist scribe of the document. But it often alludes to Hindu mythology (cf. verses 6, 10, 13, 15-16). As a matter of fact, verse 16 of the record contains a prayer to the Brāhmaṇical Trinity, viz. Svayambhū (Brahman), Hari and Hara. The Hindu Trinity is also mentioned in the description of the Chandra dynasty in verse 2 of Laḍahachandra’s grants. While there is thus no clear Buddhist association in Gōvindachandra’s record, the grant is made in favour of the god Nātēvāra-bhāttāraka in the name of Lord Śiva. Thus, while Laḍahachandra was a Vaishnavā, Gōvindachandra had obvious Śaiva leanings. It is also possible to think that, like the followers of the Paurāṇic religion, these two kings received initiation respectively into the Vaishnavism and Śaiva mantras, but exhibited their respect to different gods of the Puraṇic pantheon. This is probably suggested by the reverential mention of Śiva and Pārvatī residing at Vārāṇasi in Laḍahachandra’s record and of Brahman and Viṣṇu along with Śiva in both Laḍahachandra’s and Gōvindachandra’s grants as already referred to above. The present epigraphs thus show how the lay followers of the Buddhist faith became attracted by the mythology of the Hindus as recorded in the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana and the Puraṇas and by the Paurāṇic Hindu religion. While the Buddhists adopted some of the Hindu deities like Viṇāyaka (Gaṇapati), the Hindus not only accepted the Buddha as an incarnation of Viṣṇu but also adopted Buddhist deities like Tārā. The above factors, together with the attraction of the popular Hindu festivals and mythological dramas and other performances appear to have led to the gradual absorption of the Buddhists of Bengal and Bihar within the Hindu fold. The position of the Buddhists

in early medieval Bengal reminds us of that of the Brahmoo community of to-day when it is not easy to distinguish between a Brahmoo and a Hindu.

As regards the god Naṭṭēśvara-bhaṭṭāraka, his name reminds us of Naṭṭēśvara-bhaṭṭāraka mentioned in an inscription as caused to be made and installed by Bhāvudēva, son of the Karmāṇaṇaṇā Kusumadēva on Thursday, the 14th of Ḍāṣṭrapāla on Thursday, the 14th of Ḍāṣṭrapāla (the 14th of the dark half of the month) in the eighteenth regnal year of Laṭābalasundara’s reign. 3 The late Dr. N. K. Bhattacharjee referred to the discovery of a number of images of Naṭṭēśa-Siva (Daneing Siva) in South-East Bengal and wondered how the worship of the said god, which was a peculiarity of South India, came to be popular in these parts. 4 Probably it has to be associated with the settlement of South Indians in Bengal to which we have referred elsewhere. 5 The date of the above inscription is interesting since it speaks of the Pūrṇimānta calculation of the months and not to the solar month as now prevalent in Bengal nor to the Amānta month as popular in South India at present. 6

The land-measures mentioned in the records are as follows:—(1) būda, (2) kāka, (3) yashti, (4) ḍōṇa and (5) pāṭaka, of which, excepting būda, all the other words are well known in the sense of land measures. 7 According to an earlier inscription of the Tippera District, 40 ḍōṇas made one pāṭaka, while kāka may be the same as modern kānī which is probably the old kākini. 8 But yashti, which is bigger than kāka, really means ‘the measuring rod,’ so that it may indicate a very small area measuring only one rod on all the four sides. In such a case, kāka was very considerably smaller than the kākini which is 1/16 of a ḍōṇa or ḍōṇavāpa. 9 According to old Bengali arithmetical tables, 4 kākas make one kudā (cowrie-shell), 1280 of which were equal to a full silver coin.

The following geographical names are mentioned in the grant portion of the three epigraphs: Vikramapura, Paṇḍara-bhukti, Samatāṇa-maṇḍala, Paṭṭikēraka, Phulakaṇḍa, Dāllavāyaṇka, Sūpatāla-vāraka, Buddhānataka-grāma, Balakvāra-vāraka-grāma, Gāndhānaka-grāma, Ḍāṣṭra-vāraka-grāma, Pāṇārtaka-grāma, Gāndhānaka-grāma, Pāṇārtaka-grāma, Māyu-pāṭaka, Brāhmaṇa-deva-vāraka-grāma, Kahaṇḍa-kapalika-grāma and Sura-vāraka-grāma in No. 1; Vikramapura, Paṇḍara-bhukti, Samatāṇa-maṇḍala, Pāṇārtaka-grāma, Māyu-pāṭaka, Brāhmaṇa-deva-vāraka-grāma, Kahaṇḍa-kapalika-grāma and Sura-vāraka-grāma in No. 2; and Paṇḍara-bhukti, Samatāṇa-maṇḍala, Pāṇārtaka-grāma and Sāharatāla in No. 3.

Vikramapura was the capital of the Chandra kings in the present Dacca District of East Pakistan. The bhukti or province of Paṇḍavārdhana in the Gupta empire covered North Bengal; but the later inclusion of the maṇḍalas of Samatāṇa (Tippera-Noakhali region), Ṣrīṭītā (Sylhet) and Khādi (parts of the 24 Parganas and its neighbourhood) into the same bhukti, often called Paṇḍara, is well known. Possibly this was due to the fact that the metropolitan province of the Pāla empire, having its headquarters at the city of Gauḍa in North Bengal, included South-Eastern and Southern Bengal. Paṭṭikēraka is the Pargana of Paṭṭikēraka or Paṭṭikēraka in Tippera. Since the Chandras did not rule over Northern Bengal (with which fact the change of Paṇḍavārdhana to Paṇḍara may be associated), the words bhukti, maṇḍala and vāraka may be understood in the sense of territory, province and district respectively. The vāraka or district of Gupthaṇa in Samatāṇa is already known from

2 Ibid., p. 349.
4 [The association of Pīsika-makhātra with Ḍāṣṭrapāla bb. It shows that the month was Amānta only.—Ed.]
7 Ibid., pp. 416, 418.
the Kallan plate\(^1\) of Śrīdhāraṇarāśa, while the Pārthaśāna-vishayya is mentioned in the Ashrafpur plates\(^2\) and the Tippera plate\(^3\) of king Bhavadeva of Devaparvata.

The word vōranka recurring in the names of some of the villages seems to be the same as Bengali boro which essentially means a sort of rice sown in low swampy ground or near the banks of a river, but has probably been used in the present records in the sense of land fit for boro cultivation.\(^4\) Thus Balāsvaravardhakavi-vōranka seems to mean a plot of boro-sowing land named after the carpenter Balāsvara. A similar name is Kaṇisa-Kaddapōlaka-grāma which was a village named after the brazier Kaddapōlaka. Bhōga in Vaggura-bhōga means a small territorial unit and haṭṭikā in Dhrūtapura-haṭṭikā means a market place. The words sūchama and gōdhānikā in the names Govindāṭchama and Oḍa-gōdhānikā may be similar words of uncertain implication. The same is the case with the word uddātā. The Budhiḥ śiḥagōngi reminds us of the name of the Budhiḥ śiḥaṅgā, an offshoot of the Dhalēsvari in the Dacca District, though its identification is uncertain.

No. 1—Lāḍahachandra’s First Grant, Regnal Year 6.

The introductory part of the inscription contains nineteen verses which are followed by the grant proper in prose. The record begins with the symbol for Siddham and the maṇḍala—Oṁ namō bhagavatē Vāsudevaōṁ. Adoration to Lord Vāsudeva (Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa)’. Next comes verse 1 which introduces the dynasty of the Moon-god who sprang from Atri’s eye, there being a comparison between the dynasty and the bamboo, which is based on a pun on the word evatā which means both. The same pun occurs in other inscriptions including the grant (verse 3) of Gōvindachandra edited below.\(^4\) Likewise in the next stanza (verse 2), the Hindu Trinity is introduced in the description of the dynasty as deva-tray-ātman by using the words Viśhuvatā (Brahman), Achaṭyata (Krishṇa-Viśṇu) and Mahādevatā (Śiva) each in two different senses. Verse 3 introduces King Trailōkyaḥchandra as the jewel of the said family (evatā mutē-mangā). The next stanza (verse 4) continues the same king’s description. It is interesting to note that only three generations of the donor’s ancestors are mentioned so that Trailōkyaḥchandra’s ancestors known from the grants of his son Śrīchandra are omitted. Similar is the case with the charter of Gōvindaḥchandra which omits Trailōkyaḥchandra and describes the donor’s ancestry from Śrīchandra.

Verse 5 introduces Śrīchandra as the son of King Trailōkyaḥchandra and queen Kāñcana (kāṅkana-Kāñcaneṣu), while verse 6 states how his military exploits brought tears to the eyes of the queen of the king of Prāgyōṭihā (Assam) and did away with the smiles on the lips of the queens of Gauḍā (i.e. the Gauḍa king). This indirectly refers to Śrīchandra’s claim to have deposed the kings of Bengal and Assam, no doubt of the Pāla and Mīrchiha (Śalastambha) dynasties respectively.

The next king Kālyānaḥchandra, son and successor of Śrīchandra, is introduced in verse 7 which describes him as pure or purifying (pācana) like the waters of the Trisārōta (Ganges). Verses 8 describes Kālyānaḥchandra, as Śrīchandra is described in verse 6, as causing sorrow to the Mīrchiha and Gauḍā women, thus referring to the king’s success against the Mīrchiha king of

---

3. Loc. cit.
4. Prof. Dani speaks of Sūpakāṭra-vōranka-Buddhanandigrāma as “a village inhabited by Sūpakāṭra (cooks), Vōranka (scribes), Buddhists and Nandis—a social grouping not without significance”. There is, however, no doubt that Buddhahanandigrāma is a village named after Buddhahanandin.
Prāgjyotisha and the Pāla king of Gauḍa. The nature of the claim may suggest that Kālyānachandra obtained these successes against the rulers of Bengal and Assam during the reign of his father as the leader of the latter’s forces.

The next stanza (verse 9) introduces Kālyānachandra’s queen Kālyānadēvi who, according to the following verse (verse 10) gave birth to Ladahachandra just as Kuntī gave birth to Satyavāk (Yudhishthīra) and Rudrāni to the god Mahāśēna (Skanda-Kārttikeya). Verse 9 also represents Kālyānachandra as Purushottama (Viṣṇu) and Kālyānadēvi as Lākṣmī and also as worshipping the said goddess.

Verse 11 states how, at the birth of Ladahachandra, the divine drum sounded, the Vidyādhāras danced, flowers dropped from heaven, pleasant winds blew and the goddess of earth together with the ocean, became highly gladdened. Ladahachandra is further described in verse 12 as a past master of all the sciences, principal and auxiliary (cf. verse 15 below), and as having the goddesses Gīrī (Sarasvatī), Śīlī (Lākṣmī) and Vasundhārā (Earth) under his control. Verse 13 speaks of Ladahachandra’s conventional lordship over the entire earth bounded by the ocean, while verse 14 indirectly represents him, through a series of puns, as the god Purushottama (Viṣṇu) and ‘the Victor of Kāma’ (Śiva). In the next verse (verse 15) the king is described as a past master of the vidyās or sciences (cf. verse 12 above) and, conventionally, as one who became the lord of the entire earth in a few days.

According to verse 16, Ladahachandra visited Vārāṇasī, the abode of Śambhu (Śiva) and Gīrisūta (Pārvatī), took baths in the waters of the Ganges and offered tarpāṇa to his ancestors and granted gold to numerous Brāhmaṇas. Verse 17 again speaks of the king’s pilgrimage to Vārāṇasī, purified by the waters of the Ganges, where the god Śvabhāva (Brahman) performed ten Aśvamedha sacrifices (at the Daśāśvamedha Ghātī) and the god Śrīkaṭhā (Śiva) and the goddess Durgā resided happily. Verse 18 describes the king’s activities at the junction of the Ganga and Yamuna (i.e. at Prayāga near Allahabad), which were like those at Vārāṇasī described in verse 16. Verse 19, the last stanza of the introductory part, refers to the gifts made by the king at the said tīrtha which is sanctified by the Ganges and the Jamuna and where the eternal banyan tree (Akalīngavatā) stands.

The grant portion in lines 34 ff. introduces the donor of the charter, Paramaśiva Paramabhakti-raka Mahārāja Mahārāja the illustrious Ladachandradēva as a devout worshipper of the Sugāta (Buddha), as the successor of Mahārāja Mahārāja the illustrious Kālyānachandradēva and as issuing the record from his victorious camp at Vikramapura. Of the gift land, the first plot called Champāvāpa and measuring 5-3/4 dvāras was attached to Phullaśāda in Pāṭikēraka within the Samasta-mandala of the Paundra-bhukti. The second plot called Bappasimha-voraka grāma and measuring 8 pāṭakas, 4-3/4 dvāras, 5 yashṭis, 3 ṛākas and 2 bindus was attached to Dōllavīyikā in the same area. The boundaries of this plot are quoted as—(1) in the east, the posts (kilaka) planted in the western extremity of the land belonging to Sūpakāra-voraka and Buddhansandi-grāma in the western half of a tōn; (2) in the south, the northern demarcating border (ūḷī) of a plot of land belonging to Balāsvara-vardhaka-voraka, and also the southern bank (pāḍa; cf. Bengali pāḍ) of Gōvind-ōṇchama; (3) in the west, the eastern demarcating border of a plot of land belonging to Ōḍa-gōdhānīkā; the post planted on the demarcating border which

---

1 Elsewhere we have identified the Chandra king with the poet Ladahachandra, known from Sanakrit anthologies. See above, Vol. XXVIII, p. 239, note 7.
2 The story is known from the Purāṇas. See Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol. IV, p. 633.
3 There were two famous Akahaya-vatās, one at Prayāga and the other at Gaya. See ibid., pp. 663, 665.
is the southern boundary of a plot of land pertaining to the gōdhānī (gōdhānikā); and the demarcating borders which are the southern and eastern boundaries of a plot of land belonging to Ghaṇṭāra; and (4) in the north, the southern demarcating border of Jayalambha-grāma. The third plot of land was attached to Guptināṭana and its boundaries were—(1) in the east, the Buḍḍhigāṅgī (i.e. Buḍḍhigāṇī); (2) in the south, the northern demarcating border of Karavattī-vōraka; (3) in the west, the western border-road (daṇḍa-li) of the land called Vaggrā-bhūga; and (4) in the north, half of the southern vadikā of the land under the enjoyment of the deity Śaṅkara-bhāṭṭāraka. This plot, called Māhādeva-grāma including Vaggura-bhūga and the hassā (market place) of Dhritipura, measured 3 pāṭakas, 9 drānas and 1 bōka.

The people addressed by the king in respect of the grant of the above plots of land are enumerated in lines 46 ff. as follows—all of the rājapuruṣa, rājī, rāγika, rājaputra, rājāmālā, mahāvīhārapati, maṇḍapalapati, mahāśāntivigrahika, mahāśaṇapati, mahāśaṅkara-patikara, mahāśaṅkara-vadhipatikara, kṣaṇapāla, dausanādhikārana, chaṇḍ darüberapati, saṃbala-basta, aṣṭakapati, māhājñā-ā-nilapati, sūyapati, gāndhīpāta, sāvika, gāndhāpara, gāndhāpaśika, dāṇḍapatsa, vīṣṇapati and other royal officials not mentioned in this record but are known from the adhyakshaprabhā, such as the categories like chāta and bhotos as well as the people of the countryside and the cultivators headed by the Brāhmaṇas.1

The following passage in lines 50 ff. states that the plot of land and the two villages indicated above were granted in the name of the god Vāsudeva and in accordance with the bhūmi-chchhikara-vigōṣṭa in favour of the deity Ladahamādhava-bhāṭṭaraka installed (at Pāṭṭhikāra according to Ladahachandra’s second grant) by the king himself for the increase of religious merit and fame of his own self and of his parents by means of the tūṣṭra-kāsana to which the bhūmāhakāra-mudrā was affixed. The privileges of the donor are enumerated as follows—sva-simālatkina, tīrīṇa-pāti, gāḍhara-pāryāna, sa-tala, s-ādēśa, s-āmra-panasa, sa-gurikā-nilikāra, sa-lacaya, sa-jala-stala, sa-garīt-sahara, sa-dūṣ-āparikā, sa-chaurāhdaraṇa, pāramit-a-sarva-pāḍa, a-chāṭa-bhūta-pravāsa, a-kīchhit-pragāhikā and saṃasta-rājabhūga-kara-kirayā-pratikā-sahā.2

The donor then requests the addressers for their approval of the grant as well as to the future rulers of the region for their approval and protection of it (lines 55 ff.). The cultivators residing in the gift land were advised to be obedient to the donor and to offer him his dues. This is followed by five of the usual imprecatory verses. In line 62 with which the inscription concludes, we have the date, viz. the 30th of Jyaśiṣṭha in the 6th regnal year of King Ladahachandra, the day being called aneșicelis where in lines 53-54. The date is followed by some contractions which show that the document was first registered or approved by the Mahāśāntivigrahika and next by the Mahāśaṅkara-patikara.

TEXT

[Metres—Verses 1, 4-6 Varanatākā; verses 2, 9, 13 Upajati ; verses 3, 7-8, 11-12, 14, 17, 19 Sarvākakrīḍā ; verse 10 Arṇā ; verses 15-16 Saraydhāra ; verse 18 Viṣṇurīṣi ; verses 20-23 Anuṣṭubha ; verse 24 Pushpāṅgurā.]

Oberser

1 [Siddham] Ōū namē bhagavātē Vāsudēvāyā | Jyōtis-tushāra-sisirām chyunam-Atri-nētrī-

---

1 For the meanings of these various expressions, see Sirin’s Ind. Ep. Gloss.
2 From facsimile published in Pakistan Archaeology, No. 3. 1969. The inaccuracies in the published transcripts of the inscriptions have not been indicated in all cases.
3 Expressed by symbol.
2 ch-Chandraḥ sa tat-kaḥaṃ-abhūd-bhuvan-aika-dipah | vaḥsa(vaṃśa)-stataḥ pravāptye


4 Vidhātā dharmāt-patāh-cha Āchyuta eṣa jātya | Mahēśvarāḥ-cha-ājananād-ato-bhūdā
deva-tray-āśe
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deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
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deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
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deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
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deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa
deva-tray-āśa

5 va sa Chandraḥ vaṃśa(vanmśa) | [2°] Tasy-ābhyanati-sālinaḥ pracheyino vaṃśa(vaṃśa)-

6 yakaṭaya Trailokyachandrō niraṇaḥ || ( ) a-khaṇḍaḥ pariṇādhimān-apagaṭa-trāsah

7 tamoḥ babhūva jagataḥ prityai cha bhūtasya cha yah || [3°] Sampādyatā pratima-sūtri-pāva-

8 guṇa-saṅkāthābhūḥ | ānanda-vā(bāḥ)spa-bharā-manthara-pakhśam-chakshuḥ patyullānaspulaka-kānḍhakam-āngam-āngam || [4°] Tasmātma(na-ma-

9 hāvaniḥbhrītaḥ[n] sārapād-ananta-bhūg-āspatā-sa-makṣrād-udadhēr-iv-āṇaḥ | Śrīchandra


11 khaṇḍitaḥ-śtatāna | Gaund-śvarōḍha-vanit-ādhara-pallavāni chakre cha yo vigalita-smita-
kūrmatāni || [6°] Rājnas-ta-

12 sya pavitr-śabhaya-kulaḥ Kalyāṇchandrāḥ sutaḥ prakhyāṭo vimal-ūjvalaṁ-trībhumvab-

13 dharmamayā mahāvaniḥbritā[n] tuṣṣaṁ śīrōbir-dhrīḥ h sadbhāḥ sēvyatamah prāvāha

14 Miśchchhīnān-nayanēshu yena janitah sthūlo(la)āśe[n]a-kōsa-vyayaū Gauḍīnām smita-

15 āetatāra nijair-yāsibhir-amalair-āshīvant–ādayair-yaḥ-ch-nitāḥ śakabhir-karair-iva

16 r-iv-śyorte-sanōjāna-rūpā tasy-anurūpā Purushottamasya || priyā tad-śrīdana-kēli-kālyā

17 bhūva || [9°] Kunt-Iva Satyavācaḥ Rudrā-iv-ātmaja Mahāsēnaḥ | aṣṭē sama Laṇḍa-

18 nudhār-unnanāda nanṛtum(tu)-vīdyādharā-sṛgayaḥ pushpaṁ cha tridvāt-papātā madhu-

19 vaḥ sukhbāḥ-cha mārutas-tās-cha praseḍur-diśō dēvī dāram-uḍaiyasat-kīmvaraparnā

20 r-iva paramāḥ vīdy-ōpavyḍāsam yah kṛūrān-yaḥ-cha shad-āntarūn-iva śatam vā(bā)hyān-
ovaśīhit-ārām | bhur[tu]-yasya cha rāṣṭitas-trī-
21 bhuvaṇa-ōṅgaltair-ganapāṇām gaṇapāir-Īśa-cha Śrīśa-cha Vasundhara cha vasa(ā)gāṇe-tīrṇa-py- 
ahūvann-imābh || [12*] Prayujyatāṁ-tān gaṇapāṇa gaṇa- 
22 n yō maḥāpaḥānaḥ vṛiddhaṁ-avāpya cha-aśāḥ | bhūktā cha gṛ-oṭā cha nay-aika-chanvah- 
abhūd-bhuvaḥ sāgara-āṅgkalayaḥ || [13*] Lakṣhmimūrti- 
23 ta-vikramo va(h)ā-ja-ηya-prakhyata-vih-yodaya-πaḥ sa yāḥ prṇaḥ-taṁ- 
aṁ-guṇaṁ-saś-τaṁ-anany-āṁgkaṁ | aṅgkalv-arpyayita- 
24 ne(h)aṁ-cuha hūṁ̄-mānaḥ kāmanvina(maṁ) vijjeta cha yō durgayāḥ karaṁ-agrahod- 
giribhūvāḥ būṭēsataṁ-āśitaḥ || [14*] Yō-πntar-magnāḥ cha pāraṁ para- 
25 mun-upagata-ἀ-ḥu vṛddhā-nāma(ma)- 

rimula-surāḥbhāṭa-pāḍ-āvja(bhja)-ṛṇur-vās-āṇany- 

sprayāśaḥ-abhūḥ || [15*] Vārāṇaśyam-ayisas-saha-īśa-Gī- 
27 rista-yā Śambhuṁ-ādhyāśāṭum-āsnaḥ-tat-tatra Gaṅgō payasi gata- 

mālaḥsvān-satprasad- 

piṭrīḥ-cha | pāṇaṁ pāṇaṁ dvijāṁ-saha 
28 kanna(ā)kam-adā-tasya kō vṛtti saṅkhyaṁ saṅkhya-vāna-ekā eva tribhuvana-tilakaṁ 
khaṁpaṁpatrōdhik-tad- 

anyān || [16*] Sākhād-akahata-dhūra- 
29 yasya 

śaśābhīr-yatra-Āvaśmedhaṁ Svabhūḥ Śrīkathāḥ saha Durgāyāt pramudito yāṁ- 

adhyavāṣṭita-svayaṁ Gaṅgō-khaṁpita-pāpa-paṅka- 

vī- 
30 sha(śa)dān[ś] tām-śetya Vārāṇasīṁ samau cha pradaṁ cha kōṣaṁ- 

aṅkha[ś] dharmā-ānurāgō 

napāḥ || [17*] Sukhaṁ sūtrvā kriyā tad-saṁ paṭri-santarpā- 
31 ṭa-vidhirī ṭiṅhijāḥ 

sambhādē 

śuchi-payasi Gaṅgō-Yamunayōḥ | Dvijāṇāṁ-tarē-ārātīṁ 

ghana(ṇa)-kanaka-dhārā-vitaraṇān-mahābhūtāḥ | sō- 

Reverse 

32 bhūc-ghhandayitum-alam Bhishma-charitaḥ || [18*] Sthānō-ʌt-avāva Surāpāga cha Yamunā 

ch-ʌt-avāva vispaṇda- 
33 tā sō-π-yat-ʌt-avāva yuga-kaḥya-ākhaṁ-jagad-dvinaṁ(i)-dvinaṁ(i)- 
aṅkha[s]a-π-keśhi vataḥ | tasy- 

ʌt-avāva cha kirtti-vallabha-nripa- 
34 sy-ʌkaḷpa-dānaṁ janāḥ satyaṁ-πyāvajyāya-γhṝpṣaṁmana-śirasah kō vā na rōṁaṁchīṭaḥ || 

[19*] Svastī [ * ] sa khālotv śri-Vikramapurā-saha- 
35 vāśīta-śrīmā-jayakandhavārāt-paraṁsangato mahārājadhirāja-śri-Kalyāṇachandradēva- 
pād-ānuḍyātāḥ paramēvara-pa- 
36 ramahattāraka-mahārājadhirājaḥ śrīmāna Laṅgāchandradēvah kusāl | Paṇḍra- 

bhukty- 

antarpāta | Samatāṭa-maṇḍalai 
37 śrī-Pattikāraka | Phulahadā-samva(mba)ndha(dha)-sva-sim-āvachchhinna-pād-ōna-shaś- 

drōpa-pramāga-Champāvanti-bhūmā | tathā Dōllavā- 

1 The expression is omitted in Dani’s transcript. 
2 Dani reads jagad-dhaŋya-ākha. The stanza refers to the Aśkhaṇa-vata at Prayagā.
38 yīkā-sannah \| pūrvena dirghikā-paśehim-ārdhada-Saṇpadā-voraka-Vu(Bu)dhanandigrāma-
hūmi-paśehim-ānt-ārōpita-kilakaḥ | sī-
39 mā | dakshipāna Va(Ba)jēvāra-varuddhaka-voraka-hūmi-uttarāliḥ | Gōvinda-
oñohama-dakshipā-pādaś-cha sīmā | paśehimēna Óda-go-
40 dhānítaka-bhūmēḥ \| pūrv-āliḥ | gōdhani-hūmēr-dakshipā-sīm-āly-ārōpita-kilakaḥ | hī|
Ghaṇṭārava-bhūmēr-dakshipā-sīm-āliḥ-pūrva-
41 sīmā-lalayaḥ sīmā | uttarēṇa Jayaalambha-grāmiyà-dakshipā-liśiḥ sīmā | śvanta chatuḥ-sīm-
āvacehahūmi-va(h)ibhūdu-dvaya-hūmika-kāka-tra-
42 y-ōpēṭa-paśeha-yashti-sahita-pād-ōṇa-paśeha-drōṇ-ānvit-āshṭa-pāțaka-pramāṇa Va(Ba)ppasiṁ-
ha(simhā)-voraka-grāmē cha | tathā Guptinā-
43 ūṭana-sannah \| pūrvena Buḍḍhīgaṇḍī | dakshipāṇa Karavatī-vorak-ōttarāliḥ sīmā | paśehimēna Vaggūṭra-bhūgā-hūmēḥ paśehi-
44 ma-dapā-āliḥ sīmā | uttarēṇa Saṅkara-bhaṭṭāraka-hūnyamāṇa-bhūmēr-dakshipā-vaddik-[a]-
ārdhāḥ | śvanta chatusmīr-āvacehahūmi-Vaggūṭra-
45 bhūga \| Dhritipura-haṭṭīkā-samēta-kāk-adhika-nava-drōṇ-ōpēṭa-pāṭaka-traya-bhūmi-pramāṇa-
Mahīdēvā-grāmēcha samapaga-
46 tāṭēśa-raṃjapuruṣa-raṇī-ruṇa-rāṇapaka-rājaputra-rājāmaṇya-nahāvyūhapatī-mañḍalapatī-mahāsāndhhi-
vigrahika | mahāśa-
47 nāpati | mahākēṣapatalika | mahāśarvavādhikṛita | mahāpratihāra | kāṭṭapāla | daṇḍā-
ādhānākika | chaurōḍdharaṇīka-nau-
48 va(ba)la-hasty-asva-gō-mahish-āj-āvīk-ādi-ṛyāpritaka | gaulmika | saulmaka | daṇḍapāśika | daṇḍanāyaka-vishayapatyā-āadinanyām-
49 śeja śakala-rāja-pād-ōpājaṁ-nāyakha-prachār-ōktaṇi(n)iḥ-āśaṭṭhitān | chāṭa-bhaṭa-
jātīyān | janapādān | keśṭra-karāṇa-chā-
50 Brāhmaṇ-ōtāraṇa yathārāhān mānayaṭi vō(bōdiḥ)hyati samādiṣati cha | matams-astu bhavatām-
yath-ōpāri-liṅkita-bhūmīr-īyān grāma-dvā-
51 yāṇa-cha | sva-sīmā-āvacehahūmi | triqa-pūtī-ṛgchara-paryantaṭi | sa-talaṃ | s-ōḍḍēśaḥ | a-āmra-panasaḥ | sa-gūvā-kālīkēraḥ | sa-lavaṇāḥ | sa-jalā-
52 sthalān | sa-garrī-ṛharaḥ | sa-dā-āparśadhaḥ | sa-chaurōḍdharaṇaḥ | paribṛti-sarva-
pāṭams | a-chāṭa-bhaṭa-pravaśāṇaḥ | a-kīčchhit-prarāhyān | samasta-rā-
53 jahbhūga-kara-hiranya-pratīṣṭha-sahitaṇi(tam) | asmat-kāristi-ṛṇa-Lāṭḥhāmāṭhava-bhaṭṭāraka-
śāya | vidhiavat-udaśka-pūrvakoṁ kṛtvā | punyaḥ:-
54 hani | bhagavantamvā(ṇaṁ) Vāṣudhēva-bhaṭṭārakam-uddāśya | mātā-pitrō-satmanēcha-
punya-yāśō-bhīvpridhēy | a-chandrārka-kṣhiti-samakā-
55 lāṁ yāvat | bhūmī-čehhūdra-nyūyēna | śrīmad-dharmma-chakra-mudrayā tāmra-śaṣṭanikṛitya | dhaukicatā-samābhīḥ | atō bhavadhiḥ sarvaṁ-am

1 Saḥ is a contraction of samboddha which is used in lines 37.
2 Read bhūga: Dhritipura. The danda here as well as in lines 30 ff. has been used like a hyphen or a comma in English.
No. 35]  
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56 mantavyanā bhāvibhir-āpi bhūpatibhir-bhūṃśr-iddāna-phala-gauravaḥ-apaharaṇē mahā-narka-pāta-bhayāchē dānam-iddam-ammanādy-ā-

57 mupālamāyam niivaśibhiḥ kahōtrakaraśų-ch-ājā-śravaṇa-vidhiyibhuṣya yath-śeṣita-pratyaya-ōpanayaḥ kārya iti |

58 bhavanti cā-ātra dharm-ānuṣāṇ(a)śatraṇaḥ śālokkāḥ Bhūmān yaḥ pratigrahītā yaś-cha bhūmān prayachehhati ubhau tan puṇya-karmaṇan niyataṃ svarga-gāminau [[20*]

59 Sahaśāvat(a)śiṁ vajraha-sahasraṇi svarga mōḍati bhūmīdaḥ śekāptā cā-ānumantā cha tāny-eva narakamva(kē va)sēt | | [21*] Sva-dattāṃ para-dattāmva(ṭṭāḥ vā) yē harēta vaśuṇḍaḥ-

60 rām(ṛam) | sa viṣhṭāyāṁ krimir-bhūtvā pitṛbhiḥ-saha pachyatō | | [22*] Bahubhir-vasuḥda-dattā rājabhis-Sagar-ādibhiḥ | yasya yasya yadā bhūmis-tasya tasya

61 tadā phalan(a)lam | | [23*] Iti kamala-dal-āmvu(mbu)-vi(bih)lodos śriyaṃ-amuchintya manushya-jīvitān-cha sakalam-iddam-udāhritān-cha vus(bih)dāva na hi puruṣaḥ pari-


No. 2. — Laḍahachandra’s Second Grant, Regnal Year 6

The nineteen introductory stanzas, which are stated to be the same as in No. 1, end in line 5 on the reverse of the plate. The following passage in lines 5-7 beginning with the auspicious word saṣṭi and referring to the place of issue of the charter and to the donor is also the same as in the other record. Thus the present grant was issued from the camp at Vikramapura by Paramasvāra Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājaśūrya Laḍahachandra, who was a Paramasvagata and meditated on (or was favoured by) the feet of Mahārājavijñāna Kalyāṇachandra.

Lines 8 ff. mention the gift land which was Sura-voraka-grāma measuring 8 pāṭakas, 1/4 dṛīgas and 29 yasthis and was attached to the vishaya (district) of Pēranaṭaṇa in the maṇḍala (province) of Samataṭa within the bhūti (territory) of Pauṇḍra. The boundaries of the above gift village are mentioned as—(1) in the east, the western demarcating border of the sāvana (rent-free holding) in the possession of Lākanātha-bhaṭṭāraka (probably the Buddhist god Lākāśvara or Avalokiteśvara) situated in Māyu-pāṭaka; (2) in the south, the northern demarcating border of the said sāvana; (3) in the west, the eastern border of the village of Brāhmaṇa-dēva-voraka; and (4) in the north, the canal to the south of the village of Kāṁsāra-kaddapālaka.

The donor’s address to all the rājapuruṣhas, etc. (lines 11 ff.), is the same as in the other inscription. The privileges to be enjoyed by the donee and the other conditions relating to the grant (lines 17 ff.) are also the same. The grant was made permanently, in the name of Lord Vāsudēva-bhaṭṭāraka, in favour of the god Laḍahamādhava-bhaṭṭāraka installed by the king at Paṭṭikērāka, by means of the copper-plate charter endowed with the Dharmachakra seal. The king’s advice to the cultivators of the gift village and his appeal to the future rulers of the area are also the same as in Laḍahachandra’s first charter. The concluding part of the grant is similar to that of the other charter. The date of the present record is the 3rd of the month of Aśāḍha in the year 6 of the king’s reign.

1 Le. mahāsāṃdhī-ni anu mahāksha-ni vibuddham (or vīrakṣhitam) tud-anu mahākshopapālīkaṇa vibuddham (or vīrakṣhitam).
The introductory stanzas are said to be the same as in Laḍahachandra's Plate, No. 1.

Reverse

5 svasti / sa khulu

6 śrī-Vikramapura-samāvāsin-śramaṇa-jayaṣaka udhāvāt-paraṇa-saṅgatō mahārājādhiraṇā-śrī-Kalyāṇachandrādē-

7 va-pād-ānudhyātaḥ parameśvara-paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhiraṇāḥ śrīmān Laḍahā-chandrādevaḥ kuśali ||

8 śrī-Paunḍra-bhūkty-antarāṣṭi-Samataṭa-maṇḍalaḥ | Pēranāṭana-viśaya-śa[ṃ]† pūrvaṇa Māyu-paṭak-āvasthita-Lōkanātha-

9 bhaṭṭārakya-sāsaṇa-bhumēḥ paśchim-āliḥ śimā | daksinēṇa Lōkaṇātha-bhaṭṭārakya-sāsana-bhumēṁ ev-ottar-āliḥ

10 śimā | paśchimēṇa Brāhmaṇa-dēva-voraka-grāmiya-pūrva-antaḥ śimā | uttarēṇa , Ka[ṃ]†sāra-kaddopālaka-grāmiya-dakṣi-

11 pa-khātaḥ śimā | ēvaṁ chatuḥ-simāvachchhiminātrīśa(āśa)drīṣṭy-adhika-sārīḍha-droṇi-ōpēṭ-āśita-paṭaka-pramāṇa-Sura-voraka-grāme |

12 samupagat-aśeṣa-rājapurṣha-rājūt-rāpaka-rājaputra-rājāmātā-mahāvyēhasati-maṇḍalapati-maḥāśuddhi-

13 vigrahika | mahāsēnumatī | mahākṣaṭaṭalika | mahāśarvādhiṣṭiṣṭa | mahāpratiṭhāra | kōṭṭapaḥ | dausāṭi-

14 dhasādhanikē | chaurōḍhanatīṇaḥ | naubala-hasty-aśva-gō-mahēkā-āvik ādi-vyūpptaka | gaulniṅka | saukī-

15 ka | daṇḍapāśika† | daṇḍanāyaka | viṣhayapati-ālīṁ-anulō[ṃ]la-ṣa sakala-rājapāḍ-ōpajvilōṣh-āyaka-prachār-ōktanū(ṇi)ḥā-kīrtti-

16 tūn | chāṭa-bhaṭa-jāryaṇā | ṣaṇapaḍāṇa | kule[ṇ]tra-karānā-sa Brāhmaṇa-ōttarān yath-āraṁ mānayati vōḥ(bōḥ)hayaḥ samādi-

17 śati cha | maṭam-aṣṭa bhavatāṁ(tūm) | yath-ōparikshitamaṇo-yaṁ sa-simā-avachchhaṁnaḥ | trīṇi-pūṭī-gōchara-paryantaḥ sa-talah

18 s-ōḍaṣaḥ s-āṇa-paṇaṣaḥ sa-guvaṅka-nālikōraḥ sa-lavaṇaḥ sa-gurtt-śaḥrataḥ sa-daē-ōparūḍhaḥ sa-chau-

19 rūḍhiḥratanaḥ pariṣṭita-sarva-pūḍaḥ | a-kīṃcit-prāgrāhyāḥ samasta-rājadhōga-kara-hiraṇya-pra-

20 tyāya-sahitaḥ śrī-Paṭṭikōrakē=atosmat-kārita-śrī-Laḍahamādha-bhaṭṭārakāya | vidhiḥ-adina-pūrvakām kṛitvā

21 puyō† hani | bhugavatamāṇāntaḥ Vājsumā-bhaṭṭārakam-uddāya mātā-pitrṛ-ātmanā cha puyō-yaśōś bhūvīṭhīhayē

† From the facsimile published in Pakistan Archaeology, No. 3, 1960.
‡ The contraction saṅ stands for samabuddhā.
Reverse

From the facsimile

G S Gai

Ep. Ind., Vol. XXXVIII
22 ā-chandra-kshiti-sanakālamā yāvat | bhūmi-chodhira-nagāya | ārāma-dharmachakra-
mudrayā | tāmra-sāsanikrītya dhau-

23 kaṭā-kākūhi | aṭa bhhāvadāhī saīrvar-anumantavyaḥ | bhāvibhir-āpi bhāpatibhir-bhūmēr-
dāna-pluṣa-gauravādai-sapāha-

24 ranā mahānataksi-pāta-bhavyaḥ-cha-
dānam-idam-anumādhya-ānupālaṃyam | nīvāsibhiḥ-
ksētra-karaiś-ch-ājñā-śravaṇa-vi

25 dhaiṣībhāya yathē cētha-pratyāś-anandaya kārya iti | bhavānti cha-ātra dharmi-ānuśāsti-
(sanśi)u mahā ślokāḥ | ..........

[Here in lines 25-30 follow five imprecatory verses as in Ladahachandra’s Plate, No. 1]

30 .......... sri-Ladhahachandradēva-paḍiya-samva(samva)t 6 Ashāgha-dine 3 [10] mahā-
sāndhi-ni anu mahākāha ni [10]

No. 3.—Gōvindachandra’s Grant

The charter begins with the symbol for Śuddham and the auspicious word svasti. This is followed in lines 1-32 by sixteen verses forming the introductory part of the record.

Verse 1 constitutes the Buddhist maṅgala containing a prayer to the Jina (Buddha), Dharma and Saṅgha. Verse 2 introduces the Moon-god who sprang from Atri’s eye and was the progenitor of the royal family to which the donor belonged. The next stanza (verse 3) introduces the family (i.e. the Chandra dynasty) which descended from the Moon-god. Verse 4 introduces King Śrīchandra, great-grandfather of the donor of the charter, born in the said family. He is described as more intelligent than Vagīśa (the god Brihaspati) and as a master of the sciences (vidyā; cf. the description of Ladahachandra in his grants and in verse 9 below). Verse 5 describes him as a destroyer of his enemies, as causing the prosperity of his friends, and as the lord of the entire earth including the mountains and oceans. This last claim is of course of a conventional nature.

Verse 6 introduces Śrīchandra’s son and successor Kalyāṇachandra as equal to Bali in liberality, Rāma in prowess causing fear to the enemies, Yudhishṭhira in truthfulness and Arjuna in great prowess. It is difficult to be sure as to which one of the three Rāmas is meant here. In verse 7, Kalyāṇachandra is described as doubling the waters of the Lōhitya-nada (Brahmaputra) by means of the tears from the eyes of the Mēshēkhha women, which had been caused by him by killing their husbands, and also as humbling the power of the Gauḍa king in battle. The word mēshēkhha here undoubtedly refers to the Mēshēkhha or Mēch dynasty of Assam, founded by King Śalastambha about the middle of the seventh century A.D. It will be noticed that the same achievements have also been ascribed to Kalyāṇachandra in verse 8 of the records of his son Ladahachandra.

Verse 8 introduces Ladahachandra as the son and successor of Kalyāṇachandra. It is said that, just as the Golden Mountain (Mūrū or Sumēru) is accessible to the celestial beings known as Vidyādhāras, Ladahachandra could be easily approached by the learned men (vidyādhara). Verse 9 refers to Ladahachandra’s pilgrimage to Vārānasi, his bath in the waters of the Ganges, and his fame for kavita (poetical skill) and pādītiya (scholarship) and

1 The contraction mahāāśādhi stands for mahāāśādhiyogaha, ni for niḥuddha or niḥkīshā, and mahākāha for mahākāhapajanika while the word ana means ‘thereafter’.
for the slaughter of his enemies. Verse 10 introduces Lādākahendra’s beloved queen Saubhāgyadēvi who was like Śiva’s wife Śivā and Hari’s wife Śrī.

Verse 11 mentions Gōvindaśantra as born of queen Saubhāgyadēvi. The following stanza speaks of the happy mood in Lādākahendra’s palace and harem at the birth of his son Gōvindaśantra. Verse 13 represents young Gōvindaśantra as equal to Śaktimān Mahāśēna (Mahāśēna, the holder of sākṣi, i.e., Skanda-Kārttikeya) and his parents to Śiva and Śivā who were the latter’s parents. It is further stated that Gōvindaśantra learnt very well; in his childhood within a few days, the sciences (vidyā) and all the arts (kalā) including the sciences dealing with elephants, horses and chariots (cf. the descriptions of Śrīchantra and Lādākahendra referred to above). Verse 14 contains conventional praise of Gōvindaśantra, while the next stanza (verse 15) states that he was equal to Ākhāḍalā (Indra) in splendour, the Sun in terrible vigour, and Mriṅga’s son (i.e., Mārkaṇḍa or Mārkaṇḍya) in the matter of long life.¹ The concluding stanza (verse 16) contains a prayer to the gods Śvaymbhū, Hari and Hara (i.e., the Hindu Trinity).

The grant portion in lines 32 ff. states how the charter was issued from the royal camp at Vīkramapura by Paramāśvara Paramabhaṭṭāraṇa Mahārājādhirāja Gōvindaśantra, who was a Paramasūtata and meditated on (or was favoured by) the feet of Mahārājādhirāja Kalyāṇa-čandra. The gift land is next introduced as a plot measuring two pādaṅgas in Sāharatālaka which was attached to the viṣayya or district of Pēranātana within the Samata-māṇḍala of the Paundra-bhukti. The boundaries of the gift land are not quoted. The subordinates and officers, etc., addressed by the king in respect of the grant, the privileges of the donees and the conditions of the grant are all similar to those in the grants of Lādākahendra.

The present gift was made permanently in favour of the god Naṭṭēśvara-bhaṭṭāraka in the name of the god Śiva-bhaṭṭāraka for the religious merit and fame of the donor and his parents. The king’s advice to the cultivators of the gift land and his request to the future rulers of the area are couched in language similar to that in the charters of Lādākahendra.

The document closes with five imprecatory stanzas, there being no date and contradictions as in Lādākahendra’s grants.

TEXT²

[Metres—Verses 1-3, 10-11, 15-16 Upaṭāti; verses 4-7, 12-14 Śārdūlavirādhi; verse 8 Vasunatilakā; verse 9 Śikhariṇī; verses 17-20 Anushtubh; verse 21 Pushpitāgrā.]

Qverse

1 [Śiddham]² svasti [[*] Nihārīṇyasāy-āstu* Jinō* janānām-anuttara[m] śārma kalō-

2 tu Dharmmaḥ | Saṅgho py-agha[m] hantu tayōḥ prabhāvād-uttirṇa-saṁsāra-mahāsa-

3 mudrā || [[*] Yad-adbhuta-mūrga-t-atri-nātrāj-jyōtil prakṛtya śīśa[m] sita-vēha

[*] The story of this long-lived sage is told in the Purāṇas; cf. Padma, Śrīcchī, Ch. XXXIII, Skanda, Nāgara, Ch. XXI, and Prahaśā, Ch. XI; etc.

² From the facsimile published in Pakistan Archaeology, No. 3, 1966.

* Expressed by symbol.

* Dani reads nātrāj-yōtiḥ prakṛtyā śīśa[ṃ] sita-vēha.
4 bhūta-khaṇḍa-sundra-kāntir-indura-ānanda-vāle-jīhanā[m(nām)] || [2*] Tasya praṇā-priti-kar-ōda-1
5 yaśya diṭām-tamaḥ-khaṇḍana-paṇḍita-sya [1*] kramaḥ-pravṛddhah satalaḥ suriṇvā sam-unnataḥ-cha prasaṣa-2
6 ra vaṇśa(vaṇśa)h3 || [3*] Vāgīś-ādhika-dhir-akhaṇḍita-mahī-raḥk-ādhiḥkāra-vrataḥ 1' pratyarthi-2-pratipādit-ō-3
7 paśita-phalaḥ kalpa-drumō jaṅgamaḥ [1*] Śrīchandraḥ saradindu-sundara-mukho vidyā-vadhūnāṁ pati[h*]4
8 jātasa-tatra pavitra-ōbhaya-kulāḥ kshoṭībhujaḥ-agrāṇih ||[4*] Yenājau dvishaṭām gaṇaḥ sūna-
9 vadū-saṅg-ōtsavair-ōjitaḥ pātra-mitrā-janaḥ kriṣṭaḥ-cha dhavalā-ōchhatra-sūmitānāṁ śrīyām(yām) || lēkānām
10 paripālanaḥ cha bharaṇe ch-ātyanta-va(ba)ddh-ōdyamaḥ khyāte yaś-cha sa-saila-sagara-mahī-paryanta-pā-1-
12 layaḥ Kalyāṇachandraḥ sripaḥ || yas-tyāgāna V(a)la[ir]-dvishaṭ-bhaya-kriṣṭā Rāmaḥ prətāpōna yō yaḥ sa-1
13 tyōna Yudhiṣṭhirō va(ba)lavatā śauryāṇa yaś-oh-Arjunaḥ [[6*]Yen-āsau dviguṇikriṣṭaḥ pati-vadḥd-u-
14 dvējitānāṁ ghanair-Mīchchhinān-nayan-āmbbhūr-vigalitaḥ(tair)-Lōhita-nāmā nadāḥ || yen-ājau ga-
15 ja-vājī-patti-bahulām sēnāṁ gṛihitvā va(ba)laḍ-Gaudānām-adhipāḥ kriṣṭaḥ-cha [su*]-chramaḥ laj-āvani mar-ā-
16 naṇaḥ || [7*] Tasmāt-ājaya sutāḥ śruta-ōla-śāli kaulīna-bhairu-hridayāḥ sa-dayāḥ praṇā-
17 su || [1*] vidyaṭharaḥ kanaṣa-saiśailaiva-ōdhiḥgamyah sarv-ōttarō Laḍahachandra iti kahūndraḥ ||[1*] 8*
18 Yayaν Vāraṇāṣayāṁ Surasariti saṣṭaṃ cha va(ba)huṣaḥ satam vāraṇ-ārthiṣṭaḥ-atha kanaṣa-vṛishṭiḥ-cha vi-

1 The dāṇḍa was meant to cover a little space at the end of the line.
2 Dani reads Vāgīśa.
3 The dāṇḍa is unnecessary.
4 Dani reads pratyadh-eṣuḥa.
5 Dani reads *dīnadeh.
6 Dani reads kasaṭe-chandra.
7 Dani could not read rhishiṣṭha.
8 The dāṇḍa was meant to cover a little space at the end of the line.
19 daúhō [(*)] kavitvāt-pañjītyād-dīśī-diśī-eha yāhyā krttim-anaghāna vītēnśa śatrū-ṃtri-
nidhuvama-kal-ō.

20 chāhōdā-caturāh || [9*] Dēvasya tasy-ṃṇu-samāna-kāntēḥ Saubhāgyadēv-Śī
mahānubhāva [(*)] Śīvā Śī.

21 va[asya-ēva*] Hārōśivā Śīveh priya-karā-prāṇa-samā-priya-bhūt || [10*] Sā su-prāṣasyē-
hū śubhā mahūrtte parītam-a-.

22 āgair-dāhūta*-rāja-chinnāh | mukhā-āriyā nirjita-pūrṇa*-chandān Gōvindachandram susuhvē sukēna || [11*] Būtē janmāmi tasya

23 pūṣpaṃ-apatād-divyaṃ mahā-maṇḍalā s-amōdāḥ śiśīraḥ śaṃśir-mmarud-avāda(d-p)an
prasannā dīsah [(*)] vyāh.

24 vānum-pṛdāṅga-ṃivama-mayaṃ śṛṅgāra-cēṣṭā-mayaṃ tat-[k]al-lāṣya*-kalā-mayaṃ
pitīpurumā s-āntampuraḥ-ēh-ābha-

25 vat || [12*] Iśa-tasya pītā Śīvā oha janaṇi sō-bhūt svaya[ṃ*] ākūṭimān lōkō-yan-dṛ-timān-ajāyata ma-

26 hāṣūnaya tasya-ūdhavāt [(*)] vidyāḥ śiśīva eva tēṇa(ṇa) divasaś-śalāḥ sukham śikṣati-
śv sv-ahhyastō, *

27 gaja-vājī-vāhanā-viḥīr-ājūtā-eha sarvāḥ kalāh || [13*] Mūrtī dharmma iti kehamā-
uḍhīr-itṛ trātā prājā-

28 nāṁ-īti śrīvāḥ-pāṭram-īti śrīyāṁ vata śrīvāt-ity-uddāma-dhām-ēti oha [(*)] keḥṣṇīndrah pā-
rikiṭtīyatē prā-

29 tīdīsam pratyālayam pratyahāram s-ānandaṃ sa-kutsahalam sa-pulaka[ṃ*] lōkāḥ sa śkalab-
param(ram) || [14*] Akhaṇḍalasy-ō-

Reverse

30 va vikas[v]arā Śīveh pracoḥaṇa-māmār-iva chaudam-ējaḥ | tasya-ṣa[ta] lōh-maṇḍalā-ma-

31 ṃdānasya Mṛkṣapa-sūṁōr-iva dī[r*]gham-āyuḥ || [15*] Śīvā[ṃ*] Svayambhūḥ srijatu
prakāma[ṃ*] Harīḥ ṣa.

32 rīr-ṣthītim-ādadhēu [(*)] vipakṣeśa-sa[ṃ*]ḥarām-uṇātā-kūrtēr Gōvindachandrasya
Harāḥ taṛōtā || [16*] Sā khālu śrī-Vī-

33 krampura-samāvasita-ārīmā-j̄ayaskandhāvārāt paramasau-gatō mahārajaḥhirāja-śri-
Ladahachandra-

34 dēva-pād-śūndhyaṭaḥ paramēśvra--paramabhaṭṭārākō mahārajaḥhirājaḥ śrīmān Gōvind-
chandradēvaḥ

* Dani reads dīśrapah.
* Dani reads "ṣāṅgatīśaṃānā".
* Dani reads nirjītanāmāṇa*.
* Dani's transcript has vedōf(ā)ya.
* Dani's transcript has tat-ch(ṣ)alāya.
* The dasha was meant for covering a little space at the end of the line.
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Obverse

From the facsimile

G. S. Gai
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  

The akṣara sara stands for saṁbhaddha.

The deśa is meant for covering a little space at the end of the line.

The deśas are redundant.
54. सरस्वती स्वर्गो मोदति भृमिदाः [15] आक्षोप्ता च अनुमांता च च ताहं-श्वा नराचाँ वासाः(५) || [18*] स्वादत्तम-पराः ||

55. दत्ताग्वा(त्तान वा) यो हरेद्वा(ता वा) सुन्दरराम(राम) || सा विश्वायस्मभिः क्रिमि-भृत्वाः पिर्थित्र(त्रिबहि) सहा पच्छता || [19*] वा(ब) अन्बरा-वासुधा

56. दत्ताराजाभिः सागर-अबिभि [16] यस्या यस्या यदाभविः तस्या तस्या तादाभ-पलाम-(लाम) || [20*] इती कमला-

57. दल-अवु(म्बु-)विभिन्न-विभि अरियां-अंचिंत्या मनुष्या-ज्ञितां च च [17] वकलम- इदम-उद्धित्तां च च वु(बु) द्धवा

58. ना हि पुरुशाहि पारा-किर्त्तयो विलोप्याः || ० || [21*]

---

1 The dasha is meant for covering a little space at the end of the line.
No. 36—MODLIMB PLATES OF CHALUKYA PULAKESIN II

(I Plate)

G. S. Gai and Madhav N. Katti, Mysore

Though the set of copper plates edited here was received in the office as early as the year 1913 for examination from the late D. R. Bhandarkar, the then Superintendent of the Western Circle of the Archaeological Survey of India, it has somehow remained unpublished so far. It has been noticed in the report of the Western Circle for the year 1912-13 as No. 2595. The plates are known to have been discovered at the village Modlimb in the Miraj Taluk of South Satara District, Maharashtra State.

The set consists of three plates with writing on four sides, each measuring 15 cm × 5.8 cm. The first and the third plates are engraved on the inner sides only. The ring holding the plates was intact at the time when the impressions of the plates were taken and its ends were secured at the base of an oval seal bearing the figure of a boar facing proper right. The ring measured about 6 cm in diameter and 1 cm in thickness. The plates and the seal together weighed 443 gm. The record is in a fairly good state of preservation.

The characters of the charter belong to the early Telugu-Kannada variety and the palaeographical features are regular for the 1st half of the 7th century to which the record belongs. The language is Sanskrit, the text being in prose except for the invocatory and imprecatory verses, at the beginning and end of the record respectively.

Initial s occurs in lines 5 (in aṣṇīḍhōma), 8 (in n Pradesh) and 10 (in auṣṭrasa); f occurs in line 2 (in iṣā) and a in line 13 (in uṣṇā). In a few cases the class-nasal is replaced by anuvāra.

Of the orthographical peculiarities, attention may be drawn to the word svānta written as kṣiṇḍa (line 1) and-caret as bhṛatta (line 3). Vaiṣṭākha is written as Vaishākha (line 11).

The record opens with the auspicious word svānti and praises (lines 1-4, verse 1) the Boar form of Lord Vishnu in the words, "victorious is Varaha who possesses the complexion of the blue lotus and the sky covered with a group of clouds, who is adorned with the garland made of splendid precious stones around his neck, who is having his waist encircled with a shining belt as the cloud which is covered with lightning and who has his face full of sweat due to the burden of carrying the earth like the cloud which emanates water when it is confronted with a mountain." Then follows (lines 4-7) the prāṇas of the Chalukya family which is found in the already known charters of that family. It states (lines 7-11) that in the lineage of those Chalukyas was born Paramesvara who earned the kingdom by the might of his own arms and who became the

1 This charter is also noticed in the Marathi Magazine, Itiḥāsa-mantrāka for April 1908.
2 There is a pun in the phrase dharanti-dhara-mātrikha. Here dharmi-dhara means the one who carried the earth (i.e., Lord Vishnu in the form of Boar) as also a mountain.
supreme lord of many kings. He was the son of Kirttivarman who was like the full moon on the sky that was the race of the Chalukyas and who had earned abundant victory because of his limitless valour. He was the grandson of him who was born of Hiranyagarbhā and who had performed the asvamedha sacrifice. This is followed by the grant portion (lines 11-13) wherein it is stated that the grant of the village Tiyarāgrāma on the bank of the river Sinnā was made with ablations of water to Dēvagāgasvāmin of Kāyapa-gōtra, on the full moon day of the month of Vasākha, in connection with the construction of a tank. The charter ends with two imprecatory verses (lines 13-16).

The importance of the inscription lies in the fact that it belongs to the reign of Chalukya Paramēśvara who is described as the son of Kirttivarman and the grandson of him who was born of Hiranyagarbhā and who had performed the asvamedha sacrifice. The record states that Paramēśvara earned the kingdom by the might of his own arms (sva-bāhu-bala-vikram-āpāta-rājya) and became the supreme lord of innumerable kings (anēka-niripati-paramēśvara). It is a well-known fact that Pulakēśin I, the father of Kirttivarman, is described as born of Hiranyagarbhā and as a performer of the asvamedha sacrifice. Therefore, the king referred to in our record as born of Hiranyagarbhā and as the performer of the asvamedha sacrifice is none other than Pulakēśin I. His grandson and Kirttivarman's son, vī., Paramēśvara who is mentioned as the one who earned the kingdom by the might of his own arms and as the supreme lord of several kings is none else but Pulakēśin II. It is known that Pulakēśin II had to wrest the reigns of the Chalukya empire after a civil war with his paternal uncle Maṅgalēśa who had succeeded his brother Kirttivarman but did not want to leave the reins of the empire to Pulakēśin II.

The word Paramēśvara is used with a double meaning. The expression anēka-niripati-paramēśvara has the purport of 'Paramēśvara who was the supreme lord of many kings'. A number of records refer to Pulakēśin's subjugating several rulers and using the title Paramēśvara, while some of them state that this title was employed by him as his second name. The later inscriptions of Pulakēśin II give his other royal titles like Pṛthvīrāj-kalāka, Mahārājādhirāja and his almost inseparable title Satyārāya. Since our inscription does not give any of these titles but refers to his earning the kingdom by the might of his own arms and becoming the supreme lord over many rulers, it is likely that the grant was issued in the early years of his reign before he started employing the other titles. That this charter was issued in the early years of his reign is also supported by the short phrases introducing his family and the invocatory verse which is different from the one given by the later records of Pulakēśin II, viz., Jayatīrīṣhkrītan, etc., and which occurs in this inscription for the first time.

Tiyarāgrāma mentioned in our record can be identified with the present day village Terdāl, in Jamkhandi Taluk, Bijapur District. Sinnā may be a branch of the river Krishṇā.

---

1 There is a pun on the word Paramēśvara which hints at the name of the king (Paramēśvara i.e., Pulakēśin II) and his being the supreme lord (i.e., paramēśvara). He is described as anēka-niripati-paramēśvara.
4 The inscription employs pun in a number of places. See, vidyā-sūrya, māntaka-dēja and dharā-dēja (line 3).
6 Above Vol. XXVII, p. 117 and Ind. Ant., Vol. VI, pp. 73 and 74 etc.
7 J. F. Fleet, op. cit., p. 351.
8 Vide, above Vol. XXVII, p. 38.
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Text

[Metres: verse 1 Māñjū; verses 2 and 3 Anushṭubh]

First Plate

1 Svataśiti[ | * ] Jayati jalada-brinda-vyōma-nilūtpal-ābhaṣ sphu-
2 rad-uru maṃi-ratna-strak-samāviddha-kaṇṭha[ | * ] jaladhara i-
3 va vidya(dyu)dhr(ā)la(m-adhy-ai)ka-dēśō dharaṇi-dhara-nirōdhāsviti[t-svi]nna[h]²
4 vaktrō Varāha[h] ; () [1 | * ] Śrī-śva(svā)m-Maha(hā)sēna-pa(pā)d-anuddhyātānāḥ Ma (Mā)nāvyā-

Second Plate, First Side

5 sagōtra(trā)pā[m] Hāritī-purāṇā[m] agnīś Prison-agniḥayana-va(vā)j-
6 jāpēya-pamāṇari(rī)ka-bahuvarṇa-śvamēdh-āvabhīthasaṃ-
7 na-pavitrikrī-sīrṣāmī Chalukyāṇāṃ vaśēṃ samihūtal Ėa-
8 lukya-v[r]aśabhai[a]ś-pūrṇa-chandra[h]² aparimita-vikram-ōpāta-vipa-

Second Plate, Second Side

9 la-yāsāvataḥ tasya Kṛttivarmmā(rmma)na[h]² putraḥ Hiraṇyagarbhāsya-śvame-
10 dhā(dha)-yājina[h]² pautraḥ sva-bahu-hala-vikram-ōpāta-rājya[h]² anē-
11 ka-nripti-Paramēśvaraḥ Vaishā(ā)kha-paurṇamāśyam(syām) tāṭāk-ōdyamānē
12 Dēvagapasa(va)minē Kāyapa-sagōtrānā[h]³ Tiyarē-grā(grā)ma[rn]²

Third Plate

13 Sinnā-taṭō udaka-pūrṇa[m]² sabhōgāni(gam)[[*]Bahirbhi(hi)cvvsasudhā bhukta(ktā) rā-
14 jānai(hi)[ ] Sagar-ādibhi[h] ; | * ] yasya yasya yadā bhūmi[h]² tasya ta-
16  saṣṭi vaṃśīrah\-5-\(sa\)hasra\(srā\)pi viśṭā\(ah\hā\)ya\(yā\)\(rā\) ja\(jā\)yata kṛim[\(b\)\] \[3\]\[\*\]

1  Read sahasāra-naraha.
No. 37—TWO FRAGMENTARY CHARTERS OF MAITRAKA DHARASENA IV

(1 Plate)

P. B. Srinivasan, Mysore

The two fragmentary copper-plate inscriptions edited below are now deposited in the Prince of Wales Museum of Bombay. Their exact findspots are not known. Dr. Moti Chandra, the Director of the Museum, was kind enough to make them available for my examination when I visited the institution in 1964, during my annual collection tour, as well as to send them over subsequently to the Office of the Chief Epigraphist, for a careful study of the records. They are referred to here as Charter A\(^1\) and Charter B\(^2\), for the sake of convenience. Both of them are badly mutilated and brittle. So, their impressions could not be taken. The extant portions of the texts of both the records describe the donor king Dharaśena as Paramabhoṭṭhāraka Mahārājādhirāja Parameśvara Chakravartin. Since among the Maitraka rulers only Dharaśena IV had all these titles, the charters were evidently issued by him. Moreover he was the only king of that name whose father was Dhrusasena as stated in both records. In spite of the fact that several important details like the date have been lost due to the extreme damage suffered by the records, they are dealt with here not only because they add to the meagre number of charters belonging to the reign of Dharaśena IV, but also because they furnish particulars about new places and deities not met with in the already known records of the Maitraka dynasty.

**Charter A**

The two plates that go to make up this charter have been separately accessioned by the authorities of the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. This was perhaps due to the fact that each plate, because of the extreme damage suffered by it, has got a peculiar shape and size, which do not fit into those of the other. But when the text of one plate is read together with the text of the other, it is seen that the record pertains to one and the same grant. A unique feature noticed in these plates is that the side of each plate containing the original engraving was superimposed by a thin sheet of copper on which the text of the grant has again been engraved in such a way that the lines of writing on the upper sheet fit exactly with the corresponding lines of writing on the lower sheet. This is easily seen from the writings in the flaked off places on both the plates. The reason for this overlaying is not known. The letters of the writing on the lower sheet are bolder compared to those of the writing on the upper sheet. Of the two plates the first measures 30 cm by 18 cm and weighs 590 g. Only 22 lines of writing are extant on the first plate whereas the second plate has fragments of 23 lines of writing. Charters of this king, known so far contain between 52 to 56 lines of writing distributed evenly between the two plates. It, therefore, seems that the fragmentary charter under study had

\(^1\) This is registered in *A. R. Ep., 1963-64*, as No. A 30.
\(^2\) This is registered in ibid., as No. A 31.
about 27 lines of writing on each plate. The characters are Southern and they are regular for the period. The language is Sanskrit.

The record refers itself to the reign of Darasena (IV) a Paramamahesvara who is endowed with the imperial titles Paramabhatraka Maharatidhiraja Paramartha Chakravartin. The object of the record was the grant of the village of Pishpalashdhika perhaps for three purposes. One of them was to provide for worship and offerings to the Buddhist deity Taradevi established perhaps by Divirapati Skandabhata at the place called Kapasihanka. However, though the expression raptira pratishthita (I. 41) is too fragmentary to give its real sense, it seems that the word pura here meant a shrine named after some one, the name having been lost. The grant was also for the maintenance not only of the temple (of the deity) but also of (its) servants. The second purpose was to provide for the feeding and other comforts to the members of the Bhikshu-sangha of the Duḍḍa-vihara in Valabhi. The third purpose was to provide for the free feeding of the poor from other regions of the country. Owing to the fragmentary nature of the record, it is not possible to be sure as to who was the recipient of the gift and what privileges accompanied it. But from the few words and expressions that could be read here and there, it appears that the gift village was entrusted to the care of the Bhikshu-sangha of the above-mentioned Duḍḍa-vihara and it included the udakha, parikara, bhūmichchhiddrā convention and was meant to last till eternity.

Of the geographical names, Valabhi has been identified with modern Vala in Saurashtra. I am not able to identify the village of Kapasihanka where the temple to the deity Taradevi was established and the gift village of Pishpalashdhika.

TEXT

First Plate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7* [saṅgata-ahajya-pradāna-parataya triṇavat-apūst-āśeṣha-svakāryya-phala-

pradāna-ānandita-vidvat-sukrit-praṇayi-hridayaḥ pādachār-iva sakala bhuvana-maṇḍal-

ābhogā-pramadah paramamāheśvaram]...

8

9

10 pa-lōbbhād-iva-āśritya sarabhassam-abbhigamārikā-ggaṇasahaja-sakti-sikhai-viśeṣha-viṃśapit-

ākha-dharmikāharaṇa prathama-narapati...

* From the original plates and photographs.

Possibly the first six lines have been lost here. Cf. Ind. Ant., Vol. VII, p. 74, text line 7; ibid., Vol. XV, p. 330, text line 7.
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11 nrpālayitā dharmmadāyānām-spākartā prajugaghāta-kārīgam-upaplāvanārai darśayitā Śrī-Sarasvatyōr-ekādhiṣṭasasya saḥ(uṣaḥ)hitā   


13 udan-āty-adhūta-gūna-samudaya-sthagita-samagra-dīṇa-maṇḍalaḥ samara-sata-vijaya-tōbhā-sanātha-maṇḍal-āgra-dyuti-bhāsurataraḥ-sa pūthōdh-


17 mudhyēta[h] svayam-[Upādra-gurū-ēva gurū-āty-ādaravatā samabhīlasānpāyam- āpi rājya-lakshmiḥ [skanḍha-saktāṁ] ērī-bhādra īva dhuryyas-tadā   


20 uikhā-bhuvaṇā ti-prasabha-vī[ghāṭita-sakala]-Kali-vilasita-gatir- nīloha-jan-ādhirōhi-   

21 lakshmī-svayaṅgraha-prakāśita-   

22 sakala-vidyā-ādhigama-ve-   

23 sam-āhit-ārati-pa-   

24 kṛtrīma-prāśraya-ve-   

25 dayā ṣvadha-   

26  

27  

28  

29  

30 [kālāpah] kāntimān-nirvṛi  

31 [dhvā]nita-rāśis-satat ōdītas-savitā prakṛīṭhīyaḥ  

1 Possibly two lines have been lost here.
vidadhānāḥ sandhi-vigraha-samāsa-nīchaya-nipuṇaḥ
[sthāna=mu]-

[akā]ra-sādhūnāṁ rāja-Sālāturīya-tantrayōr-ubhayōr-apī
nīṣhṇātaḥ prakrīṣṭā-vikra

kāntō-pi prasāmi athira-sahridayyō(yō)=pi
niratī dōshavatām-udayasanaya-samū.

na-samarthana-prāthita-Bālāditya-dvitiya-nāma
paramamāhēvāraḥ sī-Drūvasēnās-tasya sutas-tat-pāda-kamala-

kāshaṇa-janita-kīna-lāṅchhana-lālaṅa-chandra-sakalāḥ śīśu-bhāva ēva
śravāṇa-niḥita-mauktik-śalākāra-viḥrām-ā-

śeṣeḥ pradāna-sallila-kalaktī-āgra-haast-ārvindha kanyāyā ēva
mṛḍu-karagrahaṅga-śambhatkṛit-ānanda-viḍhīr-vvasundha-

[rmnu]kṛ dhanur-vṛddha ēva saṁbhavīt-āśeṣa-lakṣhya-kalāpaḥ praṇata-
śamanta-maṇḍul-ōttamaṅga-dhīra-chūḍā-ratnāyamana-

[sa]nāḥ paramamāhēvāraḥ paramabhaṣṭṭaraka-mahāraja-hīraja-paramēśvara-
chakravartī-śrī-Dharmēnāḥ-kusāli sarvavān-ēva samā-

payatya-astu va[sa=saṽ]viditaṁ yathā maṁ mātāpitrōḥ puny-āpiyānanāya
Kānasihana-grāmē
divirapati-[śrī]-Skandabhata[kādhīsa]-

rapura-pratisṛṣṭhito-Tārādevi-pādebyāḥ pūja-saṁpana-saṁda-puṣpa-dhūpa-
dīpa-tailady-arthāṁ devakulasaya cha khaṇḍa-sphuṭta-prati-

[sau]karaṇā sa-pādaṁūla-prajīvanāya cha tathā Valabhy-abhyantara-Ḍuddā-vihāra-
[sthā]-bhikshu-saṅghānaṁ-

nīvāsi...kānāṁ chhvara-pīṇḍa-pātā-jayan-āśana-glaṅa-bhāsaṁyā-ā[rthāṁ].

Pīṣpalahēdhikā-grāmā-

karpattika-vaidyāyādīnāṁ satrōpayō-ārthāṁ Pīṣpalahēdhikō grāmaḥ-

grāmaḥ s-ōdraṅgaḥ sa-parivaraḥ...ta-pratyañuḥ-

bhūmiccheśvara-nyāyēn-ā-chandra-ārk-arṇava-kahiti

Valabhy-abhyantara-Ḍuddā-vihāra[sthā]-bhikshu-saṅgha-

āgāmi-aripatibhi-

yaśa yaśa yadā bhūmi

nītāni kō nāma
Charter B

Of the two plates of this charter, only the second plate is now available. It is also in a very bad state of preservation. In its present condition, the plate measures 33.5 cm by 17.5 cm at its maximum and weighs 980 g. Only 13 lines of writing are seen on the plate. The characters are Southern and the language is Sanskrit.

Like charter A, this also refers itself to the reign of Dharasena (IV), who is endowed with all his characteristic imperial titles including Chakravartin. The object of the charter seems to be to record the grant, made probably by the king, of Kshetrapadra consisting of three divisions each of which is demarcated by its boundaries which are specified. This Kshetrapadra is stated to have been included in Lushapadra in Surashta. The purposes of the grant are (1) of providing worship and offerings to a deity, whose name is lost but who, from the ending of the name in "vi-pa|a|bhyah", was in all probability no other than Tārādevī, (2) of providing clothing, food and other comforts to the members of the Bhikshu-saṅgha visiting from the four quarters (3) to provide for the repairs and maintenance of the Gandhakuti or the shrine containing an image of the Buddha, and (4) for the maintenance of the servants who were perhaps attached to the shrines.

Of the geographical names, Surashta is well known but the identity of Lushapadra and Kshetrapadra is not certain.

TEXT

Second Plate

1 [sā]dhūnām rājya-Salāturīya-tantrayō=ubha[yō]-

2 kāntō=pi praśami sthira-sauhṛdayyō(yō)=pi nirasita doṣhavatām=udaya-samaya-samupajanita

3 śri-Dhruvasenas=tasya sutas=tat-pāda-kamala-praṣāma-dharanī- kashaya-

4 mauktik-ālaṅkāra-vibhram-āmala-śruti-viśēhaḥ pradāna-salīla-kshālita

5 kārmukē dhanur-vvēda īva sambhāvit-āśēha-lakāhya-kalāpah

6 paramamāhēvaram paramabrhaṭṭaraka-mahārājādhipi-paramēvaram [chakravartti-śri-Dharasenaḥ kuśalil], sarvēn=āva samājñāpaya=asti

7 vī-pādébhyaḥ gandha-pushpa-dhūpa-dīpasa-tail-ādy-arthaṁ tathā chaturdīg-abhyāgat-ārya-bhikshu-saṁghasya cha chīvara-śūntiyā pāśa-śayan-śāna-gla-

8 [na]-bhaishajy-ārthaṁ gandha-kutya=sa cha khaṇḍa-sphuṣṭa-pratisamkaraṇāya pādamūla- jiva=nya cha Surāshṛtēṣu Lūṣhāpā[darak-ā]ntṛggaṛ Brahma

1 From the original plates and photographs.

2 It is difficult to be sure as to how many lines the lost first plate contained.

70/1248/1 DGA
prakriṣṭa-tri-khaṇḍ-śvāsthaṃ-kaṇṭhaṃ yasya-āghāṭanāni pūrvvataḥ † [ṣa]tka-kaṇṭhaṃ dakṣiṇatāḥ

aparataḥ [tā]līyaka-satka-kaṇṭhaṃ uttarataḥ [chōghi]taka-satka-kaṇṭhaṃ tathā-uttaraṃ śūn Netiṣṭhaṃ yasya-āghāṭanāni pūrvvā...

[da]kṣiṇataḥ sāṅgīnaka-satka-kaṇṭhaṃ aparataḥ [bō]ll-kaṇṭhaṃ uttarataḥ...[śūn].

[asya-āghāṭanāni pūrvvataḥ]drūṇaka-satka-kaṇṭhaṃ dakṣiṇataḥ anaṅgaka-satka-kaṇṭhaṃ...

ka sahjātā vā[p] [ṣa]yāḥ āghātā...

---

1 It is not possible to say how many lines are missing after this line; probably about 10 lines have been lost:
No. 38—SRIRANGAM INSCRIPTION OF PATTAMAHADEVI

K. G. KRISHNAN, MYSORE

The subjoined inscription edited with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist is engraved on the west wall of the fifth prākāra in the Raṅganāthasvāmi temple at Śrīraṅgam in Tiruchirappalli District in the state of Tamil Nadu. The inscription is very much damaged in some parts thus affecting the reading of important passages in the text.

The epigraph is in two parts. The first part in six lines introducing the donors is in Kannada language and is engraved in Grantha characters of about the 12th century.3 The second part is entirely in Tamil language and is engraved in Tamil characters of about the 12th century. Some Sanskrit words in this part are engraved partly in Grantha and Tamil as is usual in the case of Tamil inscriptions. The letter k exhibits an earlier form in which the central vertical stem ends far lower down from the horizontal middle curve, whereas in the thirteenth century the tendency was to reduce the stem and accentuate the middle curve. The tulasikāṭṭu also is yet to extend into a fully drawn lower arm to the left which is a feature in the later inscriptions. These considerations along with some other forms of Tamil letters point to the period of 12th century as the date of the record. The text in the first part introducing the donors is very faulty. The other palaeographical and orthographical features of the record do not call for any special remarks.

Some words of lexical interest occurring in the record may be discussed. The word abhaiyam (line 11) is used in the sense of an endowment.2 The word which means etymologically ‘dual’ gains the meaning of endowment in the context of the transaction recorded here, for which there are two parties viz., the donor and the donee. This appears to be one of the early instances of the use of this word which has survived to-day. Another word vaṇamālai (line 7) is also of some interest. This word, as an equivalent of Sanskrit vaṇamālā, may mean a garland of wood or wild flowers; but, in Vaishnavite parlance this word is generally understood as a garland of basil (tulasī) specially offered to god Vishnu in every South Indian temple. Pippappam in line 11 is an equivalent of Sanskrit vijnāpana derived through Prakrit and not of Vijñapti.4

The inscription records the creation of an endowment of two plots of land, each one mā in extent, by Paṭṭamahādevī and Kittidēva, by purchase, for tending gardens for the supply of two vaṇamālai to god Śri-Raṅganātha for their own merit. The two plots of land were purchased by the donors from Brammačakravarttigal (Brahma-chakravarttigal) and Kēśavaṇ Tiruvaijus-dinādu-tādan respectively. The lands are described as forming part of tiruppallittāsama-nilai (area

---

1 A. R. Ep., 1937-38, No. 117.
2 The characters are assigned to the 12th century in the above report.
3 The meaning ‘offering’ quoted by Sircar (Indian Epigraphical Glossary, p. 346) is not supported by the reference cited (SII, Vol. I, p. 82) where the actual word in the text is abhaiyamsārgam referring to the duties on exports and imports.
4 Sakkālai-prākāra quotes a verse from the Śukāvalī defining vaṇamālā as a long garland up to the knee with all types of flowers and with bulbous pendant flowers.
set apart for cultivation of flowers for garlands). The lands, 2 mā (i.e., 200 kūṭi) in extent, were purchased by the donors for 10000 kāśu from the parties and entrusted to Vēdanāyakappurumāḷ alias Nalanṭigāl-Nārāyaṇa Amudīnār, son of Karunākaraṇa alias Padinēppiyāhaya-chakravartīgaḷ of Vaṅgippūram among the Srivaishnavas of the sacred place and to Kēśavaṇa Tiruvajindādu-tādan among the Tādanambimār. The latter is evidently identical with his namesake from whom the second plot of land was purchased. The two men were required to supply one garland each apparently daily and also to maintain themselves out of this endowment. It is also stated that this proposal was presented to the deity whose name is lost due to the damage on stone (line 11). Since the garlands were to be offered to god Śrī-Raṅganātha (line 5) it is perhaps the same deity to whom the proposal was presented.

The inscription is important as it throws light on the relationship of the Ājupas with the Paṇḍyas of Madurai. The preamble, i.e., the first part in Kannada introducing the donors, begins with a long praṇāsti. This part may be split up into three sections. The first contains the epithets samasta-bhūvāna-vikhūyita, Sūmakuṭa-nilaka, Paṇḍyamahārājādvīra, Paramēśvaram, Parama-bhatārakam. The second section begins with śrīmat Chandrakulaśekhara (line 1 etc., and ends with Madhurādhīvarā Śrīman-Mānabharanādeva (lines 4-5). The third and final section of this preamble contains the well-known Ājupā birudas Voibhā-bhūvāna, Niśākanamalla... Śrī-Mahajanāhādeva-āteya-śripāda-padmārādhaka (lines 5-6), etc. These epithets are attributed in the record to Paṇḍya-chakravartī Vira Kavy-Ājupānanda whose relationship with Paṭṭāmahādēvi, one of the two donors occurring next, is not known on account of the damage in this part of the text. The other donor Kitiḍēva is mentioned next. Here ends the Kannada preamble introducing the donors. It may be noted that the first and the third sections together make up the full praṇāsti of the Ājupas, of which the present record seems to contain the earliest version. The passage in the first section is not met with in the Paṇḍya records, though it is applicable to the kings of that dynasty. Further the repetition of the phrase śrīmat Chandrakulaśekhara at the beginning of the second section as against Sūmakuṭalaka in the first section justifies our understanding of the Kannada preamble and its splitting up into three sections. We will revert to the Ājupa praṇāsti in the sequel while discussing the third section. In the second section attributed to Mānabharanā, epithets such as Chandrakulaśekhara (the head ornament of the lunar race), Chōlakulāntaka (the god of death to the Chōl family), Sūrēndra-dīteyāsana-madhyaṣṭha-mastakaṣṭha (one who is seated on the head in the centre of the excellent seat of Indra among the dēvas) and Madhurādīvarā (the lord of Madhurā, i.e., Madurai) clearly point to the fact that Mānabharanā was a prince of the royal house of the Paṇḍyas of Madurai. During the 12th century we do not have any inscription which refers to the reign of this prince, as a ruler in his own right. But there are other references to him as a prince holding some influence over the contemporary affairs. An inscription from Rājasängeppagālam in Tiruvadainai, Taluk in Ramanathapuram District in Tamil Nadu engraved on the walls of the Kailāśanāthavrāmi temple in the village, dated in the 10th year (1130-31 A.D.) in the reign of Jatāvarman Śrīvallabha, contains a reference to nam-pillaṁ Mānabharanān having issued an order pertaining to some transaction. The expression nam-pillaṁ implies that he was a son of the reigning king Jatāvarman Śrīvallabha who ascended the throne, in our opinion, sometime between 1120 and 1122 A.D. Mānabharanā of our record may be
identified with his namesake referred to here on account of the proximity of the period. Another reference is available in the Cūlaṇāṃsa where it is stated that Vijayabahu I, the then ruling king of Ceylon (1065-1111 A.D.) gave his sister Mittā to the Pāṇḍya (Pāṇḍya) king in marriage and Mittā gave birth to three sons Mānābharana, Kīttisirimāgha and Sirivallabha. The Cūlaṇāṃsa further reports that this Mānābharana married Ratanāvali, the daughter of Vijayabahu. The Pāṇḍya king's identity is not disclosed in the Cūlaṇāṃsa. The proximity of the period would suggest the identity of this Mānābharana also with his namesake in our record. In that case the Pāṇḍya queen Mittā's husband would be identical with Jatāvarman Śrīvallabha in whose record Mānābharana is referred to as nam pillai. We find that this Mānābharana, born of the Sinhala princess Mittā, gained through his mother's influence at the Ceylonese court, the position of sāgragara after the death of Vijayabahu in 1110-11 A.D., when on this date his father Jatāvarman Śrīvallabha was yet to become a king in his own right. There is nothing to preclude the presence of this prince in the Tamil country later in the tenth year (1130-31 A.D.) in his father's reign. Two Tamil inscriptions* from Budhumuttā tavu in Kurnagale District in Ceylon refer respectively to Śrī Virabahudēvar and Pāṇḍiyaṇār Virapperumāl. Both the inscriptions are dated in the eighth year (1118-19 A.D.) in the reign of Jayabahu, Vijayabhāhu's brother and successor. On the basis of the name Virabahu given to Mānābharana according to the Cūlaṇāṃsa Virabahu and Virapperumāl have been identified with Mānābharana. It is significant to note that in the second inscription, Chuttamalli-ālvār, the donor, is described as the queen of Virapperumāl and as the daughter of Kūlottukāchōla. Thus we can safely surmise that Mānābharana introduced in the preamble of the present record was a prince, born of Pāṇḍya Jatāvarman Śrīvallabha and his Sinhala queen Mittā, and married Ratanāvali, the daughter of Vijayabahu, and also Chuttamalli-ālvār, the daughter of Kūlottukāla.

After introducing Mānābharana in the second section it proceeds to describe the donor Paṭṭamahādevī. The passage immediately following the name Mānābharanadēvar (line 5) where one can expect the terms of relationship that connect Mānābharana with Kavi-Āḷupendra and Paṭṭamahādevī is damaged. The epithets that follow later on from Vairaśīva-Kapṭhāravam up to 'Pāṇḍyachakravarti' are attributed to Vīra Kavi-Āḷupendra. The Āḷupa praśasti obtained here appears to be the earliest occurrence so far noticed and the later instances are met with from the inscriptions of Āḷupa Virāpāṇḍyadēva, Ballamahādevī, etc. One of the inscriptions of Ballamahādevī from Keḻjûrū in Udipi Taluk in South Kanara District in Mysore State dated Śaka 1200, (wrong for 1203), Vīrūh for Vīrūha (1261 A.D.) describes the queen as belonging to the lineage of Mānābharanāvāraṇādēva. This Mānābharana seems to be referred to in the present record.

---

* Translated by Wilhelm Geiger and Mahat Rieckman. Part 1, pp. 212 and 236.
* A Concise History of Ceylon, p. 198.
* Ibid., p. 198. The fact that Jatāvarman Śrīvallabha himself had not yet become king in 1111 A.D., should have prompted this prince along with his brother to seek his fortunes on his mother's side.
* Chapter 61, verse 26.
* There is a word jukharana in line 5 which is misplaced.
* A. R. Ep., 1929-29, No. 500; 1929-30, No. 584; 1931-32, Nos. 236, 242; VII., Vol. VII., Nos. 213. 221 and 225. Some of these versions substitute the word 'Maṭṭamāthā' by Kōṭēvāra or Chārūkriṭtī thus indicating the individual or local preferences of the respective rulers. The reference to Maṭṭamāthā in the present record, probably identical with the deity of the same name now in vogue at Kōṭīri in Mangalore Taluk in South Kanara District is the earliest obtained so far.
* A. R. Ep., 1921-32, No. 256, p. 61. The identification of Mānābharana with his namesake, an adversary of Chōḷa Rājāḥirāja I (ibid.) is not correct. This reference implies that this queen was a Pāṇḍya princess. See below.
We will not be wrong if we surmise that Paṭṭamahādevī was the queen of Kavi-Āḷupendra and the daughter of Mānabharana. The possibility of this lady being the daughter (duhitarasa line 5) of a Pāṇḍya is strengthened by a reference to a Pāṇḍyamahādevi in a record dated Saka 1077 (1154 A.D.) in the reign of Kavi-Āḷupendra.¹ In that case both Paṭṭamahādevi and Pāṇḍyamahādevi could be only titles, the former referring to her status and the latter to the dynasty of her origin.² In view of the title Pāṇḍya-chakravarttigal of Kavi-Āḷupa, this title Pāṇḍyamahādevi could also be interpreted as the great queen of the Pāṇḍya i.e., the Āḷupa. But the relationship of this queen as the daughter of Mānabharana suggests the interpretation preferred here.³ It is significant that Pāṇḍya names such as Kulaśekhara and Virapāṇḍya commence to appear in the Āḷupa genealogy after the reign of Kavi-Āḷupendra.

Kittidēva, the other donor whose relationship with others mentioned in the record is not stated, is perhaps identical with Mānabharana’s brother Kittisirimēgha.⁴ The discussion on these genealogical connections is represented in a tabular form below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vijayabahu</th>
<th>Mitta =</th>
<th>Jatavarman Srivallabha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1056-1111 A.D.) of Ceylon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Ratanavali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Chuttamalli-Āḷvār</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter of Chōla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulottunga I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mānabharana</th>
<th>Kittisirimēgha</th>
<th>Srivallabha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virabahu or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virapperumāl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mānabharana³ |
| Paṭṭamahādevi= |
| Vira-Kavi-Āḷupendra |
| (Pāṇḍyamahādevi) |

Thus the present record confirms the continuity of the connections that the Āḷupas had with the Pāṇḍyas of Madurai which perhaps commenced from at least about the 8th century.⁴ It

² This Pāṇḍyamahādevi has been wrongly identified (Ancient Kṣṇāya, Vol. I, pp. 234-36) with another Paṭṭamahādevī, the queen of Pāṇḍyadēvaśāsa both of whom are mentioned in an undated but palaeographically later inscription (SII., Vol. VII, No. 380) from Koṭakālī in Udupi Taluk in South Kanara District. This Pāṇḍyadēvaśāsa could be identified only with Virapāṇḍya or Pāṇḍyadēva-Āḷupa (ibid., Vol. IX, Part I, Nos. 395 and 396) of the later half of the 13th century, and not with Kavi-Āḷupendraśāsa (Ancient Kṣṇāya, op. cit.) who lived in the 12th century.
³ Cf. for instance Śojan Śoṣulai alias Kāḍavāmamahādevi apparently a princess of Pallava extraction, a queen of Kulottunga I (The Cōḷas, second edition, p. 333).
⁴ Cōḷavarttigal (p. 358). It is significant that the other brother Srivallabha names his son Mānabharana in memory of the elder Mānabharana.
⁵ Above, Vol. XXXVII, p. 270.
is interesting to note here that this continuity was maintained till the times of Jaṭāvarman Sundara-pāṇḍya I (C. 1251-68 A.D.) who, as stated in a record from Śrīraṅgam, made his younger brother Viraṇḍya, the ruler of Köṭakapāṭiyā. There was actually a Viraṇḍya, styling himself as an Āḷupēndra, who ruled from 1254 A.D. to at least 1272 A.D., thus prompting us to suggest the identity of the two Viraṇḍyas. Further, this Viraṇḍya’s successor from 1277 A.D., was queen Ballamahādēvi who, as stated above is described as belonging to the lineage of Mānābhārāṇēśvaradēva. The absence of a clear indication of the relationship between the two seems to point to the possibility of the latter being the daughter of the former and thus would have entitled her to claim descent from Mānābhārana of Madurai evidently through Viraṇḍya. Viraṇḍya’s records refer to a Paṭṭamahādēvi at the beginning. The identity of this Paṭṭamahādēvi is uncertain. Ballamahādēvi is referred to only in one of the records of Viraṇḍya, as being present at the palace along with the other dignitaries.

The name, Nalantigal-Nārāyaṇa Amudiṅār alaś Vēdanāyakappernāl is interesting. It recalls the name Nalantigal-Nārāyaṇa-Jiyar of a pontificate that was created at Śrīraṅgam in the latter half of the 12th century after the time of Rāmānuja. We have here a reference to the name, which is contemporaneous with the creation of this pontificate.

Vāṇgippuram, the place from where Karunākaran, the Śrīvaishnava mentioned in the record (line 7) hails originally is the same as Vāṇgippuru in Guntur District in Andhra Pradesh.

**TEXT**

1 Svaṣṭi śrī [**] Samasta-bhuvana-vikhyata Sōmakulatalaka Paṇḍya(puḍya)mahārājādhirāja Paramēśvaram Paramabhaṭṭarakaṁ Śrīmat Chandraṅkulaṅkāraraḥ16 Nalu-Naku(hu)ahā-

2 [Jana]. Bharatha(ta)...aha...Japati cha, Kā[ṭyap]a...[a]...Vēda-ghōṣhāchishtāta11 Devēndravallabha............makar-ālay-āmbu[krī]pālanā-Kāḷamēkha(gha) Śrīūjikūrīta sū-

3 tikāmaya Chōjakulāntakam samastha(ta)................meru.............haka....

ayalācha...[ruj] Chakravartti(rtī) Sārvvulā...ya āśrīvatam18 jana-kaḷpa-vri(vṛ)[vṛ]-

4 kha[a|m-a*]samāna-vīraṃ makaradh[ḥ*]vajam Dākṣiṇa...........ham Suteṅtrē12 divy-āsana-

madhyastha mastaka-sti(sthi)tha(ta)[m*] sakala-sāstra-vēda-su(pu)rāṇa-pratitha-Madhurādhiśvara śrīma-

---

1 A. R. Ep., 1928-39, No. 81, pp. 83-84. No regnal yea[r or Saka date is cited in the record.
3 Ibid., 1928-29, No. 491.
4 This appears to be the general feature of the later Āḷupa records where the queens are mentioned at the beginning before the kings are introduced (cf. ŚI, Vol. IX, Part I, Nos. 395, 396 etc.)
5 A. R. Ep., 1929-30, para. 83 suggests that Ballamahādēvi could have been the sister of the previous ruler.
7 A. R. Ep., 1931-32, No. 241. It may be noted that this record introduces a Paṭṭada-piriyarasü at the beginning.
8 Above, XXIX. pp. 74-75.
9 From inlaid impressions.
10 Āḷupākulaṅkāraraḥ.
11 The intended reading is possibly ghōṣhāchīta.
12 Read āśrīta.
13 Read Sūvēndra.
5 n-Mānābharaṇadēvār..........................rum va(vai)ribha-ka[t]hramvas(vam) duhitaram rā.....
dēvāra

6 dit[i]a(divya)-śripātā(da)-patmadhaka2 parab[alasāḥ]dha[ka]............t-Pādny[ā]i[dy]-chakrava-
   [r*]tti Vira-[Kal]vy-Āñ[up-]ṇtra(ṇdra)-dēvāra . paranuṣhī3 [Pa]...'mahādēviyaru Śrī-
   Raṁganāthār[k]ku gai2 Kinti(tti)dēvarum

7 iraṇḍu vaṇamāla'[t] irunūru kuḷikkut-tiruppati2 Śrī-[vayishṇavargal]il Vaṅgippurattuk-Karṇā-
   karan-āṇa Padineṇ-vishaiya-chakravattigal magaṇ Vēdanāyakapperumā[̀]-āṇa Nalan-
tigal]-Nā-

8 rāyaṇa Amudinār oru tirumālaiyam Tāda-nambimārīl Kē[śa]vaṇ Tiruvali(ḥ)di-nāḍu-tādaṇ
   oru tirumālaiyam.....āgalu[kk]u naṇr-āgach-Chandir-ādittavār-chelvad-āga vaiṭṭa......8

9 raip-par[lil] teṇu-olugil Brammacha[kkaravattigal] pakkal vilai koṇḍu viṭṭa tiruppall[lit]-tāma-
nilai [n]lam oru māvum Kēsaṇ Tiruvan[di]ndu[*]-tādaṇ10................

10 ttāma-nilai nil[a[m] oru mā[vum āga nilam] iraṇḍu māvum vilai koṇḍu kāśu 10,10011 ik-kāṇ
   patt-ayirattukkum in-nilam iraṇḍu māvum vilai koṇḍu viṭṭuk Kittidēvaṇ-en.....

11 dēva.....perūma[̀] tirumunabhī viṇṇappān-chedu tirumālai Chandir-ādittavār-chelvad-āga
   ubhāyam(yam)-āga koṇḍu viṭṭamaikk[ku in-nilattāl-uildha bhōkam(gam) taṅgaluku jivan-
   [ttuku vaiṭṭu]

12 it[=ivargal] cheluttavār-āga kal-veṭṭi-kuduttom Kittidēvaṇum Paṭṭamahādēviyum ivv-
   iruvōm ippadi ubaiyam viṭṭamaikk[ku ivai Sēnai12]..................
No. 39—KALIGI INSCRIPTION OF KALACHURI SOYIDÉVA—YEAR 7

(1 Plate)

K. V. RAMESH, MYSORE

The inscription, edited here with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore, was copied by me in October, 1960, in the course of conducting the epigraphical survey of Chitapur Taluk, Gulbarga District, Mysore State. It was found engraved on a slab fixed into the wall of the Kālēśvara temple in the village of Kāpigī. It has been noticed in the Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy for 1960-61 as No. 499 of App. B.

The inscription, consisting of 62 lines of writing in all, is in a fairly good state of preservation. Barring a part of line 42 and the whole of lines 43 and 44, which are written in Nāgari characters, the entire inscription is engraved in the Kannada script. While the Nāgari portion and the invocatory and imprecatory stanzas are in Sanskrit, the language of the rest of the record is Kannada. The text is a mixture of verse and prose, the total number of verses being 30. As will be seen below the record under study belongs to the second half of the 12th century and both the Nāgari and Kannada characters are regular for the period.

As regards palaeography, it may be pointed out that once in line 20 and thrice in lines 9, 20 and 25, y and m respectively are written in their cursive forms. As regards orthography, more often than not, the anusvāra takes the place of the class nasals and the doubling of the consonant immediately following r is not effected in some cases.

The inscription refers itself to the 7th year of the reign of the Kalachuri ruler Bhujabalamaṇa Rāyamurārī Soyidēva who is stated to be ruling from the capital city of Modeganūru. The other details of date given in the record are the cyclic year Vijaya, Assayuṇa śū. 10, Thursday, Vishu-saṅkramaṇa. Soyidēva is known to have succeeded his father Bijala, who abdicated the throne in his son’s favour in 1167 A.D. Thus the 7th year of his reign and the cyclic year Vijaya are to be referred to 1173 A.D. Though some of the details of date given in the record under study viz., śū. 10, Thursday, Vishu-saṅkramaṇa are irregular, śū. 10 corresponding to Tuesday and there being no saṅkramaṇa, the intended date, in all probability, was 1173 A.D. September 18, Tuesday (and not Thursday).

The inscription records (lines 53-61) the grant of the village Mārudjige, situated in Teṅguli-Seventy, to the deity Svayambhu-Kālēśvara of Kājuge, the head-quarters of the division known as Māmedaṇi-nāḍu, jointly by Mahāpradhāna, Sēnādhāpati, Bāhattaraniṣṭgūḍhāpati, Hīṃgadāṇḍanāyaka Mādhavayya and Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Vira-Gomkara (IV), son of Udayāditya-Vira-Kālarasa and grandson of Vira-Gomkara (III). The grant was entrusted to Rāmēvārapandita, the sthānāpati of the Kālēśvara temple.

The inscription is important for the dynastic history of the Kalachuris, for the information it contains on the life and achievements of Mādhavayya and also for the history of the Gulbarga region.

The inscription, which commences with the invocatory stanza Namas-tukha etc. (verse 1: line 1), states (verses 2–3: lines 1–5) that, at the time of the churning of the Ocean of milk (śrī-gaṇḍa), which was the abode, among others, of Lakṣmī (Śrīvāṅkā) and Nārāyaṇa (Śrī-vallabha), by the gods and demons, the Moon was born and from him sprang up the lunar race (Chandra-kula). Many famous rulers had adorned this family and among them was Uchita, the apt lord of the damsel that was the earth. Verses 4–15 (lines 5–24) contain a detailed genealogical account of the Kalachuri family which, for the sake of convenience, is given below in tabular form:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sāti</td>
<td>Uchita</td>
<td>Asagaśa</td>
<td>Kannāma</td>
<td>Kṛitya Asaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bijā (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karṇā</td>
<td>Jōgama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permā or Permādī</td>
<td>Bijā (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sānāyana or Sāyīdāva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santama or Santasama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Śrītaraśa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kannama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nārīnā</td>
<td>Bijā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jōgama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While discussing the genealogy of the Kalachuri dynasty, Fleet, basing his conclusions on the present epigraph as also another Kannama inscription, also belonging to the reign of Sāyīdāva, from Harasūr, Gulbarga Taluk and District, formulated the following line of succession:

---

Lines 1-24 of the present inscription and lines 4-23 of the Harasūr Kannada inscription, referred to above, which contain genealogical accounts of the Kalachuri family, are exactly the same in their contents. It is likely that Fleet mistranslated *santām∗-ārya in line 6 of the present epigraph, which only refers to the nature of Uchita’s rule, for the name (Santama or Santamana) of the progenitor of the dynasty. So also, the name of Asagara in Fleet’s genealogical account appears to have resulted from a wrong reading of the passage *avantara-Asagaran-vāldina* in line 6. The name of Nāraya for the elder son of Kannama seems to have resulted from a wrong reading of the last three letters in the passage *Uttamareṇe-Rāja* in line 7.

Besides the inscription under study and the Harasūr Kannada inscription referred above which contain the names of Uchita and Asagara, a Sanskrit inscription1 from Harasūr itself and belonging to the reign of Sōyidēya, also names the earliest two members of the Kalachuri family as Uchita and Asaga. But verse 4 of the last mentioned inscription has been taken elsewhere2 to contain not only the name of Uchita but also that of his younger brother, Rāja. This verse has been read there as:

\[
\text{Tad-vaṁśa-sāmbhasau bhāṅkra\ldots}
\]

\[
\text{Uchita-tasya cha-ānujai\ldots}
\]

\[
\text{Mahān-Rāja mahā-vīrya}
\]

\[
\text{Ta\textit{s}u(va)s}bhādρa-kula-bhūṣaṇo(vah)\]

while the correct reading is:

\[
\text{Tad-vaṁśa-sāmbhasau bhāṅkra\ldots}
\]

\[
\text{Uchita-tasya cha-ānujau}
\]

\[
\text{mahā-bhuja maha-vīryau}
\]

\[
\text{tau bhādρa-kula-bhūṣaṇau}
\]

Thus the reference here is to two brothers of Uchita who are not named in the record. It is likely that while, by their achievements, they merited a reference in the record, they were not named because they did not succeed to the estate of their brother.

The Harasūr Sanskrit inscription, after mentioning Uchita and Asaga, directly passes on to Rāja, thus passing over the names of Kannama and Kiriya-Asaga who, according to the epigraph under study (verse 5: lines 6-8), were respectively the son and grandson of Asagara. The Harasūr Kannada inscription, on the other hand, gives the name of Kannama and his son, whose name is irretrievably lost, after that of Asgara. The name of Kiriya-Asaga, Kannama’s son and successor is thus, known from the inscription under study.

We learn from the present record that Rāja and Bijja I, sons of Kiriya-Asaga, succeeded one another in that order (verse 6: line 8). But the Harihar inscription3 of Kalachuri Bijja-

\[\text{raudēva}, \text{according to which Rāja and Bijja (I) were the sons of Kannama and not of Kiriya-Asaga, states that Bijja (I) was the elder of the two and that he succeeded Kannama and was then succeeded by Rāja. The accuracy of this latter statement is thrown into doubt by the record under study which specifically states that Rāja and Bijja (I), sons of Kiriya-Asaga, succeeded one another in that order (see ant-avār-kumārāṁ-āḥ-ilejau, etc., in line 8).}

\[2\] Above, Vol. XXVII, pp. 24, 28, 30.
\[3\] Ep. C.α., Vol. XI, Dg. 42
In the record under study, Uchita, Asagarasa and Kannama are referred to, in general terms, as having ruled over the entire earth. No reference is made to the reign of Kiriya-Asaga who is merely mentioned as the son of Kannama and father of Râja and Bijja (I), who are also referred to as rulers of the earth.

Of the two brothers Râja and Bijja (I), Karuña was the son of the latter and he was the very Yama to his enemies and had attained great prowess through the boon of Lord Śiva. He is mentioned in the record as Karuña nrîpâkâ and nrîpati (verses 6-7: lines 9-10).

Karuña’s son was Jûgama-râja whose fame pervaded everywhere, who was the beloved of the earth and who had triumphed in many a battle (verse 7: lines 10-11). Jûgama is the earliest Kalachuri ruler to find mention in a contemporaneous record. An inscription1 from Kôlagirî, Jath State, states that he was ruling over Karahâda-Four Thousand in 1037-88 A.D. as a feudatory of Châlukya Vikramâditya VI (1076-1126 A.D.).

Jûgama was succeeded by his son Perma or Permûdî who, according to the present inscription (verse 8: lines 12-13), successfully destroyed the circle of his enemies and whose great arms had become famous as a result of his victories in battles. Permûdî is known to have been governing the Tardavâdi district, in the neighbourhood of Bijapur, in A.D. 1128 as a feudatory of Western Châlukya Sômâsvara III (1125-38 A.D.).2

Permûdî’s son, who is named in our record as Bijja, was the famous Bijjâla, who brought forth the eclipse of the imperial power of the Western Châlukyas of Kâlyâna in about 1162 A.D. The present record states (verses 9-11 lines 13-16) that Bijja secured control over the entire Kuntâja-râjya and destroyed the (might of the) Châlukya emperor. The inscription further credits him with victories over the rulers of Nêpâlaj, Beûgij, i.e., Beûgî, the capital of the Eastern Châlukyas, Kaûnîga, Gîrjara, Lîjâ, i.e., Lîjâ and Baûgîla. In the absence of corroborative historical evidence, the claim for Bijjâla’s victories over such distant rulers as have been named in our inscription cannot but be dismissed as a mere conventional hyperbole. Bijjâla abdicated the throne in favour of his son Sôyîdêva sometime after the 19th July, 1167 A.D.3

Sômâsvara, Bijjâla’s son and successor, surpassed his father in brilliance as a victor and freed the world from evil rulers (verse 12: lines 16-19). In three explanatory verses, which follow in lines 19-24, it is stated that enemy rulers, on hearing that Râyamûrâri Sôyîdêva had been crowned king, marched their cavalry and elephant corps against him. But, when Sôma-nrîpati i.e., Sôyîdêva, prepared for warding off the invaders, the very sound of his war-drums ensured his resounding victory. Among the enemy kings who were thus defeated by Sôyîdêva are mentioned those of Arîga, Kîngâja (Koûgî), Aûdhra, Chôla and Kaûnîga.

That the accession of Sôyîdêva was disputed, as is implied by the present inscription, appears to be a historical fact; but the enemies, whom Sôyîdêva had to put down in order to ensure the throne for himself, were the scions of his own family.4 As in the case of his father, Sôyîdêva’s claim for defeating so many powerful and distant rulers will have to be treated, in the present state of our knowledge, as mere exaggeration.

Verse 16 (lines 25-27) states that while Kalachuri-Chakravartti Sôma-bhûtalapati was ruling over the earth bounded by the oceans, daûpamîyàkà Mâdhava was administering many a dêsa

---

1 B. K. No. 103 of A. R. Ep., 1940-41.
3 Ibid., p. 477.
including Mannedaḍi-nādu. Verses 17-22 (lines 27-37) give the genealogical descent of Mādhava as follows:

Aīa (Brahmā)  
Vasiṣṭha

Annapama-chamūpa

Vishnuṛṇāva-rathinātha

Māñyideva-chamūpa  
(married Sāvitṛdēvi)

Mādhava-daṇḍanāyaaka  
(married Rōkalaḍēvi)

It is interesting to note that Mādhava belonged to a family of brahmanaśas who were, for generations, army generals by profession. Verse 23 (lines 37-38) states that Mādhava became famous by restoring order in the kingdom of the Kalachuri emperor by putting an end to the chaos created by the durmantri Kasapeya and his associates. The next verse (verse 24; lines 38-40) reveals that the confusion was caused by the usurpation of the Kalachuri throne (and country) by one Karpṇa and that Mādhava killed the usurper and restored Sōma-nāpa to the throne. Karpṇa has been identified elsewhere with the grandsons of Bijjāla and son of a brother of Sōyindāva. Kasapeya was a powerful official during the reign of Bijjāla II and it is likely that he rose against Sōyindāva and temporarily succeeded in displacing him and placing his own candidate on the throne. Whatever the ulterior motives of Kasapeya were, his designs were defeated by Mādhava-daṇḍanāyaaka. Verses 25-26 (lines 40-44) describe Mādhava’s greatness as a vanquisher of enemies and allude to his widespread fame. Verse 27 (line 44) mentions Rōkalaḍēvi as Mādhava’s wife. Line 44 ends with the words Nṛgānāya nāmaḥ.

While verse 28 (lines 45-46) repeats that Rōkalaḍēvi was Mādhava’s wife, the next verse (verse 29; lines 46-47) compares her virtues to those of Sati, Sarasvati and Lakshmi.

Lines 47-53 introduce the reigning king Rāyamurāri Sōyindāva, with all the usual imperial titles and epithets, as ruling from the capital city of Modegaṇuṇa.

Lines 54-61 record the grant, details of which have been given above, while lines 58-59 give the details of the date, discussed above. Lines 61-62 contain the well-known imprecatory verse (verse 30) Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā, etc.

Of the two donors, Mādhava and Vīra-Gomkarasa, the former is also known from the Harasūr Sanskrit inscription, referred to above, wherein he is stated to have installed a svavarta-kalāśa on the top of the temple of Lakshmi-pati (i.e. Viśnū), built earlier by Paramardidēva, (i.e., Permaḍi, the father of Bijjāla II). The Harasūr epigraph also informs us that Mādhava’s parents were Māñyideva and Sāvitri and that he belonged to the Vasiṣṭha-varṇa.¹

¹ The verse in lines 29-31 alludes to Vasiṣṭha’s curse upon Nāma as a result of which the latter lost his body and also to the former’s conflict with Kauśika (i.e., Viśvāmitra).
⁴ Cf. above, Vol. XXVIII, p. 23 where it is been wrongly stated that the temple of Lakshmi-pati was built by Mādhava himself.
⁵ Mādhava also figures in a Kasappa inscription of Sōyindēva (A.R. Ep., 1862-63, No. B 787) belonging to 1178 A.D. and found in Harasūr itself. While he is introduced in it in identical passages as in the record under study, the Harasūr inscription records a grant made to the deity Bhūgōcara of Sālayadgna jointly by Mādhava, Māñyideva-Vīra-Bamanēcarasa and Vīra-Gomkarasa.
The other donor, Vira-Gomikaraśa, receives the subordinate epithets of *Samadhiyajatapaśčamahāśabda* and *Mahāmaṇḍalādīvṛtara* and is mentioned as the son of Udayāditya Vira-Kālaraśa and grandson of Vira-Gomikaraśa and as belonging to the Bāṣa-vaṁśa. The existence of a Bāṣa family in the Gulbarga region during the 10th-12th centuries is attested to by a few more inscriptions copied from the Chitapur and Gulbarga Taluks of the Gulbarga District. A brief narrative of the known history of this family, as gleaned from such inscriptions, is given below.

An inscription from Teṅgli, Chitapur Taluk, Gulbarga District, belonging to A.D. 1162-63 and to the reign of Western Chālukya Taila III, gives the mythical genealogy of the above family as follows:

```
Brahma
| Marichi
| Kāśyapa
| Hiranyakaśipu
| Prahlāda
| Vīrōchana
| Bali
| Bāṣa
```

The inscription then states that in the Bāṣa-kula was born the king Bibha who performed many acts of piety and bravery at Jivāṅkaṇyā. He was followed by a number of rulers and, at the time of the engraving of the Teṅgli inscription, Vira-Gomikaraśa was ruling over his kingdom. The inscription ascribes to him the epithets *Khāṇḍava-maṇḍalādīvṛtara* and *Bāṣa-vaṁś-oḍbhava* and gives the name of his wife as Maillaladēvi. A much damaged inscription from Kālīki itself, belonging to 1102 A.D., provides us with the names of Bibha’s immediate predecessors and successors. The line of succession, as given in this record, is as follows:

```
Bāṣa
After many had ruled
```

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charṇāraśa (I)</th>
<th>Bainḍāraśa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bibha (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charṇāraśa (II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibha (II) (married Rebbaladēvi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira Goṅka (I) alias Bāṇaparādityadēva (married Maillaladēvi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāra Mallu aśias Mallidēva-kumāra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

---

2. Jivāṅkaṇyā is to be identified with the modern village of Jivanagi in the Chitapur Taluk. This village has yielded two inscriptions of the Western Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa (*A. R. Ep.* 1962-63, No. B 706-97).
3. Ibid., 1960-61, No. B 504. The date of the inscription, which could not be read at the time of its notice, is as follows: Government of India, Press, 1949. Tuesday, 15th Monday, Solar eclipse. Barring the solar eclipse, the other details regularly correspond to 1102 A.D., January 20.
Of these, Charidharma and Banidharma, who appear to have been brothers, are stated in the record to have put down the rebellious rulers of Nurgubhada in Mainmeda-1000 and to have established themselves as the rulers of the conquered territory. Bibba (I) is eulogized as Śrīdharmaśādheśa and is stated to have built the temple of Bibbāśvara at Kājuge. This Bibba (I) and Bibba of the Teōgli inscription, discussed above, may be treated as identical. Vīra Gomukha alias Bāparādityadēva is described as the agraja of Bibba (II) and Rebbaladēvi, implying thereby that other issues followed him. Vīra Gomukha built the temple of Gomkēśvara at Kājige while his queen Mallaladēvi also built a temple, details about which are lost.

This Vīra Gomkārakara is to be identified with his namesake who figures as the mānneya (i.e., chieftain or ruler) of Gomukha-nādu, a subdivision of Aland-1000 and as a feudatory of Chālukya Vikramāditya VI in an inscription from Harasūr, Chitapur Taluk, belonging to 1097 A.D.

The next inscription containing a genealogical account of this family is from Martūr, also in the Chitapur Taluk, and belongs to 1124 A.D. and to the reign of Chālukya Vikramāditya VI. According to this inscription Gomkāna-nādu was, at that time, under the sway of Gomukha (III), son of Katta and grandson of Gomukha (II). We have seen above that Vīra Gomukha (I) was the ruling member of this family in 1102 A.D. Even if we assume that he had ended his reign in about 1102 A.D. itself, we have the difficult task of accommodating no less than three reigns within a span of two decades, viz., the reigns of Mallidēvakumāra, mentioned as the son of Vīra Gomukha (I) in 1102 A.D., and Gomukha (II) and his son Katta, figuring in the Martūr inscription. It is likely that Mallidēva, Gomukha (II) and Katta enjoyed only brief reigns and that Katta’s son Gomukha (III) was already on the throne in 1120 A.D. For, mānneya Gomukha, figuring as one of the donors in an inscription from Syed Chińchhōli, Gulbarga Taluk, belonging to 1122 A.D., in the reign of Chāluksya Vikramāditya VI is to be identified with this Gomukha (III). His three predecessors, Mallidēva, Gomukha (II) and Katta are, therefore, to be deemed as having ruled between 1102 and 1122 A.D.

The next dated reference to a ruling member of this family is only in 1157 A.D., to which year an inscription of Chāluksya Taila III from Mupty, Chitapur Taluk, belongs. This inscription refers to Mahāmangalēśvara Gomkārakara as the ruler of Gomukha-nādu. We have seen above that the Teōgli inscription of 1162 A.D. names the then ruling member of the family as Vīra Gomkārakara. So also, an inscription from Harasūr, Gulbarga Taluk, belonging to A.D. 1172 and to the reign of Kalakhatrā Sōyidēva, gives the name of the then Bāpa chief as Vīra Gomukha.

As has been stated above, our inscription, belonging to September, 1173 A.D., refers to the Bāpa chief as Vīra Gomkārakara, son of Udayāditya Vīra Kālaras. A second inscription from Syed Chińchhōli, Gulbarga Taluk, belonging to the reign of Kalakhatrā Bhujahalamalla (i.e., Sōyidēva) and to June, 1173 A.D., records a donation jointly made by Mahāmangalēśvara Kālarāvāra and Mahāmangalēśvara Vīra Gomkēdevāvāra.

Of these rulers discussed above, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, Mānneya Gomukha, who has been identified above with the son of Katta and who is known to have commenced his reign at least in 1122 A.D., and Vīra Gomkārakara, figuring as the Bāpa ruler in the Harasūr inscription of 1172 A.D. referred to above, will have to be treated as identical. This

1 Ibid., 1963-64, No. B 734.
2 Ibid., 1959-60, No. B 452.
4 Ibid., No. B 518.
will give Vira Gomkarsa (III) a long reign of nearly five decades. We have seen above that, according to the Teñgli inscription, his queen had the name of Maijaladēvi. It will naturally follow that this Vira Gomkarsa (III) was the father of Vira Kājarasa (or Kājadēvarasa) and grandfather of Vira Gomkarsa (IV) (or Vira Gomkiddāvarasa). The Syed Chiñchōli inscription of 1173 A.D. suggests that Kājarasa and his son Gomkarsa (IV) ruled in joint capacity while the inscription being edited below shows that the former reigned for a very short duration.

In the light of the above discussions, the genealogy of the Bāna family from Vira Gomka (I) onwards may be given as follows:

Vira Gomka (I) alias
Bānarādityadēva
(married Maijaladēvi; known dates: 1077 and 1102)

Kumāra Malla alias
Mallidēva-kumāra
(known date: 1102 A.D.)

Gomka (II)
Katta

Gomka (III)
(married Maijaladēvi; known dates: 1122, 1123-24, 1157, 1162 and 1172)

Udayāditya Vira Kājarasa
alias Vira Kājadēvarasa
(known date: 1173 A.D.)

Gomka (IV)
(known date: 1173 A.D.)

We have seen above that the territory which was under the sway of this Bāna family was known as Gomka-nādu (or Gomkana-nādu) and that it formed a part of Alande-1000. Some of the inscriptions refer to this territory as Gomka nūrippatt-uruvattu. It is likely that Gomka-nādu was a 180 division (nūrippattu=120+aruvattu=60).

Gomka-nādu comprised portions of the Gulbarga and Chitapur Taluks. The epithet Khāṇḍava-mandala-ūdākēvara borne by the rulers of this family is interesting. Khāṇḍava-mandala may have been another name for Gomka-nādu. Khāṇḍava was, in ancient times, the name of a forest in Kurkeshtra and, therefore, the epithet may also indicate a claim by the Bānas of Gomka-nādu that they originally hailed from the sacred north.

Among the place-names occurring in the epigraph under study, Modeganûr, the capital city of Kalachuri Sócīdēva is the same as modern Máninûr, a village about 4 miles from Koppal, the headquarters of the taluk of the same name in Raichur District, Mysore State. Kāljuga, the headquarters of Mānmedadji-nādu, which lay in the Gulbarga region, is the same as Kālijgi, the find-spot of the present record. The damaged Kālijgi inscription of 1102 A.D., discussed above, mentions Kāljuga as the vijadēni of Vira-Gomkarsa (I). Teñgli-70, the subdivision in which the gift village Mārūdige was situated, is the region around Teñgli, Chitapur Taluk, Gulbarga.

1 Ibid., Nos. B 508 and 516.
2 It is also possible that Gomka-nādu was a 60 division forming a part of a bigger 120 division.
FULL SLAB

Scale: One-sixth
District. The gift village Māruḍīga, which I am unable to identify, is to be located in the neighbourhood of Tāngli.

TEXT:

[Metres : verses 1, 27 and 30 : Anuḥyaḥṭāḥ ; verses 2, 4-5, 7-11, 13, 17, 19-24, 28 and 29 : Kanda ;
verses 3 and 16 : Chamukamāla ; verse 6 : Mālikāmāla ; verses 12 and 20 : Śārvūlavikṛṣiṭa ;
verses 14, 18 and 25 : Mātṛēhaṃkṛṣiṭa ; verse 15 : Utpalamāla.]

1 "Namaśi tuṁga-śīrṣā-ṣaṁbhī-ṣaṭhadra-ṣaṁbarda-ṣaṁvāry [1]śraiḥlokiya-nagar-āraṇībha-mūla-
staṁbhaḥ Śaṁbhavā || [1 || 2] Śravadvah.

2 ge tavar-udagra-Śrīvallabha-n[2]kke-dāṇam-Aditya-vijaya-Śrīvadhu-gupāya-enē Vaḍ-
śri-

3 vaḷlabhaṇ-aḷave pogaṇaḷiṅ-gaḍaḷ-oḷaṇā̃ [2 || 4] Nanēnu sar-āśara-kkaṭeyal-aiṅ-
gaḍalind-ogodaṁ niį-āṇu-saṅsta-

4 ra-paripūrit-ākhiya-diśā-vaḷayam Kamalā-sahōdaram śura-gaja-sēdarah āśi tadiya
kula-āchara-

Kath || Aṇṭ-taṭavāṭ-ākhiya-vaṣudhā-kānt-ōcita-ūchita-ūchita-ūchita-

6 tan-āldan-ahūlaṇīyam saṁtaṇam-enē tattanūjan-anaimtaṇav-Asagarmam-adan-
ahūlaṇīyam || [4 || 4] tattanām

7 Kanvāma-uripan-ottamabhadra-āldan-īyeṇa-ātana tanaṇaṁ matte Kiriṣṭi-Asagama-
ataṅga-uttarām-enē Rāja-

8 Bījjar-ogedaṁ-tanayaṁ || [5 || 4] Mālikāmāla || Antavara-kramad-īuḍum-āld-īyeṇaṁ nimir-
cheha-ṣaṅtigal-aṇṭakaḷa-la-

9 man-aṅgi Bījja-uripālaṅg-oṭedaṁ suṭataṁ Khaṅṭu-vairavara-praṣāda-ṣaḷabha-
dorvva[ṛ-bha][n-iḥaṛya-viṅkāni-

Karṇaṇa-uripatig-oged-ahūla-ākarṇa-

11 ta-viśadā-kirtti Jōgama-rāṇam bhū-kāṁṭaṇ-emisi nega[daṇ-ānēk-āhava-viyayi-ni-

12 ja-bhunī-āvasāṭambhaṇ [7 || 4] Ā Jōgama[mī]ge magan-udvājaṛu[pa]-chakran-ārjita-
ōrjita-tējō-bhrājīṣūṛ-jaṭhaṃ-āv[rom-ā-

13 ji-jaya-prathita-prithu-bhujāṇv Perminna-uripam || [8 || 4] Ā Permināḷi-uripālaṅg-
āpaṭita-sakala-Kuṅ-

Āpāṭita-Nāṭpāla-mahīpālakaṇ-ākram-ā-

1 From inked impressions.
2 There is a floral design at the beginning of this line.
3 The first quarter of this verse is metrically defective.
4 There is a blank space, about 8.0 cm. long, after this, but no letter is lost.
5 The last quarter of this verse is metrically defective.
6 Read "nega[daṇ-ānēk-āhava etc.
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15 tta-Bēṅgi-Kajñāga-kahānpūjā-rajya-an-idāja-an-āpaṇṭa-Gūrijara-jvaram Bijja-ūpān
|| [10 [*]] Lājan-alava-lidana-uddhata-rac

16 i-avān-eō-gē antenna-aṣīyi Rāgha-yāya aṣāpa-aṣāram pēla-ad-ār-alamo Bijja-bhūpa-balaka || [11 [*]] Vṛ Ṛ Ātaṅga-pra-

17 tīma-pratāpā-vībhu-vāng-ānma-bhūpa-vraja-vāīpēta-vadīma-vākram-aṅka-nūjamā Sōma-vāram puṣṭi tat-tātāmī-

18 gim-migli-śānañīīmā rīp-bal-āekraup-khalā-mābāmañ māraññānt-adānt-ppadal-
padgu-nāma niṣkamitakanā mādi-

19 duñ || [12 [*]] Va || Ad-aṁt-eṣā[n*]doçe || Neṣṭane Rāyamārīgre paṭṭaṁ gaṭṭidu-
gōl du vairi-nripāla-ttoṭ-fin-eō-gēṭṭu bāy-viīṭ-

20 ṭīdār-āmāya-kari-taraṅg-ōtiamati || [13 [*]] Balavad-Rāyamārī Sōma-nripati-
prasthāna-hā SERIES

21 ravañ nelan-aṅkampisal-ūṇme vairīgas-adirīdd-aṅtañ-adārāyaāmām kolar-adar-
kkolar-ājolar-kkolar-usi-

22 r-viīṭar-kkolar-staggidar-kkolar-arṛdar-kkolar-arṛgīdar-kkolar-aḷaṅgirddar-kkolar-
marggīdar || [14 [*]] Aṃga-nripāla-Koṅgaja-mahāśvaran-Ām-

23 dhra-nrip-eṁdra matta-mātāṅga-māṇijāhīpa chhalā-cholā-nrip-echaḷa-vajrapāta-
uttuṁ-

24 ga-Kajñāga-raja-rajan-arāśa-rāghava-Rāman-en-bōm-eṅgaḷa bappisal-namag ga-
charan-ādane Sōma-bhūmipān || [15 [*]]

25 Kajñār-čhakravartti vibhu dorrbaḷa-mallan-enippa Sōma-bhūtalapi vārdhī-
mudrita-mahītañamām parima(rā)-

26 kełiṣuṭ-te-anukām-ire daṇḍanāyaka-śikhāmaṇī Mādhevan-adan-i dharā-tālam-
osevantu

27 Mannēdaṇi-nād-medal-āgīra[=a*]nēka-dēmañam ||[16 [*]] Va ||Tad-varṇē-āvatāram-
ent-endoçe || Sarasī-ruha-nābha-

28 nēbhi-sarasī-ruha-in-ogedan-Ajaṇ-Ajaṅg-ātma-manah-sarasīruha-janman-ādanī sura-
muni-samabhiñtetaṁ

29 Vasīṣṭha-munīdramā ||[17 [*]] Animittaṁ munid-itta śaṇadi[N] Nimi-kahā警方aṅg-
āytu tat-tanu-hīnatvan-ā

30 d-oṁme Kanśika-balām key-kol[ad-erd[d]adu tan-muni-yastī-agniyol-ādud-āhuti vēl-eṅḍ-ad-āniva-sāmān-

31 ne muni-viṇḍāraṇa-viṇḍāṇa-vahdita-pada-dvāṁvāna Vasīṣṭha[N]-āhvayam ||[18[*]]
Ā muni-pānvayā-

32 āgana-ābhū-māṇya-ānḍamāna-taṁ vēbh-sutan-uddāma-yāsā-paraṁparaṁ-

33 byō(yrō)ma-ṭaḷaṁ Viśnudēva-rathini-nāthaṁ ||[19[*]] Ā viśva-vinuta-kīrtti-śrī-vallā-
bhūn-ṇepa Viṣṇug-ogedāṁ tanayaṁ bhū-

---

1 Read maṅkagama.
2 Though the introduction of the latter ā will mar the metre, it is done so in order to rectify what otherwise
will be a flaw in the language.
No. 39] Kaligi inscription of Kalachuri Soydeva—Year 7

34. valaya-vitata-krittī-śrī-vallabhan-enisi Mānyidēva-chamūpam ([[20*]]) Å Mānyidēva-vipra-sīromaṇī-
35. g-atiivmaja-ḥarite bhārīyā-padamati pṛēmade tāleda-kuṇa-chintāmaṇi Sāvitriddēvi
sudātī-ratnani ([[21*]]) Å Śa-
36. vitri-satigāṁ bhūsurapati Mānyidēva-piranā-patīgāṁ Vāsava-vibhavāṁ puṭṭiḍaṇ-
ā-sukātāṁ pōgale Mādhava-dhva-
37. jīneṣaṁ ([[22*]]) Va Tadiya sāch-charitaṁ-ent-enudene] Kalachuri-nripa-kuṇa-rājyaṁ
balavad-dur-mmaṇti Kasapey-adigalāndanaṁ-ga-
38. laṇām-āgire nij-i-dōrbaḷadindu-alavāḍiśi Mādhavaṁ pesarvaṇaṁ [[23*]] Ād-
entene Ā Kārma-
39. si-rājya-lakṣhimyān-akramadind-āḷḍa Karṇaṇa[n]u] koṇḍu dharā-ḥakraman-
alavāḍiṣṭān-annukramāṁ 85-
prōddhamā-dāvāṇaḥ ripu-
41. mōgh-āgha-sāmṛtaṁ ripu-mahibhūt-khaṇḍaṇā-Ākhaṇḍaṇaḥ ripu-patikṣa-sita-
pрабhāṁ ripu-mad-ābh-āṁdr-angha-paṁ-
42. chānanamaḥ ripu-kōṭiḥkhaṇaṇ-eṇuḍ-gōṇu] voga[vudō śṛi-Mādhava-āmātyaṇaṁ] [[25*]] ]'
Dik-kāṁṭa-yugapad-viḷo ो ो ो — —
43. sa vin[i(būḥ)bāyate] dig-dānti-prakār-āvagāhava-vidhau dugdh-ābdhi-pūrṇyaṭe] dig-
bhīṭṭa-prakār-āmuleṇa-va[i[dha] — ो ो ो ो ो ो ो yatō] śṛman-Mādhava-dāndanāṭha
ो ो — —
44. kṛttitā-jagad-vyāpini ][26*]] Taṣyā Rākaladevi-ti bhāryā-bhūt-prēma-bhājanāṁ |
bhājanaṁ sarva-bhogānāṁ Lakṣmīr-iva Mura-dvishāḥ][[27*]] ] Nārayanāya nā[mah] ]'
45. Å sachiya-patige vipula-śri-satitum tānum-ā chamūpati-vakṣhō-vāsiniyar-enisi
nagalda mahāstai [sa-
46. tiy-ādala-eseva Rākaladevi ][28*] Satyā-ṣaṁte pati-vrata Vāk-satiya-ṣaṁte kalā-
kāḷaṁ-kōvīde Lakṣmī-sati-
47. y-aṁt-adhīṣa-vakṣha-sthitē Rākaladeviy-enuḍ poga[jvud-i lōkaṁ ][29*] ] ][ Gadya ]
Svasti[ * ] Samasta-bhū[vanā]-
48. āraya-śri-prithvivallabhān-Mahārājāḥirājā-Paramēvaram Ā Kālanjarapuravar-ādhī-
varāṁ su-
49. vanuṇa-vṛiṣbha-dhvajām ripa-Makaraṇahvajāṁ ḍamaruga-tūrīya-nirgghōṣanāṁ
vairi-mada-Śeṣhanāṁ Kalachuri-ku-
50. la-kamaḷa-mārttaṇḍaṁ kadaṇa-praḥaṇḍaṁ ṣaraṇ-āgata-gaja-sāmanta-vajra-pañjaram
vairi-dik-kumjaraṇaṁ subhaṭar-ādi-
51. tyah kaliga[a]-aṅkuśanā nām-ādi praśasti-sahitaṁ śrīmad-Bhujaḷa[malla-Rāya-
murārī- Sōyidēva-vijaya-rājyaṁ-uttā-——

1 There is an ekṣera-like symbol in between the two pairs of dandās here and at the end of verse 27 in line
44.
2 Verses 26-27 and the obeisance to Nārayana are engraved in Nāgarī characters.
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52 r-ōttar-ābhivyāddhi-pravardhamānam-ā-chaundr-ārkka-tarádhbaranā saluttam-īre Modes-
ganūra-nele-vijīnoj-sukha-saṁkathā-vinō-
53 dādiṁ rājyaṁ gavyuttam-īre tat-pāda-padm-ōpajīviṁ-oppa ārīman-mahāpadhānam-
śeṇādhipati bāhattaraniyō-
54 gādhipati hūriya-daṁḍanāyakaṁ Mādhavayyam svasti-samadhigata-parīchha-mahā-
sabda-mahā-maṭhālaṁ-
55 śvarumū Khāṁḍava-maṇḍaṁśvarumū Bāga-vanāś-ōdhabhavumū vivēka-vanaj-ōdbha-
varumū Durmmukha-kshētrapāla-labdhva-vara-prasā-
56 darunī mrigamad-śmōdarumī nām-ādi-prasāsti-sahitaṁ śrimad-Vira-Goṇukara[sa*]na-
magan-Ūdayāditya-
57 Vira-Kālarasana maga Vira-Goṇkarasan-ivar-ībbaru verasu Mannaḍāti-nāḍa rāja-
dhāni Kālugeya śrī-Svayaṁbhū-Kālēsvaradā-
58 varu aniga-bhōga-ranita-bhūgakkaṁ chaśtra-pavitrakkam khaṇḍa-sphūṭita-jirpiṁ-
oḍdhārakam alliya sthānapati Rāmāśvara-paim-
59 qitana keiyulu Bhujabāja-chakravartttī Rāyanurari-Sōru(Sō)yidēva-varshada 7
vijaya-sarvatsaradā
60 Āśvayujha śuddha 10 Bṛhaspati-vārad-arudd Vishu-samkramaṇa Vyātipāta
nimittav-āgī Tēnuguḷī-70 ro[lag]-
61 [na] bāḍaṁ Bōchha-gāvunādana majeyya Mārudigeyāṁ sarvavanamasyavāgī dhā-
[rāpurvavakam]
62 mādī kottar [ Sva-dat[t*]jam para-dattāṁ vā yō harāta vasumādharāṁ | Shaśtiṁ
varsha-sahasrāṇi visiṁḥāyāṁ đầyāya-
63 [tā kṛjīniḥ | [30*]jj]
NO. 41—A NEW GRANT OF BHULUNDÁ, YEARS 38 AND 77

(I Plate)

G. S. GAI, MYSORE

In the course of my official tour in February 1971, I visited Indore in Madhya Pradesh and when I was camping there, I came to know about the existence of an early copper-plate grant in the possession of a prominent merchant Shri Prabhaschandra Santoshchandra Sastri. I secured the plate for my examination and for taking estampages through the good offices of Dr. S. N. Nagu, a prominent citizen and doctor of Indore, who, though in medical profession, is much interested in securing materials of antiquarian interest like coins, inscriptions, etc. It is reported that Shri Sastri obtained the plate from a resident of Indore and saved it from being melted into copper. The plate was shown to the local museum authorities who recognised it to be a grant of Mahārāja Bhulundā and a brief note about its discovery appeared in the Daily Newspaper Naiy Duniya in September 1969. I am thankful to Dr. Nagu and to Shri Sastri for making this plate available to me.

This is a single plate measuring 31 cm. long and 11 cm. broad and weighing 521 gm. It is engraved on one side only and contains 10 lines of writing which is in a fairly satisfactory state of preservation. The characters belong to what is called the western variety of the southern alphabets. They generally resemble the characters of the previously discovered Indore plate1 of Bhulundā and more closely those of the Indore plate of Svāmīdāsa2 which have been referred to the end of the 4th century A. D. and the beginning of the 5th century A. D. It may, however, be noted that our grant has both the types of y, viz. bipartite and tripartite while the other two grants have only tripartite. The bipartite y is used only twice in line 1 (cf. sunājñāpayati and dyukta-kā). In all other cases, the tripartite y is used. As regards orthography, it may be observed that the consonant following r is generally re-duplicated (cf. sarvēm, line 1, -Āryadvāra-, line 2, karmma, line 3, Narmnadā, line 4, etc.). The consonants preceding y and r are also re-duplicated in some cases (cf. padānudhyātā, line 1 and kramēya, line 7). The language is Sanskrit and the composition is prose. There are some errors in the language as well as in the composition which have been duly corrected while giving the text below.

The inscription, which is issued from Valkha, refers itself to the reign of Mahārāja Bhulundā who describes himself as parata-bhaṭṭaraka-padānuddhyāṭa 'meditating on the feet of the great Lord', indicating the feudal status of Bhulundā. The object of the epigraph is to register the grant2 by Bhulundā as vrtamaṭri, of a village-site called Rōhyavāhaka or Rōhyavāhaka in the opraḥra named Uddhāritaka of Āryadvāra of Vātasya-gōṭra and situated in Dāsila-kapalī-rāṣṭra on the other bank of the Narmada river. It is stated that this village-site was created by stopping the cultivation of the field there. The donors of the grant were the brāhmaṇa Asvadēva of Kāśyapa-gōṭra, Agniśarmman of Vātasya-gōtra, Skanda of Bhāradiśāja-gōtra,

1 Above, Vol XV, pp. 286 ff. and plate.
2 Ibid.

The expression assajñām in line 6 has to be understood in the sense of 'grant', since it is accompanied by the words adakā-dhisa-sagatā. It is used in this sense only in the other allied grants and not in the sense of 'consent, confirmation, assent' as taken by R. C. Majumdar and V. V. Mirashi (cf. above, Vol XV, pp. 288, 290; CII, Vol. IV, Pt. I, p. 6 and note 3).

2 DGA/72

(245)
Tupārika of Kauṭyakūṭra, Vāsulaśarmman of Dāsila-Kauṭyakūṭra, Durakkha of the Kauṭyakūṭra and Mahāśarmman of Gārggā-kūṭra.

The record contains two dates viz. year 38, Vaiśākha śu. 13 and the year 77, Māgha baddi 3. It seems that the gift was made on the first date by the order of the ruler himself (sea-mukhājan) while it was re-described and engraved on the copper-sheet on the second date, also by the order of the same ruler (sea-mukha-vandādār) at the request of the assembly of the brāhmaṇas. The signature of Mahārāja Bhuulūḍa is found on the left-hand margin of the plate.

The present grant of Mahārāja Bhulūḍa belongs to the same category as the two grants of Śvāmīḍāsa and Bhuulūḍa mentioned above who are also described as Mahārāja and parama-bhaṭṭāraka-pādāvuddhyātā. These two latter grants were also found, like the present charter, at Indore, by D. R. Bhandarkar in the possession of Pandit Vaman Sastri Isalmurkar and were edited by R. C. Majumdar in the pages of this journal.1 The grant of Śvāmīḍāsa is dated in the year 67 while that of Bhuulūḍa bears the date in the year 107. R. C. Majumdar referred these dates to the Gupta era of 319-20 A. D. But this view was questioned by V. V. Mirashi on the ground that these two grants, though found at Indore, did not belong to that area but to Khandesh in Maharashatra, since they bear close resemblance to another copper-plate grant found at Sirpur in West Khandesh. The Sirpur plate, which is fragmentary, registers the grant of Mahārāja Rudradāsa, who, like Śvāmīḍāsa and Bhuulūḍa, describes himself as parama-bhaṭṭāraka-pādāvuddhyātā. It is dated in the year 117 of an unspecified era. Mirashi argued that since Rudradāsa belongs to the same dynasty to which the other two rulers viz. Śvāmīḍāsa and Bhuulūḍa belong and since the Sirpur plate was found in West Khandesh, the other two plates were also originally found in Khandesh only and then taken to Indore. He further referred the dates of all these three grants to the Kalachurī-Chēḍi era of 248-49 A. D. and suggested that these rulers were probably the feudatories of the Abhira Emperors who held sway over the Khandesha region during this period.2 In this connection, we may notice two copper-plate grants of Mahārāja Subandhu, both issued from Mīlīshmatī, one of which was found in Barwani area (to the south-west of Indore) and the other in one of the famous Bagh caves.3 In respect of character, phraseology and the royal signatures, these two grants bear close resemblance to the three grants referred to above viz. the two plates found at Indore long ago and the Sirpur plate. Of course, they also bear affinity to the charter under study. But the two grants of Mahārāja Subandhu do not describe the ruler as parama-bhaṭṭāraka-pādāvuddhyātā unlike all the remaining grants of this type. While the date of the Bagh cave plate is lost, that of the Barwani plate is 167 of an unspecified era, which was referred to the Gupta era by R. R. Halder who first edited the plate and to the Kalachurī-Chēḍi era by V. V. Mirashi.4

D. C. Srirch, however, does not agree with V. V. Mirashi in referring the dates of these grants to the Kalachurī-Chēḍi era. According to him, the title parama-bhaṭṭāraka was popularised by the Guptas while the feudatories and the subordinate allies of the early Gupta emperors enjoyed the title Mahārāja.5 Moreover, the Kalachurī became powerful and occupied northern Mahārāṣṭra, Gujarāt and parts of Mālwa in the second half of the 6th century A. D.6 Therefore, the dates of the grants under question should be referred to the Gupta era only.7

---

1 Above, Vol. XV, pp. 236 ff. and plates.
4 Above, Vol. XIX, pp. 261 ff. and plate (Barwani plate); CII., Vol. IV, Pt. I, pp. 17—21, Nos. 6 and 7 (Barwani plate and Bagh Caves plate).
5 Ibid.
6 IHQ., Vol. XXII, pp. 64 65.
7 The Classical Age, p. 194.
Now, as already mentioned, the plate under study was found at Indore only and the grant was issued from Valkha. It also registers the gift of a house-site on the other bank of the river Narmadā and situated in Dāsilakapalli-rāṣṭra. Dāsilakapalli is also mentioned in the Bagh Cave plate of Subandhu and is identified with modern Deswalia which lies about 14 miles to the south of the Bagh Caves. It is, therefore, certain that Mahārāja Bhulundā was ruling over this area which included the Bagh Caves. The expression Valkha in the grant refers to modern Bagh only. This Valkha is mentioned in the two grants of Svāmīdāsa and Bhulundā previously found at Indore by D. R. Bhandarkar. In view of the discovery of the present grant of Mahārāja Bhulundā, there can be no doubt that the other two grants also belonged to the Indore region only and not to the Khandesh area as suggested by V. V. Mirashi. And, in the Sirpur plate of Rudradāsa of the year 117, the first two letters at the beginning of the grant are lost since the plate is broken here. But the visarga mark is seen in the plate and the initial akshara have been restored as Valkha only. Hence Svāmīdāsa, Bhulundā and Rudradāsa seem to belong to one and the same family and held sway over the Bagh region and issued their grants from Valkha i.e. Bagh. It is likely that this Sirpur plate travelled to Khandesh from where it was found instead of the other two grants travelling from Khandesh to Indore.

We thus get four sets of copper-plate grants of this area including the present one, three of which are found at Indore and one at Sirpur. The rulers mentioned in them are Svāmīdāsa (year 67), Bhulundā (years 38 and 77 of the present grant and year 107 of the other Indore grant) and Rudradāsa (year 117). Now the question arises whether Mahārāja Bhulundā of the present plate is the same as his namesake of the other Indore plate. If they are identical, then we have to assume that he had a long reign of 69 years which appears to be unlikely. Therefore it seems that there were two Bhulundās, one mentioned in the present plate who may be called Bhulundā I (years 38 and 77) who had a reign of about 40 years while the one mentioned in the other plate from Indore may be called Bhulundā II (year 107). The relationship between these two is not known. In fact all these four rulers stand by themselves without disclosing their relationship with each other or with Mahārāja Subandhu who ruled from Māhishmati-nāgara, identified with Māheshwar or Orkkār Māndhātā on the bank of the Narmadā in the Nemar District of Madhya Pradesh, in the year 167 of an unspecified era. If, as suggested by R. C. Majumdar and D. C. Sircar, the dates of these grants are referred to the Gupta era of 319 A. D., the date of the present grant, viz. 77, would be 396 A. D. which would fall during the reign of the imperial Gupta king Chandragupta II (376-414 A. D.). It may be noticed that the present grant mentions that the king made the gift mentioned therein in the year 38 which has to be referred to the Gupta era only in which case its equivalent would be 367 A. D. This date falls during the reign of Samudragupta (345-75 A. D.).

As already pointed out, it is stated that the gift which was made by Bhulundā I on the earlier date was re-described (ana-caryāmita) and engraved on the copper-plate, at the request of the assembly of the brahmansas, on the second date, after a period of 39 years. This may suggest that the earlier gift was cancelled by somebody and had to be revived by the same ruler Bhulundā I later on. Would this suggest that this ruler was temporarily replaced on the throne by some other ruler between the years 38 and 77, the dates mentioned in the grant? In this connection, attention may be drawn to the grant of Svāmīdāsa, which is also issued from Valkha and which is dated in the year 67 which falls between the two dates mentioned in the grant of Bhulundā I. It is, therefore, tempting to suggest that Svāmīdāsa, who might have been a brother or a member of the collateral line of Bhulundā I, occupied Bhulundā's throne for sometime during the latter's rule, though it is not possible to say how long in the present state of our knowledge. This might have happened after the end of the reign of the imperial Gupta king Samudragupta and at the

---

1 It may be suggested that Bhulundā II might have been the grandson of Bhulundā I, following the Hindu practice of naming the grandson after his grandfather.
commencement of the reign of Chandragupta II. We have now established the historicity of Rāmāgupta, the elder brother of Chandragupta II whose short rule seems to have ended in disaster. And during this confused state of affairs, the feudatories or subordinate allies seem to have tried to take advantage of the situation by partially acknowledging the suzerainty of the imperial Guptas. It is also possible that Svāmidāsa might have usurped the kingdom of Bhūlūṇḍa I during this period. But Bhūlūṇḍa seems to have re-established himself on the throne and re-issued the grant. We do not know who was the ruler between Bhūlūṇḍa I and Bhūlūṇḍa II but the latter seems to have been succeeded by Rudradāsa for whom we have the date 117 i. e. 10 years later than the date of Bhūlūṇḍa II. And Mahārāja Subandhu, who does not acknowledge the suzerainty of any imperial ruler, seems to have declared himself practically independent in the year 167, the date of his Barwani plate which falls in the year 486 A. D. i.e. during the reign of Buda-gupta. We must, however, await future discoveries for confirmation or otherwise of these events.

As regards the geographical localities, we have already suggested the identification of Dāsilakan-tīrśtre which comprised the area round modern Deswala, 14 miles to the south of Bāgh caves. It is stated that the house-site known as Rōhyavāhaka or Rōhyavāhakā is located, on the other bank of the Narmadā river, to the east of Īśvara-sēnānaka. This appears to be a place named after Īśvara-sēnānaka. The identification of Rohyavāhaka or Rohyavāhaka and Īśvara-sēnānaka is uncertain.

**TEXT**


3 Skanda-Kautāya-Tuṇḍika-Kauśika-Dāsilak-Vāsula-sarman-Kauśika-Durakka-Gāngga-Mahāsa-rma-purūgāmāḥ brāhmaṁ-

4 gānāṁ Nārmadāyāḥ para-kōlē Dāsilakapalli-rāśtrē Īśvara-sēnānakaśya pūrvvataḥ Karjūrikāyāḥ uttaratāḥ.

5 Rōhyavāhaka-ātī vijayājñānaṁ-akṣam kriṣṭā-āvasannīkāṁ grāma-dānam-ā-chandra-ārka-kālaṁ yam-anvaḥ-bhūjaṁ-uḍaṁ-

6 k-ātisarggīṁ-ānujāmīmaṁ [s] Īvamiṁ (mi) ādam-ēśāṁ brāhmaṁ-ādīm-āśāṁ kriṣṭā-ānujā-(jñāna-)m-ēdam-grānīm-udī (ahā).

7 [tē]na brāhmaṁ-dvānākṣya(kayakrama) bhūjaṁ-ādīmaṁ-samāvaye-tēhāḥ (u) sarvān-eva-āsamat-pakaha-tat-kulin-ārakṣiha-prēśa-

8 [nīka-bhāya-hohhrār-jījaṁ-vinirghgatakatpaaśadhaka-kraṇyā-ādibhū(bhēḥ)r-apy-anumāntayam-it (ti) pratiśāhādhavīpā na kārīyaḥ [s] [s]

9 sva-mukhā [jīna ] varhē 30 8 Vaiśākha śu 10 3 brāhmaṁ-parshada-vaijñāyād-āmī-cka (va) rūjnītāṁ tāmā-paṭṭaḥ oh cānīvēsītāṁ (tam) [s] [s]

10 sva-mukha-sandāndā(udē)śadā (dē) va varhē 77 Māgha badi 3 [s] [s]

11 Mahārāja Bhūlūṇḍaśya.

---

2 From the original and impressions.
3 Read Valkhā. It is interesting that the other grants issued from this place also read either Valkhā or Valkhāk only.
4 There is an unnecessary viṣaya mark after ma at the end.
5 Read vinirghgata-Praśa.
6 Read pratiśāhādhavīpā.
7 Read parshada vajñānaposaya ānī.
8 This line is engraved on the left-hand margin of the plate.
A NEW GRANT OF BHULUNDA, YEARS 38 AND 77

(From Photograph)
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(1 Plate)

D. C. SIRCAR, CALCUTTA

This inscribed copper plate was secured for the Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi in 1961, from a Hindu gentleman of Jagadishpur, a village under the Putia Police Station of the Rajshahi District, East Pakistan. It has been said that the plate was discovered under-ground fifteen feet below the surface of the earth by an ancestor of the gentleman while the former was digging the earth for the excavation of a ring-well. The account, however, may not be accurate. The plate was given to Shri Suchindranath Siddhanta, M.Sc., for decipherment and publication, and Siddhanta's paper on it in Bengali appeared in the Bāgūla Academy Patrikā, Dacca, Magh-Chaitra, B.S. 1370, pp. 36 ff., and Plates.

The news of the publication of the inscription reached me a few years back; unfortunately, the said issue of the Patrikā was not available in Calcutta. It was only in December, 1969, that Dr. S. C. Bhattacharya of the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, who had an opportunity, while he was in London, to prepare photographic copies of the pages of Siddhanta's paper together with the illustrations, was good enough to supply me with the material in his possession for study. I found out from an examination of the material that the transcript and translation of the inscription as published by Siddhanta contain many errors.

The rectangular plate measures 7⅝"×4⅛", there being a projection about the middle of the left end, which apparently bore the seal affixed to it, though it was not found with the plate. The lines of writing were engraved lengthwise, and there are 14 and 15 lines incised respectively on the obverse and reverse of the plate. The letters are between ⅝" and ⅞" in size. The plate weighs about 31½ tolas.

The preservation of the writing on the plate is unsatisfactory in a few places. Moreover, the inscribed text contains mistakes of omission and commission because the person responsible for its composition had poor knowledge of the Sanskrit language. The style of the record is similar to that of the copper-plate inscriptions found at Damodarpur, Baigrama, Paharpur, Nandapur and Kalkaikuri (Sultānpur); but none of these other epigraphs exhibits poverty of knowledge in Sanskrit to such a degree as the record under study. The above facts render the decipherment of the inscription somewhat difficult at places. It is therefore no wonder that Siddhanta has misread and misunderstood certain parts of the record.

As regards palaeography and orthography, the present inscription resembles the other epigraphs cited above. Of palaeographical interest is the fact that the record employs both the signs of b and e in writing b. As is well known, b soon came to be written

1 What was then East Pakistan is now Bangladesh.
(247)
only with the sign for v. Interesting from the orthographical point of view is the reduplication of the sibilant in bhaga-vatas–sahasra (line 10) and anambhasu (line 27) because the characteristic is rare in the records of Eastern India. The resemblance of the epigraph with other Bengal records, to which we have referred, is particularly close with the Kalaikuri-Sultanpur inscription. The reason is that these two records were issued from the same place within a few years' interval by the same executive officer (ayuktaka) and the board of administration (adhirakṣaṇa) of the same area. The present charter was issued in the Guptā year 128 (447 A.D.) while the date of the Kalaikuri-Sultanpur plate is Guptā year 120 (439 A.D.), i.e., the latter is only about eight years earlier than the former. Both the documents were issued from Pārśakauktaka belonging to (i.e. the headquarters of) the territorial and administrative unit called Śrīnagar-vīthi. The officer in charge of the vīthi (subdivision), who issued the record, was Ayuktaka Achyuta (called Achyutadāsa in the Kalaikuri-Sultanpur plate) described as meditating on (or favoured by) the feet of the bhīṣṭāra (i.e., lord) meaning the contemporary Gupta monarch Kumāragupta I (c. 415-55 A.D.).

Ayuktaka Achyuta and the adhirakṣaṇa, according to the first sentence in lines 1-3, issued the document from Pārśakauktaka in the Śrīnagar-vīthi as an address to the chief householder (probably agriculturists) including the Brāhmaṇas inhabiting Guimagandhika and Sāṅgohālika. The locality called Guimagandhika (lines 2, 2 and 10) is also mentioned in the Kalaikuri-Sultanpur plate under the form Guimagandhika, and it is interesting that the latter form is also used in the present epigraph in lines 4 and 19. Likewise, Sāṅgohālika is mentioned in the other inscription with this difference that it is Sāṅgohālika and in the singular in the present epigraph but Sāṅgohāli in the plural in the other, the plural number probably indicating that it was a group of villages.

The address of the Ayuktaka and the adhirakṣaṇa to the inhabitants of Guimagandhika (or Guimagandhikā) and Sāṅgohālika is of the following purport (lines 3-8): This should be known to you that the following three persons of Pundaravardhana, viz., the agriculturist householder Kahemuka, who is a resident of Mūlakavastukā, Bhōyila residing at Guimagandhika and Mahidāsa residing at the same place (Guimagandhika) have informed us beginning with our following selves—(1) Kumārādeva, (2) Gana, (3) Prājāpati, (4) Yēṣṭhādāman, (5) Yasōvīśhu, (6) Umayāsā, (7) Hariśarmā, (8) Sarpapāḷita, (9) Hiraṇyagupta, (10) Kumārayasāh, (11) Kumārabhaṭī, (12) Śivakunḍa, (13) Śiva, (14) a second Śiva, (15) Śūnavishnu, (16) Sātavishnu, (17) Kaṅkuṭi, (18) Nandadāman, (19) Viranāga, (20) Nāryāṇadāsa, (21) Ātruda, (22) Bhava, (23) Gana, (24) Achyuta, (25) Kuvēra, (26) Śūnaviśtya, (27) Bhavanāga, (28) Śrīdatta, (29) Bhavadhata, (30) Dhavanāṣṭa, (31) Guṇarathe and (32) Narādeva. Nos. 1-4 of this list of members of the adhirakṣaṇa are called Viśhi-mahattaras or members of the viṇī council, the rest being called kutumbins or agriculturist house-holder. Of these 32 names, many are also found in the Kalaikuri-Sultanpur plate which offers a bigger list of the Viśhi-mahattaras. The Viśhi-mahattara Umayaśās of that record of 439 A.D. is called a mere kutumbin in the present document of 447 A.D. probably because he failed to be elected to the board of elders. It may be noticed that the Kalaikuri-Sultanpur plate records a grant of land situated in Hastisāra-vibhittaki, Guimagandhika, Dhānya-paṭalikā and the village group of Sāṅgohāli, while the land granted by the present epigraph was situated in Guimagandhika (or Guimagandhikā) and Sāṅgohālika.

The representation of Kahemuka, Bhōyila and Mahidāsa contained the following (lines 8-14): We are desirous of purchasing one kutya-vipa of upaṇikara fallow land for dedicating it as an
akṣhayā-nīcī in favour of (1) the vihāra (monastery) built on the border for ‘the worshipful Arhat’s’ at the sidhāyatana at Māchikāmara in the southern part of the vihā, (2) the vihārikā (small vihāra) built for the worship of ‘the Arhat’s’ at Gulmagandhika, and (3) the temple built for the lord Sahasraraśmi (the Sun-god) at Gulmagandhika, the purpose being the making of provision for bali (offerings to creatures), āharu (offerings to the manes) and satra (reception of guests) and of repairs to the establishments. Since the sale of one kulavaṇa of the above type of land at two dinaras is prevalent in your vihā, you may please accept two dinaras from us and let us have one kulavaṇa of land. By the expression ‘Arhat’s’, used in the record in the plural, the Buddha appears to be indicated, the plural number indicating gauras (venerableness). The expression apratikara is often explained as ‘without the right of alienation’, ‘without yield of revenue’; but it may really mean ‘land for which no compensatory allowances are required to be paid by the Government’.1

On receipt of the representation from the three persons, the record-keepers (pustapīla), Sīhna-nandin and Yaśdāman, reported that the sale of the above type of land at the quoted price was prevalent in the vihā and that the proposal was in order; then Bhima, the Kulika (representative of the artisan class on the board of administration), collected two dinaras from the applicants and one kulavaṇa of land was made over to the three persons. Of the said land, six drōgasāpas (I.e. 3 1/2 kulavaṇa) purchased by all the three persons were entrusted to Balakūpa, described as the Śravasakāśagāra, i.e. Buddhist religious teacher (lines 14-18). The area must have been granted in favour of the two Buddhist establishments of which the said monk was apparently in charge. The remaining two drōgasāpas (1 1/4 kulavaṇa) of land were purchased by Bhāyila and given in favour of Sāṃbapura which seems to be the name of the religious establishment in which the Sun-god was installed and worshipped, probably so named because Sāṃba, the most celebrated devotee of the Sun-god, was also worshipped in the shrine. In lines 19 ff., it is stated that out of these two drōgasāpas of land, one plot measuring one drōgasāpa lay near the temple (i.e. the Sun temple) and was utilised for making a flower-garden for the shrine and for creating its talaśṭhā, ‘adjoining land’ i.e., land granted in favour of a temple at the time of its foundation for its maintenance. The Sun temple at Gulmagandhika seems to have been founded by Bhāyila who was an inhabitant of the said village. The prevalence of the worship of Sun-god in Bengal in the age of the Gupta is an interesting information supplied by the inscription. The earliest Sūrya images discovered in Bengal, assigned to the pre-Gupta age, come from Kumarpur and Niyamatpur in the Rajshahi District which has also yielded the copper-plate under study.2 Of greater interest seems to be the fact that Bhāyila was probably devoted to both the Buddha and the Sun-god.

A sentence in lines 19-20 states that, out of the one kulavaṇa (i.e. 8 drōgasāpas) of gift land, an area of seven drōgasāpas was situated in the north-eastern part of Gulmagandhika and one in the vicinity of the temple (i.e. the Sun-temple). The boundaries of the gift land, described in lines 20 ff., were (1) the kandara of a tank in the east; (2) the dēv-kandara of the tank of Dhanavishṇu (probably the kujumbhī of the same name mentioned in the list of the members of the adhikarana) in the south; (3) Nābhaka’s property in the west; and some kunda or pond in the north. The word kandara means ‘a cavity’ probably for enshrining a deity, so that kandara and dēv-kandara would mean the same thing. Lines 22-24 contain a prayer to the effect that the vyavahārins or administrators like the Vishaya-patis (governors of districts), Ayukta-kas, Kujumbīna or Adhikarana (members of the board of administration) of any time should be good enough to protect the permanent endowment (akṣhayā-nīcī) created by the document. This is followed in lines 24-28, by four of the usual imprecatory and benedictory stanzas, as uttered by Vyāsa.

---
The date, viz. the 20th day of the month of Chaitra in the year 128 apparently of the Gupta era, is quoted in line 28. The concluding part of the record in lines 28-29 states that the document was written by Rudradāsa and that the plate was heated (no doubt for the purpose of affixing a seal) by a person whose name may be Susiūha. Rudradāsa either composed the document or wrote the letters on the plate for facilitating the work of engraving.

Of the geographical names mentioned in the record, Pundravardhana was the name of a city situated at the site of modern Mahāsthān in the Bogra District (Bangladesh) as well as of the province covering North Bengal, of which the headquarters were at the city in question. The name of Śṛṅgavēra can be traced in that of the present Singra Police Station in the Natore Sub-Division of the Rajahahi District, Bangladesh. The other places cannot be definitely located.

TEXT

First Side

1 Svasti [∗] Śṛṅgavēra-vaitheya-Pūrṇakauśikāyāh bhāṭāraka-pāḍ-ānuddhyyataḥ āyuktak-Āchyuṭo-

2 dhikaraṇaḥ-cha Gulmagandhikā Sa[∗]iggōhālikā [cha∗] Vṛā(Brā)hmaṇ-ādīn= pradhānā-kuṭum[i]-nāḥ kuśala-

3 mūḍāsya bōdhayanti [∗] viditambō (taṇ vowed=yathā Pundravardhanē ya(yē) Mūlakavastukā-vāstavya-kun[∗]

4 mbi-Kahēmāka[∗] Gulmagandhikā-vāstavya-Bhūyālaḥ tattva-vāstavya-Mahādāśā-

viha vīthi-maha[tā]-

5 ra-Kumāradēvā-Gaṅgā-Prajāpati-Jē(Jyē)ṣṭhadāmā(ḥa)-kuṭumbi-Yaśovishṇu-ṣe Umayāsa(ṣ)–Hariṣa[fmmma]-

6 Sarp[papālita-Hiraṇyagupta-Kumārayaṣṭi[∗]-Kumārabhūti-Sivakundā-Sivāpa-Siva-

Somav [ṣṇu]-

7 Satyavishṇu-Kaṁkuṭi-Nandadāma-Viranāga-Nārayaṇa[∗]-dāsa-Rudra-Bhava-Guha-Āchūta-Ku-

vāra-Survanāga-[Bhava]-

8 nāgā-Śṛīdatta-Bhavadatta-Dhanavishṇu-Guṇaratha-Naradēva-purūgāḥ vayaḥ-cha vijnā-

pitāḥ [∗] ichchā[āhma] da[śkhi]-

1 From photographic copies of the illustrations appearing with Siddhanta’s paper in the Bāṅgāla Academy Pātriḵ. The minor errors in Siddhanta’s transcript have not been noticed here.
2 Siddhanta: ‘dāsa-raśikāhā.
3 The plural number seems to be due to the fact that the adhikaraṇa consisted of many members. See Sircar, Qā. Is., Vol. I, 1905, p. 352, note 4.
4 Siddhanta reads Pundravardhanāya and regards Kahēmāka as an epithet of Bhūyāla in the sense of Śāiva.
5 Read ‘dāsa-raśikā. Siddhanta: ‘dāsa-ibh. The author of the record thought of the dual number probably because Bhūyāla and Mahādāsa were residents of the same place while Kahēmāka was the inhabitant of a different locality.
6 Sidāha has not been observed here.
7 Read Nārāyaṇa. The letter ra (for ra) was originally omitted and is incised at a lower level.
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9 5-a[A]saka1 vi-th[y]a Mechikāmra-siddh-ayatanē bhagavatāmna(m=a)ra[tā]nāk(ā-hekā)2
   rītika-vih[ā]rē Gulmagandhiē ch-ārhatāṃ [pū][j-ā]1

10 rūthān kārito[ka2-vihārika(kāyān)[a] tae-aiva Gulmagandhiē bhagavata-sahārraśmēh
   kārito-dēvakulē cha va(ha-li)charu-sa[ttra*]-

   (gō)ya śāvat-kāl-ōpahūgy-ākshaya-[nr]-

12 vyām-a4-pratikara-khila-kṣēṭrasaṣa kulyavāpam-ekān krūvā dātuṁ(tum[)] yushmākañ-
   cha viṭhyam-anuvṛtta[l*] dvi-dināriki-ā pratikara[r-]-

13 khila-kṣēṭrasaṣa kulyavāpa-vikraya[ḥ[*] ] tad-arhat-āsūbhir-hastād5-dināra-dvayam
   grīhitvā kṣēṭrasaṣa kulyavāpam-ē[kad]1

14 dāṅ[da]tum-itī [*] yatō[ta] ēta-vijāṇyāya-am[u]*[ja][bhya*] pustapāla-Sīhha(Sīhha*-
   -nandī-Yaśōdāmayor-[avadh[a*]raūyā-ā-

Second Side

15 śty-af[yam-a]samad-viṭhy-anuvṛtta[l*] dvi-dināriki-ā[pra]tikara4-khila-kṣēṭrasaṣa kulyavāpa-
   vikrayas-tad-dīyaṭān[a-

16 vinōdān kāchid-īty-avasthāpya Kahēmāka-Bhūyāla-Mahi[hi]dāsayor-ha[ha]*stāt-Kulika-
   Bhūmān-ōpasangrihitakā-dināra-

17 dvayam-ēta*[krūvā Khaṃmāka-Bhūyāla-Mahīdāsayō(sanānā) shād-ḍrōṇavāpāḥ śrava-
   (ma)gāk-āchārya10-balakund[asaya samā-

18 vi(vē)śatāḥ [*] Bhūyālen-āpi Sāṃbaparasya-āṛṭha(ṛthē) ḍrōṇavāpa-dvayam tatra
   [cha dē]vatakula14-samē[pi pushpavāṭikā-talavā-*

19 ṭaka-śmitta(tta)ān-cha ḍrōṇavāpam-ekān kārītam12-īty-ēta[*] khaṭrām Gulmagan-
   dhikāyā[ṛ]m* pūrvvottattāra[rānyā(rasyānā) diśi sapta-ḍrōṇav-

20 [pāh] ṛddidāvākula-samē[pi cha ḍrōṇavāpam-ekān-na likhyamatra18 sīmā pūrvvēṇa pushki-
   (elka)riṇyā[l*] kandra-simā cha dakhinē-

1 Read *u-ākāśā. Siddhanta: *ūdān aha.
2 The reading seems to be kāritoī. [Patil. — Ed.]
3 The word is sometimes found in the Sanskrit form āphutka.
4 Better read “niṣpat a”
5 Better read “reiṭa-prati[kara.”
6 Read *āṃkāhastād.
7 Read *dānuś.
8 Read “dānusāh ha.”
9 Better read “dāyanē laḥāram-lāt.”
10 Siddhanta: Ānīcakkā āchāryā.
11 Read dēśakula. Siddhanta: tattvaś[hi]khatika[la].
12 Read kriya. Siddhanta: kāriṇihāṣīṣa.
13 This ta is redundant, Siddhanta: pūrvottattārāḥ prā
dēś.
15 Read likhyate[=]aka.
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21 na Dhanavishṇu-pushti(cheka)rinī dāvā-kandara-sūmā cha paśchimēn-āpi Nābhraka-sataka- 
sūmā uttarēn-āpi mā ..... ta-ku

22 ṇda-sūmā ity-ēt[ach*]-chatana-sūmā-nyamita-kṣētraṁ samu[pa*]sthitarī(ram)| kālaṁ-yē=py= 
anyē viṣaya-patayayaḥ ayu-

23 kta[k](h*) kutumbinī-dhikaraṇikā vā samvya(sam vya)vahāriṇī bhavishyanti [ta[i]- 
r-āpi bhūmi-dāna-phalam=a[vē]-

24 kṣhay-ākṣhaya-nivy-ānu'pālaṇīya [[*] ukta[ṅ]-cha bhagavatā Vyāsēna [[*] Sva-[da*]- 
tāṁ(tāṁ) para-dātāṁ(tāṁ) vā yō harēta vasundha-

25 rāṁ(rāṁ) sa viṣabhāya[ūn*] krimir-bhūtvā pītṛbhis-saha pachyate [[*] Šaśṭiṁ v 
varsha-sahasrāṇi svargge vasati bhūmi-

26 daḥ [[*] ākṣheptā ch-anumantā cha tāṇy-e[va] na[ra*]kē vasēt [[*] Iyam rāja- 
śatarī-dāttvā(ḥ)[a] rddi(di)ya[ṭē*] cha [p]unah punah[[*] yaśya]

27 yasya yada(dā) bhūmi[s*]-tasya tasya tadda phalāṁ(lam ||) Vindhya-śaśṭa[hy]-anambhassu 
sūkṣa-kōṭara-vāsinaḥ [[*] krishnāha-

28 yō-bhijāyantī[ntē] bhūmi-dāyā[ūn*] haranti [yē] [[*] di(i)ti [[*] Sarh 100 20 8 Chaittra-dī 
20 likhitam Rudradā[śena] tāpi-

29 [ta]ṁś[ű]ṣuṁhas mī ti[*] [[*]
NO. 43—PANHALE COPPER-PLATES OF SILAHARA APARADITYA I
AND VIKRAMADITYA, SAKA 1061

(I Plate)

BY SHOBHANA GOKHALE, POONA

The Marathi Daily Tarun Bhārata, Poona, dated the 16th August 1969, published the news of the discovery of a set of copper-plates, which were in the possession of Shri Keshava Pandurang Jadhav of Panhale, Taluk Dapoli, District Ratnagiri. Shri Jadhav handed over the plates to Shri Annasaheb Shirgaonkar, Upasabhapati, Dapoli Taluka Panchayat Samiti. The latter kindly brought the plates to my notice. The Director of Archaeology and Archives of Maharashtra State kindly gave me permission to examine the plates and study them. My thanks are due to the Director of Archaeology and Archives, Maharashtra State, to Shri Jadhav and to Shri Shirgaonkar.

The set consists of three copper plates of which the first and the third bear writing on one side only and the second on both the sides. The engraving is fairly bold and deep. The plates measure 29.50 cm in length and 19.50 cm in height and 0.5 cm in thickness. Their rims are slightly raised. On the top of each plate, at the centre, a square of four cm is left blank for the holes. A ring of 9 cm in diameter passing through the holes holds the plates together. The ends of the ring are soldered under a circular seal about 5 cm in diameter and it bears in high relief the representation of Gauḍa with a body of a man sitting and facing full-front with his hands clasped on the breast. There is no legend on the seal. The writing is throughout in an excellent state of preservation. The total weight of the plates is 6.25 kg.

The inscription contains 94 lines of writing of which twenty-five are written on the inner side of the first plate, twenty-six and twenty-two respectively on the first and second side of the second plate, and the remaining twenty-one lines on the inner side of the third plate.

The characters are Nāgari and closely resemble those of the Śilāhāra copper-plates of the 10th and 11th century A.D. The draft of the record contains some errors which are corrected while giving the text below. Punctuation is indicated by single or double bars.

The language of the record is Sanskrit and the text is written in prose and verse. In point of orthography and style also the inscription resembles the contemporary Śilāhāra records. It may be pointed out that the vowel ṛ in has been used for ṛ. The consonant following ṛ is often doubled. Sometimes there is no discrimination in the use of v and ṛ. In some cases there is no difference between the letter t and n.

The date of the charter is quoted in lines 63-64 as Saka 1061 expired, Siddhārtha, Aśvayuja Śuddha 15, Monday, both in words and figures. These details are regular and correspond to the 9th October, 1139 A.D. ¹

The inscription begins with Ṛta, followed by two verses in adoration of the gods Gaṇapati and Śiva. Then begins the mythical genealogy of the Śilāhāras claiming descent from Jimūtabhā, son of Jimūtabhā, mentioned as the founder of the family. Line 4 mentions the name

¹ The other details of the date given in the record are the total eclipse (of the moon) and Chūdāmaṇi. On the 9th October 1139, there was actually a total lunar eclipse and as the eclipse fell on a Monday, it was known as Chūdāmaṇi.—ED.}
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(253)
of the family as Śīhāra. Lines 4-37 present the historical pedigree of the family, starting from Kapardin (I) down to Aparāditya I, the issuer of the charter. This position is exactly the same as that found in the Vajjavati plates, also of Aparāditya I. The person Chhittuka, described as Aparāditya's enemy (line 39) in our plates figures also in that capacity in the said plates and he was no other than the Kadamba ruler Jayashrī II, as Chhittuka was the well-known Kadamba title, as observed by the late Dr. Pathak.3

Lines 43-44 speak of the Mahāvīra Kaitamā-thakcura, Mahāpradhāna Śaṅkramadārāha, who was bearing the burden of the administration of Prāṇālaka-vaśya, and Mahāpradhāna Lakṣaṁaprabhau. The name of Mahāpradhāna Lakşmanaprabhau occurs in the Chanja inscription4 and the Śomānāha inscription, dated Śaka 1060 and Vikrama 1176 respectively. In the present inscription some space has been left blank to be filled by the names of the officers Mahāsīndhuvirakha and Śīkaraṇa. From the Chanja inscription of Śaka 1060, it seems that the posts of Śaṅkramadārāha and Śīkaraṇa were not filled in that year also. This is clear from the fact that instead of giving the actual names of the respective officers, the word amana "so and so" has been used in that record after the above designations.5 So it seems that both the above posts had remained vacant for at least two years. It might be either due to internal political disturbances or due to the non-availability of suitable persons. From the Vajjavati plates it seems that the post of the Mahāpradhāna was occupied by Lakṣmanaprabhau for a long period and from the inscription of Mallīkāriņa it appears that he was succeeded by his son Amanta.

Lines 62-79 describe the object of the record which was the grant of a village made by Aparāditya and his son Vikramāditya. It is stated that on the occasion of the lunar eclipse, after bathing in the creek of the Western sea (i.e., the Arabian sea) at the Marut-kṣetrā and after worshipping Śiva in the form of Manadīvara, the king Aparāditya donated the village Khaṇḍāti in the Parālaka-viśhyā to Vīdyaśāhana-vaśya who was the son of Śomāpāja Rāva-dvīvādi-baṭṭopādhyāya and the grandson of Vidyādha-baṭṭopādhyāya. The donors belonged to the Bhāratīya gōra and Tattiriya Śākha and hailed from Āraṇā. The king Aparāditya is stated to have donated the village for the welfare of the prince Vikramāditya. The same village was granted to the same donors by Vikramāditya for the welfare of his parents and of his own.6 Lines 83-90 contain the usual benedictive and imperatory passages and line 91 contains the sanction of Vikramāditya to the grant.

Thus the present inscription is a joint donation of Aparāditya I and his son Vikramāditya.7 It suggests that the crown prince Vikramāditya probably was in charge of the Prāṇālaka-viśhyā. The charter is stated to have been written with the consent of the Śaṅkramadārāhā by one Lakṣmanādhara Paṇḍita, the son of Nāgavāmi Paṇḍita. The importance of the inscription lies in the fact that it introduces Aparāditya's son prince Vikramāditya who has been so far unknown to the students of the history of the Śīlāhāras of North Konkan. It also mentions the administrative unit Prāṇālaka-viśhyā for the first time thereby indicating the southward expansion of the Śīlāhāra dominion during the reign of Aparāditya I.

---

1 JBBRAS, Vol. XXI, pp. 505 ff.
2 Ibid., p. 506.
3 Above, Vol. XXIII, p. 270.
5 Above, Vol. XXIII, p. 271.—Ed.
6 Tulpule S. G., Prakriti Mañcākhi Konkan Lekha, p. 53.
7 In fact the king Aparāditya caused the grant to be made (of dēpāśk in line 72) through his son who actually gave the grant (cf. datēk in line 73).—Ed.
8 [See note above.—Ed.]
9 [In fact, the last or the 39th verse in the introductory portion of the record describes Vikramāditya, the son of Aparāditya, as a ruler of Prāṇālaka-vaśya.—Ed.]
The discovery of the present copper-plates raises the following question: From the record, it would appear that Vikramaditya was a legitimate heir to the throne. So far, Harapaladēva is considered as the successor of Aparāditya I. Why could Vikramaditya not ascend the throne? The answer is that either he must have predeceased his father or Harapaladēva might have usurped the throne. The problem would be solved if we get further evidence. The king Aparāditya might have died before the execution of the present grant. Otherwise there was no need to ask his son Vikramaditya to execute it. Secondly, after the death of king Aparāditya there might have been a partition of the Śilāhāra kingdom. The northern portion of the Thana and Kolaba districts was occupied by Harapaladēva and the southern portion of the Ratnagiri district was ruled by Vikramaditya with his capital at prapāla. The discovery of the present plate makes it clear that Harapaladēva was the elder son of Aparāditya I.

Of the geographical names occurring in the present record, Prapālaka-vishaya is evidently the region around the village Panhāla, where the present copper-plates have been found. Khairadi, the donated village, is 8 miles to the north of Panhāla. Of the villages mentioned as boundaries of the gift-village, Karajapi is 1.5 miles to the south of Khairadi. Ushikho, the northern boundary, is 1 mile from Khairadi, where there are some ancient remains. Hāują is 2 miles to the south of Khairadi. Marut-khēśa is the modern Murud. At Murud there is a creek of Arabian sea, which is mentioned in the inscription as Marut-khēśaṇaṇaartyaṇu. There is an ancient śiva temple and it is called Tamasatirtha. All places may be located in the survey map sheet No. 47, G. 1-5 and 2-6.

The name Prapālaka-dēsa occurs in the Marāḷi inscription of the Śilāhāra king Mallikājuna found at Chiplaṇa in Ratnagiri District and dated Saka 1078. The record mentions the appointment of Sūpayā as Daṇḍāśripati of Prapālaka-dēsa. M.G. Dikshit identified Prapālaka-dēsa with Panhāla near Kolhapur. Taipur refuted his view on the basis that the king Mallikājuna of North Kōkār branch had no business to appoint his officer in the kingdom of Vījayanātika of the Kolhapur branch. So he identified Prapālaka with modern Panvel in the Kolhapur district. The discovery of the present copper-plates solves the question of this identification in as much as the Prapālaka-dēsa was the same as the Prapālaka-vishaya of the present inscription which, as shown above, is modern Panhāla. So far as the name Marut-khēśa is concerned it may throw important light on the existing religious practices of the Prapālaka-vishaya near Tamasatirtha and Murud which is ancient Murud-khēśa. There are fishermen quarters here and the deity, Marut, which is locally known as Varebhā, is worshipped there even today.

TEXT

Metres: Verses 1, 2, 11, 12, 18, 32-39, 41-43, 46 and 47 Anuṣṭubha; verses 3-5, 14, 17, 21, 22 and 28 Vasantaśālā; verse 6 Prithēi; verses 7, 8, 10, 15, 19 and 23-29 Sāradavaśādiṣṭa; verse 9 Sruṣṭikara; verse 13 Gīt; verses 16, 40 and 44 Indra-vijā; verse 20 Mūlī; verses 30 and 45 Sālīś; verse 31 Vaiśāsīka.

First Plate

1 Adds (1st) text not very clear: I have translated in [context]. S. W. Paria. Paria (2nd) (report) and the authenticity of the discovery. I am so thankful to Dr. V. V. Mirashi for this suggestion. [But that is nothing to show that Vikramaditya was the eldest son of his father and therefore had a full claim to the latter's throne.—Ed.]

2 Tu-pulga, S. G., op. cit.

3 From photographs.
2 सुमेद्रविशृङ्खलनविन्दुर्भ्रायति कलोपमा। ॥२॥
3 कलयन्तराय रो रक्षति सा सुविशृङ्खलां श्रवणुर्वीर्मायुः। ॥३॥
4 ठः। श्रीसाहसांक इव साहित्यः श्रवणेऽवशिष्ट्वद्वृत्तिः नृपतिभुवेऽवल। ॥४॥
5 गुहाजितराजनीति। ॥५॥ निग्रहल संगमुवेंद्रसि
6 रिवारोपिकरणाः कपालः। ॥६॥
7 भविभृृतप(क)पात्र पदितः कंकालेर्वम्भावतः श्रीपति
8 लूणकदत्ता हमास्तवः येन विनायकविविधिनिश्चितमदेविश्चितम्यादिः। ॥८॥
9 च्यः श्रीजाज्ञाजो दिवसकः इव व्यस्तरिष्टिः कथडयुक्ताविक कीर्तिनिश्चितसापाना। ॥९॥
10 व वस्त्रेण प्रतिपुरुषविवाचनादिः श्रीमानः तृष्णा दृष्ट्रव्य-।
11 निर्गुराः| हराजीतपश्चात्साृति। ॥११॥
12 अवरुपोग्निरावरोपिकिरृति। ॥१२॥
13 जयवरीः स्वनेत्रवशिष्टिः रतिः चक्रवरीरित। ॥१३॥

1 This Punctuation mark is unnecessary.
2 Read शांकुवर्मांवकारी.
3 [Reading is श्रीवनमः। —Ed.]
4 Read बाबासाहिबः
5 Read शांकुवर्मांवकारी
From Photographs
14 श्रीमति यथावत सात्सुन्दरी। कालदेशक यो हिंदू (चामु)। [१२११*] शरणागतसामान्य परिपुर्ण हूँ जगति

15 जंबिता येन। स ज्ञति यथावत शरणागतसामान्य परिपुर्ण यो हिंदू (चामु)। [१२११*] श्रीमान–

16 म्हूलवन वज्रदेवनाम भूलमस्तकमणिष्ठन–

17 यो नयनः। अवधारे यथा चर्तति जना: सामा (स्या) सता (सता) श्रीमानकन्तुकिलग्राहलता

18 तुष्काराया तत्ततिकसिन्धो जात: स–

19 तां सम्मतो दुर्लालुकलां (ला) चलबंदले वंभोलिलीलां दपतु। गला जीवाणु एक स्थायित्वी दूष्या च सोमवर तत्यात्रे पितु–

20 राजारा: जगदल्य ये कीलपिता गतः। [१२११*] तदनुजो वज्रदेवसूरू: श्रीविशेष–

21 रामनंदस्यमुखस्य [१२११*] लंबालकाविन् (निम) कुचुल्मतोपकंप्रभारालिकानि

22 तथातात्सर्नकाविन् वारस्त्रो च तत्रोजु:। चम्का कर्माणानुरुपे। श्रीपरमुच्चान्तः।

23 र्म (म्य) हिंदो निविचार रावणण्यस्गन्निनी होरकंकूलता। [१२११*] तदनु

24 तदनुजमा भूमितान्तिरकेल। [१२११*] ऋतुस्रविलिमोभूमिम्

25 शीलाराया नागावास्तेन तत्त्वो नयणकतव्यः। [१२११*] सूपोमवतत्ममश्रमविषुवजे: शीलाराया नागावास्तेन तत्त्वो नयणकतव्यः। [१२११*] निर्योगविरङ्गनीविषय विषय:

1 [Read अपरेदिप]
2 [The correction may not be necessary—Ed.]
3 [Reading is कीतिवचन्यविषय—Ed.]
26 धर्मण पालयति तथ नरेन्द्रज्ञे ||२२।१२।** श्रीनाराजजीविनरससुतनयो जिवता ततो भूतां स श्रीमानपरारक्षस्वःसुन्पः

27 ति पातु समायौभवतृ पुरुषंस्तिनु धिया विकसिन्त देवोभवमूवेदित्वृत्तिः शोधनो- दितयुक्तवत मुखगण्ये

28 चेत्तसन्तीशासरेण ||२३।१२।** श्रवणसंहरति विशिष्ट वितुमुचो शीघ्र य(स) समालयस्ते धरते धैयर्यार परे रणसतानचासे स पुरो धा

29 चतु ॥ (१) स्तोत्र व वहतु वा न देवतु तुर्सात्यो व षोडःशतकानोव्ययम तदरैश्यर्थाने न सत्तर्त किंयापि तथालये ॥२४।१२।** श्रासिकोनपथु

30 रो गुह्यपितुव चिन्तकानमोटकतत्सत्यव समस्तसे(म)व मिलिते सामात्सन सत्तः छात्रो धर्मयते गतेयु गुह्यक विलयेः

31 चिन्तकानये स्तोत्र जीतुभुखुर्यापिनमं नचेते व राष्ट्रोवरे ॥२५।१२।** एकशुभच- पुरुस्सर्वमस्तु मुज्जोफळां छ सब्जुंगच ल द्राक्षुप्रवा करे(तिनेय) रण

32 सर्वसंगा स (ति) संसूच संहिता (ति) । नो सोहू न पालविं पिकापि व श्रातं च तैन स्त्रुत संप्रम संहिता यस्य च विमया स्त्रेष्ठायय संचितः ॥२६।।

33 शतत संहित सुहुन्न गविज्ञवीर्णणम श्रमणः मक्तिेकळम्बिनिनित्तिः परिबंधाभपे जग्यगणताः। वेन द्वेषत्वक्लेन हृत निःहे ते

34 किंचिनिः (ट) पो ता युतिनिनित्ति प्रियपुनावमुहुस्तंगमीमसुः वीयातुनर् ॥२७।१२।** सो [५] य पुण्यमयः समुद्रतनामः वयस्वायायः सत्यायां प्रतिप

35 तिरंगममयः संबुधुशाशयः ॥५॥ संप्राप्याप्यमध्यवुष्टमयः कांतकांतप्रवस्तुं वेदव्य
विवेकसारायणिः स्फूज्ज्वतापोद

36 य: ॥२८।।** व: सत्यसामायार्यकमंचवां व दीर्घितः ॥५॥ विता येवः यें धूतत प्रजाः प्रतिविं यस्मै दद्यायायः। यस्मायाहृतस्वः

1 [The reading is रण(श)ःस्वल्कम्—Ed.]
2 Read किंचिनिः नामांशकः for the sake of meter.
3 [The reading is संहिताः—Ed.]
4 [The reading is द्राक्षुप्रवा—Ed.]
5 [After this there is space for two long syllables which are required for the metre—Ed.]
6 [The reading is यस्मायाहृतस्वः—Ed.]
37 लालिकवल्लसत्वक यस्मयेन यत्र श्री व सत्वकार व विषाण सत्वगच्छो लोकोतरा
[[१२६४*]] तत्त्वपथं तिकमात्वपेषेव स सत्व—
38 साक्ष्यार्ध सार्ध प्रणाले । तुच्छ्वार्यी रत्नाजाते यस्मादेकी जाते: कोषुम्य: श्रीशाहाय: हीनार
[[३२०*]] जन्य स्वतीयपुष्पोदः—
39 यात्तमसिन्त्रवंचसहा मुखार्द: श्रीविलाय[३*] वचनकति तपसुरुप[२*] मेलवर: श्रीललहरीर्देव: जनकीमूर्ति जातकन्ये प्रसूतः[८*]
40 सुश्रुषास्याभस्य: अभिमानमाहोहदिवर्षागाधं जपनज्ञप्रक्रिया बधावत्यायार्यपितामुद्विश्वम्
समुद्राधिक—
41 शिक्षार्थाधिकारिवंजयार्थादि समस्तराजाधीनस्वराजमानमहामहाकेशवादरानिलित्विषती श्रीमदरानेर्दिववेदे राज—
42 नि निजमलावः नागमिलावः नागमलसमुदयुगमुदसब्राहमात्वतीतामवित्तिसमलकंकाण्युक्ताम्
समुदायाती—
43 तथाकाव्यसङ्गकपसति महामानाय श्रीकादमत्तकुरे तथा प्रणालके
रायसराय समुद्रहः(४)—
44 नि महाप्राच्छ श्रीशंकररामको' तथा महाशंकिविशेषकारी' तथा श्रीकरणभाद्र(७) पारे
प्रथमस्यस्तादिभिस्म—
45 धान श्रीनिदिश्यिनान्न: दिति प्रसाधो श्रीसँगरदिशीकरिते स्नेहसंपत्ती' प्रवच—
माते स स महाम्—
46 लड़तयार्यितवः (पति) श्रीमदपरादित्येशराज: सर्वाप्रव स्वसंबधामानकान्यायाति
समागामिरजापनिद्विस्तृपुरे—
47 धितामाल्यावानायानियोगिकंस्तथा राष्ट्राधिक्याववतत्ताच (र) पति प्रामपतितिनिकृता
नियुक्तराजु—
48 यहजनंददेशस हुमामनगरप्रवति(४) ममुष्टीदेव प्रणालपुजासंकान्यासंसादेशेः संदिष्टः
वस्तु भ: संविविद—

¹ [The reading of the name is शकरनाथ—Ed.]
² After three horizontal strokes are indicated for the name of the officer to be filled later.
³ [The reading is काले—Ed.]
⁴ Read 'मंडलवर'
49 त यथा ॥ चला विभूति[१५] क्षमाग्नि योवनं कलात्मकता(ता) तरस्वति जीवित[१५] ॥
लघुप्रयोगार्थ परकोकालाने नूयामहो
50 विस्मयकारिति सेवित(तमु) [१३११५] तथा चोजकं महत्वता व्यासने(न) ॥ समागमः
सापऽगऽं सबवंसतिप भगुरं(रमु) ॥ कायः भौतिभिः—
51 पायः संपदः पदमपवातः [१३२१५] उच्चु वासाचरणः प्राणः [१५] स चोज्युवासः
समीरणः । समीरणाचलवानसः ॥ यज्ञोवितः
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52 तदन्तुः(तमु) [१३३१५] दान वितादता श्री[१५] कौतिष्ठ्वः तथापुपः [१५]
पराप्वर्यसः काम्यावशाक्तसारावर्यसः [१३४१५] अन्तःदानः
53 तु सब्यः भूमिदानांस्थिते । अज्ञाः हृदयाः भूमिः सच्चिकामाणस्यच्यूति [१३५१५]
भिन्नः स्वर्गारुपः शाश्वतीर्षः—
54 ते समाः । पुनः अन्तः संप्रायः भवेष्टृमित्वतः(तमु) [१३६१५] याक्षेतिश्चेष्टे
पापः पृथ्वीः नृतिकिंवतः । अर्पः गोचरामाहो(त्रे) —
55 न भूमिदानेन सूक्ष्मिति [१३७१५] आशोपयति पितरः प्रवल्लः पितामहः [१५]
भिन्नाति[१५]हेमकुले जातः सोऽस्मासायरायिः—
56 ति [१३८१५] तथा चांत्वर्यनराराशीप्राच्चर्याः योवनं स्वर्गवासाष्टकान्तसम—
मिदास्मागामिण्यंहुः कदः—
57 सीतावंस्याः समाः १ सहजःवार्षिकारःधारणयं धार्यर सवनलितकमलिनीवलगत—
जलवतरलत—
58 र वनायुः इति मल्या दुहतविनिरेक्तत् व (ः) ह(ः) ह(ः) संग्रेशत(ः) मानोः [१५]
तथा सापल विभ्या न तथा सापल तपः।
59 यथात्र सुनयः प्राहुःलिमकं कली युगः [१३६१५] अमनरपत्य प्रत्यः(मः) शुक्लः
भूमिः(भूः)समुत्तथा गावः [१५] लोकस्थय—
60 स्तनेन भवति दत्ता यः काँचनं गात्वं च महींच च देयतुः [१४०१५] सवनामेव दानाः[१५]
मेकालामारुगः कल्ल । हातकितिगी—
61 रीणा संतजनानुरूः फल(तमू) [१४१३५] इति धम्माङ्गविचारचुरुचिचिरंतनामनुन—
वनान्यवधाः सकताराज्यगुणः—
62 सनात्कुलवत्तवत्तवाकार श्रीविन्दुमादिमत्ववाच्यवेदेः महारामण्डलवाच्यपित श्रीमदपरामितः

[The intended reading seems to be समीरणाचलवानसि—Ed.]

[The intended word is शेषारि—Ed.]
63 देवेन शक्नुपकालातीतसंस्कृतासर्वत्र दस्रू एकसहस्त्राकोषण यत्नान्। 

64 सिद्धार्थसंवस्त्रारंगाङ्गालत्वात्युत्पत्ति[०]वदन्तिः सोमेन महासोमप्रवर्ण चुंबायण गवङ्गे 

65 वात्वनि निपन्नमुद्रः शास्त्रास सोमाय सुगंधिकुमुद्मलायम्य सदा सकल-

66 श्वसुमार्गाति कुंकुमम् तदसुरभिमुद्रसर्म्यः अर्णयाजनालिजुकमोकरिताय 

67 दञ्जोसाय पस्तक(क)हुक्तिवर परमात्रासंह(क)हुक्ताय श्रीमाराजसंगीतासिने 

68 पवित्तीकलस(क) रिमानसाय अंगिरस(क) हुक्ताय भाराजागोगाय तैत्तिरीयकालिने 

69 भुजाप्रायायाय सोमपाणिकेविद्विन्दिभुजाप्रायायाय 

70 ठुक्करामपुरः तव(क)कल्लक्कुलक्कहोकयकछिमादिनिनि भाषालात्ताशि 

71 द्वितीयविद्वि रुपमिराकापाशियाय च प्राणालकवियान्तः नाती बेल्डॉक्माय; पुण्य- 

72 रामसहित्: गुड्डम[दम्मी]्छादिकस्तरातन्मोग्यमान्तौ दापित्र: श्रीविक्रमादि- 

73 त्वदेवेन अ माथितास परमार्गेन मार्तिनोरात्मनात्व श्रेष्ठेऽदतः य- 
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74 स्य(स्य) चाचातानि ॥ पूर(व)कतया कर्जारिग्रामसिमा। तथा कलग्रीदीर कलकुशो 

75 दक्षिणत: तालसुप्रायासि। तथा निःसर्निवके कदव(व)कुशो मयादा। पवित्रसम- 

76 :। हुडक्तालसीयां नवी मयादा। उन्ततः उश्चुप्रायासिमा। तथा नदी के- 

77 नकोनिकते लङ्गाय: मयादा।। एवं चतुरापाटनोपविज्ञ: सतीमार्यः: 

1 [The reading is कालातिथि —Ed.] 

2 [The reading is सुदृढःसुप्रायियि —Ed.]
78 सत्तुष्णस्कौटाकपेश: सागुरसमस्तत्तत्त्तस्थियत:। पुञ्जेन्द्रुदेवदायतः (श्री)इयादयवतः। अ--

79 चाटेदुःखप्रदेशः उदसकातिसम्बृहः पभुख्यमरायन्तियोगे। सात्तेन्द्रवें (श्री)पौराणिकः।

80 जयां मोराकजातं ज न केनापि परिवंतना करणाय। दर्पु उक्तं महामुनिमहं।

81 कत्ता राज्जिम: समरादिक:। यस्य यथे यदा भूमिस्वत्त्व तस्य तदा फल (लमु)। \(\text{[४२]१०}"\)

82 यत्र दोहे तरोरावत। अत एवंः प्राणूर्द्वाराण्त:। भोतोपालने (लमु)। \(\text{[४३]१०}"\) यानीहुः

83 यस्य दक्षकाृणिः (१०।११) निमायपायंप्रतिलमाणि यात्रा को नाम साध। पुनरावदीत। \(\text{[४४]१०}"\)

84 ब्राह्मण्यो भूमिं भूमो याचे राज्यम्। \(\text{[१०।५०]"}\) सामार्यः। यमसेतुनृपाणां काले काले पालणीयो भवः। 

85 विशारदचन्द्रवर्तनमुनिवचनायथार्थ: सत्तेन विशालामहिमिरस्तरस्वेत:। भुवायः 

86 फललोम एव क[रै]णिः। न पुनस्तलोपनपापाफलकोऽप्रसङ्गे।केनापि महित्याः।

87 भारद्वानितिपरदातबोधतातिरितिबाहुतु।। अिध्वेशमानंमुनोदेत वा ह संतारिगिरि 

88 लिसू रीत्रवन्हारीवंर्णभावादिवर्छरकंविवचरमनुविवयक्ती। यथोक्तं भवत्ता 

89 परमां फल यो हरेत वसुंधरां(रामू) \(\text{[१०]"}\)व्विन्नात्तां। क्रिमिमुल्लिन पितृभिः। सह प्रयतं।

90 वासिंत: \(\text{[१०]"}\) कुण्यःस्पर्शेण(हि)जायते भूमिदानं हरेति ये \(\text{[१४०]१०}"\)यथा चैत्यवें तथा शासनवता लेखःकहस्तेन सम्म--

91 तमाघेपयति। ताप्त्या तथा मम महामुदेस्वराक्षित्य धीरज्ञकमादित्यश्वस्य श्रीमत- 

92 देवसूयोऽपितः शासने विषयत।। विषयत चैतन्याया राजनियूक्तेन सांविविधश्नित्यानुमत्या।

93 विषय लक्ष्मीरहस्यतेन श्रीगद्विवाम्परिवृत्तेन यत्रोन्योत्तरामध्यकारं वा त \(\text{[०]"}\)

94 \(\text{[०]"}\) माणिकिति। चैरं।। मंगलमहायोः। मयुषु।। त।।

\(\text{[Read: "मतिराच्छिच्छादा। विचित्वमान" — Ed.]}\)
NO. 44—INSCRIPTION DATED V. S. 1341 FROM SURWAYA

(1 Plate)

M. S. Bhat, Bombay

This inscription, is engraved on a stone which, in the words of Mr. M. B. Garde, "belonged to an old ruined well locally known as Dabia Baoi situated in a jungle about three miles north in the Surwaya fort. The stone was brought from the well and placed in the present position with a view to rescue it from obscurity and possible destruction". It is, in the words of the same scholar, "exhibited in the portico of the temple No. 1". Surwaya is situated in the Shivapuri District of the former Gwalior State now merged in Madhya Pradesh. It is edited here with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore.

The inscription consists of 24 lines of writing. At the top of the record, there is a short passage constituting half a line, indicating the name of the person after whom the well is named. The writing covers a space of about 44 cm broad by 56 cm high.

The characters belong to the Devanagari alphabet of the 13th century and closely resemble those of other contemporary epigraphs discovered in the area in question such as the Surwaya inscription of V. S. 1350. As regards orthography it may be pointed out that the avagraha sign is consistently omitted. V is throughout substituted for b and the consonant following r is generally doubled.

The language is Sanskrit and the composition is in verse throughout with the exception of one line at the top and another (line 24) at the bottom of the record which are in prose. The verses are consecutively numbered, the numerical figures being placed after a double dasga at the end of each verse. There are altogether 19 stanzas in various metres and the eulogy is stated to have been composed by Soma-mistra (1.19), also called Soma-kavi (1.15), son of Samadhara and brother of the deceased Javara by whom the well is said to have been excavated. A few sentences at the end of the record in lines 23-24 refer to the writer and the engraver of the eulogy and to the date of the construction of the step-well.

The date is expressed by chronogram in lines 22-23 as Ek-avadhi (bdh)-rama-bhutru-p-arnk-Vikramaditya-sasara krtikti sukla-pashchampab praasatir-vihuta vu(bu)dhe. It is repeated in line 24 as follows: Sarvat 13[41], Krtikti sudi 5 Vu(Bu)dha. These details correspond to the 27th October, 1283 A.D.4

The object of the inscription is to record the construction of a step-well. The inscription begins with an auspicious symbol, resembling the numerical figure 80, followed by Osh siddhi. The opening verse seeks the perpetual blessings of Sarva (i.e. Siva) as the creator, protector and destroyer of the Universe. Verse 2 introduces the Brahma-saras, the lake of Brahma, wherefrom the river Sarasvati takes its origin, and Sarasvata, the son of Sarasvati and the sage Dadhichi.
Verse 3 refers to the spell of severe drought for twelve years during which the sage Sarvasvati maintained himself by the side of the river Sarvasvati, preserving thereby the Vedic tradition. It was finally he who brought forth rain through the good offices of Indra and imparted the Vedas and the Vedangas to other brâhmanas who had become scarce and were averse to the rules laid down in the svritas for the brâhmanas. 4 Verse 4 speaks of the descendants (literally sons) of the sage Sarvasvati as well-versed in the traditional lore, as devotees of Śiva and as having been settled in a place named Sarvasvati-pattana. Verses 5 ff. describe the family of Īśvara, by whom the well was excavated. The first stanza of this section (verse 5) introduces one Bhadrēśvaras as belonging to the Sarvasvata family and as having performed several sacrifices. Verses 6 and 7 describe Āśādharas and Hrīshikēśa, son and grandson respectively of Bhadrēśvaras, who were known for their charitable disposition. Hrīshikēśa married Lahū, daughter of Bāhu-Dvīvēda (verse 8) and had by her three sons, viz. Sāmadharas, Vidyādharas-nāyakas, and Ghuhuddēvahūtis (verse 9), amongst whom Sāmadhara, excelled others in learning and wealth (verse 10). Sāmadhara married Dēvasūri, daughter of Bharahapāla (verse 11) and had by her six sons, viz. Ratnākara, Sômakaśvī, Īśvara, Śāmkara, Sīlaśa and Rudra (verse 12). Verse 13 states that Īśvara, living in the midst of his relations and having constructed a well, left for heaven, i.e. passed away, being remembered by heavenly denizens. Verse 14 contains the description of the well as being as graceful as the Himalayan slabs, meaning thereby that it was built of white marble slabs, and delightful like the moonlight to the chakrās in the form of the eyes of the people and resounding with the cackling noise of the rows of kāka and kalakama birds. In short, the well appeared like a creation of Brahmā himself. Verse 15 states that the poet Sūna-miśra, son of Sāmadhara and brother of Īśvara, composed the praiasti. He seems to have been a poet of no mean order. As a matter of fact he states that he composed a spotless eulogy (vimala praiastiḥ) which is full of profound and charming words, sentiments, and metre (guruhāra-pāśalakapāla sarasā swritā). The inscription under study bears ample testimony to this fact. Verse 16 prays for the permanence of the vāpiśa. Verse 17 draws a comparison between the praiasti and a pearl-necklace by employing parosamanas. Both possess excellences that embellish a good poetry and an ornament respectively; and both are ultimately meant to grace the throat or the neck of the good. Verse 18 gives the date of the record in a chronogram as pointed out above. The last stanza (verse 19) states that the praiasti was written (i.e. written on the stone evidently to facilitate the work of the engraver) by Gārgadeva, son of Manu, a brâhmaṇa hailing from the Gandā country. A line of writing beginning from about the middle of the stone below the last stanza states that the record was engraved by the sūtrādhāra named Ratana. The date given here is the same as the one expressed by chronogram in verse 18 above.

1 With the account given here cf. Māhaśākatas, IX, 51, verses 19-22 (Roy’s edition):--

2 [See below, p. 265, i. 1, — E.L.]

3 The second half of verse 10 refers to the proficiency gained by Sāmadhara in the purāṇas and saṅkaras.——

Ed.]
From Photograph
Of the geographical names mentioned in the inscription, Brahma-sarana may be identified with the lake Pushkar near Ajmer and the river Sarasvati with the river Lūnā which issues out of the lake Pushkar and empties itself into the gulf of Kutch; Sarasvati-pattana may be identified with the modern Surwaya, the findspot of the record.

TEXT

(Metres: Verses 1, 2, and 12 Sārdālavikrīḍita; verse 3 Srupdhara; verses 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10 Upajāti; verse 7 Śikharīgha; verses 8, 18 and 19 Avasāthaks; verse 11, Pajhaśikā; verses 13 and 14, Rathīddhā; verse 15 Vasantarīkā; verse 17 Indravaiśā; verse 17 Āryā).

1 यो सिध्दः ।। विशेष विद्विद्विकृतया सूतित य य संयोगितास्पदं भूतं भूतिरत्स्या स्वतित य संतप्रभलामस्थति । कल्याणंमेधीहि—

2 या पुरुरितस्वमहत्ततेऽस्मवः स्वयम्(त) धारणो निहायो वो देवः सूतं स्वावतसम् ।।

3 प्राचिणो(स्त) सर्पस्वी सुरस्वी गंगारीतीरा भूविः । सा लीरे तपसय स्वतवती

4 तो नामतः ।। ॥[II*] तथावीरत्सर्पस्वीतात्मव्रतिः तनुर्त श्र(त्र)हनेः त्रावशार्यव(त्र) तस्यासादार्य रूपमपूर्ण कथमपी तस्य देव्यार्यससादात् । वेदान—

5 मै: समेतानु मृत्युविपचिते नाम्भवज भूतिभाषो सर्व: सर्वस्वतो यः अववा-

6 ननामयेव सर्वस्वतत्त्स्य सुता व(त्र)पुरुषः । श्रृत्सत्सीत्सुपुराणविव यय्यसत्प्रायणान: विवस्थितानातः ।। ॥[II*] व(त्र)पुरुष तेलो वि—

7 दुः शुचमिन्य(त्र) मंचेत्तरो शीतकमसमिवन्य(प्रम) । तथ्य समासाध निवासवो(यो) विवासाकारे स सन्तुक्ष: वपहुः व(प्रम) ।। ॥[II*] तस्यासु—

8 दुः(त्र) हरिवं विरं (स्त) धाराप्त: धारास्थीकलात: । यज्ञा साधारनिविध(व्र्वी)तिः

9 सर्वस्वतस्वाभावः तत्तत्त्वो निम्न(स्त्र) लभते न व्याक्षरवी क्षमामपूर्व घो न विवधे ।

10 वामासदितसमु: स सात्तारो वृक्ता जगदुपपती कौशिपत्तो: ।। ॥[II*] विच्छेदाराहृतनामम-

1 From impressions.
2 On the top of the inscription there is a line reading प्रिंकिरियाम[र]वक्ष्यावामका!
3 Before श्री there is an auspicious symbol resembling the numerical figure 80. It is followed by a double danda. Possibly a symbol for निवाम.
4 There is a superfluous danda after सर्वस्वतिपत.
5 Intended reading is चुंतामर्मिष्टां. The syllable ति is dropped obviously for the sake of the metre.
6 Read खिलेव. 
11 के सहूल(ि) हृदयांतं धम्म्ष्ठतां भज्ज्यांनं तत्तत्रत(ि) तथाः । व(ि) भृज्ञस्तनपत्यस्ते । गृहस्तयम्भां सांस्कृतमोऽन्याः । विद्यारोः

12 नायकनामेयक्षत्नो चुठ्णकृति(ि)ः । प्रसिद्धिः । साहसीदो सामथरो चरायं । श्रीविविष्येऽपि समात्पुष्टः ।

13 गुरुणमुद्र(ि)नगरिराजः । पदस्रपचे जित्वारिराजः । भर्तराजपत्तनममुपेयः । वेषसिंहः थलि

14 नाम स भवनाः(ि) यानकराजहविद्वानामुपिरः । देवनामिव पुय्यचारिनाः(ि) चामः । तथाः । ततः । न्युपरतने मुतः

15 नया रत्नाकरः । कोवित्ते मिथः । सोमकविसत्यस्य थलि श्यामः । सांकरः । अण्यः । सोमन शालकः । सुषुरितो वि

16 को विद्वास्तथा घोषलमना मनोजविनयो विद्मानु । विद्मानायः । नामादायः । ईश्वरः । न्युनमह्यतः शीर्षया

17 चवा निवालयं धुराः । सम्माना गुरुणेन वापिकां निर्माणाय निरस्त्रविव्रेषः(ि) पमः । चवा । चवा या विमालविला विला

18 सिमी लोकलूचच(ि) नन्दकारणत्रिका । कोलकालहृदयः नवना भावति निम्ता मित्रतेहिः

19 विना कविने सोममिश्रे पुनराधिपतरामत्रे । गंगैरस्तलवसा ससा सुबुला

20 दिवे विमाला प्रसिद्धः । दशंगिरीशो गिरिजामुद्धलेच्छसे च यावकल्मः

21 तो नमोगणे तावद्रा तित्तु वापिकेयः(ि) । दशंकालेपदचिरा श्रवणः

22 मुक्तानिरीत सिलमा विलसयू सततं सततं कें । दशंकालेपदचिरा श्रवणः

23 कुलप्रमाणम्या रामसविविहिता वु(ि)धे । दशंकालेपदचिरा श्रवणः

24 चुंबाचर रत्नः । चुंबाचर रत्नः । संतु । काव्यकत्तुऽव । चुंबाचर रत्नः ।

1 (Better read anyogkubuddhi ca iti and correct it to anyog-pujya-abhút Dīvā iti.—Ed.)
2 Sandha is not observed here.
3 This line is written quite below and it begins from about the middle of the stone.
NO. 45—TWO EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

By

H. D. SANKALIA, POONA

1. Kaśadeśikae

In the Wani inscription of Rudrasimha (I), year 106, published in 1967, Shri P. R. Srinivasan has regarded the expression Kaśadeśikae, as a place-name and identified it as modern Kutch in Gujarat.¹

Even if the expression is regarded as a place-name, its identification with Kutch cannot be accepted for two reasons.

Whenever and wherever Kutch has appeared in literature or inscriptions or folk-songs and folklore, it has always been written as or in the form of Kachchh. And this is since the time of Pāṇini.

In the Junāgadh inscription of Rudradāman, whether as an independent country or as a suffix of Maru, it is written as Kachchha.² It is in this form that it is invariably mentioned in the records of the Chaulukyas (or Sōlanis) of Gujarat³ during the 10th-13th centuries A.D. Its epigraphical occurrence in between the 2nd and 13th century is probably not documented.

This being the history of the word Kachchha it cannot be said that Kuta in Kaśadeśikae stands for Kachchha.

This is not linguistically possible, nor is there any such dialectical variation or linguistic usage in Gujarat (proper), Saurashtra or Kutch.

Secondly, the second part of the expression Kaśadeśikae, viz. deśikae does not stand for the word Deśa, meaning a country, or a region. No early usage like this can be cited from literature or inscriptions. The Junāgadh inscription cited above merely gives a string of names of regions or countries, without calling them Deśas.

Further, there seems to be one more letter after e in the original stone.

¹ Above, Vol. XXXVII, p. 144.
² Ibid., Vol. VIII p. 44, line 11.
2. Aṁkoṭṭaka

This occurs in Maitraka records, and was left unidentified. But since 1953, it is well known as the Aṁkoṭṭaka of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records, and known in the region as Akota, a part of Baroda town.²

---

¹ Above, Vol. XXXVII, p. 168.
² Subbarao Bendapudi, Baroda Through the Ages, 1953, p. 10.
³ Shah, Umakant, P., Akota Brosne, 1959, p. 2. Shri Shah also suggested that originally it might be Graeco-Roman Polis and known as Antiochus. Ibid., p. 3, f.n. 10.
NO. 46—RAMVAN PLATE OF CHANDELLA TRAILOKYAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1283

(1 Plate)

P. R. Srinivasan, Mysore

The copper-plate is now deposited in the Museum at Ramvan, a village near Satna, Satna Taluk and District, Madhya Pradesh. Its exact findspot is not known. Mr. Niraj Jain of Satna was kind enough to let me know about its existence in the Museum when I was camping at Satna in the course of my annual collection tour early in 1966. I copied the charter at the Museum and it is edited below from the impressions procured by me.

It is a single copper-plate measuring about 42 cm by 29 cm. It has writing on one side only. A small strip of metal is riveted along the edges of this side of the plate, probably to protect the writing. In these respects this plate resembles more the two Garra plates and the Tehri (really Sangor) plate of the same ruler who issued the charter under study than the Samra plates of the time of Paramardidēva and of the Rewah plates of Trailōkyamalladēva. There is no hole at the top centre of the plate. But below the top centre and dividing into two halves the first four lines of the inscription is engraved a figure of the goddess Lakshmi with four arms, the upper two hands holding lotuses and the lower two hands kept over the knees, seated in the padmāsana pose on a very poorly sketched full blown lotus. Unlike the two Garra plates, each of which contains only 17 lines of writing, and the Tehri (Sangor) plate which has 19 lines of writing, the present plate contains 24 lines. The writing is generally well preserved but along the edges on either side, here and there, a few letters are hidden below the metal strip.

The Characters are Nāgari, regular for the period and locality to which the record belongs. But the engraving here is careless compared to the engraving of the other plates mentioned already. The present record however shows the palaeographical features similar to those noticed in the other charters of this family mentioned above. The spelling and other mistakes are pointed out in the text.

The language is Sanskrit prose throughout excepting a verse at the beginning and a couple of verses at the end. Regarding orthography, there is nothing noteworthy in this charter, which is not present in the other charters of the family already referred to.

The record refers itself to the reign of Paramahāttāraka Mahrājādirōja Paramēśvara Paramamahēśvara Kulaśārādhipati sīrī-Trailōkyavarmadēva of the well-known Chandālla dynasty. As usual he is described as meditating on the feet of P. M. P. Paramardidēva who meditated on the feet of P. M. P. Madanavarmadēva.

The two Garra plates and the Tehri (Sangor) plate, also contain the same description of the king. Besides, it is only in all these four records, the māṅgala-liṅka, Jayatī-āśūdayan etc., followed by the prose passage commencing with Tatra pravardhāmānē, etc. occur. Moreover, these records register grants made by the king himself. These features show that these charters were drafted

1 This is registered as No. A 10 of A. R. Ep., 1965-66.
2 Above, Vol. XVI, plate facing page 275.
3 Ibid., Vol. XXXI, plate facing page 72.
4 Ibid., Vol. IV, plate between pages 266-67.
5 Ibid., Vol. XXV, plate facing page 5.
6 This figure is poor in execution compared to the figures occurring in the Garra plates and definitely poorer than the beautifully sketched figure of the Samra plates, which, however, represents Gajālakṣaṇa.
at the imperial headquarters. So, the king who issued the charter under study is evidently the same as the issuer of the other three charters also. This king has been identified with the king, Trailokyamalladeva of the Rewah plates of Kalachuri year 963, and of the Rewah plates of V. S. 1298 and the king Trailokyavarman of the Rewah plates of V. S. 1297. This has been done in spite of the fact that the introductory portions of these records contain passages similar to those of the records of the Kalachuri kings—one of them, the Rewah plates of Kalachuri year 963, containing the title Kanyakubjachipati, a characteristic title of the Gahadavala, in the place of Trikalingachipati of the plates dated V. S. 1297 and the name of the king in two of the three charters is Trailokyamalla, which sounds more like a title, and not Trailokyavarman. No doubt, being issued by the feudatories of the king, their introductory parts differ from that of the imperial charters as well as between themselves, but the change introduced in the name of the king is a problem which cannot be solved in the present state of our knowledge of the history of the dynasty. It may be noted that while all the four charters issued by the king are on single copper-plates, the three charters belonging to his reign but issued by his subordinates consist each of two plates, besides not having the Gajalakshmi figure sketched at the top of the first side.

The inscription appears to have been issued from Jayapura-durgga (line 7) and is dated (lines 7-8) V. S. 1283, Chaitra-sudi 11, Wednesday. These details are found to correspond to 1226 A.D., March 11, the Vikrama year being current.

The object of the inscription is to record the grant made by the king of the village of Paishä in Varahi-vishaya to several Brahmanas belonging to various gotras. The importance of the record lies in the fact that this is the fourth charter issued by the king and the seventh belonging to his reign and that this charter clearly shows that the king was in possession of Jayapura-durgga.

The inscription commences with the symbol for Siddhas which is followed by the word Svasti. Then there is an Avashtubh verse in praise of the family of the Chandraditya kings. Lines 1-3 refer to P. M. P. Madanavarmanadiva and P. M. P. Paramardidiva, who were respectively the predecessor's predecessor and the predecessor of Trailokyavarmanadiva who is described as the Kalaajgaridhipati, etc., in lines 4-5. Lines 5-6 state that the king addressed an order to the Brahmanas, other respectable people, adhikitas, house-holders, kayasthas, ditas, vaidyas, mahattaras, medas and chandhas in Paishä-gräma situated in Varahi-vishaya. Lines 6-9 contain the object of the order namely the grant made by the king, perhaps encamped at Jayapura-durgga and on the date mentioned above, of the village of Paishä together with all its past, present and future incomes and with the exemption from entry into it of the prohibited chäjas and others. It is stated that the gift was made to several Brahmanas belonging to different gotras and that it would go to the sons and grandsons of the donees. In lines 9-19 there is a list of 31 Brahmanas together with the names of their fathers and the names of the gotras to which they belonged. The extent of land that each of the donees got is also mentioned here. For the sake of convenience these details are given in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Name of the donee</th>
<th>Father's name</th>
<th>Gotra</th>
<th>Pada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Svasti Mēhāsarman</td>
<td>Svasti Mēhilä</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Svasti . . .</td>
<td>Svasti Gōvidā</td>
<td>Da.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Ibid., pp. 239 ff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Name of the donees</th>
<th>Father's name</th>
<th>Gotra</th>
<th>Poda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Śrāuti Manacātha</td>
<td>Paśa (Pandita) Vyasa</td>
<td>Agastya</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paśa (Pandita) Dāravātā</td>
<td>Śrāuti Śāmba</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tāhuka (brother of No. 4)</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Paśa, Āhāra</td>
<td>Dikshita</td>
<td>Kauśika</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Paśa, Gū.ka (Probably related to No. 6 and possibly his brother)</td>
<td>Do. (?)</td>
<td>Do. (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Paśa, Lāhāda along with his 4 brothers</td>
<td>Paśa, Dēvakā</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Paśa, Gāgāka</td>
<td>Paśa, [Jājha]</td>
<td>Kauśika</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Paśa, Mālgāhara (probably related to No. 9 and possibly his brother)</td>
<td>Do. (?)</td>
<td>Do. (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Paśa, Sāhe</td>
<td>Paśa, [Dē[kha]</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Paśa, Riti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jāsō</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vātāka</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Paśa, Nānēka</td>
<td>Paśa, Mīhē</td>
<td>Śāndilya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Paśa, Kumāraka</td>
<td>Paśa, Sōmē</td>
<td>[Vādāhūn]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tha. (Thakura) Vāndēva</td>
<td>Tha. (Thakura) [Vāyavera ?]</td>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tha. [...]hūka</td>
<td>Tha. Nākēyana</td>
<td>Vyēsa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lōt</td>
<td>Lōt</td>
<td>Lōt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Paśa, [...]jya</td>
<td>Paśa, Dāmōdara</td>
<td>Śāndilya</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Paśa, [...]jya</td>
<td>Vāmādēva</td>
<td>Pārśēara</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Paśa, Va. [...]va</td>
<td>Paśa, Mālāhara</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Paśa, Vi. [...]ja</td>
<td>Paśa, [......]</td>
<td>Kaśyapa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Paśa, Pānēka</td>
<td>Paśa, [.]vata</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Paśa, Pivuka</td>
<td>Paśa, Kulacahāmanda</td>
<td>Pārśēara</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jā[pda]ka (probably related to No. 25 and possibly his brother)</td>
<td>Do. (?)</td>
<td>Do. (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Paśa, Sādēhēka</td>
<td>Paśa, Dēvādītya</td>
<td>Bhārgava</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Paśa, Purunātētama</td>
<td>Paśa, Deśa [Meṣāvāra]</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Paśa, Dēvādītya</td>
<td>Paśa, Gāngē</td>
<td>Kaśyapa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Paśa, [kha]jou</td>
<td>Deśa[Dōdē]</td>
<td>Bhuradvēja</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tha. Mārckumājā</td>
<td>Tha, Nākēyana</td>
<td>Kaśyapa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It will be found from the table that each of the donees got or more paddas into which probably the whole village was divided and the total number of paddas comes to 34 1/4. It is interesting to note in this connection that the Semra plates also contains a list of donees who were given each an extent of land in units of paddas. Lines 19-22 of the present charter contain a list of privileges accompanying the gift and a request by the king made not only to the various categories of people mentioned above but also to the future kings, to honour the gift. This is followed in lines 22-23 by two imprecatory verses of which only the first one commencing with Śatākhatā is met with in the two Garra plates mentioned above. Line 24 contains the signature of the king in his own handwriting.

Of the localities mentioned in the record, Jayapura-durgga is modern Ajaygaḍhi. The gift village Paṭisā and Varāhi-vishaya in which it was situated, I am not able to identify.

TEXT

1 Siddham[²][³] Svasti || Jayaty-āḥildayan-viśvaṁ Viśveśvara-śīrō-dhītaḥ || Chandrātrēyā

2 rōdhi-vijaya-bhrājishuṇa-Jayasaṅkta(kti)-Vijayaśaṅktyā-di-vīr-śvarāha-śivasvarē paramabhaṭṭa-

3 araka-mahārūjādhīrāja-paramēśvara-ṛṣi-Madana-varmahādeva-pādānudhyā-

4 ra-ṛṣi-Kālaṁjara-[dh]i[paṭi-ṛṣi][⁴][⁵][⁶]Trailūkya-varmahādevo vijaya(yt) | sa ēsha durvishahatararā-

5 pratāpa-tāpita-sakalan-a bip-vṣa[ṛ]kula[ṛ] kulīvradhūm[४]iva vasmūdharaṁ-nirākula[m] paripā-

6 layamna(ṇ-ṇa)vikala-vē(v)jvēkā-nirṛmnalī-kṛta-matiḥ | Varāhi-vishaya-ṛṇahpāti-Paṭisā-

7 gram-ṛṇagataṁ-brāhmaṇaṁ-anvān-oṣa cha māṁsya-adhi[kṛ][t]an-kuṭumvi(bhi)-kēyastha-

8 vaidyam-hēmārāṇ-śekā-paryāntaṁ-sarvam-sahvō(bhi)dhayati samājā-

9 payati ch-astu vah satīviditaṁ [ya]th-ṛṇih-likhitō-yam grāmāḥ sa-jaḷasthalāḥ

10 sa-yvāva-ra-jāṅga-

11 mahēm sa-śu-śa-śa-[h]hinnaḥ s-ādha-ūrdvō (ṛṇdhvō) [bhūta-bhavīyad-vartamānān-

12 niḥsāh-ādhyā-sahitaḥ pratishiddha-chuṭ-ṛṇih-pravēsāḥ-ch-āsambhūḥ | ṛṇ-ṛṣi-Jayapura-

13 durggā śa[ṛ]n[ṛ]vat(t) 1283 Chaitra

14 sudi 11 V(a)du[ḥ]a-vārē nānā gōtrēbhīyō nānā-praprau(pau)trēbhīyō nānā-paṭrēbhīyō nānā-

15 paṭrēbhīyō nānā-sarmma-vṛū[brā]hmanēbhīyaḥ kuśalatā-pū[ṛ]ṇa hast-ōdakāna svasti-

---

¹ Above, Vol. IV, pp. 158 ff.
² From impression.
³ Expessed by a symbol.
⁴ The metre is Ānukūṭaḥ.
⁵ This akṣara is not carefually formed.
⁶ Read kula-vadhūm.
RAMVAN PLATE OF CHANDELLA TRAILOKYAVARMAN, VIKRAMA 1283

Scale: One-third

G. S. Gai

Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVIII
9 vāchana-pûrvvā[ṛḥ]* chanḍr-ārkka-samakālaiḥ put[ṛ]
   -pastr-ānvay-ānagāmi-sāsana[ṛḥ]*

10 ṛṇ ṛa[da]-[dva]yaṁ[ | ] Gautama-gōtra-[śrau]*ti | Gōvīṇḍa-putra Upā... nasya padam
   -ekām | Agastū(śya)-gōtra-pa[ṛḥ]* | Vyāsa-putra-śrī(śrau)ti-Manorathasya pada-[ṛ]
   -yaṁ | Vatsa-gōtra-śrōtri²-

11 Sā[ṛ]v[ha]-pita(tr)a pa[ṛḥ]* | Dēvavratasya pada-trayām | tathā bhurātri Tēlīkāsya pada-dvayaṁ | Kausī(śi)ka-gōtra-Dikṣāta-putra-pa[ṛḥ]* | Āhāṃsya | s-ārdha-pada-dvayaṁ | tathā pa[m]* | Gō...ka-

12 sya pad-ārdha[ṛḥ]* | Vatsa-gōtra-paṁ | Dēvaka-putra-paṁ | Lāhaḍa-bhrātri-chatu[r*]-
   bhīṁ(bhyaḥ) saha padaṃme(dam-e)kaṁ | Gau(Kau)śika-gōtra-paṁ | [Jā]ha-putra-paṁ | Gagēkasya padaṃ-e kaṁ | tathā paṁ | Mālīḍhara-

13 sya pad-ārdha[ṛḥ]* | Vatsa-gyē(gōtra-paṁ) | Dē[k]ha-putra-paṁ | Sākhā Rishi sthayōḥ
   padam-ekāṁ | tathā Jāsō-Vāṭākayōḥ padaṃ(m-e)ka[m]* | Sā(Sā)mēḍēla-gōtra-paṁ | Mīhē-putra-paṁ | Nānakṣaya

14 padam-ekāṁ | [Vādhu]-gōtra-paṁ | Sāmē-putra-pa[m]* | Kumātra(ra)kasya pada-
   dvayaṁ | Gautama-ṇa(gōtra)-ṭha | [Vāyavē[r]*]-putra-ṭha Vāsūdevasya pada[m]=
   -ekāṁ | [Vyā]sa-gōtra-ṭha | Nā[r]ṛyaṇa-putra-

15 ṭha | bhū-bhākṣaya [pa]dam-ekāṁ | .................² padam-ekā[m]* | Sāmēḍēla-
   gōtra-paṁ | Dāmēḍara-putra-paṁ | .... vasya pad-ārdha[ṛḥ]* | Pārśasa(śa)ra-gōtra-

16 Vāmādeva-putra-pa[m]* | ...nasya pada-ārdha[ṛḥ]* | Vatsa-gōtra-paṁ | Mādhava-
   putra-paṁ [Va]... vasya padam-ekāṁ Kaṇya(śya)pa-gōtra-pa[m]* | [Nāṃṣyasthēva]!
   -pra[pu]ta(tr)a-va[m](paṁ) | V[t]*]gasya [pa]damēkaṁ- | Kaṇya-pa-gōtra-va[m](paṁ) | .


18 padam-ekāṁ | [V[a]tsa-gōtra-Dvi-[Mējāvara]-putra-pa[m*] | Vu(Pu)rashīttamasya pada-
   ārdha(ddha)[m]* | Kasa(śya)pa-śhō(gōtra)-pa[m] | Gāṃghu-putra(tr)a-pa[m] | Dēvō(व)
   -dītyasya pava[da]m-ekām | Ta([ṛh][a]d)dvāja-gōtra-Dvi-Dōḍi-putra-pa[m]* | [ ].

19 [k]ha]ṛ[ṣ]asya pava[(da)m]=ekā[m]* | Kasa(śya)pa-gōtra-ṭha | Nārāyaṇa-putra-ṭha | Mānaka[M]k[ṛ]*kk[ā]m[ṛ]-dasya pada-[ś]*ddha(ddha)[m]* | iti matvā bhava[dd]hīr= ājīśa-śra-
   vaṇa-vive(ddhō)yē(yai)[ṛ*]-bhūtvā bhāga-[bhōg]-ādika[m]* sarvvaṁ-ekāṁ

¹ Read śrauti.
² The names of the donors and his father are erased.
³ This anuśāsana is engraved on the next letter. Read Śāsā.
⁴ Read Bhīmprāya.
⁵ The scribe first added the sign for the subscript u to pa and then scored it off.
⁶ This letter is engraved above the line.
20 samupanētavyat || [ta]d-ēnam-ēsāṁ grāmah sa-ma[ṇ]diram sa-nirggama-pravēsa-
(ātā) sa-sarvāsān-ēkshu- ka[r]ppāsa-kun(ku)suma-saṇ-āmra-[ma*]dhūk-ādi-bhū-
ruhāṁ sa-vara-khani-vīdhātam sa-tō(h)h-ādy-ā.

21 karaṁ ava(pa)rair-āpi [si]pā(mā)ntarga[tai]c-vvasu-[dēula] sabitaṁ sa-vaṁ(bā)hy-ābhyy-
antar-ādā[ya]m [bhu[m*]jānāṁ(na)vāṁ(naṁ) va(na) kēn-āpi vā(bā)dhā kāryā | 
atra cha rāja-rājavu(pu)rush-ādibhiḥ sva[m*] svam-ā.

22 bhāvyam pārili(ha)rtavyam-idaṁ-ch-śaṁdal-dānam-[nā]ohhēdyam-anāhā[r*]yyaṁ= 
ch-ētē(ti) bhāvibhiva(r-a)pi bhūmī-pāla[la]i[ḥ*] pālapāṁ! | uktān-cha Ṣa[ṛm*]- 
kham bhadr-āsavaṁ(nam) [chha]tra[m*] vadhātvā varavā-

23 ra-vāraṇāḥ | bhūmi-dānasya pushpāśim(ṇi) phalam sva[r*]jagāḥ Pura[r*]dara || Shawṣṭiṁ-
varsha-sahasāṇā sva[r*]gge [vata(ṇa)ti] bhūmē(mi)daḥ | ohohhēttā ch-śaṁmantā cha 
tāṇy-ēva tavākē varā-va=

24 sva-hastō-yam rāja(jña)[ḥ*] ātri-Trērōyava[va[r*]mmadāvasya[ ||*]]

---

1 Read pālantyam.
2 Read vṛ-ṇānd.
3 This כו is redundant.
4 Read naraḥ.
5 Read Trōkaya.
NO. 47.—TWO WESTERN GANGA INSCRIPTIONS

(2 Plates)

K.G. KRISHNAN, MYSOR

The two subjoined inscriptions were copied by me from Navalai in Harur Taluk, Dharampuri District, Tamil Nadu in February 1968. They are edited here with the permission of the Chief Epigraphist, Mysore. They are marked A and B.

A.—Inscription of Śivamāravarman I, Year 3

This inscription is engraved on a hero-stone lying inside a pond called Etikuttai to the north of the highway passing through the village. The stone bears three lines of writing on the top. The writing is continued on the left of a sculpture carved in relief in the middle. The sculpture is that of a hero with his face turned to his left. His lifted right hand holds a dagger with its point to the right and his left hand holds a bow. His body is pierced by an arrow at the waist. A sheath is hanging down from his garment from below the waist. His feet are turned in the direction of the left. There are on the ground a water pot in front and a crude representation of a sculpture looking like a pedestal, behind him.

The inscription is in Tamil language and is engraved in Vaṭṭeluttu characters. Some of the salient features of the script may be noticed here. The letter y (lines 1 and 2) is formed by a concave semi-circle from the left bottom of which another slightly bigger semi-circle is drawn to its right. X has its top in a curved form and t in a small angular form. Both tend to be straight lines at their bottom. These characteristics point to a date earlier than the two inscriptions of Gaṅga Śrīparvata (c. 725-88 A.D.) from Oldappati, Harur Taluk, Dharampuri District, in Tamil language and Vaṭṭeluttu characters. In these later inscriptions n has a curved top beginning with a loop and t has a rounded top. Therefore this record may be placed about the seventh-eighth centuries.

The word pājajitam (lines 5-6) is of some lexicographical interest. It can be compared with pājaiyar occurring in an inscription of Kampavarmaṇ. It is apparent that both mean 'a member of the regiment'.

This inscription is dated in the 3rd year in the reign of Śivamāravarman. It records that while Kanda-Vāṇṇadiyacaiyar was ruling over Puramalai-nādu and when Vāṇṇaperumal attacked Kōḍal (for Kōḍal), Koṭṭi (Kaṭṭi) Nattī, a member of the regiment of Chārvappanār, died. He is obviously the hero represented in the sculpture.

The palaeography of the record and the name of the king make the record an important one in several respects. Śivamāravarman in whose reign it is dated may be identified with...

---

2 Ibid., No.240.
3 Cf. plate facing p. 111, above, Vol. XXXII, where a small shrine is carved apparently pointing to the practice of erecting shrines for the dead. Hero-stones bearing such figures are worshipped even today in the north-western parts of Tamil Nadu. They are called locally Vediippaṭṭu temples. These hero-stones were generally called Kaṭṭiḍu (above, Vol. XXII, p. 113) or Kaṭṭi-nādu (SHI., Vol.VII, No. 881).
4 A. R. Ep., 1910, Nos. 211 and 212.
5 Above, Vol. XXII, p. 143.
first king of that name among the Gaṅgas of Taḷļakādu. The Haḷḷegere plates belonging to the reign of this king are dated Śaka 635 (713-14 A.D.) equated with the 34th year of his reign.

This yields 679-80 A.D. as the date of his accession. If so, the date of the present record of the 3rd year of his reign will be 682-33 A.D. This is the only record of this king so far discovered in the north-western parts of the Tamil country, and it is also the earliest Vaṭṭeluttu inscription for this dynasty in this region and thus testifies to the use of Vaṭṭeluttu also during this period.

Kanda-Vaṅṇadiyaraiyar was evidently a member of the Bāṇa family. The name is obviously a Tamil tātsama of the Sanskrit Skanda-Bāṇadhirāja. A chief bearing the same name figures in an inscription from Baṅgaḷaḍi in Mulbagal Taluk in Kolar district, Mysore State. This inscription in Tamil language and script of about the eighth century is dated in the reign of Narasiṁhavarman who was also a Gaṅga king. Another inscription of this king in Tamil language and Vaṭṭeluttu characters of about the same period from Vaijūr, Chengam Taluk, North Arcot District, Tamil Nadu refers to a Vaṅṇakōṅ-adiyaraiyar. The chief mentioned in our record is evidently different from the Bāṇa chief mentioned in the above records on account of palaeography, though the two might have belonged to the same family. Kanda-Vaṅṇadiyaraiyar of our record is stated to be ruling over Puṟamalai-nādu and Vaṅṇapurumāṇ is stated to have attacked Kūḍal. It is apparent that Kūḍal attacked by Vaṅṇapurumāṇ was situated in Puṟamalai-nādu. This indicates that Kanda-Vaṅṇadiyaraiyar and Vaṅṇapurumāṇ, though of the same dynasty, were adversaries. The circumstances under which two members of the same stock had to fight each other are not now known. Charuvaṭṭappāṇgar was perhaps a commander under Kanda-Vaṅṇadiyaraiyar and Koṭṭi (Kaṭṭi)-Nāṭti the hero was a member of the former’s regiment (paṭṭindar). This word Koṭṭi which is perhaps a corruption of Kaṭṭi recalls to us a chieftain of the early Saṅgam period who is described as a Gaṅga and whose territory is stated to be on the borders beyond which a different language was spoken. The chiefs of the Yaḍavarāya family who ruled over the region along the north-western and the northern borders of the Tamil country in the 12th century had the titles Gaṭṭiyadēva, Gaṭṭiyidēva or Kaṭṭi-ramaṇ. There was a Kaṭṭi-mudaliyar.

---

1 Ep. Carn., Vol. III, Md. 113, pp. 107 ff., and plates. It is noteworthy that while most other Gaṅga copper plates give full details of date, this charter does not give them except Jyēṭha-mēnu and Puḷḷaṇai-pūḷḷai.

2 Fleet had his reservation in accepting the genuineness of this copper-plate (Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, p. 301, note 1).


4 Ibid.

5 Above, Vol. IV, p. 177. Though he has been correctly considered as a Gaṅga, his identity is yet to be established. There was no Gaṅga king of that name during the eighth century to which we assign his records. However, we find a Narasiṁhavarman among the Gaṅgas, who is removed from Śivamāra I by five generations. It is not known whether Śivamāra I or II was also called Narasiṁhavarman. The Suraḍhamura copper-plates, which are patently spurious (Ep. Carn., Vol. IX, Dv. 44), mention Narasiṁhavarman as another name for Śivamāra II.

6 Above, Vol. XXXII, pp. 111 ff and plate. The characters of this record are assigned to the 9th century. The view that the scribe or the hero of this record was responsible for the introduction of Vaṭṭeluttu in this region is untenable. Nor is the script unusual to this area as stated therein.

7 It is a curious coincidence that the Baṅgaḷaḍi inscription (above Vol. VII, pp. 22 ff.) of Narasiṁhavarman also points to the same situation whereby a servant of Kanda-Vaṅṇadiyaraiyar fought against a group in which there was a Vaṅṇarāṇar.

8 Kaṇṭatopala, verse No. 11: Akkaṇṭaṁ, verse No. 44 and 226.

9 Ibid., No. 44. Gaṅga, a dynastic name may better be taken to qualify the following name Kaṭṭi (contra. Pre-Pallavan Tamil Index, a.v.).


11 Ibid., No. 531.

12 Ibid., No. 101.
among the well-known chieftains of Tāramaṅgalam in Omalur Taluk in Salem District in 1540-41 A.D. ¹

Puramalai-nādu ruled over by Kanda-Vaṅgadiyaraiyar is stated to have been included in Tagalur-nādu in Gaṅga-nādu in later inscriptions.⁴ It roughly comprises the area to the north of the Sērvarāyan (Shavarvai) hills on the borders of the Salem Taluk in Salem District and to the west of the Kalāyān hills on the south-eastern borders of the Harur Taluk in Dharmapuri District. The name Puramalai-nādu is geographically very apt because the area to the south and east of this nādu beyond the two hills, was called Malainādu or Milādu² for short and Puramalai-nādu, as now identified, lies outside (pura) this Malai-nādu. The present record contains the earliest reference to Puramalai-nādu. Two inscriptions⁴ from Tīrthamalai in Harur Taluk, Dharmapuri District, dated in the 4th year (1015-16 A.D.) in the reign of Chōlā Rājendra I seem to refer to a local deity as Kūṭal-aiyār. Another from the same place dated in the 8th year (1153-54 A.D.) in the reign of Chōlā Rājārāja II also refers to Kūṭal in Puramalai-nādu.⁴ This Kūṭal was important enough for a minor division under the nādu to be named itself as Kūṭalarpuram in the days of Vijayaṅagarara rulers. Kūṭal is the same as Kūṭal (spelt as Gūḍalār in the map) near Tīrthamalai and about fifteen miles east by south as the crow flies from Navalai, the findspot of the record.⁸ The relevance of the hero-stone being set up at Navalai, away from the place of the fight is, however, not clear.

TEXT:

1 Śri Śivamāraparumark-iyāndu mūrṇavadu
2 Kandavānpadiyaraiyar Puramalai-nād-āḷa
3 Vaṅparumāḷ Kō(Kū)ḍallṇaṇḍa nāngu Charu-
4 vappu-
5 nār paṭai-
6 ttaṅ Ko(Ka)ṭ-
7 ti-Nātti
8 paṭṭāṅ

B.—Inscription¹ of [Śivamāra II], Year 17

This record is engraved on another hero-stone set up inside a lake locally called Vikkalēri, to the south of the highway passing through Navalai. The stone bears five lines of writing above a

¹ ibid., Nos. 21 and 28,
² ibid., No. 9 : A.R. Ep., 1903, No. 676.
⁴ ibid., 1905, Nos. 672 and 673.
⁵ ibid., No. 660.
⁶ ibid., 1915, No. 658. It is possible that the name Kūṭal was given to this place since it is so near the confluence where the rivers Pāṁhāru from the north and Vaṅiyāṟu from the south-east mingle with Pewulai (now called Ponnaiyar).
⁷ From impressions.
⁸ The letter ri is engraved below the line.
sculpture, and the last two lines (6 and 7) are engraved below the fifth line at the right end. The sculpture in relief depicts a hero in the posture of attacking a horse which he seems to hold by its reins in his left hand, his right hand holding aloft a dagger. There are also on the ground a pot behind him and another pot with elongated body and a spout to its left.

The inscription is in Tamil language and is engraved in Vaṭṭeḻuttu characters of about the 9th century. The letter ęż has a loop inside at the beginning of the concave form. N has a curved upper part with a loop at the beginning and also has a curved lower part. T is in a transitional stage with both a prominent angular upper part (line 3) and a curved one (line 5). These indicate that this inscription should be assigned to a date much later to record A published here and also to the inscriptions of Srīprusala referred to above.1 It may be assigned to about the ninth century. From the orthographical point of view it may be noted that the word Kudirai (line 5) is also written as Kuduri (line 4). This word has kuṭi (to gallop) as its root. The form Kudirai is apparently the result of an attempt to make the spelling uniform allowing the vowel u in Ku to occur concurrently.2 In this connection the word Kuduri in Kannada may be compared.

The inscription is dated in the seventeenth year in the reign of a king whose name is lost due to damage. It records that while somebody, presumably the king (himself) was ruling over Gangañādu, Koyirār-nādu, Velaiñādu, Kovunār-nādu, Eyiñā-nādu, Puramalai-nādu and Tayañār-nādu, Koindaraiyan came with thousand horses and attacked Vada-Vellur and that, on that occasion, Pungudi Vaḍugan stabbed (some) horses and died.

This inscription raises two problems: (1) the identity of the king and (2) that of Koindaraiyan. In trying to solve them in the sequel it is found that it affords a striking confirmation of Rāṣṭracūḍa Gōvinda (III)'s second campaign in the south.

The identity of the king in whose reign the record is dated can be arrived at by a consideration of the area said to have been ruled over by him. Among such territorial divisions (nādu), Gangañādu is given first. This nādu is probably the original home of the Gaṅgas near about Nandi and Kōlar in Karnatakav. The expansion of the Gaṅgas in early times brought them to the northwestern frontiers of the Tamil country and thus we find in later inscriptions3 that Gaṅgañādu is stated to include Tagada or Tagadhir-nādu (Dharmapuri) and the latter to include Puramalai-nādu4 which is stated separately in the present record. While the other divisions mentioned in our record cannot be identified in the present state of our knowledge, Gaṅgañādu and Puramalai-nādu appear to indicate the extent of the area i.e., from Chikballapur in the north-west to Harur in the south-east. This, it will be seen, roughly aligns with the basin watered by the river Poṇnai locally called Poṇnaiyar. It should be, however, noted that the inscriptions copied from the intervening area do not contain these names such as Koyirār-nādu, Kovunār-nādu, Eyiñā-nādu, and Tayañār-nādu. An inscription5 from Tirthamalai in Harur Taluk, Dharmapuri District, Tamil Nadu refers to Miniyūr in Tayañādu, which, though it cannot be identified, is the same as

1 Above, p. 275, note 4.
2 The uniform usage of koḍu (to give) as kuṭu in Tamil inscriptions (SII., Vol. XIII, Nos. 1, 2, etc.) suggests the influence of the second u on the first o.
4 While the epithet Koṅḍalapura-paramāsvara, of the Gaṅgas points to Kōlar being their original capital, their another epithet Nandagiri-nātha refers to the famous Nandi Hills as their possession.
6 Ibid., Vol. VII, No. 9.
7 A.R. Ep., 1906, No. 661.
Tāy wrinkles. The contiguity of the area seems to suggest that the ruler, whose name is lost, but in whose reign the record is dated, may be considered to be a member of Western Gaṅga family. An inscription from Rāyachoti in Krishnagiri Taluk, Dharmapuri District, in Kannada language and characters of about the 8th-9th centuries, dated in the 4th year of the reign of a Mahābali-Bānaraśa states that the chief was ruling over among others Gaṅga-nāḍu, Poramale-nāḍu, Kovunur-nāḍu, Tāyali-nāḍu, and Meṣala-nāḍu which are no doubt identical with their namesakes in the present record. Another inscription in Tamil language and Vaiṣṇavottu characters of about the ninth century from Dharmapuri also refers to the rule of one Arimidaiya-Māvali-Vaññāyār over Gaṅga-nāḍu, Puramalai-nāḍu, Koyiṇur-nāḍu, Kōvur-nāḍu and Tāyanur-nāḍu. The nature of the damage in the present record rules out the possibility of a Bāna name being read. The frequent change in the control of this area identically described in both the present record and the Bāna records mentioned above, between the Gaṅga and the Bāna was otherwise a well-known feature in the times to which the present record is assigned.

The event which is next described in the record leads us further to find out the identity of the Gaṅga king and also that of Kōlmariyāya. It is stated that while the king was ruling over the said area, Kōlmariyāya came with thousand horses and attacked Vaḍa-Vellūr and that Puṇḍuri Vaḍaṇa fell after killing some horses. The name Kōlmariyāya is apparently a corrupt form of Gōvindarāya. There was no chief or king of this name during the 8th-9th centuries anywhere near this area. On the other hand it is well known that Rāshtrakūṭa Gōvinda III conducted his southern campaign after November 803 A.D., and before December 806 A.D. It is, therefore, very likely that the attack on Vaḍa-Vellūr by Gōvinda formed part of this campaign. The contemporary Gaṅga ruler on this date was Śivamāra II, the son and successor of Śripurusha, to whose reign the present record may be assigned. Śripurusha is known to have ruled till at least 788 A.D. Śivamāra II should have succeeded him immediately so that the date 17th year in his reign could just be 804-05 A.D., the upper limit of his southern campaign referred to above. The wording in the text of this inscription seems to imply that Gōvinda III could have come in person to lead the campaign against the Pālava and the Gaṅga. In the course of this campaign Śivamāra was again imprisoned. Vaḍa-Vellūr, the target of Gōvinda’s attack cannot be identified.

TEXT*

1. [Ṣr]. [...] [par]maṇḍakku yānḍu padīnēlājāvadu Gaṅga-nā-

2. _PUSH[Ve]l-l[n]āḍum Koyiṇur-nāḍum E-

3_yiṇa-nāḍum Pur[ma]lai-nāḍum Tāyanur-nāḍum ālā-

---

2 The difference in spelling is due to the fact that the inscription is in Kannada.
3 Ibid., No. 581.
4 It may be noted that the name Kōlmariyāya is nearer in form to Gōvindara of the British Museum Plates (above, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 237 ff.) of Rāshtrakūṭa Gōvinda III.
5 Ibid.
7 Above, Vol. VI, pp. 239 ff. Verses 6 and 14 of the Radhanpur plates refer to the imprisonment of the Gaṅga once by Dhuora and again, after release, by Gōvinda himself. Śivamāra’s checkered career would not have, however, prevented him from citing his own regal years. Alakesar dates the second imprisonment in c. 788 A.D. (The Rāshtrakūṭas and Their Times, p. 63).
8 From impressions.

DGA/72
4 niqka Kəndaraïyanä ayirañ-kuduraiyodu va-
5 ndu Vaşa-Vellär orı...ru¹ kudirái kuttī
6 paṭṭān Puñ-
7 gudi Vaḍg[a]n]
The impressions of the inscription edited below belong to the old collection of the Chief Epigraphist, Mysore. As the record is important for the history of the reign of the king Udayaditya of the Paramara dynasty of Malwa and still remains unpublished, I am editing it here with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist.

The inscription consists of three parts which have been engraved in three different places in the eastern porch of the temple of Nilakantheshvara at Udayapur, Basoda Tahsil, Vidisha District, M.P. and therefore treated as yet as three separate records, but, as will be presently noted, all the three parts are interdependent and therefore form part of one and the same inscription.

The first part\(^1\) engraved on the stone seat was first noticed by F. Kielhorn.\(^2\) D.R. Bhandarkar noticed it twice.\(^3\) H.N. Divedi has included it in his Abhilêkha.\(^4\) It contains six lines of writing which is well executed and occupies a space which measures 48 cm \(\times\) 30 cm. Each line consists of 16 to 23 letters, which are not uniform in size and measure from 3 cm to 5.5 cm.

The second part\(^5\) is engraved on the bracket-capital of the right pillar. D.R. Bhandarkar\(^*\) noted it as a separate inscription. Divedi\(^*\) too took it for a different record. It occupies a space measuring 30 cm \(\times\) 35 cm. It contains seven lines of writing and each line is shorter than the previous one so as to be accommodated in the lower right corner of a simple arch. All the lines contain 12 to 17 letters except the last line which contains only nine letters. The letters vary in size from 3 cm to 4.5 cm.

The third part\(^6\) engraved on the right pillar occupies a space which measures 8 cm \(\times\) 28.5 cm. It consists of two lines of writing. The size of the letters is about 2.5 cm to 4 cm.

The characters which are bold and engraved deep are Nâgarî of the period to which the inscription belongs. Amongst the vowels, the forms of ` in ityâdâya (line 2) and ` in âka (line 1) and `è (line 14) are noteworthy. The form of `è in âku (line 10) is slightly different. Among the consonants, two forms of `h in bhaureka (lines 1 and 7) and `rahabhâh (line 9) are interesting. The letters `v and `h can be confused with each other, of `h in dhaurekha (line 6) and `v in sarveva (line 2).

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit which is grammatically correct. The composition of the record is in prose and in verse. The rules of sandhi have been regularly observed. As

\(^1\) This is A.R. Ep., 1961-62, C 1639.
\(^2\) Cf. Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, p. 83.
\(^3\) Cf. PRAS. WC., 1914, p. 56, para 29 and Bhandarkar's list, No. 147.
\(^4\) Cf. Gwâler Râja be Abhilêkha, No. 61.
\(^5\) This is A.R. Ep., 1961-62, C 1640.
\(^6\) Cf. PRAS. WC., 1914, p. 56, para 29.
\(^*\) Cf. op. cit., No. 649.
\(^*\) This is A.R. Ep., 1961-62, C 1648.
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brother Thiradāva (Śhiradāva) who was apparently the engraver of the previous part also. The expression utkīrṇaḥ ślokāḥ in plural and the calligraphy of the writing also support the same conclusion. This part also has been closed with the auspicious expression of navāḷaṁ mahāśiriḥ as seen in the previous part.

The third part contains the concluding portion of the inscription. It contains in a verse the statement that these ślokas which are sarvaśrīta-siddhakas, composed by Pahōṛīta śrī Mahipāla were engraved by the śilpin (i.e., architect) Śhiradāva. The expression stā ślokāḥ seemingly refers to all the three ślokas forming part of both the previous parts.

The king Udayaditya mentioned in lines 1 and 7 has been identified with the famous ruler of that name who occupied the throne of the Paramāra dynasty of Malwa after Jayasimha I. The epithet svayamabhū applied for the king (line 7) may be significant, if it is interpreted in the light of the circumstances under which he occupied the Paramāra throne and became conspicuously victorious over the Chaulukyas and the Karnaṭas in liberating his ancestral dominion.  

A name of geographical importance is Udayapurā mentioned in line 8, which is modern Udayapur. While Udayāśvara (line 8) refers to the Nilakaṭṭhāśavara temple where the inscription has been found, the deity Udayāśvaradeva (line 6) is obviously the presiding god Śiva in the same temple. The Udayaśamudra (line 8) should be the name of some tank nearby.

TEXT

[Metre: Verses 1—4 Anushṭubh]

First Part

1 Svasti || Eka-chhathtraṁ karotu kshēmām-UDAYADITYA-bhūpatiḥ || (1)

2 ity-ādyaṁ siddhidaṁ vedaṁ śaṁśamaṁ sarvavatō nṛpa || [1*]

3 Kshēmā-s(a)iśraṁ bhūtyā sa krāmā-bhṛdd-yā[śasva]|| Ravi-saṁkṛanti

4 karaṇaṁ(m)|| ślokāḥ =yaṁ pahōṛīta-āri-Grihavāsa-śunōḥ ||

5 Pahōṛīta-āri-Mahipālaya || SARHVAT 1137 VAISĀKHA SUDĪ 7

6 śrīmad - Udayāśvaradevāya dhvaj-ārōhaḥ sampūrṇaḥ | maṁgaṁmahāśiriḥ [ ||*]

Second Part

7 Svayambhūr-apaṁraḥ śrīmān-UDAYADITYA-bhūpatiḥ [ ]

8 pur-śāvara-samudr-ādinaudaya-āpapadāṇ-vyadhāt ||[2 ||*]

1. Note this expression in Part II, line 11 also.
4. From ink impressions.
5. The engraving is defective here and therefore the reading is not quite clear. Another intended reading may be Yākas-kartvā, if the king is to be referred to here as responsible for the performance of Ravi-saṁkranti. In that case a palatal ś will have to be supplied after dya and the danda removed.
6. The danda is redundant.
7. The anuvāra is added to the bottom of the upper letter in the previous line.
9 Kim=anyair=vva(bba)hubhir=vēdaḥ kim=anyair=va(ba)hubhīḥ stā-

10 vaiḥ | ēka-chohhatr-ādikāṁ vēdatāṁ satīsa sarvā-ā-

11 rtha-siddhidam || [3 [1*] utkīrṇaḥ ślokaḥ

12 sūtradhāra-śri-Madhusūdana-bhṛṣtri-Thī(Thi)ra-

13 dēvena || mahgalam=mahā-śrīḥ [||1*]

Third Part

14 Étē ślokaḥ sam-utkīrṇas=Sthirādevēna śilpinā [1*]

15 Pāñjita-śrī-Mahīpāla-kritāḥ sarvā-ārtha-sādhakāḥ [||4||1*]
Chalikya. This form is noticed in the earliest record of the family, viz. the Bâdâmi rock inscription\(^1\) of Vallabhaśvara, i.e. Pulikeśin I, dated Śaka 465 or 514 A. D. This is the second copper-plate grant of Maṅgalarājā discovered so far, the other one being the Nerur plates\(^4\) which were discovered as early as 1848 and which are also undated. There also the name of the family is spelt as Chalikya and the king is called Maṅgalarājā as in the present record. There are two stone inscriptions belonging to this king, one of which is the well known Maṅkâka pillar inscription\(^5\) dated in his fifth regnal year and written in Sanskrit, fixing the date of his accession to the throne in 597-98 A.D. The other is the undated Bâdâmi rock inscription\(^6\) outside the Vaṣṇupava cave. We also know from the Vaṣṇupava cave inscription\(^7\) of his elder brother Kirtivarman I dated in 578 A.D., that Maṅgalarājâ completed the construction of this cave-temple (i.e. Vaṣṇupava cave) under the orders of his brother and made some endowment to the temple on the occasion of the installation of the image of Viṣṇu.

The object of the record is to register the gift of a land measuring 50 mvaṟtanalu\(^8\) in the village Kīrvaṇatākara by Raviśakti who was administering that village. Raviśakti is stated to be the son of Kaṇṭakaśakri who belonged to Phañikula and who was the lord of the Sûndrakas. The gift was made to the temple of Śaṅkunītha and was entrusted to Abhayanaṇḍyāḥārya, the disciple of Śrīnandyāḥārya who belonged to the lineage of the Pârâśurâmaṇa-saṅgha. The details about the sericia in the temple for which the income from the gift-land was to be utilised are not specified.

Maṅgalarājâ of the inscriptions is evidently the same as Maṅgalarājâ of the Mahâkâta pillar inscription\(^9\) of the same king who was the son of Pulikeśin I, the real founder of the Chalikya family, and the younger half-brother of Kirtivarman I. His name is also spelt as Maṅgalarājâ and Maṅgalarâka. He is listed in the present record as having the second name of Kâpanavikrânta. In the Bâdâmi cave inscription\(^10\) belonging to the 12th year of the reign of Kirtivarman I, Maṅgalarājâ is referred to as Kâpanavikrânta while the Mahâkâta inscription calls him Uru-Kâpanavikrânta. The present inscription does not give any new historical information about the achievements of this king.

The Sûndraka chiefs Kaṇṭakaśakri and his son Raviśakti who was governing the village Kîrvaṇatākara and who was the donor of the gift are known for the first time from this record as subordinate rulers of the Chalikyas of Bâdâmi. We know that some Sûndraka chiefs were ruling as subordinate of Pulikeśin II, Vikramâditya I and Viśnuvardana\(^11\). An earlier member of the family in the person of Śaṅkukâta Bhânuśakri is met with in the Halsi plates\(^12\) of Kadamba Harivarman (c. 519-30). But the exact relationship of these Sûndraka chiefs with Kaṇṭakaśakri and his son Raviśakti of the present inscription cannot be established in the present state of our knowledge. A certain Kaṇṭakaśakri-arasa is mentioned as a donor in an undated record\(^13\) of about the 7th century A. D. belonging to the reign of one Pithâman who's identity is uncertain. From the name, this Kaṇṭakaśakri-arasa

---

3. Ibid., Vol. XIX, pp. 7 ff.
5. Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 363.
6. For the meaning of this term, see D. C. Sircar, Ind. Ep. Gl., p. 230.
7. Ibid., Vol. XIX, pp. 7 ff.
8. Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 363.
10. Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 31-32.
No. 49.—HULI PLATES OF MANGALARAJA

(1 Plate)

G. S. GAI, MYSORE

These plates were discovered in 1969 at Huli in the Savadatti Taluk of Belgaum District, Karnataka State. They were obtained by the University of Karnatak, Dharwar and are now deposited in the Kannada Research Institute of that University. They have been published in the Journal of the Karnatak University (Social Sciences), Vol. V, pp. 175-81 with plates.

The set consists of three copper plates, each measuring 17.5 cm in length and 5.5 cm in breadth. On the left margin of each plate is a round hole, 1 cm in diameter, through which passes a circular ring, 7.7 cm in diameter. The ends of the ring are secured by an oval seal which is 5 cm in length and 1.7 cm in breadth. The seal contains the figure of a standing tigress, facing proper right, with its tail turned upwards and suckling its cub. This seal is interesting since the other seals of the Chalukyan copper plate grants, including the Nerur plates of this Mangalaraja to whom the present record belongs, contain the figure of a boar (vardha) which was the royal emblem. The circumstances under which the emblem of the tigress with its cub was adopted in the present grant are not known. It may, however, be suggested that this may be due to the fact that the donor of the grant Ravisakti belonged to the Sindraka family, some members of which had sa-vata-vyāghra-lāṇḍekha.

The characters belong to what is known as early Telugu-Kannada script and are regular for the period of the ruling king Mangalaraja mentioned in the epigraph who ruled at the end of the 6th century and the beginning of the 7th century A.D. Of the initial vowels, a and i are found, the former in lines 5 and 14 and the latter in line 14. The sign for upadhmāṇya occurs in line 1 while that for r appears in line 11. Final consonantal letters m (lines 1, 3, 16 and 18), t (line 19) and n (line 3) are written in their diminutive forms. In the last plate which contains the imprecatory verses, there is some space after the first pāda of each line of the verse. As regards orthography, the consonant following r is re-duplicated except in dharma in line 3. In the Kannada place name Kiruvaṭakere in line 11, the vowel e in kere has to be read as short. The language of the record is Sanskrit and the composition which is partly in prose and partly in verse is fairly correct except some minor errors which are corrected while giving the text below.

After a siddhama symbol and the expression svasti at the beginning, the inscription gives a verse in praise of Śantīśvara or Śantiṇātha, the 16th Jain tirthankara followed by another verse extolling the Jaina religion. Śantiṇātha is described as the seer of the three worlds by his wide vision of wisdom and as the bestower of peace (śantidāh).

The inscription refers itself to the reign of the Chalukya king Mangalaraja who is described as having the second name of Rāṇavikrānta, who had obtained victories in many battles, who was endowed with virtues like bestowing gifts, who was like Purandara (i.e., Indra) in valour and who had the title prithvi-valabha. The name of the dynasty to which Mangalaraja belonged is spelt as

\[\text{Ind. Ant., Vol. VII, pp. 161 ff. and plate. The seal has also been illustrated. Therefore, the statement}
\[\text{“the facsimiles of the record are not reproduced and the seal is not illustrated” (Journ. Karn. Uni. Soc. Sc.,}
\[\text{Vol. V, p. 178) is not correct.}
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appears to belong to the Śendraka family, though it is not stated so in the record; but, we do not know whether he had anything to do with Kappāsakti of the present epigraph.

Abhayanandayāchārya to whom the gift was entrusted and his teacher Śrimandyāchārya belonged to Paralur-saṅgha i.e. the Jaina community of monks established at Paralur. There is an earlier reference to Paralur, called Brihat-Paralur in the Devagiri plates1 of Kadamba Mrigēśavarman (c. 450-75 A.D.). And the Aḍūr inscription2 of Chālukya Kṛtivarman II (746-57 A.D.) mentions a few Jaina teachers belonging to Paralur-gaṇa.

Besides Paralur, another geographical name mentioned in the present record is Kiruvattakāra. We are not certain about the identification of both these places.

TEXT

First Plate

1 Siddham[* | *] Svasti [ | *] Vistiruṇa-jñāna-nētriṇa yah-paśyati jagat-trayam [ | *]
2 sa jayaty-amaraṇa (nyā) taḥ śāntidāś-Śāntir-Iśvarah [ || *]
3 Sārga-āpavargga-saukhyāni dēhinō yēna bhūjatē [ | *]
4 sa dharmo jayati śreyān satya-niṣṭhās-sad-Ārhatām [ || *]
5 Atha Chālukya-vadhā-āmbar-ōdīta-chandramasi anēka-yuddha-

Second Plate, First Side

6 prati-labdha-vijaya-patākē dān-ādi-guṇa-saṃpannē Purandara-
7 prati-mājasī Prithivivallabha-paṭṭa-buddha-lalātē
8 śrīmatī Maṅgalarājā Rāṇavikrāntādvīṭya-nāmadhēyē
9 śāsāti vasundharām tri-samudra-parīyāntām tasya-anuśāsa-
10 nēna Phānikul-ānvaya-śrī-Sēndrak-śendra-śrī-Kaṅpāsakti-priya-tanayēnā

Second Plate, Second Side

11 Raviśaktinā śaktimatā Kiruvattakāres-grāmam-ardhipālayatā tasminnē-
12 va grāmē pāṃchāśañ-nivarttanāh kaḥetraḥ dattaih Śānti-bhagavatāś-chaityāyaś tē (ta)jāy-

2 Ibid., Vol. XI, pp. 63-71 ; Kāra. Ins., Vol. I (Dharwar, 1941), No. 3.
3 From the impressions.
4 Denoted by a symbol.
5 The letter which looks like nyā is not properly formed. Read -amaraṇa-ādhātā. This has been read as amaraṇa-dānā and corrected into amaraṇa-dānā in the Jour. Kāra. Uni., Vol. V, p. 181.
6 Cf. the expression Chālukya-māṇa-āmbara-pūrṇa-chandraḥ in the Mahakūta pillar inscription.
7 Cf. naya-sīhās-dānā-dānā-sīhās-dānā in the Mahakūta pillar inscription and naya-sīmaya-
8 naya-sīha-dānā-dānā-sīhās-sāmpannāḥ in the Nertu Plates.
9 This ya is engraved in smaller characters below the line.
10 Read sayyama- or sayyama.
14 Abhaya-Nandyāchāryyaḥ iti svasti || Bahubhir=vasudhā bhuktā rājabhis-Sa-
15 gar-ādibhiḥ [\*] yasya yasya yadā bhūmiḥ tasya tasya tadā phalaḥ(lam) [\[3\*]\]

Third Plate

16 Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yō harēta vasundharām [\*]
17 shassṭīṁ varsha-sahasrāṇi narakē pachyatē tu saḥ [\[4\*]\]
18 Pitrīḥr=vasaṣatais=sārddhaṁ\textsuperscript{1} putra-pautrais-sa-bāṇḍhavaḥ [\[\*]\]
19 shassṭīṁ varsha-sahasrāṇi rauravē narakē vasa(sē)t [\[5\*]\]

\textsuperscript{1} Both a māṇḍūra and class nasal are written, Read a śaḍdhaṁ.
NO. 50.—GANESHVADI INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF CHALUKYA TRIBHUVALANAMALLA, YEAR 24

(2 Plates)

V. B. KOLTE, NAGPUR

Ganēśhvādi is a suburb of the village Hippalāgon in the Nilanga Taluk of the Osmanabad District, Maharashtra State. There is an old temple of Śiva near which there is the samādhi of a saint, Keshav Bharati by name. Two inscribed stone slabs1 have been lying there since long. Information about these was supplied by the Sarpanche to the Department of Archaeology, Government of Maharashtra, Aurangabad, in 1964. Research Assistants Messrs. N. S. Pohanker and Harihar Thosar visited the place and took stampanages of the inscription. The department published a small note on the contents of the inscription. Thereafter no efforts seem to have been made for editing the same. Last year my attention was invited to these facts and therefore I requested permission to edit these inscriptions which the late Dr. M. G. Dixit, then Director of Archaeology and Archives of the Government of Maharashtra, very gladly accorded. He also supplied me with excellent stampanages of the same. I am thankful to the Department of Archaeology and Archives of the Government of Maharashtra for this courtesy. I have published this inscription subsequently in the Marathi Journal Vidarbha Samādikana Mandal, An. Rep. for 1969, pp. 36-80.

Of the two slabs, the first measures 150 cm high and 80 cm wide. On the upper part of this slab are carved out in bold relief representations of the Sun, the Moon, a kālaśa (suspicious jar) and a cow with a calf, and below this part there is an inscription of 52 lines. The second slab measures 153 cm high, 64 cm wide and 33 cm thick. On the upper part of the front side of this slab are carved out in bold relief representations of a bull (two) and a Śiva-līnga with a devotee standing in front with folded hands. Below these figures there is an inscription of 52 lines. The left side of this slab also contains an inscription of 50 lines. The total number of lines of the record is therefore 154.

The record belongs to the time of the Chalukya king Vikramāditya VI. It is in Nāgari characters of the Northern class regular for the period. The prishabhātrā have been extensively used. The letters t and bh are almost similar and therefore cause some confusion at some places in reading. There is no appreciable difference in the signs of the letters j and ṣ also (see lines 9, 10, 14). The letter v has been invariably used in place of b, which is an orthographical point to note. Other orthographical peculiarities noticed here are the use of anuvātra for para-sacarā almost everywhere except in the words sāmanta (line 8), grāmā-bhāyantara (line 15), tad-antargata (line 23) and the doubling of the consonants following r everywhere.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit and it is faultless. The text is in prose and verse.

As has been stated above the inscription is of the period of Chalukya Vikramāditya VI. The details of the date are given in lines 22-24 as Monday, the full-moon-day, when there was a lunar eclipse in the month of Mārgasirha of the sarivatsara Pramāthin in the 24th regnal year of the king. On the evidence of an inscription at Wadagiri1 in Hyderabad State the cyclic year Nala or Anala corresponding to Śaka 998 expired (= A. D. 1076) is reckoned

1 [These have been listed in A. R. Ep. 1964-65 as Nos. B 354-55 and their contents are discussed in the Introduction on p. 11.—Ed.]

2 Ind. Ant., Vol. XXII, pp. 109-10. [See also, above, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 193-96 for a discussion on this Wadagiri inscription.—Ed.]
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as the first year of the new era initiated by Vikramaditya on his accession. Our present record belongs to his 24th regnal year which would, therefore, correspond to Saka 1021 (=1099 A.D.). According to the Indian Ephemeris, the cyclic year was certainly Pramāthin in Saka 1021, but the full-moon-day in the month of Mārgaśīrṣa was Wednesday and not Monday as mentioned in the record. It may be possible that the word Samrāṣṭa must have been intended in place of which the engraver has inscribed Sāmaśēra due to inadvertence. The corresponding date according to the Christian era was Wednesday, the 30th November, 1099 A.D.

The record may be divided into three sections. The first section on the first slab ends in line 53 and the word puṇar-āpi at the end of the line connects it with the second section on the first side of the second slab. This section ends in the 116th line on the second side of the slab. The third section commences in the 117th line.

The object of the first section, which is in prose, is to record a gift of land measuring 500 mīvatīs in the village Pippalāgrāma for the maintenance and worship of the temple of the gods, including Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Maheśa, etc., and also for the supply of meals to the students in the Sarasaṇa-mandapa by Bhimanātha to Tatparṇa-ṇaḍīta. It also records the gift of some residential land in the village itself.1

The record opens with the introduction of Tribhuvarnamālādeva, which was another name of the Chāluṇya emperor Vikramaditya VI. He is endowed with the usual titles. Thereafter, the inscription introduces the emperor’s Chief Minister Bhimanātha by name. From lines 7-11 we know his various titles. It is stated that he got the honour of the Pahāsa-mahāsāda and bore the distinctive titles like mahāśeśa-maṇḍīkayati and mahāpachāna-daṇḍanāyaka. Among his personal attributes, the record mentions that he was an artist on the face of Kaśmira (line 10), which implies that he originally belonged to Kashmir. He has also been referred to as Sauvadallāṇṭam-adhikṣhāyaka (i.e., an Officer of the Service in the harem).2 He is mentioned as one who beheaded those who betrayed his master. Bhimanātha, under the name Bhīvanāyya, is mentioned in an inscription in a temple at Hujasi-Hasadali, in Gulberga District, Karnata, dated in the 23rd year of the Chāluṇya Vikrama era. In this inscription he is styled Mahāpachāna (Chief Minister), Manveṣaṇa (Superintendent of Home Affairs), Sahavāsa-adhikṣhāyaka (Leader of the Sahavāsa), Pattale-karaṇa (Commissioner of Records), Manneva-adhikṣhāyaka (Head of the Subordinate Chiefs) and Dānāvāyaka (Commander of the Forces).3 A Kannada inscription from Lakshmīśvar in Dharwar District, Karnata, also refers to this Bhimanāḥa. It is dated in the 27th year of the Chāluṇya-Vikrama era, i.e., Saka 1024 (=1102 A.D.) and records some gifts by one Madhava Bhaṭṭa, who was a very loyal servant of Bhima who is none else but Bhimanāṭha of our record. He is named as Bhīvanāyya also. This inscription mentions all the epithets of Bhimanātha referred to in our present record. Besides this, it adds that Bhimanāṭha ruled over Paṇsilaka-12,000 and was the Provincial Records Officer.2 The present inscription of Gāpurāyaḍi is three years earlier than the Lakshmīśvar inscription.4

---

1 [There does not seem to be any reference to this gift in the record.—Ed.]
2 [This term probably means 'controller of attendants on women's apartment', see A. B., Ep., 1904-5, Intro., p. 11.—Ed.]
4 Above, Vol. XVI, pp. 31-33.
5 The expression akeśaṃpanaṇagad-adhikṣhāyaka, used here would mean 'superintendent of revenue from mines'.—Ed.
6 This Bhīvanāyya is mentioned in an earlier inscription dated 1095 A.D. from Hebbal in Bijapur District.—cf. S.I., Vol. XI, No. 139. His description given in the Lakshmīśvar inscription is also found in another record from Gudag in Dharwar District which is also dated in 1102 A.D., Ibid., No. 150—Ed.]
Bhūmanātha obtained from the king the village Pippalagrāma, where he constructed temples of all the gods including Brahmā, Vishnu and Mahāśa. For the maintenance and daily worship of these temples, and also for feeding the students and ascetics residing in the Saravatamandapa, he made a gift of land measuring 500 shrītika from the village Pippalagrāma (lines 14-29). The boundaries of the land are mentioned in lines 30-42. He also gifted out some land for residential purpose in the village itself, the boundaries of which have been mentioned in detail in lines 44-52. The name of the donor is Taipurushapandita whose spiritual lineage is given in section three dealt with below.

The second section of the inscription in line 53-116 is in verse, except the text in lines 113-16 which is in prose. The last verse (verse 52) of this section ends with the passage dyēripita svastimatah prākāshī which would show that it was composed as an eulogy of Bhūmanātha. Therefore, this section of the record may be called as Bhūmanātha-prākāti.

It commences with a verse in praise of the Śivalingasannāsartanā (verse 1) and the incarnation of Mahāvarāha (verse 2) and of Śri-Gaṅgā (verse 3). Verses 4 to 7 refer to the Chālukya king Vikramāraka, i.e., Vikramādiyavī. VI. These verses contain conventional praise of the king and do not add anything new to the historical information. Thereafter Bhūmanānāpathi is introduced as the Chief Minister of the king and as having attained the highest position amongst the ministers, learned men, religious personalities, etc. (verse 8-9). Then follows the eulogy and personal information of this Bhūmanātha. He belonged to the Āstīya-gōtra (verses 10-11). His forefathers hailed from Himāchala, i.e., Himālaya mountain (verse 12). Āditya-bhaṭṭa, a scholar renowned for his learning in Vedic exegesis and philosophy, was the great-grandfather of Bhūmanātha (verse 13), and he was a religious personality who had obtained for his family prosperity and wealth by his devotion to the god. Śiva on the banks of the Vītasa (verse 14). Śīru-bhaṭṭa, the son of Āditya-bhaṭṭa, was the grandfather of Bhūmanātha, and was an agraśātrī (verse 15). Valla-bhaṭṭa, the son of Śīru-bhaṭṭa, was the father of Bhūmanātha (verses 16-18). Then follows the eulogy of Bhūmanātha which is of conventional type. His fame was spread over all the three worlds (verse 19). His qualities of head and heart have been described (verse 20). Beautiful description of his erudition and eloquence find a place in the next two verses (verses 21-22). Then follows the description of his valor on the battle-field (verse 23). He has been described as a veritable ascetic (verse 24). The next three verses are also of conventional type. The next verses (verses 28-30) describe his qualities of debate and quick-wittedness. His mother’s name was Jayāvati (verse 32). Jūgala-dēvi also called Jūgavā was the wife of Bhūmanātha (verses 34-36).

Verses 37-51 refer to the pious deeds of Bhūmanātha which may be enumerated as follows; He built a big hall called Bhūma-vikrama at Maṃsa-kara and installed the images of Kṛṣṇa, Piṭāmaka and Rudra, for the maintenance and worship of which he granted the village Triparikhāta (verse 37). He built a temple called Pratapabhūma at Nānditāta on the bank of the river Gōdāvari and installed therein the shrines of Triparikha, i.e. Brahmā, Vishnu and Mahāśa for the maintenance and worship of which he donated the village Vaghhika (verse 38). He constructed the temple of Vishnu named Bhāma’ at Bhavanāchala. At Śivapura he constructed a temple of Śiva called Bhūmeśvara (verse 39). He built a temple for Bhūmeśvara as Kalyāṇa and granted the village Murunhika, evidently for its maintenance. He constructed a lake at Kallurtharaka (verse 40). He obtained Pippalagrāma from the king from which he granted some land to the religious brahmanas (verse 41). At Pippalagrāma he constructed three temples of

1 Literally Niṣa-bhūga-śāhā-śāhā.
Trilōchana (Śiva) and donated 1,000 nivartanas of land (verse 42). There he built another temple called Bāmīka; a lake named Bhūmāsmadura, a temple of Gāpāsa named Bhūmabala and donated 100 nivartanas of land for its maintenance (verses 43-45). He also constructed the temple of Kāhārapāla named Bhūmāyudha on the bank of Bhūmāsmadura and two wells with niches for twelve deities in one of them. He also built the temple of Chandrī and donated 100 nivartanas of land for its maintenance (verse 47). He performed sacrifices in all important cities of his country, where religious brahmapas were fed in abundance (verses 48-50). In fact, there was no limit to the pious deeds and donations of Bhūmānātha, who had filled the treasuries of the king Vikramārka by lakhs of gold coins and, therefore, says the composer of the prāśasti, it was impossible to enumerate his high qualities and describe them in words (verse 51). Thus ends the main portion of the prāśasti.

It will be seen that Bhūmānātha, the hero of this prāśasti, has been referred to as Bhūma (line 76), Bhūma-sēnāpāti (lines 71-73, 109-10) and Bhūma-chānūpāti. It is obvious that his name was Bhūma and that the official title of Sēnāpāti or Chamūpāti has been added to it in some places.

The writer of the prāśasti was Kālidāsa-dānānāyaka (verse 53), who was the son of Bhūmānātha. He had several qualities of head and heart, was well-versed in the Rgveda and, because of his poetic excellence, was known as Abhinava-Kālidāsa. He mentions himself as dānānāyaka, which implies that he was also either a legal officer or an army officer.

The third section of the record in lines 117-54, in prose and verse, has as its object the description of the spiritual lineage of the dhārya Tatparasha-paṇḍita, who was the chief of the Sarasvati-mandapa; and the priest in the temple built by Bhūmānātha at Pippalagāma. This section opens with the words 'sh namah', and then gives details of the spiritual qualities of Vadirādra-paṇḍita, who was the foremost among the Kālamukha sect of the Parvatāvats school, who was learned in various religious sciences including the sciences of logic, who, in debates, was a terror to the opponents, who was a dhimuktā, i.e., the fire to the Jainas and the Buddhists. A resident of Kāśagāma, he was virtuously the moon blooming the night lotus of Śivalinga-saṅkāma and was esteemed by Rudra Himself. Verse 53 describes his excellence in all the disciplines of philosophy so much so that he has been described to be Lakulīśvara himself in the Śaiva system of philosophy. Besides Lakulīśvara, the present record refers to his philosophy as Lakulīśvar-āgama (line 124) and Lakulīśvarāgama (lines 134, 141) which is obviously the same as Śaiva philosophy referred to in line 124. The doctrine of Lakulīśvara believes that Jīva is not subservient to god but equal to god himself and advocates salvation after destroying miseries through the practice of Yōga and Viśdhi. Yōga is eight-fold and consists of restraint of body (yama), restraint of mind (niyama), postures of sitting (āsana), self-study (swādhyāya), meditation (dhyāna), controlling the breath (āṛṣṭra), silence (mauna), practising religious austerities (anukīkāsha), muttering prayers (japa) and absorption of mind into the supreme spirit (sāmkhyā). Viśdhi are many. They consist of bathing in ashes thrice a day and observance of six-fold oblations (sūpadh-āpahāra). They are: Ḥasita (laughing), Gīt (singing), niyga (dancing), hupaḥkāra (murmuring), namaskīrā (saluting by lying prostrate).

1 [The purport of this verse seems to be that a niyga-troya (i.e., a three-called temple) was built for the god having three faces with three eyes in each and possessing three head-gears. — Ed.]

2 In the Sarvadārikā-Sangrahā it is referred to as Nakulīśvarā-darīkā or Śaiva-Pāṇḍapata-darīkā. For details of the origin etc. of Lakulīśvara, the founder of the Śaiva-Pāṇḍapata-philosophy, see JERAS., 1908, pp. 151-67; The Early History of the Deccan, ed. by G. Yaxdani, p. 704; and A.S.I., A.R., 1909-07.

3 Of, Sarvadārikā-Sangrahā, Nakulīśa Pāṇḍapata-darīkā.
and japa (muttering). Vādirudra-pañḍita was an adept in all these yogic practices and the six-fold oblations. He has, therefore, been very aptly described as yama-nigam-dśana-svādhhyāya-
dhyāna-dhāraṇa-maṃ-anvāh-thāna-japa-samādhi-śaṭṭāng-ōpahārīdī-sampānam (lines 117-13).

As has been stated above, he is said to be the foremost amongst the Kālamukha ascetics of the Parvatāvalī school. The Kālamukha or Kālāmukha ascetics were the followers of the Lakulāgama system, and they are different from the Kāpālīkās. The Kālamukha sect split itself into different āśālīs and āśāgās. Parvatāvalī is one of them which is known also as Parvatāmāṇya. These āśālīs and āśāgās were further divided into various subsects which were called as santānas or santatis. In the Abūr inscription we come across one of such santānas known as mūrana-kongey belonging to the Parvatāmāṇya sect of the Kālamukhas. In our present record we find the mention of Sivalingi-santāna which is obviously another subject of the Parvatāvalī. The name Sivalingi given to the santāna appears to suggest that the followers of this sect were wearing a Śiva-liṅga, like the Bhūraśivas figuring in the Yākṣāka records. The chief place of this Sivalingi-santāna may have been Pippalagrāma, the findspot of the inscription.

The disciple of Vādirudra-pañḍita had a disciple named Kriyāśakti-pañḍita, whose various qualities are described in lines 124-30. It seems that his other name was Bhārati-Kanāṇāpūra (lines 128-29, 145). He was well-versed in the doctrine of Lakulīvaṇa, an erudite scholar, protector of religion, adept in yogic practices, humble, an ornament of his sect, proficient in all the systems of philosophy, always calm and tranquil, an ear-ornament of goddess of speech, of widespread fame and above all an image of Śiva himself.

Kriyāšakti had a younger brother (line 130) by name Trilōchanaśāhrya. His various qualities are described in lines 130-37. In general they are the same as those of Vādirudra and Kriyāśakti. He was also a devotee of Śiva, well-versed in the Lakulīgama and an ornament of his sect. Then the poet Tatpurusā-pañḍita is introduced. He was also well-versed in different philosophies and was a great poet and a debater. Verses 54-56 describe his various qualities of head and heart. He is credited with the construction of lakes, temples and hermitages for ascetics. He was greatly meritorious and like a great tirtha (line 146-51). Both Trilōchanaśāhrya and Tatpurusā-panḍita were the disciples of Kriyāśakti. The hierarchical relationship of these is not explicit but it appears that they became the chief dhārīgas one after the other, after Kriyāśakti-panḍita.

Thereafter follows the description of Śrikanṭhamuni. It seems that he rose to the position of chief priest after Tatpurusā-panḍita. Whether he was a disciple of Tatpurusā is not specifically mentioned. But in all probability it seems that he was. His qualities of head and heart have been described in verses 55 to 58. They are full of praise but do not give any distinguishing additional information about either Śrikanṭha-muni or the Śivalingi sect.

The importance of this record lies in the fact that it refers to the chief place or matha at Pippalagrāma which belonged to the Śivalingi-santāna of the Parvatāvalī sect of the Kālamukha school.
of the Lakulīśvara system, and to the line of pontiffs of the same, although I have not been able to find reference to this sāntāna in any other inscription so far.

As regards the places mentioned in the record we may say the following. The places mentioned in the first section are: Kalyāṇapura, the place from where Vikramaditya VI ruled, is the present Kalyāṇa, Bidar District, Karnatakā. The gift village Pippalagāṇa is the modern Hipppalagāṇ in the Nilanga Taluk of the Osmanabad District in Maharashtra State, about 10 miles south-east of Lātūr. Gaṅgēśhvaḍi, the findspot of this inscription, is a suburb of this Hipppalagāṇ. Śilīkaraṛāṇa referred to in the inscription as situated to the south of Pippalagāṇa may be the present Salgār, about 4 miles south of Pippalagāṇa. Sūshkāṛāṇa, said to be to the north of Pippalagāṇa, is possibly the present Sūgāṇ, some 4 miles north to Hipppalagāṇ. The places mentioned in the second section are: Kaśmirā is the same as the modern Kasmirī region in the Himalayan mountain. It may be noted that in line 10 Kaśmirā is spelt as Kāśmira. The river Vitastā is the same as the modern Jhelum. It may be noted that in the 11th century also this Jhelum was being referred to as Vitastā. Mēghāṃkara is the modern Mēhakar, a Taluk place in the Buldana District, Maharashtra State. The place was named after the demon Mēghāmka, who was killed by the god Vishnu. Mēhakar has been referred to as Mēghāṃkara in Matsyapurīṣa ( Chap. 23), Padmapurīṣa ( Chap. 185), Līlācharitā, a Marāṭhi prose work of the 13th century and Sthānapoṭhī also. Pippārakāṭa may be identified with the present Pimpārakāṭ at a distance of 25 km south-east of Mēhakar. Nāṁdītaṭa is the present Nāndēḍ, the District place in Maharashtra State. Vagghi can certainly be identified with the village Wāghi on the bank of the Gōḍāvāri about 6 km west of Nāndēḍ. Bhuvanāchala cannot be identified with certainty. It may be identified with a village Bhuvana in the Partula Taluk of Parbhani District. Another possible identification may be with Bhōṅgira (Bhuvanāchala-Bhuvanagiri-Bhōṅgira) 40 miles away from Hyderabad. Śivapurī could be the present Shivapurī in Gangespur Taluk of Aurangabad District. It can also be Śivapurī, 6 miles north of the confluence of the Gōḍāvāri and the Kaum, or Śivapurī in Hadagao Taluk, 23 miles north-east of Nāndēḍ. Kalyāṇapuri is the same as the present village Kalyāṇa in the Hunnabad Taluk of Bidar District. Murunibikā may be the present Murum in Umarga Taluk of Osmanabad District. It may also be identified with the village Murunibi 10 miles west of Kandhar in Nanded District. Kallurūhara may be the village Kalatibār 10 miles north-east of Kandhar and about 15 miles east of Murunibi.

TEXT

[Metres: Verses 1, 10, 12, 23, 24, 31, 49, 50 and 58 Amuṣuhā; verses 2-4, 17, 37-39 Vasantaṭilakā; verses 5 Mālinī; verses 6, 21 Mandaṅkṛ āṇā; verses 7-8, 19, 20, 22, 25-27, 42, 51, 54-55 and 59 Śaṅdalahṣkrīdītā; verses 9, 11, 13, 18 and 44 In śravasjarī; verse 38 Uṇḍraḥcaya; verses 14-16, 29-29, 32-35, 41, 45-47, 52 and 56 Upuṣṭāti; verses 40 and 43 Vaiśkṣaṭha; verses 50 and 57 Dṛśṭavilambita; verse 47 Śrāgāhārā; verse 53 Pusāḍhāṭrā].

First Slab

1 स्वस्ति [1*] समस्तमूनमनय : श्री [पृथ्वीवलुलमभवारा]*—
2 जाष्ठराजः परमेश्वरः परम[एक्षः सत्यः]*
3 यकुलित्तकः[[*] चालुक्यायमर्णः[१४]—
4 महित्रमुञ्नमल्लदेवः प्रभिनव[विजयकः[१४]—
5 तस्मादमकुसकोशाभिनो [[?]—
6 रमनवरं कथाणपुरे साम्राज्यविन्य[चः[१४]—
7 सति । तत्महाप्रथमं (१.१)[१४] स्वस्ति समधिगतपर[चः[१४]—
8 महासमन्तायपिपर्महाप्रचंदङ्गनाय[कः कित्यः]*—
9 वत्जमानीष्टलप्रदायकः वत्मनिधानः[सः*—
10 वनमात्तेंद्रः कास्मीरबिषयमुखमहं[सः*—
11 वंचकिवलं विंडः स्वरमित्रमुष्मल्लवेपः*—
12 दाबजः[व्या] बः साहोशोऽऽ एवसामामाधिवसमस्तः[प्रवृत्तिः*—
13 सहिन्दः सौविद्वलानामधिपायकः सवंधरः[कर्माः*—
14 पवः स्वीर्मीरणाथो राजः[जः] सकालातिप[लयः*—
15 मं संग्रामः[व्या] सा कालातिप[लयः*—
16 तीरे च (१) हाविण्यमुदेश्वरादिवसस्ताः[वेपः*—
17 वतालवांश्च कार्यक्ष्या तदेवतानाः[लयः*—
18 नैमिन्तिकविकोपपूपाविधानाचः बुध[भ्यू[सः*—
19 नैवेद्यदिव्यदानाचः च वंदनकुकुमारग[भो*—
20 मग्नर्तायमधिपः क वर्तं वरस्ववीमधिये
21 तपस्नाना विवाचिनाः चांरदासवंदन्यानार्थः त्वसः[विचि*]
22 श्रीमुखालुक्यविकरमनुपङ्कलेन नवविचित्रः[तमः*]
23 प्रमाणिसंबंधिते तदन्तगतमार्गीय भाषेः पो[वर्मा*]—

24 स्वासोमवारे सोमप्रहणपर्वती मंडलविशा—

25 नातिन धारापूर्वकः कुल्वा सर्वनमस्तवेन श्रीम—

26 तत्तुर्वपद्विते: उज्जवलाणि मानवद्रप्तमा—

27 शेन पिपलाङ्गामसूम्यां निवर्तनानां पंचशतातः(त)—

28 संहित्या श्रन्तोपि तत्संहित्या ५०० जलपा—

29 पाणसहितां संभितां मुम्मोम प्राणालुः। तत्स्या:

30 पुनरार्पण: [१*] दक्षिण: विलकरप्राम्सीमा [१*]

31 प्रचिरित: शुक्क्रप्राम्सीमवः। उत्तरत: शुक्क्राः—

32 मार्विकक्षायम् शरीरी भार्यः। ततो ग्रामादः—

33 यवविभ्रभे व्यवर्तिताया: पुष्करिण्य: सकाशा—

34 दु ग्रामादायनेवविभ्रमाधिमुखम् वर्तं गता: भू: [१*]

35 तत्र शिलासांस्यापितं [१*] ततो दक्षिणाधिमुखः

36 गत्वा भीममुद्धसवित्तितमहावनालकुतरः—

37 त: शिलाशास्य तिस्त्टित। तत: पवित्रमिनु—

38 खं खोतो विलंप्व तत्रापि शामनविला दिशा—

39 ता [१*] ततो दक्षिणाधिमुखं शिलाकरप्राम्सी—

40 माविचः स्वतं मुम्मिः। एवं सम[त्ता]दाचाटकिष्मा—

41 ध्व(व)वर्षः सर्वात्म सिवु तत्र तत्र शिलाशास्य स्थापितः[पिऴ*]

42 तस्मिन् अन्तः श्रीभीमामाथो भीमेश्वरवेव—

[१*] The reading is मासी—Ed.
[२*] The reading is शासातिथिस्थाय( दय )वर्ष—Ed.
43 नाम पूर्ववाहा ग्राममध्ये निवेदनमूलं
44 ददो। तर्या: प्रमाण [1*] मैलारेवेच्छुहुँ (ढुँ) तर—
45 विश्ववेश्वतिपरसुत्पमिति: [1*] पश्चिमाभि—
46 मृत परसं नैम्न्या विशिष्य विलासासन स्थि—
47 तं। तदुरार्मिन्द्र उपास्माकारस्मिनेन वाय—
48 व्यति: विलासासन। तत्त: पूर्वमिन्द्र पुरातना—
49 राहु (ढुँ) हिंसाधार्म्या विशिष्य पुरानाकारस्मिनेन स्त्रि—
50 ततो विक्षणामिन्द्र उपाराज्याकारस्मिनेन विषा
51 प्राकारस्मिनेन ग्रामनेया विशिष्य विलासासनमेन—
52 तं परस्य सत्तु दिसू शासन स्थापितं। पुनर्खि

Second Slab: First Side

53 स्वतित भी। ये संसारमुद्रस्य पारं सतो विया\[1*\] ते सिवरंगितिसतानचासनम्।
54 वस्तिः श्रीमानायेरिसिं: स महावराहः [1*] यत्कोपवन्हुः उपाराज्यायामां दर.
55 कायलार्यात: परिर्देरमान: [1*] श्रवणामधिनिरतिनिरिनापायो।
56 विष्णुप्रायायकरणमुभिरार्यवर्ये: [1*] सिद्धविपुरसमुद्धतरुद्धतिसत्सिंहकलस्य.
57 सतिबंधुः तशाशासनभ: [1*] विमलतरविपुरलीलितिविनात् सुरतिरिति लोकः.
58 नान्ममिहसाश्चतिकालितुरुग्नो विनिता:\[1*\] एकस्य सुरतिरितिः स्वर्गमेशसः पाताले वा परिसरस्वूँ

1 This punctuation mark is unnecessary.
59 लोचनाचार्यपत्रः (भम) ।।११।।* \text{रत्नविशिष्टसौरपालकरकसंकीर्तिमंधन यस्यानां विशालमी-}
जुञ्जयोऽक्षाणेकाकाः कान्तिस्त्रावरंकम: [१*] कुतानेकविरः शरोऽ-

60 हुलनमाराजः पिज़रे रेते स्वस्तितोऽयम स्वसुरिवालंतातुः संगमः ।।११।।* \text{रघुदानविवाकर: परिजनान्त्रीतः परां प्रा—}

61 पवशोदयेऽ(वाः)हुमोरे एव निलोत्र रहस्यज्ञा: सर्वतः [१*] \text{चम्ककारभूमिरामभिमाः}
हुमायूः गोभीरिमा तस्यार्थीद—

62 परस्परे न हृदय श्रीमोऽसनापति: ।।११।।* \text{तथा प्रवानः विजितप्रवान: सेनाप्रवानः विद्युत}
प्रवानः (नमु) [१*] भर्मोऽसन जगतसाप्रवानः

63 श्रीभौमानः सकमुनिवसी ।।११।।* \text{बः(व)हुमायुः मानस: पुत्रः क्रीपार्णा सप्तमो मतः}
[१*] भविष्यमर्य सप्तिपद्युगोताविश्रुण्यि: ।।१०।।* सेव्य

64 मुनीरूपरिविवातचन्द्रयः मोनम्बानेरनमीवरिः \text{रघु} (भम) \begin{align*} [१*] \text{विन्दकल्पत्रों(व)धुप्य-} \end{align*}
भारभरार्थः (व्य) मत्यर्थकल्पुस्त्र सिद्धसे ।।११।।* \text{हिमाचलसमुन्नना}

65 यस्य बंधाविलेन (व) भी [१*] \text{विज्ञप्तितपश्चोण पूर्वाचार्यविन्दु मुखा ।।१२।।*}
आदिलम्बः विन्दितालिखानो वेदार्थविभाजनपरः वृङ्खि—

66 वचै[१*] \text{सौकस्तुतो यथपितामहोऽसुकसेवकसंप्रदीप्तिमन्तिरः ।।१३।।*} \text{महावर-}
ध्वस्तसमस्तपापो गाढ़म्बध्वम्बमेष्टितमबावः [१*] \text{गुप्तितस्तापविवचितः} ।

67 स्तिनाका: प्रिनाकरोपणकुलकविधः ।।१४।।* \text{पितामहो: यः(व)स्य व(व)भूव मूली}
कृषिशेषभः: \text{रुचिस्चमकमूः} [१*] \text{हुमायुः ह्रस्वकामस्तिरः}

68 \text{सांस्कृतिकार्थिविश्वितकसीति: ।।१५।।*} \text{श्रीवलम्बः गुणपुरसन्नमी: पिता व(व)}-
भूव्रोच्चवष: पताकः [१*] \text{संसारायुनितिपवार्तान(व)वस्त्र वृंगोर्तपरः—}

69 \text{पराय: ।।१६।।*} \text{श्रीमोऽसंगमहोरहस्यपक्षोऽगमोब्यानु मुक्तिभि: परिवेस्वरायम्}
[१*] \text{समागमग्नस्नितितितविवचयः गंगमवाह इत्यदृः}

70 \text{सितम्बराया: ।।१७।।*} \text{श्रीकर्मिकनिर्देशकलाविलाल्लोकः(व)दया भृतुपदाधर्मीन्[१]}
\text{लक्ष्मीपियो नावविशिष्टानुचक्र: भ्राकितोक्तिनित्यप्रस्ताप: ।।११।।*} \text{भृ—}
७१ री किनरापालिका: सुपत्तेरूस्थानसंस्था: पुरो: पातालेयहिंकका अहरह: कित्यां कितीशां
गना: [१४] कीतिन्द्र (व) स्वे: जनप्रियस्य वितता गीमी—
७२ सत्यनाथनेहरूस्तिवर्धनकरणा गारित गीतमाहुः: [१६] सांस्कृतिक महोदयः
हुदया सामाजिक धर्माभिमान: शोयणार्य (वृ) न— १°
७३ बिक्षें रविनिम: शायव्यापोतकृ: [१२] बहुतेनुस्मानानिनिलिनिः: शायोरा पुष्पिर्या सम: 
श्रीमान्मीमच्छूपि: समवतस्वरुप ह—
७४ प्वायः: [२०] वारम: कीतिशिवभुवनपारोहिनः: श्रीकामिस्करोखः (र्था) बीचारा—
लक्ष्यविवृपो हिष्ठिद्वाहिह (ध्व) पश्च [१४] प्रितिप्राल: शिष्ठिपतिमयू पूण्य—
७५ रण्यर्वाम्भ शालवाने यो वेदत महत मामुरति सम्यकिये [२६] भारतसंगतमानस 
च सुमहत्त्याक्यरूपपिनिः शैविकीविकता स—
७६ भा सुमानां गर्भास्यो बतले: [१०] भोसे वि (वि) भति भूमूखद्रयते साधिब्यमयः जूहुत (च)
— शायोराच्छिकितर: विनायक हयो भूतान समय—
७७ सन्त च [२२] [विष्णूषमरस्व[ग] रे प्रेतसः: परस्पर (र) [१०] पुदे युक्ति
युव्यरत रक्तमातामहिमाविशिष्टः: [२२] शात्रे यम सुराच्छायि
७८ सदाचारे सत्य (व) के (कि) मेरे: [१०] राजकायः सतां कायां समतयामयिनः: रथुम [२४] [२२]
सवा: परिपुर्ण (न) इविलब्धवर्णा (बृ) धाः—
७९ रोकरौरौराधाराकृतिजीविधृपुरवे संवादपोतन तत: [१०] कुवंमाधरमरजररितिमुद्
प्रोष्ण्यितं सर्वत्रेः: सावितितुतुदहर—
८० सूभिकराराधिन्यायिन्यामुच्छने संवादपोतन तत: [१०] कुवंमाधरमरजररितिमुद्
प्रोष्ण्यितं सर्वत्रेः: सावितितुतुदहर—
८१ प्ययौ नागर: [१०] नायेन्द्रलय्यम्यूष्यवद्यनावताकाामसम्मतस्थादुचलित: [१०] पययौ—
(बृ) चिलुलभलानुकारे दलयु: [२६] आयायिः
८२ कुण्येन होयोमबंधु स्थत्वादा धर्मीन: प्रीतिविच्छिद्रित रा व्युष्णि श्वेत्यं यस्स्युरस्तरे
[१०] कुंडः सत्यग्राम (व) ये चतु—
83 रता व(ब) दिकम विक्रमे शुचिवर्म नितारामरी गुणवर्णा एतेपु यस्यास्ति II[२७॥]*
विश्वामनसबदि समयोपाय(व) व्यवहयः

84 रंग्रं नृणायकने [१] अन्त:स्वरो यो मूलिकांकावान् सपरसवृतीस्फवनाौँकसः II
[२५॥]* सा दस्ते जाता न जनित्यष्टे या

85 तस्यात्तिदुसाहित्य प्रतीता [१] चरितसंचारिसंहृष्णो यदीयोपपुरवद(व)हस्तः
समस्तम् II[२६॥]* विच(व) चत्रवेष्वे विहरस्तमः कृतः

86 कव(व)ण्ण विवक्ष: य: [१]* सपादः कृष्णमुण्ड वचलाकृतिः प्रतिपंशो मूलिकावः
विज्ञानसया II[३०॥]* लक्ष्मी विन्यो(व)ऩऩा शमन्गभीः

87 यः च पशोवशः [१] कमां भोज्य जहारायः सत्यमेतु तु यात्राय: II[३१॥]* कृते
दितिबीरसुता ब(व) भूव वेतायथे रामाः

88 माता [१]* या देवकी द्वारवलोच्या सा जयवती वशुजनी कली च II[३२॥]*
श्रीसम्प्रथुमुखोभवेलवकाया यशावदातातिसिद्धार्थकीतः

89 विमूलयाती वर्षोहिमय ब(व)भावःवेंदुकलायवस्य II[३३॥]* पतिततः चम्परातिः
रम्या चर्मावधिता चर्मराजयवायम्[१]* विच्चारातिर्विः

90 शुष्ककृत: श्रीशर्यास्य व(व)भूव पवः II[३५॥]* पचैव विष्णुमूङ्गनाधिपस्य
शंभोभवेलवाविनिवत्स्यायनम् [१]* रतिवशः कामस्य है(ह) रे: शचीव

91 हिमांतुविव(विं)व(व)स्य च रोहिःपीव II[३६॥]* कनोपकारा व(व)हुम: प्रकारे
श्वारतारापरितिकांतिवामिः [१]* अनुप्रत्यधातपश्च है II

92 तलव्यापितमहागुणोवः II[३६॥]* मेंचकरे विबु(वु)वचवर्यावोपसनः यो श्रीविक्रम:-
समास्त्विवशालशालां लामुः [१]* निमाण केवलविताम रे

93 हृद्भूतीः सर्वत्र विष्णुरकेस्तेमदामृतः II[३७॥]* गौदवारीस्वलयोभवसः नारीत्तवे निपुणः
कुतुहलपितामु(द्यामु) [१]* नक्रे प्रतः

94 पनवभीमसमास्याल्पाग्राम दरी विपुलवभवविनिवकायः II[३८॥]* योसी महर्षि:-
भूजोट(व)लभेभमानव विकाशस्वकार सा

95 दन मुनमाच्ये च[१]* महामार्गनाम विकीर्षोदयां निधानं चके तथा विपुरे विकर्षाय
य: II[३६॥]* चकार श्रीमंडळवेद्वितायां क-
96 ल्याणपुर्णिष्ठितंतिममन्यम् (व्यम्) सम्य [²] मुर्गीवः (वि) काप्रामदासलिस्तरं चकार 
कल्पुल्लिब्र (व्यम्) रक्षिपिनः सरः ॥५०॥ [⁴] स्फितप्रामणमवायु राजेः

97 जानानुत्ताणितकलमः [²] भूय ददी ठरमपरो भिजेयः पद्म स्वकीर्तिनिव विस्फुरत्यायः ॥
[⁴] चके यरस्त्रिविलोचनाविवः

98 वने: स्वरूणमणिक्षोतिया विभागमणुेकतवः यद्वादातं वि (वि) सङ्कगैरित्विन (सम्य) [²] 
देवानां नित्ययथं स्वयसोऽनििनः

99 एकास्विनं प्रत्याप्रभुमसाधारणं च प्रावतसहगं भूवः ॥[⁴] भीमाक्षणनामावि 
च देवतायं चकार रौचिवपरिपूर्ताचले[²]

100 भानो: समान कसकोज्ञम् (व्यम्) लक्षिता प्राचीनिर्मेरे: शुनहूच्च विभिन्नयः ॥[⁴] भीम्भोमानामार्को 
स निम्ममे भीमसमुखम तदायमादोभिव स्वकीर्तिर्[²]

101 कोन्तापंकोपमसुमुद्द्रवं वि (वि) प्रस्तुतपुण्युक्तमादित्रदिमु (दिमु) ॥[⁴] विधन- 
हयेतीपशस्तित्वारं सेतुवं भोमाम (व) लाभिनान्त (सम्य) [²] हे-

102 रंग (व) धामाम प्रविष्टमे सः समायचनापी शतं पुवियतः ॥[⁴] स क्षेत्रपलस्य 
चकार धाम भीमापुरास्य स्वदानां

103 तीरे [²] बाणामापी थारावेदतानं चकार धामान्यपरो व वा वामिनः ॥[⁴] भवत् चः 
करोसंगक्षणपावः

104 फिष्टमाओपियायुरधियः [²] चंडारिष्टिमाणिमाभिमाको (क) उच्चकरिचकार मूते: स 
ददी शंति तत: ॥[⁴] [²]

Second Slab: Second Side

105 यन्त्र यक्षपासि तीर्थ महदपि नगरं मन्त्र जाते त्वदवे शीतो मर्यादि चके प्रतिपदमितिवा-

106 यान्ति स्तने सूर्य [²] यद्भावावपूर्णिन दिव्यवर्णिनका वु (व) वर्णाचारशाय नारेः

107 रुच: परिच्छिपरम (व) द्रामान् विपापा: ॥[⁴] होममृतम्य ययस्य विप्र- 
नवंतनोऽहः [²] यथ: ॥-

108 पुफ्रतसुमादया सदा नवफलाकुल ॥[⁴] यददभोजने: पुलः: विन्ध्रा भूविः सहसः

² This punctuation mark is unnecessary.
109 मररामाभिवर्युकलाभिभोज्यम्। \[[५०२१*] \] श्रीतो नासित परोपकारकः श्रीभीरभरि। \[१\]
110 पतेयनापुरी सुख्यातलकारः श्रीविभ्रमकारं नुः। \[[१*] \] तत्यथेऽ प्रभृत्य सुकोपु गणना कर्तु। \[१\]
111 समीहे परे भूयस्यातलकारः स्ववच्छ वक्तु न शक्तोपमः। \[[५४९१*] \] यावसभी यावधन्यं विरिचि।
112 यावमुखः यावधसी च क्रृणः। \[[१*] \] ताब्जनभोज्यसुखावहास्ता (स्त्ताः) दिग्पिता स्वस्तितमः। प्रसादः। \[[४२८२*] \]
113 मदभुदिकतत्वेद्युद्धिनियन्तरः। सकलार्थात्रा। \[२५३३*] \] सुलोकितकवितनवस्त्तरः।
114 यदुपुरुषः कृतः नवरात्रिलाला एनामो। \[[५३४१*] \] इति प्रववंदनवाक श्रीमोग्नायनमुनु। \[१\]
115 सुरिजनावनंदसंवर्तः। गुज्जरेवरणपरायणः। कृष्णदृढः मुदितनिधि। \[४५४५५*\]
116 चूड़ामणि। श्रीभबनाविहारः। क [ललित] वास्यंदनावकाव्यकार प्रशस्तिमिति शुभम्। \[१\]
117 त्रूः नमः। स्वसित \[२५३३*] यमनिमहेश्वरायवायनाभारणमो (सो) नानुष्ठानांजनमाहिकादिशः (ह)। गोपहा। \[१\]
118 राविशंक्तः। अनेककृत्तिभाषानारायानारः। अववासः एतिष्ठाना। \[२५३३*] \] श्रीमलिनकर।
119 ना। दुर्मदिविज्ञदिवसमलकालापासा वातविंवंस (व) रम्यावा। (त्र) हुकुलभुमक्रंतः। प्रत्येकः। \[२\]
120 ल्या। कालमुखतेनाग्नआयग्न्यः। किल्ल्वाक्रमहताविवात श्रीमहाविविलितानं।
121 मुदितीलक्ष्यिनाय:। प्रववाक [ह] महिता। \[२\] श्रीमद्वदित्तिपिर्वितः। \[१\] तेषामेव क्री।
122 तित:। काणाद्रे। कणमुखः (सु) हृद्यात्मकसर्वस्यर्द्यः। काणिले मामाय रे। कपिल। \[२\] वर्युः।
123 गद्दरे। या (सो) सौगले सदुः। \[[१*] \] श्रीमानाधिकरसः से श्रीभिप्रियानिधिमापः। \[३\] क्रर्ती। \[२५४५५*\]
124 जो लगुक्तीकरे विजयवते शोः शिव:। सांतर्तम। \[[५४३३*] \] तत्कथा। \[५४३३*] \] श्रीमलकुलिद्वराः। गणमाणसमरः।
125 वरराजसे। सरस्त्रीमहेश्वरभूणावत्ताः। किल्ल्वाक्रममहाविविलितमाध्याणः। \[१\]

\[१\] This punctuation mark is unnecessary.
\[२\] This double danda is redundant.
126 गुजुकसमुदरणः यमनिमसमीवशालवालसकालवालसामुचितकलः धारः
127 गणान्तसामाधिविधिनिपुणः संसारभविधः गुजनकतविनयः भूषितनिजः
128 मयः बृ(बु)धजनकतपः तकादिशान्तवेः सततबीतरागः परहितवभोगः भा
129 रतीकरण्णपुरः नरकमयुः निम्भुवनविविकीतिसः महेश्वरमूर्तिः महापुरः
130 पक्षमुन्तः श्रीमत्क्याषानिशिंवितेवः सदनूः स्वस्त् त् समस्तलोकः
संस्तूः
131 यमन्त्वगुणमणिभगमरीविमालालंकातः समस्तलोकसंस्तुता द् पार्वतीमातारमण
132 ' चरणपुगारविकिरणः द्वारमण्डलसिरः भिक्षुः सुपूर्विरुपस्य
133 धुःपुष्पावलिंता भारौकरण्णुः निविदूः धजनवनावमातः रात्रः
134 ' जुंगितमदनधवतनमिश्रः लाकुलामसमरोजिनिराेणः निजसमयः
135 ' वत्स्सः कलिंतकलिभिपक्षकविविधः विचारात्वातास्विनः समस्तमुजनः
136 परिरक्षणकुशितंपावित्तः आः स्वस्त्ति त् यमनिमात्वतीभावामवत्वाहारवः
137 ' श्रीमत्क्याषानवाचारिपठः स्वस्त्ति त् यमनिमात्वत्वतीभावामवत्वाहारव
138 ' धारार्यामणिभिधिसंपन्तः अनेककलिभिसंधानान्तवेशान्तपारारापणः कपिलः
139 ' क्षाव्याधिबामितासंपदाधारः समस्तवतिरास्तकीविविधः अनवरतः कप
140 ' यासदनकतस्तिन्यिनः भिक्षुः त् मुद्रानकमुदितनिलसम्भडः अन्याय्युभिन्नियः प्रति
141 ' मृणिश्रमणः गुजनपदोब्धजनविलपः त्वचाः लाकुलामसमयासुः
142 ' रात्रः दृष्टान्तविधिसमाधायः आधितजनकविदः पवित्रनिजसम
143 ' यस्तः (त्त्वः) समासिद्धातः (त्त्वः) परिचितस्वमणिवगमाणः विगत्तोष
संस्ताः करणः
144 मृतिसारिनियः प्रक्तिपरहितद्रुवः समस्तमुन्तनानवासः महेश्वरदासः

1 This punctuation mark is unnecessary.
2 This double dash is redundant.
श्रीमद्वारातिकण्णपुराणाम् कियाशकिमयामहमुनीद्वराणां किष्या: श्रीमतपुरुषपदिता–

श्रीरामविविष्यकः (स्त्र) धानिवहानत्वंसंवेदितां सिद्धान्तविभवत्।

तिथिवादानान्वितान् [1∗] श्रावसान्त्रतिनां विमानवदृश्यके समंताकती श्रीमान्तरुप–

यो मुनिद्धाविश्वनसकोणकीक्ष्मित्त्वम्। [१५५१] समस्तशास्त्रान्तद्वृत्ति लिखातिपिक्षिकारुण्–

नकलप्रकाश: [१∗] विचक्षणान्वो: (नै) कभास्वाबाधिराजे तत्तुहो मुनीवच:। [१५६१] समायित स।

प्रज्ज्वलन [चित्त] सुसंगमेशिवज्वरञ्ज्ञ: परिचित: [१∗] विविघुषितपितित: सुभाष्यं तं त।

दशाविश्व तत्तुहो मुनि। [१५७१] यमादिपमसंपत्त: मुनीनां प्रवरो महान् (त) [१∗] सवमिश्र–

गुणाधार: श्रीकंठो मुनिमयय: [१५८१] कामवानुकीकर्मनर्मवरे: संतापितार्गिताना–

माहावं जनयशिशुपिष्टकलं संप्राप्यकारिनां (नाम) [१∗] यो विद्वद्धुष्मोकारक्षणपरे

विचारानान्वित: सोप्य भालि यमादिपमनिर्दलः (तः) श्रीकंठायो मुनि। [१५६२] यो नम: [१५२]*

*This punctuation mark is unnecessary.
No. 51—FIVE GWALIOR GANGOLA TANK-BED INSCRIPTIONS  
(2 Plates)

P. R. SRINIVASAN, MYSORE

I visited Raipur sometime in January 1965, during my annual collection tour. Mr. Bala-
chandra Jain, Deputy Director of Archaeology and Museums, Government of Madhya Pradesh,
who was in charge of the Raipur Museum, was kind enough to show me impressions of several
inscriptions which belonged to different periods. He narrated to me the story about the discovery
of these records. He said that the Gangolā tank at Gwalior became dry in 1964 for once after
a long time and that his officials at the Museum there found several inscribed slabs having been
paved on the bed of the tank. They took steps to copy as many inscriptions as possible. But
during one night there was a heavy downpour of rains and the tank was again full making the
work of copying all the inscriptions on the tank-bed impossible. Having stated thus Mr. Jain
promised to send the impressions over to this office after his study of them was over. On my
returning to headquarters, at my request Dr. G. S. Gai, Government Epigraphist for India, kindly
arranged to get from Mr. Jain one set of impressions of these valuable records. As the work
of taking the impressions seems to have been done in a hurry, they are not very good although
they will remain the only best ones till better impressions can be had. These were subsequently
these, Nos. B 78-81 and 85 are in local dialect while the rest are in Sanskrit. Five of the Sanskrit
records (Nos. B 73-77) are edited here from the above-mentioned impressions kindly supplied
by Mr. Jain.

A. Inscriptions of the Pratihāras of Gwalior

Of the five records, four belong to the Pratihāra family of Gopāḍri or Gopagiri or Gwalior.
For the sake of convenience they are given the numbers I to IV. All the four are engraved in
ornamental Nāgarī characters regular for the period and locality, and their texts are in verse with
a sentence or two in prose, but their constructions in some places being defective, the purport of
the passages where these defects occur is difficult to make out.

Three of them (Nos. I-III) belong to the time of Malayavarman or Malayakshitiṣa who
is known to have ruled between V. S. 1277, the date of his Kurēthā plate and V. S. 1290, the date
of one of his coins. Of these, Nos. I and II are dated V. S. 1282 (1226 A. D.) which is five years
later than the date of the above-mentioned Kurēthā plate, while No. III, though not dated, may,
on palaeographical grounds, be assigned to about the same time. So far the only known records of
the time of this ruler have been the Kurēthā plate mentioned above and the fragmentary stone
inscription found at Mangrol in the former Kotah State. The three inscriptions edited here
are important because they confirm the rule of this king over Gwalior and its neighbouring terri-
tories.

Inscription No. IV refers to Nāravarman who is stated to be the son of Vigrāharaṇa. He is
no doubt identical with the homonymous brother of Malayavarman whose records have been

1 Above, Vol. XXX, pp. 144 ff., and plate where other references are given.
2 Ibid., p. 145.
3 Ibid., Vol. XXVI, pp. 279 ff., and plate.
mentioned above, and who was another son of Vighrakṣa. The second copper-plate from Kurūshā dated V. S. 1904 (1248 A.D.) is the only record known so far as belonging to Naravarman’s time. The record examined here, though not dated, may have to be assigned to about the same period on palaeographical grounds. This record is important not only because it is the second epigraph known of this Naravarman’s period, but also because it proves beyond doubt Naravarman’s connection with Gwalior. Although there is nothing specifically mentioned in this short record about Naravarman being the ruler of the place, the tenor of the inscription shows that it was put up most probably during the period when he was ruling from Gwalior in which case the observations made by Dr. D. C. Sircar, while editing the second plate from Kurūshā, that Naravarman “may have held sway over the present Shivapuri region where Kurūshā, the findspot of his plate, is situated,” and that at that time “Gwalior together with the surrounding area was under the Turkish Muslims” require modification.

I. Inscription of Malayakshitā, V. S. 1282

This record is engraved on a dressed slab of stone which, as has been stated above, is paved on the bed of the tank. It contains ten lines of writing. It is dated (line 3) V. S. 1282, Aṣṭādī śādi 11, Friday corresponding to 1226 A.D., June 5. This date falls within the period of reign of Malayavarman. The inscription commences with the Siddhaṃ symbol. It is followed by verse 1 (lines 1–4) which states that the queen Talhādēvikā, the mother of Malayakshitā, for the merit of her royal husband śrinād-Vighrakṣa, arranged for the desilting of two tanks called Gōgaga-udāga and Raṣa-saras, each of which was provided with compound wells and flights of steps (ṣīhaṇa-viśeṣām). The statement that she did this work due to a different power (ṣaṃjña-saṃgātā śaṅkya) is noteworthy. It is not unlikely that she was under the spell of remorse and sorrow at the death of her husband Vighrakṣa and that she shook it off when she became imbued with a new motive power which was responsible for her undertaking the public utility work of desilting of the tanks which must have been evidently used by hundreds of people of the locality. The name of the queen is clearly Talhādēvikā in the present record, although in the Kurūshā plate of Malayavarman dated V. S. 1277, the name of his mother is quoted as Alhānadevi. The names of the two tanks are interesting to note, but it is not clear which of them denoted the tank now called the Gaṅgā tank the bed of which is the findspot of the present record. Of the two names, Gōgaga-udāga may have been the ancient name of the Gaṅgā tank. In this connection it may be noted that another inscription paved on the same tank-bed, belonging to the time of the Kachhchhapatī ruler Ajayapalādeva and dated V. S. 1251 (1194 A.D.), also relates to the desilting of a tank, most probably the Gaṅgā tank itself, which is referred to simply as the udāga in the epigraph. It is not known if the name Gōgā was added subsequent to this record or was there but omitted at the time of engraving of the record. Since this record speaks of only desilting of the tank, it is evident that it was already in existence. The tank which went by the name of Raṣa-saras in olden times has to be located elsewhere in the place.

Verse 2 (lines 4–6) introduces the princess named Aruridhāti who is stated to be the daughter of the king of Mithilā, and who, like the splendour of the wife of the sun-god causing daily the blossoming of the lotus, was causing the bloom of prosperity daily in the

1 Above, Vol. XXX, pp. 106-102, and plate.
1 Ibid., p. 151.
1 Ibid., Vol. XXXVII, pp.
kingdom of Kalayęśa. The word 'Kalayęśa' does not fit into the context and in all probability the scribe had committed a mistake in engraving Ka for Ma, after the word Bhānakō in the third pāda of the verse. If so, Malayęśa would be seen to be the shorter form of Malāyakshithiśa occurring in verse 1. Then the comparison that as Prabhā was to Bhānakō so was Aurnādhıś to Malayęśa becomes meaningful and we understand that this princess was the queen of the ruling king. The reason for mentioning her here is not stated, but it is likely that she was also associated in the work with her mother-in-law. Unfortunately, the name of the father of this princess is not given, although it may be presumed that he was a member of the Karna family that ruled during the 13th century over the Mithilā region.

Verse 3 (lines 6-7) states that the two verses, evidently those discussed above, were composed by a certain Ānakeśhāka, the son of Yasodęśa. This composer is described above as a rājya and learned in the Vedas and Vedāṅgas. The expression slokaḥ adhyātyamaṇyaṃ āt is not a happy one. It appears that for the sake of metre this expression has been used for the correct expression slokaḥ adhyātyamaṇyaṃ. Even then, one is at a loss to know why the expression adhyātyamaṇyaṃ is used to qualify the word slokaḥ when both the verses deal with certain matter-of-fact occurrences and contain little or nothing pertaining to the self. This verse is followed by a prose passage in line 8 which contains the details of date already mentioned. This is followed by another sentence which states that the text was engraved by a certain Thāku (Thākura) Vāghadēva. The writer of the Kurēha plate of V.S. 1277 belonging to Malāyvarman's time is stated to be a certain Vāghadēva, son of Vāhu belonging to the Kāyastha family of the Mathura class. He appears to be identical with Thākura Vāghadēva of the present record.

In line 9 there is verse 4 which contains the important statement that Malāyadēva had a beloved wife named Jīvādēvi endowed with good qualities and that she was the mother of Kumāra Harivarman. That she was also the mother of (Kumāra) Jayavarman is contained in the fourth pāda (line 10) of another verse of which the first three pādas are to be presumed to be the same as those of verse 4. These people may also have assisted Talānadhikaka in her work, and that is why they are referred to here. Jīvādēvi, who was evidently another queen, Aurnādhıś, mentioned above, and the two princes viz., Harivarman and Jayavarman, sons of Malāyadēva, Malāyęśa or Malāyakshithiśa, are known for the first time from this record.

Of the localities mentioned in the inscription, Gōpadri is modern Gwalior, the findspot of the record and Mithilā is the territory lying to the north of Bengal.

TEXT

[Metre: Verse 1 Sārdulavikṛiti: verse 2 Idravajra: verse 3-4 Anuvsthah.]

1 Siddham: || Śrīmad-Vigrarāja-vra-aripatē || Kālaśaya sarvēryasē
2 Gōpadrau Malāyakshithiśa-janani prākāra-sāpanā ||
3 rajā Talānadhikaka sūsaha-dhiyā Sākty-ānyay-āyātyā ṛṣi ||
4 mād-Gōga-taḍāga-Rāja-sarasi niṣṭha[pa]jākhiṃ kārī || 1 Arumāhā,
5 tī Mithilā-rāja-putrī vichitra-chāritra-saṭṭa-pūtā | prabhēva Bhānakō (r-Mi)lā-

2 From impression.
3 Expressed by a symbol.
4 This date is superfluous.
II. Inscription of Malayakshmapala, V. S. 1282

This inscription is also engraved on a dressed stone slab which is paved on the bed of the tank. There are five lines of writing and the text consists of a single verse and a line containing the details of date. The details of the date are V. S. 1282, Ashadhasudi 11. They do not include the weekday which seems to have been omitted by the scribe due to inadvertence. Notwithstanding this omission, it is not difficult to know from the details that this date is only two tithis or days later than the date of the inscription No. I discussed above, and that therefore the corresponding equivalent in the Christian era would be 1226 A.D., June 7.

This inscription is in praise of a certain Yasodhara belonging to the Mathura-vamsa. In the first half of the verse (lines 1-2), this record refers to a certain Tejapala who is described as mathura-vamsa-hira-kamala-vrata-ahima-pragaha. The meaning of this passage is that he caused the flowering of the people belonging to the Mathura-vamsa, just as the sun causes the blossoming of the lotuses. In effect what is meant to be conveyed by this expression seems to be that he was a brilliant member of the Mathura family. At the end of this half of the verse there is mention made of Tejapala's son named Padma. In the second half of the verse (lines 3-4), Padma's son named Yasodhara is referred to and he is described as a pillar in the lofty mansion in the form of the kingdom of Malayakshmapala of the Pratihara family. It is not clear in what capacity did Yasodhara serve the ruler so as to earn this description. Neither is there any mention made of his work. In all probability this person too may have contributed something to the upkeep, maintenance and repairs to the tank where the inscription is found embedded. In the last line (line 5), the details of the date, already mentioned above, are given.

TEXT

[Metro: Sardulavikriyita]

1 Asv-Ma, a-vamahira-hita-jiiva-kamala-vrata-ahima-pragaha-
2 a-Tejapala iti kshita pravidita Padma-abhidhas-tat suta 
3 uchhaB-shri-Pratihara-vamsa-Malayakshmapala-raha-kalaya-
4 sambhas-tat-tanay va (babhuva cha dhara-shri-ma Yasah-purvaka
5 Sarvat 1282 Ashadhha-sudi 11

1 Perhaps this should read as itkav adhyatmayatau.
2 The first two verses are to be understood here.
3 This is redundant.
5 The adjective uchhaB-. . . . sambhas has been taken to qualify the person referred to in the immediately following passage, because it is at the beginning of the second half of the verse. But if it is taken to qualify the person who is referred to in the passage immediately preceding it than it might refer to Padma also.
6 From impressions.
III. Undated inscription of Malayavarman's time

This record is engraved on another dressed stone slab which is paved on the bed of the tank. There are four lines of writing and the text consists of two Anushṭubh verses only. It is not dated but, on palaeographical grounds, this record appears to belong to the period of Malayavarman, and in point of time not far removed from the two records, both dated V.S. 1282, discussed above. This short record is important in that it makes mention of two more queens of the ruler, his matrimonial alliances with two more royal houses through these queens, and of another son and a daughter.

The inscription commences with the Siddham symbol. It is followed by verse 1 (lines 1-2) which simply states that Śrīṅgārādēvī was the daughter of Vallālādēva, the queen of Malayavarman and the mother of Viravarman. Verse 2 states likewise that Śāmkaraśadēvī was the daughter of Trailōkyavarman, the queen of Malayavarman and the mother of Lakṣhmīdēvī. From inscription No. 1 above we have already known that Aruṇāchālāi and Jivādēvī were the other queens of Malayavarman. By furnishing particulars of two more queens the present record makes it known that the ruler had at least four queens. Similarly the same inscription No. 1 speaks of two other sons of the ruler namely Harivarman and Jayavarman and, with the addition of Viravarman disclosed by the present record, it is clear that the ruler had at least three sons, each through a different queen. That the ruler had a daughter named Lakṣhmīdēvī through the fourth queen is known from this record only. Inscription No. 1 has revealed that Malayavarman had marital alliances with the royal house of Mithūlī. The present inscription shows that queen Śrīṅgārādēvī was the daughter of Vallālādēva. Doubtless this Vallālādēva belonged to a royal family or to a feudatory royal house of North India of the period, although it is difficult to identify the family. That Malayavarman had alliances with the house of the Chandālās is known from the fact that Trailōkyavarman, whose daughter Śāmkaraśadēvī was also a queen of Malayavarman according to the present record, appears to be identical with Trailōkyavarman (c. 1205 A.D.) of that dynasty, who was a contemporary of Malayavarman. The reason for the putting up of this inscription which only makes mention of these queens without referring to the connection they had with the tank, is not easy to explain although the very presence of the record in the place suggests that they had also had a share in its upkeep. The marital alliances entered into with several royal houses of North India by Malayavarman prove his political acumen and must have helped him a great deal in establishing himself firmly in Gwalior against the formidable Muslim onslaught.

TEXT

[Metre : Verses 1-2 Anushṭubh]

1 Siddham|| Putri Vallālādēvasya rājñī Malayavarmanah ||

2 śrīmat-Śrīṅgārādēvī-iti janani Viravarnaṇah ||[1*]||

3 Khyätā Śāmkaraśadēvī-iti putri Trailōkyavarmanah ||

4 Lakṣhmīdēvīydh savitri cha rājñī Malayavarmanah ||[2*]

---

2 DHN1, p. 277.
3 From impression.
4 Expressed by a symbol.
IV. Undated inscription of Naravarman's time

This record is also engraved on a dressed stone slab which is paved on the bed of the tank. There are only two lines of writing here and the text consists of a single verse. It is not dated but on palaeographical grounds, it may be assigned to a date not much later than the records I-III discussed above.

This short and undated inscription records only an event, perhaps of great importance at that time, viz., the killing of a lion by Naravarman, the son of Vigrahārāja. The narration of how it took place is interesting. It is stated that the prince, who was desirous of releasing (killing) a lion called Chitta which he knew was in a forest close by, hit it by an arrow while sporting and it departed to the supreme abode leaving the forest. There is, however, the word pāravim in line 2, which appears to be a mistake for some other word which would have thrown some light on the meaning of the verse. For, such words as mumuksha, sanshaya, Chitta, and paramān gatiḥ, when viewed together seem to suggest not a naturalistic meaning but a different one. This hunting spree of Naravarman, described in a beautiful and lively manner in this record, is not unlikely to have taken place during the time when he was ruling; and so, even in the absence of the date and expressions like Naravarmanṣaḥ vājyaḥ in this record, it may be presumed to have belonged to the time of Naravarman's rule.

TEXT

[Metre: Sārdūlavikrīḍita]

1 Siddham Śrīmad-Vigrahārāja-vāna-gataḥ saṁbhavaḥ mumukshuḥ vābaṁ jñāna yaḥ

2 viddhaḥ śrī-Naravarmaṇaḥ Mrigapatiḥ sukrīḍatā pāravim Chiś[ti]-ākhyaḥ sa gatō gatiḥ cha paramān saṁtājya tat-kāmanam(nam) ||

V. Inscription of Tūmara Mānasimha's time, V. S. 1551

This fifth epigraph which belongs to the Tūmara family of Gwallor is also engraved on a dressed stone-slab which is paved on the bed of the tank. It has eight lines of writing. The language is corrupt Sanskrit, which is evident especially from verse 1, and the text is in verse and prose. The corrupt nature of the text indicates that by the time of this record, the standards of composition in classical Sanskrit had gone low, due apparently to the neglect of a proper study of the language as well as to the increasing influence exerted by the local dialects that were in vogue amongst the masses.

The record refers itself to the reign of Mahāraja Kālidhīya Mānasīngha (i.e., Mānasimha) of the Tūmara-vahā of Gopādri. It is dated V. S. 1551, Vaiśākha sudī 3, Tuesday, Rōhini nakshatra, Saubhāgya yōga, which correspond to 1494 A. D., April 8. The object of the inscription is to record the desilting of the Gaṅgālā tank by one of the ruler's subordinates.

2 From impression.
3 Expended by a symbol.
4 It is not clear whether this word is correctly spelt and what it means.
5 This letter can be read as si as well.
This epigraph is important in that this is the only record known so far of this ruler who is known to have ruled from about 1486-1517 A.D., and during whose long reign "the power of Gwalior Tomaras attained its greatest splendour." The inscription commences with the Siddham symbol followed by the word Siddhī and then the passage paying obeisance to the god Gaṇeśa. Lines 1-2 contain verse 1 which invokes the blessings of the god Krishṇa, who had lifted up the mountain Góvardhana with the tip of his hand over the cows to protect them from the torrential rains, on Tómara Mānasimga. Verse 2 (lines 2-3) is of benedictory nature proclaiming that the king Mānasimga should live long, enjoy long and protect the earth till such time as the sun and moon endure. Then follows a prose passage in lines 3-5, which contains the details of the date already mentioned. This is followed by another passage in lines 5-6, which makes mention of the victorious reign of Mahāraja Mahāraja of the Tómara-varshā of the Gōpāchala fort. The following passage introduces the ruler's Pradhāna named Sāka Khēma belonging to the Saravakhandēlāvarā-jāti and also others named Sāka śri-Tōjara and Tāsall Mahāraja, although what Tāsall stands for is not clear. Line 7 contains the statement that the Gaṅgādēva was desecrated by him, perhaps by the ruler himself. The same line also has another benedictory passage meaning 'let (people) enjoy till the sun and moon exist, and let there be righteousness, prosperity and happiness.' Line 8 states that the record was written by Śā.(Śākhā) Jāsa belonging to Śrijāla-jāti, and mentions the Sūtradhāra Pabhū who probably engraved the text on the slab. Then follows another benediction viz., 'let there be the grace of ishādevatā, or favourite deity'.

The only locality occurring here is Gōpāchala-durga which is modern Gwalior.

**TEXT**

[Motra: Verse 1 Vasantatīkā; verse 2 Anuḥṣubh.]


2. || vā(hūr)ṭīya=pi viyāya-viṇāyala[ka]-sacca-charitnā[lah] Kva (Krj)na(sūna)āryē=stu tava Tómara-Mānasimga2 || 1 || Chiras ̣ filla chiraṁ nau-||

3. || dā(da) chirāṁ pālaya *mādiṁ(nām)] || śri-Mānasimga-rājēndra || jā(yā)vach-charitnā- ̣ divākarau || 2 || Atha saṁvatsarē=smi-||

4. || n śri-Vikramādi(di)tya-rājye saṁvata 1551 varshē Vaiśāsha[ka] sudi 3 Markgala vāsare || Rōhiḍi-nakshatrē[Sau-||

---

3. From impression.
4. Expressed by a symbol.
5. Mānasimga is the equivalent of Mānasimha.
6. The head of a pig is the equivalent of Mānasimha.
7. One đaḍa is superfluous.
8. This đaḍa is superfluous.
5 || bhāgya-nāmā-jō(yō)gō || ārī-Gōpāchala-durgō || Tōmara-varbhē(śē) Mahārājādhirāja-rājā-ārī-Mānasimhādēva-vijai(jaya)-||

6 || rājyē || tasya pradhāna-Saravasha(kha)mēlāvāra--jñātiya || sāha-Shē(Khē)ma sāha-ārī-Tōdara Tasalī Mahārūṇā ||

7 || tēna Gamgolā-taḍāgam nirmālī-kra(kri)taṁ(tam) || ā-cāthdr-ārkadh chirah naṁahāyāt || subhām kalyāṇam ūrēyō bhavatu ||

8 || līṣh(i)khi)taṁ Śrīmāla-jñāti Sā -Jasū || su(sū)tradhārī(ra) Pabhū || ārī-iaḍadēvatā-prasādī- ||
stu || ārī || ārī || ārī ||

———
No. 52.—KESANAPALLI INSCRIPTION OF CHANTAMULA, YEAR 13

(1 Plate)

S. SANKARANARAYANAN, MYSORE

The subjoined inscription was discovered in a ruined Buddhist stūpa in the village Kesānapalli1 in the Palnad taluk, Guntur district, Andhra Pradesh. It has been noticed in the A. P. Govt. Report on Epigraphy for 1965 (No. B 92) and subsequently published by Shri N. Ramesan2 and also by Dr. R. Subrahmanyan.3 However in view of the fact that the treatment of this important record by the above scholars is rather inadequate and faulty, the Chief Epigraphist secured, on my request, two sets of impressions of the epigraph from the Director of Archaeology and Museum, A.P., and kindly permitted me to edit it in the following pages. I thank the Chief Epigraphist for the same.

The pillar bearing the inscription is said to be octagonal and broken, the extant portion measuring 60 cm in length. The inscription is engraved on two facets of the pillar, each facet containing two lines of writing. Since both the ends of the pillar are broken away and lost some akṣaras are missing both in the beginning and end of the lines.4 Thus the record is unfortunately fragmentary.

The characters of the epigraph are Brāhmī and they very much resemble those of the inscriptions of the Ikshvāku king Virapurisadata, found at Nāgārinakṣaṇa,5 and therefore do not call for special remarks. However, the following features may be observed. Though the middle stroke of k here is usually curved as in the inscriptions of Virapurisadata, it is straight in one place (cf. nai- kiniya, line 3) as we find in the Rṣṭhala inscription6 of Chantamula I, to whose period, as we shall see subsequently, the present record also belongs. The loop in t in our record is sometimes very conspicuous (cf. Bahuṣṭiṇāṃ, line 2) and sometimes it is not so (cf. putasa, line 1). The signs for the medial i, u and ā are not as prominent here, as they are in the Nāgārinakṣaṇa inscriptions.

Regarding the engraving of the record it may be stated that the engraver had done his job very well and it is in the tradition in which almost all the Ikshvāku inscriptions are engraved. Besides, while writing, the scribe had allowed some gaps between the words, though this feature is not found in some cases (lines 1 and 3). This peculiarity, which is a general feature in the modern writing, may also be found in some of the well-executed inscriptions from Nāgārinakṣaṇa7 and in the Pillar Edicts of Asoka.8

---

1 The macrons over e and o are not marked in this article.
4 See ibid., p. 146. The stone is stated to be kept at present in the office of the Dept. of Archaeology, A.P. Govt., Hyderabad. See A.P. Govt. Report on Epigraphy (op. cit.), No. B. 92.
5 See, eg. above, Vol. XX, plates facing pp. 8 ff.; etc.
6 Above, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 29 ff. and plate.
7 See eg. above, Vol. XX, plates facing pp. 22-34.
8 See CII, Vol. I (1925), plates facing pp. 122, 129, 134, etc.
The language of the record is Prakrit. It may be noted here that the medial short i of Sanskrit is occasionally lengthened (cf. nīgasanabhāmaḥ-Skt. nīgasanabhāma). Besides, the text contains, as we shall see later, a few words which are not usually met with in other similar inscriptions.

In spite of the fragmentary nature of the record, it is certain that it refers itself to the reign of the king Chantamula and is dated in the thirteenth year of his rule, the details of the date of the record being the first day of the first fortnight of the Hemaranta or Winter Season of the year. The object of the inscription is to record the erection of a pillar (khaṁbha-Skt. skambha) by some individuals in a Buddhist shrine (chetiṅa).

The extant portion of the record commences with the partly preserved expression tīhpūtasa understandably of the matronymic Vāsēhipūtasa of the original. It is followed by the name Sīri-Chantamula (Skt. Śrī-Sāntamula). One cannot be sure of the extent of the portion lost before the above expression. However, in view of what we have in the Reṇṭāla inscription of Chantamula I himself, it seems reasonable to assume that even if there was no reference to any of the sacrifices of the king3 it might have originally read as Sidhām nāma Bhagavato Rāhuno Vāsēhipūtasa or more probably Sidhām Rāhuno etc. The name of Chantamula is followed by the details of the date as we saw above.

Then follows the passage giving the purport of the epigraph. And it is written in a single long sentence occupying four lines. It is stated that a Buddhāṅkhamā was set up in the great shrine (makā-chetiṅa) situated in the village Nidigala. Before the name of the village some portion of the text is lost and the gap is preceded by a reference to one māhārāthi (Skt. māhārāthi). It is a matter of regret that both the name of the māhārāthi and the expression (either a word or a case-ending) that might have indicated the nature of the officer's connection with the village, are lost. Yet, in view of the probability that much portion of the record has not been lost,3 it may be surmised that the village Nidigala is most probably referred to as a property of the māhārāthi. Inscriptions of early period where villages are stated to have been the properties of high officials are not wanting.4

The chetiṅa or shrine of the above village is described as niṅgūsa Balkusutiyānasam mūla-vāser-viṅkārachetiṅa (line 2), meaning the shrine of the mūla-vāser-viṅkārachetiṅa of the niṅgūsa of the Balkusutiyānasam. Here niṅgūsa is same as niṅgūsa of the Dharamkotā pillar inscription and it stands for Sanskrit niṅgūsa 'school'.5 Balkusutiyāna (Skt. Balkusutiyāna) is the name of a sub-division of the Gokulika sect of the Buddhists belonging to the Mahāsāṅghika school, and it is referred to in some Nāgājunaṅka inscriptions also.6 The expression mūla-vāser-viṅkārachetiṅa those who are having or undergoing

---

3 Both Makāhā (also spelt as Makāhā) and its synonym khaṁbha (also spelt as khambha) occur in the Nāgājunaṅka inscriptions. See above, Vol. XXXV, p. 23, of their respective Sanskrit equivalents, i.e. skambha and stāmbha, the former seems to be earlier than the latter one. See Macdonell and Keith, Peric Inscriptions, Vol. II, p. 483.
4 See below.
5 See below p. 317, line 7 and 10.
6 Cf. e.g. the passage gāmakas Kavakadatanā yeṭi Vepurenā in the Mūsākonā inscriptions of Pulāṃvi. See above, Vol. XIV, p. 155, line 3.
7 Ibid., Vol. XXIV, p. 259, text line 7.
9 See above Vol. XX, pp. 24, 31.
mulanaśa', is interesting. The word mūla both in Sanskrit and in Pāli may mean 'beginning' or 'commencement'. The Buddhist Sanskrit texts prefix this word to the names of certain penances known as pariśākṣa (penance to be performed by the probationers) and mūnādyapā (a penance prescribed after pariśāna). So it is probable that mūla-nāśa of our record denotes the monks performing some such penances. It is also not unlikely that mūla-pariśākṣa (mūla-pariśākṣa of the Buddhist texts) is actually intended here. Consequently the whole passage given above may denote a shrine of the monastery of those (monks) who were performing those penances and who belonged to the school of the Bahuṣrutīya sect.

The plural sunyākāhi (by merchants) signifies that there must have been more than one donor. In the extant portion of the record we find actually two names of the donors, one preserved fully and the other partly. The former is Mahā-Chandha (=Skt. Mahā-Chandra) or Chandra the Elder. The available first part of the second name reads Chula. On the analogy of some of the Vishvakṣa inscriptions where similar names occur, this second name here may be restored as Chula-Chandha (=Skt. Kashdra-Chandra) or Chandra the Younger. The donor-merchants are stated to be the sons of one Budhi (=Skt. Budhī), evidently a merchant, and (his wife) Hāthgā (Skt. Sāgghā), the vānīkini (Skt. vanijkini 'a wife of a merchant').

It is difficult to be sure whether the record originally contained the name of the native place of the donors and their father Budhi. However, it may be observed that the passage, which is lost before Budhi, commences with the syllable gāḥ. In this connection it may be recalled that a merchant by name Sāggha, the husband of one Hāthgā (Skt. Sāgghā), a namesake of the woman mentioned in the present record, figures as a donor in the Rauñā inscription, referred to above and that there he is stated to have been a resident of the village Gaṇīkāṭa. It may, therefore, be tentatively suggested that here too the latter gāḥ in our record formed the beginning.

1 So mūla-pariśākṣa may mean 'probation (i.e. penance during probation) starting over from the beginning (as the original offences are repeated by the monks). See Edgerton, B. H. S. J. Dict., s.v. Pariśākṣa may be pariśākṣa vāśā, 'receding after abandoning (a time or a place)'. See the Valabhikṣapata of Amalanka (I., 1, 24).
2 i.e., Pāli māndre-Skt. māndarīt.
3 Cf. sa ṣaḥkhā ṣaḥkhā paṭiḥśaṭṭoḥ (Vinaya Pitaka, PTS Ed., Vol. II, p. 62) that monk must be thrown back to the beginning (to perform penances for committing offences). The monks performing these penances are included in the list of those of salvation. See ibid., p. 162.
4 Sanskrit lexicons refer also to the use of mālānakṣa as an adjective of Yavana. (See Bollingllo, Sanskrit Wörterbuch s.v. and Monier Williams, Skt. Eng. Dict., s.v.). The Nāggrānukaṇḍa inscriptions also tell us that the Buddhist Monks of the locality had converted Yavana, among many other people, to Buddhism and that the Yavana of Saṅjayapura (i.e. Saṇjan, Thana District) actually visited the place. See above Vol. XX, p. 22; Vol. XXXIII, p. 259; Vol. XXXIV, p. 199 ff.). However, it may be noted that in our record mālānakṣa is not used as an adjective of any. Again we do not know whether the Yavana had any visāra in Kasinapalli or elsewhere in coastal Andhra. Besides, the adjective mālānakṣa qualifying Yavana in literature probably means 'resident in (i.e. Mālasṭha or modern Mīlān) and it is perhaps used to distinguish the Yavana of Mālasṭha from those of their neighbouring country, viz. Yavana country. For Yavana (i.e. the Country of the Yavana) and the Mālasṭha are mentioned together in the Purānic list of countries. See the Saṁgītravāhana, Mālānakṣapadana, Kaumārikābha, Ch. 39, verse 161.
5 Cf. Mahā-Chandha-Chula-Chandakapūrana and Mahā-Māla-Chula-Mālakapā in a Nāggrānukaṇḍa inscription (above Vol. XX, p. 22). The present record does not at all indicate that the pillar was erected by the son of Gubabuddhi and the lady Hāthgā and a group of merchants including Mahā Chandha and Chula. Cf. Ep. Andhrā, op. cit., p. 146.
6 In the third line of the record we have lost the portion preceding Buddhī. However a gap before sa is quite conspicuous. As we have already observed, the scribe has given gaps between words in a majority of cases. Therefore Buddhī may be a name by itself as in some of the Amarāvati inscriptions (Lādāra, op. cit., Nos. 1214, 1223, 1230 etc.; and need not be taken as the end of a name like Gubabuddhi. Cf. Ep. Andhrā, op. cit., p. 146.
7 Vānīkini is same as vanijkini or same of the Amarāvati inscriptions (see Lādāra, op. cit., Nos. 1235, 1292).
part of Gañjikûṣa, the name of the native village of Budhi. Elsewhere the said Gañjikûṣa has been identified with either of the two modern villages Chinaganjam and Pedaganjam of the Bapatla taluk in the Guntur district.

The pillar under question is stated to have been erected for the union (ekata-hetuno-Skt. ekata-hetoh) with those who are referred to as niga-sambahândhi-vâga. The last compound expression is enigmatic as the meaning of niga is not clear. May be it is same as the Sanskrit niga 'fettered', 'bound' or the Buddhist Sanskrit and Pâli nîgha (also written as nigha) denoting 'sin, evil including desire, anger' etc. Consequently the passage niga-sambahândhi-vâgehi ekata-hetuno may be tentatively rendered as 'for the union with the class of people fettered (with their own) evils'. There is no word in the extant portion of the record to tell us whose union with the fettered people was thus desired for. But it is not difficult to surmise. Obviously it must have been only those who were not fettered with their evils. They are referred to in the Buddhist literature (both Sanskrit and Pâli) as nîgha or a.nîgha. Thus the aim of the pious act of setting up the pillar seems to be the union of the emancipated people with the fettered. Now it may be interesting to recall a sentence in the Minor Rock Edict of Ashoka in which that Maurya emperor informs us, with satisfaction, that thanks to his parâkrama or pious efforts, those gods who had been earlier unmingled with men, became mingled with them.

The pillar thus erected is referred to as budhinikhañhika. It is difficult to be sure at present about what is meant by the epithet budhini as it does not seem to occur elsewhere. However, if it is possible to connect it with bodhi or budhikâ 'the crowning member of the pillar' of the Sanskrit texts on Indian architecture, then the whole expression may be taken to mean a pillar (with) budhini. Again it is also possible that the merchant donors named the pillar as Budhi (Budhi-nikhañhika)38 evidently after the name of their father and set up in the chaitya for the above purpose. Another explanation of the term is also probable. It has already been pointed out that it is written in more than one way in the present inscription. Therefore it is not unlikely that the intended reading is Budhisati khasihko (=Skt. Buddhîhi ti skamhâha) meaning 'a pillar named Budhi'. An instance of erecting a pillar named after an individual is probably met with a mediæval inscription.39

The name of the family of the king Chaitistamûla of the present record is not found in the preserved portion of the record. However, if the age and the region, to which our epigraph belongs, are taken into account, then there can hardly be any doubt that the monarch belonged to the

---

1 Above, Vol. XXXII, p. 31.
2 See Monier-Williams, op. cit., s.v.
3 See Edgerton, op. cit., s.v. Pali-Eng. Dict., op. cit. s.v. Possibly the Skt. nîga too is connected with nigha, as sina are supposed to constitute the real bondage.
4 The partly preserved expression asahi cha preceding the passage under question may be a letter part of an adjective in the 3rd case (followed by ca) qualifying the following sambahândhi-vâgehi.
5 In regular Skt. also the antonym of niga and nîgha must be obviously asina and anîgha respectively.
6 If, on the other hand, one is permitted to correct niga into nîga 'one's own', then the compound may be easily rendered as 'with their own relatives (obviously of the donors)'.
8 See e.g. P. K. Acharya, A Dict. of Hindu Architecture, pp. 442, 445, 448. For a bodhikâ of pillars in the chaitya caves at Kanheri, see Arch. Surv. W. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 62, fig. 21.
10 Nikhañhika is of course an unusual word. May be it is a synonym of khasihko (=Skt. akshamkha) 'pillar'. (Cf. niśam as a synonym of sama 'sound'; nîskyanda and apyanda meaning 'flowing'; niśâma and vâcra 'residence' etc.)
11 E.g. the Kalachuri king Karuṣa is said to have erected a pillar of the deity Karpâvâlli, named after himself. See above, Vol. II, pp. 4, 6. For the other view see CII., Vol. IV, p. 290.
KESANAPALLI INSCRIPTION OF CHANTAMULA, YEAR 13
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Ikshvāku dynasty of Vijayapura well known from the Nāgarjuna-kopā inscriptions. However, we must pay attention to the fact that there had been not one, but two Chaṅtāmulaśas in that dynasty, one being the grand father of the other. Again, it should not also be forgotten that both the grandfather and the grandson had one and the same matronymic Vāseṭhiputsa, the only available adjective of the king in our record. Nevertheless, it may be pointed out that the grandson is always found using another name of his, viz. Ehuvala or Vuvala, or Vula,¹ which is attached to the name Chaṅtāmulaśa, as if to distinguish himself from his grandfather. Moreover, while the grandson is simply referred to, at times, by the name Ehuvala alone,² nowhere he is called, like his grandfather, merely as Chaṅtāmulaśa, as we find in our record. Hence, it is logical to identify the king of the present epigraph with the grandfather, viz. Chaṅtāmulaśa I, the founder of the dynasty of the southern Ikshvākus, in whose time the Reṇṭāla pillar inscription also is to be attributed on the same grounds. So, the importance of the present record lies in that it gives the latest regnal year of the king, viz. the year thirteen, the Reṇṭāla inscription being dated in his fifth regnal year.

In spite of the fact that Chaṅtāmulaśa I is credited with the performance of Aṇghṣṭoma, Vājapeya, Aśvamedha etc., in the records of his successors, the Reṇṭāla epigraph is silent about any such sacrifices of the king. The present record too does not seem to have contained any reference to those sacrifices.³ The Buddhist nature of the Kesānapalli inscription, like that of the Reṇṭāla epigraph indicates that the religion of the Buddha did not suffer a set back during the reign of Chaṅtāmulaśa I.⁴

The only geographical name occurring in our record is the village Niḍigala and it is obviously identical with the modern Kesānapalli, where the inscription has been unearthed.⁵

TEXT⁶

1. ⁷ṭhiputasa ari-Chaṅtāmulaśa sarivachharas 10 3 Hemarāṭānārah [pakharā*]
    1 diva¹ 1 mahāraṭhisas

2. ⁸gāme Niḍigala nigājasa Bahusutiyanāmah māla-va(vā)si-vihāra-chetik[e] Gaṅ

3. ⁹Buddha putehi vānikiniya Haṃgāya putehi vrñjakehi Mahā-Chaṃdena Chula-

---

¹ See above, Vol. XXXV, p. 22.
² Ibid., Vol., XXXIV, p. 149.
³ See below, fn 7 and 10.
⁴ See above, Vol. XXXIV, p. 31.
⁵ Niḍigala of our record has been identified with the modern Niḍigala in the Nalgonda district. (Ep. Andhrica, op. cit., p. 149). The basis for this identification is understandably the striking similarity of sounds of these two names. But this is likely to be questioned as there is no reason to believe that the pillar under question travelled from that place to Kesānapalli.
⁶ From impressions.
⁷ The portion lost here may be conjecturally restored as Sidhaṃ nāma Bhapugat Rāha Vāse or more probably Sidhaṃ Rāha Vāse. Therefore not much seems to have been lost in the beginnings of the lines.
⁸ This stands for dīnasaṃ.
⁹ The portion lost obviously contained the name and surname, if any, of the mahāraṭhi.
¹⁰ The passage lost may be conjecturally restored as Ganiṣṭikapuṇañcāsa varijakāsas. It would, therefore, appear that not much has been lost at the ends of lines too.
¹¹ The name intended is Chula-Chamda.
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4. saschi cha¹ nigamandhī-vagehi ekata-hetuno mahā-chetika Budhini-khamāhāpatei.

**Translation**

[Success*]. The 1st day of the 1st fortnight of the winter season in the 13th year of [the reign of the king] Sri-Chaithamula, the son of [a Vāseṭṭha]. The Budhini-khamāha² is set up at the great shrine in the monastery of the mūlāvāsin³ of the school of the Bhumisuttas, in the village Nīgala [belonging to]....... the mahāraṭhi by the merchants Mahā-Chanda and Chula-[Chanda*] who are the sons of (the merchant) Budhi of Gaṇḍiṣṭa* and his wife Harīgā for the union [of the emancipated*] with the class (of people) fettered with (their) evils.

---

¹ For a discussion on these four letters see above, p 316.
² Evidently patikapito is intended.
³ See above, p 316.
⁴ See above, p 315.
No. 53.—MENAL INSRIPTION OF THE TIME OF CHAHAMANA
PRITHVIRAJA II, VIKRAMA 1226

(1 Plate)

RAMSHARMA, NEW DELHI.

This inscription is engraved on a short pillar in the upper Mahāmaṇḍapa of the monastery in Mēṇal, Mandalgarh Tahsil, Bhilwara District, Rajasthan. It was transcribed by Kaviṣṭhā Śyramala Das1 who wrongly ascribed it to the great hero Prithvirāja Chauhan of Prithvirāja-Rāṣṭrīya fame. The mistake was, however, corrected by D. R. Bhandarkar.2 It is edited here with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist, from the impressions which were sent to him by the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Baroda.

The inscription2 consists of twelve lines of writing which is well engraved, and covers a space measuring 39 cm × 30.5 cm. Except the first three lines which consist of about 9 letters each, each remaining line contains about 15 letters. The letters measure about 2 cm to 3 cm. The characters are regular for the period to which the record belongs. The language of the epigraph is Sanskrit which is not free from mistakes. It is composed in verse throughout. Of ortho

graphical interest is the doubling of the letters following a superscript r, e.g. rēva, lines 3 and 11; rppa, line 6; and, mmma, lines 7–8 and 11). The doubling of dr in vva-va-ddharma (line 7) is also noteworthy. The letter s is wrongly used for r in sōhama (line 6).

The inscription is dated in 1226 of the era called here as Mālavīḍa-gata-ratsara (lines 1–2). Therefore the year 1226 has to be referred to the Vikrama era. Though it is difficult to verify this date in the absence of other details, it has to be referred to the expired Vikrama Sāvivat and may be equal to 1169 A. D.

The record commences with a symbol for siddham followed by a passage containing the obeisance paid to the god Śiva. Then in the first stanza the date as noted above as well as the object of the inscription which is to record the construction of the monastery by Bhāva Brahmamuni is given.

The second verse starts with the word tasmāt, making it appear that the king Prithvirāja was the son of Bhāva Brahmamuni. We know that Prithvirāja was the son of the parricide Jagadēśa. It is not impossible that Jagadēśa became a recluse out of remorse and weariness on committing such a grave sin of murdering his own father when he adopted the name Bhāva Brahmamuni. But according to some scholars Jagadēśa was removed from the throne and assassinated by his younger brother, Vīghrahaṇa IV. However, from the Poem,

1 Cf. JASB, Vol. LV, part I, p. 46.
2 Cf. Bhandarkar’s List, No. 346.
3 This is A.R.Ep., 1962-63, No. II 442.
4 Cf. Dasaratha Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, p. 64.
6 Cf. Dasaratha Sharma, op. cit., p. 56.
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Prithvirāja Vijaya: it appears that Jagadēva neither occupied the throne nor became a recluse, but had committed suicide. Perhaps it was due to this that his name is not mentioned in the Bijōli inscription. In view of this it is not likely that the expression tasmāt refers to the person mentioned in the immediately preceding passage. If this is so then it will not be unreasonable to suppose that the engraver had omitted to inscribe one or two passages here which might have furnished some definite information about the parentage of Prithvirāja. This verse describes the personality of the king in the following words: “The king Prithvirāja who is born in the Chāhamāna family of accomplished ones, who is splendid like the moon, but, unlike the latter, without any blemishes, who knows righteousness, who has performed a number of benevolent deeds, who is possessed of [a kingdom] which is full of noble families, or who himself belongs to an excellent and also not so excellent family, who inspires his subjects to follow the Varṇāśrama-dharma, who is possessed of the lustre of cupid, who is eloquent and a lover of truth.” The third verse states that during the auspicious rule of that wise and meritorious king and the best of all righteous people, the construction work of the monastery was over.

Now, according to Kavirāja Shyamaladasa, the name of the builder of the monastery under reference, was Bhāva Brahmac, but it seems that this is not correct. We have another undated inscription of a disciple of Bhāsa Vasantarūti, which, on palaeographical grounds, is assignable to the 12th century and which too was discovered from the same place where the present inscription was found. It appears from this record that while Bhāsa Brahmac was the founder of the monastery at Mēnāl, Bhāsa Vasantarūti too might have remained the head of the monastery for some time. Thus it would appear that Bhāsa was an honorific title preceding generally the names of the sants and priests, but sometimes extended to the names of other eminent personalities also. We find the same epithet prefixed to the name of the king Sūmēśvara also in his inscription of V.S. 1235.

The king Prithvirāja of the present inscription is Prithvirāja II otherwise known as Prithvi-

bhaṭṭa who appears to have succeeded his cousin Aparagāṇī on the Chāhamāna throne and was himself succeeded by his uncle Sūmēśvara, but on the basis of the present inscription, as well as the inscription from Bijōli dated Vikrama 1226, which too was published by Kavirāja Shyamaladasa, some wrong inferences were drawn by him. He assigned the present inscription to the hero of the epic Prithvirāja Rāo, who married Sathiyōgītā the daughter of Jayachandra the king of Kannauj and fought heroically against Shahabuddīn Ghōrī, but who in fact was Sūmēśvara’s son and successor Prithvirāja III. Due to this confusion Shyamaladasa thought that Prithvirāja of the present inscription ascended the throne between Phālguna-bādi and Chaitra-bādi in Vikrama 1226, but in reality sometime before Phālguna-bādi, his reign itself was over.

1 Cf. The Prithvirāja Vijaya of Jayāśaka (ed. by G. H. Ojha and C. S. Gulati, Ajmer, 1941), p. 181, verse 13 (na paruṁ vidadṛṣṭe goutīya janaśaktāṃ svaḥ-mahām vinaśya yāvat | evam-va vinaśya garbhasya vyatikṣeta-hṛṣita eva hām-guṇḍam ।).
2 Above, Vol. XXVI, pp. 102 ff; Bhandarkar’s List, No. 344.
5 Cf. Bhandarkar’s List, Nos. 1980 and 1983, where a temple priest is called as Bhāsa Brīhaspati.
7 The term Bhāsa is explained as māyī (āmarakāśa) and is used while addressing the sūtraśāstra by his assistant in the Sanskrit dramas, eg. The Vikramorvasīyam (N.S. edition, 1923) p. 8; and the Mālaimāhāvan. (ibid., 1905), pp. 9 and 11.
MENAL INSCRIPTION OF THE TIME OF PRITHVIRAJA II, VIKRAMA 1226

SCALE: One-third
The date of the Bijjāia inscription is Vikrama 1226, Phālguna ba.3, Thursday, Hasta mukhastra, which corresponds, according to the Pūrṇimānta month of the expired year, to A.D. 1170, February 5. The present inscription too explicitly refers to the same expired year. Therefore it can be concluded that in the expired Vikrama year 1226 and sometimes before Phālguna ba.3 as recorded in the Bijjāia inscription, the reign of Prithvīrāja II came to an end whereupon he was succeeded by his uncle Sūmēśvara. If we, therefore, allow some margin of time which Sūmēśvara might have taken in settling down in his position before he made the donation as recorded in the Bijjāia inscription, it will be seen that in the first half of Vikrama 1226, these events had taken place. It seems therefore possible that A.D. 1169 and not A.D. 1170 was the year when Sūmēśvara succeeded to the throne.¹

Prithvīrāja of our inscription, therefore, does not figure in the epic in question. Nevertheless, it is clear from the present record that Prithvīrāja II should have been quite a successful king. The eulogy of the king seems to have become a realistic one when the author calls him kul-ākula mahāyā. The significance of the expression is not quite clear, but probably it refers to the excellent and not so excellent family of the king. We know that he was the son of the parricide Jagadēva whose heinous act of murdering his own father has been condemned severely in the Prithvīrāja Vijaya² and therefore he seems to have been described as belonging to an akula but as he belonged to the noble Chāhāmāna family and was himself a noble king, so he has been correctly described as belonging to a noble family (kula). He is eulogised in the Hansi inscription³ of his time as Rāma himself. Even in some of the later records he is described as a great king. In the Bijjāia inscription⁴ of Sūmēśvara, it is stated that Prithvīrāja resembled Prithu in protecting his subjects by giving them gifts of villages, gold etc., while in the Prithvīrāja Vijaya he has been described as possessed of all the good qualities⁵ and ranked with the meritorious kings who enjoyed heaven⁶.

The view of L.B. Dessai⁷ that Sūmēśvara occupied the throne of Sāmbhara after having dethroned Prithvībhūta appears to be baseless in view of the compliments paid to him in the Bijjāia inscription of Sūmēśvara and the testimony of Prithvīrāja Vijaya.⁸

No name of geographical importance is mentioned in the inscription. The monastery mentioned in line 4 is still extant at Mēnal, the findspot of the inscription.

² It is, however, not possible to fix conclusively the upper limit for these events in this year in the present state of our knowledge as it is difficult to say definitely as to which of the three systems of the Vikrama era viz., Chaitra, Asvédha and Karthikā, was prevalent in this part of Rajasthan, during those days and employed in the records. Another inscription from Bijjāia listed in A.R. Ep., 1967-68, No. C 2468 is dated Vikrama 1385, Vaishākh ba. 13, Thursday which corresponds to A.D. 1329, April 27, according to either Karthikā or Asvédha systems. The month was Ananta. In the neighbouring Kōlā region the Chaitra system seems to have been prevalent (cf. Bhādarākaras List, No. 331), so also in Chittāgarh (cf. Ibid., Nos. 391 and 393). But in places like Jōdhpur situated further west, the Asvédha system seems to have been in use (cf. Ibid., Nos. 312, 318, 329, 337, 367, 377, 379).
³ Cf. p. 203, Verse 61.
⁴ Cf. Dasharatha Sharma, op. cit. p. 193 and n.5 (Prithvīrāja mahārāja-Rāmō-sau sankhyāyaḥ vina).
⁶ Cf. op. cit., p. 202, verse 56.
⁷ Ibid., p. 205, verses 74-75.
⁸ Cf. op. cit., p. 29.
⁹ Cf. op. cit., p. 202, verses 56 (prasthātī Prithet-bhaṣā) and 57 (tapaśa-Lakṣhmanāvinyāt mahāmāyājir= mahaṣṭapatiḥ).
1 Siddham² || Ōṁ⁴ namaḥ Śivāya || Mālavē-
2 sa-gata-vatsara³-satih dvāda-
3 sāñ-cha shat(4)-vīrsā-pūrvvakāth |
4 kārītaṁ maṭham-anuttamaṁ kalaṅ Bhāva Brahma-
5 muninā manaḥ[ḥ]-kṛhayaṁ || [18] || tasmāt* satya-mayāḥ
6 subhāṣita-mayaḥ kandarpa-sō(śo)bhā-mayaḥ
7 sva-sva-dharmma-mayaḥ kula-śkula-mayaḥ* ka-
8 lyāṇa-mālā-mayaḥ | dharmmajñāṁ(jñāḥ)cham (cha) akalma⁵-
9 shah(shaḥ) kṛita-dhiyaṁ (yāṁ) śri-Chāhamān-ānvayaṁ(yē) Sātipra-kṣmā
10 dhípa⁶-sundarō-vaṇipatiḥ śri-Pṛthvirājō
11 bhav[a7] || [21]⁷] tasmāt* dharmma-varishthasya-pṛthvirajasya dhīr²-
12 mataḥ | punyō((ōye) kurvati vai rūjye(jyam) nih(mi)śpannaṁ maṭham-uttaman(m) ][[3]⁸]
No. 54.—SAKRAI STONE INSCRIPTION OF GOVINDA, SAMVAT 55

(1 Plate)

K. V. RAMESH, MYSORE

The stone, bearing the inscription edited here with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist, Mysore, is said to be on the north wall of the shrine of the Sākambhari temple at Sakrāi, a village in the Śāhavāri province of the former princely state of Jaipur, Rajasthan. While noticing this inscription in the Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of Western India for 1909-10 Bhandarkar1 observed, in page 57, as follows: "It is engraved on a slab which is somewhat mutilated, and which, what is worse, is coated with a whitewash, with the result that many letters have thus become illegible. The slab is now placed in the principal niche of the exterior of the shrine facing the north. And as a cattle pen has been put up against the north wall of the temple, the inscription stone is practically in the dark. It is, therefore, no easy task to read this inscription. It apparently refers itself to the reign of the Chāhavāna king Vigrahāraja, and records that Dayikā, queen of Vachchharaja, i.e., no doubt of Vatsaraja, uncle of Vigrahāraja, as we know from the Harsha inscription, repaired the temple of Śaṅkarādēvi, which was situated in a bṛhad-dvāra, i.e., in a large valley between two mountains. This is, no doubt, the case with the temple, as it is. The inscription ends with the date Śravanas 55 Māgha śudi 4. It is indeed curious that the date is here specified with the hundreds omitted. But we know from the Harsha inscription that Vigrahāraja was living in V. E. 1030. The full date of our record must therefore, be 1055."  

The inscription consists of 15 lines of writing and the engraving has been well executed. The characters belong to the northern class of alphabets and are assignable to the close of the 10th century A. D.

But for a part of lines 8 and 9 and most of line 15, which are in prose, the text of our inscription is in verse, the language being Sanskrit. The total number of verses is nineteen. The right and left hand top corners of the slab are broken away resulting in the loss of a number of letters in the first three lines. Also a few letters all along the right margin of the slab are lost and a few more letters in the middle of most of the lines are somewhat obscured, probably owing to constant white-washing.

The object of the inscription is to record the renovation of the temple of Śaṅkarādēvi, built in olden days (purāṇa) by some one (kēmāsta kūrtaṇa) and which had fallen into disrepair, by Déyinī, probably under the supervision of the śresthis Jajjaka and Jayamātra. The village of Drōgaka was also granted to the temple by Déyinī for augmenting the merit of herself and her parents.

The first few letters of line I, probably containing an auspicious symbol and some maṅgala-śākya, are lost. The record then opens with two stanzas, the first one (lines 1-2) in praise of Śiva whose eulogy is sung by men and sages alike and who had eliminated all his enemies. The second verse (line 2) is in praise of some territory, probably the valley in which Sakrāi is located, which is compared to the majesty of the Malaya tree because of its spacious and winding terrain and to the foot of the Mēru mountain in view of its lustrous diamonds. Verse 3 (line 3) states that

1 Bhandarkar's List, No. 97.
there was a powerful ruler named Vijayarāja, who belonged to the Chāhavāna family, who had defeated the armies of his enemies, who was kind to the learned and the needy and who was like Čuha. Verse 4 (lines 3-4) speaks of Narmadā, who was verily like the river Narmadā and who was born of a family of noble deeds. She was obviously the daughter of Chāhavāna Vijayarāja for, the very next verse (verse 5, lines 4-5) states that she (śā) begot a son named Gōvindarāja by her husband Vachchha (Vatsa)rāja-nirpata, who had crushed all his enemies and in the lotus pond which was the circle of his feudatories, Narmadā was the royal swan. According to verse 6 (lines 5-6) Gōvindarāja made the sky gleam with the pearls split from the heads of the elephants (of enemy rulers). He had for his queen (rājñī) the goddess-like Dēyiṃa who was ever engaged in the service of the gods and who was a boon-giver to the modest (verse 7, line 6). Verse 8 (lines 6-7) further praises her munificence, generosity and purity and adds that heavenly birds were constantly singing her praise in the house of the Lord of the immortals (i.e., Indra).

The next verse (verse 9, lines 7-8) describes the town of Pārṇatallaka as famous in the world, as having a network of lofty temples and many types of houses belonging to brāhmaṇas and merchants and as having (the body called) mahājana which included good śṛṣṭhīnas. The short prose passage in lines 8-9 introduces the śṛṣṭhīnas Jajjaka and Jayamātra who probably hailed from Pārṇatallaka pura and refers to a déva-droṣa i.e., the valley of the gods, probably as settled or created into a divine holding by the two śṛṣṭhīnas. A description of the temple, (tāmāha) of goddess Śaṅkarādevī and its surroundings follows in verses 10-12 (lines 9-12). It is stated that the temple was surrounded by rameya (i.e., Champa) trees, that there were creepers with tender leaves, that the place resounded with the cries of flocks of cumulus, that it was adorned by heaps of jasmine, that it had waterfalls, that it was dirtied by the cries of peacocks and that it was nked by the sounds made by parrots and pigeons (verses 10-11). This temple of Śaṅkarādevī, which was situated in the huge valley (brihad-droṣa) and which had been built in olden days by some one, was the subject of praise from the siddhas and gamaśaras (verse 12). Verse 13 (line 10-11) states that the temple of the goddess, constructed of brick, had fallen into disrepair in course of time, with its turrets ruined. Verse 14 (line 11) states that this temple at Ghōshāya[ka?] was renovated (bhāya kārita) by Dēyiṃa under the supervision of the two (tāya) i.e., probably, of the śṛṣṭhīnas Jajjaka and Jayamātra. While verse 15 (lines 11-12) speaks of the impermanence of worldly values, the next verse (lines 12-13) states that Dēyiṃa made a grant of the village Drōma, obviously to the temple of Śaṅkarādevī, in order to augment her and her parents’ merit. Verse 17 (line 13) is a benedictory stanza wishing the temple eternal glory. Verse 18 (line 14) contains a eulogy of the temple while verse 19 (lines 14-15) states that the text of the record was composed by Varāha. It is stated in line 15 that the inscription was engraved by the sūtradāra Silagaṇa, who was the son of Voddaka. Then follow the details of the date, discussed above, and then the record ends with a symbol.

The primary importance of the inscription is historical. The genealogy given in the praśasti portion of our inscription could be tabulated as follows:—

Chāhavāna

Vijayarāja

Narmadā married to Vachchharāja

Gōvinda [rāja] married Dēyiṃa

1 The import is that even as Vatsarāja was like a rājakaśa in the lotus pond, which was the circle of his feudatories, his queen was like a rājakaśa.

2 In the context in which it occurs, déva-droṣa may be interpreted as the valley of the goddess Śaṅkarādevī. It is likely that the valley was donated to the goddess by the two śṛṣṭhīnas.
It is thus clear that, while Bhandarkar was right in identifying the Vigharaharaja of our inscription with Vigharaharaja of the Harsha inscription of V.S. 1030, he was wrong in suggesting the identity of Vachchhharaja with Vatsaraaja, the maternal uncle of Vigharaharaja II. Vachchharaja was, on the other hand, the son-in-law of Vigharaharaja probably belonged to some local ruling house of the Sakhavati region. Bhandarkar did not read the name Govinda occurring at the end of line 4 of our inscription and he, therefore, made Dayika (which name he wrongly read as Dayikâ) the queen of Vachchharaja himself. In truth, he was her father-in-law and she was the queen of his son Govindaraja.

Commenting on our inscription, Dasharatha Sharma observes that "as Vigharaharaja's successor Durabharaja II was on the throne of Sambhahi in V. 1053, Vigharaharaja of the Sakrai inscription must be identified with Vigharaharaja III and the omitted figures regarded as 11 instead of 10". Not only does this suggestion militate against palaeographical considerations, but also ignores the fact that our inscription refers to Vigharaharaja in the past tense, making it clear that he was no longer alive at the time of the engraving of the inscription. The intended date of our record is, therefore, V. S. 1050 and not V. S. 1155 as suggested by Dasharatha Sharma. Since Dayika is stated to be the raja of Govindaraja, it is obvious that the latter was ruling over some territory, probably in the Sakhavati region, as a feudatory of the Chahamanaas.

The antiquity of the temple of Sankaradvi is attested to by another inscription from Sakra. This beautifully engraved inscription, the date given in which is a subject of controversy. Bhandarkar reading the numerical symbols as [V. S. 879 (822 A. D.) and Dr. Chhabra reading them as [V. S. 699 (642-43 A. D.), records the construction of a mantapap in front of (the temple) of the goddess Sankaradvi by an association composed of eleven members, all of whom were srishthi. On grounds of palaeography, the inscription is to be assigned only to the middle of the 7th century A. D. and since it records the construction of a mantapa, it follows that the temple itself was in existence from earlier days. Verse 14 gives the name of the place, in which the temple was located, as Ghoshayi [kà].

The name of the person who renovated the temple and made a grant of the village Drinaka to the goddess is given in line 11 (verse 14) as Devin. It is tempting to suggest that Devin is only another form of the name Devikâ, borne by the queen of Govindaraja. But, verse 8, by stating that Devikâ's praise was being sung by heavenly harpies in the palace of Indra, seems to suggest that she was not alive at the time of the engraving of the record. It is possible that Devin was the daughter of Govindaraja and Devikâ.

The reference, in our inscription, to Purnatallakapura is of considerable importance. While Bhandarkar and A. K. Vyas believed that Purnatalla, occurring in the Bhishma inscription of Chahamanas Somaswara was the name of an early ruler of that dynasty, Dasharatha Sharma is of the opinion that it is a place-name represented by modern Puntala in the Jodhpur State. The name of the place as given in our inscription is Purnatallaka. The suffix ka could mean, on the one hand, that it was founded by or named after king Purnatalla or that it was a smaller town named after the bigger and more famous Purnatalla.

**TEXT**

[Notes: Verses 1-2: Árya; Verses 3-4, 7, 10-14, 16 and 19 Anushthubha; verses 5-6, 9, 17-18 Vasanta; verse 8 Šardalavikridita; verse 15 Rathdhihata]

I..............[jaryati muni-manuya-gitaḥ sa[rabhasa]ṁ nirdārit-āhirāya(yo) yūḥ (yaḥ) ||

[1*] Kvana(ña)d-uru-nupura-mukharaḥ sa[lastambha]-lamchhehmanaḥ pa...................
3 ...hit-ānkaḥ śaktimān-śivam(bu)jñāḥ-śrīt- [ * ] śrīmat-Vigrahājī-śrī[ * ] Chāhavān ī Guh-ōpanāḥ [3*] Sad-vṛitta-vanā(śa-so) prabhāya sādhy-agu... rāl ( ) tasya .........
6 lilāṃ (lam) | [6*] Dēva-karma-ramah nityam vinatāṃ vara-pradā | rājā śrī-Dēyikā- kāntā tasya-āmmūṃ-śevat-ōpanaṃ [7*] Kō dānēṇa na pūrītuḥ pratiśāṃ kasya-śrayoh- nō-ṇavataḥ kō [vā] ○ ○ ○ ○
7 nityāt-śalāḥ kasya-śrayoh nō dhūtāḥ |  īty-śevam Tri(Tri)lāsāsvasraya bhavanē jēgjayate-syāṣ=chiraṇa āchāraṃ chārāṇaḥ-chakrahāich-virvāchita Chandrāvādāram yasaḥ [8*] Asty-śunati[e*]surā-grīhīḥ ○ ○ ○ ○ [nā]
8 nā-vidhair-dvīja-vanā-vēsānā-jālaḥ | sat-śrēṣṭha-sat-saṁhitā-mahājana-saṁvitēsam śrī-Pārṇāntaka-puṣṭiḥ pratiśihāṃ prthivyāḥ(yam) [9*] Śrē(śrē)ha-śri-Ja-jaka sarē(śrē)hāk-Jayānā-sūyayō[ξ] i ....
10 taṁ(tam) | ( ) śikhali(ṛa)-kēk-ākulaṁ hari-hārita-nālitaṁ(ta n) [11*] Vṛi(Bṛi)ha(ṛi) drōpy-āśritaḥ śrīmat-Siddha-Γandharvya-saṁśutstām | saṁthām śrī-Śaṅkarādēvyāḥ purā kēn-āpi kāritaṁ(tam) | [12] Vidirūpa-kūtā-śikha(rain) ......
11 tit-ēṣṭakāmaḥ | dēvyās-tan-mandirān jātmā kāla-yogāḥ-oḥal-āchalaṁ(lam) | [13*] | Tāyār-śaṁyōgē Dēyīyā śāñē [Ghōshāyh]...... | tad-āyatanaḥ bhūyāḥ kāritaṁ ruchimattarān(ram) [14*] Jīvitaṁ ka ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
12 sampadō-śitarās-taraṅgavage | yauvanāni su-ĉhirāḥ na dēhināṃ-īty-aētya jāgatō- hy-anityaṁ(tam) [15*] Yasāyēs-cha pita(tri)mātṛbhyām-śitmana[h] punya- priddhāyē | grāmō Drōpana-saṁjās-cha [Dēy]
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2 Could the three worn out letters be 'k-āreyā'?
3 A symbol for śiddha is engraved at the end.
The present inscription was discovered in February 1970 while digging a pit for fixing an electric pole in front of the Trivikrama temple in the compound of the fort of Vasai in the district of Thana (Maharashtra). I am thankful to Shri V.G. Khobarekar, Director of Archives, Government of Maharashtra, for supplying excellent engravings of the inscription and for permitting me to edit the same. I am thankful to Dr. V.V. Mirashi also for his valuable help and guidance in deciphering the inscription.

The stone slab on which the inscription is engraved is 75 cm in length and 34 cm in height. On the upper part of the slab are carved in relief the figures of the Sun, the Moon and an auspicious pact (kumāraṇḍu). On the lower side of the slab the figure of a cow with a calf sucking its milk has been carved in relief in a rectangle measuring 21 cm in length and 14 cm in width. The actual inscription has been engraved in the middle part and occupies a space measuring 46 cm × 34 cm. The inscription is very badly damaged. Many letters have been lost and many more are indistinct. It is therefore very difficult to decipher the whole inscription. The inscription contains twenty lines in all, but I could decipher the first eight lines successfully with the help of the records hitherto published. The information contained in those lines is very important since it throws some new light on the history of the Śilāhāra dynasty to which the record belongs.

The characters are Nāgarī and belong to the northern variety of the alphabet. Prākṣhata-nātriya have been used extensively to denote the medial ai and au. As regards orthography, consonants following r have been doubled e.g. pravartamātī (1.2) saṅvatvarūtarggata (1.3), mārgaṇāra, etc.

The language is Sanskrit. The word padeinā in lines 15, 16 and 17 would show that the inscription contains a few lines or at least a few words in Marathi. The words Saku saṅvatu are Marathi forms of the Sanskrit words Saka Saṅvatsa. The correctness or otherwise of the Sanskrit language cannot be ascertained since the full text of the inscriptions could not be deciphered. However, the use of long r in place of short r in the word viṁṣatya-udhikēśhu in line 2 is incorrect.

The record commences with the auspicious expressions, āri-śvasti jayot-ch-abhay-adayās-cha which are found in almost all the records of the Śilāhāras of Northern Koṅkan. The date of the inscription as given in the first four lines is Monday, the eighth tīthī in the dark half of the Mārgaṇṭha month of the expired Saka year 1120, the cyclic year (saṅvatavara) being Kālayukta. The year 1120 has been mentioned in words as well as in figures. The given details of date correspond to 23rd November 1198 A.D.¹

¹[The day of the dark fortnight referred to in the inscription is 15. Therefore the details correspond to Monday, the 29th November, 1198 A.D.—Ed.].
In line 5 the king Anantadēva is introduced and bears the titles samasta-rājāvali-virājīta mahārajaḥdhirīja-paramēśvara.

The names of the ministers during the reign of Anantadēva II occur in lines 7 and 8. If my readings are correct, it may be said that Vṛhima Prabhū was the Chief Minister and Vādima Prabhū, the Commander-in-Chief. In lines 12 and 13 the names of certain other persons can be read as Mālupai Prabhū and Dādākā Mālī. Probably they were the donees. The object of this donation cannot be ascertained since the rest of the record is badly damaged. The word pāṇi in lines 16 and 17 is not found in either Sanskrit or Marāṭhī dictionaries. From the context it seems to have the meaning of a field. The next word pāṇḍīya in lines 15, 16 and 17 is the plural of the Marāṭhī word pāṇḍī which means a bundle. It appears that from each of the two fields belonging to certain persons a right to have one thousand bundles of grain was given to somebody.

The record does not mention the dynasty to which this Anantadēva belonged nor does it give the name of any of his predecessors. But in view of the provenance of the record and the manner in which the king is introduced, Anantadēva may be taken to have belonged to the Śīlaḥāra dynasty of Northern Koṅkana. But the only hitherto known Śīlaḥāra Anantadēva ruled almost a century earlier than the date of the present record. Therefore, the importance of the epigraph under review lies in the fact that it reveals the existence of a second Anantadēva in this family in 1198 A.D., and he may be called Anantadēva II.

The Śīlaḥāra kings before Aparādīṭya II styled themselves as mahāmanḍalāścarādhipati or mahāśaṃantuḍāhipati which shows their feudatory status. It was only Aparādīṭya II who first adopted the title Mahārajaḥdhirīja and Anantadēva II of the present inscription continued its use. Besides this, Anantadēva used the title paramēśvara also. This may suggest that during the period of Aparādīṭya II, the Śīlaḥāra kings became independent and during the reign of our Anantadēva their power rose still higher.

There is also no doubt that Anantadēva II of our present record was occupying the throne sometime after Aparādīṭya II for whom we have dates in the Śaka years 1106, 1107 and 1108 and before Aparādīṭya’s son Kēsidēva II of whom there are inscriptions dated in Śaka 1125 and 1161. Now it may be surmised that probably Anantadēva II was the younger brother or the elder son of Aparādīṭya. He may have succeeded Aparādīṭya and after his death, sometime between Śaka 1120 and 1125, Kēsidēva II may have occupied the throne.

The record ends with the usual inprecatory verse svadattāṁ parādattāṁ &c, which shows that the record is complete. It also shows that gift of some land was made to the donee or donees by the King Anantadēva II.

---

1 In line 12 the same appears as Humi Prabhū.
3 Prāchīna Marāṭhī Kōlmā Lakha (Tulipule), p. 83.
6 As, Bh., Or. Res., Ind., Vol. XXIII, pp. 89-102.
1. [श्री] स्वरूपित जयस्मायुदयश्च शक्तिप्रकाशातीतसः

2. वस्तरसातपुं एकाभ्य (अ) पुं श्री (व) सत्यचिंकेश्वर प्रवक्तरमाने व्

3. जाक्तोपि शक्तिसवतु ११२० काल्युक्तसंवस्तारांतः

4. त मामाण्डिर वनि [++] सोमे [***] अभेः समस्तराजावलीवि

5. राजित महाराजान्तराज परस्त्वर स्वीमदन्तदेवरा

6. यहल्यानविजयराज्ये तथात्प्रसादावानसमस्तराज्य

7. चितारार (र) समू[ह]ैल महामाय [पोटि] श्री[ब्रह्म]प्रभु

8. [म***] हादलाणिपति स्वार्थ्यिमप्रभुपे इत्यादि स्वेतरणे

9. वत्सलमाने वति ........... पुरु माहारि घ

10. ........... विग्राह महाराज श्रीप्रसं

11. देवेन महाराजान्तराज ..............

12. व महामास्त्विमप्रभुपुत्रय [आलु] पै प्रभु

13. ........... प्रमात्यपुरुषोदातामालुकाय

14. ........... स्थाप सुक्तो क्रता

15. ........... पंडित्या सहस्त्रय [प] जाक्तोपि [२०००]

16. [मालु प्रभु] सत्क पावी पंडित्या १००० इ
17 सलक पावी में हिय्या १००० ह्यः त
18 न(व)दुभिः[व्यवस्था भुज्य] राजभिः समः
19 स्वदं च प्रदत्तं च यो [हुरेत स्वुः]
20 चरा [१४] पुष्प वर्ष्यसहाय्य विष्ठायो जा [पते क्रमं: २०]
No. 56—SEVEN INSCRIPTIONS OF THE CHALUKYAS OF BADAMI

K. V. RAMESH AND S. S. RAMACHANDRA MURTHY, MYSORE

The seven inscriptions edited here with the kind permission of the Chief Epigraphist, Mysore, were all discovered in the Talipatri taluk, Anantapur District, Andhra Pradesh during the years 1953-60. They will be referred to hereunder as A-G for the sake of convenience. All the seven inscriptions are in early Telugu-Kannada characters, palaeographically assignable to the 8th century A.D. and their language, barring G which is in Kannada, is Telugu. All these inscriptions belong to the period of the Western Chalukyas of Badami and to the reigns of three emperors of that dynasty viz., Vinayaditya (A and B), Vijayaditya (C-E) and Kirtivarman II (F and G).

As regards palaeography, the characters in the seven records under study are generally comparable to those in the Tarimallja inscription of Vikramaditya I, the Kottur inscription of Vijayaditya and the Tippaluru inscription of Vikramaditya II. Attention may be drawn to the occurrence of initial a in A-D and F, initial ã in C and G, initial i in all the seven records, initial u in B, initial û in F and G, initial e or ã in B-D and F and initial o in F. The forms of r, both as superscript and subscript, and of l are noteworthy in that they exhibit certain earlier as well as later features. The letter y occurs in A in two forms, in one case the tripartite formation having no loop and in the other the letter having a developed loop. The subscript m shows the transitional stage of its later development in D in line 10.

As regards orthography the inscriptions, most of them indifferently engraved, are not wanting in errors of omission and omission. There are quite a number of words of lexical interest. The most important orthographical feature is the usage of class nasal in some cases and its replacement by the anusvara in some others, and indiscriminate intermixture of r and r, e.g., Lëmuraṇa for Lëmuṇaṇa (A line 7) and Konuru for Konṟu (A line 8-9). In A the earlier form nṝṇu (line 13) as well as the later form nṟṇu (line 7) occur. The occurrence of ikkina (line 4) and iekkira (line 5) in B shows the transitional stage when palatalization of k to ch had not become universal. The word agulu in C (line 10) in the place of the more grammatical aguttam occurring in a similar context in E (lines 26-27) is noteworthy. Innumaru, in the sense of two persons, which is the older form of ivumaru occurs in D (line 12). The expression pulpagaṇa in D (line 14) is a mistake for polpagaṇa meaning ‘be prosperous’. The writing of mṉagha in E (line 9) as mṉagku shows the absence of the softening of the older k. This can be compared with the Kannada form akku (of G line 25).

The inscriptions are of considerable historical in portance. They reveal the names of some hitherto unknown subordinates of the Chalukyas of Bāḍāmi A (lines 6-7) and B (lines 2-3) reveal the fact that Vāṇarāṇi was administering Vāṅganur-nādu as the feudatory of Vinayaditya. We learn from the three inscriptions of Vijayaditya (C-E) that the same Vāṇarāṇi continued to administer the same territory referred to in C (lines 3-4) and E (lines 10-11) as a vishaya. Inscription F (lines 4-5) introduces Prabhivīl-Vāṇarāṇi as the feudatory of Kirtivarman II but does not name any territory over which he was ruling. Inscription G (line 7-10) refers to a feudatory of

---

2 Ibid., Vol. XXX, pp. 69 ff.
3 Ibid., pp. 12 ff.

2 DGA/73
of the same emperor, Bāṇarāja, as administering Suramaru-viśhaya. A, C and E also mention Lemurāja or Lemurāja of the Chaḷki family as administering Niṭūru while D mentions Mutturāja of the same Chaḷki family. Inscription G describes the donor Dharanaṇapaṇa, son of Irigaṇga, as the ruler of Chaṇḍiṅga.

The reference to Bāṇas as the feudatories of these three emperors and as local administrators in the Tāḍapatri region is of historical importance. The history of the Bāṇas goes back to considerable antiquity, their earliest epigraphical reference being found in the Tāḷagarunda inscription of Kadamba Kākusthavarman (C. 550 A.D.). The Bāṇas were a well spread out family and their scions are known to have held sway over different principalities from early times. It is likely that the Bāṇas who were ruling over this territory were subjected by Pulakāsin II and that, from that time onwards, they became the feudatories of the Chaḷukyas of Bāṇḍi. This direct relationship of the Chaḷukyas and the Bāṇas was for the first time brought to light by the Kottāru inscription of the 4th year of the reign of Chaḷukya Vijayāditya. This inscription also refers to Vāṇaraṇaṇa as the ruler of Vāṇarānaṇa-viśhaya. The name of the chieftain who was present at the time of the making of the grand recorded in the Kottāru inscription was wrongly read as Cāṇḍa Bāṇaraṇa. A careful study of the facsimile shows that the correct reading of the name is Chaḷki Bāṇaraṇa, the chieftain bearing this name being the same as the one figuring in our records A, C and E. Inscription A, which is dated in the 10th regnal year of Viṇavāda, as against the Kottāru inscription which is dated in the 4th regnal year of his successor Vijayāditya, is thus the earliest dated reference to Vāṇarāṇaṇa as a Chaḷukya feudatory. The mention of Chaḷki Lemurāṇaṇa and Chaḷki Mutturāṇaṇa as the rulers of Niṭūru and Chaṇḍiṅga respectively shows that scions of the Chaḷki family were entrusted with administrative responsibilities in the Tāḍapatri region during that period.

The gift land in inscription A is referred to as paṇṭhikāṭ-kāśṭeṣṭra (lines 9-10) without the mention of any measure like niṃrtana or maṛata. In B the 50 maṛata of gift-land is mentioned as paṇṇava (line 5). In inscription D the gift-land which was probably 40 maṛata in extent is called paṇṇava (line 9). In F the 25 maṛata of gift-land is called paṇṇava (line 9) and in the same verse Paṇṭhikāṭaṇa is stated to have received a gift of paṇṇava (lines 25-26), the extent of which is not specified. Similarly the extent of the paṇṇava gift-land stated in inscription G (lines 16-17) as given to Kāṇavādā is not given. Paṇṇava which also occurs in Kannada inscriptions as paṇṇaṣa, paṇṇava and paṇṇaya is apparently a tadbhava of Sanskrit paṇṭhikāṭa. Paṇṇava or paṇṇava is similarly derived from Sanskrit paṇṭhavaiṣṇvāṭi. The two terms paṇṇava and paṇṇava have therefore been interpreted elsewhere to mean that the recipient of the paṇṇava or paṇṇava land was to enjoy 50 or 25 per cent respectively of the income from such gift-land. We differ from this interpretation. In some early inscriptions from Karṇaḍaka the gift-lands measuring paṇṭhikāṭa niṃrtana and paṇṭhavaiṣṇvāṭi-niṃrtana are mentioned. In course of time the term niṃrtana as a land measure became less popular and was replaced by local measures such as māṭṭa, etc. In inscription A itself we have the instance of the gift-land being merely referred to as paṇṭhikāṭ-kūṭra (lines 9-10). It is likely that when, in course of time, paṇṭhikāṭa and paṇṭhavaiṣṇvāṭi became corrupted into paṇṇava and paṇṇava they came to denote any gift-land in general, without any reference to the exact measure of the land or lands gifted.

2 JIH., Vol. XXXIX, pp. 163 ff.
3 Above, Vol. XXXI, p. 70.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid., p. 71, text, line 3.
6 D. C. Sircar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, s.v.
SEVEN INScriPTIONS OF THE CHALUKYAS OF BADAMI

VIRAReDDIPALLE INSCRIPTION OF VINAyADITYA, YEAR 10
A—Virāreḍḍipalle Inscription of Vinayāditya, Year 10

This inscription was found engraved on a stone in a field to the west of the village which is a hamlet of Kamalapādu. This record refers itself to the 10th regnal year of Vinayāditya Satyāśraya who is endowed with the usual imperial titles of the rulers of his family. Since he is known to have ascended the throne some time in 681 A.D., this epigraph could be assigned to 690-91 A.D. As pointed out above the inscription refers to Vānarāju as the ruler of Vaṅganūr-nādu (lines 6-7).

The object of the record is to register the grant of a piece of land measuring 50 (pañcāśat-kshētra) by Chalki-Lēṃūrāju to Varachāmi-pāpa (i.e., the brāhmaṇa named Varachāmi) of Koriṇṭuru. The gift land was situated to the west, obviously of Nīṭṭhru. Then follows a list of witnesses which included the nādu and the mahājana (line 13). The record ends with the imprecatory verse Svadattāḥ, etc., which is, however, left incomplete.

As has been pointed out above, this inscription contains the earliest reference to Vānarāju. Of the geographical names occurring in this record, viz., Vaṅganūr-nādu, Nīṭṭhru, Koṃṭhru, Muḷupāḷ and Muḷumṛgu, the first one is represented by the territory in and around the present-day village Vaṅgi in the Tadipatri taluk. Nīṭṭhru is the same as modern Nīṭṭhru the find-spot of the inscription C. We are unable to locate the remaining place names on a modern map.

TEXT

1 Svasti[[-*]] Śri-Vinayā-
2 ditya-Satyāśraya-śrī-Prithvi-
3 vivallabha Mahārājādhirā-
4 ja parā[ra)mēśvara-bha[ta(tā)r[a][l[a [vl]-
5 jaya-rājya-saṃvatsarasambhul pa-
6 di agumēṇṭu Vānarājul-Vaṅgā-
7 nūr-ṇṇāṇḍ-član Chalki-Lēṃūrāju-
8 1 Nīṭṭhru Varachāmi-pāpa Ko[m]-
9 ṛṇēṇiki paschuma-diśāna paṅchā-
10 ṣat-kshētraṁb-ichchhī[-*] dāniki śākshi
11 Muḷupāḷ-Mu[tshi]ya Muḷumṛgu I-
12 lūṇchadārī-ḥōṇu Vaṇgāra-
13 bōḷu nāṅru mahājanaṁbu [subhāṁ]-
14 bu vrīḍhiyunikkā [-*] Svā-dattaṁ(ttaṁ) para-dā-
15 tāṁ vā yō harēta vasu

* From inked estampages.
* This name has not been read in the above A.B.Ep.
* The text stops here.
B.—Igadur Inscription of Vinayaditya, Year 14

This record was found engraved on a stone in the village on the way to Bandarlapalle. It refers itself to the 14th year of the reign of Vinayaditya and hence it may be assigned to 694-95 A.D. As in the case of A this record also ends with Vinayaditya with the usual imperial titles (lines 1-2) and refers to the same Vajra, as the ruler of Vainganur-nadu (line 3). It is further stated that Bandula Peenachiyaru was administering Pujanur (lines 3-4).

The object of the record is to register the gift of 50 maruthu of land measured by rachamana as pannasa to Kumara-sarma of Bharadwaja-sagatra, who is described as uchcha-pura, by Mallayaru, the younger brother of Peenachiyaru, who was at that time administering Igaduru.

This inscription is related to the Kotturu inscription, the donee Uchhapara Kumara-sarma also figuring in the same capacity in the later record. While in the present epigraph the donee receives 50 maruthu of land as pannasa from Mallayaru, he was given, according to the Kotturu inscription, 30 (not 50 as understood by the editor) maruthu of land at Peenakaparuti as pannasa by Pula Mahakki Beha Kanyakayaru.

The geographical names occurring in this inscription are Vainganur-nadu, already discussed, Pujanur and Igaduru. While Igaduru is the same as the village which has yielded this inscription, we are unable to identify Pujanur which was being administered by Peenachiyaru, the elder brother of the donor.

TEXT

1 Svasti [**] Sri-Vinayaditya-Satyashaya-Sri-Prithivallabh-Maharaja-
2 Parameswara-bhatara-sajaya-sahityasara-path payamalugu agunendu Va[ya]-
5 [bhadi] maqutupan pannasa udala-purva chesu ichchiri [**]

C.—Kotturu Inscription of Vijayaditya, Year 2

This inscription is engraved on a stone in a field belonging to Narayana Reddi to the west of the path leading to Kottapalle from Kotturu near Gudipadu. It is dated in the 2nd regnal year of the prathama-raja (line 1) of Vijayaditya-Satyashaya who receives the usual titles (lines 1-2). Of these maharajadhiraja is split and written as maharaja-adhiraja (lines 1-2). The expression prathama-raja, which defies easy interpretation, seems to merely allude to the pre-eminence of the emperor's reign. Since Vijayaditya is known to have ascended the throne in 696 A.D., the present record may be assigned to 697-98 A.D. Hitherto the Kotturu inscription dated in the 4th regnal

---

2 Above, Vol. XXX, p. 76.
3 From inked estampages.
4 The name of this division has been wrongly read as Vanga Bhatara in the A.R.E., 1939-40, No. B 5.
5 This name has been read as Pundadigura in the above report.
6 This has been read as Parinara in the said report.
7 This has been read as Uchcha-pura in the above report. It may be mentioned here that the Kotturu inscription also refers to the donee as Uchcha-pura.
CHANDANA INSCRIPTION OF VIJAYADITYA, YEAR 2

SCALE: One-nineth
year was the earliest record of this ruler from the Telugu country. The present inscription and inscription D which are dated in the 2nd regnal year thus become the earliest dated records of this ruler as yet discovered in the Telugu region.

As is the case with A and B this inscription also refers to Vañgaraju’s (line 3) rule over the Vañganuru region which is herein denoted as Vishaya (nāyika in A and B, lines 6-7 and 3 respectively). Chalki-Leenuraj, who also figures in A, is mentioned here as ruling from his headquarters at Nītūru (line 4).

The purpose of the record is to register the grant of 50 maḷuttu of land measured by rāchamana to Venaya-reṅgari who was probably the son of Gunḍiya-pāra of Vējāla of Gaṇḍallī-gōtra, which is probably a corrupt form of Kaṇḍinya-gōtra, by Chalki-Leenuraj when he was ruling from Nītūru.

The grant portion is followed in lines 6-8 by a list of names of witnesses. In lines 8 and 9 are given the names of four persons who are to be the protectors (kāpālu) of the grant-land (paṭṭu). Lines 9 and 10 contain an imprecatory passage in Telugu followed in lines 10 and 11 by the well known stanza Scaḍatām, etc., which is left incomplete as in A above.

The two geographical names Vañganura-Vishaya and Nītūru occurring in this inscription have already been discussed.

TEXT

1 Svasti [ | ] Śrīnāka-Vījāyāditya-saṁya-śri-Priṣ (Pri)thivibha(va)llaḥba-Ma(Ma)h[a] rā-
2 ju-adhiraja-Paramāvara-bhāṭaraja vijaya-rājya-saṁvarsabhu[ī]
3 prathama-rājakabuna-reṇḍ-agunāṇḍu Va(Vā)parājul Vagārīru
4 vishayabu ēṭa va(vā)ri pa(pā)la Chalki-Łenurajula(l) Nītu(tū)ru paṭṭu-
5 gana(śānu) ēṭuchu Gaṇḍallī-gōtraṁbuna Vējāla Gaṇḍiya-pāra Venaya-reṅgari[ki*]
6 rāṭraḥamana[śu]buna śobhadi maṇuttṛu ichchinad[ī | | ] dēn-
7 ki sākshi Gōnya-bōlu Kundākakalu Vēdārī-bōlu Valaya-
8 ru Neṇu-b[ś]ulu [ | | ] paṭṭi-gāpulu Janna-pāru Ājavapāru
9 Varasāṃ[śi]pāru Vachchanalu [ |[*] dēniki yakrabu vaḥchuvāru paṇcha-
10 mahāpātaka-sa[ṃ]yuktu-agulçi [ |[*] Sva-datta(dattāṁ) para-datta[m*] vā yō harēti
vasu-
11 niḥara(rā)m [ |[*] shashti(shṭi)[rś] -varu(r)sha-sa

D. — Chandana Inscription of Vījāyāditya, Year 2

This inscription* is engraved on a stone lying in survey No. 563-D to the east of the village. It belongs to the reign of Vījāyāditya-Satyaśraya. After the mention of the emperor’s name

---

1 From inked stammapes.
2 Read Satyāśraya.
3 Read Subrataśraya.
4 Read Vaṅganura. The name of this division has been read as Vaṅgaru-Vishaya in A, R. Ep., 1939-60, No. B 10.
5 The inscription stops here.
(line 1), in lines 2-4 the usual imperial titles are mentioned immediately followed by the name of Kattriraju (line 4). This has led to the conclusion that the record belongs to the reign of Krittivarman II, of which name Kattiraju is a well-known corruption. However, Vijayaditya is only the grandfather of Krittivarman II and it will be difficult to explain why he chose to associate his name with that of his grandfather. On the other hand in inscription G (lines 1-6) we find Krittivarman II’s name associated with that of his father Vikramaditya II which is a well-recognised practice. In the case of the present inscription, therefore, we assume that it belongs to the reign of Vijayaditya who may have had the secondary name of Kattiraju which never gained much importance. Like C the present record also is to be assigned to 698 A.D.

As in the case of A, B and C Gyanaprabha figures in this record also as the ruler of Vaŋganur-nāṇḍu (line 6). The object of the inscription is to record the grant of a pannavisa, measured by rākṣamāna, to Iraṭṭa-pāra of the Kāyapa-gōtra, who was probably a Śāmavēdin, by a chieftain of the Chalki family whose name in all probability was Mutturaju. The gift-land was situated in Cheñjunōna. We are unable to understand the passage in lines 10-11. The passage in lines 12-13 is again not happily constructed. But the idea seems to be that U-pāra and Kavaṣya-pāra were witnesses to the grant and that they were, on that account given 10 paṇḍan of land. Lines 13-14 speak of the prosperity of the donor Iraṭṭa-pāra, probably with reference to the land granted to him. Kumara is mentioned as yet another witness (line 14). The inscription was engraved by Kanakasiddhi (lines 14-15), and the letters were written by Rēṇḍi (line 15).

Line 16-17 are engraved on top of the boar figure and the former seems to read nāhaṇdi-maruntratu i.e., 40 marutu. It is possible that the land granted to Iraṭṭa-pāra, the extent of which is not specified earlier in the record, measured 40 marutu. Lines 17-19 contain the usual imprecatory passage in Telugu.

As has been pointed out above the reference to Chalki Mutturaju shows that scions of the Chalki family held administrative posts in the Tēḍapati-region.

The only new geographical name occurring in the record is Cheñjunōna which is the same as modern Chandana, the findspot of the inscription.

TEXT

1 Svasti [ ] Sri-Vijayaditya-Satyāśraya-
2 Prithu(thi)vāllabhā-Mahārā-
3 jāhīrāja-Paramēśvara-bhūṣā-
4 māl Kattiraju reṇ-āgu ēṇdu
5 prithivivvī-rājyaubhū chēyan
6 Va(Va)ñnarāJu-[V]aŋganur-nnāṇḍu ēḷan
7 Chalki-Mu [ttur]aj-Ju-Cheñjunōna

1 ibid., p.8.
2 From inked estampages.
3 This has been read in A, R. Ep., 1936-39, p. 9 as Bhaṭṭarāja-Kattiraju in the sense of belonging to the family of ‘i.e., Kattiraju, belonging to the family of (his grandfather) Vijayaditya.
4 The name of this division has been wrongly read as Ganges-Rēṇḍi in the said report. p. 9 and No. B 15.
5 This family name has been wrongly read as Cheñi in the above report (No. B 15) and Muttu rēṇḍi i.e., accordingly assigned to the Rēṇḍi Chōla family (p. 9).
6 This name has been read in the above report as Cheñjuṇa.
This inscription was found engraved on a stone belonging to Rangayana and lying to the west of the village Kottapalle which is a hamlet of Niṣṭūra, the last spot of inscription C. It belongs to the 3rd regnal year (i.e., 690 A.D.) of Vijayāditya-Satyaśraya, who is introduced in the usual manner. In this inscription also Vānurāja figures as the ruler of Varāganāru-vishaya (lines 9-11).

The inscription registers the grant of 50 māruṭu of land, measured by rāchamana, to Marishamiyaru (Marivāṇi Ṛ.), who was probably the son of Varasāmi-pāra and who belonged to the Kāsyapa-gotra (lines 21-22) by Chalki Lengurāju who was at that time administering Niṣṭūra (lines 12-14). Lines 23-37 contain an imprecise essay in Telugu and lines 27-32 give a list of five witnesses who were designated as mahājanas. Chalki Lengurāju is already known from inscriptions A and C above and also from the Kottur inscription already referred to. The donee of inscription A and one of the protectors of the gift-land in inscription C also bear the name Varasāmi-pāra. But it is not known if they are identical with the name-saka who is mentioned in this record probably as the father of the donee.

The geographical names occurring in this record have been discussed above.

TEXT

1 Svasti [ ] Śrīmān-
2 Vījāyādityātya[tya]-
3 Satyāšraya[ya*]-ēri-Pri(Pri)-
4 thīvīval[1st] abha - Mā(Ma)-
5 ha[hā]rājadhirāja-

1 This has been read in the above report as Sāmadīyār and taken to be the name of the donee. It is however, likely that Sāmadīyār is the corruption of Sāmādīyār.
2 This seems to be the laddhāna of Kaulika.
3 Lines 16 and 17 are engraved on top of the bear figure.
5 From inked estampages.
F.—Peddapēja Inscription of Kirtivarman II

This inscription is engraved on a stone lying in a field to the east of the village Peddapēja which is a hamlet of Yadiki. It belongs to the reign of Kirtivarman II who is given the other name of Anivārīta. This secondary name is not known from any other source. The ruler is not endowed with any of the titles of the Chalukyas of Bahānī and is merely introduced with the honorific Śrimāt (line 1). The inscription is not dated.

1 The name of this division is wrongly read as Vasūga-vishaya in A. R. Ep., 1959-60, No. B 7.
2 Better read viṣhayavābratejana.
3 Better read viṣhayavābratejana.
4 Read Viṣṭa-vābratejana.
5 Read Viṣṭa-vābratejana.
The object of the epigraph is to record the grant of 25 marutu of land at Kuḍalāra as pannasa to Duggaya, a brāhmaṇa of Vēgi (i.e., Vēṅgi) by Raṇavijaya when Prithvi Vāṇarāju and Paramēśvara were together (lines 4-6). It is not known if Paramēśvara refers to the supreme lord i.e., Kirtivarman II or is the proper name of a chieftain, who was jointly ruling over the region with Prithvi-Vāṇarāju. Probably the passage in lines 11-12 has to be read with reference to the grant portion and interpreted as meaning that Duggaya received the grant as payment for holding the office of the karaṇa of the nāyakas.

Lines 12-17 invoke prosperity on a number of karaṇas whose names are given. Lines 17-20 contain an imprecatory passage in Telugu. Lines 21-26 record the grant of pannasa land to one Perisāmiyaru. But the details are not clear.

Prithvi-Vāṇarāju is not mentioned as the administrator of any particular territory. It is, however, likely that he was the administrator either of Vaṅgaṇūru-nāḍu mentioned in inscriptions A-E above or of Suramaṇu-vishaya mentioned in G below. We do not know if this Prithvi-Vāṇarāju is the same as Vāṇarāju figuring in the five inscriptions edited above.

Of the new geographical names mentioned in the record Vēgi is same as the famous Vēṅgi, the capital of the Eastern Chālukyas. We are unable to identify Kuḍalāra in which the gift-land was situated.

TEXT

1 Svasti [‡] Śrīmat-
2 K[‡]ttiva[‡]jma-Ani-
3 vāritull-śan
4 Pri(Pr)thivi-Vāṇarā-
5 julum-Paramēśvarum
6 okkaṇa unṛi paraśi-
7 vagānu Raṇavijay-
8 yunṛu Kuḍalāra iruvadi-
9 ēnu marunturũ pannasṛ(a)
10 Vēgi-pāra Duggaya‡-
11 k-ichchhīnayadi nāyagu-
12 | karaṇabugānu [‡] Guṇḍya-
13 pāru Dolla-pāru Nigama [‡]

1 From inked stammapages.
2 The letter u is engraved below the line, in slightly smaller size.
3 This name has been read as Duggiya in the A. R. Ep., 1928-29, No. B 23.
4 DGA/73
G.—Chandana Inscription of Kirtivarman II

This inscription\(^1\) is engraved on a stone in a field (Survey No. 253) to the north-east of the village. The language of this inscription is Kannada. It endows the ruler with the usual titles and introduces him as Vikramaditya Satyashraya Kirtivarman Bhatara. It is obvious that the ruler's name is here suffixed to that of his father Vikramaditya II. It may be pointed out here that in an inscription\(^2\) from Paṭṭadakal, Badami taluk, Bijapur district, Vikramaditya II is introduced as Vijayaditya-Vikramaditya, Vijayaditya being his father.

In lines 7-10 it is stated that Bāṇavarāja was administering Suraṅgupata. The object of the record is to register the grant of a pannavisā to Kaṇavādi (Gaṇapati), probably the son of Kurunbharva by Dharaṇapanna the ruler of Cheṇjoṇe, who was the son of Irigaṇa, resident (okkal) of Tagaṇḍarāṇḍu (lines 10-12). Lines 17-20 state that the 96 prakriti were witnesses to the grant. Lines 21-25 contain an imprecation passage in Kannada. Lines 26-27, in Sanskrit language, state that the writing is that of Bharata. Line 28 gives the name of the engraver as Bāṇa.

Suraṅgupata, which was under the sway of Bāṇavarāja, is the same as Turamara-vishaya, an ancient sub-division in the Guttī region of Anantapur district. An inscription\(^3\) of Vijayaditya from Bēṭapalle, Guttī taluk, mentions a certain Bāṇavarāja as the then ruler of Turamara-vishaya. Tagaṇḍarāṇḍu (lines 10-11) of which Irigaṇa, the father of the donor is stated to be a resident, is to be identified with the region round about modern Dharmapuri in Tamilnadu, the headquarters of the district of the same name, the ancient name of which was Tagaṇḍar. The geographical name in the record, Cheṇjoṇe, which is mentioned as Cheṇjumone in inscription D, is the same as the findspot of this inscription as well as that of D.

---

\(^3\) SII, Vol. IX, part 1, No. 47.
1 O Svasti [||*] Śrī-Vikramā-
2 ditya-Satyāśraya-śrī-
3 Pri(Pri)ahivallava(bha)-Ma-
4 hārājādhirāja-
5 Paramāsvara-Kṛtṛti-
6 varmma-bhaṣāra-rājya-
7 dol Sura-
8 maru-vishaya[m]
9 Bānarakya
10 r-āle Tagaṇḍu-
11 r-āṇāḍ-okkall-Irigaṅga-
12 r-ṃmaṇa-Dharaṇappan
13 Cēbōjone ājuttu
14 Kuṇum-bārvvra
15 Kaṇavadige
16 koṭṭodu pannā-
17 viṣe [||*] āda-
18 ḍke sākṣhi ā-
19 ra tombhättāru
20 prakṛti [||*]
21 āda-
22 n-ālīvo-

¹ From inked stampages.
23 n-paścha-ma-
24 hāpātaka-
25 sa[thłyuktan-akku [\*]
26 Bharatasya
27 likhitam [\*]
28 Bāna vajjīge āgıldon [\*]